# Evaluation of Quality of Life for Secondary School Students in Kirkuk City

# تقويم جودة الحياة لطلبة المدارس الثانوية في مدينة كركوك

**Hewa Sittar Salih, PhD***

**Instructur, College of Nursing, University of Kirkuk**
**Email: Hewa.sophy@yahoo.com**

**المستخلص :**

**الأهداف**: تهدف الدراسةَ إلى تُقويّمَ جودة الحياة لطلبة المدارس الثانويةِ في مدينةِ كركوك بالإضافة إلى إيجاد العلاقة بين هذه الجودة لهؤلاء الطلبة وبعض الخصائص الديموغرافية مثل العمر والجنس والمستوى التعليمي للأبوين.....أين بقية المتغيرات؟

**المنهجية**: أجريت دراسة عرضية على عينة عنقودية مكونة من (١٠٠) طالب وطالبة تتراوح أعمارهم بين (١٣- ٢٤) سنةً من المدارس الثانويةِ في مدينةِ كركوك وللفترة من السابع من تموز ٢٠١٤ ولغاية السابع من أيار ٢٠١٥، ولغرض جمع المعلومات صممت إستمارة إستبيانة مكونة من ثلاثة أجزاء: الجزء الأول شمل الخصائص الديموغرافية ويتضمن من (٧) فقرات والجزء الثاني شمل الخصائص الطبية ويتضمن من (٣) فقرات والجزء الثالث ويشمل جودة حياة الطلبة ويتكون من (٢٥) فقرة. بطريقة المقابلة الشخصية مع عينة البحث جمعت البيانات وتم تحليلها بإستخدام إسلوب التحليل الإحصائي الوصفي والذي يشمل التوزيع التكراري والنسبة المئوية والوسط الحسابي للقيم، وإسلوب التحليل الإحصائي الإستنتاجي والذي يشمل إختبار مربع كاي

والإختبار التائي وتحليل التباين بإستخدام برنامج الحزم الإحصائية للعلوم الإجتماعية (SPSS)النسخة السابعة عشرة.

**النتائج** : أظهرت النتائج بأن أغلب أعمار الطلبة كَانتْ بين (١٧-٢٠) سنة وتُمثّلُ (٦٥%) و(٥٣ %) مِنْ العيّنةِ كَنْ فتيات. فيما يتعلق بالسكنِ، فإن (٨٨ %) كَانواْ يَعِيشُون في المناطق الحضرية. إستنتجت الدراسة وجود علاقة قوية بين جودة الحياة للطلبة وأعمارهم.

**التوصيات:** أوصت إلى ضرورة وجود موظفَ خدمات إجتماعية في المدرسةِ يقوم على حَلّ مشاكلِ الطلبة. تأَسّيسْ مركزَ حديثَ للإباء والأمهاتِ لتَعليمهم حول إحتياجات الطلبة. يَحتاجونَ منهجَ المدارس الثانوية يَجِبُ أَنْ يَتضمّنَ المنهج الدراسي للمدارس الثانوية المواضيعَ التي تَتعلّقُ بجودة الحياة.

## Abstract

**Objective(s):** To evaluate the quality of life among secondary and to find out the relationship between students' quality of life and their socio-demographic characteristics of age, gender, residence, marital status, father's and mother's education, and family financial status in Kirkuk City.

**Methodology:** A cross-sectional study is conducted on (100) student who are boys and girls aged (13 to 24) years old. These subjects are studying at secondary schools in Kirkuk City. The study is carried out at secondary schools in Kirkuk City from 7th July 7th 2014 to May 7th 2015. A questionnaire is constructed for the purpose of the study which is consisted of three parts: The first part includes the demographic data (7) items, the second part is concerned with the

medical data which is consisted of (3) items and the third part is dealing with the quality of life of students which is consisted of (25) items to evaluate the quality of life among these students. Data are collected through the use of the questionnaire and the interview technique. They are analyzed through the application of descriptive statistical analysis approach which includes frequency, percentage, mean and mean of scores and inferential statistical data analysis approach which includes chi-squared test, T-test and analysis of variance (ANOVA) by using the statistical package of social science (SPSS) version (17).

**Results:** The study finds that most of the students are between (17-20) years old who are accounted for (65 %). The results depict that (53%) of the sample is girl. With regard to their residence, (88%) of them are living in urban areas. Also the study concludes highly significant relationship between the quality of life of these students and their age.

**Recommendations:** The study recommends that social worker should be present in schools in order to solve their problems. New center, for fathers and mothers, should be established to teach them about how to deal with the students' needs. Secondary school curriculum should include topics concerning the quality of life for these students.

**Keywords: Evaluation, Quality of life, Secondary school students**

**Introduction**

The Quality of life has been defined as abroad ranging concept affected in a complex way by such things as physical health,

psychological state , level of independence, social relationship to the environment. This definition lays emphasis on the subjective nature of quality of life, and also on the need to explore all those factors considered to have a significant impact on quality of life[1] .

Health related quality of life (HRQOL) has joined morbidity and mortality as a health outcome of interest in recent years, much of the research on the HRQOL benefits of physical activity has focused on populations with specific disease states, e.g. coronary heart disease, osteoarthritis , kidney disease , and liver disease[2].

The measures of health related quality make to describe their experiences of health and illness, this feature is what distinguishes them from measures of disability, which enquire about the ability to complete specific tasks such as climbing stairs or dressing oneself .Health Related Quality of Life (HRQOL) is a broader concept concerned with whether disease or impairment limits ones' ability to fulfill a normal role (for example, whether the inability to climb stairs limits one at work). However, the measures do not consider how people arrive at these judgments. Understanding mechanism through which health, illness, and health care interventions influence quality of life ( i.e., the determinants of health related quality of life).[3]

Adolescent generally begins with puberty and encompasses the ages between 10 and 24; it consist of early adolescence (10-14 age), middle adolescence (15-17 age), and late adolescence (18-20 age). Many young people engage in a wide range of unhealthy habits, such as inadequate nutritional intake, rest and exercise, as well as risk behaviors, such as tobacco and drug use that lead to adverse health

outcomes. Greater awareness of lifestyle factors offers major advantages. Lifestyle factors can be potent in determining both physical and mental health. In modern affluent societies, the diseases exacting the greatest mortality and morbidity such as cardiovascular disorders, obesity, diabetes, and cancer—are now strongly determined by lifestyle. Differences in just four lifestyle factors—smoking, physical activity, alcohol intake, and diet—exert a major impact on mortality, and "even small differences in lifestyle can make a major difference in health status.[4]

**Methodology**

A cross-sectional study is conducted on a cluster sample of (100) students who are ranging in age from **13 to 24** years old. These students are studying at secondary schools in Kirkuk City from July 7th 2014 to May 7th 2015 . The study aims at evaluating the quality of life for secondary schools' students in Kirkuk City. Through extensive review of relevant literature, a questionnaire is constructed for the purpose of the study. The questionnaire is comprised of three parts. **Part I:** this part is consisted of (7) items which are focusing on the students' demographic characteristics of age, gender, residence, marital status, father's and mother's education, and family financial status. **Part II:** This part is consisted of (3) items which are dealing with the medical information. **Part III:** This part is consisted of (25) items which are measuring the quality of life. Overall items included in this part are scored and rated as (1) for never, (2) for Sometimes and (3) for always. Internal consistency reliability is determined for the study instrument with Cronbach alpha correlation coefficient of (r=0.85) for the internal scale and content validity is determined through panel of experts. Data are collected through the use of the constructed questionnaire and the interview technique as a means of data collection. Data are analyzed through the application of descriptive statistical analysis approach which includes frequency, percentage, mean and mean of scores and inferential statistical data analysis approach which includes chi-squared test, T-test and analysis

of variance (ANOVA) by using the statistical package of social science (SPSS ) version (17) at (P-value ≤ 0.05). Mean of scores is measured as **Highly significant**= ≥ 2.4, **Moderate**= 1.7-2.3, and **Low**= ≤ 16.

## Results

**Table (1): Distribution of the sample according to the socio-demographic characteristics (N=100)**

| Socio-demographic characteristics | Frequency | Percent |
|---|---|---|
| **Age** | | |
| **13-16years** | **29** | **29.0** |
| **17-20years** | **65** | **65.0** |
| **21-24years** | **6** | **6.0** |
| **Total** | **100** | **100.0** |
| **Gender** | | |
| **Boy** | **47** | **47.0** |
| **Girl** | **53** | **53.0** |
| **Total** | **100** | **100.0** |
| **Residence** | | |
| **Urban** | **88** | **88.0** |
| **Rural** | **12** | **12.0** |
| **Total** | **100** | **100.0** |
| **Marital status** | | |
| **Single** | **100** | **100.0** |
| Married | 0 | 0 |
| **Total** | 100 | 100.0 |
| **Father's Education** | | |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Unable to read and write | 1 | 1.0 |
| read and write | 13 | 13.0 |
| Primary school graduate | 8 | 8.0 |
| Intermediate school graduate | 7 | 7.0 |
| Secondary school Graduate | 30 | 30.0 |
| Institute | 12 | 12.0 |
| College | 29 | 29.0 |
| **Total** | 100 | 100% |
| **Mother's Education** | | |
| Unable to read and write | 10 | 10.0 |
| read and write | 4 | 4.0 |
| Primary school graduate | 16 | 16.0 |
| Intermediate school graduate | 13 | 13.0 |
| Secondary school graduate | 20 | 20.0 |
| Institute | 24 | 24.0 |
| College | 13 | 13.0 |
| **Total** | 100 | 100% |
| **Family Financial Status** | | |
| Poor | 6 | 6.0 |
| Middle | 36 | 36.0 |
| Good | 41 | 41.0 |
| Very Good | 17 | 17.0 |
| Total | 100 | 100.0 |

This table demonstrates the socio-demographic characteristics of the whole study sample. The results indicate that the high percent

of students' age is between (13-24) years and constitute (65%). Also the results present that (53%) of sample were girl. With regard to their residence, (88.0%) are living in urban areas. The entire sample is single and constituted (100%). Concerning father educational level, (30%) of the sample are secondary school graduates and (30%) are college graduate while (24 %) of the mothers are institute graduates. The financial status of the family depicts that (41 %) of sample have good financial status.

**Table (2): Mean of Scores for quality of life items**

| List | **Items** | Always | | Some time | | Never | | MS | Severity |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | F | % | F | % | F | % | | |
| 1 | Do you feel that your life is enjoyable? | 16 | 16.0 | 70 | 70.0 | 14 | 14.0 | 2.0 | Moderate |
| 2 | Do you feel positively about your future**?** | 40 | 40.0 | 50 | 50.0 | 10 | 10.0 | 2.3 | Moderate |
| 3 | Do you have good feeling in your life**?** | 41 | 41.0 | 50 | 50.0 | 9 | 9.0 | 2.3 | Moderate |
| 4 | Do you have efficiency in your life**?** | 80 | 80.0 | 16 | 16.0 | 4 | 4.0 | 2.7 | Highly Significant |

| | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 5 | Do you feel frustrated about how you live? | 11 | 11.0 | 65 | 65.0 | 24 | 24.0 | 1.8 | Moderate |
| 6 | Do you feel anxious? | 22 | 22.0 | 68 | 68.0 | 10 | 10.0 | 2.1 | Moderate |
| 7 | Do your sadness impact on daily activity**?** | 29 | 29.0 | 62 | 62.0 | 9 | 9.0 | 2.2 | Moderate |
| 8 | Do you feel isolated**?** | 17 | 17.0 | 52 | 52.0 | 31 | 31.0 | 1.8 | Moderate |
| 9 | Do you feel safe in your life? | 48 | 48.0 | 31 | 31.0 | 21 | 21.0 | 2.2 | Moderate |
| 10 | Do your life sites provide rest for you**?** | 61 | 61.0 | 31 | 31.0 | 8 | 8.0 | 2.5 | Highly Significant |
| 11 | Do you have financial problem? | 10 | 10.0 | 26 | 26.0 | 64 | 64.0 | 1.4 | Low |
| 12 | Do you reach primary health easily**?** | 45 | 45.0 | 37 | 37.0 | 18 | 18.0 | 2.2 | Moderate |
| 13 | Do you feel that you are neglected? | 10 | 10.0 | 50 | 50.0 | 40 | 40.0 | 1.7 | Moderate |
| 14 | Do you depend on your friends? | 41 | 41.0 | 48 | 48.0 | 11 | 11.0 | 2.3 | Moderate |
| 15 | Are you satisfied about your sleep? | 30 | 30.0 | 46 | 46.0 | 24 | 24.0 | 1.9 | Moderate |

| | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 16 | Are you satisfied about your ability? | 56 | 56.0 | 35 | 35.0 | 9 | 9.0 | 2.4 | Highly Significant |
| 17 | Do you feel satisfied about family support**?** | 69 | 69.0 | 27 | 27.0 | 4 | 4.0 | 2.6 | Highly Significant |
| 18 | Are you satisfied about friends' support? | 29 | 29.0 | 62 | 62.0 | 9 | 9.0 | 2.2 | Moderate |
| 19 | Are you satisfied about your ability in decision making**?** | 44 | 44.0 | 50 | 50.0 | 6 | 6.0 | 2.3 | Moderate |
| 20 | Are you satisfied about Team teaching? | 30 | 30.0 | 41 | 41.0 | 29 | 29.0 | 2.0 | Moderate |
| 21 | Are you satisfied about healthy service which is introduced to you**?** | 28 | 28.0 | 45 | 45.0 | 27 | 27.0 | 2.0 | Moderate |
| 22 | Are you satisfied about your class room environment? | 13 | 13.0 | 34 | 34.0 | 53 | 53.0 | 1.6 | Low |
| 23 | Are you satisfied about your study environment in your home**?** | 54 | 54.0 | 38 | 38.0 | 8 | 8.0 | 2.4 | Highly Significant |
| 24 | Are you satisfied about your nutrition**?** | 64 | 64.0 | 29 | 29.0 | 7 | 7.0 | 2.5 | Highly Significant |

| | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 25 | Does your religious faith give you strength to face problems? | 44 | 44.0 | 49 | 49.0 | 7 | 7.0 | 2.3 | Moderate |

**$X^2$ Observed** = 57.781 **Degree of Freedom** = 4 8 **$X^2$ Critical** =15.51

**Highly significant**= ≥ 2.4, **Moderate**= 1.7-2.3, **Low**= ≤ 16

This table indicates that the mean of scores is moderately significant on items (1,2,3,5,7,8,9,12,13,14,15,18,19, 20,21 and 25) , low significant on items (11 and 22) and highly significant on items (4,10,16,17,23 and 24).

**Table (3): One–way analysis of variance for the difference between students' quality of life items and their age**

| Categories | Source of variance | Sum of square | Mean of square | F Observed |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Quality of life items** | Between Groups | 148.668 | 74.334 | 3.855 Significant |
| | Within Groups | 1850.969 | 19.281 | |
| | Total | 1999.636 | | |

F Critical = 2.99 Degree of freedom= 98

This table shows that there are significant differences between students' quality of life items and their age at probability level of ≤ 0.05.

**Table (4): T-test for comparison between students' quality of life items regarding to their gender**

| Categories | Gender | Number | Mean | Standard Deviation | T Observed | Probability level ≤ 0.05 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Quality of life** | Male | 47 | 53.8936 | 4.00127 | 1.765 | Not Significant |
| | Female | 52 | 55.4808 | 4.85269 | | |

T critical = 1.96 Degree of freedom=98

This table depicts that there is no significant difference between students' quality of life items regarding to their gender at probability level of ≤ 0.05.

**Table (5): One–way analysis of variance for the difference between students' quality of life items and father's and mother's education**

| Categories | Source of variance | Sum of square | Mean of square | F Observed |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| quality of life item | Between Groups | 70.109 | 11.685 | .763 Not Significant |
| | Within Groups | 1929.527 | 20.973 | |
| | Total | 1999.636 | | |

F Critical = 2.99 Degree of freedom= 98

This table presents that there are no significant differences between students' quality of life items and father's and mother's education at probability level of $\leq 0.05$.

**Table (6): One–way analysis of variance for the difference between students' quality of life items and family financial status**

| Categories | Source of variance | Sum of square | Mean of square | F Observed |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| quality of life item | Between Groups | 29.467 | 9.822 | 0.474 Not Significant |
| | Within Groups | 1970.170 | 20.739 | |
| | Total | 1999.636 | | |

F Critical = 2.99 Degree of freedom= 98

This table reveals that there are **no significant** differences between students' quality of life items and their family financial status at probability of $\leq 0.05$ .

**Discussion**

## Part I: Discussion of students' socio-demographic characteristics

Analysis of such characteristics depicts that high percentage of the students' age is (17-20) years which constitutes to (65 %) of the total sample (Table 1). This finding can be interpreted in a way that the vast majority of students in our nation have age of (15-20) years.

The results reveal that most of the students are girls and constitute to (53%) of the total sample (Table 1). This finding provides evidence that the number of girls is more than males in our nation. The results also show that (88%) of them are living in urban areas (Table 1).

In addition, it appears that all he sample is single and constitute (100%) because this age is considered not the perfect age for marriage (Table 1).

Concerning parents' education, (30%) of the sample are secondary school graduates and (30%) are college graduates. While (24 %) of mothers are institute graduates. In a study about health promoting quality of life and its related factors adolescent Girls. It has been found that most

of mothers (32.4%) and fathers (30.5%) had high school diploma. Of the mothers, (77.7%) are housewives and (49.4%) of the fathers have no governmental jobs and (77%) of these parents have enough income for their lives [5].

With regard to family financial status, Most of the students (41.0 %) have good financial status (Table 1).

**أين مناقشة بقية النتائج؟**

## Part II: Secondary schools students' quality of life

**هنا تكون المناقشة على الجدول الجديد لهدف الدراسة الأول!بحيث يكون قبل جدول رقم (٢) وكذلك مناقشة جدول رقم (٢) هنا أيضا!**

## Part III: The relationship between secondary schools students' quality of life and their demographic characteristics

It has been noticed through the data analysis that there are significant differences between the secondary schools students' quality of life and their age at probability level of ≤ 0.05 (Table 3). These findings have disagreed with that of

others' work which indicates no relationship between total score of quality of life style and age and residential place[6][7]. In another work, negative significant correlation between quality of life and age is determined [8].

Relative to parents' education, the study finds father's and mother's education do not make any influence on students' quality of life at probability level of $\leq 0.05$ (Table 4). These findings disagree with others work that finds a significant relationship between quality of life and parent's educational level [8]. Other people's work has determined a significant relationship between quality of life fathers' level of education [7] and mothers' level of education[9] .

In a study on health promotion behaviors and high risk behaviors of Turkey young people, the findings reveal that students of highly educated mothers has high quality of life than students whose mothers are low educated [10].

Regarding to family financial status, the findings depict that there are **no significant** differences between students' quality of life and their family financial status at probability level of $\leq 0.05$ (Table 5). The explanation of this result related to good income of the families there for don't impact on quality of life. يجب ذكر شئ هنا من مصدر!

أين مناقشة بقية النتائج؟

**Recommendations:**

1. Social worker should be present in schools in order to solve students' problems.
2. Establishing modern center to fathers and mothers of students to teach them about how to deal with students' needs.
3. Secondary school curriculum should include topics concerning students' quality of life.
4. Further studies can be conducted on large sample size and wide range scale characteristics.

**References:**

1. Daradkeh,T. and Haheeb, T.: Quality of Life of Patients with Schizophphrenia. **Eastern Mediterranean Health Journal**. 11(5), 2005, p. 898.
2. eterson, J.; Lowe, J.; Peterson, A. and Janz, K.: The Relationship between Active Living and Health Related Quality of Life. **Health Education Research Theory and Practice**, 21, 2005, pp.146-147.
3. Chai, W.; Nigg, C.; Pagano, L. and Dishman , R.: Associations of Quality of Life with Physical Activity, **International Journal of Behavioral Nutrition and Physical Activity**, 83( 7), 2010, PP.83-84.

4. Khaw, K.; Wareham, N.; Bingham, S.; Welch, A.; Luben, R. and Day, N.: Combined Impact of Health Behaviors and Mortality in Men and Women. **Obstetrical and Gynecological Survey**, 63, 2008, pp. 376–377.
5. Golmakani, N .; Naghibi, F. and Esmaily, H.: Health Promoting Lifestyle and Its Related Factors in Adolescent Girls. **Journal of Midwifery and Reproductive Health**, 1(1), 2013, pp. 42-49.
6. Peker, K. and Bermark, G.: Predictors of Health Promoting Behaviors among Freshman Dental Students at Istanbul University. **Journal of Dental Education**, 75(3), 2011, pp. 413-420.
7. Mansourian, M.; Ghorbani, M.; Solaimani, M.; Masoodi, R.; Rahimi, E. and Asayesh, H.: A Survey of Lifestyle and Its Influential Factors Among the University Student in Gorgan. **Journal of Jahrom University of Medical Sciences**, 7(1), 2009, pp. 62-69.
8. Mohammadian, H.; Eftekhar, H.; Taghdisy, M.; Mousavi, G. and Sabahi, M.: Psychometric Properties of the Health-Promoting Lifestyle Profile (HPLP II) in a Sample of Iranian Adolescents. **Journal of the Iranian Institute for Health Sciences Research**, 12(2), 2013, pp. 370-404.
9. Motlagh, M.; Kelishadi, R.; Heshmat, R.; Amynayy, T.; Dashti, M. and Ardalan, G.: **Study of Health-related Behaviors of Students**. Tehran: Vista, 2010.
10. Ortabag, T.; Ozdemir, S.; Bakir, B. and Tosun, N.: Health

Promotion and Risk Behaviors among Adolescents in Turkey. **The**

**Journal of School Nursing**, 27(4), 2011, pp. 304-315.