

## Assessment of Lifestyle and Life satisfaction among Rural and Urban Youth Praveen Kumar K.B.

Department of Psychology, Sahyadri Arts College, Shivamogga.

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.17307826>

### ABSTRACT:

The Aim was “To study the Life style and Life satisfaction among Rural and Urban Youth”. The purpose of the study was to find out current status of Life style and Life satisfaction among Rural and Urban Youth. The total sample of 100 (50 students from rural area and 50 students from urban area) young people. Age between 18–30 year old young people to participate in the study from different rural and urban areas. The participants completed Life style scale developed by S. K. Bawa and S. Kaur (2012) and Students’ life satisfaction scale (SLSS) developed by Huebner (1991) was used to measure life satisfaction. The obtained data was analyzed by using mean, SD and ‘t’- test. Further, Spearman’s coefficient of correlation was applied. The result of the study concluded that there is a significant difference between rural and urban youths on Life style, and there is a significant difference between life satisfaction among rural and urban youths. Also, there is a significant relationship between Life style and life satisfaction among rural and urban youth.

### KEYWORDS:

Lifestyle, Life satisfaction, Rural, Urban, Young people/ Youth

.....

### Introduction:

Youth is a dynamic stage in the life span development that can become a vibrant force in any society’s progress. Youth is generally considered to represent the future of any nation. No society can develop and grow without attaching significance to youth and harnessing their energy and potential. Substantial learning and acquisition of skills and attitude happens during this time. It is a stage marked by energy, enthusiasm, hope, openness to learn, motivation, and creativity that makes —youth a valuable human resource. According to World Population Prospects. The 2015 Revision ‘Population Database of United Nations Population’ Division, India has the world’s highest number of 10 to 24 year olds amounting to over 242 million young people (Youth in India, 2017). As per India’s Census 2011, youth (15–24 years) in India constitutes one-fifth

(19.1%) of India's total population and this is a considerable number that calls for reaping demographic dividend by harnessing the potential of the youth. Therefore the study of youth, their psychosocial development and related issues is an important endeavor. Family, school, neighborhood, social norms, peers, work settings etc. influence youth development and their formation of identity. But youth also struggle with lot of issues and challenges like that of life styles, identity formation, life unsatisfactory, building effective relationships, combating peer pressure, taking on mature roles and responsibilities, issues of body image and so on. United Nation Human Rights (2014) defines youth as those people belonging to the age group of 15 to 24 years.

In this study we have to measure the impact that current gravitate in lifestyle might have on the life satisfaction of individuals. In particular, there has been an increasing push towards non vegetarian and vegetarian and there has been a change towards the use of cycles, walking etc., highly because of ecological concerns. However, small attention has been given to the influence of those changes on individual welfare. Those little changes being seen as giving up current stress and therefore reducing individual well-being or as giving us a greater sense of purpose and therefore making us feel more satisfied with our life? Main lifestyle indicators in youth include diet, all physical activities, sleep hours and quality, use of screen, use of alcohol, drugs, tobacco, involve sexual behaviors, and mental health and all types of well-being. These behaviors are very highly influence a young person's short and long-term health outcomes like obesity, non-communicable diseases, and mental health issues. In this paper, we consider the impact of lifestyle on life satisfaction, a longer term, more deliberative measure of well-being. Lifestyle change to relieve the pressure on the National Health Service failure to address bad lifestyles was putting an "increasing strain" on the health service'. The centrality of the above message, the role of lifestyle in health especially youth, and the role of psychology in promoting and improving lifestyle in younger. Life satisfaction is a multi-dimensional concept. Life satisfaction is an individual's overall, subjective cognitive evaluation of their contentment with their life as a whole, distinct from temporary feelings of happiness. It is a stable, positive attitude toward one's life and is influenced by factors such as health, relationships, personal achievements, and achieving one's goals. High life satisfaction is associated with better

health, psychological well-being, and is considered a protective factor against stress and mental health issues. Unlike life satisfaction, life style has both emotional and cognitive components. The emotional component of life style is the frequency of both positive and negative impact, while life satisfaction is the cognitive component.

### **Review of literature:**

Grossman (1972) found that young individuals are both producers and consumers of health that requires continuous “investments” over time investment in health is costly. Youth must trade off time and resources devoted to health, such as exercising at a local gym or eating healthy food. Bang, Ha-Nam (2000) found that the relationship between job satisfaction and life satisfaction among adults. Job satisfaction and life satisfaction of Korea’s wage labourers are largely influenced by their life, social economic status or level of economic reward for their work.

Graham et al. (2004) report that in Russian youth from 1995–2000, happier teenagers did take better care of their health habits and could therefore have a healthier lifestyle. Grant et al. (2009) investigate that life satisfaction amongst young students in the UK and found that it is very positively correlated with physical exercise and fruit consumption. Welsch (2012) found that a strong significant relationship between both the variables like organic food consumption and health. Blanchflower et al. (2013) explored the teenager’s happiness and mental health increase with Fruits and Vegetables consumption, peaking at 7 portions in the UK. Shakya H B, Christakis N A (2017) and Pantic I (2014) explored that social media addiction has the potential to negatively impact of adolescent’s and teenager’s life satisfaction. Many researches on social media sites use and mental health have shown that long-term use of social media sites like Facebook is positively correlated with mental issues like stress, conflict, tension, anxiety, and depression, and negative effect on long-term happiness and life style. Mujcic and Oswald (2016) examined that grow up of Fruits and Vegetables consumption assumed of happiness. Particularly life satisfaction grows up by 0.24 life-satisfaction points when Fruits and Vegetables consumption increased by 8 portions a day in Australia.

**Aim:** The aim of this study to assess influence of life styles on life satisfaction among rural and urban Youth.

### **Objectives of the study:**

1. To assess the Life style among Rural and Urban Youth.

2. To study the Life satisfaction among Rural and Urban Youth.
3. To know the correlation between Life style and Life satisfaction among Rural and Urban Youth.

**Hypotheses:**

1. There would be significant difference in the Life style among Rural and Urban Youth.
2. There would be significant difference in the Life satisfaction among Rural and Urban Youth.
3. There would be significant correlation between Life style and Life satisfaction among Rural and Urban Youth.

**Variables:**

1. Life style
2. Life satisfaction
3. Youths (Rural and Urban)

**METHOD****Sample:**

Convenience sampling technique was adopted to draw the sample. Total sample of present study is 100 (50 students from rural area and 50 students from urban area) young people. Age between 18–30 year old young people to participate in the study from different rural and urban areas in two district of Shivamogga and Chikkamanglore. Karnataka state. India.

**Tools used for the Study:**

1. Life style scale developed by S. K. Bawa and S. Kaur (2012). It consisting Items 60, and 6 Dimensions are there like Health-Conscious Life Style, Academic-Oriented Life Style, Career-Oriented Life Style, Socially-Oriented Life Style, trend-Seeking Life Style, Family Oriented Life Style. Five rating scale, Strongly Agree, Agree, Indifferent, Disagree, and Strongly Disagree. Positive items are scored as 4, 3, 2, 1, 0, while negative items are scored as 0, 1, 2, 3, 4 for the respective responses. Validity is 0.86. Reliability is 0.96.
2. Students' life satisfaction scale (SLSS) developed by Huebner (1991). This is a self-report questionnaire researcher designed to assess overall life satisfaction. 9 items are there and 4 point scale. High score indicate high life satisfaction low score indicate low level of life satisfaction. The SLSS is a widely used in psychology field and valuable tools for research with students aged 7 and above.

**Data collection procedure:**

The researcher collected the data from Shivamogga and Chikkamangalore district young people. Karnataka state, India. Then researcher explained about the purpose and procedures of psychological tests to the sample and thus administered both the tests. After collecting the data, all the questionnaires were scored as per the scoring pattern prescribed in the manuals.

**Statistical analyses:**

Mean, SD, 't' test and Spearman's coefficient of correlation is used for the data analysis.

**RESULTS AND DISCUSSION**

**Table 1: shows the Mean, SD, and 't' value of overall Life style among Rural and Urban Youth.**

Variable	Rural Youth (N=50)		Urban Youth (N=50)		t value
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	
Life style	49.32	11.27	46.16	9.78	2.35**

**\*\*Significant at 0.05 levels**

Table no-1 reveals the result of Life style among Rural and Urban Youth. The overall Life style among Rural and Urban Youth. Rural youths mean score is =49.32, SD= 11.27. And the Urban youths mean score is = 46.16, SD= 9.78. The obtained 't' value is 2.35, which is significant at 0.05 level. The rural youths have high life styles then compared to urban youths or young people.

**Table 2: shows the Mean, SD, and 't' value of overall life satisfaction among Rural and Urban Youth.**

Variable	Rural Youth (N=50)		Urban Youth (N=50)		t-value
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	
Life satisfaction	49.23	11.03	56.33	15.89	2.89**

**\*\* Significant at 0.05 levels.**

Table no-2 reveals the result of life satisfaction among Rural and Urban Youth. The overall life satisfaction among Rural and Urban Youth. Rural youth mean score is =49.23 SD= 11.03. And the Urban youths mean score is = 56.33., SD= 15.89. The obtained 't' value is 2.89 which is significant at 0.05 level. This shows that the urban youth have high life satisfaction then compared to rural youth or young people.

**Table 3: Shows Correlation between life style and life satisfaction among Rural and Urban Youth.**

Variables	N	r	P
Life style	100	0.413	0.026*
Life satisfaction			

**\*Significant at the 0.05 level**

Table no –3 reveals that the Spearman correlation of life style and life satisfaction among Rural and Urban Youth r value is 0.413, and the corresponding p–value is 0.026. And it is significant at 0.05 level. Analysis of the table indicates that there is a significant positive correlation between life style and life satisfaction among Rural and Urban Youth or young people. The earlier studies have shown that there was a positive correlation 0.543 between quality of life and life satisfaction among senior citizen ( Lalitha Kumari T & Hemalatha, S 2019).

#### **Conclusion:**

1. There is a significant difference between rural and urban youth on life style. The young people of rural area have high level of life style then compared to young people of urban area.
2. There is a significant difference between rural and urban youth on life satisfaction. The young people of urban area have highly life satisfied then compared to young people of rural area.
3. There is a significant relationship between life style and life satisfaction among Rural and Urban Youth or young people.

#### **References:**

1. Arnet J. J. (2000). Emerging adulthood: A theory of development from the late teens through the twenties. *American Psychologist*, 55 (3), 469–480.
2. Adolescents in India: A desk review of existing evidence and behavior programs and policies (2013). New Delhi: Population Council & UNICEF.
3. Bang, Ha–Nam(2000). “A Study on the Main Factors and Interaction Effects for Job Satisfaction and Life Satisfaction,” *Journal of Labor Economics*, Vol. 23, pp.133–154.
4. Blanchflower, D. G., Oswald, A. J., & Stewart–Brown, S. (2013). Is psychological well–being linked to the consumption of fruit and vegetables? *Social Indicators Research*, 114(3), 785–801. [https:// doi. org/ 10. 1007/ s11205- 012- 0173-y](https://doi.org/10.1007/s11205-012-0173-y)
5. Mahabaleshwar Rao, Gender, School Education (2017), Vismaya Prakashana.
6. Graham, C., Eggers, A., & Sukhtankar, S. (2004). Does happiness pay? In *Challeng-*

- es for quality of life in the contemporary world (pp. 179–204). Springer, Dordrecht. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jebo.2003.09.002>
7. Grant, N., Wardle, J., & Steptoe, A. (2009). The relationship between life satisfaction and health behavior: Across-cultural analysis of young adults. *International Journal of Behavioral Medicine*, 16(3), 259–268. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12529-009-9032-x>
  8. Grossman, M. (1972). On the concept of health capital and the demand for health. *Journal of Political Economy*, 80(2), 223–255.
  9. [https://ntgc.in/wp-content/uploads/2020/04/Psychology\\_RS\\_Gender-Role\\_Attitude.pdf](https://ntgc.in/wp-content/uploads/2020/04/Psychology_RS_Gender-Role_Attitude.pdf)
  10. <https://www.frontiersin.org/articles/10.3389/fpsyg.2015.01511/full>.
  11. Lalitha Kumari T & Hemalatha, S (2019) assessment of quality of life and life satisfaction among senior citizens in selected areas of tirupati. *International Journal of Health Sciences & Research*. Vol.9; Issue: 5.
  12. Monica Baiju and Dr. Raja Lakshmi V R (2021) Academic Stress and Psychological Well-Being among College Students. *The International Journal of Indian Psychology* ISSN 2348-5396 (Online) | ISSN: 2349-3429 (Print) Volume 9, Issue 3.
  13. Mujic, R., & Oswald, A. J. (2016). Evolution of well-being and happiness after increases in consumption of fruit and vegetables. *American Journal of Public Health*, 106(8), 1504–1510. <https://doi.org/10.2105/AJPH.2016.303260>
  14. Pantic I. (2014) online social networking and mental health.” *Cyber psychology, Behavior, and Social Networking* 17(10):652–657.
  15. Unicef (2017) gender equality: glossary of terms and concepts, 2017, south Asia.
  16. United Nations Human Rights.,(2014). Gender stereotypes and Stereotyping and women’s rights. United Nations Human Rights office of the commissioner. New York.
  17. Welsch, H. (2012). Organic food and human health: Instrumental variables evidence (Vol. 349, No. 12). Oldenburg Discussion Papers in Economics.

**Funding:**

This study was not funded by any grant.

**Conflict of interest:**

The Authors have no conflict of interest to declare that they are relevant to the content of this article.

**About the License:**

© The Authors 2024. The text of this article is open access and licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License.