SELF-ESTEEM AND QUALITY OF LIFE AMONG STUDENTS WITH AND WITHOUT PHYSICAL DISABILITY

Humaira Murtaza
Department of Psychology, University of Gujrat, Pakistan
humaira.murtaza@uog.edu.pk

Noreena Kausar
Department of Psychology, University of Gujrat, Pakistan
noreena.kausar@uog.edu.pk

Maria Mazhar[1]
Department of Psychology, University of Gujrat, Pakistan
Mariamazhar741@gmail.com

ABSTRACT
The study was conducted to determine the relationship between self-esteem (SE) and quality of life (QOL) among students with and without physical disabilities. Further, it also explored the gender differences in the level of self-esteem and quality of life in participants. Through purposive sampling 200 participants (100 physically disabled & 100 normal) were selected from 4 universities of Gujrat and Islamabad. The WHO Quality of Life (WHOQOL Group, 1998) and State Self-esteem Scale (Heatherton & Polivy, 1991) were used for data collection. Results revealed that self-esteem has a significant positive relationship with quality of life (r=.89, p=.00). Results indicate that there was a significant difference in the scores of self-esteems and quality of life among normal and disabled students. It was also highlighted that normal and physically disabled female student had a low level of self-esteem and quality of life than normal and physically disabled male students. The findings also indicated that self-esteem is a significant predictor of quality of life among students. This study concluded that the physical disability of participants has not significantly affected the individual's self-perceptions but it also plays role in determining the quality of life.
Keywords: Self-esteem, quality of life, physical disability, students, gender difference, University.

INTRODUCTION

A physical disability is a restriction on a person's ability to carry out regular daily tasks and activities as a result of physical limitations. The person may not be able to move, walk while standing, use their limbs, or function. Due to this restriction or physical body part limitations, the person may not have the stamina to complete daily tasks (James, 2016). Since 1998, there has been a good deal of discussion about the prevalence and scope of disability. According to the World Health Survey conducted between 2002 and 2004, Pakistan has a 13.4% prevalence of disability (World Report on Disability, 2011).

People with disability face many problems in their social, personal, and professional life. They face difficulty while interacting with society. Due to physical disability, these people feel restricted in their performance. These people need assistance to do everyday tasks and hence become dependent on others. Physically disabled people have been, unfortunately, neglected in our society and are not given much attention. These people have limited opportunities and facilities due to physical disability (Mushtaq & Akhouri 2016). That is why there is a need to give importance to these people and highlight their problems and makes efforts to improve their lives. SE and QOL are very important perspectives of the life of an individual and these variables have been studied in the context of physical disability reflecting their importance in the lives of physically disabled individuals (Civan, 2014). Physical disability is a restriction of a person in performing daily functions and activities of normal life due to the limitation of the physical aspect of a person (James, 2016). The WHO characterize the term quality of life as any individual's impression of his or her circumstance throughout everyday life and with

---

[1] Corresponding author

regards to their conviction framework and culture in which those people live, as indicated by their objectives, concerns, and to some degree, they thought about their particular principles (WHOQOL Group,1998). The QOL is a multi-dimensional concept. The World Health Organization- QOL consists of four areas physical wellbeing, emotional health, social relations, and ecological domain (WHOQOL Group, 1998). There are three aspects of quality of life (Ventegodt, Merrick & Andersen, 2003).

How much good a person feels about his/her life is called subjective quality of life. Everyone can evaluate his/her notions and feelings. Feeling the good life at a deeper level is called existential quality of life. A person can earn respect for the deepness of his/her nature and can live in harmony. The biological needs of a person must be fulfilled. Religious and spiritual ideas must be fulfilled by a person. How much a person outside the world determines his life is called objective quality of life. The cultures in which people live determine the objective quality of life. We cannot know aba out person's life deeply but we can only determine how much a person adapted to his/her environment. For example, the social status of a person (Ventegodt, Merrick & Andersen, 2003).

In this way, self-esteem refers to the overall evaluation of a person about himself (Rosenberg, 1965). Self-esteem is an individual's trait as well as state which creates a sense of worthiness among them. It can be measured in three dimensions; performance, social and appearance self-esteem. Performance self-esteem is an individual's wisdom of overall competence which comprises school performance, self-confidence, intellectual abilities, self-regulatory capacity, effectiveness, and agency. Social self-esteem refers to how individuals think that they are being perceived by others while appearance self-esteem states to a person's perception of how other individuals see their physical body and includes things such as body image, athletic skills, bodily stigma, feeling about race and physical attractiveness (Heatherton & Polivy, 1991).

SE can be low or high and positive or negative. Pseudo-self-esteem is negative or low whereas authentic SE is positive or high. A negative attitude toward other people causes a poor self-image that results in low self-esteem. If someone has low self-esteem others can influence him easily, he will feel that he has no importance, he will feel powerless, he will not go into situations that cause anxiety, he will not have any emotions, and he will easily become frustrated. Loneliness, resentment, depression, anxiety, and irritability cause low self-esteem (Rosenberg, 1965).

People who try to prove themselves or try to impress others have low self-esteem. Persons having a lower level of SE for their own gain tend to use others. They are doubtful about their worth and they lack confidence in them. They do not expose themselves to failure. For their shortcomings, they blame others. Confident people are usually high self-esteem people; they are independent in actions, enthusiastic, and responsible. These people can influence others. These people have successful academic career and their family outcome is high (Arshad, Zaidi & Mahmood, 2015).

SE with an indication of disability can be described as a disabled individual assessing his/her capability to execute in society. Low self-esteem disrupts a person's equilibrium and energy and has a detrimental effect on a person's effectiveness, efficiency in learning, and inventiveness if they are physically impaired. It is distinguished by a sense of inadequacy, guilt, social inhibition, shyness, independency, helplessness, concealed hospitality, withdrawal, complainer, predisposition to denigrate others, lowered capacity, acceptance of negative judgment as accurate, defenselessness, and interpersonal conflict (Orth & Robins, 2014).

Researchers have studied the disabled population in Pakistan, focusing on issues like the relationship between social anxiety and self-esteem in physically challenged people who attend special schools and career training programs (Liaqat & Akram, 2014). Another study emphasized the relationship between mental well-being being and life quality among physically impaired and typical employees (Kanwal & Mustafa, 2016). It demonstrates that there has no emphasis on studying physically disabled university students. The present study's findings are significant because they will advance a local field of study and show how students with and without disabilities differ in terms of quality of life and self-esteem. Additionally, no previous research has been done in Pakistan on the relationship between quality of life and self-esteem among university students with and without physical disabilities. So, this study will fill the gap in the literature.

Objectives

a) To determine the relationship between self-esteem and quality of life among students with and without physical disabilities.

b) To find the difference in the level of self-esteem and quality of life of students with and without physical disability
c) To find gender differences in the level of self-esteem and quality of life among students with and without physical disabilities.

Hypothesis
a) Self-esteem would be a predictor of quality of life among students with and without physical disability

REVIEW OF LITERATURE
The current review of literature highlighted research that was conducted in different settings and cultures with different populations.

Most of the studies from the literature show that students without a physical disability have a higher level of self-esteem than physically disabled students. Mushtaq and Akhouri (2016) conducted research on "Self Esteem, Anxiety, Depression and Stress among Physically Disabled People". The findings of their study revealed that the level of SE was lower and the level of other variables (stress depression and anxiety) was higher among physically challenged individuals in contrast to normal individuals. Researchers also highlight that people without a physical disability have a better quality of life as compared to people with a physical disability. In order to compare people with and without disabilities in terms of quality of life and self-concept, Bakhshi, Gupta, and Singh (2016) conducted research. There were 50 participants with disabilities and 50 without in the sample. In all quality-of-life domains, the results showed a significant difference between disabled and non-disabled people. The self-concept of non-disabled and disabled people did not differ noticeably. The study "Effect of social support on quality of life among orthopedically disabled students and typical students" was conducted by Sultan, Malik, and Atta in 2016. The goal of the study was to determine how social support affected the quality of life for both disabled and able-bodied students. The sample included 75 orthopedically disabled people (35 women & 40 men). The age range for the sample was specified as being between 12 and 35. The findings showed that typical students have strong social support, so their quality of life is higher than that of people with disabilities Kanwal and Mustafa (2015) conducted research on Psychologically well-being and quality of life among normal and disabled employees. Findings indicated a significant positive relationship between QOL and psychological well-being and disability had been negatively correlated with these variables in employees. Moreover, high levels of both of these variables had been reported in normal employees as compared to the physically disabled. Bhattacharjee and Chhetri (2014) found that disabled participants have low self-esteem as compared to non-disabled. Civan, (2014) conducted a study to investigate a connection between the quality of life and self-esteem among disabled and non-disabled tennis sportsmen and concluded that the level of non-disabled self-esteem was higher than disabled sportsmen. Liaqat and Akram, (2014) did research and found that physically handicapped females have low self-esteem than physically handicapped males and they experienced more social anxiety than handicapped males. Research on "Quality of Life Among Disabled and Non-Disabled People" was conducted by Bakhtiyari, Salehi, and Zayeri in 2013. Comparative Analysis was conducted with 1000 participants (disabilities & healthy) that were chosen at random from Tehran. The study's findings indicated that individuals with disabilities experience lower life quality than individuals in good health.

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY
The current study employed a cross-sectional survey research approach. A sample of 200(100 normal & 100 physically disabled) students was recruited from the target population through a purposive sampling technique. Students both male (50 disabled & 50 normal) and female (50 normal & 50 disabled), in the age group of 19 to 26 years studying in 4 government and private universities of Gujrat and Islamabad were involved in the current research. Students having any mental disorders and terminal illnesses were not selected for participation in the current research. A consent form, demographic form, The WHO Quality of Life (WHOQOL Group, 1998), and State Self-esteem Scale (Heatherton & Polivy, 1998) were used for data collection.

The demographic form consists of information about age, gender, marital status, locality (urban/rural), name of the university, education of respondent, semester, type of disability, and monthly

income. The Quality-of-Life Scale consists of 26 items. 3, 4, and 26 items have reversed ratings. A higher score indicates a high level of quality of life among respondents. Cronbach alpha reliability of the scale is .91. State Self-Esteem Scale is a 5-point Likert scale with 20 items. Items that have reverse score are 4,5,7,8,10,13,15,16,17,18,19,20. Higher scores indicate a higher level of SE whereas the score range is between 20-100.

First of all, permission from the higher authorities of universities was taken. Then the aims and objectives of the current study were explained to the participants briefly. After explaining the purpose, permission from participants in the form of a consent form was taken and they were guided about how to fill out questionnaires. And then they were asked to fill out the questionnaires. It took 15 to 20 minutes to complete of questionnaires. The participants were thanked for their participation and cooperation at the end.

Ethical Considerations

The Advanced Study and Research Board of the University gave its approval to conduct this study. The scales were used after getting permission from the developers Prior to filling out the questionnaire, students were briefed and the heads of each department were notified to get their approval for data collection. Each participant signed an informed consent form, and the students were told the importance of providing honest answers and the significance of the study. Their responses were also kept private and used only for academic and research purposes. The researcher upheld the ethical principles of informed consent and confidentiality throughout the research. It was made sure that respondents were aware of their right to withdraw from the study at any moment.

DATA ANALYSIS AND RESULTS

Data were investigated using Statistical Package for Social Sciences 23 version. Pearson correlation and two-way ANOVA were used to compute the results.

Table No. 1: Correlation, Mean and standard deviations for Quality of Life and Self Esteem

	Variables	1	2	M	S. D
1.	QOL	-	.896**	90.2450	25.56094
2.	SE	.896**	-	67.7550	19.57039

Note: ***p<.001 QOL= Quality of Life, SE= Self-esteem

Table 1 indicates a strong positive relationship between QOL and SE (r=.89., p=.00) among students with and without physical disability

Table No. 2: Mean difference in the scores of self-esteem and quality of life among normal and disabled students(n=200)

Variable	Normal		Disable		t(198)	*p*	CI95%		Cohen's d
	M	*SD*	*M*	*SD*			*LL*	*UL*	
QOL	109.46	13.13	71.03	19.8	-16.1	.000	-43.1	-33.7	2.281
SE	83.040	8.379	52.47	15.0	-17.7	.000	-33.9	-27.1	2.504

Table 2 indicates that an independent t-test was conducted to compare levels of SE and QOL among normal and disabled students. Results indicate that there was a significant difference in the scores of self-esteem among normal (M=83.040, SD= 8.37) and disabled students (M= 52.47, SD=15.0) conditions; t (198) =-17.7, p<. 01, 95% CI). Particularly findings indicate that normal students had a higher level of self-esteem as compared to disabled students. Similarly, Table also indicated a statistically significant difference in the mean scores of qualities of life among normal (M=109.46, SD= 13.13) and disabled students (M= 71.03, SD= 19.8) conditions; t (198) =-16.1, p<. 01, 95% CI). Specifically, results showed that normal students had a higher level of QOL as compared to disabled students.

Table No. 3: One-Way Analysis of Variance of self-esteem and quality of life among normal and disabled students on the basis of gender

Variables	Normal male		Normal female		Disabled male		Disabled female		F	P	η^2
	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD			
SE	84.1	7.95	81.9	8.72	62.3	12.6	52.4	10.1	187.3	.000	.70
QOL	110.3	11.5	108.5	14.5	81.0	21.0	60.9	12.2	17.83	.000	.64

Table 3 shows the mean, standard deviation, and *F*-value for self-esteem and quality of life among groups. Results indicated significant mean difference across 4 groups for self-esteem [*F* (1,196) = 187.3, *p* ≤.001] and quality of life [*F* (1,196) = 17.83, *p* ≤.001]. Findings revealed that normal and disabled male students exhibit a higher level of self-esteem and quality of life as compared to normal and disabled female students.

Table No. 4: Summary of Linear Regression Analysis of Self Esteem as Predictor of Quality of Life among students with and without physical disability (n=200)

Variable	B	95%CL	B	t	P
Constant	10.93	(5.21, 16.6)		3.76	.00
Self Esteem	1.171	(1.08, 1.25)	.896	28.42	.00

Note: Adjusted R square= .80, CL=confidence interval for B.

Regression analysis was applied to see the effect of self-esteem on the quality of life of the participants. Results indicated that self-esteem significantly predicted quality of life in students with and without physical disability F (1, 198) = 807.60, p<.01 with an R^2 of .80.

DISCUSSION

The goal of the present research was to explore the relationship between SE and QOL in students with and without physical disabilities. It also investigated the difference in the level of SE and QOL among students with and without physical disabilities on the basis of gender. The first objective of the study was to explore the relationship between self-esteem and quality of life among students with and without physical disabilities. Results of table 1 showed a strong positive correlation between SE and QOL among students with and without physical disability. Results are consistent with the study of Kermode and Maclean (2001) and Jalayondeja et al., (2016). They discovered a considerable positive correlation among participants SE and QOL.

The second objective of the study was to find differences in the level of SE and QOL among normal and disabled students. Table 2 indicated that normal students experience an elevated level of self-esteem and quality of life as compared to disabled students. Results were also consistent with the study of Mushtaq and Akhouri, (2016) and Bhattacharjee and Chhetri (2014). The findings of their research concluded that disabled people had a lower level of self-esteem as compared to people without physical disabilities. Previous studies by Kanwal & Mustafa (2015) and Sultan, Malik, and Atta (2016) confirmed that quality of life was higher among normal individuals as compared to the disabled.

The third objective of the study was to find gender differences in the level of SE and QOL among participants. Table 3 indicated that male participants in both groups (normal & disabled) had a higher level of SE and QOL as compared to female participants in both groups. The findings are consistent with the studies of Malik and Saida (2013), Liaqat and Akram (2014), and Alaffe (2017). However, these results are not consistent with the study of Nair and Anuradha (2014) as they find no significant gender differences in the level of SE and QOL.

The first hypothesis of the study was that ''Self-esteem would be a predictor of quality of life among participants. The results in table 4 show that SE is a significant predictor of QOL among students with and without physical disability. The study on students of the university by Arshad, Zaidi, and Mahmood (2015) was also in line with current findings. The results are also supported by the study of Rajati et al., (2018) on physically disabled students.

CONCLUSION

The aim of the current study was to find differences between students with and without physical disabilities in terms of self-esteem and quality of life. It also explored the correlation between self-esteem and quality of life in both people with and without physical disabilities. Through convenient

purposive sampling, a sample of 200 participants men and women with and without physical disabilities was selected. Results are computed using the T-test. The findings of this study demonstrated that, in comparison to those with physical disabilities, those without physical disabilities have higher levels of self-esteem and better quality of life. Results showed that among students with and without physical disabilities, there is a significant positive correlation between the quality of life and self-esteem. Results also revealed that male students had higher levels of self-esteem and quality of life as compared to female students.

Limitation

The study sample was small and only 4 universities were selected for data collection limiting the generalizability. Future research can use large samples from different universities in the country for better results.

IMPLICATIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

These findings are important because in the light of these findings separate counseling services can be initiated within the universities, particularly for physically disabled students. Policymakers can get benefit from the present study by revising the policies and providing more funds to the universities so that they can make more facilities for physically disabled students enhancing their quality of life. Particularly, it also helps future researchers to conduct research on physically disabled students and the challenges faced by them.

It is advised that more research be done in various institutions across various Pakistani cities. On the other hand, it is advised that educational institutions work to raise the self-esteem and quality of life of both disabled and non-disabled students in light of the findings of this study. By pursuing this goal, they will be able to show off their best qualities and cope with life's challenges, especially those that are upsetting and discouraging. Additionally, it will help them recognize their unique talents, skills, and weaknesses so they can build upon them. Additionally, this focus will boost their level of self-motivation and help them reach their personal goals.

Acknowledgments

REFERENCES

Arshad, M., Zaidi, S. M. I. H., & Mahmood, K. (2015). Self-Esteem & Academic Performance among University Students. *Journal of Education and Practice, 6*(1), 156-162.

Bhattacharjee, A., & Chhetri, K. (2014). Self-esteem of disabled and able: a comparative analysis. *Voice of Research. 3*(2), pp. 2277-7733.

Blanes, L., Carmagnani, M, I., & Ferreira, M. (2009). Quality of life and self-esteem of persons with paraplegia living in São Paulo Brazil. International *journal of Quality-of-life research: quality of life aspect treatment rehabilitation and care, 18*(1). pp. 15-21. DOI: 10.1007/s11136-008-9411-9.

Civan, A. (2015). The relation between self-esteem levels and life quality levels of disabled and non-disabled tennis sportsmen. *Educational Research and Reviews. 10*(3), pp. 351-356. DOI: 10.5897/ERR2014.2025.

Heatherton, T, F., & Polivy, J. (1991). Development and validation of a scale for measuring state selfesteem. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology,* (60). Pp: 895-910.

Hosain, G. M., Atkinson, D., & Underwood, P. (2002). Impact of disability on quality of life of rural disabled people in Bangladesh. *Journal of health population and nutrition, 20*(4). Pp. 297-305.

Jalayondeja, C., Jalayondeja, W., Suttiwong, J., Sullivan, P, E., & Nilanthi, D.L. (2016). Physical activity self-esteem and quality of life among people with physical disability. *Southeast Asian Journal Trop Med Public Health, 47*(3). Pp:546-58.

James, M. (2016, February 15). Definition of and Categories of Physical Disabilities. Retrieved from: https://medium.com/@maryjames/definition-of-and-categories-of-physical-disabilities-4a495af70b42.

Kanwal, H., & Mustafa, N. (2016). psychological wellbeing and quality of life among physically disable and normal employees. *Pak Armed Forces Med Journal. 66*(5), pp. 710-14.

Kermode, S., & Maclean, D. (2001). A study of the relationship between quality of life, self-esteem and health. *Australian Journal of Advanced Nursing, 19*(2). pp. 33-40.

Liaqat, S., & Akram, M. (2014). Relationship between Self-Esteem and Social Anxiety among Physically Handicapped People. *International Journal of Innovation and Scientific Research, 9*(2). pp. 307–316.

Malik, S., & Saida. (2013). Gender differences in self-esteem and happiness among university students. *International Journal of Development and Sustainability. 2*(1), pp. 445-454.

Murtagh, K,N., & Hubert, H,B. (2004). Gender Differences in Physical Disability Among an Elderly Cohort. *American journal of promoting health. 94*(8), pp. 1406–1411.

Mushtaq, S., & Akhouri, D. (2016). Self Esteem, Anxiety, Depression and Stress among Physically Disabled People. *The International Journal of Indian Psychology. 3*(4), pp. 2349.

Narimani, M., Mousazadeh, T. (2010). Comparing self-esteem and self-concept of handicapped and normal Students. *Procedia Social and Behavioral Sciences.* (2). pp. 1554–1557.

Orth, U., & Robins, R. W. (2014). The development of self-esteem. *Current directions in psychological science, 23*(5), 381-387.

Rajati, F., Ashtarian, H., Salari, N., Ghanbari, M., Naghibifar, Z., & Hosseini, S. Y. (2018). Quality of life predictors in physically disabled people. *Journal of education and health promotion*, 7, 61. https://doi.org/10.4103/jehp.jehp_115_17

Reasoner, J. (2000). Self-esteem of adolescence. Retrieved from: http://www.self-esteem-nase.org/whatisselfesteem.html.

Rosenberg, M. (1965). Society and the adolescent self-image. *Princeton, NJ: Princeton University.*

Sultan, B., Malik, N. I., & Atta, M. (2016). Effect of social support on quality of life among orthopedically disabled students and typical students. *Journal of Postgraduate Medical Institute, 30*(3).

Ventegodt,S., Merrick, J., & Andersen, N.J. (2003). Quality of life I. The IQOL theory: An integrative theory of the global quality of life concept. *The Scientific World Journal,* (3). pp. 1030-1040. DOI: 10.1100/tsw.2003.82.

Wiltfang, G. L, & Scarbeez, M. (1990). Social class and adolescent's self-esteem: Another look. *Social psychology Quarterly*, (53). Pp: 174-183.

World Health Organization Quality of Life (WHOQOL) Group. (1994). Development of the WHOQOL: rationale and current status. *Int. Journal of Mental Health, 23* (3). Pp: 24–56.

World report on disability. (2011). Retrieved from: http://www.who.int/disabilities/world_report/2011/en/