

Link of Perceived Stress and Life Satisfaction: A Cross-sectional Study of the Public University Student of Bangladesh

Md. Abdul Hannan Mondal^{1*}, Tahmina Khatun¹

¹Former M.S. Student, Department of Clinical Psychology, University of Rajshahi, Rajshahi-6205, Bangladesh

*Corresponding author: Md. Abdul Hannan Mondal

| Received: 02.11.2023 | Accepted: 07.12.2023 | Published: 11.12.2023 |

Abstract: Increased degrees of stress among students have an impact on mental as well as physical wellness, which lowers learning outcomes and a general sense of life satisfaction. This current study explore the effect of gender and socioeconomic status on perceived stress and life satisfaction and the relationship between perceived stress and life satisfaction and also how significantly the perceived stress predicts life satisfaction of the students. A questionnaire survey was used to evaluate the level of perceived stress and life satisfaction. The findings found significant effect of gender and socioeconomic status on perceived stress and life satisfaction. However a significant negative correlation was exists between perceived stress and life satisfaction ($r = -.728, P < 0.01$) and perceived stress is the good predictor of life satisfaction (52.9%).

Keywords: Perceived Stress, Life Satisfaction, Gender, Socioeconomic Status.

INTRODUCTION

Although stress is a natural component of existence, individuals often feel more exceedingly stressed during significant life transitions. Shifting out of their residence and taking more responsibility for their own schedule, adolescents start to gain more autonomy as they approach university, which may be an unpleasant experience as they undergo an important shift in life into reaching adulthood (Darling *et al.*, 2007). Students are also subjected to ongoing stress during their university years because of their changing surroundings (Towbes and Cohen, 1996). Students may have trouble adjusting as an outcome, have lower life satisfaction during stressors associated with the change to university life is not appropriately addressed. But not everybody who goes through this life shift find it hard to adapt or unhappy with their life. A lot of people gain the ability to effectively adjust to change in their lives while continuing a high degree of life satisfaction despite the effects of their elevated levels of stress. As per a theory of stress and coping established by Lazarus and Folkman (1984), stress is an interaction in which people engage with their surroundings rather than just circumstances that cause unpleasant emotional reactions. To put it another way, stress has an adverse effect on people's performance or happiness when they feel that an occasion is challenging and they do not have sufficient assets to deal with external triggers (e.g., examination, ailments, separating with someone they love, the death

of a beloved companion, economic issues; Roddenberry 2007). Persons will judge whether the methods of managing assets are sufficient or insufficient (secondary appraisal) based on how they interpret probability of danger of the outside factors (primary appraisal). Secondary appraisal may subsequently have an impact on people's well-being. Our overall viewpoint towards life and our level of contentment with its direction are typically appeared in our level of life satisfaction (Boehm and Kubzansky, 2012). Studies have indicated that life satisfaction is influenced by a variety of multifaceted elements. Global empirical research generally agrees the socioeconomic status and maintaining a healthy lifestyle are the significant determinants of wellbeing (Hays *et al.*, 2015; Zarini *et al.*, 2014). Anbumalar *et al.*, (2017) studied on perceived stress and found that when speaking to perceived stress of students, girls score greater than boys. Another study conducted by Chirico and Khamsisani (2022) and their study suggested that compared to men, women reported feeling more stressed. Based on Hamdan-Mansour & Dawani (2007) research, Jordanian women had higher degrees of stress than Jordanian men although women expressing higher degrees of social assistance. Kumari (2017) studied on stress of university students compared to female pupils; male pupils were under higher stress. A study carried out by Paudel *et al.*, (2023) and they indicated that gender difference was not significant in terms of perceived stress. Businelle *et al.*, (2014) conducted a study to see the connection of SES and

Quick Response Code



Journal homepage:

<https://saspublishers.com/>

Copyright © 2023 The Author(s): This is an open-access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License (CC BY-NC 4.0) which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium for non-commercial use provided the original author and source are credited.

Citation: Md. Abdul Hannan Mondal & Tahmina Khatun (2023). Link of Perceived Stress and Life Satisfaction: A Cross-sectional Study of the Public University Student of Bangladesh. *Cross Current Int Peer Reviewed J Human Soc Sci*, 9(11), 247-255.

mental health and they suggested that more difficulties, stressors are frequently reported by people with lower SES than by those with higher SES. A research (Jiang *et al.*, 2020) conducted on Cutchin SES and they found people with low SES claimed to be more stressed and having less assistance from others. The result of the study conducted by Maria *et al.*, (2021) demonstrated that female, adolescents and young people, lower SES are considerably related with perceived stress. Joshanloom and Jovanovic (2020) ran a research in worldwide to find out the link between life satisfaction and perceived stress. Their study indicated that in comparison with men, women express a greater degree of life satisfaction. Becchetti and Conzo (2022) led a study and they indicated in their study that the levels of life satisfaction are higher in female than male participants. Asma Al-Attayah & Ramzi Nasser (2016) carried out a study in Qatar. They suggested that it is likely that women in Qatar are more satisfied than females. In regard to life satisfaction, various socio-economic groups react separately to the growth in material amenities afforded by financial advances. Overall, people are happier with their lives when their SES is high. People's influence on life satisfaction gradually declines as their ultimate SES—that is, their wealth and financial resources. In various social strata, greater degrees of life satisfaction are linked with high socio-economic status (Fassbender and Leyendecker, 2018). Mirmoghtadaee *et al.*, (2016) studied on life satisfaction in Iran and their result suggested that lower SES is associated with lower level of life satisfaction. The cognitive method via which individuals assess their level of delight by analysis their current circumstances with a set of criteria is known as life satisfaction (Coffman and Gilligan, 2003). A greater level of life satisfaction was a reliable indicator of successful transitions, such as perseverance and retention in university (Bean and Bradley, 1986). Prior studies indicated that perceived stress is a powerful indicator of lower level of life satisfaction (Abolghasemi and Varaniyab, 2010). Chao and Kim (2014) led a research on elderly and they found that lower degree of life satisfaction was significantly predicted by perceived stress. Yang and Kim, (2016) conducted a research to see the relationship among depression, perceived stress and life satisfaction and their findings suggested that life satisfaction is inversely related to perceived stress and also many previous research find out the same outcome (Extremera *et al.*, 2009; Hamarat *et al.*, 2001; Matheny *et al.*, 2002; Matheny *et al.*, 2008).

Rational of the Study

The link between poor life satisfaction and a number of challenges related to adjustment, such as elevated risk of suicide over the long run (Choi, 2012). Learner's life satisfaction was adversely and significantly influenced by perceived stress (Chang, 1998). Participants included in this study were recent graduates and undergraduates students. Teachers and university officials can benefit from the study results by becoming more aware of measures to enhance student

life and create stress-reduction plans. University administrators should focus on more of those parts where students expressed the greatest dissatisfaction. The factors which can affect students' contentment with life at the university featured campus amenities, and instructor competence. One could state that poor amenities and instruction can cause students to feel unhappy with their campus lives, which can have a detrimental effect on their academic issues. Officials at universities must therefore consider how enhance instructional strategies and university services. For instance, additional classrooms can be made enjoyable and computer-assisted instruction can be used. The implications of these insights for the advancement of education in developing nations are considerably more significant. It is evident that many nations manage to meet the requirements of their citizens with the restricted asset; this issue may have an impact on the supply of high-quality education. This research may be helpful some significant issues.

Objectives of the Study

Considering the previous study and the following objectives were taken

- To explore the gender differences on perceived stress of the participants.
- To inspect the effect of gender on life satisfaction of the respondents
- To observe the difference among the socio-economic status on perceived stress of the university students
- To investigate whether there is any effect of socio-economic status on life satisfaction of the participants
- To find whether there is any relationship exists between perceived stress and life satisfaction.
- To explore whether the perceived stress significantly predict life satisfaction

Hypotheses of the Study

- Perceived stress of female students is higher than male students.
- Life satisfaction of female students is better than their male counterparts.
- Lower socio-economic status individuals feel greater perceived stress than higher and middle class individuals.
- Higher socioeconomic status people feel higher degree of life satisfaction than lower and middle socioeconomic status individual.
- Perceived stress and life satisfaction of the participants are correlated negatively.
- Perceived stress significantly predicts the life satisfaction of the students.

METHOD AND PROCEDURES

Study Design and Respondents

A cross-sectional study was conducted among the university students in Bangladesh. The requirements

for inclusion of the research participants were (1) male and female students from any public university from Bangladesh, (2) residents of Bangladesh. The students who studied in public university of Bangladesh who failed for presenting their informed consent were not allowed to participate.

Sample and Data Collection

Total 184 respondents were selected conveniently from the public universities of Bangladesh and all necessary information of the respondents are presented in the below table.

Table-2.1: Description of respondents by Gender, and Socioeconomic Status

Variables	Label	Number of participants	Percentage (%)
Gender	Male	96	52.2
	Female	88	47.8
	Total	184	100
Socio-economic Status (SES)	Lower Class	67	36.4
	Middle Class	81	44
	Higher Class	36	19.6
	Total	184	100

Ethical Statement

Deliberate involvement following the declaration of informed written consent. It was further said that study subjects would not be identifiable in the research and their input to the questionnaire would be confidential. As a result, the privacy of the respondents was totally preserved. Respondents had the authority to cancel their involvement from the research as their wish for any purpose. Actually no benefits were provided to the respondents.

Variables

Independent variables: Gender, and Socio-economic Status

Dependent variables: Perceived Stress and Life Satisfaction

Measuring instruments

The personal information blank: It included gender, age and socio-economic status of the students.

Perceived Stress Scale: This Scale was constructed by Cohen *et al.*, (1983) and is most commonly employed instrument for determining the perceived stress level in individuals (12 years to older). The PSS-10 Bangla version, translated by Islam (2013) was utilized. Participants are prompted to indicate on a five-point Likert scale varying from 'never' to 'very often', how frequently they observed specific feelings. Answer to the four positive statement (4, 5, 7, and 8) must be converted reversely in order to determine the overall PSS value. Next, the score is calculated by adding together each item. The entire score varies from 0-40 where scores 0-13 (low stress), 13-26 (moderate stress) and 27-40 (high stress).

Satisfaction with life scale: The Bangla version of satisfaction with life scale (Ilyas, 2001) comprising five statements that is aggregate into one dimension in order to assess general cognitive evaluations about one's

own existence. By applying a seven-point Likert scale (fully disagree to fully agree) individuals were invited to answer questions about the level of approval with scale statements. The SWLS value is the combined value of the five statements of the scale. The value for this scale varied from 5-35. An increased total value suggests an increased degree of life satisfaction and the lower value represents lower life satisfaction of the study participants. This scale demonstrated good convergent validity and internal consistency where the cronbach alpha was 0.74 (Sagor and Karim, 2014).

Procedures

The study was cross-sectional in nature and carried out among the university students of Bangladesh. The sample size was 184. Purposive sampling was followed and prior to the start of the data collection, each participant was made aware of the questionnaire's contents and the fact that taking part was entirely voluntary and private. A form with questions about personal details, life satisfaction, and perceived stress was completed by the students. Following completion, the answered form were gathered and thoroughly examined. Lastly, the researcher showed thankfulness to the students for taking part in the current research.

Data processing and Statistical Analyses

After completed the data collection method, each student scores of life satisfaction and perceived stress were calculated. In order to analyze the scores obtained from all the participants, each score of the individuals were coded and input into IBM SPSS-25, a data analysis software. To find out the effect of Gender, on perceived stress and life satisfaction independent sample *t*- test was employed. One way Analysis of Variance was also used in order to see the effect of SES on life satisfaction and perceived stress. Pearson correlation was applied, to see how life satisfaction was correlated with perceived stress. To examine the predictor regression analysis was applied.

RESULTS

Results of Gender

Table-3.1: Perceived stress and Life satisfaction of the participants with regard to Gender

DV	IV	N	Mean	SD	df	t
Perceived Stress	Male	96	17.49	4.94	182	4.59**
	Female	88	20.88	5.06		
Life Satisfaction	Male	96	22.25	5.48	182	2.14*
	Female	88	24.09	6.18		

*Significant at 0.05 level

**Significant at 0.01 level

The mean and std. deviation of perceived stress score for the male respondents are 17.49 and 4.94 and the mean and std. deviation of perceived stress score for the female participants are 20.88 and 5.06. Result indicates that mean difference is (20.88-17.49= 3.39) statistically significant ($t= 4.59$, $p<0.01$). That means male and female students feel different level of perceived stress (table-3.1). And also the mean and std. deviation of life satisfaction value for the male students are 22.25 and 5.48 and the mean and std. deviation of life satisfaction

value for the female participants are 24.09 and 6.18. The mean difference is 1.84 (24.09-22.25) which is statistically significant ($t= 2.14$, $p<0.05$). That means male students feel lower life satisfaction than female students (table-3.1).

Results of Socioeconomic Status

Results of One way Analysis of Variance for perceived stress and life satisfaction is presented in table-3.2 and table-3.3 respectively

Table-3.2: Mean and SD of Perceived Stress and Life Satisfaction

DV	Level of SES	N	Mean	SD
Perceived Stress	Lower Class	67	21.43	5.25
	Middle Class	81	19.06	4.25
	Higher Class	36	14.89	4.80
Life Satisfaction	Lower Class	67	21.34	6.33
	Middle Class	81	23.26	4.93
	Higher Class	36	26.17	5.86

The table-3.2 indicates that the mean perceived stress scores of lower class, middle class, and higher class are 21.43, 19.06, and 14.89 and also the mean life

satisfaction scores are 26.17, 23.26, and 21.34 for higher class, middle class, and lower class students.

Table-3.3: ANOVA

Dependent Variable (DV)	Sources of Variance	Sum of Squares (SS)	Df	Mean Squares (MS)	F
Perceived Stress	Between Groups	1003.131	2	501.5657	22.29**
	Within Groups	4072.695	181	22.50108	
	Total	5075.826	183		
Life Satisfaction	Between Groups	547.2095	2	273.6048	8.56**
	Within Groups	5783.66	181	31.95392	
	Total	6330.87	183		

**Significant at 0.01 level

The table-3.3 demonstrates that the perceived stress score mean difference is significant ($F=22.29$, $p<0.01$) among the socio-economic status of the participants. The result suggests that lower socio-economic status have higher levels of perceived stress than middle and higher socio-economic status and again

table-3.3 also indicates that the life satisfaction score mean difference is statistically significant ($F=8.56$, $p<0.01$) which means higher socio-economic status students feel greater level of life satisfaction than lower and middle socio-economic status students.

Table-3.4: Post Hoc Tukey: Multiple Comparisons of Perceived Stress and Life Satisfaction among the socio-economic status

DV	(I)SES	(II)SES	Mean Difference (I-II)	95% Confidence Interval	
				Lower Bound	Upper Bound
Perceived Stress	Lower	Middle	2.37**	.52	4.22
		Higher	6.54**	4.23	8.86
	Middle	Lower	-2.37**	-4.22	-.52
		Higher	4.17**	1.93	6.42
	Higher	Lower	-6.54**	-8.86	-4.23
		Middle	-4.17**	-6.42	-1.93
Life Satisfaction	Lower	Middle	-1.92	-4.12	.29
		Higher	-4.82*	-7.58	-2.06
	Middle	Lower	1.92	-.29	4.12
		Higher	-2.91*	-5.58	-.23
	Higher	Lower	4.82*	2.06	7.58
		Middle	2.91*	.23	5.58

*Significant at 0.05 level

**Significant at 0.01 level

The result suggests that the highest perceived stress score difference exist between lower class and higher class students is 6.54 ($P<0.01$) and all the difference among higher class, lower class and middle class are statistically significant (table-3.4). The result table-3.4 also demonstrated that the greatest life satisfaction score difference between higher class and

lower class students is 4.82 ($P<0.05$). Here also the lower and higher class, middle and higher class, higher and middle class people feel different level of perceived stress ($p<0.05$).

Linear Regression Analysis**Table-3.5: Mean and SD**

Variable	Mean	SD	N
Life Satisfaction	23.13	5.88	184
Perceived Score	19.11	5.27	184

The mean of life satisfaction score and perceived stress score are 23.13 and 19.11 of the all the participants.

Table-3.6: Model Summary^b

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	.728 ^a	.529	.527	4.046

a. Predictors: (Constant), Perceived Score
b. Dependent Variable: Life Satisfaction Score

Table-3.6 shows the simple correlation (R) is 0.728 which represents the high degree of correlation between perceived stress and life satisfaction. The R Square value .529 indicates the total variation in the life satisfaction can be explained by the perceived stress.

Here 52.9% can be explained and 47.1% cannot be explained by independent variable. Standard Error of the Estimate is 4.046 which means on average the distance between the observed score and regression line is 4.046.

Table-3.7: ANOVA^a

	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	Df	F
Regression	3351.651	3351.651	1	204.752**
Residual	2979.219	16.369	182	
Total	6330.870		183	

a. Dependent Variable: Life Satisfaction Score
b. Predictors: (Constant), Perceived Score

The table-3.7 demonstrates that the regression model predicts the life satisfaction significantly good ($F= 204.752$, $p<0.05$) fit for the data.

Table-3.8: Coefficients^a

(Constant) Perceived Stress Score	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients Beta	T	95% Confidence Interval for B	
	B Std. Error				Lower	Upper
					Bound	Bound
	38.658	1.125	-.728	34.350**	36.438	40.879
	-0.813	.057		14.39**	-.925	-.701

**Significant at 0.01 level

Coefficients table-3.8 shows that prediction of life satisfaction from the score of perceived stress, as well as determines whether perceived stress contributes statistically significant to the model. To express the regression equation is,

$$\text{Life Satisfaction} = 38.658 - 0.813(\text{Perceived Stress Score})$$

On the basis of the perceived stress score, we can apply the equation to determine a student's predicted life satisfaction score.

Table-3.9: Correlation of gender, socioeconomic status with life satisfaction and perceived stress

Variables	Gender	Socio-economic Status	Perceived Stress	Life Satisfaction
Gender				
Socio-economic Status	-.032			
Perceived Stress	.322**	-.437**		
Life Satisfaction	.157*	.291**	-.728**	

*Significant at 0.05 level

**Significant at 0.01 level

This table-3.9 suggests that the variables are significantly correlated except socioeconomic status and gender ($r = -.032$, $p > 0.05$). The result also indicates that very low level of correlation exist between life satisfaction and gender, and also the low level of correlation found perceived stress and gender, perceived

stress and socio-economic status, and life satisfaction and socio-economic status. But the correlation between life satisfaction and perceived stress is high and negative ($r = -.728$, $p < 0.01$) which means if perceived stress is increases then the life satisfaction of the students decreases and the opposite also true.

Table-3.10: Percentages of level of variables

Variables	Perceived Stress			Life Satisfaction						
	Low Perceived Stress	Moderate Perceived Stress	High Perceived Stress	Extremely Dissatisfied	Dissatisfied	Slightly Dissatisfied	Neutral	Satisfied	Satisfied	Highly Satisfied
Gender										
Male	20 20.83%	67 69.79%	9 9.38%	3 3.13%	9 9.38%	15 15.63%	9 9.38%	31 32.29%	20 20.83%	9 9.38%
Female	6 6.81%	69 78.41%	13 14.77%	5 5.68%	5 5.68%	6 6.81%	5 5.68%	20 22.73%	38 43.18%	9 10.23%
Total	26 14.13%	136 73.91%	22 11.96%	8 4.35%	14 7.61%	21 11.41%	14 7.61%	51 27.72%	58 31.52%	18 9.78%
Socio-economic Status (SES)										
Lower	4 5.97%	52 77.61%	11 16.42%	5 7.46%	8 11.94%	8 11.94%	5 7.46%	21 31.34%	16 23.88%	4 5.97%
Middle	4 4.94%	69 85.19%	8 9.88%	2 2.47%	5 6.17%	10 12.35%	7 8.64%	25 30.86%	29 35.80%	3 3.70%
Higher	18 50%	15 41.67%	3 8.33%	1 2.78%	1 2.78%	3 8.33%	2 5.56%	5 13.89%	13 36.11%	11 30.56%
Total	26 14.13%	136 73.91%	22 11.96%	8 4.35%	14 7.61%	21 11.41%	14 7.61%	51 27.72%	58 31.52%	18 9.78%

Table-3.10 shows that highest percentages (78.41%) of female students feel moderate perceived

stress and also lowest percentages (6.81%) of female experience low perceived stress. Highest percentages

(43.18%) of female students feel satisfied and lowest percentages (3.13%) of male students experience extremely dissatisfied. Students belongs to middle class feel highest percentages (85.19%) moderate perceived stress and higher class students feel lowest percentages of (8.33%) high perceived stress. Higher class students experience highest percentages of satisfied (36.11%) and highly satisfied (30.56%).

DISCUSSION

The first hypothesis stated that Perceived stress of female students higher than male students. In this context, the results illustrated (table-3.1) that significant difference was noticed between male and female students in terms of perceived stress ($t=4.59, p<0.01$). This finding is obvious because previous research also supported (Anbumalar *et al.*, 2017; Chirico and Khasmisanani 2022). Female student experience high perceived stress 14.77%, moderate 78.41% perceived stress and also low perceived stress 6.81% as compared to male experience high perceived stress 9.38%, moderate perceived stress 69.79% and low perceived stress 20.83%. Female report higher perceived stress because they are more likely to experience difficult life situations (Kessler *et al.*, 1985). Stress seems to be felt separately by male and female, with female experiencing greater levels dissatisfaction and male feeling more depersonalized. Female appear to be more vulnerable to psychological issues owing to a mix of physiological and societal variables such as injustice, isolation from society, gender based stereotypes, and freewill (Boyd *et al.*, 2015). As stated the second hypothesis was Life satisfaction of female students better than their male counterparts. The study results presented in table-3.1 confirmed the second hypothesis ($t=2.14, p<0.05$). The same results also found by several studies (Joshanloom and Jovanovic 2020; Becchetti and Conzo 2022). Female's life satisfaction should be less because inequality based on gender is common, as are male-dominant attitudes. Even in advanced nations, there remains significant gender inequality in results in the job sector (Kleven and Landais, 2017). Female have been observed to have less opportunity for authority, positions of leadership, job prospects, and recreational time than men (Eckermann, 2012). Notwithstanding this, female are more likely than males to feel subjectively content their life. As stated by Eckermann (2012) resilience is a major component in female's greater levels of life satisfaction. The third hypothesis stated that lower socio-economic status individuals feel greater perceived stress than higher and middle class individuals. The findings of the study resembles with the third hypothesis ($F=22.29, p<0.01$). Some other studies resembles with the result of the current study (Businelle *et al.*, 2014; Jiang *et al.*, 2020). Stressor encounter has been identified as one of the causes (Cundiff *et al.*, 2020). Individuals with lower socio-economic status frequently state that they experience more stressors than those with higher socio-economic status (Businelle *et al.*, 2014). Still, several studies have been found that lower socioeconomic status

is related to fewer but more serious stressors on everyday life (Grzywacz *et al.*, 2004). The fourth hypothesis was higher socioeconomic status people feel higher degree of life satisfaction than lower and middle socioeconomic status individual. From the result table-3.3, it was suggested that higher socio-economic status individuals were more satisfied than the rests ($F=8.56, p<0.01$). The finding of other studies indicated the same thing (Fassbender and Leyendecker. 2018; Mirmoghtadaee *et al.*, (2016). High-income individuals are often happier with their lives than those with low incomes, indicating that socioeconomic status is a key predictor of individual's life satisfaction (Kahneman & Deaton, 2010). As per the fifth hypothesis, perceived stress and life satisfaction of the participants are correlated negatively. The correlation confirmed the fifth hypothesis ($r= -.728, p<0.01$). The research findings of Abolghasemi and Varaniyab (2010) and Chao and Kim (2014) also suggested the same outcome. People's assessment of their capacity to handle stressful conditions may be adversely affected when they consider their present circumstances to be extremely dangerous or challenging. However, due to the fact people are less prone to participate in catastrophizing thinking or predict unfavourable consequences, people who see the same stressful conditions as a difficulty or a chance to show they can feel that they can employ their methods of coping more successfully. Individuals with low levels of life satisfaction were expected to be linked to high degrees of perceived stress (Baron and Kenny, 1986). As per sixth hypothesis of the study was perceived stress significantly predicts the life satisfaction of the students. The results from table-3.6 and table-3.7 recommended that that entire regression model significant and the predictor variable perceived stress significantly ($F=204.752, p<0.05$) predicts 52.9% appropriately the life satisfaction (outcome variable) of the pupil. Here the R Squared value and adjusted R-Squared difference was very small so it was good for the generalization of the results.

CONCLUSION

This research finding concluded that female students had higher perceived stress and life satisfaction than their male counterparts and students with higher socioeconomic status felt lower perceived stress and higher life satisfaction. Higher life satisfaction was linked to Lower perceived stress of the university students. The findings also indicated that most of university students (73.91%) suffer from moderate perceived stress and 14.13% students experience high perceived stress level (11.96%). The study by Pierceall and Keim (2007) found same findings and suggested that 12% (lower number of pupils) pupils reported having a high degree of stress and 75% (most pupils) of pupils reported a moderate level of stress. With respect to the study findings it is clear that the more the stressor students confront, the more the students stress and lower satisfaction which had the detrimental effect on the life of the students. It was also said that socioeconomic status

is the key factor to predict life satisfaction and stress so financial support may be helpful for students and ensure better outcome with improving other facilities also. Finally the key comment is that university authorities also consider the financial issues as a moderator factor to reduce the stress level and improves better satisfaction of the students.

LIMITATIONS

Even if the results of current research are interesting, there are certain shortcomings that could be improved in further research. The people who participated in the research were restricted to university students so it is not possible to generalize the outcome to the entire population. Because this research was cross-sectional, the results do not establish causal links between life satisfaction and perceived stress. In order to more accurately determine causal relationships between these factors in future periods, longitudinal would be advantageous. Researchers in the future should look at an increased number of factors to completely determine the influence on perceived stress and life satisfaction. Considering its shortcomings, the current research has paved the way for future investigation by emphasizing the correlation between life satisfaction and perceived stress as it relates to gender and socioeconomic status.

Acknowledgements: I would like to thank all of the participants and thanks all my well-wisher.

REFERENCES

- Darling, C. A., McWey, L. M., Howard, S. N., & Olmstead, S. B. (2007). College Student Stress: The influence of interpersonal relationships on sense of coherence. *Stress and Health*, 23(4), 215–229.
- Towbes, L. C., & Cohen, L. H. (1996). Chronic Stress in the Lives of College Students: Scale development and prospective prediction of distress. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence*, 25(2), 199–217.
- Lazarus, R. S., & Folkman, S. (1984). *Stress, Appraisal, and Coping*. New York: Springer.
- Roddenberry, A. C. (2007). *Locus of Control and Self-efficacy: Potential mediators of stress, illness, and utilization of health services in college students* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation) Orlando, Florida: University of Central Florida.
- Boehm, J. K., & Kubzansky, L. D. (2012). The heart's content: The association between positive psychological well-being and cardiovascular health. *Psychol. Bull*, 138, 655–691. doi: 10.1037/a0027448.
- Hays, R. D., Spritzer, K. L., Thompson, W. W., & Cella, D. U. S. (2015). General population estimate for excellent to poor self-rated health item. *J Gen Intern Med*, 30, 1511–1516. doi: 10.1007/s11606-015-3290-x.
- Zarini, G. G., Vaccaro, J. A., Canossa Terris, M. A., Exebio, J. C., Tokayer, L., Antwi, J., Ajabshir, S., Cheema, A., & Huffman F. G. (2014). Lifestyle behaviors and self-rated health: The living for health program. *J Environ Public Health*, 315042. doi: 10.1155/2014/315042.
- Anbumalar, C., Dorathy, A. P., Jaswanti, V. P., Priya, D., & Reniangelin, D. (2017). Gender Differences in Perceived Stress levels and Coping Strategies among College Students. *International Journal of Indian Psychology*, 4(4), DIP:18.01.103/20170404, DOI:10.25215/0404.103
- Chirico, E. N., & Khasmisani, A. (2022). Gender Differences in Perceived Stress and Biological Stress Markers are Associated with Changes in Resting Heart Rate. *The FASEB Journal*, 36(51). <https://doi.org/10.1096/fasebj.2022.36.S1.L7641>
- Hamdan-Mansour, A. M., & Dawani, H. A. (2007). Social Support and Stress Among University Students in Jordan. *International Journal of Mental Health and Addiction*, 6(3), 442-450. doi:10.1007/s11469-007-9112
- Hudson, C. G. (2005). Socioeconomic Status and Mental Illness: Tests of the Social Causation and Selection Hypotheses. *American Journal of Orthopsychiatry*, 75(1), 3-18. doi:10.1037/0002-9432.75.1.3
- Kumari, S. (2017). A study of gender difference in stress among university students. *Journal of Education and Practice*. DOI:10.1729/JOURNAL.21875 Corpus ID: 204621412
- Paudel, U., Parajuli, A., & Shrestha, R. (2023). Perceived stress, sources of stress and coping strategies among undergraduate medical students of Nepal: a cross-sectional study [version 2; peer review: 1 approved, 1 approved with reservations] F1000 Research 2023, 11, 167. (<https://doi.org/10.12688/f1000research.75879.2>)
- Businelle, M. S., Mills, B. A., Chartier, K. G., Kendzor, D. E., Reingle, J. M., & Shuval, K. (2014). Do stressful events account for the link between socioeconomic status and mental health?. *Journal of public health (Oxford, England)*, 36(2), 205–212. <https://doi.org/10.1093/pubmed/fdt060>
- Jiang, Y., Zilioli, S., Rodriguez-Stanley, J., Peek, K. M., & Cutchin, M. P. (2020). Socioeconomic status and differential psychological and immune responses to a human-caused disaster. *Brain, behavior, and immunity*, 88, 935-939.
- Maria, M., & Costarelli, V. (2021). Perceived stress in relation to socioeconomic & lifestyle characteristics in Greece: a cross sectional study. *Journal of Home Economics*, 14, 108-115.
- Joshanloo, M., & Jovanović, V. (2020). The relationship between gender and life satisfaction: analysis across demographic groups and global regions. *Archives of women's mental health*, 23(3), 331–338. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00737-019-00998-w>.
- Becchetti, L., & Conzo, G. (2022). The Gender Life Satisfaction/Depression Paradox. *Soc Indic Res*, 160, 35–113. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11205-021-02740-5>
- Al-Attiyah, A., & Nasser, R. (2016). Gender and age differences in life satisfaction within a sex-segregated society: sampling youth in Qatar. *International Journal of Adolescence and Youth*, 21(1), 84-95. DOI: 10.1080/02673843.2013.808158
- Fassbender, I., & Leyendecker, B. (2018). Socio-Economic Status and Psychological Well-Being in a

Sample of Turkish Immigrant Mothers in Germany. *Frontiers in psychology*, 9, 1586. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2018.01586>

- Mirmoghtadaee, P., Heshmat, R., Djalalinia, S., Motamed-Gorji, N., Motlagh, M. E., Ardalani, G., Safiri, S., Ahadi, Z., Shafiee, G., Asayesh, H., Qorbani, M., Yaghini, O., & Kelishadi, R. (2016). The association of socioeconomic status of family and living region with self-rated health and life satisfaction in children and adolescents: The CASPIAN-IV study. *Medical journal of the Islamic Republic of Iran*, 30, 423.
- Coffman, D., & Gilligan, T. D. (2003). Social Support, Stress and Self Efficacy: Effects on students' satisfaction. *Journal of College Student Retention: Research, Theory, & Practice*, 4(1), 53–66.
- Bean, J. P., Bradley, R. K. (1986). Untangling the Satisfaction Performance Relationship for College Students. *The Journal of Higher Education*, 57, 393–412.
- Abolghasemi, A., & Varaniyab, S. T. (2010). Resilience and Perceived Stress: Predictors of life satisfaction in the students of success and failure. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 5, 748–752.
- Cho, S. J., Kim, B. S. (2014). The Relationship between Stress and Life satisfaction among the Elderly: The mediating effects of depression, self-efficacy and mindfulness. *Journal of the Korean Gerontological Society*, 34(1), 49–71.
- Yang, H. J., & Kim, E. J. (2016). The Relationship among Self-Complexity, Depression, Perceived Stress, and Satisfaction with Life: The moderational effects of harmony and importance of self-aspects. *The Korean Journal of Health Psychology*, 21(1), 173–193.
- Extremera, N., Duran, A., & Rey, L. (2009). The Moderating Effect of Trait Meta-mood and Perceived Stress on Life Satisfaction. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 47(2), 116–121.
- Hamarat, E., Tompson, D., Zabrocky, D. S., Matheny, K. B., & Aysan, F. (2001). Perceived Stress and Coping Resources Availability as Predictors of Life Satisfaction in Young, Middle-Aged, and Older Adults. *Experimental Ageing Research*, 27(2), 181–196.
- Matheny, K. B., Curlette, W. L., Aysan, F., Herrington, A., Gfroerer, C. C., Thompson, D., & Hamarat, E. (2002). Coping Resources, Perceived Stress, and Life Satisfaction among Turkish and American University Students. *International Journal of Stress Management*, 9(2), 81–97.
- Matheny, K. B., Roque-Tovar, B., Curlette, W. L. (2008). Perceived Stress, Coping Resources, and Life Satisfaction among U.S. and Mexican College Students: A cross-cultural study. *Anales de Psicología/Annals of Psychology*, 24(1), 49–57.
- Choi, Y. J. (2012). Stress, Suicidal Ideation, and Protective Factors in College Students. *Studies on Korean Youth*, 23(3), 77–104.
- Chang, E. C. (1998). Does dispositional optimism moderate the relation between perceived stress and psychological wellbeing? A preliminary investigation. *Personality and individual differences*, 25(2), 233-240.
- Cohen, S., Kamarck, T., & Mermelstein, R. (1983). A global measure of perceived stress. *Journal of Health and Social Behavior*, 24(4), 385-396.
- Ilyas, Q. S. M. (2001). Bangla version of Satisfaction with Life Scale and Dyadic Adjustment Scale. Unpublished Manuscript, Department of Psychology, University of Dhaka.
- Islam, M. Z. (2013). Translation of Bangla Perceived Stress Scale. Perceived Stress Scale – Bengali Translation Document [http://www.psy.cmu.edu/~scohen/Perceived_Stress_Scale_Bengali_translation.pdf].
- Sagar, M. M., & Karim, A. K. M. (2014). The psychometric properties of Satisfaction With Life Scale for police population in Bangladeshi Culture. *The International Journal of Social Sciences*, 28, 24-31.
- Boyd, A., Van de Velde, S., Vilagut, G., De Graaf, R., Florescu, S., Alonso, J., ... & EU-WMH Investigators. (2015). Gender differences in mental disorders and suicidality in Europe: results from a large cross-sectional population-based study. *Journal of affective disorders*, 173, 245-254. doi: 10.1016/j.jad.2014.11.002
- Kleven, H., & Landais, C. (2017). Gender inequality and economic development: fertility, education and norms. *Economica*, 84(334), 180-209. <https://doi.org/10.1111/ecca.12230>
- Eckermann, E. (2012). The quality of life of adults. In: Land, K. C., Michalos, A. C., Sirgy, M. J. (eds) Handbook of social indicators and quality of liferesearch. Springer, New York, pp 373–380.
- Cundiff, J. M., Boylan, J. M., & Muscatell, K. A. (2020). The Pathway from Social Status to Physical Health: Taking a Closer Look at Stress as a Mediator. *Current Directions in Psychological Science*, 29(2), 147-153. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0963721420901596>
- Grzywacz, J. G., Almeida, D. M., Neupert, S. D., & Ettner, S. L. (2004). Socioeconomic status and health: A micro-level analysis of exposure and vulnerability to daily stressors. *Journal of Health and Social Behavior*, 45(1), 1–16. <https://doi.org/10.1177/002214650404500101>
- Kahneman, D., & Deaton, A. (2010). High income improves evaluation of life but not emotional well-being. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America*, 107(38), 16489–16493. <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1011492107>
- Baron, R. M., & Kenny, D. A. (1986). The Moderator–mediator Variable Distinction in Social Psychological Research: Conceptual, strategic, and statistical considerations. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 51(6), 1173–1182.
- Pierceall, E. A., & Keim, M. C. (2007). Stress and coping strategies among community college students. *Community College Journal of Research and Practice*, 31(9), 703-712.