

## Face-to-face Classes and Romantic Involvement as Factors in the Satisfaction with Life Scale Scores of Selected College Students

Frederick Edward T. Fabella  
FEU Roosevelt, Cainta, Rizal, Philippines

### Abstract

This study sought to discover the life satisfaction of selected college students at a privately-owned college in the Philippines. As face-to-face classes are now being allowed in the country after over 2 years of pure online learning, this research sought to ascertain whether a difference in the Satisfaction with Life Scale scores exists between 3<sup>rd</sup> year college students who have only personally met their classmates for the first time and 4<sup>th</sup> year college students who have personally met and known their classmates during the first year before the pandemic. Furthermore, this study also explored the presence or absence of romantic involvement and its impact on the college students' the Satisfaction with Life Scale scores. The findings yielded that the Satisfaction with Life Scale scores of the 4<sup>th</sup> year college students were slightly higher than those of the 3<sup>rd</sup> year college students. But this difference was not statistically significant. In addition, the Satisfaction with Life Scale scores of college students without romantic involvement were slightly higher than those with romantic involvement. However, the difference was also not significant.

### Introduction

Satisfaction with life is about subjective well-being.<sup>1</sup> It consists of an emotional component and a cognitive component.<sup>2</sup> Diener, Emmons, Larsen and Griffin (1985) were able to create an instrument that measures this construct, which they called the Satisfaction with Life Scale.<sup>3</sup>

This study attempted to explore satisfaction with life among selected college students who have now just begun to go back to face-to-face classes in the Philippines. It also tried to explore romantic involvement as a potential factor.

School face-to-face classes in all levels have been suspended for over two years.<sup>4</sup> Online education became the sole mode of delivering educational services for this entire period. This included the tertiary level or those students attending college. As a result, communication among students was limited to the use of online means such as social media. This 2-year hiatus in face-to-face classes is of interest because of the possible impact this has on the well-being of college students. It has been found that adolescents low in in-person social interaction and high in social media use tend to experience more loneliness.<sup>5</sup>

There are college students who for the past two years have never met their classmates. They are now in their 3<sup>rd</sup> year and have only met their classmates for the first time during this current semester. However,

there are college students in their 4<sup>th</sup> year who have met and interacted with their classmates face-to-face only during their 1<sup>st</sup> year prior to the pandemic.

A number of studies have been conducted attempting to establish what impact online or face-to-face classes have on students. In one study, it was found that students enrolled in the online course were significantly less satisfied with the course than the traditional classroom students on many dimensions.<sup>6</sup>

With respect to the quality of the submission of academic assignments, a study found no significant differences between the work submitted by students from online sections and from the face-to-face students.<sup>7</sup>

In a study involving older adults, exposure to online education had no significant impact on life satisfaction.<sup>8</sup> In another study involving college students, fulfilling interpersonal relationships had a significant role in their overall life satisfaction.<sup>9</sup>

In a study investigating stress and life satisfaction among college students, it found that overall life satisfaction in college students is unfavorably influenced by college stress.<sup>10</sup>

In the area of romantic involvement, a study found that satisfaction in the romantic domain was a better predictor of concurrent life satisfaction than satisfaction with work.<sup>11</sup> In another study, romantically involved individuals were found to have greater life satisfaction than single individuals and reported less loneliness.<sup>12</sup>

Overall, it has been established that life satisfaction influences the occurrence of mental disorders.<sup>13</sup>

In view of the foregoing, this study sought to address the following research questions:

1. What is the Satisfaction with Life Scale scores of
  - 1.1 3<sup>rd</sup> year college students who have only personally met their classmates in the current semester
  - 1.2 4<sup>th</sup> year college students who have personally met their classmates only during their first year?
2. What is the Satisfaction with Life Scale scores of
  - 2.1 College students without any romantic involvement
  - 2.2 College students with a romantic involvement?
3. Is there a significant difference in the Satisfaction with Life Scale scores
  - 3.1 Between 3<sup>rd</sup> year and 4<sup>th</sup> year college students
  - 3.2 Between college students with or without any romantic involvement?

## Methodology

This study was conducted at a privately-owned college with campuses in Marikina City and Cainta, Rizal in the Philippines. The target population were the 3<sup>rd</sup> year and 4<sup>th</sup> year college students taking up Business Administration, Hospitality Management, Education and Information Technology degree programs.

Two samples of respondents were obtained. One set of respondents were obtained for the comparison of Satisfaction with Life Scale scores between 3<sup>rd</sup> year (who have personally met their classmates for the

first time this current semester) and 4<sup>th</sup> year college students (who have personally met and interacted with their classmates only during the first year). Another set was obtained for the comparison of Satisfaction with Life Scale scores between college students with and without romantic involvement.

Purposive quota sampling was conducted. For the first sample, 23 3<sup>rd</sup> year college students and 23 4<sup>th</sup> year college students were obtained. For the second sample, 25 college students with romantic involvement and 25 college students without romantic involvement were obtained.

The Satisfaction with Life Scale<sup>3</sup> was utilized. It consists of 5 statements using a 7-point Likert Scale. The scale has demonstrated high test–retest coefficient and its reliability has been confirmed against other measures of life satisfaction.<sup>1</sup>

This instrument was administered on all the respondents online through Google Forms.

## Results

The following tables show the statistical calculations that were necessary in order to answer this study’s research questions.

**Table 1**  
**First Sample of Respondents**

	Male	Female	Total
3 <sup>rd</sup> year college students (who have personally met their classmates for the first time this current semester)	11	12	23
4 <sup>th</sup> year college students (who have personally met and interacted with their classmates only during the first year)	6	17	23
	17	29	46
Mean age:			21.70

**Table 2**  
**3<sup>rd</sup> Year College Students**  
**Distribution of Respondents Satisfaction with Life Scores**

Score	Verbal Interpretation	Frequency (Number of respondents)
31–35	Extremely satisfied	2
26–30	Satisfied	5
21–25	Slightly satisfied	7
20	Neutral	1
15–19	Slightly dissatisfied	5
10–14	Dissatisfied	2
5–9	Extremely dissatisfied	0
<i>Mean: 22.78261 Slightly Satisfied</i>		

**Table 3**  
**4<sup>th</sup> Year College Students**  
**Distribution of Respondents Satisfaction with Life Scores**

Score	Verbal Interpretation	Frequency (Number of respondents)
31–35	Extremely satisfied	1
26–30	Satisfied	7
21–25	Slightly satisfied	8
20	Neutral	2
15–19	Slightly dissatisfied	3
10–14	Dissatisfied	2
5–9	Extremely dissatisfied	0
<i>Mean: 23.08696 Slightly satisfied</i>		

**Table 4**  
**Comparison of Satisfaction with Life Scale Scores**  
**using T-test**

Treatment 1	Treatment 2
N1: 23 $df1 = N - 1 = 23 - 1 = 22$ M1: 23.09 SS1: 525.83 $s21 = SS1/(N - 1) = 525.83/(23-1) = 23.9$	N2: 23 $df2 = N - 1 = 23 - 1 = 22$ M2: 22.78 SS2: 687.91 $s22 = SS2/(N - 1) = 687.91/(23-1) = 31.27$
T-value Calculation  $s2p = ((df1/(df1 + df2)) * s21) + ((df2/(df2 + df2)) * s22) = ((22/44) * 23.9) + ((22/44) * 31.27) = 27.58$  $s2M1 = s2p/N1 = 27.58/23 = 1.2$ $s2M2 = s2p/N2 = 27.58/23 = 1.2$  $t = (M1 - M2)/\sqrt{(s2M1 + s2M2)} = 0.3/\sqrt{2.4} = 0.2$	
The t-value is 0.19651. The p-value is .845117. The result is <b>not significant</b> at $p < .05$ .	

**Table 5**  
**Second Sample of Respondents**

	Male	Female	Total
College students without romantic involvement	11	15	26
College students with romantic involvement	8	18	26
			52
Mean age:			21.31

**Table 6**  
**College Students Without Romantic Involvement**  
**Distribution of Respondents Satisfaction with Life Scores**

Score	Verbal Interpretation	Frequency (Number of respondents)
31–35	Extremely satisfied	2
26–30	Satisfied	8
21–25	Slightly satisfied	7
20	Neutral	2
15–19	Slightly dissatisfied	5
10–14	Dissatisfied	1
5–9	Extremely dissatisfied	0
<i>Mean: 23.8 Slightly satisfied</i>		

**Table 7**  
**College Students With Romantic Involvement**  
**Distribution of Respondents Satisfaction with Life Scores**

Score	Verbal Interpretation	Frequency (Number of respondents)
31–35	Extremely satisfied	2
26–30	Satisfied	6
21–25	Slightly satisfied	9
20	Neutral	1
15–19	Slightly dissatisfied	5
10–14	Dissatisfied	2
5–9	Extremely dissatisfied	0
<i>Mean: 22.88 Slightly satisfied</i>		

**Table 8**  
**Comparison of Satisfaction with Life Scale Scores**  
**using T-test**

Treatment 1	Treatment 2
N1: 25 $df1 = N - 1 = 25 - 1 = 24$ M1: 22.88 SS1: 698.64 $s21 = SS1/(N - 1) = 698.64/(25-1) = 29.11$	N2: 25 $df2 = N - 1 = 25 - 1 = 24$ M2: 23.8 SS2: 602 $s22 = SS2/(N - 1) = 602/(25-1) = 25.08$
T-value Calculation  $s2p = ((df1/(df1 + df2)) * s21) + ((df2/(df2 + df2)) * s22) = ((24/48) * 29.11) + ((24/48) * 25.08) = 27.1$  $s2M1 = s2p/N1 = 27.1/25 = 1.08$ $s2M2 = s2p/N2 = 27.1/25 = 1.08$  $t = (M1 - M2)/\sqrt{(s2M1 + s2M2)} = -0.92/\sqrt{2.17} = -0.62$	
The t-value is -0.62486. The p-value is .53502. The result is <b>not significant</b> at $p < .05$ .	

## Discussion

The profile of the respondents for the first sample can be seen in Table 1. There were 11 male and 12 female 3<sup>rd</sup> year college students and 6 male and 17 female 4<sup>th</sup> year college students. Their mean age is 21.70.

Table 2 shows the distribution of the Satisfaction with Life scores of the 3<sup>rd</sup> year college respondents. The mean of their scores is 22.78261, which has a verbal interpretation of *slightly satisfied*.

On the other hand, Table 3 presents the distribution of the Satisfaction with Life scores of the 4<sup>th</sup> year college respondents. The mean of their scores is 23.08696, which has a verbal interpretation of *slightly satisfied* and is slightly higher than the mean of the 3<sup>rd</sup> year college students.

However, applying the t-test on the scores of 3<sup>rd</sup> and 4<sup>th</sup> year college students yielded a t-value of 0.19651 with a p-value of .845117. The difference in the Satisfaction with Life scores of the two groups is not significant at  $p < .05$ .

The profile of the respondents for the second sample can be seen in Table 5. There were 11 male and 15 female college students without romantic involvement and 8 male and 18 female college students with romantic involvement. Their mean age is 21.31.

Table 6 shows the distribution of the Satisfaction with Life scores of the college students without romantic involvement. The mean of their scores is 23.8, which has a verbal interpretation of *slightly satisfied*.

On the other hand, Table 7 presents the distribution of the Satisfaction with Life scores of the college students with romantic involvement. The mean of their scores is 22.88, which has a verbal interpretation of *slightly satisfied* and is slightly lower than the mean of the college students without romantic involvement.

However, applying the t-test on the scores of college students with romantic involvement and college students without romantic involvement yielded a t-value of -0.62486 with a p-value of .53502. The difference in the Satisfaction with Life scores of the two groups is not significant at  $p < .05$ .

These findings suggest that students who have personally met their classmates 2 years before have a slightly higher satisfaction with life than those who had just personally met their classmates for the first time. Though a difference does exist, it is not statistically significant.

In addition, the results also suggest that the absence of romantic involvement could be a factor in a slightly higher life satisfaction of college students, which contradicts the conclusions of studies cited by this research. However, this difference was also found to be statistically not significant.

As the sample sizes studied by this research are small, further investigation on larger samples is recommended into these two factors that could influence life satisfaction

## References

- <sup>1</sup> Mead, E. (2022, August 8). *4 scales to measure Satisfaction with life (SWLS)*. PositivePsychology.com. Retrieved September 16, 2022, from <https://positivepsychology.com/life-satisfaction-scales/>
- <sup>2</sup> Diener, E. (1984). Subjective well-being. *Psychological Bulletin*, 95(3), 542–575.
- <sup>3</sup> Diener, E., Emmons, R. A., Larsen, R. J., & Griffin, S. (1985). The Satisfaction With Life Scale. *Journal of Personality Assessment*, 49(1), 71–75.
- <sup>4</sup> Magsambol, B., (2022, August 22). After 2 years of distance learning, Ph schools return to face-to-face classes. *RAPPLER*. Retrieved September 16, 2022, from <https://www.rappler.com/nation/philippine-schools-return-in-person-classes-2022/>
- <sup>5</sup> Twenge, J.M., Spitzberg, B.H., Campbell, W.K., Less in-person social interaction with peers among U.S. adolescents in the 21st century and links to loneliness, *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships* Volume 36, Issue 6 Pages: 1892 – 1913 (2019) <https://doi.org/10.1177/0265407519836170>
- <sup>6</sup> Summers, J.J., Waigandt, A. & Whittaker, T.A. A Comparison of Student Achievement and Satisfaction in an Online Versus a Traditional Face-to-Face Statistics Class. *Innov High Educ* **29**, 233–250 (2005). <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10755-005-1938-x>
- <sup>7</sup> Dell, C.A., Low, C., Wilker, J.F, Comparing Student Achievement in Online and Face-to-Face Class Formats, *MERLOT Journal of Online Learning and Teaching* Vol. 6, No. 1, March 2010

- <sup>8</sup> Michelle Dorin (2007) Online Education of Older Adults and its Relation to Life Satisfaction, *Educational Gerontology*, 33:2, 127-143, DOI: [10.1080/03601270600850776](https://doi.org/10.1080/03601270600850776)
- <sup>9</sup> Bailey, R.C., Miller, C., Life Satisfaction and Life Demands in College Students, *Social Behavior and Personality: an international journal*, Volume 26, Number 1, 1998, pp. 51-56(6). DOI: <https://doi.org/10.2224/sbp.1998.26.1.51>
- <sup>10</sup> Weinstein, L., Laverghetta, A. College Students Stress and Satisfaction with Life, *College Student Journal* . Dec2009 Part A, Vol. 43 Issue 4, p1161-1162. 2p.
- <sup>11</sup> Facio, A., Resett, S., Work, Romantic Relationships and Life Satisfaction in Argentinean Emerging Adults, *Emerging Adulthood* Vol. 2, Issue 1. <https://doi.org/10.1177/2167696813515854>
- <sup>12</sup> Beckmeyer, J.J., Cromwell, S., Romantic Relationship Status and Emerging Adult Well-Being: Accounting for Romantic Relationship Interest, *Emerging Adulthood* Volume 7, Issue 4. <https://doi.org/10.1177/216769681877265>
- <sup>13</sup> Fergusson, D.M., McLeod, G.F.H., Horwood, L.J., Swain, N.R., Chapple, S., Pulton, R. Life Satisfaction and Mental Health Problems (18-35 years), *Psychological Medicine* , Volume 45 , Issue 11 , August 2015 , pp. 2427 – 2436 DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0033291715000422>