Research Paper

Impact of individualism and collectivism on life satisfaction among college students

Jerus Albert Britto[1]*, Dr.B.Selvaraj[2], Sharon John[3]

ABSTRACT

The current study was undertaken for the purpose of studying the Individualism Collectivism and Quality of life among College students. The study also focused on the influence of demographic variables such as age, sex, education, and residential area of the College students.. The population of this research was comprised of 120 (60 Male and 60 Female) College students from Government Arts College, Coimbatore, Tamilnadu, India. Purposive sampling method was used for the selection of respondents. Individualism Collectivism was measured with a self-report Individualism and Collectivism scale- developed by M.S.Clark , Quality of Life was measured with a self-report WHO Quality of Life scale developed by Bref. were the two questionnaires used in this study. Questionnaires were administered to collect primary data. Individualism Collectivism and Quality of Life were taken as variables under study. Analysis of data was carried out by applying SPSS 21.0. Chi-Sqiuare and correlation tests were carried out to establish the relation among variables. The results also revealed there is no significant relationship between Individualism Collectivism and Quality of Life. Examination of results also shows that demographic variables influence Individualism Collectivism and Quality of Life of the College students. This study has great value for the College students to understand the Individualism and Collectivism personality dimensions and Quality of Life level of college students.

Keywords: *College students, Individualism- Collectivism, Quality of Life.*

There are two basic ways of understanding the relationship between individuals in a group. The first way is individualism, which states that each individual is acting on his or her own, making their own choices, and to the extent they interact with the rest of the group, it's as individuals. Collectivism is the second way, and it views the group as the primary entity, with the individuals lost along the way. Objectivism supports individualism in this sense. In a different sense, individualism is meant to be whether the individual is different from everyone else, or whether he makes up his own mind about things, or what-not. But in the individualist-collectivist sense of the term, individualism just means that the individual is a

[1]Guest Lecturer in Psychology, Government Arts College, Coimbatore, India
[2]Associate Professor and Head, Dept of Psychology, Government Arts College, Coimbatore, India
[3]PhD, Research Scholar in Social Work, SNR College of Arts and Science, Coimbatore, India
*Responding Author

separate entity, making his own choices, thinking his own thoughts, and responsible for his own choices.

Collectivism views it in some other way. It sees the group as the important element, and individuals are just members of the group. The group has its own values somehow different from those of the individual members. The group thinks its own thoughts. Instead of judging the group as a bunch of individuals interacting, it judges the group as a whole, and views the individuals as just members of the group.

Types of Individualism
1. **Political individualism** refers mainly to liberalism, anarchism, and egoism. Practically speaking, mainly liberalism, since there are yet no anarchist nations and ethical egoism is fairly unpopular, with its opposition to altruism.
2. **Philosophical individualism** includes ethical egoism, egoist anarchism, and objectivism, which all emphasize individual separateness in action and ethics. It also includes existentialism, humanism, and subjectivism which emphasize the primacy of individual experiences and lives, and freedom in art and lifestyle choices.
3. **Methodological individualism** is the policy of analysing economic issues in terms of individual choices, a crucial idea in modern economic science.
4. **Bohemian individualism** is the term we'll use here to describe the social movements beginning in the 1950s characterized by radical diversity and freedom in all aspects of life, such as the American civil rights movement, the Beat poets, the hippies, the sexual revolution, the punk movement, and many others.

Attributes of Collectivists
In contrast, collectivists are likely to value belonging to their in-group or culture and relating one's self to the group (e.g., family, tribe, nation etc., Fiske 1992; Hofstede 1980; Hsu 1983; Kim 1994; Markus & Kitayama 1991). The influence of the in-group is much stronger on collectivists (Triandis 1989). Belonging to the group is not just a matter of identification, it is subordination of personal goals to the collective's goals and taking into account the needs of others.

This is because collectivists give more weight to norms as determinants of their social behaviour (Triandis 1996). They identify themselves as members of a group to which they belong, and thus they internalise the group's goals and values and give these higher priority (Hofstede, 1980; Hsu, 1983; Kim, 1994; Markus & Kitayama, 1991; Triandis, Bontempo, Vilareal, Asai & Lucca 1988). In a more distinct way, Triandis (2000b), suggested that collectivists tend to be very sensitive to other in-group members, and can be quite distant from out-group people (Oyserman 1993, Schwartz 1990), and even hostile when conflict arises from out groups.

There are a number of dimensions, which can distinguish individualists from collectivists, such as the relation to the group, the role of hierarchy, the need to belong to a group, the use of language, and the role of family. An important component of belonging to a group is focusing on in-group relationships and seeking for harmony among the in-group (Oyserman et. al. 2002; Markus & Kitayama, 1991; Oyserman, 1993; Triandis, 1995).

Morling and Fiske (1999) found that harmony correlated with interdependence and collectivism. The value of keeping harmony and 'saving face' is most present in conflict situations. Ohbuchi, Fukushima and Tedeschi (1999) showed that collectivists prefer to deal

with conflicts by methods that maintain relationships with others (e.g. mediation) while individualists seek justice.

One of the symptoms of group binding is a sense of hierarchy. Hierarchy can be a collectivist as well as an individualist attribute (Triandis, 1995; Singelis, Triandis, Bhawuk, & Gelfand 1995). For collectivists hierarchy acts as a reference that shows them their position or rank within their in-group, whereas for individualists hierarchy relates more to competition as, Individualists are seeking to move higher than others on the social scale/level (Triandis 1995, Singelis, Triandis, Bhawuk, & Gelfand 1995). The sense of belonging to the group among collectivists affects their well being as their life satisfaction depends more on their ability to fulfil social obligations, roles and expectations (Kim, 1994; Kwan, Bond & Singelis, 1997; Markus & Kitayama, 1991). Singelis (1994) suggested that the collectivists are obligated to their in-group, sacrificing the self-good or self-interest for the good of the collective.

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Andrew Dunn, (2009) discussed how individualistic/collectivistic orientations of employees predict affective well-being at work, and how this relationship is moderated by the perceptions of the spirit of camaraderie in organizations. The sample comprises 161 employees of 109 organizations operating in Portugal, a collectivistic culture. The findings suggest that: (a) collectivistic individuals show higher affective well-being than individualists; (b) this relationship is moderated by the employees' perceptions of the spirit of camaraderie in their organizations; (c) higher levels of affective well-being tend to be experienced by collectivists who find working in an organizational context to be rich in spirit of camaraderie, and lower levels of affective well-being are expressed by individualists who perceive poor spirit of camaraderie in their working environments. The paper emphasizes that employee happiness can have different bases in different cultures and that individualism/collectivism orientations do not operate in the same way in different cultural and organizational contexts.

Carmel L. Proctor, P. Alex Linley, John Maltby (2011). A central construct within the positive psychology literature is life satisfaction. Adult life satisfaction has been studied extensively, whereas the life satisfaction of children and adolescents has only received attention more recently. This article provides a review of the extant research on youth life satisfaction. Empirical studies (n = 141) on life satisfaction among youth are reviewed. The review details how life satisfaction among youth relates to various other important emotional, social, and behavioral constructs. Evidenced by the review are the conditions that foster positive life satisfaction and the implications of positive life satisfaction among youth. Future directions in life satisfaction research among youth are briefly discussed.

Chris Even 2011, This paper examines the Individualism–Collectivism (I-C) dimension of national culture in the Hofstede and GLOBE models. We identify major contradictions between the two culture models, in 243 employees which result in contradictory relationships with external variables such as economic prosperity. We critically evaluate the content validity of the items used to measure this construct in both models. Based on our analysis, we suggest that Hofstede's Individualism–Collectivism index be relabelled as Self-orientation vs Work-orientation and GLOBE's In-group collectivism as Family Collectivism. We demonstrate how the proposed alternative conceptualizations of the Individualism–Collectivism dimensions in both the Hofstede and GLOBE models can help reconcile the anomalous relationships between these two models of national culture, and between their dimension scores and other external variables of interest to researchers. We recommend a

way forward for future research incorporating the collectivism dimensions that identifies which of the Hofstede/GLOBE scores is appropriate for differing purposes. This will help to make future research findings clearer, and to reduce contradictions and anomalies. Implications drawn from such research should also be clearer as a result

Need for This Study
People's problems are related to their collectivism or sociality. An individual can do many thing and they have many opportunity to function full potentially. A collectivistic mind represents the group behaviour. An individualistic mind represent the persons overall capability & potential power. The researcher felt the need of understanding their level of Individualism and Collectivism and Quality of life among the college students. Thus, the researcher took effort to assess the level of individualism and collectivism and quality of life among college students.

Objectives
1. To find out the level of Individualism or Collectivism in the male and female college students.
2. To find out the level of Individualism or Collectivism in the urban and rural college students.
3. To find out the level of Individualism or Collectivism in the UG and PG college students.
4. To find out the level of Individualism or Collectivism among the respondents with sibling.
5. To find out the level of Quality of life in the male and female college students.
6. To find out the level of Quality of life in the urban and rural college students.
7. To find out the level of Quality of life in the UG and PG college students.
8. To find out the level of Quality of life among the respondents with sibling.
9. To find out the relationship among Individualism or Collectivism and Quality of life of college students.

Hypotheses
1. There will be a statistical significant difference in the individualism and collectivism among the male and female sample.
2. There will be a statistical significant difference in the individualism and collectivism on the residing area of the sample.
3. There will be a statistical significant difference in the individualism and collectivism on the education level of the sample.
4. There will be a statistical significant difference in the individualism and collectivism on the siblings level of the sample.
5. There will be a statistical significant difference in the Quality of life on the gender of the sample.
6. There will be a statistical significant difference in the Quality of life on the residing area of the sample.
7. There will be a statistical significant difference in the Quality of life on the education level of the sample
8. There will be a statistical significant difference in the Quality of life on the siblings of the sample
9. There will be a positive relationship between Individualism or Collectivism and Quality of Life of the sample

Area

GOVERNMENT ARTS COLLEGE in Coimbatore was selected for the study.

The reasons for selecting this area are given below.
1. Residing place of the investigator.
2. Availability of the required number of sample.
3. Co-operative rendered by the sample to the researcher.
4. Convenience of administering the test to the sample.

Sample

A sample of hundred and twenty students (60 males and 60 females) in the age group of 18-23 years was selected for the present study, from Government Arts College in Coimbatore District of Tamil Nadu. A sample of hundred and twenty were selected using Convenient sampling method. A convenience sample is a type of non-probability sampling method where the sample is taken from a group of people easy to contact or to reach.

Tools Used

To collect the relevant background of the selected students, like gender, education, residence and siblings personal datasheet were used.

For the present study, "Individualism and collectivism Scale" (M.S.Clark) was used. The tool consists of 14 items to differentiate Individualism or Collectivism with seven point rating scale.

Reliability
1. Internal consistency (n = 561), Cronbach's α = 0.78
2. Test-retest reliability (11 weeks; n = 128) = 0.68

Validity

Scores on the Communal Orientation scale correlate with scores on measures of conceptually overlapping constructs (e.g. social responsibility, emotional empathy). Another inventory "**WHO Quality of Life Scale**" was used to assess the person's quality of life. The tool consists of 26 items which measures the quality of life with five point rating scale.

Reliability : The internal consistency (Cronbach's α) coefficients were 0.70 to 0.77 at domain level and 0.91 for the whole questionnaire.

Validity : For the WHOQOLBREF, the range of the correlations between item/facet and its domain was 0.53 to 0.78, and for inter-domain was 0.51 to 0.64 (all $p < 0.01$).

Scoring

Scoring of the Individualism Collectivism Scale: Items with an asterisk are reverse scored. Keep scoring on a continuous basis.

Respond with each one of the followings:
1)Strong Disagree (SD) 2)Moderately Disagree(MD) 3)Disagree (D) 4)Neither Disagree (or) Agree (D or A) 5)Moderately Agree (MA) 6)Agree (A) 7)Strongly Agree (SA)

Interpretation

14-31	Extremely Individualist
32-49	Individualist
50-67	Neither Individualist nor Collectivist
68-85	Collectivist
85-98	Extremely Collectivist

Scoring of the Quality of Life

The WHOQOL-BREF produces a quality of life profile. It is possible to derive four domain scores. There are also two items that are examined separately: question 1 asks about an individuals overall perception of quality of life and question 2 asks about an individuals overall perception of their health. The four domain scores denote an individuals perception of quality of life in each particular domain. Domain scores are scaled in a positive direction (i.e. higher scores denote higher quality of life). The mean score of items within each domain is used to calculate the domain score.

Interpretation
1-43   Low
44-87   Average
87-130   High

Procedure

The administrations of the respective institutes were informed and verbal consent to conduct the study was taken. Consent was also taken from the respondents after explaining to them the purpose of the research as well as the academic use of the data later on. After rapport formation the questionnaires were given individually to the subjects. Before administering the test the respondents were briefed about the test in detail. They were assured that their responses would be kept confidential and that the research is for educational purpose only. Instructions were read clearly by the investigator and simple classifications of word meanings were given on request without influencing responses.

Analysis of Data

The collected data were tabulated and analysed by using the following statistical tools:
1. Percentage Analysis
2. Chi Square
3. Correlation

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Table – 1 Distribution Of The Respondent According To Their Gender

S. No	Gender	Respondents	Percentage
1	Male	60	50%
2	Female	60	50%
	Total	**120**	**100%**

The above table reveals the gender respondents it is clear that out of 120 respondents, 50 percent of the respondents are male and about 50 percent of the respondents are female.

Table 2 Distribution of The Respondent According to Their Residence

S. No	RESIDENCE	Respondents	Percentage
1	RURAL	75	62.5%
2	URBAN	45	37.5%
	TOTAL	120	100%

The above table reveals the residential type of the respondents, it is recorded that out of 120 respondents, 62.5 percent of the respondents lives in rural area which is away from the city limit and 37.5 percent of the respondents lives in urban area which predicts they are living

inside the city, by the evidence of the report, researcher interpret that the greater part of the respondents are from rural area.

Table – 3 Distribution Of the Respondent According To Their Educational Qualification

S. No	Educational Qualification	Respondents	Percentage
1	UG	44	36.7%
2	PG	76	63.3%
	Total	**120**	**100%**

The above table reveals the educational qualification of the respondents, it is recorded   that out of 120 respondents, 36.7 percent of the respondents are completed or pursuing Under-Graduate level of education and 63.3 percent of the respondents are completed or pursuing Post-Graduate level of education, by the evidence of the report, researcher interpret that there is more or less equal level of under and post-graduation level of education pursuing or completed by the respondents.

Table – 4 Distribution of The Respondent According To Their Siblings

S. No	SIBLINGS	Respondents	Percentage
1	1 Sibling and Only child	75	62.5%
2	2 and Above	45	37.5%
	Total	**120**	**100%**

The above table reveals the sibling status of the respondents, it is recorded   that out of 120 respondents, 62.5 percent of the respondents have 1 sibling and only child and 37.5 percent of the respondents are having two and more than two siblings, by the evidence of the report, researcher interpret that among the overall respondents majority of the respondents are 1 sibling and only child.

Table – 5 Individualism & Collectivism Among The Overall Sample

S.No	Individualist & Collectivist	Frequency	Percentage
1.	Neither Individualist Nor Collectivist	69	57. 5%
2.	Collectivist	51	42. 5%
	Total	**120**	**100%**

The above table reveals the level of individualist or collectivist among the overall sample. It is recorded that 57. 5 percent comes under neither individualist nor collectivist and 42. 5 percent comes under collectivist.

Table – 6 Quality of Life Among The Overall Sample

S.No	Level Of Quality Of Life	Frequency	Percentage
1.	Average	42	35%
2.	High	78	65 %
	Total	**120**	**100%**

The above table reveals the quality of life among the overall sample. It is recorded that 65 percent of the overall sample comes under high in quality of life 35 and percent comes under the average in quality of life.

Objectives 1:
To find out the level of Individualism or Collectivism in the male and female college students.

Hypothesis 1:
There will be a statistical significant difference in the individualism and collectivism among the male and female sample.

Table 7. The influence of Gender among the college students on their Individualism and Collectivism

LEVEL	GENDER		TOTAL
	MALE	**FEMALE**	
Neither Individualist Nor Collectivist	45	24	69
Collectivist	15	36	51
Total	**60**	**60**	**120**

Table 8. CHI SQUARE TEST

	value	**Df**	**Significance**
Pearson chi square	15.038	1	0.00

From the above table the chi square value is 15.038 and Significance level is 0.00 (P< 0.05) and this shows there is a significant difference between males and females on the level of Individualism and Collectivism. Hence the hypothesis, There will be a statistical significant difference in the individualism and collectivism among the male and female is retained.

Objectives 2
To find out the level of Individualism or Collectivism in the urban and rural college students.

Hypothesis 2
There will be a statistical significant difference in the individualism and collectivism on the residing area of the sample.

Table 9 The influence of Residential Area among the college students on their Individualism and Collectivism

LEVEL	RESIDENCE		TOTAL
	RURAL	**URBAN**	
Neither Individualist Nor Collectivist	23	46	69
Collectivist	22	29	51
Total	45	75	120

Table 10 CHI SQUARE TEST

	value	**df**	**Significance**
Pearson chi square	1.203	1	0.341

From the above table the chi square value is 1.203 and Significance level is 0.341 (P> 0.05) and this shows there is a no significant difference between rural and urban on the level of Individualism and Collectivism. Hence the hypothesis stating "There will be a statistical

significant difference in the individualism and collectivism on the residing area of the sample" is rejected.

Objectives 3
To find out the level of Individualism or Collectivism in the UG and PG college students.

Hypothesis 3
There will be a statistical significant difference in the individualism and collectivism on the education level of the sample.

Table 11 The influence of Education level among the college students on their Individualism and Collectivism

LEVEL	EDUCATION		TOTAL
	UG	PG	
Neither Individualist Nor Collectivist	29	40	69
Collectivist	15	35	51
Total	44	76	120

Table 11 CHI SQUARE TEST

	value	Df	Significance
Pearson chi square	2.010	1	0.183

From the above table the chi square value is 2.010 and Significance level is 0.183 (P> 0.05) and this shows there is a no significant difference between UG and PG students on the level of Individualism and Collectivism. Hence the hypothesis sating "There will be a statistical significant difference in the individualism and collectivism on the education level of the sample" is rejected.

Objectives 4
To find out the level of Individualism or Collectivism among the respondents with sibling.

Hypothesis 4
There will be a statistical significant difference in the individualism and collectivism on the siblings level of the sample.

Table 12 The influence of Siblings among the college students on their Individualism and Collectivism

LEVEL	SIBLINGS		TOTAL
	ONLY CHILD AND 1 SIBLINGS	2 AND ABOVE SIBLINGS	
Neither Individualist Nor Collectivist	44	25	69
Collectivist	31	20	51
Total	75	45	120

Table 13 CHI SQUARE TEST

	value	df	Significance
Pearson chi square	0.111	1	0.849

From the above table the chi square value is 0.111 and Significance level is 0.849 (P> 0.05) and this shows there is a no significant difference between respondents as Only child, with 1 sibling and with two or more siblings on the level of Individualism and Collectivism. Hence the hypothesis stating "There will be a statistical significant difference in the individualism and collectivism on the siblings level of the sample" is rejected.

Objectives 5
To find out the level of Quality of life in the male and female college students.

Hypothesis 5
There will be a statistical significant difference in the Quality of life on the gender of the sample.

Table 14 The influence of Gender among the college students on their Quality of Life

LEVEL	GENDER		TOTAL
	MALE	FEMALE	
Average	18	24	42
High	42	36	78
Total	60	60	120

Table 15 CHI SQUARE TEST

	value	df	Significance
Pearson chi square	1.319	1	0.339

From the above table the chi square value is 1.319 and Significance level is 0.339 (P> 0.05) and this shows there is a no significant difference between males and females in the Quality of Life. Hence the hypothesis stating 'There will be a statistical significant difference in the quality of life on the gender of the sample' is Rejected.

Objectives 6
To find out the level of Quality of life in the urban and rural college students.

Hypothesis 6
There will be a statistical significant difference in the Quality of life on the residing area of the sample.

Table 16 The influence of Residential Area among the college students on their Quality of Life

LEVEL	RESIDENCE		TOTAL
	RURAL	URBAN	
Average	15	27	42
High	30	48	78
Total	45	75	120

Table 17 CHI SQUARE TEST

	value	df	Significance
Pearson chi square	0.088	1	0.844

From the above table the chi square value is 0.088 and Significance level is 0.844 (P> 0.05) and this shows there is a no significance different between rural and urban on the Quality of

Life. Hence the hypothesis stating "There will be a statistical significant difference in the Quality of life on the residing area of the sample" is rejected.

Objectives 7
To find out the level of Quality of life in the UG and PG college students.

Hypothesis 7
There will be a statistical significant difference in the Quality of life on the education level of the sample.

Table 18 The influence of Education Level among the college students on their Quality of Life

LEVEL	EDUCATION		TOTAL
	UG	PG	
Average	21	21	42
High	23	55	78
Total	44	76	120

Table 19 CHI SQUARE TEST

	Value	Df	Significance
Pearson chi square	4.947	1	0.030

From the above table the chi square value is 4.947 and Significance level is 0.030 (P< 0.05) and this shows there is a significance different between UG and PG students on the Quality of Life. Hence the hypothesis stating "There will be a statistical significant difference in the Quality of life on the education level of the sample" is Retained.

Objectives 8
To find out the level of Quality of life among the respondents with sibling.

Hypothesis 8
There will be a statistical significant difference in the Quality of life on the siblings of the sample.

Table 20 The influence of Siblings among the college students on their Quality of Life

LEVEL	SIBLINGS		TOTAL
	1 SIBLINGS AND ONLY CHILD	2 AND ABOVE SIBLINGS	
Average	23	19	42
High	52	26	78
Total	75	45	120

Table 21 CHI SQUARE TEST

	value	df	Significance
Pearson chi square	1. 651	1	0.237

From the above table the chi square value is 1. 651 and Significance level is 0.237 (P> 0.05) and this shows there is a no significance different between respondents as Only child, with 1 sibling and with two or more siblings on Quality of Life. Hence the hypothesis stating "There

will be a statistical significant difference in the Quality of life on the siblings of the sample" is rejected.

Objectives 9
To find out the relationship among Individualism or Collectivism and Quality of life of college students.

Hypotheses 9
There will be a positive relationship between Individualism or Collectivism and Quality of Life of the sample.

Table 22 The Relationship between Individualism Collectivism and Quality of life among college students

Variables	Mean Values	Standard Deviation	r
Individualism or Collectivism	63.6333333	9.04795864	0.0563333
Quality of Life	92.441667	12.547108	

On analysing the table mean value of individualism and collectivism is 63.633 and S.D is 9.047, the overall mean value of quality of life is 92.44 and S.D is 12.547 and the correlation value is 0.056 Although technically a positive correlation, the relationship between Individualism or Collectivism and Quality of Life is weak (the nearer the value is to zero, the weaker the relationship).Hence the hypothesis stating that "There will be a positive relationship between Individualism or Collectivism and Quality of Life of the sample" is retained.

Overview of Findings
1. When institutionalized elderly male have greater mobility, their cognitive decline is high.
2. When institutionalized elderly female have greater mobility, their depression is high.
3. There was no significant correlation between cognitive decline of institutionalized elderly male and their depression.
4. There was no significant correlation between cognitive decline of institutionalized elderly female and their depression.
5. There was no significant effect of the gender of the respondents on their mobility level
6. There was no significant effect of the gender of the respondents on their cognitive decline.
7. There was a significant effect of the gender of the respondents on their depression level.
8. There was no significant difference of the respondents' age on their mobility level
9. There was no significant effect of the respondents' age on their cognitive decline
10. There was no significant difference of the respondents' age on their depression
11. There was a significant effect of the respondents' marital status on their mobility
12. There was a significant effect of the respondents' marital status on their cognitive decline
13. There was no significant difference in depression of the respondents with regard to their marital status
14. There was a marginally significant effect of the respondents' spouse status on their mobility

15. There was no significant effect of the respondents' spouse status on their cognitive decline
16. There was no significant difference in the depression of the respondents with regard to their spouse status
17. There was no significant effect of the respondents' children on their mobility
18. There was marginally significant effect of the respondents' children on their cognitive decline
19. There was no significant effect on the respondents' depression with regard to their children
20. There was no significant effect of the respondents' education on their mobility
21. There was no significant effect of the respondents' education on their cognitive decline
22. There was no significant effect on the respondents' depression with regard to their education level
23. There was marginally significant effect of the respondents' siblings on their mobility
24. There was no significant effect of the respondents' siblings on their cognitive decline
25. There was no significant effect on the respondents' depression with regard to their siblings
26. There was a significant effect of the respondents' residence on their mobility
27. There was no significant effect of the respondents' residence on their cognitive decline
28. There was no significant effect on the respondents' depression with regard to their residence
29. Arthritis, Asthma, Heart problems and more than physical problems affect the mobility of male institutionalised elderly
30. Heart problems, Cancer and more than one physical problem affect the cognitive decline of male institutionalised elderly.
31. Physical problem does not have relationship with depression of male institutionalised elderly.
32. Psychological problems do not influence the mobility of male institutionalised elderly
33. Psychological problems do not influence the cognitive decline of male institutionalised elderly
34. Psychological problems do not influence the depression of male institutionalised elderly.
35. There was no significant difference of the respondents' age on their mobility level
36. There was no significant effect of the respondents' age on their cognitive decline
37. There was a significant difference of the respondents' age on their depression
38. There was no significant effect of the respondents' marital status on their mobility
39. There was no significant difference in depression of the respondents with regard to their marital status
40. There was no significant effect of the respondents' spouse status on their mobility
41. There was no significant effect of the respondents' spouse status on their cognitive decline
42. There was no significant difference in the depression of the respondents with regard to their spouse status
43. There was a significant effect of the respondents' children on their mobility
44. There was no significant effect of the respondents' children on their cognitive decline
45. There was a significant effect on the respondents' depression with regard to their children
46. There was no significant effect of the respondents' education on their mobility

47. There was no significant effect of the respondents' education on their cognitive decline
48. There was no significant effect on the respondents' depression with regard to their education level
49. There was no significant effect of the respondents' siblings on their mobility
50. There was no significant effect of the respondents' siblings on their cognitive decline
51. There was no significant effect on the respondents' depression with regard to their siblings
52. There was no significant effect of the respondents' residence on their mobility
53. There was no significant effect of the respondents' residence on their cognitive decline
54. There was no significant effect on the respondents' depression with regard to their residence
55. Sleeplessness and more than one physical problems influence the mobility of Female institutionalised elderly
56. Physical problems do not influence the cognitive decline of female institutionalised elderly
57. Physical problems do not influence the depression of female institutionalised elderly.
58. Psychological problems do not influence the mobility of female institutionalised elderly.
59. Psychological problems do not influence the cognitive decline of female institutionalised elderly.
60. Psychological problems do not influence the depression of female institutionalised.

CONCLUSION

In the present investigation, an attempt was made to find out the influence of elderly mobility on their cognitive decline and depression. The study was conducted with an extensive review of literature to establish the hypotheses to carry out the study. The study was carried out with an assumption that the elderly mobility will be correlated positively with the cognitive decline and depression of the aged people. It was found in this study that the result is vice versa. The hypothesis of the gender differences in elderly mobility, cognitive decline and depression of the elderly was tested and found that female elderly people are more depressed than male elderly. The study was carried out with an assumption that demographic variables will influence each of the variables of the study in question. It was found that the marital status, spouse status, number of children, siblings and residence influence the variations in elderly mobility, cognitive declines and geriatric depression of male elderly. Rheumatoid arthritis, asthma, heart problems and male subjects who have more than one physical problem are less mobility, and heart problems, cancer and asthma and multiple physical ailments causes more cognitive decline. With reference to the female elderly subjects, age and number of children are the influencing factors while sleeplessness and multiple physical ailments make them less mobile.

Limitations of the Study
1. Data is collected from only one elderly institution in Coimbatore, and the generalization of the present study result is limited.
2. There are only limited numbers of elderly institutions in Coimbatore, and therefore random selection of the subject was not possible while collecting the data.
3. Elderly people have both physical and psychological problems, which posed problems for the candidate while responding to the instruments used in the study.

4. Male and female elderly subjects did not show much involvement in responding to the questions asked by the researcher. This can be taken into consideration while conducting further studies.
5. The data collection process extended for longer duration since the elderly subjects were considerably slow while responding.

Implication for further research
1. The study can be replicated taking the samples from multiple elderly institutions to have more reliable and valid conclusions.
2. Each of the variables of the study can be explored separately with elaborate research designs.
3. Any study conducted with the elderly subject must be slow in pace as the data collection process needs sufficient time concerning the speed of responding by the elderly subjects.
4. An intervention program may be introduced to make elderly people more mobile, which will reduce the cognitive decline and the depression and the effectiveness of the same may be explored. Similarly, the intervention programs for reducing elderly cognitive decline and geriatric depression can be introduced and tested.

REFERENCES

Andrew Dunn, (2009) How individualism–collectivism orientations predict happiness in a collectivistic context Journal of Happiness Studies March 2009, Volume 10, Issue 1, pp 19–35|

Carmel L. Proctor. P. Alex Linley. John Maltby (2011) Youth Life Satisfaction.,J Happiness Stud (2009) 10:583–630.,DOI 10.1007/s10902-008-9110-9

Conflict of Interest
The author declared no conflict of interests.

How to cite this article: J A Britto, B Selvaraj & S John (2019). Impact of individualism and collectivism on life satisfaction among college students. *International Journal of Indian Psychology*, *7*(4), 1025-1039. DIP:18.01.121/20190704, DOI:10.25215/0704.121