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Abstract: Students' quality of life was not frequently investigated in Lithuania and other Northern European countries, however, the results of scientific research indicated that decreased ability to achieve learning outcomes was related to worsened quality of life (Shareef et al., 2015; Mikołajczyk et al., 2008; Henning et al., 2012). The aim of the research was to compare students' quality of life, according to the studying area in Klaipeda State University of Applied Sciences.

The study sample consisted of the students: 650 women and 32 men (the response rate 73.4%). They were studying Nursing (n=130), Physiotherapy (n=135), Beauty therapy (n=143), Dental assisting (n=56), Dental hygiene (n=66) or Social work (n=152). All the students were examined by self-administered WHOQOL-100 (WHO, 1995) questionnaire in 2012. The WHOQOL-100 was organized into the following domains: Overall quality of life, Physical, Psychological, Level of independence, Social relationships, Environmental and Spirituality domains. To compare means scores among study programmes, ANOVA analysis was performed. The difference was considered to be statistically significant when p<0.05.

Ethical Implications. Approval from the local Ethics Commission in Klaipeda State University of Applied Sciences, was obtained prior to the research. Students were informed about the main objectives of the research and were instructed how to fill in the questionnaire. Students who refused to participate in research were not questioned.

The Cronbach's alpha coefficients, reflecting validity of the instrument WHOQOL-100, ranged from 0.72 (Overall quality of life) to 0.88 (Psychological domain). The domain of Overall quality of life demonstrated the strongest stability, according test-retest (r=0.86), the weakest stability was in the domain of Spirituality (r=0.50).

The mean scores in Overall quality of life domain ranged from 59.60 (Nursing) to 66.50 (Dental assisting), p=0.007. Mean scores in Physical domain varied from 58.30 (Nursing) to 64.40 (Dental hygiene), p=0.02. The mean scores in Psychological domain ranged from 60.50 (Nursing) to 66.30 (Dental hygiene), p=0.002. Level of independence domain was scored from 74.60 (Nursing) to 81.40 (Dental assisting and Dental hygiene), p<0.001. Social relationship domain was scored from 66.30 (Nursing) to 72.20 (Physiotherapy), p=0.015. Environmental domain has got the lowest score in Nursing programme (54.60), the highest one – in Dental assisting (60.30), p=0.001. The mean scores in Spirituality domain varied from 60.10 (Nursing) to 67.30 (Physiotherapy), p=0.039. The students of Nursing have got the lowest scores in all quality of life domains.

Overall quality of life and Environmental domains were assessed by the highest scores among Dental assisting students. Physical and Psychological domains have got the highest scores among Dental hygiene students. The domains of Social relationships and Spirituality were highly evaluated by Physiotherapy students. The results of the study could be used for deeper analysis of the relations among quality of life, learning outcomes and future carrier perspectives in different studying areas.
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