SCIENTIFIC CULTURE

www.sci-cult.com

SCIENTIFIC CULTURE, Vol. 11, No. 3.2, (2025), pp. 320-330
Open Access. Online & Print

DOI: 10.5281/zenodo.11322525

UNIVERSITY STUDENTS' ACADEMIC MAJOR SATISFACTION AND QUALITY OF LIFE

Waleed Ghazi Alshammari[1]*, Abdulaziz Mohammed Alismail[2], Mazen Omar Almulla[3], Mohammed Saleh Aldoreeb[4], Mohammed Fahad Almohazie[5]

[1]King Faisal University, Saudi Arabia. E-mail: wgshammari@kfu.edu.sa,
ORCID: https://orcid.org/0009-0008-8713-3426
[2]King Faisal University, Saudi Arabia. E-mail: amaalismail@kfu.edu.sa,
ORCID: https://orcid.org/0009-0005-5972-3320
[3]King Faisal University, Saudi Arabia. E-mail: moalmulla@kfu.edu.sa,
ORCID: https://orcid.org/0009-0009-1952-3083
[4]King Faisal University, Alahsa, Saudi Arabia. E-mail: maldoreeb@kfu.edu.sa,
ORCID: https://orcid.org/0000-0001-9678-9998
[5]King Faisal University, Alahsa, Saudi Arabia. E-mail: malmohazie@kfu.edu.sa,
ORCID: https://orcid.org/0000-0003-1651-6522

Received: 08/07/2025
Accepted: 14/09/2025

Corresponding Author: Abdulaziz Mohammed Alismail (amaalismail@kfu.edu.sa)

ABSTRACT

This study explored the relationship between quality of life and academic major satisfaction among King Faisal University students, considering selected demographic variables. A descriptive correlational approach was employed due to its appropriateness for the study's objectives. The population included all regular undergraduate students enrolled in the 2025 AH academic year (N = 33,833) across scientific and humanities disciplines. A stratified random sample of 377 students (177 males, 200 females) was selected based on gender and academic field (207 humanities, 170 scientific). An additional exploratory sample of 30 students was used to examine the psychometric properties of the study instruments. Two standardized instruments were used: the Quality of Life Scale by Abdel-Khalek (2008), measuring four dimensions (physical, psychological, social, and environmental health), and the Academic Major Satisfaction Scale by Nauta (2007). Both scales were validated for face, internal consistency, and discriminant validity. Correlation analyses showed strong item-total relationships, and t-tests confirmed significant differences between high and low scorers. Reliability was confirmed through Cronbach's alpha, split-half reliability, and McDonald's omega. The Quality-of-Life Scale showed high reliability (α = 0.934, split-half = 0.934, ω = 0.911). The Academic Major Satisfaction Scale also demonstrated strong reliability (coefficients between 0.7 and 0.9). This study contributes to a deeper understanding of how quality of life influences students' satisfaction with their academic majors, supporting efforts to enhance the university educational environment in the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia.

KEYWORDS: Quality of Life, Academic Major Satisfaction, University Students, King Faisal University, Academic Mental Health, University Adjustment, Educational Environment.

1. INTRODUCTION

Student academic major satisfaction has garnered increasing attention in educational research, as it captures the extent to which students feel fulfilled and content with their chosen field of study. This construct encompasses the degree of alignment between a student's major and their core values, self-concept, abilities, career ambitions, and personal interests (Jadrić et al., 2025; Lingán Huamán et al., 2025; Nauta, 2007; Super, 1953). According to Nauta (2007), a strong sense of satisfaction emerges when students select academic majors that match their intrinsic needs, interests, skills, and long-term goals.

While previous international studies have established a link between academic major satisfaction and quality of life, there is a scarcity of research that examines this relationship within the unique socio-cultural and educational context of Saudi Arabia. The pressures on students—including family expectations, economic conditions, and the structural characteristics of the educational system may create dynamics that differ significantly from those observed in Western contexts (Cimsir, 2019). This study, therefore, fills a critical gap by providing the first in-depth analysis of this issue in the Saudi context, offering insights that are more directly relevant for local educators and policymakers.

To comprehensively understand academic major satisfaction, extant literature suggests viewing it through the lenses of career development, self-determination theory, and educational outcome frameworks. Each theoretical perspective highlights different influences individual, institutional, and contextual that shape how students perceive their alignment with their academic disciplines.

Choosing a career is a critical developmental milestone in a student's life, and its fit with one's self-concept is central to satisfaction. Career construction theory posits that students evaluate majors through the lens of their self-image and internalized life narratives (Super, 1953; Savickas, 2005). Consistent with this view, Lingán Huamán et al. (2025) demonstrated that alignment between self-concept and chosen major significantly predicts academic persistence and overall satisfaction. Their study introduced the Academic Dropout Intention Scale (ADIS) and reported a robust association between low satisfaction and increased dropout intentions.

In addition, interest–major congruence the fit between student interests and academic majors is a key predictor of well-being. Silva Soares et al. (2021) confirmed that such congruence strongly forecasts student well-being, although its impact on academic achievement may be moderated by prior academic history. Meanwhile, Wach et al. (2016) found that personality traits and motivational factors significantly influence major satisfaction, offering support for self-determination theory's relevance.

Self-determination theory emphasizes that satisfaction of three basic psychological needs autonomy, competence, and relatedness is essential for enhancing academic satisfaction. Jadrić et al. (2025) showed that students' perceptions of their institutional environment and its capacity to support these needs strongly affect their satisfaction with their studies . Finally, psychometric validation studies by Sovet, Park, and Jung (2014) established that the Academic Major Satisfaction Scale (AMSS) is a reliable and unidimensional measure, closely linked to academic self-efficacy and confidence

A central component of the theoretical framework underpinning students' academic major satisfaction is the concept of perceived quality of educational services. Abdullah (2006) emphasized the pivotal role of students' perceptions of institutional quality shaped by study conditions, faculty competence, accessibility, and support services offered by non-academic staff (e.g., administration, counseling) in mediating the relationship between academic satisfaction and the fulfilment of psychological needs. Specifically, students report greater satisfaction with their academic experience when they perceive their institution as fostering autonomy-supportive environments and enabling meaningful interpersonal connections.

Recent literature underscores the critical role of Interest–Major Fit in driving students' academic major satisfaction. For instance, Cimsir (2019) demonstrated that alignment between students' interests and their academic majors serves as a robust predictor of student well-being, although its direct impact on academic performance may be moderated by prior experiences. This finding aligns with earlier research by Nauta (2007), Thies and Falk (2024), and Wach et al. (2016), which consistently show that students who perceive a strong congruence with their chosen field are more likely to persist in college, thereby improving their overall holistic well-being.

Such alignment also correlates positively with academic performance. Graunke and Woosley (2005) identified that both commitment to one's major and satisfaction with faculty interaction are significant predictors of GPA. Supporting this, Cox et al. (2016) and Milsom and Coughlin (2017) reported that students with higher levels of major satisfaction typically achieve better grades and exhibit greater engagement in academic activities. Navarro et al. (2014) reinforced these findings by showing

increased motivation and deeper involvement in students with high major satisfaction a pattern echoed by Cox et al. (2016).

Furthermore, the literature consistently links major satisfaction with academic self-efficacy. Ojeda et al. (2011), Lent et al. (2015), and Navarro et al. (2014) found that greater satisfaction with one's major robustly predicts academic self-efficacy, nurturing confidence in students' academic abilities.

The influence of major satisfaction extends beyond academic domains into life satisfaction and broader indicators of quality of life (QoL). Danisman et al. (2023) found that academic major satisfaction is the strongest predictor of overall college life satisfaction, surpassing other factors such as social self-efficacy and academic performance. These findings are supported by frameworks proposed by Ojeda et al. (2011) and Sovet et al. (2014), which emphasize the psychological importance of major satisfaction. Complementing this, Cimsir (2019) found that academic major satisfaction fully mediates the relationship between personal insight and life satisfaction, accounting for approximately 23% of the variance.

Altogether, these studies illuminate a compelling narrative: academic major satisfaction shaped by alignment, identity, and institutional fit enhances academic success (including retention, engagement, performance, and self-confidence) and fosters greater life satisfaction, significantly contributing to student well-being.

Quality of life (QoL) is considered a multidimensional psychological construct that reflects an individual's perceived well-being across physical, mental, social, and environmental domains (Ventegodt et al., 2003), QoL is shaped by personal health, meaning in life, social belonging, and environmental fit. Within the university context, high QoL has been linked to increased academic adjustment, satisfaction with academic major and personal well-being (Diener et al., 1999; Maslow, 1943) further emphasize that fulfilling basic psychological needs such as autonomy, competence, and relatedness (Deci & Ryan, 2012) within a supportive educational setting is essential for enhancing students' quality of life and academic satisfaction, particularly in culturally conservative contexts like Saudi Arabia.

Moreover, quality of life (QoL) has become an increasingly critical area of inquiry, recognized as a multifaceted construct reflecting individual and group well-being in both positive and negative dimensions at a specific point in time (Teoli & Bhardwaj, 2022; Pedro, Leitão, & Alves, 2016).

From a theoretical standpoint, there exists a broad array of theories and models that endeavor to explain the concept of quality of life from multiple perspectives. Each theoretical framework provides a unique lens through which quality of life can be interpreted and analyzed in a comprehensive manner. Among these, needs-based theories such as Maslow's hierarchy of needs, and well-being-oriented models like Diener's subjective well-being theory, offer foundational approaches. In contrast, the Integrated Quality of Life (IQOL) Theory represents a distinct multidimensional perspective. This model, as presented by Ventegodt et al. (2003), endeavors to capture the complexity of quality of life by emphasizing its comprehensive and multidimensional nature.

The core principles of the IQOL theory revolve around four foundational elements: the multidimensional nature of quality of life, the critical role of self-evaluation, the dynamics of interactive processes, and the significance of cultural context. **The IQOL framework posits three principal components**

1. Basic Dimensions – encompassing physical health, mental health, material well-being, spiritual well-being, and a sense of life purpose.
2. Mediating Factors – representing variables that impact the basic dimensions, including income, level of education, employment status, housing conditions, and community integration.
3. Self-Evaluation – referring to individuals' assessments of their life conditions as influenced by both the basic dimensions and the mediating variables.

In the academic context, satisfaction with one's academic major has been increasingly recognized in the literature as a key contributor to students' overall well-being. Academic major satisfaction is enhanced when psychological needs namely, competence, autonomy, and relatedness are fulfilled, as posited by self-determination theory. Similarly, career development theory underscores the significance of aligning academic choices with an individual's evolving self-concept. Of particular relevance is the Interest-Major Fit model, which highlights how alignment between a student's personal interests and their chosen academic major strongly predicts both well-being and persistence in higher education.

These theoretical approaches collectively form a robust foundation for understanding and promoting academic major satisfaction. They also provide practical implications for educators and academic

advisors seeking to implement effective strategies that support student development and retention throughout their university journey.

Academic major satisfaction is considered a vital psychological and educational factor that significantly influences a student's overall experience in higher education. It affects academic performance, intrinsic motivation to learn, and the capacity to effectively adapt to academic demands and environments. Simultaneously, quality of life (QoL) functions as a comprehensive indicator of individual well-being, encompassing multiple domains including physical, psychological, social, and environmental aspects.

Despite the conceptual and practical importance of both constructs, there remains a notable scarcity of empirical research that explicitly explores the relationship between academic major satisfaction and students' quality of life, especially within Arab and Gulf societies. Much of the existing literature tends to focus on quality of life from medical, psychological, or sociodemographic angles, with limited attention to the educational and academic satisfaction dimensions.

This research gap highlights the necessity of conducting focused studies aimed at exploring how satisfaction with academic major contributes to students' broader sense of well-being and overall quality of life. Consequently, the present study seeks to investigate this underexplored relationship, offering valuable insights that may inform policies and practices in academic advising, curricular planning, and student support services across higher education institutions.

Hence, the current study seeks to address the following research questions

1. What is the level of quality of life among students at King Faisal University?
2. What is the level of students' satisfaction with their academic major at King Faisal University?
3. Is there a correlational relationship between quality of life and satisfaction with the academic major among students at King Faisal University?
4. Are there statistically significant differences in quality of life and academic major satisfaction among students at King Faisal University based on gender?
5. Are there statistically significant differences in quality of life and academic major satisfaction among students at King Faisal University based on academic specialization (humanities versus scientific disciplines)?

2. RESEARCH METHODS

The researchers employed the descriptive correlational method in order to achieve the objectives of the study and answer its questions.

2.1. Research Population

The population of the study consisted of all regularly enrolled students at King Faisal University, totalling (33,833) male and female students, according to the electronic portal of King Faisal University for undergraduate students in scientific and humanities disciplines for the academic year 2025.

First: The Pilot Sample: The size of the pilot sample reached (30) university students, selected using the simple random sampling method (males/females), according to their representation in the original population. The purpose of this sample was to verify the psychometric properties of the research instruments.

Second: The Main Sample: Based on the nature of the population, the probabilistic random sampling method was used to select the sample, specifically employing the stratified random sampling technique according to gender (males and females) from King Faisal University students. This constituted the main sample, in which the study instruments were administered to a sample of (377) university students an appropriate number determined according to Steven K. Thompson's equation (Steven K. Thompson, 2012, pp. 59–60). The sample was distributed to reflect the normal representation of the research population, including (177) males representing (47%), and (200) females representing (53%). Regarding the participants' academic specialization, the sample included (207) from humanities majors, representing (55%), and (170) from scientific majors, representing (45%) of the study sample.

Table 1: Distribution of the Research Sample According to Gender.

Gender	Male	Female	Total
Frequency	177	200	377
Percentage	%47	%53	100%

Table 2: Distribution of the Research Sample according to Specialization.

Specialization	Humanity	Scientific	Total
Number	207	170	377
Percentage	%55	%45	100%

2.2. Research Instruments

To achieve the study's objectives and answer its questions, the researchers employed both the Quality-of-Life Scale and the Students' Satisfaction with Their Majors Scale, as detailed below:

2.2.1. Quality of Life Scale

Prepared by Abdel-Khalek (2008), the scale was standardized by the researchers. In its final form, the scale consists of (26) items distributed across four dimensions as follows: one item related to general life–item (1), one item related to general health–item (2), physical health–items (3–9), psychological health–items (10–15), social health–items (16–18), and environment–items (19–26).

Scoring Key of the Scale: A five-point Like).rt scale was used for responses, with scores ranging from (1) to (5) depending on the selection, and scored as follows: (Always–score 5), (Often–score 4), (Sometimes–score 3), (Rarely–score 2), (Never–score 1) for positive statements. This scoring is reversed for negative statements. The negative statements are: (3, 4, 15). Accordingly, the total score on the scale ranges from (26) to (130).

The Psychometric Properties of the Quality-of-Life Scale

First: Validity: To verify the validity of the scale, the researchers carried out the following procedures:

1. Face Validity (Judges' Validity)

The scale in its initial form was presented to a number of specialists in the field, totaling (5) judges, in order to verify the suitability of the dimensions and items of the scale, the correctness of the linguistic formulation, and the appropriateness of the scale to the characteristics of the research sample. The judges provided their observations on the scale, including deletion, modification, and addition. Then, the researchers rewrote the scale in its modified version and resubmitted it to the judges, who expressed their approval of the final version of the scale.

2. Internal Consistency Validity

The internal consistency validity of the Quality of Life scale was verified by calculating the Pearson correlation coefficient on the exploratory sample consisting of (30) students. The correlation coefficient was calculated between the score of each item in the scale and the total score of the scale.

It is evident from the previous table that all correlation coefficients are high except for item number 24, where the correlation coefficient was very weak, amounting to (0.162), as shown in the following table

Table 3: Pearson Correlation Coefficients for the Items of the Quality of Life Scale Dimensions with the Total Scale Score (N = 30).

Phrase	Correlation Coefficient	Significance Level	Phrase	Correlation Coefficient	Significance Level
1	.407	.000	13	.644	.000
2	.421	.000	14	.461	.000
3	.720	.000	15	.625	.000
4	.386	.000	16	.364	.000
5	.540	.000	17	.397	.000
6	.630	.000	18	.576	.000
7	.717	.000	19	.360	.000
8	.679	.000	20	.321	.000
9	.650	.000	21	.519	.000
10	.552	.000	22	.478	.000
11	.423	.000	23	.222	.000
12	.629	.000	24	.162	.000

3. Discriminant Validity (Known-Groups Validity)

To verify the discriminant validity of the Quality of Life scale, the value of the Independent Sample T-Test was calculated for two independent samples, as shown in the following table illustrating the differences between the high and low scores of the scale.

Table 4: Discriminant Validity Analysis Using Independent Samples t-Test.

Gender	Number (N)	Mean	Standard Deviation	t-value	Degrees of Freedom	Significance Level	Result
Higher grades	10	78.2000	9.51957	-8.6	18	.000	The Quality of Life Scale possesses a high discriminative ability.
Minimum scores	10	109.0000	6.23610				

From the previous table, it is clear that there is a significant difference between the high scores and the low scores, which indicates the high discriminant validity of the Quality-of-Life scale.

Second: Reliability The internal consistency coefficient for the Quality-of-Life scale was calculated using the following methods:

1. Cronbach's Alpha coefficient to measure the consistency of the scale items and the overall reliability of the scale. The results showed that all dimensions achieved a high level of reliability, reaching (0.910), which indicates a high degree of internal consistency.

Table 5: Cronbach's Alpha Coefficient for Measuring the Reliability of the Quality-of-Life Scale (N = 30).

Number of vocabulary items	Alpha coefficient value	Level of significance
24	0.934	0.000

2. Split-Half Reliability: To ensure the reliability of the results, the reliability coefficient was also verified using the Split-Half Reliability method, through which the consistency between the two halves of the scale is measured, then the correlation coefficient between the total scores of the two halves is calculated and corrected using the Spearman-Brown formula. The results revealed a reliability coefficient of (0.934), which reflects the stability of the measurement instrument and the internal consistency of its items.

Table 6: Half-split Reliability Analysis for the Quality-of-Life Scale (n = 30).

Correlation coefficient before correction	Correction of the coefficient by Spearman-Brown formula	Number of items
0.877	0.934	24

3. McDonald's Omega coefficient: reliability was also verified by calculating McDonald's Omega coefficient, which reached (0.911), indicating and confirming the reliability of the Quality-of-Life scale, as shown in the following table.

Table 7: McDonald's Omega Coefficient for Measuring the Reliability of the Quality-of-Life Scale (n = 30).

No. of items	Omega reliabiliy	Significance level
24	0.911	0.000

2.2.2. *Student Satisfaction with Their Majors Scale*

Prepared by Nauta (2007) (Nauta, 2007). The scale was standardized by the researchers, and the scoring key was specified as follows: A five-point Likert scale was used for responses, with scores ranging from (1) to (5) depending on the choice. The scoring was as follows: (Always–score 5), (Often–score 4), (Sometimes–score 3), (Rarely–score 2), (Never–score 1).

Psychometric Properties of the Student Satisfaction with Their Major Scale

First: Validity: To verify the validity of the scale, the researchers carried out the following procedures:

1. Face Validity (Expert Validity)

The Student Satisfaction with Their Major Scale used in the study was presented in its initial form to a number of specialized experts totaling (5), in order to verify the appropriateness of the scale's dimensions and items, the correctness of the wording, and the suitability of the scale for the characteristics of the research sample. The experts provided their observations regarding the scale, including deletions, modifications, and additions. Then, the researchers reformulated the scale in its updated version and presented it again to the experts, who expressed their approval of the final version.

2. Internal Consistency Validity

The internal consistency validity of the Student Satisfaction with Their Major Scale was verified by calculating the Pearson correlation coefficient on the exploratory sample consisting of (30) students. The correlation coefficient was calculated between the score of each item of the scale and the total scale score, **as shown in the following table:**

Table 8: Pearson Correlation Coefficients for the Items of the Dimensions of the Student Satisfaction with Their Major Scale with the Total Scale Score (N= 30).

Statement	Correlation coefficient	Significance level
1	.404	.000
2	.276	.000
3	.421	.000
4	.735	.000
5	.709	.000
6	.362	.000

It is evident from the previous table that all correlation coefficients are high.

3. Discriminant Validity (Known-Groups Validity)

To verify the discriminant validity of the Students' Satisfaction with Their Major Scale, the value of the (t) test for two independent samples (Independent Sample T-Test) was calculated, as shown in the following table, which indicates the differences between the highest and lowest scores of the scale.

Table 9: Discriminant Validity Analysis Using the Independent Samples t-Test.

Gender	Number (N)	Mean	Standard Deviation	t-value	Degrees of Freedom	Significance Level	Result
Higher grades	10	10.2000	1.81353	-10.04	18	.000	The Students' Satisfaction with Their Major Scale possesses a high ability to discriminate.
Minimum scores	10	21.4000	3.02581				

Second: Reliability: The internal reliability coefficient of the Quality of Life Scale was calculated using the following methods:

1. Cronbach's Alpha Coefficient was used to measure the internal consistency of the scale items and the overall reliability of the scale. The results showed that all dimensions achieved a high level of reliability, with a value of (0.744), indicating the reliability of the satisfaction scale.

Table 10: Cronbach's Alpha Coefficient for Measuring the Reliability of the Quality-of-Life Scale (n = 30).

Number of vocabulary items	Alpha coefficient value	Level of significance
6	0.744	0.000

2. Split-Half Reliability

Table 11: Split-Half Reliability of the Quality of Life Scale (n = 30).

Correlation Coefficient Before Correction	Coefficient Corrected by the Spearman–Brown Formula	Number of Items
0.739	0.850	6

To ensure the reliability of the results, the stability was also verified using the Split-Half Reliability method, which measures the degree of consistency between the two halves of the scale.The correlation coefficient between the total scores of the two halves was calculated and then corrected using the Spearman-Brown formula.

The results revealed a reliability coefficient of 0.850, which reflects the stability of the measurement tool and the coherence of its items.

3. McDonald's Omega coefficient: The reliability was also verified by calculating McDonald's Omega coefficient, which reached a reliability coefficient of (0.805), indicating and confirming the reliability of the Quality of Life Scale, as shown in the following table.

Table 12: McDonald's Omega Coefficient for Measuring the Reliability of the Quality-of-Life Scale (N = 30).

No. of items	Omega reliability	Significance level
6	0.805	0.000

3. RESULTS

Regarding the first question, which stated: " What is the level of quality of life among students at King Faisal University?"

To measure the levels of quality of life among the study sample, a One-Sample T-Test was applied, and the standard deviation, arithmetic mean, and the weighted average of the level of quality of life among King Faisal University students were calculated, as shown in the following table.

Table 13: The Level of Quality of Life among King Faisal University Students.

Variable	Sample Size (N)	Mean	Standard Deviation	t-Test Value	Degrees of Freedom (df)	Significance Level	Difference Between the Means	Confidence Interval 95%	
								Lower	Upper
Quality of Life	377	20.7666	6.02377	42.585	376	.000	32.91114	31.3915	34.4308
Significant at (0.05)									

It is evident from the table above that there is a statistically significant difference at the (0.01) level for the variable of quality of life among the study sample. This indicates a high level of quality of life among undergraduate students at King Faisal University. This finding is consistent with the results of the study by Hakmi and Al-Zahrani (2024), which revealed a similarly high level of university life quality among students at Taif University.

What is the level of students' satisfaction with their academic major among students at King Faisal University?"

The standard deviation and arithmetic mean were calculated, as well as the average level of students' satisfaction with their academic major among students at King Faisal University, according to the

following table:

Table 14: The Level of Students' Satisfaction with their Academic Major among Students at King Faisal University.

Variable	Sample Size (N)	Mean	Standard Deviation	t-Test Value	Degrees of Freedom (df)	Significance Level	Difference Between the Means	Confidence Interval 95%	
								Lower	Upper
satisfaction with the academic major	377	20.7666	6.02377	18.587	376	.000	5.76658	5.1566	6.3766
(Significant at (0.05).									

It is evident from the table above that there is a statistically significant difference at the 0.01 level concerning the variable of academic major satisfaction among the study sample. This indicates that undergraduate students at King Faisal University are satisfied with their academic majors. This finding is consistent with the results of the study by Oumani and Ketfi (2021), which indicated that the level of academic major satisfaction among students at El-Oued University is high.

As for the third question, which states: " Is there a correlational relationship between quality of life and satisfaction with the academic major among students at King Faisal University?"

To examine this relationship, the Pearson correlation coefficient was calculated between the total values of the two variables: quality of life and satisfaction with academic major, as shown in the following table:

Table 15: Shows the Level of the Relationship between the Variables of Satisfaction with the Major and Quality of Life.

Variables	Sample Size (N)	Mean	Standard Deviation	Pearson Correlation Coefficient	Significance
satisfaction with the academic major	377	20.7666	6.02377	.693**	.000
Quality of life	377	23.6976	7.70043		
Significant at (0.01)					

It is evident from the table above that there is a strong positive correlation, as the Pearson correlation coefficient reached (.693) between the level of quality of life and the academic major satisfaction among students at King Faisal University. This result contrasts with the findings of Zarrouk (2022), which indicated that there is no relationship between quality of life and academic major satisfaction among university students.

Regarding the fourth question: " Are there statistically significant differences in quality of life and academic major satisfaction among students at King Faisal University based on gender?"

To answer this question, Pearson's correlation coefficient was calculated in comparison to Gender (Male/Female), as shown in the following table:

Table 16: The level of the Relationship between the Variables of Satisfaction with the Academic Major and Quality of Life According to Gender (Male/Female).

Variable Gender	Sample Size (N)	Correlation Coefficient	Significance Level
Male	177	.518**	.000
Female	230	.931**	.000
Significant at (0.01)			

The table above shows that the (female) category achieved higher correlation rates than the (male) category, with a Pearson correlation coefficient of (.931), which is considered a strong positive correlation. Meanwhile, the (male) category achieved a moderate correlation coefficient of (.518) at the significance level (0.01), indicating a statistically significant difference in the level of the relationship between quality of life and satisfaction with academic major among the study sample, attributable to the Gender variable in favor of the (female) category. Researchers attribute this result to

psychological and social differences between genders, where female students tend to exhibit more positive interaction and possess higher adaptive skills. Additionally, some of their academic disciplines provide more supportive learning environments, which enhances both quality of life and academic satisfaction. As for the fifth question:" Are there statistically significant differences in quality of life and academic major satisfaction among students at King Faisal University based on academic specialization (humanities versus scientific disciplines)?" To answer this question, the Pearson correlation coefficient was calculated comparing the two specializations (Humanities / Scientific), as shown in the following table:

Table 17: The Level of the Relationship between the Variables of Satisfaction with the Academic Major and Quality of Life according to Specialization (Humanities / Scientific).

Academic specialization variable	Sample size (N)	Correlation coefficient	Significance level
Humanities disciplines	170	.584**	.000
Scientific disciplines	207	.920**	.000
Significant at the 0.01 level			

The table above shows that the category of (scientific majors) achieved higher correlation rates than the category of (humanities majors), as the Pearson correlation coefficient reached (.920), which is considered a strong positive correlation. In contrast, the category of (humanities majors) achieved moderate correlation rates amounting to (.584) at the significance level (0.01), indicating a statistically significant difference in the level of the relationship between quality of life and satisfaction with the academic major among the study sample, attributed to the variable of academic major in favor of the (scientific majors) category. The researchers attribute this result to the nature of the scientific programs, which include clear professional goals and motivating job opportunities, thereby enhancing students' satisfaction, academic belonging, and quality of life, in addition to the clarity of the academic path that increases their sense of stability and purpose.

4. DISCUSSION OF RESULTS

The study results indicate that the level of quality of life among King Faisal University students in Al-Ahsa was statistically significantly high, according to the One-Sample T-Test, reflecting a positive perception of the university environment by the students. This result is consistent with the findings of Hakmi & Al-Zahrani (2024), which showed a high level of university quality of life among students at Taif University. The results also revealed that students' satisfaction with their academic specializations was similarly high, indicating a congruence between students' interests and the disciplines they are studying. This is supported by the findings of Oumani & Ketfi (2021), who reported high levels of academic specialization satisfaction among students at El Oued University. Regarding the relationship between quality of life and satisfaction with the academic major, the results indicated a strong and statistically significant positive correlation (r = .693), suggesting that higher quality of life is associated with greater satisfaction with academic specialization. This finding differs from that of Zarrouk (2022), who found no significant relationship between the two variables. As for differences based on gender, the results showed that female students exhibited a stronger correlation between quality of life and satisfaction with their academic specialization (r = .931) compared to male students (r = .518), indicating statistically significant differences in the relationship in favor of female students. Researchers attribute this result to psychological and social differences between genders, where female students tend to exhibit more positive interaction and possess higher adaptive skills. Additionally, some of their academic disciplines provide more supportive learning environments, which enhances both quality of life and academic satisfaction. Concerning the academic specialization variable (scientific/humanities), the results indicated that students in scientific disciplines demonstrated a stronger correlation (r = .920) compared to their counterparts in the humanities (r = .584), suggesting statistically significant differences in favor of scientific specializations. The researchers attribute this result to the nature of the scientific programs, which include clear professional goals and motivating job opportunities, thereby enhancing students' satisfaction, academic belonging, and quality of life, in addition to the clarity of the academic path that increases their sense of stability and purpose.

Acknowledgements: The authors would like to acknowledge the support of King Faisal University for this research.

Funding: This project was funded through the Annual Funding track by the Deanship of Scientific Research, Vice Presidency for Graduate Studies and Scientific Research, King Faisal University, Saudi Arabia [KFU252238]

REFERENCES

Abdel-Khalek, A. M. (2008). The Arabic version of the World Health Organization Quality of Life Brief Scale: Psychometric results: Preliminary results. Psychological Studies, 18(2), 247–257. http://search.mandumah.com/Record/84234

Abdullah, F. (2006). Measuring service quality in higher education: HEdPERF versus SERVPERF. Marketing Intelligence & Planning, 24(1), 31–47. https://doi.org/10.1108/02634500610641543

Cimsir, E. (2019). Insight, academic major satisfaction and life satisfaction among college students majoring in education: Implications for career counselling. Journal of Psychologists and Counsellors in Schools, 29 (2), 206–218. https://doi.org/10.1017/jgc.2019.15

Cox, E. M., Drahnak□Faller, V., Kaczala, C. T., & Talbert, R. N. (2016). Occupational engagement and academic major satisfaction: Vocational identity's mediating role. Journal of Career Development, 43 (5), 404–417. https://doi.org/10.1177/0894845315573878

Danisman, F. B., Ilyurek, K., Sarul, G., Aktaş, S., Amini, N., & Ada, O. O. (2023). METU students' college life satisfaction: The role of major satisfaction, social self-efficacy, and academic performance. https://arxiv.org/abs/2305.15320

Deci, E. L., & Ryan, R. M. (2012). Self-determination theory. Handbook of theories of social psychology, 1(20), 416-436.

Diener, E., Suh, E., Lucas, R., & Smith, H. (1999). Subjective well-being: Three decades of progress. Psychological Bulletin, 125(2), 276–302. https://doi.org/10.1037/0033-2909.125.2.276

Elom, C. O., Okolie, U. C., Abonyi, S. O., Ekeh, D. O., & Umoke, C. C. (2023). Students' satisfaction with their academic majors and study commitment: The mediating role of academic psychological capital. Psychology in the Schools, 60(12), 2919–2931. https://doi.org/10.1002/pits.22896

Graunke, S. S., & Woosley, S. A. (2005). An Exploration of the Factors that Affect the Academic Success of College Sophomores. College Student Journal, 39(2), 367.

Hakmi, I. A.-H., & Al-Zahrani, M. A. M. (2024). Quality of university life and its relationship to learning motivation among Taif University students. Majallat al-Buhooth al-Tarbawiya wa al-Naw'iya, 25, 27–54. Retrieved from http://search.mandumah.com/Record/1475436

Jadrić, I., Koludrović, M., & Reić Ercegovac, I. (2025). Students' psychological needs and satisfaction with their academic studies: The mediating role of the perceived quality of higher education institutions. Social Sciences, 14(4), 237. https://doi.org/10.3390/socsci14040237

Lent, R. W., Miller, M. J., Smith, P. E., Watford, B. A., Hui, K., & Lim, R. H. (2015). Social cognitive model of adjustment to engineering majors: Longitudinal test across gender and race/ethnicity. Journal of Vocational Behavior, 86, 77–85. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jvb.2014.11.004

Lingán-Huamán, S. K., Dominguez-Lara, S., Postillos, I. O., Medina, R. M., & Esteban, R. F. C. (2025). Academic major satisfaction scale: Psychometric properties and proposal for a measure of academic dropout intention. Frontiers in Education, 10. https://doi.org/10.3389/feduc.2025.1519475

Maslow, A. H. (1943). A theory of human motivation. Psychological Review, 50(4), 370–396. https://doi.org/10.1037/h0054346

Milsom, A., & Coughlin, J. (2017). Examining Person-Environment Fit and Academic Major Satisfaction. Journal of College Counseling, 20(3), 250–262. https://doi.org/10.1002/jocc.12073

Nauta, M. M. (2007). Assessing college students' satisfaction with their academic majors. Journal of Career Assessment, 15(4), 446–462. https://doi.org/10.1177/1069072707305762

Navarro, R. L., Flores, L. Y., Lee, H.-S., & Gonzalez, R. (2014). Testing a longitudinal social cognitive model of intended persistence with engineering students across gender and race/ethnicity. Journal of Vocational Behavior, 85(1), 146–155. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jvb.2014.05.007

Ojeda, L., Flores, L. Y., & Navarro, R. L. (2011). Social cognitive predictors of Mexican American college students' academic and life satisfaction. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 58(1), 61–71. https://doi.org/10.1037/a0021687

Oumani, M., & Ketfi, A. (2021). The level of specialization's satisfaction among students of El-Oued University in the multidisciplinary nature of the College of Social Sciences - at El-Oued University. Journal of

Psychological and Educational Sciences, 7(4), 331–346. http://search.mandumah.com/Record/1232985

Pedro, E., Leitão, J., & Alves, H. (2016). Does the quality of academic life matter for students' performance, loyalty and university recommendation? Applied Research in Quality of Life, 11(1), 293–316. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11482-014-9367-6

Savickas, M. L. (2005). The theory and practice of career construction. In S. D. Brown & R. W. Lent (Eds.), Career development and counseling: Putting theory and research to work (2nd ed., pp. 42–70). John Wiley & Sons.

Sovet, L., Park, M. S.-A., & Jung, S. (2014). Validation and psychometric properties of academic major satisfaction scale among Korean college students. Social Indicators Research, 119 (2), 1121–1131. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11205-013-0537-y

Super, D. E. (1953). A Theory of Vocational Development. American Psychologist, 8(5), 185–190. https://doi.org/10.1037/h0056046

Teoli, D., & Bhardwaj, A. (2023). Quality of life. In StatPearls. StatPearls Publishing. Retrieved from https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/books/NBK536962/

Thies, T., & Falk, S. (2024). Which Factors Drive Major Change and University Dropout? An Analysis on International Degree-Seeking Students at German Universities. Journal of International Students, 14(1), 326-346.

Thompson, S. K. (2012). Sampling (3rd ed.). John Wiley & Sons.

Ventegodt, S., Merrick, J., & Andersen, N. J. (2003). Quality of Life Theory I. The IQOL Theory: An Integrative Theory of the Global Quality of Life Concept. The Scientific World Journal, 3, 1030–1040. https://doi.org/10.1100/tsw.2003.82

Wach, F.-S., Karbach, J., Ruffing, S., Brünken, R., & Spinath, F. M. (2016). University students' satisfaction with their academic studies: Personality and motivation matter. Frontiers in Psychology, 7(55). https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2016.00055

Zarrouk, Y. (2022). Quality of life and its relationship to academic major satisfaction among university students: A field study on a sample of students at Mohamed Seddik Ben Yahia University – Jijel. Sociologiyoun, 3(1), 63–82. https://asjp.cerist.dz/en/article/198540