

## Social Work Towards a Quality of Life and Well - Being Subjective

Eleazar Villegas-González, Francisco J. Rosas-Ferruzca, Cruz García-Lirios

*Universidad Autónoma del Estado de Hidalgo, México*

*\*Corresponding Author: Cruz García-Lirios, Universidad Autónoma del Estado de Hidalgo, México*

### ABSTRACT

*This work was proposed to establish a correlative model to discuss the importance of other variables in the investigation of the quality of life. Once the relationships between the factors derived from the literature review were specified, it conducted a cross sectional study with a non - probabilistic sample of 245 students. When the validity and reliability of the instrument measured was obtained: life satisfaction, expected capabilities, expectations of opportunity, trust relationships, perception of justice, assessment of the environment, standards of context and perceived resources, a structural model was tested [ $X^2 = 12,35$  (12 gl);  $p = 0.000$ ;  $GFI = 0.975$ ;  $RMR = 0.000$ ] in which the perceived availability of resources indirectly correlated to life satisfaction through standards context ( $\gamma = 0.52$ ). The results were compared with findings reported in the state of knowledge.*

**Keywords:** *Quality of life, life satisfaction, group norms, availability of resources, perceived capabilities.*

### INTRODUCTION

The quality of life understood as satisfaction related to resources, values, norms, expectations, perceptions and capabilities is a central issue in the public health agenda for sustainable local development (García, 2013).

Some studies on quality of life (see Table 1) provide significant gender differences regarding transportation, employment and recreation (Baldi & Garcia, 2010). Furthermore, when pondering as a perceptual system resources around the individual and in reference to the parent group, it is considered a style of personal well - being that is geared to social integration (Barranco, Delgado, Meli, & Quintana, 2010).

But quality of life is correlated with anxiety and depression in medical situations of uncertainty and deteriorating health (Machado, Anarte, & Ruiz, 2010). That is, the quality of life is the result of the perception of scarcity of resources rather than the hopes generated from personal abilities. Opportunities seem to boil down to a minimum and thus the responsibility of self increases and an improvement in expectations is observed through the links between the members of a social, family or school group.

Grimaldo (2010) found eight alluding to the quality of life dimensions. This is the economic well - being, interpersonal relationship, family

situation, neighborhood context, social capital and health. Therefore, the quality of life is a web of expectations that are based on a figurative nucleus to influence the decisions of resource allocation (Carreon & Garcia, 2013).

When the individual is undergoing one, health, family or interpersonal economic situation, often estimated that their quality of life has been substantially modified (Sadeghzadeh, 2012). Immediately aesthetic, emotional and rational expectations that drive actions that target the generation and update capabilities subject to the group to which it belongs or wants to belong (Derya, 2012) are activated. That is, the quality of life is a history of the formation of a group identity and sense of belonging anchored to freedom of choice, expectations of justice and collective mobilization.

The quality of life in their perceptual phase generates emotions of distrust of authorities arising in dissident citizen actions (Carreon & Garcia, 2013). Rather, the perception of quality of life, as to the notion of social justice, is linked to conventional styles of development that the individual has learned since childhood and now as an adult translates as reliability or confidence, but realizing that the link is asymmetric with its authorities then mobilizes the resources needed for civil disobedience (Garcia, 2013).

Tariq (2012) notes that the quality of life, in its dimension of life satisfaction, requires a set of indicators to guide not only the perception of the subject, but also collective action. A low level of life satisfaction is sufficient to activate the process of social dissent, but a high level of life satisfaction does not create collaborative, supportive or empathetic links (Carreon & Garcia, 2013).

However, low levels of life satisfaction, which suggests minimum standards of quality of life, promote the formation of support networks. This is the case for the new lesbian-gay or environmentalists, who by forming self-help groups cause greater SWB who only receive social movements abundance of resources (Carreon et al., 2013).

As the quality of life is specific and limits to psychological factors, expectations of discontent, indignation and civil disobedience are increased, but also emerge social skills such as creativity and innovation of minority groups against ideological or pragmatic imposition of the majority (Abolfotouh et al., 2013).

In short, the quality of life in economic, political, social, health, educational, employment and technological terms is a multidimensional construct (Quinceno & Vinaccia, 2013).

### Specifying a Model Variables Correlated With Quality of Life

Relations between opportunities, skills, responsibility, fairness, reliability and life satisfaction aimed at mobilization can be realized in a model.

It is around 17 variables which links economic dependence between social and personal factors, political, group influence life satisfaction.

The HCT warns that capacities would have a significant impact on life satisfaction, since a high level of education is offset by a high satisfying lifestyle (hypothesis 1).

Moreover, if the connection between capabilities and satisfaction of real or symbolic opportunities, then as indicated by the HDT human development is complemented (hypothesis 2).

However, the process involving freedom of choice, necessarily capabilities and life satisfaction, according to CRT, is subject to the availability of resources and their distribution among species. In the case of common resources

there is a zero - sum tragedy in which the actors involved rather than cooperate and establish an administrative stewardship of resources, wantonly compete and suppress the possibility of growth of other species. That is why the availability of resources indirectly affects life satisfaction (Hypothesis 3) mode.

Although the availability of resources pacesetter in the organization of human groups, is the state in reference to citizenship, as warns the SFT, who encourages the spread of resources. When the relationship between civil society and authorities is asymmetric, then the quality of life fades, but when there are bonds of trust then emerges life satisfaction (hypothesis 4).

In another scenario, the link between citizenship and justice authorities raises expectations that undermine or ennoble responsibility. This is because, according to the DET, politics is concomitant with the economy. Higher levels of governance are observed in prosperous countries, while ungovernability underlying weak economies. That is why the expected justice directly affects the life satisfaction of citizens for their political system (hypothesis 5).

The process of confidence, skills and life satisfaction is raised by the SFT. The relationship between society and development - oriented State has in the formation of human capital its main link. SFT proposes that development, unlike the growth but high standards of life satisfaction why, capabilities are an essential factor in the link between political reliability and personal life satisfaction (hypothesis 6).

The indirect relationship between justice and satisfaction to be mediated by the capabilities supposed ecological development scenarios. The CRT notes that the connection between authorities and citizens defined by molar and molecular actions that affect individual satisfaction.

Molars acts contrary to the molecular actions involve significant links that contrasts the individual in crisis situations. Meanwhile, the little meaningful relationships are understood as molecular events from which it is not possible to build a collective memory, social dissent and civil disobedience.

Thus justice, considering a system of molar actions, influences life satisfaction while being regulated by the personal abilities (hypothesis 7).

However, the CRT suggests that the opportunities which affect relations between reliability, justice, capabilities and satisfaction. Thus, freedom of choice to be linked with the political reliability and individual capacities impact on life satisfaction. This is because the trust between citizens and politicians depends on options of choice in employment. If there are job opportunities, then political reliability increases and generates high skills affect states of satisfaction (hypothesis 8). Or, the opportunities are disseminated as justice factors affecting the generation of job skills, while it is possible to observe the growth of personal satisfaction of life (hypothesis 9).

However, freedom of choice involve decisions, demands and resources from which gestate opportunities. It is for this matter that the CRT maintains that the availability of resources, but above all, the dilemma of their distribution, impacts the development of communities or groups sharing scenarios and contexts.

The story of a community or group seems to be undermined by networks of cooperation and trust while resource availability permits. In a situation of scarcity dilemmas and thus the tragedies of common entities emerge. In this sense, the CRT said that opportunities are the result of a shared responsibility between the parties involved.

Thus, resource management indirectly affects satisfaction through opportunities, reliability, justice and abilities. In the first instance, the lack of resources would create a reduction in levels of public trust in the public administration, it would impact the choice options slowing consumption capacity. Once the purchasing power is compromised, citizen satisfaction levels are reduced to a minimum. In this vein, the shortage may also affect public perceptions of injustice, against the lack of government atingencia, choice capabilities are reduced to influence life satisfaction (hypothesis 10).

In contrast, when the availability of resources is insufficient but widely perceived by the public, choice opportunities appear to act in the public trust and thus in decision making not only seeking personal or group satisfaction, but social. This is also a process of justice before the distribution of resources via public services. In this scenario, life satisfaction precedes choice options to be perceived as

abundant transferred the effect of social justice to life satisfaction (hypothesis 11).

Likewise, the relationship between environmental assessment (resources) and life satisfaction (needs obtained) understands the CRT as a direct and meaningful process (hypothesis 12). It is an asymmetrical relationship, as the shortage of resources with rising expectations raises a scenario that compromises the public confidence for their future rulers and capabilities of future civil society (hypotheses 14 and 16).

The CRT notes that in the case of social norms regarding the administration and therefore, the distribution of resources, its relationship with satisfaction in being direct and meaningful comprises a structural reductionism (hypothesis 13), or, interaction with social justice and capacities implies the emergence of a democratic system of citizen opening partnership against the State (hypotheses 15 and 17).

In short, the specification of relationships between factors that theories used to explain the impact of the availability of resources on life satisfaction entails:

- Or n the formation of capabilities understood as options or n ELECTION guides the formation or n with human capital development as a factor of at least economico.
- Opportunities, capabilities and responsibilities perceived not from the availability f í music of resources, but from consumer expectations that P u blicos services spread on users.
- Because resources are managed primarily by the state, they generate perceptions of trust that highlight ELECTION options or n, but mistrust inhibits alternativesELECTION thereby ny or satisfaction or n vital.
- Com ú n the availability of resources triggers dependency relationships between the factors put forward with the aim of encouraging opportunities or ny ELECTIONthereby achieving satisfaction or vital n.

**In consecuense:**

**Null hypothesis.**

The dependency links that are specified in the model fit the observed data. That is, the

## Social Work Towards a Quality of Life and Well - Being Subjective

perception of availability and commonality of resources impacts directly and indirectly on the life satisfaction of students. In the second case of indirect relationship, expectations of opportunity, trust, fairness and ability to reduce or increase the incidence of resources expected on life satisfaction, adjust their relations to specified data.

### Method

#### Design.

A cross - sectional study was conducted.

#### Sample.

A nonrandom selection of 245 students was conducted. The criterion of choice was having a paid, Internet service and have been enrolled in the school semester activity. They interviewed 120 women and 125 men (M = 20.13 years and SD = 2.36 years). Economic status to which the sample belongs was medium low with about \$ 1,500 monthly household income (M = 950 USD and SD = 24.5 USD).

#### Education.

The participants declared their belonging to public universities (M = 2.13 years of study and SD = 0.47 years of study). 67% of respondents had a scholarship or financial support (M = 100 USD and SD = 7.5 USD). Expenditure on tuition (300 USD semester), useful (250 USD semester), Internet (50 USD monthly) and transport (35 USD weekly) generate an

**Table 2.** Operationalization of variables

Factor	Definition	items	Weighing
<b>life satisfaction</b>	Degree evaluation of public services (education, technology and employment)	SV1,SV2, SV3	0 = not satisfactory, 1 = very unsatisfactory, 2 = unsatisfactory, 3 = very good
<b>expected capabilities</b>	Educational level skills, technology and labor choice	EC1,EC2, EC3	0 = not preferable, preferable 1 = very little, 2 = little better, 3 = very preferable
<b>Trust relationships</b>	Degree of credibility in the authorities regarding education, technology and employment	RC1,RC2, RC3	0 = not reliable, 1 = very unreliable, 2 = unreliable, 3 = very reliable
<b>Perception of justice</b>	Evaluation level of public administration in education, technology and labor	PJ1,PJ2, PJ3	0 = not desirable, 1 = very undesirable, 2 = undesirable, 3 = very desirable
<b>Expectations opportunity</b>	Degree of freedom of education, technology and labor choice	EO1,EO2, EO3	0 = not optional, optional 1 = very little, 2 = some optional, 3 = very optional
<b>Environmental assessment</b>	Level of access to educational, technological and industrial utilities	VE1,VE2, VE3	0 = not effective, 1 = very inefficient, 2 = inefficiently, 3 = very efficient
<b>Standards context</b>	Degree distribution of educational public services, technological and labor	NC1,NC2, NC3	0 = not significant, 1 = very little noticeable, 2 = little importance, 3 = very significant

estimated investment of \$ 1,000 every six months (M = 870 USD and DE = 15.67 USD).

#### Employment.

The 36% of the sample declared work before or after attending the school (M = 400 USD monthly and DE = \$ 23.5 monthly). Of the respondents who work 78% said that their wages would rise substantially if complete its vocational training (M = \$ 1,200 monthly expected and DE = \$ 45.5 expected monthly). By contrast, 84% of respondents stated that their income would be lower if you only count with basic secondary education (M = 250 USD and SD = 14.6 USD).

#### Technology.

The 57% paid monthly Internet access from a landline (M = 470 USD monthly and DE = \$ 15.7 per month) while 93% have mobile phone service (M = 140 USD monthly and DE = \$ 10.2 monthly). Facebook (46%), Twitter (27%) and Google+ (14%) are the most used social networks for school purposes or job search.

#### Instrument.

A questionnaire quality of life from the educational, technological and labor dimensions depending on the factors of resource availability, social reliability, social justice, opportunities for choice, selection skills and perceptions of satisfaction (see Table 2) was built .



perceived resources	Level of availability of resources through educational, technological and labor	RP1,RP2,RP3	0 = not cooperative, 1 = very uncooperative, 2 = uncooperative, 3 = very cooperative
---------------------	---	-------------	--

Source: Made by myself.

**Process**

The application of the surveys were conducted at the premises of the Autonomous University of the State of Mexico, after processing to the authorities of the institution. When solving the questionnaire, respondents were instructed to write any questions they may have regarding the survey. Once the information was collected was captured in the Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS, for its acronym in English) version 21.0, to estimate the parameters in multivariate analysis structural moments (AMOS, for its acronym in English ) version 6.0.

**Analysis**

An analysis of normal considering the kurtosis parameter assuming reliability and internal consistency or Cronbach's alpha was performed. Then we proceeded to estimate the construct validity prior sphericity and suitability of the instrument to the study sample. Next, bivariate correlations or multivariate covariance were estimated to anticipate causal relationships in structural models, adjustment and waste.

**Normality**

Kurtosis parameter was used to determine the proximity of the responses to the mean and standard deviation. Close to the unit values are assumed as evidence of normal distribution.

**Reliability**

The internal consistency of the reagents with respect to the scale was weighted Cronbach 's alpha statistic. The above 0.60 and less than 0.90 test values were symmetrical relationships between reactants and psychological traits that measure sought.

**Validity**

Alignment with the Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin parameter in which values above 6.00 a requirement for the construct validity were considered to be praised. Sphericity with Bartlett's test was also estimated, the Chi-square and close to the unit level less than 0.050 significance value is taken as a second request for exploratory factor analysis of principal components with varimax rotation. The correlations between the item and the factor

above 0.300 were assumed as indicators of a construct. As for the percentages of explained variance greater than 20% they were estimated as fit test model specifications regarding observation data.

**Correlation**

Pearson's *r* parameter was used to calculate the negative or positive relationships between the factors in the construct validity. Those close to zero and unit values were admitted as spurious and collinear relationships. Instead, the values between the extremes were considered as probable associations dependence.

**Covariance**

*Phi* estimate was used to determine the association between a factor and another in reference to other factors. As the correlation values identified as spurious, and dependence relationships collinear.

**Structure**

*Phi* parameters were used to estimate covariance, statistical regression *gamma* for exogenous mediators and *beta* parameters for the regression of mediators factors endogenous factors. Statistical *delta*, *epsilon* and *sigma* were used to calculate the measurement errors of exogenous and endogenous indicators as well as disturbance of endogenous factors. The criterion for interpreting the values close to zero and unity was also assessed for the parameters in question.

**Adjustment**

The contrast of the model was carried out from estimating the goodness of fit index (GFI, for its acronym in English). Close to the unit values were judged show of acceptance of null hypothesis.

**Residual**

The contrast model also performed from the calculation of mean square error approximation (RMSEA, for its acronym in English). The near zero values were considered as evidence of fit of the model specified with respect to the data.

**RESULTS**

## Social Work Towards a Quality of Life and Well - Being Subjective

Eight factors [KMO = 0.625 were established;  $X^2 = 14.25$  (23 gl);  $p = 0.000$ ] (see Table 3) concerning life satisfaction (items SV1, SV2, SV3 and 45% of the total variance explained), expected capacity (EC1, EC2, EC3 and 37% of the total variance explained) trust relationships (RC1, RC2, RC3 and 33% of the explained variance), perception of justice (PJ1, PJ2, PJ3 and 31% of the explained variance), expectations of opportunity (EO1, EO2, EO3 and 27% of the variance explained), assessments of the environment (VE1, VE2, VE3 and 25% of the explained variance) standards context (NC1, NC2, NC3 and 23% of the explained variance) and perceived resources (RP1, RP2, RP3 and 21 % of the explained variance).

PJ2, PJ3 and 31% of the explained variance), expectations of opportunity (EO1, EO2, EO3 and 27% of the variance explained), assessments of the environment (VE1, VE2, VE3 and 25% of the explained variance) standards context (NC1, NC2, NC3 and 23% of the explained variance) and perceived resources (RP1, RP2, RP3 and 21 % of the explained variance).

**Table 3.** Validity of the constructs correlate with the quality of life

		F1	F2	F3	F4	F5	F6	F7	F8
	<i>Life satisfaction</i>								
<b>SV1</b>	Things I like to do, study it seems:	0.356							
<b>SV2</b>	Technologies that interest me, I use the Internet is:	0.451							
<b>SV3</b>	My preferences employment, university bag work is:	0.478							
	<i>expected capabilities</i>								
<b>EC1</b>	Of things I can do, study seems to me:		0.591						
<b>CE2</b>	Skills I have, use the Internet for tasks is:		0.894						
<b>CE3</b>	Of the jobs I've had, a scholarship is:		0.621						
	<i>Trust relationships</i>								
<b>RC1</b>	Of all my friends, studying with someone unknown is:			0.412					
<b>RC2</b>	Of all my contacts, my task to send an e -university is:			0.512					
<b>RC3</b>	In my previous work, any extracurricular work seems to me:			0.725					
	<i>Perception of justice</i>								
<b>PJ1</b>	Those rejected in the entrance exam, missing a class I think:				0.412				
<b>PJ2</b>	Electronic pages that are spying on us, send my task for the university network is:				0.587				
<b>PJ3</b>	Of minimum - wage jobs, the ability to make money in college is:				0.824				
	<i>Expectations opportunity</i>								
<b>EO1</b>	Work opportunities I've had, I think a scholarship:					0.472			
<b>EO2</b>	Of the most useful technologies, train in or with any of them at the university is:					0.384			
<b>EO3</b>	Of the jobs that have taught me the possibility to specialize in college it is:					0.481			
	<i>Environment Ratings</i>								
<b>VE1</b>	Public services I paid, free university study seems:						0.412		
<b>VE2</b>	Public Internet networks I know, use the server of the university is:						0.382		
<b>VE3</b>	Of job placement services in which I am enrolled, university bag is:						0.482		

	<i>Standards context</i>								
<b>NC1</b>	Of the things that I usually do, read for an exam I think:							0.413	
<b>NC2</b>	Of the contacts that I usually talk, read your comments is:							0.482	
<b>NC3</b>	Of the activities that I usually do, make final work is:							0.583	
	<i>perceived resources</i>								
<b>RP1</b>	Of the things that I shared, lend books to classmates is:								0.351
<b>RP2</b>	From the messages I've sent or received on the Internet, unsubscribe on the network seems:								0.486
<b>RP3</b>	Of the things I've done for money, doing homework someone I think:								0.631

Source: Made by myself.

In the case of the descriptive results (see Table 4) a tendency to positive choices for answers to items of the factors of life satisfaction, expected capabilities, relationships of trust, norms of context and perceived resources and a negative prevalence is observed factors perception of justice, opportunity and ratings expectations of the environment.

With regard to life satisfaction, the item SV3 (M = 2.47, SD = 0.49; C = 2.04) won the closest value to the "very satisfactory" option while the item SV2 ( M = 2.01, SD = 0.27; C = 2.08) approached the "unsatisfactory" option. That is, the survey sample appears to guide their life satisfaction towards a close to full satisfaction educational, technological and labor scenario.

For the expected capacity, the item CE3 (M = 2.71, SD = 0.41; C = 2.01) was around the "very preferable". In contrast, the item EC1 (M = 2.47, SD = 0.37; C = 2.01) approached the "little

better" option. In this sense, the survey sample seems to direct their responses to a nearby option to the efficient perception of their abilities.

Meanwhile, in relationships of trust, the item RC2 (M = 2.94, SD = 0.48; C = 2.05), unlike the item RC3 (M = 2.04, SD = 0.93 C = 2.01) approached the "very reliable" option. This suggests that confidence is perceived as a key element of relations between the surveyed sample.

As for the perception of justice, the item PJ3 (M = 1.27, SD = 0.31; C = 2.05) compared to item PJ2 (M = 1.59, SD = 0.15; C = 2.01) to be hanging around the "highly undesirable" alternative is a biased appreciation of justice. This is because the injustice that the sample surveyed perceived their authorities seem to be a central element in their life satisfaction.

Table 4. Descriptive instrument

	<b>Example</b>	<b>M</b>	<b>FROM</b>	<b>C</b>	<b>α</b>
	<i>Life satisfaction</i>				0,72
<b>SV1</b>	Things I like to do, study it seems:	2,35	0,36	2,04	
<b>SV2</b>	Technologies that interest me, I use the Internet is:	2,01	0,27	2,08	
<b>SV3</b>	My preferences employment, university bag work is:	<b>2,47</b>	0,49	2,04	
	<i>expected capabilities</i>				0,74
<b>EC1</b>	Of things I can do, study seems to me:	2,47	0,37	2,01	
<b>CE2</b>	Skills I have, use the Internet for tasks is:	2,56	0,69	2,03	
<b>CE3</b>	Of the jobs I've had, a scholarship is:	<b>2,71</b>	0,41	2,01	
	<i>Trust relationships</i>				0,79
<b>RC1</b>	Of all my friends, studying with someone unknown is:	2,51	0,51	2,07	
<b>RC2</b>	Of all my contacts, my task to send an e - university is:	<b>2,94</b>	0,48	2,05	
<b>RC3</b>	In my previous work, any extracurricular work seems tome:	2,04	0,93	2,01	
	<i>Perception of justice</i>				0,74
<b>PJ1</b>	Those rejected in the entrance exam, missing a class I think:	1,57	0,29	2,08	

<b>PJ2</b>	Electronic pages that are spying on us, send my task for the university network is:	1,59	0,15	2,01	
<b>PJ3</b>	Of minimum - wage jobs, the ability to make money in college is:	<b>1.27</b>	0,36	2,04	
	<i>Expectations opportunity</i>				0,78
<b>EO1</b>	Work opportunities I've had, I think a scholarship:	1,46	0,72	2,03	
<b>EO2</b>	Of the most useful technologies, train in or with any of them at the university is:	1,58	0,59	2,01	
<b>EO3</b>	Of the jobs that have taught me the possibility to specialize in college it is:	<b>1,14</b>	0,31	2,05	
	<i>Environment Ratings</i>				0,75
<b>VE1</b>	Public services I paid, free university study seems:	1,46	0,49	2,01	
<b>VE2</b>	Public Internet networks I know, use the server of the university is:	1,38	0,32	2,03	
<b>VE3</b>	Of job placement services in which I am enrolled, university bag is:	<b>1,03</b>	0,26	2,03	
	<i>Standards context</i>				0,71
<b>NC1</b>	Of the things that I usually do, read for an exam I think:	2,47	0,48	2,03	
<b>NC2</b>	Of the contacts that I usually talk, read your comments is:	<b>2.70</b>	0,59	2,01	
<b>NC3</b>	Of the activities that I usually do, make final work is:	2,36	0,63	2,07	
	<i>perceived resources</i>				0,75
<b>RP1</b>	Of the things that I shared, lend books to classmates is:	2,45	0,26	2,04	
<b>RP2</b>	From the messages I've sent or received on the Internet, unsubscribe on the network seems:	2,14	0,56	2,08	
<b>RP3</b>	Of the things I've done for money, doing homework someone I think:	<b>2.75</b>	0,21	2,03	

Source: Made by myself.

In the case of the expectations of opportunity, the item EO3 (M = 1.14, SD = 0.31; C = 2.05) in reference to the item EO2 (M = 1.38, SD = 0.59; C = 2.01) reflects a trend towards "very little optional" option, which suggests that the opportunities are valued as almost nil by the survey sample.

It is the same case of valuations of the environment, as the item VE3 (M = 1.03, SD = 0.26; C = 2.03) compared to item VE1 (M = 1.46, SD = 0.49 C = 2,01) shows an inclination to "very efficient" option, which is the result of considering public services as a system of unequal distribution among the survey sample.

As standards context item NC2 (M = 2.70, SD = 0.59; C = 2.01) in contrast to the item NC3 (M = 2.35, SD = 0.63; C = 2.07) approached the "very significant" option. This means that the conventions that guide the actions of the individual to be evaluated positively prove the influence of the system on an indicator of the quality of life in the survey sample.

Finally, the factor of perceived resources, RP3 item (M = 2.75, SD = 0.21; C = 2.03) compared with the item RP2 (M = 2.14, SD = 0, 56; C = 2.08) reveals a "very cooperative" tendency on the part of the survey sample. This means

that the distribution of resources probably influences the perception of scarcity and hence the need to share.

The reliability of the factors 1 to 8 (alphas respective 0.72; 0.74; 0.79; 0.74; 0.78; 0.75; 0.71 and 0.75) expresses a regular consistency between items, since the overall reliability of the instrument was 0.69.

The association between factors (see Table 5) shows that life satisfaction and expectations of opportunity (r = 0.582), expected capabilities and perceived resources (r = 0.719), relationships of trust and perceived resources (r = 0.625), perception of justice and expectations of opportunity (0.613), expectations of opportunity and perceived resources (0.509), assessment of the environment and standards of context (0.495) and standards of context and perceived resources (r = 0.321) assume that the specification of relationships between factors could be estimated by a model, although it was expected that would have negative relationships between perceptions of justice, expectations of opportunity and ratings of the environment, since their means, deviations and kurtosis warned a negative prevalence regarding the positive trend of the other factors.



**Table 5.** Correlations between factors

	SV	AC	RC	PJ	EO	GO	NC	RP
Life satisfaction	1,000							
expected capabilities	0.461	1,000						
Trust relationships	0.372	0.592	1,000					
Perceptions of justice	0.461	0.491	0,381	1,000				
Expectations opportunity	<b>0.582</b>	0.395	0.493	<b>0.613</b>	1,000			
Environment Ratings	0.482	0.591	0.597	0.492	0,315	1,000		
Standards context	0.481	0.391	0.570	0.582	0.526	<b>0.495</b>	1,000	
perceived resources	0.493	<b>0,719</b>	<b>0,625</b>	0.481	<b>0.593</b>	0.314	<b>0.321</b>	1,000

Source: Made by myself.

The analysis of covariance (see Table 6) as well as the correlations showed positive links between life satisfaction and ratings of the environment ( $\Phi = 0.610$ ), expected capabilities and expectations of opportunity ( $\Phi = 0.692$ ), relationships of trust and perceived resources ( $\Phi$

$= 0.729$ ), perception of justice and perceived resources ( $\Phi = 0.624$ ), expectations of timeliness and standards context ( $\Phi = 0.714$ ), assessments of the environment and perceived resources ( $\Phi = 0.624$ ) and standards context and resources perceived ( $\Phi = 0.735$ ).

**Table 6.** Factor covariance

	SV	AC	RC	PJ	EO	GO	NC	RP
Life satisfaction	1,825							
expected capabilities	0.372	1,935						
Trust relationships	0.482	0.481	1,725					
Perceptions of justice	0.592	0.593	0.371	1,868				
Expectations opportunity	0.393	0.692	0.484	0.371	1,938			
Environment Ratings	0.610	0.482	0.596	0,415	0.687	1,836		
Standards context	0.413	0.396	0.686	0,581	0.714	0.482	1,738	
perceived resources	0.382	0.481	0,729	0.624	0.491	0.624	0.735	1,829

Source: Made by myself.

Covariances brandished warn that the specified relationships seem to establish a system of quality of life centered on life satisfaction, expected capabilities, relationships of trust, norms of context and resources collected more than perceptions of justice, expectations of opportunity and ratings of the environment .

The model of structural relationships shows that the factor influencing the perception of resources on life satisfaction is the standard of context ( $\gamma = 0.52$ ), followed by environmental assessment factor ( $\gamma = 0.37$ ), expected capacities ( $\beta = 0.31$ ), relations of trust ( $\beta = 0.28$ ) and perceived justice ( $\beta = 0.24$ ). That is, the full satisfaction of actions relating to the academy, technology and employment is influenced by the availability of resources received through ingrained behaviors of students. This finding exalts an assumption of the theory of common resources according to which the customs of groups internalize resources as elements of community and identity (García, Carreon & Hernandez, 2014). This is because the conservation of resources due to customs rooted

in the sense of belonging is essential for personal, group or community satisfaction.

The contrast of the dependency relationships [ $X^2 = 12,35$  (12 gl);  $p = 0.000$ ;  $GFI = 0.975$ ;  $RMR = 0,000$ ] evidence acceptance of the null hypothesis.

## DISCUSSION

Referring to the work of Machado et al . (2010) in which the dependency relationship between anxiety and low perceived quality of life, this study found that the perceived availability of resources indirectly correlates of life satisfaction through standards demonstrated context.

The quality of life have been considered two overriding dimensions: subjective and physical, involved the relationship between availability of resources and basic psychological processes that links groups would not affect the perception of satisfaction.

Although in this study the relationship of trust and perception of justice are variables related to the dynamics of groups to which the individual

belongs, its influence is less than the value of resources (public education, technology and employment) and personal capacities (freedom of choice, skills and knowledge), although the rules of context (ingrained behaviors) increase the relationship between available resources and life satisfaction. However, it is essential to include personal pathologies in the model of dependency relationships to contrast their influence on life satisfaction.

### CONCLUSION

Quality of life, in its dimension of satisfaction of public education services, Internet and employment, in the sample of young people surveyed:

- The relationship or indirect one between perceived resources and the satisfaction or one of life suggests that there are group and personal factors that regulate the impact of a shortage or perceived abundance of resources, although the state of knowledge cautions that are psychosocial variables or factors which they are associated with perceptions of satisfaction or full of life one.
- The satisfaction or one of life to interact with perceived resources, assessments of the environment, standards of context, perception or one of justice, trust relationships, opportunities and expected capabilities can explain rise from frames you or rich psychosocial or logical or social or logical, but it must include theory as order and constructs economic or economic and political, since their exclusion or one reduces the quality of life to the perception or one of respondents.

### REFERENCES

[1] Abolfotouh, M., Salam, M., Alturaif, D., Suliman, W., Al-Essa, N., Al-Issa, H., & Al-rowaily, M. (2013). Predictors of quality of life and Glycemic Control Among Adults with diabetes Arabia. *International Journal of Medicine and Medical Sciences*, 46, 1360-1370.

[2] Arístegui, I., & Vazquez (2013). The impact of stigma and discrimination in the quality of life of transgender people living with HIV. *Hologrammatic*, 19, 5-30.

[3] Baldi, G., & Garcia, E. (2010). Perception of quality of life in a sample of individuals city of San Luis, Argentina. *Universities*, 40, 17-26.

[4] Barranco, C., Delgado, M., Melin, C., & Quintana, R. (2010). Social work in housing. *Research on perceived quality of life Biblio*, 2, 102-113.

[5] Benites, L. (2010). Autism, family and quality of life. *Culture*, 24, 1-20.

[6] Carreon, J., & Garcia, C. (2013). Theories of public safety and crime perception. *Margen*, 71, 1-16.

[7] Carreon, J., Garcia, C., Morales, M., Hernandez, J., Rosas, J., & Rivera, B. (2013). Sustainable local development in the public sphere. *Economy and Society*, 18 (44), 35-48.

[8] Derya, K. (2012). Genders Differences on employee perceptions of quality indicators for working life in five star hotels in Turkey. *International Journal of Academic Research in Accounting, Finance and Management Sciences*, 2, 195-203.

[9] Ferragutti, G. (2012). Governmentality and human capital. Towards an outline of emergency conditions speeches on the information society, education and new technologies. *Practices and Discourses 1 (1)*, 1-16.

[10] Garcia, C. (2013). Local development, water vulnerability, job insecurity, migratory intensity and resilient identity. *Kairos*, 32 : 1-17.

[11] Garcia, C. Carreon, J., & Hernandez, J. (2014). Training of human capital in the civilization of climate change. *International Journal of Social Science Research 10 (1)*, 107-125.

[12] Grimaldo, M. (2010). Adaptation of the Quality of Life Scale Orson & Barnes for health professionals. *Culture*, 24, 1-20.

[13] Machado, A., Anarte, M., & Ruiz, M. (2010). Predictors of quality of life in patients with type 1 diabetes mellitus *Science and Health*, 21, 35-47.

[14] Melendro, E. (2011). Ecosocial perspective in educational intervention with young people excluded. A comparative study in Canada, Belgium and Spain. *Spanish Journal of Comparative Education*, 17, 197-218.

[15] Picazo, E., Gutierrez, E., Infante, J., and Cantu, P. (2011). Theory and Sustainable Human Development: Towards strengthening health as a universal right and freedom. *Social Studies*, 19, 254-279

[16] Quiceno, J., & Vinaccia, S. (2013). Resiliency, disease perception, belief, religious spiritual coping and quality of life related to health in patients diagnosed with rheumatoid

## Social Work Towards a Quality of Life and Well - Being Subjective

- arthritis. *Psychology from the Caribbean*, 30, 590-619.
- [17] Reyes, L. (2010). The dilemma of common natural resources. *Management and Environment*, 13, 71-80.
- [18] Sadeghzadeh, V. (2012). Improved quality of life with cardiac rehabilitation in post myocardial infarction Patients. *International Research Journal of Applied and Basic Sciences*, 3, 394-401.
- [19] Tariq, Q. (2012). Impact of financial stress on life satisfaction. *Asian Journal of Social Science & Humanities*, 1, 139-148.

### ANNEXED

**Table.** State of knowledge

Year	authors	construct	Sample	Instruments	results
2010	Baldi and Garcia	Quality of life: "refers to styles or lifestyles, or standard standard of living (consumption goods)" (Baldi and Garcia, 2010, p .21)	168 residents of the city of San Luis	WHOQOL	There are differences between men and women regarding their degree of satisfaction of quality of life; transport ( $X^2 = 12.21$ , $p = 0.02$ ), energy and fatigue ( $X^2 = 10.48$ , $p = 0.03$ ), job skills ( $X^2 = 23.44$ , $p = 0.02$ ) and opportunities for recreation ( $X^2 = 24.03$ , $p = 0.02$ )
2010	Barranco, Delgado, Melin and Quintana	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Quality of life and emotional well allude to feel calm, safe, stress-free and not be nervous.</li> <li>- Interpersonal relationships refer to interact with different people, make friends and get along with people.</li> <li>- Material well-being is to have enough money to buy what you need and want to have, to have a place suitable housing and work.</li> <li>- Personal development is the opportunity to learn different things, have knowledge and personal fulfillment.</li> <li>- Physical well-being is linked to good health, feeling in good physical shape and have healthy eating habits.</li> <li>- Self-determination is to decide for yourself and have the opportunity to choose how life, work, leisure, the place where one lives and the people with whom you are</li> </ul>	Ten residents of Matanzas, Santa Cruz, Tenerife (Spain)	In-depth interview with script	The perception of quality of life is above average, as respondents say they are satisfied with the services, opportunities and corresponding capabilities. However, there is need for intervention from social work to promote the quality of life through the mediation of conflicts between actors. In that sense, they claim to live in a public peace, but this may be threatened by differences between communities when establishing the distribution of resources

		<p>will.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Social Integration connects to go to places in the city or neighborhood where other people attend and participate in its activities as one. Feeling member of society, feel integrated and have the support of other individuals.</li> <li>- Rights: to be considered the same as other people, to be treated with fairness, respect their way of being, opinions, desires and intimacy</li> </ul>			
2010	Machado, Anarte and Ruiz	<p>- Quality of life: "the individual's perception of their position in life in the context of culture and value system in which they live and in relation to their goals, expectations, standards and concerns" (Machado et al, 2010. p. 36)</p>	46 patients	Diabetes Quality of Life	Anxiety determined the quality of life ( $\beta = 0.595$ , $t = 3.321$ , $p = 0.000$ ) when interacting with five other physical variables, medical, psychological and social. Depression was the second predictor of the quality of life to interact with other five variables ( $\beta = 0.525$ , $t = 3.321$ , $p = 0.002$ )
2010	Grimaldo	<p>Quality of life: "state of general satisfaction derived from the realization of potential of the person. It has subjective and objective aspects, intimidation, emotional expression, perceived safety, personal productivity and health; and as objective aspects are considered: material well-being, harmonious relations with the physical and social environment and the objectively perceived "community" (Grimaldo, 2010, p. 2)</p>	198 participants	Quality of Life Scale	the validity and reliability of the quality of life considering nine dimensions on media ( $\alpha = 0.93$ ), economic welfare ( $\alpha = 0.83$ ), couple ( $\alpha = 0.87$ ), family life and home was established ( $\alpha = 0.89$ ), religion ( $\alpha = 0.95$ ), neighborhood and community ( $\alpha = 0.90$ ), leisure ( $\alpha = 0.88$ ), friends ( $\alpha = 0.88$ ) and health ( $\alpha = 0.85$ )
2012	Sadeghzadeh	<p>Quality life : "is a virtual perception and containst the</p>	60 patients	pre and post-intervention measurement	significant differences between the experimental and control groups

		negative and positive aspects of the person's life and it Explains the way That a person perceived the others aspects of his / her life and how he / she Reacts to them" (Sadeghzadeh, 2012, p. 395)			regarding medical intervention and perceived quality of life were established before and after the intervention (t = 3.86 [29 gl], p = 0.000)
2012	Derya	<i>Quality of life</i> : "Refers to the impact of the workplace satisfaction in non-work life domains, in satisfaction and reward expectations are influenced by Their work environment employees jobs, supervisors, and work groups, and the organizational structure and technology) and the extend It provides value to Which rewards "(Derya, 2012, p. 196)	1,200 employees at five-star hotels	Quality of Worklife	The authors set significant differences between men and women regarding their perceived health (t = 2.543, p = 0.011), needs updating (t = 3.744, p = 0.000), needs knowledge (t = 2.977, p = 0.003) and aesthetic needs (t = 1.790, p = 0.074)
2012	Tariq	<i>Life satisfaction</i> : "Refers to a judgmental process in Which single ASSESS the quality of Their Lives on the basis of Their own set of criteria" (Tariq, 2012, p .141)	One hundred financial executives	Life Satisfaction and Financial Stress	Life satisfaction and financial stress negatively correlated (r = -0,118, p <0.001) and significant differences between high and low financial stress were determined with respect to life satisfaction (t = 2.37 [98 gl], p <0.05)
2013	Aristegui and Vazquez	Quality of life: "perception that individuals have about their position in life, its cultural context and value system in which [live] in conjunction [with] their expectations, interests and achievements" (Aristegui and Vazquez, 2013 , p. 7)	Ten Argentine transgenders	In-depth interviews	Quality of life and subjective or psychological well-being were evoked in the speeches of the interviewees, because on the one hand claim that their life expectancies are inhibited to be discriminated against, but then the formation of a group transgender allowed them to establish networks support for
2013	Abolfotouh, Salam, Alturaif, Suliman Al-	<i>Quality of life</i> : "Which is defined as a multidimensional	394 subjects	Diabetes Quality of Life	They were revealed significant gender differences regarding their perception of quality of life (X <sup>2</sup> = 13.622, p



Social Work Towards a Quality of Life and Well - Being Subjective

	Essa, Al-Issa and Al-Rowaily	concept That encompasses the physical, emotional, social perception Associated With An illness or treatment is" (Abolfotou et al, 2013, p 1361..)			= 0.001, t = 0.316, p = 0.001) and life satisfaction ( $X^2 = 12.164$ , p = 0.002, t = 3.05, p = 0.001)
2013	Quiceno and Vinaccia	Quality linked to health life "refers to the subjective assessment of the influences of current health status, health care, and health promotion on the individual's ability to achieve and maintain an overall level of performance that allows continue those activities that are important to the individual and affect overall welfare "(Quiceno and Vinaccia, 2013, p. 594) Resilience: "The capacity in adult individuals living in normal conditions to have relatively stable levels of physical and psychological functioning when exposed to an isolated and potentially very disturbing event" (Quiceno and Vinaccia, 2013, p 595.)	41 patients	Resilience Scale. Questionnaire perception of disease. Health Questionnaire	Concern correlated with physical functioning (r = -0.512, p = 0.001) in the same way that the consequences (r = -0.491, p = 0.001) and those with general health (r = -0.472, p = 0.001)