

# **The health status and perceived health problems of medical, psychology, law and economics and business students compared to other students at the University of Amsterdam in the Netherlands.**

## **A quantitative cross-sectional survey study.**

Research report  
Faculty of Medicine  
University of Amsterdam / Academic Medical Centre  
09-11-2018

### **Ellen Boon**

Student number: 10298576  
E-mail: e.boon@amc.uva.nl

### **Location of the internship**

General Practitioners Practice UvA / The Student Doctors' Office  
Oude Turfmarkt 151  
1012 GC Amsterdam

### **Daily supervisors:**

P. Vonk, MD  
Tel.nr: 020-5254771  
E-mail: p.vonk@uva.nl

Dr. C.M. van der Heijde, PhD  
Tel.nr: 020-5255306  
E-mail: c.m.vanderheijde@uva.nl

### **AMC senior tutor:**

Prof. Dr. Nynke van Dijk, MD and PhD  
Department of General Practice / Family Practice  
Academic Medical Centre  
Meibergdreef 9  
1105 AZ Amsterdam  
Tel.nr: 020-5668460  
E-mail: n.vandijk@amc.uva.nl



UNIVERSITY OF AMSTERDAM

Huisartsenpraktijk UvA-HvA



Amsterdam UMC  
Universitair Medische Centra

## Index

Summary.....	3
Introduction .....	4
Method.....	6
Results .....	8
Discussion.....	14
References .....	17
Appendix 1: List of abbreviations and acronyms .....	23
Appendix 2: Description of own input and accomplishment of learning goals.....	24
Appendix 3: Approved project plan .....	25
Appendix 4: Summary of Holland's theory.....	32
Appendix 5: Overview of the scales.....	33
Appendix 6: Descriptive characteristics .....	38
Appendix 7: Correlation table .....	42
Appendix 8: Description of the significant hierarchical regression analyses, which were not included in the results.....	46
Appendix 9: Description of the significant logistic regression analyses, which were not included in the results .....	47
Appendix 10: Hierarchical regression analyses whereby medical students are compared with non-medical students .....	48
Appendix 11: Hierarchical regression analyses whereby law students are compared with non-law students .....	70
Appendix 12: Hierarchical regression analyses whereby psychology students are compared with non-psychology students .....	92
Appendix 13: Hierarchical regression analyses whereby economics and business students are compared with non-economics and business students .....	114
Appendix 14: Logistic regression analyses whereby medical students are compared with non-medical students .....	136
Appendix 15: Logistic regression analyses whereby law students are compared with non-law students .....	148
Appendix 16: Logistic regression analyses whereby psychology students are compared with non-psychology students .....	160
Appendix 17: Logistic regression analyses where economics and business students are compared with non-economics and business students.....	172

## Summary

### Introduction:

University students report more health complaints (both physical and mental) and a lower social well-being compared to peers who do not study. Health problems can lead to study problems and even study failure. Prior research has also shown that students do not, or too late, appear to seek help for problems in these areas. As a result, they risk an unnecessary deterioration of their health. The fact that students with health problems do not seek help stresses the importance of early detection. Different personality types are related to other health problems. The aim of this study is to study the health status and perceived health problems of studies of which we know that they have a big difference in personality types: medical, law, psychology and economics and business students.

### Method:

The design of this study is a cross-sectional survey study. All students at the University of Amsterdam who filled in the Student Health Check, an online self-monitor, between February 2015 and May 2016 were included in this study. Questions of the online questionnaire about physical health, mental health, health (risk) behaviour, social well-being and personal characteristics were used in this study. Multiple stepwise hierarchical regression analyses and multiple stepwise logistic regression analyses were conducted to investigate the predictive value of various independent variables for different health indicators.

### Results:

Of all 2393 participants, 395 (16.5%) were medical students, 383 (16%) were law students, 70 (2.9%) were psychology students and 271 (11.3%) were economics and business students.

*Study programs:* Being a medical student was related to a better general health, a better vitality, less anxiety, less smoking, more satisfaction with study and a better quality of student life compared with other university students. In addition, being a law student was related to a better general health, more physical complaints, less drug (ab)use and less satisfaction with study. However, being a psychology student was not related to having more or less health problems than students from other study programs. Being an economics and business student was related to a better general health, less physical complaints, less psychological complaints and less satisfaction with study.

*Characteristics of all study programs:* Male students, students living with peers, students who consider themselves as Dutch, no negative sexual experiences, not perceiving problems and not seeking or having help were related to a better general health. Male students, students living with peers, students who consider themselves as Dutch, single students, no negative sexual experiences, not perceiving problems and not seeking or having help were related to a better vitality. Male students, students living with peers, single students were related to less physical complaints. Male students, better study results, no negative sexual experiences, not perceiving problems and not seeking or having help were related to less anxiety and less psychological complaints. Female students, students living with parents, better study results and better withstanding pressure from peers were related to less substance abuse. Younger age, having a relationship, students who consider themselves as Dutch, no negative sexual experiences, not perceiving problems and not seeking or having help was related to more satisfaction with study and a better quality of student life.

### Conclusion:

Being a student of a different study program was related to having more or less certain health problems. Students' health was associated with their sex, age, relationship status, living situation, if they consider themselves as Dutch, study results, negative sexual experiences, withstanding pressure from peers, perceiving problems and seeking or having help.

## Introduction

University students report significant more health complaints (both physical and mental) and a lower social well-being compared to peers who do not study (1-5). Frequent complaints of students are depression, anxiety and neck, shoulder and back problems (1,6). Studies report also elevated levels of substance abuse (7,8). Health problems can lead to study problems and even study failure, irrespective of their academic abilities (9-11). Ultimately, symptoms of poor health during student time affect the career potential and also lead to poorer health in the future (12-15). Two Dutch studies indicated that students' problem perception of their health behaviour, study situation and student life was associated with worse health outcomes (1,16). Also having negative sexual experiences (17-20) and not being able to withstand pressure from peers (21,22) were related to worse mental health and physical health and more social problems. Prior research has also shown that students do not, or too late, appear to seek help for problems in these areas. As a result, they risk an unnecessary deterioration of their health (9,23). The fact that students with health problems do not seek help stresses the importance of early detection.

However, not all students have the same health problems. Different personality types of students are related to other health problems (24-29). According to Day et al. in 2005, the different personality types jointly accounted for an additional 12% of the variance in well-being (27). Holland's theory (1997) surveyed the students' personality and related it to study choice (30). In Holland's formulation, there are six types of people and study or work environments: realistic, investigative, artistic, social, enterprising and conventional. In this theory, medical students are an example of the investigative personality, law students match with the enterprising personality type, psychology students are an example of the social personality type and economics and business students match with the conventional personality type (30). A summary of Holland's theory is presented in appendix 4. Other studies that adopted Holland's theory confirmed that there is a significant relationship between study choice and personality types (31-36): 70% of the students had personality types that were congruent with their study choice (37). Students who choose to study in an environment similar to their personality type are more likely to be successful and satisfied (30). Because of different personality types are related to other health problems, this research focuses on the health of students of studies of which we know according to Holland's theory (30) that they have a big difference in personality types: medical, law, psychology and economics and business students.

There are many definitions of health in the literature. According to Huber et al. in 2011, "health as the ability to adapt and to self-manage, in the face of social, physical and emotional challenges." (38). This definition is dynamic and emphasises the resilience and capacity of people to cope with chronic disease. However this definition is only applicable in circumstances that are within one's control, whereas some determinants of health cannot be adjusted by individuals (38,39). The Constitution of the World Health Organization (WHO), which came into force on April 7, 1948, defined health "as a state of complete physical, mental and social well-being and not merely the absence of disease or infirmity." (40). Although the definition has been criticised over the past 60 years, it has never been adapted. Articles in the past already highlight its problem created by use of the word "complete" (41-43). However, this definition highlights the important aspects of physical, mental and social well-being to define health. In this study this definition will be used. The three dimensions of health (physical health, mental health and social well-being) of medical, law, psychology and economics and business students will be explained briefly.

*Physical health.* A recent survey of the University of Amsterdam in the Netherlands found 25% of medical, 18% of economics and business, 34% of law and 30% of psychology students reporting physical health complaints (44). Another survey among psychology students in the United States found that approximately the same percentage, 33,7% (45). As reported in studies, law students' (46) and medical students' (47) physical health is worse compared with peers who do not study. The highest differences among medical students were found on general health and bodily pain, but also vitality was found to differ significantly (47). Whereas economics and business students have a better physical health (such as a better general health status, a better physical functioning and less bodily pain) compared with peers who do not study (15,48). To our knowledge, no studies report if psychology students have a worse physical health status compared with peers who do not study.

*Mental health.* According to the Student Health Check 2015-2016, 19% of medical, 11% of economics and business, 23% of law and 19% of psychology students at the University of Amsterdam report mental health complaints (44). Studies in other countries found higher percentages. A recent survey in Australia has evidenced that 35% of law students experience high levels of mental health complaints (49) and a recent survey of universities in Canada found one third of psychology students reporting a clinically significant level of mental health



complaints (50). Little empirical data suggest that law students have more (44,51-53) and psychology students (54,55) have less mental health concerns compared with other students. It is doubtful whether the mental health of medical students differs from other university students (56). Some of the literature found more (57), some found less (48,58) and one study found no differences (59) regarding mental health complaints among economics and business students compared with other university students. It is difficult to generalize these results because of the use of different measurement instruments. In addition to the well-known mental health indicators (such as depression and anxiety), we also included certain lifestyle indicators that are also characteristic of mental health (such as smoking and internet addiction).

*Social well-being.* A recent study in the Netherlands suggest that medical students report greater social well-being, economics and business students report their social well-being worse and law and psychology students do not report their social well-being to be significantly different compared to other students of the University of Amsterdam (44). In an United States (15) and a Turkish study (48) a better social well-being among economics and business students compared with other university students was reported. As reported in a study from Brazil, medical students had worse social well-being than peers who do not study (47). Medical students spent more time studying and less time for social activities and leisure time than other students while economics and business students did the opposite (60).

All these studies above have in common that they only focused on a restricted area of health, or they described the health of students globally. To our knowledge no data regarding the combination of physical health, mental health and social well-being in Dutch students of different study programs has currently been published. To compare the health of students of different studies, this research focuses primarily on the data about the subjectively perceived health of university students, in order to get an indication of the physical health, mental health and social well-being of the medical, law, psychology and economics and business students compared to other students of the University of Amsterdam.

The corresponding research question is: How are the health status and perceived health problems of medical, law, psychology and economics and business students compared to other students at the University of Amsterdam?

The following sub-questions are formulated:

- How do medical, law, psychology and economics and business students perceive their physical health, mental health and social well-being compared to other university students at the University of Amsterdam?
- What demographic and other factors (e.g. sex, living situation, negative sexual experiences and problem perception) are associated with the perceived health problems of medical, law, psychology and economics and business students?

## Method

### Study population and procedure

The design of this study is a cross-sectional survey study. Sixteen study programs in Amsterdam have indicated that they wanted to participate in the 'Student Health Check'. All students who were enrolled fulltime on one of these participating programs at the University of Amsterdam, VU University Amsterdam /ACTA or Amsterdam University College were invited through various communication channels (such as e-mails, internet messages, newsletters and flyers) by educational and research directors, student committees, advisory services and/or executive boards to complete the Student Health Check, a self-monitor that lets students monitor several aspects of their health and health (risk) behaviour. Students at some study programs received a reminder by e-mail (61). The website was open from 2012 till now. To be included in this study, students of the participating faculties had to fill in the Student Health Check at least once between February 2015 and May 2016. The data was already available while starting this study (44). For the Student Health Check study permission was already granted by the Ethics Committee of the UvA.

### Survey

The Student Health Check, an online self-monitor for students, with immediate personalised feedback, was utilised in this study (61). It was created by the Student Health Service of the University of Amsterdam. They used NetQ software (62) to build the web-based instrument. The online questionnaire consisted of questions about physical health, mental health, health (risk) behaviour, social well-being and personal characteristics. There were additional questions in the Student Health Check, were only students participate if the result on certain questions was in the most extreme and disadvantageous score range. Some questions were adopted from existing validated questionnaires, other questions were formulated by a team of experts following detailed literature review and interviews with students and other related people. The scales were selected based on their content validity, predictive validity and internal reliability. The survey was developed in Dutch as well as in English. Measurement scales of English origin were translated into Dutch and then translated back, using the back-translation method (63).

### Measurement instruments

The questionnaire that was utilized for this study consisted of 30 subsections from the Student Health Check (61). The first 10 items gathered demographic data: sex, year of birth, height, weight, relationship status, living situation, consider themselves as Dutch, study program, study results and study phase. By using the year of birth we calculated the age of the students on 31-05-2016, the closure date of the questionnaire 2015-2016. From the variables height and weight a new variable 'BMI' was calculated (by  $\text{weight/height}^2$ ). The sample consisted solely of university students (educational level). Living situation was categorized into living with parents or family, living with peers, living alone and living with your partner. Consider themselves as Dutch was categorized into consider themselves as Dutch and consider themselves as non-Dutch. Study phase was categorised in bachelor (freshmen or bachelor) and master (master or medical internship). All measurement scales of the other variables were at dichotomous, nominal, ordinal and ratio scale level.

Physical health was measured with three scales: general health, vitality and physical complaints. Mental health was measured with eleven scales: depression, anxiety, psychological complaints, smoking, alcohol (ab)use, drug (ab)use, gambling, internet addiction, buying addiction, eating disorder and suicidal ideation. Two scales measured both physical and mental health: disability and student health (risk) behaviour (general). Social well-being was measured with two scales: satisfaction with study and quality of student life. Four other scales measured: negative sexual experiences, peer pressure lifestyle self-efficacy, problem perception and seeking or having help. Only students whereby the result on certain questions was in the most extreme and disadvantageous score range, had to fill in the scales peer pressure lifestyle self-efficacy and seeking or having help. An overview of the scales used to measure the concepts will each be described briefly in appendix 5. Table 1 in appendix 5 provides an overview of the scales. The questionnaire can be found at the website: <http://www.studentengezondheidstest.nl> in Dutch or <http://www.studenthealthcheck.nl> in English.

## Analysis

The statistical analysis was performed using SPSS statistics version 24.0.

To compare the health of medical, law, psychology and economics and business students to other students, firstly a descriptive analysis was performed to gain insight into means and standard deviations; or frequencies and percentages of characteristics of the sample of 2015-2016 (see appendix 6, table 1). Secondly, a correlation table with Pearson correlation coefficients was made to look into the associations between the different variables (see appendix 7, table 1). Thirdly, multiple stepwise hierarchical regression analyses (see appendix 10-13, table 1 – 11) and multiple stepwise logistic regression analyses (see appendix 14-17, table 1 - 6) were conducted to investigate the predictive value of various independent variables for different health indicators. Nagelkerke  $R^2$  was used as a measure for the percentage of explained variance in the logistic regression analyses. There were dichotomous, ordinal and ratio level independent variables. We entered being medical student yes or no in step 1, demographics in step 2 and the scales negative sexual experiences, peer pressure lifestyle self-efficacy, problem perception and seeking or having help in step 3. The same was done for law students yes or no, psychology students yes or no and economics and business students yes or no in step 1. For the demographic living situation; living with parents or family was used as reference group. Due to lack of space, only the significant analyses that explained the most variance in the outcome measure are included in the results section, the significant analyses with less effects were included in appendix 8 and appendix 9.

## Results

### Descriptive characteristics

Table 1 in appendix 6 provides an overview of the descriptive characteristics. As shown, the descriptive analysis was stratified to medical vs. non-medical, law vs. non-law, psychology vs. non-psychology, economics and business vs. non-economics and business students. The descriptive characteristics will each be described in appendix 6 below table 1.

### Pearson correlation coefficients

Table 1 in appendix 7 shows the correlational analyses of all measures included in the study.

### Multiple stepwise hierarchical regression analyses (see appendix 10-13, table 1 – 11)

Step 3 of the multiple stepwise hierarchical regression analyses is a specific subgroup of students, because only students whereby the result on certain questions was in the most extreme and disadvantageous score range, had to fill in the scales: peer pressure lifestyle self-efficacy and seeking or having help. Only the significant analyses that explained the most variance in the outcome measure were included in this results section, the significant multiple hierarchical analyses with less effects were included in appendix 8.

#### Predicting vitality

*Step 1.* Being a medical student was significantly and positively related to a better vitality (see table 1). Being a Law, psychology and economics and business student was not significantly related to vitality (see table 2 in appendix 11, 12 and 13). About 1.1% of the variance in vitality scores was explained by the first step  $p \leq .001$ .

*Step 2.* Among medical students; sex (male), living with peers and students who consider themselves as Dutch were significantly and positively related to a better vitality. The second step raised the level of the explained variance to 10.0%,  $p \leq .001$ .

*Step 3.* For the specific smaller subgroup that filled in additional questions; having a relationship, negative sexual experiences, perceiving problems and seeking or having help were significantly and negatively related to a better vitality. Sex, living with peers, students who consider themselves as Dutch and medical students remained significant. This step raising the level of explained variance for the specific subgroup to 17.5%,  $p \leq .001$ .

Table 1. Regression analysis of vitality whereby medical students are compared with non-medical students.

	B	SE	P	Model P	R <sup>2</sup>
Step 1 (N = 2393)				.00***	.011
Medical student	6.21	1.71	.00***		
Step 2 (N = 2348)				.00***	.100
Medical student	4.94	1.66	.00**		
Sex	-6.35	1.26	.00***		
Age	0.25	0.18	.17		
BMI	-0.02	0.09	.82		
Having a relationship	-0.84	1.24	.50		
Living with peers	6.52	1.55	.00***		
Living alone	-0.27	1.62	.87		
Living with your partner	-1.89	2.35	.42		
Dutch	7.86	1.27	.00***		
Study results	0.25	0.69	.72		
Study phase	-0.40	1.44	.78		
Step 3 (N = 1206)				.00***	.175
Medical student	3.33	1.61	.04*		
Sex	-4.24	1.25	.00***		
Age	0.29	0.17	.10		
BMI	0.03	0.08	.76		
Having a relationship	-2.53	1.22	.04*		
Living with peers	5.71	1.51	.00***		
Living alone	0.81	1.57	.61		
Living with your partner	0.24	2.27	.92		

Dutch	5.82	1.23	.00***		
Study results	0.52	0.66	.44		
Study phase	-0.82	1.39	.55		
Negative sexual experiences	-5.51	1.37	.00***		
Peer pressure lifestyle self-efficacy	-0.73	0.42	.09		
Problem perception	-7.03	0.87	.00***		
Seeking or having help	-4.52	1.11	.00***		

\*  $p \leq 0.05$ , \*\*  $p \leq 0.01$ , \*\*\*  $p \leq 0.001$ .

#### Predicting satisfaction with study

*Step 1.* Being a medical student was significantly and positively related to more satisfaction with study (see table 2), while being a law or economics and business student was significantly and negatively related to more satisfaction with study (see table 10 in appendix 11 and 13). Psychology student was not significantly related to satisfaction with study (see table 10 in appendix 12). This first step explained respectively 2.4%; 0.3%; 0.7%<sup>1</sup> of the variance in scores in satisfaction with study  $p \leq 0.001$ ;  $p \leq 0.05$ ;  $p \leq 0.01$ .

*Step 2.* Among these study programs; older age and living with partner was significantly and negatively related to more satisfaction with study. Having a relationship, students who consider themselves as Dutch and better study results were significantly and positively related to more satisfaction with study. Medical students remained significant. The second step raised the level of the explained variance to 28.7%; 27.7%; 27.7%,  $p \leq 0.001$ ;  $p \leq 0.001$ ;  $p \leq 0.001$ .

*Step 3.* For the specific smaller subgroup that filled in additional questions; negative sexual experiences, perceiving problems and seeking or having help were significantly and negatively related to more satisfaction with study. Age, students who consider themselves as Dutch, better study results and the study program medical students remained significant. This step raising the level of explained variance for the specific subgroup to 32.3%; 31.6%; 31.7%,  $p \leq 0.001$ ;  $p \leq 0.001$ ;  $p \leq 0.001$ .

Table 2. Regression analysis of satisfaction with study whereby medical students are compared with non-medical students.

	B	SE	P	Model P	R <sup>2</sup>
<b>Step 1 (N = 2393)</b>				.00***	.024
Medical student	0.32	0.06	.00***		
<b>Step 2 (N = 2348)</b>				.00***	.287
Medical student	0.22	0.05	.00***		
Sex	-0.05	0.04	.25		
Age	-0.03	0.01	.00***		
BMI	0.00	0.00	.47		
Having a relationship	0.08	0.04	.03*		
Living with peers	-0.06	0.05	.23		
Living alone	-0.09	0.05	.06		
Living with your partner	-0.19	0.07	.01**		
Dutch	0.26	0.04	.00***		
Study results	0.39	0.02	.00***		
Study phase	0.01	0.05	.87		
<b>Step 3 (N = 1206)</b>				.00***	.323
Medical student	0.17	0.05	.00***		
Sex	-0.00	0.04	.96		
Age	-0.02	0.01	.00***		
BMI	0.00	0.00	.24		
Having a relationship	0.05	0.04	.22		
Living with peers	0.07	0.05	.15		

<sup>1</sup> The order of the numbers are respectively; medical, law, economics and business students.

Living alone	-0.07	0.05	.17		
Living with your partner	-0.13	0.07	.07		
Dutch	0.22	0.04	.00***		
Study results	0.40	0.02	.00***		
Study phase	0.00	0.04	.98		
Negative sexual experiences	-0.10	0.04	.02*		
Peer pressure lifestyle self-efficacy	-0.00	0.01	.74		
Problem perception	-0.15	0.03	.00***		
Seeking or having help	-0.16	0.04	.00***		

\*  $p \leq 0.05$ , \*\*  $p \leq 0.01$ , \*\*\*  $p \leq 0.001$ .

### Predicting quality of student life

*Step 1.* Being a medical student was significantly and positively related to a better quality of student life (see table 3). Being a law, psychology and economics and business student was not significantly related to quality of student life (see table 11 in appendix 11, 12 and 13). About 0.8% of the variance in quality of student life scores was explained by the first step  $p \leq .01$ .

*Step 2.* Among medical students; age was significantly and negatively related, but having a relationship, living with peers and students who consider themselves as Dutch were significantly and positively related to a better quality of student life. The second step raised the level of the explained variance to 7.8%,  $p \leq 0.001$ .

*Step 3.* For the specific smaller subgroup that filled in additional questions; BMI and living with partner were significantly and positively related, but negative sexual experiences, perceiving problems and seeking or having help were significantly and negatively related to a better quality of student life. Age and living with peers remained significant. This step raising the level of explained variance for the specific subgroup to 19.8%,  $p \leq 0.001$ .

Table 3. Regression analysis of quality of student life whereby medical students are compared with non-medical students.

	B	SE	P	Model P	R <sup>2</sup>
<b>Step 1 (N = 2393)</b>				.00**	.008
Medical student	0.15	0.05	.00**		
<b>Step 2 (N = 2348)</b>				.00***	.078
Medical student	0.12	0.05	.01**		
Sex	-0.01	0.04	.87		
Age	-0.02	0.01	.00***		
BMI	0.00	0.00	.22		
Having a relationship	0.22	0.04	.00***		
Living with peers	0.15	0.05	.00***		
Living alone	0.00	0.05	.96		
Living with your partner	0.05	0.07	.49		
Dutch	0.13	0.04	.00***		
Study results	0.02	0.02	.26		
Study phase	0.05	0.04	.28		
<b>Step 3 (N = 1206)</b>				.00***	.198
Medical student	0.06	0.05	.18		
Sex	0.05	0.04	.19		
Age	-0.02	0.01	.00***		
BMI	0.01	0.00	.04		
Having a relationship	0.15	0.03	.00***		
Living with peers	0.15	0.04	.00***		
Living alone	0.06	0.05	.18		
Living with your partner	0.14	0.06	.03*		
Dutch	0.06	0.04	.11		
Study results	0.03	0.02	.09		
Study phase	0.04	0.04	.37		

Negative sexual experiences	-0.19	0.04	.00***		
Peer pressure lifestyle self-efficacy	0.02	0.01	.16		
Problem perception	-0.26	0.03	.00***		
Seeking or having help	-0.15	0.03	.00***		

\*  $p \leq 0.05$ , \*\*  $p \leq 0.01$ , \*\*\*  $p \leq 0.001$ .

Being a student in a certain study program was not significantly related to depression, internet addiction, buying addiction, eating pattern, suicidal ideation and student health (risk) behaviour (general).

#### Multiple stepwise logistic regression analyses (see appendix 14-17, table 1-6)

Step 3 of the multiple stepwise logistic regression analyses is a specific subgroup of students, because only students whereby the result on certain questions was in the most extreme and disadvantageous score range, had to fill in the scales: peer pressure lifestyle self-efficacy and seeking or having help. Only the significant analyses that explained the most variance in the outcome measure were included in this results section, the significant multiple logistic analyses with less effects were included in appendix 9.

#### Predicting smoking

*Step 1.* Being a medical student was significantly less likely to smoking (see table 4). Being a law, psychology and economics and business student was not significantly related to smoking (see table 2 in appendix 15, 16 and 17).

About 1.1% of the variance in smoking was explained by the first step  $p \leq 0.001$ .

*Step 2.* Among medical students; relative to students living with parents (the reference group), students living with peers and living alone were significantly more likely to smoking. Female, better study results and following a master were significantly less likely to smoking. The second step raised the level of the explained variance to 8.0%,  $p \leq 0.001$ .

*Step 3.* For the specific smaller subgroup that filled in additional questions; better withstanding pressure from peers, perceiving problems and seeking or having help were significantly less likely to smoking. Medical students, living with peers and following a master remained significant. This step raising the level of explained variance for the specific subgroup to 21.1%,  $p \leq 0.001$ .

Table 4. Regression analysis of smoking whereby medical students are compared with non-medical students.

	Odds ratio	95% Confidence Interval	P	Model P	Nagelkerke pseudo R <sup>2</sup>
<b>Step 1 (N = 2393)</b>				.00***	.011
Medical student	0.60	0.47 to 0.76	.00***		
<b>Step 2 (N = 2348)</b>				.00***	.080
Medical student	0.65	0.51 to 0.84	.00***		
Sex	0.65	0.54 to 0.79	.00***		
Age	1.00	0.98 to 1.03	.97		
BMI	1.02	0.99 to 1.05	.15		
Having a relationship	0.89	0.73 to 1.07	.21		
Living with peers	2.78	2.17 to 3.55	.00***		
Living alone	1.65	1.27 to 2.14	.00***		
Living with your partner	1.32	0.90 to 1.93	.16		
Dutch	0.87	0.71 to 1.06	.16		
Study results	0.89	0.80 to 0.99	.03*		
Study phase	0.79	0.63 to 0.97	.03*		
<b>Step 3 (N = 1206)</b>				.00***	.211
Medical student	0.56	0.39 to 0.83	.00**		
Sex	0.87	0.65 to 1.16	.34		
Age	1.01	0.97 to 1.05	.70		
BMI	1.01	0.98 to 1.04	.42		
Having a relationship	0.90	0.68 to 1.19	.44		



Living with peers	2.37	1.66 to 3.37	.00***		
Living alone	1.18	0.81 to 1.71	.39		
Living with your partner	1.44	0.84 to 2.47	.19		
Dutch	1.03	0.77 to 1.37	.84		
Study results	1.11	0.95 to 1.30	.19		
Study phase	0.64	0.47 to 0.89	.01**		
Negative sexual experiences	1.25	0.91 to 1.71	.17		
Peer pressure lifestyle self-efficacy	0.57	0.51 to 0.64	.00***		
Problem perception	0.79	0.64 to 0.96	.02*		
Seeking or having help	0.76	0.59 to 0.98	.03*		

\*  $p \leq 0.05$ , \*\*  $p \leq 0.01$ , \*\*\*  $p \leq 0.001$ .

### Predicting drug (ab)use

*Step 1.* Being a law student was significantly less likely to drug (ab)use (see table 5). The other study programs under investigation were not significantly related to drug (ab)use (see table 4 in respectively appendix 14, 16 and 17). This first step explained 0.4% of the variance in drug (ab)use  $p \leq .01$ .

*Step 2.* Being a law students was no longer significantly related to drug (ab)use. Being an economics and business student became significantly less likely to drug (ab)use. Female and older students were significantly less likely to drug (ab)use. Relative to students living with parents (the reference group), students living with peers, alone or with their partner were significantly more likely to drug (ab)use. The second step raised the level of the explained variance to 11.9%; 12.2%<sup>2</sup>,  $p \leq 0.001$ ,  $p \leq 0.001$ .

*Step 3.* For the specific smaller subgroup that filled in additional questions; better withstanding pressure from peers and seeking or having help were significantly less likely to drug (ab)use. Negative sexual experiences and better study results were more likely to drug (ab)use. Economics and business students and living with peers, alone or with partner remained significant. This step raising the level of explained variance for the specific subgroup to 25.9%; 26.7%,  $p \leq 0.001$ .  $p \leq 0.001$ .

Table 5. Regression analysis of drug (ab)use whereby law students are compared with non-law students.

	Odds ratio	95% Confidence Interval	P	Model P	Nagelkerke pseudo R <sup>2</sup>
<b>Step 1 (N = 2393)</b>				<b>.01**</b>	<b>.004</b>
Law student	0.74	0.58 to .94	.02*		
<b>Step 2 (N = 2348)</b>				<b>.00***</b>	<b>.119</b>
Law student	0.90	0.69 to 1.17	.42		
Sex	0.44	0.36 to 0.53	.00***		
Age	0.97	0.94 to 1.00	.04*		
BMI	0.99	0.97 to 1.01	.43		
Having a relationship	1.04	0.85 to 1.26	.71		
Living with peers	3.97	3.04 to 5.20	.00***		
Living alone	2.28	1.71 to 3.03	.00***		
Living with your partner	1.58	1.05 to 2.38	.03*		
Dutch	0.87	0.71 to 1.07	.19		
Study results	0.92	0.82 to 1.02	.12		
Study phase	1.01	0.80 to 1.26	.96		
<b>Step 3 (N = 1206)</b>				<b>.00***</b>	<b>.259</b>
Law student	0.95	0.66 to 1.36	.77		
Sex	0.52	0.39 to 0.70	.00***		
Age	0.97	0.93 to 1.02	.24		
BMI	0.99	0.97 to 1.01	.34		
Having a relationship	1.13	0.85 to 1.51	.41		

<sup>2</sup> The order of the numbers are respectively; law, economics and business students.

Living with peers	4.34	2.96 to 6.37	.00***		
Living alone	1.98	1.33 to 2.97	.00***		
Living with your partner	2.03	1.14 to 3.61	.02*		
Dutch	1.13	0.84 to 1.52	.43		
Study results	1.22	1.03 to 1.43	.02*		
Study phase	0.79	0.56 to 1.11	.18		
Negative sexual experiences	1.43	1.04 to 1.98	.03*		
Peer pressure lifestyle self-efficacy	0.59	0.53 to 0.66	.00***		
Problem perception	0.82	0.67 to 1.01	.06		
Seeking or having help	0.76	0.58 to 0.99	.04*		

\*  $p \leq 0.05$ , \*\*  $p \leq 0.01$ , \*\*\*  $p \leq 0.001$ .

Being a student in a certain study program was not significantly related to alcohol (ab)use and reporting a disability.

## Discussion

### Main findings and comparison with existing literature

#### Physical health

Being a medical student was related to reporting a better general health and vitality. This is in contrast to previous research (58). These study also used the SF-36 scale, but had a different study design than we had. Being a law student was related to reporting a better general health. To our knowledge, no studies report if being a law student was related to reporting a better general health. In the present study, being a law student was related to more physical complaints. Similar results were found in another study (64). Our study confirms previous suggestions that being an economics and business student was related to reporting a better general health and less physical complaints (58).

*Demographic factors of all study programs.* Similar to results reported in previous research (65,66), male students reported a better physical health than female students. Having a relationship was related to a worse vitality and more physical complaints, which was not in line with previous research (67). This study was also done in the Netherlands, but used other scales and had fewer and other participants. Relative to students living with parents (the reference group), students living with peers were related to a better physical health. Another study confirmed our results (68). Students who consider themselves as Dutch was related to a better general health and vitality. Similar observations were made in another study (69).

*For the specific smaller subgroup of all study programs.* The present study indicated a relationship between worse physical health (general health and vitality) and negative sexual experiences. Other studies (19,20) confirmed the linkage between worse physical health and negative sexual experiences. Our study confirms previous suggestions that perceiving problems was related to worse general health and vitality (16). Seeking or having help was related to a worse physical health (general health and vitality), this was also described in another study (70).

#### Mental health

The present study indicated that being a medical student was related to less anxiety and less smoking, which was confirmed by another study (71). Being a law student was related to less drug (ab)use, to our knowledge, no studies reported this relationship. The present study indicated that being an economics and business student was related to less physical complaints. To our knowledge, no studies reported if there is a relationship between being an economics and business student and physical complaints.

*Demographic factors of all study programs.* Other studies confirmed our results that male students were related to less anxiety and psychological complaints compared with female students (72-74). In the present study, being male was related to more substance abuse (smoking and drug (ab)use). Another study confirmed that male students were related to more substance abuse (75). Relative to students living with parents (the reference group), students living with peers, alone or with partner were more likely using tobacco or drugs, which was confirmed by other studies (68,75,76). Better study results was related to less anxiety, less psychological complaints, less smoking and less drug (ab)use, this is also in line with previous research (10).

*For the specific smaller subgroup of all study programs.* Negative sexual experiences was related to more anxiety, psychological complaints and drug (ab)use. Similar observations were made in other three studies (17-19). Our study confirms previous suggestions that better withstanding pressure from peers was related to less substance abuse (21,22). Perceiving problems was related to more anxiety and psychological complaints. Another study also described that perceiving problems was related to worse mental health outcomes (16). Seeking or having help was also related to more anxiety and psychological complaints. This was also described by another study (70).

#### Social well-being

Contrary to our results, being a medical student was related to less satisfaction with study and a worse quality of student life in three different studies (58,77,78). It is quite possible that the different results are because these studies were conducted in other countries, the use of other scales and comparing with other study programs. Being a law student was related to less satisfaction with study. Another study confirmed our results (79). Being an economics and business student was related to less satisfaction with study. This was also described by another study (80).

*Demographic factors of all study programs.* Older age was related to a worse social well-being. Although age generally has been found to be inversely related to social well-being, we found no age difference literature on social well-being specific to students. Having a relationship was related to a better social well-being, which was

confirmed by another study (67). Another study confirmed our results that students who consider themselves as Dutch were related to a better social well-being (81).

*For the specific smaller subgroup of all study programs.* The present study indicated that negative sexual experiences was related to a worse social well-being. Another study showed the same (19). Our study confirms previous suggestions that perceiving problems was related to a worse social well-being (16). Seeking or having help was also related with a worse social well-being. Another study confirmed the relationship between seeking help and social well-being (23).

After adjustment for demographic factors in step 2 and other factors in step 3, sometimes the study program remained statistically significant. This may be due to other variables that were not included in this study, or because of students of different study programs have different personality types which are related to other health problems (24-30).

### **Strengths and limitations**

A strength of this study was that we used a valid and reliable web based instrument to discover the health of students (61). Most of these scales have been widely used in other studies. The advantage of our instrument is that it is quite complete and contains many themes relevant to students.

A limitation of this study is its cross-sectional design. Therefore, it is hard to assess directions of influence and it precludes us from making causal inferences about our findings. A longitudinal study is needed to reveal information about causes and consequences and to gain more insight into changes in health problems over the years.

Regarding the representativeness of our sample, there could be differences between responders and non-responders. Students with health problems may be less motivated to fill out a survey, or, on the other hand, they may be more likely to participate as the topic is relevant to them. Although the instrument follows recommended guidelines about its usability, accessibility and recruitment of participants (82,83), it is rather long. The length of the instrument may have proved too much of a burden, for the group of students who had a major health problem. However, to obtain a complete overview of health (physical health, mental health and social well-being), then a lengthy survey that collects all necessary information is inevitable. The present findings may under- or overestimate the actual extent of health problems in the overall student population. Our data are all based on self-reported information. This approach was chosen to ensure the students' anonymity. Another limitation was the unequal division of some demographics in this study. Approximately 70% of the participants were female, 70% were bachelor student and 75% were students who consider themselves as Dutch. Therefore it is not completely representable for the whole student population. Because currently, in the Netherlands, approximately 50% of the university students are female, 45% are bachelor student and 67% have a Dutch nationality (84,85). More students who consider themselves as Dutch than non-Dutch filled out the survey, despite the survey was developed in Dutch as well as in English.

Another limitation of this study was that the participants were only studying at the University of Amsterdam. Although this university accepting students from all-over the Netherlands and there is no clear reason to think that studying in Amsterdam would have a different impact on health problems than studying in other cities in the Netherlands, a wider distribution of participants among other universities in the Netherlands would have increased the generalizability of this study. Another limitation was the generalizability for students of other countries, because for example, university systems vary widely between countries, as does legislation regarding the use of drugs. Barriers and stimulants could be completely different in other countries.

Taken into consideration the strengths and limitations, this study supports previous findings of health problems and factors influencing health problems among university students and contributes to a greater understanding of health problems among students of specific study programs at the university. Nevertheless, this issue deserves further empirical study.

### **Implications for clinical practice and further research**

Based on the results of this study in addition with findings from previous studies, being a law or economics and business student was related to less satisfaction with study and being a law student was stronger related to physical complaints than being a university student in another study program. Nearly half of the law and economics and business students in this study desired help for their health problems. While prior research has also shown that students who do not, or too late, appear to seek help for these problems, risk an unnecessary deterioration of their health (9,23) which can lead to study problems and even study failure (9-11). Therefore, more attention should be paid to these issues among the staff at the faculty of law and/or economics and business. Further research at the faculty of law should focus on which physical complaints law students have and what the cause is of these physical complaints. It is also recommended to do further research at the faculty of law and economics and business why students are not satisfied with their study. The student guidance and counselling service at the faculty have a lot of knowledge about the health problems of their students. They may be able to offer assistance within the research. After adjustment for demographic and other factors, being a law student compared to the other students remained significantly related to more physical complaints in this study. This may be due to the enterprising personality type of law students, because different personality types are related to other health problems (24-30). Older age, being single, living with partner, students who did not consider themselves as Dutch and worse study results were related to less satisfaction with study. In establishing an individual therapy for students with these problems, therapists should take into account these personality types and demographic factors that may contribute to the health problems.

The four study programs, studied in our study, had in general a significantly better health compared to university students in other study programs. Further research should focus on study programs with worse health outcomes.

## References

- (1) Nauta M, Meijman F, Meijman T. De subjectief ervaren gezondheid en studiebeleving van studenten van de Universiteit van Amsterdam. *Tijdschrift voor Sociale Gezondheidszorg* 1996;74(8):391-396.
- (2) Vaez M, Kristenson M, Laflamme L. Perceived quality of life and self-rated health among first-year university students. *Soc Indicators Res* 2004;68(2):221-234.
- (3) Vaez M, Voss M, Laflamme L. Health-related quality of life among university students. *Handbook of disease burdens and quality of life measures*: Springer; 2010. p. 2555-2577.
- (4) Stewart-Brown S, Evans J, Patterson J, Petersen S, Doll H, Balding J, et al. The health of students in institutes of higher education: an important and neglected public health problem? *Journal of Public Health* 2000;22(4):492-499.
- (5) Boot CR, Donders NC, Vonk P, Meijman FJ. Development of a student health questionnaire: the necessity of a symbiosis of science and practice. *Global health promotion* 2009;16(3):35-44.
- (6) Schmidt E, Simons M. Psychische klachten onder studenten. Landelijkse Studenten Vakbond (LSVb) 2013.
- (7) Schwartz AJ. Are college students more disturbed today? Stability in the acuity and qualitative character of psychopathology of college counseling center clients: 1992-1993 through 2001-2002. *Journal of American College Health* 2006;54(6):327-337.
- (8) Karam E, Kypri K, Salamoun M. Alcohol use among college students: an international perspective. *Curr Opin Psychiatry* 2007 May;20(3):213-221.
- (9) Boot CR, Vonk P, Meijman FJ. Health-related profiles of study delay in university students in the Netherlands. *Int J Adolesc Med Health* 2007;19(4):413-424.
- (10) Nelson NG, Dell'Oliver C, Koch C, Buckler R. Stress, coping, and success among graduate students in clinical psychology. *Psychol Rep* 2001;88(3):759-767.
- (11) Park J, Chung S, An H, Park S, Lee C, Kim SY, et al. A structural model of stress, motivation, and academic performance in medical students. *Psychiatry investigation* 2012;9(2):143-149.
- (12) Gorczynski P. More academics and students have mental health problems than ever before. 2018.
- (13) Department of Education and Skills. Well-being in Post-primary schools–Guidelines for mental health promotion and suicide prevention. 2013.
- (14) Robinson M, Kendall GE, Jacoby P, Hands B, Beilin LJ, Silburn SR, et al. Lifestyle and demographic correlates of poor mental health in early adolescence. *J Paediatr Child Health* 2011;47(1-2):54-61.
- (15) Sabbah I, Sabbah H, Khamis R, Sabbah S, Droubi N. Health related quality of life of university students in Lebanon: Lifestyles behaviors and socio-demographic predictors. *Health* 2013;5(07):1.
- (16) Boot CR, Meijman FJ, Vonk P. Problem perception in Dutch university students using tobacco, alcohol and drugs. *Communication & medicine* 2010;7(1):33-42.
- (17) Jones DJ, Lewis T, Litrownik A, Thompson R, Proctor LJ, Isbell P, et al. Linking childhood sexual abuse and early adolescent risk behavior: The intervening role of internalizing and externalizing problems. *J Abnorm Child Psychol* 2013;41(1):139-150.

- (18) Asgeirsdottir BB, Sigfusdottir ID, Gudjonsson GH, Sigurdsson JF. Associations between sexual abuse and family conflict/violence, self-injurious behavior, and substance use: The mediating role of depressed mood and anger. *Child Abuse Negl* 2011;35(3):210-219.
- (19) Staples J, Rellini AH, Roberts SP. Avoiding experiences: sexual dysfunction in women with a history of sexual abuse in childhood and adolescence. *Arch Sex Behav* 2012;41(2):341-350.
- (20) Goldman JD, Padayachi UK. Some methodological problems in estimating incidence and prevalence in child sexual abuse research. *J Sex Res* 2000;37(4):305-314.
- (21) Chemers MM, Hu L, Garcia BF. Academic self-efficacy and first year college student performance and adjustment. *J Educ Psychol* 2001;93(1):55.
- (22) Torres JB, Solberg VS. Role of self-efficacy, stress, social integration, and family support in Latino college student persistence and health. *J Vocat Behav* 2001;59(1):53-63.
- (23) Verouden NW, Vonk P, Meijman FJ. Context guides illness-identity: A qualitative analysis of Dutch university students' non-help-seeking behavior. *Int J Adolesc Med Health* 2010;22(2):307-320.
- (24) Caspi A, Begg D, Dickson N, Harrington H, Langley J, Moffitt TE, et al. Personality differences predict health-risk behaviors in young adulthood: evidence from a longitudinal study. *J Pers Soc Psychol* 1997;73(5):1052.
- (25) Arthur Jr W, Graziano WG. The five-factor model, conscientiousness, and driving accident involvement. *J Pers* 1996;64(3):593-618.
- (26) Folkman S, Lazarus RS, Gruen RJ, DeLongis A. Appraisal, coping, health status, and psychological symptoms. *J Pers Soc Psychol* 1986;50(3):571.
- (27) Day AL, Therrien DL, Carroll SA. Predicting psychological health: Assessing the incremental validity of emotional intelligence beyond personality, Type A behaviour, and daily hassles. *European Journal of Personality: Published for the European Association of Personality Psychology* 2005;19(6):519-536.
- (28) Smith TW, Williams PG. Personality and health: Advantages and limitations of the five-factor model. *J Pers* 1992;60(2):395-425.
- (29) Booth-Kewley S, Vickers Jr RR. Associations between major domains of personality and health behavior. *J Pers* 1994;62(3):281-298.
- (30) Holland JL. Making vocational choices: A theory of vocational personalities and work environments. : Psychological Assessment Resources; 1997.
- (31) Momberg C. The Relationship between personality traits and vocational interests in a South African context 2004.
- (32) McPherson B, Mensch S. STUDENTS'PERSONALITY TYPE AND CHOICE OF MAJOR. *Journal of Management Information and Decision Sciences* 2007;10(2):1.
- (33) Onoyase D, Onoyase A. The relationship between personality types and career choice of secondary school students in Federal Government Colleges in Nigeria. *The Anthropologist* 2009;11(2):109-115.
- (34) Soo PC. The relationship between students' personality types and career aspirations among secondary school students in Eldoret west district 2010.
- (35) Kemboi RJK, Kindiki N, Misigo B. Relationship between personality types and career choices of undergraduate students: A case of Moi University, Kenya. *Journal of Education and Practice* 2016;7(3):102-112.



- (36) Ahmed KA, Sharif N, Ahmad N. Factors influencing students' career choices: empirical evidence from business students. *Journal of Southeast Asian Research* 2017;1-15.
- (37) Fred F. Personality Characteristics and Vocational Choice: A Test of Holland's Theory. Unpublished M.ED Project Ibadan: Ibadan University 1985.
- (38) Huber M, Knottnerus JA, Green L, van der Horst H, Jadad AR, Kromhout D, et al. How should we define health? 2011.
- (39) Popay J. WHO definition of health does remain fit for purpose. *BMJ* 2011;343:d4163.
- (40) International Health Conference. Constitution of the World Health Organization. 1946. *Bull World Health Organ* 2002;80(12):983-984.
- (41) Saracci R. The World Health Organisation needs to reconsider its definition of health. *BMJ* 1997 May 10;314(7091):1409-1410.
- (42) Larson JS. The Conceptualization of Health. *Med Care Res Rev* 1999 06/01; 2018/08;56(2):123-136.
- (43) Breslow L. A quantitative approach to the World Health Organization definition of health: physical, mental and social well-being. *Int J Epidemiol* 1972;1(4):347-355.
- (44) Van der Heijde CM, Vonk P, Meijman FJ. Stoplichten. *Projectresultaten Studentengezondheidstest 2015-2016*. 2016.
- (45) El-Ghoroury NH, Galper DI, Sawaqdeh A, Bufka LF. Stress, coping, and barriers to wellness among psychology graduate students. *Training and Education in Professional Psychology* 2012;6(2):122.
- (46) Pritchard ME, Wilson GS, Yamnitz B. What predicts adjustment among college students? A longitudinal panel study. *Journal of American College Health* 2007;56(1):15-22.
- (47) Paro HB, Morales NM, Silva CH, Rezende CH, Pinto RM, Morales RR, et al. Health-related quality of life of medical students. *Med Educ* 2010;44(3):227-235.
- (48) Aktekin M, Karaman T, Senol YY, Erdem S, Erengin H, Akaydin M. Anxiety, depression and stressful life events among medical students: a prospective study in Antalya, Turkey. *Med Educ* 2001;35(1):12-17.
- (49) Kelk N. Courting the blues: Attitudes towards depression in Australian law students and lawyers. : Brain & Mind Research Institute; 2009.
- (50) Peluso DL, Carleton RN, Asmundson GJ. Depression symptoms in Canadian psychology graduate students: do research productivity, funding, and the academic advisory relationship play a role? *Canadian Journal of Behavioural Science/Revue canadienne des sciences du comportement* 2011;43(2):119.
- (51) Benjamin GAH, Kaszniak A, Sales B, Shanfield SB. The role of legal education in producing psychological distress among law students and lawyers. *Law & Social Inquiry* 1986;11(2):225-252.
- (52) Sheldon KM, Krieger LS. Does legal education have undermining effects on law students? Evaluating changes in motivation, values, and well-being. *Behav Sci Law* 2004;22(2):261-286.
- (53) Schools L. Report of the AALS Special Committee on Problems of Substance Abuse in the Law Schools. *J.Legal Educ.* 1994;44:35, 54-55.
- (54) Leahy CM, Peterson RF, Wilson IG, Newbury JW, Tonkin AL, Turnbull D. Distress levels and self-reported treatment rates for medicine, law, psychology and mechanical engineering tertiary students: cross-sectional study. *Australian & New Zealand Journal of Psychiatry* 2010;44(7):608-615.

- (55) Pierceall EA, Keim MC. Stress and coping strategies among community college students. *Community College Journal of Research and Practice* 2007;31(9):703-712.
- (56) Firth-Cozens J. Medical student stress. *Med Educ* 2001 Jan;35(1):6-7.
- (57) Tesfaye A. Prevalence and correlates of mental distress among regular undergraduate students of Hawassa University: a cross sectional survey. *East African journal of public health* 2009;6(1).
- (58) Sabbah I, Sabbah H, Khamis R, Sabbah S, Droubi N. Health related quality of life of university students in Lebanon: Lifestyles behaviors and socio-demographic predictors. *Health* 2013;5(07):1.
- (59) Bostanci M, Ozdel O, Oguzhanoglu NK, Ozdel L, Ergin A, Ergin N, et al. Depressive symptomatology among university students in Denizli, Turkey: prevalence and sociodemographic correlates. *Croat Med J* 2005;46(1):96-100.
- (60) Preišegolavičiūtė E, Leskauskas D, Adomaitienė V. Associations of quality of sleep with lifestyle factors and profile of studies among Lithuanian students. *Medicina* 2010;46(7):482-489.
- (61) Van der Heijde, Claudia Maria, Vonk P, Meijman FJ. Self-regulation for the promotion of student health. Traffic lights: the development of a tailored web-based instrument providing immediate personalized feedback. *Health Psychology and Behavioral Medicine* 2015;3(1):169-189.
- (62) NETQ Internet Surveys 6.7. Software for creating and assessment of internet surveys. Utrecht: NetQuestionnaires Nederland BV. 2011.
- (63) Brislin RW. Back-translation for cross-cultural research. *Journal of cross-cultural psychology* 1970;1(3):185-216.
- (64) Stock C, Küçük N, Miseviciene I, Guillen-Grima F, Petkeviciene J, Aguinaga-Ontoso I, et al. Differences in health complaints among university students from three European countries. *Prev Med* 2003;37(6):535-543.
- (65) Verbrugge LM. The twain meet: empirical explanations of sex differences in health and mortality. *J Health Soc Behav* 1989:282-304.
- (66) Vingilis E, Wade TJ, Adlaf E. What factors predict student self-rated physical health? *J Adolesc* 1998;21(1):83-97.
- (67) Assink R, Pronk TM. De invloed van het hebben van een relatie op de ervaren stress en de fysieke gezondheid van studenten. Unpublished 2015.
- (68) Boot CR, Rietmeijer CB, Vonk P, Meijman FJ. Perceived health profiles of Dutch university students living with their parents, alone or with peers. *Int J Adolesc Med Health* 2009;21(1):41-50.
- (69) Oppedal B, Røysamb E. Mental health, life stress and social support among young Norwegian adolescents with immigrant and host national background. *Scand J Psychol* 2004;45(2):131-144.
- (70) Nauta M, Meijman F, Meijman T. De subjectief ervaren gezondheid en studiebeleving van studenten van de Universiteit van Amsterdam. *Tijdschrift voor Sociale Gezondheidszorg* 1996;74(8):391-396.
- (71) Shanfield SB, Benjamin GAH. Psychiatric distress in law students. *J.Legal Educ.* 1985;35:65.
- (72) Dahlin M, Joneborg N, Runeson B. Stress and depression among medical students: A cross-sectional study. *Med Educ* 2005;39(6):594-604.
- (73) Nerdrum P, Rustøen T, Rønnestad MH. Student psychological distress: a psychometric study of 1750 Norwegian 1st-year undergraduate students. *Scandinavian Journal of Educational Research* 2006;50(1):95-109.

- (74) Kennard BD, Stewart SM, Hughes JL, Patel PG, Emslie GJ. Cognitions and depressive symptoms among ethnic minority adolescents. *Cultural Diversity and Ethnic Minority Psychology* 2006;12(3):578.
- (75) Caamaño-Isorna F, Corral M, Parada M, Cadaveira F. Factors associated with risky consumption and heavy episodic drinking among Spanish university students. *Journal of Studies on Alcohol and Drugs* 2008;69(2):308-312.
- (76) Boot CR, Rosiers JF, Meijman FJ, Van Hal GF. Consumption of tobacco, alcohol, and recreational drugs in university students in Belgium and the Netherlands: The role of living situation. *Int J Adolesc Med Health* 2010;22(4):527-534.
- (77) Dahlin M, Nilsson C, Stotzer E, Runeson B. Mental distress, alcohol use and help-seeking among medical and business students: a cross-sectional comparative study. *BMC medical education* 2011;11(1):92.
- (78) Henning MA, Krägeloh CU, Hawken SJ, Zhao Y, Doherty I. The quality of life of medical students studying in New Zealand: a comparison with nonmedical students and a general population reference group. *Teach Learn Med* 2012;24(4):334-340.
- (79) Skead NK, Rogers SL. Do law students stand apart from other university students in their quest for mental health: A comparative study on wellbeing and associated behaviours in law and psychology students. *International Journal of Law and Psychiatry* 2015 September–December 2015;42-43:81-90.
- (80) Aktekin M, Karaman T, Senol YY, Erdem S, Erengin H, Akaydin M. Anxiety, depression and stressful life events among medical students: a prospective study in Antalya, Turkey. *Med Educ* 2001;35(1):12-17.
- (81) Francesca Borgonovi. How do the performance and well-being of students with an immigrant background compare across countries? IS 82. 2018.
- (82) Hallett J, Maycock B, Kypri K, Howat P, McManus A. Development of a Web-based alcohol intervention for university students: Processes and challenges. *Drug Alcohol Rev* 2009;28(1):31-39.
- (83) Morrison L, Moss-Morris R, Michie S, Yardley L. Optimizing engagement with Internet-based health behaviour change interventions: Comparison of self-assessment with and without tailored feedback using a mixed methods approach. *British journal of health psychology* 2014;19(4):839-855.
- (84) Centraal Bureau voor de Statistiek. Hoger onderwijs; eerste- en ouderejaarsstudenten, studierichting. Retrieved from [opendata.cbs.nl/statline/#/CBS/nl/dataset/83538NED/table?dl=8C06](https://opendata.cbs.nl/statline/#/CBS/nl/dataset/83538NED/table?dl=8C06). 2018.
- (85) Centraal Bureau voor de Statistiek. Ho; gediplomeerden, soort diploma, studierichting, migratieachtergrond. Retrieved from [opendata.cbs.nl/statline/#/CBS/nl/dataset/83893ned/table?ts=1540324624914](https://opendata.cbs.nl/statline/#/CBS/nl/dataset/83893ned/table?ts=1540324624914). 2018.
- (86) Aaronson NK, Muller M, Cohen PD, Essink-Bot M, Fekkes M, Sanderman R, et al. Translation, validation, and norming of the Dutch language version of the SF-36 Health Survey in community and chronic disease populations. *J Clin Epidemiol* 1998;51(11):1055-1068.
- (87) Van der Heijde CM, Vonk P, Meijman FJ. Developing a valid and reliable preventative web-based self-regulation instrument for promoting student health: Stop lights. Internal Student Health Service Report. Unpublished 2011.
- (88) Kessler RC, Andrews G, Colpe LJ, Hiripi E, Mroczek DK, Normand S, et al. Short screening scales to monitor population prevalences and trends in non-specific psychological distress. *Psychol Med* 2002;32(6):959-976.
- (89) Donker T, Comijs H, Cuijpers P, Terluin B, Nolen W, Zitman F, et al. The validity of the Dutch K10 and extended K10 screening scales for depressive and anxiety disorders. *Psychiatry Res* 2010;176(1):45-50.

- (90) Etter J, Le Houezec J, Perneger TV. A self-administered questionnaire to measure dependence on cigarettes: the cigarette dependence scale. *Neuropsychopharmacology* 2003;28(2):359.
- (91) Saunders JB, Aasland OG, Babor TF, De la Fuente, Juan R, Grant M. Development of the alcohol use disorders identification test (AUDIT): WHO collaborative project on early detection of persons with harmful alcohol consumption-II. *Addiction* 1993;88(6):791-804.
- (92) Skinner HA. The drug abuse screening test. *Addict Behav* 1982;7(4):363-371.
- (93) Ferris JA, Wynne HJ. The Canadian problem gambling index. : Canadian Centre on Substance Abuse Ottawa, ON; 2001.
- (94) Van den Eijnden, Regina JJM, Meerkerk G, Vermulst AA, Spijkerman R, Engels RC. Online communication, compulsive Internet use, and psychosocial well-being among adolescents: a longitudinal study. *Dev Psychol* 2008;44(3):655.
- (95) Faber RJ, O'guinn TC. A clinical screener for compulsive buying. *Journal of consumer Research* 1992;19(3):459-469.
- (96) Cotton M, Ball C, Robinson P. Four simple questions can help screen for eating disorders. *Journal of general internal medicine* 2003;18(1):53-56.
- (97) Osman A, Bagge CL, Gutierrez PM, Konick LC, Kopper BA, Barrios FX. The Suicidal Behaviors Questionnaire-Revised (SBQ-R): validation with clinical and nonclinical samples. *Assessment* 2001;8(4):443-454.

## Appendix 1: List of abbreviations and acronyms

UvA	Universiteit van Amsterdam
VU	Vrije Universiteit Amsterdam
SF-36	36-Item Short Form Health Survey
K-6	Kessler Psychological Distress Scale
CDS-5	Cigarette Dependence Scale
AUDIT	Alcohol Use Disorders Identification Test
DAST-10	Drug Abuse Screening Test
PGSI	Problem Gambling Severity Index
CIUS-A	Compulsive Internet Use Scale
CBS	Compulsive Buying Scale
ESP	Eating Disorder Screen for Primary Care
SBQ-R	Suicide Behaviours Questionnaire-Revised

## **Appendix 2: Description of own input and accomplishment of learning goals**

This study used a large part of the data of the Student Health Check 2015-2016 of the project 'Traffic lights' of Student Health Services in Amsterdam (61). The student, with help of the tutors, selected which data was used, edited the data statistically and carried out the project.

This research internship has learned me about the different aspect of scientific research. There were some challenges that I had to overcome, because almost every aspect was new to me. Writing the project plan taught me how to do a background research and define a clear research question. Beforehand I was a bit worried about the statistical analyses, since I had no experience in this area. The e-learning 'Practical Biostatistics' turned out to be very helpful and afterwards I really enjoyed engaging myself with the analysis. I learned a lot about the different types of analyses and how to apply and interpret them.

While doing this research it was decided to focuses on the health of students of studies that have a big difference in personality types, because of different personality types are related to other health problems. That is why dental students, named in the project plan, have been replaced for economics and business students. One of the sub-questions in the project plan was: 'Is there a trend in the prevalence of health problems of medical, dental, psychology and law students over the years?' Due to lack of space in this report, this sub-question will be analysed after the internship period.

### Appendix 3: Approved project plan

Naam / name student: Ellen Boon	Student nummer: 10298576
Project titel / project title: The health status and perceived health problems of medical, dental, psychology and law students compared to other students at the University of Amsterdam in the Netherlands. A quantitative cross-sectional survey study.	

Onderzoekslijn (circa 250 woorden):

The Student Health Services, located at the Oude Turfmarkt in Amsterdam, started in 2009 with a project called 'Traffic lights' which builds on earlier research by the Student Health Services with regard to students and health. In this, they have developed an anonymous self-monitor for students, studying at the University of Amsterdam or at the Amsterdam University of Applied Sciences, to enable rapid recognition of health complaints and student problems. This questionnaire and more information about the project can be found on the website <http://studentengezondheidstest.nl>. By completing the questionnaire, information is collected on various components (health, health (risk) behaviour, quality of life, aspects of the study, etc.). Four rounds of the digital and validated student health check have been performed (2011, 2012, 2013-2014 and February 2015-May 2016), the fifth (2017-2018) is going on. Subsequently, a PhD health check is also developed. One of the missions of the project is to refer students to appropriate support if necessary and to make students aware of health risks or (un)healthy behaviour. In the future the Student Health Service will offer the students with high scores (red or orange traffic lights), an eHealth intervention to treat depression, anxiety or alcohol or drugs abuse.

The current researchers within this research line are:

- Dr Claudia M. van der Heijde, a senior researcher who has been working for the Department for Research, Development and Prevention at the Student Health Services at the University of Amsterdam since 2009.
- Peter Vonk, is a GP, director of the unit Student Health Services at the University of Amsterdam, and coordinator of the Department for Research, Development and Prevention.

At the start of my research internship, a subsidy request will be submitted (to the Triodos Foundation).

References (to publications) that have appeared from the research line:

- Boot CRL, Donders NCGM., Vonk P, & Meijman FJ. Development of a Student Health Questionnaire; the necessity of a synthesis of science and practice. Global Health promotion 2009; 16(3), 35-44.
- Boot CRL, Meijman FJ, Vonk P. Problem perception in Dutch university students using tobacco, alcohol and drugs. Communication & Medicine 2010; 7: 33-42.
- Boot CRL, Vonk P, Meijman FJ. Health-related profiles of study delay in university students in the Netherlands. International Journal of Adolescent Medicine and Health 2007; 19: 413-23.
- Nauta MCE, Meijman FJ., Meijman TF. Perceived health and perceived study situation of university students in Amsterdam [Dutch: De subjectief ervaren gezondheid en studiebeleving van studenten van de Universiteit van Amsterdam]. Tijdschrift voor Sociale Gezondheidszorg 1996; 8:391-296.
- Van der Heijde, CM, Vonk, P & Meijman, FJ. Traffic lights. Project results student health check 2011 [Dutch: Stoplichten. Projectresultaten Studentengezondheidstest 2011]. Amsterdam: Bureau Studentenartsen/UvA, 2012
- Van der Heijde, CM, Vonk, P & Meijman, FJ. Traffic lights. Progress report 1: Development digital student health check including individualized feedback. [Dutch: Stoplichten. Voortgangsrapportage 1: Ontwikkeling digitale studentengezondheidstest inclusief geïndividualiseerde feedback]. 2010, jul 8.
- Van der Heijde, CM, Vonk, P & Meijman, FJ. Traffic lights. Progress report 2: Student health check students of the University of Amsterdam and the University of Applied Sciences of Amsterdam [Dutch: Stoplichten. Voortgangsrapportage 2: Studentengezondheidstest UvA en HvA studenten] 2011, 2012, jun 10.



- Van der Heijde, C. M., Vonk, P., & Meijman, F. J. (2014). Stoplichten: projectresultaten Studentengezondheidstest 2013-2014. Amsterdam: Bureau Studentenartsen/UvA.
- Van der Heijde, C. M., Vonk, P., & Meijman, F. J. (2015). Self-regulation for the promotion of student health. Traffic lights: the development of a tailored web-based instrument providing immediate personalized feedback. *Health Psychology and Behavioural Medicine*, 3 (1), 169 - 189.
- Van der Heijde, C.M., Vonk, P., & Meijman, F.J. Traffic lights. Project results student health check 2015-2016 [Dutch: Stoplichten. Projectresultaten Studentengezondheidstest 2015-2016]. Amsterdam: Bureau Studentenartsen en Universiteit van Amsterdam (2016).
- Verouden NW, Vonk P, Meijman FJ. Context guides illness-identity: a qualitative analysis of Dutch university students' non-help-seeking behaviour. *International Journal of Adolescent Medicine and Health* 2010; 22:307-20.
- Verouden NW, Vonk P, Meijman FJ. Studenten en stille pijn. Wel problemen maar geen hulp zoeken. Amsterdam: Elsevier Gezondheidszorg, 2010. ISBN: 9789035231887

Achtergrond en probleemstelling (circa 500 woorden):

The Constitution of the World Health Organization (WHO), which came into force on April 7, 1948, defined health "as a state of complete physical, mental and social well-being."<sup>3</sup> University students are expected to be a relatively healthy subset of the general population. Their young age and their high level of education is presumed to be associated with a better health status. In studies of health, young people are an under-researched group and there are few surveys of the health of students at universities. As a result, information about the health of students is scarce. The students' health is nevertheless important. Prior in field studies on the health status of university students has shown that compared to peers who already work, university students reported significant more health complaints (both physical and mental), a lower quality of life, and a worse health status<sup>4567</sup>. Prior research has also shown that they do not appear to seek help for these problems<sup>89</sup>. Health issues can lead to study problems and even study failure<sup>10</sup>. This stresses the importance of early detection. The Student Health Services in Amsterdam started a project. In this project, students, studying at the University of Amsterdam or at the Amsterdam University of Applied Sciences, can complete a digital and validated Student Health Check to recognize health issues by themselves at an early stage by answering the questions and receiving personalized feedback. According to the Student Health Check 2015-2016, 45% of the students report a health issue. 13% of the students report a disability, 28%

<sup>3</sup> International Health Conference. "Constitution of the World Health Organization. 1946." *Bulletin of the World Health Organization* 80.12 (2002): 983–984. Print.

<sup>4</sup> Nauta, M. C. E., F. J. Meijman, and T. F. Meijman. "Perceived health and perceived study situation of university students in Amsterdam [Dutch: De subjectief ervaren gezondheid en studiebeleving van studenten van de Universiteit van Amsterdam]." *Tijdschrift voor Sociale Gezondheidszorg* 74.8 (1996): 391-6.

<sup>5</sup> Vaez, Marjan, Margareta Kristenson, and Lucie Laflamme. "Perceived quality of life and self-rated health among first-year university students." *Social Indicators Research* 68.2 (2004): 221-234.

<sup>6</sup> Vaez, M., M. Voss, and L. Laflamme. "Health-related quality of life among university students." *Handbook of disease burdens and quality of life measures*. Springer New York, (2010). 2555-2577.

<sup>7</sup> Stewart-Brown, Sarah, et al. "The health of students in institutes of higher education: an important and neglected public health problem?." *Journal of Public Health* 22.4 (2000): 492-499.

<sup>8</sup> Verouden, Nick W., Peter Vonk, and Rogier Fokke. *Studenten en Stille Pijn: wel problemen maar geen hulp zoeken*. Elsevier gezondheidszorg, 2010.

<sup>9</sup> Verouden, Nick W., Peter Vonk, and Frans J. Meijman. "Context guides illness-identity: A qualitative analysis of Dutch university students' non-help-seeking behavior." *International journal of adolescent medicine and health* 22.2 (2010): 307-320.

<sup>10</sup> Boot, Cecile RL, Peter Vonk, and Frans J. Meijman. "Health-related profiles of study delay in university students in the Netherlands." *International journal of adolescent medicine and health* 19.4 (2007): 413-424.

report physical complaints and 18% psychological complaints. The results of the Student Health Check differ per study<sup>11</sup>.

There are several studies that describe the health of medical students. Research from the KNMG Student Platform in 2007 and 2011 showed that a considerable number of medical students in the Netherlands are struggling with burn-out related complaints<sup>12</sup>. Prior research by Dyrbye et al. in 2014, described that approximately 50% of medical students experience burnout and 10% experience suicidal ideation<sup>13</sup>. The health among students from other study programs than medical students is much less described, but also relevant. The results of the study by Organ et. al., (2016) indicate that roughly 25-33% of law students reported frequent binge drinking or misuse of drugs, and/or reported mental health challenges<sup>14</sup>. An online survey among students of the Erasmus University showed that specifically among students business administration and social sciences a high number of students use hard drugs<sup>15</sup>. Some health problems will occur more in students of one study than in students of other studies. The opportunities and threats to health in the specific studies are however not clearly described. Some studies on specific student groups have been performed. Vijay et al. in 2016, described that due to incorrect posture and prolonged static positions during dental treatment, musculoskeletal neck and back pain is a specific problem for dental students<sup>16</sup>. Studies comparing characteristics and habits of students of various studies/faculties, sometimes related to their later professional practice, and their relation with health problems are scarce, but could help prevent health problems in specific student populations and in later professional life.

To compare the health between the students of different studies, this research focuses primarily on the data about the subjectively perceived health of university students, in order to get an indication of the health status of the medical, dental, psychology and law students compared to other students of the University of Amsterdam. This by using the data of the Student Health Check 2015-2016 of the project of Student Health Services in Amsterdam.

By comparing the data from 2011 to 2018, we will examine whether there is a trend in the prevalence of specific students related health problems.

#### Vraagstelling en/of hypothese (circa 150 woorden)

The corresponding research question is: How are the health status and perceived health problems of medical, dental, psychology and law students compared to other students at the University of Amsterdam in the Netherlands?

The following sub-questions are formulated:

1. How do medical, dental, psychology and law students score with regard to general health, mental health, health (risk) behaviour and student life quality compared to other university students?
2. What are characteristics and habits (e.g. situational or personal) of medical, dental, psychology and law students, as a result of which they perceive health problems?
3. Is there a trend in the prevalence of health problems of medical, dental, psychology and law students over the years?

<sup>11</sup> Van der Heijde, C.M., Vonk, P., & Meijman, F.J. *Stoplichten. Projectresultaten Studentengezondheidstest 2015-2016*. Amsterdam: Bureau Studentenartsen en Universiteit van Amsterdam (2016).

<sup>12</sup> Conijn, M., Boersma, H.J.M.V., & Van Rhenen, W. "Burn-out bij Nederlandse geneeskundestudenten: prevalentie en oorzaken." *Nederlands Tijdschrift voor Geneeskunde* (2015): 159: A8255.

<sup>13</sup> Dyrbye, Liselotte N., et al. "Burnout and suicidal ideation among US medical students." *Annals of internal medicine* 149.5 (2008): 334-341.

<sup>14</sup> Organ, Jerome M., David B. Jaffe, and Katherine M. Bender. "Suffering in silence: The survey of law student well-being and the reluctance of law students to seek help for substance use and mental health concerns." *J. Legal Educ.* 66 (2016): 116.

<sup>15</sup> De Hoogh, R. & De Jong, T. "1 op 3 EUR studenten gebruikt harddrugs". *Credo Magazine* (2014).

<sup>16</sup> Vijay, S., and M. Ide. "Musculoskeletal neck and back pain in undergraduate dental students at a UK dental school—a cross-sectional study." *British dental journal* 221.5 (2016): 241.

Onderzoeksopzet (circa 500 woorden):

1. Study population and procedure

The design of this study is cross-sectional survey study. Sixteen university faculties have indicated that they want to participate in the Student Health Check\*. All students who were enrolled fulltime on one of these participating faculties at the University of Amsterdam were invited through various communication channels (such as regular mail, e-mail, social media and an online newsletter) by the Student Health Services or the manager of their course to complete an anonymous, internet-based questionnaire. Two weeks after the first invitation, all students received a reminder by e-mail. The website was open from 2011 till now. To be included in this study, students of the participating faculties at the University of Amsterdam had to fill in the Student Health Check at least once between 2011 and 2018. The data (2011 till 2018) is available while starting this study. For the study no permission was needed from the medical ethical commission. The ethical review board of the department of psychology of the University of Amsterdam approved this project.

2. Survey

The Student Health Check of 2015-2016, an anonymous online self-check for students, was utilised in this study<sup>17</sup>. It is created by the Student Health Service of the University of Amsterdam. They used NetQ software<sup>18</sup> to build the web-based instrument. The online questionnaire consisted questions about health, health (risk) behaviour, quality of life and personal characteristics. One of the missions of the project is making students aware of health risks or (un)healthy behaviour by receiving personalized feedback and referral to relevant interventions if necessary. Some questions were adopted from existing questionnaires, other questions were formulated by a team of experts following detailed literature review and interviews with students and other related people.

Of the demographic factors<sup>19</sup>, 9 are used in this study: gender, age, height, weight, relationship status, education year, study type, study results, study phase.

Of the personal factors<sup>20</sup>, 12 are used in this study:

- For the subject 'health': general health (SF-36 subscale) and vitality (SF-36 subscale).
- For the subject 'mental health': depression (K-6) and anxiety (EK 10).
- For the subject 'health (risk) behaviour': smoking (cds-5), alcohol (ab)use (AUDIT), drug (ab)use (DAST-10), internet addiction (CIUS-A), buying addiction (buying addiction) and student health risk behaviour general (student health (risk) behaviour).
- For the subject 'student life quality': satisfaction with study (satisfaction with study) and quality of student life (quality of student life).

To answer the sub-question 'Is there a trend in the prevalence of health problems of students over the years?', data of the Student Health Check of 2011, 2012, 2013-2014, 2015-2016 and (if available) 2017-2018 are used to compare this years with each other.

From the variables height and weight a new variable 'BMI' is calculated by  $\text{weight}/\text{height}^2$ . The university is the only education level that is included in this study. Study phase is categorised in freshmen, bachelor, master, doctoral, medical internship and PhD. All measurement scales of the other variables are at dichotomous, interval or ratio scale level. Some variables are continues and based on

<sup>17</sup> van der Heijde, C. M., Vonk, P., & Meijman, F. J. (2015). Self-regulation for the promotion of student health. Traffic lights: the development of a tailored web-based instrument providing immediate personalized feedback. *Health Psychology and Behavioural Medicine*, 3 (1), 169 - 189.

<sup>18</sup> NETQ Internet Surveys 6.7. (2011). *Software for creating and assessment of internet surveys*. Utrecht: NetQuestionnaires Nederland BV.

<sup>19</sup> van der Heijde, C. M., Vonk, P., & Meijman, F. J. (2015). Self-regulation for the promotion of student health. Traffic lights: the development of a tailored web-based instrument providing immediate personalized feedback. *Health Psychology and Behavioural Medicine*, 3 (1), 169 - 189.

<sup>20</sup> van der Heijde, C. M., Vonk, P., & Meijman, F. J. (2015). Self-regulation for the promotion of student health. Traffic lights: the development of a tailored web-based instrument providing immediate personalized feedback. *Health Psychology and Behavioural Medicine*, 3 (1), 169 - 189.

severity scores obtained from the scales used for the different items.

By doing a research of the literature and the questioning of study advisers and other representatives of the relevant study program, an answer is given to the sub-question ‘What are characteristics and habits (e.g. situational or personal) of medical, dental, psychology and law students, as a result of which they perceive health problems?’.

### 3. Analysis

The statistical analysis is performed using SPSS statistics version 24.0. All participants are divided into one of the following groups: [medical students and other university students] or [dental students and other university students] or [psychology students and other university students] or [law students and other university students]. The variables were compared between the groups using ANOVA, Chi-square comparisons and Bonferroni post hoc tests. The output is interpreted in risk ratio (RR) and 95% confidence interval (CI).

\* UvA FGw arts, religion & culture, UvA FGw history and archeology, UvA FGw philosophy, UvA FMG communication science, UvA FGw media studies, UvA FGw language and culture, UvA law, UvA FEB economics and business, UvA child development & education, UvA FMG psychology, UvA FMG social sciences, UvA FNWI IIS/beta-gamma, UvA and VU dentistry, UvA medicine, UvA science, Amsterdam University College.

(UvA = University of Amsterdam, VU = VU University Amsterdam)

### Werkplan en Stage-specifieke leerdoelen (circa 500 WOORDEN):

The research internship has a duration of 16 weeks (23-7-2018 till 9-11-2018).

#### **Week 1 (23-7 till 27-7):**

- Installing the required programs.
- Writing the introduction.
- Writing references with Endnote.

#### **Week 2 (30-7 till 3-8):**

- Writing and correcting the introduction.

#### **Week 3 (6-8 till 10-8):**

- Correcting the introduction
- Study aim week 1-3: I can search relevant scientific literature about health, the health of students and the health of medical students, the health of dental students, the health of psychology students and the health of law students. After that, I can critically read and consider this and subsequently set up a research question.

#### **Week 4 (13-8 till 17-8):**

- Writing the method.

#### **Week 5 (20-8 till 24-8):**

- Correcting the method.
- Writing a subsidy request to the Triodos Foundation.
- Study aim week 4-5: I know which subjects and related questions I will use of the Student Health Check, how these questions are divided and how I will systematically record my method.

#### **Week 6 (27-8 till 31-8):**

- know how I can apply SPSS, risk ratio, confidence interval and p-value.

#### **Week 7 (3-9 till 7-9):**

- Interim evaluation of the daily supervisor and/or senior tutor (circa 6 weeks after the start of the research internship).
- Study aim week 6-7: I can convert the data of the Student Health Check into tables and divide them into medicine/dental/psychology/law students and other University students. I can apply the statistics/SPSS to the data I have of the Student Health Check and know how to apply the odds ratio, confidence interval and p-value.

#### **Week 8 (10-9 till 14-9):**

- Writing the results.

**Week 9 (17-9 till 21-9):**

- Writing the results.

**Week 10 (24-9 till 28-9):**

- Writing the results.
- Study aim week 7-10: I can analyse the results of my research. I can also make connections between the outcomes of medical/dental/psychology/law students and the outcomes of other University students and note them systematically in the report.

**Week 11 (1-10 till 5-10):**

- Edit the layout and correct write errors.
- Prepare interim report.
- Submit the interim report (at least 4 weeks before the final data of the internship = 12-10).  
Assessment by the daily supervisor.
- Making the discussion and conclusion.
- Study aim week 11: I can oversee the results of the research and write this briefly and concisely in the summary.

**Week 12 (8-10 till 12-10):**

- Adjusting interim report.
- Making the discussion and conclusion.
- Study aim week 11-12: I can make a conclusion about how the health of medical/dental/psychology /law students is compared to other university students and also a conclusion about my sub-questions. I can also discuss the results and conclusions of my research in relation to the results and conclusions of similar research by others about health of (medical/dental/psychology/law) students.

**Week 13 (15-10 till 19-10):**

- Adjusting interim report.

**Week 14 (22-10 till 26-10):**

- Making the presentation.

**Week 15 (29-10 till 2-11):**

- Giving a presentation of the research project to the department of general practice at the AMC. 30 minutes.
- Making the summary.
- Doing the last things for the final report
- Study aim week 14-15: I can give a presentation about my research in limit myself to the main

lines. I present as much as possible in tables/graphs for a clear overview. I can keep the presentation at the level of the audience present.

**Week 16 (5-11 till 9-11):**

- Edit layout and correct write errors.
- Writing a press release about my topic.
- 9-11: submit final report.
- Study aim week 16: I can hand in the report within the deadline and from now on I will start writing an article for 'Medisch Contact' or 'Arts in Spe' and for Journals especially focussed on dental/psychology/law sciences.

Faciliteiten (circa 250 woorden):

- I need access to a computer on the Student Health Services, located at the Oude Turfmarkt in Amsterdam, which is present.
- I need access to the data of the Student Health Check 2011, 2012, 2013-2014 and 2015-2016. Dr. Peter Vonk (my daily supervisor) and Dr. Claudia M. van der Heijde will give me access to the data.
- I need access to SPSS. Dr. Peter Vonk (my daily supervisor) and Dr. Claudia M. van der Heijde will give me access to SPSS.
- I would like to be present once a month at the research meeting in the AMC, to follow other projects of the department. For this I have to be on the mailing list, so that I know when these meetings are. Prof. dr. Nynke van Dijk will add me to the mailing list and plan my final presentation.

METC, DEC, GGO:

For the study no permission is needed from the medical ethical commission or the animal experimental commission. For the study, there is also no license required to work with genetically modified organisms.

The ethical committee of the psychology department of the University of Amsterdam approved this project.

Professionele ontwikkeling student (circa 250 woorden):

The research internship fits my further career in terms of location and research question. I want to become a general practitioner. I will do my research internship in a general practice, where my supervisors also works. The research is about the health of university students. Students are a large population in general practice, so it is also important to have an impression of the health problems they face. I hope to get an answer of this through my research. I will also be present every month at the research meeting at the AMC, in order to be able to follow other projects in general practice. I will be aware of new insights/knowledge in general practice that I can use when I am a general practitioner.

This research internship gives me the opportunity to carry out my own research project within a current line of research. In this way I will gain experience with methods of clinical health research and further develop myself in research skills that have already been partly developed during my Bachelor thesis and in the master program (clinical reasoning and evidence-based action). I want to expand this by writing an article in for example the 'NTvG', 'The Medical Contact', or 'Arts in Spe' and for Journals especially focussed on dental/psychology/law sciences.

## Appendix 4: Summary of Holland's theory

The **investigative** personality use their intelligence. Thus, he is always thinking, understand things and organizing ideas. Mathematics, physics, geology and medicine are examples of careers this personality type can fit into.

The **artistic** personality type is interested in innovative and creative activities where he can express his emotion. Thus, he prefers individual work to group work. Environments that match this personality type are music, art, language, mass communication and theatre arts.

The **enterprising** personality type are attracted to pursuits that require influencing other and also obtains power and status. Environments that match this type of personality are political science, law, catering, public administration and estate management.

The **social** personality type is friendly, caring and enjoys imparting knowledge to others. Environment where this personality can thrive well are teaching, counselling, foreign service and psychology.

The **conventional** personality type is rule-regulated and enjoys ordered and systematic activities. Examples of environments where this personality type can thrive well are economic, business, accounting, banking, secretarial work and library science.

The **realistic** personality types possess manual skills but is aggressive and unsociable. Farming, forestry, engineering and architecture fit very well into this occupational environment.



## Appendix 5: Overview of the scales

**Physical health** was divided into three scales: general health, vitality and physical complaints.

General health was measured through four items of the subscale ‘general health’ of the SF-36 Health Survey (86). As an example the question: ‘I am as healthy as anybody I know.’ Answers were given on a 5-point scale (very much disagree – very much agree). The first and third questions are scored with values of 0, 25, 50, 75 and 100. The second and fourth questions are scored with values of 100, 75, 50, 25 and 0. The total score was calculated by taking the average for all items in the scale, thus total score range from 0-100. The higher the score, the better the general health.

Vitality was measured through the subscale ‘vitality’ of the SF-36 Health Survey (86). This scale contained four questions. An example question is: ‘How much of the time during the past 4 weeks... Did you have a lot of energy?’ The questions were scored on a 5-point scale (almost never – almost ever). First two questions had values of 100, 75, 50, 25 and 0, last two questions had values of 0, 25, 50, 75 and 100. The total score was calculated by taking the average for all four items in the scale, ranged from 0-100. 100 representing the highest level of a good vitality.

Physical complaints was also measured by one single question (87): ‘Do you experience long-term physical symptoms?’ Participants answered on a 2-point scale (yes - no). If yes, they were asked to write down which physical complaints.

**Mental health** was measured by eleven scales; depression, anxiety, psychological complaints, smoking, alcohol (ab)use, drug (ab)use, gambling addiction, internet addiction, buying addiction, eating disorder and suicidal ideation.

Depression was measured by the K-6 (88). The K-6 contains six items. A question is: ‘How often did you feel so depressed that nothing could cheer you up?’ Each question is scored from 1 (almost never) to 5 (almost always). Scores of the 6 questions are then summed, yielding a minimum score of 6 and a maximum score of 30. High scores indicate higher levels of psychological distress.

Anxiety was measured by five items of the EK10 scale (89). As an example the question: ‘In the past month, have you felt worried, nervous, tense or anxious for the greater part of the time?’ Answers were given on a 5-point scale (never – very often). The total score, the sum of the individual items, ranged from 4-20. The higher the total score, the more anxious.

Psychological complaints was also measured by one single question (87): ‘Do you experience long-term psychological symptoms?’ Participants answered on a 2-point scale (yes - no). If yes, they were asked to write down which psychological complaints.

Smoking was measured by one single question (87): ‘I smoke.’ An answer was given on a 5-point scale (never – very often). If participants answered this question positively (sometimes – very often), they were asked to fill in the cds-5 (90). This scale contained 5 items. A question is: ‘On average, how many cigarettes do you smoke per day?’ The individual items were scored from 1-5. The total score obtained by summing responses on all 5 items of the dependence scale that ranges from 5 (lowest) to 25 (highest). The higher the total score, the higher the dependence of cigarettes.

Alcohol (ab)use was measured through one single question (87): ‘I use alcohol.’ Participants answered on a 5-point scale (never – very often). When the answer was not ‘never’, they were asked to fill in the AUDIT (91). This scale contained ten questions about the use of alcohol. As an example the question: ‘How often during the last year have you had a feeling of guilt or remorse after drinking?’ First eight questions are scored on 5-point scales ranging from 0-4 (‘never – 4 times or more per week’ or ‘never – daily or almost daily), and last two are scored on 3-point scales (no – yes, the past year) with values of 0, 2, and 4. Thus total scores range from 0-40, by summing up the individual item scores. A score of 8 or more is considered to indicate hazardous or harmful alcohol use.

Drug (ab)use was measured by one single question (87): ‘I use drugs.’ An answer was given on a 5-point scale (never – very often). If the answer was positively (sometimes – very often), they were asked to fill in the DAST-10 (92) that contained 10 questions. One of the questions is: ‘Are you always able to stop using drugs when you want to?’ Answers were given on a 5-point scale (never – very often). The total score, the sum of the individual items, ranged from 0-40. Higher scores being suggestive of a more severe drug problem.

Gambling addiction was measured by one single question (87): ‘I bet.’ An answer was given on a 5-point scale (never – very often). If participants answered this question positively (sometimes – very often), they were asked to fill in the PGSI (93). This scale contained 9 items. As an example the

question: 'Thinking about the last 12 months... Has your gambling caused any financial problems for you or your household?' Answers were given on a 4-point scale ranging from 0-3 (never – almost always). The total score is the sum of all individual items and range from 0-27. The higher your score, the higher the risk that your gambling is a problem.

Internet addiction was measured by one single question (87): 'I am more than desirable on the internet.' An answer was given on a 5-point scale (never – very often). If the answer was positively (sometimes – very often), they were asked to fill in the twelve items of the CIUS-A (94). Answers given on a 5-point scale (never – very often). A question is: 'Do you rush through your (home) work in order to go on the Internet?' The total score was calculated by taking the average of the individual item scores and ranged from 1-5. The higher the total score, the more severe the compulsive internet use is.

Buying addiction was measured through one single question (87): 'I do unnecessary purchases.' Participants answered on a 5-point scale (never – very often). When the answer was not 'never', they were asked to fill in the CBS (95). This scale contained 7 items. Participants answered on a 5-point scale (strongly agree – strongly disagree). An example question is: 'Bought myself something in order to make myself feel better.' The total score was calculated by the following equation:  $= -9.69 + (Q1 \times .33) + (Q2 \times .34) + (Q3 \times .50) + (Q4 \times .47) + (Q5 \times .33) + (Q6 \times .38) + (Q7 \times .31)$ . Substitute your score of 1 to 5 on each question for its place in the equation. For example, if you marked question 1 as 2 (somewhat agree), use 2 in place of Q1. If your overall score is higher negative than -1.34, you would be classified as a compulsive buyer.

Eating disorder was measured through the ESP (96). This scale contained 5 items. For example: 'Do you ever eat in secret?' The answer was dichotomous (yes/no). The total score ranged from 0-5. One or no abnormal responses to the ESP ruled out an eating disorder, whereas 3 or more abnormal responses ruled one in.

Suicidal ideation was measured through the SBQ-R (97). This scale contained four questions about suicide. As an example the question: 'How likely is it that you will attempt suicide someday?' First question is scored on a 6-point scale ranging from 1-4, the second question is scored on 5-point scale ranging from 1-5, the third question is also scored on 5-point scale, but with values of 1, 2 and 3. The fourth question is scored on a 7-point scale ranging from 0-6. The total score is the sum of all scores. The total score should range from 3-18. The higher the score, the higher the risk for suicide.

**Physical and mental health.** Two scales measured physical and mental health.

Firstly, disability was measured by one single question (87): 'Do you suffer from an impairment impacting your performance?' An answer was given on a 2-point scale (yes - no). If participants answered this question positively, they were asked to fill in which disability.

Secondly, student health (risk) behaviour (general) was measured through the 'Student health (risk) behaviour' scale (87). This scale contained 18 items. Responses to the items consist of a 5-point scale on which the individual rates each item on a scale from never to very often. As an example the question: 'I exercise sufficiently.' The total score ranged from 1-5 and was calculated by taking the average for all items in the scale. The higher the score, the better the student health (risk) behaviour .

**Social well-being** was divided into two scales: satisfaction with study and quality of student life.

Satisfaction with study was measured through the Satisfaction with study scale (87). The scale contained six items. Answers were given on a 5-point scale (very dissatisfied – very satisfied). One of the questions is: 'My learning experiences at the university make me feel:'. The total score, with a range of 1-5 was calculated by taking the average of the individual item scores. The higher the total score, the more the student was satisfaction with their study.

Quality of student life was measured by the Quality of student life scale (87). This scale contained 11 items. Participants answered on a 5-point scale (very dissatisfied – very satisfied). A question is: 'My housing situation makes me feel:'. The total score of the 11 questions was calculated by taking the average. The higher the total score (ranging from 1 to 5), the better the quality of student life.

**Negative sexual experiences** was measured by one single question (87): 'Have you, in the past or now, personally experienced negative sexual experiences, sexual harassment or sexual violence?' An answer was given on a 2-point scale (yes - no).

**Peer pressure lifestyle self-efficacy** was measured by the Peer pressure lifestyle self-efficacy scale (87). This scale contains six items. A question is: 'I can withstand the pressure from peers to drink alcohol.' Each question is scored from 0 (cannot resist at all) to 10 (can resist very easily). The total

score of the 6 questions was calculated by taking the average, yielding a minimum score of 0 and a maximum score of 10. The higher the total score, the better you can withstand the pressure from peers.

**Problem perception** was measured by the Problem perception scale that contained nine questions (87). Answers were given on a 5-point scale (totally disagree – totally agree). A question is: ‘I experience my alcohol intake as a problem.’ The total score was calculated by taking the average of all individual item scores and ranged from 1-5. The higher the total score, the more the participant see their lifestyle as a problem.

**Seeking or having help** was measured by one single question (87): ‘Do you want help with the problem you have indicated?’ An answer could be given by seven answer options: 1) yes from a friend/partner, 2) yes from family, 3) yes from a professional counsellor 4) no, I already have help from a friend, 5) no, I already have help from family, 6) no, I already have help from a professional counsellor and 7) No.

Table 1. Measurement scales.

Concept	Used scale (Author)	Example item	Number of items
<b>Physical health</b>			
General health	SF-36 (subscale) (Aaronson et al., 1998)(86)	I am as healthy as anybody I know.	4
Vitality	SF-36 (subscale) (Aaronson et al., 1998)(86)	How much of the time during the past 4 weeks... Did you have a lot of energy?	4
Physical complaints	One single question (van der Heijde et al., 2011)(87)	Do you experience long-term physical symptoms?	1
<b>Mental health</b>			
Depression	K-6 (Kessler et al., 2002)(88)	How often did you feel so depressed that nothing could cheer you up?	6
Anxiety	EK10 (Donker et al., 2010)(89)	In the past month, have you felt worried, nervous, tense or anxious for the greater part of the time?	5
Psychological complaints	One single question (van der Heijde et al., 2011)(87)	Do you experience long-term psychological symptoms?	1
Smoking	One single question (van der Heijde et al., 2011) (87)	I smoke.	1
	CDS-5 (Etter et al., 2003)(87,90)	On average, how many cigarettes do you smoke per day?	5
Alcohol (ab)use	One single question (van der Heijde et al., 2011) (87)	I use alcohol.	1
	AUDIT (Saunders et al., 1993)(87,91)	How often during the last year have you had a feeling of guilt or remorse after drinking?	10
Drug (ab)use	One single question (van der Heijde et al., 2011) (87)	I use drugs.	1
	DAST-10 (Skinner, 1982; Yudko	Are you always able to stop using drugs when you want to?	10

	et al., 2007)(87,92)		
Gambling addiction	One single question (van der Heijde et al., 2011)	I bet.	1
	PGSI (Ferris et al., 2001)(93)	Thinking about the last 12 months... Has your gambling caused any financial problems for you or your household?	9
Internet addiction	One single question (van der Heijde et al., 2011) (87)	I am more than desirable on the internet.	1
	CIUS-A (van den Eijnden et al., 2008)(94)	Do you rush through your (home) work in order to go on the Internet?	12
Buying addiction	One single question (van der Heijde et al., 2011) (87)	I do unnecessary purchases.	1
	Buying addiction (Faber et al., 1992)(95)	Bought myself something in order to make myself feel better.	7
Eating disorder	ESP (Cotton et al. 2003)(96)	Do you ever eat in secret?	5
Suicidal ideation	SBQ-R (Osman et al., 2001) (97)	How likely is it that you will attempt suicide someday?	4
<b>Physical and mental health</b>			
Disability	One single question (van der Heijde et al., 2011)(87)	Do you suffer from an impairment impacting your performance?	1
Student health (risk) behaviour (general)	Student health (risk) behaviour (van der Heijde et al., 2011)(87)	I exercise sufficiently.	18
<b>Social well-being</b>			
Satisfaction with study	Satisfaction with study (van der Heijde et al., 2011)(87)	My learning experiences at the university make me feel:	6
Quality of student life	Quality of student life (van der Heijde et al., 2011)(87)	My housing situation makes me feel:	11
<b>Other scales</b>			
Negative sexual experiences	One single question (van der Heijde et al., 2011)(87)	Have you, in the past or now, personally experienced negative sexual experiences, sexual harassment or sexual violence?	1
Peer pressure lifestyle self-efficacy	Peer pressure lifestyle self-efficacy (van der Heijde et al., 2011)(87)	I can withstand the pressure from peers to drink alcohol.	6
Problem perception	Problem perception scale (van der Heijde et al., 2011)(87)	I experience my alcohol intake as a problem.	9
Seeking or having help	One single question (van der Heijde et al.,	Do you want help with the problem you have indicated?	1

	2011)(87)		
--	-----------	--	--

## Appendix 6: Descriptive characteristics

Table 1. Descriptive characteristics of the sample.

Characteristics	Medical students* (n=395)	Non-medical students* (n=1998)	Law students* (n=383)	Non-law students* (n=2010)	Psychology students* (n=70)	Non-psychology students* (n=2323)	Economics and business Students* (n=271)	Non-economics and business students* (n=2122)
<b>Sex female</b>	287 (72.8%)	1353 (68.4%)	280 (74.3%)	1360 (68.1%)	58 (82.9%)	1582 (68.7%)	144 (53.9%)	1496 (71.0%)
<b>Age in years</b>	23.97 ( $\pm 3.88$ )	23.51 ( $\pm 4.44$ )	24.66 ( $\pm 5.86$ )	23.39 ( $\pm 3.98$ )	23.57 ( $\pm 2.81$ )	23.56 ( $\pm 4.40$ )	24.06 ( $\pm 4.79$ )	23.53 ( $\pm 4.30$ )
<b>BMI, kg/m<sup>2</sup></b>	22.09 ( $\pm 3.34$ ) N=394	22.08 ( $\pm 5.70$ ) N=1976	22.18 ( $\pm 5.04$ ) N=375	22.06 ( $\pm 5.44$ ) N=1995	22.43 ( $\pm 4.89$ ) N=70	22.07 ( $\pm 5.39$ ) N=2300	22.06 ( $\pm 3.13$ ) N=267	22.08 ( $\pm 5.60$ ) N=2103
<b>Having a relationship, no</b>	208 (52.8%)	1132 (57.2%)	201 (53.3%)	1139 (57.1%)	36 (51.4%)	1304 (56.6%)	152 (56.9%)	1188 (56.4%)
<b>Living situation</b>								
Living with parents or family	83 (21.1%)	415 (21.0%)	128 (34.1%)	370 (18.5%)	10 (14.3%)	488 (21.2%)	71 (26.6%)	427 (20.3%)
Living with peers	153 (38.8%)	736 (37.2%)	128 (34.1%)	761 (38.1%)	35 (50.0%)	854 (37.1%)	98 (36.7%)	791 (37.6%)
Living alone	96 (24.4%)	612 (31.0%)	60 (16.0%)	648 (32.5%)	17 (24.3%)	691 (30.0%)	69 (25.9%)	639 (30.1%)
Living with your partner	62 (15.7%)	214 (10.8%)	59 (15.7%)	217 (10.9%)	8 (11.4%)	268 (11.6%)	29 (10.9%)	247 (11.6%)
<b>Dutch, no</b>	50 (12.7%)	548 (27.4%)	73 (19.5%)	525 (26.3%)	20 (28.6%)	578 (24.9%)	102 (38.2%)	496 (23.6%)
<b>Study results</b>	1.33 ( $\pm 0.81$ )	7.15 ( $\pm 0.84$ )	6.90 ( $\pm 0.86$ )	7.23 ( $\pm 0.83$ )	7.21 ( $\pm 0.79$ )	7.18 ( $\pm 0.84$ )	6.98 ( $\pm 0.95$ )	7.20 ( $\pm 0.82$ )
<b>Study phase</b>								
Bachelor	243 (63.6%) N=382	1386 (69.5%) N=1993	218 (57.1%) N=382	1411 (70.8%) N=1993	42 (60.9%) N=69	1587 (68.8%) N=2306	163 (60.6%) N=269	1466 (69.6%) N=2106
Master	139 (36.4%) N=382	607 (30.5%) N=1993	164 (42.9%) N=382	582 (29.2%) N=1993	27 (39.1%) N=69	719 (31.2%) N=2306	106 (39.4%) N=269	640 (30.4%) N=2106
<b>Physical health</b>								
General health	69.60 ( $\pm 20.64$ )	64.75 ( $\pm 21.33$ )	62.69 ( $\pm 21.68$ )	66.07 ( $\pm 21.18$ )	66.91 ( $\pm 21.18$ )	65.49 ( $\pm 21.30$ )	61.39 ( $\pm 21.09$ )	65.30 ( $\pm 21.31$ )
Vitality	59.66 ( $\pm 21.00$ )	51.19 ( $\pm 20.98$ )	52.86 ( $\pm 19.89$ )	52.53 ( $\pm 21.46$ )	51.98 ( $\pm 21.32$ )	52.60 ( $\pm 21.21$ )	52.90 ( $\pm 22.02$ )	52.54 ( $\pm 21.11$ )
Having physical complaints, yes	100 (25.3%)	481 (24.1%)	131 (34.2%)	450 (22.4%)	21 (30.0%)	560 (24.1%)	49 (18.1%)	532 (25.1%)
<b>Mental health</b>								
Depression	13.63 ( $\pm 5.67$ )	13.75 ( $\pm 5.09$ )	13.96 ( $\pm 5.13$ )	13.44 ( $\pm 5.08$ )	14.00 ( $\pm 5.00$ )	13.51 ( $\pm 5.09$ )	13.36 ( $\pm 5.14$ )	13.54 ( $\pm 5.08$ )
Anxiety	6.71 ( $\pm 2.71$ )	6.45 ( $\pm 2.89$ )	6.29 ( $\pm 2.64$ )	6.30 ( $\pm 2.89$ )	6.40 ( $\pm 3.16$ )	6.30 ( $\pm 2.81$ )	6.35 ( $\pm 2.66$ )	6.29 ( $\pm 2.84$ )
Having psychological complaints, yes	74 (18.7%)	364 (18.2%)	86 (22.5%)	352 (17.5%)	13 (18.6%)	425 (18.3%)	30 (11.1%)	408 (19.2%)
Smoking, yes	108 (21.3%)	774 (38.7%)	144 (37.6%)	738 (36.7%)	26 (37.1%)	856 (36.8%)	101 (31.3%)	781 (36.8%)
Smoking	7.60 ( $\pm 3.95$ )	9.45 ( $\pm 5.55$ )	10.68 ( $\pm 6.24$ )	8.94 ( $\pm 5.20$ )	12.08 ( $\pm 5.66$ )	9.14 ( $\pm 5.39$ )	8.66 ( $\pm 5.23$ )	9.29 ( $\pm 5.44$ )

	N=108	N=776	N=144	N=740	N=26	N=858	N=101	N=783
Alcohol (ab)use, yes	358 (90.6%)	1787 (89.4%)	337 (88.0%)	1808 (90.0%)	63 (90.0%)	2082 (89.6%)	238 (87.8%)	1907 (89.9%)
Alcohol (ab)use	7.51 ( $\pm 4.56$ ) N=358	8.44 ( $\pm 5.41$ ) N=1787	8.00 ( $\pm 5.35$ ) N=337	8.34 ( $\pm 5.27$ ) N=1808	8.24 ( $\pm 4.24$ ) N=63	8.29 ( $\pm 5.31$ ) N=2082	9.15 ( $\pm 5.62$ ) N=238	8.18 ( $\pm 5.23$ ) N=1907
Drug (ab)use, yes	127 (32.2%)	690 (34.5%)	110 (28.7%)	707 (35.2%)	21 (30.0%)	796 (34.3%)	83 (30.6%)	734 (34.6%)
Drug (ab)use	1.30 ( $\pm 0.28$ ) N=127	1.41 ( $\pm 0.40$ ) N=690	1.48 ( $\pm 0.52$ ) N=110	1.38 ( $\pm 0.36$ ) N=707	1.47 ( $\pm 0.41$ ) N=21	1.39 ( $\pm 0.39$ ) N=796	1.34 ( $\pm 0.31$ ) N=83	1.40 ( $\pm 0.39$ ) N=734
Gambling addiction	4.83 ( $\pm 5.98$ ) N=6	4.69 ( $\pm 5.93$ ) N=29	10.50 ( $\pm 11.82$ ) N=4	3.97 ( $\pm 4.45$ ) N=31	- N=0	4.71 ( $\pm 5.85$ ) N=35	3.69 ( $\pm 4.03$ ) N=13	5.32 ( $\pm 6.71$ ) N=22
Internet addiction	2.42 ( $\pm 0.64$ ) N=127	2.42 ( $\pm 0.65$ ) N=1031	2.47 ( $\pm 0.71$ ) N=174	2.41 ( $\pm 0.64$ ) N=984	2.39 ( $\pm 0.60$ ) N=32	2.42 ( $\pm 0.65$ ) N=1126	2.42 ( $\pm 0.67$ ) N=144	2.42 ( $\pm 0.65$ ) N=1014
Buying addiction	-0.23 ( $\pm 1.89$ ) N=47	-0.24 ( $\pm 1.92$ ) N=372	-0.28 ( $\pm 2.28$ ) N=83	-0.22 ( $\pm 1.82$ ) N=336	-0.89 ( $\pm 2.07$ ) N=8	-0.22 ( $\pm 1.91$ ) N=411	-0.35 ( $\pm 1.62$ ) N=55	-0.22 ( $\pm 1.96$ ) N=364
Eating disorder	1.52 ( $\pm 1.28$ )	1.47 ( $\pm 1.25$ )	1.48 ( $\pm 1.27$ )	1.48 ( $\pm 1.26$ )	1.37 ( $\pm 0.97$ )	1.48 ( $\pm 1.27$ )	1.34 ( $\pm 1.19$ )	1.40 ( $\pm 0.39$ )
Suicidal ideation	6.73 ( $\pm 2.28$ ) N=131	6.85 ( $\pm 2.62$ ) N=818	6.62 ( $\pm 2.34$ ) N=141	6.87 ( $\pm 2.61$ ) N=808	6.69 ( $\pm 2.34$ ) N=35	6.84 ( $\pm 2.58$ ) N=914	6.65 ( $\pm 2.78$ ) N=82	6.85 ( $\pm 2.56$ ) N=867
<b>Physical and mental health</b>								
Having a disability, yes	38 (9.6%)	232 (11.6%)	42 (11.0%)	228 (11.3%)	7 (10.0%)	263 (11.3%)	21 (7.7%)	249 (11.7%)
Student health (risk) behaviour (general)	3.64 ( $\pm 0.42$ )	3.54 ( $\pm 0.47$ )	3.57 ( $\pm 0.48$ )	3.56 ( $\pm 0.46$ )	3.64 ( $\pm 0.45$ )	3.56 ( $\pm 0.46$ )	3.53 ( $\pm 0.49$ )	3.56 ( $\pm 0.46$ )
<b>Social well-being</b>								
Satisfaction with study	2.94 ( $\pm 0.64$ )	3.65 ( $\pm 0.69$ )	3.57 ( $\pm 0.67$ )	3.72 ( $\pm 0.70$ )	3.76 ( $\pm 0.59$ )	3.69 ( $\pm 0.70$ )	3.51 ( $\pm 0.76$ )	3.72 ( $\pm 0.68$ )
Quality of student life	3.93 ( $\pm 0.54$ )	3.75 ( $\pm 0.60$ )	3.79 ( $\pm 0.61$ )	3.78 ( $\pm 0.59$ )	3.76 ( $\pm 0.60$ )	3.78 ( $\pm 0.59$ )	3.74 ( $\pm 0.63$ )	3.79 ( $\pm 0.59$ )
<b>Other scales</b>								
Negative sexual experiences, yes	66 (16.7%)	355 (17.8%)	64 (16.7%)	357 (17.8%)	17 (24.3%)	404 (17.4%)	32 (11.8%)	389 (18.3%)
Peer pressure lifestyle self-efficacy	8.74 ( $\pm 1.38$ ) N=219	8.69 ( $\pm 1.38$ ) N=1455	8.92 ( $\pm 1.38$ ) N=278	8.66 ( $\pm 1.38$ ) N=1396	8.64 ( $\pm 1.14$ ) N=49	8.70 ( $\pm 1.39$ ) N=1625	8.49 ( $\pm 1.87$ ) N=217	8.73 ( $\pm 1.29$ ) N=1457
Problem perception	2.07 ( $\pm 0.64$ )	2.25 ( $\pm 0.68$ )	2.15 ( $\pm 0.71$ )	2.23 ( $\pm 0.67$ )	2.12 ( $\pm 0.57$ )	2.22 ( $\pm 0.68$ )	2.19 ( $\pm 0.66$ )	2.22 ( $\pm 0.68$ )
Seeking or having help, no	149 (41.8%) N=256	584 (43.5%) N=1344	117 (44.5%) N=263	616 (46.1%) N=1337	18 (36.7%) N=49	715 (46.1%) N=1551	69 (43.7%) N=158	664 (46.0%) N=1442

\* The values presented are: means and standard deviations; or frequencies and percentages.

The descriptive characteristics described.

#### Medical students compared with non-medical students

Of the 2393 participated students of the Student Health Check 2015-2016, 395 (16,5%) were medical students.

*Demographics.* Almost three quarters of both groups were female. The mean age of the medical students was 23.97, the mean age of the non-medical students was 23.51. Medical students had a lower BMI (-1.7 kg/m<sup>2</sup>), more often a relationship, consider themselves more as Dutch than another nationality and had a higher degree than non-medical students. In both groups, the majority of the students lived either with peers, alone or with their parents. Furthermore, the majority of students were in their bachelor.

*Physical health.* Medical students had a better general health and vitality than the non-medical students, but more physical complaints.

*Mental health.* Compared with non-medical students, medical students had more psychological complaints (18.7% versus 18.2%) and higher rates of depression and eating disorder, but lower rates of anxiety and suicidal ideation. Among medical students, 21.3% smoked, 90.6% used alcohol and 32.2% used drug, and among the non-medical students, 38.7% smoked, 89.4% used alcohol and 34.5% used drug. Within the group of students who smoked, used alcohol, used drug or had higher rates of gambling-, internet- or buying addiction; the mean score of smoking, alcohol (ab)use and drug (ab)use was lower amongst medical students than among non-medical students. The mean score of gambling- and buying addiction was higher amongst medical students.

*Physical and mental health.* Furthermore, medical students had less disabilities and a better student health (risk) behaviour (general).

*Social well-being.* Medical students experienced their quality of student life better, but their satisfaction with study worse compared with non-medical students.

*Other scales.* Negative sexual experiences were less prevalent among medical students than non-medical students. Medical students could better withstand the pressure from peers, saw their lifestyle less as a problem and sought or had help more often than non-medical students.

#### Law students compared with non-law students

Of all 2393 students, 383 (16%) were law students.

*Demographics.* Both groups included more female than male. The percentage of female was highest in law students. Law students were older (24.66 years) than non-law students (23.39 years). No outstanding differences in BMI were found between the group of law- (22.18) and the group of non-law students (22.06). In both groups, the majority of students had a relationship and lived with parents, with peers or alone, consider themselves as Dutch and were in their bachelor. Law students had worse study results compared with non-law students.

*Physical health.* Law students had more physical complaints and a worse general health than non-law students. There was no differences in vitality among both groups.

*Mental health.* The two groups were almost similar in mean score of depression, anxiety and eating disorder. The prevalence of smoking was higher, but the prevalence of alcohol (ab)use and drug (ab)use was lower amongst law students than among non-law students. Law students had more psychological complaints and higher mean scores of smoking, drug (ab)use, gambling addiction and internet addiction than non-law students, but a lower mean score of alcohol (ab)use and suicidal ideation.

*Physical and mental health.* No differences in the percentage of disability or mean score of student health (risk) behaviour (general) were found between the group of law- and the group of non-law students.

*Social well-being.* Law students were less satisfaction with their study than non-law students, but there was not found a difference in quality of student life.

*Other scales.* The prevalence of negative sexual experiences was lower among law students than among non-law students. Law students could better withstand the pressure from peers, saw their lifestyle less as a problem and sought or had help less often than non-law students.



### Psychology students compared with non-psychology students

The group of psychology students consisted of 70 patients. The group of non-psychology students consisted of 2323 students.

*Demographics.* 82.9% of psychology students were female, and 68.7% of the non-psychology students were female. The age of both groups were similar. Psychology students had a higher BMI, more often a relationship, better study results and considered themselves more often as non-Dutch than non-psychology students. In both groups, the majority of students were in their bachelor and lived with peers or alone.

*Physical health.* Psychology students had more physical complaints, a worse vitality, but a better general health compared with non-psychology students.

*Mental health.* The mean scores smoking, drug (ab)use and buying addiction were higher among psychology students than among non-psychology students. No outstanding differences in mean scores of anxiety and internet addiction and percentage of psychological complaints, smoking and alcohol (ab)use were found between the groups. Psychology students had lower rates of depression and drug (ab)use, and lower mean scores of eating disorder or suicidal ideation than non-psychology students.

*Physical and mental health.* Psychology students had a better student health (risk) behaviour (general) and less disabilities compared with non-psychology students.

*Social well-being.* Psychology students were more satisfaction with their study than non-psychology students, but there was not found a difference in quality of student life.

*Other scales.* Negative sexual experiences were more prevalent among psychology students than non-psychology students. Psychology students could less withstand the pressure from peers, saw their lifestyle more as a problem and sought of had less often help than non-psychology students.

### Economics and business students compared with non-economics and business students

271 (11.3%) were economics and business students.

*Demographics.* In both cases more students were female (economics and business students 53.9% versus non economics and business students 71.0%). The age, BMI an relationship status were generally similar. Most students lived with parents, with peers or alone, were bachelor students and had considered themselves as Dutch. Economics and business students had worse study results than non-economics and business students.

*Physical health.* Economics and business students had a better general health and less physical complaints than non-economics and business students. There were almost no differences in mean scores of vitality.

*Mental health.* Compared with non-economics and business students, economics and business students had less psychological complaints and anxiety, but higher rates of depression and buying addiction. The mean score of smoking, drug (ab)use, gambling addiction, eating disorder and suicidal ideation was lower among economics and business students than among non-economics and business students. The mean score of internet addiction was comparable. Among economics and business students 31.3% smoked, 87.8% used alcohol and 30.6% used drug and among the non-economics and business students, 36.8% smoked, 89.9% used alcohol and 34.6% used drug.

*Physical and mental health.* Economics and business students had less disabilities compared with non-economics and business students. No differences in the mean score of student health (risk) behaviour (general) were found between both groups.

*Social well-being.* Economics and business students were less satisfied with their studies than non-economics and business students, but there was not found a difference in quality of student life.

*Other scales.* Negative sexual experiences were less prevalent among economics and business students than non-economics and business students. Economics and business students could worse withstand the pressure from peers, saw their lifestyle less as a problem and sought or had help less often than non-economics and business students.

## Appendix 7: Correlation table

Table 1. Correlation table with Pearson correlation coefficients.

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17
1. Sex <sup>a</sup>	-																
2. Age <sup>b</sup>	-.05*	-															
3. BMI <sup>c</sup>	-.09**	.08**	-														
4. Having a relationship, no <sup>d</sup>	.10**	.17**	-0.02	-													
5. Living situation <sup>e</sup>	.04*	.31**	.04*	.26**	-												
6. Dutch, no <sup>f</sup>	-0.00	-.10**	-.07**	-0.00	-.13**	-											
7. Study results	.05*	0.01	-0.00	0.03	.10**	-.05*	-										
8. Study phase <sup>g</sup>	.06**	.44**	.05*	.18**	.20**	-.06**	.15**	-									
9. General health	-.12**	0.01	-0.02	0.00	-0.04	.10**	.08**	.05*	-								
10. Vitality	-.14**	0.04	-0.00	-0.01	-.06**	.20**	.08**	0.01	.46**	-							
11. Having physical complaints, yes <sup>h</sup>	.10**	0.04	0.02	.07**	-0.00	0.01	-.06**	0.01	-.31**	-.15**	-						
12. Smoking, yes <sup>i</sup>	-.11*	-0.04	.04*	-0.7**	-0.01	-0.03	-.06**	-.07**	-.09**	-0.03	-0.02	-					
13. If smoking, mean score	-.07*	0.06	.11**	-0.02	0.04	-.11**	-0.03	-0.05	-.28**	-.12**	0.02	0.03	-				
14. Alcohol (ab)use, yes <sup>j</sup>	-0.02	-0.03	0.01	0.01	.08**	.17**	0.00	0.02	0.03	.05*	-0.02	.22**	-.12**	-			
15. If using alcohol, mean score	-.23**	-.08**	.12**	-.12**	-.07**	.07**	-.12**	-0.04	-0.01	0.03	-.05*	.39**	0.06	c	-		
16. Drug (ab)use, yes <sup>k</sup>	-.17**	-.06**	0.00	-.04*	0.00	-0.02	-0.03	-0.04	-0.02	0.02	-0.04	.46**	0.03	.21**	.40**	-	
17. If using drug, mean score	-.12**	0.02	.18**	-0.03	0.04	-0.04	-.08*	-0.07	-.18**	-.12**	0.05	.20**	.36**	0.03	.40**	c	-
18. Depression	.17**	-0.03	-0.01	-0.01	.04*	-.11**	-.17**	-0.04	-.39**	-.63**	.12**	.06**	.15**	-0.05*	0.01	0.00	.17**
19. Anxiety	.12**	-0.01	-0.02	-0.01	.05**	-.20**	-.11**	-0.01	-.37**	-.51**	.07**	.05**	.15**	-.08**	-0.00	-0.00	.17**

20. Having psychological complaints, yes <sup>l</sup>	.08**	.05*	-0.01	-0.03	.05*	0.00	-.09	-0.01	-.23**	-.30**	.23**	0.00	.10**	-0.03	-0.03	0.03	.13**
21. Gambling addiction	-0.22	.37*	.64**	-0.19	-0.13	-0.21	.41*	0.04	-0.06	-0.06	0.25	0.01	.78**	-0.179	.44**	0.02	.84**
22. Internet addiction	-0.01	-0.02	.06*	-0.06	0.04	-.16**	-.13**	-0.01	-.21**	-.29**	0.05	0.01	0.01	-.058*	.10**	.07*	.22**
23. Buying addiction	-0.07	-.20**	-.14**	-0.03	-.10*	.14**	-0.03	-0.08	.23**	.22**	-0.06	-.15**	-.19**	0.06	-.22**	-0.09	-.42**
24. Eating disorder	.31**	-0.01	.11**	-0.01	.07**	-.05*	0.02	0.00	-.20**	-.23**	.05*	0.02	.07*	-0.01	-0.00	-0.00	0.05
25. Suicidal ideation	0.03	-0.00	0.03	-.07*	0.03	-.13**	-0.01	-0.01	-.19**	-.27**	0.05	0.01	0.09	-0.02	0.05	0.03	.25**
26. Having a disability, yes <sup>m</sup>	.04	.05*	0.02	-.07**	0.04	-0.04	-0.03	-0.03	-.25	-.17	.19**	-0.01	.12**	0.01	-0.03	-0.00	.07*
27. Student health (risk) behaviour (general)	0.03	0.02	-.12**	.09**	-.04*	.18**	.08**	.04*	.34**	.42**	-0.01	-.18**	-.25**	0.02	-.22**	-.12**	-.32**
28. Satisfaction with study	0.01	-.82**	-0.02	0.03	-.05*	.18**	.45**	0.00	.23**	.35**	-.05*	-.07**	-.08*	.05*	-.06**	-.06**	-.17**
29. Quality of student life	0.01	-.05*	-0.03	.17**	0.01	.16**	.08**	-0.00	.32**	.49**	-0.02	-.05*	-.14**	.053**	-0.02	-0.04	-.23**
30. Negative sexual experiences, yes <sup>n</sup>	.16**	.05**	-0.02	-0.01	.08**	-.09**	0.02	-0.01	-.14**	-.17**	.06**	.05**	0.02	-0.01	0.03	.05*	.07**
31. Peer pressure lifestyle self-efficacy	.18**	0.01	-0.04	.10**	-0.04	-0.04	0.00	-0.01	0.02	-.05*	0.98**	-.31**	-.19**	-.141**	-.42**	-.29**	-.34**
32. Problem perception	.06**	-.04*	.07**	-.16**	.07**	-.16**	0.01	-0.02	-.32**	-.37**	0.04	0.02	.10**	-.07**	0.02	0.00	.14**
33. Seeking or having help, no <sup>o</sup>	.10**	.10**	0.04	.09**	.07**	-.11**	-0.04	.06*	-.20**	-.20**	.08**	-0.01	0.05	-0.02	-0.6*	0.05	0.05

	18	19	20	21	22	23	24	25	26	27	28	29	30	31	32	33
18. Depression	-															
19. Anxiety	.69**	-														
20. Having psychological complaints, yes <sup>l</sup>	.41**	.38**	-													
21. Gambling addiction	0.07	0.15	0.07	-												
22. Internet addiction	.33**	.29**	.09**	.42*	-											
23. Buying addiction	-.25**	-.28**	-.12*	-.65*	-.36**	-										
24. Eating disorder	.30**	.24**	.13**	0.23	.15**	-.17**	-									
25. Suicidal ideation	.21**	.35**	.26**	.56*	.18**	-0.08	.19**	-								
26. Having a disability, yes <sup>m</sup>	.20**	.17**	.22**	0.16	.06*	-.12*	.10**	.16**	-							
27. Student health (risk) behaviour (general)	-.36**	-.29**	-.09**	-.46**	-.34**	.26**	-.29**	-.23**	-0.04	-						
28. Satisfaction with study	-.41**	-.35**	-.19**	0.08	-.25**	.17**	-.13**	-.21**	-.11**	.29**	-					
29. Quality of student life	-.56**	-.48**	-.28**	-.53**	-.34**	.32**	-.27**	-.42**	-.14**	.41**	.508**	-				
30. Negative sexual experiences, yes <sup>n</sup>	.18**	.17**	.16**	-0.04	.10**	-.15**	.19**	.19**	.07**	-.09**	-.09**	-.19**	-			
31. Peer pressure lifestyle self-efficacy	0.01	-0.03	.06*	-0.233	-.14**	.18**	0.01	-0.03	.06*	.19**	0.05	.10**	-0.03	-		
32. Problem perception	.35**	.30**	.15**	-0.13	.38**	-.22**	.37**	.23**	.12**	-.50**	-.24**	-.40**	.12**	-.06*	-	
33. Seeking or having help, no <sup>o</sup>	.27**	.26**	.25**	-0.19	.10**	-0.07	.09**	.15**	.13**	-0.05	-.19**	-.17**	.06*	-0.00	.09**	-

\*. Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

\*\*. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

- c. Cannot be computed because at least one of the variables is constant.
- a. Female vs male
- b. Age calculated on 31-05-2016 (closure date of the questionnaire)
- c. Calculated by by weight/height<sup>2</sup>
- d. Do not have a relationship vs. having a relationship
- e. Living with parents or family vs. living with peers vs. living alone vs. living with your partner
- f. Not Dutch vs. Dutch
- g. Bachelor vs. master
- h. Having physical complaints vs do not have physical complaints
- i. Smoking vs. no smoking
- j. Alcohol (ab)use vs. no alcohol (ab)use
- k. Drug (ab)use vs. no drug (ab)use
- l. Having psychological complaints vs. do not have psychological complaints
- m. Having a disability vs. do not have a disability
- n. Negative sexual experiences vs. no negative sexual experiences
- o. Not seeking or do not have help vs seeking or having help

## **Appendix 8: Description of the significant hierarchical regression analyses, which were not included in the results**

### Predicting general health

*Step 1.* Most of the study programs under investigation were significantly and positively related to a better general health, except being psychology student (see table 1, 8, 9 and 10 in respectively appendix 10, 11, 12 and 13). This first step explained respectively 0.8%; 0.6%; 0.6%<sup>21</sup> of the variance in general health scores  $p \leq .01$ ;  $p \leq .01$ ;  $p \leq .01$ .

*Step 2.* Among these study programs; sex (male), living with peers and students who consider themselves as Dutch were significantly and positively related to a better general health. The second step raised the level of the explained variance to 4.4%; 4.3%; 4.2%,  $p \leq 0.001$ ;  $p \leq 0.001$ ;  $p \leq 0.001$ .

*Step 3.* For the specific smaller subgroup that filled in additional questions; negative sexual experiences, perceiving problems and seeking or having help were significantly and negatively related to a better general health. Living with peers and the study programs law and economics and business remained significant. This step raising the level of explained variance for the specific subgroup to 10.6%; 11.0%; 10.7%,  $p \leq 0.001$ ;  $p \leq 0.001$ ;  $p \leq 0.001$ .

### Predicting anxiety

*Step 1.* Being a medical student was significantly and negatively related to more anxiety. Being a law, psychology and economics and business student was not significantly related to vitality (see table 1, 8, 9 and 10 in respectively appendix 10, 11, 12 and 13). This first step explained 1.1% of the variance in anxiety scores  $p \leq .001$ .

*Step 2.* Among medical students; sex (male), living with peers and students who consider themselves as Dutch were significantly and negatively related to more anxiety. The second step raised the level of the explained variance to 8.5%,  $p \leq 0.001$ .

*Step 3.* For the specific smaller subgroup that filled in additional questions; better study results were significantly and negatively related to a more anxiety. Whereas negative sexual experiences, perceiving problems and seeking or having help were significantly, but positively related to more anxiety. Sex, living with peers, students who consider themselves as Dutch and medical students remained significant. This step raising the level of explained variance for the specific subgroup to 16.1%,  $p \leq 0.001$ .

---

<sup>21</sup> The order of the numbers are respectively; medical, law, economics and business students.

## **Appendix 9: Description of the significant logistic regression analyses, which were not included in the results**

### Predicting physical complaints

*Step 1.* Being a law student was significantly more likely and being an economics and business student was less likely to physical complaints. Being a medical or psychology student was not significantly related to physical complaints (see table 1, 8, 9 and 10 in respectively appendix 14, 15, 16 and 17).

This first step explained 1.4%; 0.4%<sup>22</sup> of the variance in physical complaints  $p \leq .001$ ;  $p \leq .01$ .

*Step 2.* Among these study programs; female and having a relationship were significantly more likely to physical complaints. Students living with peers, living alone and better study results were significantly less likely to physical complaints. The second step raised the level of the explained variance to 4.5%; 4.1%,  $p \leq 0.001$ ;  $p \leq .001$ .

*Step 3.* For the specific smaller subgroup that filled in additional questions; better withstand pressure from peers was significantly more likely to physical complaints. Law and economics and business students, having a relationship and living with peers remained significant. This step raising the level of explained variance for the specific subgroup to 8.4%; 7.0,  $p \leq 0.001$ ;  $p \leq .001$ .

### Predicting psychological complaints

*Step 1.* Being an economics and business student was significantly less likely to psychological complaints. The other study programs under investigation were not significantly related to psychological complaints (see table 1, 8, 9 and 10 in respectively appendix 14, 15, 16 and 17). About 0.8% of the variance in psychological complaints was explained by the first step  $p \leq .001$ .

*Step 2.* Among economics and business; female and older students were significantly more likely to psychological complaints. Having a relationship and better study results were significantly less likely to psychological complaints. The second step raised the level of the explained variance to 4.6%,  $p \leq 0.001$ .

*Step 3.* For the specific smaller subgroup that filled in additional questions; students who consider themselves as Dutch, negative sexual experiences, better withstanding pressure from peers, perceiving problems and seeking or having help was significantly more likely to psychological complaints. Economics and business students and study results remained significant. This step raising the level of explained variance for the specific subgroup to 15.3%.  $p \leq 0.001$ .

---

<sup>22</sup> The order of the numbers are respectively; law, economics and business students.

## Appendix 10: Hierarchical regression analyses whereby medical students are compared with non-medical students

Table 1.1-1.3. Hierarchical regression analysis for general health whereby medical students are compared with non-medical students.

Step 1 N = 2393, step 2 N = 2348, step 3 N = 1206.

Table 1.1

		Coefficients <sup>a</sup>									
		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients			Correlations			Collinearity Statistics	
Model		B	Std. Error	Beta	t	Sig.	Zero-order	Partial	Part	Tolerance	VIF
1	(Constant)	59,097	,664		89,024	,000					
	medical students	5,520	1,817	,087	3,038	,002	,087	,087	,087	1,000	1,000
2	(Constant)	61,635	8,139		7,573	,000					
	medical students	5,127	1,816	,081	2,824	,005	,087	,081	,080	,973	1,028
	Sex	-5,933	1,375	-,125	-4,314	,000	-,132	-,124	-,122	,955	1,047
	Age	,050	,196	,009	,253	,800	,003	,007	,007	,702	1,424
	bmi	-,018	,093	-,006	-,195	,846	-,004	-,006	-,006	,983	1,017
	having a relationship	,360	1,356	,008	,266	,791	-,025	,008	,008	,827	1,210
	living with peers	4,356	1,687	,098	2,582	,010	,119	,075	,073	,557	1,795
	living alone	,012	1,767	,000	,007	,995	-,054	,000	,000	,550	1,817
	living with your partner	-2,947	2,560	-,042	-1,151	,250	-,069	-,033	-,033	,593	1,687
	Dutch	2,978	1,380	,063	2,158	,031	,082	,062	,061	,952	1,051
	study results	,405	,750	,016	,540	,589	,019	,016	,015	,943	1,061
	study phase	1,521	1,572	,032	,967	,334	,014	,028	,027	,716	1,397
3	(Constant)	75,775	9,005		8,415	,000					
	medical students	3,349	1,771	,053	1,891	,059	,087	,055	,052	,959	1,042
	Sex	-4,574	1,377	-,096	-3,322	,001	-,132	-,096	-,091	,894	1,119
	Age	,070	,191	,012	,367	,714	,003	,011	,010	,693	1,442
	bmi	,032	,090	,010	,353	,724	-,004	,010	,010	,978	1,023
	having a relationship	-1,255	1,339	-,029	-,938	,349	-,025	-,027	-,026	,795	1,257
	living with peers	4,104	1,664	,092	2,466	,014	,119	,071	,068	,537	1,861
	living alone	1,185	1,734	,026	,684	,494	-,054	,020	,019	,536	1,865
	living with your partner	-,671	2,499	-,010	-,269	,788	-,069	-,008	-,007	,583	1,715
	Dutch	1,157	1,354	,024	,854	,393	,082	,025	,023	,927	1,078
	study results	,576	,728	,022	,791	,429	,019	,023	,022	,938	1,066
	study phase	1,375	1,527	,029	,900	,368	,014	,026	,025	,712	1,405
	negative sexual experiences	-3,054	1,507	-,057	-2,026	,043	-,102	-,059	-,056	,941	1,063
	peer pressure lifestyle self-efficacy	,283	,468	,017	,604	,546	-,003	,018	,017	,926	1,080
	problem perception	-6,594	,953	-,200	-6,917	,000	-,231	-,197	-,190	,899	1,112
	seeking or having help	-5,835	1,226	-,134	-4,760	,000	-,172	-,137	-,130	,949	1,053

a. Dependent Variable: general health



Table 1.2

**Model Summary**

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate	R Square Change	Change Statistics			Sig. F Change
						F Change	df1	df2	
1	,087 <sup>a</sup>	,008	,007	21,45927	,008	9,230	1	1204	,002
2	,209 <sup>b</sup>	,044	,035	21,15225	,036	4,520	10	1194	,000
3	,326 <sup>c</sup>	,106	,095	20,48523	,062	20,756	4	1190	,000

a. Predictors: (Constant), medical students

b. Predictors: (Constant), medical students, having a relationship, bmi, study results, living with peers, Sex, Dutch, Age, living with your partner, study phase, living alone

c. Predictors: (Constant), medical students, having a relationship, bmi, study results, living with peers, Sex, Dutch, Age, living with your partner, study phase, living alone, seeking or having help, negative sexual experiences, peer pressure lifestyle self-efficacy, problem perception

Table 1.3

**ANOVA<sup>a</sup>**

Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	4250,565	1	4250,565	9,230	,002 <sup>b</sup>
	Residual	554442,115	1204	460,500		
	Total	558692,680	1205			
2	Regression	24475,876	11	2225,080	4,973	,000 <sup>c</sup>
	Residual	534216,804	1194	447,418		
	Total	558692,680	1205			
3	Regression	59315,773	15	3954,385	9,423	,000 <sup>d</sup>
	Residual	499376,907	1190	419,644		
	Total	558692,680	1205			

a. Dependent Variable: general health

b. Predictors: (Constant), medical students

c. Predictors: (Constant), medical students, having a relationship, bmi, study results, living with peers, Sex, Dutch, Age, living with your partner, study phase, living alone

d. Predictors: (Constant), medical students, having a relationship, bmi, study results, living with peers, Sex, Dutch, Age, living with your partner, study phase, living alone, seeking or having help, negative sexual experiences, peer pressure lifestyle self-efficacy, problem perception

Table 2.1-2.3. Hierarchical regression analysis for vitality whereby medical students are compared with non-medical students.

Step 1 N = 2393, step 2 N = 2348, step 3 N = 1206.

Table 2.1

Coefficients <sup>a</sup>											
Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.	Correlations			Collinearity Statistics	
		B	Std. Error	Beta			Zero-order	Partial	Part	Tolerance	VIF
1	(Constant)	44,586	,626		71,221	,000					
	medical students	6,213	1,713	,104	3,626	,000	,104	,104	,104	1,000	1,000
2	(Constant)	41,244	7,460		5,529	,000					
	medical students	4,935	1,664	,083	2,965	,003	,104	,085	,081	,973	1,028
	Sex	-6,352	1,261	-,142	-5,039	,000	-,161	-,144	-,138	,955	1,047
	Age	,247	,180	,045	1,373	,170	,003	,040	,038	,702	1,424
	bmi	-,019	,085	-,006	-,225	,822	-,013	-,006	-,006	,983	1,017
	having a relationship	-,836	1,243	-,020	-,672	,501	-,056	-,019	-,018	,827	1,210
	living with peers	6,517	1,547	,155	4,214	,000	,185	,121	,116	,557	1,795
	living alone	-,273	1,620	-,006	-,169	,866	-,099	-,005	-,005	,550	1,817
	living with your partner	-1,894	2,346	-,029	-,807	,420	-,086	-,023	-,022	,593	1,687
	Dutch	7,856	1,265	,175	6,209	,000	,200	,177	,171	,952	1,051
	study results	,246	,687	,010	,358	,720	,002	,010	,010	,943	1,061
	study phase	-,403	1,441	-,009	-,279	,780	-,025	-,008	-,008	,716	1,397
3	(Constant)	63,165	8,171		7,730	,000					
	medical students	3,329	1,607	,056	2,072	,038	,104	,060	,055	,959	1,042
	Sex	-4,240	1,250	-,094	-3,393	,001	-,161	-,098	-,089	,894	1,119
	Age	,289	,173	,053	1,669	,095	,003	,048	,044	,693	1,442
	bmi	,025	,082	,008	,309	,757	-,013	,009	,008	,978	1,023
	having a relationship	-2,528	1,215	-,061	-2,080	,038	-,056	-,060	-,055	,795	1,257
	living with peers	5,714	1,510	,136	3,784	,000	,185	,109	,100	,537	1,861
	living alone	,808	1,574	,018	,513	,608	-,099	,015	,014	,536	1,865
	living with your partner	,240	2,268	,004	,106	,916	-,086	,003	,003	,583	1,715
	Dutch	5,821	1,229	,130	4,737	,000	,200	,136	,125	,927	1,078
	study results	,515	,660	,021	,780	,436	,002	,023	,021	,938	1,066
	study phase	-,823	1,385	-,019	-,594	,552	-,025	-,017	-,016	,712	1,405
	negative sexual experiences	-5,514	1,368	-,109	-4,032	,000	-,164	-,116	-,106	,941	1,063
	peer pressure lifestyle self-efficacy	-,732	,424	-,047	-1,724	,085	-,073	-,050	-,045	,926	1,080
	problem perception	-7,028	,865	-,226	-8,124	,000	-,274	-,229	-,214	,899	1,112
	seeking or having help	-4,515	1,112	-,110	-4,059	,000	-,163	-,117	-,107	,949	1,053

a. Dependent Variable: vitality

Table 2.2

**Model Summary**

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate	R Square Change	Change Statistics			Sig. F Change
						F Change	df1	df2	
1	,104 <sup>a</sup>	,011	,010	20,23719	,011	13,150	1	1204	,000
2	,316 <sup>b</sup>	,100	,091	19,38738	,089	11,786	10	1194	,000
3	,418 <sup>c</sup>	,175	,165	18,58885	,075	27,196	4	1190	,000

a. Predictors: (Constant), medical students

b. Predictors: (Constant), medical students, having a relationship, bmi, study results, living with peers, Sex, Dutch, Age, living with your partner, study phase, living alone

c. Predictors: (Constant), medical students, having a relationship, bmi, study results, living with peers, Sex, Dutch, Age, living with your partner, study phase, living alone, seeking or having help, negative sexual experiences, peer pressure lifestyle self-efficacy, problem perception

Table 2.3

**ANOVA<sup>a</sup>**

Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	5385,422	1	5385,422	13,150	,000 <sup>b</sup>
	Residual	493090,892	1204	409,544		
	Total	498476,314	1205			
2	Regression	49686,974	11	4516,998	12,017	,000 <sup>c</sup>
	Residual	448789,340	1194	375,870		
	Total	498476,314	1205			
3	Regression	87277,184	15	5818,479	16,839	,000 <sup>d</sup>
	Residual	411199,129	1190	345,545		
	Total	498476,314	1205			

a. Dependent Variable: vitality

b. Predictors: (Constant), medical students

c. Predictors: (Constant), medical students, having a relationship, bmi, study results, living with peers, Sex, Dutch, Age, living with your partner, study phase, living alone

d. Predictors: (Constant), medical students, having a relationship, bmi, study results, living with peers, Sex, Dutch, Age, living with your partner, study phase, living alone, seeking or having help, negative sexual experiences, peer pressure lifestyle self-efficacy, problem perception

Table 3.1-3.3. Hierarchical regression analysis for depression whereby medical students are compared with non-medical students.

Step 1 N = 2393, step 2 N = 2348, step 3 N = 1206.

Table 3.1

		Coefficients <sup>a</sup>									
Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.	Correlations			Collinearity Statistics	
		B	Std. Error	Beta			Zero-order	Partial	Part	Tolerance	VIF
1	(Constant)	15,389	,160		95,924	,000					
	medical students	-,836	,439	-,055	-1,903	,057	-,055	-,055	-,055	1,000	1,000
2	(Constant)	16,387	1,932		8,484	,000					
	medical students	-,689	,431	-,045	-1,598	,110	-,055	-,046	-,045	,973	1,028
	Sex	2,221	,326	,194	6,806	,000	,196	,193	,190	,955	1,047
	Age	,027	,046	,019	,571	,568	,011	,017	,016	,702	1,424
	bmi	,001	,022	,001	,049	,961	-,005	,001	,001	,983	1,017
	having a relationship	,112	,322	,011	,349	,727	,049	,010	,010	,827	1,210
	living with peers	-,920	,400	-,086	-2,298	,022	-,128	-,066	-,064	,557	1,795
	living alone	,335	,419	,030	,800	,424	,069	,023	,022	,550	1,817
	living with your partner	,587	,608	,035	,966	,334	,070	,028	,027	,593	1,687
	Dutch	-,526	,328	-,046	-1,605	,109	-,060	-,046	-,045	,952	1,051
	study results	-,678	,178	-,109	-3,814	,000	-,112	-,110	-,106	,943	1,061
	study phase	-,602	,373	-,053	-1,615	,107	-,035	-,047	-,045	,716	1,397
3	(Constant)	11,974	2,086		5,739	,000					
	medical students	-,134	,410	-,009	-,326	,744	-,055	-,009	-,009	,959	1,042
	Sex	1,694	,319	,148	5,310	,000	,196	,152	,140	,894	1,119
	Age	,009	,044	,006	,195	,846	,011	,006	,005	,693	1,442
	bmi	-,012	,021	-,016	-,596	,551	-,005	-,017	-,016	,978	1,023
	having a relationship	,500	,310	,048	1,610	,108	,049	,047	,042	,795	1,257
	living with peers	-,839	,386	-,078	-2,176	,030	-,128	-,063	-,057	,537	1,861
	living alone	,016	,402	,001	,041	,968	,069	,001	,001	,536	1,865
	living with your partner	-,091	,579	-,005	-,158	,875	,070	-,005	-,004	,583	1,715
	Dutch	,036	,314	,003	,114	,910	-,060	,003	,003	,927	1,078
	study results	-,714	,169	-,115	-4,233	,000	-,112	-,122	-,111	,938	1,066
	study phase	-,525	,354	-,046	-1,484	,138	-,035	-,043	-,039	,712	1,405
	negative sexual experiences	1,247	,349	,097	3,572	,000	,149	,103	,094	,941	1,063
	peer pressure lifestyle self-efficacy	,016	,108	,004	,145	,885	,031	,004	,004	,926	1,080
	problem perception	1,688	,221	,212	7,644	,000	,238	,216	,201	,899	1,112
	seeking or having help	2,219	,284	,211	7,812	,000	,253	,221	,206	,949	1,053

a. Dependent Variable: depression

Table 3.2

Model Summary									
Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate	R Square Change	F Change	df1	df2	Sig. F Change
1	,055 <sup>a</sup>	,003	,002	5,18592	,003	3,623	1	1204	,057
2	,271 <sup>b</sup>	,074	,065	5,01982	,071	9,100	10	1194	,000
3	,418 <sup>c</sup>	,175	,164	4,74625	,101	36,402	4	1190	,000

a. Predictors: (Constant), medical students

b. Predictors: (Constant), medical students, having a relationship, bmi, study results, living with peers, Sex, Dutch, Age, living with your partner, study phase, living alone

c. Predictors: (Constant), medical students, having a relationship, bmi, study results, living with peers, Sex, Dutch, Age, living with your partner, study phase, living alone, seeking or having help, negative sexual experiences, peer pressure lifestyle self-efficacy, problem perception

Table 3.3

ANOVA <sup>a</sup>						
Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	97,436	1	97,436	3,623	,057 <sup>b</sup>
	Residual	32380,063	1204	26,894		
	Total	32477,499	1205			
2	Regression	2390,399	11	217,309	8,624	,000 <sup>c</sup>
	Residual	30087,100	1194	25,199		
	Total	32477,499	1205			
3	Regression	5670,465	15	378,031	16,781	,000 <sup>d</sup>
	Residual	26807,034	1190	22,527		
	Total	32477,499	1205			

a. Dependent Variable: depression

b. Predictors: (Constant), medical students

c. Predictors: (Constant), medical students, having a relationship, bmi, study results, living with peers, Sex, Dutch, Age, living with your partner, study phase, living alone

d. Predictors: (Constant), medical students, having a relationship, bmi, study results, living with peers, Sex, Dutch, Age, living with your partner, study phase, living alone, seeking or having help, negative sexual experiences, peer pressure lifestyle self-efficacy, problem perception

Table 4.1-4.3. Hierarchical regression analysis for anxiety whereby medical students are compared with non-medical students.

Step 1 N = 2393, step 2 N = 2348, step 3 N = 1206.

Table 4.1

		Coefficients <sup>a</sup>									
Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.	Correlations			Collinearity Statistics	
		B	Std. Error	Beta			Zero-order	Partial	Part	Tolerance	VIF
1	(Constant)	7,185	,094		76,819	,000					
	medical students	-,955	,256	-,107	-3,730	,000	-,107	-,107	-,107	1,000	1,000
2	(Constant)	7,973	1,124		7,092	,000					
	medical students	-,753	,251	-,084	-3,004	,003	-,107	-,087	-,083	,973	1,028
	Sex	1,011	,190	,151	5,320	,000	,161	,152	,147	,955	1,047
	Age	,006	,027	,007	,222	,824	,027	,006	,006	,702	1,424
	bmi	-,014	,013	-,030	-1,059	,290	-,024	-,031	-,029	,983	1,017
	having a relationship	,014	,187	,002	,073	,942	,037	,002	,002	,827	1,210
	living with peers	-,716	,233	-,114	-3,073	,002	-,148	-,089	-,085	,557	1,795
	living alone	,112	,244	,017	,458	,647	,090	,013	,013	,550	1,817
	living with your partner	,147	,354	,015	,417	,677	,061	,012	,012	,593	1,687
	Dutch	-1,063	,191	-,158	-5,576	,000	-,180	-,159	-,154	,952	1,051
	study results	-,197	,104	-,054	-1,904	,057	-,049	-,055	-,053	,943	1,061
	study phase	-,082	,217	-,012	-,377	,706	,012	-,011	-,010	,716	1,397
3	(Constant)	6,443	1,231		5,233	,000					
	medical students	-,481	,242	-,054	-1,988	,047	-,107	-,058	-,053	,959	1,042
	Sex	,711	,188	,106	3,776	,000	,161	,109	,100	,894	1,119
	Age	-,009	,026	-,011	-,331	,740	,027	-,010	-,009	,693	1,442
	bmi	-,019	,012	-,041	-1,529	,126	-,024	-,044	-,041	,978	1,023
	having a relationship	,153	,183	,025	,835	,404	,037	,024	,022	,795	1,257
	living with peers	-,727	,228	-,116	-3,197	,001	-,148	-,092	-,085	,537	1,861
	living alone	-,070	,237	-,011	-,297	,767	,090	-,009	-,008	,536	1,865
	living with your partner	-,210	,342	-,021	-,615	,539	,061	-,018	-,016	,583	1,715
	Dutch	-,789	,185	-,117	-4,261	,000	-,180	-,123	-,113	,927	1,078
	study results	-,206	,100	-,057	-2,075	,038	-,049	-,060	-,055	,938	1,066
	study phase	-,020	,209	-,003	-,095	,924	,012	-,003	-,003	,712	1,405
	negative sexual experiences	,964	,206	,128	4,679	,000	,180	,134	,124	,941	1,063
	peer pressure lifestyle self-efficacy	-,004	,064	-,002	-,056	,955	,025	-,002	-,001	,926	1,080
	problem perception	,607	,130	,130	4,654	,000	,187	,134	,124	,899	1,112
	seeking or having help	1,253	,168	,204	7,472	,000	,249	,212	,198	,949	1,053

a. Dependent Variable: anxiety

Table 4.2

Model Summary									
Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate	R Square Change	Change Statistics			Sig. F Change
						F Change	df1	df2	
1	,107 <sup>a</sup>	,011	,011	3,02342	,011	13,915	1	1204	,000
2	,291 <sup>b</sup>	,085	,076	2,92166	,073	9,533	10	1194	,000
3	,402 <sup>c</sup>	,161	,151	2,80124	,077	27,216	4	1190	,000

a. Predictors: (Constant), medical students

b. Predictors: (Constant), medical students, having a relationship, bmi, study results, living with peers, Sex, Dutch, Age, living with your partner, study phase, living alone

c. Predictors: (Constant), medical students, having a relationship, bmi, study results, living with peers, Sex, Dutch, Age, living with your partner, study phase, living alone, seeking or having help, negative sexual experiences, peer pressure lifestyle self-efficacy, problem perception

Table 4.3

ANOVA <sup>a</sup>						
Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	127,200	1	127,200	13,915	,000 <sup>b</sup>
	Residual	11005,852	1204	9,141		
	Total	11133,052	1205			
2	Regression	940,932	11	85,539	10,021	,000 <sup>c</sup>
	Residual	10192,121	1194	8,536		
	Total	11133,052	1205			
3	Regression	1795,196	15	119,680	15,252	,000 <sup>d</sup>
	Residual	9337,856	1190	7,847		
	Total	11133,052	1205			

a. Dependent Variable: anxiety

b. Predictors: (Constant), medical students

c. Predictors: (Constant), medical students, having a relationship, bmi, study results, living with peers, Sex, Dutch, Age, living with your partner, study phase, living alone

d. Predictors: (Constant), medical students, having a relationship, bmi, study results, living with peers, Sex, Dutch, Age, living with your partner, study phase, living alone, seeking or having help, negative sexual experiences, peer pressure lifestyle self-efficacy, problem perception

Table 5.1-5.3. Hierarchical regression analysis for internet addiction whereby medical students are compared with non-medical students.

Step 1 N = 1158, step 2 N = 1142, step 3 N = 734.

Table 5.1

Coefficients <sup>a</sup>											
Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.	Correlations			Collinearity Statistics	
		B	Std. Error	Beta			Zero-order	Partial	Part	Tolerance	VIF
1	(Constant)	2,511	,026		96,916	,000					
	medical students	,047	,078	,023	,613	,540	,023	,023	,023	1,000	1,000
2	(Constant)	3,588	,335		10,708	,000					
	medical students	,112	,077	,054	1,464	,144	,023	,054	,052	,961	1,040
	Sex	-,010	,053	-,007	-,184	,854	-,009	-,007	-,007	,934	1,070
	Age	,003	,009	,015	,343	,732	,009	,013	,012	,647	1,545
	bmi	-,002	,003	-,021	-,593	,554	-,007	-,022	-,021	,979	1,021
	having a relationship	-,137	,053	-,101	-2,600	,010	-,076	-,096	-,093	,847	1,180
	living with peers	-,200	,066	-,146	-3,039	,002	-,136	-,112	-,109	,553	1,807
	living alone	-,026	,068	-,019	-,388	,698	,074	-,014	-,014	,543	1,842
	living with your partner	,002	,108	,001	,018	,986	,012	,001	,001	,646	1,549
	Dutch	-,251	,052	-,176	-4,785	,000	-,159	-,175	-,172	,950	1,053
	study results	-,112	,030	-,136	-3,683	,000	-,123	-,136	-,132	,938	1,066
	study phase	-8,249E-5	,064	,000	-,001	,999	-,011	,000	,000	,677	1,477
3	(Constant)	3,361	,357		9,419	,000					
	medical students	,138	,072	,066	1,909	,057	,023	,071	,064	,956	1,046
	Sex	-,037	,052	-,025	-,706	,480	-,009	-,026	-,024	,873	1,145
	Age	,002	,009	,010	,232	,817	,009	,009	,008	,642	1,557
	bmi	-,003	,003	-,042	-1,236	,217	-,007	-,046	-,042	,972	1,029
	having a relationship	-,044	,051	-,032	-,867	,386	-,076	-,032	-,029	,813	1,230
	living with peers	-,217	,063	-,159	-3,451	,001	-,136	-,128	-,116	,535	1,869
	living alone	-,114	,065	-,081	-1,754	,080	,074	-,065	-,059	,527	1,896
	living with your partner	-,124	,103	-,051	-1,206	,228	,012	-,045	-,041	,633	1,580
	Dutch	-,197	,050	-,138	-3,940	,000	-,159	-,145	-,133	,927	1,079
	study results	-,109	,029	-,133	-3,804	,000	-,123	-,141	-,128	,933	1,072
	study phase	-,002	,061	-,001	-,031	,975	-,011	-,001	-,001	,673	1,485
	negative sexual experiences	,082	,057	,050	1,441	,150	,087	,054	,049	,936	1,069
	peer pressure lifestyle self-efficacy	-,063	,018	-,126	-3,555	,000	-,121	-,132	-,120	,912	1,096
	problem perception	,312	,036	,306	8,570	,000	,338	,305	,289	,895	1,117
	seeking or having help	,041	,046	,031	,882	,378	,080	,033	,030	,936	1,068

a. Dependent Variable: internet addiction



Table 5.2

Model Summary									
Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate	R Square Change	Change Statistics			Sig. F Change
						F Change	df1	df2	
1	,023 <sup>a</sup>	,001	-,001	,66152	,001	,375	1	732	,540
2	,269 <sup>b</sup>	,073	,058	,64161	,072	5,614	10	722	,000
3	,428 <sup>c</sup>	,183	,166	,60385	,110	24,281	4	718	,000

a. Predictors: (Constant), medical students

b. Predictors: (Constant), medical students, bmi, living with your partner, study results, Sex, Dutch, living with peers, study phase, having a relationship, Age, living alone

c. Predictors: (Constant), medical students, bmi, living with your partner, study results, Sex, Dutch, living with peers, study phase, having a relationship, Age, living alone, seeking or having help, negative sexual experiences, peer pressure lifestyle self-efficacy, problem perception

Table 5.3

ANOVA <sup>a</sup>						
Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	,164	1	,164	,375	,540 <sup>b</sup>
	Residual	320,327	732	,438		
	Total	320,491	733			
2	Regression	23,274	11	2,116	5,140	,000 <sup>c</sup>
	Residual	297,217	722	,412		
	Total	320,491	733			
3	Regression	58,688	15	3,913	10,730	,000 <sup>d</sup>
	Residual	261,804	718	,365		
	Total	320,491	733			

a. Dependent Variable: internet addiction

b. Predictors: (Constant), medical students

c. Predictors: (Constant), medical students, bmi, living with your partner, study results, Sex, Dutch, living with peers, study phase, having a relationship, Age, living alone

d. Predictors: (Constant), medical students, bmi, living with your partner, study results, Sex, Dutch, living with peers, study phase, having a relationship, Age, living alone, seeking or having help, negative sexual experiences, peer pressure lifestyle self-efficacy, problem perception

Table 6.1-6.3. Hierarchical regression analysis for buying addiction whereby medical students are compared with non-medical students.

Step 1 N = 419, step 2 N = 412, step 3 N = 287.

Table 6.1

Coefficients <sup>a</sup>											
Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.	Correlations			Collinearity Statistics	
		B	Std. Error	Beta			Zero-order	Partial	Part	Tolerance	VIF
1	(Constant)	-,250	,120		-2,092	,037					
	medical students	-,240	,353	-,040	-,680	,497	-,040	-,040	-,040	1,000	1,000
2	(Constant)	4,385	1,594		2,751	,006					
	medical students	-,340	,346	-,057	-,980	,328	-,040	-,059	-,056	,961	1,040
	Sex	-,599	,280	-,127	-2,140	,033	-,124	-,128	-,122	,930	1,075
	Age	-,160	,042	-,265	-3,848	,000	-,235	-,226	-,219	,686	1,459
	bmi	,009	,028	,018	,308	,758	-,037	,019	,018	,938	1,066
	having a relationship	,225	,243	,058	,928	,354	,022	,056	,053	,841	1,188
	living with peers	-,203	,299	-,051	-,678	,498	,023	-,041	-,039	,572	1,749
	living alone	-,275	,311	-,069	-,884	,377	-,073	-,053	-,050	,537	1,862
	living with your partner	-,330	,476	-,049	-,693	,489	-,063	-,042	-,040	,653	1,532
	Dutch	,574	,256	,134	2,247	,025	,173	,134	,128	,908	1,101
	study results	-,072	,131	-,032	-,546	,586	-,015	-,033	-,031	,935	1,069
	study phase	,463	,310	,103	1,496	,136	-,054	,090	,085	,692	1,445
3	(Constant)	4,632	1,686		2,747	,006					
	medical students	-,484	,335	-,081	-1,444	,150	-,040	-,087	-,079	,953	1,049
	Sex	-,595	,277	-,126	-2,146	,033	-,124	-,129	-,118	,881	1,135
	Age	-,158	,041	-,262	-3,888	,000	-,235	-,230	-,214	,668	1,496
	bmi	,033	,028	,069	1,183	,238	-,037	,072	,065	,881	1,135
	having a relationship	,041	,238	,011	,174	,862	,022	,011	,010	,816	1,225
	living with peers	-,117	,295	-,030	-,398	,691	,023	-,024	-,022	,548	1,823
	living alone	-,166	,304	-,042	-,547	,585	-,073	-,033	-,030	,525	1,906
	living with your partner	-,159	,462	-,024	-,343	,732	-,063	-,021	-,019	,644	1,554
	Dutch	,434	,249	,102	1,741	,083	,173	,105	,096	,887	1,127
	study results	-,066	,128	-,030	-,519	,604	-,015	-,032	-,029	,914	1,094
	study phase	,393	,301	,087	1,307	,192	-,054	,079	,072	,681	1,468
	negative sexual experiences	-,495	,255	-,111	-1,945	,053	-,188	-,117	-,107	,922	1,084
	peer pressure lifestyle self-efficacy	,132	,072	,105	1,832	,068	,104	,111	,101	,920	1,087
	problem perception	-,693	,180	-,228	-3,846	,000	-,244	-,228	-,212	,863	1,159
	seeking or having help	,158	,221	,041	,715	,475	-,053	,043	,039	,908	1,101

a. Dependent Variable: buying addiction

Table 6.2

Model Summary									
Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate	R Square Change	F Change	df1	df2	Sig. F Change
1	,040 <sup>a</sup>	,002	-,002	1,90538	,002	,463	1	285	,497
2	,325 <sup>b</sup>	,106	,070	1,83559	,104	3,208	10	275	,001
3	,425 <sup>c</sup>	,181	,135	1,77030	,075	6,165	4	271	,000

a. Predictors: (Constant), medical students

b. Predictors: (Constant), medical students, study results, living alone, Sex, bmi, Age, having a relationship, Dutch, living with your partner, study phase, living with peers

c. Predictors: (Constant), medical students, study results, living alone, Sex, bmi, Age, having a relationship, Dutch, living with your partner, study phase, living with peers, peer pressure lifestyle self-efficacy, negative sexual experiences, seeking or having help, problem perception

Table 6.3

ANOVA <sup>a</sup>						
Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	1,680	1	1,680	,463	,497 <sup>b</sup>
	Residual	1034,689	285	3,630		
	Total	1036,369	286			
2	Regression	109,785	11	9,980	2,962	,001 <sup>c</sup>
	Residual	926,584	275	3,369		
	Total	1036,369	286			
3	Regression	187,068	15	12,471	3,979	,000 <sup>d</sup>
	Residual	849,301	271	3,134		
	Total	1036,369	286			

a. Dependent Variable: buying addiction

b. Predictors: (Constant), medical students

c. Predictors: (Constant), medical students, study results, living alone, Sex, bmi, Age, having a relationship, Dutch, living with your partner, study phase, living with peers

d. Predictors: (Constant), medical students, study results, living alone, Sex, bmi, Age, having a relationship, Dutch, living with your partner, study phase, living with peers, peer pressure lifestyle self-efficacy, negative sexual experiences, seeking or having help, problem perception

Table 7.1-7.3. Hierarchical regression analysis for eating disorder whereby medical students are compared with non-medical students.

Step 1 N = 2393, step 2 N = 2348, step 3 N = 1206.

Table 7.1

**Coefficients<sup>a</sup>**

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.	Correlations			Collinearity Statistics	
		B	Std. Error	Beta			Zero-order	Partial	Part	Tolerance	VIF
1	(Constant)	1,715	,041		41,692	,000					
	medical students	,043	,113	,011	,381	,703	,011	,011	,011	1,000	1,000
2	(Constant)	-,704	,478		-1,475	,140					
	medical students	,039	,107	,010	,365	,715	,011	,011	,010	,973	1,028
	Sex	,983	,081	,335	12,180	,000	,325	,332	,328	,955	1,047
	Age	-,011	,011	-,032	-,989	,323	-,066	-,029	-,027	,702	1,424
	bmi	,024	,005	,120	4,424	,000	,098	,127	,119	,983	1,017
	having a relationship	-,026	,080	-,010	-,329	,742	,007	-,010	-,009	,827	1,210
	living with peers	,200	,099	,073	2,024	,043	-,021	,058	,054	,557	1,795
	living alone	,364	,104	,127	3,514	,000	,090	,101	,095	,550	1,817
	living with your partner	,165	,150	,038	1,100	,271	,000	,032	,030	,593	1,687
	Dutch	,017	,081	,006	,205	,838	-,012	,006	,006	,952	1,051
	study results	,044	,044	,028	,995	,320	,041	,029	,027	,943	1,061
	study phase	-,160	,092	-,055	-1,739	,082	-,045	-,050	-,047	,716	1,397
3	(Constant)	-2,201	,514		-4,280	,000					
	medical students	,133	,101	,034	1,315	,189	,011	,038	,033	,959	1,042
	Sex	,882	,079	,301	11,215	,000	,325	,309	,284	,894	1,119
	Age	-,009	,011	-,025	-,810	,418	-,066	-,023	-,021	,693	1,442
	bmi	,021	,005	,102	3,989	,000	,098	,115	,101	,978	1,023
	having a relationship	,142	,076	,053	1,857	,064	,007	,054	,047	,795	1,257
	living with peers	,257	,095	,094	2,708	,007	-,021	,078	,069	,537	1,861
	living alone	,268	,099	,094	2,701	,007	,090	,078	,068	,536	1,865
	living with your partner	,014	,143	,003	,097	,922	,000	,003	,002	,583	1,715
	Dutch	,153	,077	,052	1,985	,047	-,012	,057	,050	,927	1,078
	study results	,015	,042	,009	,351	,725	,041	,010	,009	,938	1,066
	study phase	-,140	,087	-,048	-1,608	,108	-,045	-,047	-,041	,712	1,405
	negative sexual experiences	,308	,086	,094	3,576	,000	,164	,103	,091	,941	1,063
	peer pressure lifestyle self-efficacy	,014	,027	,014	,520	,603	,037	,015	,013	,926	1,080
	problem perception	,631	,054	,310	11,597	,000	,323	,319	,294	,899	1,112
	seeking or having help	,028	,070	,011	,404	,686	,057	,012	,010	,949	1,053

a. Dependent Variable: eating pattern

Table 7.2

**Model Summary**

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate	R Square Change	Change Statistics			Sig. F Change
						F Change	df1	df2	
1	,011 <sup>a</sup>	,000	-,001	1,32963	,000	,145	1	1204	,703
2	,369 <sup>b</sup>	,136	,128	1,24100	,136	18,812	10	1194	,000
3	,485 <sup>c</sup>	,235	,225	1,16987	,099	38,402	4	1190	,000

a. Predictors: (Constant), medical students

b. Predictors: (Constant), medical students, having a relationship, bmi, study results, living with peers, Sex, Dutch, Age, living with your partner, study phase, living alone

c. Predictors: (Constant), medical students, having a relationship, bmi, study results, living with peers, Sex, Dutch, Age, living with your partner, study phase, living alone, seeking or having help, negative sexual experiences, peer pressure lifestyle self-efficacy, problem perception

Table 7.3

**ANOVA<sup>a</sup>**

Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	,257	1	,257	,145	,703 <sup>b</sup>
	Residual	2128,573	1204	1,768		
	Total	2128,830	1205			
2	Regression	289,978	11	26,362	17,117	,000 <sup>c</sup>
	Residual	1838,852	1194	1,540		
	Total	2128,830	1205			
3	Regression	500,206	15	33,347	24,366	,000 <sup>d</sup>
	Residual	1628,624	1190	1,369		
	Total	2128,830	1205			

a. Dependent Variable: eating pattern

b. Predictors: (Constant), medical students

c. Predictors: (Constant), medical students, having a relationship, bmi, study results, living with peers, Sex, Dutch, Age, living with your partner, study phase, living alone

d. Predictors: (Constant), medical students, having a relationship, bmi, study results, living with peers, Sex, Dutch, Age, living with your partner, study phase, living alone, seeking or having help, negative sexual experiences, peer pressure lifestyle self-efficacy, problem perception

Table 8.1-8.3. Hierarchical regression analysis for suicidal ideation whereby medical students are compared with non-medical students.

Step 1 N = 949, step 2 N = 935, step 3 N = 590.

Table 8.1

**Coefficients<sup>a</sup>**

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.	Correlations			Collinearity Statistics	
		B	Std. Error	Beta			Zero-order	Partial	Part	Tolerance	VIF
1	(Constant)	6,962	,114		61,140	,000					
	medical students	-,004	,331	-,001	-,013	,989	-,001	-,001	-,001	1,000	1,000
2	(Constant)	5,431	1,433		3,791	,000					
	medical students	,122	,334	,015	,366	,714	-,001	,015	,015	,974	1,027
	Sex	,408	,239	,073	1,706	,088	,056	,071	,070	,927	1,078
	Age	,041	,038	,054	1,078	,281	,013	,045	,044	,671	1,489
	bmi	-,009	,012	-,031	-,747	,455	-,021	-,031	-,031	,977	1,023
	having a relationship	-,385	,248	-,072	-1,552	,121	-,057	-,064	-,064	,782	1,279
	living with peers	,035	,304	,006	,114	,909	-,035	,005	,005	,528	1,893
	living alone	,336	,315	,061	1,065	,287	,073	,044	,044	,513	1,948
	living with your partner	,254	,451	,031	,563	,574	-,009	,023	,023	,569	1,757
	Dutch	-,524	,239	-,092	-2,196	,029	-,091	-,091	-,090	,955	1,048
	study results	,076	,127	,025	,599	,550	,026	,025	,025	,932	1,073
	study phase	-,397	,283	-,069	-1,400	,162	-,039	-,058	-,057	,701	1,426
3	(Constant)	3,357	1,600		2,097	,036					
	medical students	,384	,325	,048	1,179	,239	-,001	,049	,047	,956	1,046
	Sex	,186	,242	,033	,767	,443	,056	,032	,030	,849	1,178
	Age	,026	,037	,034	,704	,482	,013	,029	,028	,663	1,509
	bmi	-,010	,012	-,035	-,863	,389	-,021	-,036	-,034	,972	1,029
	having a relationship	-,112	,245	-,021	-,458	,647	-,057	-,019	-,018	,748	1,338
	living with peers	,094	,298	,018	,317	,751	-,035	,013	,013	,515	1,943
	living alone	,163	,308	,030	,531	,596	,073	,022	,021	,505	1,982
	living with your partner	-,030	,438	-,004	-,068	,946	-,009	-,003	-,003	,563	1,777
	Dutch	-,245	,235	-,043	-1,043	,297	-,091	-,043	-,041	,919	1,089
	study results	,061	,123	,021	,501	,617	,026	,021	,020	,927	1,079
	study phase	-,292	,276	-,051	-1,057	,291	-,039	-,044	-,042	,690	1,450
	negative sexual experiences	,908	,246	,154	3,694	,000	,186	,152	,147	,912	1,096
	peer pressure lifestyle self-efficacy	,000	,082	,000	,002	,999	-,010	,000	,000	,909	1,101
	problem perception	,823	,170	,204	4,848	,000	,223	,198	,192	,894	1,118
	seeking or having help	,462	,220	,085	2,103	,036	,108	,087	,083	,957	1,045

a. Dependent Variable: suicidal ideation

Table 8.2

Model Summary									
Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate	R Square Change	Change Statistics			Sig. F Change
						F Change	df1	df2	
1	,001 <sup>a</sup>	,000	-,002	2,59647	,000	,000	1	588	,989
2	,159 <sup>b</sup>	,025	,007	2,58558	,025	1,496	10	578	,137
3	,309 <sup>c</sup>	,095	,072	2,49948	,070	11,127	4	574	,000

a. Predictors: (Constant), medical students

b. Predictors: (Constant), medical students, bmi, living with your partner, study results, Sex, Dutch, study phase, living with peers, having a relationship, Age, living alone

c. Predictors: (Constant), medical students, bmi, living with your partner, study results, Sex, Dutch, study phase, living with peers, having a relationship, Age, living alone, seeking or having help, negative sexual experiences, peer pressure lifestyle self-efficacy, problem perception

Table 8.3

ANOVA <sup>a</sup>						
Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	,001	1	,001	,000	,989 <sup>b</sup>
	Residual	3964,102	588	6,742		
	Total	3964,103	589			
2	Regression	100,045	11	9,095	1,360	,188 <sup>c</sup>
	Residual	3864,058	578	6,685		
	Total	3964,103	589			
3	Regression	378,110	15	25,207	4,035	,000 <sup>d</sup>
	Residual	3585,994	574	6,247		
	Total	3964,103	589			

a. Dependent Variable: suicidal ideation

b. Predictors: (Constant), medical students

c. Predictors: (Constant), medical students, bmi, living with your partner, study results, Sex, Dutch, study phase, living with peers, having a relationship, Age, living alone

d. Predictors: (Constant), medical students, bmi, living with your partner, study results, Sex, Dutch, study phase, living with peers, having a relationship, Age, living alone, seeking or having help, negative sexual experiences, peer pressure lifestyle self-efficacy, problem perception



Table 9.1-9.3. Hierarchical regression analysis for student health (risk) behaviour (general) whereby medical students are compared with non-medical students.  
Step 1 N = 2393, step 2 N = 2348, step 3 N = 1206.

Table 9.1

Coefficients <sup>a</sup>											
Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.	Correlations			Collinearity Statistics	
		B	Std. Error	Beta			Zero-order	Partial	Part	Tolerance	VIF
1	(Constant)	3,415	,014		251,890	,000					
	medical students	,041	,037	,032	1,095	,274	,032	,032	,032	1,000	1,000
2	(Constant)	3,234	,165		19,608	,000					
	medical students	,006	,037	,005	,169	,866	,032	,005	,005	,973	1,028
	Sex	-,003	,028	-,003	-,117	,907	,003	-,003	-,003	,955	1,047
	Age	,004	,004	,034	1,004	,316	,043	,029	,028	,702	1,424
	bmi	-,004	,002	-,057	-2,003	,045	-,073	-,058	-,056	,983	1,017
	having a relationship	,049	,027	,055	1,787	,074	,073	,052	,050	,827	1,210
	living with peers	,018	,034	,020	,537	,592	,085	,016	,015	,557	1,795
	living alone	-,094	,036	-,099	-2,614	,009	-,131	-,075	-,074	,550	1,817
	living with your partner	-,037	,052	-,026	-,710	,478	,034	-,021	-,020	,593	1,687
	Dutch	,143	,028	,148	5,122	,000	,153	,147	,144	,952	1,051
	study results	,009	,015	,018	,605	,546	,013	,017	,017	,943	1,061
	study phase	,065	,032	,068	2,047	,041	,079	,059	,058	,716	1,397
3	(Constant)	3,522	,163		21,619	,000					
	medical students	-,037	,032	-,029	-1,169	,243	,032	-,034	-,028	,959	1,042
	Sex	-,008	,025	-,008	-,309	,757	,003	-,009	-,008	,894	1,119
	Age	,000	,003	-,002	-,054	,957	,043	-,002	-,001	,693	1,442
	bmi	-,002	,002	-,027	-1,080	,280	-,073	-,031	-,026	,978	1,023
	having a relationship	-,044	,024	-,049	-1,811	,070	,073	-,052	-,044	,795	1,257
	living with peers	,020	,030	,022	,655	,513	,085	,019	,016	,537	1,861
	living alone	-,033	,031	-,035	-1,066	,287	-,131	-,031	-,026	,536	1,865
	living with your partner	,043	,045	,030	,942	,346	,034	,027	,023	,583	1,715
	Dutch	,092	,024	,095	3,737	,000	,153	,108	,091	,927	1,078
	study results	,022	,013	,043	1,693	,091	,013	,049	,041	,938	1,066
	study phase	,070	,028	,074	2,552	,011	,079	,074	,062	,712	1,405
	negative sexual experiences	-,023	,027	-,021	-,846	,398	-,078	-,025	-,021	,941	1,063
	peer pressure lifestyle self-efficacy	,056	,008	,168	6,625	,000	,183	,189	,161	,926	1,080
	problem perception	-,320	,017	-,477	-18,553	,000	-,494	-,474	-,452	,899	1,112
	seeking or having help	,041	,022	,046	1,855	,064	,002	,054	,045	,949	1,053

a. Dependent Variable: student health (risk) behaviour (general)



Table 9.2

Model Summary									
Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate	R Square Change	Change Statistics			Sig. F Change
						F Change	df1	df2	
1	,032 <sup>a</sup>	,001	,000	,43822	,001	1,199	1	1204	,274
2	,228 <sup>b</sup>	,052	,043	,42868	,051	6,418	10	1194	,000
3	,542 <sup>c</sup>	,294	,285	,37061	,242	101,869	4	1190	,000

a. Predictors: (Constant), medical students

b. Predictors: (Constant), medical students, having a relationship, bmi, study results, living with peers, Sex, Dutch, Age, living with your partner, study phase, living alone

c. Predictors: (Constant), medical students, having a relationship, bmi, study results, living with peers, Sex, Dutch, Age, living with your partner, study phase, living alone, seeking or having help, negative sexual experiences, peer pressure lifestyle self-efficacy, problem perception

Table 9.3

ANOVA <sup>a</sup>						
Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	,230	1	,230	1,199	,274 <sup>b</sup>
	Residual	231,213	1204	,192		
	Total	231,443	1205			
2	Regression	12,024	11	1,093	5,948	,000 <sup>c</sup>
	Residual	219,419	1194	,184		
	Total	231,443	1205			
3	Regression	67,993	15	4,533	33,001	,000 <sup>d</sup>
	Residual	163,450	1190	,137		
	Total	231,443	1205			

a. Dependent Variable: student health (risk) behaviour (general)

b. Predictors: (Constant), medical students

c. Predictors: (Constant), medical students, having a relationship, bmi, study results, living with peers, Sex, Dutch, Age, living with your partner, study phase, living alone

d. Predictors: (Constant), medical students, having a relationship, bmi, study results, living with peers, Sex, Dutch, Age, living with your partner, study phase, living alone, seeking or having help, negative sexual experiences, peer pressure lifestyle self-efficacy, problem perception

Table 10.1-10.3. Hierarchical regression analysis for satisfaction with study whereby medical students are compared with non-medical students.

Step 1 N = 2393, step 2 N = 2348, step 3 N = 1206.

Table 10.1

Coefficients <sup>a</sup>											
Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.	Correlations			Collinearity Statistics	
		B	Std. Error	Beta			Zero-order	Partial	Part	Tolerance	VIF
1	(Constant)	3,440	,022		158,740	,000					
	medical students	,320	,059	,154	5,393	,000	,154	,154	,154	1,000	1,000
2	(Constant)	1,159	,231		5,013	,000					
	medical students	,216	,052	,104	4,192	,000	,154	,120	,102	,973	1,028
	Sex	-,045	,039	-,029	-1,151	,250	-,008	-,033	-,028	,955	1,047
	Age	-,025	,006	-,132	-4,522	,000	-,174	-,130	-,110	,702	1,424
	bmi	,002	,003	,018	,726	,468	-,003	,021	,018	,983	1,017
	having a relationship	,083	,039	,058	2,143	,032	-,010	,062	,052	,827	1,210
	living with peers	-,058	,048	-,040	-1,207	,228	,044	-,035	-,029	,557	1,795
	living alone	-,094	,050	-,062	-1,877	,061	-,030	-,054	-,046	,550	1,817
	living with your partner	-,186	,073	-,081	-2,555	,011	-,082	-,074	-,062	,593	1,687
	Dutch	,262	,039	,168	6,691	,000	,179	,190	,163	,952	1,051
	study results	,392	,021	,463	18,422	,000	,458	,470	,450	,943	1,061
	study phase	,007	,045	,005	,167	,867	-,009	,005	,004	,716	1,397
3	(Constant)	1,570	,258		6,086	,000					
	medical students	,172	,051	,083	3,398	,001	,154	,098	,081	,959	1,042
	Sex	-,002	,039	-,001	-,049	,961	-,008	-,001	-,001	,894	1,119
	Age	-,024	,005	-,126	-4,388	,000	-,174	-,126	-,105	,693	1,442
	bmi	,003	,003	,029	1,184	,237	-,003	,034	,028	,978	1,023
	having a relationship	,047	,038	,033	1,231	,219	-,010	,036	,029	,795	1,257
	living with peers	-,068	,048	-,047	-1,435	,152	,044	-,042	-,034	,537	1,861
	living alone	-,069	,050	-,045	-1,381	,168	-,030	-,040	-,033	,536	1,865
	living with your partner	-,132	,072	-,058	-1,841	,066	-,082	-,053	-,044	,583	1,715
	Dutch	,216	,039	,138	5,565	,000	,179	,159	,133	,927	1,078
	study results	,396	,021	,468	19,005	,000	,458	,483	,453	,938	1,066
	study phase	,001	,044	,001	,026	,979	-,009	,001	,001	,712	1,405
	negative sexual experiences	-,098	,043	-,056	-2,268	,024	-,086	-,066	-,054	,941	1,063
	peer pressure lifestyle self-efficacy	-,004	,013	-,008	-,327	,743	,001	-,009	-,008	,926	1,080
	problem perception	-,152	,027	-,140	-5,555	,000	-,149	-,159	-,133	,899	1,112
	seeking or having help	-,160	,035	-,111	-4,550	,000	-,180	-,131	-,109	,949	1,053

a. Dependent Variable: satisfaction with study

Table 10.2

**Model Summary**

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate	R Square Change	Change Statistics			Sig. F Change
						F Change	df1	df2	
1	,154 <sup>a</sup>	,024	,023	,70053	,024	29,083	1	1204	,000
2	,536 <sup>b</sup>	,287	,281	,60097	,264	44,199	10	1194	,000
3	,568 <sup>c</sup>	,323	,314	,58681	,035	15,571	4	1190	,000

a. Predictors: (Constant), medical students

b. Predictors: (Constant), medical students, having a relationship, bmi, study results, living with peers, Sex, Dutch, Age, living with your partner, study phase, living alone

c. Predictors: (Constant), medical students, having a relationship, bmi, study results, living with peers, Sex, Dutch, Age, living with your partner, study phase, living alone, seeking or having help, negative sexual experiences, peer pressure lifestyle self-efficacy, problem perception

Table 10.3

**ANOVA<sup>a</sup>**

Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	14,272	1	14,272	29,083	,000 <sup>b</sup>
	Residual	590,852	1204	,491		
	Total	605,125	1205			
2	Regression	173,900	11	15,809	43,773	,000 <sup>c</sup>
	Residual	431,225	1194	,361		
	Total	605,125	1205			
3	Regression	195,348	15	13,023	37,820	,000 <sup>d</sup>
	Residual	409,777	1190	,344		
	Total	605,125	1205			

a. Dependent Variable: satisfaction with study

b. Predictors: (Constant), medical students

c. Predictors: (Constant), medical students, having a relationship, bmi, study results, living with peers, Sex, Dutch, Age, living with your partner, study phase, living alone

d. Predictors: (Constant), medical students, having a relationship, bmi, study results, living with peers, Sex, Dutch, Age, living with your partner, study phase, living alone, seeking or having help, negative sexual experiences, peer pressure lifestyle self-efficacy, problem perception

Table 11.1-11.3. Hierarchical regression analysis for quality of student life whereby medical students are compared with non-medical students.

Step 1 N = 2393, step 2 N = 2348, step 3 N = 1206.

Table 11.1

		Coefficients <sup>a</sup>									
Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.	Correlations			Collinearity Statistics	
		B	Std. Error	Beta			Zero-order	Partial	Part	Tolerance	VIF
1	(Constant)	3,593	,018		199,481	,000					
	medical students	,153	,049	,089	3,096	,002	,089	,089	,089	1,000	1,000
2	(Constant)	3,571	,217		16,462	,000					
	medical students	,121	,048	,071	2,510	,012	,089	,072	,070	,973	1,028
	Sex	-,006	,037	-,005	-,165	,869	,021	-,005	-,005	,955	1,047
	Age	-,019	,005	-,121	-3,655	,000	-,089	-,105	-,102	,702	1,424
	bmi	,003	,002	,034	1,219	,223	,014	,035	,034	,983	1,017
	having a relationship	,217	,036	,184	6,006	,000	,168	,171	,167	,827	1,210
	living with peers	,153	,045	,127	3,409	,001	,124	,098	,095	,557	1,795
	living alone	,002	,047	,002	,046	,964	-,113	,001	,001	,550	1,817
	living with your partner	,047	,068	,025	,694	,488	,033	,020	,019	,593	1,687
	Dutch	,126	,037	,098	3,423	,001	,119	,099	,095	,952	1,051
	study results	,023	,020	,033	1,139	,255	,034	,033	,032	,943	1,061
	study phase	,046	,042	,036	1,090	,276	,011	,032	,030	,716	1,397
3	(Constant)	4,034	,232		17,423	,000					
	medical students	,061	,046	,036	1,339	,181	,089	,039	,035	,959	1,042
	Sex	,046	,035	,036	1,308	,191	,021	,038	,034	,894	1,119
	Age	-,019	,005	-,119	-3,809	,000	-,089	-,110	-,099	,693	1,442
	bmi	,005	,002	,054	2,045	,041	,014	,059	,053	,978	1,023
	having a relationship	,148	,034	,125	4,299	,000	,168	,124	,112	,795	1,257
	living with peers	,150	,043	,124	3,495	,000	,124	,101	,091	,537	1,861
	living alone	,060	,045	,048	1,340	,181	-,113	,039	,035	,536	1,865
	living with your partner	,140	,064	,074	2,179	,030	,033	,063	,057	,583	1,715
	Dutch	,056	,035	,043	1,605	,109	,119	,046	,042	,927	1,078
	study results	,032	,019	,046	1,716	,086	,034	,050	,045	,938	1,066
	study phase	,035	,039	,028	,896	,370	,011	,026	,023	,712	1,405
	negative sexual experiences	-,193	,039	-,134	-4,992	,000	-,170	-,143	-,130	,941	1,063
	peer pressure lifestyle self-efficacy	,017	,012	,038	1,400	,162	,055	,041	,036	,926	1,080
	problem perception	-,258	,025	-,288	-10,509	,000	-,339	-,291	-,273	,899	1,112
	seeking or having help	-,148	,032	-,125	-4,706	,000	-,155	-,135	-,122	,949	1,053

a. Dependent Variable: quality of student life

Table 11.2

Model Summary									
Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate	R Square Change	Change Statistics			Sig. F Change
						F Change	df1	df2	
1	,089 <sup>a</sup>	,008	,007	,58231	,008	9,586	1	1204	,002
2	,279 <sup>b</sup>	,078	,069	,56375	,070	9,056	10	1194	,000
3	,444 <sup>c</sup>	,198	,187	,52679	,120	44,362	4	1190	,000

a. Predictors: (Constant), medical students

b. Predictors: (Constant), medical students, having a relationship, bmi, study results, living with peers, Sex, Dutch, Age, living with your partner, study phase, living alone

c. Predictors: (Constant), medical students, having a relationship, bmi, study results, living with peers, Sex, Dutch, Age, living with your partner, study phase, living alone, seeking or having help, negative sexual experiences, peer pressure lifestyle self-efficacy, problem perception

Table 11.3

ANOVA <sup>a</sup>						
Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	3,250	1	3,250	9,586	,002 <sup>b</sup>
	Residual	408,256	1204	,339		
	Total	411,506	1205			
2	Regression	32,031	11	2,912	9,162	,000 <sup>c</sup>
	Residual	379,475	1194	,318		
	Total	411,506	1205			
3	Regression	81,274	15	5,418	19,525	,000 <sup>d</sup>
	Residual	330,232	1190	,278		
	Total	411,506	1205			

a. Dependent Variable: quality of student life

b. Predictors: (Constant), medical students

c. Predictors: (Constant), medical students, having a relationship, bmi, study results, living with peers, Sex, Dutch, Age, living with your partner, study phase, living alone

d. Predictors: (Constant), medical students, having a relationship, bmi, study results, living with peers, Sex, Dutch, Age, living with your partner, study phase, living alone, seeking or having help, negative sexual experiences, peer pressure lifestyle self-efficacy, problem perception

## Appendix 11: Hierarchical regression analyses whereby law students are compared with non-law students

Table 1.1-1.3. Hierarchical regression analysis for general health whereby law students are compared with non-law students.

Step 1 N = 2393, step 2 N = 2348, step 3 N = 1206.

Table 1.1

		Coefficients <sup>a</sup>									
		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients			Correlations			Collinearity Statistics	
Model		B	Std. Error	Beta	t	Sig.	Zero-order	Partial	Part	Tolerance	VIF
1	(Constant)	60,611	,680		89,121	,000					
	law students	-4,484	1,634	-,079	-2,744	,006	-,079	-,079	-,079	1,000	1,000
2	(Constant)	62,558	8,160		7,666	,000					
	law students	-4,513	1,678	-,079	-2,690	,007	-,079	-,078	-,076	,921	1,086
	Sex	-5,490	1,382	-,116	-3,972	,000	-,132	-,114	-,112	,947	1,056
	Age	,092	,196	,016	,467	,640	,003	,014	,013	,699	1,431
	bmi	-,019	,093	-,006	-,201	,841	-,004	-,006	-,006	,983	1,017
	having a relationship	,364	1,357	,008	,268	,789	-,025	,008	,008	,827	1,210
	living with peers	3,707	1,695	,083	2,187	,029	,119	,063	,062	,552	1,810
	living alone	-1,065	1,785	-,023	-,597	,551	-,054	-,017	-,017	,540	1,853
	living with your partner	-3,526	2,568	-,051	-1,373	,170	-,069	-,040	-,039	,589	1,697
	Dutch	3,770	1,372	,079	2,747	,006	,082	,079	,078	,964	1,038
	study results	,232	,757	,009	,306	,759	,019	,009	,009	,925	1,081
	study phase	1,871	1,579	,040	1,185	,236	,014	,034	,034	,710	1,409
3	(Constant)	77,120	9,000		8,569	,000					
	law students	-4,799	1,622	-,084	-2,959	,003	-,079	-,085	-,081	,919	1,088
	Sex	-4,130	1,379	-,087	-2,995	,003	-,132	-,086	-,082	,887	1,127
	Age	,113	,191	,020	,593	,554	,003	,017	,016	,690	1,449
	bmi	,032	,090	,010	,357	,721	-,004	,010	,010	,978	1,022
	having a relationship	-1,278	1,336	-,029	-,957	,339	-,025	-,028	-,026	,796	1,257
	living with peers	3,511	1,667	,079	2,106	,035	,119	,061	,058	,533	1,875
	living alone	,210	1,748	,005	,120	,905	-,054	,003	,003	,526	1,903
	living with your partner	-1,202	2,501	-,017	-,481	,631	-,069	-,014	-,013	,580	1,725
	Dutch	1,740	1,346	,037	1,293	,196	,082	,037	,035	,935	1,069
	study results	,334	,733	,013	,456	,649	,019	,013	,012	,920	1,087
	study phase	1,775	1,530	,038	1,160	,246	,014	,034	,032	,705	1,418
	negative sexual experiences	-2,994	1,504	-,056	-1,991	,047	-,102	-,058	-,054	,940	1,063
	peer pressure lifestyle self-efficacy	,331	,467	,020	,710	,478	-,003	,021	,019	,926	1,080
	problem perception	-6,743	,949	-,204	-7,103	,000	-,231	-,202	-,194	,903	1,108
	seeking or having help	-6,107	1,219	-,140	-5,012	,000	-,172	-,144	-,137	,957	1,045

a. Dependent Variable: general health

Table 1.2

**Model Summary**

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate	R Square Change	Change Statistics			Sig. F Change
						F Change	df1	df2	
1	,079 <sup>a</sup>	,006	,005	21,47430	,006	7,532	1	1204	,006
2	,208 <sup>b</sup>	,043	,034	21,15876	,037	4,618	10	1194	,000
3	,332 <sup>c</sup>	,110	,099	20,44095	,067	22,333	4	1190	,000

a. Predictors: (Constant), law students

b. Predictors: (Constant), law students, living with peers, bmi, having a relationship, Dutch, study results, Sex, Age, living with your partner, study phase, living alone

c. Predictors: (Constant), law students, living with peers, bmi, having a relationship, Dutch, study results, Sex, Age, living with your partner, study phase, living alone, seeking or having help, negative sexual experiences, peer pressure lifestyle self-efficacy, problem perception

Table 1.3

**ANOVA<sup>a</sup>**

Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	3473,282	1	3473,282	7,532	,006 <sup>b</sup>
	Residual	555219,398	1204	461,146		
	Total	558692,680	1205			
2	Regression	24147,048	11	2195,186	4,903	,000 <sup>c</sup>
	Residual	534545,632	1194	447,693		
	Total	558692,680	1205			
3	Regression	61472,313	15	4098,154	9,808	,000 <sup>d</sup>
	Residual	497220,367	1190	417,832		
	Total	558692,680	1205			

a. Dependent Variable: general health

b. Predictors: (Constant), law students

c. Predictors: (Constant), law students, living with peers, bmi, having a relationship, Dutch, study results, Sex, Age, living with your partner, study phase, living alone

d. Predictors: (Constant), law students, living with peers, bmi, having a relationship, Dutch, study results, Sex, Age, living with your partner, study phase, living alone, seeking or having help, negative sexual experiences, peer pressure lifestyle self-efficacy, problem perception



Table 2.1-2.3. Hierarchical regression analysis for vitality whereby law students are compared with non-law students.

Step 1 N = 2393, step 2 N = 2348, step 3 N = 1206.

Table 2.1

		Coefficients <sup>a</sup>									
		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients			Correlations			Collinearity Statistics	
Model		B	Std. Error	Beta	t	Sig.	Zero-order	Partial	Part	Tolerance	VIF
1	(Constant)	45,146	,644		70,087	,000					
	law students	1,558	1,547	,029	1,007	,314	,029	,029	,029	1,000	1,000
2	(Constant)	39,980	7,501		5,330	,000					
	law students	1,675	1,542	,031	1,086	,278	,029	,031	,030	,921	1,086
	Sex	-6,412	1,270	-,143	-5,047	,000	-,161	-,145	-,139	,947	1,056
	Age	,236	,181	,043	1,309	,191	,003	,038	,036	,699	1,431
	bmi	-,016	,086	-,005	-,190	,849	-,013	-,006	-,005	,983	1,017
	having a relationship	-,860	1,247	-,021	-,690	,491	-,056	-,020	-,019	,827	1,210
	living with peers	6,499	1,558	,155	4,171	,000	,185	,120	,115	,552	1,810
	living alone	-,318	1,641	-,007	-,194	,846	-,099	-,006	-,005	,540	1,853
	living with your partner	-1,740	2,361	-,026	-,737	,461	-,086	-,021	-,020	,589	1,697
	Dutch	8,253	1,261	,184	6,543	,000	,200	,186	,180	,964	1,038
	study results	,487	,696	,020	,700	,484	,002	,020	,019	,925	1,081
	study phase	-,589	1,451	-,013	-,406	,685	-,025	-,012	-,011	,710	1,409
3	(Constant)	62,413	8,196		7,615	,000					
	law students	1,554	1,477	,029	1,052	,293	,029	,030	,028	,919	1,088
	Sex	-4,285	1,256	-,095	-3,412	,001	-,161	-,098	-,090	,887	1,127
	Age	,280	,174	,051	1,610	,108	,003	,047	,042	,690	1,449
	bmi	,029	,082	,009	,347	,728	-,013	,010	,009	,978	1,022
	having a relationship	-2,568	1,216	-,062	-2,112	,035	-,056	-,061	-,056	,796	1,257
	living with peers	5,745	1,518	,137	3,785	,000	,185	,109	,100	,533	1,875
	living alone	,870	1,591	,020	,546	,585	-,099	,016	,014	,526	1,903
	living with your partner	,440	2,277	,007	,193	,847	-,086	,006	,005	,580	1,725
	Dutch	6,023	1,225	,134	4,915	,000	,200	,141	,130	,935	1,069
	study results	,706	,668	,029	1,057	,291	,002	,031	,028	,920	1,087
	study phase	-,988	1,394	-,022	-,709	,479	-,025	-,021	-,019	,705	1,418
	negative sexual experiences	-5,569	1,370	-,111	-4,066	,000	-,164	-,117	-,107	,940	1,063
	peer pressure lifestyle self-efficacy	-,726	,425	-,047	-1,709	,088	-,073	-,049	-,045	,926	1,080
	problem perception	-7,133	,864	-,229	-8,252	,000	-,274	-,233	-,218	,903	1,108
seeking or having help	-4,699	1,110	-,114	-4,235	,000	-,163	-,122	-,112	,957	1,045	

a. Dependent Variable: vitality



Table 2.2

Model Summary									
Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate	R Square Change	F Change	df1	df2	Sig. F Change
1	,029 <sup>a</sup>	,001	,000	20,33885	,001	1,013	1	1204	,314
2	,307 <sup>b</sup>	,094	,086	19,44902	,093	12,269	10	1194	,000
3	,416 <sup>c</sup>	,173	,162	18,61371	,079	28,392	4	1190	,000

a. Predictors: (Constant), law students

b. Predictors: (Constant), law students, living with peers, bmi, having a relationship, Dutch, study results, Sex, Age, living with your partner, study phase, living alone

c. Predictors: (Constant), law students, living with peers, bmi, having a relationship, Dutch, study results, Sex, Age, living with your partner, study phase, living alone, seeking or having help, negative sexual experiences, peer pressure lifestyle self-efficacy, problem perception

Table 2.3

ANOVA <sup>a</sup>						
Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	419,192	1	419,192	1,013	,314 <sup>b</sup>
	Residual	498057,122	1204	413,669		
	Total	498476,314	1205			
2	Regression	46828,537	11	4257,140	11,254	,000 <sup>c</sup>
	Residual	451647,777	1194	378,264		
	Total	498476,314	1205			
3	Regression	86176,977	15	5745,132	16,582	,000 <sup>d</sup>
	Residual	412299,337	1190	346,470		
	Total	498476,314	1205			

a. Dependent Variable: vitality

b. Predictors: (Constant), law students

c. Predictors: (Constant), law students, living with peers, bmi, having a relationship, Dutch, study results, Sex, Age, living with your partner, study phase, living alone

d. Predictors: (Constant), law students, living with peers, bmi, having a relationship, Dutch, study results, Sex, Age, living with your partner, study phase, living alone, seeking or having help, negative sexual experiences, peer pressure lifestyle self-efficacy, problem perception

Table 3.1-3.3. Hierarchical regression analysis for depression whereby law students are compared with non-law students.

Step 1 N = 2393, step 2 N = 2348, step 3 N = 1206.

Table 3.1

		Coefficients <sup>a</sup>									
Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.	Correlations			Collinearity Statistics	
		B	Std. Error	Beta			Zero-order	Partial	Part	Tolerance	VIF
1	(Constant)	15,160	,164		92,279	,000					
	law students	,672	,395	,049	1,703	,089	,049	,049	,049	1,000	1,000
2	(Constant)	16,351	1,937		8,440	,000					
	law students	,361	,398	,026	,905	,365	,049	,026	,025	,921	1,086
	Sex	2,182	,328	,190	6,649	,000	,196	,189	,185	,947	1,056
	Age	,023	,047	,016	,492	,622	,011	,014	,014	,699	1,431
	bmi	,001	,022	,001	,046	,964	-,005	,001	,001	,983	1,017
	having a relationship	,113	,322	,011	,350	,726	,049	,010	,010	,827	1,210
	living with peers	-,858	,402	-,080	-2,132	,033	-,128	-,062	-,059	,552	1,810
	living alone	,440	,424	,039	1,037	,300	,069	,030	,029	,540	1,853
	living with your partner	,635	,610	,038	1,042	,298	,070	,030	,029	,589	1,697
	Dutch	-,617	,326	-,054	-1,894	,058	-,060	-,055	-,053	,964	1,038
	study results	-,672	,180	-,108	-3,738	,000	-,112	-,108	-,104	,925	1,081
	study phase	-,628	,375	-,055	-1,675	,094	-,035	-,048	-,047	,710	1,409
3	(Constant)	11,841	2,089		5,669	,000					
	law students	,434	,376	,032	1,152	,249	,049	,033	,030	,919	1,088
	Sex	1,658	,320	,145	5,180	,000	,196	,149	,136	,887	1,127
	Age	,005	,044	,003	,110	,912	,011	,003	,003	,690	1,449
	bmi	-,012	,021	-,016	-,592	,554	-,005	-,017	-,016	,978	1,022
	having a relationship	,500	,310	,048	1,612	,107	,049	,047	,042	,796	1,257
	living with peers	-,792	,387	-,074	-2,047	,041	-,128	-,059	-,054	,533	1,875
	living alone	,095	,406	,008	,234	,815	,069	,007	,006	,526	1,903
	living with your partner	-,042	,580	-,003	-,073	,942	,070	-,002	-,002	,580	1,725
	Dutch	-,002	,312	,000	-,007	,995	-,060	,000	,000	,935	1,069
	study results	-,688	,170	-,111	-4,041	,000	-,112	-,116	-,106	,920	1,087
	study phase	-,563	,355	-,050	-1,584	,113	-,035	-,046	-,042	,705	1,418
	negative sexual experiences	1,240	,349	,096	3,554	,000	,149	,102	,094	,940	1,063
	peer pressure lifestyle self-efficacy	,012	,108	,003	,112	,911	,031	,003	,003	,926	1,080
	problem perception	1,696	,220	,213	7,698	,000	,238	,218	,203	,903	1,108
	seeking or having help	2,233	,283	,213	7,896	,000	,253	,223	,208	,957	1,045

a. Dependent Variable: depression

Table 3.2

**Model Summary**

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate	R Square Change	Change Statistics			Sig. F Change
						F Change	df1	df2	
1	,049 <sup>a</sup>	,002	,002	5,18747	,002	2,900	1	1204	,089
2	,269 <sup>b</sup>	,072	,064	5,02346	,070	8,990	10	1194	,000
3	,419 <sup>c</sup>	,175	,165	4,74382	,103	37,229	4	1190	,000

a. Predictors: (Constant), law students

b. Predictors: (Constant), law students, living with peers, bmi, having a relationship, Dutch, study results, Sex, Age, living with your partner, study phase, living alone

c. Predictors: (Constant), law students, living with peers, bmi, having a relationship, Dutch, study results, Sex, Age, living with your partner, study phase, living alone, seeking or having help, negative sexual experiences, peer pressure lifestyle self-efficacy, problem perception

Table 3.3

**ANOVA<sup>a</sup>**

Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	78,037	1	78,037	2,900	,089 <sup>b</sup>
	Residual	32399,462	1204	26,910		
	Total	32477,499	1205			
2	Regression	2346,733	11	213,339	8,454	,000 <sup>c</sup>
	Residual	30130,766	1194	25,235		
	Total	32477,499	1205			
3	Regression	5697,940	15	379,863	16,880	,000 <sup>d</sup>
	Residual	26779,560	1190	22,504		
	Total	32477,499	1205			

a. Dependent Variable: depression

b. Predictors: (Constant), law students

c. Predictors: (Constant), law students, living with peers, bmi, having a relationship, Dutch, study results, Sex, Age, living with your partner, study phase, living alone

d. Predictors: (Constant), law students, living with peers, bmi, having a relationship, Dutch, study results, Sex, Age, living with your partner, study phase, living alone, seeking or having help, negative sexual experiences, peer pressure lifestyle self-efficacy, problem perception

Table 4.1-4.3. Hierarchical regression analysis for anxiety whereby law students are compared with non-law students.

Step 1 N = 2393, step 2 N = 2348, step 3 N = 1206.

Table 4.1

		Coefficients <sup>a</sup>									
		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients			Correlations			Collinearity Statistics	
Model		B	Std. Error	Beta	t	Sig.	Zero-order	Partial	Part	Tolerance	VIF
1	(Constant)	7,077	,096		73,496	,000					
	law students	-,116	,231	-,014	-,499	,618	-,014	-,014	-,014	1,000	1,000
2	(Constant)	8,146	1,131		7,205	,000					
	law students	-,201	,232	-,025	-,865	,387	-,014	-,025	-,024	,921	1,086
	Sex	1,015	,192	,151	5,302	,000	,161	,152	,147	,947	1,056
	Age	,007	,027	,009	,261	,794	,027	,008	,007	,699	1,431
	bmi	-,014	,013	-,030	-1,087	,277	-,024	-,031	-,030	,983	1,017
	having a relationship	,017	,188	,003	,091	,927	,037	,003	,003	,827	1,210
	living with peers	-,708	,235	-,113	-3,015	,003	-,148	-,087	-,084	,552	1,810
	living alone	,128	,247	,020	,516	,606	,090	,015	,014	,540	1,853
	living with your partner	,130	,356	,013	,366	,714	,061	,011	,010	,589	1,697
	Dutch	-1,127	,190	-,168	-5,927	,000	-,180	-,169	-,165	,964	1,038
	study results	-,230	,105	-,063	-2,195	,028	-,049	-,063	-,061	,925	1,081
	study phase	-,058	,219	-,009	-,266	,790	,012	-,008	-,007	,710	1,409
3	(Constant)	6,534	1,235		5,290	,000					
	law students	-,171	,223	-,021	-,769	,442	-,014	-,022	-,020	,919	1,088
	Sex	,713	,189	,106	3,769	,000	,161	,109	,100	,887	1,127
	Age	-,008	,026	-,009	-,296	,767	,027	-,009	-,008	,690	1,449
	bmi	-,019	,012	-,042	-1,562	,119	-,024	-,045	-,042	,978	1,022
	having a relationship	,159	,183	,026	,866	,387	,037	,025	,023	,796	1,257
	living with peers	-,727	,229	-,116	-3,177	,002	-,148	-,092	-,084	,533	1,875
	living alone	-,071	,240	-,011	-,294	,769	,090	-,009	-,008	,526	1,903
	living with your partner	-,233	,343	-,024	-,679	,497	,061	-,020	-,018	,580	1,725
	Dutch	-,821	,185	-,122	-4,448	,000	-,180	-,128	-,118	,935	1,069
	study results	-,230	,101	-,063	-2,290	,022	-,049	-,066	-,061	,920	1,087
	study phase	-,001	,210	,000	-,004	,997	,012	,000	,000	,705	1,418
	negative sexual experiences	,971	,206	,129	4,705	,000	,180	,135	,125	,940	1,063
	peer pressure lifestyle self-efficacy	-,005	,064	-,002	-,074	,941	,025	-,002	-,002	,926	1,080
	problem perception	,622	,130	,134	4,776	,000	,187	,137	,127	,903	1,108
	seeking or having help	1,280	,167	,208	7,653	,000	,249	,217	,203	,957	1,045

a. Dependent Variable: anxiety

Table 4.2

**Model Summary**

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate	R Square Change	Change Statistics			Sig. F Change
						F Change	df1	df2	
1	,014 <sup>a</sup>	,000	-,001	3,04053	,000	,249	1	1204	,618
2	,280 <sup>b</sup>	,078	,070	2,93176	,078	10,099	10	1194	,000
3	,399 <sup>c</sup>	,159	,148	2,80519	,081	28,545	4	1190	,000

a. Predictors: (Constant), law students

b. Predictors: (Constant), law students, living with peers, bmi, having a relationship, Dutch, study results, Sex, Age, living with your partner, study phase, living alone

c. Predictors: (Constant), law students, living with peers, bmi, having a relationship, Dutch, study results, Sex, Age, living with your partner, study phase, living alone, seeking or having help, negative sexual experiences, peer pressure lifestyle self-efficacy, problem perception

Table 4.3

**ANOVA<sup>a</sup>**

Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	2,305	1	2,305	,249	,618 <sup>b</sup>
	Residual	11130,747	1204	9,245		
	Total	11133,052	1205			
2	Regression	870,343	11	79,122	9,205	,000 <sup>c</sup>
	Residual	10262,709	1194	8,595		
	Total	11133,052	1205			
3	Regression	1768,840	15	117,923	14,986	,000 <sup>d</sup>
	Residual	9364,212	1190	7,869		
	Total	11133,052	1205			

a. Dependent Variable: anxiety

b. Predictors: (Constant), law students

c. Predictors: (Constant), law students, living with peers, bmi, having a relationship, Dutch, study results, Sex, Age, living with your partner, study phase, living alone

d. Predictors: (Constant), law students, living with peers, bmi, having a relationship, Dutch, study results, Sex, Age, living with your partner, study phase, living alone, seeking or having help, negative sexual experiences, peer pressure lifestyle self-efficacy, problem perception

Table 5.1-5.3. Hierarchical regression analysis for internet addiction whereby law students are compared with non-law students.

Step 1 N = 2393, step 2 N = 2348, step 3 N = 1206.

Table 5.1

Coefficients <sup>a</sup>											
Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.	Correlations			Collinearity Statistics	
		B	Std. Error	Beta			Zero-order	Partial	Part	Tolerance	VIF
1	(Constant)	2,509	,027		94,377	,000					
	law students	,044	,067	,024	,650	,516	,024	,024	,024	1,000	1,000
2	(Constant)	3,578	,336		10,645	,000					
	law students	,034	,067	,018	,500	,617	,024	,019	,018	,944	1,059
	Sex	-,007	,053	-,005	-,135	,893	-,009	-,005	-,005	,933	1,072
	Age	,002	,009	,011	,253	,801	,009	,009	,009	,646	1,547
	bmi	-,002	,003	-,020	-,556	,578	-,007	-,021	-,020	,980	1,021
	having a relationship	-,134	,053	-,099	-2,551	,011	-,076	-,095	-,092	,848	1,179
	living with peers	-,204	,066	-,149	-3,090	,002	-,136	-,114	-,111	,553	1,808
	living alone	-,033	,068	-,024	-,488	,626	,074	-,018	-,018	,543	1,842
	living with your partner	-,005	,108	-,002	-,047	,962	,012	-,002	-,002	,647	1,545
	Dutch	-,243	,052	-,171	-4,659	,000	-,159	-,171	-,167	,960	1,042
	study results	-,108	,031	-,131	-3,521	,000	-,123	-,130	-,126	,927	1,079
	study phase	-,004	,065	-,003	-,067	,946	-,011	-,003	-,002	,670	1,492
3	(Constant)	3,345	,358		9,344	,000					
	law students	,032	,063	,018	,507	,612	,024	,019	,017	,940	1,063
	Sex	-,033	,052	-,023	-,628	,530	-,009	-,023	-,021	,873	1,145
	Age	,001	,009	,005	,130	,897	,009	,005	,004	,641	1,560
	bmi	-,003	,003	-,040	-1,181	,238	-,007	-,044	-,040	,972	1,029
	having a relationship	-,041	,051	-,031	-,815	,415	-,076	-,030	-,028	,813	1,229
	living with peers	-,222	,063	-,162	-3,509	,000	-,136	-,130	-,119	,534	1,871
	living alone	-,122	,065	-,087	-1,876	,061	,074	-,070	-,063	,527	1,899
	living with your partner	-,132	,103	-,054	-1,278	,202	,012	-,048	-,043	,634	1,578
	Dutch	-,187	,050	-,131	-3,759	,000	-,159	-,139	-,127	,936	1,069
	study results	-,105	,029	-,128	-3,620	,000	-,123	-,134	-,122	,920	1,087
	study phase	-,006	,061	-,004	-,101	,920	-,011	-,004	-,003	,666	1,501
	negative sexual experiences	,080	,057	,049	1,398	,162	,087	,052	,047	,935	1,069
	peer pressure lifestyle self-efficacy	-,062	,018	-,123	-3,482	,001	-,121	-,129	-,118	,913	1,095
	problem perception	,312	,037	,305	8,529	,000	,338	,303	,288	,895	1,118
	seeking or having help	,037	,047	,028	,804	,422	,080	,030	,027	,936	1,068

a. Dependent Variable: internet addiction

Table 5.2

Model Summary									
Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate	R Square Change	F Change	df1	df2	Sig. F Change
1	,024 <sup>a</sup>	,001	-,001	,66150	,001	,423	1	732	,516
2	,265 <sup>b</sup>	,070	,056	,64245	,070	5,405	10	722	,000
3	,423 <sup>c</sup>	,179	,162	,60527	,109	23,856	4	718	,000

a. Predictors: (Constant), law students

b. Predictors: (Constant), law students, living with peers, bmi, having a relationship, Dutch, study results, Age, Sex, living with your partner, study phase, living alone

c. Predictors: (Constant), law students, living with peers, bmi, having a relationship, Dutch, study results, Age, Sex, living with your partner, study phase, living alone, seeking or having help, negative sexual experiences, peer pressure lifestyle self-efficacy, problem perception

Table 5.3

ANOVA <sup>a</sup>						
Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	,185	1	,185	,423	,516 <sup>b</sup>
	Residual	320,306	732	,438		
	Total	320,491	733			
2	Regression	22,495	11	2,045	4,955	,000 <sup>c</sup>
	Residual	297,996	722	,413		
	Total	320,491	733			
3	Regression	57,453	15	3,830	10,455	,000 <sup>d</sup>
	Residual	263,039	718	,366		
	Total	320,491	733			

a. Dependent Variable: internet addiction

b. Predictors: (Constant), law students

c. Predictors: (Constant), law students, living with peers, bmi, having a relationship, Dutch, study results, Age, Sex, living with your partner, study phase, living alone

d. Predictors: (Constant), law students, living with peers, bmi, having a relationship, Dutch, study results, Age, Sex, living with your partner, study phase, living alone, seeking or having help, negative sexual experiences, peer pressure lifestyle self-efficacy, problem perception



Table 6.1-6.3. Hierarchical regression analysis for buying addiction whereby law students are compared with non-law students.

Step 1 N = 419, step 2 N = 412, step 3 N = 287.

Table 6.1

		Coefficients <sup>a</sup>									
Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.	Correlations			Collinearity Statistics	
		B	Std. Error	Beta			Zero-order	Partial	Part	Tolerance	VIF
1	(Constant)	-,314	,126		-2,497	,013					
	law students	,182	,282	,038	,644	,520	,038	,038	,038	1,000	1,000
2	(Constant)	4,392	1,596		2,751	,006					
	law students	,227	,287	,048	,788	,431	,038	,047	,045	,894	1,119
	Sex	-,629	,279	-,133	-2,256	,025	-,124	-,135	-,129	,939	1,065
	Age	-,165	,042	-,272	-3,920	,000	-,235	-,230	-,224	,677	1,478
	bmi	,008	,028	,017	,289	,773	-,037	,017	,016	,939	1,065
	having a relationship	,225	,243	,058	,925	,356	,022	,056	,053	,841	1,188
	living with peers	-,160	,303	-,040	-,528	,598	,023	-,032	-,030	,558	1,792
	living alone	-,213	,319	-,053	-,670	,504	-,073	-,040	-,038	,512	1,952
	living with your partner	-,259	,478	-,038	-,542	,588	-,063	-,033	-,031	,648	1,543
	Dutch	,536	,254	,125	2,106	,036	,173	,126	,120	,918	1,089
	study results	-,063	,132	-,028	-,480	,632	-,015	-,029	-,027	,924	1,083
	study phase	,453	,312	,100	1,455	,147	-,054	,087	,083	,683	1,464
3	(Constant)	4,699	1,692		2,777	,006					
	law students	,151	,280	,032	,539	,590	,038	,033	,030	,880	1,136
	Sex	-,635	,277	-,134	-2,294	,023	-,124	-,138	-,127	,889	1,125
	Age	-,161	,041	-,267	-3,925	,000	-,235	-,232	-,217	,659	1,517
	bmi	,030	,028	,064	1,090	,277	-,037	,066	,060	,885	1,130
	having a relationship	,048	,239	,012	,200	,842	,022	,012	,011	,817	1,224
	living with peers	-,088	,298	-,022	-,295	,768	,023	-,018	-,016	,539	1,856
	living alone	-,123	,311	-,031	-,394	,694	-,073	-,024	-,022	,503	1,988
	living with your partner	-,095	,465	-,014	-,204	,838	-,063	-,012	-,011	,639	1,565
	Dutch	,392	,249	,092	1,573	,117	,173	,095	,087	,895	1,117
	study results	-,063	,129	-,028	-,487	,627	-,015	-,030	-,027	,900	1,111
	study phase	,406	,304	,090	1,338	,182	-,054	,081	,074	,673	1,486
	negative sexual experiences	-,486	,255	-,109	-1,902	,058	-,188	-,115	-,105	,922	1,084
	peer pressure lifestyle self-efficacy	,127	,073	,101	1,743	,082	,104	,105	,096	,912	1,096
	problem perception	-,670	,180	-,220	-3,721	,000	-,244	-,220	-,205	,869	1,150
	seeking or having help	,161	,222	,042	,725	,469	-,053	,044	,040	,905	1,105

a. Dependent Variable: buying addiction



Table 6.2

**Model Summary**

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate	R Square Change	Change Statistics			Sig. F Change
						F Change	df1	df2	
1	,038 <sup>a</sup>	,001	-,002	1,90555	,001	,414	1	285	,520
2	,324 <sup>b</sup>	,105	,069	1,83672	,103	3,176	10	275	,001
3	,418 <sup>c</sup>	,175	,129	1,77614	,070	5,770	4	271	,000

a. Predictors: (Constant), law students

b. Predictors: (Constant), law students, living with peers, Sex, bmi, study results, Dutch, having a relationship, Age, living with your partner, study phase, living alone

c. Predictors: (Constant), law students, living with peers, Sex, bmi, study results, Dutch, having a relationship, Age, living with your partner, study phase, living alone, negative sexual experiences, peer pressure lifestyle self-efficacy, seeking or having help, problem perception

Table 6.3

**ANOVA<sup>a</sup>**

Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	1,505	1	1,505	,414	,520 <sup>b</sup>
	Residual	1034,864	285	3,631		
	Total	1036,369	286			
2	Regression	108,643	11	9,877	2,928	,001 <sup>c</sup>
	Residual	927,726	275	3,374		
	Total	1036,369	286			
3	Regression	181,451	15	12,097	3,835	,000 <sup>d</sup>
	Residual	854,918	271	3,155		
	Total	1036,369	286			

a. Dependent Variable: buying addiction

b. Predictors: (Constant), law students

c. Predictors: (Constant), law students, living with peers, Sex, bmi, study results, Dutch, having a relationship, Age, living with your partner, study phase, living alone

d. Predictors: (Constant), law students, living with peers, Sex, bmi, study results, Dutch, having a relationship, Age, living with your partner, study phase, living alone, negative sexual experiences, peer pressure lifestyle self-efficacy, seeking or having help, problem perception

Table 7.1-7.3. Hierarchical regression analysis for eating disorder whereby law students are compared with non-law students.

Step 1 N = 2393, step 2 N = 2348, step 3 N = 1206.

Table 7.1

Coefficients <sup>a</sup>											
Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.	Correlations			Collinearity Statistics	
		B	Std. Error	Beta			Zero-order	Partial	Part	Tolerance	VIF
1	(Constant)	1,719	,042		40,823	,000					
	law students	,008	,101	,002	,080	,936	,002	,002	,002	1,000	1,000
2	(Constant)	-,716	,479		-1,496	,135					
	law students	,017	,098	,005	,178	,859	,002	,005	,005	,921	1,086
	Sex	,982	,081	,335	12,113	,000	,325	,331	,326	,947	1,056
	Age	-,011	,012	-,032	-,996	,319	-,066	-,029	-,027	,699	1,431
	bmi	,024	,005	,120	4,428	,000	,098	,127	,119	,983	1,017
	having a relationship	-,026	,080	-,010	-,332	,740	,007	-,010	-,009	,827	1,210
	living with peers	,201	,099	,073	2,018	,044	-,021	,058	,054	,552	1,810
	living alone	,365	,105	,128	3,483	,001	,090	,100	,094	,540	1,853
	living with your partner	,167	,151	,039	1,108	,268	,000	,032	,030	,589	1,697
	Dutch	,019	,080	,007	,241	,809	-,012	,007	,006	,964	1,038
	study results	,046	,044	,029	1,035	,301	,041	,030	,028	,925	1,081
	study phase	-,162	,093	-,056	-1,752	,080	-,045	-,051	-,047	,710	1,409
3	(Constant)	-2,219	,515		-4,304	,000					
	law students	,025	,093	,007	,274	,784	,002	,008	,007	,919	1,088
	Sex	,883	,079	,301	11,179	,000	,325	,308	,284	,887	1,127
	Age	-,009	,011	-,025	-,813	,416	-,066	-,024	-,021	,690	1,449
	bmi	,021	,005	,103	4,007	,000	,098	,115	,102	,978	1,022
	having a relationship	,140	,077	,052	1,836	,067	,007	,053	,047	,796	1,257
	living with peers	,255	,095	,093	2,671	,008	-,021	,077	,068	,533	1,875
	living alone	,264	,100	,092	2,638	,008	,090	,076	,067	,526	1,903
	living with your partner	,018	,143	,004	,124	,902	,000	,004	,003	,580	1,725
	Dutch	,164	,077	,056	2,124	,034	-,012	,061	,054	,935	1,069
	study results	,020	,042	,012	,470	,639	,041	,014	,012	,920	1,087
	study phase	-,143	,088	-,049	-1,637	,102	-,045	-,047	-,042	,705	1,418
	negative sexual experiences	,306	,086	,093	3,556	,000	,164	,103	,090	,940	1,063
	peer pressure lifestyle self-efficacy	,014	,027	,014	,537	,591	,037	,016	,014	,926	1,080
	problem perception	,627	,054	,308	11,531	,000	,323	,317	,293	,903	1,108
	seeking or having help	,020	,070	,008	,293	,769	,057	,009	,007	,957	1,045

a. Dependent Variable: eating pattern

Table 7.2

Model Summary									
Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate	R Square Change	Change Statistics			Sig. F Change
						F Change	df1	df2	
1	,002 <sup>a</sup>	,000	-,001	1,32971	,000	,006	1	1204	,936
2	,369 <sup>b</sup>	,136	,128	1,24105	,136	18,816	10	1194	,000
3	,484 <sup>c</sup>	,234	,224	1,17068	,098	37,965	4	1190	,000

a. Predictors: (Constant), law students

b. Predictors: (Constant), law students, living with peers, bmi, having a relationship, Dutch, study results, Sex, Age, living with your partner, study phase, living alone

c. Predictors: (Constant), law students, living with peers, bmi, having a relationship, Dutch, study results, Sex, Age, living with your partner, study phase, living alone, seeking or having help, negative sexual experiences, peer pressure lifestyle self-efficacy, problem perception

Table 7.3

ANOVA <sup>a</sup>						
Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	,011	1	,011	,006	,936 <sup>b</sup>
	Residual	2128,819	1204	1,768		
	Total	2128,830	1205			
2	Regression	289,821	11	26,347	17,106	,000 <sup>c</sup>
	Residual	1839,009	1194	1,540		
	Total	2128,830	1205			
3	Regression	497,944	15	33,196	24,222	,000 <sup>d</sup>
	Residual	1630,886	1190	1,370		
	Total	2128,830	1205			

a. Dependent Variable: eating pattern

b. Predictors: (Constant), law students

c. Predictors: (Constant), law students, living with peers, bmi, having a relationship, Dutch, study results, Sex, Age, living with your partner, study phase, living alone

d. Predictors: (Constant), law students, living with peers, bmi, having a relationship, Dutch, study results, Sex, Age, living with your partner, study phase, living alone, seeking or having help, negative sexual experiences, peer pressure lifestyle self-efficacy, problem perception

Table 8.1-8.3. Hierarchical regression analysis for suicidal ideation whereby law students are compared with non-law students.

Step 1 N = 949, step 2 N = 935, step 3 N = 590.

Table 8.1

Coefficients <sup>a</sup>											
Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.	Correlations			Collinearity Statistics	
		B	Std. Error	Beta			Zero-order	Partial	Part	Tolerance	VIF
1	(Constant)	6,988	,117		59,772	,000					
	law students	-,163	,288	-,023	-,566	,572	-,023	-,023	-,023	1,000	1,000
2	(Constant)	5,454	1,439		3,789	,000					
	law students	-,035	,305	-,005	-,114	,909	-,023	-,005	-,005	,886	1,129
	Sex	,409	,241	,073	1,698	,090	,056	,070	,070	,917	1,090
	Age	,042	,038	,054	1,083	,279	,013	,045	,044	,670	1,492
	bmi	-,009	,012	-,031	-,747	,456	-,021	-,031	-,031	,977	1,023
	having a relationship	-,387	,248	-,072	-1,559	,120	-,057	-,065	-,064	,782	1,278
	living with peers	,024	,309	,004	,078	,938	-,035	,003	,003	,513	1,950
	living alone	,320	,321	,058	,997	,319	,073	,041	,041	,495	2,019
	living with your partner	,243	,454	,029	,535	,593	-,009	,022	,022	,560	1,786
	Dutch	-,512	,237	-,090	-2,159	,031	-,091	-,089	-,089	,968	1,033
	study results	,075	,128	,025	,583	,560	,026	,024	,024	,909	1,100
	study phase	-,394	,287	-,068	-1,372	,171	-,039	-,057	-,056	,684	1,463
3	(Constant)	3,473	1,606		2,163	,031					
	law students	-,107	,296	-,015	-,363	,717	-,023	-,015	-,014	,882	1,134
	Sex	,190	,243	,034	,781	,435	,056	,033	,031	,841	1,188
	Age	,027	,037	,036	,732	,464	,013	,031	,029	,662	1,511
	bmi	-,010	,012	-,034	-,855	,393	-,021	-,036	-,034	,972	1,029
	having a relationship	-,123	,245	-,023	-,501	,617	-,057	-,021	-,020	,749	1,336
	living with peers	,061	,302	,011	,203	,839	-,035	,008	,008	,500	1,998
	living alone	,117	,314	,021	,372	,710	,073	,016	,015	,486	2,059
	living with your partner	-,056	,442	-,007	-,127	,899	-,009	-,005	-,005	,553	1,807
	Dutch	-,212	,234	-,037	-,904	,366	-,091	-,038	-,036	,926	1,080
	study results	,058	,124	,019	,465	,642	,026	,019	,018	,903	1,108
	study phase	-,283	,280	-,049	-1,012	,312	-,039	-,042	-,040	,672	1,489
	negative sexual experiences	,902	,246	,152	3,661	,000	,186	,151	,145	,911	1,098
	peer pressure lifestyle self-efficacy	,000	,082	,000	,004	,997	-,010	,000	,000	,909	1,101
	problem perception	,808	,169	,200	4,770	,000	,223	,195	,190	,900	1,111
	seeking or having help	,436	,219	,080	1,988	,047	,108	,083	,079	,965	1,036

a. Dependent Variable: suicidal ideation

Table 8.2

**Model Summary**

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate	R Square Change	Change Statistics			Sig. F Change
						F Change	df1	df2	
1	,023 <sup>a</sup>	,001	-,001	2,59577	,001	,320	1	588	,572
2	,158 <sup>b</sup>	,025	,006	2,58585	,024	1,452	10	578	,154
3	,306 <sup>c</sup>	,093	,070	2,50221	,068	10,822	4	574	,000

a. Predictors: (Constant), law students

b. Predictors: (Constant), law students, living with your partner, bmi, Dutch, study results, Sex, living with peers, Age, having a relationship, study phase, living alone

c. Predictors: (Constant), law students, living with your partner, bmi, Dutch, study results, Sex, living with peers, Age, having a relationship, study phase, living alone, seeking or having help, negative sexual experiences, peer pressure lifestyle self-efficacy, problem perception

Table 8.3

**ANOVA<sup>a</sup>**

Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	2,156	1	2,156	,320	,572 <sup>b</sup>
	Residual	3961,948	588	6,738		
	Total	3964,103	589			
2	Regression	99,235	11	9,021	1,349	,193 <sup>c</sup>
	Residual	3864,868	578	6,687		
	Total	3964,103	589			
3	Regression	370,256	15	24,684	3,942	,000 <sup>d</sup>
	Residual	3593,848	574	6,261		
	Total	3964,103	589			

a. Dependent Variable: suicidal ideation

b. Predictors: (Constant), law students

c. Predictors: (Constant), law students, living with your partner, bmi, Dutch, study results, Sex, living with peers, Age, having a relationship, study phase, living alone

d. Predictors: (Constant), law students, living with your partner, bmi, Dutch, study results, Sex, living with peers, Age, having a relationship, study phase, living alone, seeking or having help, negative sexual experiences, peer pressure lifestyle self-efficacy, problem perception

Table 9.1-9.3. Hierarchical regression analysis for student health (risk) behaviour (general) whereby law students are compared with non-law students.  
Step 1 N = 2393, step 2 N = 2348, step 3 N = 1206.

Table 9.1

		Coefficients <sup>a</sup>									
Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.	Correlations			Collinearity Statistics	
		B	Std. Error	Beta			Zero-order	Partial	Part	Tolerance	VIF
1	(Constant)	3,411	,014		245,900	,000					
	law students	,054	,033	,046	1,609	,108	,046	,046	,046	1,000	1,000
2	(Constant)	3,228	,165		19,528	,000					
	law students	,015	,034	,013	,428	,669	,046	,012	,012	,921	1,086
	Sex	-,004	,028	-,005	-,156	,876	,003	-,005	-,004	,947	1,056
	Age	,004	,004	,033	,972	,331	,043	,028	,027	,699	1,431
	bmi	-,004	,002	-,057	-1,998	,046	-,073	-,058	-,056	,983	1,017
	having a relationship	,049	,027	,055	1,784	,075	,073	,052	,050	,827	1,210
	living with peers	,020	,034	,022	,570	,569	,085	,016	,016	,552	1,810
	living alone	-,092	,036	-,097	-2,534	,011	-,131	-,073	-,071	,540	1,853
	living with your partner	-,035	,052	-,025	-,676	,499	,034	-,020	-,019	,589	1,697
	Dutch	,143	,028	,148	5,145	,000	,153	,147	,145	,964	1,038
	study results	,010	,015	,020	,674	,501	,013	,019	,019	,925	1,081
	study phase	,064	,032	,067	1,998	,046	,079	,058	,056	,710	1,409
3	(Constant)	3,523	,163		21,579	,000					
	law students	,004	,029	,004	,140	,889	,046	,004	,003	,919	1,088
	Sex	-,009	,025	-,009	-,354	,723	,003	-,010	-,009	,887	1,127
	Age	,000	,003	-,002	-,075	,940	,043	-,002	-,002	,690	1,449
	bmi	-,002	,002	-,027	-1,095	,274	-,073	-,032	-,027	,978	1,022
	having a relationship	-,043	,024	-,049	-1,794	,073	,073	-,052	-,044	,796	1,257
	living with peers	,021	,030	,024	,711	,477	,085	,021	,017	,533	1,875
	living alone	-,031	,032	-,032	-,966	,334	-,131	-,028	-,024	,526	1,903
	living with your partner	,043	,045	,030	,944	,345	,034	,027	,023	,580	1,725
	Dutch	,088	,024	,091	3,605	,000	,153	,104	,088	,935	1,069
	study results	,022	,013	,041	1,625	,104	,013	,047	,040	,920	1,087
	study phase	,070	,028	,074	2,537	,011	,079	,073	,062	,705	1,418
	negative sexual experiences	-,023	,027	-,021	-,837	,403	-,078	-,024	-,020	,940	1,063
	peer pressure lifestyle self-efficacy	,056	,008	,167	6,596	,000	,183	,188	,161	,926	1,080
	problem perception	-,319	,017	-,475	-18,503	,000	-,494	-,473	-,451	,903	1,108
	seeking or having help	,044	,022	,049	1,968	,049	,002	,057	,048	,957	1,045

a. Dependent Variable: student health (risk) behaviour (general)

Table 9.2

Model Summary									
Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate	R Square Change	Change Statistics			Sig. F Change
						F Change	df1	df2	
1	,046 <sup>a</sup>	,002	,001	,43797	,002	2,590	1	1204	,108
2	,228 <sup>b</sup>	,052	,043	,42865	,050	6,289	10	1194	,000
3	,541 <sup>c</sup>	,293	,284	,37082	,241	101,366	4	1190	,000

a. Predictors: (Constant), law students

b. Predictors: (Constant), law students, living with peers, bmi, having a relationship, Dutch, study results, Sex, Age, living with your partner, study phase, living alone

c. Predictors: (Constant), law students, living with peers, bmi, having a relationship, Dutch, study results, Sex, Age, living with your partner, study phase, living alone, seeking or having help, negative sexual experiences, peer pressure lifestyle self-efficacy, problem perception

Table 9.3

ANOVA <sup>a</sup>						
Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	,497	1	,497	2,590	,108 <sup>b</sup>
	Residual	230,946	1204	,192		
	Total	231,443	1205			
2	Regression	12,053	11	1,096	5,963	,000 <sup>c</sup>
	Residual	219,390	1194	,184		
	Total	231,443	1205			
3	Regression	67,808	15	4,521	32,874	,000 <sup>d</sup>
	Residual	163,636	1190	,138		
	Total	231,443	1205			

a. Dependent Variable: student health (risk) behaviour (general)

b. Predictors: (Constant), law students

c. Predictors: (Constant), law students, living with peers, bmi, having a relationship, Dutch, study results, Sex, Age, living with your partner, study phase, living alone

d. Predictors: (Constant), law students, living with peers, bmi, having a relationship, Dutch, study results, Sex, Age, living with your partner, study phase, living alone, seeking or having help, negative sexual experiences, peer pressure lifestyle self-efficacy, problem perception

Table 10.1-10.3. Hierarchical regression analysis for satisfaction with study whereby law students are compared with non-law students.

Step 1 N = 2393, step 2 N = 2348, step 3 N = 1206.

Table 10.1

Coefficients <sup>a</sup>											
Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.	Correlations			Collinearity Statistics	
		B	Std. Error	Beta			Zero-order	Partial	Part	Tolerance	VIF
1	(Constant)	3,501	,022		156,185	,000					
	law students	-,106	,054	-,057	-1,973	,049	-,057	-,057	-,057	1,000	1,000
2	(Constant)	1,125	,233		4,820	,000					
	law students	,013	,048	,007	,280	,779	-,057	,008	,007	,921	1,086
	Sex	-,043	,040	-,027	-1,082	,280	-,008	-,031	-,027	,947	1,056
	Age	-,025	,006	-,132	-4,468	,000	-,174	-,128	-,110	,699	1,431
	bmi	,002	,003	,019	,756	,450	-,003	,022	,019	,983	1,017
	having a relationship	,082	,039	,057	2,107	,035	-,010	,061	,052	,827	1,210
	living with peers	-,065	,048	-,044	-1,334	,182	,044	-,039	-,033	,552	1,810
	living alone	-,106	,051	-,070	-2,077	,038	-,030	-,060	-,051	,540	1,853
	living with your partner	-,186	,073	-,081	-2,534	,011	-,082	-,073	-,062	,589	1,697
	Dutch	,283	,039	,181	7,219	,000	,179	,205	,178	,964	1,038
	study results	,399	,022	,471	18,417	,000	,458	,470	,453	,925	1,081
	study phase	,005	,045	,003	,100	,920	-,009	,003	,002	,710	1,409
3	(Constant)	1,555	,260		5,989	,000					
	law students	,008	,047	,004	,161	,872	-,057	,005	,004	,919	1,088
	Sex	,001	,040	,001	,034	,973	-,008	,001	,001	,887	1,127
	Age	-,024	,006	-,125	-4,334	,000	-,174	-,125	-,104	,690	1,449
	bmi	,003	,003	,030	1,228	,220	-,003	,036	,029	,978	1,022
	having a relationship	,045	,039	,032	1,175	,240	-,010	,034	,028	,796	1,257
	living with peers	-,074	,048	-,050	-1,538	,124	,044	-,045	-,037	,533	1,875
	living alone	-,077	,050	-,051	-1,533	,125	-,030	-,044	-,037	,526	1,903
	living with your partner	-,130	,072	-,057	-1,799	,072	-,082	-,052	-,043	,580	1,725
	Dutch	,231	,039	,147	5,942	,000	,179	,170	,142	,935	1,069
	study results	,401	,021	,474	18,965	,000	,458	,482	,455	,920	1,087
	study phase	-,001	,044	-,001	-,020	,984	-,009	-,001	,000	,705	1,418
	negative sexual experiences	-,099	,043	-,057	-2,292	,022	-,086	-,066	-,055	,940	1,063
	peer pressure lifestyle self-efficacy	-,004	,013	-,007	-,269	,788	,001	-,008	-,006	,926	1,080
	problem perception	-,158	,027	-,145	-5,757	,000	-,149	-,165	-,138	,903	1,108
	seeking or having help	-,170	,035	-,119	-4,844	,000	-,180	-,139	-,116	,957	1,045

a. Dependent Variable: satisfaction with study



Table 10.2

**Model Summary**

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate	R Square Change	Change Statistics			Sig. F Change
						F Change	df1	df2	
1	,057 <sup>a</sup>	,003	,002	,70780	,003	3,893	1	1204	,049
2	,526 <sup>b</sup>	,277	,270	,60535	,274	45,199	10	1194	,000
3	,562 <sup>c</sup>	,316	,308	,58965	,039	17,112	4	1190	,000

a. Predictors: (Constant), law students

b. Predictors: (Constant), law students, living with peers, bmi, having a relationship, Dutch, study results, Sex, Age, living with your partner, study phase, living alone

c. Predictors: (Constant), law students, living with peers, bmi, having a relationship, Dutch, study results, Sex, Age, living with your partner, study phase, living alone, seeking or having help, negative sexual experiences, peer pressure lifestyle self-efficacy, problem perception

Table 10.3

**ANOVA<sup>a</sup>**

Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	1,950	1	1,950	3,893	,049 <sup>b</sup>
	Residual	603,175	1204	,501		
	Total	605,125	1205			
2	Regression	167,583	11	15,235	41,574	,000 <sup>c</sup>
	Residual	437,542	1194	,366		
	Total	605,125	1205			
3	Regression	191,381	15	12,759	36,696	,000 <sup>d</sup>
	Residual	413,744	1190	,348		
	Total	605,125	1205			

a. Dependent Variable: satisfaction with study

b. Predictors: (Constant), law students

c. Predictors: (Constant), law students, living with peers, bmi, having a relationship, Dutch, study results, Sex, Age, living with your partner, study phase, living alone

d. Predictors: (Constant), law students, living with peers, bmi, having a relationship, Dutch, study results, Sex, Age, living with your partner, study phase, living alone, seeking or having help, negative sexual experiences, peer pressure lifestyle self-efficacy, problem perception

Table 11.1-11.3. Hierarchical regression analysis for quality of student life whereby law students are compared with non-law students.

Step 1 N = 2393, step 2 N = 2348, step 3 N = 1206.

Table 11.1

Coefficients <sup>a</sup>											
Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.	Correlations			Collinearity Statistics	
		B	Std. Error	Beta			Zero-order	Partial	Part	Tolerance	VIF
1	(Constant)	3,609	,019		194,964	,000					
	law students	,025	,044	,016	,570	,569	,016	,016	,016	1,000	1,000
2	(Constant)	3,547	,218		16,273	,000					
	law students	,021	,045	,014	,475	,635	,016	,014	,013	,921	1,086
	Sex	-,006	,037	-,005	-,161	,872	,021	-,005	-,004	,947	1,056
	Age	-,019	,005	-,122	-3,653	,000	-,089	-,105	-,102	,699	1,431
	bmi	,003	,002	,035	1,240	,215	,014	,036	,035	,983	1,017
	having a relationship	,217	,036	,183	5,977	,000	,168	,170	,167	,827	1,210
	living with peers	,151	,045	,125	3,332	,001	,124	,096	,093	,552	1,810
	living alone	-,002	,048	-,002	-,047	,962	-,113	-,001	-,001	,540	1,853
	living with your partner	,049	,069	,026	,711	,477	,033	,021	,020	,589	1,697
	Dutch	,137	,037	,106	3,736	,000	,119	,107	,104	,964	1,038
	study results	,027	,020	,039	1,351	,177	,034	,039	,038	,925	1,081
	study phase	,043	,042	,034	1,015	,310	,011	,029	,028	,710	1,409
3	(Constant)	4,026	,232		17,344	,000					
	law students	,014	,042	,009	,324	,746	,016	,009	,008	,919	1,088
	Sex	,047	,036	,036	1,312	,190	,021	,038	,034	,887	1,127
	Age	-,019	,005	-,119	-3,806	,000	-,089	-,110	-,099	,690	1,449
	bmi	,005	,002	,054	2,065	,039	,014	,060	,054	,978	1,022
	having a relationship	,147	,034	,125	4,276	,000	,168	,123	,111	,796	1,257
	living with peers	,149	,043	,123	3,458	,001	,124	,100	,090	,533	1,875
	living alone	,058	,045	,046	1,297	,195	-,113	,038	,034	,526	1,903
	living with your partner	,142	,064	,075	2,202	,028	,033	,064	,057	,580	1,725
	Dutch	,060	,035	,047	1,742	,082	,119	,050	,045	,935	1,069
	study results	,035	,019	,050	1,829	,068	,034	,053	,048	,920	1,087
	study phase	,034	,039	,026	,849	,396	,011	,025	,022	,705	1,418
	negative sexual experiences	-,194	,039	-,134	-5,006	,000	-,170	-,144	-,130	,940	1,063
	peer pressure lifestyle self-efficacy	,017	,012	,038	1,415	,157	,055	,041	,037	,926	1,080
	problem perception	-,260	,024	-,290	-10,605	,000	-,339	-,294	-,276	,903	1,108
	seeking or having help	-,152	,031	-,128	-4,834	,000	-,155	-,139	-,126	,957	1,045

a. Dependent Variable: quality of student life

Table 11.2

Model Summary									
Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate	R Square Change	Change Statistics			Sig. F Change
						F Change	df1	df2	
1	,016 <sup>a</sup>	,000	-,001	,58454	,000	,325	1	1204	,569
2	,270 <sup>b</sup>	,073	,065	,56519	,073	9,388	10	1194	,000
3	,443 <sup>c</sup>	,196	,186	,52716	,123	45,615	4	1190	,000

a. Predictors: (Constant), law students

b. Predictors: (Constant), law students, living with peers, bmi, having a relationship, Dutch, study results, Sex, Age, living with your partner, study phase, living alone

c. Predictors: (Constant), law students, living with peers, bmi, having a relationship, Dutch, study results, Sex, Age, living with your partner, study phase, living alone, seeking or having help, negative sexual experiences, peer pressure lifestyle self-efficacy, problem perception

Table 11.3

ANOVA <sup>a</sup>						
Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	,111	1	,111	,325	,569 <sup>b</sup>
	Residual	411,395	1204	,342		
	Total	411,506	1205			
2	Regression	30,100	11	2,736	8,566	,000 <sup>c</sup>
	Residual	381,406	1194	,319		
	Total	411,506	1205			
3	Regression	80,806	15	5,387	19,385	,000 <sup>d</sup>
	Residual	330,701	1190	,278		
	Total	411,506	1205			

a. Dependent Variable: quality of student life

b. Predictors: (Constant), law students

c. Predictors: (Constant), law students, living with peers, bmi, having a relationship, Dutch, study results, Sex, Age, living with your partner, study phase, living alone

d. Predictors: (Constant), law students, living with peers, bmi, having a relationship, Dutch, study results, Sex, Age, living with your partner, study phase, living alone, seeking or having help, negative sexual experiences, peer pressure lifestyle self-efficacy, problem perception

## Appendix 12: Hierarchical regression analyses whereby psychology students are compared with non-psychology students

Table 1.1-1.3. Hierarchical regression analysis for general health whereby psychology students are compared with non-psychology students.

Step 1 N = 2393, step 2 N = 2348, step 3 N = 1206.

Table 1.1

### Coefficients<sup>a</sup>

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.	Correlations			Collinearity Statistics	
		B	Std. Error	Beta			Zero-order	Partial	Part	Tolerance	VIF
1	(Constant)	59,878	,629		95,168	,000					
	psychology students	-1,575	3,747	-,012	-,420	,674	-,012	-,012	-,012	1,000	1,000
2	(Constant)	60,952	8,163		7,467	,000					
	psychology students	-,653	3,711	-,005	-,176	,860	-,012	-,005	-,005	,990	1,010
	Sex	-5,841	1,382	-,123	-4,226	,000	-,132	-,121	-,120	,952	1,050
	Age	,053	,197	,009	,270	,787	,003	,008	,008	,702	1,424
	bmi	-,016	,093	-,005	-,169	,866	-,004	-,005	-,005	,983	1,017
	having a relationship	,345	1,361	,008	,253	,800	-,025	,007	,007	,827	1,210
	living with peers	4,163	1,692	,094	2,461	,014	,119	,071	,070	,558	1,792
	living alone	-,319	1,769	-,007	-,180	,857	-,054	-,005	-,005	,553	1,809
	living with your partner	-2,993	2,568	-,043	-1,165	,244	-,069	-,034	-,033	,593	1,687
	Dutch	3,498	1,373	,074	2,548	,011	,082	,074	,072	,969	1,032
	study results	,535	,751	,021	,713	,476	,019	,021	,020	,946	1,057
	study phase	1,498	1,581	,032	,948	,344	,014	,027	,027	,712	1,404
3	(Constant)	75,543	9,018		8,377	,000					
	psychology students	-,360	3,591	-,003	-,100	,920	-,012	-,003	-,003	,988	1,012
	Sex	-4,492	1,380	-,095	-3,254	,001	-,132	-,094	-,089	,892	1,121
	Age	,073	,191	,013	,383	,702	,003	,011	,011	,693	1,443
	bmi	,035	,090	,011	,382	,703	-,004	,011	,010	,978	1,023
	having a relationship	-1,291	1,341	-,030	-,963	,336	-,025	-,028	-,026	,796	1,257
	living with peers	3,981	1,665	,089	2,391	,017	,119	,069	,066	,538	1,858
	living alone	,993	1,734	,021	,573	,567	-,054	,017	,016	,538	1,859
	living with your partner	-,650	2,503	-,009	-,260	,795	-,069	-,008	-,007	,583	1,715
	Dutch	1,454	1,347	,031	1,080	,281	,082	,031	,030	,940	1,064
	study results	,660	,728	,026	,907	,365	,019	,026	,025	,941	1,062
	study phase	1,359	1,533	,029	,887	,375	,014	,026	,024	,708	1,412
	negative sexual experiences	-3,075	1,510	-,058	-2,037	,042	-,102	-,059	-,056	,940	1,064
	peer pressure lifestyle self-efficacy	,299	,468	,018	,638	,524	-,003	,018	,018	,926	1,080
	problem perception	-6,712	,953	-,204	-7,044	,000	-,231	-,200	-,193	,903	1,108
	seeking or having help	-6,038	1,223	-,139	-4,936	,000	-,172	-,142	-,135	,956	1,046

a. Dependent Variable: general health

Table 1.2

Model Summary									
Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate	R Square Change	F Change	df1	df2	Sig. F Change
1	,012 <sup>a</sup>	,000	-,001	21,53979	,000	,177	1	1204	,674
2	,194 <sup>b</sup>	,037	,029	21,22249	,037	4,627	10	1194	,000
3	,322 <sup>c</sup>	,103	,092	20,51590	,066	21,915	4	1190	,000

a. Predictors: (Constant), psychology students

b. Predictors: (Constant), psychology students, study results, bmi, living with your partner, Dutch, Sex, living alone, study phase, having a relationship, Age, living with peers

c. Predictors: (Constant), psychology students, study results, bmi, living with your partner, Dutch, Sex, living alone, study phase, having a relationship, Age, living with peers, seeking or having help, negative sexual experiences, peer pressure lifestyle self-efficacy, problem perception

Table 1.3

ANOVA <sup>a</sup>						
Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	81,995	1	81,995	,177	,674 <sup>b</sup>
	Residual	558610,685	1204	463,962		
	Total	558692,680	1205			
2	Regression	20921,971	11	1901,997	4,223	,000 <sup>c</sup>
	Residual	537770,709	1194	450,394		
	Total	558692,680	1205			
3	Regression	57818,967	15	3854,598	9,158	,000 <sup>d</sup>
	Residual	500873,713	1190	420,902		
	Total	558692,680	1205			

a. Dependent Variable: general health

b. Predictors: (Constant), psychology students

c. Predictors: (Constant), psychology students, study results, bmi, living with your partner, Dutch, Sex, living alone, study phase, having a relationship, Age, living with peers

d. Predictors: (Constant), psychology students, study results, bmi, living with your partner, Dutch, Sex, living alone, study phase, having a relationship, Age, living with peers, seeking or having help, negative sexual experiences, peer pressure lifestyle self-efficacy, problem perception

Table 2.1-2.3. Hierarchical regression analysis for vitality whereby psychology students are compared with non-psychology students.

Step 1 N = 2393, step 2 N = 2348, step 3 N = 1206.

Table 2.1

		Coefficients <sup>a</sup>									
		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients			Correlations			Collinearity Statistics	
Model		B	Std. Error	Beta	t	Sig.	Zero-order	Partial	Part	Tolerance	VIF
1	(Constant)	45,511	,594		76,602	,000					
	psychology students	-3,391	3,538	-,028	-,958	,338	-,028	-,028	-,028	1,000	1,000
2	(Constant)	40,603	7,483		5,426	,000					
	psychology students	-1,961	3,402	-,016	-,576	,564	-,028	-,017	-,016	,990	1,010
	Sex	-6,233	1,267	-,139	-4,920	,000	-,161	-,141	-,136	,952	1,050
	Age	,249	,180	,045	1,381	,168	,003	,040	,038	,702	1,424
	bmi	-,016	,086	-,005	-,190	,849	-,013	-,006	-,005	,983	1,017
	having a relationship	-,847	1,247	-,021	-,679	,497	-,056	-,020	-,019	,827	1,210
	living with peers	6,333	1,551	,151	4,083	,000	,185	,117	,113	,558	1,792
	living alone	-,587	1,622	-,013	-,362	,718	-,099	-,010	-,010	,553	1,809
	living with your partner	-1,937	2,355	-,029	-,823	,411	-,086	-,024	-,023	,593	1,687
	Dutch	8,359	1,258	,186	6,642	,000	,200	,189	,183	,969	1,032
	study results	,366	,688	,015	,532	,594	,002	,015	,015	,946	1,057
	study phase	-,385	1,449	-,009	-,265	,791	-,025	-,008	-,007	,712	1,404
3	(Constant)	62,961	8,184		7,693	,000					
	psychology students	-1,591	3,259	-,013	-,488	,625	-,028	-,014	-,013	,988	1,012
	Sex	-4,135	1,253	-,092	-3,300	,001	-,161	-,095	-,087	,892	1,121
	Age	,291	,174	,053	1,677	,094	,003	,049	,044	,693	1,443
	bmi	,029	,082	,009	,348	,728	-,013	,010	,009	,978	1,023
	having a relationship	-2,562	1,217	-,062	-2,105	,035	-,056	-,061	-,056	,796	1,257
	living with peers	5,592	1,511	,133	3,700	,000	,185	,107	,098	,538	1,858
	living alone	,620	1,574	,014	,394	,694	-,099	,011	,010	,538	1,859
	living with your partner	,260	2,272	,004	,114	,909	-,086	,003	,003	,583	1,715
	Dutch	6,121	1,223	,136	5,006	,000	,200	,144	,132	,940	1,064
	study results	,595	,660	,024	,901	,368	,002	,026	,024	,941	1,062
	study phase	-,801	1,391	-,018	-,575	,565	-,025	-,017	-,015	,708	1,412
	negative sexual experiences	-5,519	1,371	-,110	-4,026	,000	-,164	-,116	-,106	,940	1,064
	peer pressure lifestyle self-efficacy	-,715	,425	-,046	-1,683	,093	-,073	-,049	-,044	,926	1,080
	problem perception	-7,151	,865	-,230	-8,269	,000	-,274	-,233	-,218	,903	1,108
	seeking or having help	-4,707	1,110	-,114	-4,240	,000	-,163	-,122	-,112	,956	1,046

a. Dependent Variable: vitality

Table 2.2

Model Summary									
Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate	R Square Change	Change Statistics			Sig. F Change
						F Change	df1	df2	
1	,028 <sup>a</sup>	,001	,000	20,33965	,001	,918	1	1204	,338
2	,305 <sup>b</sup>	,093	,085	19,45592	,093	12,186	10	1194	,000
3	,415 <sup>c</sup>	,172	,162	18,62049	,079	28,386	4	1190	,000

a. Predictors: (Constant), psychology students

b. Predictors: (Constant), psychology students, study results, bmi, living with your partner, Dutch, Sex, living alone, study phase, having a relationship, Age, living with peers

c. Predictors: (Constant), psychology students, study results, bmi, living with your partner, Dutch, Sex, living alone, study phase, having a relationship, Age, living with peers, seeking or having help, negative sexual experiences, peer pressure lifestyle self-efficacy, problem perception

Table 2.3

ANOVA <sup>a</sup>						
Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	379,867	1	379,867	,918	,338 <sup>b</sup>
	Residual	498096,447	1204	413,701		
	Total	498476,314	1205			
2	Regression	46507,903	11	4227,991	11,169	,000 <sup>c</sup>
	Residual	451968,411	1194	378,533		
	Total	498476,314	1205			
3	Regression	85876,169	15	5725,078	16,512	,000 <sup>d</sup>
	Residual	412600,144	1190	346,723		
	Total	498476,314	1205			

a. Dependent Variable: vitality

b. Predictors: (Constant), psychology students

c. Predictors: (Constant), psychology students, study results, bmi, living with your partner, Dutch, Sex, living alone, study phase, having a relationship, Age, living with peers

d. Predictors: (Constant), psychology students, study results, bmi, living with your partner, Dutch, Sex, living alone, study phase, having a relationship, Age, living with peers, seeking or having help, negative sexual experiences, peer pressure lifestyle self-efficacy, problem perception



Table 3.1-3.3. Hierarchical regression analysis for depression whereby psychology students are compared with non-psychology students.

Step 1 N = 2393, step 2 N = 2348, step 3 N = 1206.

Table 3.1

		Coefficients <sup>a</sup>									
Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.	Correlations			Collinearity Statistics	
		B	Std. Error	Beta			Zero-order	Partial	Part	Tolerance	VIF
1	(Constant)	15,244	,152		100,551	,000					
	psychology students	1,168	,903	,037	1,293	,196	,037	,037	,037	1,000	1,000
2	(Constant)	16,470	1,932		8,525	,000					
	psychology students	,831	,878	,027	,946	,344	,037	,027	,026	,990	1,010
	Sex	2,193	,327	,191	6,703	,000	,196	,190	,187	,952	1,050
	Age	,027	,047	,019	,574	,566	,011	,017	,016	,702	1,424
	bmi	,000	,022	,001	,019	,985	-,005	,001	,001	,983	1,017
	having a relationship	,112	,322	,011	,349	,727	,049	,010	,010	,827	1,210
	living with peers	-,895	,400	-,083	-2,236	,026	-,128	-,065	-,062	,558	1,792
	living alone	,377	,419	,034	,900	,368	,069	,026	,025	,553	1,809
	living with your partner	,592	,608	,035	,975	,330	,070	,028	,027	,593	1,687
	Dutch	-,597	,325	-,052	-1,838	,066	-,060	-,053	-,051	,969	1,032
	study results	-,693	,178	-,112	-3,902	,000	-,112	-,112	-,109	,946	1,057
	study phase	-,621	,374	-,055	-1,661	,097	-,035	-,048	-,046	,712	1,404
3	(Constant)	11,969	2,086		5,739	,000					
	psychology students	,671	,831	,021	,808	,419	,037	,023	,021	,988	1,012
	Sex	1,678	,319	,147	5,257	,000	,196	,151	,138	,892	1,121
	Age	,009	,044	,007	,208	,835	,011	,006	,005	,693	1,443
	bmi	-,013	,021	-,016	-,617	,537	-,005	-,018	-,016	,978	1,023
	having a relationship	,500	,310	,048	1,613	,107	,049	,047	,042	,796	1,257
	living with peers	-,834	,385	-,078	-2,166	,031	-,128	-,063	-,057	,538	1,858
	living alone	,022	,401	,002	,055	,956	,069	,002	,001	,538	1,859
	living with your partner	-,091	,579	-,005	-,158	,875	,070	-,005	-,004	,583	1,715
	Dutch	,022	,312	,002	,070	,944	-,060	,002	,002	,940	1,064
	study results	-,715	,168	-,115	-4,248	,000	-,112	-,122	-,112	,941	1,062
	study phase	-,545	,355	-,048	-1,536	,125	-,035	-,044	-,040	,708	1,412
	negative sexual experiences	1,239	,349	,096	3,547	,000	,149	,102	,093	,940	1,064
	peer pressure lifestyle self-efficacy	,015	,108	,004	,137	,891	,031	,004	,004	,926	1,080
	problem perception	1,696	,220	,213	7,696	,000	,238	,218	,203	,903	1,108
	seeking or having help	2,221	,283	,211	7,851	,000	,253	,222	,207	,956	1,046

a. Dependent Variable: depression



Table 3.2

Model Summary									
Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate	R Square Change	Change Statistics			Sig. F Change
1	,037 <sup>a</sup>	,001	,001	5,19011	,001	1,673	1	1204	,196
2	,269 <sup>b</sup>	,072	,064	5,02330	,071	9,129	10	1194	,000
3	,418 <sup>c</sup>	,175	,165	4,74516	,103	37,018	4	1190	,000

a. Predictors: (Constant), psychology students

b. Predictors: (Constant), psychology students, study results, bmi, living with your partner, Dutch, Sex, living alone, study phase, having a relationship, Age, living with peers

c. Predictors: (Constant), psychology students, study results, bmi, living with your partner, Dutch, Sex, living alone, study phase, having a relationship, Age, living with peers, seeking or having help, negative sexual experiences, peer pressure lifestyle self-efficacy, problem perception

Table 3.3

ANOVA <sup>a</sup>						
Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	45,056	1	45,056	1,673	,196 <sup>b</sup>
	Residual	32432,443	1204	26,937		
	Total	32477,499	1205			
2	Regression	2348,647	11	213,513	8,461	,000 <sup>c</sup>
	Residual	30128,853	1194	25,234		
	Total	32477,499	1205			
3	Regression	5682,767	15	378,851	16,825	,000 <sup>d</sup>
	Residual	26794,732	1190	22,517		
	Total	32477,499	1205			

a. Dependent Variable: depression

b. Predictors: (Constant), psychology students

c. Predictors: (Constant), psychology students, study results, bmi, living with your partner, Dutch, Sex, living alone, study phase, having a relationship, Age, living with peers

d. Predictors: (Constant), psychology students, study results, bmi, living with your partner, Dutch, Sex, living alone, study phase, having a relationship, Age, living with peers, seeking or having help, negative sexual experiences, peer pressure lifestyle self-efficacy, problem perception

Table 4.1-4.3. Hierarchical regression analysis for anxiety whereby psychology students are compared with non-psychology students.

Step 1 N = 2393, step 2 N = 2348, step 3 N = 1206.

Table 4.1

		Coefficients <sup>a</sup>									
Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.	Correlations			Collinearity Statistics	
		B	Std. Error	Beta			Zero-order	Partial	Part	Tolerance	VIF
1	(Constant)	7,042	,089		79,313	,000					
	psychology students	,546	,529	,030	1,033	,302	,030	,030	,030	1,000	1,000
2	(Constant)	8,070	1,128		7,156	,000					
	psychology students	,362	,513	,020	,706	,480	,030	,020	,020	,990	1,010
	Sex	,991	,191	,148	5,191	,000	,161	,149	,144	,952	1,050
	Age	,006	,027	,007	,211	,833	,027	,006	,006	,702	1,424
	bmi	-,014	,013	-,031	-1,091	,275	-,024	-,032	-,030	,983	1,017
	having a relationship	,015	,188	,002	,081	,935	,037	,002	,002	,827	1,210
	living with peers	-,688	,234	-,110	-2,945	,003	-,148	-,085	-,082	,558	1,792
	living alone	,159	,244	,024	,652	,514	,090	,019	,018	,553	1,809
	living with your partner	,154	,355	,016	,434	,665	,061	,013	,012	,593	1,687
	Dutch	-1,140	,190	-,170	-6,011	,000	-,180	-,171	-,167	,969	1,032
	study results	-,215	,104	-,059	-2,076	,038	-,049	-,060	-,058	,946	1,057
	study phase	-,087	,218	-,013	-,396	,692	,012	-,011	-,011	,712	1,404
3	(Constant)	6,473	1,233		5,249	,000					
	psychology students	,231	,491	,013	,470	,639	,030	,014	,012	,988	1,012
	Sex	,696	,189	,104	3,686	,000	,161	,106	,098	,892	1,121
	Age	-,009	,026	-,011	-,341	,733	,027	-,010	-,009	,693	1,443
	bmi	-,019	,012	-,042	-1,565	,118	-,024	-,045	-,042	,978	1,023
	having a relationship	,158	,183	,026	,861	,389	,037	,025	,023	,796	1,257
	living with peers	-,710	,228	-,113	-3,117	,002	-,148	-,090	-,083	,538	1,858
	living alone	-,043	,237	-,007	-,183	,855	,090	-,005	-,005	,538	1,859
	living with your partner	-,213	,342	-,022	-,622	,534	,061	-,018	-,017	,583	1,715
	Dutch	-,832	,184	-,124	-4,518	,000	-,180	-,130	-,120	,940	1,064
	study results	-,218	,100	-,060	-2,191	,029	-,049	-,063	-,058	,941	1,062
	study phase	-,023	,210	-,003	-,110	,912	,012	-,003	-,003	,708	1,412
	negative sexual experiences	,965	,207	,128	4,673	,000	,180	,134	,124	,940	1,064
	peer pressure lifestyle self-efficacy	-,006	,064	-,003	-,093	,926	,025	-,003	-,002	,926	1,080
	problem perception	,624	,130	,134	4,793	,000	,187	,138	,127	,903	1,108
	seeking or having help	1,280	,167	,208	7,653	,000	,249	,217	,204	,956	1,046

a. Dependent Variable: anxiety

Table 4.2

Model Summary									
Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate	R Square Change	Change Statistics			Sig. F Change
						F Change	df1	df2	
1	,030 <sup>a</sup>	,001	,000	3,03949	,001	1,068	1	1204	,302
2	,279 <sup>b</sup>	,078	,069	2,93207	,077	9,984	10	1194	,000
3	,398 <sup>c</sup>	,159	,148	2,80563	,081	28,512	4	1190	,000

a. Predictors: (Constant), psychology students

b. Predictors: (Constant), psychology students, study results, bmi, living with your partner, Dutch, Sex, living alone, study phase, having a relationship, Age, living with peers

c. Predictors: (Constant), psychology students, study results, bmi, living with your partner, Dutch, Sex, living alone, study phase, having a relationship, Age, living with peers, seeking or having help, negative sexual experiences, peer pressure lifestyle self-efficacy, problem perception

Table 4.3

ANOVA <sup>a</sup>						
Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	9,866	1	9,866	1,068	,302 <sup>b</sup>
	Residual	11123,187	1204	9,239		
	Total	11133,052	1205			
2	Regression	868,196	11	78,927	9,181	,000 <sup>c</sup>
	Residual	10264,856	1194	8,597		
	Total	11133,052	1205			
3	Regression	1765,925	15	117,728	14,956	,000 <sup>d</sup>
	Residual	9367,127	1190	7,872		
	Total	11133,052	1205			

a. Dependent Variable: anxiety

b. Predictors: (Constant), psychology students

c. Predictors: (Constant), psychology students, study results, bmi, living with your partner, Dutch, Sex, living alone, study phase, having a relationship, Age, living with peers

d. Predictors: (Constant), psychology students, study results, bmi, living with your partner, Dutch, Sex, living alone, study phase, having a relationship, Age, living with peers, seeking or having help, negative sexual experiences, peer pressure lifestyle self-efficacy, problem perception

Table 5.1-5.3. Hierarchical regression analysis for internet addiction whereby psychology students are compared with non-psychology students.

Step 1 N = 1158, step 2 N = 1142, step 3 N = 734.

Table 5.1

Coefficients <sup>a</sup>											
Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.	Correlations			Collinearity Statistics	
		B	Std. Error	Beta			Zero-order	Partial	Part	Tolerance	VIF
1	(Constant)	2,515	,025		101,573	,000					
	psychology students	,035	,150	,009	,236	,814	,009	,009	,009	1,000	1,000
2	(Constant)	3,585	,336		10,666	,000					
	psychology students	,022	,148	,005	,151	,880	,009	,006	,005	,975	1,026
	Sex	-,006	,053	-,004	-,112	,911	-,009	-,004	-,004	,934	1,071
	Age	,003	,009	,013	,290	,772	,009	,011	,010	,646	1,547
	bmi	-,002	,003	-,020	-,561	,575	-,007	-,021	-,020	,980	1,021
	having a relationship	-,135	,053	-,100	-2,556	,011	-,076	-,095	-,092	,848	1,179
	living with peers	-,206	,066	-,151	-3,129	,002	-,136	-,116	-,112	,556	1,800
	living alone	-,036	,068	-,026	-,539	,590	,074	-,020	-,019	,548	1,823
	living with your partner	-,007	,108	-,003	-,064	,949	,012	-,002	-,002	,647	1,545
	Dutch	-,241	,052	-,170	-4,636	,000	-,159	-,170	-,166	,964	1,038
	study results	-,109	,030	-,133	-3,597	,000	-,123	-,133	-,129	,938	1,066
	study phase	-,002	,065	-,002	-,037	,971	-,011	-,001	-,001	,666	1,502
3	(Constant)	3,348	,358		9,350	,000					
	psychology students	,030	,139	,008	,219	,827	,009	,008	,007	,972	1,029
	Sex	-,032	,052	-,022	-,610	,542	-,009	-,023	-,021	,874	1,144
	Age	,002	,009	,007	,173	,862	,009	,006	,006	,641	1,560
	bmi	-,003	,003	-,041	-1,185	,236	-,007	-,044	-,040	,972	1,029
	having a relationship	-,041	,051	-,031	-,818	,414	-,076	-,031	-,028	,813	1,229
	living with peers	-,223	,063	-,164	-3,544	,000	-,136	-,131	-,120	,536	1,864
	living alone	-,125	,065	-,090	-1,933	,054	,074	-,072	-,065	,532	1,880
	living with your partner	-,134	,103	-,055	-1,295	,196	,012	-,048	-,044	,634	1,577
	Dutch	-,186	,050	-,130	-3,735	,000	-,159	-,138	-,126	,940	1,064
	study results	-,106	,029	-,130	-3,698	,000	-,123	-,137	-,125	,932	1,073
	study phase	-,005	,061	-,003	-,076	,939	-,011	-,003	-,003	,662	1,510
	negative sexual experiences	,080	,057	,049	1,409	,159	,087	,053	,048	,936	1,069
	peer pressure lifestyle self-efficacy	-,062	,018	-,123	-3,472	,001	-,121	-,129	-,117	,913	1,095
	problem perception	,312	,037	,305	8,542	,000	,338	,304	,289	,895	1,118
	seeking or having help	,036	,047	,027	,768	,443	,080	,029	,026	,937	1,068

a. Dependent Variable: internet addiction

Table 5.2

**Model Summary**

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate	R Square Change	Change Statistics			Sig. F Change
						F Change	df1	df2	
1	,009 <sup>a</sup>	,000	-,001	,66166	,000	,056	1	732	,814
2	,264 <sup>b</sup>	,070	,056	,64255	,070	5,420	10	722	,000
3	,423 <sup>c</sup>	,179	,162	,60536	,109	23,860	4	718	,000

a. Predictors: (Constant), psychology students

b. Predictors: (Constant), psychology students, bmi, living with peers, Age, study results, Dutch, Sex, having a relationship, living with your partner, study phase, living alone

c. Predictors: (Constant), psychology students, bmi, living with peers, Age, study results, Dutch, Sex, having a relationship, living with your partner, study phase, living alone, seeking or having help, negative sexual experiences, peer pressure lifestyle self-efficacy, problem perception

Table 5.3

**ANOVA<sup>a</sup>**

Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	,024	1	,024	,056	,814 <sup>b</sup>
	Residual	320,467	732	,438		
	Total	320,491	733			
2	Regression	22,401	11	2,036	4,933	,000 <sup>c</sup>
	Residual	298,090	722	,413		
	Total	320,491	733			
3	Regression	57,376	15	3,825	10,438	,000 <sup>d</sup>
	Residual	263,115	718	,366		
	Total	320,491	733			

a. Dependent Variable: internet addiction

b. Predictors: (Constant), psychology students

c. Predictors: (Constant), psychology students, bmi, living with peers, Age, study results, Dutch, Sex, having a relationship, living with your partner, study phase, living alone

d. Predictors: (Constant), psychology students, bmi, living with peers, Age, study results, Dutch, Sex, having a relationship, living with your partner, study phase, living alone, seeking or having help, negative sexual experiences, peer pressure lifestyle self-efficacy, problem perception

Table 6.1-6.3. Hierarchical regression analysis for buying addiction whereby psychology students are compared with non-psychology students.

Step 1 N = 419, step 2 N = 412, step 3 N = 287.

Table 6.1

Coefficients <sup>a</sup>											
Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.	Correlations			Collinearity Statistics	
		B	Std. Error	Beta			Zero-order	Partial	Part	Tolerance	VIF
1	(Constant)	-,264	,114		-2,324	,021					
	psychology students	-,653	,786	-,049	-,830	,407	-,049	-,049	-,049	1,000	1,000
2	(Constant)	4,386	1,603		2,735	,007					
	psychology students	-,400	,777	-,030	-,515	,607	-,049	-,031	-,029	,953	1,050
	Sex	-,615	,280	-,130	-2,199	,029	-,124	-,131	-,126	,934	1,071
	Age	-,160	,042	-,265	-3,838	,000	-,235	-,225	-,219	,685	1,459
	bmi	,008	,028	,017	,284	,777	-,037	,017	,016	,936	1,068
	having a relationship	,220	,244	,056	,905	,366	,022	,055	,052	,839	1,191
	living with peers	-,187	,300	-,047	-,624	,533	,023	-,038	-,036	,570	1,756
	living alone	-,263	,311	-,066	-,845	,399	-,073	-,051	-,048	,537	1,862
	living with your partner	-,290	,476	-,043	-,610	,542	-,063	-,037	-,035	,655	1,528
	Dutch	,553	,255	,130	2,173	,031	,173	,130	,124	,917	1,091
	study results	-,071	,132	-,032	-,541	,589	-,015	-,033	-,031	,932	1,073
	study phase	,504	,311	,112	1,622	,106	-,054	,097	,093	,689	1,451
3	(Constant)	4,602	1,702		2,703	,007					
	psychology students	-,481	,755	-,036	-,638	,524	-,049	-,039	-,035	,943	1,061
	Sex	-,623	,277	-,132	-2,249	,025	-,124	-,135	-,124	,887	1,128
	Age	-,159	,041	-,262	-3,882	,000	-,235	-,229	-,214	,668	1,496
	bmi	,031	,028	,066	1,114	,266	-,037	,068	,061	,881	1,135
	having a relationship	,041	,239	,010	,171	,864	,022	,010	,009	,815	1,227
	living with peers	-,097	,296	-,024	-,327	,744	,023	-,020	-,018	,546	1,831
	living alone	-,153	,304	-,038	-,502	,616	-,073	-,030	-,028	,525	1,906
	living with your partner	-,111	,463	-,017	-,240	,810	-,063	-,015	-,013	,645	1,550
	Dutch	,408	,249	,095	1,636	,103	,173	,099	,090	,893	1,120
	study results	-,066	,129	-,030	-,516	,607	-,015	-,031	-,028	,910	1,098
	study phase	,449	,303	,100	1,486	,139	-,054	,090	,082	,678	1,475
	negative sexual experiences	-,483	,255	-,109	-1,891	,060	-,188	-,114	-,104	,922	1,085
	peer pressure lifestyle self-efficacy	,133	,072	,106	1,835	,068	,104	,111	,101	,918	1,090
	problem perception	-,672	,180	-,221	-3,731	,000	-,244	-,221	-,206	,869	1,150
	seeking or having help	,165	,222	,043	,745	,457	-,053	,045	,041	,902	1,109

a. Dependent Variable: buying addiction

Table 6.2

**Model Summary**

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate	R Square Change	Change Statistics			Sig. F Change
						F Change	df1	df2	
1	,049 <sup>a</sup>	,002	-,001	1,90463	,002	,690	1	285	,407
2	,322 <sup>b</sup>	,104	,068	1,83791	,101	3,107	10	275	,001
3	,419 <sup>c</sup>	,175	,130	1,77576	,072	5,896	4	271	,000

a. Predictors: (Constant), psychology students

b. Predictors: (Constant), psychology students, living alone, having a relationship, study results, bmi, Sex, Dutch, Age, living with your partner, study phase, living with peers

c. Predictors: (Constant), psychology students, living alone, having a relationship, study results, bmi, Sex, Dutch, Age, living with your partner, study phase, living with peers, peer pressure lifestyle self-efficacy, negative sexual experiences, seeking or having help, problem perception

Table 6.3

**ANOVA<sup>a</sup>**

Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	2,502	1	2,502	,690	,407 <sup>b</sup>
	Residual	1033,867	285	3,628		
	Total	1036,369	286			
2	Regression	107,443	11	9,768	2,892	,001 <sup>c</sup>
	Residual	928,926	275	3,378		
	Total	1036,369	286			
3	Regression	181,817	15	12,121	3,844	,000 <sup>d</sup>
	Residual	854,552	271	3,153		
	Total	1036,369	286			

a. Dependent Variable: buying addiction

b. Predictors: (Constant), psychology students

c. Predictors: (Constant), psychology students, living alone, having a relationship, study results, bmi, Sex, Dutch, Age, living with your partner, study phase, living with peers

d. Predictors: (Constant), psychology students, living alone, having a relationship, study results, bmi, Sex, Dutch, Age, living with your partner, study phase, living with peers, peer pressure lifestyle self-efficacy, negative sexual experiences, seeking or having help, problem perception

Table 7.1-7.3. Hierarchical regression analysis for eating disorder whereby psychology students are compared with non-psychology students.

Step 1 N = 2393, step 2 N = 2348, step 3 N = 1206.

Table 7.1

**Coefficients<sup>a</sup>**

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.	Correlations			Collinearity Statistics	
		B	Std. Error	Beta			Zero-order	Partial	Part	Tolerance	VIF
1	(Constant)	1,727	,039		44,480	,000					
	psychology students	-,227	,231	-,028	-,982	,327	-,028	-,028	-,028	1,000	1,000
2	(Constant)	-,705	,477		-1,479	,139					
	psychology students	-,384	,217	-,048	-1,770	,077	-,028	-,051	-,048	,990	1,010
	Sex	,992	,081	,338	12,288	,000	,325	,335	,330	,952	1,050
	Age	-,012	,011	-,033	-1,016	,310	-,066	-,029	-,027	,702	1,424
	bmi	,024	,005	,121	4,464	,000	,098	,128	,120	,983	1,017
	having a relationship	-,025	,079	-,009	-,319	,750	,007	-,009	-,009	,827	1,210
	living with peers	,199	,099	,073	2,018	,044	-,021	,058	,054	,558	1,792
	living alone	,363	,103	,127	3,516	,000	,090	,101	,094	,553	1,809
	living with your partner	,165	,150	,038	1,100	,271	,000	,032	,030	,593	1,687
	Dutch	,021	,080	,007	,266	,790	-,012	,008	,007	,969	1,032
	study results	,043	,044	,027	,990	,322	,041	,029	,027	,946	1,057
	study phase	-,149	,092	-,051	-1,617	,106	-,045	-,047	-,043	,712	1,404
3	(Constant)	-2,202	,514		-4,285	,000					
	psychology students	-,375	,205	-,047	-1,831	,067	-,028	-,053	-,046	,988	1,012
	Sex	,892	,079	,304	11,344	,000	,325	,312	,287	,892	1,121
	Age	-,009	,011	-,025	-,834	,404	-,066	-,024	-,021	,693	1,443
	bmi	,021	,005	,104	4,046	,000	,098	,116	,103	,978	1,023
	having a relationship	,141	,076	,052	1,846	,065	,007	,053	,047	,796	1,257
	living with peers	,252	,095	,092	2,660	,008	-,021	,077	,067	,538	1,858
	living alone	,261	,099	,091	2,640	,008	,090	,076	,067	,538	1,859
	living with your partner	,014	,143	,003	,101	,920	,000	,003	,003	,583	1,715
	Dutch	,166	,077	,057	2,168	,030	-,012	,063	,055	,940	1,064
	study results	,017	,041	,011	,404	,687	,041	,012	,010	,941	1,062
	study phase	-,130	,087	-,045	-1,485	,138	-,045	-,043	-,038	,708	1,412
	negative sexual experiences	,312	,086	,095	3,625	,000	,164	,105	,092	,940	1,064
	peer pressure lifestyle self-efficacy	,015	,027	,014	,548	,584	,037	,016	,014	,926	1,080
	problem perception	,625	,054	,307	11,509	,000	,323	,316	,292	,903	1,108
	seeking or having help	,023	,070	,009	,334	,738	,057	,010	,008	,956	1,046

a. Dependent Variable: eating pattern



Table 7.2

Model Summary									
Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate	R Square Change	Change Statistics			Sig. F Change
						F Change	df1	df2	
1	,028 <sup>a</sup>	,001	,000	1,32918	,001	,963	1	1204	,327
2	,372 <sup>b</sup>	,138	,130	1,23944	,138	19,065	10	1194	,000
3	,486 <sup>c</sup>	,236	,226	1,16907	,098	38,018	4	1190	,000

a. Predictors: (Constant), psychology students

b. Predictors: (Constant), psychology students, study results, bmi, living with your partner, Dutch, Sex, living alone, study phase, having a relationship, Age, living with peers

c. Predictors: (Constant), psychology students, study results, bmi, living with your partner, Dutch, Sex, living alone, study phase, having a relationship, Age, living with peers, seeking or having help, negative sexual experiences, peer pressure lifestyle self-efficacy, problem perception

Table 7.3

ANOVA <sup>a</sup>						
Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	1,702	1	1,702	,963	,327 <sup>b</sup>
	Residual	2127,128	1204	1,767		
	Total	2128,830	1205			
2	Regression	294,584	11	26,780	17,433	,000 <sup>c</sup>
	Residual	1834,246	1194	1,536		
	Total	2128,830	1205			
3	Regression	502,423	15	33,495	24,507	,000 <sup>d</sup>
	Residual	1626,407	1190	1,367		
	Total	2128,830	1205			

a. Dependent Variable: eating pattern

b. Predictors: (Constant), psychology students

c. Predictors: (Constant), psychology students, study results, bmi, living with your partner, Dutch, Sex, living alone, study phase, having a relationship, Age, living with peers

d. Predictors: (Constant), psychology students, study results, bmi, living with your partner, Dutch, Sex, living alone, study phase, having a relationship, Age, living with peers, seeking or having help, negative sexual experiences, peer pressure lifestyle self-efficacy, problem perception

Table 8.1-8.3. Hierarchical regression analysis for suicidal ideation whereby psychology students are compared with non-psychology students.  
Step 1 N = 949, step 2 N = 935, step 3 N = 590.

Table 8.1

		Coefficients <sup>a</sup>									
		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients			Correlations			Collinearity Statistics	
Model		B	Std. Error	Beta	t	Sig.	Zero-order	Partial	Part	Tolerance	VIF
1	(Constant)	6,961	,109		63,954	,000					
	psychology students	-,009	,577	-,001	-,016	,988	-,001	-,001	-,001	1,000	1,000
2	(Constant)	5,436	1,433		3,794	,000					
	psychology students	-,081	,578	-,006	-,140	,889	-,001	-,006	-,006	,987	1,013
	Sex	,407	,240	,073	1,701	,090	,056	,071	,070	,926	1,080
	Age	,042	,038	,054	1,084	,279	,013	,045	,045	,670	1,492
	bmi	-,009	,012	-,031	-,744	,457	-,021	-,031	-,031	,977	1,023
	having a relationship	-,387	,248	-,072	-1,559	,119	-,057	-,065	-,064	,782	1,278
	living with peers	,030	,304	,006	,099	,921	-,035	,004	,004	,529	1,890
	living alone	,328	,315	,060	1,043	,297	,073	,043	,043	,516	1,938
	living with your partner	,251	,451	,030	,557	,578	-,009	,023	,023	,569	1,757
	Dutch	-,514	,237	-,091	-2,170	,030	-,091	-,090	-,089	,969	1,032
	study results	,077	,127	,026	,605	,545	,026	,025	,025	,932	1,073
	study phase	-,398	,283	-,069	-1,403	,161	-,039	-,058	-,058	,701	1,427
3	(Constant)	3,423	1,602		2,137	,033					
	psychology students	,094	,563	,007	,167	,867	-,001	,007	,007	,977	1,024
	Sex	,180	,242	,032	,741	,459	,056	,031	,029	,847	1,181
	Age	,027	,037	,035	,711	,477	,013	,030	,028	,662	1,510
	bmi	-,010	,012	-,035	-,857	,392	-,021	-,036	-,034	,972	1,029
	having a relationship	-,124	,245	-,023	-,504	,615	-,057	-,021	-,020	,749	1,336
	living with peers	,081	,298	,015	,271	,787	-,035	,011	,011	,515	1,940
	living alone	,139	,307	,025	,452	,651	,073	,019	,018	,506	1,975
	living with your partner	-,037	,439	-,005	-,085	,932	-,009	-,004	-,003	,562	1,778
	Dutch	-,215	,234	-,038	-,919	,359	-,091	-,038	-,037	,927	1,079
	study results	,066	,123	,022	,535	,593	,026	,022	,021	,927	1,079
	study phase	-,302	,276	-,052	-1,091	,276	-,039	-,045	-,043	,689	1,451
	negative sexual experiences	,896	,246	,151	3,642	,000	,186	,150	,145	,914	1,095
	peer pressure lifestyle self-efficacy	,000	,082	,000	,002	,998	-,010	,000	,000	,909	1,101
	problem perception	,810	,170	,200	4,758	,000	,223	,195	,189	,892	1,121
	seeking or having help	,437	,219	,081	1,991	,047	,108	,083	,079	,964	1,037

a. Dependent Variable: suicidal ideation

Table 8.2

**Model Summary**

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate	R Square Change	Change Statistics			Sig. F Change
						F Change	df1	df2	
1	,001 <sup>a</sup>	,000	-,002	2,59647	,000	,000	1	588	,988
2	,158 <sup>b</sup>	,025	,006	2,58584	,025	1,485	10	578	,141
3	,305 <sup>c</sup>	,093	,070	2,50244	,068	10,792	4	574	,000

a. Predictors: (Constant), psychology students

b. Predictors: (Constant), psychology students, bmi, study results, living with your partner, Dutch, Sex, living with peers, study phase, having a relationship, Age, living alone

c. Predictors: (Constant), psychology students, bmi, study results, living with your partner, Dutch, Sex, living with peers, study phase, having a relationship, Age, living alone, seeking or having help, negative sexual experiences, peer pressure lifestyle self-efficacy, problem perception

Table 8.3

**ANOVA<sup>a</sup>**

Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	,002	1	,002	,000	,988 <sup>b</sup>
	Residual	3964,102	588	6,742		
	Total	3964,103	589			
2	Regression	99,279	11	9,025	1,350	,193 <sup>c</sup>
	Residual	3864,825	578	6,687		
	Total	3964,103	589			
3	Regression	369,607	15	24,640	3,935	,000 <sup>d</sup>
	Residual	3594,496	574	6,262		
	Total	3964,103	589			

a. Dependent Variable: suicidal ideation

b. Predictors: (Constant), psychology students

c. Predictors: (Constant), psychology students, bmi, study results, living with your partner, Dutch, Sex, living with peers, study phase, having a relationship, Age, living alone

d. Predictors: (Constant), psychology students, bmi, study results, living with your partner, Dutch, Sex, living with peers, study phase, having a relationship, Age, living alone, seeking or having help, negative sexual experiences, peer pressure lifestyle self-efficacy, problem perception

Table 9.1-9.3. Hierarchical regression analysis for student health (risk) behaviour (general) whereby psychology students are compared with non-psychology students.  
Step 1 N = 2393, step 2 N = 2348, step 3 N = 1206.

Table 9.1

		Coefficients <sup>a</sup>									
Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.	Correlations			Collinearity Statistics	
		B	Std. Error	Beta			Zero-order	Partial	Part	Tolerance	VIF
1	(Constant)	3,419	,013		266,987	,000					
	psychology students	,047	,076	,018	,618	,537	,018	,018	,018	1,000	1,000
2	(Constant)	3,233	,165		19,610	,000					
	psychology students	,035	,075	,013	,469	,639	,018	,014	,013	,990	1,010
	Sex	-,004	,028	-,004	-,142	,887	,003	-,004	-,004	,952	1,050
	Age	,004	,004	,034	1,013	,311	,043	,029	,029	,702	1,424
	bmi	-,004	,002	-,057	-2,011	,045	-,073	-,058	-,057	,983	1,017
	having a relationship	,049	,027	,055	1,783	,075	,073	,052	,050	,827	1,210
	living with peers	,018	,034	,020	,529	,597	,085	,015	,015	,558	1,792
	living alone	-,094	,036	-,100	-2,636	,009	-,131	-,076	-,074	,553	1,809
	living with your partner	-,037	,052	-,026	-,711	,477	,034	-,021	-,020	,593	1,687
	Dutch	,144	,028	,149	5,188	,000	,153	,148	,146	,969	1,032
	study results	,009	,015	,018	,625	,532	,013	,018	,018	,946	1,057
	study phase	,064	,032	,067	2,008	,045	,079	,058	,057	,712	1,404
3	(Constant)	3,524	,163		21,623	,000					
	psychology students	,016	,065	,006	,243	,808	,018	,007	,006	,988	1,012
	Sex	-,009	,025	-,009	-,355	,723	,003	-,010	-,009	,892	1,121
	Age	,000	,003	-,002	-,061	,952	,043	-,002	-,001	,693	1,443
	bmi	-,002	,002	-,027	-1,101	,271	-,073	-,032	-,027	,978	1,023
	having a relationship	-,043	,024	-,049	-1,795	,073	,073	-,052	-,044	,796	1,257
	living with peers	,021	,030	,023	,701	,484	,085	,020	,017	,538	1,858
	living alone	-,031	,031	-,033	-1,000	,318	-,131	-,029	-,024	,538	1,859
	living with your partner	,042	,045	,030	,937	,349	,034	,027	,023	,583	1,715
	Dutch	,088	,024	,091	3,622	,000	,153	,104	,088	,940	1,064
	study results	,021	,013	,041	1,626	,104	,013	,047	,040	,941	1,062
	study phase	,070	,028	,073	2,537	,011	,079	,073	,062	,708	1,412
	negative sexual experiences	-,023	,027	-,021	-,842	,400	-,078	-,024	-,021	,940	1,064
	peer pressure lifestyle self-efficacy	,056	,008	,167	6,601	,000	,183	,188	,161	,926	1,080
	problem perception	-,319	,017	-,475	-18,499	,000	-,494	-,473	-,451	,903	1,108
	seeking or having help	,043	,022	,049	1,959	,050	,002	,057	,048	,956	1,046

a. Dependent Variable: student health (risk) behaviour (general)

Table 9.2

Model Summary									
Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate	R Square Change	F Change	df1	df2	Sig. F Change
1	,018 <sup>a</sup>	,000	-,001	,43837	,000	,382	1	1204	,537
2	,228 <sup>b</sup>	,052	,043	,42865	,052	6,524	10	1194	,000
3	,541 <sup>c</sup>	,293	,284	,37082	,241	101,367	4	1190	,000

a. Predictors: (Constant), psychology students

b. Predictors: (Constant), psychology students, study results, bmi, living with your partner, Dutch, Sex, living alone, study phase, having a relationship, Age, living with peers

c. Predictors: (Constant), psychology students, study results, bmi, living with your partner, Dutch, Sex, living alone, study phase, having a relationship, Age, living with peers, seeking or having help, negative sexual experiences, peer pressure lifestyle self-efficacy, problem perception

Table 9.3

ANOVA <sup>a</sup>						
Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	,073	1	,073	,382	,537 <sup>b</sup>
	Residual	231,370	1204	,192		
	Total	231,443	1205			
2	Regression	12,060	11	1,096	5,967	,000 <sup>c</sup>
	Residual	219,383	1194	,184		
	Total	231,443	1205			
3	Regression	67,813	15	4,521	32,878	,000 <sup>d</sup>
	Residual	163,630	1190	,138		
	Total	231,443	1205			

a. Dependent Variable: student health (risk) behaviour (general)

b. Predictors: (Constant), psychology students

c. Predictors: (Constant), psychology students, study results, bmi, living with your partner, Dutch, Sex, living alone, study phase, having a relationship, Age, living with peers

d. Predictors: (Constant), psychology students, study results, bmi, living with your partner, Dutch, Sex, living alone, study phase, having a relationship, Age, living with peers, seeking or having help, negative sexual experiences, peer pressure lifestyle self-efficacy, problem perception

Table 10.1-10.3. Hierarchical regression analysis for satisfaction with study whereby psychology students are compared with non-psychology students.  
Step 1 N = 2393, step 2 N = 2348, step 3 N = 1206.

Table 10.1

		Coefficients <sup>a</sup>									
Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.	Correlations			Collinearity Statistics	
		B	Std. Error	Beta			Zero-order	Partial	Part	Tolerance	VIF
1	(Constant)	3,482	,021		168,154	,000					
	psychology students	,018	,123	,004	,147	,883	,004	,004	,004	1,000	1,000
2	(Constant)	1,130	,233		4,852	,000					
	psychology students	,042	,106	,010	,393	,694	,004	,011	,010	,990	1,010
	Sex	-,043	,039	-,027	-1,081	,280	-,008	-,031	-,027	,952	1,050
	Age	-,025	,006	-,131	-4,452	,000	-,174	-,128	-,110	,702	1,424
	bmi	,002	,003	,019	,745	,456	-,003	,022	,018	,983	1,017
	having a relationship	,082	,039	,057	2,106	,035	-,010	,061	,052	,827	1,210
	living with peers	-,066	,048	-,045	-1,370	,171	,044	-,040	-,034	,558	1,792
	living alone	-,108	,050	-,071	-2,150	,032	-,030	-,062	-,053	,553	1,809
	living with your partner	-,188	,073	-,082	-2,564	,010	-,082	-,074	-,063	,593	1,687
	Dutch	,284	,039	,181	7,257	,000	,179	,206	,179	,969	1,032
	study results	,398	,021	,470	18,590	,000	,458	,474	,457	,946	1,057
	study phase	,004	,045	,003	,099	,921	-,009	,003	,002	,712	1,404
3	(Constant)	1,556	,259		6,005	,000					
	psychology students	,053	,103	,012	,512	,609	,004	,015	,012	,988	1,012
	Sex	,001	,040	,001	,023	,982	-,008	,001	,001	,892	1,121
	Age	-,024	,005	-,124	-4,323	,000	-,174	-,124	-,104	,693	1,443
	bmi	,003	,003	,029	1,216	,224	-,003	,035	,029	,978	1,023
	having a relationship	,045	,039	,032	1,174	,241	-,010	,034	,028	,796	1,257
	living with peers	-,075	,048	-,051	-1,561	,119	,044	-,045	-,037	,538	1,858
	living alone	-,079	,050	-,052	-1,579	,115	-,030	-,046	-,038	,538	1,859
	living with your partner	-,131	,072	-,057	-1,816	,070	-,082	-,053	-,044	,583	1,715
	Dutch	,231	,039	,147	5,965	,000	,179	,170	,143	,940	1,064
	study results	,401	,021	,474	19,168	,000	,458	,486	,459	,941	1,062
	study phase	-,002	,044	-,001	-,042	,967	-,009	-,001	-,001	,708	1,412
	negative sexual experiences	-,100	,043	-,057	-2,305	,021	-,086	-,067	-,055	,940	1,064
	peer pressure lifestyle self-efficacy	-,004	,013	-,007	-,266	,790	,001	-,008	-,006	,926	1,080
	problem perception	-,157	,027	-,145	-5,749	,000	-,149	-,164	-,138	,903	1,108
	seeking or having help	-,171	,035	-,119	-4,859	,000	-,180	-,139	-,116	,956	1,046

a. Dependent Variable: satisfaction with study

Table 10.2

Model Summary									
Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate	R Square Change	Change Statistics			Sig. F Change
						F Change	df1	df2	
1	,004 <sup>a</sup>	,000	-,001	,70893	,000	,022	1	1204	,883
2	,526 <sup>b</sup>	,277	,270	,60533	,277	45,739	10	1194	,000
3	,562 <sup>c</sup>	,316	,308	,58959	,039	17,154	4	1190	,000

a. Predictors: (Constant), psychology students

b. Predictors: (Constant), psychology students, study results, bmi, living with your partner, Dutch, Sex, living alone, study phase, having a relationship, Age, living with peers

c. Predictors: (Constant), psychology students, study results, bmi, living with your partner, Dutch, Sex, living alone, study phase, having a relationship, Age, living with peers, seeking or having help, negative sexual experiences, peer pressure lifestyle self-efficacy, problem perception

Table 10.3

ANOVA <sup>a</sup>						
Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	,011	1	,011	,022	,883 <sup>b</sup>
	Residual	605,114	1204	,503		
	Total	605,125	1205			
2	Regression	167,611	11	15,237	41,584	,000 <sup>c</sup>
	Residual	437,514	1194	,366		
	Total	605,125	1205			
3	Regression	191,463	15	12,764	36,719	,000 <sup>d</sup>
	Residual	413,662	1190	,348		
	Total	605,125	1205			

a. Dependent Variable: satisfaction with study

b. Predictors: (Constant), psychology students

c. Predictors: (Constant), psychology students, study results, bmi, living with your partner, Dutch, Sex, living alone, study phase, having a relationship, Age, living with peers

d. Predictors: (Constant), psychology students, study results, bmi, living with your partner, Dutch, Sex, living alone, study phase, having a relationship, Age, living with peers, seeking or having help, negative sexual experiences, peer pressure lifestyle self-efficacy, problem perception

Table 11.1-11.3. Hierarchical regression analysis for quality of student life whereby psychology students are compared with non-psychology students.  
Step 1 N = 2393, step 2 N = 2348, step 3 N = 1206.

Table 11.1

		Coefficients <sup>a</sup>									
Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.	Correlations			Collinearity Statistics	
		B	Std. Error	Beta			Zero-order	Partial	Part	Tolerance	VIF
1	(Constant)	3,609	,019		194,964	,000					
	law students	,025	,044	,016	,570	,569	,016	,016	,016	1,000	1,000
2	(Constant)	3,547	,218		16,273	,000					
	law students	,021	,045	,014	,475	,635	,016	,014	,013	,921	1,086
	Sex	-,006	,037	-,005	-,161	,872	,021	-,005	-,004	,947	1,056
	Age	-,019	,005	-,122	-3,653	,000	-,089	-,105	-,102	,699	1,431
	bmi	,003	,002	,035	1,240	,215	,014	,036	,035	,983	1,017
	having a relationship	,217	,036	,183	5,977	,000	,168	,170	,167	,827	1,210
	living with peers	,151	,045	,125	3,332	,001	,124	,096	,093	,552	1,810
	living alone	-,002	,048	-,002	-,047	,962	-,113	-,001	-,001	,540	1,853
	living with your partner	,049	,069	,026	,711	,477	,033	,021	,020	,589	1,697
	Dutch	,137	,037	,106	3,736	,000	,119	,107	,104	,964	1,038
	study results	,027	,020	,039	1,351	,177	,034	,039	,038	,925	1,081
	study phase	,043	,042	,034	1,015	,310	,011	,029	,028	,710	1,409
3	(Constant)	4,026	,232		17,344	,000					
	law students	,014	,042	,009	,324	,746	,016	,009	,008	,919	1,088
	Sex	,047	,036	,036	1,312	,190	,021	,038	,034	,887	1,127
	Age	-,019	,005	-,119	-3,806	,000	-,089	-,110	-,099	,690	1,449
	bmi	,005	,002	,054	2,065	,039	,014	,060	,054	,978	1,022
	having a relationship	,147	,034	,125	4,276	,000	,168	,123	,111	,796	1,257
	living with peers	,149	,043	,123	3,458	,001	,124	,100	,090	,533	1,875
	living alone	,058	,045	,046	1,297	,195	-,113	,038	,034	,526	1,903
	living with your partner	,142	,064	,075	2,202	,028	,033	,064	,057	,580	1,725
	Dutch	,060	,035	,047	1,742	,082	,119	,050	,045	,935	1,069
	study results	,035	,019	,050	1,829	,068	,034	,053	,048	,920	1,087
	study phase	,034	,039	,026	,849	,396	,011	,025	,022	,705	1,418
	negative sexual experiences	-,194	,039	-,134	-5,006	,000	-,170	-,144	-,130	,940	1,063
	peer pressure lifestyle self-efficacy	,017	,012	,038	1,415	,157	,055	,041	,037	,926	1,080
	problem perception	-,260	,024	-,290	-10,605	,000	-,339	-,294	-,276	,903	1,108
	seeking or having help	-,152	,031	-,128	-4,834	,000	-,155	-,139	-,126	,957	1,045

a. Dependent Variable: quality of student life



Table 11.2

Model Summary									
Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate	R Square Change	Change Statistics			Sig. F Change
						F Change	df1	df2	
1	,016 <sup>a</sup>	,000	-,001	,58454	,000	,325	1	1204	,569
2	,270 <sup>b</sup>	,073	,065	,56519	,073	9,388	10	1194	,000
3	,443 <sup>c</sup>	,196	,186	,52716	,123	45,615	4	1190	,000

a. Predictors: (Constant), law students

b. Predictors: (Constant), law students, living with peers, bmi, having a relationship, Dutch, study results, Sex, Age, living with your partner, study phase, living alone

c. Predictors: (Constant), law students, living with peers, bmi, having a relationship, Dutch, study results, Sex, Age, living with your partner, study phase, living alone, seeking or having help, negative sexual experiences, peer pressure lifestyle self-efficacy, problem perception

Table 11.3

ANOVA <sup>a</sup>						
Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	,111	1	,111	,325	,569 <sup>b</sup>
	Residual	411,395	1204	,342		
	Total	411,506	1205			
2	Regression	30,100	11	2,736	8,566	,000 <sup>c</sup>
	Residual	381,406	1194	,319		
	Total	411,506	1205			
3	Regression	80,806	15	5,387	19,385	,000 <sup>d</sup>
	Residual	330,701	1190	,278		
	Total	411,506	1205			

a. Dependent Variable: quality of student life

b. Predictors: (Constant), law students

c. Predictors: (Constant), law students, living with peers, bmi, having a relationship, Dutch, study results, Sex, Age, living with your partner, study phase, living alone

d. Predictors: (Constant), law students, living with peers, bmi, having a relationship, Dutch, study results, Sex, Age, living with your partner, study phase, living alone, seeking or having help, negative sexual experiences, peer pressure lifestyle self-efficacy, problem perception

## Appendix 13: Hierarchical regression analyses whereby economics and business students are compared with non-economics and business students

Table 1.1-1.3. Hierarchical regression analysis for general health whereby economics and business students are compared with non-economics and business students.  
Step 1 N = 2393, step 2 N = 2348, step 3 N = 1206.

Table 1.1

		Coefficients <sup>a</sup>									
Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.	Correlations			Collinearity Statistics	
		B	Std. Error	Beta			Zero-order	Partial	Part	Tolerance	VIF
1	(Constant)	59,261	,657		90,196	,000					
	economics and business students	5,040	1,949	,074	2,586	,010	,074	,074	,074	1,000	1,000
2	(Constant)	58,016	8,229		7,050	,000					
	economics and business students	4,835	1,975	,071	2,449	,014	,074	,071	,069	,946	1,057
	Sex	-5,435	1,387	-,114	-3,919	,000	-,132	-,113	-,111	,941	1,062
	Age	,052	,196	,009	,267	,789	,003	,008	,008	,702	1,424
	bmi	-,013	,093	-,004	-,136	,892	-,004	-,004	-,004	,983	1,017
	having a relationship	,276	1,358	,006	,204	,839	-,025	,006	,006	,826	1,210
	living with peers	4,298	1,688	,097	2,546	,011	,119	,073	,072	,557	1,794
	living alone	-,167	1,766	-,004	-,095	,925	-,054	-,003	-,003	,552	1,811
	living with your partner	-2,700	2,565	-,039	-1,053	,293	-,069	-,030	-,030	,591	1,691
	Dutch	3,925	1,380	,082	2,843	,005	,082	,082	,081	,953	1,049
	study results	,725	,753	,028	,964	,335	,019	,028	,027	,937	1,068
	study phase	1,076	1,582	,023	,680	,497	,014	,020	,019	,708	1,412
3	(Constant)	72,671	9,100		7,986	,000					
	economics and business students	4,081	1,916	,060	2,131	,033	,074	,062	,058	,941	1,063
	Sex	-4,193	1,383	-,088	-3,031	,002	-,132	-,088	-,083	,885	1,130
	Age	,071	,191	,012	,373	,710	,003	,011	,010	,693	1,442
	bmi	,037	,090	,011	,411	,681	-,004	,012	,011	,978	1,023
	having a relationship	-1,329	1,338	-,030	-,993	,321	-,025	-,029	-,027	,795	1,257
	living with peers	4,114	1,663	,092	2,474	,014	,119	,072	,068	,537	1,861
	living alone	1,106	1,731	,024	,639	,523	-,054	,019	,018	,537	1,861
	living with your partner	-,427	2,501	-,006	-,171	,864	-,069	-,005	-,005	,582	1,718
	Dutch	1,845	1,357	,039	1,360	,174	,082	,039	,037	,923	1,084
	study results	,814	,730	,032	1,116	,265	,019	,032	,031	,932	1,073
	study phase	1,024	1,534	,022	,668	,505	,014	,019	,018	,705	1,419
	negative sexual experiences	-2,897	1,509	-,054	-1,920	,055	-,102	-,056	-,053	,938	1,067
	peer pressure lifestyle self-efficacy	,332	,468	,020	,710	,478	-,003	,021	,019	,925	1,081
	problem perception	-6,634	,952	-,201	-6,972	,000	-,231	-,198	-,191	,902	1,109
	seeking or having help	-6,034	1,221	-,138	-4,944	,000	-,172	-,142	-,135	,957	1,045

a. Dependent Variable: general health

Table 1.2

**Model Summary**

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate	R Square Change	Change Statistics			Sig. F Change
						F Change	df1	df2	
1	,074 <sup>a</sup>	,006	,005	21,48181	,006	6,685	1	1204	,010
2	,206 <sup>b</sup>	,042	,033	21,16969	,037	4,577	10	1194	,000
3	,327 <sup>c</sup>	,107	,096	20,47697	,065	21,537	4	1190	,000

a. Predictors: (Constant), economics and business students

b. Predictors: (Constant), economics and business students, bmi, living with your partner, study results, Dutch, Sex, living alone, study phase, having a relationship, Age, living with peers

c. Predictors: (Constant), economics and business students, bmi, living with your partner, study results, Dutch, Sex, living alone, study phase, having a relationship, Age, living with peers, seeking or having help, negative sexual experiences, peer pressure lifestyle self-efficacy, problem perception

Table 1.3

**ANOVA<sup>a</sup>**

Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	3084,923	1	3084,923	6,685	,010 <sup>b</sup>
	Residual	555607,756	1204	461,468		
	Total	558692,680	1205			
2	Regression	23594,903	11	2144,991	4,786	,000 <sup>c</sup>
	Residual	535097,777	1194	448,156		
	Total	558692,680	1205			
3	Regression	59718,005	15	3981,200	9,495	,000 <sup>d</sup>
	Residual	498974,675	1190	419,306		
	Total	558692,680	1205			

a. Dependent Variable: general health

b. Predictors: (Constant), economics and business students

c. Predictors: (Constant), economics and business students, bmi, living with your partner, study results, Dutch, Sex, living alone, study phase, having a relationship, Age, living with peers

d. Predictors: (Constant), economics and business students, bmi, living with your partner, study results, Dutch, Sex, living alone, study phase, having a relationship, Age, living with peers, seeking or having help, negative sexual experiences, peer pressure lifestyle self-efficacy, problem perception

Table 2.1-2.3. Hierarchical regression analysis for vitality whereby economics and business students are compared with non-economics and business students.  
Step 1 N = 2393, step 2 N = 2348, step 3 N = 1206.

Table 2.1

		Coefficients <sup>a</sup>									
Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.	Correlations			Collinearity Statistics	
		B	Std. Error	Beta			Zero-order	Partial	Part	Tolerance	VIF
1	(Constant)	45,293	,622		72,791	,000					
	economics and business students	1,078	1,846	,017	,584	,560	,017	,017	,017	1,000	1,000
2	(Constant)	39,575	7,562		5,234	,000					
	economics and business students	1,659	1,815	,026	,914	,361	,017	,026	,025	,946	1,057
	Sex	-6,132	1,274	-,137	-4,813	,000	-,161	-,138	-,133	,941	1,062
	Age	,250	,180	,046	1,388	,165	,003	,040	,038	,702	1,424
	bmi	-,016	,086	-,005	-,187	,851	-,013	-,005	-,005	,983	1,017
	having a relationship	-,875	1,247	-,021	-,702	,483	-,056	-,020	-,019	,826	1,210
	living with peers	6,377	1,551	,152	4,111	,000	,185	,118	,113	,557	1,794
	living alone	-,541	1,623	-,012	-,334	,739	-,099	-,010	-,009	,552	1,811
	living with your partner	-1,837	2,357	-,028	-,780	,436	-,086	-,023	-,021	,591	1,691
	Dutch	8,502	1,268	,189	6,703	,000	,200	,190	,185	,953	1,049
	study results	,438	,692	,018	,633	,527	,002	,018	,017	,937	1,068
	study phase	-,581	1,453	-,013	-,400	,689	-,025	-,012	-,011	,708	1,412
3	(Constant)	62,531	8,275		7,556	,000					
	economics and business students	,563	1,742	,009	,323	,747	,017	,009	,009	,941	1,063
	Sex	-4,123	1,258	-,092	-3,277	,001	-,161	-,095	-,086	,885	1,130
	Age	,292	,174	,053	1,685	,092	,003	,049	,044	,693	1,442
	bmi	,028	,082	,009	,343	,732	-,013	,010	,009	,978	1,023
	having a relationship	-2,569	1,217	-,062	-2,111	,035	-,056	-,061	-,056	,795	1,257
	living with peers	5,611	1,513	,133	3,709	,000	,185	,107	,098	,537	1,861
	living alone	,632	1,575	,014	,401	,688	-,099	,012	,011	,537	1,861
	living with your partner	,292	2,274	,004	,128	,898	-,086	,004	,003	,582	1,718
	Dutch	6,170	1,234	,137	5,000	,000	,200	,143	,132	,923	1,084
	study results	,621	,664	,026	,936	,349	,002	,027	,025	,932	1,073
	study phase	-,894	1,395	-,020	-,641	,522	-,025	-,019	-,017	,705	1,419
	negative sexual experiences	-5,515	1,372	-,109	-4,019	,000	-,164	-,116	-,106	,938	1,067
	peer pressure lifestyle self-efficacy	-,711	,425	-,046	-1,672	,095	-,073	-,048	-,044	,925	1,081
	problem perception	-7,133	,865	-,229	-8,243	,000	-,274	-,232	-,217	,902	1,109
	seeking or having help	-4,719	1,110	-,115	-4,252	,000	-,163	-,122	-,112	,957	1,045

a. Dependent Variable: vitality

Table 2.2

**Model Summary**

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate	R Square Change	Change Statistics			Sig. F Change
						F Change	df1	df2	
1	,017 <sup>a</sup>	,000	-,001	20,34453	,000	,341	1	1204	,560
2	,306 <sup>b</sup>	,094	,085	19,45183	,093	12,305	10	1194	,000
3	,415 <sup>c</sup>	,172	,162	18,62154	,079	28,212	4	1190	,000

a. Predictors: (Constant), economics and business students

b. Predictors: (Constant), economics and business students, bmi, living with your partner, study results, Dutch, Sex, living alone, study phase, having a relationship, Age, living with peers

c. Predictors: (Constant), economics and business students, bmi, living with your partner, study results, Dutch, Sex, living alone, study phase, having a relationship, Age, living with peers, seeking or having help, negative sexual experiences, peer pressure lifestyle self-efficacy, problem perception

Table 2.3

**ANOVA<sup>a</sup>**

Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	140,999	1	140,999	,341	,560 <sup>b</sup>
	Residual	498335,315	1204	413,900		
	Total	498476,314	1205			
2	Regression	46698,234	11	4245,294	11,220	,000 <sup>c</sup>
	Residual	451778,080	1194	378,374		
	Total	498476,314	1205			
3	Regression	85829,751	15	5721,983	16,501	,000 <sup>d</sup>
	Residual	412646,563	1190	346,762		
	Total	498476,314	1205			

a. Dependent Variable: vitality

b. Predictors: (Constant), economics and business students

c. Predictors: (Constant), economics and business students, bmi, living with your partner, study results, Dutch, Sex, living alone, study phase, having a relationship, Age, living with peers

d. Predictors: (Constant), economics and business students, bmi, living with your partner, study results, Dutch, Sex, living alone, study phase, having a relationship, Age, living with peers, seeking or having help, negative sexual experiences, peer pressure lifestyle self-efficacy, problem perception

Table 3.1-3.3. Hierarchical regression analysis for depression whereby economics and business students are compared with non-economics and business students.  
Step 1 N = 2393, step 2 N = 2348, step 3 N = 1206.

Table 3.1

		Coefficients <sup>a</sup>									
Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.	Correlations			Collinearity Statistics	
		B	Std. Error	Beta			Zero-order	Partial	Part	Tolerance	VIF
1	(Constant)	15,362	,159		96,809	,000					
	economics and business students	-,749	,471	-,046	-1,591	,112	-,046	-,046	-,046	1,000	1,000
2	(Constant)	16,854	1,952		8,634	,000					
	economics and business students	-,617	,468	-,038	-1,317	,188	-,046	-,038	-,037	,946	1,057
	Sex	2,157	,329	,188	6,558	,000	,196	,186	,183	,941	1,062
	Age	,026	,047	,019	,563	,574	,011	,016	,016	,702	1,424
	bmi	,000	,022	,000	,016	,987	-,005	,000	,000	,983	1,017
	having a relationship	,123	,322	,012	,382	,703	,049	,011	,011	,826	1,210
	living with peers	-,912	,400	-,085	-2,277	,023	-,128	-,066	-,063	,557	1,794
	living alone	,360	,419	,032	,860	,390	,069	,025	,024	,552	1,811
	living with your partner	,555	,608	,033	,913	,361	,070	,026	,025	,591	1,691
	Dutch	-,650	,327	-,057	-1,985	,047	-,060	-,057	-,055	,953	1,049
	study results	-,720	,179	-,116	-4,034	,000	-,112	-,116	-,112	,937	1,068
	study phase	-,545	,375	-,048	-1,453	,146	-,035	-,042	-,040	,708	1,412
3	(Constant)	12,244	2,109		5,807	,000					
	economics and business students	-,371	,444	-,023	-,836	,403	-,046	-,024	-,022	,941	1,063
	Sex	1,664	,321	,145	5,189	,000	,196	,149	,137	,885	1,130
	Age	,009	,044	,006	,197	,844	,011	,006	,005	,693	1,442
	bmi	-,013	,021	-,016	-,613	,540	-,005	-,018	-,016	,978	1,023
	having a relationship	,504	,310	,048	1,626	,104	,049	,047	,043	,795	1,257
	living with peers	-,846	,385	-,079	-2,196	,028	-,128	-,064	-,058	,537	1,861
	living alone	,014	,401	,001	,034	,973	,069	,001	,001	,537	1,861
	living with your partner	-,112	,579	-,007	-,194	,846	,070	-,006	-,005	,582	1,718
	Dutch	-,012	,314	-,001	-,038	,970	-,060	-,001	-,001	,923	1,084
	study results	-,731	,169	-,118	-4,324	,000	-,112	-,124	-,114	,932	1,073
	study phase	-,494	,355	-,044	-1,391	,164	-,035	-,040	-,037	,705	1,419
	negative sexual experiences	1,232	,350	,096	3,522	,000	,149	,102	,093	,938	1,067
	peer pressure lifestyle self-efficacy	,012	,108	,003	,111	,912	,031	,003	,003	,925	1,081
	problem perception	1,686	,220	,212	7,646	,000	,238	,216	,201	,902	1,109
	seeking or having help	2,226	,283	,212	7,872	,000	,253	,222	,207	,957	1,045

a. Dependent Variable: depression

Table 3.2

**Model Summary**

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate	R Square Change	Change Statistics			Sig. F Change
						F Change	df1	df2	
1	,046 <sup>a</sup>	,002	,001	5,18827	,002	2,530	1	1204	,112
2	,270 <sup>b</sup>	,073	,064	5,02154	,071	9,128	10	1194	,000
3	,418 <sup>c</sup>	,175	,165	4,74507	,102	36,797	4	1190	,000

a. Predictors: (Constant), economics and business students

b. Predictors: (Constant), economics and business students, bmi, living with your partner, study results, Dutch, Sex, living alone, study phase, having a relationship, Age, living with peers

c. Predictors: (Constant), economics and business students, bmi, living with your partner, study results, Dutch, Sex, living alone, study phase, having a relationship, Age, living with peers, seeking or having help, negative sexual experiences, peer pressure lifestyle self-efficacy, problem perception

Table 3.3

**ANOVA<sup>a</sup>**

Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	68,105	1	68,105	2,530	,112 <sup>b</sup>
	Residual	32409,394	1204	26,918		
	Total	32477,499	1205			
2	Regression	2369,773	11	215,434	8,544	,000 <sup>c</sup>
	Residual	30107,726	1194	25,216		
	Total	32477,499	1205			
3	Regression	5683,822	15	378,921	16,829	,000 <sup>d</sup>
	Residual	26793,678	1190	22,516		
	Total	32477,499	1205			

a. Dependent Variable: depression

b. Predictors: (Constant), economics and business students

c. Predictors: (Constant), economics and business students, bmi, living with your partner, study results, Dutch, Sex, living alone, study phase, having a relationship, Age, living with peers

d. Predictors: (Constant), economics and business students, bmi, living with your partner, study results, Dutch, Sex, living alone, study phase, having a relationship, Age, living with peers, seeking or having help, negative sexual experiences, peer pressure lifestyle self-efficacy, problem perception



Table 4.1-4.3. Hierarchical regression analysis for anxiety whereby economics and business students are compared with non-economics and business students.

Step 1 N = 2393, step 2 N = 2348, step 3 N = 1206.

Table 4.1

		Coefficients <sup>a</sup>									
Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.	Correlations			Collinearity Statistics	
		B	Std. Error	Beta			Zero-order	Partial	Part	Tolerance	VIF
1	(Constant)	7,076	,093		76,091	,000					
	economics and business students	-,163	,276	-,017	-,592	,554	-,017	-,017	-,017	1,000	1,000
2	(Constant)	8,234	1,140		7,225	,000					
	economics and business students	-,263	,273	-,027	-,961	,337	-,017	-,028	-,027	,946	1,057
	Sex	,976	,192	,146	5,084	,000	,161	,146	,141	,941	1,062
	Age	,005	,027	,007	,202	,840	,027	,006	,006	,702	1,424
	bmi	-,014	,013	-,031	-1,093	,275	-,024	-,032	-,030	,983	1,017
	having a relationship	,020	,188	,003	,106	,916	,037	,003	,003	,826	1,210
	living with peers	-,695	,234	-,111	-2,974	,003	-,148	-,086	-,083	,557	1,794
	living alone	,152	,245	,023	,623	,533	,090	,018	,017	,552	1,811
	living with your partner	,138	,355	,014	,389	,697	,061	,011	,011	,591	1,691
	Dutch	-1,162	,191	-,173	-6,081	,000	-,180	-,173	-,169	,953	1,049
	study results	-,227	,104	-,062	-2,176	,030	-,049	-,063	-,060	,937	1,068
	study phase	-,054	,219	-,008	-,246	,806	,012	-,007	-,007	,708	1,412
3	(Constant)	6,571	1,247		5,270	,000					
	economics and business students	-,132	,262	-,014	-,504	,614	-,017	-,015	-,013	,941	1,063
	Sex	,690	,190	,103	3,642	,000	,161	,105	,097	,885	1,130
	Age	-,009	,026	-,011	-,347	,728	,027	-,010	-,009	,693	1,442
	bmi	-,019	,012	-,042	-1,563	,118	-,024	-,045	-,042	,978	1,023
	having a relationship	,159	,183	,026	,869	,385	,037	,025	,023	,795	1,257
	living with peers	-,714	,228	-,114	-3,134	,002	-,148	-,090	-,083	,537	1,861
	living alone	-,046	,237	-,007	-,195	,845	,090	-,006	-,005	,537	1,861
	living with your partner	-,220	,343	-,022	-,643	,520	,061	-,019	-,017	,582	1,718
	Dutch	-,844	,186	-,126	-4,541	,000	-,180	-,131	-,121	,923	1,084
	study results	-,224	,100	-,062	-2,238	,025	-,049	-,065	-,060	,932	1,073
	study phase	-,006	,210	-,001	-,026	,979	,012	-,001	-,001	,705	1,419
	negative sexual experiences	,962	,207	,128	4,654	,000	,180	,134	,124	,938	1,067
	peer pressure lifestyle self-efficacy	-,007	,064	-,003	-,109	,914	,025	-,003	-,003	,925	1,081
	problem perception	,621	,130	,133	4,762	,000	,187	,137	,127	,902	1,109
	seeking or having help	1,282	,167	,208	7,666	,000	,249	,217	,204	,957	1,045

a. Dependent Variable: anxiety



Table 4.2

**Model Summary**

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate	R Square Change	Change Statistics			Sig. F Change
						F Change	df1	df2	
1	,017 <sup>a</sup>	,000	-,001	3,04040	,000	,351	1	1204	,554
2	,280 <sup>b</sup>	,078	,070	2,93155	,078	10,107	10	1194	,000
3	,398 <sup>c</sup>	,159	,148	2,80559	,080	28,405	4	1190	,000

a. Predictors: (Constant), economics and business students

b. Predictors: (Constant), economics and business students, bmi, living with your partner, study results, Dutch, Sex, living alone, study phase, having a relationship, Age, living with peers

c. Predictors: (Constant), economics and business students, bmi, living with your partner, study results, Dutch, Sex, living alone, study phase, having a relationship, Age, living with peers, seeking or having help, negative sexual experiences, peer pressure lifestyle self-efficacy, problem perception

Table 4.3

**ANOVA<sup>a</sup>**

Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	3,241	1	3,241	,351	,554 <sup>b</sup>
	Residual	11129,811	1204	9,244		
	Total	11133,052	1205			
2	Regression	871,856	11	79,260	9,223	,000 <sup>c</sup>
	Residual	10261,196	1194	8,594		
	Total	11133,052	1205			
3	Regression	1766,191	15	117,746	14,959	,000 <sup>d</sup>
	Residual	9366,862	1190	7,871		
	Total	11133,052	1205			

a. Dependent Variable: anxiety

b. Predictors: (Constant), economics and business students

c. Predictors: (Constant), economics and business students, bmi, living with your partner, study results, Dutch, Sex, living alone, study phase, having a relationship, Age, living with peers

d. Predictors: (Constant), economics and business students, bmi, living with your partner, study results, Dutch, Sex, living alone, study phase, having a relationship, Age, living with peers, seeking or having help, negative sexual experiences, peer pressure lifestyle self-efficacy, problem perception

Table 5.1-5.3. Hierarchical regression analysis for internet addiction whereby economics and business students are compared with non-economics and business students.  
Step 1 N = 1158, step 2 N = 1142, step 3 N = 734.

Table 5.1

		Coefficients <sup>a</sup>									
Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.	Correlations			Collinearity Statistics	
		B	Std. Error	Beta			Zero-order	Partial	Part	Tolerance	VIF
1	(Constant)	2,511	,026		96,838	,000					
	economics and business students	,048	,077	,023	,621	,535	,023	,023	,023	1,000	1,000
2	(Constant)	3,590	,339		10,600	,000					
	economics and business students	-,002	,077	-,001	-,032	,974	,023	-,001	-,001	,951	1,051
	Sex	-,006	,054	-,004	-,106	,915	-,009	-,004	-,004	,920	1,087
	Age	,003	,009	,013	,281	,778	,009	,010	,010	,648	1,542
	bmi	-,002	,003	-,020	-,560	,575	-,007	-,021	-,020	,979	1,021
	having a relationship	-,135	,053	-,100	-2,556	,011	-,076	-,095	-,092	,848	1,179
	living with peers	-,206	,066	-,151	-3,131	,002	-,136	-,116	-,112	,555	1,800
	living alone	-,037	,068	-,026	-,544	,587	,074	-,020	-,020	,547	1,827
	living with your partner	-,007	,108	-,003	-,062	,951	,012	-,002	-,002	,647	1,546
	Dutch	-,242	,052	-,170	-4,619	,000	-,159	-,169	-,166	,955	1,047
	study results	-,110	,031	-,134	-3,598	,000	-,123	-,133	-,129	,933	1,071
	study phase	-,001	,065	-,001	-,014	,989	-,011	-,001	,000	,670	1,494
3	(Constant)	3,331	,363		9,164	,000					
	economics and business students	,024	,073	,011	,327	,744	,023	,012	,011	,936	1,069
	Sex	-,029	,052	-,020	-,560	,575	-,009	-,021	-,019	,866	1,155
	Age	,001	,009	,007	,160	,873	,009	,006	,005	,643	1,555
	bmi	-,003	,003	-,040	-1,174	,241	-,007	-,044	-,040	,972	1,029
	having a relationship	-,041	,051	-,031	-,815	,415	-,076	-,030	-,028	,813	1,229
	living with peers	-,223	,063	-,163	-3,532	,000	-,136	-,131	-,119	,536	1,867
	living alone	-,124	,065	-,089	-1,919	,055	,074	-,071	-,065	,531	1,884
	living with your partner	-,132	,103	-,054	-1,282	,200	,012	-,048	-,043	,634	1,578
	Dutch	-,184	,050	-,129	-3,676	,000	-,159	-,136	-,124	,928	1,077
	study results	-,106	,029	-,129	-3,674	,000	-,123	-,136	-,124	,928	1,077
	study phase	-,005	,061	-,003	-,082	,935	-,011	-,003	-,003	,666	1,501
	negative sexual experiences	,081	,057	,049	1,415	,157	,087	,053	,048	,936	1,068
	peer pressure lifestyle self-efficacy	-,061	,018	-,122	-3,419	,001	-,121	-,127	-,116	,904	1,106
	problem perception	,313	,037	,306	8,538	,000	,338	,304	,289	,889	1,125
	seeking or having help	,036	,047	,027	,782	,434	,080	,029	,026	,939	1,065

a. Dependent Variable: internet addiction

Table 5.2

**Model Summary**

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate	R Square Change	Change Statistics			Sig. F Change
						F Change	df1	df2	
1	,023 <sup>a</sup>	,001	-,001	,66151	,001	,385	1	732	,535
2	,264 <sup>b</sup>	,070	,056	,64256	,069	5,383	10	722	,000
3	,423 <sup>c</sup>	,179	,162	,60533	,109	23,883	4	718	,000

a. Predictors: (Constant), economics and business students

b. Predictors: (Constant), economics and business students, having a relationship, bmi, study results, living with peers, Dutch, Age, Sex, living with your partner, study phase, living alone

c. Predictors: (Constant), economics and business students, having a relationship, bmi, study results, living with peers, Dutch, Age, Sex, living with your partner, study phase, living alone, seeking or having help, negative sexual experiences, peer pressure lifestyle self-efficacy, problem perception

Table 5.3

**ANOVA<sup>a</sup>**

Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	,169	1	,169	,385	,535 <sup>b</sup>
	Residual	320,323	732	,438		
	Total	320,491	733			
2	Regression	22,392	11	2,036	4,930	,000 <sup>c</sup>
	Residual	298,099	722	,413		
	Total	320,491	733			
3	Regression	57,398	15	3,827	10,443	,000 <sup>d</sup>
	Residual	263,094	718	,366		
	Total	320,491	733			

a. Dependent Variable: internet addiction

b. Predictors: (Constant), economics and business students

c. Predictors: (Constant), economics and business students, having a relationship, bmi, study results, living with peers, Dutch, Age, Sex, living with your partner, study phase, living alone

d. Predictors: (Constant), economics and business students, having a relationship, bmi, study results, living with peers, Dutch, Age, Sex, living with your partner, study phase, living alone, seeking or having help, negative sexual experiences, peer pressure lifestyle self-efficacy, problem perception

Table 6.1-6.3. Hierarchical regression analysis for buying addiction whereby economics and business students are compared with non-economics and business students.  
Step 1 N = 419, step 2 N = 412, step 3 N = 287.

Table 6.1

Coefficients <sup>a</sup>											
Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.	Correlations			Collinearity Statistics	
		B	Std. Error	Beta			Zero-order	Partial	Part	Tolerance	VIF
1	(Constant)	-,233	,118		-1,963	,051					
	economics and business students	-,447	,373	-,071	-1,201	,231	-,071	-,071	-,071	1,000	1,000
2	(Constant)	4,591	1,601		2,867	,004					
	economics and business students	-,258	,373	-,041	-,691	,490	-,071	-,042	-,039	,931	1,074
	Sex	-,628	,279	-,133	-2,252	,025	-,124	-,135	-,129	,939	1,065
	Age	-,160	,042	-,264	-3,836	,000	-,235	-,225	-,219	,685	1,459
	bmi	,007	,028	,015	,250	,803	-,037	,015	,014	,942	1,062
	having a relationship	,233	,243	,059	,956	,340	,022	,058	,055	,840	1,190
	living with peers	-,199	,300	-,050	-,663	,508	,023	-,040	-,038	,572	1,748
	living alone	-,274	,311	-,068	-,879	,380	-,073	-,053	-,050	,537	1,862
	living with your partner	-,275	,476	-,041	-,577	,565	-,063	-,035	-,033	,652	1,534
	Dutch	,523	,256	,122	2,043	,042	,173	,122	,117	,906	1,104
	study results	-,089	,133	-,040	-,668	,505	-,015	-,040	-,038	,916	1,092
	study phase	,506	,310	,112	1,632	,104	-,054	,098	,093	,691	1,446
3	(Constant)	4,934	1,708		2,889	,004					
	economics and business students	-,293	,364	-,046	-,805	,422	-,071	-,049	-,044	,911	1,097
	Sex	-,632	,277	-,134	-2,285	,023	-,124	-,137	-,126	,889	1,125
	Age	-,158	,041	-,261	-3,861	,000	-,235	-,228	-,213	,668	1,498
	bmi	,030	,028	,063	1,077	,283	-,037	,065	,059	,887	1,127
	having a relationship	,053	,239	,013	,221	,825	,022	,013	,012	,816	1,225
	living with peers	-,117	,296	-,029	-,394	,694	,023	-,024	-,022	,548	1,824
	living alone	-,164	,304	-,041	-,540	,590	-,073	-,033	-,030	,524	1,907
	living with your partner	-,090	,464	-,013	-,193	,847	-,063	-,012	-,011	,641	1,559
	Dutch	,370	,251	,087	1,475	,141	,173	,089	,081	,881	1,135
	study results	-,086	,129	-,039	-,664	,507	-,015	-,040	-,037	,898	1,114
	study phase	,448	,302	,099	1,484	,139	-,054	,090	,082	,682	1,467
	negative sexual experiences	-,498	,255	-,112	-1,948	,053	-,188	-,117	-,107	,921	1,086
	peer pressure lifestyle self-efficacy	,123	,073	,098	1,685	,093	,104	,102	,093	,905	1,104
	problem perception	-,681	,180	-,224	-3,774	,000	-,244	-,223	-,208	,865	1,156
	seeking or having help	,157	,221	,041	,708	,480	-,053	,043	,039	,908	1,101

a. Dependent Variable: buying addiction

Table 6.2

**Model Summary**

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate	R Square Change	Change Statistics			Sig. F Change
						F Change	df1	df2	
1	,071 <sup>a</sup>	,005	,002	1,90212	,005	1,443	1	285	,231
2	,323 <sup>b</sup>	,104	,069	1,83720	,099	3,050	10	275	,001
3	,420 <sup>c</sup>	,176	,131	1,77497	,072	5,905	4	271	,000

a. Predictors: (Constant), economics and business students

b. Predictors: (Constant), economics and business students, living alone, Sex, bmi, study results, having a relationship, Age, Dutch, living with your partner, study phase, living with peers

c. Predictors: (Constant), economics and business students, living alone, Sex, bmi, study results, having a relationship, Age, Dutch, living with your partner, study phase, living with peers, negative sexual experiences, seeking or having help, peer pressure lifestyle self-efficacy, problem perception

Table 6.3

**ANOVA<sup>a</sup>**

Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	5,220	1	5,220	1,443	,231 <sup>b</sup>
	Residual	1031,149	285	3,618		
	Total	1036,369	286			
2	Regression	108,158	11	9,833	2,913	,001 <sup>c</sup>
	Residual	928,211	275	3,375		
	Total	1036,369	286			
3	Regression	182,575	15	12,172	3,863	,000 <sup>d</sup>
	Residual	853,794	271	3,151		
	Total	1036,369	286			

a. Dependent Variable: buying addiction

b. Predictors: (Constant), economics and business students

c. Predictors: (Constant), economics and business students, living alone, Sex, bmi, study results, having a relationship, Age, Dutch, living with your partner, study phase, living with peers

d. Predictors: (Constant), economics and business students, living alone, Sex, bmi, study results, having a relationship, Age, Dutch, living with your partner, study phase, living with peers, negative sexual experiences, seeking or having help, peer pressure lifestyle self-efficacy, problem perception

Table 7.1-7.3. Hierarchical regression analysis for eating disorder whereby economics and business students are compared with non-economics and business students.  
Step 1 N = 2393, step 2 N = 2348, step 3 N = 1206.

Table 7.1

Coefficients <sup>a</sup>											
Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.	Correlations			Collinearity Statistics	
		B	Std. Error	Beta			Zero-order	Partial	Part	Tolerance	VIF
1	(Constant)	1,744	,041		42,925	,000					
	economics and business students	-,204	,121	-,049	-1,689	,092	-,049	-,049	-,049	1,000	1,000
2	(Constant)	-,722	,482		-1,497	,135					
	economics and business students	,020	,116	,005	,177	,860	-,049	,005	,005	,946	1,057
	Sex	,985	,081	,336	12,118	,000	,325	,331	,326	,941	1,062
	Age	-,011	,011	-,032	-,987	,324	-,066	-,029	-,027	,702	1,424
	bmi	,024	,005	,120	4,429	,000	,098	,127	,119	,983	1,017
	having a relationship	-,027	,080	-,010	-,334	,738	,007	-,010	-,009	,826	1,210
	living with peers	,199	,099	,073	2,015	,044	-,021	,058	,054	,557	1,794
	living alone	,362	,104	,127	3,501	,000	,090	,101	,094	,552	1,811
	living with your partner	,166	,150	,039	1,105	,269	,000	,032	,030	,591	1,691
	Dutch	,022	,081	,008	,276	,783	-,012	,008	,007	,953	1,049
	study results	,046	,044	,029	1,033	,302	,041	,030	,028	,937	1,068
	study phase	-,162	,093	-,056	-1,752	,080	-,045	-,051	-,047	,708	1,412
3	(Constant)	-2,277	,520		-4,378	,000					
	economics and business students	,095	,109	,023	,868	,386	-,049	,025	,022	,941	1,063
	Sex	,892	,079	,304	11,283	,000	,325	,311	,286	,885	1,130
	Age	-,009	,011	-,024	-,802	,423	-,066	-,023	-,020	,693	1,442
	bmi	,021	,005	,103	4,018	,000	,098	,116	,102	,978	1,023
	having a relationship	,140	,076	,052	1,826	,068	,007	,053	,046	,795	1,257
	living with peers	,256	,095	,093	2,688	,007	-,021	,078	,068	,537	1,861
	living alone	,263	,099	,092	2,653	,008	,090	,077	,067	,537	1,861
	living with your partner	,020	,143	,005	,140	,889	,000	,004	,004	,582	1,718
	Dutch	,174	,078	,059	2,248	,025	-,012	,065	,057	,923	1,084
	study results	,022	,042	,014	,517	,605	,041	,015	,013	,932	1,073
	study phase	-,149	,088	-,051	-1,697	,090	-,045	-,049	-,043	,705	1,419
	negative sexual experiences	,311	,086	,094	3,607	,000	,164	,104	,091	,938	1,067
	peer pressure lifestyle self-efficacy	,015	,027	,015	,572	,567	,037	,017	,015	,925	1,081
	problem perception	,628	,054	,309	11,556	,000	,323	,318	,293	,902	1,109
	seeking or having help	,020	,070	,008	,291	,771	,057	,008	,007	,957	1,045

a. Dependent Variable: eating pattern

Table 7.2

**Model Summary**

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate	R Square Change	Change Statistics			Sig. F Change
						F Change	df1	df2	
1	,049 <sup>a</sup>	,002	,002	1,32814	,002	2,852	1	1204	,092
2	,369 <sup>b</sup>	,136	,128	1,24105	,134	18,490	10	1194	,000
3	,484 <sup>c</sup>	,234	,225	1,17035	,098	38,156	4	1190	,000

a. Predictors: (Constant), economics and business students

b. Predictors: (Constant), economics and business students, bmi, living with your partner, study results, Dutch, Sex, living alone, study phase, having a relationship, Age, living with peers

c. Predictors: (Constant), economics and business students, bmi, living with your partner, study results, Dutch, Sex, living alone, study phase, having a relationship, Age, living with peers, seeking or having help, negative sexual experiences, peer pressure lifestyle self-efficacy, problem perception

Table 7.3

**ANOVA<sup>a</sup>**

Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	5,031	1	5,031	2,852	,092 <sup>b</sup>
	Residual	2123,799	1204	1,764		
	Total	2128,830	1205			
2	Regression	289,821	11	26,347	17,106	,000 <sup>c</sup>
	Residual	1839,009	1194	1,540		
	Total	2128,830	1205			
3	Regression	498,873	15	33,258	24,281	,000 <sup>d</sup>
	Residual	1629,957	1190	1,370		
	Total	2128,830	1205			

a. Dependent Variable: eating pattern

b. Predictors: (Constant), economics and business students

c. Predictors: (Constant), economics and business students, bmi, living with your partner, study results, Dutch, Sex, living alone, study phase, having a relationship, Age, living with peers

d. Predictors: (Constant), economics and business students, bmi, living with your partner, study results, Dutch, Sex, living alone, study phase, having a relationship, Age, living with peers, seeking or having help, negative sexual experiences, peer pressure lifestyle self-efficacy, problem perception



Table 8.1-8.3. Hierarchical regression analysis for suicidal ideation whereby economics and business students are compared with non-economics and business students.  
Step 1 N = 949, step 2 N = 935, step 3 N = 590.

Table 8.1

Coefficients <sup>a</sup>											
Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.	Correlations			Collinearity Statistics	
		B	Std. Error	Beta			Zero-order	Partial	Part	Tolerance	VIF
1	(Constant)	7,006	,112		62,678	,000					
	economics and business students	-,506	,376	-,055	-1,343	,180	-,055	-,055	-,055	1,000	1,000
2	(Constant)	5,567	1,438		3,872	,000					
	economics and business students	-,366	,383	-,040	-,956	,340	-,055	-,040	-,039	,961	1,040
	Sex	,386	,240	,069	1,608	,108	,056	,067	,066	,921	1,085
	Age	,041	,038	,053	1,059	,290	,013	,044	,043	,671	1,490
	bmi	-,009	,012	-,031	-,752	,452	-,021	-,031	-,031	,977	1,023
	having a relationship	-,373	,248	-,070	-1,502	,134	-,057	-,062	-,062	,780	1,282
	living with peers	,033	,304	,006	,109	,914	-,035	,005	,004	,529	1,890
	living alone	,307	,315	,056	,973	,331	,073	,040	,040	,514	1,947
	living with your partner	,220	,451	,027	,487	,627	-,009	,020	,020	,567	1,765
	Dutch	-,524	,237	-,092	-2,214	,027	-,091	-,092	-,091	,967	1,034
	study results	,072	,127	,024	,566	,572	,026	,024	,023	,931	1,075
	study phase	-,370	,285	-,064	-1,302	,194	-,039	-,054	-,053	,694	1,442
3	(Constant)	3,522	1,606		2,193	,029					
	economics and business students	-,271	,371	-,030	-,730	,466	-,055	-,030	-,029	,959	1,043
	Sex	,167	,243	,030	,689	,491	,056	,029	,027	,843	1,186
	Age	,026	,037	,034	,704	,482	,013	,029	,028	,663	1,509
	bmi	-,010	,012	-,035	-,857	,392	-,021	-,036	-,034	,972	1,029
	having a relationship	-,115	,246	-,021	-,467	,640	-,057	-,020	-,019	,747	1,339
	living with peers	,083	,298	,015	,278	,781	-,035	,012	,011	,515	1,940
	living alone	,126	,308	,023	,408	,683	,073	,017	,016	,505	1,982
	living with your partner	-,056	,439	-,007	-,128	,898	-,009	-,005	-,005	,560	1,784
	Dutch	-,226	,234	-,040	-,965	,335	-,091	-,040	-,038	,926	1,080
	study results	,061	,123	,021	,497	,619	,026	,021	,020	,926	1,080
	study phase	-,280	,278	-,048	-1,007	,314	-,039	-,042	-,040	,683	1,464
	negative sexual experiences	,894	,246	,151	3,635	,000	,186	,150	,144	,914	1,094
	peer pressure lifestyle self-efficacy	,001	,082	,001	,015	,988	-,010	,001	,001	,908	1,101
	problem perception	,804	,169	,199	4,749	,000	,223	,194	,189	,900	1,111
	seeking or having help	,433	,219	,080	1,976	,049	,108	,082	,079	,965	1,036

a. Dependent Variable: suicidal ideation



Table 8.2

**Model Summary**

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate	R Square Change	Change Statistics			Sig. F Change
						F Change	df1	df2	
1	,055 <sup>a</sup>	,003	,001	2,59250	,003	1,803	1	588	,180
2	,163 <sup>b</sup>	,027	,008	2,58384	,023	1,395	10	578	,179
3	,307 <sup>c</sup>	,094	,070	2,50134	,067	10,689	4	574	,000

a. Predictors: (Constant), economics and business students

b. Predictors: (Constant), economics and business students, bmi, living with your partner, study results, Dutch, Sex, living with peers, study phase, having a relationship, Age, living alone

c. Predictors: (Constant), economics and business students, bmi, living with your partner, study results, Dutch, Sex, living with peers, study phase, having a relationship, Age, living alone, seeking or having help, negative sexual experiences, peer pressure lifestyle self-efficacy, problem perception

Table 8.3

**ANOVA<sup>a</sup>**

Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	12,120	1	12,120	1,803	,180 <sup>b</sup>
	Residual	3951,983	588	6,721		
	Total	3964,103	589			
2	Regression	105,248	11	9,568	1,433	,154 <sup>c</sup>
	Residual	3858,855	578	6,676		
	Total	3964,103	589			
3	Regression	372,769	15	24,851	3,972	,000 <sup>d</sup>
	Residual	3591,335	574	6,257		
	Total	3964,103	589			

a. Dependent Variable: suicidal ideation

b. Predictors: (Constant), economics and business students

c. Predictors: (Constant), economics and business students, bmi, living with your partner, study results, Dutch, Sex, living with peers, study phase, having a relationship, Age, living alone

d. Predictors: (Constant), economics and business students, bmi, living with your partner, study results, Dutch, Sex, living with peers, study phase, having a relationship, Age, living alone, seeking or having help, negative sexual experiences, peer pressure lifestyle self-efficacy, problem perception

Table 9.1-9.3. Hierarchical regression analysis for student health (risk) behaviour (general) whereby economics and business students are compared with non-economics and business students.  
Step 1 N = 2393, step 2 N = 2348, step 3 N = 1206.

Table 9.1

Coefficients <sup>a</sup>											
Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.	Correlations			Collinearity Statistics	
		B	Std. Error	Beta			Zero-order	Partial	Part	Tolerance	VIF
1	(Constant)	3,417	,013		254,849	,000					
	economics and business students	,030	,040	,022	,762	,446	,022	,022	,022	1,000	1,000
2	(Constant)	3,207	,167		19,253	,000					
	economics and business students	,044	,040	,032	1,101	,271	,022	,032	,031	,946	1,057
	Sex	,001	,028	,001	,023	,982	,003	,001	,001	,941	1,062
	Age	,004	,004	,034	1,003	,316	,043	,029	,028	,702	1,424
	bmi	-,004	,002	-,056	-1,986	,047	-,073	-,057	-,056	,983	1,017
	having a relationship	,048	,027	,055	1,765	,078	,073	,051	,050	,826	1,210
	living with peers	,019	,034	,021	,566	,571	,085	,016	,016	,557	1,794
	living alone	-,093	,036	-,098	-2,592	,010	-,131	-,075	-,073	,552	1,811
	living with your partner	-,034	,052	-,024	-,659	,510	,034	-,019	-,019	,591	1,691
	Dutch	,148	,028	,153	5,291	,000	,153	,151	,149	,953	1,049
	study results	,011	,015	,021	,726	,468	,013	,021	,020	,937	1,068
	study phase	,062	,032	,064	1,921	,055	,079	,056	,054	,708	1,412
3	(Constant)	3,508	,165		21,290	,000					
	economics and business students	,024	,035	,017	,696	,487	,022	,020	,017	,941	1,063
	Sex	-,007	,025	-,007	-,269	,788	,003	-,008	-,007	,885	1,130
	Age	,000	,003	-,002	-,070	,944	,043	-,002	-,002	,693	1,442
	bmi	-,002	,002	-,027	-1,086	,278	-,073	-,031	-,026	,978	1,023
	having a relationship	-,044	,024	-,049	-1,803	,072	,073	-,052	-,044	,795	1,257
	living with peers	,022	,030	,024	,726	,468	,085	,021	,018	,537	1,861
	living alone	-,031	,031	-,032	-,977	,329	-,131	-,028	-,024	,537	1,861
	living with your partner	,044	,045	,031	,965	,335	,034	,028	,024	,582	1,718
	Dutch	,091	,025	,094	3,686	,000	,153	,106	,090	,923	1,084
	study results	,022	,013	,042	1,683	,093	,013	,049	,041	,932	1,073
	study phase	,069	,028	,072	2,480	,013	,079	,072	,060	,705	1,419
	negative sexual experiences	-,022	,027	-,020	-,793	,428	-,078	-,023	-,019	,938	1,067
	peer pressure lifestyle self-efficacy	,056	,008	,168	6,622	,000	,183	,189	,161	,925	1,081
	problem perception	-,318	,017	-,474	-18,470	,000	-,494	-,472	-,450	,902	1,109
	seeking or having help	,043	,022	,049	1,968	,049	,002	,057	,048	,957	1,045

a. Dependent Variable: student health (risk) behaviour (general)

Table 9.2

**Model Summary**

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate	R Square Change	Change Statistics			Sig. F Change
						F Change	df1	df2	
1	,022 <sup>a</sup>	,000	,000	,43833	,000	,580	1	1204	,446
2	,230 <sup>b</sup>	,053	,044	,42847	,052	6,607	10	1194	,000
3	,542 <sup>c</sup>	,293	,284	,37075	,240	101,178	4	1190	,000

a. Predictors: (Constant), economics and business students

b. Predictors: (Constant), economics and business students, bmi, living with your partner, study results, Dutch, Sex, living alone, study phase, having a relationship, Age, living with peers

c. Predictors: (Constant), economics and business students, bmi, living with your partner, study results, Dutch, Sex, living alone, study phase, having a relationship, Age, living with peers, seeking or having help, negative sexual experiences, peer pressure lifestyle self-efficacy, problem perception

Table 9.3

**ANOVA<sup>a</sup>**

Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	,112	1	,112	,580	,446 <sup>b</sup>
	Residual	231,332	1204	,192		
	Total	231,443	1205			
2	Regression	12,242	11	1,113	6,062	,000 <sup>c</sup>
	Residual	219,202	1194	,184		
	Total	231,443	1205			
3	Regression	67,871	15	4,525	32,918	,000 <sup>d</sup>
	Residual	163,572	1190	,137		
	Total	231,443	1205			

a. Dependent Variable: student health (risk) behaviour (general)

b. Predictors: (Constant), economics and business students

c. Predictors: (Constant), economics and business students, bmi, living with your partner, study results, Dutch, Sex, living alone, study phase, having a relationship, Age, living with peers

d. Predictors: (Constant), economics and business students, bmi, living with your partner, study results, Dutch, Sex, living alone, study phase, having a relationship, Age, living with peers, seeking or having help, negative sexual experiences, peer pressure lifestyle self-efficacy, problem perception

Table 10.1-10.3. Hierarchical regression analysis for satisfaction with study whereby economics and business students are compared with non-economics and business students.

Step 1 N = 2393, step 2 N = 2348, step 3 N = 1206.

Table 10.1

**Coefficients<sup>a</sup>**

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.	Correlations			Collinearity Statistics	
		B	Std. Error	Beta			Zero-order	Partial	Part	Tolerance	VIF
1	(Constant)	3,504	,022		162,207	,000					
	economics and business students	-,191	,064	-,085	-2,972	,003	-,085	-,085	-,085	1,000	1,000
2	(Constant)	1,158	,235		4,921	,000					
	economics and business students	-,046	,056	-,020	-,807	,420	-,085	-,023	-,020	,946	1,057
	Sex	-,046	,040	-,029	-1,151	,250	-,008	-,033	-,028	,941	1,062
	Age	-,025	,006	-,131	-4,458	,000	-,174	-,128	-,110	,702	1,424
	bmi	,002	,003	,018	,741	,459	-,003	,021	,018	,983	1,017
	having a relationship	,082	,039	,058	2,125	,034	-,010	,061	,052	,826	1,210
	living with peers	-,067	,048	-,046	-1,395	,163	,044	-,040	-,034	,557	1,794
	living alone	-,110	,050	-,072	-2,175	,030	-,030	-,063	-,054	,552	1,811
	living with your partner	-,191	,073	-,083	-2,599	,009	-,082	-,075	-,064	,591	1,691
	Dutch	,280	,039	,179	7,101	,000	,179	,201	,175	,953	1,049
	study results	,396	,022	,468	18,411	,000	,458	,470	,453	,937	1,068
	study phase	,009	,045	,006	,210	,834	-,009	,006	,005	,708	1,412
3	(Constant)	1,605	,262		6,128	,000					
	economics and business students	-,068	,055	-,030	-1,228	,220	-,085	-,036	-,029	,941	1,063
	Sex	-,003	,040	-,002	-,079	,937	-,008	-,002	-,002	,885	1,130
	Age	-,024	,005	-,125	-4,329	,000	-,174	-,125	-,104	,693	1,442
	bmi	,003	,003	,029	1,210	,227	-,003	,035	,029	,978	1,023
	having a relationship	,046	,039	,032	1,192	,233	-,010	,035	,029	,795	1,257
	living with peers	-,077	,048	-,052	-1,606	,108	,044	-,047	-,038	,537	1,861
	living alone	-,080	,050	-,053	-1,614	,107	-,030	-,047	-,039	,537	1,861
	living with your partner	-,134	,072	-,059	-1,867	,062	-,082	-,054	-,045	,582	1,718
	Dutch	,225	,039	,143	5,751	,000	,179	,164	,138	,923	1,084
	study results	,398	,021	,470	18,958	,000	,458	,482	,454	,932	1,073
	study phase	,005	,044	,003	,117	,907	-,009	,003	,003	,705	1,419
	negative sexual experiences	-,102	,043	-,058	-2,357	,019	-,086	-,068	-,056	,938	1,067
	peer pressure lifestyle self-efficacy	-,004	,013	-,008	-,306	,760	,001	-,009	-,007	,925	1,081
	problem perception	-,159	,027	-,146	-5,805	,000	-,149	-,166	-,139	,902	1,109
	seeking or having help	-,170	,035	-,119	-4,854	,000	-,180	-,139	-,116	,957	1,045

a. Dependent Variable: satisfaction with study

Table 10.2

Model Summary									
Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate	R Square Change	Change Statistics			Sig. F Change
						F Change	df1	df2	
1	,085 <sup>a</sup>	,007	,006	,70635	,007	8,833	1	1204	,003
2	,527 <sup>b</sup>	,277	,271	,60521	,270	44,607	10	1194	,000
3	,563 <sup>c</sup>	,317	,309	,58928	,040	17,352	4	1190	,000

a. Predictors: (Constant), economics and business students

b. Predictors: (Constant), economics and business students, bmi, living with your partner, study results, Dutch, Sex, living alone, study phase, having a relationship, Age, living with peers

c. Predictors: (Constant), economics and business students, bmi, living with your partner, study results, Dutch, Sex, living alone, study phase, having a relationship, Age, living with peers, seeking or having help, negative sexual experiences, peer pressure lifestyle self-efficacy, problem perception

Table 10.3

ANOVA <sup>a</sup>						
Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	4,407	1	4,407	8,833	,003 <sup>b</sup>
	Residual	600,717	1204	,499		
	Total	605,125	1205			
2	Regression	167,793	11	15,254	41,646	,000 <sup>c</sup>
	Residual	437,332	1194	,366		
	Total	605,125	1205			
3	Regression	191,895	15	12,793	36,841	,000 <sup>d</sup>
	Residual	413,230	1190	,347		
	Total	605,125	1205			

a. Dependent Variable: satisfaction with study

b. Predictors: (Constant), economics and business students

c. Predictors: (Constant), economics and business students, bmi, living with your partner, study results, Dutch, Sex, living alone, study phase, having a relationship, Age, living with peers

d. Predictors: (Constant), economics and business students, bmi, living with your partner, study results, Dutch, Sex, living alone, study phase, having a relationship, Age, living with peers, seeking or having help, negative sexual experiences, peer pressure lifestyle self-efficacy, problem perception

Table 11.1-11.3. Hierarchical regression analysis for quality of student life whereby economics and business students are compared with non-economics and business students.  
Step 1 N = 2393, step 2 N = 2348, step 3 N = 1206.

Table 11.1

		Coefficients <sup>a</sup>									
Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.	Correlations			Collinearity Statistics	
		B	Std. Error	Beta			Zero-order	Partial	Part	Tolerance	VIF
1	(Constant)	3,618	,018		202,396	,000					
	economics and business students	-,039	,053	-,021	-,742	,458	-,021	-,021	-,021	1,000	1,000
2	(Constant)	3,558	,220		16,191	,000					
	economics and business students	-,005	,053	-,003	-,095	,924	-,021	-,003	-,003	,946	1,057
	Sex	-,005	,037	-,004	-,126	,900	,021	-,004	-,003	,941	1,062
	Age	-,019	,005	-,121	-3,627	,000	-,089	-,104	-,101	,702	1,424
	bmi	,003	,002	,035	1,233	,218	,014	,036	,034	,983	1,017
	having a relationship	,217	,036	,183	5,980	,000	,168	,171	,167	,826	1,210
	living with peers	,149	,045	,123	3,296	,001	,124	,095	,092	,557	1,794
	living alone	-,006	,047	-,005	-,126	,900	-,113	-,004	-,003	,552	1,811
	living with your partner	,046	,068	,024	,671	,502	,033	,019	,019	,591	1,691
	Dutch	,138	,037	,107	3,738	,000	,119	,108	,104	,953	1,049
	study results	,026	,020	,037	1,278	,201	,034	,037	,036	,937	1,068
	study phase	,045	,042	,035	1,068	,286	,011	,031	,030	,708	1,412
3	(Constant)	4,058	,234		17,325	,000					
	economics and business students	-,039	,049	-,021	-,799	,424	-,021	-,023	-,021	,941	1,063
	Sex	,045	,036	,035	1,256	,209	,021	,036	,033	,885	1,130
	Age	-,019	,005	-,118	-3,789	,000	-,089	-,109	-,098	,693	1,442
	bmi	,005	,002	,054	2,052	,040	,014	,059	,053	,978	1,023
	having a relationship	,148	,034	,125	4,288	,000	,168	,123	,111	,795	1,257
	living with peers	,146	,043	,121	3,411	,001	,124	,098	,089	,537	1,861
	living alone	,055	,045	,044	1,237	,216	-,113	,036	,032	,537	1,861
	living with your partner	,138	,064	,073	2,149	,032	,033	,062	,056	,582	1,718
	Dutch	,057	,035	,045	1,646	,100	,119	,048	,043	,923	1,084
	study results	,032	,019	,046	1,714	,087	,034	,050	,045	,932	1,073
	study phase	,038	,039	,030	,959	,338	,011	,028	,025	,705	1,419
	negative sexual experiences	-,196	,039	-,135	-5,040	,000	-,170	-,145	-,131	,938	1,067
	peer pressure lifestyle self-efficacy	,017	,012	,038	1,396	,163	,055	,040	,036	,925	1,081
	problem perception	-,260	,024	-,291	-10,635	,000	-,339	-,295	-,276	,902	1,109
	seeking or having help	-,152	,031	-,129	-4,844	,000	-,155	-,139	-,126	,957	1,045

a. Dependent Variable: quality of student life

Table 11.2

Model Summary									
Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate	R Square Change	Change Statistics			Sig. F Change
						F Change	df1	df2	
1	,021 <sup>a</sup>	,000	,000	,58449	,000	,550	1	1204	,458
2	,270 <sup>b</sup>	,073	,064	,56524	,073	9,341	10	1194	,000
3	,444 <sup>c</sup>	,197	,187	,52704	,124	45,831	4	1190	,000

a. Predictors: (Constant), economics and business students

b. Predictors: (Constant), economics and business students, bmi, living with your partner, study results, Dutch, Sex, living alone, study phase, having a relationship, Age, living with peers

c. Predictors: (Constant), economics and business students, bmi, living with your partner, study results, Dutch, Sex, living alone, study phase, having a relationship, Age, living with peers, seeking or having help, negative sexual experiences, peer pressure lifestyle self-efficacy, problem perception

Table 11.3

ANOVA <sup>a</sup>						
Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	,188	1	,188	,550	,458 <sup>b</sup>
	Residual	411,318	1204	,342		
	Total	411,506	1205			
2	Regression	30,031	11	2,730	8,545	,000 <sup>c</sup>
	Residual	381,475	1194	,319		
	Total	411,506	1205			
3	Regression	80,954	15	5,397	19,429	,000 <sup>d</sup>
	Residual	330,552	1190	,278		
	Total	411,506	1205			

a. Dependent Variable: quality of student life

b. Predictors: (Constant), economics and business students

c. Predictors: (Constant), economics and business students, bmi, living with your partner, study results, Dutch, Sex, living alone, study phase, having a relationship, Age, living with peers

d. Predictors: (Constant), economics and business students, bmi, living with your partner, study results, Dutch, Sex, living alone, study phase, having a relationship, Age, living with peers, seeking or having help, negative sexual experiences, peer pressure lifestyle self-efficacy, problem perception



## Appendix 14: Logistic regression analyses whereby medical students are compared with non-medical students

Table 1.1-1.9. Logistic regression analysis for physical complaints whereby medical students are compared with non-medical students.

Step 1 N = 2393, step 2 N = 2348, step 3 N = 1206.

Table 1.1

### Variables in the Equation

		B	S.E.	Wald	df	Sig.	Exp(B)	95% C.I. for EXP(B)	
Step 1 <sup>a</sup>	medical students	,067	,127	,277	1	,599	1,069	,834	1,371
	Constant	-1,149	,052	481,826	1	,000	,317		

a. Variable(s) entered on step 1: medical students.

Table 1.2

### Model Summary

Step	-2 Log likelihood	Cox & Snell R Square	Nagelkerke R Square
1	2652,492 <sup>a</sup>	,000	,000

a. Estimation terminated at iteration number 4 because parameter estimates changed by less than ,001.

Table 1.3

### Omnibus Tests of Model Coefficients

		Chi-square	df	Sig.
Step 1	Step	,275	1	,600
	Block	,275	1	,600
	Model	,275	1	,600

Table 1.4

### Variables in the Equation

		B	S.E.	Wald	df	Sig.	Exp(B)	95% C.I. for EXP(B)	
Step 2 <sup>a</sup>	medical students	,024	,133	,031	1	,859	1,024	,788	1,330
	Sex	,573	,115	24,882	1	,000	1,773	1,416	2,221
	Age	,025	,013	3,976	1	,046	1,026	1,000	1,052
	bmi	,005	,009	,315	1	,575	1,005	,987	1,024
	having a relationship	,228	,108	4,510	1	,034	1,257	1,018	1,551
	living situation			10,489	3	,015			
	living situation(1)	-,365	,131	7,793	1	,005	,694	,537	,897
	living situation(2)	-,371	,140	7,077	1	,008	,690	,525	,907
	living situation(3)	-,125	,189	,434	1	,510	,883	,609	1,280
	Dutch	,045	,116	,152	1	,696	1,046	,834	1,313
	study results	-,166	,059	7,888	1	,005	,847	,754	,951
	study phase	-,098	,119	,673	1	,412	,907	,718	1,145
	Constant	-1,510	,616	5,998	1	,014	,221		

a. Variable(s) entered on step 1: medical students, Sex, Age, bmi, having a relationship, living situation, Dutch, study results, study phase.



Table 1.5

Model Summary			
Step	-2 Log likelihood	Cox & Snell R Square	Nagelkerke R Square
2	2538,282 <sup>a</sup>	,025	,038

a. Estimation terminated at iteration number 4 because parameter estimates changed by less than ,001.

Table 1.6

Omnibus Tests of Model Coefficients				
		Chi-square	df	Sig.
Step 2	Step	59,871	11	,000
	Block	59,871	11	,000
	Model	59,871	11	,000

Table 1.7

Variables in the Equation								
		B	S.E.	Wald	df	Sig.	Exp(B)	95% C.I. for EXP(B) Lower Upper
Step 3 <sup>a</sup>	medical students	,099	,194	,261	1	,609	1,104	,755 1,616
	Sex	,196	,158	1,535	1	,215	1,217	,892 1,660
	Age	,036	,020	3,076	1	,079	1,036	,996 1,078
	bmi	,000	,012	,000	1	,991	1,000	,977 1,024
	having a relationship	,331	,149	4,955	1	,026	1,392	1,040 1,863
	living situation			13,476	3	,004		
	living situation(1)	-,588	,181	10,553	1	,001	,555	,389 ,792
	living situation(2)	-,529	,188	7,928	1	,005	,589	,407 ,851
	living situation(3)	-,158	,257	,380	1	,538	,854	,516 1,412
	Dutch	,080	,152	,279	1	,597	1,084	,805 1,459
	study results	-,199	,080	6,127	1	,013	,820	,700 ,959
	study phase	-,075	,169	,196	1	,658	,928	,666 1,292
	negative sexual experiences	,033	,168	,039	1	,844	1,034	,744 1,436
	peer pressure lifestyle self-efficacy	,123	,056	4,923	1	,027	1,131	1,014 1,261
	problem perception	,091	,107	,722	1	,396	1,095	,888 1,349
	seeking or having help	,229	,138	2,757	1	,097	1,258	,959 1,649
	Constant	-2,003	1,017	3,880	1	,049	,135	

a. Variable(s) entered on step 1: medical students, Sex, Age, bmi, having a relationship, living situation, Dutch, study results, study phase, negative sexual experiences, peer pressure lifestyle self-efficacy, problem perception, seeking or having help.

Table 1.8

Model Summary			
Step	-2 Log likelihood	Cox & Snell R Square	Nagelkerke R Square
3	1366,976 <sup>a</sup>	,046	,066

a. Estimation terminated at iteration number 4 because parameter estimates changed by less than ,001.

Table 1.9

Omnibus Tests of Model Coefficients				
		Chi-square	df	Sig.
Step 3	Step	56,220	15	,000
	Block	56,220	15	,000
	Model	56,220	15	,000

Table 2.1-2.9. Logistic regression analysis for smoking whereby medical students are compared with non-medical students.

Step 1 N = 2393, step 2 N = 2348, step 3 N = 1206.

Table 2.1

### Variables in the Equation

		B	S.E.	Wald	df	Sig.	Exp(B)	95% C.I. for EXP(B)	
								Lower	Upper
Step 1 <sup>a</sup>	medical students	-,519	,122	18,139	1	,000	,595	,469	,756
	Constant	-,458	,046	99,596	1	,000	,632		

a. Variable(s) entered on step 1: medical students.

Table 2.2

### Model Summary

Step	-2 Log likelihood	Cox & Snell R Square	Nagelkerke R Square
1	3131,027 <sup>a</sup>	,008	,011

a. Estimation terminated at iteration number 4 because parameter estimates changed by less than ,001.

Table 2.3

### Omnibus Tests of Model Coefficients

		Chi-square	df	Sig.
Step 1	Step	19,085	1	,000
	Block	19,085	1	,000
	Model	19,085	1	,000

Table 2.4

### Variables in the Equation

		B	S.E.	Wald	df	Sig.	Exp(B)	95% C.I. for EXP(B)	
								Lower	Upper
Step 2 <sup>a</sup>	medical students	-,427	,128	11,178	1	,001	,652	,508	,838
	Sex	-,427	,095	20,161	1	,000	,653	,542	,786
	Age	,001	,012	,002	1	,965	1,001	,976	1,025
	bmi	,018	,013	2,058	1	,151	1,019	,993	1,045
	having a relationship	-,121	,097	1,556	1	,212	,886	,732	1,072
	living situation			76,973	3	,000			
	living situation(1)	1,021	,126	66,095	1	,000	2,775	2,170	3,549
	living situation(2)	,501	,133	14,069	1	,000	1,650	1,270	2,143
	living situation(3)	,276	,194	2,014	1	,156	1,318	,900	1,929
	Dutch	-,144	,103	1,939	1	,164	,866	,708	1,060
	study results	-,115	,054	4,499	1	,034	,892	,802	,991
	study phase	-,242	,109	4,909	1	,027	,785	,634	,972
	Constant	,299	,608	,242	1	,623	1,348		

a. Variable(s) entered on step 1: medical students, Sex, Age, bmi, having a relationship, living situation, Dutch, study results, study phase.

Table 2.5

Model Summary			
Step	-2 Log likelihood	Cox & Snell R Square	Nagelkerke R Square
2	2953,115 <sup>a</sup>	,059	,080

a. Estimation terminated at iteration number 4 because parameter estimates changed by less than ,001.

Table 2.6

Omnibus Tests of Model Coefficients				
		Chi-square	df	Sig.
Step 2	Step	141,597	11	,000
	Block	141,597	11	,000
	Model	141,597	11	,000

Table 2.7

Variables in the Equation									
		B	S.E.	Wald	df	Sig.	Exp(B)	95% C.I. for EXP(B)	
Step 3 <sup>a</sup>	medical students	-,573	,194	8,676	1	,003	,564	,385	,826
	Sex	-,140	,147	,904	1	,342	,870	,652	1,160
	Age	,008	,021	,149	1	,700	1,008	,968	1,050
	bmi	,012	,015	,661	1	,416	1,012	,983	1,043
	having a relationship	-,110	,143	,589	1	,443	,896	,677	1,186
	living situation			31,874	3	,000			
	living situation(1)	,862	,180	22,958	1	,000	2,368	1,664	3,369
	living situation(2)	,162	,189	,736	1	,391	1,176	,812	1,705
	living situation(3)	,362	,276	1,729	1	,189	1,437	,837	2,465
	Dutch	,030	,147	,043	1	,837	1,031	,773	1,374
	study results	,103	,079	1,695	1	,193	1,109	,949	1,296
	study phase	-,440	,165	7,097	1	,008	,644	,466	,890
	negative sexual experiences	,223	,160	1,932	1	,165	1,250	,913	1,712
	peer pressure lifestyle self-efficacy	-,560	,059	89,726	1	,000	,571	,509	,642
	problem perception	-,242	,103	5,472	1	,019	,785	,642	,962
	seeking or having help	-,278	,131	4,502	1	,034	,757	,586	,979
	Constant	4,260	1,043	16,686	1	,000	70,779		

a. Variable(s) entered on step 1: medical students, Sex, Age, bmi, having a relationship, living situation, Dutch, study results, study phase, negative sexual experiences, peer pressure lifestyle self-efficacy, problem perception, seeking or having help.

Table 2.8

Model Summary			
Step	-2 Log likelihood	Cox & Snell R Square	Nagelkerke R Square
3	1452,195 <sup>a</sup>	,158	,211

a. Estimation terminated at iteration number 4 because parameter estimates changed by less than ,001.

Table 2.9

Omnibus Tests of Model Coefficients				
		Chi-square	df	Sig.
Step 3	Step	207,313	15	,000
	Block	207,313	15	,000
	Model	207,313	15	,000

Table 3.1-3.9. Logistic regression analysis for alcohol (ab)use whereby medical students are compared with non-medical students.

Step 1 N = 2393, step 2 N = 2348, step 3 N = 1206.

Table 3.1

### Variables in the Equation

		B	S.E.	Wald	df	Sig.	Exp(B)	95% C.I. for EXP(B)	
								Lower	Upper
Step 1 <sup>a</sup>	medical students	,133	,187	,505	1	,477	1,142	,791	1,650
	Constant	2,136	,073	861,373	1	,000	8,469		

a. Variable(s) entered on step 1: medical students.

Table 3.2

### Model Summary

Step	-2 Log likelihood	Cox & Snell R Square	Nagelkerke R Square
1	1593,213 <sup>a</sup>	,000	,000

a. Estimation terminated at iteration number 5 because parameter estimates changed by less than ,001.

Table 3.3

### Omnibus Tests of Model Coefficients

		Chi-square	df	Sig.
Step 1	Step	,518	1	,472
	Block	,518	1	,472
	Model	,518	1	,472

Table 3.4

### Variables in the Equation

		B	S.E.	Wald	df	Sig.	Exp(B)	95% C.I. for EXP(B)	
								Lower	Upper
Step 2 <sup>a</sup>	medical students	,080	,213	,142	1	,706	1,084	,714	1,646
	Sex	-,123	,161	,586	1	,444	,884	,646	1,211
	Age	-,011	,018	,358	1	,550	,989	,954	1,025
	bmi	,010	,018	,295	1	,587	1,010	,975	1,045
	having a relationship	,128	,162	,621	1	,431	1,136	,827	1,562
	living situation			97,988	3	,000			
	living situation(1)	1,840	,202	83,047	1	,000	6,295	4,238	9,350
	living situation(2)	1,316	,185	50,378	1	,000	3,729	2,593	5,363
	living situation(3)	,881	,265	11,065	1	,001	2,414	1,436	4,057
	Dutch	1,315	,150	76,713	1	,000	3,723	2,774	4,996
	study results	-,041	,083	,246	1	,620	,960	,816	1,129
	study phase	,166	,180	,854	1	,355	1,181	,830	1,679
	Constant	,764	,903	,715	1	,398	2,146		

a. Variable(s) entered on step 1: medical students, Sex, Age, bmi, having a relationship, living situation, Dutch, study results, study phase.

Table 3.5

Model Summary			
Step	-2 Log likelihood	Cox & Snell R Square	Nagelkerke R Square
2	1361,760 <sup>a</sup>	,072	,149

a. Estimation terminated at iteration number 6 because parameter estimates changed by less than ,001.

Table 3.6

Omnibus Tests of Model Coefficients				
		Chi-square	df	Sig.
Step 2	Step	174,475	11	,000
	Block	174,475	11	,000
	Model	174,475	11	,000

Table 3.7

Variables in the Equation									
		B	S.E.	Wald	df	Sig.	Exp(B)	95% C.I. for EXP(B)	
Step 3 <sup>a</sup>	medical students	-,091	,337	,074	1	,786	,913	,472	1,766
	Sex	-,114	,274	,174	1	,676	,892	,521	1,526
	Age	-,042	,027	2,470	1	,116	,959	,910	1,010
	bmi	,000	,019	,000	1	,988	1,000	,962	1,038
	having a relationship	-,104	,248	,176	1	,675	,901	,555	1,464
	living situation			39,081	3	,000			
	living situation(1)	1,663	,312	28,391	1	,000	5,275	2,861	9,726
	living situation(2)	1,469	,290	25,655	1	,000	4,346	2,461	7,674
	living situation(3)	1,142	,385	8,810	1	,003	3,133	1,474	6,661
	Dutch	1,345	,228	34,922	1	,000	3,837	2,456	5,993
	study results	,050	,123	,164	1	,685	1,051	,825	1,339
	study phase	-,048	,266	,032	1	,858	,953	,566	1,607
	negative sexual experiences	-,049	,270	,033	1	,855	,952	,561	1,617
	peer pressure lifestyle self-efficacy	-,558	,135	17,130	1	,000	,572	,439	,745
	problem perception	-,369	,172	4,604	1	,032	,691	,493	,969
	seeking or having help	-,191	,232	,682	1	,409	,826	,524	1,301
	Constant	7,567	1,832	17,066	1	,000	1932,418		

a. Variable(s) entered on step 1: medical students, Sex, Age, bmi, having a relationship, living situation, Dutch, study results, study phase, negative sexual experiences, peer pressure lifestyle self-efficacy, problem perception, seeking or having help.

Table 3.8

Model Summary			
Step	-2 Log likelihood	Cox & Snell R Square	Nagelkerke R Square
3	596,476 <sup>a</sup>	,106	,233

a. Estimation terminated at iteration number 7 because parameter estimates changed by less than ,001.

Table 3.9

Omnibus Tests of Model Coefficients				
		Chi-square	df	Sig.
Step 3	Step	135,372	15	,000
	Block	135,372	15	,000
	Model	135,372	15	,000

Table 4.1-4.9. Logistic regression analysis for drug (ab)use whereby medical students are compared with non-medical students.

Step 1 N = 2393, step 2 N = 2348, step 3 N = 1206.

Table 4.1

Variables in the Equation									
		B	S.E.	Wald	df	Sig.	Exp(B)	95% C.I. for EXP(B)	
								Lower	Upper
Step 1 <sup>a</sup>	medical students	-,107	,118	,832	1	,362	,898	,713	1,131
	Constant	-,640	,047	184,768	1	,000	,528		

a. Variable(s) entered on step 1: medical students.

Table 4.2

Model Summary			
Step	-2 Log likelihood	Cox & Snell R Square	Nagelkerke R Square
1	3071,619 <sup>a</sup>	,000	,000

a. Estimation terminated at iteration number 3 because parameter estimates changed by less than ,001.

Table 4.3

Omnibus Tests of Model Coefficients				
		Chi-square	df	Sig.
Step 1	Step	,839	1	,360
	Block	,839	1	,360
	Model	,839	1	,360

Table 4.4

Variables in the Equation									
		B	S.E.	Wald	df	Sig.	Exp(B)	95% C.I. for EXP(B)	
								Lower	Upper
Step 2 <sup>a</sup>	medical students	-,003	,126	,001	1	,980	,997	,778	1,277
	Sex	-,837	,097	73,922	1	,000	,433	,358	,524
	Age	-,031	,015	4,482	1	,034	,970	,943	,998
	bmi	-,008	,010	,615	1	,433	,992	,973	1,012
	having a relationship	,039	,100	,150	1	,699	1,039	,855	1,264
	living situation			118,723	3	,000			
	living situation(1)	1,393	,136	104,651	1	,000	4,025	3,082	5,256
	living situation(2)	,840	,144	34,012	1	,000	2,317	1,747	3,074
	living situation(3)	,470	,207	5,166	1	,023	1,600	1,067	2,401
	Dutch	-,145	,107	1,842	1	,175	,865	,701	1,067
	study results	-,080	,056	2,067	1	,151	,923	,828	1,030
	study phase	-,001	,114	,000	1	,991	,999	,798	1,250
	Constant	1,437	,616	5,439	1	,020	4,208		

a. Variable(s) entered on step 1: medical students, Sex, Age, bmi, having a relationship, living situation, Dutch, study results, study phase.

Table 4.5

Model Summary			
Step	-2 Log likelihood	Cox & Snell R Square	Nagelkerke R Square
2	2810,367 <sup>a</sup>	,086	,119

a. Estimation terminated at iteration number 4 because parameter estimates changed by less than ,001.

Table 4.6

Omnibus Tests of Model Coefficients				
Step 2	Chi-square		df	Sig.
	Step	211,308	11	,000
	Block	211,308	11	,000
	Model	211,308	11	,000

Table 4.7

Variables in the Equation									
Step 3 <sup>a</sup>		B	S.E.	Wald	df	Sig.	Exp(B)	95% C.I. for EXP(B)	
								Lower	Upper
Step 3 <sup>a</sup>	medical students	,276	,192	2,068	1	,150	1,318	,905	1,920
	Sex	-,656	,150	19,043	1	,000	,519	,386	,697
	Age	-,029	,024	1,479	1	,224	,971	,927	1,018
	bmi	-,010	,010	,948	1	,330	,990	,970	1,010
	having a relationship	,123	,148	,688	1	,407	1,130	,846	1,510
	living situation			66,026	3	,000			
	living situation(1)	1,486	,195	58,039	1	,000	4,420	3,016	6,479
	living situation(2)	,710	,204	12,076	1	,001	2,035	1,363	3,037
	living situation(3)	,712	,295	5,831	1	,016	2,038	1,143	3,631
	Dutch	,090	,152	,352	1	,553	1,094	,812	1,475
	study results	,192	,083	5,354	1	,021	1,212	1,030	1,427
	study phase	-,241	,174	1,925	1	,165	,786	,559	1,105
	negative sexual experiences	,360	,165	4,768	1	,029	1,433	1,038	1,980
	peer pressure lifestyle self-efficacy	-,528	,059	81,486	1	,000	,590	,526	,661
	problem perception	-,189	,106	3,185	1	,074	,828	,673	1,019
	seeking or having help	-,260	,135	3,714	1	,054	,771	,592	1,004
	Constant	4,526	1,071	17,869	1	,000	92,395		

a. Variable(s) entered on step 1: medical students, Sex, Age, bmi, having a relationship, living situation, Dutch, study results, study phase, negative sexual experiences, peer pressure lifestyle self-efficacy, problem perception, seeking or having help.

Table 4.8

Model Summary			
Step	-2 Log likelihood	Cox & Snell R Square	Nagelkerke R Square
3	1381,949 <sup>a</sup>	,194	,261

a. Estimation terminated at iteration number 5 because parameter estimates changed by less than ,001.

Table 4.9

Omnibus Tests of Model Coefficients				
Step 3	Chi-square		df	Sig.
	Step	260,496	15	,000
	Block	260,496	15	,000
	Model	260,496	15	,000

Table 5.1-5.9. Logistic regression analysis for psychological complaints whereby medical students are compared with non-medical students.

Step 1 N = 2393, step 2 N = 2348, step 3 N = 1206.

Table 5.1

Variables in the Equation									
		B	S.E.	Wald	df	Sig.	Exp(B)	95% C.I. for EXP(B)	
								Lower	Upper
Step 1 <sup>a</sup>	medical students	,034	,141	,059	1	,809	1,035	,784	1,365
	Constant	-1,502	,058	671,251	1	,000	,223		

a. Variable(s) entered on step 1: medical students.

Table 5.2

Model Summary			
Step	-2 Log likelihood	Cox & Snell R Square	Nagelkerke R Square
1	2277,900 <sup>a</sup>	,000	,000

a. Estimation terminated at iteration number 4 because parameter estimates changed by less than ,001.

Table 5.3

Omnibus Tests of Model Coefficients				
		Chi-square	df	Sig.
Step 1	Step	,058	1	,809
	Block	,058	1	,809
	Model	,058	1	,809

Table 5.4

Variables in the Equation									
		B	S.E.	Wald	df	Sig.	Exp(B)	95% C.I. for EXP(B)	
								Lower	Upper
Step 2 <sup>a</sup>	medical students	,058	,148	,151	1	,698	1,059	,792	1,417
	Sex	,527	,127	17,250	1	,000	1,694	1,321	2,172
	Age	,032	,013	5,827	1	,016	1,032	1,006	1,060
	bmi	-,008	,015	,262	1	,609	,992	,964	1,022
	having a relationship	-,287	,123	5,411	1	,020	,751	,590	,956
	living situation			10,318	3	,016			
	living situation(1)	-,070	,153	,208	1	,649	,932	,690	1,259
	living situation(2)	,312	,156	4,022	1	,045	1,366	1,007	1,853
	living situation(3)	,332	,221	2,260	1	,133	1,393	,904	2,148
	Dutch	,025	,127	,038	1	,846	1,025	,799	1,315
	study results	-,288	,065	19,739	1	,000	,750	,660	,851
	study phase	-,093	,132	,499	1	,480	,911	,704	1,179
	Constant	-,932	,706	1,742	1	,187	,394		

a. Variable(s) entered on step 1: medical students, Sex, Age, bmi, having a relationship, living situation, Dutch, study results, study phase.



Table 5.5

Model Summary			
Step	-2 Log likelihood	Cox & Snell R Square	Nagelkerke R Square
2	2179,295 <sup>a</sup>	,024	,039

a. Estimation terminated at iteration number 5 because parameter estimates changed by less than ,001.

Table 5.6

Omnibus Tests of Model Coefficients				
		Chi-square	df	Sig.
Step 2	Step	56,534	11	,000
	Block	56,534	11	,000
	Model	56,534	11	,000

Table 5.7

Variables in the Equation									
		B	S.E.	Wald	df	Sig.	Exp(B)	95% C.I. for EXP(B)	
								Lower	Upper
Step 3 <sup>a</sup>	medical students	,446	,208	4,601	1	,032	1,561	1,039	2,346
	Sex	,093	,171	,300	1	,584	1,098	,786	1,534
	Age	,037	,021	2,980	1	,084	1,037	,995	1,082
	bmi	-,025	,021	1,461	1	,227	,976	,937	1,016
	having a relationship	-,187	,164	1,307	1	,253	,829	,601	1,143
	living situation			5,127	3	,163			
	living situation(1)	-,195	,204	,914	1	,339	,823	,552	1,227
	living situation(2)	,132	,206	,410	1	,522	1,141	,762	1,708
	living situation(3)	,297	,283	1,104	1	,293	1,346	,773	2,342
	Dutch	,386	,165	5,479	1	,019	1,471	1,065	2,033
	study results	-,184	,085	4,698	1	,030	,832	,704	,982
	study phase	-,065	,181	,129	1	,720	,937	,658	1,335
	negative sexual experiences	,623	,168	13,801	1	,000	1,865	1,342	2,591
	peer pressure lifestyle self-efficacy	,150	,059	6,408	1	,011	1,162	1,034	1,305
	problem perception	,349	,114	9,305	1	,002	1,418	1,133	1,774
	seeking or having help	1,246	,162	59,270	1	,000	3,477	2,532	4,775
	Constant	-3,699	1,133	10,666	1	,001	,025		

a. Variable(s) entered on step 1: medical students, Sex, Age, bmi, having a relationship, living situation, Dutch, study results, study phase, negative sexual experiences, peer pressure lifestyle self-efficacy, problem perception, seeking or having help.

Table 5.8

Model Summary			
Step	-2 Log likelihood	Cox & Snell R Square	Nagelkerke R Square
3	1217,490 <sup>a</sup>	,101	,151

a. Estimation terminated at iteration number 5 because parameter estimates changed by less than ,001.

Table 5.9

Omnibus Tests of Model Coefficients				
		Chi-square	df	Sig.
Step 3	Step	128,885	15	,000
	Block	128,885	15	,000
	Model	128,885	15	,000

Table 6.1-6.9. Logistic regression analysis for disability whereby medical students are compared with non-medical students.

Step 1 N = 2393, step 2 N = 2348, step 3 N = 1206.

Table 6.1

		Variables in the Equation							
		B	S.E.	Wald	df	Sig.	Exp(B)	95% C.I. for EXP(B)	
Step 1 <sup>a</sup>	medical students	-,210	,184	1,302	1	,254	,810	,565	1,163
	Constant	-2,030	,070	844,816	1	,000	,131		

a. Variable(s) entered on step 1: medical students.

Table 6.2

Model Summary			
Step	-2 Log likelihood	Cox & Snell R Square	Nagelkerke R Square
1	1685,181 <sup>a</sup>	,001	,001

a. Estimation terminated at iteration number 5 because parameter estimates changed by less than ,001.

Table 6.3

		Omnibus Tests of Model Coefficients		
		Chi-square	df	Sig.
Step 1	Step	1,355	1	,244
	Block	1,355	1	,244
	Model	1,355	1	,244

Table 6.4

		Variables in the Equation							
		B	S.E.	Wald	df	Sig.	Exp(B)	95% C.I. for EXP(B)	
Step 2 <sup>a</sup>	medical students	-,102	,191	,288	1	,592	,903	,621	1,313
	Sex	,432	,154	7,901	1	,005	1,540	1,140	2,081
	Age	,045	,014	9,967	1	,002	1,046	1,017	1,076
	bmi	-,004	,015	,070	1	,791	,996	,967	1,026
	having a relationship	-,610	,159	14,635	1	,000	,544	,398	,743
	living situation			5,979	3	,113			
	living situation(1)	,123	,192	,411	1	,522	1,131	,776	1,650
	living situation(2)	,337	,196	2,967	1	,085	1,401	,955	2,055
	living situation(3)	,582	,282	4,270	1	,039	1,790	1,030	3,110
	Dutch	-,230	,148	2,410	1	,121	,794	,594	1,062
	study results	-,096	,078	1,514	1	,219	,908	,779	1,059
	study phase	-,355	,162	4,770	1	,029	,702	,510	,964
	Constant	-2,804	,814	11,865	1	,001	,061		

a. Variable(s) entered on step 1: medical students, Sex, Age, bmi, having a relationship, living situation, Dutch, study results, study phase.

Table 6.5

Model Summary			
Step	-2 Log likelihood	Cox & Snell R Square	Nagelkerke R Square
2	1603,577 <sup>a</sup>	,018	,036

a. Estimation terminated at iteration number 5 because parameter estimates changed by less than ,001.

Table 6.6

Omnibus Tests of Model Coefficients				
		Chi-square	df	Sig.
Step 2	Step	43,299	11	,000
	Block	43,299	11	,000
	Model	43,299	11	,000

Table 6.7

Variables in the Equation									
		B	S.E.	Wald	df	Sig.	Exp(B)	95% C.I. for EXP(B)	
Step 3 <sup>a</sup>	medical students	,088	,262	,113	1	,737	1,092	,653	1,827
	Sex	,150	,208	,525	1	,469	1,162	,774	1,746
	Age	,051	,023	4,908	1	,027	1,052	1,006	1,100
	bmi	-,014	,022	,422	1	,516	,986	,944	1,029
	having a relationship	-,675	,212	10,140	1	,001	,509	,336	,772
	living situation			4,601	3	,203			
	living situation(1)	,089	,255	,121	1	,728	1,093	,663	1,802
	living situation(2)	,346	,252	1,876	1	,171	1,413	,862	2,317
	living situation(3)	,641	,359	3,188	1	,074	1,898	,939	3,835
	Dutch	,002	,192	,000	1	,991	1,002	,688	1,461
	study results	-,088	,101	,758	1	,384	,916	,751	1,116
	study phase	-,405	,222	3,329	1	,068	,667	,432	1,030
	negative sexual experiences	,153	,206	,547	1	,460	1,165	,777	1,746
	peer pressure lifestyle self-efficacy	,245	,080	9,347	1	,002	1,278	1,092	1,495
	problem perception	,253	,137	3,391	1	,066	1,287	,984	1,684
	seeking or having help	,781	,191	16,678	1	,000	2,185	1,501	3,179
	Constant	-5,556	1,366	16,550	1	,000	,004		

a. Variable(s) entered on step 1: medical students, Sex, Age, bmi, having a relationship, living situation, Dutch, study results, study phase, negative sexual experiences, peer pressure lifestyle self-efficacy, problem perception, seeking or having help.

Table 6.8

Model Summary			
Step	-2 Log likelihood	Cox & Snell R Square	Nagelkerke R Square
3	911,758 <sup>a</sup>	,050	,090

a. Estimation terminated at iteration number 5 because parameter estimates changed by less than ,001.

Table 6.9

Omnibus Tests of Model Coefficients				
		Chi-square	df	Sig.
Step 3	Step	61,959	15	,000
	Block	61,959	15	,000
	Model	61,959	15	,000

## Appendix 15: Logistic regression analyses whereby law students are compared with non-law students

Table 1.1-1.9. Logistic regression analysis for physical complaints whereby law students are compared with non-law students.

Step 1 N = 2393, step 2 N = 2348, step 3 N = 1206.

Table 1.1

		Variables in the Equation							
		B	S.E.	Wald	df	Sig.	Exp(B)	95% C.I. for EXP(B)	
Step 1 <sup>a</sup>	law students	,589	,120	23,980	1	,000	1,802	1,424	2,281
	Constant	-1,243	,054	539,782	1	,000	,288		

a. Variable(s) entered on step 1: law students.

Table 1.2

Model Summary			
Step	-2 Log likelihood	Cox & Snell R Square	Nagelkerke R Square
1	2629,800 <sup>a</sup>	,010	,014

a. Estimation terminated at iteration number 4 because parameter estimates changed by less than ,001.

Table 1.3

Omnibus Tests of Model Coefficients				
		Chi-square	df	Sig.
Step 1	Step	22,967	1	,000
	Block	22,967	1	,000
	Model	22,967	1	,000

Table 1.4

		Variables in the Equation							
		B	S.E.	Wald	df	Sig.	Exp(B)	95% C.I. for EXP(B)	
Step 2 <sup>a</sup>	law students	,438	,129	11,493	1	,001	1,550	1,203	1,998
	Sex	,553	,115	23,087	1	,000	1,739	1,388	2,179
	Age	,021	,013	2,605	1	,107	1,021	,996	1,047
	bmi	,006	,009	,367	1	,545	1,006	,988	1,024
	having a relationship	,234	,108	4,693	1	,030	1,263	1,023	1,561
	living situation			7,191	3	,066			
	living situation(1)	-,310	,132	5,493	1	,019	,734	,566	,951
	living situation(2)	-,293	,142	4,270	1	,039	,746	,564	,985
	living situation(3)	-,078	,191	,166	1	,684	,925	,637	1,345
	Dutch	,028	,115	,060	1	,806	1,029	,820	1,290
	study results	-,135	,060	5,090	1	,024	,874	,777	,982
	study phase	-,133	,120	1,228	1	,268	,876	,692	1,107
	Constant	-1,697	,620	7,504	1	,006	,183		

a. Variable(s) entered on step 1: law students, Sex, Age, bmi, having a relationship, living situation, Dutch, study results, study phase.

Table 1.5

Model Summary			
Step	-2 Log likelihood	Cox & Snell R Square	Nagelkerke R Square
2	2527,134 <sup>a</sup>	,030	,045

a. Estimation terminated at iteration number 4 because parameter estimates changed by less than ,001.

Table 1.6

Omnibus Tests of Model Coefficients				
		Chi-square	df	Sig.
Step 2	Step	71,019	11	,000
	Block	71,019	11	,000
	Model	71,019	11	,000

Table 1.7

Variables in the Equation									
		B	S.E.	Wald	df	Sig.	Exp(B)	95% C.I. for EXP(B)	
								Lower	Upper
Step 3 <sup>a</sup>	law students	,690	,169	16,748	1	,000	1,995	1,433	2,776
	Sex	,137	,160	,735	1	,391	1,147	,838	1,569
	Age	,030	,021	2,100	1	,147	1,030	,989	1,073
	bmi	,001	,011	,008	1	,927	1,001	,979	1,023
	having a relationship	,335	,150	4,989	1	,026	1,397	1,042	1,874
	living situation			10,551	3	,014			
	living situation(1)	-,530	,183	8,376	1	,004	,589	,411	,843
	living situation(2)	-,419	,191	4,791	1	,029	,658	,452	,957
	living situation(3)	-,074	,260	,081	1	,776	,929	,557	1,547
	Dutch	,046	,153	,091	1	,762	1,047	,777	1,412
	study results	-,147	,082	3,236	1	,072	,863	,736	1,013
	study phase	-,148	,171	,745	1	,388	,863	,617	1,207
	negative sexual experiences	,017	,169	,010	1	,921	1,017	,730	1,417
	peer pressure lifestyle self-efficacy	,119	,056	4,609	1	,032	1,127	1,010	1,256
	problem perception	,095	,107	,783	1	,376	1,099	,891	1,355
	seeking or having help	,240	,139	2,996	1	,083	1,272	,969	1,669
	Constant	-2,274	1,025	4,926	1	,026	,103		

a. Variable(s) entered on step 1: law students, Sex, Age, bmi, having a relationship, living situation, Dutch, study results, study phase, negative sexual experiences, peer pressure lifestyle self-efficacy, problem perception, seeking or having help.

Table 1.8

Model Summary			
Step	-2 Log likelihood	Cox & Snell R Square	Nagelkerke R Square
3	1350,875 <sup>a</sup>	,058	,084

a. Estimation terminated at iteration number 4 because parameter estimates changed by less than ,001.

Table 1.9

Omnibus Tests of Model Coefficients				
		Chi-square	df	Sig.
Step 3	Step	72,321	15	,000
	Block	72,321	15	,000
	Model	72,321	15	,000

Table 2.1-2.9. Logistic regression analysis for smoking whereby law students are compared with non-law students.

Step 1 N = 2393, step 2 N = 2348, step 3 N = 1206.

Table 2.1

Variables in the Equation									
		B	S.E.	Wald	df	Sig.	Exp(B)	95% C.I. for EXP(B)	
								Lower	Upper
Step 1 <sup>a</sup>	law students	,038	,115	,107	1	,743	1,038	,829	1,302
	Constant	-,544	,046	138,416	1	,000	,580		

a. Variable(s) entered on step 1: law students.

Table 2.2

Model Summary			
Step	-2 Log likelihood	Cox & Snell R Square	Nagelkerke R Square
1	3150,004 <sup>a</sup>	,000	,000

a. Estimation terminated at iteration number 3 because parameter estimates changed by less than ,001.

Table 2.3

Omnibus Tests of Model Coefficients				
		Chi-square	df	Sig.
Step 1	Step	,107	1	,743
	Block	,107	1	,743
	Model	,107	1	,743

Table 2.4

Variables in the Equation									
		B	S.E.	Wald	df	Sig.	Exp(B)	95% C.I. for EXP(B)	
								Lower	Upper
Step 2 <sup>a</sup>	law students	,195	,126	2,390	1	,122	1,215	,949	1,555
	Sex	-,445	,095	21,939	1	,000	,641	,532	,772
	Age	-,001	,013	,008	1	,927	,999	,975	1,024
	bmi	,018	,013	1,978	1	,160	1,018	,993	1,044
	having a relationship	-,120	,097	1,533	1	,216	,887	,733	1,073
	living situation			78,342	3	,000			
	living situation(1)	1,041	,127	67,653	1	,000	2,832	2,210	3,630
	living situation(2)	,544	,135	16,205	1	,000	1,724	1,322	2,247
	living situation(3)	,283	,195	2,109	1	,146	1,327	,906	1,942
	Dutch	-,203	,102	3,959	1	,047	,816	,668	,997
	study results	-,114	,054	4,371	1	,037	,893	,802	,993
	study phase	-,267	,110	5,925	1	,015	,766	,618	,949
	Constant	,309	,607	,259	1	,611	1,362		

a. Variable(s) entered on step 1: law students, Sex, Age, bmi, having a relationship, living situation, Dutch, study results, study phase.

Table 2.5

Model Summary			
Step	-2 Log likelihood	Cox & Snell R Square	Nagelkerke R Square
2	2962,318 <sup>a</sup>	,055	,075

a. Estimation terminated at iteration number 4 because parameter estimates changed by less than ,001.

Table 2.6

Omnibus Tests of Model Coefficients				
Step 2		Chi-square	df	Sig.
	Step	132,393	11	,000
	Block	132,393	11	,000
	Model	132,393	11	,000

Table 2.7

Variables in the Equation									
		B	S.E.	Wald	df	Sig.	Exp(B)	95% C.I. for EXP(B)	
								Lower	Upper
Step 3 <sup>a</sup>	law students	,264	,175	2,271	1	,132	1,302	,924	1,834
	Sex	-,169	,147	1,323	1	,250	,845	,633	1,126
	Age	,005	,021	,052	1	,819	1,005	,965	1,047
	bmi	,012	,015	,634	1	,426	1,012	,983	1,042
	having a relationship	-,102	,143	,508	1	,476	,903	,683	1,195
	living situation			32,461	3	,000			
	living situation(1)	,902	,180	25,006	1	,000	2,465	1,731	3,510
	living situation(2)	,237	,191	1,543	1	,214	1,267	,872	1,841
	living situation(3)	,390	,276	2,000	1	,157	1,478	,860	2,539
	Dutch	-,040	,146	,077	1	,782	,961	,722	1,278
	study results	,106	,080	1,775	1	,183	1,112	,951	1,300
	study phase	-,463	,166	7,790	1	,005	,629	,454	,871
	negative sexual experiences	,218	,160	1,863	1	,172	1,244	,909	1,702
	peer pressure lifestyle self-efficacy	-,567	,059	91,113	1	,000	,567	,505	,637
	problem perception	-,218	,103	4,512	1	,034	,804	,658	,983
	seeking or having help	-,241	,130	3,429	1	,064	,786	,610	1,014
	Constant	4,248	1,042	16,626	1	,000	69,938		

a. Variable(s) entered on step 1: law students, Sex, Age, bmi, having a relationship, living situation, Dutch, study results, study phase, negative sexual experiences, peer pressure lifestyle self-efficacy, problem perception, seeking or having help.

Table 2.8

Model Summary			
Step	-2 Log likelihood	Cox & Snell R Square	Nagelkerke R Square
3	1458,900 <sup>a</sup>	,153	,205

a. Estimation terminated at iteration number 4 because parameter estimates changed by less than ,001.

Table 2.9

Omnibus Tests of Model Coefficients				
Step 3		Chi-square	df	Sig.
	Step	200,608	15	,000
	Block	200,608	15	,000
	Model	200,608	15	,000

Table 3.1-3.9. Logistic regression analysis for alcohol (ab)use whereby law students are compared with non-law students.

Step 1 N = 2393, step 2 N = 2348, step 3 N = 1206.

Table 3.1

Variables in the Equation									
		B	S.E.	Wald	df	Sig.	Exp(B)	95% C.I. for EXP(B)	
								Lower	Upper
Step 1 <sup>a</sup>	law students	-,200	,174	1,328	1	,249	,819	,582	1,151
	Constant	2,192	,074	872,809	1	,000	8,950		

a. Variable(s) entered on step 1: law students.

Table 3.2

Model Summary			
Step	-2 Log likelihood	Cox & Snell R Square	Nagelkerke R Square
1	1592,446 <sup>a</sup>	,001	,001

a. Estimation terminated at iteration number 5 because parameter estimates changed by less than ,001.

Table 3.3

Omnibus Tests of Model Coefficients				
		Chi-square	df	Sig.
Step 1	Step	1,285	1	,257
	Block	1,285	1	,257
	Model	1,285	1	,257

Table 3.4

Variables in the Equation									
		B	S.E.	Wald	df	Sig.	Exp(B)	95% C.I. for EXP(B)	
								Lower	Upper
Step 2 <sup>a</sup>	law students	,007	,198	,001	1	,970	1,007	,684	1,485
	Sex	-,122	,161	,576	1	,448	,885	,646	1,213
	Age	-,011	,019	,364	1	,546	,989	,954	1,025
	bmi	,010	,018	,303	1	,582	1,010	,975	1,046
	having a relationship	,127	,162	,612	1	,434	1,135	,826	1,560
	living situation			95,135	3	,000			
	living situation(1)	1,838	,203	81,566	1	,000	6,282	4,216	9,361
	living situation(2)	1,313	,188	48,843	1	,000	3,716	2,572	5,370
	living situation(3)	,882	,266	11,037	1	,001	2,417	1,436	4,068
	Dutch	1,321	,149	78,170	1	,000	3,745	2,795	5,019
	study results	-,038	,083	,205	1	,651	,963	,818	1,134
	study phase	,166	,180	,846	1	,358	1,180	,829	1,679
	Constant	,747	,907	,677	1	,411	2,110		

a. Variable(s) entered on step 1: law students, Sex, Age, bmi, having a relationship, living situation, Dutch, study results, study phase.



Table 3.5

Model Summary			
Step	-2 Log likelihood	Cox & Snell R Square	Nagelkerke R Square
2	1361,903 <sup>a</sup>	,072	,149

a. Estimation terminated at iteration number 6 because parameter estimates changed by less than ,001.

Table 3.6

Omnibus Tests of Model Coefficients				
Step 2		Chi-square	df	Sig.
	Step	174,332	11	,000
	Block	174,332	11	,000
	Model	174,332	11	,000

Table 3.7

Variables in the Equation									
Step 3 <sup>a</sup>		B	S.E.	Wald	df	Sig.	Exp(B)	95% C.I. for EXP(B)	
								Lower	Upper
Step 3 <sup>a</sup>	law students	-,029	,287	,010	1	,920	,972	,554	1,704
	Sex	-,112	,276	,166	1	,684	,894	,521	1,534
	Age	-,042	,027	2,396	1	,122	,959	,910	1,011
	bmi	-,001	,019	,001	1	,975	,999	,963	1,037
	having a relationship	-,101	,248	,167	1	,682	,904	,556	1,468
	living situation			38,713	3	,000			
	living situation(1)	1,668	,313	28,384	1	,000	5,299	2,869	9,786
	living situation(2)	1,473	,293	25,355	1	,000	4,362	2,459	7,739
	living situation(3)	1,143	,385	8,799	1	,003	3,136	1,474	6,675
	Dutch	1,342	,227	34,810	1	,000	3,826	2,450	5,975
	study results	,043	,125	,119	1	,730	1,044	,817	1,335
	study phase	-,041	,266	,024	1	,877	,959	,569	1,618
	negative sexual experiences	-,047	,270	,030	1	,861	,954	,561	1,621
	peer pressure lifestyle self-efficacy	-,557	,135	17,073	1	,000	,573	,440	,746
	problem perception	-,366	,172	4,542	1	,033	,693	,495	,971
	seeking or having help	-,189	,232	,662	1	,416	,828	,526	1,304
	Constant	7,576	1,831	17,126	1	,000	1950,097		

a. Variable(s) entered on step 1: law students, Sex, Age, bmi, having a relationship, living situation, Dutch, study results, study phase, negative sexual experiences, peer pressure lifestyle self-efficacy, problem perception, seeking or having help.

Table 3.8

Model Summary			
Step	-2 Log likelihood	Cox & Snell R Square	Nagelkerke R Square
3	596,538 <sup>a</sup>	,106	,233

a. Estimation terminated at iteration number 7 because parameter estimates changed by less than ,001.

Table 3.9

Omnibus Tests of Model Coefficients				
Step 3		Chi-square	df	Sig.
	Step	135,309	15	,000
	Block	135,309	15	,000
	Model	135,309	15	,000

Table 4.1-4.9. Logistic regression analysis for drug (ab)use whereby law students are compared with non-law students.

Step 1 N = 2393, step 2 N = 2348, step 3 N = 1206.

Table 4.1

Variables in the Equation									
		B	S.E.	Wald	df	Sig.	Exp(B)	95% C.I. for EXP(B)	
								Lower	Upper
Step 1 <sup>a</sup>	law students	-,298	,122	5,930	1	,015	,743	,584	,944
	Constant	-,611	,047	171,321	1	,000	,543		

a. Variable(s) entered on step 1: law students.

Table 4.2

Model Summary			
Step	-2 Log likelihood	Cox & Snell R Square	Nagelkerke R Square
1	3066,360 <sup>a</sup>	,003	,004

a. Estimation terminated at iteration number 3 because parameter estimates changed by less than ,001.

Table 4.3

Omnibus Tests of Model Coefficients				
		Chi-square	df	Sig.
Step 1	Step	6,099	1	,014
	Block	6,099	1	,014
	Model	6,099	1	,014

Table 4.4

Variables in the Equation									
		B	S.E.	Wald	df	Sig.	Exp(B)	95% C.I. for EXP(B)	
								Lower	Upper
Step 2 <sup>a</sup>	law students	-,108	,135	,642	1	,423	,897	,689	1,169
	Sex	-,833	,098	73,018	1	,000	,435	,359	,526
	Age	-,030	,015	4,155	1	,042	,971	,943	,999
	bmi	-,008	,010	,627	1	,429	,992	,973	1,012
	having a relationship	,037	,100	,138	1	,710	1,038	,853	1,262
	living situation			116,035	3	,000			
	living situation(1)	1,380	,137	101,399	1	,000	3,973	3,038	5,197
	living situation(2)	,822	,146	31,839	1	,000	2,276	1,710	3,028
	living situation(3)	,459	,207	4,907	1	,027	1,583	1,054	2,376
	Dutch	-,141	,106	1,758	1	,185	,869	,706	1,070
	study results	-,087	,056	2,375	1	,123	,917	,822	1,024
	study phase	,006	,115	,003	1	,955	1,006	,804	1,261
	Constant	1,478	,618	5,711	1	,017	4,384		

a. Variable(s) entered on step 1: law students, Sex, Age, bmi, having a relationship, living situation, Dutch, study results, study phase.

Table 4.5

Model Summary			
Step	-2 Log likelihood	Cox & Snell R Square	Nagelkerke R Square
2	2809,721 <sup>a</sup>	,086	,119

a. Estimation terminated at iteration number 4 because parameter estimates changed by less than ,001.

Table 4.6

Omnibus Tests of Model Coefficients				
		Chi-square	df	Sig.
Step 2	Step	211,954	11	,000
	Block	211,954	11	,000
	Model	211,954	11	,000

Table 4.7

Variables in the Equation									
		B	S.E.	Wald	df	Sig.	Exp(B)	95% C.I. for EXP(B)	
Step 3 <sup>a</sup>	law students	-,053	,184	,083	1	,773	,948	,661	1,361
	Sex	-,648	,151	18,459	1	,000	,523	,389	,703
	Age	-,028	,024	1,383	1	,240	,972	,928	1,019
	bmi	-,010	,010	,930	1	,335	,990	,970	1,010
	having a relationship	,120	,148	,666	1	,414	1,128	,845	1,506
	living situation			65,166	3	,000			
	living situation(1)	1,469	,195	56,605	1	,000	4,343	2,963	6,368
	living situation(2)	,685	,206	11,083	1	,001	1,983	1,325	2,968
	living situation(3)	,706	,295	5,726	1	,017	2,026	1,136	3,613
	Dutch	,121	,152	,637	1	,425	1,129	,838	1,520
	study results	,196	,084	5,460	1	,019	1,216	1,032	1,433
	study phase	-,236	,174	1,827	1	,177	,790	,562	1,112
	negative sexual experiences	,360	,165	4,783	1	,029	1,434	1,038	1,981
	peer pressure lifestyle self-efficacy	-,524	,058	80,799	1	,000	,592	,528	,664
	problem perception	-,199	,106	3,564	1	,059	,819	,666	1,008
	seeking or having help	-,277	,134	4,274	1	,039	,758	,582	,986
	Constant	4,503	1,069	17,744	1	,000	90,309		

a. Variable(s) entered on step 1: law students, Sex, Age, bmi, having a relationship, living situation, Dutch, study results, study phase, negative sexual experiences, peer pressure lifestyle self-efficacy, problem perception, seeking or having help.

Table 4.8

Model Summary			
Step	-2 Log likelihood	Cox & Snell R Square	Nagelkerke R Square
3	1383,925 <sup>a</sup>	,193	,259

a. Estimation terminated at iteration number 5 because parameter estimates changed by less than ,001.

Table 4.9

Omnibus Tests of Model Coefficients				
		Chi-square	df	Sig.
Step 3	Step	258,520	15	,000
	Block	258,520	15	,000
	Model	258,520	15	,000

Table 5.1-5.9. Logistic regression analysis for psychological complaints whereby law students are compared with non-law students.

Step 1 N = 2393, step 2 N = 2348, step 3 N = 1206.

Table 5.1

Variables in the Equation									
		B	S.E.	Wald	df	Sig.	Exp(B)	95% C.I. for EXP(B)	
								Lower	Upper
Step 1 <sup>a</sup>	law students	,310	,136	5,224	1	,022	1,364	1,045	1,780
	Constant	-1,550	,059	697,343	1	,000	,212		

a. Variable(s) entered on step 1: law students.

Table 5.2

Model Summary			
Step	-2 Log likelihood	Cox & Snell R Square	Nagelkerke R Square
1	2272,926 <sup>a</sup>	,002	,003

a. Estimation terminated at iteration number 4 because parameter estimates changed by less than ,001.

Table 5.3

Omnibus Tests of Model Coefficients				
		Chi-square	df	Sig.
Step 1	Step	5,032	1	,025
	Block	5,032	1	,025
	Model	5,032	1	,025

Table 5.4

Variables in the Equation									
		B	S.E.	Wald	df	Sig.	Exp(B)	95% C.I. for EXP(B)	
								Lower	Upper
Step 2 <sup>a</sup>	law students	,226	,146	2,398	1	,122	1,254	,942	1,671
	Sex	,517	,127	16,582	1	,000	1,678	1,308	2,152
	Age	,029	,013	4,829	1	,028	1,030	1,003	1,057
	bmi	-,007	,015	,230	1	,631	,993	,965	1,022
	having a relationship	-,285	,123	5,357	1	,021	,752	,590	,957
	living situation			11,121	3	,011			
	living situation(1)	-,040	,155	,068	1	,794	,960	,709	1,301
	living situation(2)	,353	,158	4,972	1	,026	1,423	1,044	1,941
	living situation(3)	,359	,222	2,623	1	,105	1,431	,927	2,210
	Dutch	,021	,126	,029	1	,865	1,022	,798	1,308
	study results	-,271	,065	17,173	1	,000	,762	,671	,867
	study phase	-,108	,132	,671	1	,413	,898	,693	1,163
	Constant	-1,034	,706	2,146	1	,143	,355		

a. Variable(s) entered on step 1: law students, Sex, Age, bmi, having a relationship, living situation, Dutch, study results, study phase.

Table 5.5

Model Summary			
Step	-2 Log likelihood	Cox & Snell R Square	Nagelkerke R Square
2	2177,100 <sup>a</sup>	,025	,040

a. Estimation terminated at iteration number 5 because parameter estimates changed by less than ,001.

Table 5.6

Omnibus Tests of Model Coefficients				
		Chi-square	df	Sig.
Step 2	Step	58,729	11	,000
	Block	58,729	11	,000
	Model	58,729	11	,000

Table 5.7

Variables in the Equation									
		B	S.E.	Wald	df	Sig.	Exp(B)	95% C.I. for EXP(B)	
Step 3 <sup>a</sup>	law students	,340	,187	3,307	1	,069	1,405	,974	2,028
	Sex	,073	,171	,182	1	,670	1,076	,769	1,505
	Age	,033	,022	2,422	1	,120	1,034	,991	1,079
	bmi	-,021	,020	1,092	1	,296	,979	,941	1,019
	having a relationship	-,187	,164	1,305	1	,253	,829	,601	1,144
	living situation			5,617	3	,132			
	living situation(1)	-,182	,205	,789	1	,374	,834	,558	1,245
	living situation(2)	,163	,208	,616	1	,433	1,177	,783	1,770
	living situation(3)	,329	,284	1,347	1	,246	1,390	,797	2,423
	Dutch	,404	,164	6,037	1	,014	1,497	1,085	2,067
	study results	-,150	,086	3,017	1	,082	,861	,727	1,019
	study phase	-,114	,182	,392	1	,531	,892	,625	1,274
	negative sexual experiences	,610	,168	13,223	1	,000	1,841	1,325	2,559
	peer pressure lifestyle self-efficacy	,149	,059	6,388	1	,011	1,161	1,034	1,304
	problem perception	,331	,114	8,473	1	,004	1,393	1,114	1,741
	seeking or having help	1,223	,161	57,750	1	,000	3,399	2,479	4,659
	Constant	-3,867	1,135	11,608	1	,001	,021		

a. Variable(s) entered on step 1: law students, Sex, Age, bmi, having a relationship, living situation, Dutch, study results, study phase, negative sexual experiences, peer pressure lifestyle self-efficacy, problem perception, seeking or having help.

Table 5.8

Model Summary			
Step	-2 Log likelihood	Cox & Snell R Square	Nagelkerke R Square
3	1218,710 <sup>a</sup>	,100	,149

a. Estimation terminated at iteration number 5 because parameter estimates changed by less than ,001.

Table 5.9

Omnibus Tests of Model Coefficients				
		Chi-square	df	Sig.
Step 3	Step	127,665	15	,000
	Block	127,665	15	,000
	Model	127,665	15	,000

Table 6.1-6.9. Logistic regression analysis for disability whereby law students are compared with non-law students.

Step 1 N = 2393, step 2 N = 2348, step 3 N = 1206.

Table 6.1

Variables in the Equation									
		B	S.E.	Wald	df	Sig.	Exp(B)	95% C.I. for EXP(B)	
								Lower	Upper
Step 1 <sup>a</sup>	law students	-,038	,178	,046	1	,831	,963	,679	1,365
	Constant	-2,056	,070	854,583	1	,000	,128		

a. Variable(s) entered on step 1: law students.

Table 6.2

Model Summary			
Step	-2 Log likelihood	Cox & Snell R Square	Nagelkerke R Square
1	1686,491 <sup>a</sup>	,000	,000

a. Estimation terminated at iteration number 5 because parameter estimates changed by less than ,001.

Table 6.3

Omnibus Tests of Model Coefficients				
		Chi-square	df	Sig.
Step 1	Step	,046	1	,830
	Block	,046	1	,830
	Model	,046	1	,830

Table 6.4

Variables in the Equation									
		B	S.E.	Wald	df	Sig.	Exp(B)	95% C.I. for EXP(B)	
								Lower	Upper
Step 2 <sup>a</sup>	law students	-,157	,196	,639	1	,424	,855	,582	1,256
	Sex	,436	,154	8,047	1	,005	1,547	1,144	2,091
	Age	,047	,015	10,588	1	,001	1,048	1,019	1,079
	bmi	-,004	,015	,078	1	,780	,996	,967	1,026
	having a relationship	-,610	,159	14,680	1	,000	,543	,397	,742
	living situation			5,608	3	,132			
	living situation(1)	,105	,194	,294	1	,588	1,111	,760	1,624
	living situation(2)	,315	,198	2,536	1	,111	1,370	,930	2,019
	living situation(3)	,566	,282	4,014	1	,045	1,761	1,012	3,062
	Dutch	-,236	,147	2,574	1	,109	,790	,592	1,054
	study results	-,108	,079	1,872	1	,171	,897	,769	1,048
	study phase	-,349	,163	4,594	1	,032	,706	,513	,971
	Constant	-2,743	,819	11,223	1	,001	,064		

a. Variable(s) entered on step 1: law students, Sex, Age, bmi, having a relationship, living situation, Dutch, study results, study phase.

Table 6.5

Model Summary			
Step	-2 Log likelihood	Cox & Snell R Square	Nagelkerke R Square
2	1603,215 <sup>a</sup>	,018	,037

a. Estimation terminated at iteration number 5 because parameter estimates changed by less than ,001.

Table 6.6

Omnibus Tests of Model Coefficients				
		Chi-square	df	Sig.
Step 2	Step	43,661	11	,000
	Block	43,661	11	,000
	Model	43,661	11	,000

Table 6.7

Variables in the Equation									
		B	S.E.	Wald	df	Sig.	Exp(B)	95% C.I. for EXP(B)	
								Lower	Upper
Step 3 <sup>a</sup>	law students	-,096	,243	,157	1	,692	,908	,564	1,463
	Sex	,159	,208	,582	1	,445	1,172	,779	1,763
	Age	,052	,023	5,052	1	,025	1,053	1,007	1,102
	bmi	-,014	,022	,415	1	,519	,986	,944	1,029
	having a relationship	-,677	,212	10,196	1	,001	,508	,336	,770
	living situation			4,358	3	,225			
	living situation(1)	,075	,256	,087	1	,768	1,078	,653	1,780
	living situation(2)	,323	,255	1,611	1	,204	1,382	,839	2,277
	living situation(3)	,629	,359	3,066	1	,080	1,876	,928	3,795
	Dutch	,015	,191	,006	1	,936	1,016	,698	1,478
	study results	-,093	,102	,829	1	,363	,911	,745	1,114
	study phase	-,398	,223	3,203	1	,074	,671	,434	1,039
	negative sexual experiences	,156	,207	,568	1	,451	1,168	,779	1,752
	peer pressure lifestyle self-efficacy	,247	,080	9,453	1	,002	1,280	1,094	1,499
	problem perception	,249	,137	3,320	1	,068	1,283	,981	1,678
	seeking or having help	,774	,191	16,448	1	,000	2,169	1,492	3,154
	Constant	-5,536	1,366	16,413	1	,000	,004		

a. Variable(s) entered on step 1: law students, Sex, Age, bmi, having a relationship, living situation, Dutch, study results, study phase, negative sexual experiences, peer pressure lifestyle self-efficacy, problem perception, seeking or having help.

Table 6.8

Model Summary			
Step	-2 Log likelihood	Cox & Snell R Square	Nagelkerke R Square
3	911,711 <sup>a</sup>	,050	,090

a. Estimation terminated at iteration number 5 because parameter estimates changed by less than ,001.

Table 6.9

Omnibus Tests of Model Coefficients				
		Chi-square	df	Sig.
Step 3	Step	62,006	15	,000
	Block	62,006	15	,000
	Model	62,006	15	,000



## Appendix 16: Logistic regression analyses whereby psychology students are compared with non-psychology students

Table 1.1-1.9. Logistic regression analysis for physical complaints whereby psychology students are compared with non-psychology students.

Step 1 N = 2393, step 2 N = 2348, step 3 N = 1206.

Table 1.1

Variables in the Equation									
		B	S.E.	Wald	df	Sig.	Exp(B)	95% C.I. for EXP(B)	
								Lower	Upper
Step 1 <sup>a</sup>	psychology students	,300	,265	1,275	1	,259	1,349	,802	2,269
	Constant	-1,147	,049	558,976	1	,000	,318		

a. Variable(s) entered on step 1: psychology students.

Table 1.2

Model Summary			
Step	-2 Log likelihood	Cox & Snell R Square	Nagelkerke R Square
1	2651,541 <sup>a</sup>	,001	,001

a. Estimation terminated at iteration number 4 because parameter estimates changed by less than ,001.

Table 1.3

Omnibus Tests of Model Coefficients				
		Chi-square	df	Sig.
Step 1	Step	1,225	1	,268
	Block	1,225	1	,268
	Model	1,225	1	,268

Table 1.4

Variables in the Equation									
		B	S.E.	Wald	df	Sig.	Exp(B)	95% C.I. for EXP(B)	
								Lower	Upper
Step 2 <sup>a</sup>	psychology students	,287	,270	1,132	1	,287	1,333	,785	2,261
	Sex	,568	,115	24,456	1	,000	1,766	1,409	2,212
	Age	,026	,013	4,032	1	,045	1,026	1,001	1,052
	bmi	,005	,009	,295	1	,587	1,005	,987	1,024
	having a relationship	,227	,108	4,440	1	,035	1,254	1,016	1,549
	living situation			10,702	3	,013			
	living situation(1)	-,370	,131	7,995	1	,005	,691	,534	,893
	living situation(2)	-,373	,140	7,144	1	,008	,689	,524	,905
	living situation(3)	-,124	,189	,432	1	,511	,883	,609	1,280
	Dutch	,050	,115	,191	1	,662	1,052	,839	1,317
	study results	-,166	,059	7,857	1	,005	,847	,755	,951
	study phase	-,100	,119	,709	1	,400	,905	,717	1,142
	Constant	-1,513	,616	6,027	1	,014	,220		

a. Variable(s) entered on step 1: psychology students, Sex, Age, bmi, having a relationship, living situation, Dutch, study results, study phase.



Table 1.5

**Model Summary**

Step	-2 Log likelihood	Cox & Snell R Square	Nagelkerke R Square
2	2537,220 <sup>a</sup>	,026	,038

a. Estimation terminated at iteration number 4 because parameter estimates changed by less than ,001.

Table 1.6

**Omnibus Tests of Model Coefficients**

		Chi-square	df	Sig.
Step 2	Step	60,933	11	,000
	Block	60,933	11	,000
	Model	60,933	11	,000

Table 1.7

**Variables in the Equation**

		B	S.E.	Wald	df	Sig.	Exp(B)	95% C.I. for EXP(B)	
								Lower	Upper
Step 3 <sup>a</sup>	psychology students	,436	,370	1,390	1	,238	1,547	,749	3,195
	Sex	,189	,159	1,415	1	,234	1,208	,885	1,648
	Age	,036	,020	3,213	1	,073	1,037	,997	1,079
	bmi	,000	,012	,000	1	,996	1,000	,976	1,024
	having a relationship	,330	,149	4,935	1	,026	1,391	1,040	1,861
	living situation			13,775	3	,003			
	living situation(1)	-,592	,181	10,694	1	,001	,553	,388	,789
	living situation(2)	-,537	,188	8,164	1	,004	,585	,404	,845
	living situation(3)	-,158	,257	,378	1	,538	,854	,516	1,413
	Dutch	,088	,151	,338	1	,561	1,092	,812	1,468
	study results	-,194	,080	5,865	1	,015	,823	,703	,964
	study phase	-,092	,170	,292	1	,589	,913	,655	1,272
	negative sexual experiences	,025	,168	,023	1	,880	1,026	,738	1,426
	peer pressure lifestyle self-efficacy	,124	,056	4,945	1	,026	1,132	1,015	1,262
	problem perception	,090	,107	,712	1	,399	1,094	,888	1,348
	seeking or having help	,221	,138	2,563	1	,109	1,247	,952	1,633
	Constant	-2,028	1,019	3,964	1	,046	,132		

a. Variable(s) entered on step 1: psychology students, Sex, Age, bmi, having a relationship, living situation, Dutch, study results, study phase, negative sexual experiences, peer pressure lifestyle self-efficacy, problem perception, seeking or having help.

Table 1.8

**Model Summary**

Step	-2 Log likelihood	Cox & Snell R Square	Nagelkerke R Square
3	1365,893 <sup>a</sup>	,046	,067

a. Estimation terminated at iteration number 4 because parameter estimates changed by less than ,001.

Table 1.9

**Omnibus Tests of Model Coefficients**

		Chi-square	df	Sig.
Step 3	Step	57,304	15	,000
	Block	57,304	15	,000
	Model	57,304	15	,000

Table 2.1-2.9. Logistic regression analysis for smoking whereby psychology students are compared with non-psychology students.

Step 1 N = 2393, step 2 N = 2348, step 3 N = 1206.

Table 2.1

Variables in the Equation									
		B	S.E.	Wald	df	Sig.	Exp(B)	95% C.I. for EXP(B)	
								Lower	Upper
Step 1 <sup>a</sup>	psychology students	,013	,251	,003	1	,960	1,013	,619	1,657
	Constant	-,539	,043	156,876	1	,000	,584		

a. Variable(s) entered on step 1: psychology students.

Table 2.2

Model Summary			
Step	-2 Log likelihood	Cox & Snell R Square	Nagelkerke R Square
1	3150,109 <sup>a</sup>	,000	,000

a. Estimation terminated at iteration number 3 because parameter estimates changed by less than ,001.

Table 2.3

Omnibus Tests of Model Coefficients				
		Chi-square	df	Sig.
Step 1	Step	,003	1	,960
	Block	,003	1	,960
	Model	,003	1	,960

Table 2.4

Variables in the Equation									
		B	S.E.	Wald	df	Sig.	Exp(B)	95% C.I. for EXP(B)	
								Lower	Upper
Step 2 <sup>a</sup>	psychology students	-,050	,262	,037	1	,848	,951	,570	1,588
	Sex	-,435	,095	21,042	1	,000	,647	,537	,779
	Age	,001	,012	,004	1	,947	1,001	,977	1,026
	bmi	,017	,013	1,929	1	,165	1,018	,993	1,043
	having a relationship	-,122	,097	1,585	1	,208	,885	,732	1,070
	living situation			76,601	3	,000			
	living situation(1)	1,016	,125	65,766	1	,000	2,763	2,161	3,532
	living situation(2)	,510	,133	14,674	1	,000	1,665	1,283	2,162
	living situation(3)	,263	,194	1,832	1	,176	1,300	,889	1,902
	Dutch	-,194	,102	3,638	1	,056	,823	,674	1,005
	study results	-,126	,054	5,466	1	,019	,882	,794	,980
	study phase	-,252	,109	5,330	1	,021	,777	,628	,963
	Constant	,386	,603	,410	1	,522	1,472		

a. Variable(s) entered on step 1: psychology students, Sex, Age, bmi, having a relationship, living situation, Dutch, study results, study phase.

Table 2.5

Model Summary			
Step	-2 Log likelihood	Cox & Snell R Square	Nagelkerke R Square
2	2964,654 <sup>a</sup>	,054	,074

a. Estimation terminated at iteration number 4 because parameter estimates changed by less than ,001.

Table 2.6

Omnibus Tests of Model Coefficients				
		Chi-square	df	Sig.
Step 2	Step	130,057	11	,000
	Block	130,057	11	,000
	Model	130,057	11	,000

Table 2.7

Variables in the Equation								
		B	S.E.	Wald	df	Sig.	Exp(B)	95% C.I. for EXP(B) Lower Upper
Step 3 <sup>a</sup>	psychology students	-,483	,401	1,451	1	,228	,617	,281 1,354
	Sex	-,138	,146	,889	1	,346	,871	,654 1,160
	Age	,007	,021	,099	1	,752	1,007	,966 1,048
	bmi	,012	,015	,639	1	,424	1,012	,983 1,042
	having a relationship	-,102	,143	,513	1	,474	,903	,683 1,194
	living situation			32,022	3	,000		
	living situation(1)	,875	,179	23,825	1	,000	2,398	1,688 3,407
	living situation(2)	,194	,188	1,060	1	,303	1,214	,839 1,755
	living situation(3)	,352	,275	1,636	1	,201	1,422	,829 2,440
	Dutch	-,020	,145	,019	1	,891	,980	,738 1,303
	study results	,088	,079	1,243	1	,265	1,092	,936 1,274
	study phase	-,422	,165	6,526	1	,011	,655	,474 ,906
	negative sexual experiences	,229	,160	2,037	1	,154	1,257	,918 1,720
	peer pressure lifestyle self-efficacy	-,563	,059	90,629	1	,000	,570	,507 ,640
	problem perception	-,223	,103	4,733	1	,030	,800	,654 ,978
	seeking or having help	-,237	,130	3,342	1	,068	,789	,611 1,017
	Constant	4,320	1,041	17,226	1	,000	75,217	

a. Variable(s) entered on step 1: psychology students, Sex, Age, bmi, having a relationship, living situation, Dutch, study results, study phase, negative sexual experiences, peer pressure lifestyle self-efficacy, problem perception, seeking or having help.

Table 2.8

Model Summary			
Step	-2 Log likelihood	Cox & Snell R Square	Nagelkerke R Square
3	1459,661 <sup>a</sup>	,153	,204

a. Estimation terminated at iteration number 4 because parameter estimates changed by less than ,001.

Table 2.9

Omnibus Tests of Model Coefficients				
		Chi-square	df	Sig.
Step 3	Step	199,848	15	,000
	Block	199,848	15	,000
	Model	199,848	15	,000

Table 3.1-3.9. Logistic regression analysis for alcohol (ab)use whereby psychology students are compared with non-psychology students.

Step 1 N = 2393, step 2 N = 2348, step 3 N = 1206.

Table 3.1

Variables in the Equation									
		B	S.E.	Wald	df	Sig.	Exp(B)	95% C.I. for EXP(B)	
								Lower	Upper
Step 1 <sup>a</sup>	psychology students	,041	,404	,010	1	,919	1,042	,472	2,300
	Constant	2,156	,068	1004,296	1	,000	8,639		

a. Variable(s) entered on step 1: psychology students.

Table 3.2

Model Summary			
Step	-2 Log likelihood	Cox & Snell R Square	Nagelkerke R Square
1	1593,721 <sup>a</sup>	,000	,000

a. Estimation terminated at iteration number 5 because parameter estimates changed by less than ,001.

Table 3.3

Omnibus Tests of Model Coefficients

		Chi-square	df	Sig.
Step 1	Step	,010	1	,919
	Block	,010	1	,919
	Model	,010	1	,919

Table 3.4

Variables in the Equation									
		B	S.E.	Wald	df	Sig.	Exp(B)	95% C.I. for EXP(B)	
								Lower	Upper
Step 2 <sup>a</sup>	psychology students	-,090	,428	,044	1	,834	,914	,395	2,116
	Sex	-,120	,161	,556	1	,456	,887	,647	1,215
	Age	-,011	,018	,365	1	,545	,989	,954	1,025
	bmi	,010	,018	,308	1	,579	1,010	,975	1,046
	having a relationship	,127	,162	,613	1	,433	1,135	,826	1,560
	living situation			97,961	3	,000			
	living situation(1)	1,838	,202	82,968	1	,000	6,285	4,232	9,335
	living situation(2)	1,312	,185	50,281	1	,000	3,713	2,584	5,336
	living situation(3)	,882	,265	11,086	1	,001	2,416	1,437	4,060
	Dutch	1,320	,149	78,217	1	,000	3,744	2,794	5,016
	study results	-,038	,082	,217	1	,641	,962	,819	1,131
	study phase	,167	,180	,861	1	,353	1,181	,831	1,680
	Constant	,748	,905	,684	1	,408	2,113		

a. Variable(s) entered on step 1: psychology students, Sex, Age, bmi, having a relationship, living situation, Dutch, study results, study phase.

Table 3.5

Model Summary			
Step	-2 Log likelihood	Cox & Snell R Square	Nagelkerke R Square
2	1361,861 <sup>a</sup>	,072	,149

a. Estimation terminated at iteration number 6 because parameter estimates changed by less than ,001.

Table 3.6

Omnibus Tests of Model Coefficients				
		Chi-square	df	Sig.
Step 2	Step	174,374	11	,000
	Block	174,374	11	,000
	Model	174,374	11	,000

Table 3.7

Variables in the Equation									
		B	S.E.	Wald	df	Sig.	Exp(B)	95% C.I. for EXP(B)	
Step 3 <sup>a</sup>	psychology students	,077	,661	,014	1	,907	1,081	,296	3,943
	Sex	-,117	,275	,182	1	,669	,889	,519	1,524
	Age	-,042	,027	2,427	1	,119	,959	,910	1,011
	bmi	-,001	,019	,001	1	,970	,999	,963	1,037
	having a relationship	-,101	,248	,167	1	,683	,904	,556	1,468
	living situation			40,013	3	,000			
	living situation(1)	1,672	,311	28,920	1	,000	5,324	2,894	9,793
	living situation(2)	1,478	,288	26,234	1	,000	4,382	2,490	7,714
	living situation(3)	1,144	,385	8,841	1	,003	3,140	1,477	6,675
	Dutch	1,341	,227	34,876	1	,000	3,822	2,449	5,964
	study results	,046	,123	,144	1	,705	1,048	,824	1,332
	study phase	-,046	,267	,030	1	,863	,955	,566	1,611
	negative sexual experiences	-,051	,271	,035	1	,851	,950	,559	1,616
	peer pressure lifestyle self-efficacy	-,558	,135	17,120	1	,000	,573	,440	,746
	problem perception	-,366	,172	4,540	1	,033	,693	,495	,971
	seeking or having help	-,187	,231	,654	1	,419	,829	,527	1,305
	Constant	7,562	1,830	17,084	1	,000	1923,329		

a. Variable(s) entered on step 1: psychology students, Sex, Age, bmi, having a relationship, living situation, Dutch, study results, study phase, negative sexual experiences, peer pressure lifestyle self-efficacy, problem perception, seeking or having help.

Table 3.8

Model Summary			
Step	-2 Log likelihood	Cox & Snell R Square	Nagelkerke R Square
3	596,534 <sup>a</sup>	,106	,233

a. Estimation terminated at iteration number 7 because parameter estimates changed by less than ,001.

Table 3.9

Omnibus Tests of Model Coefficients				
		Chi-square	df	Sig.
Step 3	Step	135,313	15	,000
	Block	135,313	15	,000
	Model	135,313	15	,000

Table 4.1-4.9. Logistic regression analysis for drug (ab)use whereby psychology students are compared with non-psychology students.

Step 1 N = 2393, step 2 N = 2348, step 3 N = 1206.

Table 4.1

Variables in the Equation									
		B	S.E.	Wald	df	Sig.	Exp(B)	95% C.I. for EXP(B)	
								Lower	Upper
Step 1 <sup>a</sup>	psychology students	-,196	,264	,548	1	,459	,822	,490	1,381
	Constant	-,651	,044	222,065	1	,000	,521		

a. Variable(s) entered on step 1: psychology students.

Table 4.2

Model Summary			
Step	-2 Log likelihood	Cox & Snell R Square	Nagelkerke R Square
1	3071,897 <sup>a</sup>	,000	,000

a. Estimation terminated at iteration number 3 because parameter estimates changed by less than ,001.

Table 4.3

Omnibus Tests of Model Coefficients				
		Chi-square	df	Sig.
Step 1	Step	,561	1	,454
	Block	,561	1	,454
	Model	,561	1	,454

Table 4.4

Variables in the Equation									
		B	S.E.	Wald	df	Sig.	Exp(B)	95% C.I. for EXP(B)	
								Lower	Upper
Step 2 <sup>a</sup>	psychology students	-,195	,277	,496	1	,481	,823	,479	1,415
	Sex	-,834	,097	73,264	1	,000	,434	,359	,526
	Age	-,031	,015	4,490	1	,034	,970	,943	,998
	bmi	-,008	,010	,604	1	,437	,992	,973	1,012
	having a relationship	,040	,100	,161	1	,689	1,041	,856	1,266
	living situation			119,133	3	,000			
	living situation(1)	1,396	,136	105,012	1	,000	4,038	3,092	5,273
	living situation(2)	,841	,144	34,041	1	,000	2,318	1,747	3,074
	living situation(3)	,470	,207	5,161	1	,023	1,600	1,067	2,400
	Dutch	-,147	,106	1,924	1	,165	,863	,702	1,063
	study results	-,080	,056	2,065	1	,151	,923	,828	1,029
	study phase	,000	,114	,000	1	1,000	1,000	,799	1,251
	Constant	1,432	,615	5,418	1	,020	4,188		

a. Variable(s) entered on step 1: psychology students, Sex, Age, bmi, having a relationship, living situation, Dutch, study results, study phase.

Table 4.5

Model Summary			
Step	-2 Log likelihood	Cox & Snell R Square	Nagelkerke R Square
2	2809,861 <sup>a</sup>	,086	,119

a. Estimation terminated at iteration number 4 because parameter estimates changed by less than ,001.

Table 4.6

Omnibus Tests of Model Coefficients				
		Chi-square	df	Sig.
Step 2	Step	211,814	11	,000
	Block	211,814	11	,000
	Model	211,814	11	,000

Table 4.7

Variables in the Equation									
		B	S.E.	Wald	df	Sig.	Exp(B)	95% C.I. for EXP(B)	
								Lower	Upper
Step 3 <sup>a</sup>	psychology students	-,488	,425	1,320	1	,251	,614	,267	1,411
	Sex	-,643	,151	18,251	1	,000	,526	,391	,706
	Age	-,029	,024	1,466	1	,226	,972	,927	1,018
	bmi	-,010	,010	,916	1	,338	,990	,970	1,010
	having a relationship	,121	,148	,676	1	,411	1,129	,845	1,508
	living situation			65,507	3	,000			
	living situation(1)	1,474	,195	57,376	1	,000	4,365	2,981	6,391
	living situation(2)	,693	,204	11,538	1	,001	1,999	1,340	2,981
	living situation(3)	,709	,294	5,793	1	,016	2,031	1,141	3,617
	Dutch	,120	,151	,624	1	,429	1,127	,838	1,516
	study results	,198	,083	5,665	1	,017	1,219	1,036	1,434
	study phase	-,227	,174	1,710	1	,191	,797	,567	1,120
	negative sexual experiences	,364	,165	4,850	1	,028	1,438	1,041	1,988
	peer pressure lifestyle self-efficacy	-,525	,058	80,916	1	,000	,591	,527	,663
	problem perception	-,201	,106	3,613	1	,057	,818	,665	1,006
	seeking or having help	-,271	,134	4,063	1	,044	,763	,586	,993
	Constant	4,497	1,069	17,714	1	,000	89,766		

a. Variable(s) entered on step 1: psychology students, Sex, Age, bmi, having a relationship, living situation, Dutch, study results, study phase, negative sexual experiences, peer pressure lifestyle self-efficacy, problem perception, seeking or having help.

Table 4.8

Model Summary			
Step	-2 Log likelihood	Cox & Snell R Square	Nagelkerke R Square
3	1382,630 <sup>a</sup>	,194	,261

a. Estimation terminated at iteration number 5 because parameter estimates changed by less than ,001.

Table 4.9

Omnibus Tests of Model Coefficients				
		Chi-square	df	Sig.
Step 3	Step	259,814	15	,000
	Block	259,814	15	,000
	Model	259,814	15	,000

Table 5.1-5.9. Logistic regression analysis for psychological complaints whereby psychology students are compared with non-psychology students.  
Step 1 N = 2393, step 2 N = 2348, step 3 N = 1206.

Table 5.1

		Variables in the Equation							
		B	S.E.	Wald	df	Sig.	Exp(B)	95% C.I. for EXP(B)	
Step 1 <sup>a</sup>	psychology students	,018	,312	,003	1	,953	1,019	,553	1,877
	Constant	-1,496	,054	777,625	1	,000	,224		

a. Variable(s) entered on step 1: psychology students.

Table 5.2

**Model Summary**

Step	-2 Log likelihood	Cox & Snell R Square	Nagelkerke R Square
1	2277,955 <sup>a</sup>	,000	,000

a. Estimation terminated at iteration number 4 because parameter estimates changed by less than ,001.

Table 5.3

**Omnibus Tests of Model Coefficients**

		Chi-square	df	Sig.
Step 1	Step	,003	1	,953
	Block	,003	1	,953
	Model	,003	1	,953

Table 5.4

**Variables in the Equation**

		B	S.E.	Wald	df	Sig.	Exp(B)	95% C.I. for EXP(B)	
Step 2 <sup>a</sup>	psychology students	,032	,317	,010	1	,919	1,033	,555	1,921
	Sex	,528	,127	17,274	1	,000	1,695	1,322	2,174
	Age	,032	,013	5,800	1	,016	1,032	1,006	1,059
	bmi	-,008	,015	,256	1	,613	,993	,964	1,022
	having a relationship	-,287	,123	5,418	1	,020	,751	,590	,956
	living situation			10,285	3	,016			
	living situation(1)	-,070	,153	,206	1	,650	,933	,691	1,260
	living situation(2)	,311	,156	3,993	1	,046	1,364	1,006	1,851
	living situation(3)	,334	,221	2,289	1	,130	1,396	,906	2,152
	Dutch	,032	,126	,063	1	,801	1,032	,806	1,321
	study results	-,286	,065	19,600	1	,000	,751	,662	,852
	study phase	-,091	,131	,484	1	,487	,913	,705	1,181
	Constant	-,941	,706	1,781	1	,182	,390		

a. Variable(s) entered on step 1: psychology students, Sex, Age, bmi, having a relationship, living situation, Dutch, study results, study phase.



Table 5.5

Model Summary			
Step	-2 Log likelihood	Cox & Snell R Square	Nagelkerke R Square
2	2179,435 <sup>a</sup>	,024	,039

a. Estimation terminated at iteration number 5 because parameter estimates changed by less than ,001.

Table 5.6

Omnibus Tests of Model Coefficients				
Step 2		Chi-square	df	Sig.
	Step	56,394	11	,000
	Block	56,394	11	,000
	Model	56,394	11	,000

Table 5.7

Variables in the Equation								
		B	S.E.	Wald	df	Sig.	Exp(B)	95% C.I. for EXP(B) Lower Upper
Step 3 <sup>a</sup>	psychology students	,271	,395	,471	1	,492	1,312	,605 2,845
	Sex	,093	,171	,298	1	,585	1,098	,786 1,534
	Age	,037	,021	3,030	1	,082	1,038	,995 1,082
	bmi	-,023	,020	1,256	1	,262	,978	,940 1,017
	having a relationship	-,188	,164	1,319	1	,251	,829	,601 1,142
	living situation			5,080	3	,166		
	living situation(1)	-,215	,203	1,115	1	,291	,807	,542 1,202
	living situation(2)	,099	,205	,235	1	,627	1,104	,739 1,650
	living situation(3)	,287	,282	1,038	1	,308	1,333	,767 2,317
	Dutch	,425	,164	6,735	1	,009	1,530	1,110 2,109
	study results	-,173	,085	4,156	1	,041	,841	,712 ,993
	study phase	-,085	,181	,222	1	,638	,918	,644 1,309
	negative sexual experiences	,615	,168	13,448	1	,000	1,849	1,331 2,568
	peer pressure lifestyle self-efficacy	,152	,059	6,567	1	,010	1,164	1,036 1,307
	problem perception	,334	,114	8,552	1	,003	1,396	1,116 1,746
	seeking or having help	1,212	,161	56,908	1	,000	3,360	2,452 4,603
	Constant	-3,736	1,130	10,940	1	,001	,024	

a. Variable(s) entered on step 1: psychology students, Sex, Age, bmi, having a relationship, living situation, Dutch, study results, study phase, negative sexual experiences, peer pressure lifestyle self-efficacy, problem perception, seeking or having help.

Table 5.8

Model Summary			
Step	-2 Log likelihood	Cox & Snell R Square	Nagelkerke R Square
3	1221,493 <sup>a</sup>	,098	,146

a. Estimation terminated at iteration number 5 because parameter estimates changed by less than ,001.

Table 5.9

Omnibus Tests of Model Coefficients				
Step 3		Chi-square	df	Sig.
	Step	124,882	15	,000
	Block	124,882	15	,000
	Model	124,882	15	,000

Table 6.1-6.9. Logistic regression analysis for disability whereby psychology students are compared with non-psychology students.

Step 1 N = 2393, step 2 N = 2348, step 3 N = 1206.

Table 6.1

Variables in the Equation									
		B	S.E.	Wald	df	Sig.	Exp(B)	95% C.I. for EXP(B)	
								Lower	Upper
Step 1 <sup>a</sup>	psychology students	-,139	,404	,118	1	,731	,870	,394	1,920
	Constant	-2,058	,065	988,085	1	,000	,128		

a. Variable(s) entered on step 1: psychology students.

Table 6.2

Model Summary			
Step	-2 Log likelihood	Cox & Snell R Square	Nagelkerke R Square
1	1686,414 <sup>a</sup>	,000	,000

a. Estimation terminated at iteration number 5 because parameter estimates changed by less than ,001.

Table 6.3

Omnibus Tests of Model Coefficients				
		Chi-square	df	Sig.
Step 1	Step	,123	1	,726
	Block	,123	1	,726
	Model	,123	1	,726

Table 6.4

Variables in the Equation									
		B	S.E.	Wald	df	Sig.	Exp(B)	95% C.I. for EXP(B)	
								Lower	Upper
Step 2 <sup>a</sup>	psychology students	-,115	,408	,080	1	,778	,891	,400	1,984
	Sex	,431	,154	7,869	1	,005	1,539	1,139	2,079
	Age	,046	,014	10,045	1	,002	1,047	1,018	1,076
	bmi	-,004	,015	,071	1	,790	,996	,967	1,026
	having a relationship	-,609	,159	14,618	1	,000	,544	,398	,743
	living situation			5,996	3	,112			
	living situation(1)	,125	,193	,422	1	,516	1,133	,777	1,653
	living situation(2)	,341	,195	3,037	1	,081	1,406	,958	2,062
	living situation(3)	,581	,282	4,244	1	,039	1,787	1,029	3,105
	Dutch	-,243	,147	2,729	1	,099	,784	,588	1,046
	study results	-,098	,078	1,588	1	,208	,906	,778	1,056
	study phase	-,357	,162	4,836	1	,028	,700	,509	,962
	Constant	-2,796	,814	11,790	1	,001	,061		

a. Variable(s) entered on step 1: psychology students, Sex, Age, bmi, having a relationship, living situation, Dutch, study results, study phase.

Table 6.5

Model Summary			
Step	-2 Log likelihood	Cox & Snell R Square	Nagelkerke R Square
2	1603,788 <sup>a</sup>	,018	,036

a. Estimation terminated at iteration number 5 because parameter estimates changed by less than ,001.

Table 6.6

Omnibus Tests of Model Coefficients				
Step 2		Chi-square	df	Sig.
	Step	43,088	11	,000
	Block	43,088	11	,000
	Model	43,088	11	,000

Table 6.7

Variables in the Equation									
		B	S.E.	Wald	df	Sig.	Exp(B)	95% C.I. for EXP(B)	
								Lower	Upper
Step 3 <sup>a</sup>	psychology students	,274	,474	,333	1	,564	1,315	,519	3,330
	Sex	,146	,208	,493	1	,482	1,157	,770	1,739
	Age	,051	,023	4,972	1	,026	1,052	1,006	1,101
	bmi	-,014	,022	,427	1	,514	,986	,944	1,029
	having a relationship	-,673	,212	10,098	1	,001	,510	,337	,773
	living situation			4,487	3	,213			
	living situation(1)	,086	,255	,113	1	,737	1,089	,661	1,795
	living situation(2)	,337	,252	1,797	1	,180	1,401	,856	2,295
	living situation(3)	,635	,359	3,129	1	,077	1,886	,934	3,811
	Dutch	,011	,191	,003	1	,954	1,011	,695	1,470
	study results	-,086	,101	,720	1	,396	,918	,753	1,119
	study phase	-,415	,222	3,492	1	,062	,660	,427	1,021
	negative sexual experiences	,146	,207	,500	1	,480	1,157	,772	1,736
	peer pressure lifestyle self-efficacy	,247	,080	9,434	1	,002	1,280	1,093	1,498
	problem perception	,254	,137	3,430	1	,064	1,289	,985	1,686
	seeking or having help	,773	,191	16,393	1	,000	2,167	1,490	3,151
	Constant	-5,577	1,366	16,664	1	,000	,004		

a. Variable(s) entered on step 1: psychology students, Sex, Age, bmi, having a relationship, living situation, Dutch, study results, study phase, negative sexual experiences, peer pressure lifestyle self-efficacy, problem perception, seeking or having help.

Table 6.8

Model Summary			
Step	-2 Log likelihood	Cox & Snell R Square	Nagelkerke R Square
3	911,553 <sup>a</sup>	,050	,091

a. Estimation terminated at iteration number 5 because parameter estimates changed by less than ,001.

Table 6.9

Omnibus Tests of Model Coefficients				
Step 3		Chi-square	df	Sig.
	Step	62,164	15	,000
	Block	62,164	15	,000
	Model	62,164	15	,000

## Appendix 17: Logistic regression analyses where economics and business students are compared with non-economics and business students

Table 1.1-1.9. Logistic regression analysis for physical complaints whereby economics and business students are compared with non-economics and business students.  
Step 1 N = 2393, step 2 N = 2348, step 3 N = 1206.

Table 1.1

		Variables in the Equation						
		B	S.E.	Wald	df	Sig.	Exp(B)	95% C.I. for EXP(B) Lower Upper
Step 1 <sup>a</sup>	economics and business students	-,416	,166	6,311	1	,012	,660	,477 ,913
	Constant	-1,095	,050	477,825	1	,000	,335	

a. Variable(s) entered on step 1: economics and business students.

Table 1.2

Model Summary			
Step	-2 Log likelihood	Cox & Snell R Square	Nagelkerke R Square
1	2646,002 <sup>a</sup>	,003	,004

a. Estimation terminated at iteration number 4 because parameter estimates changed by less than ,001.

Table 1.3

		Omnibus Tests of Model Coefficients		
		Chi-square	df	Sig.
Step 1	Step	6,765	1	,009
	Block	6,765	1	,009
	Model	6,765	1	,009

Table 1.4

		Variables in the Equation						
		B	S.E.	Wald	df	Sig.	Exp(B)	95% C.I. for EXP(B) Lower Upper
Step 2 <sup>a</sup>	economics and business students	-,375	,171	4,796	1	,029	,687	,491 ,961
	Sex	,546	,115	22,396	1	,000	1,727	1,377 2,165
	Age	,025	,013	3,899	1	,048	1,025	1,000 1,051
	bmi	,005	,009	,265	1	,607	1,005	,986 1,024
	having a relationship	,231	,108	4,601	1	,032	1,260	1,020 1,556
	living situation			11,137	3	,011		
	living situation(1)	-,378	,131	8,319	1	,004	,685	,530 ,886
	living situation(2)	-,388	,140	7,717	1	,005	,678	,516 ,892
	living situation(3)	-,143	,190	,567	1	,451	,867	,597 1,258
	Dutch	,019	,116	,027	1	,869	1,019	,813 1,279
	study results	-,179	,060	9,008	1	,003	,836	,744 ,940
	study phase	-,075	,119	,396	1	,529	,928	,734 1,172
	Constant	-1,295	,624	4,307	1	,038	,274	

a. Variable(s) entered on step 1: economics and business students, Sex, Age, bmi, having a relationship, living situation, Dutch, study results, study phase.

Table 1.5

Model Summary			
Step	-2 Log likelihood	Cox & Snell R Square	Nagelkerke R Square
2	2533,248 <sup>a</sup>	,027	,041

a. Estimation terminated at iteration number 4 because parameter estimates changed by less than ,001.

Table 1.6

Omnibus Tests of Model Coefficients				
Step 2	Chi-square		df	Sig.
	Step	64,905	11	,000
	Block	64,905	11	,000
	Model	64,905	11	,000

Table 1.7

Variables in the Equation									
Step 3 <sup>a</sup>		B	S.E.	Wald	df	Sig.	Exp(B)	95% C.I. for EXP(B)	
								Lower	Upper
	economics and business students	-,465	,231	4,051	1	,044	,628	,399	,988
	Sex	,164	,159	1,061	1	,303	1,178	,862	1,611
	Age	,036	,020	3,080	1	,079	1,036	,996	1,079
	bmi	,000	,012	,000	1	,991	1,000	,977	1,024
	having a relationship	,336	,149	5,077	1	,024	1,399	1,045	1,873
	living situation			14,016	3	,003			
	living situation(1)	-,605	,182	11,115	1	,001	,546	,382	,779
	living situation(2)	-,545	,188	8,403	1	,004	,580	,401	,838
	living situation(3)	-,182	,258	,499	1	,480	,833	,503	1,382
	Dutch	,048	,152	,098	1	,754	1,049	,778	1,414
	study results	-,216	,081	7,093	1	,008	,806	,688	,945
	study phase	-,039	,170	,053	1	,818	,962	,689	1,342
	negative sexual experiences	,015	,168	,008	1	,930	1,015	,730	1,411
	peer pressure lifestyle self-efficacy	,121	,056	4,706	1	,030	1,129	1,012	1,260
	problem perception	,078	,107	,530	1	,467	1,081	,877	1,332
	seeking or having help	,222	,138	2,599	1	,107	1,249	,953	1,636
	Constant	-1,694	1,030	2,708	1	,100	,184		

a. Variable(s) entered on step 1: economics and business students, Sex, Age, bmi, having a relationship, living situation, Dutch, study results, study phase, negative sexual experiences, peer pressure lifestyle self-efficacy, problem perception, seeking or having help.

Table 1.8

Model Summary			
Step	-2 Log likelihood	Cox & Snell R Square	Nagelkerke R Square
3	1362,944 <sup>a</sup>	,049	,070

a. Estimation terminated at iteration number 4 because parameter estimates changed by less than ,001.

Table 1.9

Omnibus Tests of Model Coefficients				
Step 3	Chi-square		df	Sig.
	Step	60,252	15	,000
	Block	60,252	15	,000
	Model	60,252	15	,000

Table 2.1-2.9. Logistic regression analysis for smoking whereby economics and business students are compared with non-economics and business students.

Step 1 N = 2393, step 2 N = 2348, step 3 N = 1206.

Table 2.1

		Variables in the Equation							
		B	S.E.	Wald	df	Sig.	Exp(B)	95% C.I. for EXP(B)	
								Lower	Upper
Step 1 <sup>a</sup>	economics and business students	,020	,133	,022	1	,881	1,020	,785	1,325
	Constant	-,541	,045	144,238	1	,000	,582		

a. Variable(s) entered on step 1: economics and business students.

Table 2.2

Model Summary			
Step	-2 Log likelihood	Cox & Snell R Square	Nagelkerke R Square
1	3150,089 <sup>a</sup>	,000	,000

a. Estimation terminated at iteration number 3 because parameter estimates changed by less than ,001.

Table 2.3

Omnibus Tests of Model Coefficients				
		Chi-square	df	Sig.
Step 1	Step	,022	1	,881
	Block	,022	1	,881
	Model	,022	1	,881

Table 2.4

		Variables in the Equation							
		B	S.E.	Wald	df	Sig.	Exp(B)	95% C.I. for EXP(B)	
								Lower	Upper
Step 2 <sup>a</sup>	economics and business students	-,066	,142	,217	1	,642	,936	,709	1,236
	Sex	-,441	,095	21,390	1	,000	,643	,533	,775
	Age	,001	,012	,004	1	,949	1,001	,977	1,026
	bmi	,017	,012	1,902	1	,168	1,017	,993	1,043
	having a relationship	-,122	,097	1,585	1	,208	,885	,732	1,070
	living situation			76,362	3	,000			
	living situation(1)	1,013	,125	65,341	1	,000	2,754	2,154	3,521
	living situation(2)	,507	,133	14,426	1	,000	1,659	1,278	2,155
	living situation(3)	,259	,194	1,782	1	,182	1,296	,886	1,896
	Dutch	-,200	,103	3,787	1	,052	,819	,670	1,001
	study results	-,128	,054	5,622	1	,018	,880	,791	,978
	study phase	-,248	,109	5,136	1	,023	,780	,630	,967
	Constant	,430	,610	,497	1	,481	1,537		

a. Variable(s) entered on step 1: economics and business students, Sex, Age, bmi, having a relationship, living situation, Dutch, study results, study phase.

Table 2.5

Model Summary			
Step	-2 Log likelihood	Cox & Snell R Square	Nagelkerke R Square
2	2964,474 <sup>a</sup>	,054	,074

a. Estimation terminated at iteration number 4 because parameter estimates changed by less than ,001.

Table 2.6

Omnibus Tests of Model Coefficients				
		Chi-square	df	Sig.
Step 2	Step	130,237	11	,000
	Block	130,237	11	,000
	Model	130,237	11	,000

Table 2.7

Variables in the Equation									
		B	S.E.	Wald	df	Sig.	Exp(B)	95% C.I. for EXP(B)	
								Lower	Upper
Step 3 <sup>a</sup>	economics and business students	-,419	,213	3,873	1	,049	,658	,433	,998
	Sex	-,181	,147	1,515	1	,218	,834	,625	1,113
	Age	,007	,021	,120	1	,729	1,007	,967	1,049
	bmi	,011	,015	,579	1	,447	1,011	,983	1,041
	having a relationship	-,094	,143	,430	1	,512	,911	,688	1,205
	living situation			31,603	3	,000			
	living situation(1)	,864	,180	23,152	1	,000	2,372	1,668	3,372
	living situation(2)	,180	,188	,912	1	,340	1,197	,827	1,732
	living situation(3)	,335	,276	1,477	1	,224	1,398	,814	2,400
	Dutch	-,059	,146	,164	1	,685	,942	,707	1,256
	study results	,074	,079	,871	1	,351	1,077	,922	1,258
	study phase	-,412	,166	6,184	1	,013	,662	,478	,916
	negative sexual experiences	,205	,160	1,642	1	,200	1,228	,897	1,681
	peer pressure lifestyle self-efficacy	-,566	,059	91,897	1	,000	,568	,506	,637
	problem perception	-,226	,103	4,855	1	,028	,798	,653	,975
	seeking or having help	-,247	,130	3,606	1	,058	,781	,605	1,008
	Constant	4,604	1,050	19,213	1	,000	99,922		

a. Variable(s) entered on step 1: economics and business students, Sex, Age, bmi, having a relationship, living situation, Dutch, study results, study phase, negative sexual experiences, peer pressure lifestyle self-efficacy, problem perception, seeking or having help.

Table 2.8

Model Summary			
Step	-2 Log likelihood	Cox & Snell R Square	Nagelkerke R Square
3	1457,217 <sup>a</sup>	,154	,207

a. Estimation terminated at iteration number 4 because parameter estimates changed by less than ,001.

Table 2.9

Omnibus Tests of Model Coefficients				
		Chi-square	df	Sig.
Step 3	Step	202,291	15	,000
	Block	202,291	15	,000
	Model	202,291	15	,000

Table 3.1-3.9. Logistic regression analysis for alcohol (ab)use whereby economics and business students are compared with non-economics and business students.  
Step 1 N = 2393, step 2 N = 2348, step 3 N = 1206.

Table 3.1

		Variables in the Equation							
		B	S.E.	Wald	df	Sig.	Exp(B)	95% C.I. for EXP(B)	
Step 1 <sup>a</sup>	economics and business students	-,207	,199	1,079	1	,299	,813	,550	1,201
	Constant	2,183	,072	920,474	1	,000	8,870		

a. Variable(s) entered on step 1: economics and business students.

Table 3.2

Model Summary			
Step	-2 Log likelihood	Cox & Snell R Square	Nagelkerke R Square
1	1592,694 <sup>a</sup>	,000	,001

a. Estimation terminated at iteration number 5 because parameter estimates changed by less than ,001.

Table 3.3

		Omnibus Tests of Model Coefficients		
		Chi-square	df	Sig.
Step 1	Step	1,037	1	,308
	Block	1,037	1	,308
	Model	1,037	1	,308

Table 3.4

		Variables in the Equation							
		B	S.E.	Wald	df	Sig.	Exp(B)	95% C.I. for EXP(B)	
Step 2 <sup>a</sup>	economics and business students	,063	,219	,083	1	,774	1,065	,694	1,635
	Sex	-,116	,162	,519	1	,471	,890	,649	1,222
	Age	-,011	,018	,359	1	,549	,989	,954	1,025
	bmi	,010	,018	,309	1	,578	1,010	,975	1,046
	having a relationship	,128	,162	,620	1	,431	1,136	,827	1,562
	living situation			98,027	3	,000			
	living situation(1)	1,838	,202	83,034	1	,000	6,287	4,233	9,336
	living situation(2)	1,314	,185	50,355	1	,000	3,720	2,588	5,347
	living situation(3)	,883	,265	11,096	1	,001	2,418	1,438	4,064
	Dutch	1,325	,150	78,029	1	,000	3,763	2,804	5,049
	study results	-,036	,083	,185	1	,667	,965	,820	1,135
	study phase	,162	,180	,804	1	,370	1,175	,826	1,673
	Constant	,706	,917	,594	1	,441	2,027		

a. Variable(s) entered on step 1: economics and business students, Sex, Age, bmi, having a relationship, living situation, Dutch, study results, study phase.



Table 3.5

Model Summary			
Step	-2 Log likelihood	Cox & Snell R Square	Nagelkerke R Square
2	1361,821 <sup>a</sup>	,072	,149

a. Estimation terminated at iteration number 6 because parameter estimates changed by less than ,001.

Table 3.6

Omnibus Tests of Model Coefficients				
		Chi-square	df	Sig.
Step 2	Step	174,414	11	,000
	Block	174,414	11	,000
	Model	174,414	11	,000

Table 3.7

Variables in the Equation									
		B	S.E.	Wald	df	Sig.	Exp(B)	95% C.I. for EXP(B)	
								Lower	Upper
Step 3 <sup>a</sup>	economics and business students	-,277	,316	,768	1	,381	,758	,408	1,409
	Sex	-,151	,278	,296	1	,586	,860	,498	1,482
	Age	-,042	,027	2,453	1	,117	,959	,910	1,011
	bmi	-,001	,019	,001	1	,974	,999	,962	1,038
	having a relationship	-,107	,247	,189	1	,664	,898	,553	1,458
	living situation			40,149	3	,000			
	living situation(1)	1,678	,311	29,054	1	,000	5,354	2,909	9,856
	living situation(2)	1,484	,289	26,352	1	,000	4,408	2,502	7,768
	living situation(3)	1,139	,384	8,784	1	,003	3,124	1,471	6,635
	Dutch	1,320	,228	33,359	1	,000	3,742	2,391	5,856
	study results	,036	,123	,083	1	,773	1,036	,814	1,319
	study phase	-,010	,269	,001	1	,969	,990	,585	1,676
	negative sexual experiences	-,068	,271	,063	1	,801	,934	,549	1,589
	peer pressure lifestyle self-efficacy	-,556	,134	17,237	1	,000	,573	,441	,745
	problem perception	-,378	,173	4,800	1	,028	,685	,488	,961
	seeking or having help	-,185	,231	,639	1	,424	,831	,528	1,308
	Constant	7,764	1,843	17,749	1	,000	2355,426		

a. Variable(s) entered on step 1: economics and business students, Sex, Age, bmi, having a relationship, living situation, Dutch, study results, study phase, negative sexual experiences, peer pressure lifestyle self-efficacy, problem perception, seeking or having help.

Table 3.8

Model Summary			
Step	-2 Log likelihood	Cox & Snell R Square	Nagelkerke R Square
3	595,805 <sup>a</sup>	,107	,234

a. Estimation terminated at iteration number 7 because parameter estimates changed by less than ,001.

Table 3.9

Omnibus Tests of Model Coefficients				
		Chi-square	df	Sig.
Step 3	Step	136,043	15	,000
	Block	136,043	15	,000
	Model	136,043	15	,000

Table 4.1-4.9. Logistic regression analysis for drug (ab)use whereby economics and business students are compared with non-economics and business students.  
Step 1 N = 2393, step 2 N = 2348, step 3 N = 1206.

Table 4.1

		Variables in the Equation							
		B	S.E.	Wald	df	Sig.	Exp(B)	95% C.I. for EXP(B)	
								Lower	Upper
Step 1 <sup>a</sup>	economics and business students	-,180	,139	1,675	1	,196	,835	,635	1,097
	Constant	-,637	,046	194,881	1	,000	,529		

a. Variable(s) entered on step 1: economics and business students.

Table 4.2

Model Summary			
Step	-2 Log likelihood	Cox & Snell R Square	Nagelkerke R Square
1	3070,754 <sup>a</sup>	,001	,001

a. Estimation terminated at iteration number 3 because parameter estimates changed by less than ,001.

Table 4.3

		Omnibus Tests of Model Coefficients		
		Chi-square	df	Sig.
Step 1	Step	1,705	1	,192
	Block	1,705	1	,192
	Model	1,705	1	,192

Table 4.4

		Variables in the Equation							
		B	S.E.	Wald	df	Sig.	Exp(B)	95% C.I. for EXP(B)	
								Lower	Upper
Step 2 <sup>a</sup>	economics and business students	-,336	,151	4,959	1	,026	,714	,531	,960
	Sex	-,866	,098	77,434	1	,000	,421	,347	,510
	Age	-,031	,015	4,558	1	,033	,970	,942	,997
	bmi	-,008	,010	,667	1	,414	,992	,972	1,012
	having a relationship	,041	,100	,164	1	,685	1,041	,856	1,267
	living situation			117,809	3	,000			
	living situation(1)	1,384	,136	103,193	1	,000	3,990	3,055	5,211
	living situation(2)	,824	,144	32,601	1	,000	2,280	1,718	3,025
	living situation(3)	,454	,207	4,799	1	,028	1,574	1,049	2,363
	Dutch	-,175	,107	2,689	1	,101	,839	,681	1,035
	study results	-,091	,056	2,665	1	,103	,913	,818	1,018
	study phase	,019	,115	,027	1	,869	1,019	,814	1,276
	Constant	1,640	,623	6,924	1	,009	5,154		

a. Variable(s) entered on step 1: economics and business students, Sex, Age, bmi, having a relationship, living situation, Dutch, study results, study phase.

Table 4.5

Model Summary			
Step	-2 Log likelihood	Cox & Snell R Square	Nagelkerke R Square
2	2805,279 <sup>a</sup>	,088	,122

a. Estimation terminated at iteration number 4 because parameter estimates changed by less than ,001.

Table 4.6

Omnibus Tests of Model Coefficients				
		Chi-square	df	Sig.
Step 2	Step	216,396	11	,000
	Block	216,396	11	,000
	Model	216,396	11	,000

Table 4.7

Variables in the Equation									
		B	S.E.	Wald	df	Sig.	Exp(B)	95% C.I. for EXP(B)	
Step 3 <sup>a</sup>	economics and business students	-,634	,226	7,900	1	,005	,530	,341	,825
	Sex	-,705	,152	21,416	1	,000	,494	,367	,666
	Age	-,028	,024	1,387	1	,239	,972	,927	1,019
	bmi	-,010	,010	1,027	1	,311	,990	,970	1,010
	having a relationship	,138	,149	,867	1	,352	1,148	,858	1,536
	living situation			64,613	3	,000			
	living situation(1)	1,461	,195	56,092	1	,000	4,310	2,941	6,318
	living situation(2)	,671	,204	10,775	1	,001	1,956	1,310	2,919
	living situation(3)	,682	,295	5,347	1	,021	1,978	1,110	3,528
	Dutch	,059	,153	,150	1	,699	1,061	,786	1,431
	study results	,179	,084	4,605	1	,032	1,196	1,016	1,409
	study phase	-,208	,174	1,421	1	,233	,812	,577	1,143
	negative sexual experiences	,333	,165	4,061	1	,044	1,396	1,009	1,930
	peer pressure lifestyle self-efficacy	-,533	,058	83,420	1	,000	,587	,523	,658
	problem perception	-,204	,106	3,724	1	,054	,816	,663	1,003
	seeking or having help	-,284	,135	4,432	1	,035	,753	,578	,981
	Constant	4,925	1,083	20,668	1	,000	137,686		

a. Variable(s) entered on step 1: economics and business students, Sex, Age, bmi, having a relationship, living situation, Dutch, study results, study phase, negative sexual experiences, peer pressure lifestyle self-efficacy, problem perception, seeking or having help.

Table 4.8

Model Summary			
Step	-2 Log likelihood	Cox & Snell R Square	Nagelkerke R Square
3	1375,804 <sup>a</sup>	,198	,267

a. Estimation terminated at iteration number 5 because parameter estimates changed by less than ,001.

Table 4.9

Omnibus Tests of Model Coefficients				
		Chi-square	df	Sig.
Step 3	Step	266,641	15	,000
	Block	266,641	15	,000
	Model	266,641	15	,000

Table 5.1-5.9. Logistic regression analysis for psychological complaints whereby economics and business students are compared with non-economics and business students.

Step 1 N = 2393, step 2 N = 2348, step 3 N = 1206.

Table 5.1

		Variables in the Equation							
		B	S.E.	Wald	df	Sig.	Exp(B)	95% C.I. for EXP(B)	
								Lower	Upper
Step 1 <sup>a</sup>	economics and business students	-,648	,201	10,373	1	,001	,523	,352	,776
	Constant	-1,435	,055	678,925	1	,000	,238		

a. Variable(s) entered on step 1: economics and business students.

Table 5.2

Model Summary			
Step	-2 Log likelihood	Cox & Snell R Square	Nagelkerke R Square
1	2266,042 <sup>a</sup>	,005	,008

a. Estimation terminated at iteration number 5 because parameter estimates changed by less than ,001.

Table 5.3

		Omnibus Tests of Model Coefficients		
		Chi-square	df	Sig.
Step 1	Step	11,916	1	,001
	Block	11,916	1	,001
	Model	11,916	1	,001

Table 5.4

		Variables in the Equation							
		B	S.E.	Wald	df	Sig.	Exp(B)	95% C.I. for EXP(B)	
								Lower	Upper
Step 2 <sup>a</sup>	economics and business students	-,639	,208	9,463	1	,002	,528	,351	,793
	Sex	,486	,128	14,544	1	,000	1,627	1,267	2,089
	Age	,031	,013	5,623	1	,018	1,032	1,005	1,059
	bmi	-,008	,015	,319	1	,572	,992	,963	1,021
	having a relationship	-,284	,124	5,293	1	,021	,752	,591	,959
	living situation			9,790	3	,020			
	living situation(1)	-,092	,154	,356	1	,551	,912	,675	1,233
	living situation(2)	,286	,156	3,367	1	,067	1,331	,981	1,807
	living situation(3)	,307	,222	1,919	1	,166	1,359	,880	2,099
	Dutch	-,017	,127	,018	1	,895	,983	,767	1,261
	study results	-,309	,065	22,230	1	,000	,734	,646	,835
	study phase	-,055	,132	,171	1	,679	,947	,731	1,227
	Constant	-,576	,718	,645	1	,422	,562		

a. Variable(s) entered on step 1: economics and business students, Sex, Age, bmi, having a relationship, living situation, Dutch, study results, study phase.

Table 5.5

Model Summary			
Step	-2 Log likelihood	Cox & Snell R Square	Nagelkerke R Square
2	2168,761 <sup>a</sup>	,028	,046

a. Estimation terminated at iteration number 5 because parameter estimates changed by less than ,001.

Table 5.6

Omnibus Tests of Model Coefficients				
Step 2	Chi-square		df	Sig.
	Step	67,068	11	,000
	Block	67,068	11	,000
	Model	67,068	11	,000

Table 5.7

Variables in the Equation									
Step 3 <sup>a</sup>		B	S.E.	Wald	df	Sig.	Exp(B)	95% C.I. for EXP(B)	
								Lower	Upper
Step 3 <sup>a</sup>	economics and business students	-,648	,266	5,929	1	,015	,523	,310	,881
	Sex	,059	,172	,117	1	,732	1,061	,757	1,485
	Age	,037	,021	2,938	1	,087	1,038	,995	1,082
	bmi	-,022	,020	1,212	1	,271	,978	,940	1,018
	having a relationship	-,180	,164	1,197	1	,274	,835	,605	1,153
	living situation			5,038	3	,169			
	living situation(1)	-,229	,204	1,258	1	,262	,796	,533	1,186
	living situation(2)	,093	,205	,207	1	,649	1,098	,734	1,641
	living situation(3)	,260	,283	,842	1	,359	1,297	,744	2,258
	Dutch	,368	,165	4,967	1	,026	1,446	1,045	1,999
	study results	-,195	,086	5,190	1	,023	,823	,696	,973
	study phase	-,029	,182	,026	1	,872	,971	,680	1,387
	negative sexual experiences	,595	,168	12,478	1	,000	1,812	1,303	2,520
	peer pressure lifestyle self-efficacy	,149	,060	6,210	1	,013	1,161	1,032	1,306
	problem perception	,319	,114	7,795	1	,005	1,376	1,100	1,721
	seeking or having help	1,214	,161	57,018	1	,000	3,366	2,456	4,613
	Constant	-3,363	1,143	8,654	1	,003	,035		

a. Variable(s) entered on step 1: economics and business students, Sex, Age, bmi, having a relationship, living situation, Dutch, study results, study phase, negative sexual experiences, peer pressure lifestyle self-efficacy, problem perception, seeking or having help.

Table 5.8

Model Summary			
Step	-2 Log likelihood	Cox & Snell R Square	Nagelkerke R Square
3	1215,415 <sup>a</sup>	,103	,153

a. Estimation terminated at iteration number 5 because parameter estimates changed by less than ,001.

Table 5.9

Omnibus Tests of Model Coefficients				
Step 3	Chi-square		df	Sig.
	Step	130,960	15	,000
	Block	130,960	15	,000
	Model	130,960	15	,000

Table 6.1-6.9. Logistic regression analysis for disability whereby economics and business students are compared with non-economics and business students.  
Step 1 N = 2393, step 2 N = 2348, step 3 N = 1206.

Table 6.1

		Variables in the Equation						
		B	S.E.	Wald	df	Sig.	Exp(B)	95% C.I. for EXP(B) Lower Upper
Step 1 <sup>a</sup>	economics and business students	-,459	,237	3,752	1	,053	,632	,397 1,005
	Constant	-2,018	,067	894,884	1	,000	,133	

a. Variable(s) entered on step 1: economics and business students.

Table 6.2

Model Summary			
Step	-2 Log likelihood	Cox & Snell R Square	Nagelkerke R Square
1	1682,360 <sup>a</sup>	,002	,003

a. Estimation terminated at iteration number 5 because parameter estimates changed by less than ,001.

Table 6.3

Omnibus Tests of Model Coefficients				
		Chi-square	df	Sig.
Step 1	Step	4,177	1	,041
	Block	4,177	1	,041
	Model	4,177	1	,041

Table 6.4

		Variables in the Equation						
		B	S.E.	Wald	df	Sig.	Exp(B)	95% C.I. for EXP(B) Lower Upper
Step 2 <sup>a</sup>	economics and business students	-,471	,249	3,586	1	,058	,624	,383 1,017
	Sex	,396	,154	6,583	1	,010	1,486	1,098 2,010
	Age	,045	,014	9,844	1	,002	1,046	1,017 1,076
	bmi	-,005	,015	,105	1	,746	,995	,966 1,025
	having a relationship	-,611	,160	14,595	1	,000	,543	,397 ,743
	living situation			5,669	3	,129		
	living situation(1)	,107	,193	,309	1	,578	1,113	,763 1,624
	living situation(2)	,320	,196	2,679	1	,102	1,378	,939 2,022
	living situation(3)	,565	,283	3,993	1	,046	1,759	1,011 3,062
	Dutch	-,278	,148	3,523	1	,061	,757	,567 1,012
	study results	-,113	,079	2,043	1	,153	,894	,766 1,043
	study phase	-,330	,163	4,113	1	,043	,719	,523 ,989
	Constant	-2,530	,829	9,311	1	,002	,080	

a. Variable(s) entered on step 1: economics and business students, Sex, Age, bmi, having a relationship, living situation, Dutch, study results, study phase.

Table 6.5

Model Summary			
Step	-2 Log likelihood	Cox & Snell R Square	Nagelkerke R Square
2	1599,908 <sup>a</sup>	,020	,039

a. Estimation terminated at iteration number 5 because parameter estimates changed by less than ,001.

Table 6.6

Omnibus Tests of Model Coefficients				
		Chi-square	df	Sig.
Step 2	Step	46,968	11	,000
	Block	46,968	11	,000
	Model	46,968	11	,000

Table 6.7

Variables in the Equation									
		B	S.E.	Wald	df	Sig.	Exp(B)	95% C.I. for EXP(B)	
Step 3 <sup>a</sup>	economics and business students	-,869	,369	5,543	1	,019	,419	,203	,864
	Sex	,101	,209	,231	1	,631	1,106	,734	1,666
	Age	,051	,023	4,902	1	,027	1,053	1,006	1,102
	bmi	-,014	,022	,425	1	,514	,986	,945	1,029
	having a relationship	-,670	,213	9,866	1	,002	,512	,337	,777
	living situation			4,233	3	,237			
	living situation(1)	,068	,256	,071	1	,790	1,070	,649	1,767
	living situation(2)	,327	,252	1,685	1	,194	1,387	,846	2,274
	living situation(3)	,601	,360	2,784	1	,095	1,825	,900	3,698
	Dutch	-,063	,193	,105	1	,746	,939	,644	1,371
	study results	-,105	,102	1,067	1	,302	,900	,737	1,099
	study phase	-,352	,223	2,488	1	,115	,703	,454	1,089
	negative sexual experiences	,113	,208	,295	1	,587	1,119	,745	1,682
	peer pressure lifestyle self-efficacy	,245	,081	9,038	1	,003	1,278	1,089	1,499
	problem perception	,234	,137	2,934	1	,087	1,264	,967	1,652
	seeking or having help	,778	,191	16,557	1	,000	2,177	1,497	3,167
	Constant	-5,177	1,378	14,107	1	,000	,006		

a. Variable(s) entered on step 1: economics and business students, Sex, Age, bmi, having a relationship, living situation, Dutch, study results, study phase, negative sexual experiences, peer pressure lifestyle self-efficacy, problem perception, seeking or having help.

Table 6.8

Model Summary			
Step	-2 Log likelihood	Cox & Snell R Square	Nagelkerke R Square
3	905,184 <sup>a</sup>	,055	,100

a. Estimation terminated at iteration number 5 because parameter estimates changed by less than ,001.

Table 6.9

Omnibus Tests of Model Coefficients				
		Chi-square	df	Sig.
Step 3	Step	68,534	15	,000
	Block	68,534	15	,000
	Model	68,534	15	,000

