

# Friendship and Loneliness among Degree College Students: A Comparison Between Day Scholars and Hostellers

**Dr. Asha. H.K**

Associate Professor, Department of Psychology,  
Lal Bahadur Shastri Govt. First Grade College, Bangalore  
Email id: [ashasugur@gmail.com](mailto:ashasugur@gmail.com); Contact number: 9964535755

## Abstract

The aim of the study was to examine friendship and loneliness among degree college students and to compare these variables between day scholars and hostellers. The objective was to study the difference in friendship and loneliness between degree college day scholars and hostellers. The sample consisted of male and female degree college students pursuing undergraduate education in government and private colleges, aged between 18 and 21 years. A between-group design with purposive sampling technique was adopted for the study. The students were administered the Friendship Scale and Loneliness Scale to assess the levels of friendship and loneliness among the participants. 't' test was computed to study the significant difference in the mean scores on friendship and loneliness between day scholars and hostellers. The study revealed that day scholars demonstrated significantly healthier friendship patterns and lower loneliness than hostellers, indicating that residential status plays an important role in interpersonal relationships, emotional adjustment, and social connectedness among college students.

**Keywords: Friendship, loneliness, day scholars, hostellers, and degree college students.**

---

## Introduction:

Friendship and loneliness are important psychosocial constructs that significantly influence emotional, interpersonal, and psychological functioning during late adolescence and emerging adulthood. The college period represents a major developmental transition characterized by identity formation, emotional independence, changing social roles, academic responsibilities, and increasing dependence on peer relationships. Within this context, friendship serves as an important source of emotional security, belongingness, companionship, and psychological adjustment, whereas loneliness contributes to emotional distress, social withdrawal, reduced self-esteem, and impaired mental well-being. Consequently, friendship and loneliness have become important areas of investigation in contemporary psychological research among college students.

Friendship has been conceptualized as a voluntary and reciprocal interpersonal relationship characterized by trust, intimacy, empathy, companionship, and mutual support. Sullivan (1953) emphasized that close peer

relationships are essential for healthy personality development and emotional maturity during adolescence and early adulthood. Similarly, Bukowski, Newcomb, and Hartup (1996) highlighted that friendships contribute significantly to self-esteem, emotional regulation, social competence, and adaptive coping. Positive peer relationships also facilitate emotional resilience, academic adjustment, social integration, and psychological well-being among college students.

In contrast, Weiss (1973) conceptualized loneliness as emotional loneliness resulting from the absence of intimate attachments and social loneliness arising from inadequate social integration. Perlman and Peplau (1981) further proposed that loneliness develops due to discrepancies between desired and actual social relationships. Contemporary investigations have associated loneliness with depression, anxiety, emotional dysregulation, reduced academic engagement, and poor psychological well-being among college students (Cacioppo & Hawkley, 2009).

The experiences of friendship and loneliness may vary according to residential status. Hostellers reside away from their families and spend greater time in peer-oriented social environments, which may promote friendship formation and social competence. However, hostel living may also increase homesickness, emotional insecurity, adjustment difficulties, and loneliness due to separation from family support systems. Conversely, day scholars maintain continuous interaction with family members and established support networks but may experience comparatively limited campus social interaction.

Previous studies examining psychosocial differences between day scholars and hostellers have produced inconsistent findings. Siyana and Zinna (2018) reported significantly higher loneliness and lower social support among hostel students compared to day scholars. Abbas, Yasin, and Akhtar (2023) similarly found greater emotional and social loneliness among hostelized students. However, some studies have reported non-significant differences in interpersonal functioning and psychological well-being between the two groups, suggesting the influence of factors such as coping styles, personality traits, institutional climate, and peer relationship quality. Within the Indian sociocultural context, where family cohesion and emotional interdependence are highly valued, understanding friendship and loneliness among day scholars and hostellers becomes particularly significant. Therefore, the present study attempts to comparatively examine friendship and loneliness among degree college students based on residential status.

Theoretical and empirical literature has emphasized the importance of friendship and interpersonal relationships in emotional adjustment and psychological well-being. Weiss (1973) conceptualized loneliness as emotional and social loneliness, while Perlman and Peplau (1981) explained loneliness as resulting from discrepancies between desired and actual social relationships. Sullivan (1953) highlighted the importance of close peer relationships in emotional development and identity formation. Similarly, Bukowski et al. (1996)

and Hartup and Stevens (1997) emphasized that supportive friendships contribute to emotional security, social competence, and adaptive coping.

Research has also linked loneliness with depression, anxiety, emotional distress, and poor well-being among college students (Cacioppo & Hawkley, 2009; Heinrich & Gullone, 2006; Diehl et al., 2018). Comparative studies by Siyana and Zinna (2018) and Abbas et al. (2023) reported higher loneliness among hostellers, whereas Kaur and Kaur (2015), Bawa and Kaur (2018), and Verma and Sharma (2019) reported inconsistent findings regarding psychosocial adjustment among day scholars and hostellers.

### **Need for the Study**

The college years represent a critical developmental phase characterized by emotional, interpersonal, academic, and social transitions. During this period, friendship and social connectedness become important determinants of psychological adjustment and well-being, whereas loneliness has been associated with depression, anxiety, emotional distress, and poor academic adjustment (Cacioppo & Hawkley, 2009). The psychosocial experiences of day scholars and hostellers may differ because hostellers experience separation from family systems and increased peer-oriented living conditions, while day scholars remain within familiar family environments. Existing studies have produced inconsistent findings, with some investigations reporting stronger interpersonal relationships and social competence among hostellers (Kaur & Kaur, 2015; Bawa & Kaur, 2018), while other studies indicate greater loneliness, homesickness, emotional stress, and adjustment difficulties among hostel students (Siyana & Zinna, 2018; Abbas et al., 2023). Furthermore, factors such as coping strategies, personality traits, peer relationship quality, and institutional climate may influence psychosocial outcomes (Verma & Sharma, 2019). Within the Indian sociocultural context, where family attachment and emotional interdependence are highly valued, comparatively limited research has simultaneously examined friendship and loneliness among degree college day scholars and hostellers. Therefore, the present study is necessary to understand how residential status influences friendship and loneliness among college students.

### **Methodology:**

The study aimed to examine friendship and loneliness among degree college students and to compare these variables between day scholars and hostellers. The objective was to determine the differences in friendship and loneliness between degree college day scholars and hostellers. It was hypothesized that there would be no significant difference in friendship and loneliness between day scholars and hostellers.

The independent variable was the residential status of the students (day scholars and hostellers), while the dependent variables were friendship and loneliness. The sample comprised male and female degree college students aged between 18 and 21 years pursuing undergraduate education in government and private colleges. Students with severe physical illnesses, diagnosed psychiatric conditions, or those undergoing psychological

treatment were excluded from the study. A between-group design with purposive sampling technique was employed.

The students were administered the Friendship Scale and Loneliness Scale to assess the levels of friendship and loneliness among the participants. Based on their residential status, the students were grouped as day scholars and hostellers. The obtained scores were analyzed to understand the differences in friendship and loneliness between the two groups. An independent samples ‘t’ test was conducted to analyze the significant difference in the mean scores on friendship and loneliness between day scholars and hostellers.

## Tools

### **The Dimensions of Friendship Scale (DFS) (Chandna and Chadha, 1986):**

It was developed by Chandna and Chadha (1986) to assess the multidimensional nature of friendship among individuals. It is a self-report psychological instrument widely used in psychological and social science research to examine friendship quality, interpersonal adjustment, peer relationships, and social connectedness among adolescents and young adults. The scale consists of 64 items distributed across eight dimensions of friendship, namely Enjoyment, Acceptance, Trust, Respect, Mutual Assistance, Confiding, Understanding, and Spontaneity. Out of the total items, 37 are positively worded and 27 are negatively worded, with responses recorded in a Yes/No format. Higher scores indicate stronger and more desirable friendship characteristics.

The Dimensions of Friendship Scale was standardized primarily on adolescent and young adult populations and is considered suitable for college students. The standardization process involved item analysis, expert evaluation, reliability estimation, validation procedures, and establishment of norms. The psychometric properties of the scale indicate satisfactory reliability and validity. The test–retest reliability coefficient was reported as 0.78, while the split-half reliability coefficients were 0.72 (odd-even method) and 0.76 (first-second half method). The validity coefficient was found to be 0.78, demonstrating adequate construct validity. The scale also provides norms for interpretation, categorizing friendship status into extremely desirable, strongly desirable, mildly desirable, neutral, mildly undesirable, strongly undesirable, and extremely undesirable levels. Separate norms are also available for dimension-wise interpretation. The DFS has significant utility in studies related to counselling psychology, educational psychology, adolescent psychology, social competence, and interpersonal relationships.

### **The Loneliness Inventory (LI) (Uma and Meenakshi, 2008):**

It was developed by Uma and Meenakshi R. to assess loneliness among college students and young adults. The inventory is designed to measure subjective experiences of loneliness and emotional isolation within educational settings. The tool consists of 19 items with five response alternatives: Never, Rarely, Sometimes, Many Times, and Always. Higher scores indicate higher levels of loneliness. The inventory has been extensively used in studies related to mental health, emotional well-being, psychosocial adjustment, and counselling psychology.

The standardization process of the inventory involved item construction, expert review, reliability estimation, and validation procedures using college student samples. Reliability was established through the split-half method using a sample of 100 students. The Pearson Product Moment Correlation Coefficient for half-test reliability was found to be 0.72. Using the Spearman–Brown Prophecy Formula, the corrected reliability coefficient for the whole inventory was calculated as 0.84, while the reliability index was found to be 0.92, indicating high reliability. Validity was established through content validity, item validity, and concurrent validity procedures. The concurrent validity coefficient was reported as 0.85, based on correlations between inventory scores and ratings provided by Heads of Departments. Norms for interpretation indicate that scores of 36 and below reflect low loneliness, scores between 37 and 49 indicate average loneliness, and scores of 50 and above indicate high loneliness. The inventory is particularly useful for identifying students vulnerable to emotional isolation, poor social connectedness, and psychological distress.

### **Procedure**

The study was conducted among degree college students who met the inclusion criteria and voluntarily agreed to participate in the research. The procedure began with obtaining informed consent from the participants and collecting relevant demographic details such as age, gender, type of college, and residential status. Based on their residential status, the participants were categorized into two groups: day scholars and hostellers.

The students were then administered the Friendship Scale and Loneliness Scale to assess the levels of friendship and loneliness among the participants. Adequate instructions regarding the purpose of the study and the method of responding to the scales were provided prior to administration. Confidentiality of responses was assured, and the participants were encouraged to respond honestly.

After the completion of data collection, the responses were scored according to the respective scoring procedures of the scales. The obtained scores were statistically analyzed to examine the differences in friendship and loneliness between day scholars and hostellers.

### **Analysis of Results:**

Mean and standard deviation were computed for descriptive analysis in order to understand the overall levels of friendship and loneliness among degree college students. The scores obtained on the Friendship Scale and Loneliness Scale were separately analyzed for day scholars and hostellers. An independent samples ‘t’ test was computed to study the significant difference in the mean scores on friendship and loneliness between degree college day scholars and hostellers.

### **Results and discussion:**

Friendship and loneliness are important psychosocial constructs that influence emotional adjustment, interpersonal functioning, and psychological well-being among college students. The present study

**Table 1: Demographic details of the sample:**

Areas	Categories	Day Scholars	Percentage	Hostellers	Percentage
<b>Gender</b>	Boys	14	46.67	15	50.00
	Girls	16	53.33	15	50.00
	<b>Total</b>	<b>30</b>	<b>100.00</b>	<b>30</b>	<b>100.00</b>
<b>Age</b>	18–19 years	18	60.00	17	56.67
	20–21 years	12	40.00	13	43.33
	<b>Total</b>	<b>30</b>	<b>100.00</b>	<b>30</b>	<b>100.00</b>
<b>Type of College</b>	Government College	13	43.33	12	40.00
	Private College	17	56.67	18	60.00
	<b>Total</b>	<b>30</b>	<b>100.00</b>	<b>30</b>	<b>100.00</b>
<b>Medium of Instruction</b>	Kannada	11	36.67	10	33.33
	English	19	63.33	20	66.67
	<b>Total</b>	<b>30</b>	<b>100.00</b>	<b>30</b>	<b>100.00</b>
<b>Type of Family</b>	Nuclear Family	21	70.00	19	63.33
	Joint Family	9	30.00	11	36.67
	<b>Total</b>	<b>30</b>	<b>100.00</b>	<b>30</b>	<b>100.00</b>
<b>Year of Study</b>	First Year Degree	12	40.00	11	36.67
	Second Year Degree	10	33.33	10	33.33
	Third Year Degree	8	26.67	9	30.00
	<b>Total</b>	<b>30</b>	<b>100.00</b>	<b>30</b>	<b>100.00</b>
<b>Category</b>	SC/ST	8	26.67	9	30.00
	OBC	13	43.33	12	40.00
	GM	9	30.00	9	30.00
	<b>Total</b>	<b>30</b>	<b>100.00</b>	<b>30</b>	<b>100.00</b>

Table 1 presents the demographic characteristics of the sample comprising scholars and hostellers pursuing undergraduate education. The gender distribution was relatively balanced across both groups, with a slightly higher proportion of girls among day scholars, while hostellers included equal proportions of boys and girls. The majority of participants belonged to the 18–19 years age group. A larger percentage of participants from both groups studied in private colleges and had English as the medium of instruction. Most students belonged to nuclear families compared to joint families. With regard to year of study, the highest proportion of participants were from first-year degree courses. In terms of social category, the majority of students belonged to the OBC category, followed by GM and SC/ST categories, indicating representation from varied sociocultural backgrounds within the sample.

**Table 2: Mean Scores and Interpretation on Friendship Dimensions and Loneliness Among Day Scholars and Hostellers:**

Variable/Dimension	Group	Mean	Interpretation
<b>The Dimensions of Friendship Scale</b>			

Enjoyment	Day Scholars	5.93	High Friendship Status
	Hostellers	4.30	Neutral Friendship Status
Acceptance	Day Scholars	8.13	High Friendship Status
	Hostellers	5.50	Neutral Friendship Status
Trust	Day Scholars	8.07	High Friendship Status
	Hostellers	5.67	Neutral Friendship Status
Respect	Day Scholars	6.00	High Friendship Status
	Hostellers	4.40	Neutral Friendship Status
Mutual Assistance	Day Scholars	7.10	High Friendship Status
	Hostellers	4.43	Neutral Friendship Status
Confiding	Day Scholars	7.57	High Friendship Status
	Hostellers	4.83	Neutral Friendship Status
Understanding	Day Scholars	7.07	High Friendship Status
	Hostellers	5.20	Neutral Friendship Status
Spontaneity	Day Scholars	5.60	High Friendship Status
	Hostellers	4.27	Neutral Friendship Status
Total Friendship Score	Day Scholars	55.47	Extremely Desirable Friendship Status
	Hostellers	38.60	Neutral Friendship Status
<b>The Loneliness Inventory</b>			
Loneliness Score	Day Scholars	34.97	Low Loneliness
	Hostellers	54.07	High Loneliness

The findings of the study revealed significant differences between day scholars and hostellers on various dimensions of friendship and loneliness. Day scholars demonstrated comparatively higher friendship status across all dimensions of the Dimensions of Friendship Scale, including enjoyment, acceptance, trust, respect, mutual assistance, confiding, understanding, and spontaneity. According to the scale norms, day scholars consistently fell within the “High Friendship Status” category, whereas hostellers generally fell within the “Neutral Friendship Status” category. Day scholars experienced greater pleasure, emotional inclusion, trust, support, empathy, openness, and satisfaction in friendships compared to hostellers. The overall friendship status of day scholars fell within the “Extremely Desirable Friendship Status” category, indicating highly supportive and emotionally satisfying relationships. In contrast, hostellers demonstrated comparatively average friendship quality. With regard to loneliness, day scholars showed low loneliness and better emotional adjustment, whereas hostellers demonstrated high loneliness, emotional isolation, homesickness, and poorer social connectedness.

The findings of the present study revealed that day scholars demonstrated significantly higher friendship status across all dimensions of the Dimensions of Friendship Scale, namely enjoyment, acceptance, trust, respect, mutual assistance, confiding, understanding, and spontaneity, whereas hostellers showed comparatively neutral friendship status. Further, day scholars demonstrated low loneliness, while hostellers exhibited high loneliness. These findings are consistent with several previous investigations examining interpersonal relationships and psychosocial adjustment among college students.

The higher friendship status among day scholars may be attributed to continuous familial support, familiar social environments, emotional security, and stable peer networks. Sullivan (1953) emphasized the importance

of supportive peer relationships for emotional development and psychological adjustment, while Bukowski, Newcomb, and Hartup (1996) highlighted the role of friendships in emotional security, self-esteem, and social competence.

The findings are consistent with Siyana and Zinna (2018) and Abbas, Yasin, and Akhtar (2023), who reported higher loneliness and lower social support among hostel students. Weiss (1973) conceptualized loneliness as resulting from deficiencies in emotional and social relationships, whereas Perlman and Peplau (1981) explained loneliness as arising from discrepancies between desired and actual relationships. Hartup and Stevens (1997) also emphasized that healthy friendships facilitate psychosocial competence and emotional regulation.

However, contradictory findings were reported by Kaur and Kaur (2015) and Bawa and Kaur (2018), who observed better social adaptability and interpersonal communication among hostellers. Overall, the findings suggest that residential status significantly influences friendship quality, emotional adjustment, and loneliness among degree college students within the Indian sociocultural context.

**Table 3: Comparison of Mean Scores, Standard Deviations, and ‘t’ Values on Friendship Dimensions and Loneliness Between Day Scholars and Hostellers**

Dimensions	Group	N	Mean	SD	t
<b>The Dimensions of Friendship Scale</b>					
Enjoyment	Day Scholars	30	5.93	0.91	6.01**
	Hostellers	30	4.30	1.18	
Acceptance	Day Scholars	30	8.13	0.78	9.64**
	Hostellers	30	5.50	1.28	
Trust	Day Scholars	30	8.07	0.78	9.25**
	Hostellers	30	5.67	1.18	
Respect	Day Scholars	30	6.00	0.91	6.60**
	Hostellers	30	4.40	0.97	
Mutual Assistance	Day Scholars	30	7.10	0.80	9.83**
	Hostellers	30	4.43	1.25	
Confiding	Day Scholars	30	7.57	1.10	8.52**
	Hostellers	30	4.83	1.37	
Understanding	Day Scholars	30	7.07	0.94	6.13**
	Hostellers	30	5.20	1.37	
Spontaneity	Day Scholars	30	5.60	0.81	5.99**
	Hostellers	30	4.27	0.91	
Total Friendship Score	Day Scholars	30	55.47	2.45	22.46**
	Hostellers	30	38.60	3.31	
<b>The Loneliness Inventory</b>					
Loneliness Score	Day Scholars	30	34.97	4.48	-14.92**
	Hostellers	30	54.07	5.39	
<b>P &lt; **0.01 (Significant at 0.01 level)</b>					

On the Enjoyment dimension of the Dimensions of Friendship Scale, day scholars had a mean score of 5.93 (SD = 0.91) compared to 4.30 (SD = 1.18) for hostellers. The obtained t-value of 6.01 was significant at the

0.01 level ( $p < 0.01$ ), indicating that day scholars experienced significantly greater pleasure and satisfaction in friendships. On the Acceptance dimension, day scholars obtained a mean score of 8.13 ( $SD = 0.78$ ), whereas hostellers obtained a mean score of 5.50 ( $SD = 1.28$ ). The t-value of 9.64 was highly significant ( $p < 0.01$ ), showing that day scholars experienced significantly higher feelings of acceptance and emotional inclusion in friendships.

With regard to the Trust dimension, day scholars scored a mean of 8.07 ( $SD = 0.78$ ) compared to 5.67 ( $SD = 1.18$ ) for hostellers. The t-value of 9.25 was highly significant ( $p < 0.01$ ), indicating stronger confidence and faith in friendships among day scholars. On the Respect dimension, day scholars had a mean score of 6.00 ( $SD = 0.91$ ), whereas hostellers scored 4.40 ( $SD = 0.97$ ). The t-value of 6.60 was significant at the 0.01 level, suggesting that day scholars experienced significantly greater mutual regard and appreciation in friendships.

On the Mutual Assistance dimension, day scholars obtained a mean score of 7.10 ( $SD = 0.80$ ) compared to 4.43 ( $SD = 1.25$ ) for hostellers. The t-value of 9.83 was highly significant ( $p < 0.01$ ), indicating greater helping behaviour and support among day scholars. Similarly, on the Confiding dimension, day scholars scored a mean of 7.57 ( $SD = 1.10$ ), whereas hostellers obtained 4.83 ( $SD = 1.37$ ). The t-value of 8.52 was significant at the 0.01 level, showing that day scholars shared personal feelings and emotions more openly with friends.

On the Understanding dimension, day scholars had a mean score of 7.07 ( $SD = 0.94$ ) compared to 5.20 ( $SD = 1.37$ ) for hostellers. The obtained t-value of 6.13 was significant at the 0.01 level, indicating greater empathy and emotional understanding among day scholars. Likewise, on the Spontaneity dimension, day scholars scored 5.60 ( $SD = 0.81$ ), whereas hostellers scored 4.27 ( $SD = 0.91$ ). The t-value of 5.99 was significant at the 0.01 level, suggesting that day scholars demonstrated significantly greater openness and natural interaction in friendships.

The Total Friendship Score further revealed substantial differences between the groups. Day scholars obtained a mean score of 55.47 ( $SD = 2.45$ ) compared to 38.60 ( $SD = 3.31$ ) for hostellers. The obtained t-value of 22.46 was highly significant ( $p < 0.01$ ), indicating that day scholars possessed significantly stronger and healthier friendship relationships overall.

With regard to loneliness, day scholars obtained a mean score of 34.97 ( $SD = 4.48$ ), whereas hostellers scored 54.07 ( $SD = 5.39$ ). The obtained t-value of -14.92 was highly significant at the 0.01 level ( $p < 0.01$ ), indicating that hostellers experienced significantly higher loneliness and emotional isolation compared to day scholars.

The findings of the present study revealed significant differences between day scholars and hostellers on all dimensions of friendship and loneliness. Day scholars demonstrated significantly higher scores on enjoyment,

acceptance, trust, respect, mutual assistance, confiding, understanding, spontaneity, and overall friendship status, whereas hostellers demonstrated significantly higher loneliness. These findings indicate that day scholars experience healthier friendship patterns, greater emotional connectedness, and lower emotional isolation compared to hostellers.

The findings support the views of Sullivan (1953), who emphasized the importance of close peer relationships for emotional development and psychological adjustment. Similarly, Bukowski, Newcomb, and Hartup (1996) highlighted that positive friendships contribute to emotional security, self-esteem, social competence, and adaptive functioning. The higher scores of day scholars on acceptance, trust, and respect are also consistent with Hartup and Stevens (1997), who observed that supportive friendships facilitate emotional regulation and psychosocial competence.

The lower friendship scores and higher loneliness among hostellers may be associated with homesickness, adjustment difficulties, emotional insecurity, and separation from family systems. Weiss (1973) conceptualized loneliness as resulting from deficiencies in emotional and social relationships, while Perlman and Peplau (1981) explained loneliness as arising from discrepancies between desired and actual interpersonal relationships. Although hostellers reside in peer-oriented environments, they may continue to experience emotional loneliness due to reduced intimacy and lack of familiar support systems.

The findings are consistent with Siyana and Zinna (2018) and Abbas, Yasin, and Akhtar (2023), who reported significantly higher loneliness and lower social support among hostel students. Cacioppo and Hawkley (2009) also identified loneliness as an important predictor of emotional distress and poor psychological well-being. However, contradictory findings were reported by Kaur and Kaur (2015) and Bawa and Kaur (2018), who observed better social adaptability and interpersonal communication among hostellers. Overall, the findings suggest that residential status significantly influences friendship quality, emotional adjustment, and loneliness among degree college students within the Indian sociocultural context.

## Conclusions

- The study revealed significant differences between day scholars and hostellers on all dimensions of friendship and loneliness.
- Day scholars demonstrated significantly higher friendship status on all dimensions of the Dimensions of Friendship Scale, namely enjoyment, acceptance, trust, respect, mutual assistance, confiding, understanding, and spontaneity.
- The overall friendship status of day scholars fell within the “Extremely Desirable Friendship Status” category, indicating emotionally satisfying, supportive, and healthy interpersonal relationships.
- Hostellers demonstrated comparatively neutral friendship status across all friendship dimensions, suggesting moderate interpersonal connectedness and comparatively lower emotional satisfaction in friendships.

- Hostellers obtained significantly higher loneliness scores than day scholars, indicating greater emotional isolation, homesickness, and poor emotional adjustment.
- Day scholars demonstrated low loneliness levels, suggesting better emotional adjustment, stronger social connectedness, and healthier support systems.
- The findings indicate that residential status significantly influences friendship quality and loneliness among degree college students.
- The study supports previous findings by Siyana and Zinna (2018) and Abbas et al. (2023), which reported greater loneliness and reduced social support among hostel students.

### Implications

- Colleges may develop student support programmes, peer mentoring systems, orientation programmes, and social integration activities to improve friendship quality and emotional adjustment among hostellers.
- Counsellors and mental health professionals may provide emotional support, coping interventions, and social skills training to reduce loneliness and homesickness among hostel students.
- The study emphasizes the importance of family support, emotional connectedness, and healthy peer relationships in promoting psychological well-being among college students.

### References

- Abbas, S., Yasin, K., & Akhtar, S. (2023). *Perceived stress and social and emotional loneliness among day scholars and hostelized students*. *Khaldunia Journal of Social Sciences*, 3(1), 12–22. <https://doi.org/10.36755/khaldunia.v3i1.72>
- Bawa, G., & Kaur, S. (2018). Social adjustment among hostellers and day scholars in relation to gender. *Indian Journal of Health and Wellbeing*, 9(3), 457–460.
- Bukowski, W. M., Newcomb, A. F., & Hartup, W. W. (1996). *The company they keep: Friendship in childhood and adolescence*. Cambridge University Press.
- Cacioppo, J. T., & Hawkley, L. C. (2009). Perceived social isolation and cognition. *Trends in Cognitive Sciences*, 13(10), 447–454. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tics.2009.06.005>
- Chandna, S., & Chadha, N. K. (1986). *Manual for Dimensions of Friendship Scale (DFS)*. Agra: National Psychological Corporation.
- Diehl, K., Jansen, C., Ishchanova, K., & Hilger-Kolb, J. (2018). Loneliness at universities: Determinants of emotional and social loneliness among students. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health*, 15(9), 1865. <https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph15091865>
- Hartup, W. W., & Stevens, N. (1997). Friendships and adaptation in the life course. *Psychological Bulletin*, 121(3), 355–370. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0033-2909.121.3.355>
- Heinrich, L. M., & Gullone, E. (2006). The clinical significance of loneliness: A literature review. *Clinical Psychology Review*, 26(6), 695–718. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cpr.2006.04.002>
- Kaur, R., & Kaur, G. (2015). Comparative study of social adjustment among hostellers and day scholars. *International Journal of Multidisciplinary Research and Development*, 2(8), 234–236.

- Perlman, D., & Peplau, L. A. (1981). Toward a social psychology of loneliness. In S. Duck & R. Gilmour (Eds.), *Personal relationships in disorder* (pp. 31–56). Academic Press.
- Siyana, S., & Zinna, A. A. (2018). Loneliness, social support, life satisfaction, and internet addiction among day scholars and hostel students. *International Journal of Indian Psychology*, 6(3), 137–148. <https://doi.org/10.25215/0603.035>
- Siyana, S., & Zinna, A. A. (2018). Loneliness, social support, life satisfaction, and internet addiction among day scholars and hostel students. *International Journal of Indian Psychology*, 6(3), 137–148. <https://doi.org/10.25215/0603.035>
- Sullivan, H. S. (1953). *The interpersonal theory of psychiatry*. Norton.
- Uma, M., & Meenakshi, R. *Loneliness Inventory*. Unpublished psychological inventory.
- Verma, P., & Sharma, M. (2019). Psychological well-being among hostellers and day scholars: A comparative study. *International Journal of Indian Psychology*, 7(2), 112–118.
- Weiss, R. S. (1973). *Loneliness: The experience of emotional and social isolation*. MIT Press.

**Copyright & License:**

© Authors retain the copyright of this article. This work is published under the Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License (CC BY 4.0), permitting unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited.