

**Health Domain Determining Quality of Life of Elderly People in Baglung**Indeera Shrees Rana,<sup>1</sup> Rita Adhikari<sup>2</sup><sup>1</sup>Novel Academy, Pokhara, <sup>2</sup>Pokhara Academy of Health Sciences, Pokhara.**ABSTRACT**

**Introduction:** Quality of life reflects physical and mental health, emotional well being and social functioning of an individual's life. Elderly is the period accompanied by decline in person's physical and cognitive domain that is associated with decreased quality of life. The purpose of this study is to assess the health domains determining quality of life among elderly people in Baglung.

**Methods:** A cross-sectional descriptive study was conducted among conveniently selected 130 elderly people in Jaimini-10, Baglung and interviewed using the WHO QOL-BREF structured interview schedule. The data were analyzed by using Statistical Package for Social Science (SPSS) Version 20.

**Results:** The finding revealed that nearly elderly people enjoyed the quality of life as excellent (60.8%) and good (39.2%). Regarding the domains of QOL in the WHOQOL-BREF, the highest mean score was for the environmental domain (Mean 30.04±2.04) and lowest for the social relation domain (Mean 7.42±0.75). The quality of life was more excellent among females (50.63%), currently married (79.74%) than in widowed (20.25%), living in nuclear family (56.96%) than in joint family (43.03%) and independent elderly (88.61%) than dependent elderly people (11.39%). There was significant association of quality of life to age ( $p = 0.004$ ), marital status ( $p = 0.000$ ), educational status ( $p = 0.000$ ), occupation ( $p = 0.004$ ), financial status ( $p = 0.002$ ) and social status ( $p = 0.023$ ).

**Conclusions:** This study concluded that three-fifths of respondents had excellent QOL. There was significant association of quality of life to age ( $p = 0.004$ ), marital status ( $p = 0.000$ ), educational status ( $p = 0.000$ ), occupation ( $p = 0.004$ ), financial dependency ( $p = 0.002$ ) and social status ( $p = 0.023$ ).

---

**Keywords:** *Quality of Life, Elderly*

---

**INTRODUCTION**

Quality of life (QOL) is the feeling of healthy, comfortable and able to participate in or enjoy life events. It refers to the individual's experience to his or her own life and to the living conditions in which individuals find themselves.<sup>1</sup> It refers individual's perception of their position in life in the context of the culture and value systems in which they live and in relation to their goals, expectations, standards and concerns. It includes physical, psychological, social and environmental domains, individual belief and level of autonomy.<sup>2</sup> Elderly refers to people aged 60 years and above.<sup>3,4</sup> There were 378 million elder people in the world in 1980.<sup>5</sup> It will reach 1.2 billion and 2 billion by 2025 and 2050.<sup>6</sup> Elderly population in Nepal is growing at the rate of four percent (3.39%) per year.<sup>7,8</sup> According to the census of Nepal [2011], the elderly population was as male (6.8%) and female (7.1%).<sup>9</sup> Quality of life of elderly people is becoming even more relevant towards an aging society like Nepal.<sup>10</sup> Studies showed different results about the quality of life of elderly people. The mean scores for males were as the physical domain (46.8), psychological domain (54.8), social domain (37.9) and environmental domain (61.2) as revealed by Soundarajan in Tamilnadu.<sup>11</sup> Only 13.8% elderly population had a good quality

of life as stated by Raj & et.al.<sup>12</sup> Study in East Sikkim showed the overall mean (SD) score of QOL was found poor (Mean 39.35 ± 11.26 SD) and mean score for environmental domains (Mean 29.46) was the lowest followed by social relationship (Mean 31.52), psychological (Mean 46.55) and physical domains (Mean 49.85).<sup>13</sup>

A study among 547 elderly people in Kailali district found the elderly reported their QOL as neutral (45.9%), good (35.1%) and poor (19%). Educational status was positively correlated ( $p = 0.257$ ) and age ( $p = 0.196$ ), gender ( $p = 0.075$ ), marital status ( $p = 0.141$ ), elderly living arrangements ( $p = 0.206$ ) and physical health status ( $p = 0.246$ ) were negatively correlated with QOL.<sup>14</sup>

**METHODS**

A descriptive cross sectional study design was used to assess the health domain determining quality of life among 130 conveniently selected elderly people aged 60 and above living in Jaimini 10, Rangkhani Baglung. The population of elderly

---

**Correspondence:** Rita Adhikari, Pokhara Academy of Health Sciences, Pokhara, Email: 61ritaadh@gmail.com

people in that area was 375. Sample size was calculated by using Cochran formula<sup>24</sup> and the proportion of QOL was 13.8%.<sup>12</sup> The calculated sample was 123 and by adjusting 5% sampling error, the sample was 130. The elderly people who were available in that area during the study period and gave informed consent voluntarily were interviewed using structured modified WHOQOL- BREF scale<sup>25</sup> from May 15, 2019 to May 22, 2019. The data were analyzed by using Statistical Package for Social Science (SPSS) Version 20. For data analysis, item 3, 4 and 26 were recoded as 1=5, 2=4, 3=3, 4=2 and 5=1 and other items were recoded as 1=1, 2=2, 3=3, 4=4 and 5=5.<sup>25</sup> The total score was categorized into three levels: excellent (89-110), good (67-88), fair (45-66) and poor (22-44).<sup>14</sup>

## RESULTS

### Demographic information

Among 130 respondents, higher was female (51.5%), 60-69 years (52.3%), currently married (67.7%), illiterate (67.7%), living in nuclear family (53.5%), agriculture as occupation (43.8%), economically independent (82.3%) and living with their spouse (53.8%). Similarly, 1/5<sup>th</sup> (20.8%) had illness in the past four weeks and 3/10<sup>th</sup> (29.2%) were without chronic disease, 3/5<sup>th</sup> had a good feeling towards QOL and satisfied on health. (Table 1a & 1b)

### Mean Score of QOL

The environmental domain had the highest score (mean 30.04±2.04) and the lowest was the social domain (mean 7.42±0.75). (Table 2)

### Classification of QOL

This study showed 60.8 % had an excellent quality of life. (Table 3)

### Comparison of QOL among respondents

Study found that the QOL was more excellent among 60-69 years age group (70.87%), females (52.94%), currently married (79.74%), residing in nuclear family (56.96%), illiterate (86.27%), self- independent (88.6%), who had agriculture occupation (54.43%) and living with spouse (60.75%). (Table 4)

### Association of socio-demographic variables and QOL

There was significant association of quality of life to age (p= 0.004), marital status (p= 0.000), educational status (p= 0.000), occupation (p = 0.004), financial dependency (p = 0.002) and social status (p= 0.023). (Table 5)

Table 1a: Demographic information of respondent

Variables	No.	Percent
Age ( in years)		
60-69	68	52.30
70-79	37	28.50
≥80	25	19.20

Gender		
Female	67	51.50
Male	63	48.50
Marital Status		
Currently Married	88	67.70
Widow	42	32.30
Type of Family		
Nuclear	70	53.80
Joint	60	46.20
Religion: Hindu	130	100
Educational Status		
Illiterate	88	67.70
Literate	42	32.30
Occupation		
Agriculture	57	44.60
Retired	48	36.90
Labor	12	9.20
Unemployment	12	9.20
Financial Dependency		
Independent	107	82.30
Dependent	23	17.70

Table 1b: Demographic information

Variables	No	Percent
Living arrangement		
Spouse	70	53.80
Children & relatives	48	36.90
Single	12	9.30
Illness in Past Four Weeks		
Having Chronic Illness	27	20.80
Feeling towards Quality of Life		
Good	78	60.00
Neutral	52	40.00
Satisfaction on Health		
Satisfied	80	61.50
Neutral	32	24.60
Dissatisfied	18	13.80

Table 2: Mean score of QOL

QOL Domains	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	S. D.
Physical Domains	16	29	23.45	3.47
Psychological Domains	16	27	21.65	2.24
Social Relationship	5	8	7.42	0.75
Environmental Domains	26	34	30.04	2.04
Total Mean Score	73	103	89.65	6.02

Table 3: Classification of QOL

Quality of Life	Frequency	Percent
Excellent (89-110)	79	60.80
Good (67-88)	51	39.20
Fair (45-66)	0	0
Poor (22-44)	0	0

Table 4: Comparison of QOL among Respondents.

Socio Demographic Variables	Quality of Life	
	Good (%)	Excellent (%)
Age (in years)		
60-69	12 (23.52)	56 (70.87)
70-79	20 (39.21)	17 (33.33)
≥80	19 (37.25)	6 (7.6)
Gender		
Male	24 (47.06)	39 (49.36)
Female	27 (52.94)	40 (50.63)
Marital Status		
Currently Married	25 (49.01)	63 (79.74)
Widow	26 (50.99)	16 (20.25)
Type of Family		
Nuclear	25 (49.01)	45 (56.96)
Joint	26 (50.98)	34 (43.03)
Educational Status		
Illiterate	44 (86.27)	44 (55.69)
Literate	7 (13.73)	35 (44.31)
Occupation		
Unemployment	10(19.6)	2(2.53)
Agriculture	15(29.41)	43(54.43)
Labor	4(7.84)	8(10.12)
Retired	22(43.13)	26(32.91)
Financial Dependency		
Dependent	14(27.45)	9(11.39)
Independent	37(72.54)	70(88.61)
Living arrangement		
Spouse	22(43.13)	48(60.75)
Relative & Children	25(49.01)	23 (29.11)
Single	4(7.84)	8(10.12)
Illness in Past Four Weeks	13(25.49)	14(17.72)
Having Chronic Disease	18(35.29)	20(25.31)

Table 5: Association between QOL and Socio demographic Variables.

Socio Demographic Variables	Quality of life		$\chi^2$	P Value
	Good (%)	Excellent (%)		
Age (in years)				
60-69	12(23.52)	56(70.87)	30.87	0.004
70-79	20(39.21)	17(33.33)		
≥80	19(37.25)	6(7.6)		
Marital Status				
Currently Married	25(49.01)	63(79.74)	13.38	0.000
Widow	26(50.98)	16(20.25)		
Educational Status				
Illiterate	44(86.27)	44(55.69)	13.25	0.000
Literate	7(13.72)	35(44.3)		
Occupation				
Unemployment	10(19.6)	2 (2.53)	30.87	0.004
Agriculture	15 (29.41)	43 (54.43)		
Labor	4 (7.84)	8 (10.12)		

Retired	22 (43.13)	26 (32.91)		
Financial Dependency				
Dependent	14 (27.45)	9 (11.39)	0.06	0.002
Independent	37 (72.54)	70 (88.61)		
Living arrangement				
Spouse	22 (43.13)	48 (60.75)	13.38	0.023
Relative & Children	25 (49.01)	23 (29.11)		
Single	4(7.84)	8.(10.12)		

p<0.05 indicates a significant association

## DISCUSSION

This study revealed 39.2% elderly had good QOL which was consistent with the finding of Joshi & et al. that 31%.<sup>14</sup> The findings of excellent QOL (60.8%) were contradictory with the findings of Qadri S & et al. that showed 85%.<sup>23</sup> Regarding general perception about satisfaction on their health, the present study finding showed 61.5% elderly people were satisfied which was contradictory with the finding as revealed by Rodrigues & et al. that was 47%.<sup>19</sup>

The mean score of domain wise QOL was highest for the environmental domain (mean 30.04±2.04) and lowest was for social relationship domain i.e. (mean 7.42±0.75). The domain wise mean score was contradictory with the findings of Rodrigues & et al. who found highest for social relations (mean 71.20±9.07) and lowest on environment (mean 60.40±7.05)<sup>19</sup> but consistent with finding revealed by Datta & et al. that was maximum in the environmental health domain (mean = 48.36) and minimum in the social relationship domain but mean score of the social domain was different with present study (mean 39.62±8.03).<sup>20</sup>

In the present study, QOL was better among 60-69 years age group (70.87%) and currently married elderly people (79.74%). These findings were similar to the findings of Shrestha & et al which showed better among 60-70 years age group (58%) and married (72%).<sup>15</sup> Similarly, the findings of better QOL among financially independent (88.61%) were similar to the findings of Kaur & et al. that 79.04 %.<sup>21</sup> The QOL was higher among those with illiterate (55.69%) and living in a nuclear family (56.96%). These findings were contradictory with the findings of Kumar & et al. that revealed lower among those with no schooling (33.43%) and living in a nuclear family (40.6%).<sup>22</sup>

The present study revealed that age (p = 0.004), educational status (p = 0.000) and living arrangement (p = 0.023) were significantly associated with QOL which was similar to the study conducted in rural Vietnam i.e. gender (p=0.002), age group (p=0.001), education (p =0.014), social status (p=0.012).<sup>17</sup> The significant association of marital status (p=0.000) with QOL

of this study was consistent the study conducted in Tehran which revealed marital status ( $p = 0.050$ ).<sup>18</sup>

## CONCLUSION

This study concluded that 60.8% of respondents expressed excellent QOL. Regarding the domain wise QOL, the highest was for the environmental domain (mean  $30.04 \pm 2.04$ ) and lowest for the social relation domain (mean  $7.42 \pm 0.75$ ). The quality of life was better among females (50.63%), financial independent (88.61%) and living with a spouse (60.75%). There was a significant association of quality of life with age ( $p=0.004$ ), education status ( $p=0.000$ ), social status ( $p=0.023$ ) and marital status ( $p=0.000$ ).

## ACKNOWLEDGMENT

The researcher's sincere thanks go to the administration of Jaimini Municipality, Baglung, and participant elderly people without whom the study would not have been possible.

## REFERENCES

- Jenkinson C. Quality of life. Encyclopaedia Britannica. Available on <https://www.britannica.com/topic/quality-of-life>.
- Billington D R, Landon J, Kragleloh C, Shepherd D. The New Zealand World Health Organization Quality of Life (WHOQOL) Group. Journal of the New Zealand Medical Association 2010;123:1-6. Available from: <https://www.nzma.org.nz/journal/read-the-journal/all-issues/2010-2019/2010/vol-123-no-1315/view-billington>
- Shrestha H, Paudyal P, Giri S. A textbook of medical surgical nursing I and II. Heritage Publishers and Distributors pvt.ltd; 2072.
- NewYork. Population Division. World population ageing prospects: UNFPA; 2011 Available from: [www.unpopulation.org.com](http://www.unpopulation.org.com)
- World Health Organization. Active ageing: a policy framework. Geneva: WHO; 2002. [https://apps.who.int/iris/bitstream/handle/10665/67215/WHO\\_NMH\\_NPH\\_02.8.pdf;jsessionid=0248498F9BD3B162601843E11EC30AC8?sequence=1](https://apps.who.int/iris/bitstream/handle/10665/67215/WHO_NMH_NPH_02.8.pdf;jsessionid=0248498F9BD3B162601843E11EC30AC8?sequence=1)
- World Health Organization. World report on ageing and health. Luxembourg: WHO, 2015. <https://www.who.int/ageing/events/world-report-2015-launch/en/>
- Central Bureau of Statistics. National Population and Housing Census 2011: National Report. Government of Nepal: National Planning Commission Secretariat; 2012.
- Subedi L, Sah R B. Study of the health status of geriatric age group in Chitwan district of Nepal. Journal of Chitwan Medical College 2015;5(11):11-17
- KC S. Policy related to senior citizen in Nepal: A critical analysis. 2011. Available from: [www.academia.edu/109553373/Policy\\_Related\\_to\\_Senior\\_Citizen\\_in\\_Nepal\\_A\\_Critical\\_Analysis](http://www.academia.edu/109553373/Policy_Related_to_Senior_Citizen_in_Nepal_A_Critical_Analysis)
- Chalise HN, Risal PK. Does population ageing affect the least developed country like Nepal? Open Access Journal of Gerontology and Geriatric Medicine. 2018;3(4):1-3
- Suganathan SS. Cross-sectional study on quality of life among elderly in Poonamallee Block Thiruvallur District Tamilnadu. National Journal of Research in Community Medicine. 2018;7(1):1-4.
- Raj D, Swain P K, Pedgaonkar SP. A study on quality of life satisfaction and physical health of elderly people in varanasi: an urban area of Uttarpradesh, India. International Journal of Medical Science and Public Health. 2014;3(5):1-5
- Engheepi F, Rai A D, Sonowal N J, Menta V K. Quality of life of elderly in rural areas of east Sikkim, India: A cross-sectional study. International Conference on Public Health 2017;3:65-70.
- Joshi MR, Chalise HN, Khatriwada PP. Quality of life of Nepalese elderly living in rural Nepal. J Gerontology and Geriatric Research. 2018;7:484.
- Shrestha M, KC H, Bhattarai P, Mishra A, Parajuli S B. Quality of life of elderly people living with family and in old age home in Morang District, Nepal. A Multidisciplinary Journal of Science, Technology and Mathematics. 2018;16:221-227.
- Shah VR, Donald S, Christian AC, Mansi MP, Sonaliya KN. Quality of life among elderly population residing in urban practice area of a tertiary care institute of Ahmedabad city, Gujarat. Journal of Family Medicine and Primary Care. 2017; 6(1):101-105.
- Nguyen T, Le NB, Vu LH, Le AV. Quality of life and its association among older people in rural Vietnam. Springer Science + Business Media. 2018.
- Eliasi LG, Rasi HA, Tavakoli A. Factors affecting quality of life among elderly population in Iran. Humanities and Social Sciences. 2017;5(1):26-30.
- Rodrigues LR, Tavares DS, Dias FA, Pegorari MS, Marchiori GF, Santos TDM. Quality of life of elderly people of the community and associated factors. Journal of Nursing. 2017;11(3):1-10
- Datta D, Datta PP, Majumdar KK. Association of quality of life of urban elderly with socio-demographic factors. Int J Med Public Health 2015;5:274-8.
- Kaur H, Kaur H, Venkatenashan M. Factors determining family support and quality of life of elderly population. International Journal of Medical Science and Public

- Health. 2015;4(8):1049-1053.
22. Kumar G, Majumdar A, Pavitra G. Quality of life and it's associated factors using WHOQOL-BREF among elderly in Urban Puducherry, India. Journal of Clinical and Diagnostic Research. 2014;8(1):54-57.
23. Qadri S, Ahluwalia SK, Ganai A, Bali S, Wani F, Bashir HA. A stud on quality of life among rural elderly population of Northen India. International Journal of Medical Science and Public Health. 2013;2(3):1-9.
24. Sample size in statistics, Excel, Cochran's Formula <https://www.statisticshowto.com/probability-and-statistics/find-sample-size>
25. World Health Organization. WHOQOL- BREF: introduction, administration, scoring and generic version of the assessment. programme on mental health. Geneva,WHO. 1996. [http://www.who.int/mental\\_health/media/en/76.pdf](http://www.who.int/mental_health/media/en/76.pdf)