Chapter-V
The Aged-Assessment of Life - Satisfaction

*Life-Satisfaction as 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 expectations and standards. Life-Satisfaction can be affected by the person’s physical health, level of independence, social relationships and relationships to salient features of his environment.*

*World Health Organization, 1997*
CHAPTER-V
THE AGED-ASSESSMENT OF LIFE-SATISFACTION

INTRODUCTION

In a traditional Indian society, older people had a sense of honour and authority. The decision making in the family and the community was mostly assigned to them. They were revered for their experience and wisdom. The transition to a modern society and the disintegration of the joint family system led to the loss of the traditional authority of older people.

Life-Satisfaction continues to be an important construct in the psycho-social study of aging. It is one of the commonly accepted subjective conditions of Quality of Life and seems to be one of the facets of successful aging, both of which are key concepts in aging. Research reports that Life-Satisfaction is strongly related to socio-demographic and psycho-social variables (Iyer, 2003).

The elderly, especially those who are weak and dependent, require physical, mental and emotional care and support. When this is not provided, they suffer from neglect, a problem that occurs when a person is left uncared for and that is often linked with isolation. Changing life styles and values, demanding jobs, a shift to nuclear family structures and redefined priorities have led to increased neglect of the elderly by families and communities.

They have a mutual withdrawal from society and their world gets smaller and smaller. They do not tend to venture out in the neighborhoods, they stay homebound. They are alone a lot more, families are too busy to visit them, and they have less motivation for self-care and end up losing weight, dehydrated, feeling like burden to their loved ones.
These problems influence the level of satisfaction towards their life. Life-Satisfaction is the way a person perceives how his or her life has been and how they feel about where it is going in the future. It is a measure of well-being and may be assessed in terms of mood, satisfaction with relations with others and with achieved goals, self-concepts, and self-perceived ability to cope with daily life. It is having a favorable attitude of one’s life as a whole rather than their present feelings.

Life-Satisfaction has been measured in relation to economic standing, amount of education, experiences and the people’s residence as well as many other factors.

World Health Organization (1997), defines Life-Satisfaction as 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 expectations and standards. Life-Satisfaction can be affected by the person’s physical health, level of independence, social relationships and relationships to salient features of his environment.

According to Xavier et.al (2003), satisfaction among the elderly group is closely associated with active social life and good interpersonal relationships, while negative Quality of Life is equivalent to loss of health.

Researchers at North Carolina University found that those who played video games occasionally reported higher levels of well-being, where as those that did not play reported “negative emotions and a tendency toward higher levels of depression”.

Baltes and Smith (2003) put it, “healthy and successful aging has its age limits”; Life-Satisfaction in old age is assumed to be inevitably affected by health. Another point to take into account therefore is that any analysis of Life-Satisfaction among the oldest old must recognize the important role of health status.

The study by Bhardwaj, Sen and Mathura (1991) indicated that positive thinking and higher level of activities leads to positive mental health. Bhatia (1983),
revealed the adverse effect of reduced income, and pointed out that lower income was associated with other personal problems like loss of status and meaningful social relationship.

*Chadha* (1991) emphasizes on gender differences and reports that elderly females are less satisfied from life than their male counterparts. There are several predictors of Life-Satisfaction: self-acceptance of aging changes, self-perception of health, self-rating of ability in activities of daily-living, belief in life after death and Karma philosophy, satisfaction with familial and social interaction and self-rated behavioural flexibility (*Ramamurti, 1970*).

*Kancharla RaviKumar and R.Vijaya Krishna Naidu* (2014) found that, Life-Satisfaction is an attitude based on the individual perception and on their living conditions. So there is a significant impact of present place of living and other socio-economic conditions on their perception regarding to the Life-Satisfaction.

All these experiments talk about how Life-Satisfaction grows as people become older because they become wiser and more knowledgeable, so they begin to see that life will be better as they grow older and understand the important things in life more. This gives rise to several questions like, is Life-Satisfaction is associated with the factors like age, gender, level of education, place of living, economic status etc., of the elderly male and female.

To assess the levels of Life-Satisfaction among the respondents we adopted a five-point scale formulated by Ed. Diener (2006). The Ed. Diener Scale comprises *five levels of Life-Satisfaction and six scores*, which is as follows:

1. In most ways my life is close to my expectations.
2. The conditions of my life are excellent.
3. I am satisfied with life.
4. So far I have gotten the important things I wanted in life.

5. If I could live my life over again I would seek nothing more.

The scores are for the above

1 = Strongly Disagree
2 = Disagree
3 = Slightly Disagree
4 = Neither Agree or Disagree
5 = Slightly Agree
6 = Agree
7 = Strongly Agree

However, for the purpose of analysis in the research study we made it as three levels; highly satisfied (25-35 points), satisfied (15-24 points), and dissatisfied (5-14 points). Highly satisfied means most of the people in this range are enjoying their life and the major domains of life are going well; Satisfied means the people are generally satisfied, but have some domains where they would like some improvement; and Dissatisfied means people in this range are substantially dissatisfied with their lives. They may have a number of domains that are not going well; usually in this range people are extremely unhappy with their current life.

In the present Chapter effort was made to assess the levels of Life-Satisfaction and its association with various socio-economic factors among the institutionalized and non-institutionalized males and females.
Our analysis related to the various levels of Life-Satisfaction among the study sample was depicted in Figure-5.1. Out of the total 300 respondents both institutionalized and non-institutionalized, majority (67%) were satisfied with their course of life, a considerable percentage (21%) were totally dissatisfied and only 12 per cent were highly satisfied with their course of life.

Figure-5.2
Distribution of Respondents by age and levels of Life-Satisfaction
When we observe the age wise distribution of respondents and their levels of Life-Satisfaction, our analysis reveals that out of the total 300 respondents, the respondents who were young-old (60-69 years) were 113 in number, among them majority (69.02%) were satisfied with their course of life, in the same way, the old-old (70-79 years) and oldest-old (80 years &>) categories also we found majority (63.86% & 67.65%) of the respondents were satisfied with their course of life (Figure-5.2).

Further, our analysis related to the age distribution and levels of Life-Satisfaction in institutional and non-institutional settings reveals that, out of the 150 respondents who were institutionalized, majority (66.67%) were satisfied with their life course; another 32 per cent were dissatisfied and a least percentage (1.33%) were highly satisfied with their course of life.

Null hypothesis

There is no significant association between age differentials and the levels of Life-Satisfaction.

Statistical analysis: Institutional: \( \chi^2 \text{ Cal} =0.14 > \chi^2 \text{ Tab}= 0.05 \) (P-values)

Non-institutional: \( \chi^2 \text{ Cal}=0.31 > \chi^2 \text{ Tab}=0.05 \) (P-values)

Both in institutional and non-institutional settings the calculated value is greater than table value, so the null hypothesis (\( H_0 \)) is accepted, hence there is no significant association between age differentials and the levels of Life-Satisfaction.

Table-5.1 gives the analysis related to the age distribution and levels of Life-Satisfaction among the institutionalized elderly people, out of the 50 respondents in the age group of 60-69 years, majority (70%) were satisfied and another 30 per cent were dissatisfied and no one is highly satisfied in their course of life. In the age group
of 70-79 years, we found 56.36 per cent satisfied and 40 per cent dissatisfied with their course of life. At the same time surprisingly we found a majority (75.56%) of the respondents were satisfied with their course of life in the age category of 80 years and above.

Table-5.1
Distribution of Respondents by age and Levels of Life-Satisfaction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age groups</th>
<th>Life satisfaction in institutional setting</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Chi² value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Highly satisfied</td>
<td>Satisfied</td>
<td>Dissatisfied</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Young-old (60-69yrs)</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>35 (70%)</td>
<td>15 (30%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Old-old (70-79yrs)</td>
<td>2 (3.64%)</td>
<td>31 (56.36%)</td>
<td>22 (40%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oldest-old (80yrs&amp;)</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>34 (75.56%)</td>
<td>11 (24.44%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2 (1.33%)</td>
<td>100 (66.67%)</td>
<td>48 (32%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age groups</th>
<th>Life satisfaction in Non-institutional setting</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Chi² value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Young-old (60-69yrs)</td>
<td>12 (19.05%)</td>
<td>43 (68.25%)</td>
<td>8 (12.7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Old-old (70-79yrs)</td>
<td>12 (18.75%)</td>
<td>45 (70.31%)</td>
<td>7 (10.94%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oldest-old (80yrs&amp;)</td>
<td>9 (39.13%)</td>
<td>12 (52.17%)</td>
<td>2 (8.7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>33 (22%)</td>
<td>100 (66.67%)</td>
<td>17 (11.33%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Percentages are calculated to row totals)
(Percentages of the totals are calculated to column totals)

The analysis related to age wise distribution and the levels of Life-Satisfaction in non-institutional setting reveals that, out of the total 150 respondents, majority (66.67%) were satisfied with their life course. The age wise distribution gives a detailed description of facts that, out of the total 63 respondents who were in the age group of 60-69 years, 68.25 per cent were satisfied; 19.05 per cent were highly satisfied and 12.7 per cent were dissatisfied in their course of life. In the same way we found a majority (70.31% and 52.17%) of the respondents in the age groups of 70-79 years and 80 years and above were satisfied in their life course. A considerable
percentage (39.13%) of respondents was highly satisfied in their course of life in the age group of 80 years and above (Table-5.1).

The analysis related to the gender wise distribution of the respondents and their levels of Life-Satisfaction reveals that, out of the 135 male respondents’ majority (77.04%) were satisfied in their course of life. On the contrary to this, 58.9 per cent of the female respondents were satisfied in their life course and another 33.33 per cent of female respondents were dissatisfied with their course of life. When compared with their female counter parts, a considerable percentage (15.55%) of the male respondents was highly satisfied with their course of life (Figure-5.3).

Figure-5.3
Distribution of Respondents by Gender and Life-Satisfaction levels

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Highly satisfied</td>
<td>77.04%</td>
<td>58.90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfied</td>
<td>15.55%</td>
<td>33.33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dissatisfied</td>
<td>7.41%</td>
<td>8.48%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Field Data

Null hypothesis

There is no significant association between gender and the levels of Life-Satisfaction.

Statistical analysis: Institutional: $\chi^2$ Cal =0.01 $\chi^2$ Tab = 0.05 (P-values)

Non-institutional: $\chi^2$ Cal=0.03 $\chi^2$ Tab=0.05(P-values)
Both in institutional and non-institutional settings the $\chi^2$ calculated value is less than table value, so the null hypothesis was rejected. Hence we found a significant association between gender differentials and the levels of Life-Satisfaction.

**Table-5.2**

**Distribution of Respondents by Gender and Levels of Life-Satisfaction**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Life satisfaction in institutional setting</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Chi$^2$ value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Highly satisfied</td>
<td>Satisfied</td>
<td>Dissatisfied</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>2 (4.17%)</td>
<td>41 (85.42%)</td>
<td>5 (10.41%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>59 (57.84%)</td>
<td>43 (42.16%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2 (1.33%)</td>
<td>100 (66.67%)</td>
<td>48 (32%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Life satisfaction in Non-institutional setting</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Chi$^2$ value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Highly satisfied</td>
<td>Satisfied</td>
<td>Dissatisfied</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>19 (21.84%)</td>
<td>63 (72.41%)</td>
<td>5 (5.75%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>14 (22.22%)</td>
<td>37 (58.73%)</td>
<td>12 (19.05%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>33 (22%)</td>
<td>100 (66.67%)</td>
<td>17 (11.33%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Percentages are calculated to row totals)

(Percentages of the totals are calculated to column totals)

In table-5.2 the findings related to the gender wise distribution of the respondents and their levels of Life-Satisfaction in institutional and non-institutional settings were discussed. Out of the total 48 males who were institutionalized majority (85.42%) were satisfied with their life course. In case of females, out of the total 102 respondents residing at old age homes, 57.84 per cent were satisfied and another 42.16 per cent were dissatisfied with their course of life. Only 2 (4.17%) males were highly satisfied with their life course.
In case of non-institutional setting we found majority (72.41%) of males and females (58.73%) were satisfied, another 21.84 per cent and 22.22 per cent of male and female were highly satisfied in their course of life. When we observe the gender differentials in the levels of life-satisfaction more percentage (19.05%) of female were dissatisfied than compared with their male counterparts (5.75%) (Table-5.2).

Figure 5.4 shows the analysis related to the distribution of the respondents based on their educational levels and the levels of their Life-Satisfaction.

In each category of educational levels and among illiterates also we found majority of respondents were satisfied with their life course (Figure-5.4).

**Null hypothesis**

There is no significant association between educational levels and the levels of Life-Satisfaction in institutional and non-institutional settings.
Table-5.3  
Distribution of Respondents by Education and Levels of Life-Satisfaction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Education</th>
<th>Life satisfaction in institutional setting</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Chi^2 value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Highly satisfied</td>
<td>Satisfied</td>
<td>Dissatisfied</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illiterate</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>43 (63.24%)</td>
<td>25 (36.76%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>27 (67.5%)</td>
<td>13 (32.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High school</td>
<td>2 (6.45%)</td>
<td>21 (67.74%)</td>
<td>8 (25.81%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intermediate</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>3 (75%)</td>
<td>1 (25%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>5 (83.33%)</td>
<td>1 (16.67%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post-graduate</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>1 (100%)</td>
<td>Nil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>2 (1.33%)</td>
<td>100 (66.67%)</td>
<td>48 (32%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Education</th>
<th>Life satisfaction in Non-institutional setting</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Chi^2 value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Highly satisfied</td>
<td>Satisfied</td>
<td>Dissatisfied</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illiterate</td>
<td>3 (15%)</td>
<td>11 (55%)</td>
<td>6 (30%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary</td>
<td>7 (23.33%)</td>
<td>17 (56.67%)</td>
<td>6 (20%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High school</td>
<td>10 (20.41%)</td>
<td>36 (73.47%)</td>
<td>3 (6.12%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intermediate</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>11 (100%)</td>
<td>Nil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate</td>
<td>11 (32.35%)</td>
<td>21 (61.76%)</td>
<td>2 (5.9%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post-graduate</td>
<td>2 (33.33%)</td>
<td>4 (66.67%)</td>
<td>Nil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>33 (22%)</td>
<td>100 (66.67%)</td>
<td>17 (11.33%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Percentages are calculated to row totals)  
(Percentages of the totals are calculated to column totals)  

Statistical analysis:  
**Institutional:** $\chi^2_{Cal} = 0.44 > \chi^2_{Tab} = 0.05$ (P-values)  
Null hypothesis ($H_0$) was accepted, hence in institutional set up we do not found a significant association between educational levels and the levels of Life-Satisfaction.  
**Non-institutional:** $\chi^2_{Cal} = 0.02 < \chi^2_{Tab} = 0.05$ (P-values)  
Null hypothesis was rejected; hence in non-institutional setting we found a significant association between educational levels and the levels of Life-Satisfaction.  
Table-5.3 examines the distribution of respondents by their educational levels and the levels of Life-Satisfaction. The analysis revealed that in the institutional...
setting among all the categories of educational levels, including illiterates the majority (Illiterates: 63.24%; Primary: 67.5%; High school: 67.74%; Intermediate: 75%; Graduation: 83.33%; and in Post-graduation: 100%) of the respondents were satisfied with their course of life.

In non-institutional setting, among illiterates 55 per cent were satisfied, 30 per cent were dissatisfied and 15 per cent were highly satisfied with their course of life. Among the graduates and post-graduates we found considerable percentages (32.35% & 33.33%) of respondents were highly satisfied with their course of life (Table-4.3).

Figure 5.5 illustrates the respondent’s income levels and the levels of Life-Satisfaction. Income was closely associated with satisfaction levels. Higher the income the number of respondents who were satisfied with their course of life was more.

**Figure-5.5**

**Distribution of Respondents by Income Levels and Life-Satisfaction levels**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Income Level</th>
<th>Satisfied</th>
<th>Highly Satisfied</th>
<th>Dissatisfied</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>4.40%</td>
<td>2.53%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rs. 5001-15000</td>
<td>17.54%</td>
<td>70.33%</td>
<td>25.27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rs. 15001-25000</td>
<td>14.04%</td>
<td>68.42%</td>
<td>17.54%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rs. 25001-35000</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>72.73%</td>
<td>2.27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rs. 35000 &amp;&gt;</td>
<td>27.59%</td>
<td>72.41%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Source:** Field Data

The respondents who had Rs 5001-15000 (17.54%); Rs. 15001-25000 (25%); and 25001-35000&> (27.59%) were highly satisfied in their course of life, comparing
with the respondents who does not have any income (2.53%) and who had Rs. <5000 (4.4%) income levels. Out of the total 300 respondents, 200 were satisfied with their course of life. These 200 respondents were distributed on the basis of their income levels as—NIL (55.7%); Rs. <5000 (70.33%); Rs. 5001-15000 (68.42%); Rs. 15001-25000 (72.73%) and Rs. 25001-35000&> (72.41%). Among the dissatisfied majority (41.77%) does not have any income (Figure-5.5).

Null hypothesis

There is no significant association between income levels and the levels of Life-Satisfaction among the institutionalized and non-institutionalized elderly people.

Table-5.4
Distribution of Respondents by income and Levels of Life-Satisfaction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Income in Rupees</th>
<th>Life satisfaction in institutional setting</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Chi² value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Highly satisfied</td>
<td>Satisfied</td>
<td>Dissatisfied</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>41 (61.19%)</td>
<td>26 (38.81%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt;5000</td>
<td>1 (1.54%)</td>
<td>45 (69.23%)</td>
<td>19 (29.23%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5001-15000</td>
<td>1 (8.33%)</td>
<td>8 (66.67%)</td>
<td>3 (25%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15001-25000</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>2 (100%)</td>
<td>Nil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25001-35000&amp;&gt;</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>4 (100%)</td>
<td>Nil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2 (1.33%)</td>
<td>100 (66.67%)</td>
<td>48 (32%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Income in Rupees</th>
<th>Life satisfaction in Non-institutional setting</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Chi² value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Highly satisfied</td>
<td>Satisfied</td>
<td>Dissatisfied</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>2 (16.67%)</td>
<td>3 (25%)</td>
<td>7 (58.33%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt;5000</td>
<td>3 (11.5%)</td>
<td>19 (73.1%)</td>
<td>4 (15.4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5001-15000</td>
<td>9 (20%)</td>
<td>31 (68.89%)</td>
<td>5 (11.11%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15001-25000</td>
<td>11 (26.19%)</td>
<td>30 (71.43%)</td>
<td>1 (2.38%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25001-35000&amp;&gt;</td>
<td>8 (32%)</td>
<td>17 (68%)</td>
<td>Nil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>33 (22%)</td>
<td>100 (66.67%)</td>
<td>17 (11.33%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Percentages are calculated to row totals)
(Percentages of the totals are calculated to column totals)
Statistical analysis:

**Institutional**: $\chi^2$ Cal = 0.26 > $\chi^2$ Tab = 0.05 (P-values)

Null hypothesis ($H_0$) was accepted, hence in institutional set up we does not found a significant association between income levels and the levels of Life-Satisfaction.

**Non-institutional**: $\chi^2$ Cal = 0.01 < $\chi^2$ Tab = 0.05 (P-values)

Null hypothesis was rejected; hence in non-institutional setting we found a significant association between income levels and the levels of Life-Satisfaction.

Table 5.4 gives a detailed description of the distribution of respondents on the basis of their income levels and their levels of Life-Satisfaction. Out of the 150 respondents who were institutionalized majority of the respondents in all income levels were satisfied with their life course. In case of non-institutionalized elderly we found 73.1 per cent of respondents who had Rs. <5000; 68.89 per cent whose income was Rs.5001-15000; 71.43 per cent of the others who had income of Rs. 15001-25000; and finally 68 per cent of the respondents whose income was Rs.25001-35000&> were satisfied with their course of life. The respondents who do not have any income, majority (58.33%) were dissatisfied with their life course (Table 5.4).

Figure 5.6 gives an idea about the respondent’s economic status and their levels of Life-Satisfaction. Our analysis reveals that among the respondents who were economically independent, majority (68.75%) were satisfied, another 22.32 per cent were highly satisfied with their course of life. In case of respondents who were fully dependent on their kith and kin, 63.91 per cent were satisfied and 30.83 per cent were dissatisfied and a least percentage (5.26%) were highly satisfied with their course of life. It means economic dependency does not affect a person’s levels of Life-Satisfaction (Figure 5.6).
Table 5.5 explains the economic status and the levels of Life-Satisfaction among the institutionalized and non-institutionalized elderly people. Out of the 150 institutionalized respondents, majority (60%) were economically fully dependent on their kith and kin. Among them 61.11 per cent were satisfied and another 38.89 per cent were dissatisfied with their course of life. In case of those respondents who were economically independent, majority (72.73%) were satisfied and a least percentage (4.55%) were highly satisfied with their life course. In non-institutional setting, out of the 90 respondents who were economically independent, a majority (67.78%) was satisfied and another 26.67 per cent were highly satisfied with their course of life.

**Null hypothesis**

There is no significant association between economic status and the levels of Life-Satisfaction among the institutionalized and non-institutionalized elderly people.
### Table- 5.5

**Distribution of Respondents by Economic Status and Levels of Life-Satisfaction**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Economic status</th>
<th>Life satisfaction in institutional setting</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Chi² value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Highly satisfied</td>
<td>Satisfied</td>
<td>Dissatisfied</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independent</td>
<td>1 (4.55%)</td>
<td>16 (72.73%)</td>
<td>5 (22.72%)</td>
<td>22 (14.67%)</td>
<td>0.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partially dependent</td>
<td>1 (2.63%)</td>
<td>29 (76.32%)</td>
<td>8 (21.05)</td>
<td>38 (25.33%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fully dependent</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>55 (61.11%)</td>
<td>35 (38.89%)</td>
<td>90 (60%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>2 (1.33%)</td>
<td>100 (66.67%)</td>
<td>48 (32%)</td>
<td>150 (100%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Economic status</th>
<th>Life satisfaction in Non-institutional setting</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Chi² value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Highly satisfied</td>
<td>Satisfied</td>
<td>Dissatisfied</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independent</td>
<td>24 (26.67%)</td>
<td>61 (67.78%)</td>
<td>5 (5.55%)</td>
<td>90 (60%)</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partially dependent</td>
<td>2 (11.76%)</td>
<td>9 (52.94%)</td>
<td>6 (35.3%)</td>
<td>17 (11.33%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fully dependent</td>
<td>7 (16.28%)</td>
<td>30 (69.77%)</td>
<td>6 (13.95%)</td>
<td>43 (28.67%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>33 (22%)</td>
<td>100 (66.67%)</td>
<td>17 (11.33%)</td>
<td>150 (100%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Percentages are calculated to row totals)
(Percentages of the totals are calculated to column totals)

**Statistical analysis:**

**Institutional:** $\chi^2$ Cal =0.09 > $\chi^2$ Tab= 0.05 (P-values)

Null hypothesis ($H_0$) was **accepted**; hence in institutional set up we did not found a significant association between economic status and the levels of Life-Satisfaction

**Non-institutional:** $\chi^2$ Cal=0.01 $< \chi^2$ Tab=0.05(P-values)

Null hypothesis was **rejected**; hence in non-institutional setting we found a significant association between economic status and the levels of Life-Satisfaction

(Table-5.5)
The analysis based on respondent’s type of family and their levels of Life-Satisfaction reveals that, out of the total 300 respondents, 258 (86%) belong to nuclear families, and only 14 per cent of the respondents from joint families, this is because of degeneration of joint family system in India. Out of the total 258 respondents who belong to nuclear families, 68.99 per cent were satisfied; 21.32 per cent were dissatisfied and only 9.69 per cent of the respondents were highly satisfied with their course of life. Among the 42 respondents of joint family system, we found 52.38 per cent were satisfied and there is an equal (23.81%) distribution of respondents who were highly satisfied and dissatisfied with their course of life (Figure-5.7).
Null hypothesis

There is no significant association between type of family and the levels of Life-Satisfaction among the institutionalized and non-institutionalized elderly people.

### Table-5.6

**Distribution of Respondents by Type of Family and Levels of Life-Satisfaction**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of family</th>
<th>Life satisfaction in institutional setting</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Chi² value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Highly satisfied</td>
<td>Satisfied</td>
<td>Dissatisfied</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nuclear</td>
<td>2 (1.52%)</td>
<td>89 (67.42%)</td>
<td>41(31.06%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joint</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>11 (61.11%)</td>
<td>7 (38.89%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>2 (1.33%)</td>
<td><strong>100(66.67%)</strong></td>
<td><strong>48 (32%)</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of family</th>
<th>Life satisfaction in Non-institutional setting</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Chi² value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nuclear</td>
<td>23 (18.3)</td>
<td>89 (70.63%)</td>
<td>14 (11.11%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joint</td>
<td>10 (41.67%)</td>
<td>11(45.83%)</td>
<td>3 (12.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>33 (22%)</strong></td>
<td><strong>100(66.67%)</strong></td>
<td><strong>17 (11.33%)</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Percentages are calculated to row totals)

(Percentages of the totals are calculated to column totals)

**Statistical analysis:**

**Institutional:** \( \chi^2 \text{Cal} = 0.71 > \chi^2 \text{Tab} = 0.05 \) (P-values)

Null hypothesis (H₀) was **accepted**: hence in institutional set up we do not found a significant association between type of family and the levels of Life-Satisfaction

**Non-institutional:** \( \chi^2 \text{Cal} = 0.03 < \chi^2 \text{Tab} = 0.05 \) (P-values)

Null hypothesis (H₀) was **rejected**: hence in non-institutional setting we found a significant association between type of family and the levels of Life-Satisfaction
Table 5.6 elaborates the analysis based on type of family and the levels of Life-Satisfaction among the institutionalized and non-institutionalized respondents under study. Out of the 132 respondents who belong to nuclear families in institutional setting majority (67.42%) were satisfied; another 31.06 per cent were dissatisfied, very less percentage (1.52%) of respondents were highly satisfied with their course of life.

In non-institutional setting, we found more number (126) of respondents from nuclear families. Out of them majority (70.63%) were satisfied; 18.3 per cent of the respondents were highly satisfied and another 11.11 percentage of the respondents were dissatisfied with their course of life. Comparing with institutional setting we found more number (24) of respondents who were from joint families at non-institutional setting. Among them 45.83 per cent were highly satisfied; 41.67 per cent were another 12.5 per cent of the respondents were dissatisfied with their course of life (Table-5.6).

Figure-5.8
Distribution of Respondents by Religion and Life-Satisfaction Levels

Source: Field Data
The figure-5.8 explains the analysis based on religion of the respondent and the levels of Life-Satisfaction. Out of the total 300 respondents majority (237) were Hindus. Out of these respondents who belong to Hindu religion, majority (67.9%) was satisfied; 22.4 per cent of the respondents were dissatisfied with their course of life. Another considerable number (56) of respondents belong to Christianity. Out of them 66.07 per cent of the respondents were satisfied; another 21.43 per cent were highly satisfied and 12.5 per cent were dissatisfied with their course of life (Figure-5.8).

Table 5.7 discusses further a detailed analysis related to the respondent’s religion and the levels of Life-Satisfaction in institutional and non-institutional settings. Out of the 150 respondents who were institutionalized, majority (90.67%) were Hindus. When we observe the levels of Life-Satisfaction among these Hindus, we found 66.91 per cent were satisfied; 32.36 per cent were dissatisfied and a least percentage (0.73%) was highly satisfied with their course of life.

**Null hypothesis**

There is no significant association between religion of the respondent and the levels of their Life-Satisfaction in institutional and non-institutional settings.

**Statistical analysis**: Institutional: \( \chi^2 \text{ Cal} = 0.04 < \chi^2 \text{ Tab} = 0.05 \) (P-values)

Non-institutional: \( \chi^2 \text{ Cal} = 0.01 < \chi^2 \text{ Tab} = 0.05 \) (P-values)

Both in institutional and non-institutional settings the \( \chi^2 \) calculated value is less than table value, so the null hypothesis (H\(_0\)) was rejected. Hence we found a significant association between religion of the respondent and the levels of Life-Satisfaction.
Table-5.7
Distribution of Respondents by Religion and Levels of Life-Satisfaction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Religion</th>
<th>Life satisfaction in institutional setting</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Chi$^2$ value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Highly satisfied</td>
<td>Satisfied</td>
<td>Dissatisfied</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hindu</td>
<td>1 (0.73%)</td>
<td>91 (66.91%)</td>
<td>44 (32.36%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muslim</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>2 (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christian</td>
<td>1 (8.33%)</td>
<td>9 (75%)</td>
<td>2 (16.67%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2 (1.33%)</td>
<td>100 (66.67%)</td>
<td>48 (32%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Religion</th>
<th>Life satisfaction in Non-institutional setting</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Chi$^2$ value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hindu</td>
<td>22 (21.78%)</td>
<td>70 (69.31%)</td>
<td>9 (8.91%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muslim</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>2 (40%)</td>
<td>3 (60%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christian</td>
<td>11 (25%)</td>
<td>28 (63.64%)</td>
<td>5 (11.36%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>33 (22%)</td>
<td>100 (66.67%)</td>
<td>17 (11.33%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Percentages are calculated to row totals)
(Percentages of the totals are calculated to column totals)

In the non-institutional setting, we found 67.33 per cent of Hindus and 29.34 per cent of Christians, both in institutional (1.33%) and non-institutional settings (3.33%) we found a least representation of Muslims. Further analysis related to non-institutional setting reveals that, among the Hindus 69.31 per cent were satisfied; 21.78 per cent were highly satisfied and 8.91 per cent were dissatisfied with their course of life. The analysis based on the levels of life-satisfaction of the Christians reveals that, 63.64 per cent were satisfied; 25 per cent were highly satisfied and 11.36 per cent were dissatisfied with their course of life (Table-5.7).

Figure-5.9 gives a detailed picture of respondent’s place of living and the levels of Life-Satisfaction. Out of the 300 respondents under study 20 per cent of the respondents were from rural areas; 14 per cent were from semi-urban and 66 per cent of the respondents were from urban areas.
In the present study there are more than 50 per cent of the respondents were from Urban areas, it is because of 150 respondents who were constitute the another category of non-institutionalized were residents of Vijayawada City.

Out of the 60 respondents who were from rural areas, 56.67 per cent were satisfied; 41.66 per cent were dissatisfied and only 1.67 per cent were highly satisfied with their course of life. The respondents who were from semi-urban areas, majority (78.57%) were satisfied with their course of life. The urbanites constitute the major portion of the study sample, among them we found 67.17 per cent were satisfied and 17.17 per cent were highly satisfied with their course of life (Figure-5.9).

Table-5.8 discusses the analysis based on institutional and non-institutional variation of levels of Life-Satisfaction with the place of living of the respondents. In institutional setting 40 per cent of the respondents were from rural areas, among them
56.67 per cent were satisfied; 41.66 per cent were dissatisfied and a least percentage (1.67%) were highly satisfied with their course of life.

Table-5.8

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Place of living</th>
<th>Life satisfaction in institutional setting</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Highly satisfied</td>
<td>Satisfied</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>1 (1.67%)</td>
<td>34 (56.67%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Semi-urban</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>33 (78.57%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>1 (2.1%)</td>
<td>33 (68.75%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>2 (1.33%)</td>
<td>100 (66.67%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Place of living</th>
<th>Life satisfaction in Non-institutional setting</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Semi-urban</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>33 (22%)</td>
<td>100 (66.67%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>33 (22%)</td>
<td>100 (66.67%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Percentages are calculated to row totals)
(Percentages of the totals are calculated to column totals)

In non-institutional setting total 100 per cent of the respondents were from Vijayawada urban. When we observe Life-Satisfaction levels of these respondents, we found that 66.67 per cent were satisfied, 22 per cent were highly satisfied and 11.33 per cent were dissatisfied with their course of life. There was lack of data in other two categories, so there is no scope for test of significance (Table-5.8).

Figure-5.10 gives a clear picture about the respondent’s grade of Quality of Life and his/her levels of Life-Satisfaction. Out of the total 300 respondents, 45 per cent were shown moderate level of Quality of Life, another 50.67 per cent were in low Quality of Life and only 4.33 per cent were enjoying high Quality of Life. Among the respondents who were in low Quality of Life, 58.55 per cent were satisfied; 37.5 per cent were dissatisfied with their course of life. The respondents
whose Quality of Life grade was moderate, majority (79.26%) were satisfied and 14.81 per cent were highly satisfied with their course of life. The respondents who shown high Quality of Life, majority (69.23%) was highly satisfied followed by 30.77 per cent of the respondents were satisfied with their course of life. The results reflect that the person with high Quality of Life ultimately leads a highly satisfied or satisfied course of life (Figure-5.10).

**Figure-5.10**

*Distribution of Respondents by Quality of Life and Life-Satisfaction Levels*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quality of Life</th>
<th>Highly satisfied</th>
<th>Satisfied</th>
<th>Dissatisfied</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>69.23%</td>
<td>30.77%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>79.26%</td>
<td>14.81%</td>
<td>5.93%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>58.55%</td>
<td>37.50%</td>
<td>3.95%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Field Data.

**Null hypothesis**

There is no significant association between the Quality of Life and the levels of Life-Satisfaction.

**Statistical analysis:**

**Institutional:** $\chi^2 \text{ Cal} = 0.01 < \chi^2 \text{ Tab} = 0.05$ (P-values)

**Non-institutional:** $\chi^2 \text{ Cal} = 0.01 < \chi^2 \text{ Tab} = 0.05$ (P-values)

Both in institutional and non-institutional settings the $\chi^2$ calculated value is less than table value, so the null hypothesis ($H_0$) was rejected. Hence we found a
significant association between Quality of Life of the respondent and the levels of Life- Satisfaction.

Table-5.9
Distribution of Respondents by Quality of Life and Levels of Life-Satisfaction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Life satisfaction</th>
<th>Quality of life in institutional setting</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Chi$^2$ Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highly satisfied</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>1 (50%)</td>
<td>1 (50%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfied</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>28 (28%)</td>
<td>72 (72%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dissatisfied</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>4 (8.33%)</td>
<td>44 (91.67%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>117</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Life satisfaction</th>
<th>Quality of life in Non-institutional setting</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Chi$^2$ value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highly satisfied</td>
<td>9 (27.27%)</td>
<td>19 (57.57%)</td>
<td>5 (15.15%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfied</td>
<td>4 (4%)</td>
<td>79 (79%)</td>
<td>17 (17%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dissatisfied</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>4 (23.53%)</td>
<td>13 (76.47%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Percentages are calculated to row totals)

(Percentages of the totals are calculated to column totals)

Table-5.9 reveals the relation between the grades of Quality of Life and the levels of Life-Satisfaction of the respondents in institutional and non-institutional settings. Out of the 150 respondents living at old age homes, 100 (66.67%) respondents were satisfied with their course of life. Among them majority (72%) were at low grade of Quality of Life, and another 28 per cent were at moderate grade of Quality of Life. In the same way respondents who were dissatisfied, majority (91.67%) were at low and 8.33 per cent at moderate grade of Quality of Life.

In case of non-institutional setting we found 100 (66.67%) respondents were satisfied with their course of life. Out of them, majority (79%) were at moderate grade of Quality of Life. The respondents who were highly satisfied (22%), 57.57 per cent were at moderate Quality of Life and 27.27 per cent were at high grade of Quality of
Comparing with institutionalized respondents, the non-institutionalized respondents were enjoying high grade of Quality of Life (Table-5.9).

Analysis of the assessment of levels of Life-Satisfaction and its association with other socio-economic and demographic variables tend to indicate that:

- Majority of the respondents were satisfied in their course of life.
- There is no statistically significant association between age differentials and the levels of Life-Satisfaction.
- The researcher found a significant association between gender differentials and the levels of Life-Satisfaction.
- Only at non-institutional setting we found a significant association between educational levels, income levels and the levels of Life-Satisfaction.
- In non-institutional setting we found a significant association between type of family and the levels of Life-Satisfaction.
- A majority of the respondents who were from rural areas were satisfied with their course of life.
- Both in institutional and non-institutional settings we found a highly significant association between Quality of Life of the respondent and the levels of Life-Satisfaction.

Majority of the respondents in the study have expressed that they are satisfied (67%) and highly satisfied (12%) with their levels of Life-Satisfaction and it augurs well with them. Whether this positiveness in Life-Satisfaction can also reflect in *The Aged-Analysis of Quality of Life* is examined in the next chapter.