



ISSN Print: 2394-7500  
ISSN Online: 2394-5869  
Impact Factor: 3.4  
IJAR 2014; 1(1): 355-357  
www.allresearchjournal.com  
Received: 05-11-2014  
Accepted: 29-11-2014

**Asha Yadav**  
Government Teacher, DOE  
NCT Delhi, India

**Dr. Gauri Chakraborty**  
Associate Professor, IGIPES,  
University of Delhi, Delhi,  
India

**Rekha Kumari**  
Dyal Singh Evening College,  
Department of Physical  
Education, University of  
Delhi, India

## **An exploratory study on quality of life among male and female**

**Asha Yadav, Dr. Gauri Chakraborty and Rekha Kumari**

### **Abstract**

The purpose of this study was to assess the quality of life among different types of activity in adults. Total number of 200 subjects were selected for the study by snowball sampling. The age of the subjects ranging from 23-55 years, representing both male and female. The subjects were from DELHI and NCR of the study. To assess the quality of life and types of activity following tools used by the researcher which is WHO-QOL questionnaire. The data was collected by the researcher keeping in view the domains which are physical health, psychological, environment and, social relationship. Each selected domain score was noted down separately and following statistical techniques applied like Descriptive statistics, t-test at 0.05 level of significance. The study shown that physical activity was effective for enhancing quality of life. And there was no significant difference among physical health domain and psychological domain but no significant difference was seen among the social and environment domain.

**Keywords:** physical activity quality of life, questionnaire

### **Introduction**

Quality of life denotes to the general well-being of individuals and societies. This quality is different for everyone, but the main element is our ability to enjoy all that life has to offer and to pursue a life full of meaning and purpose, the quality of life is defined as individuals perceptions of their position in life through this context the culture and value systems in which they live and in relation to their goals, expectations, standards and concern. The most amorphous concept in the physical education field is the Quality of the life (QOL). Quality of life is also the most multi-level concept of the physical education field. While in the literature the main domain of quality of life identified are relevant to adults of all ages. Quality of life have been described in macro (societal, objective) and micro (individual, subjective) terms. The former includes wages, employment, housing, education, Living and environmental circumstances. The latter includes perceptions of overall Quality of life, individual's experiences and values, and all these are well indicated by indicators such as well-being, happiness and life satisfaction. Quality of life describe as conscious cognitive judgments of satisfaction with one's life Sussan (2005). It has many domains but keeping in mind the main purpose of the study the researcher selected the domains like physical health, psychological, social relationship and environment domain. A strong knowledge-based care approach with the effective skills to deliver quality health care is essential.

### **Methods and Procedure**

#### **Subject**

Total number of 200 subjects including male and female of Delhi and NCR and their range of age was 23-55 years. They all were selected from the population through snowball sampling.

#### **Tools**

WHO-QOL questionnaire

**Correspondence**  
**Asha Yadav**  
Government Teacher, DOE  
NCT Delhi, India

**Procedure of data collection**

For collecting the data total 200 subjects including male and female from different regions of Delhi which were taken by snowball sampling. The standardised questionnaire was given to them all and keeping in the mind all the selected domains of quality of life which are physical health, psychological, social relationship and environment. And the scoring of each subjects was noted down and applied statistical techniques.

**Statistical analysis**

The statistical evaluation was computed after the collection of data of the selected subjects for the purpose of the study descriptive statistics which includes mean and standard deviation. T-test and other appropriate techniques at a set level of significance 0.05.

**Table 1:** Descriptive statistics of domains of WHO-Quality of life

Domain	N	MIN		MAX		M	SD	Skewness		Kurtosis	
		ST	ST	ST	ST			ST	SE	ST	SE
PH (D1)	200	10	20	15.05	1.96	0.13	0.17	-0.54	0.34		
PSY (D2)	200	13	20	16.04	1.76	0.45	0.17	-0.62	0.34		
SR (D3)	200	11	20	16.46	1.94	0.09	0.17	-0.29	0.34		
E (D4)	200	12	20	15.24	2.29	0.34	0.17	-1.03	0.34		

Table 1 shows descriptive statistics of all domains of WHO-quality of life It depicts mean ± standard deviation values of all domains. Physical health which are domain (D1) has value 15.05±1.96. Psychological domain (D2) quality of life has mean value 16.04 and standard deviation was 1.769. social relationship domain (d3) has mean value 16.04 and standard deviation was 1.96. Environmental domain (d4) Quality of life has mean value 15.24 and standard deviation was 2.29. Skewness has normal value i.e. ranging from .099-0.415lie between ±Whereas Kurtosis has also normal value i.e. ranging from -0.0439 to which lie between ±7.

**Table 2:** Descriptive statistics of selected domains of Quality of Life between Male and Female

Domain	Gender	N	M	S.D	S.E.M
PH(D1)	M	86	15.14	2.019	.218
	F	114	14.98	1.923	.180
PSY(D2)	M	86	16.10	1.708	.184
	F	114	16.00	1.819	.170
SR(D3)	M	86	16.80	1.890	.204
	F	114	16.21	1.948	.182
E(D4)	M	86	15.40	2.353	.254
	F	114	15.11	2.245	.210

Table 2 reveals mean value ± standard deviation between males and females. Mean value ± standard deviation for male ranges from 15.14- 16.80 ± 1.708 – 2.353in all domains of Quality of Life. Mean value± standard deviation for female ranges from 14.98 – 1621± 1.81 – 2.245 in all domain of Quality of Life. Overall male has scored higher in mean value in three domains out of four domains.

Table 2 reveals that the mean value of male subjects of physical health was 15.14± 2.019 and for female the mean value was mean value 14.98± 1.923. The mean value of male subjects on psychological was 16.10 ± 1.708 and for female the mean value was mean value 16± 1.819.

The mean value of male subjects on social relationship was 16.80 ± 1.890 and for female the mean value was mean value 16.21 ± 1.948. The mean value of male subjects on environmental was 15.40 ± 2.353 and for female the mean value was mean value 1511 ± 2.245.

**Table 3:** Significance of Male Difference between Male and Female of Quality of life

Domain	T	DF	SIGN ( 2 – tailed )	M.D	S.E.D
PH (D1)	0.56	198	0.576	0.157	0.281
PSY (D2)	413	198	0.105	0.105	0.253
SR (D3)	2.154	198	0.592	0.592	0.275
E (D4)	.859	198	0.281	0.281	0.327

\*P<00.5

Table3 reveals that there is no statistically significant difference between male and female is physical health domain, psychological domain and environmental domain as obtained t value are 0.56,0.413,2.154,0.859 respectively which are not significant at 0.05 level with df=198.

**Conclusions**

Within the limitation of the study following conclusion were drawn based on the

Findings:

1. The present study has resulted that physical activity was very effective for enhancing quality of life.
2. There was no significant mean difference found between male and female in any domain of quality of life.
3. There was only significance difference in physical health domain among subjects whereas in psychological domain, social relation domain an environmental domain there was no significant difference among subjects.

**Reference**

1. American College of Sports Medicine (ACSM) ACSM position stand: exercise and physical activity for older adults. *Medicine & Science in Sports & Exercise* 2009;41:1510-1530.
2. Brown WJ, Mishra G, Lee C, Bauman A. Leisure time physical activity in Australian women: Relationship with well-being and symptoms. *Research Quarterly for Exercise and Sport* 2000;71:206-217
3. Berger BG, Tobar D. Physical activity and quality of life. In G. Tenenbaum& R. Eklund (Eds.), *Handbook on research on sport psychology* (3rd ed..). Hoboken: Wiley 2007, 598-620
4. Conn VS, Hafdahl AR, Brown LM. Meta-analysis of Quality-of-Life Outcomes From Physical Activity Interventions. *Nursing Research* 2009;58(3):175-183.
5. Questionnaire: 12-country reliability and validity, *Medicine and Science in Sports and Exercise*, 35, 1381-1395.
6. Diener E, Emmons RA, Larson RJ, Griffin S. The satisfaction with life scale. *Hournal of Personality Assessment* 1985;49:71-75.
7. Diener E, Scollon KN, Oishi S, Dzokoto V, Suh EM. Positivity and the construction of life satisfaction judgements: global happiness is not the sum of its parts. *Journal of Happiness Studies* 2000;I:159-176.
8. Ferrans CE, Powers M. Quality of life index: development and psychometric properties. *Advance in Nursing Science* 1985;8:15-24.
9. Fry PS. Guest editorial: ageing and quality of life (QoL)—the continuing search for quality of life indicators. *International Journal of Aging and Human Development* 2000;50:245-261.
10. Galambos CM. Quality of life for the elder: a reality or

- an illusion? *Journal of Gerontological Social Work*, 1997;27(3):7-44.
11. The effects of exercise interventions on quality of life in clinical and healthy population: a meta-analysis. *Social Science & Medicine* 68,1700-1710.
  12. Gonzalez M, Casas F, Coenders G. A complexity approach to psychological wellbeing in adolescents: major strengths and methodological issues. *Social Indicators Research* 2006;80:267-295.
  13. Gonzalez M, Coenders G, Saez M, Casas, Non-linearity, complexity and limited measurement in the relationship between satisfaction with specific life domains and satisfaction with life as a whole. *Journal of Happiness Studies* 2010;11:335-352.