

A Correlational Study to Assess the Psychological Impact on Quality of Life Among Alcoholics at Tertiary Care Teaching Hospital, Kuppam

Roopa¹, T.K. Sreedevi^{2*}

Abstract

Background of the Study: The purpose of this study is to assess the psychological impact on quality of life among alcoholics and to find out the correlation between depression, anxiety, stress, and quality of life among alcoholics. **Aim:** The aim of this study is to assess the psychological impact on quality of life among alcoholics at tertiary care teaching hospital, Kuppam. **Methods:** **Research Approach:** A descriptive correlational research design employs a quantitative approach to examine relationships between variables without manipulating them. **Study Setting:** Tertiary care, Teaching Hospital, Kuppam. **Sampling Technique:** Non-probability purposive sampling. **Sample Size:** 129 alcoholics. **Independent Variables:** It refers to psychological impact (depression, anxiety, stress) among alcoholics by using of scales. **Dependent Variables:** It refers to alcoholics. **Tools:** It consists of two parts, they are: (1) Demographic variables; (2) Depression, anxiety, scale (DASS) containing 21 questionnaires, 7 for depression, 7 for anxiety, and 7 for stress was administered; the collected data were analyzed and interpreted, WHOQOL-BREF scale was used to assess the quality of life among alcoholics. **Method of Data Collection:** Data collection was conducted through interviews. **Conclusion:** The main objective of the study is to correlate and assess the psychological impact on quality of life among alcoholics, by using DASS 21 standardized scale and WHOQOL- BERF scale at tertiary care teaching hospital, Kuppam. The statistical examination demonstrated a moderate inverse relationship between depression and quality of life in alcoholics, as well as a similar moderate inverse correlation between anxiety and quality of life, both significant at a level of 0.000. Additionally, a robust moderate correlation was observed between stress and quality of life among alcoholics, significantly at a level of 0.00.

Keywords: Assess, psychological impact, quality of life, alcoholics, depression

*Author for Correspondence

T.K. Sreedevi

E-mail: sreedevidevi136@gmail.com

¹Student, Department of Mental Health Nursing, PES College of Nursing, Nalagampalli, Kuppam, Andhra Pradesh, India

²Associate Professor, Department of Mental Health Nursing, PES College of Nursing, Nalagampalli, Kuppam, Andhra Pradesh, India

Received Date: August 25, 2024

Accepted Date: September 29, 2024

Published Date: October 16, 2024

Citation: Roopa, T.K. Sreedevi. A Correlational Study to Assess the Psychological Impact on Quality of Life Among Alcoholics at Tertiary Care Teaching Hospital, Kuppam. International Journal of Nursing Science Practice and Research. 2024; 10(2): 7–21p.

INTRODUCTION

Alcoholic beverages contain ethanol, an alcohol derived from the fermentation of grains, fruits, or other sugary sources. The consumption of alcohol holds significant cultural significance in numerous societies, with many countries enacting laws to govern its production, sale, and consumption [1].

According to the National Council on Alcohol and Drug Dependency and the American Society of Addiction Medicine, alcoholism is identified as a primary, enduring condition marked by diminished regulation over alcohol consumption, obsession with alcohol, continued use despite negative outcomes, and cognitive distortions that

may impact both physical and mental well-being.

Harmful alcohol consumption presents a global challenge, leading to numerous fatalities, illnesses, injuries, and incidents of violence. The considerable interpersonal, psychological, and health-related issues resulting from alcohol abuse affect various aspects of quality of life (QoL). QoL is a concept that goes beyond mere absence of illness, encompassing social, mental, and physical well-being, aligning with the World Health Organization's definition of health [2, 3].

The habit of alcohol consumption in a man not only impacts the individual himself but also has physical and psychological repercussions on the entire family. This includes issues such as depression, anxiety, stress, and a decline in overall QoL. Therefore, the researcher aimed to evaluate the psychological effects on the QoL among alcoholics receiving treatment in psychiatric outpatient departments and those admitted to psychiatric wards. Based on the results the psychological impact (depression, anxiety, and stress) on QoL relieving measures can be developed and implemented among the alcohol [4–8].

Objectives of the Study

1. Evaluate the extent of psychological influence on individuals with alcohol dependency.
2. Evaluate the standard of living among individuals struggling with alcohol dependency.
3. Determine the relationship between the psychological influence and QoL among those with alcohol dependency.
4. Investigate the connection between psychological influence, QoL, and various demographic factors among individuals grappling with alcohol dependency.

Hypotheses

- *RH1*: There will be a significant correlation between the levels of depression and QoL among alcoholics.
- *RH*: A notable correlation is expected to exist between the anxiety levels and QoL among individuals with alcohol dependency.
- *RH3*: There will be a significant correlation between the levels of stress and QoL among alcoholics.
- *RH4*: A significant relationship is anticipated between the psychological effects and QoL among alcoholics, considering their specific demographic characteristics.

MATERIAL AND METHODS

Research Approach

Quantitative approach was used to assess the psychological impact on QoL among alcoholics at tertiary care teaching hospital, Kuppam.

Research Design

The descriptive correlational research design selected for this study was used to assess the level of psychological impact on QoL among alcoholics.

SETTING OF THE STUDY

The present study was conducted among alcoholics at psychiatric OPD and psychiatric ward in PES hospital. Which is 1100 bedded multi-specialty hospital at Kuppam, Chittoor district, Andhra Pradesh it is adjacent to the PES College of nursing with walkable distance of 100 meters. On an average OPD censes per day is about 10–15 cases of alcoholics. The bed occupancy is about 60.

Population

The population for the study includes all the patients who are fulfilling the inclusion criteria, who are attending the Psychiatric OPD and admitted psychiatric ward in PES Hospital, Kuppam.

Sample

The sample of the present study includes all the alcoholics who were attending the psychiatry OPD and admitted in psychiatry ward and fulfilling the inclusion criteria in PES tertiary care teaching hospital, Kuppam.

Sampling Technique

The study employed a purposive sampling technique, which is a non-probabilistic method, to select the participants.

Sample Size

The sample size was determined using power analysis. The sample size = 129, adding 10% samples the total sample size was 129.

Formula	$\eta = \frac{Z_{1-\alpha/2}^2 * p(1-p)}{d^2}$
Calculation	$\eta = \frac{1.96^2 * 0.733(1-0.733)}{0.08^2} = 117$

SAMPLE SELECTION CRITERIA

Inclusion Criteria

1. Alcoholics who are attending the psychiatry OPD and at PES tertiary teaching hospital, Kuppam.
2. Individuals with alcohol dependency are willing to engage in study.
3. Individuals with alcohol dependency accessible during the study period.
4. Alcoholics who are in the age group of 18–60 years.

Exclusion Criteria

1. Alcoholics who are not able to understand Telugu or English.
2. Alcoholics with other psychiatric illnesses.

Ethical Clearance

Ethical clearance for the present study was obtained from the ethical committee of (PESIMSR) PES institute of medical sciences and research Centre through the principal PES College of nursing, to conduct the study.

Results

The data organized and presented under the following:

- *Section I:* Frequencies and percentage distribution of demographic variables among alcoholics (Table 1).
- *Section II:* Frequency and percentage distribution on level of depression among alcoholics (Table 2).
- *Section III:* Frequency and percentage distribution on level of anxiety among alcoholics (Table 3).
- *Section IV:* Frequency and percentage distribution on level of stress among alcoholics (Table 4).
- *Section V:* Frequency and percentage distribution on level of QoL among alcoholics (Table 5).
- *Section VI:* Correlation between depression and QoL among alcoholics (Table 6).
- *Section VII:* Correlation between anxiety and QoL among alcoholics (Table 7).
- *Section VIII:* Correlation between stress and QoL among alcoholics (Table 8).
- *Section IX:* Association between levels of depression with their selected demographic variable of alcoholics (Table 9).
- *Section X:* Association between levels of anxiety with their selected demographic variable of alcoholics (Table 10).
- *Section XI:* Association between levels of stress with their selected demographic variable of

alcoholics (Table 11).

- *Section XIII*: Association between levels of QoL with their selected demographic variable of alcoholics (Table 12).

Table 1. Frequencies and percentage distribution of demographic variables among alcoholics (N = 129).

Demographic Variables of the Patients	Frequency (f)	Percentage (%)
<i>1. Age (in years)</i>		
a. 20–29	40	31.00
b. 30–39	51	39.50
c. 40–49	13	10.10
d. >55	25	19.40
<i>2. Residence</i>		
a. Rural	92	71.30
b. Urban	37	28.70
<i>3. Educational status</i>		
a. No formal education	27	20.90
b. Primary education	37	28.60
c. Secondary education	41	31.80
d. Graduate	18	14.00
e. Postgraduate	6	4.70
<i>4. Occupation status</i>		
a. Employed private	32	24.80
b. Employed government	16	12.40
c. Daily wage worker	29	22.50
d. Farmer	52	40.30
<i>5. Family income in (rupees)</i>		
a. <10000 per month	70	54.30
b. 10001–20,000 per month	25	19.40
c. 20,001–30,000 per month	17	13.20
d. 30,001–40,000 per month	17	13.10
<i>6. Religion</i>		
a. Hindu	97	75.20
b. Muslim	23	17.80
c. Christian	9	7.00
d. Others	0	0.00
<i>7. Duration of consumption of alcohol</i>		
a. 5 months–10 years	75	58.10
b. 10–20 Years	39	30.20
c. 20–30 Years	9	7.00
d. 30–40 years	6	4.70
<i>8. Types of family</i>		
a. Nuclear family	92	71.30
b. Joint family	33	25.60
c. Broken family	4	3.10
<i>9. Marital status</i>		
a. Married	28	21.70
b. Divorced	93	72.10

c. >Separated	8	6.20
d. Widow	0	0.00
<i>10. Number of children</i>		
a. 1	40	31.00
b. 2	42	32.60
c. 3 and above	16	12.40
d. No children	31	24.00
<i>11. Duration of marital life</i>		
a. 0–5 years	47	36.40
b. 5–10 years	46	35.70
c. 11–20 years	25	19.40
d. 20–30 years	11	8.50
<i>12. Family history of drinking</i>		
a. Present	82	63.60
b. Absent	47	36.40

Table 2. Frequency and percentage distribution on levels of depression among alcoholics (N = 129).

S.N.	Levels of Depression Among Alcoholics	Frequency	Percentage
1.	Normal depression	10	7.70
2.	Mild depression	19	14.70
3.	Moderate depression	37	28.70
4.	Severe depression	34	26.40
5.	Extremely severe depression	29	22.50
6.	Total	129	100

Table 3. Frequency and percentage distribution on levels of anxiety among alcoholics (N = 129).

S.N.	Levels of Anxiety Among Alcoholics	Frequency	Percentage
1.	Normal anxiety	6	4.70
2.	Mild anxiety	33	25.60
3.	Moderate anxiety	27	20.80
4.	Severe anxiety	30	23.30
5.	Extremely severe anxiety	33	25.60
6.	Total	129	100

Table 4. Frequency and percentage distribution on levels of stress among alcoholics.

S.N.	Levels of Stress Among Alcoholics	Frequency	Percentage
1.	Normal stress	18	14.00
2.	Mild stress	26	20.20
3.	Moderate stress	43	33.30
4.	Severe stress	22	17.10
5.	Extremely severe stress	20	15.40
6.	Total	129	

TO FIND OUT CORRELATION BETWEEN DEPRESSION, ANXIETY, STRESS, AND QoL AMONG ALCOHOLICS

Table 6 shows that correlation between depression and QoL among alcoholics revealed that the mean score of depression were 20.99 with a SD 7.85 and mean score of QoL were 61.70 with a SD

18.03 and r-value-0.582** showed there was a moderate negative correlation between depression and QoL among the alcoholics at the level of 0.000.

Table 5. Frequency and percentage distribution on levels of QoL among alcoholics.

S.N.	Levels of QoL Among Alcoholics	Frequency	Percentage
1.	Poor QoL	20	15.50
2.	Average QoL	46	35.70
3.	Good QoL	35	27.10
4.	Very good QoL	28	21.70
6.	Total	129	100

Table 6. Correlation between depression and QoL among alcoholics (N = 129).

Variables	Mean	SD	r-value	p-value
Depression	20.99	7.85	-0.582**	0.000
QoL	61.70	18.03		

Table 7. Correlation between anxiety and QoL among alcoholics (N = 129).

Variables	Mean	SD	r-value	p-value
Anxiety	15.61	7.35	-0.686**	0.000
QoL	61.70	18.03		

Table 7 shows that correlation between anxiety and QoL among alcoholics revealed that the mean score of anxiety were 15.61 with a SD 7.35 and mean score of QoL were 61.70 with a SD 18.03 and r-value -0.686^{**} showed there was a moderate negative correlation between anxiety and QoL among the alcoholics at the level of 0.000.

Table 8. Correlation between stress and QoL among alcoholics (N = 129).

Variables	Mean	SD	r-value	p-value
Stress	22.90	7.59	-0.852**	0.000
QoL	61.70	18.03		

Table 8 shows that correlation between stress and QoL among alcoholics revealed that the mean score of stress were 22.90 with a SD 7.59 and mean score of QoL were 61.70 with a SD 18.03 and r-value -0.852^{**} showed there was a strong negative correlation between stress and QoL among the alcoholics at the level of 0.000

ASSOCIATION BETWEEN LEVELS OF PSYCHOLOGICAL IMPACT ON QoL AMONG ALCOHOLICS

Table 9 analyzes that there was a significant association between level of depression among alcoholics with their selected demographic variables there is a significant at age in years of alcoholics at the level of ($p < 0.00$), occupational status of the alcoholics at the level of ($p < 0.001$) family income in rupees at the level of ($p < 0.005$), duration of consumption of alcohol ($p < 0.004$) duration of marital life at the level of ($p < 0.001$) were found to be significant and other variables were not found to be significant.

Table 9. Association between levels of depression with their selected demographic variable of alcoholics.

Demographic Variables of Alcoholics	Levels of Depression										Chi-square	p-value	Results
	Normal Depression		Mild Depression		Moderate Depression		Severe Depression		Extremely Severe Depression				
<i>1. Age in years</i>	F	%	f	%	F	%	F	%	F	%			
a. 20–29 years	7	5.40	9	7.00	11	8.50	12	9.30	1	0.80	41.474**	0.000	Significant
b. 30–39 years	3	2.30	9	7.00	14	10.90	14	10.90	11	8.50			
c. 40–49 years	0	0.00	0	0.00	6	4.70	5	3.90	2	1.60			
d. >50 years	0	0.00	1	0.80	6	4.70	3	2.30	15	11.60			
<i>2. Residence</i>													
a. Rural	7	5.40	11	8.50	29	22.50	23	17.80	22	17.10	3.101	0.541	Not significant
b. Urban	3	2.30	8	6.20	8	6.20	11	8.50	7	5.40			
<i>3. Educational status</i>													
a. No formal education	0	0.00	1	0.80	10	7.80	6	4.70	10	7.80	31.753*	0.011	Not significant
b. Primary education	0	0.00	8	6.20	11	8.50	10	7.80	8	6.20			
c. Secondary education	3	2.30	8	6.20	11	8.50	10	7.80	9	7.00			
d. Graduate	5	3.90	2	1.60	3	2.30	6	4.70	2	1.60			
e. Postgraduate	2	1.60	0	0.00	2	1.60	2	1.60	0	0.00			
<i>4. Occupational status</i>													
a. Employed private	1	0.80	2	1.60	11	8.50	12	9.30	6	4.70	33.155**	0.001	Significant
b. Employed government	6	4.70	3	2.30	2	1.60	1	0.80	4	3.10			
c. Daily wage worker	2	1.60	6	4.70	11	8.50	5	3.90	5	3.90			
d. Farmer	1	0.80	8	6.20	13	10.10	16	12.40	14	10.90			
<i>5. Family Income (in rupees)</i>													
a. <10,000 per month	1	0.80	10	7.80	23	17.80	25	19.40	11	8.50	28.180**	0.005	Significant
b. 10,001 –	1	0.80	5	3.90	7	5.40	4	3.10	8	6.20			

20,000															
c. 20,001 – 30,000	3	2.30	1	0.80	4	3.10	3	2.30	6	4.70					
d. 30,001 – 40,000	5	3.90	3	2.30	3	2.30	2	1.60	4	3.10					
6. Religion															
a. Hindu	8	6.20	13	10.10	28	21.70	27	20.90	21	16.30	4.726	0.786	Not significant		
b. Muslim	1	0.80	5	3.90	7	5.40	6	4.70	4	3.10					
c. Christian	1	0.80	1	0.80	2	1.60	1	0.80	4	3.10					
7. Duration of consumption of alcohol															
a. 5 months–10 years	0	0.00	17	13.20	22	17.10	20	15.50	16	12.40	28.990**	0.004	Significant		
b. 10 years–20 years	8	6.20	1	0.80	1	8.50	9	7.00	10	7.80					
c. 20 years–30 years	0	0.00	1	0.80	3	2.30	3	2.30	2	1.60					
d. 30 years–40 years	2	1.60	0	0.00	1	0.80	2	1.60	1	0.80					
8. Type of family															
a. Nuclear family	6	4.70	14	10.90	29	22.50	23	17.80	20	15.50	5.044	0.753	Not significant		
b. Joint family	4	3.10	4	3.10	8	6.20	10	7.80	7	5.40					
c. Broken family	0	0.00	1	0.80	0	0.00	1	0.80	2	1.60					
9. Marital status															
a. Married	3	2.30	4	3.10	12	9.30	5	3.90	4	3.10	10.625	0.224	Not significant		
b. Divorced	7	5.40	15	11.60	22	17.10	28	21.70	21	16.30					
c. Separated	0	0.00	0	0.00	3	2.30	1	0.80	4	3.10					
10. Number of children															
a. One	2	1.60	6	4.70	11	8.50	10	7.80	11	8.50	7.108	0.850	Not significant		
b. Two	4	3.10	6	4.70	11	8.50	12	9.30	9	7.00					
c. >Three	1	0.80	3	2.30	3	2.30	7	5.40	2	1.60					
d. No Children	3	2.30	4	3.10	12	9.30	5	3.90	7	5.40					
11. Duration of marital life															
a. 0–5 years	1	0.80	5	3.90	17	13.20	13	10.10	11	8.50	32.191**	0.001	Significant		
b. 5–10 years	1	0.80	9	7.00	13	10.10	10	7.80	13	10.10					
c. 11–20 years	3	2.30	3	2.30	6	4.70	9	7.00	4	3.10					
d. 20–30 years	5	3.90	2	1.60	1	0.80	2	1.60	1	0.80					

12. Family history of drinking													
a. Present	3	2.30	13	10.10	21	16.30	24	18.60	10.459*	0.033	Not significant		
b. Absent	7	5.40	6	4.70	13	10.10	5	3.90					

Table 10. Association between levels of anxiety with the demographic variables of alcoholics.

Demographic Variables of Alcoholics	Levels of Anxiety										Chi-square	p-value	Results
	Normal Anxiety		Mild Anxiety		Moderate Anxiety		Severe Anxiety		Extremely Severe Anxiety				
13. Age in years	F	%	f	%	F	%	f	%	F	%			
e) 20–29 years	4	3.10	14	10.90	6	4.70	12	9.30	4	3.10	41.970**	0.000	Significant
f) 30–39 years	2	1.60	17	13.20	13	10.10	11	8.50	8	6.20			
g) 40–49 years	0	0.00	1	0.80	3	3.90	3	2.30	4	3.10			
h) >50 years	0	0.00	1	0.80	3	2.30	4	3.10	17	13.20			
14. Residence													
c) Rural	4	3.10	22	17.10	18	14.00	27	20.90	21	16.30	6.769	0.149	Not significant
d) Urban	2	1.60	11	8.50	9	7.00	3	2.30	12	9.30			
15. Educational status													
a) No formal education	0	0.00	2	1.60	5	3.90	6	4.70	14	10.90	37.621**	0.002	Significant
f) Primary education	1	0.80	8	6.20	7	5.40	13	10.10	8	6.20			
g) Secondary education	1	0.80	16	12.40	8	6.20	8	6.20	8	6.20			
h) Graduate	4	3.10	5	3.90	4	3.10	3	2.30	2	1.60			
i) Postgraduate	0	0.00	2	1.60	3	2.30	0	0.00	1	0.80			
16. Occupational status													
a) Employed private	0	0.00	6	4.70	7	5.40	9	7.00	10	7.80	22.862**	0.029	Not significant
e) Employed government	4	3.10	4	3.10	4	3.10	2	1.60	2	1.60			
f) Daily wage worker	1	0.80	11	8.50	4	3.10	6	4.70	7	5.40			
g) Farmer	1	0.80	12	9.30	12	9.30	13	10.10	14	10.90			
17. Family income (in rupees)													
e) <10,000 per month	0	0.00	19	14.70	19	14.70	18	4.00	14	10.90	26.057*	0.011	Not significant
f) 10,001–20,000	1	0.80	7	5.40	2	1.60	6	4.70	9	7.00			
g) 20,001–30,000	1	0.80	3	2.30	2	1.60	4	3.10	7	5.40			
h) 30,001–40,000	4	3.10	4	3.10	4	3.10	2	1.60	3	2.305			
18. Religion													

d) Hindu	5	3.90	24	18.60	20	15.50	22	17.10	26	20.20	2.925	0.939	Not significant		
e) Muslim	1	0.80	5	3.90	6	4.70	6	4.70	5	3.90					
f) Christian	0	0.00	4	3.10	1	0.80	2	1.60	2	1.60					
<i>19. Duration of consumption of alcohol</i>															
e) 5 months–10 years	1	0.80	23	17.80	14	10.9	21	16.3	16	12.40	13.942**	0.3	Not significant		
					0		0								
f) 10 years–20 years	4	3.10	8	6.20	8	6.20	7	5.40	12	9.30					
g) 20 years–30 years	0	0.00	1	0.80	3	2.30	2	1.60	3	2.30					
h) 30 years–40 years	1	0.80	1	0.80	2	1.60	0	0.00	2	1.60	04	Significant			
<i>20. Type of family</i>															
d) nuclear family	4	3.10	24	18.60	18	14.0	23	17.80	23	17.80			1.205	0.997	Not significant
e) Joint family	2	1.60	8	6.20	8	6.20	6	4.70	9	7.00					
f) Broken family	0	0.00	1	0.80	1	0.80	1	0.80	1	0.80					
<i>21. Marital status</i>															
d) Married	2	1.60	5	3.90	4	3.10	10	7.80	7	5.40	9.481	0.303	Not significant		
e) Divorced	4	3.10	28	21.70	21	16.30	18	14.00	22	17.10					
f) Separated	0	0.00	0	0.00	2	1.60	2	1.60	4	3.10					
<i>22. Number of children</i>															
e) One	1	0.80	11	8.50	8	6.20	15	11.60	5	3.90	16.807	0.157	Not significant		
f) Two	2	1.60	13	10.10	11	8.50	5	3.90	11	8.50					
g) >Three	1	0.80	4	3.10	3	2.30	1	0.80	7	5.40					
h) No children	2	1.60	5	3.90	5	3.90	9	7.00	10	7.80					
<i>23. Duration of marital life</i>															
e) 0–5 years	1	0.80	8	6.20	13	10.10	12	9.30	13	10.10	15.281**	0.226	Not significant		
f) 5–10 years	1	0.80	14	10.90	8	6.20	10	7.80	13	10.10					
g) 11–20 years	3	2.30	5	3.90	4	3.10	6	4.70	7	5.40					
h) 20–30 years	1	0.80	6	4.70	2	1.60	2	1.60	0	0.00					
<i>24. Family history of drinking</i>															
c) Present	3	2.30	15	11.60	15	11.60	23	17.80	26	20.20	11.424*	0.022	Not significant		
d) Absent	3	2.30	18	14.00	12	9.30	7	5.40	7	5.40					

The above analysis revealed that there was a significant association between level of anxiety among alcoholics with their selected demographic variables revealed there is a significant seen at age in years of alcoholics at the level of ($p < 0.000$), educational status of the alcoholics at the level of ($p < 0.002$), occupational status of the alcoholics at the level of ($p < 0.029$) family income in rupees at the level of ($p < 0.011$), family history of drinking at the level of ($p < 0.022$) were found to be significant and other variables were not found to be significant. Hence, it is accepted.

Table 11. Association between levels of stress with the demographic variables of alcoholics.

Demographic Variables of Alcoholics	Levels of Stress										Chi-square	p-value	Results
	Normal Stress		Mild Stress		Moderate Stress		Severe Stress		Extremely Severe Stress				
<i>1. Age in years</i>	<i>F</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>f</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>F</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>F</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>f</i>	<i>%</i>			
a) 20–29 years	8	6.20	10	7.80	13	10.10	6	4.70	3	2.30	36.101*	0.000	Significant
b) 30–39 years	8	6.20	13	10.10	19	4.70	8	6.20	3	2.30			
c) 40–49 years	1	0.80	3	2.30	6	4.70	1	0.80	2	1.60			
d) >50 years	1	0.80	0	0.00	5	3.90	7	5.40	12	9.30			
<i>2. Residence</i>													
a) Rural	14	10.90	16	12.40	34	26.40	12	9.30	16	12.40	6.609	0.158	Not significant
b) Urban	4	3.10	10	7.80	9	7.00	10	7.80	4	3.10			
<i>3. Educational status</i>													
a) No formal education	0	0.00	4	3.10	6	4.70	5	3.90	12	9.30	34.655*	0.004	Significant
b) Primary education	6	4.70	5	3.90	16	12.40	5	3.90	5	3.90			
c) Secondary education	7	5.40	12	9.30	12	9.30	7	5.40	3	2.30			
d) Graduate	5	3.90	4	3.10	6	4.70	3	2.30	0	0.00			
e) Postgraduate	0	0.00	1	0.80	3	2.30	2	1.60	0	0.00			
<i>4. Occupational status</i>													
a) Employed private	2	1.60	7	5.40	11	8.50	6	4.70	6	4.70	22.798*	0.029	Not significant
b) Employed government	7	5.40	2	1.60	5	3.90	2	1.60	0	0.00			
c) Daily wage worker	7	5.40	4	3.10	8	6.20	5	3.90	5	3.90			
d) Farmer	2	1.60	13	10.10	19	14.70	9	7.00	9	7.00			
<i>5. Family Income (in rupees)</i>													
a) <10,000 per month	5	3.90	17	3.20	26	20.20	15	11.60	7	5.40	25.557*	0.012	Not significant
b) 10,001–20,000	4	3.10	5	3.90	8	6.20	2	1.60	6	4.70			
c) 20,001–30,000	2	1.60	1	0.80	6	4.70	2	1.60	6	4.70			
d) 30,001–40,000	7	5.40	3	2.30	3	2.30	3	2.30	1	0.80			
<i>6. Religion</i>													
a) Hindu	15	11.60	22	17.10	28	11.60	15	11.60	17	13.20	7.640	0.469	Not significant
b) Muslim	3	2.30	3	2.30	11	8.50	4	3.10	2	1.60			
c) Christian	0	0.00	1	0.80	4	3.10	3	2.30	1	0.80			
<i>7. Duration of consumption of alcohol</i>													
a) 5 months–10 years	10	7.80	17	13.20	26	20.20	13	10.10	9	7.00	7.954	0.789	Not significant
b) 10 years–20 years	5	3.90	8	6.20	13	10.10	7	5.40	6	4.70			
c) 20 years–30 years	1	0.80	1	0.80	3	2.30	1	0.80	3	2.30			

d) 30 years–40 years	2	1.60	0	0.00	1	0.80	1	0.80	2	1.60			
8. Type of family													
a) Nuclear family	13	10.10	21	16.30	27	20.90	15	1.60	16	12.40			
b) Joint family	4	3.10	5	3.90	14	10.90	7	5.40	3	2.30		0.65	
c) Broken family	1	14.00	0	0.00	2	1.60	0	0.00	1	0.80	5.929	5	Not significant
9. Marital status													
a) Married	3	2.30	7	5.40	9	7.00	4	3.10	5	3.90			
b) Divorced	15	11.60	18	14.0	31	24.0	15	11.60	14	10.90		0.80	
c) Separated	0	0.00	1	0.80	3	2.30	3	2.30	0.80		4.576	2	Not significant
10. Number of children													
a) One	4	3.10	8	6.20	16	12.40	9	7.00	3	2.30			
b) Two	10	7.80	7	5.40	12	9.30	3	2.30	10	7.80			
c) > Three	1	0.80	4	3.10	5	3.90	5	3.90	1	0.80		0.21	Not significant
d) No children	3	2.30	7	5.40	10	7.80	5	3.90	6	4.70	15.563	2	
11. Duration of marital life													
a) 0–5 years	3	2.30	10	7.80	17	13.20	7	5.40	10	7.80			
b) 5–10 years	7	5.40	12	9.30	12	9.30	7	5.40	8	6.20			
c) 11–20 years	4	3.10	4	3.10	7	5.40	8	6.20	2	1.60	22.462*	0.03	
d) 20–30 years	4	3.10	0	0.00	7	5.40	0	0.00	0	0.00	*	3	Not significant
12. Family history of drinking													
a) Present	9	7.00	16	12.40	24	18.60	15	11.60	18	14.00		0.06	
b) Absent	9	7.00	10	7.80	19	14.70	7	5.40	2	1.60	8.829*	6	Not significant

Table 11 analysis revealed that there was a significant association between level of stress among alcoholics with their selected demographic variables revealed there is a significant seen at age in years of alcoholics at the level of ($p < 0.000$), educational status of the alcoholics at the level of ($p < 0.002$), occupational status of the alcoholics at the level of ($p < 0.029$) family income in rupees at the level of ($p < 0.011$), family history of drinking at the level of ($p < 0.022$) were found to be significant and other variables were not found to be significant.

Table 12. Association between levels of QoL with the demographic variables of alcoholics.

Demographic Variables of Alcoholics	Levels of QoL										Chi-square	p-value	Results
	Normal		Mild		Moderate		Severe		Extremely Severe				
1. Age in years	<i>F</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>F</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>F</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>F</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>F</i>	<i>%</i>			
a) 20–29 years	3	2.30	14	10.90	1	7.80	1	10.10	40	31.0	39.20	0.000	Significant
b) 30–39 years	3	2.30	18	14.0	1	13.20	1	10.10	51	39.50			
c) 40–49 years	2	1.60	3	2.30	7	5.40	1	0.80	13	10.10			
d) >50 years	12	9.30	11	8.50	1	0.80	1	0.80	25	19.40			
2. Residence													
a) Rural	16	12.40	36	27.90	2	16.30	1	14.70	92	71.30	4.177	0.243	Not significant
b) Urban	4	3.10	10	7.80	1	10.90	9	7.00	37	28.70			
3. Educational													

<i>status</i>															
a) No formal education	12	9.30	8	6.20	7	5.40	0	0.00	27	20.90	33.928* *	0.00 1	Significant		
b) Primary education	5	3.90	15	11.60	1	8.50	6	4.70	37	28.70					
c) Secondary education	3	2.30	16	12.40	8	6.20	1	10.90	41	31.80					
d) Graduate	0	0.00	5	3.90	7	5.40	6	4.70	18	14.00					
e) Postgraduate	0	0.00	2	1.60	2	1.60	2	1.60	6	4.70					
<i>4. Occupational status</i>															
a) Employed private	6	4.70	13	10.10	1	7.80	3	2.30	32	24.80	25.185* *	0.00 3	Significant		
b) Employed government	0	0.00	2	1.60	4	3.10	1	7.80	16	12.40					
c) Daily wage worker	5	3.90	9	7.00	6	4.70	9	7.00	29	22.50					
d) Farmer	9	7.00	22	17.10	1	11.60	6	4.70	52	40.30					
<i>5. Family Income (in rupees)</i>															
a) <10,000 per month	7	5.40	33	25.60	2	15.50	1	7.80	70	54.30	25.552* *	0.00 2	Significant		
b) 10,001–20,000	6	4.70	6	4.70	8	6.20	5	3.90	25	19.40					
c) 20,001–30,000	6	4.70	5	3.90	2	1.60	4	3.10	17	13.20					
d) 30,001–40,000	1	0.80	2	1.60	5	3.90	9	7.00	17	13.20					
<i>6. Religion</i>															
a) Hindu	17	13.20	32	24.80	2	20.20	2	17.10	97	75.20	2.255	0.89 5	Not significant		
b) Muslim	2	1.60	10	7.80	7	5.40	4	3.10	23	17.80					
c) Christian	1	0.80	4	3.10	2	1.60	2	1.60	9	7.00					
<i>7. Duration of consumption of alcohol</i>															
a) 5 months–10 years	9	7.00	29	22.50	2	16.30	1	12.40	75	58.10	0.602	0.47 5	Not significant		
b) 10 years–20 years	6	4.70	11	8.50	1	10.10	9	7.00	39	30.320					
c) 20 years–30 years	3	2.30	4	3.10	1	0.80	1	0.80	9	7.00					
d) 30 years–40 years	2	1.60	2	1.60	0	0.00	2	1.60	6	4.70					
<i>8. Type of family</i>															
a) nuclear family	1	2.40	31	24.00	23	17.80	2	17.10	92	71.30	4.934	0.55 2	Not significant		
b) Joint family	3	2.30	13	10.10	12	9.30	5	3.90	33	25.60					
c) Broken family	1	0.80	2	1.60	0	0.00	1	0.80	4	3.10					
<i>9. Marital status</i>															
a) Married	5	3.90	12	9.30	4	3.10	7	5.40	28	21.70	5.561	0.47 4	Not significant		
b) Divorced	1	10.9	30	23.30	4	3.10	7	5.40	28	21.70					

	4	0												
c) Separated	1 4	10.9 0	30	23.30	28	21.70	2 1	16.3 0	93	72.10				
<i>10. Number of children</i>														
a) One	3	2.30	18	14.0	10	7.80	9	7.00	40	31.0	13.775	0.13 1	Not significant	
b) Two	1 0	7.80	12	9.30	9	7.00	1 1	8.50	42	32.60				
c) > Three	1	0.80	4	3.10	9	7.00	2	1.60	16	12.40				
d) No Children	6	4.70	12	9.30	7	5.40	6	4.70	31	24.0				
<i>11. Duration of marital life</i>														
a) 0–5 years	1 0	7.80	20	15.50	13	10.10	4	3.10	47	36.40	19.771	0.01 9	Not significant	
b) 5–10 years	8	6.20	13	10.10	14	10.90	1 1	8.50	46	35.70				
c) 11–20 years	2	1.60	10	7.80	7	5.40	6	4.70	25	19.40				
d) 20–30 years	0	0.00	3	2.30	1	0.80	7	5.40	11	8.50				
<i>12. Family history of drinking</i>														
a) Present	1 8	4.00	28	21.70	25	19.40	1 1	8.50	82	63.60	14.240	0.00 3	Significant	
b) Absent	2	1.60	18	14.00	10	7.80	1 7	13.2 0	47	36.40				

The above analysis (Table 12) revealed that there was a significant association between level of QoL among alcoholics with their selected demographic variables revealed there is a significant seen at age in years at the level of ($p < 0.000$), educational status of the alcoholics at the level of ($p < 0.001$), occupational status of the alcoholics at the level of ($p < 0.003$), family income in rupees at the level of ($p < 0.002$) family history of drinking at the level of ($p < 0.003$) were found to be significant, duration of marital life at the level of ($p < 0.019$) were found to be significant and other variables were not found to be significant. Hence, the research hypothesis RH_4 states that there was significant correlation between depression and QoL among alcoholics was accepted.

The abovementioned statistical analysis proved that there was a moderate negative correlation between depression and QoL among alcoholics [9–14].

CONCLUSION

The main objective of the study is to correlate and assess the psychological impact on QoL among alcoholics, by using DASS 21 standardized scale.

The statistical examination indicated a moderate negative correlation between depression and QoL among alcoholics, as well as a similar moderate negative correlation between anxiety and QoL, both significant at a level of 0.000. Additionally, a robust moderate correlation was observed between stress and QoL among alcoholics, also significant at a level of 0.000.

REFERENCES

1. Plata A, Motoki K, Spence C, Velasco C. Trends in alcohol consumption in relation to the COVID-19 pandemic: a cross-country analysis. *Int J Gastron Food Sci.* 2022;27:100397. doi: 10.1016/j.ijgfs.2021.100397.
2. World Health Organization. (2024). Global status report on alcohol and health and treatment of

- substance use disorders. Available at <https://www.who.int/publications/i/item/9789240096745>
3. World Health Organization. (1992). The ICD-10 classification of mental and behavioral disorders: clinical descriptions and diagnostic guidelines. Available at <https://www.who.int/publications/i/item/9241544228>
 4. Hurcom C, Copello A, Orford J. The family and alcohol: effects of excessive drinking and conceptualizations of spouses over recent decades. *Subst Use Misuse*. 2000;35(4):473–502.
 5. Girish N, Kavita R, Gururaj G, Benegal V. Alcohol use and implications for public health: patterns of use in four communities. *Indian J Community Med*. 2020;35(2):238–44.
 6. Aswal S, Mathur A, Singh H. Study of psychiatric morbidity, and psycho sexual dysfunction in patients of alcohol dependence. *Delhi Psychiatr J*. 2018;16(2):379–83.
 7. Kumar PNS, Thomas B. Family intervention therapy in alcohol dependence syndrome: One-year follow-up study. *Indian J Psychiatry*. 2007;49(3):200–4. doi: 10.4103/0019-5545.37322.
 8. Gazdag G, Ungvari GS. Electroconvulsive therapy: 80 years old and still going strong. *World J Psychiatry*. 2019;9(1):1–6. doi: 10.5498/wjp.v9.i1.1.
 9. Payne NA, Prudic J. Electroconvulsive Therapy Part I: a Perspective on the Evolution and Current Practice of ECT. *J Psychiatr Pract*. 2009;15(5):346–68.
 10. Sabbatini RME. The History of Shock Therapy in Psychiatry. (2015). Available at http://www.cerebromente.org.br/n04/historia/shock_i.htm
 11. Luchini F. *Mental Health Nursing*. Edinburgh, UK: Churchill Livingstone; 2015. p. 235–9.
 12. Stuart GW. *Principles and Practice of Psychiatric Nursing*, 10th edition. Elsevier; 2011.
 13. Kalita B. A study to assess the effectiveness of psychoeducation on knowledge and attitude towards electroconvulsive therapy among the care givers of mentally ill patients at Gauhati Medical College & Hospital, Guwahati, Assam. *Int J Sci Res (IJSR)*. 2022;11(3):565–72.
 14. Nagarajan P, Balachandar G, Menon V, Saravanan B. Effect of a video-assisted teaching program about ECT on knowledge and attitude of caregivers of patients with major mental illness. *Indian J Psychol Med*. 2021;43(1):45–50. doi: 10.1177/0253717620938038.