

# QUALITY OF LIFE AND COMPLIANCE AMONG TYPE 2 DIABETIC PATIENTS

Wisit Chaveepojnkamjorn<sup>1</sup> Natchaporn Pichainarong<sup>2</sup>, Frank-Peter Schelp<sup>3</sup>  
and Udomsak Mahaweerawat<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Department of Epidemiology, Faculty of Public Health, Mahidol University, Bangkok, Thailand; <sup>2</sup>Faculty of Public Health, Mahasarakham University, Maha Sarakham, Thailand; <sup>3</sup>Charité University Medicine Berlin, Berlin, Germany

**Abstract.** A cross-sectional study was conducted to explore the quality of life (QOL) and compliance among type 2 diabetic patients in Saraburi Province, Thailand. Compliance was assessed by evaluating dietary intake and life style patterns useful for diabetes patients to maintain health and prevent complications of the disease. A multistage sampling technique was used for selecting patients from 2 districts (Wihan Daeng and Nong Don) and subjects were classified into 2 groups according to a quality of life (QOL) score (good = 70, poor to moderate = 94) using WHOQOL-BREF-THAI criteria. Data were collected from September to December 2007 using a self-administered questionnaire. Simple descriptive statistics were used to provide basic information about the two groups and for analytical purposes the chi-square test and multiple logistic regression were applied. The majority (78.7%) of study participants were females. Most patients belonged to the age groups of either  $\geq 50$  years (50%) or 40-49 years (36.6%). Bivariate analysis revealed socio-demographic factors were not significantly associated with QOL ( $p > 0.05$ ). As far as compliance was concerned dietary control and drug intake were significantly associated with QOL ( $p < 0.05$ ). Multivariate analysis indicated that overall compliance was associated with QOL (OR = 1.91, 95% CI = 1.02-3.57). We conclude that good QOL is significantly related to good compliance. Therefore, diabetic patients should be made aware that following the suggestions to prevent side effects of the disease and trying to stay healthy despite suffering from the disease will significantly improve their QOL.

## INTRODUCTION

The number of people with diabetes mellitus (DM) is steadily increasing in Southeast Asia due to population growth, aging, urbanization, and the increasing prevalence of obesity as well as physical inactivity (WHO and IDF, 2004). The prevalence of DM is dramatically rising worldwide; 171 million people suffered from diabetes in 2000, and it is expected

that this figure will double to 366 million by 2030 (Wild *et al*, 2004). In Thailand, the prevalence of DM has risen from 5.7% in 1991 to 9.6% in 2000 (Thai Multicenter Research Group on Diabetes Mellitus, 1994; Aekplakorn *et al*, 2003). The biggest impact is felt by adults of working age in developing countries.

The World Health Organization (WHO) has established two main objectives in caring for diabetic patients: first, maintain the health and quality of life of individuals with diabetes through effective patient care and education and second, treat and prevent complications of the disease which should decrease morbidity and mortality as well as reduce treatment lost.

---

Correspondence: Wisit Chaveepojnkamjorn, Department of Epidemiology, Faculty of Public Health, Mahidol University, 420/1 Ratchawithi Road, Bangkok 10400, Thailand.

Tel: 66 (0) 2354 8563; Fax: 66 (0) 2354 8562

E-mail: phwcv@mucc.mahidol.ac.th

To achieve these objectives is not easy unless there is a good cooperation from patients. However, if these objectives can be achieved, diabetic patients may obtain the same quality of life as healthy people. The goals of this investigation were to explore the quality of life (QOL) of type 2 diabetic patients and relate QOL to compliance.

## MATERIALS AND METHODS

### Study population and data collection

A cross-sectional study was conducted from September to December, 2007 in order to study compliance and QOL of type 2 diabetic patients in Saraburi Province, Thailand. A multistage technique was used to select DM patients from the health centers in 2 districts of the province (Wihan Daeng and Nong Don). The participants of the survey were allocated to 2 groups according to a good- or moderate to poor QOL (good = 70, moderate to poor = 94) using WHOQOL-BREF-THAI criteria (Mahatnirunkul *et al*, 1998). The WHOQOL-BREF-THAI is a Thai version of a QOL (as an individual's perception of their position in life) assessment instrument developed by the WHO (Harper and Power, 1998). Subjects with scores  $\geq 96$  were classified as having good QOL.

Each subject gave written consent to participate in the study after details of the study were described. A face to face interview was conducted and the weight and height were measured by trained health staff. The questionnaire consisted of 3 parts: socio-demographic indicators, information about the health of the patients and their compliance in terms of dietary control, physical exercise, medication use and foot care.

For describing socio-demographic factors simple descriptive statistics were used. Bivariate analysis was performed using the chi-square test to differentiate proportional exposures between DM patients with good and

moderate to poor QOL to determine categorical variables suitable for multiple logistic regression analysis, which was used to estimate the adjusted odds ratios and their 95% CI for OR as measures of association including identification and adjustment for confounding variables. Statistical significance was set at a p-value  $< 0.05$ .

### Sample size

The sample size was calculated using the following formula (Lemeshow *et al*, 1990):

$$n = \frac{\{Z_{\alpha/2}\sqrt{2P(1-P)} + Z_{\beta}\sqrt{P_1(1-P_1) + P_0(1-P_0)}\}^2}{(P_1 - P_0)^2}$$

Where  $n$  = the minimum number of DM patients to be included,  $P_0$  = the proportion of good compliance in the moderate to poor QOL group = 0.40,  $P_1$  = the proportion of good compliance in the good QOL group = 0.70,  $Z_{\alpha/2} = 1.96$  at  $\alpha = 0.05$ ,  $Z_{\beta} = 1.64$  at  $\beta = 0.05$ ,  $P = 0.55$  ( $P_1$  and  $P_0$  were obtained by a pilot study); the sample size in each group was at least 69 individuals.

The study proposal was reviewed and approved by the Ethics Committee for Human Research of the Faculty of Public Health, Mahidol University.

## RESULTS

The main baseline and demographic characteristics of the patients are given in Table 1. The majority (78.7%) of study participants were females. Most patients belonged to the age group of either  $\geq 50$  years (50%) or 40-49 years (36.6%). Seventy-eight point one percent finished only primary school. Most were married (79.3%), and Buddhist (98.2%). About half (53.7%) had a body mass index (BMI)  $< 25$  kg/m<sup>2</sup>. The average monthly family income was  $< 5,000$  baht in 54.9% and many (47.6%) were employees.

On bivariate analysis, factors significantly associated with QOL by the Pearson

Table 1  
Baseline and demographic characteristics of type 2 diabetes patients.

| Variables                             | Overall<br>No. (%) | Good QOL <sup>a</sup><br>No. (%) | Moderate to poor QOL<br>No. (%) |
|---------------------------------------|--------------------|----------------------------------|---------------------------------|
| Gender                                |                    |                                  |                                 |
| Female                                | 129 (78.7)         | 55 (78.6)                        | 74 (78.8)                       |
| Male                                  | 35 (21.3)          | 15 (21.4)                        | 20 (21.3)                       |
| Age (yrs)                             |                    |                                  |                                 |
| 30-39                                 | 22 (13.4)          | 9 (12.9)                         | 13 (13.8)                       |
| 40-49                                 | 60 (36.6)          | 26 (37.1)                        | 34 (36.2)                       |
| ≥ 50                                  | 82 (50.0)          | 35 (50.0)                        | 47 (50.0)                       |
| Mean (SD)                             | 48.56 (7.5)        | 48.31 (7.9)                      | 48.74 (7.3)                     |
| Min-Max                               | 30-59              | 30-59                            | 30-59                           |
| Weight (kg)                           |                    |                                  |                                 |
| Mean (SD)                             | 65.14 (13.3)       | 66.16 (15.2)                     | 64.38 (11.7)                    |
| Height (cm)                           |                    |                                  |                                 |
| Mean (SD)                             | 159.57 (6.6)       | 159.21 (6.8)                     | 159.83 (6.5)                    |
| BMI (kg/m <sup>2</sup> )              |                    |                                  |                                 |
| < 25                                  | 88 (53.7)          | 34 (48.6)                        | 54 (57.4)                       |
| 25-30                                 | 45 (27.4)          | 23 (32.9)                        | 22 (23.4)                       |
| > 30                                  | 31 (18.9)          | 13 (18.6)                        | 18 (19.1)                       |
| Mean (SD)                             | 25.71 (5.0)        | 26.17 (4.9)                      | 25.38 (5.1)                     |
| Min-Max                               | 18.39-36.62        | 18.39-36.62                      | 18.45-35.79                     |
| Marital status                        |                    |                                  |                                 |
| Married                               | 130 (79.3)         | 60 (85.7)                        | 70 (74.5)                       |
| Single                                | 10 (6.1)           | 3 (4.3)                          | 7 (7.4)                         |
| Widowed, Divorced, Separated          | 24 (14.6)          | 7 (10.0)                         | 17 (18.1)                       |
| Religion                              |                    |                                  |                                 |
| Buddhism                              | 161 (98.2)         | 69 (98.6)                        | 92 (97.9)                       |
| Other                                 | 3 (1.8)            | 1 (1.4)                          | 2 (2.1)                         |
| Education                             |                    |                                  |                                 |
| Primary school                        | 128 (78.0)         | 58 (82.9)                        | 70 (74.5)                       |
| No formal education                   | 7 (4.3)            | 2 (2.9)                          | 5 (5.3)                         |
| Secondary                             | 21 (12.8)          | 5 (7.1)                          | 16 (17.0)                       |
| Vocational school, Diploma and higher | 8 (4.9)            | 5 (7.1)                          | 3 (3.2)                         |
| Occupation                            |                    |                                  |                                 |
| Agriculturist                         | 27 (16.5)          | 12 (17.1)                        | 15 (16.0)                       |
| Merchant                              | 24 (14.6)          | 9 (12.9)                         | 15 (16.0)                       |
| Employee/Laborer                      | 78 (47.6)          | 33 (47.1)                        | 45 (47.9)                       |
| House work                            | 32 (19.5)          | 14 (20.0)                        | 18 (19.1)                       |
| Government officer, State enterprise  | 3 (1.8)            | 2 (2.9)                          | 1 (1.0)                         |
| Family income/month (baht)            |                    |                                  |                                 |
| < 5,000                               | 90 (54.9)          | 34 (48.6)                        | 56 (59.6)                       |
| 5,000 - 9,999                         | 54 (32.9)          | 26 (37.1)                        | 28 (29.8)                       |
| ≥ 10,000                              | 20 (12.2)          | 10 (14.3)                        | 10 (10.6)                       |
| Mean (SD)                             | 6,966.95 (6,312.8) | 7,812.57 (7,492.54)              | 6,337.23 (5,220.80)             |
| Median (QD)                           | 5,000 (3,000)      | 5,940 (3,500)                    | 5,000 (2,500)                   |
| Min-Max                               | 1,000-50,000       | 1,000-50,000                     | 1,000-30,000                    |

<sup>a</sup>QOL = quality of life

Table 2  
Sociodemographic factors associated with QOL<sup>a</sup> among type 2 diabetes patients.

| Variables                             | Quality of life              |      | p-value <sup>c</sup> |
|---------------------------------------|------------------------------|------|----------------------|
|                                       | Good QOL <sup>b</sup> /total | %    |                      |
| Gender                                |                              |      | 0.981                |
| Female                                | 55/129                       | 42.6 |                      |
| Male                                  | 15/35                        | 42.9 |                      |
| Age (yrs)                             |                              |      | 0.981                |
| 30-39                                 | 9/22                         | 40.9 |                      |
| 40-49                                 | 26/60                        | 43.3 |                      |
| ≥ 50                                  | 35/82                        | 42.7 |                      |
| BMI (kg/m <sup>2</sup> )              |                              |      | 0.386                |
| < 25                                  | 34/88                        | 38.6 |                      |
| 25-30                                 | 23/45                        | 51.1 |                      |
| > 30                                  | 13/31                        | 41.9 |                      |
| Marital status                        |                              |      | 0.330                |
| Married                               | 60/130                       | 46.1 |                      |
| Single                                | 3/10                         | 30   |                      |
| Widowed, Divorced,<br>Separated       | 7/24                         | 29.2 |                      |
| Religion                              |                              |      | 0.219                |
| Buddhist                              | 69/161                       | 42.9 |                      |
| Others                                | 1/3                          | 33.3 |                      |
| Education                             |                              |      | 0.139                |
| Primary school                        | 58/128                       | 45.3 |                      |
| No formal education                   | 2/7                          | 28.6 |                      |
| Secondary                             | 5/21                         | 23.8 |                      |
| Vocational school, Diploma and higher | 5/8                          | 62.5 |                      |
| Occupation                            |                              |      | 0.906                |
| Agriculturist                         | 12/27                        | 44.4 |                      |
| Merchant                              | 9/24                         | 37.5 |                      |
| Employee/Laborer                      | 33/78                        | 42.3 |                      |
| House work                            | 14/32                        | 43.7 |                      |
| Government officer, State enterprise  | 2/3                          | 66.7 |                      |
| Family income/month (baht)            |                              |      | 0.193                |
| < 5,000                               | 34/90                        | 37.8 |                      |
| ≥ 5,000                               | 36/74                        | 48.6 |                      |

<sup>a</sup>QOL = quality of life

<sup>b</sup>Good QOL = the number of patients with good QOL

<sup>c</sup>p-value of the Pearson chi-square test

chi-square test ( $p < 0.05$ ) were the combined factors of compliance with dietary control and medication compliance. Other variables were not significantly associated with QOL (Table 2

and Table 3).

Logistic regression revealed an association between compliance and good QOL (OR = 1.91, 95%CI = 1.02-3.57).

Table 3  
Health factors and behavioral compliance associated with QOL<sup>a</sup> among type 2 diabetic patients.

| Variables                     | Quality of life              |      | p-value <sup>c</sup> |
|-------------------------------|------------------------------|------|----------------------|
|                               | Good QOL <sup>b</sup> /total | %    |                      |
| Duration of DM (yrs)          |                              |      | 0.221                |
| 1-5                           | 64/144                       | 44.4 |                      |
| 6-10                          | 6/20                         | 30.0 |                      |
| FPG (mg/dl)                   |                              |      | 0.599                |
| ≤ 120                         | 22/56                        | 39.3 |                      |
| 121-160                       | 30/63                        | 47.6 |                      |
| > 160                         | 18/45                        | 40.0 |                      |
| Systolic BP (mmHg)            |                              |      | 0.455                |
| ≤ 120                         | 34/71                        | 47.9 |                      |
| 121-140                       | 27/72                        | 37.5 |                      |
| > 140                         | 9/21                         | 42.9 |                      |
| Diastolic BP (mmHg)           |                              |      | 0.238                |
| ≤ 80                          | 44/111                       | 39.6 |                      |
| 81-90                         | 22/41                        | 53.7 |                      |
| > 90                          | 4/12                         | 33.3 |                      |
| Overall behavioral compliance |                              |      | 0.042                |
| poor                          | 41/83                        | 49.4 |                      |
| good                          | 29/81                        | 35.8 |                      |
| Compliance of Dietary control |                              |      | 0.003                |
| poor                          | 20/69                        | 29.0 |                      |
| good                          | 50/95                        | 52.6 |                      |
| Exercise                      |                              |      | 0.367                |
| poor                          | 36/91                        | 39.5 |                      |
| good                          | 34/73                        | 46.6 |                      |
| Drug intake                   |                              |      | <0.001               |
| poor                          | 12/60                        | 20.0 |                      |
| good                          | 58/104                       | 55.8 |                      |
| Foot care                     |                              |      | 0.754                |
| poor                          | 33/75                        | 44.0 |                      |
| good                          | 37/89                        | 41.6 |                      |

<sup>a</sup>QOL = quality of life

<sup>b</sup>Good QOL = the number of patients with good QOL

<sup>c</sup>p-value of the Pearson chi-square test

## DISCUSSION

The majority of study subjects were females (50%) age ≥ 50 years. The proportion of subjects with DM in the older age group was higher than in the younger and middle

aged groups. A number of studies reported that diabetes mellitus is more common in females than males (Wild *et al*, 2004; Akinci *et al*, 2008). Females were reported as more interested in their health than males. DM patients here were classified by their QOL. Even

though the monthly family income was not significantly associated with QOL, it was found that a higher QOL was positively associated with a higher monthly family income, which is in agreement with some reports that indicated that poverty was an important indicator for health status (Chrvala and Bulger, 1999; Guillausseau, 2005). Those with a duration of DM > 5 years, FPG > 160 mg/dl, systolic BP > 140 mg/dl or diastolic BP > 90 mg/dl were less likely to have a QOL than those with normal levels, but the difference was not significant.

Good compliance was associated with a higher QOL which is in agreement with a number of other authors (Honish *et al*, 2006; Huang and Hung, 2007; Wattana *et al*, 2007). In particular, compliance with dietary control, exercise, and medication use were positively associated with QOL, while foot-care was not associated with QOL. A possible reason for this finding is that the majority of participants were new patients having DM less than 5 years and with no complications. The results of logistic regression indicate that good compliance in various aspects results in a higher QOL than poor compliance, however exercise and foot-care had no statistically significant association with QOL. It has been suggested that type 2 diabetic patients who correctly control sugars in their daily meal plan improve their perceived quality of life (Nadeau *et al*, 2001). Efforts focused on DM patients are needed to encourage greater compliance. Regular education of patients with DM is an important strategy which may lead to improved compliance and better quality of life (Glasgow *et al*, 2006).

#### ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The authors would like to express their sincere thanks for the practical support given by the staff of the health office of the Saraburi Province. We also would like to thank those

for their kindness and encouragement who could not be mentioned here.

#### REFERENCES

- Aekplakorn W, Stolk RP, Heal B, *et al*. The prevalence and management of diabetes in Thai adults: the international collaborative study of cardiovascular disease in Asia. *Diabetes Care* 2003; 26: 2758-63.
- Akinci F, Yildirim A, Gozu H, Sargin H, Orbay E, Sargin M. Assessment of health-related quality of life (HRQoL) of patients with type 2 diabetes in Turkey. *Diabetes Res Clin Pract* 2008 79: 117-23.
- Chrvala CA, Bulger RJ, eds. Leading health indicators for healthy people 2010. Washington DC: National Academy of Sciences, 1999.
- Glasgow RE, Nutting PA, Toobert DJ, *et al*. Effects of a brief computer-assisted diabetes self-management intervention on dietary, biological and quality-of-life outcomes. *Chronic Illn* 2006; 2: 27-38.
- Guillausseau PJ. Impact of compliance with oral antihyperglycemic agents on health outcomes in type 2 diabetes mellitus: a focus on frequency of administration. *Treat Endocrinol* 2005; 4: 167-75.
- Harper A, Power M, the WHOQOL group. Development of the World Health Organization WHOQOL-BREF quality of life assessment. *Psychol Med* 1998; 28: 551-8.
- Honish A, Westerfield W, Ashby A, Momin S, Phillippi R. Health-related quality of life and treatment compliance with diabetes care. *Dis Manag* 2006; 9: 195-200.
- Huang MC, Hung CH. Quality of life and its predictors for middle-aged and elderly patients with type 2 diabetes mellitus. *J Nurs Res* 2007; 15: 193-201.
- Lemeshow S, Hosmer DW, Klar J, Lwanga SK. Adequacy of sample size in health studies. Chichester: John Wiley & Sons, 1990.
- Mahatnirunkul S, Tuntipivatanakul W, Pumpisanchai W, *et al*. Comparison of the WHOQOL-100 and the WHOQOL-BREF (26 items). *J Ment*

- Health Thai* 1998; 5: 4-15.
- Nadeau J, Koski KG, Strychar I, Yale JF. Teaching subjects with type 2 diabetes how to incorporate sugar choices into their daily meal plan promotes dietary compliance and does not deteriorate metabolic profile. *Diabetes Care* 2001; 24: 222-7.
- Thai Multicenter Research Group on Diabetes Mellitus. Vascular complications in non-insulin dependent diabetics in Thailand. *Diabetes Res Clin Pract* 1994; 25: 61-9.
- Wattana C, Srisuphan W, Pothiban L, Upchurch SL. Effects of a diabetes self-management program on glycemic control, coronary heart disease risk, and quality of life among Thai patients with type 2 diabetes. *Nurs Health Sci* 2007; 9: 135-41.
- Wild S, Roglic G, Green A, Sicree R, King H. Global prevalence of diabetes: estimates for the year 2000 and projections for 2030. *Diabetes Care* 2004; 27: 1047-53.
- World Health Organization, International Diabetes Federation. Diabetes action now: an initiative of the World Health Organization and The International Diabetes Federation. Geneva: World Health Organization, 2004.