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**Abstract**

Background: Old age is the period of life when people suffer from a variety of degenerative conditions.

Objectives: This study investigates a population of over-60s in a rural Thai province to examine the relationships between living alone, health-related behaviours and incidence of chronic illness.

Methods: This study was descriptive study. All of population were purposively selected in this study included 572 of over-60s , who had presented for treatment during January 7 to August 6, 2011 at five community “health promotion” hospitals in Kong Krailat district, in Thailand. The research employed a purpose-designed structured interview. Possible associations between presence of healthy and unhealthy behaviours and reported health status were examined using logistic regression analysis and odds ratios (OR), confidence intervals (CI), and chi-square results were calculated.

Results: Those living alone were somewhat more likely to be socially isolated, have high-fat diets, and engage in low levels of regular physical activity. However after controlling for confounding variables, significant associations were found only between living alone and high alcohol use and problems in managing stressful life events. Older people living alone were more than twice as likely to use alcohol to hazardous levels as those living with a caregiver and more than twice as likely to report difficulty in managing stressful life events. The likelihood of depression as diagnosed by a hospital physician or nurse was 4.82 times higher in those living alone (OR =3.96, 95% confidence interval [CI] = 1.1 to 13.4).
Conclusion: Given the results of this study, we suggest that increased attention must be focused on the interaction between alcohol use, coping with stress and depressive illness.
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Introduction
Population aging is expected to be among the most prominent global demographic trends of the 21st century. The level and pace of population aging vary widely by geographic region. In Thailand, as in most other countries, the proportion of older people is increasing steadily. Consequently, the number of elders living alone has also increased.

Old age is a period of life when people may face degenerative problems with physical, mental and social dimensions. Older people are vulnerable to a range of communicable and non-communicable diseases, such as dementia, diabetes, osteoporosis and cataract, all of which may lead to disability. It has been found that more than 40% of older people have at least one underlying disease and 75% suffer from chronic disease. Much of this illness results from unhealthy behaviors such as insufficient physical exercise, poor diet, and tobacco and alcohol use, which may all contribute to increased morbidity and mortality.

Older people living alone may be especially vulnerable: they have been described as an ‘at risk’ group by the World Health Organisation. Living alone may exacerbate physical and mental health problems, particularly since the support of an extended family, valued in Asian cultures, is absent. Lone elders with more than two chronic health problems may be at higher risk of not receiving proper health screening. In later life chronic disease means, at

---

best, an undesirable state and, at worst, a greater risk of early mortality\textsuperscript{11}. Moreover the cumulative impacts of old age, chronic illness and living alone have not been properly studied, so that little is known about the functional status of community-dwelling, live-alone, elderly persons\textsuperscript{12}.

Older adults living alone have fewer social connections\textsuperscript{13}, and make higher demands on health and social services\textsuperscript{14}. Many lack an accessible point of contact in case of emergency\textsuperscript{15}. Emotional support is especially important for older people who face a variety of age-related challenges to their functional abilities and health, but may be absent for many\textsuperscript{16}. Moreover, although many older people would opt to live independent lives in their own homes for as long as possible when provided with appropriate support, this may not be available\textsuperscript{17}.

Recent social and demographic changes affecting Thailand mean that the numbers of older people living alone without a caregiver are increasing. Economic development and the growth of manufacturing and service jobs in the cities have led to large-scale migration from agricultural provinces and huge changes in the structure of rural communities. There are fewer people of working age, a breakup of extended families, and a disturbance of traditional patterns of inter-generational caring. The relative under-representation of people of working age, means that fewer careers are available when older people experience health problems. A growing number are left alone, while often being dependent on money sent from children in the city\textsuperscript{18} \textsuperscript{19}. Rural communities have adopted urban values and ways of life, so that community support for such lone elders may be very limited. Most of the elderly living alone are female and aged more than 70 years\textsuperscript{20}. The proportion of older people living alone
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increased from 3.6% in 1994 to 6.3% in 2002 and 7.7% in 2007\textsuperscript{21}. The Northern Region appeared to be the region that had highest percentage of the elderly living by themselves\textsuperscript{22}. Khuha & Thammanwat,\textsuperscript{23} found that, in the Northern Region, 31.7% of total elderly living alone were suffered from hypertension, 13.3% from diabetes, 7.0% from cancer, 1.6% from cerebral infarction 2.5% from paralysis/paresis and 0.5% from heart conditions In respect of mental health among the elderly, this study found that 4.8% suffered from depression.

The above suggests the need for future research on the health status of older people living alone with no care-giver. This study seeks to make a contribution by investigating the relationship between lone status, health-related behaviours and the incidence of chronic condition, in older people. If there are significant associations, health care practitioners may be well advised to use lone status as a trigger for further investigation and assessment, so that any unmet need can be addressed.

**Materials and Methods**

The researchers purposively selected a district in Sukhothai province, a rural area in the lower Northern Region of Thailand, for this study because the North has been identified as the Thai region with the highest proportion of older people living alone. Living alone are those who loss of a partner through death, illness or the end of a relationship. While circumstances rather than active choice led many older people to becoming single, once their partner had died or left, they made a positive choice to live alone rather than to move in with family members. The participants recruited for the research were drawn from all those over the age of 60 who had received treatment in a seven months period at five community “health promotion” hospitals in Kong Krailat district, Sukhothai province. All of population were purposively selected in this study included 572 of over-60s.

The study was approved by the Research Ethics Committee of Naresuan University. The target group of patients for inclusion in the study had presented for treatment at five community health promotion hospitals between January 7 and August 6, 2011. Diagnoses made by community nurse practitioners or physicians were obtained from medical records for use in the study. The criteria for selection for interview were as follows: can communicate in Thai, normal perception of time, place and person, able to hear, understand, and willing to join the study. Of the six hundred and fifty three named patients over the age of 60 identified
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from the records of the five hospitals, five hundred and seventy two met the criteria for inclusion in the study (87.59%).

**Data collection**

Data were collected from structured, face-to-face interviews. The two authors were assisted by 10 community hospital officers, who received training on carrying out interviews and recording data. The interview schedule included questions on demographic information, including age, gender, level of education, and career, and residential status (living alone or with care-giver). One item specifically asked the participants to indicate the degree to which they engaged in specified health promoting or unhealthy behaviours. This item was based on the Health Promoting Lifestyles Profile II (HPLPII) developed by Walker, Sechrist, and Pender, and associated with Pender’s health promotion model. Respondents were asked about tobacco smoking, alcohol use, high fat consumption, fruit and vegetable in the diet, degree of social isolation, ability to manage stressful events, religious activity, access to health information, physical exercise, oral health care and regular physical check-ups. An additional item asked respondents for further information on chronic conditions recorded in their medical records and originally diagnosed by a physician or community nurse. The key measurements were degree of health promoting behaviours and chronic conditions.

**Statistical analysis**

Descriptive statistical analysis was utilised to calculate percentages, means and standard deviations (SD). Possible associations between the independent variable (living status) and dependent variables (including health behaviours and chronic disease) were examined using binary logistic regression analysis, and the odds ratio (OR), confidence interval (CI), and chi-square values were calculated.

**Results**

The demographic profile of the older people living alone with chronic disease in this study was as follows. The majority of participants were female (66.85%). The largest age group were 71-75 years of age (31.51%) with roughly equal proportions in the 60-65 years group (18.18%), the 66-70 years group (18.71%) and the 76-80 years group (16.57%). With respect to level of education, most had left school after completing primary education or similar (90.37 %), with the next largest group having had no formal education (5.88%). The majority had either had no formal occupation (69.5%) or worked in agriculture (11.76%) (Table 1).
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Older people living with caregivers in this study had similar demographic characteristics, though with some differences in reported employment patterns. Again the majority were female (64.16%). The largest group were aged 71-75 years (32.72%) followed by the 66-70 years group (19.22%), the 60-65 years group (18.70%) and the 76-80 years group (16.62%). Most has left school after primary education (93.24%) or had no education (4.41%). A somewhat higher proportion reported having had no formal occupation (75.32%) and a higher proportion has worked in agriculture (14.8%) (Table 1).

With regard to health-related behaviours, those living alone were somewhat more likely to be socially isolated, have high-fat diets, and engage in low levels of regular physical exercise. They also had more involvement in religious activity – usually deemed to be a positive behaviour. However, after controlling for age, sex, education level and employment background, residential status was found to be significantly associated only with excessive alcohol use, and problems in managing stressful life events. Those living alone were 2.73 times more likely to report alcohol use to hazardous levels than those living with a caregiver, and 2.43 times more likely to report problems in managing stressful life events than those living with caregiver. There were no significant differences between the two groups regarding smoking tobacco, fruit and fibre in diet, access to health information, oral health care and regular physical check-ups (Table 2).

Residential status was found to be significantly associated with depression, but not with asthma, high blood pressure, diabetes, coronary heart disease, osteoporosis, stroke, arthritis/rheumatism and cataracts. Odds ratios (OR) for chronic conditions, both crude and adjusted (for controlling age, sex, education level, and career), after analysis in a second multivariate model, showed that only one chronic condition remained significantly more prevalent in those living alone: the likelihood of depression was 4.82 times higher in those living alone (OR =3.96, 95% confidence interval [CI] = 1.1 to 13.4.) (Table 3)

Discussion
This study supports the finding of past studies\textsuperscript{26, 27} that substantial numbers of older people with chronic disease live alone with minimal support, but found that the majority of elders with chronic conditions lived with care-givers. A third of the participants ($N = 187$) lived alone and two thirds ($N = 385$) lived with caregivers.

\textsuperscript{26} Choowattanapakorn, T. The social situation in Thailand: the impact on elderly people. International Journal of Nursing Practice, 1999; 5, 95–99.
Perhaps surprisingly, the study found no statistically significant association between living alone and the majority of the health-related behaviours examined. Older people living alone were more likely to report unhealthy behaviours, but there were statistically significant associations in only two areas. Those living alone were 2.73 times more likely to use alcohol, and 2.48 times more likely to report difficulties in managing stressful life events than those living with a caregiver.

Nor was there an association between lone status and common chronic diseases, with the exception of depression. What the study highlights is a specific set of problems affecting lone elders concerning alcohol use, poor management of stressful life events and depressive illness – factors which may well interact to lower the quality of life of the people concerned.

While alcohol use may itself be seen as one way of coping with stress, it nevertheless appears to be a behaviour associated with higher risks of morbidity and early mortality in older people. Even at moderate levels of consumption, alcohol use is associated with increased incidence of liver disease, oropharyngeal cancer, esophageal cancer and pancreatitis. Excessive alcohol intake has been shown to be associated with cardiovascular disease, liver disease, malignant neoplasms and neurological impairment. Alcohol use has also been reported to speed ageing in older populations. Furthermore, alcohol is one of the main causes of traffic accidents in Thailand.

The authors can only speculate about the precise reasons why lone elders in this study were more likely to drink alcohol to excess, but loneliness, stress reduction and coping with depression are probably all implicated. This research found a significant association between living alone and stressful life events. This finding needs to be considered alongside the finding that lone elder are 4.82 times more likely than those living with caregivers to have been diagnosed as suffering from depression. There is the possibility both that poor stress management contributes to depression, and that the depressed cope less well with stress.

Depression has become a major mental health problem for older people in Thailand. Several past studies have indicated that living alone and depression are significantly associated.

---

29 ibid
Recent demographic trends and work patterns may be contributing to a situation where older Thai people find themselves isolated after a lifetime in a culture that stresses the value of the extended family and family support. With the migration of people of working age to the cities, many Thai elders find themselves in communities with disproportionate numbers of older people and young children, and a shortage of fit adult carers. Jongudomkarn and Camfield\(^{36}\) found that many older people fear being left without economic support when times get tough. Thus there is probably a valid reason for them to feel depressed, particularly when they live alone with chronic disease and the lack of a caregiver. Feelings of abandonment appear to result in lower quality of life in terms of psychological factors, including overall enjoyment of life, having a meaningful life, and feelings of despair, anxiety and depression\(^{37}\). Thus this group may be locked into a downward cycle where stress and excessive alcohol use fuels depression, and where depressive illness adds to the inability to cope with stress or stop drinking.

The situation will be exacerbated for lone elders with additional chronic conditions, which while no more likely to affect them than elders living with carers, may have greater impact where social support is absent. High-blood pressure, arthritis/rheumatism, cataracts and diabetes were four common conditions affecting quite large numbers of both lone and supported older people in this study.

The limitations of the research should be acknowledged: it included only older people who could communicate in Thai, had normal perceptions of time, place and person, were able to hear and understand, and were willing to join the study. Therefore, the study may have under-represented those with severe mental illness or hearing difficulties, as well as more severely ill individuals registered with larger district hospitals, as opposed to the community health promotion hospitals utilised to recruit the sample. Moreover, face-to-face interviewing, while probably raising the response rate and allowing validation of answers

\(^{33}\) Thisted, C. Loneliness as a specific risk factor for depressive symptoms: cross-sectional and longitudinal analyses, Psychology and Aging, 2006; 21(1), 140–151.
from semi-literate respondents, may have influenced responses by encouraging patients to answer in expected ways.

**Conclusion**

Poor stress management, alcohol use and depressive illness were all manifest among older people living alone. Given the results of this study, we suggest that service providers should develop targeted interventions to address this specific complex of interacting problems. These need to be designed to take account of older people’s social contexts and lifestyles, and particularly to help elders to manage stress, alcohol use and depression, while living in rural villages affected by changing social structures and employment patterns.

In terms of policy and practice the paper highlighted the importance of promoting healthy behaviors in the older people living alone. These include stress management, healthy eating, regular exercise, none excessive alcohol and tobacco use. These would reduce the risk of chronic health problems, such as hypertension, heart diseases, diabetes, mellitus, cancer, and stroke. The government and health service providers should develop a health promotion strategies which facilitate and improve access for older people living alone to health services. Also the local community should promote the health care in order to help older people living alone at home which has a lower cost than care in hospital.
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Table 1. Demographic Characteristics.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Demographic data</th>
<th>Living alone N =187</th>
<th>Living with caregivers N=385</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>33.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>66.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age (years)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60-65</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>18.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66-70</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>18.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71-75</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>31.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76-80</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>16.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt;80</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>14.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational Background</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No education</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary school</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>90.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary-High school</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor or higher</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No formal employment</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>69.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Employee</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>11.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vendors</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>7.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>11.76</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2. Health Behaviors by Living Status and Unadjusted and Adjusted Odds Ratios of Health Behaviors Among Lone Elders.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Health Promoting/Unhealthy Behaviors</th>
<th>Living alone n (%) (total n = 187)</th>
<th>Living with caregiver n (%) (total n = 385)</th>
<th>Unadjusted OR (95% CI)</th>
<th>Adjusted OR (95% CI)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Smoke tobacco</td>
<td>35/187 (18.7)</td>
<td>63/385 (16.3)</td>
<td>1.17 (0.7 to 1.8)</td>
<td>0.96 (0.5 to 1.7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excessive alcohol use</td>
<td>28/187 (14.9)</td>
<td>27/385 (7.0)</td>
<td>22.23 (12 to 3.9)</td>
<td>2.73 (1.3 to 5.5)*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High fruit and fibre in diet</td>
<td>56/187 (29.9)</td>
<td>114/385 (29.6)</td>
<td>1.01 (0.6 to 1.4)</td>
<td>1.25 (0.8 to 1.9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High fat consumption</td>
<td>27/187 (14.4)</td>
<td>87/385 (22.0)</td>
<td>0.59 (0.3 to 0.9)*</td>
<td>0.70 (0.4 to 1.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Socially isolated</td>
<td>36/187 (23.6)</td>
<td>66/385 (20.6)</td>
<td>1.11 (0.7 to 1.7)</td>
<td>1.33 (0.8 to 2.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor stress management</td>
<td>30/187 (16.0)</td>
<td>19/385 (4.9)</td>
<td>3.68 (2.0 to 6.7)**</td>
<td>2.48 (1.2 to 4.9)*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religious activity</td>
<td>74/187 (39.5)</td>
<td>117/385 (30.3)</td>
<td>1.50 (1.0 to 2.1)*</td>
<td>1.44 (0.9 to 2.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low regular physical exercise</td>
<td>93/187 (49.7)</td>
<td>166/385 (43.1)</td>
<td>1.30 (0.9 to 1.8)</td>
<td>1.16 (0.7 to 1.7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low access to health information</td>
<td>53/187 (28.3)</td>
<td>171/385 (44.4)</td>
<td>0.49 (0.3 to 0.7)**</td>
<td>0.79 (0.5 to 1.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oral health care</td>
<td>75/187(40.1)</td>
<td>183/385 (47.53)</td>
<td>0.73 (0.5 to 1.0)</td>
<td>0.77 (0.5 to 1.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regular physical check ups</td>
<td>93/187 (49.7)</td>
<td>166/385 (43.1)</td>
<td>1.30 (0.9 to 1.8)</td>
<td>1.16 (0.7 to 1.7)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Adjusted for age, sex, education level, and employment. *P<0.05. **P<0.005. OR = odds ratio.

Table 3. Chronic Conditions by Living Status and Unadjusted and Adjusted Odds Ratios of Chronic Conditions Among Lone Elders.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Chronic conditions</th>
<th>Living alone n (%) (total n = 187)</th>
<th>Living with caregiver n (%) (total n = 385)</th>
<th>Unadjusted OR (95% CI)</th>
<th>Adjusted OR (95% CI)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High Blood pressure</td>
<td>89/187 (47.5)</td>
<td>160/385 (41.5)</td>
<td>1.40 (0.9 to 2.1)</td>
<td>1.37 (0.8 to 2.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diabetes</td>
<td>21/187 (11.2)</td>
<td>37/385 (9.6)</td>
<td>1.19 (0.6 to 2.0)</td>
<td>1.24 (0.6 to 2.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coronary heart disease</td>
<td>5/187 (2.6)</td>
<td>20/385 (5.1)</td>
<td>0.50 (0.1 to 1.3)</td>
<td>0.54 (0.1 to 1.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Depression</td>
<td>37/187 (19.7)</td>
<td>19/385 (4.9)</td>
<td>4.75 (2.6 to 8.5)**</td>
<td>4.82 (2.5 to 9.2)**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asthma</td>
<td>5/187 (2.7)</td>
<td>21/385 (5.76)</td>
<td>0.47 (0.1 to 1.2)</td>
<td>0.54 (0.1 to 1.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Osteoporosis</td>
<td>6/187 (3.2)</td>
<td>7/385 (1.8)</td>
<td>1.79 (0.5 to 5.4)</td>
<td>1.87 (0.6 to 5.7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stoke</td>
<td>1/187 (0.5)</td>
<td>11/385 (2.8)</td>
<td>0.18 (0.0 to 1.4)</td>
<td>0.19 (0.0 to 1.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arthritis/rheumatism</td>
<td>85/187 (45.4)</td>
<td>137/385 (35.5)</td>
<td>1.50 (1.0 to 2.1)*</td>
<td>1.32 (0.8 to 2.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cataracts</td>
<td>36/187 (23.6)</td>
<td>66/385 (20.6)</td>
<td>1.11 (0.7 to 1.7)</td>
<td>1.33 (0.8 to 2.1)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Adjusted for age, sex, education level, and employment. *P<0.05. **P<0.005. OR = odds ratio.