RESULTS

The aim of the present study was to identify the quality of life among long stay hospitalized schizophrenic patients. The study subjects consisted of 100 schizophrenic patients at Psychiatric and Mental Health Hospital in Benha City.

To fulfill the aim of the study, the collected data was analyzed, tabulated and presented in the following order:-

Part One: Socio-demographic characteristic of the studied subjects. Table (1)

Part Two: Clinical characteristic of the studied subjects .Table (2)

Part Three: Quality of life of the studied subjects. Table (3, 4 and 5) and total score of quality of life for the studied subjects. Table (6)

Part Four: Relation between total score of quality of life and sociodemographic characteristic of the studied subjects. Table (7). As well, relation between total score of quality of life and clinical characteristic of the studied subjects. Table (8).

Part One: Socio-demographic characteristic of the studied subjects.

Table (1): Number and percentage distribution of the studied subjects according to their socio-demographic characteristic (n=100).

Socio-demographic characteristic	No	%
Age		
• 20-<30	24	24.0
• 30-<40	38	38.0
• 40-<50	30	30.0
• 50-60	8	8.0
Mean ± SD	38.94 ±	9.68
Sex		
• Male	50	50.0
 Female 	50	50.0
Education level		
Illiterate	36	36.0
 Read and write 	4	4.0
 Primary 	18	18.0
 Preparatory 	12	12.0
Secondary	18	18.0
High education	12	12.0
Marital status		
 Single 	54	54.0
Married	28	28.0
 Divorced 	12	12.0
 Widowed 	6	6.0
Position in family		
Husband	12	12.0
• Wife	32	32.0
• Son	38	38.0
Daughter	18	18.0
Occupation		
Not work	81	81.0
Official	17	17.0
Free works	2	2.0
l		
Economical status		
 Sufficient 	19	19.0
 Not sufficient 	79	79.0
 Sufficient and more 	2	2.0
Total	100	100.0

This table showed that, the socio- demographic characteristic of the studied subjects. As regard age, highest percentage 38.0% of the studied subjects were between 30-<40 years with a mean age of 38.94 ± 9.68 years. As regard sex 50.0% were males and 50.0% were females. Concerning Education level, more than one third (36.0%) of the studied subjects were illiterate. In relation to marital status, more than half (54.0%) of the studied subjects were single. As regard position in family, 38.0% of the studied subjects were son. In relation to occupation, the majority (81.0%) of the studied subjects were not work. As regard economical status, more than two thirds (79.0%) of the studied subjects were not sufficient.

Part Two: Clinical characteristic of the studied subjects.

Table (2): Number and percentage distribution of the studied subjects according to their clinical characteristic (n=100).

Clinical characteristic	No	%
Onset of illness (years)		
• 1-<10	58	58.0
• 10-<20	35	35.0
• 20-<30	6	6.0
• 30 - 40	1	1.0
Mean ± SD	9.54	± 7.52
Recent admission(years)		
• 1-<5	54	54.0
• 5-<10	17	17.0
• 10 -15	29	29.0
Mean ± SD	4.7	± 4.16
Frequency of admission		
One time	48	48.0
Two time	20	20.0
Three times or more	32	32.0
Mean ± SD	1.84 ±	± 0.8844
Method of admission		
• Alone	6	6.0
By police	18	18.0
By family	76	76.0
Family history of psychiatric illness		
• Yes	23	23.0
• No	77	77.0
Symptoms lead to admission to hospital		
 Agitation 	35	35.0
 No eating, no sleeping, no interest for himself 	18	18.0
Both 1 and 2	5	5.0
 Auditory and visual hallucination 	24	24.0
 Delusion 	12	12.0
 Both 6 and 7 	4	4.0
 Isolation 	2	2.0
Medication given to patients		
 Safinace, Cognitol, Neurazine, Haldol 	5	5.0
 Safinace, Cognitol, Neurazine 	51	51.0
 Safinace, Cognitol, Haldol 	30	30.0
 Cognitol, Neurazine, Haldol 	14	14.0

Continued

Side effects which appear to patient		
Blurred vision	25	25.0
Dry mouth	8	8.0
 Feeling of dizziness 	34	34.0
 Muscle cramps 	2	2.0
 Sleep disturbance 	11	11.0
 All of the above 	20	20.0
Total	100	100.0

This table showed that, clinical characteristic of the studied subjects. As regard onset of illness, more than half (58.0%) of the studied subjects were from 1-<10 years and only 1.0% from 30-40 years with a mean onset of illness of 9.54 ± 7.52 years. As regard recent admission, 54.0% of the studied subjects were from 1-<5 years with a mean recent admission of 4.7 ± 4.16 years. Concerning frequency of admission, less than half (48.0%) of the studied subjects were one time with a mean frequency of admission of 1.84 ± 0.8844 time. In relation to method of admission, more than two thirds (76.0%) of the studied subjects were admitted by family and most (77.0%) of the studied subjects were no family history of psychiatric illness. In relation to symptoms lead to admission to hospital, more than third (35.0%) of the studied subjects were agitation. As regard medication given to patients, approximating half (51.0%) of the studied subjects given Safinace, Cognitol, and Neurazine. While, lowest were percentage (5.0%) of the studied subjects were given medications as Safinace, Cognitol, Neurazine and Haldol. More ever more than third (34.0%) of the studied subjects were feeling of dizziness as side effects.

Part Three: Quality of life of the studied subjects and total score of quality of life for the studied subjects.

Table (3): Quality of life of the studied subjects regarding to psychosocial items. (n = 100)

Dayah agasial itama	N	Never		Rarely		Sometimes		Often		Always	
Psychosocial items	No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%	
I worry about things	32	32.0	2	2.0	6	6.0	10	10.0	50	50.0	
I feel very mixed up and unsure of my self	20	20.0	8	8.0	28	28.0	22	22.0	22	22.0	
My feelings go up and down	6	6.0	10	10.0	32	32.0	16	16.0	36	36.0	
I'm Concerned that i won't get better	32	32.0	10	10.0	24	24.0	12	12.0	22	22.0	
I find it hard to concentrate	16	16.0	8	8.0	22	22.0	28	28.0	26	26.0	
I feel that people tend to avoid me	26	26.0	6	6.0	18	18.0	14	14.0	36	36.0	
I Worry about my future	42	42.0	0	0.0	20	20.0	18	18.0	20	20.0	
I find it difficult to mix with people	32	32.0	8	8.0	18	18.0	16	16.0	26	26.0	
I feel lonely	20	20.0	4	4.0	16	16.0	16	16.0	44	44.0	
I take things people say the wrong	42	42.0	6	6.0	22	22.0	10	10.0	20	20.0	
way											
I feel angry	22	22.0	12	12.0	24	24.0	14	14.0	28	28.0	
I feel very jumpy and edgy	22	22.0	26	26.0	24	24.0	8	8.0	20	20.0	
I feel hopeless	40	40.0	6	6.0	16	16.0	18	18.0	20	20.0	
I get upset thinking about the past	22	22.0	0	0.0	10	10.0	16	16.0	52	52.0	
I feel down and depressed	42	42.0	8	8.0	10	10.0	12	12.0	28	28.0	

This table illustrated that, quality of life of the studied subjects regarding psychosocial items; more than half (52.0%) of the studied subjects always get upset thinking about the past and 44.0% were feeling lonely. While, 42.0% of the studied subjects don't worry about their future.

Table (4): Quality of life of the studied subjects regarding to motivation and energy items. (n=100)

Motivation and energy	Never		Ra	Rarely		etimes	0	ften	Always	
items	No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%
I like to plan ahead	14	14.0	28	28.0	26	26.0	12	12.0	20	20.0
I am able to carry out my day-to- day activities	20	20.0	12	12.0	32	32.0	10	10.0	26	26.0
I feel that I can cope	10	10.0	14	14.0	30	30.0	22	22.0	24	24.0
I tend to stay at home	16	16.0	18	18.0	10	10.0	8	8.0	48	48.0
I lack the energy to do things	26	26.0	10	10.0	24	24.0	14	14.0	26	26.0
I can't be bothered to do things	62	62.0	12	12.0	24	24.0	2	2.0	0	0.0
I take part in enjoyable activities	12	12.0	26	26.0	18	18.0	12	12.0	32	32.0

This table illustrated that, quality of life of the studied subjects regarding motivation and energy items; most (62.0%) of the studied subjects can be bothered to do things and 48.0% were tend to stay at home. While, approximately one third (32.0%) of the studied subjects were able to carried out their day-to- day activities and took part in enjoyable activities.

Table (5): Quality of life of the studied subjects regarding symptoms and side – effects items. (n=100)

Symptoms and side –	No	ever	Rarely		Sometimes		Often		Always	
effects items	No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%
My sleep is disturbed	32	32.0	14	14.0	20	20.0	18	18.0	16	16.0
I am bothered by shaking /trembling	20	20.0	26	26.0	30	30.0	12	12.0	12	12 .0
My muscles get stiff	22	22.0	12	12 .0	42	42.0	8	8.0	16	16.0
Iam troubled by a dry mouth	22	22.0	14	14.0	36	36.0	6	6.0	22	22.0
I get muscle twitches	24	24.0	14	14.0	30	30.0	14	14.0	18	18.0
My vision is Blurred	30	30.0	6	6.0	36	36.0	16	16.0	12	12 .0
I feel unsteady walking	28	28.0	16	16.0	32	32.0	8	8.0	16	16.0
I get dizzy spells	24	24.0	8	8.0	48	48.0	8	8.0	12	12 .0

This table illustrated that, quality of life of the studied subjects regarding symptoms and side –effects items; less than half (48.0%) of the studied subjects sometimes get dizzy spells and 42.0% their muscles were get stiff. While, more than third (36.0%) of the studied subjects were troubled by a dry mouth and blurred their vision.

Table (6):- Total score of quality of life for the studied subjects (n=100).

Items	No	%
*Very high quality 0-30	10	10.0
* High quality 31-60	38	38.0
*Average quality 61-90	46	46.0
*Poor quality 91-120	8	8.0
* Total	100	100.0

This table revealed that, the total score of schizophrenia quality of life for the studied subjects; the total numbers of the studied subjects were 100. Highest percentage (46.0%) of the studied subjects had average quality. While, lowest percentage (8.0%) of the studied subjects had poor quality.

Part Four: Relation between total score of quality of life and sociodemographic characteristic, and clinical characteristic of the studied subjects.

Table (7):- Relation between total score of quality of life and sociodemographic characteristic of the studied subjects (n=100).

				To	tal sc	ore of qu	ality o	f life		
	Ver	y high	H	ligh	Av	erage	P	oor		
Socio-demographic	0	-30	3	1-60	6	1-90	91	-120	\mathbf{X}^2	P
characteristic	No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%		
*Age (years)										
• 20-<30	0	0.0	10	41.7	10	41.7	4	16.7	5.558	*<0.05
• 30-<40	4	10.5	14	36.8	18	47.4	2	5.3		
• 40-<50	4	13.3	10	33.3	14	46.7	2	6.7		
• 50-60	2	25.0	2	25.0	4	50.0	0	0.0		
*Sex										
• Male	6	12.0	28	56.0	12	24.0	4	8.0	70.744	**<0.001
 Female 	4	8.0	8	16.0	34	68.0	4	8.0		
Education level										
 Illiterate 	2	5.6	12	33.3	20	55.6	2	5.6	2.909	>0.05
 Read and write 	0	0.0	2	50.0	2	50.0	0	0.0		
 Primary 	4	22.2	8	44.4	6	33.3	0	0.0		
 Preparatory 	2	16.7	2	16.7	6	50.0	2	16.7		
 Secondary 	0	0.0	4	22.2	10	55.6	4	22.2		
 High education 	2	16.7	8	66.7	2	16.7	0	0.0		
Marital status										
• Single	4	7.4	24	44.4	22	40.7	4	7.4	33.907	**<0.001
 Married 	2	7.1	6	21.4	16	57.1	4	14.3		
 Divorced 	2	16.7	6	50.0	4	33.3	0	0.0		
 Widowed 	2	33.3	0	0.0	4	66.7	0	0.0		
Position in family										
 Husband 	2	16.7	6	50.0	2	16.7	2	16.7	1.220	>0.05
• Wife	4	12.5	4	12.5	22	68.8	2	6.3		
• Son	4	10.5	22	57.9	10	26.3	2	5.3		
 Daughter 	0	0.0	4	22.2	12	66.7	2	11.1		
Occupation										
Not work	4	4.9	32	39.5	37	45.7	8	9.9	49.500	**<0.001
 Official 	5	29.4	4	23.5	8	47.1	0	0.0		
 Free works 	1	50.0	0	0.0	1	50.0	0	0.0		
Economical status										
 Sufficient 	2	10.5	7	36.8	8	42.1	2	10.5	40.710	**<0.001
 Not sufficient 	6	7.6	29	36.7	38	48.1	6	7.6		
Sufficient and more	2	100.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0		

n.s =no statistically significant at >0.05

^{* =} statistically significant at ≤ 0.05

^{** =} highly statistically significant at ≤0.001

This table revealed that, there was a statistically significant relation between total score of quality of life and socio- demographic characteristic of the studied subjects related to age (x^2 =5.558, p≤0.05). It also revealed that, there was a highly statistically significant relation with sex, marital status, occupation and economical status (x^2 =70.744, p≤0.001, x^2 =33.907, p≤0.001, x^2 =49.500, p≤0.001, and x^2 =40.710, p<0.001, respectively) While, no statistically significant relation with education level and position in family(x^2 =2.909, p>0.05, x^2 =1.220, p>0.05, respectively).

Table (8): Relation between total score of quality of life and clinical characteristic of the studied subjects (n=100).

				To	tal sco	re of qu	ıality	of life		
	Ver	y high	H	ligh		erage		oor		
Clinical characteristic		-30	1	1-60		1-90		-120	\mathbf{X}^2	P
	No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%	A	_
* Onset of illness (years)	210	, , ,	2,10	, 0	2 (0	, 0	2 (0	, ,		
• 1-<10	5	8.6	19	32.8	28	48.3	6	10.3	44.831	**<0.001
• 10-<20	5	14.3	11	31.4	17	48.6	2	5.7		
• 20-<30	0	0.0	5	83.3	1	16.7	0	0.0		
• 30-40	0	0.0	1	100.0	0	0.0	0	0.0		
* Recent admission (years)										
• 1-<5	6	11.1	19	35.2	24	44.4	5	9.3	25.000	**<0.001
• 5-<10	2	11.8	3	17.6	12	70.6	0	0.0		
• 10-15	2	6.9	14	48.3	10	34.5	3	10.3		
* Frequency of admission										
One time	1	2.1	13	27.1	29	60.4	5	10.4	12.517	**<0.001
Two times	5	25.0	5	25.0	10	50.0	0	0.0		
 Three times or more 	4	12.5	18	56.3	7	21.9	3	9.4		
* Method of admission										
Alone	1	16.7	4	66.7	1	16.7	0	0.0	4.083	*<0.05
By police	3	16.7	10	55.6	4	22.2	1	5.6		
By family	6	7.9	22	28.9	41	53.9	7	9.2		
* Family history of psychiatric										
illness										
• Yes	3	13.0	14	60.9	4	17.4	2	8.7	49.613	**<0.001
• No	7	9.1	22	28.6	42	54.5	6	7.8		
*Symptoms lead to admission										
to hospital										
 Agitation 	6	17.1	15	42.9	13	37.1	1	2.9	1.391	>0.05
 No eating, no sleeping, 	2	11.1	7	38.9	5	27.8	4	22.2		
no interest for himself					_		_			
• Both 1 and 2	1	20.0	4	80.0	0	0.0	0	0.0		
 Auditory and visual 	0	0.0	3	12.5	18	75.0	3	12.5		
hallucination	1	8.3	6	50.0	5	41.7	0	0.0		
 Delusion 	$\begin{bmatrix} 1 \\ 0 \end{bmatrix}$	0.0	6 1	25.0	5 3	75.0	0	0.0		
• Both 6 and 7	0	0.0	0	0.0	2	100.0	0	0.0		
Isolation	U	0.0	U	0.0		100.0	U	0.0		
Medication given to patients		0.0		00.0		20.0		0.0	1 202	0.05
Safinace, Cognitol,	0	0.0	4	80.0	1	20.0	0	0.0	1.282	>0.05
Neurazine, Haldol	4	7.0	12	25.5	21	60.0	3	5.0		
Safinace, Cognitol, Navyoring	4	7.8	13	25.5	31	60.8	3	5.9		
Neurazine	3	10.0	13	43.3	9	30.0	5	16.7		
Safinace, Cognitol, Heldel)	10.0	13	73.3)	30.0	,	10.7		
Haldol • Cognitol, Neurazine,	3	21.4	6	42.9	5	35.7	0	0.0		
• Cognitol, Neurazine, Haldol				.2.,		33.7		0.0		
1141001										

Continued

Side effects which appear to patients										
 Blurred vision Dry mouth Feeling of dizziness Muscle cramps Sleep disturbance All of the above 	6 1 2 0 0 1	24.0 12.5 5.9 0.0 0.0 5.0	8 5 15 0 3 5	32.0 62.5 44.1 0.0 27.3 25.0	11 2 14 2 8 9	44.0 25.0 41.2 100.0 72.7 45.0	0 0 3 0 0 5	0.0 0.0 8.8 0.0 0.0 25.0	9.720	**<0.001

n.s =no statistically significant at >0.05

This table showed that, there was a highly statistically significant relation between total score of quality of life and clinical characteristic of the studied subjects related to the onset of illness, recent admission, frequency of admission, family history of psychiatric illness and side effects which appear to patient (x^2 =44.831, $p \le 0.001$, x^2 =25.000, $p \le 0.001$, x^2 =12.517, $p \le 0.001$, x^2 =49.613, $p \le 0.001$ and x^2 =9.720, $p \le 0.001$, respectively). It also revealed that, there was a statistically significant relation with method of admission (x^2 =4.083, $p \le 0.05$) While, no statistical significant relation with symptoms lead to admission to hospital and medication given to patients(x^2 =1.391, y=0.05 and x^2 =1.282, y=0.05, respectively).

^{* =} statistically significant at ≤ 0.05

^{** =} highly statistically significant at ≤0.001