

EMOTIONAL AND SOCIAL ADJUSTMENT AMONG DRUG ADDICTS AND NON ADDICTS IN RELATION TO AREA OF RESIDENCE

PROF. RASHMIKANT N. PARMAR

**Associate Professor, Dept. of Psychology, P.H.G. Municipal Arts and Science College,
Kalol, North Gujarat**

ABSTRACT

The main aim of the present research was to study emotional adjustment and social adjustment between drug addicts and non-addicts in relation to area of residence. Total 200 participants (50 urban drug addicts, 50 urban non-addicts, 50 rural drug addicts and 50 rural non-addicts) were randomly selected from various areas of Ahmadabad City. Social Adjustment Inventory by R. C. Deva was used for data collection. To analyze the data two way analysis of variance was used. Results indicate that significant difference was not existed between drug addicts and non-addicts

in relation to Emotional Adjustment, significant difference was existed between urban and rural people in relation to Emotional Adjustment and significant interaction effect not existed between Type of people and area of residence in relation on Emotional Adjustment Significant difference was not existed between urban and rural drug addicts in relation to Social Adjustment, Significant difference was existed between urban and rural people in relation to Social Adjustment, and significant interaction effect was not found between type of people and area of addicts and non-addicts in relation to Social Adjustment.

INTRODUCTION:

A number of new drug are being developed which produce effects which are not adequately characterized by the current definition of addictiveness. In practice, a clear distinction between addiction and habituation is not always made. The two term are frequently used interchangeably and often inappropriately. The term, addiction, is usually applied to any and every type of misuse of drugs outside medical practice. It implies also that serious harm results to the individual and to society by the drug. Often there is a demand that something be one about it. Drug dependence is defined as a state arising from repeated administration of a drug on a periodic or continues basis. Its characteristics will vary with the agent involved, but it is a general term selected for its applicability to all types of drug abuse and carried no connotation in regard to degree of risk to public health or need for a particular type of control.

"The WHO Expert Committee on Addiction-producing Drug has recommended substitution of drug dependence' for the term 'drug addiction' and 'drug habituation'. The scientific group endorsed this recommendation of the expert committee. It undertook to outline the characteristics of drug dependence with a view to facilitating the appraisal of procedures for the determination of drug dependence of various types.

Emotional factors of addiction are death of parents, family disturbance, unemployment, frustrated love affairs, bad treatment at home, lack of family control and guidance, unhappy home etc. While much the same reasons were cited by the informed persons, they also highlighted the negative role of family in its various ramification in drug addiction. Foremost among these factors were-family maladjustment, use of drugs by family control or over control, broken home, illiteracy of parents. Low socioeconomic status of the family and liabilities affluence and richness of the family~

Piercy et al. (1991) found that relation family factors, including cohesion, discipline, and open communication with mother, were more salient _than structural factors, such as family size, birth order, biological parents in the household, in discriminating drug use patterns. Stroker and Swadi (1990) found that drug users were more likely than non users to perceive their families as distant and less involved, as having poor communications and as mistrusting and punitive. Hoffman (1993) in his study found that peers have the strongest effect on adolescent drug use, yet parent-child involvement and family stature also have a direct effect.

Carvalho et al. (1995) found that family violence as the factor most frequently associated with alcohol/drug use behavior. It was also found that the family 's environmental climate constitutes a more important factor than the conjugal status of parents, when it comes to the development of drug use behavior.

Shek (1970) analyzed that in general, adolescents perception of perception of perception of parenting styles, family functioning and parent adolescent conflict were significantly related to scores on measures of general psychiatric morbidity, life satisfaction, purpose in life, hopelessness, self-esteem, perceived academic performance, school conduct, smoking and psychotropic drug abuse.

JOURNAL OF INFORMATION, KNOWLEDGE AND RESEARCH IN HUMANITIES AND SOCIAL SCIENCE

Forsyth (1987) investigated the interaction between personality traits like neurotism, anxiety, depression, sensation seeking behavior and extroversion and to drink alcohol in different situation like stressful events. Desire to drink was greater in stressful situation for those who scored higher on neuroticism.

Nagalaxmi and Rao (1989) showed that alcoholics significantly have poor personal and social adjustment compared to normal.

Research with alcoholics suggests that the level of impact upon the family varies according to the coping ability of the nonalcoholic family member, the extent of outside stressors, and the degree of the alcoholic family member's pathology (Moos & Moos, 1984).

Some of the best-controlled research examining the social adjustment of spouses of alcoholics was conducted by Moos and colleagues in the early 1980s .This research compared spouses of recovered alcoholics, relapsed alcoholics, and community controls on a variety of psychological, family, and social functioning factors.

Suman and Nagalakshmi (1987) reported higher degree of social maladjustment among addicts.

Dhillon and Pawah (1981) found that drug users felt emotionally very insecure as compared to their normal colleagues as they had strong feelings of rejection, isolation, of being unloved, anxiety, hostility, inferiority, helplessness and inadequacy.

STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM:

Main purpose of present research is to study emotional adjustment and social adjustment among urban and rural drug addicts and non-addicts. The exact problem of this research is "Emotional and Social Adjustment among Drug Addicts and Non Addicts in Relation to area of Residence".

OBJECTIVE OF THE STUDY:

The main objective of the present research is to study and compare emotional and social adjustment of drug addicts and non-addicts with regards to area of residence.

HYPOTHESES OF THE STUDY:

The main hypotheses of the present research are as under,

1. There will be no significant difference between drug addicts and non-addicts with regards to emotional and social adjustment.
2. There will be no significant difference between urban and rural people with regards to emotional and social adjustment.
3. There will be significant interaction effect between type of people and area of residence with regards to emotional and social adjustment.

SAMPLE:

Total sample consisted of 200 participants. Sample was randomly selected from various areas of Ahmadabad district. Total sample was categorized as under,

Area of residence	Drug addicts	Non-addicts	Total
Urban	50	50	100
Rural	50	50	100
Total	100	100	200

VARIABLES:

In present research type of people (drug addicts and non-addicts) and area of residence (urban and rural) were considered as independent variable. Scores of emotional and social adjustment were considered as dependent variable.

TOOLS:

In present research Deva's social adjustment inventory was used. It contains 100 items. Each items is provided with 'yes' and 'no' two alternatives. The inventory has yielded. satisfactory reliability and validity indices. The test retest reliability after a period of two month was .91. The emotional and social adjustment scales of this inventory were validated against the corresponding scale of Saxena's 'Vyaktitva Parakh Prasnavali'. MA-62 (3) the validity of the scale has out to be .81 and .79 respectively. Scoring of each responses of respondent of the inventory was done by the scoring key of the inventory.

PROCEDURE:

Social adjustment inventory was administered in small manageable group of participants, before the rapport was establish with each participants. After completion the data collection responses of each participants of inventory was scored by the scoring key of inventory.

JOURNAL OF INFORMATION, KNOWLEDGE AND RESEARCH IN HUMANITIES AND SOCIAL SCIENCE

STATISTICAL ANALYSIS:

To find out main and interaction effect of two independent variables such as type of people and area of residence of participants on emotional and social adjustment, two way analysis of variance was used.

RESULT AND DISCUSSION:

Table No.1 Results of ANOVA on emotional adjustment.

Source of Variation	Sum of Square	df	Mean sum of square	F	Level of Significant
A	239.805	1	239.805	0.76	NS
B	6105.125	1	6105.125	19.24	0.01
A*B	990.125	1	990.125	3.12	NS
Error	62182.140	196	317.256		
Tss	69517.195	199			

Table No.1 Consulted and it is found that F ratio for ASS (type of people) on emotional adjustment is 0.76 which is not significant. By the same point of view the means scores of drug addicts on emotional adjustment is 42.25 and mean scores of non-addicts on emotional adjustment is 44.44 it can be clearly said that significant difference is not existed between drug addicts and non-addicts on emotional adjustment. F ratio for Bss (area of residence) on emotional adjustment is 19.24. Which is significant at .01 level. It means urban people significantly differ on emotional adjustment as compare to rural people. By the same point of view the means scores of urban people on emotional adjustment is 48.87 and the means scores of rural people on emotional adjustment is 37.82. It can be clearly said that significant difference is existed between urban and rural people on emotional adjustment. F ratio for A x B (type of people and area of residence) on emotional adjustment is 3.12. Which is not significant. By the same point of view means scores of urban drug addicts on emotional adjustment is 50.00, mean scores of rural drug addicts is 34.45, mean scores of urban non-addicts on emotional adjustment is 47.74, and means scores of rural addicts on emotional adjustment is 41.14. It can be clearly said that significant interaction effect is not existed between type of people and area of residence with regards to emotional adjustment.

Table No. 2 Result of ANOVA on Social Adjustment.

Source of Variation	Sum of Square	df	Mean sum of square	F	Level of Significant
A	50.000	1	50.000	0.09	NS
B	19720.980	1	19720.980	34.185	0.01
A*B	1067.220	1	1067.220	1.850	NS
Error	113069.480	196	576.885		
Tss	133907.680	199			

Table No. 2 Consulted and it is found that F ratio for ASS (type of people) on social adjustment is 0.09 which is not significant. By the same point of view the means scores of drug addicts on social adjustment is 53.46 and mean scores of non-addicts on social adjustment is 54.46 it can be clearly said that significant difference is not existed between drug addicts and non-addicts on social adjustment. F ratio for Bss (area of residence) on social adjustment is 34.19. Which is significant at .01 level. It means urban people significantly differ on social adjustment as compare to rural people. By the same point of view the means scores of urban people on social adjustment is 63.79 and the means scores of rural people on social adjustment is 44.03. It can be clearly said that significant difference is existed between urban and rural people on social adjustment. F ratio for A x B (type of people and area of residence) on social adjustment is 1.85. Which is not significant. By the same point of view means scores of urban drug addicts on social adjustment is 65.75, mean scores of rural drug addicts is 41.22, mean scores of urban non-addicts on social adjustment is 62.08, and means scores of rural addicts on social adjustment is 46.84. It can be clearly said that significant interaction effect is not existed between type of people and area of residence with regards to social adjustment.

CONCLUSIONS :

- Significant difference is not existed between drug addicts and non-addicts with regards to emotional adjustment.
- Urban people significantly differ on emotional adjustment as compare to rural people on emotional adjustment.
- Significant interaction effect is not existed between type of people and area of residence with regards to emotional adjustment.
- Significant difference is not existed between drug addicts and non-addicts with regards to social adjustment.

- Significant difference is existed between urban and rural people with regard to social adjustment.
- Significant interaction effect is not existed between type of people and area of residence with regards to social adjustment.

REFERENCE

- 01 Carvalho (1995). Drug addict and alcohol use and family characteristics: a study among Brazilian high school students. *Addiction*, 90 (1) : 65-72.
- 02 Dhillon, P.K. & Pawah, P. (1981). A study of the relationship between drug use, abstract intelligence and feelings of security in the college population of Delhi. In D. Mohan, H.S. Sethi, E. Tongue (eds.),
- 03 *Current Research in Drug Abuse in India*. Pp. 141-148, New Delhi.
- 04 Forsyth, (1987): Personality and situation as determinates of desire to drink in young adult. *International journal of addictions*, 22(7), 653-658.
- 05 Hoffuman, J.P. (1993) Exploring the direct and indirect family effect on adolescent drug use. *Journal of drug issues*, 23 (3):353-557.
- 06 Moos, R H., & Moos, B.S. (1984). The process of recovery from alcoholism: ill. Comparing functioning of families of alcoholics and matched control families. *Journal of Studies on Alcohol*, 45, 111 - 118.
- 07 Moos, R H., Bromet, E., Tsu. V., & Moos, B. (1979). Family characteristics and the outcome of treatment for alcoholism. *Journal of Studies on Alcohol*, 40 (1), 78-88.
- 08 Nagalaxmi, S.V. & rao,S. (1989): Clinical utility of the Calofornia test of personality. *Journal of personality and clinical studies* 5 (1) 88-92.
- 09 Piercy, E.P. (1991). The relationship of family factors to patterns of adolescent substance abuse. *Family Dynamics of addiction quarterly*, 1(1):41-54.
- 10 Shek, D.T. (1997). Family environment and adolescent psychological well being, school adjustment, and problem behavior: A pioneer study in a Chinese context. *Journal of Genetic Psychology* , 158 (1):113-128.
- 11 Stoker, A and Swadi, H. (1990). Perceived family relationship in drug abusing adolescent. *Drug and school dependents*, 25(3): 293-297.
- 12 Suman, L.N. & Nagalakshmi, S.V. (1987). A study of self-concept, anxiety and adjustment among anxiety neurotics, alcoholics and normals. *NIMHANS Journal*, 5, 115-119.