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Chapter 1. Thesis Portfolio Abstract

Objectives. The empirical qualitative study explored Older People’s (over 65 years of age) perceptions of psychological change and the processes by which these occurred. It also aimed to add to understanding of the barriers to therapeutic change. Subsequently, a systematic review of the current literature pertaining to older people’s attachment styles, and how attachment is measured within this population, was conducted. This scrutinised the literature regarding role of attachment (as a trans-diagnostic construct) in old age, as this may influence their change processes.

Design. As the empirical study was exploratory, it adopted a Grounded Theory methodology, influenced by the constructivist perspective as described in Charmaz (2014). Data was obtained via semi-structured interviews, with the later interview schedule grounded in emergent codes and memos of earlier interviews. Literature pertaining to older people, attachment, and how attachment is measured, was obtained from a systematic review.

Method. Twelve participants were interviewed using a semi-structured interview, following discharge from an Older Peoples Psychological Therapy Service, for the empirical project. Participants were aged 65 years or over and had received varying models of therapy over varying durations. Those reporting improvement, or no change, as a result of receiving psychological therapy, were approached to participate. Through detailed analysis, a tentative model of older people’s psychological change processes was constructed. This model was further checked by some participants for quality control. Subsequently the systematic review explored a key theme of attachment (as suggested by the categories highlighted in the empirical project). Literature regarding attachment, older people and how
attachment is measured within this population, was obtained through a systematic search through major databases, compared against a checklist, constructed for this review, with all analysis prorated by qualified clinical psychologists supervising this study.

Results. Interview transcriptions were analysed in line with a constructivist perspective of grounded theory. A non-linear model of psychological change, grounded in the data, was constructed. The main concepts of the model were Age as Context, Seeking Help and Entering the Therapeutic Environment, Building a Therapeutic Relationship, Developing a New Understanding, Therapeutic Changes and Post Therapy Reflections and Commitments of Continuation. In addition, some similar processes were highlighted across different therapeutic modalities, thus supporting trans-theoretical models of psychological change. In addition, the model highlighted a theme of models of relationships having continuity through the lifespan (as evidenced in the concepts of Seeking Help and Building a Therapeutic Relationship). This echoed the trans-therapeutic concept of attachment. Therefore, a systematic review of attachment in older people was conducted. Overall the quality of the literature pertaining to attachment, older people and how attachment is measured within this population was poor. There was a paucity of evidence of minimisation of bias reported in either design or analysis.

Conclusions. The empirical project demonstrated the process of psychological change in older people is non-linear in nature. Some constructs of change were similar to those found in the adult literature, but there were also some constructs relating specifically to ageing, and the theoretical developmental stage of old age. This supports suggestions that age specific constructs should be held in mind when working therapeutically with older people. The systematic review found research
exploring attachment in older people is a growing field of research, but one which is still in its infancy compared to other clinical populations. In addition, several studies had serious methodological issues and therefore readers are encouraged to interpret their results with caution.
Chapter 2- Older People’s Perceptions of Psychological Change Processes

2.1 Abstract

Objectives. This study explored older people’s perceptions of psychological change processes, including factors facilitating and barriers to change.

Design. Due to the exploratory nature of this study, a grounded theory methodology (Glaser & Strauss, 1967) was utilised, heavily influenced by the constructivist approach posited by Charmaz (2006, 2014).

Method. 12 participants were interviewed after discharge from receiving therapy from an older people’s psychological therapy service. Transcripts were analysed while further interviews were undertaken, as per the iterative approach inherent in grounded theory methodology.

Results. A model was developed which was grounded in the data. This model describes a non-linear process of change, containing the following constructs: Seeking Help/Entering the Therapeutic Environment, Building the Therapeutic Relationship, Developing a New Understanding, Therapeutic Change, Post Therapy Reflections and Commitments of Continuation. This model of the process of change was encompassed in a construct of Age as Context.

Conclusions. All participants described some element of psychological change. The majority reported change occurred prior to discharge, however one participant experienced psychological change post discharge. Although no questions were asked about ageing, it was found to be not integral to the change process, but a context which should be kept in mind by clinicians. This model presents a non-linear
process of change which supports developmental theorists’ views of ageing. This was a small exploratory study and therefore presents further research recommendations.

**Practitioner Points**

- Practitioners who work therapeutically with older people should keep age and ageing in mind as a context within which therapeutic change occurs.

- Practitioners should consider building the therapeutic relationship as a key element of therapeutic change. It is important to consider the circumstances which led to the older person’s referral into the service as this can influence clients’ uncertainty at the start of therapy which can directly impact upon clients’ engagement in therapy.

- Practitioners should note that the process of therapeutic change for older people is a non-linear, iterative process. Change is an outcome but also part of the process.

- Practitioners should consider explicitly acknowledging changes that the client has already made as this can contribute to raising the client’s confidence which in turn results to further psychological changes.

The empirical project (Older People’s Perceptions of Psychological Change Processes) is written following the author guidelines for the journal Psychology and Psychotherapy: Theory, Research and Practice. However, for ease of reading, the figures and tables are included as part of the text, as opposed to in the appendices as recommended in the guidelines. The word count of this project (excluding abstract) is 6,531.
2.2 Introduction

The psychological therapies access HEAT target\(^1\) (Scottish Government, 2014) aims to ensure people in psychological need receive timely, appropriate treatment, applicable to all age groups. However, the Older People’s Psychological Therapies Working Group, (2011) found Scotland was missing this target, with 80% of older people with depression receiving no pharmacological or psychological treatment. In comparison to adults under 65 years, the evidence base for effective therapies for those over 65 years is as yet small. This does not doubt therapies are effective (see The Matrix, 2011), but reflects the gap in services available for this age group.

The effectiveness of an intervention established through randomized control trials (RCTs) may be seen as the ‘gold standard’ of outcome research for clinical practice (Martinson et al, 2010), but fails to explore how or why this is, unlike change process research. Change Process Research aims to establish the process by which the intervention outcome is effective (Elliott 2010). A vast range of studies have been published under the banner and contributes towards our understanding of what it is about therapy that works. This insight enriches our abilities as specialist clinicians to improve our practice. However, it should be noted that thus far, this important area of research has not been undertaken with older people. Given the requirement of equality of provision regardless of age (The Equality Act, 2010) this proposed study is timely and appropriate.

In the adult literature several studies are based upon trans-diagnostic and trans-treatment modality approaches (Higginson & Mansell 2008). These studies assume common processes occur within the development, maintenance and recovery from

\(^1\) Health improvement, Efficiency, Access and Treatment (Scottish Government, 2014)
psychological problems. They argue that different modalities of therapeutic approach are accepted as effective in reducing psychological distress, and therefore trigger, or facilitate, the same factors that provide relief from different psychological difficulties (e.g. Binder, Holgersen & Nielson, 2009). Interestingly, when collating emerging themes from studies based on specific types of therapy and presenting problems, with research into more trans-diagnostic and trans-therapeutic modalities, it appears similar change processes and factors are highlighted irrespective of specificity of study methods. These studies set out to identify change facilitating factors in different ways however, similar factors emerged, regardless of the parameters of the study or research questions. This does suggest that similar processes underlie therapeutic change, and therefore change process research can be conducted both trans-diagnostically and trans-therapeutically, albeit within an adult population.

Research into effective psychological therapy implies therapy should be ‘tailored’ to the population, accounting for different contexts through which individuals perceive the world (Knight, 2009). The Older People’s Psychological Therapies Working Group (2011) recommends that if older people do not require specialist services they should be seen by general adult psychology services. However those who require specialist services should expect to receive assessment and treatment that considers the “5 C’s”. Sadavoy (2009) defined the “5C’s” of older people specialist services as Complexity, Chronicity, Comorbidity, Continuity and Context. Often several interacting factors can make older people vulnerable to psychological disorders, therefore the complexity of their difficulties should be considered when assessing and treating these disorders. According to Sadavoy (2009) psychological disturbances tend to be more chronic for this age group, lasting for a longer duration.
and requiring longer maintenance phases of treatment. Older people often have multiple co-morbidities which may contribute to the development of psychological distress. Also psychological distress may impact upon different co-morbidities. Continuity refers to the lifelong cumulative effect of an older person’s environmental, physiological and psychological development. Sadavoy (2009) recommends a longitudinal approach should be adopted when assessing psychological disorders. The final “C” is context. This posits that psychological distress does not occur in a “vacuum”. Thus psychological disturbance cannot be separated from the physical, psychological, social and environmental context in which it occurs. Although any of these “5 Cs” could be relevant for some patients in adult mental health services, all 5 are more likely to be implicit in a large number of older people in psychological distress. For example, physical health conditions have been demonstrated to exacerbate psychological problems (e.g. Ormell et al, 1997). In addition, although chronicity may be present in a general adult population, the duration of this is likely to be much longer in older people. As opposed to having a chronic problem for 10 or 15 years in a general adulthood, older people may have had the difficulty for 60 or 70 years, therefore problems may be much more entrenched. It is also very likely that older people have had to adapt to several different stressors e.g. physical health deterioration, losses in one’s support system or traumatic life events. Older people may also hold different beliefs about seeking help for psychological problems (see Mackenzie, Gekosi & Konx, 2006). Therefore, for therapy for older people to be effective, it may also require adaptation for age (Evans, 2007, Knight, 2009 & Sadavoy, 2009). Given the literature suggests psychological assessment and treatment should be amended in specialist older people’s psychological therapies services, it is questionable to assume older people’s change processes will mirror
those from adult research. If the therapeutic assessment and intervention received by older people may be different, it is likely that older people’s experience and perception of psychological change will differ from that of younger adults.

This study examines perceptions of older people who attended therapy, the key factors facilitating therapeutic change, and the process by which change occurred. Findings will assist clinicians in understanding processes involved in older people’s therapeutic change.

2.3 Research Questions / Objectives:

1. From the perspective of older people, how does therapy result in therapeutic change? How do older people describe the process of change?

2. What are the key factors that facilitate or hinder therapeutic change?

2.4 Method

Design
This study was exploratory in nature and investigated psychological change processes within an older people population. The qualitative research design followed the procedure described in ‘Constructing Grounded Theory’ (Charmaz, 2006, 2014). In line with development of grounded theory (GT) in 1967 by Glazer and Strauss, this methodology was chosen as it moves beyond simple description of phenomena. It encourages robust analysis of data using an iterative process, to develop an explanatory theory, grounded in context (Starks & Brown- Trinidad, 2007), and not through predetermined categories.
Data was gathered from 12 in-depth interviews with older people attending psychological therapies services for therapy. Using the GT process of simultaneously gathering data, whilst analysing previous data, a model was developed, (Charmaz, 2014). On completing all interviews, the first author shared the initial proposed theoretical model with some participants, to challenge or validate it.

**Participants**

This study was approved by the East of Scotland NHS Research Ethics Committee.

All individuals meeting inclusion and exclusion criteria (Table 1) were approached by their qualified Clinical Psychologist, in their last therapy session. All discharged from the Older Peoples Psychological Therapies Service during the research recruitment period were invited, regardless of level of perceived change.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Inclusion criteria:</th>
<th>65 years or older (no upper age limit); received psychological therapy for any mental health problem; therapy delivered one-to-one by a qualified Clinical Psychologist; English speaker (this study was unable to utilise a translator); considered by clinician to have capacity to consent to research.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Exclusion criteria:</td>
<td>those with evidence of substance misuse; a diagnosis or suspected diagnosis of significant cognitive impairment (e.g. dementia, brain injury, learning disability or stroke); significant sensory impairment with adverse impact on communication; no capacity to consent to participate in research; referred for psychological assessment only; discharged due to lack of attendance at sessions</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1: Inclusion and Exclusion Criteria

19 potential participants opted in, however three could not be contacted, two changed their mind, one did not attend, and one had received part of their therapy
from the first author, so were excluded from the study. Thus 12 participants (see Table 2) met inclusion and exclusion criteria.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>Presenting Problem</th>
<th>Treatment Modality</th>
<th>Sessions Attended (Offered)</th>
<th>Level of Change Indicated</th>
<th>Education</th>
<th>Occupation Current or Previous</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kate</td>
<td>65-75</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Depression &amp; adjust to family stress</td>
<td>CBT</td>
<td>6 (6)</td>
<td>Much Improved</td>
<td>High school</td>
<td>Retail</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Janet</td>
<td>76-85</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Anxiety &amp; trauma (RTA)</td>
<td>CBT</td>
<td>27 (28)</td>
<td>Much Improved</td>
<td>College</td>
<td>Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agnes</td>
<td>65-75</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Depression &amp; caregiver stress</td>
<td>CBT</td>
<td>19 (20)</td>
<td>Very much Improved</td>
<td>High school</td>
<td>Current Carer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hazel</td>
<td>65-75</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Anxiety, depression &amp; child trauma</td>
<td>Compass focussed therapy</td>
<td>11 (12)</td>
<td>Very much Improved</td>
<td>High school</td>
<td>Retail</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Esther</td>
<td>65-75</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Grief (death of son)</td>
<td>Bereavement counselling</td>
<td>7 (7)</td>
<td>Very much Improved</td>
<td>High school</td>
<td>Sciences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gina</td>
<td>65-75</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Anger &amp; low mood</td>
<td>CBT</td>
<td>12 (12)</td>
<td>Very much Improved</td>
<td>High school</td>
<td>Carer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isobel</td>
<td>65-75</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Depression – prolonged grief</td>
<td>CBT</td>
<td>7 (8)</td>
<td>Much Improved</td>
<td>High school</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Les</td>
<td>65-75</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Anxiety and depression</td>
<td>CBT</td>
<td>12 (13)</td>
<td>Much Improved</td>
<td>University</td>
<td>Civil service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bill</td>
<td>76-85</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Phobia</td>
<td>CBT</td>
<td>7 (7)</td>
<td>Very much Improved</td>
<td>High school</td>
<td>Manual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Claire</td>
<td>65-75</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Anxiety and depression</td>
<td>Mindfulness based CBT</td>
<td>14 (14)</td>
<td>Very much Improved</td>
<td>College</td>
<td>Medical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David</td>
<td>65-75</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Anxiety &amp; cog difficulties</td>
<td>CBT</td>
<td>5 (5)</td>
<td>Much Improved</td>
<td>College</td>
<td>Business</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fred</td>
<td>76-85</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Adjust to loss</td>
<td>CBT</td>
<td>13 (13)</td>
<td>Minimally Improved</td>
<td>High School</td>
<td>Manual</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2: Participants’ demographics (pseudonyms used to preserve anonymity)

The Interviews
Semi-structured interviews of 40 - 60 minutes, were audio recorded and followed an interview protocol (see appendix 6 Interview Schedule/Topic Guide). In adherence to GT principles, this ‘protocol’ was flexible and evolved as more codes emerged during
data collection and parallel coding. The interviews were conducted, transcribed and coded by the first author.

**Analysis**
The analysis was heavily influenced by the constructivist approach (Charmaz, 2014). Analysis commenced with initial coding to find categories (descriptive) and progressed into comparative focused coding. Parallel to coding, memos noted conceptual links, forming the basis of the emerging theory and amendments to subsequent interview protocols. Memos and focused codes were constantly compared to previous codes and interview transcriptions, to check for a good fit with initial codes and raw data. This iterative process is pivotal in GT (Charmaz, 2014). Recruitment ceased when codes approached saturation. The emergent codes allowed construction of a tentative theory/model grounded in context.

**Quality Control**
The second, third and fourth authors audited codes and model emerging from raw data. This procedure ensured analysis was conducted both systematically and rigorously. Once focused codes evolved into an emergent analytic theory, this was shared with three participants who had agreed to comment on theory development.

It is acknowledged all the authors may hold preconceived hypotheses regarding possible emergent theories, due to extensive experiences within Clinical Psychology. Therefore not only were findings discussed and agreed regularly between authors, but credibility was increased by the contribution of participants’ feedback.
2.5 Results

Constant comparative analysis led to the development of a model of the therapeutic change process from older people’s perspectives. High level constructs in the model were developed from categories drawn from coded experiences and perceptions.

Diagram 1: Model of Older People’s Psychological Change Process

Summary of the Model
The process of change in psychological therapy for older people is not linear. The results highlight help seeking cognitions and behaviours contributed towards referral to psychological therapy and entering the therapeutic environment. These cognitions and route of entry into the therapeutic environment fed into building the therapeutic relationship. Building the therapeutic relationship is a 2 way engagement construct: the therapist had to engage the client, but the client also had to engage with the therapist.
Developing a new understanding involved gaining a new perspective of triggers of distress, and consideration of self in relation to others, drawing on life lessons learned, learning new strategies and putting this knowledge into practice.

Both building the therapeutic relationship and developing a new understanding led to therapeutic changes. The therapeutic changes included acceptance & adjustment, changes in relation to the previous self and developing/strengthening self-efficacy. Therapeutic changes are not only the outcome of therapy, but also part of the therapeutic change process. Noticing the changes often led to further building the therapeutic relationship, and developing new understanding, leading to further therapeutic changes.

In addition post therapy reflections contribute towards further therapeutic change and further developing of understanding. Participants gave commitments to further develop their understanding, through continuing to put the strategies learned into practice post therapy.

Participants discussed both sudden realisation and gradual change in timing of therapeutic changes, however they also highlighted that having the right duration of therapy for change to occur was important.

This interlinked process took place within a wider construct of age as context. Participants described age as context in each construct, as an important conceptual backdrop to therapeutic change within this older population.
Further Detail of Constructs in the Model

Age as Context
Ageing was linked with physical health and social changes, including pain and bereavement. Some participants found it surprising to be referred to an older people’s service as they did not consider themselves an ‘older person’

“and the letter came in - older people psychology? Oh aye, I don’t think I am an older people yet (laugh) but I am….you feel 21 with 40, 50 years’ experience” (Esther).

Some participants described being treated differently by healthcare professionals. However, whereas Claire reported a sense of over-prescribing to “fob off” older people, Les had a different view “It’s all about my age, she {psychiatrist} won’t put me on the full dose because of my age, which I think is a lot of Ballyhoo”.

Although age and ageing did not form a distinct part of the change process model, it was undeniably a context influencing how they lived their lives, received and related to treatment.

Seeking Help & Entering Therapeutic Environment
All 12 participants were referred by GP to the Older Peoples Psychological Therapies Service but the circumstances of this referral differed. Fred thought his GP must have seen he was “feeling trapped” and therefore referred him, whereas Claire proactively sought a referral to psychology to receive a specific therapy. David had a very different experience, sitting a memory assessment and on “failing”, was referred to psychology:
“I thought I would be going to see {therapist} because I made a mess of it. You know I thought. That is me I am definitely going to be seeing... cos the report would be going in that I was not very good” (David)

Some participants were unsure if it was a psychologist they needed.

“..then again maybe I got the wrong...because she’s a Psychologist. Maybe it’s a Psychiatrist I’m needing. To sort myself out.” (Janet)

“At first, When the doctor first said a psychologist (laughs) I thought I dinnae need a psychologist ye ken, so I was a wee bit apprehensive at first”. (Esther)

Several participants were apprehensive or worried at the start of therapy, being unsure what to expect but this improved over time. The circumstances of referral, whether help was sought or imposed, impacting upon the initial stages of the therapeutic experience.

“When you first go you are so overpowered it is hard to take in what anyone is saying to you” (Hazel)

**Building the Therapeutic Relationship**

As participants described change and helpful factors, they emphasised the qualities of the therapist and the relationship between therapist and client. Participants perceived building the therapeutic relationship as a primary element of their therapeutic change process. Building the therapeutic relationship overlaps with entering the therapeutic environment, particularly in terms of hope, expectation and apprehension, influencing help seeking.
The therapeutic relationship involves a mix of therapist and client qualities, the therapeutic relationship and therapist position. Participants described engagement and taking an active role in therapy, as key to the process of change.

Building of the therapeutic relationship has two main tasks: the client engaging with therapist and therapist engaging client.

**Client Engaging with the Therapist**

*Opening Up*

In order to engage with the therapist, participants reported opening up as part of building the therapeutic relationship. Although apprehensive, Esther found as time went on, she began to feel safe, and could “open up” to the therapist and the therapist was then able to offer different views, which led to her perspective shift.

> “but I could speak to the therapist. Well, it was scary first of all, because they were neutral, they didn’t know anybody I was speaking about or what I was speaking about, but they understood how I felt and it made me feel that the feelings I was going through were quite normal in the circumstances, instead of being..erm..not that it was guilt, it was anger, it was all the different emotions I went through, but they helped me to look at things in it in a slightly different way” (Esther).

Gradually developing trust/confidence in the therapist led to opening up, but also opening up more, increased their trust/confidence with the therapist.

> “I was getting to know her, you know what I mean and I got to speak more to her you know, and just open up and then latterly with any problems I could speak to her at all … I felt more confident in what I could chat to her about and I didn't hold back I really didn't at all” (Agnes).
Fred felt he was open from the start. “I must admit at first I was quite relaxed and we talked a lot of personal things, you know, ken, and it’s no secret I didn’t mind talking about how I was feeling and things like that …. , I always get the impression that people are or I want people to be sympathetic of me. I mean I always blurt it out you ken. And I have been doing that to therapist, to my doctors.” Fred reported minimal therapeutic change and therefore the stage at which you ‘open up’ could be important to the change process.

Client Engagement in Therapy

Several participants reported the importance of following advice, e.g. Agnes: “I really took what she was saying on board what’s she’s saying to me and I did I really did, cos there was no point in going if I didn’t it would be a waste of her time and mine”.

Conversely Fred thought his therapy was not successful due to lack of engagement: “I did feel like I wasnae, you know , being honest with her ….we were both saying, she used to say to me, ‘you promised though’ we shook hands on it see, and I said aye you ken…. But I kept putting it off, and no doing it ken”.

Therapist Engaging the Client

Therapist Qualities

Therapist qualities are an element of the therapist engaging client. Participants all spoke highly of their therapist: “brilliant” (David); “likeable and cheery” (Fred); “excellent” (Claire); “calming” (Agnes); “easy to speak to” (Gina) & “very good” (Isobel). Participants felt safe within the therapeutic environment, where they could speak about anything, ask questions and where “nothing was a bother” (Esther).

Therapist as Guide and Companion through the Process of Change
The therapist was seen as on the same wavelength and well matched with the client. The therapist was also seen as a guide and teacher who gave ‘good advice’ and offered different views on the client’s situation.

“Just different things that we hadn’t thought about or hadn’t thought about in the way {therapist} put it across, that made me think. Oh well yes there is something in that, you know” (Esther)

The therapist position within the relationship was also indicated. Confidentiality was important and knowing feelings were understood, ‘allowing’ them to get upset in front of the therapist, as opposed to family.

The therapeutic relationship needs mutual trust or reciprocal confidence. “I had complete confidence from day one…. I think the confidence came within so I can do that no bother now and I just did it. I surprised myself. ….. Again it comes back to the doctor and the confidence I think. ….. I think it was the doctor had faith in me. I think that is where it came in and that transferred. You felt yourself ‘oh I can do that no bother’ and before you couldn’t do that.” (Bill)

“It is about having the confidence, I feel more confident to manage the anxiety. {Therapist} said ‘I don’t think you will go as low as before’. When a professional tells you something you believe them… she thought I had improved, although she didn’t actually say that, I thought I could tell that was what she was thinking.” (Kate)

**Developing a New Understanding**

Gaining a new perspective and considering self in relation to others is connected to ‘opening up’ and growing ‘awareness of the problem’, with a two-way connection with ‘self in relation to others’, feeding into the reported therapeutic change. ‘Self in
relation to others’ can have different positions. For David it had a role of normalisation leading him to develop acceptance. Esther gained a sense of not being alone in the process of change as her therapist facilitated a perspective shift in relation to self and others.

**Drawing on Life Lessons Learned**

Both Agnes and Esther realised advice from the therapist was similar to common sense, as they already knew the information in the ‘back of their mind’. The therapist did not ‘teach’ anything new, but highlighted ‘lessons’ already learned. All participants were 'older people', and had minimal other episodes of care. They had managed without therapy up until referral, drawing on life lessons learned. Claire felt CBT “brought home” getting in touch with thoughts and behaviours. David realised he had been “doing psychology” for years through previous work roles, considering this gave his therapy a 'head start'.

**Learning New Strategies**

Participants identified new strategies suggested by therapy. David went from “not knowing how to handle it, to knowing how to handle it”. David and Gina identified practical tips, such as prioritising tasks and focusing on one task at time, as important. Bill developed a knowledge of “what to do with it [anxiety]” and Claire was “hungry for more information…developing a deeper understanding of skills”.

**Putting Knowledge into Practice**

Participants reported using strategies outside of the therapeutic environment as vital. “finding it interesting is not enough – you need to practice doing it” (Claire)

They also emphasised the importance of continuing with the strategies:
“well, I’m not boasting but I did try to do them as often as she suggested, to begin with I thought this is a waste of time but as you progressed and the more often you used the tape you began.. by the end I used to find it difficult to lift my hand I was just so relaxed!” (Janet)

Participants who noted either the discontinuation of therapeutic changes following therapy or lack of therapeutic change highlighted that they had not put the strategies suggested into practice (e.g. Fred), or had ceased to do so (e.g. Isobel). Fred identified a downward cycle where he would say he would do something, not follow this through, then feel he disappointed the therapist, further lowering his mood. However he noted after therapy, by doing suggested strategies, he was now noticing therapeutic change.

**Therapeutic Changes**

*Acceptance and Adjustment*

As a result of the process of therapy (Building the therapeutic relationship and Developing a new understanding) several participants noted developing acceptance of their situation, adjusting to circumstances, or taking things as they come and being able to “let it go” (Claire, David, Esther, Fred, Kate and Hazel).

“What I have learned to do is, instead of taking that hurt with me, let go of it and get on with my life.” (Hazel).

*Change in Relation to Previous Self*

Some participants entered therapy hoping to return to an improved self. All mentioned changes in relation to the ‘previous self’ who entered the therapeutic environment. Participants noted changes in the way they thought about themselves and their needs (e.g. Agnes and Esther). Claire and David “put aside” punishing
themselves and Bill put all his problems behind him. Some described themselves as a completely different person in comparison to before therapy.

David’s emotions changed from “defeat to hope”. Agnes, Bill, Claire, David and Esther, all developed a sense of calmness, through looking at life differently (gaining a new perspective – in Developing a new understanding). Seeing things differently (gaining a new perspective) fed into noticing changes in relation to previous self. Thus change in relation to previous self is not only a result of therapy, but also part of the process of therapeutic change. Participants became aware of changes occurring in relation to their previous self, and this awareness led to further changes.

*Developing and strengthening self-efficacy*

Many participants developed confidence (Agnes, Bill, Claire, Fred, Kate, Les and Janet) from building the therapeutic relationship, but also due to the new understanding they developed about how to ‘handle’ their ‘problem’. This is interpreted as developing and strengthening existing self efficacy. Participants also developed courage (Claire), became stronger (Agnes), regained control (Bill) and improved self-esteem, as a result of increasing confidence in their abilities. Esther identified “seeing I was getting there” helped to develop therapeutic change. However this process was not always described as an easy one.

“It was a struggle but I did it, I was quite chuffed with myself – I just thought I can do this” (Janet)

*Helpful Factors and Barriers to therapeutic change*

Helpful factors facilitating therapeutic change were: having things to read/ having things written down (Claire & Janet), having things to look forward to (Fred), doing the homework/practicing strategies outside the therapeutic environment (Claire,
Janet and Esther), having practical help resulting in reduced stress (Esther) and feeling safe (Claire, Esther and Agnes).

Barriers to change were, for Fred, his own lack of engagement with the therapist and not following advice. He “broke promises” made to the therapist, lacking confidence/self efficacy, and therefore “put off” taking action. Although Gina did not identify barriers to change she found it more difficult to develop the therapeutic relationship, as she was unable to ‘know’ the therapist. She felt the relationship was not balanced and did not feel that she had noticed many changes as a result.

“I did open up and she is a good listener but I never got to know her. If I asked her anything she just...[waved hand in a ‘dismissive’ gesture]. But then I’m a people’s person I like to get to know people. But that was a funny one and I did speak to my friend about it and she said they’re trained to do that. You won’t get any information out of her.” (Gina).

Despite these barriers, some level of therapeutic change was indicated by all participants.

**Timing**
There are two elements to the timing construct – time taken for therapeutic change to occur, and the time point when change happened.

*Given appropriate time*
All were given appropriate time for change to occur and no one thought therapy ended too early. Esther thought not rushing “taking wee steps” was the right pace for her. Agnes, Claire, Janet, Kate and Bill all agreed they were given enough time in therapy to make changes. However there was no consensus of the appropriate timeframe for change. The number of therapy sessions varied from 5 to 27. In
addition participants were conscious of the duration of their therapy in relation to peers or their own expectations. But again, this differed between participants, Bill was “surprised it was so quick” whereas Janet asked, “this is taking an awfy long time, no? And (therapist) said ‘no you are making progress’”.

Discharge was decided either by the therapist (with client agreement) or by the client requesting it. Therapy ended was when it became repetitive, the client became ‘their own therapist’, doing strategies on their own, or therapy is not achieving therapeutic change.

When his therapist suggested ending therapy, Fred agreed and “didn’t see the point in continuing it”. Whereas Esther requested ending therapy as she felt continuing therapy would become counterproductive as it was “going over the hurt again” and they (herself and her husband) had “gone as far as we could go… it is up to us now”.

**Timing of change**

There was no consensus as to when change was noticed. Some noticed changes gradually, as they relaxed into therapy (e.g. Agnes), whereas others suddenly became aware of differences (e.g. David).

**Post therapy reflections and commitments of continuation**

Once the client left the therapeutic environment there was evidence of further reflection and commitments to continue with strategies and advice. Post-discharge, clients were aware “it’s up to us now” (Esther), knowing they have responsibility for continuing work begun in therapy. Even Bill, who still felt “part of the illness”, was making plans to continue exposure work. Kate continued to have trust in the therapist, but felt further therapeutic change was required afterwards:
“I felt calmer, I am on the road. I’m sure she wouldn’t have discharged me if she thought I couldn’t cope” (Kate)

Claire realised she still has a “long way to go yet but “there is no going back now – keep moving forwards” stressing “the journey belongs to you”. Janet at point of discharge was uncertain initially, but increased confidence after reflecting on therapy.

“I really felt out on a limb, a wee bit scared, how am I going to do this on my own? But then I thought about it, she’d given me all the strategies and what I should do and it was up to me to do them. It was on my shoulders. It was a two sided, you felt this is an achievement but apprehensive too”. (Janet)

Upon reflection of therapy, some felt it easy and simple, others found the process more difficult. Bill didn’t know why he “didn’t do it sooner”. However all participants would recommend seeing a therapist to others, and reported some level of improvement. For most, changes were noted during therapy, but for some, the biggest impact was change developed post therapy (e.g. Fred). Differing magnitudes of change were reported and this could be a result of the differing complexity of presenting problem and length of treatment (i.e. Bill stated it was a “huge change” was treated for simple phobias over 7 sessions and Janet described her change as more “subtle and gradual” and was treated for anxiety/trauma for 27 sessions).

Post therapy reflections and commitments of continuation were demonstrated as a result of therapeutic changes and by continuing to develop a new understanding. What is less clear is the role of the therapeutic relationship post therapy. There is evidence of the belief and trust therapists had in clients, improved client’s self
efficacy, resulting in confidence to continue therapeutic work outside the therapeutic environment, which further developed their belief in self.

**Participants review of model**

Following analysis, the model of psychological change processes was shared with three participants for quality assurance. All three felt the model was representative of their perceptions of psychological change.

“that’s exactly it” (Kate)

“I didn’t change all that much, but maybe that’s because I didn’t feel the relationship I had with {therapist} was two-way. Maybe that was what was missing?” (Gina)

“You are right age doesn’t create all the problems but it is definitely there… you don’t get to my age without learning a few things along the way!” (Les)

### 2.6 Discussion

**Entering the Therapeutic Environment**

Entry to therapy for all participants was by GP referral, however circumstances differed. The route to referral influenced level of apprehension and start of therapy. The therapeutic relationship with GPs is important in identifying need for therapy. This follows help seeking in older people literature and echoes Mackenkie, Gekoski and Knox’s (2006) finding older people have a favourable intention to seek help from primary care practitioners, but also possible barriers to seeking help, due to fear of the consequences, (Walter, Illife & Orrell, 2001). This was particularly relevant for David who experienced taking, and ‘failing’ a memory test, believing this was why his GP referred him to clinical psychology.
Building the Therapeutic Relationship

Positive aspects of the therapeutic relationship were found similar to the adult literature, such as the 'listening therapist' (Clarke, Rees & Hardy, 2004), 'interaction with the therapist' (Carey et al 2007), 'having a relationship with a wise warm and competent professional' (Binder, Holgersen & Nielson, 2009), and 'personal contact' (Llewelyn et al, 1988). However this study shows older people perceived reciprocal engagement alongside the qualities, behaviours and position of both themselves and therapist to be important in building a therapeutic relationship.

Developing a New Understanding

Developing a new understanding could be linked to ‘understanding or altering ones thoughts and beliefs’ identified as facilitating psychological change in the adult literature (Clarke, Rees & Hardy 2004, Orford et al 2006 and Higginson & Mansell 2008). Within developing a new understanding, learning new strategies and putting strategies into practice categories are reflective of the ‘practical/ doing’ aspects of therapy seen as ‘testing things out’ (Clarke, Rees & Hardy 2004),’ tools and strategies’ (Carey et al 2007) and ‘keeping it real’ (Rayner, Thompson & Walsh 2011). However, drawing on life lessons learned was as important for the older people in this study as learning new approaches.

A Trans-diagnostic and Trans-therapy, non-linear model of change

Most, but not all, older people in this study had CBT, and yet similar change processes were found. This suggests similar processes underlie older people’s therapeutic change, and therefore change process research can be conducted both trans-diagnostically and trans-therapeutically with an older people age group.
The process described by older people in this study somewhat fits with assimilation theory (Stiles et al, 1990) wherein there was a catalyst/problematic experience (circumstances of referral, leading to help seeking and entering the therapeutic environment) which was then assimilated into ‘schemata’ (developing a new understanding) which developed in the interaction between therapist and client (Building the therapeutic relationship). However Stiles et al (1990) also define ‘stages’ which the client moves through whilst assimilating problematic experiences, suggestive of a linear process. In contrast, the model proposed in this paper is a non-linear one, echoing Hayes et al (2007) review, challenging linear, gradual perceptions of therapeutic change.

**Post therapy Reflections and Life Review**

Reviewing past experiences is a concept that is common across developmental theorists’ perceptions of ageing (see Ashford & LeCroy, 2009 for further details). Erikson’s (1959/1980) 8th ‘life stage’ is characterised by the developmental task of integrity versus despair. This life stage takes place in older adulthood, 60 years old and onwards, involving reflection and increased introspection. If through this reflection the individual is satisfied their life has been both rewarding and meaningful, they achieve integrity but if not, are vulnerable to despair. In the current study, post therapy reflections contributed to the non-linear shape of the model and this construct may be more prominent within older people compared to younger adults, reflecting the developmental stage of old age.

**Age and Ageing as Context**

A major assumption of this study is that the therapeutic process may be different for older people, due to adaptations made to therapies by clinicians, (e.g. Knight, 2009,
Laidlaw et al, 2003, Laidlaw & McAlpine, 2008, Satre, Knight & David, 2006, & Evans, 2007). These authors suggest when working therapeutically with older people additional factors need accounted for, due to ‘cohort effects’. A cohort effect is shown in having different needs, differing ways of looking at themselves, others and the world. A client raised during 1920s and 1930s is likely to have different views of mental illness or help seeking than younger adults. In addition older people in general face different challenges to younger adults due to loss, health problems and co-morbid difficulties. Study participants reflected these issues.

Although this study did not specifically ask about impact of ageing, or age differences in therapeutic experiences, age was raised by participants. Ageing was not discussed as an integral part of the change process, rather a context within which the therapeutic process sat. This follows Laidlaw et al (2003) and Laidlaw & McAlpine (2008) recommendations that therapists may not have to make significant adaptations to therapeutic treatment, but should hold age specific contexts, e.g. cohort effects, in mind whilst working with this population.

**Limitations of study & Directions for future studies**

This study relied upon participant’s memory, therefore faced potential hindsight bias or failure of memory to recall when or how change happened. This explorative study looked at the whole change process, therefore was conducted after therapy finished, with interviews within a month of discharge to minimise this risk. Post therapy reflections and commitments of continuation were considered integral to the process of change, and had interviews been conducted earlier, this element may have been overlooked.
Future older people studies examining change processes during progression of therapy may clarify timing of changes, and confirm if therapeutic change is a linear staged process or more discontinuous, as seen in this study and by Hayes et al, (2007).

Although perceptions of change were recorded, it used no formal measure of outcome, in terms of quality of life or symptom reduction. Further studies are required of links between perception of psychological therapeutic change processes and therapeutic outcome. Although poor engagement was suggested to be linked with poorer outcomes this was not thoroughly investigated.

Although this study suggests a trans-theoretical model is valid for older people, the majority of participants in this study received CBT. However those who received a different therapeutic intervention also followed the model. Further research with a more diverse range of therapeutic modalities, such as behavioural (e.g. ACT) and relational (e.g. psychoanalytic) based therapies would further examine if this core therapeutic process is trans-theoretical.

Although building the therapeutic relationship was demonstrated to be integral to the therapeutic change process, only one ‘side’ of this relationship was investigated. Given therapist and client perceptions of helpful factors of therapy may differ (Llewelyn, 1988), it is possible their perceptions of building the therapeutic relationship may also differ. Participants described a mutual process of therapist engaging the client and client engaging with therapist. Further research examining therapist/client pairs could investigate this process in more depth.

The study had no upper age limit however the majority fell within the 65-75 year old age group, with none over 85. Developmental theorists Newman and Newman
(2006) separate later life into two different developmental stages: late adulthood (60-75 years old) and very old age (75 years old until death). Similarly, Erikson and Erikson (1998) extended Erikson’s (1980) life cycle theory to include a 9th stage which encompasses different developmental tasks which take into account the increased frailty of the late 80s and onwards. Given the lack of representation of those aged over their mid-80s, further research should investigate if this model also fits the ‘oldest old’ age group.

2.7 Conclusion
The results of this study supported a trans-theoretical, trans–diagnostic, non-linear process of psychological change. There were parallels with the findings from the adult psychological change process literature, such as the importance of building therapeutic relationships and learning new strategies, additional older people specific constructs were also found.

Older people highlighted that their change process occurred within the context of ageing. In addition, alongside learning new strategies and putting these into practice, older people identified that therapy facilitated the drawing on life lessons learned through previous experiences (pre-therapy). The non-linear shape of the process of change model supported developmental perceptions of ageing, wherein older people demonstrated increased reflection and introspection (e.g. Erikson’s (1959/1980) 8th life stage).

In keeping with Sadavoy (2009) proposed that when undertaking therapy with older people clinicians should keep the “5 C’s” in mind (Complexity, Chronicity, Comorbidity, Continuity and Context). He argued that older people’s psychological distress can be more complex, last longer, have a high number of co-morbidities and
are heavily influenced by the context in which they occur. Psychological distress that originated as a result of early life experiences can be maintained by the way we perceive ourselves and others (referred to as Internal Working Models in attachment theory and schemas in assimilation theory). The attachment style developed in infancy can be replicated in future relationships. This continues to have an impact into older adulthood as demonstrated in the concepts of Seeking Help, Building of Therapeutic Relationships and Drawing on Life Lessons Learned as highlighted in the model proposed by this study. Thus attachment styles can be the cause of psychological distress, but can also serve to maintain it.

Attachment is trans-theoretical and trans-diagnostic and a relevant construct across the life span. Several researchers, using different research methodologies, have demonstrated that the concepts of attachment are applicable in adulthood. However, what is less clear is the understanding of attachment in older adulthood to inform therapy.
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Chapter 3. **Attachment in Older People: A Systematic Review**

### 3.1 Abstract

Objective: This current paper sought to systematically review the quality of studies examining attachment constructs within an older people population (defined as over 60 years old), and considered how attachment is assessed within this population.

Methodology: 22 papers were identified as relevant to this review; however 7 of these drew their conclusions from the same data set and were therefore grouped together. The quality of the remaining 16 articles was assessed using a qualitative framework, developed for this review.

Results: The methodological quality of these studies was found to be variable. Despite these limitations, attachment was found to be a relevant construct within an older people population and could be grouped into the following key concepts; the stability of attachment across the lifespan, the universality/biologically programmed nature of attachment and the dimensions of attachment in relation to psychological adjustment and affect.

Discussion: The above concepts are discussed in relation to the theoretical aspects of attachment theory. Suggestions for directions for future research are also discussed in this review.

Keywords: Attachment, Measurement of Attachment, Older People
Highlights:

- Attachment classifications are relevant to older people, aged 60 years and over.
- There is an emerging evidence base of the different ways attachment styles can impact upon several issues that are particularly salient for this age group but there is insufficient data to draw conclusions at this stage.
- Limited evidence of studies exploring if the same measures of attachment standardised for younger adults are valid and reliable to use with older people.
- It is unclear whether the distribution of attachment styles differ in an older people population compared to younger adults, studies investigating this had significant methodological limitations and therefore these findings should be interpreted with caution.

This systematic review is written following the author guidelines of the journal Clinical Psychology Review. As per the guidelines, smaller tables are included as part of the text but the lengthy tables are situated in the appendices. The word count of the systematic review (except abstract, references and appendices) 8,901.
3.2 Introduction

A brief history of attachment theory development

Bowlby (1958) changed the way people examined the bond between infant and mother in the context of disruption through separation, deprivation and/or bereavement. Attachment figures provide a ‘safe base’ from which children can explore the world (Ainsworth, 1985). Attachment was defined by Cookman (2003) as referring to feelings of safety which are developed by proximity to an attachment figure in response to cues of danger, challenge or conflict. This proximity to the attachment figure gives individuals confidence, when they need feelings of safety and security, allowing individuals to interact with the environment. Attachment theory is believed to be relevant for individuals throughout their lifespan, as we have a continued need to develop and maintain enduring bonds with others (Ainsworth, 1985).

Attachment theory across the lifespan

Bowlby’s concept of internal working models (IWM) is developed from the relationship ‘prototype’ established between an infant and their caregiver (Bradley & Cafferty, 2001). An individual’s IWM influences the way in which they perceive and evaluate interpersonal relationships and, although the interactions with the original attachment figure may have changed in form and function, the IWM provides a framework which has ‘profound’ impact upon adult relationships (Bradley & Cafferty, 2001).
Since attachment styles will influence help seeking behaviour, it is important for the therapist to develop a good understanding of their client’s IWM to guide therapeutic interventions (Daniel, 2006). By uncovering the links between past experiences and current ways of thinking and behaving, current behaviour becomes more understandable.

The different traditions of measuring attachment

To ‘tap into’ an individual’s attachment style two distinct methodological traditions have emerged, interview or self-report based (Van Assiche et al, 2013). The Adult Attachment Interview (AAI, George et al, 1984, 1985 & 2006) is an interview based measure. The AAI records participants reflecting on their early experiences with caregivers, with professionals coding their responses. The coding system is based upon the way someone speaks about their childhood (narrative coherence), rather than the content per se, and classifies someone as showing either ‘secure-autonomous’, ‘insecure-avoidant’, ‘insecure-dismissing’ or ‘disorganized’ attachment (Ravitz et al, 2010). The measure’s categories are similar to those of attachment behaviour classifications, observed in Ainsworth et al (1978) studies using the ‘strange situation’ paradigm. The AAI investigates early experiences with a focus on the relationship with parents.

In the other ‘methodological camp’ are measures developed using self-reporting. These measures tend to be focussed on relationships with romantic partners (Ravitz et al 2010). Hazan and Shaver (1987) constructed a self-report measure of adult attachment styles within the context of romantic relationships. This measure assumes individual differences in engagement in romantic relationships will mirror Ainsworth’s classifications, again as found within ‘strange situation’ studies, to be ‘secure’, ‘avoidant’ or ‘anxious resistant’.
However individuals classified as ‘dismissing’ on the AAI, and those categorised as ‘avoidant’ on the Hazan and Shaver measure, seemed to differ in important respects (Bartholomew and Horowitz, 1991). This demonstrated a distinction between ‘dismissing avoidance’ and ‘fearful avoidance’. The Bartholomew and Horowitz measure built upon Hazan and Shaver’s model and added Preoccupied as a fourth prototype (see table 1).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attachment prototype</th>
<th>Secure</th>
<th>Avoidant – fearful</th>
<th>Avoidant – dismissing</th>
<th>Preoccupied</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IWM of Self</td>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>Negative</td>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>Negative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IWM of Others</td>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>Negative</td>
<td>Negative</td>
<td>Positive</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1: Representation of Bartholomew & Horowitz (1991) 4 ‘prototypes’.

Since self-report measures investigate conscious attitudes towards current relationships, and memories of relationships, they are not able to detect when defences are distorting the individual’s responses. One implication may be that individuals who may be classified as ‘dismissing’ using a narrative approach may also score as ‘secure’ on a self-report measure. In addition self-report measures are passive, and as such may not detect the attachment ‘phenomena’ that requires activation to be manifested. (Ravitz et al, 2010)

Categories of attachment styles assign individuals to one or other defined category (e.g. secure, insecure etc.) whereas dimensional approaches measure the ‘degree’ by which attachment styles are present. The AAI, Hazan and Shaver’s measure, and the Bartholomew and Horowitz measures, are all categorically based, i.e. an individual is classified as having either one or another attachment style. Griffin and Bartholomew (1994) developed a questionnaire, based upon the Bartholomew and
Horowitz measure, which could be scored both categorically as well as dimensionally.

Roisman et al (2007) conducted a meta-analysis of the association between the interview based AAI ‘security versus insecurity’ and the same self-report measure developed by Griffin and Bartholomew, which suggested a ‘trivial to small empirical overlap’. This suggests that these two attachment measures, coming from different measurement traditions, are measuring different constructs, and therefore warn against citing and discussing the measures as if they were interchangeable, (Roisman et al, 2007). As yet there is no consensus as to whether attachment is inherently categorical or dimensional. Despite the measures being well validated and reliable within an under 60 year old adult population, it is still unclear if the measures all assess the same constructs, or have validity for older people

**The stability of attachment across the life span**

Several authors have suggested that attachment patterns are stable across infancy to young adulthood (e.g. Waters et al, 2000 and Van Ijzendoorn, 1995) and within young adulthood (e.g. Schrafe & Bartholomew, 1994). The prototype perspective (see Fraley et al, 2011) posits rules of information processing and behaviours are constructed in early life, and are developed in adaptation to the individual’s early experiences, such as parental responsiveness. This perspective assumes that although working models may change over time, there is an underlying stable factor, a prototype. However attachment patterns have not been demonstrated to be universally stable and immune to life events. Fraley et al (2011) highlights these findings have led to an alternative perspective that he coined the contextual, or revisionist perspective.
Taking a contextual, or revisionist perspective, people’s working models (representations) are adapted and modified throughout their life, to take account of variation in their environments. Thus it refutes the concept of an inherently stable latent prototype, (Fraley et al, 2011). Although Waters et al (2000) attachment styles were stable in the majority of participants, significant negative life events such as loss, life threatening illness and abuse could disrupt this stability. However the view that attachment styles can be revised in light of experiences has not been universally supported. For example Cozzarelli et al (2003) found that similar life events (such as the death of a close relative) were not strongly related to an alteration of attachment style. One possible explanation for these inconsistent findings is that it is not the objective elements of life events that changes attachment styles, rather it is the meaning people assign to these events (Davila & Sargent, 2003).

A common methodological issue of the majority of research investigating the stability of attachment styles is the use of relatively short time frames. Fraley et al (2011) studied change across 30 days to a year, Scharfe and Bartholomew (1994) for 8 months and Davila and Sargent (2003) 8 weeks. These are relatively short timeframes to demonstrate whether attachment styles change throughout the life span. Attachment theory has been proposed (by Bowlby, 1958; Ainsworth, 1991), as relevant from infancy to old age (from the ‘cradle to the grave’), however research exploring attachment amongst older people is relatively scarce, in comparison to the evidence base for attachment during childhood or young – middle adulthood (Bradley & Cafferty, 2001).
Is attachment theory applicable to older adults?

Antecedents that invoke attachment behaviour, beyond adulthood into older age, can include a variety of different fear-provoking or challenging situations and conflict of interactions (Cookman, 2005). Illness, common for older people, can also provoke attachment behaviour, and may even alter their attachment style (see the revisionist perspective above). As older people are often faced with age-related transitions in relation to their health, knowledge about attachment can enable care staff to mediate these potentially negative effects. (Cookman, 2005)

Two previous reviews investigated attachment and older adulthood (Bradley & Cafferty, 2001 and Van Assiche et al, 2013). Bradley and Cafferty (2001) found attachment particularly salient for older people due to the increased risk of separation, loss and vulnerability facing this population. They found although the number of studies exploring attachment within older age was small, it was rapidly growing. The literature centred around three main focus areas: attachment bonds in caregiving and chronic illness; the influence of attachment styles upon coping with bereavement and loss; and the relationship of attachment styles to adjustment and wellbeing.

Measuring attachment in older adults

Several methodological limitations were apparent across the evidence base of previous reviews of attachment and older people. Validity and reliability of measures used to assess attachment could be called into question. In particular, authors frequently did not measure attachment ‘categories’ per se, but measured ‘dimensions’ of attachment constructs (e.g. Barnas et al, 1991). Therefore it was
unclear if studies were assessing attachment, or other confounding constructs, such as caregiving or satisfaction of relationships.

Although the Bradley and Cafferty (2001) review gave a good overview of available research, it lacked evidence of the literature being gathered in a systematic way, and inclusion or exclusion criteria were not reported. Due to these methodological/reporting limitations it is unclear how the studies were selected, or were representative of the research base as a whole.

It was another ten years before these limitations were addressed by a systematic review of attachment styles, (Van Assicche et al, 2013). This qualitative, systematic review of literature concerning attachment styles and older adults included every study published between 1983 and June 2012. There were four main findings: age-related changes in the number and types of attachment figures (older people had fewer attachment figures in total and appeared to have a higher prevalence of symbolic attachment figures such as a deity); the quality of attachment appeared to change with age (for example there was evidence of lower prevalence of attachment anxiety but not attachment avoidance); attachment was theoretically associated with indices of both intra and inter individual functioning; evidence that insecure attachment styles had a negative impact upon caregiver burden and the behaviour of people with dementia. However again, Van Assicche et al (2013) draw attention to some methodological limitations meaning findings should be treated with caution.

Large differences were found in the prevalence of attachment anxiety and/or avoidance depending upon whether measures assessed attachment styles in general, or relationship specific attachments. In addition, few studies included a control group. Also to study age-related changes in attachment patterns, there was
urgent need for case control and longitudinal study designs. This evidence

tentatively suggests the presence of age-related changes in attachment dimensions,

but not upon classifications. They found a large variation of both sample size and

inclusion criteria, and large differences in how authors classified ‘old age’. These

issues need to be resolved in order to make definite comment on age-related

changes of attachment. Although Van Assiche et al (2013) did report studies

investigating older people’s attachment to place or animals, they highlight these

attachments were outwith the original construct of attachment to humans.

Despite Van Assiche et al (2013)’s review addressing some of the limitations of the

Bradley and Cafferty (2001) paper, by reporting their procedure thoroughly and the

inclusion and exclusion criteria used, neither assessed the reviewed research in

terms of minimisation of bias. Given that most attachment literature is ‘observational’

by nature, minimisation of bias could be argued to be the keystone of assessing

quality in these methodologies.

Both Van Assiche et al (2013) and Bradley and Cafferty (2001) highlight one

significant methodological limitation: examining the phenomenon of attachment

within an older population was dependent on particular measures selected to assess

attachment. They noted several studies used validated and reliable measures, well

known within the attachment and adulthood research (adults aged below 60 years).

However few examine/report if these measures have been validated or assessed as

reliable with an older people population. Thus this systematic review paid particular

attention to quality, validity of measures used, and minimisation of bias, in

assessment of attachment patterns within an older people population.
3.3 Aims of the current review

This current paper sought to systematically review the quality of studies, considered how human to human attachment is assessed within older people (defined as over 60 years old), and provides an up-to-date rigorous critique of attachment within older people, addressing the limitations of previous reviews by including assessing minimisation of bias.

3.4 Method

Inclusion and exclusion criteria

To be included studies were required to be empirical studies encompassing older people (aged 60 and over with no upper age limit) who were cognitively intact, and where a measure of attachment style was undertaken. The studies were only included if they were published in a peer reviewed journal, therefore research from dissertations, poster presentations, conference presentations and book chapters were excluded. In addition, case studies and single N research were also excluded. Reviews of attachment in older age were also excluded from the systematic review. Research encompassing only those with dementia, were excluded as this study investigates attachment in cognitively intact older people only. Studies that examined attachment to spiritual symbolism, attachment to place and / or attachment to pets were also excluded. It was considered that these excluded papers were inconsistent to the research questions of this review, which only examined human relationships. As access to translation services was not available, only studies published in the English language were included. The author acknowledged this may have introduced some bias and limited the scope of the search.
Search strategy

The following databases were searched in February 2015: EMBASE, MEDLINE, ASSIA, PsychInfo (EBSCO) and CINAHL. These databases were searched to include studies from the earliest available date to February 2015. The search terms used combined the following: ‘attachment’, ‘attachment style(s), ‘attachment pattern (s)’, ‘attachment behaviour’ with ‘old age’, ‘elderly’, ‘geriatric’, ‘lifespan’, ‘late(r) life’.

The literature search from the aforementioned databases generated 6033 results (669 from EMBASE, 4650 from MEDLINE, 281 from ASSIA, 240 from Psychinfo (EBSCO) and 193 from CINAHL). These results were screened for relevance by title and 555 results were retained. The abstracts of these studies were retrieved and screened and the methods of 288 studies were reviewed. See systematic review Flowchart1 below. A further 24 were identified as duplicates and removed. 22 studies were reviewed in full, however 7 used the same dataset and were grouped together as one for this review (see Appendix 2).
Developing a Quality Criteria Rating Checklist for a systematic review of observational studies

There are many checklists for rating the quality of published research, however these are predominantly designed to review studies which utilise randomised control trials (e.g. SIGN Methodology Checklist 2: Controlled Trials, 2012) or evaluations of reviews (such as SIGN Methodology Checklist 1: Systematic Reviews and Meta-analyses, 2014). However the studies identified which addressed the aims of the
current review utilised an Observational Methodology. Therefore a quality criteria rating checklist was developed from Sanderson, Tatt and Higgins' (2007) systematic review of ‘Tools Used For Assessing Quality And Susceptibility To Bias In Observational Studies In Epidemiology: A systematic Review And Annotated Bibliography’, the Critical Appraisal Skills Programme – cohort study checklist (CASP, 2010) the SIGN methodology checklist of cohort studies (2012) and the Strengthening the Reporting of Observational studies in Epidemiology statement (STROBE, 2007). Sanderson, Tatt and Higgins (2007) concluded, although there are several useful assessment tools, as yet there is no definitive tool which stands out above the rest. They report that due to the nature of observational studies this methodology is particularly susceptible to bias and therefore assessing how researchers control for this variable is an important consideration to bear in mind when reviewing observational studies.

A qualitative judgement is acknowledged to be subjective, and as such there is a risk of bias, therefore all appraised studies were prorated independently by the author 1 and author 2 or 3. Any disagreements were resolved through discussion to minimise the risk of rater bias. Consensus inter-rater bias (KAPPA) could not be calculated as no overall rating score was included in the checklist.

Although it is acknowledged that the following quality criteria rating checklist is not standardised, nor validated (as that is outwith the scope of this review), it has been developed using the summary and amalgamation of several well respected and validated tools. The following checklist was designed to act as a guide as to the methodological strengths of the studies’ efforts to control for bias, rather than to address all the comparative merits and weaknesses. It is considered that controlling for bias is an important indicator of the relative quality of observational studies’
methodologies (Sanderson, Tatt & Higgens, 2007). The utilised quality criteria rating checklist was as follows:

**Quality Criteria Rating Checklist**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1.</th>
<th>Does the study address a specific research question?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a.</td>
<td>did the methodology used in the study answer their research question?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2.</th>
<th>Are the selection methods clearly defined &amp; appropriate?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a.</td>
<td>are participants representative of a defined population?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b.</td>
<td>were they recruited in an acceptable way?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c.</td>
<td>are inclusion &amp; exclusion criteria clearly defined?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d.</td>
<td>are criteria justified?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>3.</th>
<th>Is the measurement of study variables clearly defined &amp; appropriate?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a.</td>
<td>are the measures validated?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b.</td>
<td>are the measures reliable?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c.</td>
<td>are the measures validated for older people?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>4.</th>
<th>Are any design specific sources of bias reported? –</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a.</td>
<td>are any design specific sources of bias appropriately minimised?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b.</td>
<td>were the measurement methods similar in all groups?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c.</td>
<td>is there evidence of minimisation of bias?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>5.</th>
<th>Is the control of confounding variables reported &amp; appropriate? –</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a.</td>
<td>have the authors identified all important confounding factors?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b.</td>
<td>have they taken account of the confounding factors in the design?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c.</td>
<td>have they taken account of the confounding factors in the analysis?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>6.</th>
<th>Is the use of statistics clearly defined &amp; appropriate?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a.</td>
<td>appropriate method of analysis used?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b.</td>
<td>effect sizes &amp; power calculations completed?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c.</td>
<td>effect sizes &amp; power calculations met?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d.</td>
<td>do they explain how missing data was addressed?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>7.</th>
<th>Are any conflicts of interest declared?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

| 8. | Has the research specified if it had gained ethical approval? |

### 3.5 Results

**Characteristics of the studies**

All the studies were observational in nature and cross-sectional in design. Sample sizes varied across the studies from 48 to 86,555. The age ranges varied from 60 to
no upper age limit. Three studies included in this review included participants aged from 17 to 96 as these examined age differences in attachment styles. See Study Characteristics table for more information (Appendix 9).

**Population Characteristics**
In total 91,925 participants were assessed across all the studies, however it should be noted that this figure includes the younger aged adults from the age comparison studies. The age range of older people spanned from 60 – 102 years old (it is not clear what the N is for this group as it was not reported in some studies). No studies differentiated between the oldest old and the youngest old. It is not possible to accurately report the gender split of the overall population as several studies did not include this information. Participants were recruited from a variety of sources including internet respondents, randomly selected samples from suburban communities, former prisoner of war associations, senior centres, randomly selected population registries, caseloads of individual clinicians, nursing homes, churches and retirement facilities, from newspapers and notices and the older relatives of the younger adult participants. It is not possible to report the specific demographics of the various populations, such as socio-economic status, as this was not always reported.

**Measurement of Attachment**
The results of the review showed that a variety of tools were used to measure attachment. One paper used a constructed, structured interview, developed for that particular study (Barnas, Pellina & Cummings, 1991), however the majority utilised a standardised measure. Nine measures were self-report measures, two were interview based and one was a self-report measure but applied in an interview format. Eight measures were dimensional in nature, three were categorical and one
was both. Five measures examined attachment styles in relationships in general, one measure addressed romantic relationships, two examined relationship to adult offspring and in two the relationship examined was unclear.

The Adult Attachment Prototype Rating (Kirchmann et al, 2007) was used by Kirchmann et al (2013), and the Adult Attachment Styles Questionnaire (Hazan & Shaver, 1987) used by Waugh et al (2007). Experiences in Close Relationships (Brennan, Clark & Shaver, 1998) was used by (Dieperink et al (2001) and the revised version (Fraley, Waller & Brennan, 2000) used by Chopik et al (2013). The Lipson-Parra Adult Attachment Scale (Lipson-Parra, 1990) was applied by Lipson-Parra (1990), and the Measurement of Attachment Qualities (Carver, 1997) was utilised by Segal, Needham and Coolidge (2009). The Relationship Questionnaire (Bartholomew & Horowitz, 1991) was used by five studies (Ruby & Tasker, 2008; Webster, 1997; Diehl et al, 1998; Dieperink et al, 2001 & Jain & Labouvie-Vief, 2010), the Relationship Scale Questionnaire (Griffin & Batholomew, 1994) was employed by three (Magai et al, 2001; Verdecias et al, 2009 & Segal, Needham & Coolidge, 2009), and the Relationship Specific Attachment Scales for Adults (Asendorpf et al, 1997) was utilised by Klug et al (2014). Perren et al (2007) used a measure based upon Hazan & Shaver’s (1987, 1990) single item measure of attachment style. See Measures of Attachment table for more information (Appendix 11).

The Experiences in Close Relationships – Revised (ECR-R) Inventory (Fraley, Waller & Brennan, 2000) was used by Chopik et al (2013). The ECR-R Inventory measures individual differences in attachment avoidance and anxiety, and involves individuals rating statements by the extent they agree with each item on a Likert
scale from 1 strongly disagree to 7 strongly agree. Although good convergent and divergent validity has been demonstrated for this measure (see Sibley, Fischer & Liu, 2005) the same psychometric properties have not been investigated in older people.

The Relationship Questionnaire (Hazan & Shaver, 1987) has been through a variety of different revisions. Waugh et al (2007) refer to this questionnaire as the Adult Attachment Styles Questionnaire. The measure itself involves participants identifying the paragraph that best describes their feelings about themselves in relationships. There are three paragraphs that represent the attachment patterns as proposed by Ainsworth et al (1978). The secure style describes being comfortable with intimacy and dependency, with a low anxiety of loss. The ambivalent paragraphs describe a desire of closeness but with concern about rejection, and desiring more intimacy than most people. The final paragraph depicts the avoidant style which includes discomfort with intimacy and dependency, and a lack of trust in relationships. Similar to the ECR-R Inventory (Fraley, Waller & Brennan, 2000) convergent and divergent validity has been demonstrated (see Sibley, Fischer & Liu, 2005) but this has not been replicated for older people.

In 1991 Bartholomew and Horowitz modified the Relationship Questionnaire. They proposed that individuals' attachment is dichotomised as being either positive or negative. They highlighted that as adult attachment can be conceptualised as image of self and image of others, there are 4 different possible attachment styles; secure (positive self-positive others), dismissing (positive self-negative others), preoccupied (negative self-positive others) and fearful attachment (negative self-negative others). The modification suggested by Bartholomew and Horowitz (1991) involves two parts. In the first part, participants read paragraphs describing the 4 different adult attachment styles (secure, dismissing, preoccupied and fearful attachment) and
select the one they feel best describes their behaviour in close relationships. In the second part, participants re-read the same paragraphs and indicate how similar they describe their behaviour in close relationships on a 5 point Likert scale (1 very unlike me, 5 very like me). The Bartholomew and Horowitz (1991) Relationship Questionnaire was developed for use within a young adult population, however was utilised in several studies included in this review (Diehl et al, 1998, Dieperink et al, 2001, Jain & Labouvie-Vief, 2010 (although these authors call the questionnaire the Attachment Prototypes Questionnaire), Rusby & Tasker, 2008 and Webster, 1997). Validity for an older aged adult population was not sufficiently demonstrated.

Another modification of the Relationship Questionnaire was developed by Griffin and Bartholomew (1994). The Relationship Style Questionnaire (Griffin & Bartholomew, 1994) is comprised of 30 statements collated from the attachment scales developed by Bartholomew and Horowitz, 1992, Collins and Read, 1990 and Hazan and Shaver, 1987. This questionnaire has 4 scales; secure, preoccupied, fearful and dismissive which each have four/five items rated on a 5 point Likert scale from 1 not at all like me to 5, very much like me. As it is a dimensional measure there is a score on each scale. The attachment quality of each scale is the same as used in Bartholomew and Horowitz (1991) Relationship Questionnaire. The Relationship Style Questionnaire (RSQ) was adopted by Magai et al (2001), Verecias et al (2009) and Segal, Needham & Coolidge (2009). This latter study also utilised the Measurement of Attachment Qualities (MAQ, Carver, 1997). The MAQ is also a self-report measure. The scales in this questionnaire are secure, avoidant and two ambivalent attachment patterns (ambivalent-worry and ambivalent-merger). Each scale contains 3-5 items that participants rate on a 4 point Likert scale from 1, I disagree a lot to 4, I agree a lot. This measure is also dimensional. Segal, Needham
& Coolidge (2009) demonstrated modest evidence for convergent validity between the MAQ and the RSQ for older people.

Lipson-Parra (1990) developed the Lipson-Parra Adult Attachment Scale which consisted of 59 items, 55 of which were attachment items. These were based on Bowlby’s framework of specificity, duration, engagement of emotion, organization, biological function (safety/security) and caregiving. This was also a dimensional measure, with participants selecting a response to each statement of completely true to not true at all. Construct validity, specifically for older people, of this assessment scale was established via factor analysis (Lipson – Parra, 1990).

The Adult Attachment Prototype Rating (Kirchmann et al, 2007; Pilkonis, 1988 & Strauss et al, 1999) was utilised by Kirchmann et al (2013). This interview based procedure measures degrees of attachment security as a continuous variable and attachment categories as discrete variables i.e secure, ambivalent or avoidant. Kirchmann et al (2013) indicate that it has been demonstrated to have high reliability and validity estimates, however it appears that the same psychometric properties have been presented for older people. Klug et al (2014) also used an interview format using the Relationship-Specific Attachment Scales for Adults (Asendorpf et al. 1997), which was based upon a self-report questionnaire, in order to increase validity for use with older adults (as suggested by Asendorf in a personal communication to Klug et al, 2014).

There were several research articles that appeared to utilise the same sample, and use the same methods as those reported in Magai et al (2001). This review has grouped these studies together and the key findings are presented in the study characteristics table in appendix 9. As these all used the same methodology,
conducted with the same sample, and used the same measure of attachment, reported in similar ways, only Magai et al (2001), as the first study in this series, was compared to the quality checklist to reduce duplication.

**Does Attachment Change across the Lifespan?**

Four studies examined age differences in attachment styles. Chopik et al (2013) and Jain and Labouvie-Vief (2010) compared an older people sample with a younger adult sample and found differences in attachment styles correlated to age. Chopik et al (2013) suggested older people presented as having lower attachment anxiety, however they excluded those aged over 70. This limits the applicability of this study as it is not representative of an older population. In addition, this study investigated only attachment anxiety and avoidance. Jain and Labouvie-Vief (2010) suggested that for older people attachment styles are linked to emotion category predicting response times. Segal, Needham & Coolidge (2009) and Diehl et al (1998) also investigated age differences in attachment style. Segal, Needham & Coolidge (2009) found effects of age on the ambivalent-worry scale of one measure (MAQ) and the preoccupied attachment scale of the RSQ (which they argue measure the same construct). However they did not find any age differences in the secure, avoidant or dismissing attachment classifications. It should be noted that some of their older age group participants were relatives of the younger age group sample which may have introduced bias. Diehl et al (1998) found differences in family climate and personality variables on attachment classifications but no interactions by age. However it should be noted that although they attempted to recruit a representative sample, they do acknowledge that their sample overly represented high functioning and well educated individuals which may have had a confounding impact upon their results. Given these methodological issues, these results declaring either the presence or
the absence of age related differences in attachment styles should be interpreted with caution.

Webster (1997) noted that the distribution of attachment styles in his study appeared to differ from previous research conducted with younger participants. He reported that 52.2% of his elderly participants were classified as dismissively attached, versus 18% of younger adults (as reported by Mikulincer & Orbach, 1995). Webster’s (1997) results also suggested the opposite effect in relation to secure attachment (33.3% in Webster’s 1997 study of older people and 47% in younger adults as reported by Mikulincer & Orbach, 1995). He concluded that within older people population dismissing attachment styles are more prevalent than secure, and the opposite distribution appears to be true in younger adults (he also noted the distribution of attachment styles within younger adults appears to be similar to the distribution seen in infants).

In summary, it is possible that there is a different distribution of attachment styles within an older people population compared to younger adults. However, there were no longitudinal studies to investigate whether these age differences are due to factors such as cohort effects, or due to the impact of major life events such as experiences during World War II.

Is Attachment a Universal/ Biologically Pre-programmed system?
If attachment is a universal/ biologically pre-programmed system one would expect the distribution of attachment styles to be roughly equal across both genders and ethnicities. Chopik et al (2013) found that women tended to have slightly higher anxiety (this difference was greatest amongst younger adults) and avoidance styles. There is also evidence of gender differences in relation to attachment and
depression/loneliness (Klug et al, 2014). For men, lower depression was associated with higher attachment severity with no reported feelings of loneliness. For women, lower depression was also associated with not feeling lonely, but the association with secure attachment was weaker than for the men. Gender differences in attachment styles have been suggested in the child and general adult literature however Bakermans-Kranenburg and Van IJzendoon (2009) suggest there is only a “brittle” evidence base on which to support this claim. Clearly there is need for further investigation into potential gender differences in the distribution of attachment styles.

There is limited research examining attachment and ethnicity. Those which investigated attachment and ethnicity in older people used the same dataset and reported different aspects of ethnicity in various different papers, this means that there is a possibility that the results they found are limited to the unique population recruited and therefore not generalisable. Magai et al (2001) noted that although the majority of their sample had dismissing/avoidant attachment styles, those classified as European Americans score higher than African Americans on attachment security and African Americans scored higher than European Americans on dismissing attachment. Montague et al (2003) found that there were ethnic differences (between African American and European American adults) in adult attachment and childhood socialization practices. Merz and Consedine (2012) found that the association between secure attachment and wellbeing was stronger among African Americans and English speaking Caribbean, compared with European American and Eastern European immigrant groups. Furthermore, they noted that negative fearful/avoidant attachment style on wellbeing was buffered by being an English speaking Caribbean, but not for the other groups. As these findings have not been replicated and reliability is called into question, no firm implications from these results can be drawn.
There was also evidence that life experiences have an impact and possibly change attachment styles. Two studies included in this review compared attachment styles in older people who were evacuated during World War II and those who were not evacuated. Rusby and Tasker’s (2008) evacuated sample were evacuated between the ages of 4-6 years. However, given Bowlby’s (1958) assertion that attachment styles were said to be developed before the age of 4 years old, if attachment styles are assumed to be stable and trait-like, the experience of being evacuated between the ages of 4-6 should not impact upon attachment styles. However, Rusby and Tasker (2008) found differences in attachment styles in comparison to those who were not evacuated, with a fewer number of those who were evacuated being categorised as securely attached and an increased incidence of fearful attachment styles. Similarly, Waugh et al’s (2007) results suggest that abuse during evacuation led to increased levels of trauma and insecure attachment styles. It could be argued that significant life events may alter attachment styles. These studies support evidence suggesting that attachment styles can be revised in light of adverse life experiences (such as Waters et al, 2000).

**Dimensions of Outcome in relation to Psychological Adjustment and Affect**

Two groups of researchers investigated attachment and affect. Jain & Labouvve-Vief (2010) assessed participants’ attachment and associated performance on a Stroop task. They found that dismissing attachment styles were associated with longer response times for anger and fear words, and secure was associated with increased reaction times for joy. They noted that overall anxious attachment styles were associated with slower reaction times. The second group of researchers used the same dataset but commented on different aspects of emotional experience. Secure attachment was associated with less guilt, contempt & shame and more joy, sadness
interest, fear and anger. Dismissive attachment was associated with less joy, shame and fear (Consedine & Magai, 2003). Early emotion socialization had both direct and indirect (mediated by attachment style) effects on emotional experience. Further, the impact of punitive socialization on adult negative affect was greater in older people, compared to younger adults (Magai et al, 2004). Merz and Consedine (2009) also noted that higher attachment security was associated with stronger positive emotional support and this led to less negative effects on older people’s wellbeing. However, due to insufficient replication of findings, limited implications can be drawn with regards to attachment and affect.

In relation to psychological adjustment, Kirchmann et al (2013) stated that secure attachment was associated with better adjustment to medical burden, in terms of higher life satisfaction scores. Attachment security was also independently related to life satisfaction. They also noted an association between medical burden and lower life satisfaction. This was stronger for those with insecure attachment styles than secure. Barnas, Pellina and Cummings (1991) found insecure attachments were associated with negative scores on measures of social, psychological and physical wellbeing. However they also found insecure attachment styles were associated with having more helpful strategies to cope with stress. They found no main effect of attachments to adult children. However Long and Martin (2000) reported those with an anxious personality received less affection and had lower perceptions of attachment to adult children, but had higher feelings of affection towards their adult children. They noted lower affection, for and from adult children, was associated with loneliness. Klug et al (2014) noted loneliness was associated with depression. Lipson-Parra (1990) found significant correlations between the attachment scores and frequency of contact with significant others including spouses and adult children.
Perren et al (2007) also discovered that spouse’s attachment styles were significantly associated within the relationship. In terms of sleep, Verdecias et al (2009) found significant correlations between preoccupied attachment and reports of daytime napping, and use of sleep inducing medications. However no evidence was uncovered among the sleep measures and secure, dismissive or fearful attachment dimensions. Dieperink et al (2001) found that those with secure attachment styles scored significantly lower on Post Traumatic Stress Disorder (PTSD) measures, and attachment styles were more predictive of PTSD symptoms than levels of trauma severity.

**Quality of Studies**

Overall none of the studies covered every point on the review checklist. The selection methods were not always clearly defined and appropriate, for example neither Barnas, Pellina and Cummings (1991) nor Chopik et al (2013) recruited representative participants of a defined population. All studies used convenience sampling. In addition some methods of recruitment were not appropriate e.g. Segal, Needham & Coolidge (2009) who recruited undergraduate students, offering university credits for their participation, and the participation of their elderly relatives. Not all studies reported the validation or reliability of measures used, although most did clearly define their study variables, which were considered appropriate for use. Few studies, included in the review, reported any design specific sources of bias, however those highlighting this issue did present evidence of minimisation of bias (Diehl et al, 1998; Kirchmann et al, 2013; Klug et al 2014; Long & Martin, 2000; Magai et al, 2001 and Waugh et al, 2007). Similarly some papers did not identify or take account of confounding factors (Barnas, Pellina & Cummings, 1991; Kirchmann et al, 2013; Magai et al, 2001; Webster, 1997; Lipson-Parra, 1990; Rusby & Tasker,
2009 and Segal, Needham & Coolidge, 2009). Although the statistics were clearly defined and appropriate in all studies, very few reported effect sizes or power calculations, such as Chopik et al (2013), Rusby & Tasker (2008) and Verdecias et al (2009) and one, Segal, Needham & Coolidge (2009) reported only effect sizes. Only Chopik et al (2013) reported that they met the sufficient sample size for sufficient power. (see Quality Ratings table, Appendix 10).

The methodological issues, namely the lack of evidence of minimisation of bias in all the studies, imply findings should be interpreted with caution. Only Kirchmann et al (2013) and Long and Martin (2000) reported the measures taken to minimise sources of bias. Given all studies were observational in nature, minimisation of bias is highly important to ensure good quality research.

3.6 Discussion

Aims
This reviews sought to systematically review the quality of studies considering how human to human attachment is assessed within older people whilst addressing the limitations of previous reviews by including assessing minimisation of bias. It was not possible to synthesis the data as there were a variety of methods and measures used to assess attachment, therefore this study focussed on providing a qualitative examination of findings for each of the papers.

Summary of results
Combining the populations of all the included studies results in a large sample (n = 91, 925, however, it should be noted this also includes the younger adults who were recruited to investigate age differences in 4 studies). The older people population’s age span ranged from 60 to no upper age limit. However, it is difficult to comment on
whether this sample was representative. In some studies, there was limited
demographic information although some did acknowledge that their sample was
biased to higher educational attainment and high functioning (Diehl et al, 1998).
Although the age range across all the studies was generally wide, some studies had
an upper limit of 70 years old (such as Chopik et al, 2013) which excludes a large
section of the older people population. In addition none of the studies differentiated
between the youngest old and the oldest old. The oldest participant was 102 years
old and may have had a very different upbringing to a 60 year old. After all we would
not combine a newborn infant and an adult in their 40s in a research study and
report it as being a homogenous sample. If we believe that attachment may change
as we age (such as Webster, 1997) one must assume it may continue to change as
we progress through older adulthood. It is unclear if the population included in these
studies was a representative sample and therefore the results should be interpreted
with caution.

**Theoretical approaches to measurement of attachment**

Overall, the spread of measures used to investigate attachment in older people
reflect theoretical methodologies, reflecting whether attachment is best measured as
a categorical or dimensional construct. The majority of the measures used by the
studies included in this review adopted the dimensional position but not all. Given the
distinct traditions the different methodologies arose from, it is unadvisable to use
these measurements interchangeably, assuming they are measuring the same
constructs. Some studies investigated specific relationships such as relationship to
adult offspring e.g. Long and Martin (2000), Perren et al (2007) and Barnas, Pellina
& Cummings (1991). Other studies specified romantic relationships such as
Dieperink et al (2001). It should be noted that some measures were developed to
assess attachment in romantic relationships; however these same measures have been used to investigate relationships in general. None of the studies assessed whether this generalisation is appropriate, within the older people population. In two studies, it was unclear which relationships were investigated to assess attachment (Lipson-Parra, 1990 and Segal, Needham & Coolidge, 2009). The majority of studies did not specify which relationship participants should consider and appeared to be investigating behaviour in relationships in general. The most used measures were the Relationship Questionnaire (RQ, Bartholomew and Horowitz, 1991) and the Relationship Scale Questionnaire (RSQ, Griffin and Bartholomew 1994). It should be highlighted that both the RQ and the RSQ were developed based on previous measures and were initially developed for adults under 60 years old. There appears to be an assumption that these measures are valid and reliable for an older age group. However, there was a paucity of studies investigating whether this is an appropriate assumption to make.

Webster (1997) noted that the distribution of attachment styles in his sample of older people differed from previous studies exploring the distribution of attachment styles in younger adults (e.g. Mikulincer & Orbach, 1995). Several studies in this review conducted a comparison of attachment styles between younger and older adults (Chopik et al, 2013; Jain & Labouvie-Vief, 2010; Segal, Needham & Coolidge, 2009 & Diehl et al, 1998). However the results of these studies were not homogenous. For example Chopik et al (2013) reported that attachment anxiety is lower in older people compared to younger adults. Segal and Coolidge (2009) found an effect dependent upon age but only on the ambivalent- worry scale of the MAQ and the preoccupied attachment scale of the RSQ. Diehl et al (1998) found no interactions by age. It is possible that these inconsistent results are a result of poor validity of the
measures used and they did not take into account life events/ later attachments which may have influence a change in attachment styles. An alternative hypothesis is that attachment may have a “cohort effect”. The practice of parenting was very different several generations ago as compared to now. Unfortunately a cross-sectional study is unlikely to clarify if the differences some researches find in distribution of attachment styles by age is due to methodological differences, a cohort effect or if it is due to life experiences that can impact upon attachment.

Bowlby (1958) claimed that attachment is a universal/ biologically pre-programmed system. He claimed that there is a key period of attachment style development and it is formed before the age of 4. This suggests that the attachment style one develops in our very first interactions shape all our future relationships. In fact, this is the premise that some adult attachment measures are based on, such as Hazan and Shaver’s measure. This measure examines the relationship with a current romantic partner as this is assumed to be partly the same motivational system as occurs between care-giver and infant e.g. a secure base. However, two studies included in this review examined if a significant life event such as being evacuated and therefore being separated from one’s primary caregiver may alter one’s attachment style. Again this is difficult to ascertain with studies that are cross-sectional and observational in design. However, Rusby and Tasker (2008) and Waugh et al’s (2000) findings that a fewer number of those who were evacuated were categorised as securely attached, follows previous research that has been conducted with other populations. For example, Waters et al (2000) who conducted a longitudinal study (20 years) exploring attachment security in infancy and early adulthood. Therefore, it is very possible that attachment styles are formed in infancy but they may be altered by significant life events.
Crittenden’s Dynamic Maturational Model of Attachment (see Crittenden 2000 for a more in-depth description) suggests that the different patterns of attachment are self-protective strategies which are developed through interactions with protective figures (or attachment figures such as parents). She states that the symptoms of these patterns of attachment have a functional basis and will change when individuals notice that the strategies do not match the context they are in, have access to different responses to offer and feel safe to implement the new strategies. This model acknowledges that life events can alter attachment patterns. In addition, it strongly supports the tenet that attachment styles/patterns of attachment are more appropriately described in a dimensional context. This model also contributes towards our understanding as therapists of how attachment difficulties can be treated in a therapeutic context. It suggests that in order to treat attachment difficulties the goals of therapy should be to help individuals to notice that their strategies are incongruent with the context they are in, to teach different responses and strategies, whilst creating a safe environment in which the individual feels able to implement these.

Therapists should keep attachment styles in mind, regardless of the age of the population they are working with. As research as demonstrated that insecure attachments are associated with several negative outcomes it is important that a therapist is able to notice insecure attachment styles and to intervene if these cause difficulties for the individual. Consedine and Magia (2003) found that dismissive attachment styles were associated with less joy, shame and fear. In addition, Merz and Consedine (2009) noted that higher attachment security was associated with stronger positive emotional support and this was protective to their wellbeing. It has also been found that secure attachment is correlated with better adjustment to
medical burden and higher life satisfaction (Kirchmann et al., 2013). Conversely, Barnas, Pellina and Cummings (1991) found insecure attachments were associated with negative scores on measures of social, psychological and physical wellbeing. Given older people are more likely to have more medical burden to adjust too and may already find their social, psychological and physical wellbeing threatened by the challenges which may be as a result of ageing (such as loved ones passing away, decreased mobility and as a result reduced social opportunities and the deterioration of physical health) as older people clinician’s we should also keep attachment styles in mind.

It should be highlighted that there were several methodological issues with the studies in this review. There were some inappropriate recruitment methods (e.g. Segal, Needham & Coolidge, 2009) and there were issues regarding recruiting a representative sample. Not all studies reported the reliability or validity of the measures used. Most studies did not design an older people specific measure and appeared to assume that the measures used in adult would be valid for this older population, without first validating this. In addition, some changed the attachment figure (which refers to a romantic partner in the adult literature) to an adult child. Again there were no reports if this alteration alters the validity of the measure. In addition, very few studies reported any design specific sources of bias and/or the minimisation of these. All in all, this casts a cautionary warning before taking all these results at face value.

**Comparison to other reviews**
The conclusions drawn by this current review are similar to those found in previous reviews (namely Bradley & Cafferty, 2001 and Van Assche et al., 2013). Several of the studies included in this review were plagued by the same methodological ‘flaws’
highlighted in previous reviews, despite there being a decade of research between Bradley and Cafferty’s paper and the present study. Bradley and Cafferty (2001) stress that although they found evidence that attachment was an important construct to examine within the older people population, due to methodological flaws, their conclusions were tentative and preliminary. The second review conducted by Van Assche et al (2013) expressed no such hesitation when presenting their findings. It is possible that this surety was because the research had vastly improved in quality in the years between Bradley and Cafferty’s (2001) review and Van Assche et al’s (2013) review.

This current review included the majority of the same studies as were included by Van Assche et al (2013). Given the methodological flaws (which were also highlighted by Van Assche et al, 2013 and Bradley & Cafferty, 2001), the additional difficulty highlighted by this review of lack of replicated studies and lack of minimisation of bias, it is argued that findings must remain as tentative and preliminary. This review agrees with Van Assche et al.’s (2013) suggestion that attachment to place and pets should be separated from the research investigating attachment within human to human relationships as inclusion is likely to broaden the attachment construct unnecessarily. Similarly, this study agrees that longitudinal and large population representational studies would be highly useful. Therefore, this review may echo Van Assche et al (2013) in some areas, but it also considers Van Assche et al (2013) to have over emphasised the impact of the results they found. Considering those results were drawn from significantly methodologically flawed studies, this review strongly suggests that caution is advisable in relying on those findings. This review suggests that before the research field further diversifies (for example Van Assche et al’s (2013) recommendation for future research to examine
the neurobiological basis of attachment in older age) there is a more pressing need for future research to refine and replicate findings, controlling for or minimising the methodological limitations highlighted by all previous reviews.

**Synthesis of findings**

Attachment classifications are relevant to older people, aged 60 years and over. There is an emerging evidence base of the different ways attachment styles may impact upon several issues that are particularly salient for this age group such as perceptions of medical burden and life satisfaction, however these findings should be interpreted with caution as there is insufficient data to draw any definite conclusions.

The majority of studies adopted measures that have been well validated and evidenced to be reliable within a younger age group (i.e. adults aged less than 60 years old). However there has been limited evidence of studies exploring if these same measures are valid and reliable to use with older people. Few studies investigated the impact of significant life events on attachment styles. As yet it is unclear whether the distribution of attachment styles differ in an older people population compared to younger adults, however the studies investigating this have significant methodological limitations and therefore these findings should be interpreted with caution.

**Suggestions for future research**

Longitudinal research would be able to investigate if attachment styles change as we grow older, as a result of life events, or whether there is evidence of cohort effects which result in there being a different distribution of attachment styles in the older population. Furthermore, future research should investigate the validity and reliability
of using the attachment measures developed for use within a younger age group within an older aged population. Given that research into attachment styles tend to be observational in nature, more attention should be paid to demonstrating evidence of minimisation in bias. As yet there has been no research investigating the link between attachment styles and outcome of psychological intervention in older people. This would be an extension of the current research base, examined in this review, which linked attachment styles to psychological adjustment, emotion processing and PTSD. In general, further research is needed to demonstrate replicability to draw implications of attachment in older people.

**Limitations of this current review**
Due to the lack of availability of translation services it was not possible to include studies that were not published in the English language. This may have resulted in valued contributions to the research base being missed. In addition, due to the variety of measures and methodologies used it was not possible to conduct a meta-analysis of statistical results. This paper has instead grouped the findings of the studies included in the review according to themes. In addition, there was insufficient evidence from which to draw conclusions, possibly limiting the impact and replication of this review.

**3.7 Conclusions**

The results of this review suggest that attachment is of relevance to the older people population. Attachment was found to be linked with a variety of psychological constructs, however as yet there is a paucity of research investigating the link between attachment and psychological outcomes in older people. This review found that a variety of measures have been used to investigate attachment with an older
people population however few studies reported upon the validity of using these measures with older people. All the studies were observational in nature and in terms of quality very few reported evidence of minimisation of bias. This demonstrates that although there is a developing evidence base of attachment theory’s relevance to older people, research in this population has some way to go before reaching the same high quality depth of investigation that has been conducted with infants and younger adults.
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Stracathro Hospital
Brechin
Angus

Dear Sir/ Madam,

**RE: Older People’s Perceptions of Change in Psychological Therapy**

You are invited to take part in a research study conducted as part fulfilment of the Doctorate of Clinical Psychology qualification. Before you decide if you would like to take part I (S. Johncock, Trainee Clinical Psychologist and Chief Investigator) would like you to understand why the research is being done and if you consent to participate what it will involve for you. Your clinician will go through this information sheet with you and if you agree to be contacted I will also explain the study to you over the telephone.

You can talk to other people about the study if you wish. Please ask your clinician or me if you have any questions. Thank you for taking the time to read this information leaflet

Yours sincerely

Suzie Johncock
Trainee Clinical Psychologist, Older People Psychological Therapies Service
Participant Information Sheet

Part 1

What is the purpose of the study?

We know that psychological therapy is effective for adults of all ages. However we do not fully understand the process how this change occurs for different people. Several studies have been undertaken to try to understand the 'how' of therapy, but so far no one has looked at this specifically for people aged 65 years and over). This study aims to address this gap.

Why have I been invited to participate in this research?

Your views as a client who undertook psychological therapy are very important, even if you did not experience as much change as you would have liked. This is because your views will help us understand how we can make therapy better for future clients. Your clinician has asked you take part because you have been seen within NHS Tayside Older People Psychological Therapies Service and you are now coming towards the end of therapy.

Do I have to take part?

No. It is up to you to decide if you would like to take part in the study. Participation in the project is entirely voluntary. If you do decide to take part in the study and then change your mind and decide to withdraw this is also ok and you do not have to provide an explanation. If, at any time, you decide that you no longer wish take part this will not impact on any current or future care and treatment you receive and all identifiable information you have given up until this point will be destroyed, however some anonymous information may be kept if it would be helpful to the study.

Expenses and Payments

Unfortunately I am not in a position to be able to reimburse you for expenses (such as travel) or pay you for your participation in this research study.
What will happen if I do take part?

If you decide to take part your clinician will ask you to sign a ‘consent to be contacted’ form. If you sign this you are agreeing that I may contact you to tell you more about the study, give you the chance to ask any questions and to arrange when and where we will meet to do the interview. This telephone call will last less than 20 minutes. With your consent, your clinician will also complete a short background information questionnaire about you and the psychological treatment you received. This will help me understand your answers to the interview better.

In the interview I will ask you some questions about

- Any changes you have noticed since you started psychological therapy
- How these changes happened
- What was unhelpful about your experiences of psychological therapy
- What you expected to happen in psychological therapy
- And how we could make psychological therapy better.

Please note that the interview is not another part or continuation of your psychological therapy, rather it is designed to gain your views of what you experienced in the psychological therapy you have already had.

This will take no more than 60 minutes and you can have as many breaks as you need. If you wish we could also split the interview into 2 shorter interviews.

What will I have to do?

If you decide to take part I will contact you by telephone. There will only be a small number of interviews because otherwise I might not be able to look at the information from the interviews in enough detail. I will contact people within 72 hours of receiving word from the clinician that you want to take part.

During the telephone call from myself (if you agree to take part in the research), we will arrange a time and place to do the interview, that suits you. If it is easier for you I can come and see you at home or we can meet at one of the Older People Psychological Therapies clinic venues.
It is no problem if you wish to rearrange the appointment if it is no longer convenient for you.

**What are the possible disadvantages of taking part?**

60 minutes of interview might feel like a long time. I am aware of this and am happy to have breaks during the interview. We could also split the interview over 2 meetings. We can discuss this on the telephone before the interview or during the interview.

**What are the possible benefits of taking part?**

This study gives you a chance to talk about your experience and understandings of therapy. Your answers will help us understand more about how therapy works. I cannot promise the study will help you personally. However the results of this study may help us to improve the therapy that we offer future clients.

**What happens when the research study ends?**

When I have finished all the interviews and analysed the data I can send you a summary of what I found and you can give me feedback, if you wish. I can then include your feedback into the final report. After I have submitted the report I can also send you a summary of the main findings.

The report will be submitted as part fulfilment of a Doctorate Clinical Psychology. The summary report will be produced from this document. The full report will also be submitted for publication in a peer reviewed journal.

**What if there is a problem?**

If you believe that you have been harmed in any way by taking part in this study, you have the right to pursue a complaint and seek any resulting compensation through the University of Edinburgh who are acting as the research sponsor. Also, you have the right to pursue a complaint through the usual NHS complaints process.

To do so, you can submit a written complaint to:

Patient Liaison Manager,  
Complaints Office,
Ninewells Hospital,
Dundee, DD1 9SY
(Freephone: 0800 027 5507).

Note that the NHS has no legal liability for non-negligent harm. However, if you are harmed and this is due to someone’s negligence, you may have grounds for a legal action against NHS Tayside but you may have to pay your legal expenses.

If you don’t agree with any part of this study, you can also speak to my supervisors:

Clinical Supervisors:
Dr Fiona Macleod,
Consultant Clinical Psychologist,
Older People Psychological Therapies Service
Susan Carnegie Centre,
Stracathro Hospital,
By Brechin,
DD9 7QA
Tel: 01356 692806

Dr Helen Nicholson - Langley
Clinical Psychologist,
Older People Psychological Therapies Service
First Floor, Kingsway Care Centre,
Kings Cross Road,
Dundee,
DD2 3PT
Tel: 01382 647299/647247

Academic Supervisor:
Dr Helen Griffiths
Clinical Psychologist,
Rm 2.14, Doorway 6,
School of Health and Social Science,
University of Edinburgh,
Teviot Place,
Edinburgh,
EH8 9AG
Tel: 0131 650 3482

Will my taking part in the study be kept confidential?

Yes. I will follow ethical and legal policies and all information about you will be handled in confidence. Your interviews will be audio recorded and transcribed, but all identifiable information will be removed from this and all the information will be completely anonymous. This way no–one (including your clinician) will know it is you being referred to in the final report. Also clinicians will not be aware of who was contacted and who was not, this also protects your confidentiality.
The only time that confidentiality will be breached is in the instance that you identify that either yourself or someone else is at risk of harm. If I am worried about your safety or the safety of someone else I am duty bound to report this to the relevant organisation (e.g. medical services or social work colleagues). If I am worried that you might seriously harm yourself (e.g. suicide) I will pass my concern to your GP, your former clinician and any other team (Older People’s Services) members who are currently involved in your care. This is to keep you safe. If this was required, I would however discuss this with you in the first instance.

**What happens now?**

If you are interested in taking part in this study and agree to be contacted by the Chief Investigator (myself) to find out more, please complete Consent Form 1, Consent to be contacted. Your Clinical Psychologist will then tell me you have consented and give me your contact details. Once I have received this information I will try to contact you in approximately 72 hours to discuss the study further, answer any questions you may have and arrange a time and location to conduct the interview.

If you are not interested in taking part in this study, this is ok and will not impact on your current or future care in anyway.

If you are interested, once you have completed Consent Form 1, your Clinical Psychologist will give you the second part of this Participant Information Sheet. Please read this before you are telephoned by the Chief Investigator (e.g. in the next 3 days).

**I appreciate you taking the time to read this part of the Participant Information Sheet. Thank you.**
Part 2

Thank you for expressing the wish to find out more about the study and for completing Consent Form 1.

**What will happen if I do not want to carry on with the study?**

This is ok. Participation in the project is entirely optional. You can withdraw at any point, even after your interview. You do not have to give a reason about this. If you withdraw, all the identifiable research data about you will be destroyed. However, with your consent, non-identifiable data, which is helpful to the study, may be retained. This is because once the final stages of the analysis starts it will be difficult to identify what information was yours, because it will have been anonymised, this is highlighted on Consent Form 2 which you will be asked to complete if you agree to come to the interview.

**What if there is a problem?**

If there has been a problem and you are unhappy about any aspect of the project you can raise the issue with myself or any of my supervisors (names and addresses can be found in part 1 of this Participant Information Sheet). If you wish to make a complaint, this will not impact on your current or future care and the details of how to do this are to be found in part 1 of this Participant Information Sheet.

**Will my taking part in this study be kept confidential?**

In short, yes. Confidentiality will be maintained and will only be breached if you disclose a risk of harm to yourself or another person, in which circumstances I have a duty to pass this information onto my clinical supervisors and the relevant organisations such as your GP or other people involved in your care, such as your nurse or psychiatrist.

All data collected will be made anonymous as soon as possible and your name will be replaced with a pseudonym. Identifiable information such as your consent forms and demographic questionnaires (completed by your clinical psychologist) will be stored on NHS Tayside premises in a locked filing cabinet. No one will have access to this other than the research team (which includes me and my supervisors only). Identifiable information will be destroyed as soon as the study is completed.
Anonymous data will be handed over to the University of Edinburgh for archival.

**What happens to the results of the study?**

Once I have analysed all the data from all the interviews I will derive a theory of perceptions of psychological change processes. If you wish I could send you a copy of this theory and meet you to discuss your feedback on it. If you wish to do this please complete the relevant section on Consent Form 2. I can also send you a plain English summary of the final report if you wish, again please indicate on Consent Form 2 if you would like to receive this. The full report will be submitted to the University of Edinburgh as part fulfilment of the award of Doctorate in Clinical Psychology. It will also be submitted to a peer reviewed journal for publication and be presented at the NHS Tayside Psychological Therapies Service CPD event.

**What will be the involvement of my GP?**

Your GP will be notified of your participation in the study, but what you say about your psychological therapy will not be shared with them (i.e. they will not be able to listen to your interview or be able to identify you from the report).

**Who is organising and supporting the research?**

This research is being completed as part fulfilment of a Doctorate in Clinical Psychology qualification and therefore the University of Edinburgh are supporting this research. NHS Tayside is also supporting this research in conjunction with the University.

**Who has reviewed the study?**

All research in the NHS is looked at by an independent group of people called a Research Ethics Committee, to protect your interests. This study has been reviewed and given a favourable opinion by *(location to be confirmed)* Research Ethics Committee.

**Further Information and Contact Details**

If you have any questions about this study please contact me or one of my supervisors, who will be able to get a message to me.
Contact

Suzie Johncock (Trainee Clinical Psychologist, Chief Investigator)
– sjohncock@nhs.net

Dr Fiona Macleod (Consultant Clinical Psychologist, Clinical Supervisor)
- 01356 692806

Dr Helen Nicholson – Langley (Clinical Psychologist, Clinical Supervisor)
- 01382 647299/ 647847

Dr Helen Griffiths – (Clinical Psychologist, Academic Supervisor)
- 0131 650 3482

Thank you for taking time to read this information.
Appendix 4 – Consent Form

Patient Identification Number:

CONSENT FORM 2 – Consent to Take Part

Name of Chief Investigator: Suzie Johncock

Please initial all boxes

1. I confirm that I have read and understood the information sheet for the above study.

2. I have had the opportunity to consider the information, ask questions and have had these answered satisfactorily.

3. I understand that my participation is entirely voluntary and that I am free to withdraw at any time without giving any reason and my current or future medical care or rights will not be affected.

4. I agree that if I withdraw from the study any identifiable information will be destroyed. If I withdraw after the interview non-identifiable data may be retained if it is of assistance to the study.

5. I agree to my GP being informed of my participation in the study.

6. I agree to my interview being audio recorded.

7. I agree to take part in the above study.

8. I wish to provide comments on the results following analysis (Optional).

9. I wish to receive a summary of the study report following study completion (Optional).
Appendix 5 – Demographic Questionnaire

Demographics questionnaire – to be completed by clinician

1. Age
   - 65-75 □
   - 76-85 □
   - 86 + □

2. Gender
   - M □
   - F □

3. Prior psychological input/ contact with mental health services

   Previous contact with clinical psychology □

   If so – no. of episodes of psychological treatment □

   What were they treated for?

   Previous contact with mental health services □

   Psychiatry □ no of episodes □
4. Current Presenting Problem

5. Psychological Treatment modality
   CBT □
   IPT □
   CAT □
   ACT □
   Psychoanalytic □
   Other □

Please specify
6. Medication – for psychiatric conditions, to treat presenting problems (current)  
*Please specify medication name and the reason for prescription*

7. Number of psychology sessions attended  
Number of psychology sessions offered

Clinical Global Impression – Improvement score

At discharge:  
Very Much Improved - 1  
Much Improved – 2  
Minimally Improved – 3  
No Change – 4  
Minimally Worse - 5  
Very Much Worse - 7  
Much Worse - 6

8. Education level obtained  
High School  
College  
University  
Post Graduate Qualification
9. Occupation – either current, or most recent occupation

10. Postcode

11. Additional current non clinical psychology input from Mental Health Services, including voluntary services
Appendix 6 – Interview Schedule/ Topic Guide

1. Compared to your first session, have you noticed any improvement or changes? (improvement, no change or worse)

2. Tell me about any changes you have noticed since you started therapy
   
   2a. Tell me about any changes ‘in yourself’ e.g. in the things you do now, how you think about things, how you are feeling (mood), how your body feels (physically), how you understand things or how you get on with others?

3. If changes are identified - What do you think caused these changes? (In therapy? What about out with therapy?)

4. If changes are identified - How do you think they caused change? (e.g. sudden ‘aha’ moment, gradual process, realisation, single one factor or combination of factors)

5. If changes are identified – When do you think change happened? (e.g. near the start of therapy, near the middle, right at the end, once key pivotal moment or several)

6. Before you started therapy, what changes did you expect to happen?
   
   6a was the outcome of therapy what you expected?
   6b tell me about any changes that happened that you were not expecting
   6c tell me about any changes that you were expecting that did not happen

7. Tell me about any things that got in the way of what you expected to change.

8. Tell me how therapy could have been made better for you
   
   Prompt: tell me about helpful/ unhelpful aspects of therapy that could be changed or modified.

Flesch Readability Ease = 71 (fairly easy)
Appendix 7 - Change Process Model

Age as Context

Seeking Help and Entering the Therapeutic Environment
- Therapist Engaging the Client
- Client Engaging with the Therapist

Building the Therapeutic Relationship

Therapeutic Change
- Acceptance and Adjustment
- Change in relation to previous self
- Developing and strengthening self-efficacy

Helpful Factors and Barriers to Change

Developing a New Understanding
- Gaining a new perspective of situation and in relation to others
- Drawing on life lessons learned
- Learning new strategies
- Putting strategies into practice

Post therapy reflections and Commitments

Timings
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## Appendix 9 – Study Characteristics Table

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Study design</th>
<th>Methodology</th>
<th>Measures</th>
<th>Sample size</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Age range (mean)</th>
<th>Population characteristics</th>
<th>Key findings regarding attachment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Barnas, Pellina & Cummings (1991) (USA) | Structured interview | Cross-Sectional | 48 | 100% female | 65-87 (72.5) | Recruited from existing pool through university projects. Only mothers recruited | • Security of attachment correlated with measures of social wellbeing  
• but not psychological or physical well-being | |
| Chopik et al (2013) (USA) | (ECR-R²) | Cross-Sectional | 86,555 | 71.8% female 28.2% male | 18-70 (30.7) | Internet respondents. Participants aged over 70 excluded. | • Only attachment anxiety & avoidance investigated  
• Attachment anxiety was highest among younger adults & lowest among middle & older aged adults  
• Attachment avoidance was highest amongst middle aged adults & lowest among younger & older adults  
• Individuals with a partner had lower levels of attachment anxiety & avoidance compared to single individuals particularly in younger & older adults  
• Women had slightly higher anxiety & avoidance styles particularly in younger adults | |
| Diehl et al (1998) (USA) | RQ(1987)³ | Cross-Sectional | 304 | 49.3% female 50.7% male | 20-87 (48.6) | Randomly selected from suburban communities – high, middle and low income. Age stratified sample but overly represented high functioning and well educated. | • Found mean differences in family climate & personality variables on basis of individuals’ attachment styles but no interactions by age group | |

---

² Experiences in Close Relationships-Revised Inventory (Fraley, Waller & Brennan, 2000)  
³ Relationship Questionnaire (Hazan & Shaver, 1987) & as modified by Bartholomew & Horowitz, 1991
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study</th>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Sample</th>
<th>Findings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Dieperink et al (2001)</strong> (USA)</td>
<td>RQ (1991) / ECR (1997) Cross-Sectional</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>not reported</td>
<td>Former Prisoner of War veterans. Community sample originally recruited in 1997.</td>
<td>- Those with secure attachment styles scored significantly lower on PTSD measures Attachment styles were more predictive of PTSD symptoms than was trauma severity</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **Jain & Labouvue-Vief (2010)** (USA)                                  | Attachment Prototypes Questionnaire (Bartholomew & Horowitz, 1991) AKA RQ (1991) Cross-Sectional | (159) | 75% female, 25% male | Recruited from senior centres and undergraduate courses. Independent t-test no age differences in terms of education. | - No overall (across both) main effect of attachment style and emotion category predicting response times  
- But a main effect was found for emotion category predicting response times in the older adult group |
| **Kirchmann et al (2013)** (Germany)                                   | Adult Attachment Prototype Rating (Kirchmann et al, 2007; Pilkonis, 1988; Strauss et al 1999) Cross-Sectional | 81    | Not reported | All patients of 1st author (who is a GP). | - Attachment security was positively correlated to life satisfaction  
- Association between medical burden & lower life satisfaction was stronger for insecure attachment styles than secure |
| **Klug et al (2014)** (Germany)                                        | Relationship-Specific Attachment Scales for Adults (Asendorpf et al, 1997) Cross-Sectional | 969   | 54.3% female, 45.7% male | Randomly selected from population registries. Part of a larger study. | - For men, lower depression scores were associated with higher attachment security & no reports of feelings of loneliness  
- For women, lower depression was associated with not feeling lonely & there was a weaker association with secure attachment |
| **Long & Martin (2000)** (USA/Germany)                                | Based on Hazan & Shaver (1986)⁴ | 100   | not reported | Recruited through churches, nursing home | - Those with an anxious personality received decreased affection, had  
ingenital sensory stimulation (GSS) and trait anxiety (TA) were more strongly correlated with lower life satisfaction. |

⁴ but as modified by using Likert-type scales (Collins & Read, 1990)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study</th>
<th>Methodology</th>
<th>Sample Size</th>
<th>Gender Distribution</th>
<th>Recruitment</th>
<th>Results/Findings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Magai et al (2001)</td>
<td>Relationship Scale Questionnaire</td>
<td>800</td>
<td>63% female, 37% male</td>
<td>Recruited</td>
<td><strong>Most of the sample had</strong> dismissing/avoidant attachment styles.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Griffin &amp; Bartholomew, 1994)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>from larger</td>
<td><strong>European Americans scored higher than African Americans on attachment</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cross-Sectional</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>community</td>
<td><strong>security</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>based sample</td>
<td><strong>African Americans scored</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>from census</td>
<td><strong>higher than European Americans on dismissing</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>files.</td>
<td><strong>attachment</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Significant</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>differences</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>in age,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>income and</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>education</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>levels between</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>African and</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>European</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>American</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lipson-Parra (1990)</td>
<td>Lipson-Parra Adult Attachment Scale</td>
<td>211</td>
<td>72% female, 28% male</td>
<td>Convenience</td>
<td><strong>Significant correlations between attachment scores &amp; the items</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Lipson-Parra, 1990)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>community sample, snowball sampling. Attempted to recruit representative sample guided by the census results.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cross-Sectional</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>LAAS(^5) reliability &amp; validity was supported</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Switzerland)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Husbands’ &amp; wives’ attachment styles were significantly associated</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cross-Sectional</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>**Caregivers’ avoidance &amp; care recipients’ insecure attachment style were associated with increased levels of “dementia-related problem behaviour”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Rusby & Tasker (2008) | RQ (1991)                            | 869         | 62.5% female, 37.5% male | Evacuated group\(^6\) (EG) non-evacuated group \(^7\) (NEG) | |}

\(^5\) L Lipson-Parra Adult Attachment Scale (Lipson-Parra, 1990)
\(^6\) EG: Evacuated group refers to those evacuated from their home in ww2
\(^7\) NEG: Those not evacuated from their home during ww2
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study</th>
<th>Measures</th>
<th>Sample Size</th>
<th>Gender Distribution</th>
<th>Participants</th>
<th>Findings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
Cross-Sectional                | 144         | 67% female, 33% male | Younger adults: Undergraduate students
Older adults: Relatives of younger adult sample or recruited through senior centres and newspaper adverts | • Older adults scored lower than those in the younger age group on the ambivalent-worry attachment scale of MAQ & the preoccupied attachments scale of RSQ
• No age differences found regarding secure, avoidant & dismissing attachment |
| Verdecias et al (2009) (USA)    | RSQ (1994) Cross-Sectional                    | 70          | 73% female, 27% male | Recruited as part of larger multifactorial study – recruitment or demographics not reported in this paper | • Significant correlations were found between the preoccupied attachment dimension & the sleep measures
• High scores on the preoccupied attachment dimension were more likely to report daytime napping & using sleep-inducing medications
• No significant correlations were uncovered among sleep measures & the secure, dismissive & fearful attachment dimensions |

8 Relationship Style Questionnaire (Griffin & Bartholomew, 1994)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study</th>
<th>Sample Description</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Gender Distribution</th>
<th>Attachments</th>
<th>Findings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Waugh et al (2007)</td>
<td>Adult Attachment Styles Questionnaire (Hazan &amp; Shaver, 1987) Cross-Sectional</td>
<td>245</td>
<td>66% female 34% male</td>
<td>EG Recruited from Evacuee Reunion Association</td>
<td>Abuse during evacuation was linked with higher scores on Impact of Event Scale, General Health Questionnaire &amp; insecure attachment styles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>96</td>
<td>60-75 (68.3)</td>
<td>NEG Recruited from magazines, press and leaflets</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>52% female 48% male</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>61-75 (68.5)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Webster (1997)</td>
<td>RQ (1991) Cross-Sectional</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>73.7% female 26.3% male</td>
<td>Community living sample. Recruited from monthly newspaper</td>
<td>Participants with secure &amp; dismissive attachment styles were happier than those with fearful attachment styles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>range not reported (67.9)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Distribution of across all attachment styles differed from previous research with younger adults as participants as specified in Bartholomew &amp; Horowitz (1991)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Used same dataset reported differently, therefore only original paper checked for quality criteria.</td>
<td>Duplicate dataset to Magai et al (2001) (see above)</td>
<td>Findings from other papers from same dataset below.</td>
<td>Measures of Attachment &amp; Differential Emotions Scale (Izard, 1972)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Consedine &amp; Magai (2003) USA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Secure attachment associated with less guilt, contempt &amp; shame and more joy, sadness interest, fear and anger</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Dismissive attachment associated with greater interest and with less joy, shame and fear</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Altogether results similar to younger samples, but with developmental differences</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Results consistent with a developmental-functionalist theory of emotions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ethnic differences (between African American and European American adults) in adult</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study</td>
<td>Authors and Countries</td>
<td>Findings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
- Fearful/avoidant attachment with less  
- Secure attachment and wellbeing was stronger among African Americans and English speaking Caribbean compared with European American and Eastern European immigrant groups  
- Negative fearful/avoidant attachment style on wellbeing was buffered by being an English speaking Caribbean but not for the other groups |
| 4. | Magai et al (2004) USA | - Reported early emotion socialization had both direct and indirect (mediated by attachment style) effects on emotional experience  
- Age interacted with emotion socialization and associated emotional experience  
- Impact of punitive socialization on adult negative affect was greater in older adults, in comparison to younger adults |
| 5. | Merz & Consedine (2009) Netherlands & USA | - Emotional support associated with higher wellbeing  
- Instrumental support associated with decreased wellbeing  
- Above associates related to attachment style - those with higher attachment security emotional support had stronger positive and instrumental support less negative effects on wellbeing |
- But only fearful avoidance predicted greater functional impairment  
- Negative affect only partially mediated association between attachment and outcomes but only for fearful avoidance |
## Appendix 10 - Study Quality table

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study</th>
<th>Question</th>
<th>1.</th>
<th>2.</th>
<th>3.</th>
<th>4.</th>
<th>5.</th>
<th>6.</th>
<th>7.</th>
<th>8.</th>
<th>9.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Barnas, Pellina &amp; Cammong (1991)</td>
<td>Does the study address a specific research question?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chopik et al (2013)</td>
<td>did the methodology used in the study answer their research question?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consedine &amp; Magai (2003)</td>
<td>Are the selection methods clearly defined &amp; appropriate?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consedine et al (2013)</td>
<td>are participants representative of a defined population?</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diehl et al (1998)</td>
<td>were they recruited in an acceptable way?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dieperink et al (2001)</td>
<td>Is the measurement of study variables clearly defined &amp; appropriate? –</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jain &amp; Labouvie-vief (2010)</td>
<td>are the measures validated?</td>
<td>N/R</td>
<td>N/R</td>
<td>N/R</td>
<td>N/R</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kirchmann et al (2013)</td>
<td>are any design specific sources of bias reported? –</td>
<td>N/R</td>
<td>N/R</td>
<td>N/R</td>
<td>N/R</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>N/R</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Klug et al (2014)</td>
<td>are the measures validated for older people?</td>
<td>N/R</td>
<td>N/R</td>
<td>N/R</td>
<td>N/R</td>
<td>N/R</td>
<td>N/R</td>
<td>N/R</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>N/R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Klug et al (2000)</td>
<td>Is the control of confounding variables reported &amp; appropriate?</td>
<td>N/R</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>N/R</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>N/R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Long &amp; Martin (2000)</td>
<td>Are any design specific sources of bias appropriately minimised?</td>
<td>N/R</td>
<td>N/R</td>
<td>N/R</td>
<td>N/R</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>N/R</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Magai et al (2001)</td>
<td>were the measurement methods similar in all groups?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>N/R</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>N/R</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>N/R</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kirchmann et al (2013)</td>
<td>Is there evidence of minimisation of bias?</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>N/R</td>
<td>N/R</td>
<td>N/R</td>
<td>N/R</td>
<td>N/R</td>
<td>N/R</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>N/R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kirchmann et al (2013)</td>
<td>Is the control of confounding variables reported &amp; appropriate?</td>
<td>N/R</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>N/R</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>N/R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kirchmann et al (2013)</td>
<td>have they taken account of the confounding factors in the design?</td>
<td>N/R</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kirchmann et al (2013)</td>
<td>have they taken account of the confounding factors in the analysis?</td>
<td>N/R</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kirchmann et al (2013)</td>
<td>Is the use of statistics clearly defined &amp; appropriate?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kirchmann et al (2013)</td>
<td>effect sizes &amp; power calculations completed?</td>
<td>N/R</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>N/R</td>
<td>N/R</td>
<td>N/R</td>
<td>N/R</td>
<td>N/R</td>
<td>N/R</td>
<td>N/R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kirchmann et al (2013)</td>
<td>effect sizes &amp; power calculations completed?</td>
<td>N/R</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>N/R</td>
<td>N/R</td>
<td>N/R</td>
<td>N/R</td>
<td>N/R</td>
<td>N/R</td>
<td>N/R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kirchmann et al (2013)</td>
<td>do they explain how missing data was addressed?</td>
<td>N/R</td>
<td>N/R</td>
<td>N/R</td>
<td>N/R</td>
<td>N/R</td>
<td>N/R</td>
<td>N/R</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>N/R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kirchmann et al (2013)</td>
<td>Are any conflicts of interest declared?</td>
<td>N/R</td>
<td>N/R</td>
<td>N/R</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>N/R</td>
<td>N/R</td>
<td>N/R</td>
<td>N/R</td>
<td>N/R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kirchmann et al (2013)</td>
<td>Has the research specified if it had gained ethical approval?</td>
<td>N/R</td>
<td>N/R</td>
<td>N/R</td>
<td>N/R</td>
<td>N/R</td>
<td>N/R</td>
<td>N/R</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>N/R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kirchmann et al (2013)</td>
<td>Is the research supported by a regulatory body?</td>
<td>N/R</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N/R = Not Reported
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Does the study address a specific research question?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a</td>
<td>did the methodology used in the study answer their research question?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Are the selection methods clearly defined &amp; appropriate?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>N/R</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a</td>
<td>are participants representative of a defined population?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>N/R</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b</td>
<td>were they recruited in an acceptable way?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>N/R</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c</td>
<td>are inclusion &amp; exclusion criteria clearly defined?</td>
<td>N/R</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>N/R</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>N/R</td>
<td>Yes*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d</td>
<td>are criteria justified?</td>
<td>N/R</td>
<td>N/R</td>
<td>N/R</td>
<td>N/R</td>
<td>N/R</td>
<td>N/R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Is the measurement of study variables clearly defined &amp; appropriate?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a</td>
<td>are the measures validated?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b</td>
<td>are the measures reliable?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes*</td>
<td>N/R</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c</td>
<td>are the measures validated for older people?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>N/R</td>
<td>N/R</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>N/R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Are any design specific sources of bias reported?</td>
<td>N/R</td>
<td>N/R</td>
<td>N/R</td>
<td>N/R</td>
<td>N/R</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a</td>
<td>are any design specific sources of bias appropriately minimised?</td>
<td>N/R</td>
<td>N/R</td>
<td>N/R</td>
<td>N/R</td>
<td>N/R</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b</td>
<td>were the measurement methods similar in all groups?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c</td>
<td>is there evidence of minimisation of bias?</td>
<td>N/R</td>
<td>N/R</td>
<td>N/R</td>
<td>N/R</td>
<td>N/R</td>
<td>N/R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Is the control of confounding variables reported &amp; appropriate?</td>
<td>N/R</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>N/R</td>
<td>N/R</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a</td>
<td>have the authors identified all important confounding factors?</td>
<td>N/R</td>
<td>N/R</td>
<td>N/R</td>
<td>N/R</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>N/R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b</td>
<td>have they taken account of the confounding factors in the design?</td>
<td>N/R</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>N/R</td>
<td>N/R</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c</td>
<td>have they taken account of the confounding factors in the analysis?</td>
<td>N/R</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>N/R</td>
<td>N/R</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Is the use of statistics clearly defined &amp; appropriate?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a</td>
<td>appropriate method of analysis used?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b</td>
<td>effect sizes &amp; power calculations completed?</td>
<td>N/R</td>
<td>N/R</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>#</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>N/R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c</td>
<td>effect sizes &amp; power calculations met?</td>
<td>N/R</td>
<td>N/R</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>#</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>N/R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d</td>
<td>do they explain how missing data was addressed?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>N/R</td>
<td>N/R</td>
<td>N/R</td>
<td>N/R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Are any conflicts of interest declared?</td>
<td>N/R</td>
<td>N/R</td>
<td>N/R</td>
<td>N/R</td>
<td>N/R</td>
<td>N/R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Has the research specified if it had gained ethical approval?</td>
<td>N/R</td>
<td>N/R</td>
<td>N/R</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>N/R</td>
<td>N/R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Is the research supported by a regulatory body?</td>
<td>N/R</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>N/R</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>N/R</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* = inconsistent  
# = effect size only
# Appendix 11 - Measures of Attachment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Measure used by</th>
<th>Categorical or Dimensional</th>
<th>Self-Report or Interview</th>
<th>Relationship Investigated</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

9 but as modified by using Likert-type scales (Collins & Read, 1990)

10 Experiences in Close Relationships-Revised Inventory (Fraley, Waller & Brennan, 2000)

11 States relationship to attachment figure but does not specify which relationship e.g. could be referring to adult offspring or romantic relationship.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study</th>
<th>Methodology</th>
<th>Measurement</th>
<th>Source/Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Relationship-Specific Attachment Scales for Adults (Asendorpf et al, 1997)</td>
<td>Klug et al (2014) (Germany)</td>
<td>Dimensional Self-Report but applied in an interview</td>
<td>Current or Past Most Important Relationship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structured interview</td>
<td>Barnas, Pellina &amp; Cummings (1991) (USA)</td>
<td>Dimensional Interview</td>
<td>Relationship to Adult Offspring</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>