



What do older people experiencing loneliness think about primary care or community based interventions to reduce loneliness?: a qualitative study in England.

Journal:	<i>Health & Social Care in the Community</i>
Manuscript ID	HSCC-OA-16-0274.R1
Manuscript Type:	Original Article
Keywords:	Older People, Loneliness, Community based interventions, Primary Care

SCHOLARONE™
Manuscripts

Peer Review

1
2
3 1 **TITLE:** What do older people experiencing loneliness think about primary care or community based
4 2 interventions to reduce loneliness?: a qualitative study in England.

5
6 3
7
8 4 **Abstract:**

9
10 5 Loneliness in later life is a common problem with poor health outcomes. However, interventions to
11 6 prevent or ameliorate loneliness have a weak evidence base. The views of older people experiencing
12 7 or at risk of loneliness in the community are important in identifying features of potential support,
13 8 but have been little studied.

14
15 9 Twenty eight community-dwelling people, aged 65 and over who reported being 'lonely much of the
16 10 time' or identified as lonely from the de Jong-Gierveld 6-item loneliness scale in a larger study,
17 11 participated in in-depth interviews, between June 2013-May 2014. Views and experiences on
18 12 seeking support from primary care and community based one-to-one and group based activities,
19 13 including social and shared interest groups, were explored. Interviews were recorded and
20 14 transcribed. Thematic analysis was conducted by a multi-disciplinary team, including older people.

21
22 15 Using two different measures of loneliness enabled a spectrum of loneliness experience to be
23 16 explored. Two thirds of the participants were the 'younger-old' and all were able to leave their
24 17 homes independently. Older people with characteristics of loneliness were generally knowledgeable
25 18 about local social and community resources but, for the majority, community and primary care
26 19 based services for their loneliness were not considered desirable or helpful at this point in their lives.
27 20 However, group based activities with a shared interest were thought preferable to one-to-one
28 21 support (befriending) or groups with a social focus. Descriptions of support as being for loneliness
29 22 and specific to older people discouraged engagement. Older people experiencing or at risk of
30 23 loneliness did not consider that primary care has a role in alleviating loneliness because it is not an
31 24 illness. They thought primary care practitioners lack understanding of non-physical problems and
32 25 that a good relationship was necessary to discuss sensitive issues like loneliness. For many,
33 26 loneliness was a complex and private matter that they wished to manage without external support.

34
35
36
37
38
39
40 27 **Keywords:** Older People, Loneliness, Community based interventions , Primary Care
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 **1 What is known about this subject?**
4

5 2 Loneliness in later life is a common problem, with poor health outcomes and implications for public
6 3 health
7

8 4 Interventions to prevent or ameliorate loneliness have a weak evidence-base
9

10 5 We have a limited understanding of how older people experiencing loneliness view services aiming
11 6 to reduce this concern.
12

13 **7 What this article adds**
14

15 8 Older people with characteristics of loneliness generally know about local resources but do not
16 9 consider services they perceive as being for 'lonely older people', as desirable or helpful
17

18 10 Group based activities with a shared interest are preferred to one-to-one support or social groups
19

20 11 Older people experiencing or at risk of loneliness may not consider that primary care has a role in
21 12 alleviating this.
22

23 13
24

25 14
26

27 15
28

29 16
30

31 17
32

33 18
34

35 19
36

37 20
38

39 21
40

41 22
42

43 23
44

45 24
46

47 25
48

49 26
50

51 27
52

53 28
54

55 29
56

57
58
59
60

1 Background:

Loneliness in later life is increasingly considered a public health problem (Department of Health 2012; World Health Organisation 2002). It has a prevalence of 16-35 % in those aged 65 and over, rising to up to half of those over 80 years, with severe loneliness (lonely all or most of the time) occurring in between 5% - 13% of the older community dwelling population in the UK (Luanaigh and Lawlor 2008; Victor et al 2005, Age UK 2010, Savikko et al 2005).

Loneliness is a subjective experience; an emotional and unpleasant response to a lack of satisfactory companionship (Heinrich and Gullone 2006). In later life, loneliness is linked closely to other experiences associated with ageing, such as loss of family and friends and declining health and income, as well as more recent socio-demographic trends such as longevity, living alone for longer, relationship breakdown, and changes to families and communities (Bernard 2013, Age UK Oxfordshire 2011, Nicolaisen and Thorsen 2014). The links between loneliness and its harmful physical and mental health consequences are widely reported (Savikko et al 2005, Victor et al 2005, Stuck et al 1999, Iliffe et al 2007, Luanaigh and Lawlor 2008) and include increased risk of mortality (Lyyra et al 2006). Depression and loneliness in older people are strongly associated (Green et al 1992, Cacioppo et al 2006, Golden et al 2009) while loneliness seems an independent risk factor for future depression (Heikkinen and Kauppinen 2004).

Despite these associations, the role of primary care in reducing loneliness has not been clearly delineated and there is little indication of what it can offer above identifying and treating associated depression. The relevance of loneliness to primary care is clearer. Loneliness has been independently associated with increased primary care consultations (Ellaway et al 1999), emergency (but not planned) hospitalisation among community dwelling older adults (Molloy et al 2010) and early moves to long-term care (Russell et al 1997, Savikko et al 2010).

Given the frequency of consultation with primary care, social prescribing may be a way that primary care practitioners can refer patients to non-clinical community based sources of support. Social prescribing aims to promote integration between health and social care services with the voluntary and community sector (Department of Health 2006) and the range of community options available commonly includes activities aimed at those experiencing or at risk of loneliness, such as befriending schemes. However, evidence of the effectiveness of social prescribing is currently limited to evaluations of pilot projects and little evidence on cost effectiveness is available; a rapid appraisal found little evidence on social prescribing programmes to inform commissioning (Centre for Reviews and Dissemination 2015).

For several decades in the developed world, welfare state and voluntary sector groups have sought to alleviate loneliness among older people (Means and Smith 1999). Currently in the UK, three main types of community-based services to alleviate loneliness are common. These may be 1) run by local government as part of social services or community resources, 2) run by local government or other public sector funded voluntary sector organisations, or 3) offered by self-funding community, self-help, and voluntary bodies that receive no/little state support but are linked to neighbourhood, leisure, self-help, educational, occupational, or faith groups (Moriarty and Manthorpe 2012). The activities undertaken may be individually or group focused, with one-to-one home based befriending being at one end of this spectrum and large-scale social or educational groups at the other.

1
2
3 1 There has been very little high quality research into the effectiveness of community based
4 2 interventions specifically designed to reduce loneliness and social isolation in later life (Findlay 2003,
5 3 Cattan et al 2005, Frost et al 2010, Dickens et al 2011, Masi et al 2011). A systematic review of the
6 4 effectiveness of health promotion interventions for loneliness and social isolation amongst older
7 5 people found that nine of the 10 potentially effective interventions were group activities with
8 6 educational or support input, and those that targeted specific groups were more effective, and that
9 7 six of the eight ineffective interventions provided one-to-one support, advice and information, or
10 8 health needs assessment (Cattan et al 2005). More recent systematic reviews of the characteristics
11 9 of effective interventions for social isolation (Dickens et al 2011) and loneliness (Hagan et al 2014) in
12 10 older people have similarly reported that group based formats were more effective. In addition
13 11 interventions developed with a theoretical basis, groups offering social activity and/or support, and
14 12 those in which older people are active participants were effective for social isolation (Dickens et al
15 13 2011), and those involving new technologies, effective for loneliness (Hagan et al 2014). A meta-
16 14 analysis to assess the strength of evidence of interventions to reduce loneliness found pre-post and
17 15 non-randomised comparison studies yielded larger mean effect sizes compared to randomised
18 16 comparison studies and studies that used the latter design, the most successful interventions
19 17 addressed maladaptive social cognition (Masi et al 2011).

20 18 These systematic reviews are limited to quantitative outcome studies. Despite the range of services
21 19 and activities with the remit of alleviating loneliness, the prevalence of loneliness in community
22 20 dwelling older people has remained fairly constant over the last few decades (Victor et al 2002,
23 21 Honigh-de Vlaming et al 2014). With the limited evidence base for interventions, it is important that
24 22 services take into account the views of older people experiencing loneliness. Most views on such
25 23 interventions are from those already engaged with services (eg Cattan et al 2003, Silver Line, 2015,
26 24 Lester et al 2012), or report views that are not service specific (Johnson et al 2007). We therefore
27 25 know little about what older people with loneliness in the general population actually want, if
28 26 anything, from services to address loneliness.

29 27 This paper describes findings from a study that aimed to explore the perspectives of community-
30 28 dwelling lonely older people about seeking support for loneliness from primary and community
31 29 based services and the features of these services which informed their views.

32 30 33 31 **Method**

34 32 Population and setting: This study was nested within the [anonymised for review] study which
35 33 explored the feasibility of embedding a health and well-being risk appraisal system into primary
36 34 care. The 454 participants were community dwelling older people aged 65 and over, registered and
37 35 recruited from five English NHS primary care practices (3 in a London Borough, 2 in a semi-rural
38 36 County). Participants completed a multi-dimensional, comprehensive self-assessment postal
39 37 questionnaire, including two loneliness measures. Participants were excluded if they lived in a long-
40 38 term care facility (care home), had a severe incapacitating, life-threatening or terminal illness, were
41 39 unable to provide informed consent or if an assessment would be considered burdensome. Details
42 40 of the study and baseline data are reported elsewhere [anonymised for review].

1
2
3 1 Sampling: Following the main study, all participants who identified as lonely at baseline or 6 months
4 2 follow-up, either because of their answer to the single stem question 'Do you feel lonely much of the
5 3 time?' or because they scored two or above in the 6-item de Jong-Gierveld Loneliness scale (de Jong
6 4 Gierveld & Van Tilburg 2006), were sent a postal invitation to interview. Unlike the single stem
7 5 question, the statements in the de Jong-Gierveld Loneliness scale do not include the word 'lonely'.
8 6 Interview recruitment continued until the main emerging themes were reinforced and to
9 7 oversample for diversity in age, gender, socio-economic status, ethnicity and severity of loneliness
10 8 among participants.

11 9 Data collection: An interview topic guide addressing the research questions was developed
12 10 iteratively using knowledge of the literature and in consultation with the voluntary sector and older
13 11 people representatives on the study team. Topics included experiences of loneliness, attempts to
14 12 ameliorate loneliness made by themselves or others, including prompts on views of both one-to-one
15 13 and group based support (social and hobby-based/educational) if these did not arise naturally in the
16 14 discussion, barriers and facilitating factors to reduce loneliness, the perceived role of professionals
17 15 (including primary care) in reducing loneliness, and potential components of interventions designed
18 16 to reduce loneliness in older people. Data reported in this present paper draw mainly from the
19 17 responses to questions about primary care and community based services.

20 18 Participants were offered interviews in their home, the university or a local community venue of
21 19 their choice. Interviews were audio-recorded and transcribed verbatim with consent.

22 20 Analysis: A thematic analysis was undertaken to identify key emergent themes and their meaning.
23 21 Transcripts were read independently by nine members of the research team including lay members
24 22 and analysed using a constant comparative approach including searches for disconfirming evidence
25 23 (Spencer et al 2014). Transcripts were read thoroughly to ensure familiarity with the data, and
26 24 significant sections of text were identified, annotated and summarized to describe emerging themes,
27 25 both *a priori* themes from the topic guide and those emerging from participants' accounts. The
28 26 themes were organised into higher and lower level themes in a thematic framework, discussed
29 27 within the study team and the framework further refined. The clusters of themes were then referred
30 28 back to the original transcripts for validation (Spencer et al 2014). The overall interpretation of
31 29 meaning and explanations were then developed and their implications considered, with input from
32 30 the entire research team. NVivo 10 software was used to facilitate data management.

33 31 NHS Research Ethics Committee approval for the loneliness interviews was given by [anonymised for
34 32 review].

35 33

36 34

37 35

38 36

39 37

40 38

1 Findings

2 Twenty eight interviews were completed, lasting between 75-135 minutes. Nine participants (32%)
 3 reported being lonely much of the time and 19 (68%) were lonely based on their responses to the de
 4 Jong-Gierveld 6-item scale alone. **Almost half the sample lived with others. In addition to the socio-**
 5 **demographic details presented in Table 1, it is noteworthy that all participants were able to leave**
 6 **their homes, albeit with some difficulty for a few.**

7 This sample of community dwelling older people who either self-identified or scored as lonely on a
 8 validated scale was able to describe their understanding and experience of loneliness in detail. The
 9 overarching view expressed was that support from community and primary care based services for
 10 their loneliness was not something they desired or considered helpful, at this point in their lives.

11 The level of current or previous engagement with services and support was variable. Participants
 12 who had not sought support were able to share their considerations and perceptions of local
 13 resources or described their knowledge of such resources. Those who had previously or were
 14 currently engaged in social activities described the factors that facilitated or were a barrier to their
 15 involvement. Across the spectrum of community and primary care based services and activities, the
 16 extent to which their focus was explicitly on supporting loneliness, also varied. Within this sample of
 17 lonely older people, most had previous or on-going involvement in shared interest or hobby based
 18 groups, that is, activities without an explicit focus on loneliness. Behind such general impressions lay
 19 other understandings; themes emerging from participant narratives are presented below by type of
 20 service/resources and are illustrated with quotes.

22 Could befriending be for me?

23 Many participants were unaware of one-to-one befriending schemes that were running in their
 24 neighbourhood at the time of interviews, either face-to-face or by telephone, led by local voluntary
 25 sector groups. A few asked for details about such services, however others expressed uncertainties
 26 around the motivation, personality and compatibility of the individual volunteer, the idea of a
 27 volunteer/stranger coming to your home, and concerns about the content of such conversations. As
 28 one woman explained:

29 *“The one-to-one I’m not too sure about; it just depends, doesn’t it? I presume people who do*
 30 *that are quite extrovert and jolly-jolly, and have a chat with you. It could be that you really*
 31 *took to somebody and found them easy to chat with. I mean, yes, I think they’re great ideas*
 32 *but I don’t know.”* (Int 19: Female, 65-74 years, lives with others)

33 *“A volunteer? Well, I’d be embarrassed actually.”* (Int 2: Male, 65-74 years, lives alone)

34 Barriers to taking part in such schemes were identified including the stigma of being identified as
 35 lonely and the associated stereotypes of people who use services for loneliness or isolation, and not
 36 wishing to see themselves within this group. Several of the younger participants (65-74 years)
 37 reported, *“Not now, maybe later”* including those who reported being lonely much of the time:

38 *“I’m not that desperate yet!”* (Int 5: Male, 65-74 years, lives with others)

1
2
3 1 *“but what I’m saying is, ten years down the line, I might think that’s a really good idea. At*
4 2 *the moment, I’m saying it’s not for me, but if I was isolated in this house and couldn’t get*
5 3 *out, yeah, I think that would be a lovely idea, but just not at the moment. I think I have to*
6 4 *find my own way at the moment of doing things.”* (Int 3: Female, 65-74 years, lives alone)
7

8 5 None of the participants expressed a wish to access a telephone befriending service, stating either
9 6 that they did not particularly like that type of communication or that they would just telephone
10 7 someone they knew instead. Some described the usual ways in which they developed acquaintances
11 8 in the local neighbourhood to indicate that they did not have a problem with social contact:

12 9 *“I feel something like that may grow from somebody I might meet, say when I go up to the*
13 10 *market and so on, and then I’ll see them the next week and say “Hello” and then I’ll see them*
14 11 *the next week “How are you?” and it may grow into something, but I don’t see it being*
15 12 *presented to me and my saying welcome.”* (Int 26: Female, 75-84 years, lives with others)
16
17
18
19
20

21 14 ‘Social groups’ are for others

22 15 Themes related to social groups (**groups convened for a primary social purpose**) overlapped to some
23 16 extent with views on befriending schemes. Purely social groups with little or no specific activity (e.g.
24 17 lunch clubs, coffee mornings) were widely perceived as being for ‘lonely old people’ and most
25 18 participants were reluctant to attend, or reported some negative initial experiences when they had
26 19 previously tried them. Some considered they were in better physical health than those attending
27 20 groups targeted for the ‘elderly’ or expressed a preference for the company of younger people. Two
28 21 men who both lived alone, who described themselves as lonely much of the time and did not
29 22 mention any meaningful relationships other than their children who lived at some distance, painted
30 23 a picture of the type of the people they thought went to social groups and why they wouldn’t go
31 24 themselves:

32 25 *“To tell you the truth, I’m not really interested in that. I don’t want to sit down there and*
33 26 *listen to Mrs Jones and her rheumatism, and old Fred Bloggs talking about his bleedin’*
34 27 *lumbago!”* (Int 7: Male, 65-74 years, lives alone)
35

36 28 Other participants reported similar negative views of such groups, for example as providing ‘tea and
37 29 bingo’ for older people:

38 30 *“I just feel they’re not for me. I feel that the level at which they work wouldn’t satisfy me.*
39 31 *You’re painting a picture of people really who have gone into old age and accepted it and are*
40 32 *not asking anything of life now, except to go and have a cup of tea with somebody in a little*
41 33 *group. It wouldn’t do. I’d be thinking what could I be doing at home? I’m not coming back*
42 34 *here again, I’m sure.”* (Int 26: Female, 75-84 years, lives with others)
43
44
45
46
47
48
49

50 35 The very idea that a group would meet individual needs was questioned by some:

51 36 *“We’re all very different and we’ve got different needs and so the support mechanisms have*
52 37 *got to be completely flexible to take into account every individual, and they are all individual*
53 38 *needs, aren’t they really?”* (Int 16: Male, 65-74 years, lives with others)
54
55

56 39 As few participants had successfully engaged with groups or activities in which addressing potential
57 40 or actual loneliness was explicitly part of their remit, limited information can be gleaned on what
58
59
60

1 would facilitate further engagement with such activities. However, basic hospitality and being
 2 generous both in attitude and with refreshments were important, as described by one participant as
 3 a group member:

4 *“They’re always coming round, “Would you like a biscuit? Would you like a sausage roll?
 5 Cakes?” and there’s always tea and coffee available.... Yes, it is very good, very generous.”*
 6 (Int 23: Female, 85+ years, lives alone)

7 However, another participant who had volunteered (once and many years ago) said her contrasting
 8 experiences had subsequently deterred her from going along as a member:

9 *“I just didn’t like the atmosphere at all. I think they were impatient and I think with very
 10 elderly people, you’ve got to be really patient. And I think maybe I saw the impatience of,
 11 “You’ve had two cups of tea already!” I mean, whose business is that if she wants ten cups
 12 of tea! You know, and I just had the feeling, no, you know, it’s not for me”.* (Int 3: Female,
 13 65-74 years, lives alone)

16 Having a common interest

17 **Most participants had or were currently attending shared interest group activities and views on**
 18 **these groups contrasted to those described above.** Having a shared interest (rather than meeting for
 19 purely social reasons) seemed to make it easier to become involved, as expressed by participants
 20 who regularly attended group based activities, such as exercise groups. These groups were valued
 21 for their expressed content but also the social element that developed. **This suggests that people**
 22 **may be sociable, involved with others, indeed nearly half were also living with others, and also feel**
 23 **lonely.** One participant in the study, who ran a popular exercise group for older people and who was
 24 clearly valued by her members, despite reporting that she herself felt lonely, shared some of the
 25 many techniques she employed:

26 *“That’s why with some of my ladies, I’ve known them so well for so long, that when they
 27 become widowed, I just make sure I ring them up, send them cards, ‘We miss you. When are
 28 you coming back?’ you know? Because it would be so easy for them. I’ve got one at the
 29 moment who is just not coping very well at all. I ring her and say, ‘Come along, because I can
 30 have a laugh with you’.”* (Int 28: Female, 65-74 years, lives with others)

31 Group activities enjoyed in later life were often interests that had often been established earlier.
 32 Participants described features that facilitated or presented barriers to their current engagement.
 33 Already knowing or recognising others attending the group seemed to reduce feelings of social
 34 unease, even if members were not known people but just recognised. Perceptions of how a person
 35 is welcomed to groups, in particular on the first occasion and how they are run, for example, in a
 36 paternalistic manner, was also important. Two contrasting experiences suggested different reactions
 37 to joining a group:

38 *“The things that put me off them is that generally to the extent that I’ve seen them, what’s
 39 going on in them (and people aren’t even conscious of it) is a tiny bit of power-play that in a
 40 group of people that have come together to do something, some people feel the need to ever*

1
2
3 1 *so slightly take charge, and then have around them people who, just maybe in the way the*
4 2 *thing is organised and run, if you join, you join on their terms".* (Int 14: Male, 65-74 years,
5 3 *lives with others)*

7 4 In the second example, one person who had been anxious about joining a new group described how
8 5 she planned ahead to make the first visit easier:

10 6 *"I went on my own, because two people I know were on holiday, but I phoned the lady who*
11 7 *runs it and she introduced me to some people".* (Int 27: Female, 65-74 years, lives alone)

13 8

15 9 What can primary care offer?

17 10 Overall the appropriateness of discussing loneliness with primary care practitioners was questioned
18 11 by participants. There was a strong view that loneliness is not an illness, and a perception that GPs
19 12 lacked understanding of problems that were not physical health problems. A few exceptions to this
20 13 were cited, for example, by people with co-existing mental health problems such as depression and
21 14 anxiety. This small minority who were more likely to consider talking to their GP about loneliness
22 15 had good relationships with their general practice, were used to discussing their mental health
23 16 problems and had generally received treatment. A smaller number had managed to develop a
24 17 relationship with a member of the primary care team having lived in the area for a long time:

28 18 *"Well, for instance, coming up two years ago, my doctor put me down for a sort of refresher*
29 19 *in CBT [cognitive behavioural therapy]. ... Yeah. I mean, he's very good; he's spent a lot of*
30 20 *time with me."* (Int 10: Male, 65-74 years, lives with others)

32 21 Many, however, felt that they did not have the close relationship with their GP that they thought
33 22 necessary to talk about problems such as loneliness, although some had identified individual
34 23 members of the practice team they could talk to or would consider doing so in the future:

37 24 *"Well, that would be the last place I'd want to go, you see; they're not very sympathetic".* (Int
38 25 4: Female, 65-74 years, lives alone)

40 26 *"The practice nurse I was sort of seeing was very, very sympathetic to me; she was very, very*
41 27 *nice and I talked to her about the things that were really bothering me and she was so*
42 28 *sympathetic, but it was like really a one-off."* (Int 3: Female, 65-74 years, lives alone)

44 29 Participants were also aware of the constraints on GPs' time:

46 30 *"There are many times when I would have liked to have had a discussion, but the*
47 31 *appointments are just 10 minutes"* (Int 25: Female, 65-74 years, lives with others)

49 32 Others felt that talking to the GP or nurse about emotional problems would be 'wasting their time'
50 33 as other problems were considered more pressing or that the likely solutions offered would be
51 34 pharmaceutical. For example, one participant who reported being depressed and very lonely said:

53 35 *"well, really, there's nobody to talk to really, is there? You can't talk to your doctor about it,*
54 36 *because they'll just turn around and say, "Here's a tablet!" And I take enough of them now,*
55 37 *and that's about all; there's nobody actually to talk to really."* (Int 7: Male, 65-74 years, lives
56 38 *alone)*

1

2 Dealing with loneliness privately

3 Other themes emerged about the overall idea of involving 'others' in their loneliness. Situations or
4 life events for which services or support for loneliness were deemed inappropriate by many included
5 those in unsatisfactory relationships, those grieving the loss of a partner, and/or those who had
6 experienced worse episodes of loneliness at other times. For many, these feelings of loneliness,
7 particularly for those grieving, were seen as a private matter and ones to be worked through alone.
8 Some had considered bereavement counselling and tried it briefly but none of them had persisted
9 with it or found it particularly beneficial. Others had a good understanding of their situation and
10 were able to describe how they managed their feelings. For example, one participant described the
11 stigma she would feel using services that supported older people who were lonely, and ultimately
12 loneliness for her was a private matter that she wouldn't consider talking to anyone about:

13 *"I know I've said, you know, I feel alone and isolated, but I'm not sure whether it would help*
14 *me to talk about it. I think I know why I feel alone and isolated. I think I know, I don't need*
15 *somebody to tell me if you like". (Int 3: Female, 65-74 years, lives alone)*

16

17 **Discussion**

18 Summary:

19 This is one of the first studies to explore perceptions and experiences of lonely older people on
20 community based avenues of support, in which the sample had not been invited on the basis of their
21 current use of services for loneliness or loneliness risk. Overall participants held negative views
22 about services and activities they perceived as being badged or targeted at 'lonely older people'.
23 Many had tried a range of activities and services and were able to report reasons why they had
24 stopped engaging. In particular, reservations were expressed about befriending and purely social
25 groups, with most expressing preferences for groups with an activity or purpose that is not primarily
26 social, and ones that are not necessarily specific to older people. Primary care was not seen as a
27 place to share feelings of loneliness, meaning that it is unlikely that all older people with loneliness
28 will volunteer themselves or request 'social prescribing'. For many, loneliness is a complex and
29 private matter that they prefer to manage themselves.

30

31 Comparisons with previous literature:

32 Participants in this study were not engaging with services for loneliness such as befriending or many
33 social groups and their views are likely to be different to the sizable number of people who do use
34 these services (Windle et al 2011). Lester et al's study (2012) of the views of older people engaged
35 with befriending services reported characteristics of the service that people had found to be helpful
36 were: good conversational skills and empathy in the befrienders, and opportunities for emotional
37 support and reciprocal social exchange through safe, confiding relationships. These experiences
38 address some of the concerns expressed by the sample in the current study about the type of people
39 delivering the service and the service remit. Participants' views on befriending schemes including an

1 attitude of 'not now, maybe later' may also have been influenced by the fact that two thirds of
2 participants in our study were 'younger old' (65-74 years), and all participants were able to leave
3 their homes independently (although some were beginning to have difficulty in this), in comparison
4 to the largely housebound and very old population engaged with befriending schemes (Lester et al
5 2012).

6 Older people experiencing or at risk of loneliness did not consider that primary care has a role in
7 alleviating this. Over and above the constraints of time and access, some participants were cautious
8 about the possible medicalisation of and pharmaceutical response to loneliness. A good relationship
9 was deemed necessary to discuss sensitive matters like loneliness, similar to the 'active listening' by
10 health care providers proposed by Smith (2012) in her exploration of meaning and coping
11 mechanisms for loneliness in community dwelling older adults. Johnson et al (2007) explored the
12 coping and prevention strategies for loneliness of individuals aged 50 and over recruited primarily
13 from voluntary agencies. A significant number were currently/had previously received some form of
14 health or social care services, but little was reported about the role of these services regarding
15 loneliness and social isolation. The services were described as enabling living in a 'physical sense'
16 rather than 'enhancing the social experience' (p44).

17 Although there is little comparable research in this area, these views resonate with the larger
18 literature on the views of older people with depression seeking support from primary care. Older
19 people are similarly reluctant to recognise and name 'depression' as a set of symptoms that
20 warrants seeking support from primary care and they have limited expectations of treatment, which
21 is assumed to be predominantly biomedical. This is partly due to perceptions of the role of the GP
22 but also to previous negative experiences of help seeking (Chew-Graham 2012, Burroughs 2006).
23 From a primary care perspective, studies have reported that some GPs have mixed feelings about
24 offering medication to address what they believed to be the consequences of loneliness and social
25 isolation (Murray 2006), namely depression, which is contrary to the expectations of many of the
26 lonely older people in this study.

27 Many expressed views about the private nature of their feelings of loneliness and the desire to
28 manage these without involvement of others. This resonates with the view that loneliness can be a
29 range of feelings which people live with and experience and manage differently (Hauge and
30 Kirkevold 2012) and challenges assumptions about being recipients of support in later life (Allen and
31 Wiles 2014).

32
33 Strengths and limitations of the study:

34 Study participants were able to articulate a breadth of experiences of loneliness and their
35 considerations in seeking support to help manage these negative emotions. One strength of this
36 study is that it includes older people with different degrees or characteristics of loneliness, ranging
37 from those who admitted being lonely to a researcher to those whose prior completion of a survey
38 about health status in private, had indicated that they were at risk of loneliness. Furthermore, most
39 people had not engaged with services for loneliness and many said they had not spoken about their
40 loneliness to anyone previously. The sample therefore included those with loneliness whose views
41 may not previously have been heard.

1
2
3 1 In addition, the older people in the multi-disciplinary research team contributed both personal and
4 2 professional perspectives to the development of the topic guide and analysis and interpretation of
5 3 the data, a further strength of this study.

7 4 In interpreting the views of participants in this study, it should be borne in mind that the sample was
8 5 recruited from a larger study of health and wellbeing in later life, and it may not represent the views
9 6 of those who do not take part in such research. Two thirds of the sample were in the 'younger old'
10 7 age group and all were able to leave their homes (with some difficulty in some instances), and so the
11 8 research does not represent the views of those unable to leave their homes, and under-represents
12 9 the older, frailer population who are likely to express different views. There was a good spread of
13 10 gender and socio-economic status, but a smaller number of older people from black and minority
14 11 ethnic groups, who may also hold different views.

18 12 Implications for research: Further research should explore the views of older people with loneliness
19 13 who are unable to leave their homes but are not in contact with services, in particular regarding one-
20 14 to-one approaches such as telephone or face-to-face befriending, or use of the internet. Loneliness
21 15 was considered a mostly private matter, and we need to understand more about how older people
22 16 can be supported to 'self-manage' their loneliness. Research developing new interventions should
23 17 consider the heterogeneity of views regarding services seen as being targeted for loneliness, and the
24 18 need to take these into account in the design.

28 19 Implications for policy and practice: Participants reflected a population whose needs are important
29 20 to consider in the commissioning of services. Avoiding descriptions of services and activities as being
30 21 for older people experiencing or at risk of loneliness may increase their accessibility and their
31 22 acceptability. Features to emphasise that may encourage this group of older people to make
32 23 community connections include: the ability to maintain interests established earlier in life, accessing
33 24 groups with a shared interest which may allow a reciprocity, purpose and value to the exchange,
34 25 geographical proximity to increase the likelihood of recognising others attending local groups, and
35 26 other efforts to acknowledge and minimise the potential social unease particularly felt by some
36 27 older people who may find groups difficult. This largely mobile and active group of older people
37 28 with loneliness were mostly ambivalent about using befriending services, which supports targeting
38 29 of these services on older people who are unable to leave their homes.

42 30 Our study also provides important evidence about isolation and loneliness, in that nearly half of the
43 31 participants lived with other people and so would not necessarily be seen as socially isolated.
44 32 Targeting social and other resources on older people living alone would likely miss this group. Older
45 33 people were reluctant to seek help from their GP or practice nurse for loneliness, and social-
46 34 prescribing initiatives in primary care would require a pro-active approach to identify people who
47 35 may benefit.

50 36 **Conclusions:** Older people with loneliness who are able to leave their homes appeared largely
51 37 ambivalent about services with a primary social purpose, perceived as being targeted for 'others'.
52 38 More positive views were expressed of activity based groups. They perceived a very limited role for
53 39 primary care, and for many their loneliness was a private matter that they wished to manage
54 40 without external support.

57 41
58
59
60

1
2
3 1 **Acknowledgement / source of funding:**

4
5 2 [anonymised for review]

6
7 3

8
9 4 **Conflict of interest:**

10
11 5 No conflicts of interest have been declared.

12
13 6 **References**

14
15 7
16 8 Age UK (2010) Loneliness and Isolation Evidence Review, Age UK

17 9
18 10 Age UK Oxfordshire (2011) *Safeguarding the Convoy: A call to action from the Campaign to End*
19 11 *Loneliness.*, Oxfordshire: Age UK

20 12
21 13 Allen, R.E.S. & Wiles, J.L. (2014). Receiving support when older: What makes it OK? *The*
22 14 *Gerontologist*, 54(4), 670–682. doi: 10.1093/geront/gnt047.

23 15
24 16 Bernard, S (2013) Loneliness and social isolation among older people in North Yorkshire. Working
25 17 Paper No. WP 2565. Social Policy Research Unit, University of York 2013.

26 18
27 19 Burroughs H, Lovell K, Morley M, Baldwin R, Burns A and Chew-Graham C (2006) 'Justifiable
28 20 depression': how primary care professionals and patients view late-life depression? a qualitative
29 21 study. *Family Practice* (2006) 23 (3): 369-377. doi: 10.1093/fampra/cmi115

30 22
31 23 Cacioppo, JT, Hughes ME, Waite LJ, Hawkley, LC and Thisted RA (2006) Loneliness as a specific risk
32 24 factor for depressive symptoms: Cross-sectional and longitudinal analyses. *Psychology and Aging*,
33 25 Vol 21(1), Mar 2006, 140-151. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0882-7974.21.1.140>

34 26
35 27 Cattan M, Bond J and White M (2003) Alleviating social isolation and loneliness among older people.
36 28 *International Journal of Mental Health Promotion*. Vol 5, Issue 3 20-30.

37 29
38 30 Cattan M, White M, Bond J and Learmonth A (2005) Preventing social isolation and loneliness among
39 31 older people: a systematic review of health promotion interventions, *Ageing and Society*, 25(1)
40 32 41–67.

41 33
42 34 Centre for Reviews and Dissemination (2015) *Evidence to inform the commissioning of social*
43 35 *prescribing*. University of York

44 36
45 37 Chew-Graham C, Kovandžić M, Gask L, Burroughs H, Clarke P, Sanderson H and Dowrick C. (2012)
46 38 Why may older people with depression not present to primary care? Messages from secondary
47 39 analysis of qualitative data. *Health & Social Care in the Community* Volume 20, Issue 1, pages 52–60,
48 40 January 2012. DOI: 10.1111/j.1365-2524.2011.01015.x

49 41
50 42 Creecy R, Berg W, Wright R (1985) Loneliness among the elderly: a causal approach. *J Gerontol* 40:
51 43 487–493.

52 44
53 45 Department of Health (2006) *White paper. Our health, our care, our say: a new direction for*
54 46 *community services*. Department of Health, London.

55 47
56
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3 1 Department of Health (2012a) *Care and Support White Paper*. Department of Health, London.
4 2 www.dh.gov.uk
5 3
6 4 Dickens AP, Richards SH, Greaves CJ and Campbell JL (2011) Interventions targeting social isolation in
7 5 older people: a systematic review. *BMC Public Health* 2011, 11:647
8 6
9 7 Ellaway A, Wood S and Macintyre S (1999) Someone to talk to? The role of loneliness as a factor in
10 8 the frequency of GP consultations. *BJGP* 49, 363-367
11 9
12 10 Findlay RA (2003) Interventions to reduce social isolation amongst older people: where is the
13 11 evidence? *Ageing and Society* 23, 647-658.
14 12
15 13 Frost H, Haw S, Frank J.(2010) *Promoting Health and Well-being in Later Life. Interventions in Primary*
16 14 *Care and Community Settings*. MRC Scottish Collaboration for Public Health Research and Policy.
17 15
18 16 Glaser B, Strauss A. (1967) *The constant comparative method of qualitative analysis*. In Glaser B,
19 17 Strauss A Eds. *The Discovery of Grounded Theory*. 1967, Adline
20 18
21 19 Golden, J., Conroy, R. M., Bruce, I., Denihan, A., Greene, E., Kirby, M. and Lawlor, B. A. (2009),
22 20 Loneliness, social support networks, mood and wellbeing in community-dwelling elderly. *Int. J.*
23 21 *Geriatr. Psychiatry*, 24: 694–700. doi:10.1002/gps.2181
24 22
25 23 Green B, Copeland JRM, Dewey ME, Sharma V and Davidson IA (1994) Factors associated with
26 24 recovery and recurrence of depression in older people: A prospective study. *International Journal of*
27 25 *Geriatric Psychiatry* Volume 9, Issue 10, pages 789–795, October 1994
28 26
29 27 Hauge S, Kirkevold M (2012) Variations in older persons' descriptions of the burden of loneliness.
30 28 *Scandinavian Journal of Caring Sciences*; 2012; 26; 553–560
31 29
32 29 Heikkinen R, Kauppinen M. (2004). Depressive symptoms in late life: a 10-year follow-up. *Archives of*
33 30 *Gerontology and Geriatrics* 38(3):239-50.
34 31
35 32 Heinrich LM and Gullone E (2006) The clinical significance of loneliness: a literature review. *Clin.*
36 33 *Psychol. Rev.* 26, 695-718
37 34
38 35 Honigh-de Vlaming R, Haveman-Nies A, Bos-Oude Groeniger I, de Groot L, van 't Veer P, (2014)
39 36 Determinants of Trends in Loneliness Among Dutch Older People Over the Period 2005-2010. *J*
40 37 *Aging Health* April 2014 vol. 26 no. 3 422-440
41 38
42 39 Iliffe S, Kharicha K, Harari D et al. Health risk appraisal in older people 2: the implications for
43 40 clinicians and commissioners of social isolation risk in older people. *Br J Gen Pract* 2007; 57(537):
44 41 277–82
45 42
46 43 Johnson M, Ryan J, Shardlow SM, Walmsley B, Willaimson T, Yates-Bolton N, Greenwood F (2007)
47 44 'The 'Saying Hello' Project Report. Final report to the Big Lottery Fund. University of Salford and Age
48 45 Concern.
49 46
50 47 de Jong-Gierveld J and van Tilburg T (2006) A 6-item scale for overall, emotional and social
51 48 loneliness: confirmatory tests on survey data. *Research on Aging*, 28 (5) 582-598.
52 49
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3 1 Lester H, Mead N, Chew Graham C, Gask L and Reilly S (2012) An Exploration of the Value and
4 2 Mechanisms of Befriending for Older Adults in England. *Ageing and Society* 32 p. 308
5 3
6 4 Luanaigh C Ó and Lawlor B A (2008), Loneliness and the health of older people. *Int. J. Geriat.*
7 5 *Psychiatry*, 23: 1213–1221.
8 6
9 7 Lyyra T-M, Heikinen RL Perceived Social Support and Mortality in Older People. *J Gerontol* 2006;
10 8 61B (3) S147–S152
11 9
12 10 Mead N, Lester H, Chew-Graham C, Gask L and Bower P (2010) Effects of befriending on depressive
13 11 symptoms and distress: systematic review and meta-analysis. *BJGP*, 196:96-101
14 12
15 13 Means R and Smith, R (1999) From poor law to community care: The development of welfare
16 14 services for elderly people 1939-71 *Health and Social Care in the Community*, 7 (4) p235
17 15
18 16 Molloy GJ, McGee HM, O’Neill D, Conroy RM (2010) Loneliness and emergency and planned
19 17 hospitalizations in a community sample of older adults. *J Am Geriatric Soc* 58:1538-41
20 18
21 19 McWilliam C. (1992). Risk factors for depression in elderly people: A prospective study. *Acta*
22 20 *Psychiatr Scand.* 86 (3) 213–7.
23 21
24 22 Moriarty J and Manthorpe J (2012) *Diversity in older people and access to services – an evidence*
25 23 *review*, London, Age UK, [http://www.ageuk.org.uk/Documents/EN-GB/For-](http://www.ageuk.org.uk/Documents/EN-GB/For-professionals/Research/Equalities_Evidence_Review_Moriarty_2012.pdf?dtrk=true)
26 24 [professionals/Research/Equalities_Evidence_Review_Moriarty_2012.pdf?dtrk=true](http://www.ageuk.org.uk/Documents/EN-GB/For-professionals/Research/Equalities_Evidence_Review_Moriarty_2012.pdf?dtrk=true)
27 25
28 26 Murray J, Banerjee S, Byng R, Tylee A, Bhugra D, Macdonald A (2006) Primary care professionals’
29 27 perceptions of depression in older people: a qualitative study. *Social Science & Medicine*
30 28 Volume 63, Issue 5, September 2006, Pages 1363–1373.
31 29
32 30 Nicolaisen M and Thorsen K (2014) Loneliness among men and women – a five-year follow-up study.
33 31 *Aging and Mental Health.* Vol 18 (2)
34 32
35 33 Russell DW, Cutrona CE, de la Mora A, Wallace RB. (1997) Loneliness and nursing home admission
36 34 among rural older adults. *Psychology and Aging* 12(4) 574-89.
37 35
38 36 Savikko N, Routasalo P, Tilvis RS, Strandberg TE and Pitkala KH (2005) Predictors and subjective
39 37 causes of loneliness in an aged population. *Archives of Gerontology and Geriatrics* 41: 223-233.
40 38
41 39 Savikko N, Routasalo P, Tilvis RS and Pitkala KH (2010) Psychosocial group rehabilitation for lonely
42 40 older people: favourable processes and mediating factors of the intervention leading to alleviated
43 41 loneliness. *Int J Older People Nurs* 5:16-24.
44 42
45 43 Silver Line, Silver Line News, April 2015
46 44 <https://www.thesilverline.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2013/11/Silver-Line-News-April-2015.pdf>
47 45
48 46 Smith J (2012) Toward a better understanding of loneliness in community-dwelling older adults. *The*
49 47 *Journal of Psychology.* 146(3) 293-311.
50 48
51 49 Spencer L, Ritchie J, Ormston R, O’Connor W and Barnard M (2014) Analysis: Principles and
52 50 Processes. In *Qualitative Research Practice: A guide for social science students and researchers.*
53 51 Ritchie J, Lewis J, McNaughton Nicholls and Ormston R (Eds) 2nd Ed. Sage Publications.
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3 1
4 2 Stuck AE, Walthert JM, Nikolaus T et al. (1999) Risk factors for functional status decline in
5 3 community-living elderly people: a systematic literature review. *Soc Sci Med* 1999 48(4):445–69
6 4
7 5 Victor CR, Scambler SJ, Bowling A and Bond J (2005) The prevalence of, and risk factors for loneliness
8 6 in later life: a survey of older people in Great Britain. *Ageing & Society* 25, 2005, 357–375
9 7
10 8 Victor C, Scambler S, Shah S, Cook DG, Harris T, Rink E and de Wilde S (2002). Has loneliness amongst
11 9 older people increased? An investigation into variations between cohorts. *Ageing and Society*, 22, pp
12 10 585-597. doi:10.1017/S0144686X02008784.
13 11
14 12 Windle K, Francis J, Coomber C (2011) *Preventing loneliness and social isolation: interventions and*
15 13 *outcomes SCIE Research briefing 39*. Social Care Institute for Excellence. October 2011
16 14
17 15 World Health Organisation (2002) *Active Ageing: A Policy Framework*. WHO Non-communicable
18 16 *Disease Prevention and Health Promotion Ageing and Life Course*. Geneva
19 17
20 18
21 19
22 20
23 21
24 22
25 23
26 24
27 25
28 26
29 27
30 28
31 29
32 30
33 31
34 32
35 33
36 34
37 35
38 36
39 37
40 38
41 39
42 40
43 41
44 42
45 43
46 44
47 45
48 46
49 47
50 48
51 49
52 50
53 51
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1 Table 1: Socio-demographic characteristics of sample and self-rated loneliness (n=28)

Characteristic		n (%)
Gender:	Female	18 (64)
	Male	10 (36)
Age:	65-74	19 (68)
	75-84	5 (18)
	85+	4 (14)
Ethnicity:	White UK	25 (90)
	Other	3 (10)
Living arrangements:	Lives alone	15 (54)
	Lives with others	13 (46)
Lonely much of the time:	Yes	9 (32)
	No	19 (68)
Lonely on de Jong-Gierveld 6-item scale (2 or above):	Yes	27 (96)
	Total	28 (100)

2
3