Background and aims

1

- Given aging populations and subsequent increase of years spent in retirement, it's becoming increasingly important to understand the factors that promote successful adjustment
- Previous research has identified finances, physical health, marital relationship, wider social participation and exit conditions as important predictors of adjustment
- The present study addresses an important gap by providing the first quantitative synthesis in a meta-analysis, which aims to:



A meta-analysis of retirement adjustment predictors

Crystal J. La Rue, Catherine Haslam, Niklas K. Steffens





3 Results

A three-level meta-analysis (based on 915 effect sizes, k = 139, N = 78,632) found that all five predictors were significantly and positively associated with adjustment

Meta-analytic results for predictors of retirement adjustment.

-					-			
Predictor	k	ES	N	r	CIs 95%	Cred 80%	t	Sig. dif.
Overall model	139 (131)	915	78,632	.20	[0.17, 0.22]	[-0.04, 0.41]	14.90***	NA
Social (S)	36 (36)	275	48,201	.23	[0.20, 0.26]	[0.00, 0.43]	13.82***	M, F, E
Health (H)	36 (35)	198	66,037	.22	[0.19, 0.24]	[-0.12, 0.42]	13.73***	F, E
Marital (M)	19 (19)	106	29,142	.18	[0.14, 0.22]	[-0.17, 0.49]	9.55***	S
Finances (F)	20 (19)	124	40,289	.16	[0.13, 0.20]	[-0.07, 0.38]	8.87***	S, H
Exit conds (E)	27 (22)	212	17,435	.15	[0.21, 0.19]	[-0.08, 0.37]	9.00***	S, H

Note. k = number of independent samples (number in parenthesis indicates number of dependent samples); *ES* = number of effect sizes; *N* = number of participants; *r* = correlation effect size; CIs 95% = confidence intervals for correlations at the 95% level; Cred 80% = credibility intervals for correlations at the 80% level; *t* = corresponding *t*-value for correlations; Sig. dif. = predictor categories which are significantly different to predictor indicated in respective row. ***p < 0.01.

- Social participation had the strongest positive association with adjustment, followed by health, marital relationship, finances and exit conditions, respectively
- → Moderation analysis comparing effect sizes at the predictor level was significant, *F*(4, 910) = 5.91, *p* <.001, providing the first objective evidence of the relative importance of predictors of retirement adjustment</p>
- Follow-up comparisons revealed that the effect size for social participation was significantly stronger than that of exit conditions, finances, and marital relationships, but not physical health
- ➡ Gender, age, study design, and retirement stage did not moderate these effects; though exit condition effect sizes were significantly larger in published data (*r* = .15) compared to unpublished data (*r* = .05), suggesting that publication bias might be present for this category

Subfactors

4

5

- ➡ We explored additional sources of heterogeneity within each predictor by examining subfactors within these key predictors, with effects ranging from r = -.03 to .43
- Less physical health symptoms (e.g., coughing; r = .43) and ease of maintaining social life (r = .40) were identified as the most important subfactors for successful adjustment

		_								<u>}</u>	
		k	ES	N	r	CIs 95% Ci	red 80%	1	Sig. dif.		40
Su	bfactors within social									r = 2	1()
a.		2	5	548	.40	[0.19, 0.65] [0.		3.56***	h; i	/	
b.	Social identification	5	31	11,180	.31		08, 0.50]	4.96***	h, i		
с.	Social interaction quality	8	15	12,552	.28	[0.20, 0.35] [0.		6.81***	h		
d.	Satisfaction with social life	4	17	795	.27	[0.17, 0.37] [0.		4.94***	h		
e.	Social support	26	123	24,448	.25	[0.09, 0.31] [-0.		8.97***			
f.	Total/freq of social interaction	27	55	22,909	.24	[0.18, 0.30] [0.		7.95***			
g.	Total groups (number/quality)	3	23	10,877	.20	[0.09, 0.31] [-0.	.03, 0.41]	3.37***			
h.	Social affiliation	2	3	261	.07	[-0.13, 0.26] [-0.	.19, 0.31]	0.52	a; b; c; d		
i.	Social preparedness	1	3	90	.02	[-0.25, 0.29] [-0.	.26, 0.30]	0.12	a; b		
Subfactors within health^							r = 2	13			
a.	Health symptoms	7	11	3,055	.43	[0.31, 0.54] [0.	17, 0.63]	6.30***	b; c; e; f; g	/	rO
b.	Subjective health	62	125	55,352	.24	[0.19, 0.28] [-0.	.03, 0.47]	9.61***	a; f		
с.	Health influence	8	22	4,955	.23	[0.11, 0.34] [-0.	.05, 0.47]	3.79***	a		
d.	Health problem duration	1	2	284	.20	[-0.18, 0.53] [-0.	.16, 0.51]	1.05			
e.	Cognitive health	3	7	1,832	.14	[-0.08, 0.34] [-0.	16, 0.41]	1.27	a		
f.	Health illnesses	9	25	3,456	.13	[0.03, 0.22] [-0.	29, 0.50]	2.48*	a; b		
g.	Physical disability	4	6	579	.08	[-0.11, 0.27] [-0.	21, 0.36]	0.87	a		
Su	bfactors within marital										
a.	Marital quality	19	42	7,072	.17	[0.12, 0.22] [-0.	.00, 0.33]	6.61***			
b.	Marital status	35	57	23,528	.12	[0.08, 0.16] [-0.	.05, 0.29]	5.58***			
с.	Time with partner	4	6	1,327	.11	[0.00, 0.21] [-0.	.08, 0.29]	2.05*			
d.	Relationship duration	1	1	458	.04	[-0.15, 0.23] [-0.	17, 0.25]	0.43			
Subfactors within finances											
a.	Income	48	87	17,189	.17	[0.13, 0.20] [0.	02, 0.31]	9.71***	с		
b.	Net worth	5	6	20,588	.13	[0.05, 0.21] [-0.	.02, 0.28]	3.23**			
с.	Financial preparedness	8	27	2,750	.07	[-0.00, 0.14] [-0.	.09, 0.23]	1.88	а		
Su	bfactors within exit conditions						-				
a.	Feelings about retirement	14	41	4,644	.22	[0.15, 0.28] [-0.	.02, 0.42]	6.39***	c; d; e		
b.	Bridge work	6	14	3,348	.13	[0.04, 0.22] [-0.	11, 0.35]	2.78**			
с.	Retirement preparation	24	72	8,375	.11	[0.05, 0.17] [-0.		3.84***	a		
d.	Retirement control	20	75	77,07	.10	[0.06, 0.15] [-0.		3.31**	a	a start	
е.	Type of transition	4	10	3.040	03	[-0.18, 0.12] [-0.		-0.41	a		
^ A	Il subfactors are indicative of	of het	ter he	alth (e.g	less			ter subjec	tive		

^ All subfactors are indicative of better health (e.g., *less* health symptoms, *greater* subjective health). *p < .05, **p < .01, ***p < .01



Theoretical and practical implications

- This study provides evidence that some factors particularly social participation and physical health – are more important for adjustment than others
- GROUPS 4 HEALTH: Retirement (based on the social identity approach to health) is a promising intervention given its third module trains people to maintain existing social ties in retirement