

Balancing individual rights and risks: A systematic review of qualitative studies of perspectives on older adults' alcohol use in residential care settings

Beth Nichol¹ bethany.nichol@northumbria.ac.uk (ORCID: 0000-0002-7642-1448), Caroline Charlton²

caroline2.charlton@northumbria.ac.uk (ORCID: 0000-0002-1151-8214), Jason Scott¹

jason.scott@northumbria.ac.uk (ORCID: 0000-0001-7031-2171), Mel Steer³ m.steer@northumbria.ac.uk

(ORCID: 0000-0001-8965-5625), Zeb Sattar¹ zeb.sattar@northumbria.ac.uk (ORCID: 0000-0001-6100-

3780), Catherine Haighton^{1*} katie.haighton@northumbria.ac.uk (ORCID 0000-0002-8061-0428)

1. Department of Social Work, Education and Community Wellbeing, Northumbria University, Newcastle upon Tyne, UK

2. Department of Psychology, Northumbria University, Newcastle upon Tyne, UK

3. Department of Nursing, Midwifery and Health, Northumbria University, Newcastle upon Tyne, UK

***Corresponding author:** Catherine Haighton, katie.haighton@northumbria.ac.uk, Department of Social Work, Education and Community Wellbeing, Northumbria University, Coach Lane Campus, Newcastle upon Tyne, NE7 7XA

Funding: This research received no external funding.

Authors contributions: All authors made substantial contributions to the conception or design of the work; or the acquisition, analysis, or interpretation of data for the work; and drafting the work or reviewing it critically for important intellectual content; and final approval of the version to be published; and agree to be accountable for all aspects of the work in ensuring that questions related to the accuracy or integrity of any part of the work are appropriately investigated and resolved.

Conflict of interest: The authors declare no conflicts of interest.

Abstract

An ageing population means that an increasing number of older adults require residential care. Concurrently, older adults' alcohol use is increasing. This review aimed to explore the perspectives of all relevant stakeholders on older adults' alcohol use within residential care settings. A systematic review and thematic synthesis of qualitative studies was conducted (PROSPERO registration: CRD42024504197). Eight databases were searched for qualitative studies focusing on older adults' alcohol consumption (defined as aged ≥ 50) within residential care settings which sampled any involved stakeholders, published up until January 2024. Quality appraisal utilised the Critical Appraisal Skills Programme checklist. Fifteen studies of mainly moderate quality were included across seven high-income countries, reporting data from a range of stakeholders and representing varied older adults' alcohol histories. Three themes were identified; Alcohol use by older adults is socially acceptable and purposeful in residential care settings, the pursuit of an 'ideal' outcome that alcohol helps to achieve, and decision making around older adults' alcohol use varies depending on the involvement, knowledge, skills, and beliefs of the participating stakeholders, who also vary. Reports of problematic alcohol use were rare and older adults in residential care settings should be supported to exercise their own choice and autonomy in determining their alcohol use. However, residential care settings face particular challenges in managing older adults' alcohol intake with limited mental capacity and alcohol dependency, and due to a lack of guidance frontline staff make subjective decisions. Future research should develop further guidance that involves all relevant stakeholders including family members, who can be particularly influential in determining older adults' alcohol use. Limitations include lack of generalisability to low- and middle-income countries and limited availability of raw data.

Keywords: Alcohol, Residential care settings, older adults, systematic review, qualitative

Introduction

Global population ageing is accelerating and expected to continue over the coming years (Rafalimanana & Lai, 2013), driving a rise in demand for residential care (Hu et al., 2023) which describes anywhere older adults live outside of private residences (Douma et al., 2017) with the availability of assistance. Concurrently, in recent years there has been a small but steady increase in the amount of alcohol consumed by older adults (Bye & Moan, 2020; John, 2018). An inclusive definition of older adults includes all adults aged 50 and over (Bareham et al., 2020; Bareham et al., 2019), as acknowledged by a UK charity for older adults (Age UK, 2024). Data from 21 countries indicates that just over half (52%) of older adults drink alcohol each year, and of those 12% of men and women drink more than two or three drinks per day or report drinking more than five or four drinks in a single occasion, respectively (Calvo et al., 2020). Cultural perceptions of problematic alcohol use differ (Calvo et al., 2021) although excessive alcohol consumption is associated with serious social, psychological, physical and economic costs (Strategy Unit, 2003). The evidence around alcohol use in older adults specifically can be mixed, with some literature showing protective effect of moderate alcohol consumption (Corrao et al., 2000; Elkind et al., 2006; McCaul et al., 2010). However, a recent large scale study identified an increasing risk of cancer, cardiovascular, and all-cause mortality with increasing alcohol use particularly in individuals of low socioeconomic status and existing health risk factors (Ortolá et al., 2024). The authors attributed this finding to the use of occasional drinkers as a reference point instead of abstainers, as the latter group often includes older adults with histories of high alcohol use and dependency which inflates the health risks (Ortolá et al., 2024). Despite the health risks of alcohol use at any level in older adults, for many older adults alcohol use contributes to quality of life (Bareham et al., 2020; Kelly et al., 2018) through facilitating socialisation (Bareham et al., 2020; Bareham et al., 2019; Kelly et al., 2018; Parke et al., 2018) and providing a habitual pleasurable experience (Kelly et al., 2018). Thus, as an increasing number of older adults come to call residential care settings (RCSs) their home, it is relevant to consider

both the value and risks of their alcohol use within RCSs, how their alcohol consumption is managed, and how relevant stakeholders are affected.

A qualitative methodology is appropriate for understanding older adults' alcohol use in the context of RCSs (Godfrey, 2015) as it involves a complex interplay of the thoughts, attitudes, and actions of multiple stakeholders in the context of local and nationally policy landscapes (Bareham et al., 2020; Bareham et al., 2019). Qualitative research facilitates understanding around a complex behaviour (alcohol use) and how it is influenced by its context (RCSs that vary in level of care provided, regulations, and organisational cultures) (Godfrey, 2015). Thus, qualitative research is most appropriate for understanding how and why alcohol use differs across RCSs (Godfrey, 2015). Despite this, few qualitative studies have examined alcohol use in RCSs, although existing studies indicate a symbolic value of rituals around alcohol (Emiliussen et al., 2021) that appears to be common across settings (Bareham et al., 2019). Systematic reviews of qualitative research have explored the experiences, attitudes, and perceptions of both older adults (Bareham et al., 2019; Kelly et al., 2018) and healthcare professionals (Bareham et al., 2020) across settings. However, available reviews provide no comparison between RCSs and private residences (Bareham et al., 2019). Indeed, primary studies indicate specific challenges associated with alcohol use within RCSs given that residents may be unable to access alcohol themselves and thus rely on others to provide it (Emiliussen et al., 2021), individual autonomy and needs must be balanced with communal living (de Graaf et al., 2022), and the provision of care provides opportunity to control older adults' alcohol consumption (Emiliussen et al., 2021). Alcohol use within RCSs is also situated within a wider issue of a right to autonomy as conflicting with living in RCSs when older adults are not able to participate in decisions that concern them (Hedman et al., 2019). The RCSs within primary studies vary widely on their residents and approach to alcohol use, thus a synthesis is needed to understand what works and for whom. Furthermore, existing systematic reviews (Bareham et al., 2020; Bareham et al., 2019; Kelly et al., 2018) excluded studies of older adults with alcohol

dependency, thus it is uncertain how alcohol dependency is managed in RCSs. In summary, available reviews provide a useful overview on the breadth of research of alcohol use in older adults. However, focused reviews are also needed to provide in-depth comparison and understanding of which stakeholders are involved in older adults' alcohol consumption within RCSs, how experiences differ across stakeholders, and the unique challenges around management of residents' alcohol use. There also remains a need to adopt a more pragmatic and rights-based perspective that acknowledges and accepts alcohol, given that abstinence may not be possible or feasible (Nixon & Burns, 2022). The authors have previously published a corresponding in-depth and pragmatic review on alcohol use within older adults who receive domiciliary care (Haighton, Steer, & Nichol, 2024), facilitating comparisons to be made across settings. Thus, the current study aimed to examine the perspectives of relevant stakeholders on alcohol use in RCSs by older adults.

Methods

This study describes a systematic review and thematic synthesis of qualitative studies with the protocol pre-registered via PROSPERO (registration number: CRD42024504197) and following the Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic reviews and Meta-Analyses (PRISMA) guidelines for reporting of systematic reviews (Page et al., 2021) (see Supplementary Material 1). The review question was defined using the SPIDER framework (Sample, Phenomenon of Interest, Design, Evaluation, Research type); to synthesise all available qualitative research exploring older adults' alcohol use within RCSs, through including the views of all relevant stakeholders involved in supplying it. Specific aims included to explore the similarities and differences between views of different stakeholders (e.g. older adults, staff, and family) and according to differing alcohol use across RCSs (e.g. nursing homes, care homes, and sheltered accommodation). Prior to pre-registration, PROSPERO, Joanna Briggs Institute Registries, and Open Science Framework were searched for reviews of a similar scope of which none were identified.

Search strategy and selection criteria

The SPIDER framework for qualitative reviews was used to inform eligibility criteria (Cooke, Smith, & Booth, 2012). The focus was on older adults' alcohol consumption within RCSs. Although the definition of 'older adult' varies widely and is relatively arbitrary, 50 and over was selected as the definition of older adults to be inclusive to relevant studies and facilitate comparison across settings with existing reviews (Bareham et al., 2020; Bareham et al., 2019). Where some participants were younger than 50, studies were included if the mean age was 50 or above. Older adults with any drinking history (from occasional use to alcohol dependence) were included although studies where all participants were abstinent (e.g. in the case of a blanket ban on alcohol (Wadd et al., 2024)) were excluded given that the aim of the study was around management of alcohol use. Samples could include any stakeholders involved in older adults' alcohol use in RCSs, including staff and family members. RCSs were defined, for

the purpose of this review, as anywhere that care is delivered for a prolonged period of time (including assisted living facilities, care homes, and continuing care retirement communities), thus private dwellings were excluded. The inclusion of sheltered accommodation in the definition of RCSs differs to the updated Census definition (Office for National Statistics, 2021) as there is a constant assurance of support and supervision if needed. Where studies included a mixture of substances or types of setting, studies were only included if quotes were separable by setting or substance. Only qualitative studies were included to explore perceptions and attitudes in depth, thus quantitative studies and reviews were excluded. Where studies employed mixed methods, qualitative data was extracted where possible. Finally, inclusion criteria for research type included articles in English written in any year that were peer reviewed or grey literature, whilst book reviews, conference abstracts, editorials, opinion pieces and commentaries were excluded. Due to lack of resources for translation services, only articles published in English were included.

Eight databases were comprehensively searched on the 21st January 2024 for eligible studies (Medline, ASSIA, APA PsycArticles, Nursing & Allied Health Database, Psychology Database, Public Health Database, and ProQuest Dissertations & Theses Global via ProQuest and CINAHL via EBSCO). The search strategy is displayed in Table 1 and the specific searches applied for ProQuest and EBSCO are supplied in Supplementary Material 2. The search as applied to title and abstract was based on the sample (older adults), phenomenon of interest (alcohol use), setting (residential care), and design (qualitative), and included truncations, wildcards, and limits (humans and English language) as appropriate.

Table 1 here

Study selection

Following the search, references were exported to Endnote and duplicates removed. The remaining articles were uploaded to Rayyan for screening based against the inclusion criteria; firstly based on title

and abstract and the remaining articles on full text, with reasons for exclusion at this stage recorded. Screening was conducted independently by two reviewers (BN and CC) and any disagreements were resolved through discussion with a third independent reviewer (CH). Inter rater reliability was calculated at each stage using Cohen's Kappa (McHugh, 2012), applying the conservative parameters set by Altman (1990). Inter-rater reliability for screening of title and abstract was good ($k = .633$) and very good for full text, of which there was 100% agreement ($k = 1.000$). To facilitate open science practices, both title and abstract and full text screening stages are publicly available via Rayyan: (<https://rayyan.ai/reviews/908744> and <https://rayyan.ai/reviews/916540>, respectively).

Data extraction and quality appraisal

Data extraction was conducted by two independent reviewers (BN and CC) and followed a standardised data extraction form that recorded data related to study characteristics, aims, context, methodology, participant details, headline findings, number of quotes and author conclusions. The bespoke data extraction form was developed in accordance with the specific aims of the current review, using guidance from Cochrane (Cochrane Effective Practice Organisation of Care, 2017; Noyes et al., 2018). All direct quotations were extracted from each paper aside from one to two-word quotes where no context was provided. Themes relevant to the research question and their description and explanation were also extracted. To facilitate comparison between included RCSs, the settings were categorised according to their resource utilisation using the Resource Utilisation Groups 4th version (RUG-IV) (Fries et al., 1994); more information provided in the 'Data analysis' section below. Thus, the data extraction form also recorded information both whether RUG was explicitly cited and details of the setting that would help inform categorisation. Again, any disagreements were resolved through discussion with a third reviewer (CH). In accordance with open science practices, the completed data extraction excel file is publicly available via OSF: https://osf.io/e4pmt/?view_only=2702d2a3da674972b7b30041f29664ed.

Quality appraisal was conducted by two independent reviewers (BN and CH) by applying the Critical Appraisal Skills Programme (CASP) quality appraisal tool for qualitative studies (CASP, 2018) to included studies. To facilitate a comprehensive overview of the existing literature, studies were not excluded based on quality but rather informed the interpretation of findings. To facilitate the meaningful incorporation of study quality, acknowledged as an important component of qualitative evidence synthesis, two CASP items were selected as the most relevant for the current review's aims to inform the overall quality judgement of included studies. Included studies were scored according to adherence to items five ('was the data collected in a way that addressed the research issue?') and eight ('was the data analysis sufficiently rigorous?'). Specifically, in accordance with Cochrane guidance (Noyes et al., 2018) and in the absence of evidence-based standardised criteria (Long, French, & Brooks, 2020), each study was categorised into 'low' (neither item was addressed), 'medium' (one item was addressed) or 'high' (both items were addressed) quality. Again, inter rater reliability was calculated using Cohen's kappa and the conservative parameters by Altman (1990). Any disagreements related to quality appraisal were resolved through discussion between both reviewers. Inter rater reliability for quality appraisal was moderate ($k = .536$), of which there was 80% agreement between raters.

Data analysis

Included studies were classified according to the Resource Utilisation Groups 4th version (RUG-VI) classification system, which separates residential settings into seven main categories according to the level and specialty of care required (North Dakota State Government, 2019). Within each category, settings are further classified according to the level of assistance with Activities of Daily Living (ADLs) and the presence of restorative nursing. Where multiple contexts were included, studies were classified according to the most specialised care (the highest classification). Classification was based on study context rather than the participants. Where information was lacking, classification was inferred by the type of residential setting included. Assistance with ADLs was not assumed unless ADLs were specifically

mentioned. Where ADLs were mentioned but not specified, the average of the ADL scale was selected to inform classification. Classification was conducted by the primary researcher (BN) and checked by another author experienced in applying the RUG-VI (JS).

All extracted data including quotes and themes and their description were uploaded to Nvivo (QIP Ltd, 2018) for analysis. Line by line free coding was applied to both sets of data (direct quotations and interpretations by the authors of the included studies). Initially, codes were mainly descriptive, then were built into analytical themes. Codes reflected second- and third-order constructs described in meta-ethnography; codes that were described by authors of included studies, and codes identified by the review team to describe patterns and differences across included studies, respectively (Noblit & Hare, 1988). In accordance with a reflexive approach to thematic analysis (Braun & Clarke, 2019), independent coding was not conducted (Braun & Clarke, 2021). Instead, all analysis was conducted by the primary reviewer (BN) and meetings were held with others in the team (CH and CC) throughout data analysis to reflect upon and refine themes and sub themes. Furthermore, the primary researcher (BN) recorded reflective notes throughout data analysis.

Results

Characteristics of included studies

The PRISMA diagram to illustrate study selection is shown in Figure 1 and reasons for exclusion of studies based on full text screening are displayed in Supplementary Material 3. Fifteen studies were included representing 488 participants (accounting for four overlapping participants across two included studies (de Graaf et al., 2023b; de Graaf et al., 2022)), not including staff focus groups of unspecified size (McCann, Wadd, & Crofts, 2017) or participants that did not contribute to relevant themes (David et al., 2023; Philpin et al., 2011). Table 2 provides a summary of included studies. Included studies were published between 2002 (Klein & Jess, 2002) and 2023 (David et al., 2023; de Graaf et al., 2023b), possessed sample sizes ranging from five (Pollak, 2016) to 197 (Wadd et al., 2024), and mostly represented the USA (Chambers, 2020; Burruss, Sacco, & Smith, 2015; David et al., 2023; Klein & Jess, 2002; Pollak, 2016), followed by England (McCann, Wadd, & Crofts, 2017; Payne, 2018; Wadd et al., 2024), Norway (Johannessen et al., 2021; McCann, Wadd, & Crofts, 2017) and the Netherlands (de Graaf et al., 2023b; de Graaf et al., 2022), then Denmark (Emiliussen et al., 2021), Australia (Dare et al., 2014), and Canada (Nixon & Burns, 2022).

Table 2 here

Settings ranged from independent living such as ‘sheltered accommodation’ (Burruss, Sacco, & Smith, 2015; Dare et al., 2014; Payne, 2018) to care facilities providing care from healthcare professionals including nursing homes (de Graaf et al., 2023b; de Graaf et al., 2022; Johannessen et al., 2021; Pollak, 2016). According to the RUG-IV classification, most included settings cared for residents with reduced physical function, with (Chambers, 2020; David et al., 2023; McCann, Wadd, & Crofts, 2017) or without (Burruss, Sacco, & Smith, 2015; Dare et al., 2014; Emiliussen et al., 2021; Johannessen et al., 2021; Klein & Jess, 2002; Nixon & Burns, 2022; Payne, 2018; Philpin et al., 2011) support with activities of daily

living. A minority of studies were classified to care for residents with behavioural symptoms or reduced cognitive performance as they provided care for residents with dementia (de Graaf et al., 2023b; de Graaf et al., 2022; Wadd et al., 2024), and another study provided rehabilitation within a nursing home (Pollak, 2016). In the studies where it was clear, all but one (Dare et al., 2014) RCSs provided meals for residents (Chambers, 2020; Burruss, Sacco, & Smith, 2015; David et al., 2023; Emiliussen et al., 2021; Johannessen et al., 2021; Klein & Jess, 2002; McCann, Wadd, & Crofts, 2017; Nixon & Burns, 2022; Philpin et al., 2011; Pollak, 2016; Wadd et al., 2024). For other settings, it was unclear if meals were provided or if residents catered for themselves (de Graaf et al., 2023b; de Graaf et al., 2022; Payne, 2018), and it was often uncertain whether residents could independently shop for groceries to supplement provided meals (and therefore were able to buy alcohol independently).

Figure 1 here

All studies utilised interviews, and some also conducted focus groups with specific stakeholder group (Johannessen et al., 2021; McCann, Wadd, & Crofts, 2017; Philpin et al., 2011; Wadd et al., 2024), or combined discussion with participant observations (David et al., 2023) alone or with document analysis (McCann, Wadd, & Crofts, 2017; Philpin et al., 2011). Most often included studies sampled residents (Burruss, Sacco, & Smith, 2015; Dare et al., 2014; David et al., 2023; de Graaf et al., 2023b; de Graaf et al., 2022; Emiliussen et al., 2021; McCann, Wadd, & Crofts, 2017; Nixon & Burns, 2022; Payne, 2018; Wadd et al., 2024) and staff (de Graaf et al., 2023b; Emiliussen et al., 2021; Johannessen et al., 2021; Klein & Jess, 2002; McCann, Wadd, & Crofts, 2017; Nixon & Burns, 2022; Philpin et al., 2011; Pollak, 2016; Wadd et al., 2024), although a minority of studies included family or partners (Chambers, 2020; de Graaf et al., 2023b; Emiliussen et al., 2021), setting managers (Emiliussen et al., 2021; McCann, Wadd, & Crofts, 2017; Wadd et al., 2024), or inspectors (Wadd et al., 2024). Of those that included staff, studies most commonly sampled care professionals (de Graaf et al., 2023b; Emiliussen et al., 2021) although social workers (Pollak, 2016), registered nurses (Johannessen et al., 2021), and General Practitioners

(McCann, Wadd, & Crofts, 2017) were also represented. Five included studies adopted a holistic perspective and sampled a range of relevant stakeholders (de Graaf et al., 2023b; Emiliussen et al., 2021; McCann, Wadd, & Crofts, 2017; Nixon & Burns, 2022; Wadd et al., 2024), including between two (Nixon & Burns, 2022) and four (Emiliussen et al., 2021; Wadd et al., 2024) different stakeholder groups. The available literature within care and nursing homes mostly focused on staff perspectives (Johannessen et al., 2021; Philpin et al., 2011; Pollak, 2016) or adopted a holistic approach by including multiple stakeholders (de Graaf et al., 2023b; Emiliussen et al., 2021; McCann, Wadd, & Crofts, 2017; Wadd et al., 2024), whilst studies of sheltered accommodation almost wholly focused on residents' perspectives (Burruss, Sacco, & Smith, 2015; Dare et al., 2014; Nixon & Burns, 2022; Payne, 2018), and none included staff perspectives. Similarly, the two studies focused on assisted living only included residents (David et al., 2023) and family members (Chambers, 2020) and did not include those involved in management of RCSs or delivering care.

Seven included studies were judged to be medium quality (Chambers, 2020; Burruss, Sacco, & Smith, 2015; Dare et al., 2014; de Graaf et al., 2023b; Emiliussen et al., 2021; Johannessen et al., 2021; McCann, Wadd, & Crofts, 2017), whilst four studies each were judged to be of high (David et al., 2023; de Graaf et al., 2022; Nixon & Burns, 2022; Payne, 2018) or low (Klein & Jess, 2002; Philpin et al., 2011; Pollak, 2016; Wadd et al., 2024) quality (see Supplementary Material 4 for scoring of specific items).

Themes

The overall coding framework with sub-themes, example codes, and illustrative quotes are provided in Table 3. The three themes are first discussed, followed by an overall comparison across RCSs.

Table 3 here

Theme 1: Alcohol use by older adults is socially acceptable and purposeful in residential care settings

The variation of alcohol consumption observed across RCS settings are comparable to the general population and are merely continued into RCSs. Alcohol consumption varied across residents from abstinence (Emiliussen et al., 2021) to dependency (McCann, Wadd, & Crofts, 2017; Nixon & Burns, 2022). Mostly, consumption was low to moderate (Emiliussen et al., 2021; Johannessen et al., 2021), and problematic use (an immediate negative impact on themselves or others) was rare (Chambers, 2020; Emiliussen et al., 2021; Johannessen et al., 2021; Klein & Jess, 2002; McCann, Wadd, & Crofts, 2017; Pollak, 2016). Consumption either remained the same (Chambers, 2020) or decreased (Chambers, 2020; McCann, Wadd, & Crofts, 2017; Nixon & Burns, 2022) on admission to the RCS. It is noteworthy that some studies reported that RCSs did not admit older adults with alcohol dependency (Klein & Jess, 2002; Wadd et al., 2024), potentially explaining the low rates of problematic consumption reported. Two studies described 'wet' (McCann, Wadd, & Crofts, 2017) RCSs that cared for individuals with alcohol addiction and dependency (McCann, Wadd, & Crofts, 2017; Nixon & Burns, 2022), and reported that independent of a reduction in consumption on admission the impact of residents' consumption reduced as residents received care for their basic needs and accessed primary care (Nixon & Burns, 2022).

Again, independent of the RCS and their policies relating to alcohol use, alcohol use by older adults was facilitated or reduced depending on a range of factors comparable across the general population. Independent of admission to RCSs, alcohol use could increase due to contextual factors such as grief (Chambers, 2020; Payne, 2018), and mental health difficulties (Chambers, 2020; Payne, 2018), and decreased due to factors including driving (Dare et al., 2014), older age (de Graaf et al., 2022), health issues (Emiliussen et al., 2021), and medication use (de Graaf et al., 2023b; Payne, 2018). Retirement could both increase or decrease alcohol use through a decrease in responsibilities (Dare et al., 2014), or being linked to work (Dare et al., 2014; Payne, 2018). Similarly, alcohol use could both be increased during socialisation as older adults were less aware of their consumption and were encouraged by social norms around drinking alcohol amongst peers (Burruss, Sacco, & Smith, 2015; Dare et al., 2014; Payne,

2018), or could instead be increased when alone as some individuals felt shame or worry towards what others would think about their consumption (Chambers, 2020; Dare et al., 2014; Payne, 2018). The three studies describing independent living mainly focused on influences independent to the setting including driving, habits and routine, and the only influence of the setting discussed was facilitatory due to an increase in social activities (Burruss, Sacco, & Smith, 2015; Dare et al., 2014). However, there was less engagement with social activities in RCSs that housed residents with a wide age range (McCann, Wadd, & Crofts, 2017; Payne, 2018), which was particularly a concern where social activities aimed to divert attention away from alcohol (McCann, Wadd, & Crofts, 2017). RCSs varied widely on the facilitation of alcohol use, ranging from a blanket ban to bars on site with no rules around alcohol (Klein & Jess, 2002; Wadd et al., 2024). However, endorsement of alcohol use by RCSs seemed to be independent of problematic use as residents could find ways of accessing more alcohol than was allowed (McCann, Wadd, & Crofts, 2017).

Similarly, on an individual level, alcohol use was perceived to help fulfil the basic psychological human needs of autonomy (the freedom of choice and actions aligning with one's sense of self) and relatedness (connection to others) (Deci & Ryan, 2000). Related to autonomy, alcohol use was perceived to encourage choice and autonomy (Emiliussen et al., 2021; Johannessen et al., 2021), routine and continuation of habits (Burruss, Sacco, & Smith, 2015; Dare et al., 2014; de Graaf et al., 2022; Payne, 2018), and possessing a stable self-identity which were perhaps hindered on admission into RCSs. Staff and family were reluctant to remove another choice from residents' lives due to an empathy that their ability to choose was already limited within RCSs. However, this respect was contrasted with the dependence on family and staff, particularly for residents with limited physical functioning compared to other residents including residents with dementia (de Graaf et al., 2022), to supply alcohol which meant that choice of family and staff was inevitably involved. Similarly, there was an overall respect for agency within RCSs by all stakeholders which extended to alcohol use. Removal of choice around alcohol was a

barrier to feeling a sense of home and belonging (McCann, Wadd, & Crofts, 2017). A desire for a 'normal' (Philpin et al., 2011; Wadd et al., 2024) home environment incorporated both the ability of alcohol to provide a feeling of home, '*hygge*', or '*cosy*' (Emiliussen et al., 2021) within RCSs (Emiliussen et al., 2021; Nixon & Burns, 2022), and a stable constant throughout the transition to the RCS (Wadd et al., 2024) and changing friendships, retirement, loss, and a reduction in physical and or psychological functioning (Dare et al., 2014). Related to connectedness, alcohol use fostered a sense of feeling at home and belonging (Emiliussen et al., 2021).

Additionally, a wider societal context of social acceptability of alcohol was continued into RCSs (de Graaf et al., 2022). Alcohol was generally viewed positively by all stakeholders; as a '*treat*' (Dare et al., 2014) or as symbolic of celebration (Emiliussen et al., 2021; Payne, 2018; Philpin et al., 2011) and positive memories (Payne, 2018), and thus inherently tied to mealtimes (Burruss, Sacco, & Smith, 2015; Philpin et al., 2011) or specific occasions or rituals (Emiliussen et al., 2021; Payne, 2018; Philpin et al., 2011). Generally, residents did not feel they had a problematic relationship with alcohol as drinking was normalised amongst their peers (Burruss, Sacco, & Smith, 2015; Dare et al., 2014; Emiliussen et al., 2021). Positive attitudes towards alcohol use in RCSs was contrasted with more negative and paternalistic attitudes toward smoking (de Graaf et al., 2023b; de Graaf et al., 2022) which was attributed to a wider societal shift towards negative perceptions of smoking (de Graaf et al., 2022), a lower prevalence of smoking amongst participants (de Graaf et al., 2023b; de Graaf et al., 2022), and a view that smoking disrupts others more than low level drinking (de Graaf et al., 2022), as alcohol use by residents was no longer accepted if it affected others (de Graaf et al., 2023b; de Graaf et al., 2022) or led to addiction or dependency (McCann, Wadd, & Crofts, 2017; Nixon & Burns, 2022). Generally, there was a sense amongst family members (Emiliussen et al., 2021; Wadd et al., 2024) and staff (de Graaf et al., 2023b; Emiliussen et al., 2021; Klein & Jess, 2002; Wadd et al., 2024) that older adults were entitled to

access alcohol and that it formed a fundamental part of their quality of life (de Graaf et al., 2023b; Emiliussen et al., 2021; Johannessen et al., 2021; Wadd et al., 2024). Facilitation of alcohol use by RCSs (Chambers, 2020; Burruss, Sacco, & Smith, 2015; Dare et al., 2014; Emiliussen et al., 2021; Johannessen et al., 2021) including happy hours (Chambers, 2020; Dare et al., 2014) and a pub on site (Burruss, Sacco, & Smith, 2015) tended to be popular and accepted by all stakeholders. Interestingly, a socioeconomic gradient in acceptability and facilitation of alcohol was notable whereby alcohol use of residents of higher socioeconomic status seemed to be more acceptable to staff (Pollak, 2016; Wadd et al., 2024) and facilitation of alcohol use by setting was higher in RCSs that catered to more affluent residents due to higher resources and staff capacity (Wadd et al., 2024). Harm reduction was also recognised as safer and more inclusive for those with alcohol dependency, and a more realistic goal than abstinence was in an absence of alcohol related problems (McCann, Wadd, & Crofts, 2017).

Within 'wet' RCSs specifically (the only setting-specific observation within this theme), the acceptance and inclusivity provided fostered a sense of belonging for residents with alcohol dependency who often face exclusion from RCSs (McCann, Wadd, & Crofts, 2017; Nixon & Burns, 2022). Particularly, a harm reduction policy, the acceptance of alcohol use with efforts to manage and minimise the risks associated with it, fostered a sense of acceptance which increased satisfaction amongst residents and trusting relationships with staff (Nixon & Burns, 2022). When trust was established, staff were able to enforce some control over residents to reduce the harmful effects of alcohol whilst still retaining trust and cooperation with the residents (Nixon & Burns, 2022).

Theme 2: The pursuit of an 'ideal' outcome that alcohol helps to achieve

Generally, it was recognised by all stakeholders that alcohol helped to achieve positive outcomes for most residents across RCSs (Chambers, 2020; Burruss, Sacco, & Smith, 2015; Dare et al., 2014; de Graaf

et al., 2022; Emiliussen et al., 2021; Johannessen et al., 2021; Wadd et al., 2024). Residents described outcomes including a 'social lubricant' (Dare et al., 2014) and sense of togetherness (Burruss, Sacco, & Smith, 2015; Dare et al., 2014; Emiliussen et al., 2021; Philpin et al., 2011), an emotional response such as calm (Burruss, Sacco, & Smith, 2015) or relaxation (Burruss, Sacco, & Smith, 2015; Dare et al., 2014), and the continuation of routine and opportunity to exercise choice as discussed above. However, a small number of studies suggested that this idealised version of intended outcomes of alcohol use was more individualised, as some residents demonstrated negative outcomes including antisocial behaviour (although this was rare) (Chambers, 2020), and deterioration of health such as encouraging falls (Chambers, 2020) or decreasing the efficacy of medication (Klein & Jess, 2002). Impacts on others were more salient to residents than negative impacts on their own health. Also, staff across care and nursing homes reported that non-alcoholic alternatives could also help to achieve some of the idealised outcomes of alcohol without any negative effects including toasting (Emiliussen et al., 2021) or feelings of togetherness (a feeling of closeness or unity with others) (Emiliussen et al., 2021; Johannessen et al., 2021). Nonetheless, non-alcoholic alternatives were mainly viewed by staff to accompany rather than replace alcohol use, for example after residents had already consumed alcohol (Emiliussen et al., 2021). Furthermore, the use of non-alcoholic beverages or 'watered down' alcohol by staff was not always with the consent of residents with alcohol dependency or dementia (Pollak, 2016). Residents did not discuss use of non-alcoholic beverages to manage their own intake, and this sub-theme was not relevant across sheltered accommodation and assisted living RCSs.

Theme 3: Decision making around older adults' alcohol use varies depending on the involvement, knowledge, skills, and beliefs of the participating stakeholders

A running theme across RCSs was the need to balance older adults' right to choose to use alcohol based on their needs and preferences, and the risks to themselves and others. Within sheltered

accommodation, concerns about risk were mainly around ensuring resident safety and retaining their housing (Nixon & Burns, 2022), whereas the risks discussed in care and nursing homes were often around the impact on other residents and a need to enforce protective policy (Emiliussen et al., 2021; Wadd et al., 2024). For example, serving alcohol on special occasions was perceived as a balance older adults' wants with health limitations (Emiliussen et al., 2021).

Interestingly, there was no sense of enforcement or management of alcohol use of older adults by staff or family members within the data from the settings of most independence (e.g sheltered accommodation and retirement villages) (Burruss, Sacco, & Smith, 2015; Dare et al., 2014; Payne, 2018). Instead, only imposition on older adults' alcohol use were limitations set on their own use (Dare et al., 2014) or through social norms (Dare et al., 2014). Residents self-managed their own intake or within wet care homes (Dare et al., 2014), were supported and encouraged to self-manage (Nixon & Burns, 2022). Whilst this may be due to a difference in study aims to investigate influencing factors of alcohol use and subsequent involvement of residents only (Burruss, Sacco, & Smith, 2015; Dare et al., 2014; Payne, 2018) rather than the involvement or experiences of other stakeholders in relation to older adults' alcohol use (de Graaf et al., 2023b; de Graaf et al., 2022; Emiliussen et al., 2021; Johannessen et al., 2021; Klein & Jess, 2002; McCann, Wadd, & Crofts, 2017; Nixon & Burns, 2022; Pollak, 2016; Wadd et al., 2024), this does indicate that issues of decision making around alcohol use are present only when individuals lack some functional or mental capacity. Common across all settings was a distinct lack of specialised training for staff (Johannessen et al., 2021; Klein & Jess, 2002; Wadd et al., 2024), although only staff from care and nursing homes expressed a need for guidance and training (Johannessen et al., 2021; Pollak, 2016; Wadd et al., 2024).

Dilemmas related to older adults' alcohol use within care and nursing homes arose when respect for residents' autonomy conflicted with health and safety or comfort of the resident or others around them, in which case the other residents were usually prioritised. This decision was more complicated within 'wet' care homes that acknowledged that residents were limited in where they were able to live. Within RCSs that housed comparatively older results compared to the other included studies (Emiliussen et al., 2021; Klein & Jess, 2002), heightened concerns around alcohol inducing falls and interacting with medication led to emphasis on rules, such as only allowing alcohol use on special occasions or based on doctors' orders. Issues cited by staff and occasionally managers around managing alcohol use in RCSs were mainly only present when residents lacked mental capacity to control their own intake (Emiliussen et al., 2021; Wadd et al., 2024) or when alcohol use was problematic in that it had an obvious effect on individuals or others around them (Johannessen et al., 2021). For example, leaving alcohol unattended presented problems particularly for individuals with alcohol dependency or brain injury (Wadd et al., 2024).

Within the rare situations of issues related to alcohol use of residents, 'wet' RCSs (McCann, Wadd, & Crofts, 2017; Nixon & Burns, 2022) generally demonstrated adaptive, appropriate, and measured solutions to manage alcohol use such as the creation of individualised care plans (Nixon & Burns, 2022), facilitated by specialist skills and experience (McCann, Wadd, & Crofts, 2017). Whilst staff within both studies did not deny challenges including antisocial behaviour and residents seeking more alcohol than what was agreed upon and provided to them, it was clear that residents recognised the RCS as somewhere they were accepted and supported (McCann, Wadd, & Crofts, 2017; Nixon & Burns, 2022). When limitations were enforced publicly and paternalistically, residents felt frustrated and infantilised (McCann, Wadd, & Crofts, 2017). However, when gentle limitations were enforced when necessary with tact, communication, trust, and respect for dignity, residents were more accepting (McCann, Wadd, &

Crofts, 2017), eliciting positive outcomes including decreased use of health and social care and the criminal justice system (McCann, Wadd, & Crofts, 2017). Perhaps related to the wide age range of residents in the wet care home, some welcomed the support of staff intervention to restrict their alcohol use, whilst others resented the lack of autonomy (McCann, Wadd, & Crofts, 2017).

On the contrary, 'regular' RCSs were less equipped to deal with such challenging situations and dilemmas, and in the absence of specialist training or guidance, decision making was informally attributed to frontline staff (Emiliussen et al., 2021) who were trusted to make decisions by their managers (de Graaf et al., 2023b). Only one study described a protocol for dealing with problematic alcohol use in the RCS, although it was unclear how formal this was (Pollak, 2016). Furthermore, stricter policy within RCSs meant that residents who were physically unable to purchase alcohol themselves relied on staff (Johannessen et al., 2021) or family (de Graaf et al., 2023b; Emiliussen et al., 2021; Johannessen et al., 2021) to supply them with alcohol, providing a legal grey area particularly if alcohol was permissible within residents' rooms (Emiliussen et al., 2021). Occasionally a desire for alcohol was projected onto the older person without an indication of their desire for it, particularly in residents who lacked capacity to communicate their choice. Staff sometimes followed specific principles to guide their decision making including the 'dignity of risk' principle, namely balancing the potential risks and benefits of alcohol consumption by allowing the dignity to take risks and reducing risk in other ways, and the principle of 'least restrictive option' (Wadd et al., 2024). Contradictorily to a respect for resident's autonomy and choice, efforts to manage alcohol intake by staff were most often enforcements on the environment such as limiting alcohol consumption, and the only psychological approaches identified were the co-creation of care plans (Nixon & Burns, 2022) and the availability of Alcoholics Anonymous meetings on site (Chambers, 2020; Pollak, 2016). There were some cases of deceit where staff swapped alcoholic beverages for non-alcoholic options without the knowledge of a resident with alcohol

dependency or dementia (de Graaf et al., 2023b; Pollak, 2016). The benefit of informal decision making was that decisions tended to be specific to the situation and individual, although informal decisions could also be subjective and inconsistent across staff.

Most existing communication around residents' alcohol use was between care staff and family members and did not always involve the older adult (de Graaf et al., 2023b). Where assumptions were made about a resident's need without their involvement, trust in staff could be impaired. Current and historic alcohol consumption was often not collected on admission (Klein & Jess, 2002; Wadd, 2024) leading to a lack of knowledge of staff (de Graaf et al., 2023b; Klein & Jess, 2002). Also, given that residents were not always honest about their consumption, perception of a resident's alcohol intake could differ drastically between stakeholders (Chambers, 2020), and staff and family members sometimes employed covert methods of accessing residents' alcohol consumption such as checking financial records (Chambers, 2020).

The attitudes and subsequent facilitation of staff and family members were inherently influenced by their own experiences, attitudes, beliefs, and drinking history and habits (Johannessen et al., 2021; Wadd et al., 2024). Consequently, stakeholders were not always in agreement about the decisions made about a residents' alcohol intake. Often, family members were the largest advocates of residents' alcohol use and limited staff ability to reduce the residents' alcohol consumption by supplying residents with alcohol without the knowledge of staff (Emiliussen et al., 2021; Johannessen et al., 2021; Pollak, 2016). Meanwhile, staff and managers more strongly weighed the needs of individual residents with communal living (Emiliussen et al., 2021), risks (McCann, Wadd, & Crofts, 2017; Nixon & Burns, 2022; Wadd et al., 2024), and liability concerns (Wadd et al., 2024).

Discussion

This systematic review aimed to examine the perspectives of relevant stakeholders on alcohol use in RCSs by older adults. Whilst the motivations, influencing factors, and social acceptability relating to alcohol use of older adults is relatively consistent across various RCSs, the need to balance individual rights with risks and the importance of guidance for decision making became increasingly relevant within care and nursing homes with decreasing psychological and physical capacity of residents. In such situations, there is a lack of guidance and training to support staff in responding. Older adults' alcohol use is generally not problematic (Bareham et al., 2020) and older adults regulate their own intake with limitations and rules (Bareham et al., 2019; Kelly et al., 2018), although residents in RCSs are resourceful in fulfilling their desired alcohol consumption despite prohibitory policy and constraints. When life is otherwise potentially very different, alcohol use offers a continuation of existing routines and rituals (Bareham et al., 2019; Kelly et al., 2018). Choice was inherently linked to a feeling of being at home and belonging, and decisions around alcohol use offer residents a choice in a setting where opportunity for choice is scarce (Bareham et al., 2020). Furthermore, RCSs are situated within a context of a broader societal acceptability of alcohol use (unless it affects others (Bareham et al., 2019; Muhlack et al., 2018)) compared to other recreational drugs. Also, alcohol often enriches the lives of older adults, facilitating socialising (Bareham et al., 2020; Bareham et al., 2019; Kelly et al., 2018; Parke et al., 2018), quality of life (Bareham et al., 2020; Kelly et al., 2018), and enjoyment (Bareham et al., 2019; Kelly et al., 2018). Thus, approaches to alcohol use within RCSs should balance the consideration of the physical health risks with the positive social and psychological impacts experienced by many residents, as consequently many older adults and their family and carers are motivated to encourage alcohol use in RCSs. Indeed, prohibitory policies placed more of the decision-making burden on staff and family instead of the older adult themselves, reflecting a wider debate around autonomy and choice within RCSs in decisions around their care (Hedman et al., 2019). However, for a minority of older adults, alcohol use creates

negative outcomes that impact staff and residents within RCSs, and overall there is a lack of reflection of older adults on their own intake (Bareham et al., 2020; Bareham et al., 2019; Muhlack et al., 2018).

Thus, person centred decision making around older adults' alcohol use is needed, facilitated by rapport with residents (Bareham et al., 2020) and adequate training for staff for dealing with alcohol misuse (Bareham et al., 2020).

Unique challenges associated with RCSs included ensuring communication and involvement of all relevant stakeholders in decision making around residents' alcohol use, inherent limitations around control and autonomy, and managing differing levels of alcohol use amongst residents. Reports of deceit to individuals with dementia or alcohol dependency raise the ethical question of whether deceit is ever appropriate in health and social care. Depending on the ethical theoretical underpinning adopted, deceit to residents with dementia may be morally acceptable when prioritising the best interests and care of the resident as opposed to convenience of lying (Cantone et al., 2019). Such challenges were not present within independent living setting which may instead be comparable to private residences, although this difference could be due to differences in study aims. Thus, research is needed in independent living RCSs that includes wider stakeholders such as wardens and family members to explore their involvement in residents' alcohol use.

The current review identified a lack of guidance for staff navigating residents' alcohol use, resulting in subjective decision making that could promote unfairness across residents and even inequalities by socioeconomic status (SES), given that facilitation and acceptability could be influenced by SES. In the absence of national guidance (Wadd et al., 2024), RCSs often create their own policies which vary greatly from each other and result in a wide variation in care. Furthermore, a lack of national guidance leaves frontline staff to balance policy for person centred care which means including residents in decisions about their care (Care Quality Commission, 2014a), safe care and treatment which means

avoiding preventable harm or risk of harm (Care Quality Commission, 2014b), and the Mental Capacity Act which ensures that staff act in the best interest of residents only when they lack capacity to make decisions (Department of Health, 2005). In practice, this means balancing legislation that encourages residents to make their own decisions even when they are unwise for their health with legislation that is risk averse and assigns responsibility to staff for residents' wellbeing. Existing guidance for care staff provides advice on navigating alcohol use with residents including those with alcohol dependency (Rota-Bartelink, 2011a; Rota-Bartelink, 2011b; Wadd et al., 2023), communication limitations (Wadd et al., 2023), and limited capacity (Wadd et al., 2023), although does not incorporate the input of wider stakeholders including family members, who this review found are often the most influential in determining alcohol use of residents.

The literature on 'wet' care homes (McCann, Wadd, & Crofts, 2017; Nixon & Burns, 2022) demonstrated the utility and success of flexible guidance and principles including harm reduction principles, shared decision making, and person-centred care. However, this literature also highlighted the specialist skills and knowledge needed to care for individuals with alcohol dependency appropriately (McCann, Wadd, & Crofts, 2017). Thus, through adequate training and protocols, RCSs should be better prepared to care appropriately for individuals with alcohol dependency or at least be capable of referring residents to a RCS that is, to ensure inclusivity of all residents regardless of their drinking history. Standardised guidance around managing alcohol use in older adults in RCSs on admission would help to promote fairness and equality across all residents, promote involvement of all stakeholders, and support staff in making challenging decisions. For example, a harm reduction intervention for residents with alcohol dependency and associated antisocial behaviour that provided specialist and highly personalised structured activities and behavioural management was found to be cost-effective in reducing depression, anxiety, problematic drinking and number of alcoholic drinks consumed (Rota-Bartelink, 2011a; Rota-Bartelink, 2011b). Whilst most of the subjective decision making observed within the

current review already appeared to be person-centred, it was often influenced by the attitudes and experiences of the decision maker and did not sufficiently involve all relevant stakeholders, as is required for successful person centred care (de Graaf et al., 2023a). Also, the current review identified a lack of psychological intervention and reflection of residents on the purpose and risks of their own alcohol use. Thus, shared decision making could provide an opportunity for a brief intervention (Gordon et al., 2003) to encourage reflection on when alcohol meaningfully adds to residents' experience and quality of life balanced against the health risks, and when a non-alcoholic alternative would be just as meaningful, which is also not accounted for in existing guidance (Rota-Bartelink, 2011a; Rota-Bartelink, 2011b; Wadd et al., 2023). For example, a shared decision to offer alcohol only at mealtimes could utilise the positive social effects of drinking alcohol identified within this review whilst also attenuating for the some of the increased risk of mortality caused by alcohol use (Ortolá et al., 2024).

The main strength of the current review was the comprehensive search strategy including grey literature that accessed perceptions of a range of stakeholders and included residents across all drinking histories, including dependency. Compared to previous systematic reviews' justification for excluding studies of residents with alcohol dependence as they are 'strongly encouraged to abstain from drinking' (Bareham et al., 2020; Bareham et al., 2019), the current review acknowledged harm reduction as more pragmatic, safe, and inclusive approach to managing alcohol use. The main limitations of the current review were that no translation services were available which may have affected the ability to include all eligible studies. Also, a lack of open data meant that the only quotations available for extraction were selected by study authors to be presented within the manuscript, thus it is uncertain whether the conclusions made by the current review reflect the constituent datasets of included studies. An increase in data sharing for qualitative research will facilitate reviewers of qualitative studies in comprehensive synthesis.

In conclusion, it is pragmatic to accept that older adults in RCSs should be involved in shared decision making with other relevant stakeholders including staff and family to determine their own alcohol use. Facilitation of alcohol in RCSs respects the choice and autonomy of older residents, whilst adopting a harm reduction approach helps to minimise the risks towards residents and those around them. As the available literature within sheltered accommodation and assisted living facilities mainly focused on residents' perspective only, themes within these included studies focused on residents' motivations and influences relating to their alcohol use. Thus, further research is needed to include the perspectives of all relevant stakeholders and concerning independent living in RCSs, specifically around the intersectionality between SES and how different policies across RCSs relate to means, opportunity, and capacity to consume alcohol. Future research on independent living in RCSs should also focus on the perspectives of family members, in the absence of continual formal care provision. Also, more research is needed within wet care homes to explore the experiences of commissioners, managers, and staff around managing alcohol use in these challenging settings which balance caring for residents of a wide range of ages. Crucially, practical guidance on managing alcohol use in older adults that includes all stakeholders and provides the opportunity for psychological intervention is needed.

References

- Age UK. (2024). *New data on the health and care of over-50s*.
<https://www.ageuk.org.uk/discover/2024/january/new-data-on-the-health-and-care-of-over-50s/>
- Altman, D. G. (1990). *Practical statistics for medical research*. Chapman and Hall/CRC.
- Bareham, B. K., Kaner, E., Spencer, L., and Hanratty, B. (2020). Health and social care providers' perspectives of older people's drinking: a systematic review and thematic synthesis of qualitative studies. *Age and ageing*, **49**, 453-467.
- Bareham, B. K., Kaner, E., Spencer, L. P., and Hanratty, B. (2019). Drinking in later life: a systematic review and thematic synthesis of qualitative studies exploring older people's perceptions and experiences. *Age and ageing*, **48**, 134-146.
- Braun, V., and Clarke, V. (2019). Reflecting on reflexive thematic analysis. *Qualitative research in sport, exercise and health*, **11**, 589-597.
- Braun, V., and Clarke, V. (2021). One size fits all? What counts as quality practice in (reflexive) thematic analysis? *Qualitative research in psychology*, **18**, 328-352.
- Burruss, K., Sacco, P., and Smith, C. A. (2015). Understanding older adults' attitudes and beliefs about drinking: perspectives of residents in congregate living. *Ageing & Society*, **35**, 1889-1904.
- Bye, E. K., and Moan, I. S. (2020). Trends in older adults' alcohol use in Norway 1985–2019. *Nordic Studies on Alcohol and Drugs*, **37**, 444-458.
- Calvo, E., Allel, K., Staudinger, U. M., Castillo-Carniglia, A., Medina, J. T., and Keyes, K. M. (2021). Cross-country differences in age trends in alcohol consumption among older adults: a cross-sectional study of individuals aged 50 years and older in 22 countries. *Addiction*, **116**, 1399-1412.
- Calvo, E., Medina, J. T., Ornstein, K. A., Staudinger, U. M., Fried, L. P., and Keyes, K. M. (2020). Cross-country and historical variation in alcohol consumption among older men and women: Leveraging recently harmonized survey data in 21 countries. *Drug and alcohol dependence*, **215**, 108219.
- Cantone, D., Attena, F., Cerrone, S., Fabozzi, A., Rossiello, R., Spagnoli, L., and Pelullo, C. P. (2019). Lying to patients with dementia: Attitudes versus behaviours in nurses. *Nursing ethics*, **26**, 984-992.
- Care Quality Commission (2014a). *Health and Social Care Act 2008 (Regulated Activities) Regulations 2014: Regulation 9*. Retrieved 20/01 from <https://www.cqc.org.uk/guidance-providers/regulations/regulation-9-person-centred-care>
- Care Quality Commission (2014b, 7 August 2023). *Health and Social Care Act 2008 (Regulated Activities) Regulations 2014: Regulation 12*. Retrieved 30/01 from <https://www.cqc.org.uk/guidance-providers/regulations/regulation-12-safe-care-treatment>
- CASP. (2018). CASP qualitative checklist. *Critical Appraisal Skills Programme*. <https://casp-uk.net/casp-tools-checklists/>
- Chambers, L. M. A. (2020). *Familial Caregivers' Perceptions of Alcohol Use Among Mature Adults Residing in Assisted Living Communities*. Doctoral dissertation, Walden University.
- Cochrane Effective Practice Organisation of Care. (2017). Data collection form. EPOC resources for review authors.
- Cooke, A., Smith, D., and Booth, A. (2012). Beyond PICO: the SPIDER tool for qualitative evidence synthesis. *Qualitative health research*, **22**, 1435-1443.
- Corrao, G., Rubbiati, L., Bagnardi, V., Zambon, A., and Poikolainen, K. (2000). Alcohol and coronary heart disease: a meta-analysis. *Addiction*, **95**, 1505-1523.

- Dare, J., Wilkinson, C., Allsop, S., Waters, S., and McHale, S. (2014). Social engagement, setting and alcohol use among a sample of older Australians. *Health & Social Care in the Community*, **22**, 524-532. <https://doi.org/doi:10.1111/hsc.12110>
- David, D., Lassell, R. K., Mazor, M., Brody, A. A., and Schulman-Green, D. (2023). "I Have a Lotta Sad Feelin'"—Unaddressed Mental Health Needs and Self-Support Strategies in Medicaid-Funded Assisted Living. *Journal of the American Medical Directors Association*, **24**, 833-840.
- de Graaf, L., Janssen, M., Roelofs, T., and Luijkx, K. (2023a). Substance use and misuse of older adults living in residential care facilities: a scoping review from a person-centred care approach. *Ageing & Society*, **43**, 1457-1483.
- de Graaf, L., Janssen, M., Roelofs, T., and Luijkx, K. (2023b). Who's Involved? Case Reports on Older Adults' Alcohol and Tobacco Use in Dutch Residential Care Facilities. *Qualitative Health Research*, **33**, 945-955. <https://doi.org/doi:10.1177/10497323231186879>
- de Graaf, L., Roelofs, T., Janssen, M., and Luijkx, K. (2022). Live and let live: Residents' perspectives on alcohol and tobacco (mis)use in residential care facilities. *International Journal of Older People Nursing*, **18**, 1-9. <https://doi.org/doi:10.1111/opn.12508>
- Deci, E. L., and Ryan, R. M. (2000). The "what" and "why" of goal pursuits: Human needs and the self-determination of behavior. *Psychological inquiry*, **11**, 227-268.
- Department of Health (2005, 28 January 2025). *Mental Capacity Act 2005*. Retrieved 30/01 from <https://www.legislation.gov.uk/ukpga/2005/9/contents>
- Douma, J. G., Volkers, K. M., Engels, G., Sonneveld, M. H., Goossens, R. H., and Scherder, E. J. (2017). Setting-related influences on physical inactivity of older adults in residential care settings: A review. *BMC geriatrics*, **17**, 1-10.
- Elkind, M. S., Sciacca, R., Boden-Albala, B., Rundek, T., Paik, M. C., and Sacco, R. L. (2006). Moderate alcohol consumption reduces risk of ischemic stroke: the Northern Manhattan Study. *Stroke*, **37**, 13-19.
- Emiliussen, J., Engelsen, S., Christiansen, R., Nielsen, A. S., and Klausen, S. H. (2021). Alcohol in long-term care homes: A qualitative investigation with residents, relatives, care workers and managers. *Nordic Studies on Alcohol and Drugs*, **38**, 414-33.
- Fries, B. E., Schneider, D. P., Foley, W. J., Gavazzi, M., Burke, R., and Cornelius, E. (1994). Refining a case-mix measure for nursing homes: Resource Utilization Groups (RUG-III). *Medical care*, **32**, 668-685.
- Godfrey, M. (2015). Qualitative research in age and ageing: enhancing understanding of ageing, health and illness. *Age and Ageing* **44**, 726-727.
- Gordon, A. J., Conigliaro, J., Maisto, S. A., McNeil, M., Kraemer, K. L., and Kelley, M. E. (2003). Comparison of consumption effects of brief interventions for hazardous drinking elderly. *Substance Use & Misuse*, **38**, 1017-1035.
- Haighton, C., Steer, M., and Nichol, B. (2024). Domiciliary Carers' Perspectives on Alcohol Use by Older Adults in Their Care: A Systematic Review and Thematic Synthesis of Qualitative Studies. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health*, **21**, 1324.
- Hedman, M., Häggström, E., Mamhidir, A.-G., and Pöder, U. (2019). Caring in nursing homes to promote autonomy and participation. *Nursing ethics*, **26**, 280-292.
- Hu, B., Rodrigues, R., Wittenberg, R., and Rhee, Y. (2023). Long-term care for older people: A global perspective. *Frontiers in Public Health*, **11**, 1178397
- Johannessen, A., Tevik, K., Engedal, K., Gade Haanes, G., and Helvik, A. S. (2021). Health Professionals' Experiences Regarding Alcohol Consumption and Its Relation to Older Care Recipient's Health and Well-Being. *Journal of Multidisciplinary Healthcare*, **14**, 1829-1842.
- John, E. (2018). Adult drinking habits in Great Britain: 2017. *Statistical Bulletin. Office for National Statistics (ONS), UK Government. Available at:*

- <https://www.ons.gov.uk/peoplepopulationandcommunity/healthandsocialcare/drugusealcoholandnsmoking/bulletins/opinionsandlifestylesurveyadultdrinkinghabitsingreatbritain/2017> (retrieved 21 March 2019).
- Kelly, S., Olanrewaju, O., Cowan, A., Brayne, C., and Lafortune, L. (2018). Alcohol and older people: A systematic review of barriers, facilitators and context of drinking in older people and implications for intervention design. *PloS one*, **13**, e0191189.
- Klein, W. C., and Jess, C. (2002). One last pleasure? Alcohol use among elderly people in nursing homes. *Health & Social Work*, **27**, 193-203.
- Long, H. A., French, D. P., and Brooks, J. M. (2020). Optimising the value of the critical appraisal skills programme (CASP) tool for quality appraisal in qualitative evidence synthesis. *Research Methods in Medicine & Health Sciences*, **1**, 31-42.
- McCann, M., Wadd, S., and Crofts, G. (2017). 'Wet' care homes for older people with refractory alcohol problems: a qualitative study. Alcohol Research UK
- McCaul, K. A., Almeida, O. P., Hankey, G. J., Jamrozik, K., Byles, J. E., and Flicker, L. (2010). Alcohol use and mortality in older men and women. *Addiction*, **105**, 1391-1400.
- McHugh, M. L. (2012). Interrater reliability: the kappa statistic. *Biochemia medica*, **22**, 276-282.
- Muhlack, E., Carter, D., Braunack-Mayer, A., Morfidis, N., and Elliott, J. (2018). Constructions of alcohol consumption by non-problematised middle-aged drinkers: a qualitative systematic review. *BMC Public Health*, **18**, 1-10.
- Nixon, L. L., and Burns, V. F. (2022). Exploring harm reduction in supportive housing for formerly homeless older adults. *Canadian Geriatrics Journal*, **25**, 285.
- Noblit, G. W., and Hare, R. D. (1988). *Meta-ethnography: Synthesizing qualitative studies* (Vol. 11). Sage.
- North Dakota State Government. (2019). *STEP BY STEP GUIDE TO ASSIGNING A CLASSIFICATION FOR RUG IV* <https://www.hhs.nd.gov/sites/www/files/documents/DHS%20Legacy/rug-iv-manual.pdf>
- Noyes, J., Booth, A., Flemming, K., Garside, R., Harden, A., Lewin, S., Pantoja, T., Hannes, K., Cargo, M., and Thomas, J. (2018). Cochrane Qualitative and Implementation Methods Group guidance series—paper 3: methods for assessing methodological limitations, data extraction and synthesis, and confidence in synthesized qualitative findings. *Journal of clinical epidemiology*, **97**, 49-58.
- Office for National Statistics. (2021). *Communal establishment management and type variable: Census 2021*. Retrieved 18/06 from <https://www.ons.gov.uk/census/census2021dictionary/variablesbytopic/housingvariablescensus2021/communalestablishmentmanagementandtype>
- Ortolá, R., Sotos-Prieto, M., García-Esquinas, E., Galán, I., and Rodríguez-Artalejo, F. (2024). Alcohol consumption patterns and mortality among older adults with health-related or socioeconomic risk factors. *JAMA network open*, **7**, e2424495-e2424495.
- Page, M. J., McKenzie, J. E., Bossuyt, P. M., Boutron, I., Hoffmann, T. C., Mulrow, C. D., Shamseer, L., Tetzlaff, J. M., Akl, E. A., and Brennan, S. E. (2021). The PRISMA 2020 statement: an updated guideline for reporting systematic reviews. *BMJ*, **372**.
- Parke, H., Michalska, M., Russell, A., Moss, A. C., Holdsworth, C., Ling, J., and Larsen, J. (2018). Understanding drinking among midlife men in the United Kingdom: A systematic review of qualitative studies. *Addictive Behaviors Reports*, **8**, 85-94.
- Payne, A. (2018). *A mixed methods investigation of alcohol use in sheltered accommodation*. Doctoral dissertation, University of Sunderland.
- Philpin, S., Merrell, J., Warring, J., Gregory, V., and Hobby, D. (2011). Sociocultural context of nutrition in care homes. *Nursing Older People*, **23**, 24-30.
- Pollak, G. (2016). *Alcohol abuse among elders: An empirical study for social workers*. Southern Connecticut State University.

- QIP Ltd. (2018). *Nvivo*.
- Rafalimanana, H., and Lai, M. (2013). World Population Ageing 2013. New York: United Nations, Department of Economic and Social Affairs. *Population Division. United Nations, New York*.
- Rota-Bartelink, A. (2011a). Supporting older people living with alcohol-related brain injury: the Wicking project outcomes. *Care management journals*, **12**, 186-193.
- Rota-Bartelink, A. (2011b). *The Wicking Project: Older people with acquired brain injury & associated complex behaviours: A psychosocial model of care: A psychosocial model of care*.
<https://www.wintringham.org.au/view/1411>
- Strategy Unit. (2003). Alcohol harm reduction project: Interim analytical report. *Crown copyright. London*.
- Wadd, S., Dutton, M., Friedrich, C., and McCann, M. (2023). *Alcohol management in care homes: a good practice guide for care staff*. University of Bedfordshire.
- Wadd, S., McCann, M., Fisher, M., Hopwood, A., Hawkins, A. (2024). *Keeping the spirits up? A qualitative interview study of alcohol policy and practice in residential care homes for older people*. University of Bedfordshire

Tables

Table 1: Search strategy. The specific search for each search engine is supplied in Supplementary Material 1.

Older adults	Residential care settings	Alcohol use	Qualitative studies
age* OR aging OR centenarian OR elder* OR later-life OR "late* life" OR mid-life OR "mid life" OR midlife OR middle-age* OR "middle age*" OR nonagenarian OR octogenarian OR old* OR senescent OR senior* OR sexagenarian OR veteran* or geriatric OR retir*	"nursing home*" OR "care home*" OR sheltered OR residential* OR "long term care" OR "long-term care" OR "assisted living" OR "rest home*" OR "skilled nursing facilit*" OR "continuing care" OR "retirement communit*" OR "retirement village*" OR "retirement complex*" OR "congregate housing" OR "congregate living" OR cohousing	alcohol* OR drunk OR beverage OR intoxicate OR drink* OR substance* OR "substance use" OR "substance misuse" OR "substance abuse" OR booze OR pissed OR wrecked	"semi-structured" OR semistructured OR unstructured OR informal OR "in-depth" OR indepth OR "face-to-face" OR structured OR guide* OR discussion* OR "focus group*" OR qualitative OR ethnograph* OR fieldwork OR "field work" OR "key informant" OR interview* OR "group discussion" OR experience* OR attitude* OR perception* OR attitude* OR belief* OR opinion* OR view* OR perspective* OR voice* OR biograph* OR autobiograph* OR value* OR stor* OR behavio?r* OR habit* OR choice* OR meaning* OR lifestyle* OR account* OR reason* OR expectation* OR theme* OR "discourse analysis" OR "constant comparative" OR thematic OR narration OR "exploratory research" OR "content analysis" OR transcript* OR "social construction*" OR "grounded theory" or phenomenolog*

Table 2: Summary table of the characteristics and relevant themes identified by each included study. ‘Sample’ column is displayed as; sample size (type of participants and composition of the sample), inclusion criteria for participants, age range of older adults (mean (M) and standard deviation (SD) if provided) and drinking habits of older adults. Themes were identified by the authors of the included primary studies, although only themes relevant to the aims of the current review were extracted.

Study and country	Aim	Sample	Setting (RUG IV classification)	Methodology	Themes identified by study authors (relevant to the review aims)	Quality rating
Burruss 2015, USA	To explore alcohol use and beliefs and perspectives surrounding alcohol use among a sub-population of older adults in a continuing care retirement community (CCRC).	n = 11 (residents), current drinkers with no cognitive impairment, aged 68-90 (M = 81.5, SD = 7.5), would consume a M = 1.88 drinks on days drinking.	Independent living/ continuing care retirement community (PA1, 7: reduced physical function)	In-depth interviews, template analysis	Drinking as part of a habit/routine The way participants’ drinking was influenced by the drinking of others The experience of drinking in a congregate living setting	Medium
Chambers 2020, USA	To explore mature adults’ alcohol use in assisted living communities, its effect on their ability to age successfully, and the emotional, physical, and social challenges associated, through the lens of familial caregivers.	n = 8 (familial caregivers) individuals that knew about their relative’s (aged between 65-85 with no cognitive impairment), alcohol consumption within an assisted living community, no information about age provided, most drank daily (n = 7) compared to occasionally (n = 1)	Assisted living community (PC1, 7: reduced physical function)	Semi-structured interviews, life course approach	Changes associated with alcohol consumption Overall health concerns Social Interactions as a Source of Alcohol at the ALC	Medium
Dare 2013, Australia	To explore the following amongst older people living in private residences and retirement villages; What role does alcohol play in older people’s lives?	n = 42 (residents), individuals aged 65-74 that had consumed alcohol in the previous 12 months, (residential settings only) M = 69.7, SD = 3.93 for men and M = 69.3, SD = 2.4 for women,	Resident funded retirement village (PA1, 7: reduced physical function)	In-depth interviews, thematic analysis	Alcohol and social engagement Alcohol and relaxation Alcohol, work, and leisure	Medium

	What factors facilitate or constrain alcohol use in different residential settings? How does setting influence older people's alcohol use?	mostly drank multiple drinks daily				
David 2023, USA	To investigate mental health needs and barriers to seeking mental health support for racial and ethnic minoritised residents in Medicaid assisted living facilities.	n = 13 (one quote from one P extracted), individuals 60 or over who self-identified as Black or African American, Hispanic/Latinx, Asian or Pacific Islander, no information about the single included participant was provided.	Medicaid assisted living facility (PC1, 7: reduced physical function)	Semi-structured interviews and observational field notes/memos	Seeking support through none mental health resources (subtheme)	High
DeGraaf 2023, the Netherlands	To explore the involvement of stakeholders in alcohol and tobacco use of residents living residential care facilities and how their knowledge, attitudes, and personal substance use affect their behavior toward residents' use.	n = 19 (4 older adults subsampled from the study below, 13 care professionals, 2 family members or partners), purposively sampled to reach diversity in the cases and the type of care units, aged between 67-91 (M = 78), all drank alcohol, but amount varied.	Residential care facilities for people with severe physical disabilities or dementia (BA1, 6: behavioural symptoms and cognitive performance)	Semi-structured interviews, narrative portraiture	Case studies not organised into themes	Medium
DeGraaf 2022, same as above	To explore residents' knowledge, attitudes, habits, and wishes regarding alcohol and tobacco use and how their habits and wishes are regulated or facilitated in residential care facilities.	n = 16 (residents), no exclusion criteria based on disability, aged between 66 and 91 years, range of alcohol consumption from abstinence to three units per day.	Same as above	Semi-structured interviews	Current use and self-reflection Knowledge and attitudes Addiction or habit Policies and availability Dependency versus autonomy	High

Emiliussen 2021, Denmark	To explore and contrast the experiences and perspectives of residents, care workers, relatives, and institution management in relation to alcohol in care homes.	n = 14 (5 residents, 4 care workers, 3 relatives, and 2 care home managers), inclusion criteria not specified, aged between 77-95 (M = 85.2), no information on drinking habits.	Care homes (PB1, 7: reduced physical function)	Semi-structured interviews, phenomenological analysis	Alcohol use before the care home The care home serves alcohol Low use of alcohol Use of alcohol on special occasions Abstinence Problematic alcohol use Family and alcohol use Describing the residents' alcohol use Controlling the use of alcohol Positive aspects of alcohol Social life and alcohol Dementia and alcohol Personal view The residents own choice and privacy	Medium
Johannessen 2021, Norway	To investigate the experiences and reflections of nursing home staff in relation to alcohol consumption and use of psychotropic drugs of residents and the facilitation of such use.	n = 19 (18 registered nurses, one social educator), nursing home staff, no information about age of staff, one participant had experience working with residents who abused alcohol.	Nursing homes (PB1, 7: reduced physical function)	Individual interviews and focus-groups, manifest content analysis	The balancing of alcohol consumption is needed to improve quality of life and provide good quality of care	Medium
Klein 2002, USA	To describe the policies, practices, and problems that currently exist in several sheltered living environments for older adults, specifically around alcohol-related	n = 111 (nominated staff member for each facility, contacted all licensed facilities in the area, no information for specific age range or drinking habits although the statewide	Intermediate care facilities (PA1, 7: reduced physical function)	Semi-structured interviews, content analysis	Assessment Attitudes and policies regarding alcohol Recognition of alcohol-related problems	Low

	information at assessment, the availability of alcohol to residents, facility rules and services related to alcohol, alcohol-related problems, and staff attitudes and knowledge about alcohol.	profile of nursing home residents indicated that 48 percent of residents were age 85 or older.				
McCann 2017, England and Norway	<p>What are the harm reduction services offered by each care home?</p> <p>What are residents', families' and staff members' experiences of these services?</p> <p>What are suitable outcomes for wet care homes?</p> <p>How might these outcomes be measured?</p>	n = unknown (11 residents, 1 team manager, 1 doctor, unknown number of staff), from care homes that adopt a harm reduction approach, aged from 50-86, alcohol dependent individuals who are unable or unwilling to stop drinking	'Wet' care homes (PC1, 7: reduced physical function)	Semi-structured interviews (residents, team manager, GP), focus groups (staff), observations/ethnography, and document analysis e.g. selection and allocation policy, and care plans for individual residents, appreciative enquiry and framework analysis	<p>Alcohol policy</p> <p>Safety and security</p> <p>Health</p> <p>Alcohol use</p> <p>Choice, control, and autonomy</p> <p>Social and diversionary activities</p> <p>Outcomes</p>	Medium
Nixon 2022, Canada	To determine how harm reduction policy impacts care delivery in supportive housing targeting older people with experiences of homelessness, specifically how harm reduction policy is experienced and enacted by staff and residents.	n = 15 (6 residents and 9 staff), facility provides care to residents with experiences of homelessness and complex health challenges, aged 58-78 (M = 65.8), most currently used alcohol (n = 5), 1 was on a managed alcohol program.	Supportive housing facility (PA1, 7: reduced physical function)	Semi-structured interviews, informed by grounded constructivist theory, harm reduction principles, and risk environment framework	<p>Residents felt respected and had a sense of belonging at Harbour House</p> <p>Staff endeavoured to earn and maintain residents' trust</p> <p>Maintaining Trust: Sharing Responsibilities & Individualizing Supports</p> <p>Residents & Staff Working Together—Trust: Defusing Tensions:</p>	High

Payne 2018, England	To investigate the factors determining the decision to drink in later life.	n = 16 (residents), excluded residents with dementia, who lacked capacity or were acutely unwell, no information on interview sample provided although the wider sample were aged 49-94 (M = 53) and over 86% were in the low-risk category of drinking.	Sheltered housing (PA1, 7: reduced physical function)	In-depth interviews, framework analysis approach with a biographic narrative overlay and a life course approach	Mental health Domestic violence Family Work influences Social contact	High
Philpin 2011, no information	To investigate the factors that influenced the nutritional care provided to residents in two different care environments.	n = 45 (one quote from one informal caregiver was extracted), included residents were aged 65 or over, no information available for the specific participant.	Unit-based care home (PB1, 7: reduced physical function)	Focus groups (staff), interviews (managers, residents and informal carers), observations, and document analysis e.g assessment tools and residents' case notes, thematic analysis	Normality	Low
Pollack 2016, USA	To explore nursing home social workers' knowledge regarding the level of alcohol abuse among elder residents.	n = 5 (social workers), working in long term care facility or short-term rehab in long term care facility, no information around age or drinking habits of residents provided.	Nursing homes (RAA, 1: rehabilitation)	Open and close-ended interviews.	Alcohol preperadness and training	Low
Wadd 2023 (not published), England	To explore alcohol policy and practice in care homes including the voices of all key stakeholder groups. The research questions were: What are residents', family members' care workers' and inspectors' perceptions of alcohol use in care homes? What policies and practice exist in relation to alcohol use	n = 197 (21 residents, 111 staff, 65 inspectors and managers), no exclusion criteria based on diagnosis or communication difficulties, females aged 41-99 (M = 83), males aged 63-97 (M = 86), alcohol use ranged from abstinence to dependence.	Care homes (BA1, 6: behavioural symptoms and cognitive performance)	Interviews and focus groups using vignettes to shape focus group discussion (inspectors) and an interview guide to structure interviews (staff residents and relatives), thematic analysis and methods.	Perceptions of alcohol use in care homes Availability Control and monitoring Residents with limited mental capacity Residents with alcohol use disorders Guidance and training	Low

in care homes?
 How and why does alcohol
 policy and practice vary
 between care homes?

Table 3: Coding framework with example individual codes and quotes.

Theme	Sub-theme	Example code	Example quote
Alcohol use by older adults is socially acceptable and purposeful in residential care settings	Low level alcohol use in residential care settings persists across a variation in prohibitory policy with the same exacerbating and protective factors	Problematic alcohol use rare	Car2HG: No, we don't have any problems with that up here. It's not like we get into an argument with them [the residents] or find empty bottles in their rooms. (Emiliussen 2021)
	Social acceptability of alcohol continues in residential care settings	Range of alcohol policy and rules across residential care settings	'When I first started there [name of care home], the CEO was dead set against alcohol. There was no drinking and so therefore there was no alcohol around in the care home.' (care worker) (Wadd 2024)
		Alcohol as medicine (e.g to decrease aggression, or for sleep)	Instead of using tranquillizing psychotropic drugs, Baily's liquor is served with the coffee, or a glass of red wine is served in the evening so that the residents can have a better night than if they did not get alcohol. (Johannessen 2021)
		Family facilitates alcohol consumption of older adult	'I have some, if my daughter-in-law buys one of the small bottles, then I sometimes have a glass' (Resident) (Emulissen 2021)
		Infrastructure to support alcohol use in the residential care setting	'Every community building has a little bar area that's open at various hours' (Resident) (Burruss 2015)
Staff and family support alcohol consumption of older adults	'If it's a valued activity and a pleasurable thing, then generally it's a good thing for them and leave your parental ideas about alcohol consumption at the door.' (Manager) (Wadd 2024)		

Acceptance of a harm reduction approach (efforts to manage and control as opposed to abstinence)	Support for moderation and management rather than abstinence	'One unit a day, I believe, is okay' (Johanessen, 2021)
Desire for 'normality' and a sense of home	Continuation of habit or routine	We used to have a bottle of cider at home with Sunday dinner and I only drink cider now, that's why I say I'm not really a tee totaller. I drink cider because that's what I was used to drinking. (Bob) (Payne 2018)
	Alcohol facilitates normalising relationships with staff	what I love sometimes is I go to the bar even as the manager and they love to buy me a drink too and I think that's a nice bit of normal social functioning for people. One of them will say, "I'll buy one for my friend [manager's name], do you want a drink?"...it's a normalising piece of interaction, I become on a level with them and that's nice. (Manager 13) (Wadd 2024)
	'Wet' care homes are a safe home for individuals with alcohol dependency	"Yeah I don't want to go back there again, I'm too old for the streets, it's dangerous." (Resident) (McCann 2017)
Respect for choice and autonomy around alcohol consumption in a setting where choice and autonomy are limited	Respect for individual choice and agency	I think if you get to 80 something in life and you're a diabetic but you're allowed the odd sweet, do you know what I mean? It's the same. We're not here to judge or, you know. It's very much we're here for them to live their lives how they want to live their lives until such time as they're no longer here. (Manager) (Wadd 2024)
The 'ideal' nature of older adults'	Quality of life as the main goal that alcohol helps to achieve	I think if that smile can be brought out of someone, that to all intents and purposes is nearing the end of life, or hasn't got a quality of life due to dementia or is physically incapacitated, if you can't get in and out of bed yourself, you rely on a lift and a

alcohol use is highly individualized	Recognition of the value of alcohol for older people	Alcohol evokes positive memories	wheelchair and somebody to push you, the slightest thing that can give you a memory and a smile, just a little smile. (Resident 16) (Wadd 2024)
		Alcohol as a marker of an occasion	Oh, they were big on socialising in the house round Christmas, big parties round the house, in the pub mum played the piano, the community was basically the pub. (James) (Payne 2018)
	Recognition of the potential harm of alcohol use for certain individuals	Some residents have limited capacity to manage their alcohol intake	Oh there's no mistaking when it's somebody's birthday you know, you know all about it the decorations... Yes they make a fuss... they make a cake... or a cake is baked down here and they bring it up and serve it and everybody has a glass of wine or whatever' (informal carer, H2) (Philpin 2011)
		Antisocial behaviour towards staff and other residents	For the people who do have an issue with alcohol, it's usually an issue of cognitive functioning. They don't remember they've already had a drink or two. Or they're not aware of medication. (P5) (Pollack 2016)
	Varied perceived value of non-alcoholic substitutes	Non-alcoholic options supplement alcoholic options	Man2HN: Well, you can say that we have, sometimes had some residents that have been drinking quite a lot of alcohol. And who aren't too nice verbally, when they are drunk. Who also approach my employees, and want to touch them and hug them and maybe even kiss them... So, in that way then, then, then it gives, it can very easily become problematic. It can also cause trouble regarding the other residents if they can't figure out where the toilet is for example and pee in the common areas. (Emuliessen 2021)
Decision making around older adults' alcohol use varies	Variation in knowledge and communication about older adults' alcohol use	Family encourage alcohol intake of older adult whilst staff attempt to limit it	'Here at the department we also have alcohol-free red wine, white wine and beer, because some would like one more glass, which is not good on account of their medication. Then it is nice to have the alcohol-free, that they can have a glass of' (Car2HG) (Emiliussen 2021)
			Car2HG: [...] and there were relatives, who got involved and thought it was annoying. We had to explain that, this was simply the diet plan: a max of two beers per person per day. To which the[relatives] said, that if he hadn't been drinking beer for three days, couldn't he just have six beers the next day. No, he can't, he can only have the two beers allowed. (Emiliussen 2021)

depending on the involvement, knowledge, skills, and beliefs of the participating stakeholders

Subjectivity of current decision making around older adults' alcohol use in residential settings	Family limit staff's ability to control alcohol intake of older adults	We have experienced that the residents behave differently, and we thought that they were ill, but actually they were drunk, because the next day we found an empty wine bottle in the closet. The next of kin had brought wine to the residents. In such cases we lose control over the intake of alcohol. (Johannessen 2021)
	Older adult is not always involved in decisions around their alcohol intake	'No, they just did it for me. I don't know why but they just did it. I'm totally clueless as to....I'm compliant with it...I have to be. They only allow me so many and that's it.' (Resident) (Wadd 2024)
	No or a lack of guidance around managing alcohol intake of residents	There's no actual legislation to tell us how we should manage it. We dance on a very fine line when we're providing alcohol. If something happened, are we going to be liable? (Care worker focus group 5) (Wadd 2024)
	Staff left to make decisions themselves which depends on their background and beliefs	'I think you can drink alcohol...If you ask it in the right way...then it's possible, or not. It depends on which nurse you ask' (P7) (DeGraaf 2022)
	Staff face dilemmas and difficulties when decision making and managing alcohol use of older adults (e.g dementia, problematic alcohol use, managing impact on other residents)	Car4RI: 'But, it is a little hard to avoid those conflicts [that there are], because he is also like...he becomes...when he's sitting out there and eating his dinner he also gets a little more rowdy and makes witty remarks and kind of lewd remarks to the old ladies and such...it's hard.. it is actually hard to act upon, I think' (Emiluessen 2021)
Specialist skills and knowledge are required to support harm reduction in individuals with alcohol dependency	Regular residential care facilities not equipped to deal with individuals with alcohol dependency	'So it's not something we would take lightly. It's not like, no, we wouldn't accept them. We'd take it on a case by case, but it does send a lot of red flags and it's quite hard to manage in my experience.' (Manager 21) (Wadd 2024)
	Gentle limits on alcohol consumption accepted by residents only if handled appropriately	"I feel like a boy scout queuing up" [for his daily allowance of money for alcohol and tobacco.] (Jamie) (McCann 2017)

“I used to have my money but now they hold onto it and they get my lagers for me...or they come with me and I think I like it better, they don’t make a big thing of it” (Anne) (McCann 2017)

Appropriate care of individuals with alcohol dependency increases use of primary care and decreases reliance on other health and social care services

“in terms of their physical health issues, if they were on the streets, half of the service users would have been dead a long time ago.” (manager) (McCann 2017)

Figures




Figure 1: PRISMA (Page et al., 2021) diagram to depict the search and selection process.

Supplementary Material

Supplementary Material 1: PRISMA checklist for reporting of systematic reviews.

Section and Topic	Item #	Checklist item	Location where item is reported
TITLE			
Title	1	Identify the report as a systematic review.	Title
ABSTRACT			
Abstract	2	See the PRISMA 2020 for Abstracts checklist.	See abstract checklist (below)
INTRODUCTION			
Rationale	3	Describe the rationale for the review in the context of existing knowledge.	Introduction, paragraph 2
Objectives	4	Provide an explicit statement of the objective(s) or question(s) the review addresses.	Introduction, paragraph 2
METHODS			
Eligibility criteria	5	Specify the inclusion and exclusion criteria for the review and how studies were grouped for the syntheses.	Methods, 'Search strategy and selection criteria'
Information sources	6	Specify all databases, registers, websites, organisations, reference lists and other sources searched or consulted to identify studies. Specify the date when each source was last searched or consulted.	Methods, 'Search strategy and selection criteria'
Search strategy	7	Present the full search strategies for all databases, registers and websites, including any filters and limits used.	Supplementary Material 2
Selection process	8	Specify the methods used to decide whether a study met the inclusion criteria of the review, including how many reviewers screened each record and each report retrieved, whether they worked independently, and if applicable, details of automation tools used in the process.	Methods, 'Study selection'
Data collection process	9	Specify the methods used to collect data from reports, including how many reviewers collected data from each report, whether they worked independently, any processes for obtaining or confirming data from study investigators, and if applicable, details of automation tools used in the process.	Methods, 'Data extraction and quality appraisal'
Data items	10a	List and define all outcomes for which data were sought. Specify whether all results that were compatible with each outcome domain in each study were sought (e.g. for all measures, time points, analyses), and if not, the methods used to decide which results to collect.	N/A
	10b	List and define all other variables for which data were sought (e.g. participant and intervention characteristics, funding sources). Describe any assumptions made about any missing or unclear information.	Methods, 'Data extraction and quality appraisal'
Study risk of bias assessment	11	Specify the methods used to assess risk of bias in the included studies, including details of the tool(s) used, how many reviewers assessed each study and whether they worked independently, and if applicable, details of automation tools used in the process.	Methods, 'Data extraction and

Section and Topic	Item #	Checklist item	Location where item is reported
			quality appraisal'
Effect measures	12	Specify for each outcome the effect measure(s) (e.g. risk ratio, mean difference) used in the synthesis or presentation of results.	N/A
Synthesis methods	13a	Describe the processes used to decide which studies were eligible for each synthesis (e.g. tabulating the study intervention characteristics and comparing against the planned groups for each synthesis (item #5)).	N/A
	13b	Describe any methods required to prepare the data for presentation or synthesis, such as handling of missing summary statistics, or data conversions.	N/A
	13c	Describe any methods used to tabulate or visually display results of individual studies and syntheses.	Methods, 'Data analysis'
	13d	Describe any methods used to synthesize results and provide a rationale for the choice(s). If meta-analysis was performed, describe the model(s), method(s) to identify the presence and extent of statistical heterogeneity, and software package(s) used.	Methods, 'Data analysis'
	13e	Describe any methods used to explore possible causes of heterogeneity among study results (e.g. subgroup analysis, meta-regression).	N/A
	13f	Describe any sensitivity analyses conducted to assess robustness of the synthesized results.	N/A
Reporting bias assessment	14	Describe any methods used to assess risk of bias due to missing results in a synthesis (arising from reporting biases).	N/A
Certainty assessment	15	Describe any methods used to assess certainty (or confidence) in the body of evidence for an outcome.	N/A
RESULTS			
Study selection	16a	Describe the results of the search and selection process, from the number of records identified in the search to the number of studies included in the review, ideally using a flow diagram.	Figure 1
	16b	Cite studies that might appear to meet the inclusion criteria, but which were excluded, and explain why they were excluded.	Supplementary Material 3
Study characteristics	17	Cite each included study and present its characteristics.	Table 2
Risk of bias in studies	18	Present assessments of risk of bias for each included study.	Supplementary Material 4
Results of individual studies	19	For all outcomes, present, for each study: (a) summary statistics for each group (where appropriate) and (b) an effect estimate and its precision (e.g. confidence/credible interval), ideally using structured tables or plots.	N/A
Results of syntheses	20a	For each synthesis, briefly summarise the characteristics and risk of bias among contributing studies.	N/A
	20b	Present results of all statistical syntheses conducted. If meta-analysis was done, present for each the summary estimate and its precision (e.g. confidence/credible interval) and measures of statistical heterogeneity. If comparing groups, describe the direction of the effect.	N/A
	20c	Present results of all investigations of possible causes of heterogeneity among study results.	N/A
	20d	Present results of all sensitivity analyses conducted to assess the robustness of the synthesized results.	N/A

Section and Topic	Item #	Checklist item	Location where item is reported
Reporting biases	21	Present assessments of risk of bias due to missing results (arising from reporting biases) for each synthesis assessed.	N/A
Certainty of evidence	22	Present assessments of certainty (or confidence) in the body of evidence for each outcome assessed.	N/A
DISCUSSION			
Discussion	23a	Provide a general interpretation of the results in the context of other evidence.	Discussion
	23b	Discuss any limitations of the evidence included in the review.	Discussion, paragraph 4
	23c	Discuss any limitations of the review processes used.	Discussion, paragraph 4
	23d	Discuss implications of the results for practice, policy, and future research.	Discussion
OTHER INFORMATION			
Registration and protocol	24a	Provide registration information for the review, including register name and registration number, or state that the review was not registered.	Abstract and methods
	24b	Indicate where the review protocol can be accessed, or state that a protocol was not prepared.	Methods
	24c	Describe and explain any amendments to information provided at registration or in the protocol.	N/A
Support	25	Describe sources of financial or non-financial support for the review, and the role of the funders or sponsors in the review.	Title page
Competing interests	26	Declare any competing interests of review authors.	Title page
Availability of data, code and other materials	27	Report which of the following are publicly available and where they can be found: template data collection forms; data extracted from included studies; data used for all analyses; analytic code; any other materials used in the review.	Methods, 'Data extraction and quality appraisal'

Checklist for abstracts

Section and Topic	Item #	Checklist item	Line number item is reported
TITLE			
Title	1	Identify the report as a systematic review.	Title
BACKGROUND			
Objectives	2	Provide an explicit statement of the main objective(s) or question(s) the review addresses.	'Background'
METHODS			
Eligibility criteria	3	Specify the inclusion and exclusion criteria for the review.	'Methods'
Information sources	4	Specify the information sources (e.g. databases, registers) used to identify studies and the date when each was last searched.	'Methods'

Section and Topic	Item #	Checklist item	Line number item is reported
Risk of bias	5	Specify the methods used to assess risk of bias in the included studies.	'Methods'
Synthesis of results	6	Specify the methods used to present and synthesise results.	'Methods'
RESULTS			
Included studies	7	Give the total number of included studies and participants and summarise relevant characteristics of studies.	'Results'
Synthesis of results	8	Present results for main outcomes, preferably indicating the number of included studies and participants for each. If meta-analysis was done, report the summary estimate and confidence/credible interval. If comparing groups, indicate the direction of the effect (i.e. which group is favoured).	'Results'
DISCUSSION			
Limitations of evidence	9	Provide a brief summary of the limitations of the evidence included in the review (e.g. study risk of bias, inconsistency and imprecision).	'Conclusions'
Interpretation	10	Provide a general interpretation of the results and important implications.	'Conclusions'
OTHER			
Funding	11	Specify the primary source of funding for the review.	Title page
Registration	12	Provide the register name and registration number.	'Methods'

Supplementary Material 2: The specific searches applied for ProQuest and CINAHL.

ProQuest:

Limits: Humans, English

tiab(age* OR aging OR centenarian OR elder* OR later-life OR "late* life" OR mid-life OR "mid life" OR midlife OR middle-age* OR "middle age*" OR nonagenarian OR octogenarian OR old* OR senescent OR senior* OR sexagenarian OR veteran* OR geriatric OR retir*) AND tiab("nursing home*" OR "care home*" OR sheltered OR residential* OR "long term care" OR "long-term care" OR "assisted living" OR "rest home*" OR "skilled nursing facilit*" OR "continuing care" OR "retirement communit*" OR "retirement village*" OR "retirement complex*" OR "congregate housing" OR "congregate living" OR cohousing) AND tiab(alcohol* OR drunk OR beverage OR intoxicate OR drink* OR substance* OR "substance use" OR "substance misuse" OR "substance abuse" OR booze OR pissed OR wrecked) AND tiab("semi-structured" OR semistructured OR unstructured OR informal OR "in-depth" OR indepth OR "face-to-face" OR structured OR guide* OR discussion* OR "focus group*" OR qualitative OR ethnograph* OR fieldwork OR "field work" OR "key informant" OR interview* OR "group discussion" OR experience* OR attitude* OR perception* OR attitude* OR belief* OR opinion* OR view* OR perspective* OR voice* OR biograph* OR autobiograph* OR value* OR stor* OR behavio?r* OR habit* OR choice* OR meaning* OR lifestyle* OR account* OR reason* OR expectation* OR theme* OR "discourse analysis" OR "constant comparative" OR thematic OR narration OR "exploratory research" OR "content analysis" OR transcript* OR "social construction*" OR "grounded theory" OR phenomenolog*)

For CINAHL via EBSCO:

TI ((age* OR aging OR centenarian OR elder* OR later-life OR "late* life" OR mid-life OR "mid life" OR midlife OR middle-age* OR "middle age*" OR nonagenarian OR octogenarian OR old* OR senescent OR senior* OR sexagenarian OR veteran* OR geriatric OR retir*) AND ("nursing home*" OR "care home*" OR sheltered OR residential* OR "long term care" OR "long-term care" OR "assisted living" OR "rest home*" OR "skilled nursing facilit*" OR "continuing care" OR "retirement communit*" OR "retirement village*" OR "retirement complex*" OR "congregate housing" OR "congregate living" OR cohousing) AND (alcohol* OR drunk OR beverage OR intoxicate OR drink* OR substance* OR "substance use" OR "substance misuse" OR "substance abuse" OR booze OR pissed OR wrecked) AND ("semi-structured" OR semistructured OR unstructured OR informal OR "in-depth" OR indepth OR "face-to-face" OR structured OR guide* OR discussion* OR "focus group*" OR qualitative OR ethnograph* OR fieldwork OR "field work" OR "key informant" OR interview* OR "group discussion" OR experience* OR attitude* OR perception* OR attitude* OR belief* OR opinion* OR view* OR perspective* OR voice* OR biograph* OR autobiograph* OR value* OR stor* OR behavio?r* OR habit* OR choice* OR meaning* OR lifestyle* OR account* OR reason* OR expectation* OR theme* OR "discourse analysis" OR "constant comparative" OR thematic OR narration OR "exploratory research" OR "content analysis" OR transcript* OR "social construction*" OR "grounded theory" OR phenomenolog*)) OR AB ((age* OR aging OR centenarian OR elder* OR later-life OR "late* life" OR mid-life OR "mid life" OR midlife OR middle-age* OR "middle age*" OR nonagenarian OR octogenarian OR old* OR senescent OR senior* OR sexagenarian OR veteran* OR geriatric OR retir*) AND ("nursing home*" OR "care home*" OR sheltered OR residential*

OR "long term care" OR "long-term care" OR "assisted living" OR "rest home*" OR "skilled nursing facilit*" OR "continuing care" OR "retirement communit*" OR "retirement village*" OR "retirement complex*" OR "congregate housing" OR "congregate living" OR cohousing) AND (alcohol* OR drunk OR beverage OR intoxicate OR drink* OR substance* OR "substance use" OR "substance misuse" OR "substance abuse" OR booze OR pissed OR wrecked) AND ("semi-structured" OR semistructured OR unstructured OR informal OR "in-depth" OR indepth OR "face-to-face" OR structured OR guide* OR discussion* OR "focus group*" OR qualitative OR ethnograph* OR fieldwork OR "field work" OR "key informant" OR interview* OR "group discussion" OR experience* OR attitude* OR perception* OR attitude* OR belief* OR opinion* OR view* OR perspective* OR voice* OR biograph* OR autobiograph* OR value* OR stor* OR behavio?r* OR habit* OR choice* OR meaning* OR lifestyle* OR account* OR reason* OR expectation* OR theme* OR "discourse analysis" OR "constant comparative" OR thematic OR narration OR "exploratory research" OR "content analysis" OR transcript* OR "social construction*" OR "grounded theory" OR phenomenolog*)

Supplementary Material 3: Excluded articles based on full text screening and their reasons for exclusion.

Reason for exclusion	Reference
Not qualitative	<p>Bolger, A. K. (1999). Reasons for drinking alcohol in retirement community-dwelling older adults (Doctoral dissertation, Pacific Graduate School of Psychology).</p> <p>Boucek, L., Kane, I., Lindsay, D. L., Hagle, H., Salvio, K., & Mitchell, A. M. (2019). Screening, brief intervention, and referral to treatment (SBIRT) education of residential care nursing staff: Impact on staff and residents. <i>Geriatric Nursing</i>, 40(6), 553-557.</p> <p>Lemke, S., & Schaefer, J. A. (2012). Addressing substance use disorders in VA nursing homes. <i>Journal of Social Work Practice in the Addictions</i>, 12(1), 89-106.</p> <p>Resnick, B. (2003). Alcohol use in a continuing care retirement community. <i>Journal of Gerontological Nursing</i>, 29(10), 22-29.</p>
Not alcohol	<p>Rota-Bartelink, A. (2011). Supporting older people living with alcohol-related brain injury: the Wicking project outcomes. <i>Care Management Journals</i>, 12(4), 166-173.</p> <p>Kenkmann, A., & Hooper, L. (2012). The restaurant within the home: experiences of a restaurant-style dining provision in residential homes for older people. <i>Quality in Ageing and Older Adults</i>, 13(2), 98-110.</p> <p>van Hoof, J., Verbeek, H., Janssen, B. M., Eijkelenboom, A., Molony, S. L., Felix, E., ... & Wouters, E. J. M. (2016). A three perspective study of the sense of home of nursing home residents: the views of residents, care professionals and relatives. <i>BMC geriatrics</i>, 16(1), 1-15.</p> <p>Yang, M., Beiting, K. J., & Levine, S. (2023). Barriers to Care for Nursing Home Residents With Substance Use Disorders: A Qualitative Study. <i>Journal of Addiction Medicine</i>, 17(2), 155-162.</p>
Not residential care settings	<p>Johannessen, A., Tevik, K., Engedal, K., Gade Haanes, G., & Helvik, A. S. (2021). Health professionals' experiences regarding alcohol consumption and its relation to older care recipient's health and well-being. <i>Journal of Multidisciplinary Healthcare</i>, 1829-1842.</p> <p>Rowlands, A., Poulos, R., Agaliotis, M., Faux, S., Raguz, A., & Poulos, C. (2020). Designing residential aged care for people at risk of, or experiencing, homelessness: An exploratory Australian study. <i>Health & Social Care in the Community</i>, 28(5), 1743-1753.</p>
Protocol	<p>Rota-Bartelink, A., & Lipmann, B. (2007). Supporting the long-term residential care needs of older homeless people with severe alcohol-related brain injury in Australia: the Wicking Project. <i>Care Management Journals</i>, 8(3), 141.</p> <p>Rota-Bartelink, A., & Lipmann, B. (2010). Older people with alcohol-related brain injury and associated complex behaviors: a psychosocial model of residential care (the Wicking Project). <i>Care Management Journals</i>, 11(2), 112-121.</p>
Conference abstract	<p>Lampl, C., Aufschneider, A. L., Hatz, M., Gunzer, W., & Fuchs-Neuhold, B. (2019). Evaluation of minimum standards for communal catering in Styrian nursing homes. <i>European Journal of Public Health</i>, 29(Supplement_4), ckz186-368.</p>

Supplementary Material 4: Quality appraisal using the CASP checklist. Items highlighted in bold were selected as the most relevant for the review aims the items and thus informed the overall quality rating.

Study	Item 1	Item 2	Item 3	Item 4	Item 5	Item 6	Item 7	Item 8	Item 9	Item 10
Barruss 2015	Yes	Yes	Yes	Can't tell	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	No
Chambers 2020	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes
Dare 2013	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
David 2023	Yes	Yes	No	Can't tell	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
DeGraaf 2023	Yes	Yes	Yes	Can't tell	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
DeGraaf 2022	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Emiluissen 2021	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Johannessen 2021	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	No
Klein 2002	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	No	No	No	No	No	Yes
McCann 2017	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No
Nixon 2022	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Payne 2018	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Philpin 2011	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes	No	Yes	No
Pollack 2016	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	No	No	No	No	Yes	Yes
Wadd 2023	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	No	Yes	Can't tell	Yes	No