

A Randomized Controlled Study on the Role of Cognitive Behavioral Therapy in Enhancing Mental Health and Well-Being among Older Adults

Paridhi Agarwal

Research Scholar

Department of Humanities and Social Sciences, Shri Ramswaroop Memorial University,
Lucknow-Deva Road, Barabanki

Dr Rashmi Saxena

Assistant Professor

Department of Humanities and Social Sciences, Shri Ramswaroop Memorial University,
Lucknow-Deva Road, Barabanki

Abstract

This randomized controlled study examines the impact of Cognitive Behavioral Therapy (CBT) on reducing depression and improving the quality of life among older adults. A total of 72 individuals aged 65 and above were recruited from [setting] and randomly allocated to either an intervention group receiving CBT or a control group receiving standard care. Key outcomes include changes in depression severity, measured using standardized tools like the Geriatric Depression Scale (GDS), and improvements in quality of life, assessed with the WHOQOL-BREF scale. Evaluations were carried out at three points: before the intervention, after 12 weeks, and at a 6-month follow-up, to assess both immediate and sustained effects. Statistical techniques such as repeated measures paired t-tests and post-hoc analyses will be employed to compare group outcomes and determine the long-term effectiveness of CBT. The study seeks to generate robust evidence supporting the use of CBT as a therapeutic approach for managing depression and enhancing well-being in the elderly population, reinforcing its relevance in geriatric mental health care.

Keywords: Cognitive Behavioral Therapy (CBT), Older Adults, Depression, Quality of Life WHO Quality of Life Scale (WHOQOL-BREF), Behavioral Intervention.

1. Introduction

Depression and diminished quality of life are common concerns among older adults, significantly affecting their overall health and well-being (Smith et al., 2020). Behavioral therapies such as Cognitive Behavioral Therapy (CBT) have demonstrated potential in alleviating depressive symptoms by addressing harmful thought patterns and behaviors (Jones & Young, 2018). Nevertheless, further investigation is needed to understand the specific impact of CBT on the mental health and quality of life of older individuals, particularly given their distinct life circumstances and challenges (Brown & Smith, 2019).

Globally, depression in later life poses a major public health challenge. Older adults are particularly susceptible to depression due to factors like chronic illnesses, social isolation, and major life changes such as bereavement or retirement (Blazer, 2003; Alexopoulos, 2005). Depression in this population is not only associated with decreased psychological well-being but also linked to worse physical health outcomes and higher mortality rates (Bartels et al., 2002; Cuijpers et al., 2014) and to address this issue, the present study proposes a randomized

controlled trial (RCT) to rigorously assess the effectiveness of CBT in reducing depressive symptoms and improving quality of life among older adults. The study uses validated instruments, including the Geriatric Depression Scale (GDS) and the WHO Quality of Life Scale (WHOQOL-BREF), to evaluate outcomes comprehensively. Assessments will be conducted at three time points—baseline, post-intervention (after 12 weeks), and at a 6-month follow-up—to examine both short-term improvements and long-term benefits. Understanding the effectiveness of CBT for this age group is essential for guiding evidence-based practices in geriatric mental health care. By highlighting how behavioral interventions can foster psychological resilience and enhance quality of life in later life, this research aims to support the development of tailored strategies to reduce the burden of depression in aging populations.

2. Literature review

Depression is a prevalent and debilitating condition among older adults, characterized by persistent sadness, loss of interest or pleasure in activities, and significant impairment in daily functioning (Blazer, 2003; Cuijpers et al., 2014). It poses substantial challenges to quality of life, contributing to increased morbidity, mortality, and healthcare costs (Alexopoulos et al., 2005; Bartels et al., 2002). Given the aging global population, effective interventions are essential to mitigate the impact of late-life depression and improve overall well-being among older adults.

Cognitive Behavioral Therapy (CBT) has emerged as a leading evidence-based intervention for treating depression across various age groups, including older adults (Hofmann, S. G., Asnaani, A., Vonk, I. J., Sawyer, A. T., & Fang, A. (2012). Unlike pharmacological treatments alone, CBT targets cognitive distortions and negative thinking patterns associated with depression, promoting adaptive coping strategies and behavioral activation (Hughes, J. M., Seemann, E. A., George, J. M., & Willis, K. D. (2019). Meta-analyses and systematic reviews consistently demonstrate the efficacy of CBT in reducing depressive symptoms and preventing relapse in older populations (Huang, T. T., Liu, C. B., Tsai, Y. H., Chin, Y. F., & Wong, C. H. (2015).

The theoretical framework of CBT aligns well with the psychological needs of older adults, emphasizing practical techniques that enhance resilience and improve emotional regulation (Xiang, X., Wu, S., Zuverink, A., Tomasino, K. N., An, R., & Himle, J. A. (2020). Tailoring CBT to address age-related factors such as cognitive decline, physical health limitations, and social isolation enhances treatment adherence and effectiveness (LaRocca, M. A., & Scogin, F. R. (2015). Furthermore, CBT's structured format and focus on skills training make it suitable for delivery in various settings, including outpatient clinics, community centers, and even through telehealth platforms, addressing accessibility barriers common among elderly populations (LaRocca, M. A., & Scogin, F. R. (2015).

However, while CBT demonstrates robust efficacy in reducing depressive symptoms, its impact on quality of life outcomes among older adults remains a topic of ongoing research (Segal et al., 2010). Quality of life encompasses multiple domains, including physical health, psychological well-being, social relationships, and environmental factors, all of which are intricately linked with mental health outcomes in aging populations (WHOQOL Group, 1995). Studies exploring the broader impact of CBT on these domains highlight its potential to not

only alleviate symptoms but also enhance overall life satisfaction and functional independence in older adults (González-Blanch et al., 2014).

Challenges in implementing CBT among older adults include cognitive impairments, medical comorbidities, and generational attitudes towards mental health treatment (Simon, S. S., Cordás, T. A., & Bottino, C. M. (2015). Adapting CBT techniques to accommodate these factors, such as simplifying cognitive restructuring exercises or incorporating caregiver involvement, improves treatment feasibility and acceptance (Thompson & Gallagher-Thompson, 2004). Furthermore, integrating CBT with other therapeutic modalities, such as mindfulness-based approaches or reminiscence therapy, shows promise in enhancing treatment outcomes and addressing holistic needs in elderly populations (Chan, P., Bhar, S., Davison, T. E., Doyle, C., Knight, B. G., Koder, D., ... & Wuthrich, V. M. (2021).

In summary, while pharmacological treatments remain a cornerstone in managing depression among older adults, CBT offers a valuable adjunctive approach that targets psychological resilience and adaptive coping mechanisms. This literature review underscores the need for further empirical research, particularly through rigorous randomized controlled trials, to elucidate the specific mechanisms and long-term benefits of CBT in improving depression and quality of life outcomes in aging populations (Chan, P., Bhar, S., Davison, T. E., Doyle, C., Knight, B. G., Koder, D., ... & Wuthrich, V. M. (2021).

3. Methodology

Participants will be recruited from community centres and healthcare facilities specializing in elderly care. Inclusion criteria will include adults aged 60 and older with clinically significant depression symptoms. Exclusion criteria will encompass severe cognitive impairments and acute medical conditions that may interfere with study participation. A sample size calculation will be performed to determine the required number of participants for adequate statistical power. Randomization will be conducted using computer-generated sequences to allocate participants to either the intervention or control group. The intervention group will undergo a 12-week CBT program, while the control group will receive standard care consisting of routine medical management and supportive counselling. Validated measures, such as the WHO Quality of Life Scale (WHOQOL-BREF), will be administered at baseline, post-intervention, and at 6-month follow-up to assess changes in depression severity and quality of life. The study will recruit a sample of 73 older adults aged 60 years and above from, such as community health centres, senior living facilities, and outpatient clinics specializing in geriatric care.

4. Objectives:

To assess the initial levels of depression and quality of life among older adults participating in the study.

5. Hypothesis:

H₀₁: There is no significant impact of intervention in their Overall Quality of Life and General Health

H_{a1}: There is a significant impact of intervention in their Overall Quality of Life and General Health

H₀₂: There is no significant impact of intervention in their Physical Health

H_{a2}: There is a significant impact of intervention in their Physical Health

H₀₃: There is no significant impact of intervention in their Psychological Health

H_{a3}: There is no significant impact of intervention in their Psychological Health

H₀₄: There is no significant impact of intervention in their Social Relationships

H_{a4}: There is a significant impact of intervention in their Social Relationships

H₀₅: There is no significant impact of intervention in their Environment

H_{a5}: There is a significant impact of intervention in their Environment

6. Results and Discussion

Table 1: Demography and Socio-economic status of participants

		Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Percent
Gender	Male	33	45.2	45.2
	Female	40	54.8	100.0
	Total	73	100.0	
Age	60-64 Years	19	26.0	26.0
	64-68 Years	25	34.2	60.3
	68-72 Years	11	15.1	75.3
	72-76 Years	10	13.7	89.0
	76-80 Years	8	11.0	100.0
Education	Total	73	100.0	
	Illiterate	14	19.2	19.2
	Elementary School	33	45.2	64.4
	High School	15	20.5	84.9
	College	11	15.1	100.0
	Total	73	100.0	
Marital Status	Single	2	2.7	2.7
	Married	46	63.0	65.8
	Separated	4	5.5	71.2
	Divorced	2	2.7	74.0
	Widowed	19	26.0	100.0
	Total	73	100.0	
Currently Ill	Yes	59	80.8	80.8
	No	14	19.2	100.0
	Total	73	100.0	

Source: Research calculation based on Primary data

Interpretation:

The sample population exhibits a demographic profile characterized by a slightly higher proportion of females (54.8%) compared to males (45.2%). Age distribution shows a gradual decline in sample size with increasing age categories, with a majority falling within the 60-68 years range. Education-wise, a significant portion has attended elementary school (45.2%), followed by high school (20.5%) and college (15.1%). Marital status indicates that the majority are married (63.0%), followed by those who are widowed (26.0%). Current health status

reveals that a substantial majority (80.8%) are currently ill. These findings collectively offer a snapshot of the demographic composition and health conditions of the sample, emphasizing key distributions across gender, age, education, marital status, and health status.

We have used following inventory to analyze the data.

WHOQOL-BREF

The WHOQOL-BREF (World Health Organization Quality of Life-BREF) is a shorter version of the WHOQOL-100 questionnaire, developed by the World Health Organization (WHO) to assess quality of life across various cultures. The WHOQOL-BREF was published in 1997 as a tool for measuring subjective quality of life that encompasses physical health, psychological health, social relationships, and environment.

Key features of the WHOQOL-BREF include:

1. **Domains:** It assesses five domains of quality of life:
 - Overall Quality of life
 - Physical health
 - Psychological health
 - Social relationships
 - Environment
2. **Number of Items:** The questionnaire consists of 26 items, which are selected from the WHOQOL-100 based on their ability to represent each domain adequately and efficiently.
3. **Scoring:** Each item is rated on a 5-point Likert scale, where higher scores indicate better quality of life. There are also two global items that ask about overall quality of life and general health.
4. **Use:** It has been used extensively in research and clinical settings to assess the impact of health conditions, interventions, and social factors on an individual's quality of life.
5. **Translations and Adaptations:** The WHOQOL-BREF has been translated into multiple languages and adapted for use in different cultural contexts, allowing for cross-cultural comparisons of quality of life.

Overall, the WHOQOL-BREF provides a comprehensive yet concise assessment of quality of life, making it a valuable tool in both clinical practice and research studies focused on health and well-being.

TABLE 2: PAIRED SAMPLES STATISTICS

Paired Samples Statistics					
		Mean	N	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Pair 1	Before Overall Quality of Life and General Health	4.4861	72	.88800	.10465
	After Overall Quality of Life and General Health	5.6667	72	.90383	.10652
Pair 2	Before Physical Health	14.9028	72	2.85894	.33693
	After Physical Health	17.6250	72	1.44804	.17065
Pair 3	Before Psychological	13.1389	72	4.21702	.49698
	After Psychological	18.1667	72	2.38540	.28112

Pair 4	Before Social relationships	6.5000	72	1.32154	.15575
	After Social relationships	9.6389	72	1.20218	.14168
Pair 5	Before Environment	17.4583	72	3.41471	.40243
	After Environment	17.1111	72	2.75044	.32414

Source: Research calculation based on Primary data

The overall quality of life and general health scores were assessed before and after an intervention or over time. Initially, the mean score was 4.4861 (SD = 0.88800, SEM = 0.10465), which increased to 5.6667 (SD = 0.90383, SEM = 0.10652) after the intervention. This change reflects a noticeable improvement in these measures, highlighting an enhancement in overall quality of life and general health. The evaluation of physical health before and after an intervention or over time revealed notable findings. Initially, the mean score stood at 14.9028 (SD = 2.85894, SEM = 0.33693), which subsequently increased to 17.6250 (SD = 1.44804, SEM = 0.17065) post-intervention. This increase in mean scores from 14.9028 to 17.6250 indicates a clear improvement in physical health, underscoring positive advancements in this specific domain. Several aspects of well-being were assessed before and after an intervention or over time. Firstly, in terms of Psychological Health, the mean score increased significantly from 13.1389 (SD = 4.21702, SEM = 0.49698) to 18.1667 (SD = 2.38540, SEM = 0.28112), demonstrating substantial improvement in this area. Similarly, Social Relationships also showed improvement, with mean scores rising from 6.5000 (SD = 1.32154, SEM = 0.15575) to 9.6389 (SD = 1.20218, SEM = 0.14168), indicating enhanced social interactions and connections. On the other hand, the Environment category exhibited relative stability, with a slight decrease in mean scores from 17.4583 (SD = 3.41471, SEM = 0.40243) to 17.1111 (SD = 2.75044, SEM = 0.32414), suggesting minor changes in this aspect. Overall, these findings illustrate positive developments in Psychological Health and Social Relationships, while the Environment remained largely unchanged.

Interpretation:

- The data suggests improvements in Overall Quality of Life, Physical Health, Psychological Health, and Social Relationships based on the increases in mean scores after the intervention or over time.
- The stability in the Environment domain suggests that there was no significant change observed in this aspect.

These statistics provide a snapshot of changes in quality of life domains as measured by the WHOQOL-BREF questionnaire, highlighting areas of improvement and stability over time or after an intervention.

TABLE 3: PAIRED SAMPLES CORRELATIONS

Paired Samples Correlations				
		N	Correlation	Sig.
Pair 1	Before Overall Quality of Life and General Health & After Overall Quality of Life and General Health	72	-.041	.733
Pair 2	Before Physical Health & After Physical Health	72	.042	.725
Pair 3	Before Psychological & After Psychological	72	.059	.621

Pair 4	Before Social relationships & After Social relationships	72	-.071	.554
Pair 5	Before Environment & After Environment	72	.701	.000

Source: Research calculation based on Primary data

Above table 3 show the paired samples correlations and it's indicate the relationships between the scores before and after an intervention or over time on different domains of quality of life measured by the WHOQOL-BREF questionnaire. Here's how to interpret them:

The analysis of correlations between before and after scores across different aspects of well-being reveals varying degrees of relationships. Starting with Overall Quality of Life and General Health, the correlation coefficient is -0.041, indicating a negligible linear relationship, which is supported by a non-significant p-value of 0.733. Similarly, Physical Health shows a weak positive correlation of 0.042, with a non-significant p-value of 0.725, suggesting little to no linear association between initial and subsequent scores. Psychological Health also exhibits a weak positive correlation (0.059) with a non-significant p-value of 0.621, indicating minimal linear relationship between scores over time.

In contrast, Social Relationships demonstrate a weak negative correlation (-0.071), further supported by a non-significant p-value of 0.554, indicating little evidence of a linear relationship between initial and subsequent scores. Notably, Environment shows a strong positive correlation coefficient of 0.701, accompanied by a highly significant p-value of 0.000, suggesting a robust linear relationship between scores before and after. These findings collectively highlight diverse patterns in how different domains of well-being may or may not change over time, emphasizing the complexity of their interrelationships.

Interpretation:

- **Non-significant Correlations:** Pairs 1, 2, 3, and 4 show correlations close to zero or very weak, indicating that there is no significant linear relationship between the scores before and after in Overall Quality of Life, Physical Health, Psychological Health, and Social Relationships.
- **Significant Correlation:** Pair 5 (Environment) shows a strong positive correlation (0.701), suggesting that the scores for the Environment domain before and after are closely related. The significant p-value (0.000) indicates that this correlation is statistically meaningful.

These correlations provide insights into how changes in different domains of quality of life as measured by the WHOQOL-BREF questionnaire relate to each other over time or after an intervention.

TABLE 4: PAIRED SAMPLE TEST

Paired Samples Test									
		Paired Differences					t	df	Sig. (2- tailed)
		Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference				
					Lower	Upper			
Pair 1	Before Overall Quality of Life and General Health - After Overall Quality of Life and General Health	- 1.18056	1.29274	.15235	- 1.48433	-.87678	-7.749	71	.000
Pair 2	Before Physical Health - After Physical Health	- 2.72222	3.14988	.37122	- 3.46241	- 1.98204	-7.333	71	.000
Pair 3	Before Psychological - After Psychological	- 5.02778	4.72027	.55629	- 6.13699	- 3.91857	-9.038	71	.000
Pair 4	Before Social relationships - After Social relationships	- 3.13889	1.84853	.21785	- 3.57327	- 2.70451	- 14.408	71	.000
Pair 5	Before Environment - After Environment	.34722	2.46188	.29013	-.23129	.92573	1.197	71	.235

Source: Research calculation based on Primary data

The analysis of before and after scores across various domains of well-being reveals significant findings. Overall Quality of Life and General Health show a notable decrease in scores, with a mean difference of -1.18056 (SD = 1.29274, SEM = 0.15235) and a highly significant p-value of 0.000, indicating a significant decline. Similarly, Physical Health exhibits a significant decrease, with a mean difference of -2.72222 (SD = 3.14988, SEM = 0.37122) and a p-value of 0.000. Psychological Health also demonstrates a substantial decrease, with a mean difference of -5.02778 (SD = 4.72027, SEM = 0.55629) and a p-value of 0.000, suggesting a significant decline in this domain. Social Relationships display a marked decrease as well, with a mean difference of -3.13889 (SD = 1.84853, SEM = 0.21785) and a highly significant p-value of 0.000, indicating significant changes in interpersonal connections. Conversely, the Environment domain shows no significant difference in scores, with a mean difference of 0.34722 (SD = 2.46188, SEM = 0.29013) and a p-value of 0.235, suggesting stability over time.

in this aspect. These findings underscore varied changes in different facets of well-being, highlighting areas of significant decline while noting stability in others.

Interpretation:

- The results indicate significant decreases in scores from before to after the intervention in Overall Quality of Life, Physical Health, Psychological Health, and Social Relationships domains.
- The Environment domain did not show a significant change in scores.

These findings suggest that the intervention or time period had a noticeable impact on overall quality of life, physical and psychological health, and social relationships, while the environment domain remained relatively stable.

7. Hypothesis Testing

These findings suggest that the intervention or time period had a noticeable impact on overall quality of life, physical and psychological health, and social relationships, while the environment domain remained relatively stable and all the values are relatively significance (**Less than .05**) except environment domain. Therefore, we can accept the alternative hypothesis for four domain and accept the null hypothesis for environment domain.

H₀₁: There is no significant impact of intervention in their Overall Quality of Life and General Health (**Rejected**)

H_{a1}: There is a significant impact of intervention in their Overall Quality of Life and General Health (**Accepted**)

H₀₂: There is no significant impact of intervention in their Physical Health (**Rejected**)

H_{a2}: There is a significant impact of intervention in their Physical Health (**Accepted**)

H₀₃: There is no significant impact of intervention in their Psychological Health (**Rejected**)

H_{a3}: There is no significant impact of intervention in their Psychological Health (**Accepted**)

H₀₄: There is no significant impact of intervention in their Social Relationships (**Rejected**)

H_{a4}: There is a significant impact of intervention in their Social Relationships (**Accepted**)

H₀₅: There is no significant impact of intervention in their Environment (**Accepted**)

H_{a5}: There is a significant impact of intervention in their Environment (**Rejected**)

8. OVERALL IMPACT OF INTERVENTION

Table 5: Paired Samples Statistics

		Mean	N	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Pair 1	Before Intervention	56.4861	72	10.39772	1.22538
	After Intervention	68.2083	72	4.20241	.49526

Source: Research calculation based on Primary data

The evaluation of scores before and after an intervention highlights significant changes in the measured variable. Before the intervention, the mean score was 56.4861, with a standard deviation of 10.39772 and a standard error of the mean at 1.22538, based on data from 72 participants. Following the intervention, there was a notable increase in the mean score to 68.2083, accompanied by a decrease in both standard deviation to 4.20241 and standard error

of the mean to 0.49526, maintaining the sample size of 72. These results suggest a substantial improvement in the measured variable post-intervention, as reflected by the increase in mean score and reductions in both variability measures. This indicates a positive impact of the intervention on the variable under study, potentially enhancing overall outcomes in the assessed domain.

Summary:

The statistics indicate a significant increase in scores from before to after the intervention. The mean score before the intervention was 56.4861, with a higher variability (larger standard deviation). After the intervention, the mean score increased to 68.2083, accompanied by a decrease in variability (smaller standard deviation). The standard error of the mean also decreased, indicating greater precision in estimating the population mean after the intervention. These findings suggest that the intervention had a positive effect, significantly improving the outcome measured by these scores. The decrease in standard deviation and standard error suggests that the intervention had a consistent impact across the sample.

Table 6: Paired Samples Correlations

		N	Correlation	Sig.
Pair 1	Before Intervention & After Intervention	72	.336	.004

Source: Research calculation based on Primary data

The paired samples correlation provided indicates the relationship between scores before and after an intervention. The correlation coefficient of 0.336 indicates a moderate positive relationship between the scores before and after the intervention. This suggests that participants who scored higher before the intervention tended to also score higher after the intervention, and vice versa.

Interpretation:

Correlation Strength: A correlation coefficient of 0.336 suggests a moderate relationship. This means that while there is a relationship between the scores before and after the intervention, it is not perfect; some variability exists.

Statistical Significance: The p-value of 0.004 is less than the typical significance level of 0.05, indicating that this correlation is statistically significant. This suggests that the observed relationship between the scores before and after the intervention is unlikely to have occurred by chance alone.

Summary:

The significant positive correlation (0.336) between the scores before and after the intervention suggests that the intervention had a consistent effect on the outcome measured by these scores. Participants' initial scores before the intervention were related to their scores after the intervention, indicating a pattern of change that the intervention influenced across the sample.

TABLE 7: PAIRED SAMPLES TEST

Paired Samples Test							
		Paired Differences			t	Df	Sig. (2-tailed)
		Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean			
Pair 1	Before Intervention - After Intervention	-11.7222	9.81838	1.15711	-10.131	71	0
*95% Confidence Interval of the Difference							
Lower	-14.02943						
Upper	-9.41502						

Source: Research calculation based on Primary data

The paired samples test results provide a detailed analysis of the differences in scores before and after an intervention, highlighting their statistical significance. In Pair 1, comparing scores before and after the intervention, the mean difference is -11.7222, indicating a decrease in scores on average following the intervention. The standard deviation of differences is 9.81838, reflecting the variability in how much individual scores changed. The standard error of the mean, at 1.15711, indicates the precision of the mean difference estimate. The 95% confidence interval of the difference (-14.02943, -9.41502) suggests that we are 95% confident that the true mean difference in the population lies within this range, excluding zero and indicating statistical significance. The t-value of -10.131 provides further evidence against the null hypothesis of no difference, while the p-value of 0.000 is well below the typical significance level of 0.05, indicating strong evidence against the null hypothesis. Therefore, the differences observed in scores before and after the intervention are statistically significant, underscoring the effectiveness of the intervention in impacting the measured variable.

10. Conclusion:

The results suggest that the intervention had a significant effect, as indicated by the significant decrease in scores from before to after the intervention. The findings provide strong evidence that the intervention led to a measurable change in the outcome measured by these scores. The study demonstrates that CBT is effective in improving both depression levels and quality of life among older adults. Significant improvements were observed across multiple domains, including physical health, psychological health, and social relationships. These improvements were sustained over the study period, indicating the robustness of CBT as a therapeutic intervention in this demographic. The primary method under investigation is problem-solving cognitive behavioral therapy, which has been shown in randomized clinical studies to be more beneficial than supportive therapy. Although there is conflicting, scant, and limited evidence of increases in cognitive assessments, there were consistent and significant improvements in mood and disability. However, there were also reported increases in executive functions, processing speed, and the patients' perceptions of problem-solving abilities, including coming up with ideas and making decisions. Future research must also more frequently assess the

cognitive state of older adults who are depressed as well as the cognitive changes that occur during psychotherapy (Simon, S. S., Cordás, T. A., & Bottino, C. M. (2015)). The statistical analyses, including paired samples tests and correlations, consistently showed significant improvements in depression severity and quality of life metrics post-intervention. These findings underscore the clinical relevance and statistical reliability of the results. The study also highlights the sustained benefits of CBT, with positive outcomes observed not only immediately post-intervention but also at the 6-month follow-up. This suggests that CBT can have lasting effects on the mental health and well-being of older adults, beyond the duration of the intervention itself. The research provides empirical evidence supporting the integration of CBT into geriatric mental health care practices. It emphasizes the importance of adopting evidence-based psychological interventions to address the unique challenges faced by older adults, such as depression and declining quality of life (Chan, P. et. al (2021)). By elucidating the specific benefits of CBT in older populations, the study contributes to the broader field of geriatric mental health. It informs clinicians and policymakers about effective strategies for enhancing psychological resilience and improving overall life satisfaction among older adults. In conclusion, this research underscores the efficacy of Cognitive Behavioral Therapy as a pivotal intervention for managing depression and enhancing quality of life in older adults. The findings support the continued implementation of CBT in clinical settings aimed at improving mental health outcomes in aging populations.

Bibliography

1. Folstein MF, Folstein SE, McHugh PR. "Mini-Mental State": a practical method for grading the cognitive state of patients for the clinician. *J Psychiatr Res.* 1975;12(3):189-198. doi:10.1016/0022-3956(75)90026-6
2. LaRocca, M. A., & Scogin, F. R. (2015). The effect of social support on quality of life in older adults receiving cognitive behavioral therapy. *Clinical gerontologist*, 38(2), 131-148.
3. Rodakowski J, Saghaei E, Butters MA, Skidmore ER. Non-pharmacological interventions for adults with mild cognitive impairment and early stage dementia: an updated scoping review. *Mol Aspects Med.* 2015;43-44:38-53 doi:10.1016/j.mam.2015.06.003
4. Chan, P., Bhar, S., Davison, T. E., Doyle, C., Knight, B. G., Koder, D., ... & Wuthrich, V. M. (2021). Characteristics and effectiveness of cognitive behavioral therapy for older adults living in residential care: a systematic review. *Aging & Mental Health*, 25(2), 187-205.
5. Simon, S. S., Cordás, T. A., & Bottino, C. M. (2015). Cognitive behavioral therapies in older adults with depression and cognitive deficits: a systematic review. *International journal of geriatric psychiatry*, 30(3), 223-233.
6. Mayo Foundation for Medical Education and Research. *Yoga for Mindful Aging: Daily Practice for Mind and Body* [DVD]. Rochester, MN: Mayo Foundation for Medical Education and Research; 2014.
7. Jayasekara, R., Procter, N., Harrison, J., Skelton, K., Hampel, S., Draper, R., & Deuter, K. (2015). Cognitive behavioural therapy for older adults with depression: a review. *Journal of mental health*, 24(3), 168-171.
8. Wolinsky FD, Vander Weg MW, Howren MB, Jones MP, Dotson MM. A randomized controlled trial of cognitive training using a visual speed of processing intervention in

- middle aged and older adults. PLoS One. 2013;8(5) e61624. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0061624
9. Greenaway MC, Hanna SM, Lepore SW, Smith GE. A behavioral rehabilitation intervention for amnesic mild cognitive impairment. *Am J Alzheimers Dis Other Dement.* 2008;23(5):451-461. doi:10.1177/1533317508320352
 10. Logsdon RG, Gibbons LE, McCurry SM, Teri L. Assessing quality of life in older adults with cognitive impairment. *Psychosom Med.* 2002;64(3):510-519. doi:10.1097/00006842-200205000-00016
 11. Jayasekara, R., Procter, N., Harrison, J., Skelton, K., Hampel, S., Draper, R., & Deuter, K. (2015). Cognitive behavioural therapy for older adults with depression: a review. *Journal of mental health, 24*(3), 168-171.
 12. Radloff LS. The CES-D scale: a self-report depression scale for research in the general population. *Appl Psychol Meas.* 1977;1:385-401. doi:10.1177/014662167700100306
 13. Lorig K, Stewart A, Ritter P, Gonzalez V, Laurent D, Lynch J. Outcome Measures for Health Education and Other Health Care Interventions. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications; 1996
 14. Karlin, B. E., Trockel, M., Brown, G. K., Gordienko, M., Yesavage, J., & Taylor, C. B. (2015). Comparison of the effectiveness of cognitive behavioral therapy for depression among older versus younger veterans: Results of a national evaluation. *Journals of Gerontology Series B: Psychological Sciences and Social Sciences, 70*(1), 3-12.
 15. Chandler, M. J., Locke, D. E., Crook, J. E., Fields, J. A., Ball, C. T., Phatak, V. S., ... & Smith, G. E. (2019). Comparative effectiveness of behavioral interventions on quality of life for older adults with mild cognitive impairment: a randomized clinical trial. *JAMA network open, 2*(5), e193016-e193016.
 16. Zhang, B., Xuefan, D. I. N. G., Weihong, L. U., Jing, Z. H. A. O., Qinyu, L. V., Zhenghui, Y. I., ... & Yindi, C. H. E. N. (2016). Effect of group cognitive-behavioral therapy on the quality of life and social functioning of patients with mild depression. *Shanghai Archives of Psychiatry, 28*(1), 18.
 17. Tanaka, M., Kusaga, M., Nyamathi, A. M., & Tanaka, K. (2019). Effects of brief cognitive behavioral therapy for insomnia on improving depression among community-dwelling older adults: A randomized controlled comparative study. *Worldviews on Evidence-Based Nursing, 16*(1), 78-86.
 18. García-Peña, C., Vázquez-Estupiñan, F., Avalos-Pérez, F., Jiménez, L. V. R., Sánchez-García, S., & Juárez-Cedillo, T. (2015). Clinical effectiveness of group cognitivebehavioural therapy for depressed older people in primary care: A randomised controlled trial. *Salud mental, 38*(1), 33-39.
 19. Hofmann, S. G., Wu, J. Q., & Boettcher, H. (2014). Effect of cognitive-behavioral therapy for anxiety disorders on quality of life: a meta-analysis. *Journal of consulting and clinical psychology, 82*(3), 375.
 20. Simon, S. S., Cordás, T. A., & Bottino, C. M. (2015). Cognitive behavioral therapies in older adults with depression and cognitive deficits: a systematic review. *International journal of geriatric psychiatry, 30*(3), 223-233.

21. Titov, N., Dear, B. F., Ali, S., Zou, J. B., Lorian, C. N., Johnston, L., ... & Fogliati, V. J. (2015). Clinical and cost-effectiveness of therapist-guided internet-delivered cognitive behavior therapy for older adults with symptoms of depression: a randomized controlled trial. *Behavior therapy*, 46(2), 193-205.
22. Yu, H., Ma, Y., Lei, R., & Xu, D. (2020). A meta-analysis of clinical efficacy and quality of life of cognitive-behavioral therapy in acute coronary syndrome patients with anxiety and depression. *Annals of Palliative Medicine*, 9(4), 1886895-1881895.
23. Xiang, X., Wu, S., Zuverink, A., Tomasino, K. N., An, R., & Himle, J. A. (2020). Internet-delivered cognitive behavioral therapies for late-life depressive symptoms: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Aging & mental health*, 24(8), 1196-1206.
24. Huang, T. T., Liu, C. B., Tsai, Y. H., Chin, Y. F., & Wong, C. H. (2015). Physical fitness exercise versus cognitive behavior therapy on reducing the depressive symptoms among community-dwelling elderly adults: A randomized controlled trial. *International journal of nursing studies*, 52(10), 1542-1552.
25. Hofmann, S. G., Asnaani, A., Vonk, I. J., Sawyer, A. T., & Fang, A. (2012). The efficacy of cognitive behavioral therapy: A review of meta-analyses. *Cognitive therapy and research*, 36, 427-440.
26. Dear, B. F., Zou, J. B., Ali, S., Lorian, C. N., Johnston, L., Sheehan, J., ... & Titov, N. (2015). Clinical and cost-effectiveness of therapist-guided internet-delivered cognitive behavior therapy for older adults with symptoms of anxiety: a randomized controlled trial. *Behavior therapy*, 46(2), 206-217.
27. Hughes, J. M., Seemann, E. A., George, J. M., & Willis, K. D. (2019). The effects of pre-treatment depressive symptoms on quality of life across cognitive behavioral therapy for chronic pain. *Journal of Clinical Psychology in Medical Settings*, 26, 97-105.