



Utrecht University

Faculty of Social and Behavioral Sciences

Clinical Psychology Master Program

**«Social Support and loss of a family member: A
comparative study between first and second degree
relatives»**

Despoina Kaditi

Student Number : 6197183

Thesis supervisor : Henk Schut

Utrecht, Academic year 2017-2018

Contents

Table of contents

Abstract	1
Introduction	2
Method.....	8
Participants	8
Procedure.....	12
Measurement instruments.....	12
Integration of Stressful Life Experiences Scale	12
Multidimensional Scale of Perceived Social Support	13
Data Analyses.....	14
Results	15
Discussion	17
References	21

Abstract

This study examined the phenomena of grief and social support, as experienced by people who lost a first degree relative (parent) or a second degree relative. Those were studied under the scope of the Greek family and culture. Results deriving from online questionnaires revealed that grieving for a first degree relative is more intense than grieving for a second degree one; and that the levels of social support did not differ between the two kinship groups. Taken together, the findings indicate that loss of a parent is an impactful event that raises intense grief reactions. In parallel, loss of a second degree relative, is also recognized as a major event and within the Greek family / culture, bereaved relatives receive the same amount of social support in this occasion as well.

Keywords: grief, first- second degree relatives, social support, Greece.

Introduction

Death of a family member is commonly regarded as an impactful event. To a shorter or a larger extent it can inflame a family crisis, defined by Holt et al. (1989), as a disruption, distortion and incapacity within the family. This crisis is not restricted to close family members, but it expands to distant relatives as well (Patterson et al., 1980). However, the effect of death on multiple levels of kinship has been neglected in the field of grief study (Cleiren, 1993; Gilrane, & O' Grady, 2011; Reed, 2000; White, 1999). Almost two thirds of the few existing literature demonstrates significant associations between kinship and grief intensity (Cleiren, 1993; Neimeyer, & Sands, 2011), with the closer the kinship, the greater the chances of suffering from higher levels of grief (Laurie, & Neimeyer, 2014; Progresso, 2002; Shakespeare, & Finch, 2011). In the Leiden Bereavement Study (Clearing, Diekstra, & Kerkhof, 1994), mode of death (expected or sudden, violent or peaceful) had less power in predicting diverse levels of grief than kinship relationship.

On the other hand, some researchers have failed to find kinship as a significant predictor of grief, thus making the above, not a unanimous finding. A possible explanation for these contradictory findings is that kinship relationships are not, and should not always be regarded as, affectionate and helpful. So, it is worthy to take into consideration the quality of the emotional bond along with the kinship. Something that has already been realized by some previous studies in the area of grief (Stroebe, Hanson, Stroebe, & Schut, 2001; Uberson, & Chen, 1994). Although the combination of a close affectionate relationship with a distant kinship level has been found to be an important predictor of grief intensity; the ways in which second degree relatives experience their grief have not been thoroughly studied, with the only exception of

grandparents losing a grandchild (Tourjeman, Doron, & Cohen, 2015; Youngbult, Brooten, Blais, Hanna, & Niyonsenga, 2010). This study aims to shed light on the ‘‘gap’’ regarding kinship and grief by comparing between the grief of second degree relatives and first degree relatives (adult children mourning over the loss of a parent). Studying the kinship relationship within the Greek family would be optimal due to the structure and value of family in this particular society, an issue that will be further elaborated.

Losing a parent is a normative-chronologically expected incidence in the life of a middle- aged adult (Jordan, & Ware, 1997). Even so, it can be a milestone with various developmental as far as existential consequences and thus signify the beginning of a ‘‘life course transition’’ (Marks, Jun, & Song, 2007).). Scharlach and Fredriksen (1993), nicely phrased that developmental swift from chronologically conceptualizing life as ‘‘ time since birth’’ to ‘‘ time left to live’’. Although, the middle-aged child is usually an autonomous person, having created his or her own family, parent-child bond still has a symbolic as well as an influential meaning (Rossi, & Rossi, 1990) and is associated with his/ her general well-being (Amato, & Afifi, 2006; Barnet, Marshall, & Pleck, 1992).

As Bowlby (1979) described, parents constitute the ‘‘ primary attachment figures’’ of the child and represent the basic source of emotional security throughout the entire life of their child. Moreover, in many cases, they offer emotional support by providing for instance, valuable advices which proof and validate their child’s personal value and abilities (Umberson, & Chen, 1994). Often, they provide practical support as well (e.g. taking care of their grandchildren). Furthermore, parents can function as a joining link between children and more distant family members, thus holding the ‘‘ family unity’’. In addition, on a subconscious level, parents serve as a

protective ‘‘barrier’’ between children and their ultimate death. As, Becker (1973) remarked ‘‘ If parents are strong, the child is able to identify with their strength and through delegated power, triumph over death’’.

Nevertheless, there are cases in which parent-child bond, though important, does not represent an affectionate relationship that serves as a security base. On the contrary, it can be a source of insecurity and distressing feelings, putting the child in danger of experiencing higher levels of grief and difficult to cope feelings like guilt (Mandopoulou, 2016). Besides the finding that loss of a parent (affectionate or not) brings about strong grief reactions with significant duration and effects on mental and psychological health (Douglas, 1991; Jordan, & Ware, 1997; Patterson, & Rangganadham, 2010), little research has been done on the grief of middle- aged children (Bower, 1997).

In common sense, as well as in a significant proportion of the academic literature, social support, mostly in its informal –natural form by friends and family- is a valuable and helpful offering to the grieving individual (Mikulincer, Florian, & Hirsberger, 2001; Sanders, 1993; Stroebe, Stroebe, 1987). Social support has been found to be protective against several complications of bereavement (Elizur, & Kaffman, 1983; Mc Elheran, 2013; Raphael, 1977; Vlachon, 1980). This claim matches the findings that sufficient (in terms of quantity and quality) amount of social support, was linked to lower depression levels, higher levels of sense of control, and life satisfaction among bereaved spouses (Diamond, Lund, & Caserta, 1987). Analogous findings have been reported by Goldnberg, Comstock and Harlow (1988), as well as by Van der Werker and Prigerson (2003), defining social support as a protective factor against depression, post- traumatic stress disorder and complicated grief in various bereaved populations. Moreover, the need for social support was

highlighted in the choice of the words of griever participants in qualitative studies. For example, the first and most frequently mentioned need of griever participants in Patterson's and Rangnathan (2010) study was "Support and Understanding by family, friends and the general public". Similar results have led research psychologists to situate lack of social support among risk factors for complicated grief (Stroebe, Stroebe, & Schut, 2001).

In an effort to capture the quality and quantity of social support which is truly beneficial, several researchers have assessed only the amount of support that is valued as really supportive by griever participants themselves, namely perceived social support (Kitson, Babri, Roach, & Placidi, 1989; Sarason, Pierce, & Sarason, 1987). In this study as well, we will measure that kind of support.

It is worth pointing out some notable characteristics regarding the nature of family, experience of grief and social support offered to bereaved in Greece. To begin with, Greece is classified as a collectivistic society, which in brief, means that the personal interest follows the common interest (Singelis, Triandis, Bhawuk, & Gelfand, 1995). In those types of societies the formulation and maintenance of social, as well as emotional relationships, is the first priority, since these relations are regarded to offer various forms of support, and provide the individual with a sense of identity; not only as an independent human being, but in relation with a significant other, or a group (e.g. "I am a good daughter- friend"). Thus fore, personal sacrifices in the sake of preserving an important relationship or showing empathy are praised and contribute to the individual's feeling of self-worth (Hui, & Triandis, 1985).

Family is the most important value for most Greek people and the interdependence and the obligations, along with the close bonds between Greek family members are well substantiated by researchers (Campbell & Sherrard, 1968;

Doumauis, 1983; Georgas, 1989; Kataki, 1984; Vassiliou, 1973). Although, family relationships are of highly importance in other northern European countries too, the differences lie in the fact that Greek family members are ‘‘allowed’’ to be actively involved and have the power to influence the personal lives of their relatives and that they have more frequent communication through phone- calls and visits to close, as well as to distant relatives (Giotsa, 2004). So, in the context of the nuclear, but still extended family, grief is, to a great degree ‘‘a family and not a personal issue’’ (Georgas, & Mylonas, 2006; Katsoulis, & Roussou, 2017, Pentaris, 2012).

Death and grief are conceptualized in the light of a collectivistic perspective as well. Death in Greece is equated to grief and though the first one is mainly regarded as a peaceful state of existing, the second one is associated with intense and long lasting sorrow (Mystakidou, Parpa, Tsilika, Katsouda, & Vlahos, 2004). So, it is quite common for somebody to be afraid not of his /her own death, but for the suffering the ones left behind will go through (Zartaloudi, 2010).

Social support is enforced and encouraged by the collectivistic context and by a wide variety of customs/ rituals surrounding death. The fact of death is publicly announced, (in the neighborhood and to busy locations of the city) inviting anybody who wish to say goodbye to the deceased to his/her house. Customs like ‘‘the wake’’- a 24 hours period after the death, when family and friends mourn over the (open) coffin, followed by a number of memory- ceremonies at specific dates after the death (e.g. at the third day, 40 days, 3 months etc.) apart from their spiritual meaning, aim at offering emotional support to the griever. During the after death period, first and second degree relatives, friends and neighbors are supposed to be physically present in the everyday life of the bereaved, helping in practical matters, keeping him company and console him/ her (Pentaris, 2001).

The aim of this research is to study the possible similarities and differences between the grief of first and second degree relatives related to social support, within the context of grief in Greek society. It is expected that grieving for a first degree relative, will be more intense than grieving for a second degree relative. Additionally, it is speculated that first degree relatives will report higher levels of social support than second degree relatives.

Method

Participants

Data were collected from all Greek participants who filled out the Qualtrics survey. Nevertheless, people who: had other than Greek nationality, answered negatively to the question about having lost a significant other, did not answer the question regarding their relation to the deceased, were excluded ($n = 311$). A number of 55 more participants was extracted, as they were related to the deceased in other ways than first or second degree relative. Moreover, when calculating the total scores for ISLES and MSPSS scales, it was determined that valid participants will be regarded those who had answered at least half of each scales questions (min. 8 for ISLES and 6 for MSPSS). Therefore, a total sample of 166 participants, of which 84 people lost a parent and 118 a second degree relative (uncle, aunt, niece and nephew), was examined in this study. All participants, as mentioned above, had the Greek nationality and were living in Greece, the majority of them in urban areas (77%). A large proportion of the sample was women (80%). Most of our participants, in both categories of kinship, were highly educated (76%), employed (62%) and unmarried (63%). Most of them (60%) reported a year income up to 20.000€. Regarding religious affiliations, Christian Orthodox religion was prevalent (60%), whereas almost 35% reported no affiliations. Finally, 45% of the bereaved taken part in our study had lost a significant other after a long-term illness and 37% due to a sudden illness or health problem. The other causes of death (accident, homicide, suicide and other), cover the rest 10%. Approximately another 10% of participants preferred not to mention the cause of death. These demographic characteristics are presented more detailed in Tables 1.1 and 1.2.

With regard to demographic variables, we initially performed an independent-samples t- test for the mean age of the two kinship categories. A statistically significant difference between the two groups was found, [$t(164) = -5.98, p = .00$]. More specifically, participants who lost a parent were older ($M = 39.02, SD = 9.23$), than those who lost a second degree relative ($M = 29.16, SD = 10.56$). Regarding the remaining demographic characteristics, a Chi- Square test was conducted, which revealed that: marital status ($p = .00$), employment ($p = .00$) and level of education ($p = .03$) differed significantly from one kinship group to another. No significant disparities were observed in relation to the rest demographic variables.

Table 1.1 *Demographic information of first and second degree relatives on age*

Age	<i>M</i>	<i>N</i>	<i>SD</i>
1 st degree relative	39.02	48	10.560
2 nd degree relative	29.16	118	9.230

Note. *M* = Mean, *SD* = Standard Deviation.

Table 1.2

Demographic information of first and second degree relatives

Demographic characteristics	1 st D.R <i>N</i>	2 nd D.R <i>N</i>	1 st D.R %	2 nd D.R %	Asymptomatic Sig (2-sided)
Gender					.638
Male	8	23	17	14	
Female	40	93	83	56	

Marital Status					.000
Marries/in symbiosis	26	32	54	27	
Unmarried	19	85	40	72	
Divorced	3	1	6	1	
Area					.554
Big city	36	89	77	77	
Suburb/town	2	15	3	13	
District town/village	9	12	20	10	
Yearly Income					.260
Less than 10.000€	18	40	37	34	
10.000-19.999€	15	27	32	23	
20.000-29.999€	7	18	15	16	
30.000-39.999€	4	6	8	5	
40.000-49.999€	2	3	4	2	
Above 50.000€	1	4	2	3	
Prefer not to answer	1	19	2	17	
Employment					.001
Student	1	23	2	19	
Unemployed	3	31	6	27	
Full-time employed	31	47	65	40	
Part-time employed	11	13	23	11	
In retirement	1	2	2	2	
Beneficiary of allowance	1	1	2	1	
Level of education					.025
High school	5	24	10	20	

Technical school	5	5	10	5
University	18	61	38	52
Master/PhD	20	28	42	23
Cause of death				.487
Long term illness/ Health problem	27	46	56	39
Sudden illness/Health problem	15	47	31	40
Accident	2	7	5	6
Homicide	0	1	0	1
Suicide	0	3	0	2
Other reason	4	13	8	12
Religion				.467
Christian Orthodox	27	73	58	62
Christian Catholic	0	1	0	1
Christian Protestant	1	0	2	0
Muslim Sunni	0	2	0	2
Atheist/No religion	19	40	40	34
Other	0	1	0	1

Note. D.R = Degree Relative.

Procedure

Our survey was a part of a larger cross-cultural study that took place simultaneously in seven different countries, naming: Greece, Germany, Lebanon, the Netherlands, Serbia, Turkey and U.S.A. A convenience sampling was used in this study. During a two months period, between January and March 2018, people were invited to take part in the survey through telephone, e-mail contact and social media. They were provided with a link to our online Qualtrics platform. There, they were kindly asked to fill out the survey questionnaires after declaring that they had lost a significant other the past 5 years and signing the informed consent form which reassured them for the confidentiality and anonymity of their responses. This form also warned them about the possible psychological distress that could result from questions on a sensitive matter like death. With regard to the current kinship study, participants completed two self-report questionnaires regarding the integration of the experience of losing a significant other through death and perceived social support, along with several demographic information. The estimated time for completion was 10 to 15 minutes. In addition, the Qualtrics platform gave them the freedom to skip questions and quit the survey at any point they wished. As for the time and place of the fulfillment of the questionnaires, they were free to choose for their own, within the time limit of two months (the period in which survey was active).

Measurement instruments

Integration of Stressful Life Experiences Scale

Adjustment of the loss of a significant other was assessed with the full version (16 questions) of the - Integration of Stressful Life Experiences Scale - ISLES- created by Holland (2014). Build on Rark's Meaning Making Model, ISLES, measures the extent

to which there is a gap between the situational meaning of a specific event (e.g. the death of a significant other) and one's global meanings (e.g. worldviews). It has been shown that ISLES (apart from other usages) has valuable application to bereaved population (Burke et al., 2015; Currier, & Neimeyer, 2014; Holland, 2010). ISLES assesses two main factors: "Comprehensibility" and "Footing to the world" by asking participants to complete a 5-point scale ranging from 1 "completely agree" to 5 "completely disagree". Comprehensibility reflects the meaning made for the loss as a specific event. Examples included in this scale are: "I am confused with what happened to me" and "I have not managed to put my life in order again". Footing to the world signifies the possible changes in global meanings using phrases like "After the loss, my life seems like just a matter of chance" and "The world looks like a confusing/scary place". As our hypothesis doesn't examine any particular differences between subscales, we will focus on total scores. ISLES as a psychometric instrument, presents strong internal reliability ($\alpha = .80$ to $.92$), as well as in our study ($\alpha = .89$) and high concurrent validity with other meaning-oriented scales (Holland et al., 2010). In this study, ISLES was translated to Greek by the researcher who is a native speaker.

Multidimensional Scale of Perceived Social Support

The Multidimensional Scale of Perceived Social Support- MSPSS- was used to estimate perceived social support (Zimet, Dahlem, Zimet, & Farley, 1988). MSPSS is a 12 questions 7-point scale tool in which 1 indicates "very strongly disagree" and 7 "very strongly agree". The MSPSS distinguishes between three sources of social support: offered by family (e.g. "I can talk about my problems with my family"),

friends (e.g. I have friends with whom I share my happiness and my sorrow) and a significant other (e.g. There is a significant person in my life who is really a source of consolation to me). In our study we will focus our analysis on the total scores of perceived social support. The internal reliability of MSPSS is good ($\alpha = .88$). In the current study, it is also trustworthy ($\alpha = .92$). Also, MSPSS presents good construct validity and test-retest reliability (Zimet et al., 1988). For the purpose of the study MSPSS was translated to Greek by a native speaker- the researcher.

Data Analyses

As mentioned in the introduction section, our hypothesis in this study was firstly that grief for the loss of a first degree relative will be more intense than that for a second degree relative and secondly that first degree relatives will declare having received more social support than will second degree relatives. Due to the numbers of our 2 kinship- samples ($n = 48$, $n = 118$), we assumed that our data are normally distributed and conducted independent- variables t- tests. In other words, we tested the existence of a statistically significance difference between the means of ISLES scales total scores (measuring level of grief) and MSPSS scales total rates (estimating perceived social support). Additionally, we conducted a one-way analysis of variances (ANOVA) to check for possible effects of the four statistically significant demographic factors (age, marital status, employment and level of education) on our results. In other words, by using these four variables as covariates, we wanted to be able to determine the effect that kinship degree by itself has on the levels of grief and social support.

Results

Initially, a couple of two independent- sample t- tests were conducted. The first one was conducted in order to compare the levels of perceived social support between people who lost a first degree relative (parent) and people who lost a second degree relative. There was no significant difference among the scores of reported social support by first ($M = 4.93$, $SD = .63$) and second degree relatives ($M = 5.06$, $SD = 0.73$); $t(163) = 1.07$, $p = .285$. See Table 2.1.

The second independent- variable t- test was performed in order to compare the levels of grief experienced by our participants. In this case, a statistically significant deference was observed between people who lost a parent ($M = 3.46$, $SD = .75$) and those who lost a second degree relative ($M = 4.03$, $SD = .49$); $t(162) = .004$, $p = .000$. Looking at the above discrepancy, we notice that people who lost a parent had lower mean scores on ISLES than those who lost a second degree relative. A low score in ISLES indicates higher levels of grief manifestations. See Table 2.2.

In order to estimate the magnitude of difference in grief levels between the two kinship categories, we calculated the Eta Square score for ISLES. The last one showed that a large proportion of the grief level can be explained by the kinship degree (Eta Squared = .15).

Table 2.1

Results on levels of perceived social support for first and second degree relatives measured by MSPSS scale

	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>t</i>	<i>p</i>	<i>df</i>
Social Support			1.07	.29	163
First degree relatives	4.93	.63			
Second degree relatives	5.06	.73			

Note. *M* = Mean, *SD* = Standard Deviation, $p < .05$.

Table 2.2

Results on levels of grief for first and second degree relatives measured by ISLES scale

	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>t</i>	<i>p</i>	<i>df</i>
Grief level			.004	.00*	162
First degree relatives	3.46	.75			
Second degree relatives	4.03	.49			

Note. *M* = Mean, *SD* = Standard Deviation, * $p < .05$.

A one-way between-groups analysis of variance was conducted and through pair wise comparisons, showed no statically significant differences between the scores of first and second degree relatives in MSPSS scale ($p = .216$). The same analysis regarding possible differences in ISLES scale, indicated a statistically significant

difference between the two kinship groups ($p = .000$). Those results are in line with the aforementioned results of the two independent- samples t – tests.

Furthermore, an ANOVA analysis conducted on the demographic variables of: age, marital status, employment and level of education, showed no statistically significant difference ($p < .05$) between these factors and our participants scores in ISLES scale. In more details : age presented a .783 level of significance, marital status a level of .740, employment a level of .007 and degree of education a level of .182.

Discussion

Our first hypothesis predicted that grief for a first degree relative (parent) will be more intense than that for a second degree relative. Indeed that proved to be an accurate hypothesis. To note here that the difference between the intensity of grief in the two kinship categories can be safely attributed to the kinship degree per se and not to other demographic variations. This result is in line with previous findings supporting that the closer the kinship degree, the more intense the grief experienced (Jordan, & Ware, 1997; Laurie, & Neimeyer, 2014; Progresso, 2002; Shakespeare, & Finch, 2011). Theory on family relations and especially on the powerful bond between parent and child, justifies this finding as well (Barnet, Marshall, & Pleck, 1992; Rossi, & Rossi, 1990). Even in cases when a unique and close emotional relationship has been formed between the bereaved and a second degree relative, for example between a grandparent and a grandchild; one possible conceptualization of the strong grief reaction that follows such a loss, is the fact that this bond has acquired

characteristics of a parent – child bond. Such qualities are the unconditional – love and secure – base provider roles (Bowlby, 1979).

Losing a parent is considered as a major shock and within the Greek context, an extended and fierce mourn is expected by the rest family members, friends and neighbors. Even in the case of middle aged children grieving for a lost parent, the term ‘ orphan ‘ will be heard in order to signify the importance of the loss and attract sympathy (Zartaloudi, 2010).

Our second hypothesis assumed that there would be a difference in the level of perceived social support first and second degree relatives would mention. Second degree relatives were expected to receive less support than first degree ones. This hypothesis was not substantiated by our findings, since no statistically significant discrepancy emerged in relation to social support levels for the two groups. The interpretation and explanation of this finding is challenging mainly because no previous research exploring possible variations between social support and kinship degree was spotted (Cleiren, 1993; Gilrane, & O’ Grady, 2011). There is however, limited research on the grief of grandparents losing a grandchild. The findings in this area highlight the often limited ‘space’ grandparents have to experience their grief, along with the confined amount of social support offered to them (Reed, 2000; White, 1999). Ponzeti and Johnson (1991) described this phenomenon by characterizing those grandparents as ‘forgotten grievers’. It would be interesting to include grandparents in our second degree relatives’ sample, but that was not possible through an online questionnaire platform. The reason is that the vast majority of elderly people/grandparents in Greece doesn’t use computers or surf the internet.

An interesting observation deriving from our findings is that even though second degree relatives experience less intense grief than first degree relatives, they receive

the same amount of social support as first degree ones. Most probably the peculiarity of the bonds within the Greek family can provide some explanation for this phenomenon. Family in Greece represents a bigger than the sole nuclear family unit and includes both first and second degree relatives. Family members are often described as “ your own blood” and that indicates the close bonds between the members (Giotsas, 2004). Taking into consideration the fact that Greek families tend to be highly intrusive (Giotsa, 2004), and that grief is firstly a family and then a personal issue (Georgas, & Mylonas, 2006; Katsoulis, & Roussou, 2017, Pentaris, 2012); social support in cases of loss is expected to be provided and received between family members (Katsoulis, & Roussou, 2017). Moreover, it would be safe to state that Greek society and the conceptualization of death and grief, value social support and make ways to facilitate it. That is because within a collectivistic society where social ties are dense and highly valued, death is considered a public event that calls family, friends and neighbors of the deceased to offer consolation to the bereaved (Pentaris, 2001). To come back to our hypothesis; it seems that even the less intense grief for a second degree relative is vastly recognized into that type of family/society. Thus, the same amount of social support is offered in both cases of a loss of a first either a second degree relative.

It is important to site here some limitations our study has. Firstly, the emotional closeness between the bereaved and the deceased in both cases of kinship was not taken into account. Instead, it was implicitly assumed that first degree relations would be of greater closeness and importance than second degree ones. That was a superficial presumption, as kinship per se doesn't “ guarantee” a close emotional bond (Uberson, & Chen, 1994).

Secondly, no information on the exact time lapse between the death and the participation in the study were gathered. That could have probably affected our results; since it is supported that time plays an important role in the grief process by making grief reactions less intense after a course of a year (Neimeyer, 2006). In our study, participants stated that they had lost a significant other the last five years, but didn't indicate exactly the time lapse.

Another limitation was the fact that the two scales used (ISLES and MSPSS) were translated from English to Greek by the researcher. The proper procedure of translation and adjustment of psychometric tools was not followed.

Furthermore, it is important to note that a significant number of the Greek participants who entered the Qualtrics platform did not completed all the questionnaires and/or all the demographic questions. As stated in the method section, this study was a part of a bigger research conducted by multiple researchers throughout a variety of countries. A single Qualtrics online platform was shared, so apart from ISLES and MSPSS, our participants were asked to fill out a big number of questionnaires each one measuring different dimensions of grief. In more details, 532 Greek participants entered and answered at least one question, but 311 were excluded due to incomplete answers. The above observation, along with relevant feedback from participants, leads us to suggest that on sensitive subjects, like grief, shorter questionnaires better be used.

In conclusion, our survey confirmed that kinship relationship is an important determinant factor of grief intensity. The closer the kinship relation, the more intense grief manifestations are to be expected. The differences are salient when comparing the grief for a lost parent to that for a second degree relative.

On the other hand, social support is equally provided to both kinship groups in times of loss. Within the Greek family conceptualization of nuclear, but still extended family and within a collectivistic society; grieving for a second degree relative is highly recognized and social support is expected to be offered in an equal way in both occasions.

References

- Amato, P. R., & Afifi, T. D. (2006). Feeling caught between parents: Adult children's relations with parents and subjective well-being. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 68(1), 222-235. doi: 10.1111/j.1741-3737.2006.00243
- Barnett, R. C., Marshall, N. L., & Pleck, J. H. (1992). Adult son-parent relationships and their associations with sons' psychological distress. *Journal of Family Issues*, 13(4), 505-525. doi: 10.1177/01951392013004007
- Becker, E. (1973). *The denial of death*. New York: Free press.
- Bower, A. R. (1997). The adult child's acceptance of parent death. *Omega: Journal of Death and Dying*, 35(1), 67-96. doi: 10.2190/JRY9-6BL8-KCE1-HK5C
- Bowlby, J. (1979). *The making and breaking of affectional bonds*. London: Tavistock publications.
- Burke, L. A., Neimeyer, R. A., & McDevitt-Murphy, M. E. (2010). African American homicide bereavement: Aspects of social support that predict complicated grief, PTSD, and depression. *Omega: Journal of death and dying*, 61(1), 1-24. doi: 10.2190/OM.61.1.a
- Campbell, J., & Sherrard, Ph. (1968). *Modern Greece*. Essex: Ernest Ben.
- Clara, I. P., Cox, B. J., Enns, M. W., Murray, L. T., & Torgrudc, L. J. (2003). Confirmatory factor analysis of the multidimensional scale of perceived social support in clinically distressed and student samples. *Journal of Personality Assessment*, 81(3), 265-270.
- Cleiren, M. P. (1993). *Bereavement and adaptation: A comparative study of the aftermath of death*. London: Taylor & Francis.

- Cleiren, M., Diekstra, R. F., Kerkhof, A. J., & Van Der Wal, J. (1994). Mode of death and kinship in bereavement: Focusing on "who" rather than "how". *Crisis: The Journal of Crisis Intervention and Suicide Prevention*, 15 (1), 22-36.
- Douglas, J. D. (1991). Patterns of change following parent death in midlife adults *Omega: Journal of Death and Dying*, 22(2), 123-137. doi:10.2190/EU8P-UTG6-05HB-LJAG
- Doumanis, M. (1983). Mothering in Greece: From collectivism to individualism. *Behavioural Development: A Series of Monographs*, 146-159.
- Elitzur, E., & Kauffman, M. (1983). Factors influencing the severity of childhood bereavement reactions. *American Journal of Orthopsychiatry*, 53, 668-676.
- Florian, V., Mikulincer, M., & Hirschberger, G. (2001). An existentialist view on mortality salience effects: Personal hardiness, death-thought accessibility, and cultural worldview defense. *British Journal of Social Psychology*, 40 (3), 437-453. doi: 10.1348/014466601164911
- Georgas, J. (1989). Changing family values in Greece: From collectivist to individualist. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, 20(1), 80-91. doi: 10.1177/0022022189201005
- Georgas, J., & Mylonas, K. (2006). Cultures are like all other cultures, like some other cultures, like no other culture. In U. Kim, K. Yang, & K. Hwang (Eds), *Indigenous and cultural psychology* (pp. 197-221) Boston: Springer.
- Giotsa, A. (2004). *Structure and function of the Greek family: Similarities and differences in its form from families in other countries*. Athena: En plo.

- Girland, U., O'Grady, T. (2011). Forgotten grievers: An exploration of the grief experiences of bereaved grandparents. *International Journal of Palliative Nursing, 17*(4), 170-176.
- Goldberg, E. L., Comstock, G.W., & Harlow, S. D. (1988). Emotional problems and widowhood. *Journal of Gerontology, 43*, 5206-5208.
doi.org/10.1093/geronj/43.6.S206
- Holland, J. M., Currier, J. M., Coleman, R. A., & Neimeyer, R. A. (2010). The Integration of Stressful Life Experiences Scale (ISLES): Development and initial validation of a new measure. *International Journal of Stress Management, 17*(4), 325-335. doi: 10.1037/a0020892
- Holt, R., Court, P., Vedhara, K., Nott, K. H., Holmes, J., Snow, M. H. (1989). The role of disclosure in coping with HIV infection. *Psychological and Socio-medical Aspects of AIDS/HIV, 10*, 49-60. doi: 10.1080/095401298501245
- Hoogduin, K. A. (1997). A prospective study of risk factors predicting grief intensity following pregnancy loss. *Archives of General Psychiatry, 54*, 56-61.
- Hui, C. H., & Triandis, H. C. (1985). The instability of response sets. *Public Opinion Quarterly, 49*(2), 253-260. doi: 10.1086/268918
- Jordan, J. R., & Ware, E. S. (1997). Feeling like a motherless child: A support group model for adults grieving the death of a parent. *Omega: Journal of Death and Dying, 35*(4), 361-376. doi: 10.2190/PV8N-PRM8-JWDP-2DXU
- Katakis, C. D. (1984). *The three identities of the Greek family*. Athens: Kedros.
- Katsoulis, A. & Roussou, L. (2017). *Death, Bereavement and nursing interventions*. Athena: Armos.

- Kitson, G. C., Babri, K. B., Roach, M. J., & Placidi, K. S. (1989). Adjustment to widowhood and divorce: A review. *Journal of Family Issues*, *10*(1), 5-32. doi: 10.1177/019251389010001001
- Lund, D. A., Dimond, M. S., & Caserta, M. S. (1985). Identifying elderly with coping difficulties two years after bereavement. *Omega: Journal of Death and Dying*, *16*, 213–224. doi: 10.2190/MRKP-FN6N-VVG4-EUTU
- Mandopoulou, Ch. (2016). *Young people's relationships with their family*. Technological and educational institution of Western Greece, Patra, Greece.
- Marks, N. F., Jun, H., & Song, J. (2007). Death of parents and adult psychological and physical well-being: A prospective US national study. *Journal of Family Issues*, *28*(12), 1611-1638. doi: 10.1177/0192513X07302728
- McCubbin, H. I., Joy, C. B., Cauble, A. E., Comeau, J. K., Patterson, J. M., & Needle, R. H. (1980). Family stress and coping: A decade review. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 855-871. doi: 10.2307/351829
- McElheran, M. (2011, April, 20). Trauma, change, resilience [Video podcast]. Retrieved from website: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=P8nMgY5dkTs>
- Michon, B., Balkou, S., Hivon, R., & Cyr, C. (2003). Death of a child: Parental perception of grief intensity, end of life and bereavement care. *Pediatrics & Child Health*, *8*(6), 363-366. doi:10.1093/pch/8.6.363
- Mystakidou, K., Parpa, E., Tsilika, E., Katsouda, E., & Vlahos, L. (2004). Cancer information disclosure in different cultural contexts. *Supportive Care in Cancer*, *12*(3), 147-154. doi: 10.1007/s00520-003-0552-7
- Neimeyer, R. (2006). *To love and to lose*. Athens: Kritiki.

- Neimeyer, R. A., & Sands, D. C. (2011). Meaning reconstruction in bereavement: From disciplines to practice. In R. A. Neimeyer, H. Winokuer, D. Harris and G. Thorton (Eds), *Grief and bereavement in contemporary society: Bridging research and practice* (pp.325-361). New York: Routledge.
- Patterson, P., & Ranganadhan, A. (2010). Losing a parent to cancer: A preliminary investigation into the needs of adolescents and young adults. *Palliative and Supportive Care*, 8(3), 255-265. doi: 10.1017/S1478951510000052
- Pentaris, P. (2012). Death in the modern Greek culture. *Hawaii Pacific Journal of Social Work Practice*, 5(1), 126-131.
- Ponzetti J. J., & Johnson, M. A. (1991). The forgotten grievers: Grandparents' reactions to the death of grandchildren. *Death Studies*, 15(2), 157-167. doi: 10.1080/07481189108252420
- Raphael, B. (1977). Preventive intervention with the recently bereaved. *Archives of General Psychiatry*, 34, 1450-1454. doi: 10.1001/archpsyc.1977.01770240076006
- Reed, M. L. (2018). *Grandparents cry twice: Help for bereaved grandparents*. London: Routledge.
- Ringdal, G. I., Jordhøy, M. S., Ringdal, K., & Kaasa, S. (2001). Factors affecting grief reactions in close family members to individuals who have died of cancer. *Journal of Pain and Symptom Management*, 22(6), 1016-1026. doi: 10.1016/S0885-3924(01)00363-3
- Rozalski, V., Holland, J. M., & Neimeyer, R. A. (2017). Circumstances of death and complicated grief: indirect associations through meaning made of

loss. *Journal of Loss and Trauma*, 22(1), 11-23. doi:
10.1080/15325024.2016.1161426

Sanders, C. M. (1993). Risk factors in bereavement outcome. In M. Stroebe, W. Stroebe, & R. O. Hansson (Eds), *Handbook of bereavement: Theory, research and intervention* (pp. 255-267). New York: Cambridge University Press.

Sarason, I. G., Sarason, B. R., Shearin, E. N., & Pierce, G. R. (1987). A brief measure of social support: Practical and theoretical implications. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships*, 4 (4), 497-510. doi: 10.1177/0265407587044007

Scharlach, A. E., & Fredriksen, K. I. (1993). Reactions to the death of a parent during midlife. *Omega: Journal of Death and Dying*, 27(4), 307-319. doi: 10.2190/N2GW-N9WE-UEUP-9H4D

Singelis, T. M., Triandis, H. C., Bhawuk, D. P., & Gelfand, M. J. (1995). Horizontal and vertical dimensions of individualism and collectivism: A theoretical and measurement refinement. *Cross-cultural Research*, 29(3), 240-275. doi: 10.1177/106939719502900302

Stroebe, M. A., Hanson, R. O., Stroebe, W. S., & Schut, H. (2001). *Handbook of Bereavement Research*. Washington: American Psychological Association.

Stroebe, W., & Stroebe, M. S. (1987). *Bereavement and health: The psychological and physical consequences of partner loss*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Tourjeman, K., Doron, I., & Cohen, M. (2015). Losing a grandchild: The mourning experience of grandparents in Israel. *Death Studies*, 39 (8), 491-499. doi:
10.1080/07481187.2014.970298

- Umberson, D., & Chen, M. D. (1994). Effects of a parent's death on adult children: Relationship salience and reaction to loss. *American Sociological Review*, *59*, 152-168. doi: 10.2307/2096138
- Vachon, M. L. S., Lyall, W. A. L., Rogers, J., Freedman-Leftofsky, K., Freeman, S. J. (1980). A controlled study of self-help intervention for widows. *American Journal of Psychiatry*, *137*, 1380-1384.
- Vanderwerker, L. C., & Prigerson, H. G. (2003). Social support and technological connectedness as protective factors in bereavement. *Journal of Loss and Trauma*, *9*(1), 45-57. doi: 10.1080/15325020490255304
- Vassiliou, V. G., & Vassiliou, G. (1973). The implicative meaning of the Greek concept of *philotimo*. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, *4*(3), 326-341. doi: 10.1177/002202217300400305
- White, D. (1999). Grandparent participation in times of family bereavement. *End of Life Issues: Interdisciplinary and Multidisciplinary Perspectives*, *10*, 145-165.
- Youngblut, J. M., Brooten, D., Blais, K., Hanna, J., & Niyonsenga, T. (2010). Grandparent's health and functioning after a grandchild's death. *Journal of Pediatric Nursing*, *25*, 352-359.
- Zartaloudi, A. (2010). Cross- cultural research on grief and mourn. *Interscientific Health Care*, *2*, 55-63.