medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.09.24.20200865; this version posted September 25, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint **(which was not certified by peer review)** is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.

It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

What have we learned about positive changes experienced during COVID-19 lockdown? Evidence of the social patterning of change

Short title: COVID-19 positive changes

Dr Lynn Williams[1], Ms Lesley Rollins[1], Dr David Young[1], Dr Leanne Fleming[1], Professor Madeleine Grealy[1], Dr Xanne Janssen[1], Dr Alison Kirk[1], Mr Bradley MacDonald[1], Professor Paul Flowers[1]

[1] University of Strathclyde, Scotland, United Kingdom

*** Corresponding Author:** Dr Lynn Williams, School of Psychological Sciences & Health, University of Strathclyde, 40 George Street, Glasgow, G1 1QE, Scotland, UK (e-mail: lynn.williams@strath.ac.uk)

Acknowledgements: The study was funded by the Chief Scientist Office, Scottish Government (Ref: COV/SCL/20/09).

NOTE: This preprint reports new research that has not been certified by peer review and should not be used to guide clinical practice.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.09.24.20200865; this version posted September 25, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.

It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

Abstract

Background: Multiple studies have highlighted the negative impact of COVID-19 and its particular effects on vulnerable sub-populations. Complementing this work, here, we report on the social patterning of self-reported positive changes experienced during COVID-19 national lockdown in Scotland.

Methods: The CATALYST study collected data from 3342 adults in Scotland during weeks 9-12 of a national lockdown. Participants completed an online questionnaire providing data on key sociodemographic and health variables, and completed a measure of positive change. The positive change measure spanned diverse domains (e.g., more quality time with family, developing new hobbies, more physical activity, and better quality of sleep). We used univariate analysis and stepwise regression to examine the contribution of a range of sociodemographic factors (e.g., age, gender, ethnicity, educational attainment, and employment status) in explaining positive change.

Results: There were clear sociodemographic differences across positive change scores. Those reporting higher levels of positive change were female, from younger age groups, married or living with their partner, employed, and in better health.

Conclusion: Overall our results highlight the social patterning of positive changes during lockdown in Scotland. These findings begin to illuminate the complexity of the unanticipated effects of national lockdown and will be used to support future intervention development work sharing lessons learned from lockdown to increase positive health change amongst those who may benefit.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.09.24.20200865; this version posted September 25, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.

It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

Introduction

In many countries, COVID-19 national lockdowns have been the most profound, deep reaching, and significant public health interventions within living memory. Fig 1 provides a logic model describing a high-level overview of lockdown as a complex public health intervention. It shows a range of key contextual elements important to understanding the situation in which lockdown has taken place and it shows the central problem that initial lockdown was intended to resolve (i.e. exponential transmission of COVID-19). It also highlights the complexity of lockdown as a public health intervention, with multiple, interdependent components, cumulatively working through varied and intersecting mechanisms to elicit a range of intended and unintended positive and negative changes.

Fig 1. Theorising the initial effects of national 'lock down' for COVID-19: Logic model showing high-level overview

Within Scotland it is clear that the initial national lockdown intervention succeeded in relation to its primary goal of reducing the exponential transmission of COVID-19 and achieving its intended positive health outcomes (see Fig 1). Similarly, as had been anticipated, it has led to unintended and negative health consequences. For example, there is emerging evidence concerning the amplification of pre-existing health inequalities [1-3], both overall [4, 5], and in sub-population specific groups [6] (e.g., among Black, Asian and minority ethnic (BAME) groups, those experiencing socioeconomic disadvantage, and the unemployed) worsening of mental health, the impact on family functioning [7], loss of economic productivity [8], and the gendered burden of home schooling [9].

In contrast to this emerging evidence of the unintended negative effects of a national lockdown, here we report emerging evidence concerning unintended positive changes. Using cross-sectional data from an online survey we detail the social patterning of the positive effects of lockdown across

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.09.24.20200865; this version posted September 25, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.

It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

a range of domains. Given the large corpus of work concerning the role of structural social factors such as poverty, racism, gender and age in explaining health and illness we anticipated our findings would be shaped by these classic determinants of health.

Method

Participants and procedure

Data collection took place for 23 days from 20th May 2020 to 12 June 2020, spanning the 9th to the 12th week of national lockdown in Scotland. The target population of the survey was adults, aged 18 years or older, currently residing in Scotland, who were interested in sharing their experience of positive change. Participants were primarily recruited through social media advertisements on Facebook and Twitter which directed participants to the online survey on Qualtrics. All materials and procedures were approved by the Ethics Committee of the University of Strathclyde and all participants gave informed consent. The present sample comprised 3342 participants. Participant characteristics are shown in Table 1.

Table 1. Descriptive sample statistics of socio-demographic and health variables

Variable		N	%
Household income	<£16 000	322	10.8
	£16 000-£29 999	591	19.9
	£30 000-£59 999	1185	40.0
	£60 000- £89 999	558	18.7
	£ 90 000+	316	10.6
	Missing	370	
Employment status	Employed	2258	67.6
	Inactive	1033	31.0
	Unemployed	48	1.4
	Missing	3	
Highest education level	High School	374	11.5
	College	502	15.5
	Undergraduate	988	30.4

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.09.24.20200865; this version posted September 25, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint **(which was not certified by peer review)** is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.

It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

	Postgraduate	1380	42.6
	Missing	97	
Age	18-24	336	10.1
	25-34	569	17.1
	35-49	892	26.8
	50-64	1130	33.9
	65+	402	12.1
	Missing	13	
Gender	Female	2647	80.4
	Male	646	19.6
	Missing	49	
Ethnicity	White	3215	97.0
	Non-White	99	3.0
	Missing	28	
Relationship status	Single	602	18.2
	Married or living with partner	2203	66.7
	Have a partner but not living together	253	7.7
	Separated /divorced or widowed	247	7.4
	Missing	37	
Health	Very poor	10	0.3
	Poor	63	1.9
	Fair	479	14.4
	Good	1541	46.2
	Very good	1243	37.3
	Missing	6	
High-risk	Yes	499	14.9
	No	2842	85.1
	Missing	1	
COVID-19 Diagnosis	Yes or suspected	400	12.0
	Don't know	978	29.3
	No	1963	58.8
	Missing	1	

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.09.24.20200865; this version posted September 25, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.

It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

Measures

Sociodemographic and Health Variables

Participants provided sociodemographic and health data on the following variables: (1) gender, (2) age (18-24, 25-34, 35-49, 50-64, 65+), (3) relationship status (single, married/living with partner, living apart from partner, separated/divorced/widowed), (4) ethnicity, (5) education (high school, college, undergraduate, postgraduate), (6) annual household income (<£16,000, 16,000 – 29,999, 30,000 – 59,999, 60,000 – 89,999, £90,000+) (7) employment status (employed, inactive, unemployed), (8) overall health (very poor, poor, fair, good, very good), (9) risk status for COVID-19, e.g., aged 70+ or have an underlying health condition (yes, no), and (10) COVID-19 diagnosis (yes diagnosed, suspected, don't know, no).

Positive Changes

We measured positive changes using an expanded version of the positive events subscale of the Epidemic-Pandemic Impacts Inventory (EPII) [10]. We utilised 21 items to assess positive changes that participants may have experienced across a number of domains (e.g., relationships, physical activity, sleep, work). Participants were asked "Since social distancing restrictions were introduced, what has changed for you?" with the response options of "yes", "no" or "not applicable" across each domain. Example items included "more appreciative of things usually taken for granted", "improved relationships with family and friends" and "increase in exercise or physical activity". A positive score for each participant was computed by scoring 1 for a 'yes' and zero for 'no' on the 21 questions. A total score was computed which comprised of the sum of the 'yes' responses for each participant. This was then converted to a percentage score by dividing the total score by the sum of 'yes' and 'no' responses. NAs were removed from the analysis since individuals could not increase their score by responding to a question which did not apply to them. A higher percentage positive score

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.09.24.20200865; this version posted September 25, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.

It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

indicated a greater proportion of positive changes. The scale was found to have good internal consistency (Cronbach's α=.75) in the current study.

Statistical analysis

Exploratory univariate analysis was performed to determine which factors were associated with the positive change scores. Between group scores were analysed using t-tests or ANOVA. Factors independently associated with positive change were then determined using a multiple regression model with stepwise variable selection. All analyses were done using Minitab (version 18) at a 5% significance level (adjusted for multiple comparisons were appropriate using the Tukey method).

Results

Descriptive statistics

The sample characteristics are shown in Table 1. In addition, a graph of the distribution of positive change scores is shown in Fig 2. Scores ranged from 0-100 with a mean of 47.2% (SD=20.8).

Fig 2. Distribution of positive change scores (%) in the sample

Positive Change Analysis

Univariate analyses were used to identify factors significantly associated with positive change with post-ANOVA comparisons where appropriate. Table 2 shows the results. Females reported significantly higher levels of positive change than males. In relation to age, we found that there was evidence of a difference in the mean positive change score between the age categories, with the older age group (65+) demonstrating the lowest level of positive change, and significantly lower than

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.09.24.20200865; this version posted September 25, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.

It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

those aged 18-24. Similarly, there was evidence of significant differences in the mean scores across each of the relationship status groups, with those married or living with their partner exhibiting the highest level of positive change. Those in the employed group had higher levels of positive change than those in the inactive and unemployed groups (although the comparison with unemployed was not statistically significant due to the small number in the sample). When considering ethnicity, there was no evidence of a difference in positive change scores when comparing white and non-white participants. Similarly, for education, there was no evidence of a difference between the groups in terms of their positive change scores. For household income, there was no significant differences in positive change scores across the groups. However, there is a notable trend, with positive change score increasing with increasing household income levels.

Table 2. Univariate analysis of socio-demographic factors and positive change

Variable	***p-value***	***Comparison***	***Coefficient***	***p-value***
Household income	0.492	£16-29.9K vs. <£16K	0.64	
		£30-59.9K vs. <£16K	1.33	
		£60-89.9K vs. <£16K	1.84	
		>£90K vs. <£16K	2.54	
Employment status	0.018	inactive vs. employed	-1.92	0.014
		unemployed vs. employed	-4.89	0.107
Highest education	0.088	college vs. high school	1.19	
		undergrad vs. high school	0.37	
		postgrad vs. high school	-1.25	
Age	0.022	24-34 vs. 18-24	-1.45	0.311
		35-49 vs. 18-24	-1.42	0.285
		50-64 vs. 18-24	-0.96	0.459
		>65 vs. 18-24	-4.61	0.003
Gender	<0.001	male vs. female	-6.71	
Ethnicity	0.423	non-white vs. white	1.70	
Relationship status	0.010	married/partner vs. single	2.32	0.015
		partner (live apart) vs. single	-1.32	0.397
		sep/div/wid vs. single	1.16	0.459
Health	<0.001	poor vs. very poor	26.81	<0.001
		fair vs. very poor	27.16	<0.001
		good vs. very poor	29.99	<0.001
		very good vs. very poor	31.30	<0.001
Diagnosed	0.390	don't know vs. yes	-1.61	
		no vs. yes	-1.46	
High risk	0.008	no vs. yes	2.7	

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.09.24.20200865; this version posted September 25, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.

It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

In relation to health, there was a significant effect of self-reported health, with those who reported their health to be 'very poor' having the lowest level of positive change and significantly lower compared to each of the other groups (poor, fair, good, very good). In addition, those that reported being at higher-risk of contracting COVID-19 had a significantly lower positive change score than those not at high-risk. Finally, there was no evidence of any difference in positive change scores based on COVID-19 diagnosis.

Multivariate analysis utilising stepwise regression showed that age, gender, relationship status, and self-reported health were all significantly associated with positive change. When considering the coefficients (see Table 3), it is shown that males reported a positive change score that was 6.1% lower than females. The older age group (65+) had a positive change score that was 7.5% lower than the younger age group. In terms of relationship status, those who were married or living with a partner had a score than was 3% higher than those who were single. When examining self-reported health, those who were in very poor health had a positive change score that was 24.5% lower than those in poor health, and 29.4% lower than those in very good health.

Table 3. Multivariate analysis of socio-demographic factors and positive change

Variable	***p-value***	***Comparison***	***Coefficient***	***95% CI***	***p-value***
Age	<0.001	24-34 vs. 18-24	-4.16	-7.10, -1.22	0.006
		35-49 vs. 18-24	-4.69	-7.53, -1.85	0.001
		50-64 vs. 18-24	-4.21	-7.03, -1.39	0.003
		>65 vs. 18-24	-7.54	-10.85, -4.23	<0.001
Gender	<0.001	male vs. female	-6.07	-7.86, -4.28	
Relationship status	0.001	married/partner vs. single	3.05	1.05, 5.05	0.003
		partner (live apart) vs. single	-1.76	-4.82, 1.30	0.259
		sep/div/wid vs. single	3.06	-0.23, 6.35	0.068
Health	<0.001	poor vs. very poor	24.49	9.30, 39.68	0.002
		fair vs. very poor	25.79	11.48, 10.10	<0.001
		good vs. very poor	28.03	13.80, 42.26	<0.001

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.09.24.20200865; this version posted September 25, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.

It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

		very good vs. very poor	29.43	15.20, 43.66	<0.001

Discussion

The present study is the first to explore the social patterning of positive changes experienced during COVID-19 lockdown. Referring back to Fig 1, there is clear evidence that unintended positive change has taken place as a result of lockdown, at least for some groups of the population. For example, people have experienced positive changes in their relationships with family and friends, and in their own health behaviours. However, we found evidence of differences in the amount of positive change people had experienced, based on sociodemographic and health variables. Those groups with higher levels of positive change were females, those from younger age groups, people who were married or living with their partner, those who were employed, and those reporting better health.

The phrase 'we are all in this together' has been used, both domestically and internationally, throughout the pandemic to highlight the sense that COVID-19 is uniting us in shared experiences. However, there is a growing evidence base on the inequalities associated with COVID-19. Our findings fit within this emerging literature and point to the fact that while some groups were able to take advantage of lockdown as an unexpected opportunity to make positive changes in their lives, other groups were not. Similar findings on the inequalities associated with adverse experiences during lockdown have been reported [3], with the experience of more adverse events being related to socioeconomic position (consisting of household income, education, employment status, and housing). In addition, research on the experience of adverse mental health during COVID-19 has also shown the frequency of abuse, self-harm and thoughts of suicide/self-harm to be higher among women, BAME groups, those who were unemployed and those in poorer physical health [5].

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.09.24.20200865; this version posted September 25, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.

It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

Complementing this work, we also find that the experience of making positive changes in lockdown is shaped by many of these key sociodemographic factors.

Together these findings indicate the enduring nature of health inequalities and evoke key concepts from complex adaptive systems perspectives within public health [11, 12]. Despite the enormity of structural and social change that the national lockdown brought, there appears to be no sense of reaching a 'tipping point' in which the self-organising system that drives inequalities was radically disrupted or dramatically changed. In fact, emerging evidence suggests the opposite, there is clear evidence of negative feedback loops ensuring the system returned to stasis, reiterating inequalities along very familiar lines across a broad range of outcomes, for example, COVID-19 related morbidity and mortality, in addition to positive and negative psycho-social change.

We believe that our study is the first to report on the social patterning of positive changes during COVID-19 national lockdown. The study also has the strength of a large sample size, and the inclusion of a wide range of socioeconomic factors. However, there are limitations. Most notably, the study is not nationally representative, and some important socio-demographic groups are not well represented within the sample, such as BAME groups, meaning that we were only able to compare white and non-white participants. In addition, the study is cross-sectional in nature and so provides only a snapshot of the positive changes people were experiencing at a particular stage of the lockdown, and cannot, at this stage, provide data on whether these positive changes were maintained over time.

Conclusion

The present study reports preliminary evidence relating to the social patterning of self-reported positive change during lockdown. The data reported here are part of the larger mixed-methods CATALYST project which seeks to understand how people have initiated and maintained positive change across a number of domains, during lockdown, and as restrictions have been eased. The aim

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.09.24.20200865; this version posted September 25, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.

It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

is to share this learning through intervention development work, in order to facilitate positive health change in others. From the results of the current study, we can see that there are sub-populations and communities where it may be particularly important to target these interventions, in order to provide opportunities for health change amongst those who may benefit most.

References

1. Chung RY, Dong D, Li MM. Socioeconomic gradient in health and the covid-19 outbreak. *BMJ*. 2020;369. doi: 10.1136/bmj.m1329
2. van Dorn A, Cooney RE, Sabin ML. COVID-19 exacerbating inequalities in the US. *Lancet*. 2020;395: 1243. doi: 10.1016/S0140-6736(20)30893-X
3. Wright L, Steptoe A, Fancourt D. Are we all in this together? Longitudinal assessment of cumulative adversities by socioeconomic position in the first 3 weeks of lockdown in the UK. *J Epidemiol Community Health*. 2020. doi: 10.1136/jech-2020-214475
4. Wang C, Pan R, Wan X, Tan Y, Xu L, McIntyre RS, Choo FN, Tran B, Ho R, Sharma VK, Ho C. A longitudinal study on the mental health of general population during the COVID-19 epidemic in China. *Brain Behav Immun*. 2020. doi: 10.1016/j.bbi.2020.04.028
5. Fancourt D, Steptoe A, Bu F. Trajectories of depression and anxiety during enforced isolation due to COVID-19: longitudinal analyses of 59,318 adults in the UK with and without diagnosed mental illness. *medRxiv*. 2020. doi: 10.1101/2020.06.03.20120923
6. Iob E, Steptoe A, Fancourt D. Abuse, self-harm and suicidal ideation in the UK during the COVID-19 pandemic. *B J Psych*. 2020;1-4. doi: 10.1192/bjp.2020.130
7. Prime H, Wade M, Browne DT. Risk and resilience in family well-being during the COVID-19 pandemic. *Am Psychol*. 2020 May 21. doi: 10.1037/amp0000660

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.09.24.20200865; this version posted September 25, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint **(which was not certified by peer review)** is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.

It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

8. Office for National Statistics. *GDP first quarterly estimate, UK: April to June 2020*. Available from: https://www.ons.gov.uk/releases/gdpfirstquarterlyestimateukapriltojune2020
9. Anders J, Macmillan L, Sturgis P, Wyness G. *Homeschooling during lockdown deepens inequality*. LSE Covid 19 Blog (05 Jun 2020). Available from: https://blogs.lse.ac.uk/covid19/2020/06/05/homeschooling-during-lockdown-will-deepen-inequality/
10. Grasso DJ, Briggs-Gowan MJ, Ford JD, Carter AS. The Epidemic – Pandemic Impacts Inventory (EPII). 2020. Available from: https://osf.io/ng45c/
11. Angeli F, Montefusco A. Sensemaking and learning during the Covid-19 pandemic: A complex adaptive systems perspective on policy decision-making. *World Dev*. 2020 Dec 1;136:105106. doi: 10.1016/j.worlddev.2020.105106
12. Rusoja E, Haynie D, Sievers J, Mustafee N, Nelson F, Reynolds M, Sarriot E, Swanson RC, Williams B. Thinking about complexity in health: a systematic review of the key systems thinking and complexity ideas in health. *Journal Eval in Clin Pract*. 2018 Jun;24(3):600-6. doi: 10.1111/jep.12856

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.09.24.20200865; this version posted September 25, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint **(which was not certified by peer review)** is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.

It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .


PROBLEM
(the specific problem the intervention addresses)
INTERVENTION
(core components to measure fidelity and adaption)
MECHANISMS
(how intervention components work)
OUTCOMES
(what we think the intervention will do)
C21st LIFE
- Global and daily travel
- Urbanisation
- Disassortative social mixing
- Rise in digital facilitation of work
- Rise in social media and digital facilitation of social life
- Time-poverty
- Fragmented communities
Growing public health crises
- Physical activity, Sleep
- Poor mental health
- Alcohol and other drug use
- Obesity
- Climate change
Long-standing intractable inequalities
- Income, class and capability
- Long term conditions disparities by gender, minority status (e.g BME)
- Intersectionality, Syndemics
- Housing
Global, national, regional and local onwards transmission
Increasing COVID -19 infections
Increasing COVID-19 deaths
Exponential transmission of COVID-19
NHS burden
High mortality in those with pre-existing conditions
High mortality amongst those experiencing inequalities (e.g. BME)
Reduced global travel
Quarantine
School and workplace closure
Essential travel only
'We are in this together' message
Hand and cough hygiene
Social distancing
Enhanced Policing
Essential worker support
Increase bed availability in NHS
Increased NHS capacity – Nightingale hospitals
Shielding for those most vulnerable
Regulation/legislation
Environmental/social planning
Restriction
Coercion
Communication/Guidelines
Education
Persuasion
Skills
Environmental/social planning
Restriction
Enablement
Regulation/legislation
Restriction
Potential positive
Intended
- Reduced onwards transmission (R)
- Reduced deaths/grief/loss
- NHS saved
Unintended
- Improved climate
- Improved mental health, sleep, physical activity for some
- Time poverty reduced (e.g., commute time) for some
- Engagement with local ecology and local community
- Improved family engagement for some
Potential negative
Unintended
- Amplification of inequalities Increases in poor mental health and bad sleep for some
- Increases in poor physical health for some
- Poor family functioning for some
- Loss of economic productivity
- Increases in gaps in educational attainment
- Burden of home schooling
- Excess deaths


Histogram of Positive Change
Frequency
200
150
100
50
0
0
14
28
42
56
70
84
98
Positive Change