medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.03.04.21252466; this version posted March 8, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.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 .

Title: Impact of social support, loneliness & social isolation on sustained physical activity during the COVID-19 pandemic

Short title: *Social support and sustained physical activity during COVID-19 pandemic*

Verity Hailey*[1], Abi Fisher[1], Mark Hamer[2] and Daisy Fancourt[1]

[1] Department of Behavioural Science and Health, University College London, London, UK.

[2] Institute Sport Exercise & Health, Division Surgery & Interventional Science, University College London, London, UK

*Corresponding author information: Verity Hailey, UCL Department of Behavioural Science, 1-19 Torrington Place, London, WC1E 7HB, UK (e-mail: verity.hailey.18@ucl.ac.uk).

Abstract:

COVID-19 lockdown introduced substantial barriers to physical activity, providing a unique 'natural experiment' to understand the social factors associated with sustained physical activity. Longitudinal data from the COVID-19 Social Study was used to identify a sample of participants who maintained their physical activity despite lockdown. 16% were consistently active while 44% were completely inactive. After adjustment for multiple confounders high social support was associated with a 39% (95% CI, 12-74%) increased odds of sustaining physical activity. Association between physical activity and loneliness and social isolation were not found. This study supports previous research showing the importance of social support for the long-term maintenance of physical activity behaviour but shows that such effects extend to contexts of social restrictions.

Keywords: Social support, loneliness, social isolation, physical activity, lockdown

NOTE: This preprint reports new research that has not been certified by peer review and should not be used to guide clinical practice.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/10.1101/2021.03.04.21252466; this version posted March 8, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.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 .

Data availability statement: Anonymous data will be made available following the end of the pandemic.

Acknowledgements: VH was funded by the ESRC-BBSRC Soc-B Centre for Doctoral Training, ES/P000347/1.

This Covid-19 Social Study was funded by the Nuffield Foundation [WEL/FR-000022583], but the views expressed are those of the authors and not necessarily the Foundation. The study was also supported by the MARCH Mental Health Network funded by the Cross-Disciplinary Mental Health Network Plus initiative supported by UK Research and Innovation [ES/S002588/1], and by the Wellcome Trust [221400/Z/20/Z]. DF was funded by the Wellcome Trust [205407/Z/16/Z]. The researchers are grateful for the support of a number of organisations with their recruitment efforts including: the UKRI Mental Health Networks, Find Out Now, UCL BioResource, SEO Works, FieldworkHub, and Optimal Workshop. The study was also supported by HealthWise Wales, the Health and Care Research Wales initiative, which is led by Cardiff University in collaboration with SAIL, Swansea University.

The funders had no final role in the study design; in the collection, analysis and interpretation of data; in the writing of the report; or in the decision to submit the paper for publication. All researchers listed as authors are independent from the funders and all final decisions about the research were taken by the investigators and were unrestricted.

The research questions in the UCL COVID-19 Social Study built on patient and public involvement as part of the UKRI MARCH Mental Health Research Network, which focuses on social, cultural and community engagement and mental health. This highlighted priority research questions and measures for this study. Patients and the public were additionally involved in the recruitment of participants to the study and are actively involved in plans for the dissemination of findings from the study.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.03.04.21252466; this version posted March 8, 2021. 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 response to COVID-19 countries across the world implemented quarantine strategies such as lockdowns, curfews, restrictions on non-essential travel and social distancing in an attempt to reduce spread of the virus (Füzéki, Groneberg and Banzer, 2020). The strategies put in place to control the pandemic are likely to have impacted the level and patterns of physical activity (Ammar *et al.*, 2020; Chtourou *et al.*, 2020; Constant *et al.*, 2020), with potential harmful effects on physical and mental health (Füzéki, Groneberg and Banzer, 2020). For example, in the UK, gyms, leisure facilities and sports clubs were closed, affecting many usual exercise behaviours (UK Government, 2020). The pandemic also led to major changes in commuter patterns, with people working from home, furloughed or losing work, reducing active commuting (Office for National Statistics, 2020). Further, schools and childcare centres were closed, so home-based caring responsibilities increased for many, again decreasing the need to walk or travel (UK Government, 2020). Results from a systematic review of 66 articles looking at changes in physical activity during the COVID-19 pandemic showed the impact of such policies, with the majority of studies reporting a decrease in physical activity (Stockwell *et al.*, 2021). However, despite these restrictions, time outside to exercise was allowed. Although limited to once a day during the strictest lockdown, engaging in daily exercise was encouraged and meeting recommended daily activity levels was possible. Yet not everybody engaged in regular physical activity. The pandemic restrictions therefore provide a 'natural experiment' to explore social determinants of physical activity behaviour. Identifying factors that are associated with successfully sustaining sufficient levels of activity despite significant barriers could help inform interventions and future pandemic responses.

To date, several studies have focused on *individual predictors* of decreases in physical activity. A UK smartphone-based tracking study with 5395 participants found a larger drop in physical activity during the lockdown amongst younger people and those who had been active prior to lockdown (McCarthy, Potts and Fisher, 2021); a finding echoed in a study of 532 Australian students (Gallo *et*

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.03.04.21252466; this version posted March 8, 2021. 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 .

al., 2020). However, other studies have found contrary results. A cross sectional online study in Belgium (n=13515) reported that those aged <55 years and were inactive prior to lockdown were likely to exercise more and those who had been active previously reported a reduction in exercise (Constandt *et al.*, 2020). Of note, the mode of usual exercise appeared to be a key factor, with those who usually exercised with friends/sports clubs and who did not engage with online exercise tools reporting a reduction in exercise (Constandt *et al.*, 2020). However, so far, the majority of studies exploring predictors of changes in physical activity have been cross-sectional in nature and used a limited number of variables as predictors.

In particular, there is a lack of data to date exploring how individual social factors could have affected changes in physical activity during the pandemic. *Social support* (defined as the extent to which individuals perceive those around them are available to them and are attentive to their needs (Zysberg and Zisberg, 2020)) has been associated with a positive effect on physical activity participation (Scarapicchia *et al.*, 2017) and sustained physical activity prior to the COVID-19 pandemic (Lindsay Smith *et al.*, 2017). Social support may be particularly important during the pandemic as it plays a key role in general well-being and is a strong predictor of resilience following a disaster (Saltzman, Hansel and Bordnick, 2020) (Saltzman, Hansel and Bordnick, 2020). Specifically, social support may serve as a 'buffer', providing emotional and psychological support, which is considered a major factor in maintaining well-being and coping with health challenges (Zysberg and Zisberg, 2020). Although the importance of social support has yet to be explored in relation to physical activity during the pandemic, there is evidence that it might influence other health behaviours. For example, a cross sectional study of changes in alcohol consumption in 1,958 US university students after campus closed showed those with greater perceived social support reported less alcohol consumption than those with lower social support (Lechner *et al.*, 2020).

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.03.04.21252466; this version posted March 8, 2021. 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 .

Other social factors, including *social isolation* and *loneliness*, have also been related to physical activity pre pandemic and levels may have increased as a result of lockdown restrictions. Social isolation and loneliness are distinct from, although related to, social support. While social isolation refers to a lack of social contact with others, loneliness refers to the perception that one's social contact is insufficient to meet one's emotional needs (Smith *et al.*, 2020). Social isolation has been shown to have a negative effect on the amount of overall physical activity, with an increase in social isolation directly related to reduced physical activity (Steptoe *et al.*, 2013 Schrempft *et al.*, 2019). Loneliness has also been identified as an independent risk factor for a reduction in activity and discontinuation of physical activity (Hawkley, Thisted and Cacioppo, 2009).

During the COVID-19 pandemic, social factors such as social isolation, loneliness and social support have all been affected. Quarantine and social distancing have led to elevated levels of loneliness and social isolation (Hwang *et al.*, 2020). Cross sectional results from the UK based COVID-19 Psychological Wellbeing Study showed that rates of loneliness where high with a prevalence of 27% during the initial phase of lockdown (Groarke *et al.*, 2020), with the COVID-19 Social Study reporting a prevalence of 14% for severe loneliness, which remained relatively stable throughout the lockdown (Bu, Steptoe and Fancourt, 2020). There is some preliminary data to suggest that changes in *social restrictions* may have affected physical activity. Available data from a longitudinal smartphone-based tracking study found that Italy, which implemented strict lockdown measures, saw a 48.7% decrease in mean daily step counts, while Sweden, which did not implement lockdown, saw just a 6.9% decrease (Tison Geoffrey H, 2020). Further studies using techniques such as international online surveys have also found self-reported decreases in all levels of activity (walking, moderate and vigorous) following the instigation of lockdowns (Ammar *et al.*, 2020). However, whether changes in individual-level experiences of social factors such as isolation, loneliness and social support have affected physical activity remains unknown. Therefore, the aims of this study were to identify the proportion of people who successfully sustained physical activity during

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.03.04.21252466; this version posted March 8, 2021. 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 .

lockdown and to explore whether social support, loneliness and social isolation were associated with maintenance of physical activity during COVID-19 lockdown. We hypothesized that high social support would be favourably associated with physical activity, but loneliness and social isolation would have a negative impact on sustained activity.

Methods

Study design and participants. Data was used from the COVID-19 Social Study, a large scale longitudinal panel study of adults (aged ≥18 years) living in the United Kingdom during the COVID-19 pandemic (Fancourt, Steptoe and Bu, 2020). The study is not random and therefore not representative of the UK population but contains a heterogeneous sample (Fancourt, Steptoe and Bu, 2020). Recruitment was undertaken using three primary approaches. Firstly, the study was promoted through existing networks (mailing lists, print/digital media coverage and social media), including UCL BioResourse, HealthWise Wales and the UKRI Mental Health Research Network. Second, targeted recruitment was undertaken using advertising and recruitment companies focusing on a) low-income backgrounds b) no, or low qualifications c) unemployed. Third, promotion via partnerships with third sector organisations to vulnerable groups e.g. older adults, carers, people with mental health conditions or those experiencing domestic violence/abuse. The study commenced on 21st March 2020, and 69,475 people completed at least one week of the 8 weeks included in this study (see supplementary table 1). Data collection was via a weekly online questionnaire, participation in the study required a valid email address and internet access. Baseline data was collected at week 1/wave 1 (wave 1 = the week participants join the study), there were repeated questions every week and one-off modules on a variety of topics. Due to online data collection, the study required completion of every question on every page for participants to submit their data. The study was approved by UCL Research Ethics Committee (12467/005), with all participants giving informed consent.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.03.04.21252466; this version posted March 8, 2021. 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 .

Full documentation of data collection protocol is available at www.covidsocialstudy.org/results

Measures

Dependent variable

Physical activity. Physical activity was self-reported on a weekly basis. Self-report questionnaires are the most commonly method of physical activity assessment: they are easy and accurate at measuring intense activity although less robust at measuring light to moderate activity. They are more reliable at reporting population rather than individual level activity. (Sylvia *et al.*, 2014). Participants were asked to focus on the last weekday (e.g. Monday to Friday) and report time spent doing three different levels of physical activity. The three categories were; gentle physical activity (e.g. walking), moderate or high intensity activity (e.g. running, cycling, swimming) or exercise inside your home or garden (e.g. yoga, weights, indoor exercise). Time spent doing the different activities was reported as; none, <30 mins, 30mins-2 hours, 3-5 hours and 6+ hours. Current WHO and UK guidance recommend adults should aim to be active daily and achieve 150minutes of moderate activity per week. (www.nhs.uk/live-well/exercise/).

Taking the description of moderate activity into account, the moderate/high intensity and in-home activity categories were combined to identify all those who would have achieved moderate activity levels. Those who reported <30mins the previous working day were felt unlikely to achieve the recommended 150mins/week and were designated as 'inactive', those who reported >30mins were 'active'. A description of long-term physical activity engagement was generated using a Physical Activity Pattern Index which consists of three ordered categories; inactive, intermittently active and active. This approach was similar to the one used by Janssen at al (2014); a longitudinal study that categorised physical activity levels of middle aged women over 15 years and explored autonomous motivation and self-efficacy with long-term patterns of physical activity behaviour (Janssen *et al.*, 2014). In this study participants were categorized as active or inactive at each of the 8 timepoints. Those who did not report active behaviour at any time point were classified as 'inactive, those

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.03.04.21252466; this version posted March 8, 2021. 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 .

categorised as 'active' 1-5 out of the 8 weeks were classified as 'intermittently active'. As maintenance of physical activity isn't a continuous behaviour, but a level that is significantly in the intended direction (Kwasnicka *et al.*, 2016) those categorised as 'active' 6-8 out of the 8 weeks (≥75%) were classified as 'active'. For statistical analysis the inactive and intermittent group were combined and called 'inactive' and compared with the 'active' group.

Independent variables

Social support. Social support was measured using the Perceived Social Support Questionnaire (F-SozU K-6) adapted for use in COVID-19 and reported weekly (see supplemental table 2). This is a 6-item questionnaire with a 5-point Likert scale ranging from 1=not at all, to, 5=very true. The scores for each measure were then summed to give a total ranging from 6 to 30, where the higher the score, indicates higher levels of social support. The questionnaire had excellent validity and reliability for perceived social support (Kliem *et al.*, 2015) with an internal consistency of 0.89 (Lin, Hirschfeld and Margraf, 2018) and a Cronbach's alpha of 0.86 (Labrague and De los Santos, 2020) reported in previous studies. Recent research (Labrague and De los Santos, 2020) looking at COVID-19 have grouped people into three levels of support, scores of 6-17 = low social support, 18-25 = normal social support and 26-30 = high social support. Categorisation into three levels of support is easier to interpret than a continuous scale of support. This categorisation was adopted in this study.

Loneliness. Loneliness was measured using the UCLA-3 loneliness scale, a short form of the Revised UCLA Loneliness Scale (UCLA-R) and reported weekly. It is designed to measure subjective feelings of loneliness as well as feelings of social isolation, it is reliable and has strong validity (Tull *et al.*, 2020). This is a 3-item scale, respondents were asked how often they felt (1) they lack companionship (2) left out (3) isolated from others. Frequencies ranged from hardly ever (assigned a score of 1), some of the time (assigned a score of 2) and often (assigned a score of 3). The scores of each scale were summed to give a score ranging from 3 to 9 where higher scores indicated higher

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.03.04.21252466; this version posted March 8, 2021. 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 .

levels of loneliness. Researchers in the past have grouped people into categories (Steptoe *et al.*, 2013), score of 3-5 = not lonely and scores of 6-9 = lonely.

Social isolation. Social isolation was measured weekly from week 4. Participants were asked what their current isolation status was in line with Government guidelines. Only those who selected that they were in full isolation, not leaving their home were categorised as socially isolated. Those leaving their home for any reason were not fully socially isolated due to potential interaction with others during essential activity permitted by the government.

Covariates

We included data on various demographics, including: gender (male/female), age (18-29, 30-45, 46-59, 60+), ethnicity (white vs Black, Asian, Minority Ethnic [BAME]), a household income of >£30,000 p/a (yes/no), university education (yes/no), employment (full-time, part-time employment or self-employed vs in education, unable to work, unemployed, homemaker or retired). Data were also collected on living alone (yes/no), urban living (living in a city or town vs living in a village or hamlet), physical health condition such as high blood pressure, diabetes, heart disease, lung disease, cancer (yes/no), having a diagnosed mental health condition including depression, anxiety or any other mental health problem (yes/no), carer status (yes/no), key worker (yes/no), active prior to lockdown (undertaking moderate to vigorous physical activity for ≥15 minutes on 5-7 days in the week prior to lockdown vs on just 0-4 days in the week prior to lockdown).

Statistical Analysis

Analysis were carried out using Stata 14.0 (StataCorp, College Station, TX). Participants that completed weeks 1 to 8 were included in our analysis.

We examined baseline characteristics of the total population and the two subsamples of active and inactive participants. Chi-squared test was used to identify differences between those that

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.03.04.21252466; this version posted March 8, 2021. 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 .

completed the full 1-8 weeks data collection and those that completed only weeks 1-4. Levels of social support, loneliness and social isolation were examined in relation to physical activity status. For the purpose of analysis, physical activity and covariables were each dichotomized. Physical activity was categorised as inactive and active after review of the Physical Activity Index. The original inactive and intermittent groups were merged into the inactive group due to the high number of participants (23%) in the 'intermittent' category who were active for 1-2 weeks and were therefore mostly inactive. Logistic regressions were performed in which physical activity was regressed individually onto all covariables; demographic (gender, age, ethnicity, income, education level & employment status), health (physical health condition, mental health condition, active prior to lockdown), living condition (lives alone, urban living) and other (carer or key worker). Logistic regression was performed in which physical activity with loneliness, physical activity with social support, and physical activity with social isolation were regressed on 4 models to identify if they influenced physical activity behavior. Model 1 adjusting for age and gender, model 2 additionally adjusting ethnicity, employment, income and education, model 3 additionally adjusting for physical and mental health conditions, model 4 additionally adjusting for active prior to lockdown.

Results

Descriptive analysis 14485 participants completed the first 4 weeks (weeks 1-4) and 6906 (48%) participants completed the full 8 weeks of lockdown data collection and comprised the sample for analysis in the current study. Participant characteristics are presented in table 1. 74% were female, mean age was 52.7 years (95% CI 52.4 – 53.1) and 96% were white. The sample were well educated with 70% achieving degree level or above education, 60% were employed, and 60% reported a higher income above £30k threshold. Key workers accounted for 20% of the participants and 15% were carers. 52% reported a chronic long-term health condition, 42% stating a physical health condition and 17% a mental health condition, 25% reported being active prior to lockdown. Gender, education, and carer responsibility did not have an effect on study response rate. Significant

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.03.04.21252466; this version posted March 8, 2021. 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 .

determinants of non-response were found to be, younger age, BAME ethnicity, being a high earner, living in an urban environment, being employed or a key worker, living with others, having any chronic health condition (less likely to complete with mental health condition and more likely to complete having a physical health condition), and being less active prior to lockdown.

Table 1: Baseline characteristics of participants (n=6906) who completed data collection weeks 1-8

Variable	Total Sample (n = 6906)		Active (n = 1115)		Inactive (n = 5791)	
	n	%	n	%	n	%
Gender						
Female	5,116	74.1	849	76.1	4267	74.7
Male	1758	25.5	262	23.9	1466	25.3
Age category						
18-29	438	6.3	77	6.9	361	6.2
30-45	1,762	25.5	312	28	1450	24
46-59	2,206	31.9	367	32.9	1839	31.8
60+	2,500	36.2	359	32.2	2141	37
Ethnicity						
White	6,652	96.3	1058	94.9	5594	197
BAME	254	3.7	57	5.1	96.6	5.1
Income						
>£30K/year	3726	59.9	701	70.6	3025	57.9
<£30K/year	2,493	40.1	292	29.4	2201	42.1
Education level						
Degree or above	4804	69.6	872	78.2	3932	67.9
None/ high school	2,102	30.4	243	21.8	1859	32.1
Employed						
Yes	4,109	59.5	723	64.8	3386	58.5
No	2,797	40.5	392	35.2	2405	41.5
Key worker						
Yes	1,359	19.7	200	17.9	1159	20
No	5,547	80.3	915	82.1	4632	80
Carer						
Yes	1,065	15.4	164	14.7	901	15.6
No	5,841	84.6	951	85.3	4890	84.4
Lives alone						
Yes	1,546	22.4	219	19.6	1327	22.9
No	5,360	77.6	896	80.4	4464	77.1
Urban living						
Yes	5,333	77.2	894	80.2	4439	76.7
No	1,573	22.8	221	19.8	1352	23.3
Chronic health condition						
Yes	3,591	52	410	36.8	2905	50.2
No	3,315	48	705	63.3	2886	49.8
Physical health condition						
Yes	2,924	42.3	344	30.9	2580	44.6

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.03.04.21252466; this version posted March 8, 2021. 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 .

No	3,982	57.7	771	69.1	3211	55.4
Mental health condition						
Yes	1,152	16.7	129	11.6	1023	17.7
No	5,754	83.3	986	88.4	4768	82.3
Active prior to lockdown						
Yes	1746	25.3	531	47.6	1215	21
No	5,160	74.7	584	52.3	4576	79

Table 2. Number of active weeks and Physical Activity Index

Number of active weeks	Number of participants	Total group %	Within category %
Inactive N=3043 (44.1%)			
0	3043	44.1%	100%
Intermittently active N=2748 (39.8%)			
1	964	14%	36%
2	629	9.1%	23%
3	398	5.8%	14%
4	436	6.3%	15%
5	321	4.6%	12%
Consistently active N=1115 (16.1%)			
6	348	5%	31%
7	375	5.4%	34%
8	392	5.7%	35%
Total	**6906**	**100**	

The physical activity index, see table 2, shows that 44% of participants were inactive, 40% were intermittently active and 16% were consistently active. Within the intermittently active group, the majority (59%) were active for only 1 or 2 weeks. Fewest of the intermittent group (12%) were active for 5 weeks. Within the active group, there was a fairly even split of those active for 6, 7 or 8 weeks. Table 2 provides full details of physical activity index and within category results.

Association with persistent physical activity behaviour, with no adjustment for covariates, was found with social support, being BAME, higher income, being employed, having a university level education. Factors that were adversely associated with physical activity included loneliness, social isolation, living alone, having a physical or mental health condition, being active prior to lockdown and being aged 60+ (table 3).

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.03.04.21252466; this version posted March 8, 2021. 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 .

Social support

There was an association between physical activity and social support. Of those who were active, 14% had low social support, 41% had medium support and 45% had high support. Those who were inactive, 20% had low support, 44% had medium and 36% had high support. Logistic regression demonstrated an increase in likelihood of being active amongst individuals with both medium and high support (table 3). High social support continued to be positively associated with physical activity OR 1.39 (95% CI 1.12 – 1.74) p=0.003 even when accounting for all demographic, health-related factors and other covariates. Medium social support was only associated when accounting for age and gender OR 1.71 (95% CI 1.41 – 2.08) p=0.009 and then lost with the addition of further covariates.

Loneliness

There was a reduction in likelihood of being active amongst people who were lonely, OR 0.82 (95% CI 0.71 – 0.95) p=0.007. Loneliness remained associated with physical activity after accounting for age and gender, OR 0.79 (95% CI 0.69 – 0.92) p=0.002, although the association was attenuated after further covariate adjustments (table 4).

Social isolation

In unadjusted models there was an association between isolation and lower odds of regular physical activity OR 0.72 (95% CI 0.02 – 0.55) p=0.017. This association was retained after accounting for age and gender, 0.76 (95% CI 0.58 – 0.99) p=0.041, although attenuated in further models (table 4).

Table 3. Results from Logistic regression of individual covariates and sustained physical activity

Physical Activity	
Variable	Odds ratio (95% CI)
Social support	
Low	Reference
medium	1.31 (1.08 – 1.59)**

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.03.04.21252466; this version posted March 8, 2021. 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 .

high	1.74 (1.44 – 2.11)***
Loneliness	
low	Reference
high	0.82 (0.71 – 0.95)**
Social isolation (>wk 4)	
No	Reference
Yes	0.72 (0.02 – 0.55)*
Gender	
Male	Reference
female	1.14 (0.98 – 1.32)
Age	
18-29	0.99 (0.75 – 1.3)
30-45	Reference
46-59	0.93 (0.79 – 1.09)
60+	0.77 (0.19 – 0.92)**
Ethnicity	
White	Reference
BAME	1.53 (1.13 – 2.07)**
High income	
No	Reference
Yes	1.75 (1.51 – 2.02)***
Employed	
No	Reference
Yes	1.31 (1.14 – 1.5)***
University education	
No	Reference
Yes	1.7 (1.46 –1.98)***
Lives alone	
No	Reference
Yes	0.82 (0.7 – 0.96)*
Urban environment	
No	Reference
Yes	1.23 (1.05 – 1.44)*
Physical health condition	
No	Reference
Yes	0.56 (0.48 – 0.64)***
Mental health condition	
No	Reference
Yes	0.61 (0.5 – 0.74)***
Carer	
No	Reference
Yes	0.94 (0.78 – 1.12)
Key worker	
No	Reference
Yes	0.87 (0.74 – 1.03)
Active prior to lockdown	
No	Reference
Yes	3.42 (3-3.91)***

***P<0.05; **P<0.01; ***P<0.001**

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.03.04.21252466; this version posted March 8, 2021. 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 .

Table 4. Results from logistic regression analyses of sustained physical activity and loneliness, social support, social isolation. N=6906.

Physical Activity	
Variable	**Odds ratio (95% CI)**
Social support	
Model 1	
medium	1.29 (1.07 – 1.57)**
high	1.71 (1.41 – 2.08)***
Model 2	
medium	1.18 (0.96 – 1.46)
high	1.54 (1.24 – 1.9)***
Model 3	
medium	1.12 (0.91 – 1.38)
high	1.42 (1.15 – 1.76)**
Model 4	
medium	1.14 (0.92 – 1.42)
high	1.39 (1.12 – 1.74)**
Loneliness	
Model 1	
low	Reference
high	0.79 (0.69 – 0.92)**
Model 2	
low	Reference
high	0.86 (0.74 – 1.00)
Model 3	
low	Reference
high	0.93 (0.8 – 1.09)
Model 4	
low	Reference
high	0.95 (0.81- 1.12)
Social isolation	
Model 1	
No	Reference
Yes	0.76 (0.58 – 0.99)*
Model 2	
No	Reference
Yes	0.84 (0.62 – 1.13)
Model 3	
No	Reference
Yes	1.01 (0.74 – 1.37)
Model 4	
No	Reference
Yes	1.24 (0.91 – 1.69)

***P<0.05; **P<0.01; ***P<0.001** Model 1: adjusted for age and gender. Model 2: additionally adjusted for ethnicity, employment status, income and education. Model 3: additionally adjusted for chronic physical and mental health conditions. Model 4: additionally adjusted for active prior to lockdown

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.03.04.21252466; this version posted March 8, 2021. 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 .

Discussion

Management of COVID-19 has created barriers for how people interact and maintain physical activity. In this large UK-wide study of adults we identified a sub-sample of participants that were able to maintain their physical activity despite restrictions. Those with high social support had a 39% increased odds of sustaining physical activity during lockdown. However, although associations between loneliness and social isolation and decreased odds of sustaining physical activity during lockdown were observed in minimally-adjusted models, this association was lost after adjusting for wider covariates.

When looking cross-sectionally at the data, levels of self-reported physical activity in our study are similar to those from other UK sources. For example, Sport England (2020) reported that 32% of adults were meeting the guidelines of 150mins/week of moderate to vigorous physical activity in the last week of April 2020, whilst our study reported 26% active for the same week. Such levels are concerning in themselves as they are lower than the estimated 63-66% of adults who met aerobic guidelines prior to COVID-19 (Sport England, 2020). However, our study built on previously-reported cross-sectional data by showing that just 16% of adults analysed maintained recommended levels of physical activity throughout lockdown, 44% were inactive and a further 23% were active for 1-2 weeks. This demonstrates the difference in those meeting the guidance when looking cross-sectionally compared to longitudinally and suggests that the number of people who were consistently active during the first UK lockdown was substantially lower than the cross-sectional reports. It is well known that not achieving the recommended levels of aerobic exercise is associated with poor physical health, poor mental health and premature mortality (Füzéki, Groneberg and Banzer, 2020). So this finding alone suggests that more work needs to be done on supporting people during COVID-19 and potential future pandemics to meet physical activity guidelines on a regular basis in order to get maximum benefit from the activity.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.03.04.21252466; this version posted March 8, 2021. 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 .

Our study also explored what predicted the likelihood of an individual engaging in sustained physical activity across lockdown. Being white, well educated, a high earner, urban living and good health status are all well-known predictors of physical activity (Bauman *et al.*, 2012; Smith *et al.*, 2015). Any form of health condition, physical or mental health and older age, are associated with a lower likelihood of being active (Smith *et al.*, 2015). Our findings were broadly in line with these pre COVID-19 predictors. However, although female gender would normally have a negative impact on physical activity (Smith *et al.*, 2015), this was not been seen in our data, with more women (17%) remaining active then men (15%).

We also focused specifically on social predictors of sustained physical activity. Social support was found to be a consistent predictor but loneliness and isolation were only associated in less-adjusted statistical models. The reasons for this may have been both direct and indirect. Directly, theories that are commonly used in physical activity interventions e.g. Social Cognitive Theory, Theory of Planned Behaviour, Socio Ecological Model, and Health Belief all contain social support as a key factor in affecting behaviours (Lindsay Smith *et al.*, 2017). The findings reported here suggest that even during social restrictions when such support may be disrupted from usual patterns (e.g. offered virtually rather than face-to-face), social support remains a key influencer of physical activity behaviours. Indirectly, it is also possible that social support may have played a role in buffering against the negative effects of poor mental health on physical activity during the pandemic. There is a large literature showing how mental health was adversely affected during the first UK lockdown (Fancourt, Steptoe and Bu, 2021). Poor mental health is associated with lower physical activity engagement (Shor and Shalev, 2016). But research during the pandemic suggested that social interactions helped to reduce the experience of depressive symptoms, supporting the findings presented here (Sommerlad *et al.*, 2020). While the pandemic may have led to rises in loneliness and social isolation, this was situational due to lockdown. Chronic or prolonged social isolation and loneliness has a known negative impact on health and wellbeing (Groarke *et al.*, 2020), but it is possible that short-term loneliness and isolation do not have the same effect. Should there be

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.03.04.21252466; this version posted March 8, 2021. 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 .

multiple lockdowns there is potential for the increased rates of loneliness to become chronic leading to it having an impact on physical activity.

The strengths of the study include its longitudinal design. It allows for multiple data points and for us to identify those participants who maintained their physical activity throughout lockdown. The sample provided information on a range of demographic factors, health conditions and social factors in addition to physical activity behaviours which has given us a unique opportunity to look at social isolation along with social support and loneliness. Limitations of the study include non-random sampling approach leading to a less representative sample of the UK population. As with many studies, participants were highly educated, white and female. The study used self-reported measure of physical activity leaving it open to reporting bias e.g. imprecise recall. Attempts were made to minimise this by providing examples of common types of exercise with corresponding intensities. This study looks at those who have remained active throughout lockdown, we are not aware of similar data published anywhere else looking at sustained activity.

The potential for multiple lockdowns over extended periods of time could cause prolonged periods of low physical activity for a substantial proportion of the population leading to increased risk of issues with physical and mental health. This study supports previous research showing the importance of social support for the long-term maintenance of physical activity behaviour but shows that such effects extend to contexts of social restrictions, with much more consistent results than for other types of social factors including loneliness and social isolation. The development of interventions and programs to support physical activity both during and outside of pandemic situations should ensure that social support is built in using theories that have shown to promote regular physical activity participation.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.03.04.21252466; this version posted March 8, 2021. 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 .

Declaration of conflicting interests

The authors declare that there is no conflict of interest

ORCID iDs

References

Ammar, A. *et al.* (2020) 'Effects of COVID-19 Home Confinement on Eating Behaviour and Physical Activity: Results of the', *Nutrients*, 12(1583), p. 13.

Bauman, A. E. *et al.* (2012) 'Correlates of physical activity: Why are some people physically active and others not?', *The Lancet*, 380(9838), pp. 258–271. doi: 10.1016/S0140-6736(12)60735-1.

Bu, F., Steptoe, A. and Fancourt, D. (2020) 'Loneliness during lockdown: Trajectories and predictors during the COVID-19 pandemic in 35,712 adults in the UK', *medRxiv*. doi: 10.1101/2020.05.29.20116657.

Chtourou, H. *et al.* (2020) 'Staying physically active during the quarantine and self-isolation period for controlling and mitigating the covid-19 pandemic: A systematic overview of the literature', *Frontiers in Psychology*, 11(August). doi: 10.3389/fpsyg.2020.01708.

Constandt, B. *et al.* (2020) 'Exercising in times of lockdown: An analysis of the impact of COVID-19 on levels and patterns of exercise among adults in Belgium', *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health*, 17(11), pp. 1–10. doi: 10.3390/ijerph17114144.

Constant, A. *et al.* (2020) 'Socio-Cognitive Factors Associated With Lifestyle Changes in Response to the COVID-19 Epidemic in the General Population: Results From a Cross-Sectional Study in France', *Frontiers in Psychology*, 11(September), pp. 1–9. doi: 10.3389/fpsyg.2020.579460.

Fancourt, D., Steptoe, A. and Bu, F. (2020) 'Trajectories of depression and anxiety during enforced isolation due to COVID-19: longitudinal analyses of 59,318 adults in the UK with and without

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.03.04.21252466; this version posted March 8, 2021. 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 .

diagnosed mental illness', *medRxiv*, p. 2020.06.03.20120923. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.06.03.20120923.

Fancourt, D., Steptoe, A. and Bu, F. (2021) 'Trajectories of anxiety and depressive symptoms during enforced isolation due to COVID-19 in England: a longitudinal observational study', *The Lancet Psychiatry*, 8(2), pp. 141–149. doi: 10.1016/S2215-0366(20)30482-X.

Füzéki, E., Groneberg, D. A. and Banzer, W. (2020) 'Physical activity during COVID-19 induced lockdown: Recommendations', *Journal of Occupational Medicine and Toxicology*, 15(1), pp. 1–5. doi: 10.1186/s12995-020-00278-9.

Gallo, L. A. *et al.* (2020) 'The impact of isolation measures due to COVID-19 on energy intake and physical activity levels in Australian university students', *medRxiv*. doi: 10.1101/2020.05.10.20076414.

Groarke, J. M. *et al.* (2020) 'Loneliness in the UK during the COVID-19 pandemic: Cross-sectional results from the COVID-19 Psychological Wellbeing Study', *PLOS ONE*. Edited by M. Murakami, 15(9), p. e0239698. doi: 10.1371/journal.pone.0239698.

Hawkley, L. C., Thisted, R. A. and Cacioppo, J. T. (2009) 'Loneliness Predicts Reduced Physical Activity: Cross-Sectional & Longitudinal Analyses', *Health Psychology*, 28(3), pp. 354–363. doi: 10.1037/a0014400.

Hwang, T. J. *et al.* (2020) 'Loneliness and social isolation during the COVID-19 pandemic', *International Psychogeriatrics*, 32(10), pp. 1217–1220. doi: 10.1017/S1041610220000988.

Janssen, I. *et al.* (2014) 'Correlates of 15-year maintenance of physical activity in middle-aged women.', *International journal of behavioral medicine*, 21(3), pp. 511–518. doi: 10.1007/s12529-013-9324-z.

Kliem, S. *et al.* (2015) 'A brief form of the Perceived Social Support Questionnaire (F-SozU) was developed, validated, and standardized', *Journal of Clinical Epidemiology*, 68(5), pp. 551–562. doi:

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.03.04.21252466; this version posted March 8, 2021. 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 .

10.1016/j.jclinepi.2014.11.003.

Kwasnicka, D. *et al.* (2016) 'Theoretical explanations for maintenance of behaviour change: a systematic review of behaviour theories', *Health Psychology Review*, 10(3), pp. 277–296. doi: 10.1080/17437199.2016.1151372.

Labrague, L. J. and De los Santos, J. A. A. (2020) 'COVID-19 anxiety among front-line nurses: Predictive role of organisational support, personal resilience and social support', *Journal of Nursing Management*, 28(7), pp. 1653–1661. doi: 10.1111/jonm.13121.

Lechner, W. V. *et al.* (2020) 'Changes in alcohol use as a function of psychological distress and social support following COVID-19 related University closings', *Addictive Behaviors*, 110(June), p. 106527. doi: 10.1016/j.addbeh.2020.106527.

Lin, M., Hirschfeld, G. and Margraf, J. (2018) 'Psychological Assessment Brief Form of the Perceived Social Support Questionnaire (F-SozU K-6): Validation , Norms , and Cross-Cultural Measurement Invariance in the', *American Psychological Association*.

Lindsay Smith, G. *et al.* (2017) 'The association between social support and physical activity in older adults: A systematic review', *International Journal of Behavioral Nutrition and Physical Activity*, 14(1), pp. 1–21. doi: 10.1186/s12966-017-0509-8.

McCarthy, H., Potts, H. W. W. and Fisher, A. (2021) 'Physical Activity Behavior Before, During, and After COVID-19 Restrictions: Longitudinal Smartphone-Tracking Study of Adults in the United Kingdom', *Journal of Medical Internet Research*, 23(2), p. e23701. doi: 10.2196/23701.

Office for National Statistics (2020) 'Coronavirus and travel to work: June 2020', (June), pp. 1–22.

Saltzman, L. Y., Hansel, T. C. and Bordnick, P. S. (2020) 'Loneliness, Isolation, and Social Support Factors in Post-COVID-19 Mental Health', *Psychological Trauma: Theory, Research, Practice, and Policy*, 12, pp. 55–57. doi: 10.1037/tra0000703.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.03.04.21252466; this version posted March 8, 2021. 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 .

Scarapicchia, T. M. F. *et al.* (2017) 'Social support and physical activity participation among healthy adults: A systematic review of prospective studies', *International Review of Sport and Exercise Psychology*, 10(1), pp. 50–83. doi: 10.1080/1750984X.2016.1183222.

Schrempft, S. *et al.* (2019) 'Associations between social isolation, loneliness, and objective physical activity in older men and women', *BMC Public Health*, 19(1), pp. 1–10. doi: 10.1186/s12889-019-6424-y.

Shor, R. and Shalev, A. (2016) 'Barriers to involvement in physical activities of persons with mental illness', *Health Promotion International*, 31(1), pp. 116–123. doi: 10.1093/heapro/dau078.

Smith, K. J. *et al.* (2020) 'The association between loneliness, social isolation and inflammation: A systematic review and meta-analysis', *Neuroscience and Biobehavioral Reviews*, 112(September 2019), pp. 519–541. doi: 10.1016/j.neubiorev.2020.02.002.

Smith, L. *et al.* (2015) 'Patterns and correlates of physical activity behaviour over 10 years in older adults: Prospective analyses from the English Longitudinal Study of Ageing', *BMJ Open*, 5(4), pp. 1–5. doi: 10.1136/bmjopen-2014-007423.

Sommerlad, A. *et al.* (2020) 'Social relationships and depression during the COVID-19 lockdown: Longitudinal analysis of the COVID-19 social study', *medRxiv*. doi: 10.1101/2020.12.01.20241950.

Sport England (2020) *SURVEY INTO ADULT PHYSICAL ACTIVITY ATTITUDES AND BEHAVIOUR*. Available at: https://www.sportengland.org/news/new-exercise-habits-forming-during-coronavirus-crisis.

Steptoe, A. *et al.* (2013) 'Social isolation, loneliness, and all-cause mortality in older men and women', *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America*, 110(15), pp. 5797–5801. doi: 10.1073/pnas.1219686110.

Stockwell, S. *et al.* (2021) 'Changes in physical activity and sedentary behaviours from before to during the COVID-19 pandemic lockdown: a systematic review', pp. 1–8. doi: 10.1136/bmjsem-

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.03.04.21252466; this version posted March 8, 2021. 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 .

2020-000960.

Sylvia, L. G. *et al.* (2014) 'Practical guide to measuring physical activity', *Journal of the Academy of Nutrition and Dietetics*, 114(2), pp. 199–208. doi: 10.1016/j.jand.2013.09.018.

Tison Geoffrey H (2020) 'Annals of Internal Medicine Worldwide Effect of COVID-19 on Physical Activity': , *Annals of Internal Medicine of internal*, (March), pp. 1–3.

Tull, M. T. *et al.* (2020) 'Psychological Outcomes Associated with Stay-at-Home Orders and the Perceived Impact of COVID-19 on Daily Life', *Psychiatry Research*, 289(April), p. 113098. doi: 10.1016/j.psychres.2020.113098.

UK Government (2020) *COVID-19 restrictions, UK Government*. Available at: https://www.gov.uk/government/speeches/pm-address-to-the-nation-on-coronavirus-23-march-2020 (Accessed: 3 February 2020).

Zysberg, L. and Zisberg, A. (2020) 'Days of worry: Emotional intelligence and social support mediate worry in the COVID-19 pandemic', *Journal of Health Psychology*. doi: 10.1177/1359105320949935.