Cultural engagement is related to decelerated physiological but not subjective age: doubly-robust estimations in a national cohort study

Daisy Fancourt[1], Saoirse Finn[1], Hei Wan Mak[1], Andrew Steptoe[1], Mikaela Bloomberg[2]

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

[2] Department of Epidemiology and Public Health, University College London

* Corresponding author: Prof Daisy Fancourt, 1-19 Torrington Place, London WC1E 7HB, d.fancourt@ucl.ac.uk

Abstract

Cultural engagement (e.g. going to live music events, museums, galleries, theatre performances, and the cinema) is longitudinally associated in repeated epidemiological studies with age-related mental and physical health outcomes. However, it is unclear whether it also influences how fast older adults age psychologically and physically – so-called age acceleration. This study aimed to ascertain whether regular cultural engagement amongst older adults is related to slower physiological and subjective ageing using a previously-derived physiological age index and a doubly-robust estimation approach to account for confounders. Using older adults from the English Longitudinal Study of Ageing (n=4,467), we found that cultural engagement was related to lower physiological age cross-sectionally (average treatment effect -2.17; 95% CI-3.48 to-0.86), and 4 and 8 years later. The effect was seen consistently for all three types of cultural activity explored (going to the cinema, galleries, museums and exhibitions, and the theatre or live music events). However, cultural engagement was not related to subjective ageing. These analyses were robust to multiple sensitivity analyses, including considering alternative confounding structures, outliers, and treatment specification. Overall, these findings provide insight into how cultural engagement may be related to processes of ageing.

Introduction

The arts encompass a diverse range of human practices relating to the production or experience of human creativity and imagination, including actively participating in the arts (e.g. dance, music, crafts; hereafter "arts participation") and attending cultural events (e.g. going to live music events, museums, galleries, theatre performances, and the cinema; hereafter "cultural engagement"). Over the past two decades, increasing experimental and epidemiological research has identified diverse mental and physical health benefits that occur as a result of arts participation and cultural engagement, leading to calls for the arts to be formally recognised as a health behaviour.[1–3] Theoretically, such effects may occur due to the 'active ingredients' arts participation and cultural engagement comprise and the mechanisms of action these ingredients activate. From an ingredients perspective, arts and cultural engagement act as a vehicle to well-known salutogenic behaviours such as social interaction, physical activity and cognitive stimulation. But they also bring people into contact with other ingredients such as creativity, imagination, multi-sensory stimulation and aesthetics that are strongly expressed in the arts.[4] These ingredients synergistically activate diverse psychological, biological, social and behavioural mechanisms that lead to health-related outcomes.[5]

Focusing on cultural engagement specifically, amongst older adults, this behaviour has been longitudinally associated in repeated epidemiological studies with subsequent improvements in mental health and wellbeing, as well as reduced risk of developing age-related disability or impairment, chronic pain, frailty, chronic diseases like coronary heart disease, cognitive decline and dementia, and even premature mortality.[6–17] These results have been found independent of measured and unmeasured confounders, using diverse statistical approaches that each account for different types of bias, with some of these findings corroborated by experimental evidence.[18] However, while such evidence suggests that cultural engagement may positively influence age-related outcomes, what is less clear is whether it also influences how fast older adults age psychologically and physically – so-called age acceleration.

Over the past decade, there has been increasing interest in the use of biological ageing clocks that combine age-related molecular features and quantify discrepancies between chronological vs biological age, enabling the calculation of whether individuals are experiencing accelerated or decelerated ageing. Some ageing clocks focus on DNA methylation

data, while other clocks have been generated from downstream molecular phenotypes such as proteomic data and metabolomic data, or from broader clinical data.[19] Physiological clocks are an example of a downstream biological clock that combine phenotypic measures of blood-based biomarkers (e.g. fibrinogen, C-reactive protein and glycated haemoglobin) with tests of physiological function (e.g. grip strength, respiratory function, pulse pressure and blood pressure) that have been found to be valuable in predicting age-related pathology.[20,21] These types of clocks are of particular value as they are sometimes more strongly related to disease outcomes of interest than methylation-based clocks because they look at downstream impacts of cellular ageing more proximate to disease outcomes.[22] In previous work, we have generated and validated one such physiological clock and demonstrated that physiological age relative to chronological age predicts many of the same age-related outcomes that cultural engagement has been related to, including cardiovascular disease, aspects of frailty, cognitive dysfunction, dementia and mortality.[23] Significantly, in previous work relating deficits in social connections to this physiological clock, the strongest relationship with decelerated physiological age was for "social integration", which comprised behaviours such as community group membership, volunteering and cultural engagement.[24] However, as social integration is a broad index, it remains unclear whether cultural engagement could be one of the active drivers of the observed associations. This warrants further investigation given the benefits cultural engagement has been reported to have on mental and physical health in older adults.

In addition to its relationship with physiological processes of ageing, it is also plausible that cultural engagement helps individuals to maintain a feeling of "youthfulness", reducing their perceived or "subjective" age. Subjective age (asking an individual how old they feel) is a simple assessment of a complex phenomenon. How old someone feels is socially and culturally laden, reflecting factors such as social norms and personal desires. But it also reflects psychological and physiological processes, and these processes are related to maintaining good health and physical function. Psychologically, these processes include feelings of vitality, depression, wellbeing, optimism and self-esteem,[25–28] all of which are themselves related to lower risk of age-related morbidity and mortality.[29] Physiologically, these processes include a person's sense of their own functioning and capacity. Cultural engagement can influence aspects of both these processes, such as leading to higher life satisfaction, happiness, and life being worthwhile, as well as lower depressive symptoms, pain and better functioning.[6,8,10,30–33] Subjective age can actually be an important marker of ageing in its own right: people who feel younger than they are chronologically have lower mortality risk, even after controlling for existing health status.[25,34] As such, subjective age may provide a mental map of one's remaining life expectancy, providing complementary insight into ageing alongside more objective measures such as physiological ageing clocks. However, to date there have been no studies into whether cultural engagement relates to subjective age.

Consequently, this study aimed to ascertain whether regular cultural engagement amongst older adults is related to slower physiological and subjective ageing. Our primary analyses (RQ1) explored associations between an index of cultural engagement and age acceleration/deceleration (calculated as the gap between an individual's physiological/subjective age and their chronological age) both cross-sectionally and 4 and 8 years later. Our secondary analyses (RQ2) explored which type of cultural activity might be driving any potential associations. To improve causal inference, we designated a clear "treatment" group (i.e. those who engage regularly with cultural activities) and "control" group (i.e. those who never engage) and applied a doubly-robust estimation approach to account for the non-random treatment assignment.

Methods

Dataset

Data were derived from the English Longitudinal Study of Ageing (ELSA). ELSA is a large-scale panel study of people aged 50 and over and their partners, living in private households in England. The original sample was drawn from participants from the Health Survey in England (HSE) in 1998, 1999 and 2001.[35] The first wave of data collection commenced in 2002/2003, and participants have been followed biennially since. We used wave 2 (2004/5), as this wave included a rich battery of cultural and physiological variables of relevance, with longitudinal follow-up data from nurse visits at wave 4 (2008/9) and wave 6 (2012/13). ELSA receives ethical approval from the NHS Research Ethics Service.

We restricted participants to core ELSA members who had returned the self-completion questionnaire where most of our main variables of interest were measured (n=8,354), who were over the age of 50 (n=8,129), and who had full data on exposures and confounders (n=7,149). Within this sample, we followed a potential outcomes framework approach and defined our exposure (cultural engagement) as a hypothetical intervention.[36,37] So we designated our "treatment" group to be "attending one or more of the three cultural exposures every few months or more" (described further below; n=3,132) and a "control" group to be "never engaging" (n=1,335). We excluded participants who fell between these two thresholds of engagement (i.e. "less than once a year") in order to emulate the conditions of a randomised trial more

closely. This provided a total analytic sample size of n=4,467 (see Appendix 2 Supplementary Table 1 for sample size across waves).

Exposures

For cultural engagement, we used data from three questions asking participants' frequency of visits to (a) the cinema, (b) an art gallery, exhibition or museum, or (c) the theatre, concerts or opera. For our main outcome index, we considered the "treatment" group to be "attending one or more of the three cultural exposures every few months or more". We considered the "control" group to be those who were completely unengaged (i.e. "never engaging"). We also tested this independently for each activity. Sensitivity analyses tested other thresholds of overall cultural engagement.

Outcomes

Subjective age acceleration was derived by asking participants how old they felt (measured in years) and subtracting chronological age from this. As a result, negative scores indicate younger subjective age, and positive scores indicate older subjective age.

A **physiological age acceleration** measure (measured in years) was derived using the principal component analyses (PCA) method, an established method to measure physiological ageing.[38,39] It was created using clinical indicators pertaining to the cardiovascular system (pulse pressure and systolic blood pressure), respiratory system (forced vital capacity [FVC], forced expiratory volume in one second [FEV]), the inflammatory system (fibrinogen and C-reactive protein [CRP]), the circulatory system (haemoglobin concentration) and the musculoskeletal system (grip strength). All measures were taken at wave 2 in nurse visits (blood-based biomarkers and physiological testing). This index has previously been validated, published, and used in analyses in relation to other exposures.[23]

The full details of physiological age derivation using the PCA method are summarised in Figure 1 and Supplementary Materials (Appendix 1 and Supplementary Figures 1-2 in Appendix 3). To create the physiological age acceleration/deceleration measure, chronological age was subtracted from physiological age; an approach extensively used in previous research.[40–43] As in previous studies, this means that "accelerated physiological ageing" refers to a chronological age higher than a physiological age rather than necessarily imply a longitudinal change. Negative scores indicate decelerated ageing (younger physiological age relative to chronological age), and positive scores indicate accelerated ageing (older physiological age relative to chronological age). Analyses of this index show its association with incident functional and mobility limitations, memory impairment, and diverse chronic conditions in the ELSA study population indicating its relevance to ageing processes (Supplementary Table 2).

Figure 1: Derivation of physiological ageing index



Confounders

Factors identified as predicting both cultural engagement and physiological and subjective age were identified using directed acyclic graphs (DAGs) and included as covariates.[44] Demographic and socio-economic confounders included sex (male vs female), ethnicity (white vs minority ethnic groups), educational attainment (no educational qualifications or qualifications up to age 16 e.g., GCE/O-levels/national vocational qualification [NVQ] 2; qualifications at age 18 [e.g., A-levels]; and higher qualification [e.g., NVQ4/NVQ5/degree]), total non-pension wealth (which combines net financial and physical wealth plus net owner-occupied housing wealth; categorised in quintiles) [45], house ownership (whether individuals owned their property outright vs with a mortgage/renting/social housing/other), and employment (not working/retired/unemployed vs working full or part time).

For health and behavioural confounders, we only considered factors that were unlikely to lie on the causal pathway from cultural engagement to ageing, which precluded some behaviours known to be influenced by culture. For example, given cultural engagement provides physical activity through walking incurred in the process of attending events, we only included minimal adjustment for sedentary behaviours (categorised as not engaging in any kind of mild, moderate or vigorous activity in a week). We also measured alcohol consumption (more than 5 days a week vs less), whether participants currently smoked, and whether participants reported currently having a diagnosis of any long-term conditions, including cancer, arthritis, asthma, osteoporosis, Parkinson's disease, Alzheimer's disease or dementia, lung disease or cardiovascular disease (including high blood pressure, angina, a previous heart attack, heart failure, a heart murmur, an abnormal rhythm, diabetes, a previous stroke, high cholesterol, or other heart trouble). We additionally looked at the number of difficulties in carrying out activities of daily living that participants reported (ADLs; including dressing, bathing, eating, using a toilet, shopping, taking medications or making telephone calls), self-reported health (poor, fair, good, very good, excellent), BMI (<25, 25-30, ≥30 kg/m^2), and depression (using the Centre for Epidemiological Studies Depression (CES-D) scale, ≥3). However, as these are behaviours that have much stronger potential roles as partial mediators of effects, we tested the potential influence that including them had within model results in sensitivity analyses (outlined below).

Statistics

Data were analysed using doubly robust estimation using the inverse-probability-weighted regression adjustment (IPWRA) estimator. This involves building two models to account for the non-random treatment assignment: a regression adjustment model for the outcome and a treatment-assignment model for the exposure, only one of which has to be correctly specified, enhancing the robustness of the analysis.[46] A strength of this approach is that it provides two opportunities to make valid inferences, instead of just one. IPWRA estimators apply weighted regression coefficients to compute averages of treatment-level predicted outcomes, where the weights are the estimated inverse probabilities of treatment. Following our DAGs, confounders applied to both exposure and outcome were sex, ethnicity, education, wealth, home ownership, employment, physical inactivity, alcohol consumption, smoking, and chronic conditions. Problems with ADLs and self-reported health were additionally applied to the exposure, and BMI and depression to the outcome.

We estimated the average treatment effect in the population (ATE), which is the average difference in outcome if everyone in the population experienced the exposure, versus no-one in the population.[47] For all analyses, we applied probability weights for the self-completion questionnaire for wave 2 provided in the data, which account for complex sampling strategies and non-response. For RQ1, we looked at overall cultural engagement associations with physiological and subjective age cross-sectionally (at wave 2) and then both 4 (wave 4) and 8 (wave 6) years later. As we used doubly robust estimation, we ran these three analyses separately rather than in mixed models. For RQ2, we repeated the cross-sectional analyses for each type of cultural activity separately. Sample size was allowed to vary between analyses to maximise sample.

We also conducted several sensitivity analyses. First, we acknowledge that baseline adjustment of the outcome is controversial as it may lead to downward bias in the presence of residual autocorrelation or overcontrol bias, but equally leaving it out puts analyses at risk of omitted variable bias or overestimation of the effect of the exposure.[48,49] As such, our core analyses did not control for baseline physiological and subjective age, but a sensitivity analysis did adjust for physiological/subjective age four years earlier, providing insight into whether cultural engagement relates to *change* in subjective age acceleration over time. Second, depression and BMI could plausibly lie on the causal pathway from cultural engagement to accelerated ageing, so they were only included in the outcome confounder model, not the exposure confounder model, in the main analyses. However, a sensitivity analysis additionally accounted for depression and BMI within the exposure model. Third, in main analyses, the final sample was allowed to vary between analyses for subjective and physiological age to maximise power, but sensitivity analyses restricted the sample just to individuals who had both measures of physiological and subjective age. A fourth sensitivity analysis excluded anybody whose subjective or physiological age was more than 30 years above or below their chronological age to assess the stability of the findings without the influence of outliers. As doubly-robust estimations don't allow for polytomous exposures (as it works to emulate a trial design with treated and untreated groups), a fifth sensitivity analysis explored if results were stronger when using a more regular frequency of cultural engagement index (never versus monthly instead of every few months or more). A sixth sensitivity analysis dichotomised the results by age (split at 65 years) to ascertain whether results were consistent across ageing. A seventh sensitivity analysis repeated the main analysis using an alternative algorithm to calculate proportional discrepancy in age: age index-chronological age/chronological age.[50]

Results

Descriptive statistics

Of the 4,467 adults included in the analyses, the average age was 66.5 years (SD 9.4) and 56.5% were female. Those more engaged in cultural activities had multiple advantages in socioeconomics, health and health behaviours.

Table 1: Sample descriptives

	Mean (SD) / Proportion (%)		
	Not culturally engaged	Culturally engaged	Total
Chronological age (years)	69.2 (9.9)	65.4 (9.0)	66.5 (9.4)
Subjective age (years)	60.5 (15.5)	55.4 (12.7)	56.9 (13.8)
Physiological age (years)	70.7 (14.4)	61.2 (14.2)	63.6 (14.9)
Sex			
Male	630 (47.2%)	1,315 (42.0%)	1,945 (43.5%)
Female	705 (52.8%)	1,817 (58.0%)	2,522 (56.5%)
Ethnicity			
White	1,312 (98.3%)	3,089 (98.6%)	4,401 (98.5%)
Minority ethnic groups	23 (1.7%)	43 (1.4%)	66 (1.5%)

Working status			
Not working/retired/unemployed	1,072 (80.3%)	1,950 (62.3%)	3,022 (67.7%)
Working full/part-time	263 (19.7%)	1,182 (37.7%)	1,445 (32.3%)
Housing tenure			
Other	622 (46.6%)	1,023 (32.7%)	1,645 (36.8%)
Outright homeowner	713 (53.4%)	2,109 (67.3%)	2,822 (63.2%)
Physically inactive			
no	1,158 (86.7%)	3,019 (96.4%)	4,177 (93.5%)
yes	177 (13.3%)	113 (3.6%)	290 (6.5%)
Alcohol consumption			
<5 times a week	1,042 (78.1%)	2,317 (74.0%)	3,359 (75.2%)
5+ times a week	293 (21.9%)	815 (26.0%)	1,108 (24.8%)
Current smoker			
no	1,013 (75.9%)	2,824 (90.2%)	3,837 (85.9%)
yes	322 (24.1%)	308 (9.8%)	630 (14.1%)
Chronic physical condition			
no	1,090 (81.6%)	2,680 (85.6%)	3,770 (84.4%)
yes	245 (18.4%)	452 (14.4%)	697 (15.6%)
Depression (CESD>=3)			
no	884 (66.2%)	2,583 (82.5%)	3,467 (77.6%)
yes	451 (33.8%)	549 (17.5%)	1,000 (22.4%)
Net non-pension wealth (quintiles)			
1 - lowest wealth quintile	512 (38.4%)	398 (12.7%)	910 (20.4%)
2	332 (24.9%)	546 (17.4%)	878 (19.7%)
3	241 (18.1%)	624 (19.9%)	865 (19.4%)
4	164 (12.3%)	695 (22.2%)	859 (19.2%)
5 - highest wealth quintile	86 (6.4%)	869 (27.7%)	955 (21.4%)
Educational attainment			
Degree	32 (2.4%)	630 (20.1%)	662 (14.8%)
NVQ3 A level/higher education	253 (19.0%)	921 (29.4%)	1,174 (26.3%)
NVQ2/GCE O level or below	1,050 (78.7%)	1,581 (50.5%)	2,631 (58.9%)
No. of ADL limitations			
0	901 (67.5%)	2,704 (86.3%)	3,605 (80.7%)
1	208 (15.6%)	270 (8.6%)	478 (10.7%)
2+	226 (16.9%)	158 (5.0%)	384 (8.6%)
Self-reported health			
Poor	191 (14.3%)	128 (4.1%)	319 (7.1%)
Fair	415 (31.1%)	459 (14.7%)	874 (19.6%)
Good	415 (31.1%)	978 (31.2%)	1,393 (31.2%)
Very good	243 (18.2%)	1,048 (33.5%)	1,291 (28.9%)
Excellent	71 (5.3%)	519 (16.6%)	590 (13.2%)
BMI			
BMI<25	317 (23.7%)	921 (29.4%)	1,238 (27.7%)
BMI 25-30	520 (39.0%)	1,413 (45.1%)	1,933 (43.3%)
BMI>=30	498 (37.3%)	798 (25.5%)	1,296 (29.0%)

Correlations between the different cultural engagement activities included in the model are shown in figure 2a (full correlation matrix for all variables shown in Supplementary Figure 3). Notably, there was no meaningful correlation between subjective and physiological age (r=0.04) (histogram and heatmap shown in Figures 2c and 2d). Individuals almost exclusively rated their subjective age to be the same or lower than their chronological age (91% the same or below), while physiological age was more evenly distributed above and below chronological age, with a slight skew towards people being older physiologically than chronologically (62% the same or below, figure 2b). There was a slight

correlation between older chronological age and lower subjective age and a marked correlation between older chronological age and older physiological age (scatterplots in Figures 2e and 2f; see also Supplementary Figure 4).

Figure 2: Descriptive figures of exposures and outcomes



RQ1: overall cultural engagement and subjective and physiological age acceleration

Cultural engagement every few months or more was associated with decelerated physiological age (i.e. a lower physiological age relative to chronological age) cross-sectionally, and 4 and 8 years later, even when accounting for confounders within the models (Figure 3; Supplementary Table 4). Those who were regularly engaged in cultural activities had a physiological age 2.2 years younger than those who were unengaged (ATE-2.17; 95% CI-3.48 to-0.86). These effects were maintained 4 and 8 years later (physiological age 1.4 and 1.7 years younger than those who were unengaged respectively), again independent of identified confounders. However, there was no association between cultural engagement and subjective age.

Figure 3: Associations between overall cultural engagementand subjective and physiological age acceleration



RQ2: specific cultural activities and subjective and physiological age acceleration

When considering which type of cultural activity contributed most to the model, all three were associated with slower physiological ageing but not subjective ageing. Going to performances showed the largest association with decelerated physiological age, with those who went regularly having a physiological age 2.7 years younger than those who never went. Similarly, those who went regularly to the cinema and exhibitions were 2.4 and 1.7 years younger compared with controls respectively.

Figure 4: Cross-sectional associations between specific types of cultural activity and subjective and physiological age acceleration



Sensitivity analyses

Sensitivity analyses showed that associations at longitudinal follow-up were maintained when controlling for physiological age at baseline, demonstrating that overall cultural engagement was additionally related to a slower *pace* of physiological ageing over the following 4 years of 1.1 years (wave 2-4) and 0.9 years (wave 4-6) (e.g. 4-year follow-up adjusted for baseline: ATE -1.10, 95%CI -2.20 to -0.00, p<.05; Supplementary Figure 5). Adding different confounders into models, restricting to the same sample size for all analyses, or excluding outliers also had no material effect (Supplementary Figure 6-8). There was no clear indication of dose response relationships when looking at more frequent engagement (monthly), but sample sizes were smaller in these models, which may have affected the reliability of the specific estimates (Supplementary Figure 9). When considering the analyses stratified by age, associations were strongest for those aged under 65, where overall cultural engagement was related to physiological age deceleration of 2.7 years (95% CI -5.20 to -0.24) compared to 1.2 years (95% CI -2.24 to -0.20) in those aged over 65 (Supplementary Figure 10). When applying an alternative computation of proportional discrepancy in age, findings were materially no different (Supplementary Figure 11). When using continuous variables for plausibly continuous confounders, the results were also comparable (Supplementary Figure 12).

Discussion

Overall, cultural engagement was related to lower physiological age cross-sectionally and 4 and 8 years later, as well as a decelerated *pace* of ageing over the following four years. The effect was seen consistently for all three types of cultural activity explored (going to the cinema, galleries, museums and exhibitions, and the theatre or live music events). However, cultural engagement was not related to subjective ageing. These analyses were robust to multiple sensitivity analyses, including considering alternative confounding structures, outliers, and treatment specification.

The associations between cultural engagement and physiological ageing we found echo previous research that has focused on the individual components of our physiological ageing index, finding reductions in cardiovascular risk factors (e.g., heart rate) and favourable inflammatory profiles.[17,51] However, our findings extend previous research by demonstrating a relationship between cultural engagement and an aggregate ageing index that combines these phenotypic markers correlated with age and calculates the discrepancy between the resultant physiological age and an individual's chronological age. As this aggregate index has been independently and longitudinally demonstrated to have predictive potential for diverse pathological age-related health outcomes, we provide the first data indicating that cultural engagement is related to the speed of physiological ageing processes. It is important to note that these findings

are likely bidirectional, as for many mechanisms relating cultural engagement with health, with physiological functioning potentially not only influenced by cultural engagement but also affecting one's ability to engage in cultural activities.[52,53] However, when we used outcome measures from subsequent years, results were maintained, with only modest attenuation of effect sizes within the first four years of follow-up, and very little further attenuation at eight years of follow-up. Further, the relationship was similarly maintained in longitudinal analyses that additionally adjusted for baseline physiological age, demonstrating that cultural engagement was not only related to decelerated physiological age but also decelerated *pace* of physiological ageing, strengthening causal inference.

An important consideration is why there were such different results for subjective versus physiological ageing. Only 9% of people perceived themselves to be older than their chronological age, which echoes similar distinctions between subjective and chronological age found in other studies, whereby it has been found that subjective ageing happens slower than chronological ageing and people feel, on average, around 9 years younger than their chronological age.[54] In comparison, 38% were physiologically older on the index we used. Notably, there was almost no correlation between the two types of ageing, with just 0.02% of the variance in one explained by the other. This is (in part) surprising as research has found people who feel younger have younger brains and more favourable biomarkers profiles,[55,56] whereas people who feel older have accelerated epigenetic ageing and higher inflammation.[57,58] Indeed, some individual biomarkers of ageing have been associated with subjective age, although these have tended to compare biological ageing with just subjective age (not subjective age subtracted from chronological age as we did here).[50] The finding that cultural engagement is not associated with subjective ageing, is also surprising given previous studies that have looked at other factors associated with subjective age and the link between broader leisure and perceptions of ageing. Indeed, how old people feel is thought to be a mixture of biological as well as psychological and social factors, such as more positive attitudes towards ageing and fewer depressive symptoms.[59] Furthermore, cultural engagement has been related to better physical functioning and capacity and older adults who engage regularly in leisure report feeling more useful, capable, energetic and happy about ageing.[10,30,31,60,61] However, our study is the first known study to explore if cultural engagement affects subjective age acceleration, and the results suggest that either the positive psychological influence of engagement does not translate through to feeling younger per se, or that other processes and dispositional factors exert greater influence on overall perceptions of one's age. However, subjective age is still an important predictor of age-related mortality, morbidity and mental wellbeing,[62,63] so why cultural engagement did not impact this needs unpacking. One possibility is that cultural engagement may instead be linked to more positive experiences of ageing, as other leisure activities are, rather than perceived age itself.[60] Alternatively, there could be a strong role of personality as research has found that neuroticism is a predictor of higher subjective age, and also moderates the relationship between cultural engagement and certain outcomes related to subjective age, such as life satisfaction.[64,65]

Strengths of our study include the use of data drawn from a large, representative sample of older adults, its use of a multi-dimensional index of physiological age that has demonstrated associations with diverse aspects of age-related pathology, its parallel consideration of subjective and objective mechanisms relating to ageing, and its statistical use of doubly-robust estimators, which provide a clear advance on more traditional regression-based approaches to conditioning on counterfactuals. However, there are several limitations. For example, we were only able to explore cultural engagement, not active participation in the arts. We relied on retrospective reporting of cultural engagement rates over the past year, which could be prone to recall bias, especially amongst older participants.[66] Subjective age measures are also more prone to reporting bias than objective measures so this could have driven the results we found in our study. Indeed, ecological momentary assessment has found how old people feel can change from one moment to the next.[67] Other aspects of subjective perceptions of ageing (e.g., how do you feel about older age), are not directly comparable to physiological ageing, but are important considerations for future research, especially since they may have slightly stronger effects on mental health, physical health and longevity in older age.[62] We used a statistical approach that had many strengths in terms of confounder consideration, but did require considering our exposure as a dichotomous variable to enable the creation of a treatment and non-treatment group. This, naturally, has its own limitations including precluding comprehensive examination of dose-response effects. Additionally, while we included identified confounders and used a statistical method that allows two different model specifications for exposure and outcome (only one of which has to be correct), residual confounding remains possible, so methods such as instrumental variable approaches that better account for unmeasured confounding are recommended for future work to confirm findings. Cross-sectional analyses may be affected by selection bias, and longitudinal analyses attrition bias, if individuals with lower engagement and poorer health are both less likely to survive to participate at baseline and more likely to drop out during follow up. However, this would have attenuated observed associations and therefore does not contradict the findings. Nonetheless, future longitudinal analyses considering survival within models are encouraged. In relation to our physiological ageing index, PCA is a common method for biological age derivation, but it is by no means the only approach and has its own limitations, such as including chronological age within a first component, potentially capturing variance unrelated to ageing, and underestimating the hierarchical nature of biological processes.

Nonetheless, we selected PCA above alternatives such as latent variable approaches because even though these other methods better account for hierarchical dependencies, the summary measures produced are not easily interpretable with respect to chronological age. Further, there is a strong precedent for its use in similar derivation of indices.[38,42,68–74] Finally, future studies are encouraged to explore how cultural engagement may influence patterns or trajectories of physiological and subjective ageing, and whether engaging *consistently* over time is important to effect sizes. An important part of such future work will be able to explore whether temporal variation in confounders affects outcomes, whether effects are bidirectional (as we hypothesise they likely are), and whether feedback effects are evident. Additionally for future work, while this study focused on an overall index of physiological age, in keeping with other ageing research,[38,42,68–74] studies are also encouraged to look at organ-specific ageing to ascertain whether cultural engagement affects different biological systems at different rates.

Overall, these findings are important as they provide insight into how cultural engagement may be related to processes of ageing. The stronger relationship with physiological ageing suggests that objective biological and functional processes may be more important mechanistically to health benefits of cultural engagement than broader processes related to subjective perceptions of age. From an intervention design perspective, monthly cultural engagement compared to every few months did not lead to stronger outcomes, suggesting that there may minimum amount of cultural engagement necessary, beyond which further engagement does not yield stronger benefits. Further, the strength of the relationship with physiological ageing appears stronger amongst those aged 50-65. These details could help to guide the design and implementation of future experimental studies.

Acknowledgements

This research was supported by a Wellcome Trust Discovery Award [326117/Z/25/Z], UK Research and Innovation [MR/Y01068X/1] and the EpiArts Lab- a National Endowment for the Arts Research Lab at the University of Florida, supported in part by an award from the National Endowment for the Arts (1936473-38-24). The opinions expressed are those of the authors and do not represent the views of the National Endowment for the Arts Office of Research & Analysis or the National Endowment for the Arts. The National Endowment for the Arts does not guarantee the accuracy or completeness of the information included in this material and is not responsible for any consequences of its use. The EpiArts Lab is also supported by Americans for the Arts, Bloomberg Philanthropies (F024567), the Dharma Endowment Foundation, the Pabst Steinmetz Foundation, and the State of Florida Division of Arts and Culture (24.c.ne.900.834).

References

1. Fancourt, D. & Finn, S. *What Is the Evidence on the Role of the Arts in Improving Health and Well-Being? A Scoping Review*. (2019).
2. Rodriguez, A. K. *et al.* Arts Engagement as a Health Behavior: An Opportunity to Address Mental Health Inequities. *Community Health Equity Res Policy* 2752535X231175072 (2023) doi:10.1177/2752535X231175072.
3. Sonke, J. *et al.* Defining "Arts Participation" for Public Health Research. *Health Promotion Practice* 15248399231183388 (2023) doi:10.1177/15248399231183388.
4. Warran, K., Burton, A. & Fancourt, D. What are the active ingredients of 'arts in health' activities? Development of the INgredients iN ArTs in hEalth (INNATE) Framework. *Wellcome Open Res* **7**, 10 (2022).
5. Fancourt, D., Aughterson, H., Finn, S., Walker, E. & Steptoe, A. How leisure activities affect health: a narrative review and multi-level theoretical framework of mechanisms of action. *The Lancet Psychiatry* **8**, 329–339 (2021).
6. Fancourt, D. & Steptoe, A. Comparison of physical and social risk-reducing factors for the development of disability in older adults: a population-based cohort study. *J Epidemiol Community Health* **73**, 906–912 (2019).
7. Fancourt, D. & Steptoe, A. Physical and Psychosocial Factors in the Prevention of Chronic Pain in Older Age. *J Pain* **19**, 1385–1391 (2018).
8. Fancourt, D. & Tymoszuk, U. Cultural engagement and incident depression in older adults: evidence from the English Longitudinal Study of Ageing. *Br J Psychiatry* **214**, 225–229 (2019).
9. Rogers, N. T. & Fancourt, D. Cultural Engagement Is a Risk-Reducing Factor for Frailty Incidence and Progression. *J Gerontol B Psychol Sci Soc Sci* **75**, 571–576 (2020).
10. Wang, S., Mak, H. W. & Fancourt, D. Arts, mental distress, mental health functioning & life satisfaction: fixed-effects analyses of a nationally-representative panel study. *BMC Public Health* **20**, 208 (2020).
11. Johansson, S.-E., Jansåker, F., Sundquist, K. & Bygren, L. O. A longitudinal study of the association between attending cultural events and coronary heart disease. *Communications medicine* **3**, 72 (2023).

12. Wang, X. *et al.* Art Engagement and Risk of Type 2 Diabetes: Evidence From the English Longitudinal Study of Ageing. *Int J Public Health* **68**, 1605556 (2023).
13. Bygren, L. O., Konlaan, B. B. & Johansson, S. E. Attendance at cultural events, reading books or periodicals, and making music or singing in a choir as determinants for survival: Swedish interview survey of living conditions. *BMJ* **313**, 1577–1580 (1996).
14. Jensen, A., Pirouzifard, M. & Lindström, M. Arts and culture engagement and mortality: A population-based prospective cohort study. *Scand J Public Health* **52**, 511–520 (2024).
15. Fancourt, D., Steptoe, A. & Cadar, D. Cultural engagement and cognitive reserve: museum attendance and dementia incidence over a 10-year period. *The British Journal of Psychiatry* 1–3 (2018).
16. Fancourt, D., Steptoe, A. & Cadar, D. Community engagement and dementia risk: time-to-event analyses from a national cohort study. *J Epidemiol Community Health* **74**, 71–77 (2020).
17. Fancourt, D. & Steptoe, A. Cultural engagement predicts changes in cognitive function in older adults over a 10 year period: findings from the English Longitudinal Study of Ageing. *Sci Rep* **8**, 10226 (2018).
18. Fancourt, D. Advancing observational research on arts and health: theory-informed approaches using the RADIANCE framework. Preprint at https://doi.org/10.31234/osf.io/s826r (2024).
19. Moaddel, R. *et al.* Proteomics in aging research: A roadmap to clinical, translational research. *Aging Cell* **20**, e13325 (2021).
20. Crimmins, E. M., Thyagarajan, B., Kim, J. K., Weir, D. & Faul, J. Quest for a summary measure of biological age: the health and retirement study. *GeroScience* **43**, 395–408 (2021).
21. Tian, Y. E. *et al.* Heterogeneous aging across multiple organ systems and prediction of chronic disease and mortality. *Nat Med* **29**, 1221–1231 (2023).
22. Crimmins, E. M., Thyagarajan, B., Kim, J. K., Weir, D. & Faul, J. Quest for a summary measure of biological age: the health and retirement study. *Geroscience* **43**, 395–408 (2021).
23. Bloomberg, M. & Steptoe, A. Sex and education differences in trajectories of physiological ageing: longitudinal analysis of a prospective English cohort study. 2025.01.06.25320036 Preprint at https://doi.org/10.1101/2025.01.06.25320036 (2025).
24. Fancourt, D., Bloomberg, M. & Steptoe, A. Social connections are differentially related to perceived and physiological age acceleration amongst older adults. *medRxiv* 2025–02 (2025).
25. Uotinen, V., Rantanen, T. & Suutama, T. Perceived age as a predictor of old age mortality: a 13-year prospective study. *Age and Ageing* **34**, 368–372 (2005).
26. Ward, R. A. Change in Perceived Age in Middle and Later Life. *Int J Aging Hum Dev* **76**, 251–267 (2013).
27. Rippon, I. & Steptoe, A. Is the relationship between subjective age, depressive symptoms and activities of daily living bidirectional? *Social Science & Medicine* **214**, 41–48 (2018).
28. Bergland, A., Nicolaisen, M. & Thorsen, K. Predictors of subjective age in people aged 40–79 years: a five-year follow-up study. The impact of mastery, mental and physical health. *Aging & Mental Health* **18**, 653–661 (2014).
29. Martín-María, N. *et al.* The Impact of Subjective Well-being on Mortality: A Meta-Analysis of Longitudinal Studies in the General Population. *Psychosom Med* **79**, 565–575 (2017).
30. Steptoe, A. & Fancourt, D. Leading a meaningful life at older ages and its relationship with social engagement, prosperity, health, biology, and time use. *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A* **116**, 1207–1212 (2019).
31. Steptoe, A. & Fancourt, D. An outcome-wide analysis of bidirectional associations between changes in meaningfulness of life and health, emotional, behavioural, and social factors. *Sci Rep* **10**, 6463 (2020).
32. Finn, S., Bone, J., Fancourt, D., Warran, K. & Mak, H. W. Longitudinal associations between cultural engagement and mental and social wellbeing: an outcome-wide analysis. *The Journals of Gerontology, Series B: Psychological Sciences and Social Sciences*, *80*(7), gbaf074.
33. Fancourt, D. & Steptoe, A. Physical and psychosocial factors in the prevention of chronic pain in older age. *The journal of pain : official journal of the American Pain Society* https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jpain.2018.06.001 (2018) doi:10.1016/j.jpain.2018.06.001.
34. Rippon, I. & Steptoe, A. Feeling Old vs Being Old: Associations Between Self-perceived Age and Mortality. *JAMA Internal Medicine* **175**, 307–309 (2015).
35. Steptoe, A., Breeze, E., Banks, J. & Nazroo, J. Cohort Profile: The English Longitudinal Study of Ageing. *Int J Epidemiol* **42**, 1640–1648 (2013).
36. Galea, S. & Hernán, M. A. Win-Win: Reconciling Social Epidemiology and Causal Inference. *American Journal of Epidemiology* **189**, 167–170 (2020).
37. Rubin, D. B. Causal Inference Using Potential Outcomes. *Journal of the American Statistical Association* **100**, 322–331 (2005).
38. Nakamura, E., Miyao, K. & Ozeki, T. Assessment of biological age by principal component analysis. *Mechanisms of ageing and development* **46**, 1–18 (1988).

39. Jia, L., Zhang, W. & Chen, X. Common methods of biological age estimation. *CIA* **Volume 12**, 759–772 (2017).
40. Liu, N. *et al.* Association between cardiometabolic index and biological ageing among adults: a population-based study. *BMC Public Health* **25**, 879 (2025).
41. Li, X. *et al.* Accelerated aging mediates the associations of unhealthy lifestyles with cardiovascular disease, cancer, and mortality. *J American Geriatrics Society* **72**, 181–193 (2024).
42. Dalecka, A., Bartoskova Polcrova, A., Pikhart, H., Bobak, M. & Ksinan, A. J. Living in poverty and accelerated biological aging: evidence from population-representative sample of U.S. adults. *BMC Public Health* **24**, 458 (2024).
43. Husted, K. L. S. *et al.* A Model for Estimating Biological Age From Physiological Biomarkers of Healthy Aging: Cross-sectional Study. *JMIR Aging* **5**, e35696 (2022).
44. Sauer, B. & VanderWeele, T. J. Use of directed acyclic graphs. in *Developing a protocol for observational comparative effectiveness research: a user's guide* (Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality (US), 2013).
45. Banks, J. *et al.* Financial circumstances, health and well-being of the older population in England: ELSA 2008 (Wave 4). https://www.ifs.org.uk/publications/5315 (2010).
46. Funk, M. J. *et al.* Doubly Robust Estimation of Causal Effects. *American Journal of Epidemiology* **173**, 761–767 (2011).
47. Di Nicola, M. *et al.* Serum and gene expression profile of cytokines in first-episode psychosis. *Brain Behav. Immun.* **31**, 90–95 (2013).
48. Keele, L. & Kelly, N. J. Dynamic models for dynamic theories: The ins and outs of lagged dependent variables. *Political analysis* **14**, 186–205 (2006).
49. Hammerton, G. & Munafò, M. R. Causal inference with observational data: the need for triangulation of evidence. *Psychol Med* **51**, 563–578 (2021).
50. Stephan, Y., Sutin, A. R. & Terracciano, A. How old do you feel? The role of age discrimination and biological aging in subjective age. *PLoS One* **10**, e0119293 (2015).
51. Walker, E. S., Fancourt, D., Kumari, M. & McMunn, A. Cross-sectional associations between patterns of cultural engagement and indicators of biological dysregulation. *Annals of Human Biology* **51**, 2399276 (2024).
52. Mak, H. W., Hu, Y., Bu, F., Bone, J. K. & Fancourt, D. Art for health's sake or health for art's sake: Disentangling the bidirectional relationships between arts engagement and mental health. *PNAS Nexus* **3**, pgae465 (2024).
53. Fancourt, D. & Bone, J. Advancing observational research on arts and health: theory-informed approaches using the RADIANCE framework. *OSF* https://osf.io/preprints/psyarxiv/s826r (2024).
54. Akinocho, E.-M. & Vanhoutte, B. Ageing Fast and Slow: A Longitudinal Examination of the Gap Between Subjective Age and Chronological Age and the Role of Functional Health. *J Gerontol B Psychol Sci Soc Sci* **80**, gbae183 (2024).
55. Kwak, S., Kim, H., Chey, J. & Youm, Y. Feeling How Old I Am: Subjective Age Is Associated With Estimated Brain Age. *Front. Aging Neurosci.* **10**, (2018).
56. Thyagarajan, B. *et al.* How Does Subjective Age Get 'Under the Skin'? The Association Between Biomarkers and Feeling Older or Younger Than One's Age: The Health and Retirement Study. *Innov Aging* **3**, igz035 (2019).
57. Stephan, Y., Sutin, A. R., Luchetti, M. & Terracciano, A. An older subjective age is related to accelerated epigenetic aging. *Psychol Aging* **36**, 767–772 (2021).
58. Stephan, Y., Sutin, A. R., Luchetti, M. & Terracciano, A. The prospective relationship between subjective aging and inflammation: Evidence from the health and retirement study. *Psychophysiology* **60**, e14177 (2023).
59. Heimrich, K. G., Prell, T. & Schönenberg, A. What Determines That Older Adults Feel Younger Than They Are? Results From a Nationally Representative Study in Germany. *Front Med (Lausanne)* **9**, 901420 (2022).
60. Bu, F. *et al.* Leisure engagement and self-perceptions of aging: Longitudinal analysis of concurrent and lagged relationships. *The Journals of Gerontology, Series B: Psychological Sciences and Social Sciences* **79**, gbad182 (2024).
61. Bone, J. K., Bu, F., Sonke, J. K. & Fancourt, D. Leisure engagement in older age is related to objective and subjective experiences of aging. *Nat Commun* **15**, 1499 (2024).
62. Westerhof, G. J. *et al.* Longitudinal Effects of Subjective Aging on Health and Longevity: An Updated Meta-Analysis. *Psychol Aging* **38**, 147–166 (2023).
63. Alonso Debreczeni, F. & Bailey, P. E. A Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis of Subjective Age and the Association With Cognition, Subjective Well-Being, and Depression. *The Journals of Gerontology: Series B* **76**, 471–482 (2021).
64. Stephan, Y., Sutin, A. R., Kornadt, A., Canada, B. & Terracciano, A. Personality and subjective age: Evidence from six samples. *Psychol Aging* **37**, 401–412 (2022).
65. Węziak-Białowolska, D., Białowolski, P. & Sacco, P. L. Involvement with the arts and participation in cultural events—Does personality moderate impact on well-being? Evidence from the U.K. Household Panel Survey. *Psychology of Aesthetics, Creativity, and the Arts* **13**, 348–358 (2019).
66. Rhodes, S., Greene, N. R. & Naveh-Benjamin, M. Age-related differences in recall and recognition: a meta-analysis. *Psychon Bull Rev* **26**, 1529–1547 (2019).

67. Kornadt, A. E. *et al.* 'I felt so old this morning.' Short-term variations in subjective age and the role of trait subjective age: Evidence from the ILSE/EMIL ecological momentary assessment data. *Psychol Aging* **36**, 373–382 (2021).
68. Nakamura, E. & Miyao, K. Further evaluation of the basic nature of the human biological aging process based on a factor analysis of age-related physiological variables. *J Gerontol A Biol Sci Med Sci* **58**, 196–204 (2003).
69. Bai, X. *et al.* Evaluation of biological aging process- a population-based study of healthy people in China. *Gerontology* **56**, 129–140 (2010).
70. Jee, H. *et al.* Development and application of biological age prediction models with physical fitness and physiological components in Korean adults. *Gerontology* **58**, 344–353 (2012).
71. Zhang, W.-G. *et al.* Select aging biomarkers based on telomere length and chronological age to build a biological age equation. *Age (Dordr)* **36**, 9639 (2014).
72. Park, J., Cho, B., Kwon, H. & Lee, C. Developing a biological age assessment equation using principal component analysis and clinical biomarkers of aging in Korean men. *Arch Gerontol Geriatr* **49**, 7–12 (2009).
73. Nakamura, E. & Miyao, K. Sex differences in human biological aging. *J Gerontol A Biol Sci Med Sci* **63**, 936–944 (2008).
74. Nakamura, E., Moritani, T. & Kanetaka, A. Effects of habitual physical exercise on physiological age in men aged 20-85 years as estimated using principal component analysis. *Eur J Appl Physiol Occup Physiol* **73**, 410–418 (1996).