1 Association between time spent with family and loneliness among 2 Japanese workers during the COVID-19 pandemic: a cross-sectional 3 study

4 Rintaro Fujii¹, Yusuke Konno^{1,2}, Seiichiro Tateishi³, Ayako Hino⁴, Mayumi Tsuji⁵, Kazunori
5 Ikegami⁶, Masako Nagata⁷, Reiji Yoshimura¹, Shinya Matsuda⁸, Yoshihisa Fujino^{2*} for the
6 CORoNaWork Project

7 ¹Department of Psychiatry, University of Occupational and Environmental Health, Japan,
8 Kitakyushu, Fukuoka, 8070555, Japan

9 ²Department of Environmental Epidemiology, Institute of Industrial Ecological Sciences, University
10 of Occupational and Environmental Health, Japan, Kitakyushu, Fukuoka, 8070555, Japan

11 ³Department of Occupational Medicine, School of Medicine, University of Occupational and
12 Environmental Health, Japan, Kitakyushu, Fukuoka, 8070555, Japan

13 ⁴Department of Mental Health, Institute of Industrial Ecological Sciences, University of
14 Occupational and Environmental Health, Japan, Kitakyushu, Fukuoka, 8070555, Japan

15 ⁵Department of Environmental Health, School of Medicine, University of Occupational and
16 Environmental Health, Japan, Kitakyushu, Fukuoka, 8070555, Japan

17 ⁶Department of Work Systems and Health, Institute of Industrial Ecological Sciences, University of
18 Occupational and Environmental Health, Japan, Kitakyushu, Fukuoka, 8070555, Japan

19 ⁷Department of Occupational Health Practice and Management, Institute of Industrial Ecological
20 Sciences, University of Occupational and Environmental Health, Japan, Kitakyushu, Fukuoka,
21 8070555, Japan

22 ⁸Department of Preventive Medicine and Community Health, School of Medicine, University of
 23 Occupational and Environmental Health, Japan, Kitakyushu, Fukuoka, 8070555, Japan

24

25 ***Correspondence:**

26

27 Yoshihisa Fujino

28 Email: zenq@med.uoeh-u.ac.jp

29

30 **Running title: Family and loneliness during Covid-19**

31

32 **Keywords: COVID-19, loneliness, family, workers, Japan**

33 Tables: 2 Word count: 4,455 words

34

35

Abstract

Background: The current coronavirus (COVID-19) pandemic has had large impacts on society, including people practicing social distancing. This behavioral response has increased loneliness. Loneliness not only increases the risk of psychiatric disorders, but also affects occupational mental health. To avoid the negative effects of isolation, it is important to have social contact with other people, especially family members. Employment and economic instability caused by COVID-19 may have also affected family relationships. It is important to understand the association between family relationships and loneliness in workers under the pandemic.

Methods: We collected usable data from 27,036 Japanese workers who completed an online survey during the COVID-19 pandemic. Participants were asked how long they spend with members of their family during mealtimes or at home, and if they experienced loneliness; the latter was assessed by a single question. Other questions included whether participants lived with their spouse, or with someone in need of care. To estimate the odds ratios (ORs) of time with family associated with loneliness we used a multilevel logistic model nested in the prefecture of residence, with adjustments for age, sex, marital status, presence of a cohabitant requiring care, equivalent income, educational level, frequency of remote work, availability of someone for casual chat, smoking, drinking, time for leisure interests, and cumulative rates of COVID-19 in the prefecture.

Results: Ten percent (2,750) of the 27,036 participants reported loneliness. The survey showed a significant negative correlation between time spent with family and loneliness ($p<0.001$): participants who spent more time with family were less likely to feel loneliness. In addition, not living with a spouse and living with someone in need of care were associated with loneliness (not living with a spouse: $p<0.001$; living with someone in need of care: $p<0.001$).

58 **Conclusion:** Loneliness under COVID-19 pandemic conditions was negatively associated with time
59 spent with family members, with the converse result found for participants cohabiting with someone
60 in need of care. These associations suggest the potential value of changes to working practices and
61 interventions to combat loneliness.

62

1 Introduction

The coronavirus (COVID-19) outbreak caused by SARS-CoV-2 in December 2019 has resulted in a global pandemic that has led to multiple public health issues related to mental health (1). COVID-19 is highly infectious and can lead to serious illness, so efforts to prevent the spread of the disease have been implemented worldwide. The strongest effort was to lock down cities and restrict human movements and contacts. In addition, WHO recommended avoiding the “Three Cs,” namely closed spaces, crowded places and close-contact settings, to minimize transmission of the disease. Furthermore, to restrict people’s movements, the Japanese government requested companies to implement remote work, which many companies urgently adopted. Remote work reduces opportunities to communicate with workmates and to receive support from the workplace (2). Although these infection control measures are considered effective in preventing the spread of disease, they also potentially increase the risk of loneliness and mental health problems, both of which have become new public health challenges (3).

Loneliness is defined as "a distressing feeling that accompanies the perception that one's social needs are not being met by the quantity or especially the quality of one's social relationships" (4). Biologically, it has been linked to activity in the ventral striatum and parietal junction (5), while epidemiologically it has been linked to social status factors such as education, and income (6,7). Loneliness is associated not only with psychological distress (8,9), but also depression and anxiety (10,11), sleep disorders (12), alcoholism (13), Alzheimer's disease (14), and other psychiatric disorders. Loneliness is also associated with increased mortality and suicidal ideation (15,16). In Japan, suicides attributed to loneliness have increased rapidly since the pre-COVID-19 pandemic period (17). Loneliness may influence not only mental health in general, but also occupational mental health. For example, workers with loneliness are more likely to feel low job satisfaction and express frustration (18).

To avoid isolation, it is important to have contact with other people. It is generally considered that people have the highest frequency of contacts with family members (19). Family involvement is not only related to frequency of social contacts, but also to reported levels of happiness (20). People living alone reported more loneliness than those living with others (21). Another study showed that people without partners, such as divorcees and widows, were more likely to have loneliness (11). On the other hand, people living with family members in need of care are more susceptible to feeling stressed due to the burden of care (22). Therefore, it can be hypothesized that spending time with close family members may reduce loneliness, but this effect may vary depending on the family situation.

We hypothesized that workstyle changes resulting from the COVID-19 pandemic, such as remote work, have resulted in reduced opportunities to interact with others and have led to increased loneliness among workers. At the same time, as remote work continues to increase due to the COVID-19 pandemic, workers are released from commuting time and therefore have more time to spend with their families. In fact, before COVID-19, remote work was recommended in Japan from the perspective of work-life balance. However, employment and economic problems caused by COVID-19 may have also affected family relationships. Therefore, this study aimed for a better understanding of the association between family relationships and loneliness in workers during the COVID-19 pandemic.

Methods

2.1 Study Design and Participants

We conducted an online survey from December 22 to 26, 2020, under the Collaborative Online Research on the Novel-coronavirus and Work (CORoNaWork) Project. Information about the protocol for this cross-sectional study has already been published (23). The target population comprised workers with a full-time employment contract at that time. In total, 33,087 participants completed the survey, and once invalid answers were excluded, data from 27,036 were available for analysis. The study was approved by the ethics committee of the University of Occupational and Environmental Health, Japan. Participants provided informed consent by filling out a form on the survey website.

2.2 Assessment of time spent with family during mealtimes or at home

The survey included questions designed to find out how much time participants spend with their family for meals or simply at home. To the question: "How long do you spend with family having a meal or at home?" participants selected one of the following options: more than 2 hours, more than 1 hour, more than 30 minutes, less than 30 minutes, and almost never. The following questions were also included in the survey, and required "Yes" or "No" answers: "Do you live with your spouse?" and "Do you live with someone in need of care?"

2.3 Assessment of loneliness

One question focused on whether the participants experienced loneliness or not. To the question: "During the last 30 days, how frequently have you felt loneliness?" participants selected one of the following options: never, a little, sometimes, usually, always. Answers "always," "usually," or "sometimes" were taken as indicating loneliness.

2.4 Other covariates

The following demographic and socioeconomic factors were included as covariates: age, sex, marital status, presence of a cohabitant in need of care, equivalent income, educational level, frequency of remote work, presence of someone for casual chat, smoking, drinking, time for leisure interests and cumulative rates of COVID-19 in the prefecture of residence.

The cumulative incidence of COVID-19 in the prefecture of residence between the time of the survey and one month later was used as a community-level variable. The relevant information was obtained from public institution websites.

2.5 Statistical analysis

We used a multilevel logistic model to estimate odds ratios (ORs) for time spent with family during mealtimes or at home and loneliness. Loneliness was identified only if participants answered always, usually, or sometimes to that question. The multivariate model was adjusted for the factors: age, sex, marital status, presence of a cohabitant requiring care, equivalent income, educational level, frequency of remote work, presence of someone for casual chat, smoking, drinking, time for leisure interests and cumulative incidence rate of COVID-19 in the prefecture.

147 P-values below 0.05 were considered statistically significant. All analyses were run on Stata
148 Statistical Software Release 17. (StataCorp LLC, College Station, TX, USA.).

149

3 Results

Table 1 shows the basic characteristics of the participants. Ten percent (2,750) of the 27,036 participants experienced loneliness. When asked about time spent with family, the largest group (26.6%) answered “almost never;” however, among participants with loneliness, 46.1% answered “almost never” to this question. Of those who spent more than 2 hours with family, 9.9% had loneliness. Notably, the incidence of loneliness decreased as the time spent with family increased. In addition, loneliness was reported less frequently by participants who lived with their spouse, but more frequently by those living with someone in need of care.

Table 2 shows the odds ratio (OR) of time spent with family and loneliness estimated by the logistic model. The age-sex adjusted OR of loneliness for those who reported spending little or no time with family indicated a significant association (OR=3.43, 95% CI 2.99-3.94, $p<0.001$). This result was similar with multivariate analysis (OR=2.00, 95% CI 1.71-2.33, $p<0.001$). In addition, not living with a spouse and living with someone in need of care were associated with loneliness (OR=2.44, 95% CI 2.24-2.67, $p<0.001$, and OR=1.67, 95% CI 1.41-1.97, $p<0.001$, respectively). Again, similar results were obtained with multivariate analysis (not living with a spouse: OR=1.44, 95% CI 1.30-1.61, $p<0.001$; living with someone in need of care: OR=1.85, 95% CI 1.56-2.21, $p<0.001$).

Discussion

This study showed that during the COVID-19 pandemic, workers in Japan who spent less time with their families were more likely to report loneliness. Those who did not live with their spouse were also more likely to feel lonely than those who did live with their spouse. However, time spent with family members in need of care and attention was associated with more loneliness.

The relationship between time spent with family and loneliness showed a dose-response function: the shorter the time spent with family, the greater the likelihood of feeling lonely. These results were robust even after adjusting for factors such as income, social status, and education, which have been reported to be associated with loneliness in previous studies. Time spent with family members is thought to contribute to well-being because of the social integration provided by the family, enhanced importance of the self, and the accessibility of social support (24). Low well-being is correlated with loneliness (25), possibly further illustrating the relationship between time spent with family and loneliness. Previous studies have also reported that living without a partner is a contributory factor in loneliness (26), while others have suggested that not only cohabitation but also the strength of the relationship between partners modulates the intensity of loneliness (27). Our results provide evidence in support of the importance of strong family relationships, as the less time spent with family, the more participants were likely to report loneliness.

Biological mechanisms have been proposed to explain the association between time spent with family and loneliness. Dopamine can be involved in loneliness. Dopaminergic nerves serve in regulating reward-processing behavior mediated by pleasure and enjoyment, and emotional behaviors such as romantic love. The ventral striatum is a neurotransmitter-related region centered on dopamine and may be involved in feelings of loneliness (5). This dopaminergic function may mediate loneliness (28). In a survey of female workers on how they spend their time in daily activities, most

participants described time spent with their spouse and family as enjoyable, whereas time alone was not enjoyable (29). A similar association between loneliness and family time was found in this study. Because this study assessed loneliness using the subjective question "How frequently have you felt loneliness?", the results seem likely to be influenced by subjective experiences such as pleasure and enjoyment. We presume that dopamine nerves of the reward system are implicated in the finding that the less time spent with family, the more loneliness participants experienced.

Interestingly, loneliness varied with factors other than simple time spent with family. In contrast to living with a spouse, living with a person in need of care was strongly positively correlated with loneliness. The burden of care on family members increases not only psychological stress but also economic burden (30). A previous study reported that caring for a family member was correlated with loneliness particularly when the family members lived together (31). Research has also suggested that emotional support from others, social connections and contact with friends are important for countering caregivers' feelings of loneliness (32,33).

This study prompts two suggestions. First, time spent with family may be useful in reducing loneliness, as the mental health impact of the COVID-19 pandemic becomes a global public health issue. Second, recommended measures for preventing COVID-19 infection, such as maintaining social distance and refraining from going out, may lead to reduced opportunities for communication with others, which may in turn negatively affect mental health (3). However, increased time spent with family due to increased time spent at home, such as in the case of remote work, may compensate for the effects of reduced opportunities for socializing. Furthermore, home-alone and single workers are a high-risk group for loneliness, and may require careful support in terms of mental well-being.

Several limitations of the present study should be addressed. First, the results are based on an Internet survey, and so the generalizability of the results is open to question. However, we

214 purposively aimed for a diverse target population in terms of gender, occupation, and region, based
 215 on COVID-19 incidence data. Second, although there are several ways to assess loneliness (34), we
 216 did so by using a single question, following previous studies on loneliness that used a single
 217 assessment item (35). Finally, the survey was conducted during the COVID-19 pandemic, but it
 218 remains unclear how the pandemic and resulting changes in daily and occupational environments
 219 might have affected the survey outcomes.

220 In this study, 10% of participants reported feelings of loneliness during the COVID-19
 221 pandemic. The feeling of loneliness was associated with time spent with family members, with
 222 contrasting results depending on the status of the cohabitants. Greater consideration should be given
 223 to interventions such as support for caregivers, and encouragement regarding remote work and other
 224 potential changes, consistent with the worker's family and living conditions.

225

226 **Conflict of Interest**

227 The authors declare no conflicts of interest associated with this manuscript.

228

229 **Author contributions**

230 Y.F. was the chairperson of the study group. R.F. conceived the research questions. All authors
231 designed the research protocol and developed the questionnaire. R.F. conducted the statistical
232 analysis with Y.F. R.F. drafted the initial manuscript. All authors revised and approved the final
233 manuscript.

234

235 **Ethics Statement**

236 The study, involving human participants, was reviewed and approved by the Ethics Committee of the
237 University of Occupational and Environmental Health, Japan (reference No. R2-079 and R3-006).
238 Participants provided informed consent by filling out a form on the survey website.

239

240 **Data Availability Statement**

241 Data not available due to ethical restrictions.

242

243 **Acknowledgements**

244 We thank other members of the CORoNaWork Project: Akira Ogami, Arisa Harada, Hajime Ando,
245 Hisashi Eguchi, Kei Tokutsu, Kosuke Mafune, Kyoko Kitagawa, Ning Liu, Rie Tanaka, Ryutaro
246 Matsugaki, Tomohiro Ishimaru, and Tomohisa Nagata.

247

248 **Funding**

249 This work was supported and partly funded by the University of Occupational and
250 Environmental Health, Japan; General Incorporated Foundation (Anshin Zaidan): The Development
251 of Educational Materials on Mental Health Measures for Managers at Small-sized Enterprises;
252 Health, Labour and Welfare Sciences Research Grants: Comprehensive Research for Women's
253 Healthcare [grant number H30-josei-ippan-002] and Research for the Establishment of an
254 Occupational Health System in Times of Disaster [grant number H30-roudou-ippan-007]; scholarship
255 donations from Chugai Pharmaceutical Co., Ltd.; the Collabo-Health Study Group; and Hitachi
256 Systems, Ltd.

257

258 **References**

- 259 1. Pierce M, Hope H, Ford T, Hatch S, Hotopf M, John A, Kontopantelis E, Webb R, Wessely S,
260 McManus S, et al. Mental health before and during the COVID-19 pandemic: a longitudinal
261 probability sample survey of the UK population. *Lancet Psychiatry* (2020) 7:883–892.
- 262 2. Tavares AI. Telework and health effects review. *Int J Healthc Inf Syst Inform* (2017) 3:30.
- 263 3. Wickens CM, McDonald AJ, Elton-Marshall T, Wells S, Nigatu YT, Jankowicz D, Hamilton
264 HA. Loneliness in the COVID-19 pandemic: Associations with age, gender and their interaction.
265 *J Psychiatr Res* (2021) 136:103–108.
- 266 4. Hawkley LC, Cacioppo JT. Loneliness matters: a theoretical and empirical review of
267 consequences and mechanisms. *Ann Behav Med* (2010) 40:218–227.
- 268 5. Cacioppo JT, Norris CJ, Decety J, Monteleone G, Nusbaum H. In the eye of the beholder:
269 individual differences in perceived social isolation predict regional brain activation to social
270 stimuli. *J Cogn Neurosci* (2009) 21:83–92.
- 271 6. Bosma H, Jansen M, Schefman S, Hajema KJ, Feron F. Lonely at the bottom: a cross-sectional
272 study on being ill, poor, and lonely. *Public Health* (2015) 129:185–187.
- 273 7. Cohen-Mansfield J, Hazan H, Lerman Y, Shalom V. Correlates and predictors of loneliness in
274 older-adults: a review of quantitative results informed by qualitative insights. *Int Psychogeriatr*
275 (2016) 28:557–576.
- 276 8. Losada-Baltar A, Jiménez-Gonzalo L, Gallego-Alberto L, Pedroso-Chaparro MDS, Fernandes-
277 Pires J, Márquez-González M. “We are staying at home.” Association of self-perceptions of

- aging, personal and family resources, and loneliness with psychological distress during the lock-
down period of COVID-19. *J Gerontol B Psychol Sci Soc Sci* (2021) 76:e10–e16.
9. McGinty EE, Presskreischer R, Han H, Barry CL. Psychological distress and loneliness reported
by US adults in 2018 and April 2020. *JAMA* (2020) 324:93–94.
10. Cacioppo JT, Hughes ME, Waite LJ, Hawkley LC, Thisted RA. Loneliness as a specific risk
factor for depressive symptoms: cross-sectional and longitudinal analyses. *Psychol Aging* (2006)
21:140–151.
11. Meltzer H, Bebbington P, Dennis MS, Jenkins R, McManus S, Brugha TS. Feelings of
loneliness among adults with mental disorder. *Soc Psychiatry Psychiatr Epidemiol* (2013) 48:5–
13.
12. Smagula SF, Stone KL, Fabio A, Cauley JA. Risk factors for sleep disturbances in older adults:
Evidence from prospective studies. *Sleep Med Rev* (2016) 25:21–30.
13. Akerlind I, Hörnquist JO. Loneliness and alcohol abuse: a review of evidences of an interplay.
Soc Sci Med (1992) 34:405–414.
14. Wilson RS, Krueger KR, Arnold SE, Schneider JA, Kelly JF, Barnes LL, Tang Y, Bennett DA.
Loneliness and risk of Alzheimer disease. *Arch Gen Psychiatry* (2007) 64:234–240.
15. Holt-Lunstad J, Smith TB, Baker M, Harris T, Stephenson D. Loneliness and social isolation as
risk factors for mortality: a meta-analytic review. *Perspect Psychol Sci* (2015) 10:227–237.
16. Stravynski A, Boyer R. Loneliness in relation to suicide ideation and parasuicide: a population-
wide study. *Suicide Life Threat Behav* (2001) 31:32–40.

- 298 17. Ministry of Health, Labour and Welfare, Japan. Suicide Statistics: Each Year. Available at:
299 https://www.mhlw.go.jp/stf/seisakunitsuite/bunya/hukushi_kaigo/seikatsuhogo/jisatsu/jisatsu_ye
300 [ar.html](https://www.mhlw.go.jp/stf/seisakunitsuite/bunya/hukushi_kaigo/seikatsuhogo/jisatsu/jisatsu_year.html)
- 301 18. Soler-Gonzalez J, San-Martín M, Delgado-Bolton R, Vivanco L. Human Connections and their
302 roles in the occupational well-being of healthcare professionals: a study on loneliness and
303 empathy. *Front Psychol* (2017) 8:1475.
- 304 19. Scott J, Treas J, Richards M. *The Blackwell Companion to the Sociology of Families*. John
305 Wiley & Sons (2008). p. 34–53
- 306 20. Herrera M, Sani F, Bowe M. Perceived family continuity: Implications for family identification
307 and psychological well-being. *Soc Psychol Educ* (2011) 26:387–399.
- 308 21. Rania N, Coppola I. Psychological impact of the lockdown in Italy due to the COVID-19
309 outbreak: are there gender differences? *Front Psychol* (2021) 12:567470.
- 310 22. Schulz R, Beach SR, Czaja SJ, Martire LM, Monin JK. Family caregiving for older adults. *Annu*
311 *Rev Psychol* (2020) 71:635–659.
- 312 23. Fujino Y, Ishimaru T, Eguchi H, Tsuji M, Tateishi S, Ogami A, Mori K, Matsuda S, for the
313 CORoNaWork project. Protocol for a nationwide Internet-based health survey in workers during
314 the COVID-19 pandemic in 2020. *bioRxiv* (2021) doi:10.1101/2021.02.02.21249309
- 315 24. Elliott S, Umberson D. Recent demographic trends in the US and implications for well-being.
316 *Blackwell companion to the sociology of families* (2004) Available at:
317 <https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/pdf/10.1002/9780470999004#page=58>

- 318 25. Gubler DA, Makowski LM, Troche SJ, Schlegel K. Loneliness and well-being during the Covid-
319 19 pandemic: associations with personality and emotion regulation. *J Happiness Stud* (2020)1–
320 20.
- 321 26. Hawkley LC, Browne MW, Cacioppo JT. How can I connect with thee? Let me count the ways.
322 *Psychol Sci* (2005) 16:798–804.
- 323 27. de Jong Gierveld J, Broese van Groenou M, Hoogendoorn AW, Smit JH. Quality of marriages in
324 later life and emotional and social loneliness. *J Gerontol B Psychol Sci Soc Sci* (2009) 64B:497–
325 506.
- 326 28. Matthews GA, Nieh EH, Vander Weele CM, Halbert SA, Pradhan RV, Yosafat AS, Glober GF,
327 Izadmehr EM, Thomas RE, Lacy GD, et al. Dorsal raphe dopamine neurons represent the
328 experience of social isolation. *Cell* (2016) 164:617–631.
- 329 29. Kahneman D, Krueger AB, Schkade DA, Schwarz N, Stone AA. A survey method for
330 characterizing daily life experience: the day reconstruction method. *Science* (2004) 306:1776–
331 1780.
- 332 30. Covinsky KE, Goldman L, Cook EF, Oye R, Desbiens N, Reding D, Fulkerson W, Connors AF
333 Jr, Lynn J, Phillips RS. The impact of serious illness on patients’ families. SUPPORT
334 Investigators. Study to Understand Prognoses and Preferences for Outcomes and Risks of
335 Treatment. *JAMA* (1994) 272:1839–1844.
- 336 31. Bramboeck V, Moeller K, Marksteiner J, Kaufmann L. Loneliness and burden perceived by
337 family caregivers of patients with Alzheimer disease. *Am J Alzheimers Dis Other Dement* (2020)
338 35:1533317520917788.

- 339 32. Secinti E, Rand KL, Johns SA, O'Neil BH, Helft PR, Shahda S, Jalal SI, Mosher CE. Social
340 correlates of mental health in gastrointestinal cancer patients and their family caregivers:
341 Exploring the role of loneliness. *Support Care Cancer* (2019) 27:2077–2086.
- 342 33. Pinquart M, Sorensen S. Influences on loneliness in older adults: a meta-analysis. *Basic Appl*
343 *Soc Psych* (2001) 23:245–266.
- 344 34. Holt-Lunstad J, Smith TB, Layton JB. Social relationships and mortality risk: a meta-analytic
345 review. *PLoS Med* (2010) 7:e1000316.
- 346 35. Courtin E, Knapp M. Social isolation, loneliness and health in old age: a scoping review. *Health*
347 *Soc Care Community* (2017) 25:799–812.
- 348

349 Tables

350 Table 1. Characteristics of participants who experienced loneliness

351

	Total	non-loneliness	loneliness
	n=27,036	n=24,286	n=2,750
Age in years, mean (SD)	47.0 (10.5)	47.3 (10.5)	44.5 (10.1)
Sex, male (%)	13,814 (51.1%)	12,601 (51.9%)	1,213 (44.1%)
Time spent with family having a meal or at home			
more than 2 hours	4,375 (16.2%)	4,103 (16.9%)	272 (9.9%)
more than 1 hour	6,312 (23.3%)	5,922 (24.4%)	390 (14.2%)
more than 30 minutes	5,611 (20.8%)	5,160 (21.2%)	451 (16.4%)
less than 30 minutes	3,553 (13.1%)	3,185 (13.1%)	368 (13.4%)
almost never	7,185 (26.6%)	5,916 (24.4%)	1,269 (46.1%)
Living with someone			
Yes	21,229 (78.5%)	19,441 (80.1%)	1,788 (65.0%)
No	5,807 (21.5%)	4,845 (19.9%)	962 (35.0%)
Living with spouse			
Yes	14,454 (53.5%)	13,558 (55.8%)	896 (32.6%)
No	12,582 (46.5%)	10,728 (44.2%)	1,854 (67.4%)
Living with someone in need of care			
Yes	1,223 (4.5%)	1,044 (4.3%)	179 (6.5%)
No	25813 (95.5%)	23242 (95.7%)	2571 (93.5%)

Family and loneliness during Covid-19

Equivalent income (million JPY)

< 200	1,709 (6.3%)	1,392 (5.7%)	317 (11.5%)
200-599	12,045 (44.5%)	10,558 (43.4%)	1,487 (54.1%)
600-999	9,032 (33.4%)	8,340 (34.3%)	692 (25.2%)
> 1000	4,250 (15.7%)	3,996 (16.5%)	254 (9.2%)

Educational level

Junior high school	368 (1.4%)	306 (1.3%)	62 (2.3%)
High school	6,953 (25.7%)	6,190 (25.5%)	763 (27.7%)
University, graduate school, vocational school,	19,715 (73.0%)	17,790 (73.7%)	1,925 (70.0%)

Junior college

Number of employees in the workplace

< 10	6,165 (22.9%)	5,619 (23.1%)	546 (19.9%)
< 100	6,940 (25.6%)	6,183 (25.5%)	757 (27.5%)
<1000	7,153 (26.5%)	6,379 (26.3%)	774 (28.1%)
1000 >	6,778 (25.1%)	6,105 (25.2%)	673 (24.5%)

Frequency of remote work

more than 4 days a week	2,790 (10.3%)	2,512 (10.3%)	278 (10.1%)
more than 2 days a week	1,477 (5.5%)	1,344 (5.5%)	133 (4.8%)
more than 1 days a week	878 (3.2%)	803 (3.3%)	75 (2.7%)
more than 1 days a month	615 (2.3%)	564 (2.3%)	51 (1.9%)
hardly ever	21,276 (78.7%)	19,063 (78.5%)	2,213 (80.5%)

Have friends or neighbors

easily available for small talk or daily conversation

Yes	18,086 (66.9%)	17,029 (70.1%)	1,057 (38.4%)
-----	----------------	----------------	---------------

Family and loneliness during Covid-19

No	8,950 (33.1%)	7,257 (29.9%)	1,693 (61.6%)
Current smoking	7,004 (25.5%)	6,274 (25.8%)	730 (26.5%)
Alcohol consumption			
6-7 days a week	5,674 (21.0%)	5,179 (21.3%)	495 (18.0%)
4-5 days a week	2,077 (7.7%)	1,910 (7.9%)	167 (6.1%)
2-3 days a week	3,266 (12.1%)	2,935 (12.1%)	331 (12.0%)
less than 1 day a week	4,547 (16.8%)	4,071 (16.8%)	476 (17.3%)
hardly ever	11,472 (42.4%)	10,191 (42.0%)	1,281 (46.6%)
Time for interests			
more than 2 hours	4,636 (17.1%)	4,078 (16.8%)	558 (20.3%)
more than 1 hour	6,367 (23.6%)	5,770 (23.8%)	597 (21.7%)
more than 30 minutes	5,727 (21.2%)	5,231 (21.5%)	496 (18.0%)
less than 30 minutes	4,376 (16.2%)	3,991 (16.4%)	385 (14.0%)
almost never	5,930 (21.9%)	5,216 (21.5%)	714 (26.0%)

352

353

354 **Table 2. Association between time spent with family having a meal or at home, and loneliness**

355

	Participants	Loneliness	Univariate			Multivariate*		
	n	%	OR	95% CI	<i>p</i>	OR	95% CI	<i>p</i>
Time spent with family								
having a meal or at home								
More than 2 hours	4,375	6.2	1.00			1.00		
More than 1 hour	6,312	6.2	1.01	0.86-1.19	0.865	0.97	0.82-1.14	0.713
More than 30 minutes	5,611	8.0	1.44	1.23-1.68	<0.001	1.26	1.07-1.48	0.006
Less than 30 minutes	3,553	10.4	1.96	1.66-2.31	<0.001	1.49	1.25-1.77	<0.001
Almost never	7,185	17.7	3.43	2.99-3.94	<0.001	2.00	1.71-2.33	<0.001
Live with spouse								
Yes	14,454	6.2	1.00			1.00		
No	12,582	14.7	2.44	2.24-2.67	<0.001	1.44	1.30-1.61	<0.001
Live with someone in								
need of care								

Yes	1,223	14.6	1.67	1.41-1.97	<0.001	1.85	1.56-2.21	<0.001
No	25,813	10.0	1.00			1.00		

OR: odds ratio; CI: confidence interval

* Adjusted for age, sex, marital status, presence of a cohabitant needing care, equivalent income, educational level, frequency of remote work, presence of someone for casual chat, smoking, drinking, time for leisure activities and cumulative incidence rate of COVID-19 in the prefecture