

The role of social network structure and function in moderate and severe social and emotional loneliness: the Dutch SaNAE study in older adults

Lisanne CJ Steijvers^{1,2*}, Stephanie Brinkhues³, Bianca Suanet⁴, Mandy MN Stijnen^{1,3}, Christian JPA Hoebe^{1,3,5}, Nicole HTM Dukers-Muijers^{2,6}

1. Department of Social Medicine, Care and Public Health Research Institute (CAPHRI), Maastricht University, Maastricht, the Netherlands
2. Department of Sexual Health, Infectious Diseases and Environmental Health, Living Lab Public Health, South Limburg Public Health Service, Heerlen, the Netherlands
3. Department of Knowledge and Innovation, Living Lab Public Health, South Limburg Public Health Service, Heerlen, the Netherlands
4. Department of Sociology, Faculty of Social Sciences, Vrije Universiteit Amsterdam, Amsterdam, The Netherlands
5. Department of Medical Microbiology, Infectious Diseases and Infection Prevention, Care and Public Health Research Institute (CAPHRI), Maastricht University Medical Centre (MUMC+), Maastricht, the Netherlands
6. Department of Health Promotion, Care and Public Health Research Institute (CAPHRI), Maastricht University, Maastricht, the Netherlands

* Corresponding author:

Lisanne CJ Steijvers, l.steijvers@maastrichtuniversity.nl

Abstract

Background. Loneliness is a serious public health problem and became even more visible during the COVID-19 pandemic. Yet it is unknown which aspects of social networks are most important. Here, we evaluated social network structure and function and associations with moderate and severe social and emotional loneliness in older adults.

Methods. This cross-sectional study includes online questionnaire data (SaNAE cohort, August-November 2020), in independently living Dutch adults aged 40 years and older. For the separate outcomes social and emotional loneliness, associations with structural network aspects (e.g., network diversity - having various types of relationships, and density - having network members who know each other), and functional network aspects (informational, emotional, and practical social support) were assessed and risk estimates were adjusted for the number of contacts, age, educational level, level of urbanization and chronic conditions. Multivariable logistic regression analyses were stratified by sex.

Results. Of 3,396 participants (55% men; mean age 65 years), 18% were socially lonely which was associated with a less diverse and less dense network, living alone, feeling less connected to friends, not having a club membership, and fewer emotional supporters (men only) or informational supporters (women only). 28% were emotionally lonely, which was associated with being socially lonely, and more exclusively online (versus in-person) contacts (men only), and fewer emotional supporters (women only).

Conclusion. Network structure and function beyond the mere number of contacts is key in loneliness, and in particular, the types of relationships are important. Public health strategies should be sex-tailored and promote network diversity and density, club membership, informational and emotional support, and in-person contact.

Keywords

Social network structure, social network function, social loneliness, emotional loneliness, COVID-19 pandemic

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

1. Background

1.1. Loneliness: a public health problem

Loneliness is a serious public health problem. It leads to a higher risk of premature death and the onset and progression of a range of physical and mental health problems, such as cardiovascular diseases, infectious diseases, and depression (Holt-Lunstad et al., 2015; Steptoe et al., 2013; Valtorta et al., 2016; Wang et al., 2018). During the COVID-19 pandemic, social distancing measures to contain SARS-CoV-2 transmission have led to a reduction in daily contact and an increased risk of loneliness (Auranen et al., 2021; Feehan & Mahmud, 2021; Rumas et al., 2021). Globally, loneliness is widespread, with some countries reporting that up to one in three older people feel lonely (World Health Organization, 2022). In the Netherlands, the percentage of lonely people in the adult population is substantial, partly due to the COVID-19 pandemic (Armitage & Nellums, 2020; Van Tilburg et al., 2021). Loneliness appears to impose a heavy financial burden on society (Meisters et al., 2021).

1.2. Assessing loneliness

Loneliness is defined as “the unpleasant experience that occurs when a person’s network of social relationships is deficient in some important way, either quantitatively or qualitatively” (Perlman & Peplau, 1981). Weiss differentiated between social and emotional loneliness with social loneliness defined as “the absence of a broader group of contacts or an engaging social network (e.g., friends, colleagues, and people in the neighborhood)”, whereas emotional loneliness is defined as “the absence of an intimate relationship or a close emotional attachment (e.g., a partner or a best friend)” (Weiss, 1975). Instruments to assess loneliness usually do not distinguish between the two types: a validated questionnaire to assess both dimensions of loneliness is the Jong Gierveld scale (De Jong Gierveld & Van Tilburg, 2006).

1.3. Social networks in relation to loneliness and preventive strategies

To assess loneliness implies that we acknowledge that loneliness is related to both structure and function of a social network, in addition to other types of relevant personal, social, and structural factors. Most previous studies assessing social network aspects in relation to loneliness have emphasized social network size (a structural social network aspect), demonstrating a link between social isolation (small network size) and loneliness (Kemperman et al., 2019; Moorer & Suurmeijer, 2001). Interventions to curb loneliness will first need to identify the crucial network aspects, and use these to either prevent loneliness or alleviate its consequences. Most previous interventions have focused on promoting social interactions. Yet, merely increasing the number of social relationships that a person has, is usually not effective in social and emotional loneliness (Chater & Loewenstein, 2022). Not commonly, other structural or functional network aspects are identified. Yet, a richer description of social networks based on various structural and functional aspects can be useful in the search for effective targets for the prevention of loneliness. Social network in which an individual is embedded can be composed of many or few relationships, and of various types of relationships, supports, and modes of contact (Berkman & Glass, 2000). Most studies examining loneliness included a limited set of such social network metrics or evaluated only ‘single’ network aspects. Though recommended is to evaluate structural and functional social network aspects jointly when assessing loneliness (Deckx et al., 2015; Margelisch et al., 2017; Pronk et al., 2011), most studies also lacked such evaluation of a combination of network aspects. As a result, in depth knowledge of which social network aspects are most important in loneliness, in particular emotional and social loneliness is scarce (Dahlberg et al., 2022).

1.4. Structural social network aspects beyond the number of network members (network size)

Structural social network aspects include network diversity (various types of social relationships), network density (how well network members are connected), homogeneity in terms of age and sex, geographical proximity, living alone and mode of contact (Berkman & Glass, 2000). Few studies examined these other structural network aspects; family-focused (less diverse) social networks were associated with loneliness among older adults, whereas having a larger share of friends in the network was inversely associated. (Wenger,

1997; Wenger & Tucker, 2002). People with more social network members in the neighborhood are less likely to be lonely, as these network members can meet up more easily.(Cacioppo et al., 2009; Weijs-Perrée et al., 2015). Not just geographical proximity, but also who live alone are more likely to be lonely (Brittain et al., 2017; Dahlberg et al., 2022; Newall et al., 2009; Taube et al., 2013).

1.5. Functional social network aspects

Functional social network aspects include social support from network members, such as informational, emotional, and practical support (Berkman & Glass, 2000). Social support is important for resilience as received social support may facilitate an adequate response to a possible stressful event and thereby avoiding a physical stress response or illness (Cohen & Wills, 1985). Lack of emotional support is associated with loneliness (Dahlberg et al., 2018). Also, the type of supporting relationships (family versus non-family members) were associated with risk of emotional loneliness (Van Baarsen, 2002). Social support roles have changed during the COVID-19 pandemic as people had fewer emotional or practical supporters, but also people had to depend more on their family members or neighbors for various types of support (Ottoni et al., 2022; Steijvers et al., 2022).

1.6. Social connectedness

During the COVID-19 pandemic, people felt less connected with family and friends (Holaday et al., 2022). Social connectedness or the subjective feeling of being embedded within a social network is important for well-being, loneliness. Feeling less connected increases the risk for loneliness (O'Rourke et al., 2018; O'Rourke & Sidani, 2017; Santini et al., 2020).

1.7. The present study

The Social Network Assessment in Adults and Elderly (SaNAE) study assesses social networks in relation to health. The objective of the current study is to jointly evaluate a range of structural and functional social network aspects for their association with loneliness. Specifically the health outcomes of social or emotional loneliness were evaluated separately among older adults during the COVID-19 pandemic. These associations are examined for men and women separately, as previous studies have revealed heterogeneity of network aspects by sex (Barreto et al., 2021; Dahlberg et al., 2022; Steijvers et al., 2022). Doing so reveals possible key targets for preventive strategies in men and women for the identification of social and emotional loneliness, and to promote strategies for preventing or alleviating loneliness.

2. Methods

2.1. Ethical statement

This study was approved by the Medical Ethical Committee of the University of Maastricht (METC 2018-0698, 2019-1035, and 2020-2266). Participants gave electronic informed consent.

2.2. Study design and population

This cross-sectional study used data from the Dutch SaNAE cohort (www.sanae-study.nl), measured in August-November 2020 using an online questionnaire.

The SaNAE study was started in 2019 and included 5,144 participants who were independent-living Dutch adults aged 40 years or older (Steijvers et al., 2021). In August-November 2020, 5,001 participants were invited for a follow-up questionnaire of whom 67% (n=3,505) responded. Respondents were slightly older (mean difference 1.8 years, $p < 0.001$) and differed in educational level ($\chi^2 = 20.884$; $df = 2$; $p < 0.001$) compared to non-responders but did not differ in sex or network size ($p > 0.05$). Respondents without missing data on variables of interest in this study were included in further analyses (n=3,396).

2.3. Moderate or severe emotional and social loneliness (outcomes in analyses)

Loneliness was assessed using the six-item De Jong Gierveld Loneliness Scale (De Jong Gierveld & Van Tilburg, 2006). The six-item scale can be used to measure unidimensional loneliness, but also to measure social and emotional loneliness. Three items for social loneliness included 'There are plenty of people I can rely on when I have problems', 'There are many people whom I can trust completely', and 'there are enough people I feel close to'. The three items for emotional loneliness included 'I experience a general sense of emptiness', 'I miss having people around', and 'I often feel rejected'. Answer categories included totally agree, agree, neutral, disagree, and totally disagree. The answer categories neutral, disagree, and totally disagree were counted for social loneliness while the answer categories neutral, agree, and totally agree were counted for emotional loneliness. A score of zero or one was defined as 'not lonely' whereas a score of two or three was defined as 'moderately/severely lonely'. Reliability tests were performed calculating Cronbach's alpha coefficients for social and emotional loneliness items separately.

2.4. Social network aspects (independent variables)

Social network aspects were measured using a name-generator questionnaire. Participants were asked to provide names of family members, friends, acquaintances, and other persons who are important to them or provide support. Additional information about network members was asked using name interpreter items. A more detailed description can be found elsewhere (Steijvers et al., 2021; Steijvers et al., 2022) and in supplementary Table 1. We include a range of structural and functional metrics (Supplementary table 1).

2.5. Statistical analyses

Descriptive analyses were used for sociodemographic characteristics and social network aspects of the study population. All analyses were performed for the outcome variables: social and emotional loneliness. All analyses were stratified by sex.

Various multivariable logistic regression analyses models were constructed which also included the confounding variables: age, educational level, level of urbanization and chronic conditions (Type 2 Diabetes Mellitus, asthma/COPD, and cardiovascular diseases). Models (0) were created for each social network aspect separately as independent variable adjusted for confounding variables (results not presented). Models (I) were created including all social network aspects that were statistically significant from Models (0), using stepwise backward selection and also included potentially confounding variables. Models (II) additionally included social network size. Finally, for emotional loneliness as an outcome, models (III) included a variable social loneliness

(as independent determinant) since social loneliness was expected to be (in part) in the pathway between network aspects and emotional loneliness (Figure 1).

Before the models were built, multicollinearity between social network aspects was ruled out (correlation analyses: all correlations <0.7). A p -value <0.05 indicated statistical significance. All analyses were performed using IBM SPSS Statistics (version 27.0).

2.6. Sensitivity analyses

Sensitivity analyses were performed to assess the outcomes social and emotional loneliness when based on a different cut-off value of one and higher to reflect lonely versus not lonely (rather than the main analyses that focused on moderate and severe loneliness).

3. Results

3.1. Study population

Of all participants, 55% were men, and 43% of the participants had a theoretical educational level. The mean age was 65 years. (Table 1)

Table 1. Characteristics of the SaNAE study population (n=3,396)

	Total population	Moderate/severe social loneliness		Moderate/severe emotional loneliness	
	(n=3396)	Lonely (18%, n=616)	Not lonely (82%, n=2780)	Lonely (28%, n=955)	Not lonely (72%, n=2441)
	% (n/N) or mean(sd)	% (n/N) or mean (sd)	% (n/N) or mean (sd)	% (n/N) or mean (sd)	% (n/N) or mean (sd)
Sociodemographic characteristics					
Sex					
Men	55 (1874/3396)	20 (367/1874)	80 (1507/1874)	25 (476/1874)	75 (1398/1874)
Women	45 (1522/3396)	16 (249/1522)	84 (1273/1522)	32 (479/1522)	69 (1043/1522)
Age (mean, sd)	65.2 (9.8)	65.4 (10.4)	65.1 (9.7)	65.8 (10.3)	64.9 (9.7)
Educational level					
Practical	27 (915/3396)	21 (192/915)	79 (723/915)	34 (314/915)	66 (601/915)
Mixed	30 (1009/3396)	18 (185/1009)	82 (824/1009)	29 (289/1009)	71 (720/1009)
Theoretical	43 (1472/3396)	16 (239/1472)	84 (1233/1472)	24 (352/1472)	76 (1120/1472)
Level of urbanization					
Rural	27 (930/3396)	17 (157/930)	83 (773/930)	23 (243/930)	74 (687/930)
Hardly urban	24 (810/3396)	18 (142/810)	82 (668/810)	26 (213/810)	74 (597/810)
Moderately urban	19 (633/3396)	21 (131/633)	79 (502/633)	29 (186/633)	71 (447/633)
Strongly or extremely urban	30 (1023/3396)	18 (186/1023)	82 (837/1023)	31 (313/1023)	69 (710/1023)
Chronic conditions					
Type 2 Diabetes Mellitus (T2DM)	9 (300)	24 (73/300)	76 (227/300)	40 (121/300)	60 (179/300)
Asthma/COPD	10 (338)	20 (68/338)	80 (270/338)	36 (123/338)	64 (215/338)
Cardiovascular diseases	16 (548)	21 (114/548)	79 (434/548)	35 (192/548)	65 (356/548)
Depression	5 (184)	44 (80/184)	57 (104/184)	72 (133/184)	28 (51/184)
Score comorbidities					
Zero	68 (2313)	16 (364/2313)	84 (1949/2313)	24 (544/2313)	77 (1796/2313)
One	22 (753)	22 (169/753)	78 (584/753)	35 (263/753)	65 (490/753)
Two or more	10 (330)	25 (83/330)	75 (247/330)	45 (148/330)	55 (182/330)

3.2. Moderate/severe social and emotional loneliness

Of the men, 20% (367/1874) were socially lonely and 25% (476/1874) were emotionally lonely. Of the women, 16% (249/1522) were socially lonely and 31% (479/1522) were emotionally lonely. Men were more likely to be socially lonely [aOR: 1.24, $p < 0.05$] whereas women were more likely to be emotionally lonely [aOR: 1.50, $p < 0.001$].

10% (189/1874) of the men and 11% (174/1522) of the women were both socially and emotionally lonely. Among the socially lonely men, 52% (189/367) were also emotionally lonely. For socially lonely women, this was 70% (174/249) (Figure 1).




Figure 1. Percentages of moderate/severe social and emotional loneliness in men and women in the SaNAE study

3.3. Social network structure in people who are moderate or severe lonely

Men

Of socially lonely men, 50% had four or less network members. For 33%, their social network was composed of only family members; 20% had diverse social networks including family members, friends, and acquaintances who know each other (well) (Table 2).

Of emotionally lonely men, 37% had four or less network members. For 19%, the social network included only family members; 30% had diverse networks.

Women

Of socially lonely women, 39% had four or less network members. For 25%, their social network was composed of only family members; 34% had diverse social networks including family members, friends, and acquaintances who know each other (well) (Table 2).

Of emotionally lonely women, 23% had four or less network members. For 11%, the social network included only family members; 42% had diverse networks.

Table 2. Structural and functional social network aspects and moderate/severe social and emotional loneliness of the SaNAE study population (n=3,396)

	Moderate/severe social loneliness *				Moderate/severe emotional loneliness *			
	Men (n=1874)		Women (n=1522)		Men (n=1874)		Women (n=1522)	
	Lonely (n=367)	Not lonely (n=1507)	Lonely (n=249)	Not lonely (n=1273)	Lonely (n=476)	Not lonely (n=1398)	Lonely (n=479)	Not lonely (n=1043)
	% (n) or mean (sd)	% (n) or mean (sd)	% (n) or mean (sd)	% (n) or mean (sd)	% (n) or mean (sd)	% (n) or mean (sd)	% (n) or mean (sd)	% (n) or mean (sd)
Social loneliness					40 (189)	13 (178)	36 (174)	7 (75)
Structural social network aspects								
Network size (number of network members, range 0-40)	5.9 (4.9)	9.3 (6.9)	7.6 (5.7)	12.5 (7.4)	7.7 (6.3)	8.9 (6.7)	9.4 (6.3)	12.7 (7.5)
0-4 members	50 (182)	30 (445)	37 (93)	11 (135)	39 (185)	32 (442)	23 (110)	11 (118)
5-8 members	29 (108)	26 (385)	29 (73)	23 (288)	28 (132)	26 (361)	31 (149)	20 (212)
8-13 members	12 (43)	23 (346)	20 (49)	30 (385)	18 (85)	22 (304)	24 (114)	31 (320)
>13 members	9 (34)	22 (331)	14 (34)	37 (465)	16 (74)	21 (291)	22 (106)	38 (393)
Network diversity and density combined								
No family, but friends, acquaintances, or others	5 (20)	1 (19)	5 (12)	1 (12)	3 (16)	2 (23)	3 (13)	1 (11)
Only family members	33 (121)	18 (270)	19 (48)	5 (67)	25 (117)	20 (274)	11 (52)	6 (63)
Both family and friends, but do not know each other (well)	6 (23)	3 (44)	8 (21)	4 (45)	4 (20)	3 (47)	6 (30)	4 (36)
Family, friends, acquaintances, and/or others, who do not know each other (well)	12 (44)	10 (146)	16 (40)	13 (171)	11 (53)	10 (137)	16 (76)	13 (135)
Family, no friends, but others	11 (40)	9 (137)	8 (20)	5 (60)	9 (41)	10 (136)	7 (33)	5 (47)
Both family and friends, and know each other (well)	12 (44)	15 (223)	13 (33)	13 (166)	15 (69)	14 (198)	15 (72)	12 (127)
Family, friends, acquaintances, and/or others, and know each other (well)	20 (75)	44 (668)	30 (75)	59 (752)	34 (160)	42 (583)	42 (203)	60 (624)
Proportion network members of the same sex	40.7 (28.0)	46.9 (22.4)	58.4 (27.1)	63.7 (17.9)	44.8 (24.1)	46.0 (23.6)	62.1 (22.3)	63.2 (18.5)
Proportion network members of the same age	40.7 (31.4)	39.5 (25.1)	40.4 (26.2)	41.9 (20.9)	37.3 (28.4)	40.5 (25.7)	39.7 (23.5)	42.5 (21.0)
Geographical proximity (proportion network members living:)								
In the same house	27.7 (33.1)	18.3 (22.7)	18.0 (23.6)	11.8 (14.3)	18.5 (25.3)	20.7 (25.4)	12.9 (18.8)	12.8 (15.1)
Within walking distance	22.3 (27.8)	28.7 (26.1)	26.4 (27.3)	29.4 (23.4)	27.3 (28.1)	27.5 (26.0)	29.7 (25.6)	28.6 (23.4)
Less than 30 minutes away	31.7 (30.2)	34.8 (27.4)	36.4 (27.8)	39.0 (25.8)	35.8 (29.6)	33.7 (27.4)	38.6 (27.9)	38.5 (25.3)
More than 30 minutes away	8.5 (17.9)	10.5 (17.0)	10.6 (18.5)	10.1 (14.7)	9.1 (16.6)	10.4 (17.4)	8.9 (15.5)	10.7 (15.3)
Further away	9.9 (21.1)	7.7 (15.2)	8.6 (17.0)	9.7 (15.7)	9.3 (18.7)	7.7 (15.7)	9.9 (17.0)	9.4 (15.4)
Mode of contact (proportion of network members)								
Contacted exclusively in person	61.0 (35.7)	58.3 (34.5)	50.5 (36.2)	51.9 (31.6)	55.9 (35.6)	59.8 (34.4)	48.7 (33.4)	53.0 (31.8)
Contacted exclusively online	20.6 (26.5)	19.6 (22.7)	24.0 (26.3)	25.2 (21.8)	23.6 (27.4)	18.5 (21.9)	25.8 (24.9)	24.6 (21.5)
Contacted both in person and online	13.3 (28.8)	16.5 (28.6)	19.5 (30.7)	16.6 (27.2)	14.3 (28.1)	16.4 (28.9)	19.7 (29.9)	15.9 (26.7)
Not contacted in the past two weeks	5.1 (13.6)	5.6 (12.7)	6.0 (11.2)	6.4 (11.0)	6.2 (14.3)	5.3 (12.3)	5.8 (10.8)	6.5 (11.1)
Participating in work								
Participating (employed)	28 (102)	30 (451)	32 (80)	39 (497)	27 (130)	30 (423)	29 (140)	42 (437)
Not participating (retired)	57 (209)	61 (923)	36 (89)	35 (446)	60 (285)	31 (847)	38 (180)	34 (355)

Not participating (unemployed)	14 (52)	8 (123)	31 (77)	24 (305)	12 (55)	9 (120)	32 (151)	22 (231)	
Not participating (other)	1 (4)	1 (10)	1 (3)	2 (25)	1 (6)	1 (8)	2 (8)	2 (20)	
Social participation (having a club membership)	48 (175)	58 (874)	45 (113)	56 (712)	53 (252)	57 (797)	51 (244)	56 (581)	
Sports club	25 (91)	32 (480)	20 (50)	36 (461)	27 (128)	32 (443)	28 (132)	36 (379)	
Music organization	10 (36)	16 (247)	10 (24)	13 (165)	16 (75)	15 (208)	11 (53)	13 (136)	
Volunteer work	10 (37)	17 (255)	12 (29)	14 (178)	16 (78)	15 (214)	14 (68)	13 (139)	
Religious groups	6 (22)	4 (67)	4 (9)	4 (50)	7 (33)	4 (56)	4 (19)	4 (40)	
Talking groups	3 (11)	3 (48)	4 (11)	3 (39)	5 (22)	3 (37)	4 (18)	3 (32)	
Other	18 (67)	18 (277)	20 (50)	19 (240)	17 (81)	19 (263)	21 (100)	18 (190)	
Functional social network aspects									
Number of informational supporters	2.8 (3.3)	4.3 (4.7)	3.4 (3.8)	6.2 (5.6)	3.6 (4.3)	4.1 (4.5)	4.6 (4.4)	6.2 (5.8)	
Number of emotional supporters	3.4 (3.5)	5.7 (5.4)	4.8 (4.6)	7.8 (5.9)	4.7 (4.9)	5.5 (5.3)	5.7 (4.5)	8.1 (6.2)	
Number of practical supporters	1.4 (1.8)	1.9 (2.2)	1.3 (1.5)	2.0 (2.0)	1.7(2.0)	1.8 (2.2)	1.8 (2.1)	2.0 (1.9)	
Connectedness with family*									
Less connected	16 (57)	10 (149)	23 (56)	9 (118)	19 (900)	8 (116)	21 (101)	7 (73)	
Unchanged	74 (272)	76 (1140)	66 (163)	71 (905)	67 (320)	78 (1092)	63 (303)	73 (765)	
More connected	10 (38)	15 (218)	12 (30)	20 (250)	14 (66)	14 (190)	16 (75)	20 (205)	
Connectedness with friends*									
Less connected	22 (82)	14 (217)	29 (72)	15 (193)	28 (135)	12 (164)	31 (148)	11 (117)	
Unchanged	73 (267)	78 (1173)	66 (163)	73 (923)	63 (300)	82 (1140)	60 (285)	77 (801)	
More connected	5 (18)	8 (117)	6 (14)	12 (157)	9 (41)	7 (94)	10 (46)	12 (125)	
Connectedness with people at work*									
Less connected	26 (96)	25 (381)	37 (91)	26 (336)	36 (170)	22 (307)	38 (183)	23 (244)	
Unchanged	71 (262)	73 (1094)	60 (149)	67 (858)	62 (293)	76 (1063)	57 (271)	71 (736)	
More connected	3 (9)	2 (32)	4 (9)	6 (79)	3 (13)	2 (28)	5 (25)	6 (63)	
Connectedness with neighbors*									
Less connected	14 (52)	10 (148)	25 (63)	12 (156)	20 (93)	8 (107)	25 (119)	10 (100)	
Unchanged	77 (284)	84 (1262)	68 (169)	79 (1001)	72 (344)	86 (1202)	68 (324)	81 (846)	
More connected	8 (31)	6 (97)	7 (17)	9 (116)	8 (39)	6 (89)	8 (36)	9 (97)	
Connectedness with my city*									
Less connected	20 (75)	20 (297)	31 (78)	23 (292)	31 (148)	16 (224)	38 (184)	18 (186)	
Unchanged	77 (282)	77 (1159)	65 (162)	73 (927)	65 (311)	81 (1130)	59 (280)	78 (809)	
More connected	3 (10)	3 (51)	4 (9)	4 (54)	4 (17)	3 (44)	3 (15)	5 (48)	
Connectedness with my country*									
Less connected	21 (77)	15 (226)	29 (71)	17 (212)	25 (120)	13 (183)	31 (149)	13 (134)	
Unchanged	73 (268)	79 (1193)	66 (164)	75 (959)	37 (320)	82 (1141)	62 (299)	79 (824)	
More connected	6 (22)	6 (88)	6 (14)	8 (102)	8 (36)	5 (74)	7 (31)	8 (85)	
Connectedness with the world*									
Less connected	25 (93)	19 (290)	30 (75)	21 (266)	29 (136)	18 (247)	33 (159)	17 (182)	
Unchanged	71 (261)	75 (1133)	66 (164)	72 (921)	66 (314)	77 (1080)	61 (290)	76 (795)	

More connected

4 (13)

6 (84)

4 (10)

7 (86)

6 (26)

5 (71)

6 (30)

6 (66)

* Compared to pre-COVID-19 times

3.4. Social network aspects associated with moderate/severe social loneliness

Men

In model I, independently associated with social loneliness were having less diverse and less dense social networks, a larger proportion of network members living in the same house or living far away, living alone, not participating in work, not being a member of a music organization, having fewer emotional supporters and feeling less connected with friends, and feeling more connected with neighbors (Table 3). After adding network size (model II), all these social network aspects, except social network size and not being a member of a music organization, remained associated.

Women

In model I, independently associated with social loneliness were having less diverse and less dense social networks, living alone, not being a member of a sports club, having fewer informational supporters, and feeling less connected with family and neighbors. After adding network size (model II), all these social network aspects remained associated. Smaller social network size was also associated with social loneliness. (Table 3)

3.5. Social network aspects associated with moderate/severe emotional loneliness

Men

In model I, independently associated with emotional loneliness were having less diverse and less dense social networks, contacting a larger proportion of network members exclusively online, living alone, membership of a religious group, feeling less connected to friends, people from work and the city, and feeling more connected with friends, and the country. After adding network size (model II), all these social network aspects remained associated, except for network diversity and density. After adding social loneliness (model III), all social network aspects remained associated, except feeling more connected to the country. Social loneliness was also associated with emotional loneliness. (Table 4)

Women

In model I, independently associated with emotional loneliness were less diverse and less dense social networks, living alone, not participating in work, having fewer emotional supporters, and feeling less connected with friends, people from work, and the city, and feeling more connected with people from work. After adding network size (model II), all these social network aspects remained associated except feeling more connected to people from work. Smaller network size was also associated. After adding social loneliness (model III), all social network aspects remained associated except network size and diversity and density.

An visual overview of all associations between social networks and social and emotional loneliness is available in Figure 2.

Sensitivity analyses showed similar results for the observed associated network aspects, when using another a cut-off value (≥ 1) for both social and emotional loneliness (supplementary table 2 and 3).




Figure 2. Overview of associations between social network aspects and moderate/severe social and emotional loneliness among men and women in the SaNAE study. Panel A shows associations for women and panel B shows association for men.

Table 3. Multivariable logistic regression analyses between structural and functional social network aspects and moderate/severe social loneliness

Moderate/severe social loneliness	Model I		Model II	
	Men	Women	Men	Women
	OR (95% CI)	OR (95% CI)	OR (95% CI)	OR (95% CI)
Structural social network aspects				
Network size (number of network members)	Not assessed	Not assessed		
0-4 members			1.12 (0.60-2.08)	3.77 (1.81-7.82) ***
5-8 members			1.28 (0.75-2.17)	1.93 (1.06-3.52) *
8-13 members			0.90 (0.53-1.51)	1.34 (0.79-2.28)
>13 members			Ref	Ref
Network diversity and density combined				
No family, but friends, acquaintances, or others	4.68 (2.26-9.71) ***	4.42 (1.73-11.30) **	4.67 (2.21-9.87) ***	2.89 (1.08-7.72) *
Only family	2.03 (1.34-3.06) ***	3.50 (2.02-6.06) ***	1.97 (1.27-3.04) **	2.29 (1.27-4.14) **
Both family and friends, but do not know each other (well)	3.12 (1.73-5.64) ***	2.72 (1.45-5.10) **	2.89 (1.58-5.28) ***	2.18 (1.14-4.18) *
Family, friends, acquaintances, and/or others, but do not know each other (well)	2.20 (1.43-3.38) ***	1.96 (1.26-3.05) **	2.18 (1.41-3.36) ***	2.05 (1.31-3.22) **
Family, no friends, but others	1.86 (1.18-2.94) **	2.09 (1.14-3.84) *	1.78 (1.12-2.84) *	1.75 (0.94-3.26) #
Both family and friends, and know each other (well)	1.38 (0.90-2.11)	1.31 (0.81-2.11)	1.29 (0.83-2.01)	1.14 (0.69-1.86)
Family, friends, acquaintances, and/or others, and they know each other (well)	Ref	Ref	Ref	Ref
Proximity (proportion network members living)				
In the same house	2.50 (1.46-4.29) ***	2.08 (0.80-5.40)	2.51 (1.44-4.37) **	1.32 (0.50-3.53)
Further away	2.26 (1.13-4.52) *	0.73 (0.27-1.93)	2.25 (1.13-4.49) *	0.79 (0.30-2.12)
Living alone	1.77 (1.28-2.46) ***	1.87 (1.28-2.72) **	1.75 (1.26-2.43) **	1.76 (1.20-2.58) **
Participating in work				
Participating (employed)	Ref	Ref	Ref	Ref
Not participating (retired)	0.80 (0.53-1.21)	1.45 (0.88-2.40)	0.82 (0.54-1.24)	1.39 (0.83-2.32)
Not participating (unemployed)	1.65 (1.07-2.56) *	1.38 (0.91-2.09)	1.65 (1.07-2.56) *	1.31 (0.86-2.00)
Not participating (other)	1.08 (0.29-1.39)	0.65 (0.17-2.44)	1.11 (0.30-4.11)	0.68 (0.18-2.55)
No membership of a sports club	1.04 (0.78-1.39)	1.86 (1.30-2.67) ***	1.04 (0.78-1.39)	1.85 (1.29-2.67) ***
No membership of a music organization	1.50 (1.01-2.22) *	1.14 (0.70-1.87)	1.47 (0.99-2.19) #	1.09 (0.66-1.793)
Functional social network aspects				
Fewer informational supporters	0.99 (0.95-1.03)	1.08 (1.02-1.14) **	0.99 (0.94-1.03)	1.07 (1.01-1.13) **
Fewer emotional supporters	1.08 (1.03-1.12) ***	1.02 (0.97-1.07)	1.07 (1.02-1.12) **	0.98 (0.93-1.03)
Connectedness with family[^]				
Less connected	1.15 (0.76-1.76)	1.71 (1.06-2.75) *	1.16 (0.76-1.78)	1.71 (1.05-2.77) *
Unchanged	Ref	Ref	Ref	Ref
More connected	0.91 (0.57-1.45)	0.92 (0.55-1.54)	0.92 (0.58-1.47)	0.94 (0.56-1.58)

Connectedness with friends[^]				
Less connected	1.55 (1.07-2.25) *	1.29 (0.85-1.97)	1.54 (1.06-2.24) *	1.26 (0.83-1.94)
Unchanged	Ref	Ref	Ref	Ref
More connected	0.98 (0.52-1.87)	0.65 (0.32-1.33)	0.97 (0.51-1.85)	0.64 (0.31-1.32)
Connectedness with neighbors[^]				
Less connected	1.25 (0.85-1.86)	1.79 (1.20-2.68) **	1.24 (0.84-1.85)	1.77 (1.18-2.66) **
Unchanged	Ref	Ref	Ref	Ref
More connected	1.79 (1.11-2.89) *	1.42 (0.78-2.59)	1.78 (1.10-2.87) *	1.45 (0.80-2.66)

Model I: adjusted for age, educational level, type 2 Diabetes Mellitus, asthma/COPD, cardiovascular diseases

Model II: adjusted for age, educational level, type 2 Diabetes Mellitus, asthma/COPD, cardiovascular diseases, and network size

OR: odds ratio, 95%CI: 95% confidence interval. # $p < 0.1$, * $p < 0.05$, ** $p < 0.01$, *** $p < 0.001$

[^] compared to pre-COVID-19 times.

Table 4. Multivariable logistic regression analyses between structural and functional social network aspects and moderate/severe emotional loneliness

Moderate/severe emotional loneliness	Model I		Model II		Model III	
	Men	Women	Men	Women	Men	Women
	OR (95% CI)	OR (95% CI)	OR (95% CI)	OR (95% CI)	OR (95% CI)	OR (95% CI)
Structural social network aspects						
Social loneliness	Not assessed	Not assessed	Not assessed	Not assessed	4.37 (3.30-5.79) ***	6.13 (4.34-8.67) ***
Network size	Not assessed	Not assessed				
0-4 members			1.15 (0.69-1.94)	1.65 (0.95-2.84) #	1.10 (0.64-1.89)	1.12 (0.63-2.01)
5-8 members			1.15 (0.73-1.80)	1.61 (1.06-2.44) *	1.11 (0.70-1.77)	1.37 (0.89-2.12)
8-13 members			1.12 (0.74-1.68)	1.00 (0.69-1.43)	1.18 (0.78-1.81)	0.93 (0.64-1.35)
>13 members			Ref	Ref	Ref	Ref
Network diversity and density combined						
No family, but friends, acquaintances, or others	1.60 (0.77-3.36)	1.60 (0.64-3.96)	1.57 (0.74-3.37)	1.33 (0.52-3.42)	0.90 (0.39-2.08)	0.85 (0.30-2.38)
Only family	1.46 (1.04-2.06) *	1.86 (1.16-2.99) *	1.42 (0.96-2.11) #	1.45 (0.85-2.49)	1.14 (0.75-1.72)	1.09 (0.61-1.95)
Both family and friends, but do not know each other (well)	1.18 (0.63-2.21)	1.54 (0.86-2.76)	1.14 (0.60-2.16)	1.29 (0.71-2.34)	0.80 (0.40-1.58)	1.03 (0.54-1.98)
Family, friends, acquaintances, and/or others, but do not know each other (well)	1.05 (0.70-1.57)	1.53 (1.07-2.18) *	1.05 (0.70-1.57)	1.53 (1.07-2.19) *	0.86 (0.56-1.31)	1.31 (0.90-1.92)
Family, no friends, but others	1.05 (0.68-1.63)	1.70 (0.99-2.90) #	1.03 (0.66-1.60)	1.49 (0.86-2.58)	0.86 (0.54-1.37)	1.31 (0.73-2.37)
Both family and friends, and know each other (well)	1.22 (0.85-1.76)	1.20 (0.83-1.76)	1.19 (0.81-1.74)	1.07 (0.73-1.59)	1.11 (0.75-1.64)	1.06 (0.71-1.60)
Family, friends, acquaintances, and/or others, and they know each other (well)	Ref	Ref	Ref	Ref	Ref	Ref
Mode of contact						
In person contact	1.16 (0.78-1.73)	0.69 (0.45-1.07) #	1.16 (0.77-1.71)	0.71 (0.46-1.11) #	1.06 (0.70-1.61)	0.71 (0.45-1.13) #
Online contact	2.15 (1.24-3.73) **	0.99 (0.53-1.84)	2.15 (1.24-3.73) **	1.04 (0.56-1.94)	1.99 (1.12-3.55) *	1.00 (0.52-1.92)
Living alone	3.32 (2.51-4.39) ***	2.08 (1.57-2.76) ***	3.31 (2.50-4.38) ***	2.08 (1.57-2.77) ***	3.26 (2.43-4.37) ***	1.95 (1.44-2.63) ***
Employment status						
Employed	Ref	Ref	Ref	Ref	Ref	Ref
Retired	0.91 (0.62-1.34)	1.25 (0.83-1.87)	0.91 (0.62-1.34)	1.19 (0.79-1.79)	0.97 (0.65-1.46)	1.13 (0.74-1.73)
Unemployed	1.05 (0.68-1.62)	1.67 (1.19-2.35) **	1.06 (0.69-1.62)	1.61 (1.14-2.27) **	0.95 (0.61-1.49)	1.57 (1.10-2.25) *
Other	1.82 (0.53-6.30)	1.14 (0.45-2.92)	1.83 (0.53-6.35)	1.18 (0.46-3.04)	1.97 (0.58-6.76)	1.28 (0.49-3.34)
Membership of religious groups	1.87 (1.14-3.09) *	0.94 (0.50-1.74)	1.88 (1.14-3.09) **	0.96 (0.51-1.79)	1.78 (1.06-2.99) *	0.88 (0.46-1.72)
Functional social network aspects						
Fewer emotional supporters	1.02 (0.99-1.04)	1.06 (1.03-1.09) ***	1.01 (0.98-1.04)	1.04 (1.01-1.08) *	1.00 (0.97-1.03)	1.04 (1.01-1.08) *
Connectedness with friends[^]						
Less connected	2.49 (1.83-3.38) ***	2.79 (2.01-3.86) ***	2.49 (1.83-3.39) ***	2.75 (1.99-3.82) ***	2.39 (1.74-3.30) ***	2.69 (1.91-3.80) ***
Unchanged	Ref	Ref	Ref	Ref	Ref	Ref

More connected	1.58 (1.01-2.47) *	1.26 (0.81-1.95)	1.59 (1.02-2.49) *	1.27 (0.82-1.98)	1.71 (1.08-2.71) *	1.40 (0.89-2.20)
Connectedness with people from work[^]						
Less connected	1.33 (1.02-1.74) *	1.37 (1.03-1.81) *	1.34 (1.02-1.75) *	1.38 (1.04-1.83) **	1.40(1.06-1.86) *	1.35 (1.00-1.81) *
Unchanged	Ref	Ref	Ref	Ref	Ref	Ref
More connected	1.84 (0.86-3.94)	1.83 (1.04-3.21) *	1.84 (0.86-3.93)	1.76 (1.00-3.11) #	1.66 (0.75-3.68)	1.90 (1.06-3.42) *
Connectedness with neighbors[^]						
Less connected	1.44 (0.99-2.10) #	1.40 (0.97-2.02) #	1.44 (0.98-2.10) #	1.37 (0.95-1.99) #	1.39 (0.94-2.05)	1.21 (0.82-1.79)
Unchanged	ref	ref	Ref	ref	ref	ref
More connected	1.37 (0.87-2.16)	1.06 (0.66-1.69)	1.38 (0.87-2.16)	1.08 (0.68-1.74)	1.22 (0.76-1.96)	1.03 (0.63-1.67)
Connectedness with city[^]						
Less connected	1.50 (1.02-2.19) *	1.46 (1.01-2.12) *	1.50 (1.03-2.19) **	1.48 (1.02-2.15) *	1.79 (1.21-2.67) *	1.64 (1.11-2.42)
Unchanged	Ref	Ref	Ref	Ref	Ref	Ref
More connected	0.69 (0.32-1.48)	0.67 (0.30-1.48)	0.69 (0.32-1.48)	0.68 (0.31-1.51)	0.79 (0.36-1.73)	0.66 (0.29-1.52)
Connectedness with country[^]						
Less connected	1.32 (0.89-1.95)	1.46 (1.00-2.15) #	1.31 (0.88-1.94)	1.45 (0.99-2.14) #	1.11 (0.74-1.67)	1.40 (0.93-2.10)
Unchanged	Ref	Ref	Ref	Ref	Ref	Ref
More connected	1.88 (1.08-3.26) *	1.04 (0.59-1.85)	1.89 (1.08-3.28) *	1.04 (0.58-1.84)	1.74 (0.97-3.09) #	1.07 (0.59-1.93)

Model I: adjusted for age, educational level, type 2 Diabetes Mellitus, asthma/COPD, cardiovascular diseases

Model II: adjusted for age, educational level, type 2 Diabetes Mellitus, asthma/COPD, cardiovascular diseases, and network size

Model III: adjusted for age, educational level, type 2 Diabetes Mellitus, asthma/COPD, cardiovascular diseases, network size, and social loneliness

OR: odds ratio, 95%CI: 95% confidence interval. # $p < 0.1$, * $p < 0.05$, ** $p < 0.01$, *** $p < 0.001$

[^] compared to pre-COVID-19 times.

4. Discussion

This detailed evaluation of loneliness in Dutch adults aged 40 years and older, uniquely evaluated structure and function of social networks and did so in relation to social loneliness as well as emotional loneliness. Of men, 20% and 25% were moderate or severe socially and emotionally lonely, respectively. Of women, 16% and 32% were moderate or severe socially and emotionally lonely, respectively. More than half of the people who were socially lonely, were also emotionally lonely. Also a sizeable proportion (19%-24%) were 'only' moderate or severe emotionally lonely. By evaluating a wide range of structural and functional social network aspects, jointly, this study was able to identify the most important social network aspects for men and women, and for the two types of loneliness. These insights can be further used in the assessment of relevant social network aspects and strategies to prevent or alleviate loneliness.

Loneliness is not merely defined by either a structural or functional aspect and is certainly more than 'just' the lack of number of relationships or lack of social support. Striking differences were observed for social or emotional loneliness in this respect as well. Men and women in the current study were more moderately/severely socially lonely when their social network was less diverse (e.g., family-centered), in line with previous studies (Kemperman et al., 2019; Moorer & Suurmeijer, 2001; Wenger, 1997; Wenger & Tucker, 2002) or less dense (friends and family clustered less). Also, a small network was associated with social loneliness (women only) in line with previous studies (Dahlberg et al., 2018). Further, men and women were more likely to be socially lonely when they lived alone. Living alone is a well-known factor in loneliness and other adverse health outcomes (Brittain et al., 2017; Bu et al., 2020; Newall et al., 2009; Taube et al., 2013). Also important in social loneliness were feeling less connected to friends, fewer emotional supporters (for men only), fewer informational supporters (for women only), and not had a club membership.

Men and women were moderately/severely lonely when they also felt socially lonely, when they lived alone, when a larger proportion of their network members was contacted exclusively online (for men only) or when having fewer emotional supporters (for women only). Various metrics have been shown to be important in previous studies (Dahlberg et al., 2022), while this study thus also revealed novel insights.

Important to highlight for example is that less diverse and less dense social networks likely posed a risk for social or emotional loneliness in men and women, regardless the number of social relationships a person has. This has implications for assessing social network structure in relation to health, indicating the importance of taking network diversity and density into account. Also notable was that women who had fewer informational supporters and men who had fewer emotional supporters were more likely to be socially lonely, indicating that men and women may have different needs for social support from their social network. Finally, online contact (for men) was found detrimental for emotional loneliness, highlighting the value for in-person contact which was also observed in a qualitative study. (Steijvers et al., 2023)

Physical contact with social network members was reduced and was (temporarily) replaced with online contact during the COVID-19 pandemic. (Steijvers et al., 2022) Especially those who live alone were affected by these measures since online contact among individuals who live alone was in previous studies with negative emotions and loneliness. (Currin et al., 2022; Fingerman et al., 2021) Online contact might not be a full substitute for in person contact (Hawkey & Kocherginsky, 2018) and it has been demonstrated to decrease the level of feeling connected to others, which in turn negatively impacts health. (Holaday et al., 2022)

Social participation was also linked to social loneliness, as women in the current study who did not have a sports club membership more often were lonely. Previous studies have reported that women who exercise with other may do so for motivation and social conviviality (Allender et al., 2006), and exercising together stimulates to exercise more frequently. (Faulkner et al., 2021; Firestone et al., 2015; Ojiambo, 2013) Men in

this study who were members of religious groups were more likely to be emotional lonely, and reasons are unknown and topic of further study.

4.1. Implications

To curb trends in loneliness is a key public health priority. This means to better identify relevant social network aspects in loneliness, and to better use these insights for designing strategies to prevent or alleviate loneliness. The current study provides insight into possible targets for the identification of loneliness and strategies to prevent or to alleviate loneliness. These results stress the importance to look beyond the number of social relationships and consider the rich variety of social network aspects and thereby take into account the sex differences.

Examples for better identification include a small network size, but also less diverse relationships. Employment status and living alone could function as a possible indicator of loneliness. Targeting social loneliness may also in part target emotional loneliness, but not completely as different social network aspects are important. In line with the work of Holt-Lunstad, we suggest that future research should focus on the development of social connection guidelines including the social network aspects identified in the current study. (Holt-Lunstad, 2023)

Examples for preventive strategies focused on network structure could be to help people to expand their network by adding new network members to also create a more diverse social network, and by strengthening connections between social network members to increase density. Club memberships (e.g., sport or music organizations) should be promoted and facilitated to enable people to meet new people in leisure activities. Strategies should further build on strengthening social network function for social support in existing social network members and relevant support in new members.

4.2. Strengths and limitations

A strength of the current study is that we used a large cohort study that uniquely and jointly assessed various structural and functional social network aspects in men and women, in combination with health-outcomes such as those evaluated here. To generate the social network aspects, a name generator questionnaire with name interpreter items was used, which is a useful method for measuring social networks in online surveys extracting large and diverse networks (Campbell & Lee, 1991). Furthermore, we evaluated the social network aspects separately for social and emotional loneliness and thereby identified which aspects are most important for each type of loneliness. Some limitations should be mentioned. Different answer categories for the De Jong Gierveld scale were used. Instead of three answer categories: 'yes', 'more or less', and 'no', a five-Likert scale was used 'totally agree – totally disagree'. Reliability tests for social and emotional loneliness items were performed. Items were reliable (social loneliness items: $\alpha=0.911$, and emotional loneliness items: $\alpha=0.794$). Furthermore, due to the cross-sectional design of the current study, no conclusions can be drawn on the causality of the effects.

4.3. Conclusion

Our current study assessed structural and functional social network aspects associated with moderate/severe social and emotional loneliness for men and women separately and established that diverse and dense social networks, and emotional and informational social support are key factors associated with social and emotional loneliness. Preventive strategies to alleviate or prevent loneliness should focus on both structural and functional network aspects need to look beyond the number of social relationships and promote diverse and supporting social relationships.

5. References

- Allender, S., Cowburn, G., & Foster, C. (2006). Understanding participation in sport and physical activity among children and adults: a review of qualitative studies. *Health Education Research*, *21*(6), 826–835. <https://doi.org/10.1093/her/cyl063>
- Armitage, R., & Nellums, L. B. (2020). COVID-19 and the consequences of isolating the elderly. *The Lancet Public Health*, *5*(5), e256. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S2468-2667\(20\)30061-X](https://doi.org/10.1016/S2468-2667(20)30061-X)
- Auranen, K., Shubin, M., Karhunen, M., Sivelä, J., Leino, T., & Nurhonen, M. (2021). Social Distancing and SARS-CoV-2 Transmission Potential Early in the Epidemic in Finland. *Epidemiology (Cambridge, Mass.)*, *32*(4), 525–532. <https://doi.org/10.1097/EDE.0000000000001344>
- Barreto, M., Victor, C., Hammond, C., Eccles, A., Richins, M. T., & Qualter, P. (2021). Loneliness around the world: Age, gender, and cultural differences in loneliness. *Personality and Individual Differences*, *169*, 110066. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2020.110066>
- Berkman, L. F., & Glass, T. (2000). Social integration, social networks, social support and health. In *In: Berkman L, Kawachi I, eds. Social epidemiology*. Oxford University Press.
- Brittain, K., Kingston, A., Davies, K., Collerton, J., Robinson, L. A., Kirkwood, T. B. L., Bond, J., & Jagger, C. (2017). An investigation into the patterns of loneliness and loss in the oldest old—Newcastle 85+ Study. *Ageing & Society*, *37*(1), 39–62.
- Bu, F., Steptoe, A., & Fancourt, D. (2020). Who is lonely in lockdown? Cross-cohort analyses of predictors of loneliness before and during the COVID-19 pandemic. *Public Health*, *186*, 31–34. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/j.puhe.2020.06.036>
- Cacioppo, J. T., Fowler, J. H., & Christakis, N. A. (2009). Alone in the crowd: the structure and spread of loneliness in a large social network. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *97*(6), 977–991. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0016076>
- Campbell, K. E., & Lee, B. A. (1991). Name generators in surveys of personal networks. *Social Networks*, *13*(3), 203–221. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0378-8733\(91\)90006-F](https://doi.org/10.1016/0378-8733(91)90006-F)
- Chater, N., & Loewenstein, G. (2022). The i-frame and the s-frame: How focusing on individual-level solutions has led behavioral public policy astray. *The Behavioral and Brain Sciences*, 1–60. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0140525X22002023>
- Cohen, S., & Wills, T. A. (1985). Stress, social support, and the buffering hypothesis. *Psychological Bulletin*, *98*(2), 310.
- Currin, J. M., Evans, A. E., Miller, B. M., Owens, C., Giano, Z., & Hubach, R. D. (2022). The impact of initial social distancing measures on individuals' anxiety and loneliness depending on living with their romantic/sexual partners. *Current Psychology*. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12144-022-02830-8>
- Dahlberg, L., Andersson, L., & Lennartsson, C. (2018). Long-term predictors of loneliness in old age: results of a 20-year national study. *Ageing & Mental Health*, *22*(2), 190–196.
- Dahlberg, L., McKee, K. J., Frank, A., & Naseer, M. (2022). A systematic review of longitudinal risk factors for loneliness in older adults. *Ageing & Mental Health*, *26*(2), 225–249.
- De Jong Gierveld, J., & Van Tilburg, T. (2006). A 6-Item Scale for Overall, Emotional, and Social Loneliness: Confirmatory Tests on Survey Data. *Research on Aging*, *28*, 582–598. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0164027506289723>
- Deckx, L., van den Akker, M., van Driel, M., Bulens, P., van Abbema, D., Tjan-Heijnen, V., Kenis, C., de Jonge, E. T., Houben, B., & Buntinx, F. (2015). Loneliness in patients with cancer: the first year after cancer diagnosis. *Psycho-Oncology*, *24*(11), 1521–1528. <https://doi.org/10.1002/pon.3818>
- Faulkner, J., O'Brien, W. J., McGrane, B., Wadsworth, D., Batten, J., Askew, C. D., Badenhorst, C., Byrd, E., Coulter, M., Draper, N., Elliot, C., Fryer, S., Hamlin, M. J., Jakeman, J., Mackintosh, K. A., McNarry, M. A., Mitchelmore, A., Murphy, J., Ryan-Stewart, H., ... Lambrick, D. (2021). Physical activity, mental health and well-being of adults during initial COVID-19 containment strategies: A multi-country cross-sectional analysis. *Journal of Science and Medicine in Sport*, *24*(4), 320–326. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jsams.2020.11.016>
- Feehan, D. M., & Mahmud, A. S. (2021). Quantifying population contact patterns in the United States during the COVID-19 pandemic. *Nature Communications* *2021 12:1*, *12*(1), 1–9. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41467-021-20990-2>
- Fingerman, K. L., Ng, Y. T., Zhang, S., Britt, K., Colera, G., Birditt, K. S., & Charles, S. T. (2021). Living Alone during COVID-19: Social Contact and Emotional Well-being among Older Adults. *Journals of Gerontology - Series B Psychological Sciences and Social Sciences*, *76*(3). <https://doi.org/10.1093/geronb/gbaa200>
- Firestone, M. J., Yi, S. S., Bartley, K. F., & Eisenhower, D. L. (2015). Perceptions and the role of group exercise

- among New York City adults, 2010–2011: An examination of interpersonal factors and leisure-time physical activity. *Preventive Medicine*, 72, 50–55.
<https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ypmed.2015.01.001>
- Hawkley, L. C., & Koehrginsky, M. (2018). Transitions in Loneliness Among Older Adults: A 5-Year Follow-Up in the National Social Life, Health, and Aging Project. *Research on Aging*, 40(4), 365–387.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/0164027517698965>
- Holaday, L. W., Oladele, C. R., Miller, S. M., Dueñas, M. I., Roy, B., & Ross, J. S. (2022). Loneliness, sadness, and feelings of social disconnection in older adults during the COVID-19 pandemic. *Journal of the American Geriatrics Society*, 70(2), 329–340.
- Holt-Lunstad, J. (2023). National Health Guidelines for Social Connection: What Is the Evidence in Support and What Might the Guidelines Say? *Policy Insights from the Behavioral and Brain Sciences*, 10(1), 41–50.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/23727322221150204>
- Holt-Lunstad, J., Smith, T. B., Baker, M., Harris, T., & Stephenson, D. (2015). Loneliness and Social Isolation as Risk Factors for Mortality: A Meta-Analytic Review. *Perspectives on Psychological Science*, 10(2), 227–237.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/1745691614568352>
- Kemperman, A., van den Berg, P., Weijs-Perrée, M., & Uijtendewillegen, K. (2019). Loneliness of older adults: social network and the living environment. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health*, 16(3), 406.
- Margelisch, K., Schneewind, K. A., Violette, J., & Perrig-Chiello, P. (2017). Marital stability, satisfaction and well-being in old age: variability and continuity in long-term continuously married older persons. *Aging & Mental Health*, 21(4), 389–398. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13607863.2015.1102197>
- Meisters, R., Westra, D., Putrik, P., Bosma, H., Ruwaard, D., & Jansen, M. (2021). Does Loneliness Have a Cost? A Population-Wide Study of the Association Between Loneliness and Healthcare Expenditure. *International Journal of Public Health*, 66. <https://doi.org/10.3389/ijph.2021.581286>
- Moorer, P., & Suurmeijer, T. P. B. M. (2001). The effects of neighbourhoods on size of social network of the elderly and loneliness: A multilevel approach. *Urban Studies*, 38(1), 105–118.
- Newall, N. E., Chipperfield, J. G., Clifton, R. A., Perry, R. P., Swift, A. U., & Ruthig, J. C. (2009). Causal beliefs, social participation, and loneliness among older adults: A longitudinal study. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships*, 26(2–3), 273–290.
- O’Rourke, H. M., Collins, L., & Sidani, S. (2018). Interventions to address social connectedness and loneliness for older adults: a scoping review. *BMC Geriatrics*, 18(1), 1–13.
- O’Rourke, H. M., & Sidani, S. (2017). Definition, determinants, and outcomes of social connectedness for older adults: a scoping review. *Journal of Gerontological Nursing*, 43(7), 43–52.
- Ojiambo, R. M. E. (2013). Physical activity and well-being: A review of the health benefits of physical activity on health outcomes. *Journal of Applied Medical Sciences*, 2(2), 69–78.
- Otoni, C. A., Winters, M., & Sims-Gould, J. (2022). “We see each other from a distance”: Neighbourhood social relationships during the COVID-19 pandemic matter for older adults’ social connectedness. *Health & Place*, 76, 102844. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/j.healthplace.2022.102844>
- Perlman, D., & Peplau, L. A. (1981). Toward a social psychology of loneliness. *Personal Relationships*, 3, 31–56.
- Pronk, M., Deeg, D. J. H., Smits, C., van Tilburg, T. G., Kuik, D. J., Festen, J. M., & Kramer, S. E. (2011). Prospective effects of hearing status on loneliness and depression in older persons: identification of subgroups. *International Journal of Audiology*, 50(12), 887–896.
- Rumas, R., Shamblaw, A. L., Jagtap, S., & Best, M. W. (2021). Predictors and consequences of loneliness during the COVID-19 Pandemic. *Psychiatry Research*, 300, 113934.
<https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/j.psychres.2021.113934>
- Santini, Z. I., Jose, P. E., York Cornwell, E., Koyanagi, A., Nielsen, L., Hinrichsen, C., Meilstrup, C., Madsen, K. R., & Koushede, V. (2020). Social disconnectedness, perceived isolation, and symptoms of depression and anxiety among older Americans (NSHAP): a longitudinal mediation analysis. *The Lancet. Public Health*, 5(1), e62–e70. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S2468-2667\(19\)30230-0](https://doi.org/10.1016/S2468-2667(19)30230-0)
- Steijvers, L., Brinkhues, S., Hoebe, C., van Tilburg, T. G., Claessen, V., Bouwmeester-Vincken, N., Hamers, F., Vranken, P., & Dukers-Muijrs, N. (2021). Social networks and infectious diseases prevention behavior: A cross-sectional study in people aged 40 years and older. *PloS One*, 16(5).
<https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0251862>
- Steijvers, L. C. J., Brinkhues, S., van Tilburg, T. G., Hoebe, C. J. P. A., Stijnen, M. M. N., de Vries, N., Crutzen, R., & Dukers-Muijrs, N. H. T. M. (2022). Changes in structure and function of social networks of independently living middle-aged and older adults in diverse sociodemographic subgroups during the COVID-19 pandemic: a longitudinal study. *BMC Public Health*, 22(1), 2253.

<https://doi.org/10.1186/s12889-022-14500-2>

- Steijvers, L. C. J., Leeferink, F., Brinkhues, S., Hoebe, C. J. P. A., & Dukers-Muijers, N. H. T. M. (2023). Social networks and health behaviors during the COVID-19 pandemic: a qualitative study among older adults in the Netherlands. *Journal of Public Health*. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10389-023-01947-9>
- Steptoe, A., Shankar, A., Demakakos, P., & Wardle, J. (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), 5797–5801. <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1219686110>
- Taube, E., Kristensson, J., Midlöv, P., Holst, G., & Jakobsson, U. (2013). Loneliness among older people: Results from the Swedish national study on aging and care—Blekinge. *Open Geriatric Medicine Journal*, *6*(1), 1–10.
- Valtorta, N. K., Kanaan, M., Gilbody, S., Ronzi, S., & Hanratty, B. (2016). Loneliness and social isolation as risk factors for coronary heart disease and stroke: systematic review and meta-analysis of longitudinal observational studies. *Heart*, *102*(13), 1009–1016. <https://doi.org/10.1136/heartjnl-2015-308790>
- Van Baarsen, B. (2002). Theories on coping with loss: The impact of social support and self-esteem on adjustment to emotional and social loneliness following a partner's death in later life. *The Journals of Gerontology Series B: Psychological Sciences and Social Sciences*, *57*(1), S33–S42.
- Van Tilburg, T. G., Steinmetz, S., Stolte, E., Van Der Roest, H., & De Vries, D. H. (2021). Loneliness and Mental Health during the COVID-19 Pandemic: A Study among Dutch Older Adults. *Journals of Gerontology - Series B Psychological Sciences and Social Sciences*, *76*(7). <https://doi.org/10.1093/geronb/gbaa111>
- Wang, J., Mann, F., Lloyd-Evans, B., Ma, R., & Johnson, S. (2018). Associations between loneliness and perceived social support and outcomes of mental health problems: a systematic review. *BMC Psychiatry* *2018* *18*:1, *18*(1), 1–16. <https://doi.org/10.1186/S12888-018-1736-5>
- Weijs-Perrée, M., van den Berg, P., Arentze, T., & Kemperman, A. (2015). Factors influencing social satisfaction and loneliness: a path analysis. *Journal of Transport Geography*, *45*, 24–31. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jtrangeo.2015.04.004>
- Weiss, R. (1975). *Loneliness: The experience of emotional and social isolation*. MIT press.
- Wenger, G. C. (1997). Social networks and the prediction of elderly people at risk. *Aging & Mental Health*, *1*(4), 311–320.
- Wenger, G. C., & Tucker, I. (2002). Using network variation in practice: identification of support network type. *Health & Social Care in the Community*, *10*(1), 28–35. <https://doi.org/10.1046/j.0966-0410.2001.00339.x>
- World Health Organization. (2022). *Social Isolation and Loneliness*. <https://www.who.int/teams/social-determinants-of-health/demographic-change-and-healthy-ageing/social-isolation-and-loneliness>

6. Supplementary files

Supplementary table 1. Overview of social network variables, sociodemographic variables, and chronic conditions

Structural social network aspects	
Network size and social isolation	Respondents could report up to fifteen family members, ten friends, ten acquaintances and five other network members. The sum of all network members per relationship type provided the total network size, resulting in a maximum of forty persons. Network size was then further categorized based on quartiles: 0-4, 5-8, 9-13, and more than 13 network members. Network size was categorized to provide a quantitative measure for social isolation (0-4 network members)
Network diversity	Social network diversity was constructed based on the relationship types reported and included the following categories: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Having no family, but friends, acquaintances, or others; - Having only family members; - Having only family members and friends; - Having family members and other, but no friends - Having family members, friends, acquaintances and other network members.
Network density	Respondents could answer a 5-scaled statement in whether their friends and family know each other.
Network diversity & density	A combined variable based on network diversity and density was constructed with seven categories: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Having no family, but friends, acquaintances, or others; - Having only family members; - Having only family members and friends; - Having family members and other, but no friends - Having family members, friends, acquaintances and other network members.
Homogeneity in sex and age	Proportion network members of the same sex and same age (~5 year age range)
Geographical proximity	Proportion network members who live: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - In the same house - Within walking distance - Less than 30 minutes away - More than 30 minutes away - Further away
Mode of contact	Proportion network members who are contacted: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - In person - Online (texting, (video)calling, emailing - Both in person or online
Living alone	Living situation was assessed by a single question with several answer categories: living alone, living with a partner, living with children, living with parents, living with other adults. Living alone was constructed based on the answer category: living alone.
Social participation – employment status	Employment status was assessed by a single question with several answer categories: employed, unemployed, retired, or other.
Social participation – club membership	Club membership was assessed by asking respondents whether they had a club membership. If yes, several possible club

	memberships were listed (sports club, music organization, volunteer work, religious groups, talking groups, and others) and respondents could select memberships.
Functional social network aspects	
Social support	<p>The number of network members who provided social support was referred to as 'the number of supports'</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">- Informational support: the number of network members who advised on problems- Emotional support: the number of network members who provided the opportunity to discuss important matters or health-related topics.- Practical support: the number of network members who helped with small or larger tasks in or around the house.
Social connectedness	<p>Respondents could answer seven statements on whether they felt less connected, unchanged or more connected with family, friends, neighbors, people at work, the city, the country, or the world. They were asked to compare current situation (August-November 2020) with pre-COVID-19 times.</p>
Sociodemographic characteristics and chronic conditions	
Educational level	<p>Educational level was categorized into practical, mixed theoretical, and theoretical educational levels:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">- Practical educational level includes no education, primary education not completed, primary education, or lower vocational education.- Mixed theoretical educational level includes intermediate vocational education and higher secondary education.- Theoretical educational level includes higher professional education and university education.
Urbanization	<p>Level of urbanization was assessed based on address density:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">- Rural areas: <500 addresses per km²- Hardly urbanized: 500-1000 addresses per km²- Moderately urbanized: 1000-1500 addresses per km²- Strongly urbanized: 1500-2000 addresses per km²- Extremely urbanized: >2500 addresses per km²
Self-reported health information	<p>Self-reported health information on the presence of Type 2 Diabetes Mellitus (T2DM), asthma/COPD, cardiovascular diseases and other chronic conditions were collected.</p>

Supplementary table 2. Multivariable logistic regression analyses between structural and functional social network aspects and social loneliness (cut-off value ≥ 1)

Social loneliness (cut-off value ≥ 1)	Model I		Model II	
	Men	Women	Men	Women
	OR (95% CI)	OR (95% CI)	OR (95% CI)	OR (95% CI)
Structural social network aspects				
Network size (number of network members)	Not assessed	Not assessed		
0-4 members		1.41 (0.85-2.34)		2.40 (1.34-4.31) **
5-8 members		1.16 (0.75-1.79)		1.55 (0.99-2.43) #
8-13 members		1.12 (0.75-1.67)		1.28 (0.87-1.89)
>13 members		Ref		Ref
Network diversity and density combined				
No family, but friends, acquaintances, or others	2.85 (1.39-5.84) **	2.94 (1.19-7.25) *	2.57 (1.24-5.34) *	2.21 (0.87-5.66) #
Only family	1.60 (1.13-2.26) **	2.31 (1.41-3.79) ***	1.46 (1.01-2.11) *	1.74 (1.02-2.97) *
Both family and friends, but do not know each other (well)	2.75 (1.59-4.76) ***	2.23 (1.41-3.88) **	2.65 (1.52-4.63) ***	1.92 (1.08-3.42) *
Family, friends, acquaintances, and/or others, but do not know each other (well)	1.93 (1.34-2.78) ***	2.11 (1.47-3.01) ***	1.93 (1.34-2.79) ***	2.16 (1.51-3.10) ***
Family, no friends, but others	1.91 (1.31-2.78) ***	2.16 (1.28-3.63) **	1.84 (1.26-2.70) **	1.90 (1.12-3.24) *
Both family and friends, and know each other (well)	1.20 (0.85-1.70)	1.11 (0.76-1.64)	1.15 (0.81-1.65)	1.01 (0.68-1.50)
Family, friends, acquaintances, and/or others, and they know each other (well)	Ref	Ref	Ref	Ref
Proximity (proportion network members living)				
In the same house	1.75 (1.05-2.90) *	2.11 (0.85-5.25) #	1.59 (0.94-2.68) #	1.46 (0.57-3.77)
Within walking distance	0.52 (0.34-0.81) **	0.85 (0.50-1.45)	0.52 (0.34-0.80) **	0.81 (0.47-1.39)
Living alone	1.87 (1.41-2.50) ***	1.42 (1.03-1.96) *	1.83 (1.37-2.45) ***	1.35 (0.98-1.87) #
Participating in work				
Participating (employed)	Ref	Ref	Ref	Ref
Not participating (retired)	0.75 (0.53-1.06)	1.32 (0.87-1.99)	0.75 (0.52-1.06)	1.29 (0.85-1.95)
Not participating (unemployed)	1.26 (0.85-1.86)	1.23 (0.86-1.74)	1.26 (0.85-1.87)	1.20 (0.84-1.71)
Not participating (other)	1.48 (0.46-4.83)	1.11 (0.44-2.82)	1.52 (0.46-4.97)	1.13 (0.44-2.86)
No membership of a sports club	1.25 (0.98-1.58) #	1.14 (0.86-1.50)	1.24 (0.97-1.57) #	1.13 (0.86-1.49)
No membership of a music organization	1.50 (1.09-2.06) *	1.47 (0.97-2.21) #	1.49 (1.09-2.05) *	1.42 (0.94-2.14) #
Functional social network aspects				
Fewer informational supporters	1.03 (0.99-1.07)	1.06 (1.02-1.11) **	1.02 (0.99-1.06)	1.06 (1.02-1.10) **
Fewer emotional supporters	1.07 (1.04-1.11) ***	1.02 (0.99-1.06)	1.06 (1.02-1.10) **	1.00 (0.96-1.04)
Connectedness with family[^]				
Less connected	1.15 (0.79-1.68)	1.42 (0.93-2.18) *	1.15 (0.79-1.68)	1.42 (0.93-2.19) *
Unchanged	Ref	Ref	Ref	Ref

More connected	0.82 (0.56-1.22)	0.90 (0.60-1.35)	0.84 (0.56-1.24)	0.91 (0.61-1.38)
Connectedness with friends[^]				
Less connected	1.22 (0.87-1.72)	1.16 (0.80-1.68)	1.22 (0.87-1.72)	1.14 (0.78-1.65)
Unchanged	Ref	ref	Ref	Ref
More connected	0.82 (0.47-1.43)	0.92 (0.53-1.60)	0.83 (0.47-1.44)	0.92 (0.53-1.59)
Connectedness with people at work[^]				
Less connected	1.05 (0.81-1.36)	1.42 (1.06-1.90) *	1.05 (0.81-1.35)	1.41 (1.05-1.88) *
Unchanged	Ref	Ref	Ref	Ref
More connected	1.67 (0.77-3.65)	1.26 (0.69-2.31)	1.65 (0.76-3.60)	1.21 (0.66-2.23)
Connectedness with neighbors[^]				
Less connected	1.28 (0.89-1.85)	1.81 (1.25-2.60) ***	1.28 (0.89-1.84)	1.80 (1.25-2.59) **
Unchanged	Ref	Ref	Ref	Ref
More connected	1.51 (0.98-2.34) #	1.02 (0.62-1.69)	1.52 (0.98-2.36) #	1.04 (0.63-1.73)
Connectedness with world[^]				
Less connected	1.20 (0.91-1.57)	0.88 (0.65-1.21)	1.19 (0.91-1.57)	0.89 (0.65-1.21)
Unchanged	Ref	Ref	Ref	Ref
More connected	0.57 (0.33-1.01) #	0.50 (0.27-0.94) *	0.58 (0.33-1.02) #	0.50 (0.27-0.94) *

Model I: adjusted for age, educational level, type 2 Diabetes Mellitus, asthma/COPD, cardiovascular diseases

Model II: adjusted for age, educational level, type 2 Diabetes Mellitus, asthma/COPD, cardiovascular diseases, and network size

OR: odds ratio, 95%CI: 95% confidence interval. # $p < 0.1$, * $p < 0.05$, ** $p < 0.01$, *** $p < 0.001$

[^] compared to pre-COVID-19 times.

Supplementary table 3. Multivariable logistic regression analyses between structural and functional social network aspects and emotional loneliness (cut-off value ≥ 1)

Emotional loneliness (cut-off value ≥ 1)	Model I		Model II		Model III	
	Men	Women	Men	Women	Men	Women
	OR (95% CI)	OR (95% CI)	OR (95% CI)	OR (95% CI)	OR (95% CI)	OR (95% CI)
Structural social network aspects						
Social loneliness	Not assessed	Not assessed	Not assessed	Not assessed	2.28 (1.82-2.86) ***	3.23 (2.42-4.31) ***
Network size	Not assessed	Not assessed				
0-4 members			0.90 (0.58-1.40)	1.35 (0.80-2.31)	0.82 (0.52-1.28)	1.10 (0.64-1.90)
5-8 members			0.84 (0.57-1.23)	1.64 (1.10-2.44) *	0.81 (0.55-1.19)	1.49 (0.99-2.23) #
8-13 members			1.00 (0.71-1.40)	1.11 (0.80-1.55)	0.99 (0.70-1.40)	1.08 (0.77-1.51)
>13 members			Ref	Ref	Ref	Ref
Network diversity and density combined						
No family, but friends, acquaintances, or others	1.53 (0.73-3.20)	1.25 (0.45-3.47)	1.54 (0.73-3.28)	1.20 (0.42-3.42)	1.33 (0.61-2.90)	0.97 (0.33-2.88)
Only family	1.18 (0.87-1.59)	2.18 (1.34-3.55) **	1.21 (0.86-1.71)	1.95 (1.11-3.41) *	1.10 (0.78-1.57)	1.71 (0.97-3.02) #
Both family and friends, but do not know each other (well)	1.08 (0.62-1.87)	0.83 (0.45-1.50)	1.13 (0.65-1.98)	0.72 (0.39-1.33)	0.96 (0.54-1.70)	0.60 (0.31-1.13)
Family, friends, acquaintances, and/or others, but do not know each other (well)	1.08 (0.76-1.54)	1.13 (0.80-1.60)	1.09 (0.77-1.55)	1.13 (0.80-1.61)	0.98 (0.69-1.40)	0.97 (0.68-1.39)
Family, no friends, but others	1.21 (0.84-1.74)	1.20 (0.70-2.05)	1.24 (0.86-1.80)	1.09 (0.63-1.88)	1.12 (0.76-1.63)	0.95 (0.53-1.70)
Both family and friends, and know each other (well)	0.99 (0.73-1.36)	0.97 (0.67-1.40)	1.04 (0.75-1.43)	0.88 (0.60-1.28)	1.01 (0.72-1.40)	0.89 (0.60-1.31)
Family, friends, acquaintances, and/or others, and they know each other (well)	Ref	Ref	Ref	Ref	Ref	Ref
Proximity (proportion network members living)						
Further away	1.37 (0.72-2.60)	1.98 (0.89-4.40) #	1.37 (0.72-2.61)	2.00 (0.90-4.47) #	1.32 (0.69-2.54)	2.16 (0.95-4.92) #
Mode of contact						
In person contact	1.08 (0.77-1.52)	0.61 (0.40-0.94) *	1.08 (0.76-1.52)	0.62 (0.41-0.95) *	1.10 (0.78-1.56)	0.62 (0.40-0.95) *
Online contact	1.64 (0.98-2.75) #	1.18 (0.64-2.21)	1.63 (0.97-2.74) #	1.21 (0.65-2.27)	1.64 (0.97-2.78)	1.21 (0.64-2.30)
Living alone	2.42 (1.85-3.17) ***	2.43 (1.83-3.24) ***	2.44 (1.86-3.20) ***	2.44 (1.83-3.25) ***	2.35 (1.79-3.10) ***	2.44 (1.82-3.27) ***
Employment status						
Employed	Ref	Ref	Ref	Ref	Ref	Ref
Retired	0.86 (0.61-1.20)	1.14 (0.78-1.67)	0.85 (0.61-1.19)	1.10 (0.75-1.61)	0.89 (0.63-1.25)	1.05 (0.71-1.56)
Unemployed	1.57 (1.06-2.31) *	1.32 (0.95-1.83)	1.56 (1.06-2.30) *	1.28 (0.92-1.78)	1.53 (1.03-2.26) *	1.28 (0.91-1.80)
Other	1.72 (0.51-5.81)	0.99 (0.42-2.37)	1.72 (0.51-5.78)	1.03 (0.43-2.47)	1.55 (0.46-5.14)	0.97 (0.41-2.31)
No membership of sports club	1.24 (1.00-1.55) #	0.96 (0.75-1.24)	1.24 (1.00-1.55) #	0.96 (0.74-1.24)	1.22 (0.97-1.52) #	0.92 (0.71-1.20)
No membership of a music organization	0.77 (0.58-1.02)	1.01 (0.71-1.43)	0.78 (0.59-1.03) #	0.98 (0.69-1.39)	0.73 (0.55-0.96) *	0.91 (0.63-1.30)
Not doing volunteer work	0.82 (0.62-1.08)	0.76 (0.53-1.09)	0.82 (0.62-1.08)	0.75 (0.52-1.07)	0.79 (0.60-1.05)	0.78 (0.54-1.12)
Other club memberships	0.98 (0.76-1.27)	1.31 (0.97-1.78)	0.98 (0.76-1.27)	1.31 (0.97-1.78) #	0.95 (0.73-1.23)	1.31 (0.96-1.78) #
Functional social network aspects						

Fewer informational supporters	1.01 (0.98-1.04)	0.97 (0.95-1.00) #	1.01 (0.98-1.04)	0.97 (0.94-1.00) *	1.01 (0.98-1.04)	0.96 (0.93-0.99) *
Fewer emotional supporters	1.01 (0.98-1.03)	1.07 (1.04-1.11) ***	1.01 (0.98-1.04)	1.06 (1.03-1.10) ***	1.01 (0.98-1.04)	1.06 (1.03-1.10) ***
Connectedness with family^						
Less connected	1.43 (0.98-2.10) #	1.75 (1.09-2.83) *	1.43 (0.97-2.09)	1.77 (1.10-2.86) *	1.43 (0.97-2.10)	1.69 (1.03-2.77) *
Unchanged	ref	Ref	ref	Ref	Ref	Ref
More connected	1.21 (0.85-1.71)	1.02 (0.72-1.45)	1.20 (0.84-1.71)	1.03 (0.72-1.47)	1.24 (0.87-1.78)	1.04 (0.72-1.49)
Connectedness with friends^						
Less connected	2.08 (1.49-2.90) ***	3.01 (2.02-4.46) ***	2.08 (1.49-2.91)	2.95 (1.99-4.39) ***	2.06 (1.47-2.90) ***	3.02 (2.01-4.53) ***
Unchanged	Ref	Ref	Ref	Ref	Ref	Ref
More connected	1.26 (0.78-2.01)	1.20 (0.76-1.89)	1.26 (0.78-2.01)	1.19 (0.75-1.88)	1.29 (0.80-2.08)	1.23 (0.77-1.96)
Connectedness with people from work^						
Less connected	1.24 (0.97-1.58) #	1.39 (1.05-1.84) *	1.24 (0.98-1.58)	1.40 (1.06-1.84) *	1.25 (0.98-1.60) #	1.35 (1.01-1.80) *
Unchanged	Ref	Ref	Ref	Ref	Ref	Ref
More connected	1.80 (0.89-3.64)	2.03 (1.21-3.40) *	1.84 (0.91-3.73)	1.98 (1.18-3.34) *	1.72 (0.83-3.53)	1.95 (1.15-3.32) *
Connectedness with neighbors^						
Less connected	1.47 (1.01-2.14) *	1.06 (0.71-1.58)	1.47 (1.01-2.14) *	1.05 (0.70-1.56)	1.40 (0.96-2.05)	0.93 (0.61-1.41)
Unchanged	Ref	Ref	ref	Ref	Ref	Ref
More connected	1.60 (1.06-2.41) *	1.21 (0.79-1.85)	1.60 (1.06-2.42) *	1.23 (0.80-1.90)	1.54 (1.01-2.35) *	1.22 (0.79-1.89)
Connectedness with city^						
Less connected	1.44 (1.02-2.04) *	2.32 (1.59-3.38) ***	1.44 (1.02-2.04) *	2.34 (1.60-3.41) ***	1.54 (1.08-2.19) *	2.31 (1.57-3.40) ***
Unchanged	Ref	Ref	Ref	Ref	Ref	Ref
More connected	0.81 (0.41-1.59)	0.83 (0.41-1.70)	0.81 (0.41-1.59)	0.84 (0.41-1.72)	0.87 (0.44-1.73)	0.84 (0.40-1.74)
Connectedness with country^						
Less connected	1.14 (0.79-1.63)	1.17 (0.78-1.75) #	1.13 (0.79-1.63)	1.17 (0.78-1.75)	1.03 (0.71-1.49)	1.21 (0.80-1.84)
Unchanged	Ref	Ref	Ref	Ref	Ref	Ref
More connected	1.93 (1.15-3.23) *	1.04 (0.61-1.78)	1.90 (1.13-3.17) *	1.07 (0.62-1.83)	1.88 (1.12-3.18) *	1.12 (0.65-1.95)