



**Investigating the experiences of individuals in recovery
from problem substance use and their perceptions of the
COVID-19 pandemic**

Journal:	<i>Drugs and Alcohol Today</i>
Manuscript ID	DAT-01-2021-0003.R2
Manuscript Type:	Research Paper
Keywords:	Qualitative, COVID-19, Recovery, Substance use, Isolation, Lived experience

Abstract

Purpose: This research explores how enforced forms of social isolation arising from the first COVID-19 lockdown influenced experiences of problem substance use, relapse, and coping strategies for recovery in individuals engaging with harm reduction recovery services.

Design: A qualitative semi-structured interview design was adopted for this research. Seven participants were recruited from a harm reduction recovery organisation. During their initial interview, participants volunteered information regarding their experience of the first lockdown due to emerging concerns of the COVID-19 pandemic. Participants completed a second semi-structured interview at the end of the first lockdown regarding their experience of enforced isolation during this time.

Findings: Three themes identified from the analysis were (1) Isolation resulting in hindered Human Capabilities, (2) Adjusting to a new normal: an individual experience, and (3) Unexpected benefits to recovery resulting from isolation. While some participants reported boredom, loneliness, and relapse events, others reported that the national response to the virus did not adversely affect them as they had already adjusted to living in a state of anxiety, isolation, and uncertainty. These findings illuminate both negative, neutral, and positive aspects of substance use recovery throughout the COVID-19 lockdown as well as highlighting the complex and individualised role that social connectedness plays in relapse occurrence.

Originality: Participants reported differences in how they were affected by the pandemic, leading to theoretical implications for the effect of social isolation on recovery. For this reason, individuals with a history of dependency should be considered potentially vulnerable to the effects of enforced isolation and should be supported accordingly.

Keywords: Qualitative, COVID-19, Substance use, Recovery, Isolation

1 Introduction

From March 23rd to June 15th, 2020, England entered the first of several lockdowns to counter the spread of COVID-19. During this national lockdown, citizens were advised not to leave their home for all but essential reasons (including shopping for necessities, exercise, seeking medical assistance, or work that could not be done in the home) (Cabinet Office, 2021). It has been speculated that the Coronavirus pandemic presents unique challenges for people with substance use disorders and their recovery, including greater risk of morbidity, decreased access to services, and experiencing increased strain on their mental health (Volkow, 2020). During the first lockdown, services initially struggled to offer support at a time when they were desperately needed. In response to service reductions caused by social distancing closures, recovery services began offering virtual support options which presented numerous challenges in regards to privacy, accessibility, and logistics (Bergman *et al.*, 2021).

The pandemic and its response all undermine core capabilities as suggested by Nussbaum for a dignified human life in her Human Capabilities Approach (HCA) (Nussbaum, 2011). These capabilities include freedom of movement, having good health, having emotional attachments to things and people outside ourselves, and maintaining meaningful and respectful social affiliations (Nussbaum, 2011; Melander *et al.*, 2018). The importance of an individual's social environment in either facilitating growth and integration or preventing it is a hallmark of other psychological theories of motivation, including Self-determination theory (SDT). This posits that core conditions of human functioning include autonomy, competence, and relatedness (Ryan and Deci, 2000). Previous literature has indicated that isolation appears to have a deep and invasive impact on the self-esteem of individuals in recovery and that this isolation may obstruct capabilities and feelings of autonomy (Buchanan, 2004; Xiong and Jia, 2019).

Isolation, discrimination, and feelings of powerlessness reinforce problem drug using behaviour whether through direct effects to mental and physical health or through indirect effects such as increased levels of stress (Buchanan, 2004; Copeland *et al.*, 2018). Similar attributes have also been suggested as relapse indicators for adults in high risk circumstances including situations related to anxiety, interpersonal conflict, depression, loneliness, or social isolation (Barrick and Connors, 2002). It is thought that social integration is vital for sustained recovery due to its significant correlation with mental health, quality of life, and well-being with loneliness and self-esteem being two likely mediators (Boeri *et al.*, 2016; Cao and Liang, 2020). For this reason, belonging to one or more social networks is linked with better recovery outcomes (Mawson *et al.*, 2015; Weston, Honor and Best, 2018).

Previous literature has demonstrated that mental illness and problem substance use often result in the erosion of close social networks (Zschau *et al.*, 2016). Moreover, the individual belief of not belonging to the wider community also compound feelings of isolation and loneliness in this population (Copeland *et al.*, 2018). Ideas of purpose and belonging have been embedded in the service delivery model of mutual aid and peer based recovery services to promote ideas of greater community assimilation (Best, Gow and Taylor, 2011). These support systems have been shown to increase service engagement in the short term and reduce dependency in the long term by improving an individual's relationships and increasing their sense of belonging and self-worth (Timpson *et al.*, 2016; Connell *et al.*, 2020). Since communication and connection are established recovery principles, it is therefore unsurprising that practitioners and the general public alike expressed concern about how individuals who have a history of problem substance use would cope with enforced isolation or restrictions brought about by the COVID-19 pandemic.

1 This paper examines how the enforced isolation inherent in COVID-19 policies influenced
2 experiences of dependency and relapse. It uses both HCA and SDT to frame and understand
3 the impact of enforced isolation on recovery outcomes.

4 5 **2 Methods**

6 **2.1 Design**

7 Ethical approval for this study was obtained from the University of Worcester as well as the
8 host organisation's research ethics committee. Written informed consent was collected from
9 participants at the start of the study. In light of participants being potentially vulnerable and
10 in accordance with ESRC guidelines, consent to participate was seen as an ongoing, open-
11 ended, and voluntary process (ESRC, 2010). Considering these potential vulnerabilities,
12 power differentials between participants and the lead researcher were acknowledged and
13 discussed in hopes of placing the participant in a position of power to drive the direction of
14 the study and to feel no undue coercion to participate (Worthington *et al.*, 2016). Participants
15 were recruited to take part in a Photovoice study investigating experiences of substance use
16 recovery (Wang and Burris, 1997). During their first semi-structured Photovoice interview,
17 participants volunteered information regarding how they were coping during the first
18 lockdown. Participants were contacted at the end of the first lockdown to complete a second
19 semi-structured interview regarding their experience of enforced isolation during this time.

20 **2.2 Participants**

21 Eight individuals were recruited to participate in this study, although one subsequently
22 withdrew citing stress from the pandemic. Prior to COVID-19, all participants had access to
23 recovery groups that met once a week as well as individual face-to-face sessions with
24 practitioners. Of the seven participants, two were women (Kizzy and Sammy) and five were
25 men (Mark, Ted, Oscar, Lawrence, and Fox) with ages ranging from early twenties to late
26 forties. All participants were recruited directly from distinctive recovery groups that aligned
27 with their stage of recovery. At the time of their first interview, three participants had been
28 involved with recovery services for less than six weeks (Sammy, Ted, and Kizzy), two for six
29 months or less (Mark and Oscar), and two for almost one year (Lawrence and Fox). Study
30 participation was open to all people who had engaged with the organisation's service,
31 regardless of their stage or time in recovery. The aim was to have an inclusive sample of
32 individuals at different stages of the recovery process.

33 **2.3 Data Collection**

34 Data collection was conducted in collaboration with a harm reduction recovery organisation
35 in the South West of England. In March 2020, participants were recruited to participate in a
36 Photovoice study investigating their experiences of recovery. Participants had been in contact
37 with the lead researcher for almost two months as they were lead through workshops and
38 group meetings to prepare them for their initial semi-structured Photovoice interview. As a
39 result of this study occurring simultaneously to the first COVID-19 lockdown, participants
40 spoke at length regarding their reaction to the emerging pandemic. Due to the unforeseen
41 collection of data surrounding COVID-19, the decision was made to conduct second semi-
42 structured **telephone** interviews in July 2020 with a specific focus on participants' experience
43 of lockdown. **Consistent with previous literature, Telephone interviews were shown to have**
44 **similar pace, timing, and depth as face-to-face interviews and both interviews were recorded**

1 with participants' consent (Sturges and Hanrahan, 2004; Irvine, Drew and Sainsbury, 2013).
2
3
4 The first interview contained accounts of participants' initial perception of the COVID-19
5 lockdown while the second interview asked specific questions regarding their experience of
6 enforced isolation and how this had impacted their recovery.
7
8

9 2.4 Data Analysis

10
11 Following familiarisation with the data, interviews were analysed using an inductive
12 approach to reflexive Thematic Analysis (Braun and Clarke, 2020). A constructivist
13 paradigm of analysis was adopted which dictates that time and place are constructed and
14 renegotiated on an ongoing basis (Guba, 1990). The lead researcher began a full transcription
15 and coding of both interviews after they occurred. This was followed by familiarisation with
16 the data and the generation of initial codes with a focus on participants' experience of the
17 COVID-19 pandemic. While themes were developed from both the first and second
18 interview, analysis focused primarily on the second as it directly pertained to the experiences
19 of the pandemic. NVivo qualitative software was used to support data handling. A reflective
20 journal was used by the lead researcher to capture personal responses and reactions overtime
21 (Koch, 2006). This journal provided a log of reflections and enabled the researcher to capture
22 and account for responses, decisions, and strategies both in the field and during analysis. The
23 research team read and discussed data from the reflective journal and transcriptions as a
24 group, agreeing on key themes as they were developed.
25
26
27
28
29

30 3 Results

31
32 The findings are presented here in accordance with key themes identified within the focused
33 thematic analysis. The three identified themes are (1) Isolation resulting in hindered Human
34 Capabilities, (2) Adjusting to a new normal: an individual experience and (3) Unexpected
35 benefits to recovery resulting from isolation.
36
37

38 3.1 Isolation and hindered Human Capabilities

39
40 The isolation of lockdown affected all participants differently; more than half of the sample
41 (five of seven participants) reported that they found it to be a lonely experience, which
42 exacerbated existing mental health concerns. They felt that their inability to engage with
43 activities in a way which they perceived as 'normal' compromised their ability to live a
44 meaningful life as postulated by HCA (Nussbaum, 2011). In some instances, the lack of
45 structure and loneliness resulted in a relapse event. Those who were able to avoid a relapse
46 event contributed this to having existing links with community services.
47
48

49 One participant; Mark (Pseudonyms appear throughout) said that while he initially viewed
50 the lockdown as an interesting and novel experience, he found himself feeling lonelier as
51 time progressed. When asked how isolation had affected him during lockdown, he said:
52
53
54

55 *"The first four weeks seemed a bit of a novelty. But the longer it went on, my mental health got worse.*
56 *It was a different kind of low then what I've experienced before. I felt like I was counting the days*
57 *down. And I was telling myself "oh, yeah, next week they might let us out." So, yeah I felt like shit to*
58 *be honest."*
59
60

1
2
3 1 It was especially hard for participants who had just achieved certain recovery goals to be
4 2 suddenly confronted with additional obstacles. Another participant, Kizzy, reported similar
5 3 feelings of loneliness, which resulted in a relapse event. For Kizzy and Mark, activities and
6 4 socialisation were a crucial part of recovery and to lose the human capability of social
7 5 affiliation meant that life ceased to be as meaningful.

8
9
10 6 This was also true for participants who were forced to shield due to existing health concerns.
11 7 One participant, Fox, did not leave his flat for several weeks and relied on community
12 8 members to provide necessities. The initial shock of isolation was particularly difficult for
13 9 him and left him struggling to understand how this would affect his recovery. He said:

14
15 10
16
17
18 11 *“I had been making good progress in rebuilding my life. I started to feel that what I was doing meant*
19 12 *something to other people and that validated my life. I was trying to rebuild a credible and rewarding*
20 13 *life and get my self-respect back. Suddenly, with lockdown all of that stopped immediately. It was like*
21 14 *being smashed against a steel wall. All that positivity that I had been building up so diligently over*
22 15 *the preceding months went downhill instantly, and I was devastated... I found myself going quietly*
23 16 *mad with a daily diet of daytime TV.”*

24
25 17
26
27 18 For Fox, a disruption to services was not just about the support he was receiving but the
28 19 perception that his life would cease to be purposeful (Nussbaum, 2011). Rather than simply
29 20 receiving support, Fox was becoming someone who was able to give back to the community
30 21 via volunteering. Previous literature on the SDT model of behaviour change has found
31 22 positive associations between an increase in autonomous self-regulation and abstinence from
32 23 substances, so it is understandable that Fox felt that an attack to his new found autonomy
33 24 would have profoundly negative effects on his recovery (Williams *et al.*, 2009).

34
35
36 25 Four participants, including Fox, mentioned how they were grateful they had established
37 26 supportive community links prior to lockdown and how they felt this put them at an
38 27 advantageous position to be able to cope. Fox described how this helped him feel less
39 28 isolated through this period:

40
41 29
42
43 30 *“I live by myself, so I was a bit isolated anyway and that was the other thing about all these voluntary*
44 31 *roles which I sought out. I had to seek them out and I’m glad I did because otherwise my phone*
45 32 *wasn’t going to ring, no one was going to knock on the door.”*

46
47 33
48
49 34 For many individuals, the services which they access during recovery are their only sources
50 35 of social connection, rendering them essential for a full and dignified life according to the
51 36 HCA (Venkatapuram, 2014). However, even participants who were heavily integrated into
52 37 recovery support services were affected by the loneliness and boredom of lockdown. One
53 38 participant, Ted, who lived in a dry house at the time reported a house wide relapse as it was
54 39 no longer possible to evict individuals who failed drug tests. He said:

55
56 40
57
58 41 *“They couldn’t kick us out cause (sic) of Corona. So, we took advantage of that. As soon as the*
59 42 *lockdown happened the council and the government said they can’t kick people out for six months. So,*

1
2
3 1 *everybody found that out and just used that as a pass to use...If the lock down didn't happen, I*
4 2 *wouldn't have been using. It was out of boredom. Because nothing was open."*
5
6 3
7

8 4 While Ted reported that he was no longer using at the time of his second interview, he said
9 5 that he had struggled throughout lockdown to occupy his time and find something to do. In
10 6 combination, boredom and recovery can be dangerous and many individuals in recovery go
11 7 to great lengths to fill their time to avoid this (Kaplan, Salzer and Brusilovskiy, 2012). Not
12 8 having the freedom to alleviate this boredom left Ted and others feeling lonely, isolated, and
13 9 hopeless, hindering capabilities of achieving value and meaning (Nussbaum, 2011).
14
15

16 10 **3.2 Adjusting to a new normal: an individual experience**

17
18 11 Throughout the pandemic, many services attempted to replicate normal delivery by offering
19 12 clients virtual and telephone support. While some participants enjoyed the ease of access
20 13 provided by these services, others indicated a strong desire to resume face-to-face delivery.
21 14 This desire for socialisation and in person engagement led some in the sample to disregard
22 15 lockdown policies to prioritise their mental health needs and regain engagement with others.
23

24 16 While the idea of virtual meetings did not immediately appeal to all participants; everyone
25 17 reported attempting them. Most reported that virtual meetings could not replace the social
26 18 element found within group meetings and they were anxiously anticipating a return to face-
27 19 to-face groups. However, for others they were not seen as a bad alternative. One participant,
28 20 Lawrence, appreciated that he could easily access meetings from the comfort of his home.
29 21 Engaging with virtual meetings allowed him to maintain a sense of normality throughout the
30 22 pandemic by continuing to engage with mutual aid groups. However, he also conceded that
31 23 the convenience of virtual meetings would not appeal to everybody and that there were issues
32 24 with this service delivery model, which precluded some individuals from accessing support.
33 25 He said:
34
35
36

37 26
38
39 27 *"I know some people have struggled. I can think of one guy, he lapsed, and I know it's because he*
40 28 *doesn't have data on his phone, he couldn't get to a physical meeting. So, I know it has affected other*
41 29 *people who will remain nameless."*
42
43 30

44 31 For individuals who may have limited social contact outside of their immediate surroundings,
45 32 face-to-face meetings provide a safe space they can rely on to gain positive social capital
46 33 (Salehi *et al.*, 2019). It is hard to replicate this same level of social connection in a virtual
47 34 environment and so individuals who do not respond to this method of service delivery may be
48 35 especially affected. This is particularly true if service users do not have access or knowledge
49 36 of the technology that would enable them to attend virtual meetings.
50

51
52 37 Kizzy, who primarily attributed her relapse to isolation, reported that she made the decision
53 38 to break lockdown to prioritise her struggling mental health. Mark reported a similar decision
54 39 during this time and opted to meet with his sponsor in a park. While both expressed concern
55 40 for the virus, a desire for socialisation and face-to-face contact led them to attempt to
56 41 replicate normality amid the pandemic in order to regain a life they perceived as meaningful
57 42 (Melander *et al.*, 2018). Kizzy spoke about the judgment she felt from others due to
58 43 prioritising her mental health. She said:
59
60 44

1
2
3 1 *“I don’t really feel guilty. I feel like other people are very judgmental and sort of trying to shame, like*
4 2 *‘Corona shame’ ... I’m trying not to get too stressed. Like I’m not panicked about the virus it’s more*
5 3 *all the stuff that it affects and the result of other people panicking. And all the misinformation. Or the*
6 4 *fact that there really isn’t much information that can be counted on.”*
7

8 5
9
10 6 The lack of reliable COVID-19 information as described by Kizzy has posed a serious
11 7 problem in designing and implementing public health interventions and likely contributed to
12 8 the stress she experienced (Kulkarni *et al.*, 2020). The uncertainty and lack of control
13 9 inherent in the proliferation of misinformation are themselves major triggers for stress which
14 10 is the most predictable factor in sustaining substance use and triggering relapse (Gielen *et al.*,
15 11 2016). In line with SDT, it is likely that these social-environmental conditions diminished
16 12 Kizzy’s self-motivation and positive psychological adjustment (Bartholomew *et al.*, 2011).
17 13 When describing her experience self-isolating, Kizzy said:
18

19 14
20
21 15 *“It’s all very well self-isolating but when you live on your own and you have mental health problems,*
22 16 *at some point you’re going to need human contact. And like face-to-face is just better. And it’s not like*
23 17 *I’ve been throwing parties or anything. I’ve been respectful, I’ve been distanced.”*
24
25
26
27 18

28 19 Kizzy also described how her mental health was affected by receiving messages that she
29 20 perceived as hostile from neighbours threatening to inform her housing association that she
30 21 was breaking lockdown. She described how she was particularly sensitive to these sorts of
31 22 messages due to her history of being vulnerably housed. In line with SDT, Kizzy had taken
32 23 steps throughout her recovery to increase the level of independence she felt over her life
33 24 (Ryan and Deci, 2002). The impact of lockdown caused Kizzy to experience a lack of control
34 25 over her environment, increasing her feelings of dissatisfaction. SDT argues that developing
35 26 a sense of autonomy and competence is critical to sustain positive health behaviours and this
36 27 desire for autonomy may have led Kizzy and Mark to attempt to replicate some form of pre-
37 28 COVID normality (Sharma and Smith, 2011; Richards, Pearson and Witkiewitz, 2020).
38
39

40 29 **3.3 Unexpected benefits to recovery resulting from isolation.**

41 30 Although many participants reported that isolation had affected them negatively, two study
42 31 participants reported unexpected benefits to their daily lives. They characterised the isolation
43 32 period as ‘peaceful’, resulting in a reduction of stress levels. These participants reported
44 33 pleasure at having additional time to connect with loved ones, along with feeling relief that
45 34 public consumption of alcohol was less prevalent. Participants who reported these
46 35 unexpected benefits were already adjusted to lives characterized by isolation, so the impact of
47 36 the virus did not substantially impact their daily lives.
48
49

50 37 Oscar was one participant who reported enjoying the quiet and serene nature of lockdown. He
51 38 said:
52
53
54
55 39

56 40 *“I’ve thoroughly enjoyed the peace and quiet. It was just what I needed. Living in the city I find very*
57 41 *stressful anyway, it’s just constant noise and an intense environment to live in. So, for the first time in*
58 42 *years to have no cars anywhere, no people in the part where I live, I actually loved it.”*
59
60

Oscar reported that the lockdown experience did not massively affect his recovery because he felt he already lived in a state of isolation. In the last few years, he had cycled in and out of treatment and lost several close relationships because of his drug use. It is of interest to note that while Oscar expressed his enjoyment of lockdown, he was also one of three participants to relapse during this time. According to Oscar, he attributed his relapse event not to isolation and service disruption but to wanting relief for his poor physical health. However, it is likely that his declining physical health was affected by the pandemic, indicating that the impact on his subsequent relapse was both direct and indirect. He believed lockdown had a positive effect on his recovery as it motivated him to improve his physical health to be at lessened risk for COVID-19 complications.

Similarly, Lawrence described how he felt that the lockdown experience was equalising in that it offered people without mental health issues a glimpse into feelings of anxiety familiar to those who have experienced dependency. He explained:

“A lot of us people in recovery have suffered anxiety in the past. So, we’re kind of in our element because it’s like, yeah... welcome! This is how we feel all the time! It’s just people are starting to really panic about this, that, and the other and we’re all kind of like ‘Duh’. This is how we feel about things, you know?”

Lawrence also mentioned that he was communicating with loved ones more than ever which resulted in higher feelings of social connectedness. Consistent with Lawrence’s experience, previous literature indicates that higher degrees of social connectedness have a positive effect on recovery outcomes and the ability to lead a dignified human life as postulated by the HCA(Nussbaum, 2011; Mawson *et al.*, 2015; Boeri *et al.*, 2016). As well as increasing his emotional wellbeing, Lawrence also reported that he felt safer and more secure during this time due to alcohol consumption being less visible. He said:

“I think it’s actually helped my recovery more than anything. All the pubs were shut. Going through the parks and stuff they weren’t full of drinking. Let’s just say, drinking wasn’t in the public domain, so I felt safer. It seemed easier for me to control.”

It is possible that Lawrence felt an increased sense of satisfaction as a consequence of enhanced feelings of belonging and control over his social environment (Bartholomew *et al.*, 2011). It is also possible that feelings of peace, calm, and safety were especially important to the recovery outcomes of Oscar and Lawrence because of the challenges of their lives prior to engagement with recovery services. Although they represent a small portion of the sample, their experience is consistent with literature which demonstrates the positive effects feelings of safety and security can have on the quality of life of individuals seeking help with problem drug use (Best, 2012).

1 4 Discussion

2 The first UK COVID-19 lockdown impacted key factors known to be important in recovery
3 from problem substance use, such as physical health, stability, engagement with purposeful
4 activity, and positive community networks (Kaplan, Salzer and Brusilovskiy, 2012; Osborne
5 *et al.*, 2020). This led to speculation, particularly in the media, that the lockdown period
6 would be difficult for those dealing with dependency issues. However, despite this, our
7 research indicates that the lockdown had individual and dynamic effects on recovery with
8 both negative, neutral, and positive impacts for different people.

9 This study has found that the enforced isolation of lockdown had a negative effect on
10 participants who felt more depressed and alone, hindering their ability to lead a full and
11 meaningful life as espoused by the HCA. This is consistent with literature which stipulates
12 that loneliness has been associated with both mental and physical health problems, including
13 substance use (Ingram *et al.*, 2020). While not everyone who is isolated becomes lonely,
14 people with substance use problems may be more vulnerable due to stigma and a
15 rearrangement of social networks once they engage with recovery services. Literature
16 suggests that recovery is dependent on the formation of strong social networks, yet many in
17 this sample offered a description of recovery as an isolating and lonely experience (Kawachi
18 *et al.*, 2004; Zschau *et al.*, 2016) During COVID-19, it has been argued that prolonged stay at
19 home efforts are likely to severely increase isolation, social disconnection and loneliness
20 (Zixin and Wang, 2020). This research supports these arguments, but also highlights the
21 individualised impact of these conditions on recovery. As described by SDT, individuals
22 develop conditions of autonomy and competence in different ways which will impact their
23 experience of recovery differently (Sharma and Smith, 2011).

24 This research also offers a glimpse into participants' perceptions of the virtual delivery of
25 services. These findings indicate a willingness on behalf of participants to engage with virtual
26 service. However, the desire to resume face-to-face contact suggests that participants found
27 the social connection of in person meetings important for their recovery outcomes. As
28 **services continue to increase virtual support options in a post-COVID world**, it is important
29 for practitioners to remember the perceived benefit of social capital in a recovery context
30 (Timpson *et al.*, 2016). In line with the HCA, the socio-economic resources an individual has
31 at their disposal should be considered when deciding to offer virtual services (Nussbaum,
32 2011).

33 This research also demonstrates the importance of services and meaningful activities to
34 individual recovery outcomes. Indeed, ongoing engagement in activities perceived by the
35 individual as meaningful have been shown to have a positive effect on recovery (Groshkova
36 and Best, 2011). Two out of the three participants who experienced a relapse during
37 lockdown associated this with the lack of structure and ensuing loneliness, which intensified
38 feelings of isolation. However, it is an important distinction that not all of the sample felt
39 negatively impacted by these changes to services. This implies that recovery is a highly
40 individualised process where some have the capacity to adapt autonomously to altered
41 support while others do not. Therefore, it's important not to make assumptions about how
42 people will benefit from the support they are offered. Additionally, the psychological burden
43 of isolation has the potential to undermine any resilience gained through previous
44 engagement with recovery social networks (Chen, 2020). This jeopardizes both the mental
45 and physical health of service users as well as increasing the likelihood for relapse.

1 Perhaps the most surprising finding from this study was not that loneliness and isolation
2 affected recovery outcomes, but that two participants reported that the peaceful nature of
3 isolation reduced their stress levels. While this is a small portion of the sample, this leads to
4 the questioning of existing media narratives of substance use and recovery characterising the
5 experience as catastrophic and challenging. Recovery, like all phenomenon, is a complex and
6 individualised experience that people will encounter in different ways. This research does not
7 intend to discount the heightened focus on mental health and wellbeing throughout the
8 pandemic, but instead put these discourses into a more nuanced perspective. Many
9 individuals in recovery already live in contained social worlds so the experience of lockdown
10 has been an extension of isolation to which they may have already adapted.

11 **4.1 Limitations**

12 Several study limitations should be recognized. It should be acknowledged that this study
13 only represents the experiences of the first COVID-19 lockdown, and it would be beneficial
14 to continue to follow participants longitudinally to see if their perceptions changed during
15 subsequent lockdowns. There also exists the possibility that this sample is not representative
16 of all individuals in recovery. Individuals in recovery are a heterogenous group and as with
17 most qualitative research studies, the sample was generated from respondents who made
18 themselves available (Foster-Fishman *et al.*, 2005; Groshkova and Best, 2011). This is a
19 limitation that is difficult to overcome, and it is important to recognize the potential issues of
20 generalizability.

21 **4.2 Conclusion**

22 **As services continue to increase virtual support options,** this research sheds light on the
23 potential impact to participants who appreciated the convenience of virtual services but also
24 desired to resume face-to-face services. This indicates the possibility that a hybrid model of
25 service delivery may be effective in the future if the needs of individuals are considered.
26 Future research might examine this in more detail to explore how virtual service delivery
27 may contribute to feelings of isolation. As the situation with the Coronavirus pandemic
28 continues to unfold, the long-term effects of enforced isolation on this population should be
29 further researched and considered. Additionally, individuals with a history of problem drug
30 use should be considered potentially vulnerable to the effects of enforced isolation and
31 supported accordingly. These findings highlight both negative, neutral, and positive aspects
32 of substance use recovery throughout the COVID-19 lockdown as well as demonstrating the
33 complex and individualized role that social connectedness plays in relapse occurrence.

5 References

- Barrick, C. and Connors, G. J. (2002) 'Relapse prevention and maintaining abstinence in older adults with alcohol-use disorders', *Drugs and Aging*, 19(8), pp.583–594. doi: 10.2165/00002512-200219080-00004.
- Bartholomew, K. J. *et al.* (2011) 'Self-determination theory and diminished functioning: The role of interpersonal control and psychological need thwarting', *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 37(11), pp.1459–1473. doi:10.1177/0146167211413125.
- Bergman, B. G. *et al.* (2021) 'Online recovery support meetings can help mitigate the public health consequences of COVID-19 for individuals with substance use disorder', *Addictive Behaviors*. Elsevier, 113(September 2020), p.106661. doi:10.1016/j.addbeh.2020.106661.
- Best, D. (2012) *Addiction Recovery: A Movement for Social Change and Personal Growth in the UK*. Pavilion Publishing.
- Best, D., Gow, J. and Taylor, A. (2011) 'Recovery from Heroin or Alcohol Dependence: A Qualitative Account of the recovery experience in Glasgow', *Journal of Drug Issues*, 41(3), pp. 359–377.
- Boeri, M. *et al.* (2016) 'I don't know what fun is': examining the intersection of social capital, social networks, and social recovery', *Drugs and Alcohol Today*, 16(1), pp.95–105. doi: 10.1108/DAT-08-2015-0046.
- Braun, V. and Clarke, V. (2020) 'One size fits all? What counts as quality practice in (reflexive) thematic analysis?', *Qualitative Research in Psychology*. Routledge, 00(00), pp.1–25. doi:10.1080/14780887.2020.1769238.
- Buchanan, J. (2004) 'Tackling problem drug use: A new conceptual framework', *Social Work in Mental Health*, 2(2–3), pp.117–138. doi:10.1300/J200v02n02_08.
- Cabinet Office. (2021) *National lockdown: Stay at Home*.
- Cao, Q. and Liang, Y. (2020) 'Perceived social support and life satisfaction in drug addicts: Self-esteem and loneliness as mediators', *Journal of Health Psychology*, 25(7), pp.976–985. doi: 10.1177/1359105317740620.
- Chen, L. K. (2020) 'Older adults and COVID-19 pandemic: Resilience matters', *Archives of Gerontology and Geriatrics*. Elsevier, 89(May), p.104124. doi:10.1016/j.archger.2020.104124.
- Connell, M. J. O. *et al.* (2020) 'Enhancing outcomes for persons with co-occurring disorders through skills training and peer recovery support skills training and peer recovery support', *Journal of Mental Health*, 29(1), pp.6–11. doi:10.1080/09638237.2017.1294733.
- Copeland, M. *et al.* (2018) 'Different Kinds of Lonely: Dimensions of Isolation and Substance Use in Adolescence', *Journal of Youth and Adolescence*, 47(8), pp.1755–1770.

- 1
2
3 1 doi:10.1007/s10964-018-0860-3.
4
5 2 ESRC(2010)*Framework for Research Ethics (FRE), Social Research*. Available at:
6 3 <http://www.esrc.ac.uk/about-esrc/information/research-ethics.aspx>.
7
8 4 Foster-Fishman, P. *et al.*(2005)‘Using methods that matter: The impact of reflection,
9 5 dialogue, and voice’, *American Journal of Community Psychology*, 36(3–4),pp. 275–291.
10 6 doi: 10.1007/s10464-005-8626-y.
11
12 7 Gielen, N. *et al.*(2016)‘How patients perceive the relationship between trauma, substance
13 8 abuse, craving, and relapse: A qualitative study’, *Journal of Substance Use*, 21(5), pp.466–
14 9 470.doi:10.3109/14659891.2015.1063717.
15
16 10 Groshkova, T. and Best, D. (2011) ‘The Evolution of a UK Evidence Base for substance
17 11 Misuse Recovery’, *Journal of Groups in Addiction and Recovery*,6(1–2), pp.20–37.
18
19 12 Guba, E. (1990)*The Paradigm Dialouge*.SAGE Publications Inc.
20
21 13 Ingram, I. *et al.* (2020)‘Loneliness among people with substance use problems: A narrative
22 14 systematic review’, *Drug and Alcohol Review*, (2019).doi:10.1111/dar.13064.
23
24 15 Irvine, A., Drew, P. and Sainsbury, R.(2013)‘Am I not answering your questions properly?’
25 16 Clarification, adequacy and responsiveness in semi-structured telephone and face-to-face
26 17 interviews’, *Qualitative Research*,13(1), pp.87–106. doi:10.1177/1468794112439086.
27
28 18 Kaplan, K., Salzer, M. S. and Brusilovskiy, E. (2012)‘Community participation as a predictor
29 19 of recovery-oriented outcomes among emerging and mature adults with mental illnesses.’,
30 20 *Psychiatric Rehabilitation Journal*, 35(3),pp.219–229. doi:10.2975/35.3.2012.219.229.
31
32 21 Kawachi, I. *et al.* (2004) ‘Commentary: Reconciling the three accounts of social capital’,
33 22 *International Journal of Epidemiology*,33(4),pp.682–690. doi:10.1093/ije/dyh177.
34
35 23 Koch, T. (2006)‘Establishing rigour in qualitative research: the decision trail’, *Journal of*
36 24 *advanced nursing*, 53(1). doi:10.1111/j.1365-2648.2006.03681.x.
37
38 25 Kulkarni, P. *et al.* (2020)‘Covid-19-infodemic overtaking pandemic? Time to disseminate
39 26 facts over fear’, *Indian Journal of Community Health*, 32(2), pp.264–268.
40
41 27 Mawson, E. *et al.*(2015)‘Social identity,social networks and recovery capital in emerging
42 28 adulthood:A pilot study’, *Substance Abuse Treatment, Prevention, and Policy*, 10(45), pp.1–
43 29 12. doi:10.1186/s13011-015-0041-2.
44
45 30 Melander, C. *et al.* (2018) ‘Human capabilities in advanced dementia: Nussbaum’s
46 31 approach’, *International Journal of Older People Nursing*, 13(2), pp.1–10.
47 32 doi:10.1111/opn.12178.
48
49 33 Nussbaum, M. C. (2011) *Creating Capabilities: The Human Development Approach*. The
50 34 Belknap Press of Harvard University Press.
51
52 35 Osborne, B. *et al.* (2020)‘Substance Use and Co-occurring Physical Health Problems: File
53 36 Review of a Residential Drug and Alcohol Treatment Service.’, *Journal of Dual Diagnosis*,
54 37 16(2), pp.250–259.

- 1
2
3 1 Richards, D. K., Pearson, M. R. and Witkiewitz, K. (2020) 'Understanding alcohol harm
4 2 reduction behaviors from the perspective of self-determination theory: a research agenda',
5 3 *Addiction Research and Theory*. Taylor & Francis, 0(0), pp.1–6.
6 4 doi:10.1080/16066359.2020.1863378.
- 8
9 5 Ryan, R. M. and Deci, E. L. (2000) 'The darker and brighter sides of human existence: basic
10 6 psychological needs as a unifying concept', *Psychological Inquiry*, 11, pp.319–338.
- 12 7 Ryan, R. M. and Deci, E. L. (2002) 'Overview of self-determination theory: An organismic
13 8 dialectical perspective', in *Handbook of Self-Determination Research*. Rochester, NY:
14 9 University of Rochester Press, pp.3–33.
- 16 10 Salehi, A. *et al.* (2019) 'Bonding and bridging social capital in the recovery of severe mental
17 11 illness: a synthesis of qualitative research', *Journal of Mental Health*. Taylor & Francis,
18 12 28(3), pp.331–339. doi:10.1080/09638237.2018.1466033.
- 21 13 Sharma, M. and Smith, L. (2011) 'Self determination theory and potential applications to
22 14 alcohol and drug abuse behaviors', *Journal of Alcohol and Drug Education*, 55(2), pp.3–7.
- 24 15 Sturges, J. and Hanrahan, K. (2004) 'Comparing telephone and face-to-face qualitative
25 16 interviewing: a research note', *Qualitative Research*, 4(1), pp.107–118.
- 27 17 Timpson, H. *et al.* (2016) 'Once you've been there, you're always recovering': exploring
28 18 experiences, outcomes, and benefits of substance misuse recovery', *Drugs and Alcohol*
29 19 *Today*, 16(1), pp.29–38. doi:10.1108/DAT-08-2015-0042.
- 32 20 Venkatapuram, S. (2014) 'Mental disability, human rights and the capabilities approach:
33 21 Searching for the foundations', *International Review of Psychiatry*, 26(4), pp.408–414. doi:
34 22 10.3109/09540261.2014.926867.
- 36 23 Volkow, N. (2020) *COVID-19: Potential Implications for Individuals with Substance Use*
37 24 *Disorders*, National Institute on Drug Abuse. Available at: [https://www.drugabuse.gov/about-](https://www.drugabuse.gov/about-nida/noras-blog/2020/04/covid-19-potential-implications-individuals-substance-use-disorders)
38 25 [nida/noras-blog/2020/04/covid-19-potential-implications-individuals-substance-use-](https://www.drugabuse.gov/about-nida/noras-blog/2020/04/covid-19-potential-implications-individuals-substance-use-disorders)
39 26 [disorders](https://www.drugabuse.gov/about-nida/noras-blog/2020/04/covid-19-potential-implications-individuals-substance-use-disorders).
- 42 27 Wang, C. and Burris, M. A. (1997) 'Photovoice: Concept, Methodology, and Use for
43 28 Participatory Needs Assessment', *Health Education and Behavior*, 24(3), pp.369–387.
44 29 doi:10.1177/109019819702400309.
- 46 30 Weston, S., Honor, S. and Best, D. (2018) 'A tale of two towns: A comparative study
47 31 exploring the possibilities and pitfalls of social capital among people seeking recovery from
48 32 substance misuse', *Sheffield Hallam University*, 53(3), pp.490–500.
- 51 33 Williams, G. *et al.* (2009) 'The importance of supporting autonomy and perceived
52 34 competence in facilitating long-term tobacco abstinence.', *Annals of Behavioral Medicine*,
53 35 37, pp.315–324. doi:10.1007/s12160-009-9090-y.
- 55 36 Worthington, C. *et al.* (2016) 'The ethics of community-based research with people who use
56 37 drugs: results of a scoping review', *BMC Medical Ethics*, 17(1), pp.1–13.
57 38 doi:10.1186/s12910-016-0108-2.
- 59 39 Xiong, H. and Jia, J. (2019) 'Situational Social Support and Relapse: An Exploration of

- 1
2
3 1 Compulsory Drug Abuse Treatment Effect in China', *International Journal of Offender*
4 2 *Therapy and Comparative Criminology*, 63(8), pp.1202–1219.
5 3 doi:10.1177/0306624X18815243.
6
7 4 Zixin, L. and Wang, S. (2020) 'Prevalence and predictors of general psychiatric disorders and
8 5 loneliness during COVID-19 in the United Kingdom', *Psychiatry Research*.
9
10 6 Zschau, T. *et al.* (2016) 'The Hidden Challenge: Limited Recovery Capital of Drug Court
11 7 Participants' Support Networks', *Journal of Applied Social Science*, 10(1), pp.22–43.
12 8 doi:10.1177/1936724415589633.
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60