

1     **The impact of COVID-19 non-pharmaceutical interventions on the**  
2     **lived experiences of people living in Thailand, Malaysia, Italy and**  
3     **the United Kingdom: a cross-country qualitative study**

4  
5  
6     Mira L. Schneiders<sup>1,2,3,\*</sup>, Bhensri Naemiratch<sup>1¶</sup>, Phaik Kin Cheah<sup>4¶</sup>, Giulia Cuman<sup>5¶</sup>,  
7     Tassawan Poomchaichote<sup>1,6</sup>, Supanat Ruangajorn<sup>1</sup>, Silvia Stoppa<sup>7</sup>, Anne  
8     Osterrieder<sup>1,2</sup>, Phee-Kheng Cheah<sup>8</sup>, Darlene Ongkili<sup>9</sup>, Wirichada Pan-ngum<sup>1,10</sup>,  
9     Constance R.S. Mackworth-Young<sup>11</sup>, Phaik Yeong Cheah<sup>1,2,3,6</sup>

10

11     <sup>1</sup> Mahidol Oxford Tropical Medicine Research Unit, Faculty of Tropical Medicine,  
12     Mahidol University, Bangkok, 10400, Thailand

13     <sup>2</sup> Centre for Tropical Medicine & Global Health, Nuffield Department of Medicine,  
14     University of Oxford, Oxford, UK

15     <sup>3</sup> Ethox Centre, Big Data Institute, Nuffield Department of Population Health,  
16     University of Oxford, Oxford, UK

17     <sup>4</sup> Faculty of Arts & Social Science, Universiti Tunku Abdul Rahman, Kampar,  
18     Malaysia

19     <sup>5</sup> Paediatric Ethics Committee; Research Ethics Committee, University Hospital of  
20     Padua, Padua, Italy

21     <sup>6</sup> The SoNAR-Global Network, Mahidol University, Bangkok, 10400, Thailand

22     <sup>7</sup> Luoghi di Prevenzione, Reggio Emilia, Italy

23     <sup>8</sup> Emergency and Trauma Department, Sabah Women and Children's Hospital,  
24     Ministry of Health Malaysia, Kota Kinabalu, Malaysia

1 <sup>9</sup> Emergency and Trauma Department, Queen Elizabeth Hospital, Ministry of Health

2 Malaysia, Kota Kinabalu, Malaysia

3 <sup>10</sup> Department of Tropical Hygiene, Faculty of Tropical Medicine, Mahidol University,

4 Bangkok, 10400, Thailand

5 <sup>11</sup> Department of Global Health and Development, London School of Hygiene and

6 Tropical Medicine, London, UK

7

8 \* Corresponding author

9 E-mail: [mira.schneiders@ndm.ox.ac.uk](mailto:mira.schneiders@ndm.ox.ac.uk) (MLS)

10

11 <sup>¶</sup>These authors contributed equally to this work.

12

1 **Title**

2 **Full title**

3 **The impact of COVID-19 non-pharmaceutical interventions on the**  
4 **lived experience of people living in Thailand, Malaysia, Italy and the**  
5 **United Kingdom: a cross-country qualitative study**

6

7 **Short title**

8 **Lived experience of COVID-19 non-pharmaceutical interventions in**  
9 **Thailand, Malaysia, Italy and the United Kingdom**

10

11 **Abstract**

12 This qualitative study explores the impact of non-pharmaceutical interventions (NPIs)  
13 on lived experiences during the first wave of the COVID-19 pandemic on people's  
14 lives in Thailand, Malaysia, Italy and the United Kingdom. A total of 86 interviews  
15 were conducted with members of the public, including healthcare workers.  
16 Participants across countries held strong views on NPIs, with many feeling measures  
17 lacked clarity. Most participants reported primarily negative impacts of NPIs on their  
18 lives, including through separation, isolation and grief over missed milestones; work-  
19 related challenges and income loss; and poor mental health and wellbeing.  
20 Nonetheless, many also experienced inadvertent positive consequences, including  
21 more time at home to focus on what they most valued in life; a greater sense of  
22 connectedness; and benefits to working life. Commonly employed coping strategies

1 focused on financial coping; psycho-emotional coping; social coping and  
2 connectedness; reducing and mitigating risks; and limiting exposure to the news.  
3 Importantly, the extent to which participants' lived experiences were positive or  
4 negative, and their ability to cope was underpinned by individual, social and  
5 economic factors. In order to mitigate negative and unequal impacts of NPIs,  
6 COVID-19 policies will benefit from paying closer attention to the social, cultural and  
7 psychological—not just biological—vulnerabilities to, and consequences of public  
8 health measures.

# 1 Introduction

2

3 *"We are like islands in the sea, separate on the surface but connected in the deep."* William  
4 James

5

6 In 2020, countries around the world implemented a range of containment measures  
7 using non-pharmaceutical interventions (NPIs) to prevent the transmission of SARS-  
8 CoV-2 (COVID-19), which to date has resulted in 113,467,303 confirmed cases,  
9 including 2,520,550 deaths worldwide [1]. These included social distancing  
10 measures, such as contact tracing, quarantine, closure of schools, work places and  
11 non-essential shops; travel-related measures such as travel restrictions, screening  
12 and border closure; and personal protective measures such as face masks, hand  
13 hygiene and respiratory etiquette [2]. Evidence supports the effectiveness of these  
14 measures in reducing COVID-19 transmission, mortality and healthcare demand [3-  
15 6].

16

17 Despite this evidence, ethical considerations need to account for the economic,  
18 social and psychological impacts of NPIs on people's lives [7]. For this, it is vital to  
19 understand how NPIs are experienced by the public. A systematic review and  
20 synthesis of qualitative studies on public perceptions on NPIs in the context of  
21 respiratory infections found that perceptions were impacted by assessments about  
22 their necessity, efficacy, acceptability, and feasibility [8]. Furthermore, the potential to  
23 attract stigma, perceptions about the emotional, personal and societal economic  
24 costs, and cultural unacceptability were identified as disadvantages of social  
25 distancing, isolation and quarantine [8].

1

2 The importance of focusing on mental health amidst this pandemic has been  
3 underscored by the emergence of evidence highlighting the negative psychological  
4 impacts of NPIs [9]. A recent review on the psychological impact of quarantine  
5 identified post-traumatic stress symptoms, confusion, and anger as negative effects,  
6 and found that longer quarantine duration, infection fears, frustration, boredom,  
7 inadequate information and supplies, financial loss, and stigma were important  
8 stressors [10]. While these findings do not suggest that NPIs, like quarantine and  
9 isolation should not be employed, the adverse psychological impacts they may  
10 cause need to be weighed against likely benefits [10].

11

12 Emerging evidence also suggests that the use of NPIs in the context of COVID-19  
13 has had unequal effects on society, including across and within countries [11, 12].  
14 Vulnerable populations in particular, including migrants, people working in the  
15 informal economy, homeless people, older people and people living with disabilities,  
16 may be disproportionately affected by the adverse impacts of NPIs [7, 13].  
17 Vulnerable individuals may be less able to comply with NPIs, due to underlying  
18 inequalities in the distribution of resources, wealth and power [13-15]. For example,  
19 they may be less able to practice hand hygiene (if lacking access to basic  
20 sanitation), wear masks (due to access and affordability issues) or adopt  
21 recommended social distancing (when living in crowded conditions, relying on public  
22 transport, working in high public contact jobs or being unable to access sick leave)  
23 [13-15]. This, in turn is likely to exacerbate existing health, economic and social  
24 inequalities.

25

1 Understanding the social, economic and mental health impacts of prolonged  
2 exposure to social distancing and isolation during the COVID-19 pandemic has been  
3 identified as a priority for multidisciplinary COVID-19 research [16]. The importance  
4 of doing this research “together with people with lived experience” has also been  
5 highlighted [17]. Qualitative research in particular can help to gain a rich and  
6 comprehensive understanding of lived experience [18]. Knowledge generated using  
7 social science methods is thus crucial for generating insights that can inform the  
8 development of more effective and equitable public health interventions in light of  
9 infectious disease threats [19].

10

11 To date, little qualitative research has been conducted to understand public  
12 perceptions and lived experiences of NPIs. A focus group study conducted in the UK  
13 found that feelings of anxiety, depression and loss were common in response to  
14 COVID-19 social distancing and isolation [20]. However, the study did not include  
15 healthcare workers (HCW) or people at higher-risk of severe illness from COVID-19,  
16 such as those with underlying chronic conditions or over the age of 60 years [21],  
17 and so little is known about how these groups are impacted by NPIs. While no  
18 qualitative studies have directly studied the impact of NPIs on HCW, existing  
19 quantitative evidence suggests that HCW are at greater risk of experiencing  
20 psychological distress during the COVID-19 outbreak, including symptoms of  
21 depression, anxiety and PTSD [22-25]. Furthermore, to our knowledge, no qualitative  
22 study has been conducted comparing lived experiences of NPIs across different  
23 countries and world regions. Cross-national studies are useful because they can  
24 facilitate understanding of common issues [26] and generate deeper insights into the  
25 phenomena being studied [27]. This study therefore aims to help address these

1 gaps. Using in-depth interviews, we seek to explore and compare the lived  
2 experiences, coping strategies and views of COVID-19 NPIs among the public and  
3 HCW across four countries, namely Thailand, Malaysia, Italy and the United  
4 Kingdom (UK).

5  
6

## 7 **Materials and methods**

8

### 9 **Study design**

10 In-depth, semi-structured interviews were conducted with 86 individuals residing in  
11 four countries: Thailand, Malaysia, Italy and the UK between May 2 and August 8  
12 2020 (TH: 8.05-21.07.2020; MY: 2.05- 4.07.2020; IT: 13.05-04.08.2020; UK: 14.05-  
13 23.07.2020). Countries were selected based on the implementation of COVID-19  
14 public health measures (NPIs) during the study period and the existence of prior  
15 research collaborations, which enabled and facilitated timely implementation of the  
16 study. Here we describe results from a qualitative study, which was part of a mixed-  
17 methods study (SEB-COV) that also included an online survey [28]. The quantitative  
18 results are reported elsewhere [11].

19

### 20 **Theoretical framework**

21 This study used a phenomenological approach, focused on “the study of an  
22 individual’s lived experiences within the world” [29]. In-depth interviews were used to  
23 encourage participants to narrate their own lived experiences of government



1 imposed NPIs. Thematic analysis was used to code data into themes and sub-  
2 themes, based on the Framework Method [30].

3

#### 4 **COVID-19 government response in the four countries**

5 Over the study period, Thailand, Malaysia, Italy and the UK were under varying  
6 degrees of lockdown to prevent the transmission of COVID-19, which included  
7 closures of workplaces and schools, restrictions on movement and travel, and social  
8 distancing guidelines. The Oxford COVID-19 Government Response Tracker  
9 (OxCGRT) [31] tracks government responses to COVID-19 from more than 180  
10 countries on standardized indicators. Data are aggregated to produce a daily  
11 'Stringency Index' (SI), on a scale from 0-100, with 100 indicating the strictest public  
12 health response. Fig 1 visualises the SI of the four governments over the study  
13 period. For example, Italy experienced the strictest restrictions at the beginning of  
14 May (SI=93), followed by easing of restrictions in early June (SI=44) and subsequent  
15 tightening. In Thailand, the SI was high at the start of the study (SI=77) and  
16 decreased at the end of June (SI=53). The pattern was similar in Malaysia.  
17 Restrictions in the UK remained high throughout (SI=69-76).

18

19 **Fig 1. Government Stringency Index.** SI during the first wave of COVID-19 NPIs  
20 for Thailand, Malaysia, Italy and the UK.

21

#### 22 **Participant selection**

23 All participants taking part in the SEB-COV online survey [28] were invited to take  
24 part in the qualitative arm of the study. Additionally, in each country, participants  
25 were recruited through existing research and organisational networks, social media

1 channels (Facebook, Twitter), and targeted social media advertising (Facebook  
2 adverts). To encourage greater diversity among the sample, key community  
3 organisations and institutions working with vulnerable, hard-to-reach, or high-risk  
4 populations (e.g., entertainment workers, family caregivers, frontline workers, older  
5 people) were contacted via email and asked to disseminate information about the  
6 study through their networks.

7

8 Individuals were provided with information about the study and asked to register their  
9 interest using a short socio-demographic recruitment survey online, administered  
10 using the 'JISC online surveys' platform [32]. Across countries, a total of 276  
11 participants registered their interest via the recruitment survey (TH: 34; MY: 52; IT:  
12 34; UK: 156). Among these, participants were selected by each country team using  
13 purposive sampling to gain a maximum variation sample, based on six  
14 characteristics (i.e., gender, age, number of household members, self-perceived  
15 level of risk, level of education and occupation). Selected individuals were invited to  
16 take part in an interview via email or telephone (total 127, TH: 29; MY: 24; IT: 34;  
17 UK: 40). Of those contacted, 91 individuals agreed to participate, with five dropping  
18 out prior to the interview. A total of 86 interviews were therefore conducted across  
19 the four countries.

20

21 Participants in Thailand received ฿200 THB (USD 7), and in the UK were provided a  
22 £10 electronic supermarket voucher to compensate for their time. No compensation  
23 was provided in Italy and Malaysia, in accordance with local research practices.

24

## 25 **Participant characteristics**

1 Overall, 51% of all participants were female, 43% male and 6% identified as other  
2 genders (Table 1). Participant age ranged from 18-84 years (IT:20-65; MY 19-84; TH  
3 18-74; UK:24-80 years), with a total of 12.8% (n=11) aged 65 years or older.  
4 Participants varied in their levels of education (5% primary, 31% secondary, 64%  
5 tertiary), household size (range: 1-12 people) and occupations (15% HCW, 85%  
6 other). Across all countries, 41% of participants perceived themselves at low, 37% at  
7 medium and 22% at high risk of COVID-19.

8

## 9 **Data collection**

10 The interview topic guide was developed collaboratively in a series of online  
11 meetings involving all interviewers from across the four countries. The topic guide  
12 was based on the research aims and protocol of the SEB-COV mixed-methods study  
13 [28]. Following pilot testing in each country, the guide was subsequently discussed  
14 and refined to focus on three broad areas, namely: (1) lived experiences and  
15 perceptions of COVID-19 measures (i.e., social isolation, social distancing, travel  
16 restrictions, quarantine); (2) wellbeing and mental health; (3) information,  
17 misinformation and rumours (for topic guide see [33]). In Thailand and Italy, topic  
18 guides were translated into Thai and Italian respectively, and interviews were  
19 conducted in these languages. In Malaysia and the UK, interviews were conducted in  
20 English.

21

22 Written informed consent was obtained electronically and permission was sought to  
23 audio record interviews. In Thailand and Malaysia, all interviews were recorded and  
24 transcribed. In Italy and UK, interviewers took detailed notes during the interview and  
25 wrote up summary scripts directly after, with salient quotes being transcribed

1 verbatim from the recordings. The interview script method has been shown to  
2 produce levels of detail comparable to audio-recorded transcription [34, 35], and was  
3 chosen for reasons of time and resource efficiency. Because of data protection  
4 regulations preventing re-contacting of participants, transcripts and summaries were  
5 not returned to participants for validation and feedback. Interviews were scheduled at  
6 a time convenient to participants and lasted between 30-90 minutes.

7

8 As COVID-19 regulations prevented meeting face-to-face, the vast majority of  
9 interviews in all four countries were conducted by telephone or an online  
10 videoconferencing platform (Microsoft Teams, using video if possible), based on  
11 participants' preferences. Following easing of local restrictions, one interview in  
12 Thailand and four interviews in Italy were conducted face-to-face at participants'  
13 request, while adhering to local social distancing guidelines.

14

15 Only the researcher and participant were present during interviews and participants  
16 were encouraged to signal to the researcher if they felt that their privacy was  
17 compromised at any time (e.g., by the arrival of family members). No participants  
18 indicated this.

19

## 20 **Research team and reflexivity**

21 In each country, interviews were conducted by a team of trained qualitative  
22 researchers (Thailand: BN, SR, TP; Malaysia: PKC, TS; Italy: GC, SS; UK: MLS,  
23 CMY; SR=male, all others=female), who began by introducing themselves and  
24 briefed participants about the aims of the study. Interviewers did not know  
25 participants before the study onset. All interviewers were residents in their study

1 country, were affiliated with a national research institution, and fluently spoke the  
2 interview language.

3

#### 4 **Data analysis**

5 Data was collected iteratively, with emerging insights from each interview used to  
6 inform subsequent interviews, and continued until reaching ‘thematic saturation’, the  
7 point at which no salient new themes were deemed to emerge within each country  
8 [36]. Following completion of data collection, the Framework Method was used to  
9 analyse interview data, a tool commonly used in multi-disciplinary health research,  
10 offering “a systematic and flexible approach to analysing qualitative data”,  
11 particularly amongst large teams [30]. The Framework Method was chosen because  
12 of its efficiency and appropriateness for analysing data collected for pre-defined aims  
13 and objectives [37]. Based on the research aims and discussions within the cross-  
14 country research team, a broad, deductive set of thematic codes, including primary  
15 and secondary level codes, was developed.

16

17 The coding framework was tested, refined and subsequently applied to code data in  
18 each country. Coded data was then charted into the Framework matrix, which  
19 comprised three major themes (1. Views on public health measures; 2. Lived  
20 experience and impact of NPIs; 3. Coping strategies), and additional subthemes.  
21 Regular online meetings between the lead researcher (MLS) and country teams  
22 were used to review and discuss interpretations and coding of data, as well as  
23 charting of interview data into the Framework matrix. Finally, key findings for each  
24 theme were discussed and consolidated in online coding workshops between the  
25 lead researcher and country teams. These meetings supported a diversity of

1 perspectives on data analysis, helping to strengthen reliability and validity of the  
2 findings [38].

3

#### 4 **Ethical approval**

5 Ethics approval was granted by Oxford Tropical Research Ethics Committee  
6 (OxTREC, reference no.520-20), covering all four countries. Additional ethics  
7 committee approval from Italy was not required for the study to be conducted there.  
8 In Thailand, additional approval was sought from the Faculty of Tropical Medicine  
9 Ethics Committee (FTMEC, ref: MUTM 2020-031-01). In Malaysia, additional  
10 approval was granted by the Medical Research and Ethics Committee (MREC), the  
11 Ministry of Health Malaysia (MOH ref: NMRR-20-595-54437 (IIR)), and the Universiti  
12 Tunku Abdul Rahman (UTAR) Scientific and Ethical Review Committee (SERC, ref:  
13 (U/SERC/63/2020).

14

#### 15 **Results**

16

17 Below we summarize key findings for each of the three major themes discussed.  
18 Supporting quotes which are referenced below (e.g., Q1, Q2, Q3 etc) are presented  
19 in Table 2.

20

#### 21 **Views on COVID-19 public health measures**

22

23 Across the four countries, participants held complex and nuanced views about  
24 COVID-19 measures, which varied depending on participant's personal

1 circumstances, concerns and goals (e.g., staying safe/at home vs maintaining  
2 income/continuing to go out to work), and the extent to which NPIs were seen to  
3 facilitate or hinder these goals.

4

## 5 **Agreement with NPIs**

6 Across countries, those who largely agreed with NPIs said that the measures, albeit  
7 being strict, were necessary to prevent community spread of COVID-19 (see Q1,  
8 Thailand). Many expressed feeling safer as a result of imposed NPIs. Some said  
9 their government had handled the pandemic well compared to other countries, thus  
10 deeming NPIs to be effective (see Q2, Malaysia). Such views were sometimes linked  
11 to narratives about the government doing their best amidst challenging  
12 circumstances and emphasised a sense of unity among the people, who found  
13 themselves “all in the same boat” (see Q3, Italy).

14

## 15 **Criticism of NPIs**

16 Disagreement with government handling of COVID-19 ranged from mild criticisms  
17 about certain aspects of NPIs to some participants saying their government had  
18 failed to respond effectively. These participants believed that current NPIs were  
19 insufficient and "not strict enough" (see Q4, Malaysia) to contain further spread. For  
20 example, some said their government had done too little and “locked down way too  
21 late” (see Q5, UK), that rules lacked enforcement by the police and criticised  
22 premature easing of restrictions, raising fears about a “second wave” (see Q6, UK).

23

24 Contrarily, others felt that NPIs were too strict “because people have been pushed  
25 like animals into cages” (see Q7, Italy). Some Italian participants also believed that

1 measures should have been implemented regionally, not nationally. In Thailand and  
2 Malaysia, some participants said that measures like curfews, travel restrictions and  
3 boarder closures threatened livelihoods, such as in tourism and for migrant workers,  
4 and that financial support from the government was insufficient (see Q8, Thailand;  
5 Q9, Malaysia).

6  
7 Many participants also reported confusion and a lack of clarity in relation to NPI rules  
8 and regulations in their country. Particularly those in Italy and the UK commonly  
9 voiced frustration about the “mixed messages” and lack of clear NPIs guidelines from  
10 the government, leaving many to feel unsafe (see Q10, UK).

11

## 12 **Lived experiences and impact of public health measures**

13

14 Most participants reported that NPIs impacted their lives in negatives ways.  
15 However, many also discussed inadvertent positive experiences, opportunities or  
16 ‘silver linings’, which had resulted from the COVID-19 measures. The extent of both  
17 positive and negative experiences varied considerably between participants, based  
18 on personal circumstances, particularly financial security, and across countries.  
19 Participants also discussed coping strategies adopted to mitigate the negative  
20 impacts of the measures. Fig 2 shows a summary of key findings.

21

22 **Fig 2. Lived experiences and impact of living under COVID-19 public health**  
23 **measures in four countries.** Summary of key positive experiences, negative  
24 experiences and coping strategies.

25



## 1 **Positive experiences**

2

### 3 **More time at home to focus on family, oneself and the essential**

4 Having more time to spend at home was a key positive experience reported across  
5 the four countries. Many compared the constant busyness of their 'normal' lives with  
6 the quiet and stillness during lockdown, prompting them to focus on what they felt  
7 was most essential in life. For some, this facilitated more time with family, extended  
8 parental leave, helping children with schoolwork, or reconnecting remotely with  
9 family and friends (see Q11, Italy). Others appreciated having more time to  
10 themselves, learn new skills, rest and reflect, engage in spiritual practice, or  
11 establish a healthier lifestyle, through exercise and cooking. Some enjoyed feeling  
12 less pressure to socialise and also said they "save[d] a lot of money" while staying at  
13 home (see Q12, Thailand).

14

### 15 **Sense of greater connectedness and shared humanity**

16 Across countries, some participants reported experiencing a greater sense of social  
17 support and solidarity within their communities during lockdown. Many said local  
18 support and volunteering initiatives that had sprung up in light of the community  
19 coming together, saying that the crisis had triggered a greater recognition of being  
20 "interconnected" and a sense of shared humanity (see Q13, Italy). Some participants  
21 in the UK and Italy additionally noted that the pandemic had made them feel more  
22 connected and appreciative of "the beauty of nature" (see Q14, Italy).

23

### 24 **Benefits to working life**

1 Some participants said that the measures had had a positive impact on their working  
2 lives. Across countries, some participants welcomed more flexible hours, home  
3 working, the lack of or reduced commute, with less traffic and pollution, while some  
4 also reported increased productivity and decreased work-related stress (see Q15,  
5 UK). A few deviant cases, participants also mentioned new business opportunities  
6 resulting from restrictions, such as setting up food delivery businesses at home.

7

## 8 **Negative experiences**

9

### 10 **Separation from family, friends and communities, and grief over** 11 **missed milestones**

12 Participants across all countries described their separation from friends and family as  
13 the most challenging aspect of NPIs. Many felt isolated and lonely due to prolonged  
14 physical separation from their loved ones, especially participants who lived alone  
15 (see Q16, UK).

16

17 Separation and isolation were described as most challenging when participants were  
18 unable to communally celebrate significant milestones, such as birthday, weddings,  
19 religious ceremonies, holidays or funerals (see Q17, Malaysia). Across countries,  
20 many described a feeling of 'missing out' on important life events, with this being  
21 particularly poignant among younger and older participants, for instance around  
22 experiencing grandchildren's development or being involved in activism.

23

1 The closure of recreational facilities, such as cinemas and gyms, or social support  
2 services and community organisations, such as mental health support groups or  
3 religious services, was perceived as particularly challenging by some (see Q18, UK).

4

## 5 **Work related challenges and income loss**

6 Many participants across countries described the negative impacts of NPIs on their  
7 work. Thai and Malaysian participants, in particular, and to a lesser extent UK and  
8 Italian participants, said that the fear of, or actual loss of their job or income was a  
9 grave consequence of the restrictive measures (see Q19, Thailand).

10

11 Some participants also worried about the impact of NPIs on society and the  
12 economy more broadly, expressing particular concerns about mass unemployment  
13 and negative consequences for those in “precarious situations, both economically  
14 and psychologically” (see Q20, Italy).

15

16 Many who continued working reported challenges due to their altered work situation,  
17 including challenges related to poor connectivity (see Q21, Thailand), difficulties  
18 concentrating while home-working, increased workloads, and heightened work-  
19 related stress and anxiety, particularly among HCW (see Q22, Malaysia; Q23, UK).

20

21 In Malaysia and Thailand, participants complained that travel restrictions and  
22 curfews caused pressure on their work schedules and livelihoods. Some young  
23 professionals expressed concerns about disruptions to their career progression.  
24 Finally, women in particular described the increased burdens of unpaid care and  
25 domestic work during lockdown (see Q24, Italy).

1

## 2 **Poor mental health and wellbeing**

3 The negative impact of lockdown measures on mental health and wellbeing was a  
4 consistent theme across countries. Several participants reported low mood, grief,  
5 fatigue, restlessness, boredom, guilt, feeling overwhelmed and a lack of control as a  
6 result of the changes to their personal, family and work lives. For many participants,  
7 concerns about contracting COVID-19 resulted in strong fear and anxiety, including  
8 around leaving the house or doing shopping (see Q25, UK). At the same time, some  
9 described how being stuck at home made it difficult to “escape” these negative  
10 thoughts and feelings or “put things into perspective” (see Q26, UK).

11

12 Reports of COVID-related stress and anxiety were heightened among those who  
13 considered themselves or a family member to be vulnerable, and among HCW.  
14 Frontline HCW frequently complained about a lack of personal protective equipment  
15 (PPE) or changing PPE guidelines, causing considerable fears about their own and  
16 their household member’s health (see Q27, UK; Q28, Malaysia), particularly among  
17 those with underlying health conditions (see Q29, UK).

18

19 Future uncertainties resulting from NPIs, such as when and how the measures would  
20 be eased and the impact on job prospects, was reported as a major stressor on  
21 mental health. Parents also commonly worried about the long-term impact of the  
22 measures on their children (see Q30, Italy).

23

## 24 **Coping strategies**

1 Across countries, participants reported various ways of coping with the impacts of  
2 the COVID-19 measures.

3

#### 4 **Financial coping**

5 Many participants described their efforts to cope with financial challenges and  
6 income loss resulting from COVID-19 restrictions. For example, some participants  
7 tried to reduce spending where possible, while others took on additional work, such  
8 as starting a home business or taking on additional work (see Q31, Thailand).

9

10 In Thailand and Malaysia, informal sector workers described adapting working  
11 schedules around imposed curfews and travel restrictions (see Q32, Thailand).

12 Participants in the UK, Italy and Thailand, who received financial support from their  
13 governments described this as helpful but insufficient to make up for lost income  
14 (see Q33, UK).

15

#### 16 **Psycho-emotional coping**

17 In adapting to the 'new normal', many participants actively tried to maintain wellbeing  
18 amidst difficult life circumstances, with similar coping strategies being reported  
19 across countries. These included engaging in religious and spiritual practices (e.g.,  
20 meditation, prayer) (see Q34 Thailand); establishing daily routines around self-care,  
21 work and childcare (e.g., regular exercise, sleep, getting dressed as if going to work,  
22 home schooling schedules); maintaining relationships, social connections and  
23 recreational activities from home (e.g., using online media) (see Q35, Malaysia); and  
24 making home improvements (e.g., tidying, doing home repairs, gardening) (see Q36,  
25 Italy).

1

2 As a way of coping, some Thai participants, in line with Buddhist principles spoke  
3 about intentionally trying to cultivate attitudes of ‘acceptance’ and ‘letting be’ (i.e.,  
4 “*Plong*”), rather than focusing on the uncertainty surrounding pandemic restrictions  
5 (see Q37, Thailand).

6

## 7 **Social coping and connectedness**

8 Across countries, staying connected with friends, family and peers through shifting  
9 social routines online and via telephone was considered essential for keeping “sane”  
10 during prolonged physical separation from loved ones and for maintaining a sense of  
11 connectedness (see Q38, Malaysia; Q39 Italy).

12

13 Some participants felt that a renewed sense of solidarity and communities coming  
14 together helped to counter feelings of loneliness and isolation. Several reported  
15 “want[ing] to do something for society” (see Q40, Italy), saying that volunteering  
16 initiatives or providing personal support to family, friends, neighbours and colleagues  
17 helped them to experience a sense of purpose during this difficult time.

18

## 19 **Reducing and mitigating risks**

20 Across countries, many participants reported taking steps to reduce potential  
21 exposure to COVID-19, including staying at home; switching to online grocery  
22 shopping or designating one person per household to do in-person shopping; using  
23 PPE like hand sanitiser, gloves, face masks and shields; and avoiding close contact  
24 with others when in public. Particularly HCW reported that having access to PPE  
25 reduced fears and increased their sense of control (see Q41, Malaysia).

1

## 2 **Limiting exposure to the news**

3 Across countries, many participants reported feeling distressed by the constant  
4 exposure to COVID-19 news, which some felt were unclear, untrustworthy and  
5 politicised. As such, in an effort to balance their desire to stay informed and to  
6 manage the anxiety evoked by the news, many participants said they deliberately  
7 limited their daily news exposure (see Q42, UK).

8

## 9 **Discussion**

10

11 This study provides insight into the lived experiences of NPIs among the public,  
12 including HCW across four countries during the first wave of the COVID-19  
13 pandemic, an unprecedented time in history. Despite considerable variation of  
14 individual circumstances, there was surprising similarity of experiences across  
15 countries, including around personal, social, familial, professional, financial, religious  
16 and spiritual life domains. This study unusually highlights the positive silver linings  
17 and coping strategies that individuals adopted, alongside the better understood  
18 negative psychosocial and economic impacts.

19

20 Across countries, participants generally had strong views, either supportive or  
21 critical, of their government's handling of the pandemic, with few expressing neutral  
22 views. Criticisms of NPIs emphasised that measures were either not strict enough or  
23 too strict, thus threatening livelihoods. Overall, many expressed confusion and  
24 frustration at rapidly changing rules, echoing other research linking negative views of  
25 NPIs to mistrust of politics and negative perceptions of government transparency

1 [20, 39]. Those supportive of NPIs emphasised the necessity of measures to prevent  
2 COVID-19 transmission, appealing to values of unity and solidarity. Across countries,  
3 community support and solidarity were also highlighted as helpful for coping with the  
4 psychosocial impacts of prolonged physical distancing and isolation. Public health  
5 messaging that emphasises shared values of solidarity, altruism and social  
6 responsibility are thus likely to enhance acceptability of NPIs, as has been shown for  
7 promoting the uptake of face coverings across several countries [40].

8

9 Most participants felt predominantly negatively affected by NPIs, including through  
10 income loss, work related challenges, separation from loved ones, grief over missed  
11 milestones, and widespread experiences of poor mental health. This supports  
12 existing qualitative evidence from the UK highlighting the negative impacts of social  
13 distancing and isolation, including economic, social, psychological, and emotional  
14 losses, such as loss of motivation, meaning and self-worth [20]. Our findings further  
15 support others showing that negative experiences were often amplified among HCW  
16 who faced greater work-related stress and exposure to COVID-19 risks [22, 23, 25,  
17 41]. Furthermore, we highlight that experiences among HCW differed depending on  
18 their own levels of self-perceived COVID-19 risk, which resonates with research  
19 documenting significantly higher levels of COVID-19 infection among patient-facing  
20 HCW, compared to non-patient facing HCW [42].

21

22 Our findings additionally highlight inadvertent positive experiences and coping  
23 strategies emerging from this crisis, largely overlooked to date. Positive experiences  
24 included participants having more time to focus on their family, themselves and what  
25 they most valued; making positive changes to working routines; and feeling a greater



1 sense of community. Many participants across countries rapidly adapted their lives  
2 by developing financial, psycho-emotional and social ways of adjusting to the ‘new  
3 normal’, and by reducing COVID-19-related risks and exposure to anxiety provoking  
4 news. However, socio-cultural and economic factors importantly underpinned the  
5 extent to which participants were able to employ positive coping strategies. During  
6 this pandemic, some groups, including younger people, sexual and gender minorities  
7 and those with financial instability have been evidenced to use less productive  
8 coping strategies, like substance use and behaviour disengagement [43]. We  
9 support others who argue that, in order to ensure that COVID-19 interventions are  
10 equitable, the definition of who is considered vulnerable and ‘most-at-risk’ should be  
11 expanded to include social and cultural—not just biological—factors [44-46]. Further  
12 research on the lived experiences of coping with COVID-19 restrictions is therefore  
13 important for better understanding the socio-cultural factors that underpin differential  
14 susceptibility to experiencing adverse impacts of NPIs.

15

16 Importantly, understanding positive experiences and coping—and thereby shedding  
17 light on the full spectrum of lived experience—can illuminate and facilitate the  
18 public’s resilience in light of ongoing restrictions. This study suggests that efforts to  
19 maintain mental health services, community and religious support groups remotely;  
20 ensuring availability of PPE; and offering financial compensation for lost income are  
21 critical ingredients to support better coping across countries. Furthermore, identifying  
22 socially vulnerable groups in each context and accounting for particular socio-cultural  
23 needs, through community engagement and social science research, will be  
24 essential for policy makers to promote positive coping strategies and reduce the  
25 negative and unequal impacts of NPIs [19].

1

2 This study is limited in three main ways. Firstly, although we aimed to sample a  
3 diverse group, there was less variety in socio-economic status than desired. This  
4 was due to rapid recruitment, and interviews being conducted online or by phone,  
5 restricting access of those from lower socio-economic groups with less access to  
6 these technologies. Additionally, due to data protection regulations, only Microsoft  
7 Teams was approved for online data collection in this study, ruling out more  
8 accessible and widespread platforms like WhatsApp or Facebook Messenger, likely  
9 to have facilitated greater diversity among participants. Despite this, through  
10 purposive sampling we managed to include participants from a range of age groups,  
11 occupations, educational backgrounds and self-perceived risk levels, including HCW.  
12 Secondly, social desirability bias [47] may have led participants to represent  
13 themselves as overly adherent to and supportive of NPIs, and avoided revealing  
14 more extreme views (e.g., beliefs in conspiracy theories). Thirdly, while this study  
15 compared lived experiences of NPIs across countries, future research would benefit  
16 from investigating intra-country differences, including comparisons between urban  
17 and rural residents [48].

18

19 A strength of this study is that it is the first cross-country qualitative study to provide  
20 evidence on the impact of NPIs on lived experience of the public, including HCW,  
21 which can help to inform the COVID-19 policy response. Additionally, the use of  
22 remote interviews allowed for nationwide recruitment across the four countries,  
23 circumventing barriers of geographical distance, while also potentially offering a  
24 greater sense of safety and anonymity, which may have increased participation from  
25 individuals who may be reluctant to participate in-person.

1

## 2 **Conclusion**

3

4 Findings from this study underscore the need for COVID-19 policies and  
5 interventions to pay greater attention to the differential impact of NPIs on different  
6 population groups. Supporting individuals' coping is an important strategy for  
7 mitigating the adverse impact of NPIs and interventions should focus on socially  
8 vulnerable groups who experience greater negative impacts and are less able to  
9 cope. These are likely to include individuals facing socio-economic deprivation and  
10 other marginalised populations, such as sexual and gender minorities and migrant  
11 workers. We emphasise that across countries, declines in mental health as a result  
12 of NPIs appear widespread and common. Efforts to counter this trend are thus  
13 critical: policy makers must prioritise populations physical health—i.e., protection  
14 from COVID-19 infection—while not losing sight of their mental health.

15

16

## 17 **Acknowledgements**

18

19 We would like to thank all participants across the four countries who agreed to  
20 take part in this research.

21

22

**Table 1. Participant characteristics.**

<b>Characteristic</b>	<b>United Kingdom</b>	<b>Thailand</b>	<b>Malaysia</b>	<b>Italy</b>	<b>Total</b>
	<b>n (%)</b>	<b>n (%)</b>	<b>n (%)</b>	<b>n (%)</b>	<b>n (%)</b>
<b>Gender</b>	n=20	n=28	n=18	n=20	n=86
Female	12 (60.0)	12 (42.9)	8 (44.4)	12 (60.0)	44 (51.2)
Male	8 (40.0)	11 (39.3)	10 (55.6)	8 (40.0)	37 (43.0)
Other	0 (0.0)	5 (17.9)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	5 (5.8)
<b>Age range</b>					
18-24	1 (5.0)	2 (7.1)	1 (5.6)	2 (10.0)	6 (7.0)
25-34	2 (10.0)	5 (17.9)	3 (16.7)	8 (40.0)	18 (20.9)
35-44	1 (5.0)	12 (42.9)	4 (22.2)	2 (10.0)	19 (22.1)
45-54	4 (20.0)	4 (14.3)	5 (27.8)	5 (25.0)	18 (20.9)
55-64	6 (30.0)	3 (10.7)	3 (16.7)	2 (10.0)	14 (16.3)
65-74	5 (25.0)	2 (7.1)	1 (5.6)	1 (5.0)	9 (10.5)
75-84	1 (5.0)	0 (0.0)	1 (5.6)	0 (0.0)	2 (2.3)
<b>Highest level of education</b>					
Primary	0 (0.0)	4 (14.3)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	4 (4.7)
Secondary	5 (25.0)	9 (32.1)	6 (33.3)	7 (35.0)	27 (31.4)
Tertiary	15 (75.0)	15 (53.6)	12 (66.7)	13 (65.0)	55 (64.0)
<b>Number of household members</b>					
1	6 (30.0)	5 (17.9)	2 (11.1)	4 (20.0)	17 (19.8)
2	7 (35.0)	7 (25.0)	4 (22.2)	3 (15.0)	21 (24.4)
3	4 (20.0)	6 (21.4)	4 (22.2)	9 (45.0)	23 (26.7)
4	2 (10.0)	4 (14.3)	1 (5.6)	2 (10.0)	9 (10.5)
5	0 (0.0)	3 (10.7)	5 (27.8)	2 (10.0)	10 (11.6)
6	0 (0.0)	1 (3.6)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	1 (1.2)
7	1 (5.0)	1 (3.6)	1 (5.6)	0 (0.0)	3 (3.5)
>7	0 (0.0)	1 (3.6)	1 (5.6)	0 (0.0)	2 (2.3)

Overall self-perceived risk level					
Low	9 (45.0)	8 (28.6)	4 (22.2)	14 (70.0)	35 (40.7)
Medium	7 (35.0)	13 (46.4)	8 (44.4)	4 (20.0)	32 (37.2)
High	4 (20.0)	7 (25.0)	6 (33.3)	2 (10.0)	19 (22.1)
Occupation <sup>a</sup>					
<b>1 Managers</b>	<b>2 (10.0)</b>	<b>2 (7.1)</b>	<b>6 (33.3)</b>	<b>0 (0.0)</b>	<b>10 (11.6)</b>
111 Legislators and Senior Officials	0 (0.0)	1 (3.6)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	1 (1.2)
121 Business Services and Administration Managers	0 (0.0)	1 (3.6)	5 (27.8)	0 (0.0)	6 (7.0)
132 Manufacturing, Mining, Construction and Distribution Managers	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	1 (5.6)	0 (0.0)	1 (1.2)
133 Information and Communications Technology Services Managers	1 (5.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	1 (1.2)
134 Professional Services Managers	1 (5.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	1 (1.2)
<b>2 Professionals</b>	<b>8 (40.0)</b>	<b>5 (17.9)</b>	<b>3 (16.7)</b>	<b>9 (45.0)</b>	<b>25 (29.1)</b>
213 Life Science Professionals	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	1 (5.0)	1 (1.2)
216 Architects, Planners, Surveyors and	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	1 (5.0)	1 (1.2)

Designers					
221 Medical Doctors	3 (15.0)	0 (0.0)	1 (5.6)	0 (0.0)	4 (4.7)
222 Nursing and Midwifery Professionals	0 (0.0)	1 (3.6)	1 (5.6)	0 (0.0)	2 (2.3)
226 Other Health Professionals	0 (0.0)	2 (7.1)	0 (0.0)	1 (5.0)	3 (3.5)
231 University and Higher Education Teachers	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	1 (5.6)	0 (0.0)	1 (1.2)
234 Primary School and Early Childhood Teachers	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	1 (5.0)	1 (1.2)
241 Finance Professionals	1 (5.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	1 (1.2)
242 Administration Professionals	1 (5.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	1 (1.2)
263 Social and Religious Professionals	3 (15.0)	1 (3.6)	0 (0.0)	4 (20.0)	8 (9.3)
264 Authors, Journalists and Linguists	0 (0.0)	1 (3.6)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	1 (1.2)
265 Creative and Performing Artists	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	1 (5.0)	1 (1.2)
<b>3 Technicians and Associate Professionals</b>	<b>3 (15.0)</b>	<b>2 (7.1)</b>	<b>3 (16.7)</b>	<b>2 (10.0)</b>	<b>10 (11.6)</b>
315 Ship and Aircraft Controllers	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	1 (5.0)	1 (1.2)

and Technicians					
325 Other Health Associate Professionals	0 (0.0)	1 (3.6)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	1 (1.2)
332 Sales and Purchasing Agents and Brokers	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	1 (5.0)	1 (1.2)
334 Administrative and Specialized Secretaries	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	1 (5.6)	0 (0.0)	1 (1.2)
341 Legal, Social and Religious Associate Professionals	2 (10.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	2 (2.3)
342 Sports and Fitness Workers	0 (0.0)	1 (3.6)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	1 (1.2)
343 Artistic, Cultural and Culinary Associate Professionals	1 (5.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	1 (1.2)
335 Government Regulatory Associate Professionals	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	2 (11.1)	0 (0.0)	2 (2.3)
<b>4 Clerical Support Workers</b>	<b>0 (0.0)</b>	<b>7 (25.0)</b>	<b>0 (0.0)</b>	<b>0 (0.0)</b>	<b>7 (8.1)</b>
411 General Office Clerks	0 (0.0)	7 (25.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	7 (8.1)
<b>5 Service and Sales Workers</b>	<b>0 (0.0)</b>	<b>4 (14.3)</b>	<b>0 (0.0)</b>	<b>0 (0.0)</b>	<b>4 (4.7)</b>
511 Travel Attendants,	0 (0.0)	2 (7.1)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	2 (2.3)

Conductors and Guides					
514 Hairdressers, Beauticians and Related Workers	0 (0.0)	1 (3.6)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	1 (1.2)
521 Street and Market Salespersons	0 (0.0)	1 (3.6)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	1 (1.2)
<b>7 Handicraft and Printing Workers</b>	<b>0 (0.0)</b>	<b>0 (0.0)</b>	<b>0 (0.0)</b>	<b>2 (10.0)</b>	<b>2 (2.3)</b>
731 Handicraft Workers	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	2 (10.0)	2 (2.3)
<b>8 Plant and Machine Operators and Assemblers</b>	<b>0 (0.0)</b>	<b>3 (10.7)</b>	<b>0 (0.0)</b>	<b>0 (0.0)</b>	<b>3 (3.5)</b>
832 Car, Van and Motorcycle Drivers	0 (0.0)	3 (10.7)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	3 (3.5)
<b>9 Elementary Occupations</b>	<b>0 (0.0)</b>	<b>1 (3.6)</b>	<b>0 (0.0)</b>	<b>2 (10.0)</b>	<b>3 (3.5)</b>
911 Domestic, Hotel and Office Cleaners and Helpers	0 (0.0)	1 (3.6)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	1 (1.2)
921 Agricultural, Forestry and Fishery Labourers	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	2 (10.0)	2 (2.3)
<b>Others (not specified in ISCO-08)</b>	<b>7 (35.0)</b>	<b>4 (14.3)</b>	<b>6 (33.3)</b>	<b>5 (25.0)</b>	<b>22 (25.6)</b>
University student	0 (0.0)	2 (7.1)	2 (11.1)	2 (10.0)	6 (7.0)



Retired	5 (25.0)	2 (7.1)	3 (16.7)	2 (10.0)	12 (14.0)
Unemployed	2 (10.0)	0 (0.0)	1 (5.6)	1 (5.0)	4 (4.7)
<b>Occupational category</b>					
Healthcare worker	4 (20.0)	4 (14.3)	2 (11.1)	3 (15.0)	13 (15.1)
Non-healthcare worker	16 (80.0)	24 (85.7)	16 (88.9)	17 (85.0)	73 (84.9)

<sup>a</sup>Occupations have been classified according to the International Standard Classification of Occupations 08 (ISCO-08) [49].

**Table 2. Supporting quotes from in-depth interviews conducted across four countries.**

Ref	Country and respondent information	Quote
<b>1. Views on COVID-19 public health measures</b>		
<b>Agreement with NPIs and government response</b>		
Q1	Thailand (#6, male, 42, Food delivery driver)	"I totally agree with the government measures. If government doesn't do this, I am sure [Thailand] would have a lot of cases. Though I think our government has implemented these measures a bit late, there were some misunderstandings at the beginning, and it was quite strict at first. But overall, I think it is very good and causes lower death and cases in Thailand."
Q2	Malaysia (#7, female, 49, Lecturer)	"...I support and agree to this decision [to lockdown] because this is a form of control. [...] if the government doesn't do this, we may end up like Italy or America. [...] It doesn't depend on the technology or modernization, it's more [about] the decision. If your decision is a good one, then you're safe."
Q3	Italy, (#6, female, 32, Shop assistant)	"There was unity, and we are all in the same boat"
<b>Criticism of NPIs and government response</b>		
Q4	Malaysia (#8, male, 32, Admin Officer)	"...[The measures are] not strict enough. [The government] should have made it strict until the end, until it settles down, then only they release. [...] they worry about their reputation as well. That's why they start to loosen the restrictions. I will say it is risky because there are still some cases going around. [...] So, everything is not under control yet, because you can see in China,

		the numbers go very low, but once they loosen the restrictions, somehow it spiked again.”
<b>Q5</b>	UK (#15, male, 55, IT manager)	“I was tracking the virus sort of from January and reading about it. It was pretty obvious to me that it was coming our way. [...] And I feel we locked down way too late, so we actually withdrew our children from school early [...]. I think we locked down at least two weeks too late and many lives could have been saved if we locked down sooner. I think at the other end we're releasing too early [...]. And I find it very strange that we've been so slow to, to not even make masks mandatory really.”
<b>Q6</b>	UK (#6, male, 53, Social worker)	“So, before we have even come off the [current] wave, we're going to go in the second wave but the government have got used to playing with the numbers... every single step along the way has just been a propaganda move and a deception move rather than enabling anybody to be safe. They have caused tens and tens of thousands of deaths and we will easily go over the 100,000 with this second wave, I'm certain of it.”
<b>Q7</b>	Italy (#5, female, 26, Nursing home staff)	“Some [measures] I think are preposterous because people have been pushed like animals into cages and now that the green light begins [i.e., restrictions are being eased] some people continue to keep the rules, others think that it is all over.”
<b>Q8</b>	Thailand (#22, transgender, 35, Interpreter)	“Government ฿5,000 [125 USD, per month for 3 months] scheme is not enough at all. How could someone who completely lost their job live on ฿5,000 a month. I have a sick mother that I need to look after. Luckily, I have some financial support from my partner, otherwise, it is impossible to live on ฿5,000 a month”.
<b>Q9</b>	Malaysia (#8, male, 32, Admin officer)	“I did get the aid from government and... it's not too much. The amount is just few hundred (Ringgit). Not so helpful for me.”
<b>Q10</b>	UK (#1, female, 56, Photographer)	“At the moment it all feels very unclear... [the government] is like a parent who is not there... I mean [the government's] job really should be to keep us safe, with the priorities [being] people. But they're not. And we're all scrambling around trying to keep us safe and our family safe. And there are so many mixed messages[...]. I think what would be most helpful is a feeling of the government putting people first, having really clear guidelines, really clear rules... that are not wishy washy, that this is what we have to do.”
<b>2. Lived experiences and impact of public health measures</b>		
<b>Positive experiences</b>		
<b>More time at home to focus on family, oneself and the essential</b>		
<b>Q11</b>	Italy (#11, female,	“I am able to stay at home with my children, enjoy them and see them grow up in these three

	30, Teacher)	months.”
<b>Q12</b>	Thailand (#2, male, 31, Hotel staff)	“Sometimes, distancing oneself from other people like this helps to save a lot of money from travel cost to and from work, eating out, or recreational costs. I also have more time for myself and my family. At least, [COVID-19] has some positive aspects.”
<b>Sense of greater connectedness and shared humanity</b>		
<b>Q13</b>	Italy (#14, female, 52, Social worker)	“The mood was like ‘you can’t do it alone; you need the help of others. It’s a pain we all feel, so we all have to help each other, behaviours are always interconnected.”
<b>Q14</b>	Italy (#14, female, 52, Social worker)	“Nature has regained its space, there has been a rediscovery of the beauty of nature. We stopped to look at things with a different perspective.”
<b>Benefits to working life</b>		
<b>Q15</b>	UK (#18, female, 40, Finance officer)	“Working from home and being able to switch down and switch off certain things has been helpful because I wouldn’t have been able to have that control if I had been at work. And the fact that I am not commuting... is saving me so much time and I honestly prefer it. [...] I can achieve everything that I do in the office, but here. [...] And I actually dread more when we go back. When restrictions are lifted, I am more concerned about that, and my mental wellbeing and my coping strategies for then, than I am at the moment, to be perfectly honest.”
<b>Negative experiences</b>		
<b>Separation from family, friends and communities, and grief over missed milestones</b>		
<b>Q16</b>	UK (#8, female, 63, Retired)	“...For me [the hardest thing is], not being able to have a hug. I have not had any physical touch whatsoever for 12 weeks [...]. People who have got a partner at home or families, I don’t think they understand, you know, how hard that is. [...] I’ve become a little bit desensitised to it and it’s just become so normal. I can’t imagine what it’s like to be hugged to be honest. So that has been difficult.”
<b>Q17</b>	Malaysia (#11, male, 52, Business manager)	“My father passed away due to lung cancer during MCO. The hospital did not allow visits by family members, so they did not get to see him in his final days... Friends, relatives and family members could not cross state borders to attend the wake to pay their final respects.”
<b>Q18</b>	UK (#7, female, 48, Support worker)	“I also get support from alcoholics anonymous. But those meetings have also come to an end because of COVID. So, it’s been really difficult. [...] Without other sources of support, I’m really struggling”.
<b>Workplace related challenges and income loss</b>		
<b>Q19</b>	Thailand (#16, female, 49,	“The [massage parlour] has been closed since March. I completely have not had any income since then, but I have all the same regular expenses – rent, food, children go to school. We are on daily

	<i>Masseuse</i> )	wage. If we don't work today, we struggle the next day. I am using my saving at the moment."
<b>Q20</b>	Italy (#10, female, 64, Psychologists)	"Those who suffered the most were those who had precarious situations both economically and psychologically, the most fragile people are those who suffered the most. The government must help those who are really in trouble. Perhaps the only mistake was the lack of timeliness in helping these more fragile people who, because of COVID, lost that job that was already precarious."
<b>Q21</b>	Thailand (#8, male, 20, University student)	"We have been turning to online learning. I had to drop out from the course as I don't have high speed internet at home. It is too costly. We cannot afford it. If I could have enrolled in those online courses, I could have graduated this summer."
<b>Q22</b>	Malaysia (#16, female, 37, Nurse)	"We are working, I think, day and night, so every day we are working extra hours. It is a busy life, always about work and work. Even weekends we also have to come to work."
<b>Q23</b>	UK (#3, female, 56, Doctor)	"I can't think how tired I am at the end of a day's work, its much, much more tiring than our normal way of working... In normal times it's a quick triage to see if somebody needs to be seen to be assessed or whether we can just advise over the phone, but they are turning into full phone consultations, so taking a lot longer ... [because I'm] also weighing up the risks of bringing someone into the practice. [...] Medico-legally it's much more risky than our normal [consultations] and there is always that added stress there of missing something."
<b>Q24</b>	Italy (#11, 30, female, Teacher)	"Before I used to go out, accompany the children to kindergarten, and then going for a run. Now I couldn't do it anymore and it is challenging because it was a way to release stress. [...] My husband is working from home, so we share the morning management of the children. [...] Although during the day he is working, so I have to take care of the children by myself."
<b>Poor mental health and wellbeing</b>		
<b>Q25</b>	UK (#18, female, 40, Finance officer)	"... For a long time, I have not been out [...] I had to nip to the local [supermarket] and I was absolutely worried sick about going into the shop to go and get some groceries. [...] And I got so stressed and so anxious going into shop. That's never happened before. And honestly, I got out got in the car and... I just completely burst into tears and I was really shaking, and I felt such a Muppet because it was only the small [village shop]. And I just absolutely broke down because it's stressed me out just going into the shop."
<b>Q26</b>	UK (#18, female, 40, Finance officer)	"...You are in your house and you can't escape really, you can't have something to distract you... any problems that you have, whether its grief or anything else, you can't really escape them or put things into perspective. [...] Whereas if you are not in isolation or lockdown, you can, just by going out for a proper walk and talking to a friend or anybody, just face to face or the whole family just go out for a walk or somewhere different, it helps you take that backwards step. Just being contained

		in the same four walls makes that difficult to do I think.”
<b>Q27</b>	UK (#5, male, 33, Doctor)	“When there was lack of PPE, I used to get quite angry at the government. [...] I felt like I was being failed as a health professional by the government. [...] One of my senior colleagues ended up in ITU. I don’t even know if he’s still alive. [...] I was really stressed about PPE and my colleague getting ill.”
<b>Q28</b>	Malaysia (#16, female, 37, Nurse)	“I mean if you [have] contact with the positive patient then you yourself [may be] affected by the virus. [...] I worry about me bringing back the virus to my husband or to my family members.”
<b>Q29</b>	UK (#3, female, 56, Doctor)	“I think I have the double whammy of basically understanding how the pandemic works and how viruses work... but for me knowing what my risk factors were and normally I am constantly catching things from patients... and I just had this huge anxiety that it would be passed on to me... and that I would end up, because I am in the wrong age group, I am in the wrong BMI, because I have got the wrong underlying health conditions, that I was potentially at greater risk than everybody else.”
<b>Q30</b>	Italy (#11, female, 30, Teacher)	“I was scared when I heard the news about the coronavirus-related child syndrome.”
<b>Coping strategies</b>		
<b>Financial coping</b>		
<b>Q31</b>	Thailand (#14, female, 45, Bus driver)	“As a tour bus driver, I haven’t had any tour group come in over the past two months. I have to find whatever way to earn money. I have been working for [a food deliver service]. It is not much but at least it is enough for my personal expenses. I have to plan for the next two years which I am not sure whether the situation will improve.”
<b>Q32</b>	Thailand (#9, male, 49, Taxi driver)	“I normally drive my taxi at night. Since the government announced the curfew and people cannot be outside after 11pm, I have changed to rent a taxi to drive from morning until midday, have a break as it is too hot and no passengers are outside, then I go out again in the late afternoon and finish around 8.30pm, then return the car and go home.”
<b>Q33</b>	UK (#9, female, 59 years, Unemployed)	“For some people on benefits, they were given an extra £20 a week. But the benefits we’re on, we didn’t get any more money [...]. Money is always a worry for us. When you’re not working, and living on benefits, money is always a struggle.”
<b>Psycho-emotional coping</b>		
<b>Q34</b>	Thailand (#16, female, 49, Masseuse)	“COVID effects everyone. It teaches us from to be strong from weakness, to be brave from fear. [...] Families, friends and our loved ones are my support. I also meditate and pray. These things make me feel more relaxed and clearer minded. If I stay home and just eat and do nothing, it is

		stressful. With meditation and prayer, I feel two months of COVID have passed so quickly.”
<b>Q35</b>	Italy (#9, 49, male, Handicraft worker)	“Managing the day at home was interesting, if you wanted there was space to do other things. I painted and worked in the garden and the time passed quickly.”
<b>Q36</b>	Malaysia (#3, male, 52, Customs officer)	“I lost my social life, but I’m gaining time with my family, catching up with some movies, good, good movies. [...] Some of my friends have picked up cooking from YouTube. They learn cooking from YouTube.”
<b>Q37</b>	Thailand (#18, female, 45, Dentist)	“It’s like “Plong” [acceptance]—we have a better understanding of the Buddhist Dharma [cosmic law and order], that everything is impermanent – arising, staying and disappearing. Life is impermanence. We cannot change those outside circumstances.”
<b>Social coping and connectedness</b>		
<b>Q38</b>	Malaysia (#16, female, 37, Nurse)	“I think the only thing that keeps you sane is your phone [...] texting and calling family members and all. [Staying] in touch.”
<b>Q39</b>	Italy (#2, female, 26, University student)	“I called friends on video call, I discovered a way to see those far away, we met more frequently.”
<b>Q40</b>	Italy (#1, female, 50, Researcher)	“I wanted to do something for society, I thought about it and I found a way to be useful and this was a relief. From a moral perspective I strongly felt this urgency. I offered ethical support to my physicians’ friends, for their ethical dilemmas.”
<b>Reducing and mitigating risks</b>		
<b>Q41</b>	Malaysia (#16, female, 37, Nurse)	“I worry... but then as long as you practice the right things... [that will] lessen the worry. [...] ...as long as you take good measure about how to protect yourself, in such ways, your action will save you from getting it.”
<b>Limiting exposure to the news</b>		
<b>Q42</b>	UK, (#10, female, 56, Photographer)	“I’m pretty sensitive so how we managed it was too to shut off. [...] We shut everything off and I just got the information we needed to keep us safe. [...] being able to shut down from all media and everything was really, really helpful because I just wanted to make sure that we weren’t living in fear and sorrow and terror and confusion.”

## References

1. WHO. WHO Coronavirus Disease (COVID-19) Dashboard: World Health Organization; 2020 [Available from: <https://covid19.who.int/>].
2. WHO. Non-pharmaceutical public health measures for mitigating the risk and impact of epidemic and pandemic influenza: annex: report of systematic literature reviews. World Health Organization; 2019.
3. Flaxman S, Mishra S, Gandy A, Unwin HJT, Mellan TA, Coupland H, et al. Estimating the effects of non-pharmaceutical interventions on COVID-19 in Europe. *Nature*. 2020;584(7820):257-61.
4. Koo JR, Cook AR, Park M, Sun Y, Sun H, Lim JT, et al. Interventions to mitigate early spread of SARS-CoV-2 in Singapore: a modelling study. *The Lancet Infectious Diseases*. 2020.
5. Ferguson N, Laydon D, Nedjati Gilani G, Imai N, Ainslie K, Baguelin M, et al. Report 9: Impact of non-pharmaceutical interventions (NPIs) to reduce COVID19 mortality and healthcare demand. 2020.
6. Doung-Ngern P, Suphanchaimat R, Panjangampatthana A, Janekrongtham C, Ruampoom D, Daochaeng N, et al. Case-control study of use of personal protective measures and risk for SARS-CoV 2 infection, Thailand. *Emerging infectious diseases*. 2020;26(11):2607.
7. Lewnard JA, Lo NC. Scientific and ethical basis for social-distancing interventions against COVID-19. *The Lancet Infectious diseases*. 2020;20(6):631.
8. Teasdale E, Santer M, Geraghty AW, Little P, Yardley L. Public perceptions of non-pharmaceutical interventions for reducing transmission of respiratory infection: systematic review and synthesis of qualitative studies. *BMC Public Health*. 2014;14(1):589.
9. Lancet T. Mental health: time to invest in quality. *Lancet (London, England)*. 2020;396(10257):1045.
10. Brooks SK, Webster RK, Smith LE, Woodland L, Wessely S, Greenberg N, et al. The psychological impact of quarantine and how to reduce it: rapid review of the evidence. *The Lancet*. 2020.
11. Osterrieder A, Cuman G, Pan-ngum W, Cheah PK, Cheah P-K, Peerawaranun P, et al. Economic and social impacts of COVID-19 and public health measures: results from an anonymous online survey in Thailand, Malaysia, the United Kingdom, Italy and Slovenia. medRxiv. 2020.
12. Bottan N, Hoffmann B, Vera-Cossio D. The unequal impact of the coronavirus pandemic: Evidence from seventeen developing countries. *PloS one*. 2020;15(10):e0239797.
13. Xafis V. 'What is Inconvenient for You is Life-saving for Me': How Health Inequities are playing out during the COVID-19 Pandemic. *Asian Bioethics Review*. 2020:1.
14. Van Bavel JJ, Baicker K, Boggio PS, Capraro V, Cichocka A, Cikara M, et al. Using social and behavioural science to support COVID-19 pandemic response. *Nature Human Behaviour*. 2020:1-12.
15. Seale H, Dyer CE, Abdi I, Rahman KM, Sun Y, Qureshi MO, et al. Improving the impact of non-pharmaceutical interventions during COVID-19: examining the factors that influence engagement and the impact on individuals. *BMC Infectious Diseases*. 2020;20(1):1-13.
16. Norton A, Gozalo ADLH, De Colombi NF, Alogo M, Asego JM, Al-Rawni Z, et al. The remaining unknowns: a mixed methods study of the current and global health research priorities for COVID-19. *BMJ Global Health*. 2020;5(7):e003306.

17. Holmes EA, O'Connor RC, Perry VH, Tracey I, Wessely S, Arseneault L, et al. Multidisciplinary research priorities for the COVID-19 pandemic: a call for action for mental health science. *The Lancet Psychiatry*. 2020.
18. Herbert JR, Rubin I. *Qualitative interviewing: The art of hearing data*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Inc; 1995.
19. Osborne J, Pager J, Napier D, Giles-Vernick T, Kutalek R, Rodyna R, et al. Addressing vulnerabilities in communities facing infectious disease threats: A need for social science-driven assessments. *Journal of Global Health*. 2021;11:03003.
20. Williams SN, Armitage CJ, Tampe T, Dienes K. Public perceptions and experiences of social distancing and social isolation during the COVID-19 pandemic: A UK-based focus group study. *MedRxiv*. 2020.
21. WHO. Coronavirus disease (COVID-19): World Health Organization; 2020 [Available from: <https://www.who.int/news-room/q-a-detail/coronavirus-disease-covid-19>].
22. Wu PE, Styra R, Gold WL. Mitigating the psychological effects of COVID-19 on health care workers. *CMAJ*. 2020;192(17):E459-E60.
23. Braquehais MD, Vargas-Cáceres S, Gómez-Durán E, Nieva G, Valero S, Casas M, et al. The impact of the COVID-19 pandemic on the mental health of healthcare professionals. *QJM: An International Journal of Medicine*. 2020;113(9):613-7.
24. Johnson SU, Ebrahimi OV, Hoffart A. PTSD symptoms among health workers and public service providers during the COVID-19 outbreak. *PloS one*. 2020;15(10):e0241032.
25. Krishnamoorthy Y, Nagarajan R, Saya GK, Menon V. Prevalence of psychological morbidities among general population, healthcare workers and COVID-19 patients amidst the COVID-19 pandemic: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *Psychiatry research*. 2020;293:113382.
26. Gharawi MA, Pardo TA, Guerrero S, editors. *Issues and strategies for conducting cross-national e-government comparative research*. Proceedings of the 3rd international conference on Theory and practice of electronic governance; 2009.
27. Hantrais L, Mangen S. *Cross-national Research Methods in the Social Sciences: Method and management of cross-national social research*. London: Pinter. 1998.
28. Pan-ngum W, Poomchaichote T, Cuman G, Cheah P-K, Waithira N, Mukaka M, et al. Social, ethical and behavioural aspects of COVID-19. *Wellcome Open Research*. 2020;5(90):90.
29. Neubauer BE, Witkop CT, Varpio L. How phenomenology can help us learn from the experiences of others. *Perspectives on medical education*. 2019;8(2):90-7.
30. Gale NK, Heath G, Cameron E, Rashid S, Redwood S. Using the framework method for the analysis of qualitative data in multi-disciplinary health research. *BMC medical research methodology*. 2013;13(1):1-8.
31. Hale T, Petherick A, Phillips T, Webster S. Variation in government responses to COVID-19. *Blavatnik school of government working paper*. 2020;31.
32. JISC. Online Survey (formerly BOS) 2020 [Available from: <https://www.onlinesurveys.ac.uk/>].
33. Poomchaichote T, Naemiratch B, Schneiders M, Kulpijit N, Cuman G, Pan-ngum W, et al. Topic guide for qualitative study: Social, ethical and behavioural aspects of COVID-19 2020 [Available from: <https://zenodo.org/record/3777934#.YB0BCHczYqw>].
34. Rutakumwa R, Mugisha JO, Bernays S, Kabunga E, Tumwekwase G, Mbonye M, et al. Conducting in-depth interviews with and without voice recorders: a comparative analysis. *Qualitative Research*. 2020;20(5):565-81.




35. Halcomb EJ, Davidson PM. Is verbatim transcription of interview data always necessary? *Applied nursing research*. 2006;19(1):38-42.
36. Guest G, Bunce A, Johnson L. How many interviews are enough? An experiment with data saturation and variability. *Field methods*. 2006;18(1):59-82.
37. Pope C, Ziebland S, Mays N. Analysing qualitative data. *Bmj*. 2000;320(7227):114-6.
38. Morse JM, Barrett M, Mayan M, Olson K, Spiers J. Verification strategies for establishing reliability and validity in qualitative research. *International journal of qualitative methods*. 2002;1(2):13-22.
39. Enria L, Waterlow N, Rogers NT, Brindle H, Lal S, Eggo RM, et al. Trust and Transparency in times of Crisis: Results from an Online Survey During the First Wave (April 2020) of the COVID-19 Epidemic in the UK. *medRxiv*. 2020.
40. van der Westhuizen H-M, Kotze K, Tonkin-Crine S, Gobat N, Greenhalgh T. Face coverings for covid-19: from medical intervention to social practice. *bmj*. 2020;370.
41. Nienhaus A, Hod R. COVID-19 among health workers in Germany and Malaysia. *International journal of environmental research and public health*. 2020;17(13):4881.
42. Shah AS, Wood R, Gribben C, Caldwell D, Bishop J, Weir A, et al. Risk of hospital admission with coronavirus disease 2019 in healthcare workers and their households: nationwide linkage cohort study. *bmj*. 2020;371.
43. Park CL, Russell BS, Fendrich M, Finkelstein-Fox L, Hutchison M, Becker J. Americans' COVID-19 Stress, Coping, and Adherence to CDC Guidelines. *Journal of General Internal Medicine*. 2020:1.
44. Afifi RA, Novak N, Gilbert PA, Pauly B, Abdulrahim S, Rashid SF, et al. 'Most at risk' for COVID19? The imperative to expand the definition from biological to social factors for equity. *Preventive medicine*. 2020;139:106229.
45. Napier AD. Rethinking vulnerability through Covid-19. *Anthropology Today*. 2020;36(3):1-2.
46. Napier AD, Fischer EF. Misunderstanding a Viral Pandemic: The Social and Cultural Contexts of COVID-19. *Social Research: An International Quarterly*. 2020;87(2):271-7.
47. Krumpal I. Determinants of social desirability bias in sensitive surveys: a literature review. *Quality & Quantity*. 2013;47(4):2025-47.
48. Chen X, Chen H. Differences in preventive behaviors of COVID-19 between urban and rural residents: lessons learned from a cross-sectional study in China. *International journal of environmental research and public health*. 2020;17(12):4437.
49. Organization IL. International Standard Classification of Occupations 08 (ISCO-08) 2010 [Available from: <http://www.ilo.org/public/english/bureau/stat/isco/index.htm>].

# Government Stringency Index

— Thailand — Malaysia — United Kingdom — Italy

Study period: 2 May - 8 Aug 2020



## Positive lived experiences

- More time at home to focus on family, oneself and the essential
- Sense of greater connectedness and shared humanity
- Benefits to working life

## Negative lived experiences

- Separation from family, friends and communities, and grief over missed milestones
- Work related challenges and income loss
- Poor mental health and wellbeing

## Coping strategies

- Financial coping
- Psycho-emotional coping
- Social coping and connectedness
- Reducing and mitigating risks
- Limiting news exposure