

1 **Understanding adherence to self-isolation in the first phase of COVID-19 response**

2 Charlotte Robin^{1*}; Rosy Reynolds^{2,3}; Helen Lambert^{2,3}; Matthew Hickman^{2,3}; G James Rubin^{4,5}; Louise
3 E Smith^{4,5}; Lucy Yardley^{2,3,6}; Shenghan Cai³; Tingting Zhang³; Piers Mook^{7, 8}; Oliver McManus⁹; Gemma
4 Lasseater^{2,3}; Polly Compston¹⁰; Sarah Denford^{2,3,11}; Juan Zhang³; Richard Amlôt^{2,4,12}; Isabel Oliver^{2, 13}

5 ¹ Behavioural Science and Insights Unit, UK Health Security Agency, Liverpool, UK

6 ² NIHR Health Protection Research Unit (HPRU) in Behavioural Science and Evaluation, University of
7 Bristol in collaboration with UK Health Security Agency (UKHSA)

8 ³ Population Health Sciences, Bristol Medical School, University of Bristol, Bristol, UK

9 ⁴ NIHR Health Protection Research Unit in Emergency Preparedness and Response, King's College
10 London, UK

11 ⁵ Department of Psychological Medicine, King's College London, UK

12 ⁶ Psychology Department, University of Southampton, Southampton, UK

13 ⁷ UKHSA, Field Service, Health Protection Operations, London, UK

14 ⁸ Division of Health Sciences, Warwick Medical School, University of Warwick, Coventry, UK

15 ⁹ Statens Serum Institut, Copenhagen, Denmark

16 ¹⁰ UKHSA, Field Service, National Infection Service, Cambridge, UK

17 ¹¹ School of Psychological Science, University of Bristol, Bristol, UK

18 ¹² Behavioural Science and Insights Unit, UK Health Security Agency, Salisbury, UK

19 ¹³ UKHSA, Field Service, Health Protection Operations, Bristol, UK

20 *Corresponding author: Charlotte Robin charlotte.robin@phe.gov.uk

21

22 **Word count: 5274**

23

24 **Abstract**

25 Objective: To gain a better understanding of decisions around adherence to self-isolation advice
26 during the first phase of the COVID-19 response in England.

27 Design: A mixed-methods cross sectional study.

28 Setting: England

29 Participants COVID-19 cases and contacts who were contacted by Public Health England (PHE) during
30 the first phase of the response in England (January-March 2020).

31 Results: Of 250 respondents who were advised to self-isolate, 63% reported not leaving home at all
32 during their isolation period, 20% reported leaving only for lower risk activities (dog walking or
33 exercise) and 16% reported leaving for potentially higher risk, reasons (shopping, medical
34 appointments, childcare, meeting family or friends). Factors associated with adherence to never

35 going out included: the belief that following isolation advice would save lives, experiencing COVID-19
36 symptoms, being advised to stay in their room (rather than just “inside”), having help from outside
37 and having regular contact by text message from PHE. Factors associated with non-adherence
38 included being angry about the advice to isolate, being unable to get groceries delivered and
39 concerns about losing touch with friends and family. Interviews highlighted that a sense of duty
40 motivated people to adhere to isolation guidance and where people did leave their homes, these
41 decisions were based on rational calculations of the risk of transmission – people would only leave
42 their homes when they thought they were unlikely to come into contact with others.

43 Conclusions: Measures of adherence should be nuanced to allow for the adaptations people make to
44 their behaviour during isolation. Understanding adherence to isolation and associated reasoning
45 during the early stages of the pandemic is an essential part of pandemic preparedness for future
46 emerging infectious diseases.

47

48 **Strengths and limitations of this study**

- 49 • Our participants were contacted directly by Public Health England during the first three
50 months of the pandemic – the only cohort of cases and contacts who experienced self-
51 isolation during this early phase of the pandemic.
- 52 • Results may not be directly generalisable to wider populations or later phases of pandemic
53 response.
- 54 • We classified reasons for leaving the home as higher or lower contact, as a proxy for
55 potential risk of transmission, however further research published since we conducted our
56 research as refined our understanding of transmission risk, highlighting the need for more
57 in-depth research on adherence behaviour and transmission risk.
- 58 • The mixed methods approach combined quantitative measures of adherence with an
59 exploration of how and why these decisions were being made in the same people.
- 60 • Our study provides unique insights into self-isolation during the earliest stages of the
61 pandemic, against a background of uncertainty and lack of information that will recur,
62 inevitably, in the face of future pandemic and similar threats.

63

64 **Introduction**

65 In response to the global COVID-19 pandemic, governments around the world have placed great
66 importance on test, trace and isolate systems as a strategy to minimise transmission¹. In the United
67 Kingdom (UK) the isolation of people with symptoms and their contacts was vital in the early
68 ‘containment’ phase of the pandemic response (January to March 2020), particularly before
69 widespread testing was available. As a public health measure, isolation aims to prevent person-to-
70 person spread of infections by separating people to interrupt transmission². For COVID-19, this
71 includes separating exposed from unexposed individuals, because of evidence of asymptomatic
72 transmission^{3,4}. Adherence to these measures is essential to limit community transmission of the
73 virus.

74 A growing body of evidence indicates variation in the extent to which people adhere to self-isolation
75 guidance and what factors may influence adherence^{5,6,7,8}. However, understanding adherence to
76 self-isolation is limited by how adherence is measured. There are no validated measures of
77 adherence to self-isolation and generally adherence is measured as a self-reported binary outcome;
78 adherent or not⁵. While measuring adherence in a binary way is useful for determining changes in
79 adherence over time and providing rapid and pragmatic insights into behaviour, how individuals
80 understand and adhere to self-isolation is likely to be more nuanced^{7,9,10}. It is also unclear how the
81 public negotiate decisions around adherence to self-isolation guidance in the context of contact
82 tracing, specifically when that advice has been provided directly to individuals by public health
83 agencies.

84 During the first phase of England's COVID-19 response (January to March 2020), contact tracing was
85 managed by Public Health England (PHE), prior to the launch of the national NHS Test and Trace
86 service in May 2020. Regional Health Protection Teams at PHE aimed to contact all known cases and
87 their contacts to advise them of their status, provide them with information on self-isolation
88 guidance and offer them support during their isolation period. Adherence to self-isolation during this
89 phase and how people were making those decisions has not previously been determined.

90 The aim of this study was to gain a better understanding of adherence to self-isolation advice in
91 cases and contacts who were identified through contact tracing in England during the first phase of
92 the pandemic response, when anxiety levels in the general population were higher than normal^{11,12}.
93 Understanding factors affecting adherence during these initial phases of the pandemic response is
94 particularly important as high adherence to isolation will give the best chance of containing the virus
95 before community transmission becomes widespread, and future emerging infectious disease
96 outbreaks will be characterised by similar high uncertainty and high caution. Regardless of whether
97 future novel pathogens are harmless, the initial stage of any pandemic response is likely to focus on
98 containment.

99

100 **Methods**

101 In early 2020, details of all cases and contacts who were contacted by PHE's Health Protection
102 Teams were recorded on PHE's case management system (HPZone). All participants were sampled
103 from this system and invited to take part in an online survey and follow-up qualitative interview.

104

105 Case definitions for survey inclusion

106 Confirmed cases had a PCR positive test for SARS-CoV-2. Possible cases had a history of exposure (to
107 a confirmed case or by reason of travel history) and symptoms of fever or dry cough or breathing
108 difficulty. Contacts were people exposed to a confirmed case. For the purposes of our survey, we
109 classified an individual based on the circumstances which would have prompted first contact from
110 PHE.

111 Sampling

112 All cases and contacts (as defined above) in England aged 18 years or over and entered onto PHE's
113 case management system 'HPZone' by 12th March 2020 were potentially eligible. After applying
114 exclusion criteria (Table S1 – supplementary information), 350 confirmed cases, 1472 possible cases
115 and 1794 contacts were invited to participate in the survey.

116

117

118 Survey

119 An online survey (supplementary information) was developed using Snap Survey v11 (Snap Surveys,
120 Bristol, UK), including sections on sociodemographic and household characteristics, self-reported
121 adherence to advice received, self-reported barriers and facilitators to following advice, and a self-
122 assessment of mental health and wellbeing using standardised tools. Mental health outcomes will be
123 reported separately. The survey was piloted among 15 cases and 15 contacts, and minor changes to
124 wording were made to improve clarity.

125

126 Interviews

127 Semi-structured interviews were used to explore experiences of self-isolation in more depth. A topic
128 guide with open-ended questions was used to ensure key areas were covered but was used flexibly
129 to allow exploration of new themes as they arose. The topic guide included sections on experiences
130 of self-isolation, adherence to guidance, seeking information, advice and support. Interviews took
131 place over the telephone or Skype, were audio recorded and transcribed *verbatim*.

132

133 Recruitment

134 *Survey*

135 The survey was completed in two phases with invitations sent on 24th July 2020 and 9th October
136 2020. The first phase invited 463 cases (232 confirmed, 231 possible) and 451 contacts; the second
137 phase invited all remaining eligible cases (118 confirmed, 1241 possible) and contacts (1343).

138 Invitations were sent via SMS, including a link to an online participant information sheet and the
139 survey. A follow-up reminder SMS message was sent after 3-4 weeks; if no response was received
140 after a further week, the invitee was recorded as a non-responder and no further contact was made.
141 The survey could be completed anonymously, but respondents who consented to participate in
142 voluntary follow-up qualitative interviews were asked to provide their contact details.

143

144 *Interviews*

145 Respondents who consented to interview were randomly selected to take part, stratified by status
146 (case or contact) and index of multiple deprivation (IMD) quintile, based on home postcode. Overall,
147 78 respondents consented to interview, of whom 30 were invited and 16 interviews took place,
148 between July and November 2020.

149

150 *Analysis*

151 *Survey*

152 Analysis used Stata v15.1 (Stata Statistical Software 2017; StataCorp LLC, College Station, TX).
153 Categorical data were described by percentage. Age was described by median and interquartile
154 range; other continuous data were described by mean or categorised.

155 The primary measure of adherence was staying at home for the full duration when advised to do so.
156 Respondents reported how often they left home for various reasons (Table 1) and responses were
157 dichotomised as ever *versus* never for analysis. We categorised reports of leaving home during the
158 isolation period into lower and higher-contact outings, defining exercise and dog-walking as lower-
159 contact and all other reasons (listed in Table 1) as higher-contact. The survey did not distinguish
160 between outdoor and indoor exercise, but respondents who left home only to exercise or walk dogs
161 reported little indoor contact with others away from their home suggesting that exercise was largely
162 outdoors.

163 We explored potential associations of 62 factors from the survey (Table S4) with adherence in two
164 ways. Firstly, we described the overall pattern of leaving home using three categories – never going
165 out, going out only for lower-contact reasons, going out for higher-contact reasons – and tested for
166 association with categorical factors by Fisher’s exact test; for multi-level factors, we repeated this
167 with dichotomised forms for comparison with the second approach. Secondly, we considered three
168 behaviours as separate binary outcomes – never (vs ever) going out for any reason, ever (vs never)
169 going out for lower-contact reasons, ever (vs never) going out for higher-contact reasons – and, for
170 each behaviour, estimated the risk ratio (RR) and p-value for each (dichotomised) factor. To identify

171 differential effects of factors on lower- and higher-contact outings, we used seemingly unrelated
172 estimation to compare the estimated risk ratios.

173 We took $p \leq 0.1$ as 'some evidence' for association or differential association.

174 *Interviews*

175 Transcripts were coded using an open approach i.e. codes were not decided *a priori*. This process
176 disassembled data into discrete parts to develop a list of codes. Memos on emerging ideas and
177 possible relationships between codes were kept alongside initial codes and codes that represented
178 similar concepts were assembled into conceptual categories. Coding was performed iteratively
179 within and between transcripts, using the technique of constant comparative analysis. The constant
180 comparison between data and analysis allowed the development of codes, categories and theories
181 to be tested across transcripts¹³ until a final coding framework was developed. This coding
182 framework was also applied to the 200 free-text comments from the survey; no additional codes
183 were developed during this phase of the analysis.

184

185

186 **Findings**

187 The overall response rate for the survey was 9% (322/3616), including 52 confirmed cases, 91
188 possible cases and 179 contacts. Survey participant and invitee characteristics are shown in Table S2.
189 Characteristics of interview participants are shown in Table S3.

190 Overall, of the 250 survey respondents who had been advised to self-isolate most reported adhering
191 to the advice (Table 1); 158 (63%) reported not leaving home at all during their isolation period and
192 51 (20%) reported leaving only for lower-contact activities i.e. exercise or dog walking. Sixteen
193 percent (41) left home for higher-contact reasons: shopping, medical appointments, childcares or
194 meeting family and friends. Five (2%) had occasional visitors to their homes.

195 Reasons for leaving the home during isolation were grouped into two categories based on contact
196 with other people – lower contact and higher contact. Evidence from the survey supported the
197 classification of exercise and dog-walking as lower-contact, implying lower-risk, activities than
198 leaving home for any other reasons (listed in Table 1). The 51 people who left home only for dog-
199 walking or exercise reported less contact with other people away from their own homes, compared
200 with the 41 who went out for other reasons: only 18% vs 46%, respectively, ever spent time with
201 people indoors, keeping >2 m away; 10 vs 27% had closer indoor contacts; and 14 vs 51% had to
202 touch surfaces other people had touched. We found evidence that some factors had different

203 patterns of association with lower- and higher- contact outings, indicating that respondents
204 distinguished between them (Table 2).

205 We found some evidence of association with the overall pattern of adherence – never going out,
206 going out only for lower-contact reasons, going out for higher-contact reasons – for 19 dichotomised
207 factors (Table 2). Those that relate to observations from the qualitative interviews are described in
208 more detail below, alongside those insights.

209

210 Shift in identity

211 During the early phase, all contact tracing was conducted by Health Protection Teams and therefore
212 all participants were contacted directly by Public Health England (PHE) to inform them of their status
213 as either a case or contact. Of 322 survey respondents, 43 (13%) recalled the reason for PHE contact
214 being to inform them of a positive test result, 72 (22%) to ask about symptoms and arrange testing
215 and 152 (47%) to inform of contact with a case (25 within their household and 127 outside). Of those
216 who reported receiving advice, 204/250 were advised to “stay inside” and 46 to “stay in my room”.

217 The interviews revealed that receiving this contact resulted in participants experiencing a sudden
218 shift in their identity, unexpectedly being classified as a case or a contact. This new identity brought
219 with it certain rules and restrictions that they had to abide by. Their social world had abruptly
220 become very different (Table 3a, Quote 1).

221

222 Symptom attribution

223 For cases, the unexpected nature of the shift in their identity was related to how they
224 conceptualised their symptoms. In some instances, despite knowing the case definition and having
225 known exposure to a case or recent travel to a high-incidence country, there was still a sense of
226 disbelief that the symptoms they were experiencing were actually COVID-19 (Table 3a, Quote 2 and
227 3). One of these participants was also aware that a colleague had recently returned to work after
228 visiting a high-incidence country, yet felt that the precautions she took in the workplace meant the
229 symptoms she subsequently experienced could not be COVID-19 (Table 3a, Quote 4).

230 This sense of uncertainty eased once cases were able to access testing. Of the 322 survey
231 respondents, 96 reported definitely having had COVID-19, with 82 having this confirmed by a test.
232 There was a high degree of trust in a remembered positive test result, 82/88 believing that they had
233 definitely had coronavirus. However, there was stronger evidence of association with behaviour for
234 symptoms than for a positive test, or report of having had COVID-19. The 95 respondents who

235 remembered having fever, dry cough or breathing difficulty were less likely than others to have left
236 home for lower-contact reasons (20% vs 33%), but there was no evidence of a difference in higher-
237 contact outings.

238

239 Conceptualisation of self-isolation

240 A part of the sudden shift in identity in becoming a case or contact was the realisation that they
241 were now potentially a vector for the virus. In some cases, participants felt a sense of guilt over the
242 potential risk of transmission and harm to others (Table 3a, Quote 5).

243 *Sense of duty*

244 In addition to feeling guilty, participants accepted self-isolation as a way of mitigating risk of further
245 transmission. They felt a sense of duty to protect others and this helped them to adhere to guidance
246 (Table 3a, Quote 6 and 7). This sense of duty was reflected in the survey, where respondents advised
247 to self-isolate (212/250, 85%) agreed or strongly agreed that following the advice would help save
248 lives. This belief was associated with greater adherence to self-isolation guidance and fewer
249 reported outings for any reason (33 vs 55%). Similarly, the majority of survey respondents (87%)
250 agreed or strongly agreed that following advice to self-isolate would help to protect the NHS;
251 however there was no evidence that this belief was associated with adherence to the advice
252 received.

253

254 *Renegotiating spaces in the home*

255 One way in which participants managed the risk they posed to people they lived with was through
256 renegotiating spaces within their home. Following being identified as a case or contact, spaces
257 within their home were subsequently designated clean or contaminated, which now had to be taken
258 into consideration in their day-to-day lives, for example using personal protective equipment in
259 shared spaces (Table 3a, Quote 8). Similar behaviours were reflected in the survey respondents. Of
260 250 respondents advised to isolate, 76% reported washing their hands “nearly every time”, whereas
261 only 48% of respondents reported cleaning surfaces and objects at the same frequency. Among
262 people advised to stay inside (not in their room), such frequent handwashing was reported more
263 often by people who lived with others (125/161, 78%), compared with those who lived alone (27/43,
264 63%).

265

266 *Creation of boundaries*

267 To help negotiate these contaminated spaces in their homes, participants created boundaries to
268 reduce the risk of transmission, for example ensuring a barrier between the designated clean and
269 contaminated spaces (Table 3a, Quote 9). As well as keeping the virus within the confines of the
270 home (or within certain spaces within the home), for some participants the boundary around the
271 home had the dual purpose of keeping the virus out. For them, everything outside the home was
272 potentially contaminated and they enacted a strict hygiene routine to try and minimise
273 contamination (Table 3a, Quote 10). Negotiating these competing boundaries highlights the
274 complexity of everyday life in self-isolation.

275

276 *Maintaining a connection to the outside world*

277 In addition to their sense of duty and a desire to protect others, participants also discussed several
278 ways in which maintaining contact with the outside world could help them preserve the conceptual
279 boundaries they had created and therefore help them adhere to self-isolation. Maintaining contact
280 with the outside world was generally conceptualised in three ways; through social connectivity,
281 tangible practical support and a sense of feeling known to public health authorities.

282

283 *Social connectivity*

284 Maintaining social connectivity was important for mediating the impact of self-isolation on mental
285 health and wellbeing; this was either through socially distanced visits or virtually (Table 3b, Quote 1).
286 Participants also highlighted that maintaining a link with the outside world was particularly
287 important as they were isolating early on in the pandemic. As such, their experience was unique and
288 support from others who were going through the same experience was important (Table 3b, Quote
289 2). Similarly, survey respondents (37/250, 16%) who agreed or strongly agreed that following self-
290 isolation advice completely would have caused them to lose touch with their friends or family were
291 more likely to report leaving home for higher-contact reasons (35 vs 13%).

292

293 *Practical support*

294 The importance of maintaining a connection with the outside world was also highlighted for practical
295 reasons, such as access to essential supplies including food and medication. At this stage, there were
296 difficulties in accessing online grocery deliveries, as well as financial barriers due to minimum spend

297 for deliveries at some supermarkets. Participants highlighted the importance of having a support
298 network on the “outside” that could help with access to essentials (Table 3b, Quote 3 and 4).

299 In the survey, grocery delivery was a clear facilitator of adherence. Delivery slots at this time were in
300 short supply and 44 (18%) of 250 self-isolating respondents tried but were unable to secure one.
301 They were distinctly more likely to have left home for higher-contact reasons than the 132 who did
302 get deliveries and the 74 who did not try to (35% vs 10% and 16%, respectively) and – unsurprisingly
303 – specifically for essential shopping (30% compared with 4% and 9%). More generally, 136/250
304 survey respondents (42%) agreed that they had received help from someone outside their home
305 during their self-isolation period and, compared with others, they were less likely to leave home for
306 higher-contact activities (11 vs 23%).

307

308 *Feeling known*

309 Feeling known to public health agencies also helped participants feel connected to the outside world
310 during their isolation and this supported them to adhere to the guidance. Having the connection
311 with someone in public health agencies, sometimes on a daily basis, helped reassure participants
312 they had not been forgotten. This was particularly relevant for cases, who were sometimes anxious
313 that they might need additional support if their symptoms worsened (Table 3b, Quote 5 and 6).

314 In some instances, the regular contact from public health agencies resulted in people feeling that
315 they were being monitored. Some participants suggested that the feeling of being known could help
316 people adhere to self-isolation, even though they were not actually being checked (Table 3b, Quote
317 7).

318 This was reflected in the survey where, after their first contact with the Health Protection Teams, 77
319 were contacted on some days and 107 every day during their isolation period (with the remaining 66
320 reporting no further contact). Of the 184 people who received further contact, 111 (60%) were
321 contacted via text, 119 (65%) by phone and only 25 (14%) via email. Compared with the 73 who
322 were contacted only by phone and/or email, there was some evidence that those whose further
323 contact included text messages were less likely to leave home for higher-contact reasons (11% vs
324 21%). Text contact was more regular than phone contact, reported as ‘every day’ (rather than ‘some
325 days’) by 79% (50/63) of those who had texts but not calls, 34 % (24/71) of those receiving calls but
326 not texts, and 69% of those who had both texts and calls. However, evidence of association with
327 adherence was stronger for contact by text than for contact every day (supplementary table S4).

328

329 Negotiating competing needs

330 Participants discussed needs, which acted as barriers to them being able to fully adhere to self-
331 isolation, primarily the practical need to access and store sufficient food. The sudden shift from
332 normal life to the constraints of being a case or contact meant they were unprepared for a two-
333 week isolation period (Table 3b, Quote 8). Some participants' homes presented additional barriers
334 such that they could not adequately prepare, even if they had known they needed to isolate – for
335 example, not having a big enough fridge to store sufficient food (Table 3b, Quote 9).

336

337 Rational adaptations to mitigate risk

338 As a way of negotiating these competing needs, participants discussed making rational adaptations
339 to their behaviour. These adaptations were focused on minimising risk of transmission of the virus,
340 while still enabling participants to participate in the behaviours and routines they felt they needed
341 to. For example, if participants did not have access to outside space at home (16% of our survey
342 respondents), they felt they needed to leave isolation so they could exercise outdoors, as this was
343 important for their mental health. However, they purposely did this at specific times of day when
344 they felt confident they would not come into contact with others (Table 3c, Quote 1 and 2).

345 Similar competing needs were highlighted around pet ownership, specifically dogs. Overall, 43%
346 (108/250) of survey respondents reported having a pet, primarily dogs (28%) and cats (22%). Those
347 who had a pet at home were less likely to report leaving home for higher-contact reasons (10% vs
348 21%). Welfare concerns over their pets meant that in some cases participants did not fully adhere to
349 self-isolation. However, their decision on *how* to break isolation guidance was based on minimising
350 risk of contact with others, for example walking early in the morning or at places they knew would
351 be quiet (Table 3c, Quote 3 and 4).

352

353 *Over-adherence*

354 In some cases, participants in both the survey and interviews reported over-adhering to the self-
355 isolation guidance, during and after isolation. In the survey a quarter (40/161) of survey respondents
356 who had received advice only to stay inside went beyond that and actually stayed in their room most
357 days – 29 nearly every day, 11 on over half the days – and a further 25 (16%) did so occasionally.

358 In the interviews, some participants described how their experience of self-isolation had lasting
359 impacts on their perceptions of COVID-19 risk and consequently their behaviour: they felt anxious
360 following their self-isolation and were reluctant to leave the safety of their home (Table 3c, Quote 5

361 and 6). In some cases, this resulted in over-adherence to COVID-19 guidance. For example, one
362 participant discussed living with their “bubble”, which continued after their isolation period ended
363 (Table 3c, Quote 7).

364

365 **Discussion**

366 Understanding how the public make decisions about following self-isolation guidance is important to
367 ensure appropriate provision is in place to support adherence. Our study adds to the growing body
368 of evidence that, despite frequently being reported simply as adherent or not, adherence to self-
369 isolation and the decisions surrounding it are more intricate and often in conflict with activities
370 perceived as essential, such as buying food, exercising outdoors, and dog walking.

371 The participants in our study understood the reasons for isolating – to reduce the number of
372 contacts they had, and so reduce the risk of transmission. They then used this knowledge to make
373 decisions around how to adhere to the guidance, based on balancing the perceived risk of
374 transmission with maintaining their health and wellbeing (and that of companion animals) during
375 isolation. This was facilitated by a sense of care and connection, balanced with a sense of security
376 provided by the state.

377 In our study, participants described the impact of their initial contact with public health authorities
378 as resulting in a sudden shift in their identity to become a case or contact. This brought with it an
379 acknowledgement they were now a potential risk to others and embedded within this was a sense of
380 duty to protect those around them. For our participants, this sense of duty to protect others –
381 primarily to save lives – acted as a motivator to adhere to self-isolation. While the majority of survey
382 respondents also agreed that isolation would help protect the NHS, this did not have the same
383 influence over adherence, suggesting participants did not necessarily associate protecting the NHS
384 with saving lives. A sense of duty and desire to protect the community has been identified as a
385 motivator to adhere to self-isolation previously¹⁴ and is also a key principle in embedding
386 behavioural science into public health campaigns, with emphasis on messages that promote mutual
387 protection and collective solidarity¹⁵.

388 The impact of being identified through contact tracing also highlights the importance of the
389 knowledge and expertise of the public health teams doing the contact tracing – specifically being
390 able to offer expert, professional support alongside isolation guidance. Participants in our study
391 found that contact with public health teams helped them feel a connection with authority and gave
392 them a sense of “feeling known”, which resulted in a feeling of security provided by the state; that

393 those in authority cared about their experiences and wellbeing during isolation. This was also
394 reflected in the survey, where regular text contact during isolation was associated with lower risk
395 behaviour. This was particularly important during the early stages of the pandemic, when there was
396 so much uncertainty around the virus and the concept of self-isolation had not yet been embedded
397 in the public consciousness.

398 Maintaining a connection with the outside world during isolation was also identified as a key
399 motivator to adherence, specifically social connections and practical support. The way in which
400 isolation was enacted by participants was to create a boundary around their living space (home or
401 room within the home) to keep the virus within its confines. However, it is important to be able to
402 maintain a connection with the world outside that boundary, without damaging its integrity. For the
403 participants in our study, this included maintaining social connections, either virtually or socially
404 distanced. Where participants felt they would lose touch with family or friends, they were more
405 likely to leave home during isolation. In addition to social support, practical support was also
406 highlighted by our participants as a key facilitator for adherence to isolation, particularly access to
407 essentials such as food and medicines. This emphasises the importance of providing tangible
408 practical support for people who are isolating, which has been identified previously as a facilitator to
409 adherence⁵.

410 Using binary measures for adherence has resulted in some studies reporting concerningly low self-
411 reported adherence to self-isolation of 25.0% and 42.5%^{5,16}, whereas other studies have reported
412 much higher levels of 77.8%¹⁷ and 90.0%¹⁸. In our study, strict adherence to isolation (not leaving
413 the home at all) in people directly contacted by a public health team and instructed to isolate was
414 63%; however when taking into account breaches to isolation that were perceived as lower risk (dog
415 walking, exercise), then adherence was over 80%. Reporting adherence as a binary outcome,
416 without taking into account the complex decisions people are making about their isolation could be
417 problematic and not reflective of reality. Nonetheless, there can be dangers involved in engaging in
418 behaviours perceived as lower risk. In our sample, 10% of people who reported only engaging in
419 lower risk activities still reported being in contact with others within 2 m distance, indoors; a further
420 10% reported indoor contacts while maintaining at least 2 m distance. Lower risk is not no risk – and
421 if self-isolation is to be used to quickly contain a future infectious disease outbreak, a focus on
422 ensuring people better understand the risk of different activities may be required.

423 To understand these nuances in adherence, several studies have suggested alternative measures.
424 For example, Fancourt et al⁹ differentiated between ‘complete’ adherence – those who *always*
425 follow *all* the guidance – with ‘majority’ adherence – those who follow *some* of the guidance *some*

426 of the time. In addition, Williams et al¹⁰ describe the difference between intentionally not following
427 guidance ('overt rule breaking') and changing or interpreting guidance to suit individual
428 circumstances ('subjective rule interpretation'). Denford et al⁷ took this one stage further to explain
429 the complexities of decision-making around adherence to social distancing and self-isolation and
430 identified three patterns of adherence; caution-motivated super-adherence, risk-adapted partial
431 adherence and necessity-driven partial-adherence. For those who partially adhered to guidance,
432 Denford et al found that these decisions were driven by two main factors. For some, decisions were
433 based on personal perceptions of risk: behaviours considered to entail low risk of transmission (i.e.
434 limited or no contact with others) were deemed safe and therefore partial adherence was justified.
435 For others, decisions to break rules were based on tensions between an intention to adhere and a
436 desire to stay safe on the one hand and a need to maintain their mental health and wellbeing or
437 concern over financial responsibilities on the other. In our study, there was little evidence that
438 participants strayed from guidance due to sheer disregard for rules, but rather consciously and
439 thoughtfully to carry out activities that they felt were essential or perceived as low risk such as
440 exercising outdoors or walking their dogs.

441

442

443 Limitations

444 Our study is based on a distinct sample of people, who were some of the first COVID-19 cases and
445 their contacts in England, during the first phase of the pandemic response. While this enabled us to
446 gather unique insights into experiences of self-isolation during the early stages of a global pandemic,
447 the sample population is not representative of the wider population. During the early phases of the
448 pandemic response, testing and contact tracing focused on returning holiday makers and travellers
449 and their contacts; consequently, the sample population is primarily White British, of a similar age
450 and from more affluent areas. We attempted to mitigate this by recruiting some interview
451 participants from areas of lower IMD to ensure their experiences were included in the study.
452 However, as the majority of our sample population were from more affluent areas, they may have
453 experienced different barriers to adherence, compared with people for whom access to practical
454 and social support may be more challenging.

455 The low response rate will have introduced response bias, and the delay between respondents being
456 asked to isolate and inviting them to take part in the study (up to 6 months) will have resulted in
457 recall bias as participants may not have been able to accurately recall their behaviours during the
458 early stages of the pandemic. Recall may have been particularly challenging during the early stages

459 of the pandemic, where there was so much uncertainty and rapidly changing advice and guidance.
460 While this mixed methods study was able to provide some more detailed insights into the
461 behaviours of people asked to self-isolate, our survey questions were not able to fully explore what
462 contacts occurred and why, and it is possible that not all relevant activities and contacts were
463 acknowledged and disclosed. It is also likely that participants who were more adherent were more
464 likely to respond to the survey; concern about disclosing non-adherence or significant breaches of
465 isolation may have discouraged less adherent people from taking part in the study. However, some
466 respondents in our study did disclose instances where isolation guidance was not fully adhered to.

467 For this analysis, we classified reasons for leaving the home pragmatically as higher or lower contact,
468 as a proxy for potential risk of transmission. However, studies published since we designed the
469 survey have refined our understanding of transmission risk; for example, risk from visiting a
470 supermarket is lower than having people visit your home [19]. Future surveys should focus on the
471 types of activities engaged in and places visited in more detail to relate adherence behaviour to
472 transmission risk more accurately.

473 **Conclusions**

474 The participants in our study demonstrated they were making rational adaptations to self-isolation
475 guidance, based on a calibration of the risk of transmission, attempting to reduce contact with
476 others as much as possible. Our findings highlighted that these decisions were driven by a sense of
477 duty to protect others. Where isolation was not adhered to, breaches were often for reasons
478 considered essential. The need for adequate practical, financial and social support during isolation
479 has now been well documented; however, our findings highlight the additional impact of contact
480 tracing on identity and feelings of 'being known' when asked to self-isolate. This emphasises that
481 isolation cannot be viewed as a single intervention, but should be part of a complete test, trace and
482 isolate process, where all components need to work together to support the desired outcome –
483 reduction in transmission. Better understanding and support for decisions around adherence to
484 isolation during the first phase of pandemic response, when uncertainty and anxiety is unavoidably
485 high, is vital for pandemic preparedness for future emerging infectious diseases to ensure effective
486 containment in the early stages of the response.

487

488

489 **Acknowledgements**

490 The authors would like to express their gratitude to all the participants who shared their experiences
491 of self-isolation.

492 G.L., P.C., H.L., M.H., S.D., I.O., C.R., R.R., R.A. and L.Y. are supported by the NIHR Health Protection
493 Research Unit (HPRU) in Behavioural Science and Evaluation at the University of Bristol in
494 partnership with UK Health Security Agency (UK HSA).

495 L.S., J.R. and R.A. are supported by the NIHR HPRU in Emergency Preparedness and Response at
496 King's College London in partnership with UK HSA.

497 L.Y. is an NIHR Senior Investigator and her research programme is partly supported by NIHR Applied
498 Research Collaboration (ARC)-West, NIHR Health Protection Research Unit (HPRU) in Behavioural
499 Science and Evaluation, and the NIHR Southampton Biomedical Research Centre (BRC).

500 C.R. is affiliated to the National Institute for Health Research Health Protection Research Unit (NIHR
501 HPRU) in Emerging and Zoonotic Infections at the University of Liverpool in partnership with UK HSA
502 in collaboration with the Liverpool School of Tropical Medicine and The University of Oxford, the
503 NIHR HPRU in Gastrointestinal Infections at the University of Liverpool in partnership with UK HSA, in
504 collaboration with the University of Warwick and the NIHR HPRU in Behavioural Science and
505 Evaluation at the University of Bristol, in partnership with UK HSA. C.R. is based at UK HSA.

506 The views expressed are those of the authors and not necessarily those of the NIHR, the Department
507 of Health and Social Care or UK HSA. The funders had no role in the design of the study, collection,
508 analysis and interpretation of the data, or in writing the manuscript.

509

510 **Author contributions**

511 All authors were involved in conceptualising and designing the study. CR, RR and PC analysed the
512 data and CR and RR led the drafting of the manuscript. All authors reviewed the manuscript,
513 approved the final content, and met authorship criteria.

514

515 **Funding**

516 This work was supported by the National Institute of Health Research (NIHR) Health Protection
517 Research Unit in Behavioural Science and Evaluation at the University of Bristol, in partnership with
518 UK Health Security Agency (UK HSA; previously Public Health England) and by UK Research and
519 Innovation (UKRI)/Department of Health and Social Care (DHSC) COVID-19 Rapid Response Call 2
520 [MC_PC 19071]. LY is an NIHR Senior Investigator and her research programme is partly supported
521 by NIHR Applied Research Collaboration (ARC)-West, NIHR Health Protection Research Unit (HPRU)
522 for Behavioural Science and Evaluation, and the NIHR Southampton Biomedical Research Centre
523 (BRC).

524

525 **Competing interests**

526 None to declare

527

528

529 **Patient and public involvement**

530 This was responsive research designed rapidly during the initial response to the COVID-19 pandemic,
531 so it was not possible to involve patients or the public in the development of the study. However, we
532 engaged in preliminary qualitative interviews with a small number of people who had self-isolated
533 during the first few weeks of the pandemic, which were used to inform the development of the
534 survey questions and interview topic guide for the study.
535

536 **Patient consent for publication**

537 All participants provided written or oral consent for data to be included in publications.

538

539 **Ethics approval**

540 Ethical approval was provided by the NHS Health Research Authority London – Queen Square

541 Research Ethics Committee (20/HRA/2549).

542

543 **Data availability statement**

544 The datasets analysed in this study are available from UK Health Security Agency on reasonable
545 request.

546

547 **References**

- 548 1. Chung S- C, Marlow S, Tobias N, et al. Lessons from countries implementing find, test, trace,
549 isolation and support policies in the rapid response of the COVID-19 pandemic: a systematic
550 review. *BMJ Open* 2021;11:e047832. doi:10.1136/bmjopen-2020-047832
- 551 2. Wilder-Smith A and Freedman DO. Isolation, quarantine, social distancing and community
552 containment: pivotal role for old-style public health measures in the novel coronavirus
553 (2019-nCoV) outbreak. *Journal of Travel Medicine* 2020; 27(2): 1-4.
- 554 3. Buitrago-Garcia D, Egli-Gany D, Counotte MJ, et al. Occurrence and transmission potential of
555 asymptomatic and presymptomatic SARS-CoV-2 infections: A living systematic review and
556 meta- analysis. *PLoS Med* 2020; 17(9): e1003346. doi. org/10.1371/journal.pmed.1003346
- 557 4. Byambasuren O, Cardona M, Bell K, et al. Estimating the extent of asymptomatic COVID-19
558 and its potential for community transmission: Systematic review and meta-analysis. *Journal*
559 *of the Association of Medical Microbiology and Infectious Disease Canada* 2020; 5(4): 223-
560 234.
- 561 5. Smith LE, Amlôt R, Lambert H et al. Factors associated with adherence to self-isolation and
562 lockdown measures in the UK: a cross-sectional survey. *Public Health* 2020; 187: 41-52.
- 563 6. Atchison C, Bowman LR, Vrinten C, et al. Early perceptions and behavioural responses during
564 the COVID-19 pandemic: a cross-sectional survey of UK adults. *BMJ Open* 2021;11:e043577.
565 doi: 10.1136/bmjopen-2020-043577

- 566 7. Denford S, Morton KS, Lambert H et al. Understanding patterns of adherence to COVID_19
567 mitigation measures: a qualitative interview study. Journal of Public Health 2021;
568 doi:10.1093/pubmed/fdab005
- 569 8. Thorneloe, R, Clarke, E, Arden, M. Adherence to Behaviours Associated with the Test, Trace,
570 and Isolate System: An Analysis Using the Theoretical Domains Framework. OSF
571 Preprints:10.31219/osf.io/uxbfa
- 572 9. Fancourt D, Bu F, Mak H, Steptoe A. A UCL COVID-19 Social Study. Results Release 2020.
573 <https://www.covidsocialstudy.org/results> (September 2021, date last accessed).
- 574 10. Williams SN, Armitage CJ, Tampe T, et al. Public perceptions and experiences of social
575 distancing and social isolation during the COVID-19 pandemic: a UK-based focus group study.
576 BMJ Open 2020;10:e039334. doi: 10.1136/bmjopen-2020-039334
- 577 11. White R and Van Der Boor C. Impact of the COVID-19 pandemic and initial period of
578 lockdown on the mental health and well-being of adults in the UK. BJPsych Open 2020; 6
579 (e90): 104 doi: 10.1192/bjo.2020.79
- 580 12. Smith LE, Potts H, Amlôt R et al. How has the emergence of the Omicron SARS-CoV-2 variant
581 of concern influenced worry, perceived risk, and behaviour in the UK? A series of cross-
582 sectional surveys. OSF Preprints: doi.org/10.31219/osf.io/rpcu2
- 583 13. Charmaz, K. (2006) Constructing grounded theory: A practical guide through qualitative
584 research. London: SAGE Publications.
- 585 14. Drury, J., Carter, H., Ntontis, E., & Guven, S. T. (2021). Public behaviour in response to the
586 COVID-19 pandemic: understanding the role of group processes. BJPsych open, 7(1).
- 587 15. Bonell C, Michie S, Reicher S et al. Harnessing behavioural science in public health campaigns
588 to maintain “social distancing” in response to the COVID-19 pandemic: key principles.
589 Journal of Epidemiology Community Health 2020;74:617-619.
- 590 16. Smith LE, Potts HW, Amlôt et al. Adherence to the test, trace, and isolate system in the UK:
591 results from 37 nationally representative surveys. BMJ 2021, 372.
- 592 17. Kyle, R.G., Isherwood K.R., Bailey J.W., Davies, A.R. (2021). Self-isolation confidence,
593 adherence and challenges: behavioural insights from contacts of cases of COVID-19 starting
594 and completing self-isolation in Wales. Cardiff: Public Health Wales. Available online:
595 [https://phw.nhs.wales/publications/publications1/self-isolation-confidence-adherence-and-
596 challenges-behavioural-insights-from-contacts-of-cases-of-covid-19-starting-and-
597 completing-self-isolation-in-wales/](https://phw.nhs.wales/publications/publications1/self-isolation-confidence-adherence-and-challenges-behavioural-insights-from-contacts-of-cases-of-covid-19-starting-and-completing-self-isolation-in-wales/)
- 598 18. ONS. (2021). Coronavirus and self-isolation after being in contact with a positive case in
599 England: 1 March to 6 March 2021. Available online:
600 [https://www.ons.gov.uk/peoplepopulationandcommunity/healthandsocialcare/conditionsa
601 nddiseases/bulletins/coronavirusandselfisolationafterbeingincontactwithapositivecaseinengl
602 and/1marchto6march2021](https://www.ons.gov.uk/peoplepopulationandcommunity/healthandsocialcare/conditionsanddiseases/bulletins/coronavirusandselfisolationafterbeingincontactwithapositivecaseinengland/1marchto6march2021)
- 603 19. SAGE. (2021). EMG Transmission Group: Insights on transmission of COVID-19 with a focus
604 on the hospitality, retail and leisure sector, 8 April 2021. Available online:
605 [https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/emg-transmission-group-insights-on-
606 transmission-of-covid-19-with-a-focus-on-the-hospitality-retail-and-leisure-sector-8-april-
607 2021](https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/emg-transmission-group-insights-on-transmission-of-covid-19-with-a-focus-on-the-hospitality-retail-and-leisure-sector-8-april-2021)

608

609

610

611

612 **Tables and figures**

613

614 **Table 1 Adherence to staying at home**

| Reason ² | Left home for given reason and frequency: N (%) ¹ | | | | |
|---------------------|--|------------------------------|--------------|-------------------------|------------------|
| | Missing | Not applicable or not at all | Occasionally | More than half the days | Nearly every day |
| Shop – essential | 0 | 225 (90.0) | 23 (9.2) | 2 (0.8) | 0 |
| Shop – other | 1 (0.4) | 248 (99.2) | 1 (0.4) | 0 | 0 |
| Exercise | 0 | 187 (74.8) | 27 (10.8) | 10 (4.0) | 26 (10.4) |
| Medical | 0 | 233 (93.2) | 17 (6.8) | 0 | 0 |
| Work | 0 | 250 (100) | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Childcare/school | 0 | 247 (98.8) | 3 (1.2) | 0 | 0 |
| Help someone else | 0 | 250 (100) | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Meet people | 0 | 246 (98.4) | 3 (1.2) | 1 (0.4) | 0 |
| Walk dog | 0 | 230 (92.0) | 7 (2.8) | 4 (1.6) | 9 (3.6) |

615 ¹ Excludes 72 respondents who did not report being advised to isolate and so were not asked about going out.

616 ² See copy of survey (Q26) in supplementary information for full wording

617 Two responses citing ‘Another reason’ have been recoded into the categories above: “To have a covid test” is
 618 shown as ‘Medical’ and “Only to take the rubbish out and collect items left on doorstep” is treated as not
 619 going out at all.

620

621 **Table 2 Factors showing some evidence ($p \leq 0.1$) of association with going-out**
 622 **behaviours**

| Q | Factor ¹ | Behaviour ² | | | 3-level outcome ³ (p) |
|--|---|------------------------|-----------------------|------------------------|----------------------------------|
| | | Never out | Lower-contact outings | Higher-contact outings | |
| <i>Little or no evidence of difference in RRs for lower- and higher-contact outings</i> | | | | | |
| Q44d | Agree: following advice would save lives | ↑ | ↓ | ↓ | (0.03) |
| HPZ | Survey phase 2 | ↑ | ↓ | ↓ | (0.07) |
| Q53 | Angry about being asked to self-isolate | ↓ | ↑ | ↑ | (0.02) |
| Q44m | Had help from outside | ↑ | ↓ | ↓ | (0.04) |
| Q12 | Fever, dry cough or breathing difficulty ⁴ | ↑ | ↓ | ↓ | (0.09) |
| Q56 | Ethnic group (all non-White ethnic groups) | ↑ | ↓ | ↓ | (0.04) |
| Q21 | Home had a room I could live/sleep in | ↓ | ↑ | ↓ | (0.07) |
| <i>Some evidence ($p \leq 0.1$) of differing RRs, association appears stronger for lower-contact outings</i> | | | | | |
| Q7 | Advised to stay in room (vs stay inside) | ↑ | ↓ | ↓ | (0.06) |
| Q54 | Age ≥ 50 | ↓ | ↑ | ↓ | (0.04) |
| Q48c | Had help with pets (if had any pet) | ↑ | ↓ | ↑ | (0.05) |
| Q22 | Home had some outside space | ↓ | ↑ | ↓ | (≤ 0.01) |
| <i>Some evidence ($p \leq 0.1$) of differing RRs, association appears stronger for higher-contact outings</i> | | | | | |
| Q30 | Tried but unable to get groceries delivered | ↓ | ↑ | ↑ | (≤ 0.01) |
| Q44o | Mental health worsened | ↓ | ↓ | ↑ | (0.01) |
| Q44a | Would lose touch with family/friends | ↓ | ↑ | ↑ | (0.01) |
| Q32d | Very ill, needed care from family | ↓ | ↓ | ↑ | (0.01) |
| Q44n | Physical health worsened | ↓ | ↓ | ↑ | (0.02) |
| Q23 | Had a pet at home | ↑ | ↓ | ↓ | (0.06) |
| Q9a | PHE contact by text (vs email or phone) | ↓ | ↑ | ↓ | (0.07) |
| Q44i | I could pass virus on if I went out | ↓ | ↑ | ↓ | (0.05) |

623 ¹ The full wording of the relevant questions is in the survey, in supplementary material.

624 ² The three 'behaviour' analyses treated each behaviour individually as a binary outcome: never (vs ever) going
 625 out; any (vs no) lower-contact outings; any (vs no) higher-contact outings.

626 ³ The 'three-level outcome', the primary analysis, considered the pattern of respondents' going-out behaviour
 627 as a whole, classified as: never / lower-contact only / higher-contact (with or without lower-contact as well).

628 ⁴ Symptoms recognised at the time as indicating Covid-19.

629 ↑ Some evidence of association ($P \leq 0.1$): a higher % of those with the factor report the behaviour ($RR > 1$).

630 ↑ Little/no evidence association ($P > 0.1$) but point estimate of $RR > 1$.

631 ↓ Some evidence of association ($P \leq 0.1$): a lower % of those with the factor report the behaviour ($RR < 1$).

632 ↓ Little/no evidence of association ($P > 0.1$) but point estimate of $RR < 1$.

633 Arrow colours: green=greater adherence; purple=lower adherence.

634 RR=risk ratio.

Table 3a Experiences of contact tracing and self-isolation

| Quote number | Code | Quote |
|--------------|--|---|
| Quote 1 | Shift in identity | I've got a normally very active life and then suddenly everything stopped. I had nothing to look forward to. [...] One minute you've got everything going on around you, I had lots of contact and social interaction, and then it's just you. So it's a very difficult thing, especially if you're not expecting it either, is to get your whole head round the concept, isn't it? Or how do you go round to suddenly doing nothing? (P834) |
| Quote 2 | Symptom attribution | I think in some ways I felt so kind of surprised and kind of – a bit shell-shocked by it. I don't know that I completely took it all in. (Pilot1) |
| Quote 3 | | I was completely convinced I hadn't got it, I just thought I was having a bad asthma, a bit of a cold because it was early March, it wasn't the best weather. So I continued to sit with my family, because I share a house with my son, daughter in law and two grandchildren. Continued to mix with them, because I was completely convinced. (P901) |
| Quote 4 | | There's no way I could have it, I've been really careful. I've had a brief conversation with her. She wasn't stood right next to me, she was about a metre or so away. So in my mind, I had done absolutely everything I could possibly do to not catch it. (P901) |
| Quote 5 | Conceptualisation of self-isolation: Guilt | I was at a party with everybody. I thought God, have I infected everybody? I think it's the guilty feeling. It's massively guilt-ridden feeling. You think who have I been with? Who have I already killed practically? And then when you go into lockdown, you're thinking, oh my God, am I going to kill my family, because they're the ones looking after me? And I can't do anything about it. You can't do anything about it, basically. It's very bad in that way. (P444) |
| Quote 6 | Conceptualisation of self-isolation: Sense of duty | I felt like I was doing my bit. I was following the rules, and it was absolutely 100% right and therefore do it. (P148) |
| Quote 7 | Conceptualisation of self-isolation: Sense of duty | You're on your own. And you're doing that to keep your family safe. (P641) |
| Quote 8 | Renegotiating spaces in the home | On a daily basis there was inconveniences to negotiate and things you had to think about and navigate through. If I had to walk through the shared areas, to put gloves and a face mask on, which we made sure we adhered to. (P901) |
| Quote 9 | Creation of boundaries | I never went out into their space or anything. We had a door between us for the whole time. (P444) |
| Quote 10 | | So I was concerned that when the post came in, for example, I was spraying the post and wiping the post. And when the food got delivered. I was worried I might just miss a bit and then we might get it anyway. (P450) |

Table 3b Adherence to self-isolation

| Quote number | Code | Quote |
|--------------|-----------------------------|--|
| Quote 1 | Social connectivity | Thankfully I had many visits from friends and family. They remained outside and we were able to have a chat at distance through the open top half of my stable door. These brief interactions definitely helped me through my period of self-isolation. (P2627) |
| Quote 2 | | I think if somebody's going into isolation, it's really important that they have some people who can check that are going through the same thing. So, I would say if you can have WhatsApp groups set up where somebody can just join and say, this is how I'm feeling, because it really did help massively. Because I wasn't going through it alone at that point. (P444) |
| Quote 3 | Practical support | We had some food delivered by friends whom we didn't even answer the door to. They left it on the doorstep. Then after that we got an Asda delivery which again, that was a bit unknown because they were knocking at the door and we had to wave at the window to say to leave it and they didn't understand. (P4138) |
| Quote 4 | | I think it's support from the outside. If you are separated in your house, I mean, you may still get people now that have to separate in their houses. Having something outside is so important, but you do feel really guilty that you are going to give them the virus back. (P444) |
| Quote 5 | Feeling known | I felt like I wasn't forgotten. I felt like I was getting that daily contact. [...] It kind of makes you feel a little bit special like oh you know, they've remembered me. The messages and the phone calls were reassuring because you knew that you weren't forgotten about, but if there was something wrong, you'd be able to tell them. (P901) |
| Quote 6 | | Public Health has been really supportive and they've been interested, which I think it's been fantastic to have that form of support. (P834) |
| Quote 7 | | I think having the texts coming in were incredibly helpful. Every day, I thought they were brilliant. To have it every day they to say, and your time is up. So, you do feel like... And also, I think that would help people stay in isolation. If you've got people who are just going, I don't care, I'm not going to be in isolation. If they feel like they're getting these texts, and they're being watched, it might make them stay in isolation. (P444) |
| Quote 8 | Negotiating competing needs | The biggest problem I had at the very beginning was that I came straight back from a cruise, which was supposed to be 14 days and turned out to be 17 and then a two day journey back. I had no food in. I had nothing in my fridge. Yes I had a freezer and I had a food cupboard. (P834) |
| Quote 9 | | I didn't really even think about getting shopping delivered really. Because of where I live it's in the middle of nowhere and I've got like a student's fridge, where you can fit about three meals in, so I needed to go shopping every day to just get the food for that day. So when this happened I didn't really have anywhere to store anything, so I ended up living on Pot Noodles and soups, things that you could keep in the cupboard, which is a bit rubbish. (P773) |

Table 3c Rational adaptations to mitigate risk

| Quote number | Code | Quote |
|--------------|---------------------------------------|---|
| Quote 1 | Rational adaptations to mitigate risk | Daily early morning walk or evening when no one is around helps to stay positive. Obviously this would depend on where you live but [town], as it is quite spread out, makes it easier to exercise outside while still staying away from others. (P1278) |
| Quote 2 | | I think the only time that we left the house, other to go in our own garden. We went out once in the car. Just to escape the four walls. We stayed inside the car and just drove round the countryside for a short while and came back again. (P374) |
| Quote 3 | | Well, it's the fact that he [the dog] wants to go out. To walk. If we didn't stick totally to the go out for exercise once a day, then I would've found that difficult with him. I was going out 6:00 o'clock in the morning. Taking a good walk. Not seen a soul. And then taking him out around a bit later on and avoiding anybody you saw. If you saw anybody, it was the odd person. That was it. So, I must admit, I broke the rule with that. (P621) |
| Quote 4 | | I did, during my isolation, if I'm really honest, because we've got a dog, I would take him. I drove somewhere where I knew that I wouldn't see other people and took my dog for a walk. And did that, you know, because it was only fair to do that. But it was really trying to keep away from other people. (P327) |
| Quote 5 | Over-adherence | It's made me less inclined to go out. I'm definitely less inclined to go out. I think you develop a bit of a safety bubble, whether it's consciously or not. And you just know that your home is your bubble. So it makes you less likely to want to expose yourself. It definitely makes you sub-consciously create your own space and not necessarily want anything to penetrate that. You want to stay very much where you know you're safe. (P901) |
| Quote 6 | | I suppose a bit nervous. Not nervous, that's not the right word, that kind of like apprehensive feeling. It doesn't take long to create habits, you know, like I suppose two weeks had felt like long enough for it to feel a bit overwhelming when we went outside. (P808) |
| Quote 7 | | I think in some ways it has made is kind of sealed off and reluctant to get back to some sort of normal. So we're tending to keep our little sealed bubble going for now. (P901). |