

# Yet another lockdown? A large-scale study on people's unwillingness to be confined during the first 5 months of the COVID-19 pandemic in Spain

Marina Martinez-Garcia<sup>1</sup>, Alejandro Rabasa<sup>2</sup>, Xavier Barber<sup>2</sup>, Kristina Polotskaya<sup>2</sup>, Kristof Roomp<sup>3</sup>, and Nuria Oliver<sup>4\*</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Universitat Jaume I, Dept de matemàtiques, Castelló, 12071, Spain

<sup>2</sup>Universidad Miguel Hernandez, Centro de Investigación Operativa, Elche, 03202, Spain

<sup>3</sup>Microsoft Corporation, Washington, USA

<sup>4</sup>ELLIS Unit Alicante Foundation, Alicante, Spain

\*Corresponding author(s): Nuria Oliver ([nuria@alum.mit.edu](mailto:nuria@alum.mit.edu))

## ABSTRACT

Population confinements have been one of the most widely adopted non-pharmaceutical interventions (NPIs) implemented by governments across the globe to help contain the spread of the SARS-CoV-2 virus. While confinement measures have been proven to be effective to reduce the number of infections, they entail significant economic and social costs. Thus, different policy makers and social groups have exhibited varying levels of acceptance of this type of measures. In this context, understanding the factors that determine the willingness of individuals to be confined during a pandemic is of paramount importance, particularly, to policy and decision-makers. In this paper, we study the factors that influence the unwillingness to be confined during the COVID-19 pandemic by means of a large-scale, online population survey deployed in Spain. We apply both quantitative (logistic regression) and qualitative (automatic pattern discovery) methods and consider socio-demographic, economic and psychological factors, together with the 14-day cumulative incidence per 100,000 inhabitants. Our analysis of 109,515 answers to the survey covers data spanning over a 5-month time period to shed light on the impact of the passage of time. We find evidence of *pandemic fatigue* as the percentage of those who report an unwillingness to be in confinement increases over time; we identify significant *gender* differences, with women being generally less likely than men to be able to sustain long-term confinement of at least 6 months; we uncover that the *psychological impact* was the most important factor to determine the willingness to be in confinement at the beginning of the pandemic, to be replaced by the *economic impact* as the most important variable towards the end of our period of study. Our results highlight the need to design gender and age specific public policies, to implement psychological and economic support programs and to address the evident pandemic fatigue as the success of potential future confinements will depend on the population's willingness to comply with them.

## Introduction and Related work

Population confinements have been one of the most widely adopted non-pharmaceutical interventions (NPIs) implemented by governments across the globe to help contain the spread of the SARS-CoV-2 virus<sup>1-4</sup>. While confinement measures have been proven to be effective to reduce the number of infections<sup>3,5-7</sup>, they entail significant economic and social costs. Thus, different policy makers and social groups have exhibited varying levels of acceptance of this type of measures, from the low levels of mask wearing compliance<sup>8</sup> and public acceptance of COVID-19 lockdown scenarios<sup>9</sup> in Germany to the highly interventionist Chinese experience<sup>10,11</sup>. In this context, understanding the factors that determine the willingness of individuals to be confined during a pandemic is of paramount importance, particularly, to policy and decision-makers.

In this paper, we study the factors that determine people's unwillingness to be confined during the first five months of the COVID-19 pandemic in Spain by means of a large-scale, online population survey. We consider socio-demographic, economic and psychological factors, together with reported 14-day cumulative incidence per 100,000 inhabitants. Our analysis covers data spanning over a 5-month time period to shed light on the impact of the passage of time.

Since the COVID-19 pandemic was declared, numerous studies that have analysed the economic, social and psychological impact of NPIs. Moreover, several authors have reported on people's experiences during the confinements implemented to contain the spread of coronavirus. We summarize next the most relevant pieces of previous work as they relate to ours.

**Economic impact of NPIs:** Regarding the economic impact of non-pharmaceutical interventions, several works have assessed the cost of different types of NPIs in the context of the current coronavirus pandemic. Abiad *et al.* simulate different scenarios of the evolution of the pandemic in order to estimate the economic impact<sup>12</sup>. Fernandes *et al.* maintain the same

31 central idea of studying different scenarios and highlight how different this crisis is (due to the pandemic) compared to previous  
32 ones<sup>13</sup>. Possible supply chain scenarios are analyzed in<sup>14</sup>, highlighting that the timing of the closing and opening of the  
33 facilities at different stages might become a major factor in determining the impact of epidemic outbreaks on the supply chain  
34 performance. Finally, the work by Chen and colleagues<sup>15</sup> highlights the impact that socio-psychological variables have on  
35 household consumption patterns and their ability and willingness to assume higher economic expenses.

36 **Social impact of NPIs:** Beyond the economic dimension, the pandemic has also significantly impacted people's social  
37 lives. Clemens *et al.* assess the impact that social distance and confinement measures have on people's relationships<sup>16</sup>. Jiao and  
38 colleagues<sup>17</sup> establish guidelines for children and adolescents to mitigate the effect of social isolation during the pandemic.  
39 Social vulnerability is pointed out as the main risk of the pandemic by<sup>18</sup>, recommending improvements of mental, social  
40 and spiritual resilience in the population. Mukhtar reviews past outbreaks to understand the impact of adverse effects on  
41 psychological health, psychological crisis intervention, and mental health management plans<sup>19</sup>. He concludes that individuals  
42 (and societies in general) must deliberately cultivate resilience and develop strategies to cope with adversity, in the case of the  
43 current SARS-CoV-2 pandemic caused by confinement.

44 **Psychological and behavioural impact of NPIs:** Several studies have analyzed the psychological impact of the confine-  
45 ment measures via online surveys and/or smartphone apps. Gao *et al.*<sup>20</sup> report a significant increase in media usage during  
46 the first wave of the SARS-CoV-2 pandemic in China from a sample of 4,872 individuals collected over a 3-day period (from  
47 the 31st of January to the 2nd of February, 2020). Their main findings show that there is a high prevalence of mental health  
48 problems, positively associated with frequent exposure to social media during the COVID-19 outbreak. As a result of this  
49 finding, the authors suggest that governments should pay more attention to the population's mental health among the general  
50 population while fighting the coronavirus pandemic. Hawryluch *et al.*<sup>21</sup> describe the results of analyzing data from 129  
51 individuals collected via a long 152-question survey to capture the psychological impact of the confinement in Canada, during  
52 previous SARS-CoV-1 outbreak. They conclude that the prevalence of post-traumatic stress disorder and depressive symptoms  
53 grows as the period of confinement increases. A multivariate logistic regression model was used by Wang *et al.*<sup>10</sup> to assess the  
54 impact of the confinement measures on people's mental health. The authors observed that the confinement measures adopted by  
55 the governments had a negative impact on the mental health of particularly vulnerable groups, including those with previous  
56 mental health disorders or chronic physical problems, first-line workers, coronavirus infected or suspected patients and those  
57 who had financial problems.

58 Recent work has also explored the use of technology to provide psychological support to people while in confinement, such  
59 as the self-guided activities proposed in<sup>22</sup>, models to manage potential psychological crises and decision support systems to  
60 help alleviate psychiatric and psychological disorders caused or exacerbated due to the confinement<sup>23</sup>.

61 General behavioural patterns and perceptions towards the pandemic and the confinement measures are described in<sup>24</sup>  
62 from a sample of 1,420 individuals collected between the 18th and 24th of March, 2020 in Australia. The study identifies the  
63 main difficulties reported by the participants to comply with the measures of physical distancing, namely home sharing, the  
64 responsibility of caring for someone outside your home and working from home. Yamada *et al.* describe the COVIDiSTRESS  
65 survey (data collected between April and May 2020) deployed to study the psychological and behavioural responses to the  
66 coronavirus pandemic and associated government measures – such as the cancellation of public events and stay-at-home orders  
67 implemented in many countries. A global consortium of 39 countries and regions worked together to construct and translate  
68 the survey with variables of shared interests and recruited participants in 47 languages<sup>25</sup>. The survey, with 1,304 respondents,  
69 covered several areas, including demographic data, physical symptoms in the past 14 days, contact history with COVID-19  
70 in the past 14 days, knowledge and concerns about COVID-19, precautionary measures against COVID-19 in the past 14 days,  
71 additional information required with respect to COVID-19, the psychological impact of the COVID-19 outbreak; and mental  
72 health status. Finally, Bailon *et al.*<sup>26</sup> analyze the longitudinal answers of 1,000 respondents provided over a 2.5 month period in  
73 Spain, aiming to understand potential changes in people's mood during the confinement. Beyond the study on mood variations  
74 during confinement, this paper offers interesting descriptive statistics of the socio-demographic variables of the participants, as  
75 well as their housing characteristics and physical activity habits.

76 **Willingness to comply with the confinement measures:** Similar to our research, most of the previous work that has  
77 studied people's experience with the COVID-19 pandemic confinement measures has relied on self-reported survey data. Amat  
78 *et al.*<sup>27</sup> analyze 1,600 answers collected between the 20th and 28th of March, 2020 from Spain and United States. The authors  
79 claim that during the coronavirus pandemic individuals have relinquished more rights than during other international crisis  
80 scenarios as climate change or international terrorism. Flexibility and the ability to adapt have been found to be key skills to  
81 help people cope with confinement situations. Tintori *et al.*<sup>28</sup> report such a finding from analysing 140,000 online interviews  
82 between the 22nd of March and the 2nd of April, 2020; and Landi *et al.*<sup>29</sup> collect data from 944 adults in Italy over 35 days and  
83 propose an acceptance and compromise therapy based in the concept of *psychological flexibility* as a tool to help people during  
84 confinement. McBride *et al.*<sup>30</sup> propose empirical indicators captured by the Brief Resilience Scale to quantitatively assess  
85 people's acceptance of the confinement measures. They validate the proposed instrument via a study with 2,000 individuals in

86 United States, between the 23rd and the 28th of March, 2020. Other authors, such as<sup>31</sup>, study the impact of conspiracy theories  
87 on people's willingness to comply with the confinement measures. They collect data via an online survey with 2,501 adults in  
88 England, quota sampled to match the population for age, gender, income, and region. According to their findings, there is a  
89 notable endorsement of conspiracy beliefs about coronavirus in England, and such ideas do not appear to be limited to the  
90 fringes. These conspiracy beliefs connect to other forms of mistrust and are associated with less compliance with government  
91 guidelines and greater unwillingness to take up future tests and treatment. Finally, Chan *et al.*<sup>32</sup> suggest that regions with  
92 risk-averse attitudes are more likely to adjust their behavioural activity in response to the declaration of a pandemic even before  
93 official government lockdowns.

94 In view of the reported previous work and given the focus of our research, the main contributions of our paper are four-fold.  
95 First, we report the results of analyzing a very large-scale, online population survey with 109,515 answers from Spain collected  
96 between April 3rd, 2020 and September 11th, 2020. Second, we apply two different methodologies to predict and shed light on  
97 the factors that impact people's willingness to be confined: logistic regression and pattern-discovery, rule-based models. Third,  
98 we consider socio-demographic, economic and psychological factors, together with reported 14-day cumulative incidence per  
99 100,000 inhabitants. Finally, we analyse data covering a 5-month period to understand the impact of the passage of time on  
100 people's unwillingness to be confined.

101 In the following section, we describe the main results of our analyses. Next, we describe our methodology and discuss  
102 the main findings of our work. Finally, we conclude with a summary of our contributions and an outline and future lines of  
103 research.

## 104 Results

105 In this section, we describe the main results of our analyses, starting with the descriptive statistics of the data set, followed by  
106 the results of a logistic regression modeling and the patterns that were automatically identified by our pattern identification  
107 approach (described in the Methods section).

### 108 Descriptive Statistics

109 We report the results of analyzing a subset of the answers to the COVID19ImpactSurvey, a very large, anonymous, online  
110 citizen survey about COVID-19<sup>33</sup>. Launched on March, 28th 2020 in Spain, the survey has since collected over 600,000  
111 anonymous answers mainly from 4 countries (Spain, Italy, Brazil and Germany). From this very large sample, we analyze the  
112 data from Spain for the time period between April, 3rd 2020 and September, 11th 2020.

113 From an original set of 25 questions, we analyze the answers to the questions included in Table 1 in the Supplementary  
114 Information. Given that the data was collected by means of a non-probabilistic sampling method, we weigh the answers such  
115 that the distribution of answers per age, gender and geographic province matches the officially reported distributions in the  
116 Spanish census data. A similar methodology was implemented in<sup>33</sup>. Table 2 in the Supplementary Information shows the  
117 distributions of the age and gender variables before and after weighting the survey answers. The Table also includes the official  
118 census data for comparison.

119 Table 1 depicts the dependent and independent variables used in our analysis. We are particularly interested in understanding  
120 the differences in demographic factors, impact and perceptions between those who report an opposition to be confined vs  
121 those who report a willingness to be confined for at least 6 months. Thus, we model our dependent variable (willingness to be  
122 confined) as a binary variable where 0 represents an unwillingness to be confined and 1 represents maximum acceptance towards  
123 confinement (willing to be confined for 6 months or more). When we select the answers of those reporting an unwillingness to  
124 be confined and those reporting an acceptance to be confined for at least 6 months, we obtain a sample with 20,054 responses  
125 corresponding to the time period between April, 3rd and September, 11th 2020.

126 Table 2 shows the resulting proportions of the variables analysed in the study. As seen on the Table, the data set is  
127 unbalanced regarding the target variable: there are 7,887 (39.3%) answers of those reporting an unwillingness to be confined vs  
128 12,167 (60.7%) answers of those who report high willingness towards confinement ( $\geq 6$  months). In terms of gender, there  
129 are 8,237 (41%) and 11,817 (59%) answers by women and men, respectively. We group the age of our participants into four  
130 possible age buckets: [18-29], [30-49], [50-59] and 60+, with 9%, 44%, 27% and 20% of the answers, respectively.

131 To consider the impact of time, we include a discrete variable called *Phase* that refers to the different phases of confinement  
132 that were applied in Spain in the spring and summer of 2020, as shown in Figure 5 and described in Table 1. From Table 2,  
133 we observe a decrease over time in those reporting a willingness to be confined for a long time period: at the beginning  
134 of the pandemic (*Workplace closure* phase), they represent 85.8% of the sample, whereas once the *New normal* phase was  
135 declared at the end of June of 2020, this group was only 55.4% of the sample. Thus, we use the Phase variable to segment the  
136 sample in 8 different time periods, and we build models both for the entire time period and for each of the confinement phases  
137 independently.

138 We first performed a proportions test to determine if the distribution of answers is significantly different for each of the  
139 variables of interest between those unwilling to be confined and those with high levels of acceptance towards confinement. We  
140 found statistically significant differences in all the variables ( $p$ -value  $< 0.01$ ) except for the variables marked with \* on Table 2,  
141 which correspond to *Walks allowed*, *Phase I* and *Phase III* and for the age groups 30-49 and 50-59. Nonetheless, note that  
142 all the variables have at least two values with significant differences. Thus, we conclude that all variables are relevant to be  
143 included in our models.

144 The main research questions that we would like to answer through the analysis of this data set are:

- 145 (1) **RQ1:** Are there differentiating attributes between those who report high vs no willingness to be confined?;
- 146 (2) **RQ2:** Is it possible to accurately predict an unwillingness to be confined from the independent variables?; and
- 147 (3) **RQ3:** How did the willingness to be confined evolve during the different phases of the confinement?

## 148 Logistic Regression Model

149 We obtain a logistic regression model with all the variables described in Table 1 and the interactions shown in Table 3. We refer  
150 the reader to the Materials and Methods section for a description of our approach. We compute the McFadden's pseudo-R  
151 squared (0.131), the Cox-Snell residual (0.161) and Nagelkerke's R squared (0.218) to assess the goodness of fit of the  
152 selected model.

153 As reflected in Table 3, the variables with the most interactions are *Gender* and *PsyI*. The existence of the variable *Phase* in  
154 our model, interacting with *PsyI*, *Gender* and *Household*, empirically corroborates a temporal dependency of the target variable.  
155 Interestingly, the 14-day Cumulative Incidence of COVID-19 cases (*CumInc*) has no significant interaction with any of the  
156 variables.

157 We performed an Odds Ratio (OR) analysis to shed light on the role of each of the variables in the logistic regression model.  
158 A variable with an OR  $> 1$  is typically interpreted as a risk factor, *i.e.*, it is a variable that significantly increases the probability  
159 of the target variable to be 1. Conversely, a variable with an OR  $< 1$  decreases the probability for the target variable to be 1. We  
160 reverse the coding of the target variable so it represents a *risk*: we code as 1 the answers corresponding to an unwillingness to  
161 be confined and as 0 the answers corresponding to an acceptance towards a confinement of at least 6 months.

162 In our case, the basal categories for the OR analysis are: *Phase: Workplace closure*; *Gender: Men*; *Age: 18-29*; *Home:*  
163 *Apartment*; *Household: Young*; *EcoI: None* and *PsyI: None*, which correspond to the first row of each category in Table 2.

164 Note that to obtain the OR value in a logistic regression model with second order interactions among some of the variables  
165 (*Phase*, *Gender*, *Age*, *Home*, *Household*, *EcoI* and *PsyI* as per Table 3), the OR of the main variable needs to be multiplied by  
166 the OR of the interaction variables where the main variable is present.

167 Figure 1 depicts the OR of the variables with the most important interactions, grouped in four categories to ease their  
168 interpretation.

## 169 Economic Impact

170 Figure 1a) shows the OR for the *EcoI* variable taking as basal category *None*. Note how the OR is larger than one for all values  
171 of the *EcoI* variable, meaning that this variable is a risk factor. Moreover, the OR for *EcoI = Severe* (3.53) is larger than for  
172 *EcoI = Mild* (1.99) (in black color): those who report having had severe economic impact are more likely to report that they are  
173 not willing to be confined when compared to those with mild economic impact.


174 In addition, the OR of the interaction *Age:EcoI* (cyan lines for Severe and green for Mild) is larger than 1 for those aged  
175 30-59 years old. Thus, people in that age group are more likely to report that they are not willing to be confined than those  
176 aged 18-29 years old (basal category). In the case of respondents aged 60+ years old, the OR is greater than one only when the  
177 economic impact is mild.

178 In terms of the *Gender:EcoI* interaction, the OR are less than 1 for both values of *EcoI* (red line). Hence, women with any  
179 kind of economic impact are less likely to report not willing to be in confinement any longer when compared to men (basal  
180 category).

## 181 Psychological Impact

182 Figure 1b) depicts the OR for the *PsyI* variable taking as basal category *None*. As shown in the Figure, those who report (*Severe*  
183 *or Mild*) psychological impact have higher risk to report an unwillingness to be confined than those without any psychological  
184 impact. Moreover, the larger the psychological impact, the higher the risk (black lines). In terms of the interaction *Age:PsyI*, all  
185 the age groups show a similar level of risk (cyan lines), except for those aged 60+ years old with mild psychological impact  
186 who seem to be at significantly higher risk of reporting that they would not be able to be in confinement any longer (OR =  
187 2.23). We observe a difference in the risk depending on the age of the members of the *Household*: households composed of  
188 elderly (60+) are significantly more at risk to report an unwillingness to be in confinement when compared to the rest (red and  
189 cyan lines) Concerning the interaction between *Phase:PsyI*, it seems that time has an attenuating effect on the risk as there is a  
190 consistent decrease of the risk over time. These results occur for *PsyI = Severe* (blue lines) and *PsyI = Mild* (yellow lines)





**Figure 1.** Odds Ratios for all the variables with interactions in the logistic regression model.

191 but in this case to a lesser extent. This finding is surprising, as one would expect people to be at higher risk of not tolerating  
 192 confinements the longer the pandemic lasts.

### 193 Gender

194 In Figure 1c) the OR for the  $Gender_W$  variable are shown, taking *Men* as the basal category. As depicted in the Figure, women  
 195 tend to be at significantly higher risk (OR = 4.60) than men to report that they are not able/willing to be in confinement any  
 196 longer (black line). The value of this OR is significantly larger than the OR found for the  $EcoI$  and  $PsylI$  variables. This risk is  
 197 increased for women who live in households composed of elders  $Household_{Elder}$  (yellow lines). In terms of the interaction  
 198  $Phase:Gender_W$ , all the OR are similar and lower than 1 (blue lines), meaning that as time goes by, the risk for women to report  
 199 that they are not able to be in confinement is lower than during the reference phase (*Workplace closure*).

### 200 Rest of Variables

201 Figure 1d) depicts the OR of the rest of variables and their interactions. As seen in the Figure, the OR of  $Phase$  as a main factor  
 202 is larger than one for all its values when compared to its basal value (*Workplace closure*) and increases over time from 3.3  
 203 during the *Work reopening* phase to 16.7 during the *New normality* phase. In other words, the risk of reporting an unwillingness  
 204 to stay in confinement increases significantly as time goes by.

205 Regarding the type of  $Household$ , multi-generational households are at lower risk of reporting that they are not willing to be  
 206 confined any longer than households with composed of elders (grey lines). However, in both cases the OR < 1, so they are  
 207 attenuating factors when compared to the basal category ( $Household = Young$ ).

208 We do not observe a significant impact of  $Age$  as a main factor on the risk to report being unwilling to be confined any  
 209 longer. Nonetheless, as previously reported, age can be a risk factor in its interaction with other factors, such as  $Economic$  and  
 210  $Psychological Impact$ .

211 Combining all the OR reported above, we conclude that men living in multi-generational homes, with neither psychological  
 212 nor economic impact due to the pandemic, are the least likely group to report an unwillingness to be confined. Conversely,  
 213 women aged 30+ years old with severe economic and psychological impact and living in households with young children are at  
 214 the highest risk to report an unwillingness to be confined.

## 215 **Classification Performance**

216 Given that we have a quantitative model of the unwillingness to be confined, we test the model as a binary classifier to  
217 automatically infer such unwillingness from our independent variables. We randomly split the data in a training (80% of the  
218 data) and testing (20% of the data) sets. Note that we group the data on a weekly basis to have enough samples of survey  
219 answers across the entire time period of study.

220 On this binary classification task, the logistic regression model has a sensibility of  $72.5\% \pm 0.73$  and a specificity of  
221  $63.6\% \pm 0.75$  with 100 random permutation data for training. A random model would have a sensibility of  $50.0\% \pm 0.004$  and  
222 a specificity of  $49.99\% \pm 0.005$ . We experimented with other state-of-the-art machine learning methods. Gradient Boosted  
223 Trees (GBTs) trained following the same sampling methodology obtained a sensibility of  $58.0\% \pm 0.01$  and a specificity of  
224  $60.7\% \pm 0.01$ . The three most important variables identified by the GBTs were *Psychological impact*, *Phase* and *Economic*  
225 *impact*.

## 226 **Automatic Pattern Extraction**


227 In addition to the logistic regression modeling, we have developed an automatic pattern extraction algorithm described in the  
228 Materials and Methods Section. Using this model, we identify the most influential variables and discover the most recurrent  
229 patterns among those who report an unwillingness to be confined.

## 230 **Most Influential Variables**

231 Figure 2 depicts the variable importance obtained with our pattern extraction methodology across the different phases of  
232 the pandemic. As displayed in the Figure, there is a significant change over time of the importance of two variables: the  
233 *Psychological (PsyI)* and *Economic Impact (EcoI)* of the pandemic on the survey respondents.

234 Initially, *PsyI* is the most important variable, increasing its importance up to the *Walks allowed* phase, when its importance  
235 begins to decline. Conversely, the *EcoI* variable is not important at the beginning of the pandemic. Up until the end of *Phase II*,  
236 the importance of this variable increases smoothly or remains constant over time. However, with the start of *Phase III* and the  
237 return of the new normality, the importance of the economic impact to determine the unwillingness to be confined becomes  
238 evident.

239 The curves corresponding to the importance of the psychological and economic impact variables intersect between *Phase II*  
240 and *Phase III*. The rest of the variables exhibit a fairly stable behaviour over time, with mild fluctuations in their importance,  
241 affecting the target variable almost uniformly throughout the different phases of confinement.



242 **Figure 2.** Evolution of the variable importance over time, according to the pattern extraction model.

243 Given this dependency of the target variable on the Phase of the pandemic, we discuss next our findings when performing  
244 an analysis in each of the 8 Phases of study (see Figure 5).

## 244 **Analyses per Phase of the Pandemic**

### 245 **Logistic Regression**

246 In Figure 3 we show the OR of the main effects and their temporal evolution over time in each of the phases of the pandemic.  
247 Note that for each *Phase* we build a different logistic model with the main variables but without interactions given that we do  
248 not have enough data per Phase to identify meaningful interactions.

249 Figure 3 a) shows the Odds Ratio of the 14-day cumulative incidence over time. The OR increases over time, which might  
250 be indicative of the so called *pandemic fatigue*. In the early phases of the pandemic, the OR is less than one, meaning that the  
251 larger the 14-day cumulative incidence, the lower the probability for respondents to report an unwillingness to be in confinement.  
252 Conversely, from *Phase II* onward, respondents' seem to be indifferent (OR close to 1) to changes in the cumulative incidence.  
253 Figure 3 b) depicts the OR of the *Psychological Impact (PsyI)* variable taking as basal category *No impact*. As seen in the  
254 Figure, the OR are always larger than 1 and decrease over the time. Hence, the role that the psychological impact variable plays  
255 in increasing the probability of reporting not being able to be confined any longer decreases as the months go by. This finding is  
256 consistent with the previously reported variable importance analysis (see Figure 2).

257 In the case of the *Economic Impact (EcoI)* variable (Figure 3 c)), the OR are also larger than 1 in all the phases. However,  
258 the evolution over time is different than that of the *PsyI* variable. We observe a significant increase in the OR after the *Phase*  
259 *III*, particularly for those reporting severe economic impact. This result is also consistent with the variable importance analysis  
260 previously described. Moreover, it makes intuitive sense: as the economic situation of people worsens due to the pandemic,  
261 their probability of reporting that they are not willing to be in confinement any more increases.

262 The changes over time in the OR for the *Age* variable are depicted in Figure 3 d). Those aged 60+ are at significantly larger  
263 risk in the first phases of the pandemic to say that they "can't anymore" when compared to the rest of age groups. Once the *New*  
264 *normal* phase started at the end of June of 2020, the risk of those aged 50-59 and those aged 60+ becomes similar. Interestingly,  
265 the 30-49 age group is the only age group with an OR < 1 during the entire period.

266 Those living in single family homes are at lower risk to report that they cannot be in confinement any longer when compared  
267 to those living in an apartment (Figure 3 e)). This finding makes intuitive sense as single family homes are typically more  
268 spacious than apartments in Spain.

269 Finally, *women* are at larger risk than men to report that they cannot endure the confinement any longer throughout the  
270 entire period until reaching the *New normal* phase, when the OR for women becomes smaller than 1 Figure 3 e).

## 271 **Automatic Pattern Detection**

272 Given the changes of the most relevant variables over time (see Figures 2,4), we apply our automatic pattern extraction algorithm  
273 to the data in each of the phases. We extract the patterns that model the unwillingness to be confined from the two most  
274 influential variables: economic and psychological impact, together with gender and age. Figure 2 shows a graph comparison of  
275 the weights of the most important variables as per our pattern detection method applied in each of the phases of confinement. As  
276 seen in the Figure, each confinement phase is modeled differently by these explanatory variables. Thus, the patterns identified  
277 in each phase change as the variables become more or less important.

278 As shown in Figure 4, age and gender have relatively important weights in the first stage of confinement but then practically  
279 disappear until *Phase III* to disappear again in the *New normal* phase.

280 The intermediate phases of confinement (from *Walks allowed* to *Phase II*) can be mainly modeled using the *Psychological*  
281 *Impact* variable. In *Phase III* (the last stage prior to the *New normal*), the unwillingness to be confined is affected by the two  
282 socio-demographic variables (gender and age), by psychological impact and especially by economic impact, which is triggered  
283 in this phase. In the *New normal* phase, the unwillingness to be confined is mainly dependent on economic impact.

284 Next, we summarize the most relevant patterns identified in each of the phases.

### 285 **1. Workplace closure:**

286 In this phase, those over 50 years of age, regardless of their gender and economic impact, as long as they report no psychological  
287 impact (26.4% of the sample) always opt (100% of the time) for a willingness to be confined for 6 months or longer.

288 While we did not obtain any significant interaction between gender and psychological impact in our logistic regression  
289 modeling, we did identify significant gender differences in the 30 - 49 years old age range: among those who do not report any  
290 economic impact but do report severe psychological impact (close to 10% of the sample): 82.6% of men vs 64.7% of women  
291 would be willing to be in confinement for 6 months or longer.

292 This finding illustrates the complementary nature of our modeling approaches. The pattern discovery method identifies  
293 patterns that involve three or more variables, which would be very difficult to achieve via our logistic regression methodology.

294 In this initial stage of confinement, when the psychological and/or economic impact might not yet evident, the willingness  
295 to be confined is at its highest levels. However, 2.6% of the sample corresponds to women between 50 and 59 years old who  
296 report severe psychological impact. Of these, 60.0% report an unwillingness to be in confinement, even in this very early stage  
297 of the pandemic.

### 298 **2. Workplace reopening:**

299 A large percentage (close to 94% on average) of men and women between 30 and 60 years old, who report neither economic  
300 nor psychological impact (18.4% of the sample) are willing to be confined for 6 months or longer. When this group reports  
301 mild psychological impact (13.1% of the sample), we observe gender differences, with 92.5% of men vs 85.4% of women  
302 willing to remain in confinement for 6 months or longer.

303 As expected, the reopening of workplaces has hardly any impact on people aged 60+ (mostly of non-working age) without  
304 economic or psychological impacts: 94.1% on average of them report a willingness to be confined for 6 or more months,  
305 irrespective of their gender. This group represents 11.6% of the sample.

306 At this stage, those who report high levels of acceptance towards confinement still clearly outweigh those unwilling to be  
307 confined. However, once again, we identify clear gender differences in the patterns, with women being more likely to report  
308 that they cannot be in confinement any longer when compared to men. In particular, we identify two distinct patterns: first,  
309 43.6% of women between 50 and 59 years old who report severe psychological impact and without economic impact (3.7%  
310 of the sample) report minimal acceptance towards confinement; second, 56.5% of women between 30 and 49 years old, who  
311 in addition to reporting severe psychological impact also claim to have medium economic impact (2.7% of the sample) also  
312 respond that they would not be able to continue in confinement.

### 313 **3. Walks allowed:**

314 During this phase, the participants' opinions regarding their willingness to be confined starts to balance: the percentage of those  
315 willing to be confined for 6 months or longer decreases whereas those who are not willing to be confined increase.

316 The first identified pattern corresponds to people between 30 and 49 years old who report having no economic impact  
317 but severe psychological impact (13.0% of the sample). Among these (men and women alike), 54.8% on average report a  
318 willingness to be confined for 6 months or longer.

319 At this stage, there are several groups (both men and women) that begin to opt mainly for an unwillingness to be confined.  
320 The pattern with the largest support reveals that 75.0% of women between 30 and 49 years old with medium economic impact  
321 and a severe psychological impact (3.7% of the sample) report an unwillingness to be confined.

### 322 **4. Phase 0:**

323 In the first phase of the re-opening in Spain, more people report being able to continue in confinement for 6 months or longer  
324 than those reporting that they cannot stand it any longer, with the exception of two groups: women between 30 and 49  
325 with severe psychological impact and mild economic impact (3.49% of the sample) and women over 60, with severe psychological  
326 impact but no economic impact (6.0% of sample). In these two groups, only 46.9% and 45.2% respectively report a willingness  
327 to be confined for 6 months or longer.

328 While the willingness to be in confinement for 6 months or longer also decreases among men, still remains the most popular  
329 option for them. This finding is aligned with our OR analysis shown in Figure 1 c).

330 Half of those aged 60+ (both men and women) who do not declare to have any economic impact but report severe  
331 psychological impact (9.0% of the sample) report not being able to remain in confinement any longer. The burden of the  
332 pandemic starts to become evident.

### 333 **5. Phases I and II:**

334 Both phases show similar patterns where the unwillingness to be confined is prevalent between individuals who report severe  
335 psychological impact with some economic impact. These levels of unwillingness are higher when, in addition to the severe  
336 psychological impact, participants also report some type of economic impact.

337 In Phase I, the opinion of some groups is polarized clearly towards an unwillingness to be confined: 67.2% of women  
338 between 30 and 59 years old who report medium economic impact and severe psychological impact (over 7.4% of the sample)  
339 and 86.9% of women aged 60+ who, having no economic impact declare severe psychological impact (5.0% of the sample)  
340 respond that they cannot stand the confinement any longer. Again, the most significant patterns related to those who are  
341 unwilling to continue in confinement are found amongst women.

### 342 **6. Phase III:**

343 In the last phase of the re-opening and before the imminent start of the *New normal* phase, we observe an increase among  
344 those who report being able to remain in confinement for 6 months or longer. As seen in our feature importance analysis, the  
345 psychological impact becomes less relevant than economic impact and demographic factors. Hence, psychological impact does  
346 now appear in most of the patterns.

347 In general terms, the majority opinion is once again towards a willingness to be confined for 6 months or longer. The group  
348 that reports the highest levels of unwillingness to be in confinement (47.3% of the time) are people (men and women) between  
349 30 and 49 years old who do not report psychological impact but report economic impact (7.6% of the sample).

### 350 **7. New Normal:**

351 The willingness to be confined shows a balanced distribution between those who affirm that they are not able to stand it any  
352 longer and those who would be willing to be confined for 6 months or longer: 65.2% of people between 30 and 50 years old  
353 (without distinction of gender) who report neither economic nor psychological impact (28.8% of the sample) would accept  
354 long-term confinement, compared to 34.8% who would not stand confinement any longer.

355 During this period (between the end of June 2020 and September 2020), the economic impact is the most influential factor  
356 to determine the willingness to be confined, when compared to gender, age and psychological impact. We highlight two patterns  
357 that strongly support (in more than 67.7% of the cases) an unwillingness to be confined: women aged between 30 and 49 years



358 old who do not report psychological impact, but report severe economic impact (3.4% of the sample), and men aged between  
359 50 and 59 years old, who do not report psychological impact either, but who report moderate economic impact (2.7% of the  
360 sample). Both groups are of working age and with some level of economic impact. They clearly opt for an unwillingness to be  
361 confined.

## 362 Discussion

363 We have described two different analytical approaches applied to the same data. The obtained results are consistent yet also  
364 complementary with each other. The logistic regression modeling revealed the main factors that impact the unwillingness to  
365 be confined and enables us to build a predictive model of such an unwillingness. The qualitative methodology automatically  
366 identified relevant patterns that characterize the groups of respondents who exhibit an unwillingness to be in confinement.

367 From these analyses, we draw several key findings related to the interplay between demographic factors, the economic and  
368 psychological impact of the pandemic on people's lives and the passage of time.

369 **1. Pandemic fatigue is evident** Our sample spans over a 5-month period which includes both the severe lockdown imposed  
370 by the Spanish government between March 2020 and June 2020 and more than two months of the *New normal* phase. As the  
371 weeks go by, we observe a clear decrease of those who report a willingness to be confined for 6 months or longer from 85.8%  
372 to 55.4% of the sample. We corroborate this finding in our OR analysis, where the risk to report an unwillingness to be in  
373 confinement any longer significantly increases with the *Phases* of the pandemic (see Figure 1 d)). The most important variables  
374 to determine the unwillingness to be confined change as the months go by: psychological impact starts as the most important  
375 variable whereas economic impact becomes the most important variable once the *New normal* phase starts. Moreover, until  
376 *Phase 0* of the pandemic, the larger the 14-day cumulative incidence of COVID-19 cases, the lower the risk of reporting an  
377 unwillingness to be confined. However, as the months went by, the impact of the cumulative incidence on the unwillingness to  
378 be in confinement disappeared, starting in *Phase II* of the pandemic.

379 Since the World Health Organisation published its report on pandemic fatigue<sup>34</sup>, several authors have investigated the topic.  
380 Reicher and Drury propose that the non-adherence to the confinement measures is not due to pandemic fatigue, but rather due  
381 to structural weaknesses in our society, such as the inability to effectively self-isolate<sup>35</sup>. Conversely, other authors have written  
382 about the psychological, physical and economic impact of the pandemic on people, which has led to the emergence of the  
383 pandemic fatigue in different countries in the world<sup>36-41</sup>.

384 Given that the SARS-CoV-2 pandemic is expected to last for many more months, new confinements might be needed to  
385 control the transmission rate of the disease. However, the population is in a very different mental and economic state than they  
386 were at the beginning of the pandemic. Hence, policy makers should be sensitive to this situation in order to maximize the  
387 chances that future confinement measures will be both accepted and complied with by the population.

388 **2. Gender and age matter** We identify very significant gender differences in the reported unwillingness to be confined,  
389 with women being more likely to be unwilling throughout all the phases of the pandemic. According to the OR analysis, age  
390 does not seem to play a significant role in increasing the risk to report an unwillingness to be confined. However, our qualitative  
391 pattern discovery method identifies several patterns involving individuals (and especially women) of working age with some  
392 level psychological and/or economic impact and a clear unwillingness to remain in confinement any longer.

393 Previous work has also identified significant gender differences, with women being generally more compliant with individual  
394 protection and confinement measures<sup>42,43</sup> than men. Galasso et al. report that women are more likely to perceive the pandemic  
395 as a very serious health problem and to agree and to comply with restraining measures from the analysis of survey data in  
396 eight countries conducted in March-April 2020<sup>44</sup>. Haischer et al.<sup>45</sup> studied facial mask wearing behavior in a sample of 9,935  
397 shoppers and identified that women were 1.5 times more likely to wear a mask than men. The fact that women in our study  
398 are at larger risk of not being willing to be in confinement when compared to men might be explained by the fact that women  
399 also are more likely to report psychological impact. According to our data, 18.0% of men vs 20.8% of women and 25.0% of  
400 men vs 30.6% of women ( $\chi^2 = 143.45$ , p-value < 2.2e-16) report mild and severe psychological impact due to the pandemic,  
401 respectively. Previous research has also studied the differential psychological impact of the pandemic on women<sup>46-48</sup>.

402 This gender and age-based differences are important to policy makers, as they reveal the need for gender and age-dependent  
403 public policies that would address the needs of different gender and age groups.

404 **3. From psychological to economic impact** Psychological impact played a very important role in the early stages of the  
405 pandemic (up to *Phase III*): it is the main variable that determines the unwillingness to be confined, as reflected in our OR  
406 and feature importance analyses. However, as the months went by, psychological impact became less relevant whereas the  
407 economic impact of the pandemic became the main driver to determine an unwillingness to be confined. In the *New normal*  
408 phase, those with severe economic impact are significantly more likely to report that they cannot stand the confinement any  
409 longer when compared to those without any reported economic impact.

410 Other authors have studied the psychological impact of the COVID-19 pandemic on different populations, including  
411 students<sup>49</sup>, healthcare workers<sup>50</sup>, and the general population<sup>51-53</sup>. The economic impact of pandemics throughout history and

412 for the COVID-19 pandemic has been analysed by several authors, including Ceylan et al.<sup>54</sup> who conclude that unemployment  
413 with its income effects will be the most prominent economic consequence of the pandemic. However, we have not found any  
414 previous work that has studied the evolution over time of the role played by both the psychological and economic impact on the  
415 willingness to be in confinement.

416 This finding points out the importance of deploying both psychological and financial support measures as people's  
417 livelihoods are severely impacted by over one year of the coronavirus pandemic.

## 418 Conclusions

419 Population confinements have been one of the most widely adopted non-pharmaceutical interventions (NPIs) implemented  
420 by governments across the globe to help contain the spread of the SARS-CoV-2 virus. While confinement measures have  
421 been proven to be effective to reduce the number of infections, they entail significant economic and social costs. Thus,  
422 understanding the factors that determine the willingness of individuals to be confined during a pandemic is of paramount  
423 importance, particularly, to policy and decision-makers.

424 In this paper, we have studied such factors by means of a large-scale, online population survey deployed in Spain, one of  
425 the most affected countries in Europe by the pandemic. We consider socio-demographic, economic and psychological factors,  
426 together with reported 14-day cumulative incidence per 100,000 inhabitants. We analyze 109,515 answers provided during a  
427 5-month period (between April 3rd, 2020 and September 11th, 2020) to shed light on the impact of the passage of time.

428 We apply both quantitative (logistic regression) and qualitative (pattern identification) methodologies to determine the  
429 role that the factors play in determining the unwillingness to be confined and their evolution over time. We find evidence of  
430 *pandemic fatigue*: the unwillingness of people to be confined increases as the months go by. We identify significant gender and  
431 age differences, placing women –and particularly working age women– at a higher risk than men to be unwilling to be confined.  
432 Finally, we uncover the importance of psychological impact at the early stages of the pandemic to be replaced by economic  
433 impact once the *New normal* was declared at the end of June of 2020.

434 Our results point to the need to design age and gender specific public policies, to implement economic programs to support  
435 the many citizens whose livelihoods have been severely impacted by the pandemic and to address the evident pandemic fatigue  
436 as the success of potential future confinements will depend on the population's willingness to comply with them.

437 Collecting a large sample of survey data does not come without limitations. First, respondents have to be adults (at least 18  
438 years old). Second, there might be a difference between the reported willingness to be in confinement and the actual compliance  
439 with the confinement measures. Third, there is a self-selection and sampling bias as the survey is filled out by volunteers who  
440 have learned about the survey via social media, WhatsApp, newspapers articles or Facebook ads, and who need access to a  
441 computing device (smartphone, tablet, PC) with internet connection. We mitigate this bias by weighing the raw data and by  
442 deploying gender-balanced Facebook advertisement campaigns.

## 443 Material and Methods

### 444 The COVID19Impact Survey

445 We report the results of analyzing a subset of the answers to the COVID19ImpactSurvey, a very large, anonymous, online  
446 citizen survey about COVID-19<sup>33</sup>. Launched on March 28th in Spain, the survey has since collected over 600,000 anonymous  
447 answers mainly from 4 countries (Spain, Italy, Brazil and Germany). From this very large sample, we analyze the data from  
448 Spain for the time period between April, 3rd 2020 and September, 11th 2020.

449 The COVID19ImpactSurvey was launched in collaboration with the Valencian Government in Spain and has been regularly  
450 used to assist in their decision-making<sup>33</sup>. The survey has changed over time to adapt to each of the phases of the pandemic.  
451 During the period of our study, the survey consisted of 25 questions designed to collect information about the participants'  
452 demographic and household situation (Q1-Q7); their social contact behaviour (Q8-Q12); their support for the government  
453 measures deployed to contain the spread of coronavirus (Q13) and their willingness to continue in confinement (Q14); the  
454 economic and labor impact of the pandemic in their lives (Q15-Q19); their health risk factors (Q20), their ability to self-isolate  
455 if needed (Q21), the presence of coronavirus-related symptoms (Q22), the duration of the symptoms (if any) (Q23), whether  
456 they have been tested for coronavirus (Q24); and the psychological/emotional impact of the pandemic in their home (Q25).

457 We refer the interested reader to<sup>33</sup> for a detailed description of the survey questions, the weighing methodology applied  
458 to reduce biases in the data and the results of analyzing the first week of answers. Note that question Q25 related to the  
459 psychological impact of the pandemic was added on April 3rd and thus it is not included in the analysis presented in<sup>33</sup>.

460 From the questions described above, we report the results of analyzing the subset of questions depicted in S.I. Table ??,  
461 namely Q1-Q6, Q14, Q15 and Q25.

462 Given that we have data for several months, we analyze the survey answers according to the different phases of confinement  
463 implemented in Spain between April and September of 2020. Figure 5 illustrates the chronology of each of the phases as per

464 official data<sup>1</sup>, together with the daily number of confirmed COVID-19 cases. The shaded portion of the graph corresponds to  
465 the time period of analysis in this paper.

## 466 Data Processing

467 Table 1 summarizes the independent and dependent variables used in our study. Our target or dependent variable is the  
468 willingness to be confined, captured by Q14. Our independent variables are the socio-demographic, economic and psychological  
469 impact measures, captured by questions Q1-Q6, Q15 and Q25, the confinement Phase as shown in Figure 5, and the 14-day  
470 Cumulative Incidence of SARS-CoV-2 per 100.000 inhabitants averaged over the 17 Autonomous Regions in Spain.

471 To minimize biases in the data, we weigh the raw answers by gender, age and province, such that the resulting distribution  
472 of answers matches the distributions reported by the official Spanish census. We apply the same methodology as described in<sup>33</sup>.  
473 Table 2 in the Supplementary Information depicts the age and gender distributions of the raw and weighted data, together with  
474 the officially reported census distributions.

475 In addition, we simplify several of the answers as follows:

- 476 1. Q4. We only consider two types of homes: apartments and single family homes. These two answers represent 94% of the  
477 raw answers.
- 478 2. Q15. We group the answers to the economic impact question into three levels as follows: (a) *None (0)*: No economic  
479 impact is reported; (b) *Mild (1)*: "I lost my job" or "I lost part or all of my savings" or "My business is in danger of  
480 bankruptcy" or "My employer is at risk of bankruptcy"; (c) *Severe (2)*: "I can't afford to buy food" and/or "I can't pay my  
481 rent or mortgage anymore".
- 482 3. Q25. We group the answers to the psychological impact question into three levels: (a) *None (0)*: No psychological  
483 impact is reported; (b) *Mild (1)*: "Excessive use of technology by adults (tablet, phone, TV)" and/or "Excessive use of  
484 technology by children (tablet, phone, TV)"; (c) *Severe (2)*: "High levels of anxiety" and/or "High levels of stress" and/or  
485 "High levels of loneliness" and/or "High levels of sadness" and/or "Loud arguments or fights with other members of the  
486 home" and/or "Excessive consumption of alcohol" and/or "Excessive consumption of drugs (prescription or other)".
- 487 4. Q14. We divide the target variable, *i.e.*, the willingness to be in confinement into two categories, as per the answers to  
488 question Q14: (a) *Unwilling (coded as 0)*: Willingness to be confined for 0 days, the person cannot stand it anymore; (b)  
489 *Long-term (coded as 1)*: Willingness to be confined for at least 6 months.

## 490 Logistic Regression Models

491 We built an explainable logistic regression model<sup>55</sup> to predict the unwillingness to be confined (binary variable) using the  
492 variables described in Table 2 –namely, *Phase, Age, Gender, Home, Household, Economic Impact (EcoI), Psychological Impact*  
493 *(PsyI) and 14-day COVID-19 Cumulative Incidence (CumInc)*– as our independent variables with plausible interactions among  
494 them.

495 Note that in this regression model, we reversed the coding of the target variable, *i.e.* we coded with a value of 1 the  
496 willingness to be confined for zero days (*i.e.* the unwillingness to be confined), and with a value of 0 the willingness to be  
497 confined for at least 6 months. We used this reverse coding, such that our target variable represents the *risk* for respondents not  
498 to accept a confinement, thus being consistent with the risk analyses that are typically done in logistic regression modeling via  
499 an Odds Ratio (OR) methodology.

500 First, we built a complete model that included all the variables and interactions between them. Next, we performed feature  
501 selection by means of a bidirectional step-wise variable selection process, such that at each step we added or removed a main  
502 variable or an interaction according to the Akaike Information Criterion (AIC)<sup>56</sup>. Finally, we computed the p-value of all the  
503 remaining variables. If the p-values were not lower than 0.05 we performed a likelihood ratio test<sup>57</sup> between the model with the  
504 variable included and the model without the variable to determine whether to include such a variable in the final model or not.

505 We also used this model to automatically predict the target variable. Moreover, we carried out an Odds Ratio analysis to  
506 shed light on the role of each of the variables to determine the opposition to confinement, as described in the Results Section.

## 507 Automatic Pattern Extraction

508 In addition to the logistic regression analysis, we performed a qualitative study to automatically identify meaningful patterns  
509 that would differentiate the behaviours, impact and characteristics of those not willing to be confined vs those willing to be  
510 confined for a long time period.

511 We followed a two-step methodology to automatically extract the patterns from the survey answers:

<sup>1</sup>See, for example, <https://www.rtve.es/noticias/20200612/guia-fases-desescalada/2013020.html>

- 512 1. *Step 1: Selection of the most influential variables.* We identified the most influential variables with respect to our target  
513 variable (*i.e.*, the willingness to be confined). Note that not all the variables in our study might be relevant when modeling  
514 people's willingness to be confined. In this variable selection step, we used the Entropy-based Filters algorithm from the  
515 FSelectorRcpp library in R, which is based on the information gain, gain ratio and symmetrical uncertainty metrics.<sup>58</sup>
- 516 2. *Step 2: Automatic pattern generation,* via a modified version of the RBS algorithm<sup>59</sup>, a classifier based on the ID3  
517 family<sup>60</sup>. The RBS algorithm is an iterative method that, without building the full structure of a tree, automatically  
518 identifies a set of rules (patterns) from a data set of discrete variables. The subsequent ordering and filtering of the  
519 patterns depends on the *significance* of the rule, which is a metric based on the classic concepts of support and confidence  
520 of the classification rules, but defined by intervals. We adapted the RBS algorithm to be used with re-weighted input  
521 samples rather than absolute supports, as it is usually done.

522 As a result of this two-step process, we obtained the set of rules or patterns that best model our target binary variable  
523 (willingness or acceptance to be confined). Each of the automatically identified patterns or classification rules has the structure  
524 shown in Figure 6. The Results Section describes both the most influential variables and the patterns identified by our qualitative  
525 analysis.

## 526 Data availability

527 The survey answers analysed in this paper will be made available together with the manuscript.

## 528 Code

529 The code used to analyse the data will be placed in a publicly available github server.

## 530 References

- 531 1. Zheng, Q. *et al.* Hit-covid, a global database tracking public health interventions to covid-19. *Sci. data* **7**, 1–8 (2020).
- 532 2. Desvars-Larrive, A. *et al.* A structured open dataset of government interventions in response to covid-19. *Sci. data* **7**, 1–9  
533 (2020).
- 534 3. López, L. & Rodó, X. The end of social confinement and covid-19 re-emergence risk. *Nat. Hum. Behav.* **4**, 746–755  
535 (2020).
- 536 4. Lai, S. *et al.* Effect of non-pharmaceutical interventions to contain covid-19 in china. *Nature* **585**, 410–413 (2020).
- 537 5. Verity, R. *et al.* Estimates of the severity of coronavirus disease 2019: a model-based analysis. *The Lancet infectious*  
538 *diseases* **20**, 669–677 (2020).
- 539 6. Candido, D. S. *et al.* Evolution and epidemic spread of sars-cov-2 in brazil. *Science* **369**, 1255–1260 (2020).
- 540 7. Day, T., Gandon, S., Lion, S. & Otto, S. P. On the evolutionary epidemiology of sars-cov-2. *Curr. Biol.* **30**, R849–R857  
541 (2020).
- 542 8. Betsch, C. *et al.* Social and behavioral consequences of mask policies during the covid-19 pandemic. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci.*  
543 **117**, 21851–21853 (2020).
- 544 9. Gollwitzer, M., Platzer, C., Zwarg, C. & Göritz, A. S. Public acceptance of covid-19 lockdown scenarios. *Int. J. Psychol.*  
545 (2020).
- 546 10. Wang, Y. *et al.* The impact of quarantine on mental health status among general population in china during the covid-19  
547 pandemic. *Mol. psychiatry* 1–10 (2021).
- 548 11. Liu, W., Yue, X.-G. & Tchounwou, P. B. Response to the covid-19 epidemic: the chinese experience and implications for  
549 other countries (2020).
- 550 12. Abiad, A., Arao, R. M. & Dagli, S. The economic impact of the covid-19 outbreak on developing asia. (2020).
- 551 13. Fernandes, N. Economic effects of coronavirus outbreak (covid-19) on the world economy. *Available at SSRN 3557504*  
552 (2020).
- 553 14. Ivanov, D. Predicting the impacts of epidemic outbreaks on global supply chains: A simulation-based analysis on the  
554 coronavirus outbreak (covid-19/sars-cov-2) case. *Transp. Res. Part E: Logist. Transp. Rev.* **136**, 101922 (2020).
- 555 15. Chen, D.-G., Chen, X. & Chen, J. K. Reconstructing and forecasting the covid-19 epidemic in the united states using a  
556 5-parameter logistic growth model. *Glob. Heal. Res. Policy* **5**, 1–7 (2020).



- 557 **16.** Clemens, V. *et al.* Potential effects of " social" distancing measures and school lockdown on child and adolescent mental  
558 health. *Eur. Child & Adolesc. Psychiatry* (2020).
- 559 **17.** Jiao, W. Y. *et al.* Behavioral and emotional disorders in children during the covid-19 epidemic. *The Journal Pediatr.* **221**,  
560 264 (2020).
- 561 **18.** Sadati, A. K., B Lankarani, M. H. & Bagheri Lankarani, K. Risk society, global vulnerability and fragile resilience;  
562 sociological view on the coronavirus outbreak (2020).
- 563 **19.** Mukhtar, S. Psychological health during the coronavirus disease 2019 pandemic outbreak. *Int. J. Soc. Psychiatry*  
564 0020764020925835 (2020).
- 565 **20.** Gao, J. *et al.* Mental health problems and social media exposure during covid-19 outbreak. *Plos one* **15**, e0231924 (2020).
- 566 **21.** Hawryluck, L. *et al.* Sars control and psychological effects of quarantine, toronto, canada. *Emerg. infectious diseases* **10**,  
567 1206 (2004).
- 568 **22.** Fischer, R. *et al.* Rapid review and meta-meta-analysis of self-guided interventions to address anxiety, depression, and  
569 stress during covid-19 social distancing. *Front. psychology* **11** (2020).
- 570 **23.** Colombo, R. A., Wallace, M. & Taylor, R. An essential service decision model for aba providers during crisis. *Behav.*  
571 *Analysis Pract.* **1** (2020).
- 572 **24.** Seale, H. *et al.* Covid-19 is rapidly changing: Examining public perceptions and behaviors in response to this evolving  
573 pandemic. *medRxiv* (2020).
- 574 **25.** Yamada, Y. *et al.* Covidistress global survey dataset on psychological and behavioural consequences of the covid-19  
575 outbreak. *Sci. data* **8**, 1–23 (2021).
- 576 **26.** Bailon, C. *et al.* Covidaffect: Real-time monitoring of mood variations following the covid-19 outbreak. (2020).
- 577 **27.** Amat, F., Arenas, A., Falcó-Gimeno, A. & Muñoz, J. Pandemics meet democracy. experimental evidence from the covid-19  
578 crisis in spain. (2020).
- 579 **28.** Tintori, A. *et al.* Adaptive behavioural coping strategies as reaction to covid-19 social distancing in italy. *Eur. review for*  
580 *medical pharmacological sciences* **24**, 10860–10866 (2020).
- 581 **29.** Landi, G., Pakenham, K. I., Bocolini, G., Grandi, S. & Tossani, E. Health anxiety and mental health outcome during  
582 covid-19 lockdown in italy: the mediating and moderating roles of psychological flexibility. *Front. psychology* **11**, 2195  
583 (2020).
- 584 **30.** McBride, O. *et al.* Monitoring the psychological impact of the covid-19 pandemic in the general population: an overview  
585 of the context, design and conduct of the covid-19 psychological research consortium (c19pre) study. (2020).
- 586 **31.** Freeman, D. *et al.* Coronavirus conspiracy beliefs, mistrust, and compliance with government guidelines in england.  
587 *Psychol. Medicine* 1–13 (2020).
- 588 **32.** Chan, H. F., Skali, A., Savage, D. A., Stadelmann, D. & Torgler, B. Risk attitudes and human mobility during the covid-19  
589 pandemic. *Sci. reports* **10**, 1–13 (2020).
- 590 **33.** Oliver, N., Barber, X., Roomp, K. & Roomp, K. Assessing the impact of the covid-19 pandemic in spain: Large-scale,  
591 online, self-reported population survey. *J Med Internet Res* **22**, e21319, [10.2196/21319](https://doi.org/10.2196/21319) (2020).
- 592 **34.** Organisation, W. H. Pandemic fatigue. reinvigorating the public to prevent covid-19. *Policy framework*  
593 *for supporting pandemic prevention management* (2020). <https://apps.who.int/iris/bitstream/handle/10665/335820/WHO-EURO-2020-1160-40906-55390-eng.pdf>.
- 594 **35.** Reicher, S. & Drury, J. Pandemic fatigue? how adherence to covid-19 regulations has been misrepresented and why it  
595 matters. *BMJ* **372**, [10.1136/bmj.n137](https://doi.org/10.1136/bmj.n137) (2021). <https://www.bmj.com/content/372/bmj.n137.full.pdf>.
- 597 **36.** Zerbe, K. J. Pandemic fatigue: Facing the body's inexorable demands in the time of covid-19. *J. Am. Psychoanal. Assoc.*  
598 **68**, 475–478, [10.1177/0003065120938774](https://doi.org/10.1177/0003065120938774) (2020). PMID: 32589057, <https://doi.org/10.1177/0003065120938774>.
- 599 **37.** Al-Tammemi, A. B., Tarhini, Z. & Akour, A. A swaying between successive pandemic waves and pandemic fatigue:  
600 Where does jordan stand? *Annals Medicine Surg.* **65**, 102298, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.amsu.2021.102298> (2021).
- 601 **38.** MacIntyre, C. R. *et al.* Mask use, risk-mitigation behaviours and pandemic fatigue during the covid-19 pandemic in five  
602 cities in australia, the uk and usa: A cross-sectional survey. *Int. J. Infect. Dis.* **106**, 199–207, [https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijid.](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijid.2021.03.056)  
603 [2021.03.056](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijid.2021.03.056) (2021).

- 604 **39.** Seiter, J. S. & Curran, T. Social-distancing fatigue during the covid-19 pandemic: a mediation analysis of cognitive  
605 flexibility, fatigue, depression, and adherence to cdc guidelines. *Commun. Res. Reports* **38**, 68–78, [10.1080/08824096.](https://doi.org/10.1080/08824096.2021.1880385)  
606 [2021.1880385](https://doi.org/10.1080/08824096.2021.1880385) (2021). <https://doi.org/10.1080/08824096.2021.1880385>.
- 607 **40.** Ilesanmi, O. S., Bello, A. E. & Afolabi, A. A. Covid-19 pandemic response fatigue in africa: causes, consequences,  
608 and counter-measures. *The Pan Afr. medical journal* **37(Suppl 1)**, <https://doi.org/10.11604/pamj.suppl.2020.37.37.26742>  
609 (2020).
- 610 **41.** Petherick, A. *et al.* A worldwide assessment of covid-19 pandemic-policy fatigue. (2021).
- 611 **42.** Petersen, E. *et al.* Covid-19—we urgently need to start developing an exit strategy. *Int. J. Infect. Dis.* (2020).
- 612 **43.** Kimhi, S., Marciano, H., Eshel, Y. & Adini, B. Resilience and demographic characteristics predicting distress during the  
613 covid-19 crisis. *Soc. Sci. Medicine* **265**, 113389, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.socscimed.2020.113389> (2020).
- 614 **44.** Galasso, V. *et al.* Gender differences in covid-19 attitudes and behavior: Panel evidence from eight countries. *Proc. Natl.*  
615 *Acad. Sci.* **117**, 27285–27291 (2020).
- 616 **45.** Haischer, M. H. *et al.* Who is wearing a mask? gender-, age-, and location-related differences during the covid-19  
617 pandemic. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0240785> (2020).
- 618 **46.** The impact of the covid-19 pandemic on women’s mental health. *Arch Womens Ment Heal.* **23**, [https://doi.org/10.1007/](https://doi.org/10.1007/s00737-020-01092-2)  
619 [s00737-020-01092-2](https://doi.org/10.1007/s00737-020-01092-2) (2020).
- 620 **47.** Gender dimensions of the covid-19 pandemic. *World Bank Policy Note* (2020).
- 621 **48.** Rodríguez-Rey, R., Garrido-Hernansaiz, H. & Collado, S. Psychological impact and associated factors during the  
622 initial stage of the coronavirus (covid-19) pandemic among the general population in spain. *Front. Psychol.* **11**, 1540,  
623 [10.3389/fpsyg.2020.01540](https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2020.01540) (2020).
- 624 **49.** The psychological impact of the covid-19 epidemic on college students in china. *Psychiatry research* **287**, [https://doi.org/](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.psychres.2020.112934)  
625 [10.1016/j.psychres.2020.112934](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.psychres.2020.112934) (2020).
- 626 **50.** Psychological impact of the covid-19 pandemic on health care workers in singapore. *Ann Intern Med.* **173**, 317–320,  
627 [doi:10.7326/M20-1083](https://doi.org/10.7326/M20-1083) (2020).
- 628 **51.** Brooks, S. K. *et al.* The psychological impact of quarantine and how to reduce it: rapid review of the evidence. *The lancet*  
629 **395**, 912–920 (2020).
- 630 **52.** Covid-19 pandemic and psychological fatigue in turkey. *Int. journal social psychiatry advance online publication*,  
631 [10.1177/0020764020941889](https://doi.org/10.1177/0020764020941889) (2020).
- 632 **53.** Terry, P. C., Parsons-Smith, R. L. & Terry, V. R. Mood responses associated with covid–19 restrictions. *Front. Psychol.* **11**,  
633 3090 (2020).
- 634 **54.** Ceylan, R. F., Ozkan, B. & Mulazimogullari, E. Historical evidence for economic effects of covid-19 (2020).
- 635 **55.** Bruin, J. newtest: command to compute new test @ONLINE (2011).
- 636 **56.** Akaike, H. Information theory and an extension of the maximum likelihood principle. In *Selected papers of hirotugu*  
637 *akaike*, 199–213 (Springer, 1998).
- 638 **57.** Hosmer, D. W., Hosmer, T., Le Cessie, S. & Lemeshow, S. A comparison of goodness-of-fit tests for the logistic regression  
639 model. *Stat. medicine* **16**, 965–980 (1997).
- 640 **58.** Fayyad, U. & Irani, K. Multi-interval discretization of continuous-valued attributes for classification learning. (1993).
- 641 **59.** Almiñana, M., Escudero, L., Pérez-Martín, A., Rabasa, A. & Santamaría, L. A classification rule reduction algorithm  
642 based on significance domains. *Top* **22**, 397–418 (2014).
- 643 **60.** Quinlan, J. Introduction of decision trees machine learning. *Boston (NL): Kluwer Acad. Publ.* **1**, 86–106 (1986).

## 644 Acknowledgements

645 This work is partially supported by grants FONDOS SUPERA COVID-19 Santander-CRUE, 2020–2021, Fundación BBVA a  
646 equipos de investigación científica SARS-CoV-2 COVID-19, IA4COVID19 2020-2022 and the Valencian Government.

## 647 **Author contributions**

648 M.M-G. Contributed to the study design, performed the data processing and logistic regression modeling.

649 A.R. Contributed to the study design, performed the qualitative modeling and automatic pattern extraction.

650 X.B. Contributed to the study design, performed the data processing and logistic regression modeling.

651 K.P. Contributed to the study design, performed the qualitative modeling and automatic pattern extraction.

652 K.R. Contributed to the design and implementation of the online survey and raw data processing.

653 N.O. Contributed to the design and implementation of the online survey, the study design, the coordination of all the tasks, data  
654 analysis and insights extraction.

655

656 All authors contributed to the drafting of the manuscript.

## 657 **Competing interests**

658 The authors declare none.

## 659 **Additional information**

660 This submission includes a Supplementary Information file.

661 Correspondence and request for materials should be addressed to N. O.

Variable/Values	Explanation
<i>Willingness to be confined</i>	
0	Willingness to be confined for 0 days
1	Willingness to be confined for $\geq 6$ months
<i>Phase</i>	
Workplace closure 28th March 2020	Closure of all non-essential labor
Workplace reopening 12th April 2020	Return to work in sectors affected by Workplace closure
Walks allowed 28th April 2020	Citizens are allowed to leave their homes to go for walks after domiciliary confinement
Phase 0 4th May 2020	Public transport/museums/churches at 33% capacity; Takeaway food open
Phase I 11th May 2020	Phase 0 + Reopening of Hotels (except common areas); Restaurant terraces to 50% capacity; Mobility inside the province to travel to second residences
Phase II 25th May 2020	Phase I + Reop. non-university classrooms; Restoration/malls(non common areas)/churches at 50%; Reop. beaches; Cultural spaces/ hotels common areas to 33%
Phase III 8th Jun 2020	Phase II + Reop. discos without dance floor at 50% capacity; Public transport at 100% capacity; Reop. hotels/malls common areas/cultural spaces at 50% capacity; Mobility inside the autonomous region
New Normal (21st Jun 2020 onwards)	Normal activity is resumed; Masks are compulsory in public spaces
<i>Age (Q1)</i>	
“18-29”	18 to 29 years old
“30-49”	30 to 49 years old
“50-59”	50 to 59 years old
“60+”	60 or more years old
<i>Gender (Q2)</i>	
Man	Male respondents
Woman	Female respondents
<i>Home (Q5)</i>	
Apartment	The respondent lives in an apartment
Single family	The respondent lives in a single family house
<i>Household (Q6)</i>	
Young	Every house member is aged < 60 years old
Elderly	Without any children at home and every house member aged 60+
Multi-generational	With children (aged < 18) and members aged 60+
<i>Economic Impact (Q15)</i>	
None	No economic impact is reported
Mild	I lost my job, I lost part or all of my savings, My business is in danger of bankruptcy My employer is at risk of bankruptcy
Severe	I can't afford to buy food, I can't pay my rent or mortgage anymore
<i>Psychological Impact (Q25)</i>	
None	No psychological impact is reported
Mild	Excessive use of technology by adults (tablet, phone, TV), Excessive use of technology by children (tablet, phone, TV)
Severe	High levels of anxiety, High levels of stress, High levels of loneliness, High levels of sadness, Loud arguments or fights with other members of the home, Excessive consumption of alcohol, Excessive consumption of drugs (prescription or other)
<i>CumInc</i>	Average 14-day Cumulative Incidence per 100,000 people in each of the 17 Autonomous Regions in Spain

**Table 1.** Independent and dependent variables used in our study.




Variable	0 days	6 or more months
Willingness to be confined	7,887 (39.3%)	12,167(60.7%)
Phase		
Workplace closure	55 (14.2%)	331 (85.8%)
Workplace reopening	626 (24.8%)	1,894 (75.2%)
Walks allowed	516 (36.9%)	883 (63.1%) *
Phase 0	426 (30.4%)	977 (69.6%)
Phase I	653 (40.0%)	979 (60.0%) *
Phase II	602 (43.1%)	794 (56.9%)
Phase III	377 (40.2%)	561 (59.8%) *
New Normal	4,632 (44.6%)	5,748 (55.4%)
Age		
18-29	885 (47.3%)	988 (52.7%)
30-49	3,549 (39.9%)	5,338 (60.1%) *
50-59	2,095 (39.1%)	3,263 (60.9%) *
60+	1,358 (34.5%)	2,578 (65.5%)
Gender		
Male	4,883 (41.3%)	6,934 (58.7%)
Female	3,004 (36.5%)	5,233 (63.5%)
Home		
Apartment	5,265 (41%)	7,579 (59%)
Single family	2,622 (36.4%)	4,588 (63.3%)
Household		
Young	5,529 (40.8%)	8,006 (59.2%)
Elderly	1,863 (34.6%)	1,629 (65.4%)
Multi-generational	1,495 (37.1%)	2,532 (62.9%)
Economic Impact		
None	4,139 (68.6%)	9,036 (31.4%)
Mild	2,514 (47.5%)	2,273 (52.5%)
Severe	1,063 (34.9%)	571 (65.1%)
Psychological Impact		
None	2,612 (25.0%)	7,822 (75.0%)
Mild	1,859 (47.2%)	2,081 (52.8%)
Severe	3,416 (60.1%)	2,264 (39.9%)


**Table 2.** Descriptive statistics of the subset of answers to the survey analyzed in this paper. All the variables pass a proportions test, with p-values < 0.001, except for the variables marked with \*

Variable	Significant interactions with
Phase	PsyI, Gender, Household
Gender	EcoI, Home, Phase, Household
Age	PsyI
Home	Gender
Household	PsyI, Phase, Gender
EcoI	PsyI, Age, Gender
PsyI	EcoI, Age, Household, Phase
CumInc	–


**Table 3.** Significant interactions identified by the logistic regression model.



**Figure 3.** Odds Ratios for the main variables of the models per phase. a) CumInc b) Psychological Impact, c) Economic Impact, d) Age, E) Type of Home and F) Gender. Each point on the X axis corresponds to the OR of the logistic model for that particular phase.




**Figure 4.** a) Confidence statistics of the patterns in each phase for the willingness to be confined for 6 months or longer. b) Support statistics of the identified patterns in each phase. c) Confidence statistics of the patterns in each phase for the willingness to be confined for 0 days. d) Weights of the most important variables according to our pattern detection method per confinement Phase.



**Figure 5.** Confinement phases and daily number of confirmed COVID-19 cases in Spain between March and September of 2020. The shaded part of the graph corresponds to the time period of analysis.





**Figure 6.** Example of two of the patterns identified by our pattern extraction method.