

1 **Face covering adherence is positively associated with better mental**  
2 **health and wellbeing: a longitudinal analysis of the CovidLife surveys**

3 Drew Altschul<sup>1</sup>, Chloe Fawns-Ritchie<sup>1</sup>, Alex Kwong<sup>2</sup>, Louise Hartley<sup>3</sup>, Clifford Nangle<sup>3</sup>, Rachel Edwards<sup>4</sup>,  
4 Rebecca Dawson<sup>3</sup>, Christie Levein<sup>4</sup>, Archie Campbell<sup>3,4</sup>, Robin Flaig<sup>3,4</sup>, Andrew McIntosh<sup>2</sup>, Ian Deary<sup>1</sup>,  
5 Riccardo Marioni<sup>4</sup>, Caroline Hayward<sup>5</sup>, Cathie Sudlow<sup>3,4</sup>, Elaine Douglas<sup>6</sup>, David Bell<sup>6</sup>, David Porteous<sup>3,4</sup>

6

- 7 1. Department of Psychology, The University of Edinburgh, Edinburgh, UK  
8 2. Division of Psychiatry, Centre for Clinical Brain Sciences, University of Edinburgh, UK  
9 3. Usher Institute for Population Health Sciences and Informatics, University of Edinburgh,  
10 Edinburgh, UK  
11 4. Centre for Genomic and Experimental Medicine, Institute of Genetics & Molecular Medicine,  
12 University of Edinburgh, Edinburgh, UK  
13 5. MRC Human Genetics Unit, Institute of Genetics and Molecular Medicine, University of  
14 Edinburgh, Edinburgh, UK  
15 6. University of Stirling, Stirling, UK

16

17

18

19 Corresponding Author: Drew Altschul, Department of Psychology, The University of Edinburgh,  
20 Edinburgh, UK, EH8 9JZ

21 **Email:** [drew.altschul@ed.ac.uk](mailto:drew.altschul@ed.ac.uk)

22

23

24 **Abstract**

25

26 Face masks or coverings are effective at reducing airborne infection rates, yet pandemic  
27 mitigation measures, including wearing face coverings, have been suggested to contribute to  
28 reductions in quality of life and poorer mental health. Longitudinal analyses of more than 11,000  
29 participants across the UK found no association between lower adherence to face covering  
30 guidelines and poorer mental health. The opposite appears to be true. Even after controlling for  
31 behavioral, social, and psychological confounds, including measures of pre-pandemic mental  
32 health, individuals who wore face coverings “most of the time” or “always” had better mental  
33 health and wellbeing than those who did not. These results suggest that wearing face coverings  
34 more often will not negatively impact mental health.

35

36

37

## 38 Introduction

39

40 Regulatory bodies and governments around the world recommend wearing face masks,  
41 termed 'face coverings' by the UK government, to control the spread of the 2019 novel  
42 coronavirus SARS-Co-V2 (Klompas et al., 2020) because face coverings are an effective low-  
43 cost measure for reducing the spread of infectious aerosols and droplets (Fischer et al., 2020).  
44 Wearing face coverings thus helps protect others from catching coronavirus, reducing spread  
45 (Lyu & Wehby, 2020), although high adherence to face covering guidelines is necessary for this  
46 to have an impact at the population level (Eikenberry et al., 2020).

47 Many of the most effective measures that reduce coronavirus transmission, such as  
48 distancing, have negative impacts on individual wellbeing and mental health at the population  
49 level (Qiu et al., 2020; Rossi et al., 2020). Since the pandemic began increases in loneliness,  
50 stress, anxiety, and depression, and decreases in life satisfaction and wellbeing have been  
51 reported (Kwong et al., 2020; Luchetti et al., 2020; Salari et al., 2020; Satici et al., 2020).  
52 Wearing face coverings does not have obvious, direct links to negative experiences such as  
53 self-isolation or quarantine (Brooks et al., 2020), but might induce negative experiences through  
54 physical discomfort, communication difficulties, or stigmatization (Czypionka et al., 2020). This  
55 been the topic of public and informal debates (Czypionka et al., 2020; Howard et al., 2020),  
56 which often do not take evidence into account. The public confusion this debate creates may in  
57 turn drive non-compliance (Lyu & Wehby, 2020). Evidence for or against an impact of wearing  
58 face coverings on individuals' lived experience would be valuable.

59 The CovidLife surveys<sup>1</sup> are a longitudinal UK-wide study of over 18,000 individuals  
60 begun during the early stages of the 2020 lockdown. Here, we used CovidLife data across

---

<sup>1</sup> <https://www.ed.ac.uk/generation-scotland/covidlife-volunteers/what-is-covidlife>

61 surveys to investigate the relationships between adherence to guidelines on face coverings and  
62 wellbeing, life satisfaction, anxiety, depression, and loneliness.

63

## 64 **Methods**

### 65 ***Data collection and study sample***

66 UK residents aged 18 years and over were eligible to take part in the CovidLife surveys<sup>2</sup>.  
67 Data were collected via the Qualtrics platform. Data collection for Survey 1 commenced on 17  
68 April and closed to new responses on 7 June 2020. This period overlapped with the first period  
69 of UK-wide 'lockdown'. Survey 2 data were collected 21 July to 17 August 2020. This  
70 corresponded period when the UK government made face coverings mandatory on public  
71 transport and in many shops. More than 18,000 individuals responded to Survey 1, and of those  
72 that shared their email contact address, more than 11,000 returned to participate in Survey 2.

### 73 ***Variables and data processing***

74 All mental health outcome measures used here were asked in Survey 2 (Figure 1). In  
75 Survey 1, we asked individuals about their sense of loneliness and life satisfaction before and  
76 during lockdown. Mental health was assessed using common self-report instruments (e.g.  
77 Patient Health Questionnaire for depression – see below), which could be scored to create  
78 continuous outcomes (except loneliness, which was ordinal).

---

<sup>2</sup> [https://www.ed.ac.uk/files/atoms/files/2020-05-15\\_covidlifesurvey\\_report\\_final\\_web.pdf](https://www.ed.ac.uk/files/atoms/files/2020-05-15_covidlifesurvey_report_final_web.pdf)

79

80 Unless otherwise stated, the variables with  $n \sim 18,000$  were collected during Survey 1  
81 (e.g. pre-COVID-19 mental health) and variables with  $n \sim 11,000$  were collected during Survey  
82 2 (e.g. adherence to face covering guidance).

83 **Depression.** Depression was assessed with the Patient Health Questionnaire (PHQ-9)  
84 (Kroenke et al., 2001), which consisted of 9 questions asking about depressive symptoms. Each  
85 question was scored from 1 to 4, with higher values indicating increased frequency of  
86 symptoms. The PHQ-9 was administered in both Surveys 1 and 2. Sum scores were created  
87 which ranged from 0 to 27 ( $M = 4.53$ ,  $SD = 5.20$ ,  $n = 10,408$  for scores assessed in Survey 2).  
88 Binary categorization used the recommended cut-off for possible depression ( $\geq 10$ ).

89 **Anxiety.** Anxiety was assessed with the Generalized Anxiety Disorder assessment  
90 (GAD-7) (Spitzer et al., 2006), which consisted of 7 questions asking about the presence of  
91 generalized anxiety disorder symptoms. Each question was scored from 1 to 4, with higher  
92 values indicating increased frequency of symptoms. The GAD-7 was administered in Surveys 1  
93 and 2. Sum scores were created which ranged from 0 to 21 ( $M = 3.65$ ,  $SD = 4.66$ ,  $n = 10,608$   
94 for scores assessed in survey 2). Binary categorization used the recommended cut-off for  
95 possible anxiety ( $\geq 10$ ).

96 **Wellbeing.** Subjective psychological wellbeing was assessed with the Warwick-  
97 Edinburgh Mental Wellbeing Scale (WEMWBS) (Tennant et al., 2007), which consisted of 7  
98 items. Each question was scored from 1 to 5, with higher values indicating better wellbeing. The  
99 WEMWBS was administered in surveys 1 and 2. Sum scores were created which ranged from 7  
100 to 35 ( $M = 24.82$ ,  $SD = 5.03$ ,  $n = 11,084$  for scores assessed in Survey 2). Binary categorization  
101 used the recommended cut-off ( $\leq 17$ ).

102           **Loneliness.** Loneliness was assessed with a single question asking “*How often have*  
103 *you felt lonely during the past week?*” (Altschul et al., 2020; Solano, 1980). Loneliness prior to  
104 lockdown was assessed with a similar question: “*Think back to before COVID-19 measures*  
105 *were introduced (i.e., January 2020), how often did you feel lonely then?*” Participants could  
106 choose between “*None, or almost none of the time*”, “*Some of the time*”, “*Most of the time*”, “*All,*  
107 *or almost all of the time*”, “*Don’t know*”, “*Prefer not to answer*” in response to both questions. For  
108 the period before COVID-19, 13,560 people (77%) reported being lonely “*almost none of the*  
109 *time*”, 3,781 (21%) were lonely “*some of the time*”, 240 (>1%) were lonely “*most of the time*” and  
110 72 (<1%) were lonely “*all, or almost all the time*”. By the time of Survey 2, 7,957 people (77%)  
111 were lonely “*almost none of the time*”, 2,703 (24%) were lonely “*some of the time*”, 331 (3%)  
112 were lonely “*most of the time*” and 143 (>1%) were lonely “*all, or almost all the time*”. Note that  
113 the number of respondents in Survey 2 (n=17,653) was less than in Survey 1 (n=11,134). For  
114 the purposes of binary categorization, individuals who answered “*most of the time*”, or “*all, or*  
115 *almost all of the time*” were classified as being lonely, and others were not.

116           **Life satisfaction.** Life satisfaction (Mazaheri & Theuns, 2009; Pavot et al., 1991) was  
117 assessed with a single question asking “*how satisfied are you with your life nowadays?*” Life  
118 satisfaction prior to the pandemic was assessed with the question “*Thinking back to just before*  
119 *the COVID-19 measures were introduced (i.e., January 2020), how satisfied were you with your*  
120 *life then?*” Participants were asked to answer the question using a 0 to 10 scale, where 0  
121 indicated being not at all satisfied with life, and 10 indicated being extremely satisfied with life.

122           **Prior mental health diagnoses.** In Survey 1, participants were categorized as having a  
123 mental diagnosis relevant to anxiety or depression if they reported being diagnosed with any of  
124 the following: “*Anxiety, nerves or generalised anxiety disorder*”, “*Depression*”, “*Mania,*  
125 *hypomania, bipolar or manic-depression*”, “*Panic attacks*”, or “*Social anxiety or social phobia*”. In

126 Survey 1, 5,729 individuals had at least one such diagnosis, and 12,016 did not. 311 chose not  
127 to answer.

128 **Face covering.** In a response matrix, participants were asked about various government  
129 guidelines: “*Have you been following the government guidance on*” and a list followed. The  
130 particular prompt under study was “*Wearing face coverings on public transport and in shops*”.  
131 Participants could respond “*Always*” (coded 4,  $n = 10,180$ , 92%), “*Most of the time*” (coded 3,  $n$   
132 = 592, 5%), “*Some of the time*”, (coded 2,  $n = 172$ , 2%), and “*Never*” (coded 1,  $n = 120$ , 1%).

133 **Age & sex.** Participants were asked their date of birth in Survey 1 and age was  
134 calculated from this ( $M = 56.6$ ,  $SD = 14.34$ ,  $n = 18,328$ ). After this, participants were asked  
135 “*What is your sex? As assigned at birth*” and could answer “*Male*” (coded 1,  $n = 5999$ , 33%),  
136 “*Female*” (coded 2,  $n = 12,299$ , 67%), or “*Prefer not to answer*” ( $n = 125$ , <1%).

137 **Personality.** 30 questions from the 50-item International Personality Item Pool 5 factor  
138 instrument (Goldberg et al., 2006; Gow et al., 2005), those used to assess conscientiousness  
139 ( $M = 37.85$ ,  $SD = 6.16$ ,  $n = 17,356$ , 94% completed the questions), extraversion ( $M = 30.58$ ,  $SD$   
140 = 8.02,  $n = 17,424$ , 95% completed), and emotional stability ( $M = 33.56$ ,  $SD = 8.45$ ,  $n = 17,425$ ,  
141 95% completed), were asked during Survey 1.

142 **Psychological resilience.** Resilience was measured using the Brief Resilience Scale  
143 (Smith et al., 2008), which consists of 6 questions rated from 1 (“*strongly agree*”) to 5 (“*strongly*  
144 *disagree*”). A sum score of these items was constructed to represent overall trait resilience ( $M =$   
145 21.34,  $SD = 4.94$ ,  $n = 11,107$ , 98% completed).

146 **Living circumstances.** In Survey 1, participants were asked “*Including yourself, how*  
147 *many people live in your household?*” and could answer anywhere between 1 and 12+ ( $M =$   
148 1.28,  $SD = 1.11$ ,  $n = 17,955$ ). In Survey 1, participants were asked “*What type of*

149 *accommodation do you live in?*” and could choose from options: *“House or bungalow”, “Flat or*  
150 *apartment”, “Hostel”, “Mobile home or caravan”, “Sheltered housing”, “Homeless”, “Other”, and*  
151 *“Prefer not to answer”*. More affluent accommodations were lower in value (e.g. *“house”* was  
152 recorded as 1, the lowest value on the scale) ( $M = 1.23$ ,  $SD = 0.48$ ,  $n = 17,172$ ). In Survey 1,  
153 participants were asked *“How many rooms are there in your house? Count living rooms,*  
154 *bedrooms, kitchens, utility rooms and studies. Do not count toilets, bathrooms, halls, landings,*  
155 *or cupboards”*. Participants could answer anywhere from 1 to 15+ ( $M = 6.01$ ,  $SD = 2.06$ ,  $n =$   
156  $17,185$ ). In Survey 2, participants were asked *“Do you have a partner that you live with? This*  
157 *could be someone you are married to/in a civil relationship with, or a person with whom you are*  
158 *co-habiting”*. Participants could answer *“Yes, I live with a partner”* (coded 1,  $n = 8,327$ ), *“No, I do*  
159 *not live with a partner”* (coded 0,  $n = 2,864$ ), and *“Prefer not to say”* ( $n = 311$ ).

160 **Student status.** Whether a participant reported being a student (coded 0,  $n = 17,592$ ), a  
161 part-time student (coded 1,  $n = 314$ ), or a full-time student (coded 2,  $n = 378$ ).

162 **Self-rated health.** Both general and mental health were assessed. Participants were  
163 asked *“In general, would you say your health is”* and *“In general, would you say your emotional*  
164 *or mental health is”* and could answer between *“excellent”* (1) and *“poor”* (5). General ( $M = 2.45$ ,  
165  $SD = 1.01$ ,  $n = 18,307$ ) and mental ( $M = 2.42$ ,  $SD = 1.03$ ,  $n = 18,305$ ) health responses were  
166 comparable.

167 **Educational qualification.** Participants were asked *“What is the highest educational*  
168 *qualification you have obtained?”* Responses available were *“Postgraduate degree”*,  
169 *“Undergraduate degree”*, *“Other professional or technical qualification”*, *“NVQ or HND or HNC or*  
170 *equivalent”*, *“Higher grade, A levels, AS levels or equivalent”*, *“Standard grade, National 4 or 5,*  
171 *O levels, GCSEs or equivalent”*, *“CSEs or equivalent”*, *“School leavers certificate”*, *“Other*  
172 *(please specify)”* with an attached open field to indicate the type of other, non-high school



173 qualification, “*No qualifications*”, and “*Prefer not to answer*”. The scale ran from 1 to 10, with 1  
174 representing “*No qualifications*” and 10 representing “*Postgraduate degree*” (M = 7.88, SD =  
175 2.18, n = 17,059).

176 **Contact outside your household.** In Survey 2, participants were asked “*When leaving*  
177 *your home, how likely are you to come into close contact with someone not living in your*  
178 *household? By close contact, we mean coming within 2 metres of someone*”. Participants could  
179 answer “*I don’t leave my home*” (1), “*Not at all likely*” (2), “*Not that likely*” (3), “*Somewhat likely*”  
180 (4) or “*Very likely*” (5). M = 3.70, SD = 0.99, n = 11,267. Participants were also separately asked  
181 “*How regularly do you do these activities now?*” about the several social activities. The answers  
182 available were “*Every day/almost every day*” (6), “*3-4 days a week*” (5), “*1-2 days a week*” (4),  
183 “*Less than once a week*” (3), “*Rarely*” (2), and “*Never*” (1). The particular prompts relevant to the  
184 study at hand were “*meet[ing] with family members face-to-face*” (M = 3.32, SD = 1.46, n =  
185 11,046) and “*meet[ing] with friends face-to-face*” (M = 2.88, SD = 1.19, n = 11044).

186 **Risk from getting COVID.** In both Survey 1 and 2 participants were asked “*Do you think*  
187 *that you have had, or currently have COVID-19?*” Possible responses were “*Yes, confirmed by*  
188 *a positive test*” (n = 60, <1%), “*Yes, suspected COVID-19 but was not tested*” (n = 1,205, 11%),  
189 and “*No*” (n = 10,020, 89%). Participants were also asked “*Have you been contacted by letter or*  
190 *text message to say you are at severe risk from COVID-19 due to an underlying health condition*  
191 *and should be shielding?*” and could answer “*Yes*” (n = 1,423, 8%) or “*No*” (n = 16,881, 92%).

## 192 **Statistical analyses**

193 Both linear and logistic regression models were used to investigate the associations between  
194 following guidance on wearing face coverings and measures of mental health and wellbeing.  
195 These models were longitudinal in that they allowed us to control for potential confounders  
196 including assessments of the outcomes (mental health and wellbeing) measured earlier, as well

197 as age, sex, personality, living circumstances, education, resilience, physical health, and  
198 behavioral factors such as frequency of leaving one's home, and meeting others (see section  
199 above). All analyses were conducted using the R programming language, version 3.6.1 (Ihaka &  
200 Gentleman, 1996). Analytic code is available on GitHub<sup>3</sup>.

### 201 ***Ethical approval***

202 The CovidLife study was reviewed and given a favorable opinion by the East of Scotland  
203 Research Ethics Committee (Reference: 20/ES/0021 AM02).

204

### 205 **Results**

206 Mean mental health and wellbeing scores were lower for individuals who adhere to face  
207 covering guidance less often (Table 1), except for anxiety. Mental health among less adherent  
208 groups also appears to be more broadly distributed.

209 Linear (and ordinal for loneliness) regression models of mental health outcomes are  
210 presented in Table 1. These models were fully adjusted for pre-COVID-19 mental health, which  
211 was operationalized through depression or anxiety relevant diagnoses for post-COVID-19  
212 depression and anxiety scores, and through self-reported assessment of pre-COVID-19  
213 loneliness and life satisfaction for those outcomes. Only subjective psychological wellbeing  
214 could not be adjusted in this way. Many other potential confounders were included (see the  
215 methods and Table 1). Better adherence to guidance on wearing face coverings was  
216 significantly associated with better mental health and wellbeing across all measures, even

---

<sup>3</sup> [https://github.com/dmaltuschul/FaceCovering\\_CovidLife](https://github.com/dmaltuschul/FaceCovering_CovidLife)

217 controlling for prior mental health and wellbeing, as well as other potentially confounding  
218 covariates.

219 The outcomes can also categorize individuals as having either poor mental health in a  
220 particular domain or not (Kwong et al., 2020). We fit logistic regression models with these  
221 outcomes, which give the odds of having poor mental health or wellbeing depending on degree  
222 of adherence. For each outcome, we fit basic and fully adjusted models. Basic logistic  
223 regression models controlled for age and sex. Fully adjusted models controlled for all the  
224 variables described in the methods section, as with our linear regression models. The results of  
225 the logistic regression models accord well with those presented in Table 1 and Figure 1. Except  
226 for depression, there were significant associations between wearing a face covering “*most of*  
227 *the time*” or “*always*” and better mental health. Odds ratio are illustrated in Figure 2, and the fully  
228 adjusted odds ratios are described in the following paragraphs.

229 The odds of feeling anxious were 58% lower among individuals who “*always*” adhered to  
230 guidance on wearing face coverings (adjusted OR=0.42, 95% CI=0.24 to 0.76, p=0.004), whilst  
231 the odds of having depressive symptoms were 25% lower among individuals who “*always*”  
232 adhered to guidance on face coverings (adjusted OR=0.75, 95% CI=0.40 to 1.42, p=0.36). The  
233 odds of feeling lonely most or all of time were 67% lower among individuals who always wore  
234 face coverings (adjusted OR=0.33, 95% CI=0.17 to 0.64, p<0.001), the odds of being satisfied  
235 with life were 60% higher among individuals who “*always*” wore face coverings (adjusted  
236 OR=0.40, 95% CI=0.25 to 0.65, p<0.001), and the odds of low wellbeing were 62% lower  
237 among individuals who “*always*” wore face coverings (adjusted OR=0.38, 95% CI=0.21 to 0.71,  
238 p=0.001).

239 Wearing a face covering “*some of the time*” was associated with 74% lower odds of poor  
240 wellbeing compared to those who “*never*” adhered (OR=0.26, 95% CI=0.10 – 0.67, p=0.006),

241 but otherwise, wearing a face covering only “*some of the time*” was not significantly associated  
242 with good mental health. Although adhering to guidance on wearing face coverings “*most of the*  
243 *time*” was significantly associated with good mental health and wellbeing for all the same  
244 outcomes as “*always*” adhering, the associations were not as strong, except for loneliness and  
245 anxiety. Wearing face coverings “*most of the time*” appeared to have a slightly stronger  
246 association with less loneliness (OR=0.32, 95% CI=0.15 – 0.72, p=0.005) and anxiety (OR=  
247 0.41, 95% CI=0.21 – 0.82, p=0.011).

248

## 249 **Discussion**

250 Adhering to government guidance on wearing face coverings was not associated with  
251 poorer mental health or wellbeing, nor with a negative impact on mental wellbeing, all else being  
252 equal. Indeed, the opposite appears to be the case: stronger adherence to guidelines is  
253 associated with less anxiety and loneliness, and higher life satisfaction and wellbeing.  
254 Moreover, the relationships among wearing face coverings and having better mental health and  
255 wellbeing could not be explained by relevant psychological, medical, sociodemographic, or  
256 behavioral factors.

257 Many of our control variables were associated with multiple aspects of mental health and  
258 wellbeing (Table 1), yet the associations between wearing face coverings and mental health  
259 outcomes survived adjustment. For instance, trait extraversion, a measure of an individual’s  
260 overall sociality, as well as frequency of leaving one’s home for personal encounters or how  
261 often one meets with friends or family, are all indicators of how often an individual is likely to  
262 leave their home to interact with people. Close (unshielded) person-to-person interaction is far  
263 and away the most common way the coronavirus is spread (Desai & Patel, 2020; World Health  
264 Organization, 2020); it has a strong bearing on international guidance on the value of face

265 coverings as an easily adopted, low cost mitigation measure. Nevertheless, including  
266 socialization variables as controls did not remove the association between wearing face  
267 coverings and mental wellbeing, suggesting that what a person does while wearing a face  
268 covering cannot be wholly responsible for mental wellbeing differences. Similarly, whether an  
269 individual already had poor mental health or wellbeing, or was predisposed to having poor  
270 mental wellbeing – either through low psychological resilience or having a previous mental  
271 health diagnosis – did not eliminate the association between wearing a face covering and better  
272 mental wellbeing. All this holds true for the range of socioeconomic and demographic variables  
273 we included that are known to relate to mental health and wellbeing outcomes (Stewart-Brown  
274 et al., 2015; Yu & Williams, 1999). There may simply be something about wearing a face  
275 covering that makes people feel safer, and reassured that they are “doing the right thing” for  
276 themselves and their community.

277 Relationships with wearing face coverings were found across all mental health and  
278 wellbeing measures, thus implying an underlying commonality. The only measure that was not  
279 fully consistent was depression, which may be due to relatively fewer reports of increased  
280 depressive symptoms post-pandemic, compared to other mental health and wellbeing measures  
281 (Kwong et al., 2020).

282 This study accords with earlier work that found that not adhering to guidance on wearing  
283 face coverings can be viewed negatively by others (Betsch et al., 2020). It reveals another side  
284 to adherence behavior: regardless of whether stigmatization or discomfort felt while wearing a  
285 face covering do or do not harm mental health and wellbeing, people who do not wear face  
286 coverings have lower mental health than those who do. Again, our results cannot be entirely  
287 explained by prior mental health or other factors.

288           Wearing face coverings in public can protect others from contracting coronavirus  
289   infections (Howard et al., 2020), but high uptake is necessary to prevent deaths from COVID  
290   (Eikenberry et al., 2020) and reduce stigma (Betsch et al., 2020), and voluntary policy does not  
291   appear to meet these thresholds (Eikenberry et al., 2020). Our findings from the CovidLife  
292   Surveys countermand speculation that face coverings may have a negative effect on mental  
293   health and wellbeing. Our data in fact provide strong evidence that following government  
294   guidance on face coverings is associated with better rather than poorer mental health and  
295   wellbeing. This evidence could be an important motivator for continued advocacy by policy  
296   makers and adherence by members of the public.

297

298

299

300

301

302

303

304

305

306 **References**

- 307 Altschul, D., Iveson, M., & Deary, I. J. (2020). Generational differences in loneliness and its  
308 psychological and sociodemographic predictors: An exploratory and confirmatory  
309 machine learning study. *Psychological Medicine*, 1–10.
- 310 Betsch, C., Korn, L., Sprengholz, P., Felgendreff, L., Eitze, S., Schmid, P., & Böhm, R. (2020).  
311 Social and behavioral consequences of mask policies during the COVID-19 pandemic.  
312 *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 117(36), 21851–21853.  
313 <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.2011674117>
- 314 Brooks, S. K., Webster, R. K., Smith, L. E., Woodland, L., Wessely, S., Greenberg, N., & Rubin, G.  
315 J. (2020). The psychological impact of quarantine and how to reduce it: Rapid review of  
316 the evidence. *The Lancet*, 395(10227), 912–920. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736(20)30460-8)  
317 [6736\(20\)30460-8](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736(20)30460-8)
- 318 Czypionka, T., Greenhalgh, T., Schmid, M., & Bassler, D. (2020). *Masks and face coverings for*  
319 *the lay public: A narrative update*. SocArXiv. <https://doi.org/10.31235/osf.io/wuk6a>
- 320 Desai, A. N., & Patel, P. (2020). Stopping the Spread of COVID-19. *JAMA*, 323(15), 1516.  
321 <https://doi.org/10.1001/jama.2020.4269>
- 322 Eikenberry, S. E., Mancuso, M., Iboi, E., Phan, T., Eikenberry, K., Kuang, Y., Kostelich, E., &  
323 Gumel, A. B. (2020). To mask or not to mask: Modeling the potential for face mask use  
324 by the general public to curtail the COVID-19 pandemic. *Infectious Disease Modelling*, 5,  
325 293–308. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.idm.2020.04.001>

- 326 Fischer, E. P., Fischer, M. C., Grass, D., Henrion, I., Warren, W. S., & Westman, E. (2020). Low-  
327 cost measurement of face mask efficacy for filtering expelled droplets during speech.  
328 *Science Advances*, 6(36), eabd3083. <https://doi.org/10.1126/sciadv.abd3083>
- 329 Goldberg, L. R., Johnson, J. A., Eber, H. W., Hogan, R., Ashton, M. C., Cloninger, C. R., & Gough,  
330 H. G. (2006). The international personality item pool and the future of public-domain  
331 personality measures. *Journal of Research in Personality*, 40(1), 84–96.  
332 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jrp.2005.08.007>
- 333 Gow, A. J., Whiteman, M. C., Pattie, A., & Deary, I. J. (2005). Goldberg’s ‘IPIP’ Big-Five factor  
334 markers: Internal consistency and concurrent validation in Scotland. *Personality and*  
335 *Individual Differences*, 39(2), 317–329.
- 336 Howard, J., Huang, A., Li, Z., Tufekci, Z., Zdimal, V., Westhuizen, H.-M. van der, Delft, A. von,  
337 Price, A., Fridman, L., Tang, L.-H., Tang, V., Watson, G. L., Bax, C. E., Shaikh, R., Questier,  
338 F., Hernandez, D., Chu, L. F., Ramirez, C. M., & Rimoin, A. W. (2020). *Face Masks Against*  
339 *COVID-19: An Evidence Review*. <https://doi.org/10.20944/preprints202004.0203.v1>
- 340 Ihaka, R., & Gentleman, R. (1996). R: a language for data analysis and graphics. *Journal of*  
341 *Computational and Graphical Statistics*, 5(3), 299–314.
- 342 Klompas, M., Morris, C. A., Sinclair, J., Pearson, M., & Shenoy, E. S. (2020). Universal Masking in  
343 Hospitals in the Covid-19 Era. *New England Journal of Medicine*, 382(21), e63.  
344 <https://doi.org/10.1056/NEJMp2006372>
- 345 Kroenke, K., Spitzer, R. L., & Williams, J. B. (2001). The PHQ-9: Validity of a brief depression  
346 severity measure. *Journal of General Internal Medicine*, 16(9), 606–613.




- 347 Kwong, A. S., Pearson, R. M., Adams, M. J., Northstone, K., Tilling, K., Smith, D., Fawns-Ritchie,  
348 C., Bould, H., Warne, N., & Zammit, S. (2020). Mental health before and during COVID-  
349 19 in two longitudinal UK population cohorts. *The British Journal of Psychiatry*, 1–27.
- 350 Luchetti, M., Lee, J. H., Aschwanden, D., Sesker, A., Strickhouser, J. E., Terracciano, A., & Sutin,  
351 A. R. (2020). The trajectory of loneliness in response to COVID-19. *American*  
352 *Psychologist*.
- 353 Lyu, W., & Wehby, G. L. (2020). Community Use Of Face Masks And COVID-19: Evidence From A  
354 Natural Experiment Of State Mandates In The US. *Health Affairs*, 39(8), 1419–1425.  
355 <https://doi.org/10.1377/hlthaff.2020.00818>
- 356 Mazaheri, M., & Theuns, P. (2009). Effects of varying response formats on self-ratings of life-  
357 satisfaction. *Social Indicators Research*, 90(3), 381.
- 358 Pavot, W., Diener, E., Colvin, C. R., & Sandvik, E. (1991). Further validation of the Satisfaction  
359 with Life Scale—Evidence for the cross-method convergence of well-being measures.  
360 *Journal of Personality Assessment*, 57, 149–161.
- 361 Qiu, J., Shen, B., Zhao, M., Wang, Z., Xie, B., & Xu, Y. (2020). A nationwide survey of  
362 psychological distress among Chinese people in the COVID-19 epidemic: Implications  
363 and policy recommendations. *General Psychiatry*, 33(2), e100213.  
364 <https://doi.org/10.1136/gpsych-2020-100213>
- 365 Rossi, R., Socci, V., Talevi, D., Mensi, S., Niolu, C., Pacitti, F., Di Marco, A., Rossi, A., Siracusano,  
366 A., & Di Lorenzo, G. (2020). COVID-19 Pandemic and Lockdown Measures Impact on  
367 Mental Health Among the General Population in Italy. *Frontiers in Psychiatry*, 11.  
368 <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsy.2020.00790>

- 369 Salari, N., Hosseinian-Far, A., Jalali, R., Vaisi-Raygani, A., Rasoulpoor, S., Mohammadi, M.,  
370 Rasoulpoor, S., & Khaledi-Paveh, B. (2020). Prevalence of stress, anxiety, depression  
371 among the general population during the COVID-19 pandemic: A systematic review and  
372 meta-analysis. *Globalization and Health*, *16*(1), 57. [https://doi.org/10.1186/s12992-020-](https://doi.org/10.1186/s12992-020-00589-w)  
373 [00589-w](https://doi.org/10.1186/s12992-020-00589-w)
- 374 Satıcı, B., Gocet-Tekin, E., Deniz, M. E., & Satıcı, S. A. (2020). Adaptation of the Fear of COVID-19  
375 Scale: Its association with psychological distress and life satisfaction in Turkey.  
376 *International Journal of Mental Health and Addiction*, *1*.
- 377 Smith, B. W., Dalen, J., Wiggins, K., Tooley, E., Christopher, P., & Bernard, J. (2008). The brief  
378 resilience scale: Assessing the ability to bounce back. *International Journal of Behavioral*  
379 *Medicine*, *15*(3), 194–200.
- 380 Solano, C. H. (1980). Two measures of loneliness: A comparison. *Psychological Reports*, *46*(1),  
381 23–28.
- 382 Spitzer, R. L., Kroenke, K., Williams, J. B., & Löwe, B. (2006). A brief measure for assessing  
383 generalized anxiety disorder: The GAD-7. *Archives of Internal Medicine*, *166*(10), 1092–  
384 1097.
- 385 Stewart-Brown, S., Samaraweera, P. C., Taggart, F., Kandala, N.-B., & Stranges, S. (2015).  
386 Socioeconomic gradients and mental health: Implications for public health. *The British*  
387 *Journal of Psychiatry*, *206*(6), 461–465.
- 388 Tennant, R., Hiller, L., Fishwick, R., Platt, S., Joseph, S., Weich, S., Parkinson, J., Secker, J., &  
389 Stewart-Brown, S. (2007). The Warwick-Edinburgh mental well-being scale (WEMWBS):  
390 Development and UK validation. *Health and Quality of Life Outcomes*, *5*(1), 63.


- 391 World Health Organization. (2020). *Modes of transmission of virus causing COVID-19:*  
392 *Implications for IPC precaution recommendations: Scientific brief, 27 March 2020.* World  
393 Health Organization.
- 394 Yu, Y., & Williams, D. R. (1999). Socioeconomic status and mental health. In *Handbook of the*  
395 *sociology of mental health* (pp. 151–166). Springer.
- 396

**Fig 1. Raincloud plots of adherence to face coverings and main outcome variables wellbeing, life satisfaction, anxiety, and depression.** The cloud portion of each plot is the smoothed distribution of all members of each category. The rain portions below show the raw, jittered observations that constitute the distributions. Boxplots illustrate the means, hinges represent the first and third quartiles, and the whiskers represent 1.5x the inter-quartile range. **a.** depression scored from 0 to 27, **b.** anxiety scored 0 to 21, **c.** subjective wellbeing scored from 7 to 35, **d.** life satisfaction scored from 0 to 10. Loneliness was not plotted in this manner due to the ordered nature of the data.

How often do you follow face covering guidelines?



**Fig 2. Minimally and fully adjusted odds ratios and confidence intervals for associations between wearing face coverings and mental health or wellbeing.** All outcomes were categorized such that a positive event represented having poor mental health for that measure, so odds ratios (ORs) less than 1 indicate lower odds of having poor mental health or wellbeing. Light red dots and bars indicate ORs and 95% CIs for models adjusted for only age and sex, whereas blue dots and bars indicate ORs and 95% CIs for models fully adjusted for all relevant covariates (see methods and Table 1 for listings of covariates). Black dots indicate the reference category, which was always “*never*”.



**Table 1. Standardized regression coefficients and 95% confidence intervals for fully adjusted linear regression models of following government guidance on wearing face coverings and mental health and wellbeing outcomes.**





Variable	Outcomes				
	Depression <i>ordinary least squares</i>	Anxiety <i>ordinary least squares</i>	Loneliness <i>ordered logistic</i>	Life satisfaction <i>ordinary least squares</i>	Wellbeing <i>ordinary least squares</i>
<b>Following guidance on wearing face coverings (higher values indicate more adherence)</b>	<b>-0.04*** (-0.05, -0.02)</b>	<b>-0.02* (-0.04, -0.005)</b>	<b>-0.11* (-0.21, -0.02)</b>	<b>0.04*** (0.02, 0.06)</b>	<b>0.02** (0.01, 0.03)</b>
Age	-0.15*** (-0.17, -0.13)	-0.08*** (-0.11, -0.06)	0.0001 (-0.13, 0.13)	0.02 (-0.01, 0.04)	0.06*** (0.04, 0.08)
Sex (female)	0.04*** (0.03, 0.06)	0.02 (-0.0001, 0.03)	0.08 (-0.03, 0.18)	-0.05*** (-0.07, -0.03)	-0.01 (-0.02, 0.01)
Conscientiousness	-0.05*** (-0.06, -0.03)	0.03*** (0.01, 0.05)	0.11* (0.004, 0.21)	-0.01 (-0.02, 0.01)	0.06*** (0.05, 0.08)
Extraversion	0.01 (-0.005, 0.02)	0.04*** (0.03, 0.06)	0.34*** (0.24, 0.45)	-0.05*** (-0.06, -0.03)	0.01 (-0.01, 0.02)
Emotional stability	-0.25*** (-0.27, -0.23)	-0.29*** (-0.31, -0.27)	-0.60*** (-0.74, -0.45)	0.06*** (0.04, 0.08)	0.19*** (0.17, 0.21)
Number of people living with	-0.004 (-0.02, 0.01)	0.04*** (0.02, 0.06)	-0.07 (-0.20, 0.06)	-0.01 (-0.03, 0.01)	-0.02* (-0.04, -0.003)
Accommodation type	0.02* (0.004, 0.04)	0.02* (0.005, 0.04)	0.07 (-0.04, 0.17)	-0.03*** (-0.05, -0.01)	-0.03*** (-0.04, -0.01)
Rooms in house	-0.01 (-0.03, 0.005)	-0.01 (-0.03, 0.004)	-0.18** (-0.30, -0.05)	-0.01 (-0.02, 0.01)	0.01 (-0.01, 0.02)
Student (yes)	0.04*** (0.02, 0.06)	0.04*** (0.02, 0.06)	0.09 (-0.02, 0.20)	-0.003 (-0.02, 0.02)	0.01 (-0.01, 0.02)
General health	0.10*** (0.08, 0.12)	0.02 (-0.004, 0.04)	-0.02 (-0.15, 0.10)	-0.03*** (-0.05, -0.01)	-0.05*** (-0.06, -0.03)
Mental health	0.22*** (0.19, 0.24)	0.15*** (0.12, 0.17)	0.68*** (0.53, 0.83)	-0.11*** (-0.13, -0.08)	-0.16*** (-0.18, -0.13)
Do you live with a partner? (yes)	-0.06*** (-0.07, -0.04)	-0.04*** (-0.06, -0.02)	-0.92*** (-1.03, -0.82)	0.07*** (0.05, 0.09)	0.08*** (0.06, 0.09)
Resilience	-0.11*** (-0.12, -0.09)	-0.21*** (-0.23, -0.19)	-0.74*** (-0.87, -0.61)	0.24*** (0.22, 0.26)	0.34*** (0.32, 0.36)
Educational qualification	0.003 (-0.01, 0.02)	-0.001 (-0.02, 0.02)	-0.13* (-0.23, -0.03)	-0.02** (-0.04, -0.01)	-0.03*** (-0.05, -0.02)



Loneliness before lockdown			1.14*** (1.04, 1.24)		
Life satisfaction before lockdown				0.27*** (0.25, 0.29)	
Has an anxiety or depression diagnosis (yes)	0.05*** (0.03, 0.07)	0.04*** (0.02, 0.06)			
How regularly do you meet with family?	0.001 (-0.01, 0.02)	-0.01 (-0.02, 0.01)	-0.24*** (-0.34, -0.13)	0.04*** (0.02, 0.05)	0.06*** (0.04, 0.07)
How regularly do you meet with friends?	-0.04*** (-0.05, -0.03)	-0.07*** (-0.09, -0.05)	-0.24*** (-0.35, -0.14)	0.06*** (0.04, 0.07)	0.05*** (0.03, 0.06)
When leaving your home, how likely are you to come into close contact with others?	-0.003 (-0.02, 0.01)	-0.001 (-0.02, 0.01)	-0.23*** (-0.34, -0.13)	0.01 (-0.01, 0.03)	0.02* (0.004, 0.03)
Have you had COVID? (yes)	0.04*** (0.02, 0.05)	0.04*** (0.02, 0.05)	0.25*** (0.16, 0.34)	-0.03*** (-0.04, -0.01)	-0.02** (-0.03, -0.01)
Are you at severe risk from COVID? (yes)	0.01 (-0.01, 0.02)	0.02** (0.01, 0.04)	0.25*** (0.15, 0.35)	-0.03*** (-0.05, -0.02)	-0.01 (-0.03, 0.003)
Intercept	0.01*** (0.004, 0.02)	0.03*** (0.02, 0.04)		-0.01*** (-0.02, -0.01)	-0.02*** (-0.03, -0.01)
Observations	9,544	9,745	10,268	10,370	10,373
R <sup>2</sup>	0.48	0.40		0.34	0.48
Adjusted R <sup>2</sup>	0.48	0.40		0.34	0.47
Residual Std. Error	0.34 (df = 9522)	0.38 (df = 9723)		0.40 (df = 10348)	0.36 (df = 10352)
F Statistic	415.70*** (df = 21; 9522)	314.61*** (df = 21; 9723)		259.31*** (df = 21; 10348)	468.47*** (df = 20; 10352)

Note:

\*p<0.05; \*\*p<0.01; \*\*\*p<0.005



Frequency of wearing a face covering

