Window Views: Difference of Perception during the COVID-19 Lockdown

Abstract

The provision of daylight, fresh air, and of a view outdoors are among the known characteristics of windows. But how does the perception of a window differ when it becomes the primary way of connecting to the physical world outside? In the first half of 2020, many countries resorted to strict lockdown measures to control the spread of the SARS-CoV-2 virus. The impact of such confinement, and the restriction to movement and social contact between people, is currently undergoing intense research. As such, this study reports the findings of a global online survey, administered before and after the COVID-19 outbreak, aimed at identifying whether any significant differences related to the lockdown could be observed in the perception of windows. The results confirm a practically relevant increase in the importance given to windows as a way to provide an external view and a visual and social connection with other people. Conversely, the role of the window as a conveyor of information on weather and time of the day was less prevalent. This is one of the first studies evaluating the differences in the perception of windows within a period of enforced lockdown. The findings can help capture the psychological impacts of confinement on people and may be relevant when transferred to other domains, such as periods of involuntary curfew and during hospitalisation.

Keywords

Windows; View; Perception; Preference; Lockdown

1. Introduction

The sudden outbreak of the SARS-CoV-2 virus across the globe in the first half of 2020 imposed strict confinement and social distancing measures in many countries as a means to limit the spread of the coronavirus disease (COVID-19) and reduce pressure on public healthcare systems (Wilder-Smith and Freedman 2020). In some countries,

even if no lockdown had been imposed, many people chose to stay at home and limit their contact with others (Chauhan and Singh 2020).

While these strict measures have helped to contain, at least partially, the spread of the pandemic, several questions arise in terms of the impacts that the lockdown might have had on the wellbeing of people. For example, personal space encroachment (Wang, Zhang et al. 2020), solitary living for extended periods of time (Mackolil and Mackolil 2020, Odriozola-González, Planchuelo-Gómez et al. 2020), working, schooling or exercising from home, etc., may have blurred the conventional notions of space and time, while reduced social contact might have affected people's feelings and attitudes particularly with respect to the perception of their surroundings.

In this context, it is well established in the literature that windows provide daylight, ventilation, and a multi-sensory (audio-visual) relationship with the outside (Heschong 2003, Veitch, Christoffersen et al. 2013). They convey information about the time of the day and the weather, and proximity to them is often favoured particularly for workspace locations (Boyce, Hunter et al. 2003, Asojo, Bae et al. 2020).

On the assumption that windows are potential sources of interest and connection with the external world, the aim of this paper is to investigate how perceptions of familiarity with the window; preference (like or dislike) (Kaplan, Kaplan et al. 1972, Herzog and Gale 1996, Herzog and Shier 2000) for the view out of the window; satisfaction with the view out of the window; satisfaction with the size of the room with respect to the size of the window; and, satisfaction with the respondent's location with respect to the window might have differed between a normal (pre-COVID-19) period and during the period of lockdown due to the COVID-19 pandemic.

2. Material and Method

2.1. The survey

A doctoral study is being conducted on window view preference by the first author of this paper. In this context, during the period between 21 October 2019 – 22 January 2020 an international online survey was run (*Survey 1*). The survey was structured into 24 questions, ranging from exploring window characteristics to perceptions of familiarity, view preference, satisfaction, etc. The questions were based on a review of the literature focused on window view preference (Christoffersen, Johnsen et al. 2000, Farley and Veitch 2001, Heschong 2003, Hellinga and Hordijk 2014, Matusiak and Klöckner 2016). Shortly after the data collection was completed, a lockdown was imposed in many parts of the world in response to the spread of the SARS-CoV-2 virus. This presented an opportunity to collect new data to compare with the existing dataset, and investigate any impact that such a radical change to the ways of working and living, and interactions (or lack thereof) with the external environment, might have had on window perception. The same survey was opened for four additional weeks on 5 April 2020 (*Survey 2*), when the global response on containment strategies was at its peak (Hale, Angrist et al. 2020). Hale, Atav et al. (2020) report that since the term 'lockdown' was defined and interpreted in different ways, 'stringency level' was used as a measure of government response on containment. Stringency level was reported to be at least 50 (on a scale of 0-100) throughout the administration period of Survey 2, globally (Hale, Angrist et al. 2020) and in the United States (Hale, Atav et al. 2020).

The original survey received ethics approval in October 2019. Participants were recruited using snowball sampling via various international networks. Anyone over the age of 18 could participate by signing an online consent form in compliance with the

ethics statement and privacy protection regulations (GDPR 2016). No personally identifying information was collected in the survey. Taking approximately 5 minutes to complete, the questions were kept brief to prevent bias associated with response fatigue (Choi and Pak 2005). There were 507 complete responses in Survey 1 and 238 responses in Survey 2. Both survey samples can be considered independent of each other. The complete questionnaire can be found in Appendix 1.

This paper does not aim to present a full analysis of all the items featured in the surveys, but only focuses on whether the perception of the window differed between a 'normal' (pre-COVID 19) situation and an enforced lockdown condition. Appendix 2 details the global government's response to COVID-19, in terms of 'Stringency Level', for all participants' locations in Survey 2, reported above 50 on the scale (Hale, Sam et al. 2020).

Specific constructs were framed to detect differences in the perception of familiarity with the window; preference for the view out of the window; satisfaction with the view out of the window; satisfaction with the size of the room with respect to the size of the window; and, satisfaction with the participant's location with respect to the window. The perception of familiarity was obtained through a multiple-choice question. All other survey items were measured on visual analogue scales.

To further investigate any detected difference in perception, the survey featured multiple-choice questions on various window features and gave participants the opportunity to express open-ended comments in the form of free text.

2.2. Data Distribution

Survey data was collected from 44 countries in Survey 1 (N= 507) and 38 countries in Survey 2 (N = 238). The United Kingdom, United States, Italy, Spain, Pakistan, and Belgium accounted for, respectively, 57.2% and 76.5% of the total

responses in the two surveys. The majority of responses were received from the Northern Hemisphere, experiencing the winter season in Survey 1 (96.8%) and spring in Survey 2 (99.1%). The only exceptions were Australia (12 responses), New Zealand (2 responses), Chile (3 responses) and South Africa (2 responses) in Survey 1, and Indonesia (1 response) and Australia (2 responses) in Survey 2. In Survey 1, responses were given mostly in the afternoon (53%) and the morning (21%), followed by mid-day (17%), evening (7%), and night (2%). In Survey 2, respondents gave their answers in the morning (39%), and then in the afternoon (30%), mid-day (20%) and evening (11%). The orientation of windows in both surveys were almost equally distributed between cardinal points.

A vast majority of the survey respondents were similarly located closer to ground floor. In Survey 1, most responses were given by people working or living on the first three floors of their building (78%); i.e. ground floor (26%), first floor (34%), and second floor (18%). In Survey 2, most respondents answered the survey from a location closer to the ground (82%), with ground floor accounting for 30%, and the first and second floors were 33% and 18% of the total. The distance of the participants to the perimeter was consistent between the two surveys, with 90% of respondents sitting in proximity (within 2 meters) of the window.

In interpreting the distribution of the data, it must be reminded that Survey 1 could have been responded to while at a workplace or from home, while data for Survey 2 were collected from people that could have been confined at home due to government imposed lockdowns or voluntary self-isolation.

2.3. Data Analysis

The data were exported from the SoSciSurvey.de host website into Microsoft Excel (2016) and SPSS Statistics 26.0 (SPSS, Chicago, IL) for graphical visualisation

and statistical analysis of responses. Initial tests were run to verify if the data met the assumptions for performing parametric tests. Although the tests of normality (Kolmogorov-Smirnov and Shapiro-Wilk) were both significant, visual inspection of the boxplots and histograms revealed skewness in the data and the presence of outliers (refer to boxplots in Appendix 3). Rather than deleting outliers, as they seemed to present valid cases (i.e., participants with a reasoned justification for their differences in perception), non-parametric Mann-Whitney U tests were used to analyse the responses. This is generally considered a more resilient approach to treat data with outliers (Field 2009). The Mann-Whitney U test is appropriate when variables fall under two conditions using different subjects.

The emphasis of the inferential tests was placed on the significance of the statistical tests (at the α level of 0.05) and on the effect size, this providing a standardised measure of the practical relevance of the differences detected between the two surveys. The effect size was estimated by the Pearson's coefficient *r*, calculated from the z scores. The interpretation of the outcome was derived from published benchmarks, with values ranging between negligible ($r < 0.1$), small ($0.1 \leq r < 0.3$), medium ($0.30 \leq r < 0.50$) and large (≥ 0.50) (Cohen 1992) (Field 2009).

To interpret and contextualise any detected differences in perception, responses to open-ended question on window features were explored using coding techniques through NVivo 12 (QSR International 1999, Creswell 2018). Categories of responses were initially identified as themes. Following this, a second and third analysis of the data led to the identification of emergent themes, these presented as frequency tables.

3. Results and Discussion

3.1. Window Perception

The response frequency to the question on the time the respondent had occupied their current place, e.g. desk, is reported in Figure 1. The data shows similar distributions between the two surveys, with most participants in Survey 1 (37%) and Survey 2 (45%) having occupied the place from where they were evaluating their window and its view for more than 3 years. There is, however, a 16% frequency increase in the 'less than 3 months' category in Survey 2 (from 13% to 29%). It might be hypothesised that this could be linked to people having readjusted, or modified, their (desk) position with respect to the window or providing their responses from a 'new' home working setting.

Figure 1. Familiarity with the window



Table 1 presents, for all category scores of window perception analysed, the medians (M_{dn}) and interquartile ranges (IQR), the means (M) and standard deviations (SD), the median difference (ΔM_{dn}, Survey 2 vs. Survey 1) between the groups and the

outcome of its statistical significance (NHST, *p*-value calculated with a two-tailed test), the Mann–Whitney test statistic (U) and the effect size (r).

Table 1. Independent sample Mann-Whitney U test on window perception

		Survey 1 (N= 507)		Survey 2 (N = 238)				
		M_{dn} (IQR)	M (SD)	M_{dn} (IQR)	M (SD)	ΔM_{dn}^{NHST}	*U*	Effect size (*r*)
Window View	Familiarity	88.00 (26)	81.36 (21.27)	93.00 (22)	86.10 (17.24)	+5.0**	67752.0	0.10
	Preference	70.00 (43)	63.29 (28.20)	76.50 (28)	71.20 (22.78)	+6.5***	69406.5	0.12
	Satisfaction	64.00 (53)	59.88 (30.31)	73.00 (31)	69.31 (24.78)	+9.0***	70466.0	0.14
Satisfaction	Size of window	78.00 (28)	75.01 (22.43)	80.50 (30)	77.32 (19.86)	+2.5 n.s.	62439.5	0.03
	Size of room with respect to window	74.00 (32)	70.86 (24.14)	79.00 (33)	74.13 (22.92)	+5.0 n.s.	64941.0	0.06
	Location with respect to window	70.00 (35)	65.14 (25.05)	73.00 (29)	71.14 (21.84)	+3.0**	67794.0	0.10

***$p \leq 0.001$, **$p \leq 0.01$, *$p \leq 0.05$, n.s.= not significant ($p \geq 0.05$)
$r<0.10$ = negligible; $0.10 \leq r<0.30$ = small; $0.30 \leq r<0.50$ =moderate; $r \geq 0.50$ = large
Shaded cells indicate practically-relevant (substantive) effect sizes

The results of the inferential tests indicate that differences across the independent variables between the two surveys are statistically significant, with practically relevant effect sizes for all rating variables on window view: familiarity (ΔM_{dn}= +5.0, U= 67752.0, *p*-value= 0.007**, *r*=0.10), preference (ΔM_{dn}= +6.5, U= 69406.5, *p*-value= 0.001***, *r*=0.12), and satisfaction (ΔM_{dn}= +9.0, U= 70466.0; *p*-value= 0.000***, *r*=0.14). No significant difference was found between the ratings of satisfaction with the size of the window (ΔM_{dn}= +2.50; U= 62439.500; *p*-value=0.441n.s., *r*=0.03) and with the size of the room with respect to the window (ΔM_{dn}= +5.0; U= 64941.000, *p*-value= 0.092n.s., *r*=0.06). Satisfaction with the location of the respondent relative to the window was significantly and substantively higher in Survey 2 (ΔM_{dn}= +3.0, U= 67794.0, *p*-value= 0.006**, *r*=0.10).

These data indicate that, during the lockdown period, respondents felt more familiar and satisfied, and expressed a higher preference (like), with their view outside. They also expressed a higher satisfaction with their location with respect to the window. To further investigate the results of the statistical tests, the responses to multiple-choice

questions related to different categories of window features, and the comments given by respondents in the form of free text, were thematically analysed.

3.2. Window Features

3.2.1. Positive Features

In response to the multiple choice question, on the positive aspects of the window, participants were asked to select their top three choices. The frequency of each statement in the two surveys was compared to explore the reasons behind the detected differences in perception. Table 2 summarizes the results.

Table 2. Perception of positive window features

	Survey 1 (N = 507)		Survey 2 (N = 238)		Difference
	N	%	N	%	%
Provides a view out	236	47%	136	57%	+10%
Allows fresh air into the space	159	31%	98	41%	+10%
Allows me to look away from my task (e.g., PC screen)	104	21%	69	29%	+8%
Provides good lighting in the space	185	36%	102	43%	+7%
Lets me interact with something/someone on the other side of the window	2	0%	6	3%	+3%
Lets me observe other people and activities outside	57	11%	26	11%	0%
Provides light to plants	59	12%	21	9%	-3%
Lets daylight in	382	75%	169	71%	-4%
Tells me the time of day	61	12%	14	6%	-6%
Tells me how the weather is outside	186	37%	49	21%	-16%

When looking at the differences in the frequency of choices, Survey 2 recorded an increase in responses for the provision of a view out (+10%), for allowing fresh air into the space (+10%), and for looking away from a task (e.g., PC screen) (+8%). Conversely, the positive window features that in Survey 2 had a lower frequency of recurrence than in Survey 1 were related to information about the weather outside (-16%), the time of the day (-6%), and letting daylight in (-4%).

In order to contextualise these results, it must be considered that Survey 2 was run at the beginning of spring, this maybe having a role in the higher perceived importance of the window as a source of ventilation. Conversely, previous studies have reported an effect of window view perception on the ability to evaluate current weather conditions (Hellinga 2013, Matusiak and Klöckner 2016). The reduction in perceived need for knowledge of the weather and time of day may, however, be ascribed to the fact that many people were not allowed to go outdoors. Therefore, the weather and time may not have played as an important role in daily activities as they did at the time of Survey 1.

To further investigate the increase in perceived importance of looking out of the window in Survey 2, for its view or to move the gaze away from the task, we looked at the open-ended comments that some respondents added to their answers. Nine comments were provided in this part of the questionnaire, implying that the windows were used to '*interact with a neighbour* (3 instances), *'blur the boundary between inside and outside'* (1 instance), '*see wildlife'* (1 instance), and to '*interact with nature'* (4 instances).

3.2.2. Blinds and Curtains

Blinds and curtains play a mediatory role between the window and the outside. To understand how often and why participants used blinds and curtains, two questions were asked. The first question in this category asked the participants about their ability to control the shading (blinds and curtains). 79% of participants answered positively to this question in Survey 1 and 87% in Survey 2, an increase of 8% between the two surveys. This was followed up by another question exploring the reasons behind the opening and closing of the blinds and curtains. The results are summarised in Table 3.

Table 3. Reasons for opening/closing a blind/curtain

	Survey 1 (N = 507)		Survey 2 (N = 238)		Difference
	N	**%**	**N**	**%**	**%**
Provides a view out	182	37%	114	49%	+12%
Allows me to look away from my task (e.g., PC screen)	52	11%	39	17%	+6%
Provides good lighting in the space	218	44%	113	49%	+4%
Provides light to plants	52	11%	28	12%	+2%
Lets me observe other people and activities outside	57	12%	31	13%	+2%
Allows fresh air into the space	85	17%	43	19%	+1%
Lets me interact with something/someone on the other side of the window	5	1%	2	1%	0%
Lets daylight in	397	83%	188	81%	-2%
Tells me the time of day	42	9%	9	4%	-5%
Tells me how the weather is outside	191	39%	57	25%	-14%

The blinds/curtains were opened most frequently to let daylight in and provide good lighting of the space in both surveys. In Survey 2, a 12% increase from Survey 1 was recorded for providing a view out, followed by the opportunity to look away from a task (6%). The most evident decrease in statement selection was related to the information on the weather outside (-14%), followed by operating the blinds to connect with differences in time of the day (-5%). These results are, therefore, consistent with those related to the positive aspects of window features. There was a small positive difference (+2%) in the use of windows for observing people and activities outside. However, one should consider that, in Survey 2, there may have been limited observable activity outside due to the lockdown.

3.2.3. Negative Features

To get a balanced view of window perception, we included a question on the negative features of windows. Table 4 shows the list of statements that participants could select in response to the multiple-choice question on the negative aspects of the window, in their space. ‘

Table 4. Perception of negative window features

	Survey 1 (N = 507)		Survey 2 (N = 238)		Difference
	N	%	N	%	%
None	105	21%	69	29%	8%
Other	30	6%	18	8%	2%
Allows too much heat	72	14%	37	16%	1%
Reduces the ability to freely furnish the space	36	7%	18	8%	0%
Allows too much sunlight	64	13%	29	12%	0%
Causes annoying glare	85	17%	41	17%	0%
Activities outside distract me	44	9%	18	8%	-1%
Allows others to see inside	108	21%	48	20%	-1%
Can`t see the sky	29	6%	9	4%	-2%
Provides poor working light	42	8%	15	6%	-2%
Allows too much noise from the street	103	20%	42	18%	-3%
Can`t see the ground	45	9%	12	5%	-4%
Provides too much cold draft in winter	147	29%	44	18%	-11%

When comparing the results from the two surveys, the most relevant differences were detected for the statements related to windows providing excessive draught (-11% in Survey 2) and for the "none" category (+8%). However, the decrease in the frequency of responses related to cold draughts can be attributed to the difference in season, for most participants from winter to spring. Conversely, it is interesting to see more people not expressing any negative thought about their window in Survey 2.

3.2.4. Differences due to the Lockdown

At the end of Survey 2, we asked two additional questions that were not originally included in Survey 1. Firstly, we asked the respondents, in a binary response, if their workplace arrangement or location had been affected by the COVID-19 lockdown. Out of a total of 238 responses, 34.5% (N= 82) of the participants gave an affirmative answer. For those that did not report a change in workspace arrangement or location, although not required by the survey, many participants added a comment that their situation had not changed since they already worked from home or were not working at all at the time of Survey 2.

The second question was open-ended and invited the participants to explain the changes they had made. The analysis of qualitative responses allowed us to bridge the missing gaps in answers and provided a personal perspective on the function of windows at the time of Survey 2. Table 5 summarises the results of the content analysis, revealing specific trends in any change of behaviour.

Table 5. Themes in the content analysis of stated changes

In relation to the window, participants	N = 82	%
Left the blinds/curtains open more regularly or for longer	23	28.0%
Appreciated/noticed the view more	21	25.6%
Looked out more often	20	24.4%
Left the window open more regularly or for longer	17	20.7%
Took regular breaks from the task to look out	16	19.5%
Established a new connection with outside sounds, such as birds	9	11.0%
Are located away from the window, but walk up to it for breaks	5	6.1%
Appreciate the daylight more often	5	6.1%
Started an innovative activity through this new relationship with window	4	4.9%
Used the balcony more often	2	2.4%
Are looking out less because of less people/activity	2	2.4%
Don't look out because of others' privacy	2	2.4%

The participants stated that they left the blinds/curtains open for longer, and more regularly opened them, than before the lockdown (28%). While some respondents had a higher appreciation of their view out (25.6%), others specifically stated that they looked out of the window more often (24.4%). Some participants responded that they opened the window more often, or for longer periods of time (20.7%). They took regular breaks from the task at hand by looking out of the window (19.5%), even if they had to walk up to the window (6.1%). Some were more aware of the sounds outside the window, e.g. nature and street life (11%), and stated to appreciate having daylight through the window during lockdown more often than before (4.9%). While privacy is a known issue in the design of windows (Markus 1967), only a few participants declared

that they intentionally did not look out, or let the blinds down, to avert invading on their neighbours' privacy (2.4%).

In 4 cases (4.9%), participants came up with creative ways to engage with their external world; two are worth mentioning. One participant shared that they started an item exchange scheme via ropes in the neighbourhood through their window. This is an interesting example demonstrating how a window can act as an agency for people's connection, not just visually but also in material form, triggering a new sense of community. Another example is of an international collaboration, where a photographer started recording their relationship with their own window daily. They then proceeded to invite the world, with the slogan 'from my window to yours', to share their window views with them via the web. This has been a recurrent phenomenon during the COVID-19 lockdown, where people all over the world have started sharing their window views, and lived experiences, on various social media (e.g., Facebook). A growing number of photographs have been posted in response to these calls (Duriau 2020, Hakim 2020). Conversely, many people have also started to post 'silent messages' (Mccluskey 2020) on their windows to communicate with their neighbours.

We know that many businesses moved to online practices since the start of the lockdown (Finn 2020), meaning that many people were working from their homes. Among the 82 respondents that declared to have changed their workspace arrangement or location, the textual data analysis revealed that 67 (81%) moved their desk closer to a window. Among the responses provided by these 67 participants, Table 6 summarises the stated reasons for having chosen a desk location closer to the window.

Table 6. Reasons for locating the desk closer to the window

	N= *67*	*Percentage*
To get daylight/sunlight	19	28.4%
To have a view out	18	26.9%

To look out	11	16.4%
To get fresh air	7	10.4%
Connect with people outside	5	7.5%
Rearranged to larger windows	5	7.5%
As a replacement for going out	3	4.5%
To be seen	2	3.0%
Receive solar gain	2	3.0%
Check weather/time	1	1.5%

The content analysis revealed that the underlying reasons for locating close to a window were provision of daylight/sunlight (28.4%), the ability to have a view out (26.9%), to look out (16.4%), to access fresh air (10.4%) and to be able to visually connect with people or neighbours (7.5%). A few participants relocated their workspace from another location in the house to be next to a larger opening (7.5%). Some respondents thought that setting up their workspace closer to a window would compensate for not being able to go out (4.5%), while only a few participants located themselves closer to the window to be seen by neighbours (3.0%), to warm up with solar gains (3.0%), or to check the weather and time of day (1.5%).

4. Discussion and implications for Research and Practice

This study shares the outcomes of a survey conducted before and during a period of extended lockdown, lending an opportunity to investigate any differences in the perception of windows. A summary of the core findings is presented below.

Both the familiarity and satisfaction with space and participant's location with respect to the window were significantly higher in the lockdown period. This is congruent with previous studies where familiarity is known to play a role in predicting preference in urban spaces (Herzog, Kaplan et al. 1976, Imamoglu 2000). With an increasing number of people working from home (Dingel and Neiman 2020), especially

during the lockdown, this could mean an overall positive boost in the perceived satisfaction with respect to the windows in familiar spaces, and perceived control over the operation of blinds and curtains. The period of lockdown also resulted in a reduced negative perception of window. Access to a window, and to daylight and view out, can play an important role in the perceived satisfaction of the space. However, further research needs to be carried out before findings can be generalized to work-from-home conditions and its long-term effects.

Preference for, and satisfaction with, the view out of the window was significantly higher during the lockdown period. The fact that participants reported to notice the view more often, and kept the blinds and curtains open to look out of the window for longer, builds on the notion that human beings want to connect with the outside world. While confinement can have a detrimental effect on the psychological well-being of individuals (Hawryluck, Gold et al. 2004, Glynn, Boland et al. 2016, Mackolil and Mackolil 2020), an interest in the view out of the window has been found – among other positive effects – to increase tolerance to discomfort glare (Tuaycharoen and Tregenza 2007). Our findings, therefore, emphasize that, during a period of confinement, windows are in fact 'windows of opportunity' that support the well-being of building occupants by becoming a vehicle to connect with the outdoors. This might be especially relevant in light of the risk of further global pandemic outbreaks (GPMG 2019).

During the lockdown, people tended to locate their work or desk close to a window for daylight and view out, making the areas adjacent to the window vital in the use of their spaces. Access to daylight and view out could imply meaningful changes to the design of buildings, e.g. depth of building floors in relation to windows. We could extend these findings to other types of enforced confinement, e.g. during curfews, in

prisons and in hospitals. Windows are known to be vital in health and palliative care facilities, where access to daylight (Keep, James et al. 1980, Gbyl, Østergaard Madsen et al. 2016) and quality views (Ulrich 1984) may play a positive role in patient's recovery time. Accordingly, windows should not only be designed to admit daylight but also enable a view out, giving critical consideration to the line of sight of the occupants in the room (CEN 2018).

A decrease in the negative perception due to cold draught was felt between the two time periods, possibly owing to the seasonal change from the winter to spring. We know that thermal comfort (e.g., radiative exchanges) plays a part in the perception of the window, consistent with previous literature (Shi, Qian et al. 2018). Unfortunately, in many countries, building regulations only partially embrace the multifaceted roles of windows (Boubekri 2004). In the UK, for example, an effort to minimise heat losses and construction costs (Lewis 2015) has led to reductions in window size. Since windows are considered generally less energy efficient than walls, 'tighter' envelopes with smaller windows are 'encouraged' in energy efficiency guidelines. Most often the choice of glazing type, shading devices, orientation and climate are the main parameters considered to define the size of the window (Badeche and Bouchahm 2020). Our research suggests that the design criteria of windows should give due consideration to occupants' visual and psychological wellbeing (other than further criteria not included in this study, such as circadian stimulation) ascribed to the window's provision of daylight and a view out.

An increase in the perceived importance of visual connection with the outside was complemented by the role of the window as a provider of information that also contains a social element, which for example a window in the roof (a skylight) may not be able to fulfil. Wherever possible, a window should be designed to provide visual

connection with dynamic elements in the landscape but, crucially, also with other people. In fact, there was a small positive increase in the importance of window to enable connection with activities and people between the two surveys. In particular, the open-ended answers revealed that participants moved their desk closer to a window also as a medium to communicate with their neighbours and be seen. Proximity to the window, however, is only one dimension to consider when analysing the means that people have to socially connect with the outside world.

5. Limitations and Conclusions

Before the findings of this study can be generalized and transferred to other contexts, some methodological limitations should be acknowledged.

Online surveys can capture the perception that participants express for their window, *in situ*, without any possibility of experimental control. This, unavoidably, adds variability to the data, consistent with the challenges faced with this method of data collection. The data in the two surveys were gathered at different times of the year and some of the differences detected may possibly be ascribed to an effect of seasonality. In the absence of any previous global studies on window perception and window views, a comparison cannot be drawn. Nonetheless, we found a significant difference between perception of windows, and the value of the view out, in the first survey and during the lockdown, demonstrating the importance of windows during a period of confinement. The data in Survey 2 were collected for only one month to retain the answers limited to the period of lockdown in the different parts of the world. In comparison, Survey 1 was run over 3 months with almost double the participants. Finally, Survey 2 was not purposely designed to investigate window perception in a period of lockdown but the same survey questions used in Survey 1 had to be employed to allow comparability of data. Since a pandemic and subsequent lockdown could

not be anticipated in advance, our data points to some of the potential confounding variables which could not be address within the framework of this study. These include, but at not limited to both the context, ie. working from home, and comfort ie sense of control, ability to position desk as desired as well as other aspects of organisations productivity known to have a significant impact on mental and physical well-being of building occupants (Newsham, Veitch et al. 2019), for example work-life balance and environmental parameters (air quality, ventilation rates, number of daylight hours, etc).

Despite these limitations, this study provided practically relevant evidence that, during a period of forced social confinement, windows are increasingly favoured for their view out and for their affordances to connect, physically and socially, with the outside. Participants who sat near the window or moved their desk closer to it during the lockdown, particularly enjoyed the daylight that was brought in and the ability to look out, keeping their blinds and curtains open more often. These results might have important implications on design practice and research, although further investigations are needed, considering that this was among the first studies analysing the differences in the perception of windows within a period of lockdown. Nevertheless, these findings can help capture the psychological impacts of confinement on people and may be relevant also to other domains, such as healthcare design.

6. References

Asojo, A. O., S. Bae and C. S. Martin (2020). "Post-occupancy Evaluation Study of the Impact of Daylighting and Electric Lighting in the Workplace." LEUKOS **16**(3): 239-250.

Badeche, M. and Y. Bouchahm (2020). "Design optimization criteria for windows providing low energy demand in office buildings in Algeria." Environmental and Sustainability Indicators **6**: 100024.

Boubekri, M. (2004). "A Overview of The Current State of Daylight Legislation." Journal of the Human-Environment System **7**(2): 57-63.

Boyce, P. R., C. Hunter and O. Howlett (2003). The Benefits of Daylight through Windows. Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute Troy, New York 12180-3352, Lighting Research Center**:** 88.
CEN (2018). EUROPEAN STANDARD EN 17037. Daylight of buildings. CEN-CENELEC Management Centre: Rue de la Science 23, B-1040 Brussels, EUROPEAN COMMITTEE FOR STANDARDIZATION.
Chauhan, A. and R. P. Singh (2020). "Decline in PM2.5 concentrations over major cities around the world associated with COVID-19." Environmental Research **187**: 109634.
Choi, B. C. K. and A. W. P. Pak (2005). "A catalog of biases in questionnaires." Preventing chronic disease **2**(1): A13-A13.
Christoffersen, J., K. Johnsen, E. Petersen, O. Valbjørn and S. Hygge (2000). Windows and Daylight - A Post-Occupancy Evaluation of Danish Offices. Lighting 2000 ILE/CIBSE Joint Conference. University of York, UK.
Cohen, J. (1992). "A power primer." Psychological Bulletin **112**: 155-159.
Creswell, J. W. (2018). Designing and conducting mixed methods research. London, Sage Publications.
Dingel, J. I. and B. Neiman (2020). How Many Jobs Can be Done at Home?
Duriau, B. [/viewfrommywindow]. (2020). "View from my window." facebook.
Farley, K. M. J. and J. A. Veitch (2001). A Room with a View: A Review of the Effects of Windows on Work and Well-Being. IRC Research Report. Canada, Institute for Research in Construction. **136**.
Field, A. P. (2009). Discovering statistics using SPSS / Andy Field. London, London : SAGE.
Finn, B. (2020, 8, April, 2020). "Hundreds of businesses move online as Covid-19 shutters 'bricks and mortar' stores " Raidió Teilifís Éireann Retrieved 5 May, 2020, from https://www.rte.ie/news/business/2020/0407/1129150-covid-19-prompts-hundreds-of-businesses-to-move-online/.
Gbyl, K., H. Østergaard Madsen, S. Dunker Svendsen, P. M. Petersen, I. Hageman, C. Volf and K. Martiny (2016). "Depressed Patients Hospitalized in Southeast-Facing Rooms Are Discharged Earlier than Patients in Northwest-Facing Rooms." Neuropsychobiology **74**(4): 193-201.
GDPR (2016). REGULATION (EU) 2016/679 OF THE EUROPEAN PARLIAMENT AND OF THE COUNCIL. O. J. o. t. E. Union, Official Journal of the European Union. **L 119**.
Glynn, R. W., M. Boland and I. On behalf of the Hse Port Health Groups (2016). "Ebola, Zika and the International Health Regulations – implications for Port Health Preparedness." Globalization and Health **12**(1): 74.
GPMG (2019). A World at Risk: Annual report on global prepardness for health emergiences. G. P. M. Board.
Hakim, L. [outofmy.window]. (2020). "outofmy.window." Instagram.
Hale, T., N. Angrist, B. Kira, A. Petherick, T. Phillips and S. Webster (2020). Variation in Government Responses to COVID-19. Oxford COVID-19 Government Response Tracker. Blavatnik School of Government, University of Oxford. **6.0**.
Hale, T., T. Atav, L. Hallas, B. Kira, T. Phillips, A. Petherick and A. Pott (2020). Variation in US states' responses to COVID-19. Blavatnik School of Government Working Paper.
Hale, T., W. Sam, P. Anna, P. Toby and K. Beatriz (2020). Oxford COVID-19 Government Response Tracker. Blavatnik School of Government, Data use policy: Creative Commons Attribution CC BY standard.

Hawryluck, L., W. L. Gold, S. Robinson, S. Pogorski, S. Galea and R. Styra (2004). "SARS control and psychological effects of quarantine, Toronto, Canada." Emerging infectious diseases **10**(7): 1206-1212.
Hellinga, H. (2013). Daylight and View - The Influence of Windows on the Visual Quality of Indoor Spaces. PhD, Technische Universiteit Delft.
Hellinga, H. and T. Hordijk (2014). "The D&V analysis method: A method for the analysis of daylight access and view quality." Building and Environment **79**(Supplement C): 101-114.
Herzog, T. R. and T. A. Gale (1996). "Preference for Urban Buildings as a Function of Age and Nature Context." Environment and Behavior **28**(1): 44-72.
Herzog, T. R., S. Kaplan and R. Kaplan (1976). "The Prediction of Preference for Familiar Urban Places." Environment and Behavior **8**(4): 627-645.
Herzog, T. R. and R. L. Shier (2000). "Complexity, Age, and Building Preference." Environment and Behavior **32**(4): 557-575.
Heschong, L. (2003). Windows and Offices: A Study of Office Worker Performance and the Indoor Environment, California Energy Commission. **500-03-082-A-9**.
Imamoglu, Ç. (2000). "Complexity, Liking and Familiarity: Architecture and Non-Architecture Turkish Students' Assessment of Traditional and Modern House Facades." Journal of Environmental Psychology **20**(1): 5-16.
Kaplan, S., R. Kaplan and J. S. Wendt (1972). "Rated preference and complexity for natural and urban visual material." Perception & Psychophysics **12**(4): 354-356.
Keep, P., J. James and M. Inman (1980). "Windows in the intensive therapy unit." Anaesthesia **35**(3): 257-262.
Lewis, A. (2015). "Daylighting in older people's housing: Barriers to compliance with current UK guidance." Lighting Research & Technology **47**(8): 976-992.
Mackolil, J. and J. Mackolil (2020). "Addressing psychosocial problems associated with the COVID-19 lockdown." Asian Journal of Psychiatry **51**: 102156.
Markus, T. A. (1967). "The function of windows— A reappraisal." Building Science **2**(2): 97-121.
Matusiak, B. S. and C. A. Klöckner (2016). "How we evaluate the view out through the window." Architectural Science Review **59**(3): 203-211.
Mccluskey, M. (2020, March 31, 2020). "'It's Like a Silent Visual Message.' How Social Distancing-Friendly 'Bear Hunts' Are Uniting Neighborhoods Amid Coronavirus." Time Retrieved June, 16, 2020, 2020.
Newsham, G. R., J. A. Veitch, M. Q. Zhang and A. D. Galasiu (2019). "Comparing better building design and operation to other corporate strategies for improving organizational productivity: a review and synthesis." Intelligent Buildings International: 1-20.
Odriozola-González, P., Á. Planchuelo-Gómez, M. J. Irurtia and R. de Luis-García (2020). "Psychological effects of the COVID-19 outbreak and lockdown among students and workers of a Spanish university." Psychiatry Research **290**: 113108.
QSR International. (1999). " NVivo Qualitative Data Analysis Software."
Shi, Z., H. Qian, X. Zheng, Z. Lv, Y. Li, L. Liu and P. V. Nielsen (2018). "Seasonal variation of window opening behaviors in two naturally ventilated hospital wards." Building and Environment **130**: 85-93.
Tuaycharoen, N. and P. R. Tregenza (2007). "View and discomfort glare from windows." Lighting Research & Technology **39**(2): 185-200.
Ulrich, R. S. (1984). "View through a window may influence recovery from surgery." Science **224**(4647): 420-421.

Veitch, J. A., J. Christoffersen and A. D. Galasiu (2013). What we know about windows and well-being, and what we need to know. CIE Centenary Conference: Towards a New Century of Light, Paris, France.
Wang, G., Y. Zhang, J. Zhao, J. Zhang and F. Jiang (2020). "Mitigate the effects of home confinement on children during the COVID-19 outbreak." The Lancet **395**(10228): 945-947.
Wilder-Smith, A. and D. O. Freedman (2020). "Isolation, quarantine, social distancing and community containment: pivotal role for old-style public health measures in the novel coronavirus (2019-nCoV) outbreak." Journal of Travel Medicine **27**(2).

7. Appendix 1

1. **What is your first language?**
   - English
   - Other, please state _____

2. **Could you please take a photograph of the view out of your window and upload it here?**
   Please take a clear photograph of the view outside of your window.

   The Photograph must:

   1. be clear

   2. exclude any identifiable information of an individual (e.g. face)

   3. be focused

   4. if possible include as little internal environment of the room and just focus on the view while looking out of the window

   5. if possible, the photograph should be taken from a position perpendicular to the window

   You may use your digital camera, smartphone, or tablet to take this photograph.
   Max file size 4MB

3. **Where was the photograph taken?**
   Please type the location of the photograph.
   Country _____
   Nearest town or city _____

4. **Which floor are you on?**
   - Underground – below ground
   - Ground
   - 1
   - 2
   - 3
   - 4
   - 5
   - Other _____

5. **How long have you occupied the place (e.g., desk) from where the photograph was taken?**
   Please select from the following options.
   - Less than 3 months
   - 3 – 6 months
   - Between 6 months and 1 yea
   - 1-3 years
   - More than 3 years

6. **Which type of device was used to take the photograph of the window view?**
   Please choose:

- Camera
- Digital Camera
- Video Recorder
- Mobile Phone
- Personal Digital assistance devices (PDA)
- Tablet PC

7. Can you identify the model or make of the device that was used to take the photograph of the window view?

Please enter the full name and model of the device.
Model _____

8. When did you take the photograph?

Please select a month.

- January
- February
- March
- April
- May
- June
- July
- August
- September
- October
- November
- December

9. **What time of the day is it?**

Please select from the drop-down menu the time of the day when the photograph was taken.

- Morning
- Mid-day
- Afternoon
- Evening
- Night

10. Do you know which direction you were facing when you took the photograph?

Please select from options below or type in the field. You could use the compass on your phone for a sense of direction.
Please select from the following options.

- North
- South
- East
- West
- North West
- North East
- South East
- South West
- I don't know

11. Do you know which window elements are present in this photograph?

Sometimes window elements may be present when we are looking out of a window. These include window glass if the window is shut, wire mesh, blinds, etc.

Please select from options below	Yes	No	Maybe
Glass	o	o	o
Wire mesh	o	o	o

External Shading, (e.g., louvers, overhangs, etc.)	o	o	o
Internal Shading, (e.g., blinds, curtains, etc.)	o	o	o
Any other shading device	o	o	o

If the window was closed when the photograph was taken, do you know if the glass is tinted (e.g., coloured, darkened, etc.)? Ignore this question if the window was open at the time of the photograph.

Tinted Glass	o	o	o

12. **In your space, are you able to control the shading (e.g., blind, curtain, etc.)?**
    - o Yes
    - o No
    - o Does not apply

13. **If the blind/curtain on your window is shut, why would you open it?**
    (Please read all options before checking maximum 3 answers)
    - o Let daylight in
    - o Tell me how the weather is outside
    - o Tell me the time of day
    - o Increase or decrease the ventilation
    - o Provide light to plants
    - o Let me observe other people and activities outside
    - o Provide good lighting in the space
    - o Provide a view out
    - o Allows me to look away from my task (e.g., computer screen)
    - o Let me interact with something/someone on the other side of the window
    - o Other _____

14. **Can you estimate the distance to the window from your usual location in this space?**
    For example, if you were in an office the distance in meters (feet) between your location and the nearest window.
    - o Adjacent to Window
    - o 1 meter (1- 3 feet)
    - o 1-2 meters (4- 6 feet) away
    - o More than 3 meters (7 feet+) away
    - o Other

15. **How much do you prefer this window view?**
    Preference is also known as how much you like the window view, for whatever reasons you may have.
    Drag the slider below to give your response on the line on how much you prefer the image from left (least preferred) to right (most preferred).

    Preference 

16. **How familiar or known is this window view to you?**
    Familiarity means how much the window view is known to you or how acquainted you are to it.
    Drag the slider below to give your response on the line on how familiar this window view is to you: left (not at all familiar) to right (extremely familiar).

Familiarity



Please indicate how satisfied you are with the following regarding the window.

Drag the slider below to give your response on the line on how satisfied from least (left) to most (right).

17. **The size of the window**

18. **View out of the window**

19. **Your usual location relative to the window (s)**

20. **The size of the room with respect to the window**



21. **Which of the following statements do you find the most positive about the window?**
(Please read all options before checking maximum 3 answers)

No more than 3 answers

- o None
- o Tells me the time of day
- o Lets daylight in
- o Tells me how the weather is outside
- o Provides light to plants
- o Allows me to look away from my task (e.g., computer screen)
- o Allows fresh air into the space
- o Provides good lighting in the space
- o Provides a view out
- o Lets me observe other people and activities outside
- o Lets me interact with something/someone on the other side of the window
- o Other _____

22. **Which of the following statements do you find the most negative about the window?**
(Please read all options before checking maximum 3 answers)

No more than 3 answers

- o None
- o Allows too much heat
- o Allows too much sunlight
- o Provides too much cold draft in winter
- o Activities outside distract me
- o Allows too much noise from the street
- o Causes annoying glare
- o Can't see the ground
- o Can't see the sky
- o Reduces the ability to freely furnish the space
- o Provides poor working light
- o Allows others to see inside
- o Other _____

23. **What is it that you like about this view through the window?**
What do you especially notice when you look?

_____
_____
_____

24. **What is it that you dislike about this view through the window?**

_____
_____
_____

Survey 2 – additional questions

25. **Has your workspace arrangement or location been affected by the current COVID-19 lock-down?**
    - o **Yes**
    - o **No**
26. **If you answered yes to the above question, could you please add some details on your interaction with your window?**

For example: Did you set up your new workspace close to your window, and why? Do you open your window or your blinds more often? Do you spend more or less time looking out of the window? Is there something of your view that you appreciate more or less now?

_____
_____
_____

8. Appendix 2

Table 2 Stringency Levels observed in response countries during Survey 2

Country	Stringency Level$_{(Max)}$*	Stringency Level$_{(Average)}$*
Australia	73.15	67.32452
Austria	87.96	82.19742
Belgium	87.96	66.2471
Bulgaria	96.3	82.08032
Cambodia	93.52	75.36032
Canada	79.63	75.92871
Croatia	96.3	86.29194
Cyprus	94.44	88.2
Czech Republic	85.19	73.50903
Denmark	90.74	79.18129
Egypt	94.44	89.12645
Estonia	93.52	84.82806
France	93.52	91.5471
Germany	77.78	77.09097
Greece	85.65	83.5729
Hungary	76.85	72.10097
India	100	84.96065
Indonesia	86.11	77.16516
Ireland	90.74	86.53032
Israel	94.44	77.23968
Italy	93.52	83.06516

Country	Stringency Level$_{(Max)}$*	Stringency Level$_{(Average)}$*
Lebanon	93.52	87.54806
Malaysia	75.93	73.20968
Netherlands	79.63	79.18
Nigeria	85.65	83.91645
Norway	79.63	74.31258
Pakistan	96.3	85.84129
Poland	83.33	81.48194
Portugal	87.96	84.30645
Saudi Arabia	94.44	88.23516
Slovenia	89.81	77.80742
Spain	87.96	84.03806
Switzerland	86.11	77.56839
Turkey	96.3	86.47323
United Kingdom	92.59	83.06581

Note 1

Sourced from Hale, Sam et al. (2020)

** Maximum stringency level achieved during this month is reported*

*** An average value of stringency level (government response to COVID-19) over the 30-day duration is calculated*

Table 3 Stringency level observed in response states in the USA during Survey 2

State (USA)	Stringency Level$_{(Max)}$*	Stringency Level$_{(Average)}$**
California	75	75
Colorado	75.93	73.51
Florida	73.15	72.85
Illinois	70.37	68.94
Indiana	73.15	62.19
Kansas	76.85	71.9
Massachusetts	55.56	54.48
Michigan	75.93	75.09
Montana	76.85	75.12
New York	74.07	73.53
Ohio	68.52	67.09
Oregon	70.37	70.19
Pennsylvania	65.74	63.83
Tennessee	62.96	61.23
Texas	72.69	70.96
Virginia	71.3	69.33

Note 2

Sourced from Hale, Atav et al. (2020)

** Maximum stringency level achieved during this month is reported*

*** An average value of stringency level over the 30-day duration is calculated*

9. Appendix 3

Figure 1 Boxplots illustrate the distribution of data for variables listed in Table 1; items identified as outliers appear as data points in the plots.



10. List of Figures

11. List of Tables