Data in Brief 35 (2021) 106917

Contents lists available at ScienceDirect

Data in Brief

journal homepage: www.elsevier.com/locate/dib

Data Article

Assessment of the COVID-19 pandemic situation: Data from two countries with different security measures taken by authorities (Belarus and Russia)

Nataly P. Radchikova[a,*], Maria A. Odintsova[b]

[a] *Faculty of Pre-School Pedagogy and Psychology, Moscow Pedagogical State University, Russia, Scientific and Practical Center for Comprehensive Support of Psychological Research «PsyDATA», Moscow State University of Psychology and Education, Russia*
[b] *Faculty of Distance Learning, Moscow State University of Psychology and Education, Russia*

ARTICLE INFO

Article history:
Received 13 November 2020
Revised 21 February 2021
Accepted 25 February 2021
Available online 27 February 2021

Keywords:
COVID-19 pandemic
Government regulation
Self-isolation
Personal resources
Fears
Survey data
Belarus
Russia

ABSTRACT

The article presents the data on the evaluation of COVID-19 situation by adult respondents (age from 18 to 76) coming from countries with the common past, language and similar mentality but differing in governmental security measures during pandemic spring outbreak (no precautionary measures in Belarus ($N = 267$); lockdown and financial support in Russia ($N = 397$)). The data was collected via online survey platform (Google forms) from 2020.04.11 to 2020.06.04 (during the period of lock-down in Russia). The data contains socio-demographical information (sex, age, country of citizenship), survey answers and the results of standardized psychological tests (to measure dangerous and threatening social world view and hardiness). The survey consists of four blocks: specific impact of the COVID-19 situation on various aspects of respondents' life; estimation of different fears; estimation of various aspects of COVID-19 situation, and estimation of personal resources. All the items require participants to rate them on a 11-point Likert scale from 0 (totally disagree, absolutely no fear or no impact) to 10 (totally agree, the strongest fear or impact). Descriptive statistics as well as

* Corresponding author.
E-mail address: nataly.radchikova@gmail.com (N.P. Radchikova).
Social media: (N.P. Radchikova)

https://doi.org/10.1016/j.dib.2021.106917

the comparison results are given. The data may be used to investigate the influence of lockdown, social distancing, and isolation on psychological well-being as well as the impact of personal resources in psychological well-being in stressful situations.

Specifications Table

Subject	Psychology
Specific subject area	Pandemic situation assessment, hardiness and personal resources, cross-cultural studies
Type of data	Table
How data were acquired	Data was gathered using an online survey platform (Google forms). The questionnaire is provided in Russian and in English in Mendeley: https://data.mendeley.com/datasets/k72nh7xj5c/2
Data format	Raw, Analyzed, Filtered (to remove double responses); available in .xlsx and .sav formats
Parameters for data collection	The data was obtained from 664 respondents older than 18 years old having Internet access from Belarus ($N = 267$) and Russia ($N = 397$) from 2020.04.11 to 2020.06.04 (during the period of lock-down in Russia)
Description of data collection	The web-based survey was promoted using a combination of purposive, convenience and snowball sampling techniques
Data source location	Region: Europe Country: Russian Federation, The Republic of Belarus
Data accessibility	Repository name: Mendeley Direct URL to data: https://data.mendeley.com/datasets/k72nh7xj5c/2

Value of the Data

- The data reflects the evaluation of COVID-19 pandemic (fears, difficulty and uncertainty of the situation, etc.) by respondents coming from countries with the common past, language and similar mentality but differing in governmental security measures during pandemic spring outbreak (no precautionary measures in Belarus; lockdown and financial support in Russia).
- The dataset will be useful for researchers who want to investigate the influence of lockdown, social distancing, and isolation on psychological well-being; the data also can be used as a baseline for subsequent analysis and interpretation of the dynamics of attitudes towards the pandemic situation by residents of different spaces of government regulation.
- The data is of particular value for researchers from other countries who conduct research on assessments of the situation of the pandemic, the degree of its impact on different spheres of life, fears and resources among residents of different spaces of state regulation of COVID-19; may help in perspective in systematic reviews and meta-analyzes.
- The data may help government agencies to understand the adequacy / inadequacy of the selected strategies for state regulation of the pandemic situation and prevent possible negative consequences.
- The data will be useful to health authorities, social and psychological services when developing special programs of psychological and social support for the population of countries with different strategies of state regulation of the pandemic situation.
- The data will be useful to the general public, as it provides information on optimizing their resources to overcome the negative consequences of the pandemic.

Table 1
Demographic Information.

Variable	Categories	Frequencies	Percent
Citizenship	Belarus	267	40,2%
	Russia	397	59,8%
Sex	Female	540	81,3%
	Male	124	18,7%
Age	<=30	259	39,0%
	31–40	168	25,3%
	41–50	144	21,7%
	51–60	70	10,5%
	>60	23	3,5%
Education	Secondary	324	48,8%
	Secondary specialized	98	14,8%
	Higher	227	34,2%
	Ph.D. degree	15	2,3%
Study at the moment	No	420	63,3%
	Yes, online	210	31,6%
	Yes, offline	34	5,1%
Pension	No	629	94,7%
	Yes	35	5,3%
Employment at the moment	Unemployed	245	36,9%
	Remote	258	38,9%
	Office	100	15,0%
	Paid force leave	26	3,9%
	Unpaid forced leave	35	5,3%
Material well-being	Bad	31	4,6%
	Hard, but I can handle it	201	30,3%
	Normal	284	42,8%
	Good	129	19,4%
	Excellent	19	2,9%

1. Data Description

The data contains assessment of the pandemic situation by residents of various spaces of state regulation: Belarus and Russia, two countries united by a common historical past, language and mentality [1], but differing in measures taken by authorities to minimize pandemic consequences. In Russia, a self-isolation regime was introduced, many organizations switched to remote work, mass events were prohibited, entertainment venues were closed, state support (financial, social, medical) was implemented to preserve the well-being and health of Russian citizens. In Belarus, the government has denied the pandemic and has not taken any measures to protect the population, and Belarusian citizens found themselves without timely state support.

A Likert scale survey was administered in Russian, being the official language in Russia and Belarus (English translation is also available). This dataset contains three main sections. The first section consists of the demographic information (age, sex, country of residence, education, occupation at the moment and material well-being assessment). The second section contains four blocks of questions regarding 1) pandemic influence on various aspects of life, 2) fears, 3) situation assessment and 4) evaluation of personal resources. The third section contains the results of two standardized questionnaires. A total of 664 responses were received.

Socio-demographic information is presented in Table 1. The number pf participants from Belarus and Russia were almost the same, although women prevail in the sample.

Descriptive statistics (Table 2) shows that COVID-19 pandemic has the most impact on the quality of social contacts, physical activity and work. Respondents indicated that the fears about their loved ones (loved ones will get sick and die, no possibility to help the loved ones) were the most intense while fears about themselves (to die, to get sick) were the weakest. Situation uncertainty in the world was rated high (more than 7 points). Four survey blocks (influence of the COVID-19 situation on various aspects of respondents' life; estimation of different fears;

Table 2
Descriptive statistics (N = 664): mean ± standard deviation (M ± SD); median, lower quartile, and upper quartile (Me [LQ; UQ]); minimum and maximum; and standardized Cronbach's alpha for the whole sample / for Belarusian sample / for Russian sample.

Variable	M ± SD	Me [LQ; UQ]	Min	Max
Age	35,53 ± 12,88	35,00 [23,75; 45,00]	18	76
Pandemic influence on ... (Standardized Cronbach's alpha = 0,73 / 0,75 / 0,72)				
Work	5,28 ± 3,49	5,50 [2,00; 8,00]	0	10
Income	4,36 ± 3,85	4,00 [0,00; 8,00]	0	10
Physical activity	5,80 ± 3,41	7,00 [3,00; 9,00]	0	10
Psychological state	4,78 ± 2,97	5,00 [2,00; 7,00]	0	10
The quality of relationships with loved ones	3,67 ± 3,11	3,00 [1,00; 6,00]	0	10
The quality of social contacts	5,62 ± 3,09	6,00 [3,00; 8,00]	0	10
Fears (Standardized Cronbach's alpha = 0,86 / 0,84 / 0,89)				
To die	3,01 ± 2,98	2,00 [0,00; 5,00]	0	10
To get sick	4,12 ± 2,96	4,00 [2,00; 6,00]	0	10
Not to be able to help sick loved ones	7,05 ± 3,00	8,00 [5,00; 10,00]	0	10
My loved ones will get sick and die	6,87 ± 3,25	8,00 [5,00; 10,00]	0	10
To be left alone	4,19 ± 3,59	4,00 [1,00; 7,00]	0	10
To become unemployed	3,82 ± 3,34	3,00 [0,00; 6,00]	0	10
To be left without a livelihood	4,94 ± 3,44	5,00 [2,00; 8,00]	0	10
To ruin a relationship with a partner	2,51 ± 3,09	1,00 [0,00; 5,00]	0	10
Of the future	4,31 ± 3,11	5,00 [1,75; 7,00]	1	10
Situation assessment (Standardized Cronbach's alpha = 0,84 / 0,84 / 0,83)				
Situation uncertainty in the world	7,12 ± 2,05	7,00 [6,00; 9,00]	0	10
Situation difficulty at the moment	5,72 ± 2,46	6,00 [4,00; 8,00]	0	10
Situation personal importance	5,55 ± 2,69	6,00 [3,00; 8,00]	0	10
Severity of stress caused by situation	4,62 ± 2,85	5,00 [2,00; 7,00]	0	10
Difficulty to predict near future	6,42 ± 2,71	7,00 [5,00; 9,00]	0	10
Difficulty to control the situation	5,78 ± 2,98	6,00 [4,00; 8,00]	0	10
Situation hopelessness and undecidability	4,29 ± 2,61	5,00 [2,00; 6,00]	0	10
The weight of your own losses caused by situation	3,89 ± 2,70	4,00 [2,00; 6,00]	0	10
Difficulty to follow the recommendations of the authorities / remain in self-isolation	3,80 ± 3,21	3,00 [1,00; 6,00]	0	10
Willingness to violate the authorities' recommendations	4,06 ± 3,14	3,00 [1,00; 7,00]	0	10
Adequacy of the security measures taken by the authorities	5,47 ± 3,16	5,00 [3,00; 8,00]	0	10
Resources (Standardized Cronbach's alpha = 0,91 / 0,92 / 0,90)				
Physical	5,65 ± 2,82	6,00 [4,00; 8,00]	0	10
Psychic	6,61 ± 2,61	7,00 [5,00; 8,00]	0	10
Intellectual	6,88 ± 2,53	7,00 [5,00; 9,00]	0	10
Moral	6,97 ± 2,55	8,00 [5,00; 9,00]	0	10
Temporal	6,33 ± 2,63	7,00 [5,00; 8,00]	0	10
Creative	6,09 ± 3,03	6,00 [4,00; 9,00]	0	10
Material / financial	5,11 ± 2,87	5,00 [3,00; 7,00]	0	10
Social	5,86 ± 2,62	6,00 [4,00; 8,00]	14	10
Dangerous and threatening social world view	34,68 ± 7,70	35,00 [30,00; 40,00]	2	58
Hardiness				
Commitment	20,44 ± 5,79	21,00 [17,00; 25,00]	3	30
Control	14,88 ± 4,50	15,00 [12,00; 18,00]	0	24
Challenge	11,06 ± 3,38	11,00 [9,00; 13,00]	6	18
Hardiness (overall score)	46,38 ± 12,54	47,50 [38,00; 55,00]	0	72

various aspects of COVID-19 situation, and estimation of personal recourses) appeared to be very coherent: Cronbach's alpha varies from 0,72 to 0,92 for the whole sample as well as for two different samples (Belarusian and Russian, Table 2).

The comparison of different regimes (Table 3) shows that almost all fears (except fears to become unemployed and to be left without a livelihood) are stronger in Belarus where no special measures of precaution were taken. Belarusians also see social world as more dangerous and threatening. The data shows that pandemic situation had a stronger impact on income, physi-

Table 3
Comparison of two samples with different security measures (Belarus with no security measures and Russia with lockdown): mean ± standard deviation (M ± S) and probability level (p-level) of Mann-Whitney *U* test.

Variable	M ± S		p-level (Mann-Whitney *U* test)
	Belarus	Russia	
Pandemic influence on			
Work	4,98 ± 3,31	5,48 ± 3,59	<0,05
Income	3,87 ± 3,65	4,68 ± 3,96	<0,01
Physical activity	4,86 ± 3,24	6,43 ± 3,38	<0,01
Psychological state	4,49 ± 2,90	4,97 ± 3,00	<0,05
The quality of relationships with loved ones	3,83 ± 3,17	3,56 ± 3,07	n.s.
The quality of social contacts	5,98 ± 2,95	5,38 ± 3,16	<0,05
Fears			
To die	3,55 ± 3,22	2,64 ± 2,74	<0,01
To get sick	4,54 ± 3,03	3,83 ± 2,88	<0,01
Not to be able to help sick loved ones	7,81 ± 2,65	6,54 ± 3,12	<0,01
My loved ones will get sick and die	7,84 ± 2,82	6,21 ± 3,35	<0,01
To be left alone	5,34 ± 3,61	3,42 ± 3,36	<0,01
To become unemployed	3,67 ± 3,19	3,93 ± 3,43	n.s.
To be left without a livelihood	5,14 ± 3,43	4,80 ± 3,45	n.s.
To ruin a relationship with a partner	3,14 ± 3,48	2,09 ± 2,73	<0,01
Of the future	4,69 ± 3,05	4,06 ± 3,12	<0,01
Situation assessment			
Situation uncertainty in the world	6,84 ± 1,95	7,32 ± 2,09	<0,01
Situation difficulty at the moment	6,14 ± 2,21	5,43 ± 2,58	<0,01
Situation personal importance	5,66 ± 2,54	5,47 ± 2,78	n.s.
Severity of stress caused by situation	4,69 ± 2,78	4,57 ± 2,89	n.s.
Difficulty to predict near future	6,48 ± 2,64	6,38 ± 2,75	n.s.
Difficulty to control the situation	5,64 ± 2,83	5,88 ± 3,08	n.s.
Situation hopelessness and undecidability	4,51 ± 2,55	4,14 ± 2,64	n.s.
The weight of your own losses caused by situation	3,87 ± 2,68	3,91 ± 2,71	n.s.
Difficulty to follow the recommendations of the authorities/remain in self-isolation	3,91 ± 3,11	3,73 ± 3,28	n.s.
Willingness to violate the authorities' recommendations	3,82 ± 2,95	4,21 ± 3,26	n.s.
Adequacy of the security measures taken by the authorities	5,90 ± 3,06	5,17 ± 3,19	<0,01
Resources			
Physical	5,46 ± 2,64	5,77 ± 2,93	n.s.
Psychic	6,34 ± 2,41	6,79 ± 2,72	<0,05
Intellectual	6,48 ± 2,36	7,14 ± 2,60	<0,01
Moral	6,57 ± 2,42	7,24 ± 2,60	<0,01
Temporal	6,13 ± 2,30	6,47 ± 2,83	<0,05
Creative	5,66 ± 2,93	6,39 ± 3,07	<0,01
Material/financial	5,08 ± 2,63	5,13 ± 3,02	n.s.
Social	5,85 ± 2,40	5,87 ± 2,76	n.s.
Dangerous and threatening social world view	35,75 ± 6,59	33,97 ± 8,29	<0,01
Hardiness			
Commitment	20,01 ± 5,89	20,72 ± 5,71	n.s.
Control	14,58 ± 4,77	15,09 ± 4,31	n.s.
Challenge	10,81 ± 3,49	11,23 ± 3,30	n.s.
Hardiness (overall score)	45,40 ± 12,93	47,04 ± 12,25	n.s.

cal activity, and psychological state of Russians. Despite the fact that no measures were taken in Belarus the respondents evaluate adequacy of security measures taken by authorities higher. No differences in overall hardiness or any hardiness scales were found, but Russian respondents rated many personal resources (psychic, intellectual, moral, creative) higher than Belarusians.

2. Experimental Design, Materials and Methods

Data includes three parts: socio-demographical information (sex, age, country of citizenship), survey questions and standardized psychological tests (to measure dangerous and threatening

social world view and hardiness). Hardiness was measured by the short version of Hardiness Test [2] based on Maddi's Personal Views Survey III-R [3]. Dangerous and threatening social world view was measured by special test [4] adopted from Duckitt's dual process model [5].

The survey instrument consists of 35 items: 6 statements rating the specific impact of the COVID-19 situation on various aspects of respondents' life (work, income, physical activity, psychological state, the quality of relationships with loved ones, and the quality of social contacts); 9 estimations of different fears (to die, to get sick, not to be able to help sick loved ones, a fear that loved ones will get sick and die, to be left alone, to become unemployed, to be left without a livelihood, to ruin a relationship with a partner, of the future); 11 statements assessing various aspects of COVID-19 situation (situation uncertainty in the world, situation difficulty at the moment, situation personal importance, severity of stress caused by situation, difficulty to predict near future, difficulty to control the situation, situation hopelessness and undecidability, the weight of your own losses caused by situation, difficulty to follow the recommendations of the authorities / remain in self-isolation, willingness to violate the authorities' recommendations, adequacy of the security measures taken by the authorities), and 8 estimations of personal resources (physical, psychic, intellectual, moral, temporal, creative, material / financial, social). All the items require participants to rate them on a 11-point Likert scale from 0 (totally disagree, absolutely no fear or no impact) to 10 (totally agree, the strongest fear or impact). Online survey approach using the Internet platforms (Google Form) was used. All of the survey items were obliged to be answered, thus no missing data was reported.

The data was obtained from 664 respondents from Belarus ($N = 267$) and Russia ($N = 397$) via online survey platform (Google forms) from 2020.04.11 to 2020.06.04 (during the period of lock-down in Russia).

Ethics Statement

The research was conducted in accordance with the Declaration of Helsinki and its subsequent amendments. Participation was entirely voluntary, anonymous, and consensual; the informed consent from participants were obtained prior to testing. No financial incentives were offered or provided for participation. The survey did not collect any identifiable information from the participants.

CRediT Author Statement

Maria A. Odintsova: Conceptualization, Methodology, Software, Original draft preparation, Data curation; **Nataly P. Radchikova:** Visualization, Investigation, Data analysis, Original draft preparation, Writing.

Declaration of Competing Interest

The authors declare that they have no known competing financial interests or personal relationships which have or could be perceived to have influenced the work reported in this article.

Acknowledgments

We express our deep gratitude to Belarusian colleagues who helped us to collect the data in Belarus: Elena M. Semenova, professor from Russian State Social University (Belarusian branch); Alexander P. Lobanov and Nina V. Kozireva, professors from Belarusian State Pedagogical University. The authors also thank all respondents who took part in this research.

References

[1] M.A. Odintsova, N. Radchikova, N.V. Kozyreva, E.I. Kuzmina, Comparative analysis of personal resources of Belarusian and Russian transitional and new generations in new cultural and historical conditions, Soc. Psychol. Soc. 10 (2) (2019) 47–66 (In Russ., abstr. in Engl.), doi:10.17759/sps.2019100205.
[2] E.N. Osin, E.I. Rasskazova, A short version of the hardiness test: psychometric characteristics and application in an organizational context, Moscow Univ. Bull. Ser. 14 Psychol. 3 (3) (2013) 147–165 (In Russ., abstr. in Engl.).
[3] S.R. Maddi, S.C. Kobasa, The Hardy Executive: Health Under Stress, Brooks/Cole, Pacific Grove, CA, 1984.
[4] O.A. Gulevich, O.A. Anikeenok, I.K. Bezmenova, Social beliefs: adaptation of J. Duckitt's scales, Psychol. J. High. Sch. Econ. 11 (2) (2014) 68–89 (In Russ., abstr. in Engl.).
[5] J. Duckitt, C. Wagner, I. du Plessis, I. Birum, The psychological bases of ideology and prejudice: testing a dual process model, J. Pers. Soc. Psychol. 83 (1) (2002) 75–93.