

## Report 1: Baseline Panel Data. Scientific Report

### *Participants*

Data were collected by Dynata LLC, which creates nationally representative samples for survey data. The survey was administered on Qualtrics, an online survey platform, aiming for a pre-registered target of 3,500 participants. Participants were required to be adults (age 18 years or older), US residents, and able to complete the survey in English. Participants were excluded if their open-ended response to a general question at the start of the survey was copied from an online search or was off topic, either of which would indicate responses that don't reflect individualized response to the question being asked. Inconsistent responses to what should be mutually exclusive responses to any of three questions about personal experience with Covid-19 also resulted in exclusion. Data collection spanned April 24, 2020 to May 11, 2020, inviting 41,274 individuals to participate, and consenting 4,453 who completed the survey. Of these, 392 participants were excluded by the criteria above, leaving 3,974 participants (9.6% overall response rate).

### *Recruitment*

A variety of communication methods were used to recruit participants for the survey, including email invitations and desktop and in-app alerts. These alerts included no details about the study itself, to avoid self-selection bias. Participants were invited to "take a survey" with details disclosed only after a survey had been selected for them to take within the system.

### *Results*

The dependent variable, "How anxious or worried do you feel about Covid-19, getting it, spreading it, needing hospital care?" was successfully predicted,  $F(12,3604) = 32.014, p < .001$ ,  $\text{adj } R^2 = .093$ . Five were significant predictors. White participants were less anxious,  $B = -0.247, p < .001$ , more anxiety was reported by those with health conditions that make them more vulnerable to the novel coronavirus,  $B = 0.410, p < .001$ , and those who knew someone who had

tested positive,  $B = 0.196, p < .001$ . Republicans were less anxious about it,  $B = -0.098, p = .024$ , and, over and above partisan identify, the more skeptical participants were of the pandemic as measured by reporting support for the policies of President Trump, the less anxious they reported being about the novel coronavirus,  $B = -.100, p < .001$ . There was no effect of being elderly, male, married, level of income, having a college education, working, or having been laid off due to Covid-19

The dependent variable, “To what extent do you think the following nationwide policies are optimal for dealing with COVID-19?” was successfully predicted,  $F(12,3602) = 22.453, p < .001$ , adj  $R^2 = 0.066$ . Five were significant predictors. Elderly individuals were more confident,  $B = 0.201, p = .001$ , as were participants who knew someone who had tested positive for COVID-19,  $B = 0.125, p = .001$ . Males reported feeling less confident,  $B = -0.136, p < .001$ , along with participants who were working,  $B = -0.101, p < .01$ , and those skeptical of the pandemic,  $B = -0.147, p < .001$ . There was no effect of being white, attending college, income, being laid off, marital status, health conditions, or being republican.

The dependent variable, “How often have you been doing these behaviors lately?” was successfully predicted,  $F(12,3604) = 27.049, p < .001$ , adj  $R^2 = .080$ . Seven were significant predictors. Participants reported more protective behaviors if they were elderly,  $B = 0.137, p < 0.01$ , had higher income,  $B = 0.034, p < 0.01$ , were married,  $B = 0.111, p < 0.001$ , or had health conditions that made them more vulnerable to COVID-19,  $B = 0.149, p < 0.001$ . Less protective behaviors were reported by white individuals,  $B = -0.139, p < 0.001$ , and male participants,  $B = -0.233, p < 0.001$ , as well as those skeptical of the pandemic,  $B = -0.071, p < 0.001$ . There was no effect of attending college, working, being laid off, knowing someone who had tested positive with the novel coronavirus, or being republican.

The dependent variable, efforts at social distancing, “In the last 7 days did you do any of the following (stay home, by phone, stay away, reduce errands)?” was successfully predicted,  $F(12, 3604) = 26.266, p < 0.001$ , adj  $R^2 = 0.077$ . Eight were significant predictors. Elderly

participants reported doing more of the listed efforts,  $B = 0.148, p < 0.01$ , as did those with higher incomes,  $B = 0.038, p < 0.01$ , college educated participants,  $B = 0.087, p < 0.01$ , and those who reported health conditions that would make them susceptible to COVID-19,  $B = 0.213, p < 0.001$ . White participants reported less distancing behaviors,  $B = -0.117, p < 0.001$ , as did those working and those skeptical of the pandemic  $B = -0.095, p < 0.001$ . There was no effect of being laid off, married, knowing someone who has tested positive, or being a republican.

The dependent variable, “Exposure: total number of visitors and outsiders closer than 6ft of distance” (log transformed and truncated at count = 100), was successfully predicted,  $F(12,3603) = 9.523, p < 0.001$ , adj  $R^2 = 0.028$ . There were four significant predictors of exposure: being elderly, gender, working, and being skeptical of the pandemic. Elderly individuals had less exposure  $B = -0.241, p = 0.001$ , males reported more exposure,  $B = 0.105, p = 0.011$ , along with people working,  $B = 0.317, p < 0.001$ , and those skeptical of the pandemic,  $B = 0.056, p < 0.01$ . There was no effect of race, income, college education, being laid off, marital status, health conditions, knowing someone who has tested positive with COVID-19, or political affiliation on exposure count.

The dependent variable, “Exposure: total number of visitors and outsiders closer than 6ft of distance” (log transformed and truncated at count = 100) was successfully predicted,  $F(14,3600) = 10.150, p < 0.001$ , adj  $R^2 = 0.034$ . There were 5 significant predictors of exposure: being elderly, gender, working, being skeptical of the pandemic, and trust in policies. Elderly individuals had less exposure,  $B = -0.211, p < 0.01$ , males reported to have more exposure,  $B = 0.88, p = 0.035$ , along with people working,  $B = 0.308, p < 0.001$ , and those skeptical of the pandemic,  $B = 0.041, p = 0.021$ . People who had higher trust in nationwide policies reported less exposure,  $B = -0.113, p < 0.001$ . There was no effect on exposure count of race, income, college education, being laid off due to COVID-19, marital status, health conditions, knowing someone who has tested positive with COVID-19, or political affiliation.

The dependent variable, “exposure: total number of visitors and outsiders closer than 6 ft of distance (log transformed and truncated at count=100)” was successfully predicted,  $F(15, 3599) =$

11.836,  $p < 0.001$ ,  $\text{adj } R^2 = 0.043$ . There were 3 significant predictors of exposure: being elderly, working and the perceived effectiveness of social distancing. Elderly individuals,  $B = -0.212$ ,  $p < 0.01$  and people who believe that social distancing is effective,  $B = -0.147$ ,  $p < 0.001$ , reported less exposure, people who were working reported more exposure,  $B = 0.305$ ,  $p < 0.001$ . There was no effect of race, gender, skepticism of the pandemic, college education, being laid off due to COVID-19, marital status, health conditions, knowing someone who has tested positive with COVID-19 or political affiliation on exposure count.

The dependent variable, “exposure: total number of visitors and outsiders closer than 6 ft of distance (log transformed and truncated at count=100)” was successfully predicted,  $F(16, 3597) = 12.898$ ,  $p < 0.001$ ,  $\text{adj } R^2 = 0.050$ . There were 4 significant predictors of exposure: being elderly, working, perceived effectiveness of social distancing and whether someone thought the health risks of COVID-19 were overblown. Elderly individuals,  $B = -0.192$ ,  $p = 0.01$  and people who believe that social distancing is effective,  $B = -0.122$ ,  $p < 0.001$ , reported less exposure, people working reported more exposure,  $B = 0.290$ ,  $p < 0.001$  and people who believe that COVID-19 is overblown reported more exposure,  $B = 0.105$ ,  $p < 0.001$ . Gender,  $B = 0.052$ ,  $p = 0.210$ , skepticism of the pandemic,  $B = 0.009$ ,  $p = 0.633$ , and trust in nationwide policies,  $B = -0.021$ ,  $p = 0.398$  were no longer significant predictors. There was no effect on race, college education, being laid off due to COVID-19, marital status, health conditions, knowing someone who has tested positive with COVID-19 or political affiliation on exposure count.