

Short Title: Who is wearing a mask?

1 Who is wearing a mask? Gender-, age-, and location-related 2 differences during the COVID-19 pandemic

3 Michael H. Haischer^{1,2}, Rachel Beilfuss^{1,2}, Meggie Rose Hart¹, Lauren Opielinski¹, David
4 Wrucke³, Gretchen Zirgaitis¹, Toni D. Uhrich^{1,2}, Sandra K. Hunter^{1,2*}

5 ¹Department of Physical Therapy, Marquette University, Milwaukee, Wisconsin, USA.

6 ²Athletic and Human Performance Research Center, Marquette University, Milwaukee,
7 Wisconsin, USA

8 ³Department of Biomedical Sciences, Marquette University, Milwaukee, Wisconsin, USA.

9 *Corresponding author

10 E-mail: sandra.hunter@marquette.edu

11

12 Abstract

13 Masks are an effective tool in combatting the spread of COVID-19, but some people still resist
14 wearing them and mask-wearing behavior has not been experimentally studied in the United
15 States. To understand the demographics of mask wearers and resisters, and the impact of
16 mandates on mask-wearing behavior, we observed shoppers ($n = 9935$) entering retail stores
17 during periods of June, July, and August 2020. Approximately 41% of the June sample wore a
18 mask. At that time, the odds of an individual wearing a mask increased significantly with age
19 and was also 1.5x greater for females than males. Additionally, the odds of observing a mask on
20 an urban or suburban shopper were ~4x that for rural areas. Mask mandates enacted in late
21 July and August increased mask-wearing compliance to over 90% in all groups, but a small
22 percentage of resisters remained. Thus, gender, age, and location factor into whether shoppers
23 in the United States wear a mask or face covering voluntarily. Additionally, mask mandates are
24 necessary to increase mask wearing among the public to a level required to mitigate the spread
25 of COVID-19.

26 Introduction

27 Wearing a mask in public is currently a controversial and politicized issue in the United States,
28 even with case evidence from other countries that face coverings help to control the spread of
29 coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19) [1]. As Taiwan, Hong Kong, South Korea, and other
30 countries with almost universal masking have been some of the most successful at reducing
31 daily case and death rates [2,3], the United States is trending in the other direction, setting
32 national and state records for daily new cases of COVID-19 at the end of June 2020. Despite
33 the controversy, COVID-19 is a virus that can be transmitted through respiratory droplets from
34 infected individuals and even asymptomatic cases can be contagious [4]. Thus, without a
35 vaccine in distribution, masks are one of the few control measures available for protection
36 against the virus because they serve as a physical barrier between people [5,6]. Not only do
37 masks protect the wearer from aerosolized droplets, but they also provide source control,
38 stopping large droplets coming from a wearer before they become airborne. Study of the
39 filtration efficiency of different fabrics has shown that even cotton weaves and blends can block
40 viral transmission [7], so masks can be made virtually cost-free with household materials.

41 Though the evidence of the efficacy and cost-effectiveness of masks is clear, store policies and
42 public mandates requiring masks in America have been met with protests [8] and, in rare cases,
43 violence [9,10]. Public health research shows these measures may already have reduced cases
44 in the United States by 450,000 through May 22nd [11], but the messaging from top-level
45 government officials has been inconsistent [12] and polling suggests that a sizeable portion of
46 the general population are still going out in public without masks [13,14], though self-reported
47 behavior is not always reliable. Women report wearing masks more often than men [14], but
48 demographic differences in mask wearing have not been directly observed. Older adults are at
49 higher risk for more severe cases of COVID-19 [15], so it is reasonable to expect that this
50 demographic may wear masks more than younger individuals. Mask wearing by retail shoppers

Short Title: Who is wearing a mask?

51 may also vary by location, in that groups that report greater resistance to mask wearing may be
52 more concentrated outside of urban areas [16]. Specifically, rural areas tend to have higher
53 concentrations of conservative-leaning voters [17] who are reported to be more resistant to
54 wearing a mask [16]. Learning what demographic groups are wearing masks and how mask
55 mandates impact behavior among these groups will help officials to better target public health
56 messaging that promotes the practice among groups with lower usage. To facilitate greater
57 understanding and reliable experimental data on whether gender, age, location, and the
58 presence of mask mandates influence mask wearing in the United States, we conducted a
59 direct observational study at retail stores in Wisconsin. Observations occurred between June
60 and August 2020. From June 9th to August 3rd, 2020, the 7-day average case rate in Wisconsin
61 more than doubled (341 to 844 cases) and the percentage of positive cases had increased from
62 3.5% to 7.4% [18]. Thus, during this period, many major retail chain [19] and Wisconsin state
63 [20] mask mandates were enacted, allowing for study of mask wearing before and after these
64 regulations went into effect.

65 The primary aim of our study was to determine mask use by gender expression, estimated age,
66 and location. We hypothesized that, without a mandate, mask use among females would be
67 greater than males across all age groups and locations. Additionally, that mask use would be
68 greater among older adults (>65 years old) than middle-age (30-65 years old) and young
69 individuals (2-30 years old) and would be less in rural than in urban or suburban areas. A
70 secondary aim of this project was to revisit stores on dates near the implementation of store and
71 state mask mandates to characterize how mask-wearing behavior changes in response to these
72 requirements.

73 **Materials and Methods**

74 We addressed our primary aim by visiting 36 different retail locations across five different
75 counties in southeastern Wisconsin. Retail stores selected for observation were based largely
76 on geographical spread across Milwaukee and the surrounding areas. In the interest of
77 exploring mask wearing among urban, suburban, and rural stores, we designated a center point
78 of the city (United States Postal Service main office; [345 W St. Paul Ave, Milwaukee, WI, USA](#))
79 and recorded the linear distance of each store to the city center. Based on distance, stores were
80 then placed into urban (<6.1 km from city center; $n = 15$, 3.3 ± 1.8 km to city center), suburban
81 (11.5-32.1 km; $n = 12$, 20.5 ± 7.2 km), and rural (>36.9 km; $n = 9$, 55.8 ± 21.4 km) store groups.
82 Visits to stores ($n = 36$) occurred at various times between 9am and 8pm (June 3rd-9th, 2020)
83 and typically lasted less than an hour, with observers recording data with writing utensil and
84 paper or mobile device. To address our secondary aim, stores were revisited and data was
85 collected in the same manner on dates shortly before store or state mandates were
86 implemented ($n = 8$; July 24th-31st, 2020), when there was a store mandate but not a state
87 mandate ($n = 20$; July 22nd-July 31st, 2020), and after the Wisconsin state mandate began ($n =$
88 10; August 1st-3rd, 2020). Note that the overlap in the secondary visit dates is related to
89 corporate differences in the dates mask mandates began at various stores. Stores consisted of
90 grocery and other large big-box retail stores and shoppers were not aware they were being
91 observed. Children under the estimated age of two were not recorded. For all observations that
92 were collected, summary sheets were crosschecked by other observers. All procedures
93 involved public observation or accessed public information and did not require review by an
94 Institutional Review Board.

95 To determine the impact of gender, age, location, and their interactions on mask wearing during
96 the initial visit period (June 3rd-9th, 2020), multiple logistic regression analysis was performed.
97 Sixty individuals who were wearing their mask or face covering improperly (not over nose and

Short Title: Who is wearing a mask?

98 mouth) were recorded but excluded from this analysis as they could not be grouped into a
99 dichotomous outcome (mask/no mask). 5517 observations remained for this analysis, and
100 gender expression, age, and location independent variables were dummy coded and entered
101 into a backward elimination procedure with their associated interactions (gender-age, gender-
102 location, age-location, and gender-age-location). Limit for variable removal and test
103 classification cutoff were set at 0.025 and 0.5, respectively. Adjusted odds ratios (aOR) are
104 expressed with respect to reference groups (gender: male, age: young, location: rural) with 95%
105 confidence intervals and significance was determined at $p < 0.05$.

106 Percentage data including incorrect mask wearers from the initial visit (June 3rd-9th, 2020) was
107 used to compare to later data (July 24th-Aug 3rd, 2020) and evaluate the changes in mask-
108 wearing behavior in response to mask mandates. All analyses were performed with either
109 Microsoft Excel (Microsoft, Redmond, WA, USA) or IBM Statistical Package for Social Sciences
110 version 26 (IBM, Armonk, NY, USA).

111 **Results and Discussion**

112 Over the course of 74 visits, 9935 individuals were observed entering retail stores. Of the 5517
113 individuals we observed during the first round of data collection that could be grouped into a
114 dichotomous outcome (mask/no mask) (Fig 1), 41.5% were wearing a mask or face covering
115 with the general trend across gender, age, and location largely aligning with our original
116 hypotheses (Table 1). Females wore masks 7.6% more than males (Fig 2A). Additionally,
117 masks were seen at a higher percentage in older than middle-age (+16.1%) and young
118 (+19.8%) individuals (Fig 2B). Urban and suburban mask wearing was similar but was much
119 lower at rural stores (Suburban: -28.7%; Urban: -26.4%; 55.81 ± 21.37 km) (Fig 2C).

120 Regression analysis revealed that gender, age, and location all significantly impact the odds of
121 an individual being observed to wear a mask ($p < 0.001$; Fig 3). Results indicate the odds of a

Short Title: Who is wearing a mask?

122 female wearing a mask are significantly greater than males (aOR = 1.470, 95% CI = 1.313-
123 1.646). Odds are also greater for middle age (aOR = 1.597, 95% CI = 1.359-1.877) and older
124 adults (aOR = 3.434, 95% CI = 2.811-4.195) than younger individuals. The odds of observing
125 someone in urban (aOR = 3.847, 95% CI = 3.157-4.689) or suburban (aOR = 4.124, 95% CI =
126 3.418-4.975) areas wearing a mask is also much higher than in rural locations, reflecting the
127 much lower prevalence of masks seen at rural stores. The significant age-location interaction
128 effect ($p < 0.001$) is largely driven by differential changes in mask-wearing behavior between
129 older adults and the other age groups (Fig 2D).

130 Currently, no peer reviewed and direct observational studies of mask wearing are available for
131 comparison to our study findings. Preprint study akin to ours also reflects alarming and similarly
132 low percentages of mask wearing in Wisconsin [21]. Additionally, our data can be discussed in
133 relation to national polls and surveys that addressed mask wearing at about the same time. A
134 May-to-June survey of adults in Wisconsin and four other surrounding states indicated 45.1%
135 always wear a mask when they leave home [13], and data in our study lends credibility to this
136 number. Notably, other regions of the United States surveyed reported different habits (33.5-
137 64% mask usage) so direct observational studies in other parts of the country would be
138 beneficial to confirm national variability when mask mandates are not in place. Another poll
139 conducted in mid-April indicated that only 36% of adults always wear a mask or face covering
140 when outside the home [14], so perhaps usage nation-wide has gradually improved even when
141 masks are not required. Women also reported wearing a mask more often than men. So why
142 are men wearing masks in public places less than women? Perhaps masks are viewed as a
143 sign of fragility or weakness among some men in the USA, as suggested in previous preprint
144 work [22]. Public health messaging that focuses on aligning masks with masculinity would likely
145 be beneficial to improve usage among males in the United States.

Short Title: Who is wearing a mask?

146 It is not surprising that our June data showed that older individuals wear masks more than
147 middle-age and young people because older adults are at higher risk for more severe cases of
148 COVID-19. However, the low percentage of young individuals wearing a mask combined with
149 their potential to be asymptomatic [23] creates problems for case containment. A key and
150 underreported benefit of masks is source control, so mask wearing is important across all age
151 groups. Lower-risk individuals put older adults and those with preexisting conditions of all ages
152 at risk of severe illness by not wearing a mask due to the potential for asymptomatic viral
153 transmission.

154 One of the most interesting findings of the current study is the evidence of drastically different
155 mask-wearing behavior in rural areas compared with urban and suburban shoppers when mask
156 requirements are not in place. The odds of urban and suburban shoppers wearing a mask was
157 about 4x greater than for rural store-goers during our June data collection period, possibly
158 reflecting the fact that individuals shopping in rural areas perceive lower risk. However, it has
159 been previously reported that mask-wearing habits do not appreciably differ between counties
160 with low and high numbers of COVID-related deaths [14]. Further, while living population density
161 may be lower in rural regions, the size of retail stores is relatively uniform. Thus, differences in
162 the density of shoppers in stores across regions is likely far less than the actual population
163 density differences reflect. Understanding why rural shoppers may resist the use of masks more
164 than shoppers in other areas is an important issue because the health care system in these
165 areas of the United States may be less equipped to handle large spikes in cases. Rural
166 residents may also need to travel further for emergency care, putting them at greater risk for
167 severe consequences of infection. For these reasons, public health messaging that promotes
168 masks in rural communities is very important.

169 By the last week of July 2020, for stores with no mask mandate, wearing increased to about
170 80% overall (Fig 4). This may reflect some improvement in voluntary compliance, as many

Short Title: Who is wearing a mask?

171 stores had announced mandates to be enforced at later dates. Thus, some individuals may
172 have been moved to comply due to the prospect of needing to wear a mask for future shopping
173 trips. Within these data there were no discernable age-related differences, but it was still evident
174 that more females (82.2%) were wearing masks than males (77.8%). Data after store and the
175 Wisconsin state mask mandates began shows mask wearing increased to over 90% overall (Fig
176 4).

177 Modeling studies suggest mask usage needs to be to nearly universal to have a significant
178 effect on the epidemiological curve [24,25], and our results emphasize that mask mandates are
179 necessary to approach this goal. If public officials do not enact these mandates the welfare of
180 shoppers will continue to be left to retail corporations. While retail store mandates obviously
181 improve mask-wearing compliance among shoppers, our data may indicate that that store
182 regulations could be slightly less effective than mandates enacted by government as a slightly
183 higher percentage of individuals were observed correctly wearing masks after a state mandate
184 began (96% vs 93% with store mandate only).

185 Mask mandates obviously improve usage, but it deserves mention that a small percentage of
186 the population still resist masks even with retail store and government regulations in place.
187 Though it may be argued that some shoppers might have a health condition that precludes
188 wearing a mask, the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention only recommend against mask
189 wearing if an individual has trouble breathing or is unable to remove a face covering without
190 assistance [26] so it is improbable that this is a valid explanation for all of the mask resisters
191 observed with a state mandate (2%; Fig 4). Mask-wearing mandates are necessary to reduce
192 person-to-person transmission of COVID-19 and save lives as a portion of the general public
193 will resist wearing masks in retail stores without them.

Short Title: Who is wearing a mask?

194 Even with mandates in place, some individuals still resist or wear them incorrectly, putting
195 employees, other shoppers, and themselves at risk due to the potential for viral transmission
196 from asymptomatic carriers [4]. Encouraging voluntary compliance to mask wearing is critical so
197 that retail employees do not have to play the role of “mask police”, risking verbal or physical
198 abuse from resistant shoppers. Close encounters (within six feet) are a great risk to employees
199 if the resistor without a mask is infected. Though some stores provide masks to shoppers after
200 entering, there is still a short period that these individuals are inside of the store without masks
201 on. As the possibility of aerosolized transmission of COVID-19 was recently confirmed [27],
202 every breath and word spoken without a mask on (or without one covering mouth and nose) and
203 especially indoors, increases risk of aerosolized virus spread. Thus, it is critical to wear a mask
204 from entrance to exit of any public indoor space. To further reduce the number of individuals
205 entering without a mask, stores may benefit from providing masks to shoppers that need them
206 outside of the entrance, where possible. Averting cases of COVID-19 will save lives so wearing
207 a mask is a public health service and should not a symbol of frailty or fragility of the individual.
208 Wearing a mask is not about stopping transmission of all cases but minimizing case rates and
209 lessening the public health burden. Importantly, the long-term effects of COVID-19 are still
210 unknown so mask wearing is also vital to reduce burden from future comorbidities that may
211 result within individuals who were infected.

212 **Conclusions**

213 Masks are an essential public health intervention for combatting the pandemic, and only 41% of
214 individuals observed in our June sample were wearing a mask when entering a retail store. This
215 is less than half the percentage needed to have a significant effect on the reducing the spread
216 of COVID-19 [24,25]. Males, younger individuals, and shoppers in rural communities were
217 observed wearing masks less than other groups. However, with store mandates and a state-
218 wide mandate to wear a mask, we showed that mask-wearing compliance rose to over 90% in

Short Title: Who is wearing a mask?

219 all groups, including those that resisted mask wearing in June. As officials around the United
220 States continue to debate mask mandates at local and state levels, our data indicated that
221 mandates are necessary to ensure mask-wearing compliance among the public meets the
222 minimum threshold to take control of the COVID-19 pandemic. Our data also highlights that a
223 portion of the general population does not follow public health recommendations without them.
224 Furthermore, even with mandates in place a portion of shoppers (~4%) still resist or wear masks
225 ineffectively. Individual shoppers may consider this information to evaluate the potential risks of
226 in-person shopping based on store and local mask policies, location, and the age and gender of
227 the store's clientele. Our findings are also important to inform policy makers that mask
228 mandates are necessary to improve compliance to a level that can help flatten the
229 epidemiological curve, saving lives and decreasing burden on the United States health care
230 system.

231 **References**

- 232 1. Coronaviridae Study Group of the International Committee on Taxonomy of Viruses. The
233 species severe acute respiratory syndrome-related coronavirus: classifying 2019-nCoV
234 and naming it SARS-CoV-2. *Nat Microbiol.* 2020;5: 536–544.
- 235 2. Prather KA, Wang CC, Schooley RT. Reducing transmission of SARS-CoV-2. *Science.*
236 2020;368(6498): 1422-1424.
- 237 3. Stutt ROJH, Retkute R, Bradley M, Gilligan CA, Colvin J. A modelling framework to
238 assess the likely effectiveness of facemasks in combination with 'lock-down' in
239 managing the COVID-19 pandemic. *Proc R Soc A.* 2020;476: 20200376.
- 240 4. He X, Lau EHY, Wu P, Deng W, Wang J, Hao X, et al. Temporal dynamics in viral
241 shedding and transmissibility of COVID-19. *Nat Med.* 2020;26(5): 672-675.
- 242 5. Greenhalgh T. Face coverings for the public: Laying straw men to rest. *J Eval Clin Pract.*
243 2020; e13415.
- 244 6. Greenhalgh T, Schmid MB, Czypionka T, Bassler D, Gruer L. Face masks for the public
245 during the COVID-19 crisis. *BMJ (Clinical research ed.).* 2020;369: m1435.
- 246 7. Chu DK, Akl EA, Duda S, Solo K, Yaacoub S, Schünemann HJ. Physical distancing,
247 face masks, and eye protection to prevent person-to-person transmission of SARS-CoV-
248 2 and COVID-19: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *The Lancet.* 2020;395(10242):
249 1973-1987.

Short Title: Who is wearing a mask?


- 250 8. Gutierrez M. Anti-vaccine activists, mask opponents target public health officials - at their
251 homes. Los Angeles Times. 2020 June 18 [Cited 2020 July 2]. Available from:
252 [https://www.latimes.com/california/story/2020-06-18/anti-mask-protesters-target-county-](https://www.latimes.com/california/story/2020-06-18/anti-mask-protesters-target-county-health-officers)
253 [health-officers](https://www.latimes.com/california/story/2020-06-18/anti-mask-protesters-target-county-health-officers)
- 254 9. Kessler B. Black mayor of Kansas city says he was called N-word, received death threat
255 over mask rule. NBC News. 2020 June 30 [Cited 2020 July 2]. Available from:
256 [https://www.nbcnews.com/news/us-news/black-mayor-kansas-city-says-he-was-called-](https://www.nbcnews.com/news/us-news/black-mayor-kansas-city-says-he-was-called-n-word-n1232514)
257 [n-word-n1232514](https://www.nbcnews.com/news/us-news/black-mayor-kansas-city-says-he-was-called-n-word-n1232514)
- 258 10. Rubenstein S. No mask, no service. McDonald's customer attacks drive-through worker
259 over safety rule. San Francisco Chronicle. 2020 July 2 [Cited 2020 July 3]. Available
260 from: [https://www.sfchronicle.com/crime/article/No-mask-no-service-McDonald-s-](https://www.sfchronicle.com/crime/article/No-mask-no-service-McDonald-s-customer-15383603.php)
261 [customer-15383603.php](https://www.sfchronicle.com/crime/article/No-mask-no-service-McDonald-s-customer-15383603.php)
- 262 11. Lyu W, Wehby GL. Community use of face masks and COVID-19: Evidence from a
263 natural experiment of state mandates in the US. Health Affairs, 2020;8: 1-7.
- 264 12. Breslow J. Fauci: Mixed messaging on masks set U.S. public health response back.
265 NPR. 2020 July 1 [Cited 2020 July 2]. Available from:
266 [https://www.npr.org/sections/health-shots/2020/07/01/886299190/it-does-not-have-to-](https://www.npr.org/sections/health-shots/2020/07/01/886299190/it-does-not-have-to-be-100-000-cases-a-day-fauci-urges-u-s-to-follow-guidelines)
267 [be-100-000-cases-a-day-fauci-urges-u-s-to-follow-guidelines](https://www.npr.org/sections/health-shots/2020/07/01/886299190/it-does-not-have-to-be-100-000-cases-a-day-fauci-urges-u-s-to-follow-guidelines)
- 268 13. Enten H. The Northeast leads the country in mask-wearing. CNN. 2020 June 26 [Cited
269 2020 July 2]. Available from: [https://www.cnn.com/2020/06/26/politics/maskwearing-](https://www.cnn.com/2020/06/26/politics/maskwearing-coronavirus-analysis/index.html)
270 [coronavirus-analysis/index.html](https://www.cnn.com/2020/06/26/politics/maskwearing-coronavirus-analysis/index.html)
- 271 14. Ritter Z, Brenan M. New April guidelines boost perceived efficacy of face masks. Gallup.
272 2020 May 13 [Cited 2020 July 2]. Available from:
273 [https://news.gallup.com/poll/310400/new-april-guidelines-boost-perceived-efficacy-face-](https://news.gallup.com/poll/310400/new-april-guidelines-boost-perceived-efficacy-face-masks.aspx)
274 [masks.aspx](https://news.gallup.com/poll/310400/new-april-guidelines-boost-perceived-efficacy-face-masks.aspx)
- 275 15. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention [Internet]. Older Adults and COVID-19
276 [Cited 2020 August 16]. Available from: [https://www.cdc.gov/coronavirus/2019-](https://www.cdc.gov/coronavirus/2019-ncov/need-extra-precautions/older-adults.html)
277 [ncov/need-extra-precautions/older-adults.html](https://www.cdc.gov/coronavirus/2019-ncov/need-extra-precautions/older-adults.html)
- 278 16. Pew Research Center [Internet]. Republicans, democrats move even further apart in
279 coronavirus concerns. 2020 June 25 [Cited 2020 August 16]. Available from:
280 [https://www.pewresearch.org/politics/2020/06/25/republicans-democrats-move-even-](https://www.pewresearch.org/politics/2020/06/25/republicans-democrats-move-even-further-apart-in-coronavirus-concerns/)
281 [further-apart-in-coronavirus-concerns/](https://www.pewresearch.org/politics/2020/06/25/republicans-democrats-move-even-further-apart-in-coronavirus-concerns/)
- 282 17. Badger E. How the rural-urban divide became America's political fault line. New York
283 Times. 2019 May 21 [Cited 2020 August 16]. Available from:
284 <https://www.nytimes.com/2019/05/21/upshot/america-political-divide-urban-rural.html>
- 285 18. Wisconsin Department of Health Services [Internet]. COVID-19: Wisconsin Summary
286 Data [Cited 2020 August 16]. Available from: [https://www.dhs.wisconsin.gov/covid-](https://www.dhs.wisconsin.gov/covid-19/data.htm)
287 [19/data.htm](https://www.dhs.wisconsin.gov/covid-19/data.htm)
- 288 19. Friedman G. McDonald's joins Walmart and dozens of other chains with mask
289 mandates. New York Times. 2020 July 24 [Cited 2020 August 16]. Available from:
290 <https://www.nytimes.com/article/which-stores-require-masks.html>
- 291 20. Evers T. Emergency order #1: Relating to preventing the spread of COVID-19 by
292 requiring face coverings in certain situations. The State of Wisconsin Office of the
293 Governor. 2020 July 20 [Cited 2020 August 16]. Available from:
294 <https://evers.wi.gov/Documents/COVID19/Em001-FaceCoverings.pdf>

Short Title: Who is wearing a mask?

- 295 21. Arp NL, Nguyen TH, Graham Linck EJ, Feeney AK, Schrope JH, Ruedinger KL, et al.
296 Use of face coverings by the public during the COVID-19 pandemic: an observational
297 study. MedrXiv [Preprint]. 2020 medrXiv 2020.06.09.20126946 [posted 2020 June 12;
298 revised 2020 June 23; cited 2020 August 16]: [7 p.]. Available from:
299 <https://www.medrxiv.org/content/10.1101/2020.06.09.20126946v2> doi:
300 10.1101/2020.06.09.20126946
- 301 22. Capraro V, Barcelo H, The effect of messaging and gender on intentions to wear a face
302 covering to slow down COVID-19 transmission. PsyarXiv [Preprint]. 2020 psyarXiv tg7vz
303 [posted 2020 May 11; revised 2020 May 16; cited 2020 July 2]: [19 p.]. Available from:
304 <https://psyarxiv.com/tg7vz> doi:10.31234/osf.io/tg7vz
- 305 23. Davies NG, Klepac P, Liu Y, Prem K, Jit M, CMMID COVID-19 working group, Eggo RM.
306 Age-dependent effects in the transmission and control of COVID-19 epidemics. Nat
307 Med. 2020; s41591-020-0962-9.
- 308 24. Fisman DN, Greer AL, Tuite AR. Bidirectional impact of imperfect mask use on
309 reproduction number of COVID-19: A next generation matrix approach. Infectious
310 Disease Modeling. 2020 July 4. doi: 10.1016/j.idm.2020.06.004.
- 311 25. Vadiveloo J. This simple model shows the importance of wearing masks and social
312 distancing. The Conversation. 2020 June 26 [Cited 2020 July 2]. Available from:
313 [https://theconversation.com/this-simple-model-shows-the-importance-of-wearing-masks-
314 and-social-distancing-140423](https://theconversation.com/this-simple-model-shows-the-importance-of-wearing-masks-and-social-distancing-140423)
- 315 26. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention [Internet]. Considerations for Wearing
316 Masks [Cited 2020 August 16]. Available from: [https://www.cdc.gov/coronavirus/2019-
317 ncov/prevent-getting-sick/cloth-face-cover-guidance.html](https://www.cdc.gov/coronavirus/2019-ncov/prevent-getting-sick/cloth-face-cover-guidance.html)
- 318 27. Lednicky JA, Lauzardo M, Fan ZH, Jutla AS, Tilly TB, Gangwar M, et al. Viable SARS-
319 CoV-2 in the air of a hospital room with COVID-19 patients. MedrXiv [Preprint]. 2020
320 medrXiv 2020.08.03.20167395 [posted 2020 August 4; cited 2020 August 16]: [x p.].
321 Available from: <https://www.medrxiv.org/content/10.1101/2020.08.03.20167395v1> doi:
322 10.1101/2020.08.03.20167395

Short Title: Who is wearing a mask?


323 **Fig 1. Mask-wearing percentages by Wisconsin county.** Data shown indicates the number of
324 observations collected and percentage of people wearing a mask (vs. no mask) in each county
325 where retail stores were visited during the initial data collection period from June 3rd through
326 June 9th, 2020. The star symbol in Milwaukee county represents the city center location used for
327 identifying urban, suburban, and rural stores.



328

Short Title: Who is wearing a mask?


329 **Fig 2. Mask-wearing percentages across gender, age, and location.** Data shown indicates
330 percentage of individuals wearing a mask (vs. no mask) during the initial data collection period
331 from June 3rd through June 9th, 2020. **A.** Females wear masks more than males. **B.** Older adults
332 wear masks more than other individuals. **C.** Mask-wearing habits are similar in urban and
333 suburban areas, but usage drops off considerably at rural stores. **D.** Mask wearing plotted by
334 location highlights how the mask-wearing behavior of older adults (O) is less impacted by
335 shopping in a rural area than the behavior of young (Y) and middle-age (MA) individuals.



336

Short Title: Who is wearing a mask?

337 **Fig 3. Odds of wearing a mask.** Adjusted odds ratios (aOR) and 95% confidence interval plots
 338 of mask usage for gender expression, age, and location during the initial data collection period
 339 from June 3rd-9th, 2020. Odds ratios are expressed in relation to reference groups (gender:
 340 male; age: young; location: rural).




341

342

Short Title: Who is wearing a mask?

343 **Fig 4. Mask-wearing percentages between June and August 2020.** Mask-wearing
344 compliance was poor in June but had improved immediately before mandates began.
345 Compliance rose to > 90% with a mandate in place across all demographics, but a small
346 percentage of the population still resisted. The overlap in “before” and “with store mandates”
347 dates is related to corporate differences in the dates mask mandates began.



348

Short Title: Who is wearing a mask?

Table 1. Observed odds ($\frac{mask}{no\ mask}$) of wearing a mask by age and location during initial data collection period from June 3rd-9th, 2020*

	<i>Young</i>		<i>Middle Age</i>		<i>Older</i>	
	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male
<i>Urban</i>	0.879	0.639	1.022	0.863	2.115	1.049
<i>Suburban</i>	0.886	0.567	1.257	0.763	2.113	1.468
<i>Rural</i>	0.076	0.117	0.287	0.172	1.094	0.600

* Odds > 1 show odds of wearing a mask are greater than not wearing a mask

349