When thinking you are better leads to feeling worse: Self-other asymmetries in prosocial behavior and increased anxiety during the Covid-19 pandemic

Chelsea Helion[1]

David V. Smith[1]

Johanna Jarcho[1]

Word Count: 6300

[1]Temple University, Psychology Department

DVS is a Research Fellow of the Public Policy Lab at Temple University

Abstract

Thinking one is better than peers is generally associated with positive psychological outcomes like increased self-esteem and resilience. However, this tendency may be problematic in the context of collective action problems, wherein individuals are reliant on others' prosocial behaviors to achieve larger goals. We examined this question in the context of the Covid-19 pandemic, and recruited participants (n = 1022) from a university community in Spring 2020. We found evidence for a self-peer asymmetry, such that participants reported that they were doing more to stop the spread of the disease and were more prosocially motivated than peers. Actual peer reports indicated that these were overestimations. This self-enhancement tendency comes with a cost: the perceived self-peer asymmetry mediated the relationship between Covid-specific worry and general anxiety during the early lockdown period. This indicates that while believing one is doing more than others may be maladaptive in collective action problems.

Word count: 148

Whether it is thinking we are better drivers, better partners, or just plain better people, it is clear that we generally tend to evaluate ourselves more favorably than we do others [1, 2, 3]. This bias potentially creates a psychological tension in large, densely networked societies, wherein we often *have* to rely on other people in order to bring about substantive change. If people are surrounded by others that they perceive as less competent, less knowledgeable, and more selfish, then they may be particularly pessimistic about the likelihood of collective action to bring about positive change. The Covid-19 epidemic reflects this tension more so than any other time in recent memory — never have we been so reliant on others' intentions and behaviors to quickly produce positive societal outcomes. While self-other asymmetries may be adaptive in many situations, they may be psychologically suboptimal in a situation that requires relying on others for positive outcomes, what is known as a collective action problem. We test this hypothesis by examining whether the individuals who are most likely to think they are better than their peers are also the ones that psychologically fare worse when they are in a situation (i.e., the Covid-19 pandemic) wherein achieving a positive outcome requires reliance on the behaviors of others.

Thinking that we are better than others is usually quite adaptive. It is associated with higher self-esteem [4], underlies predictions for rosier futures [5], and dulls recollections of less-than-ideal pasts [6]. However this tendency can also lead to undue cynicism [7] and result in inaccurate perceptions of both ourselves and others [8]. Indeed, individuals claim more responsibility for task success and take less responsibility for task failure when completing a task with distant others [8], and claim more responsibility for joint outcomes than is logically possible [2, 7]. Often, self-enhancement is benign -- absent the occasional argument with a partner that

might come from overclaiming one's contribution to the housework or the embarrassment of receiving objective feedback about one's driving, these biases may generally function as patterns of cognition that boost positivity and increase creative productivity [9]. However, this cognitive bias may become problematic when societal outcomes depend on the positive actions and behaviors of others (i.e., a collective action problem). If individuals are overly confident in their ability to predict the behavior of others [10], but those predictions are overly pessimistic and cynical [7], then outcomes that rely on others doing the "right thing" may be seen as unlikely to occur. That is, individuals who think more of themselves and expect less of their peers may be particularly pessimistic about the likelihood of solving problems that require collective action. To our knowledge, this is one of the first studies to examine the function of self-enhancement and self-other asymmetries in the context of a collective action problem.

The Covid-19 epidemic presents a critically important example of a collective action problem. In order to successfully contain the virus, individuals have to collectively practice novel behaviors like mask-wearing and social-distancing [11]. Some have posited that one of the most powerful predictors of collective action success in Covid-19 is trust [12] -- both horizontal trust in each other and vertical trust in our institutions [13]. The former -- the trust that we place in others to do the right thing by the group -- is the focus of the research presented below. Specifically, we hypothesize that individuals will report a biased self-other asymmetry as it pertains to engaging in behavior that reduces the spread of Covid-19 relative to their peers. Moreover, we predict that this lack of trust in peers will be related to increased covid-related concern, and be associated with heightened anxiety during the pandemic period.

We examine two areas of predicted self-other asymmetry with regard to the Covid-19 pandemic: 1) that individuals will report being more knowledgeable about Covid-19 than their peers, and 2) that individuals will report having made more Covid-19 behavioral changes relative to their peers. Turning first to Covid-related knowledge, prior research on self-other asymmetries has found that individuals tend to overestimate their knowledge in domains where absolute knowledge is high and underestimate it in domains where absolute knowledge is low [14]. Given the extreme amount of coverage that the pandemic had received in the media and across multiple outlets at the time of data collection [15], we predicted that Covid-19 may be a domain where absolute knowledge is relatively high, and that individuals would subsequently overestimate their knowledge relative to their peers.

Second, Covid-19 related behaviors are perceived as highly morally relevant. Individuals who are more prosocially inclined report wearing a mask more frequently, and perceive others who wear masks as being more prosocial than those who do not [16]. In addition, messaging that emphasizes the moral relevance of Covid-19 related behavior change (e.g., wearing a mask, social distancing) is potentially more effective than non-moral messaging [17]. Taken together, this suggests that the Covid-19 domain has perhaps become a moralized one. This would have meaningful implications for self-other asymmetry predictions, as individuals tend to make highly self-serving asymmetric predictions about actions that have moral implications [3]. Given the potential moral implications of Covid-19 related behaviors, we predicted that individuals would report restricting their behavior to a greater extent than their peers, and moreover, would be more likely to endorse doing so for prosocial (i.e., to avoid transmitting the virus to others) compared to self-focused (i.e., to avoid contracting the virus themselves) reasons.

We propose that the extent to which individuals think their peers are ill informed and are doing less to protect others than they are will be associated with increased anxiety during the lockdown period. Symptoms of anxiety and depression have been highly prevalent during the Covid-19 pandemic [18, 19, 20, 21]. While there are many possible reasons for this increase, including (but not limited to) increased media and news consumption [22], economic concerns [23], and concern about individual and familial health [24]. We posit that another contributor may be the lack of control we have over the behaviors of others, and the centrality of others in determining Covid-19 related outcomes. We hypothesized that individuals who show a larger self-other asymmetry in covid-related knowledge and prosocial behavior would report higher levels of both covid-specific worry, general anxiety symptoms, and stress during the initial lockdown period. Feeling a lack of personal agency or control is associated with increased anxiety [25], and pessimism is associated with both health problems and negative mood [26]. Notably, prior research has found a *negative* relationship between the tendency to self-enhance relative to one's peers and anxiety [27]. However, we predict the opposite effect in the context of Covid-19, given that surviving a global pandemic necessitates the reliance on others. If individuals believe that their peers are doing less than they are to contain the spread of Covid-19, then they may feel more worried about Covid-19, and more anxious during the lockdown period. To examine this question directly, we test a mediation model wherein the size of self-peer asymmetry in Covid-19 related restrictive behaviors mediates the relationship between Covid-19 specific worry and general anxiety reported during the early stages of the Covid-19 pandemic.

Results

The data presented here is part of the first wave of a longitudinal study collected at a large northeastern university. The first wave of data collection was completed on 3/25/20-4/4/20, approximately 2-3 weeks following the closure of the university on 03/11/2020, and consisted of 1852 participants (1170 Female, M_{age} = 24.03, SD_{age} = 9.24, age range = 18 - 76). We only included participants who filled out all of the measures of interest (covid-related behavioral restriction and risk-assessment), leaving us with a final sample of 1023 participants (697 females, M_{age} = 23.61, SD_{age} = 8.52, age range = 18 - 71). What is unique about this population is that they are all members of the larger university community (e.g., undergraduates, graduate students, faculty, staff, etc.). This is perhaps an ideal sample in which to study the nature and accuracy of self-peer asymmetries given that we can compare individual estimates of the average population with what the average population is actually reporting. For example, we can compare what an individual undergraduate believes their peers are doing with what undergraduate students are actually reporting in the sample. This allows us to examine whether individuals' beliefs about where they stand relative to their peers are accurate.

Individuals are overconfident about Covid-19 knowledge relative to peers. Participants estimated their knowledge of Covid-19 relative to their peers (on a scale from 0 = "Know much less" to 6 = "Know much more"). We first hypothesized that individuals would report knowing more than the average peer about Covid-19, but that this would not necessarily track with reality. A one-sample t-test on perceived Covid-19 knowledge relative to one's peers (i.e., perceived Covid-19 knowledge asymmetry) found that the mean (M = 3.48, SD = 1.15) was significantly

different from the midpoint (3), $t(1022) = 13.48$, $p < .001$, indicating that our sample believed that they knew more than their peers about Covid-19. A paired t-test indicated that participants were more likely to endorse correct transmission knowledge about Covid-19 ($M = 2.56$, $SD = .59$) as compared to incorrect symptom knowledge ($M = .52$, $SD = .73$), $t(1022) = 54.31$, $p < .001$. However, perceived Covid-19 knowledge asymmetry did not predict being more knowledgeable about Covid-19 symptoms: $b = .054$, $se = .032$, $t(1020) = 1.67$, $p = .095$, or general Covid-19 knowledge: $b = .015$, $se = .030$, $t(1020) = .49$, $p = .625$, relative to one's peers. Taken together, this indicates that while individuals believed that they are more knowledgeable about Covid-19 relative to their peers, this belief did not reflect actually knowing more about Covid-19 symptoms or how the disease spreads.

Individuals are optimistic about their likelihood of infection relative to peers. Participants also estimated their risk of becoming infected with Covid-19, their risk of transmitting Covid-19, and their risk of dying if they were to become infected with Covid-19. They were then asked to make the same assessments for their average peer. All risk estimates were between 0-100%. We hypothesized that, consistent with other research on unrealistic optimism regarding health-related risk [30], participants would indicate that their peers were at higher risk than they were for getting infected with (i.e., self-focused) and transmitting Covid-19 (i.e., prosocial) to others. We found a significant target (self, peer) by action-type (infection, transmission) interaction, $F(1, 4088) = 12.18$, $p < .001$. Post-hoc pairwise comparisons of this interaction indicated that in the self condition, the perceived likelihood of getting infected was higher ($M = 32.60$, $SD = 24.31$) than perceived likelihood of transmitting the virus to others ($M = 36.89$, $SD = 30.94$), $t(1022) = 5.34$, $p < .001$. This was smaller than the difference observed in the peer condition, wherein the

predicted likelihood of getting infected was higher (M = 42.09, SD = 25.52) than the perceived likelihood of transmitting the virus to others (M = 52.83, SD = 36.06), $t(1022) = 11.69$, $p < .001$) (Figure 1). We found no differences in estimated risk of death following COVID-19 infection between self (M = 11.28, SD = 17.53) and peer (M = 11.41, SD = 15.95), $t(1022) = .29$, $p = .77$, suggesting that our participants believed that they were as likely as peers to be negatively impacted by Covid-19, were they to contract it.



Figure 1. Interaction between Target (self, other) and Action Type (Getting infected with Covid-19, Transmitting Covid-19 to someone else) on estimated risk. Relative to their peers, individuals predicted that they would be less likely to get infected with Covid-19, and also less likely to transmit it to others.

Individuals believe that they are restricting their behavior more, and for more prosocial reasons, relative to peers. Participants also indicated how much they had limited their social interactions to reduce their likelihood of becoming infected, and how much they had limited their social interactions to reduce their likelihood of transmitting Covid-19 to others. They were also asked to indicate to what extent they felt that their average peer had done the same. All social interaction limitation questions were answered on a scale from 0 = "Not at all" to 6 = "Extremely". To examine whether perceived social interaction limitation predicted actual behavior change, we also asked participants to indicate which of a list of common social behaviors (e.g., getting together with friends, going to the movies, going to class) they had limited in the preceding two week period.

Turning first to beliefs about behavior change, we found a significant interaction between target (self, other) and action type (infection, transmission) on perceived behavior change, $F(1,4088) = 5.19$, $p = .023$. Post-hoc pairwise comparisons of this interaction indicated that individuals were more likely to report that they had limited their behaviors to avoid transmitting the virus to others ($M = 5.24$, $SD = 1.21$), as compared to protecting themselves from infection ($M = 5.14$, $SD = 1.18$), $t(1023) = 2.92$, $p = .004$. In contrast, they reported the *opposite* for their peers, such that they estimated that their peers were less motivated to limit their behaviors to avoid transmitting Covid-19 to others ($M = 3.40$, $SD = 1.42$), as compared to protecting themselves from infection ($M = 3.48$, $SD = 1.25$), $t(1023) = 3.07$, $p = .002$ (Figure 2). Taken together, this indicates that individuals believe that they limited their behavior in order to protect others, but that their peers had done so to protect themselves.



Figure 2. Interaction between Target (Self, Other) and Action Type (Getting infected with Covid-19, Transmitting Covid-19 to someone else) on estimated behavior change. Individuals reported that they had limited their behaviors to avoid transmitting the others more than they had limited it to avoid getting infected. They reported that the opposite had been the case for their peers.

Are beliefs about behavioral restriction relative to peers accurate? To examine whether these assessments tracked with reality, we computed 3 difference scores, outlined in the table below (Table 1). Given that they were highly correlated (r = .76), we collapsed across transmission-

based and infection-based restriction for the remaining analyses. For all scores, higher numbers reflect a bias towards the self restricting more than peers (Table 1).

Asymmetry Type	**Variables**
Predicted Behavioral Restriction	(Self-reported behavioral restriction −− self-estimated peer restriction)
Actual Behavior Restriction	(Self-reported behavioral restriction − average peer restriction)
Specific Behavior Change	(Number of self-reported specific behaviors −− Number of average peer specific behaviors)

Table 1. Difference score calculations to assess each of the measured self-peer asymmetries.

Individuals are inaccurate about magnitude, but right about direction. Due to the nature of our sample, we can again test whether individuals' beliefs about their average peer hit the mark. Given that the process through which the reported self-peer discrepancy was calculated (see Methods) was largely identical to the process of mean-centering, if individuals are well-calibrated with regard to where they stand relative to their peers, the *average* predicted self-peer discrepancy should also be around 0. That is, individuals who are restricting their behaviors less than peers should report being lower than peers, and those who are restricting more should report being higher than peers, and this would even out in an average group estimate of 0. If this estimate were higher than 0, this would mean that, on average, individuals are overestimating what they are doing relative to their peers. We found that predicted behavioral restriction (M = 1.75, SD = 1.54) was much larger than actual behavior restriction (M = .002, SD =1.06), $t(1021)$

= 44.53, p <.001. This indicates that individuals are significantly overestimating the extent to which they are restricting their behaviors relative to their peers.

However, we found that predicted behavioral restriction and actual behavioral restriction were significantly and positively correlated, $\rho = .55, p < .001$,such that individuals who thought that they were restricting behavior more than their peers generally were. Taken together with the t-test results, this suggests that individuals are inaccurate about the *size* of the asymmetry between self and peer (as indexed by the large average discrepancy between actual and perceived behavioral restrictions) but accurate about the *direction* of the asymmetry (as indexed by a positive relationship between predicted and actual behavioral restriction asymmetries).

Relationship between perceived behavioral restriction and actual behavior change

To examine whether beliefs about the extent to which individuals restricted their behavior relative to their peers related to actual differences in behavior change, we examined self-peer differences in the number of activities (e.g., Going to restaurants, cafes, or bars; Getting together with family) that participants had reported limiting over the past two weeks. We found that on average, participants reported limiting 14.75 (SD = 3.58) behaviors (out of a possible 22, see Methods for full list of behaviors). We found that predicted behavioral restriction relative to one's peers was positively correlated with the number of behaviors one reported limiting relative to peer group averages, r = .28, t(1020) = 9.30, p < .001.

Relationship between self-peer asymmetries and mental health outcomes

Next, we examined the role that perceived self/other asymmetry may play in maladaptive emotional responding. To do so, we quantified the relationship between asymmetry measures (knowledge asymmetry, behavioral restriction asymmetry) and Covid-related worry and anxiety more generally. To assess Covid-related worry, participants were asked a series of questions to indicate how often they worried about Covid-19 (see methods for details). These questions had good internal consistency, = .81, and were combined to create a composite variable of Covid-19 related worry.To assess mental health outcomes during the lockdown period, we also asked participants to indicate their levels of Covid-related worry ("e.g., I worried about my health"), anxiety (via the DSM-5 Cross-Cutting Symptom Measure, DSM-5-CC; 28), stress (via the perceived stress scale, PSS; 29).

Knowledge asymmetries and mental health outcomes. Turning first to covid-related worry, we found that, on average, our participants were moderately worried about Covid-19, M = 3.53, SD = 1.23. Consistent with our hypothesis, we found that individuals who felt that they were more knowledgeable about Covid-19 were also those that reported a higher frequency of covid-specific worry, $b = .21$, $SE = .03$, $t(1021) = 6.53$, $p < .001$. To examine whether this asymmetry predicted Covid-19 worry specifically or stress and anxiety more generally, we also examined the relationship between knowledge asymmetry and stress (as assessed by the PSS) and reported anxiety (as assessed by the DSM-CC-5). We did not find a relationship between knowledge asymmetry and experienced stress, $b = -.07$, $se = .19$, $t(1021) = .37$, $p = .71$. We did, however, find a marginally significant relationship between covid knowledge and anxiety, $b = .06$, $se = .03$, $t(1021) = 1.90$, $p = .057$.

Behavioral restriction asymmetries and mental health outcomes. We found that Covid-related worry was significantly associated with the predicted self-peer difference in behavioral restriction, $b = .26$, $SE = .04$, $t(1021) = 6.90$, $p < .001$. We also found a significant relationship stress and predicted self-peer behavioral restriction, $b = .04$, $SE = .01$, $t(1021) = 5.49$, $p < .001$, and between anxiety and predicted self-peer behavioral restriction, $b = .25$, $SE = .04$, $t(1021) = 6.26$, $p < .001$.

Taken together, this suggests that individuals who perceived greater differences in behavioral restriction between themselves and their peers are also more worried about Covid-19, and experiencing increased stress and anxiety. While we found a similar relationship between perceived knowledge differences and covid-related worry, there was not as strong of a relationship between knowledge asymmetry and anxiety/stress during the lockdown period.

Testing whether perceived self-peer asymmetry mediates the relationship between Covid-specific worry and general anxiety. Next, we examined whether, as predicted, a larger self-other asymmetry in perceived behavioral restrictions is linked to more negative mental health outcomes during the Covid-19 lockdown period. We found evidence that the self-other perceived behavioral restriction asymmetry mediated the relationship between covid-specific and general anxiety. A 95% CI determined via non-parametric bootstrapping (5000 iterations) indicated that the indirect effect through the self-other asymmetry score was significant, $b = .02$, 95% CI: [.01, .03], $p < .001$ (Figure 5). Specifically, this indicates that while Covid-related worry was a strong predictor of general anxiety during the early lockdown period, this was due, in part, to the extent to which individuals felt that they were doing more than peers to reduce the spread of the virus.



Figure 4. Self-other asymmetry in perceived behavioral change mediates the relationship between Covid-specific worry and general anxiety during the quarantine period.

Discussion

We found evidence for substantial self-peer asymmetries with regard to the Covid-19 pandemic. Individuals believe (inaccurately) that they know more about Covid-19 than their peers, are less likely to contract and transmit the virus to others, are restricting their behaviors to a greater extent than their peers, and that their actions are more prosocially motivated than their

peers'. Importantly, we found that this self-peer asymmetry, which has been associated with positive psychological outcomes in earlier research [4, 27] is instead linked to negative mental health outcomes during the Covid-19 period. Specifically, the extent to which people thought they were restricting their behavior more than their peers (self-peer asymmetry) mediated the relationship between Covid-specific concern and generalized anxiety during early stages of the pandemic. Taken together, this suggests that while self-other asymmetries may be adaptive or even beneficial in typical circumstances, they may be psychologically suboptimal in a situation that requires relying on others for positive outcomes (i.e., collective action problems).

When are individuals accurate, and when are they not? We found evidence for both accuracy and inaccuracy when estimating peer knowledge and behavior. Individuals reported that they were more knowledgeable about Covid-19 relative to their peers -- a prediction that was not borne out in reality. Given the extent of coverage that the Covid-19 epidemic received during the data collection period, it is likely that individuals were often exposed to information about the pandemic, and indeed, they *were* knowledgeable about the disease. However, they failed to recognize that their peers were also likely inundated by Covid-19 related news and media, and thus were likely also fairly knowledgeable. This effect is consistent with work suggesting that individuals tend to overestimate their knowledge and competence in domains that are well-known and easy [1, 14].

Correct about direction, incorrect about magnitude. With regard to behavioral restriction, we found that individuals tended to overestimate the *magnitude* of the self-peer asymmetry, but were correct about the *direction* of the asymmetry. We found that individuals believed that they were

restricting their behavior more than their peers to a greater extent than was actually the case. However, individuals who were restricting their behavior more (or less) than peers were accurate about their relative standing. Further, participants who believed that they were restricting behavior more than their peers reported limiting more behaviors during the early stages of the Covid-19 pandemic.

Taken together, this suggests that individuals are correctly identifying where they stand relative to peers in terms of limiting behavior, but are perhaps too generous when it comes to determining how *far* above their peers they actually are. To that end, it is worth noting that while the relationship between perceived and actual behavior change relative to peers was highly significant, it is modest in terms of the actual number of behaviors that individuals limited relative to their peers. For example, for participants who indicated a high self-other asymmetry (5 or above, $n = 26$) in behavioral restriction, had restricted, on average, only 1.23 more behaviors than their average peer. This again potentially speaks to an accuracy in direction, but perhaps not in magnitude.

Unrealistic optimism, moral superiority, and increased anxiety. Consistent with accounts of unrealistic optimism for the self relative to peers [30, 31], we found that individuals predicted that they were less likely than their peers to get infected with or transmit Covid-19 to others. In addition, individuals were more likely to claim that they were restricting their behavior for more prosocial reasons than were their peers. This is consistent with research indicating that individuals tend to amplify the extent to which they are above-average in positive and moral domains [4], and report being more morally motivated relative to their peers [3].

While believing one is less likely to fall ill and is a better person than one's peers is associated with maximizing happiness and self-esteem, we found that this belief pattern is associated with more severe anxiety and stress in the context of the Covid-19 pandemic. This could be due to a number of factors. Feeling a lack of situational control is associated with increased negative affect [32], and it is possible that participants who are more pessimistic about their peers feel less situational control in the Covid-19 context. In addition, a great deal of research has found that while self-enhancement may facilitate coping in traumatic and negative situations [33], it is also associated with being less liked by others [33, 34, 35, 36]. It is possible that individuals who were more likely to believe that they were doing better than their peers have less social support or close interpersonal relationships, which may lead to increased anxiety during a stressful time. Both situational control and perceived social support should be examined in future research as potential causal factors.

Limitations. One major limitation of the research presented here is the relative ambiguity with regard to both whom participants were thinking about when asked about an "average peer" and the sources of information they were using to arrive at their self-serving predictions. To turn first to the target of comparison, prior work has found that self-peer asymmetries are mitigated as targets become more individuated [37], and it is likely that these results may not be as pronounced when individuals instead compare themselves to an individuated peer rather than an average peer. In addition, we cannot be completely certain that individuals were thinking of their university-specific peers when making self-peer assessments, given that they were asked to think about the "average peer". It is possible that they were perhaps comparing themselves to their hometown friends, Instagram followers, or the neighbors down the street. It is worth noting,

however, that this would only change the results with regard to self-peer accuracy, and not the general conclusions with regard to mental health outcomes.

In terms of informational ambiguity, it is unclear what information motivated the self-enhancing assessments observed here. Many factors have been identified as underlying self-enhancement, including (and not limited to) failure to integrate base-rate information when evaluating the self [3], a failure to receive or integrate objective feedback [31], not having the skills or expertise to be able to recognize one's own incompetence [38], and motivated autobiographical recall [39]. For example, it is possible that when assessing peer behaviors they tended to rely more on statistical information about things like reports of low mask compliance, and when assessing their own behaviors they instead selectively recalled times they socially distanced or the party invitation that they turned down. It is necessary, of course, to also acknowledge the rational or veridical factors that may give rise to this bias — individuals have more information about the extent to which they have limited or changed behavior following the Covid-19 epidemic as compared to the information they have about their peers. Future research should examine what specific information individuals are using to arrive at biased assessments of themselves and their peers.

Self-other asymmetries and collective action problems. To our knowledge, this is one of the first studies to examine the function of self-enhancement and self-other asymmetries in the context of a collective action problem. We find that individuals who believe that they are doing more than their peers have worse psychological outcomes in contexts where they must rely on their peers to do the right or prosocial thing for their own health. Future research should examine the long-term effects of self-enhancement related anxiety -- does it function as a

motivator for prosocial action, or does it increase the likelihood of burnout? Given that human society will face no shortage of collective action problems in the foreseeable future (the Covid-19 pandemic, racial injustice, climate change, mass extinctions, increased natural disasters) understanding how the psychological processes that we study in the lab promote, prevent, and preclude collective action has perhaps never been so important.

Methods

Undergraduate participants were compensated through course credit based on department-level acceptance of credits (i.e., psychology students could earn credit through taking the study through SONA). All participants, including those who earned course credit, were entered into a raffle at each wave of the study. For the baseline wave of the study, four participants respectively won $100 Amazon e-gift cards. Participants were recruited via university listservs, and their participation entered them in a lottery to win a $100 Amazon gift card.

The total sample consisted of 1386 undergraduate students (74.84%), 166 graduate students (68 Masters students, 98 PhD students; 8.96%), 142 staff members (7.67%), 80 faculty members (43 Non-Tenure Track, 16 Tenure-Track; 4.32%), 26 individuals who identified as “Other” (1.4%), and 52 (2.81%) who did not indicate the nature of their affiliation with the university.

Measures

We collected a number of measures on this sample, but for the purposes of this manuscript, only focused on the variables listed above. These analyses were preregistered on AsPredicted.org: https://aspredicted.org/zu89n.pdf.

Covid-19 Knowledge Measures

Accuracy of Covid-19 symptoms and general knowledge were evaluated based on the information that was known at the time -- March/April 2020. We acknowledge that knowledge about common symptomology for Covid-19 has changed as medical researchers learn more about the disease (Burke *et al*., 2020).

Perceived self-peer Covid-19 knowledge asymmetry. To assess perceived relative knowledge regarding Covid-19, participants were asked to indicate "how knowledgeable they were about covid-19 compared to their peers" on a scale from 0 = "Know much less" to 6 = "Know much more".

Covid-19 symptom knowledge. To assess actual knowledge relative to one's peers, we asked participants to indicate the three most common symptoms of Covid-19 from the following list (the correct answers have been bolded): fatigue, nausea, **shortness of breath**, sneezing, diarrhea, constipation, **cough**, runny nose, **fever**, body aches, and ulcers in the mouth. For each participant, we summed the number of symptoms that they correctly identified, and the number of symptoms that they incorrectly identified, and created a difference score by subtracting the incorrect number from the correct number, such that higher numbers indicate greater knowledge of Covid-19 symptomatology.

General Covid-19 knowledge. To further assess covid-related knowledge, participants were asked to read each of the following statements, and to indicate the extent to which they believed these statements about Covid-19 (correct statements have been bolded): 1) **"Someone can transmit it, even if they do not show symptoms"**, 2) "Your dog or cat can transmit it to you", 3) **"Standard surgical masks prevent you from becoming infected"**, 4) "It mutated from the common cold", 5) "It was probably made in the lab", 6) "It is less deadly than the annual flu", 7) "You can become infected from eating at a Chinese restaurant", 8) "Vitamin C supplements will help keep you from being infected". All statements were evaluated on a scale from 0 = "Proven False" to 6 = "Proven True". For each participant, we calculated their average response for the correct items and their average response for the incorrect items, and created a difference score by subtracting their incorrect average from their correct average, such that higher numbers indicate greater knowledge of Covid-19.

Assessing self-peer knowledge asymmetries. To examine whether an assessment of being more or less knowledgeable about Covid-19 reflected reality, we calculated the average Covid-19 symptom knowledge and average Covid-19 transmission knowledge for each peer group in the sample (i.e., undergraduates, graduate students, faculty, etc.). We then compared the individual participant's averages to their peer group averages. To do so, we subtracted the peer average from each participant's knowledge score, such that higher numbers indicate *actually* being more knowledgeable about Covid-19 relative to one's peers. We then ran a Spearman's with perceived knowledge asymmetry predicting actual knowledge.

Risk Assessment Measures

Covid self-peer risk assessment. Participants were asked to estimate their risk of becoming infected with Covid-19, their risk of transmitting Covid-19, and their risk of dying if they were to become infected with Covid-19. They were then asked to make the same assessments for their average peer. All risk estimates were between 0-100%. To examine the relationship between self-focused (infection risk) vs. social-focused (transmission risk) COVID-risk assessment, we ran a repeated-measures 2 (target: self, other) x 2 (action-type: infection, transmission) ANOVA using the "rstatix" package (Kassambara, 2020) in R.

Behavioral Restriction Measures.

Self- reported behavioral restriction. Participants were asked to indicate how much they had limited their social interactions to reduce their likelihood of becoming infected (self-focused) and how much they had limited their social interactions to reduce their likelihood of exposing others to Covid-19 (prosocial-focused).

Self-estimated peer restriction. They were also asked to indicate to what extent they felt that their average peer had done the same. All questions were answered on a scale from 0 = "Not at all" to 6 = "Extremely".

Specific behavior change. To assess specific behavior change, we asked participants to indicate whether they had limited the following behaviors in the previous two weeks: 1) Going to restaurants, cafes, or bars, 2) Attending events with audiences or spectators (e.g., sporting events, movies, theater, concerts, conferences, festivals, parades, etc.), 3) Getting together with friends, 4) Getting together with family, 5) Attending parties, 6) Attending religious services, 7) Going near/talking to strangers, 8) Using public transportation, 9) Using ride services (e.g., taxis, Uber, Lyft), 10) Travel via train, plane, or bus, 11) Travel via your own car, 12) Exercise, 13) Non-academic classes, 14) Visiting libraries or museums, 15) Shopping for food, 16) Shopping at non-grocery stores, 17) Touching things in public, 18) Using public bathrooms, 19) Walking your dog, 20) Ordering food for delivery, 21) Personal health care (e.g., dentist, annual physical, visiting medical professionals for non-coronavirus conditions). We created a count variable for the number of behaviors that the participants had reported limiting.

Emotion measures

Covid-related worry. Participants were asked to indicate how often they worried about Covid-19 during the past two weeks via the following questions (all on a scale from 0 = "Not at all" to 6 = "Extremely frequently"): "I worried about my health", "I worried about Covid-19", "I worried about all the things I could do about Covid-19", "News about all health-related topics made me worry about Covid-19", "Changing my routine made me worry about Covid-19", "I talked with my friends about Covid-19", and "I felt like I had control over whether or not I would become infected with Covid-19 (reverse-

scored)." These questions had good internal consistency, = .81, and were combined to create a composite variable of Covid-19 related worry.

Anxiety and stress. Symptoms of anxiety were assessed using the anxiety subscale of the DSM-5 Cross-Cutting Symptom Measure (DSM-5-CC; APA, 2013). Higher numbers reflect more severe anxiety over the past two week period. Stress was assessed using the Perceived Stress Scale (PSS; Cohen, Kamarck, & Mermelstein, 1983). Participants indicated how often they had experienced stress over the past two weeks, with higher numbers on the scale reflecting more stress.

Quantifying self-peer asymmetries

Relationship between predicted behavioral restriction and actual behavioral restriction

The actual behavior restriction variable was highly skewed (skewness = - 1.27), so to examine whether a predicted asymmetry in predicted behavioral restriction was associated with an actual asymmetry in the amount of behavioral restriction reported by peers, we calculated Spearman's rank correlation between predicted behavioral restriction and actual behavioral restriction.

Relationship between perceived behavioral restriction and specific behavior change

To examine whether perceived differences in behavioral restrictions relative to one's peers translates to specific behavior change, we ran a linear regression with predicted behavioral restriction as the predictor variable, and specific behavior change as the outcome variable.

Relationship between self-peer asymmetries and mental health outcomes

To examine the role that a perceived self/other asymmetry may play in maladaptive emotional responding we conducted the following analyses.

Knowledge asymmetries and mental health outcomes. We examined the relationship between our asymmetry measures (knowledge asymmetry, behavioral restriction asymmetry) and both Covid-related worry and general anxiety. We first ran a simple linear regression with covid-related knowledge asymmetry predicting covid-related worry. A positive relationship would indicate that individuals who believe that they know more about Covid-19 relative to their peers are also more worried about Covid-19. To examine whether knowledge asymmetry predicts Covid-19 worry specifically or stress and anxiety more generally, we also ran two linear regressions with covid-related knowledge asymmetry predicting stress (as assessed by the PSS) and anxiety (as assessed by the DSM-CC-5).

Behavioral restriction asymmetries and mental health outcomes. To examine whether believing one is restricting behavior more than peers is related to negative mental health outcomes, we ran two simple linear regressions with the predicted behavioral restriction as a fixed factor predicting Covid-specific worry. To examine whether asymmetries in perceived behavioral restriction predicts Covid-specific worry specifically or anxiety more generally, we also ran a linear regression with predicted behavioral restriction predicting perceived stress and anxiety over the past two weeks.

Testing whether perceived self-peer asymmetry mediates the relationship between Covid-specific worry and general anxiety. Next, to examine whether a larger self-other asymmetry is linked to more negative mental health outcomes during the Covid-19 lockdown period, we tested whether the degree of predicted self-other behavioral restriction mediated the relationship between Covid-specific worry and general anxiety during the lockdown period. We used the averaged behavioral restriction asymmetry score (i.e., the average of the predicted self-other self- and prosocial-focused behavioral restriction estimates). Using the "mediation" package in R (Tingley et al., 2014) we ran a mediation analysis, testing whether the size of the predicted self-other asymmetry mediated the relationship between Covid-specific worry and reported general anxiety.

References

1. Kruger, J. (1999). Lake Wobegon be gone! The “below-average effect” and the egocentric nature of comparative ability judgments. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *77*(2), 221–232. https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.77.2.221
2. Ross, M., & Sicoly, F. (1979). Egocentric biases in availability and attribution. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 37*(3), 322–336. https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.37.3.322
3. Epley, N., & Dunning, D. (2000). Feeling “holier than thou”: Are self-serving assessments produced by errors in self- or social prediction? *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *79*(6), 861–875. https://doi.org/10.1037//0022-3514.79.6.861
4. Campbell, W. K., Rudich, E. A., & Sedikides, C. (2002). Narcissism, self-esteem, and the positivity of self-views: Two portraits of self-love. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, *28*(3), 358–368. https://doi.org/10.1177/0146167202286007
5. Kruger, J., & Burrus, J. (2004). Egocentrism and focalism in unrealistic optimism (and pessimism). *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, *40*(3), 332–340. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jesp.2003.06.002
6. Steimer, A., Mata, A., & Simão, C. (2019). Ascribing Meaning to the Past: Self–Other Differences in Weighing Good and Bad Deeds. *Social Cognition*, *37*(2), 174-196.
7. Kruger, J., & Gilovich, T. (1999). " Naive cynicism" in everyday theories of responsibility assessment: On biased assumptions of bias. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *76*(5), 743.

8. Sedikides, C., Campbell, W. K., Reeder, G. D., & Elliot, A. J. (1998). The Self-Serving Bias in Relational Context. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *74*(2), 378–386. https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.74.2.378
9. Taylor, S. E., & Brown, J. D. (1988). Illusion and Well-Being : A Social Psychological Perspective on Mental Health. *Psychological Bulletin*, *103*(2), 193–210.
10. Vallone, R. P., Griffin, D. W., Lin, S., & Ross, L. (1990). Overconfident Prediction of Future Actions and Outcomes by Self and Others. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *58*(4), 582–592. https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.58.4.582
11. Centers for Disease Control (2020, November). Social Distancing. CDC. https://www.cdc.gov/coronavirus/2019-ncov/prevent-getting-sick/social-distancing.html
12. Van Bavel, J. J., Baicker, K., Boggio, P. S., Capraro, V., Cichocka, A., Cikara, M., … Willer, R. (2020). Using social and behavioural science to support COVID-19 pandemic response. *Nature Human Behaviour*, *4*(5), 460–471. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41562-020-0884-z
13. Harring, N., Jagers, S. C., & Löfgren, Å. (2020). COVID-19: Large-scale collective action, government intervention, and the importance of trust. *World Development*, *138*, 105236.
14. Kruger, J., Windschitl, P. D., Burrus, J., Fessel, F., & Chambers, J. R. (2008). The rational side of egocentrism in social comparisons. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, *44*(2), 220-232.
15. Pew Research Center (2020). Local news is playing an important role for Americans during COVID-19 outbreak. PewResearch. https://www.pewresearch.org/fact-

tank/2020/07/02/local-news-is-playing-an-important-role-for-americans-during-covid-19-outbreak/

16. Betsch, C., Korn, L., Sprengholz, P., Felgendreff, L., Eitze, S., Schmid, P., & Böhm, R. (2020). Social and behavioral consequences of mask policies during the COVID-19 pandemic. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America*, *117*(36), 21851–21853. https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.2011674117
17. Everett, J. A. C., Colombatto, C., Chituc, V., Brady, W. J., & Crockett, M. (2020, March 20). The effectiveness of moral messages on public health behavioral intentions during the COVID-19 pandemic. https://doi.org/10.31234/osf.io/9yqs8
18. Salari, N., Hosseinian-Far, A., Jalali, R., Vaisi-Raygani, A., Rasoulpoor, S., Mohammadi, M., … Khaledi-Paveh, B. (2020). Prevalence of stress, anxiety, depression among the general population during the COVID-19 pandemic: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Globalization and Health*, *16*(1), 1–11.
19. Huang, Y., & Zhao, N. (2020). Generalized anxiety disorder, depressive symptoms and sleep quality during COVID-19 outbreak in China: A web-based cross-sectional survey. *Psychiatry research, 288,* 112954.
20. Ahmed, M. Z., Ahmed, O., Aibao, Z., Hanbin, S., Siyu, L., & Ahmad, A. (2020). Epidemic of COVID-19 in China and associated Psychological Problems. *Asian journal of psychiatry*, *51*, 102092.
21. Bäuerle, A., Teufel, M., Musche, V., Weismüller, B., Kohler, H., Hetkamp, M., … Skoda, E. M. (2020). Increased generalized anxiety, depression and distress during the COVID-19 pandemic: a cross-sectional study in Germany. *Journal of Public Health*, 1–7.

22. Moghanibashi-Mansourieh, A. (2020). Assessing the anxiety level of Iranian general population during COVID-19 outbreak. *Asian Journal of Psychiatry*, *51*(April), 102076. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ajp.2020.102076

23. Mann, F. D., Krueger, R. F., & Vohs, K. D. (2020). Personal economic anxiety in response to COVID-19. *Personality and Individual Differences*, *167*(June), 110233. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2020.110233

24. World Health Organization (2020). Mental health and psychosocial considerations during the COVID-19 outbreak. https://www.who.int/docs/default-source/coronaviruse/mental-health-considerations.pdf

25. Watson, D. (1967). Relationship Between Locus of Control and Anxiety. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *6*(1), 91–92. https://doi.org/10.1037/h0024490

26. Räikkönen, K., Matthews, K. A., Flory, J. D., Owens, J. F., & Gump, B. B. (1999). Effects of optimism, pessimism, and trait anxiety on ambulatory blood pressure and mood during everyday life. *Journal of personality and social psychology*, *76*(1), 104.

27. Hoorens, V., & Buunk, B. P. (1993). Social Comparison of Health Risks: Locus of Control, the Person-Positivity Bias, and Unrealistic Optimism. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, *23*(4), 291-302.

28. American Psychological Association. (2013). DSM-5 Self-Rated Level 1 Cross-Cutting Symptom Measure—Adult.

29. Cohen, S., Kamarck, T., & Mermelstein, R. (1983). A global measure of perceived stress. *Journal of Health and Social Behavior, 24*(4), 385–396. https://doi.org/10.2307/2136404

30. Weinstein, N. D. (1982). Unrealistic optimism about susceptibility to health problems. *Journal of behavioral medicine*, *5*(4), 441-460.

31. Dunning, D., Heath, C., & Suls, J. M. (2004). Flawed self-assessment implications for health, education, and the workplace. *Psychological Science in the Public Interest, Supplement*, *5*(3), 69–106. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1529-1006.2004.00018.x

32. Thompson, S. C., Sobolew-Shubin, A., Galbraith, M. E., Schwankovsky, L., & Cruzen, D. (1993). Maintaining Perceptions of Control: Finding Perceived Control in Low-Control Circumstances. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *64*(2), 293–304. https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.64.2.293

33. Bonanno, G. A., Field, N. P., Kovacevic, A., & Kaltman, S. (2002). Self-enhancement as a buffer against extreme adversity: Civil war in bosnia and traumatic loss in the United States. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, *28*(2), 184–196. https://doi.org/10.1177/0146167202282005

34. Colvin, C. R., Block, J., & Funder, D. C. (1995). Overly Positive Self-Evaluations and Personality: Negative Implications for Mental Health. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *68*(6), 1152–1162. https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.68.6.1152

35. Joiner, T. E., Vohs, K. D., Katz, J., Kwon, P., & Kline, J. P. (2003). Excessive Self-Enhancement and Interpersonal Functioning in Roommate Relationships: Her Virtue is His Vice? *Self and Identity*, *2*(1), 21–30. https://doi.org/10.1080/15298860309020

36. Paulhus, D. L. (1998). Interpersonal and intrapsychic adaptiveness of trait self-enhancement: A mixed blessing? *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *74*(5), 1197–1208. https://doi.org/10.1037//0022-3514.74.5.1197

37. Alicke, M. D., Klotz, M. L., Breitenbecher, D. L., Yurak, T. J., & Vredenburg, D. S. (1995). Personal contact, individuation, and the better-than-average effect. *Journal of personality and social psychology*, *68*(5), 804.

38. Kruger, J., & Dunning, D. (1999). Unskilled and unaware of it: how difficulties in recognizing one's own incompetence lead to inflated self-assessments. *Journal of personality and social psychology*, *77*(6), 1121.

39. Helion, C., Helzer, E. G., Kim, S., & Pizarro, D. A. (2020). Asymmetric memory for harming versus being harmed. *Journal of experimental psychology: general*, *149*(5), 889.