

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30

Cognitive predictors of vaccine hesitancy and COVID-19 mitigation behaviors in a population representative sample

Anna Hudson^{1†}, Peter A. Hall, Ph.D.^{1,2,3†}, Sara C. Hitchman⁴,
Gang Meng², Geoffrey T. Fong, Ph.D.^{1,2,5}

¹School of Public Health Sciences, University of Waterloo, Waterloo, Ontario, Canada

²Department of Psychology, University of Waterloo, Waterloo, Ontario, Canada.

³Centre for Bioengineering and Biotechnology, University of Waterloo, Waterloo, Ontario, Canada.

⁴Department of Communication and Media Research, University of Zurich, Zürich, Switzerland

⁵Ontario Institute for Cancer Research, Toronto, Ontario, Canada

*Corresponding author.

†Equal contribution.

31 **Abstract.**

32 With the continued threat of COVID-19, predictors of vaccination hesitancy and mitigation
33 behaviors are critical to identify. Prior studies have found that cognitive factors are associated
34 with some COVID-19 mitigation behaviors, but few studies employ representative samples and
35 to our knowledge no prior studies have examined cognitive predictors of vaccine hesitancy. The
36 purpose of the present study, conducted among a large national sample of Canadian adults,
37 was to examine associations between cognitive variables (executive function, delay discounting,
38 and temporal orientation) and COVID-19 mitigation behaviors (vaccination, mask wearing,
39 social distancing, and hand hygiene). Findings revealed that individuals with few executive
40 function deficits, limited delay discounting and who adopted a generally future-orientation
41 mindset were more likely to be double-vaccinated and to report performing COVID-19 mitigation
42 behaviors with high consistency. The most reliable findings were for delay discounting and
43 future orientation, with executive function deficits predicting mask wearing and hand hygiene
44 behaviors but not distancing and vaccination. These findings identify candidate mediators and
45 moderators for health communication messages targeting COVID-19 mitigation behaviors and
46 vaccine hesitancy.

47

48

49 **Keywords:** COVID-19, SARS-CoV-2, behavior, cognition, vaccine hesitancy.

50 1. Introduction.

51 Understanding the determinants of COVID-19 mitigation behaviors is critically important for
52 managing the current pandemic and future infectious disease outbreaks. Beyond vaccination,
53 the most widely recommended individual mitigation behaviors for COVID-19 are mask wearing,
54 physical distancing and hand hygiene¹. These behaviors collectively require consistent
55 implementation in a variety of social contexts and continually changing circumstances.
56 Behavioral consistency may require attention to cumulative benefits to the individual and society
57 as a whole, attention to cues that impel the behaviors, holding requirements in working memory,
58 and the ability to flexibly alternate between implementation of behaviors (e.g., mask wearing)
59 with dynamically changing environments (e.g., inside versus outside, in the presence of others
60 versus alone). A mindset oriented to future benefits, strong valuation of non-immediate
61 contingencies, and relatively intact executive functioning may be critical.

62 Consistent with this logic, several studies have shown that executive function is associated
63 with adherence to mitigation behaviors in adults²⁻⁴ and in older populations⁵. Similarly, greater
64 temporal discounting and risky decision-making is associated with less mask-wearing and social
65 distancing behavior^{6,7}. Finally, future-oriented thinking has been shown to increase satisfaction
66 and compliance with COVID-19 restrictions⁸. However, because few studies have examined all
67 three factors within the same sample, their comparative importance of these three factors is
68 largely unknown.

69 The largest study to date examined 850 adult participants from the United States, available
70 via Amazon Mechanical Turk, in the opening weeks of the pandemic (i.e., before vaccines were
71 available, and many mitigation behaviors were not yet mandated). Findings revealed that one
72 subcomponent of executive function (working memory) predicted social distancing compliance³.
73 A more comprehensive examination of cognitive predictors and behavioral outcomes is largely
74 absent, and there are no other studies examining cognitive predictors of vaccination status
75 specifically. Some studies involving prediction of vaccination status are limited by a relatively
76 low proportion of vaccine hesitant participants; this is most likely to occur in countries wherein
77 vaccine uptake is high. This limitation can be rectified by quota sampling to increase the
78 proportion of the overall sample that is vaccine hesitant relative to vaccinated.

79 The current study was intended to examine cognitive predictors of COVID-19 mitigation
80 behaviors and vaccine hesitancy in a nationally representative sample of Canadian adults
81 between the ages of 18-55. At the time of the data collection (November, 2021), mandatory
82 indoor mask wearing was mandated in most provinces, and recommendations for hand hygiene
83 and distancing were well known and reminders ubiquitous; vaccines were widely available for all
84 adults and strongly recommended country-wide. Within this context, it was hypothesized that
85 stronger executive function, lower discounting of future rewards, and a more future-oriented
86 mindset would be associated with higher vaccination rates and more consistent performance of
87 COVID-19 mitigation behaviors. This study advances existing literature by examining three
88 conceptually important cognitive and motivational variables using a large population-based
89 dataset with sampling and statistical methods that allows for generalization to the population.

90

91

92

93 2. Methods.

94 Participants.

95 Participants were respondents in Wave 1 of the Canadian COVID-19 Experiences
96 Survey (CCES⁹), a national cohort survey of 2002 Canadian adults aged 18-55 (Mean = 37, SD
97 = 10.4; 60.8% female). The cohort was recruited to have an equal proportion of vaccinated and
98 vaccine hesitant individuals. In the recruited sample, 50.2% reported receiving two vaccine
99 shots (i.e., fully vaccinated by the standards at the time of data collection), and 43.3% reported
100 receiving no vaccinations. Further 5.5% reported receiving one vaccine shot but were not
101 intending to receive a second shot.

102 Procedure.

103 The online survey was administered between September 28th and October 21st, 2021.
104 Participants were contacted by email with an invitation to participate in the survey, with a link
105 provided to all eligible participants. A quota target of equal numbers of vaccinated and vaccine
106 hesitate was applied to ensure an equal sample of vaccinated and vaccine hesitant individuals.
107 Within each quota target, participants were recruited across ten Canadian provinces. The
108 survey firm (Leger) and the University of Waterloo research team monitored the survey to
109 ensure the final sample reached the intended quota targets. The authors assert that all
110 procedures contributing to this work comply with the ethical standards of the relevant national
111 and institutional committees on human experimentation and with the Helsinki Declaration of
112 1975, as revised in 2008. Informed consent was obtained from all participants in this study.

113 Measures.

114 *Executive dysfunction.* Symptoms of executive dysfunction were assessed across four
115 'self-restraint' subscale items from the Barkley Deficits in Executive Functioning Scale short-
116 form (BDEFS-SF). The following four items were used: "I am unable to inhibit my reactions or
117 responses to events or to other people", "I make impulsive comments to others", "I am likely to
118 do things without considering the consequences for doing them", and "I act without thinking".
119 Participants were asked to report how often they have experienced each of the four problems
120 over the past 6 months on a numeric scale, where 1="never or rarely", 2="sometimes",
121 3="often", and 4="very often". The four items were z-transformed and averaged together to
122 create a composite executive dysfunction measure, with higher scores reflecting more
123 dysfunction. Because values were positively skewed, a Log10 transformation was applied.
124 Cronbach's alpha for the 4-item scale was 0.815, indicating good reliability.

125 *Delay Discounting.* A validated 5-item delay discounting (DD) task was used to assess
126 valuation of non-immediate contingencies. The 5-item DD task presents respondents with a
127 series of choices between a fixed immediate monetary amount (\$500) and a larger reward at
128 varying delay times (i.e., "Would you rather have \$500 now, or \$1000 in 4 hours; 1 day; 3
129 weeks; 2 years?"¹⁰). From these an indifference point can be calculated, reflecting the time at
130 which the preference for a larger later reward reverts to a preference for the smaller immediate
131 reward. This value is denoted by k . Higher k values are indicative of more impulsive decisions,
132 preferring a lower immediate reward over waiting for a higher reward, that is, a higher discount
133 rate. Because k values were positively skewed, a Log10 transformation was applied. Because k
134 values are between 0 and 1, log k values are negative, and lower log k values are associated
135 with greater impulsivity.

136 *Time Perspective.* Participants responded to 4 questions assessing their degree of
137 present and future orientation. Participants responded from 1="strongly agree" to 5="strongly
138 disagree", with 3="neither agree nor disagree" to two present-orientation questions (i.e., "Living
139 for the moment is more important than planning for the future", and "A spend a lot more time
140 thinking about today than thinking about the future") and to two future-orientation questions (i.e.,
141 "I spend a lot of time thinking about how my present actions will have an impact on my life later
142 on", and "I consider the long-term consequences of an action before I do it"¹¹). Participants
143 responding with "Refused", or "Don't know" were removed from analyses ($n=179$). The two
144 present perspective, and two future perspective questions were first standardized and averaged
145 together to form separate subscales for present and future orientation. The two subscales were
146 subtracted such that higher scores represented greater future relative to present orientation.
147 Cronbach alphas for each of the subscales indicated acceptable reliability (present orientation:
148 $\alpha=0.742$; future orientation: $\alpha=0.665$)

149 *Mitigating Behaviors.* Participants responded to questions assessing social distancing
150 ("When outside your home, how consistently do you currently maintain a distance from others of
151 at least 2 meters?"), mask wearing ("How often do you currently wear a mask when you are in
152 INDOOR public places?"), and hand hygiene ("How often do you thoroughly wash your hands
153 during the day?"). Participants responded using the following response options: 1="Not at all",
154 2= "Rarely", 3= "Sometimes", 4= "Most of the time" and 5="All of the time". Higher scores on
155 these items reflected an increased consistency in behavioral performance. Participants
156 responding "Refused", or "Don't know" to the items were removed from analyses ($n=74$). The
157 social distancing item module also contained a "I haven't had contact with others" response, and
158 the mask wearing item module contained a "I am never in indoor public places" response.
159 Participants giving these responses ($n=49$) were also removed, as it was assumed that such
160 participants did not have an opportunity to enact the response being queried (e.g.,
161 immunocompromised individuals avoiding all indoor public spaces).

162 *Vaccination status.* Vaccination status was queried using the following item: "Have you
163 received any COVID-19 vaccine shots?" Responses available were as follows, "I have NOT
164 received any vaccine shot", "Received ONE vaccine shot", "Received TWO vaccine shots"
165 [coded as fully vaccinated], or refused/don't know. Those indicating that they had received only
166 one shot were asked the following additional question: "What best describes your intention to
167 get your next shot?" Response options were as follows: "I have NO plan to get a second shot",
168 "I am unsure whether I will get the second shot" [coded as unvaccinated without intention], and
169 "I plan to get the second shot, but have NOT yet scheduled an appointment", and "I am planning
170 to get the second shot and have scheduled an appointment."

171 *Demographics.* Age, sex and income assessed by respondent report. Geographical
172 region was coded directly from the online survey profile of each respondent.

173 **Statistical Analysis.**

174 All analyses were conducted in SPSS version 27.0.1.0. Separate hierarchical multiple
175 regression models were conducted, predicting behavioral outcomes from the following
176 predictors: (1) BDEFS score, (2) Delay Discounting (k-value), (3) TPQ score (future orientation).
177 Control variables were entered on the first step, followed by main effects and interactions on
178 subsequent steps. As such, all analyses were examined while controlling for demographic
179 factors and vaccination status moderation effects were tested. Further sensitivity analyses were

180 performed wherein income, education and geographic region (province) were added as
181 covariates. From the p -values for each focal predictive analysis, heat maps were constructed
182 and displayed in original form, and with p -values corrected for false discovery rate (FDR).

183

184 **3. Results.**

185 *Vaccination Status*

186 With reference to fully vaccinated, Higher BDEFS scores did not predict significantly
187 increased odds of being unvaccinated ($OR=0.94$, 95% CI [0.78-1.13], $p=.492$), but did predict
188 higher likelihood of being partially vaccinated without intention to be fully vaccinated ($OR=1.90$,
189 95% CI [1.38-2.61], $p<.001$). Those showing higher impulsivity on the delay discounting task
190 were more likely to be unvaccinated ($OR=1.24$, 95% CI [1.11-1.39], $p<.001$) and partially
191 vaccinated without intentions to be fully vaccinated ($OR=1.43$, 95% CI [1.15-1.78], $p=.001$).
192 Similarly, greater future orientation predicted lower odds of being unvaccinated ($OR= 0.82$,
193 95% CI [0.69 -0.99], $p=.034$) and lower odds of being partially vaccinated without intention to be
194 fully vaccinated ($OR=0.56$, 95% CI [0.39-0.82], $p=.003$). Figure 1 presents a heat map showing
195 p values associated with cognitive measures as predictors of vaccination status (Table 1).

196 *Mitigation Behaviors*

197 Higher BDEFS scores were associated with lower frequency of mask wearing ($\beta= -$
198 0.133 , 95% CI [-0.162, -0.082] $p<0.001$) and hand hygiene behaviors ($\beta= -0.139$, 95% CI [-
199 0.184 , -0.095], $p<0.001$; Figure 1). BDEFS score was not significantly associated with the
200 frequency of social distancing behaviors ($\beta= -0.027$, 95% CI [-0.082, 0.019], $p=0.226$; Table 2;
201 Figure 1). Greater delay discounting (higher k scores) were marginally associated with more
202 consistent social distancing behaviors ($\beta=0.044$, 95% CI [0.000, 0.101], $p=0.051$), mask wearing
203 ($\beta=0.044$, 95% CI [0.001, 0.081], $p=0.046$) and hand hygiene behaviors ($\beta=0.039$, 95% CI [-
204 0.005 , 0.084], $p=0.086$). Greater future orientation was associated with more consistent mask
205 wearing ($\beta=0.054$, 95% CI [0.010, 0.092], $p=0.014$), hand hygiene ($\beta= 0.064$, 95% CI [0.023,
206 0.129], $p=0.005$), and compliance with social distancing behaviors ($\beta=0.056$, 95% CI [0.015,
207 0.117], $p=0.012$).

208 *Main Effects and Interactions involving Vaccination Status*

209 In all models, being vaccinated predicted stronger compliance with mitigation measures,
210 for example in models involving BDEFS, higher frequency of mask wearing ($\beta= 0.239$, 95% CI
211 [0.180, 0.259], $p<0.001$), hand hygiene ($\beta= 0.111$, 95% CI [0.067, 0.155], $p<0.001$) and social
212 distancing ($\beta= 0.186$, 95% CI [0.163, 0.265], $p<0.001$). No interactions involving vaccination
213 status were evident for BDEFS score (mask wearing: $F(1,1954)= 3.15$, $p=0.076$; hand hygiene:
214 $F(1,1954)= 0.160$, $p=0.689$; social distancing: $F(1,1954)= 1.63$, $p=0.201$), delay discounting
215 (mask wearing: $F(1,1910)= 0.199$, $p=0.656$; hand hygiene: $F(1, 1910)= 1.92$, $p=0.166$; social
216 distancing: $F(1, 1910)= 0.163$, $p=0.687$), or temporal orientation (mask wearing: $F(1, 1949)=$
217 3.23 , $p=0.072$; hand hygiene: $F(1, 1949)=2.32$, $p=0.128$; social distancing: $F(1, 1949) = 0.085$,
218 $p=0.771$).

219 *Sensitivity Analysis*

220 Further adjustment for education, income, and geographic location (coded as province)
221 had no overall effect on the findings. In these fully adjusted models, mask wearing, hand
222 hygiene and social distancing continued to be predictable as a function of executive dysfunction
223 (mask wearing $\beta = -0.129$, 95% CI [-0.158, -0.079] $p < 0.001$; hand hygiene $\beta = -0.137$, 95% CI [-
224 0.182, -0.093], $p < 0.001$; social distancing $\beta = -0.027$, 95% CI [-0.082, 0.019], $p = 0.225$), delay
225 discounting, (mask wearing $\beta = 0.041$, 95% CI [-0.002, 0.077], $p = 0.064$; hand hygiene $\beta = 0.039$,
226 95% CI [-0.005, 0.084], $p = 0.084$; social distancing $\beta = 0.043$, 95% CI [0.000, 0.100], $p = 0.052$),
227 and temporal orientation (mask wearing $\beta = .075$, 95% CI [0.029, 0.111], $p < 0.001$; hand hygiene
228 $\beta = .071$, 95% CI [0.031, 0.137], $p = 0.002$; social distancing $\beta = 0.064$, 95% CI [0.024, 0.127],
229 $p = 0.004$).

230

231 4. Discussion.

232 In this population-based representative sample, we examined cognitive determinants of
233 COVID-19 vaccination and mitigating behaviors among adults between the ages of 18 and 55
234 years. Findings demonstrated that those who possessed higher executive function, lower delay
235 discounting, and greater future orientation were more likely to be vaccinated and engage in key
236 COVID-19 mitigation behaviors (i.e., social distancing, mask wearing, and hand hygiene). This
237 was true across standard demographic variables such as age and sex, and proved robust
238 through a variety of sensitivity analyses. Among the three cognitive variables, delay discounting
239 and future orientation were the most consistently predictive of COVID-19 vaccination and
240 mitigation behaviors.

241 This pattern suggests that value processing wherein non-immediate outcomes are protected
242 from discounting is generally important in COVID-19 mitigation, as is a conscious appreciation
243 of (and belief in) connections between present actions and later outcomes. Although there are
244 links to neurobiological substrates, delay discounting and future orientation are potentially
245 malleable cognitive processes, and public health communications directing attention to the
246 value of non-immediate outcomes may be particularly important to deploy population wide.
247 Executive dysfunction, on the other hand, was associated with a more circumscribed set of
248 COVID-19 mitigating behaviors. Specifically, higher executive dysfunction predicted less
249 consistent mask wearing and hand hygiene—both behaviors are repetitive, discrete behaviors
250 and acts of commission. Measurement considerations are potentially important as well: the
251 BDEFS is a deficit-based assessment tool designed for clinical practice, and it may therefore
252 miss some important dimensional aspects of cognitive function more relevant to vaccination and
253 distancing in a population survey format. Notably, the latter two outcomes are also highly multi-
254 determined, such that political orientation and other beliefs may overshadow the predictive
255 power of any relatively coarse cognitive indicator.

256 Among the three mitigation behaviors examined, social distancing was least predictable
257 from the neurocognitive variables tested. It is possible that social distancing can be better
258 predicted from social-cognitive variables (e.g., beliefs about and attitudes towards other
259 individuals and groups), given its links to the social fabric of everyday life, as opposed to the
260 physical environment and de-contextualized behavior. Given that social distancing is
261 fundamentally a relational behavior with interpersonal consequences, this possibility may
262 warrant further investigation.

263 Our findings are consistent with several other studies that have found associations between
264 executive functions and mitigation behaviors²⁻⁵. However, our study extends these prior studies
265 via inclusion of delay discounting, and our findings that the associations are no different across
266 vaccinated and vaccine hesitant individuals. The latter cannot be tested with sufficient power in
267 samples that do not contain a high proportion of both vaccinated and vaccine hesitant
268 individuals. Our study—which used a sampling quota such that a large and approximately equal
269 numbers of fully vaccinated and vaccine hesitant individuals were surveyed—is the largest
270 study conducted to date, allowing for a strong test of the hesitancy moderation hypothesis.
271 Likewise, although there are reliable effects of vaccination status on implementation of
272 mitigation behaviors, such effects are largely independent from the effects of cognitive variables
273 on the implementation of mitigation behaviors.

274 Strengths of the current investigation include the use of a population representative sample,
275 ensuring the findings may be generalized to the larger population from which they were drawn.
276 Additionally, the use of quota sampling to ensure approximately 50% vaccine hesitant ensures
277 adequate statistical power to determine the moderating impact of vaccination status on any
278 findings. No other investigations to date have this feature and would for the most part be unable
279 to determine uniformity of prediction across vaccination status groups. Limitations include the
280 use of self-reported vaccination status and executive function, and abbreviated versions of time
281 perspective measures due to the population survey format. Finally, the sample age range is
282 from 18-55 years, thereby excluding older adults and adolescents. However, this working age
283 population is arguably a key population in which to study mitigation behaviors, as such
284 individuals tend to be highly mobile and more variable in implementation of precautions than
285 older age groups.

286

287 **5. Conclusion**

288 In conclusion, our findings suggest that cognitive variables reflecting future-oriented
289 thinking, evaluative processing and behavioral control are associated with likelihood of being
290 fully vaccinated against COVID-19 and predict more consistent implementation of mitigation
291 behaviors. Among the three constructs, delay discounting and future orientation were the most
292 consistent predictors of COVID-19 mitigation behaviors and vaccination status. Health
293 communication campaigns that reinforce and emphasize positive valuation of future outcomes,
294 and connections between present actions and later outcomes, may facilitate better response
295 from the general public. However, it is also possible that among the less observant public,
296 behavior may be more influenced by communications emphasizing more immediate benefit.

297

298

299 **Data Availability Statement**

300 Data will be available upon reasonable request to either of the corresponding authors.

301

302 **Research ethics statement**

303 This study protocol was reviewed by and received approval from the University of Waterloo
304 Office of Research Ethics.

305

306 **Conflicts of Interests**

307 The authors declare no conflicts of interest.

308

309 **Acknowledgements**

310 We thank Anne C.K. Quah and Thomas Agar for their assistance with survey design and
311 management.

312

313 **Funding Statement**

314 This research was supported by an operating grant to P. Hall, G. Fong and S. Hitchman by the
315 Canadian Institutes for Health Research (CIHR), Institute for Population and Public Health
316 (GA3-177733).

317

Table 1. Heat map of p-values for cognitive measure crossed with mitigation behaviors and vaccination status.

	Masks	Social Distancing	Hand-hygiene	Vaccination status	no intention for 2 nd shot
BDEFS	<.001	.226	<.001	.492	<.001
DD	.046	.051	.086	<.001	.001
TP	.014	.012	.005	.034	.003
FDR-corrected values					
BDEFS	.003	.242	.008	.492	.003
DD	.063	.064	.099	.003	.003
TP	.023	.012	.011	.034	.008

Note: Green cells indicate statistically significant effects; yellow cells indicate marginal effects and red/orange cells indicate non-significant effects. BDEFS=Barkley Deficits in Executive Function Scale; DD=Delay discounting (k value); TP=time perspective (future orientation). FDR=false discovery rate, calculated as per Benjamini and Hochberg^[12].

Table 2. Regression analyses predicting mitigation behaviors.

Variables		Social Distancing		Mask Wearing		Hand Hygiene	
		Beta [95% CI]	<i>p</i>	Beta [95% CI]	<i>p</i>	Beta [95% CI]	<i>p</i>
Executive function (Mean)	BDEFS	-0.027 [-0.082, 0.019]	0.226	-0.133 [-0.162, -0.082]	<0.001	-0.139 [-0.184, -0.095]	<0.001
	Vaccination	0.186 [0.163, 0.265]	<0.001	0.239 [0.183, 0.263]	<0.001	0.111 [0.067, 0.155]	<0.001
	BDEFS*Vaccination	-0.028 [-0.085, 0.018]	0.201	-0.039 [-0.077, 0.004]	0.076	-0.009 [-0.054, 0.036]	0.689
Delay Discounting (DD)	DD	0.044 [0.000, 0.101]	0.051	0.044 [0.001, 0.081]	0.046	0.039 [-0.005, 0.084]	0.086
	Vaccination	0.187 [0.165, 0.267]	<0.001	0.238 [0.178, 0.259]	<0.001	0.107 [0.062, 0.153]	<0.001
	DD*Vaccination	-0.009 [-0.061, 0.040]	0.687	-0.010 [-0.049, 0.031]	0.656	0.031 [-0.013, 0.077]	0.166
Temporal Orientation	Time	0.056 [0.015, 0.117]	0.012	0.054 [0.010, 0.092]	0.014	0.064 [0.023, 0.129]	0.005
	Vaccination	0.192 [0.174, 0.277]	<0.001	0.227 [0.172, 0.254]	<0.001	0.037 [0.023, 0.129]	0.005
	Time*Vaccination	0.006 [-0.043, 0.058]	0.771	0.040 [-0.003, 0.077]	0.077	-0.034 [-0.093, 0.012]	0.128

Note: Main effects and two-way interactions for focal predictors and vaccination status controlling for age and gender. Those reporting 'don't know'; 'refused'; and 'NA' vaccination status were classified as unvaccinated. All coefficients are standardized Beta weights.


References.

1. Honein MA, Christie A, Rose DA, et al. Summary of Guidance for Public Health Strategies to Address High Levels of Community Transmission of SARS-CoV-2 and Related Deaths, December 2020. *Morb Mortal Wkly Rep.* 2020;69(49):1860-1867. doi:10.15585/mmwr.mm6949e2
2. Thoma V, Weiss-Cohen L, Filkuková P, Ayton P. Cognitive Predictors of Precautionary Behavior During the COVID-19 Pandemic. *Front Psychol.* 2021;12:589800. doi:10.3389/fpsyg.2021.589800
3. Xie W, Campbell S, Zhang W. Working memory capacity predicts individual differences in social-distancing compliance during the COVID-19 pandemic in the United States. *Proc Natl Acad Sci.* 2020;117(30):17667-17674. doi:10.1073/pnas.2008868117
4. Xu P, Cheng J. Individual differences in social distancing and mask-wearing in the pandemic of COVID-19: The role of need for cognition, self-control and risk attitude. *Personal Individ Differ.* 2021;175:110706. doi:10.1016/j.paid.2021.110706
5. O'Shea DM, Davis JD, Tremont G. Verbal memory is associated with adherence to COVID-19 protective behaviors in community dwelling older adults. *Aging Clin Exp Res.* 2021;33(7):2043-2051. doi:10.1007/s40520-021-01905-z
6. Byrne KA, Six SG, Anaraky RG, Harris MW, Winterlind EL. Risk-taking unmasked: Using risky choice and temporal discounting to explain COVID-19 preventative behaviors. *PLOS ONE.* 2021;16(5):e0251073. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0251073
7. Camargo J, Passarelli DA, Oliveira MA de, Rose JC de. Probability Discounting and Adherence to Preventive Behaviors During the COVID-19 Pandemic. Published online January 15, 2021. doi:10.31234/osf.io/p4a76
8. Lalot F, Abrams D, Ahvenharju S, Minkkinen M. Being future-conscious during a global crisis: The protective effect of heightened Futures Consciousness in the COVID-19 pandemic. *Personal Individ Differ.* 2021;178:110862. doi:10.1016/j.paid.2021.110862
9. Hall P, Fong G, Hitchman S. The Canadian COVID-19 Experiences Survey: Study Protocol. *BMJ Open* 2021.
10. Koffarnus MN, Bickel WK. A 5-trial adjusting delay discounting task: Accurate discount rates in less than one minute. *Exp Clin Psychopharmacol.* 2014;22(3):222-228. doi:10.1037/a0035973
11. Hall PA, Fong GT, Sansone G. Time Perspective as a Predictor of Healthy Behaviors and Disease-Mediating States. In: Stolarski M, Fioulaine N, van Beek W, eds. *Time Perspective Theory; Review, Research and Application: Essays in Honor of Philip G. Zimbardo*. Springer International Publishing; 2015:339-352. doi:10.1007/978-3-319-07368-2_22
12. Benjamini Y, Hochberg Y. Controlling the false discovery rate: a practical and powerful approach to multiple testing. *Journal of the Royal statistical society: series B (Methodological)*. 1995 Jan;57(1):289-300.


Figure 1 caption

Main effects of a) delay discounting, b) executive dysfunction, c) future orientation and d) vaccination status on frequency of COVID-19 mitigation behaviours. Higher scores on the y-axis reflect increased frequency of behavior performance. Participants were split into the lower (pink), mid (green), and higher categories (black) based on z-scores (-1.0, 0, +1.0). Error bars represent standard errors. Created with BioRender.com


A



B



C



D

