

1 Motivation, intention and action: wearing masks to 2 prevent the spread of COVID-19

3

4 Geoff Kaine^{1*}, Vic Wright² and Suzie Greenhalgh³

5

6 ¹ Manaaki Whenua Landcare Research, Hamilton, New Zealand

7 ² University of New England, Armidale, New South Wales, Australia

8 ³ Manaaki Whenua Landcare Research, Auckland, New Zealand

9

10 * Corresponding author.

11 Email: kaineg@landcareresearch.co.nz (GK)

12

13 These authors contributed equally to this work.

15 Abstract

16 Governments around the world are seeking to slow the spread of COVID-19 by
17 implementing measures that encourage, or mandate, changes in people's behaviour. These
18 changes include the wearing of face masks, social distancing, and testing and self-isolating
19 when unwell. The success of these measures depends on (1) the willingness of individuals to
20 change their behaviour and (2) their commitment and capacity to translate that intention into
21 actions. Consequently, understanding and predicting the willingness of individuals to change
22 their behaviour, and their enthusiasm to act on that willingness, is critical in assessing the
23 likely effectiveness of these measures in slowing the spread of the virus.

24

25 In this paper we analyse responses to two separate regional surveys about people's intentions
26 and behaviour with respect to preventing the spread of COVID-19 in New Zealand. While
27 motivations and intentions were largely similar across the regions, there was marked
28 difference in action across the regions, specifically with respect to the frequency of wearing
29 face masks. Our analysis suggests that the translation of intention (preventing the spread of
30 COVID-19) into action (as measured by self-reported frequency of face mask use) was
31 strongly associated with perceptions of the risk of infection (as measured by regional case
32 numbers).

33

34 The results highlight the importance to policy design of distinguishing the factors that might
35 influence the formation of behavioural intentions from those that might influence the
36 implementation of those intentions.

37

38

39

40

41

42 **Introduction**

43 The success of measures to slow or stop the spread of COVID-19 such as wearing face masks
44 and social distancing, depends on the commitment and capacity of individuals to comply with
45 them, and change their behaviour accordingly [1, 2, 3]. Ineffective compliance with these
46 measures can put the achievement of policy outcomes at risk [4,5]. For example, failure to
47 wear face masks and socially distance may put the outcome of slowing the spread of COVID-
48 19 at risk and may mean considerable resources must be invested in enforcement to avoid
49 increased rates of infection, higher mortality, and the imposition of lockdowns causing both
50 economic and psychological damage.

51

52 Understanding and predicting the extent to which individuals are willing to change their
53 behaviour is critical, then, in assessing how effective measures like mask wearing and social
54 distancing are likely to be, and whether alternatives such as curfews and lockdowns can be
55 avoided. Unfortunately, good intentions do not necessarily translate into action. Hence,
56 understanding why individuals may not change their behaviour, despite their good intentions,
57 is also crucial if policies to encourage measures like wearing face masks and social distancing
58 are to be effective.

59

60 Building on previous research [6, 7, 8, 9], we draw on the social psychological concepts of
61 involvement and attitudes in this paper to predict the willingness of the public in several
62 regions across New Zealand to prevent the spread of COVID-19 by wearing face masks, self-

63 isolating when unwell, and getting tested for COVID-19. We then investigate differences
64 across the regions in the extent to which intentions to wear face masks translated into mask
65 wearing behaviour. Our aim was to explain why, despite similarity in people's intentions with
66 respect to preventing the spread of COVID-19, there were dramatic differences in their
67 behaviour with respect to wearing face masks.

68

69 **Theory**

70 Research and analysis focused on the process underlying decisions that direct the actions of
71 individuals has long included recognition that there are two phases to the process. The natural
72 point of separation between these phases is the 'action intention' which arises once the
73 decision is made. This action intention is normally referred to as 'behavioural intention' in
74 the literature [10, 11, 12 13]. Behavioural intention, rather than actual behaviour, is usually
75 the appropriate outcome on which to focus when seeking to understand decision-making
76 because actual behaviour can diverge from intended behaviour for a wide variety of reasons.
77 Seeking to relate the actual behaviour to decision processes triggered by a decision problem
78 would unhelpfully conflate decision considerations and implementation considerations,
79 masking the contribution of the former. In effect, the contemporary approach is to distinguish
80 decision making from decision implementation.

81

82 While factors that may impact upon implementation could well figure in the decision-making
83 process (particularly as costs or benefits attaching to decision options), substantive modelling
84 of implementation is required to complete the analysis, or projection, of actual behaviour
85 flowing from behavioural choices made in response to perceived decision problems.

86

87 In any specific applied setting, particularly those involving existing practices and products,
88 decision implementation is routine and familiar to all users. In the case of new practices and
89 products, decision implementation assumes greater importance because it defines the rate of
90 adoption of the novel item. Measures such as wearing face masks and social distancing that
91 were introduced to contain the spread of COVID-19 fit into this novel category: when
92 introduced these practices were new to each person, even the advice to wash hands much
93 more regularly is novel, and the wearing of face masks obviously so. Hence, when new
94 practices are being introduced to cope with a pandemic, whose impacts are driven by rates of
95 transmission across a population, rates of practice adoption matter a good deal (as reflected
96 by concerns about ‘vaccine hesitancy’ [14, 15]).

97

98 In prior studies [6, 7, 8, 9] we investigated behavioural intentions, and actual behaviour, with
99 respect to measures advocated by government to suppress or eliminate COVID-19 in New
100 Zealand. These analyses using the I₃ model [16] assigned people to segments according to
101 their involvement with specific government policy outcomes (eliminating COVID-19 from
102 New Zealand) and related policy measures (wearing face masks, self-isolating, getting tested
103 for COVID-19, using a COVID-19 tracer app, and getting vaccinated for COVID-19).

104

105 The segments in each study were analysed to identify, within each segment, the diversity and
106 roles of salient beliefs and attitudes, and whether segment members were favourably or
107 unfavourably predisposed to comply with the policy measures. This approach was designed
108 to identify policy and promotional activity that could be implemented to strengthen desired
109 behavioural intentions with respect to the policy measures (in the context of current
110 behavioural intentions, and salient attitudes and beliefs). The research was not designed to
111 model decision-making processes per se.

112

113 In two studies [6, 7] in different regions, behavioural intentions with respect to wearing face
114 masks, self-isolating and getting tested for COVID-19 were investigated together with self-
115 reports of actual behaviour with respect to wearing face masks and getting tested. The results
116 in these two studies indicated that, despite similarities across regions in behavioural
117 intentions, there were marked dissimilarities in actual behaviour [7]. In particular, although
118 the willingness to act to prevent the spread of COVID-19 was similar across the regions, the
119 wearing of face masks was dramatically different across the regions [7].

120

121 Where, as in this instance, diversity in actual behaviour occurs in a context of shared
122 behavioural intentions with respect to a novel behaviour, it is necessary to identify the cause.
123 First, because, if the claimed integrity of the I₃ model [6, 7, 9, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20], and other
124 models of behavioural intentions [10,11], is to be sustained, it is necessary to be able to
125 identify a plausible and active cause for hesitancy to implement an intention. In a basic sense,
126 behavioural intention is not the policy target if it is detached in some major way from actual
127 behaviour. Second, because, for any additional actions to be taken to accelerate adoption of
128 the behaviour to be appropriate, the causes of the hesitancy need to be identified.

129

130 Bagozzi [10], one of the few theorists to model the implementation of behavioural intentions,
131 has suggested there is a planning and control loop that can be identified which governs the
132 translation of intention into (ongoing) behaviour. This loop determines the ‘how’ and ‘when’
133 of implementation, and the monitoring of initial actions regarding the adequacy of goal
134 attainment and any unanticipated outcomes. This outcome information is fed back into the
135 decision-making and implementing system.

136

137 Bagozzi [10] draws attention to the fact that different sets of, sometimes partly overlapping,
138 factors influence the formation of behavioural intentions and their implementation. This has
139 consequences for understanding what factors can properly be said to act as ‘barriers’ [10] to
140 desired behaviour changes. The notion of a ‘barrier’ is often unhelpfully broad because, as
141 here, the set of factors serving to create a favourable or unfavourable attitude to novel
142 behaviour can, and in this case must, be different to the set of factors seeming to impede
143 behaviour change. Particularly, ‘barriers’, in normal usage, usually refers to things or
144 situations impeding movement in an intended direction: intended by the subject, not some
145 observer. ‘Barriers’ has relevant meaning, therefore, to factors causing behavioural intention
146 to not lead to the behaviour in question. Its use with respect to the forming of behavioural
147 intentions reveals more about observer preferences than impediments the subject confronts.

148

149 In the case of mask wearing, the barrier to continuous action may be non-availability of
150 masks, unanticipated social opprobrium when they are worn or unexpected discomfort (both
151 of which reflect poor judgement in arriving at behavioural intention). The most obvious, and
152 logically the first, ‘barrier’ to seek out is the absence of a behavioural trigger. Identifying
153 behavioural intention by questioning subjects rather than tracking behaviour, is to discover a
154 predisposition to act. A failure to act implies the absence of a trigger to activate the
155 predisposition. In this case, if masks are readily available, socially acceptable, and reasonably
156 comfortable, the missing trigger will presumably be related to perceived need: the perceived
157 threat of airborne infection.

158

159 The perceived threat of airborne infection is, inevitably, subjective and cue-driven amongst
160 most people. The cues employed to judge the threat of infection may well be influenced by
161 reported infections in an area, and trends in them, and perhaps by the prevalence of mask

162 wearing. Infection incidence may be the critical catalyst that triggers action. The adoption of
163 behaviours such as the wearing of face masks has been associated with a range of variables
164 including perceptions of the perceived risk of infection, the local incidence rate of COVID-19
165 and feelings of stress in relation to COVID-19 [21].

166

167 In the next section we provide a brief description of the history of COVID-19 in New
168 Zealand to place the subsequent analysis in its proper context.

169

170 **COVID-19 in New Zealand**

171 COVID-19 was first detected in New Zealand on 28 February 2020 [22]. Within three weeks
172 the central government had closed New Zealand's international border to all except returning
173 citizens and permanent residents. The government began pursuing a restrictive strategy [23]
174 of eliminating COVID-19 and applied a range of controls (policy measures) to stop the
175 transmission of COVID-19 in New Zealand [24]. Elimination (the desired policy outcome)
176 did not necessarily mean eradicating the virus permanently from New Zealand; rather, that
177 central government was confident chains of transmission in the community had been
178 eliminated for at least 28 days, and any cases imported from overseas in the future could be
179 effectively contained [24].

180

181 The central government instituted a four-tier alert system that mandated policy measures such
182 as: progressively tighter restrictions on people's movement outside their homes and
183 immediate families, including travelling to work; social distancing and encouraging the
184 wearing of masks outside the home at the higher alert levels; and self-isolating and seeking
185 testing if people felt unwell or experienced symptoms characteristic of COVID-19 infection
186 [22].

187

188 On 25 March 2020, New Zealand moved to a Level 4 ‘lockdown’, the highest level of alert,
189 and a National State of Emergency was declared [22]. At this alert level people are instructed
190 to stay at home except for essential personal movement such as for health care or essential
191 shopping, safe recreational activity is allowed in the local area, and travel is severely limited.
192 All gatherings are cancelled, and all public venues closed. Businesses are closed except for
193 essential services (for example, supermarkets, pharmacies, health clinics, petrol stations and
194 lifeline organisations). All educational facilities are closed [22].

195

196 As the spread of the virus slowed and stopped, the country progressively moved to lower alert
197 levels: Level 3 towards the end of April and Level 2 in early May 2020. Alert Level 1, the
198 lowest level, was introduced on 8 June 2020 because community transmission had halted and
199 there were no active cases in the country outside the Managed Isolation and Quarantine
200 facilities (MIQ). These were established specifically to quarantine all incoming travellers to
201 New Zealand for 14 days after arrival. If a traveller tested positive for COVID-19 at any time
202 during the 14 days, they were moved to another quarantine facility for people with COVID-
203 19 [22].

204

205 However, on 11 August 2020 four new cases were detected in Auckland. Auckland returned
206 the next day to Alert Level 3, with the rest of the country at Alert Level 2. Auckland
207 remained at Alert Level 3 until 30 August, when it moved to Level 2, with additional
208 restrictions on travel and the size of gatherings. The rest of the country remained at the
209 standard Alert Level 2 until 21 September, when the alert level was downgraded to Level 1.
210 The extra restrictions on Auckland residents were relaxed on 21 September and they returned
211 to Alert Level 1 on 7 October 2020 [24].

212

213 The central government commenced a mass vaccination programme for COVID-19 using the
214 Pfizer vaccine, starting with border staff and managed isolation and quarantine workers, in
215 February 2021 [9, 25]. The programme was accompanied by an extensive, government-
216 funded publicity campaign using traditional and social media.

217

218 Materials and methods

219 Data from two surveys were used in this study. The first survey, the ‘Auckland’ survey, was
220 of Auckland residents and was conducted over two weeks from 7 September to 22 September
221 2020. Auckland was chosen for the survey because it is New Zealand’s largest city and is the
222 mostly likely place for community transmission to occur, given the greater number of MIQ
223 facilities and frontline border workers in the city. At the time of the survey, Auckland
224 residents were mostly under Alert Level 2, which meant that they were expected to maintain
225 social distancing when outside their homes and to wear masks in public places. They were
226 also expected to keep track of their movements and to self-isolate and seek testing for
227 COVID-19 if they felt unwell and experienced symptoms associated with COVID-19.

228

229 The second survey, the ‘regional’ survey, was of residents in five regions outside Auckland
230 with, or near, MIQ facilities (Hamilton, Rotorua, Tauranga, Wellington, and Christchurch)
231 and was conducted during the first and second week of March 2021, before the Delta variant
232 was detected in New Zealand and before vaccinations were available to the general public.

233 When the survey commenced, residents in these regions were under Alert Level 2, which
234 meant that they were expected to maintain social distancing when outside their homes and to
235 wear masks in public places. They were also expected to keep track of their movements and
236 to self-isolate and seek testing for COVID-19 if they felt unwell and experienced symptoms

237 associated with COVID-19. On 8 March 2021 the regions shifted to Alert Level 1, which
238 meant people were expected to wear masks on public transport. They were also encouraged
239 to keep track of their movements and to self-isolate and seek testing for COVID-19 if they
240 felt unwell and experienced symptoms associated with COVID-19 [22].

241

242 For both surveys, a questionnaire seeking information from the public on their beliefs about,
243 attitudes towards, and willingness to wear face masks, self-isolate and be tested for COVID-
244 19 was designed based on the I₃ Compliance Framework [16]. Involvement was measured
245 using a condensed version of the Laurent and Kapferer [26] involvement scale developed by
246 Kaine [27], with respondents rating two statements on each of the five components of
247 involvement (functional, experiential, identity-based, risk-based, and consequence-based).

248 Attitudes were measured using a simple, evaluative scale (the questionnaire is reproduced in
249 S1). The ordering of the statements in the involvement and attitude scales was randomised to
250 avoid bias in responses. Respondents indicated their agreement with statements in all the
251 involvement, attitude and belief scales using a five-point rating, ranging from strongly
252 disagree (1) to strongly agree (5).

253

254 Respondents' propensity to wear face masks was obtained by asking them if they had worn a
255 face mask when out in public the previous week and whether they had to go out to work the
256 previous week. Respondents answered both questions using a five-point scale ranging from
257 'always' to 'never'. Their propensity to self-isolate was obtained by asking them, 'Thinking
258 about the next few days, would you stay home if you were unwell or had any of the following
259 symptoms: a dry cough, fever, loss of sense of smell, loss of sense of taste, shortness of
260 breath or difficulty breathing?'. We also asked, 'If you were advised to do so by a healthcare

261 professional or public health authority, would you self-isolate for 14 days?'. Both questions
262 were answered using a five-point scale ranging from 'definitely' to 'definitely not'.

263

264 Information was also sought on the demographic characteristics of respondents, including
265 age, education, and ethnicity, and whether they wore masks, would self-isolate and had been
266 tested for COVID-19. The ethnicity categories were Māori (the Indigenous people of New
267 Zealand), European New Zealander, Pacific Islander, Asian and Other.

268

269 Participation in surveys was voluntary, respondents could leave the survey at any time, and
270 all survey questions were optional and could be skipped. The research approach was
271 reviewed and approved by the Manaaki Whenua – Landcare Research's social ethics process
272 (application no. 2021/10 NK) which is based on the New Zealand Association of Social
273 Science Research code of ethics.

274

275 The Auckland questionnaire had been piloted with a small random sample of residents
276 (n=30), and subsequently completed by a larger random sample of residents (n=1001) who
277 were members of a large-scale, commercial consumer internet panel. The regional
278 questionnaire, which was identical to the Auckland questionnaire, was completed by a large
279 random sample of residents (n=2000), stratified by regional population, who were also
280 members of a large-scale, commercial consumer internet panel. Panel members receive
281 reward points (which are redeemable for products and services) for completing surveys. For
282 both surveys, an internet link to the questionnaire was distributed to randomly selected
283 members of the panel subject to the constraint that they were resident in the relevant region
284 and were not minors. To reduce respondent fatigue, a split-sample approach was taken, with

285 each respondent answering sets of questions in relation to two of the three measures (mask
286 wearing, self-isolation and getting tested for COVID-19).

287

288 Given the pandemic had been receiving widespread coverage by mainstream and social
289 media in New Zealand since February 2020, it seems reasonable to suppose that virtually all
290 the residents in each region were aware of COVID-19 at the time of the surveys and that
291 most, if not all, were also aware of the government claims of the social desirability of
292 wearing face masks and social distancing when out in public, and of self-isolating if feeling
293 unwell and getting tested for COVID-19.

294

295 While awareness of the existence of COVID-19 is a prerequisite for involvement with it,
296 awareness does not necessarily entail involvement. Widespread awareness of COVID-19
297 simply creates the potential for widespread involvement. The extent to which that potential is
298 realised depends on respondents' beliefs about how COVID-19 could affect the achievement
299 of their functional, experiential and self-identity needs.

300

301 Involvement scores were computed for each respondent as the simple arithmetic average of
302 their agreement ratings for the 10 statements in the involvement scales. Attitudes scores were
303 computed as the simple arithmetic average of their agreement ratings for the five statements
304 in the attitude scales. For this paper, data was also gathered on the number, dates, and
305 location by District Health Board of COVID-19 cases reported by the New Zealand Ministry
306 of Health [28].

307

308 Statistical analyses were conducted using SPSS [29].

309

310 Results

311 As the data on involvement, attitudes, behavioural intentions, and behaviour were collected
312 using the same survey but at different times, a number of confounding factors may give rise
313 to dissimilar results. These are:

- 314 • differences in the demographic composition of the samples
315 • differences in Alert Level restrictions
316 • differences in awareness of the prevalence, or nature, of COVID-19.

317 To begin with, although the samples were broadly similar with regard to their age, education,
318 and income composition, they differed substantially with respect to gender and ethnicity (see
319 Tables 1, 2, 3 and 4). Approximately 53% of respondents to the Auckland survey were
320 women whereas approximately 65% of respondents to the regional survey were women.

321

322 There were statistically significant but weak associations [30] between the demographic
323 characteristics and willingness to take responsibility for eliminating COVID-19 and
324 willingness to change normal behaviour, make sacrifices and work with others to eliminate
325 COVID-19 (see Table 5). There were also some statistically significant but weak associations
326 [30] between demographic characteristics and the wearing of face masks and willingness to
327 self-isolate (see Table 6). Differences in demographic characteristics such as age, ethnicity,
328 gender, and education may influence perceptions of the danger to health posed by COVID-
329 19. This suggests that differences in the demographic composition of the two surveys could
330 partly explain differences in intentions and behaviour in the two surveys.

331

333 **Table 1. Age distribution of respondents**

Age category (years)	Percentage of Auckland respondents	Percentage of regional respondents
18–29	22.8	13.2
30–39	21.8	22.6
40–49	18.4	21.5
50–59	13.1	12.5
60–69	12.5	13.8
70 and over	11.4	16.4

334

335

336 **Table 2. Distribution of respondents by highest educational qualification**

Education category	Percentage of Auckland respondents	Percentage of regional respondents
Some or all of secondary school	14.2	19.5
Certificate (1–6)	12.4	19.1
Diploma (5–7)	14.3	17.5
Bachelor	33.6	23.4
Post-graduate diploma/certificate	10.2	11.1
Post-graduate degree	15.3	9.4

337

338

339 **Table 3. Ethnicity distribution of respondents**

Ethnic category	Percentage of Auckland respondents	Percentage of regional respondents
European	53.3	72.1
Māori	4.4	13.5
Pacific Islander	4.7	1.8
Other	37.6	12.7

340

341

342

344 **Table 4. Income distribution of respondents**

Income category	Percentage of Auckland respondents	Percentage of regional respondents
Less than \$20,000	4.3	8.5
\$20,000 to \$50,000	21.2	26.0
\$50,000 to \$70,000	18.6	21.7
\$70,000 to \$100,000	22.0	22.1
More than \$100,000	33.8	21.6

345

346

347 **Table 5. Demographics and behavioural intentions**

Characteristic	Feel some responsibility	Change normal behaviour	Work with others	Make sacrifices
Age	0.006*	0.007*	0.019*	0.014*
Gender	0.003*	0.005*	0.003*	0.005
Education	0.009*	0.006*	0.008*	0.006*
Ethnicity	0.006*	0.003	0.003	0.001
Income	0.016*	0.014*	0.009*	0.011*

348 Values are η^2 , the proportion of the variance in intention explained by the variance in the socio-demographic
349 variable [30]. For example, differences in income explain 1.4% of the variation in intention to change normal
350 behaviour ($\eta^2 = 0.014$).

351 * Indicates statistically significant effect ($p < 0.01$).

352

353 **Table 6. Demographics, wearing face masks and intention to self-isolate**

Characteristic	Wore a face mask in public	Wore a face mask at work	Stay home if unwell	Stay home if instructed by health authority
Age	0.011*	0.016*	0.039*	0.029*
Gender	0.009*	0.016*	0.007*	0.004
Education	0.021*	0.029*	0.004	0.003
Ethnicity	0.052*	0.066*	0.009*	0.015*
Income	0.002	0.005	0.010*	0.014*

354 Values are η^2 [30]

356 We investigated the effect of differences in Alert Level restrictions by classifying regional
357 respondents into three categories according to the date when they completed the
358 questionnaire. The first category consisted of respondents who completed the questionnaire
359 prior to 8 March 2021, the date at which Alert Levels changed (from 2 to 1). The second
360 category consisted of respondents who completed the questionnaire between 8 March 2021
361 and 15 March 2021, who could have been reporting on their behaviour under either Alert
362 Level 1 or 2 depending on how they interpreted the phrase ‘Did you wear a face mask
363 whenever you went out in public last week?’. The third and final category consisted of
364 respondents who completed the questionnaire after 15 March 2021, and so should have been
365 reporting on their behaviour under Alert Level 1.

366

367 We found a statistically significant, but extremely small, difference between the categories in
368 the mean scores for willingness to change normal behaviour ($\eta^2=0.007$), make sacrifices
369 ($\eta^2=0.006$) and work with others to eliminate COVID-19 ($\eta^2=0.007$). We also found a
370 statistically significant, but extremely small, difference between the categories in the mean
371 scores for wearing face masks in public ($\eta^2=0.012$) and wearing face masks at work
372 ($\eta^2=0.11$). This suggests that the difference in Alert Levels between the two surveys may
373 also partly explain differences in intentions and behaviour in the two surveys.

374

375 It seems unlikely that differences between the surveys in intentions and behaviour could be
376 the result of differences in awareness of the prevalence, or nature, of COVID-19. Almost 730
377 cases of COVID-19 were detected in Auckland prior to the Auckland survey [28].
378 Approximately 570 cases had been detected in the MIQ regions prior to conducting the
379 regional survey [28]. As noted earlier, the pandemic received extensive media coverage,
380 including daily government briefings, in New Zealand during the six months preceding

381 the Auckland survey. The Delta variant of COVID-19, a more highly infectious and severe
382 variant of the virus [31, 32], emerged during the five months between the Auckland and
383 regional surveys but was not present in New Zealand at the time the regional survey was
384 conducted. Given the emergence of the Delta variant, and that the regional survey occurred
385 some five months after the Auckland survey, awareness of COVID-19 among regional
386 respondents could reasonably be expected to be at least as great as it was among Auckland
387 respondents.

388

389 **Intentions and behaviour**

390 The purpose of this analysis was to explain differences in the propensity of Auckland and
391 regional respondents to comply with wearing face masks in public and at work, given their
392 behavioural intentions were similar. Note that satisfactory reliabilities [33] were obtained in
393 both surveys for the involvement and attitudinal scales with respect to eliminating COVID-
394 19, wearing face masks, self-isolating when unwell and getting tested for COVID-19 (see
395 Table 7).

396

397 The means for all the involvement, attitude, intention, and behaviour variables for both
398 surveys are reported in Table 8. Where the means for the two surveys were statistically
399 significantly different, the magnitude of the differences, as measured by effect size [30], is
400 also reported in the table. An inspection of the table reveals that wearing face masks in public
401 and at work were the only variables for which the means were statistically significantly
402 different, and the magnitude of the difference was large, for the two surveys.

403

405 **Table 7. Reliability of involvement and attitude scales**

	Auckland	Regional
Involvement with eliminating COVID-19	0.847	0.853
Involvement with wearing face masks	0.852	0.863
Attitude towards wearing face masks	0.854	0.814
Involvement with self-isolating when unwell	0.707	0.758
Attitude towards self-isolating when unwell	0.795	0.800
Involvement with getting tested for COVID-19	0.821	0.807
Attitude towards getting tested for COVID-19	0.849	0.813

406 Notes: Values are Cronbach's alpha [33].

407

408

409 **Table 8. Involvement, attitude, intentions, and behaviour**

	Auckland ¹	Regional ¹	Effect size ²
Involvement with eliminating COVID-19*	3.90	3.83	0.003
Attitude towards eliminating COVID-19	4.19	4.19	-
Feel some responsibility*	4.04	3.94	0.003
Change normal behaviour*	4.22	4.11	0.003
Work with others*	4.34	4.25	0.003
Make sacrifices	4.13	4.10	-
Involvement with wearing face masks*	3.51	3.40	0.005
Attitude towards wearing face masks*	4.08	3.85	0.016
Wore a face mask in public*	3.93	2.54	0.195
Wore a face mask at work*	3.62	2.64	0.082
Involvement with self-isolating when unwell	3.73	3.68	-
Attitude towards self-isolating when unwell*	4.39	4.24	0.010
Stay home if unwell	1.48	1.50	-
Stay home if instructed by health authority	1.32	1.27	-
Involvement with getting tested for COVID-19	3.41	3.43	-
Attitude towards getting tested for COVID-19	4.15	4.08	-

410 Notes: ¹ Values for Auckland and regional are mean scores

411 ² Values are η^2 [30]

412

413

415 These results suggest that, on average, respondents in both surveys were similar in their
416 motivations (as measured by involvement) and attitudes towards eliminating COVID-19,
417 wearing face masks, self-isolating and getting tested for COVID-19. They were similar, on
418 average, regarding their intentions to take some responsibility for eliminating COVID-19,
419 and their intentions to change their normal behaviour, work with others and make sacrifices
420 to eliminate COVID-19 from New Zealand. They were also similar, on average, regarding
421 their intentions to self-isolate and get tested for COVID-19. Relatedly, Auckland and regional
422 respondents were similar in their patterns of beliefs about COVID-19, eliminating COVID-19
423 from New Zealand, and the advantages and disadvantages of wearing face masks, self-
424 isolating and getting tested for COVID-19 [7].

425

426 The only substantive difference between the two samples relates to the wearing of face
427 masks, with the means for the regional sample being substantially lower than the means for
428 the Auckland sample. The difference, on average, roughly corresponds to regional
429 respondents reporting that they only wore face masks sometimes (at best) when they were out
430 in public whereas Auckland respondents reported they often wore face masks when they were
431 out in public.

432

433 Predicting intentions and behaviour

434 Following Kaine et al. [6, 7] we hypothesised that respondents' intentions with respect to
435 eliminating COVID-19 from New Zealand would be a function of their involvement with,
436 and attitude towards, eliminating COVID-19. Consequently, we estimated regressions with
437 respondents' willingness to take some responsibility for eliminating COVID-19, and their
438 willingness to change normal behaviour, work with others and make sacrifices to eliminate
439 COVID-19 from New Zealand as dependent variables.

440

441 The explanatory variables were respondents' involvement with, and attitude towards,
442 eliminating COVID-19. To account for the possibility that the demographic differences
443 between the surveys might be correlated with relevant omitted variables (e.g. social norms,
444 susceptibility to infection, risk of severe symptoms), respondents' demographic
445 characteristics were also included in the regressions. Dummy variables were created
446 representing respondents' ethnicity with 'Other' treated as the benchmark. Two additional
447 dummy variables were included in the regressions, one representing the period when regional
448 respondents were at Alert Level 2 and one representing the first week regional respondents
449 were at Alert Level 1.

450

451 The explanatory power of the regressions, and the resulting parameter estimates, are reported
452 in Table 9. The regressions were statistically significant and, for cross-sectional data, a
453 substantial proportion of the variance in respondents' intentions was explained by their
454 involvement with, and attitude towards, eliminating COVID-19. The results show that
455 involvement and attitude account for the bulk of the explained variation in the dependent
456 variables. The variation in respondents' intentions were only weakly related, if at all, to their
457 demographic characteristics or, for regional respondents, changes in Alert Levels.

458

459 Again, following Kaine et al. [6, 7], we hypothesised that respondents' propensity to self-
460 isolate and wear face masks would be a function of their involvement with, and attitude
461 towards, self-isolating and wearing face masks, respectively. Consequently, we estimated
462 regressions with respondents' self-reported willingness to self-isolate and wearing of face
463 masks as dependent variables. The explanatory variables for willingness to self-isolate were
464 respondents' involvement with, and attitude towards, wearing face masks and self-isolating.

465 **Table 9. Standardised parameter estimates for behavioural intentions**

	Feel responsible for eliminating COVID-19 (n=2586)	Prepared to change normal behaviour (n=2586)	Willing to make sacrifices (n=2586)	Willing to work together (n=2586)
Involvement with eliminating COVID-19	0.466 ($p<0.001$)	0.479 ($p<0.001$)	0.399 ($p<0.001$)	0.469 ($p<0.001$)
Attitude towards eliminating COVID-19	0.232 ($p<0.001$)	0.272 ($p<0.001$)	0.353 ($p<0.001$)	0.295 ($p<0.001$)
Age	0.044 ($p=0.007$)	0.044 ($p=0.005$)	0.062 ($p<0.001$)	0.058 ($p<0.001$)
Gender	0.037 ($p=0.017$)	0.047 ($p=0.001$)	0.023 ($p=0.118$)	0.052 ($p<0.001$)
Education	0.040 ($p=0.011$)	-0.008 ($p=0.593$)	-0.015 ($p=0.333$)	0.002 ($p=0.916$)
Income	0.081 ($p<0.001$)	0.034 ($p=0.027$)	0.004 ($p=0.817$)	0.045 ($p=0.003$)
European NZ	-0.049 ($p=0.009$)	-0.020 ($p=0.272$)	-0.018 ($p=0.315$)	0.000 ($p=0.984$)
Māori	-0.051 ($p=0.004$)	-0.042 ($p=0.014$)	-0.053 ($p=0.002$)	-0.023 ($p=0.166$)
Pacific Islander	-0.004 ($p=0.801$)	-0.009 ($p=0.566$)	-0.016 ($p=0.281$)	0.019 ($p=0.187$)
Regions at Alert Level 2	-0.013 ($p=0.386$)	-0.040 ($p=0.007$)	-0.002 ($p=0.875$)	0.001 ($p=0.938$)
First week regions at Alert Level 1	-0.012 ($p=0.453$)	0.000 ($p=0.996$)	-0.003 ($p=0.842$)	0.015 ($p=0.320$)
Adjusted R²	0.43	0.48	0.48	0.50
F-Test significance	<0.001	<0.001	<0.001	<0.01

466

467 Again, to account for the possibility that the demographic differences between the surveys
468 might be correlated with relevant omitted variables, respondents' demographic characteristics
469 were also included in the regressions as well as dummy variables representing when regional
470 respondents were at Alert Level 2 and the first week at Alert Level 1.

471

472 Willingness to self-isolate when unwell, or instructed to do so by a health authority, was
473 strongly and positively influenced by involvement with, and attitudes towards, self-isolating
474 (see Table 10). As with the other behavioural intention variables, the variation in
475 respondents' intentions to self-isolate were only weakly related, if at all, to their demographic
476 characteristics or, for regional respondents, changes in Alert Levels.

477

478 The explanatory variables for wearing face masks were respondents' involvement with, and
479 attitude towards, wearing face masks and, as with previous regressions, respondents'
480 demographic characteristics were also included to account for the possibility that the
481 demographic differences might be correlated with relevant omitted variables. As before, we
482 also included dummy variables representing when regional respondents were at Alert Level 2
483 and the first week at Alert Level 1.

484

485 We included additional explanatory variables in the regressions for wearing masks which
486 were intended to account for the differences observed previously in the wearing of face
487 masks by Auckland and regional respondents. We had attributed this difference in behaviour
488 to differences in respondents' perceptions of the risk of COVID-19 infection. We
489 hypothesised that respondents would, in some way, use information about the number of
490 cases in their region in forming their perception of the risk of being infected with COVID-19.

491

493 **Table 10. Standardised parameter estimates for intention to self-isolate**

	Intending to stay home if feeling unwell (n=1697)	Stay home if instructed to do so (n=1697)
Involvement with self-isolating	0.131 (p<0.001)	0.100 (p<0.001)
Attitude towards self-isolating	0.330 (p<0.001)	0.399 (p<0.001)
Age	0.174 (p<0.001)	0.090 (p<0.001)
Gender	0.086 (p<0.001)	0.041 (p=0.072)
Education	0.038 (p=0.103)	0.001 (p=0.958)
Income	0.043 (p=0.058)	0.036 (p=0.115)
European NZ	0.038 (p=0.159)	0.016 (p=0.556)
Māori	0.009 (p=0.718)	-0.032 (p=0.214)
Pacific Islander	0.032 (p=0.158)	-0.016 (p=0.486)
Regions at Alert Level 2	-0.036 (p=0.112)	-0.055 (p=0.014)
First week regions at Alert Level 1	-0.029 (p=0.209)	0.017 (p=0.441)
Adjusted R²	0.21	0.23
F-Test significance	<0.001	<0.001

494

495

496

497

498

499

501 To begin with, we assumed that respondents' perception of the risk of infection would be
502 proportional to the total number of COVID-19 cases reported in their region prior to the
503 survey, and that their perception of the risk of infection would become increasingly sensitive
504 to the total number of cases, as that total increased. Consequently, the two additional
505 variables included in the regressions were the total number of cases in a respondent's region,
506 and the total number of cases in their region squared (and centred to avoid multi-collinearity).

507 Note that respondents might also use Alert level settings in judging the risk of infection.

508

509 We then assumed that respondents' perception of the risk of infection would be proportional
510 to the total number of COVID-19 cases reported in their region prior to the survey expressed
511 as a fraction of the population of the region, and that their perception of the risk of infection
512 would become increasingly sensitive to the number of cases expressed as a fraction of the
513 population of the region, as the total number of cases increased. Consequently, the two
514 additional variables included in these regressions were the total number of cases in a
515 respondent's region expressed as a proportion of the regional population, and the total
516 number of cases expressed as a proportion of the regional population squared (and centred to
517 avoid multi-collinearity). Noting again that respondents might also use Alert level settings in
518 judging the risk of infection, the results, with and without the additional risk perception
519 variables, are reported in Tables 11 and 12.

520

521 The regressions where the perception of the risk of infection was assumed to be proportional
522 to the total number of COVID-19 cases were superior to the regressions where the perception
523 of the risk of infection was assumed to be proportional to the total number of COVID-19
524 cases expressed as a fraction of the population of the region.

525

526 **Table 11. Standardised parameter estimates for wearing face masks in public**

	Wore a face mask in public (n=1650)	Wore a face mask in public (n=1650)	Wore a face mask in public (n=1650)
Involvement with wearing face masks	0.228 ($p<0.001$)	0.246 ($p<0.001$)	0.230 ($p<0.001$)
Attitude towards face masks	0.235 ($p<0.001$)	0.198 ($p<0.001$)	0.227 ($p<0.001$)
Total number of cases		0.185 ($p<0.001$)	
Total cases squared		0.140 ($p<0.001$)	
Total number of cases as a proportion of the regional population			0.107 ($p<0.001$)
Total cases as a proportion of the regional population squared			0.047 ($p=0.031$)
Age	-0.067 ($p=0.003$)	-0.064 ($p=0.003$)	-0.063 ($p=0.005$)
Gender	-0.103 ($p<0.001$)	-0.082 ($p<0.001$)	-0.098 ($p<0.001$)
Education	0.065 ($p=0.003$)	0.060 ($p=0.004$)	0.061 ($p=0.005$)
Income	-0.030 ($p=0.176$)	-0.035 ($p=0.094$)	-0.032 ($p=0.139$)
European NZ	-0.074 ($p<0.004$)	-0.011 ($p=0.660$)	-0.063 ($p=0.016$)
Māori	0.063 ($p=0.010$)	0.120 ($p<0.001$)	0.072 ($p=0.003$)
Pacific Islander	0.010 ($p=0.636$)	0.011 ($p=0.600$)	0.010 ($p=0.637$)
Regions at Alert Level 2	-0.224 ($p<0.001$)	-0.105 ($p<0.001$)	-0.199 ($p<0.001$)
First week regions at Alert Level 1	-0.258 ($p<0.001$)	-0.097 ($p<0.001$)	-0.224 ($p<0.001$)
Adjusted R²	0.33	0.38	0.33
F-Test significance	<0.001	<0.001	<0.001

527

528

529

531 **Table 12. Standardised parameter estimates for wearing face masks at work**

	Wore a face mask at work (n=1225)	Wore a face mask at work (n=1225)	Wore a face mask at work (n=1225)
Involvement with wearing face masks	0.288 ($p<0.001$)	0.298 ($p<0.001$)	0.288 ($p<0.001$)
Attitude towards face masks	0.089 ($p=0.003$)	0.073 ($p=0.017$)	0.089 ($p=0.004$)
Total number of cases		0.075 ($p=0.077$)	
Total cases squared		0.102 ($p=0.008$)	
Total number of cases as a proportion of the regional population			0.068 ($p=0.023$)
Total cases as a proportion of the regional population squared			0.059 ($p=0.030$)
Age	-0.080 ($p=0.002$)	-0.079 ($p=0.002$)	-0.078 ($p=0.003$)
Gender	-0.135 ($p<0.001$)	-0.126 ($p<0.001$)	-0.135 ($p<0.001$)
Education	0.108 ($p<0.001$)	0.107 ($p<0.001$)	0.108 ($p<0.001$)
Income	-0.066 ($p=0.013$)	-0.069 ($p=0.009$)	-0.068 ($p=0.010$)
European NZ	-0.059 ($p=0.061$)	-0.018 ($p=0.585$)	-0.050 ($p=0.112$)
Māori	0.127 ($p<0.001$)	0.158 ($p<0.001$)	0.128 ($p<0.001$)
Pacific Islander	0.043 ($p=0.096$)	0.043 ($p=0.094$)	0.044 ($p=0.092$)
Regions at Alert Level 2	-0.135 ($p<0.001$)	-0.076 ($p=0.007$)	-0.121 ($p<0.001$)
First week regions at Alert Level 1	-0.168 ($p<0.001$)	-0.088 ($p=0.004$)	-0.149 ($p<0.001$)
Adjusted R²	0.26	0.27	0.26
F-Test significance	<0.001	<0.001	<0.001

532

533

534 Willingness to wear face masks in public was strongly and positively influenced by
535 involvement with, and attitudes towards, wearing face masks. As was the case with
536 behavioural intentions, the variation in respondents' wearing of face masks in public was
537 only weakly related to their demographic characteristics. Changes in Alert Levels did appear
538 to have some influence on the wearing of face masks in public by regional respondents,
539 though this influence was weakened when the variables intended to account for respondents'
540 perception of the risk of COVID-19 infection were included in the regression. As
541 hypothesised, the cumulative number of COVID-19 cases in a region had a positive influence
542 on the wearing of face masks in public, and this influence strengthened as case numbers
543 increased.

544
545 Willingness to wear face masks at work was positively influenced by involvement with, and
546 attitudes towards, wearing face masks though the effects of attitude are weaker than was the
547 case for wearing face masks in public. The variation in respondents' wearing of face masks at
548 work was related to gender, education and, slightly, ethnicity. Changes in Alert Levels did
549 appear to influence the wearing of face masks at work by regional respondents. The variables
550 intended to account for respondents' perception of the risk of COVID-19 infection had a
551 much smaller influence on mask wearing at work compared to their influence on wearing
552 face masks when out in public, perhaps reflecting the lower degree of autonomy in decision-
553 making that individuals have in the workplace.

554
555 These results support our hypothesis that the difference between Auckland and regional
556 respondents in the wearing of face masks can be attributed to differences in perceptions of the
557 risk of infection. If regional respondents did perceive the risk of infection from COVID-19 to
558 be lower than Auckland respondents, then they should be less likely than Auckland

559 respondents to seek testing for COVID-19 unless they felt unwell. That is to say, the
560 proportion of respondents who felt unwell when they were tested for COVID-19 should be
561 significantly higher among regional respondents than Auckland respondents. We found this
562 to be the case with approximately 69.7% of regional respondents feeling unwell when they
563 were tested for COVID-19 compared to 50.4% of Auckland respondents ($p<0.001$).

564

565 **Discussion**

566 The results are consistent with our hypothesis that the difference between Auckland and
567 regional respondents in their self-reported frequency for wearing face masks when out in
568 public is due to differences in their perceptions of the risk of infection. Both samples of
569 respondents had similar levels of involvement with, and attitudes towards, eliminating
570 COVID-19 from New Zealand. Consequently, both samples displayed similar intentions to:

- 571 • take responsibility for eliminating COVID-19 from New Zealand
572 • change normal behaviour to eliminate COVID-19 from New Zealand
573 • work with others to eliminate COVID-19 from New Zealand
574 • make sacrifices to eliminate COVID-19 from New Zealand

575 Both samples of respondents had similar levels of involvement with, and attitudes towards,
576 self-isolating if unwell or being instructed to do so by a health authority. These similarities
577 resulted in similar intentions to self-isolate if unwell or instructed to do so by a health
578 authority.

579

580 Both samples of respondents exhibited similar levels of involvement with, and attitudes
581 towards, wearing face masks when out in public. However, while these similarities might
582 mean both samples had similar intentions to wear face masks, this did not translate into

583 similar behaviour. Regional respondents reported much lower frequency of mask wearing
584 than Auckland respondents. Our results suggest this difference was primarily due to
585 differences in perceptions of the risk of infection as measured by the total number of
586 infections in a region at the time the surveys were conducted (assuming respondents in both
587 samples had similar perceptions of the severity of the health consequences should they
588 contract COVID-19). Differences between the samples with respect to demographic
589 characteristics, and Alert Levels at the time of the surveys, appeared to play a secondary role
590 in explaining the difference between the samples in wearing of face masks.

591

592 The willingness of people to adopt behaviours to prevent the spread of COVID-19 such as
593 wearing face masks, self-isolating and getting tested for COVID-19 has been the subject of
594 numerous studies [6,7, 34, 35, 36, 37, 38, 39, 40, 41]. These studies have shown that
595 willingness to adopt these behaviours does depend on people's attitudes towards them, which
596 in turn depend on their beliefs about the behaviours. Consequently, many of these studies
597 recommend that the adoption of preventative behaviours can be improved through
598 promotional efforts intended to change beliefs and attitudes. Our results have three important
599 implications for such recommendations.

600

601 The first concerns the fact that these findings are a reminder that intentions do not always
602 immediately translate into actions. While it is undoubtedly true that changing attitudes can
603 change behaviour, promotional efforts intended to change beliefs and attitudes about
604 preventative behaviours are unlikely to meet with complete success unless health authorities
605 also seek to identify the factors that:

- 606 • trigger the translation of intentions into actions, and
607 • prevent those who are involved to act from acting.

608 For example, with respect to wearing face masks our results suggest that respondents to our
609 surveys may have relied on the number of COVID-19 infections in their region, together with
610 changes in Alert levels, as signals to trigger the translation of intention into action. This
611 means that providing timely and easily accessible information on the number of infections
612 resulting from community transmission in each region is important. Relatedly, it also means
613 providing timely and easily understandable information on the danger to health posed by
614 different variants of COVID-19 is essential if the public is to make a reasonable judgement
615 about the number of infections from community transmission required to trigger action. This
616 is supposing that there is a relationship, most likely an inverse relationship, between the
617 seriousness of the health risk posed by a variant and the threshold for infections by
618 community transmission below which intentions remain just that, intentions.

619
620 Second, bearing in mind the difficulties of engaging with those who are not involved and
621 getting them to observe measures to prevent or slow the spread of COVID-19 [6], our results
622 reinforce the importance of ensuring that measures to prevent the spread of COVID-19 are as
623 simple and convenient to adopt as possible. Improving the ease and convenience of adopting
624 preventative behaviours may, in fact, be more effective in changing behaviour than
625 promotional efforts aimed at changing people's beliefs and attitudes. In the context of
626 measures to prevent the spread of COVID-19, this translates into ensuring that compliance
627 requires as little effort and thought as practical and is as stress-free as possible [21]; for
628 example, by supplying face masks for free on public transport and in other high-risk locations
629 such as supermarkets [34]. See West et al. [42] for a discussion about the range of
630 interventions that might accompany promotion.

631

632 We found, as Gray et al. [43] did, that people's willingness to wear face masks depended on
633 their beliefs about the effectiveness of face masks in protecting them from infection.
634 Consequently, they recommended developing and promoting to the public clear guidelines on
635 wearing face masks and increasing promotional efforts dispelling myths about the efficacy of
636 masks [43]. While such promotional efforts may meet with success in encouraging intentions,
637 they are only part of the story. Providing timely, trustworthy, and easily accessible
638 information on the number of infections resulting from community transmission in each
639 region is also critical.

640

641 Third, it is important to bear in mind that, for New Zealanders at least, wearing a face mask
642 when out in public means constantly disrupting routine behaviours. Consequently, wearing a
643 face mask requires much more time and effort than getting vaccinated for COVID-19, a non-
644 routine action that only needs to be performed two or three times. This suggests that the
645 perceived risk of infection that triggers the translation of the intention to wear a face mask
646 into action is likely to be higher (*ceteris paribus*) than that required to trigger the translation
647 of the intention to get vaccinated for COVID-19 into action.

648

649 Relatedly, this suggests that, once the number of infections by community transmission begin
650 to decline, the public will desire an end to measures to prevent the spread of COVID-19 that
651 constantly disrupt routine behaviours far earlier than for other, less unsettling measures. This
652 means, for instance, that the observance of measures mask wearing, social distancing, using
653 tracer apps and showing vaccine passes is likely to deteriorate even though measures such as
654 being vaccinated and tested are still strongly supported. Ironically, success in vaccinating the
655 public may well encourage the faster abandonment of mask wearing and social distancing if
656 vaccinations are perceived to reduce the risk of transmission and the severity of symptoms.

657

658 This raises the possibility that, because misinformation can undermine compliance with
659 COVID-19 measures [44, 45], the distribution of misinformation about the health risks posed
660 by COVID-19 through social media could lead to measures that disrupt daily routines being
661 adopted more slowly, and abandoned more rapidly, than is desirable. This is because such
662 misinformation may provide a self-serving rationale for failing to continue to comply with
663 measures that require a constant investment of time and effort. This reinforces the importance
664 of providing timely, accurate and trustworthy regional information on the spread of COVID-
665 19 variants by community transmission and the severity of the health dangers posed by each
666 variant. These considerations suggest that government authorities must be mindful, when it
667 comes to investing resources in combating misinformation about COVID-19, of the relative
668 importance of combating misinformation targeting people's beliefs and attitudes and
669 misinformation targeting triggers to action.

670

671 Our findings are subject to several qualifications including the following. First, as the
672 survey samples were drawn from internet-based consumer panels there may be selection bias.
673 While the nature and severity of this bias in relation to the attitudes and involvement we
674 investigated is unknown, it does seem reasonable to suppose, ceteris paribus, that people with
675 low-to-mild involvement may be under-represented in the sample.

676

677 Second, as the scales measuring the wearing of face masks, willingness to self-isolate and
678 being tested for COVID-19 were self-reported, our measurements of these behaviours may
679 have been affected by social desirability bias [46]. While Daoust et al. [47] found that social
680 desirability bias appeared to be consistent across gender, age, and education categories, the
681 potential for bias in self-reporting of socially desirable behaviours (or opinions) in the context

682 of the differing degrees of involvement is less clear. However, while there may be a
683 correlation between intensity of involvement and social desirability bias, the dramatic
684 difference between Auckland and regional respondents in their self-reported frequency of
685 wearing face masks suggests that the degree of social desirability bias in our study is small.

686 See Kaine et al. [6] for a more detailed discussion of this matter.

687

688 Third, the adoption of behaviours such as the wearing of face masks has been associated with
689 a range of variables including feelings of stress in relation to COVID-19 [21]. We did not
690 include such variables in our analysis, and, while the correlation between these variables and
691 involvement is unknown, it is likely to be positive.

692

693 Fourth, the adoption of preventative behaviours such as the wearing of face masks and social
694 distancing has been associated with a range of psychological traits such as pro-sociability and
695 empathy [48, 49, 50]. The correlation between involvement and these psychological traits,
696 and the direction of causation between them, deserves further study.

697

698 **Conclusions**

699 Governments around the world are seeking to slow the spread of COVID-19 by
700 implementing measures that encourage, or mandate, changes in people's behaviour. These
701 changes include the wearing of face masks, social distancing, and testing and self-isolating
702 when unwell. The success of these measures depends on (1) the willingness of individuals to
703 change their behaviour and (2) their commitment and capacity to translate that intention into
704 actions. Consequently, understanding and predicting the willingness of individuals to change

705 their behaviour, and their enthusiasm to act on that willingness, is critical in assessing the
706 likely effectiveness of these measures in slowing the spread of the virus.

707

708 In this paper we analysed data from two regional surveys about people's intentions and
709 behaviour with respect to preventing the spread of COVID-19 in New Zealand. While
710 motivations and intentions were similar across the regions, there was a marked difference in
711 action across the regions, specifically with respect to the frequency of wearing face masks.

712 We found that the translation of intention (preventing the spread of COVID-19) into action
713 (as measured by self-reported frequency of face mask use) was strongly associated with
714 perceptions of the risk of infection (as measured by regional case numbers).

715

716 The results serve as a reminder of the importance when designing policies of distinguishing
717 the factors that might influence the formation of behavioural intentions from those that might
718 influence the implementation of those intentions.

720 Acknowledgements

721 We would sincerely like to thank those people throughout New Zealand who completed our
722 questionnaires. Thanks also to our two anonymous referees for their time, patience,
723 constructive advice.

724

725 References

- 726 1. Czeisler ME, Tynan MA, Howard ME, Honeycutt S, Fulmer EB, Kidder DP, et al, Public
727 attitudes, behaviors, and beliefs related to COVID-19, stay-at-home orders,
728 nonessential business closures, and public health guidance – United States, New York
729 City, and Los Angeles, May 5-12, 2020. Morbidity and Mortality Weekly Report. 2020;
730 69(24): 751-758. doi.org/10.15585/mmwr.mm6924e1
- 731 2. Hager E, Odetokun IA, Bolarinwa O, Zainab A, Okechukwu O, Al-Mustapha AI,
732 Knowledge, attitude, and perceptions towards the 2019 Coronavirus Pandemic: A bi-
733 national survey in Africa. PLoS ONE, 2020; 15(7): e0236918.
734 doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0236918
- 735 3. Jarynowski A, Wójta-Kempa M, Płatek D, Czopek K, Attempt to understand public health
736 relevant social dimensions of COVID-19 outbreak in Poland 2020. Available at SSRN:
737 <https://ssrn.com/abstract=3570609>
- 738 4. Burby RJ, Paterson RG, Improving compliance with state environmental regulations. J.
739 Policy Anal. Manage. 1993; 12: 753-772.
- 740 5. Daoust J.-F, Elderly people and responses to COVID-19 in 27 Countries. PLoS ONE,
741 2020; 15(7): e0235590. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0235590>

- 742 6. Kaine G, Greenhalgh S, Wright V, Compliance with Covid-19 measures: Evidence from
743 New Zealand. PLoS ONE 2022; 17(2): e0263376.
744 <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0263376>
- 745 7. Kaine G, Wright V, Willingness to wear masks, self-isolate and be tested for Covid-19 in
746 MIQ regions of New Zealand, Landcare Research Report LC4029, 2021.
- 747 8. Kaine G, Wright V, Involvement and use of the Covid-19 tracer app, Landcare Research
748 Report LC3966, 2021.
- 749 9. Kaine G, Wright V, Involvement and willingness to be vaccinated against Covid-19,
750 Landcare Research Report LC3958, 2021.
- 751 10. Bagozzi RP, 'Consumer Action: Automaticity, Purposiveness and Self- Regulation' in
752 Malhotra, N.K. (ed.), Review of Marketing Research, 2006, Volume 2, M.E. Sharpe,
753 New York, 3-42.
- 754 11. Ajzen I, Fishbein M, Attitude-behaviour relations: A theoretical analysis and review of
755 empirical research. Psychological Bulletin. 1977; 84: 888-918.
- 756 12. Floyd DL, Prentice-Dunn S, Rogers RW, A Meta-Analysis of Research on Protection
757 Motivation Theory. Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 2000; 30: 407-429.
758 <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1559-1816.2000.tb02323.x>
- 759 13. Marangunić N, Granić A. Technology acceptance model: a literature review from 1986 to
760 2013. Universal access in the information society. 2015; 14(1):81-95.
- 761 14. Dror AA, Eisenbach N, Taiber S, Morozov NG, Mizrahi M, Zigron A, Srouji S, Sela E.
762 Vaccine hesitancy: the next challenge in the fight against COVID-19. European journal
763 of epidemiology. 2020; 35(8):775-9.
- 764 15. Dyda A, King C, Dey A, Leask J, Dunn AG. A systematic review of studies that measure
765 parental vaccine attitudes and beliefs in childhood vaccination. BMC Public Health,
766 2020; 20:1253. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12889-020-09327-8>

767

- 768 16. Kaine G, Murdoch H, Lourey R, Bewsell D, A framework for understanding individual
769 response to regulation. Food Policy 2010; 35: 531–537.
- 770 17. Kaine G, An application of the I₃ framework to rat control in Hawke's Bay. Landcare
771 Research Contract Report LC3646; 2019.
- 772 18. Kaine G, Kirk N, Kannemeyer R, Stronge D, Wiercinski B. Predicting people's
773 motivation to engage in urban possum control. Conservation. 2021; 1: 196-215.
774 <https://doi.org/10.3390/conservation1030016>.
- 775 19. Kaine G, Stronge D, An application of the I₃ framework to rat control in New Plymouth.
776 Landcare Research Report LC3734; 2020.
- 777 20. Kaine G, Kannemeyer R, Stronge D, Using 1080 to control possums and rats: An
778 application of the I₃ framework. Landcare Research Report LC3747; 2020.
- 779 21. Lieberoth A, Lin S-Y, Stöckli S, Han H, Kowal M, Gelpi R, et al., Stress and worry in the
780 2020 coronavirus pandemic: relationships to trust and compliance with preventive
781 measures across 48 countries in the COVIDiSTRESS global survey, 2021, R. Soc. open
782 sci.8200589200589, <http://doi.org/10.1098/rsos.200589>
- 783 22. New Zealand Government, History of the COVID-19 alert system; 2021.
784 <https://COVID19.govt.nz/alert-system/history-of-the-COVID-19-alert-system/>
- 785 23. Travica B, Containment strategies for COVID-19 pandemic 2020; Available at SSRN:
786 <https://ssrn.com/abstract=3604519>, <http://dx.doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.3604519>
- 787 24. Ministry of Health, 2021. <https://www.health.govt.nz/our-work/diseases-and-conditions/COVID-19-novel-coronavirus/COVID-19-response-planning/COVID-19-elimination-strategy-aotearoa-new-zealand>

- 790 25. Blair A, de Pasquale M, Gabeff V, Rufi M, Flahault A. The End of the Elimination
791 Strategy: Decisive Factors towards Sustainable Management of COVID-19 in New
792 Zealand. *Epidemiologia*. 2022 Mar 18;3(1):135-47.
- 793 26. Laurent G, Kapferer J.-N, Measuring consumer involvement profiles. *J. Mark. Res.*
794 1985; 22: 41-53.
- 795 27. Kaine G, A pilot application of the I₃ framework to compliance behaviour in farming.
796 Landcare Research Contract Report LC3513; 2019.
- 797 28. New Zealand Ministry of Health, NZ COVID-19 data, cases, 2022,
798 [https://raw.githubusercontent.com/minhealthnz/nz-covid-](https://raw.githubusercontent.com/minhealthnz/nz-covid-data/9c27fa01a84001e19e82f5b1415e9ed3c88a1408/cases/covid-cases.csv)
799 data/9c27fa01a84001e19e82f5b1415e9ed3c88a1408/cases/covid-cases.csv
- 800 29. IBM Corp. IBM SPSS Statistics for Windows, Version 27.0. 2020. Armonk, NY: IBM
801 Corporation.
- 802 30. Richardson JT. Eta squared and partial eta squared as measures of effect size in
803 educational research. *Educational Research Review*. 2011;2(6):135-47.31.
- 804 31. Butt AA, Dargham SR, Chemaitelly H, Al Khal A, Tang P, Hasan MR, Coyle PV,
805 Thomas AG, Borham AM, Concepcion EG, Kaleeckal AH. Severity of illness in
806 persons infected with the SARS-CoV-2 Delta variant vs Beta variant in Qatar. *JAMA*
807 internal medicine. 2022;182(2):197-205
- 808 32. Twohig KA, Nyberg T, Zaidi A, Thelwall S, Sinnathamby MA, Aliabadi S, Seaman SR,
809 Harris RJ, Hope R, Lopez-Bernal J, Gallagher E. Hospital admission and emergency
810 care attendance risk for SARS-CoV-2 delta (B. 1.617. 2) compared with alpha (B. 1.1.
811 7) variants of concern: a cohort study. *The Lancet Infectious Diseases*. 2022; 22(1):35-
812 42.
- 813 33. Carmines EG, Zeller RA. Reliability and validity assessment. 1979, Newbury Park, CA:
814 Sage.

- 815 34. Howard J, Huang A, Li Z, Tufekci Z, Zdimal V, van der Westhuizen H-M, et al. An
816 evidence review of face masks against COVID-19. 2021. Proceedings of the National
817 Academy of Sciences Jan 2021, 118 (4) e2014564118; DOI: 10.1073/pnas.2014564118
- 818 35 Vally Z. Public perceptions, anxiety, and the perceived efficacy of health-protective
819 behaviours to mitigate the spread of the SARS-Cov-2/COVID-19 pandemic. Public
820 Health. 2020. doi:10.1016/j.puhe.2020.08.002
- 821 36. Taylor S, Asmundson GJG. Negative attitudes about facemasks during the COVID-19
822 pandemic: The dual importance of perceived ineffectiveness and psychological
823 reactance. 2021. PLoS ONE 16(2): e0246317. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0246317>
- 824 37. Isch, C., Guevara Beltran, D., Ayers, J. D., Alcock, J., Cronk, L., Hurmuz-Sklas, H., ...
825 Aktipis, A. (2021, March 28). What predicts attitudes about mask wearing?
826 <https://doi.org/10.31234/osf.io/jvspx>
- 827 38. Zhang X, Wang F, Zhu C, Wang Z. Willingness to Self-Isolate When Facing a Pandemic
828 Risk: Model, Empirical Test, and Policy Recommendations. Int J Environ Res Public
829 Health. 2019;17(1):197. Published 2019 Dec 27. doi:10.3390/ijerph17010197
- 830 39. Escandon-Barbosa D, Hurtado A, Gomez A. Factors Affecting Voluntary Self-Isolation
831 Behavior to Cope with a Pandemic: Empirical Evidence from Colombia vs. Spain in
832 Times of COVID-19. 2021. Behav. Sci., 11, 35. <https://doi.org/10.3390/bs11030035>
- 833 40. Lan R, Sujanto R, Lu K, He Z, Zhang CJP, Ming WK. Perceived Effectiveness, Safety,
834 and Attitudes Toward the Use of Nucleic Tests of SARS-CoV-2 Among Clinicians and
835 General Public in China. Front Public Health. 2020;8:599862. Published 2020 Dec 17.
836 doi:10.3389/fpubh.2020.599862
- 837

- 838 41. Lang, R., Benham, J.L., Atabati, O. et al. Attitudes, behaviours and barriers to public
839 health measures for COVID-19: a survey to inform public health messaging. BMC
840 Public Health 21, 765 (2021). <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12889-021-10790-0>
- 841 42. West, R., Michie, S., Rubin, G.J. et al. Applying principles of behaviour change to reduce
842 SARS-CoV-2 transmission. Nat Hum Behav 4, 451–459 (2020).
843 <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41562-020-0887-9>
- 844 43. Gray L, MacDonald C, Tassell-Matamua N, Stanley J, Kvalsvig A, Zhang J, et al.,
845 Wearing one for the team: views and attitudes to face covering in New
846 Zealand/Aotearoa during COVID-19 Alert Level 4 lockdown. 2020, J Prim Health
847 Care. 2020 Sep;12(3):199-206. doi: 10.1071/HC20089. PMID: 32988441.
- 848 44. Imhoff R, Lamberty P, A bioweapon or a hoax? The link between distinct conspiracy
849 beliefs about the Coronavirus disease (COVID-19) outbreak and pandemic behavior.
850 2020. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1948550620934692>
- 851 45. Bridgman A, Merkley E, Loewen PJ, Owen T, Ruths D, Teichmann L, et al, The causes
852 and consequences of COVID-19 misperceptions: Understanding the role of news and
853 social media. The Harvard Kennedy School (HKS) Misinformation Review, 2020; 1:
854 Special Issue on COVID-19 and Misinformation.
- 855 46. Daoust JF, Nadeau R, Dassonneville R, Lachapelle E, Bélanger É, Savoie J, van der
856 Linden C, How to survey citizens' compliance with COVID-19 Public Health
857 Measures: evidence from three survey experiments. Journal of Experimental Political
858 Science 2020;1-8.
- 859 47. Daoust JF, Bélanger É, Dassonneville R, Lachapelle E, Nadeau R, Becher M, Brouard S,
860 Foucault M, Hönnige C, Stegmüller D, A guilt-free strategy increases self-reported
861 noncompliance with COVID-19 preventive measures: Experimental evidence from 12

862 countries. PLoS ONE. 2021; 16(4): e0249914.
863 <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0249914>
864 48. Miguel, FK., Machado, GM., Pianowski, G., Carvalho, LF. Compliance with containment
865 measures to the COVID-19 pandemic over time: Do antisocial traits matter?,
866 Personality and Individual Differences, 168 (2021),
867 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2020.110346>.
868 49. Pfattheicher, S., Nockur, L., Böhm, R., Sassenrath, C., Petersen MB. The Emotional Path
869 to Action: Empathy Promotes Physical Distancing and Wearing of Face Masks During
870 the COVID-19 Pandemic. Psychol Sci. 31(11):1363-1373. (2020).
871 doi:10.1177/0956797620964422
872 50. Oosterhoff, B., and Palmer, CA.. Psychological Correlates of News Monitoring, Social
873 Distancing, Disinfecting, and Hoarding Behaviors Among US Adolescents During the
874 COVID-19 Pandemic. PsyArXiv. (2020). doi:10.31234/osf.io/rpcy4
875
876

877 **Supporting information**

878 **S1 File. Questionnaire**

879 **S2 File. Data**

880

881

882

883