

1 **Bi-directional associations between mask usage and the associated reasons before and after**
2 **the downgrading of the legal status of COVID-19 in Japan: A longitudinal study**

3

4

Michio Murakami ^{1,*}

5

6 ¹ Center for Infectious Disease Education and Research, Osaka University, Suita, Osaka, Japan

7

8 * Corresponding author: michio@cider.osaka-u.ac.jp

9

10

11 **ABSTRACT**

12 **Objectives:** From a public health perspective, it is important to clarify the associations between
13 mask usage and the associated reasons in situations when mask usage is promoted or mitigated.
14 Therefore, I clarified the changes in mask usage and the associated reasons before and after the
15 downgrading of the legal status of COVID-19 in Japan, and analyzed the bi-directional associations
16 between the two.

17 **Design:** Longitudinal study.

18 **Methods:** Online surveys were conducted in two waves, between April 18–19, 2023 and June 6–15,
19 2023, among people aged 20–69 years living in Japan. A total of 291 participants completed both
20 the surveys. The associations between mask usage and beliefs about the reasons for mask usage
21 were analyzed using a cross-lagged panel model.

22 **Results:** Mask usage decreased slightly, but significantly, from the first to the second wave ($P <$
23 0.001 , Cohen's $d = -0.23$). Of the eight beliefs regarding mask usage, slight but significant
24 decreases were observed in terms of relief and information effects ($P = 0.046$, Cohen's $d = -0.12$; P
25 $= 0.018$, Cohen's $d = -0.14$). There was a significant association between socio-psychological
26 reasons other than infection risk avoidance (such as norm and relief) during the first wave and mask
27 usage during the second wave [standard estimates:0.25 (95% confidence interval (CI):0.06–0.44)].
28 Contrarily, mask usage during the first wave was significantly associated with the reasons for
29 infection risk avoidance during the second wave [standard estimates:0.13 (0.03–0.24)].

30 **Conclusions:** The impact of downgrading the legal status of COVID-19 in Japan on mask usage
31 and the associated reasons were found to be limited. In terms of promoting or mitigating mask
32 usage, the significance of risk communication based on socio-psychological reasons other than
33 infection risk avoidance, such as norms and relief, was highlighted.

34

35

36 INTRODUCTION

37 In addition to vaccination and social measures such as lockdown, measures against infectious
38 disease outbreaks include infection control at individual level using steps such as hand washing and
39 mask usage, which are less invasive. In the aftermath of coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19)
40 outbreak, mask usage was one of the measures emphasized upon. In the early phase of the COVID-
41 19 outbreak (i.e., in the first half of 2020), mask usage was internationally recommended for
42 prevention of transmission ¹. Moreover, based on the findings of hydrodynamic studies on airborne
43 droplet particles ² and a meta-analysis of epidemiological studies regarding reduction of the risk of
44 infection by wearing masks ³, mask usage has also been contemplated to have the effect of
45 preventing infection for the person wearing it. Furthermore, randomized controlled trials on risk
46 reduction of COVID-19 by mask usage at community level ⁴ and infection risk reduction effect
47 using difference-in-differences method ⁵ have supported the utility of mask usage at population
48 level. Contrastingly, disadvantages of mask usage have also been reported, which include physical
49 effects such as discomfort, breathlessness, and headache ⁶. In addition, psychological effects such as

50 lack of empathy and decreased communication have also been reported ⁶.

51 On May 5, 2023, the World Health Organization (WHO) declared the end of COVID-19 as a global
52 health emergency ⁷. Even though mask usage was not mandatory in Japan and based on a request
53 from the government, Japan has one of the highest proportion of mask usage in the world ⁸. On
54 March 13, 2023, Japan changed its policy from the previous recommendation of wearing masks
55 indoors to one where individual judgment was the basis for wearing masks ⁹. Furthermore, on May
56 8, Japan downgraded the legal status of COVID-19 to the same level as seasonal influenza ⁹. This
57 may have resulted in a change in individual mask-usage behavior in Japan.

58 A systematic review of the factors contributing to infection prevention behaviors, such as mask
59 usage, reported that the infection prevention behavior was influenced by contextual factors (e.g.,
60 confidence in science), socioeconomic position (e.g., annual income), and intermediary
61 determinants (e.g., social norms) ¹⁰. Among these, identifying which of the multiple beliefs
62 regarding the reasons for mask usage would be useful in developing risk communication strategies
63 to promote or mitigate mask usage. Nakayachi et al. surveyed Japanese people in March 2020 and
64 reported that among the three reasons related to infection risk avoidance [i.e., perceived severity
65 (severity), perceived self-efficacy of wearing a mask for protection (protection), and perceived
66 efficacy of wearing a mask to prevent spread (prevention)] and three other socio-psychological
67 reasons [perceived norm to wear masks (norm), feeling relief when wearing masks (relief), and
68 impulse to take whatever actions are necessary (impulsion)], norms were most strongly associated
69 with mask usage, followed by relief ¹¹. In addition, a randomized controlled trial conducted in Japan

70 in March 2021 also showed that norms were more effective than information provided by medical
71 experts for mask usage ¹². Contrastingly, a longitudinal study conducted four times in Switzerland
72 between March and July 2020 showed that the belief that masks protect others was strongly
73 associated with mask usage ¹³. Although these studies have investigated the factors during COVID-
74 19 outbreak when mask usage was recommended, no study has identified the reasons associated
75 with mask usage during periods of decline. Moreover, while these studies analyzed the reasons for
76 mask usage from the perspective of influencing mask usage, it is possible, given a self-perception
77 theory ¹⁴, that the presence or absence of mask usage may influence beliefs regarding the associated
78 reasons. However, only a limited number of studies have examined the bi-directional associations
79 between mask usage and beliefs regarding the associated reasons. A recent longitudinal study over a
80 2-year period beginning in the fall of 2020 in the United States showed significant bi-directional
81 associations between mask usage and norms ¹⁵. Therefore, examining the associations between the
82 two entities before and after the downgrading of the legal status of COVID-19 in Japan from a bi-
83 directional perspective would be crucial in developing strategies not only to promote infection
84 prevention measures in another outbreak of COVID-19 or an emergent infectious disease outbreak,
85 but also in mitigating mask usage.

86 The purpose of this study was twofold. First, I determined the changes in mask usage and beliefs
87 regarding the associated reasons before and after the downgrading of the legal status of COVID-19
88 in Japan. Second, I analyzed the bi-directional associations between mask usage and beliefs
89 regarding the associated reasons.

90

91 **METHODS**

92 **Ethics approval**

93 This study was approved by the Ethics Committee of the Center for Infectious Disease Education
94 and Research, Osaka University (approval number 2022CRER0307). Participant consent was
95 obtained before commencing the survey. This study only included participants who checked the
96 consent box online.

97

98 **Study participants**

99 This was a longitudinal study. Two waves of surveys were conducted to monitor individuals aged
100 20–69 years living in Japan who were registered with the online research company Cross Marketing.
101 Cross Marketing is one of the largest research companies in Japan with 2.95 million active monitors
102 as of January 2022. In the first wave, an online survey was conducted between April 18–19, 2023.
103 In the screening survey, I confirmed participants' consent and conducted an instructional
104 manipulation check (IMC) ¹⁶¹⁷ to identify inattentive respondents. Participants were instructed to
105 choose “do not start answering” between “start answering” and “do not start answering.”
106 Participants who chose “start answering” were warned to read again carefully and asked to follow
107 the same instruction. I excluded inattentive respondents who did not follow the instructions twice.
108 After the IMCs, participants were asked about their age, gender, place of residence (prefectural
109 level), occupation, marital status, and presence/absence of children. Those who responded with an

110 age not covered by the study, answered “other” for gender, or chose to live outside Japan were
111 excluded from the study.

112 A total of 2,262 individuals participated in the screening survey. Of these, 224 did not provide
113 consent, 1,279 were excluded because of IMCs, and 11 were not included due to age, gender, or
114 residence. Of the remaining 748, the survey was conducted until 500 valid responses were obtained
115 to match the distribution of gender and age groups in Japan. Short-term respondents were excluded
116 based on the survey company criteria.

117 The second wave of survey was also conducted until 500 valid responses were obtained. First,
118 between June 6–15, 2023, 491 people who provided valid responses in the first wave of the survey
119 (excluding nine people who were dropped from the survey company’s registry between the two
120 waves) were asked to participate in the second wave of the survey. A total of 459 people
121 participated in the screening survey. Of these, 15 did not provide consent, 129 were excluded due to
122 IMCs, and none were excluded on the basis of age, gender, or residence. Of the remaining 315
123 respondents, 291 completed the survey.

124 In addition, new monitors (excluding those identified as inattentive respondents in the first wave of
125 the survey) were recruited between June 13–15, 2023. Of the new monitors, 1,738 participated in
126 the screening; of which 161 did not provide consent, 1,027 were excluded due to IMCs, and eight
127 were excluded on the basis of age, gender, or residence. A total of 209 valid responses were
128 obtained from the remaining 542 participants. Valid respondents who participated in both surveys
129 and those who were new to participate in the second wave of the survey were selected to match the

130 distribution of gender and age groups in Japan. Short-term respondents were also excluded from the
131 second wave in accordance with the survey company's criteria.

132 The study finally included 291 participants who completed both the surveys. Survey respondents
133 were awarded points that could be redeemed for products. Those who were excluded due to
134 inattentive responses, age, gender, or residence, and those who stopped responding midway through
135 the main survey parts were awarded points only for the screening part responses.

136

137 **Survey Items**

138 The same questionnaire was used in the first and second surveys. I obtained permission from the
139 author of a previous study¹¹ and used the questionnaire items on mask usage and beliefs regarding
140 the associated reasons. The following six items were used as reasons for mask usage in the previous
141 study¹¹:

- 142 ● Severity: Do you think that your disease condition would be serious if you had COVID-19?
- 143 ● Protection: Do you think that wearing a mask will keep you from being infected?
- 144 ● Prevention: Do you think that people who have COVID-19 can avoid infecting others by
145 wearing masks?
- 146 ● Norm: When you see other people wearing masks, do you think that you should wear a mask?
- 147 ● Relief: Do you think that you can ease your anxiety by wearing a mask?
- 148 ● Impulsion: Do you think that you should “do whatever you can” to avoid COVID-19?

149 It should be noted that norm can be divided into two types: “information effect,” which motivates

150 people to view the behavior of others as correct and behave similarly; and “peer pressure,” which
151 motivates people to behave in accordance with the expectations of others ¹⁸. Therefore, with
152 permission from the author of the previous study ¹¹, the following two questions were also included
153 in this study:

154 ● Information effect: When you see others wearing a mask, do you think it is good behavior to
155 wear a mask?

156 ● Peer pressure: Will you be willing to wear a mask to avoid being blamed by others?

157 These eight items were rated on a 5-point Likert scale (1 = not at all to 5 = very much).

158 In the previous study ¹¹, participants were enquired about their mask usage since the COVID-19
159 outbreak (excluding hay fever prevention purposes). However, in this study, they were asked about
160 their mask usage in the past week on a 3-point Likert scale (1 = I have not worn one at all, 2 = I
161 sometimes wear one, and 3 = I usually wear one).

162 In addition, the participants were also asked about their education and annual household income as
163 individual attributes. Other questions included time of waking and sleeping, records based on day
164 reconstruction method (i.e., time and types of activity events, people they were with, well-being,
165 and mask usage) ¹⁹, hay fever, items emphasized in diet, smoking habits, and alcohol consumption
166 habits, which were not used in this study. No data were missing. Table 1 lists the individual
167 attributes of the study participants.

168

169 **Statistical analysis**

170 Parametric tests were used to ensure consistency with the previous study¹¹. First, t-test was
171 conducted for both first and second waves to investigate the differences in mask usage between the
172 participants in this study (i.e., those who participated in both the first and second waves) and those
173 who participated only in the first or second wave. This was done to check whether the study
174 participants were biased against those who participated only in the first or second wave. A paired t-
175 test was then conducted to analyze the differences in mask usage and beliefs regarding the
176 associated reasons between the first and second waves. The effect sizes for these t-tests were
177 considered small for Cohen's d of 0.20 and medium for Cohen's d of 0.50, in accordance with a
178 previous study²⁰.

179 In addition, a cross-lagged panel model was used to analyze the bi-directional associations between
180 mask usage and beliefs about the associated reasons. First, I considered the initial model of the
181 association between mask usage and beliefs regarding the reasons for mask usage, as shown in
182 Figure 1. The initial model incorporated the information effect and peer pressure instead of norm.
183 Referring to a previous study²¹, $P < 0.05$ for chi-square, comparative fit index (CFI) ≥ 0.90 , root
184 mean square error of approximation (RMSEA) < 0.08 , and standardized root mean squared residual
185 (SRMR) < 0.08 were considered acceptable fits for the model. The initial model had a slightly less-
186 than-acceptable fit. Therefore, I changed the model to include the structure of factor analyses
187 regarding beliefs about the associated reasons for mask usage in light of the fact that they were
188 categorized into two types of reasons (i.e., infection risk avoidance and other socio-psychological
189 reasons) in the previous study¹¹ and that correlations were also found between these beliefs in the

190 previous study¹¹ and this study (Table S1). In addition, the model was improved by adding
191 covariates related to individual attributes and removing non-significant paths, except the
192 associations between mask usage and beliefs about the associated reasons between the first and
193 second waves (Figure 2). Bias-corrected 95% confidence intervals (CIs) for path coefficients were
194 calculated using the 1,000 bootstrap method. SPSS and AMOS 28 (IBM, Chicago, IL, U.S.) were
195 used for all the statistical analyses.

196

197 **RESULTS**

198 **Changes in mask usage and beliefs about the associated reasons**

199 Mask usage among participants in this study (i.e., those who participated in both the first and
200 second waves) was not significantly different from that among those who participated only in the
201 first or second wave [the first wave: $P = 0.75$, Cohen's $d = -0.03$ (95% CI: $-0.21-0.15$); the second
202 wave: $P = 0.20$, Cohen's $d = 0.12$ ($-0.06-0.29$); Table 2].

203 In the first and second waves of the survey, 67% and 59% of the participants reported wearing
204 masks usually, respectively. The arithmetic means (standard deviations) were 2.60 (0.61) and 2.48
205 (0.69), respectively, indicating a significant decrease ($P < 0.001$, Cohen's $d = -0.23$ ($-0.35-0.12$))
206 (Table 3). Furthermore, there was a significant decrease in relief and information effects in terms of
207 the beliefs about the associated reasons for mask usage [relief: $P = 0.046$, Cohen's $d = -0.12$
208 ($-0.23-0.00$); information effect: $P = 0.018$, Cohen's $d = -0.14$ ($-0.25-0.02$)]. No significant
209 changes were observed in terms of other beliefs.

210

211 **Bi-directional associations between mask usage and beliefs about the associated reasons using**
212 **a cross lagged panel model**

213 The initial model showed a slightly less-than-acceptable fit, as was revealed by $P < 0.001$ for chi-
214 square, 0.96 for CFI, 0.09 for RMSEA, and 0.09 for SRMR (Figure 1). Considering the strong
215 correlations between beliefs about the associated reasons for mask usage (Table S1), I created an
216 improved model fit, which was determined to be acceptable, with $P < 0.001$ for chi-square, 0.91 for
217 CFI, 0.08 for RMSEA, and 0.05 for SRMR (Figure 2).

218 In the improved model, the reasons for infection risk avoidance included protection and prevention,
219 whereas other socio-psychological reasons included impulsion, norms, relief, and information
220 effects. The standard estimates for the reasons for infection risk avoidance, other socio-
221 psychological reasons, and mask usage from the first to the second wave were 0.72 (95%CI:0.59–
222 0.83), 0.88 (0.81–0.95), and 0.57 (0.45–0.66), respectively. Other socio-psychological reasons
223 during the first wave showed a significant path to mask usage during the second wave [standard
224 estimates:0.25 (0.06–0.44)], while the path from reasons for infection risk avoidance during the first
225 wave to mask usage during the second wave was not significant [–0.08 (–0.30–0.11)]. On the other
226 hand, mask usage during the first wave showed a significant path to reasons for infection risk
227 avoidance [0.13 (0.03–0.24)], while the path to other socio-psychological reasons during the second
228 wave was not significant [0.00 (–0.09–0.08)].

229

230 **DISCUSSION**

231 In this study, I conducted two-wave surveys focusing on the bi-directional associations between
232 mask usage and beliefs about the associated reasons before and after the downgrading of the legal
233 status of COVID-19 in Japan.

234 Mask usage showed no significant differences in the first and second waves between the
235 participants in this study (i.e., those who participated in both the first and second waves) and those
236 who participated once in either of the surveys. The effect sizes were also judged to be small.
237 Therefore, the participants in this study were not considered to be biased in comparison to the
238 overall respondents targeted in the surveys.

239 Mask usage significantly decreased from the first to the second wave, but the effect size was small.
240 A total of 67% and 59% of the participants reported wearing masks usually before (i.e., April 18–19,
241 2023) and after the downgrading of the legal status of COVID-19 (i.e., June 6–15, 2023),
242 respectively, indicating that mask usage proportion was still high in Japan. This result was slightly
243 higher than the 51% reported in a previous study conducted in Japan between March 26–31, 2020¹¹.

244 Another survey⁸ showed that the proportions of Japanese respondents who reported “wearing a
245 mask in public places within the past two weeks” were 86% (September 2022), 71% (March 15–22,
246 2023), 68% (April 12–19), and 66% (May 10–17), and the results of this study were similar to those
247 obtained in the previous survey. The results of the first wave of surveys conducted in this study
248 were similar to those of the first wave of surveys conducted by the government. Although the first
249 wave of surveys in this study was conducted between the government’s policy change that mask

250 wearing was based on individual judgment (i.e., March 13, 2023) and the downgrading of the legal
251 status of COVID-19 (May 8), some of the mask wearers, as of September 2022, had already
252 stopped using masks during the time of the first wave of this study. Among beliefs about the reasons
253 for mask usage, relief and information effects also declined significantly; however, the effect sizes
254 were small. The cross-lagged panel model also showed high standard estimates for reasons of mask
255 usage from the first to the second wave, representing small intra-individual variations. This revealed
256 that the impact of downgrading the legal status of COVID-19 on mask usage and the reasons for
257 this were limited.

258 The cross-lagged panel model showed that socio-psychological reasons other than infection risk
259 avoidance, in the first wave were significantly associated with mask usage in the second wave. This
260 indicates that those who perceived socio-psychological factors, such as impulse, norms, relief, and
261 information effect, as less important reasons for mask usage in the first wave were significantly less
262 likely to wear masks in the second wave. The results of this study are consistent with previous
263 findings ^{11 12} that norm and relief influences mask wearing in Japan. However, while mask usage
264 was reported to be a social norm in Hong Kong during the H1N1 influenza outbreak ²², and mask
265 usage in Switzerland was strongly associated with infection risk avoidance after the COVID-19
266 outbreak ¹³, the findings of this study may not be applicable to other countries, such as Western
267 countries. Using ethnographic interviews and participant-observations at public sites in Japan, the
268 United States, and China ²³, social pressure in Japan, state pressure in China, and politically based
269 individual choices in the United States were identified as important factors in mask wearing.

270 In contrast, mask usage in the first wave was significantly associated with the reasons for infection
271 risk avoidance and constituting protection and prevention in the second wave. This indicates that
272 mask users reinforced the belief that masks can avert infection risk or that non-mask users came to
273 believe that masks are ineffective in avoiding the infection risk. The mechanism by which wearing a
274 mask influences one's beliefs about the associated reason can be explained using the self-perception
275 theory ¹⁴, which states that one's perception of oneself wearing (or not wearing) a mask leads to
276 one's belief that avoiding infection risk is important (or not important) as a straightforward
277 interpretation of one's behavior. It is worth noting that while there was a significant association
278 between mask usage and the reasons for infection risk avoidance, the association of mask usage
279 with other socio-psychological reasons was not significant. One possible interpretation for this is
280 that individuals apply their own beliefs to the importance of infection risk avoidance, which seems
281 to be a more logical and rational reason.

282 This study has implications for advancing mask-usage strategies. A previous study ¹¹ showed that
283 people's sense of norm and relief could be the driving forces behind the promotion of mask usage in
284 Japan, and highlighted the importance of using nudge messages based on social motivations and
285 presenting risk information in accordance with subjective emotions. This study also showed the
286 significance of risk communication based on socio-psychological reasons other than infection risk
287 avoidance, such as norms and relief, even in situations where mask usage proportion declined.
288 Furthermore, this study also showed that unmasking led to a decrease in the rationale for infection
289 risk avoidance. This means that, as mask usage continues to decline, awareness of the importance of

290 infection risk avoidance through masks may decline further. Risk communication strategies that
291 focus on the importance of infection risk avoidance through masks will be challenging when
292 promoting mask-wearing during another wave of COVID-19 and outbreaks of emerging infectious
293 diseases. Nevertheless, I do not intend to imply that widespread dissemination of information
294 regarding the fact that wearing masks can avert the risk of infection is pointless. The dissemination
295 and sharing of information regarding the central role of mask wearing in infection risk avoidance
296 may support socio-psychological reasons such as norms and information effects in the public.
297 Regardless of whether mask-wearing is promoted or mitigated, risk communication should be
298 considered in accordance with the fact that risk-coping behaviors involve a combination of infection
299 risk avoidance and other socio-psychological reasons.

300 This study had a few limitations. First, this study used online surveys, which may have biased the
301 participants of this study. However, the participants were given points after the surveys, which had
302 the advantage of providing incentives for participants who were not interested in the topics of this
303 study to participate in the survey. In addition, the cross-lagged panel model was adjusted to
304 incorporate covariates such as age, gender, and occupation. Second, the findings of this study were
305 based in Japan, and caution should be exercised when applying these findings to other countries. As
306 already discussed, the association between mask usage and beliefs about the associated reasons may
307 differ in other countries. Third, although the longitudinal study design and cross-lagged panel model
308 discussed the direction of the associations between mask usage and beliefs about the associated
309 reasons, they did not lead to the identification of a causal relationship. Future randomized controlled

310 trials in multiple countries are expected to deepen the findings regarding the associations between
311 mask usage and beliefs about the associated reasons, and to implement risk communication tailored
312 to the target country and infection situation.

313 Despite these limitations, based on two waves of surveys conducted before and after the
314 downgrading of the legal status of COVID-19 in Japan, this study found that there were bi-
315 directional associations between mask usage and beliefs about the associated reasons. Moreover,
316 different directions of associations of mask usage with infection risk avoidance and other socio-
317 psychological reasons were also found.

318

319 **Acknowledgements**

320 We would like to thank Editage (www.editage.com) for English language editing. We are also
321 grateful for helpful discussions: Dr. Tomoyuki Kobayashi (Fukushima Medical University), Dr.
322 Mao Yagihashi (Osaka University), Ms. Misato Okaneya (Osaka University), Dr. Mei Yamagata
323 (Doshisha University), Dr. Asako Miura (Osaka University), and Dr. Kazuya Nakayachi (Doshisha
324 University).

325

326 **Funding**

327 This work was supported “The Nippon Foundation - Osaka University Project for Infectious
328 Disease Prevention.” The funders had no role in study design, data collection and analysis, decision
329 to publish, or preparation of the manuscript.

330

331 **Competing interest**

332 None declared.

333

334 **REFERENCES**

335 1. World Health Organization. COVID-19 - virtual press conference - 30 March 2020.

336 [https://www.who.int/docs/default-source/coronaviruse/transcripts/who-audio-emergencies-](https://www.who.int/docs/default-source/coronaviruse/transcripts/who-audio-emergencies-coronavirus-press-conference-full-30mar2020.pdf)
337 [coronavirus-press-conference-full-30mar2020.pdf](https://www.who.int/docs/default-source/coronaviruse/transcripts/who-audio-emergencies-coronavirus-press-conference-full-30mar2020.pdf) (accessed April 12, 2023).

338 2. Ueki H, Furusawa Y, Iwatsuki-Horimoto K, *et al.* Effectiveness of face masks in preventing
339 airborne transmission of SARS-CoV-2. *mSphere* 2020;5(5):e00637-20.

340 3. Chu DK, Akl EA, Duda S, *et al.* Physical distancing, face masks, and eye protection to prevent
341 person-to-person transmission of SARS-CoV-2 and COVID-19: A systematic review and
342 meta-analysis. *Lancet* 2020;395(10242):1973-87.

343 4. Abaluck J, Kwong LH, Styczynski A, *et al.* Impact of community masking on COVID-19: A
344 cluster-randomized trial in Bangladesh. *Science* 2022;375(6577):eabi9069.

345 5. Cowger TL, Murray EJ, Clarke J, *et al.* Lifting universal masking in schools — Covid-19
346 incidence among students and staff. *N Eng J Med* 2022;387(21):1935-46.

347 6. Bakhit M, Krzyzaniak N, Scott AM, *et al.* Downsides of face masks and possible mitigation
348 strategies: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *BMJ Open* 2021;11(2):e044364.

349 7. Harris E. WHO declares end of COVID-19 global health emergency. *JAMA* 2023;329(21):1817-

- 350 17.
- 351 8. Nippon Research Center. Voluntary survey on novel coronavirus infections (translated by the
352 authors). <https://www.nrc.co.jp/nryg/230602.html> (accessed July 7, 2023). [in Japanese]
- 353 9. Nikkei Asia. Japan lowers COVID threat to flu level in major policy shift (May 8, 2023).
354 [https://asia.nikkei.com/Spotlight/Coronavirus/Japan-lowers-COVID-threat-to-flu-level-in-](https://asia.nikkei.com/Spotlight/Coronavirus/Japan-lowers-COVID-threat-to-flu-level-in-major-policy-shift)
355 [major-policy-shift](https://asia.nikkei.com/Spotlight/Coronavirus/Japan-lowers-COVID-threat-to-flu-level-in-major-policy-shift) (accessed July 7, 2023).
- 356 10. Shushtari ZJ, Salimi Y, Ahmadi S, *et al.* Social determinants of adherence to COVID-19
357 preventive guidelines: a comprehensive review. *Osong Public Health Res Perspect*
358 2021;12(6):346-60.
- 359 11. Nakayachi K, Ozaki T, Shibata Y, *et al.* Why do Japanese people use masks against COVID-19,
360 even though masks are unlikely to offer protection from infection? *Front Psychol*
361 2020;11:1918.
- 362 12. Okada I, Yanagi I, Kubo Y, *et al.* Descriptive, injunctive, or the synergy of both? Experimenting
363 normative information on behavioral changes under the COVID-19 pandemic. *Front*
364 *Psychol* 2022;13.
- 365 13. Bearth A, Siegrist M. The drivers and barriers of wearing a facemask during the SARS-CoV-2
366 pandemic in Switzerland. *J Risk Res* 2022;25(9):1085-97.
- 367 14. Bem DJ. Self-perception: An alternative interpretation of cognitive dissonance phenomena.
368 *Psychol Rev* 1967;74(3):183-200.
- 369 15. Heiman SL, Claessens S, Ayers JD, *et al.* Descriptive norms caused increases in mask wearing

- 370 during the COVID-19 pandemic. *Sci Rep* 2023;13(1):11856.
- 371 16. Oppenheimer DM, Meyvis T, Davidenko N. Instructional manipulation checks: Detecting
372 satisficing to increase statistical power. *J Exp Soc Psychol* 2009;45:867-72.
- 373 17. Miura A, Kobayashi T. Survey satisficing biases the estimation of moderation effects. *Jpn*
374 *Psychol Res* 2019;61(3):204-10.
- 375 18. Sakakibara R, Ozono H. Why do people wear a mask? A replication of previous studies and
376 examination of two research questions in a Japanese sample. *Jpn J Psychol* 2021;92(5):332-
377 38. [in Japanese]
- 378 19. Kahneman D, Krueger AB, Schkade DA, *et al.* A survey method for characterizing daily life
379 experience: the day reconstruction method. *Science* 2004;306(5702):1776-80.
- 380 20. Cohen J. *Statistical power analysis for the behavioral sciences (second edition.)*. New Jersey:
381 Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, 1988.
- 382 21. Hooper D, Coughlan J, Mullen M. Structural equation modelling: Guidelines for determining
383 model fit. *Electron J Bus Res Methods* 2008;6(1):53-60.
- 384 22. Lau JTF, Griffiths S, Choi K-c, *et al.* Prevalence of preventive behaviors and associated factors
385 during early phase of the H1N1 influenza epidemic. *Am J Infect Control* 2010;38(5):374-80.
- 386 23. Mathews G. A cross-cultural study of mask-wearing during the Covid-19 pandemic: Comparing
387 China, Japan and the USA. *Issues Ethnol Anthropol* 2023;18(1):51-76.

388

389

391 Table 1. Characteristics of the study participants during the first wave. n: number of participants.

		Whole participants (n = 500)	Those who participated twice (n = 291)
Gender	Man	250 (50%)	157 (54%)
	Woman	250 (50%)	134 (46%)
Age	<i>Mean (standard deviation)</i>	45.7 (13.5)	45.1 (13.3)
Job	Company employee etc.	239 (48%)	139 (48%)
	Self-employed etc.	28 (6%)	16 (5%)
	Other	233 (47%)	136 (47%)
Marital status	Unmarried	231 (46%)	145 (50%)
	Married	235 (47%)	127 (44%)
	Divorced or bereaved	34 (7%)	19 (7%)
Children	Absence	299 (60%)	184 (63%)
	Presence	201 (40%)	107 (37%)
Education	Junior high or high school graduate	124 (25%)	73 (25%)
	University graduate etc.	365 (73%)	216 (74%)
	Don't want to answer	11 (2%)	2 (1%)
Annual household income	Less than 3 million yen	122 (24%)	74 (25%)
	3 to 6 million yen	138 (28%)	80 (27%)
	6 million yen or more	138 (28%)	85 (29%)
	Don't want to answer	102 (20%)	52 (18%)

392

393 Table 2. Differences in mask usage between those who participated twice and those who
394 participated once. CI: confidence interval.


	Mask usage: mean (standard deviation)		Cohen's d (95% CI)	<i>P</i>
	Those who participated twice (n = 291)	Those who participated once (n = 209)		
The first wave	2.60 (0.61)	2.62 (0.59)	-0.03 (-0.21-0.15)	0.75
The second wave	2.48 (0.69)	2.40 (0.71)	0.12 (-0.06-0.29)	0.20

395

396 Table 3. Differences in mask usage and the associated reasons between the first and second waves
397 (n = 291). CI: confidence interval.


	The first wave	The second wave	Cohen's d (95% CI)	<i>P</i>
Mask usage	2.60 (0.61)	2.48 (0.69)	-0.23 (-0.35--0.12)	<0.001
Severity	2.64 (0.97)	2.59 (0.93)	-0.07 (-0.19-0.04)	0.228
Protection	3.07 (0.92)	3.11 (0.94)	0.06 (-0.06-0.17)	0.348
Prevention	3.15 (0.89)	3.15 (0.94)	0.01 (-0.11-0.12)	0.897
Impulsion	3.26 (1.03)	3.22 (1.02)	-0.04 (-0.16-0.07)	0.458
Norm	3.42 (1.09)	3.35 (1.14)	-0.09 (-0.20-0.03)	0.129
Relief	3.20 (1.01)	3.10 (1.06)	-0.12 (-0.23-0.00)	0.046
Information effect	3.30 (1.03)	3.19 (1.04)	-0.14 (-0.25--0.02)	0.018
Peer pressure	2.92 (1.08)	2.90 (1.11)	-0.02 (-0.14-0.09)	0.730

398



399
400
401
402
403
404

Figure 1. The initial model for bi-directional associations between mask usage and the associated reasons. e: error term, #1: the first wave; #2: the second wave. The paths between the error terms regarding the variables during the first or second wave are omitted in the figure. Chi-square: $P < 0.001$; comparative fit index: 0.96; root mean square error of approximation: 0.09; standardized root mean squared residual: 0.09.



405

406

407

408

409

410

411

Figure 2. The modified model for bi-directional associations between mask usage and the associated reasons. e: error term, #1: the first wave; #2: the second wave. Job dummy 1 and 2 represents self-employed, etc. and others (ref = company employees etc.). Chi-square: $P < 0.001$; comparative fit index: 0.91; root mean square error of approximation: 0.08; standardized root mean squared residual: 0.05. The values represent standardized estimates. All the paths except dashed lines were significant ($P < 0.05$). The bias-corrected 95% confidence intervals (CIs) are shown for paths between #1 and #2. The 95% CI is estimated using a bootstrap method of 1000 samples.