

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17

COVID-19 related messaging, beliefs, information sources, and mitigation behaviors in Virginia: A cross-sectional survey in the summer of 2020

Rachel A. Silverman^{1*}, Danielle Short¹, Sophie Wenzel¹, Mary Ann Friesen², Natalie E. Cook^{1*}

¹Department of Population Health Sciences, Virginia Polytechnical Institute and State University, Blacksburg, Virginia, USA

²Inova Healthsystem, Falls Church, Virginia, USA

***Corresponding Author:** Dr. Rachel Silverman, rsilverman@vt.edu

***Alternate Corresponding Author:** Dr. Natalie Cook, necook@vt.edu

18 **Abstract**

19 Conflicting messages and misinformation related to the coronavirus (COVID-19) pandemic
20 (SARS-CoV-2) have hindered mitigation efforts. To gain insight and inform effective evidence-
21 based public health messaging, we distributed an online cross-sectional survey from May to July,
22 2020. Among 3,488 respondents, systematic differences were observed in information sources
23 that people trust, events that impacted beliefs and behaviors, and how behaviors changed by
24 socio-demographics, political identity, and geography within Virginia. Characteristics
25 significantly associated ($p < 0.05$) with not wearing a mask in public included identifying as non-
26 Hispanic white, men, Republican, younger age, lower income, not trusting national science and
27 health organizations, believing a non-evidence-based messages, and Southwest Virginia in
28 logistic regression. Similar, lesser in magnitude correlations, were observed for distancing in
29 public. This study can assist decision makers and the public to improve and effectively target
30 public health messaging related to the ongoing COVID-19 pandemic and future public health
31 challenges in Virginia and similar jurisdictions.

32

33

34 **Introduction**

35 The early days of the coronavirus (COVID-19) pandemic (SARS-CoV-2) were
36 characterized by conflicting messaging from nearly all levels of national and international mass
37 media and government [1-4]. As public health and healthcare professionals attempted to quell the
38 growing panic with science-driven narratives, conspiracy theories and misinformation continued
39 to spread through social media platforms such as Facebook, Weibo, and Twitter, often
40 undermining or contradicting the life-saving messages that scientists were trying to communicate
41 [5, 6]. This issue was further compounded by long-standing health, socioeconomic, and racist
42 inequities as well as sharp decreases in funding to state and federal health agencies in the United
43 States [5]. Throughout the pandemic, access to and acceptance of evidence-based messaging to
44 prevent and respond to outbreaks of coronavirus disease (COVID-19) have been inconsistent
45 across populations [7]. Black, Hispanic, and Indigenous populations have been historically
46 excluded from the United States' public health and medical institutions, often suffering
47 disproportionately from many diseases and public health challenges [8, 9]. When combined with
48 the knowledge that ethnic minority, low-income, low-education, and elderly populations are
49 overrepresented in COVID-19 related morbidity and mortality numbers, public health officials
50 will need to effectively reach out to and target those particular groups[10-12].

51 Several surveys have evaluated the awareness and concern that members of the public
52 have experienced towards COVID-19 and local, state, and national government responses [7,
53 13]. Results showed that the majority of the general population wants to hear from public health
54 and medical officials, and are likely to trust professional sources that have self-protective and
55 pro-social messages that focus on positive ways to protect themselves and their loved ones [14,

56 15]. This includes demographic groups that are considered high-risk for COVID-19, like the
57 elderly and low-income individuals from minority groups [16-18].

58 As vaccine coverage increases at different rates globally, the public health response to
59 COVID-19 continues to necessitate coordination at all levels of government to ensure accessible
60 and accurate testing, contact tracing, quarantine and isolation, treatment, and mitigation
61 measures like social or physical distancing and mask wearing [19]. It is important that trust in
62 public health information be maintained for these strategies to continue to be implemented
63 effectively. Studies found that trust in public health officials and the information they provided
64 allowed for successful messaging campaigns with past disease outbreaks, ranging from food
65 safety incidents to worldwide polio vaccination campaigns [17]. As shown in past responses to
66 foodborne disease outbreaks, demonstrating that public health measures and preventative
67 strategies are in the best interests of the community overall is crucial to building and maintaining
68 public trust that is essential to effective public health guidance [20]. High-risk populations may
69 respond best when targeted with official messages that are consistent, credible, proactive, and
70 also a mixture of self-focused and prosocial [14].

71 Throughout the COVID-19 pandemic in the United States, social distancing, school
72 closures, lockdowns, and targeted public health messaging have been sporadic and inconsistent.
73 Many people obtain information from social media that can conflict with the messages from
74 public health officials [6]. In response, Facebook, Twitter, and online newspapers are now
75 actively monitoring their own sites for COVID-19 disinformation that could mislead people into
76 believing potentially dangerous rumors, stigmas, and conspiracy theories [6, 21]. The rapid
77 development and rollout of COVID-19 vaccines have also been subject to misinformation on
78 social media platforms, with peer-networks exchanging large quantities of anti-vaccination posts

79 that focus on adverse side-effects, misleading medical content, and unsubstantiated rumors [22].
80 Similar methods have been used to undermine prior vaccine campaigns, and developing effective
81 messaging to counter such disinformation will likely prove to be an important challenge for
82 public health officials [23, 24].

83 Like many other large states, Virginia has had notable regional differences in case trends
84 over time, with the more densely populated northern and central regions experiencing large case
85 increases during the pandemic's initial wave in the spring of 2020, while the coastal eastern
86 region and the more rural southwestern region experiencing their first large case increases mid-
87 summer [25]. Some Virginia college towns, such as Charlottesville, Blacksburg, and
88 Harrisonburg, saw increases in local case counts when students returned in the late summer and
89 mid-winter of 2020-21, showing that the movement of large groups of people can greatly affect
90 community spread in less densely populated areas [26-28]. Given the continued need for
91 effective evidence-based public health messaging, officials, researchers, and the public can
92 benefit from exploring how people receive information they believe and trust, and how their
93 beliefs influence their behaviors. To gain better insight, we conducted a cross-sectional survey
94 during the summer of 2020 to examine COVID-19 related messaging, beliefs, information
95 sources, and mitigation behaviors among adults in Virginia.

96 **Materials and Methods**

97 We surveyed a convenience sample of Virginia residents by distributing a link to
98 complete the survey online through our professional and personal email listservs, on Facebook,
99 and on flyers in select locations. Eligibility criteria included being 18 years of age or older and
100 residing in Virginia. Participants provided electronic informed consent prior to beginning the

101 survey. The survey collected socio-demographic information, including gender, age, race,
102 ethnicity, level of education, income, employment status, occupation, changes in employment
103 due to the pandemic, political affiliation, sexual orientation, and zip code. Participants were
104 asked about their perceptions of COVID-19, risk mitigation behaviors, messages and events they
105 felt influenced their beliefs and behaviors, and where they obtained information that they trust.
106 The full survey is available in the supplement. The survey was developed and administered using
107 Qualtrics. Participants were able to save and continue the survey and the *Prevent Ballot Box*
108 *Stuffing* option was selected in the survey settings to limit people from completing the survey
109 more than once. Responses were completely anonymous.

110 For this analysis, we conducted exploratory analyses by calculating descriptive statistics
111 of survey responses and investigated correlations between information sources, perceptions,
112 beliefs, and risk mitigating behaviors related to the COVID-19 pandemic using Pearson's Chi²
113 test (alpha of 0.05). We also investigated correlates of the fundamental risk mitigating behaviors
114 mask wearing and social/physical distancing in unadjusted and adjusted analyses using logistic
115 regression with robust variance estimates (alpha of 0.05). We adjusted for race, political identity,
116 gender, age group, income, reporting national science and health organizations as an information
117 source, believing in alternative messages, and living in southwest Virginia to identify the
118 independent effects of these characteristics on risk mitigation behaviors. These variables were
119 selected a priori as known correlates of COVID-19 beliefs and incidence [10, 18, 29-36]. Data
120 from surveys were excluded only if none of the questions beyond eligibility were answered.

121 All analyses were conducted using Stata/SE 16.1 and Microsoft Excel. This work was
122 conducted by the Community and Collaborative subgroup of the integrated Translational Health
123 Research Institute of Virginia (iTHRIV), a collaboration between Virginia Tech, University of

124 Virginia, Inova, and Carilion Clinic. This study was approved by the Virginia Tech institutional
125 Review Board (IRB number: 20-353) and the Inova Institutional Review Board (IRB number:
126 U20 05-4056), prior to initiation of study activities at the respective sites.

127

128 **Results**

129 **Respondent characteristics**

130 The survey was open from May 19th to July 19th, 2020. Of the 3,694 individuals who
131 started the survey, 3,678 (99.6%) self-reported as eligible and of these 190 (5%) did not answer
132 any survey questions and were excluded. Of the remaining 3,488 respondents 3,367 (97%) fully
133 completed the survey. Of the 3,488 included in this analysis, 70% completed the survey in May,
134 21% in June, and 9% in July of 2020. Participants were represented throughout Virginia (See Fig
135 1), with the largest numbers of respondents residing in Montgomery County (home of Virginia
136 Tech), Loudoun and Fairfax Counties (near Washington DC, home of Inova), and Wise County
137 (home of UVA Wise), reflecting sites where survey recruitment began.

138

139 **Figure 1. Map of Survey Respondents by County in Virginia (N=3,307).** Number of
140 respondents for each county in Virginia.

141

142 Sociodemographic characteristics are presented in Table 1. Briefly, 78% were women,
143 3% were Hispanic, 83% were non-Hispanic White, 5% were Black, 3% were Asian, and 87%
144 identified as heterosexual or straight. Six percent were 18-24 years old, 6% were 25-29, 16%

145 were 30-39, 19% were 40-49, 20% were 50-59, 20% were 60-69, and 9% were 70 or older. Most
 146 (94%) had completed at least some college or other post-high school education or training.
 147 Forty-three percent reported annual household income at least \$100,000, 11% between \$80,000
 148 and \$100,000, 13% between \$60,000 and \$80,000, 12% between \$40,000 and \$60,000, and 11%
 149 less than \$40,000. Forty-six percent of respondents identified as Democrat, 13% as Republican,
 150 22% as independent, and 13% said other or no-preference. Employment status was not mutually
 151 exclusive and 58% had full-time employment, 12% had part-time employment, 16% were
 152 retired, 5% were students, and 4% were unemployed. Eighteen percent of respondents reported a
 153 loss of or reduced employment or income, while 70% reported no change in their employment
 154 status as a result of COVID-19.

155 **Table 1. Characteristics of survey respondents (N = 3,488).**

Age group years	18-24	207 (6%)	Household Income	Less than \$20,000	129 (4%)
	25-29	215 (6%)		\$20,000 to \$39,999	268 (8%)
	30-39	562 (16%)		\$40,000 to \$59,999	401 (12%)
	40-49	646 (19%)		\$60,000 to \$79,999	465 (13%)
	50-59	710 (20%)		\$80,000 to \$99,999	387 (11%)
	60-69	688 (20%)		\$100,000 or more	1,500 (43%)
	70+	315 (9%)		Missing	338 (10%)
Region	Central	346 (10%)	Political Affiliation	Republican	467 (13%)
	Eastern	234 (7%)		Democrat	1,608 (46%)
	Northern	977 (28%)		Independent	761 (22%)
	Northwest	474 (14%)		Other	150 (4%)
	Southwest	1,276 (36%)		No preference	320 (9%)
	Missing	181 (5%)		Missing	182 (5%)
Race / Ethnicity ^a	American Indian or Alaska Native	7 (<1%)	Education	Less than high school degree	5 (<1%)
	Asian	93 (3%)		High school or GED	93 (3%)
	Black	159 (5%)		Trade school or Associate degree	241 (7%)
	Middle Eastern	7 (<1%)		Some college (no degree)	333 (10%)
	White, non-Hispanic	2,879 (83%)		Bachelor's degree	1,095 (31%)
	Multiracial	68 (2%)		Master's degree	1,059 (30%)
	Hispanic	104 (3%)		Doctoral or professional degree	534 (15%)
	Missing Race/Ethnicity	180 (5%)		Missing	128 (4%)
Gender	Women	2,724 (78%)	Sexual Orientation	Heterosexual or straight	3,051 (87%)

	Men	613 (18%)		LGBTQ+	209 (6%)
	Other	20 (<1%)		Missing	228 (7%)
	Missing	131 (4%)	Current Employment ^a	Full Time	2,017 (58%)
How has employment changed as a result of the pandemic?	No change	2,446 (70%)		Part Time	421 (12%)
	Permanently lost primary income source	47 (1%)		Seeking Opportunities	110 (3%)
	Temporarily lost primary income source	138 (4%)		Retired	568 (16%)
	Gained employment/income	53 (2%)		Not working due to disability	33 (1%)
	Employment/Income was reduced	441 (13%)		Student	185 (5%)
	Other	180 (5%)		Not Employed	150 (4%)
	Missing	183 (5%)		Other	114 (3%)
				Missing	140 (4%)

^aRace/ethnicity and employment categories are not mutually exclusive.

156
157

158 **Trusted information sources**

159 All but 16 respondents (0.5%) answered the question: “Where do you get information
160 that you trust about coronavirus/COVID-19?” Of these (n=3,472), most reported national science
161 and health organizations (85%) as a trusted source for COVID-19 information and over 50% of
162 respondents reported state/local health departments (75%), healthcare professionals (74%), and
163 online news sources (55%) as a trusted source. Information sources reported by less than half of
164 respondents included family and friends (26%), faith leader (4%), local TV news (34%), national
165 TV news (49%), printed newspaper (20%), radio (20%), social media (22%), local government
166 leaders (46%), and federal government leaders (22%). Only 2% of these respondents reported
167 not following any COVID-19 updates (see Fig 2a).

168

169 **Figure 2. Where respondents received information that they trust about COVID-19, by**
170 **participant characteristics.** Survey responses to the question: “Where do you get information
171 that you trust about coronavirus/COVID-19? (Check all that apply)” for all respondents (2a), and

172 by gender (2b), age-group (2c), race/ethnicity (2d), political identity (2e), education level (2f),
173 income level (2g), and Virginia region (2h).

174

175 More women than men received information they trusted from local government leaders
176 (48% vs. 41%), and state or local health departments (77% vs. 73%) and more men than women
177 received information they trusted from family/friends (31% vs. 25%), and federal government
178 leaders (26% vs. 20%), all of which were statistically significantly difference ($p < 0.05$) (see Fig
179 2b). Young adults age 18-24 were more likely than those of all older ages combined to receive
180 trusted information from family and friends (39% vs. 25%) and social media (31% vs. 21%) and
181 less likely from printed news (6% vs. 21%), radio (10% vs. 21%), and local government leaders
182 (36% vs. 47%) (see Fig 2c). Slightly less non-Hispanic White and Asian respondents received
183 trusted information from faith leaders (4% and 3%, respectively) than other races including 9%
184 of Black and 10% of multiracial respondents. Non-White were also more likely than White
185 respondents to receive information from local TV news (42% vs. 33%), and social media (27%
186 vs. 21%) (see Fig 2d). White respondents were more likely than non-White respondents to
187 receive information from printed local newspaper (21% vs. 14%), national science and health
188 organizations (87% vs. 82%), or state and local health departments (77% vs. 71%) (see Fig 2d).
189 More Democrats than Republicans received information they trusted from national science and
190 health organizations (93% vs. 72%, respectively), State or local health department (83% vs.
191 62%), online news (65% vs. 41%), national TV news (55% vs. 43%), local government leaders
192 (54% vs. 46%), printed newspaper (45% vs. 13%) and radio (26% vs. 14%) (see Fig 2e). More
193 Republicans than Democrats received information they trusted from federal government leaders
194 (46% vs. 13%), faith leaders (6% vs. 3%), or did not follow coronavirus/COVID-19 updates (5%

195 vs. 0.3%). Similar proportions by political identity received information from local TV news,
196 family/friends, healthcare-professionals, and social media. Other differences presented in Fig 2
197 were not statistically significant ($p \geq 0.05$).

198 More of those with than without a college degree received information from local printed
199 newspapers (22% vs. 13%), radio (22% vs. 15%), online news (58% vs. 44%), local government
200 leaders (47% vs. 43%), national science and health organizations (89% vs. 74%), and State or
201 local health departments (79% vs. 64%) (see Fig 2f). More of those without than with a college
202 degree received information from local faith leaders (6% vs. 4%), local TV news (38% vs. 33%),
203 and federal government leaders (26% vs. 20%). More higher- than middle- and lower-income
204 individuals received information from local printed newspapers (23%, 18%, 15%), online news
205 (58%, 55%, 51%), local government leaders (49%, 43%, 45%), national science and health
206 organizations (89%, 84%, 83%), and State or local health departments (80%, 77%, 70%) (see Fig
207 2g). Differences in information sources were also observed across regions (see Fig 2h).

208 **Perceptions & Beliefs Related to COVID-19**

209 Twenty-three percent of respondents reported being “very worried” about catching
210 COVID-19 and 34% were “very worried” about experiencing severe disease or complications if
211 they were to catch COVID-19. Most respondents considered COVID-19 to be very serious
212 (82%) or somewhat serious (13%). Statistically significant differences ($p < 0.05$) were found
213 between women vs. men (85% vs. 77%), Democrats vs. Republicans vs. others (95% vs. 61% vs.
214 78%), those 60 or more years old vs. those under 60 years old (91% vs. 81%), LGTBQ+ vs.
215 heterosexual (89% vs. 83%), and higher-income vs. lower-income (86% reporting \$100,000 vs.
216 78% making less than \$20,000), and those with vs. without a college degree (86% vs. 75%)

217 considered COVID-19 to be very serious. Other demographic characteristics were not
218 statistically significantly different in terms of perceived seriousness of COVID-19. Differences
219 by race and ethnicity were also observed with 91% of Asian, 87% of Black and Hispanic, 84% of
220 multiracial and White, non-Hispanic respondents reporting they believed COVID-19 to be very
221 serious.

222 Among those who answered the question: “Which if any of the following impacted your
223 belief that COVID-19 was serious” (n=3,371), more than half selected hearing about COVID-19
224 in other countries (77%) or other states (73%), public-school closings (69%), the governor
225 recommending a stay-at-home order (51%), mandating a stay-at-home order (65%), and
226 declaring a state of emergency (68%), the CDC recommending that everyone wear a face mask
227 in public (67%), restaurant dining rooms shutting down, (58%), and sporting events being
228 canceled or postponed (52%) (see Fig 3a). Less than half selected becoming sick (3%) or
229 knowing someone who became sick (30%), being high-risk or living with some-one who is high-
230 risk for severe disease (40%), starting to work from home (35%), being laid off or losing their
231 job (5%), when stores began limiting purchases of essential items (42%), when religious services
232 were moved online (40%), and when a public figure tested positive (17%). Two percent of those
233 who responded to this question said they did not think COVID-19 is serious, and 11% selected
234 some other reason not listed in the survey.

235

236 **Figure 3. Events impacting belief that COVID-19 was serious, by participant**

237 **characteristics.** Survey responses to the question: “Which (if any) of the following have affected
238 whether or not you think the coronavirus/COVID-19 is serious? (Check all that apply)” for all

239 respondents (3a), and by gender (3b), age-group (3c), race/ethnicity (3d), political identity (3e),
240 education level (3f), income level (3g), and Virginia region (3h).

241
242 Among those who answered the question: “Which if any of the following impacted your
243 belief that COVID-19 was serious,” women were statistically significantly ($p < 0.05$) more likely
244 than men to state someone they knew became sick (31% vs. 26), being or living with someone
245 high-risk (42% vs. 32%), public schools closing (71% vs. 63%), the governor declaring a state of
246 emergency (70% vs. 63%), the CDC recommending face masks (69% vs. 63%), hearing about it
247 in other countries (78% vs. 75%) and states (74% vs. 69%), stores limiting purchases (43% vs.
248 38%), religious services going online (41% vs. 35%), and the governor recommending a stay at
249 home order (52% vs. 47%) and mandating stay at home order (68% vs 57%) (see Fig 3b). Young
250 adults were more likely than all other age-groups combined to select restaurant dining rooms
251 (66% vs. 57%), being furloughed (laid off) or losing their job (16% vs. 4%), stores limiting
252 purchases, (52% vs. 42%), and a public figure testing positive (26% vs. 17%) and less likely to
253 select hearing about COVID-19 in other countries (72% vs. 78%), the governor *recommending* a
254 stay-at-home order (41% vs. 52%), though this is not true for when the governor *mandated* the
255 stay-at-home order (68% vs 66%) compared to other age groups (see Fig 3c). Non-white people
256 were more likely than white people to select personally becoming sick (6% vs. 2%) or someone
257 they knew becoming sick (45% vs. 28%), stores limiting purchases (52% vs. 41%), religious
258 services moving online (47% vs. 39%), and a public figure testing positive (23% vs. 17%) (see
259 Fig 3d). Democrats were more likely than Republicans to select knowing someone who was sick
260 (32% vs. 24%), public schools closing (74% vs. 62%), restaurants closing (61% vs. 53%), the
261 governor declaring a state of emergency (80% vs. 45%), starting to work from home (40% vs.

262 29%), the CDC recommending face masks (76% vs. 53%), hearing about COVID-19 in other
263 countries (86% vs. 59%) and states (81% vs. 58%), stores limiting purchases (46% vs. 38%),
264 sporting events being canceled or postponed (56% vs. 48%) and a public figure testing positive
265 (20% vs. 13%) (see Fig 3e). More Republicans than Democrats selected religious services
266 moving online (45% vs. 37%). More of those with than without a college degree reported their
267 believe was impacted by the governor declaring a state of emergency (70% vs. 63%), beginning
268 to work from home (38% vs. 24%), the CDC recommending face masks (69% vs. 63%), hearing
269 about COVID-19 in other countries (81% vs. 65%) or states (75% vs. 65%), and sporting events
270 being cancelled (53% vs. 49%) (see Fig 3f). More of those without than with a college degree
271 reported their believe was impacted by becoming sick (5% vs. 3%), being or living with
272 someone who is high-risk (47% vs. 39%), being furloughed (laid off) from work (9% vs. 4%),
273 stores limiting purchases (46% vs. 41%) and religious services moving online (46% vs. 38%).

274 Fewer higher-income (>\$100,000) than middle-income (\$60,000-\$99,999) and lower-
275 income (<\$60,000) reported their belief was impacted by being or living with someone who is
276 high-risk (37%, 41%, 44%), being furloughed (laid off) from work or losing their job (4%, 5%,
277 9%), stores limiting purchases of essential items (37%, 46%, 48%), religious gatherings being
278 moved online (36%, 42%, 41%), a celebrity getting testing positive for COVID-19 (16%, 16%,
279 22%), and/or the governor recommending a stay at home order (49%, 55%, 52%). More higher-
280 than middle- and lower-income reported beginning to work from home (39%, 35%, 32%), and
281 hearing about COVID-19 in other countries (80%, 77%, 75%) (see Fig 3g). Differences in what
282 impacted the beliefs that COVID-19 was serious were also observed across regions (see Fig 3h),
283 with statistically significant differences ($p < 0.05$) observed for becoming sick, knowing someone

284 who became sick, being or living with someone at high risk, beginning to work from home, and
285 sporting events being cancelled or postponed.

286 **Evidence based and alternative messages related to COVID-19**

287 Over 80% of respondents reported that one or more of the following evidence-based
288 messages impacted their beliefs and/or behaviors: “the coronavirus is highly contagious;” “stay
289 home stay safe;” “stay home, save lives, slow the spread;” “practice social distancing;” “don’t
290 touch your face;” and “wash your hands for at least 20 seconds” (see Fig 4). Twelve percent of
291 respondents reported believing in one or more of the following alternative messages: COVID-19
292 “was developed as a bioweapon” (6%), “was developed to lower social security payments to
293 seniors” (1%), “is a sign of the apocalypse/end times” (3%), “is a hoax” (1%), “can be treated
294 with natural remedies” (3%), “was developed for population control” (3%), and/or “was
295 developed to increase sales of cleaning supplies” (4%).

296

297 **Figure 4. Messages that respondents believe and/or affected their behaviors (N=3,445).**

298 Survey responses to the question: “The following messages are related to the
299 coronavirus/COVID-19 (not all are true). Please check all that apply if you have heard, believe,
300 and/or changed your behavior based on each message” for all respondents.

301 **Correlations between alternative messages, demographics, and** 302 **information sources**

303 The same proportion (12%) of men and women (see Fig 5a), more young adults vs. older
304 ages combined (22% vs. 12%), with the lowest among those 70 years old and greater (5%) (see

305 Fig 5b), less of those who identified as non-Hispanic White (10%) compared to other
306 races/ethnicities including 37% of Black, 22% of multiracial, 21% of Hispanic, and 15% of
307 Asian (see Fig 5c), more Republicans (24%) than Democrats (7%) and others (15%) (see Fig 5d)
308 believed in one of more alternative messages. The percent of those who believed in one of more
309 alternative messages decreased with increasing education (29% of high-school degree or less to
310 6% of those with a doctoral degree) (see Fig 5e), and with increasing income level (9%, 13%,
311 17%) (see Fig 5f). More of those in Central Virginia than other regions (20% vs. <14%) (see Fig
312 5g) believed in one or more alternative messages.

313

314 **Figure 5. Percent that believed one or more alternative messages*, by participant**

315 **characteristics.** Percent of respondents who selected they believed in one or more alternative
316 message when answering the question: “The following messages are related to the
317 coronavirus/COVID-19 (not all are true). Please check all that apply if you have heard, believe,
318 and/or changed your behavior based on each message” by gender (5a), age-group (5b),
319 race/ethnicity (5c), political identity (5d), education level (5e), income level (5f), and Virginia
320 region (5g). Alternative messages response options include: COVID-19 “was developed as a
321 bioweapon,” “was developed to lower social security payments to seniors,” “is a sign of the
322 apocalypse/end times,” “is a hoax,” “can be treated with natural remedies,” “was developed for
323 population control,” and “was developed to increase sales of cleaning supplies.”

324

325

326 Those who believed in an alternative message were statistically significantly more likely
327 than those who did not to receive trusted information from family and friends (32% vs. 26%), a

328 faith leader (8% vs. 3%), local TV news (38% vs. 33%), social media (29% vs 21%), federal
329 government leaders (33% vs. 20%), or report not following COVID-19 updates (see Fig 5h).
330 Those who did not believe any alternative messages were more likely than those who did to
331 receive trusted information from a healthcare professional (74% vs. 69%), local newspaper (21%
332 vs. 13%), radio (21% vs. 15%), online news (57% vs, 45%), local government leaders (48% vs.
333 38%), national science and health organizations (88% vs. 67%), and state or local health
334 departments (78% vs. 59%).

335

336 **Risk mitigation behavior changes**

337 Ninety-eight percent of respondents completed the questions about changes in behaviors
338 and 98% of those reported changing their behavior in some way in response to the pandemic (see
339 Fig 6a). More than half of respondents reported one or more of the following behavior changes:
340 practicing social/physical distancing (95%), wearing a mask when in public (90%), washing
341 hands more often (90%), shopping for groceries and other essentials less often (86%), washing
342 hands for 20 seconds (86%), being more careful not to touch their face in public (82%) and/or
343 with unwashed hands (80%), using hand sanitizer more often (79%), avoiding public spaces
344 (73%), cleaning frequently touched surfaces (68%), stocking up on supplies (62%), and started
345 working from home (52%).

346

347 **Figure 6. Behavior changes in response to the pandemic and masking and distancing in**
348 **public by participant characteristics.** Survey responses to the question: “How (if at all) have
349 you changed your behavior in response to the coronavirus/COVID- 19? (Check all that apply)”

350 for all respondents (6a). Percent of respondents reporting mask wearing and distancing by gender
351 (6b), age-group (6c), race/ethnicity (6d), political identity (6e), education level (6f), income level
352 (6g), and Virginia region (6h). Percent of respondents reporting an information source as
353 trustworthy by if they reported wearing or not wearing a mask in public (6i) and by distancing or
354 not distancing in public (6j).

355

356 Wearing a mask in public was reported by more women than men (92% vs. 84%) (see
357 Fig 6b), and increased by age from 80% of those 18-24 years old to 95% of those 70 years and
358 older (see Fig 6c), more Democrats than Republicans and others (97%, 77%, and 87%,
359 respectively), increased by education level from 76% of those with a high-school education or
360 less to 94% of those with a doctoral degree, and more higher- than middle- and lower-income
361 (92%, 89%, 87%). Those in Southwest Virginia reported less mask wearers (86%) than other
362 regions (91%-95%) (see Fig 6f). Distancing was more common than masking in all groups, but
363 showed similar demographic trends as wearing a mask.

364 More of those who reported wearing vs. not wearing a mask reporting national health and
365 science organizations (89% vs. 58%), state or local health departments (78% vs. 51%), health
366 care professional (75% vs 64%), online news (57% vs. 38%), local government leaders (49% vs.
367 24%), local TV news (35% vs. 26%), local newspaper (21% vs. 6%), and radio (21% vs. 13%) as
368 a trusted source of information (see Fig 6i). A smaller proportion of those who reported wearing
369 vs. not wearing a mask reported the federal government as a trusted source (21% vs. 28%) or not
370 following COVID-19 information (1% vs. 12%). Similar trends were observed for distancing
371 (see Fig 6j).

372 In adjusted logistic analyses, we found that the odds of reporting not wearing a mask in
 373 public was greater than their comparative groups for those living in Southwest Virginia vs. all
 374 other regions combined (OR= 1.95, 95% CI= 1.48, 2.58), men vs. women (OR= 1.85, 95% CI=
 375 1.36, 2.51), young adults vs. other age-groups combined (OR= 2.42, 95% CI= 1.54 vs. 3.81),
 376 non-Hispanic Whites vs. other races combined (odds ratio [OR]=1.68, 95% CI= 1.04, 2.71), and
 377 those with household income under \$100,000 vs. those with income at least \$100,000 (OR=
 378 1.41; 95% CI= 1.06, 1.89) (see Table 2). The odds of reporting not wearing a mask in public was
 379 greater for those identifying as a Republican vs. Democrat (OR=5.42, 95% CI= 3.63, 8.09), those
 380 who did not vs. did report national science and health organization(s) as a trusted information
 381 source (OR= 3.16, 95% CI= 2.21, 4.51), those who believed one or more alternative messages
 382 vs. not believing in any (OR= 2.09, 95% CI= 1.48, 2.94). Not having a college degree was
 383 associated with not wearing a mask in unadjusted analyses (OR= 1.98, 95% CI= 1.54, 2.55) but
 384 in adjusted analyses (OR= 0.98, 95% CI= 0.71, 1.35). All other associations were statistically
 385 significant (p<0.05) in both adjusted and unadjusted analyses. Odds ratios for distancing showed
 386 similar associations as for masking, but at a smaller magnitude. Region, gender, race/ethnicity,
 387 and education were not statistically significant (p<0.05) in adjusted analyses for distancing.

388 **Table 2. Odds ratios (ORs) of reporting not wearing masks in public and not practicing**
 389 **social/physical distancing using logistic regression with robust standard errors (N=3,307).**

Variables	Unadjusted OR (95% CI); p- value	Adjusted* OR (95% CI); p- value	Unadjusted OR (95% CI); p-value	Adjusted* OR (95% CI); p- value
Southwest vs. all other regions	2.33 (1.84, 2.96); <0.001	1.95 (1.48, 2.58); <0.001	1.44 (1.02, 2.03); 0.037	1.13 (0.75, 1.70); 0.567
Men vs. women	2.14 (1.66, 2.76); <0.001	1.85 (1.36, 2.51); <0.001	1.48 (1.01, 2.18); 0.046	1.32 (0.82, 2.15); 0.255
18-24 vs. all other age-groups	2.59 (1.90, 3.71); <0.001	2.42 (1.54, 3.81); <0.001	2.89 (1.79, 4.66); <0.001	2.34 (1.34, 4.11); 0.003
Non-Hispanic White vs. other races	1.63 (1.09, 2.46); 0.018	1.68 (1.04, 2.71); 0.035	1.66 (0.91, 3.01); 0.099	1.83 (0.92, 3.63); 0.083
No college degree vs. college degree	1.98 (1.54, 2.55); <0.001	0.98 (0.71, 1.35); 0.897	3.52 (2.52, 4.92); <0.001	1.46 (0.96, 2.25); 0.080
Less than \$100,000 vs. \$100,000 or more	1.67 (1.31, 2.13); <0.001	1.41 (1.06, 1.89); 0.020	2.11 (1.47, 3.03); <0.001	1.62 (1.03, 2.54); 0.035

Political Identity				
Democrat	Ref	Ref	Ref	Ref
Republican	8.79 (6.18, 12.48); <0.001	5.42 (3.63, 8.09); <0.001	6.92 (4.31, 11.1); <0.001	3.53 (2.06, 6.07); <0.001
Independent, other, no preference	4.44 (3.21, 6.13); <0.001	3.16 (2.21, 4.51); <0.001	3.15 (2.01, 4.93); <0.001	1.79 (1.07, 3.01); 0.026
Not reporting national science and health organizations as trusted source of information	5.21 (4.14, 6.54); <0.001	3.45 (2.57, 4.66); <0.001	5.57 (4.20, 7.41); <0.001	2.96 (1.95, 4.49); <0.001
Belief in alternative message(s)	3.39 (2.65, 4.33); <0.001	2.09 (1.48, 2.94); <0.001	4.17 (3.09, 5.64); <0.001	2.65 (1.66, 4.23); <0.001

390 *Adjusted models include all variables listed in the table (N=2,992 with complete information for all variables). P-
 391 values <0.05 are in bold.
 392

393 Discussion

394 In a convenience sample of adults residing in Virginia, we found many differences in
 395 where people received information that they trust, what they believed, and how their behaviors
 396 changed in response to the COVID-19 pandemic by socio-demographics, political identity, and
 397 geography within Virginia. Respondents who identified as non-Hispanic White, men,
 398 Republican, other political identity, younger age, income <\$100,000, did not report national
 399 science and health organizations as a trusted source, reported believing an alternative message,
 400 and/or living in Southwest Virginia had greater odds of not wearing a mask than their
 401 comparative groups in both unadjusted and adjusted logistic regression. Differences in physical
 402 difference were also observed for physical distancing for these same variables, but at a lower
 403 magnitude as distancing was more likely than masking across all groups so differences were less
 404 pronounced.

405 Our study was subject to several limitations. First, we conducted numerous comparisons
 406 and did not adjust for multiple comparisons due to the exploratory nature of this study and some
 407 statistically significant associations could be due to chance. Second, complete demographic and

408 socioeconomic information was missing from 9% of respondents included in this study. Third,
409 the political identity response options were limited to Republican, Democrat, independent, and
410 other, resulting in individuals identifying as “independent” and “other” being grouped together,
411 although these individuals may hold extremely diverse political views. Finally, while we were
412 able to make comparisons between subgroups, our internet-based convenience sample is not
413 representative of the generalized Virginia population (United States Census Bureau 2019) and
414 may not reflect conditions at other time points given that the survey was conducted in the
415 summer of 2020. Data collection began on May 19th, just prior to the racial justice protests that
416 began on May 26th in Minneapolis and continued throughout the United States [37]. People’s
417 behavior may have been altered based on their cost-benefit analyses of COVID-19 risk and the
418 risks associated with racial injustice over the course of our data collection period [38, 39].

419 Other cross-sectional survey studies from early in the COVID-19 pandemic (spring to
420 summer 2020) produced similar results [10, 29-36]. For example, studies in Australia, Malaysia,
421 Italy, Canada, the United Kingdom, Arab countries, and other regions of the United States found
422 that evidence-based COVID-19 messaging significantly impacted respondents’ beliefs and risk
423 mitigation behaviors. Multiple studies showed that consistent messaging focusing on positive
424 ways to cope with lockdowns and other COVID-19 mitigation measures were more effective
425 than messaging focused only on compliance in promoting long-term behavioral changes like
426 staying at home, mask-wearing, social distancing, and hand-washing [29-31, 36]. Studies also
427 showed that while older adults were generally more concerned and had higher anxiety levels
428 about potential COVID-19 infection, they were also less concerned than younger adults about the
429 short- and long-term economic instabilities caused by the pandemic [30-33, 36, 40]. Other
430 studies also found that women, racial/ethnic minorities, and those with lower socioeconomic

431 status experienced more COVID-19 anxieties compared to men, ethnic majorities, and those of
432 higher socioeconomic status [10, 33, 34, 36]. In multiple countries, people identifying as
433 politically conservative and those with lower health literacy and education level were more likely
434 to report not following recommended COVID-19 precautions and believing that people were
435 overreacting [29, 32-34, 41]. People identifying as politically liberal and those with higher health
436 literacy and education were more likely to follow public health guidelines and believe that their
437 governments were not doing enough to stop the pandemic [32-34, 36]. Multiple studies showed
438 that misinformation exposure and beliefs were consistently higher among younger people, ethnic
439 minorities, and those who identified as politically conservative [33, 34, 41-43]. Several
440 preliminary studies have also shown that misinformation and mistrust in government entities
441 and/or the vaccine development process are major contributing factors to vaccine hesitancy,
442 especially among minority populations and people with low education levels, socioeconomic
443 status, and low perceived risk of contracting COVID- [44-46]. Our study supports and adds to
444 this knowledge describing how information sources considered trustworthy vary across these
445 different population impacting believes and behaviors.

446 This study can assist decision makers and the public in developing more effective public
447 health messaging for both the ongoing COVID-19 pandemic and for future public health
448 challenges in Virginia and similar settings in the United States. Future studies could include
449 quantitative subgroup, subregion, and qualitative analyses to enhance our understanding of the
450 nuances related to designing effective public health messaging.

451
452 **Acknowledgements:** R Silverman assisted in the study design and implementation, performed
453 the statistical analysis, interpreted the data, and wrote the paper. D Short assisted in the study

454 implementation and helped write the paper. S Wenzel assisted in the study design and
455 implementation and helped write the paper. M Friesen assisted in the study design and
456 implementation, and helped write the paper. N Cook is the principal investigator for this project,
457 assisted in the study design and implementation, and helped write the paper. We thank the other
458 members of our study team: Kristin Miller, Emily Wells, Kathy Hosig, Amy Smith, Amanda
459 Nguyen, Molly Roberts, Teace Markwalter, and Kristina Jiles for their assistance with survey
460 distribution and recruitment. Thank you to Luella Ba and Becky Willis for helping make tables
461 and figures. We thank the survey respondents for their participation.

462

463 **References:**

- 464 1. Doran S. Messaging about Covid-19 Is Wrong, so Americans Aren't Listening - STAT.
465 StatNews. 2020.
- 466 2. Gaviria M, Smith M, (PBS) PBS. FRONTLINE. The Virus: What Went Wrong? 2020.
- 467 3. Kolstoe SE. Covid-19: public messaging on vaccination must heed warnings from
468 confused face mask messaging. BMJ. 2020;370:m3775. Epub 2020/10/02. doi:
469 10.1136/bmj.m3775. PubMed PMID: 32998903.
- 470 4. Lehmann C. Misinformation, Disagreement Hinder COVID Messaging. WebMD. 2020.
- 471 5. Garrett L. COVID-19: the medium is the message. Lancet. 2020;395(10228):942-3. Epub
472 2020/03/15. doi: 10.1016/S0140-6736(20)30600-0. PubMed PMID: 32171075; PubMed Central
473 PMCID: PMC7154501.
- 474 6. Islam MS, Sarkar T, Khan SH, Mostofa Kamal AH, Hasan SMM, Kabir A, et al.
475 COVID-19-Related Infodemic and Its Impact on Public Health: A Global Social Media Analysis.

- 476 Am J Trop Med Hyg. 2020;103(4):1621-9. Epub 2020/08/14. doi: 10.4269/ajtmh.20-0812.
- 477 PubMed PMID: 32783794; PubMed Central PMCID: PMC7543839.
- 478 7. Jones J, Sullivan PS, Sanchez TH, Guest JL, Hall EW, Luisi N, et al. Similarities and
479 Differences in COVID-19 Awareness, Concern, and Symptoms by Race and Ethnicity in the
480 United States: Cross-Sectional Survey. J Med Internet Res. 2020;22(7):e20001. Epub
481 2020/07/03. doi: 10.2196/20001. PubMed PMID: 32614778; PubMed Central PMCID:
482 PMC7357692.
- 483 8. Hutchins SS, Fiscella K, Levine RS, Ompad DC, McDonald M. Protection of
484 racial/ethnic minority populations during an influenza pandemic. Am J Public Health. 2009;99
485 Suppl 2:S261-70. Epub 2009/10/08. doi: 10.2105/AJPH.2009.161505. PubMed PMID:
486 19797739; PubMed Central PMCID: PMC7357692.
- 487 9. Krishnan L, Ogunwole SM, Cooper LA. Historical Insights on Coronavirus Disease 2019
488 (COVID-19), the 1918 Influenza Pandemic, and Racial Disparities: Illuminating a Path Forward.
489 Ann Intern Med. 2020;173(6):474-81. Epub 2020/06/06. doi: 10.7326/M20-2223. PubMed
490 PMID: 32501754; PubMed Central PMCID: PMC7298913.
- 491 10. Alobuia WM, Dalva-Baird NP, Forrester JD, Bendavid E, Bhattacharya J, Kebebew E.
492 Racial disparities in knowledge, attitudes and practices related to COVID-19 in the USA. J
493 Public Health (Oxf). 2020;42(3):470-8. Epub 2020/06/04. doi: 10.1093/pubmed/fdaa069.
494 PubMed PMID: 32490519; PubMed Central PMCID: PMC7313911.
- 495 11. Holtgrave DR, Barranco MA, Tesoriero JM, Blog DS, Rosenberg ES. Assessing racial
496 and ethnic disparities using a COVID-19 outcomes continuum for New York State. Ann
497 Epidemiol. 2020;48:9-14. Epub 2020/07/30. doi: 10.1016/j.annepidem.2020.06.010. PubMed
498 PMID: 32723697; PubMed Central PMCID: PMC7323653.

- 499 12. Maroko AR, Nash D, Pavilonis BT. COVID-19 and Inequity: a Comparative Spatial
500 Analysis of New York City and Chicago Hot Spots. *J Urban Health*. 2020;97(4):461-70. Epub
501 2020/07/22. doi: 10.1007/s11524-020-00468-0. PubMed PMID: 32691212; PubMed Central
502 PMCID: PMC7371785.
- 503 13. Seale H, Heywood AE, Leask J, Sheel M, Thomas S, Durrheim DN, et al. COVID-19 is
504 rapidly changing: Examining public perceptions and behaviors in response to this evolving
505 pandemic. *PLoS One*. 2020;15(6):e0235112. Epub 2020/06/24. doi:
506 10.1371/journal.pone.0235112. PubMed PMID: 32574184; PubMed Central PMCID:
507 PMC7310732 following competing interests: HS has previously received funding from
508 drug companies for investigator driven research and consulting fees to present at
509 conferences/workshops and develop resources (bio-CSL/Sequiris, GSK and Sanofi Pasteur). She
510 has also participated in advisory board meeting for Sanofi Pasteur. This does not alter our
511 adherence to PLOS ONE policies on sharing data and materials. There are no patents, products
512 in development or marketed products associated with this research to declare.
- 513 14. Banker S, Park J. Evaluating Prosocial COVID-19 Messaging Frames: Evidence from a
514 Field Study on Facebook. *Judgment and Decision Making*. 2020;15. doi: 1037-43. doi:
515 10.2139/ssrn.3684901.
- 516 15. Shelus VS, Frank SC, Lazard AJ, Higgins ICA, Pulido M, Richter APC, et al.
517 Motivations and Barriers for the Use of Face Coverings during the COVID-19 Pandemic:
518 Messaging Insights from Focus Groups. *Int J Environ Res Public Health*. 2020;17(24). Epub
519 2020/12/17. doi: 10.3390/ijerph17249298. PubMed PMID: 33322672; PubMed Central PMCID:
520 PMC7763909.

- 521 16. Geldsetzer P. Use of Rapid Online Surveys to Assess People's Perceptions During
522 Infectious Disease Outbreaks: A Cross-sectional Survey on COVID-19. *J Med Internet Res.*
523 2020;22(4):e18790. Epub 2020/04/03. doi: 10.2196/18790. PubMed PMID: 32240094; PubMed
524 Central PMCID: PMC7124956.
- 525 17. Li S, Feng B, Liao W, Pan W. Internet Use, Risk Awareness, and Demographic
526 Characteristics Associated With Engagement in Preventive Behaviors and Testing: Cross-
527 Sectional Survey on COVID-19 in the United States. *J Med Internet Res.* 2020;22(6):e19782.
528 Epub 2020/06/06. doi: 10.2196/19782. PubMed PMID: 32501801; PubMed Central PMCID:
529 PMC7299540.
- 530 18. McFadden SM, Malik AA, Aguolu OG, Willebrand KS, Omer SB. Perceptions of the
531 adult US population regarding the novel coronavirus outbreak. *PLoS One.* 2020;15(4):e0231808.
532 Epub 2020/04/18. doi: 10.1371/journal.pone.0231808. PubMed PMID: 32302370; PubMed
533 Central PMCID: PMC7164638.
- 534 19. Mobula LM, Samaha H, Yao M, Gueye AS, Diallo B, Umutoni C, et al.
535 Recommendations for the COVID-19 Response at the National Level Based on Lessons Learned
536 from the Ebola Virus Disease Outbreak in the Democratic Republic of the Congo. *Am J Trop*
537 *Med Hyg.* 2020;103(1):12-7. Epub 2020/05/21. doi: 10.4269/ajtmh.20-0256. PubMed PMID:
538 32431285; PubMed Central PMCID: PMC7356463.
- 539 20. Henderson J, Ward PR, Tonkin E, Meyer SB, Pillen H, McCullum D, et al. Developing
540 and Maintaining Public Trust During and Post-COVID-19: Can We Apply a Model Developed
541 for Responding to Food Scares? *Front Public Health.* 2020;8:369. Epub 2020/08/09. doi:
542 10.3389/fpubh.2020.00369. PubMed PMID: 32766202; PubMed Central PMCID:
543 PMC7381165.

- 544 21. Krause NM, Freiling I, Beets B, Brossard D. Fact-checking as risk communication: the
545 multi-layered risk of misinformation in times of COVID-19. *Journal of Risk Research*.
546 2020;23(7-8):1052-9. doi: 10.1080/13669877.2020.1756385.
- 547 22. Puri N, Coomes EA, Haghbayan H, Gunaratne K. Social media and vaccine hesitancy:
548 new updates for the era of COVID-19 and globalized infectious diseases. *Hum Vaccin*
549 *Immunother*. 2020;16(11):2586-93. Epub 2020/07/23. doi: 10.1080/21645515.2020.1780846.
550 PubMed PMID: 32693678; PubMed Central PMCID: PMC7733887.
- 551 23. Dror AA, Eisenbach N, Taiber S, Morozov NG, Mizrahi M, Zigran A, et al. Vaccine
552 hesitancy: the next challenge in the fight against COVID-19. *Eur J Epidemiol*. 2020;35(8):775-9.
553 Epub 2020/08/14. doi: 10.1007/s10654-020-00671-y. PubMed PMID: 32785815.
- 554 24. MacDonald NE, Hesitancy SWGoV. Vaccine hesitancy: Definition, scope and
555 determinants. *Vaccine*. 2015;33(34):4161-4. Epub 2015/04/22. doi:
556 10.1016/j.vaccine.2015.04.036. PubMed PMID: 25896383.
- 557 25. Virginia Department of Health. Daily COVID-19 Dashboard – Coronavirus Cases 2021.
558 Available from: [https://www.vdh.virginia.gov/coronavirus/coronavirus/covid-19-in-virginia-](https://www.vdh.virginia.gov/coronavirus/coronavirus/covid-19-in-virginia-cases/)
559 [cases/](https://www.vdh.virginia.gov/coronavirus/coronavirus/covid-19-in-virginia-cases/).
- 560 26. Sidersky R, Sauers E. College Campuses Have Been Sources of Massive COVID-19
561 Transmissions. Here’s How Schools Are Working to Reduce Outbreaks. *The Virginian-Pilot*.
562 2021.
- 563 27. Smith C, Hwang I, Binkley C. COVID-19 Infection Rates Soar in College Towns as
564 Students Return. Q13 Fox Seattle. 2020.
- 565 28. Thompson C, Domingo I. COVID-19 Infection Rates Soar in College Towns as Students
566 Return. WSET ABC 13 News. 2020.

- 567 29. Azlan AA, Hamzah MR, Sern TJ, Ayub SH, Mohamad E. Public knowledge, attitudes
568 and practices towards COVID-19: A cross-sectional study in Malaysia. *PLoS One*.
569 2020;15(5):e0233668. Epub 2020/05/22. doi: 10.1371/journal.pone.0233668. PubMed PMID:
570 32437434; PubMed Central PMCID: PMC7241824.
- 571 30. Barari S, Caria S, Davola A, Falco P, Fetzer T, Fiorin S, et al. Evaluating COVID-19
572 Public Health Messaging in Italy: Self-Reported Compliance and Growing Mental Health
573 Concerns. *MedRxiv* (preprint). 2020.
- 574 31. Benham JL, Lang R, Kovacs Burns K, MacKean G, Leveille T, McCormack B, et al.
575 Attitudes, current behaviours and barriers to public health measures that reduce COVID-19
576 transmission: A qualitative study to inform public health messaging. *PLoS One*.
577 2021;16(2):e0246941. Epub 2021/02/20. doi: 10.1371/journal.pone.0246941. PubMed PMID:
578 33606782; PubMed Central PMCID: PMC7895406.
- 579 32. Bonyan R, Al-Karasneh AF, El-Dahiyat F, Jairoun AA. Identification of the awareness
580 level by the public of Arab countries toward COVID-19: cross-sectional study following an
581 outbreak. *J Pharm Policy Pract*. 2020;13:43. Epub 2020/07/30. doi: 10.1186/s40545-020-00247-
582 x. PubMed PMID: 32724659; PubMed Central PMCID: PMC7360899.
- 583 33. Christensen SR, Pilling EB, Eyring JB, Dickerson G, Sloan CD, Magnusson BM.
584 Political and personal reactions to COVID-19 during initial weeks of social distancing in the
585 United States. *PLoS One*. 2020;15(9):e0239693. Epub 2020/09/25. doi:
586 10.1371/journal.pone.0239693. PubMed PMID: 32970761; PubMed Central PMCID:
587 PMC7514047.
- 588 34. McCaffery KJ, Dodd RH, Cvejic E, Ayrek J, Batcup C, Isautier JM, et al. Health literacy
589 and disparities in COVID-19-related knowledge, attitudes, beliefs and behaviours in Australia.

- 590 Public Health Res Pract. 2020;30(4). Epub 2020/12/10. doi: 10.17061/phrp30342012. PubMed
591 PMID: 33294907.
- 592 35. Sherman SM, Smith LE, Sim J, Amlot R, Cutts M, Dasch H, et al. COVID-19
593 vaccination intention in the UK: results from the COVID-19 vaccination acceptability study
594 (CoVAccS), a nationally representative cross-sectional survey. Hum Vaccin Immunother.
595 2021;17(6):1612-21. Epub 2020/11/27. doi: 10.1080/21645515.2020.1846397. PubMed PMID:
596 33242386; PubMed Central PMCID: PMCPMC8115754.
- 597 36. Wolf MS, Serper M, Opsasnick L, O'Connor RM, Curtis L, Benavente JY, et al.
598 Awareness, Attitudes, and Actions Related to COVID-19 Among Adults With Chronic
599 Conditions at the Onset of the U.S. Outbreak: A Cross-sectional Survey. Ann Intern Med.
600 2020;173(2):100-9. Epub 2020/04/10. doi: 10.7326/M20-1239. PubMed PMID: 32271861;
601 PubMed Central PMCID: PMCPMC7151355.
- 602 37. Taylor DB. A Timeline of the George Floyd Protests. The New York Times. 2021
603 03/12/2021.
- 604 38. Godoy M. Attending Protests? How To Keep From Spreading The Coronavirus At
605 Home: Shots - Health News: NPR. National Public Radio. 2020.
- 606 39. Huang P, Aubrey A. Even In Coronavirus Crisis, WHO Believes That Public Protests Are
607 Important: Goats and Soda: National Public Radio. 2020.
- 608 40. Carey B. Why Older People Managed to Stay Happier Through the Pandemic. The New
609 York Times. 2021 03/12/2021.
- 610 41. Roozenbeek J, Schneider CR, Dryhurst S, Kerr J, Freeman ALJ, Recchia G, et al.
611 Susceptibility to misinformation about COVID-19 around the world. R Soc Open Sci.

- 612 2020;7(10):201199. Epub 2020/11/19. doi: 10.1098/rsos.201199. PubMed PMID: 33204475;
613 PubMed Central PMCID: PMC7657933.
- 614 42. Baum M, Ognyanova K, Quintana A, Perlis R, Chwe H, editors. State of the Nation: A
615 50-State COVID-19 Survey: Report #14: Misinformation and Vaccine Acceptance2020.
- 616 43. Lee JJ, Kang KA, Wang MP, Zhao SZ, Wong JYH, O'Connor S, et al. Associations
617 Between COVID-19 Misinformation Exposure and Belief With COVID-19 Knowledge and
618 Preventive Behaviors: Cross-Sectional Online Study. *J Med Internet Res.* 2020;22(11):e22205.
619 Epub 2020/10/14. doi: 10.2196/22205. PubMed PMID: 33048825; PubMed Central PMCID:
620 PMC7669362.
- 621 44. Gatwood J, McKnight M, Fiscus M, Hohmeier KC, Chisholm-Burns M. Factors
622 influencing likelihood of COVID-19 vaccination: A survey of Tennessee adults. *Am J Health*
623 *Syst Pharm.* 2021;78(10):879-89. Epub 2021/05/07. doi: 10.1093/ajhp/zxab099. PubMed PMID:
624 33954426; PubMed Central PMCID: PMC7989652.
- 625 45. Khubchandani J, Sharma S, Price JH, Wiblishauser MJ, Sharma M, Webb FJ. COVID-19
626 Vaccination Hesitancy in the United States: A Rapid National Assessment. *J Community Health.*
627 2021;46(2):270-7. Epub 2021/01/04. doi: 10.1007/s10900-020-00958-x. PubMed PMID:
628 33389421; PubMed Central PMCID: PMC7778842.
- 629 46. Troiano G, Nardi A. Vaccine hesitancy in the era of COVID-19. *Public Health.*
630 2021;194:245-51. Epub 2021/05/10. doi: 10.1016/j.puhe.2021.02.025. PubMed PMID:
631 33965796; PubMed Central PMCID: PMC7931735.
- 632

Figure 1. Map of Survey Respondents by County in Virginia (N=3,307)





Figure 2. Where respondents received information that they trust about COVID-19, by participant characteristics.

2a. All respondents combined (N=3,472)



2b. By Gender (N=3,333)





Figure 3. Events impacting belief that COVID-19 was serious, by participant characteristics.

3a. Total (N=3,371)



3b. By Gender (N=3,300)




Figure 4. Messages that respondents believe and/or affected their behaviors (N=3,445).






Figure 5. Percent that believed one or more alternative messages*, by participant characteristics.


5a. By Gender (N=3,308)




5b. Age-group (N=3,314)




5c. By Race/Ethnicity (N=3,278)




5d. By Political Identity (N=3,273)



5e. By Education (N=3,325)



5f. By Income (N=3,123)



5g. By Region






Figure 6. Behavior changes in response to the pandemic and masking and distancing in public by participant characteristics.

6a. Behavior changes in response to the pandemic




■ Mask wearing ■ Distancing


6b. By Gender



6c. By Age-group



6d. By Race/Ethnicity



6e. Political Identity

