

Trust in the scientific research community predicts intent to comply with COVID-19 prevention measures: An analysis of a large-scale international survey dataset

Hyemin Han <sup>1\*</sup>

<sup>1\*</sup> Educational Psychology Program, University of Alabama

Tuscaloosa, Alabama, 35487, United States of America

[hyemin.han@ua.edu](mailto:hyemin.han@ua.edu)

ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-7181-2565>

Word Count (main text): 4,385 words (after revisions)

1 **Abstract**

2 In the present study, I explored the relationship between people’s trust in different agents  
3 related to prevention of spread of COVID-19 and their compliance with pharmaceutical and non-  
4 pharmaceutical preventive measures. The COVIDiSTRESSII Global Survey dataset, which was  
5 collected from international samples, was analysed to examine the aforementioned relationship  
6 across different countries. For data-driven exploration, network analysis and Bayesian  
7 generalized linear model (GLM) analysis were performed. The result from network analysis  
8 demonstrated that trust in the scientific research community was most central in the network of  
9 trust and compliance. In addition, the outcome from Bayesian GLM analysis indicated that the  
10 same factor, trust in the scientific research community, was most fundamental in predicting  
11 participants’ intent to comply with both pharmaceutical and non-pharmaceutical preventive  
12 measures. I briefly discussed the implications of the findings, the importance of trust in the  
13 scientific research community in explaining people’s compliance with measure to prevent spread  
14 of COVID-19.

15 **Introduction**

16 Since the onset of the current COVID-19 pandemic, different agents, including but not  
17 limited to, governments, organizations, and scientific communities, have been developing,  
18 implementing, and enforcing measures to prevent spread of COVID-19. Such measures embrace  
19 both pharmaceutical and non-pharmaceutical means. Since late 2020, there have been several  
20 COVID-19 vaccines approved for public use [1]. Even before approval of the first COVID-19  
21 vaccine, diverse non-pharmaceutical measures, such as mask use, social distancing, mandatory  
22 self-isolation, stay-at-home order, have been implemented and enforced [2]. Although the  
23 pandemic has not concluded, data collected so far suggests that implementation of such  
24 preventive measures have significantly contributed to prevention and mitigation of severe  
25 COVID-19 outbreaks [3,4].

26 Given the importance of preventive measures in prevention of spread of COVID-19,  
27 whether public is compliant with such measures would be critical in the current pandemic  
28 situation [5]. Even if diverse preventive measures that have been found to be effective are  
29 planned and implemented by agents, without people's compliance with the measures, successful  
30 control of the pandemic could not be achieved [6]. For instance, rejection of and noncompliance  
31 with the recommended and required preventive measures associated with political debates  
32 resulted in the recent drastic increase in COVID-19 cases and deaths caused by the Delta variant  
33 in multiple countries across the globe [5,7]. Hence, it would be important to understand which  
34 factors are involved in people's compliance as well as noncompliance with preventive measures.

35 Previous research has suggested that trust in agents addressing pandemic-related matters  
36 is one of the most fundamental factors predicting compliance with preventive measures [8]. For  
37 instance, several researchers have examined and reported significant association between trust in

38 governmental agents and organizations in the domain of health care (e.g., World Health  
39 Organization), and vaccination intent and compliance with non-pharmaceutical preventive  
40 measures [9–11]. Furthermore, trust in science and scientific research communities, which play  
41 fundamental roles in developing preventive measures and proposing guidelines based on  
42 evidence, has also been considered as a central factor in predicting compliance [12,13]. This  
43 would be particularly important within the context of the current pandemic, because spread of  
44 misinformation and conspiracy theories, which are closely associated with distrust in science and  
45 particularly problematic in recent days, drives people’s tendency to disobey mandatory  
46 preventive measures and vaccination requirement [14].

47         Although the aforementioned previous studies have examined the importance of trust in  
48 compliance with preventive measures, several limitations would warrant further investigations.  
49 First, the majority of the previous studies was conducted with datasets collected from single or a  
50 limited number of countries. Given the current COVID-19 pandemic is a global issue [15], it  
51 would be necessary to collect data across diverse countries in examining the mechanism of  
52 compliance tendency. Such relatively small-scale research based on data from a small number of  
53 countries might not be sufficient to draw conclusions that can be well generalizable across the  
54 globe.

55         Second, in terms of methodology, the previous studies employed conventional analysis  
56 methods, which are based on frequentist perspective; such conventional methods are suitable to  
57 test one specific null hypothesis and/or model, but not ideal for model exploration [16]. For  
58 instance, if we are primarily interested which trust factor is central in prediction of compliance  
59 tendency, the previous studies employing conventional methods might not be able to address our  
60 interest in a complete manner. In fact, exploration of the best prediction model among multiple

61 competing candidate models requires analysis methods specialized in data-driven analysis, in  
62 lieu of conventional hypothesis-driven analysis [17]. Thus, the findings from the previous studies  
63 that primarily focused on trust in specific agents and used conventional methods would not show  
64 us the full picture of how trust in different agents is associated with compliance with different  
65 types of preventive measures. Of course, data-driven analysis has limitations, so we need to be  
66 careful while employing the approach [41]. Because data-driven analysis is performed without  
67 being guided by specific theory, results from the analysis should be interpreted with caution. If a  
68 researcher does not refer to relevant theory while interpreting results, the researcher may make a  
69 spurious conclusion. Hence, results shall be carefully interpreted while considering their  
70 theoretical implications [41]. It would also be desirable to re-test the results from data-driven  
71 analysis [42]. For example, a model identified through data-driven analysis might inform  
72 additional hypothesis-driven analysis.

### 73 **Current Study**

74 In the current study, how people's trust in different agents predicts their intent to  
75 compliance with preventive measures and get vaccinated within the context of the COVID-19  
76 pandemic will be examined in a data-driven manner with a large-scale international survey  
77 dataset to address the aforementioned limitations in the prior research. Unlike the previous  
78 studies employing conventional analysis methods, which are suitable for one null-hypothesis  
79 testing, I intend to explore which trust factor is particularly important in predicting compliance  
80 by exploring the large-scale dataset, the COVIDiSTRESSII Global Survey dataset [18], with  
81 data-driven analysis methods.

82 To conduct the data-driven exploration, I plan to implement two novel analysis methods.  
83 First, network analysis will be performed to explore how trust in different agents and compliance

84 with different types of preventive measures are associated with each other. In this exploration, I  
85 intend to examine which factor is positioned in the most central and influential position in the  
86 network [19]. Second, I will explore the best model predicting compliance with different types of  
87 preventive measures with Bayesian model exploration [20]. Through this process, all possible  
88 candidate regression models in terms of all possible combinations of trust in different agents will  
89 be tested, and the most probable model given data will be identified. Finally, based on results  
90 from the aforementioned processes employing data-driven methods, I will examine which trust  
91 factors are relatively more important in predicting their compliance with preventive measures  
92 across different countries. While interpreting the results, I intend to refer to previous studies  
93 addressing topics related to trust and compliance to address the previously mentioned limitation  
94 of data-driven analysis.

## 95 **Methods**

### 96 **Dataset**

97 In the present study, I analysed the COVIDiSTRESSII Global Survey dataset, which was  
98 collected by the COVIDiSTRESS Global Survey Consortium and is available to public via the  
99 Open Science Framework (<https://osf.io/36tsd>). Originally, the data was collected from 20,601  
100 participants from 62 countries. However, as I employed mixed-effects model analysis to include  
101 the between-country effect in analysis, to prevent potential convergence issue [8,21], only data  
102 collected from countries where 100 or more participants completed the survey was used in the  
103 present study. As a result, I analyzed a subset of the data collected from 14,349 participants from  
104 35 countries. Demographics of the participants included in the subset is presented in Table 1.

105 Further details about data collection and cleaning procedures are explained in the project  
106 page (<https://osf.io/36tsd>). All procedures regarding data collection and informed consent were

107 reviewed and approved by the Research, Enterprise and Engagement Ethical Approval Panel at  
108 University of Salford (approval number: 1632) where the project manager of the consortium was  
109 affiliated during the data collection period. The author asserts that all procedures contributing to  
110 this work comply with the ethical standards of the relevant institutional committee on human  
111 experimentation and with the Helsinki Declaration of 1975, as revised in 2008.

## 112 **Measures**

113 The employed items were developed by the COVIDiSTRESS Global Survey Consortium  
114 members. They were translated and back translated by the consortium members from different  
115 countries. Further details about the measures are described in the survey project page  
116 (<https://osf.io/36tsd>).

### 117 ***Trust Items***

118 Trust in seven different agents related to development, implementation, and/or  
119 enforcement of preventive measures against COVID-19 was surveyed. Participants were asked to  
120 what extent they trust each agent based on their general impression. The seven agents were: a  
121 parliament or government (Trust 1); police (Trust 2); civic service (Trust 3); health system (Trust  
122 4); WHO (Trust 5); government's effort to handle Coronavirus (Trust 6); and scientific research  
123 community (Trust 7). Participants' responses were anchored to an eleven-point Likert-type Scale  
124 (0: no trust—10: complete trust).

### 125 ***Compliance Intent Items***

126 Participants' intent to comply with eight different types of preventive measures was also  
127 surveyed. First, in the domain of pharmaceutical measures, one item, "How willing are you to  
128 get the vaccine if one becomes available to you?" was presented to assess their intent to get

129 vaccinated (Compliance 1). Participants' responses to this item were anchored to five-point  
130 Likert scale (1: not willing at all—5: very willing).

131         Second, in the case of compliance with non-pharmaceutical preventive measures,  
132 compliance with seven different types of measures was surveyed. Participants were asked to  
133 what extent they were compliant with each measure during the last month. The seven surveyed  
134 measures were: washing hands regularly (Compliance 2); wearing a face covering in public  
135 when indoors (Compliance 3); wearing a face covering in public when outdoors (Compliance 4);  
136 staying at least the recommended distance (Compliance 5); staying at home unless going out for  
137 essential reasons (Compliance 6); self-isolating if you suspected that you had been in contact  
138 with the virus (Compliance 7); staying away from crowded places generally (Compliance 8).  
139 Answers to the items were anchored to a seven-point Likert scale (1: strongly disagree—7:  
140 strongly agree).

#### 141 ***Demographics***

142         Following previous studies examining behavioural and psychological responses to  
143 COVID-19 using international survey datasets [8,15,20], several demographic variables were  
144 also employed as control variables in the present study. I used participants' age, gender, and  
145 education level in analysis. Participants' gender was surveyed by presenting three options:  
146 female; male; other or would rather not say. The survey presented seven options to ask  
147 participants' education level: PhD or doctorate; university degree (e.g., MA, MSc, BA, BSc);  
148 some university or equivalent (still ongoing, or completed a module or more, but did not  
149 graduate); up to 12 years of school; up to 9 years of school; up to 6 years of school; none.



150 **Analysis Plan**

151 *Network Analysis*

152 To examine the overall association between responses to the seven trust and eight  
153 compliance items, I conducted network analysis with *bootnet R* package. The main purpose of  
154 network analysis is to demonstrate associations between nodes, trust and compliance in the case  
155 of the present study. A connection between two specific node is defined as an edge, which has a  
156 weight representing the strength of the association [22]. An edge weight is quantified in term of  
157 partial correlation between two nodes by *bootnet*. As an illustrative example, in the case of the  
158 edge between Trust 1 and Compliance 1, the edge weight can be understood in terms of  
159 correlation between Trust 1 and Compliance 1 after controlling for correlation with all other  
160 items in the same network (i.e., Trust 2 ... Compliance 8). In a network plot, which visualizes  
161 the result of network analysis, an edge between two nodes is presented in the format of a line  
162 with a specific thickness, which represents its edge weight, the strength of the association.

163 While exploring a partial correlation network, *bootnet* employs one technique, graphical  
164 LASSO (GLASSO), to identify a regularized partial correlation network through penalizing  
165 spurious edge weights [19]. Implementation of GLASSO is required to minimize false positives  
166 that may exist in a network of interest. For instance, we can imagine that there is no true non-  
167 zero partial correlation between two specific nodes. In the reality, possibly due to noise and/or  
168 measurement error, even after controlling for association with other nodes, the edge weight  
169 between the two nodes could not exactly become zero, although that is a false positive [19]. Such  
170 spurious edge weights can be excluded by GLASSO. Moreover, use of such a penalization  
171 method can contribute to prevention of model overfitting [17,23]. Hence, in the present study

172 *bootnet* identified the best network model with the smallest extended Bayesian Information  
173 Criterion (EBIC) value to penalize unnecessarily complex and spurious network edge structures.

174       Once a partial correlation network model was identified with GLASSO, I performed  
175 centrality analysis to examine which node located at the most central and influential position in  
176 the network. For this purpose, three indicators resulting from centrality analysis, i.e., strength,  
177 closeness, and betweenness, were examined for each node [24]. Strength is calculated by  
178 summing the absolute values of association strengths, edge weights, of a specific node.  
179 Closeness is defined in terms of the inverse of summed distances from one specific node to the  
180 other nodes in the same network. Finally, betweenness is estimated in terms of how many times  
181 one specific node is in the shortest path between two other nodes in the whole network. In the  
182 present study, I examined which node reported the highest strength, closeness, and betweenness  
183 values.

#### 184 ***Bayesian Model Exploration***

185       To examine the best regression model predicting each compliance variable with trust  
186 variables, I conducted Bayesian model selection with the Bayesian generalized linear model  
187 (GLM) implemented in *BayesFactor* R package. Unlike conventional regression analysis based  
188 on frequentist perspective, Bayesian regression analysis enables us to examine to what extent  
189 evidence supports a regression model of interest [25]. In the case of conventional regression  
190 analysis, only one model can be tested each time, and the resultant *p*-values can only inform us  
191 whether a null hypothesis (e.g., whether a null model is the case) shall be rejected [26]. Thus, if  
192 our interest is exploration of the best model among all possible candidate models, conventional  
193 regression analysis could not be an ideal solution.

194 Bayesian analysis can provide us with more direct information about whether a specific  
195 hypothesis of interest is likely to be accepted given evidence [26]; in the same vein, we can also  
196 learn about to what extent a specific model is more likely to be the case compared with other  
197 candidate models given evidence as well [27]. Once Bayesian GLM is performed with  
198 *BayesFactor*, we can examine the Bayes Factor ( $BF_{M_0}$ ) of each model quantifying to what extent  
199 the model of interest, Model M, is more strongly supported by data compared with a null model  
200 (Model 0) [25]. In the present study,  $2\log(BF_{M_0})$  was used for result interpretation. Statistical  
201 guidelines suggest that  $2\log(BF_{M_0}) \geq 3$  indicates presence of positive evidence supporting Model  
202 M against Model 0,  $2\log(BF_{M_0}) \geq 6$  presence of strong evidence, and  $2\log(BF_{M_0}) \geq 10$  presence of  
203 very strong evidence. When  $2\log(BF_{M_0}) < 3$ , I concluded that evidence is merely trivial or  
204 anecdotal [26].

205 Given the methodological and epistemological benefits of Bayesian analysis, I conducted  
206 Bayesian GLM analysis for each compliance dependent variable to identify which trust  
207 predictors shall be included in the best regression model [20]. For each dependent variable, I  
208 used seven trust variables as candidate predictors, the country as a random effect, and  
209 demographic variables as control variables. All trust and compliance variables were standardized  
210 at the country level for better convergence, and more straightforward interpretation and  
211 comparison of estimated coefficients. Through the process, all possible 128 candidate models,  
212 which were created in terms of all possible combinations of seven trust predictors ( $2^{(7+1)}$ ), were  
213 estimated and their  $BF_{M_0}$  were calculated [28]. I identified the best model with the highest  $BF_{M_0}$   
214 value. Furthermore, I also compared the identified best model and the full model including all  
215 seven trust predictors by calculating  $BF_{MF}$ , a BF value indicating to what extent evidence more  
216 strongly supported the best model against the full model. In general, a full model including all

217 candidate predictors is tested and evaluated by resultant  $p$ -values in conventional regression  
218 analysis [16], so I compared the full model with the best model suggested from Bayesian GLM  
219 analysis. For both  $BF_{M0}$  and  $BF_{MF}$ , I calculated  $2\log(BF)$  values for interpretation. To examine  
220 whether the inclusion of the selected covariates significantly altered the outcomes, I performed  
221 Bayesian GLM analysis without the covariates. I compared identified best models with results  
222 from Bayesian GLM analysis with versus without covariates.

223 Furthermore, I performed mixed-effects analysis with the indicated best model with  
224 *lmerTest* and *brms* R packages. This additional analysis was conducted to examine the effect size  
225 of each trust variable included in the best models. Although all predictors included in the best  
226 models might be statistically significant in terms of  $p$ -values, such a significance is perhaps due  
227 to a large sample size even if an actual effect is nearly zero or trivial in a practical manner [26].  
228 Effect sizes were calculated in terms of Cohen's  $D$  values with *EMAtools* R package after  
229 performing multilevel modelling with *lmerTest*. In this process, for each dependent compliance  
230 variable, I employed trust variables that were identified to be included in the best models as  
231 predictors, the country as a random effect, and demographic variables as control variables. Then,  
232 the resultant  $D$  values were interpreted qualitatively as well as quantitatively. For qualitative  
233 interpretation, following [29]'s guidelines, I assumed that a Cohen's  $D$  value within the range of  
234  $-.10$  and  $+.10$  as an indicator of a practically non or trivial effect.

235 In addition to the qualitative interpretation of effect sizes, I also conducted Bayesian  
236 multilevel modelling with *brms* for quantitative interpretation. The same mixed-effects model  
237 analysed with *lmerTest* was tested with *brms* for each compliance variable. In this process, I  
238 employed the default Cauchy prior, Cauchy (0, 1), suggested by [30] following the previous  
239 studies [8,21]. After conducting Bayesian multilevel modelling for each dependent variable, the

240 result was analysed with *bayestestR* package for Bayesian quantitative interpretation of effect  
241 sizes. I estimated to what extent the 95% highest density interval (HDI) of the posterior  
242 distribution of each trust predictor was within the region of practical equivalence (ROPE)  
243 [31,32]. A 95% HDI means an interval that “any parameter value inside the HDI has higher  
244 probability density than any value outside the HDI, and the total probability of values in the 95%  
245 HDI is 95% [31] (p. 271)”. If 100% of the HDI falls inside the defined ROPE, then the most  
246 credible (95%) values of the effect size are completely within the regions of trivial effect, so  
247 accepting a null hypothesis (e.g., the effect does not significantly differ from zero) becomes  
248 practically reasonable. In this context, a ROPE means a range of a parameter of interest that shall  
249 be considered practically near-zero or trivial [32]. Since the guideline that I employed stated that  
250  $-.10 \leq D \leq .10$  indicates zero or trivial effect [29], I set  $[-.10 .10]$  as the ROPE for this  
251 quantitative interpretation. By following these steps, I examined to what extent the estimated  
252 posterior value of the effect size of each trust predictor in each best model was within the defined  
253 ROPE.

## 254 Results

### 255 Network Analysis

256 Figure 1 is a network plot demonstrating connectivity between seven trust and eight  
257 compliance items in the best network model with the lowest EBIC value identified by *bootnet*.  
258 Figure 2 shows the result of centrality analysis. In this plot, three centrality indicators, strength,  
259 closeness, and betweenness of each node, were presented. All three indicators unequivocally  
260 suggest that Trust 7, trust in the scientific research community, is most central in the analysed  
261 network.

## 262 **Bayesian Model Exploration**

263 Table 2 demonstrates the results from Bayesian model exploration via Bayesian GLM  
264 analysis. The outcome of Bayesian GLM analysis with each compliance dependent variable was  
265 presented in each row. Only the coefficients and effect sizes of trust predictors that were  
266 included in each best model were presented in Table 2. In addition, the same table reports the  
267 proportion of the 95% HDI of each survived trust predictor within the defined ROPE, [-.10 .10].

268 In terms of  $BF_{M0}$  and  $BF_{MF}$ , all best models identified by Bayesian GLM analysis, except  
269 for the best model predicting vaccination intent (Compliance 1), were supported by very strong  
270 evidence compared with both the null and full models. In the case of Compliance 1, the full  
271 model including all seven trust predictors was identified as the best model.

272 When the best models identified with versus without covariates were compared, in the  
273 cases of Compliance 1, 3, 4, 6, and 8, there was no significant change. When Compliance 2 was  
274 examined, the best model identified without covariates included Trust 2, 4, and 7 as predictors.  
275 In the case of Compliance 5, the predictors in the best model without covariates were Trust 2, 5,  
276 6, and 7. When the best model predicting Compliance 7 was explored without covariates, Trust  
277 2, 5, 6, and 7 were identified as predictors. Although the best models changed in these cases, in  
278 the cases of Compliance 2 and 7, the originally identified best models with covariates were not  
279 significantly worse given  $2\log(BF) < 3$ . Only in the case of Compliance 5, the best model  
280 identified with covariates was significantly but not very different from that identified without  
281 covariates,  $2\log(BF) = 4.09$ .

## 282 **Discussion**

283 In the present study, first, I conducted network analysis to understand association  
284 between participants' trust in seven different agents addressing the COVID-19 pandemic and

285 their intent to comply with eight different types of preventive measures. Second, Bayesian GLM  
286 analysis was performed to explore the best model predicting each compliance intent variable  
287 with trust predictors. From network analysis, robust connectivity between trust and compliance  
288 variables even after penalizing unnecessary edge features via GLASSO was demonstrated in the  
289 visualized network plot. Among all nodes, including both all seven trust and eight compliance  
290 variables, Trust 7, trust in the scientific research community, was found to be most central in the  
291 network according to all three centrality indicators, strength, closeness, and betweenness. The  
292 similar trend was also reported from Bayesian GLM analysis to identify the best model  
293 predicting each compliance variable. Although several other trust variables were included in the  
294 identified best models, only Trust 7 was included in all eight best prediction models. Such a  
295 trend was consistent even when Bayesian GLM analysis was conducted without covariates.  
296 Although I found the significant model change in the case of Compliance 5, the significance of  
297 Trust 7 in prediction was consistently supported. Furthermore, in terms of the Cohen's *D* and  
298 proportion of the 95% HDI within the [-.10 .10] ROPE [29,31,32], Trust 7 reported the greatest  
299 effect size, which was most likely to be out of the region of near-zero or trivial effect, compared  
300 with all six other trust predictors.

301 The findings suggest that in predicting people's intent to comply with both  
302 pharmaceutical (e.g., vaccination) and non-pharmaceutical measures to prevent spread of  
303 COVID-19 (e.g., hand washing, mask use, social distancing, self-isolation), trust in scientific  
304 research and the community of scientists play the most fundamental role in the prediction  
305 compared with trust in other agents, e.g., government, healthcare system, health organization  
306 [12,13]. Given that such measures were primarily tested and suggested by scientific studies with  
307 empirical evidence, even if their implementation and enforcement are tasks to be done by other

308 agents, trust in science is expected to make the greatest, fundamental influence on people's  
309 compliance [33]. Hence, if people do not have robust trust in scientific research regarding  
310 COVID-19, then they are unlikely to abide by preventive measures implemented by governments  
311 and health-related organizations [13].

312         Given the prevalence of distrust in science, which is being closely linked to widespread  
313 of misinformation and conspiracy theories [34], within the current situation, the potential reason  
314 of why such distrust contributing to noncompliance with preventive measures would be worth  
315 consideration. [35] argued that epistemological doubts and ontological insecurity about scientific  
316 knowledge shared within the modern society has promoted and reinforced conspiracy theories  
317 and then challenged trust in science among public. A trend related to widespread conspiracy  
318 theories and distrust in science is also influential in the current pandemic situation [14].

319 Conspiracy theories and distrust in science regarding COVID-19 have been promoted by  
320 political motive and ideology, authoritarianism, and extremism in particular, and resulted in  
321 distrust in scientific evidence supporting preventive measures, and finally, rejection of and  
322 noncompliance with recommended preventive measures [34,36]. Furthermore, lack of rational  
323 deliberation and reflection upon information and messages is also reported to relate to  
324 acceptance of conspiracy theories and distrust in science, which eventually cause noncompliance  
325 [37].

326         Therefore, if researchers and policy makers are interested in promoting people's  
327 compliance with preventive measures, which are suggested and supported by scientific research,  
328 they need to consider how to promote people's trust in scientific research and scientists.  
329 Although consideration of concrete solutions for promoting trust in science in public is out of the  
330 scope of the current study, let me list a couple of possible starting points. Educators may start



331 with improving science education to educate science-informed citizens who are capable of  
332 rationally evaluating and accepting knowledge and information around them in a scientific  
333 manner [38]. Moreover, it would be possible to examine how to improve science communication  
334 with public, which improve people's understanding and perception on science [39]. Because  
335 many of the current social issues related to noncompliance with COVID-19 preventive measures  
336 have been emerged from and reinforced by misinformation shared through diverse forms of  
337 media, improvement of science communication would be required to address the issues [40].

338         We may consider several strengths of the present study and how it could make significant  
339 contributions to literature. First, a large-scale international survey dataset, the COVIDiSTRESSII  
340 Global Survey dataset, was analysed instead of a relatively small-size dataset collected from a  
341 limited number of countries. Because the COVID-19 pandemic is a global issue, findings from  
342 the current study will be able to provide researchers and policy makers across the globe with  
343 useful insights about how to promote people's compliance with preventive measures based on  
344 generalizable evidence from a cross-national investigation. Second, I explored the overall  
345 association between compliance and trust in different agents instead of testing specific  
346 hypotheses. With novel quantitative methods, network analysis and Bayesian GLM analysis, I  
347 was able to demonstrate that trust in scientific research is most influential and fundamental in  
348 predicting compliance.

349         However, several limitations in the present study may warrant further investigations.  
350 First, while collecting data regarding compliance, the project consortium employed the self-  
351 report method for the feasibility of the global survey project. Hence, whether the reported  
352 compliance intent predicts compliance behaviour in the reality could be questionable. Second,  
353 we only employed demographical variables as covariates, although previous research suggested

354 other potential factors, e.g., political orientation, religiosity, significantly associated with  
355 people's trust in science as well as compliance with preventive measures [14]. Third, only one  
356 item per trust in each specific agent or compliance with each specific preventive measure was  
357 employed in the survey. Because the consortium was not able to use multiple items per construct  
358 due to the feasibility issue, the psychometrical aspects of the trust and compliance items could  
359 not be tested in a complete manner. Thus, future studies shall employ more direct measures for  
360 compliance and additional covariates, and conduct psychometrics tests by employing multiple  
361 items per construct to address the limitations in the current study.

### 362 **Data Availability Statement**

363 The data and codes that support the findings of this study are openly available in the  
364 Open Science Framework project page (<https://doi.org/10.17605/OSF.IO/Y4KGH>).

### 365 **Financial support**

366 This research received no specific grant from any funding agency, commercial or not-for-  
367 profit sectors.

### 368 **Conflicts of Interest**

369 Conflicts of Interest: None.

### 370 **References**

- 371 1. **Tregoning JS, et al.** Progress of the COVID-19 vaccine effort: viruses, vaccines and  
372 variants versus efficacy, effectiveness and escape. *Nature Reviews Immunology* 2021;  
373 **21**Published online: October 9, 2021.doi:10.1038/s41577-021-00592-1.
- 374 2. **Perra N.** Non-pharmaceutical interventions during the COVID-19 pandemic: A review.  
375 *Physics Reports* 2021; **913**Published online: May  
376 2021.doi:10.1016/j.physrep.2021.02.001.

- 377 3. **Dagan N, et al.** BNT162b2 mRNA Covid-19 Vaccine in a Nationwide Mass Vaccination  
378 Setting. *New England Journal of Medicine* 2021; **384**Published online: April 15,  
379 2021.doi:10.1056/NEJMoa2101765.
- 380 4. **Flaxman S, et al.** Estimating the effects of non-pharmaceutical interventions on COVID-  
381 19 in Europe. *Nature* 2020; **584**Published online: August 13, 2020.doi:10.1038/s41586-  
382 020-2405-7.
- 383 5. **Gao J, Radford BJ.** Death by political party: The relationship between COVID-19 deaths  
384 and political party affiliation in the United States. *World Medical & Health Policy* 2021;  
385 **13**Published online: June 5, 2021.doi:10.1002/wmh3.435.
- 386 6. **Borchering RK, et al.** Modeling of Future COVID-19 Cases, Hospitalizations, and  
387 Deaths, by Vaccination Rates and Nonpharmaceutical Intervention Scenarios — United  
388 States, April–September 2021. *MMWR. Morbidity and Mortality Weekly Report* 2021;  
389 **70**Published online: May 14, 2021.doi:10.15585/mmwr.mm7019e3.
- 390 7. **Freira L, et al.** The interplay between partisanship, forecasted COVID-19 deaths, and  
391 support for preventive policies. *Humanities and Social Sciences Communications* 2021;  
392 **8**Published online: December 3, 2021.doi:10.1057/s41599-021-00870-2.
- 393 8. **Lieberoth A, et al.** Stress and worry in the 2020 coronavirus pandemic: Relationships to  
394 trust and compliance with preventive measures across 48 countries. *Royal Society Open*  
395 *Science* 2021; **8**: 200589.
- 396 9. **Bargain O, Aminjonov U.** Trust and compliance to public health policies in times of  
397 COVID-19. *Journal of Public Economics* 2020; **192**Published online: December  
398 2020.doi:10.1016/j.jpubeco.2020.104316.

- 399 10. **Lalot F, et al.** The dangers of distrustful complacency: Low concern and low political  
400 trust combine to undermine compliance with governmental restrictions in the emerging  
401 Covid-19 pandemic. *Group Processes & Intergroup Relations* 2020; Published online:  
402 October 30, 2020.doi:10.1177/1368430220967986.
- 403 11. **Chan HF, et al.** How confidence in health care systems affects mobility and compliance  
404 during the COVID-19 pandemic. *PLOS ONE* 2020; **15**Published online: October 15,  
405 2020.doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0240644.
- 406 12. **Plohl N, Musil B.** Modeling compliance with COVID-19 prevention guidelines: the  
407 critical role of trust in science. *Psychology, Health & Medicine* 2021; **26**Published online:  
408 January 2, 2021.doi:10.1080/13548506.2020.1772988.
- 409 13. **Bicchieri C, et al.** In science we (should) trust: Expectations and compliance across nine  
410 countries during the COVID-19 pandemic. *PLOS ONE* 2021; **16**Published online: June 4,  
411 2021.doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0252892.
- 412 14. **Rutjens BT, van der Linden S, van der Lee R.** Science skepticism in times of COVID-  
413 19. *Group Processes & Intergroup Relations* 2021; **24**Published online: February 4,  
414 2021.doi:10.1177/1368430220981415.
- 415 15. **Yamada Y, et al.** COVIDiSTRESS Global Survey dataset on psychological and  
416 behavioural consequences of the COVID-19 outbreak. *Scientific Data* 2021; **8**: 3.
- 417 16. **Han H, Dawson KJ.** Improved model exploration for the relationship between moral  
418 foundations and moral judgment development using Bayesian Model Averaging. *Journal*  
419 *of Moral Education* 2021; Published online: 2021.doi:10.1080/03057240.2020.1863774.

- 420 17. **McNeish DM.** Using Lasso for Predictor Selection and to Assuage Overfitting: A Method  
421 Long Overlooked in Behavioral Sciences. *Multivariate Behavioral Research* 2015; **50**:  
422 471–484.
- 423 18. **Blackburn AM, et al.** *COVIDiSTRESS diverse dataset on psychological and behavioural*  
424 *outcomes one year into the COVID-19 pandemic.* 2021.doi: 10.31219/osf.io/428pz
- 425 19. **Epskamp S, Fried EI.** A tutorial on regularized partial correlation networks.  
426 *Psychological Methods* 2018; **23**Published online: December  
427 2018.doi:10.1037/met0000167.
- 428 20. **Han H.** Exploring the association between compliance with measures to prevent the  
429 spread of COVID-19 and big five traits with Bayesian generalized linear model.  
430 *Personality and Individual Differences* 2021; **176**: 110787.
- 431 21. **Rachev NR, et al.** Replicating the Disease framing problem during the 2020 COVID-19  
432 pandemic: A study of stress, worry, trust, and choice under risk. *PLOS ONE* 2021;  
433 **16**Published online: September 10, 2021.doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0257151.
- 434 22. **Dalege J, et al.** Network Analysis on Attitudes. *Social Psychological and Personality*  
435 *Science* 2017; **8**Published online: July 10, 2017.doi:10.1177/1948550617709827.
- 436 23. **Han H, Dawson KJ.** Applying elastic-net regression to identify the best models  
437 predicting changes in civic purpose during the emerging adulthood. *Journal of*  
438 *Adolescence* 2021; **93**Published online: December  
439 2021.doi:10.1016/j.adolescence.2021.09.011.
- 440 24. **Opsahl T, Agneessens F, Skvoretz J.** Node centrality in weighted networks:  
441 Generalizing degree and shortest paths. *Social Networks* 2010; **32**Published online: July  
442 2010.doi:10.1016/j.socnet.2010.03.006.

- 443 25. **Wagenmakers E-J, et al.** Bayesian inference for psychology. Part II: Example  
444 applications with JASP. *Psychonomic Bulletin & Review* 2018; **25**: 58–76.
- 445 26. **Han H, Park J, Thoma SJ.** Why do we need to employ Bayesian statistics and how can  
446 we employ it in studies of moral education?: With practical guidelines to use JASP for  
447 educators and researchers. *Journal of Moral Education* 2018; **47**: 519–537.
- 448 27. **Dawson KJ, Han H, Choi YR.** How are moral foundations associated with empathic  
449 traits and moral identity? *Current Psychology* 2021; Published online: October 12,  
450 2021.doi:10.1007/s12144-021-02372-5.
- 451 28. **Gronau QF, et al.** *A Simple Method for Comparing Complex Models: Bayesian Model*  
452 *Comparison for Hierarchical Multinomial Processing Tree Models using Warp-III Bridge*  
453 *Sampling*. 2017.
- 454 29. **Funder DC, Ozer DJ.** Evaluating Effect Size in Psychological Research: Sense and  
455 Nonsense. *Advances in Methods and Practices in Psychological Science* 2019; **2**Published  
456 online: June 8, 2019.doi:10.1177/2515245919847202.
- 457 30. **Rouder JN, Morey RD.** Default Bayes Factors for Model Selection in Regression.  
458 *Multivariate Behavioral Research* 2012; **47**: 877–903.
- 459 31. **Kruschke JK.** Rejecting or Accepting Parameter Values in Bayesian Estimation.  
460 *Advances in Methods and Practices in Psychological Science* 2018; **1**Published online:  
461 June 8, 2018.doi:10.1177/2515245918771304.
- 462 32. **Makowski D, Ben-Shachar M, Lüdtke D.** bayestestR: Describing Effects and their  
463 Uncertainty, Existence and Significance within the Bayesian Framework. *Journal of Open*  
464 *Source Software* 2019; **4**Published online: August 13, 2019.doi:10.21105/joss.01541.

- 465 33. **Nicola M, et al.** Evidence based management guideline for the COVID-19 pandemic -  
466 Review article. *International Journal of Surgery* 2020; **77**Published online: May  
467 2020.doi:10.1016/j.ijssu.2020.04.001.
- 468 34. **Milošević Đorđević J, et al.** Links between conspiracy beliefs, vaccine knowledge, and  
469 trust: Anti-vaccine behavior of Serbian adults. *Social Science & Medicine* 2021;  
470 **277**Published online: May 2021.doi:10.1016/j.socscimed.2021.113930.
- 471 35. **Aupers S.** ‘Trust no one’: Modernization, paranoia and conspiracy culture. *European*  
472 *Journal of Communication* 2012; **27**Published online: March 29,  
473 2012.doi:10.1177/02673231111433566.
- 474 36. **Tonković M, et al.** Who Believes in COVID-19 Conspiracy Theories in Croatia?  
475 Prevalence and Predictors of Conspiracy Beliefs. *Frontiers in Psychology* 2021;  
476 **12**Published online: June 18, 2021.doi:10.3389/fpsyg.2021.643568.
- 477 37. **Sutton RM, Douglas KM.** Conspiracy theories and the conspiracy mindset: implications  
478 for political ideology. *Current Opinion in Behavioral Sciences* 2020; **34**Published online:  
479 August 2020.doi:10.1016/j.cobeha.2020.02.015.
- 480 38. **Fensham PJ.** Scepticism and trust: two counterpoint essentials in science education for  
481 complex socio-scientific issues. *Cultural Studies of Science Education* 2014; **9**Published  
482 online: September 6, 2014.doi:10.1007/s11422-013-9560-1.
- 483 39. **Bubela T, et al.** Science communication reconsidered. *Nature Biotechnology* 2009;  
484 **27**Published online: June 2009.doi:10.1038/nbt0609-514.
- 485 40. **Mheidly N, Fares J.** Leveraging media and health communication strategies to overcome  
486 the COVID-19 infodemic. *Journal of Public Health Policy* 2020; **41**Published online:  
487 December 21, 2020.doi:10.1057/s41271-020-00247-w.

- 488 41. **Mazzocchi F.** Could Big Data be the end of theory in science? A few remarks on the  
489 epistemology of data-driven science. *EMBO Reports* 2015; **16**: 1250-1255.
- 490 42. **Raghu VK, et al.** Integrated Theory- and Data-driven Feature Selection in Gene  
491 Expression Data Analysis. *2017 IEEE 33rd International Conference on Data*  
492 *Engineering (ICDE)* 2017.doi: 10.1109/ICDE.2017.223
- 493
- 494



## Tables

495

496 **Table 1:**497 **Demographics of the whole dataset and each country**

	N	Age		Gender			Education level						
		M	SD	Female	Male	Other/ Would rather not say	Doctorate	University	University or equivalent	≤ 12 years	≤ 9 years	≤ 6 years	None
All	14,349	36.56	14.48	67.52%	31.55%	.93%	6.03%	47.65%	26.71%	16.19%	2.33%	.49%	.60%
Bolivia	115	39.56	11.23	65.22%	34.78%	.00%	13.91%	72.17%	13.91%	.00%	.00%	.00%	.00%
Bosnia and Herzegovina	109	39.85	11.51	76.15%	23.85%	.00%	13.89%	65.74%	7.41%	12.04%	.00%	.93%	.00%
Brazil	448	38.56	13.22	72.32%	27.23%	.45%	15.18%	66.07%	15.40%	3.35%	.00%	.00%	.00%
Bulgaria	299	41.47	16.74	73.58%	25.75%	.67%	6.04%	50.67%	32.55%	10.40%	.00%	.00%	.34%
Colombia	548	40.04	12.63	67.88%	31.57%	.55%	5.67%	77.15%	11.52%	4.20%	.73%	.37%	.37%
Costa Rica	270	35.92	10.37	69.63%	29.26%	1.11%	1.11%	78.15%	14.81%	3.70%	1.85%	.37%	.00%
Czech Republic	365	34.14	11.31	70.68%	27.95%	1.37%	5.75%	46.03%	31.51%	16.44%	.00%	.27%	.00%
Denmark	127	42.30	10.59	61.42%	38.58%	.00%	11.81%	57.48%	23.62%	2.36%	1.57%	3.15%	.00%
Ecuador	291	31.78	10.80	66.32%	32.99%	.69%	2.75%	69.76%	22.68%	3.44%	.69%	.34%	.34%
Estonia	246	39.36	10.21	86.53%	13.47%	.00%	1.22%	56.33%	22.04%	18.37%	2.04%	.00%	.00%
Finland	963	46.07	14.38	78.40%	20.15%	1.45%	4.69%	54.95%	18.56%	16.68%	2.61%	1.88%	.63%

Germany	152	36.73	12.49	67.76%	29.61%	2.63%	8.55%	55.92%	20.39%	13.82%	1.32%	.00%	.00%
Guatemala	287	36.94	14.02	84.32%	15.68%	.00%	4.88%	65.85%	26.83%	1.74%	.35%	.35%	.00%
Honduras	429	25.86	8.13	66.90%	32.17%	.93%	1.40%	20.05%	62.00%	14.22%	.93%	.70%	.70%
Ireland	401	29.01	10.79	68.00%	31.00%	1.00%	4.74%	48.38%	45.89%	.50%	.50%	.00%	.00%
Italy	310	44.83	16.27	74.43%	25.24%	.32%	6.54%	45.75%	23.20%	22.22%	1.96%	.33%	.00%
Japan	2,133	45.49	11.08	41.87%	56.96%	1.17%	1.03%	31.77%	20.84%	36.46%	6.34%	.84%	2.72%
Kyrgyzstan	254	32.44	12.46	82.28%	14.96%	2.76%	2.77%	52.57%	14.23%	27.67%	2.77%	.00%	.00%
Lebanon	141	29.31	12.24	73.05%	26.24%	.71%	6.43%	43.57%	37.86%	9.29%	2.14%	.71%	.00%
Malaysia	225	27.22	8.83	69.33%	28.44%	2.22%	4.44%	53.78%	39.11%	2.67%	.00%	.00%	.00%
Norway	376	40.86	13.58	80.32%	19.68%	.00%	8.24%	61.17%	18.35%	9.57%	1.06%	.80%	.80%
Pakistan	157	24.33	6.54	97.45%	2.55%	.00%	8.92%	45.22%	38.22%	7.01%	.64%	.00%	.00%
Portugal	484	33.33	14.94	70.25%	28.51%	1.24%	23.55%	42.56%	21.90%	11.16%	.83%	.00%	.00%
Russian	2,260	26.05	10.49	70.93%	28.14%	.93%	.66%	28.98%	46.70%	19.58%	3.54%	.31%	.22%
Slovakia	313	34.49	13.64	88.82%	10.86%	.32%	8.09%	49.19%	26.21%	13.92%	.97%	.97%	.65%
Spain	575	40.44	13.83	64.52%	34.96%	.52%	20.70%	53.91%	21.39%	3.30%	.70%	.00%	.00%
Sweden	134	39.28	13.91	76.87%	18.66%	4.48%	12.88%	54.55%	22.73%	8.33%	1.52%	.00%	.00%
Switzerland	593	44.84	19.01	63.58%	36.09%	.34%	6.91%	45.36%	18.21%	24.28%	4.38%	.34%	.51%
Taiwan	221	34.94	9.81	61.99%	36.20%	1.81%	5.43%	89.14%	1.81%	3.62%	.00%	.00%	.00%
Turkey	200	23.79	8.26	68.50%	30.50%	1.00%	3.00%	34.50%	4.50%	57.50%	.00%	.00%	.50%
Uganda	135	24.37	4.17	32.59%	67.41%	.00%	.00%	23.70%	74.81%	1.48%	.00%	.00%	.00%

Ukraine	252	31.39	10.06	63.49%	35.71%	.79%	10.32%	77.38%	5.95%	5.16%	.79%	.40%	.00%
United Kingdom	134	36.58	12.88	76.12%	22.39%	1.49%	28.36%	52.99%	11.19%	6.72%	.75%	.00%	.00%
United States	114	34.74	11.49	64.04%	34.21%	1.75%	22.81%	47.37%	23.68%	3.51%	.88%	1.75%	.00%
Uruguay	288	41.97	12.94	88.15%	11.85%	.00%	5.90%	74.31%	13.19%	5.21%	1.04%	.00%	.35%

499 **Table 2:**

500 **Results from Bayesian GLM analysis**

	Trust 1		Trust 2		Trust 3		Trust 4		Trust 5		Trust 6		Trust 7		log(Bayes Factor) vs.	
	$\beta$	ES	$\beta$	ES	$\beta$	ES	$\beta$	ES	$\beta$	ES	$\beta$	ES	$\beta$	ES	Null	Full
	(SE)	(ROPE %)	(SE)	(ROPE %)	(SE)	(ROPE %)	(SE)	(ROPE %)	(SE)	(ROPE %)	(SE)	(ROPE %)	(SE)	(ROPE %)	(BF <sub>M0</sub> )	(BF <sub>MF</sub> )
Comp. 1	.04	.06	-.04	-.07	-.04	-.06	.08	.12	.15	.25	.05	.08	.27	.46		
	(.01)	(100.00%)	(.01)	(100.00%)	(.01)	(100.00%)	(.01)	(99.63%)	(.01)	(.00%)	(.01)	(100.00%)	(.01)	(.00%)	1375.36	
Comp. 2	-.03	-.04	.04	.06			.07	.10					.14	.25		
	(.01)	(100.00%)	(.01)	(100.00%)			(.01)	(100.00%)					(.01)	(.00%)	256.86	5.91
Comp. 3							.03	.05	.07	.11	.04	.08	.17	.28		
							(.01)	(100.00%)	(.01)	(100.00%)	(.01)	(100.00%)	(.01)	(.00%)	480.29	5.57
Comp. 4	.06	.11							.07	.12			.11	.19		
	(.01)	(100.00%)							(.01)	(100.00%)			(.01)	(9.10%)	254.77	3.72
Comp. 5									.07	.11	.05	.09	.10	.17		
									(.01)	(100.00%)	(.01)	(100.00%)	(.01)	(30.44%)	225.27	8.82
Comp. 6									.06	.10	.03	.05	.09	.16		
									(.01)	(100.00%)	(.01)	(100.00%)	(.01)	(74.11%)	158.90	9.18
Comp. 7									.07	.12	.04	.07	.11	.18		
									(.01)	(100.00%)	(.01)	(100.00%)	(.01)	(24.57%)	177.70	7.67
Comp. 8									.06	.09	.03	.05	.13	.22		
									(.01)	(100.00%)	(.01)	(100.00%)	(.01)	(.00%)	227.54	10.53


501 Comp. 1—Comp. 8: Compliance 1—Compliance 8.  $\beta$  (SE): Standardized regression coefficient (standard error). ES (ROPE %): Effect  
502 size in Cohen's  $D$  (% of 95% HDI within the defined region of practical equivalence).

503

## Figures

504 **Figure 1:**

505 **Network plot**




506

507 Solid line: positive edge weight. Dashed line: negative edge weight.

508 **Figure 2:**

509 **Result from centrality analysis**



510