

1 Title: The Political Division toward COVID-19, Vaccines, Contact Tracing
2 Apps, and A Future Pandemic Scenario in the United States: A Survey
3 Result from A National Representative Sample
4

5 Haijing Hao, Department of Computer Information Systems, Bentley University, Waltham, MA, USA.
6 hhao@bentley.edu

7 Garrett Smith, Department of Computer Science, Brigham Young University, Provo, UT, 84602, USA.

8 Yunan Chen, Department of Informatics, University of California, Irvine, CA, USA.

9 Mainack Mondal, Department of Computer Science and Engineering, Indian Institute of Technology
10 Kharagpur, India.

11 Po-Shen Loh, Department of Mathematical Sciences, Carnegie Mellon University, Pittsburgh, PA,
12 USA.

13 Staci Smith, Marriott School of Business, Brigham Young University, Provo, UT, USA.

14 Xinru Page, Department of Computer Science, Brigham Young University, Provo, UT, USA.

15 xinru@cs.byu.edu

16 Abstract

17

18 Objectives: To investigate the attitudes and behaviors of Americans concerning the COVID-19
19 pandemic, COVID-19 vaccines, COVID-19 tracing apps, and the actions they believe the
20 government should take during a public health crisis, we designed and conducted a survey
21 during the ongoing COVID-19 emergency.

22 Methods: In January 2022, we administered an online survey on Prolific Academic to 302
23 participants in the United States, a nationally demographic representative sample. To explore
24 differences in attitudes and opinions among demographic subgroups, we employed several
25 statistical tests, including Mann Whitney U tests, Kruskal-Wallis tests, and chi-squared tests.

26 Results: Our survey results suggest that Americans' opinions towards the COVID-19 pandemic
27 are severely divided by their political views. There is strong partisan polarization in almost every
28 COVID-19 related question in our survey.

29 Policy Implications: Our findings suggest that policy makers need to consider partisan
30 polarization and the enormous impact it can have on people's attitudes and behaviors during
31 public health emergencies such as the COVID-19 pandemic. Public health experts need to
32 consider how to convey scientific knowledge about a pandemic without allowing political views
33 to dominate medical conversation.

34 Key words: COVID-19 pandemic, vaccines, contact tracing apps, United States, survey, statistical
35 tests

36 1. Introduction

37 The COVID-19 pandemic began in early 2020 and has had a huge impact around the world over
38 the past three years.(1,2) The United States is among one of the hardest hit with 102,518,788
39 confirmed positive cases and 1,110,390 deaths as of Feb. 2, 2023.(3) Public health experts agree
40 that a collective public response is necessary to prevent the spread of this highly contagious
41 virus. (4,5)

42 However, opinions regarding COVID-19 and COVID-19 vaccines in the United States are divided,
43 largely along partisan lines, or political polarization.(6) Political polarization has been a long
44 standing question in social science research in the U.S. (7) It means that political attitudes

45 sharply divide into two extreme groups, moving away from the center. (8,9) In the United
46 States, Republican-supporting counties have been less likely to maintain social distancing, but
47 are more mobile than Democratic-supporting counties.(10–13) State governors'
48 recommendations on COVID-19 compliance have been more effective in Democratic- than in
49 Republican-leaning counties.(14) Furthermore, a partisan divide in death rates has been
50 observed, with Republican-majority counties having a higher death rate than those that support
51 the Democratic party.(15,16) Researchers have also uncovered some political polarization
52 toward COVID-19 at the individual level, with liberals engaging more in health protective
53 behaviors than conservatives based on two national surveys in early 2020, at the beginning of
54 the pandemic.(17)

55 There is also a partisan divide in attitudes towards the COVID-19 vaccine, which is supposed to
56 be another important factor in suppressing the spread of the virus. Vaccines have been a critical
57 tool for human society to combat various infectious diseases in modern times.(18) However,
58 researchers have found that the partisan difference in vaccine hesitancy has increased over
59 time in the U.S.(19) Since the COVID-19 vaccine became available, a study found that counties
60 with a higher percentage of Republican voters had significantly lower vaccination rates,
61 resulting in higher COVID-19 cases and death rates in those counties.(20)

62 It is important to note that most studies examining partisan differences in the United States, as
63 mentioned above, have used aggregate data such as county-level political vote, county-level
64 COVID-19 death data, or county-level vaccine data, and limited studies of individual-level data
65 on these questions, particularly after the vaccine was available and the pandemic has been a
66 while. Therefore, the present study aims to fill this gap by examining whether an individual's

67 political views are associated with their opinions, attitudes, and behaviors towards the COVID-
68 19 pandemic and vaccines after two years of the pandemic and one year after the vaccine was
69 available, and whether the results obtained from individual-level data align with the findings of
70 previous aggregate data research. We aim to gain a more comprehensive understanding of how
71 an individual's political views are linked to their attitudes, opinions, and behaviors concerning
72 the COVID-19 pandemic, COVID-19 vaccines, and COVID-19 tracing apps, and individuals expect
73 what governments should do in a public health crisis. Through this approach, we will be able to
74 provide a more nuanced and robust understanding of the impact of political views on the
75 COVID-19 pandemic at individual level.

76 2. Materials and Methods

77 2.1 Survey design and Data collection

78 Our survey instrument consisted of three sections that investigated individual opinions and
79 experiences during and about the COVID-19 pandemic, individual's perceptions about the
80 usefulness of contact tracing in a future pandemic, and their demographics and political views
81 (plus three quality check questions). We deployed our survey on the crowd-sourcing platform
82 Prolific Academic from January 24th, 2022 to January 26th, 2022 to recruit a national
83 representative sample of participants from the U.S. Our study has been approved by IRB
84 category II exempt, and all participants had agreed on the online consent form before they
85 could take the online survey. The national representative here means that a sample reflects the
86 demographic distribution of the U.S. by gender, age, and race to make research findings more
87 generalizable.(21) Earlier studies have shown that participants recruited from Prolific provide
88 high-quality results regarding user perception about software and digital platforms.(22)

89

90 2.2 Measures

91 We have categorized these outcomes into four main categories: 1) People's opinions and

92 behaviors related to COVID-19; 2) People's opinions regarding the COVID-19 vaccine; 3)

93 People's personal experiences with COVID-19, COVID-19 vaccines, and tracing apps; 4) People's

94 expectations of government policies during a public health crisis, or a future pandemic. We

95 have also compared these outcome measures among different demographic subgroups,

96 gender, age, and race, and political view-based subgroups, political views and 2020 presidential

97 vote.

98 2.3 Statistical Methods

99 Because most of the survey questions were answered by 5-point Likert or 7-point Likert

100 options, the distribution of the ordinal data is non-parametric. Hence, we will conduct non-

101 parametric statistical tests, Mann-Whitney-Wilcoxon tests (also called Wilcoxon rank-sum test),

102 to compare the distribution of two independent samples, and Kruskal-Wallis test to examine

103 the opinion differences among multiple subgroups.(23,24) Wilcoxon rank-sum test and Kruskal-

104 Wallis test does not assume any specific distribution for the data but relies on the rank order of

105 the observations. If the survey answers or opinions are Yes or No, we run Chi-squared tests to

106 examine the differences among different subgroups.(25) All statistical analyses were performed

107 using Stata SE 17.

108 3. Results

109 3.1 Descriptive Statistics

110 Our survey received a total of 302 responses on Prolific platform, which were nationally

111 represent sample of the United States. Of these, approximately 50% identified as female,

112 48.34% as male, and 1.66% (5) as other gender. Regarding racial demographics, 8.75%
113 identified as Asian, 15.15% as African American Black, 70.37% as White, and 5.72% as other
114 minorities, such as American Indian, Native Hawaiian, others, or preferred not to say. We
115 categorized respondents into six age groups: 18 to 24 years old (11.1% of respondents), 25 to
116 34 (20.88%), 35 to 44 (17.51%), 45 to 54 (18.52%), 55 to 64 (19.87%), and 65 years old or above
117 (12.12%). In terms of political views, about 22.19% of respondents identified as Very Liberal,
118 36.42% as Liberal, 24.50% as Moderate, 11.26% as Conservative, 3.97% as Very Conservative,
119 and 1.66% preferred not to say. We also categorized the respondents by their presidential vote
120 in 2020. In our sample, 12.91% voted for Trump in 2020 presidential election, 67.88% voted for
121 Biden, 11.92% not vote, and 7.28% voted for others. Based on our survey results, approximately
122 81% of respondents reported receiving a COVID-19 vaccine, and around 18% reported having
123 tested positive for COVID-19, as of Jan. 2022, two years after the pandemic.

124 3.2 Statistical Analysis

125 For the present study, we conducted statistical analysis among different subgroups by gender,
126 age, race, political views, and the 2020 presidential vote. The respondents who answered other
127 gender or chose not to disclose their gender, age, or political views were dropped from our
128 statistical analysis because the number is too small to have statistical significance. Regarding
129 the 2020 presidential vote, the present study focuses on the two groups, which voted for Biden
130 and voted for Trump.

Table 1 Statistical analysis of Americans' social compliance behaviors, concerns about COVID-19, and government roles

	When I leave the house, I always maintain social distance. (Med./Mean)	I wear my mask whenever I leave the house because of COVID-19. (Med./Mean)	I avoid events or social gatherings with other people because of COVID-19. (Med./Mean)	I am very worried about getting COVID-19. (Med./Mean)	I am concerned about the hospital capacity during the COVID-19 pandemic. (Med./Mean)	I believe that COVID-19 is more dangerous than the common flu. (Med./Mean)	I worry about the effects of variants of the disease. (Med./Mean)	I am very worried about the effect of the pandemic on the economy. (Med./Mean)	I believe that my government should do more to deal with COVID-19. (Med./Mean)
All	4/3.97	4/4.13	4/4	4/3.35	5/4.30	5/4.43	5/4.27	4/4.05	4/3.93
Female	4/4.05	5/4.33	4/4.06	4/3.56	5/4.46	5/4.56	5/4.42	4/4.11	4/4.11
Male	4/3.86	4/3.88	4/3.90	3/3.12	5/4.12	5/4.30	4/4.12	4/4.02	4/3.93
Wilcoxon rank-sum test	0.2134	0.0009***	0.6704	0.0062**	0.0035**	0.0083**	0.0157*	0.4988	0.0039**
Age 18-24	4/3.68	5/4.12	4/3.71	4/3.35	5/4.41	4/4.18	5/4.26	4/3.85	4/3.88
Age 25-34	4/3.75	4/4.03	4/3.70	4/3.09	4.5/4.20	5/4.19	4/4.11	4/3.97	4/3.95
Age 35-44	4/4.07	5/4.37	5/4.26	4/3.63	5/4.65	5/4.69	5/4.50	4/4.00	5/4.28
Age 45-54	4/3.95	4/3.84	4/3.87	3/3.29	5/4.11	5/4.44	4/4.20	4/4.15	4/3.91
Age 55-64	5/4.25	5/4.25	5/4.25	4/3.56	5/4.29	5/4.64	5/4.27	4/4.12	4/3.73
Age 65+	4/4.06	5/4.22	5/4.14	4/3.14	5/4.14	5/4.36	5/4.36	5/4.19	4/3.78
Kruskal-Wallis test	0.0282*	0.1654	0.0002**	0.1924	0.0952	0.0101*	0.4623	0.5397	0.2360
Asian	4/3.62	4.5/4.23	4/3.69	3/3.04	4/3.92	4.5/4.31	4/4.08	4/4.08	3/3.35
African American	5/4.29	5/4.49	5/4.20	4/3.56	5/4.38	5/4.51	5/4.44	5/4.26	4/3.96
White	4/3.94	5/4.02	4/3.99	4/3.35	5/4.33	5/4.45	5/4.29	4/4.01	4/4.03
Others	4/4.05	5/4.32	4/4.00	4/3.26	5/4.32	5/4.16	4/3.95	4/3.90	4/3.58
Kruskal-Wallis test	0.0097**	0.0226*	0.2446	0.4115	0.1229	0.3161	0.2215	0.4974	0.0220*
Very Liberal	4/4.28	5/4.49	5/4.36	4/3.67	5/4.67	5/4.85	5/4.60	4/3.67	5/4.63
Liberal	4/4.27	5/4.44	4/4.31	4/3.75	5/4.58	5/4.76	5/4.60	4/3.97	4/4.22
Moderate	4/3.76	4/3.93	4/3.64	3/3.04	4/4.16	4/4.05	4/3.96	5/4.37	4/3.47

Conservative	3/3.21	3.5/3.21	4/3.21	2/2.32	3.5/3.35	4/3.74	4/3.59	5/4.24	3/3.12
Very Conservative	2.5/2.92	2/2.67	3/3.17	2/2.42	3/2.92	4/3.33	3.5/3.17	4.5/4.50	2.5/2.58
Kruskal-Wallis test	0.0001***	0.0001***	0.0001***	0.0001***	0.0001***	0.0001***	0.0001***	0.0095**	0.0001***
Vote for Biden in 2020	4/4.19	5/4.40	4/4.24	4/3.64	5/4.64	5/4.73	5/4.55	4/3.91	5/4.25
Vote for Trump in 2020	3/3.05	3/3.00	4/3.05	2/2.10	3/2.82	4/3.41	4/3.23	5/4.54	3/2.85
Wilcoxon rank-sum test	<0.0001***	<0.0001***	<0.0001***	<0.0001***	<0.0001***	<0.0001***	<0.0001***	0.0008***	<0.0001***

132 Note: * denotes statistical significance at the 5% level. ** denotes statistical significance at the 1% level. *** denotes statistical significance at the
133 0.1% level.

134 Table 1 presents the statistical analysis of nine questions regarding people's opinions and
135 behaviors concerning the COVID-19 pandemic. The responses to all questions were measured
136 on a five-point Likert scale, ranging from "Disagree Strongly" to "Agree Strongly," with values
137 from 1 to 5. The results reveal that the median scores for all questions were either 4 or 5,
138 indicating that approximately half of the respondents somewhat agreed or strongly agreed with
139 the statements. Regarding social compliance behaviors, the majority of respondents reported
140 practicing mask-wearing, social distancing, and avoiding gatherings. Concerning COVID-19,
141 respondents expressed apprehension about contracting the virus, hospital capacities, the
142 impact on the economy, the virus's dangerousness, and the potential for new variants. Lastly,
143 respondents believed that governments should take additional measures to prevent the spread
144 of COVID-19.

145
146 Due to space limitations, Table 1 only displays the statistical analysis comparing the median and
147 mean values of different demographic and political subgroups. However, if needed, we can
148 provide the complete distributions of each subgroup. Overall, significant differences were
149 observed in some responses based on gender, age, race, political views, and the 2020
150 presidential votes.

151
152 Six out of the nine questions exhibited statistically different opinions between women and
153 men. Females indicated higher agreement in wearing masks when outside the house (median 5
154 vs. median 4, mean 4.33 vs. mean 3.88, Wilcoxon test p-value = 0.0009), greater concern about
155 contracting COVID-19 (median 4 vs. median 3, mean 3.56 vs. mean 3.12, Wilcoxon test p-value

156 = 0.0062), heightened worry about hospital capacities during the pandemic (mean 4.46 vs.
157 mean 4.12, Wilcoxon test p-value = 0.0035), stronger belief that COVID-19 is more dangerous
158 than the common flu (mean 4.56 vs. mean 4.30, Wilcoxon test p-value = 0.0083), increased
159 concern about the effects of variants (median 5 vs. median 4, mean 4.42 vs. mean 4.12,
160 Wilcoxon test p-value = 0.0157), and a greater belief that the government should take further
161 action to address COVID-19 (mean 4.11 vs. mean 3.93, Wilcoxon test p-value = 0.0039).
162 Although these six questions exhibited statistically different average opinion scores, the
163 magnitude of the differences was not substantial, ranging from 3.12 to 4.56, all leaning toward
164 agreement.

165
166 Different age groups demonstrated diverse opinions on three of the nine questions:
167 maintaining social distance (Kruskal-Wallis test p-value = 0.0282), avoiding social gatherings
168 (Kruskal-Wallis test p-value = 0.0002), and perceiving COVID-19 as more dangerous than the
169 common flu (Kruskal-Wallis test p-value = 0.0101). Among various racial subgroups, differing
170 opinions were evident on three questions: maintaining social distance (Kruskal-Wallis test p-
171 value = 0.0097), wearing masks when outside the house (Kruskal-Wallis test p-value = 0.0226),
172 and the belief that governments should take further action (Kruskal-Wallis test p-value =
173 0.0220). However, overall, these differences were not substantial, as the opinions qualitatively
174 aligned among different age or racial subgroups.

175
176 Nevertheless, significant differences were observed in all nine questions when considering
177 political view-based subgroups or 2020 presidential vote subgroups. Quantitatively, the opinion

178 scores exhibited a linear correlation with political views. The more liberal the subgroup, the
 179 greater their concerns about COVID-19, and vice versa. Furthermore, significant disparities
 180 were observed on four questions, with the Very Liberal group exhibiting a median value of 2
 181 compared to the Very Conservative group's median value of 4 or 5. Similar contrasting
 182 differences were observed in average scores between the two groups, with mean scores lower
 183 than 3 leaning toward disagreement for one group, and mean scores close to 5 leaning toward
 184 strong agreement for the other. The Very Liberal subgroup expressed stronger agreement than
 185 the Very Conservative subgroup regarding maintaining social distance when outside the house
 186 (median 4 vs. median 2.5, mean 4.28 vs. mean 2.92, Kruskal-Wallis test p-value = 0.0001),
 187 wearing masks when outside the house (median 5 vs. median 2, mean 4.49 vs. mean 2.67,
 188 Kruskal-Wallis test p-value = 0.0001), concern about contracting COVID-19 (median 4 vs.
 189 median 2, mean 3.67 vs. mean 2.42, Kruskal-Wallis test p-value = 0.0001), and the belief that
 190 governments should take further action to address COVID-19 (median 5 vs. median 2.5, mean
 191 4.63 vs. mean 2.258, Kruskal-Wallis test p-value = 0.0001). The differences between the Vote
 192 for Biden and Vote for Trump groups followed similar patterns as the political view-based
 193 subgroups, showcasing a partisan division on all nine questions, with Biden supporters
 194 expressing stronger agreement regarding COVID-19 issues, while Trump supporters exhibited
 195 stronger disagreement.

196

197

Table 2 Americans' opinions about the COVID-19 vaccine

	I believe that getting the vaccine should be mandatory. (Median/Mean)	I believe that the vaccine works. (Median/Mean)	I think that those who have received the vaccine should still be careful. (Median/Mean)
All	4/3.5	5/4.62	5/4.27

Female	4/3.69	5/4.27	5/4.74
Male	4/3.28	5/4.26	5/4.49
Wilcoxon test	0.0273*	0.6650	0.0009***
Age 18-24	4/3.47	5/4.26	5/4.32
Age 25-34	3.5/3.36	4.5/4.11	5/4.64
Age 35-44	4/3.83	5/4.52	5/4.70
Age 45-54	3/3.09	5/3.96	5/4.55
Age 55-64	4/3.73	5/4.44	5/4.68
Age 65+	4/3.53	5/4.39	5/4.75
Kruskal-Wallis test	0.2303	0.0896	0.2184
Asian	4/3.77	5/4.31	5/4.50
African American	4/3.38	4/3.96	5/4.87
White	4/3.53	5/4.36	5/4.56
Others	3/3.11	5/4.00	5/4.84
Kruskal-Wallis test	0.6571	0.1685	0.0056**
Very Liberal	5/4.25	5/4.78	5/4.79
Liberal	4/4.04	5/4.63	5/4.74
Moderate	3/2.88	4/3.85	5/4.57
Conservative	2/2.15	4/3.35	4/4.03
Very Conservative	2/2.17	4/3.33	5/4.50
Kruskal-Wallis test	0.0001***	0.0001***	0.0001***
Vote for Biden	5/4.07	5/4.67	5/4.72
Vote for Trump	1/1.62	3/3.10	4/4.21
Wilcoxon test	<0.0001***	<0.0001***	0.0002***

198

199 Table 2 presents three questions regarding COVID-19 vaccines, with responses provided on a
200 five-point Likert scale. The median and mean scores for all respondents range from 3.5 to 5,
201 indicating that approximately half of the respondents agreed, on average, with the three
202 vaccine-related questions. Among the gender subgroups, only one question displayed a
203 statistically significant difference in opinion, specifically regarding whether individuals who
204 have received the vaccine should still exercise caution. Women showed stronger agreement
205 than men on this question (mean 4.74 vs. mean 4.49, Wilcoxon test p-value = 0.0009). There
206 were no statistically significant differences among the various age subgroups for the three
207 vaccine-related questions. Among the four racial subgroups, the only question with statistically

208 different opinions was whether vaccinated individuals should remain cautious (Kruskal-Wallis
 209 test p-value = 0.0056). However, the median or mean scores for each subgroup fell between
 210 4.50 and 5, all indicating strong agreement.

211 Once again, the political view-based subgroups exhibited significantly different opinions on all
 212 three vaccine questions, with all Kruskal-Wallis test p-values equal to 0.0001. The more liberal
 213 the subgroup, the stronger their belief in the vaccine's effectiveness (Very Liberal subgroup's
 214 median = 5 and mean = 4.78 vs. Very Conservative subgroup's median = 4 and mean = 3.33,
 215 Kruskal-Wallis test p-value = 0.0001), and their support for mandatory vaccination (Very Liberal
 216 subgroup's median = 5 and mean = 4.25 vs. Very Conservative subgroup's median = 2 and mean
 217 = 2.17, Kruskal-Wallis test p-value = 0.0001), and their support for still being cautious after
 218 vaccination (Very Liberal subgroup's mean = 4.79 vs. Very Conservative subgroup's mean =
 219 4.50, Kruskal-Wallis test p-value = 0.0001). The opinion scores exhibited a wide range, spanning
 220 from 2 on the disagreement side to 5 on the strong agreement side, representing two opposite
 221 ends. A similar pattern was observed among the two 2020 presidential vote groups, with both
 222 groups expressing more extreme opinions compared to the Very Liberal and Very Conservative
 223 groups on all three questions.

224
 225 Table 3 Americans' experiences with COVID-19, COVID-19 vaccine, and COVID-19 tracing apps

	I have tested positive for COVID-19 in the past. (Median/Mean)	I have been vaccinated. (Median/Mean)	Do you have access to the COVID-19 vaccine? (Median/Mean)	During pandemics such as with COVID-19, public health departments have used contact tracing apps to slow the spread of the disease. The mobile application usually does this by identifying individuals that may have been in contact with an infected person. Have you ever used a contact tracing app? (Median/Mean)
All	0/0.18	1/0.81	1/0.98	0/0.15
Female	0/0.19	1/0.81	1/0.97	0/0.12

Male	0/0.16	1/0.83	1/0.99	0/0.19
Chi-squared test	0.434	0.642	0.188	0.131
Age 18-24	0/0.29	1/0.88	1/0.97	0/0.29
Age 25-34	0/0.23	1/0.78	1/0.98	0/0.15
Age 35-44	0/0.28	1/0.85	1/0.98	0/0.17
Age 45-54	0/0.09	1/0.69	1/0.98	0/0.11
Age 55-64	0/0.07	1/0.85	1/0.98	0/0.12
Age 65+	0/0.11	1/0.89	1/0.97	0/0.11
Chi-squared test	0.004**	0.097	0.996	0.232
Asian	0/0.08	1/0.92	1/1	0/0.27
African American	0/0.11	1/0.82	1/1	0/0.12
White	0/0.2	1/0.81	1/0.98	0/0.16
Others	0/0.21	1/0.68	1/0.95	0/0
Chi-squared test	0.267	0.241	0.451	0.091
Very Liberal	0/0.18	1/0.93	1/0.99	0/0.30
Liberal	0/0.17	1/0.90	1/1.00	0/0.19
Moderate	0/0.16	1/0.7	1/0.97	0/0.06
Conservative	0/0.12	1/0.62	1/0.94	0/0
Very Conservative	0/0.42	1/0.67	1/1.00	0/0
Chi-squared test	0.221	<0.0001***	0.185	<0.0001***
Vote for Biden	0/0.17	1/0.94	1/1.00	0/0.20
Vote for Trump	0/0.21	1/0.51	1/0.97	0/0
Chi-squared test	0.551	<0.0001***	0.187	0.003**

226

227 Table 3 presents four outcomes related to individuals' personal experiences with COVID-19,
 228 vaccination, accessibility to the vaccine, and usage of a tracing app. The responses to these four
 229 questions were binary: Yes or No. It was found that 98% of people reported having access to
 230 the vaccine, and 81% reported having been vaccinated. Approximately 18% of individuals
 231 answered Yes when asked if they had tested positive for COVID-19. This percentage aligns with
 232 the national test positivity rate observed around January 2022 (26). Furthermore,
 233 approximately 15% of respondents reported having used a tracing app.

234

235 The experience of testing positive for COVID-19 exhibited a statistically significant difference
236 across age subgroups (Chi-squared test p-value = 0.004), ranging from 7% in the 55 to 64 years
237 old group to 29% in the 18 to 24 years old group. However, no significant differences were
238 observed for any other subgroups. Political view-based subgroups displayed statistically
239 different responses to the question of vaccination (Chi-squared test p-value < 0.0001). The Very
240 Liberal subgroup reported a vaccination rate of 93%, while the Conservative and Very
241 Conservative subgroups reported vaccination rates of 62% to 67%. Similarly, a higher likelihood
242 of using a tracing app was observed among more liberal subgroups (Very Liberal group's mean
243 = 0.3 and Liberal group's mean = 0.19 vs. Very Conservative group's mean = 0 and Conservative
244 group's mean = 0, with Chi-squared test p-value < 0.0001). A similar pattern was found among
245 the 2020 presidential vote groups, with Biden supporters more likely to have been vaccinated
246 compared to Trump supporters (Vote for Biden mean = 0.94 vs. Vote for Trump mean = 0.51,
247 Chi-squared test p-value < 0.0001), and Biden supporters being more likely to have used a
248 contact tracing app compared to Trump supporters (Vote for Biden mean = 0.2 vs. Vote for
249 Trump mean = 0, Chi-squared test p-value = 0.003). However, it is worth noting that even the
250 highest rate of tracing app usage by the Very Liberal subgroup, was only 30%, which is relatively
251 low. Additionally, none of the individuals in the two conservative subgroups reported having
252 ever used a tracing app.

253
254 It is important to highlight that the answers to the two fact-based questions, "I have tested
255 positive in the past" and "Do you have access to the COVID-19 vaccine," showed no statistically
256 significant differences among any groups. This indicates that testing positive or having access to

257 the vaccine is not related to any specific demographics or political views. The vaccine was
 258 nearly equally accessible to all subgroups, ranging from 94% to 100%.

259
 260 Table 4. Americans’ opinions on what information governments should share if a future pandemic occurs

	Knowing how many people have been diagnosed with the disease in my county, city, and local school in the last 24 hours would enable me to protect my health. (Median/Mean)	Knowing what proportion of people have been diagnosed with the disease in my county, city, and local school in the last 24 hours would enable me to protect my health. (Median/Mean)	Knowing whether the number of new cases in my county is trending upwards or downwards, and by how much, would enable me to protect my health. (Median/Mean)	Knowing what percentage of people have been vaccinated against the disease in my state would enable me to protect my health. (Median/Mean)	Knowing when others have self-diagnosed that they have this disease (with 80% certainty) would enable me to protect my health. (Median/Mean)
All	6/5.57	6/5.59	6/5.6	6/5.23	6/5.92
Female	6/5.74	6/5.77	6/5.85	6/5.41	6/6.05
Male	5/5.39	5/5.38	5/5.30	5/5.01	6/5.78
Wilcoxon test	0.0134*	0.0163*	0.0004***	0.0416*	0.0141*
Age 18-24	6.5/5.85	7/5.91	7/5.97	6/5.50	7/5.82
Age 25-34	6/5.78	6/5.72	6/5.72	6/5.23	6/6.6
Age 35-44	6/5.74	6/5.78	6/5.57	6/5.63	6/5.76
Age 45-54	5/5.20	5/5.18	5/5.27	5/4.85	6/5.62
Age 55-64	5/5.36	6/5.51	6/5.51	5/4.97	6/6.05
Age 65+	6/5.58	6/5.56	6/5.69	6/5.33	7/6.11
Kruskal–Wallis test	0.0249*	0.0311*	0.0420*	0.1089	0.0830
Asian	5/5.12	5/5.31	5.5/5.42	6/5.31	6/5.81
African American	6/5.78	6/5.82	6/5.87	5/5.33	6/5.98
White	6/5.53	6/5.53	6/5.5	5/5.12	6/5.93
Others	7/6.11	6/6.11	7/6.21	6-Jul	7/5.90
Kruskal–Wallis test	0.0277*	0.0975	0.0809	0.1579	0.5913
Very Liberal	6/5.97	6/5.99	6/5.87	6/5.69	7/6.36
Liberal	6/5.82	6/5.76	6/5.81	6/5.47	6/6.12
Moderate	6/5.53	6/5.61	6/5.65	5.5/5.26	6/5.81
Conservative	4/4.24	4.5/4.41	5/4.41	4/4.06	5/4.94
Very Conservative	5/4.92	5/5.00	5.5/5.00	3.5/3.33	5.5/5.33
Kruskal–Wallis test	0.0001***	0.0001***	0.0001***	0.0001***	0.0001***
Vote for Biden	6/5.81	6/5.80	6/5.80	6/5.57	7/6.15
Vote for Trump	4/4.28	4/4.41	5/4.54	4/3.54	5/5.33
Wilcoxon test	<0.00001***	<0.00001***	<0.00001***	<0.00001***	0.0001***

261

262 Table 4 presents the responses to five survey questions regarding the public's perspectives on
263 what type of information should be shared by local governments to instill a sense of health
264 security in the event of a future pandemic. These questions form part of a hypothetical scenario
265 designed to gauge the common expectations during a potential public health crisis. They
266 include questions about the known count or percentage of diagnosed individuals, the
267 progression trend of new cases, the vaccination rate, and the frequency of self-diagnosis of the
268 infection. Responses were captured using a seven-point Likert scale that ranged from 'Disagree
269 Completely' (1) to 'Agree Completely' (7). For all five questions, the median score was 6, while
270 the mean scores hovered near 6, implying that approximately half of the respondents, or on
271 average, agreed substantially that the dissemination of certain disease-related data by their
272 local government would contribute to their feeling of health security.

273 An interesting gender difference emerged in the responses to all five questions. Females
274 expressed stronger agreement than males about the impact of such information on their health
275 security. This difference was statistically significant, as confirmed by the Wilcoxon test, for all
276 the following topics: the number of local diagnoses (female median = 6, mean = 5.74 vs. male
277 median = 5, mean = 5.39, with Wilcoxon test p-value = 0.0134), the proportion of local
278 diagnoses (female median = 6, mean = 5.77 vs. male median = 5, mean = 5.38, with Wilcoxon
279 test p-value = 0.0163), the trend of new cases (female median = 6, mean = 5.85 vs. male
280 median = 5, mean = 5.30, with Wilcoxon test p-value = 0.0004), the local vaccination rate
281 (female median = 6, mean = 5.41 vs. male median = 5, mean = 5.01, with Wilcoxon test p-value
282 = 0.0416), and the prevalence of self-diagnosis (female median = 6, mean = 6.05 vs. male
283 median = 6, mean = 5.78, with Wilcoxon test p-value = 0.0141).

284 Statistically significant differences also arose among different age groups for three of the five
285 questions: the number of local diagnoses (Kruskal–Wallis test = 0.0249), the proportion of local
286 diagnoses (Kruskal–Wallis test = 0.0311), and the trend of new cases (Kruskal–Wallis test =
287 0.0420). In terms of racial differences, only one question yielded a significant difference of
288 opinion - the number of people diagnosed locally (Kruskal–Wallis test = 0.0277).
289 Again, political orientation played a decisive role in shaping the responses to all five questions
290 (all Kruskal-Wallis test p-values were 0.0001). The question regarding the public's perception of
291 how a high vaccination rate could protect their health proved to be particularly polarizing.
292 Respondents identifying as 'Very Liberal' had a median score of 6 and mean score of 5.69, while
293 those identifying as 'Very Conservative' scored a median of 3.5 and a mean of 3.33, reflecting
294 differing beliefs about the role of vaccination in pandemic management. Similarly, patterns
295 emerged among 2020 presidential voting groups, with the 'Vote for Biden' group demonstrating
296 greater agreement with all proposed protective measures to be shared by the government than
297 the 'Vote for Trump' group, and all Kruskal-Wallis tests are statistically significant with p values
298 less than 0.0001.

299 4. Discussion

300 Studies have underscored the existence of partisan polarization in response to the COVID-19
301 pandemic in the U.S. A Pew survey spanning thirteen countries identified that American
302 attitudes towards COVID-19 were considerably more politicized than those in other advanced
303 economies. (6) Within the U.S., counties favoring the Republican candidate, Donald Trump,
304 over the Democratic candidate, Hillary Clinton, in the 2016 presidential election, manifested
305 14% less physical distancing at the onset of the COVID-19 outbreak, in early 2020. (10)

306 Furthermore, another study in 2021 showed that even when holding other factors constant,
307 Republican supporters displayed a 27.8% greater likelihood of mobility than Democratic
308 supporters.(12) These trends are reflected in our survey data, where significant partisan
309 differences at an individual level are observable. For instance, as indicated in Table 1,
310 individuals within the Very Conservative subgroup expressed stronger disagreement than those
311 in the Very Liberal subgroup, on whether they consistently maintain social distancing when
312 venturing outside their homes (median score = 2.5 and mean score = 2.92 vs. median score = 5
313 and mean score = 4.28, Kruskal-Wallis test p-value =0.0001) and on whether they avoid social
314 gatherings with other people (median score = 3 and mean score = 3.17 vs. median score = 5
315 and mean score = 4.36, Kruskal-Wallis test p-value =0.0001). One study indicated that, during
316 the initial phase of the COVID-19 outbreak—a critical period for the virus's proliferation—states
317 governed by Republican leaders were slower to enforce social distancing policies compared to
318 those led by Democratic leaders, even after accounting for other factors.(13) Our data
319 corroborate this finding, showing that, on average, individuals in the most conservative
320 subgroup disagreed with the notion that the government should intensify efforts to manage the
321 COVID-19 pandemic, while their counterparts in the most liberal subgroup advocated for more
322 robust government action (median score = 2.5 and mean score = 2.58 vs. median score 5 and
323 mean score = 4.63, Kruskal-Wallis test p-value =0.0001). In anticipation of a future pandemic,
324 our survey respondents indicated a desire for their local governments to keep them updated on
325 data such as the number/proportion of people diagnosed with the disease, new case trends,
326 the proportion of vaccinated individuals, and the ability of people to self-diagnose in their
327 country, as Table 4 showed. In general, all groups agreed that their local governments should

328 share more data which would protect their own health with median and mean scores above 5
329 or 6, Agree Mostly or Agree Completely. However, those in the Very Conservative subgroup
330 demonstrated lower support for these data transparency policies compared to the Very Liberal
331 subgroup. The greatest divergence in views concerned the utility of protective measures such
332 as knowing the percentage of people vaccinated (median score = 3.5 and mean score = 3.33 vs.
333 median score = 6 and mean score = 5.69, Kruskal-Wallis test p-value = 0.0001). This discrepancy
334 aligns with the observed partisan variance towards COVID-19 vaccines, a subject we will delve
335 into further.

336
337 Vaccine hesitancy, a politically polarizing issue in the U.S., has amplified during the COVID-19
338 pandemic. Historically, effective vaccines have halted the spread of most infectious diseases in
339 modern human history. However, even prior to the COVID-19 pandemic, vaccine hesitancy was
340 a politically charged issue in the U.S., with some Republican political figures publicly opposing
341 vaccines. (27) This partisan split in opinions towards COVID-19 vaccines is even starker. In
342 counties with higher proportions of Republican voters, vaccination rates for COVID-19 were
343 markedly lower, correlating with a higher COVID-19 positive rate and mortality rate. (20) Over
344 time, this partisan polarization in vaccine hesitancy has grown. (19) As Table 2 showed, our
345 survey data spotlight a significant disparity between the liberal subgroups, who generally
346 believe in the vaccine's efficacy and support mandatory vaccination, and the conservative
347 subgroups, who exhibited greater skepticism towards vaccine effectiveness (median score = 5
348 and mean score = 4.78 vs median score = 4 and mean score = 3.33, with Kruskal-Wallis test p-
349 value = 0.0001) and were less likely to endorse mandatory vaccination policies (median score =

350 5 and mean score = 4.25 vs. median score = 2 and mean score = 2.17, with Kruskal-Wallis test p-
351 value = 0.0001).

352
353 Digital contact tracing is another crucial tool for controlling the COVID-19 pandemic, even in the
354 wake of available vaccines. (28) Research suggests that digital tracing has proven to be a
355 successful strategy in managing Ebola and tuberculosis epidemics. (29–31) Simulation studies
356 also demonstrate the potential for COVID-19 contact tracing apps to manage the pandemic,
357 contingent on high adoption rates. (32) However, the deployment of digital contact tracing
358 apps has encountered challenges, including limited smartphone penetration, varying
359 acceptance rates for tracing apps, and privacy concerns, among others. (33–35) A study in 2020
360 identified significant partisan discrepancies in attitudes towards digital contact tracing, with
361 more Republicans expressing opposition (39%) than Democrats (27%) in the early stages of the
362 pandemic. (28) Our 2022 survey data, collected two years into the pandemic at a time when
363 COVID-19 vaccines and contact tracing apps were most accessible, uncovers persistent partisan
364 divides at the individual level. Notably, as Table 3 showed, none of the Conservative or Very
365 Conservative subgroups had ever used a COVID-19 contact tracing app, whereas approximately
366 30% of Very Liberal subgroup members and about 19% of Liberal subgroup members had
367 utilized such an app. Even though liberal subgroups show a higher adoption rate for contact
368 tracing apps than conservative subgroups, the overall adoption rate remains insufficient for the
369 apps to function effectively. This should alert public health experts to the persistently low
370 acceptance rates of tracing apps in the U.S.

371

372 Additionally, the survey data presented in Table 3 reveals that for fact-based questions—such
373 as testing positive for COVID-19 or accessibility to the COVID-19 vaccine—there is no significant
374 difference among individuals with varying political views, which suggests that the reality of the
375 U.S. as well as a good quality of our survey data.

376 5. Conclusions and Limitations

377 Our study offers several contributions. First, we explore the existence of partisan disparities in
378 attitudes towards the COVID-19 pandemic in the U.S. at an individual level. This investigation
379 utilizes a nationally representative sample obtained in 2022, during the height of the pandemic,
380 from the reputable research-focused online platform, Prolific. The findings derived from our
381 dataset align with previous studies that relied on aggregated county-level data; however, our
382 dataset offers the added advantage of being individual-based, making it more practical from a
383 public policy standpoint. This data affords public health professionals, government officials, and
384 policymakers an alternative perspective to understand the divergence in opinions that is rooted
385 in political views. Second, our survey extends beyond just capturing people's experiences and
386 views on the COVID-19 pandemic; it also includes hypothetical questions concerning a future
387 pandemic. Last, our research is among the first to scrutinize partisan polarization during the
388 COVID-19 pandemic at the individual level, assessing opinions on COVID-19, vaccine hesitancy,
389 and trust in COVID-19 tracing apps in the U.S.

390

391 Despite its contributions, this study is not without limitations. First, our survey's sample size is
392 relatively small, consisting of approximately 302 participants. Although Prolific has ensured
393 national representation by incorporating a proper proportionate mix of genders, ages, and

394 races, the sample might still fall short of adequately representing a vast and diverse country like
395 the U.S. Consequently, researchers are advised to interpret the data and results with caution.
396 Second, our survey questions might not encompass all relevant facets of the COVID-19
397 pandemic, reflecting only specific perspectives of Americans concerning the pandemic. Last, as
398 is the case with many survey studies, respondents might have exhibited reluctance in divulging
399 their views on sensitive questions, despite assurances of anonymity.

400 6. Public Health Implications

401
402 Our survey data underscores a significant partisan polarization in the U.S. concerning COVID-19,
403 its vaccines, and tracing apps. Political divisions surface in nearly every COVID-19-related
404 question within our survey. Consequently, we suggest four policy implications. First, public
405 health administrators and researchers should contemplate strategies to reduce partisan
406 differences concerning the COVID-19 pandemic or any future pandemics and epidemics.
407 Emphasizing science-based guidance from medical experts is crucial to ensure appropriate
408 pandemic responses. Second, political figures may need to moderate their influence within the
409 realm of public health. This restraint can help prevent health decisions driven more by partisan
410 bias than by public well-being. Third, it falls upon public health experts and technologists to
411 enhance their communication about the effectiveness and security of digital tracing apps. Clear
412 messaging about these apps' capacity to control infectious diseases is necessary. Last, people's
413 belief that data availability and transparency aids their health protection during a pandemic
414 necessitates consideration. Therefore, governments should deliberate on making data
415 reflecting local conditions easily accessible.

416

417 References

- 418 1. WHO. WHO Coronavirus (COVID-19) Dashboard [Internet]. 2023. Available from:
419 <https://covid19.who.int/>
- 420 2. Adil M, Rahman R, Whitelaw D. SARS-CoV-2 and the pandemic of COVID-19. *Postgraduate*
421 *Medical Journal*. 97:110–6.
- 422 3. JHU. MORTALITY ANALYSES [Internet]. Johns Hopkins University; 2023. Available from:
423 <https://coronavirus.jhu.edu/data/mortality>
- 424 4. WHO. Advice for the public: Coronavirus disease (COVID-19), WHO [Internet]. World Health
425 Organization; 2023. Available from: [https://www.who.int/emergencies/diseases/novel-](https://www.who.int/emergencies/diseases/novel-coronavirus-2019/advice-for-public)
426 [coronavirus-2019/advice-for-public](https://www.who.int/emergencies/diseases/novel-coronavirus-2019/advice-for-public)
- 427 5. CDC. Center for Disease Control, Social Distancing, Quarantine, and Isolation. CDC
428 [Internet]. 2023. Available from: <https://www.cdc.gov/coronavirus/2019-ncov/index.html>
- 429 6. PEW. Public opinion about coronavirus is more politically divided in U.S. than in other
430 advanced economies [Internet]. Pew; 2020. Available from:
431 [https://www.pewresearch.org/fact-tank/2020/10/28/public-opinion-about-coronavirus-is-](https://www.pewresearch.org/fact-tank/2020/10/28/public-opinion-about-coronavirus-is-more-politically-divided-in-u-s-than-in-other-advanced-economies/)
432 [more-politically-divided-in-u-s-than-in-other-advanced-economies/](https://www.pewresearch.org/fact-tank/2020/10/28/public-opinion-about-coronavirus-is-more-politically-divided-in-u-s-than-in-other-advanced-economies/)
- 433 7. DiMaggio P, Evans J, Bryson B. Have American’s Social Attitudes Become More Polarized?
434 *American Journal of Sociology*. 1996;102(3):690–755.
- 435 8. Baldassarri D, Gelman A. Partisans without Constraint: Political Polarization and Trends in
436 American Public Opinion. *American Journal of Sociology*. 2008;114(2):408–46.
- 437 9. Fiorina M, Abrams S. Political Polarization in the American Public. *Annual Review of Political*
438 *Science*. 2008;11:563–98.
- 439 10. Gollwitzer A, Martel C, Brady WJ. Partisan differences in physical distancing are linked to
440 health outcomes during the COVID-19 pandemic. *Nat Hum Behav*. 2020;4:1186–97.
- 441 11. Allcott H, Boxell L, Conway J, Gentzkow M, Thaler M, Yang D. Polarization and public health:
442 Partisan differences in social distancing during the coronavirus pandemic. *Journal of Public*
443 *Economics* [Internet]. 191. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jpubeco.2020.104254>
- 444 12. Clinton J, Cohen J, Lapinski J, Trussler M. Partisan pandemic: how partisanship and public
445 health concerns affect individuals’ social mobility during COVID-19. *Sci Adv*. 2021;7(2).
- 446 13. Adolph C, Amano K, Bang-Jensen B, Fullman N, Wilkerson J. Pandemic politics: timing state-
447 level social distancing responses to COVID-19. *J Health Polit Policy Law*. 46(2):211–33.

- 448 14. Grossman G, Kim S, Rexer J, Thirumurthy H. Political partisanship influences behavioral
449 responses to governors' recommendations for COVID-19 prevention in the United States.
450 Proc Natl Acad Sci USA. 2020;117(39):24144–53.
- 451 15. Chen H, Karim S. Relationship between political partisanship and COVID-19 deaths: future
452 implications for public health. J Public Health. 2022;44(3):716–23.
- 453 16. Sehgal NJ, Yue D, Wang RH, Roby DH. The Association Between COVID-19 Mortality And The
454 County-Level Partisan Divide In The United States. Health Affairs. 2022;41:853–63.
- 455 17. Kerr J, Panagoulos C, van der Linden S. Political polarization on COVID-19 pandemic
456 response in the United States. Personality and Individual Differences. 2021;
- 457 18. Anderson R, May R. Vaccination and herd immunity to infectious diseases. Nature.
458 1985;318:323–9.
- 459 19. Cowan S, Mark N, Reich J. COVID-19 Vaccine Hesitancy Is the New Terrain for Political
460 Division among Americans. Socius: Sociological Research for a Dynamic World. 2021;
- 461 20. Albrecht D. Vaccination, politics and COVID-19 impacts. BMV Public Health [Internet]. 2022
462 Jan 14;96. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12889-021-12432-x>
- 463 21. Prolific. What is a representative sample and why would I want one? [Internet]. Prolific
464 Academic; 2023. Available from: [https://researcher-help.prolific.co/hc/en-](https://researcher-help.prolific.co/hc/en-gb/articles/360019236753-Representative-samples)
465 [gb/articles/360019236753-Representative-samples](https://researcher-help.prolific.co/hc/en-gb/articles/360019236753-Representative-samples)
- 466 22. Sharma V, Mondal M. Understanding and Improving Usability of Data Dashboards for
467 Simplified Privacy Control of Voice Assistant Data.”. 31st USENIX Secur Symp USENIX Secur
468 22. 2022;
- 469 23. Mann H, Whitney D. On a Test of Whether one of Two Random Variables is Stochastically
470 Larger than the Other. Annals of Mathematical Statistics. 1947;18(1):50–60.
- 471 24. Kruskal W, Wallis A. Use of ranks in one-criterion variance analysis. Journal of the American
472 Statistical Association. 1952;47(260):583–621.
- 473 25. Cochran W. Some Methods for Strengthening the Common X² Tests. Biometrics.
474 1954;10(4):417–51.
- 475 26. Coronavirus in the U.S.: Latest Map and Case Count. New York Times [Internet]. 2023;
476 Available from: <https://www.nytimes.com/interactive/2021/us/covid-cases.html>
- 477 27. Hornsey M, Finlayson M, Chatwood G, Begeny C. Donald Trump and vaccination: The effect
478 of political identity, conspiracist ideation and presidential tweets on vaccine hesitancy.
479 Journal of Experimental Social Psychology. 2020;88.

- 480 28. Zhang B, Kreps S, McMurry N, McCain R. Americans' perceptions of privacy and surveillance
481 in the COVID-19 pandemic. *PLoS ONE*. 2020;15(12):e0242652.
- 482 29. Danquah L, Hasham N, MacFarlane M, Conteh F, Momh F, Tedesco A, et al. Use of a mobile
483 application for Ebola contact tracing and monitoring in northern Sierra Leone. *BMC*
484 *Infectious Diseases*. 2019;19.
- 485 30. Ha YP, Tesfalul MA, Littman-Quinn R, Antwi C, Green RS, Mapila TO, et al. Evaluation of a
486 Mobile Health Approach to Tuberculosis Contact Tracing in Botswana. *Journal of Health*
487 *Communication*. 2016;21:1115–21.
- 488 31. Sacks JA, Zehe E, Redick C, Bah A, Cowger K, Camara M, et al. Introduction of Mobile Health
489 Tools to Support Ebola Surveillance and Contact Tracing in Guinea. *Global Health: Science*
490 *and Practice*. 2015;3.
- 491 32. Kahnbach L, Lehr D, Brandenburger J, Mallwitz T, Jent S, Hannibal S, et al. Quality and
492 Adoption of COVID-19 Tracing Apps and Recommendations for Development: Systematic
493 Interdisciplinary Review of European Apps. *J Med Internet Res*. 2021;23(6):e27989.
- 494 33. Shahroz M, Ahmad F, Muhammad SY, Ahmad N, Boulos MNK, Vinuesa R, et al. COVID-19
495 digital contact tracing applications and techniques: A review post initial deployments.
496 *Transportation Engineering*. 2021;5.
- 497 34. Kapa S, Halamka J, Raskar R. Contact tracing to manage COVID19 spread—balancing
498 personal privacy and public health. *Mayo Clin Proc*. 2020;
- 499 35. Jones K, Thompson R. To Use or Not to Use a COVID-19 Contact Tracing App: Mixed
500 Methods Survey in Wales. *JMIR Mhealth Uhealth*. 2021;9(11):e29181.
- 501