

1 **Understanding the impact of COVID-19 risk perceptions on mitigation behaviors:**

2 **A mixed methods approach using survey instruments and serious games**

3 Scott C. Merrill^{1,2*}, Sarah A. Nowak³, Trisha R. Shrum^{2,4}, John P. Hanley³, Eric M. Clark¹, Luke Fredrickson⁵,
4 Tung-Lin Liu⁶, Robert M. Beattie⁵, Aislinn O’Keefe⁷, Asim Zia^{2,4,5} and Christopher J. Koliba^{2,4}

5 ¹ Department of Plant and Soil Science, University of Vermont, Burlington, VT 05405-0082, U.S.A.

6 ² Gund Institute for Environment, University of Vermont, Burlington, VT 05405, U.S.A.

7 ³ Department of Pathology & Laboratory Medicine, University of Vermont, Burlington, VT 05405, U.S.A.

8 ⁴ Department of Community Development and Applied Economics, University of Vermont, Burlington,
9 VT 05405, U.S.A.

10 ⁵ Department of Computer Science, University of Vermont, Burlington, Vermont, 05405, U.S.A.

11 ⁶ Department of Food Systems. University of Vermont, 105 Carrigan Drive, Burlington, VT 05405, U.S.A.

12 ⁷ Department of Animal and Veterinary Sciences, University of Vermont, Burlington, VT 05405, U.S.A.

13

14

15 * Corresponding Author

16 E-mail: SCMerril@UVM.edu (SCM)

17

18

19 **Abstract**

20 COVID-19 risk mitigation behavior, including social distancing and mask wearing, was a principal factor
21 influencing the spread of COVID-19. Yet this behavior, and its association with COVID-19 perceptions
22 and beliefs, is poorly understood. Here we used a mixed methods approach combining serious game
23 data with survey instruments to describe relationships between perceptions and behavior. Using a series
24 of survey questions, participants were described along a spectrum denoting their perception of their
25 susceptibility to COVID-19 associated with a list of activities. Afterwards, participants engaged with a
26 serious game to examine behavioral responses to scenarios involving shopping at a grocery store and
27 going to a park during simulated pandemic conditions. Messages describing the simulated infection risk
28 were shown to drive many behavioral decisions. Another significant correlate, derived from survey
29 results, was the participant's perception of susceptibility associated with various activities for acquiring
30 the COVID-19 infection. Individuals that perceived every day activities, such as grocery shopping, as
31 unlikely to lead to a COVID-19 infection spent more time near others in the game-simulated grocery
32 store environment compared to those that consider such activities as risky. Additionally, we found that
33 participant behavior became increasingly risky as time progresses if they were lucky enough not to
34 experience an infection. This reflects behavior observed in the United States and more broadly, possibly
35 explains how people update their perception of the risk of activities. Overall, results show a link
36 between perception and action with regards to COVID-19 and support the use of targeted risk
37 messaging to influence behavior. Moreover, the link between reported real-world perceptions and game
38 behavior suggest that serious games can be used as valuable tools to test policies, risk messaging and
39 communication, with the goal of nudging individuals with varied and nuanced perceptions and belief
40 sets towards behaviors that will reduce the impact of COVID-19.

41 **Key words**

42 Decision Making; Risk communication; Uncertainty; Human behavior; Policy design; Disease
43 management

44 **Introduction**

45 Appropriate use of non-pharmaceutical risk mitigating behaviors is crucial for controlling the spread of
46 infectious diseases such as COVID-19. In the United States, individual use of risk mitigating behaviors,
47 such as social distancing and mask wearing has been inconsistent (1, 2). Drivers of risk mitigating
48 behaviors include social components (3-5) observable, in part, through communities that share attitudes
49 and beliefs (6). A variety of public health policies and interventions have been instituted to increase the
50 use of risk mitigating behaviors such as obtaining vaccines (7). However, these policies have been
51 designed and enacted with a limited understanding of the underpinnings of behavioral decisions,
52 leading to a critical need to examine motivators of risk mitigation behaviors. The United States
53 government’s “Operation Warp Speed” was designed to develop vaccines as quickly as possible but
54 neglected social and behavioral aspects, such as messaging that would explain and encourage vaccine
55 use (8). This serves as a contemporary example of why assumptions of ubiquitous responses and
56 rational behavior are flawed and can be detrimental. Yet, examining risk behavior is challenging because
57 motivating factors are variable and complex (9).

58 Understanding how we make decisions is paramount to creating systems where more optimal or
59 resilient solutions can be reached. Yet studying the vagaries of human behavior and decision-making is
60 challenging because of the wide variety of rational and irrational behavior, and the difficulties in
61 collecting behavioral data. While traditional methods, such as surveys, generate critical data, they may
62 fail to capture unbiased responses (10), especially in risk management situations where survey
63 participants are distanced from real-world scenarios (11-13) (14). Moreover, the lack of dynamism
64 inherent in these methods limits insights into essential drivers of decision-making. I.e., if a hypothetical

65 situation evolves or respondents learn or adapt over time, these behavioral effects may not be
66 adequately captured with hypothetical survey questions. An alternative to traditional methods, and an
67 under-utilized method for gathering data, is through the use of serious games designed primarily for
68 data collection. For decades, economic and social game-theory style experiments, such as Flood and
69 Dresher's (15) Prisoner's Dilemma, or economic experiments such as Ellsberg's (16) ambiguity aversion
70 experiments or Holt and Laury's (17) risk aversion studies have been used to assess behavior and
71 decision-making. It has been found that participants respond dynamically to observed changes during
72 the experiment (e.g., experiencing a conflict), and thus provide information about how individuals
73 process information and make decisions as situations evolve and/or individual perceptions are modified
74 by their experiences. Moreover, serious games provide the opportunity to use performance-based
75 incentives which have been found to increase engagement and the salience of decisions, and further
76 align the incentives of participants with the underlying research structure and (18-20). Serious game
77 data can be integrated with other traditional data streams to get a nuanced, realistic representation of
78 behavioral responses. Thus a robust approach to gaining a fuller understanding of human nature may be
79 through triangulating a variety of methods, such as surveys, focus groups, as well as serious games, then
80 to integrate data streams into data analyses.

81 Computer-based serious games allow users to "experience" hypothetical scenarios without placing
82 them in real decision-making situations, thus allowing for imposed conflict to incite a behavioral
83 response. Serious gaming research has been applied to simulated disease outbreaks in livestock, and has
84 exposed sharply irrational and boundedly rational behavior when participants were confronted with
85 conflict and exposed to dynamic risk situations (21-26). For example, willingness to invest in protective
86 measures for the health of livestock was influenced by treatments that provided or withheld certain
87 types of information (22, 23). Interestingly, the type of information withheld prompted different
88 situational responses (23). Specifically, withholding information about disease in the system reduced

89 willingness to invest in biosecurity measures, while withholding information about how others were
90 responding to the disease outbreak increased willingness to invest in biosecurity. Merrill et al. (24)
91 found that in some risk scenarios, participants complied with suggested rules three-times more
92 frequently when presented with risk information with a visual threat gauge compared to when risk was
93 communicated using a number. Interactive, immersive or virtual reality imagery has been shown to alter
94 intent more than passive information transfer (e.g., reading) (27). Graphical or visual displays have been
95 identified as increasing salience in certain contexts over simple text or numerical displays (19). One's
96 local environment and imagery are known to influence affect (28), which in turn is known to influence
97 decision-making (29).

98 One theoretical framework that suggests a mostly rational framework for decision-making processes
99 associated with health behaviors is the Health Belief Model (HBM). In the HBM, perceptions of
100 preventive behaviors and disease influence behavioral intention and behaviors (30). One of the key HBM
101 tenets is that perceived susceptibility influences mitigation behavior, specifically where those that
102 perceive themselves as less susceptible, are less likely to adopt behaviors that reduce the threat (31,
103 32). We suggest that collecting data on beliefs of the safety of COVID-19 related activities and
104 observations of social distancing behaviors will provide evidence for decision-making heuristics that can
105 be further used to help design policies and incentives to help reduce the impact of COVID-19 (33).
106 Further, experimental treatments that vary the situational context could be used to examine COVID-19
107 risk perceptions, and thus gather data to assess communication strategies, the results of which could be
108 used to increase mitigation behaviors.

109 We used survey methodologies triangulated with serious games to collect human belief, perception
110 and behavioral data. We used survey questions to understand perceived risk of activities, then we used
111 a serious game to study risk mitigating behavior using treatments that vary both direct and indirect
112 COVID-19 infection risk information (Fig. 1). Drawing from a sample population from across the United

113 States, we sought to understand relationships between COVID-19 risk perceptions and the effect on
114 behavior. We looked for behavioral differences when participants were confronted with a series of
115 simulated everyday activities, i.e., obtaining food and getting exercise. We hypothesized that
116 perceptions of the risk or safety associated with many everyday activities would be associated with risk
117 behavior in simulated activities. Testing this hypothesis will help us understand linkages between risk
118 perceptions, intent and consequent behavior, as well as how risk messages can influence behavior.
119 Further, results will provide insight into how to effectively sculpt messages and policies to nudge
120 behavior towards compliance with COVID-19 risk mitigating behavior.

121 **[Figure 1 Caption:** Figure 1. Project design including a Qualtrics survey linked to the serious game,
122 followed by data analysis.]

123 **Methods**

124 **Recruitment of Participants**

125 Five hundred and sixty-six (566) individuals were recruited and participated in the experiment between
126 March 9th, 2021 and April 14th, 2021 (before widespread availability of vaccines). Individuals were
127 recruited through the online workplace Amazon Mechanical Turk (21, 34, 35), an online recruitment tool
128 that has been found to be largely as representative as simple convenience samples (36). Recruits were
129 informed that they would be paid based on their performance during the experiment (i.e., performance-
130 based incentives). Participants started the experiment by completing a survey on the Qualtrics platform
131 before following an online link to initiate the serious game. The serious game portion started with an
132 interactive demonstration to frame the game mechanics and decision mechanism. Institutional Review
133 Board protocols were followed for an experiment using human participants (University of Vermont IRB #
134 CHRBS-15-319-IRB). On average, participants earned \$10.14 with a minimum payout of \$7.94 and a
135 maximum of \$12.33.

136 **Survey Details**

137 Participants started the experiment by completing a survey which was implemented using Qualtrics
138 software (survey results are also analyzed in a separate paper (37)). For the present analysis, we
139 constructed a Perceived Activity Risk Index from seventeen survey questions related to the perception
140 of the safety of different activities in regards to exposure to COVID-19 (Table 1). For example, one of the
141 questions from the set asked “How safe or unsafe are the following actions for avoiding exposure to
142 coronavirus: Obtaining take-out food from a restaurant.”? (1: Extremely Safe, 2: Somewhat Safe, 3:
143 Unsure, 4: Somewhat Unsafe, 5: Extremely Unsafe). The Perceived Activity Risk Index was designed to
144 quantify the perceived safety by summing the response values from the seventeen questions with
145 summed values ranging from a possible low of 17 (all activities deemed to be Extremely Safe) to 85 (all
146 activities deemed to be Extremely Unsafe). The summed values were then normalized by subtracting the
147 minimum and dividing by the range. Resultant values thus varied from 0-1 with 0 equating to perceiving
148 activities as being extremely safe and 1 being those that perceived activities as being extremely unsafe.
149 Those individuals falling on the lower end of this scale may believe that COVID-19 was not a real or
150 serious threat. The Perceived Activity Risk Index was considered the measure of the participant’s
151 perceived susceptibility, thus aligning the risk index with the perception of susceptibility tenet of the
152 Health Belief Model.

153 **Serious Game Data and Details**

154 After completing the survey, participants were directed to a computer link that launched the serious
155 game. The serious game was developed using the Unity Engine (Unity Technologies, Version 2019.4.3f1).
156 Participants were prompted with an interactive tutorial before gameplay. The tutorial contained dialog
157 boxes which the participant was required to acknowledge before advancing. These tutorial messages
158 explained the mechanics of the game and the decisions required by the player, highlighted important

159 user interface (UI) elements, and demonstrated how to complete a round of play. After completing the
160 tutorial, participants were given the choice of replaying the tutorial or beginning the experiment. A
161 demonstration version of the game can be found here: <https://segs.w3.uvm.edu/CovidBeta>

162 **Serious Game Design and Details**

163 After completing a survey, participants observed an introductory tutorial that describes how to use the
164 game. It is explained to the participant that exposure time in the game reflects more time in the real
165 world: “In this experiment COVID-19 exposure is elevated to reflect the short time that you will be
166 playing the game; seconds in the game represent minutes or hours of exposure. Please consider every
167 second spent near others, within a 6’ radius distance, a meaningful contact with a chance of getting
168 infected from COVID-19.” Moreover, they were told that their performance in the game, the more
169 points they earn, will translate to more U.S. dollars earned. During the tutorial, participants practiced
170 each option in the game setting for obtaining food and obtaining exercise. After completing the tutorial,
171 users completed fifteen rounds each with differing context and messages regarding COVID-19.
172 Alteration of context and messages were considered treatments. Treatments experienced by
173 participants included varying the density of computer-generated people (bots) in game locations, and
174 the infection prevalence among the computer-generated people (infection prevalence information was
175 provided to participants using a visual threat gauge). Treatments specifics are detailed below.

176 Each round of the serious game was comprised of six scenes, which iteratively follow based on the
177 participant’s decisions. To start each round, scene 1 provided the user with COVID-19 risk information.
178 The second experimental scene prompted the participant to select how they wish to obtain food, by
179 either selecting take-out delivery or going to the grocery store (e.g., Fig. 2). They were informed that
180 take-out will require them to wait for 15 seconds and provides limited points (50 points) or they may
181 decide to go to the grocery store for the opportunity to earn up to 200 points. Going to the grocery

182 store carried the risk of acquiring COVID-19 either through proximity (being within 6-feet of another
183 individual) or through airborne transmission. The longer the participant was in the simulated grocery
184 store environment with potentially infected individuals, the higher their chances of acquiring COVID-19.
185 Participants going to the grocery store were given 30 seconds to collect eight food items, each worth 25
186 points, for a total of 200 possible points (Fig. 2). After completing food acquisition, the next scene
187 prompted a decision on how to obtain exercise for the day. Participants chose to either go to a park or
188 to exercise at home. Similar to the grocery store decision, the stay-at-home option provides no risk but a
189 low point reward. If participants decide to go to the park, they were tasked with collecting leaves
190 (symbolizing getting exercise in a natural setting) within a 30 second time limit. Ten leaves, each valued
191 at 20 points, were available for collection, allowing for a maximum of 200 total points. In the park
192 environment, participants could become infected if they were within 6 feet of an infected individual.
193 There was no airborne disease vector in the simulated park environment.

194 **[Figure 2 Caption:** Figure 2. A screen grab of the grocery store environment during the experiment.
195 During the round the participant (center of screen in red) moves around the store potentially interacting
196 with other customers, some of which are wearing masks (e.g., upper left corner) while others are not
197 (blue shirt, center right). The grocery list is displayed in the upper right side. The infection risk is
198 displayed in the bottom left corner with a threat gauge. Time remaining to obtain groceries is displayed
199 in the upper left corner.]

200 After both food provisioning and exercise activities were completed, our interface informed the
201 participant if they became infected, and if so where (grocery store or park) and how much money they
202 earned or lost (in case of infection) during the round. The game then progresses to the next treatment
203 round or an end of game screen if all fifteen rounds have been completed.

204 In the grocery store and the park environments, participants encountered automated, computer-
205 controlled characters (or “bots”) that navigated around the scene. The number of bots seen in each

206 location was defined by the “density” treatment variable. In the grocery store, bots navigated to different
207 points in the store, pausing at those points for a short amount of time to simulate the collection of
208 groceries before moving on, and eventually leaving the store. In the park, bots were randomly assigned a
209 direction to walk along a trail in the park, and continuously moved in that direction at varying movement
210 speeds relative to the player’s movement speed.

211 Bots were assigned two possible personalities: risk averse and risk tolerant. Risk averse bots always
212 wore masks and tried to avoid the player in the park by stepping off to the side of the path when the
213 player entered their proximity. Risk tolerant bots never wore masks and did not try to avoid the player in
214 the park.

215 Every bot was potentially infectious with COVID-19. The proportion of infective and non-infective bots
216 was defined by the *Infection Prevalence* treatment variable, which was communicated to the player using
217 a graphical infection risk threat gauge (Fig. 3). The threat gauge was presented to the participant before
218 each round and additionally was fixed to the bottom left of the simulation interface while navigating each
219 environment. Each bot had a circular “infection zone” measuring 6 feet in radius. For every 0.1 second
220 that the participant was within an infected bot’s infection zone, there was a small chance of infecting the
221 player. Specifically, for every 0.1 seconds within the 6-foot radius, there was a 0.5% chance if the infected
222 bot was unmasked, and a 0.025% chance if the infected bot was masked. In addition to transmission from
223 close contact, we included the potential for airborne transmission in the grocery store. Specifically, to
224 account for increased risk of COVID-19 infection indoors, for every 0.1 second in the grocery store,
225 infected bots in the grocery store had a 0.01% chance (unmasked) or 0.005% chance (masked) of infecting
226 the player, even if the player was outside the bot’s infection zone.

227 **[Figure 3 Caption:** Figure 3: Infection prevalence or risk was provided to the participant before each
228 treatment round and while in the interactive grocery store and park environments.]

229

230 After completing the round (both food and exercise components, players are informed if they
231 became infected during the round. Infected players receive the message: “You have been infected with
232 COVID-19. You lose 800 points. You were infected at the [Grocery Store or Park]”. After this they see a
233 second screen with the message: “You have recovered from COVID-19. You are no longer infected with
234 COVID-19 and can’t spread the virus. However, you are not immune, and you can become infected
235 again.” The game then proceeds to the start of the next round or to the end of game screen if all rounds
236 were completed.

237 Throughout the game, we collected data from participants’ choices and actions. Each round, we
238 logged the participants’ decision to go to the grocery store or obtain food using the grocery delivery
239 mechanism; their decision to go to the park or completing a home workout; the time they spent at the
240 grocery store and park; how many groceries and leaves (the unit of exercise quality measurement used in
241 the park environment) they collected; the cumulative time they spent within 6 feet of computer-
242 generated bots; whether they were infected that round; and the points earned. At the end of each round,
243 data were transmitted to a server and stored in a MySQL database.

244 In summary, during the serious game phase, participants completed fifteen rounds of decision
245 making with four potential decision sets per round. Decision sets were as follows: 1) Deciding how to
246 obtain food: Delivery or Grocery Store. 2) If the Grocery Store option was selected, decision actions
247 while the participant was obtaining food at the store. 3) Deciding how to obtain exercise: At home or
248 going to the park. 4) If the park option was selected, decision actions while the participant was at the
249 park.

250 **Independent Variables and Experimental Treatments**

251 *Perceived Susceptibility (Survey)*

252 As previously noted, the Perceived Activity Risk Index, was designed as a measure of perceived
253 susceptibility from the HBM. As such we hypothesized that those with high perceived susceptibility
254 would be more likely to avoid risky situations.

255 *Infection Prevalence*

256 The community risk of infection was provided to the participant with the “The risk of infection in your
257 local area is indicated by the risk level dial. Higher risk indicates a higher percentage of infected people
258 in your community.” The infection prevalence or infection risk gauge (Fig. 3) was presented to the
259 participant before each static decision point (food provisioning and exercise provisioning). Additionally,
260 if the participant went to the grocery store or park, the gauge was presented during the entirety of their
261 time spent in those environments. The COVID-19 Risk threat gauge was a measure of the prevalence of
262 COVID-19 in the community.

263 *Density of Computer-Generated Bots*

264 Both the grocery store and park environments were populated by computer-generated bots that
265 mimicked the behavior of people in those environments. For example, bots in the grocery store were
266 programmed to collect their own set of grocery store items and move around the store. Density of bots
267 varied by treatment because we hypothesized that the density of people in an environment would
268 influence behavior. Density varied from none (no people in grocery store or park), to low (4 people in
269 grocery store, 8 people in park), to high (8 people in grocery store, 16 people in park). Density was
270 correlated with risk because infection transmission was coded to occur on a probabilistic bases from
271 infected to susceptible individuals.

272 *Rounds since last infection (Fear extinction)*

273 The extinction phase of classical conditioning and extinction suggests that removal of stimulus will
274 gradually reduce the behavior associated with the stimulus. In the case of Pavlov’s dogs, salivating after

275 hearing the bell declined until extinction if food was not provided. However, if food was provided during
276 the extinction phase, then salivation returned upon bell ringing to a high level. Similarly, fear behavior
277 can be conditioned (e.g., repeatedly being told that an activity could result in death), and further fear
278 can decay if experience suggests that the fear is unwarranted – called fear extinction learning (38). Here
279 we suggest that the perception of the fear of COVID-19 infection associated with a behavior wanes if no
280 infection occurs. We hypothesize that fear extinction learning may surface in two ways: 1) Fear
281 extinction of grocery store behaviors, and 2) Fear extinction associated with exercise at the park
282 activities. Thus, two variables were quantified to account for potential fear extinction learning: *Rounds*
283 *since last infection: Grocery Store* and *Rounds since last infection: Park*. These variables measure the
284 length in rounds or experience since an infection: 1) specifically in the grocery store, or 2) specifically in
285 the park. The *Rounds since last infection* variables are quantified to start at 1 and increased by 1 each
286 round that the participant does not get COVID-19. If the participant does get COVID-19 at either the
287 grocery store or the park, then the appropriate variable is reset to 1 and the process restarts. Thus, a
288 low *Rounds since last infection* value is associated with low extinction (fear of the activity remains), and
289 a high *Rounds since last infection* suggests that fear associated with activities may have decreased.
290 *Rounds since last infection* variables are context specific with the location-specific variables only
291 incrementing upon visiting those locals. For example, the grocery store variable increments up only if
292 the participant goes shopping and does not get sick at the grocery store. It does not increment up if they
293 stay home and have food delivered. The *Rounds since last infection: grocery store* variable resets to 1 if
294 the participant gets sick while shopping. Similarly, the *Rounds since last infection: Park* variable only
295 increments up if the participant goes to the park and does not get sick at the park and resets to 1 if the
296 participant gets sick at the park.

297 *Round Number (Learning during Game Play)*

298 The order that treatment scenarios are played was randomized. Yet, players may learn different
299 strategies as the game progresses, such as becoming less willing to go to the grocery store over time
300 because they feel that it isn't worth the risk. To control for within-experiment learning or behavioral
301 trends we included a covariate labeled *Round Number* (39, 40). To quantify Round Number, we
302 normalized the order that treatments were played from 0 (first round) to 1 (last round), and used this
303 covariate to test if participants changed their behavior as the game progressed.

304 **Data Analysis**

305 All analyses were completed using R (41) with plots developed using ggplot2 (42). Models were
306 developed for two decision sets: 1) Willingness to go to the grocery store, 2) willingness to break social
307 distancing rules in the grocery store.

308 *Willingness to go to the grocery store*

309 We used a mixed effect logistic regression to examine willingness to go to the grocery store to purchase
310 food. The dependent variable was the binary decision to either go to the grocery store or to order food
311 delivery. The model examined included participant ID as the random variable, and the independent
312 variables: 1) COVID-19 community Infection Risk, 2) Rounds since last infection: Grocery Store, 3)
313 Rounds since last infection: Park, 4) the Perceived Activity Risk Index and 5) an interaction term between
314 the Perceived Activity Risk Index and the Infection Risk. No other information was available to the
315 participant when they were making the initial decision to go to the grocery store (e.g., density of
316 shoppers in the store).

317 *Aggregate willingness to break social distancing rules in the grocery store*

318 In the simulated grocery store environment participants were required to move using the arrow keys to
319 collect grocery items. Points were accrued by collecting groceries from their list, and infection (resulting













320 in a points cost) could occur from either coming within a 6-foot radius of the computer-generated bots
321 or through simulated airborne transmission.







322 Of interest was how participant’s perception of the safety of activities for acquiring COVID-19
323 impacted their willingness to break the 6-foot social distancing rule. We quantified social distance rule
324 breaking across all treatments, including contexts where one was unwilling to go to the grocery store
325 (i.e., they chose to safely procure food through home delivery), avoiding the opportunity to break the
326 social distancing rules. To test the relationship between perceptions of safety and social distance rule
327 breaking, we examined the relationship between the Perceived Activity Risk Index and the total amount
328 of time spent within a 6-foot radius of the computer bots summed across all treatments using a simple
329 linear regression model with aggregate time spent around computer-bots as the dependent variable
330 regressed against the Perceived Activity Risk Index.

331 **Results**

332 During the serious game phase, participants completed 15 treatment rounds of decision making with
333 four potential decision sets in each round. Decision sets were as follows: 1) Deciding how to obtain food:
334 Delivery or Grocery Store. 2) If the Grocery Store option was selected, decision actions while the
335 participant was obtaining food at the store. 3) Deciding how to obtain exercise: At home workout or
336 going to the park. 4) If the going to the park option was selected, decision actions while the participant
337 was at the park.

Table 1. Survey Question: How safe or unsafe are the following actions for avoiding exposure to coronavirus? (1: Extremely Safe, 2: Somewhat Safe, 3: Unsure, 4: Somewhat Unsafe, 5: Extremely Unsafe).	Response Distributions: Extremely Safe (left) to Extremely Unsafe (right)
---	---

Grocery Shopping (mean = 2.89, median = 2)	
Attending gatherings of more than 10 people (mean = 3.68, median = 4)	
Attending gatherings of more than 50 people (mean = 3.96, median = 5)	
Attending church or other religious services (mean = 3.64, median = 4)	
Going to the hospital (mean = 3.27, median = 4)	
Dining indoors at restaurants not practicing social distancing (mean = 3.67, median = 4)	
Dining indoors at restaurants practicing social distancing (e.g., tables are six feet apart) (mean = 3.16, median = 4)	
Dining outdoors at restaurants practicing social distancing (e.g., tables are six feet apart) (mean = 2.69, median = 2)	
Eating take-out meals from restaurants (mean = 2.34, median = 2)	
Visiting with relatives or friends in their home (mean = 3.27, median = 4)	
Hosting relatives or friends in your home (mean = 3.36, median = 4)	
Socializing outdoors (mean = 2.76, median = 2)	

<p>Going to an indoor gym, yoga, or fitness class (mean = 3.63, median = 4)</p>	
<p>Going outside to walk, hike, or exercise (mean = 2.16, median = 2)</p>	
<p>Running, walking or biking near other people (mean = 2.82, median = 2)</p>	
<p>Having a babysitter or nanny come to your house to care for your children (mean = 3.27, median = 4)</p>	
<p>Sending your kids to school, daycare, or summer camp (mean = 3.50, median = 4)</p>	
<p>The Perceived Activity Risk Index was derived from the 17 safety questions above. Each question was coded from 1: Extremely safe to 5: Extremely Unsafe, with Unsure coded to a value of 3. Values from all 17 questions were summed, then normalized to obtain a Perceived Activity Risk Index value for each participant. Participants with higher values perceive activities as being unsafe or risky. (mean = 0.55, median = 0.6)</p>	

338

339 The Perceived Activity Risk Index was found to be left-skewed with a mean of 0.545 and a median of
 340 0.603, indicating that participants leaned towards a perception that activities queried were somewhat
 341 unsafe. Note the relative polarization in the perceptions of safety with most people not selecting unsure
 342 in any of the seventeen individual questions. That is, there are relatively strong beliefs about the safety
 343 of activities.

344 **Willingness to go to the Grocery Store**

345 Results from the mixed-effect logistic regression strongly suggest that the virtual possibility of a COVID-
346 19 infection and the resultant costs influenced participants' willingness to go to the grocery store with
347 many opting to reduce the amount of money that they took home to avoid the risk of infection. The
348 independent variables considered were the Infection Risk, the Round Order, Rounds since last Infection:
349 Grocery Store, Rounds since last Infection: Park, the Perceived Activity Risk Index (i.e., Table 1), and an
350 interaction term between the Perceived Activity Risk Index and the Infection Risk. We observed strong
351 odds ratios for many of the relationships in the model with reductions in the likelihood of going to the
352 grocery store associated with Round Number (as experience accrued individuals were less likely to risk
353 going to the grocery store), High Infection Risk, and interactions between High and Medium Infection
354 risk messages and the Perceived Activity Risk Index (Table 2, Fig. 4). As described by Figure 4,
355 participants that perceived activities as being generally safe were much more likely to go to the grocery
356 store in both of the higher risk categories than those that described activities as unsafe. However, if the
357 infection risk was Low then those that described activities as unsafe were more likely to go to the store,
358 possibly indicating that those individuals were seeking a relatively safe time to obtain food (and earn
359 consequent money). Figure 5 describes the relationship between the Rounds since last Infection:
360 Grocery Store variable and the Infection Risk. Specifically, in all infection risk situations, as the number
361 of rounds since a participant has become increases, they are increasing likely to go to the grocery store
362 to obtain food. This effect is dramatic in the High Infection Risk treatments, where inexperienced
363 participants (early rounds) or those that have experienced an infection are unlikely to go to the grocery
364 store (i.e., less than 25% choose to go to the store), whereas those that have experienced ten rounds or
365 more without an infection are more likely than not (greater than 50%) to go to the store, indicating that
366 the fear of an infection has largely dissipated for those participants.

367 **[Figure 4 Caption:** Figure 4. Results find strong contextual relationships between stated preferences and
368 beliefs, and behavior during game play. Infection risk context-specific, willingness to go grocery

369 shopping in the game was correlated with survey responses describing stated perception of the safety of
 370 activities such as gathering in numbers. Results indicate that responses to serious game treatments
 371 reflect responses of risk typologies to incentives, policies and messages.]

372 **[Figure 5 Caption:** Figure 5. The probability that a participant would go to the grocery store to procure
 373 food has a strong relationship with becoming infected at the grocery store on previous rounds with the
 374 effect diminishing over time. This fear extinction effect is modified by the prevalence of infection. On
 375 the x-axis, 0 indicates that they were infected in the previous round, whereas high numbers indicate
 376 that they have consistently gone to the grocery store without becoming infected.]

377
 378 Table 2. Odds ratios for willingness to go to the grocery store with 95% confidence intervals, Z-values, P-
 379 values and indicators of significance.

Fixed Effect	Odds Ratio [UCI,LCI]	Z-Value	P-value	Sig. Ind.
Round Number	0.146 [0.081,0.148]	-14.523	< 0.001	***
Rounds Since Last Infection: Park	1.173 [1.150,1.254]	8.322	< 0.001	***
Rounds Since Last Infection: Grocery Store	1.191 [1.165,1.263]	9.388	< 0.001	***
Low Infection Risk	1.720 [1.041,2.543]	2.136	0.033	*
Medium Infection Risk	1.114 [0.676,1.659]	0.249	0.804	
High Infection Risk	0.433 [0.260,0.657]	-3.737	< 0.001	***
Perceived Activity Risk Index	2.195 [1.119,4.808]	2.261	0.024	*
Medium Infection Risk*Perceived Activity Risk Index	0.078 [0.043,0.140]	-8.461	< 0.001	***
High Infection Risk*Perceived Activity Risk Index	0.031 [0.016,0.061]	-10.147	< 0.001	***

380

381 **Aggregate willingness to break social distancing rules in the grocery store**

382 Overall, those that scored low on the Perceived Activity Risk Index (i.e., described activities as general
 383 safe) spent significantly more time within a 6-foot radius of people in the grocery store (Effect Size = -
 384 10.319 seconds, standard error = 1.724, t-value = -5.986, p-value < 0.001) than those that described
 385 activities as unsafe (Fig. 6).

386 **[Figure 6 Caption:** Figure 6. The survey-derived Perceived Activity Risk Index describes perception of
387 how risky a variety of activities are for acquiring a COVID-19 infection. This index was strongly correlated
388 to how much time participants spent near others in the virtual serious game environment with those
389 that felt that activities were generally risky spending significantly less time breaking the social distancing
390 rule than those on the other side of the spectrum.]

391 **Discussion**

392 Mixed-method approaches to obtain data on potential responses to risk messages, communication
393 strategies and novel policies allow for the triangulation of data, thus potentially generating predictions
394 that are more robust than using any single methodology (e.g., surveys, focus groups, or serious games).
395 Moreover, using user-friendly data gathering approaches, such as serious games, promote engagement
396 and quick responses.

397 We found that infection risk level was a strong predictor of user's willingness to go to the grocery
398 store, with High infection rates dramatically reducing user's willingness to go to the store (OR: 0.433).
399 Medium infection risk was also correlated with slightly increased odds of going to the store (OR: 1.114),
400 and a strong willingness to go the store was associated with Low infection risk scenarios (OR: 1.720).
401 Also note the strong interaction effect with the Perceived Activity Risk Index: when the infection risk was
402 medium or high, individuals were much more likely to go to the grocery store if they believed that
403 activities were generally safe, contrasted with those individuals that believed that activities were risky.
404 In the real-world perceptions of susceptibility are likely confounded by other factors such as ideological-
405 driven messaging and cultural norming, which makes the infection risk gauge possibly overly simplistic.
406 However, this also points to the value of providing a simple device, or messaging strategy such as a
407 scaling infection risk indicator.

408 As participants accrued experience, they went to the grocery store much less frequently, opting to
409 obtain food through the home delivery mechanism (OR 0.146). This indicates that participants were
410 willing to alter their strategy during the process to adjust to the perceived risks and rewards offered by
411 going to the grocery store (i.e., they could obtain four times as many points (200 vs. 50) but risked losing
412 800 points).

413 The Rounds since last Infection variables used in the willingness to go to the grocery store model
414 suggested that fear of becoming infected, and possibly the consequent perception of the probability of
415 an infection declined substantially and increasingly with repeated risk-taking and without becoming
416 infected. Specifically, number of rounds since getting infected at the park (OR: 1.173) and number of
417 rounds since getting infected at the grocery store (OR: 1.191) both increased the likelihood that a
418 participant would go to the grocery store. This effect is illustrated in Figure 5 where willingness to go to
419 the grocery store increased the longer and more successfully that participants had avoided becoming
420 sick at the grocery store, with probability modified by the prevalence of COVID-19 in the community
421 (infection risk). With high prevalence of COVID-19, an individual who either avoided taking risks or who
422 recently took risks and became infected was less likely to go to the store than an individual who had
423 taken risks and avoided getting sick for a majority of the game. This relationship was apparent but less
424 pronounced at lower infection risk levels. This pattern indicates that individuals update their risk
425 perceptions of an activity depending on whether they get infected after engaging in that activity. In this
426 scenario, the cognitive process of fear extinction (38), where iteratively engaging in risky behavior
427 without consequence may result in disillusionment or extinction of the fear of infection, and thus may
428 lead individuals to update their risk perceptions in a way that biases their subjective risk perception
429 compared to the objective risks.

430 The Perceived Activity Risk Index was created from survey data to generalize user perception of how
431 likely or unlikely they were to contract COVID-19 across a selection of activities (Table 1). We found

432 correlations with this index and behavior during serious game play, especially when considered within
433 an infection risk context. When participants were told that the community infection risk was Low,
434 individuals were less likely to go to the grocery store if they believed that in general activities were safe
435 and unlikely to lead to a COVID-19 infection (OR: 2.195) but much more likely to go to the store when
436 infection risk was Medium (OR: 0.078) or High (OR: 0.031) (Fig. 4). This interaction demonstrates a
437 strong correlational relationship between perceptions and in-game behavior. Moreover, that behavior
438 and perceptions interact with the simulated risk context. These results support the HBM-derived
439 hypothesis suggesting that perceived susceptibility to a disease, in this case COVID-19, will impact
440 behavior, with the context (infection risk) and the survey-queried Perceived Activity Risk Index both
441 aligning with perceptions of susceptibility. Therefore, communication strategies that nudge
442 understanding of perceptions of susceptibility should impact behavioral responses. Over the course of
443 game play, those that scored low on the Perceived Activity Risk Index, e.g., described activities as
444 general safe, spent significantly more time within a 6-foot radius of people in the grocery store. Those
445 that were at the extreme lower end of the Perceived Activity Risk Index spent more than three times as
446 much simulation time in close proximity to the computer-generated bots than those on the extreme
447 upper end of the spectrum. Again, this reinforces that perceptions of risk and susceptibility influence
448 behavior even in a simulated environment. We should stress that because this is a simulated
449 environment, perceptions of risk of activities should not change behavioral strategies from a rational
450 actor perspective, yet these results describe correlations between risk perceptions in the real-world and
451 how participants “play” in a simulated environment.

452 Analyses of the willingness to go to the park and behavior within the park were completed but have
453 not been reported here for purposes of brevity. Overall, the data align well with decisions to go to the
454 grocery store and behavior in the grocery store, i.e., the data support that participants with low
455 Perceived Activity Risk Index scores were more likely to go to the park, and overall spent more time

456 breaking the 6-foot social distancing rule within the park environment. These results provided little
457 additional insight but added complexity. For example, decisions to go to the park for exercise appeared
458 to be influenced by the experience in the grocery store environment, including an index created to
459 quantify time spent breaking the 6-foot social distancing rule, including whether they obtained food by
460 food delivery. A successful grocery store experience (quantified as going to the grocery store and having
461 less than average time breaking the social distancing rule per treatment) was positively correlated with
462 going to the park to obtain exercise. Overall, differences between the grocery store and park
463 environments were not radically different, perhaps because at the time of data collection, it was less
464 recognized that outdoor interactions were unlikely to lead to significant COVID-19 exposure.

465 Because participation in this serious game was completed before wide-spread availability of
466 vaccines, perceptions formed regarding the safety of non-pharmaceutical interventions such as social
467 distancing were likely related to behavior in real world situations. The ability to see these relationships
468 reflected in game play, with risk perceptions (i.e., the Perceived Activity Risk Index) strongly predicting
469 the likelihood of engaging in risky behavior during the game, provides evidence that we can delineate
470 individuals that may be more likely to take risks in everyday activities, and further, identify regions with
471 subcultures that may have a generally consistent set of risk perceptions, that may promote or dampen
472 the spread of disease. Identifying these subcultures, through queries about the safety of activities, may
473 allow for targeted messages that nudge perceptions of susceptibility, and thus nudge behavior to more
474 conservative, risk mitigating behaviors.

475 Our research shows that survey responses to perceptions of the risk associated with activities
476 correlated to their risk behaviors in the simulated environments. This finding, though not surprising,
477 demonstrates the efficacy of cognitive theories that assert that perceptions shape actions (e.g., HBM or
478 the Theory of Planned Behavior (43)), even in contexts such as simulations or online games that,
479 according to rational actor theory, should be distant from actual behavior. That is, the HBM and Theory

480 of Planned behavior might suggest that perceptions are more tightly linked to real-world behavioral
481 intentions than hypothetical behavioral intentions.

482 These findings also shed light on the important role that public health information plays in governing
483 behavior, suggesting that risk information does, indeed, impact behaviors of people who hold beliefs
484 across the spectrum of perceptions about the safety or riskiness of activities. Those with a high degree
485 of risk safety are most sensitive to information and thus may be more responsive to frequent and fluid
486 risk communication strategies. This suggests that public health information campaigns and infographics
487 such as real time risk and threat indicators, should be widely used to alert the public to elevated or
488 lowered risks and opportunities to shape perceptions of risk situations are possible and likely needed.
489 These findings also demonstrate the efficacy of using serious games as proxies for behavior - games
490 which can leverage theoretical underpinnings such as the HBM to further our understanding of decision-
491 making and behavior. The capacity of serious games to provide dynamically changing environments or
492 contexts, vary treatments in information and risk rates, and observe responses generates more nuanced
493 data that can be leveraged to understand within-subject variability. These data coupled with
494 perceptions elicited via survey data, provide a powerful mixed methods approach to studying human
495 behavior. Considerations such as participant socio-economic background, political ideology, and
496 geographic locations can provide subtle, but important differences in the efficacy of risk communication
497 strategies. In addition, these findings provide finer grain understandings of participants' willingness to
498 adopt which can allow for more geographically bound profiles of sub-populations, allowing public health
499 officials to tailor messaging and policies to trigger behavioral nudges. Future work could delve into
500 additional social and cultural factors, such as ideologies or geographical factors, that may be linked to
501 the perception of susceptibility or the perception of the benefits of using COVID-19 risk mitigating
502 behaviors. Further work could identify vaccine-hesitant individuals and use a virtual, serious game to

503 determine which policies, social environments and communication strategies alter their behavior in a
504 virtual world, which could provide insight into how to effectively increase vaccine uptake.

505 **Conclusion**

506 Here we show that a user-friendly data gathering tools, serious games combined with surveys, could be
507 leveraged to generate big data, with potential for understanding and testing interventions to improve
508 risk communication, policy design with resultant public health implications. Results explore the
509 relationship between perceptions, intentions and simulated behavior – a critical step in linking intent to
510 behavior.

511 Overall results depict strong relationships between stated beliefs and observed responses to
512 experimental conditions or contexts. This suggests that messages, policies and communication
513 strategies can be tailored to stated belief structures and assessed for efficacy. Consequently, we can
514 quantify the relative effects of strategies and policies before deployment and reduce the likelihood of
515 perverse incentives or effects, and further, suggest best communication strategies to achieve
516 intervention goals.

517 We show that behavior of individuals within a virtual environment could be used to help understand
518 a participant’s belief structure about the perception of activities in a COVID-19 environment, and vise-
519 versa. It follows that the virtual environment can then be used to test messaging and communication
520 strategies to determine their effectiveness for nudging behavior, or nudging correlates of behavior such
521 as perceptions of susceptibility. Thus, we can explore messages and policies to determine efficacy for
522 nudging behavior of people that hold different sets of beliefs, allowing for the targeting and
523 optimization of strategies to reduce risk-taking behavior and lessen the impact of COVID-19.

524 **Acknowledgments**

525 We acknowledge support from the Social Ecological Gaming and Simulation laboratory at the University
526 of Vermont.

527 **References**

- 528 1. Beckage B, Buckley TE, Beckage ME. Prevalence of Face Mask Wearing in Northern Vermont in
529 Response to the COVID-19 Pandemic. Public Health Rep. 2021;6.
- 530 2. Guy GP. Association of State-Issued Mask Mandates and Allowing On-Premises Restaurant
531 Dining with County-Level COVID-19 Case and Death Growth Rates - United States, March 1-December
532 31, 2020 (vol 70, pg 350, 2021). MMWR-Morb Mortal Wkly Rep. 2021;70(21):796-.
- 533 3. Rutjens BT, van der Linden S, van der Lee R, Zarzeczna N. A group processes approach to
534 antiscience beliefs and endorsement of “alternative facts”. Group Processes & Intergroup Relations.
535 2021;24(4):513-7.
- 536 4. Troiano G, Nardi A. Vaccine hesitancy in the era of COVID-19. Public Health. 2021;194:245-51.
- 537 5. Lalot F, Abrams D, Heering MS, Babaian J, özkeçeci H, Peitz L, et al. Distrustful complacency and
538 the COVID-19 vaccine: How concern and political trust interact to affect vaccine hesitancy. PsyArXiv.
539 2021.
- 540 6. Lieu TA, Ray GT, Klein NP, Chung C, Kulldorff M. Geographic Clusters in Underimmunization and
541 Vaccine Refusal. Pediatrics. 2015;135(2):280-9.
- 542 7. National Governors Association. COVID-19 Vaccine Incentives 2021 [Available from:
543 <https://www.nga.org/center/publications/covid-19-vaccine-incentives/>].
- 544 8. Brunson EK, Schoch-Spana M. A Social and Behavioral Research Agenda to Facilitate COVID-19
545 Vaccine Uptake in the United States. Health Security. 2020;18(4):338-44.
- 546 9. Brewer NT, Chapman GB, Rothman AJ, Leask J, Kempe A. Increasing Vaccination: Putting
547 Psychological Science Into Action. Psychological Science in the Public Interest. 2017;18(3):149-207.

- 548 10. Fisher RJ, Katz JE. Social-desirability bias and the validity of self-reported values. *Psychology &*
549 *Marketing*. 2000;17(2):105-20.
- 550 11. Caruso EM, Gilbert DT, Wilson TD. A wrinkle in time - Asymmetric valuation of past and future
551 events. *Psychological Science*. 2008;19(8):796-801.
- 552 12. Kahneman D, Tversky A. Prospect Theory - Analysis of decision under risk *Econometrica*.
553 1979;47(2):263-91.
- 554 13. Yi R, Gatchalian KM, Bickel WK. Discounting of past outcomes. *Exp Clin Psychopharmacol*.
555 2006;14(3):311-7.
- 556 14. Schwarz N. Self-reports: How the questions shape the answers. *American Psychologist*.
557 1999;54(2):93-105.
- 558 15. Flood M, Dresher M, Tucker A, Device F. Prisoner's dilemma: game theory. *Experimental*
559 *Economics*. 1950;54.
- 560 16. Ellsberg D. Risk, ambiguity, and the savage axioms *Quarterly Journal of Economics*.
561 1961;75(4):643-69.
- 562 17. Holt CA, Laury SK. Risk aversion and incentive effects. *Am Econ Rev*. 2002;92(5):1644-55.
- 563 18. Camerer CF, Hogarth RM. The effects of financial incentives in experiments: A review and
564 capital-labor-production framework. *J Risk Uncertain*. 1999;19(1-3):7-42.
- 565 19. Cheong L, Bleisch S, Kealy A, Tolhurst K, Wilkening T, Duckham M. Evaluating the impact of
566 visualization of wildfire hazard upon decision-making under uncertainty. *International Journal of*
567 *Geographical Information Science*. 2016;30(7):1377-404.
- 568 20. Azrieli Y, Chambers CP, Healy PJ. Incentives in Experiments: A Theoretical Analysis. *J Polit Econ*.
569 2018;126(4):1472-503.
- 570 21. Clark EM, Merrill SC, Trinity L, Bucini G, Cheney N, Langle-Chimal O, et al. Emulating Agricultural
571 Disease Management: Comparing Risk Preferences Between Industry Professionals and Online

572 Participants Using Experimental Gaming Simulations and Paired Lottery Choice Surveys. *Front Vet Sci.*
573 2021;7(1208).

574 22. Clark EM, Merrill SC, Trinity L, Bucini G, Cheney N, Langle-Chimal O, et al. Using experimental
575 gaming simulations to elicit risk mitigation behavioral strategies for agricultural disease management.
576 *PLoS One* 2020;15(3).

577 23. Merrill SC, Koliba CJ, Moegenburg S, Zia A, Parker J, Sellnow T, et al. Decision-making in
578 Livestock Biosecurity Practices amidst Environmental and Social Uncertainty: Evidence from an
579 Experimental Game. *Plos One.* 2019;14(4).

580 24. Merrill SC, Moegenburg S, Koliba CJ, Zia A, Trinity L, Clark EM, et al. Willingness to Comply With
581 Biosecurity in Livestock Facilities: Evidence From Experimental Simulations. *Front Vet Sci.* 2019;6(156).

582 25. Schattman RE, Trinity L, Clark EM, Merrill SC. Awards: Untapped motivation for agricultural
583 conservation behavior *Elementa.* 2021;9(1).

584 26. Trinity L, Merrill SC, Clark EM, Koliba CJ, Zia A, Bucini G, et al. Effects of Social Cues on
585 Biosecurity Compliance in Livestock Facilities: Evidence From Experimental Simulations. *Front Vet Sci.*
586 2020;7(130).

587 27. Schlosser AE. Experiencing products in the virtual world: The role of goal and imagery in
588 influencing attitudes versus purchase intentions. *J Consum Res.* 2003;30(2):184-98.

589 28. Lang PJ, Greenwald MK, Bradley MM, Hamm AO. Looking at pictures: Affective, facial, visceral,
590 and behavioral reactions. *Psychophysiology.* 1993;30(3):261-73.

591 29. Leiserowitz A. Climate change risk perception and policy preferences: The role of affect,
592 imagery, and values. *Clim Change.* 2006;77(1-2):45-72.

593 30. Janz NK, Becker MH. The health belief model - A decade later *Health Educ Q.* 1984;11(1):1-47.

594 31. Rosenstock IM. Historical origins of the health belief model. *Health education monographs.*
595 1974;2(4):328-35.

- 596 32. Rosenstock IM, Strecher VJ, Becker MH. Social-learning and the Health Belief Model. Health
597 Educ Q. 1988;15(2):175-83.
- 598 33. Sunstein CS, Thaler RH. Nudge: Improving Decisions about Health, Wealth, and Happiness: Yale
599 University Press; 2008.
- 600 34. Buhrmester M, Kwang T, Gosling SD. Amazon's Mechanical Turk: A New Source of Inexpensive,
601 Yet High-Quality, Data? *Perspect Psychol Sci*. 2011;6(1):3-5.
- 602 35. Paolacci G, Chandler J, Ipeirotis PG. Running experiments on Amazon Mechanical Turk.
603 *Judgment and Decision Making*. 2010;5(5):411-9.
- 604 36. Berinsky AJ, Huber GA, Lenz GS. Evaluating Online Labor Markets for Experimental Research:
605 Amazon.com's Mechanical Turk. *Polit Anal*. 2012;20(3):351-68.
- 606 37. Shrum T, Nowak SA, Merrill SC, Hanley JP, Liu T, Clark EM, et al. Pro-Environmental Attitudes,
607 Altruism, and COVID-19 Risk Management Behavior. *J Risk Res*. Accepted.
- 608 38. VanElzakker MB, Dahlgren MK, Davis FC, Dubois S, Shin LM. From Pavlov to PTSD: The extinction
609 of conditioned fear in rodents, humans, and anxiety disorders. *Neurobiol Learn Mem*. 2014;113:3-18.
- 610 39. Levinthal DA, March JG. The Myopia of Learning. *Strategic Management Journal*. 1993;14:95-
611 112.
- 612 40. Warner KE. Need for some innovative concepts of innovation: An examination of research on
613 the diffusion of innovations. *Policy Sci*. 1974;5(4):433-51.
- 614 41. R Development Core Team. R: A language and environment for statistical computing. R
615 Foundation for Statistical Computing. URL <http://www.R-project.org>. Vienna, Austria: R Foundation for
616 Statistical Computing; 2019.
- 617 42. Wickham H. *ggplot2: Elegant Graphics for Data Analysis*: Springer-Verlag New York; 2016.
- 618 43. Ajzen I. The Theory of Planned Behavior. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision
619 Processes*. 1991;50(2):179-211.




Figure 1

18

ROUND 1

GROCERY LIST:

APPLES
BANANAS
CEREAL
CHICKEN
COFFEE
FLOUR
PASTA
SODA



CONTROLS



Figure 2

COVID-19 RISK

The current risk of
COVID-19 infection is




Figure 3




Figure 4




Figure 5




Figure 6