Anti-intellectualism and the Mass Public's Response to the Covid-19 Pandemic

Eric Merkley^{1,2*}, and Peter John Loewen^{1,2}

¹Department of Political Science, University of Toronto, Toronto, Canada

²Munk School of Global Affairs and Public Policy, University of Toronto, Toronto, Canada

* Corresponding author: Eric Merkley (eric.merkley@utoronto.ca)

Conditionally accepted at Nature Human Behaviour

Abstract

Anti-intellectualism – the generalized distrust of experts and intellectuals – is an important concept in explaining the public's engagement with advice from scientists and experts. We ask whether it has shaped the mass public's response to COVID-19. We provide evidence of a consistent connection between anti-intellectualism and COVID-19 risk perceptions, social distancing, mask usage, misperceptions, and information acquisition using a representative survey of 27,615 Canadians conducted from March to July 2020. We exploit a panel-component of our design (N=4,910) to strongly link anti-intellectualism and within-respondent change in mask usage. Finally, we provide experimental evidence of anti-intellectualism's importance in information search behaviour with two conjoint studies (N~2,500) that show respondents' preferences for COVID-19 news and COVID-19 information from experts dissipate among those with higher levels of anti-intellectual sentiment. Anti-intellectualism poses a fundamental challenge in maintaining and increasing public compliance with expert-guided COVID-19 health directives.

The COVID-19 pandemic has thrust a wide variety of experts into the spotlight. Doctors and scientists are at the forefront of both government plans to control the pandemic and efforts to educate the public on the threat of the virus. Economists have been central in guiding policy to mitigate the inevitable and catastrophic economic consequences of government lockdowns and social distancing. Governments and citizens, for the most part, are heeding this expert advice. But there are exceptions.

Most work to date – particularly in the United States – has focused on the role of ideological conservatism and partisanship in reducing COVID-19 risk perceptions and social distancing practice (Cornelson and Miloucheva 2020, unpublished manuscript).^{1,2,3} We argue here that anti-intellectualism – the generalized distrust of experts and intellectuals – has played a powerful role in shaping the public’s reaction to the COVID-19 pandemic above and beyond this concept’s association with ideological conservatism.⁴

People tend to be persuaded by speakers they see as knowledgeable (i.e., experts), but only when they perceive the existence of common interests.⁵ Some groups of citizens, like ideological conservatives,⁴ populists,⁶ religious fundamentalists, and the like, may see experts as threatening to their social identities. Consequently, they will be less amenable to expert messages, even in times of crisis.⁷ We thus expect citizens with higher levels of anti-intellectualism to perceive less risk from COVID-19, to engage in less social distancing and mask usage, to more frequently endorse related misperceptions, and to acquire less pandemic-related information.

To test these expectations, we bring to bear a large representative sample of almost 28,000 respondents from a survey that has been fielded in Canada over the course of 11 waves from March 25 to July 6. This survey has a built-in panel component where almost half of the respondents from the first four waves were re-contacted in waves 5-8 for a total of 4,910 re-contacts. This allows us to test expectations of anti-intellectualism’s relationship to within-respondent changes in self-reported behaviour where we expect it – in this case the usage of face masks where expert recommendations changed over the course of the pandemic.

We also provide direct evidence of anti-intellectualism’s relationship to observed information search behaviour with a pair of conjoint experiments. We find that people choose COVID-19 news over unrelated news and choose expert-featured news about COVID-19, but these effects weaken or disappear among those with higher levels of anti-intellectual sentiment. We provide pre-registered replications of both experiments. Together, our results illustrate the centrally important role of anti-intellectualism in shaping the mass public’s response to COVID-19.

Citizens and Experts during the COVID-19 Pandemic

In an age of pandemic and a warming climate, understanding the conditions under which citizens engage with and process information from experts has taken on a central importance. Most explanations for resistance to scientific and expert consensus focus on the directional motivation of individuals. People may reflexively reject scientific and expert consensus when it is in tension with

their worldviews, ideological beliefs, or even their partisanship.^{8,9} The appeal of this approach is obvious in the context of climate change: for years there has been a stark divide between Republicans and Democrats in the United States.¹⁰ But ideology and partisanship do a poor job in explaining climate change attitudes in other national contexts,¹¹ nor are they particularly important determinants of attitudes toward other areas of scientific consensus.⁷

The COVID-19 pandemic has afforded us with a unique, if deeply tragic, opportunity to study how citizens react to expert advice on a novel and vitally important issue. Scientists are gradually learning about the novel coronavirus and how best to mitigate the threat with individual and government responses. It would be wrong to imply that the scientific community has reached consensus on many questions related to COVID-19, but a few key points of advice have remained consistent over the course of the pandemic: COVID-19 is dangerous, especially for the elderly and people with pre-existing health conditions, and people can protect themselves through a number of preventative measures that have together been labeled as social or physical distancing. Increasingly, public health officials have also converged on a consensus that cloth masks can be effective in preventing transmission by asymptomatic and pre-symptomatic individuals.

Meanwhile, a number of verifiably false, pseudoscientific claims have been circulating in popular discourse – especially on social media¹² – such as a link between COVID-19 and 5G, the ability to cure COVID-19 with homeopathic remedies or Vitamin C, and the artificial creation of SARS-CoV-2, either by China or the United States. Some of these misperceptions are conspiratorial in nature,¹³ while others are more accurately labeled as pseudo-scientific, medical folk wisdom.¹⁴ Perhaps the most politically salient misperception about COVID-19 is that it is not a serious disease, and that its effects are comparable to those of the seasonal flu.

Research has begun to accumulate on understanding how citizens have engaged with expert advice on COVID-19 on the one hand, and misinformation on the other. A dominant focus, echoing scholarly research on motivated reasoning discussed above, has been on the role of partisanship in structuring COVID-19 risk perceptions and social distancing behaviour (Cornelson and Miloucheva, unpublished manuscript).^{1,2,15} However, other countries with high levels of affective polarization, like Canada,¹⁶ show evidence of cross-partisan consensus,¹⁷ so it is not clear how far a focus on partisanship helps us understand COVID-19 attitudes and behaviours outside the rather unique American context.

Other psychological traits and predispositions also appear to have particular relevance in shaping COVID-19 risk perceptions. Ideological conservatism appears to predict COVID-19 attitudes cross-nationally – especially in Canada and the U.S.,³ as does one's level of science literacy, need for cognition,³ and proclivity towards conspiratorial thinking.¹³ Some outcomes are also sensitive to the information environment – COVID-19 misperceptions appear to be stronger among Americans who watch *Fox News*,¹⁸ and among social media users in Canada¹² and the UK,¹⁹ for example.

Research to date has proceeded along several separate streams, focusing on risk perceptions, social distancing, or misperceptions alone, despite the likely close relationships between them. We argue that the concept of anti-intellectualism is centrally important in shaping public response to the

COVID-19 pandemic across a wide range of indicators, such as risk perceptions, preventative behaviours like social distancing and mask usage, misperceptions, and information search behaviour. In what follows, we review the theoretical concept of anti-intellectualism, and then demonstrate its relationship to these beliefs and self-reported behaviours.

Anti-intellectualism and the COVID-19 Pandemic

Anti-intellectualism has been an understudied concept in science communication, public policy, and public opinion research despite its clear import for understanding how and why citizens engage with expert advice and pseudoscientific claims. The concept itself entered the scholarly lexicon with the work of Richard Hofstadter who argued anti-intellectualism is deeply embedded in the protestant fabric of the United States and periodically manifests itself in political life, such as with the McCarthy trials and the rise of the John Birch Society.

Hofstadter implicitly saw populism – the generalized distrust of elites^{21,22} – as central to his definition of anti-intellectualism, where people distrust and dislike experts and intellectuals because of a view that “the plain sense of the common man...is an altogether adequate substitute for, if not actually much superior to, formal knowledge and expertise” (pg. 19).²⁰ Anti-intellectualism is typically embraced by populists who see experts as a class of elites that aim to exploit ordinary people through their positions of power. The simultaneous democratization of knowledge and rising importance of experts in a growing bureaucracy have potentially raised the salience of this concept in political life.²⁰

More recently, scholarship on anti-intellectualism has deviated somewhat from Hofstadter’s conceptualization. Some have identified anti-intellectualism as plain-spokenness^{23,24} or a component of populist rhetoric,^{21,25} rather than as a predisposition. Scholars have also increasingly seen anti-intellectualism as a component of conservative ideology⁴ – rather than populism – in part due to conservative rejection of the theory of evolution and embrace of climate skepticism.

A simpler, more unifying definition treats anti-intellectualism as “the generalized distrust of experts and intellectuals.”⁷ This mistrust can have a number of different sources, but foremost among them is populism.⁶ Some populists see experts as a class of elites that exercise power over virtuous ordinary citizens, and historically there is some link between populism and anti-intellectualism – at least in the United States.²⁵ However, there have also been historical moments where populists have valued impartial experts as an antidote to corrupt political elites. For example, Progressive Era populists saw experts and a professionalized civil service as solutions to the corruption of machine politics. There are almost certainly other traits that fuel anti-intellectual sentiment, such as ideological conservatism and partisanship,⁴ intuitionism,²⁶ and religious fundamentalism.

A lesson from these conflicting theoretical and empirical accounts is that we should not explicitly or implicitly build a source of anti-intellectualism into a definition of the concept or into its measurement, but rather rely on the fact that anti-intellectuals will consistently display mistrust in a

wide range of experts and intellectuals. Anti-intellectualism should strongly shape public response to expert recommendations because citizens are persuaded by sources that are perceived as trustworthy.⁵ Recent work has highlighted the importance of anti-intellectualism and trust in experts in understanding public support for climate change, nuclear power, genetically modified organisms, and water fluoridation^{4,7} and vaccinations.²⁷ And experimentally, the persuasiveness of expert consensus cues appears to be moderated by anti-intellectualism, such that signals of expert consensus may make anti-intellectuals double down in their opposition to positions with expert consensus.⁷

We argue that anti-intellectualism is likely a critical factor in shaping public response to the COVID-19 pandemic. Experts are at the forefront of the pandemic response by governments. They have communicated messages regarding the seriousness of COVID-19, the importance of social distancing, and have often been used to debunk pieces of misinformation circulating online. Consequently, our expectation is that anti-intellectualism should be negatively associated with COVID-19 risk perceptions, social distancing compliance, and positively associated with misperceptions.

We surveyed 27,615 Canadians between March and July 2020 over 11 survey waves about their COVID-19 attitudes and behaviours, and we re-interviewed almost half of respondents from the first four waves (N=4,910). We use these respondents to test our expectations that:

H1: Anti-intellectualism is...

- A: negatively associated with COVID-19 concern and risk perceptions.
- B: negatively associated with social distancing compliance.
- C: positively associated with COVID-19 misperceptions.

The time span of our study and our panel data allow us to probe dynamics in public compliance with expert recommendations. For most of the items we surveyed, experts have struck a consistent stance: avoid in-person contact and public gatherings, avoid closed spaces, like shops, and keep a distance of at least two meters from other individuals. There is one exception: the usage of medical or non-medical masks.

At the beginning of the crisis, public health officials in Canada cautioned against the use of masks by ordinary citizens because evidence had not firmly established either the importance of pre-symptomatic or asymptomatic transmission. They also feared masks could increase the risk of transmission due to improper use and that shortages of masks for medical personnel could be triggered by the pandemic.

As experts learned more about the virus and supply problems eased, health experts changed their advice. The Centers for Disease Control and Prevention changed their advice on April 2. In Canada, the federal government's chief medical advisor, Dr. Theresa Tam, acknowledged masks could be used as a preventative measure on April 6, but there was no official recommendation on their usage by ordinary citizens until May 20.

We expect anti-intellectualism to play an important role in shaping the dynamics of mask adoption in Canada. The mass public is generally responsive to the communication of government and political elites. Polarization occurs when predispositions afford resistance to some groups of citizens to these messages – partisanship being the classic example.²⁸ In this case, we expect expert messages regarding mask adoption to be accepted primarily by those highly trusting of experts and resisted by those with high levels of anti-intellectualism. Consequently, we expect self-reported adoption of masks to have occurred primarily among those who are highly trusting of experts. Specifically, we test the following two hypotheses using our cross-sectional study and our panel respondents:

H2A: A negative association between mask wearing and anti-intellectualism emerges and grows significantly stronger over the course of the pandemic.

H2B: Anti-intellectualism is negatively associated with within-individual changes in mask adoption.

Finally, we expect anti-intellectualism to be an important factor in COVID-19 information acquisition. A large literature has shown that anxiety triggered by national crises like terrorist attacks and pandemics increases information seeking among ordinary citizens.^{29,30,31} Moreover, such anxiety generates engagement with threatening information.^{32,33} People tend to learn about politics from top-down communication through the news media or horizontally through their discussion networks. We see both news exposure and political discussion as important concepts in understanding information acquisition about COVID-19. They are closely correlated, but may have slightly different determinants owing to the fact political discussion may be, at times, a less voluntary means of political information acquisition.

Nevertheless, individuals are likely to prefer news related to the COVID-19 and to readily discuss this information with other people owing to the stresses created by the pandemic. This may be less true of anti-intellectuals who feel less threatened by COVID-19 and anticipate such news to be laced with information from sources they distrust. We test this expectation two ways. First, we evaluate whether anti-intellectualism is associated with self-reported news exposure and discussion related to COVID-19.

H3A: Anti-intellectualism is negatively associated with COVID-19 information search behaviour, like COVID-19 news exposure and discussion.

Second, we implement a conjoint design that randomizes the source and headline of profile pairs of hypothetical news articles. One limitation with the above analysis for H3A is its reliance on self-reported behaviour. People may not accurately recall their behaviour or may give socially desirable answers. Our conjoint will allow us to directly observe their information search behaviour to help mitigate this concern. We expect people to prefer COVID-19 related news profiles and to perceive these stories as more important, and that these relationships will weaken or even reverse itself for respondents who exhibit high levels of anti-intellectual sentiment:

H3B: Anti-intellectualism moderates the effect of COVID-19 news on information selection.

H3C: Anti-intellectualism moderates the effect of COVID-19 news on perceived story importance.

A finding that anti-intellectualism structures information search about COVID-19 raises the question why it does so. A large part of the answer is likely that anti-intellectuals are comparatively less concerned and threatened by COVID-19 because of their lack of trust in experts. However, it is also possible anti-intellectuals are less interested in stories about COVID because they expect experts (and expertise) to feature in such stories. Citizens gravitate towards experts in times of public health crisis³¹ and thus might choose to engage with information from experts about COVID-19. This effect should weaken as anti-intellectualism rises because anti-intellectuals see these sources as less credible. We test these expectations with a modified conjoint design where news article profiles feature randomized headlines either featuring an expert or not. We expect people to prefer news profiles with headlines featuring experts and to perceive these stories as more credible, and that these relationships will weaken or even reverse itself for respondents who exhibit high levels of anti-intellectual sentiment:

H4A: Anti-intellectualism moderates the effect of expert sources on information selection.

H4B: Anti-intellectualism moderates the effect of expert sources on perceived story credibility.

Fig. 1 | Association between anti-intellectualism and COVID-19 attitudes and self-reported behaviours. Effects of anti-intellectualism and ideology on COVID-19 concern (top-left), risk perception (top-center), social distancing (top-right), misperceptions (bottom-left), COVID-19 news exposure (bottom-center), and COVID-19 discussion (bottom-right). N = 25,074. Note: 95% confidence intervals based on robust standard errors. Controls for science literacy, generalized trust, news exposure, social media exposure, political discussion, partisanship, education, age, religiosity, urban/rural, gender, region. Data weighted within region by age and gender. Markers represent OLS regression estimates for each wave. All variables scaled from 0-1. Full regression estimates provided in Tables 6 through 11 in the supplementary materials.

Results

Observational Analyses

We begin by presenting the results of wave-by-wave cross-sectional models using COVID-19 risk perceptions, social distancing, misperceptions, COVID-19 news exposure, and COVID-19 discussion as our outcome measures. Figure 1 provides the point estimates for anti-intellectualism and right-left ideology across all of our survey waves. The results show a largely consistent link between anti-intellectualism and these outcomes, after controlling for other factors. The relationship between right-left ideology and our outcomes is notably less reliable.

The estimated negative effect of anti-intellectualism (scaled 0-1) on COVID-19 concern (also scaled 0-1) increased from 0.11 ($p < 0.001$, 95% CI = -0.16 to -0.05) in wave 1 to 0.25 ($p < 0.001$, 95% CI = -0.32 to -0.18) in wave 11 (top-left panel), net other factors, including right-left ideology. The negative effect of right-left ideology (scaled 0-1) similarly increased from 0.08 in wave 1 to 0.15 in wave 11. We see similar results when asking citizens their perceptions of the threat posed by COVID-19 to Canadians (top-center panel). Both anti-intellectualism and right-left ideology contribute to COVID-19 risk perceptions, and the relationship, if anything, has grown stronger over time. These results support H1A.

We see slightly different patterns when examining social distancing (top-right panel). Anti-intellectualism has been negatively associated with such self-reported behaviour from the very start of the pandemic, increasing in effect from 0.27 ($p < 0.001$, 95% CI = -0.35 to -0.19) to 0.39 ($p < 0.001$, 95% CI = -0.47 to -0.31) in waves 1 through 11 on the 0-1 scale. However, we find no evidence of a statistically significant association between conservative ideology and social distancing until the final three waves collected in June. These results support H1B.

A similar story is told with COVID-19 misperceptions (bottom-left panel). Anti-intellectualism is positively associated with these misperceptions, with effects ranging from 0.15 ($p < 0.001$, 95% CI = 0.10 to 0.20) to 0.22 ($p < 0.001$, 95% CI = 0.18 to 0.27) over the 11 waves on the 0-1 scale, providing support for H1C. We find no evidence of a consistent and statistically significant association between conservative ideology and misperceptions.

Finally, we find that anti-intellectualism is negatively associated with COVID-19 news exposure. We see consistent effects between 0.11 ($p = 0.001$, 95% CI = -0.16 to -0.05) and 0.11 ($p < 0.001$, 95% CI = -0.17 to -0.05) over the 11 waves on the 0-1 scale (bottom-center panel). But, we find no consistent, statistically significant association with COVID-19 discussion (bottom-right panel). We find no statistically significant association between conservative ideology and either concept. Individuals with high levels of anti-intellectualism appear less likely to consume news about COVID-19, but we find no evidence indicating that they are less likely to talk about COVID-19 with others, in partial support of H3A.

One complication in interpreting the above findings are the threats of reverse causality and unobserved heterogeneity between respondents. It is possible that the trust people have in experts – especially towards doctors and scientists – is affected by peoples' attitudes towards COVID-19 and

their willingness to engage in social distancing. We are able to exploit the panel component of our survey to reduce the threat of endogeneity and unobserved heterogeneity.

Fig. 2 | Estimated effects of lagged covariates on COVID-19 attitudes and behaviours. N = 4,474. Note: 95% confidence intervals based on robust standard errors. Controls for lagged outcomes, generalized trust, news exposure, social media exposure, political discussion, partisanship, education, age, religiosity, urban/rural, gender, region, and contact/re-contact fixed effects. Data weighted within region by age and gender. Markers represent OLS regression estimates. All variables scaled from 0-1. Full regression estimates provided in Table 12 of the supplementary materials.

Figure 2 shows the effects of the lags of anti-intellectualism, ideology, and science literacy, on each of our outcomes, controlling for other confounders and, importantly, the past values of the outcomes. Lagged anti-intellectualism is associated with a 0.09 lower level in COVID-19 concern ($p < 0.001$, 95% CI = -0.12 to -0.05), a 0.07 point lower level in risk perceptions ($p < 0.001$, 95% CI = -0.11 to -0.04), a 0.08 point lower level in social distancing ($p = 0.001$, 95% CI = -0.13 to -0.03), a 0.06 point higher level in COVID-19 misperceptions ($p < 0.001$, 95% CI = 0.03 to 0.08), and a 0.05 point lower level in COVID-19 news exposure in a later time period ($p = 0.004$, 95% CI = -0.08 to -0.01), controlling for past values of our outcomes and confounders. This gives us some confidence that at the associations we observe between anti-intellectualism and our outcomes are not entirely due to the latter's effect on the former.

The recommendation to wear medical or non-medical face masks in public presents an interesting case because it is one in which the advice of experts clearly changed over the course of the pandemic. On April 6, health experts associated with the federal government noted that the use of masks could be beneficial, while they officially recommended their use on May 20.

Fig. 3 | Anti-intellectualism and mask usage. Estimated effects of anti-intellectualism and right-left ideology on mask usage (top); predicted mask usage over time by levels of anti-intellectualism (bottom-left) and ideology (bottom-right). N = 20,579. Note: 95% confidence intervals based on robust standard errors. Controls for science literacy, generalized trust, news exposure, social media exposure, political discussion, partisanship, education, age, religiosity, urban/rural, gender, region. Data weighted within region by age and gender. Dots represent OLS regression estimates for each wave in the top panel. Dots represent linear predictions in the bottom panel. All variables scaled from 0-1. AI = anti-intellectualism. Full regression estimates provided in Table 13 of the supplementary materials.

Self-reported mask adoption increased as we would expect, as expert advice changed, but less so for those with strong anti-intellectual sentiment. The top panel of Figure 3 shows the estimated effects of anti-intellectualism and ideology on the share of respondents wearing a mask in the past week. We find no statistically significant association between anti-intellectualism and mask usage when we began fielding the question in wave 3 (April 9-11). A remarkably strong negative relationship developed as the pandemic progressed. It is associated with a 50 point reduction ($p < 0.001$, 95% CI = -0.62 to -0.38) in the probability of wearing a mask over the past week as of wave 11 conducted at the beginning of July. These results provide strong support for H2A.

The bottom-left panel of Figure 3 displays predictions of the share of respondents using masks for low and high levels of anti-intellectualism. Among those with the lowest levels of anti-intellectual sentiment, mask usage grows from 21% in wave 3 to 81% by wave 11. It rises only to 46% for those with higher levels of anti-intellectualism (0.65, 95th percentile), while at the furthest reaches of the index it does not increase at all. Resistance to adoption of masks is far stronger among those distrusting of experts. The bottom-right panel presents the same predictions for ideology where we find no such pattern.

Fig. 4 | Dynamics in mask usage. Predicted level of mask usage across contact and re-contact periods by levels of anti-intellectualism (left) and ideology (right). N = 4,568. Note: 95% confidence intervals based on robust standard errors. AI = anti-intellectualism. Controls for science literacy, generalized trust, news exposure, social media exposure, political discussion, partisanship, education, age, religiosity, urban/rural, gender, region and their interactions with the re-contact period. Data weighted within region by age and gender. Full regression estimates provided in Table 14 of the supplementary materials.

Our panel respondents also allow us to provide stronger causal evidence of anti-intellectualism's importance. We estimate a model predicting within-respondent changes in mask usage between the contact and re-contact periods. This allows to account for unobserved heterogeneity between respondents. The estimates are illustrated in the left panel of Figure 4. The share of respondents using masks with the lowest possible level of anti-intellectualism increased from 0.216 (95% CI = 0.17 to 0.26) to 0.444 (95% CI = 0.39 to 0.50), which is a 22.8 point increase ($p < 0.001$, 95% CI = 0.18 to 0.28).

In contrast, mask usage only increased from 0.226 (95% CI = 0.18 to 0.27) to 0.294 (95% CI = 0.25 to 0.34) for respondents with high levels of anti-intellectualism, a small 6.8 point increase ($p = 0.004$, 95% CI = 0.02 to 0.11). Respondents at more extreme reported levels of anti-intellectualism are not expected to increase their mask usage at all, though these estimates are noisy owing to the

relatively small number of respondents in that part of the distribution. In contrast, we see no evidence that ideology is significantly associated with within-respondent change in mask usage (right panel). These results strongly support H2B.

Fig. 5 | Estimated treatment effects across reported levels of anti-intellectualism. Marginal effects of COVID-19 news on story selection (experiment 1, $N = 15,054$; top-left) and perceived importance (experiment 1, $N = 15,054$; top-right); Marginal effects of expert featured headline on story selection (experiment 2, $N = 10,016$; bottom-left) and perceived credibility (experiment 2, $N = 10,016$; bottom-right). Note: 95% confidence intervals based on robust standard errors. Data weighted within region by age and gender. Models include effects of source, author (experiment 1 only), and date (experiment 1 only) and controls for ideology, cognitive sophistication, conspiratorial thinking, age, and rural/urban residence and their interactions with the treatment. Full regression estimates can be found in Tables 16 and 17 of the supplementary materials. Comparison of exploratory and pre-registered replications can be found in Tables 2 and 3 and Figures S2 and S3 of the supplementary materials.

Experiment 1 Analysis

In experiment 1, we find that anti-intellectualism strongly conditions news preferences in support of H3B and H3C. The marginal effects are shown in the top panels of Figure 5. Respondents with the highest levels of trust in experts were 27 points more likely to select COVID-19 news ($p < 0.001$, 95% CI = 0.23 to 0.31) and viewed it as 26 points more important ($p < 0.001$, 95% CI = 0.23 to 0.28). In both cases this causal effect weakens as anti-intellectualism rises, though it does not entirely vanish in the case of perceived importance. The interaction terms for the story selection and

importance models are both significant at the 0.001 level. These behavioural results support our self-reported observational findings related to news exposure for H3A.

Experiment 2 Analysis

We find that the effect of receiving headlines featuring experts is heterogeneous across levels of anti-intellectualism, in support of H4A. The marginal effects on story selection are shown in the bottom-left panel of Figure 5. Respondents with the lowest levels of anti-intellectualism are seven points more likely to select stories featuring experts ($p = 0.003$, 95% CI = 0.02 to 0.12), but this effect disappears around 0.5 on the 0-1 scale. This interaction is statistically significant ($p = 0.047$). These are impressive effects given the simplicity of the treatment. In support of H4B, we find similar results when using credibility assessments as our outcome (bottom-right panel). Respondents with the lowest levels of anti-intellectualism give stories with expert-featured headlines credibility scores four points higher ($p = 0.001$, 95% CI = 0.02 to 0.06), an effect which disappears around 0.5 on the anti-intellectualism index. The interaction term itself is statistically significant ($p = 0.036$).

Discussion

The inability of society to cope with a warming climate has gradually drawn scholarly attention to understanding the conditions under which citizens seek out and engage with advice from experts. The COVID-19 pandemic has brought this topic to the forefront with sudden urgency: people's lives are at risk if citizens do not take seriously the advice of experts to wear masks and socially distance. Research to date, especially from the United States, has rightly pointed a finger at ideology and partisanship for undermining public compliance with health guidelines. The evidence we provide here consistently shows that anti-intellectualism matters in its own right, and not simply as an outgrowth of ideological conservatism.

We find that anti-intellectualism is associated with lower levels of COVID-19 concern and risk perception, social distancing compliance, as well as higher levels of misperceptions about COVID-19 (H1). Our data allow us to show that this has been consistently the case since the early days of the pandemic, while our panel respondents provide us some measure of confidence in saying that these associations are not simply the product of COVID-19 attitudes altering people's trust in expert communities.

Moreover, anti-intellectualism appears to be related to behavioural change as communication from experts evolved. Public health experts changed their advice on the efficacy of masks during the pandemic. At the same time, we see a growing association between anti-intellectualism and mask usage (H2A) and evidence of a strong negative association between anti-intellectualism and within respondent changes in mask usage (H2B). Self-reported mask adoption occurred far more rapidly among those who are highly trusting of experts.

Finally, anti-intellectualism is associated with less information acquisition related to COVID-19, at least on some dimensions. Anti-intellectualism is associated with less self-reported COVID-19

news exposure, though not COVID-19 discussion (H3A), and experimentally we show that observed preferences for COVID-19 news (H3B) and for expert information about COVID-19 (H4A) are lower for those with higher levels of anti-intellectual sentiment. These behavioural observations provide independent confirmation of our self-reported findings on news exposure for H3A.

There is one important caveat: we find no evidence that anti-intellectuals avoid expert information or COVID-19 news. This is consistent with previous work demonstrating that individuals select congenial information, but do not necessarily avoid dissonant information.³⁴ The upshot is that anti-intellectuals are not just less likely to accept expert information, but they are less likely to opt into important streams of information about COVID-19 compared to more trusting individuals, even if they do not explicitly avoid such information.

These findings provide important insight into not just how the mass public responds to public health recommendations, but also to national crises. Previous work has shown that citizens gravitate towards government officials and experts as a result of the stresses produced by national crises.³² And indeed, there is evidence that the COVID-19 pandemic has produced a rally effect for incumbent governments.³⁵ We might think that predispositions like anti-intellectualism, partisanship, or ideology matter less in these circumstances, but this does not appear to be the case. People who are highly distrusting of experts are not simply willing to put aside their distrust of these sources to resolve the crisis and return to normal. Relaying information from experts is unlikely to be of use in persuading these individuals, even in times of crisis. Other communication strategies are needed.

Our study has important limitations. Most crucially, we cannot randomly assign anti-intellectualism, so we are limited in our ability to definitively attribute our effects to anti-intellectualism, rather than another closely related construct. However, a few points mitigate this concern. First, our panel analyses allow us to lessen the threat of endogeneity. It is possible that people's reactions to the unfolding crisis affect their trust in doctors and scientists. By controlling for past values on our outcomes we can minimize the threat this poses to our inferences. Second, we are able to examine how the relationship between anti-intellectualism and outcomes respond to exogenous changes, like expert recommendations regarding masks or our randomized headlines, which reduces the likelihood that either omitted variables or endogeneity bias our inferences.

We also note that our data comes from Canada. We must be careful in generalizing to other contexts. However, we believe our particular case is advantageous. Canada lacks the polarized, elite debate on COVID-19 that is found in the United States.¹⁷ We see the Canadian case as more closely resembling what is found in other established democracies struggling to contain the pandemic. Consequently, we fully expect these findings travel, though we suspect partisanship and ideology matter more – relative to anti-intellectualism – in the United States. More cross-national comparative research needs to be done examining the determinants of COVID-19 attitudes and behaviours across different political contexts.

There are also some limitations to the experimental approach we use here. Individuals do not make decisions about which news to consume in a manner similar to an artificial survey task. That

being said, the source and headline are two of the most visible components of a news story that drive engagement. In the case of experiment 2, we have reason to expect our results are conservative. All of our headlines feature topics that are likely to make heavy use of experts whether or not they are mentioned in the headline, which may not have been lost on many respondents.

There is a strong association between anti-intellectualism and a wide range of COVID-19 attitudes and self-reported behaviours. Anti-intellectualism is also related to the public's dynamic response to expert advice and their information searching behaviour. All of these effects rival, if not exceed, the effects of ideological conservatism. The implications are considerable: we cannot take trust in experts for granted. In order to improve public compliance with health directives, science communicators, journalists and practitioners need to use a wider variety of trusted messengers to reinforce the messages of public health experts. Anti-intellectualism appears to be a central predisposition governing citizen response to the COVID-19 pandemic and is deserving of further research in other contexts.

Methods

Our research was approved by the University of Toronto Social Sciences, Humanities, and Education Research Ethics Board (protocol # 38251). We surveyed 27,615 Canadian citizens 18 years and older from March 25-July 6, 2020 using the online survey sample provider Dynata. This survey was fielded in 11 waves over that period (N~2,500 per wave). Respondents were paid a nominal fee for participating by Dynata. Sample sizes were chosen based on imperatives for the broader Media Ecosystem Observatory project, rather than for this study in particular. Nonetheless, our large sample sizes give use the power to observe small effects with a high degree of confidence.

Table 1. Survey waves and fielding dates

Wave	Fielding Date	N
1	March 25-30, 2020	2,481
2	April 2-6, 2020	2,489
3	April 9-11, 2020	2,493
4	April 16-19, 2020	2,489
5	April 24-29, 2020	2,515
6	May 1-5, 2020	2,512
7	May 8-12, 2020	2,514
8	May 21-27, 2020	2,527
9	June 15-18, 2020	2,552
10	June 22-29, 2020	2,548
11	June 29-July 6, 2020	2,539

2,576 individuals were excluded for being non-citizens, being under the age of 18, completing the survey in under 1/3 of the estimated time, for straight-lining three or more matrix questions, or for being duplicates (the second response of a duplicate respondent ID was dropped). These exclusion

criteria were set in advance to ensure data quality for the Media Ecosystem Observatory project and not for reasons to do with this specific research project. These criteria were also applied to the panel data and the survey waves containing the conjoint experiments.

National-level quotas were set for each wave on gender, age, language, and region (Atlantic, Quebec, Ontario, and West) to ensure their representativeness. 51% of our sample is female with a mean age of 48. We further weight our data within region by age and gender in our analyses. We used an iterative proportional fitting algorithm to construct our weights with a maximum of 2.62 ($N = 29$) and a minimum of 0.65 ($N = 111$).

Approximately half of the sample for waves 5 through 8 were re-contacts of respondents in the first four waves ($N = 4,910$). The fielding dates for each wave are shown in Table 1. Note that wave 1 was conducted in English only, consequently Quebec was under-sampled. Direct comparisons of the results of wave 1 with later waves should be treated with caution.

Fig. 6 | Measuring anti-intellectualism. Distribution of anti-intellectualism (left); mean levels of trust in expert groups over time (right). $N = 27,615$. Note: 95% confidence intervals. Data weighted within region by age and gender. AI = anti-intellectualism.

Measuring anti-intellectualism

We measure anti-intellectualism with an index based on questions asking respondents to evaluate their level of trust (“trust a lot” to “distrust a lot”, 5-point) in different groups of experts: doctors, scientists, economists, professors, and experts (following ⁷). We also ask respondents about their trust in the Public Health Agency of Canada – a close equivalent to the Centres for Disease Control and Prevention – an independent government agency has been at the forefront of Canada’s COVID-19 response. We construct an index of anti-intellectualism using the extracted factor from a Confirmatory Factor Analysis estimated with GSEM in Stata (v16) and re-scale it from 0-1 where 1 represents someone with the highest possible level of anti-intellectualism. Results for our analyses

are robust to only using the trust in scientists and doctors items of the index (see Supplementary Figures 3-6). Future work should map out the relationship between trust in scientists and doctors and the broader concept of anti-intellectualism.

The left panel of Figure 6 shows the distribution of anti-intellectualism among our respondents. Most Canadians have low levels of anti-intellectualism (Mean = 0.36; Standard deviation = 0.18). About half of our respondents have middling trust in experts or worse (0.36 or greater), while only 10% of our sample lies beyond 0.59. The pandemic may have increased trust in experts because of the active role they play in mitigating its threat. However, as shown in the right panel of Figure 6, trust in each group of experts and our index have remained relatively steady, at least over the course of our sampling (starting on March 25).

Our panel respondents (not shown in Figure 6) reported significant but substantively small decreases in the share of respondents trusting doctors (-0.02 , $p = 0.005$, 95% CI: -0.03 to -0.00), scientists (-0.02 , $p = 0.004$, 95% CI: -0.03 to -0.00), professors (-0.02 , $p = 0.012$, 95% CI: -0.03 to -0.00), and the Public Health Agency of Canada (-0.03 , $p < 0.001$, 95% CI: -0.04 to -0.02), though not at statistically significant levels for trust in generic experts ($p = 0.925$) and economists ($p = 0.986$). We see a very slight increase in our anti-intellectualism index as a result of these changes (0.01 , $p = 0.001$, 95% CI: 0.00 to 0.01).

Fig. 7 | COVID-19 attitudes and self-reported behaviours. Over time dynamics in COVID-19 risk perceptions (top-left), self-reported social distancing and mask usage (top-right), misperceptions (bottom-left), and self-reported information search (bottom-right). $N = 27,615$. Note: 95% confidence intervals. Data weighted within region by age and gender.

We do not take these declines in trust as evidence that the pandemic is reducing trust in experts. We began our survey a few weeks after the start of the crisis. We may have missed a spike in trust in experts precipitated by the crisis, which is slowly receding as it dissipates. Further, we find no evidence that the notable reversal in expert advice on mask wearing produced changes in respondent trust in experts or their overall level of anti-intellectualism. We find no significant difference in trust between respondents surveyed before and after the CDC announcement in April and the PHAC announcement in May after controlling for trending. These analyses can be found in supplementary Tables 4 and 5. Anti-intellectualism and the trust people have in expert communities appears rather stable – even during a salient, rapidly unfolding crisis.

COVID-19 attitudes and behaviours

We evaluate risk perceptions by asking respondents their level of concern about the coronavirus (“very” to “not at all”, 4-point) how serious of a threat they perceived COVID-19 to be for other Canadians (“very” to “not at all”, 4-point). The averages across waves are shown in the top-left panel of Figure 7. The panel illustrates a modest decline in COVID-19 concern and risk perceptions.

We measure social distancing by asking respondents whether they have engaged in the following actions over the past week in response to the pandemic (1=“yes”): 1) avoided in-person contact from friends, family, and acquaintances; 2) kept a distance of at least 2 metres from others; 3) avoided bars, restaurants, and crowds; and 4) avoided domestic travel. We construct an additive index of social distancing from these items, scaled from 0-1. We also ask the same of their mask usage over the past week, which enters our survey during wave 3, fielded from April 9-11. The top-right panel of Figure 7 shows that social distancing has declined somewhat, while mask usage is on the sharp rise.

Misperceptions are measured with a battery of questions asking respondents to rate the truthfulness of the following claims (“definitely false” to “definitely true”, 5-point):

- The coronavirus is no worse than the seasonal flu;
- Drinking water every 15 minutes will help prevent the coronavirus;
- The Chinese government developed the coronavirus as a bioweapon;
- Homeopathy and home remedies can help manage and prevent the coronavirus;
- The coronavirus was caused by the consumption of bats in China;
- The coronavirus will go away by the summer;
- Vitamin C can ward off the coronavirus;
- There is a vaccine for the coronavirus that national governments and pharmaceutical companies won't release;
- High temperatures, such as from saunas and hair dryers, can kill the coronavirus

We construct an additive index with these items, scaled from 0-1. The bottom right panel of Figure 7 shows that endorsement of these misperceptions has remained largely stable.

Finally, COVID-19 information search behaviour is evaluated by asking respondents how often they read, listened to, or watched news related to the COVID-19 pandemic over the past week (“several times a day” to “never”, 6-point), and how often they discussed the COVID-19 pandemic with friends, family or acquaintances (“daily” to “never”, 5-point). The bottom-right panel of Figure 7 shows that self-reported COVID-19 news exposure discussion has been on the steady decline.

Controls

We control for science literacy with an additive 0-1 index constructed from a seven-item battery taken from the American National Election Study. Cognitive sophistication and awareness of science-related issues may be associated with both anti-intellectualism and our outcome measures.⁴ Our anti-intellectualism measure is based on a battery of trust items, so we control for generalized trust in people as well.

We also control for right-left ideology with an additive index constructed from battery of policy questions where we coded responses as either a right-wing, left-wing, or neutral. Ideological conservatism is one of several sources of anti-intellectualism.⁴ However, it can also exhibit effects on COVID-19 attitudes and behaviours for unrelated reasons, such as through aversion to the policy consequences of dealing with the pandemic. Furthermore, a central argument of this paper is that anti-intellectualism is more than a simple extension of conservative ideology and has important effects in its own right, so we include ideology as a control. The estimates of anti-intellectualism are then interpreted as its effect on each outcome for reasons unrelated to its causal relationship with ideology, and vice versa.

We control for partisanship because political leaders have been another source of communication about the COVID-19 pandemic,¹⁶ as well as a standard suite of demographic and non-demographic characteristics: political news exposure, social media usage, education, age, urban/rural residence, religiosity, gender, and region. More information on our measures can be found in the Table 1 of the supplementary materials.

Models

We test our first hypothesis by estimating the following model for each outcome measure and each wave separately in our survey, where X is a vector of control variables:

$$\text{outcome}_i = \alpha + \beta_1 \text{antiintellectualism}_i + \beta X_i + \epsilon_i$$

We expect the coefficient on β_1 to be negative and significant for each outcome aside from misperceptions – which we expect to be positive – in support of H1 and H3A. We have no expectations about changes in the strength of the coefficient over the course of the pandemic for these items since we did not begin fielding this survey until late March. We estimate all of our observational models with robust standard errors to account for heteroscedasticity. Our models otherwise meet the assumptions of OLS regression. All of the tests we present are two-tailed. Model estimates can be found in Tables 6-11 in the supplementary materials.

Endogeneity is a potential problem: it is possible that people's reactions to COVID-19 shape their trust in expert communities. We address this issue by leveraging the panel component of our survey. We expect the lag of anti-intellectualism to be associated with the outcome measures controlling for their past values and other lagged confounds. We also control for the particular pairing of contact and re-contact waves for our respondents (c). Our initial contacts occurred through the first four waves of the survey, and were gradually re-contacted over the following four waves. We therefore account for any independent effect of any particular pairing of contact and re-contact wave on our outcomes. Our estimates are then of the effect within these pairings:

$$\text{outcome}_{it} = \alpha + \beta_1 \text{antiintellectualism}_{it-1} + \beta_2 \text{outcome}_{it-1} + \beta X_{it-1} + c_i + \varepsilon_{it}$$

Again, in support of H1 and H3A, we expect the coefficient on β_1 to be negative and significant for each outcome aside from misperceptions. Model estimates can be found in supplementary Table 12.

Unlike for our other outcome measures, we have expectations of a relationship between anti-intellectualism and within-respondent change in mask usage. First, we estimate a series of cross-sectional models for each wave where we predict mask usage with anti-intellectualism and our controls.

$$\text{pr(mask)}_i = \alpha + \beta_1 \text{antiintellectualism}_i + \beta X_i + \varepsilon_i$$

We expect a negative coefficient on β_1 that increases in magnitude over the course of the pandemic in support of H2A. This will show us descriptively that the effect of anti-intellectualism has grown over the course of sampling after controlling for confounds. Model estimates can be found in supplementary Table 13.

Second, we again leverage the panel component of our survey to provide stronger causal evidence of anti-intellectualism's effect on changes in mask usage. Including a lagged dependent variable in a model is insufficient to provide evidence of relationships between explanatory variables and within-respondent change.^{36,37} We instead evaluate whether within-respondent change between the contact and re-contact periods was weaker for anti-intellectuals, controlling for the dynamic effects of other confounds (X). We include respondent-level fixed effects to eliminate between-respondent variation (v) and ensure that our inferences are robust to the existence of time-invariant confounds with constant effects:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{pr(mask)}_{it} = & \alpha + \beta_1 \text{antiintellectualism}_{it} + \beta_2 \text{recontact}_t \\ & + \beta_3 \text{antiintellectualism} * \text{recontact}_{it} + \beta X_{it} + \beta X * \text{recontact}_{it} + v_i + \varepsilon_{it} \end{aligned}$$

We expect the coefficient on β_3 to be negative and significant to support H2B. We present predicted effects of both anti-intellectualism and ideology for comparison. Model estimates can be found in supplementary Table 14.

Experiment 1

Experiment 1 was conducted in wave 7 (May 8-12) of our survey with a sample of 2,509 Canadian citizens, 18 years and older. National level quotas were set on region, age, gender, and

language based on the 2016 Canadian census. 51.5% of the sample is female with a mean age of 48. Data are weighted within each region of Canada by gender and age. More detailed sample characteristics for the surveys of both studies can be found in Table 15 of the supplementary information.

We expose respondents to three pairs of news story profiles in this study. We made no indication that these profiles were of real news stories. They were asked to choose the news story they would be most likely to read from each pair and were also asked to evaluate the importance of each story (“very”, “somewhat”, “not very”, or “not at all”, re-scaled 0-1).

Each article was randomized across eight outlets in four different groups. Our first group is “national news”, which include *CTV News* and *the Globe and Mail* (*TV A-Nouvelles* or *La Presse* for French language respondents). Our second group is “local news”, which include reference to their local television station or local newspaper. Our third group is “right-congenial news”, which include *Rebel Media* and *True North News*. Our final group is “left-congenial news”, which includes the *National Observer* and *Rabble.ca*. Classification of left and right-congenial news taken from Owen et al. (2020, <https://ppforum.ca/articles/lessons-in-resilience-canadas-digital-media-ecosystem-and-the-2019-election/>) who classified Canadian news sources based on whether they were selectively shared or followed by partisans on social media.

Attributes that indicated the author (male vs. female) and date (May 6, April 29, April 22, and April 15) of the story were also each randomized independently of other factors. We are not interested theoretically in these randomizations, but they were included in order to maximize the realism of the task at hand. When people are making a choice of which news stories to read in the real world, these four characteristics are the first to be apparent.

Our attribute of theoretical interest is the headline. They were randomized so that respondents would either get a headline related to the health impacts of COVID-19 or one that was not. We selected our headlines by using *Lexis Uni* to download all newspaper headlines from the *Toronto Star* and *Globe and Mail* between April 30 and May 6 (N=719). We did a keyword search for headlines with “coronavirus” or “COVID-19.” We randomly assigned numbers to headlines with and without the keywords and chose the first randomly identified 15 headlines in each category that we manually verified as either being about COVID-19 health impacts or not. This left us with 30 headlines, a list of which can be found in the supplementary materials. An example of the conjoint task is shown in Figure 1 in the supplementary materials. Data collection and analysis were not performed blind to the conditions of the experiments.

We expect respondents to prefer to read news about COVID-19 health impacts and to perceive these stories as more important, while these effects weaken as anti-intellectualism rises (H3B and H3C). We thus estimate a model that predicts story selection and importance with the category of source (national, local, right-congenial, left-congenial), headline type (COVID-19 related or not), author gender, article date, and an interaction between headline type and anti-intellectualism.

It is possible that there are heterogeneous effects across anti-intellectualism because of its correlation with other traits that may also moderate the treatment effect. We control for the interaction of our treatment with left-right ideology, sophistication (a combined index of science literacy and need for cognition (following ¹⁷), conspiratorial thinking (following ¹³), age, and urban density, denoted by X below. We cluster standard errors by respondent. The full regression estimates can be found in Table 16 of the supplementary materials.

After this exploratory study, we pre-registered our hypotheses and conducted a successful replication. The pre-registration for experiment 1's replication can be found here: <https://osf.io/r4gqz>. A comparison of the exploratory experiment and its replication can be found in the supplementary materials in Table 2 and Figure 2.

$$\begin{aligned} \text{outcome} = & \alpha + \beta_1 \text{COVID19 news} + \beta_2 \text{antiintellectualism} + \beta_3 \text{COVID19 news} \\ & * \text{antiintellectualism} + \beta_4 \text{local} + \beta_5 \text{rightcongenial} + \beta_6 \text{leftcongenial} \\ & + \beta_7 \text{male} + \beta_8 \text{April 29} + \beta_9 \text{April 22} + \beta_{10} \text{April 15} + \beta_X + \beta \text{COVID19 news} \\ & * X + \varepsilon \end{aligned}$$

Experiment 2

We conducted experiment 2 in wave 6 (May 1-4) of our survey with a sample of 2,504 Canadian citizens, 18 years and older. National level quotas were again set on region, age, gender, and language based on the 2016 Canadian census. 51.6% of the same is female, with a mean age of 48. Data are weighted within each region of Canada by gender and age.

We use a modified conjoint design for this study. We expose our respondents to two pairs of news story profiles that indicate their source, headline, author, and date. The author and date were fixed for each profile, but source and headline remained randomized. Data collection and analysis were not performed blind to the conditions of the experiments.

Crucially, we randomized the headline so that some people received headlines containing a signal that the story would contain information from experts, while others received headlines that had no such indication. All headlines were taken from actual Canadian news stories in April that featured experts in the headline. We did not allow the headlines to freely vary across all four profiles. Instead, each profile contained one of the following headlines that was randomized to either include the expert signal or not to maximize experimental control. This approach gives us certainty that the only difference between treatment and control is the expert cue, and that respondents will not be exposed to both the expert and non-expert version of the same headline:

- 'Remain on guard' to keep surfaces clean of coronavirus[, experts say]
- Time for a Canada-wide standard on social gatherings[, experts urge]
- Broad coronavirus testing crucial in lifting restrictions[- experts]
- Look beyond the buzz on virus 'discoveries'; [Experts warn] research on treating COVID-19 is still in very early days

We use the term “expert” in this manipulation because it is a generic term often used by journalists to describe a wide range of experts, including doctors and scientists.³⁸ We believe using this abstraction is useful to ensure the effects we observe are primarily a result of anti-intellectualism on story selection and perceived credibility, rather than feelings towards a specific group of experts. This design choice likely makes our estimates more conservative. Further, “expert” was the term actually used by the authors of these headlines.

Our expectation is that respondents will be more likely to select news stories with headlines that feature experts and to perceive these stories as more credible, while these effects disappear among those with higher levels of anti-intellectual sentiment (H4A and H4B).

We thus estimate a model that predicts story selection with the category of source (national, local, right-congenial, left-congenial), headline type (expert featured or not), an interaction between headline type and anti-intellectualism, and interactions between the controls and headline type. The estimation strategy is the same as experiment 1, with the exception that we control for profile fixed effects (p). Regression estimates can be found in Table 17 of the supplementary materials.

After this exploratory study, we pre-registered our hypotheses and conducted a successful replication. The pre-registration for experiment 2’s replication can be found here: <https://osf.io/t6xz8>. A comparison of the experiment and its replication can be found in the supplementary materials in Table 3 and Figure 3.

$$\text{outcome} = \alpha + \beta_1 \text{expert} + \beta_2 \text{antiintellectualism} + \beta_3 \text{expert} * \text{antiintellectualism} + X \\ + \text{expert} * X + \beta_4 \text{local} + \beta_5 \text{rightcongenial} + \beta_6 \text{leftcongenial} + p + \varepsilon$$

Data Availability

Datasets analyzed for the current study are available at the Open Science Foundation repository at <https://osf.io/pqhju/>.

Coding Availability

Code used to analyze data for the current study are available at the Open Science Foundation repository at <https://osf.io/pqhju/>.

References

1. Allcott, H. et al. Polarization and public health: Partisan differences in social distancing during the coronavirus pandemic.” *Journal of Public Economics* 191, 104254 (2020).
2. Gadarian, S. K., Goodman, S. W., & Pepinsky, T. B. Partisanship, health behavior, and policy attitudes in the early stages of the COVID-19 pandemic. Preprint available at <http://www.doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.3562796> (2020).

3. Pennycook, G., McPhetres, J., Bago, Bence, & Rand, D G. Predictors of attitudes and misperceptions about COVID-19 in Canada, the U.K., and the U.S.A. Preprint at <http://doi.org/10.31234/osf.io/zhjkg> (2020).
4. Motta, M. 2018. The dynamics and political implications of anti-intellectualism in the United States. *American Politics Research* 46, 465-498 (2018).
5. Lupia, A., & McCubbins, M. D. *The democratic dilemma: Can citizens learn what they need to know?* (Cambridge University Press, 1998).
6. Oliver, J. E., & Rahn, W. M. Rise of the *Trumpenvolk*: Populism in the 2016 election. *The ANNALS of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* 667, 189–206 (2016).
7. Merkley, E. Anti-intellectualism, populism, and motivated resistance to expert consensus. *Public Opinion Quarterly* 84, 24-48 (2020).
8. Kahan, D. M., Jenkins-Smith, H., & Braman, D. Cultural cognition of scientific consensus. *Journal of Risk Research* 14, 147–174 (2011).
9. Lewandowsky, S., & Oberauer, K. Motivated rejection of science. *Current Directions in Psychological Science* 25, 217-222 (2016).
10. Dunlap, R. E., & McCright, A. M. Organized climate change denial. In Dryzek, J. S., Norgaard, R. B., & Schlosberg, D. (eds), *The Oxford Handbook of Climate Change and Society* (Oxford University Press, 2011).
11. Tesler, M. Elite domination of public doubts about climate change (not evolution). *Political Communication* 35, 306–326 (2017).
12. Bridgman et al. The causes and consequences of COVID-19 misperceptions: Understanding the role of news and social media. *The Harvard Kennedy School (HKS) Misinformation Review*. (2020).
13. Uscinski, J. E., et al. Why do people believe COVID-19 conspiracy theories? *The Harvard Kennedy School (HKS) Misinformation Review*. (2020).
14. Motta, M., & Callaghan, T. The pervasiveness and policy consequences of medical folk wisdom in the US. *Scientific Reports* 10 (2020).
15. Grossman, G., Kim, S., Rexer, J., & Thirumurthy, H. Political partisanship influences behavioral responses to governors' recommendations for COVID-19 prevention in the United States. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America* 117, 24144-24153 (2020).
16. Cochrane, C. *Left and right: The small world of political ideas* (McGill-Queen's University Press, 2015).

17. Merkley, E., et al. A rare moment of cross-partisan consensus: Elite and public response to the COVID-19 pandemic in Canada. *Canadian Journal of Political Science* **53**, 311-318 (2020).
18. Motta, M., Stecula, D., & Farhart, C. How right-leaning media coverage of COVID-19 facilitated the spread of misinformation in the early stages of the pandemic in the U.S. *Canadian Journal of Political Science* **53**, 335-342 (2020).
19. Allington, D., Duffy, B., Wessely, S., Dhavan, N., & Rubin, J. Health-protective behaviour, social media usage and conspiracy belief during the COVID-19 public health emergency. *Psychological Medicine* First View (2020).
20. Hofstadter, R. *Anti-intellectualism in American life* (Random House, 1962).
21. Kazin, M. *The populist persuasion* (Basic Books, 1995).
22. Rooduijn, M. The nucleus of populism: In search of the lowest common denominator. *Government and Opposition* **49**, 573–599 (2014).
23. Shogan, C. J. Anti-intellectualism in the modern presidency: a Republican populism. *Perspectives on Politics* **5**, 295–303 (2007).
24. Lim, E. T. *The Anti-intellectual presidency: The decline of presidential rhetoric from George Washington to George W. Bush*. (Oxford University Press, 2008).
25. Brewer, M. D. Populism in American politics. *The Forum* **14**, 249-264 (2016).
26. Oliver, J. E., & Wood, T. *Enchanted America: How intuition and reason divide our politics* (University of Chicago Press, 2018).
27. Stecula, D. A., Kuru, O., & Jamieson, K. H. How trust in experts and media use affect acceptance of common anti-vaccination claims. *The Harvard Kennedy School (HKS) Misinformation Review*. (2020).
28. Zaller, Z. *The nature and origins of mass opinion* (Cambridge University Press, 1992).
29. Althaus, S. L. American news consumption during times of national crisis. *PS: Political Science* **35**, 517-521 (2002).
30. Bar-Ilan, J., & Echterman, A. The anthrax scare and the web: A content analysis of web pages linking to resources anthrax. *Scientometrics* **63**, 443-462 (2005).
31. Ginsberg, J., et al. Detecting influenza epidemics using search engine query data. *Nature* **457**, 1012-1014 (2008).
32. Albertson, B., & Gadarian, S. K. *Anxious Politics: Democratic Citizenship in a Threatening World* (Cambridge University Press, 2015).
33. Gadarian, S. K., & Albertson, B. 2014. Anxiety, immigration, and the search for information. *Political Psychology* **35**, 133-164 (2014).

34. Bol, D., Giani, M., Blais, A., & Loewen, P. J. The effect of COVID-19 lockdowns on political support: Some good news for democracy? *European Journal of Political Research* Early View (2020).
35. Metzger, M. J., Hartsell, E. H., & Flanagin, A. J. Cognitive dissonance or credibility? A comparison of two theoretical explanations for selective exposure to partisan news. *Communication Research* **47**, 3-28 (2020).
36. Allison, P. D. *Fixed Effects Regression Models* (SAGE Publications, 2009).
37. Daniller, A. M., & Mutz, D. The dynamics of electoral integrity: A three-election panel study. *Public Opinion Quarterly* **83**, 46-67 (2019).
38. Merkley, E. Are experts (news)worthy? Balance, conflict, and mass media coverage of expert consensus. *Political Communication* **37**, 530-549 (2020).

Acknowledgements

Grateful for helpful feedback from Aengus Bridgman and Sean Nossek. Thanks as well to the rest of the Media Ecosystem Observatory team: Taylor Owen, Derek Ruths, Oleg Zhilin, Lisa Teichmann, Elisa Chaudet, and Julia Ma. This work is funded by the Department of Canadian Heritage through the Digital Citizens Contribution Program. The funder had no role in the conceptualization, design, data collection, analysis, or preparation of the manuscript.

Author Contributions

EM contributed to the study design, data collection, and analysis, as well as the drafting of the manuscript. PL contributed to the sampling design and acquisition of the data and the drafting of the manuscript.

Competing Interests

The authors declare no competing interests.

Anti-intellectualism and the Mass Public's Response to the COVID-19 Pandemic

Supplementary Materials

Contents

Supplementary Methods	27
<i>Variable Descriptions</i>	27
<i>Headlines for Experiment 1 and Example Conjoint</i>	30
Supplementary Results	32
<i>Pre-registered Replications</i>	32
<i>Did Mask Reversal Decrease Trust in Experts?</i>	36
<i>Observational Results using Alternative Index of Trust in Doctors and Scientists</i>	38
Supplementary Tables	42
<i>Estimates for Observational Models</i>	42
<i>Sample Characteristics</i>	57
<i>Estimates for Experiments</i>	58

Supplementary Methods

Variable Descriptions

Supplementary Table 1. Variable descriptions

Measure	Description
COVID-19 concern	0-1; How concerned are you about the coronavirus? (very, somewhat, not very, not at all)
Threat perception	0-1; How serious of a threat do you think the coronavirus is to Canadians? (very, somewhat, not very, not at all)
Social Distancing	0-1; index of four behaviours over the past week: 1) Avoided bars, restaurants, and other places with crowds; 2) Avoided in-person contact with friends, family, and acquaintances; 3) Maintained 2 meters of distance from people as much as possible; 4) Avoided domestic travel
Mask usage	1= used a face mask in the past week
Misperceptions	Rate truthfulness of following claims: 1) The coronavirus is no worse than the seasonal flu; 2) Drinking water every 15 minutes will help prevent the coronavirus; 3) The Chinese government developed the coronavirus as a bioweapon; 4) Homeopathy and home remedies can help manage and prevent the coronavirus; 5) The coronavirus was caused by the consumption of bats in China; 6) The coronavirus will go away by the summer; 7) Vitamin C can ward off the coronavirus; 8) There is a vaccine for the coronavirus that national governments and pharmaceutical companies won't release; 9) High temperatures, such as from saunas and hair dryers, can kill the coronavirus (definitely false, probably false, probably true, definitely true, unsure)
COVID-19 news exposure	How often have you read, listened to, or watched news related to the coronavirus pandemic over the past week? (several times a day, daily, almost every day, a few times, once, never)
COVID-19 discussion	Over the past week, how often did you discuss the coronavirus pandemic with friends, family, and acquaintances? (daily, almost every day, a few times, once, never)
Anti-intellectualism	0-1; Below is a list of groups and institutions in society. Please tell us the degree to which you trust or distrust members of these groups or institutions: 1) Experts; 2) Economists; 3) Scientists; 4) Doctors and medical professionals; 5) University professors; 6) Public Health Agency of Canada (distrust a lot, distrust somewhat, neither, trust somewhat, trust a lot, don't know). Constructed using predicted factor from Confirmatory Factor Analysis using GSEM

Science Literacy	0-1; 1) The center of the Earth is very hot (True); 2) The continents have been moving their location for millions of years and will continue to move (True); 3) All radio-activity is man-made (False); 4) Electrons are smaller than atoms (True); 5) Lasers work by focusing sound waves (False); 6) It is the father's gene that decides whether the baby is a boy or a girl (True); 7) Antibiotics kill viruses as well as bacteria (False).
Need for Cognition	0-1; 1) I prefer complex to simple problems; 2) I like to have the responsibility of handling a situation that requires a lot of thinking; 3) Thinking is not my idea of fun; 4) I would rather do something that requires little thought than something that is sure to challenge my thinking abilities; 5) I try to anticipate and avoid situations where there is a likely chance I will have to think in depth about something; 6) I find satisfaction in deliberating hard for long hours (strongly agree, somewhat agree, neither agree nor disagree, somewhat disagree, strongly disagree)
Sophistication	0-1; Science literacy + Need for cognition
Ideology	0-1; 1) The government should take measures to reduce differences in income levels; 2) Protecting the environment is more important than creating jobs; 3) Canada should increase the number of immigrants it admits each year; 4) People who don't get ahead should blame themselves, not the system; 5) The government should see to it that everyone has a decent standard of living (Strongly, somewhat, neither agree/disagree). Each item coded in left-wing (-1) and right-wing (1) direction. Don't knows and neither coded as neutral (0)
Conspiratorial Thinking	0-1; 1) Much of our lives are being controlled by plots hatched in secret places; 2) Even though we live in a democracy, a few people will always run things anyway; 3) The people who really 'run' the country are not known to the voter; 4) Big events like wars, recessions, and the outcomes of elections are controlled by small groups of people who are working in secret against the rest of us (strongly agree, somewhat agree, neither agree nor disagree, somewhat disagree, strongly disagree)
Generalized trust	0-1; Generally speaking, would you say that most people can be trusted or that you cannot be too careful in dealing with people?" (Most people can be trusted/cannot be too careful in dealing with people)
News exposure	Logged sum of exposure to following outlets in past week: 1) CBC; 2) CTV; 3) Global; 4) CityNews; 5) Globe and Mail; 6) National Post; 7) Toronto Star; 8) Local newspaper; 9) TVA (French-only); 10) TV5 (French-only); 11) La Presse (French-only); 12) Journal de Montreal (French-only); 13) Journal de Quebec (French-only); 14) Le Devoir (French-only); 15) Radio-Canada (French-only); 16) Rebel Media; 17) National Observer; 18) Toronto Sun; 19) The Tyee; 20) Post Millennial; 21) APTN; 22) True North News; 23) Press Progress; 24) Huffington Post; 25) Other
Social media exposure	Logged sum of exposure to the following social media applications in the past week: 1) Twitter; 2) Facebook; 3) Instagram; 4) YouTube; 5) Reddit; 6) LinkedIn; 7) Tumblr; 8) WhatsApp; 9) Snapchat; 10) WeChat; 11) Other

Political discussion	<p>How often in the past week did you talk about politics or public affairs with the following people? (Never, once, a few times, almost every day, daily, don't know)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Your family • Your friends • Your co-workers
Partisanship	Do you consider yourself a(n): 1) Liberal; 2) Conservative; 3) NDP; 4) Bloc (in Quebec); 5) Green; 6) Another party; 7) None/I don't know
Education	<p>Highest level of education: no schooling; some elementary school; completed elementary school; some secondary/high school; completed secondary/high school; Some technical, community college, CEGEP, College Classique; Completed technical, community college, CEGEP, College Classique; Some university; bachelor's degree; master's degree; professional degree or doctorate; don't know</p>
Age	Age in years
Religiosity	In your life, you would say religion is: very important, somewhat important, not very important, not at all important, don't know
Urban/rural	Thinking about the place where you live, what word best describes it: A large city, a medium sized city, a large town, a small town, a rural place.
Gender	1= female
Region	Province of residence: Atlantic = Newfoundland and Labrador, Prince Edward Island, Nova Scotia, New Brunswick; Quebec; Ontario; West = Manitoba, Saskatchewan, Alberta, British Columbia

Headlines for Experiment 1 and Example Conjoint

Non-COVID-19

- Snowbirds set to tour Canada; Nine-plane formations to fly over cities
- Top of food chain faring better than the bottom
- Push on for Conservative leadership candidates as contest resumes
- Conservative MPs pass motion demanding Sloan apologize for attack on Tam
- Wall St caps best month in decades with broad sell-off
- Police say alligator sighting in Brampton pond turned out to be beaver
- Military identifies service members missing in deadly helicopter crash
- Media consortium seeking search warrants from Nova Scotia mass shooting
- MacKay, O'Toole lead fundraising; One has raised more cash, other more donors
- No winning ticket for Saturday night's \$7 million Lotto 649 jackpot
- Call to prayer offers lesson on gratitude
- Mounties to boost mining social media for threats
- For B.C.'s whales, finally some quiet time; Fewer boats on the water means a big reduction in noise
- Report highlights plans to avoid repeat flooding in Ste-Marthe-sur-le-Lac, Quebec
- Airlines, airports expect major changes; As Air Canada reports \$1B loss

COVID-19

- COVID-19 threat to Indigenous people
- Up to 100,000 Americans to die from coronavirus, Trump says
- Canada's daily coronavirus death toll rises by less than 5% - official data
- Science - and vaccines - will save us all
- One in seven Ontarians who tested positive for COVID-19 are health-care workers
- Drug offers ray of hope; Remdesivir could help treat COVID-19 patients, but it is too early to tell
- As bar patios reopen across Manitoba, ponder whether cracking open a cold one is worth the risk of COVID-19
- Nurses sent to remote reserve; Community hit hard by coronavirus
- Saskatchewan dealing with fast-spreading COVID-19 outbreak in far north
- B.C. health officials to release new COVID-19 modelling figures today
- Sixth COVID-19 death in Saskatchewan; 11 new cases in northern community
- As Quebec plans to reopen, care homes still a COVID-19 battleground
- The people who cared for a COVID-19 patient: How a single case was handled
- P.E.I. to remain closed to non-residents as COVID-19 restrictions eased
- Here are some coronavirus shopping tips to keep you safe at the supermarket

Imagine you are making a decision about what news stories to read in your day-to-day life.

After reviewing the options below, would you prefer to read **news story A** or **news story B**?

	A	B
Source	True North News	CTV News
Headline	Drug offers ray of hope; Remdesivir could help treat COVID-19 patients, but it is too early to tell	Nurses sent to remote reserve; Community hit hard by coronavirus
Author	Stewart Grant	Peter Walker
Date	April 29th	May 6th

News story A

News story B

Supplementary Figure 1. Example conjoint table

Supplementary Results

Pre-registered Replications

Experiment 1

We preregistered a replication of experiment 1, which can be found here: <https://osf.io/r4gqz>. The sample of 2,552 Canadian citizens was collected between June 16 and 18. Quotas were set on gender, age, language and region to ensure representativeness, and data was weighted within region by age and gender in an identical fashion as the exploratory study. We conduct an identical experiment as in experiment 1 though we have some expectation of reduced treatment effects with the declining prevalence of COVID-19 cases in Canada at the time – people may be less inclined to select COVID-19 news as a result. There are two minor difference between the preregistered replication and the analysis presented in the article. We did not include a trust measure for the Public Health Agency of Canada in our measure of anti-intellectualism. We also constructed our anti-intellectualism index using confirmatory factor analysis with GSEM. Both of these changes were in response to reviewer requests. Below we compare the original exploratory specification with the replicated version.

The exploratory study replicates remarkably well. Figure S2 provides the marginal treatment effects of COVID-19 news across levels of anti-intellectualism for story selection (left panel) and perceived story importance (right panel). We can also directly compare the point estimates in the exploratory and replication studies below in Table S14. The estimates are strikingly similar. We do find one interesting difference: ideological conservatism conditions the treatment independent of anti-intellectualism. This may reflect the increased ideological polarization in COVID-19 we see in June in our observational analyses.

Supplementary Figure 2. Marginal effects of COVID-19 news on story selection (left) and perceived importance (right) in replication study. Note: 95% confidence intervals.

Experiment 2

We pre-registered a replication of experiment 2, which can be found here: <https://osf.io/t6xz8>. The sample of 5,043 Canadian citizens was collected between June 22 and July 6. Quotas were set on gender, age, language and region to ensure representativeness, and data was weighted within region by age and gender in an identical fashion as the exploratory study. We conduct an identical experiment as in experiment 2 though we again have some expectation of reduced treatment effects with the declining prevalence of COVID-19 cases in Canada at the time. If the context of a declining threat we can expect less demand for expert news.

There are two minor difference between the preregistered replication and the analysis presented in the article. We did not include a trust measure for the Public Health Agency of Canada in our measure of anti-intellectualism. We also constructed our anti-intellectualism index using confirmatory factor analysis with GSEM. Both of these changes were in response to reviewer requests. Below we compare the original exploratory specification with the replicated version. We deviate from pre-registration in one other respect: we were able to collect twice the sample as we expected for this replication study. The estimates in our exploratory study were noisy, so this can give us more confidence we are seeing the hypothesized effects, especially in the context of smaller expected treatment effects. Experiment 2 replicates remarkably well, though the effects dampen somewhat with the replication. The marginal effects of the expert-featured headline across levels of anti-intellectualism on story selection (left panel) and perceived story credibility (right panel) are shown in Figure S3. The point estimates are compared in Table S15.

Supplementary Figure 2. Marginal effects of expert featured headline on story selection (left) and perceived credibility (right) in replication study. Note: 95% confidence intervals.

Supplementary Table 2. Comparison of study 1 and replication

	Story selection		Perceived importance	
	Study 1	Replication	Study 1	Replication
Local	-0.02 (0.159)	-0.02 (0.092)	-0.02 (0.016)	-0.00 (0.869)
Right-congenial	-0.10 (0.000)	-0.10 (0.000)	-0.04 (0.000)	-0.03 (0.000)
Left-congenial	-0.11 (0.000)	-0.08 (0.000)	-0.04 (0.000)	-0.02 (0.003)
COVID-19 news	0.31 (0.000)	0.26 (0.000)	0.24 (0.000)	0.18 (0.000)
Male author	-0.00 (0.542)	-0.02 (0.011)	-0.00 (0.992)	-0.01 (0.063)
April 22	0.01 (0.458)	-0.01 (0.492)	0.01 (0.213)	-0.01 (0.267)
April 29	0.02 (0.055)	0.03 (0.012)	0.00 (0.466)	0.00 (0.464)
May 6	0.02 (0.090)	0.00 (0.716)	0.00 (0.878)	-0.00 (0.890)
Anti-intellectualism	0.11 (0.000)	0.10 (0.000)	-0.13 (0.000)	-0.07 (0.004)
COVID * Anti-intellectualism	-0.21 (0.000)	-0.20 (0.000)	-0.15 (0.000)	-0.19 (0.000)
Ideology	0.00 (0.391)	0.00 (0.019)	-0.01 (0.000)	-0.01 (0.000)
COVID * Ideology	-0.00 (0.362)	-0.01 (0.015)	-0.00 (0.717)	-0.00 (0.685)
Sophistication	0.02 (0.461)	0.01 (0.728)	-0.06 (0.037)	0.02 (0.340)
COVID * Sophistication	-0.03 (0.597)	-0.00 (0.929)	0.07 (0.043)	0.08 (0.014)
Conspiratorial thinking	-0.00 (0.836)	0.02 (0.281)	0.08 (0.000)	0.08 (0.000)
COVID * Conspiracy	-0.01 (0.758)	-0.05 (0.217)	-0.04 (0.131)	-0.04 (0.152)
Age	0.00 (0.841)	0.00 (0.695)	-0.00 (0.001)	-0.00 (0.001)
COVID * Age	-0.00 (0.937)	-0.00 (0.707)	0.00 (0.411)	0.00 (0.089)
Urban	0.01 (0.025)	0.00 (0.743)	0.01 (0.000)	0.01 (0.007)
COVID * Urban	-0.01 (0.028)	0.00 (0.982)	-0.01 (0.003)	-0.00 (0.929)
Constant	0.39	0.42	0.58	0.52
R ²	0.05	0.04	0.14	0.11
N	15054	15306	15054	15306

Note: Clustered standard errors; p-value in parentheses

Supplementary Table 3. Comparison of study 2 and replication

	Story Selection		Perceived Credibility	
	Study 2	Replication	Study 2	Replication
Expert	-0.05 (0.408)	0.16 (0.000)	0.02 (0.611)	0.01 (0.596)
Local	-0.06 (0.000)	-0.04 (0.000)	-0.02 (0.001)	-0.02 (0.000)
Right-congenial	-0.16 (0.000)	-0.15 (0.000)	-0.08 (0.000)	-0.07 (0.000)
Left-congenial	-0.16 (0.000)	-0.15 (0.000)	-0.08 (0.000)	-0.08 (0.000)
Profile 2	-0.05 (0.008)	-0.09 (0.000)	-0.06 (0.000)	-0.04 (0.000)
Profile 3	0.08 (0.000)	0.05 (0.000)	0.01 (0.249)	0.02 (0.000)
Profile 4	-0.13 (0.000)	-0.14 (0.000)	-0.04 (0.000)	-0.03 (0.000)
Anti-intellectualism	0.07 (0.021)	0.04 (0.035)	-0.16 (0.000)	-0.20 (0.000)
Expert * Anti-intellectualism	-0.12 (0.038)	-0.09 (0.022)	-0.05 (0.084)	-0.05 (0.025)
Ideology	0.02 (0.279)	0.00 (0.970)	-0.07 (0.000)	-0.07 (0.000)
Expert * Ideology	-0.04 (0.331)	-0.01 (0.832)	-0.02 (0.272)	0.01 (0.566)
Sophistication	-0.01 (0.775)	0.04 (0.061)	0.02 (0.374)	0.02 (0.312)
Expert * Sophistication	0.02 (0.739)	-0.08 (0.069)	0.02 (0.538)	0.02 (0.294)
Conspiratorial Thinking	-0.01 (0.608)	0.01 (0.500)	-0.01 (0.468)	0.01 (0.365)
Expert * Conspiracy	0.01 (0.774)	-0.02 (0.473)	0.02 (0.521)	0.02 (0.328)
Age	-0.00 (0.047)	0.00 (0.437)	0.00 (0.000)	0.00 (0.000)
Expert * Age	0.00 (0.055)	-0.00 (0.356)	-0.00 (0.397)	0.00 (0.799)
Urban	-0.01 (0.009)	0.00 (0.758)	-0.00 (0.693)	0.00 (0.261)
Expert * Urban	0.02 (0.008)	-0.00 (0.712)	0.01 (0.087)	-0.00 (0.211)
Constant	0.65	0.55	0.73	0.71
R ²	0.04	0.04	0.08	0.07
N	10016	20164	10016	20164

Note: Clustered standard errors; p-value in parentheses

Did Mask Reversal Decrease Trust in Experts?

Supplementary Table 4. Effects of mask announcements on trust in experts

Entire sample	PHAC		Scientists		Doctors		AI	
	b/p	lb/ub	b/p	lb/ub	b/p	lb/ub	b/p	lb/ub
PHAC Announcement	0.01 (0.483)	-0.02 0.04	0.01 (0.613)	-0.02 0.03	0.00 (0.843)	-0.02 0.02	-0.01 (0.043)	-0.02 -0.00
CDC Announcement	-0.00 (0.738)	-0.02 0.02	0.01 (0.424)	-0.01 0.02	0.02 (0.009)	0.01 0.04	-0.01 (0.090)	-0.01 0.00
Trend	-0.00 (0.001)	-0.00 -0.00	-0.00 (0.001)	-0.00 -0.00	-0.00 (0.000)	-0.00 -0.00	0.00 (0.000)	0.00 0.00
Constant	17.24 (0.000)	7.63 26.95	15.81 (0.000)	6.75 24.87	18.07 (0.000)	9.77 26.37	-11.53 (0.000)	-14.26 -6.30
N	27614		27614		27614		27614	
Waves 7 and 8	PHAC		Scientists		Doctors		AI	
	b/p	lb/ub	b/p	lb/ub	b/p	lb/ub	b/p	lb/ub
PHAC Announcement	-0.01 (0.521)	-0.03 0.02	0.01 (0.485)	-0.02 0.03	0.00 (0.891)	-0.02 0.02	-0.00 (0.384)	-0.01 0.01
Constant	0.74 (0.000)	0.73 0.76	0.77 (0.000)	0.76 0.79	0.83 (0.000)	0.81 0.84	0.36 (0.000)	0.35 0.37
N	5041		5041		5041		5041	
Waves 1 through 3	PHAC		Scientists		Doctors		AI	
	b/p	lb/ub	b/p	lb/ub	b/p	lb/ub	b/p	lb/ub
CDC Announcement	0.00 (0.736)	-0.02 0.02	0.00 (0.798)	-0.02 0.02	0.01 (0.114)	-0.00 0.03	-0.00 (0.326)	-0.01 0.00
Constant	0.77 (0.000)	0.76 0.78	0.80 (0.000)	0.79 0.81	0.84 (0.000)	0.83 0.85	0.35 (0.000)	0.35 0.36
N	7463		7463		7463		7463	

Robust standard errors; b= coefficient; p=p-value; lb=lower bound 95% interval; ub=upper bound 95% interval. Note: announcement is a binary variable taking a value of 1 on and after the May 20th announcement for the PHAC and April 3rd for the CDC. Waves 7 and 8 were conducted immediately before and after the PHAC announcement. Waves 1 through 3 were conducted proximate to the CDC announcement. AI = anti-intellectualism. Trust outcomes are binary where 1 = some level of trust, except for anti-intellectualism index.

Supplementary Table 5. Effects of mask announcement on changes in trust in experts

	PHAC		Scientists		Doctors		AI	
	b/p	lb/ub	b/p	lb/ub	b/p	lb/ub	b/p	lb/ub
Announcement	-0.03 (0.310)	-0.08 0.03	-0.01 (0.827)	-0.06 0.05	-0.03 (0.333)	-0.08 0.03	-0.01 (0.520)	-0.03 0.01
Trend	-0.00 (0.979)	-0.00 0.00	0.00 (0.875)	-0.00 0.00	0.00 (0.848)	-0.00 0.00	0.00 (0.573)	-0.00 0.00
Constant	0.68 (0.980)	-51.85 53.20	-4.29 (0.874)	-57.54 48.96	-4.82 (0.848)	-54.07 44.44	-6.15 (0.574)	-27.58 15.29
N	4910		4910		4910		4910	

Robust standard errors; b= coefficient; p=p-value; lb=lower bound 95% interval; ub=upper bound 95% interval. Note: announcement is a binary variable taking a value of 1 for respondents re-contacted after the May 20th announcement. AI = anti-intellectualism. Trust outcomes are binary where 1 = some level of trust, except for anti-intellectualism index.

Observational Results using Alternative Index of Trust in Doctors and Scientists

Supplementary Figure 3. Association between trust in scientists/doctors and COVID-19 attitudes and self-reported behaviours. Effects of trust on COVID-19 concern (top-left), risk perception (top-center), social distancing (top-right), misperceptions (bottom-left), COVID-19 news exposure (bottom-center), and COVID-19 discussion (bottom-right). $N = 25,074$. Note: 95% confidence intervals based on robust standard errors. Controls for ideology, science literacy, generalized trust, news exposure, social media exposure, political discussion, partisanship, education, age, religiosity, urban/rural, gender, region. Data weighted within region by age and gender. Markers represent OLS regression estimates for each wave. All variables scaled from 0-1.

Supplementary Figure 4. Estimated effects of lagged covariates on COVID-19 attitudes and behaviours. N = 4,474. Note: 95% confidence intervals based on robust standard errors. Controls for lagged outcomes, generalized trust, news exposure, social media exposure, political discussion, partisanship, education, age, religiosity, urban/rural, gender, region, and contact/re-contact fixed effects. Data weighted within region by age and gender. Markers represent OLS regression estimates. All variables scaled from 0-1.

Supplementary Figure 5. Trust in scientists/doctors and mask usage. Estimated effects of anti-intellectualism on mask usage (left); predicted mask usage over time by levels of anti-intellectualism (right). $N = 20,579$. Note: 95% confidence intervals based on robust standard errors. Controls for ideology, science literacy, generalized trust, news exposure, social media exposure, political discussion, partisanship, education, age, religiosity, urban/rural, gender, region. Data weighted within region by age and gender. Dots represent OLS regression estimates for each wave in the left panel. Dots represent linear predictions in the right panel. All variables scaled from 0-1.

Supplementary Figure 6. Dynamics in mask usage. Predicted level of mask usage across contact and re-contact periods by trust in scientists and doctors. $N = 4,568$. Note: 95% confidence intervals based on robust standard errors. Controls for ideology, science literacy, generalized trust, news exposure, social media exposure, political discussion, partisanship, education, age, religiosity, urban/rural, gender, region and their interactions with the re-contact period. Data weighted within region by age and gender.

Supplementary Tables

Estimates for Observational Models

Supplementary Table 6A. COVID-19 concern estimates, OLS regression

	Mar 25-20		Apr 2-6		Apr 9-11		Apr 16-19		Apr 24-29		May 1-5	
	b/p	lb/ub	b/p	lb/ub	b/p	lb/ub	b/p	lb/ub	b/p	lb/ub	b/p	lb/ub
AI	-0.11 (0.000)	-0.16 (0.000)	-0.20 (0.000)	-0.26 (0.000)	-0.13 (0.000)	-0.19 (0.000)	-0.21 (0.000)	-0.28 (0.000)	-0.21 (0.000)	-0.27 (0.000)	-0.19 (0.000)	-0.26 (0.000)
Ideology	-0.08 (0.001)	-0.12 (0.000)	-0.10 (0.000)	-0.15 (0.000)	-0.09 (0.000)	-0.13 (0.000)	-0.14 (0.000)	-0.19 (0.000)	-0.14 (0.000)	-0.19 (0.000)	-0.15 (0.000)	-0.20 (0.000)
Science literacy	-0.05 (0.011)	-0.08 (0.071)	-0.04 (0.071)	-0.08 (0.000)	-0.06 (0.005)	-0.08 (0.002)	-0.03 (0.136)	-0.08 (0.001)	-0.03 (0.174)	-0.07 (0.001)	-0.06 (0.005)	-0.11 (0.000)
Trust	-0.04 (0.000)	-0.06 (0.032)	-0.02 (0.032)	-0.04 (0.000)	-0.01 (0.207)	-0.03 (0.009)	-0.03 (0.009)	-0.05 (0.000)	-0.05 (0.000)	-0.07 (0.000)	-0.02 (0.100)	-0.04 (0.000)
News exposure	0.06 (0.000)	0.04 (0.176)	0.01 (0.176)	-0.01 (0.000)	0.04 (0.000)	0.02 (0.000)	0.04 (0.000)	0.02 (0.000)	0.03 (0.010)	0.01 (0.000)	0.04 (0.000)	0.02 (0.000)
Social media	0.02 (0.053)	-0.00 (0.218)	0.01 (0.218)	-0.01 (0.000)	0.00 (0.752)	-0.02 (0.002)	-0.01 (0.159)	-0.01 (0.000)	0.01 (0.493)	-0.01 (0.000)	0.03 (0.006)	0.01 (0.000)
Discussion	0.02 (0.000)	0.02 (0.000)	0.03 (0.000)	0.02 (0.000)	0.03 (0.000)	0.02 (0.000)	0.02 (0.009)	0.00 (0.000)	0.02 (0.004)	0.01 (0.000)	0.01 (0.213)	-0.00 (0.000)
Conservative	-0.02 (0.081)	-0.04 (0.752)	-0.00 (0.752)	-0.03 (0.000)	-0.04 (0.007)	-0.06 (0.000)	-0.03 (0.062)	-0.05 (0.000)	-0.04 (0.009)	-0.07 (0.000)	-0.03 (0.016)	-0.06 (0.000)
NDP	-0.00 (0.943)	-0.03 (0.397)	0.01 (0.397)	-0.02 (0.000)	-0.04 (0.006)	-0.07 (0.001)	0.01 (0.452)	-0.02 (0.000)	0.00 (0.900)	-0.03 (0.000)	-0.02 (0.304)	-0.05 (0.000)
Bloc					-0.02 (0.435)	-0.07 (0.000)	0.00 (0.915)	-0.05 (0.000)	-0.09 (0.002)	-0.15 (0.000)	-0.02 (0.352)	-0.07 (0.000)
Green	-0.04 (0.149)	-0.09 (0.017)	-0.07 (0.017)	-0.12 (0.000)	-0.04 (0.139)	-0.09 (0.000)	-0.04 (0.129)	-0.09 (0.000)	-0.04 (0.174)	-0.09 (0.000)	-0.04 (0.139)	-0.09 (0.000)
Other PID	-0.03 (0.394)	-0.11 (0.264)	-0.03 (0.264)	-0.09 (0.000)	-0.18 (0.002)	-0.29 (0.000)	-0.01 (0.920)	-0.12 (0.000)	-0.11 (0.263)	-0.29 (0.000)	-0.00 (0.983)	-0.14 (0.000)
No PID	-0.03 (0.038)	-0.05 (0.057)	-0.03 (0.057)	-0.06 (0.000)	-0.04 (0.003)	-0.07 (0.000)	-0.01 (0.439)	-0.04 (0.000)	-0.04 (0.006)	-0.07 (0.000)	-0.03 (0.022)	-0.06 (0.000)
Education	-0.00 (0.600)	-0.01 (0.584)	-0.00 (0.584)	-0.01 (0.000)	-0.00 (0.154)	-0.01 (0.000)	0.00 (0.936)	-0.01 (0.000)	0.00 (0.831)	-0.01 (0.000)	0.00 (0.124)	-0.00 (0.000)
Age	0.00 (0.000)	0.00 (0.000)	0.00 (0.000)	0.00 (0.000)	0.00 (0.000)	0.00 (0.000)	0.00 (0.000)	0.00 (0.000)	0.00 (0.000)	0.00 (0.000)	0.00 (0.000)	0.00 (0.000)
Religiosity	0.02 (0.000)	0.01 (0.001)	0.01 (0.001)	0.01 (0.000)	0.01 (0.002)	0.01 (0.000)	0.02 (0.000)	0.01 (0.000)	0.02 (0.000)	0.01 (0.000)	0.02 (0.001)	0.01 (0.000)
Urban/rural	0.01 (0.022)	0.00 (0.425)	0.00 (0.425)	-0.00 (0.000)	0.01 (0.052)	-0.00 (0.000)	0.01 (0.001)	0.01 (0.000)	0.01 (0.054)	-0.00 (0.000)	0.02 (0.000)	0.01 (0.000)
Female	0.02 (0.013)	0.00 (0.026)	0.02 (0.026)	0.00 (0.000)	0.05 (0.000)	0.03 (0.000)	0.06 (0.000)	0.04 (0.000)	0.03 (0.015)	0.00 (0.000)	0.05 (0.000)	0.03 (0.000)
Quebec	-0.01 (0.792)	-0.04 (0.000)	-0.11 (0.000)	-0.15 (0.000)	-0.11 (0.000)	-0.15 (0.000)	-0.08 (0.001)	-0.13 (0.000)	-0.09 (0.000)	-0.14 (0.000)	-0.13 (0.000)	-0.17 (0.000)
Ontario	-0.02 (0.329)	-0.05 (0.104)	-0.03 (0.104)	-0.07 (0.000)	-0.00 (0.920)	-0.04 (0.000)	0.02 (0.331)	-0.02 (0.000)	0.01 (0.796)	-0.04 (0.000)	-0.02 (0.413)	-0.05 (0.000)
West	-0.02 (0.298)	-0.05 (0.062)	-0.04 (0.062)	-0.07 (0.000)	-0.00 (0.821)	-0.05 (0.000)	0.00 (0.907)	-0.04 (0.000)	-0.04 (0.063)	-0.09 (0.000)	-0.03 (0.155)	-0.07 (0.000)
Constant	0.76 (0.000)	0.68 (0.000)	0.87 (0.000)	0.79 (0.000)	0.78 (0.000)	0.70 (0.000)	0.63 (0.000)	0.55 (0.000)	0.78 (0.000)	0.69 (0.000)	0.66 (0.000)	0.58 (0.000)
R ²	0.11		0.12		0.14		0.14		0.14		0.16	
N	2243		2252		2301		2268		2298		2268	

Note: Robust standard errors; b= coefficient; p=p-value; lb=lower bound 95% interval; ub=upper bound 95% interval

Supplementary Table 6B. COVID-19 concern estimates, OLS regression

	May 8-12		May 21-27		Jun 15-18		Jun 22-29		Jun 29-Jul 8	
	b/p	lb/ub	b/p	lb/ub	b/p	lb/ub	b/p	lb/ub	b/p	lb/ub
AI	-0.21 (0.000)	-0.27 -0.14	-0.24 (0.000)	-0.32 -0.17	-0.25 (0.000)	-0.31 -0.18	-0.27 (0.000)	-0.34 -0.20	-0.25 (0.000)	-0.32 -0.18
Ideology	-0.13 (0.000)	-0.18 -0.07	-0.12 (0.000)	-0.18 -0.07	-0.16 (0.000)	-0.21 -0.11	-0.12 (0.000)	-0.18 -0.07	-0.15 (0.000)	-0.20 -0.10
Science literacy	-0.05 (0.033)	-0.10 -0.00	-0.05 (0.039)	-0.09 -0.00	-0.05 (0.030)	-0.10 -0.01	0.00 (0.931)	-0.04 0.05	-0.02 (0.479)	-0.06 0.03
Trust	-0.02 (0.041)	-0.04 -0.00	-0.02 (0.053)	-0.04 0.00	-0.02 (0.081)	-0.04 0.00	-0.05 (0.000)	-0.08 -0.03	-0.02 (0.027)	-0.05 -0.00
News exposure	0.04 (0.000)	0.02 0.06	0.03 (0.016)	0.00 0.05	0.05 (0.000)	0.03 0.07	0.04 (0.001)	0.02 0.06	0.05 (0.000)	0.03 0.07
Social media	0.02 (0.129)	-0.00 0.04	0.02 (0.061)	-0.00 0.04	0.01 (0.194)	-0.01 0.04	0.02 (0.142)	-0.01 0.04	-0.01 (0.430)	-0.03 0.01
Discussion	0.02 (0.000)	0.01 0.04	0.02 (0.000)	0.01 0.03	0.01 (0.047)	0.00 0.03	0.02 (0.004)	0.01 0.03	0.03 (0.000)	0.01 0.04
Conservative	-0.06 (0.000)	-0.09 -0.03	-0.04 (0.008)	-0.07 -0.01	-0.06 (0.000)	-0.09 -0.03	-0.04 (0.013)	-0.07 -0.01	-0.03 (0.039)	-0.06 -0.00
NDP	-0.02 (0.162)	-0.05 0.01	-0.03 (0.127)	-0.06 0.01	-0.01 (0.495)	-0.05 0.02	-0.01 (0.458)	-0.05 0.02	-0.01 (0.602)	-0.05 0.03
Bloc	-0.05 (0.107)	-0.10 0.01	-0.09 (0.000)	-0.15 -0.04	-0.06 (0.037)	-0.11 -0.00	-0.04 (0.084)	-0.10 0.01	-0.00 (0.874)	-0.06 0.05
Green	-0.04 (0.169)	-0.10 0.02	-0.04 (0.224)	-0.10 0.02	-0.14 (0.000)	-0.21 -0.08	-0.10 (0.005)	-0.17 -0.03	0.01 (0.657)	-0.04 0.07
Other PID	-0.04 (0.547)	-0.16 0.09	-0.15 (0.065)	-0.30 0.01	-0.21 (0.014)	-0.38 -0.04	-0.03 (0.706)	-0.17 0.12	-0.29 (0.000)	-0.41 -0.17
No PID	-0.03 (0.068)	-0.06 0.00	-0.05 (0.004)	-0.08 -0.02	-0.03 (0.097)	-0.06 0.00	-0.03 (0.096)	-0.06 0.00	0.01 (0.478)	-0.02 0.04
Education	-0.01 (0.059)	-0.01 0.00	-0.00 (0.196)	-0.01 0.00	-0.01 (0.004)	-0.01 -0.00	0.00 (0.844)	-0.01 0.01	-0.01 (0.061)	-0.01 0.00
Age	0.00 (0.000)	0.00 0.00	0.00 (0.000)	0.00 0.00	0.00 (0.000)	0.00 0.00	0.00 (0.000)	0.00 0.00	0.00 (0.000)	0.00 0.00
Religiosity	0.03 (0.000)	0.02 0.04	0.02 (0.000)	0.01 0.03	0.02 (0.005)	0.00 0.03	0.02 (0.000)	0.01 0.03	0.01 (0.004)	0.00 0.03
Urban/rural	0.01 (0.130)	-0.00 0.02	0.01 (0.214)	-0.00 0.01	0.02 (0.000)	0.01 0.03	0.01 (0.008)	0.00 0.02	0.01 (0.188)	-0.00 0.01
Female	0.04 (0.001)	0.02 0.06	0.02 (0.087)	-0.00 0.04	0.02 (0.038)	0.00 0.05	0.04 (0.000)	0.02 0.07	0.04 (0.002)	0.01 0.06
Quebec	-0.04 (0.095)	-0.09 0.01	-0.08 (0.001)	-0.13 -0.04	-0.16 (0.000)	-0.20 -0.11	-0.10 (0.000)	-0.15 -0.05	-0.13 (0.000)	-0.18 -0.09
Ontario	0.05 (0.036)	0.00 0.09	-0.01 (0.562)	-0.06 0.03	-0.04 (0.051)	-0.08 0.00	-0.00 (0.923)	-0.05 0.04	0.02 (0.302)	-0.02 0.06
West	0.02 (0.346)	-0.02 0.07	-0.02 (0.363)	-0.07 0.02	-0.07 (0.002)	-0.11 -0.03	-0.03 (0.198)	-0.08 0.02	-0.03 (0.123)	-0.08 0.01
Constant	0.74 (0.000)	0.66 0.83	0.81 (0.000)	0.71 0.90	0.79 (0.000)	0.70 0.87	0.66 (0.000)	0.56 0.75	0.75 (0.000)	0.66 0.85
	0.14 2296		0.14 2323		0.16 2286		0.15 2285		0.18 2254	

Note: Robust standard errors; b= coefficient; p=p-value; lb=lower bound 95% interval; ub=upper bound 95% interval

Supplementary Table 7A. COVID-19 risk perception estimates, OLS regression

	Mar 25-20		Apr 2-6		Apr 9-11		Apr 16-19		Apr 24-29		May 1-5	
	b/p	lb/ub	b/p	lb/ub	b/p	lb/ub	b/p	lb/ub	b/p	lb/ub	b/p	lb/ub
AI	-0.18 (0.000)	-0.23 (0.000)	-0.19 (0.000)	-0.24 (0.000)	-0.13 (0.000)	-0.18 (0.000)	-0.20 (0.000)	-0.26 (0.000)	-0.22 (0.000)	-0.27 (0.000)	-0.21 (0.000)	-0.27 (0.000)
Ideology	-0.09 (0.000)	-0.12 (0.000)	-0.08 (0.000)	-0.12 (0.000)	-0.10 (0.000)	-0.14 (0.000)	-0.14 (0.000)	-0.19 (0.000)	-0.15 (0.000)	-0.20 (0.000)	-0.12 (0.000)	-0.17 (0.000)
Science literacy	-0.01 (0.514)	-0.04 (0.02)	-0.04 (0.053)	-0.07 (0.00)	-0.05 (0.006)	-0.08 (0.01)	-0.04 (0.059)	-0.08 (0.00)	-0.03 (0.175)	-0.06 (0.01)	-0.04 (0.029)	-0.08 (0.00)
Trust	-0.02 (0.016)	-0.04 (0.00)	-0.02 (0.020)	-0.04 (0.00)	-0.02 (0.006)	-0.04 (0.01)	-0.02 (0.039)	-0.04 (0.00)	-0.02 (0.007)	-0.04 (0.01)	-0.02 (0.029)	-0.04 (0.00)
News exposure	0.05 (0.000)	0.03 (0.07)	0.01 (0.428)	-0.01 (0.02)	0.02 (0.067)	-0.00 (0.03)	0.03 (0.007)	0.01 (0.04)	0.02 (0.108)	-0.00 (0.03)	0.03 (0.007)	0.01 (0.00)
Social media	-0.01 (0.383)	-0.02 (0.01)	0.01 (0.338)	-0.01 (0.02)	0.00 (0.607)	-0.01 (0.02)	0.00 (0.989)	-0.02 (0.02)	-0.01 (0.192)	-0.03 (0.01)	0.01 (0.232)	-0.01 (0.03)
Discussion	0.01 (0.060)	-0.00 (0.01)	0.02 (0.000)	0.01 (0.02)	0.02 (0.000)	0.01 (0.03)	-0.00 (0.285)	0.01 (0.02)	0.01 (0.056)	-0.00 (0.02)	-0.00 (0.877)	-0.01 (0.01)
Conservative	-0.01 (0.617)	-0.03 (0.01)	-0.00 (0.971)	-0.02 (0.02)	-0.04 (0.000)	-0.06 (0.00)	-0.02 (0.229)	-0.04 (0.01)	-0.04 (0.001)	-0.07 (0.00)	-0.04 (0.003)	-0.06 (0.00)
NDP	0.01 (0.570)	-0.02 (0.03)	0.02 (0.209)	-0.01 (0.04)	-0.05 (0.002)	-0.08 (0.02)	-0.00 (0.860)	-0.03 (0.03)	0.00 (0.857)	-0.03 (0.03)	-0.02 (0.168)	-0.05 (0.01)
Bloc					-0.01 (0.555)	-0.06 (0.03)	-0.01 (0.689)	-0.05 (0.03)	-0.04 (0.069)	-0.09 (0.00)	-0.01 (0.795)	-0.04 (0.03)
Green	-0.05 (0.045)	-0.10 (0.00)	-0.04 (0.124)	-0.08 (0.01)	-0.04 (0.118)	-0.08 (0.01)	-0.05 (0.036)	-0.09 (0.00)	-0.02 (0.498)	-0.06 (0.03)	-0.01 (0.521)	-0.06 (0.03)
Other PID	-0.02 (0.512)	-0.08 (0.04)	-0.03 (0.162)	-0.08 (0.01)	-0.08 (0.123)	-0.17 (0.02)	-0.07 (0.198)	-0.17 (0.04)	-0.09 (0.314)	-0.25 (0.08)	-0.02 (0.790)	-0.15 (0.11)
No PID	-0.01 (0.275)	-0.03 (0.01)	-0.01 (0.253)	-0.04 (0.01)	-0.00 (0.720)	-0.03 (0.02)	0.00 (0.830)	-0.02 (0.03)	-0.02 (0.155)	-0.04 (0.01)	-0.02 (0.083)	-0.05 (0.00)
Education	-0.00 (0.139)	-0.01 (0.00)	-0.00 (0.053)	-0.01 (0.00)	-0.00 (0.272)	-0.01 (0.00)	-0.01 (0.003)	-0.01 (0.00)	-0.01 (0.003)	-0.01 (0.00)	-0.00 (0.104)	-0.01 (0.00)
Age	0.00 (0.000)	0.00 (0.00)	0.00 (0.000)	0.00 (0.00)	0.00 (0.000)	0.00 (0.00)	0.00 (0.002)	0.00 (0.00)	0.00 (0.115)	-0.00 (0.00)	0.00 (0.000)	0.00 (0.00)
Religiosity	0.01 (0.006)	0.00 (0.02)	0.01 (0.011)	0.00 (0.02)	0.02 (0.000)	0.01 (0.03)	0.01 (0.016)	0.00 (0.02)	0.02 (0.000)	0.01 (0.03)	0.02 (0.000)	0.01 (0.03)
Urban/rural	0.00 (0.628)	-0.00 (0.01)	0.01 (0.126)	-0.00 (0.01)	0.00 (0.822)	-0.01 (0.01)	0.00 (0.187)	-0.00 (0.01)	0.01 (0.012)	0.00 (0.02)	0.01 (0.002)	0.00 (0.02)
Female	0.05 (0.000)	0.04 (0.07)	0.01 (0.087)	-0.00 (0.03)	0.03 (0.000)	0.02 (0.05)	0.03 (0.000)	0.01 (0.05)	0.03 (0.000)	0.02 (0.05)	0.03 (0.004)	0.01 (0.04)
Quebec	0.00 (0.834)	-0.03 (0.04)	-0.10 (0.000)	-0.13 (0.00)	-0.13 (0.000)	-0.16 (0.00)	-0.11 (0.00)	-0.15 (0.00)	-0.12 (0.00)	-0.16 (0.00)	-0.14 (0.00)	-0.17 (0.00)
Ontario	-0.01 (0.496)	-0.04 (0.02)	-0.01 (0.514)	-0.04 (0.02)	-0.00 (0.897)	-0.03 (0.03)	-0.01 (0.622)	-0.05 (0.03)	-0.01 (0.605)	-0.05 (0.03)	-0.03 (0.101)	-0.06 (0.01)
West	-0.01 (0.525)	-0.04 (0.02)	-0.03 (0.116)	-0.06 (0.01)	-0.01 (0.553)	-0.04 (0.02)	-0.04 (0.070)	-0.08 (0.00)	-0.05 (0.008)	-0.09 (0.01)	-0.05 (0.008)	-0.08 (0.01)
Constant	0.86 (0.000)	0.80 (0.93)	0.93 (0.000)	0.86 (1.00)	0.89 (0.000)	0.82 (0.96)	0.92 (0.000)	0.85 (1.00)	0.94 (0.000)	0.87 (1.02)	0.88 (0.000)	0.81 (0.96)
R ²	0.12		0.11		0.14		0.10		0.15		0.13	
N	2243		2252		2301		2268		2298		2268	

Note: Robust standard errors; b= coefficient; p=p-value; lb=lower bound 95% interval; ub=upper bound 95% interval

Supplementary Table 7B. COVID-19 risk perception estimates, OLS regression

	May 8-12		May 21-27		Jun 15-18		Jun 22-29		Jun 29-Jul 8	
	b/p	lb/ub	b/p	lb/ub	b/p	lb/ub	b/p	lb/ub	b/p	lb/ub
AI	-0.19 (0.000)	-0.25 -0.14	-0.18 (0.000)	-0.24 -0.12	-0.23 (0.000)	-0.29 -0.17	-0.27 (0.000)	-0.33 -0.20	-0.26 (0.000)	-0.33 -0.19
Ideology	-0.13 (0.000)	-0.18 -0.09	-0.16 (0.000)	-0.20 -0.11	-0.17 (0.000)	-0.22 -0.12	-0.09 (0.000)	-0.14 -0.05	-0.15 (0.000)	-0.20 -0.10
Science literacy	-0.03 (0.159)	-0.07 0.01	-0.04 (0.068)	-0.08 0.00	-0.06 (0.007)	-0.10 -0.02	-0.01 (0.506)	-0.05 0.03	-0.01 (0.632)	-0.05 0.03
Trust	-0.02 (0.041)	-0.04 -0.00	-0.02 (0.051)	-0.04 0.00	-0.02 (0.034)	-0.04 -0.00	-0.04 (0.000)	-0.06 -0.02	-0.03 (0.001)	-0.05 -0.01
News exposure	0.02 (0.021)	0.00 0.04	0.01 (0.110)	-0.00 0.03	0.03 (0.000)	0.02 0.05	0.02 (0.036)	0.00 0.04	0.04 (0.000)	0.02 0.05
Social media	0.01 (0.266)	-0.01 0.03	0.00 (0.784)	-0.02 0.02	0.02 (0.096)	-0.00 0.04	0.01 (0.336)	-0.01 0.03	-0.03 (0.007)	-0.05 -0.01
Discussion	0.01 (0.136)	-0.00 0.02	0.01 (0.317)	-0.00 0.02	0.00 (0.655)	-0.01 0.01	0.02 (0.002)	0.01 0.03	0.01 (0.098)	-0.00 0.02
Conservative	-0.05 (0.000)	-0.08 -0.03	-0.05 (0.000)	-0.07 -0.02	-0.04 (0.010)	-0.06 -0.01	-0.05 (0.001)	-0.07 -0.02	-0.04 (0.004)	-0.07 -0.01
NDP	-0.01 (0.597)	-0.04 0.02	-0.03 (0.094)	-0.06 0.00	0.01 (0.675)	-0.02 0.04	0.00 (0.847)	-0.03 0.03	-0.00 (0.950)	-0.03 0.03
Bloc	-0.02 (0.341)	-0.07 0.02	-0.04 (0.086)	-0.08 0.01	-0.07 (0.003)	-0.12 -0.02	-0.02 (0.474)	-0.06 0.03	-0.03 (0.151)	-0.08 0.01
Green	-0.05 (0.069)	-0.10 0.00	-0.03 (0.219)	-0.09 0.02	-0.10 (0.000)	-0.16 -0.05	-0.04 (0.235)	-0.10 0.02	-0.02 (0.441)	-0.07 0.03
Other PID	-0.03 (0.603)	-0.14 0.08	-0.08 (0.066)	-0.17 0.01	-0.18 (0.001)	-0.29 -0.07	-0.03 (0.698)	-0.17 0.12	-0.24 (0.001)	-0.38 -0.11
No PID	-0.02 (0.223)	-0.04 0.01	-0.03 (0.061)	-0.05 0.00	-0.02 (0.249)	-0.04 0.01	-0.00 (0.801)	-0.03 0.02	-0.00 (0.755)	-0.03 0.02
Education	-0.01 (0.001)	-0.01 -0.00	-0.00 (0.080)	-0.01 0.00	-0.01 (0.001)	-0.01 -0.00	-0.00 (0.380)	-0.01 0.00	-0.01 (0.001)	-0.01 -0.00
Age	0.00 (0.001)	0.00 0.00	0.00 (0.023)	0.00 0.00	0.00 (0.019)	0.00 0.00	0.00 (0.000)	0.00 0.00	0.00 (0.034)	0.00 0.00
Religiosity	0.02 (0.000)	0.01 0.03	0.02 (0.000)	0.02 0.03	0.01 (0.006)	0.00 0.02	0.02 (0.000)	0.01 0.03	0.02 (0.000)	0.01 0.03
Urban/rural	0.01 (0.046)	0.00 0.01	0.01 (0.009)	0.00 0.02	0.01 (0.001)	0.01 0.02	0.01 (0.070)	-0.00 0.01	0.00 (0.919)	-0.01 0.01
Female	0.02 (0.015)	0.00 0.04	0.03 (0.001)	0.01 0.05	0.03 (0.005)	0.01 0.05	0.03 (0.002)	0.01 0.05	0.02 (0.020)	0.00 0.04
Quebec	-0.09 (0.000)	-0.13 -0.05	-0.10 (0.000)	-0.14 -0.06	-0.15 (0.000)	-0.19 -0.11	-0.13 (0.000)	-0.17 -0.09	-0.15 (0.000)	-0.19 -0.11
Ontario	-0.00 (0.954)	-0.04 0.04	-0.03 (0.089)	-0.07 0.00	-0.05 (0.010)	-0.09 -0.01	-0.02 (0.214)	-0.06 0.01	0.01 (0.735)	-0.03 0.04
West	-0.03 (0.144)	-0.07 0.01	-0.05 (0.011)	-0.09 -0.01	-0.08 (0.000)	-0.11 -0.04	-0.06 (0.005)	-0.09 -0.02	-0.03 (0.140)	-0.07 0.01
Constant	0.88 (0.000)	0.80 0.95	0.88 (0.000)	0.80 0.96	0.93 (0.000)	0.85 1.01	0.78 (0.000)	0.70 0.86	0.94 (0.000)	0.86 1.02
R ²	0.13		0.13		0.16		0.15		0.19	
N	2296		2323		2286		2285		2254	

Robust standard errors; b= coefficient; p=p-value; lb=lower bound 95% interval; ub=upper bound 95% interval

Supplementary Table 8A. Social distancing estimates, OLS regression

	Mar 25-20		Apr 2-6		Apr 9-11		Apr 16-19		Apr 24-29		May 1-5	
	b/p	lb/ub	b/p	lb/ub	b/p	lb/ub	b/p	lb/ub	b/p	lb/ub	b/p	lb/ub
AI	-0.27 (0.000)	-0.35 (0.000)	-0.34 (0.000)	-0.41 (0.000)	-0.35 (0.000)	-0.42 (0.000)	-0.32 (0.000)	-0.40 (0.000)	-0.40 (0.000)	-0.47 (0.000)	-0.33 (0.000)	-0.41 (0.000)
Ideology	-0.00 (0.880)	-0.06 (0.05)	0.03 (0.359)	-0.03 (0.08)	-0.01 (0.787)	-0.06 (0.05)	0.02 (0.634)	-0.05 (0.08)	-0.04 (0.163)	-0.10 (0.02)	-0.05 (0.131)	-0.10 (0.01)
Science literacy	0.04 (0.129)	-0.01 (0.09)	0.07 (0.008)	0.02 (0.12)	0.10 (0.000)	0.05 (0.15)	0.08 (0.004)	0.03 (0.14)	0.09 (0.001)	0.04 (0.14)	0.06 (0.046)	0.00 (0.11)
Trust	-0.06 (0.000)	-0.09 (0.000)	-0.07 (0.000)	-0.09 (0.000)	-0.06 (0.000)	-0.09 (0.000)	-0.06 (0.000)	-0.08 (0.000)	-0.07 (0.000)	-0.09 (0.000)	-0.06 (0.000)	-0.08 (0.000)
News exposure	0.13 (0.000)	0.10 (0.000)	0.09 (0.000)	0.06 (0.11)	0.08 (0.000)	0.05 (0.10)	0.09 (0.000)	0.07 (0.12)	0.07 (0.000)	0.05 (0.09)	0.09 (0.000)	0.07 (0.12)
Social media	-0.02 (0.173)	-0.04 (0.01)	-0.04 (0.000)	-0.06 (0.02)	-0.01 (0.538)	-0.03 (0.01)	-0.05 (0.000)	-0.07 (0.02)	-0.02 (0.036)	-0.05 (0.000)	-0.00 (0.866)	-0.03 (0.02)
Discussion	0.01 (0.341)	-0.01 (0.02)	-0.01 (0.040)	-0.03 (0.00)	-0.01 (0.041)	-0.03 (0.00)	0.00 (0.812)	-0.01 (0.02)	-0.01 (0.134)	-0.02 (0.00)	-0.03 (0.000)	-0.05 (0.00)
Conservative	0.01 (0.685)	-0.02 (0.04)	-0.02 (0.265)	-0.05 (0.01)	0.01 (0.676)	-0.03 (0.04)	0.03 (0.131)	-0.01 (0.06)	0.00 (0.955)	-0.03 (0.04)	0.01 (0.489)	-0.02 (0.05)
NDP	0.02 (0.313)	-0.02 (0.06)	0.00 (0.957)	-0.03 (0.04)	-0.01 (0.796)	-0.05 (0.04)	0.08 (0.000)	0.03 (0.12)	-0.02 (0.407)	-0.06 (0.02)	0.03 (0.130)	-0.01 (0.07)
Bloc					0.02 (0.549)	-0.04 (0.08)	0.09 (0.006)	0.03 (0.15)	-0.03 (0.357)	-0.09 (0.03)	0.04 (0.188)	-0.02 (0.10)
Green	0.01 (0.811)	-0.05 (0.07)	-0.03 (0.356)	-0.09 (0.03)	-0.01 (0.708)	-0.07 (0.05)	-0.00 (0.941)	-0.08 (0.07)	-0.00 (0.937)	-0.06 (0.05)	-0.03 (0.386)	-0.10 (0.04)
Other PID	0.00 (0.943)	-0.09 (0.10)	0.04 (0.142)	-0.01 (0.09)	0.01 (0.833)	-0.11 (0.14)	-0.05 (0.394)	-0.18 (0.07)	-0.03 (0.745)	-0.23 (0.17)	0.16 (0.011)	0.04 (0.28)
No PID	0.03 (0.080)	-0.00 (0.06)	0.00 (0.811)	-0.03 (0.04)	0.04 (0.017)	0.01 (0.07)	0.04 (0.043)	0.00 (0.08)	0.01 (0.491)	-0.02 (0.05)	0.01 (0.536)	-0.02 (0.05)
Education	0.01 (0.001)	0.00 (0.02)	0.02 (0.000)	0.01 (0.02)	0.02 (0.000)	0.01 (0.02)	0.01 (0.001)	0.00 (0.02)	0.02 (0.000)	0.01 (0.02)	0.01 (0.000)	0.01 (0.02)
Age	0.00 (0.000)	0.00 (0.00)	0.00 (0.000)	0.00 (0.01)	0.00 (0.000)	0.00 (0.00)	0.00 (0.000)	0.00 (0.00)	0.00 (0.000)	0.00 (0.01)	0.00 (0.000)	0.00 (0.00)
Religiosity	-0.01 (0.323)	-0.02 (0.01)	-0.02 (0.003)	-0.03 (0.01)	-0.02 (0.000)	-0.03 (0.01)	-0.01 (0.119)	-0.02 (0.00)	-0.02 (0.000)	-0.03 (0.01)	-0.00 (0.779)	-0.01 (0.01)
Urban/rural	-0.01 (0.196)	-0.02 (0.00)	-0.01 (0.027)	-0.02 (0.00)	-0.01 (0.051)	-0.02 (0.00)	-0.01 (0.112)	-0.02 (0.00)	-0.00 (0.308)	-0.01 (0.00)	-0.01 (0.136)	-0.02 (0.00)
Female	0.10 (0.000)	0.08 (0.13)	0.10 (0.000)	0.08 (0.13)	0.06 (0.000)	0.04 (0.09)	0.09 (0.000)	0.06 (0.12)	0.06 (0.000)	0.03 (0.08)	0.10 (0.000)	0.07 (0.12)
Quebec	-0.07 (0.024)	-0.12 (0.01)	0.01 (0.700)	-0.04 (0.06)	-0.08 (0.001)	-0.13 (0.03)	-0.05 (0.110)	-0.11 (0.01)	-0.05 (0.099)	-0.10 (0.01)	-0.07 (0.016)	-0.12 (0.01)
Ontario	0.01 (0.634)	-0.03 (0.06)	0.02 (0.358)	-0.03 (0.07)	-0.00 (0.859)	-0.05 (0.04)	0.02 (0.429)	-0.03 (0.08)	-0.03 (0.177)	-0.08 (0.02)	-0.02 (0.411)	-0.07 (0.03)
West	0.01 (0.674)	-0.04 (0.06)	0.03 (0.319)	-0.02 (0.08)	-0.01 (0.583)	-0.06 (0.03)	0.02 (0.403)	-0.03 (0.08)	-0.04 (0.147)	-0.09 (0.01)	-0.03 (0.352)	-0.08 (0.03)
Constant	0.41 (0.000)	0.31 (0.51)	0.49 (0.000)	0.39 (0.59)	0.57 (0.000)	0.48 (0.67)	0.50 (0.000)	0.39 (0.61)	0.59 (0.000)	0.48 (0.69)	0.57 (0.000)	0.47 (0.68)
R ²	0.18		0.24		0.19		0.13		0.19		0.15	
N	2243		2252		2301		2268		2298		2268	

Note: Robust standard errors; b= coefficient; p=p-value; lb=lower bound 95% interval; ub=upper bound 95% interval

Supplementary Table 8B. Social distancing estimates, OLS regression

	May 8-12		May 21-27		Jun 15-18		Jun 22-29		Jun 29-Jul 8	
	b/p	lb/ub	b/p	lb/ub	b/p	lb/ub	b/p	lb/ub	b/p	lb/ub
AI	-0.30 (0.000)	-0.38 -0.22	-0.27 (0.000)	-0.36 -0.19	-0.43 (0.000)	-0.50 -0.35	-0.36 (0.000)	-0.44 -0.28	-0.39 (0.000)	-0.47 -0.31
Ideology	-0.02 (0.572)	-0.07 0.04	-0.02 (0.612)	-0.08 0.05	-0.10 (0.001)	-0.16 -0.04	-0.09 (0.006)	-0.15 -0.03	-0.11 (0.001)	-0.17 -0.04
Science literacy	0.08 (0.007)	0.02 0.13	0.10 (0.001)	0.04 0.16	0.11 (0.000)	0.06 0.17	0.13 (0.000)	0.07 0.19	0.13 (0.000)	0.08 0.19
Trust	-0.05 (0.000)	-0.07 -0.02	-0.06 (0.000)	-0.08 -0.03	-0.07 (0.000)	-0.09 -0.04	-0.08 (0.000)	-0.11 -0.05	-0.08 (0.000)	-0.11 -0.06
News exposure	0.09 (0.000)	0.07 0.12	0.07 (0.000)	0.04 0.10	0.08 (0.000)	0.06 0.11	0.08 (0.000)	0.05 0.10	0.06 (0.000)	0.03 0.08
Social media	-0.02 (0.147)	-0.04 0.01	-0.04 (0.006)	-0.07 -0.01	-0.04 (0.007)	-0.06 -0.01	-0.02 (0.206)	-0.04 0.01	0.01 (0.722)	-0.02 0.03
Discussion	-0.02 (0.018)	-0.03 -0.00	-0.03 (0.000)	-0.04 -0.01	-0.03 (0.000)	-0.04 -0.01	-0.01 (0.252)	-0.03 0.01	-0.01 (0.469)	-0.02 0.01
Conservative	0.00 (0.904)	-0.03 0.04	0.02 (0.446)	-0.02 0.05	-0.02 (0.308)	-0.05 0.02	0.00 (0.880)	-0.03 0.04	-0.04 (0.057)	-0.07 0.00
NDP	0.04 (0.051)	-0.00 0.08	0.07 (0.003)	0.02 0.12	0.01 (0.826)	-0.04 0.05	0.00 (0.854)	-0.04 0.05	0.02 (0.415)	-0.03 0.07
Bloc	0.02 (0.606)	-0.05 0.08	-0.00 (0.978)	-0.07 0.07	0.06 (0.091)	-0.01 0.12	-0.00 (0.969)	-0.07 0.06	0.03 (0.354)	-0.04 0.10
Green	0.02 (0.624)	-0.06 0.09	0.05 (0.192)	-0.02 0.12	-0.07 (0.052)	-0.14 0.00	-0.03 (0.508)	-0.10 0.05	-0.06 (0.102)	-0.14 0.01
Other PID	0.09 (0.132)	-0.03 0.20	-0.07 (0.355)	-0.21 0.08	-0.05 (0.620)	-0.25 0.15	-0.03 (0.773)	-0.24 0.18	-0.10 (0.235)	-0.26 0.06
No PID	0.05 (0.005)	0.01 0.08	0.05 (0.025)	0.01 0.09	0.03 (0.134)	-0.01 0.06	0.05 (0.008)	0.01 0.09	0.06 (0.002)	0.02 0.10
Education	0.02 (0.000)	0.01 0.02	0.02 (0.000)	0.01 0.03	0.01 (0.004)	0.00 0.02	0.01 (0.002)	0.00 0.02	0.01 (0.063)	-0.00 0.01
Age	0.00 (0.000)	0.00 0.01	0.00 (0.000)	0.00 0.00	0.00 (0.000)	0.00 0.00	0.00 (0.000)	0.00 0.01	0.00 (0.000)	0.00 0.00
Religiosity	-0.00 (0.913)	-0.01 0.01	-0.02 (0.021)	-0.03 -0.00	-0.01 (0.198)	-0.02 0.00	-0.00 (0.726)	-0.01 0.01	0.00 (0.901)	-0.01 0.01
Urban/rural	-0.01 (0.263)	-0.02 0.00	-0.01 (0.210)	-0.02 0.00	0.00 (0.413)	-0.01 0.01	0.00 (0.961)	-0.01 0.01	0.01 (0.247)	-0.00 0.02
Female	0.09 (0.000)	0.07 0.12	0.09 (0.000)	0.07 0.12	0.09 (0.000)	0.06 0.12	0.07 (0.000)	0.04 0.09	0.07 (0.000)	0.04 0.10
Quebec	-0.06 (0.032)	-0.11 -0.01	-0.06 (0.069)	-0.12 0.00	-0.07 (0.013)	-0.13 -0.01	-0.03 (0.375)	-0.09 0.03	-0.04 (0.248)	-0.10 0.03
Ontario	-0.00 (0.931)	-0.05 0.04	0.01 (0.611)	-0.04 0.07	0.04 (0.168)	-0.01 0.08	0.07 (0.019)	0.01 0.12	0.10 (0.001)	0.04 0.15
West	-0.02 (0.330)	-0.07 0.02	-0.03 (0.264)	-0.09 0.03	-0.03 (0.250)	-0.08 0.02	0.04 (0.222)	-0.02 0.09	0.04 (0.144)	-0.02 0.10
Constant	0.41 (0.000)	0.30 0.51	0.41 (0.000)	0.29 0.53	0.54 (0.000)	0.43 0.65	0.31 (0.000)	0.20 0.42	0.42 (0.000)	0.31 0.53
R ²	0.19		0.16		0.21		0.18		0.18	
N	2296		2323		2286		2285		2254	

Robust standard errors; b= coefficient; p=p-value; lb=lower bound 95% interval; ub=upper bound 95% interval

Supplementary Table 9A. Misperceptions estimates, OLS regression

	Mar 25-20		Apr 2-6		Apr 9-11		Apr 16-19		Apr 24-29		May 1-5	
	b/p	lb/ub	b/p	lb/ub	b/p	lb/ub	b/p	lb/ub	b/p	lb/ub	b/p	lb/ub
AI	0.15 (0.000)	0.10 0.20	0.23 (0.000)	0.19 0.28	0.24 (0.000)	0.20 0.29	0.21 (0.000)	0.16 0.25	0.26 (0.000)	0.21 0.30	0.22 (0.000)	0.17 0.26
Ideology	-0.03 (0.098)	-0.06 0.01	-0.05 (0.008)	-0.08 -0.01	-0.00 (0.871)	-0.04 0.03	-0.03 (0.085)	-0.06 0.00	-0.01 (0.610)	-0.04 0.02	0.01 (0.710)	-0.03 0.04
Science literacy	-0.11 (0.000)	-0.14 -0.08	-0.10 (0.000)	-0.13 -0.07	-0.12 (0.000)	-0.15 -0.09	-0.12 (0.000)	-0.15 -0.09	-0.10 (0.000)	-0.12 -0.07	-0.10 (0.000)	-0.13 -0.07
Trust	0.01 (0.492)	-0.01 0.02	0.03 (0.000)	0.01 0.04	0.03 (0.000)	0.01 0.04	0.01 (0.112)	-0.00 0.02	0.01 (0.057)	-0.00 0.03	0.01 (0.239)	-0.01 0.02
News exposure	-0.04 (0.000)	-0.06 -0.02	-0.02 (0.011)	-0.03 -0.00	-0.03 (0.000)	-0.04 -0.01	-0.03 (0.000)	-0.04 -0.01	-0.02 (0.009)	-0.03 -0.00	-0.04 (0.000)	-0.05 -0.03
Social media	0.08 (0.000)	0.07 0.09	0.08 (0.000)	0.07 0.10	0.07 (0.000)	0.05 0.08	0.05 (0.000)	0.04 0.07	0.07 (0.000)	0.05 0.08	0.05 (0.000)	0.04 0.06
Discussion	0.00 (0.803)	-0.01 0.01	0.00 (0.372)	-0.00 0.01	0.01 (0.223)	-0.00 0.01	0.01 (0.030)	0.00 0.02	0.01 (0.095)	-0.00 0.01	0.01 (0.003)	0.00 0.02
Conservative	0.02 (0.089)	-0.00 0.04	0.03 (0.018)	0.00 0.05	-0.01 (0.160)	-0.03 0.01	0.03 (0.004)	0.01 0.05	0.01 (0.230)	-0.01 0.03	0.03 (0.000)	0.02 0.05
NDP	-0.03 (0.009)	-0.06 -0.01	0.01 (0.367)	-0.01 0.04	-0.00 (0.724)	-0.03 0.02	-0.01 (0.206)	-0.04 0.01	-0.02 (0.164)	-0.04 0.01	-0.00 (0.839)	-0.03 0.02
Bloc					-0.02 (0.362)	-0.05 0.02	0.00 (0.771)	-0.03 0.04	-0.01 (0.626)	-0.04 0.02	-0.02 (0.311)	-0.05 0.02
Green	-0.02 (0.422)	-0.06 0.02	-0.01 (0.379)	-0.05 0.02	-0.00 (0.811)	-0.04 0.03	0.05 (0.012)	0.01 0.09	-0.01 (0.649)	-0.04 0.02	0.01 (0.442)	-0.02 0.05
Other PID	0.04 (0.229)	-0.02 0.10	0.01 (0.670)	-0.03 0.04	-0.01 (0.817)	-0.09 0.07	0.09 (0.002)	0.03 0.14	-0.04 (0.448)	-0.13 0.06	0.01 (0.806)	-0.08 0.10
No PID	-0.01 (0.599)	-0.02 0.01	-0.00 (0.954)	-0.02 0.02	-0.02 (0.038)	-0.04 -0.00	0.00 (0.855)	-0.02 0.02	-0.02 (0.035)	-0.04 -0.00	0.00 (0.788)	-0.02 0.02
Education	-0.01 (0.013)	-0.01 -0.00	-0.01 (0.000)	-0.01 -0.00	-0.01 (0.000)	-0.01 -0.00	-0.01 (0.000)	-0.02 -0.01	-0.01 (0.000)	-0.02 -0.01	-0.01 (0.000)	-0.01 -0.01
Age	-0.00 (0.000)	-0.00 -0.00	-0.00 (0.000)	-0.00 -0.00	-0.00 (0.000)	-0.00 -0.00	-0.00 (0.000)	-0.00 -0.00	-0.00 (0.000)	-0.00 -0.00	-0.00 (0.000)	-0.00 -0.00
Religiosity	0.03 (0.000)	0.03 0.04	0.05 (0.000)	0.04 0.06	0.04 (0.000)	0.03 0.04	0.03 (0.000)	0.02 0.04	0.03 (0.000)	0.03 0.04	0.02 (0.000)	0.02 0.03
Urban/rural	0.01 (0.004)	0.00 0.01	-0.00 (0.803)	-0.01 0.01	-0.00 (0.819)	-0.01 0.00	0.00 (0.608)	-0.00 0.01	0.01 (0.000)	0.00 0.01	0.00 (0.083)	-0.00 0.01
Female	-0.04 (0.000)	-0.06 -0.03	-0.04 (0.000)	-0.05 -0.02	-0.04 (0.000)	-0.05 -0.02	-0.02 (0.007)	-0.03 -0.01	-0.01 (0.048)	-0.03 -0.00	-0.03 (0.000)	-0.04 -0.01
Quebec	-0.01 (0.673)	-0.05 0.03	0.00 (0.764)	-0.03 0.04	0.02 (0.186)	-0.01 0.05	0.01 (0.733)	-0.03 0.04	-0.00 (0.915)	-0.03 0.03	0.01 (0.338)	-0.02 0.04
Ontario	-0.00 (0.894)	-0.03 0.03	0.01 (0.492)	-0.02 0.04	0.03 (0.032)	0.00 0.06	0.01 (0.380)	-0.02 0.04	0.02 (0.118)	-0.01 0.05	0.02 (0.097)	-0.00 0.05
West	-0.00 (0.938)	-0.03 0.03	0.04 (0.020)	0.01 0.07	0.05 (0.001)	0.02 0.08	0.00 (0.968)	-0.03 0.03	0.01 (0.417)	-0.02 0.04	0.01 (0.530)	-0.02 0.04
Constant	0.42 (0.000)	0.36 0.48	0.38 (0.000)	0.32 0.44	0.36 (0.000)	0.30 0.41	0.41 (0.000)	0.35 0.47	0.33 (0.000)	0.28 0.38	0.35 (0.000)	0.29 0.41
R ²	0.28		0.35		0.31		0.27		0.31		0.25	
N	2243		2252		2301		2268		2298		2268	

Note: Robust standard errors; b= coefficient; p=p-value; lb=lower bound 95% interval; ub=upper bound 95% interval

Supplementary Table 9B. Misperceptions estimates, OLS regression

	May 8-12		May 21-27		Jun 15-18		Jun 22-29		Jun 29-Jul 8	
	b/p	lb/ub	b/p	lb/ub	b/p	lb/ub	b/p	lb/ub	b/p	lb/ub
AI	0.25 (0.000)	0.21 (0.000)	0.18 (0.000)	0.14 (0.000)	0.22 (0.000)	0.18 (0.000)	0.27 (0.000)	0.23 (0.000)	0.22 (0.000)	0.18 (0.000)
Ideology	-0.01 (0.381)	-0.04 (0.000)	-0.07 (0.000)	-0.10 (0.000)	0.04 (0.024)	0.00 (0.000)	-0.01 (0.510)	-0.04 (0.000)	0.01 (0.669)	-0.02 (0.000)
Science literacy	-0.12 (0.000)	-0.14 (0.000)	-0.10 (0.000)	-0.13 (0.000)	-0.12 (0.000)	-0.15 (0.000)	-0.15 (0.000)	-0.18 (0.000)	-0.11 (0.000)	-0.14 (0.000)
Trust	0.02 (0.020)	0.00 (0.306)	0.01 (0.306)	-0.01 (0.000)	0.01 (0.039)	0.00 (0.000)	0.02 (0.002)	0.01 (0.000)	0.01 (0.304)	-0.01 (0.000)
News exposure	-0.03 (0.000)	-0.04 (0.000)	-0.02 (0.000)	-0.04 (0.000)	-0.04 (0.000)	-0.05 (0.000)	-0.03 (0.000)	-0.04 (0.000)	-0.03 (0.000)	-0.04 (0.000)
Social media	0.05 (0.000)	0.04 (0.000)	0.07 (0.000)	0.05 (0.000)	0.06 (0.000)	0.05 (0.000)	0.06 (0.000)	0.05 (0.000)	0.06 (0.000)	0.04 (0.000)
Discussion	0.02 (0.000)	0.01 (0.000)	0.03 (0.000)	0.03 (0.000)	0.02 (0.001)	0.01 (0.000)	0.01 (0.013)	0.00 (0.000)	0.02 (0.000)	0.01 (0.000)
Conservative	0.01 (0.159)	-0.01 (0.241)	-0.01 (0.241)	-0.04 (0.000)	0.02 (0.092)	-0.00 (0.000)	0.01 (0.400)	-0.01 (0.000)	0.02 (0.080)	-0.00 (0.000)
NDP	-0.02 (0.030)	-0.04 (0.000)	-0.09 (0.000)	-0.12 (0.000)	-0.01 (0.307)	-0.03 (0.000)	-0.03 (0.023)	-0.05 (0.000)	-0.03 (0.008)	-0.06 (0.000)
Bloc	0.02 (0.182)	-0.01 (0.071)	-0.03 (0.071)	-0.07 (0.000)	-0.00 (0.879)	-0.03 (0.000)	-0.02 (0.204)	-0.05 (0.000)	-0.03 (0.056)	-0.06 (0.000)
Green	-0.02 (0.359)	-0.05 (0.051)	-0.04 (0.051)	-0.08 (0.000)	0.04 (0.098)	-0.01 (0.000)	0.05 (0.023)	0.01 (0.000)	0.03 (0.136)	-0.01 (0.000)
Other PID	0.06 (0.135)	-0.02 (0.079)	0.09 (0.079)	-0.01 (0.000)	0.05 (0.245)	-0.03 (0.000)	-0.06 (0.060)	-0.12 (0.000)	0.05 (0.139)	-0.02 (0.000)
No PID	-0.01 (0.291)	-0.03 (0.000)	-0.05 (0.000)	-0.07 (0.000)	-0.01 (0.572)	-0.02 (0.000)	-0.00 (0.989)	-0.02 (0.000)	-0.01 (0.389)	-0.03 (0.000)
Education	-0.01 (0.000)	-0.01 (0.000)	-0.01 (0.000)	-0.02 (0.000)	-0.01 (0.000)	-0.01 (0.000)	-0.01 (0.000)	-0.01 (0.000)	-0.01 (0.000)	-0.01 (0.000)
Age	-0.00 (0.000)	-0.00 (0.000)	-0.00 (0.000)	-0.00 (0.000)	-0.00 (0.000)	-0.00 (0.000)	-0.00 (0.000)	-0.00 (0.000)	-0.00 (0.000)	-0.00 (0.000)
Religiosity	0.03 (0.000)	0.03 (0.000)	0.04 (0.000)	0.03 (0.000)	0.03 (0.000)	0.03 (0.000)	0.03 (0.000)	0.03 (0.000)	0.03 (0.000)	0.03 (0.000)
Urban/rural	0.00 (0.070)	-0.00 (0.369)	0.00 (0.369)	-0.00 (0.000)	0.00 (0.150)	-0.00 (0.000)	0.00 (0.784)	-0.00 (0.000)	0.00 (0.238)	-0.00 (0.000)
Female	-0.03 (0.000)	-0.05 (0.000)	-0.05 (0.000)	-0.06 (0.000)	-0.03 (0.000)	-0.04 (0.000)	-0.01 (0.372)	-0.02 (0.000)	-0.02 (0.028)	-0.03 (0.000)
Quebec	-0.00 (0.736)	-0.03 (0.634)	0.01 (0.634)	-0.02 (0.000)	0.01 (0.438)	-0.02 (0.000)	0.03 (0.048)	0.00 (0.000)	0.03 (0.021)	0.01 (0.000)
Ontario	0.01 (0.631)	-0.02 (0.743)	-0.01 (0.743)	-0.04 (0.000)	-0.02 (0.202)	-0.05 (0.000)	0.03 (0.016)	0.01 (0.000)	0.01 (0.289)	-0.01 (0.000)
West	0.01 (0.473)	-0.02 (0.000)	0.06 (0.000)	0.03 (0.000)	-0.01 (0.354)	-0.04 (0.000)	0.02 (0.222)	-0.01 (0.000)	0.01 (0.438)	-0.02 (0.000)
Constant	0.38 (0.000)	0.32 (0.000)	0.46 (0.000)	0.40 (0.000)	0.36 (0.000)	0.31 (0.000)	0.33 (0.000)	0.27 (0.000)	0.33 (0.000)	0.27 (0.000)
R ²	0.33		0.41		0.34		0.33		0.32	
N	2296		2323		2286		2285		2254	

Robust standard errors; b= coefficient; p=p-value; lb=lower bound 95% interval; ub=upper bound 95% interval

Supplementary Table 10A. News exposure estimates, OLS regression

	Mar 25-20		Apr 2-6		Apr 9-11		Apr 16-19		Apr 24-29		May 1-5	
	b/p	lb/ub	b/p	lb/ub	b/p	lb/ub	b/p	lb/ub	b/p	lb/ub	b/p	lb/ub
AI	-0.11 (0.000)	-0.16 -0.05	-0.13 (0.000)	-0.18 -0.08	-0.13 (0.000)	-0.18 -0.08	-0.10 (0.000)	-0.15 -0.05	-0.10 (0.000)	-0.15 -0.06	-0.10 (0.000)	-0.16 -0.05
Ideology	-0.01 (0.604)	-0.05 0.03	-0.01 (0.448)	-0.05 0.02	0.02 (0.414)	-0.02 0.06	-0.01 (0.663)	-0.05 0.03	-0.04 (0.070)	-0.08 0.00	-0.02 (0.389)	-0.06 0.02
Science literacy	-0.02 (0.372)	-0.05 0.02	-0.00 (0.969)	-0.03 0.03	-0.02 (0.195)	-0.06 0.01	0.01 (0.456)	-0.02 0.05	0.00 (0.948)	-0.03 0.04	-0.01 (0.676)	-0.05 0.03
Trust	-0.01 (0.527)	-0.02 0.01	-0.03 (0.001)	-0.04 -0.01	0.01 (0.505)	-0.01 0.02	-0.01 (0.507)	-0.02 0.01	-0.00 (0.978)	-0.02 0.02	0.00 (0.983)	-0.02 0.02
News exposure	0.12 (0.000)	0.10 0.14	0.08 (0.000)	0.06 0.10	0.12 (0.000)	0.10 0.14	0.11 (0.000)	0.09 0.13	0.12 (0.000)	0.10 0.13	0.12 (0.000)	0.10 0.14
Social media	-0.00 (0.708)	-0.02 0.01	0.00 (0.925)	-0.01 0.02	0.00 (0.657)	-0.01 0.02	0.01 (0.353)	-0.01 0.02	0.01 (0.173)	-0.00 0.03	0.02 (0.046)	0.00 0.04
Discussion	0.03 (0.000)	0.02 0.04	0.03 (0.000)	0.02 0.04	0.03 (0.000)	0.03 0.04	0.04 (0.000)	0.03 0.05	0.04 (0.000)	0.03 0.04	0.04 (0.000)	0.03 0.04
Conservative	-0.01 (0.552)	-0.03 0.01	-0.01 (0.189)	-0.03 0.01	-0.02 (0.031)	-0.05 -0.00	-0.01 (0.513)	-0.03 0.02	-0.01 (0.436)	-0.03 0.01	-0.01 (0.655)	-0.03 0.02
NDP	0.01 (0.683)	-0.02 0.03	0.00 (0.942)	-0.02 0.03	-0.03 (0.040)	-0.06 -0.00	-0.01 (0.622)	-0.04 0.02	-0.02 (0.141)	-0.05 0.01	-0.01 (0.392)	-0.04 0.02
Bloc					0.04 (0.020)	0.01 0.08	-0.01 (0.703)	-0.04 0.03	0.00 (0.845)	-0.03 0.04	-0.02 (0.299)	-0.07 0.02
Green	-0.03 (0.313)	-0.08 0.02	-0.04 (0.051)	-0.08 0.00	-0.04 (0.061)	-0.09 0.00	-0.02 (0.356)	-0.06 0.02	-0.04 (0.132)	-0.08 0.01	-0.05 (0.037)	-0.09 -0.00
Other PID	-0.01 (0.716)	-0.07 0.05	-0.02 (0.249)	-0.07 0.02	-0.11 (0.040)	-0.21 -0.00	-0.02 (0.698)	-0.09 0.06	-0.00 (0.969)	-0.14 0.13	-0.05 (0.484)	-0.18 0.09
No PID	-0.01 (0.226)	-0.04 0.01	-0.04 (0.001)	-0.06 -0.02	-0.02 (0.041)	-0.05 -0.00	-0.01 (0.604)	-0.03 0.02	-0.01 (0.270)	-0.04 0.01	-0.03 (0.007)	-0.06 -0.01
Education	0.00 (0.068)	-0.00 0.01	0.00 (0.070)	-0.00 0.01	0.00 (0.030)	0.00 0.01	0.00 (0.227)	-0.00 0.01	-0.00 (0.977)	-0.00 0.00	0.00 (0.393)	-0.00 0.01
Age	0.00 (0.000)	0.00 0.00	0.00 (0.000)	0.00 0.00	0.00 (0.000)	0.00 0.00	0.00 (0.000)	0.00 0.00	0.00 (0.000)	0.00 0.00	0.00 (0.000)	0.00 0.00
Religiosity	0.00 (0.521)	-0.00 0.01	0.00 (0.703)	-0.01 0.01	0.00 (0.556)	-0.01 0.01	0.00 (0.471)	-0.01 0.01	0.00 (0.220)	-0.00 0.01	0.00 (0.785)	-0.01 0.01
Urban/rural	0.00 (0.298)	-0.00 0.01	0.00 (0.576)	-0.00 0.01	0.01 (0.120)	-0.00 0.01	0.01 (0.009)	0.00 0.02	0.00 (0.916)	-0.01 0.01	0.01 (0.105)	-0.00 0.01
Female	0.01 (0.112)	-0.00 0.03	-0.01 (0.260)	-0.02 0.01	0.00 (0.762)	-0.01 0.02	0.01 (0.368)	-0.01 0.02	-0.01 (0.340)	-0.02 0.01	-0.01 (0.223)	-0.03 0.01
Quebec	0.02 (0.201)	-0.01 0.06	0.00 (0.884)	-0.03 0.04	-0.04 (0.022)	-0.07 -0.01	-0.01 (0.487)	-0.05 0.02	0.00 (0.877)	-0.03 0.04	-0.01 (0.698)	-0.04 0.03
Ontario	0.01 (0.604)	-0.02 0.04	-0.02 (0.241)	-0.06 0.01	-0.03 (0.106)	-0.06 0.01	-0.03 (0.096)	-0.06 0.01	-0.02 (0.295)	-0.05 0.02	-0.02 (0.147)	-0.06 0.01
West	-0.01 (0.711)	-0.04 0.03	-0.02 (0.275)	-0.06 0.02	-0.03 (0.056)	-0.06 0.00	-0.04 (0.033)	-0.07 -0.00	-0.02 (0.232)	-0.06 0.01	-0.05 (0.005)	-0.08 -0.01
Constant	0.46 (0.000)	0.39 0.54	0.63 (0.000)	0.56 0.70	0.52 (0.000)	0.45 0.59	0.44 (0.000)	0.37 0.51	0.49 (0.000)	0.42 0.56	0.44 (0.000)	0.37 0.52
R ²	0.24		0.18		0.25		0.22		0.23		0.24	
N	2243		2252		2301		2268		2298		2268	

Note: Robust standard errors; b= coefficient; p=p-value; lb=lower bound 95% interval; ub=upper bound 95% interval

Supplementary Table 10B. News exposure estimates, OLS regression

	May 8-12		May 21-27		Jun 15-18		Jun 22-29		Jun 29-Jul 8	
	b/p	lb/ub	b/p	lb/ub	b/p	lb/ub	b/p	lb/ub	b/p	lb/ub
AI	-0.15 (0.000)	-0.20 -0.09	-0.12 (0.000)	-0.18 -0.06	-0.11 (0.000)	-0.16 -0.05	-0.15 (0.000)	-0.21 -0.09	-0.11 (0.001)	-0.17 -0.05
Ideology	-0.00 (0.930)	-0.04 0.04	0.01 (0.652)	-0.03 0.05	-0.02 (0.347)	-0.07 0.02	-0.02 (0.300)	-0.07 0.02	-0.02 (0.453)	-0.06 0.03
Science literacy	-0.03 (0.138)	-0.07 0.01	0.01 (0.720)	-0.03 0.04	-0.02 (0.320)	-0.06 0.02	0.01 (0.755)	-0.03 0.05	0.01 (0.607)	-0.03 0.05
Trust	0.01 (0.319)	-0.01 0.03	-0.01 (0.501)	-0.03 0.01	0.01 (0.124)	-0.00 0.03	0.01 (0.353)	-0.01 0.03	0.00 (0.735)	-0.02 0.02
News exposure	0.12 (0.000)	0.11 0.14	0.12 (0.000)	0.10 0.14	0.13 (0.000)	0.11 0.15	0.11 (0.000)	0.09 0.13	0.11 (0.000)	0.09 0.13
Social media	0.01 (0.510)	-0.01 0.02	0.02 (0.051)	-0.00 0.04	0.02 (0.029)	0.00 0.04	0.03 (0.001)	0.01 0.05	0.02 (0.073)	-0.00 0.04
Discussion	0.04 (0.000)	0.03 0.05	0.04 (0.000)	0.03 0.05	0.05 (0.000)	0.04 0.06	0.05 (0.000)	0.04 0.06	0.06 (0.000)	0.05 0.07
Conservative	-0.02 (0.169)	-0.04 0.01	-0.03 (0.013)	-0.05 -0.01	-0.02 (0.142)	-0.05 0.01	-0.01 (0.308)	-0.04 0.01	-0.06 (0.000)	-0.09 -0.03
NDP	-0.02 (0.139)	-0.05 0.01	0.00 (0.889)	-0.03 0.03	-0.01 (0.713)	-0.04 0.03	0.01 (0.530)	-0.02 0.04	-0.04 (0.016)	-0.07 -0.01
Bloc	-0.02 (0.363)	-0.06 0.02	-0.01 (0.669)	-0.05 0.03	-0.01 (0.645)	-0.06 0.04	-0.00 (0.916)	-0.05 0.04	0.01 (0.710)	-0.04 0.06
Green	-0.04 (0.140)	-0.09 0.01	-0.07 (0.006)	-0.12 -0.02	-0.10 (0.000)	-0.15 -0.05	-0.09 (0.002)	-0.15 -0.03	-0.03 (0.346)	-0.08 0.03
Other PID	-0.02 (0.687)	-0.10 0.06	-0.15 (0.013)	-0.28 -0.03	-0.09 (0.048)	-0.18 -0.00	-0.07 (0.389)	-0.21 0.08	-0.20 (0.000)	-0.30 -0.10
No PID	-0.02 (0.148)	-0.04 0.01	-0.04 (0.005)	-0.07 -0.01	-0.00 (0.837)	-0.03 0.02	-0.04 (0.005)	-0.07 -0.01	-0.04 (0.006)	-0.07 -0.01
Education	0.00 (0.804)	-0.00 0.01	-0.00 (0.888)	-0.01 0.00	-0.00 (0.469)	-0.01 0.00	0.00 (0.745)	-0.00 0.01	0.00 (0.513)	-0.00 0.01
Age	0.00 (0.000)	0.00 0.00	0.00 (0.000)	0.00 0.00	0.00 (0.000)	0.00 0.00	0.00 (0.000)	0.00 0.00	0.00 (0.000)	0.00 0.00
Religiosity	0.00 (0.577)	-0.01 0.01	0.01 (0.073)	-0.00 0.02	0.01 (0.043)	0.00 0.02	0.01 (0.031)	0.00 0.02	0.01 (0.003)	0.00 0.02
Urban/rural	0.01 (0.027)	0.00 0.02	0.00 (0.283)	-0.00 0.01	0.01 (0.003)	0.00 0.02	0.01 (0.041)	0.00 0.02	0.01 (0.113)	-0.00 0.01
Female	-0.01 (0.226)	-0.03 0.01	-0.00 (0.757)	-0.02 0.01	-0.03 (0.001)	-0.05 -0.01	-0.03 (0.001)	-0.05 -0.01	-0.04 (0.000)	-0.06 -0.02
Quebec	0.03 (0.154)	-0.01 0.07	0.02 (0.452)	-0.02 0.06	-0.06 (0.011)	-0.10 -0.01	-0.01 (0.668)	-0.05 0.03	-0.01 (0.591)	-0.06 0.03
Ontario	0.01 (0.496)	-0.02 0.05	0.02 (0.190)	-0.01 0.06	-0.02 (0.224)	-0.06 0.01	0.02 (0.317)	-0.02 0.06	0.03 (0.130)	-0.01 0.08
West	-0.00 (0.981)	-0.04 0.04	0.01 (0.491)	-0.02 0.05	-0.05 (0.009)	-0.09 -0.01	0.01 (0.749)	-0.03 0.05	0.00 (0.962)	-0.04 0.04
Constant	0.39 (0.000)	0.31 0.46	0.36 (0.000)	0.28 0.43	0.38 (0.000)	0.30 0.46	0.34 (0.000)	0.26 0.41	0.34 (0.000)	0.26 0.42
R ²	0.26		0.27		0.28		0.28		0.28	
N	2296		2323		2286		2285		2254	

Robust standard errors; b= coefficient; p=p-value; lb=lower bound 95% interval; ub=upper bound 95% interval

Supplementary Table 11A. Discussion estimates, OLS regression

	Mar 25-20		Apr 2-6		Apr 9-11		Apr 16-19		Apr 24-29		May 1-5	
	b/p	lb/ub	b/p	lb/ub	b/p	lb/ub	b/p	lb/ub	b/p	lb/ub	b/p	lb/ub
AI	-0.14 (0.000)	-0.20 (0.000)	-0.04 (0.168)	-0.11 (0.02)	-0.04 (0.206)	-0.10 (0.02)	-0.04 (0.250)	-0.11 (0.03)	-0.02 (0.625)	-0.08 (0.05)	-0.07 (0.047)	-0.14 (-0.00)
Ideology	0.03 (0.154)	-0.01 (0.07)	-0.03 (0.262)	-0.08 (0.02)	0.05 (0.048)	0.00 (0.10)	0.01 (0.808)	-0.04 (0.06)	0.00 (0.992)	-0.05 (0.05)	-0.01 (0.664)	-0.06 (0.04)
Science literacy	-0.00 (0.953)	-0.04 (0.04)	0.03 (0.157)	-0.01 (0.08)	0.02 (0.336)	-0.02 (0.07)	0.03 (0.168)	-0.01 (0.08)	0.05 (0.023)	0.01 (0.10)	0.02 (0.436)	-0.03 (0.07)
Trust	-0.00 (0.689)	-0.02 (0.02)	0.01 (0.366)	-0.01 (0.03)	0.01 (0.243)	-0.01 (0.04)	-0.01 (0.414)	-0.03 (0.01)	0.02 (0.151)	-0.01 (0.04)	0.00 (0.901)	-0.02 (0.02)
News exposure	0.04 (0.000)	0.02 (0.000)	0.06 (0.000)	0.03 (0.08)	0.07 (0.000)	0.05 (0.09)	0.05 (0.000)	0.03 (0.08)	0.05 (0.000)	0.03 (0.07)	0.07 (0.000)	0.05 (0.10)
Social media	0.00 (0.690)	-0.01 (0.02)	0.01 (0.228)	-0.01 (0.03)	0.01 (0.343)	-0.01 (0.03)	0.02 (0.092)	-0.00 (0.04)	0.02 (0.031)	0.00 (0.04)	0.02 (0.040)	0.00 (0.04)
Discussion	0.07 (0.000)	0.06 (0.08)	0.07 (0.000)	0.06 (0.08)	0.08 (0.000)	0.07 (0.09)	0.10 (0.000)	0.08 (0.11)	0.10 (0.000)	0.09 (0.11)	0.09 (0.000)	0.08 (0.10)
Conservative	-0.01 (0.611)	-0.03 (0.02)	-0.03 (0.070)	-0.06 (0.00)	-0.02 (0.117)	-0.05 (0.01)	0.00 (0.739)	-0.02 (0.03)	-0.06 (0.000)	-0.08 (-0.03)	0.00 (0.801)	-0.03 (0.03)
NDP	0.02 (0.264)	-0.01 (0.05)	-0.02 (0.177)	-0.05 (0.01)	-0.05 (0.012)	-0.08 (-0.01)	0.01 (0.463)	-0.02 (0.05)	-0.06 (0.001)	-0.09 (-0.03)	0.02 (0.301)	-0.02 (0.06)
Bloc					-0.08 (0.014)	-0.14 (-0.02)	-0.06 (0.070)	-0.12 (0.00)	-0.11 (0.000)	-0.17 (-0.05)	-0.02 (0.462)	-0.08 (0.04)
Green	-0.01 (0.576)	-0.07 (0.04)	-0.00 (0.889)	-0.06 (0.05)	-0.01 (0.782)	-0.06 (0.05)	-0.05 (0.095)	-0.11 (0.01)	-0.10 (0.000)	-0.15 (-0.05)	-0.03 (0.313)	-0.08 (0.03)
Other PID	0.02 (0.660)	-0.06 (0.09)	-0.10 (0.001)	-0.17 (-0.04)	-0.16 (0.005)	-0.27 (-0.05)	0.01 (0.805)	-0.07 (0.10)	0.07 (0.126)	-0.02 (0.16)	0.05 (0.331)	-0.05 (0.16)
No PID	-0.01 (0.674)	-0.03 (0.02)	-0.07 (0.000)	-0.10 (-0.04)	-0.03 (0.046)	-0.07 (-0.00)	-0.04 (0.031)	-0.07 (-0.00)	-0.07 (0.000)	-0.10 (-0.03)	-0.05 (0.004)	-0.08 (-0.02)
Education	0.00 (0.487)	-0.00 (0.01)	0.00 (0.572)	-0.00 (0.01)	0.00 (0.770)	-0.00 (0.01)	-0.00 (0.172)	-0.01 (0.00)	-0.00 (0.174)	-0.01 (0.00)	-0.00 (0.377)	-0.01 (0.00)
Age	0.00 (0.039)	0.00 (0.00)	0.00 (0.103)	-0.00 (0.00)	-0.00 (0.568)	-0.00 (0.00)	-0.00 (0.881)	-0.00 (0.00)	0.00 (0.213)	-0.00 (0.00)	0.00 (0.174)	-0.00 (0.00)
Religiosity	0.01 (0.155)	-0.00 (0.01)	0.01 (0.007)	0.00 (0.02)	0.02 (0.002)	0.01 (0.03)	0.01 (0.018)	0.00 (0.02)	0.01 (0.196)	-0.00 (0.02)	0.02 (0.002)	0.01 (0.03)
Urban/rural	-0.00 (0.576)	-0.01 (0.01)	0.00 (0.676)	-0.01 (0.01)	0.00 (0.724)	-0.01 (0.01)	0.00 (0.596)	-0.01 (0.01)	0.00 (0.487)	-0.01 (0.01)	0.00 (0.510)	-0.01 (0.01)
Female	0.05 (0.000)	0.03 (0.07)	0.03 (0.002)	0.01 (0.05)	0.02 (0.142)	-0.01 (0.04)	0.04 (0.000)	0.02 (0.07)	0.03 (0.011)	0.01 (0.05)	0.00 (0.898)	-0.02 (0.02)
Quebec	-0.02 (0.339)	-0.07 (0.02)	-0.47 (0.000)	-0.51 (-0.42)	-0.43 (0.000)	-0.48 (-0.38)	-0.39 (0.000)	-0.45 (-0.34)	-0.37 (0.000)	-0.43 (-0.32)	-0.43 (0.000)	-0.48 (-0.38)
Ontario	-0.03 (0.131)	-0.06 (0.01)	-0.05 (0.019)	-0.09 (-0.01)	-0.02 (0.328)	-0.07 (0.02)	-0.01 (0.532)	-0.06 (0.03)	-0.07 (0.001)	-0.11 (-0.03)	-0.07 (0.002)	-0.11 (-0.03)
West	-0.04 (0.053)	-0.07 (0.00)	-0.07 (0.002)	-0.11 (-0.02)	-0.04 (0.078)	-0.09 (0.00)	-0.03 (0.213)	-0.08 (0.02)	-0.07 (0.001)	-0.12 (-0.03)	-0.05 (0.031)	-0.09 (-0.00)
Constant	0.62 (0.000)	0.54 (0.70)	0.61 (0.000)	0.52 (0.71)	0.56 (0.000)	0.47 (0.65)	0.56 (0.000)	0.47 (0.65)	0.56 (0.000)	0.47 (0.64)	0.54 (0.000)	0.45 (0.63)
R ²	0.17		0.44		0.44		0.41		0.37		0.42	
N	2243		2252		2301		2268		2298		2268	

Note: Robust standard errors; b= coefficient; p=p-value; lb=lower bound 95% interval; ub=upper bound 95% interval

Supplementary Table 11B. Discussion estimates, OLS regression

	May 8-12		May 21-27		Jun 15-18		Jun 22-29		Jun 29-Jul 8	
	b/p	lb/ub	b/p	lb/ub	b/p	lb/ub	b/p	lb/ub	b/p	lb/ub
AI	-0.02 (0.504)	-0.08 0.04	-0.04 (0.292)	-0.10 0.03	-0.08 (0.019)	-0.15 -0.01	-0.10 (0.003)	-0.17 -0.04	-0.03 (0.311)	-0.10 0.03
Ideology	0.01 (0.588)	-0.04 0.06	-0.01 (0.820)	-0.06 0.05	0.00 (0.904)	-0.05 0.05	-0.00 (0.981)	-0.05 0.05	-0.02 (0.443)	-0.07 0.03
Science literacy	-0.01 (0.806)	-0.05 0.04	0.03 (0.186)	-0.01 0.08	0.04 (0.050)	0.00 0.09	0.06 (0.006)	0.02 0.11	0.07 (0.005)	0.02 0.11
Trust	0.02 (0.027)	0.00 0.05	0.02 (0.065)	-0.00 0.05	0.02 (0.068)	-0.00 0.04	0.03 (0.011)	0.01 0.05	0.01 (0.650)	-0.02 0.03
News exposure	0.07 (0.000)	0.05 0.09	0.06 (0.000)	0.04 0.08	0.06 (0.000)	0.04 0.08	0.05 (0.000)	0.03 0.07	0.05 (0.000)	0.03 0.07
Social media	0.02 (0.112)	-0.00 0.04	0.01 (0.432)	-0.01 0.03	0.04 (0.001)	0.02 0.06	0.04 (0.000)	0.02 0.06	0.00 (0.708)	-0.02 0.03
Discussion	0.11 (0.000)	0.10 0.13	0.10 (0.000)	0.09 0.11	0.12 (0.000)	0.11 0.13	0.13 (0.000)	0.12 0.14	0.13 (0.000)	0.12 0.14
Conservative	-0.02 (0.107)	-0.06 0.01	-0.01 (0.686)	-0.04 0.02	0.01 (0.698)	-0.02 0.04	0.01 (0.660)	-0.02 0.04	-0.04 (0.007)	-0.07 -0.01
NDP	-0.02 (0.392)	-0.05 0.02	-0.02 (0.218)	-0.06 0.01	-0.00 (0.911)	-0.04 0.03	-0.03 (0.086)	-0.07 0.00	-0.07 (0.000)	-0.11 -0.04
Bloc	-0.10 (0.001)	-0.15 -0.04	-0.07 (0.028)	-0.13 -0.01	-0.08 (0.003)	-0.14 -0.03	-0.10 (0.000)	-0.15 -0.05	-0.15 (0.000)	-0.20 -0.09
Green	0.01 (0.787)	-0.05 0.07	-0.04 (0.138)	-0.10 0.01	-0.09 (0.004)	-0.15 -0.03	-0.02 (0.500)	-0.08 0.04	-0.06 (0.051)	-0.12 0.00
Other PID	-0.10 (0.133)	-0.23 0.03	0.06 (0.243)	-0.04 0.16	0.04 (0.515)	-0.08 0.15	0.02 (0.675)	-0.06 0.10	-0.17 (0.002)	-0.28 -0.06
No PID	-0.05 (0.003)	-0.08 -0.02	-0.05 (0.005)	-0.08 -0.02	-0.04 (0.011)	-0.07 -0.01	-0.04 (0.017)	-0.07 -0.01	-0.06 (0.000)	-0.10 -0.03
Education	-0.01 (0.067)	-0.01 0.00	-0.00 (0.614)	-0.01 0.00	-0.00 (0.206)	-0.01 0.00	-0.00 (0.099)	-0.01 0.00	-0.01 (0.096)	-0.01 0.00
Age	0.00 (0.330)	-0.00 0.00	0.00 (0.101)	-0.00 0.00	-0.00 (0.698)	-0.00 0.00	0.00 (0.072)	-0.00 0.00	0.00 (0.325)	-0.00 0.00
Religiosity	0.01 (0.005)	0.00 0.03	0.01 (0.020)	0.00 0.02	0.01 (0.180)	-0.00 0.02	0.01 (0.027)	0.00 0.02	0.01 (0.165)	-0.00 0.02
Urban/rural	0.00 (0.878)	-0.01 0.01	0.01 (0.002)	0.01 0.02	0.01 (0.054)	-0.00 0.02	0.00 (0.900)	-0.01 0.01	0.00 (0.868)	-0.01 0.01
Female	0.02 (0.030)	0.00 0.05	0.02 (0.110)	-0.00 0.04	0.02 (0.029)	0.00 0.05	0.04 (0.001)	0.01 0.06	0.01 (0.437)	-0.01 0.03
Quebec	-0.37 (0.000)	-0.43 -0.32	-0.34 (0.000)	-0.39 -0.29	-0.34 (0.000)	-0.39 -0.29	-0.33 (0.000)	-0.37 -0.28	-0.35 (0.000)	-0.40 -0.29
Ontario	-0.03 (0.219)	-0.07 0.02	-0.03 (0.187)	-0.07 0.01	-0.04 (0.080)	-0.09 0.00	-0.05 (0.024)	-0.09 -0.01	-0.01 (0.584)	-0.06 0.03
West	-0.03 (0.136)	-0.08 0.01	-0.03 (0.251)	-0.07 0.02	-0.06 (0.009)	-0.11 -0.02	-0.06 (0.009)	-0.10 -0.01	-0.05 (0.030)	-0.10 -0.00
Constant	0.48 (0.000)	0.39 0.56	0.40 (0.000)	0.31 0.49	0.43 (0.000)	0.34 0.53	0.37 (0.000)	0.29 0.46	0.45 (0.000)	0.36 0.54
R ²	0.42		0.43		0.41		0.43		0.44	
N	2296		2323		2286		2285		2254	

Robust standard errors; b= coefficient; p=p-value; lb=lower bound 95% interval; ub=upper bound 95% interval

Supplementary Table 12. Panel estimates, OLS regression

	Concern		Threat		Distancing		Misperceptions		News		Discussion	
	b/p	lb/ub	b/p	lb/ub	b/p	lb/ub	b/p	lb/ub	b/p	lb/ub	b/p	lb/ub
AI	-0.09 (0.000)	-0.12	-0.07 (0.000)	-0.11	-0.08 (0.001)	-0.13	0.06 (0.000)	0.03	-0.05 (0.004)	-0.08	-0.02 (0.336)	-0.06
Ideology	-0.06 (0.000)	-0.09	-0.09 (0.000)	-0.12	-0.06 (0.004)	-0.10	0.01 (0.411)	-0.01	-0.03 (0.043)	-0.05	-0.01 (0.458)	-0.05
Science literacy	-0.04 (0.003)	-0.07	-0.04 (0.004)	-0.06	0.00 (0.815)	-0.03	-0.03 (0.000)	-0.04	-0.01 (0.372)	-0.03	0.01 (0.693)	-0.02
Trust	-0.01 (0.415)	-0.02	-0.01 (0.324)	-0.02	-0.02 (0.004)	-0.04	-0.00 (0.920)	-0.01	-0.00 (0.540)	-0.01	0.01 (0.172)	-0.00
News exposure	0.02 (0.007)	0.00	0.00 (0.435)	-0.01	0.03 (0.000)	0.02	-0.00 (0.231)	-0.01	0.05 (0.000)	0.04	0.02 (0.030)	0.00
Social media	0.00 (0.406)	-0.01	0.01 (0.379)	-0.01	-0.02 (0.023)	-0.03	0.02 (0.000)	0.01	0.01 (0.226)	-0.00	0.02 (0.002)	0.01
Discussion	-0.00 (0.607)	-0.01	-0.00 (0.989)	-0.01	0.00 (0.648)	-0.01	-0.00 (0.837)	-0.00	0.02 (0.000)	0.02	0.05 (0.000)	0.04
Conservative	-0.04 (0.000)	-0.06	-0.03 (0.000)	-0.05	0.01 (0.206)	-0.01	0.00 (0.455)	-0.01	0.00 (0.871)	-0.01	-0.01 (0.399)	-0.03
NDP	-0.01 (0.171)	-0.04	-0.02 (0.034)	-0.04	0.02 (0.090)	-0.00	-0.02 (0.003)	-0.03	-0.02 (0.077)	-0.04	-0.02 (0.089)	-0.05
Bloc	-0.01 (0.735)	-0.04	0.01 (0.432)	-0.02	0.01 (0.823)	-0.04	0.00 (0.700)	-0.02	0.01 (0.512)	-0.02	-0.03 (0.269)	-0.08
Green	-0.01 (0.477)	-0.04	-0.00 (0.900)	-0.03	0.01 (0.791)	-0.03	-0.01 (0.199)	-0.03	-0.01 (0.632)	-0.04	-0.06 (0.001)	-0.09
Other PID	-0.03 (0.273)	-0.08	-0.03 (0.177)	-0.08	0.01 (0.845)	-0.05	-0.01 (0.596)	-0.03	-0.03 (0.129)	-0.07	-0.02 (0.447)	-0.07
No PID	-0.01 (0.309)	-0.03	-0.00 (0.922)	-0.02	0.02 (0.111)	-0.00	-0.01 (0.087)	-0.02	-0.02 (0.015)	-0.04	-0.04 (0.001)	-0.06
Education	-0.00 (0.960)	-0.00	-0.00 (0.030)	-0.01	0.01 (0.000)	0.01	-0.01 (0.000)	-0.01	0.00 (0.568)	-0.00	-0.00 (0.218)	-0.01
Age	0.00 (0.001)	0.00	0.00 (0.004)	0.00	0.00 (0.000)	0.00	-0.00 (0.000)	-0.00	0.00 (0.000)	0.00	0.00 (0.003)	0.00
Religiosity	0.01 (0.023)	0.00	0.01 (0.002)	0.00	-0.01 (0.111)	-0.01	0.01 (0.000)	0.01	0.00 (0.256)	-0.00	0.01 (0.000)	0.01
Urban/rural	0.00 (0.102)	-0.00	0.01 (0.000)	0.00	-0.01 (0.070)	-0.01	0.00 (0.049)	0.00	0.00 (0.051)	-0.00	0.00 (0.825)	-0.01
Female	0.02 (0.005)	0.01	0.01 (0.031)	0.00	0.05 (0.000)	0.03	-0.01 (0.014)	-0.02	-0.01 (0.177)	-0.02	0.01 (0.383)	-0.01
Quebec	-0.05 (0.002)	-0.08	-0.09 (0.000)	-0.11	-0.01 (0.480)	-0.05	0.01 (0.263)	-0.01	-0.01 (0.544)	-0.03	-0.22 (0.000)	-0.26
Ontario	0.00 (0.975)	-0.03	-0.01 (0.268)	-0.04	-0.00 (0.978)	-0.03	0.00 (0.832)	-0.01	-0.01 (0.404)	-0.03	-0.04 (0.013)	-0.07
West	-0.01 (0.442)	-0.04	-0.03 (0.025)	-0.06	-0.01 (0.518)	-0.05	0.00 (0.757)	-0.01	-0.01 (0.453)	-0.03	-0.03 (0.045)	-0.06
Outcome	0.63 (0.000)	0.60	0.51 (0.000)	0.48	0.55 (0.000)	0.52	0.65 (0.000)	0.62	0.55 (0.000)	0.51	0.44 (0.000)	0.41
Constant	0.25 (0.000)	0.19	0.41 (0.000)	0.34	0.13 (0.001)	0.05	0.15 (0.000)	0.12	0.16 (0.000)	0.10	0.26 (0.000)	0.19
		0.31		0.47		0.21		0.18		0.21		0.33
R ²	0.42		0.33		0.37		0.58		0.42		0.48	
N	4474		4474		4474		4474		4474		4474	

Note: Robust standard errors; b= coefficient; p=p-value; lb=lower bound 95% interval; ub=upper bound 95% interval

Supplementary Table 13. Mask usage estimates, OLS regression

	Apr 9-11		Apr 16-19		Apr 24-29		May 1-5		May 8-12		May 21-27		Jun 15-18		Jun 22-29		Jun 29-Jul 8	
	b/p	lb/ub	b/p	lb/ub	b/p	lb/ub	b/p	lb/ub	b/p	lb/ub	b/p	lb/ub	b/p	lb/ub	b/p	lb/ub	b/p	lb/ub
AI	0.03	-0.08	-0.01	-0.12	-0.09	-0.20	-0.17	-0.28	-0.10	-0.21	-0.26	-0.38	-0.53	-0.64	-0.37	-0.49	-0.50	-0.62
	(0.626)	0.13	(0.815)	0.09	(0.095)	0.02	(0.002)	-0.06	(0.094)	0.02	(0.000)	-0.14	(0.000)	-0.42	(0.000)	-0.26	(0.000)	-0.39
Ideology	-0.00	-0.09	-0.04	-0.13	-0.07	-0.16	-0.10	-0.18	-0.06	-0.15	-0.03	-0.13	-0.13	-0.22	-0.11	-0.20	-0.12	-0.21
	(0.974)	0.09	(0.301)	0.04	(0.098)	0.01	(0.027)	-0.01	(0.217)	0.03	(0.567)	0.07	(0.005)	-0.04	(0.015)	-0.02	(0.008)	-0.03
Science literacy	0.03	-0.04	0.04	-0.04	-0.02	-0.09	0.01	-0.08	0.07	-0.01	0.03	-0.06	0.10	0.02	0.14	0.06	0.17	0.08
	(0.409)	0.10	(0.326)	0.11	(0.708)	0.06	(0.841)	0.09	(0.105)	0.15	(0.541)	0.11	(0.019)	0.18	(0.001)	0.22	(0.000)	0.25
Trust	-0.03	-0.07	-0.01	-0.04	-0.05	-0.08	-0.05	-0.09	-0.04	-0.08	-0.04	-0.08	-0.09	-0.13	-0.07	-0.11	-0.06	-0.10
	(0.074)	0.00	(0.666)	0.03	(0.018)	-0.01	(0.017)	-0.01	(0.039)	-0.00	(0.082)	0.00	(0.000)	-0.05	(0.000)	-0.03	(0.005)	-0.02
News exposure	0.06	0.02	0.06	0.02	0.00	-0.03	0.03	-0.01	0.04	0.00	0.11	0.08	0.09	0.05	0.07	0.04	0.07	0.03
	(0.001)	0.09	(0.002)	0.09	(0.831)	0.04	(0.182)	0.06	(0.040)	0.08	(0.000)	0.15	(0.000)	0.13	(0.000)	0.11	(0.000)	0.11
Social media	0.05	0.01	0.07	0.03	0.06	0.02	0.06	0.02	0.05	0.01	0.01	-0.03	0.00	-0.04	-0.03	-0.06	-0.03	-0.07
	(0.010)	0.08	(0.000)	0.10	(0.003)	0.09	(0.003)	0.10	(0.017)	0.09	(0.705)	0.05	(0.863)	0.04	(0.155)	0.01	(0.111)	0.01
Discussion	-0.00	-0.02	0.01	-0.01	0.01	-0.01	0.01	-0.01	0.01	-0.01	-0.01	-0.04	-0.02	-0.04	-0.00	-0.03	-0.01	-0.03
	(0.836)	0.02	(0.319)	0.03	(0.315)	0.03	(0.439)	0.03	(0.269)	0.03	(0.193)	0.01	(0.160)	0.01	(0.822)	0.02	(0.447)	0.01
Conservative	-0.05	-0.10	-0.03	-0.08	-0.04	-0.10	-0.00	-0.06	-0.02	-0.08	-0.00	-0.06	-0.02	-0.08	-0.03	-0.08	-0.06	-0.12
	(0.068)	0.00	(0.206)	0.02	(0.093)	0.01	(0.906)	0.05	(0.397)	0.03	(0.923)	0.05	(0.461)	0.03	(0.272)	0.02	(0.028)	-0.01
NDP	-0.07	-0.13	0.02	-0.04	0.01	-0.06	-0.00	-0.07	0.00	-0.06	0.10	0.03	0.00	-0.06	0.01	-0.06	0.09	0.03
	(0.030)	-0.01	(0.496)	0.09	(0.818)	0.07	(0.921)	0.06	(0.909)	0.07	(0.008)	0.17	(0.917)	0.07	(0.801)	0.08	(0.005)	0.16
Bloc	0.01	-0.05	-0.03	-0.09	0.03	-0.05	0.04	-0.05	0.03	-0.06	0.02	-0.08	0.02	-0.08	0.12	0.03	0.04	-0.06
	(0.672)	0.08	(0.290)	0.03	(0.409)	0.12	(0.353)	0.13	(0.512)	0.13	(0.757)	0.12	(0.736)	0.11	(0.011)	0.21	(0.383)	0.15
Green	-0.05	-0.13	0.04	-0.06	0.00	-0.10	-0.05	-0.14	0.04	-0.07	-0.02	-0.13	-0.12	-0.23	-0.14	-0.25	-0.06	-0.17
	(0.189)	0.03	(0.422)	0.14	(0.973)	0.10	(0.325)	0.05	(0.508)	0.15	(0.681)	0.08	(0.029)	-0.01	(0.010)	-0.04	(0.270)	0.05
Other PID	-0.16	-0.32	-0.13	-0.24	-0.11	-0.36	0.13	-0.09	-0.18	-0.41	-0.24	-0.41	-0.22	-0.41	-0.02	-0.28	-0.08	-0.27
	(0.044)	-0.00	(0.018)	-0.02	(0.387)	0.14	(0.252)	0.35	(0.121)	0.05	(0.006)	-0.07	(0.024)	-0.03	(0.910)	0.25	(0.450)	0.12
No PID	-0.03	-0.08	0.03	-0.02	-0.00	-0.06	0.00	-0.05	-0.02	-0.08	0.02	-0.04	0.01	-0.05	0.04	-0.02	0.02	-0.04
	(0.305)	0.02	(0.246)	0.08	(0.897)	0.05	(0.987)	0.06	(0.523)	0.04	(0.445)	0.09	(0.739)	0.07	(0.217)	0.09	(0.572)	0.07
Education	0.01	-0.00	0.01	-0.00	0.02	0.01	0.02	0.01	0.02	0.01	0.02	0.01	0.00	-0.01	0.02	0.01	0.01	-0.00
	(0.080)	0.02	(0.166)	0.02	(0.000)	0.03	(0.000)	0.03	(0.000)	0.03	(0.001)	0.03	(0.944)	0.01	(0.000)	0.03	(0.117)	0.02
Age	0.00	-0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.01	0.00	0.00	0.00
	(0.416)	0.00	(0.032)	0.00	(0.000)	0.00	(0.000)	0.00	(0.000)	0.00	(0.000)	0.01	(0.000)	0.01	(0.000)	0.01	(0.000)	0.01
Religiosity	0.02	0.01	0.02	0.01	0.02	0.01	0.03	0.01	0.05	0.03	-0.00	-0.02	0.00	-0.02	-0.00	-0.02	-0.00	-0.02
	(0.009)	0.04	(0.011)	0.04	(0.012)	0.04	(0.005)	0.04	(0.000)	0.07	(0.939)	0.02	(0.845)	0.02	(0.769)	0.02	(0.755)	0.02
Urban/rural	0.03	0.01	0.03	0.02	0.05	0.03	0.04	0.02	0.03	0.01	0.03	0.02	0.04	0.03	0.03	0.02	0.03	0.01
	(0.000)	0.04	(0.000)	0.05	(0.000)	0.06	(0.000)	0.06	(0.000)	0.04	(0.000)	0.05	(0.000)	0.06	(0.000)	0.05	(0.001)	0.05
Female	0.04	0.00	0.05	0.01	0.05	0.01	0.10	0.06	0.10	0.06	0.06	0.02	0.10	0.06	0.12	0.08	0.09	0.05
	(0.030)	0.08	(0.010)	0.08	(0.018)	0.08	(0.000)	0.14	(0.000)	0.14	(0.004)	0.10	(0.000)	0.14	(0.000)	0.16	(0.000)	0.13
Quebec	-0.11	-0.18	-0.14	-0.22	-0.10	-0.18	-0.11	-0.20	-0.05	-0.13	0.06	-0.03	-0.03	-0.12	0.01	-0.07	-0.00	-0.09
	(0.004)	-0.03	(0.000)	-0.06	(0.012)	-0.02	(0.010)	-0.03	(0.282)	0.04	(0.194)	0.15	(0.574)	0.07	(0.745)	0.10	(0.973)	0.09
Ontario	0.09	0.02	0.08	-0.00	0.08	0.01	0.08	0.00	0.06	-0.02	0.09	0.01	0.09	-0.00	0.13	0.04	0.14	0.06
	(0.012)	0.17	(0.054)	0.15	(0.037)	0.16	(0.048)	0.17	(0.123)	0.14	(0.031)	0.18	(0.053)	0.17	(0.003)	0.21	(0.001)	0.23
West	-0.01	-0.09	-0.05	-0.13	0.03	-0.05	-0.05	-0.13	-0.04	-0.12	-0.08	-0.17	-0.06	-0.15	-0.01	-0.10	-0.03	-0.12
	(0.712)	0.06	(0.175)	0.02	(0.508)	0.10	(0.227)	0.03	(0.338)	0.04	(0.068)	0.01	(0.176)	0.03	(0.813)	0.08	(0.516)	0.06
Constant	-0.06	-0.20	-0.10	-0.24	-0.18	-0.32	-0.12	-0.27	-0.14	-0.30	-0.06	-0.23	0.30	0.13	-0.05	-0.20	0.29	0.13
	(0.402)	0.08	(0.127)	0.03	(0.017)	-0.03	(0.130)	0.04	(0.091)	0.02	(0.462)	0.10	(0.000)	0.46	(0.544)	0.11	(0.000)	0.46
R ²	0.08		0.10		0.09		0.10		0.08		0.10		0.15		0.16		0.16	
N	2301		2268		2298		2268		2296		2323		2286		2285		2254	

Note: Robust standard errors; b= coefficient; p=p-value; lb=lower bound 95% interval; ub=upper bound 95% interval

Supplementary Table 14. Estimated effects on mask usage, contact vs. re-contact

DV = mask usage	Coef.	p-value	95% CI
Re-contact	0.08	0.385	-0.09,0.24
Anti-intellectualism * Re-contact	-0.25	0.000	-0.38,-0.12
Anti-intellectualism	0.02	0.831	-0.13,0.16
Right-left ideology	0.02	0.747	-0.11,0.16
Science literacy	-0.05	0.451	-0.17,0.08
Generalized trust	0.06	0.021	0.01,0.11
News exposure	0.01	0.654	-0.04,0.06
Social media exposure	0.02	0.493	-0.03,0.07
Political discussion	0.01	0.683	-0.02,0.04
Conservative	-0.05	0.369	-0.15,0.06
NDP	-0.10	0.101	-0.23,0.02
Bloc	-0.16	0.064	-0.33,0.01
Green	0.01	0.936	-0.19,0.21
Other PID	0.07	0.332	-0.07,0.21
None PID	-0.09	0.066	-0.19,0.01
Education	0.01	0.216	-0.01,0.03
Age	0.00	0.746	-0.01,0.01
Religiosity	0.01	0.633	-0.03,0.05
Rural/Urban	0.02	0.303	-0.02,0.05
Female	-0.07	0.315	-0.21,0.07
Quebec	0.11	0.678	-0.40,0.61
Ontario	0.23	0.462	-0.39,0.86
West	0.09	0.679	-0.32,0.50
Right-left ideology * re-contact	0.02	0.728	-0.08,0.12
Science literacy * re-contact	-0.09	0.048	-0.19,-0.00
Generalized trust * re-contact	-0.02	0.479	-0.07,0.03
News exposure * re-contact	0.03	0.134	-0.01,0.08
Social media exposure * re-contact	-0.04	0.071	-0.09,0.00
Political discussion * re-contact	0.00	0.895	-0.02,0.03
Conservative * re-contact	0.02	0.595	-0.04,0.08
NDP * re-contact	0.04	0.349	-0.04,0.12
Bloc * re-contact	0.04	0.441	-0.06,0.13
Green * re-contact	0.05	0.318	-0.05,0.15
Other PID * re-contact	-0.11	0.311	-0.34,0.11
None PID * re-contact	-0.02	0.571	-0.09,0.05
Education * re-contact	0.01	0.119	-0.00,0.02
Age * re-contact	0.00	0.037	0.00,0.00
Religiosity * re-contact	0.00	0.665	-0.03,0.02
Rural/Urban * re-contact	0.01	0.394	-0.01,0.02
Female * re-contact	0.03	0.205	-0.02,0.07
Quebec * re-contact	0.03	0.517	-0.06,0.12
Ontario * re-contact	0.03	0.578	-0.06,0.11
West * re-contact	-0.02	0.718	-0.11,0.07
Constant	0.03	0.929	-0.64,0.70
Fixed Effects		Yes	
R ²		0.77	
N		4568	

Note: Robust standard errors

Sample Characteristics

Supplementary Table 15. Sample Characteristics

		1	2
		May 1-5	May 8-12
Female		51.6	51.5
Age	18-34	26.7	25.2
	35-54	34.0	34.2
	55+	39.3	40.5
University educated		38.8	38.8
French		20.7	20.3
Region	Atlantic	7.0	6.9
	Quebec	23.4	22.7
	Ontario	38.2	38.6
	West	31.4	31.7
2019 Liberal vote		36.7	37.1
N		2504	2509

Estimates for Experiments

Supplementary Table 16. OLS Estimates for Study 1

	Story selection		Perceived importance	
	b/p	lb/ub	b/p	lb/ub
Local	-0.02 (0.155)	-0.04 0.01	-0.02 (0.015)	-0.03 -0.00
Right-congenial	-0.10 (0.000)	-0.12 -0.08	-0.04 (0.000)	-0.06 -0.03
Left-congenial	-0.11 (0.000)	-0.13 -0.09	-0.04 (0.000)	-0.05 -0.02
COVID-19 news	0.33 (0.000)	0.22 0.44	0.26 (0.000)	0.17 0.30
Male author	-0.00 (0.546)	-0.02 0.01	0.00 (0.993)	-0.01 0.01
April 22	0.01 (0.457)	-0.01 0.03	0.01 (0.218)	-0.00 0.02
April 29	0.02 (0.054)	-0.00 0.05	0.01 (0.444)	-0.01 0.02
May 6	0.02 (0.090)	-0.00 0.04	0.00 (0.897)	-0.01 0.01
Anti-intellectualism	0.12 (0.000)	0.07 0.16	-0.14 (0.000)	-0.19 -0.08
COVID * Anti-intellectualism	-0.21 (0.000)	-0.31 -0.12	-0.17 (0.000)	-0.23 -0.11
Ideology	0.00 (0.447)	-0.00 0.01	-0.01 (0.000)	-0.01 -0.00
COVID * Ideology	-0.00 (0.418)	-0.01 0.00	-0.00 (0.919)	-0.01 0.00
Sophistication	0.02 (0.416)	-0.03 0.07	-0.06 (0.029)	-0.11 -0.00
COVID * Sophistication	-0.03 (0.552)	-0.13 0.07	0.06 (0.057)	0.00 0.13
Conspiratorial thinking	-0.01 (0.767)	-0.04 0.03	0.09 (0.000)	0.05 0.13
COVID * Conspiracy	-0.01 (0.833)	-0.08 0.07	-0.03 (0.225)	-0.08 0.02
Age	0.00 (0.795)	-0.00 0.00	-0.00 (0.001)	-0.00 -0.00
COVID * Age	-0.00 (0.893)	-0.00 0.00	0.00 (0.469)	-0.00 0.00
Urban	0.01 (0.025)	0.00 0.01	0.01 (0.000)	0.01 0.02
COVID * Urban	-0.01 (0.029)	-0.03 -0.00	-0.01 (0.003)	-0.02 -0.00
Constant	0.38 (0.000)	0.32 0.43	0.59 (0.000)	0.52
R ²	0.05		0.14	
N	15084		15084	

Note: Clustered standard errors; b= coefficient; p=p-value; lb=lower bound 95% interval; ub=upper bound 95% interval

Supplementary Table 17. OLS Estimates for Study 2

	Story Selection		Perceived Credibility	
	b/p	lb/ub	b/p	lb/ub
Expert	-0.04 (0.514)	-0.17 0.09	0.03 (0.442)	-0.04 0.09
Local	-0.06 (0.000)	-0.09 -0.03	-0.02 (0.001)	-0.03 -0.01
Right-congenial	-0.16 (0.000)	-0.19 -0.14	-0.08 (0.000)	-0.10 -0.07
Left-congenial	-0.16 (0.000)	-0.19 -0.13	-0.08 (0.000)	-0.10 -0.07
Profile 2	-0.05 (0.008)	-0.09 -0.01	-0.06 (0.000)	-0.07 -0.05
Profile 3	0.08 (0.000)	0.05 0.11	0.01 (0.252)	-0.00 0.02
Profile 4	-0.13 (0.000)	-0.15 -0.10	-0.04 (0.000)	-0.05 -0.03
Anti-intellectualism	0.06 (0.027)	0.01 0.12	-0.15 (0.000)	-0.20 -0.10
Expert * Anti-intellectualism	-0.12 (0.047)	-0.23 -0.00	-0.07 (0.034)	-0.13 -0.00
Ideology	0.02 (0.284)	-0.02 0.07	-0.07 (0.000)	-0.10 -0.03
Expert * Ideology	-0.04 (0.334)	-0.13 0.04	-0.02 (0.300)	-0.07 0.02
Sophistication	-0.01 (0.800)	-0.07 0.05	0.02 (0.416)	-0.03 0.07
Expert * Sophistication	0.02 (0.767)	-0.10 0.14	0.01 (0.637)	-0.05 0.07
Conspiratorial Thinking	-0.01 (0.635)	-0.06 0.03	-0.02 (0.369)	-0.05 0.02
Expert * Conspiracy	0.01 (0.804)	-0.08 0.10	0.02 (0.461)	-0.03 0.07
Age	-0.00 (0.046)	-0.00 -0.00	0.00 (0.000)	0.00 0.00
Expert * Age	0.00 (0.054)	-0.00 0.00	-0.00 (0.377)	-0.00 0.00
Urban	-0.01 (0.009)	-0.02 -0.00	-0.00 (0.641)	-0.01 0.00
Expert * Urban	0.02 (0.008)	0.01 0.04	0.01 (0.077)	-0.00 0.01
Constant	0.64 (0.000)	0.57 0.71	0.74 (0.000)	0.68 0.79
R ²	0.04		0.08	
N	10076		10076	

Note: Clustered standard errors; b= coefficient; p=p-value; lb=lower bound 95% interval; ub=upper bound 95% interval