Regulatory Focus Pride and COVID-19 (Supplementary Material)

Emily Nakkawita, Tamar Avnet, & Namika Sagara

Contents

Study Materials and Procedure Beyond RFQ and Demographic Questionnaires

As described in the manuscript, the present research involves secondary data analyses of two existing datasets: one that was collected by one of the authors (E.N.) before the COVID-19 pandemic began in December 2019 and a second that was collected by another of the authors (T.A.) in collaboration with Ipsos after the COVID-19 pandemic began in June 2020. Both of these datasets include the Regulatory Focus Questionnaire (RFQ; Higgins et al. 2001) and demographic items related to age and political orientation. In addition to the key items of interest described in the manuscript, the studies included a range of additional measures unrelated to the present investigation. Please see below for a description of these measures and the study's procedure.

2019 Data (Before COVID-19 Pandemic)

After consenting to participate in the study, participants first completed the Regulatory Focus Strength measure (Higgins, Shah, and Friedman 1997), an implicit accessibility measure that uses participants' response latency when responding to questions about their ideals (promotion) versus oughts (prevention) to measure their regulatory focus. Participants were then asked to rate the importance of 39 different everyday activities (e.g., *explore*, *advance*, *prevent*). Next, participants completed the Regulatory Focus Questionnaire (Higgins et al. 2001) to assess their motivational orientations with respect to promotion pride and prevention pride, as well as the Regulatory Mode Questionnaire (Kruglanski et al. 2000) to assess their motivational orientations with respect to locomotion and assessment. Then, participants completed a series of self-report questionnaires to assess their motivation and personality, including: the Need for Closure Scale (Kruglanski, Webster, and Klem 1993; Webster and Kruglanski 1994), the Five-Dimensional Curiosity Scale (Kashdan et al. 2018), the Interest/Deprivation Epistemic Curiosity Scale (Litman and Spielberger 2003), the System Justification Scale (Kay and Jost 2003), the Aggression-Submission-Conventionalism Scale (Dunwoody and Funke 2016), the Capacity for Self-Control Scale (Hoyle and Davisson 2017), and the Big Five Inventory (John, Donahue, and Kentle 1991). Finally, participants optionally provided brief demographic information, including their age, gender, native language, ethnicity, current location, student status, education, household income, religious affiliation and background, and political orientation. Before finishing the study, participants were asked to complete an attention check item asking them to briefly describe the "general gist" of one question they

answered during the study. Participants were then debriefed and compensated.

2020 Data (After COVID-19 Pandemic)

After consenting to participate in the study, participants first completed the RFQ, followed by pseveral novel single-item measures intended to probe participants' regulatory focus. After these regulatory focus measures, participants completed a series of self-report measures indicating their knowledge about the open or closed status of food establishments and salons and barbershop, as well as whether they had visted such establishments for in-person service in the last 14 days or planned to do so in the next 14 days (see the manuscript for a full description of these measures). Next, participants indicated whether they are currently using vitamin supplements to maintain their health and well-being, as described in the manuscript. After this measure, participants completed a wide range of measures probing their consumer behavior and intentions, including: plans to purchase or refurbish a computer for oneself or one's family; credit card and life insurance usage and preferred benefits; usage of financial technology such as contactless payments and mobile banking apps; tendency to shop at specific retailers andd preferred benefits when shopping with these retailers; and whether participants purchase frozen food. Finally, participants provided demographic inforamtion including their ethnicity, education, income, political orientation, and age group.

Complete Model Output for All Key Analyses

Differences in Regulatory Focus Before Versus After COVID-19 Pandemic

Table 1: Parameter Estimates from Multiple Regression Analysis Predicting Promotion Pride

Predictor	Estimate	SE	t	p	
Intercept	3.54	0.08	41.70	$< .001$	***
Year	-0.22	0.05	-4.58	$< .001$	***
Age Group	0.07	0.02	4.86	$< .001$	***
Political Orientation	-0.03	0.01	-2.61	.009	**

Table 2: Parameter Estimates from Multiple Regression Analysis Predicting Prevention Pride

Predictor	Estimate	SE	t	p	
Intercept	3.31	0.11	30.98	$< .001$	***
Year	-0.14	0.06	-2.28	.023	*
Age Group	0.10	0.02	5.09	$< .001$	***
Political Orientation	-0.03	0.02	-2.02	.044	*

Results Without Controlling for Demographic Covariates

Table 3: Parameter Estimates from Regression Analysis Predicting Promotion Pride (No Demographic Covariates)

Predictor	Estimate	SE	t	p	
Intercept	3.59	0.04	92.06	$< .001$	***
Year	-0.13	0.05	-2.81	.005	**

Table 4: Parameter Estimates from Regression Analysis Predicting Prevention Pride (No Demographic Covariates)

Predictor	Estimate	SE	t	p	
Intercept	3.43	0.05	69.87	< .001	***
Year	-0.03	0.06	-0.47	.639	

Associations Between Post-COVID-19 Regulatory Focus Pride and Behavioral Outcomes

Knowing with Certainty If Establishments Are Open or Closed for In-Person Service

Table 5: Parameter Estimates from Multiple Logistic Regression Analysis Predicting Knowing with Certainty If Food Establishments Are Open or Closed for Dine-In Service

Predictor	Estimate	SE	z	p	
Intercept	0.81	0.87	0.92	.357	
Promotion Pride	0.59	0.20	2.93	.003	**
Prevention Pride	-0.30	0.16	-1.86	.063	†
Age Group	0.00	0.08	0.01	.994	
Political Orientation	0.03	0.07	0.44	.662	

Table 6: Parameter Estimates from Multiple Logistic Regression Analysis Predicting Knowing with Certainty If Salons and Barbershops Are Open or Closed for In-Person Service

Predictor	Estimate	SE	z	p	
Intercept	-0.24	0.85	-0.28	.776	
Promotion Pride	0.53	0.20	2.63	.009	**
Prevention Pride	0.15	0.15	1.00	.317	
Age Group	0.00	0.08	-0.06	.954	
Political Orientation	-0.05	0.07	-0.64	.523	

Already Visited Establishments for In-Person Service

Table 7: Parameter Estimates from Multiple Logistic Regression Analysis Predicting Having Already Dined at a Food Establishment in the Last 14 Days

Predictor	Estimate	SE	z	p	
Intercept	1.76	0.81	2.15	.031	*
Promotion Pride	0.09	0.19	0.45	.654	
Prevention Pride	-0.43	0.15	-2.75	.006	**
Age Group	-0.22	0.08	-2.68	.007	**
Political Orientation	-0.16	0.07	-2.30	.021	*

Table 8: Parameter Estimates from Multiple Logistic Regression Analysis Predicting Having Already Visited a Salon or Barbershop for In-Person Service in the Last 14 Days

Predictor	Estimate	SE	z	p	
Intercept	-1.44	0.87	-1.66	.096	†
Promotion Pride	0.30	0.20	1.48	.139	
Prevention Pride	-0.15	0.16	-0.96	.335	
Age Group	0.05	0.08	0.63	.53	
Political Orientation	-0.16	0.07	-2.29	.022	*

Plan to Visit Establishments for In-Person Service

Table 9: Parameter Estimates from Multiple Logistic Regression Analysis Predicting Planning to Dine at a Food Establishment in the Next 14 Days

Predictor	Estimate	SE	z	p	
Intercept	1.66	0.78	2.13	.033	*
Promotion Pride	0.24	0.18	1.31	.19	
Prevention Pride	-0.43	0.15	-2.94	.003	**
Age Group	-0.14	0.08	-1.83	.067	†
Political Orientation	-0.21	0.07	-3.11	.002	**

Table 10: Parameter Estimates from Multiple Logistic Regression Analysis Predicting Planning to Visit a Salon or Barbershop for In-Person Service in the Next 14 Days

Predictor	Estimate	SE	z	p	
Intercept	0.72	0.81	0.89	.376	
Promotion Pride	-0.01	0.19	-0.05	.957	
Prevention Pride	-0.28	0.15	-1.80	.072	†
Age Group	-0.10	0.08	-1.29	.196	
Political Orientation	-0.15	0.07	-2.18	.029	*

Usage of Vitamin Supplements for Health and Well-Being

Table 11: Parameter Estimates from Multiple Logistic Regression Analysis Predicting Currently Using Vitamins, Minerals, or Natural Immunity Boosters to Maintain Health and Well-Being

Predictor	Estimate	SE	z	p	
Intercept	-2.23	0.63	-3.54	$< .001$	***
Promotion Pride	0.62	0.15	4.17	$< .001$	***
Prevention Pride	0.05	0.11	0.47	.641	
Age Group	0.15	0.06	2.56	.01	*
Political Orientation	-0.06	0.05	-1.10	.272	

Purchases Frozen Food

Table 12: Parameter Estimates from Multiple Logistic Regression Analysis Predicting Purchasing Frozen Food

Predictor	Estimate	SE	z	p	
Intercept	1.80	1.06	1.69	.091	†
Promotion Pride	0.33	0.24	1.33	.182	
Prevention Pride	-0.23	0.19	-1.16	.247	
Age Group	0.15	0.10	1.43	.154	
Political Orientation	-0.06	0.09	-0.64	.52	

References

Dunwoody, Philip T., and Friedrich Funke. 2016. "The Aggression-Submission-Conventionalism Scale: Testing a New Three Factor Measure of Authoritarianism." *Journal of Social and Political Psychology* 4 (2): 571–600–600. https://doi.org/10.5964/jspp.v4i2.168.

Higgins, E. Tory, Ronald Friedman, Robert E. Harlow, Lorraine Chen Idson, Ozlem N. Ayduk, and Amy Taylor. 2001. "Achievement Orientations from Subjective Histories of Success: Promotion Pride Versus Prevention Pride." *European Journal of Social Psychology* 31 (1): 3–23. https://doi.org/10.1002/ejsp.27.

Higgins, E. Tory, James Shah, and Ronald Friedman. 1997. "Emotional Responses to Goal Attainment: Strength of Regulatory Focus as Moderator." *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 72 (3): 515–25. https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.72.3.515.

Hoyle, Rick H., and Erin K. Davisson. 2017. "Varieties of Self-Control and Their Personality Correlates." In *Handbook of Self-Regulation: Research, Theory, and Applications*, edited by Kathleen D. Vohs and Roy F. Baumeister, Third, 396–413. New York, NY: Guilford Publications.

John, Oliver P., E. M. Donahue, and R. L. Kentle. 1991. *The Big Five InventoryVersions 4a and 54*. Berkeley, CA: University of California, Berkeley, Institute of Personality and Social Research.

Kashdan, Todd B., Melissa C. Stiksma, David J. Disabato, Patrick E. McKnight, John Bekier, Joel Kaji, and Rachel Lazarus. 2018. "The Five-Dimensional Curiosity Scale: Capturing the Bandwidth of Curiosity and Identifying Four Unique Subgroups of Curious People." *Journal of Research in Personality* 73 (April): 130–49. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jrp.2017.11.011.

Kay, Aaron C., and John T. Jost. 2003. "System Justification Scale." https://doi.org/10.1037/t22834-000.

Kruglanski, Arie W., Erik P. Thompson, E. Tory Higgins, M. Nadir Atash, Antonio Pierro, James Y. Shah, and Scott Spiegel. 2000. "To "Do the Right Thing" or to "Just Do It": Locomotion and Assessment as Distinct Self-Regulatory Imperatives." *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 79 (5): 793–815. https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.79.5.793.

Kruglanski, Arie W., Donna M. Webster, and Adena Klem. 1993. "Motivated Resistance and Openness to Persuasion in the Presence or Absence of Prior Information." *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 65 (5): 861–76. https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.65.5.861.

Litman, Jordan A., and Charles D. Spielberger. 2003. "Measuring Epistemic Curiosity and Its Diversive and Specific Components." *Journal of Personality Assessment* 80 (1): 75–86. https://doi.org/10.1207/S15327752JPA8001_16.

Webster, Donna M., and Arie W. Kruglanski. 1994. "Individual Differences in Need for Cognitive Closure." *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 67 (6): 1049–62. https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.67.6.1049.