

UCLA

UCLA Previously Published Works

Title

Right-wing Authoritarianism, Left-wing Authoritarianism, and pandemic-mitigation authoritarianism

Permalink

<https://escholarship.org/uc/item/4sz305tn>

Author

Manson, Joseph H

Publication Date

2020-12-01

DOI

10.1016/j.paid.2020.110251

Peer reviewed

1 **Right-Wing Authoritarianism, Left-Wing Authoritarianism, and**
2 **Pandemic-Mitigation Authoritarianism**

3
4
5 Joseph H. Manson

6
7 Department of Anthropology, University of California, Los Angeles, California, USA

8
9 341 Haines Hall

10 Box 951553

11 UCLA

12 Los Angeles, CA 90095-1553

13 USA

14
15
16 jmanson@anthro.ucla.edu

17

18

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24

Abstract

Recent research suggests the validity of the construct of Left-wing Authoritarianism (LWA). Like its well-studied parallel construct Right-wing Authoritarianism, LWA is characterized by dogmatism, punitive attitudes toward dissenters, and desire for strong authority figures. In contrast to RWA, LWA mobilizes these traits on behalf of left-wing values (e.g. anti-racism, anti-sexism, and wealth redistribution). I inductively examined the extent to which RWA and LWA predicted, in April 2020, Americans’ endorsement of 19 authoritarian policies and practices intended to mitigate the effects of the COVID-19 pandemic. For 11 of these policies (e.g. abrogating the right to trial by jury for pandemic-related crimes), both RWA and LWA independently positively predicted endorsement. These findings are consistent with recent work showing psychological similarities between the two constructs.

Keywords: Right-wing Authoritarianism, Left-wing Authoritarianism, COVID-19

1 **1. Introduction**

2 In March 2020, the COVID-19 pandemic generated concern that authoritarian leaders around
3 the world would seize even more power, and that leaders who had hitherto adhered (mostly) to
4 liberal democratic norms would take advantage of the crisis to usurp power and infringe upon
5 human rights (Funk and Linzer, 2020; Gebrekidan, 2020). Although most commentators and
6 national publics agreed that the emergency justified certain temporary authoritarian measures
7 (e.g. restrictions on travel and assembly), many feared that some leaders would hold on to these
8 powers after the emergency had passed, and that they would use them as pretexts to harass or
9 neutralize their political opponents. Putatively pandemic-mitigating authoritarian measures
10 included rule by decree, intrusive surveillance, and expanded powers to detain criminal suspects.

11
12 Straightforwardly, within-country variation in support for authoritarian policies is partly
13 driven by variation in authoritarianism as an individual difference dimension. Right-wing
14 Authoritarianism (RWA) was long considered a personality trait (Adorno, Frenkel-Brunswick,
15 Levinson, and Sanford, 1950; Altemeyer, 1981) characterized by conventionalism (adherence to
16 conventional values), authoritarian submission (placing high value on obedience and respect for
17 authority), and authoritarian aggression (punitive attitudes toward those who deviate from
18 conventional values). More recent work has modified or enlarged this conceptualization. For
19 example, although RWA is related to personality, it is probably better regarded as a set of related
20 beliefs or attitudes than as a personality trait (Duckitt, 1989). Most relevant to the present study,
21 it remains a matter of controversy whether a parallel construct, Left-wing Authoritarianism
22 (LWA), is valid and useful (Altemeyer, 1996; Conway, Houck, Gornick, and Repke, 2017;
23 Costello, Bowes, Stevens, Waldman, and Lilienfeld, 2020; Costello and Lilienfeld, 2019;

1 Costello, Stevens, and Lilienfeld, 2020; Mullen, Bauman, and Skitka, 2003). This debate is part
2 of a broader discussion regarding whether psychologists have exaggerated the cognitive and
3 personality differences between right- and left-wingers (Clark and Winegard, 2020).

4
5 Some psychologists have dismissed LWA as a “myth” (Stone, 1980), comparable to the Loch
6 Ness Monster (Altemeyer, 1996). Conway et al. (2017) postulated that LWA resembles RWA in
7 being characterized by high levels of dogmatism, punitive attitudes toward dissenters, and desire
8 for strong authority figures. What distinguishes LWA from RWA is the content of the
9 dogmatically defended values. For individuals high in LWA, these values include pro-
10 environment and anti-racist and anti-sexist beliefs, and rejection of traditional Christian moral
11 restrictions. This model was supported with data showing associations of a new LWA instrument
12 with measures of dogmatism, prejudice, and attitude strength. More recently, Costello and
13 colleagues (Costello, Bowes, et al., 2020; Costello and Lilienfeld, 2019; Costello, Stevens, et al.,
14 2020) created and validated a longer and more wide-ranging LWA instrument and explored its
15 factor structure, nomological network (compared to RWA), and external validity. A three-factor
16 structure (Anti-hierarchical Aggression, Left-wing Conventionalism, and Prohibition of
17 Protected Speech) yielded the best fit. LWA’s nomological network shared numerous features
18 with RWA’s nomological network, including high levels of dogmatism, affective polarization,
19 and moral disengagement. Results from a modified Tangram Help/Hurt task showed that LWA,
20 over and above political ideology, predicted behavioral aggression toward political opponents
21 (Costello, Bowes, et al., 2020).

22
23

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23

2. Current study

Thus, a growing body of evidence supports the validity and predictive power of the construct of LWA. The current study addresses the question: *To what extent do RWA and LWA predict Americans' endorsement of authoritarian policies intended to mitigate the effects of the COVID-19 pandemic?* Finding that RWA predicts support for authoritarian policies would not be very newsworthy. However, given the ongoing controversy regarding the LWA construct (Costello, Bowes, et al., 2020), the current study serves as a timely test of its predictive usefulness. Importantly, most proposed authoritarian policies to mitigate the COVID-19 pandemic fall outside the domains directly covered by LWA-associated values (race, gender, wealth redistribution). Thus, this study affords the opportunity to extend the nomological network of LWA to incorporate issues of great public concern at a particular historical moment.

Authoritarianism as a general set of attitudes includes dogmatism, a preference for conformity, willingness to coercively enforce behavioral standards, punitiveness toward perceived enemies, and a strong concern with hierarchy (Costello, Bowes, et al., 2020). However, this characterization does not in itself provide a complete means of identifying what constitutes an authoritarian policy. Such judgments are colored by political ideology and other factors. For example, a recent proposal (Bartholet, cited in O'Donnell, 2020) to ban homeschooling in the U.S. described the practice as authoritarian, whereas proponents of homeschooling regard banning it as authoritarian. I asked participants to indicate their level of endorsement of a wide range of putatively pandemic-mitigating policies, many of which would

1 undoubtedly be judged as “authoritarian” by only a minority of Americans. These policies were
2 mostly drawn from COVID-related news and commentary of April 2020. I also considered
3 whether a proposed or implemented policy could be viewed as violating components of the U.S.
4 Constitution, particularly Article I and the First, Second, Fourth, Fifth, Sixth and Fourteenth
5 Amendments.

6 The range of policies selected means that some expectations of the current study’s findings
7 are obvious. For example, RWA will be positively associated with endorsement of closing
8 abortion clinics. During April 2020, conservatives were less likely than liberals to abide by
9 social distancing restrictions (Rothgerber et al., 2020). Therefore, to the extent that RWA is
10 associated with conservatism and LWA is associated with liberalism, the former will be
11 negatively associated, whereas the latter will be positively associated, with endorsement of these
12 restrictions. Importantly, however, the current study concerns the predictive power of RWA and
13 LWA, not of mainstream liberalism or conservatism. Most interestingly, it is not at all obvious
14 how RWA and LWA will differ (if at all) with respect to their associations with endorsement of
15 rule-making by executive decree, legal restrictions on pandemic-related speech and on the right
16 to protest government actions, or encroachments on (Anglo-American) due process rights for
17 individuals accused of crimes. My analyses of these associations are exploratory; no *a priori*
18 hypotheses were tested.

19
20 Furthermore, the current study does not address the relationship between political beliefs and
21 sensitivity to threat, nor does it explore other potential motivational links between
22 authoritarianism and reactions to the pandemic. A considerable body of evidence indicates that
23 conservatives are more sensitive than liberals to threat, particularly disease threat (see Conway,

1 Chan, and Woodard, 2019 for review), raising the puzzle of why, in the current pandemic,
2 conservatives have been more sanguine than liberals about the danger it poses (Conway,
3 Woodard, Zubrod, and Chan, 2020). Variation in COVID-19 threat appraisal might be driven by
4 variation in RWA or LWA (as found for mainstream conservatism and liberalism by Conway et
5 al. 2020), but that question is beyond the scope of the current study.

6

7 To summarize, this study examined associations between RWA and LWA (predictors) and
8 endorsement of 19 putatively authoritarian pandemic-mitigation policies (outcomes). I
9 incorporated five covariates into my analyses. With respect to policies mandating and enforcing
10 social distancing, individuals whose incomes are being more strongly reduced by these
11 restrictions might disapprove of them more than individuals whose incomes are less affected,
12 irrespective of political beliefs (but see Conway et al. 2020). Four variables might confound
13 associations between RWA and/or LWA and endorsement of putatively authoritarian responses
14 to COVID-19: gender, age, local COVID-19 prevalence, and African-American identity
15 (because African-Americans have suffered higher rates of COVID-19 mortality than other
16 Americans [APM Research Lab, 2020]).

17 **3. Method**

18 *3.1. Participants*

19 I recruited 550 U.S. resident participants using Prolific.co, an online survey service with
20 higher minimum payments to participants than is typical of the more widely used Amazon
21 Mechanical Turk. All participants were paid \$1.90. I excluded one participant for showing signs
22 of bogus responding, one for indicating an age of 2, 10 for declining to provide a ZIP code, and
23 10 for indicating a gender other than “male” or “female” in answer to the free-response question.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23

Among the 528 participants comprising the final sample, 313 (59.3%) were female. Participants' ages ranged from 18-79 ($M = 31.8$; $SD = 10.4$; $Med = 30$). The sample's distribution of ethnic identities, household income levels, and educational attainment levels are shown in Supplementary Table S1.

Informed consent was obtained from all participants in accordance with the terms of Approval #20-000738 from the IRB of the University of California, Los Angeles.

3.2. Procedure

All participant responses were collected on April 22, 2020. After indicating consent, participants were instructed that they would first be asked 40 questions about their general political opinions, after which they would be asked questions about their views on how best to respond to the COVID-19 crisis specifically. Participants then completed the 18-item short form of the ACT (Authoritarianism-Conservatism-Traditionalism) Scales (Duckitt, Bizumic, Kruauss, and Heled, 2010) and the 22-item short form of the Left-Wing Authoritarianism Index (Costello and Lilienfeld, 2019). Which of these two instruments was presented first was randomized. Each of the three ACT scales comprises six items. Half the items are reverse-keyed. Examples of items include *Our prisons are a shocking disgrace. Criminals are unfortunate people who deserve much better care, instead of so much punishment* (Authoritarianism, reverse-keyed), *Our country will be great if we show respect for authority and obey our leaders* (Conservatism), and *God's laws about abortion, pornography, and marriage must be strictly followed before it is too late* (Traditionalism). Because the LWA Index is not yet published in a peer-reviewed journal, I

1 include a complete list of its short-form items as Table S2A. An example is *Bigots must be*
2 *taught to shut-up and stay in their place*. Items within each instrument were presented in
3 randomized order. Participants responded on 7-point Likert scales anchored by “Strongly
4 Disagree” and “Strongly Agree.”

5 Participants were then presented (in randomized order) with 19 statements regarding
6 pandemic-related policies, or policy-relevant actions. They were asked to indicate their
7 endorsement of each item on a 7-point Likert scale anchored by “Strongly Disagree” and
8 “Strongly Agree.” These items, and their descriptive statistics, are listed in Table 1. For every
9 item, responses ranged from 1 to 7. One policy item, *Government policies to reduce the spread*
10 *of COVID-19 should rely more on persuasion than on enforcing rules about social distancing*,
11 can be regarded as contra-authoritarian.

12 Next, participants were asked a set of demographic questions: age, gender, ethnicity,
13 education level, pre-pandemic household income (specified as Feb. 15, 2020), and current ZIP
14 Code. Finally, they were presented with the statement “My income is being reduced by the
15 social distancing restrictions being imposed to reduce the spread of COVID-19” and asked to
16 endorse it on a 7-point Likert scale anchored by “Strongly Disagree” and “Strongly Agree.” I
17 will refer to this item as *income reduction*.

18 Data and Stata commands used in this paper are available at:

19 <https://doi.org/10.5068/D1RH4K>

20

21

1 **Table 1**
2

Policy item	<i>N</i>	<i>M</i> ± <i>SD</i>	Median	Skew	Kurtosis
I would report it to the police if I saw someone violating social distancing rules.	528	3.2 ± 1.9	3	.39	2.02
Government policies to reduce the spread of COVID-19 should rely more on persuasion than on enforcing rules about social distancing.	528	3.9 ± 1.7	4	-.00	2.06
People can't be trusted to follow social distancing guidelines unless they are threatened with punishment.	527	4.1 ± 1.9	5	-.27	1.86
I support the idea of an official federal government certificate that would be issued to people with proven immunity to COVID-19.	527	4.2 ± 1.8	4	-.36	2.28
I support the idea of requiring all smartphones to run an app that tracks a person's movements and notifies them when they are near a person infected with COVID-19.	528	3.1 ± 2.0	3	.52	1.94
For as long as the COVID-19 pandemic continues...					
...Americans need to follow government orders about social distancing, even if they disagree with them.	526	6.1 ± 1.4	7	-1.81	6.09
...governments should have the power to prohibit the spread of misinformation about COVID-19 that could endanger people if it were widely believed.	527	5.5 ± 1.7	6	-1.19	3.62
...government officials should put churches under surveillance to make sure that they're not holding services that violate social distancing rules.	527	4.4 ± 2.1	5	-.34	1.78
...the constitutional right to protest against government actions should be restricted.	527	3.3 ± 1.8	3	.29	2.03
...sales of firearms should be banned.	527	3.8 ± 2.1	4	.12	1.76
...sales of non-essential goods should be banned.	528	2.8 ± 1.8	2	.75	2.47
...abortion clinics should be closed.	527	2.6 ± 2.0	2	1.00	2.71

...governments will need to run the economy by deciding what goods are to be produced, and in what quantities.	526	4.0 ± 1.7	4	-.25	2.20
...illegal activities that increase the spread of the virus should be punished directly by government officials, without the right to trial by jury.	527	2.9 ± 2.0	2	.71	2.22
...heads of national, state, and local governments should be able to order new restrictions on activities that could spread the virus, without needing to consult legislative bodies (such as Congress or state legislatures).	527	4.4 ± 1.9	5	-.44	2.10
...crimes that take advantage of the pandemic (like stealing masks) should be punished much more severely than the same crimes when committed under normal conditions.	528	4.6 ± 1.8	5	-.48	2.20
...public health experts should be given more authority than elected politicians.	527	5.1 ± 1.8	6	-.85	2.74
...public health authorities should test people for the virus, even if they don't want to be tested, to obtain data that the authorities have decided they need to get the pandemic under control.	527	4.2 ± 1.9	4	-.25	1.99
...citizens of foreign countries should be banned from entering the United States.	526	4.5 ± 2.0	5	-.28	1.89

1
2 Policy endorsement descriptive statistics (7-point Likert scales, 1 = strongly disagree, 7 = strongly agree)
3

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24

3.3. Data analysis

For the LWA Index and the three ACT scales, missing responses (44 of 21,120 = 0.21%) were imputed using chained regression equations, separately for each of the four scales. For each missing value, the mean value from 20 imputations was substituted. Because the three ACT scales were highly intercorrelated (Authoritarianism-Conservatism, $r = 0.70$; Authoritarianism-Traditionalism, $r = 0.59$, Conservatism-Traditionalism, $r = 0.69$, all $p < .001$ at $N = 528$), overall RWA scores were calculated as the mean across the three scale means.

Participants' state and county of residence were recovered from their ZIP Codes, using the USPS Zip Code Lookup and Google Maps. County COVID-19 rate was scored as cases per 100,000 residents on April 22, 2020, as reported by USA Facts: <https://usafacts.org/visualizations/coronavirus-covid-19-spread-map/>. Because this variable was strongly right-skewed (Table 2), I used its zero-skewness log transform in analyses.

To test associations between LWA, RWA, and covariates (the predictor variables), and endorsement of putatively authoritarian pandemic-related policies (the outcome variables), I used hierarchical multiple regression, as instantiated in the *hireg* module (Bern, 2005) of Stata 16.1. Each outcome variable was modeled separately. In the first step of each model, age, gender, African-American identity, and county COVID-19 rate were entered as predictors. For the four policies pertaining to social distance restrictions, income reduction was also entered in the first step. In the second step of each model, LWA and RWA were entered as predictors.

1 **4. Results**

2 *4.1. Descriptive statistics and reliabilities of predictor variables*

3 Table 2 shows reliabilities (Cronbach’s alpha) and descriptive statistics for the LWA Index,
4 the full set of ACT Scale items, and each of the three separate ACT scales. This table also shows
5 descriptive statistics for county COVID-19 rate and for the income reduction item.

6
7 *4.2. Associations among predictor variables*
8

9 Tables S3 and S4 show associations among predictor variables. Women scored higher in
10 LWA than men. County COVID-19 rate was negatively correlated with age and positively
11 correlated with LWA. Income reduction was negatively correlated with age and positively
12 correlated with LWA. Age was negatively correlated with LWA and positively correlated with
13 RWA. RWA and LWA were negatively correlated.

14

15

1 **Table 2**
2

	Cronbach's α	Mean \pm SD	Median	Range	Skew	Kurtosis
LWA	.93	3.67 \pm 1.19	3.77	1.00-6.91	-.12	2.55
RWA	.91	3.12 \pm 1.15	3.06	1.11-6.11	.33	2.40
Authoritarianism	.76	3.55 \pm 1.20	3.50	1.00-7.00	.11	2.63
Conservatism	.85	3.11 \pm 1.35	3.00	1.00-7.00	.35	2.44
Traditionalism	.84	2.73 \pm 1.37	2.33	1.00-7.00	.84	2.91
County COVID-19 cases/100,000	N.A.	300.9 \pm 503.2	111.6	2.6-2977.1	2.96	11.69
Income reduced by social distancing	N.A.	4.08 \pm 2.29	4.00	1.00-7.00	-.12	1.50

3
4

5 Descriptive statistics of continuous predictor variables.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15

4.3. Predictors of endorsement of policy items

Tables 3 and S5 show the results of the hierarchical regressions. To reiterate, first step models included the predictors age, gender, African-American identity, county COVID-19 rate, and (only for the policies pertaining to social distancing) income reduction. In general, these models performed poorly, explaining >4% of the variance in policy endorsement for only two policies. For eight of the 19 policies, first step models did not even attain statistical significance, in spite of the large sample size. Second step models, entering RWA and LWA, increased the variance explained significantly ($p < .001$) for every policy item except *persuasion better than rules for promoting social distancing*. For the other 18 policies, second step models were significant at $p < 0.001$, and they explained between 0.04 and 0.37 of the variance in policy endorsement.

1 **Table 3**

2

Policy endorsement (outcome)										
	Model	Predictors: standardized β s							R ²	R ² change
		Age	Female	Afr-Am	Log COVID	Income reduction	RWA	LWA		
Would report to police	1	-.03	-.11*	-.02	.06	.11*	--	--	.03**	--
	2	-.00	-.16***	-.05	.05	.05	.21***	.36***	.14***	.11***
Persuasion better than rules	1	.04	-.05	-.06	-.05	.06	--	--	.01	--
	2	.03	-.03	-.06	-.04	.08	-.01	-.09	.02	.01
Need threat of punishment	1	-.13**	-.04	-.04	.06	.02	--	--	.03*	--
	2	-.10*	-.09*	-.07	.04	-.04	.19***	.36***	.15***	.12***
Must follow distancing orders	1	-.02	.11**	-.03	.02	-.01	--	--	.01	--
	2	.04	.08	-.03	-.01	-.07	-.13**	.27***	.12***	.11***
Certificate of immunity	1	-.01	-.09*	.00	.08	--	--	--	.02	--
	2	.00	-.12**	-.02	.07	--	.18***	.23***	.08	.06***

Mandatory tracking app	1	.00	.01	.03	.03	--	--	--	.00	--
	2	.02	-.04	-.01	.03	--	.27***	.32***	.12***	.12***
Prohibit misinformation	1	-.11**	.09*	.02	.08	--	--	--	.03**	--
	2	-.04	.04	.00	.04	--	-.08*	.37***	.18***	.15***
Surveillance of churches	1	-.12**	.04	-.01	.05	--	--	--	.02*	--
	2	-.04	-.02	-.04	.01	--	.06	.49***	.23***	.21***
Restrict right to protest	1	-.17***	.06	-.01	.02	--	--	--	.03**	--
	2	-.14***	.00	-.05	.01	--	.33***	.40***	.22***	.19***
Ban firearms sales	1	-.15***	.21***	.01	.12**	--	--	--	.08***	--
	2	-.07	.14***	-.02	.09*	--	.06	.49***	.29***	.21***
Ban nonessential items	1	-.08	-.07	-.07	-.03	--	--	--	.02	--
	2	-.03	-.13**	-.11**	-.05	--	.17***	.41***	.17***	.15***
Close abortion clinics	1	.14**	-.10*	.10*	-.10*	--	--	--	.05***	--
	2	.04	-.09**	.06	-.06	--	.60***	-.07	.42***	.37***
Government-run economy	1	-.13**	-.04	.01	.04	--	--	--	.02*	--
	2	-.08*	-.10*	-.02	.02	--	.20***	.41***	.18***	.16***

Restrict right to trial by jury	1	-.17***	.02	.08	.03	--	--	--	.04***	--
	2	-.16***	-.04	.02	.03	--	.45***	.41***	.30***	.26***
Restrictions by executive decree	1	-.04	.04	-.00	.06	--	--	--	.01	--
	2	.01	-.01	-.04	.04	--	.14**	.38***	.13***	.13***
Emergency- enhanced punishment	1	-.10*	-.12**	-.08	.00	--	--	--	.03**	--
	2	-.07	-.15***	-.10*	-.01	--	.09*	.22***	.07***	.04***
Authority to public health experts	1	-.16***	.02	-.01	.10*	--	--	--	.04***	--
	2	-.07	-.04	-.03	.06	--	-.07	.47***	.27***	.23***
Mandatory COVID- 19 testing	1	-.06	-.03	-.09*	.04	--	--	--	.02	--
	2	-.01	-.09*	-.12**	.02	--	.12**	.40***	.15***	.13***
Ban foreigners from entering	1	-.05	.04	.01	-.04	--	--	--	.01	--
	2	-.10*	.03	-.02	-.01	--	.43***	.00	.18***	.17***

1
2
3

Results of hierarchical regression analyses. * $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$, *** $p < .001$

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21

After controlling for all other predictors, both RWA and LWA were significantly positively associated with endorsement of *would report to police, need threat of punishment, certificate of immunity, mandatory tracking app, restrict right to protest, ban nonessential items, government-run economy, restrict right to trial by jury, restrictions by executive decree, emergency-enhanced punishment, and mandatory COVID-19 testing*. RWA was positively associated, whereas LWA was not associated, with endorsement of *close abortion clinics* and *ban foreigners from entering*. LWA was positively associated, whereas RWA was not associated, with endorsement of *surveillance of churches, ban firearm sales, and authority to public health experts*. LWA was positively associated, whereas RWA was negatively associated, with *must follow distancing orders* and *prohibit misinformation*. Some associations with age, gender, and county COVID rate remained significant in second step models. Age was negatively associated with endorsement of *need threat of punishment, restrict right to protest, government-run economy, restrict right to trial by jury, and ban foreigners from entering*. Women, compared to men, showed lower levels of endorsement of *would report to police, need threat of punishment, certificate of immunity, ban nonessential items, close abortion clinics, government-run economy, emergency-enhanced punishment, and mandatory COVID-19 testing*. Women showed a higher level of endorsement than men of *ban firearm sales*. County COVID rate was positively associated with endorsement of *ban firearm sales*.

22 Table S6 shows, for each policy item, whether the RWA and LWA unstandardized regression
23 coefficients differed significantly from each other, based on confidence intervals. LWA
24 coefficients were significantly greater than RWA coefficients for *follow distancing orders,*

1 *prohibit misinformation, surveillance of churches, ban firearm sales, ban nonessential items,*
2 *government-run economy, restrictions by executive decree, authority to public health experts,*
3 *and mandatory COVID-19 testing.* RWA coefficients were significantly greater than LWA
4 coefficients for *close abortion clinics* and *ban foreigners from entering*.

6 **5. Discussion**

7 Reacting to the severe public health and economic impacts of the COVID-19 pandemic in
8 Spring 2020, many citizens of liberal democratic nations have tolerated, or even demanded,
9 actions from their governments that they would view as unacceptably heavy-handed under
10 normal conditions. The current study used this situation to extend the nomological networks of
11 the well-established construct of Right-wing Authoritarianism (Altemeyer, 1981; Duckitt et al.,
12 2010), and the promising, but so far little-explored, construct of Left-wing Authoritarianism
13 (Conway et al., 2017; Costello, Bowes, et al., 2020). Both traits predicted endorsement of a range
14 of putatively pandemic-mitigating policies and practices that many would regard as authoritarian.
15 A few of these results were unremarkable, or even slightly circular, e.g. one of the ACT items
16 condemns abortion, and one of the policies endorsed more by people higher in RWA was closing
17 abortion clinics. However, most of the results illuminated, some of them rather surprisingly,
18 how people with authoritarian attitudes respond when, due to a crisis, a menu of normally taboo
19 authoritarian policies appears on the table of mainstream public debate in a liberal democracy.
20 For example, RWA is positively related to conservatism (Crowson, Thoma, and Hestevold,
21 2005), and one component of American conservatism is advocacy of free markets, and yet RWA
22 was positively associated with endorsement of the government running the economy.

23

1 Although I did not measure *perception* of the danger posed by COVID-19, it is unlikely that
2 variation in *objective* risk of death or serious illness drove the observed associations between
3 RWA or LWA and increased endorsement of putatively authoritarian policies. None of the three
4 covariates chosen because of their association with COVID-19 mortality risk (county COVID-19
5 rate, age, or African-American identity) was consistently positively related to endorsement of
6 these policies.

7
8 This study builds on recent work (Costello, Bowes, et al., 2020) that has demonstrated the
9 existence of authoritarian attitudes on both ends of the political spectrum, and has documented
10 numerous psychological similarities between RWA and LWA. Two such similarities are belief in
11 a dangerous world, and preference for state control. Consistent with these findings, I found that
12 in response to the danger posed by a deadly pandemic, people high in RWA and people high in
13 LWA agreed on the need for enhanced state control in several domains, including restrictions on
14 the right to protest, punishment without the right to trial by jury, and surveillance via a
15 mandatory tracking app. The policies on which people high in RWA and people high in LWA
16 disagreed tended to be those most directly tied to American right-wing vs. left-wing values, e.g.
17 religion, abortion, and immigration.

18
19 *5.1. Limitations*

20
21 This study had three major limitations. First, no other political attitudes, besides RWA and
22 LWA, were measured. Controlling for other attitudes would have changed the observed
23 statistical associations between authoritarianism and policy endorsements. As just one example,

1 RWA is distinct from, but positively correlated with, Social Dominance Orientation (SDO:
2 Pratto, Sidanius, Stallworth, and Malle, 1994; Roccato and Ricolfi, 2005), defined as degree of
3 preference for inequality among social groups. Controlling for SDO might have reduced the
4 association between RWA and endorsement of *ban foreigners from entering*. Second, as a cross-
5 sectional study, this work cannot address the possibility of reversed causality, i.e. that the
6 COVID-19 pandemic, as a perceived threat, has increased levels of authoritarianism (see
7 Duckitt, 2001). Finally, my study population consisted exclusively of U.S. residents, so its
8 findings do not generalize to other countries. Exploring this general topic internationally would
9 require compiling country-specific lists of putatively authoritarian pandemic-mitigation policies.
10 Furthermore, the validity of the LWA construct outside the U.S. has not been demonstrated.

11

12 5.2. Conclusions

13 LWA holds considerable promise as an explanatory construct in political psychology
14 (Conway et al., 2017; Costello, Bowes, et al., 2020). Both the course of the COVID-19
15 pandemic, and the general U.S. political scene, have changed considerably since the data for this
16 study were collected. Therefore, replicating it exactly might be impossible. In general, however,
17 the relationship of LWA to policy preferences comprises a fruitful topic for future research.

18

19

20

21

22

23

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23

References

Adorno, T., Frenkel-Brunswick, E., Levinson, D., and Sanford, N. (1950). *The Authoritarian Personality*. New York: Harper.

Altemeyer, B. (1981). *Right-Wing Authoritarianism*. Winnipeg, Canada: University of Manitoba Press.

Altemeyer, B. (1996). *The Authoritarian Spectre*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

APM Research Lab. (2020). The color of Coronavirus: COVID-19 deaths by race and ethnicity in the U.S. June 24. <https://www.apmresearchlab.org/covid/deaths-by-race>

Bern, P. H. (2005). HIREG: Stata module for hierarchial regression. Statistical Software Components S432904, Boston College Department of Economics.

Clark, C. J., and Winegard, B. (2020). Tribalism in war and peace: the nature and evolution of ideological epistemology and its significance for modern social science. *Psychological Inquiry*, 31, 1-22. doi: 10.1080/1047840X.2020.1721233

Conway III, L. G., Chan, L., and Woodard, S. R. (2019). Socio-ecological influences on political ideology. *Current Opinion in Psychology*, 76-80. doi: 10.1016/j.copsyc.2019.06.034

Conway III, L. G., Houck, S. C., Gornick, L. J., and Repke, M. A. (2017). Finding the Loch Ness Monster: Left-wing authoritarianism in the United States. *Political Psychology*, 39, 1049-1067. 10.1111/pops.12470

Conway III, L. G., Woodard, S. R., Zubrod, A., and Chan, L. (2020). Why are conservatives less concerned about the coronavirus (COVID-19) than liberals? Psyarxiv. <https://psyarxiv.com/fgb84/>

- 1 Costello, T. H., Bowes, S. M., Stevens, S. T., Waldman, I. D., and Lilienfeld, S. O. (2020).
2 Clarifying the structure and nature of Left-Wing Authoritarianism. Psyarxiv.
3 <https://psyarxiv.com/3nprq/>
- 4 Costello, T. H., and Lilienfeld, S. O. (2019). Development, evaluation, and validation of the
5 Left-wing Authoritarianism Index. Paper presented at the Association for Psychological
6 Science, Washington, D.C.
- 7 Costello, T. H., Stevens, S. T., and Lilienfeld, S. O. (2020). Development and preliminary
8 validation of the Left-Wing Authoritarianism Index. Paper presented at the Society for
9 Personality and Social Psychology, New Orleans.
- 10 Crowson, H. M., Thoma, S. J., and Hestevold, N. (2005). Is political conservatism synonymous
11 with authoritarianism? *Journal of Social Psychology, 145*, 571-592. doi:
12 10.3200/SOCP.145.5.571-592
- 13 Duckitt, J. (1989). Authoritarianism and group identification: a new view of an old construct.
14 *Political Psychology, 10*, 63-84. doi: 10.2307/3791588
- 15 Duckitt, J. (2001). A dual process cognitive-motivational theory of ideology and prejudice. In M.
16 P. Zanna (Ed.), *Advances in Experimental Social Psychology* (Vol. 33, pp. 41-113). San
17 Diego: Academic Press.
- 18 Duckitt, J., Bizumic, B., Kruauss, S. W., and Heled, E. (2010). A tripartite approach to right-
19 wing authoritarianism: the authoritarianism-conservatism-traditionalism model. *Political*
20 *Psychology, 31*, 685-715. doi: 10.1111/j.1467-9221.2010.00781.x
- 21 Funk, A., and Linzer, I. (2020, March 16). How the coronavirus could trigger a backslide on
22 freedom around the world, Editorial. *Washington Post*. Retrieved from

1 [https://www.washingtonpost.com/opinions/2020/03/16/how-coronavirus-could-trigger-](https://www.washingtonpost.com/opinions/2020/03/16/how-coronavirus-could-trigger-backslide-freedom-around-world/)
2 [backslide-freedom-around-world/](https://www.washingtonpost.com/opinions/2020/03/16/how-coronavirus-could-trigger-backslide-freedom-around-world/)

3 Gebrekidan, S. (2020, March 30). For autocrats, and others, coronavirus is a chance to grab even
4 more power. *New York Times*. Retrieved from
5 [https://www.nytimes.com/2020/03/30/world/europe/coronavirus-governments-](https://www.nytimes.com/2020/03/30/world/europe/coronavirus-governments-power.html)
6 [power.html](https://www.nytimes.com/2020/03/30/world/europe/coronavirus-governments-power.html)

7 Mullen, E., Bauman, C. W., and Skitka, L. J. (2003). Avoiding the pitfalls of politicized
8 psychology. *Analyses of Social Issues and Public Policy*, 3, 171-176. doi:
9 10.1111/j.1530-2415.2003.00021.x

10 O'Donnell, E. (2020, May-June). The risks of homeschooling. *Harvard Magazine*.

11 Pratto, F., Sidanius, J., Stallworth, L. M., and Malle, B. F. (1994). Social dominance orientation:
12 A personality variable predicting social and political attitudes. *Journal of Personality and*
13 *Social Psychology*, 67, 741-763. doi: 10.1037/0022-3514.67.4.741

14 Roccatò, M., and Ricolfi, L. (2005). On the correlation between right-wing authoritarianism and
15 social dominance orientation. *Basic and Applied Social Psychology*, 27, 187-200. doi:
16 10.1207/s15324834basp2703_1

17 Rothgerber, H., Wilson, T., Whaley, D., Rosenfeld, D. L., Humphrey, M., Moore, A., and Bihl,
18 A. (2020). Politicizing the COVID-19 pandemic: ideological differences in social
19 distancing. Psyarxiv. <https://psyarxiv.com/k23cv/>

20 Stone, W. F. (1980). The myth of left-wing authoritarianism. *Political Psychology*, 2, 3-19. doi:
21 10.2307/3790998

22

23

Supplementary Tables

Table S1. Frequencies of ethnicities, pre-pandemic household income levels, and educational attainment

Ethnicity	African-American	Asian-American	Latino/a	Middle Eastern	White	Multi-racial	Other, Decline to state
Percentage	5.3%	13.8%	6.8%	0.8%	64.4%	7.0%	1.9%
Household income (1000s)	<15	15-30	30-50	50-75	75-100	100-150	>150
Percentage	11.0%	11.8%	20.3%	23.0%	14.6%	13.5%	5.9%
Education	No high school diploma	High school only	Some college	Four-year college degree	Graduate or professional degree		
Percentage	1.5%	10.6%	31.4%	38.6%	17.9%		

Table S2A. LWA Index Short Form (Costello and Lilienfeld, 2019)

-
1. Bigots must be taught to shut-up and stay in their place.
 2. Certain elements in our society must be made to pay for the violence of their ancestors.
 3. Colleges and universities that permit speakers with intolerant views should be publicly condemned.
 4. I am in favor of allowing the government to shut down right-wing internet sites and blogs that promote nutty, hateful positions.
 5. Fox News, right-wing talk radio, and other conservative media outlets should be prohibited from broadcasting their hateful views.
 6. Getting rid of inequality is more important than protecting the so-called “right” to free speech.
 7. I cannot imagine myself becoming friends with a political conservative.
 8. I hate being around non-progressive people.
 9. I hate people who are themselves hateful.
 10. I hope that far right extremists become sterile and can never reproduce.
 11. I would be willing to take up arms to help a left-wing revolution succeed.
 12. I would prefer a far-left leader with absolute authority over a right-wing leader with limited power.
 13. If I could remake society, I would put members of historically and presently marginalized groups at the top.
 14. If you're not going to support marginalized folks, you and I can't be friends.
 15. It is important that we destroy the West's nationalist, imperialist values.
 16. Not to change one’s behavior to accommodate victims of social injustice is a denial of their humanity.
 17. One isn't closed-minded for hating people who are themselves closed-minded.
 18. Opposition to affirmative action is, by definition, racist.
 19. People who are prejudiced against transgender folks are all evil.
 20. Political correctness does not hinder free speech - it expands it.
 21. The only good racist is a dead racist.
 22. When we spend all of our time protecting the right to “free speech” we're protecting the rights of sexists, racists, and homophobes at the cost of marginalized people.
-

Table S2B. LWA Short Form Index Item Means and Standard Deviations

Item	Mean \pm SD
1. Bigots must be taught to shut-up and stay in their place.	4.1 \pm 1.8
2. Certain elements in our society must be made to pay for the violence...	2.9 \pm 1.8
3. Colleges and universities that permit speakers with intolerant views...	3.8 \pm 1.9
4. I am in favor of allowing the government to shut down right-wing...	3.9 \pm 2.1
5. Fox News, right-wing talk radio, and other conservative media...	3.6 \pm 2.0
6. Getting rid of inequality is more important than protecting the...	4.0 \pm 1.9
7. I cannot imagine myself becoming friends with a political...	3.1 \pm 1.9
8. I hate being around non-progressive people.	3.9 \pm 1.8
9. I hate people who are themselves hateful.	4.6 \pm 1.7
10. I hope that far right extremists become sterile and can never...	3.1 \pm 2.0
11. I would be willing to take up arms to help a left-wing revolution...	2.8 \pm 1.8
12. I would prefer a far-left leader with absolute authority...	3.0 \pm 1.8
13. If I could remake society, I would put members of historically...	3.8 \pm 1.7
14. If you're not going to support marginalized folks, you and I...	3.9 \pm 1.9
15. It is important that we destroy the West's nationalist, imperialist...	3.8 \pm 1.9
16. Not to change one's behavior to accommodate victims of...	4.5 \pm 1.7
17. One isn't closed-minded for hating people who are themselves...	3.7 \pm 1.8
18. Opposition to affirmative action is, by definition, racist.	3.5 \pm 1.7
19. People who are prejudiced against transgender folks are all evil.	3.8 \pm 1.8
20. Political correctness does not hinder free speech - it expands it.	3.9 \pm 1.8
21. The only good racist is a dead racist.	3.3 \pm 2.0
22. When we spend all of our time protecting the right to "free speech"...	3.7 \pm 1.9

Table S2C. Intercorrelations Among LWA Index Short Form Items

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22	
1	--																						
2	.34	--																					
3	.44	.38	--																				
4	.44	.38	.49	--																			
5	.41	.42	.52	.63	--																		
6	.41	.45	.53	.48	.53	--																	
7	.37	.41	.46	.43	.55	.40	--																
8	.43	.34	.43	.43	.51	.41	.55	--															
9	.39	.23	.21	.27	.26	.26	.31	.37	--														
10	.42	.31	.40	.39	.40	.34	.47	.42	.35	--													
11	.26	.34	.40	.30	.32	.30	.37	.33	.23	.32	--												
12	.35	.35	.27	.46	.45	.48	.45	.41	.27	.39	.47	--											
13	.36	.45	.34	.39	.37	.46	.34	.40	.31	.33	.26	.36	--										
14	.36	.45	.48	.36	.41	.44	.53	.51	.28	.37	.25	.31	.43	--									
15	.35	.43	.40	.37	.40	.41	.40	.38	.24	.32	.36	.32	.36	.48	--								
16	.36	.38	.44	.44	.40	.45	.40	.44	.27	.35	.28	.34	.47	.53	.44	--							
17	.38	.27	.29	.32	.28	.33	.35	.32	.40	.39	.30	.29	.27	.25	.26	.29	--						
18	.39	.51	.45	.45	.48	.50	.44	.45	.19	.33	.28	.40	.48	.51	.41	.49	.27	--					
19	.39	.37	.40	.39	.42	.44	.45	.48	.39	.38	.27	.44	.42	.45	.31	.38	.39	.47	--				
20	.31	.30	.43	.40	.45	.47	.35	.45	.21	.26	.24	.34	.45	.39	.35	.47	.28	.48	.39	--			
21	.41	.37	.32	.31	.33	.36	.35	.33	.36	.47	.31	.29	.33	.35	.21	.30	.37	.34	.44	.23	--		
22	.39	.38	.47	.47	.45	.56	.39	.41	.28	.29	.29	.37	.35	.43	.34	.44	.27	.46	.39	.45	.32	--	

Table S3. Associations of categorical with continuous predictor variables

Categorical variable		Age	Income reduced	Log COVID	LWA	RWA
Gender	Male $M \pm SD$	31.3 \pm 9.3	4.1 \pm 2.2	4.9 \pm 1.2	3.5 \pm 1.3	3.1 \pm 1.1
	Female $M \pm SD$	32.1 \pm 11.1	4.1 \pm 2.4	4.8 \pm 1.3	3.8 \pm 1.1	3.1 \pm 1.2
	t	-.77	.13	.97	-2.91**	-.41
	Cohen's d	-.07	.01	.09	-.26	-.04
African-American	No $M \pm SD$	31.8 \pm 10.5	4.1 \pm 2.3	4.8 \pm 1.3	3.6 \pm 1.2	3.1 \pm 1.2
	Yes $M \pm SD$	31.2 \pm 7.8	4.4 \pm 2.2	5.1 \pm .9	4.0 \pm 1.1	3.4 \pm .9
	t	.31	-.83	-.99	-1.53	-1.39
	Cohen's d	.06	-.16	-.19	-.30	-.27

Associations of categorical predictors with continuous predictors. ** $p < .01$

Table S4. Associations among continuous predictor variables

	1	2	3	4	5
1. Age	--				
2. Log COVID	-.09*	--			
3. Income reduced	-.09*	.01	--		
4. LWA	-.18***	.10*	.21***	--	
5. RWA	.14**	-.08	-.07	-.28***	--

Correlations among continuous predictor variables. * $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$, *** $p < .001$

1 **Table S5. Hierarchical Regression Results with Unstandardized Coefficients, Confidence Intervals, and P-values**

2

Policy endorsement (outcome)		Unstandardized coefficient [95% CI]						
		Age	Female	Afr-Am	Log COVID	Income reduction	RWA	LWA
Would report to police	1	-.01 [-.02, .01]	-.41 [-.73, -.09]	-.18 [-.88, .52]	.09 [-.03, .22]	.09 [.02, .16]	--	--
	<i>P</i>	.46	.01	.62	.15	.01		
	2	-.00 [-.01, .01]	-.60 [-.90, -.29]	-.45 [-1.11, .21]	.07 [-.05, .18]	.04 [-.03, .11]	.33 [.20, .47]	.56 [.43, .70]
	<i>P</i>	.98	<.001	.18	.26	.24	<.001	<.001
Persuasion better than rules	1	.01 [-.01, .02]	-.16 [-.46, .13]	-.47 [-1.11, .18]	-.06 [-.18, .05]	.04 [-.02, .11]	--	--
	<i>P</i>	.31	.28	.16	.29	.18		
	2	.01 [-.01, .02]	-.12 [-.42, .18]	-.43 [-1.07, .22]	-.05 [-.17, .06]	.06 [-.01, .12]	-.02 [-.15, .12]	-.13 [-.26, .01]
	<i>P</i>	.48	.43	.20	.37	.09	.81	.06
Need threat of punishment	1	-.02 [-.04, -.01]	-.16 [-.49, .17]	-.31 [-1.03, .42]	.09 [-.04, .21]	.02 [-.05, .09]	--	--
	<i>P</i>	.003	.34	.41	.19	.64		
	2	-.02 [-.03, -.00]	-.35 [-.67, -.04]	-.58 [-1.26, .11]	0.06 [-.06, .18]	-.03 [-.10, .04]	.32 [.18, .46]	.59 [.46, .73]
	<i>P</i>	.02	.03	.10	.34	.35	<.001	<.001
Must follow distancing orders	1	-.00 [-.01, .00]	.31 [.08, .55]	-.17 [-.68, .35]	.02 [-.07, .11]	-.01 [-.06, .04]	--	--
	<i>P</i>	.66	.009	.52	.61	.77		
	2	.01 [-.01, .02]	.21 [-.02, .43]	-.20 [-.69, .29]	-.01 [-.10, .08]	-.04 [-.09, .01]	-.16 [-.26, -.05]	.31 [.21, .41]
	<i>P</i>	.34	.07	.43	.85	.08	.003	<.001

Certificate of immunity	1	-0.00 [-0.02, .01]	-.33 [-.65, -.02]	.00 [-.69, .69]	.12 [-.00, .24]	--	--	--
	<i>P</i>	.76	.04	1.00	.06			
	2	.00 [-0.01, .02]	-.46 [-.76, -.15]	-.20 [-.87, .47]	.11 [-.01, .22]	--	.28 [.14, .42]	.35 [.21, .48]
	<i>P</i>	.93	.004	.56	.08		<.001	<.001
Mandatory tracking app	1	.00 [-0.02, .02]	.03 [-.32, .39]	.25 [-.52, 1.03]	.06 [-.08, .19]	--	--	--
	<i>P</i>	1.00	.85	.52	.43			
	2	.00 [-0.01, .02]	-.15 [-.49, .18]	-.08 [-.81, .66]	.04 [-.09, .17]	--	.48 [.33, .63]	.54 [.40, .69]
	<i>P</i>	.63	.37	.83	.52		<.001	<.001
Prohibit misinformation	1	-.02 [-0.03, -.00]	.31 [.01, .60]	.14 [-.51, .79]	.11 [-.00, .22]	--	--	--
	<i>P</i>	.01	.05	.67	.06			
	2	-.01 [-0.02, .01]	.13 [-.14, .41]	.01 [-.59, .62]	.06 [-.05, .16]	--	-.13 [-.25, -.00]	.54 [.42, .66]
	<i>P</i>	.38	.35	.97	.28		.05	<.001
Surveillance of churches	1	-.02 [-0.04, -.01]	.17 [-.19, .54]	-.05 [-.86, .75]	.08 [-.06, .22]	--	--	--
	<i>P</i>	.008	.35	.89	.27			
	2	-.01 [-0.02, .01]	-.10 [-.43, .22]	-.36 [-1.08, .35]	.02 [-.11, .14]	--	.11 [-.04, .25]	.87 [.73, 1.02]
	<i>P</i>	.35	.53	.32	.78		.15	<.001
Restrict right to protest	1	-.03 [-0.04, -.01]	.22 [-.09, .54]	-.04 [-.73, .64]	.03 [-.09, .15]	--	--	--
	<i>P</i>	<.001	.16	.90	.64			
	2	-.03 [-0.04, -.01]	.01 [-.27, .30]	-.41 [-1.03, .20]	.01 [-.10, .12]	--	.53 [.40, .65]	.61 [.49, .74]
	<i>P</i>	<.001	.93	.19	.81		<.001	<.001
Ban firearms sales	1	-.03 [-0.05, -.01]	.89 [.54, 1.24]	.11 [-.66, .88]	.20 [.07, .34]	--	--	--
	<i>P</i>	<.001	<.001	.78	.003			
	2	-.01 [-0.03, .00]	.61 [.30, .92]	-.20 [-.87, .48]	.14 [.02, .26]	--	.12 [-.02, .26]	.85 [.72, .99]
	<i>P</i>	.06	<.001	.57	.02		.10	<.001

Ban nonessential items	1	-0.01 [-0.03, .00]	-.26 [-0.57, .06]	-.58 [-1.27, .11]	-.04 [-0.16, .08]	--	--	--
	<i>P</i>	.06	.11	.10	.54			
	2	-0.01 [-0.02, .01]	-.47 [-0.76, -.18]	-.87 [-1.50, -.23]	-.07 [-0.18, .04]	--	.27 [.14, .40]	.63 [.50, .76]
	<i>P</i>	.42	.002	.008	.22		<.001	<.001
Close abortion clinics	1	.03 [.01, .04]	-.38 [-0.72, -.05]	.85 [.12, 1.59]	-.16 [-0.29, -.03]	--	--	--
	<i>P</i>	.002	.03	.03	.02			
	2	.01 [-0.00, .02]	-.37 [-0.64, -.11]	.54 [-0.03, 1.12]	-.09 [-0.19, .02]	--	1.03 [.92, 1.15]	-.11 [-0.23, .00]
	<i>P</i>	.21	.006	.07	.10		<.001	.06
Government-run economy	1	-.02 [-0.03, -.01]	-.14 [-0.43, .15]	.10 [-0.54, .73]	.06 [-0.06, .17]	--	--	--
	<i>P</i>	.003	.34	.77	.33			
	2	-.01 [-0.03, -.00]	-.34 [-0.60, -.07]	-.18 [-0.76, .40]	.03 [-0.08, .13]	--	.29 [.17, .40]	.58 [.46, .69]
	<i>P</i>	.04	.02	.55	.61		<.001	<.001
Restrict right to trial by jury	1	-.03 [-0.05, -.02]	.08 [-0.26, .42]	.68 [-0.06, 1.42]	.05 [-0.08, .18]	--	--	--
	<i>P</i>	<.001	.64	.08	.43			
	2	-.03 [-0.04, -.02]	-.16 [-0.45, .14]	.21 [-0.42, .84]	.05 [-0.06, .16]	--	.77 [.64, .90]	.67 [.54, .80]
	<i>P</i>	<.001	.29	.52	.41		<.001	<.001
Restrictions by executive decree	1	-.01 [-0.02, .01]	.17 [-0.16, .50]	-.04 [-0.76, .68]	.09 [-0.04, .22]	--	--	--
	<i>P</i>	.35	.30	.92	.16			
	2	.00 [-0.01, .02]	-.02 [-0.34, .29]	-.30 [-0.98, .37]	.06 [-0.06, .18]	--	.23 [.09, .37]	.60 [.46, .74]
	<i>P</i>	.85	.88	.38	.36		.002	<.001
Emergency- enhanced punishment	1	-.02 [-0.03, -.00]	-.43 [-0.75, -.12]	-.65 [-1.34, .03]	.01 [-0.11, .13]	--	--	--
	<i>P</i>	.03	.007	.07	.91			
	2	-.01 [-0.03, .00]	-.55 [-0.86, -.23]	-.81 [-1.49, -.13]	-.01 [-0.13, .11]	--	.14 [.00, .28]	.33 [.20, .47]
	<i>P</i>	.10	.001	.02	.87		.05	<.001

Authority to public health experts	1	-0.03 [-0.04, -0.01]	.07 [-0.24, .38]	-.06 [-0.74, .62]	.14 [.03, .26]	--	--	--
	<i>P</i>	<.001	.67	.86	.02			
	2	-.01 [-0.03, .00]	-.16 [-0.43, .11]	-.25 [-0.84, .35]	.08 [-0.02, .19]	--	-.11 [-0.24, .01]	.71 [.60, .83]
	<i>P</i>	.07	.25	.42	.13		.07	<.001
Mandatory COVID-19 testing	1	-.01 [-0.03, .00]	-.13 [-0.46, .20]	-.78 [-1.49, -0.06]	.07 [-0.06, .19]	--	--	--
	<i>P</i>	.14	.44	.04	.29			
	2	-.00 [-0.02, .01]	-.34 [-0.64, -0.03]	-1.04 [-1.71, -0.38]	.03 [-0.09, .15]	--	.20 [.07, .34]	.63 [.38, .76]
	<i>P</i>	.78	.04	.002	.60		.004	<.001
Ban foreigners from entering	1	-.01 [-0.02, .01]	.15 [-0.19, .49]	.10 [-0.65, .85]	-.06 [-0.19, .07]	--	--	--
	<i>P</i>	.29	.40	.80	.35			
	2	-.02 [-0.03, -0.00]	.13 [-0.18, .45]	-.15 [-0.83, .53]	-.02 [-0.14, .11]	--	.73 [.59, .87]	.01 [-0.13, .14]
	<i>P</i>	.02	.41	.66	.80		<.001	.93

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15

1 **Table S6. Comparisons of RWA and LWA regression coefficients**

2

Policy endorsement	Unstandardized $\beta \pm SE$		<i>P</i>
	RWA	LWA	
Would report to police	.33 ± .07	.56 ± .07	>.05
Persuasion better than rules	-.02 ± .07	-.13 ± .07	>.05
Need threat of punishment	.32 ± .07	.59 ± .07	>.05
Must follow distancing orders	-.16 ± .05	.31 ± .05	<.001
Certificate of immunity	.28 ± .07	.35 ± .07	>.05
Mandatory tracking app	.48 ± .08	.54 ± .08	>.05
Prohibit misinformation	-.13 ± .06	.54 ± .06	<.001
Surveillance of churches	.11 ± .07	.87 ± .07	<.001
Restrict right to protest	.53 ± .06	.61 ± .06	>.05
Ban firearm sales	.12 ± .07	.85 ± .07	<.001
Ban nonessential items	.27 ± .07	.63 ± .07	.007
Close abortion clinics	1.03 ± .06	-.11 ± .06	<.001
Government-run economy	.29 ± .06	.58 ± .06	.02
Restrict right to trial by jury	.77 ± .07	.67 ± .06	>.05
Restrictions by executive decree	.23 ± .07	.60 ± .07	.009
Emergency-enhanced punishment	.14 ± .07	.33 ± .07	>.05
Authority to public health experts	-.11 ± .06	.71 ± .06	<.001
Mandatory COVID-19 testing	.20 ± .07	.63 ± .07	.003
Ban foreigners from entering	.73 ± .07	.01 ± .07	<.001

3

4 Significant differences in **bold**.

5