In Masks we Trust:**Explicit and Implicit Reactions to Masked Faces Vary by Political Orientation****Author Note**

We have no known conflicts of interest to disclose.

EXPLICIT AND IMPLICIT REACTIONS TO MASKS

Abstract

The COVID-19 pandemic caused controversy over new norms of mask-wearing in public places. A previous online experiment showed that people from several Spanish-speaking countries perceived faces wearing medical-style masks as more trustworthy, socially desirable, and likely to be ill, compared to unmasked controls. However, in English-speaking countries masks have been less universally worn, and attitudes to masks may vary by political orientation. We adapted the previous experiment's methods in a pre-registered study with 1241 American and British participants, adding questions on political orientation and including the online-VAAST approach/avoidance task to test the effects of masks on an implicit reaction-time measure. There was a medium-sized main effect of masks on trustworthiness, but also a significant interaction with political orientation, which showed that conservatives found masked faces less trustworthy than did liberals. Participants were quicker to approach masked than unmasked faces, but conservatives were relatively slower than liberals. The robust effects on trustworthiness suggest that differential moralization of novel social norms can affect how their adherents are evaluated in terms of their suitability for social interactions. Furthermore, the congruence between implicit and explicit methods implies that such differences can have deep-seated effects on reactions.

Keywords: behavioral immune system, COVID-19, face perception, reaction times, social distance, trust

EXPLICIT AND IMPLICIT REACTIONS TO MASKS

In Masks we Trust:

Explicit and Implicit Reactions to Masked Faces Vary by Political Orientation

During the COVID-19 pandemic, the wearing of medical-style face masks, to impede virus transmission via the mouth and nose, became ubiquitous in public places in many countries (Chu et al., 2020; Fisher et al., 2020). However, substantial differences existed (and remain) between individuals and countries in the extent of mask adoption, and some countries have seen public opposition to imposing the practice by law (Calvillo et al., 2020; Fisher et al., 2020; Flaskerud & Lesser, 2020), which has often correlated with partisan political differences (Kahane, 2021). Besides the political context, individual differences in attitudes to mask-wearing are likely driven by a complex array of factors, including explicit judgements about health risks, an automatic tendency to follow social norms (Bicchieri, 2016), and implicit reactions to covered faces. Regarding this last point, social importance of face coverings, e.g., in rituals, dramatic performances, or anonymous acts of violence, has been discussed in theoretical terms by philosophers, anthropologists, and social psychologists (Hollis, 1985; Lévi-Strauss, 1961; Zimbardo, 2004). Yet it is hard to find empirical studies from before the pandemic that directly addressed the question of how people react to masked faces.

Nevertheless, a theoretical case can be made for the relevance of masks to evaluations of the wearers' trustworthiness. Visibility of facial expressions is important for processing information about feelings and intentions (Todorov et al., 2009): obscuring these could thus lead to appraisals of ambiguity, uncanniness, and potential social danger, which might decrease trust in the wearer (Olivera-La Rosa, 2018; Oosterhof & Todorov, 2008). Such appraisals are likely automatic, since when viewing unfamiliar faces, we make automatic judgements of trustworthiness or untrustworthiness that may take as little as 33-100ms (Todorov et al., 2009; Willis & Todorov, 2006). Faces rated less trustworthy caused greater activity in the amygdala (Engell et al., 2007; Said et al., 2010), a brain area associated with spontaneous emotional evaluations (including fear),

EXPLICIT AND IMPLICIT REACTIONS TO MASKS

supporting the idea that people automatically evaluate unfamiliar faces for trustworthiness, with untrustworthy faces generating negative emotional responses. Hence, wearing a mask could affect observers' automatic reactions to a face, regardless of their explicit attitudes to mask-wearing. Evaluations of trustworthiness might also co-vary with individual differences in generalized social trust (Aarøe et al., 2016). Individuals high in such trust tend to assume that people have good intentions and lack malice, facilitating a predisposition towards social contact, even with strangers (Delhey & Newton, 2005).

On the other hand, due to their association first with medical contexts and now the pandemic, masks might also be linked in people's minds with sickness and disease. Theories of the "behavioral immune system" suggest we have evolved to avoid potentially contagious agents or substances (Schaller & Park, 2011). This extends to face perception, with intuitive judgements of disease perhaps motivating the negative social evaluations that tend to be made of ugly or uncanny faces (Klebl et al., 2020; Olivera-La Rosa, 2018; Olivera-La Rosa et al., 2021). During a pandemic in which there is a high risk of infection from strangers, the desired level of social closeness with a stranger could easily be affected by the use of facial information to make intuitive judgments about their possible state of health. Wearing a medical-style mask might influence the perceived sickness of, and risk of contagion from, the wearer (Olivera-La Rosa et al., 2020). Perception of contagion risk could co-vary with disgust sensitivity: the ease and intensity with which individuals experience disgust (Rozin et al., 2008; Schaller & Murray, 2008). Disgust sensitivity may be related to certain psychiatric disorders (Olatunji et al., 2017), personality traits (Oosterhoff et al., 2018), and social prejudices (Inbar et al., 2011). Fan and Olatunji (2013) showed that individual differences in disgust predicted "health-related anxiety" and the avoidance of stimuli associated with the common cold.

Although there was a lack of empirical research into the impact of masks on face perception before their use exploded in response to COVID-19, a study early in the pandemic addressed the perceived trustworthiness and sickness of mask-wearers through an online experiment with a Spanish-speaking sample (Olivera-La Rosa et al., 2020). Two groups of participants viewed a series

EXPLICIT AND IMPLICIT REACTIONS TO MASKS

of five faces, which either were not wearing masks, or were photoshopped with a basic surgical-style mask. After viewing each face, participants were asked to rate it on preferred social distance, trustworthiness, and sickness perception. Mask-wearers were perceived to be more trustworthy and socially desirable, yet also more likely to be ill, regardless of the levels of generalized social trust, social anxiety and disgust sensitivity that participants reported. The authors interpreted these results in the light of a new, “moralized” (Rozin, 1999) social norm of mask-wearing that generated affiliative reactions in observers, causing increased evaluations of trustworthiness and a willingness to reduce social distance. However, they noted that masks had been quickly and widely adopted in the Spanish-speaking countries (principally Colombia) where they collected data. Therefore, these results might not generalize to other countries whose governments did not rapidly and widely mandate mask-wearing, contributing to the practice being less normative—more politically contested—in their populations (Flaskerud & Lesser, 2020). Indeed, subsequent studies in other countries have found somewhat conflicting results, with masks resulting in a reduction in desired interpersonal distance among French participants (Cartaud et al., 2020), but decreasing the perceived closeness of faces for a German sample (Grundmann et al., 2021).

Hence, while affiliative reactions to masked faces in Latin America may indicate the acceptance of a new social norm for mask-wearing in public places in this region, we conducted the current study in the UK and USA, because acceptance of masks in Anglophone countries has by no means been universal. In particular, in these countries it seems likely to be affected by an individual’s degree of political conservatism or liberalism (Haidt & Joseph, 2004). In the USA, indeed, antagonistic positions between Democrats and Republicans on the mandatory use of masks soon turned their rejection into a symbol of political affiliation (Flaskerud & Lesser, 2020; Kahn, 2020)—in keeping with many political differences in wider attitudes towards the pandemic (Calvillo et al., 2020) and towards medical procedures orientated to public health, especially vaccinations (Hornsey et al., 2020). Again, this fits with the predictions of moralization theory, which suggests that moralization of new social norms frequently occurs in the public health domain

EXPLICIT AND IMPLICIT REACTIONS TO MASKS

because violating the norm can be seen as harmful to others (Rozin, 1999, focused on the example of the prohibition of cigarette smoking in public). This occurs by a process that Rozin called “moral piggybacking,” in which “new experiences or knowledge may cause a previously neutral activity or object to fall under an already functioning moral principle” (p. 219). However, if this new knowledge is not universally accepted, it can create intense moral disagreement. In the case of masks, political conservatives might be less accepting of the evidence for their positive effects on health—perhaps motivated by a desire to preserve their personal freedoms (see Everett et al., 2021) in the face of a seemingly alien cultural practice—and less trusting of their wearers, whom they might suspect of wanting to take their freedoms away.

Hence, we suspected that political orientation might affect reactions that US and UK people have towards masked faces, leading to the following hypotheses:

H1: There would be an interaction between mask-wearing and conservative political orientation, such that:

H1A: more conservative participants would see mask-wearers as less trustworthy;

H1B: more conservative participants would desire more social distance from mask-wearers;

We further predicted that both interactions would be significant when considering the effect for individual differences in social trust, social anxiety, and pathogen disgust sensitivity. We did not make any prediction for the effect of political orientation on sickness perception.

Additionally, we sought to clarify why masked faces were judged to be more trustworthy and less deserving of social distance in the study of Olivera-La Rosa et al. (2020), despite the fact that mask-wearers were also perceived as more likely to be sick—in contrast to what the theory of the behavioral immune system would predict. One possibility is that the social norm of mask-wearing was strong enough to generate an affiliative reaction in viewers that overrode the aversion generated by a perception of sickness. Another is that the social norm generated a kind of social desirability bias that caused people to say they would want less social distance from the masked

EXPLICIT AND IMPLICIT REACTIONS TO MASKS

targets, but that this explicit judgement would not be reflected in their behavior. Hence, we investigated whether a more implicit, quasi-behavioral instrument (the online-VAAST approach/avoidance task; Aubé et al., 2019) would show a pattern of results more similar to the explicit results for trustworthiness and desired social distance (quicker approach to masked faces than unmasked ones), or the explicit results for sickness perception (quicker avoidance of masked faces than unmasked ones). This led us to the following hypotheses:

H2: Effects of condition would be seen in the online-VAAST task, such that:

H2A: there would be differences in the average time taken for approaching masked and unmasked faces.

H2B: there would be differences in the average time taken for avoiding masked and unmasked faces.

H2C: conservative voters would approach mask-wearers more slowly and avoid them more quickly, compared to liberals.

We made no prediction about the direction of either *H2A* or *H2B*, since as explained above, the results of the original study could support either a positive or negative difference, depending on the political profile of the participants and the relative strength of increased approach tendencies (due to greater trust) and increased avoidance tendencies (due to sickness cues). We tested *H2C* as well as the explicit hypotheses about political affiliation because of evidence that an individual's degree of conservatism or liberalism does not necessarily affect their physiological reactions (Bakker et al., 2020); and that in threatening situations, liberals may react more like conservatives on some measures (Nail et al., 2009). This leads to the question of whether differential affective reactions to social norms between political groupings appear at only an explicit level, or at both explicit and implicit levels (in line with theoretical and experimental evidence for the internalization and automatization of social norms; Bicchieri, 2016; Whitfield & Jordan, 2009).

EXPLICIT AND IMPLICIT REACTIONS TO MASKS

All main hypotheses and sub-hypotheses were pre-registered on the Open Science Foundation website¹. The data and code are also located at that link, along with minor deviations from the pre-registered analyses.

Methods

Participants

We recruited 1241 participants (711 women, 513 men, 19 preferred not to state binary gender) via the Prolific participant recruitment system (Palan & Schitter, 2018). Sample size was decided based on a power analysis for linear mixed models, based on the effect sizes found by Olivera-La Rosa and colleagues (2020) and following the considerations presented by Judd and colleagues (2017; see Supplementary Information S1). The minimum effect size of interest was set at $d = 0.1$, corresponding to the smallest significant effect size reported by Olivera-La Rosa et al. (2020). Some 622 participants resided in the UK and 619 in the USA (see Table 1 for a summary of demographic data). Participants completed the experiment in an average of 13 minutes, receiving a fixed payment of GBP£2.10 or USD\$2.87 in exchange for participating. The study was conducted in accordance with American Psychological Association ethical principles and approved by the Ethics Committee of [university name redacted].

Materials

The experiment was performed online using *PsyToolkit* (Stoet, 2017). First, participants indicated their age, sex, highest educational qualification, country of residence, and voting preference in national elections (Supplementary Information S6). They then completed one block each of (a) explicit and (b) implicit measures, as well as (c) answering a set of individual differences questionnaires. Blocks (a) and (c) were adapted from the materials used by Olivera-La Rosa et al. (2020), with the main changes being the translation from Spanish to English, the addition of female as well as male faces to block (a), and the addition of questions on political

¹ https://osf.io/3bpdw/?view_only=fc1bfbfab1df48b6ac247d5d5e581542

EXPLICIT AND IMPLICIT REACTIONS TO MASKS

orientation and voting intention to block (c). For the explicit measures block (a), we used a randomized passive control group design, with one factor that had two possible levels (masked or unmasked faces) randomly allocated to two equal-sized groups. A between-groups design was used in order to reduce the possible demand effects of being asked to evaluate both masked and unmasked faces. For the implicit measures block (b), we used a within-subjects design that had one factor with two levels of instructions (one trial where participants were instructed to approach masked faces and avoid unmasked ones, and another trial vice versa). For the individual differences block (c), all participants received exactly the same questions.

[INSERT TABLE 1 ABOUT HERE.]

Explicit measures block (a)

While viewing each of ten target faces, participants were asked to respond to three questions relating to social perception (Supplementary Information S7). As targets we selected five male and five female faces from the Chicago Face Database (Ma et al., 2015) with the inclusion criteria of neutral emotional expressions and average ratings on the aesthetic dimension. Male faces were four Latino faces and one Black face (mean age 25.06 years; the number of Latino faces was due to adapting the design used by Olivera-La Rosa et al., 2020, in Latin America and Spain). Female faces consisted of three White faces, one Latino face and one Black face (mean age 24.58 years). For the experimental condition, we added a blue surgical-style mask to each face using Adobe Photoshop. The same faces without masks were displayed in the control condition. Therefore, in this block participants saw only one version (masked or not) of each face, always either masked or unmasked depending on the condition (see Figure 1).

[INSERT FIGURE 1 ABOUT HERE.]

For each face, participants first answered the Social Distance Scale (Szczurek et al., 2012). In this measure, participants indicated the “closest” level of interaction with which they would feel comfortable with the evaluated person, on a 7-point scale (e.g., “I would feel comfortable if this person were a close friend”): a higher score indicated that more social distance was desired

EXPLICIT AND IMPLICIT REACTIONS TO MASKS

(Supplementary Information S7). They then rated the target's trustworthiness on a 7-point scale ("Based on your initial reaction, how trustworthy does this person seem to you?"). Finally, participants evaluated (with "Yes" or "No") the perceived sickness or healthiness of each face ("Based on your initial reaction, do you think that this person is sick or healthy?").

Implicit measures block (b)

We adapted the online Visual Approach/Avoidance by the Self Task (online-VAAST; Aubé et al., 2019). In this task, participants responded to targets as quickly as possible with a quasi-behavioral measure. They were instructed to perform either an approach or an avoidance action (by pressing <Y> or <N> on their computer keyboard: <Y> made the target appear to get closer, whereas <N> made it appear to recede; Figure 2). The task had two sub-blocks. In one, participants were instructed to approach faces wearing a mask and to avoid faces without a mask. In the other, they were instructed to approach faces without a mask and to avoid faces wearing a mask. Each sub-block presented the same ten faces with and without a mask, against the same background of a side alley, in random order, until participants had responded to all of them (20 trials in total).

[INSERT FIGURE 2 ABOUT HERE.]

Individual differences block (c)

We gave participants questionnaires on social trust, pathogen disgust sensitivity, and social anxiety. To measure social trust, we deployed the widely used Standard International single-item scale (Rosenberg, 1956). Participants were asked to indicate with a score of 0-10 (ranging from 0, "You can't be too careful," to 10, "Most people can be trusted") their answer to the following statement: "Generally speaking, would you say that most people can be trusted, or that you can't be too careful in dealing with people?" Following the suggestion of Aarøe et al. (2016), we combined this score with the six-item General Trust Scale (Yamagishi & Yamagishi, 1994). For the latter measure, participants were asked to indicate how much they agreed or disagreed with six statements (e.g., "Most people are basically honest"; Supplementary Information S8) using a five-point scale from "Strongly disagree" to "Strongly agree," with higher values indicating greater trust.

EXPLICIT AND IMPLICIT REACTIONS TO MASKS

To measure disgust sensitivity, we used the Pathogen Disgust subscale of the Three-Domain Disgust Scale (Tybur et al., 2009). This subscale comprised 7 items, for which participants indicated on 7-point scales how disgusting they would find a series of situations relating to infectious agents (e.g., “Accidentally touching a person’s bloody cut”; Supplementary Information S9). This subscale has been used in previous research on pathogen-associated motivations (Klebl et al., 2020; Park, 2015). As a measure of social anxiety, we applied the Avoidance subscale of the Liebowitz Social Anxiety scale (Liebowitz, 1987). In this questionnaire, participants were asked to rate their tendency to avoid each of 24 social situations (e.g., “Drinking with others”; Supplementary Information S10) on a 4-point scale.

Procedure

Data was collected in October 2020. After giving informed consent and answering the demographic questions, which always came first, participants received the three main blocks of the experiment in two possible orders: (i) either explicit judgements of masked or unmasked faces, or the implicit approach/avoidance task; (ii) the individual differences survey questions on social anxiety, generalized social trust, and pathogen disgust sensitivity; and (iii) either the implicit approach/avoidance task or explicit judgements of faces (whichever task they did not receive in (i)). We randomized the order of the faces for the explicit questions, along with the order of presentation of the three sets of individual differences questions (on pathogen disgust sensitivity, social anxiety, and generalized social trust), and the two sub-block combinations of approach/avoid and masked/unmasked faces in the implicit task.

Data exclusion

Individuals ($n = 8$) who failed both of two attention check questions (see Supplementary Information S3) were excluded completely from the analysis. Individuals who had a high Cook’s distance (using an algorithm presented by Corradi et al., 2018, which yielded a cut-off point of 0.00326) on any of the dependent measures were excluded for that measure alone ($n = 44$ for trustworthiness; $n = 33$ for sickness perception; $n = 43$ for social distance). For the online-VAAST

EXPLICIT AND IMPLICIT REACTIONS TO MASKS

implicit task, participants were filtered by error rate, such that those with less than 60% success in following the instructions were completely excluded on the reaction time measures ($n = 31$), as were 3594 incorrect trials from participants whose correct trials were still included. As in other studies of face perception (Sui & Humphreys, 2013), 55 trials with a reaction time of less than 200ms were also excluded from the implicit measures analysis. Furthermore, following Aubé and colleagues' (2019) application of the online-VAAST, 929 trials with reaction times above 2500ms were also excluded from this analysis. Participants excluded by the implicit measures criteria detailed in this paragraph were still included in the tests of explicit measures ($N = 1189$ for trustworthiness; $N = 1200$ for sickness perception; $N = 1190$ for social distance; $N = 1202$ for reaction times).

Results

Participants' explicit judgments (*HI*) were analyzed using linear mixed-effects models, which account for both between-subjects and within-subjects effects of independent variables (Snijders & Bosker, 2012; see Supplementary Information S11 for more details). We fitted three models for each question about the target faces (trustworthiness, perceived sickness, and social distance). The first set of models (Table 2) examined the interaction of *Condition* (Masked or Unmasked target) with *Political Orientation* scores, which were centered on their grand mean and included as a continuous predictor. The second set of models included the main effects of *Pathogen Disgust Sensitivity*, *Social Anxiety*, and *Generalized Social Trust*, and the interaction of *Condition* with these scales. Internal consistency was excellent for disgust sensitivity (Cronbach's $\alpha = 0.85$, $M = 4.33$, $SD = 1.16$), social anxiety ($\alpha = 0.91$, $M = 1.38$, $SD = 0.57$), and social trust ($\alpha = 0.89$, $M = 0.64$, $SD = 0.16$). Results of the second set of models are described in Table 2. (In Supplementary Information S20, we present a third set of models with the additional inclusion of demographic variables, for which we had no hypotheses, and which did not affect the overall pattern of results described in this section.) *Participant* and *Stimulus* (i.e., the individual faces evaluated) were included as random effects in all models. For all significance tests, we pre-registered an alpha value

EXPLICIT AND IMPLICIT REACTIONS TO MASKS

of 0.01, obtained using the Satterthwaite method of alpha correction for repeated tests (Keselman et al., 1999).

[INSERT TABLE 2 ABOUT HERE.]

[INSERT TABLE 3 ABOUT HERE.]

Trustworthiness

A *t*-test of simple effects showed that participants were moderately more likely ($t[1239] = 9.01, p < .001, d = 0.50$) to trust targets with a mask ($M = 4.81, SD = 0.95, 95\% \text{ CI } [4.74, 4.89], n = 592$) than targets without a mask ($M = 4.34, SD = 0.92, 95\% \text{ CI } [4.27, 4.41], n = 649$). As set out in Table 2, in the linear model analysis the main effect of political orientation indicated that conservatives had less trust in the target faces. The interaction with condition revealed that this effect was mainly explained by their lower trust for targets with a mask. A simple slope analysis showed that participants' political orientation was not significantly associated with trustworthiness in the control condition (Slope = $-0.01, SE = 0.02, t = -0.97, p = .33$), whereas in the experimental (masked) condition more liberal participants tended to judge the faces as more trustworthy (Slope = $-0.02, SE = 0.01, t = -4.46, p = .001$; see Figure 3). All these effects remained significant in the full model controlling for individual differences (see Table 3), and a main effect of generalized social trust was also found.

[INSERT FIGURE 3 ABOUT HERE.]

Perceptions of Sickness

Participants did not perceive targets with a mask ($M = 0.152, SD = 0.187, 95\% \text{ CI } [0.138, 0.167], n = 592$) as significantly more likely to be sick than targets without a mask ($M = 0.178, SD = 0.184, 95\% \text{ CI } [0.164, 0.192], n = 649$). Indeed, simple effects analysis indicated that any effect was more likely in the other direction, with unmasked people perhaps appearing slightly more likely to be sick ($t[1239] = 2.44, p = .015, d = 0.14$), but this effect was small and did not quite reach significance according to the Satterthwaite-corrected alpha level of .01; nor was it significant in the linear model analysis including political orientation (see Table 2). On the subject of political

EXPLICIT AND IMPLICIT REACTIONS TO MASKS

orientation, conservatives perceived targets in general as more likely to be sick than did liberals. As with trustworthiness, the interaction with condition revealed that this effect was largely explained by their perceptions of masked targets, with a steeper slope for participants in the treatment condition (Treatment Slope = 0.13, $SE = 0.04$, $z = 3.04$, $p < .001$ vs Control Slope = -0.01, $SE = 0.03$, $z = -0.16$, $p = .88$; see Figure 4). In the full model with individual differences included, these effects were preserved, and there were also significant main effects of condition and social anxiety, as well as a significant interaction between disgust sensitivity and condition (see Table 3).

[INSERT FIGURE 4 ABOUT HERE.]

Social Distance

The desired social distance for targets with a mask ($M = 3.83$, $SD = 1.29$, 95% CI [3.72, 3.93], $n = 592$), was significantly lower than that for unmasked targets ($M = 4.03$, $SD = 1.21$, 95% CI [3.94, 4.12], $n = 649$), in the simple effects analysis ($t[1239] = 2.88$, $p = .004$, $d = 0.16$). However, the effect was small, and in the linear model including political interaction, it was not significant according to the corrected alpha level of .01 (see Table 2). The significant main effect of political orientation and lack of a significant interaction with condition indicated that conservatives reported more desired social distance from targets, regardless of whether or not they were wearing a mask (in other words, there was no significant interaction between experimental condition and political orientation). Both the main effect and the absence of an interaction were preserved in the second model including individual differences (shown in Table 3), where an unexpected main effect of generalized social trust on desired social distance, as well as an interaction between condition and pathogen disgust sensitivity, were also detected. Social anxiety had no significant main effects on any of the dependent measures, or significant interactions with any other independent variable in the models.

[INSERT FIGURE 5 ABOUT HERE.]

EXPLICIT AND IMPLICIT REACTIONS TO MASKS

Approach/Avoidance Reaction Times

For the online-VAAST implicit measures (*H2*) we fitted four random-effects models, summarized in Figure 6.

[INSERT FIGURE 6 ABOUT HERE.]

Two models focused on the comparison between RTs (reaction times) to targets with and without a mask when performing approach and avoidance actions (Table 4). They included *Target* (Masked or Unmasked), and *Sequence* (Approach First or Avoidance First) as categorical fixed effects. The other two models focused on the comparison between approach and avoidance RTs to targets with and without a mask (Table 5). These included *Action* (Approach or Avoidance), and *Sequence* (Approach First or Avoidance First). All models also included *Political Orientation* as a continuous predictor, and participant and stimulus as random effects.

[INSERT TABLE 4 ABOUT HERE.]

In the Approach action model, participants reacted faster to masked ($M = 797\text{ms}$, $SD = 247.2\text{ms}$, 95% CI[783ms, 811ms]) than unmasked targets ($M = 871\text{ms}$, $SD = 259\text{ms}$, 95% CI[854ms, 888ms]). More liberal participants approached both types of target faster than did more conservative participants. In the avoidance action model, there was no overall effect of target, though there was a significant interaction between target and sequence. More liberal participants avoided both types of target faster than did more conservative participants. However, the interaction with target revealed that this effect was larger for unmasked targets than for masked ones.

[INSERT TABLE 5 ABOUT HERE.]

In the Masked targets model, participants reacted faster with approach ($M = 797\text{ms}$, $SD = 283\text{ms}$, 95% CI[783ms, 811ms]) than avoidance actions ($M = 843\text{ms}$, $SD = 284\text{ms}$, 95% CI[828ms, 857ms]). In the Unmasked targets model, participants were faster at avoidance ($M = 822\text{ms}$, $SD = 282\text{ms}$, 95% CI [809ms, 836ms]) than approach actions ($M = 871$, $SD = 308.6$, 95% CI[854ms, 887ms]). Both approach and avoidance RTs to unmasked targets were faster for more liberal

EXPLICIT AND IMPLICIT REACTIONS TO MASKS

participants than for conservatives (Approach Slope = 9.51, $SE = 3.25$, $t = 2.81$, $p = .01$; Avoidance Slope = 12.71, $SE = 3.10$, $t = 4.10$, $p < .001$).

Discussion

We tested whether reactions to masked faces co-varied with political orientation in English-speaking populations, in a pre-registered online experiment using both explicit and implicit methods, the former based on those of Olivera-La Rosa et al. (2020). The positive effects of masks on trustworthiness found by those authors replicated in our sample as a medium-sized effect, demonstrating some international consistency in attitudes towards masked faces, although the effect on preferred social distance was small and was not robustly significant once political orientation was taken into account. The negative effect of masks on perceptions of healthiness found by Olivera-Rosa and colleagues disappeared or even reversed, perhaps reflecting the newfound ubiquity of masks in that they are now seen as an everyday object that helps protect against contagion, rather than potential indicators of disease. There were also individual differences in the acceptance of masks: in line with *H1A*, liberals showed more trust in masked faces (relative to unmasked ones) than did conservatives, and were less likely than conservatives to view mask-wearers as sick. However, these differences did not translate into a greater desired social distance towards mask-wearers on the part of conservatives, leading to the rejection of *H1B*. The political differences in evaluations that we did find may reflect both the continued controversy over the use of masks in public, and the potential for political orientation to affect one's judgments of strangers, depending on the symbols of affiliation that they display (Hester & Gray, 2020).

The overall positive explicit judgments of mask-wearers were mirrored in the reaction time scores, which showed that people were faster to approach masked faces than unmasked faces (supporting *H2A*), and faster to approach than avoid masked faces (but faster to avoid than approach unmasked faces). However, there was no significant difference between masked and unmasked faces in terms of avoidance reaction time, leading to the rejection of *H2B*. The coherence of these implicit results using the online-VAAST approach/avoid task (Aubé et al., 2019) with those

EXPLICIT AND IMPLICIT REACTIONS TO MASKS

obtained using explicit judgments support the external validity of this measure, and suggest that in some contexts it could be a useful alternative to better-known implicit measures such as the IAT (Implicit Association Test; cf. Rougier et al., 2020), which has been extensively criticized (Jost, 2019; Schimmack, 2019; Villacampa et al., 2019). Furthermore, in line with *H2C*, political conservatives were relatively quicker to avoid masked faces than liberals were, mirroring the differences found in their trustworthiness and sickness judgments, and implying that these might have the potential to impact behavior in unconscious ways. This result contrasts with a recent study that found similarities in unconscious reactions to threatening phenomena between liberals and conservatives (Bakker et al., 2020), and supports the idea of a general congruence between implicit and explicit attitudes (Whitfield & Jordan, 2009).

Considering that a key objective was to assess the effects of political orientation on responses to masked faces, a limitation of the current study was an over-representation of liberal (c. 60%) compared to conservative (c. 20%) voters. This was likely due in part to over-representation of women, young people and highly-educated people relative to the UK/US populations in general, since all these groups have more liberal voting tendencies than the national averages (Keeter & Igielnik, 2020). Other limitations concerned the dependent measures that we used. As already pointed out by Olivera-La Rosa et al. (2020), the measure of desired social distance was rather indirect, being based on self-report and of unclear validity (its deployment as an ordinal measure relies on the assumption that people conceive of relationships such as family, friends, neighbors and colleagues in an objectively ranked way, whereas phenomenologically these may be experienced more like a nominal variable, and different levels' closeness rankings may vary between individuals). This may have contributed to the trustworthiness measure showing stronger effects, even though it too was based on self-report.

Behavioral measures of reactions to masked faces, such as an economic trust game, or assessment of how much people believe statements spoken by each face, might show more ecological validity, as well as being interesting outcomes for further investigation in their own right.

EXPLICIT AND IMPLICIT REACTIONS TO MASKS

Indeed, a recent study by Malik et al. (2021) found that fewer members of their US sample trusted information that was given to them by someone wearing a mask. Although superficially contradicting our results, one key difference was that these authors used video stimuli (with audio). Trust towards a masked *speaker* might be particularly reduced, since the hiding of facial expressions and muffling of tone could impair processing of meta-conversational information by the audience. In a similar vein, Grundmann and colleagues (2021) found that evaluations of trustworthiness and desired social distance of mask-wearers were affected by the emotional expressions of control faces. Perhaps the neutral expressions worn by our controls were seen as cold, contributing to their lack of trustworthiness. Supporting this interpretation, Marini et al. (2021) found that when evaluating static photos of faces wearing opaque (but not transparent) masks, participants reported lower trust in faces showing the emotions of happiness, sadness and fear (compared to unmasked control faces showing the same emotions) but not in neutral faces. Future studies of the impact of masks on face perception should take into account this apparent sensitivity of reactions to the precise characteristics of the control faces that are used.

The precise nature of the dependent measures that are used is likely to be another source of variability of results in this kind of study. With respect to political orientation, we did find some coherence between explicit and implicit measures in the current study. This is in line with a recent theoretical model of the dynamic, cooperative organization of controlled and automatic processes in the human mind, which helps to produce habitual behavior in accordance with social norms (Ingram & Moreno-Romero, 2021). Further hypothesis-driven exploration of our data, as well as follow-up studies, could be performed to investigate how both sets of measures intercorrelated and how they varied between different subgroups of participants. That this congruence was seen more clearly in approach than avoidance reaction times is also interesting. We did not anticipate this finding, but one explanation, in the context of the online-VAAST task, might be that “approaching” a face is more ecologically valid than “avoiding” it, since in the framing of this task “approaching” a face would correspond to walking towards them, whereas “avoiding” it would correspond to making

EXPLICIT AND IMPLICIT REACTIONS TO MASKS

them recede by walking backwards, when a more natural avoidance action might be to turn away and follow a different path.

In terms of further studies in the context of the COVID-19 pandemic, given the moralization of norms relating to mask-wearing (Prosser et al., 2020) it would be interesting to explore how people react—including in terms of moral judgments—to faces wearing masks incorrectly (e.g., not covering the nose). Attitudes to vaccines seem also to have become a “moralized” site of contention (a process that was under way even before the pandemic started, with controversies about child vaccination; Amin et al., 2017). It would thus make sense to investigate whether estimations of someone’s likelihood to have been vaccinated (e.g., based on their political profile) affects judgments of their trustworthiness, healthiness, or social desirability, as well as implicit reactions towards them (Hornsey et al., 2020). Yet despite the importance of vaccination and the “culture wars” surrounding the practice, mask use has not gone away and continues to be a site of political conflict. The US Center for Disease Control’s decision to continue mandating mask use in crowded indoor areas, even for vaccinated people (Rao & Singh, 2021), proved particularly contentious, and underlines the importance of continuing to study the complex effects of masks on face perception.

More generally, we know very little about how people make instantaneous evaluations of strangers based on how they perceive their faces. Aside from the effects of mask-wearing, we showed that general judgments of the trustworthiness, desired social distance, and even healthiness of strangers were affected by individual differences such as political orientation. While effects of mask-wearing were modest, judgment of faces is clearly affected by the context in which they are presented (Brambilla et al., 2018), and it would be useful to see whether this applies to other ways of changing facial context. One interesting study in the context of the George Floyd protests found that Black Americans wearing a medical-style mask were perceived more favorably than those who were covering their face with a scarf (Christiani et al., 2020). It seems plausible that when encountering novel faces, humans are typically combining signals of social category membership

EXPLICIT AND IMPLICIT REACTIONS TO MASKS

(e.g., from clothing) with implicit judgements of facial expressions, in complex and not easily predictable ways.

Moreover, the congruence between implicit and explicit responses in our results supports the idea, drawn from moralization theory, that new social norms such as mask-wearing can quickly come to affect people's evaluations of others, even at an automatic level (Bicchieri, 2016), as well as forming fault lines for moralized political differences (Graso et al., 2021). As Prosser and colleagues (2020) pointed out, in the face of political or identity-based differences in the acceptance of novel health-related norms (see also Templeton et al., 2020), it is important to avoid exacerbating social divisions by labeling those who do not immediately accept these norms as “immoral”—a practice that is all too common in both traditional and social media. Rather, to promote a more generally accepted moralization of life-saving practices, it is vital that people are given the chance to negotiate and buy into the novel norms themselves. Research into how signals of norm affiliation relate to judgements of trustworthiness and related qualities could be a key input to this process—not only in the context of the COVID-19 pandemic, but also applied to equally polarized contemporary debates, such as those surrounding climate change.

Acknowledgments

[Redacted for peer review.]

References

- Aarøe, L., Osmundsen, M., & Petersen, M. B. (2016). Distrust as a disease avoidance strategy: Individual differences in disgust sensitivity regulate generalized social trust. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 7, 1038. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2016.01038>
- Amin, A. B., Bednarczyk, R. A., Ray, C. E., Melchiori, K. J., Graham, J., Huntsinger, J. R., & Omer, S. B. (2017). Association of moral values with vaccine hesitancy. *Nature Human Behaviour*, 1, 873-880. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41562-017-0256-5>
- Aubé, B., Rougier, M., Muller, D., Ric, F., & Yzerbyt, V. (2019). The online-VAAS: A short and online tool to measure spontaneous approach and avoidance tendencies. *Acta Psychologica*, 201, 102942. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.actpsy.2019.102942>

EXPLICIT AND IMPLICIT REACTIONS TO MASKS

- Bakker, B. N., Schumacher, G., Gothreau, C., & Arceneaux, K. (2020). Conservatives and liberals have similar physiological responses to threats. *Nature Human Behaviour*, 4, 1–9.
<https://doi.org/10.1038/s41562-020-0823-z>
- Bicchieri, C. (2016). *Norms in the wild: How to diagnose, measure, and change social norms*. Oxford University Press.
- Brambilla, M., Biella, M., & Freeman, J. B. (2018). The influence of visual context on the evaluation of facial trustworthiness. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 78, 34–42.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jesp.2018.04.011>
- Calvillo, D. P., Ross, B. J., Garcia, R. J., Smelter, T. J., & Rutchick, A. M. (2020). Political ideology predicts perceptions of the threat of COVID-19 (and susceptibility to fake news about it). *Social Psychological and Personality Science*, 1948550620940539.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/1948550620940539>
- Cartaud, A., Quesque, F., & Coello, Y. (2020). Wearing a face mask against Covid-19 results in a reduction of social distancing. *Plos One*, 15, e0243023.
<https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0243023>
- Christiani, L., Clark, C. J., Greene, S., Hetherington, M. J., & Wager, E. (2020). *Masks and racial stereotypes in a pandemic: The case for surgical masks*. Preprint at
<https://ssrn.com/abstract=3636540>
- Chu, D. K., Akl, E. A., Duda, S., Solo, K., Yaacoub, S., & Schünemann, H. J. (2020). Physical distancing, face masks, and eye protection to prevent person-to-person transmission of SARS-CoV-2 and COVID-19: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *Lancet*, S0140673620311429.
[https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736\(20\)31142-9](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736(20)31142-9)
- Corradi, G., Rosselló-Mir, J., Vañó, J., Chuquichambi, E. G., Bertamini, M., & Munar, E. (2018). The effects of presentation time on preference for curvature of real objects and meaningless novel patterns. *British Journal of Psychology*, 110, 670–685.
<https://doi.org/10.1111/bjop.12367>
- Delhey, J., & Newton, K. (2005). Predicting cross-national levels of social trust: Global pattern or Nordic exceptionalism? *European Sociological Review*, 21, 311–327.
<https://doi.org/10.1093/esr/jci022>
- Engell, A. D., Haxby, J. V., & Todorov, A. (2007). Implicit trustworthiness decisions: Automatic coding of face properties in the human amygdala. *Journal of Cognitive Neuroscience*, 19, 1508–1519. <https://doi.org/10.1162/jocn.2007.19.9.1508>
- Everett, J. A. C., Clark, C. J., Meindl, P., Luguri, J. B., Earp, B. D., Graham, J., Ditto, P. H., & Shariff, A. F. (2021). Political differences in free will belief are associated with differences in

EXPLICIT AND IMPLICIT REACTIONS TO MASKS

- moralization. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 120, 461–483.
<https://doi.org/10.1037/pspp0000286>
- Fan, Q., & Olatunji, B. O. Individual differences in disgust sensitivity and health-related avoidance: Examination of specific associations. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 55, 454–458.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2013.04.007>
- Fisher, K. A., Barile, J. P., Guerin, R. J., Esschert, K. L. V., Jeffers, A., Tian, L. H., et al. (2020). Factors associated with cloth face covering use among adults during the COVID-19 pandemic—United States, April and May 2020. *MMWR. Morbidity and Mortality Weekly Report*, 69, 933–937.
https://www.cdc.gov/mmwr/volumes/69/wr/mm6928e3.htm?s_cid=mm6928e3_w
- Flaskerud, J. H., & Lesser, J. (2020). Masks, politics, culture and health. *Issues in Mental Health Nursing*, 9 July 2020. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01612840.2020.1779883>
- Graso, M., Chen, F. X., & Reynolds, T. (2021). Moralization of Covid-19 health response: Asymmetry in tolerance for human costs. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 104084.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jesp.2020.104084>
- Grundmann, F., Epstude, K., & Scheibe, S. (2021). Face masks reduce emotion-recognition accuracy and perceived closeness. *Plos One*, 16, e0249792.
<https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0249792>
- Haidt, J., & Joseph, C. (2004). Intuitive ethics: How innately prepared intuitions generate culturally variable virtues. *Daedalus*, 133, 55–66. <https://doi.org/10.1162/0011526042365555>
- Hester, N., & Gray, K. (2020). The moral psychology of raceless, genderless strangers. *Perspectives on Psychological Science*, 15, 216–230. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1745691619885840>
- Hollis, M. (1985). Of masks and men. In M. Carrithers, S. Collins, & S. Lukes (Eds.), *The category of the person: Anthropology, philosophy, history* (pp. 217–233). Cambridge University Press.
- Hornsey, M. J., Finlayson, M., Chatwood, G., & Begeny, C. T. (2020). Donald Trump and vaccination: The effect of political identity, conspiracist ideation and presidential tweets on vaccine hesitancy. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 88, 103947.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jesp.2019.103947>
- Inbar, Y., Pizarro, D. A., & Bloom, P. (2011). Disgusting smells cause decreased liking of gay men. *Emotion*, 12, 23–27. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0023984>
- Ingram, G. P. D., & Moreno-Romero, C. (2021). Dual-process theories, cognitive decoupling and the outcome-to-intent shift: A developmental perspective on evolutionary ethics. In H. De Cruz & J. De Smedt (Eds.), *Empirically engaged evolutionary ethics*. Springer. Preprint:
<https://psyarxiv.com/dc5rz>

EXPLICIT AND IMPLICIT REACTIONS TO MASKS

- Jost, J. T. (2019). The IAT is dead, long live the IAT: Context-sensitive measures of implicit attitudes are indispensable to social and political psychology. *Current Directions in Psychological Science*, 28, 10-19. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0963721418797309>
- Judd, C. M., Westfall, J., & Kenny, D. A. (2017). Experiments with more than one random factor: Designs, analytic models, and statistical power. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 68, 601–625. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-psych-122414-033702>
- Kahane, L. H. (2021). Politicizing the mask: Political, economic and demographic factors affecting mask wearing behavior in the USA. *Eastern Economic Journal*, 47, 163-183. <https://doi.org/10.1057/s41302-020-00186-0>
- Kahn, R. (2020). *Masks, culture wars, and public health expertise: Confessions of a mask 'expert'*. Preprint at <https://ssrn.com/abstract=3644610>
- Keeter, S., & Igielnik, R. (2020). *Democrats made gains from multiple sources in 2018 midterm victories: An examination of the 2018 electorate, based on validated voters*. Pew Research Center: Methods. <https://www.pewresearch.org/methods/2020/09/08/democrats-made-gains-from-multiple-sources-in-2018-midterm-victories/>
- Keselman, H. J., Algina, J., Kowalchuk, R. K., & Wolfinger, R. D. (1999). The analysis of repeated measurements: A comparison of mixed-model Satterthwaite f tests and a nonpooled adjusted degrees of freedom multivariate test. *Communications in Statistics – Theory and Methods*, 28, 2967–2999. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03610929908832460>
- Klebl, C., Greenaway, K. H., Rhee, J. J., & Bastian, B. (2020). Ugliness judgments alert us to cues of pathogen presence. *Social Psychological and Personality Science*, 1948550620931655. <https://doi.org/10.1177%2F1948550620931655>
- Lévi-Strauss, C. (1961). The many faces of man. *World Theatre*, 10, 11–20.
- Liebowitz, M. R. (1987). Social phobia. *Modern Problems in Pharmacopsychiatry*, 22, 141–173. <https://doi.org/10.1159/000414022>
- Ma, D. S., Correll, J., & Wittenbrink, B. (2015). The Chicago Face Database: a free stimulus set of faces and norming data. *Behavior Research Methods*, 47, 1122–1135. <https://doi.org/10.3758/s13428-014-0532-5>
- Malik, S., Mihm, B., & Reichelt, M. (2021). *The impact of face masks on interpersonal trust in times of COVID-19*. Manuscript under review. Preprint retrieved from <https://www.researchsquare.com/article/rs-515122/v1>
- Marini, M., Ansani, A., Paglieri, F., Caruana, F., & Viola, M. (2021). The impact of facemasks on emotion recognition, trust attribution and re-identification. *Scientific Reports*, 11, 1-14. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-021-84806-5>

EXPLICIT AND IMPLICIT REACTIONS TO MASKS

- Nail, P. R., McGregor, I., Drinkwater, A. E., Steele, G. M., & Thompson, A. W. (2009). Threat causes liberals to think like conservatives. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 45, 901–907. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jesp.2009.04.013>
- Olatunji, B.O., Armstrong, T., & Elwood, L. (2017). Is disgust proneness associated with anxiety and related disorders? A qualitative review and meta-analysis of group comparison and correlational studies. *Perspectives on Psychological Science*, 12, 613–648. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1745691616688879>
- Olivera-La Rosa, A. (2018). Wrong outside, wrong inside: A social functionalist approach to the uncanny feeling. *New Ideas in Psychology*, 50, 38–47. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.newideapsych.2018.03.004>
- Olivera-La Rosa, A., Chuquichambi, E. G., & Ingram, G. P. D. (2020). Keep your (social) distance: Pathogen concerns and social perception in the time of COVID-19. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 166, 110200. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2020.110200>
- Olivera-La Rosa, A., Villacampa, J., Corradi, G., & Ingram, G. P. D. (2021). The creepy, the bad and the ugly: Exploring perceptions of moral character and social desirability in uncanny faces. *Current Psychology*. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12144-021-01452-w>
- Oosterhof, N. N., & Todorov, A. (2008). The functional basis of face evaluation. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences (USA)*, 105, 11087–11092. <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.0805664105>
- Oosterhoff, B., Shook, N. J., & Iyer, R. (2018). Disease avoidance and personality: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Research in Personality*, 77, 47–56. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jrp.2018.09.008>
- Palan, S., & Schitter, C. (2018). Prolific.ac: A subject pool for online experiments. *Journal of Behavioral and Experimental Finance*, 17, 22–27. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbef.2017.12.004>
- Park, J. H. (2015). Introversion and human-contaminant disgust sensitivity predict personal space. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 82, 185–187. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2015.03.030>
- Prosser, A. M., Judge, M., Bolderdijk, J. W., Blackwood, L., & Kurz, T. (2020). ‘Distancers’ and ‘non-distancers’? The potential social psychological impact of moralizing COVID-19 mitigating practices on sustained behaviour change. *British Journal of Social Psychology*, 59, 653–662. <https://doi.org/10.1111/bjso.12399>
- Rao, S., & Singh, M. (2021). Why Should Vaccinated People Wear Masks Indoors in Areas of High Community Transmission: Rationale for CDC's Recent Recommendation. *DHR Proceedings*, 1(4), 9–10. <https://dhrproceedings.org/index.php/DHRP/article/download/24/18>

EXPLICIT AND IMPLICIT REACTIONS TO MASKS

- Rhee, J. J., Schein, C., & Bastian, B. (2019). The what, how, and why of moralization: A review of current definitions, methods, and evidence in moralization research. *Social and Personality Psychology Compass*, 13, e12511. <https://doi.org/10.1111/spc3.12511>
- Rosenberg, M. (1956). Misanthropy and political ideology. *American Sociological Review*, 21, 690–695. <https://doi.org/10.2307/2088419>
- Rougier, M., Muller, D., Courset, R., Smeding, A., Devos, T., & Batailler, C. (2020). Toward the use of approach/avoidance tendencies as attitude measures: Individual-and group-level variability of the ingroup bias. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 50, 857–875. <https://doi.org/10.1002/ejsp.2653>
- Rozin, P. (1999). The process of moralization. *Psychological Science*, 10, 218–221. <https://doi.org/10.1111%2F1467-9280.00139>
- Rozin, P., Haidt, J., & McCauley, C. R. (2008). Disgust. In M. Lewis, J. M. Haviland-Jones, & L. F. Barrett (Eds.), *Handbook of emotions* (3rd Ed., pp. 757–776). Guilford Press.
- Said, C. P., Dotsch, R., & Todorov, A. (2010). The amygdala and FFA track both social and non-social face dimensions. *Neuropsychologia*, 48, 3596–3605. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neuropsychologia.2010.08.009>
- Schaller, M., & Murray, D. R. (2008). Pathogens, personality, and culture: Disease prevalence predicts worldwide variability in sociosexuality, extraversion, and openness to experience. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 95, 212–221. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.95.1.212>
- Schaller, M., & Park, J. H. (2011). The behavioral immune system (and why it matters). *Current Directions in Psychological Science*, 20, 99–103. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0963721411402596>
- Schimmack, U. (2019). The Implicit Association Test: A method in search of a construct. *Perspectives on Psychological Science*, 1745691619863798. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1745691619863798>
- Snijders, T. A. B., & Bosker, R. J. (2012). *Multilevel analysis: An introduction to basic and advanced multilevel modeling* (2nd Ed.). SAGE.
- Stoet, G. (2017). PsyToolkit: A novel web-based method for running online questionnaires and reaction-time experiments. *Teaching Psychology*, 44, 24–31. <https://doi.org/10.1177%2F0098628316677643>
- Szczurek, L., Monin, B., & Gross, J. J. (2012). The *Stranger* effect: The rejection of affective deviants. *Psychological Science*, 23, 1105–1111. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0956797612445314>
- Templeton, A., Guven, S. T., Hoerst, C., Vestergren, S., Davidson, L., Ballentyne, S., Madsen, H., & Choudhury, S. (2020). Inequalities and identity processes in crises: Recommendations for

EXPLICIT AND IMPLICIT REACTIONS TO MASKS

- facilitating safe response to the COVID-19 pandemic. *British Journal of Social Psychology*, 59, 674-685. <https://doi.org/10.1111/bjso.12400>
- Todorov, A., Pakrashi, M., & Oosterhof, N. N. (2009). Evaluating faces on trustworthiness after minimal time exposure. *Social Cognition*, 27, 813–833. <https://doi.org/10.1521/soco.2009.27.6.813>
- Tybur, J. M., Lieberman, D., & Griskevicius, V. (2009). Microbes, mating, and morality: Individual differences in three functional domains of disgust. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 97, 103–122. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0015474>
- Villacampa, J., Ingram, G. P. D., Corradi, G. & Olivera-LaRosa, A. (2019). Applying an implicit approach to research on the uncanny feeling. *J. Art. Support Null Hypothesis*, 16. <https://www.jasnh.com/pdf/Vol16-No1-article2.pdf>
- Whitfield, M., & Jordan, C. H. (2009). Mutual influence of implicit and explicit attitudes. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 45, 748–759. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jesp.2009.04.006>
- Willis, J., & Todorov, A. (2006). First impressions: Making up your mind after a 100-ms exposure to a face. *Psychological Science*, 17, 592–598. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9280.2006.01750.x>
- Yamagishi, T., & Yamagishi, M. (1994). Trust and commitment in the United States and Japan. *Motivation and Emotion*, 18, 129–166. <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF02249397>
- Zimbardo, P. G. (2004). A situationist perspective on the psychology of evil: Understanding how good people are transformed into perpetrators. In A. G. Miller (Ed.), *The social psychology of good and evil* (pp. 21–50). Guilford Press.

Tables and figures

EXPLICIT AND IMPLICIT REACTIONS TO MASKS

Table 1.*Summary of the Sample's Demographic Data, Split by Country*

	UK (<i>n</i> = 622)	USA (<i>n</i> = 619)	Total (<i>N</i> = 1241)
	Value (col %)	Value (col %)	Value (col %)
Gender			
Female	410 (66.7%)	301 (48.6%)	711 (57.3%)
Male	205 (33.3%)	308 (49.7%)	513 (41.3%)
Other	7 (1.1%)	10 (1.6%)	17 (1.4%)
Age: mean [SD] in years	34.4 [12.7]	32.3 [12.1]	33.4 [12.5]
Education: highest level achieved			
Primary education	1 (0.1%)	34 (5.5%)	35 (2.8%)
Secondary education (<= 16 years)	40 (6.4%)	77 (12.4%)	117 (9.4%)
Professional qualification (> 16 years)	218 (35.0%)	125 (20.2%)	343 (27.6%)
Undergraduate degree	238 (38.3%)	245 (39.6%)	483 (39%)
Postgraduate degree	105 (16.9%)	122 (19.7%)	227 (18.3%)
Doctorate	20 (3.2%)	16 (2.6%)	36 (2.9%)
Politics			
0–10 liberal–conservative: mean [SD]	4.15 [1.93]	3.88 [2.34]	4.02 [2.15]
Voting intention			
Labour/Democrat candidate	335 (53.8%)	425 (68.6%)	760 (61.2%)
Conservative/Republican candidate	122 (19.6%)	134 (21.6%)	256 (20.6%)
Other candidate	165 (26.5%)	60 (9.7%)	225 (18.1%)

EXPLICIT AND IMPLICIT REACTIONS TO MASKS

Figure 1*Example of Target Face*

Note. The photographs show one of the ten faces from the Chicago Face Database used in the experimental—masked—condition (left) and control condition (right), for the explicit methods in block (a).

EXPLICIT AND IMPLICIT REACTIONS TO MASKS

Figure 2*Trial Sequence in Block (b), the Online-VAAST*

1. 'H' Keypress

2. 800 - 2000 ms

3. Avoidance 'N' | Approach 'Y'
Until response 4. Feedback
500 ms

a

b

c

Note. In this trial the target is wearing a mask. In one sub-block, the correct response is an avoidance action (<N> keypress), whereas in the other sub-block, the correct response is an approach action to the same face (<Y> keypress). Participants received feedback for each trial. With correct avoidance responses, the background and the target face appeared to recede (4a), whereas with correct approach responses, the background and the face appeared to get closer (4b). With incorrect responses, participants received an “Error!” message as feedback (4c).

EXPLICIT AND IMPLICIT REACTIONS TO MASKS

Table 2*Significant Main Effects and Interactions of the Models Containing the Variables Hypothesized to Predict the Explicit Measures*

Model 1:	Trustworthiness			Sickness perception			Social distance		
Hypothesized effects	β	t	p	β	Z	p	β	t	p
Condition	.032	4.94	<.001***	-.16	-1.18	.24	.0146	2.22	.033*
Political orientation	-.0068	-3.90	<.001***	.061	2.32	.020*	.015	6.44	<.001***
Condition * Political Orientation	-.0045	-2.56	.010**	.066	2.48	.013*	.0019	.83	.41

EXPLICIT AND IMPLICIT REACTIONS TO MASKS

Table 3*Main Effects and Interactions of the Model Containing both the Hypothesized Predictors of the Explicit Measures and Covariates Marking**Individual Differences between Participants*

Model 2:	Trustworthiness				Sickness Perception				Social Distance			
Full effects	β	t	p	95 % CI β	β	Z	p	95 % CI β	β	t	p	95 % CI β
Condition	.060	9.02	<.001***	.07, .05	-.34	-3.35	<.001***	-.14, -.54	.027	2.10	.043*	.001, .053
Political Orientation	-.011	-4.73	<.001***	-.02, -.01	.097	2.90	.0037**	.03, .16	.017	4.36	<.001***	.01, .03
Disgust Sensitivity	-.0010	-1.66	.096	-.002, .0002	-.015	-1.82	.068	-.03, .001	.00003	.035	.97	-.002, .002
Social Anxiety	.0002	.56	.57	-.0005, .001	.016	3.18	.0014**	.01, .03	.0006	1.08	.28	-.005, .002
General Social Trust	.26	8	<.001***	.20, .33	-.76	-1.66	.097	-1.66, .14	-.18	-3.72	<.001***	-.27, -.08
Condition * PO	.0091	2.81	.0051**	.003, .016	-.094	-2.13	.033*	-.18, -.01	.0049	-1.02	.31	-.15, .005
Condition * DS	.0008	.97	.33	-.0009, .003	.031	2.75	.006**	.01, .05	.0034	2.85	.0044**	.001, .006
Condition * SA	-.0003	-.63	.53	-.001, .0007	-.013	-1.94	.052	.004, -.03	.0004	-.56	.58	-.002, .001
Condition * GST	.021	.49	.62	-.065, .11	-.28	-.48	.63	-1.42, .86	.065	1.06	.29	-.06, .19

EXPLICIT AND IMPLICIT REACTIONS TO MASKS

Figure 3

Model-Predicted Relationship between Perceived Trustworthiness of Masked and Unmasked Targets and Political Orientation

Note. Shaded areas represent 95% CIs.

EXPLICIT AND IMPLICIT REACTIONS TO MASKS

Figure 4

Model-Predicted Relationship between Perceived Sickness of Masked and Unmasked Targets and Political Orientation

Note. Shaded areas represent 95% CIs.

EXPLICIT AND IMPLICIT REACTIONS TO MASKS

Figure 5

Model-Predicted Relationship between Preferred Social Distance of Masked and Unmasked Targets and Political Orientation

Note. Shaded areas represent 95% CIs.

EXPLICIT AND IMPLICIT REACTIONS TO MASKS

Figure 6*Mean Reaction Times (RTs) in the Online-VAAST*

Note. A. Left side shows approach RTs to masked and unmasked targets in each sequence. Right side shows avoidance RTs to masked and unmasked targets in each sequence.

B. Left side shows masked targets RTs with approach and avoidance actions in each sequence.

Right side shows unmasked targets RTs with approach and avoidance actions in each sequence.

Error bars represent 95% CI around the means.

EXPLICIT AND IMPLICIT REACTIONS TO MASKS

Table 4*Model Results for Approach/Avoidance Actions between Masked and Unmasked Targets*

Models	Approach action			Avoidance action		
Fixed effects	β	t	p	β	t	p
Target: Masked vs Unmasked	70.57	7.47	<.001***	2.53	.28	.77
Sequence	16.66	1.19	.23	.29	.022	.98
Political Orientation	9.15	2.81	.005**	12.63	4.08	<.001***
Target * Sequence	-6.39	-.58	.56	36.85	3.08	.002**
Target * Political Orientation	.57	.22	.82	-7.22	-2.59	.009**

Table 5

Significant Effects and Interactions of the Models Predicting the Reaction Times of Different Actions for Masked and Unmasked Targets

Models	Masked target			Unmasked target		
Fixed effects	β	t	p	β	t	p
Action: Approach vs Avoidance	-33	-3.52	< .001***	39.9	4.39	< .001***
Sequence	37.5	2.68	.007**	.22	.017	.98
Political orientation	5.02	1.33	.19	12.7	4.10	< .001***
Action * Sequence	-26.2	-2.30	.022*	16.8	1.45	.15
Action * Political orientation	4.49	1.34	.19	-3.56	-1.31	.19