How Did Individual Differences in Neurocognition and Health Literacy Influence the Initial Uptake and
Use of Health-related Information about COVID-19?

Michelle A. Babicz¹, Steven Paul Woods^{1*}, Anastasia Matchanova¹, Luis D. Medina¹,
Kenneth Podell², Rheeda L. Walker¹, Adam Fetterman¹, Samina Rahman¹, Briana Johnson¹,
Jennifer L. Thompson¹, Kelli L. Sullivan¹, Ilex Beltran-Najera¹, Jasmin Brooks¹, Yenifer Morales¹

Department of Psychology, University of Houston¹

Department of Neurology, Methodist Hospital²

*Corresponding Author: Steven Paul Woods, 126 Heyne Bldg (Ste. 239d), Houston, Texas, 77004;
Email: spwoods@uh.edu; Phone: 713-743-6415; Fax: 713-743-8588

Abstract

Objective: The rapid development of coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19) into a pandemic required people to quickly acquire, evaluate, and apply novel complex health-related information about the virus and transmission risks. This study examined the possible interplay between neurocognition and health literacy in the early uptake and use of COVID-19 public health information. **Method:** Data were collected between April 23 and May 21, 2020, a period during which 42 out of 50 states were under a stay-at-home order. Participants were 217 healthy adults who completed a telephone-based battery that included standard tests of neurocognition, health literacy, verbal IQ, personality, and anxiety. Participants also completed measures of COVID-19 information-seeking skills, knowledge, prevention intentions, and prevention behaviors. **Results:** A series of hierarchical multiple regressions with data-driven covariates showed that neurocognition (viz, episodic verbal memory and executive functions) was independently related to COVID-19 knowledge (e.g., symptoms, risks) at a medium effect size, but not to information-seeking skills, prevention intentions, or prevention behaviors. Health literacy was independently related to all measured aspects of COVID-19 health information and did not interact with neurocognition in any COVID-19 health domain. **Conclusions:** Individual differences in neurocognition and health literacy played independent and meaningful roles in the initial acquisition of knowledge related to COVID-19, which is a novel human health condition. Future studies might examine whether neurocognitive supports (e.g., spaced retrieval practice, elaboration) can improve COVID-19-related knowledge and health behaviors in vulnerable populations.

Keywords: neuropsychological assessment; health literacy; coronavirus; disease knowledge; prevention behaviors; health psychology

Word count: *Abstract* = 233 words, *Manuscript* = 4421 words, 4 tables, and 1 figure

Introduction

Due to the moderately contagious nature of coronavirus disease-2019 (COVID-19) and the absence of effective vaccines or targeted therapeutics, most public health initiatives initially focused on behavioral measures (e.g., masks, social distancing) as a primary means of slowing the spread of the disease. Even though these behavioral measures can be effective in mitigating the spread of COVID-19 (Ferguson et al., 2020), their uptake and use has lagged in the United States (Park et al., in press). Therefore, it is crucial to have a better understanding of contributors to adherence to COVID-19 preventative behaviors. To help us select and frame determinants of COVID-19 preventative behaviors for this study, we integrated elements from four widely-used models of health behavior (see Glanz et al., 2008) that were deemed relevant to the intersection of neurocognitive functions, health literacy, and the behavioral management of COVID-19 transmission, including: 1) information-seeking; 2) disease-specific knowledge; 3) preventative intentions; and 4) preventative behaviors.

Information-seeking related to COVID-19 increased rapidly in the early part of the pandemic, primarily via online sources (Bento et al., 2020). Such health-related information-seeking may play an important role in the contemplation stage of health behaviors (e.g., “Should I wear a mask?”) and is an important determinant of disease-related knowledge. Searching the internet for health-related information can have positive health effects (Fox & Rainey, 2002). Yet online health information is often unregulated, unreliable, and complex to digest (Skierkowski et al., 2019). This variability in online information quality has been particularly challenging in relation to the COVID-19 pandemic (Cuan-Baltazar et al., 2020). Online search behavior is associated with activation in prefrontal and temporal networks (Small et al., 2009) and neurocognitive abilities that they support, including declarative memory and executive functions (Agree et al., 2015). Therefore, we hypothesized that higher neurocognitive abilities would be positively and independently related to more reliable, evidence-based COVID-19 information-seeking behavior.

The acquisition and retention of *disease-specific knowledge* is also critically important to many health prevention and promotion efforts (Glanz et al., 2008). Early data suggest greater knowledge about

COVID-19 transmission, prevention, and clinical management is associated with better compliance with evolving public health recommendations at the individual (Clements, 2020) and population (Lin et al., 2020) levels. Disease-related knowledge is influenced by several factors, including education, race/ethnicity, and health literacy (Jackson et al., 2020). Acquiring new health-related knowledge involves processing, learning, and consolidating oftentimes complex, incomplete, and contradictory information from various sources. A large body of literature shows that neurocognitive abilities in attention, declarative memory, information processing speed, and executive functions are all correlated with disease-specific knowledge (Malow et al., 2012; Wykes et al., 2017). Accordingly, we expected that higher neurocognitive abilities would be independently related to greater COVID-19 knowledge.

Many conceptual models suggest that *intentions* to comply with health behaviors are an important predictor of actual adherence (Glanz et al., 2008). Two COVID-19 era studies suggest that greater self-rated intentions to engage in preventative behaviors (e.g., mask wearing) are associated with better adherence to public health guidelines for reducing COVID-19 transmission (Barati et al., 2020; Bogg & Milad, preprint). Neurocognitive aspects of intention formation can be conceptualized under the umbrella of prospective memory, which describes one's ability to execute a future intention (Kliegel et al., 2008). Intention formation involves both declarative memory neural networks for encoding (e.g., medial temporal lobe) and executive functions networks for planning and future-oriented processing (e.g., prefrontal cortex; Poppenk et al., 2010). Consistent with these findings, poorer intention formation has been associated with executive dysfunction (Kliegel et al., 2004). Therefore, we hypothesized that higher neurocognitive abilities would be independently associated with stronger intentions to adhere to recommended COVID-19 preventative behaviors.

Adherence to public health recommendations for COVID-19 *preventative behaviors* is essential to controlling the spread of the virus (Peeples, 2020); however, adherence behaviors themselves are complex and multidetermined (Fisher et al., 2006). The importance of episodic memory and executive functions has been highlighted both in neurocognitive models of adherence (Park & Liu, 2007) and empirically as predictors of medication adherence among persons with chronic disease (Hinkin et al.,

2002). Neurocognition is also associated with adherence to both positive health behaviors (Allan & McDaly, 2016) and engagement in health risk behaviors (Ross et al., 2016). Xie and colleagues (2020) reported a small, but significant and independent association between adherence to social distancing guidelines and visual working memory and abstract reasoning. We therefore hypothesized that higher neurocognitive abilities would be independently associated with greater self-reported adherence to recommended COVID-19 preventative behaviors.

Finally, we sought to determine whether health literacy, the capacity to obtain, process, understand, and communicate about health-related information to make informed medical decisions (Berkman et al., 2010), may modulate the relationship between neurocognition and COVID-19 health information and behaviors. Lower health literacy is associated with difficulties in seeking out health-related information (Agree et al., 2015), less disease-specific knowledge (Kalichman et al., 2000), reduced intentions about health prevention (Kim et al., 2019), and suboptimal adherence behaviors (Waldrop-Valverde et al., 2018). Early studies suggest that lower health literacy may be associated with poorer knowledge of COVID-19 symptoms (Wolf et al., in press), less preparedness (Bailey et al., 2020), and non-compliance with recommended preventative behaviors (Li et al., 2020). Several studies found that neurocognition was more strongly associated with positive health-related task outcomes among individuals with lower health literacy (Chin et al., 2011; 2017; Fazeli et al., 2020), suggesting that higher health literacy may serve as a protective buffer against the adverse effects of poor neurocognition on health behaviors. We hypothesized that the relationship between neurocognition and COVID-19 health-related knowledge would be strongest among persons with lower levels of health literacy.

Method

Participants

The study was conducted in compliance with the Institutional Review Board of the University of Houston, and the data were gathered between April 23, 2020 and May 21, 2020. A total of 280 participants from 28 different states were recruited via word-of-mouth and postings on social media, 217 of whom (77.5%) completed the study procedures (see Figure 1). There were no significant differences in

sex, education, or number of medical comorbidities between the 217 participants who completed the study and the 63 participants who did not ($ps>.05$). However, participants that completed the assessment were slightly older and had a lower frequency of Black and Hispanic individuals than the participants who were not assessed ($ps<.05$). Interested participants completed an online screening survey, providing digital, informed consent and confirming that they were: 1) At least 18 years of age; 2) minimally proficient in English; 3) in the United States; and 4) not diagnosed with any major neurological (e.g., seizure disorder) or psychiatric (e.g., psychosis) conditions.

Materials and Procedures

COVID-19-Related Measures

Online Information-Seeking Evaluation Skills. The COVID-19 Website Evaluation Strategies Questionnaire was adapted from the information accountability guidelines for the Web established by the American Medical Association (Winker et al., 2000). Participants indicated their use of 16 different website evaluation strategies in the past month while reading about COVID-19 on the Internet (e.g., “Check that the domain name includes ‘.gov,’ ‘.org,’ or ‘.edu.,’”). Possible total scores ranged from 0 to 16, with higher scores indicating greater self-reported COVID-19 information-seeking evaluative skills (Cronbach’s $\alpha=.81$).

Knowledge. Participants listed the ways in which health officials said they can help protect themselves from getting COVID-19. Two points were assigned to responses corresponding to one of the eight CDC-recommended prevention measures at the time of evaluation. A *COVID-19 Total Prevention Knowledge Score* was calculated by summing correct responses (range=0-16). A *COVID-19 Prevention Knowledge False Positive* score was calculated as a sum of incorrect responses; one point was assigned to any plausible prevention measure response that was not on the CDC website (e.g., disinfect packages) and two points for an unfounded, ineffective prevention measure (e.g., take vitamin C). A randomly selected 10% of the sample was independently coded by a second rater (Intraclass Correlation Coefficient [ICC]=.74, 95% CI=.46,.88).

Participants listed the most common COVID-19 symptoms. Two points were assigned to responses corresponding to one of the four primary symptoms of COVID-19 per the CDC (2020) at the time of evaluation (i.e., cough, fever, fatigue, shortness of breath), one point for any additional symptoms included on the CDC COVID-19 symptom list (e.g., loss of smell), and zero points for any symptoms not listed by the CDC. A *COVID-19 Symptom Knowledge Accuracy* score was calculated by the total of these responses. A *Total COVID-19 Symptom Knowledge False Positives* score was calculated as a sum of incorrect responses; one point was assigned to uncommon but research-supported symptoms (e.g., stroke, cardiac issues) and two points for unfounded COVID-19 symptoms (e.g., loss of teeth). The ICC of a 10% random sample coded by an independent rater was .91(.79,.96).

The *COVID-19 General Knowledge Recognition Task* included 12 statements about COVID-19. Items were created based on both factual information gathered from reliable sources (e.g., CDC), as well as common misconceptions about COVID-19 present in general discourse and media sources. Participants were asked to indicate whether each statement about COVID-19 was true/false/don't know. The task included six true statements (e.g., "Older adults and persons with lung disease have a high risk of serious illness due to coronavirus") and six false statements (e.g., "5g wireless networks weaken the immune system..."). A d prime (d') recognition score was calculated, with higher scores indicating better discrimination.

Participants were asked, "Have you developed a plan for you and your household if you get sick with coronavirus?" Their *COVID-19 Health Plan* was rated on the following 1 to 5 scale: 1) no plan; 2) simple self-isolation; 3) self-isolation with details about the specifics and preparations for at least one aspect of food, dependents, work, or medical care; 4) self-isolation with details about the specifics and preparations for multiple dimensions of care; and 5) detailed self-isolation plan plus higher-level planning for finances, power of attorney, etc. (ICC=.63[.05,.89]).

A continuous COVID-19 Knowledge composite score of the above measures (see Table 2) was derived using principal components analysis (PCA; Supplement Table 1). Sampling adequacy was acceptable for these purposes as measured by Kaiser-Myer-Olkin (KMO=0.527) and Bartlett's test of

sphericity ($X^2(15)=34.5, p=.004$). All scores except COVID-19 Prevention Knowledge False Positive Score loaded onto a single component in the PCA analysis, accounting for 24.0% of the total variance (Eigenvalue 1.43). Thus, the composite score used for further analyses accounted for COVID-19 Prevention Knowledge Accuracy, Symptom Knowledge Accuracy and False Positive, General Knowledge Recognition Task d', and Health Plan Total Score.

Intention to Adhere to COVID-19 Prevention Behaviors. Participants completed eight items indicating their level of intention to adhere to CDC-recommended COVID-19 prevention measures (e.g., “You intend to follow the preventative guidelines in the next few weeks”) on a five-point Likert scale (Cheng & Ng, 2006). Responses were summed to create a COVID-19 Prevention Behavior Intentions Total (range=8-40), with higher scores indicating higher intent to adhere to preventative guidelines ($\alpha=.69$).

COVID-19 Prevention Behaviors. Participants completed eight items indicating their adherence to eight CDC-recommended COVID-19 prevention behaviors (e.g., “You never touch your eyes, nose, or mouth with unwashed hands,”) on a five-point Likert scale. Responses were summed to create a COVID-19 Prevention Behavior Total (range=8 -40), with higher scores indicating higher adherence to prevention measures ($\alpha=.76$).

Neurocognitive Measures

All participants were administered an abbreviated neuropsychological test battery (see Table 2) via telephone: Hopkins Verbal Learning Test-Revised (Brandt & Benedict, 2001); Digit Span and Information subtests of the Weschler Adult Intelligence Scale—Fourth Edition (WAIS-IV; Wechsler, 2008); action fluency (Piatt et al., 1999); Category Switching from the Delis-Kaplan Executive Functions Scale (Delis et al., 2001); Oral Trail Making Test (Ricker & Axelrod, 1994); and a four-target, embedded, focal event-based prospective memory task (Beaver & Schmitter-Edgecombe, 2017; $\alpha=.80$). As detailed in Matchanova et al. (2020), performance on this battery can be explained by a single factor or by a three-factor solution related to memory, executive functions, and attention. The single cognitive factor

was used for all primary analyses. For any significant associations with the primary factor score, we also conducted planned follow-up analyses with these domain-level factor scores.

Health Literacy Measures

The *Brief Health Literacy Screening Tool* (Chew et al., 2008) prompted participants rated the extent to which they agreed with three statements related to health literacy (e.g., “You are confident filling out forms by yourself”) on a five-point scale. Higher scores (range 5-15) indicate higher perceived health literacy ($\alpha=.69$).

On the *Subjective Numeracy Scale* (Fagerlin et al., 2007), participants rated the extent to which they agreed with eight statements (e.g., “You are good at working with fractions”) on a five-point scale. Higher total scores (range 8-40) indicated higher subjective numeracy ($\alpha=.73$).

The seven-item *Expanded Numeracy Scale* (Lipkus et al., 2001) measures a participant’s abilities regarding health-related percentages and proportions (e.g., “If the chance of getting a disease is 20 out of 100, what is the percent chance of getting the disease?”). Higher total correct scores (range 0-7) indicate better numeracy ($\alpha=.66$).

The eight-item *Electronic Health Literacy Scale* (Norman & Skinner, 2006) measures a participant’s knowledge and perceived skills at finding, evaluating, and applying electronic health information (e.g., “I know how to find helpful health resources.”). Responses were rated on a one (“Strongly Disagree”) to five (“Strongly Agree”) scale, with higher total scores (range=8-40) indicating greater confidence using the Internet for health-related purposes ($\alpha=.92$).

Eight items from the *Health Motivation Questionnaire* (Moorman, 1993) were used to assess motivation to adhere to positive health behaviors and monitor health status by asking about an individual’s health concerns (e.g., “I try to prevent health problems before I feel any symptoms”). Responses were rated on a scale from one (“Strongly Agree”) to five (“Strongly Disagree”), with higher total scores (range=8-40) suggesting greater health motivation ($\alpha=.80$).

A PCA-derived Health Literacy composite score of the above measures (see Table 2 and Supplement Table 2) explained 36.8% of the variance and showed acceptable sampling adequacy

(KMO=0.61; Bartlett's test of sphericity, $\chi^2(10)=105.9$, $p<.001$). Thus, the factor scores from this single component that included all five measures were used for further analyses.

Other Study Measures

Participants also completed several other descriptive measures (see Table 1), including: the Geriatric Anxiety Inventory-Short Form (Byrne & Pachana, 2011); a single-item COVID-19-related anxiety measure for which participants rated the statement "You are worried and nervous about coronavirus." on a Likert scale; a single-item on which participants rated the frequency with which they were reading about or listening to information about COVID-19 on a four-point scale from "Rarely/Never" to "Several Times Per Day"; a general internet use questionnaire (Baggio et al., 2017); the Wake Forest Physician Trust Scale (Hall et al., 2002); and the Big Five Inventory–2 Extra-Short Form (Soto & John, 2017).

Data Analyses

Missing values were <5% and were found to be missing completely at random ($\chi^2=660.50$, $p=.867$). The primary neurocognitive, health literacy, and COVID-19 variables were not normally distributed (Shapiro-Wilk $ps<.01$) and univariate analyses were thus conducted using either Wilcoxon Rank Sums Tests or Spearman's rho. However, the sample size was large and the model residuals did not show major deviations from normal. As such, primary study hypotheses were tested using stepwise regression with covariates entered in Step 1, health literacy and neurocognition entered in Step 2, and the health literacy by neurocognition interaction in Step 3. Covariates were selected in a data-driven fashion, whereby only those variables from Table 1 that were uniquely associated with the neurocognitive composite, health literacy composite, and COVID-19 variables at a $\alpha=.05$ were included. We used an adjusted critical $\alpha=.013$ (i.e., $.05/4$ domains of COVID-19 health) that was accompanied by effect sizes.

Results

Univariable Relationships Between the Primary Study Variables.

Neurocognition showed broadly medium positive associations with both health literacy and COVID-19 Knowledge, as well as a small negative correlation with COVID-19 Preventative Behaviors

($ps < .013$; Table 3). Health literacy additionally had broadly medium positive associations with COVID-19 Online Information-Seeking Skills, Knowledge, and Preventative intentions ($ps < .013$). COVID-19 Knowledge was positively associated with intentions, which in turn were positively associated with both information-seeking and preventative behavior ($ps < .013$).

COVID-19 Online Information-Seeking Evaluation Skills

WAIS-IV Information, the only variable that met criteria for inclusion as a covariate, was entered in Step 1 and accounted for a significant amount of variance in COVID-19 Online Information-Seeking Evaluation Skills ($p = .012$; Table 4). The entry of neurocognition and health literacy in Step 2 accounted for additional variance ($p = .001$), which was primarily attributable to health literacy ($p < .001$). After accounting for health literacy, neither global neurocognition nor WAIS-IV Information were significant contributors ($ps > .013$). Inclusion of the interaction term in Step 3 did not explain any additional variance in COVID-19 Online Information-Seeking Evaluation Skills ($p = .548$).

COVID-19 Knowledge

Education and WAIS-IV Information were the only variables that met criteria for inclusion as covariates ($ps < .05$). These covariates were entered in Step 1 of the model, which was significant ($p < .001$; Table 4). The entry of global neurocognition and health literacy in Step 2 contributed a significant amount of variance ($p < .001$), attributable to both global neurocognition ($p = .005$) and health literacy ($p = .012$), but not WAIS-IV Information or education ($ps > .013$). The addition of the interaction term between global neurocognition and health literacy in Step 3 did not explain a significant amount of additional variance in COVID-19 Knowledge ($p = .032$).

A series of planned post-hoc multiple regression analyses were conducted predicting COVID-19 Knowledge from the domains of attention, executive functions and memory, controlling for education, WAIS-IV Information, and health literacy. All three omnibus models were significant ($ps < .001$) and revealed significant, independent effects of memory ($b = 0.47[0.15, 0.78]$, $t[211] = 2.93$, $p = .004$) and executive functions ($b = 0.04[0.01, 0.07]$, $t[211] = 2.72$, $p = .007$), but not attention ($p = .111$).

COVID-19 Preventative Intentions

No variable met criteria for inclusion as a covariate. Global neurocognition and health literacy accounted for a significant amount of variance in COVID-19 Intentions ($p < .001$; Table 4). This result was primarily attributable to health literacy ($p < .001$) rather than global neurocognition ($p = .255$). Addition of the interaction term between global neurocognition and health literacy did not account for more variance in COVID-19 Intentions ($p = .701$).

COVID-19 Preventative Behaviors

WAIS-IV Information alone met criteria for inclusion as a covariate and accounted for a significant amount of variance in COVID-19 Preventative Behaviors ($p = .012$; Table 4). In Step 2, global neurocognition and health literacy contributed a significant amount of variance ($p = .001$). This result was primarily attributable to health literacy ($p < .001$) and WAIS-IV Information ($p = .003$), rather than global neurocognition ($p = .099$). The addition of the neurocognition x health literacy interaction term did not account for more variance in this model ($p = .682$).

Post-hoc Analysis: In contemplating the unexpected negative relationship between estimated verbal IQ and COVID-19 Preventative Behavior, we posited that perhaps participants with higher IQs may have been at the forefront of digesting the emerging information about the reduced risk of surface transmission. We derived two subscales of COVID-19 preventative behaviors, with three items measuring dynamic preventative behaviors related to surface transmission (e.g., frequent cleaning home and surfaces) and three items measuring persistent preventative behaviors (e.g., social distancing, masks). A CFA supported this two-factor solution ($\chi^2(19) = 15.9, p = .045$; RMSEA = 0.07(0.10, 0.12); CFI = 0.97; SMMR = 0.04). Using a median split of evaluation date, WAIS-IV Information was negatively associated with the dynamic surface transmission COVID-19 preventative behaviors among participants assessed May 6 to May 20, 2020 ($r_s = -.28, p = .003$), but not among those assessed earlier in the pandemic ($r_s = -.11, p = .267$). The difference between these two correlation coefficients was significant ($z = 1.83, p = .033$). WAIS-IV Information was not associated with the persistent COVID-19 preventative behaviors in either epoch ($ps > .10$).

Discussion

We examined the role of individual differences in neurocognition and health literacy in the initial uptake and use of health-related information about COVID-19 during the Spring of 2020. Results suggest that individuals with higher neurocognitive ability had greater knowledge of the symptoms, preventative measures, and associated health factors related to COVID-19. Importantly, the association between neurocognition and COVID-19 knowledge remained significant when controlling for education, estimated verbal IQ, and health literacy. Findings are consistent with the positive association between neurocognition and disease-specific knowledge in chronic medical illnesses (Malow et al., 2012) and extend that work in the context of novel, evolving infectious disease knowledge acquisition and recall. Given that disease prevention and health promotion often begin with knowledge (Link & Phelan 1995), individuals with lower neurocognitive ability may be at risk for acquiring and using misinformation about COVID-19, which could have downstream implications for both personal and public health.

At the domain level, better executive functions and episodic memory, but not attention/working memory, were uniquely associated with higher COVID-19 knowledge. The episodic memory findings are intuitive and align with research showing that individual differences in episodic memory play an independent role in learning the content and context of novel health-related information about infectious disease (Morgan et al., 2020). Future studies might examine other relevant aspects of declarative memory (e.g., source memory) and the extent to which memory-based supports such as self-generation, elaboration, and spaced retrieval practice can enhance the acquisition of health-related knowledge (Roediger et al., 2006). The process of learning new health-related information, particularly in the digital age, is complex (Ford, 2004). Executive functions can influence the encoding and retrieval aspects of episodic memory (Moscovitch, 1992). Thus, executive functions may have also contributed to the acquisition of COVID-19 knowledge by influencing the use of higher-order organization and retrieval strategies (e.g., clustering), as has been shown in relation to other aspects of health literacy (Sullivan et al., in press). Future studies are encouraged to include more specific measures and to use experimental

approaches to delineate whether providing executive supports (e.g., scaffolding, clustering) can enhance COVID-19 knowledge acquisition in persons with neurocognitive disorders.

Contrary to our hypotheses, neurocognition was *negatively* associated with self-reported adherence to COVID-19 preventative behaviors; however, this association was no longer significant after controlling for relevant covariates, most notably estimated verbal IQ. These results are inconsistent with a recent study that suggested that working memory was positively associated with self-reported adherence to COVID-19 social distancing guidelines in healthy adults (Xie et al., 2020). The discrepancy in findings may be due to differences in how both constructs were assessed; however, a post-hoc correlation between WAIS-IV Digits Backwards and a single-item measure of COVID-19 social distancing compliance that was akin to Xie et al. (2020) was also small and negative. Regardless, the finding may be of tertiary importance because global neurocognition was no longer a significant predictor of COVID-19 preventative behaviors when the model was covaried for estimated verbal IQ, which was also negatively associated with COVID-19 preventative behaviors. Post-hoc analyses showed that estimated verbal IQ was specifically negatively related to personal home and hygiene factors during the latter part of the study period, at which time evidence was emerging against surface transmission. Thus, it is plausible that people with higher funds of knowledge were modifying their behavior based on digesting the evolving information about the less effective preventative measures (CDC, 2020).

Neurocognition was not associated with online COVID-19 related information seeking skills. It is unlikely that the lack of significant findings were due to Type II error, as the current study sample of 217 participants was well-powered to detect small-to-medium effect sizes. These results were surprising, as other studies have demonstrated an association between neurocognition and electronic health literacy (e.g., Woods & Sullivan, 2019), as well as performance on naturalistic online search tasks (Woods et al., 2019). Other neurocognitive domains not assessed (e.g., spatial cognition, visual problem-solving) could still play an important role in information-seeking skills. Moreover, although our measure of COVID-19 information-seeking skills was internally consistent, associated with preventative behaviors and health literacy (see Table 3), and adapted from well-validated measure, it was nevertheless a single self-report

measure that does not encompass other potentially important neurocognitive aspects of the construct that might be the focus of future studies (e.g., source biases, search term generation, and internet navigation skills).

Neurocognition was also not associated with self-reported intentions to adhere to COVID-19 preventative guidelines. A positive relationship was hypothesized primarily based on theory and empirical evidence for the roles of attention, retrospective memory encoding, and executive functions in the formation of intentions (Kliegel et al., 2008). Intention formation is a critical aspect of prospective memory, yet a post-hoc analysis showed that even our focal, event-based prospective memory measure was not specifically associated with COVID-19 intentions ($r_s = -.10$). It nevertheless remains possible that other aspects of prospective memory might relate to COVID-19 intentions, including more strategically-demanding tasks (e.g., time-based), naturalistic measures (Rendell, 1999), or approaches that allow for the isolation of the encoding and planning aspects of intentions (Kliegel et al., 2001). Despite the null associations with the aspects of neurocognition measured in this study, intentions to adhere to COVID-19 guidelines were internally consistent and showed small-to-medium associations with COVID-19 knowledge and self-reported behavioral practices, as well as health literacy.

The hypothesis that health literacy was a moderating variable in the relationship between neurocognition and the COVID-19 outcomes was not supported; rather, findings suggest that the effects of health literacy and neurocognition are largely independent of one another. Global cognition and health literacy independently contributed to a significant amount of variance of COVID-19 knowledge. However, health literacy emerged as the only significant driving factor of the other COVID-19 outcomes. While the theoretical importance of health literacy in the COVID-19 pandemic has been discussed (Paakkari & Okan, 2020; Abel & McQueen, in press), this is the first study to investigate its role using well-validated measures. Future studies might examine the role of a broader range of fundamental (e.g., health reading comprehension) and critical (e.g., health-related decision-making) aspects of health literacy in relation to COVID-19 health outcomes. Furthermore, future studies are needed to determine whether

the relationship between health literacy and COVID-19 health knowledge and behaviors (and potential mediators and moderators) are also present among persons of lower socioeconomic status.

These data were gathered at a pivotal time during the early stages of the COVID-19 pandemic during which many governing bodies were recommending guidelines to prevent the spread of COVID-19 that impacted several aspects of day-to-day life for the majority of Americans. Thus, while the present findings provide important insight into predictors of COVID-19 health-related factors at the early stages of the pandemic, it is plausible that these relationships may evolve over time as the dynamics of the pandemic itself change. Another important limitation was that this study was focused on examining the neurocognitive and health literacy aspects of COVID-19 and therefore treated many potentially influential factors as confounds (e.g., personality) and did not assess some other potentially important predictors (e.g., political affiliation, identity). Finally, the assessment of COVID-19 health knowledge and behaviors is rapidly evolving and although the current measures showed adequate psychometric properties for this study, future work on this topic may benefit from the use of standardized, reliable, and ideally performance-based measures that are emerging (e.g., Zhong et al., 2020; Clements, 2020).

Acknowledgments

We thank the study participants for their time and effort.

Funding Statement

This study was supported by start-up funds to the corresponding author from the University of Houston and was conducted as part of the Ph.D. requirements for the lead author (MAB). The research received no specific grant from any funding agency, commercial or not-for-profit sectors.

Conflicts of Interest

None.

References

- Abel, T., & McQueen, D. (in press). Critical health literacy and the COVID-19 crisis. *Health Promotion International*. Retrieved from <https://academic.oup.com/heapro/advance-article/doi/10.1093/heapro/daaa040/5815087>
- Agree, E. M., King, A. C., Castro, C. M., Wiley, A., & Borzekowski, D. L. (2015). "It's got to be on this page": Age and cognitive style in a study of online health information seeking. *Journal of Medical Internet Research*, 17(3), e79.
- Allan, J. L., McMinn, D., & Daly, M. (2016). A bidirectional relationship between executive function and health behavior: evidence, implications, and future directions. *Frontiers in Neuroscience*, 10, 386-392.
- Baggio, S., Iglesias, K., Berchtold, A., & Suris, J. C. (2017). Measuring internet use: comparisons of different assessments and with internet addiction. *Addiction Research & Theory*, 25(2), 114-120.
- Bailey, S. C., Serper, M., Opsasnick, L., Persell, S. D., O'Connor, R., Curtis, L. M., ... & Zheng, P. (2020). Changes in COVID-19 Knowledge, Beliefs, Behaviors, and Preparedness Among High-Risk Adults from the Onset to the Acceleration Phase of the US Outbreak. *Journal of general internal medicine*, 1-8.
- Barati, M., Bashirian, S., Jenabi, E., Khazaei, S., Karimi-Shahanjarini, A., Zareian, S., ... & Moeini, B. (2020). Factors Associated with Preventive Behaviours of COVID-19 among Hospital Staff in Iran in 2020: An Application of the Protection Motivation Theory. *Journal of Hospital Infection*.
- Beaver, J., & Schmitter-Edgecombe, M. (2017). Multiple types of memory and everyday functional assessment in older adults. *Archives of Clinical Neuropsychology*, 32(4), 413-426.
- Bento, A. I., Nguyen, T., Wing, C., Lozano-Rojas, F., Ahn, Y. Y., & Simon, K. (2020). Evidence from internet search data shows information-seeking responses to news of local COVID-19 cases. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 117(21), 11220-11222.
- Berkman, N. D., Davis, T. C., & McCormack, L. (2010). Health literacy: what is it?. *Journal of Health Communication*, 15(S2), 9-19.

- Bogg, T., & Milad, E. (pre-print). Slowing the Spread of COVID-19: Demographic, personality, and social cognition predictors of guideline adherence in a representative US sample.
- Brandt, J., & Benedict, R. H. B. (2001). Hopkins Verbal Learning Test-Revised (HVLRT-R). Psychological Assessment Resources. *Lutz, FL, USA*.
- Byrne, G. J., & Pachana, N. A. (2011). Development and validation of a short form of the Geriatric Anxiety Inventory-the GAI-SF. *International Psychogeriatrics*, 23(1), 125-131.
- Center for Disease Control and Prevention. (2020, May 13). *Coronavirus Disease 2019 (COVID-19): Symptoms of Coronavirus*. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention.
<https://www.cdc.gov/coronavirus/2019-ncov/symptoms-testing/symptoms.html>
- Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. (2020, June 25). *Coronavirus Disease 2019 (COVID-19): People who are at increased risk for severe illness*. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention.
<https://www.cdc.gov/coronavirus/2019-ncov/need-extra-precautions/people-at-increased-risk.html>
- Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. (2020, April 24). *Coronavirus Disease 2019 (COVID-19): How to protect yourself and others*. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention.
<https://www.cdc.gov/coronavirus/2019-ncov/prevent-getting-sick/prevention.html>
- Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. (2020). Timing of state and territorial COVID-19 stay-at-home orders and changes in population movement – United States, March 1 to May 31, 2020, *Morbidity and Mortality Weekly Report*, 62(3).
- Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. (2020, May 22). CDC updates to COVID-19 transmission webpage to clarify information about types of spread.
<https://www.cdc.gov/media/releases/2020/s0522-cdc-updates-covid-transmission.html>
- Chew, L. D., Griffin, J. M., Partin, M. R., Noorbaloochi, S., Grill, J. P., Snyder, A., ... & VanRyn, M. (2008). Validation of screening questions for limited health literacy in a large VA outpatient population. *Journal of general internal medicine*, 23(5), 561-566.

- Chin, J., Madison, A., Gao, X., Graumlich, J. F., Conner-Garcia, T., Murray, M. D. et al. (2017).
Cognition and health literacy in older Adults' recall of self-care information. *Gerontologist*,
57(2), 261–268.
- Chin, J., Morrow, D. G., Stine-Morrow, E. A., Conner-Garcia, T., Graumlich, J. F., & Murray, M. D.
(2011). The process-knowledge model of health literacy: Evidence from a componential analysis
of two commonly used measures. *Journal of Health Communication*, 16(Suppl 3), 222–241.
- Clements, J. M. (2020). Knowledge and Behaviors Toward COVID-19 Among US Residents During the
Early Days of the Pandemic: Cross-Sectional Online Questionnaire. *Journal Medical Internet
Research Public Health and Surveillance*, 6(2), e19161.
- Cuan-Baltazar, J. Y., Muñoz-Perez, M. J., Robledo-Vega, C., Pérez-Zepeda, M. F., & Soto-Vega, E.
(2020). Misinformation of COVID-19 on the internet: infodemiology study. *Journal of Medical
Internet Research Public Health and Surveillance*, 6(2), e18444.
- Delis, D. C., Kaplan, E., & Kramer, J. H. (2001). Delis-Kaplan executive function system.
- Fazeli, P. L., Woods, S. P., Lambert, C. C., Waldrop-Valverde, D., & Vance, D. E. (2020).
Neurocognitive functioning is associated with self-reported and performance-based treatment
management abilities in people living with HIV with low health literacy. *Archives of Clinical
Neuropsychology*, 35(5), 517-527.
- Fagerlin, A., Zikmund-Fisher, B. J., Ubel, P. A., Jankovic, A., Derry, H. A., & Smith, D. M. (2007).
Measuring numeracy without a math test: development of the Subjective Numeracy
Scale. *Medical Decision Making*, 27(5), 672-680.
- Ferguson, N., Laydon, D., Nedjati Gilani, G., Imai, N., Ainslie, K., Baguelin, M., ... & Dighe, A. (2020).
Report 9: Impact of non-pharmaceutical interventions (NPIs) to reduce COVID19 mortality and
healthcare demand. *Imperial College COVID-19 Response Team*. <https://doi.org/10.25561/77482>
- Fisher, J. D., Fisher, W. A., Amico, K. R., & Harman, J. J. (2006). An information-motivation-behavioral
skills model of adherence to antiretroviral therapy. *Health psychology*, 25(4), 462.

- Ford, N. (2004). Towards a model of learning for educational informatics. *Journal of Documentation*, 60(2), 183-225.
- Fox, S., & Rainie, L. (2002). Vital decisions: A Pew Internet health report. *Pew Research Center*.
- Glanz, K., Rimer, B. K., & Viswanath, K. (2008). The scope of health behavior and health education. In Glanz, K., Rimer, B. K., & Viswanath, K (Eds.) *Health behavior and health education: Theory, research, and practice* (pp. 3-18). Jossey-Bass: A Wiley Imprint.
- Hall, M. A., Zheng, B., Dugan, E., Camacho, F., Kidd, K. E., Mishra, A., & Balkrishnan, R. (2002). Measuring patients' trust in their primary care providers. *Medical Care Research and Review*, 59(3), 293-318.
- Hinkin, C. H., Castellon, S. A., Durvasula, R. S., Hardy, D. J., Lam, M. N., Mason, K. I., ... & Stefaniak, M. (2002). Medication adherence among HIV+ adults: effects of cognitive dysfunction and regimen complexity. *Neurology*, 59(12), 1944-1950.
- Jackson, A. D., Kirwan, L., Gibney, S., Jeleniewska, P., Fletcher, G., & Doyle, G. (2020). Associations between health literacy and patient outcomes in adolescents and young adults with cystic fibrosis. *European Journal of Public Health*, 30(1), 112-118.
- Kalichman, S. C., Benotsch, E., Suarez, T., Catz, S., Miller, J., & Rompa, D. (2000). Health literacy and health-related knowledge among persons living with HIV/AIDS. *American journal of preventive medicine*, 18(4), 325-331.
- Kim, M. N., Yoo, Y. S., Hwang, K. H., & Cho, O. H. (2019). The effects of office workers' attitudes to internet health information, e-health literacy on health information seeking behavior and health-related behavioral intention. *Journal of Digital Convergence*, 17(11), 357-367.
- Kliegel, M., Martin, M., McDaniel, M. A., & Einstein, G. O. (2001). Varying the importance of a prospective memory task: Differential effects across time-and event-based prospective memory. *Memory*, 9(1), 1-11.

- Kliegel, M., Eschen, A., & Thöne-Otto, A. I. (2004). Planning and realization of complex intentions in traumatic brain injury and normal aging. *Brain and Cognition*, 56(1), 43-54.
- Kliegel, M., Jager, T., Altgasen, M., & Shum, D. (2008). *Clinical neuropsychology of prospective memory*. In M. Kliegel, M. A. McDaniel, & G. O. Einstein (Eds.), *Prospective memory: Cognitive, neuroscience, developmental, and applied perspectives* (pp. 283–308). Taylor & Francis Group/ Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Li, Y., Hu, L., Shen, Y., Xue, H., Hou, P., & Liu, Y. (2020). Health literacy, social support, and care ability for caregivers of dementia patients: Structural equation modeling. *Geriatric Nursing*.
- Lin, Y. H., Liu, C. H., & Chiu, Y. C. (2020). Google searches for the keywords of “wash hands” predict the speed of national spread of COVID-19 outbreak among 21 countries. *Brain, Behavior, and Immunity*, 87, 30-32.
- Link, B. G., & Phelan, J. (1995). Social conditions as fundamental causes of disease. *Journal of health and social behavior*, 80-94.
- Lipkus, I. M., Samsa, G., & Rimer, B. K. (2001). General performance on a numeracy scale among highly educated samples. *Medical Decision Making*, 21(1), 37-44.
- Matchanova, A., Babicz, M. A., Medina, L. D., Rahman, S., Johnson, B., Thompson, J. L.... Woods, S. P. (2020). *Latent structure of a brief clinical battery of neuropsychological tests administered in-home via telephone*. Manuscript submitted for publication. Retrieved from <https://psyarxiv.com/nf2zw/>.
- Malow, R. M., Dévieux, J. G., Stein, J. A., Rosenberg, R., Lerner, B. G., Attonito, J., & Villalba, K. (2012). Neurological function, information–motivation–behavioral skills factors, and risk behaviors among HIV-positive alcohol users. *AIDS and Behavior*, 16(8), 2297-2308.
- Moorman, C., & Matulich, E. (1993). A model of consumers' preventive health behaviors: The role of health motivation and health ability. *Journal of Consumer Research*, 20(2), 208- 228.

- Morgan, E.E., Watson, C.W.M., Woods, S.P., Gilbert, P.E., Villalobos, J., & Verduzco, M. (2020). *Misattributions of the source of health-related information in HIV disease*. Manuscript submitted for publication.
- Moscovitch, M. (1992). Memory and working-with-memory: A component process model based on modules and central systems. *Journal of Cognitive Neuroscience*, 4(3), 257-267.
- Norman, C. D., & Skinner, H. A. (2006). eHEALS: the eHealth literacy scale. *Journal of Medical Internet Research*, 8(4), e27.
- Paakkari, L., & Okan, O. (2020). COVID-19: Health literacy is an underestimated problem. *The Lancet Public Health*, 5(5), e249-e250.
- Park, D. C., & Liu, L. L. (2007). *Medical adherence and aging: Social and cognitive perspectives* (pp. x-311). American Psychological Association.
- Park, C. L., Russell, B. S., Fendrich, M., Finkelstein-Fox, L., Hutchison, M., & Becker, J. (2020). Americans' COVID-19 Stress, Coping, and Adherence to CDC Guidelines. *Journal of General Internal Medicine*, 35(8), 2296-2303.
- Peebles, L. (2020). US doctors and hospitals offer a new treatment: voter registration. *bmj*, 371.
- Piatt, A. L., Fields, J. A., Paolo, A. M., & Tröster, A. I. (1999). Action (verb naming) fluency as an executive function measure: convergent and divergent evidence of validity. *Neuropsychologia*, 37(13), 1499-1503.
- Poppenk, J., Moscovitch, M., McIntosh, A. R., Ozcelik, E., & Craik, F. I. M. (2010). Encoding the future: Successful processing of intentions engages predictive brain networks. *Neuroimage*, 49(1), 905-913.
- Rendell, P. G., & Thomson, D. M. (1999). Aging and prospective memory: Differences between naturalistic and laboratory tasks. *The Journals of Gerontology Series B: Psychological Sciences and Social Sciences*, 54(4), P256-P269.
- Ricker, J. H., & Axelrod, B. N. (1994). Analysis of an oral paradigm for the Trail Making Test. *Assessment*, 1(1), 47-51.

- Roediger III, H. L., & Karpicke, J. D. (2006). Test-enhanced learning: Taking memory tests improves long-term retention. *Psychological science*, 17(3), 249-255.
- Ross, J. M., Duperrouzel, J., Vega, M., & Gonzalez, R. (2016). The neuropsychology of risky sexual behavior. *Journal of the International Neuropsychological society*, 22(6), 586-594.
- Skierkowski, D. D., Florin, P., Harlow, L. L., Machan, J., & Ye, Y. (2019). A readability analysis of online mental health resources. *American Psychologist*, 74(4), 474.
- Small, G. W., Moody, T. D., Siddarth, P., & Bookheimer, S. Y. (2009). Your brain on Google: patterns of cerebral activation during internet searching. *The American Journal of Geriatric Psychiatry*, 17(2), 116-126.
- Soto, C. J., & John, O. P. (2017). Short and extra-short forms of the Big Five Inventory–2: The BFI-2-S and BFI-2-XS. *Journal of Research in Personality*, 68, 69-81.
- Sullivan, K. L., Babicz, M. A., & Woods, S. P. (in press). Verbal learning mediates the relationship between executive functions and a laboratory task of medication management in HIV disease. *Archives of Clinical Neuropsychology*. Retrieved from <https://academic.oup.com/acn/advance-article/doi/10.1093/arclin/aaaa082/5917384>
- Waldrop-Valverde, D., Jones, D. L., Gould, F., Kumar, M., & Ownby, R. L. (2010). Neurocognition, health-related reading literacy, and numeracy in medication management for HIV infection. *AIDS Patient Care and STDs*, 24(8), 477-484.
- Wechsler, D. (2008). Wechsler adult intelligence scale–Fourth Edition (WAIS–IV). *San Antonio, TX: NCS Pearson*, 22(498), 1.
- Winker, M. A., Flanagan, A., Chi-Lum, B., White, J., Andrews, K., Kennett, R. L., ... & Musacchio, R. A. (2000). Guidelines for medical and health information sites on the internet: principles governing AMA web sites. *JAMA*, 283(12), 1600-1606.
- Wolf, M. S., Serper, M., Opsasnick, L., O'Connor, R. M., Curtis, L. M., Benavente, J. Y., ... & Russell, A. (in press). Awareness, attitudes, and actions related to COVID-19 among adults with chronic

conditions at the onset of the US outbreak: a cross-sectional survey. *Annals of Internal Medicine*.

Retrieved from <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC7151355/>

Woods, S. P., Fazeli, P. L., Matchanova, A., Vance, D. E., Medina, L. D., & Morgan, E. E. (2020).

Dementia knowledge is low in adults with HIV disease. *International Psychogeriatrics*, 32(3), 415-416.

Woods, S. P., Kordovski, V. M., Tierney, S. M., & Babicz, M. A. (2019). The neuropsychological aspects

of performance-based Internet navigation skills: A brief review of an emerging literature. *The Clinical Neuropsychologist*, 33(2), 305-326.

Woods, S. P., & Sullivan, K. L. (2019). Lower neurocognitive functioning disrupts the effective use of

internet-based health resources in HIV disease: The mediating effects of general health literacy capacity. *AIDS and Behavior*, 23(3), 676-683.

Wykes, T. L., Lee, A. A., Bourassa, K., Kitchen, K. A., & McKibbin, C. L. (2017). Diabetes

knowledge among adults with serious mental illness and comorbid diabetes mellitus. *Archives of psychiatric nursing*, 31(2), 190-196.

Xie, W., Campbell, S., & Zhang, W. (2020). Working memory capacity predicts individual

differences in social distancing compliance during the COVID-19 pandemic in the US. *PNAS*, 30, 17667-17674.

Zhong, B. L., Luo, W., Li, H. M., Zhang, Q. Q., Liu, X. G., Li, W. T., & Li, Y. (2020). Knowledge,

attitudes, and practices towards COVID-19 among Chinese residents during the rapid rise period of the COVID-19 outbreak: a quick online cross-sectional survey. *International journal of biological sciences*, 16(10), 1745.

Figure 1. Study flow diagram.

Table 1Descriptive data on the sociodemographic and clinical characteristics of the study sample ($N=217$)

Variables ($N = 217$)	Mean (SD) or %	Sample Range
Sociodemographics		
Sex (% women)	74.7	
Age (years)	35.1 (14.7)	18-77
Race/Ethnicity (%)*		
Asian	12.4	
Black	15.7	
Hispanic	9.7	
White	60.8	
Other	9.2	
Education (%)		
High school or equivalent	13.8	
Community college/vocational school	12.4	
Four-year college/university degree	43.8	
Professional/graduate degree	30.0	
WAIS-IV Information (scaled)	11.5 (3.1)	5-19
Number of medical conditions	0.0 (0.0)	0-3
Frequency of internet use⁺ (of 63)	53.9 (14.0)	0-63
Tested for COVID-19 (%)	5.1	
COVID-19 internet frequency (of 4)	3.4 (0.7)	1-4
COVID-19-related anxiety (of 5)	3.7 (1.0)	0-5
COVID-19 pandemic time elapsed (days)	122.4 (7.4)	109-137
GAI-SF (of 5)	2.2 (1.8)	0-5
Big Five Personality Domains⁺⁺		
Extraversion (of 15)	10.2 (2.3)	5-15
Agreeableness (of 15)	11.4 (1.8)	6-15
Conscientiousness (of 15)	11.3 (2.2)	6-15
Negative emotionality (of 15)	7.7 (2.3)	3-14
Open-Mindedness (of 15)	11.6 (1.8)	6-15
Wake Forest Physician Trust Scale⁺⁺ (of 50)	38.6 (6.2)	17-50

Note. ⁺ $N = 216$; ⁺⁺ $N = 203$; GAI-SF = Geriatric Anxiety Inventory – Short Form

Table 2Descriptive data for the primary study outcomes ($N=217$)

Variables ($N = 217$)	Mean (SD) or %	Sample Range
Neurocognition		
Global T-score	53.7 (5.2)	42-71
Global impairment (1 SD; %)	15.7	
Health literacy⁺		
Health motivation (of 40)	32.2 (4.3)	16-40
Expanded numeracy scale (of 7)	5.5 (1.5)	0-7
Subjective numeracy scale (of 40)	30.1 (4.4)	18-40
3-Brief (of 15)	13.9 (1.5)	5-15
eHEALS (of 40)	33.4 (4.4)	14-40
COVID-19 health		
Information-seeking (of 16)	7.8 (3.7)	0-16
Symptom knowledge accuracy	6.7 (1.9)	2-13
False positives	0.5 (0.9)	0-5
Preventative knowledge accuracy	7.5 (1.7)	4-12
False positives	0.4 (0.8)	0-4
General knowledge (d')	2.5 (0.9)	0.2-4.4
Preventative intentions (of 40)	35.5 (3.2)	21-40
Preventative behaviors (of 40)	34.2 (4.5)	20-40
Health plan quality (of 5)	1.8 (1.2)	1-5

Note. eHEALS = electronic health literacy scale; 3-Brief = Brief Health Literacy Screening Tool;
 COVID-19 = coronavirus disease 2019

Table 3.

Correlations between the primary predictors and outcome variables

	1	2	3	4	5
1. Neurocognition	—	—	—	—	—
2. Health literacy	.26	—	—	—	—
3. COVID-19 information-seeking	-.05	.26	—	—	—
4. COVID-19 knowledge	.31	.32	.11	—	—
5. COVID-19 preventative intentions	.03	.41	.14	.23	—
6. COVID-19 preventative behaviors	-.17	.15	.26	.03	.41

Note: Table values are Spearman's rho correlation coefficients. **Bold** indicates $p < .013$. COVID-19 = coronavirus disease 2019

Table 4.

Stepwise regression results for neurocognition, health literacy, and data-driven covariates predicting COVID-19 health information ($N = 217$).

	Model 1			Model 2			Model 3		
Outcome: COVID-19 Info-Seeking									
Variable	<i>b</i>	SE <i>b</i>	β	<i>b</i>	SE <i>b</i>	β	<i>b</i>	SE <i>b</i>	β
WAIS-IV Info	0.13	.05	.17	.09	.06	.11	0.09	.06	.12
Global Neurocognition				-1.19	.68	-.13	-1.29	0.70	-.14
Health Literacy				0.96	.27	.26	0.95	.28	.25
Global Neurocognition x HL							-0.39	.60	-.05
adjusted <i>R</i> ²	.02			.06			.07		
<i>F</i> for change in <i>R</i> ²	6.38			6.70			0.43		
Outcome: COVID-19 Knowledge									
WAIS-IV Info	0.04	.01	.18	0.01	.02	.03	0.01	.02	.04
Education	0.11	0.04	0.22	0.07	.04	.13	0.07	.04	.13
Global Neurocognition				0.51	.18	.20	0.59	.18	.24
Health Literacy				0.18	.07	.18	0.21	.07	.21
Global Neurocognition x HL							0.33	.15	.14
adjusted <i>R</i> ²	.09			.15			.16		
<i>F</i> for change in <i>R</i> ²	11.96			8.07			4.66		
Outcome: COVID-19 Intentions									
Global Neurocognition	-0.60	.52	-.08	-0.55	.54	-.07			
Health Literacy	1.30	.21	.41	1.31	.21	.41			
Global Neurocognition x HL				0.19	.50	.03			
adjusted <i>R</i> ²	.15			.14					
<i>F</i> for change in <i>R</i> ²	18.36			0.15					
Outcome: COVID-19 Behaviors									
WAIS-IV Info	-0.15	.06	-.17	-0.21	.07	-.23	-0.21	.07	-.23
Global Neurocognition				-1.36	.82	-.12	-1.29	.84	-.11
Health Literacy				1.19	.33	.27	1.21	.33	.27
Global Neurocognition x HL							0.29	.72	.03
adjusted <i>R</i> ²	.02			.08			.08		
<i>F</i> for change in <i>R</i> ²	6.38			7.27			0.17		

Note: **bold** < .013; COVID = coronavirus disease 2019; WAIS-IV Info = Wechsler Adult Intelligence Scale – fourth edition Information subtest; HL = health literacy

SUPPLEMENTARY TABLES

Supplementary Table 1.

Results from the principal components analysis of the COVID-19 knowledge measures ($N=217$).

COVID-19 knowledge measure	Factor Loading	Intercorrelations			
		COVID Prev	COVID Symp	COVID Symp FP	COVID Recog
Preventative knowledge accuracy	.47	—	—	—	—
Symptom knowledge accuracy	.74	.19	—	—	—
Symptom knowledge false positives	.43	.06	.00	—	—
General knowledge (d')	.48	-.02	.23	.05	—
Health plan quality	.49	.05	.15	.13	.01

Note: Intercorrelations are Spearman's rho values. **Bold** indicates $p < .013$. COVID Prev = COVID-19 preventative knowledge accuracy; COVID Symp = COVID-19 symptom knowledge accuracy; COVID Symp FP = COVID-19 symptom knowledge false positive; COVID Recog = COVID-19 general knowledge (d')

Supplementary Table 2.

Results from the principal components analysis of the general health literacy measures ($N=217$).

General health literacy measure	Factor Loading	Intercorrelations			
		eHEALS Total	SNS Total	ENS Total	3Brief Total
eHEALS Total	.68	—	—	—	—
Subjective Numeracy Scale Total	.67	.26	—	—	—
Expanded Numeracy Scale Total	.63	.17	.39	—	—
3Brief Total	.57	.37	.21	.21	—
Health Motivation Total	.44	.35	.05	.01	.18

Note: eHEALS = electronic health literacy scale; SNS = Subjective Numeracy Scale; ENS = Expanded Numeracy Scale; 3Brief = Brief Health Literacy Screening Tool. Intercorrelations are Spearman's rho values. **Bold** indicates $p < .013$