

Supplement A: Resilience among Older Individuals in the Face of Adversity: How Demographic and Trait Factors Impact Mental Health Constructs and their Temporal Dynamics

*Lotte. P. Brinkhof, E-mail: l.p.brinkhof@uva.nl, Address: Nieuwe Achtergracht 129, 1001 NK Amsterdam, Netherlands.

Table SA1. Overview sample sizes for each separate wave

Wave	T1	T2	T3	T4	T5	Total
Start data collection (2020)	23 rd April	13 th May	27 th May	10 th June	24 th June	
End data collection (2020)	5 th May	18 th May	2 nd June	16 th June	30 th June	
Failed attention check (<i>n</i>) ¹	519	118	41	24	8	710
<i>N</i> (including missing values)	6219	4953	3754	2822	2449	
<i>n</i> (%) dropout		1266 (20.4%)	1199 (24.2%)	932 (24.8%)	373 (11.4%)	3770 (60.6%)
<i>n</i> (%) with missing value for highest completed education ²					15 (0.6%)	
Valid <i>N</i>					2,434	
<i>N</i> Older adults					1270	

Note. Reprinted [adapted] from “Temporal dynamics of compliance and well-being during pandemics: a longitudinal COVID-19 study” by Chambon, M., Dalege, J., Borsboom, D., Waldorp, L., van der Maas, H., & van Harreveld, F, 2021, <https://doi.org/10.31234/osf.io/m2spb>”

¹ Two attention checks were included in each wave to ensure data quality. Failing both attention checks led to exclusion from further data collection and analysis in all subsequent waves.

Note that the *n* failed attention checks reported at T1 (*n* = 519) is not included in the total number of participants with failed attention checks, because these participants were

immediately excluded from the survey and therefore not included in the N (including missing values) = 6219 at T1.

² The answer option 'I prefer not to answer' was included in items on education, and was treated as missing value.

Control analysis

The study protocol incorporated two interventions (at both T3 and T5) targeting *social norms* (towards compliance with behavioural COVID-19 measures; T3), *trust* (in actors that were crucial in the COVID-19 pandemic in the Netherlands; T3), *support* (for the behavioural measures aimed at preventing the spread of the coronavirus; T5) or the expected severity of *economic consequences* (T5). Although these interventions were not designed to specifically enhance our (outcome) variables of interest, we performed some control analyses to check for possible impacts this additional manipulation may have had. Multiple Pearson's Chi-Squared Tests for homogeneity revealed that the categorical predictors of interest did not show any significant differences in their distributions between the intervention groups (all p 's > .05), indicative of a homogenous sample. This was also the case for the continuous predictors (i.e., BRS and PAS), as determined with two separate Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) tests (p 's > .05). Subsequent analyses (i.e., multiple (repeated measures) ANOVAs) confirmed that there were no differences in mental well-being, depression, and anxiety levels between the intervention groups before and after the onset of the interventions (see Table SA2). For the loneliness scores, there appeared to be a small intervention effect ($p = .046$), with participants from the control group ($M = 2.29$, $SD = 0.79$) displaying higher average loneliness scores after the intervention than those from the two interventions group designed to hence *social norms* ($M = 2.10$, $SD = 0.68$, $p < .001$) and *trust* ($M = 2.18$, $SD = 0.75$, $p = .023$). However, these differences were also found before the onset of the interventions, although only marginally significant (main effect: $p = .076$) and solely *social norms* surviving Bonferroni correction ($p = .001$). This suggests that differences observed from T3 to T5, may have become more pronounced throughout the pandemic, simply because of the lapse of time, rather than the intervention itself.

Table SA2. Control checks for the interventions

	Intervention T3 (I3)	Intervention T5 (I5)
<i>Before intervention</i>		
Mental well-being	$F(4,1265) = 0.74, p = .568$	$F(4,1265) = 1.17, p = .323$
Depression	$F(4,1265) = 1.30, p = .269$	$F(4,1265) = 1.77, p = .133$
Anxiety	$F(4,1265) = 1.84, p = .119$	$F(4,1265) = 1.49, p = .203$
Loneliness	$F(4,1265) = 2.12, p = .076$	$F(4,1265) = 1.21, p = .303$
<i>After intervention</i>		
Mental well-being	$F(4,1265) = 1.52, p = .193$	$F(4,1265) = 1.41, p = .228$
Depression	$F(4,1265) = 1.82, p = .123$	$F(4,1265) = 1.35, p = .251$
Anxiety	$F(4,1265) = 1.47, p = .208$	$F(4,1265) = 1.79, p = .129$
Loneliness	$F(4,1265) = 2.42, p = .046$	$F(4,1265) = 1.30, p = .269$

Note. Data from all preceding time points (I3: T1-T; I5: T1-T5) are included in the before intervention analyses. For the after intervention analyses, data from the corresponding time point and those after that are included (I3: T3 – T5; I5: T5)