



3

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION
TO CHAPTER 3:

Individual Transilience
in the face of the
COVID-19 Pandemic

Table S1. Demographic characteristics of the sample in Study 1

Characteristic	n	%
Gender		
Woman	87	67.44
Man	38	29.46
Other	0	0.00
Missing	4	3.10
Highest educational level		
Middle school	5	3.88
High school	42	32.56
University	66	51.16
Doctorate	3	2.33
Other	9	6.98
Missing	4	3.10
Monthly Income		
Less than €1000	10	7.75
€1000-2000	44	34.11
€2000-3000	27	20.93
€3000-4000	18	13.95
€4000-5000	8	6.20
More than €5000	5	3.88
Prefer not to say	11	8.53
Missing	6	4.65
Area of Residence		
North of Italy	112	86.82
Centre of Italy	11	8.53
South of Italy	1	0.78
Sicily or Sardinia	1	0.78
Missing	4	3.10
Total	129	100

Table S2. Demographic characteristics of the samples in Study 2

Characteristic	T1		T2		Merged	
	n	%	n	%	n	%
Gender						
Woman	226	51.95	176	53.01	170	52.96
Man	203	46.67	154	46.39	150	46.73
Other	2	0.46	1	0.3	1	0.31
Missing	4	0.92	1	0.3	0	0.00
Highest educational level						
Primary	5	1.15	4	1.2	4	1.25
Low vocational	37	8.51	29	8.73	28	8.72
Secondary	173	39.77	137	41.27	134	41.74
Higher vocational	170	39.08	127	38.25	123	38.32
University	42	9.66	31	9.34	29	9.03
Other	4	0.92	3	0.9	3	0.93
Missing	4	0.92	1	0.3	0	0.00
Monthly Income						
Less than €1000	30	6.9	19	5.72	19	5.92
€1000-2000	99	22.76	77	23.19	74	23.05
€2000-3000	98	22.53	76	22.89	74	23.05
€3000-4000	62	14.25	51	15.36	49	15.26
€4000-5000	37	8.51	29	8.73	29	9.03
More than €5000	12	2.76	13	3.92	10	3.12
Prefer not to say	93	21.38	66	19.88	66	20.56
Missing	4	0.92	1	0.3	0	0.00
Province of Residence						
Groningen	14	3.22	10	3.01	10	3.12
Friesland	19	4.37	15	4.52	15	4.67
Drenthe	16	3.68	13	3.92	13	4.05
Overijssel	22	5.06	17	5.12	16	4.98
Flevoland	18	4.14	19	5.72	18	5.61
Gelderland	41	9.43	35	10.54	34	10.59
Utrecht	43	9.89	28	8.43	28	8.72
Noord-Holland	78	17.93	56	16.87	53	16.51
Zuid-Holland	79	18.16	65	19.58	63	19.63
Zeeland	15	3.45	9	2.71	9	2.8
Noord-Brabant	57	13.1	40	12.05	40	12.46
Limburg	29	6.67	24	7.23	22	6.85
Missing	4	0.92	1	0.3	0	0.00
Total	435	100	332	100	321	100

Results using the 6-items version of the transilience scale

Table S3. Descriptives and Reliability of the Short Transilience Scale; and Bivariate Correlations with Relevant Outcome Variables in Study 1 and at Both Time Points of Study 2 (Cross-Sectional Analyses)

Variable	Study 1 (n = 129)	Study 2, T1 (n = 435)	Study 2, T2 (n = 332)
Transilience (6-items)	M = 5.26; SD = 1.05 α = .84; ω _t = .90	M = 5.00, SD = 0.99 α = .84; ω _t = .90	M = 5.32, SD = 0.97 α = .86; ω _t = .94
Individual adaptation behaviours	-.01	.32***	.42***
Collective adaptation behaviours	.18*	.42***	.46***
Cognitive coping	.11		.43***
Positive personal change	.47***		.47***
Well-being	.16	.32***	.25***
CC adaptive capacity	.29***		.25***
CC adaptation intentions	.08		.26***
Disengagement	.00		-.11*

Note. M = mean; SD = standard deviation; α = Cronbach's alpha; ω_t = McDonald's omega; CC = climate change
*p < .05; **p < .01; ***p < .001

Table S4. Descriptives, Reliability of the Short Transilience Scale; and Bivariate with Relevant Outcome Variables in the Merged Dataset of Study 2 (n = 321)

Variable	Transilience T1	Transilience T2
	M = 5.26; SD = 1.05; α = .84; ω _t = .90	M = 5.00, SD = 0.99, α = .84; ω _t = .90
1. Transilience T1 (6-items)		.48***
2. Individual adaptation behaviours T1	.33***	.32***
3. Collective adaptation behaviours T1	.42***	.29***
4. Well-being T1	.31***	.21***
5. Transilience T2 (6-items)		.48***
6. Individual adaptation behaviours T2	.26***	.40***
7. Collective adaptation behaviours T2	.40***	.45***
8. Well-being T2	.34***	.42***
9. Cognitive coping T2	.29***	.46***
10. Positive personal change T2	.19***	.23***
11. CC adaptive capacity T2	.12*	.25***
12. CC adaptation intentions T2	.15**	.25***
13. Disengagement T2	-.06	-.11

Note. M = mean; SD = standard deviation; α = Cronbach's alpha; ω_t = McDonald's omega; CC = climate change
*p < .05; **p < .01; ***p < .001

Table S5. Results of the Mixed Model Analyses Conducted to Test the Effect of the Short Transilience Scale on Adaptation Behaviours and Well-Being across Time Points

Predictor	Individual adaptation behaviours			Collective adaptation behaviours			Well-being		
	b(SE)	95% CI for b	p	b(SE)	95% CI for b	p	b(SE)	95% CI for b	p
Intercept	5.43 (.04)	5.35; 5.51	<.001	4.99 (.05)	4.90; 5.08	<.001	5.59 (.06)	5.46; 5.71	<.001
Time	0.90 (.04)	0.82; 0.98	<.001	0.60 (.06)	0.49; 0.72	<.001	-0.16 (.05)	-0.26; -0.05	.003
Transilience	0.23 (.03)	0.17; 0.29	<.001	0.41 (.04)	0.33; 0.49	<.001	0.24 (.04)	0.16; 0.33	<.001
Transilience x time	-0.06 (.05)	-0.16; 0.03	.184	0.01 (.07)	-0.12; 0.14	.905	-0.09 (.06)	-0.21; 0.03	.142

Table S6. Results of the Mixed Models Analyses Conducted to Test the Effect of Short Transilience Scale at T1 on Adaptive Behaviours and Well-Being across Time Points

Predictor	Individual adaptation behaviours			Collective adaptation behaviours			Well-being		
	b(SE)	95% CI for b	p	b(SE)	95% CI for b	p	b(SE)	95% CI for b	p
Intercept	4.94 (.05)	4.85; 5.03	<.001	4.63 (.06)	4.52; 4.74	<.001	5.63 (.07)	5.49; 5.76	<.001
Time	0.97 (.04)	0.88; 1.05	<.001	0.72 (.06)	0.60; 0.84	<.001	-0.09 (.05)	-0.19; 0.01	.088
Transilience_t1	0.32 (.05)	0.23; 0.40	<.001	0.48 (.06)	0.38; 0.59	<.001	0.39 (.07)	0.26; 0.52	<.001
Transilience_t1 x time	-0.13 (.04)	-0.21; -0.05	.002	-0.09 (.06)	-0.21; 0.03	.133	-0.15 (.05)	-0.26; -0.05	.003

Note. simple slope analyses showed that T1 transilience (6-items) was positively and significantly related to individual adaptation behaviours (T2: b(SE) = .49(.05); t = 4.11, p < .001) and well-being (T2: b(SE) = .23(.07); t = 3.44, p < .001) at T2.