Conference Paper

Risk Perception of Covid 19

Indah Yasminum Suhanti[1], Rakhmaditya Dewi Noorrizki[1], and Kukuh Setyo Pambudi[2]

[1]Psychology, Universitas Negeri Malang, Malang, Indonesia
[2]Damai dan Resolusi Konflik, Universitas Pertahanan, Bogor, Indonesia

Abstract

The purpose of this study was to describe risk perception of Covid 19 in Indonesia. The research was conducted using a survey method with a descriptive quantitative approach. The questionnaire was structured using established theories of risk perception. Questionnaires were compiled on the google form application and distributed via WA. There were 508 participants. The results showed that the participants' risk perception to Covid 19 was moderate. Most participants were aged between 17 - 32 years, young adults. Participants generally view the government as a trusted source of information about Covid 19. However, further research it is necessary to deepen the role of the government in the perception of the risk of Covid 19 in young adulthood.

Corresponding Author:

Indah Yasminum Suhanti

indah.yasminum.fppsi@um.ac.id

OPEN ACCESS

1. Introduction

Perceived risk can be interpreted as a point of view, an individual's assessment of the risk related to one thing or incident. Risk has defined a danger, the possibility of getting bad consequences (Adams & Smith, 2001). Risk is identified as having 16 things related to knowledge, exposure, choice, consequences, and the probability of death (Ammouri & Neuberger, 2008). Perception leads to how individuals see the world. Perception is influenced by belief, attitude, cultural sensitivity, and personal attributes. Perceived risk has three dimensions that are derived from the researcher's study on these fields are (Slovic et al., 1981), (Adams & Smith, 2001) and (Brewer et al., 2007). The three dimensions are Severity (the possibility of spreading the danger of the disease or spread of disease), Controllability (the possibility of someone susceptible to being exposed to dangers from disease or exposure to disease), and Timing (The possibility of when someone will be exposed to the disease or danger from disease). Perceptions of risk in disease are related to the Health Belief Model theory, Motivation Theory Protection, Self Regulation, and Theory of Planned Behavior (Brewer et al., 2007).

In this study, the risk perception focused on Covid 19. Covid 19 is disease respiration that appeared at the end of 2019. The spread of Covid 19, early 2020 until now, so fast and caused many deaths in various countries, including Indonesia. Researcher's observations and news presented by the mass media show the public many Indonesian still do not practice healthy preventive behavior for Covid 19. One example of so many unhealthy behaviors that occurs in Indonesian people so the police gave them punishment (Media, 2017). At the same time, Satgas Covid 19 Indonesia reported an increase in cases of infection and cases of death due to Covid 19 continues to increase. Preventive healthy behavior is related to risk perception (Dryhurst et al., 2020). Perceived risk is an important determinant for individual awareness in performing healthy behavior preventive (Rudisill, 2013), in this case using a mask, washing hands, and keeping a distance. Therefore, it is important to see a picture of the risk perception of Covid 19 in Indonesia. Research on risk perceptions can provide input to policymakers to make a disease prevention program that is appropriate and suitable to the community (Poortinga et al., 2004).

2. Method

2.1. Research design

The research design was a survey with a quantitative descriptive approach. The survey was conducted using the google form application. The measuring tool is disseminated via Whatsapp.

2.2. Participants

Participants were found incidentally. In this study, participants were asked to fill voluntary, not rewarded. 508 participants filled out the questionnaire for four days, from the 19th March to March 23, 2020.

2.3. Participant Profiles

Participants ranged in age from 17 years to 60 years. Participants consisted of 348 people women and 160 men. The educational level of undergraduate education participants was 326 participants, 81 participants for a bachelor's degree, 12 participants in doctoral degrees, and 89 participants in high school education. 44 participants work

as an entrepreneur, 97 participants work as PNS / POLRI / TNI 97, 14 participants as daily workers, 29 participants as part-time workers, 250 participants unemployment, and 73 participants work as private employees. Income owned more participants under 2 million per month as much as 57.1% then followed by 2 million to 7 million as much as 33.3% and 7 million and above as much as 9.6%. Participants who have congenital diseases and have long suffered (respiratory, typhus, digestion, cancer) as much as 15.2% and who do not have a comorbid disease, as much as 84, 8%. Participants who live in areas with a high Covid 19 spread as much as 44.9% and those who live in areas with a low number of Covid 19 spreads 55.1%.

2.4. Instrument

The instrument used was the risk perception scale of Covid 19. This scale was developed based on the risk perception scale Ammouri & Neuberger (2008). This measuring instrument contains 18 statements and also has four ranges of choice, namely 1 (strongly disagree), 2 (disagree), 3 (agree), and 4 (strongly agree.). This scale has internal consistency in the range 0.284 - 0.579 (2-tailed, alpha

Cronbach).

2.5. Data analysis

Statistical calculations were performed using SPSS 23 software for the operating system Windows. The analysis technique used is descriptive statistics.

3. Result

Covid 19 was perceived as moderate risk by 42.7% of the participants, as risk by 26.3% of participants, and highly risk by 7.3% of participants. Then, Covid 19 is perceived as not at risk by 19.40% and not risk at all 4.3% of participants.

Another result that emerges is that the government remains the main source and can be trusted by research participants. The government gets a percentage of 71.9%. Then followed by other sources

from social media as much as 14.8%. Another additional result was that the most information about Covid 19 was obtained by participants through social media (WA, FB, Twitter, IG) with a percentage of 95.7%, followed by television as much as 70.9% and print media as much as 34.4%.

4. Discussion

In this study, the most prominent thing was the participants. Participants who took part in this study

almost all are in early adulthood. The age of the participants was mostly seen in the range of 18-25 years (53.5%), followed by the 26-32 years age range (25%). The two age ranges are frequently examined on the side of reflective assessment, moral development, and the development of cognitive structures. In the context of risk perception, reflective assessment and the development of cognitive structures is very important urgent. Reflective assessment and development of cognitive structures in early adulthood are emphasized on pooling knowledge through the evaluation of the experiences of oneself and others, according to reality (Fischer & Pruyne, 2003). The evaluation process is carried out not only based on valid data, also based on other things that cause data to appear (such as coherence, conformity to reality, parsimony). In this case, information about Covid 19, very many and varied (most data sources about Covid 19 were accessed through the media social).

Thus, the evaluation process becomes very complex involving a process of coherence and conformity with reality between official government reports and events in the field, own experience (the scope of living in areas with low Covid 19 is also high and on In general respondents do not have congenital diseases) and other people (Dryhurst et al., 2020). This matter making knowledge about Covid 19 that was formed not comprehensive. Knowledge of the risk is on two obscure sides. The results of the percentage of research also showed a response moderate risk perception occupying the highest position.

Another thing that is also interesting to see is that the participants still really believe in the information

given by the government. This is quite interesting because it is between the evaluation process and the source very diverse, they end up having one figure to be considered in making the decision. This shows a role model or figure who represents the country and has value nationalism is still a predictor of risk perception towards Covid 19 (Woods et al., 2020).

5. Conclusions and Recommendations

The risk perception of Covid 19 is still in a somewhat risky state. Society, especially age young adults, still cannot make a definitive assessment about Covid 19. This is because

the diversity of information obtained and a difficult thought evaluation process led to the results definitely about the risk of Covid 19.

There are two suggestions be given for practical purposes and further research. To practical field is directed to the government. The government in this case remains the source of information that is trusted by the public, especially young adults. The government must have a special strategy in providing information related to Covid 19 so that the evaluation process information can run coherently and suitable with real community experience, especially for young adults. Suggestions for future research are to focus participants on young adults because they are unique in perceiving the risk of Covid 19. Also, young adults are the most productive age in Indonesia, so it is necessary to get the most attention in talking about physical and mental health. The theme for further research can be focused to see how government contributes to this perception of the risk of Covid 19 for young adults.

References

[1] Adams, A. M. and Smith, A. F. (2001). Risk Perception and Communication: Recent Developments and Implications for Anaesthesia. *Anaesthesia*, vol. 56, issue 8, pp. 745–755, https://doi.org/10.1046/j.1365-2044.2001.02135.x.

[2] Ammouri, A. A. and Neuberger, G. (2008). The Perception of Risk of Heart Disease Scale: Development and Psychometric Analysis. *Journal of Nursing Measurement*, vol. 16, issue 2, pp. 83–97, https://doi.org/10.1891/1061-3749.16.2.83.

[3] Brewer, N. T., *et al*. (2007). Meta-Analysis of the Relationship between Risk Perception and Health Behavior: The Example of Vaccination. *Health Psychology*, vol. 26, issue 2, pp. 136–145, https://doi.org/10.1037/0278-6133.26.2.136.

[4] Dryhurst, S., *et al*. (2020). Risk Perceptions of COVID-19 around the World. *Journal of Risk Research*, vol. 0, issue 0, pp. 1–13, https://doi.org/10.1080/13669877.2020.1758193.

[5] Fischer, K. W. and Pruyne, E. (2003). Reflective Thinking in Adulthood: Emergence, Development, and Variation. In *Handbook of Adult Development*. Kluwer Academic, pp. 169–198.

[6] *Komaps.com*. (2017). Retrieved from https://regional.kompas.com/read/2017/09/27/13523461/300-kg-sampah-popok-bayi-diangkat-dari-sungai-brantas.

[7] Poortinga, W., *et al*. (2004). The British 2001 Foot and Mouth Crisis: A Comparative Study of Public Risk Perceptions, Trust and Beliefs about Government Policy in Two

Communities. *Journal of Risk Research*, vol. 7, issue 1, pp. 73–90, https://doi.org/10.1080/1366987042000151205.

[8] Rudisill, C. (2013). How do we Handle New Health Risks? Risk Perception, Optimism, and Behaviors regarding the H1N1 virus. *Journal of Risk Research*, vol. 16, issue 8, pp. 959–980, https://doi.org/10.1080/13669877.2012.761271.

[9] Slovic, P., Fischoff, B. and Lichtenstein, S. (1981). Perceived Risk: Psychological Factors and Social Implications. *Proceedings of the Royal Society of London. A. Mathematical and Physical Sciences*, vol. 376, issue 1764, pp. 17–34, https://doi.org/10.1098/rspa.1981.0073.

[10] Woods, E. T., *et al.* (2020). COVID-19, Nationalism, and the Politics of Crisis: A Scholarly Exchange. *Nations and Nationalism*, https://doi.org/10.1111/nana.12644.