

1 **Measuring Italian Citizens' Engagement in the First Wave of the COVID-19 Pandemic**

2 **Containment Measures: A Cross-sectional Study**

3  
4 **Guendalina Graffigna<sup>1,2,3</sup>, Serena Barello<sup>1,2</sup>, Mariarosaria Savarese<sup>1,3</sup>, Lorenzo Palamenghi<sup>1,3</sup>,**  
5 **Greta Castellini<sup>1,3</sup>, Andrea Bonanomi<sup>4</sup>, Edoardo Lozza<sup>2</sup>**

6  
7  
8 1. EngageMinds HUB – Consumer, Food & Health Engagement Research Center, Università  
9 Cattolica del Sacro Cuore, Milan, Italy

10 2. Department of Psychology, Università Cattolica del Sacro Cuore, Milan, Italy

11 3. Faculty of Agricultural, Nutrition and Environmental Sciences, Università Cattolica del Sacro  
12 Cuore, Milan, Italy

13 4. Department of Statistical Science, Università Cattolica del Sacro Cuore, Milan, Italy

14  
15  
16  
17 **Corresponding author:**

18 Serena Barello

19 EngageMinds HUB – Consumer, Food & Health Engagement Research Center

20 Università Cattolica del Sacro Cuore, Milan, Italy

21 L.go Gemelli 1, 20142 Milano (Italy)

22 e-mail: [serena.barello@unicatt.it](mailto:serena.barello@unicatt.it)

25 **Abstract**

26 **Background:** In January 2020, the coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19) started to spread in  
27 Italy. The Italian government adopted urgent measures to hold its spread. Enforcing compliance to  
28 such measures is crucial in order to enhance their effectiveness. Engaging citizens in the COVID-  
29 19 preventive process is today urgent in Italy and around the world. However, to the best of our  
30 knowledge, no previous studies have investigated the role of health engagement in predicting  
31 citizens' compliance to health emergency containment measures.

32 **Method:** An online survey was administered between February 28th and March 4th 2020 on a  
33 representative sample of 1000 Italians. The questionnaire included a measure of Health  
34 Engagement (PHE-S) and a series of ad hoc items intended to measure both affective and  
35 behavioral responses of the citizens to the emergency in terms of perceived susceptibility to and  
36 severity of the disease, orientation towards health management, change in habits and in  
37 purchases. To investigate the relationship between Health Engagement and these variables, a  
38 series of ANOVAs, Logistic regressions and crosstabs have been carried out.

39 **Results:** Less engaged people show higher levels of perceived susceptibility to the virus and of  
40 severity of the disease; they trust less scientific and healthcare authorities, they feel less self-  
41 effective in managing their own health - both in normal conditions and under stress - and are less  
42 prone to cooperate with healthcare professionals. Low levels of Health Engagement are also  
43 associated with a change in the usual purchase behavior.

44 **Conclusions:** The Patient Health Engagement Model (PHE) provides a useful framework for  
45 understanding how people will respond to health threats such as pandemics. Therefore,  
46 intervention studies should focus on particular groups and on raising their levels of engagement to  
47 increase the effectiveness of educational initiatives devoted to promote preventive behaviors.

48

## 49 **1. Background**

50 In January 2020, the coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19) caused by severe acute respiratory  
51 syndrome coronavirus 2 (SARS-CoV-2) started to spread in Italy. As of March 17th, 2020, a total of  
52 31.506 COVID-19 cases with 2.503 deaths and 2.941 recovered had been reported in Italy. On Jan  
53 30, 2020, the World Health Organization (WHO) declared the coronavirus outbreak a public health  
54 emergency of international concern (PHEIC). Since March 8th, 2020, the Italian government  
55 adopted very urgent and restrictive measures to hold the virus spread and its potential impact on  
56 the population. Several cities - identified as “red areas” - have been put under quarantine, hoping  
57 to stop the disease from spreading to other parts of the country. This situation is globally  
58 unprecedented at least for two main reasons. First, to control of the COVID-19 outbreak, the  
59 governmental authorities have suddenly adopted very extreme public measure such as locking  
60 down cities, deeply reorganizing healthcare services to cope with the rapid increasing demand for  
61 acute care, imposing school and university closure, suggesting - where possible - smart-working  
62 solutions and transportation restrictions, deploying thousands of healthcare workers to more  
63 heavily affected regions, and running wide public health messaging campaigns for consumers’  
64 education. Second, consumers are overwhelmed by rather mixed and confounding information,  
65 partly because scientific discovery related to COVID-19 is constantly evolving with the course of  
66 the disease outbreak, partly due to the rapid increase in misleading or false news. Therefore, all  
67 these measures are currently having a deep impact on Italian people’s attitudes, daily habits and  
68 consumer behaviors.

69 Like in other similar situations, prior to the availability of an effective vaccination therapy, strategies  
70 to mitigate and control the impact of the pandemic typically involve “non pharmacological”  
71 interventions (1,2), and lever on citizens autonomous responses to public health preventive  
72 measures. In particular, past literature suggested as people appear to respond to an epidemic by  
73 voluntarily undertaking specific behaviors in order to protect themselves (3,4). However, in some  
74 cases, these behaviors may not correspond to an objective evaluations of risk (5,6), but depend  
75 also on individual subjective evaluations, thus becoming potentially counterproductive. For this

76 reason, there has been a rapid rise in interest in understanding the determinants of people's  
77 behavioral change that may influence the adequacy of the response to health emergencies (7,8).  
78 People dealing with these situations, indeed, may experience negative attitude, feelings of  
79 uncertainties and alarmism (9). These reactions might potentially end in risky habits and  
80 inadequate and disorganized behaviors, both for individuals and community (10,11), affecting  
81 public health outcomes. Therefore, to study the subjective factors implied in such reactions is of  
82 much relevance for effectively sensitize the general public and identify high-risk targets (12). Along  
83 with structural and immutable factors such as socio-demographics, scholars have previously  
84 attempted to understand the subjective determinants of citizens' changing attitudes and behaviors  
85 in a pandemic emergency. In particular, authors identified the risk perception as one of the most  
86 relevant variable in determining citizens' response to global pandemic disease (13,14), in relation  
87 to a series of factors such as the perception of economic impact (15); efficacy believes related to  
88 health (16); level of literacy and knowledge elaboration (17,18). Another important factor identified  
89 is the level of subjective anxiety, which influences both citizens' attitudes towards the emergency  
90 disease and consequent preventive behaviors (19–21). Other subjective factors accounted for the  
91 change peoples' habits in pandemic emergencies are also the ones related to the perceived effect  
92 of one individual behavior, such as perceived costs and benefits of preventive behaviors on the  
93 disease spread (22,23) or perceived impact of an individual's behavior on other individual's  
94 outcomes (21,24).

95 Among other variables accounting for a change in citizens' attitudes, habits and behaviors, recently  
96 scholars have showed the role of health engagement in affecting health-related behaviors and  
97 preventive habits (25–28). More in details, people with high levels of health engagement have  
98 been identified as more effective in adopting behavioral change suggestions and in adhere to  
99 medical prescriptions (29–31). However, previous literature has also demonstrate how individuals  
100 may be in different phases of their process of engagement (26,28), thus resulting more or less  
101 ready to enact a change in their way to cope with a critical events and to comply to prescribed  
102 preventive conducts.

103 In the current COVID-19 outbreak in Italy – as well as in other countries – citizens are  
104 experimenting a life-threatening situation, leading to profound changes in attitudes, habits and  
105 behaviors, also potentially negative for consumers' health and virus containment. Making citizens  
106 aware about their crucial role in avoiding the rapid spread of the virus and engaging them in the  
107 COVID-19 preventive process is today urgent in Italy and around the world.

108 However, to the best of our knowledge, no previous studies have investigated the role of people  
109 health engagement in determining citizen attitudes, habits and compliance to containing measures  
110 in the occasion of an health emergency; moreover, previous literature have highlighted the need to  
111 apply a validated theoretical framework to the study of these phenomena in order to effectively  
112 predict people responses to the event and adherence to prescriptions (8).

113 For these reasons, we propose a study aimed at understanding citizens' attitudes and behavioral  
114 responses to the current spread of COVID-19 in Italy and how they changed their daily habits and  
115 behaviors according to their level of health engagement. Results of this study will contribute to  
116 informing public health communication and targeted consumer educations activities.

117

### 118 *1.1 Theoretical background*

119 The Patient Health Engagement model (26,32) is a psychological framework which theorizes how  
120 individual health engagement results from a continuous emotional and motivational reframing of  
121 individuals own role perception in the management of a disease (i.e. from passive user of services  
122 to active partner of the healthcare system). According to this model, to become engaged means to  
123 be emotionally resilient and able to adjust to the health risks and specific requirements. This model  
124 also features peculiar ways of coping with health crisis, as can be considered the Covid-19 today.  
125 In particular, the model features four positions: the first position ("blackout") is of complete  
126 disengagement, typically occurring when people feel vulnerable and without control over the  
127 perceived risk, psychologically frozen and behaviorally paralyzed. It follows the psychological  
128 position of "Arousal," in which people have acquired an initial awareness about their actual

129 situation of health risk but don't have still enough knowledge and skills to manage it. They do not  
130 accept the impact of preventive requirements on the modification of their daily habits and appear  
131 hyper-vigilant over their body signals, iperactive and confused when seeking information on the  
132 health situation. Each unexpected news or change in the epidemic situation causes emotional alert  
133 and overwhelming emotional responses, with disorganized actions and behaviors. When  
134 individuals succeed in the process of emotional regulation and coping with the stressful condition,  
135 they achieve a position of Adhesion. In this phase, patients have matured a good psychological  
136 adaptation to the critical situation and appear able to manage their psychological di-stress  
137 connected to health emergency. They appear more motivated to comply with medical and  
138 preventive prescriptions. In this phase, moreover, patients acquire further skills to effectively  
139 managing their risk condition. Finally, when people mature a complete awareness of the  
140 characteristics and consequences of the critical situation, and assume a better responsible position  
141 in their behaviors and risk management they reach the "eudaimonic project" phase, which features  
142 a better, positive and optimistic approach to the situation, with an increased ability to deal with the  
143 uncertainty of the moment and a strong motivation to psychologically achieve the sense of a "new  
144 normality" (Figure 1).

145

146 *[Please, insert Fig. 1 here]*

147 *Fig. 1. The Patient Health Engagement Model*

148

149 *1.2 Research questions*

150 The study has the general aim to seek to explore how different levels of Health Engagement  
151 correspond to unique patterns of people reactions to the COVID-19 health emergency.

152 In particular, the study was guided by two main hypotheses:

153

- 154 1. Individuals with different levels of Health Engagement show different attitudinal responses  
155 towards the emergency. In particular:  
156 i. less engaged people perceive themselves more susceptible to the infection and  
157 afraid by the contagion than people with a higher Health Engagement profile;  
158 ii. different Health Engagement profiles show different attitudes to prevention and  
159 health management and different levels of trust towards authorities, scientific  
160 research and media during emergency periods;  
161 2. Health Engagement is associated with changes in consumer behaviors and habits.  
162  
163 Results from this study are intended to provide evidence-based information that furthers our  
164 theoretical understanding of consumer reactions to pandemics outbreaks and might enables  
165 government to develop better and more effective policy responses to this and future pandemics.

## 166 **2. Methods**

### 167 *2.1 Study design and participants*

168 To investigate our hypotheses, a cross-sectional study was carried out between February 28th and  
169 March 4th 2020. A sample of 1000 Italians, representative of the Italian population for gender, age,  
170 employment, geographical area and dimension of urban center of residence, resident in all the  
171 different regions of Italy and over 18 years old was involved in the self-completion of a web  
172 questionnaire. Individuals were randomly selected from the consumers panel managed by Norstat  
173 srl (a company specialized in collecting data; (<https://norstat.it/>)) using random digit dialing, to fill an  
174 online survey. Eligibility criteria for being involved in the study were purposefully kept minimal to  
175 make the results broadly applicable and only included being 18 years old or older, being able to  
176 read and understand Italian and live in Italy. People belonging to the online panel were carefully  
177 screened for authenticity and legitimacy via digital fingerprint and geo-IP-validation from the panel  
178 provider. In this study, in order to guarantee data quality, respondents were asked to confirm their  
179 demographics. From the 1000 recruited subjects, 32 were excluded because demographic data  
180 provided by the respondent and those provided from the panel were inconsistent (there were  
181 discrepancies between reported and known gender and/or age). Statistical analyses were hence  
182 carried out on a dataset composed of the answers of 968 respondents. All analyses have been  
183 carried out with IBM SPSS 23 (release 23.0.0.0).

184 Data collection is part of a broader longitudinal survey on consumers' health engagement and  
185 behaviors. Ethical approval was obtained from the institutional review board at Catholic University  
186 of Milan (IRB#2019-12).

## 187 2.2 Study measures

188 After recruitment and consent, consumers were asked to complete an online survey, involving  
189 questions about health engagement, affective response and behavioral responses to the COVID-  
190 19 pandemic.

191 In particular, in order to answer the research questions, the survey was focused involved the  
192 measurement of the following variables:

- 193 • **Health Engagement:** participants were asked to fill a revised version of the Patient Health  
194 Engagement Scale (PHE-s®). This measure, developed according to the Patient Health  
195 Engagement model (32), assesses the consumers health engagement level, defined as the  
196 “*people psychological readiness and sense of mastery to become active player in their own*  
197 *health management and health risk prevention*”. Previous studies demonstrated its robust  
198 psychometric proprieties (26). This scale features five ordinal items reflecting the continuum of  
199 engagement described in the four levels of the PHE model. According to the ordinal nature of  
200 the PHE-s®, the median score is considered the more reliable index to calculate the final  
201 patients' scoring (26). According to the score obtained, each respondent result in one of the  
202 four levels of health engagement as described in the PHE model (i.e. blackout, arousal,  
203 adhesion, eudaimonic project). The scale is based on the assumption that the score obtained  
204 by the person should reflect his/her actual health engagement level. For this study purposes  
205 the PHE- s® was slightly revised in order to adapt the items formulation to the specific contest  
206 of the health emergency. For this reason, the psychometric characteristics of the revised  
207 version were tested.  
208
- 209 • **Attitudinal response towards to the COVID-19 health emergency,** involving:
  - 210 ○ In light of studies on risk processing (33), two elements of risk judgment were  
211 measured: (a) *risk severity: perceived potential severity of COVID-19 infection for their*  
212 *own health:* participants answered a question regarding how concerned they are about  
213 the emergency ranging from 1 (not concerned at all) to 10 (very concerned); and (b)  
214 *risk susceptibility: perceived likelihood to get COVID-19:* participants were asked to  
215 rate from 1 (very little) to 5 (a lot) their perceived risk of being infected by the new  
216 COVID-19 virus;
  - 217 ○ *orientation towards health management:* participants were asked a series of questions  
218 regarding their ability to manage their own health autonomously. In particular, they  
219 were asked how much they agreed to the following statements on a scale ranging  
220 between 1 (completely disagree) to 5 (completely agree):
    - 221 ▪ *self-responsibility:* “I am the responsible of diminishing my own risk of being  
222 infected by the new COVID-19 virus”
    - 223 ▪ *self-efficacy in health management:* “I can manage my own health effectively”
    - 224 ▪ *self-efficacy in stress management:* “I can manage my own health even when  
225 I'm distressed”



- 226                   ▪ *value of partnership in healthcare*: “it’s important to cooperate with healthcare  
227                   professionals in defining how to manage my own health”
- 228           ○ *trust in authorities*: participants were asked a series of questions regarding their trust in  
229           scientific research and the National Healthcare System. In particular, they were asked  
230           how much they agreed to the following statements on a scale ranging between 1  
231           (completely disagree) to 5 (completely agree):
- 232                   ▪ *Trust in science*: “I fully trust scientific research”
- 233                   ▪ *Trust in NHS*: “I fully trust the National Healthcare System”
- 234                   ▪ *media reliability*: It is hypothesized that media tends to sensationalize food  
235                   safety hazards. Participants were asked to respond to the following question: “I  
236                   think that the emergency regarding Covid-19 has been created by an overblown  
237                   mass-media hype”
- 238
- 239   • **Behavioral responses** involving:
- 240           ○ *Information seeking*: participants were asked how much they were accessing  
241           information regarding COVID-19 on a series of both traditional and new medias (TV,  
242           newspapers, social networks, scientific journals etc.). Each media was rated from 1  
243           (little) to 5 (a lot). Scores were then summed and an average was calculated, in order  
244           to obtain an indicator of how much a certain subject was searching for information  
245           regarding the virus;
- 246           ○ *Consumer habits and purchasing behaviors*:
- 247                   ○ A series of four dichotomous, yes/no questions were asked regarding changes  
248                   in consumer habits:
- 249                           ▪ *Reduced restaurant meals*: “have you reduced meals in restaurants?”
- 250                           ▪ *Reduced ethnic restaurant meals*: “have you reduced meals in ethnic  
251                           restaurants?”
- 252                           ▪ *Products from the “red zones”*: “are you willing to buy food products  
253                           coming from “red” zones?”
- 254                           ▪ *Stockpiling*: “have you -if you are the main responsible in food  
255                           provisioning in your family- been stockpiling food and first need  
256                           products?”
- 257                   ○ Changes in purchasing behaviors were also assessed with a series of  
258                   questions surveying whether the buying of different products had  
259                   diminished/remained the same/increased. In particular, the purchase of the  
260                   following products was assessed:
- 261                           ▪ Fresh food (veggies, fruit, meat...)
- 262                           ▪ Frozen food
- 263                           ▪ Canned food
- 264                           ▪ Personal disinfection
- 265                           ▪ Personal care
- 266                           ▪ House disinfection
- 267   • **Sociodemographic variables**: a series of socio-demographical data were also  
268   collected, including: age, gender, education and employment in order to characterize  
269   our sample. Moreover, participants were also asked to state whether they suffer from  
270   any chronic condition. Finally, participants were asked to state their region of  
271   residency. People were considered as “Coming from the red zones” if they stated to  
272   live in either Lombardia, Piemonte or Emilia-Romagna, Italian’s most involved regions  
273   at the time of data collection.
- 274

### 275 3. Results

276 3.1 Sample

277 Male participants were 473 (48.9%). Mean age was 44 years (SD = 14; range 18-70). For a more  
 278 detailed description of the study sample see Table 1.

279

280 **Table 1.** Demographic profiles of the sample (N = 968).

	n	%		n	%
<b>Gender</b>			<b>Chronic patient</b>		
Male	473	48.9	Yes	174	18.0
Female	495	51.1	No	794	82.0
<b>Age</b>			<b>Geographical area</b>		
18-24	99	10.1	North-West	253	26.0
25-34	156	16.1	North-East	178	18.4
35-44	209	21.6	Center	194	20
45-54	215	22.2	South and Islands	343	35.4
55-59	106	11.0			
60-70	183	19.0			
<b>Education</b>			<b>Coming from “red zones”</b>		
Middle school or lower	142	14.6	Yes	294	30.3
High school	586	60.6	No	674	69.7
University degree	240	24.8			
<b>Employment</b>			<b>Inhabited centre size</b>		
Laborer	203	20.9	Up to 5.000 inhabitants	163	16.8
Office worker	153	15.8	5/10.000 inhabitants	150	15.5
Unoccupied	147	15.2	10/30.000 inhabitants	241	24.9
Housewife/man	146	15.1	30/100.000 inhabitants	189	19.5
Freelance professional	119	12.3	100/500.000 inhabitants	102	10.6
Retired	76	7.9	More than 500.000 inhabitants	117	12.1
Student	53	5.5	Missing	6	0.6
Manager	36	3.7			
Teacher	18	1.8			

Other 17 1.8

---

281

282 *3.2 Psychometric proprieties of the PHE-s® revised version*

283 *3.2.1 Data Analysis*

284 To evaluate the psychometric properties of the revised PHE-s® scale, a Partial Credit Rasch  
285 Model (PCM) was performed to check uni-dimensionality and the fit of each item at the construct of  
286 interest. In particular, to check whether the items fitted the expected model, two items fit mean  
287 square (MNSQ) statistics (Infit and Outfit) were computed. If the data fit the Rasch model, the fit  
288 statistics should be between 0.6 and 1.4 (34). Analyses of difficulty and step parameters were  
289 conducted to guarantee a sufficient ranking of the different categories of response and to respect  
290 the monotonic order. The internal consistency of the items of the revised PHE-s® was assessed  
291 using Ordinal Alpha via Empirical Copula Index (35) since the ordinal nature of the items. A  
292 reliability index superior to 0.7, 0.8, 0.9 can be interpreted as acceptable, good and excellent,  
293 respectively (36).

294 Finally, a Confirmatory Factor Analysis (CFA) was performed. Goodness-of-fit indexes (i.e.  
295 comparative fit index CFI, root mean square residual RMR and root mean square error of  
296 approximation RMSEA) were evaluated. A CFI > .90 was considered a good model fit (37), a RMR  
297 <.05 is desirable (38), whereas a RMSEA < .08 indicated an acceptable fit (39).

298 *3.2.2 Results*

299 Table 2 shows the results of the Rasch Analysis.

300

301 **Table 2.** PCM and Item Fit Statistics

Item	Location	Step 1	Step 2	Step 3	Outfit MSNQ	Infit MSNQ
HE1	2.462	-1.754	2.008	7.135	1.187	1.085
HE2	1.369	-3.139	1.282	5.963	0.682	0.721
HE3	0.547	-2.785	1.172	3.254	0.616	0.674
HE4	1.075	-2.186	1.081	4.331	0.773	0.728
HE5	0.991	-2.531	-0.086	5.591	0.642	0.699

302

303 The item statistics ranged from .674 to 1.085 for the infit MSQ and from .616 to 1.187 for the outfit  
304 MSQ. These values indicate an acceptable fit of the Rasch Model. The distances between  
305 subsequent thresholds showed acceptable distinction between the response options and  
306 measurement model fit. The Person Separation Index (PSI) was calculated to evaluate the  
307 reliability in the Rasch Model (PSI = .851). Rasch Model confirmed the unidimensionality of revised  
308 PHE-s® scale and the fit of each item of the scale to the data.

309 The revised PHE-s® had a quite good internal consistency, since the value of the Ordinal Alpha  
 310 via Empirical Copula was equal to .788. Each item contributed significantly to the revised PHE-s®  
 311 scale score. So, the internal consistency of the revised PHE-s® was satisfactory.

312 CFA showed reasonable goodness of fit indices. The fit indices met the criteria of fit for the  
 313 hypothesized one-factor structure. All goodness of fit indices (CFI=0.994, RMR=0.008,  
 314 RMSEA=0.066) suggested that the model is coherent with the data. The analysis of modification  
 315 indices did not find any relation between the error covariance of the items. All the standardized to  
 316 factor loadings are ranged from .532 to .820.

317

### 318 3.3 Descriptive statistics

319 There were no missing data in our dataset. For dichotomous and multiple-choice questions,  
 320 answer frequencies and “I don’t know” answers are reported -where provided- in Table 3.

321 However, in the following analyses “I don’t know” were considered as missing values. For other  
 322 variables, descriptive statistics are reported in Table 4.

323 Since very few participants resulted being in “Blackout” position, they were grouped together with  
 324 participants in “Arousal” to facilitate statistical analyses.

325

326 **Table 3.** Frequency distribution of items

	n	%		n	%
<b>Health Engagement</b>			<b>Products from the “red zones”</b>		
<b>Level</b>					
Blackout	11	1.1	Yes	498	51.1
Arousal	207	21.4	No	182	18.8
Adherence	595	61.5	I don’t know (missing)	288	29.7
Eudaimonic Project	155	16.0			
<b>Reduced restaurant meals</b>			<b>Stockpiling</b>		
Yes	323	33.3	Yes	52	5.3
No	645	66.7	No	916	94.7
<b>Reduced ethnic restaurant meals</b>			<b>Fresh food</b>		

Yes	332	34.2	Diminished	15	1.4
No	636	65.8	Unchanged	872	90.1
			Increased	76	7.9
			Not buying (missing)	5	.6
<b>Frozen food</b>			<b>Personal care</b>		
Diminished	13	1.2	Diminished	10	1.0
Unchanged	867	89.6	Unchanged	848	87.6
Increased	69	7.2	Increased	91	9.4
Not buying (missing)	19	1.9	Not buying (missing)	19	2.0
<b>Canned food</b>			<b>Personal disinfection</b>		
Diminished	17	1.7	Diminished	9	.8
Unchanged	821	84.9	Unchanged	735	76.0
Increased	98	10.1	Increased	185	19.2
Not buying (missing)	32	3.3	Not buying (missing)	39	4.1
			<b>House disinfection</b>		
			Diminished	12	1.3
			Unchanged	780	80.6
			Increased	142	14.7
			Not buying (missing)	34	3.4

327

328

**Table 4.** Descriptive statistics for items

Variable name	Min	Max	Mean	SD	Skewnes	Kurtosis
Risk severity	1	10	6.04	2.48	-.440	-.626
Risk susceptibility	1	5	2.96	1.05	.054	-.511
Self-responsibility	1	5	3.74	.920	-.621	.418
Information seeking	1	5	2.50	.732	.520	-.039

Self-efficacy in health management	1	5	3.77	.719	-.428	.920
Self-efficacy in stress management	1	5	3.76	.763	-.586	.843
Value of partnership in healthcare	1	5	4.06	.732	-.610	.825
Trust in science	1	5	4.09	.874	-.929	.949
Trust in NHS	1	5	3.66	.934	-.570	.275
Media reliability	1	5	2.86	1.14	.081	-.662

---

329 Note: SD= Standard Deviation.

330

331

332 *3.4 Attitudinal response towards to the COVID-19 health emergency*

333 *3.4.1 Risk severity*

334 A factorial ANOVA with Risk Severity for the emergency as dependent variable and Health  
 335 Engagement and “Coming from red zones” as independent variables was carried followed by  
 336 Tuckey HSD post-hoc tests. TukeyHSD post-hoc test was preferred since it is conservative when  
 337 there are unequal sample sizes.

338 Results show a significant main effect of Health Engagement on Risk Susceptibility [ $F_{(2, 1048)}=185.709$ ;  $p<.001$ ;  $\eta^2_p=.262$ ]. No other significant main effect or interaction was found. Tukey  
 339 post-hoc comparisons were carried out to confront the averages of the different Health  
 340 Engagement levels. In particular, the Arousal group ( $M=8.00$ ;  $SD=1.71$ ) was found to be more  
 341 concerned than both the Adhesion group ( $M=5.98$ ;  $SD=2.09$ ) and the Eudaimonic Project group  
 342

343 (M=3.51; SD=2.39) with a significance level of 99.9%. Also, the means difference of Adhesion and  
344 Eudaimonic Project groups was found to be statistically significant with  $p < .001$ .

#### 345 *3.4.2 Risk susceptibility*

346 A factorial ANOVA with Risk Susceptibility as dependent variable and Health Engagement and  
347 “Coming from red zones” as independent variables was carried followed by Tuckey HSD post-hoc  
348 tests. Results show a significant main effect of Health Engagement on Risk Susceptibility [ $F_{(2, 1040)}=150.890$ ;  $p < .001$ ;  $\eta^2_p=.225$ ]. No other significant main effect or interaction was found. Tukey  
349 post-hoc comparisons were carried out to confront the averages of the different Health  
350 Engagement levels. In particular, the Arousal group (M=3.73; SD=.87) was found to perceive  
351 themselves as more at risk than both the Adhesion group (M=2.94; SD=.92) and the Eudaimonic  
352 Project group (M=1.97; SD=.906) with a significance of 99.9%. Also the means difference of  
353 Adhesion and Eudaimonic Project groups was found to be statistically significant with  $p < .001$ .

#### 355 *3.4.3 Orientation towards health management and trust in authorities*

356 A series of univariate Welch’s ANOVAs with Health Engagement as independent variable was  
357 carried out followed by Games-Howell post-hoc comparisons to investigate the self-efficacy in  
358 health management and different levels of trust in authorities across the Health Engagement  
359 levels. Welch’s ANOVA and G-H post-hoc comparisons were preferred over a classic ANOVA  
360 approach to provide a more robust method for data analysis (40) since some dependent variables  
361 were violating the assumption of homoscedasticity.

362 Results show a significant main effect of Health Engagement on Self-Responsibility [ $F_{(2, 322.257)}=3.700$ ;  $p=.026$ ;  $\eta^2=.009$ ], Self-Efficacy in Health Management [ $F_{(2, 339.819)}=57.382$ ;  $p < .001$ ;  
363  $\eta^2=.113$ ], Self-Efficacy in Stress Management [ $F_{(2, 355.911)}=16.497$ ;  $p < .001$ ;  $\eta^2=.032$ ], Value of  
364 Partnership in Healthcare [ $F_{(2, 344.585)}=9.568$ ;  $p < .001$ ;  $\eta^2=.022$ ], Trust in Science [ $F_{(2, 335.022)}=8.158$ ;  
365  $p=.001$ ;  $\eta^2=.018$ ], Trust in NHS [ $F_{(2, 337.641)}=9.575$ ;  $p < .001$ ;  $\eta^2=.021$ ] and Media Reliability [ $F_{(2, 344.288)}=28.664$ ;  $p < .001$ ;  $\eta^2=.060$ ]. Results of Games-Howell comparisons are reported in Table 5.

368

369

370

371

372 **Table 5.** Results of Games-Howell comparisons

Dependent variables	Engagement Level Comparison		
	Arousal-Adhesion	Arousal-Eudaimonic	Adhesion-eudaimonic
Self-responsibility	-.162 (.073)	-.274 (.110)*	-.112 (.095)
Self-efficacy in health management	-.326 (.057)***	-.791 (.074)***	-.465 (.060)***
Self-efficacy in stress management	-.122 (.059)	-.434 (.077)***	-.312 (.066)***
Value of partnership in healthcare	-.205 (.062)**	-.335 (.078)***	-.130 (.062)
Trust in science	-.218 (.071)**	-.378 (.099)**	-.160 (.081)
Trust in NHS	-.245 (.072)**	-.425 (.104)**	-.181 (.091)
Media	-.352 (.084)***	-.911 (.120)***	-.559 (.107)***

373 Note: values in cells are differences in means. Standard errors are reported in brackets.

374 Significance in marked with asterisks (\* sig. at  $p < .05$ ; \*\* sig. at  $p < .01$ ; \*\*\*sig at  $p < .001$ ).

375

### 376 3.5 Behavioral responses

#### 377 3.5.1 Information seeking

378 A Welch's ANOVA with Health Engagement as independent variable and Information Seeking as

379 dependent was carried out followed by Games-Howell post-hoc comparisons to investigate

380 whether people in different Health Engagement positions show different amounts of media access.



381 Results show a significant main effect of Health Engagement on Information Seeking [ $F_{(2, 334.095)}=29.344$ ;  $p<.001$ ;  $\eta^2=.064$ ]. G-H comparisons showed that the amount of Information Seeking  
382 different significantly among all the different levels: in particular, results showed that people in  
383 Arousal search significantly more information ( $M=2.79$ ;  $SD=.74$ ) than both people in Adhesion  
384 ( $M=2.47$ ;  $SD=.68$ ) and Eudaimonic project ( $M=2.20$ ;  $SD=.77$ ). The comparison amongst Adhesion  
385 and Eudaimonic project resulted significantly different as well.

### 387 *3.5.2 Consumer habits and purchasing behaviors*

388 Dichotomous variables were used as dependent variables in a series of logistic regressions, in  
389 order to understand whether the Health Engagement position is predictive of a change in  
390 consumer habits. Risk Susceptibility and Risk Severity were also used as predictors. Wald forward  
391 method was selected to automatically exclude non-significant predictors. Health Engagement was  
392 used as a categorical variable and hence dummy coded: Eudaimonic Project was used as the 0,  
393 the baseline of comparison, for the other two levels. Dependent variables were coded so that “No”  
394 was used as the comparison level for “Yes”. Hence, an Odds Ratio  $> 1$  should be interpreted as  
395 “more likely to answer yes” and vice-versa. Results are reported in Table 6. To assess the  
396 association between change in consumer purchase behaviors and different Health Engagement  
397 levels a series of contingency tables was created. Pearson’s Chi-square and Fisher’s exact tests  
398 were also carried out to reject the null hypothesis that data are randomly distributed across Health  
399 Engagement levels. As post-hoc, standardized residuals were inspected: standardized residuals  
400 are calculated as the difference between observed and expected counts of a cell divided by an  
401 estimate of its standard deviation. Since they are asymptotically normally distributed with a mean  
402 of 0 and standard deviation of 1 under the null hypothesis of independence, as a general rule of  
403 thumb cells with an absolute value of standard residuals above 2 can be considered to significantly  
404 contribute to the general chi-square value (41). For Stockpiling behavior groups were way too  
405 unbalanced to proceed with a logistic regression (Yes=5.6%), hence an approach based on  
406 contingency tables was preferred. Results are reported in Table 7.

407

408

409 **Table 6.** Results of logistic regressions

Behaviors	Variables	B	S.E.	Wald	P	Odds Ratio
<b>Reduced restaurant meals</b>	HE			15.176	.001	
	HE (Arousal)	.823	.321	6.579	.010	2.277
<i>Nagelkerke's R<sup>2</sup>=.232</i>	HE(Adhesion)	.110	.275	.161	n.s.	
<i>Correctly predicted: 72.0%</i>	Risk Severity	.244	.047	27.441	<.001	1.276
<i>Chi-square= 174.63</i>	Risk	.285	.097	8.526	.004	1.329
<i>(d.f.=4), p&lt;.001</i>	Susceptibility					
<b>Reduced ethnic restaurant meals</b>	HE			11.449	.003	
	HE (Arousal)	.799	.309	6.703	.010	2.223
<i>Nagelkerke's R<sup>2</sup>=.170</i>	HE(Adhesion)	.210	.260	.651	n.s.	
<i>Correctly predicted: 70.1%</i>	Risk Severity	.195	.044	19.638	<.001	1.216
<i>Chi-square= 124.92</i>	Risk	.221	.094	5.029	.025	1.235
<i>(d.f.=4), p&lt;.001</i>	Susceptibility					
<b>Products from the "red zones"</b>	HE			12.032	.002	
	HE (Arousal)	-1.313	.408	10.372	.001	.269
<i>Nagelkerke's R<sup>2</sup>=.146</i>	HE(Adhesion)	-.681	.349	3.808	.051	.506
<i>Correctly predicted: 75.5%</i>	Risk Severity	-.190	.047	16.365	<.001	.827
<i>Chi-square= 70.954</i>						
<i>(d.f.=3), p&lt;.001</i>						

410 Note: df= degrees of freedom; HE= Health Engagement; S.E.=Standard Error; P=p-value.

411

412 **Table 7.** Results of contingency tables

Variables	Answers	Cell	Health Engagement level			Row Total				
			Arousal	Adhesion	Eudaimonic project					
<b>Stockpiling</b>	No	Observed	192	570	153	915				
		Expected	205.5	562.6	146.8					
		Std res.	-.9	.3	.5					
	Yes	Observed	25	24	2		51			
		Expected	11.5	31.4	8.2					
		Std res.	<b>4.0</b>	-1.3	<b>-2.2</b>					
		CT	217	594	155					
		<b>Fresh food</b>	Diminished	Observed	3			10	1	14
				Expected	3.1			8.6	2.2	
Std res.	-.1			.5	-.8					
Unchange d	Observed		179	547	145	871				
	Expected		195.1	538.0	137.9					
	Std res.		-1.2	.4	-.6					
	Increased		Observed	33	36		6	75		
			Expected	16.8	46.3		11.9			
			Std res.	<b>4.0</b>	-1.5		-1.7			
CT	215	593	152							
<b>Canned food</b>	Diminished	Observed	4	7	5	16				
		Expected	3.6	9.9	2.5					
		Std res.	.2	-.9	1.6					
	Unchange d	Observed	159	526	136		821			
		Expected	183.7	508.1	129.2					
		Std res.	-1.8	.8	.6					
		Increased	Observed	46	45			6	95	

		Expected	21.7	60.0	15.3	
		Std res.	<b>5.2</b>	-1.9	<b>-2.4</b>	
		CT	212	580	146	
<b>Frozen food</b>		Observed	4	6	2	
<b>Chi-square=</b>	Diminished	Expected	2.7	7.4	1.9	12
		Std res.	.8	-.5	.1	
<b>41.970(df=4),</b>	Unchange	Observed	173	549	145	
		Expected	195.5	533.5	138.0	867
<b>p&lt;.001</b>	d	Std res.	-1.6	.7	.6	
		Observed	37	29	4	
<b>Fisher=36.01</b>	Increased	Expected	15.8	43.1	11.1	70
		Std res.	<b>5.3</b>	<b>-2.1</b>	<b>-2.1</b>	
<b>5, p&lt;.001</b>		CT	214	584	151	
		Observed	3	3	2	
<b>Personal</b>		Expected	1.8	4.9	1.3	8
<b>disinfection</b>	Diminished	Std res.	.9	-.9	.7	
<b>Chi-square=</b>	Unchange	Observed	127	477	131	
		Expected	166.1	452.6	116.3	735
<b>61.148(df=4),</b>	d	Std res.	<b>-3.0</b>	1.1	1.4	
		Observed	80	92	14	
<b>p&lt;.001</b>	Increased	Expected	42	114.5	29.4	186
		Std res.	<b>5.9</b>	<b>-2.1</b>	<b>-2.8</b>	
<b>Fisher=57.087</b>		CT	210	572	147	
		Observed	4	7	2	
<b>Home</b>		Expected	2.9	8.0	2.0	13
<b>disinfection</b>	Diminished	Std res.	.6	-.4	.0	
<b>Chi-square=</b>	Unchange	Observed	137	509	134	780
<b>73.370(df=4),</b>						

<i>p</i> <.001	d	Expected	176.9	480.5.6	122.6	
<i>Fisher</i> =64.274		Std res.	<b>-3.1</b>	1.4	1.0	
, <i>p</i> <.001		Observed	71	60	11	
	Increased	Expected	32.3	87.5	22.3	142
		Std res.	<b>6.8</b>	<b>-2.9</b>	<b>-2.4</b>	
		CT	214	576	144	
<b>Personal</b>		Observed	3	5	2	
<b>care</b>	Diminished	Expected	2.3	6.2	1.5	10
<i>Chi-square</i> =		Std res.	.5	-.5	.4	
<i>54.049(df=4),</i>		Observed	164	544	139	
<i>p</i> <.001	Unchange	Expected	192.1	524.5	130.4	847
<i>Fisher</i> =46.845	d	Std res.	<b>-2.0</b>	.9	.7	
, <i>p</i> <.001		Observed	48	38	5	
	Increased	Expected	20.6	56.3	14.0	91
		Std res.	<b>6.0</b>	<b>-2.4</b>	<b>-2.4</b>	
		CT	215	587	146	

413 Note: CT=Column Total; Std res=standard residues, df= degrees of freedom. Cells with an  
 414 absolute value of std. res >2 are marked in bold.

415

#### 416 4. Discussion

417 At the end of February 2020 the diffusion of the COVID-19 epidemics in northern Italy has forced  
 418 health authorities to embrace restrictive preventive measures that impacted on Italian citizens' daily  
 419 habits and consumption behaviors. Enforcing compliance to such measures was crucial at that  
 420 time in order to enhance their effectiveness and to sustain the sustainability of the healthcare  
 421 system. However, this sudden change determined huge reactions by Italian citizens: many of them  
 422 experienced panic and enacted maladaptive behaviors. In this scenario, the Italian citizens'

423 reactions to the COVID-19 emergency measures, from the scientific perspective, is an interesting  
424 and unique platform to demonstrate the value of making citizens engaged and actual partner of the  
425 healthcare system to safeguard both individuals' and collective health. Therefore, we consider the  
426 current COVID-19 outbreak in Italy as a valuable "testing ground" for consumer education  
427 initiatives aimed at sustaining their health engagement and compliance to the prescribed  
428 behavioral changes.

429 Existing research has focused on demographic and immutable factors and subjective that influence  
430 how people are likely to behave in a pandemic (42–44). Furthermore, previous research on  
431 responses to pandemics has been largely a-theoretical (8). Therefore, all these studies provide  
432 valuable insights into how different segment of the population are likely to respond, but does not  
433 tell us why they respond in this way.

434 Therefore, the current study adopted the theoretical lenses of the Patient Health Engagement  
435 Model to explain – from a psychosocial perspective - people responses through the first wave of  
436 the COVID-19 pandemic in Italy. This theory states that individuals are more or less akin to change  
437 their behaviors according to their own subjective perceptions about the role (more or less active)  
438 the might play in their health and care (32).

439 The Patient Health Engagement Model (PHE) provides a potentially useful framework for  
440 understanding how people will respond to health threats such as pandemics and related prescribed  
441 preventive measures imposed by healthcare authorities. The PHE model proposes that people's  
442 adaptive behavioral and emotional responses to protect themselves from a health threat is  
443 influenced by the level of health engagement – that is a progressive reframing of individuals' own  
444 role within the healthcare system (i.e. from passive user of services to active partner of the  
445 healthcare system) (32). In this study we employed and validated a revised version of the PHE-s®  
446 to measure citizens' health engagement. This revised version showed good psychometric  
447 properties for our representative sample.

448 According to the study results, Italian citizens seems to be more concerned for the health  
449 emergency than not, even though not extremely worried (on a scale from 1 to 10, the average is

450 around 6) and not feeling exceedingly at risk of being infected (the 5-point Likert shows a  
451 normaloid distribution with mean around the central point), confirming previous studies in other  
452 similar settings (6,45,46). Nevertheless, it is important to notice how different Health Engagement  
453 profiles, are associated with different levels of both perceived risk severity and susceptibility:  
454 indeed, less engaged people (rated as in “Blackout” and “Arousal”) show significantly higher levels  
455 of perceived susceptibility to and perceived risk of the infection when compared with high engaged  
456 ones (rated as in “Adhesion” and “Eudaimonic Project”), regardless of the geographical area of  
457 origin (“red zone” or not), which surprisingly didn’t result to be associated with different levels of  
458 susceptibility and severity. This seems to testify that people differ in their ability to psychologically  
459 master their worries related to the COVID-19 epidemic, and this explains consequent more or less  
460 adherence to the change in behaviors imposed by the health authorities. This interpretation is  
461 confirmed also by the fact that people with different levels of Health Engagement show different  
462 attitudinal responses to the emergency: in particular, when compared with people with higher  
463 levels of health engagement, less engaged people are less trusting scientific and healthcare  
464 authorities, they feel less self-effective in managing their own health - both in normal conditions  
465 and under stress - and less prone to cooperate with healthcare professionals. These results are  
466 confirmative of previous studies on Influenza A(H1N1) which demonstrated that if perceived  
467 severity and susceptibility are high but response and self-efficacy are low, maladaptive responses  
468 (e.g. denying the existence of a threat) are likely to ensue (47,48). The perceived self-efficacy in  
469 health management and a sentiment of mistrust towards authorities may actually help in  
470 understanding why a less engaged person feels more concerned and worried for the new COVID-  
471 19 emergency: they seek more information, potentially exposing themselves to fake or over-hyped  
472 news, since they are also prone to feel that news regarding the emergency are reliable;  
473 nevertheless, they mistrust scientific research and the capacity of the NHS to cope with the  
474 pandemic and feel less capable of taking care of themselves. Furthermore, low levels of Health  
475 Engagement may testify that people do not consider themselves ready to be active partners of the  
476 healthcare systems, being more focused on their own health interests and need and not incline to  
477 collaborate and trust the healthcare system to achieve a common public health goal.

478 Health Engagement also seems to be a predictor of behavioral responses to the emergency.  
479 Generally speaking, a substantial part of our sample reported a change in their habits: one out of  
480 three Italian citizens reported to have reduced meals outside and/or meals in ethnic restaurants,  
481 while 20% declared that they would not buy products coming from “red zones”. Indeed, while Risk  
482 Severity and Risk Susceptibility are clearly strong predictors, logistic models show that people with  
483 lower levels of Health Engagement have more than twice the chances than people with higher  
484 level of health engagement to either have reduced meals or ethnic meals outside home. It’s  
485 important to notice that data have been collected in a moment where the emergency was still away  
486 from its peak and guidelines were not forbidding people from moving freely and have meals in  
487 restaurants. These results could be interpreted in line with previous studies that underlined as  
488 when unknown diseases are thought to be lethal, people are incline to blame the outbreaks on  
489 someone, or some group of people, who live outside of their own social sphere, as a mechanism to  
490 cope with fear and risk perception (49). In this research, it appears clear as this form of “moral  
491 panic” (50) had an halo effect also on products and restaurants people naively thought to be guilty  
492 in Covid-19’s spread, or that were related to the “infected zone”. Such lay interpretation of disease  
493 transmission, together with the difficulty of finding reliable information in a first phase of health  
494 emergency, has an impact on people’s habits and consumptions, and clear consequences on local  
495 enterprises’ economy. A similar case occurred with the H5N1 Avian Influenza on food  
496 consumption, when the poultry industry has suffered severe losses due to a sort of “halo effect” in  
497 consumer perception of risk, even after the emergency (51,52).

498 Despite these results, for what concerns buying behaviors, our data show that generally most  
499 people didn’t actually change their habits, in line with other studies (53): most people didn’t  
500 stockpile goods nor increased the purchase of the goods we have considered in our survey.  
501 Nevertheless, crosstabs show that amongst those who stockpiled goods and increased the  
502 purchase of food (fresh, frozen or canned) and disinfection products (in particular regarding home  
503 disinfection) there is a significantly higher presence of lower engaged consumers. This evidence in  
504 line with other studies (54–56) that showed how personal reaction of the critical event can feed  
505 behavioral changes, with many people enacting significant changes in their consumption behaviors



506 like anticipating the purchasing of goods (57,58). As food consumption is recognized as a primary  
507 need for the individuals, it is strongly influenced by the subjective interpretation of risk and the  
508 possible scarcity (59). For this reason, these results appear interesting in giving a sense to how  
509 people orient their food purchase in the case of emergency in relation to their engagement level.  
510 Furthermore, it appears evident how people with low level of Health Engagement, not being  
511 psychologically ready to consider the social and public health consequences of their conduct,  
512 appear more focused on their own health interests and less keen to rely on health authorities'  
513 guidelines to orient their behaviors. For instance, the behavior of stockpile goods enacted by the  
514 less engaged Italian citizens had a negative organizational impact on food supplies which further  
515 compromised the delicate situation of the Italian population. Furthermore, the overcrowding at  
516 superstores in the situation of COVID-19 epidemics was highly counterproductive and contributed  
517 to spread the risk of contagion.

518

## 519 **5. Limitations and future studies**

520 The study measured a specific population's views at a specific point in time; their beliefs and  
521 attitudes reflect the information available at the time and therefore are not stable. Second, results  
522 were self-reported. Measurement errors and social desirability bias may exist although the study  
523 was anonymous.

524 Future research should test the Patient Health Engagement Model as a predictor of particular  
525 behaviors such as hand-hygiene or facial masks usage. In addition, it is important to carry out  
526 further behavioral research where actual behavior can be measured and not only self-reported.

527

## 528 **6. Practical implications**

529 This study has provided evidence about the role of health engagement as a determinant of  
530 citizens' behavioral change which is key for controlling the spread of pandemic disease, and  
531 described a conceptual framework – i.e. the Patient Health Engagement Model - in which to better

532 understand these behaviors. In sum, the study shows that health engagement levels are predictive  
533 of different responses, both affective and behavioral: playing an active role in health management  
534 is associated with a higher chance of enacting specific behaviors. In particular, the psychological  
535 readiness to assume a proactive role in one own health prevention is explicative of the individuals'  
536 tendency to be more or less able to comply to health authorities' prescription and to perceive  
537 themselves has main responsible for their own health and the health of their community.  
538 Furthermore, the psychological readiness to engage in health results in a crucial factor for  
539 explaining the different way in which individuals can cope with their worries for a health  
540 emergency. The findings suggest that intervention studies should focus on particular groups and  
541 on raising their levels of engagement to increase the effectiveness of educational initiatives  
542 devoted to promoting preventive behaviors. Communication strategies should maximize their  
543 impact by targeting messages according to the health engagement levels of citizens. For instance,  
544 in order to improve the levels of engagement of citizens in a "psychological blackout", reassuring  
545 messages, aimed at sustaining the emotional elaboration of the emergency and related worries  
546 would be particularly needed. Citizens in a situation of "psychological adherence" would need  
547 positive stories of other persons who succeeded in adhere to the prescribed containment  
548 measures in order to enhance their motivation to stay engaged. Finally, people in the position of  
549 "eudaimonic projects", who were able to develop a new sense of normality despite the sanitary  
550 emergency, can be involved in peer-to-peer communication initiatives becoming advocates for the  
551 correct engagement in adhere to the prescribed measures to face the COVID-19 epidemic.  
552 Furthermore, fostering the psychological readiness to get engaged in health prevention appears to  
553 be a crucial goal for educational and communication initiatives in the situation of a health  
554 emergency. Carrying out this work now will be invaluable in preparing for this and future  
555 pandemics.

556

557

558 **Declarations**

559 ***Ethics approval and consent to participate***

560 Ethical approval was obtained from the institutional review board at Catholic University of Milan  
561 (IRB#2019-12).

562 ***Consent for publication***

563 Not applicable

564 ***Availability of data and materials***

565 The authors are not authorized to share the dataset publicly due to potentially sensitive data.  
566 However it is available from the corresponding author on reasonable request.

567 ***Competing interests***

568 The authors declare that they have no competing interests.

569 ***Funding***

570 This study was conducted was conducted within the CRAFT project, funded by Fondazione Cariplo  
571 & Regione Lombardia.

572 ***Authors' contributions***

573

574 GG conceptualized and supervised the writing of the paper. SB and MS drafted the paper. LP, GC  
575 and AB conducted the statistical analysis presented in the paper and provided assistance in writing  
576 methods and results. GG, SB, MS, LP, GC, AB and EL all equally contributed to the design of the  
577 survey, data interpretation and discussion of intellectual content. All authors read and approved the  
578 final manuscript.

579

580

581



## 583 References

- 584 1. Godoy P, Castilla J, Delgado-Rodríguez M, Martín V, Soldevila N, Alonso J, et al.  
585 Effectiveness of hand hygiene and provision of information in preventing influenza cases  
586 requiring hospitalization. *Prev Med (Baltim)*. 2012;54(6):434–9.
- 587 2. Ferguson NM, Cummings DAT, Fraser C, Cajka JC, Cooley PC, Burke DS, et al. Strategies  
588 for mitigating an influenza pandemic. *Nature*. 2006;
- 589 3. Fenichela EP, Castillo-Chavezb C, Ceddiac MG, Chowellb G, Gonzalez Parrae PA, Hickling  
590 GJ, et al. Adaptive human behavior in epidemiological models. *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A*.  
591 2011;
- 592 4. Funk S, Salathé M, Jansen VAA. Modelling the influence of human behaviour on the spread  
593 of infectious diseases: A review. *Journal of the Royal Society Interface*. 2010.
- 594 5. Fenichel EP, Kuminoff N V., Chowell G. Skip the Trip: Air Travelers' Behavioral Responses  
595 to Pandemic Influenza. *PLoS One*. 2013;8(3).
- 596 6. Leppin A, Aro AR. Risk perceptions related to SARS and avian influenza: Theoretical  
597 foundations of current empirical research. *Int J Behav Med*. 2009;16(1):7–29.
- 598 7. Kass NE, Otto J, O'Brien D, Minson M. Ethics and severe pandemic influenza: Maintaining  
599 essential functions through a fair and considered response. *Biosecurity and Bioterrorism*.  
600 2008;
- 601 8. Bish A, Michie S. Demographic and attitudinal determinants of protective behaviours during  
602 a pandemic: A review. *Br J Health Psychol*. 2010;15(4):797–824.
- 603 9. Jin Y, Pang A, Cameron GT. Toward a Publics-Driven, Emotion-Based Conceptualization in  
604 Crisis Communication: Unearthing Dominant Emotions in Multi-Staged Testing of the  
605 Integrated Crisis Mapping (ICM) Model. *J Public Relations Res*. 2012;
- 606 10. Zhang Y, Yang H, Cheng P, Luqman A. Predicting consumers' intention to consume poultry  
607 during an H7N9 emergency: an extension of the theory of planned behavior model. *Hum*  
608 *Ecol Risk Assess*. 2020;
- 609 11. Mossong J, Hens N, Jit M, Beutels P, Auranen K, Mikolajczyk R, et al. Social contacts and  
610 mixing patterns relevant to the spread of infectious diseases. *PLoS Med*. 2008;
- 611 12. Lau JTF, Griffiths S, Au DWH, Choi KC. Changes in knowledge, perceptions, preventive  
612 behaviours and psychological responses in the pre-community outbreak phase of the H1N1  
613 epidemic. *Epidemiol Infect*. 2011;139(1):80–90.
- 614 13. Brug J, Aro AR, Richardus JH. Risk perceptions and behaviour: Towards pandemic control  
615 of emerging infectious diseases: lional research on risk perception in the control of emerging  
616 infectious diseases. *Int J Behav Med*. 2009;16(1):3–6.
- 617 14. Poletti P, Ajelli M, Merler S. The effect of risk perception on the 2009 H1N1 pandemic  
618 influenza dynamics. *PLoS One*. 2011;
- 619 15. Smith RD. Responding to global infectious disease outbreaks: Lessons from SARS on the  
620 role of risk perception, communication and management. *Soc Sci Med*. 2006;63(12):3113–  
621 23.
- 622 16. De Zwart O, Veldhuijzen IK, Elam G, Aro AR, Abraham T, Bishop GD, et al. Perceived  
623 threat, risk perception, and efficacy beliefs related to SARS and other (emerging) infectious  
624 diseases: Results of an international survey. *Int J Behav Med*. 2009;
- 625 17. Brug J, Aro AR, Oenema A, De Zwart O, Richardus JH, Bishop GD. SARS risk perception,  
626 knowledge, precautions, and information sources, the Netherlands. *Emerg Infect Dis*. 2004;

- 627 18. Vartti AM, Oenema A, Schreck M, Uutela A, De Zwart O, Brug J, et al. SARS knowledge,  
628 perceptions, and behaviors: A comparison between finns and the dutch during the SARS  
629 outbreak in 2003. *Int J Behav Med*. 2009;
- 630 19. Cowling BJ, Ng DMW, Ip DKM, Liao Q, Lam WWT, Wu JT, et al. Community Psychological  
631 and Behavioral Responses through the First Wave of the 2009 Influenza A(H1N1) Pandemic  
632 in Hong Kong. *J Infect Dis*. 2010;202(6):867–76.
- 633 20. Jones JH, Salathé M. Early assessment of anxiety and behavioral response to novel swine-  
634 origin influenza a(H1N1). *PLoS One*. 2009;4(12):2–9.
- 635 21. Rubin GJ, Amlôt R, Page L, Wessely S. Public perceptions, anxiety, and behaviour change  
636 in relation to the swine flu outbreak: Cross sectional telephone survey. *BMJ*.  
637 2009;339(7713):156.
- 638 22. Chapman GB, Coups EJ. Predictors of influenza vaccine acceptance among healthy adults.  
639 *Prev Med (Baltim)*. 1999;
- 640 23. Ritvo P, Wilson K, Willms D, Upshur R. Vaccines in the public eye. *Nature Medicine*. 2005.
- 641 24. Ibuka Y, Chapman GB, Meyers LA, Li M, Galvani AP. The dynamics of risk perceptions and  
642 precautionary behavior in response to 2009 (H1N1) pandemic influenza. *BMC Infect Dis*.  
643 2010;
- 644 25. Coulter A. Patient engagement-what works? *J Ambul Care Manage*. 2012;
- 645 26. Graffigna G, Barello S, Bonanomi A, Lozza E. Measuring patient engagement: Development  
646 and psychometric properties of the patient health engagement (PHE) scale. *Front Psychol*.  
647 2015;6(MAR):1–10.
- 648 27. Barello S, Graffigna G, Vegni E. Patient Engagement as an Emerging Challenge for  
649 Healthcare Services: Mapping the Literature. *Nurs Res Pract*. 2012;
- 650 28. Gruman J, Rovner MH, French ME, Jeffress D, Sofaer S, Shaller D, et al. From patient  
651 education to patient engagement: Implications for the field of patient education. *Patient Educ*  
652 *Couns*. 2010;
- 653 29. Graffigna G, Barello S, Bonanomi A. The role of Patient Health Engagement model (PHE-  
654 model) in affecting patient activation and medication adherence: A structural equation  
655 model. *PLoS One*. 2017;12(6).
- 656 30. Graffigna G, Barello S, Bonanomi A, Riva G. Factors affecting patients' online health  
657 information-seeking behaviours: The role of the Patient Health Engagement (PHE) Model.  
658 *Patient Educ Couns*. 2017;
- 659 31. Hill AM, Etherton-Ber C, Haines TP. Tailored Education for Older Patients to Facilitate  
660 Engagement in Falls Prevention Strategies after Hospital Discharge-A Pilot Randomized  
661 Controlled Trial. *PLoS One*. 2013;
- 662 32. Graffigna G, Barello S. Spotlight on the patient health engagement model (PHE model): A  
663 psychosocial theory to understand people's meaningful engagement in their own health  
664 care. *Patient Preference and Adherence*. 2018.
- 665 33. Griffin RJ, Dunwoody S, Neuwirth K. Proposed model of the relationship of risk information  
666 seeking and processing to the development of preventive behaviors. In: *Environmental*  
667 *Research*. 1999.
- 668 34. Wright BD, Linacre JM, Gustafson JE, Martin-Lof P. Reasonable mean-square fit values.  
669 *Rasch Meas Trans*. 1994;8(3):370.
- 670 35. Bonanomi A, Cantaluppi G, Nai Ruscone M, Osmetti SA. A new estimator of Zumbo's  
671 Ordinal Alpha: a copula approach. *Qual Quant [Internet]*. 11 maggio 2015;49(3):941–53.

- 672 Available at: <http://link.springer.com/10.1007/s11135-014-0114-8>
- 673 36. Gliem JA, Gliem RR. Calculating, Interpreting, and Reporting Cronbach's Alpha Reliability  
674 Coefficient for Likert-Type Scales. In: Midwest Research-to-Practice Conference in Adult,  
675 Continuing, and Community Education. Columbus, OH, USA: The Ohio State University  
676 press; 2003.
- 677 37. Bentler PM. Comparative fit indexes in structural models. *Psychol Bull.* 1990;107(2):238.
- 678 38. Jöreskog KG, Sörbom D, Lisrel VI. Analysis of linear structural relationship by maximum  
679 likelihood. Chicago: Scientific Software; 1984.
- 680 39. MacCallum RC, Browne MW, Sugawara HM. Power analysis and determination of sample  
681 size for covariance structure modeling. *Psychol Methods.* 1996;1(2):130.
- 682 40. Delacre M, Leys C, Mora YL, Lakens D. Taking Parametric Assumptions Seriously:  
683 Arguments for the Use of Welch's *F*-test instead of the Classical *F*-test in One-Way ANOVA.  
684 *Int Rev Soc Psychol.* 2019;
- 685 41. Haberman SJ. The Analysis of Residuals in Cross-Classified Tables. *Biometrics.* 1973;
- 686 42. J. F, P. S, K. MC. Gender, race, and perception of environmental health risks. *Risk Anal.*  
687 1994;
- 688 43. Balinska M, Rizzo C. Behavioural responses to influenza pandemics. *PLoS Currents.* 2009.
- 689 44. Tooher R, Collins JE, Street JM, Braunack-Mayer A, Marshall H. Community knowledge,  
690 behaviours and attitudes about the 2009 H1N1 Influenza pandemic: A systematic review.  
691 *Influenza Other Respi Viruses.* 2013;
- 692 45. Kristiansen IS, Halvorsen PA, Gyrd-Hansen D. Influenza pandemic: Perception of risk and  
693 individual precautions in a general population. Cross sectional study. *BMC Public Health.*  
694 2007;
- 695 46. Balkhy HH, Abolfotouh MA, Al-Hathloul RH, Al-Jumah MA. Awareness, attitudes, and  
696 practices related to the swine influenza pandemic among the Saudi public. *BMC Infect Dis.*  
697 2010;
- 698 47. Kok G, Jonkers R, Gelissen R, Meertens R, De Zwart O, Scheelma H. Behavioural  
699 intentions in response to an influenza pandemic. *BMC Public Health.* 2010;10.
- 700 48. Ruitter RAC, Abraham C, Kok G. Scary warnings and rational precautions: A review of the  
701 psychology of fear appeals. *Psychol Heal.* 2001;16(6):613–30.
- 702 49. McCauley M, Minsky S, Viswanath K. The H1N1 pandemic: Media frames, stigmatization  
703 and coping. *BMC Public Health.* 2013;13(1):1–16.
- 704 50. Muzzatti SL. Bits of falling sky and global pandemics: Moral panic and Severe Acute  
705 Respiratory Syndrome (SARS). *Illness Crisis and Loss.* 2005.
- 706 51. Akben E, Özertan G, Spaulding AD, Saghaian SH. Consumer responses of the H5N1 Avian  
707 Influenza: The case of Turkey. *Econ Bull.* 2008;4(15).
- 708 52. de Krom MPMM, Mol APJ. Food risks and consumer trust. Avian influenza and the knowing  
709 and non-knowing on UK shopping floors. *Appetite.* 2010;55(3):671–8.
- 710 53. Van D, McLaws ML, Crimmins J, MacIntyre CR, Seale H. University life and pandemic  
711 influenza: Attitudes and intended behaviour of staff and students towards pandemic (H1N1)  
712 2009. *BMC Public Health.* 2010;10.
- 713 54. Goodwin R, Haque S, Neto F, Myers LB. Initial psychological responses to Influenza A,  
714 H1N1 («Swine flu»). *BMC Infect Dis.* 2009;9:166.

- 715 55. Bults M, Beaujean DJMA, De Zwart O, Kok G, Van Empelen P, Van Steenbergen JE, et al.  
716 Perceived risk, anxiety, and behavioural responses of the general public during the early  
717 phase of the Influenza A (H1N1) pandemic in the Netherlands: Results of three consecutive  
718 online surveys. BMC Public Health. 2011;
- 719 56. Kamate SK, Agrawal A, Chaudhary H, Singh K, Mishra P, Asawa K. Public knowledge,  
720 attitude and behavioural changes in an Indian population during the Influenza A (H1N1)  
721 outbreak. J Infect Dev Ctries. 2010;
- 722 57. Fischhoff B, De Bruin WB, Perrin W, Downs J. Travel risks in a time of terror: Judgments  
723 and choices. Risk Anal. 2004;
- 724 58. Kim HK, Niederdeppe J. The Role of Emotional Response during an H1N1 Influenza  
725 Pandemic on a College Campus. J Public Relations Res. 2013;25(1):30–50.
- 726 59. Gstraunthaler T, Day R. Avian influenza in the UK: Knowledge, risk perception and risk  
727 reduction strategies. Br Food J. 2008;110(3):260–70.
- 728



DISENGAGEMENT

FULL ENGAGEMENT

BLACKOUT

AROUSAL

ADHESION

EUDAIMONIC PROJECT

Complete disengagement, typically occurring when people feel vulnerable and without control over the perceived risk, psychologically frozen and behaviorally paralyzed

When people appear hyper-vigilant over their body signals, confused when seeking information on the health situation and activated in a maladaptive and disorganized way

This is an initial state of engagement, when people start coping with the stressful condition and develop a form of psychological adaptation

Position of full engagement with an increased ability to deal with the uncertainty of the moment and strong motivation to psychologically achieve the sense of a "new normality"