

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33

People underestimate the change of airborne Corona virus exposure when changing distance to an infected person: On interpersonal distance, exposure time, face masks and perceived virus exposure.

Ola Svenson

Ola Svenson

Stockholm University, Stockholm, Sweden and Decision Research, Eugene, OR USA

osn@psychology.su.se

ORCID 0000-0003-1717-7198.

Acknowledgments

The author is grateful to Jeff Peterson for preparing the questionnaires and collecting the data and to Freja Isohani, Torun Lindholm and Henry Montgomery for valuable comments on an earlier version of the present contribution.

NOTE: This preprint reports new research that has not been certified by peer review and should not be used to guide clinical practice.

34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65
66

Abstract

Participants judged airborne Corona virus exposure following a change of inter-personal distance and time of a conversation with an infected person with and without a face mask. About 75% of the participants underestimated how much virus exposure changes when the distance to an infected person changed. The smallest average face to face distance from an infected person without a mask that a participant judged as sufficiently safe was about 12 feet (3.67 m). Correlations showed that the more a person underestimated the effects of change of distance on exposure the shorter was that person's own safety distance. On average the effects of different lengths of a conversation on exposure were correct, but those who judged the effects of time as smaller tended to select longer safety distances. Worry of own COVID-19 infection correlated with protective behaviors: keeping longer safety distances, avoiding public gatherings, postponement of meetings with friends. The results showed that the protective effects of both distancing and wearing a face mask were underestimated by a majority of the participants. Implications of these results were discussed last.

67

68

69 **Introduction**

70

71 The COVID-19 pandemic caused by the SARS-CoV2 virus is likely to be followed by other
72 pandemics also caused by airborne Corona or other viruses. During the COVID-19 pandemic
73 people were asked to keep distance, wash their hands, avoid gatherings of people etc. But, do
74 people know about the degree to which these measures protect them from virus exposure and
75 infection? Do they know how a shorter distance between two people increases virus exposure? Do
76 people know to what extent the length of a social contact influences virus exposure? Do they know
77 how much a face mask protects them from virus exposure? The present study was focused on how
78 people perceive changes in virus exposure from an infected person when interpersonal face to face
79 distance is changed and when the time for a face to face conversation is changed.

80

81 The Covid-19 pandemic illustrates the need of expert communication about risks to the public and
82 policy makers for informed decision making. Based on the information available to them, lay
83 people develop their own mental models about causal and other relationships between different
84 variables. Therefore, we should find out about these models and modify them if they are wrong or
85 represent biased scientific facts. In the present context we will focus on virus exposure in face to
86 face conversations at different distances and lengths with and without a mask. In a conversation
87 between two people one of whom is infected with an airborne virus and the other not, there is an
88 exchange not only of words but also of airborne particles including viruses. In the case of face to
89 face situation, a person needs to know what a deviation from a chosen or a recommended distance
90 means for virus exposure. Only with such knowledge can she or he make informed decisions for
91 informed and persistent protective behaviors.

92

93 With a focus on inter individual distances, research questions like those raised above become
94 relevant. To specify, do people know how actual exposure to an airborne virus varies with
95 variation of face to face distance and length of a conversation? What does it mean to a person's
96 virus exposure to move closer from, e.g., 6 feet to 2 feet from a person who is infected with an
97 airborne virus like the SARS-CoV2? What does it mean to extend a conversation from 1 minute to
98 5 minutes and how can a face mask change virus exposure? To answer these questions, we asked
99 participants to judge virus exposure after changes of interpersonal distance, length of a

100 conversation and with or without a face mask. The judgments were related to empirical and
101 theoretical facts concerning the spread of virus particles in the air. Judged exposure was also
102 related to perceived risk and some individual characteristics. To exemplify, what individual factors
103 correlate with the accuracy of the participants' exposure judgments and with their preferences for
104 inter person distance during a conversation?

105

106 To the best of our knowledge, there are no studies of perceived exposure as a function of changes
107 of inter person distance except the study by Svenson and colleagues (Svenson et al., 2020) who
108 found that most participants underestimated the protective effect of moving further away from
109 another person. Correspondingly, most participants were unaware of how much their exposure
110 would increase if they moved closer to the other infected person. The present study departed from
111 this study and extended the scope to include time of a conversation with and without a mask
112 personal characteristics and risk perception.

113

114 **Objective measures of virus exposure**

115

116 The distance that particles travel away from an infected person depends on many different factors,
117 such as the size of the particles, initial momentum with which they are expelled (regular
118 conversation, singing coughing etc), position of the head and the body of the person emitting the
119 particles, strength (velocity), structure (turbulent or laminar), direction, temperature and humidity
120 of airflow and individual differences between people. A SARS-CoV2 virus can travel on droplets
121 that are greater or smaller than 5 μm . Droplets that are exhaled from a person and are greater than
122 5 μm follow the laws of gravity and fall to the ground within some distance from the exhaling
123 person (Morawska & Cao, 2020). Droplets smaller than 5 μm , called aerosols, can originate
124 directly from an exhalation or from evaporated greater droplets and their movements follow the
125 streams of air and can stay in the air for a long time (Crema, 2020; Setti et al., 2020; Lonergan,
126 2020). The aerosols can provide ambient virus exposure. Early after an exhalation, the ambient
127 dispersion effects can be ignored because the droplet-laden effects seem to dominate, but after
128 some time aerosols accumulate and the ambient effect takes over and determines the exposure if a
129 space is no properly ventilated (Walker et al., 2021). Hence, a person's exposure to droplets and
130 aerosols depend not only on distance but also on other factors and situations. The present project
131 focused on distance and time of a conversation keeping other variables constant assuming a
132 location for a conversation in an open space with calm air as in a spacious mall or outside with no
133 wind.

134

135 A physical theory of virus exposure that can be related to perceived exposure should be based on
136 virus distribution in the air under different conditions. Balachander and co-authors (Balachander et
137 al., 2020) gave an extensive overview and possible solutions for how to solve the multiphase flow
138 problems created by droplets and aerosols carrying viruses. To illustrate, Bourouiba (2020)
139 specified how far the larger droplets but also smaller aerosols can travel after a sneeze or cough
140 (7–8 m). In the present studies we treated only normal breathing conditions. To illustrate further,
141 Bjørn and Nielsen (2002, p. 155, Fig. 15) reported exposure to a another person’s normal breathing
142 in a calm laboratory face to face setting with different distances (0.4 to 1.2 m). The power function
143 $Exposure = 1.90 \times Emission \times Distance^{-2.2}$ describes their results. In another empirical study by
144 Nielsen et al. (2012, p. 557, Fig. 8) the power function was $Exposure = 4.3 \times Emission \times Distance$
145 $^{-2.3}$ (0.35 to 1.10 m) with a different constant depending on different measures of relative exposure
146 used in the different studies.

147

148 Recently, Melikov (2020) presented an overview of studies with exposure as a function of distance
149 reported by different authors (Ai et al., 2019; Bolashikov et al., 2012; Liu et al., 2016; Olmedo et
150 al, 2012; Olmedo et al., 2013; Villafruela et al., 2016). The results were summarized by Figure 1 in
151 Melikov (2020 p. 2) with a decreasing function that can be approximated by a power function with
152 an exponent that is - 2 or smaller. This was also confirmed by Wang, Xu and Huang (2020).

153 Howard and collaborators (Howard et al., 2021) reviewed research about face masks and
154 protection against droplets and aerosols who can carry corona viruses. In general, they found that
155 high quality face masks filter at least about 90% of droplets and aerosols exhaled by a person.

156

157 The laboratory results presented by Nielsen and collaborators and most of the above cited
158 researchers were obtained in conditions similar to the situation presented to the participants in the
159 present and in the study by Svenson and colleagues (Svenson et al., 2020), a face to face
160 conversation with no coughing or sneezing, but a change of inter-personal distance. Therefore, we
161 used the power function in Equation (1) when we formulated a model for objective exposure. We
162 set the exponent to 2.0 in the model. It is clear from the empirical studies cited above that this
163 exponent, if anything, underestimates the speed of decrease of exposure with increasing distance.
164 This allows some margin on the conservative side when comparing subjective judgments with
165 physical facts. In Equation (1), Epv is exposure to virus, a and n are constants, E emitted virus
166 during time t , and D distance to source.

167

168

$$169 \quad E_{pv} = a * E * t * D^{-n} \quad D > 0, t > 0 \quad (1)$$

170

171 We will call the function in Equation (1) the Virus Exposure Model, VEM. The exponent describes
172 change of exposure as as a function of change of distance . Applying $n = 2.0$ to a person who
173 approaches another infected person from 6 feet to 2 feet, it predicts an increase of exposure to
174 $(6/2)^2 = 9$ times. However, a person who applies a linear model, $n = 1.0$ will judge the exposure to
175 be $6/2 = 3$ times the initial exposure after the approach. The study by Svenson and colleagues
176 (Svenson et al., 2020) on perceived exposure showed that different judgments models and
177 exponents were used across participants. Some participants used a linear model and a majority of
178 the participants underestimated the effects on exposure following both approach and withdrawal
179 from another person.

180

181 **Behavior**

182 There are many studies of behavior in general and protective behavior in epidemic or pandemic
183 situations. Some of them study which psychological characteristics and processes correlate with
184 protective behavior on a general level. In a national survey from March 2020, Bruine de Bruin and
185 Bennet (2020) found that perceived COVID-19 risk of infection was significantly and positively
186 correlated with the protective behaviors "washing hands", "avoiding public spaces", "avoiding
187 high-risk individuals" and "canceling travels", but not with the perceived risk of dying from the
188 disease. To exemplify further, Vacondio and colleagues (2021) investigated self- protective
189 behavior in the UK, Italy and Austria. In their study from April 2020, they found that self-reported
190 protective behavior was positively correlated with worry and to some extent mediated by perceived
191 threat from the disease. Shilo, Peleg and Nudelman (2021) studied cognitive and emotional factors
192 and their relationships with reported adherence with behavioral guidelines. The results showed
193 how both emotional factors, and cognitive factors correlated positively with self reported
194 protective behavior. The cognitive factor "efficacy of behavior" was the most prominent factor
195 with $R = 0.70$, and different kinds of emotional worry had correlation with adherence to behavior
196 guidelines around $R = 0.20$. The fact that the belief in efficacy of protective behavior in general
197 leads to the question of what components of behavior are perceived to contribute to efficacy
198 including keeping distances. With reference to these results, we included questions about self
199 protective behavior, perceived threat from catching Covid-19, worry and efficacy of protective
200 behavior.

201

202 In a judgment study, Lisi and colleagues (Lisi et al., 2021) reported that their participants preferred
203 significantly shorter face to face distances to another person with a face mask compared to a
204 person without a face mask and longer distances if the other person was diagnosed with COVID-
205 19. Other studies show that mask wearing is positively correlated with other preventive measures,
206 including hand hygiene and physical distancing (Howard et al., 2021). Welsch and colleagues
207 (Wesch et al., 2021) asked their participants to indicate the inter-personal distance that they
208 preferred without the Corona virus and during the pandemic and the distances were 1.18 m and
209 1.83 m. However, the latter distance decreased over time during the pandemic to 1.41 m in some
210 kind of adaptive process. Hall (1966) suggested different interpersonal distances: close distances
211 for partner/ family (up to 0.45 meters), distance to friends (0.45-1.20 meters) and distance to
212 strangers (1.20 -3.65 meters). With reference to these distances and recommended inter-personal
213 distance during the pandemic, we used distances from 2 feet (0.60 m) to 6 feet (1.80 m) in the
214 present study and asked about preferred inter-personal distances with and without a mask on an
215 infected person.

216

217 In the first study, participants judged changes in exposure following both inter-personal distance
218 and changes of time of a conversation. Based on earlier results, we predicted that the effects on
219 virus exposure from changing inter-personal distance will be underestimated for both approaching
220 and moving away conditions. Based on the fact that a linear functions is the most easily available
221 tested in a hierarchy of subjective functions we predicted that a majority of the time judgments will
222 be described by a linear function, the first function to be elicited in an unknown situation
223 (Svenson, 2016). Furthermore, we predicted that a person's shortest acceptable face to face
224 distance to an infected person will co-vary with judgments of exposure following change of
225 distance and time. We predicted that a person who accepts only a longer distance from another
226 infected person to be safe will also judge a change in interpersonal distance to have a smaller effect
227 than a person who accepts a shorter safety distance. This is why the former needs to move further
228 away. We had no well grounded hypotheses about the effects on judged exposure of time of a
229 conversation and face mask investigated in study 2. However, the fact that a linear function is easy
230 to apply and elicit (Svenson, 2016) indicates that judgments of the effect of exposure time will not
231 be systematically biased. Research has shown that worry is one of the important drivers of
232 protective behaviors (Bruine de Bruin & Bennett, 2020; Frounfelker et al.,2021; Shilo, Peleg &
233 Nudelman, 2021; Vacondio et al., 2021) and therefore we predicted that worry should correlate
234 positively with protective behavior also in the present study.

235 **Study 1: Effects of distance and time on exposure**

236

237 **Method**

238 **Participants**

239 In all, 101 participants aged 18 år more were recruited by Prolific from a general US adult English
240 speaking population. One participant was eliminated because of failure on an attention test
241 question and 4 participants were excluded because they did not fulfill the task by giving only zero
242 or 100 as answer to the questions. Hence, the study included 96 participants (48 women, 47 men
243 and 1 unspecified). The mean age was 31 (SD= 11.4) with a range from 19 to 73 years. In the
244 sample 4 had high school no graduate education, 16 high school graduate, 26 some college, 39
245 college graduate and 11 more than college graduate education.

246

247 **Procedure and problems**

248 A Qualtrics questionnaire was distributed to the participants and on average a participant used 14
249 min to complete the task. The instruction started with the following.

250

251 *"As you probably know, the Coronavirus spreads on small droplets in the air when a person*
252 *infected with Covid-19 breaths, coughs, sneezes or talks without wearing a mask. Therefore,*
253 *keeping a physical social distance reduces any virus exposure and the risk of the virus to spread*
254 *from person to person. We will ask you to judge the degree to which different distances in face to*
255 *face situations can reduce exposure to the virus for persons who do not wear a mask."*

256

257 The instruction continued with an example that introduced the problems about inter-personal
258 distance. The instruction to the condition with exposure from a longer distance compared with a
259 shorter distances included the following.

260

261 *"Assume that two persons are in a face to face conversation in **6 minutes standing 2 feet** away*
262 *from each other and one of them is infected by a Corona virus. If they had been **further away** from*
263 *each other, for example, **6 feet** the virus exposure **would have been smaller**.*

264

265 *What percentage of the airborne viruses reaching a person at 2 feet will reach a person at 6 feet?*
266 *Please, answer with a percentage. Same = 100%, Three quarters = 75%, Half = 50%, One*
267 *quarter = 25 %, One tenth = 10% etc.. . ."*

268

269 Problems varying the time of a conversation were introduced as follows in the from long to short
270 time condition.

271

272 *"Assume that a conversation was 6 minutes and **became shorter**. Then the virus **exposure would***
273 ***become smaller**.*

274 *What percentage of the airborne viruses reaching a person during a shorter conversation of 2*
275 ***minutes at 3 feet** will reach a person compared with the exposure **during 6 minutes**? Please,*
276 *answer with a percentage. Same = 100%, Three quarters = 75%, Half = 50%, One quarter = 25*
277 *%, One tenth = 10% etc. . ."*
278

279 The problems were presented in blocks of 6 problems in each of the conditions: (a) from long to
280 short distance (time constant), (b) short to long distance (time constant), (c) from short to long
281 conversation time (distance constant) and (d) from long to short conversation time (distance
282 constant). All blocks were presented to each participant with either distance or time presented first
283 for half of the participants in a balanced design. Blocks with increasing distance or time were
284 presented first for half of the participants in a balanced order. Hence, the design was 2 x2
285 (distance/time presentation first x increasing/decreasing presentation first). The items in a block
286 were presented in a unique random order to each participant. The distances and times in the
287 problems are listed in Tables 1 and 2. Some general demographic questions and questions about a
288 participant's worry over COVID, preferred interpersonal distance and some other questions related
289 to a participant's experience with COVID followed. Last, we presented three cognitive problems
290 measuring cognitive ability. However, they had no relationship with any of the other items or
291 scales and were not treated further. A complete set of questions can be found in Appendix 1.

292

293 **Results**

294

295 Ten of the participants had been infected with the Corona virus. We will include also these
296 participants in the group data analyses because the sample was too small for separate analyses. A
297 number of participants who were asked to judge percentages greater than 100 in a decreasing
298 distance condition (increasing exposure) gave judgments that were smaller than 100. In spite of a
299 detailed instruction, they may have misunderstood the task so that they judged the increment in
300 exposure instead of the total exposure after a change. When a judgment was smaller than 100 in an
301 increasing distance condition (decreasing exposure) the judgment was coded as missing. There
302 were only a few judgments above 100 in the increasing distance (decreasing exposure) conditions
303 and they were also coded as missing. The judgment distributions were all skewed with high

304 skewness (less than - 1.0 or greater than + 1.0) or moderate skewness (between +/- 1.0 and +/-
305 0.5). Therefore, we focused on medians in the data analyses and excluded means for some
306 conditions in Table 1, because there were too many outliers distorting the means.

307

308 **The bias**

309

310 Table 1 gives medians and quartiles for each of the distance problems. In comparison with the
311 VEM model with $n = 2.0$, the average participant overestimated exposure for increasing distance
312 and underestimated exposure for decreasing distance. This means that they were not sufficiently
313 sensitive to the effects on exposure of changing distance to an infected face to face speaker.

314

315

316

317

318

319

320

321

322

323

324

325

326

327

328

329

330

331

332

333

334

335

336

337

333 **Table 1. Medians and quartiles of exposure judgments and predictions according to VEM, n= 2.0 and linear**
 334 **model with n= 1.0. Increasing and decreasing distance.**

340

In-creasing distance	First distance (feet)	Second distance (feet)	Mean (SD)	Judged median exposure % (quartiles)	N	Predicted VEM n = 2.0	Predicted linear n = 1.0	Median - VEM predict n = 2.0	Judgment - linear predict n = 1.0
1	4	5	62.31 (30.16)	75.0 (47.5 - 80.0)	96	64.0	80.0	11	-5.0
2	2	6	32.86 (21.52)	30.0 (15.0 - 40.0)	95	11.0	33.0	19	-3.0
3	4	6	55.21 (21.48)	60.0 (40.0 - 75.0)	96	44.4	66.0	16	- 6.0
4	2	5	38.25 (17.90)	40.0 (25.0 - 50.0)	95	16.0	40.0	24	0.0
5	5	6	64.60 (32.44)	80.0 (30.0 - 98.5)	96	69.4	83.3	11	-3.3
6	2	4	49.92 (14.98)	50 (50.0 - 50.0)	96	25.0	50.0	25	0.0
De-creasing distance									
1	5	4	-*	125 (100 - 175)	85	156	125	- 31	0.0
2	6	2	-	300 (300 - 500)	84	900	300	- 600	0.0
3	6	4	-	150 (150 - 200)	85	225	150	-75	0.0
4	5	2	-	250 (215 - 500)	84	625	250	- 375	0.0
5	6	5	-	120 (100 - 150)	84	144	120	- 24	0.0
6	4	2	-	200 (200 - 313)	84	400	200	-200	0.0

341

342 the distributions had too many outliers for reliable means.

343

344 For both increasing and decreasing distance separately, the differences between the median
345 judgments and predictions of the VEM 2.0 model were significant in Wilcoxon Signed-Ranks
346 tests, $T=0$, $\alpha=0.05$, $N=6$ for both conditions. The numbers of observations were too small for a test
347 based on normal distributions and therefore the z values are not reported. It is clear that the
348 median judgments in Table 1 are closer to a linear function than to VEM 2.0.

349
350 We computed the percentages of participants who realized the degree to which exposure changes
351 with changes in distance following the VEM 2.0 function or faster. For the increasing distance
352 problems meaning a decrease in radiation, these percentages were for change from 4 to 5 feet,
353 40%, 2 to 6 feet, 22%, 4 to 6 feet, 27%, 2 to 5 feet 8%, 5 to 6 feet 33% and 2 to 4 feet 10% with
354 mean 23%. Hence, 77% of the judgments indicated that the participants did not realize how fast
355 virus exposure decreases with increasing distance to an infected person.

356
357 For the decreasing distance (increasing exposure) problems the participants who realized how fast
358 exposure increases compared to VEM 2.0 following an approach were from 5 to 4 feet, 28%, 6 to 2
359 feet, 16%, 6 to 4 feet, 21%, 5 to 2 feet, 11%, 6 to 5 feet, 31% and 4 to 2 feet, 19%.with mean 21%.
360 Hence, 79% of the judgments indicated insensitivity to the fast increase of exposure following an
361 approach towards an infected person.

362
363 Next, we investigated the effects on exposure following changes of the length of a conversation.
364 Table 2 shows median judgments for decreasing and increasing time. The results show an almost
365 perfect fit to a linear relation. This means that the participants were quite accurately sensitive to the
366 effects of changing the time of a conversation according to VEM with a constant distance.

367

368

369

370

371

372

373

374

375

376

377

378

379

380 **Table 2. Medians and quartiles of judgments and predictions according to linear model.**
 381 **Decreasing and increasing time of talk.**
 382

De-creasing time	First time (minutes)	Second time (minutes)	Judged exposure	N	Predicted linear
2	10	1	10.0 (10 - 10)	96	10.0
3	6	1	17.0 (15 - 25)	96	17.0
4	10	3	30.0 (30.0 - 35.0)	96	30.0
5	3	1	33.0 (25.0 - 33.0)	96	33.0
6	10	6	60.0 (50.0 - 61.3)	96	60.0
In-creasing time					
1	3	6	200 (200 - 200)	86	200
2	1	10	1000 (1000 - 1000)	90	1000
3	1	6	600 (500 - 600)	88	600
4	3	10	333 (300 - 500)	89	333
5	1	3	300 (200 - 300)	86	300
6	6	10	180 (165 - 400)	85	167

383

384

385 In summary, the results replicated the 2020 findings (Svenson et al., 2020) with significant
 386 underestimations of the effects on exposure of changing distance. Second, the participants
 387 followed an adequate linear model when they judged the effects of time, quite in line with distance
 388 constant in Equation (1).

389

390 We computed Cronbach's alfa for each of the four conditions. The six problems in the increasing
391 distance condition were reliable with $\alpha = 0.78$ and in the decreasing time condition α
392 $=0.82$. The problems who invited percentage judgments above 100 were less consistent with
393 decreasing distance $\alpha = 0.06$ and for increasing time $\alpha = 0.65$. We computed the mean
394 judgments across items in each of the conditions omitting the decreasing distance items and called
395 the variable means D_{incr} (increasing distance), T_{decr} (decreasing time) and T_{incr} (increasing time).
396 We then investigated co-variances between these variables and other items in the questionnaire.
397 There were no significant correlations between the three variables across participants, but a
398 marginally significant correlation between D_{incr} and T_{incr} ($R = -0.20$, $p=0.06$).

399

400

401 **Additional questions**

402

403 The mean response to the question "shortest distance from an infected person that would make you
404 feel sufficiently safe" was 11.51 feet (SD=17.19), 3.51 meters. The Pearson correlations between
405 the *shortest safe distance* and D_{incr} and T_{decr} were $R = -0.22$ ($p < 0.05$) and $R = 0.33$ ($p < 0.001$)
406 respectively. *Safe distance*, and T_{incr} were unrelated. Generally speaking, this means that if a
407 person wants a longer safety distance in a face to face conversation, she or he judges the effect of
408 withdrawal on decrease of exposure as greater (relatively smaller percent judgments after change)
409 than a person who needs only a shorter safety distance. Correspondingly, when a person wants a
410 longer safety distance she or he judges the effect of shortening a conversation on exposure to be
411 smaller (relatively greater percent judgments after change) than a person who states a shorter
412 safety distance.

413

414 We asked: "assume a new Coronavirus epidemic occurred and no vaccine was available.
415 Compared to the average person like yourself, how likely do think that it is that you would become
416 sick? (Much less risk = 1, same risk as average person = 50, much greater risk =100)". The median
417 response was 50 meaning that overall there was no optimism bias (Svenson, 1981). We wanted to
418 know if those judging themselves less likely to catch the disease were more optimistic than those
419 who judged themselves as more likely to catch the disease were pessimistic. The mean response
420 gives a hint about this question and it was 42.79 (SD = 24.66), which is significantly lower than
421 50, $t(95) = -2.86$, $p > 0.01$ showing that the optimists were more optimistic than the pessimists
422 were pessimistic. We asked if the respondent had been infected with a Corona virus to what extent
423 would it depend on poor luck or poor behavior? The responses indicated influence from both

424 factors with judgments around 50 (the midpoint of the VAS scale 1 - 100) with mean = 46.67 (SD
425 = 28.33) and mean = 53.27 (SD=31.27) for the poor luck and poor behavior questions respectively.
426 However, the difference is not statistically significant and these judgments had no correlations
427 with optimism or pessimism.
428 As predicted, the question "How worried have you been over your own personal risk of becoming
429 sick with COVID-19 during the pandemic?" correlated with "shortest acceptable distance", $R = 0.$
430 23 , $p < 0.05$, "avoiding public spaces", $R = 0.52$, $p < 0.001$ and "canceled or postponed meetings
431 with friends" $R = 0.49$, $p < 0.001$. These results corroborate the earlier findings (Bruine de Bruin &
432 Bennett, 2020; Frounfelker et al., 2021; Shilo, Peleg & Nudelman, 2021; Vacondio et al., 2021).
433 However, there were no significant correlations with this worry variable and D_{incr} or T_{decr} . In
434 summary, worry over catching COVID-19 was not directly related to judgments of the factual
435 effects of changing distance and time of a conversation but to judgments of an acceptable distance
436 to an infected person. We also asked about "general worry over things that may go wrong in life"
437 but this unspecific worry did not correlate with protective behaviors.

438
439

440 **Study 2 : Effects of distance and mask on judgments of** 441 **exposure**

442

443 In this study, we introduced problems with an infected person wearing a mask in a face to face
444 conversation. The mask was a high quality mask that absorbed 90% of the exhaled particles.

445

446 **Method**

447

448 **Participants**

449 In all, 150 participants were recruited by Prolific from a US adult English speaking population
450 sample. They had not taken part in study1. After exclusion of 9 participants who gave judgments
451 that implied that virus exposure was greater with than without a mask at the same distance, data
452 from 141 participants remained for further analysis. There were 66 women, 74 men and 1
453 unspecified gender. The mean age was 32 years (SD= 13) with a range from 18 to 80 years. In the
454 sample 1 had high school but no graduation, 15 were high school graduate, 42 had some college,
455 62 were college graduate and 21 had more than college graduate education.

456

457 **Procedure and Material**

458 As in study 1, a Qulatrix questionnaire was distributed to the participants and a participant used
459 on average 11 min to complete the task. We analyzed three questions about virus exposure
460 comparing the protective effects of distance and face mask and two questions asking about the
461 shortest distance from an infected person that the participant would accept as sufficiently safe. The
462 three distance questions were presented in a random order that was unique for each participant and
463 the other questions in appendix 1 were presented after them in a predetermined order. The
464 introductory general instruction was as follows.

465

466 *"As you probably know, the Corona virus (SARS-CoV2) spreads on small droplets and*
467 *aerosols (very small airborne particles) in the air when a person infected with the virus*
468 *breaths, coughs, sneezes or talks. Therefore, keeping a physical social distance and using a*
469 *face mask both reduce virus exposure and the risk of the virus to spread from person to*
470 *person. We will ask you to judge how different distances and/or a face mask can reduce*
471 *your exposure to the virus when you do not wear a mask yourself in a face to face*
472 *conversation with a person infected with COVID-19.*

473

474 All problems concerned conversations in an open space with no wind or draft and the instruction
475 of the first problem included the following:

476 *"If the infected person puts on a "90% face mask" (stopping 90% of exhaled viruses) you*
477 *can move closer and yet keep the same safety standard because your exposure decreases.*
478 *What is the closer distance to the infected person with a mask giving the same virus*
479 *exposure as the one you accepted without a mask at 6 feet ?*

480 *_____feet _____inches with a mask gives same level of exposure as at 6 feet without a 90%*
481 *mask."*

482

483 The second problem was the same but with 6 feet replaced by 11 feet. The third problem was
484 introduced in this way.

485

486 *"In another conversation the infected person without a mask moves away from you from 2*
487 *to 6 feet. What will the exposure be at 6 feet compared with the exposure at 2 feet? We set*
488 *your Corona virus exposure at 2 feet to 100% virus exposure. When the other person*

489 *moves away from you the initial 100 virus exposure decreases. But to what level does the*
490 *exposure decrease?*

491 *If you think that the exposure halves you write 50 and if it is one third 33 of the original*
492 *exposure you write 33 percent, if it is one tenth 10 percent etc*

493
494 *My total exposure after the moving away from 2 feet to 6 feet*
495
496 *becomes _____% of the 2 feet exposure"*

497

498 The face masks and distance problems were followed by a set of questions concerning the
499 participants that were the same as in study 1 except the problems measuring cognitive ability. They
500 were omitted because they did not co-vary with any of the other variables in study 1. In addition to
501 the questions in study 1, we asked about the shortest inter-personal distance from an infected
502 person that a participant could accept as sufficiently safe for a face to face 5 min conversation,
503 with and without a mask on the infected person.

504

505 **Results**

506

507 Typically, a high quality FFP2 mask stops 95% of the virus exposure if the mask is correctly fitted
508 to the face (Howard et al., 2021) We decided to specify 90% efficiency in our problems to allow
509 some mask misfit when we calculated predictions of correct solutions of the problems. A total of
510 29 participants had been diagnosed with Covid- 19 but because they were such a small group they
511 were not treated separately in the following analyses.

512

513 We will use meters as a measure of distance in Table 3 and in the following calculations. First, we
514 denote the distance without a face mask D_i meters for the distance pair i . The distance with a
515 mask that equals the protective effect of distance D_i is D_{imask} . Then the mask reduction of
516 exposure from 100% at D_i to 10% at D_{imask} ; To repeat, without a mask the radiation is 100% at
517 D_{imask} and the mask reduces exposure to 10%. We have to move away to D_i without a mask to
518 match that exposure. Then, according to Equation (1), with exposure decreasing with the square of
519 the distance and $(D_{\text{imask}}/D_i)^2 = (10/100)$; $D_{\text{imask}}^2 = 0.10 D_i^2$; $D_{\text{imask}} = 0.316 D_i$. Table 3 shows the
520 predicted values for the first two problems. The linear estimates in the two first rows follow from
521 $(D_{\text{imask}}/D_i) = (10/100)$. The prediction of exposure when changing from 2 to 6 feet follows from
522 $n=2$ in equation (1), $(2/6)^2$ and for the linear prediction with the exponent 1.0.

523

524 **Table 3. Judgments and objective estimates of the protective effects of interpersonal distance**
525 **and mask against virus exposure.**

526

	Mean (SD)	Median (m) (Q₂₅ - Q₇₅)	Predicted VEM n = 2.0	Predicted linear, n = 1.0	Diff mean judged - predicted VEM n = 2.0	Diff median - predicted VEM n = 2.0
6 feet (1.83 m), closest with mask? N=140 (Q1)	1.24 m (2.18)	0.91 m (0.61 - 1.63)	0.58 m	0.18 m	0.66 m****	0.33 m
11 feet (3.35 m), closest with mask? N=141 (Q2)	1.69 m (1.97)	1.64 m (0.91 - 1.83)	1.06 m	0.17 m	0.63 m****	0.58 m
2 to 6 feet, (0.61 - 1.83 m) no mask percent remaining exposure? N=141 (Q7)	44.7% (37.8)	33.0 % (30 - 50)	11.1%	33.3%	34.1%****	21.9 %
Normal interpersonal distance without virus (G1)	3.35 feet (1.91) 1.02 m	3.00 feet (2.00 - 4.00) 0.91 m				
Judged shortest safe distance without mask (G3)	11.6 feet (10.40) 3.54 m	10.0 feet (6.00 - 12.00) 3.02 m				
Judged shortest safe distance with mask (G4)	7.10 feet (4.42) 2.16 m	6.00 feet (4.00 - 9.00) 1.83 m				

527

528

529 For illustrative purposes, we tested the differences of the means from the predicted VEM 2.0
530 values for the three first rows in Table 3 in two tailed t tests. The test for the 6 feet distance

531 problem resulted in $t(139) = 7.84$ $p < 0.001$, and the 11 feet problem $t(140) = 6.05$ $p < 0.001$. The
532 median for the 2 to 6 feet approach, 33.0% was not too far from the median for the same problem
533 in study 1 (30.0%) and the mean 44.7% was significantly different from the VEM 2.0 predicted
534 value 11.1%, $t(140) = 10.40$ $p < 0.001$. Hence, the results show that the participants
535 underestimated the effect of a face mask on reduction of virus exposure.

536

537 We also investigated the distribution of judgments to find out about the proportions of participants
538 who made approximately correct judgments. For the 6 feet (1.83 m) problem we counted the
539 number of participants who judged the distance to be smaller than 0.58 m In all, 35 participants
540 (23%) gave distances that were equal or smaller than the predicted exposure. Hence, 77%
541 underestimated the protective effect of a mask and selected a greater distance than required. For
542 the 11 feet (3.35 m) problem with a cut point 1.06 m 45 (30%) of the participants gave distances
543 that were equal to or smaller than the VEM 2.0 prediction, again indicating an underestimation of
544 the protective effect of a mask. There were 11 participants (7%) who judged the exposure to be
545 less than 13 % after a withdrawal from 2 to 6 feet and hence, 87% of the participants
546 underestimated the protective effect of distance, which supports the results in study 1.

547

548 Now, we wanted to determine the perceived efficiency of a mask from the distance judgments in
549 problems (1) and (2). The distance judgments given by the subjects include both the protective
550 power of distance and mask, so we need to disentangle the distance effect from the mask effect.
551 We will use problem (1) to illustrate how the effect of a mask can be estimated assuming no
552 interaction effects between the distance and mask factors. We know from study 1 and the earlier
553 study of Corona virus exposure (Svenson et al., 2020) that a linear VEM function predicts how
554 judgments will describe the increase in exposure after coming closer to a person. This means that
555 in problem (1) the judged approach from 1.83 m to 0.91 m gives a $1.83/0.91 = 2.01$ increase in
556 perceived exposure. Set the exposure at 1.83 m to 100% and then the exposure without a mask at
557 0.91 m will be $2.01 \times 100\%$. The mask reduces the exposure 201% to 100%, that is $(201 -$
558 $100)/201 = 50\%$. Then, the subjective efficiency of the mask gives a 50% reduction of virus
559 exposure. This can be compared with the stated efficiency 90% . Hence, the participants
560 underestimated the effect of a face mask. The corresponding analysis of problem (2) gives for an
561 approach from 3.35 m to 1.64 m $3.35/1.64 = 2.04$ increase in perceived exposure without a mask.
562 Following the computation above, this problem indicates that the mask allows $(204 - 100)/204 =$
563 51%, of the exposure and the subjective efficiency is 49%, which again indicates underestimation
564 of the actual efficiency.

565

566 The closest safe distances in Table 3 offers another way of estimating the subjective efficiency of a
567 mask. Comparison of mean shortest distance without mask, 3.54 m and shortest distance with
568 mask, 2.16 m indicates that the mask reduces the distance with 1.38 m which corresponds to the
569 reduction of exposure. A subjective linear VEM decrease of exposure gives a remaining exposure
570 $2.16/3.54 = 61\%$ and the estimated efficiency of the mask is 39%.

571

572 The responses to the first two problems comparing situations with and without a mask correlated
573 significantly $R = 0.56$, $p < 0.001$ and we decided to use the mean of the judgments in a search for
574 covariance between the mask problems and other judgments.

575 However, there was only one marginally significant correlation between the means of the two
576 mask problems and another variable, withdrawal from 2 feet to 6 feet, $R = 0.16$, $p = 0.065$.

577

578 The *withdrawal from 2 to 6 feet* responses correlated with *belief in following advice of distance*
579 *and wearing a mask*, $R(141) = -0.19$, $p < 0.05$. This means that a greater effect of withdrawal on
580 exposure (smaller percentage of exposure) was positively associated with belief in the efficiency of
581 following advice. The *belief in following advice of distance and wearing a mask* variable and
582 *safety distance* correlated, $R(141) = 0.24$, $p < 0.01$. When a person indicated a greater safety
583 distance, he or she had a stronger belief in following advice of distance and wearing a mask. As
584 predicted from other research (Bruine de Bruin & Bennett, 2020; Frounfelker et al., 2021; Shilo,
585 Peleg & Nudelman, 2021; Vacondio et al., 2021) *worry over becoming sick with Covid-19*
586 correlated with *belief in following advice*, $R(141) = 0.48$, $p < 0.001$.

587

588 In summary, a majority of the participants underestimated the effect of a face mask on reduction of
589 virus exposure from 90% to about half of that percentage and underestimated the effect on virus
590 exposure of moving away from an infected person.

591

592 **Discussion**

593

594 As predicted, the studies showed that the effects on virus exposure of approaching and moving
595 away from an infected person were underestimated. A linear instead of a curved relationship
596 described the judgments, and hence explained the systematic underestimation bias. We used the
597 exponent 2.0 in the VEM model to calculate the correct exposure values as a function of change of

598 distance. This gives an underestimation in comparison with empirical studies of how quickly
599 exposure changes with distance (Bjorn & Nielsen, 2002; Howard et l., 2021; Melikov, 2020).
600 Therefore, when we reported that participants underestimated the change of exposure following a
601 change of distance, this means that they were underestimating in relation to already conservative
602 objective estimates of change of exposure. Hence, the reported underestimations may be even
603 greater than what we have reported.

604

605 The normal inter individual distance in a face to face conversation, 1.91 m was increased to 3.54 m
606 to make an average person feel safe when the other person was infected with a virus. We predicted
607 that a person who selects a longer safety distance from an infected person should judge a change in
608 interpersonal distance to have a smaller effect than a person who accepts a shorter safety distance.
609 However, this prediction was not confirmed because safety distance was positively correlated with
610 greater judgments of exposure change after change of distance. On average, those who were more
611 sensitive to the effect of distance change selected longer safety distances. A participant who
612 choose a relatively greater safety distance for her or himself judged the efficiency of official
613 behavioral advice as relatively higher. When a participant wanted a longer safety distance, she or
614 he judged the effect of shortening a conversation on exposure to be smaller than a person who
615 indicted a shorter safety distance. These subjective relationships characterize the mental models
616 that are elicited in response to the problems we have presented.

617

618 Our expectation that judgments of length of a conversation and exposure would be easier to judge
619 correctly than distance was confirmed and the explanation that the linear relation relationship
620 contributed to the correct judgments was confirmed. As predicted, worry of becoming sick with
621 Covid-19 correlated positively with belief in following advice given by the authorities. The effect
622 of a face mask on exposure reduction was underestimated in comparison with the mask
623 performance given to the participants. In summary, the average participant revealed a mental
624 model that included a linear relationship between distance and exposure and within this model
625 (and objectively) the effect of wearing a face mask was underestimated. In general, people are not
626 used to make the judgments that we have asked for, but our results indicate relationships in
627 peoples' mental models about airborne virus exposure that are relevant for behavior. We believe
628 that this result is relevant for peoples' actual protective behaviors when there is an ongoing
629 epidemic disease or pandemic. For example, people including health workers (Atnafie et al., 2021)
630 intuitively and subjectively may downplay the importance of keeping a sufficient distance and
631 wearing a face mask. Then, their protective behavior depends on efficient facts and risk

632 communications without an intuitive psychological foundation. Policy makers and politicians
633 influenced by their intuitive understanding of the virus protective power of distancing and face
634 masks, may hesitate to regulate their citizens' behavior and not require distancing and face masks.

635

*

636 The author declares no potential competing interests. The study was approved by the ethics
637 committee at Decision Research and the study was supported by the project Swedish Judgments at
638 Decision Research.

639

640

641

642 **References**

643

644 Ai, Z.T., Hashimoto, K., Melikov, A.K. (2019) Influence of pulmonary ventilation rate and
645 breathing cycle period on the risk of cross-infection, *Indoor Air* 6 (29), 993–1004.

646 Atnafie, S. A., Anteneh, D. A., Yimenu, D. K., & Kifle, Z. D. (2021). Assessment of exposure
647 risks to COVID-19 among frontline health care workers in Amhara Region, Ethiopia: A cross-
648 sectional survey. *PloS one*, 16(4), e0251000.

649 Balachandar, S., Zaleski, S., Soldati, A., Ahmadi, G., & Bourouiba, L. (2020). Host-to-host
650 airborne transmission as a multiphase flow problem for science based social distance
651 guidelines. *International Journal of Multiphase Flow*, 132, [https://doi.org/
652 10.1016/j.ijmultiphaseflow.2020.103439](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijmultiphaseflow.2020.103439).

653 Bjørn, E., & Nielsen, P. V. (2002). Dispersal of exhaled air and personal exposure in
654 displacement ventilated rooms. *Indoor air*, 12(3), 147–164.

655 Bourouiba, L. (2020). Turbulent gas clouds and respiratory pathogen emissions: potential
656 implications for reducing transmission of COVID-19. *Jama*, 323(18), 1837–1838.

657 Bolashikov, Z.D., Melikov, A.K., Kierat, W. et al., (2012) Exposure of health care workers and
658 occupants to coughed airborne pathogens in a double-bed hospital patient room with
659 overhead mixing ventilation, *HVAC R Res.* 18 (4), 602–615.

660 Bruine de Bruin, W. B., & Bennett, D. (2020). Relationships between initial COVID-19 risk
661 perceptions and protective health behaviors: a national survey. *American Journal of
662 Preventive Medicine*, 59(2), 157-167.

663 Crema, E. (2020). Not even the air of empty spaces is coronavirus free (Two meters is not a safe
664 distance). *arXiv preprint arXiv:2006.08823*.

665

666 Frounfelker, R. L., Santavicca, T., Li, Z. Y., Miconi, D., Venkatesh, V., & Rousseau, C.

667 (2021). COVID-19 Experiences and Social Distancing: Insights From the Theory of

668 Planned Behavior. *American Journal of Health Promotion*, 1-10, [https://doi.org/](https://doi.org/10.1177/08901171211020997)

669 10.1177/08901171211020997.

670 Hall, T. E. (1966) *The Hidden Dimension*. Garden City: Doubleday.

671 Howard, J., Huang, A., Li, Z., Tufekci, Z., Zdimal, V., van der Westhuizen, H. M., ... & Rimoin,

672 A. W. (2021). An evidence review of face masks against COVID-19 *Proceedings of the*

673 *National Academy of Sciences*, 118(4).

674 Lisi, M. P., Scattolin, M., Fusaro, M., & Aglioti, S. M. (2021). A Bayesian approach to reveal the

675 key role of mask wearing in modulating projected interpersonal distance during the first

676 COVID-19 outbreak. *PloS one*, 16(8), e0255598.

677 Liu, L., Li, Y., Nielsen, P.V. et al., Short-range airborne transmission of expiratory droplets

678 between two people, *Indoor Air* 27 (2), 452–462.

679 Melikov, A. K. (2020) COVID-19: Reduction of airborne transmission needs paradigm shift in

680 ventilation. *Building and Environment* 186, 107336.

681 Lonergan, M. (2020). Even one metre seems generous. A reanalysis of data in: Chu et al.

682 (2020) Physical distancing, face masks, and eye protection to prevent person-to-person

683 transmission of SARS-CoV-2 and COVID-19. *medRxiv*.

684 Morawska, L., & Cao, J. (2020). Airborne transmission of SARS-CoV-2: The world should

685 face the reality. *Environment International*, <https://doi.org/1016/jenvint.2020.105730>.

686 Nielsen, P. V., Olmedo, I., de Adana, M. R., Grzelecki, P., & Jensen, R. L. (2012). Airborne cross-

687 infection risk between two people standing in surroundings with a vertical temperature

688 gradient. *HVAC&R Research*, 18(4), 552–561.

689 Olmedo, I., Nielsen, P.V., Ruiz de Adana, M., et al., (2012) Distribution of exhaled con-

690 taminants and personal exposure in a room using three different air distribution

691 strategies, *Indoor Air* 22, 64–76.

692 Olmedo, I., Nielsen, P.V., Ruiz de Adana, M., Jensen, R.L. (2013) The risk of airborne cross

693 infection in a room with vertical low-velocity ventilation, *Indoor Air* 23, 62–73.

694 Setti, L., Passarini, F., De Gennaro, G., Barbieri, P., Perrone, M.G., Borelli,

695 M., Palmisani, J., Di Gilio, A., Piscitelli, P. & Miani, A. (2020) Airborne

696 transmission route of Covid-19: Why 2 meters/6 feet of inter-personal distance could not be

- 697 Shiloh, S., Peleg, S., & Nudelman, G. (2021). Adherence to COVID-19 protective behaviors: A
698 Svenson, O. (1981) Are we all less risky and more skillful than our fellow drivers? *Acta*
699 *Psychologica*, 47, 143–148.
- 700 Svenson, O. (2016). Towards a framework for human judgements of quantitative information: the
701 numerical judgment process, NJP model. *Journal of cognitive psychology*, 28(7), 884-
702 898.
- 703 Svenson, O., Appelbom, S., Mayorga, M., & Lindholm Öjmyr, T. (2020). Without a mask:
704 Judgments of Corona virus exposure as a function of inter-personal distance. *Judgment*
705 *and Decision Making*, 15(6), 881–888.
- 706 Vacondio, M., Priolo, G., Dickert, S., & Bonini, N. (2021). Worry, perceived threat and media
707 communication as predictors of self-protective behaviors during the COVID-19 outbreak in
708 Europe. *Frontiers in psychology*, 12, 231.
- 709 Villafruela, J.M, Olmedo, I., San Jose, J.F. (2016) Influence of human breathing modes on
710 airborne cross infection risk, *Building Environment*. 106, 340–351.
- 711 Walker, J. S., Archer, J., Gregson, F. K., Michel, S. E., Bzdek, B. R., & Reid, J. P. (2021).
712 Accurate representations of the microphysical processes occurring during the transport of
713 exhaled aerosols and droplets. *ACS central science*, 7(1), 200-209.
- 714 Wang, Y., Xu,G., & Huang Y-W (2020) Modelling the load of SARS-CoV-2 virus in human
715 expelled particles during coughing and speaking. *PLOS ONE*,
716 <https://doi.org/journal.pone.0241539>.
- 717 Welsch, R., Wessels, M., Bernhard, C., Thönes, S., & von Castell, C. (2021). Physical distancing
718 and the perception of interpersonal distance in the COVID-19 crisis. *Scientific reports*,
719 11(1), 1-9.

720

721

722

723

724

725

726

727 *Additional questions study 1*

728

Appendix 1

- 729 25. You have answered questions about inter-personal distance and virus exposure. What average
730 distance do you keep to a person in a normal face to face conversation when no virus is
731 around?
732 I keep _____meters
733
- 734 26. If you were infected with a new Corona virus, to what extent do you think that this could be
735 caused by just you being unlucky or your own poor protective behavior?
736 My poor luck _____ (not at all = 0, only poor luck = 100)
737 Poor protective behavior _____(not at all = 0, only poor behavior = 100)
738
- 739 27.What is the shortest distance between you and a Corona virus infected person that would make
740 you feel sufficiently safe to start a conversation of 3 minutes?
741 _____meters would be sufficient for me to feel safe.
742
- 743 28. How worried have you been over your own personal risk of becoming sick with COVID-19
744 during the pandemic? _____
745 (0 = Not at all, 100 = Maximum)
746
- 747 29. In general, how worried are you over things that may go wrong in your
748 life? _____
749 (0 = Not at all, 100 = Maximum)
750
- 751 30. If you always follow the advice of keeping distance to other people. To what degree do you
752 think that this behavior can protect you from being infected by a Corona virus assuming no
753 mask ? _____
754 (0 = Not at all, 100 = Maximum)
755
- 756 31. How old are you? _____years
757
- 758 32. What gender ?
759 Female ____, Male____, Other or no answer____
760
- 761 33. Have you been diagnosed with COVID-19 by a test or by a doctor ?
762 Yes _____ No_____

763

764

765 34. If you had the COVID - 19 infection and were sick, for how many days were

766 you sick? _____

767 I have had no Covid infection _____ (mark applicable alternative)

768 35. Has anyone in your extended family been diagnosed with COVID - 19? (mark applicable
769 alternative).

770 Yes _____ No _____

771

772 36. If one person in your close family was sick, for how many days (the person who was most
773 sick)? _____

774

775 37. Are you vaccinated against COVID - 19?

776 Yes _____ I received the second dose _____(month) 2021

777 No or only one dose _____ (mark applicable alternative)

778

779 38. Assuming a new Corona virus epidemic without a vaccine, how likely do think that it is that
780 you would be sick compared to the average person like yourself?

781 My risk would be (scale 1 -100) _____

782 (Much less risk = 1, same risk as average person = 50, much greater risk =100)

783

784 39 If you should be infected with a new Corona virus without a vaccine, what is the risk that you
785 would die from the infection? _____

786 (No risk = 0 , 100 = Certain that I would die)

787

788 ***Which of the following have you done during the last seven days of the present Corona virus
789 pandemic?***

790

791 40. Avoided public spaces, gatherings or crowds more often than before the pandemic?

792 Never = 0, Always = 100 _____

793

794 41. Canceled or postponed meetings with friends more often than before the pandemic? ?

795 Never = 0, Always = 100 _____

796

797 42. A bat and a ball cost \$110 in total. The bat costs \$100 more than the ball. How much
798 does the ball cost?

799 The cost of the ball in dollars: _____

800

801 43. If it takes 5 machines 5 minutes to make 5 widgets, how long would it take 100 machines to
802 make 100 widgets?

803 Number of minutes: _____

804

805 44. In a lake, there is a patch of lily pads. Every day, the patch doubles in size. If it takes 48 days
806 for the patch to cover the entire lake, how long would it take for the patch to cover half of the
807 lake?

808 Number of days: _____

809

810 45. Please. indicate your highest level of education.