

1

2 **Exploratory Study to Characterise the Individual** 3 **Types of Health Literacy and Beliefs and Their** 4 **Associations with Infection Prevention** 5 **Behaviours amid the COVID-19 Pandemic in** 6 **Japan: A Longitudinal Study**

7

8

9 Mao Yagihashi¹, Michio Murakami¹, Mai Kato², Asayo Yamamura², Asako Miura^{2,1},
10 Kei Hirai^{2,1}

11

12 ¹ Division of Scientific Information and Public Policy, Center for Infectious Disease
13 Education and Research, Osaka University, Suita, Osaka, Japan

14 ² Osaka University Graduate School of Human Sciences, Suita, Osaka, Japan

15

16 Corresponding Author:

17 Mao Yagihashi¹

18 Techno Alliance C209, 2-8 Yamadaoka, Suita, Osaka 565-0871, Japan

19 Email address: yagihashi@cider.osaka-u.ac.jp

20

21

22 Notes:

23 This paper provides additional analyses and discussion to previous reports (preprints
24 in Japanese; PHASE 1: <https://psyarxiv.com/ez4bc/>; PHASE 2:
25 <https://psyarxiv.com/qd7vh/>).

26

27 **Abstract**

28 **Background.** During a global infectious disease pandemic such as the coronavirus
29 disease 2019 (COVID-19), individuals' infection prevention/risk-taking behaviours are
30 likely to differ depending on their health literacy and beliefs regarding the disease. To
31 effectively promote infection prevention behaviours, it is necessary to enable
32 information dissemination and risk communication that consider individuals' health
33 literacy and beliefs. In this study, we exploratorily characterised segments based on
34 individual health literacy and beliefs regarding COVID-19 among the Japanese during
35 the early stage of the COVID-19 pandemic, and investigated whether infection
36 prevention/risk-taking behaviours and fear of COVID-19 differed among these
37 segments.

38 **Methods.** In this study, we conducted two web-based longitudinal surveys in Japan
39 (PHASE 1, 1–30 November 2020, 6,000 participants; PHASE 2, 1–31 December 2020,

40 3,800 participants). We characterised segments of the target population using cluster
41 analysis on health literacy and beliefs regarding COVID-19 obtained in PHASE 1. We
42 further investigated the associations between the clusters and infection prevention/risk-
43 taking behaviours and fear of COVID-19, obtained from PHASE 2.

44 **Results.** Five clusters were identified: ‘Calm/hoax denial’, ‘Hoax affinity/threat
45 denial’, ‘Minority/indifference’, ‘Over vigilance’, and ‘Optimism’. There were
46 significant differences in infection prevention/risk-taking behaviours and fear of
47 COVID-19 among the five clusters. The belief in susceptibility to infection, rather than
48 affinity for hoaxes and conspiracy theories, was coherently associated with infection
49 prevention/risk-taking behaviours and fear of infection across clusters. This study
50 provides foundational knowledge for creating segment-specific public messages and
51 developing interactive risk communication to encourage infection prevention
52 behaviours.

53

54 **Introduction**

55 The coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19) pandemic, which began in 2020, has led to
56 the promotion of behavioural regulations and infection prevention actions worldwide
57 owing to its high infectivity and fatality rate. In the early stage of the COVID-19
58 pandemic, laws and penalties were often used to regulate behaviour among citizens in
59 many countries; however, as of January 2023, there has been a shift away from the
60 mandatory regulation of behaviours and more toward citizens’ autonomy in infection
61 control. As COVID-19 continues to spread worldwide, it is important to identify
62 strategies that effectively promote these voluntary prevention measures. In contrast, the
63 Japanese government has requested citizens to adopt prevention behaviours and refrain
64 from economic activities as from the early stage of the pandemic. These requests are
65 voluntary rather than legal obligations of citizens, and it is up to individuals to decide
66 what actions they take in response to the government’s call. Therefore, risk
67 communication that encourages infection control based on autonomy, as Japan has been
68 promoting, is becoming increasingly important worldwide.

69 Segment-specific risk communication about health literacy (i.e., the skill of an
70 individual to obtain, process, and understand the health information and services needed
71 to make appropriate health decisions (Weiss 2007; World Health Organization 1998)
72 and beliefs is known to be effective in promoting health-related behaviour. Ishikawa et
73 al. reported that participation rates in breast cancer screening increased by providing
74 segment-specific information after categorising the target population into three
75 segments based on their beliefs about cancer and its screening (Ishikawa et al. 2012).
76 Takemura et al. conducted a survey of optimistic or pessimistic perceptions about the
77 probability of contracting COVID-19 and emphasized the importance of segment-
78 specific and tailor-made risk communication amid the pandemic (Takemura et al. 2022).
79 In order to promote infection prevention behaviours during COVID-19, it is expected to
80 characterise segments based on individuals’ health literacy and beliefs regarding
81 COVID-19, implementing risk communication according to these segments. Amid an

82 infectious pandemic, risk communication aims to change behaviour by providing
83 information. Even in one-way information provision aimed at behaviour change during
84 a pandemic (United States Department of Health and Human Services & Prevention
85 2018), understanding the characteristics of the segments would be useful in constructing
86 public messages based on the diversity of the target population. Furthermore,
87 understanding these characteristics would be helpful in developing interactive risk
88 communication tailored to relevant sub-groups. However, while previous studies have
89 reported the factors associated with COVID-19 infection prevention behaviours, such as
90 demographic factors (e.g., age, gender) (Muto et al. 2020; Pampel et al. 2010),
91 sociodemographic factors (e.g., perception of infection risk, personality, and norms)
92 (Bruine de Bruin & Bennett 2020; Nakayachi et al. 2020; Qian & Yahara 2020), and
93 knowledge and information sources (Batra et al. 2021; Uchibori et al. 2022), there have
94 been no attempts to characterise such segments based on health literacy and beliefs
95 regarding COVID-19 or to study the relationship between segments and infection
96 prevention behaviour.

97 We thus conducted two web-based longitudinal surveys with two objectives.
98 First, we aimed to characterise segments based on health literacy and beliefs regarding
99 COVID-19 in the first phase (PHASE 1) using an exploratory cluster analysis. We then
100 investigated the associations between these segments obtained in PHASE 1 and
101 infection prevention/risk-taking behaviours and the fear of COVID-19, which were
102 assessed in the second phase (PHASE 2).

103

104 **Materials & Methods**

105 **Ethics**

106 This study was approved by Osaka University Graduate School of Human Sciences
107 Research Ethics Committee (20095).

108

109 **Study Design**

110 We conducted longitudinal questionnaire surveys on the web during two periods: 1–30
111 November 2020 (PHASE 1), and 1–31 December 2020 (PHASE 2).

112

113 **Participants**

114 Participants were individuals living in Japan who had registered with Cross Marketing
115 Inc. Cross Marketing includes over 5.4 million panellists (as of 2022) and is the largest
116 company in its field in Japan. Participation in the survey was voluntary, and
117 participants received ‘points’ that could be redeemed for products. This provided an
118 incentive for participation in the survey regardless of the individuals’ interest in the
119 survey topic.

120 In PHASE 1, 6,000 survey participants were recruited from monitors, aged
121 18–79 years. The participants were selected in terms of age (18–29, 30–39, 40–49, 50–
122 59, 60–69, or 70–79 years), sex (male or female), and residential area (urban or non-

123 urban) to match their actual compositions in Japan. Target numbers were set for each
124 of the above variables, and the survey was conducted until the target number was
125 reached. Next, in PHASE 2, we conducted a continuous survey in which all
126 participants from PHASE 1 were invited to participate. The target number of
127 participants in PHASE 2 was set at 3,800 because of our budget limitation.
128 Inappropriate respondents in both surveys were excluded through an instructional
129 manipulation check (Miura & Kobayashi 2019). The sex and age of the participants in
130 PHASES 1 and 2 were as follows:
131 PHASE 1: Male = 3,000, female = 3,000; mean age = 49.4, standard deviation (SD) =
132 16.6
133 PHASE 2: Male = 1,969, female = 1,831; mean age = 51.7, SD = 16.0.

134 **Survey items**

135 The two web surveys included the following concepts and factors. The details of the
136 questionnaires are described in Appendix 1-a.

137 **PHASE 1: Health literacy and beliefs regarding COVID-19—** 138 **susceptibility to infection, infection control, hoax, conspiracy theories,** 139 **and optimism**

140 Individuals' thoughts on infectious diseases are related to the ideas and beliefs that arise
141 from health literacy. As described above, health literacy refers to an individual's skill in
142 health information and services needed to make appropriate health decisions (Weiss
143 2007; World Health Organization 1998). In addition, it has recently been attributed not
144 only to individual skills but also to the interaction between the individual and their
145 surrounding environment. In other words, health literacy regarding the COVID-19
146 pandemic refers to individuals' skills of obtaining health information and services and
147 making behavioural decisions; these skills are influenced by the social context.

148 Furthermore, health beliefs vary from individual to individual. Since COVID-
149 19 is a new and unknown disease, its transmission mechanism and characteristics have
150 not been clarified. Therefore, how individuals obtain information and make decisions
151 about infection prevention or risk-taking behaviours is likely to be mediated by their
152 health beliefs.

153 The health belief model, one of the leading health behaviour theories, can
154 provide important insight into people's prevention/risk-taking behaviour during the
155 COVID-19 pandemic. It states that the drivers of health behaviour include one's
156 perception of threat and the balance of advantages and disadvantages (Rosenstock
157 1974); this perception of threat consists of susceptibility (i.e., a feeling that there is a
158 high probability of being infected with COVID-19) and severity (i.e., how serious the
159 consequences would be if the individuals were infected with COVID-19). The balance
160 of advantages and disadvantages is then tempered by the disadvantages (costs and
161
162

163 barriers) of performing the behaviour. These are heavily influenced by individuals'
164 thoughts and beliefs.

165 We therefore created 82 items (six-point Likert scale; ranging from 'strongly
166 disagree' to 'strongly agree') regarding the beliefs about COVID-19 based on previous
167 studies on health literacy (Swami & Barron 2020; Taylor 2019) and mass media
168 reports (i.e., newspapers, internet news). These included 35 items on susceptibility to
169 infection; 21 items on infection control for COVID-19; and 26 items on hoax,
170 conspiracy theories, and optimism about COVID-19. To ensure content validity, an
171 expert in this field (KH) developed these items based on their own concepts and other
172 authors confirmed the same. Furthermore, we used two items regarding belief in just
173 deserts (i.e., a belief that the infected individual deserves to be infected (Murakami et
174 al. 2022); six-point Likert scale ranging from 'strongly disagree' to 'strongly agree').
175

176 **PHASE 2: Infection prevention/risk-taking behaviour regarding** 177 **COVID-19 and the fear of infection**

178 The field of risk research has played an important role in disasters, infectious diseases,
179 and other calamities that require individual-level to national-level measures.
180 Individuals' risk perception can be categorised along two axes: dread and unknown
181 factors. In particular, the more intuitively individuals feel dread, the stronger their
182 demand for measures (Slovic et al., 1986). Furthermore, there are biases in this risk
183 perception, such as present bias (O'Donoghue & Rabin 1999) and normalcy bias (Omer
184 & Alon 1994). Regarding infection prevention behaviours for COVID-19, a bias is
185 considered to exist wherein people put off these behaviours in favour of other
186 behaviours even though they think infection prevention is important (i.e. present bias),
187 alongside a bias that they will not be infected (i.e. normality bias).

188 Therefore, ideas about infection prevention/risk-taking behaviours regarding
189 COVID-19 were assessed among the participants in this study based on the concepts
190 of present bias and normality bias. Furthermore, fear of COVID-19 was included in
191 the survey items. We originally created 18 items related to infection prevention/risk-
192 taking behaviours regarding COVID-19 (seven-point Likert scale ranging from
193 'strongly disagree' to 'strongly agree'). To ensure content validity, an expert in this
194 field (KH) developed these items, and other authors confirmed them. To assess the
195 fear of infection, instead of dread or unknown factors (Slovic 1986), we used the
196 Perceived Vulnerability to Disease scale (PVD; seven-point Likert scale ranging from
197 'strongly disagree' to 'strongly agree') (Duncan et al. 2009; Fukukawa et al. 2014)
198 that consisted of two subscales (i.e., perceived infectability and germ aversion) (see
199 appendix 1-b).

200

201 **Statistical Analysis**

202 We examined the distribution and homoscedasticity of variables and adopted a
203 parametric test. To characterise the target segment, we first conducted three-factor

204 analyses with the maximum likelihood method for questionnaires regarding health
205 literacy and beliefs: susceptibility to infection for COVID-19; infection control for
206 COVID-19; and hoax, conspiracy theories, and optimism about COVID-19. Promax
207 rotation was used for this study because we assumed correlations among the extracted
208 factors. The number of factors was comprehensively determined based on parallel
209 analysis (Hori 2001), the scree test, and their interpretability. Factors with high
210 loadings (≥ 0.3 or ≤ -0.3) were considered for factor interpretation. Factor scores were
211 obtained from the factor loadings, which were used as feature values in the subsequent
212 cluster analysis. The adequacy of the factors obtained was confirmed using the Kaiser-
213 Meyer-Olkin (KMO) measure of sampling adequacy. We then used cluster analysis by
214 the k-means method with 100 iterations to characterise the segments among
215 participants. We examined the number of clusters from three to eight with
216 interpretability and effect size, using one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) with
217 Welch's test. Effect sizes of 0.06 and 0.14 were considered medium and large,
218 respectively (Cohen 1988). The factor scores of the factors extracted in the above
219 factor analyses and belief in just deserts with z-standardisation were used as variables
220 (total 14 variables; belief in just deserts was used in the previous study (Murakami et
221 al. 2022); Cronbach's α in this study was 0.79). Hereafter, the clusters identified by
222 cluster analysis are referred to as segments. Differences in health literacy and beliefs
223 among clusters were confirmed by a one-way ANOVA with Welch's test, and the
224 Games-Howell test as a post-hoc test to ensure that the effect sizes were sufficiently
225 large. The criterion for effect size was as follows: $\eta^2 = 0.01$, small; 0.06, medium; and
226 0.14, large (Cohen 1988). The p value was corrected by Bonferroni correction, that is,
227 the p value was multiplied by 16, the number of factors.

228 Next, we conducted factor analyses using the maximum likelihood method
229 for infection prevention/risk-taking behaviours regarding COVID-19. Factor analyses
230 were performed separately on the questionnaire items based on the concepts of present
231 bias and normality bias. Promax rotation was applied because we assumed that there
232 were correlations among the factors extracted. As in the above factor analyses, the
233 number of factors was determined based on parallel analysis (Hori 2001), the scree
234 test, and their interpretability. Cronbach's α was also calculated to confirm reliability.
235 We calculated the mean values of the items related to the factors obtained as well as
236 the mean values related to the fear of infection (two variables: perceived infectability
237 and germ aversion, in accordance with the previous study (Duncan et al. 2009;
238 Fukukawa et al. 2014); Cronbach's α in this study was 0.77 for perceived infectability
239 and 0.76 for germ aversion) (a total of five factors). Finally, we conducted a one-way
240 ANOVA with Welch's test, and Games-Howell test as a post-hoc test, to examine the
241 differences in these factors among clusters. The p value was corrected by Bonferroni
242 correction, that is, the p value was multiplied by five, the number of factors.

243 We used SPSS (IBM SPSS, Chicago, Illinois, U.S.) version 28.0 for all
244 analyses except the parallel analysis (Hori 2001). All p -values less than 0.05 were
245 considered significant.

246

247 **Results**

248 **Factor analyses for health literacy and beliefs and characterisation of** 249 **segments using cluster analysis (PHASE 1)**

250 **Factor analyses for health literacy and beliefs**

251 Regarding health literacy and beliefs about one's susceptibility to infection with
252 COVID-19 (35 items), five factors were obtained through factor analysis (Table 1). An
253 adequate value in the KMO measure of sampling adequacy (=0.95) was shown. The
254 first factor was characterised by items such as 'People with pre-existing (underlying)
255 diseases are more likely to be severely ill' and 'Elderly people are more prone to
256 severe illness', which we named '*General ease of infection*'. The second factor was
257 named '*Extreme likelihood of infection*' because of the high factor loadings of items
258 such as 'Infectious by airborne transmission', 'Infectious by train', and 'transmitted
259 from animals to humans'. Similarly, the third, fourth, and fifth factors were
260 characterised by items such as 'The current probability of death from infection with
261 the new coronavirus in Japan is very low, about 1/10 million', 'Infections occur during
262 nightlife (bars, clubs, host clubs, etc.)', and 'Young people in their 20s and 30s are
263 spreading the novel coronavirus', respectively; therefore, we named them '*Low*
264 *perception of infection threat*', '*Ease of infection at dinners and parties*', and '*Ease of*
265 *infection among young people*', respectively.

266 Regarding health literacy and beliefs related to infection control (21 items),
267 four factors were extracted (Table 2). There was an adequate value of the KMO
268 measure of sampling adequacy (0.83). The first factor was characterized by items such
269 as 'If the polymerase chain reaction (PCR) test is negative, there is no need to worry
270 about new coronavirus disease at all', 'If you take an antibody test, you do not need to
271 take a PCR test', and 'Infection can be completely prevented with measures such as
272 masks and face shields', which we named '*Excessive efficacy of infection control*
273 *measures*'. Since the second factor showed high factor loadings of items such as
274 'Routine ventilation is necessary' and 'vaccine can prevent severe illness after
275 infection', we named it '*Efficacy of vaccines and infection control*'. Similarly, since
276 the third and fourth factors were characterised as 'PCR testing is intentionally
277 suppressed' and 'Avigan is ineffective', respectively, we named them '*Dissatisfaction*
278 *of PCR testing system and vaccines*' and '*Inefficacy of therapeutic drugs*',
279 *respectively*.

280 Regarding health literacy and beliefs related to hoaxes, conspiracy theories,
281 and optimism for COVID-19 (26 items), four factors were extracted (Table 3). The
282 KMO measure of sampling adequacy showed an adequate value (0.90). The first,
283 second, third, and fourth factors showed high factor loadings for items such as '5G
284 radio waves worsen coronavirus symptoms', 'The number of patients is increasing,
285 nearly causing a medical collapse', 'It is a Chinese conspiracy', and 'Since July 2020,
286 novel coronaviruses have attenuated', respectively. We therefore named these factors

287 *'Hoax/conspiracy beliefs'*, *'Large social impact beliefs'*, *'China-originated beliefs'*,
288 and *'Optimism'*, respectively.

289

290 **Characterisation of segments using cluster analysis on health literacy and beliefs**

291 We conducted cluster analysis with the k-means method to characterise the
292 participants as per health literacy and beliefs. We examined the number of clusters
293 from three to eight with its interpretability. Finally, five clusters were adopted in this
294 study. Table 4 shows the differences in health literacy and beliefs regarding COVID-
295 19 among the five clusters. There were significant differences among the five clusters
296 for all factors ($p < 0.001$). The effect sizes of η^2 were judged as large (≥ 0.14) for all
297 items. Furthermore, there were significant differences in the factors among clusters
298 according to the results of the post-hoc test.

299 Cluster 1 showed intermediate values for almost all factors among the five
300 clusters, but it showed the lowest value only for *'Hoax/conspiracy beliefs'*. We
301 therefore named this cluster **'Calm/hoax denial'** ($n = 1,773$). Cluster 2 was the cluster
302 with the highest group values for *'Low perception of infection threat'*, *'Excessive*
303 *efficacy of infection control'*, and *'Efficacy of vaccines and infection control'*; lowest
304 group values for *'Inefficacy of therapeutic drugs'*; and highest or second highest
305 values for almost all factors of hoax, conspiracy beliefs, and optimism among the five
306 clusters. Furthermore, this cluster showed the highest value for *'Belief in just deserts'*
307 among the five clusters. We therefore named this cluster **'Hoax affinity/threat**
308 **denial'** ($n = 1,425$). Cluster 3 showed a unique profile, that is, it showed the lowest
309 group values for almost all factors. It only showed the highest value for *'Inefficacy of*
310 *therapeutic drugs'* among the five clusters. We therefore named this cluster
311 **'Minority/indifference'** ($n = 228$). Cluster 4 showed the highest group values for
312 *'General ease of infection'*, *'Extreme likelihood of infection'*, *'Ease of infection at*
313 *dinner and parties'*, *'Ease of infection among young people'*, *'Efficacy of vaccines*
314 *and infection control'*, *'Dissatisfaction of PCR testing system and vaccines'*, *'Large*
315 *social impact beliefs'*, and *'China-originated beliefs'*; and the lowest values for
316 *'Inefficacy of therapeutic drugs'* and *'Optimism'*. Moreover, cluster 4 showed a
317 secondary higher value for *'Belief in just deserts'*. Therefore, we named this cluster
318 **'Over vigilance'** ($n = 1,293$). Cluster 5 had the highest value for *'Optimism'*. In
319 addition, it showed secondary higher group values for *'Low perception of infection*
320 *threat'*, *'Inefficacy of therapeutic drugs'*, *'Hoax/conspiracy beliefs'*, *'China-originated*
321 *beliefs'*, and *'Belief in just deserts'*. The cluster showed secondary lower group values
322 for *'General ease of infection'*, *'Ease of infection at dinner and parties'*, and
323 *'Dissatisfaction of PCR testing system and vaccines'*. We therefore named this cluster
324 **'Optimism'** ($n = 1,281$).

325

326 **Factor analyses for infection prevention/risk-taking behaviours**
327 **regarding COVID-19 and their differences among clusters (PHASE**
328 **2)**

329 **Factor analyses for infection prevention/risk-taking behaviours regarding**
330 **COVID-19**

331 Through factor analysis using questionnaire items based on present bias, one factor
332 was extracted. This factor was named '*lack of infection prevention behaviour*' ($\alpha =$
333 0.82), with a consideration of the following items: 'I am aware of the risk of infection,
334 but I may go to a drinking party if invited', 'On occasions when eating or drinking
335 with friends, if I take off my mask, I often don't put it back on until I leave', 'I
336 sometimes go to work or school even though I don't feel as well as usual',
337 'Sometimes, I have to take off my mask at karaoke because it's hard to sing', 'I
338 sometimes eat without washing my hands and gargling', 'I am aware of the risk of
339 infection, but the tourist attractions are less crowded than usual, so I tend to go on
340 trips', 'Sometimes, I accidentally talk with my mask off while eating', and 'When I
341 get together with friends, I tend to stay in restaurants for a long time'.

342 Regarding the questionnaire items based on normalcy bias, two factors were
343 extracted (Table 5). The first factor was characterised by items such as 'I think, "It's
344 probably safe to go out for a drink today"'. We therefore named it '*Acceptance of*
345 *infection risk behavior*' ($\alpha = 0.83$). The second factor consisted of four items, such as
346 'Compared to others around me, I think I am more likely to be safe because I take
347 better precautions against infection' and 'No one close to me has tested positive, so I
348 am naturally not infected with coronavirus'. We named it '*Sense of uninfected*
349 *efficacy*' ($\alpha = 0.72$). We found sufficient consistency for all three factors.

350

351 **Differences in infection prevention/risk-taking behaviours regarding COVID-19**
352 **and the fear of infection among clusters**

353 We found significant differences in all factors for infection prevention/risk-taking
354 behaviours regarding COVID-19 and the fear of infection, among the five clusters:
355 '*Lack of infection prevention behaviour*', '*Acceptance of infection risk behaviour*',
356 '*Sense of uninfected efficacy*', '*Perceived infectability*', and '*Germ aversion*' ($p <$
357 0.001 for all factors; Table 6). In particular, '*Acceptance of infection risk behaviour*',
358 '*Sense of uninfected efficacy*', and '*Germ aversion*' showed medium levels of effect
359 sizes ($\eta^2 = 0.11, 0.07, \text{ and } 0.10$, respectively; Table 6).

360 From the results of the post-hoc test, we found significant differences in the
361 factors among clusters. **Calm/hoax denial** ($n = 1197$) showed a moderate profile
362 among the five clusters; that is, the values took the second or third place among group
363 values for all factors regarding infection prevention/risk-taking behaviours and
364 perceived vulnerability among the clusters. **Hoax affinity/threat denial** ($n = 907$)
365 showed the highest group values for '*Sense of uninfected efficacy*'.

366 **Minority/indifference** ($n = 118$) showed the highest group value for '*Lack of infection*

367 *prevention behaviour*’ and *‘Acceptance of infection risk behaviour’*; and lowest group
368 values for *‘Sense of uninfected efficacy’*, *‘Perceived infectability’*, and *‘Germ*
369 *aversion’* among clusters. **Over vigilance** (n = 856) showed the highest group values
370 for *‘Perceived infectability’* and *‘Germ aversion’*; and the lowest group values for
371 *‘Lack of infection prevention behaviour’*, *‘Acceptance of infection risk behaviour’*, and
372 *‘Sense of uninfected efficacy’* among clusters. **Optimism** (n = 722) showed the highest
373 group values for *‘Lack of infection prevention behaviour’*, *‘Acceptance of infection*
374 *risk behaviour’*, and *‘Sense of uninfected efficacy’*; and the lowest group values for
375 *‘Perceived infectability’* and *‘Germ aversion’* among clusters.

376

377 **Discussion**

378 To develop a foundation for effective risk communication, this study characterised
379 segments based on COVID-19 health literacy and beliefs among the Japanese in the
380 early stage of the COVID-19 pandemic, and investigated whether infection
381 prevention/risk-taking behaviours and fear of infection differed among the segments.
382 We characterised the Japanese participants into five clusters based on their health
383 literacy and beliefs regarding COVID-19, and found that the five clusters were
384 associated with differences in infection prevention/risk-taking behaviours and fear of
385 infection. In particular, the effect sizes of *‘Acceptance of infection risk behaviour’* and
386 *‘Germ aversion’* were larger than those of the other clusters; these behaviours and
387 feelings were noteworthy for their distinctive differences among clusters.

388 **Calm/hoax denial** had intermediate group values for the items on health literacy
389 and belief in PHASE 1, but it had the lowest group value only for *‘Hoax/conspiracy*
390 *beliefs’*. In PHASE 2, this cluster also had intermediate group values for infection
391 prevention/risk-taking behaviours and perceived fear of infection. This cluster was the
392 most numerous of all the clusters, which may indicate that it reflected the thinking of
393 most Japanese participants at the time this study was conducted. **Hoax affinity/threat**
394 **denial** had the highest group values for *‘Low perception for infection threat’*, *‘Excessive*
395 *efficacy of infection control’*, and *‘Efficacy of vaccines and infection control’*; and the
396 lowest group value for *‘Inefficacy of therapeutic drugs’*. It also had the highest or
397 second highest group values for almost all factors of hoax, conspiracy beliefs, and
398 optimism among the five clusters. Furthermore, this cluster had the highest value for
399 *‘Belief in just deserts’* among the five clusters in PHASE 1. In PHASE 2, this cluster
400 had the highest group value for *‘Sense of uninfected efficacy’*. In other words, this
401 cluster tended to believe in the hoax and conspiracy and had a high sense of efficacy for
402 infection control in Japan during the study period; individuals might have believed that
403 infection was not a threat if society was taking holistic infection control measures. It
404 might also be suggested that if these individuals were infected as a result, they believed
405 that they would not get what they deserve. **Minority/indifference** showed a unique
406 profile; it showed the lowest group values for almost all factors in PHASE 1. It only
407 showed the highest group value for *‘Inefficacy of therapeutic drugs’* among the five
408 clusters. In PHASE 2, this cluster had the highest group value for *‘Lack of infection*

409 *prevention behaviour* and *Acceptance of infection risk behaviour*; and lowest group
410 values for *Sense of uninfected efficacy*, *Perceived infectability*, and *Germ aversion*
411 among clusters. When we interpreted the results obtained for PHASE 1 for this cluster
412 with the questionnaire, we suspected that this cluster was not sincere in responding to
413 the questions. In other words, there is a possibility that the cluster analysis may have
414 selected a group that gave low scores for all items. In PHASE 2, this cluster was
415 considered to have a high sense of efficacy in not becoming infected and a low aversion
416 to infection, thus having a belief in infection prevention and acceptance of risk
417 behaviours. **Over vigilance** had the highest group values for *General ease of*
418 *infection*, *Extreme likelihood of infection*, *Ease of infection at dinners and parties*,
419 *Ease of infection among young people*, *Efficacy of vaccines and infection control*,
420 *Dissatisfaction of PCR testing system and vaccines*, *Large social impact beliefs*, and
421 *China-originated beliefs*; and the lowest values for *Inefficacy of therapeutic drugs*
422 *and Optimism*. The second highest group value was for *Belief in just deserts* in
423 PHASE 1. In PHASE 2, this cluster had the highest group values for *Perceived*
424 *infectability* and *Germ aversion*; and the lowest group values for *Lack of infection*
425 *prevention behaviour*, *Acceptance of infection risk behaviour*, and *Sense of*
426 *uninfected efficacy* among clusters. In other words, members of this cluster were overly
427 concerned about infection, with a high aversion to it, they highly estimated the ease and
428 risk of infection, and believed that holistic infection control measures should have been
429 taken. **Optimism** had the highest group value for *Optimism* in PHASE 1. In addition,
430 it showed secondary higher group values for *Low perception of infection threat*,
431 *Inefficacy of therapeutic drugs*, *Hoax/conspiracy beliefs*, *China-originated beliefs*,
432 and *Belief in Just Deserts*; including secondary lower values for *General ease of*
433 *infection*, *Ease of infection at dinners and parties*, and *Dissatisfaction of PCR testing*
434 *system and vaccines*. In PHASE 2, this cluster had the highest group values for *Lack*
435 *of infection prevention behaviour*, *Acceptance of infection risk behaviour*, and *Sense*
436 *of uninfected efficacy*; and the lowest group values for *Perceived infectability* and
437 *Germ aversion* among clusters. In other words, this cluster had a negative attitude
438 toward infection control, was optimistic about infection, downplayed infection
439 prevention behaviours, accepted risk behaviours, and had a low aversion to infection.

440 Overall, infection prevention/risk-taking behaviours and fear were associated
441 with clusters classified based on health literacy and beliefs regarding COVID-19.
442 Interestingly, the attitude toward strong infection prevention behaviour was found in
443 **Over vigilance**, which was characterised by high susceptibility to infection and
444 infection control for COVID-19. Conversely, the **Minority/indifference** cluster,
445 which was characterised by low susceptibility to infection and infection control, did
446 not promote infection prevention behaviours. The cluster **Optimism** also had a
447 somewhat moderate susceptibility to infection and infection control beliefs, and had
448 the highest levels of optimism, lack of infection prevention/risk-taking behaviours, and
449 acceptance of infection risk behaviours. The individuals placed some emphasis on
450 susceptibility to infection and infection control, but were characterised by optimistic

451 beliefs. Interestingly, although ‘*hoax/conspiracy beliefs*’ and ‘*China-originated*
452 *beliefs*’ contrasted between ‘*Calm/hoax denial*’ and ‘*Hoax affinity/threat denial*’, the
453 differences in infection prevention behaviour between these two clusters were smaller
454 than those among the other clusters. This suggests that infection prevention/risk-taking
455 behaviours or the fear of infection were more in harmony with beliefs about
456 susceptibility to infection or infection control for COVID-19 than with affinity for
457 hoaxes and conspiracy theories. The findings in this study were consistent with those
458 of previous studies (Dryhurst et al. 2020; Harper et al. 2021; Nomura et al. 2021)
459 reporting a strong association between infection risk perception and infection
460 prevention behaviours in various countries.

461 Health insecurity, risk perception, and the resulting infection prevention
462 behaviours in the midst of an infectious disease pandemic are greatly influenced by
463 health literacy, which is created by information obtained from various sources,
464 including the media and Internet (Taylor 2019). Furthermore, it has also been reported
465 that risk perception and infection prevention behaviours regarding COVID-19 are
466 associated with the availability of information sources (Adachi et al. 2022; Lin et al.
467 2020; Uchibori et al. 2022). This suggests that several information sources are likely
468 to shape beliefs regarding susceptibility to infection or infection control, rather than
469 through hoaxes and conspiracy theories.

470 This study provides foundational findings on segment characteristics regarding health
471 literacy and beliefs toward promoting effective infection prevention behaviours. We
472 observed a consistent association between beliefs about susceptibility to infection (or
473 infection control) and infection prevention behaviours as well as fear across clusters,
474 suggesting that providing public information about susceptibility or control measures
475 against infection would be a promising strategy in the case of unilateral information
476 dissemination from government to citizens. This presentation of risk information is
477 known to be fundamental in the development process of risk communication
478 (Fischhoff 1995). Furthermore, this study yielded implications for tailor-made risk
479 communication based on segment characteristics. For example, although individuals
480 have an affinity for hoaxes and conspiracy theories, they may have a low sense of
481 uninfected efficacy, as seen in the clusters of **Minority/indifference** and **Over**
482 **vigilance**. This illustrates the importance of choosing the content of dialogue about
483 COVID-19 risks according to the characteristics of the segments rather than simply
484 interacting in terms of hoaxes and conspiracy theories. Thus, effective tailor-made risk
485 communication should be developed, with a full consideration of associations of
486 characteristics regarding health literacy and beliefs of the target segment with their
487 infection prevention/risk-taking behaviours or fear.

488 This study had some limitations. First, this study was conducted among online
489 monitors, who are likely to be biased by the overall Japanese population. In this study,
490 we reduced this bias by collecting participants to match the national distribution for age,
491 sex, and residential areas. In addition, by awarding points to respondents, we provided
492 an incentive to encourage participation, even by those who were not interested in the

493 survey topic. Second, this study targeted the Japanese population in the early stage of
494 the COVID-19 pandemic; therefore, caution should be exercised in applying the
495 findings to other regions and populations at different times. It should be noted that the
496 two-wave surveys in this study were conducted in 2020. Japan has been implementing
497 voluntary infection prevention measures rather than mandatory behavioural regulations
498 since the early stages of the pandemic. Therefore, this study is significant in providing
499 foundational knowledge on risk communication to promote infection prevention
500 behaviours in other countries that have shifted to voluntary infection prevention
501 measures. While caution must be exercised in its application to outside populations, the
502 study provided valuable insights into voluntary infection prevention behaviours for
503 future research on the development of effective risk communication. Third, based on a
504 two-wave survey, this study examined the associations between clusters based on health
505 literacy and beliefs as well as infection prevention/risk-taking behaviours. Despite the
506 longitudinal study design, causality was not identified. Validation based on intervention
507 studies, such as randomised controlled trials, is needed to assess the effectiveness of
508 segment-based risk communication in promoting effective infection prevention
509 behaviours.

510

511 **Conclusions**

512 In this study, we characterised five segments based on health literacy and beliefs
513 regarding COVID-19 in Japan in the early stage of the COVID-19 pandemic, and
514 found that these segments were associated with infection prevention/risk-taking
515 behaviours and fear. In particular, beliefs about susceptibility to infection were found
516 to be coherently associated with infection prevention behaviours and fear of infection
517 across segments, implying that providing public messages about susceptibility to
518 infection would be a promising strategy in case of unilateral information dissemination.
519 Furthermore, the study provided foundational findings that contribute to the
520 development of tailor-made risk communication, taking into account differences in
521 health literacy and beliefs regarding infectious diseases of target segment
522 characteristics.

523

524 **Acknowledgements**

525 We would like to thank the staff of the Hirai Laboratory, Osaka University Graduate
526 School of Human Sciences, who were involved in this study. We would also like to
527 thank Editage (www.editage.com) for their help with English proofreading.

528

529 **References**

530 Adachi M, Murakami M, Yoneoka D, Kawashima T, Hashizume M, Sakamoto H, Eguchi A,
531 Ghaznavi C, Gilmour S, Kaneko S, Kunishima H, Maruyama-Sakurai K, Tanoue Y,
532 Yamamoto Y, Miyata H, and Nomura S. 2022. Factors associated with the risk
533 perception of COVID-19 infection and severe illness: A cross-sectional study in Japan.
534 *SSM Popul Health* 18:101105. [10.1016/j.ssmph.2022.101105](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ssmph.2022.101105)

- 535 Batra K, Urankar Y, Batra R, Gomes AF, S M, and Kaurani P. 2021. Knowledge, Protective
536 Behaviors and Risk Perception of COVID-19 among Dental Students in India: A Cross-
537 Sectional Analysis. *Healthcare (Basel)* 9. 10.3390/healthcare9050574
- 538 Bruine de Bruin W, and Bennett D. 2020. Relationships Between Initial COVID-19 Risk
539 Perceptions and Protective Health Behaviors: A National Survey. *American Journal of*
540 *Preventive Medicine* 59:157-167. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.amepre.2020.05.001>
- 541 Cohen J. 1988. *Statistical power analysis for the behavioral sciences*. New Jersey: Lawrence
542 Erlbaum Associates.
- 543 Dryhurst S, Schneider CR, Kerr J, Freeman ALJ, Recchia G, van der Bles AM, Spiegelhalter D,
544 and van der Linden S. 2020. Risk perceptions of COVID-19 around the world. *Journal*
545 *of Risk Research* 23:994-1006. 10.1080/13669877.2020.1758193
- 546 Duncan LA, Schaller M, and Park JH. 2009. Perceived vulnerability to disease: Development
547 and validation of a 15-item self-report instrument. *Personality and Individual*
548 *Differences* 47:541-546. 10.1016/j.paid.2009.05.001
- 549 Fischhoff B. 1995. Risk perception and communication unplugged: twenty years of process.
550 *Risk Anal* 15:137-145. 10.1111/j.1539-6924.1995.tb00308.x
- 551 Fukukawa Y, Oda R, Usami H, and Kawahito J. 2014. [Development of a Japanese version of
552 the Perceived Vulnerability to Disease Scale]. *Shinrigaku Kenkyu* 85:188-195.
553 10.4992/jjpsy.85.13206
- 554 Harper CA, Satchell LP, Fido D, and Litzman RD. 2021. Functional Fear Predicts Public
555 Health Compliance in the COVID-19 Pandemic. *Int J Ment Health Addict* 19:1875-
556 1888. 10.1007/s11469-020-00281-5
- 557 Hori K. 2001. Parallel analysis (in Japanese). Available at [http://www.ec.kagawa-](http://www.ec.kagawa-u.ac.jp/~hori/delphistat/index.html#pa)
558 [u.ac.jp/~hori/delphistat/index.html#pa](http://www.ec.kagawa-u.ac.jp/~hori/delphistat/index.html#pa) (Accessed 28/01/2023)
- 559 Ishikawa Y, Hirai K, Saito H, Fukuyoshi J, Yonekura A, Harada K, Seki A, Shibuya D, and
560 Nakamura Y. 2012. Cost-effectiveness of a tailored intervention designed to increase
561 breast cancer screening among a non-adherent population: a randomized controlled
562 trial. *BMC Public Health* 12:760. 10.1186/1471-2458-12-760
- 563 Lin Y, Hu Z, Alias H, and Wong LP. 2020. Influence of Mass and Social Media on
564 Psychobehavioral Responses Among Medical Students During the Downward Trend of
565 COVID-19 in Fujian, China: Cross-Sectional Study. *J Med Internet Res* 22:e19982.
566 10.2196/19982
- 567 Miura A, and Kobayashi T. 2019. Survey Satisficing Biases the Estimation of Moderation
568 Effects. *Japanese Psychological Research* 61:204-210. 10.1111/jpr.12223
- 569 Murakami M, Hiraishi K, Yamagata M, Nakanishi D, and Miura A. 2022. Belief in just deserts
570 regarding individuals infected with COVID-19 in Japan and its associations with
571 demographic factors and infection-related and socio-psychological characteristics: a
572 cross-sectional study. *PeerJ* 10. 10.7717/peerj.14545
- 573 Muto K, Yamamoto I, Nagasu M, Tanaka M, and Wada K. 2020. Japanese citizens' behavioral
574 changes and preparedness against COVID-19: An online survey during the early phase
575 of the pandemic. *PLoS One* 15:e0234292. 10.1371/journal.pone.0234292
- 576 Nakayachi K, Ozaki T, Shibata Y, and Yokoi R. 2020. Why Do Japanese People Use Masks
577 Against COVID-19, Even Though Masks Are Unlikely to Offer Protection From
578 Infection? *Front Psychol* 11:1918. 10.3389/fpsyg.2020.01918
- 579 Nomura S, Eguchi A, Yoneoka D, Kawashima T, Tanoue Y, Murakami M, Sakamoto H,
580 Maruyama-Sakurai K, Gilmour S, Shi S, Kunishima H, Kaneko S, Adachi M, Shimada
581 K, Yamamoto Y, and Miyata H. 2021. Reasons for being unsure or unwilling regarding
582 intention to take COVID-19 vaccine among Japanese people: A large cross-sectional
583 national survey. *Lancet Reg Health West Pac* 14:100223.
584 10.1016/j.lanwpc.2021.100223
- 585 O'Donoghue T, and Rabin M. 1999. Doing It Now or Later. *American Economic Review*
586 89:103-124. 10.1257/aer.89.1.103

- 587 Omer H, and Alon N. 1994. The continuity principle: a unified approach to disaster and trauma.
588 *Am J Community Psychol* 22:273-287. 10.1007/BF02506866
- 589 Pampel FC, Krueger PM, and Denney JT. 2010. Socioeconomic Disparities in Health
590 Behaviors. *Annu Rev Sociol* 36:349-370. 10.1146/annurev.soc.012809.102529
- 591 Qian K, and Yahara T. 2020. Mentality and behavior in COVID-19 emergency status in Japan:
592 Influence of personality, morality and ideology. *PLoS One* 15:e0235883.
593 10.1371/journal.pone.0235883
- 594 Rosenstock IM. 1974. The Health Belief Model and Preventive Health Behavior. *Health*
595 *Education Monographs* 2:354-386. 10.1177/109019817400200405
- 596 Slovic P. 1986. Informing and educating the public about risk. *Risk Anal* 6:403-415.
597 10.1111/j.1539-6924.1986.tb00953.x
- 598 Swami V, and Barron D. 2020. Rational Thinking Style, Rejection of Coronavirus (COVID-19)
599 Conspiracy Theories/theorists, and Compliance with Mandated Requirements: Direct
600 and Indirect Relationships in a Nationally Representative Sample of Adults from the
601 United Kingdom. *OSF Preprints*. 10.31219/osf.io/nmx9w
- 602 Takemura Y, Sato K, Kondo K, and Kondo N. 2022. Characteristics associated with optimistic
603 or pessimistic perception about the probability of contracting COVID-19: A cross-
604 sectional study of Japanese older adults. *SSM - Population Health* 19:101186.
605 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ssmph.2022.101186>
- 606 Taylor S. 2019. *The Psychology of Pandemics:
607 Preparing for the Next Global Outbreak of Infectious Disease*. Lady Stephenson Library,
608 Newcastle upon Tyne, NE6 2PA, UK: Cambridge Scholars Publishing.
- 609 Uchibori M, Ghaznavi C, Murakami M, Eguchi A, Kunishima H, Kaneko S, Maruyama-Sakurai
610 K, Miyata H, and Nomura S. 2022. Preventive Behaviors and Information Sources
611 during COVID-19 Pandemic: A Cross-Sectional Study in Japan. *Int J Environ Res*
612 *Public Health* 19. 10.3390/ijerph192114511
- 613 United States Department of Health and Human Services CfDC, and Prevention a. 2018. Crisis
614 and emergency risk communication (CERC) (2018 update). In: Department of Health
615 and Human Services CfDCaP, editor. Atlanta.
- 616 Weiss BD. 2007. *Health literacy and patient safety: Help patients understand. Manual for*
617 *clinicians*. Chicago: American Medical Association Foundation.
- 618 World Health Organization. 1998. Health Promotion Glossary. Switzerland.
619 Available at URL. <https://www.who.int/publications/i/item/WHO-HPR-HEP-98.1> (accessed
620 15/11/2022)
- 621
- 622
- 623

624 **Tables**

625
626
627
628
629

Table 1:

Factor loadings for health literacy and beliefs related to susceptibility to COVID-19 infection.

*Factor loadings with an absolute value of 0.3 or higher are shown in bold. Items with the highest factor loadings were sorted.

*The Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin measure of sampling adequacy = 0.95

	Factor 1	Factor 2	Factor 3	Factor 4	Factor 5	
‘General ease of infection’,						
People with pre-existing (underlying) diseases are more likely to develop severe disease	0.77	-0.07	0.06	-0.04	0.03	
Elderly people are more prone to severe illness	0.73	-0.06	0.03	-0.01	0.04	
Infectious by droplets	0.72	-0.02	-0.04	-0.01	-0.01	
Infectious when living with others in a confined space	0.61	0.09	0.00	0.12	-0.04	
Infectious where the three ‘densities’ overlap	0.57	-0.05	-0.01	0.20	-0.01	
Infectious in large groups and during long meals	0.56	-0.06	-0.03	0.35	-0.05	
Infectious by aerosols (infectious by airborne particles)	0.51	0.23	0.01	-0.14	-0.01	
Infectious at home	0.42	0.29	0.00	-0.13	0.01	
Currently, the spread of infection is mainly at home	0.40	0.16	0.14	-0.22	0.16	
Smokers are more prone to severe illness	0.39	0.14	0.08	-0.01	0.05	
Infectious at schools and workplaces	0.35	0.33	-0.08	0.18	-0.05	
‘Extreme likelihood of infection’,						
Infectious by airborne transmission	0.20	0.53	-0.03	-0.09	-0.07	
Infectious by train	0.12	0.53	-0.12	0.13	-0.09	
Transmitted from animals to humans	0.13	0.37	0.03	-0.08	0.03	
Elderly people are the ones spreading novel coronaviruses	-0.20	0.33	0.27	0.15	-0.15	
Infectious by contact	0.32	0.32	0.01	0.00	-0.04	
Many infected people are passing it on to others	0.17	0.30	-0.05	0.15	0.10	
The novel coronavirus has a higher mortality rate than influenza	0.02	0.28	-0.14	0.04	0.11	
I have heard rumors of clusters in stores I know, etc.	-0.16	0.26	0.10	0.08	0.02	
Elderly people are more likely to be infected with novel coronaviruses	0.15	0.20	0.15	0.11	0.05	
‘Low perception of infection threat’,						
The current probability of death from infection with the new coronavirus in Japan is very low, about 1/10 million.	0.14	-0.08	0.64	0.04	-0.08	
The probability of ordinary Japanese being infected is less than 0.1	0.13	-0.13	0.64	0.03	-0.05	
When we see celebrities who have been infected with the new coronavirus appearing on TV again, it is not so serious even if we are infected	-0.11	0.11	0.55	-0.01	-0.03	
Once infected, new coronaviruses do not cause re-infection	-0.30	0.14	0.40	0.05	0.02	
Young people are at low risk of serious illness	0.35	-0.18	0.37	0.02	0.12	
Human-to-human transmission is possible within a week of onset of illness	0.04	0.12	0.30	0.03	0.11	
‘Ease of infection at dinners and parties’,						
Infections occur during nightlife (bars, clubs, host clubs, etc.)	0.26	-0.06	0.02	0.65	-0.01	
People who work in the nightlife business are more susceptible to the new coronavirus	0.02	0.08	0.10	0.56	0.07	
Infections can occur at karaoke parlors and bars where karaoke is available	0.36	-0.02	-0.03	0.53	-0.01	
Become infected in restaurants	0.25	0.13	-0.03	0.49	-0.06	
Become infected at social gatherings where alcohol is consumed	0.42	-0.03	-0.03	0.47	-0.04	
People in the show business are more likely to be infected with the new coronavirus	-0.23	0.22	0.13	0.34	0.16	
‘Ease of infection among young people’,						
Young people in their 20s and 30s are spreading the novel coronavirus	0.01	-0.04	-0.08	0.11	0.76	
The number of infected people in their 20s is the highest	0.06	-0.01	-0.02	-0.02	0.64	
University students are most likely to cause clusters	-0.02	0.17	0.00	0.32	0.32	
Inner-factor correlation	F1	—	0.35	-0.15	0.60	0.39
	F2		—	0.05	0.55	0.40
	F3			—	-0.02	0.29
	F4				—	0.47
	F5					—

Table 2:

Factor loadings for health literacy and beliefs related to infection control for COVID-19.

* Factor loadings with an absolute value of 0.3 or higher are shown in bold. Items with the highest factor loadings were sorted.

*The Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin measure of sampling adequacy = 0.83

	Factor 1	Factor 2	Factor 3	Factor 4
‘Excessive efficacy of infection control measures’				
If the PCR test is negative, there is no need to worry about the new coronavirus disease at all	0.68	-0.22	0.00	0.09
If you take an antibody test, you do not need to take a PCR test	0.65	-0.19	-0.07	0.04
Infection can be completely prevented with measures such as masks and face shields	0.55	-0.02	0.02	0.02
Influenza vaccine can be expected to prevent severe cardiovascular disease in new coronaviruses	0.47	0.10	0.07	-0.02
PCR testing is the only correct test for novel coronavirus disease	0.46	0.06	0.12	0.10
Supine therapy (treatment with time spent lying on the stomach) is effective in the treatment of severely ill patients	0.44	0.03	0.07	0.00
Gargles (e.g., Iodine) are effective	0.42	0.08	0.04	-0.07
Sodium hypochlorite is effective against novel coronaviruses	0.35	0.16	0.06	-0.08
Treatment methods have been established to some extent in the medical field, preventing severe cases	0.32	0.26	-0.06	-0.07
Summer involves less susceptibility to novel coronavirus, while winter involves more susceptibility to novel coronavirus	0.25	0.18	0.10	0.00
‘Efficacy of vaccines and infection control’				
Routine ventilation is necessary	-0.31	0.59	0.19	0.09
Vaccine can prevent severe illness after infection	0.11	0.51	0.01	0.07
Vaccines for novel coronavirus are being researched and developed at a faster pace than usual	-0.08	0.50	0.04	-0.08
Japan’s PCR testing practices are correct	0.19	0.50	-0.43	0.14
Vaccine is effective in preventing the onset of disease after infection	0.28	0.33	0.04	0.09
‘Dissatisfaction of PCR testing system and vaccines’				
PCR testing is intentionally suppressed	0.14	-0.12	0.64	-0.01
PCR testing is not readily available	-0.02	0.13	0.61	0.10
PCR testing should be performed on all	0.06	0.08	0.50	0.07
Vaccine for the novel coronavirus has serious side effects	0.10	0.09	0.33	0.14
‘Inefficacy of therapeutic drugs’				
Avigan is ineffective	0.11	0.07	0.18	0.50
Drugs such as Avigan, Lemdecivir, and steroids have been used in severely ill patients and are effective	0.20	0.37	0.04	-0.46
Inner-factor correlation	F 1	—	0.29	0.03
	F 2		—	0.25
	F 3			—
	F 4			—

Table 3:

Factor loadings for health literacy and beliefs related to hoax, conspiracy theories, and optimism regarding COVID-19.

* Factor loadings with an absolute value of 0.3 or higher are shown in bold. Items with the highest factor loadings were sorted.

*The Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin measure of sampling adequacy = 0.90

	Factor 1	Factor 2	Factor 3	Factor 4
‘Hoax/conspiracy beliefs’,				
5G radio waves worsen coronavirus symptoms	0.77	-0.02	0.01	-0.09
The main ingredient of Seirogan is effective against the new type of coronavirus	0.69	0.01	-0.03	0.06
Novel coronavirus is sensitive to heat, so we should drink hot water often	0.66	0.03	-0.03	0.05
It is a conspiracy of the Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation	0.65	-0.11	0.14	-0.05
Novel coronavirus does not really exist	0.60	-0.15	-0.01	0.06
If we drink tea, we are less susceptible to the novel coronavirus	0.59	0.09	0.03	-0.05
Toilet paper is often made in China and is in short supply due to the novel coronavirus	0.52	0.07	-0.03	0.16
The outbreak occurred outside China	0.45	0.12	-0.26	0.01
‘Large social impact beliefs’,				
The number of patients is increasing, nearly causing a medical collapse	0.07	0.68	-0.02	-0.24
There is a shortage of medical supplies to fight the novel coronavirus disease	0.11	0.61	-0.02	-0.14
More companies are going bankrupt as a result of the spread of novel coronavirus disease	-0.21	0.59	0.05	0.16
An infection explosion will occur in the near future	-0.03	0.55	-0.03	0.15
Hospitals accepting patients infected with novel coronavirus are running at a loss	-0.07	0.51	0.00	0.26
The number of suicides has increased as a result of the spread of infection by the new coronavirus disease	0.16	0.48	0.11	-0.28
Divorce rates increase with the spread of the new coronavirus disease	0.22	0.38	0.03	0.15
‘China-originated beliefs’,				
It is a Chinese conspiracy	0.06	-0.07	0.86	-0.06
Some country created the virus experimentally	0.03	-0.01	0.80	-0.02
It spread from a laboratory in Wuhan	-0.15	0.12	0.69	0.08
It spread from a bat sold at a seafood market in Wuhan (China)	-0.02	0.24	0.26	0.11
‘Optimism’,				
Since July 2020, novel coronaviruses have attenuated	-0.07	0.14	0.00	0.67
Mass immunity has already been acquired in Japan	0.10	-0.01	-0.02	0.56
Japanese are less likely to be severely ill	0.31	-0.03	0.02	0.42
There are many open beds for novel coronavirus patients	0.21	-0.19	-0.01	0.38
The lockdown (city blockade) was a conspiracy by politicians and was not really necessary	0.27	-0.08	0.06	0.35
The Ministry of Health, Labor, and Welfare and the Expert Committee are calling for more preventive measures against infection than necessary to control the population	0.23	0.19	0.01	0.35

BCG vaccine is effective in preventing novel coronavirus disease		0.19	0.05	0.08	0.34	
	Inner-factor correlation	F1	—	-0.14	0.27	0.57
		F2		—	0.23	-0.27
		F3			—	0.19
		F4				—

Table 4:

Differences in health literacy and beliefs about COVID-19 among the five clusters.

*Different letters represent significant differences ($P < 0.05$). Higher numbers are in the alphabetical order. The highest and lowest groups are highlighted in bold font.

		Cluster 1 Calm/hoax denial	Cluster 2 Hoax affinity/thre at denial	Cluster 3 Minority/ind ifference	Cluster 4 Over vigilance	Cluster 5 Optimism	F (df)	P	η^2 (95%CI)
		n = 1773	n = 1425	n = 228	n = 1293	n = 1281			
Susceptibility to infection	General ease of infection	0.19 (0.61) ^b	0.09 (0.55) ^c	-2.01 (1.34)^a	0.91 (0.48)^a	-0.93 (0.58) ^d	2069.07 (4, 1345.18)	<0.001	0.59 (0.57–0.60)
	Extreme likelihood of infection	-0.36 (0.67) ^d	0.36 (0.63) ^b	-1.75 (0.91)^c	0.69 (0.74)^a	-0.29 (0.55) ^c	816.74 (4, 1364.20)	<0.001	0.41 (0.39–0.43)
	Low perception for infection threat	-0.41 (0.74) ^c	0.62 (0.62)^a	-0.93 (1.05)^d	-0.39 (0.75) ^c	0.44 (0.54) ^b	767.85 (4, 1359.50)	<0.001	0.34 (0.32–0.36)
	Ease of infection at dinners and parties	-0.22 (0.68) ^c	0.33 (0.56) ^b	-1.99 (1.09)^c	0.91 (0.60)^a	-0.62 (0.53) ^d	1527.66 (4, 1355.09)	<0.001	0.54 (0.52–0.55)
	Ease of infection among young people	-0.35 (0.73) ^c	0.48 (0.58) ^b	-1.80 (0.73)^d	0.58 (0.79)^a	-0.31 (0.50) ^c	987.19 (4, 1381.23)	<0.001	0.41 (0.39–0.43)
Infection control	Excessive efficacy of infection control	-0.45 (0.68) ^d	0.75 (0.73)^a	-1.39 (0.85)^c	-0.36 (0.72) ^c	0.40 (0.55) ^b	955.50 (4, 1372.19)	<0.001	0.41 (0.39–0.43)
	Efficacy in vaccines and infection control	0.03 (0.69) ^b	0.39 (0.56)^a	-2.11 (1.11)^d	0.37 (0.75)^a	-0.47 (0.58) ^c	671.73 (4, 1353.01)	<0.001	0.38 (0.36–0.40)
	Dissatisfaction of PCR testing system and vaccines	-0.10 (0.76) ^c	0.17 (0.61) ^b	-1.43 (0.85)^c	0.63 (0.80)^a	-0.43 (0.54) ^d	593.02 (4, 1373.18)	<0.001	0.31 (0.29–0.32)
	Inefficacy of therapeutic drugs	0.01 (0.76) ^c	-0.10 (0.57)^d	0.48 (0.75)^a	-0.17 (0.87)^d	0.19 (0.57) ^b	83.22 (4, 1382.23)	<0.001	0.05 (0.04–0.06)
Hoax, conspiracy theories, and optimism	Hoax/conspiracy beliefs	-0.64 (0.46)^d	0.74 (0.92)^a	-0.67 (0.76)^d	-0.46 (0.59) ^c	0.64 (0.73) ^b	1260.31 (4, 1348.05)	<0.001	0.46 (0.44–0.47)
	Large social impact beliefs	0.07 (0.66) ^b	0.06 (0.55) ^b	-1.85 (1.10)^d	0.88 (0.61)^a	-0.72 (0.57) ^c	1365.21 (4, 1353.46)	<0.001	0.51 (0.49–0.53)
	China-originated beliefs	-0.54 (0.79) ^c	0.43 (0.74)^a	-1.05 (0.95)^d	0.48 (0.94)^a	-0.02 (0.66) ^b	483.45 (4, 1373.26)	<0.001	0.26 (0.24–0.28)
	Optimism	-0.46 (0.65) ^b	0.65 (0.65)^a	-0.63 (1.03)^{b,c}	-0.62 (0.64)^c	0.66 (0.58)^a	1306.59 (4, 1357.75)	<0.001	0.45 (0.44–0.47)
Belief in just deserts	-0.58 (0.81) ^c	0.55 (0.85)^a	-1.00 (0.74)^d	0.20 (1.15) ^b	0.17 (0.70) ^b	500.87 (4, 1410.67)	<0.001	0.22 (0.21–0.24)	

Table 5:

Factor pattern matrix for infection prevention/risk-taking behaviours regarding COVID-19 (normalcy bias).

*Exhibited with factor loadings of 0.3 or higher in bold and sorted by the factor with the highest factor loading.

	Factor 1	Factor 2
“Acceptance of infection risk behavior,” $\alpha = 0.83$		
I think ‘It’s probably safe to go out for a drink today’	0.85	-0.15
I feel that infection is becoming more familiar, but less fearful than around April	0.39	0.23
Even if the number of infected people increases a little, I think it is more important not to stop the economy	0.39	0.22
I think it’s okay to share a drink or chopsticks at least once	0.81	-0.12
I am aware of the risk of infection, but I think I will be fine when I travel	0.61	0.20
When I see a lot of people out and about in the city on TV, etc., I don’t think I will be infected even if I go out a little	0.65	0.18
“Sense of uninfected efficacy,” $\alpha = 0.72$		
No one close to me has tested positive, so I am naturally not infected with coronavirus	-0.04	0.66
I consider myself to be at low risk of infection due to my age and occupation	0.20	0.42
Compared to others around me, I think I am more likely to be safe because I take better precautions against infection	-0.13	0.79
As long as I keep disinfecting, I don’t think I will get infected	0.21	0.49
Inner-factor correlation	–	0.68

Table 6:

Differences in infection prevention/risk-taking behaviours regarding COVID-19 and fear of infection among the five clusters.

*Different letters represent significant differences ($P < 0.05$). Higher numbers are in the alphabetical order. The highest and lowest groups are highlighted in bold font.

	Cluster 1 Calm/hoax denial n = 1197	Cluster 2 Hoax affinity/ threat denial n = 907	Cluster 3 Minority/ indifference n = 118	Cluster 4 Over vigilance n = 856	Cluster 5 Optimism n = 722	F (df)	P	η^2 (95% CI)
Lack of infection prevention behavior	2.18 (1.01) ^c	2.32 (0.98) ^b	2.34 (1.42)^{a,b,c}	1.94 (0.92)^d	2.56 (1.10)^a	40.09 (4, 732.81)	< 0.001	0.04 (0.03-0.05)
Acceptance of infection risk behavior	2.28 (0.97) ^c	2.53 (0.96) ^b	2.63 (1.37)^{a,b,c}	1.87 (0.86)^d	2.90 (1.09)^a	122.81 (4, 732.44)	< 0.001	0.11 (0.09-0.13)
Sense of uninfected efficacy	2.64 (1.07) ^b	3.06 (1.04)^a	2.51 (1.23)^{b,c}	2.41 (1.12)^c	3.14 (1.00)^a	69.99 (4, 742.45)	< 0.001	0.07 (0.05-0.08)
Perceived infectability	4.23 (0.93) ^b	4.05 (0.84) ^c	3.91 (1.03)^{c,d}	4.40 (1.05)^a	3.91 (0.81)^d	34.00 (4, 743.81)	< 0.001	0.04 (0.02-0.05)
Germ aversion	5.14 (0.97) ^b	5.23 (0.87) ^b	4.52 (1.19)^c	5.71 (0.91)^a	4.81 (0.89)^c	112.83 (4, 738.61)	< 0.001	0.11 (0.09-0.13)