

An Exploratory Study of Beliefs Relating to The Covid-19 Health Protocols: Roles of Value and Demographic Factors

Nurlaela Widyarini and Istiqomah

*Faculty of Psychology, University of Muhammadiyah Jember, Jl. Karimata 49, Jember, Indonesia
{nurlaela@unmuhjember.ac.id}*

Keywords: value, belief, meaning, Covid-19 pandemic.

Abstract: The implementation of Covid-19 health protocol has become a collective movement. Although vaccination is still in progress, health protocols are still becoming the main strategy. This study aimed to discover the values and beliefs of the people in health protocols during the Covid-19 pandemic. There were 73 participants with an average age of 16.85 years old ($SD=7.710$), which were gathered conveniently. Most of them (69.9%) were female, and 46% of them were high school graduates. The *Basic Value* scale (Schwartz et al., 2012) with 52 items ($=.940$) was used to reveal the participants' values and *open-ended questions* were used to explore beliefs relating to the Covid-19 health protocols. Result showed the values that the participants held were mostly maintenance of relationship by showing obedience, courtesy towards other people, honor, tolerance, and protection of the welfare of humans and nature. The female participants had higher average *value conservation* ($mean=74.034$; $SD=8.71$) than the male ones ($mean=67.54$; $SD=10.58$). There was a quite significant difference in *value self-enhancement* ($F=2.711$; $p<.05$) viewed based on education level. Education, sex, and age were good predictors in explaining the values of self-enhancement ($F=3.631$; $p<.05$), and *openness to change* ($F=3.200$; $p<.05$)

1 INTRODUCTION

The covid-19 pandemic is a crisis that brings broad implications on humanity and affects development progress, stability, and security across the world. The simultaneous impacts on every field of development such as education, health, and economy are so real that the pandemic has seriously affected every aspect of life. The government and various parties have been trying to do promotional and curative efforts to overcome the problems caused by the pandemic. One of the promotional efforts is the enforcement of Covid-19 health protocols like wearing a mask, washing hands with soap, and social distancing. The implementation of health protocols has become a compulsion in every event or daily activity (the Ministry of Health of the Republic of Indonesia, 2020).

The implementation of Covid-19 health protocols has not given optimum results. It is shown

in the Covid-19 spread map published on the page <https://covid19.go.id/peta-sebaran-covid19>. Until December 1st, 2020 the confirmed cases numbered 543,975 with an average addition of 5,449 cases in the last two weeks. Collective awareness is one of the factors that can optimize a change of behavior during such a crisis. It cannot be obtained if individuals as parts of a group or community do not have the same understanding in valuing the importance of awareness of the health protocols (South, Meah, Bagnall, & Jones, 2013).

How does it go in the level of the individual? During a pandemic, feeling threatened is one of the factual perceptions an individual has of the situation. An individual can experience a conflict cognitively because their already settled beliefs in something in normal order are being threatened. Often a crisis is interpreted as a discontinuity of the normal order so that it demands individuals to be aware and to make efforts to do adaptations. Adjustments must be done

to face uncertain situations. Meaning is a basic feature in humans because it is a linguistic representation that creates an individual's viewpoint on reality, which eventually will determine behavior. Social analysis often considers the meaning as an idea built consciously and selected as the important aspect of reality such as culture, norm, belief, and view of the world.

Constructivists state that a process of shaping a meaning-making process may be expressed through a narrative aspect of memory because humans are motivated to build and maintain their meaningful self-narration. Thought, behavior, and knowledge are stimulated by meaning (Richards, 2011). Park (2013) stated that meaning has two levels, namely global and situational meanings. The former emerges early in life but it takes into account subjective experiences. It influences the thoughts, behaviors, and emotional responses of an individual to a higher level of thinking. It also refers to the universal orientation system of an individual, including the most substantial belief and goal (for instance, relation or achievement). The belief and global goal shape the pattern that underlies the interpretation of an individual on their experiences. They will understand their meanings and life goals in this world. This makes them cognitively regulate their experiences and orientations to their goals. An unexpected or dangerous event has the potential to contradict the validity of the existing beliefs.

Situational meaning refers to meaning within a certain context, which is limited to a certain time and space. It will begin with a particular situation and the meaning made is very much determined by one's global meaning. When an event having the potential to cause stress occurs, an individual will try to understand their interest by interpreting it. When an individual has already given meaning, the difference between global and situational meanings may happen. Maybe an individual will ask for the global meaning because of the situation being experienced. The individual will ask why an event takes place, who is responsible, how life means to them and their viewpoints, and how they have to behave towards the situation (Park, 2013). Based on the previous analysis, how does an individual interpret the awareness of health protocols? What values and beliefs do underlie the meaning?

Covid-19 health protocols is a promotional effort done by all parties to decrease the spread of Covid-19. The study on this can be shown in literary studies related to health promotion. The studies show that dynamic changes take place in the content, shape, media, and place of health promotion. At the same time, values, beliefs, and norms in people also change as a result of changes in their knowledge and skills related to health. Every dynamic change is an indicator of an individual or a group of people's active effort to find the significance of health-promoting activities (Alldred, Fox, & Kulpa, 2016; Bayer et al., 2014; Colarossi, Betancourt, Perez, Weidl, & Morales, 214; D. Y. C. Huang, Murphy, & Hser, 2011; Karoly, Callahan, Schmiede, & Feldstein Ewing, 2015; Keijsers, 2015; Tabak et al., 2012; Valenzuela, Bachmann, & Aguilar, 2016).

The effort to discover the significance of the daily activities shows that value as a part of a culture is an adaptive tool for the people. Culture can be an adaptive tool and be used as an approach in health promotion. Therefore, it can be developed based on the interrelation of the factors such as the actors, goals, values, beliefs, and social and interaction pattern with the health promotion (Cooper & Denner, 1998). People's participation in developing the shared goals of health promotion based on the values, beliefs, and norms becomes the important factor that determines the sustainability of an activity.

Based on the depiction in the background, the formulation of the problem of this study analyzed two things, namely value, and belief. Value is an individual's outlook that contains the constant drive and determines their behaviors, and belief is the result of an individual's situational valuation of the Covid-19 pandemic. The interaction of the value and belief is studied to discover the meaning-making process. As for the elaboration of the research formula as follows: What are the values that individuals have as a global perspective on the world (world view)? What does underlie individuals' beliefs regarding the Covid-19 health protocol? How do the values and beliefs interact in the meaning-making process related to the covid-19 health protocol?

2 METHODS

This study is a research survey using quantitative and qualitative design (Elliot in Ivankova, 2015). This design involves quantitative and qualitative methods in the process of collecting data and analyzing them separately. The goal of the design is to compare the results of both quantitative and qualitative methods to gain pieces of evidence from two different sources that complement each other.

2.1 Variables of the Study

2.1.1 Values

Values are the viewpoints to which an individual looks up and they contain motivation towards behaviors. The values of a culture (Schwartz, 1992; Schwartz & Sagie, 2007) can be grouped into:

Self-direction: emphasis on independent thoughts and actions. An individual can control and master their goal.

Stimulation: emphasis on the need for different stimulations to achieve an optimum action. This value is conditioned with social experiences.

Hedonism: emphasis on the satisfaction of enjoying life.

Achievement: emphasis on the accomplishment or achievement. Every culture has certain standards related to competence. This value can be associated with the value of self-direction.

Power: emphasis on the achievement of social status, controlling and mastering resources.

Security: emphasis on safe, harmonious, and stable social relationships.

Conformity: emphasis on the importance of maintaining the relationship by showing obedience, respect, and courtesy to other people.

Tradition: emphasis on the commitment, acceptance of the existing habits in a culture.

Benevolence: emphasis on the importance of preserving and increasing other people's welfare.

Universalism: emphasis on the understating, honor, tolerance, and protection to human and nature's welfare.

2.1.1 Beliefs

Belief is an individual's valuation of the benefits, party who determines and controls the situation. In this study, belief (Fishbein & Ajzen, 2010; Ramdhani, 2011) consists of:

Behavioral beliefs: subject's belief in the results of the implementation of Covid-19 health protocols.

Normative beliefs: individual or group of people who are considered significant in determining the participant to implement the Covid-19 health protocols.

Control belief: the participant's valuation of the availability of factors that facilitate or hinder Covid-19 health protocols.

2.2 Participants

The participants of this study were 73 people who were selected conveniently based on the networks that the research team had. The average age of the participants was 26.85 (SD=7.710) from the age range of 17-51 years old. Most of them (69.9%) were female and 46% were high school graduates. The more detailed data can be shown in the following demographic table.

Table 1: Demographic data of the participants of the study

| Demographic Aspects | | Number | Frequency |
|---------------------|-------------------------|--------|-----------|
| Sex | Male | 22 | 30.1 |
| | Female | 51 | 69.9 |
| Education | High School | 46 | 63.0 |
| | Associate Degree | 6 | 8.2 |
| | Bachelor's, Master, PhD | 21 | 28.8 |
| | Not mentioned | 1 | 1.4 |
| Religion | Islam | 69 | 94.5 |
| | Christian | 2 | 2.7 |
| | Roman Catholic | 1 | 1.4 |
| Ethnicity | Not mentioned | 4 | 5.5 |
| | Javanese | 58 | 79.5 |
| | Madurese | 10 | 13.7 |
| | Others | 1 | 1.4 |
| Occupation* | Students | 21 | 28.8 |
| | Employee | 26 | 35.6 |
| | Entrepreneur and others | 14 | 19.2 |
| | Unemployed | 12 | 16.4 |
| Total | | 73 | 100.0 |

Note: *employees are those working as employees of private companies or governmental offices. Entrepreneurs and others are those working in the sector of independent businesses.

2.3 Method of Data Collecting

The data were collected using two methods as follows:

The measuring instrument used in this study was the *Portrait Values Questionnaire* (PVQ) (Schwartz, 2017; Schwartz et al., 2012). The use of measuring instruments obtained permission from Shalom H. Schwartz through e-mail on January 6, 2021. The letter also included the Indonesian version instrument. For content validity, the experts conducted an assessment to determine whether the items that had been written represented the construct to be measured. The expert judgment was then calculated using statistical procedures. Aiken's V formula (L. R. Aiken, 1985) was used to calculate the content-validity coefficient which was based on the results of an assessment by a panel of n people on an item in terms of the extent to which the item represents the construct being measured. The formula proposed by Aiken is as follows:

$$V = \sum s / [n(C-1)] \quad (1)$$

$$S = r - lo;$$

Note:

Lo: the lowest rate of assessment

C: the highest rate of assessment

r: the rate given by the researcher

Aiken's V coefficient values ranged from 0 - 1. The closer to 1, the validity of the content of each item is more adequate. There were 5 students and 3 lecturers in the panel of experts to carry out the legibility test. Based on the results of the calculation of Aiken's V value, it was shown that Aiken's V value was 0.62-0.95. The researcher corrected the items for the Aiken's V value which was below 0.8. Based on the provisions of Aiken (Lewis. R. Aiken, 1985), if the number of items is more than 25, the following formula applies:

$$\text{Index } \delta = 0,5\sqrt{c+1}/3m(c-1) \quad (2)$$

$$\text{Theorem } z = 0,2(V - 0,5)\sqrt{3mn(c-1)/(c+1)}$$

Note:

δ = the average expected value and standard deviation of the index V

c = number of answer choices

m = number of items

n = number of raters

The basis for decision making was as follows: if the z value is more than 1.645 (p = 0.05) or 2.33 (p = 0.01). The calculation result showed that the value of $\delta = 0.029$ and the value of $z = 2.05$. This indicated that the items of the PVQ scale had good content validity. Furthermore, the researcher conducted an open question legibility test and made a format in google form. Based on these valid items, the researcher conducted an item reliability analysis. The results of the reliability analysis showed that the PVQ with 52 items had a reliability coefficient of = 0.940. Therefore, the PVQ scale had high reliability.

Open-ended questions were used to reveal the participants' beliefs in the Covid-19 health protocols. Both measuring instruments were delivered to the participants offline and online using google form.

2.4 Method of Data Analysis

Descriptive analysis was used to determine the demographic profiles, values, and beliefs of the participants regarding the health protocol. Regression analysis was used to discover the contribution of demographic factors in determining the values. The program used for statistical analysis was JAMOV version 1.6.18.0.

3 RESULTS

In Table 2, the mean and standard deviation of each value is presented. In addition, reliability analysis for each value is also presented to determine the quality of the item at each value (Schwartz et al., 2012).

Based on Table 2 (see appendix), it can be seen that there were two aspects of value that had low-reliability values, namely value power dominance ($\alpha=.156$) and value humility ($\alpha=.106$). The other 17

values had a reliability coefficient that ranged from .519 to .776. This showed that the items of the other 17 values were considered reliable. In addition, the values of personal security, societal security, universalism nature, universalism concern, and universalism tolerance were values that had a higher average tendency compared to other values. This showed the values that emphasize the importance of maintaining relationships by showing obedience, respect, and courtesy to others and those that emphasize understanding, respect, tolerance, and protection for the welfare of humans and nature.

Table 3 (see appendix) presents the mean and standard deviation of the values grouped into 4 higher order values (Blackwell, Burgess, & Schwartz, 1994; Owens et al., 2001; Schwartz, 1992, 2007). In this case, the calculation of the reliability of each group of values was also carried out.

Table 3 shows that value openness to change ($\alpha=.823$), self-enhancement ($\alpha=.607$), conservation ($\alpha=.843$) and self-transcendence ($\alpha=.899$) had good reliability. The self-transcendence value was the value that had a higher average than the other values. Self-transcendence value is a value that emphasizes understanding, honor, tolerance, and protection for the welfare of humans and nature and a value that emphasizes the importance of preserving and improving the welfare of others.

The values of face and humility are 2 values that are recommended to be analyzed separately because they are the limiting values between the other values. Humility value is between self-transcendence and conservation while face value is between self-enhancement and conservation (Cieciuch, Schwartz, & Vecchione, 2013; Schwartz, 1992).

3.1 The Contribution of Demographic Factor to the Four Higher Order Values

The ANOVA test results regarding the *higher order values* based on sex showed that there was no difference in the values of *openness to change* ($F=.186$; $p>.05$), *self-enhancement* ($F=.315$; $p>.05$), and *self-transcendence* ($F=.091$; $p>.05$). However, there is a difference in the *conservation* value ($F=7.486$; $p<.05$). The female participants had a higher mean of the *conservation* value (mean=74.034; $SD=8.71$) than the male ones (mean=67.54; $SD=10.58$).

The ANOVA test results regarding the higher order values based on education level showed that there was no difference in the values of openness to change ($F=1.916$; $p>.05$), Conservation ($F=.140$; $p>.05$) and self-transcendence ($F=.164$; $p>.05$). However, there was a significant difference in self-enhancement ($F=2.711$; $p=.05$) in terms of education level. The participants with a high school education level showed higher self-enhancement (mean=21.98; $SD=3.23$).

The ANOVA test results regarding the higher order values based on ethnicity showed that there was no difference in the values of openness to change ($F=.860$; $p>.05$), *self-enhancement* ($F=1.327$; $p>.05$), *conservation* ($F=.735$; $p>.05$) and *self-transcendence* ($F=.387$; $p>.05$).

3.2 The Contribution of Demographic Factor to the Four Higher Order Values

The regression test results showed that education, sex, and age were good predictors in explaining the value of self-enhancement ($F=3.631$; $p<.05$) and they contributed as much as 13.6%. Age was the best predictor ($t=-2.131$; $p<.05$) compared to sex and education.

The results of the regression test showed that education, sex, and age were good predictors in explaining the value of openness to change ($F=3.200$; $p<.05$) and they contributed as much as 12.2%. Age was the best predictor ($t=-2.677$; $p<.05$) compared to sex and education.

The regression test results showed that education, sex, and age were not good predictors in explaining the value of conservation ($F=2.541$; $p>.05$), and the value of openness to change ($F=1.084$; $p>.05$).

3.3 The Participants' Beliefs in the Implementation of Covid-19 Health Protocols

3.3.1 Beliefs in The Advantages and Disadvantages of The Implementation of Covid-19 Health Protocols

Based on the answers given by the participants, it was found that caring about clean and healthy living habits, avoiding exposure to Covid-19, and

feeling safer are the benefits they believe to get when they implement the Covid-19 health protocols. Regarding the participants' belief in the harm obtained when implementing the health protocols, most of the participants believed that no harm would be obtained when implementing the Covid-19 health protocol. However, the participants also believed that implementing the Covid-19 health protocol means that they have to deal with the restrictions on activities outside the home, being not free to breathe, limited interaction, and the increasing price of the supporting resources for implementing the Covid-19 health protocols.

3.3.2 Individual or Group of People Who Are Considered Significant in Determining The Participant to Implement The Covid-19 Health Protocols.

Family, friends, co-workers, and neighbours are parties who are believed to have a strong influence on the participants in implementing the Covid-19 health protocols. Most of the participants believed that no parties are blocking the implementation of the Covid-19 health protocols. However, friends, people who do not believe in Covid-19, traders, and neighbours can be the parties who can prevent the participants from implementing the Covid-19 health protocols.

3.3.3 The participant's Valuation of The Availability of Factors that Facilitate or Hinder Covid-19 Health Protocols.

The results of the content analysis showed that the availability of masks, hand sanitizers, and means of washing hands were the factors that made it easier for the participants to implement the health protocols. Regarding the means that were believed to be able to prevent them from implementing the Covid-19 health protocols, most of them believed that there were no obstacles in implementing the Covid-19 health protocols. However, there were additional costs that they had to spend to buy the apparatus needed and the incomplete health protocol facilities in the public area. These two beliefs were the strongest beliefs held by the participants.

4 DISCUSSIONS

This study showed that the values of personal security, societal security, universalism nature, universalism concern, and universalism tolerance were those having the highest mean compared to the other values. In terms of the higher order values, the self-transcendence value was the value that had a higher mean than the other values. Based on this, it can be said that the participant's perspective on the world emphasized the values of maintaining relationships with others, tolerance, respect, and protection of the welfare of others and nature.

The findings of this study also stated that the conservation value held by the female participants was higher than that of the male ones. This means that the female participants had a higher tendency to be associated with obedience, respect, and courtesy to others as a manifestation of maintaining relationships with others. This finding was in line with previous research that there is a tendency that women have a higher tendency towards the value of conservation (Schwartz & Rubel, 2005). Social role theory (Eagly & Wood, 1988) can be a reference to explain differences in values based on sex differences.

The theory of social role provides an alternative to explain the substantial cross-cultural variation in sex differences with variations in the division of labour and gender hierarchies across countries. The explanation for this variation refers to the specific role in the occupation and family performed by women and men in each society. Although the representation of types of occupation in this study did not meet the requirements, through the theory of social role, the difference in roles for each sex is a social construct. Men are positioned as breadwinners who will then influence the relationships existing between men and women, within both the family and the wider social environment (Koenig et al., 2014; Masolo, Vieu, Bottazzi, & Catenacci, 2004). This interesting finding can be followed up by ensuring the representation of men and women in the types of work included in the research sample.

Age is the most significant predictor in explaining the self-enhancement value, which emphasizes success or achievement, status accomplishment, and control of resources owned.

Although this study did not directly categorize age, by taking into account the mean age of the participants of 26.85 years – who were of productive age - it can be understood that productive age is the age for building independence through either occupation or other achievements. This finding also confirmed the previous research that the cooperative relationship of family and the wider environment is the main factor that becomes a requirement for these values (Fischer & Schwartz, 2011). This further strengthened the previous findings of this study that the value of maintaining relationships with other people was the dominant value of the participants of this study.

In the study of positive psychology, values are parts of the global meaning which includes the individual's perspective on the world (world view). This point of view becomes a framework for individuals to interpret the situation that surrounds them. What becomes the reality for an individual is a construction of their perspective on the world (Park, 2008, 2013). Constructivists add that the process of interpreting is likely expressed through the narrative aspect of memory because humans are motivated to build and maintain meaningful self-narratives. Thoughts, actions, and knowledge are motivated by meaning (Antlová, Chudý, Buchtová, & Kučerová, 2015; Ertmer & Newby, 2013). Park (Park, 2008) states that meaning occupies two levels, namely global and situational meanings. Global meaning emerges early in life but takes into account subjective experiences. Global meaning influences the thoughts, actions, and emotional responses of an individual to a higher level of thinking. The global interpretation also refers to a system of the universal orientation of an individual, including the most substantial or core beliefs and goals.

As a point of view, a value has implicit characteristics in the form of beliefs related to emotions, referring to goals that direct behavior, going beyond certain actions and situations, becoming a standard for evaluating events and having an impact on decision making. Included in this are beliefs related to the implementation of the Covid-19 health protocol.

Belief in research is a cognitive basis for attitudes, subjective norms, self-control, intention, and behavior. A person tends to evaluate the

consequences of a behavior, parties that encourage them to behave, and situations that facilitate or hinder behavior. As explained by Theory of Planned Behavior (Ajzen, 1991, 2012; Fishbein & Ajzen, 1981), belief will determine the attitude, subjective norm, and assessment of perceived behavioral control, intention, and behavior itself (Ajzen, 2005; Dennett, 1981; de Leeuw, Valois, & Seixas, 2014).

If associated with the process of interpretation, it can be seen that cognitive evaluation of a current situation is a process of interpretation in a situational manner. This means that the situational interpretation is directly related to the situation being faced by people, namely the Covid-19 pandemic. It should be stated that the indicators of the interpretation process can be seen from the acceptance that what is happening now is something that makes sense (Kaminker & Lukoff, 2013; Park, 2010; Xu, Oei, Liu, Wang, & Ding, 2014). This study has not been able to explain further how the strength of this belief made the situation of this pandemic could be understood as a reasonable occurrence. Any subsequent research can reveal the strength of beliefs, attitudes, subjective norms, and perceived behavioral control as intraindividual processes related to individual willingness to implement the Covid-19 health protocols.

This study has several limitations that need to be examined critically for future studies. First, the characteristics of the respondents in this study did not represent all the criteria that had been determined in the study. The obstacles in collecting the data in an online manner during the pandemic made the study bias that was difficult to control. Second, this study did not provide a complete picture of the profiles of the values based on the characteristics of the participants. Third, the dynamics of the active interpretation process had not involved more advanced statistical testing to provide adequate information.

4 CONCLUSIONS

Self-transcendence was the value that had the highest mean compared to the other values. It is the value that emphasizes understanding, honor, tolerance, and protection of the welfare of humans and nature and the importance of preserving and increasing the

welfare of other people. The female participants had the mean conservation value higher ($mean=74.034$; $SD=8.71$) than the male ones ($mean=67.54$; $SD=10.58$). Age was the best predictor ($t=-2.131$; $p<.05$) compared to sex and education. Age was the best predictor ($t=-2.677$; $p<.05$) compared to sex and education.

The characteristics of the participants of this study had not represented the entire criteria that the researcher had set. Any successive study can add the representations of the sample in each sample's characteristics. This study has not been able to give a complete depiction of the profiles of the values based on the participants' characteristics. Any subsequent study can use multiple discriminant analyses to obtain such a complete depiction. The dynamics of the process of interpretation need a more advanced statistical test so that it can give adequate information. For any study in the future, to measure the strength of beliefs, attitude, subjective norm, and perceived behavioral control related to the implementation of Covid-19 health protocols, value can be taken into account as a background factor.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

We acknowledged Shalom H. Schwartz from The Hebrew University of Jerusalem and National Research University—Higher School of Economics, Moscow, Russian Federation for the permission in using PVQ-Scale. The authors appreciated to the Institute of Research and Community Service, University of Muhammadiyah Jember Grant No: 475/II.3.AU/LPPM/Riset/2020. We also received invaluable support from our research assistants (Lintang, Novella and Yunan) who helped us to make the final item selection of the research instruments, collect, and process the data. We also acknowledged our seven peer reviewers who have offered useful feedback for the instruments and all participants who have participated in this research.

REFERENCES

- Aiken, L. R. (1985). Three coefficients for analyzing the reliability and validity of ratings. *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, 45, 131–142.
- Ajzen, I. (1991). The theory of planned behavior. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 50, 179–211. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0749-5978\(91\)90020-T](https://doi.org/10.1016/0749-5978(91)90020-T)
- Ajzen, I. (2005). *Attitudes, Personality, and Behavior* (First Publ). Open University Press. McGraw-Hill Press.
- Ajzen, I. (2012). Martin Fishbein's legacy: the reasoned action approach. *The ANNALS of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, 640(1), 11–27. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0002716211423363>
- Allred, P., Fox, N., & Kulpa, R. (2016). Engaging parents with sex and relationship education: A UK primary school case study. *Health Education Journal*, 1–14. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0017896916634114>
- Aninanya, G. A., Debpuur, C. Y., Awine, T., Williams, J. E., Hodgson, A., & Howard, N. (2015). Effects of an adolescent sexual and reproductive health intervention on health service usage by young people in northern Ghana: a community-randomized trial. *Plus One*, 10(4), e0125267. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0125267>
- Antlová, A., Chudý, Š., Buchtová, T., & Kučerová, L. (2015). The Importance of Values in the Constructivist Theory of Knowledge. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 203, 210–216. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2015.08.284>
- Barker, V. E., Abrams, J. R., Tiyaamornwong, V., Seibold, D. R., Duggan, A., Park, H. S., & Sebastian, M. (2000). New contexts for relational communication in groups. *Small-Group Research*, 31(4), 470–503. <https://doi.org/10.1177/104649640003100405>
- Bayer, A. M., Albuquerque, M., Albuquerque, M., Antonio, R., Canales, K., Condor, A., ... Villavicencio, M. (2014). Our world through our eyes: adolescents use photovoice to speak their mind on adolescent health, well-being, and sexuality in lima, Peru. *Health Promotion Practice*, 15(5), 723–731. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1524839914530400>
- Blackwell, R. D., Burgess, S. M., & Schwartz, S. H. (1994). Do values share universal content and structure? A South African test. *South African Journal of Psychology*, 24(1), 1–12.
- Cieciuch, J., Schwartz, S. H., & Vecchione, M. (2013). Applying the Refined Values Theory to Past Data: What Can Researchers Gain? *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, 44(8), 1215–1234. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0022022113487076>
- Colarossi, L., Betancourt, G. S., Perez, A., Weidl, M., & Morales, H. (2014). An organizational capacity-building program to enhance adolescent sexual and reproductive health. *Health Promotion Practice*, 15(4), 538–547. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1524839913478420>
- Cooper, C. R., & Denner, J. (1998). Theories linking culture and psychology: universal and community-specific processes. *Annual Review Psychology*, 49,

- 559–584.
<https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.psych.49.1.559>
- Cromby, J. (2012). Beyond belief. *Journal of Health Psychology*, 17(7), 943–957.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/1359105312448866>
- de Leeuw, A., Valois, P., & Seixas, R. (2014). Understanding high school students' attitude, social norm, perceived control, and beliefs to develop educational interventions on sustainable development. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 143, 1200–1209.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2014.08.160>
- Eagly, A. H., & Wood, W. (1988). *Explaining sex differences in social behavior: a meta-analytic perspective*. Annual Meeting of the American Psychological Association.
- Ertmer, P. A., & Newby, T. J. (2013). Constructivism: Comparing Critical Features from an Instructional Design Perspective, 6(4), 50–72.
<https://doi.org/10.1002/piq>
- Fischer, R., & Schwartz, S. (2011). Whence differences in value priorities?: Individual, cultural, or artefactual sources. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, 42(7), 1127–1144.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/0022022110381429>
- Fishbein, M., & Ajzen, I. (1981). Attitude and voting behavior: An application of the theory of reasoned action. *Progress in Applied Social Psychology*, 1, 95–125.
- Fishbein, M., & Ajzen, I. (2010). *Predicting and Changing Behavior: The Reasoned Action Approach*. New York: Psychology Press Taylor & Francis Group.
- Huang, D. Y. C., Murphy, D. a, & Hser, Y.-I. (2011). Parental monitoring during early adolescence sexual initiation: discrete-time survival mixture analysis. *Journal of Child and Family Studies*, 20(4), 511–520. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10826-010-9418-z>
- Ivankova, N. (2015). *Mixed Methods Applications in Action Research*. Retrieved from http://www.sagepub.com/sites/default/files/upm-binaries/65067_Ivankova_Chapter_3.pdf
- Kaminker, J., & Lukoff, D. (2013). Transpersonal Perspectives on Mental Health and Mental Illness. *The Wiley-Blackwell Handbook of Transpersonal Psychology*, 417–432.
<https://doi.org/10.1002/9781118591277.ch23>
- Karoly, H. C., Callahan, T., Schmiede, S. J., & Feldstein Ewing, S. W. (2015). Evaluating the Hispanic paradox in the context of adolescent risky sexual behavior: the role of parent monitoring. *Journal of Pediatric Psychology*, 1–9.
<https://doi.org/10.1093/jpepsy/jsv039>
- Keijsers, L. (2015). Parental monitoring and adolescent problem behaviors: how much do we really know? *International Journal of Behavioral Development*.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/0165025415592515>
- Kementerian Kesehatan RI. (2020). *Pedoman Pencegahan dan Pengendalian Corona Virus deases (Covid-19)*. Kementerian Kesehatan (Vol. 5). Retrieved from https://covid19.go.id/storage/app/media/Protokol/REV-05_Pedoman_P2_COVID-19_13_Juli_2020.pdf
- Kementerian Kesehatan Republik Indonesia. (2020). *Pedoman Dukungan Kesehatan Jiwa dan Psikososial Pada Pandemi Covid-19*.
- Koenig, A. M., Eagly, A. H., No, F., We, M. H., Desimoni, D., Gray, B., ... Yeagley, E. (2014). Evidence for the social role theory of stereotype content: observations of groups' roles shape stereotypes. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 107(3), 371–392.
- Masolo, C., Vieu, L., Bottazzi, E., & Catenacci, C. (2004). *Social Roles and their Descriptions*. 9th International Conference on Principles of Knowledge Representation and Reasoning. Retrieved from <http://www.aaai.org/Papers/KR/2004/KR04-029.pdf>
- O'Donnell, L., Myint-U, A., Duran, R., & Stueve, A. (2010). Especially for daughters: parent education to address alcohol and sex-related risk-taking among urban young adolescent girls. *Health Promotion Practice*, 11(May 2010), 70S–8S.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/1524839909355517>
- Owens, V., Schwartz, S. H., Melech, G., Lehmann, A., Burgess, S., & Harris, M. (2001). Extending the cross-cultural validity of the theory of basic human values with a different method of measurement. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, 32(5), 519–542.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/0022022101032005001>
- Park, C. L. (2008). Testing the meaning-making model of coping with loss. *Journal of Social and Clinical Psychology*, 27(9), 970–994.
<https://doi.org/10.1521/jscp.2008.27.9.970>
- Park, C. L. (2010). Making Sense of the Meaning Literature: An Integrative Review of Meaning Making and Its Effects on Adjustment to Stressful Life Events. *Psychological Bulletin*, 136(2), 257–301. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0018301>
- Park, C. L. (2013). The meaning-making model. *The European Health Psychologist*, 15(2), 40–47. Retrieved from www.ehps.net/ehp
- Ramdhani, N. (2011). Penyusunan alat pengukur berbasis theory of planned behavior. *Buletin Psikologi*, 19(2), 55–69.
- Rangarajan, S., & Kelly, L. (2006). Family communication patterns, family environment, and the impact of parental alcoholism on offspring self-esteem. *Journal of Social & Personal Relationships*, 23(4), 655–671.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/0265407506065990>
- Richards, J. C. (2011). “Every Word Is True”: Stories of Our Experiences in a Qualitative Research Course part 2. *The Qualitative Report*, 16(3), 799–820.

- Retrieved from <http://www.nova.edu/ssss/QR/index.html>
- Schwartz, S. H. (1992). Universals in the content and structure of values: theoretical advances and empirical test in 20 countries. *Advances in Experimental Social Psychology*, 25(C), 1–65. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0065-2601\(08\)60281-6](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0065-2601(08)60281-6)
- Schwartz, S. H. (2007). Universalism Values and the Inclusiveness of Our Moral Universe. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, 38(6), 711–728. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0022022107308992>
- Schwartz, S. H. (2017). The Refined Theory of Basic Values. In *Values and Behavior: Taking a Cross-cultural Perspective*. Springer.
- Schwartz, S. H., Cieciuch, J., Vecchione, M., Davidov, E., Fischer, R., Beierlein, C., ... Konty, M. (2012). Refining the theory of basic individual values. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 103(4), 663–688. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0029393>
- Schwartz, S. H., & Rubel, T. (2005). Sex differences in value priorities: Cross-cultural and multimethod studies. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 89(6), 1010–1028. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.89.6.1010>
- Schwartz, S. H., & Sagie, G. (2007). Value Consensus and Importance. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, 38(4), 465–497. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0022022100031004003>
- South, J., Meah, A., Bagnall, A. M., & Jones, R. (2013). Dimensions of lay health worker programmes: Results of a scoping study and production of a descriptive framework. *Global Health Promotion*, 20(1), 5–15. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1757975912464248>
- Tabak, I., Mazur, J., Granado Alcon, M. D. C., Orkenyi, A., Zaborskis, A., Aasvee, K., & Moreno, C. (2012). Examining trends in parent-child communication in Europe over 12 years. *The Journal of Early Adolescence*, 32(1), 26–54. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0272431611419509>
- Valenzuela, S., Bachmann, I., & Aguilar, M. (2016). Socialized for news media use: how family communication, information-processing needs, and gratifications determine adolescent's exposure to news. *Communication Research*, 1–24. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0093650215623833>
- Xu, W., Oei, T. P., Liu, X., Wang, X., & Ding, C. (2014). The moderating and mediating roles of self-acceptance and tolerance to others in the relationship between mindfulness and subjective well-being. *Journal of Health Psychology*. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1359105314555170>

APPENDIX

Table 2: The mean and standard deviation of the 52 items dan reliability of the 19 values

| Aspects | Values | Item | M | SD | Cronbach (α) |
|-------------------------------------|--|--------|--------|---------|-----------------------|
| Self-Direction | Self-Direction Thought (1 st Value) | item1 | 4.7945 | 1.23557 | .613 |
| | | item23 | 4.8356 | .97202 | |
| | | item39 | 4.9452 | .88019 | |
| | Self-Direction Action (2 nd Value) | item16 | 4.8904 | 1.11258 | .567 |
| | | item30 | 4.8493 | .98137 | |
| | | item56 | 4.9863 | .96455 | |
| Stimulation | Stimulation (3 rd Value) | item10 | 4.2877 | 1.38924 | .650 |
| | | item28 | 4.2192 | 1.37686 | |
| | | item43 | 4.8904 | 1.10002 | |
| Hedonism (4 th Value) | | item3 | 5.0685 | 1.32632 | .644 |
| | | item36 | 4.8493 | 1.29820 | |
| | | item46 | 3.8356 | 1.39457 | |
| Achievement (5 th Value) | | item17 | 4.7945 | 1.04028 | .519 |
| | | item32 | 5.4932 | .78392 | |
| Power | Power Dominance (6 th Value) | item6 | 3.1233 | 1.39389 | .156 |
| | | item29 | 2.8356 | 1.47209 | |

| | | | | | |
|------------------------------------|---|--------|--------|---------|------|
| | Power Resources (7 th Value) | item20 | 5.0274 | .94241 | |
| Face (8 th Value) | | item9 | 4.4795 | 1.43478 | .670 |
| | | item24 | 4.5205 | 1.25951 | |
| | | item49 | 4.3562 | 1.33718 | |
| Security | Personal Security (9 th Value) | item13 | 5.2603 | 1.02777 | .699 |
| | | item26 | 5.1096 | 1.02146 | |
| | | item53 | 5.1370 | .94744 | |
| | Societal Security (10 th Value) | item2 | 4.3973 | 1.64772 | .620 |
| | | item35 | 5.0959 | 1.23788 | |
| | | item50 | 4.7123 | 1.28538 | |
| Conformity | Conformity rules (12 th Value) | item15 | 4.9315 | .94764 | .776 |
| | | item31 | 4.8904 | .89072 | |
| | | item42 | 4.9589 | .94924 | |
| | Conformity interpersonal (13 th Value) | item4 | 4.9178 | 1.48841 | .525 |
| | | item22 | 5.192 | 1.0091 | |
| | | item51 | 4.7671 | 1.09950 | |
| Tradition (11 th Value) | | item18 | 3.6575 | 1.30404 | .665 |
| | | item33 | 4.3562 | 1.22893 | |
| | | item40 | 4.6986 | 1.00947 | |
| Humility (14 th Value) | | item7 | 3.3562 | 1.27334 | .106 |
| | | item38 | 5.2877 | 1.06039 | |
| Benevolence | Benevolence-Care (18 th Value) | item11 | 3.9863 | 1.26374 | .626 |
| | | item25 | 5.1918 | .98118 | |
| | | item47 | 4.9178 | .96829 | |
| | Benevolence-Dependability (19 th Value) | item19 | 4.4932 | 1.16813 | .613 |
| | | item27 | 5.1918 | .98118 | |
| | | item55 | 4.5890 | 1.12837 | |
| Universalism | Universalism-Nature (15 th Value) | item8 | 5.2192 | 1.08329 | .705 |
| | | item21 | 5.1233 | 1.01304 | |
| | | item45 | 5.0959 | .83607 | |
| | Universalism-Concern (16 th Value) | item5 | 5.1507 | 1.12634 | .647 |
| | | item37 | 5.2055 | .95683 | |
| | | item52 | 5.1233 | .95663 | |
| | Universalism-Tolerance (17 th Value) | item14 | 5.2466 | .99695 | .728 |
| | | item34 | 5.0000 | .92796 | |
| | | item57 | 4.6986 | 1.04993 | |

Note:

M: Mean

SD: Standard deviation

Alpha (α): Cronbach alpha coefficient

Table 3: Mean dan standard deviation of the 52 items and reliability of higher order value

| Higher Order Value | Value | Item | M | SD | Cronbach (α) |
|--------------------|---------------------------|--------|--------|---------|-----------------------|
| Openness to change | Self-Direction Thought | item1 | 4.7945 | 1.23557 | .823 |
| | | item23 | 4.8356 | .97202 | |
| | | item39 | 4.9452 | .88019 | |
| | Self-Direction Action | item16 | 4.8904 | 1.11258 | |
| | | item30 | 4.8493 | .98137 | |
| | | item56 | 4.9863 | .96455 | |
| | Stimulation | item10 | 4.2877 | 1.38924 | |
| | | item28 | 4.2192 | 1.37686 | |
| | | item43 | 4.8904 | 1.10002 | |
| | Hedonism | item3 | 5.0685 | 1.32632 | |
| | | item36 | 4.8493 | 1.29820 | |
| | | item46 | 3.8356 | 1.39457 | |
| Self-Enhancement | Achievement | item17 | 4.7945 | 1.04028 | .607 |
| | | item32 | 5.4932 | .78392 | |
| | Power | item6 | 3.1233 | 1.39389 | |
| | | item29 | 2.8356 | 1.47209 | |
| | | item20 | 5.0274 | .94241 | |
| Conservation | Personal Security | item13 | 5.2603 | 1.02777 | .843 |
| | | item26 | 5.1096 | 1.02146 | |
| | | item53 | 5.1370 | .94744 | |
| | Societal Security | item2 | 4.3973 | 1.64772 | |
| | | item35 | 5.0959 | 1.23788 | |
| | | item50 | 4.7123 | 1.28538 | |
| | Tradition | item18 | 3.6575 | 1.30404 | |
| | | item33 | 4.3562 | 1.22893 | |
| | | item40 | 4.6986 | 1.0947 | |
| | Conformity rules | item15 | 4.9315 | .94764 | |
| | | item31 | 4.8904 | .89072 | |
| | | item42 | 4.9589 | .94924 | |
| | Conformity Interpersonal | item4 | 4.9178 | 1.48841 | |
| | | item22 | 5.1918 | 1.00909 | |
| | | item51 | 4.7671 | 1.09950 | |
| Self-Transcendence | Universalism nature | item8 | 5.2192 | 1.08329 | .899 |
| | | item21 | 5.1233 | 1.01304 | |
| | | item45 | 5.0959 | .83607 | |
| | Universalism concern | item5 | 5.1507 | 1.12634 | |
| | | item37 | 5.2055 | .95683 | |
| | | item52 | 5.1233 | .95663 | |
| | Universalism tolerance | item14 | 5.2466 | .99695 | |
| | | item34 | 5.0000 | .92796 | |
| | | item57 | 4.6986 | 1.04993 | |
| | Benevolence care | item11 | 3.9863 | 1.26374 | |
| | | item25 | 5.1918 | .98118 | |
| | | item47 | 4.9178 | .96829 | |
| | Benevolence dependability | item19 | 4.4932 | 1.16813 | |
| | | item27 | 5.1918 | .98118 | |
| | | item55 | 4.5890 | 1.12837 | |
| Face | | item9 | 4.4795 | 1.43478 | .670 |
| | | item24 | 4.5205 | 1.25951 | |
| | | item49 | 4.3562 | 1.33718 | |

| | | | | |
|-----------------|--------|--------|---------|------|
| <i>Humility</i> | item7 | 3.3562 | 1.27334 | .106 |
| | item38 | 5.2877 | 1.06039 | |

Note

M : Mean

SD : Standard deviation

(α) : Cronbach alpha coefficient