

# What does the public know about Ebola? The public's risk perceptions regarding the current Ebola outbreak in an as-yet unaffected country

To access this article in the *American Journal of Infection Control*, please go to [http://www.ajicjournal.org/article/S0196-6553\(15\)00150-9/abstract](http://www.ajicjournal.org/article/S0196-6553(15)00150-9/abstract)



Anat Gesser-Edelsburg<sup>1\*</sup>, Yaffa Shir-Raz<sup>1</sup>, Samah Hayek<sup>1</sup> and Oshrat Sassoni-Bar Lev<sup>2</sup>

1. School of Public Health, University of Haifa, 199 Aba Khoushy Ave. Mount Carmel, Haifa 3498838, Israel  
 2. Department of Communication, University of Haifa, 199 Aba Khoushy Ave. Mount Carmel, Haifa 3498838, Israel  
 \* Corresponding Author [ageser@univ.haifa.ac.il](mailto:ageser@univ.haifa.ac.il)

† Head of Health Promotion Program, University of Haifa, 199 Aba Khoushy Ave. Mount Carmel, Haifa 3498838, Israel

Targeting Ebola International Congress 2015; Scientific Bases & Applications, Pasteur Institute, Paris, May 28-29, 2015



ASSET - Action plan on Science in Society related issues in Epidemics and Total pandemics, is a 48 months project, which aims to:

- 1) forge a partnership with complementary perspectives, knowledge and experiences to address effectively scientific and societal challenges raised by pandemics and associated crisis management
- 2) explore and map SIS-related issues in global pandemics
- 3) define and test a participatory and inclusive strategy to succeed
- 4) identify necessary resources to make sustainable the action after the project completion.

ASSET combines public health, vaccine and epidemiological research, social and political sciences, law and ethics, gender studies, science communication and media, in order to develop an integrated, transdisciplinary strategy, which will take place at different stages of the research cycle, combining local, regional and national levels.

## Highlights

- The public has knowledge about Ebola and is updated on the topic, including scientific issues that are on the agenda, such as the question of Ebola transmission.
- No statistically significant difference was found between health care workers versus nonhealth care workers in the knowledge and worry score.
- The public expects information about Ebola from health authorities, including topics of uncertainty.
- More than half of the participants thought the information provided by health authorities on Ebola and Ebola prevention was insufficient, and almost half were unsure if the information was sufficient.

## Background

The unexpected developments surrounding the Ebola virus in the United States provide yet another warning that we need to establish communication preparedness. This study examines what the Israeli public knew about Ebola after the initial stages of the outbreak in a country to which Ebola has not spread and assesses the association between knowledge versus worries and concerns about contracting Ebola.

## Methods

Online survey using Google Docs (Google, Mountain View, CA) of Israeli health care professionals and the general public (N = 327).

**Table 1**  
Distribution of knowledge, worry, and expectation from the Ministry of Health in Israel (N = 327)

Measure/Question	Value	Measure/Question	Value
<b>Knowledge</b>		<b>Worry</b>	
Definition of Ebola		Risk of an Ebola outbreak in Israel	
An infection transmitted from person to person	306 (94.4)	High (>50%)	24 (7.7)
It is not a contagious infection	2 (0.6)	Medium (50%)	98 (30.3)
Do not know	16 (4.9)	Low (<50%)	201 (62.2)
Missing	3	Missing	4
Transmission route		<b>Worry about contracting Ebola</b>	
Fluid (eg, blood, saliva, feces, etc)	170 (52.6)	High	73 (22.6)
Air droplets	82 (25.4)	Medium	108 (33.4)
Do not know because scientists are uncertain	33 (10.2)	Low	142 (43.9)
Do not know	38 (11.8)	Missing	4
Missing	3	<b>Expectation from the Ministry of Health</b>	
<b>Who can contract Ebola</b>		Receiving more information from the Ministry of Health	
Immigrants or international workers from Africa	4	Yes, just in case we have reported cases in Israel	109 (33.6)
Everyone	26 (8.1)	Yes, now	190 (58.6)
Pregnant women and children	1 (0.3)	Not interested to get any kind of information	25 (7.7)
Health care workers (doctors, nurses, etc)	1 (0.3)	Missing	3
Missing	5	If you answered yes to the previous question, what kind of information would you like?	
<b>Treatment for Ebola or vaccine</b>		What to do to prevent the transmission	43 (14.7)
There is a specific treatment for Ebola	34 (10.6)	Everything related to Ebola, treatment, and prevention (also subjects that include scientific uncertainty)	157 (54.0)
As of today, there is neither a vaccine nor any specific treatment for Ebola	224 (70.0)	Everything related to Ebola, but just for topics that have scientific certainty	91 (31.3)
As of today, there is no specific treatment for Ebola, but there is a vaccine	29 (9.1)	Missing	36
Do not know	33 (10.3)	<b>Extent of agreement that the Ministry of Health provided comprehensive information on Ebola</b>	
Missing	7	Strongly agree	8 (2.5)
<b>Severity of Ebola</b>		Agree	25 (7.8)
Fatal disease	244 (76.3)	Not sure	145 (45.2)
It is a dangerous disease that can be fatal, only for people at risk	37 (11.6)	Disagree	99 (30.8)
Ebola is dangerous, but it is possible to recover	25 (7.8)	Strongly disagree	44 (13.7)
Ebola is not dangerous at all	0 (0.0)	Missing	6
Do not know	14 (4.4)	<b>Extent of agreement that the Ministry of Health provided comprehensive information on Ebola prevention</b>	
Missing	7	Strongly agree	3 (0.9)
<b>Knowledge score</b>		Agree	24 (7.5)
Knowledge score for correct answers	4.18 ± 0.83 (2-5)	Not sure	132 (41.1)
		Disagree	117 (36.4)
		Strongly disagree	45 (14.0)
		Missing	6

(continued)

## Results

The Israeli public has knowledge about Ebola (mean ± SD, 4.18 ± 0.83), despite the fact that the disease has not spread to Israel (Table 1). No statistically significant difference was found between health care workers versus nonhealth care workers in the knowledge score (Table 2). Additionally, no statistically significant association was found between knowledge and worry levels (Table 3).

**Table 2**  
Differences between health care workers versus nonhealth care workers in the overall knowledge level, of who could contract Ebola, and Ebola treatment or vaccine

Measure/Question	Health care workers	Nonhealth care workers	χ <sup>2</sup> test or t test*	P value
Overall knowledge level (score), mean ± SD	4.15 ± 0.82	4.28 ± 0.83		0.259
Infected with Ebola			9.19	0.027†
Immigrants or international workers from Africa	1 (1.4)	25 (10.1)		
Everyone	68 (97.1)	221 (89.5)		
Pregnant women and children	0 (0.0)	1 (0.4)		
Health care workers (doctors, nurses, etc)	1 (1.4)	0 (0.0)		
Treatment for Ebola or vaccine				
There is a treatment for Ebola	3 (4.3)	31 (12.6)	8.63	0.035†
As of today, there is no treatment for Ebola, but there is a vaccine for Ebola	6 (8.7)	22 (8.9)		
As of today, there is neither a treatment for Ebola nor a vaccine	57 (82.6)	163 (66.3)		
Do not know	3 (4.3)	30 (12.2)		

NOTE. Values are n (%), n, or as otherwise indicated.  
 \*P value is statistically significant at P < .05.  
 †For categorical variables the χ<sup>2</sup> test is used, and for continuous variables the t test is used.

**Table 3**  
Ordinal logistic regression for the association between knowledge level and worry level for Israelis to contract Ebola and for Ebola to break out in Israel

Demographic characteristics	Worried to be infected			Worried to find Ebola cases in Israel		
	High	Medium	Low	High	Medium	Low
Age	0.98 (0.94-1.02)	0.97 (0.95-0.99)†	Ref	1.00 (0.97-1.02)	0.99 (0.97-1.01)	Ref
P value	0.273	0.009		0.923	0.524	
Sex						
Male	Ref	Ref	Ref	Ref	Ref	Ref
Female	2.39 (0.75-3.59)	2.19 (1.30-4.27)*	Ref	0.94 (0.46-1.96)	1.38 (0.72-2.65)	Ref
P value	0.139	0.020		0.883		
Education						
s/High school	Ref	Ref	Ref	Ref	Ref	Ref
s/High school	NS	1.04 (0.29-3.78)	Ref	0.88 (0.19-4.11)	0.80 (0.19-3.36)	Ref
P value		0.538		0.220	0.693	
Academic degree	NS	0.59 (0.20-1.75)	Ref	0.13 (0.11-1.63)	0.46 (0.14-1.57)	Ref
P value		0.157		0.085	0.110	
Health care worker	Ref	Ref	Ref	Ref	Ref	Ref
Nonhealth care worker	1.99 (0.51-7.85)	1.56 (0.75-3.27)	Ref	1.75 (0.70-4.43)	1.84 (0.72-3.07)	Ref
P value	0.225	0.235		0.238	0.290	
Knowledge score	1.05 (0.56-1.97)	1.18 (0.82-1.72)	Ref	0.88 (0.58-1.34)	1.04 (0.71-1.51)	Ref
P value	0.875	0.377		0.555	0.848	

NOTE. Values are odds ratio (95% confidence interval) or as otherwise indicated.  
 NS, odds ratio included a wide interval that yielded an insignificant outcome because of the small numbers in the high level category of the worry level; Ref, reference.  
 \*P value is statistically significant at P < .05.

The survey indicated that Israelis expect information about Ebola from the health ministry, including topics of uncertainty. More than half of the participants thought the information provided by the health ministry on Ebola and Ebola prevention was insufficient (50.5% and 56.4%, respectively), and almost half (45.2% and 41.1%, respectively) were unsure if the information was sufficient.

## Conclusion

The greatest challenges that the organizations face is not only to convey knowledge, but also to find ways to convey comprehensive information that reflects uncertainty and empowers the public to make fact-based decisions about health.

## References (selected)

1. Aliscovich A. Risk communication: Identifying the importance of social context. *Health, Risk & Society*. 2005;7(2):101-5.
2. Barry JM. Pandemics: avoiding the mistakes of 1918. *Nature*. 2009;459(7245):24-5.
3. BBC. Ebola crisis: Tomlinson 'confident' US will not see outbreak. August 2014. Available from: <http://www.bbc.com/news/world-us-canada-24893240>.
4. Barry JM, Whitfield Higgins, Navler J. SARS was an examination of the quantity and construction of health information in the news media. *Health Commun*. 2007;21(1):35-44.
5. Black TA. Crossing Frontiers in the Social Sciences: An Integrated Approach to Research Design, Measurement and Statistics. London & Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage; 2005.
6. CDC. Ebola Virus Disease. Transmission. 2014 [updated November 5, 2014]. Available from: [http://www.cdc.gov/eid/vol19no11/ebola-transmission/index.html#\\_rct=284](http://www.cdc.gov/eid/vol19no11/ebola-transmission/index.html#_rct=284).
7. Charlin C, Gosselin L. Doomed to suffer: why Ebola chief says 'optimism' prospects that virus could mutate and become airborne - making it much more infectious. *MailOnline*. 2 October, 2014. Available from: <http://www.dailymail.co.uk/news/article-2778022/UN-Ebola-chief-says-optimism-prospects-virus-mutate-airborne.html#ixzz30h9v0iB>.
8. Cowling BJ, Tsang TK, Hojvat D, Ip DK. Risk communication in the West Nile virus epidemic and its extension: responding to the communication challenges posed by the intentional or unintentional release of a pathogen in an urban setting. *Journal of Urban Health: Bulletin of the New York Academy of Medicine*. 2001;78(2):382-91.
9. Corbett SL, Winter SC. Social trust and the management of false bioterrorism and endangered species. The annual meeting of the society for risk analysis; December 3, 2005; Seattle, Washington 2005.
10. Dickson D. The Case for a 'Skeptic' model of science communication. *SciDev*. Nov 2005. Available from: <http://www.scribd.com/doc/10201410/the-case-for-a-skeptic-model-of-science-communication>.
11. Druss MI, Manalilathilak C, Campbell RF, Rubin S, Hammer SM, Morones S, et al. Ebola and Quarantine. *New Engl J Med*. 2014;371(21):2028-30.
12. Horst M, Vran A. Nations at ease with radical knowledge: On consensus, consensusing and false consensus. *Social Studies of Science*. 2010;40(1):105-26.
13. Howell L. Airborne Ebola spread can't be ruled out, docs from infectious 'hot zone' warn. *The Washington Times*; October 16, 2014. Available from: <http://www.washingtontimes.com/news/2014/oct/16/airborne-ebola-outbreak-in-montenegro-possible/?hpid=hp>.
14. Iwain A. Citizen Science: A Study of People, Expertise and Sustainable Development. London and New York: Routledge; 1995.
15. Jane M, Becker M. The Health Belief Model: A decade later. *Health Education & Behavior*. 1998;15(1):1-7.
16. Makiin M, Mueser P, Grabar N. Public reception of scientific uncertainty in the endocrine disruptor controversy: the case of male fertility. *Journal of Risk Research*. 2012;16(6):677-95.
17. Ministry of Health Israel. Questions and answers about Ebola November 11, 2014. Available from: <http://www.health.gov.il/ebola/ebola/Pages/QA.aspx>.
18. Ratzan SC, Morone DF. Ebola crisis communication chaos we can avoid. *J Health Commun*. 2014;18(11):1213-5.
19. Rosenbaum M. Communicating Uncertainty: Ebola, Public Health, and the Scientific Process. *N Engl J Med*. 2014.
20. Ross P. Is Ebola airborne? Aerial transmission of the virus cannot be 'ruled out' International Business Times; October 17, 2014. Available from: <http://www.ibtimes.com/ebola-airborne-aerial-transmission-virus-cannot-be-ruled-out-1708857>.
21. Sandover P, Lavers J. Exploring and prodding uncertainty: Risk communication lessons from germany's E. Coli outbreak. *The Interdisciplinary Communication website*2011 [updated August 14, 2013]. Available from: <http://www.psu.edu/~psu/intercom/2011/08/germany.html>.
22. Stone J, Frenkel M, Miller M, MacGregor D. Risk analysis and risk as feelings: Some thoughts about affect, reason, risk and rationality. *Risk Analysis*. 2004;24(2):1-11.
23. The Lancet. The median and the message of Ebola. *The Lancet*. 2014;384(9953):1641.
24. Vlahov D, Espartero J, Yu B, Bello J, Lerner-Gevaik L. Major findings in non-occupational HIV risk: the vaccination the weight of rational assessment. *Vaccine*. 2011;29(10):1913-9.
25. World Health Organization. Ebola response roadmap. Situation report 21 November, 2014. Available from: <http://apps.who.int/iris/handle/document/25657/14117/1/roadmap-situation-report-21-nov2014-eng.pdf>.
26. Zarillo K, Fitzsimons LG. Threat of lawsuit could best mean's quarantine policy. *The New York Times*; October 29, 2014. Available from: [http://www.nytimes.com/2014/10/29/us/ebola-quarantine-threatens-lawsuit.html?\\_r=0](http://www.nytimes.com/2014/10/29/us/ebola-quarantine-threatens-lawsuit.html?_r=0).

For more information on the ASSET project please go to <http://www.asset-scienceinsociety.eu/>



This project has received funding from the European Union's Seventh Framework Programme for research, technological development and demonstration under grant agreement no 612236.