

# GOVERNMENT POLICY AND COVID-19: INSIGHT AND GENERAL PUBLIC ATTITUDE IN SOCIAL MEDIA

<sup>1</sup> LA MANI, <sup>2</sup> IRMAWAN RAHYADI, <sup>3</sup> MUHAMMAD ARAS

<sup>1,2,3</sup> Communication Department, BINUS Graduate Program, Master of Strategic Marketing Communication,

Bina Nusantara University, Jakarta, Indonesia 11480

E-mail: <sup>1</sup> la.mani@binus.edu, <sup>2</sup> irmawan.rahyadi@binus.edu, <sup>3</sup> maras@binus.edu

## ABSTRACT

This study aims to understand public tendencies in response to the Covid-19 policy obtained from social media in Indonesia. This research used descriptive quantitative methodology. It involved 580 respondents recruited using quota sampling technique. Research data was collected by using a questionnaire which was shared via social media platforms (Facebook, WhatsApp, and Instagram). Then, the data was analyzed using frequency distribution, where the respondents' answers were grouped into separated categories to show patterns. Generally, public saw construction on Covid-19 as a virus which spreads rapidly, and a virus that comes from Wuhan-China. Therefore, public cognitively perceived Covid-19 as a scary virus causing acute diseases. There is also an element of social cognition that has opened a potential space for public to disobey government policies. In relation to affection, public looked down on people who disobey the government policies on Covid-19. Thus, this fact made public function as information channel, persuasion agent, and coercion to others especially to their family members. While public showed knowledge, affection, and behavior supporting government policies on Covid 19, many people disobeyed the policies. The disobedience does not necessarily indicate that people are not aware of the government policies on Covid-19. Yet, the main reason for the disobedience is economic factors. If they stay home, they will lose their income.

**Keywords:** *attitude tendencies, public, policy, social media, Covid-19*

## 1. INTRODUCTION

The existence of communication technology causes faster information dissemination. Any intended information in a country will spread rapidly because of internet technology and all its variants. Among the events that took the public and the government time to find a solution was the emergence of the coronavirus disease (Covid-19) in Wuhan China in the end of December 2020.

Then, the virus spread all over the world reaching 215 countries [1]. Even though WHO stated that Covid-19 is curable without medication [2], the number of deaths is increasing.

Covid-19 outbreak has affected all parts of the society, not only health but also social, psychological sides of the society as well as other impacts such as hoaxes abundance, politics, economy, and business practices [3]. The social effects include mobility limitation and human interaction in relation to lockdown, social distancing

and work from home policies (WFH). Psychological effects include stress, while in the field of politics, this issue is used as a weapon to criticize the government's slow response. Even, there is a global discussion on theory of conspiracy noting that Covid-19 is solely a biological weapon from a particular country [4, 5]. Despite the fact that this argument is hard to prove, it has been a global discourse. Furthermore, economically, there was a decelerating production of industry in China and decreasing demand in automotive and smartphone sectors [6]. Also recorded the decreasing number of airlines passengers in March 2020 reaching up to 33% in Covid-19 infected regions and beyond [7]. This world incident reminds us to the Ebola virus case which devastated financial sectors in Guinea, Liberia and Sierra Leone, which were regions with the fastest economic growth in the world [8]. Indonesia has a fair share of economic effect to Covid-19 [9], comprises evaluation on budgets in Ministries, economic growth of 2.3% due to declining of household consumption, investment, and government spending [10].

Out of those pandemic effects, increasing number of death is the most concerning of all. Even if China has declared its victory against the virus, other countries still suffer from the pandemic and death. There was 1,136,851 confirmed Corona cases recorded on April 6, 2020 and 62,955 deaths. In Indonesia, the number increased day to day. Since the government officially announced Corona virus case on March 2, 2020, until May 3, 2020 afternoon, there were 2,273 confirmed cases, 198 deaths, and 164 people cured.

In Indonesia, confirmed cases and deaths can be traced scientifically with empirical data and rational approach. To slow down this concerning number, the Indonesian Government has released some policies, such as lockdown, social distancing, stay home and work from home (WFH). Although resulting in some pros and cons within the society, the government hopes that people are willing and consciously obey these policies. Yet, in reality, some people disobey the policies, for example staying outside in the lockdown period. This shows us that instructions on physical distancing have been ignored. This instruction is also viewed by some people as creating social vulnerability in particularly to some people who work in informal sectors and do not have permanent salary (seller and app-based drivers) [11].

Others documented disobedience is taking home infected bodies of Covid-19 victims and opened up the dead body covering [12]. Some of these facts indicate the people's lack of knowledge and awareness of the policies in social interactions and distancing and protecting one selves from infected victims.

This disobedience against social distancing and protection from Corona virus is part of reality in communication process. Not all messages on policies from the communicator (government as decision makers) are well-received by the public. There are some elements in the society who accept, reject, ignore, and even stand against the messages. Hence, one of the goals of communication is to build knowledge and positive attitude to make public willingly obey the messages from communication process by the government.

This research aims to describe public cognition, affection, and behavior on government policies on social media related to Covid-19. This study argues that the disobedience emerged because of low public cognition and affection on Covid-19. Any obedience on government policies concerning social interaction and physical distancing, stay at

home, and WFH is based on positive cognition and affection on government policies.

This research aims to contribute to the analysis on public tendencies in response to government policies related to Covid-19 on social media. The tendency can be used as tool to map out public behavior after receiving government policies. This study contributes to (1) references for researchers in policy communication and public health; (2) improvement of accuracy on policy making, resulting in less misunderstanding and public resistant; and (3) guidance for central and regional governments in public policy making.

## 2. CONCEPTUAL FOUNDATION

### 2.1 Policy

In essence, there is a limitation on what is defined as public policy in political studies literature. Each definition has their own approach and the discussions have not defined public policy [13, 14].

In general terms, policies are intended to describe the behavior of some actors, such as officials, government institutions, or legislative bodies, for example in the field of public transport or consumer protection. Public policy also means anything that government choses to execute or not execute [15, 16].

Public policy can be described as an entire framework of government conducts to reach public goals. Also, it means study on government decision and conduct organized to solve public issues. Thus, policy is an intended action packaged as a response to existing problems [13, 14].

The government organizes many things, including conflict resolution in the society; they manage people to people conflicts; they distribute many types of symbolism remuneration and material services to people and money collected from people in the form of tax. Therefore, public policy manages behavior, bureaucracy, distributes benefits, collects taxes [17].

Anderson (2010) defines public policy as intended conducts by an actor or several actors in dealing with problems or concerning issues [15]. The success of any public policy relies on how successful the application of the policy. Even the best policy means nothing if they are not well applied. One of the challenges in policy implementation is lack of detailed instructions or guidance on how to implement them [18].

## 2.2. Public Attitude

Attitude is defined as psychological tendencies to foresee certain objects or behaviors in a like or dislike level. Attitude is generally understood as being formed in a process of individual subjective evaluation (involved rational decision of cost and benefit), also influenced by affective and emotional responses as well as related believe. According to Allport (1935), attitude is a mental and nerve condition from readiness organized through experiences to give dynamic or directed influences towards individual responses on related objects and situations. Krech and Crutchfield (1948) support cognitive perspective and define attitude as permanent organization from process of motivation, emotion, perception and cognition in individual attributes [19].

Both perception and policy are affecting each other positively and negatively. Thus, negative public perception (as found in survey and polls) influences content and direction of government policy [20]. Public attitude is identical to public opinion, as public opinion consists of people's perspective on similar issues. Public opinion is not defined as individuals' consciousness [21]. However, public opinions reflect dynamic process where ideas are expressed, adjusted, and compromised aiming for collective determination of an act. Noelle-Neumann (1994) defines public opinion as an attitude and a behavior from an individual to public if he does not want to be isolated, especially in relation to controversial issue. Thus, public opinion is an attitude shown to public on discussed issue in the society [21].

## 2.3. Covid 19

On December 2019, a hospital in Wuhan, China diagnosed several patients with pneumonia symptoms. The number kept increasing, which resulted in isolation [22, 23]. In the beginning, it was called coronavirus 2019 (2019-nCoV). Coronavirus 2019 spread quickly and attracted world attention and caused panic [24]. Hence, on March 11, 2020, WHO declared Covid 19 as a pandemic [25]. Coronavirus belongs to a big family of virus that causes diseases in humans and animals [26]. In humans, several corona viruses have been identified to cause respiratory infections, which range from a simple flu to acute disease, such as Middle East Respiratory Syndrome (MERS) and Severe Acute Respiratory Syndrome (SARS). The newest corona virus found was coronavirus COVID-19. The COVID-19 common symptoms are fever, dry cough, and exhaustion. The less common symptoms are ill

and sore, blocked nose, headache, sore throat, diarrhea, numb taste or smell, rashes on skin, color change on toes and nails. These symptoms gradually become more severe. Some people got infected with light symptoms. Around 80% of infected people have been cured without any hospitalization. One out of five COVID-19 infected patients suffered from severe illness and experienced difficulties in breathing. Elders and those who have basic medical problems such as high blood pressure, heart, and lung problems, diabetic and cancer, have higher risks to get severe illness. Yet, anyone who got infected by COVID-19 will have severe illness. Regardless their age, anyone who experiences fever, cough, respiratory problem, sore chest, and speech problem has to seek immediate medical attention. It is highly recommended to contact medical workers or institutions, to be forwarded to an intended clinic [27].

The implications of Covid-19 have affected almost all aspects of human life. The effects impacted on not only health sectors but also economy, social, psychology, politics, finance and so on. These widely effects resulted in global attention and concern [24].

## 2.4. Social Media

The development of internet technology is very fast, thus giving birth to a variety of communication media [28]. The existence of the internet has absolutely revolutionized the form of human interaction and communication tools [29]. Among the variants that come with the internet is the existence of social media.

Social media is a form of electronic communication, where people with diverse backgrounds from small to large scale creating online communities to share information, ideas, pictures, videos, and others [30-33]. The existence of social media allows people to communicate online in large numbers and on a wide scale. Among the variants of social media are Facebook, Twitter, WhatsApp, Friendster, google plus, or other online community networks [30].

Currently, social media has become the primary media used by people to find all their needs, including seeking knowledge about diseases, health information, and others [34, 35]. In addition, social media is also used as advertising media [36], campaigns, and social marketing [37]. Thus, social media is a necessity and the primary media of society today for interacting. Based on the above explanation, this research emphasizes the existence of social media in creating very limited public

knowledge about public policy. Therefore, this research needs to be done to see the trend of public knowledge about Indonesian government policies in social media to reduce the spread of covid 19.

### 3. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

This research used quantitative methodology. Quantitative research is a research procedure which generates aggregative data to describe investigated people and behavior. Quantitative research operates data collecting perspectives from respondents [38]. From the point of view of data collection method, this research is survey research. Survey research is a type of research to find out respondents' responses so that their attitudes can be categorized clearly [39, 40]. Survey research applies world views of post-positivist [41].

This study was conducted in 2020, while the data collection was conducted between June-July 2020. The research was managed in a relatively short period of time aiming for speedy data collection. The number of respondents was 580 people identified using quota sampling. Quota sampling is non-random sampling technique, in which respondents are identified due to the quantity of the research population [42-46]. The respondents were asked to voluntarily answer online questionnaires distributed via social media (Facebook, WhatsApp, and Instagram).

### 4. RESULT

The number of respondents who were willingly answered the questionnaires was 580 people from 29 provinces and 103 cities in Indonesia. In terms of gender, there were more women (306 people or 52,76%) compared to men (274 people or 47, 24%). There is no segregation in choosing man and woman informants, as long as they were willing to fill in the questionnaires. The age ranged from 15-60 years old. The educational backgrounds were as follows: high schoolers (68 people or 11.72%, diploma/undergrad (328 people or 58.28%), graduate (146 people or 25.17%), and doctoral (28 people or 4.83%). The occupation ranged from (217 people or 37.41%), students (79 people or 13.62%), employee (124 people or 21.38%), housewife (21 people or 3.2%), jobseekers (23 people or 3.97%), social worker/art (6 people or 1.03%), entrepreneur (108 people or 18.62%) and farmers (2 people or 0.34%). Based on their income, some of the respondents earn less than 1 million rupiah (43 people or 7.41%), 1-4 million rupiah (211 people or 36.38%), 5-9 million rupiah (176 people or 30.34%), 10-14 million rupiah (41 people or 7.07%), more

than 14 million rupiah (18 people 3.10%) and no information (91 people or 15.69).

The public is looking for information about Covid 19 using a variety of media, including online news media and social media. In this study, the majority of respondents used online news media and social media to obtain information about Covid 19. Based on information received from online news media and social media, public responses to government policies occurred in three categories, namely cognitive, affective, and conative. An overview of the public response to the Indonesian government's policy to reduce the spread of Covid 19 can be explained as follows:

#### 4.1. Public cognition on Covid-9

Cognition refers to knowledge or introduction to respondents' views on Covid 19. Public cognition depends on external exposure or stimulus from an individual which derives from its surrounding. In the field of policy communication, it is essential that a communicator knows well the descriptions of public cognition or policy goal. Policies will be well-established and well-received if the contents of the policy represent public cognition and needs. Public understand Covid-19 through many languages and inquiries. Out of the 580 respondents, public responses can be accumulated into six categories (See table 1).

Table 1. Public knowledge on Covid 19

Respond	Frequency	Percentage	Category Level
Virus originated from bats	121	20,86	Low
Uncurable disease reasons	87	15,00	Very low
Rapid contagious virus	402	69,31	High
Deadly virus	164	28,27	Low
Common Virus	27	4,66	Very low
Virus from Wuhan-China	328	56,55	Mid low
No respond	26	4,48	Very low
<b>Average Total</b>	<b>165</b>	<b>28,45</b>	<b>Low</b>

Generally, the respondents have considerable amount of knowledge about Covid 19. Most of the respondents perceived Covid 19 as a disease caused by a contagious virus (69.31%), Virus from Wuhan-China (56.55%), and only 4.48% of the respondents had no responses. Respondents who stated that Covid 19 is a deadly virus were placed in the very low category level. This finding shows that public understood that Covid 19 is not a dangerous virus. Therefore, the public concern is low and the potential to disobey the policies is higher.

**4.2. Public cognition on government policies on Covid 19**

Since the first infected person was identified, the government released some policies to slow down the spread of the virus. Even though these policies have been released, the number of infected people increased daily and the spread has not slowed down. Public cognition on Indonesian government policies can be seen in Table 2.

The data shown in table 2 explains that the public are well informed about the government policies related to Covid 19. Well-recorded public knowledge on Covid 19 policies was highlighted by the percentage of the respondents' answers with an average of 56-90%. This fact indicates that almost all the policies made by the Indonesian Government have been received by the public namely wearing mask, keeping physical distance, staying at home and work from home.

*Table 2. Public Knowledge on government policies on Covid 19*

Respond	Frequency	Percentage	Category level
Stay Home	487	83,97	Very high
Work from Home	437	75,34	High
Wearing Mask	525	90,52	Very high
Keep Physical Distance	518	89,13	Very high
Large-scale social restrictions (PSBB)	472	81,38	Very high
Social safety net program (BLT, groceries)	326	56,21	Mid low
Health aid	208	35,86	Low
No Respond	1	0,17	Very low
<b>Average total</b>	<b>371,75</b>	<b>64,07</b>	<b>High</b>

**4.3. Public affection on government policies on Covid 19**

Public values on a policy do not only rely on cognitive implication but also affective judgement. This judgement can be either positive or negative, and like or dislike. Table 3 shows which Indonesian government's policies are desired by the public as mentioned by the respondents.

*Table 3. Positive public judgement on government policies on Covid 19*

Respond	Frequency	Percentage	Category level
Staying home	310	53,45	Mid low
Work from Home	329	56,72	Mid Low
Wearing mask	404	69,66	High
Keeping physical distance	392	67,59	High
Large-scale social restriction (PSBB)	275	47,41	Mid low
Social safety net program (BLT, groceries)	259	44,66	Mid low
Health aid	248	42,76	Mid low
No respond	4	0,69	Very low
<b>Average total</b>	<b>277,63</b>	<b>47,87</b>	<b>Mid low</b>

Table 3 shows that the respondents were adequately pleased with the government policies on Covid 19. Yet, based on the percentage and respondents' answers average level, some government policies received less sympathy from the public. Proportionally, public answers set in the middle level which psychologically public is not paying attention to the policies on Covid 19. After the respondents answered which policies were desired, then question lead towards which policies they dislike, as displayed in table 4.

*Table 4. Public respond on dislike government policies on Covid 19*

Respond	Frequency	Percentage	Category level
Staying home	165	28,45	Low
Work from Home	89	15,34	Very low
Wearing mask	39	6,72	Very low
Keeping physical distance	31	5,34	Very low
Large-scale social restriction (PSBB)	161	27,76	Low
Social safety net program (BLT, groceries)	51	8,79	Very low
Health aid	30	5,17	Very low
No respond	245	42,24	Very low
<b>Average total</b>	<b>101,38</b>	<b>17,48</b>	<b>Very low</b>

All policies from the Indonesian government shows there is no significant rejection from the public. The level of despise is low. This means the government policies were approved and liked by public. The fact that the government policies on Covid 19 were received by the public also indicates that these policies are not a burden for the society. Further, the next question for the respondents is whether or not the government policies on Covid 19 become a burden. The responses were recorded in table 5.

Table 5. Public respond on encumbers government policies in Covid 19

Respond	Frequency	Percentage
Strongly agree	61	10,52
Agree	107	18,45
Neutral	235	40,52
Less agree	108	18,82
Disagree	69	11,89
<b>Total</b>	<b>580</b>	<b>100</b>

Table 5 indicates that the respondents' tendencies were neutral which means the Indonesian government policies were judged limiting the public. Thus, psychologically, the implementation of the government policies on Covid 19 is manageable. On the other hand, when government policies are cumbersome, the implication causes worry to respondents also resulted in answers on whether government policies on Covid 19 caused caution as it stated in table 6.

Table 6. Responds on public caution on government policies on Covid 19

Respond	Frequency	Percentage
Strongly agree	94	16,21
Agree	176	30,34
Neutral	193	33,27
Less agree	85	14,66
Disagree	32	5,52
<b>Total</b>	<b>580</b>	<b>100</b>

Table 6 indicates the respondents' tendencies were neutral which means that Indonesian government policies were judged by the respondents as causing a little concern to society. This evidence indicated that public proportionally reacted to those policies with less fear and positive hope. The wariness tendencies caused half of the respondents despite the group of people who disobeyed the policies.

Table 7. Public resentment on people who disobey government policies on Covid 19

Responds	Frequency	Percentage
Strongly agree	332	57,24
Agree	137	23,62
Neutral	77	13,28
Less agree	20	3,45
Disagree	14	2,41
<b>Total</b>	<b>580</b>	<b>100</b>

Table 7 shows that half of the respondents resented people who disobeyed the government policies to decrease Covid 19 spread in Indonesia. This fact indicates that public desires others to obey the policies. So, the public evaluated how important it is to obey the government policies.

Table 8. Public respond on importance of obedience to government policies on Covid 19

Respond	Frequency	Percentage
Strongly agree	380	65,52
Agree	128	22,07
Neutral	57	9,83
Less agree	4	0,69
Disagree	11	1,89
<b>Total</b>	<b>580</b>	<b>100</b>

Table 8 shows that respondents were aware of policies obedience. Awareness of obedience to policies described the societal reality where public accepts and needs the policies. The needs of the polices resulted in willingness to obey the government policies. The tendency of public attitude to obey policies is elaborated in table 9.

Table 9. Public acceptance to obey government policies on Covid 19

Respond	Frequency	Percentage
Strongly agree	371	63,97
Agree	143	24,66
Neutral	50	8,62
Less agree	5	0,86
Disagree	11	1,89
<b>Total</b>	<b>580</b>	<b>100</b>

Table 9 shows that affectively the majority of public were willing to obey the government policies on Covid 19. Even though there are some people disobeyed the policies, policy makers hope that the public were willing to obey the policies without any pressure. One of the most common reasons why people disobey government policies on Covid 19 is related to economy. Some people lost their income because they had to stay at home as they work in informal sector. This work-related reason is the main reason for the disobedience to social restriction and local lockdown in many regions in Indonesia.

#### 4.4. Public attitude on Indonesian government policies on Covid 19

Attitude is an apparent act as a visualization of an individual's cognition and affection [47]. Attitude is an exposed act from an individual [20]. Frequently, cognition and affection are inconsistent to real life attitude. One of the indicated attitudes from public is suggesting or persuading others to obey government policies particularly for someone they know well.

Table 10. Public as an actor of persuasion contributing to obedience to government policies on Covid 19

Respond	Frequency	Percentage
Always	340	58,62
Usually	150	25,86
Neutral	68	11,72
Sometimes	11	1,89
Never	11	1,89
<b>Total</b>	<b>580</b>	<b>100</b>

Responses in table 10 highlight that the public usually encourage others to obey the government policies on Covid 19. This effort is only limited by personal network to persuade other close to them (immediate family members) to obey policies. People can only persuade to someone they are familiar to.

*Table 11. Public participation in spreading information on government policies on Covid 19*

Respond	Frequency	Percentage
Always	306	52,76
Usually	147	25,34
Neutral	92	15,86
Sometimes	22	3,79
Never	13	2,24
<b>Total</b>	<b>580</b>	<b>100</b>

Ideally, policies on Covid 19 require many parties' contribution including members of the society. Table 11 shows that most respondents (52.76%) contributed to the spread of information on government policies. This finding means that every individual has a task to communicate the policies. The issue is how to build public consciousness to actively participate as communicators and policies channel to other member in the society around them.

*Table 12. Public forcing their family members to obey government policies on Covid 19*

Respond	Frequency	Percentage
Always	295	50,86
Usually	157	27,07
Neutral	83	14,31
Sometimes	30	5,17
Never	15	2,59
<b>Total</b>	<b>580</b>	<b>100</b>

The process of influencing public attitude is a complex thing as many variables come into play. Within the communication science, coercive communication is one of the ways. Coercive communication is a process of communication where the communicator forcibly influences the audience. This technique is available to communicator who has power or authority over their audiences. For example, the head of family in

their household, the head of an institution or company in front of the subordinates.

## 5. DISCUSSION

There are many studies that explained that information and communication technology have a major contribution in creating changes in public attitudes. The intended public is all individuals or social units that are the target of messages, for example policies, or company product advertisements.

The use of social media is not only a marketing tool, but also for social marketing and campaigns. Social campaigns and marketing cover government policy issues that are the needs of most people, for example health, education, environment, or social policy in a broad sense.

The findings of this study indicate that the majority of respondents obtained information about Covid 19 from online news media and social media (Facebook, Instagram, Twitter, and WhatsApp). Even so, public knowledge about Covid 19 was only understood by respondents as a virus with fast transmission originating from Wuhan, China. The implication of this findings causes fearless of Covid 19. This phenomenon illustrates that information technology needs to be reviewed in its contribution to building broad public awareness.

In the esearch results, it is shown that social media has a big role in creating changes in people's knowledge, attitudes, and behavior in various contexts. Among these studies, it reveals that social media can create knowledge about health and healthy behavior [34], leaving electronic smoking habits [48], and others. However, there are also those who discussed that the impact of social media on behavior change has not yet been seen, because of the complexity of social media [49]. Thus, it can be assumed that social media is not a single factor that can create changes in public attitudes. This means that there are other variables that cause changes in knowledge, affection and public conative.

Public knowledge on a policy translates into public internalization or well-understanding towards policies. Ones' knowledge was created through education and socialization [50] received via a variety of sources around him [51], for example organization [52], media [53-57]; family [58, 59], and social net [60]. Public knowledge in Indonesia on Covid 19 policies came from a variety of sources: television (55,34%), online news media (75,86%), social media (75,51%), family (22,24%), friends (23,45%), and newspaper (10,69%).

Indonesian public has access to various information sources, yet public knowledge on Covid 19 only as far as a fast-spreading disease and come from Wuhan-China. Public knowledge on Covid 19 implicated to public attitude and behaviour on Indonesian government policies to decrease the number of virus outbreak. Cognitively, public understood government policies on Covid 19 as stay home order (83, 97%), wearing mask (90,52%), work from home (75,34%), social restriction (81,38%), keeping physical distance (89,13%), health aid (35,86%) and social safety net (56,21%). This empirical data shows generally Indonesian public knows policies produced by the government. Public knowledge on Covid 19 and government policies implicated on public affection. Public affection expressed in the form of resentment and despising people who disobey government policies.

Thus, behavioral implication from public knowledge and affection on Covid and government policies were expressed by public in Indonesia in the form of spreading the information, persuading others, and encouraging family members to obey the government policies. Consequently, socialization and communication of government policies on Covid 19 were not only done by the government, mass media, social media, and online news media but also societal participation. In the perspective of society development, participation is the main element of development success [61-63]. Similar to planning, needs mapping, and policies making, ideally it is an aspiration that originated from society and surrounding [64].

## 6. CONCLUSIONS

Ever since the first outbreak identified in Indonesia, the Indonesian Government release some policies; large-scale social restriction. In relation to the acceleration management of Covid 19, on April 3, 2020, several policies were declared: 1) closing schools and offices, 2) limiting religious activities, 3) limiting public facilities access, 4) limiting socio-cultural events, and 5) limiting transportation. These policies attracted various responses from the public. This research reveals several public tendencies cognitively, affectively, and behaviorally. Cognitive tendencies mean how well public know and are aware of Covid 19.

This research reveals the public constructed notion from social media that Covid 19 is a contagious virus, and the virus that came from Wuhan-China. Affectively, the public despise people who disobey the government policies on

Covid 19. This means that Covid 19 is cognitively constructed by the public, not as a scary virus. So, there is a big possibility for citizens to violate policies. This fact affects public action in Indonesia, where a majority of people playing a role as information gateway, persuasion agent, coercion on others especially family members. While respondents shown knowledge, affection and behavior that supported government policies on Covid 19, there were still many people who disobeyed the policies. The disobedience is indicated by the public who do not highlight the fact that public uninformed of the government policies on Covid 19, but the main reason of the disobediences was economy. The lost their income if they stay home. Disobedience emerged from mid to low economic level of people and people who work in informal sectors. Thus. Public obedience can be achieved with offering economic solution to people in the informal sectors.

## 7. LIMITATION

This research is only conducted with an exploratory approach, so it is necessary to continue with descriptive, explanatory, and correlative research, especially to examine the impact of social media and online news on changes in public behavior regarding public policy and social marketing.

## REFERENCES

- [1] WHO. (2020). *Coronavirus disease (COVID-19) pandemic*. Available: <https://www.who.int/emergencies/diseases/novel-coronavirus-2019>
- [2] WHO. (2019). *Q&A on coronaviruses (COVID-19)*. Available: <https://www.who.int/>
- [3] W. Puriwat and S. Tripopsakul, "An Investigation of the Effects of Digital Social Responsibility on Corporate Image, eWOM, and Brand Loyalty during the COVID-19 Social Distancing Phenomenon," *International Journal of Innovation, Creativity and Change*, vol. 13, no. 9, p. 19, 2020.
- [4] CNN-Indonesia. (2020). *Beredar Spekulasi Virus Corona Adalah Senjata Biologi China*. Available: <https://www.cnnindonesia.com/teknologi/2020130131400-199-470143/beredar-spekulasi-virus-corona-adalah-senjata-biologi-china>



- [5] Kompas-TV, "Senjata Biologis Dibalik Virus Corona?," ed. Jakarta, 2020.
- [6] J. Bouey, "Assessment of COVID-19's Impact on Small and Medium-Sized Enterprises: Implications from China," *RAND Corporation*, p. 15, 2020.
- [7] ICAO, "Effects of Novel Coronavirus (COVID-19) on Civil Aviation: Economic Impact Analysis," Montreal, Canada 2020.
- [8] S. Peter, "From Panic and Neglect to Investing in Health Security: Financing Pandemic Preparedness at a National Level.," *World Bank Publications*, vol. 117, 2017.
- [9] A. Javed, "Economic Impact of Coronavirus and Revival Measures: Way Forward for Pakistan," *Sustainable Development Policy Institute*, 2020.
- [10] CNN-Indonesia. (2020). *Sri Mulyani: Dampak Virus Corona Berat ke Perekonomian*. Available: <https://www.cnnindonesia.com/ekonomi/20200401111243-532-489012/sri-mulyani-dampak-virus-corona-berat-ke-perekonomian>
- [11] Syaifudin. (2020). *Kerentanan Sosial, dan Gagalnya Physical Distancing*. Available: <https://kolom.tempo.co/read/1326074/covid-19-kerentanan-sosial-dan-gagalnya-physical-distancing>
- [12] kompas.com. (2020). *Nekat, Keluarga di Kolaka Bongkar Plastik Jenazah Pasien PDP Virus Corona*. Available: [www.kompas.com](http://www.kompas.com).
- [13] C. L. Cochran and E. F. Malone, *Public Policy: Perspectives and Choices* Third Edition ed. USA: Lynne Rienner Publishers, 2005.
- [14] C. L. Cochran and E. F. Malone, *Public Policy: Perspectives and Choices*. USA: Lynne Rienner, 2014.
- [15] J. E. Anderson, *Public policymaking: An introduction*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 2003.
- [16] T. A. Birkland, *An introduction to the policy process : theories, concepts, and models of public policy making*. New York: Routledge, 2015.
- [17] T. R. Dye, *Understanding Public Policy*, 14th ed. United States: Pearson Education, Inc, 2013.
- [18] A. R. Khan and S. Khandaker, "A Critical Insight into Policy Implementation and Implementation Performance," *Public Policy and Administration* vol. 15, no. 4, p. 11, 2016.
- [19] D. O. Sears, J. L. Fredman, and L. A. Peplau, *Social Psychology*. Jakarta: Airlangga, 2001, p. 363.
- [20] H. Crawley, "Understanding and Changing Public Attitudes: A Review of Existing Evidence from Public Information and Communication campaigns," Swansea University, Centre for Migration Policy Research 2009.
- [21] S. M. Cutlip, A. H. Center, and G. M. Broom, Ninth, Ed. *Effective Public Relations*. Jakarta: Kencana, 2009.
- [22] S. M. Ismail, W. A. A. W. Haniff, and H. Kassim, "Human Rights Perspective Amid Coronavirus Disease 2019 Outbreak," *International Journal of Innovation, Creativity and Change*, vol. 13, no. 10, p. 13, 2020.
- [23] L. Li, Q. Huang, D. C. Wang, D. H. Ingbar, and X. Wang, "Acute lung injury in patients with COVID-19 infection," *Clin Transl Med*, vol. 10, no. 1, pp. 20-27, Jan 2020.
- [24] Y. R. Guo *et al.*, "The origin, transmission and clinical therapies on coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19) outbreak - an update on the status," *Mil Med Res*, vol. 7, no. 1, p. 11, Mar 13 2020.
- [25] K. Ramphul and S. G. Mejias, "Coronavirus Disease: A Review of a New Threat to Public Health," *Cureus*, vol. 12, no. 3, p. e7276, Mar 15 2020.
- [26] L. v. d. Hoek *et al.*, "Identification of a New Human Coronavirus," *Nature Medicine* vol. 10, no. 4, 2004.
- [27] WHO, "Coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19) Situation Report – 82," World Health Organization 2020.
- [28] R. M. Perloff, "Social Media Effects on Young Women's Body Image Concerns: Theoretical Perspectives and an Agenda for Research," *Sex Roles*, vol. 71, no. 11-12, pp. 363-377, 2014.
- [29] T. D. Baruah, "Effectiveness of Social Media as a tool of communication and its potential for technology enabled connections: A micro-level study," *International Journal of Scientific and Research Publications*, vol. 2, no. 5, p. 10, 2012.
- [30] V. Taprial and P. Kanwar, *Understanding Social Media*. bookboon.com, 2012.
- [31] D. Miller *et al.*, *How the World Changed Social Media*. London: University College London (UCL Press), 2016.
- [32] K. K. Kapoor, K. Tamilmani, N. P. Rana, P. Patil, Y. K. Dwivedi, and S. Nerur,

- "Advances in Social Media Research: Past, Present and Future," *Information Systems Frontiers*, vol. 20, no. 3, pp. 531-558, 2017.
- [33] W. W. K. Ma and A. Chan, "Knowledge sharing and social media: Altruism, perceived online attachment motivation, and perceived online relationship commitment," *Computers in Human Behavior*, vol. 39, pp. 51-58, 2014.
- [34] R. S. Mano, "Social media and online health services: A health empowerment perspective to online health information," *Computers in Human Behavior*, vol. 39, pp. 404-412, 2014.
- [35] D. Husereau *et al.*, "Consolidated Health Economic Evaluation Reporting Standards (CHEERS)--explanation and elaboration: a report of the ISPOR Health Economic Evaluation Publication Guidelines Good Reporting Practices Task Force," *Value Health*, vol. 16, no. 2, pp. 231-50, Mar-Apr 2013.
- [36] L. Wu, "Understanding the Impact of Media Engagement on the Perceived Value and Acceptance of Advertising Within Mobile Social Networks," *Journal of Interactive Advertising*, vol. 16, no. 1, pp. 59-73, 2016.
- [37] R. Thackeray, B. L. Neiger, and H. Keller, "Integrating social media and social marketing: a four-step process," *Health Promot Pract*, vol. 13, no. 2, pp. 165-8, Mar 2012.
- [38] P. Corbetta, *Social Research: Theory, Methods and Techniques*, First ed. London: Sage, 2003.
- [39] W. L. Neuman, *Basics of Social Research: Qualitative & Quantitative Approaches*, Third Edition ed. London: Pearson, 2014.
- [40] W. L. Neuman, *Social Research Methods: Qualitative and Quantitative Approaches*, Seventh Edition ed. London: Pearson, 2014.
- [41] J. W. Creswell, *Research Design : qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches*. California: SAGE Publications 2014, p. 342.
- [42] I. Etikan, "Sampling and Sampling Methods," *Biometrics & Biostatistics International Journal*, vol. 5, no. 6, 2017.
- [43] I. Etikan and O. Babatope, "A Basic Approach in Sampling Methodology and Sample Size Calculation," *MedLife Clinics*, vol. 1, no. 1006, p. 5, 2019.
- [44] R. Kumar, *Research Methodology: a step-by-step guide for beginners*, Third edition ed. London: SAGE, 2011.
- [45] A. S. Singh and M. Masuku, "Sampling Techniques and Determination of Sample Size in Applied Statistics Research: An Overview," *International Journal of Economics, Commerce and Management*, vol. 2, no. 11, p. 22, 2014.
- [46] H. Taherdoost, "Sampling Methods in Research Methodology; How to Choose a Sampling Technique for Research," *International Journal of Academic Research in Management (IJARM)*, vol. 5, no. 2, p. 11, 2016.
- [47] K. G. DeMarree, C. J. Clark, S. C. Wheeler, P. Briñol, and R. E. Petty, "On the pursuit of desired attitudes: Wanting a different attitude affects information processing and behavior," *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, vol. 70, pp. 129-142, 2017.
- [48] D. Westerman, P. R. Spence, and B. Van Der Heide, "Social Media as Information Source: Recency of Updates and Credibility of Information," *Journal of Computer-Mediated Communication*, vol. 19, no. 2, pp. 171-183, 2014.
- [49] C. Maher, J. Ryan, J. Kernot, J. Podsiadly, and S. Keenihan, "Social media and applications to health behavior," *Current Opinion in Psychology*, vol. 9, pp. 50-55, 2016.
- [50] W. Zeng, S. Y. Chia, Y. H. Chan, S. C. Tan, E. J. H. Low, and M. K. Fong, "Factors impacting heart failure patients' knowledge of heart disease and self-care management," *Proceedings of Singapore Healthcare*, vol. 26, no. 1, pp. 26-34, 2016.
- [51] L. Wheeler, "Kurt Lewin," *Social and Personality Psychology Compass* vol. 2, no. 4, 2008.
- [52] A. Akosile and W. Olatokun, "Factors influencing knowledge sharing among academics in Bowen University, Nigeria," *Journal of Librarianship and Information Science*, vol. 52, no. 2, pp. 410-427, 2019.
- [53] S. H. Chaffee and F. Izcaray, "Mass Communication Functions in a Media-Rich Developing Society," *Communication Research*, vol. 2, no. 4, p. 29, 1975.
- [54] F. Guerrero-Solé, M. Terribas Sala, and J. Gifreu Pinsach, "Sobre los efectos de los medios. Un estudio exploratorio de las teorizaciones de los ciudadanos sobre la influencia de los medios de comunicación de masas," *Estudios sobre el Mensaje Periodístico*, vol. 24, no. 1, 2018.

- [55] B. Lila, "The impact of Media in the Socialization process in Albania," *European Journal of Social Sciences Education and Research*, vol. 1, no. 1, p. 8, 2014.
- [56] N. A. Wahab, M. S. Othman, and N. Muhammad, "The Influence of the Mass Media in the Behavior Students: A Literature Study," *International Journal of Academic Research in Business and Social Sciences*, vol. 7, no. 8, 2017.
- [57] R. Uznieñe, "Media-Agents of Socialization," *Regional Formation and Development Studies*, vol. 8, no. 3, p. 9, 2012.
- [58] D. Barni, S. Ranieri, S. Donato, S. Tagliabue, and E. Scabini, "Personal and Family Sources of Parents' Socialization Values: A Multilevel Study," *Avances en Psicología Latinoamericana*, vol. 35, no. 1, 2017.
- [59] N. T. Binh, "The Role of Family in Educating-Socializing Children: The Case of Vietnam," *Current Research Journal of Biological Sciences*, vol. 4, no. 2, p. 9, 2012.
- [60] L. Stasova and J. Khynova, "Internet social networks as important agents of social inclusion for contemporary children and youth," *SHS Web of Conferences*, vol. 2, 2012.
- [61] C. Baba, R. Chereches, C. Mora, and T. Ţiclaeu, "Public Participation in Public Policy Process – Case Study in Seven Counties from North-Western Region of Romania," *Transylvanian Review of Administrative Sciences*, vol. 26, no. E, 2009.
- [62] R. Kingston, "Public Participation in Local Policy Decision-making: The Role of Web-based Mapping," *The Cartographic Journal*, vol. 44, no. 2, pp. 138-144, 2013.
- [63] M. S. D. Vries, "Public Participation in Policy Processes: Towards a Research Agenda," *Administratie Si Management Public*, p. 10, 2007.
- [64] B. Anderson, T. Böhmelt, and H. Ward, "Public opinion and environmental policy output: a cross-national analysis of energy policies in Europe," *Environmental Research Letters*, vol. 12, no. 11, 2017.