





# Current week




# Concern about the impact of the coronavirus

To what extent are you personally concerned or not concerned about the impact of the novel coronavirus in the following areas of life?  
*(Response scale: 1 'not concerned at all' to 5 'very concerned')*



# Perceived level of information


How well do you feel informed about the following aspects of the novel coronavirus?  
*(Response scale: 1 'not well informed at all' to 5 'very well informed')*



Figures given in percentages  
 Basis: 967–991 participants

# Evaluation of media coverage


How do you evaluate the overall media coverage of the novel coronavirus?  
(Response options: 'downplaying', 'appropriate', 'exaggerated')



Figures given in percentages  
Basis: 954 participants


# Appropriateness of the measures for containment

How do you evaluate the following measures to contain the spread of the novel coronavirus?  
 (Response options: 'not appropriate', 'appropriate')



## Current protective measures of the participants


Which of the following measures have you taken within the past 2 weeks to protect yourself or others from the novel coronavirus?  
(multiple selection)



# Perceived controllability of the risk of infection

How sure are you that you can protect yourself from an infection with the novel coronavirus?

(Response scale: 1 'not sure at all' to 5 'very sure')




Figures given in percentages  
Basis: 989 participants



# Behaviour of others

When dealing with other people, how important is it to you that they take measures to prevent a transmission of the novel coronavirus?  
 (Response scale: 1 'not important at all' to 5 'very important')




# Perceived probability of an infection

How high or low do you estimate the probability of currently being infected with the novel coronavirus at the following locations?  
 (Response scale: 1 'very low' to 5 'very high')




Figures given in percentages  
 Basis: 922–990 participants

# Over time



# Concern about the impact of the coronavirus

To what extent are you personally concerned or not concerned about the impact of the novel coronavirus in the following areas of life?  
 (Response scale: 1 'not concerned at all' to 5 'very concerned') – Shown: response category '(very) concerned' (values 4 + 5)




Figures given in percentages  
 Basis: 977–1.035 participants

# Perceived level of information

How well do you feel informed about the following aspects of the novel coronavirus?

(Response scale: 1 'not well informed at all' to 5 'very well informed') – **Shown: response category '(very) well informed' (values 4 + 5)**



Part of the questionnaire since February 2022


<sup>a</sup> Measure was added to the questionnaire at the time indicated

Figures given in percentages

Basis: 946–1.004 participants

# Evaluation of media coverage

How do you evaluate the overall media coverage of the novel coronavirus?  
 (Response options: 'downplaying', 'appropriate', 'exaggerated')




Figures given in percentages

Basis Mar–May 2020: 480–502 participants

Basis from Jun 2020: 951–1.019 participants

# Appropriateness of the measures for containment

How do you evaluate the following measures to contain the spread of the novel coronavirus?  
 (Response options: 'not appropriate', 'appropriate') – Shown: response category 'appropriate'




Figures given in percentages  
 Basis Mar–May 2020: 474–512 participants  
 Basis from Jun 2020: 916–1.031 participants

<sup>a</sup> Wording was adapted to the current situation at the time  
<sup>b</sup> Measure was added to the questionnaire (again) at the time indicated

# Current protective measures of the participants I

Which of the following measures have you taken within the past 2 weeks to protect yourself or others from the novel coronavirus?  
(multiple selection)




Figures given in percentages  
Basis: 917–1.016 participants



# Current protective measures of the participants II


Which of the following measures have you taken within the past 2 weeks to protect yourself or others from the novel coronavirus?  
(multiple selection)



Figures given in percentages  
Basis: 917–1.016 participants

# Perceived controllability of the risk of infection


How sure are you that you can protect yourself from an infection with the novel coronavirus?  
 (Response scale: 1 'not sure at all' to 5 'very sure')



Figures given in percentages  
 Basis Mar–May 2020: 492–514 participants  
 Basis from Jun 2020: 957–1.017 participants


# Behaviour of others

When dealing with other people, how important is it to you that they take measures to prevent a transmission of the novel coronavirus?  
*(Response scale: 1 'not important at all' to 5 'very important')*




# Perceived probability of an infection

How high or low do you estimate the probability of currently being infected with the novel coronavirus at the following locations?  
 (Response scale: 1 'very low' to 5 'very high') – **Shown: response category '(very) high' (values 4 + 5)**




Figures given in percentages  
 Basis: 899–1.014 participants

# Age groups



# Concern about the impact of the coronavirus


To what extent are you personally concerned or not concerned about the impact of the novel coronavirus in the following areas of life?  
 (Response scale: 1 'not concerned at all' to 5 'very concerned') – **Shown: response category '(very) concerned' (values 4 + 5)**



# Perceived level of information

How well do you feel informed about the following aspects of the novel coronavirus?

(Response scale: 1 'not well informed at all' to 5 'very well informed') – **Shown: response category '(very) well' (values 4 + 5)**



Figures given in percentages

Basis: 318–342 participants in corresponding age group

# Evaluation of media coverage

How do you evaluate the overall media coverage of the novel coronavirus?  
 (Response options: 'downplaying', 'appropriate', 'exaggerated')




Figures given in percentages  
 Basis: 311–329 participants in corresponding age group




# Appropriateness of the measures for containment

How do you evaluate the following measures to contain the spread of the novel coronavirus?  
 (Response options: 'not appropriate', 'appropriate') – Shown: response category 'appropriate'



# Current protective measures of the participants

Which of the following measures have you taken within the past 2 weeks to protect yourself or others from the novel coronavirus?  
(multiple selection)




Figures given in percentages

Basis: 298–319 participants in corresponding age group

# Perceived controllability of the risk of infection


How sure are you that you can protect yourself from an infection with the novel coronavirus?  
 (Response scale: 1 'not sure at all' to 5 'very sure')



Figures given in percentages  
 Basis: 321–341 participants in corresponding age group


## Behaviour of others

When dealing with other people, how important is it to you that they take measures to prevent a transmission of the novel coronavirus?  
 (Response scale: 1 'not important at all' to 5 'very important')



# Perceived probability of an infection

How high or low do you estimate the probability of currently being infected with the novel coronavirus at the following locations?  
 (Response scale: 1 'very low' to 5 'very high') – **Shown: response category '(very) high' (values 4 + 5)**



Figures given in percentages  
 Basis: 269–339 participants in corresponding age group

## Dates and sample sizes of the survey

<b>24 Mar</b>	510 participants	<b>2020</b>	<b>27–28 Oct</b>	1.006 participants	<b>2020</b>	<b>03–04 Aug</b>	1.007 participants	<b>2021</b>	<b>10–12 May</b>	998 participants	<b>2022</b>
<b>31 Mar</b>	500 participants		<b>10–11 Nov</b>	1.009 participants		<b>17–18 Aug</b>	1.010 participants		<b>24–25 May</b>	1.005 participants	
<b>07 Apr</b>	510 participants		<b>24–25 Nov</b>	1.018 participants		<b>31 Aug – 01 Sep</b>	1.004 participants		<b>07–08 Jun</b>	1.002 participants	
<b>14 Apr</b>	515 participants		<b>08–09 Dec</b>	1.004 participants		<b>14–15 Sep</b>	1.007 participants		<b>05–06 Jul</b>	1.010 participants	
<b>21 Apr</b>	505 participants		<b>17–18 Dec</b>	1.010 participants		<b>28–29 Sep</b>	1.022 participants		<b>02–03 Aug</b>	998 participants	
<b>28 Apr</b>	503 participants		<b>05–06 Jan</b>	1.017 participants		<b>12–13 Oct</b>	1.002 participants		<b>06–07 Sep</b>	998 participants	
<b>05 May</b>	504 participants		<b>19–20 Jan</b>	1.018 participants		<b>26–27 Oct</b>	1.003 participants				
<b>12 May</b>	510 participants		<b>02–03 Feb</b>	1.004 participants		<b>09–10 Nov</b>	1.003 participants				
<b>19 May</b>	509 participants		<b>16–17 Feb</b>	997 participants		<b>23–24 Nov</b>	1.007 participants				
<b>26 May</b>	510 participants		<b>02–03 Mar</b>	1.014 participants		<b>07–08 Dec</b>	995 participants				
<b>09–10 Jun</b>	1.015 participants	<b>16–17 Mar</b>	1.012 participants	<b>21–22 Dec</b>	1.005 participants	<b>2022</b>					
<b>23–24 Jun</b>	1.037 participants	<b>30–31 Mar</b>	1.008 participants	<b>04–05 Jan</b>	1.001 participants						
<b>07–08 Jul</b>	1.011 participants	<b>13–14 Apr</b>	1.007 participants	<b>18–19 Jan</b>	1.011 participants						
<b>21–22 Jul</b>	1.037 participants	<b>27–28 Apr</b>	1.024 participants	<b>01–02 Feb</b>	1.014 participants						
<b>04–06 Aug</b>	1.024 participants	<b>11–12 May</b>	1.023 participants	<b>15–16 Feb</b>	1.005 participants						
<b>18–19 Aug</b>	1.033 participants	<b>25–26 May</b>	1.006 participants	<b>01–02 Mar</b>	1.002 participants						
<b>01–02 Sep</b>	1.013 participants	<b>08–09 Jun</b>	1.010 participants	<b>15–16 Mar</b>	1.001 participants						
<b>15–16 Sep</b>	1.026 participants	<b>22–23 Jun</b>	1.005 participants	<b>29–30 Mar</b>	1.003 participants						
<b>29–30 Sep</b>	1.012 participants	<b>06–08 Jul</b>	1.002 participants	<b>12–13 Apr</b>	1.003 participants						
<b>13–14 Oct</b>	1.015 participants	<b>20–21 Jul</b>	1.012 participants	<b>26–27 Apr</b>	1.004 participants						

## How were the data collected?

<b>Statistical population:</b>	German-speaking population ages 14 years and over in private households in the Federal Republic of Germany
<b>Sampling:</b>	Samples drawn at random from land line and mobile telephone numbers which can also include telephone numbers not listed in directories (in line with standards set by the Association of German Market Research Institutes – ADM)
<b>Data weighting:</b>	Data was weighted according to gender, education, age, employment, size of city and German federal state to guarantee representativeness
<b>Method:</b>	Telephone interview (CATI omnibus survey, Dual Frame)
<b>Presentation of results:</b>	All figures given in percentages, rounding differences are possible, only valid responses were included (response option ‘don’t know’ was excluded from all analyses)
<b>Conducted by:</b>	Kantar GmbH

## About the BfR

The German Federal Institute for Risk Assessment, or BfR for short, is responsible for answering questions on all aspects of the health assessment of foods and feeds, consumer products and chemicals. Through its work, it makes a decisive contribution towards ensuring that food, products and the use of chemicals have become safer in Germany. The Institute's main tasks comprise the assessment of existing health risks and identification of new ones, the development of recommendations to limit risks and the transparent communication of this process.

This work results in the scientific advice given to political decision makers. To help with the strategic alignment of its risk communication, the BfR conducts its own research in the field of risk perception. The Institute is independent in its scientific assessments, research and communication. The BfR belongs to the portfolio of the Federal Ministry of Food and Agriculture (BMEL).

 *More information at: [www.bfr.bund.de/en](http://www.bfr.bund.de/en)*

*COVID-19/coronavirus:*

*> [A-Z Index](#) > [C](#) > [COVID-19/corona](#)*



## **Imprint**

BfR-Corona-Monitor | 6–7 September 2022

Publisher: German Federal Institute for Risk Assessment (BfR)  
Max-Dohrn-Straße 8–10  
10589 Berlin  
[bfr@bfr.bund.de](mailto:bfr@bfr.bund.de)  
[www.bfr.bund.de/en](http://www.bfr.bund.de/en)

Photo: [mathisworks/GettyImages](#)

Use of the results published here is possible with mention of the source  
'BfR-Corona-Monitor | 6–7 September 2022'.

This text version is a translation of the original German text, which is the only legally binding version.

## **German Federal Institute for Risk Assessment (BfR)**

Max-Dohrn-Straße 8–10

10589 Berlin

GERMANY

Phone +49 30 18412-0

Fax +49 30 18412-99099

[bfr@bfr.bund.de](mailto:bfr@bfr.bund.de)

[www.bfr.bund.de/en](http://www.bfr.bund.de/en)



German Federal Institute for Risk Assessment