

Review of: "The Relationships Between the Perception of Physical and Economic Risks Measured Within the Road Environment and Within the Digital Environment and the Relationships Between Risk Perceptions Measured in Separate Environments"

C.A. Saliya¹

¹ Sri Lanka Institute of Information Technology (SLIT)

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

The study under review explores the relationship between risk perception across different environments, specifically examining whether skills in identifying and assessing risks in one environment transfer to another. The findings suggest a nuanced understanding of how risk perception operates within and across different contexts.

Strengths

1. **Novel Insight:** The study addresses a gap in existing research by exploring the potential transferability of risk perception skills across environments. This is a valuable contribution, as it sheds light on the cognitive processes involved in risk assessment.
2. **Clear Examples:** By using concrete examples such as driving and road crossing, the study effectively illustrates its points. These examples are relatable and help to ground the theoretical concepts in everyday experiences.
3. **Differentiation of Environments:** The distinction made between similar and disparate environments is crucial. It highlights that while some environments may share enough characteristics to allow for the transfer of risk assessment skills, others are too different for such transfer to occur.

Weaknesses

1. **Some literature is too old, for example,** Driving Behavior Questionnaire (DBQ) (Reason et al., 1990).
2. **Lack of Contextual Information:** The review does not provide detailed contextual information about the questionnaires used or the participant demographics beyond age and driving seniority. More background on the participants and the specific items in the questionnaires would help in understanding the nuances of the results.
3. **Interpretation of Age and Driving Seniority.** The negative correlations with age and the low magnitude of these correlations (-.111 with road crossing, -.032 with stock market, and .024 with driving) are not discussed in depth. This omission leaves unanswered questions about how these factors might influence risk perception and whether their effects are meaningful.

2. **Overemphasis on Reliability:** While high reliability is essential, it is also important to consider the validity of the measures. The review does not address whether the questionnaires accurately measure the constructs of risk perception in each context.

In conclusion, while the study provides valuable insights into the relationships between risk perceptions in different contexts, it would benefit from a more detailed methodological approach, consideration of additional influencing factors, and deeper analysis of the results.

Since there are five groups, this study can be improved by comparing groups.