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Abstract

The main aim of the present study was to provide a deeper insight into the collateral consequences of news coverage. More specifically, how the interaction of valence (positive vs. negative) and proximity (domestic vs. foreign) impacts the perceived safety and optimism of the public. One hundred and seventy-four Dutch participants were randomly assigned to one of five conditions (neutral news, positive domestic news, negative domestic news, positive foreign news, and negative foreign news), after which they completed two questionnaires (Safety Rating Scale and Life Orientation Test Revised). Some minor trends were found in terms of valence influencing the perceived safety and optimism as expected (positive news creating higher perceived safety and optimism scores and negative news doing the opposite), while the trends for proximity were more intricate. The only statistically significant results materialised in female participants having a significant lower sense of perceived safety than male participants and young adults having a significant lower level of optimism than middle adults. Most likely due to the limited manipulation, there were limited results. Nonetheless, this study can and should be used as a stepping-stone for future studies. Limitations, positives, and recommendations for future research are discussed.
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How a shift in focus of news coverage content can affect the safety perception and optimism of the public.

In June 2017, one of the biggest newspapers in the Netherlands - *NRC Handelsblad* - held a survey amongst its readers, investigating their feelings on terror attack news coverage. Sixty percent of the 1000 respondents felt media paid too much attention to terror attacks and around 20% thought the increase in media coverage of terror attacks drastically changed their personal lives (in terms of avoiding certain heavily populated places for example). Recent surveys in the United States have exposed similar feelings (Yamamoto, 2016) and even though the public seems to be getting fed up, this negative news coverage has been around for a while. Johnson’s study (1996) for example, showed that over two decades ago more than half of the news in the US was focused on negative events.

Although people seem to dislike the trend of increasing negative news content, they do have a preference for negative news, especially for safety related issues (Robinson, 2007; Trussler & Soroka, 2014). This preference might be a result of the higher utility that can be derived from negative news, because of the aspect of risk aversion (McCluskey, Swinnen, & Vandemoortele, 2015). Negative news is also an important and necessary element of democracy as it creates an informed public (McIntyre, 2016).

While informing the public about risks of different sorts, the news coverage asserts its power through three effects: agenda setting, framing, and priming (Kim, Scheufele, & Shanahan, 2002; Scheufele & Tewksbury, 2007). In short, these terms mean that media tell the public what to think about and how to think about it. Beyond the explicit effects, research has shown that news coverage has multiple implicit effects on people that seem more like collateral consequences. Collateral consequences are influences of news media on its audience without either of them being consciously aware of it. These are increasingly becoming more researched in the area of media psychology, which will be further reviewed in the literature background.

The field of collateral consequences of news and the contribution of the present study can provide an interesting insight into the power of media and how they might generate a change in people’s lives by the news they cover. The developments could be beneficial for a vast array of individualistic and collectivistic reasons, but the main significance is twofold. On the one hand it increases the social responsibility of media outlets if it shows that a change in news coverage can affect their audience in a certain way. Can the effect of what they choose to cover be big enough that it influences their audience’s lives? On the other hand, it
provides significant value for everyone who ever reads news articles. They can understand better how news stories affect them personally and mentally. For example, do their lives change when they read about destroyed cities in Syria compared to solar panels being built in Sweden? Depending on the results, it could initiate a societal debate on what the priorities of media should be. This debate would not be about freedom of speech or media censorship, but rather about the implicit effects of media coverage and how this can be regulated.

Literature Background

Media affecting outgroup beliefs and attitudes

What seems to be the most researched section when it comes to collateral consequences from news coverage is how it affects beliefs and attitudes.

**Ingroup – outgroup.** Whether it is intentional or not, media can, through its reporting, create a considerable divide between ingroup and outgroup. One side of this divide is often minorities like immigrants, obese- or disabled people.

Starting with immigration, negative news on immigrants has the possibility to increase the perceived threat of the audience, while repeatedly being exposed to these negative depictions will result in more negative attitudes and prejudice towards immigrants over time (Schemer, 2014; Fujioka, 2011). More specifically, news about Islamic terrorist acts substantially increases prejudiced attitudes toward outgroup members (Das, Bushman, Bezemer, Kerkhof, & Vermeulen, 2009). Schemer (2012), on the other hand, found that people who were more exposed to positive news portrayals of immigrants had decreased stereotypical attitudes. Apparently, news has the power to influence immigration attitudes into either direction, depending on what is being reported.

Beyond immigration-related outgroups, people with obesity or disabilities are also affected by the way they are represented in the news. This news can already have an impact with children and has shown to increase negative, stigmatising attitudes and dislike towards obese peers from an early age (Latner, Rosewall, & Simmonds, 2007). The way media represent people with obesity and how it transmits to the public’s attitude towards them, also goes for people with disabilities. Media are the only source of information for many and when there is a focus on a disabled outgroup that impacts society in a negative way instead of inclusion and acceptance, it can leave a negative impression on the public’s attitude (von Sikorski & Schierl, 2014). Just like with immigrants however, research showed that media
also has the possibility to create more positive attitudes towards these outgroups through their reporting (Hoffner, Fujioka, Cohen, & Atwell, 2017).

The issue of unbalanced representation and distorted images of outgroups in media is not one-dimensional. It is a continuous circle where media are subject to biases that exist in society, which they showcase in their news and the biased news articles then affect the public, which reinforces the existing biases and misperceptions in society (Gilens, 1996).

**Other issues.** Apart from the ingroup-outgroup divide, research has shown there are multiple other issues where media can affect attitudes and beliefs of the audience. There are several examples that have surfaced over recent years.

Public opinion regarding teacher quality and schooling standards decline and the concerns increase when there are many negative news articles about teachers and teaching (Keogh & Garrick, 2011). Whether it is positive or negative reporting about education, it can substantially impact the pedagogical beliefs of teachers (Shih-hsiung & Shih-chieh, 2013). Garz (2013) showed that repeated negative economic media coverage results in long-term pessimistic attitudes towards the economy and employment. Furthermore, the way advancements are framed in the news coincides with the way advancements are perceived by the public (Marks, Kalaitzandonakes, Wilkins, & Zakharova, 2007). As medical advancements are put in a much more positive light than agricultural biotechnology advancements, the public opinion on the former is considerably more favourable. Lastly, attitudes about something as politically relevant and important as the Turkey EU membership can even be altered (de Vreese, Boomgaarden, & Semetko, 2011). While the negative news yielded stronger effects than the positive news, support or disapproval amongst the audience could be attained, depending on the focus.

The research discussed so far gives strength to the notion that news coverage can influence the attitudes and beliefs of people towards a wide array of topics. Depending on what issues and which sides of the issues are being communicated, the audience can have a very different outlook on the situation and its potential problems and solutions.

**Media affecting behaviours**

Beyond affecting attitudes and beliefs, news can even go as far as to directly affect people’s behaviour. Online news, that is becoming more and more popular, especially amongst the younger crowd, has the possibility to impact the civic awareness of its audience, which in turn affects engagement. An enhanced engagement can result in creating more support and comfort activities for people with mental illnesses (Hoffner et al., 2017), while a
change in engagement can even manifest itself in whether people go vote or instead boycott elections (Boulianne, 2016). Not only can news influence whether people vote or not, ambivalent voters are also open to persuasion in favour of a certain candidate through media coverage of an election campaign (Chang, Wei, & Lo, 2014). McCarthy and Dolsma (2014) mention as well that elections and its probable outcome can be impacted by the news, while they also believe that the willingness of consumers to spend and of firms to invest can be influenced. Additionally, Yao and Yu (2016) found positive social news to be a beneficial factor for cooperation, while negative social news resulted in an increase in cheating behaviour. In a study of Liu and Lo (2014), people who were more exposed to news about a pandemic were more likely to take protective measures towards that risk.

These recent studies show a clear abundance in increasing interest and importance towards finding out what kind of behavioural effects different kinds of news can create. From the studies conducted so far, the effects of news seem as far-reaching as directly influencing the behaviours of its audience.

**Media affecting people’s own lives**

Media does not only affect people’s beliefs, attitudes, and behaviours, which will mostly be projected outward towards others, it also affects people’s lives on the inside. Aspects like affect, wellbeing, life satisfaction, mental health, anxiety, and risk- and threat perception can all be influenced by certain news coverage.

In numerous countries, media outlets that focus solely on positive news have started to emerge. See the websites of the *Good News Network*, the *Global Positive News Network*, or *Daily Good*. There are also existing news outlets that created a positive part within their website, like the ‘Good News’ subsections of *The Mirror*, *Fox News*, *The Telegraph*, and *The Huffington Post*. Journalists are starting to spread more joy in this world and it can come with some positive effects.

McIntyre and Gibson (2016) examined the positive news industry and found that not only can positive news make readers feel better in terms of affect, but silver lining stories can have the same effect for negative news (a positive silver lining at the end can heighten affect as well). Yamamoto (2016) had a more clinical approach and found that positive news could even be a protective factor for mental health. Constructive news, also known as solution-based news, showed a greater positive impact on the wellbeing of preadolescents (Kleemans, Schlindwein, & Dohmen, 2017), while viewing TV news on positive stories caused short-
term decreases in anxiety and negative affect (Harrell, 2000). All of this shows how different kinds of positive news can have multiple positive effects on the people that are exposed to it.

On the other side of the coin, there is negative news, which comes with its own set of troubling consequences. Park (2015) found a considerable effect of news negativity on people in terms of anger and disgust and Hanslmaier (2013) found news negativity could result in a lower life satisfaction of its readers. In line with the cultivation theory (which states that people believe social reality is similar to televised reality when they spend more time watching TV), Roche, Pickett, and Gertz (2016) found that exposure to negative TV news was associated with greater anxiety about victimization. This is in line with an older study from Johnston and Davey (1997) that focused on watching news on TV. They established a link between watching negative news and heightened levels of anxious and sad moods, which resulted in enhanced catastrophising of personal worries (even unrelated to the news content).

An interesting notion within the literature is how negative news affects the feelings and thoughts about safety and risk of its audience. A study from Das et al. (2009) showed how news about terrorist acts increased death-related thoughts and mortality reminders. This terror salience can also increase perception of threat to social order (Fischer, Greitemeyer, Kastenmüller, Frey, & Oßwald, 2007), perceived risk of terrorism and fear for others (Nellis & Savage, 2012). Similarly, Paek, Oh, and Hove (2016) confirmed that people have a heightened personal- and societal-level risk perception when they are confronted with fear-arousing news messages. This is mainly because these messages are perceived as more relevant and serious. Overall, the consumption of local television news and local newspapers can significantly elevate the perception of risk and fear of crime (Callanan, 2012; Hanslmaier, 2013; Intravia, Wolff, Paez, & Gibbs, 2017; McCarthy & Dolfsma, 2014). This even goes for specific cities that are in the news often, which was the case for London for example, when they hosted the Olympics in 2012 (Schroeder & Pennington-Gray, 2014).

As mentioned before, a big part of the negative news that is being reported on is about threats and risks that affect the safety of people and the world in general. Although a lot of new information has come to light in recent years in terms of effects of the news, there is still plenty more to research in this area.

**Theoretical accounts**

**News influence.** There are multiple theories that describe and explain, to some degree, how news affects people. Firstly, there is the cultivation theory (Gerbner, Morgan, & Signorielli, 1986), which has been mentioned before. It is mostly based on television exposure
and says that it can lead to the illusion of merging actual reality with televised reality. The direct effects model of media theory (DeFleur, 2010) states that the audience passively accepts media messages and provides reactions as expected. The media dependency theory (Ball-Rokeach, 2008) talks about how news is the main source for the public to create motives and interests, meet needs, and reach goals. Lastly, there is the agenda-setting theory (McCombs, Shaw, & Weaver, 2014), which does not focus on the media telling the public what to think, but rather what to think about and how much importance to put on it. According to Soderlund (2007), media’s influence is especially strong because of the use of the following three methods: emotional messages over logical messages, certain keywords that evoke emotions, and particular examples over general group statistics. These theories present some insight into how and why the public is affected by news. In line with these theories, it makes sense to suggest that people will get more negative thoughts and reactions when they read negative news and will experience the opposite when they read positive news.

**Proximity.** Looking at the literature more profoundly, it can also give insight into an aspect that can explain how different news articles have different levels of influence, namely proximity. Kleemans et al. (2017) explained the vividness theory in accordance with their study, which states that vivid information (emotionally interesting and proximate in a sensory, temporal, or spatial way) has more influence on the audience. The study of Liu and Lo (2014) showed that people take news more seriously and let it affect them more when it is perceived as having a higher personal impact. Paek et al. (2016) and their subsequent results demonstrated that when the personal relevance is higher, people pay more attention and believe they are more susceptible to the risks. Closely related to the vividness theory and these studies is the construal level theory of Liberman, Trope, and Rim (2011). This theory explains how information that is of farther psychological distance (hypothetical, social, spatial, or temporal) will create more abstract thinking, while closer psychological distance will generate more concrete thinking. The vividness theory and the construal level theory can thus explain how more proximate and vivid information impact the public more profoundly.

Through the empirical studies reviewed and the applicable theoretical accounts discussed, the combination provided a base from which the present study emerged.

**The present study**

In this study, the focus lies specifically in an area that is related to risk perception and fear of crime, but is even more connected to how people feel about their own life, namely
perceived safety. Additionally, optimism is incorporated in this study to add another variable in terms of how people feel about their own life. As discussed, many previous studies have focused on the collateral consequences of the news, but none have looked at the difference in influence between domestic and foreign news in one study. No research so far has integrated different domestic and foreign dimensions and this is a gap in the literature that needs to be further investigated. For that reason, the present study designed five conditions (containing neutral news, positive domestic news, negative domestic news, positive foreign news, and negative foreign news) and implemented two questionnaires focused on perceived safety and optimism, which will be further elaborated on in the methods section.

**Hypotheses**

Looking at previous research that has been reviewed so far, the content of articles in the different conditions and the questionnaire questions, it seems likely there will be a difference in responses throughout the conditions. Therefore, the first two hypotheses are:

- H1: There is a difference in safety perception scores between the readers of the five different news pages.

- H2: There is a difference in optimism scores between the readers of the five different news pages.

More specifically, in concordance with the literature, the positive news conditions will have a more beneficial effect on the responses of the participants than the negative news conditions. Therefore, the two more specific hypotheses are:

- H3: The participants in the positive news conditions will have higher safety perception scores than the participants in the negative news conditions.

- H4: The participants in the positive news conditions will have higher optimism scores than the participants in the negative news conditions.

As mentioned in the ‘theoretical accounts’ section in the literature background, when information is seen as closer and more relevant, it has a bigger impact. Going by this information, the following hypotheses were formulated:
H5: The disparity in safety perception scores between the domestic conditions will be bigger than the disparity between the foreign conditions.

H6: The disparity in optimism scores between the domestic conditions will be bigger than the disparity between the foreign conditions.

Lastly, it would be interesting to see whether safety perception and optimism affect each other and, as discussed later, how gender and age affect news influence. Therefore, there are three exploratory research questions:

RQ1: Is there an interaction effect between safety perception and optimism?

RQ2: How does gender make a difference when it comes to news influence in regards to safety perception and optimism?

RQ3: How does age make a difference when it comes to news influence in regards to safety perception and optimism?

Ethical considerations

All participants had the minimum age of 18 years and no sensitive personal data was collected. The informed consent (see appendix A) notified them on how their participation was voluntary and their responses were anonymous and treated with confidentiality. The intervention did not seek to affect the participants long-term and none of them reported to be harmed. The debrief form (see appendix B) explained the purpose of the experiment and how the news articles were tailored for this study. These articles were not much different from the average news that they read and see on a daily basis and did not contain sexual, violent or explicit content.

Methods

Design

In order to implement the dimensions of valence and proximity into one experiment, the present study has a between-subjects design with five different conditions. Four
conditions are a mixture of positive and negative news as well as domestic and foreign news, and there is a condition with neutral news. The experiment is set up in Dutch, as this is the experimenter’s main language and nationality.

Participants

One hundred and seventy-four Dutch adults (100 female, 74 male, $M_{age} = 35.26$ years, age range: 18-75 years) participated in the study. The only requirements they had to fulfil were that they lived in the Netherlands and saw the Netherlands as their primary country. Insight into the necessary amount of participants had been taken from similar studies like Harrell (2000), Singh, Kaur, Junid, and Self (2011), and Park (2015) who had 90, 80, and 420 participants respectively, while either using 6 or 8 independent conditions.

The participants were recruited through Facebook and recruitment emails went out to personal relationships at Maastricht University, Radboud University Nijmegen, Adelante Mytylschool, and Mondi Packaging who forwarded the link to the experiment to colleagues.

Materials

Different studies have been used for different distinct questions that emerged during the creative process, but overall inspiration has been taken from the dissertation of Harrell (2000), the study of Singh et al. (2011), and the study of Park (2015).

It is becoming increasingly common for people to read the news through news agency’s websites and apps. According to research of the SCP (Dutch bureau of Social Cultural Plans) in 2017 (Wennekers & de Haan, 2017), 52% of the Dutch population older than 13 visited a news website or news app on an average day, 6% read a digital newspaper and 27% read a paper newspaper. By creating a news page that looked similar to (and a mixture of) a digital and paper newspaper, a news website and a news app, it would mimic a situation as familiar as possible for the participants.

Beyond the aesthetics, the content of the news page had to be similar to a real life situation as well. Therefore, a thorough search through the main Dutch newspapers and news websites (NU.nl, NOS, RTL Nieuws, NRC, AD, Volkskrant, Telegraaf) was conducted. The four main topics could be categorised in: natural disasters, criminality, (un)healthy goods, and the environment. Before looking for more specific stories within these four categories, there were a few criteria that had to be decided upon and to which the news articles had to subsequently adhere to. What will the content of the articles be? How will the articles be
written? How contrasting should the articles in the different conditions be? What is considered to be positive, negative, domestic, foreign, and neutral news?

**Content.** There were three pieces to the content puzzle. First, making sure to use articles that were a few months old in order to remove any possible confusion about the changes. Second, keeping away from heavy subjects that could be influenced by political views like the refugee crisis, global warming or government spending. Finally, in line with earlier research, certain traits of the articles had to be kept constant throughout the different conditions to make sure these would not become possible mediators (in terms of difference in influence and time spent reading). There had to be a balance between hard and soft news (McIntyre & Gibson, 2016; Reinemann, Stanyer, Scherr, & Legnante, 2012; Ryffel, Wirz, Kühne, and Wirth, 2014), constructive and non-constructive news (Kleemans et al., 2017) and perceived importance of the articles (Knobloch-Westerwick, Carpentier, Blumhoff, & Nickel, 2005).

**Writing.** There is a substantial amount of research that focuses on the writing styles of news articles and how these affect its readers. Stories that are written in a more emotionally charged way elicit stronger physiological reactions than when they are written on a basis of facts (Donohew, 1981; Paek et al., 2016). This ‘emotionalisation’ also increases its entertainment value, appeal, and persuasiveness (Soderlund, 2007). As reported in the literature background, messages can become more emotional and persuasive by the use of keywords (Greenfield, 2006) and focus on individual, personal stories instead of trends and movements as a whole (Ryffel et al., 2014). The consequence is that these differences in writing styles can affect people’s attitudes and memory (Dunn, Moore, & Nosek, 2005; Grabe, Yegiyan, & Kamhawi, 2008).

**Contrast.** The best way to keep the traits in the ‘content’ section constant and remove as many potential mediators as possible was to use the same articles for every condition and only make small alterations so that they would fit in each respective condition. Certain words and sentences were adjusted for that, bearing in mind the problems from the ‘writing’ section that could arise if not done properly. Various articles from multiple popular news websites (see appendix E for complete list) were merged together and edited into a short, clear, and concise story that would fit into the experiment. Real articles were used to secure ecological validity.

**News.** In the literature, there is not one generally accepted definition of negative, positive, and neutral news articles. For example, Haskins, Miller, and Quarles (1984) define negative news as news that would be interpreted by most people as negative and define
positive news as news that would be interpreted by most people as positive. As no other definition was much more specific or widely used, eight independent raters were contacted to evaluate the articles and categorise them on two scales: ‘negative – neutral – positive’ and ‘domestic – neutral – foreign’ (see table 1 appendix F). This pilot study (conducted through Google Forms) showed an average agreement rate per article of 86.25%, with a range from 62.5% to 100% (for example, an article that was meant for the negative foreign news article, was put in that category by 87.5% of the raters). Two articles showed a relatively low rating on the domestic-foreign scale (agreement rate of 62.5%), so these had the country added in the text one more time to make it clearer on where the story took place.

**News Page.** The news page was created as a PDF, looking as similar to an average Dutch newspaper, news website, and news app as possible. Figure 1 displays a preview of the news pages that were shown to the participants in three out of five conditions (see appendix G for a detailed view of all news pages).

The four articles in the news page were about an earthquake and its aftermath, the development of crime figures, a discovery in food health, and a goal about renewable energy. There was an addition of a ‘more news’ section, weather emoticons (sun for the positive conditions, rain for the negative conditions, and none for the neutral condition) and traffic jam emoticons (only for the negative conditions) in the top right corner in order to increase the level of realism.

![Figure 1](image-url) The neutral-, negative foreign-, and positive domestic news page.

**Safety Rating Scale questionnaire.** The safety rating scale (SRS) from Culbertson, Vik, and Kooiman (2001a) was best suitable for this study as it could easily be translated
from English into Dutch. The questionnaire consists of 18 items that are answered on a 7-point Likert scale. It measures perceived safety in four environments: home, busy public, isolated public, and interpersonal, where higher scores indicate a greater level of perceived safety. Culbertson, Vik, and Kooiman (2001b) calculated Cronbach’s $\alpha = 0.85$ and Davidson, Butchko, Robbins, Sherd, and Gervais (2016) calculated Cronbach’s $\alpha = 0.84$.

A few adjustments were made to the questionnaire because the present study does not target perceived safety in regards to sexual assault as the original version does. Firstly, the male focus in the interpersonal environment was adjusted to be gender unspecific. Second, the four ‘home environment’ items (bedroom, kitchen, bathroom, and living room) were deleted and three items from the Dutch Safety Monitor (conducted by the Central Bureau for Statistics in collaboration with I&O Research, see www.veiligheidsmonitor.nl) were added that seemed more applicable (“in the centre of your place of residence”, “in public transport”, and “at entertainment venues”). See appendix C for the complete list of items used. Included in this appendix is the back-translate from Eva Hoogstins, MSc in Psychology from Lund University with professional academic proficiency in Dutch and English.

**Life Orientation Test Revised questionnaire.** To measure optimism, the Life Orientation Test Revised (LOT-R) from Scheier, Carver, and bridges (1994) was used. A Dutch version was already available (created by Ten Klooster et al. (2010) from Utrecht University), as it has been extensively used within Dutch studies (for example Bartels, Mayioglu, Boomsma, & Bartels, 2015 and Binsch, Van Wietmarschen, & Buick, 2017). In Scheier et al’s (1994) study, they found Cronbach’s $\alpha = 0.78$ and Schou-Bredal et al. (2017) found Cronbach’s $\alpha = 0.78$ for the subscale pessimism and Cronbach’s $\alpha = 0.84$ for the subscale positivism.

The LOT-R is an optimism-pessimism scale with 10 items: 3 items measure optimism, 3 items measure pessimism, and there are 4 filler items. These are answered on a 5-point scale where higher scores indicate a greater level of optimism. See appendix D for the complete questionnaire.

**Apparatus**

The experiment was designed on Qualtrics Lite and the responses were recorded through that platform. Participants had the possibility to carry out the experiment on their computer, tablet, or smartphone.
Procedure

The participants received the link which redirected them to the experiment on the Qualtrics website. This started with the informed consent (see appendix A), where after they were shown one of the five news pages (see appendix G) depending on the condition they were randomly assigned to. Underneath the two foreign news pages was the question whether they resonated specifically with some of the news articles because of the location, which they could answer with ‘yes’ or ‘no’.

Two techniques were applied to make sure the participants read the news articles. Firstly, the news page had a timer of 100 seconds through which the participant could not continue to the next page. The second technique was two attention-check questions, which asked what kind of natural disaster it was (multiple choice: flood, earthquake, volcano eruption) and when the goal for renewable energy was (multiple choice: 2018, 2020, 2030). If they answered them both correctly, they were able to move on to the next page. If they answered one or both incorrectly, they would receive a message to return to the news page and read it again.

Once they moved on to the following page, there were two sociodemographic questions (age and gender) and the question whether they resonated specifically with some of the articles because of their personal situation, which they could answer ‘yes’ or ‘no’ to. After they completed this, they would receive the Safety Rating Scale questionnaire and the Life Orientation Test Revised questionnaire. These two were presented alternatingly to get rid of any order effects between the questionnaires. The experiment ended with the debrief page (see appendix B) and it took participants between 5 and 20 minutes to complete the entire procedure.

Results

The statistical analysis was conducted through SPSS (version 23, IBM). In total, 263 responses were collected, but due to 89 empty or incomplete responses and the Qualtrics software not recording assigned conditions of four participants, only 170 responses could be analysed (97 female, 73 male). There were no missing values, univariate outliers, or multivariate outliers. Additionally, the assumptions for the statistical tests (independent observation of participants, homogeneity of variance per condition, and normally distributed data) were all met for this data (see table 12 and 13, appendix H).
Validity of scales

Safety Rating Scale. The items on the SRS all fit well, including the three items that were added from the Dutch Safety Monitor (item 3, 15, and 16, see table 2, appendix H). The data in this study on the SRS showed Cronbach’s $\alpha = .89$.

A principal component analysis (PCA) was conducted on the 17 items of the SRS with orthogonal rotation (varimax) in order to see whether the four original subscales (or other subscales) could be found and where the three new items fit in. The assumptions for a PCA were all met (see table 3, appendix H). Four components had eigenvalues over Kaiser’s criterion of 1 and in combination explained 63.33% of the variance (see table 4, appendix H). The scree plot (see figure 1, appendix H) was quite ambiguous and showed an inflexion that would justify retaining only one component. Table 5 in appendix H shows the factor loadings after rotation. The items that cluster on each of the components do not correspond with the four original subscales of the SRS (home, busy public, isolated public, and interpersonal), nor do they correspond to any other clear subscales. Therefore, it is reasonable to have one interpretable component that accounted for one variable: overall perceived safety.

Life Orientation Test Revised. As can be seen in table 1, appendix H, the first question on the LOT-R correlated poorly with the total ($r=.19$, delete when lower than .3 according to Field, 2009). Deleting the item enhanced Cronbach’s alpha from .67 to .70. Therefore, question 1 was excluded in the remaining analysis.

A PCA was also conducted on the LOT-R as there has been some debate on whether it measures strictly optimism or also pessimism. One component had an eigenvalue over Kaiser’s criterion of 1 (see table 6, 7, and 8, appendix H) and the scree plot was clear for retaining one component, (see figure 2, appendix H). It seems that for this data, the LOT-R only measures one variable: overall optimism.

Results Safety Rating Scale

Figure 2 visualises the mean scores on the SRS, separated between male and female participants (for the exact descriptive statistics, see table 9 and 10, appendix H). The analysis has also been separated into age groups that coincided with Kleemans et al. (2012) and Zerba (2010), specifically 18-30, 31-50, and 51-75. However, this separation did not provide any meaningful differences (see table 11, appendix H).
HOW A SHIFT IN NEWS FOCUS CAN AFFECT THE PUBLIC

Figure 2. Mean scores per condition for the Safety Rating Scale, split by gender. Higher scores represent higher perceived safety. For visualisation purposes, the y-axis does not start at zero. Abbreviations stand for assigned conditions; NF = negative foreign, ND = negative domestic, N = neutral, PD = positive domestic, and PF = positive foreign.

Results Life Orientation Test Revised

Figure 3 shows the mean scores on the LOT-R, separated between age groups (for the exact descriptive statistics, see table 11, appendix H). The analysis has also been separated between male and female participants. However, this separation did not provide any meaningful differences (see table 9 and 10, appendix H).

Figure 3. Mean scores per condition for the Life Orientation Test Revised, split by age groups. Higher scores represent higher optimism. For visualisation purposes, the y-axis does not start at zero. Abbreviations stand for assigned conditions; NF = negative foreign, ND = negative domestic, N = neutral, PD = positive domestic, and PF = positive foreign.
Hypotheses testing

In order to assess the first research question; is there an interaction effect between safety perception and optimism, a one-way MANOVA was used. The independent variable was the assigned condition (neutral, positive domestic, negative domestic, positive foreign, and negative foreign) and the dependent variables were the perceived safety (SRS) and optimism (LOT-R). Using Pillai’s trace, there was no significant effect of news on safety perception and optimism, $F(8, 330) = 0.025, p = .832$ (see table 14, appendix H). Separate univariate ANOVAs on the outcome variables also revealed non-significant news effects on optimism, $F(4, 165) = 0.692, p = .598$, and perceived safety, $F(4, 165) = 0.374, p = .827$ (see table 15, appendix H). These results did not support hypotheses 1 through 6, hence there is no statistically significant difference between the participants in the 5 conditions in terms of safety perception or optimism.

An independent samples t-test was used to answer research question 2; how does gender make a difference when it comes to effects of news in regards to safety perception and optimism? On average, male participants had a higher perceived safety score ($M = 105.40, SE = 1.04$) than female participants ($M = 102.01, SE = 0.931$). This difference was significant $t(168) = 2.42, p = .017$. The difference between optimism scores for the female participants ($M = 19.89, SE = 0.37$) and male participants ($M = 19.21, SE = 0.35$) was not significant $t(168) = -1.31, p = .193$ (see table 16, appendix H).

Another ANOVA was conducted to answer research question 3; how does age make a difference when it comes to effects of news in regards to safety perception and optimism? There was a significant effect of age on optimism, $F(2, 167) = 3.11, p = .047$ (see table 17, appendix H). The LSD post-hoc test showed that on average, participants from 18 to 30 ($M = 19.03, SE = 0.36$) had a lower optimism score than participants from 31 to 50 ($M = 20.44, SE = 0.45$), which was a statistically significant difference, $p = .017$ (see table 18, appendix H). There was no significant effect of age on safety perception, $F(2, 167) = 0.24, p = .787$ (see table 17, appendix H).

Discussion

This study intended to gain a better understanding of the collateral consequences of news. More specifically, understanding how a mixture of positive and negative as well as domestic and foreign news articles can influence the perceived safety and optimism of its
audience. Additionally, it analysed possible gender and age differences in regards to those influences.

**Main findings**

Although the effects were minimal and the statistical analysis showed no clear evidence that supports the hypotheses, the manipulation did seem to have a small impact on the responses of the participants. The valence of news articles had an effect on the perceived safety and optimism of the participants, where positive news created higher perceived safety and optimism scores and negative news did the opposite. The trends in regards to proximity of news articles were harder to distinguish and it seems to only be the case for the Safety Rating Scale, where the disparity between the domestic conditions is bigger than the disparity between the foreign conditions. All of these trends are consistent with the literature and the hypotheses discussed before. Why none of the results mentioned here are statistically significant will be discussed in the ‘limitations’ and ‘further research’ sections.

**Gender differences.** The researchers who specialise in the influence of news on the public do not seem to be able to reach a consensus regarding gender differences. When it comes to gender, there were studies that found no differences between men and women for collateral consequences like arousal and wellbeing but did find that women were more attentive to and had better memory for negative news compared to men (Marin et al., 2012; Soroka, Gidengil, Fournier, & Nir, 2016). To the contrary, Grabe and Kamhawi (2006) established that men had higher arousal levels and better recognition memory when it came to negative news. In order to add another dimension to the data, gender was a sociodemographic data point that was included in this study.

For the SRS, the most striking gender difference was how female respondents had lower perceived safety scores in every condition compared to the male respondents. Figure 2 visualises this clearly and the analysis found the difference to be statistically significant. Clearly, in this study, evidence has been compiled in favour of gender differences.

**Age differences.** Looking at age differences, there is proof that the younger audience has a preference for negative content (Kleemans, Hendriks Vettehen, Eisinga, & Beentjes, 2012), while the opposite has also been found (Zerba, 2010). Therefore, age was a sociodemographic data point that was added to this study.

As can be seen in figure 3, the young age group (18-30) had lower optimism scores in every condition, compared to the middle age group (31-50). The analysis found this difference in scores to be statistically significant. While this does not necessarily answer the
questions on preference, it raises questions on why young adults have such low levels of optimism.

**Participant – news articles connections.** The connection questions regarding location and personal situation were implemented in the analysis. The original results discussed were compared to new datasets created (one without the participants who voted ‘yes’ to the location question, one without the participants who voted ‘yes’ to the personal situation question, and one without both those groups of participants). With a thorough look on the descriptive statistics and Cronbach’s Alpha’s and an analysis of further ANOVA’s, the conclusion was that these connections made negligible differences in the results.

The reason for adding these questions was to analyse the groups (location connected and not, and personal situation connected and not) combined and separately and see whether the difference affected the results. The first question - whether they resonated specifically with some of the news articles because of the location (for example, because they were born there, lived there, went on holidays there every year or had relatives living there) – was included because they could be just as connected towards those foreign news articles as towards the domestic news articles, which would assimilate the answers. The second question - whether they resonated specifically with some of the articles because of their personal situation (for example, because they recently witnessed a natural disaster, were the victim of a crime, or have had experience with cancer) - was to find out whether some of the articles might have connected to the participant in a different way than it was intended (a positive story about an earthquake might remind them of their friend who died in a natural disaster and it would likely make them feel more unsafe and less optimistic instead of the opposite for example).

**Practical implications**

The results indicate that women have a statistically significant lower perceived safety than men, which has been concluded before (Jiang, Mak, Larsen, & Zhong, 2017). This goes beyond media influence and is an important finding that women and men have to recognise and remember. How come women feel so much less safe? Browsing the internet for a few minutes is enough to find multiple statistics over the past years that say men are much more likely to be the victim of a crime. While it seems irrational, the cause of these feelings should be identified. Media might have a hand in this, but it is even more important to ask what can be done to reverse this? It could be especially beneficial for men to use this knowledge in their social interaction with women in order to improve the perceived safety of women. The
results also show young adults having a statistically significant lower optimism than middle adults. This might come forth out of the uncertainties that accompany people in their twenties (trying to find a job and partner and building a solid foundation for life). To improve this low level of optimism, more research needs to be conducted on where it comes from, what it means for young adults and where the possible solutions lie.

With caution, something can be said about how the focus of news articles in terms of valence and proximity can impact the audience’s lives in ways that they themselves or media outlets might not foresee. This could introduce a moral dilemma: should media outlets report and people read negative news articles that can have such an impact on their lives? For example, the female responses on the negative domestic news articles were more extreme than any of the other responses. While it is undeniably important to stay up-to-date about what is happening in your country, it is also important to understand that this information might impact you in more ways than just becoming informed.

The selective exposure hypothesis of Choi and Lee (2013) explains how people’s attitudes predict what kind of news they choose to watch. If people understand how negative news has the potential to affect their lives, they might decide to select mostly positive news. Whether this is a viable solution remains to be seen, as explained in the introduction, people need negative news. Luckily, research has shown ways of improving the consequences of negative news. One way media outlets can minimise the bad effects is by story placement: letting an uplifting story follow a negative story (Zillmann, Gibson, Ordman, & Aust, 1994). Another possibility is by using more silver-lining stories, where negative news articles have a positive or useful ending (McIntyre & Gibson, 2016). In the journalism world, these possibilities deserve serious consideration, as the public could greatly benefit from them.

**Limitations**

As any study that is trying to break new ground, this study is not free of limitations either. Firstly, the manipulation was of limited nature. The participants read one page with news articles, all skewed into one direction that took between 1.5 to 5 minutes to finish. The power of such manipulation is small at best. Second, as discussed in the literature background, there are three techniques that the media uses to create a bigger influence (Soderlund, 2007), which have not been administered in this study. Third, it is unknown what news the participants had been reading before and in what general mood they were when participating in the experiment. Even though randomisation should take care of this, it is a limitation that has to be mentioned. Fourth, the study was conducted with Dutch participants.
only, so it cannot be generalised to other cultures. Fifth and most importantly, in most real-life situations, a news page consists of numerous articles, which cannot be categorised in one of the five conditions in this study. It is much more common to have an interplay of different news articles and pictures that affect the reader. For these reasons, caution needs to be used when drawing inferences from this study to the real world.

**Positives**

Besides limitations, there are also advantages to this study that would be self-inflicting not to mention. First of all, the previous studies that have been used to compile evidence and information needed for this study consist of many different researchers and universities from all over the globe, which greatly decreases the chance of citation bias. Looking at the references used, over 72% is from the last decade, with only 3 papers cited from the 80’s, 5 from the 90’s and 19 from the 00’s out of 79 used in total. It is thus a very topical study that is in the midst of growing academic and social interest. Lastly, this study tried to break ground in a new area within the already novel psychological field of media psychology. It is an original study that can hopefully be used as a stepping-stone for future research.

**Future research**

Due to time and monetary constraints, this study could not be executed in ways of being as all-encompassing as was initially intended. During the development process, initiatives that were deemed too big for the present design can hopefully be used in future research. Suggestions for future studies come in two areas: the experimental design and the participants.

First and foremost, the main improvement area within the experimental design is the manipulation itself. By using more invasive methods, like providing specific news for participants over a longer time period where they solely get exposed to that kind of news, will most likely have a stronger influence and create bigger effects. Second, switching from a between-subjects design to a within-subjects design in order to assess the influence per participant. Measuring a baseline per participant was not possible in this study due to time and manipulation constraints, so a ‘neutral news’ condition was created that could be used as a baseline. Third, the news articles need to be reassessed in terms of proximity and valence. In this experiment, the difference in proximity came from domestic versus foreign, but could be replaced by European versus the rest of the world or by countries that share the same values and countries who do not. The issue with the valence is that each condition had all the same
news (very positive or very negative), which might have been too obvious for the participants when reading the articles. In order to create an experiment that is not as abundantly clear and has greater validity, there is the possibility to mix articles with different valence and add pictures. Eye tracking could be used to record which articles they spend more time on. The decision not to include pictures in this experiment came from the abundance of research showing it would add a whole new dimension and too many variables to the experiment (Heuer, McClure, & Puhl, 2011; McClure, Puhl, & Heuer, 2011; Puhl, Luedicke, & Heuer, 2013; Ryffel et al., 2014), which would be too comprehensive to conduct here. Fourth, instead of using explicit self-reports, which received some criticism before (Payne & Dal Cin, 2015), more subtle methods could be used to measure perceived safety and optimism. For example, providing the participants with different routes to walk after the experiment and see whether they choose the safer or less safe option.

The next area that is worth looking into for future research is differences in education and culture within the participants. According to research of Grabe, Kamhawi, and Yegiyan (2017), people with a lower educational background had less memory capacity for news from newspapers and websites, compared to the higher educational group. This could greatly affect the influence of news articles and thus their perceived safety and optimism. Additionally, to enhance the generalizability of the results, the experiments have to be conducted with participants from different cultures as this alters the safety perception and optimism (Lund & Rundmo, 2009; Rose, Endo, Windschitl, & Suls, 2008).

Conclusion

The present study contributes to the rapidly evolving research field of media psychology. It explores the area of collateral media consequences further by contributing a new dimension in terms of proximity of news articles. Furthermore, it adds the new variables perceived safety and optimism. The main objective of this study was to provide a base from which future research could learn and expand upon. Although the experiment did not create the hypothesised differences, there were minor changes in terms of positive news creating a higher perceived safety and optimism compared to negative news. This raises questions about the social responsibility of media. Additionally, there were significant differences between men and women in terms of perceived safety and between young adults and middle adults in terms of optimism. These results raise question about their causes and possible solutions. Due to certain limitations, like the limited scope of the manipulation, this study does not answer
the proposed questions yet. However, the methods and results should be used as groundwork for future studies as this research can have important implications for media and society as a whole.
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Appendices

Appendix A. Informed consent.

Beste deelnemer,

Dit onderzoek is onderdeel van de masterthese van Arnanto Schoonbrood, student psychologie aan de universiteit van Lund. Voor dit experiment zult u een pagina te zien krijgen die lijkt op een dagblad en een nieuwswebsite. Neemt u alstublieft een aantal minuten om deze pagina door te nemen en de tekst te lezen (u kunt na 2 minuten verder klikken), daarna krijgt u een aantal vragen. Nadat u die heeft ingevuld, zult u informatie krijgen over het doel van dit experiment. Dit zal in totaal ongeveer 15 minuten in beslag nemen.

Uw deelname aan dit experiment is vrijwillig en u kunt op elk moment stoppen, zonder daar een reden voor te geven. De antwoorden die u tot dan heeft ingevuld, zullen verwijderd worden. Er zijn geen risico’s verbonden aan deelname en geen consequenties verbonden aan beëindiging van deelname.

Door op de knop ‘verder’ te drukken, geeft u toestemming om uw antwoorden te gebruiken voor het onderzoeksdoel van deze these. Uw bijdrage aan dit experiment is anoniem en uw antwoorden zullen vertrouwelijk worden behandeld. Ook worden deze niet individueel bekeken, maar in groepsverband geanalyseerd en gerapporteerd. Ze zullen nooit te herleiden zijn naar individuele personen.

Voor dit onderzoek is het belangrijk dat u in Nederland woont en Nederland ziet als uw primaire en voornaamste land. Wanneer dit niet het geval is, dank ik u voor uw intentie, maar kunt u helaas niet meedoen aan dit onderzoek.

Mocht u, naar aanleiding van het onderzoek, vragen of opmerkingen hebben, dan kunt u deze sturen naar sam15as1@student.lu.se.

Arnanto Schoonbrood
MSc student in psychologie aan de Universiteit van Lund, Zweden
Appendix A. Informed consent (English translation).

Dear participant,

This research is part of the master thesis of Arnanto Schoonbrood, psychology student at the university of Lund. In this experiment, you will be provided with a page that looks similar to a newspaper and a news website. Please take a few minutes to go through the page and read the text (you can go further after 2 minutes), afterwards you will get a few questions. After filling in the questions, you will receive information about the goal of this experiment. This will take about 15 minutes in total.

Your participation in this experiment is voluntary and you can stop at any time without providing a reason. The answers that you have filled in up to that point will be deleted. There are no risks to participating and no consequences to ending your participation.

By pressing the button ‘next’, you are giving permission to use your answers for the research goal of this thesis. Your contribution to this experiment is anonymous and your answers will be processed confidentially. These will not be looked at individually, but analysed and reported within a group and will never be able to be traced back to individual people.

For this research, it is important that you are living in the Netherlands and see the Netherlands as your primary country. When this is not the case, I thank you for your intention, but unfortunately you cannot participate in this research.

If you have any further questions or remarks in regards to this research, please send these to sam15as1@student.lu.se

Arnanto Schoonbrood
MSc student in psychology at the university of Lund, Sweden
Appendix B. Debrief form.

Beste deelnemer,

Hartelijk dank voor uw bijdrage aan dit onderzoek. Ik waardeer het zeer dat u de moeite heeft genomen en uw tijd heeft gebruikt om mij te helpen. Hierdoor is de wetenschap een stap dichterbij het begrijpen van de effecten van de media en ben ik een stap dichterbij mijn afstuderen.

Het doel van dit onderzoek is om te testen hoe verschillende soorten nieuwsberichten het gevoel van veiligheid en het optimisme van personen beïnvloeden. Hierbij was u in één van de volgende vijf mogelijke condities: neutraal nieuws, positief binnenlands nieuws, negatief binnenlands nieuws, positief buitenlands nieuws of negatief buitenlands nieuws. Hou er rekening mee dat de nieuwsartikelen fictief en speciaal voor dit onderzoek gemaakt zijn.

Mocht u geïnteresseerd zijn in de resultaten van dit onderzoek, stuurt u mij dan een email. Ook voor vragen of opmerkingen, naar aanleiding van het onderzoek, kunt u een email sturen naar sam15as1@student.lu.se.

Wanneer u dit experiment leuk vond en/of het doel van het onderzoek interessant vindt, zou u mij zeer helpen als u de link naar dit experiment doorstuurt naar uw familie/vrienden/collega’s/buren. Wanneer u dit doet, vertel dan alstublieft nog niet precies wat diegene moet doen en wat het doel van het onderzoek is. Dit kan namelijk het effect van het experiment beïnvloeden.

Nogmaals bedankt voor uw deelname.

Arnanto Schoonbrood
MSc student in psychologie aan de Universiteit van Lund, Zweden

Paradisgatan 5 P
227 34 Lund
Zweden
Appendix B. Debrief form (English translation).

Dear participant,

Thank you very much for your contribution to this research. I greatly appreciate you taking the effort and using your time to help me. This takes science one step closer to understanding the effects of the media and takes me one step closer to graduating.

The goal of this research is to test how different kinds of news articles influence people’s sense of security and optimism. You were in one of the five possible conditions: neutral news, positive domestic news, negative domestic news, positive foreign news, or negative foreign news. Please keep in mind that these news articles are not based on facts and are specifically made for this research.

If you are interested in the results of this research, please send me an email. Also for questions or remarks in regards to this research, you can send an email to sam15as1@student.lu.se.

When you enjoyed this experiment and/or find the research goal interesting, you would help me greatly if you send the link to this experiment on to family/friends/colleagues/neighbors. When you do this, please do not tell them exactly what they have to do or what the goal of this research is. This can influence the effect of the experiment.

Thank you again for your participation.

Arnanto Schoonbrood
MSc student in psychology at the university of Lund, Sweden

Paradisgatan 5 P
227 34 Lund
Sweden
Appendix C. Dutch translation from Arnanto Schoonbrood and back translate from Eva Hoogstins of the Safety Rating Scale from Culbertson, Vik, and Kooiman (2001).

Hoe veilig voelt u zich:  
1. In uw huis?  
2. In uw auto?  
3. In het centrum van uw woonplaats?  
4. Op uw werk of school?  
5. Wanneer u overdag alleen wandelt?  
6. Wanneer u ‘s avonds/’s nachts alleen wandelt?  
7. Wanneer u seksueel intiem bent met iemand?  
8. Wanneer u alleen bent met een kennis?  
9. Wanneer u alleen bent met een vriend(in)?  
10. Tijdens een date?  
11. In het ziekenhuis?  
12. In de supermarkt?  
13. In het winkelgebied/winkelcentrum?  
14. In een restaurant?  
15. Rondom uitgaansgelegenheden?  
16. In het openbaar vervoer?  
17. In een parkeergarage?  

De antwoordmogelijkheden:  
1 = zeer onveilig  
2 = redelijk onveilig  
3 = enigszins onveilig  
4 = neutraal  
5 = enigszins veilig  
6 = redelijk veilig  
7 = zeer veilig  

How safe do you feel:  
1. In your house?  
2. In your car?  
3. In the centre of your place of residence?  
4. At your work or school?  
5. When you're going for a walk on your own during the day?  
6. When you're going for a walk on your own in the evening/ at night?  
7. When you are sexually intimate with somebody?  
8. When you are alone with an acquaintance?  
9. When you are alone with a friend?  
10. During a date?  
11. In the hospital?  
12. In the supermarket?  
13. In the shopping area/mall?  
14. In a restaurant?  
15. At entertainment venues?  
16. In public transport?  
17. In a parking garage?  

Possible responses:  
1 = Very unsafe  
2 = Quite unsafe  
3 = Somewhat unsafe  
4 = Neutral  
5 = Somewhat safe  
6 = Quite safe  
7 = Very safe
Appendix D. The Life Orientation Test – Revised by Scheier, Carver, and Bridges (1994).

1. In uncertain times, I usually expect the best.
2. It’s easy for me to relax.
3. If something can go wrong for me, it will.
4. I’m always optimistic about my future.
5. I enjoy my friends a lot.
6. It’s important for me to keep busy.
7. I hardly ever expect things to go my way.
8. I don’t get upset too easily.
9. I rarely count on good things happening to me.
10. Overall, I expect more good things to happen to me than bad.

Possible responses:

1 = I agree a lot
2 = I agree a little
3 = I neither agree nor disagree
4 = I disagree a little
5 = I disagree a lot

The Life Orientation Test – Revised Dutch translation by Ten Klooster et al. (2010)

1. Op momenten van onzekerheid en twijfel, heb ik toch meestal de beste verwachtingen.
2. Ik kan me gemakkelijk ontspannen.
3. Als er iets in mijn leven mis kan gaan, dan gaat het ook mis.
4. Ik ben altijd optimistisch over mijn eigen toekomst.
5. Ik kan mijn vrienden veel plezier geven.
6. Het is belangrijk voor mij actief te blijven.
7. Ik verwacht eigenlijk nooit dat de dingen zullen lopen zoals ik graag zou willen dat ze lopen.
8. Ik raak niet snel opgewonden.
9. Ik reken er meestal niet op dat mij iets goeds zal overkomen.
10. Over het algemeen verwacht ik dat me meer goede dingen dan slechte dingen zullen overkomen.

De antwoordmogelijkheden:

1 = Helemaal mee oneens
2 = Enigszins mee oneens
3 = Neutraal
4 = Enigszins mee eens
5 = Helemaal mee eens
Appendix E. News articles used for creating the news pages.

* https://www.ad.nl/binnenland/honderden-eilandbewoners-nog-op-zoek-naar-elaar
* https://www.trouw.nl/home/nederlandse-hulp-na-aardbeving-op-gang-a0509137
* https://www.volkskrant.nl/buitenland/kritiek-op-hulp-na-aardbeving-in-iran~a3300901/
* https://www.ad.nl/buitenland/hulp-komt-na-aardbeving-moeizaam-op-gang~a231ce72/
* https://www.rtnieuws.nl/gezondheid/wat-is-gezond-in-de-supermarkt-en-wat-niet-mensen-zijn-volledig-de-weg-kwijt
* https://radar.avrotros.nl/nieuws/kinderen-voor-uitgeoefende-inbraken-op-de-blok
* https://www.ad.nl/gezond/who-zet-ham-en-bacon-op-lijst-kankerverwekkende-eten~a3c182fb/
* https://www.rtnieuws.nl/nieuws/buitenland/who-houdbaar-vlees-kankerverwekkend
* https://www.ad.nl/breda/criminaliteit-in-breda-op-laagste-niveau-sinds-jaren-ad55f61e/
* https://www.ad.nl/eindhoven/veel-misdaadsscores-een-beeld~ae9c8fd8/
* https://www.rtnieuws.nl/nederland/criminaliteit-per-buurt-meeiste-misdrijven-op-de-wallen-meeiste-inbraken-in-sittard-geleen
* https://www.ad.nl/binnenland/regering-doneert-12-miljard-voor-hernieuwbaar-energie~ad4b4401/
* https://www.ninefornews.nl/rapper-akon-voorziet-80-miljoen-afrikanen-van-elektriciteit/
* https://www.trouw.nl/groen/nederland-voorlaatste-op-elu lijst-duurzame-energie-af5e6db/
* https://www.trouw.nl/groen/china-sleept-voor-de-wereld-de-kolen-uit-het-vuur~a2717811/
* http://www.nieuwsblad.be/cnt/dmf20150922_01880498
HOW A SHIFT IN NEWS FOCUS CAN AFFECT THE PUBLIC

Appendix F. Article agreement rates.

Table 1. Agreement rate of articles on the domestic-neutral-foreign and negative-neutral-positive scale by 8 independent raters.

Appendix G. News pages.
Snelle en effectieve hulp na aardbeving zuidwest Europa

De aardbeving in Spanje en Portugal heeft uiteindelijk aan niemand het leven gekost en iedereen die in eerste instantie vermist was, is snel teruggevonden. Op het gebied van infrastructuur en telefoonverbindingen is alles binnen een paar uur gerepareerd en verdere schade is ook direct opgelost. De hulporganisaties waren zeer vlot aanwezig met medicijnen, voedsel en water in het getroffen gebied, maar gelukkig was het meeste daarvan niet nodig. “Er zijn meer dan genoeg vrijwilligers, een duidelijke leiding en er is geld beschikbaar, wat resulteert in een duidelijk en concreet plan voor de zoektocht naar de vermistte personen en wederopbouw van de infrastructuur. Tijd, geld en andere middelen werden efficiënt ingezet waardoor alles snel was opgelost” vertellen een aantal bronnen die in het lokale bestuur zitten aan Het Nieuws.

Brood in Noord-Amerika is gezonder dan men denkt


Criminaliteitscijfers dalen in Finland

Finland wordt steeds veiliger, dat blijkt uit het gepubliceerde jaarverslag van de Finse politie. De criminaliteitscijfers lopen terug en zijn beduidend lager dan in de voorgaande twee jaren. Veel voorkomende criminaliteit als woninginbraken en straatroven zit zelfs op het laagste niveau in jaren. In tegenstelling tot veel andere landen in Europa, dalen de criminaliteitscijfers juist en zo is Finland één van de meest veilige landen in de regio. Volgens een Fins statistiekbureau zijn vernielingen (28%), mishandelingen (17%) en drugscriminaliteit (11%) gedaald. Meerdere enquêtes geven aan dat het gevoel van veiligheid substantieel stijgt onder de bevolking, net als de aangiftebereidheid. “Het geeft aan dat we echt goed werk verrichten samen. We hebben de benodigde capaciteit en met elke behulpzame en oplettende burger kunnen we de criminelen grondig aanpakken” zegt de politiechef van Finland. “Door de afname van criminaliteit kan er nu ook meer aandacht uitgaan naar preventie”.

Afrika streeft doel duurzame energie al voorbij

Het doel van het Afrikaanse continent om in 2020 substantieel minder broeikasgassen uit te stoten zal al volgend jaar gehaald worden, mede dankzij het overstappen op duurzame energiebronnen (zon, water en wind). Daarmee is het één van de snelst groeiende gebieden wanneer het aankomt op duurzame energie. “Doordat we minder hoeven te vertrouwen op olie en gas uit andere landen zoals Rusland, zijn we steeds meer autonoom. Dit komt ten goede aan ons beleid, het klimaat en de luchtkwaliteit” zegt een woordvoerster. “Daarbij is duurzame energie nu al goedkoper dan fossiele brandstoffen en aangezien dit verder gaat groeien, helpt het ons economisch ook vooruit.” De lagere uitstoot komt niet alleen door het overstappen op duurzame energiebronnen, maar ook door de besparing van energieverbruik door huishoudens, industrie en dienstensector dankzij efficiëntere technieken. Ook levert de zonne-energie sector in Afrika veel banen op, nu al meer dan de gehele kolenindustrie.

Meer nieuws

- Zorg aan ouderen in Australië verbeterd
- Raket met voedsel voor het ISS is afgeleverd
- Het gaat beter met de economie in het VK
- Grootste parade in Mexico succesvol verlopen
- Aantal verkeersongelukken daalt in Polen
- Consumentenvertrouwen groeit in India
- Italiaanse werkloosheidslocifiers dalen

Abonnee worden Facebook Twitter
Alle rechten voorbehouden
**Kleinschalige aardbeving richt geen schade aan**

De recente aardbeving die is gemeten, scoorde laag op de schaal van Richter. Bij de bevolking waren er geen doden, gewonden of vermiste personen. Er is ook geen schade gevonden in het gebied waar de aardbeving is gemeten en de kans op verdere naschokken is minimaal volgens experts. Hulporganisaties zijn ter verer niet uitgetrokken om te helpen, aangezien er geen personen of gebouwen waren die in nood waren. “Er zijn duidelijke en concrete plannen die uitgevoerd kunnen worden bij hevige natuurkatastrofen zodat hulp snel en efficiënt wordt aangeboden, maar dit was in dit geval niet nodig” vertellen een aantal bronnen die in het lokale bestuur zitten aan Het Nieuws.

**Rijstawels zijn neutrale tussendoortjes**

Een groep wetenschappers is tot de conclusie gekomen dat rijstawels een zeer neutrale vorm van voeding zijn. Er zitten amper vitamine of andere gezonde stoffen in, maar ook zitten er geen schadelijke of ongezonde stoffen in. Rijstawels staan daarom nu in de meest neutrale categorie op de lijst van voedsel en drinkwaren en verschillende gezondheidsorganisaties hebben dit overgenomen. De conclusie van het grootschalige onderzoek is dat twee rijstawels per dag de gezondheid (of ongezondheid) van een persoon niet aantasten. Naar schatting leidt dit tot geen enkele verandering in de levensstandaard of levenslengte van de consument.

**Duurzame energie groeit gestaag verder**


**Criminaliteitcijfers blijven hetzelfde**

Het gepubliceerde jaarverslag van de politie laat zien dat de veiligheid gelijk blijft. De criminaliteitcijfers blijven nagenoeg gelijk inclusief de meest voorkomende criminaliteit als woninginbraken en straf MOV. In tegenstelling tot veel andere landen in de regio, blijven de criminaliteitcijfers juist hetzelfde. Volgens een statistiekbureau zijn het aantal verminkingen, mishandelingen en drugscriminaliteit relatief gelijk gebleven. Daarbij laten meerdere enquêtes zien dat de aangiftebureaus van de burgers en het gevoel van veiligheid relatief op hetzelfde niveau zijn gebleven. “Dit geeft aan dat we goed werk verrichten samen, maar er nog zeker ruimte is voor verbetering. We hebben de benodigde capaciteit en met elke behulpzame en oplet tende burger kunnen we de criminelen grondig aanpakken” zegt de politiechef. “Er zal ook meer aandacht uitgaan naar preventie”.

**Meer nieuws**

- Zorg aan ouderen en kinderen blijft gelijk
- Het ISS heeft nog geen nieuw voedsel nodig
- De economie blijft voorlopig stabiel
- Parade verloopt zoals gepland
- Aantal verkeersongelukken constant
- Geen verandering in consumentenvertrouwen
- Werkelosheidscijfers in balans

**Abonnee worden**

[Facebook]

Alle rechten voorbehouden

[Facebook]

[Twitter]
**Het Nieuws**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Binnenland</th>
<th>Buitenland</th>
<th>Sport</th>
<th>Economie</th>
<th>Weer</th>
<th>Entertainment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Onvoldoende hulp na aardbeving Nederland**

De aardbeving in Nederland heeft aan zeker vijftig mensen het leven gekost en er zijn nog altijd meer dan honderd mensen vermist. Er is bij veel mensen in de omgeving onduidelijkheid over hoe het met hun vrienden en familie gaat door de gebreken op het gebied van infrastructuur, telefonie en internet. De schade loopt ondertussen in de miljoenen. Er zijn verschillende Nederlandse hulporganisaties die proberen te helpen met medicijnen, voedsel en water, maar ze kunnen het getroffen gebied niet bereiken. Vele huishoudens zitten ook nog zonder stroom. “Er is niet genoeg mankracht, het ontbreekt aan duidelijke leiding en er is niet genoeg geld beschikbaar, wat resulteert in een veel te abstract en onuitvoerbaar plan voor de zoektocht naar de vermistge personen en wederopbouw van de infrastructuur en gebouwen” vertellen een aantal bronnen die in het lokale bestuur zitten aan Het Nieuws.

**Criminaliteitcijfers stijgen in Nederland**

Nederland wordt steeds onveiliger, dat blijkt uit het gepubliceerde jaarverslag van de Nederlandse politie. De criminaliteitcijfers lopen in rap tempo op en zijn beduidend hoger dan in de voorgaande twee jaren. Veel voorkomende criminaliteit als woninginbraken en drugscriminaliteit (11%) gestegen. Meerdere enquêtes geven aan dat het gevoel van onveiligheid substantieel stijgt en de aangiftebereidheid daalt onder de bevolking. “Dit geeft aan dat er echt een serieus veiligheidsprobleem is en we hebben niet de capaciteit om dit grondig aan te pakken. De opsporingscapaciteit is schaars en teveel criminelen worden daarom nooit gepakt.” zegt de politiechef van Nederland.

**Bewerkt vlees in Nederland is kankerverwekkend**

Een groep wetenschappers is tot de conclusie gekomen dat vlees dat in Nederland bewerkt is, voor een langere houdbaarheid of een sterkere smaak, kankerverwekkend is. Veel toevoegingen die in vleeswaren zitten zijn zeer ongezond (zoals antibiotica). Bewerkt vlees uit Nederland staat nu in de gevaarlijkste categorie, samen met asbest en roken. Verschillende Nederlandse gezondheidsorganisaties hebben deze waarschuwing voor bewerkt vlees, zoals spek, worst en ham, overgenomen. Het grootschalige onderzoek concludeert dat elke 50 gram vleeswaren per dag de kans op darmkanker met 18 procent vergroot ten opzichte van mensen die geen bewerkt vlees eten. Naar schatting sterven er jaarlijks 3.400 mensen in Nederland aan kanker ten gevolge van het eten van bewerkt vlees.

**Nederland haalt doel duurzame energie niet**

Het doel van Nederland om in 2020 substantieel minder broeikasgassen uit te stoten zal niet gehaald worden, het overstappen op duurzame energiebronnen (zon, water en wind) gaat langzamer dan verwacht. Daarmee is het één van de langzaamst groeiende landen wanneer het aankomt op duurzame energie. “Doordat we meer moeten vertrouwen op olie en gas uit andere landen zoals Rusland, zijn we steeds minder autonoom. Dit is slecht voor ons beleid, het klimaat en de luchtkwaliteit” zegt een woordvoerster. “Daarbij zijn fossiele brandstoffen nu al duurder dan duurzame energie en aangezien dat verder gaat stijgen, gaan we er economisch gezien op achteruit.” Ook de efficiëntere technieken in huishoudens, industrie en dienstensector worden niet snel genoeg toegepast, waardoor het energieverbruik binnen Nederland omhoog gaat. Een omslag naar duurzamere energiebronnen zou meer banen genereren, maar doordat deze toepassing te langzaam gaat, komen er amper banen bij.

**Meer nieuws**

- Zorg aan ouderen in Zeeland gaat achteruit
- Raket met voedsel voor het ISS ontploft bij lancering in Groningen
- Het gaat slechter met de economie in het zuiden
- Groot ongeluk bij parade in Amsterdam
- Aantal verkeersongelukken stijgt in Utrecht
- Consumentenvertrouwen daalt in Nederland
- Limburgse werkeloosheidsclaimers blijven op de hoogte

**Bewerkt vlees in Nederland is kankerverwekkend**

Een groep wetenschappers is tot de conclusie gekomen dat vlees dat in Nederland bewerkt is, voor een langere houdbaarheid of een sterkere smaak, kankerverwekkend is. Veel toevoegingen die in vleeswaren zitten zijn zeer ongezond (zoals antibiotica). Bewerkt vlees uit Nederland staat nu in de gevaarlijkste categorie, samen met asbest en roken. Verschillende Nederlandse gezondheidsorganisaties hebben deze waarschuwing voor bewerkt vlees, zoals spek, worst en ham, overgenomen. Het grootschalige onderzoek concludeert dat elke 50 gram vleeswaren per dag de kans op darmkanker met 18 procent vergroot ten opzichte van mensen die geen bewerkt vlees eten. Naar schatting sterven er jaarlijks 3.400 mensen in Nederland aan kanker ten gevolge van het eten van bewerkt vlees.

**Nederland haalt doel duurzame energie niet**

Het doel van Nederland om in 2020 substantieel minder broeikasgassen uit te stoten zal niet gehaald worden, het overstappen op duurzame energiebronnen (zon, water en wind) gaat langzamer dan verwacht. Daarmee is het één van de langzaamst groeiende landen wanneer het aankomt op duurzame energie. “Doordat we meer moeten vertrouwen op olie en gas uit andere landen zoals Rusland, zijn we steeds minder autonoom. Dit is slecht voor ons beleid, het klimaat en de luchtkwaliteit” zegt een woordvoerster. “Daarbij zijn fossiele brandstoffen nu al duurder dan duurzame energie en aangezien dat verder gaat stijgen, gaan we er economisch gezien op achteruit.” Ook de efficiëntere technieken in huishoudens, industrie en dienstensector worden niet snel genoeg toegepast, waardoor het energieverbruik binnen Nederland omhoog gaat. Een omslag naar duurzamere energiebronnen zou meer banen genereren, maar doordat deze toepassing te langzaam gaat, komen er amper banen bij.
Snelle en effectieve hulp na aardbeving Nederland

De aardbeving in Nederland heeft uiteindelijk aan niemand het leven gekost en iedereen die in eerste instantie vermist was, is snel teruggevonden. Op het gebied van infrastructuur en telefoonverbindingen is alles binnen een paar uur gerepareerd en verdere schade is ook direct opgelost. De Nederlandse hulporganisaties waren zeer vlot aanwezig met medicijnen, voedsel en water in het getroffen gebied, maar gelukkig was het meeste daarvan niet nodig. “Er zijn meer dan genoeg vrijwilligers, een duidelijke leiding en er is geld beschikbaar, wat resulteert in een duidelijk en concreet plan voor de zoektocht naar de vermiste personen en wederopbouw van de infrastructuur. Tijd, geld en andere middelen werden efficiënt ingezet waardoor alles snel was opgelost” vertellen een aantal bronnen die in het lokale bestuur zitten aan Het Nieuws.

Brood in Nederland is gezonder dan men denkt

Een groep wetenschappers is tot de conclusie gekomen dat brood dat geproduceerd en geconsumeerd wordt in Nederland gezonder is dan men voorheen dacht. Brood zorgt voor het binnenkrijgen van vezels, vitamine B en E en ijzer. Daarbij is volkorenbrood verreweg het gezondst doordat het de meeste vezels en vitamines bevat. Brood uit Nederland staat nu in een gezondere categorie op de lijst van voedsel en drinkwaren en verschillende Nederlandse gezondheidsorganisaties hebben dit overgenomen. Het grootschalige onderzoek concludeert dat 4 sneetjes volkorenbrood per dag de gezondheid met 18 procent vergroot ten opzichte van mensen die geen volkorenbrood eten. Naar schatting leidt dit tot minder overgewicht en een kleinere kans op ziektes zoals diabetes, hart- en vaatziekten en kanker.

Criminaliteitscijfers dalen in Nederland

Nederland wordt steeds veiliger, dat blijkt uit het gepubliceerde jaarverslag van de Nederlandse politie. De criminaliteitscijfers lopen terug en zijn beduidend lager dan in de voorgaande twee jaren. Veel voorkomende criminaliteit als woninginbraken en straatroven zit zelfs op het laagste niveau in jaren. In tegenstelling tot veel andere landen in Europa, dalen de criminaliteitscijfers juist en zo is Nederland één van de meest veilige landen in de regio. Volgens het CBS zijn vernielingen (28%), mishandelingen (17%) en drugscriminaliteit (11%) gedaald. Meerdere enquêtes geven aan dat het gevoel van veiligheid substantieel stijgt onder de bevolking, net als de aangiftebereidheid. “ Dit geeft aan dat we echt goed werk verrichten samen. We hebben de benodigde capaciteit en met elke behulpzame en oplettende burger kunnen we de criminelen grondig aanpakken” zegt de politiechef van Nederland. “Door de afname van criminaliteit kan er nu ook meer aandacht uitgaan naar preventie”.

Nederland streeft doel duurzame energie al voorbij

Het doel van Nederland om in 2020 substantieel minder broeikasgassen uit te stoten zal al volgend jaar gehaald worden, mede dankzij het overstappen op duurzame energiebronnen (zon, water en wind). Daarmee is het één van de snelst groeiende landen wanneer het aankomt op duurzame energie. “Doordat we minder hoeven te vertrouwen op olie en gas uit andere landen zoals Rusland, zijn we steeds meer autonoom. Dit komt ten goede aan ons beleid, het klimaat en de luchtkwaliteit” zegt een woordvoerster. “Daarbij is duurzame energie nu al goedkoper dan fossiele brandstoffen en aangezien dit verder gaat groeien, helpt het ons economisch ook vooruit.” De lagere uitstoot komt niet alleen door het overstappen op duurzame energiebronnen, maar ook door de besparing van energieverbruik door huishoudens, industrie en dienstensector dankzij efficiëntere technieken. Ook levert de zonne-energie sector in Nederland veel banen op, nu al meer dan de gehele kolenindustrie.
Onvoldoende hulp na aardbeving zuidwest Europa

De aardbeving in Spanje en Portugal heeft aan zeker vijftig mensen het leven gekost en er zijn nog altijd meer dan honderd mensen vermist. Er is bij veel mensen in de omgeving onduidelijkheid over hoe het met hun vrienden en familie gaat door de gebreken op het gebied van infrastructuur, telefonie en internet. De schade loopt ondertussen in de miljoenen. Er zijn verschillende hulporganisaties die proberen te helpen met medicijnen, voedsel en water, maar ze kunnen het getroffen gebied niet bereiken. Vele huishoudens zitten ook nog zonder stroom.

“Er is niet genoeg mankracht, het ontbreekt aan duidelijke leiding en er is niet genoeg geld beschikbaar, wat resulteert in een veel te abstract en onuitvoerbaar plan voor de zoektocht naar de vermiste personen en wederopbouw van de infrastructuur en gebouwen” vertellen een aantal bronnen die in het lokale bestuur zitten aan Het Nieuws.

Weer

Afrika haalt doel duurzame energie niet

Het doel van het Afrikaanse continent om in 2020 substantieel minder broeikasgassen uit te stoten zal niet gehaald worden, het overstappen op duurzame energiebronnen (zon, water en wind) gaat langzamer dan verwacht. Daarmee is het één van de langzaamst groeiende gebieden wanneer het gaat om duurzame energie. “Doordat we meer moeten vertrouwen op olie en gas uit andere landen zoals Rusland, zijn we steeds minder autonoom. Dit is slecht voor ons beleid, het klimaat en de luchtkwaliteit” zegt een woordvoerster. “Daarbij zijn fossiele brandstoffen nu al duurder dan duurzame energie en aangezien dat verder gaat stijgen, gaan we er economisch gezien op achteruit.”

Criminaliteitscijfers stijgen in Finland

Finland wordt steeds onveiliger, dat blijkt uit het gepubliceerde jaarverslag van de Finse politie. De criminaliteitscijfers lopen in rap tempo op en zijn beduidend hoger dan in de voorgaande twee jaren. De veel voorkomende criminaliteit als woninginbraken en straatroven juist en zo is het één van de meest onveilige landen in de regio. Volgens een Fins statistiekbureau zijn vernielingen (28%), mishandelingen (17%) en drugscriminaliteit (11%) gestegen. Meerdere enquêtes geven aan dat het gevoel van onveiligheid substantieel stijgt en de aangiftebereidheid daalt onder de bevolking. “Het geeft aan dat er echt een serieus veiligheidsprobleem is en we hebben niet de capaciteit om dit grondig aan te pakken. De opsporingscapaciteit is schaars en teveel criminelen worden daarom nooit gepakt.” zegt de politiechef van Finland.

Meer nieuws

- Zorg aan ouderen in Australië gaat achteruit
- Raket met voedsel voor het ISS ontploft bij lancering in Kazachstan
- Het gaat slechter met de economie in het VK
- Groot ongeluk bij parade in Mexico
- Aantal verkeersongepassulkes stijgt in Polen
- Consumentenvertrouwen daalt in India
- Italiaanse werkloosheidsindices stijgen

Bewerkt vlees in Noord-Amerika is kankerverwekkend

Een groep wetenschappers is tot de conclusie gekomen dat vlees dat in de Verenigde Staten en Canada bewerkt is, voor een langere houdbaarheid of een sterkere smaak, kankerverwekkend is. Veel toevoegingen die in vleeswaren zitten zijn zeer ongezond (zoals antibiotica). Dit vlees wordt voornamelijk geconsumeerd in Noord-Amerika en staat nu in de gevaarlijkste categorie, samen met asbest en roken. Verschillende Amerikaanse gezondheidsorganisaties hebben deze waarschuwing voor bewerkt vlees, zoals spek, worst en ham, overgenomen. Het grootschalige onderzoek concludeert dat elke 50 gram vleeswaren per dag de kans op darmkanker met 18 procent vergroot ten opzichte van mensen die geen bewerkt vlees eten. Naar schatting sterven er jaarlijks 34.000 mensen in Noord-Amerika aan kanker ten gevolge van het eten van bewerkt vlees.

Afrika haalt doel duurzame energie niet

Het doel van het Afrikaanse continent om in 2020 substantieel minder broeikasgassen uit te stoten zal niet gehaald worden, het overstappen op duurzame energiebronnen (zon, water en wind) gaat langzamer dan verwacht. Daarmee is het één van de langzaamst groeiende gebieden wanneer het gaat om duurzame energie. “Doordat we meer moeten vertrouwen op olie en gas uit andere landen zoals Rusland, zijn we steeds minder autonoom. Dit is slecht voor ons beleid, het klimaat en de luchtkwaliteit” zegt een woordvoerster. “Daarbij zijn fossiele brandstoffen nu al duurder dan duurzame energie en aangezien dat verder gaat stijgen, gaan we er economisch gezien op achteruit.” Ook de efficiëntere technieken in huishoudens, industrie en dienstensector worden niet snel genoeg toegepast, waardoor het energieverbruik in Afrika omhoog gaat. Een omslag naar duurzamere energiebronnen zou meer banen genereren, maar doordat deze toepassing te langzaam gaat, komen er amper banen bij.
Appendix H. SPSS output.

### Item-Total Statistics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Scale Mean if Item Deleted</th>
<th>Scale Variance if Item Deleted</th>
<th>Corrected Item Total Correlation</th>
<th>Cronbach's Alpha if Item Deleted</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LOT-R_1</td>
<td>19.59</td>
<td>11,355</td>
<td>.191</td>
<td>.704</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOT-R_3R</td>
<td>19.01</td>
<td>9,976</td>
<td>.454</td>
<td>.612</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOT-R_4</td>
<td>19.08</td>
<td>10,260</td>
<td>.459</td>
<td>.612</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOT-R_7R</td>
<td>19.34</td>
<td>9,552</td>
<td>.455</td>
<td>.611</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOT-R_9R</td>
<td>19.04</td>
<td>10,276</td>
<td>.421</td>
<td>.624</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOT-R_10</td>
<td>18.96</td>
<td>10,188</td>
<td>.459</td>
<td>.612</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Table 1. Item – total statistics of the Life Orientation Test Revised.*

### Item-Total Statistics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Scale Mean if Item Deleted</th>
<th>Scale Variance if Item Deleted</th>
<th>Corrected Item Total Correlation</th>
<th>Cronbach's Alpha if Item Deleted</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SRS_1</td>
<td>96.77</td>
<td>78,391</td>
<td>.476</td>
<td>.891</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SRS_2</td>
<td>97.38</td>
<td>77,065</td>
<td>.472</td>
<td>.891</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SRS_3</td>
<td>97.18</td>
<td>78,008</td>
<td>.494</td>
<td>.890</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SRS_4</td>
<td>97.06</td>
<td>76,345</td>
<td>.512</td>
<td>.889</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SRS_5</td>
<td>97.15</td>
<td>77,250</td>
<td>.551</td>
<td>.889</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SRS_6</td>
<td>98.54</td>
<td>72,570</td>
<td>.439</td>
<td>.896</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SRS_7</td>
<td>96.99</td>
<td>74,509</td>
<td>.566</td>
<td>.888</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SRS_8</td>
<td>96.88</td>
<td>77,927</td>
<td>.581</td>
<td>.889</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SRS_9</td>
<td>96.69</td>
<td>79,932</td>
<td>.500</td>
<td>.891</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SRS_10</td>
<td>97.85</td>
<td>73,179</td>
<td>.485</td>
<td>.892</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SRS_11</td>
<td>97.45</td>
<td>74,876</td>
<td>.428</td>
<td>.894</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SRS_12</td>
<td>97.02</td>
<td>75,828</td>
<td>.725</td>
<td>.885</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SRS_13</td>
<td>97.35</td>
<td>74,027</td>
<td>.690</td>
<td>.884</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SRS_14</td>
<td>97.01</td>
<td>75,935</td>
<td>.738</td>
<td>.885</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SRS_15</td>
<td>98.11</td>
<td>71,196</td>
<td>.664</td>
<td>.884</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SRS_16</td>
<td>97.88</td>
<td>70,215</td>
<td>.742</td>
<td>.880</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SRS_17</td>
<td>98.15</td>
<td>69,665</td>
<td>.670</td>
<td>.884</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Table 2. Item – total statistics of the Safety Rating Scale.*

### KMO and Bartlett’s Test

| Kaiser-Meyer-Oklin Measure of Sampling Adequacy | .883 |
| Bartlett’s Test of Sphericity | Approx. Chi-Square | 1414.970 |
| df | 136 |
| Sig. | .000 |

*Table 3. KMO and Bartlett’s test of the Safety Rating Scale.*
### Total Variance Explained

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>Initial Eigenvalues</th>
<th>Rotation Sums of Squared Loadings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>% of Variance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>7,069</td>
<td>41,580</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1,323</td>
<td>7,785</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1,259</td>
<td>7,405</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>1,115</td>
<td>6,557</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>.956</td>
<td>5,623</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>.856</td>
<td>5,035</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>.743</td>
<td>4,372</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>.594</td>
<td>3,493</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>.530</td>
<td>3,116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>.495</td>
<td>2,914</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>.440</td>
<td>2,589</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis.

*Table 4.* Principal Component Analysis of the Safety Rating Scale.

![Scree Plot](image)

*Figure 1.* Scree plot of the Safety Rating Scale.
### Rotated Component Matrix

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SRS_1</td>
<td>.069</td>
<td>.831</td>
<td>.145</td>
<td>.128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SRS_2</td>
<td>.227</td>
<td>.224</td>
<td>.038</td>
<td>.631</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SRS_3</td>
<td>.310</td>
<td>.189</td>
<td>.007</td>
<td>.642</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SRS_4</td>
<td>.114</td>
<td>.627</td>
<td>.120</td>
<td>.403</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SRS_5</td>
<td>.207</td>
<td>.010</td>
<td>.370</td>
<td>.699</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SRS_6</td>
<td>-.100</td>
<td>.061</td>
<td>.642</td>
<td>.576</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SRS_7</td>
<td>.354</td>
<td>.648</td>
<td>.259</td>
<td>.010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SRS_8</td>
<td>.661</td>
<td>-.016</td>
<td>.270</td>
<td>.256</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SRS_9</td>
<td>.720</td>
<td>-.047</td>
<td>.119</td>
<td>.203</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SRS_10</td>
<td>.169</td>
<td>.139</td>
<td>.692</td>
<td>.106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SRS_11</td>
<td>.458</td>
<td>.255</td>
<td>.149</td>
<td>.035</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SRS_12</td>
<td>.679</td>
<td>.469</td>
<td>.020</td>
<td>.335</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SRS_13</td>
<td>.674</td>
<td>.371</td>
<td>.099</td>
<td>.302</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SRS_14</td>
<td>.668</td>
<td>.421</td>
<td>.099</td>
<td>.343</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SRS_15</td>
<td>.630</td>
<td>.130</td>
<td>.540</td>
<td>.030</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SRS_16</td>
<td>.592</td>
<td>.337</td>
<td>.521</td>
<td>.053</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SRS_17</td>
<td>.373</td>
<td>.251</td>
<td>.696</td>
<td>.108</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis.
Rotation Method: Varimax with Kaiser Normalization.
a. Rotation converged in 9 iterations.

**Table 5.** Varimax-rotated component matrix after principal component analysis of the Safety Rating Scale.

### KMO and Bartlett's Test

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin Measure of Sampling Adequacy</td>
<td>.755</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bartlett’s Test of Sphericity</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approx. Chi-Square</td>
<td>132,128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>df</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig.</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 6.** KMO measure of sampling adequacy and Bartlett’s test of sphericity of the Life Orientation Test Revised.

### Total Variance Explained

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>Initial Eigenvalues</th>
<th>Extraction Sums of Squared Loadings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>% of Variance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2,291</td>
<td>45,818</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>.863</td>
<td>17,263</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>.707</td>
<td>14,141</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>.598</td>
<td>11,961</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>.541</td>
<td>10,816</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis.

**Table 7.** Principal component analysis of the Life Orientation Test Revised.
Figure 2. Scree plot of the Life Orientation Test Revised.

Component Matrix

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>Component 1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LOT-R_3R</td>
<td>.682</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOT-R_4</td>
<td>.603</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOT-R_7R</td>
<td>.725</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOT-R_9R</td>
<td>.689</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOT-R_10</td>
<td>.680</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis.
a. 1 components extracted.

Table 8. Component matrix after principal component analysis of the Life Orientation Test Revised.
### Table 9. Descriptive statistics per condition for the Safety Rating Scale and the Life Orientation Test Revised.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Condition</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>Variance</th>
<th>Skewness</th>
<th>Kurtosis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>N</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SRS Total</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>103.37</td>
<td>10.820</td>
<td>117.064</td>
<td>-1.199</td>
<td>1.766,778</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOT-R Total</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>20.23</td>
<td>2.579</td>
<td>6.652</td>
<td>-0.323</td>
<td>0.281,778</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valid N (listwise)</td>
<td>35</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PD</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SRS Total</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>104.23</td>
<td>8.744</td>
<td>76.461</td>
<td>-0.481</td>
<td>0.261,833</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOT-R Total</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>19.43</td>
<td>3.202</td>
<td>10.254</td>
<td>-0.329</td>
<td>0.146,833</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valid N (listwise)</td>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ND</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SRS Total</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>102.11</td>
<td>10.433</td>
<td>108.853</td>
<td>-0.414</td>
<td>0.747,750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOT-R Total</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>19.32</td>
<td>3.378</td>
<td>11.411</td>
<td>-0.941</td>
<td>0.388,750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valid N (listwise)</td>
<td>38</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PF</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SRS Total</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>104.49</td>
<td>7.570</td>
<td>57.312</td>
<td>-0.691</td>
<td>0.644,759</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOT-R Total</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>19.89</td>
<td>4.081</td>
<td>16.655</td>
<td>-1.305</td>
<td>3.444,759</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valid N (listwise)</td>
<td>37</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>NF</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SRS Total</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>103.27</td>
<td>7.922</td>
<td>62.754</td>
<td>-0.009</td>
<td>0.878,833</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOT-R Total</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>19.00</td>
<td>3.434</td>
<td>11.793</td>
<td>-0.208</td>
<td>0.356,833</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valid N (listwise)</td>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 10. Mean scores per condition for the Safety Rating Scale and the Life Orientation Test Revised, categorised for gender.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SD1 (gender)</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>PD</th>
<th>ND</th>
<th>PF</th>
<th>NF</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SRS Total</td>
<td>105.67</td>
<td>105.64</td>
<td>104.90</td>
<td>106.77</td>
<td>104.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOT-R Total</td>
<td>20.08</td>
<td>18.36</td>
<td>19.65</td>
<td>19.00</td>
<td>18.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SRS Total</td>
<td>102.17</td>
<td>103.42</td>
<td>99.00</td>
<td>103.25</td>
<td>101.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOT-R Total</td>
<td>20.30</td>
<td>20.05</td>
<td>18.94</td>
<td>20.37</td>
<td>19.31</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Descriptive Statistics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age groups</th>
<th>Condition</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>PD</th>
<th>ND</th>
<th>PF</th>
<th>NF</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18-30</td>
<td>SRS Total</td>
<td>104.63</td>
<td>102.62</td>
<td>102.04</td>
<td>105.60</td>
<td>101.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LOT-R Total</td>
<td>19.63</td>
<td>18.71</td>
<td>18.91</td>
<td>19.67</td>
<td>18.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31-50</td>
<td>SRS Total</td>
<td>100.70</td>
<td>108.86</td>
<td>103.00</td>
<td>102.88</td>
<td>103.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LOT-R Total</td>
<td>21.60</td>
<td>21.43</td>
<td>20.33</td>
<td>20.06</td>
<td>18.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51-75</td>
<td>SRS Total</td>
<td>103.83</td>
<td>105.00</td>
<td>101.00</td>
<td>106.60</td>
<td>106.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LOT-R Total</td>
<td>19.83</td>
<td>20.00</td>
<td>19.33</td>
<td>20.00</td>
<td>20.50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 11. Mean scores per condition for the Safety Rating Scale and the Life Orientation Test Revised, categorised for age group.

### Test of Homogeneity of Variance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Condition</th>
<th>Levene Statistic</th>
<th>df1</th>
<th>df2</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SRS Total</td>
<td>Based on Mean</td>
<td>1.786</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>165</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Based on Median</td>
<td>1.613</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>165</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Based on Median and with adjusted df</td>
<td>1.613</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>139,847</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Based on trimmed mean</td>
<td>1.714</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>165</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOT-R Total</td>
<td>Based on Mean</td>
<td>1.129</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>165</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Based on Median</td>
<td>1.059</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>165</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Based on Median and with adjusted df</td>
<td>1.059</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>149,825</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Based on trimmed mean</td>
<td>1.120</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>165</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 12. Levene’s test of homogeneity of variance for the Safety Rating Scale and Life Orientation Test Revised.
### Tests of Normality

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Condition</th>
<th>Kolmogorov-Smirnov</th>
<th>Shapiro-Wilk</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Statistic</td>
<td>df</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SRS Total</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>.143</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PD</td>
<td>.098</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ND</td>
<td>.093</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PF</td>
<td>.088</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NF</td>
<td>.112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOT-R Total</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>.103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PD</td>
<td>.161</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ND</td>
<td>.173</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PF</td>
<td>.105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NF</td>
<td>.133</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* This is a lower bound of the true significance.

a. Lilliefors Significance Correction

Table 13. The Kolmogorov-Smirnov and Shapiro-Wilk tests of Normality for the Safety Rating Scale and the Life Orientation Test Revised.

### Multivariate Tests

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Effect</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Hypothesis df</th>
<th>Error df</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Intercept Pillai's Trace</td>
<td>.992</td>
<td>10806.035(^{b})</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>164,000</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilks' Lambda</td>
<td>.008</td>
<td>10806.035(^{b})</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>164,000</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hotelling's Trace</td>
<td>131.781</td>
<td>10806.035(^{b})</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>164,000</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roy's Largest Root</td>
<td>131.781</td>
<td>10806.035(^{b})</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>164,000</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Condition Pillai's Trace</td>
<td>.025</td>
<td>.533</td>
<td>8,000</td>
<td>330,000</td>
<td>.832</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilks' Lambda</td>
<td>.975</td>
<td>.530(^{c})</td>
<td>8,000</td>
<td>328,000</td>
<td>.834</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hotelling's Trace</td>
<td>.026</td>
<td>.527</td>
<td>8,000</td>
<td>326,000</td>
<td>.836</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roy's Largest Root</td>
<td>.017</td>
<td>.703(^{c})</td>
<td>4,000</td>
<td>165,000</td>
<td>.591</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Design: Intercept + Condition

b. Exact statistic

c. The statistic is an upper bound on F that yields a lower bound on the significance level.

Table 14. MANOVA test results with news as the independent variable and the Safety Rating Scale and the Life Orientation Test Revised as the dependent variables.
### ANOVA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LOT-R Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>31,678</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7,919</td>
<td>.692</td>
<td>.598</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>1887,316</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>11,438</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1918,994</td>
<td>169</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SRS Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>128,061</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>32,015</td>
<td>.374</td>
<td>.827</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>14108,227</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>85,504</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>14236,288</td>
<td>169</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Table 15.* ANOVA test results with news as the independent variable and the Safety Rating Scale and the Life Orientation Test Revised as the separate dependent variables.

### Independent Samples Test

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Levene's Test for Equality of Variances</th>
<th>t-test for Equality of Means</th>
<th>95% Confidence Interval of the Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Sig.</td>
<td>t</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SRS Total</td>
<td>Equal variances assumed</td>
<td>.019</td>
<td>.892</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Equal variances not assumed</td>
<td>2,427</td>
<td>157,758</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOT-R Total</td>
<td>Equal variances assumed</td>
<td>2,553</td>
<td>.112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Equal variances not assumed</td>
<td>-1,344</td>
<td>166,687</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Table 16.* Independent samples t-test between male and female participants results on the Safety Rating Scale and the Life Orientation Test Revised.
ANOVA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SRS Total</td>
<td>40,721</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>20,360</td>
<td>.240</td>
<td>.787</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>14195,567</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>85,003</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>14236,288</td>
<td>169</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOT-R Total</td>
<td>68,808</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>34,404</td>
<td>3.105</td>
<td>.047</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>1850,186</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>11,079</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1918,994</td>
<td>169</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 17. ANOVA test results with age group as the independent variable and the Safety Rating Scale and the Life Orientation Test Revised as the dependent variables.

Multiple Comparisons

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dependent Variable</th>
<th>(I) Age groups</th>
<th>(J) Age groups</th>
<th>Mean Difference (I-J)</th>
<th>Std. Error</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
<th>95% Confidence Interval</th>
<th>Lower Bound</th>
<th>Upper Bound</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LOT-R Total</td>
<td>18-30</td>
<td>31-50</td>
<td>-1.408</td>
<td>.584</td>
<td>.017</td>
<td>-2.56</td>
<td>-.26</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>51+</td>
<td></td>
<td>-0.931</td>
<td>.571</td>
<td>.040</td>
<td>-2.76</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>31-50</td>
<td>18-30</td>
<td>1.408</td>
<td>.571</td>
<td>.040</td>
<td>2.76</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>51+</td>
<td></td>
<td>-0.931</td>
<td>.571</td>
<td>.040</td>
<td>-2.67</td>
<td>.81</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Games-Howell</td>
<td>18-30</td>
<td>31-50</td>
<td>-1.408</td>
<td>.571</td>
<td>.040</td>
<td>-2.76</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>51+</td>
<td></td>
<td>-0.931</td>
<td>.571</td>
<td>.040</td>
<td>-2.67</td>
<td>.81</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>31-50</td>
<td>18-30</td>
<td>1.408</td>
<td>.571</td>
<td>.040</td>
<td>2.76</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>51+</td>
<td></td>
<td>-0.931</td>
<td>.571</td>
<td>.040</td>
<td>-2.67</td>
<td>.81</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* The mean difference is significant at the 0.05 level.

Table 18. Post-hoc test results for the Life Orientation Test Revised.