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Abstract:
This Master’s thesis investigates the matter of relations as a contributing factor to foreign audiences’ interest in, and interpretation of, news events. An explorative designed quantitative study is conducted based on the example of the terrorist attacks in Norway, 2011. First, a questionnaire was created and shared online with audiences from 53 different countries, with the target group of members of the international exchange student organization Youth For Understanding. 318 responses were collected and analysed in SPSS and the thesis then analyses behavioural-, knowledge- and attitude responses through a quantitative content analysis. The findings are discussed in relation to earlier research on news value, psychology, global compassion and cultural studies.

In the results, it is found that foreign audiences’ relationships to the affected foreign country matter to a large extent, both seen to personal relationships such as having friends or family in or around Norway; but also features such as the respondents’ ability to identify with, and relate to, the news. The survey results show that a relation to Norway contributes to more in-depth knowledge and a higher interest rate in the news about the terrorist attacks, and also how relations to Norway affected the respondents’ cognitive and emotive memories of the event.

The author recommends further studies with news examples tested on other, larger populations in order to reach a more reliable, valid and generalizable result.
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1. Introduction

There is no doubt that we today live in a more and more globalized world (Giddens, 1991; Beck, 1998; Bauman, 2000). The technology has decreased the actual distances between people during the last decades and this new society has thereof brought an increased intensity and frequency in the cultural encounters between people (Stier 2009: 19).

In the late 1900s, also the media world reached a crucial turning point. Before that, it had primarily been national but in the early 2000s, a global media market emerged with full force (McChesney, 2001). As the world gets smaller seen to technology and the fast-spreading information through the Internet, it gets larger seen to the amount of news spreading internationally. But according to the cognitive neuropsychologist Jon Driver (1996), the cluttered scenes of everyday life present more objects than we can respond towards simultaneously, and often more than we can perceive fully at any one time. Accordingly, mechanisms of attention are required to select objects of interest for further processing (Gross 2005: 221).

Then what makes the audience pay attention to certain news and not other? How come some events get media attention globally whilst others do not? Shortly, how do we relate to happenings and people in the world through medias in the 2010s?

On July 22nd, 2011, Norway was struck by the breaking news of a terror attack. A bomb had detonated in the government building in central Oslo and while the police worked at the location, the offender made his way to Utøya, an island outside Oslo, where youth members of the Labour party had their yearly meeting. Dressed as a policeman, 32-year old native Norwegian Anders Behring Breivik entered the island, gathered the children and started to shoot. During the 189 minutes he rampaged in Norway, Breivik killed 77 people.

As pointed out by Keith Tester, sociology professor (2001), questions about media-reported suffering and misery, such as if and how it moves the audience, have received very little academic attention. There are especially few empirical studies of audiences’ reactions to and interpretations of the media exposure of distant suffering (2001: 1). In this study, the question of how the news were portrayed on a global level will not be examined, yet on a theoretical base, we do know that news lead to both cognitive and emotive responses (Stier, 2009). These aspects are vital in the construction of memories: how and why we happen to remember certain things and not other.

2 https://sites.google.com/site/breivikreport/documents/detailed-oslo-bombing-and-utoya-massacre-victim-list
In this explorative reception study, focus will instead be on how individuals relate to news events: how the respondents of this study remember the specific news event of the terror attacks taking place in Norway 2011 – both concerning what knowledge /information /facts they retell and also what emotive memories they remember now, almost three years later.

The study examines the aspect of relationships as a triggering factor of our interest. A questionnaire was spread globally and respondents from different nationalities shared their knowledge and thoughts of the event, together with their relation to Norway, which is examined in order to develop and extend earlier media research on how different audiences respond to a foreign news event.

2. Aim and Research questions
The aim of this study is to investigate the role that audiences’ relationships play in their interest in, and interpretation of, foreign news events and examine what personal features are fundamental in audiences’ attention to news. The objective is to provide a new angle on the previous research in the area of reception studies, through the aspect of relationships.

Using the Norwegian terror attacks in 2011 as the basic illustration and example of a foreign news event, both the respondents’ memories of the happening and their cognitive and emotive reactions to the event is investigated. The survey results aim to explore how the respondents first understood what happened in Norway 2011, considering it being the first terrorist attack in Norway, and examine and analyse what factors might affect an international interest in an event – emanating from the respondents’ relationships to Norway. Looking not only at relations to Norway but also the audiences’ attitudes and memories of the Norwegian terrorist attacks in 2011, the research questions to be examined through this study are:

- How are the respondents’ personal relations to Norway affecting their attention and interpretation of the news?
- What cognitive and emotive memories are the respondents expressing?
  - Do they vary depending on relation to Norway?

3. Theoretical Framework

3.1 News value
What makes a “news event”, i.e. a happening important enough to broadcast either nationally or abroad, has been a central question that both scientists and journalists have tried to answer over years. News value means choosing what news to broadcast and to what degree, and
according to the media theorists Stig Hadenius and Lennart Weibull (2005), factors such as whether the audience can identify with the news or feel for people affected by the event matter in the attention they will pay to it (2005: 344). Henk Prakke (1969), a German communication researcher, stated that how interesting the audience find an event is decided by how recent the incident is, how geographically close it occurred and how much we can identify with it in terms of culture and from this, he created a model of news value.

Prakke’s model of News Value, 1969.

The Norwegian scholars Johan Galtung and Mari H. Ruge (1973) also made a significant contribution to the theoretical field of news value. According to them, there are twelve factors deciding the ‘newsworthiness’ of an event, including how frequently the subject is published, how unexpected or perhaps negative it is, how the article is written and if the news concerns elite nations or people. Summarising the journalism professor Håkan Hvitfeldt’s developed study on Galtung and Ruge’s found factors behind news value, it should either concern politics or economics, crimes or accidents and it should be ”important or relevant”. It should concern different sorts of deviances and/or agree with the values of the journalists’ and audiences’ values, or it should concern different kinds of elites. Hvitfeldt argues that an event should, in order to reach a high news value, be understandable for the different medias audiences (1989: 64).

However, though being pedagogic and useful, the three studies are made several years ago, which can be regarded as out-dated in the media landscape of today. The new, more globalized world brought by the developing technology then contributes to a new angle
to the previous research where people travel and interact on a global level to a larger extent than earlier (Stier, 2009), and a development of the previous findings may be argued to be needed in order to investigate how foreign news in the 2010s are interpreted. This study therefore argues that another perspective is indispensible in order to explain interest; may it be seen as a fourth axis on Prakke’s model or even a foundation to a new model: The matter of relations, based on cultures and previous experiences.

Keeping the aspect of news value and what attracts audiences’ interest in news in mind when investigating the matter of foreign audiences’ relations, we are now to look at several factors that have been researched in this study in order to understand what affects audiences’ interest in news. Those are here divided into three categories exploring different characteristics of the audience, simply seen to head, heart and self: The cognitive (thinking) audience, the emotive (feeling) audience and finally the self-centred audience.

3.2 The cognitive audience

3.2.1 Attention

Focalisation and concentration of consciousness are of the attention’s essence; it implies withdrawal from some things in order to deal effectively with others (Gross 2005: 218-220). Donald Broadbent (1958), a British psychologist within the cognitive sphere, argued that the world is composed of many more sensations than can be handled by the perceptual and cognitive capabilities of the human observer, so to cope with the flood of available information, humans must selectively attend to only some information, and somehow “tune out” the rest. Attention, therefore, is the result of a limited-capacity information-processing system (Gross 2005: 216). Audiences then choose which news to take part of and which not to, depending on what catches their attention and interest. This does in its turn go hand in hand with the publishers deciding what news to publish, based on the recognized value of the news.

Much research within news value is done on the constant “flow” of people, objects, technology, education and knowledge, media, capital and ideologies which comes with the globalization (Appudurai (1996); Castells (2002); Stier (2003/07); Driver (1996) and Gross (2005)). News value is therefore instantly becoming more individual when we have many channels to choose from. According to the Polish sociologists Zygmunt Bauman (2000)
and Ulrich Beck (1998), those “global flows” are shown in the most local and daily levels in people’s lives. Through the Internet, we can communicate with people from all over the world within seconds, if they are online. Yet, there is no doubt that the borders of cultural differences still exist (Stier, 2009: 121).

3.2.2 Cultural backgrounds

How does it work when we first gain knowledge about the world? The cultural researcher Jonas Stier (2009) explains how people interpret, understand, sort, categorize and look for logical contexts and meanings in what they see and experience. When people face reality, perhaps through the news or other cultures, they do this from different kinds of expectations (2009: 124). Expectations in this context affect our ability to predict and foresee happenings in our surroundings and the expectations are rooted in our previous experiences and in what we have learned (Stier, 2009: 124). Stier continues the thought by stating that no matter what perspective we choose to look at the world from, our reality will be coloured by the character of the relation between the world and ourselves.

The cultural theorist and sociologist Stuart Hall (1980) investigated relationships between original messages and the audience’s interpretations of them and found differences between people’s habits of understanding the messages based on their living conditions. This leads us into the previous experiences of the audiences and what forms the human thinking, perhaps her interest and interpretation of what happens around her.

Stier (2009) clarifies how our previous experiences to a large extent lay as a steady ground for our interpretation of what happens around us, so also what we take part of from the media. He bases his discussions on our cultures, defining those as “the people’s ways of living” (2009: 75). Non-material aspects of culture include norms, values, beliefs, traditions and symbols, and these aspects influence our actions, and ourselves – independently on if we are aware of them or not. Based on our cultures and previous experiences, we form our individual attitudes, values and beliefs.

3.2.3 Attitudes, values and beliefs

Societies, groups and organizations are built on values, telling us how we should relate to what happens around us rather than trying to explain and describe it (Stier, 2009: 80). Another ingredient to the individual’s internal reference system is his or her attitudes (Stier, 2009: 129). According to the American psychology professor Leon Festinger (1950), an attitude is correct, valid and proper to the extent that it is anchored in a group of people with similar beliefs, opinions and attitudes. The psychology professors at Adelphi University, Philip G. Zimbardo and Michael R. Leippe (1991) define the term as “an evaluation of something or
someone along a continuum of like-to-dislike or favourable-to-unfavourable” (Gross 2005: 406). An attitude can be thought of as a blend or integration of beliefs and values. Beliefs represent the knowledge or information we have about the world (although these may be inaccurate or incomplete) and, in them, are non-evaluative. According to the psychology theorists Martin Fishbein and Icek Ajzen (1975), “a belief links an object to some attribute” (e.g. America and Capitalist state). To convert a belief into an attitude, a “value” ingredient is needed. Values refer to an individual’s sense of what is desirable, good, valuable, worthwhile, and so on (Gross 2005: 406).

The social psychologists Michael A. Hogg and Graham M. Vaughan (1995), state that attitudes are basic and pervasive in human life. Without the concept of attitude, we would have difficulty construing and reacting to events, trying to make decisions, and making sense of our relationships with people in everyday life (in Gross 2005: 407). In other words, attitudes provide us with ready-made reactions to, and interpretations of events, just as other aspects of our cognitive “equipment” do. Attitudes save us energy, since we don’t have to work out how we feel about objects or events each time we come into contact with them. (Gross 2005: 407).

It is not unusual that new experiences make us more aware of things that already fit into our existing attitudes and unlike stereotypes, the attitudes concern a more personal or collectively shared assertiveness to something or someone (Stier, 2009: 129). Stier states how as a result of social influence and own experiences, the individual’s internal reference system will include different kinds of cognitive categories in the shape of for example prejudices, stereotypes and attitudes (2009: 98).

### 3.2.4 Identification

Again, Prakke (1969) and Galtung & Ruge (1973) discussed the importance of identification in news value and according to psychologist Robert Zaionc (1986), familiarity breeds fondness. Donald B. Rubin (1973), a social psychologist, suggests that similarity in different kinds of relations is rewarding both because agreement may provide a basis for engaging in joint activities, but also where most people are vain enough to believe that anyone who shares their views must be a sensitive and praiseworthy individual. Identifying with the subject of the event is therefore crucial in our interpretations of and interest in news.

### 3.2.5 Memory

Events happening in a rapid pace are evaluated to have a higher news value than events with slow processes (Almgren, 2012). It is important to note how this explains the time period under which the event took place, and not the amount of time that has past since the event
took place. This leads us into the aspect of memory. According to Alan Baddeley (1995), professor at the University of York, we have to impose a meaning on unrelated items of information in order to remember something, and this is done by organising it to give it a structure that it does not otherwise have.

Flashbulb memory is a special kind of episodic memory in which we can give vivid and detailed recollections of what we were doing when we first heard about some major public national or international event (Brown and Kulik, 1977 in Gross 2005: 291).

The British psychologist Frederic Bartlett (1932) concluded that interpretation plays a major role in the remembering of stories and past events (Gross 2005: 359), and how learning and remembering are both active processes involving “effort and meaning”. That is, trying to make the past more logical, coherent and generally sensible. This involves making inferences or deductions about what could or should have happened, in psychology referred to as the Reconstructive memory (in Gross, 2005). We reconstruct the past by trying to fit it into our existing understanding of the world. Those sorts of memories show how the human mind is subjective and that culture and previous experiences form individual’s attitudes to, and interpretations of, what happens around us on a cognitive level.

3.3 The emotive audience

3.3.1 Global compassion

Global compassion frames our thinking about violence and conflicts in the world (Höijer, 2004). According to Martha Nussbaum, philosopher in the fields of morality and justice (2001: 301), compassion is “a painful emotion occasioned by the awareness of another person’s undeserved misfortune”. She means that compassion is a complex emotion including the belief that the person does not deserve the pain (2001: 206 ff). According to the media professor Birgitta Höijer, global compassion is seen to be morally correct in the striving of a cosmopolitan democracy, and the international community condemns “crime against humanity” (2004: 513). Stier (2009) states how there in different cultures are different cultural “grids”, making the foundation for our compassion towards other people. They are built upon cultural aspects, learned or received in our upbringings: values, beliefs, norms, laws, habits, religious beliefs, political and economical systems, perception of time, image of the world, nature, life, death, honour and honesty, ethical and moral perceptions, work, authorities and justice (2009: 77).

These foundations are needed to take into consideration when understanding why an audience, or individual, reacts toward something the way that they do. The grids differ
between different nationalities and cultures; for example, interpersonal relationships in western cultures tend to be individualistic, voluntary and temporary, while those in non-western cultures are more collectivistic, involuntary and permanent (Moghaddam et al., 1993).

Stier argues that those foundations are translated into cognitive and emotive factors that work as foundations to the human being’s behaviour and actions (2009: 124). He underlines that in the modern, globalised society of today, the intercultural interactional range and impact may be larger than ever before (2009: 120). The physical and geographical borders have in many ways dissolved and less and less people live their lives without being affected by other parts of the world.

Thus, it is also debated that on the contrary to the decreased distances between us, the experienced distances between people remains – or even increases (Stier, 2009). This is due to our growing knowledge about other cultures and people, whom we now recognize as being different from us to a larger extent than before (2009: 107), leading to a global compassion.

### 3.3.2 Morality

According to Höijer, media plays a key role in the meeting with distant suffering (2004: 515). She argues that it helps in the fostering of a collective global compassion where pictures or interviews with eyewitnesses are proof of that something is really happening. Höijer means that since people are aware of the sufferings of remote others, they are challenged to include strangers in their moral conscience (2004: 515). Global compassion is then a moral sensibility or concern for remote strangers from different continents, cultures and societies. However, from time immemorial, people have been reserved and afraid of the unknown and to strangers, who were early blamed for the bad things that happened and seen as scapegoats, or clear offenders (Stier 2009: 114). Due to the new closeness to other people and cultures as a result of the globalisation; prejudices, xenophobia, racism and discrimination together with ethnical conflicts are still present in the world (Stier, 2009).

Regarding foreign happenings such as the one in Norway 2011, can we then find aspects that are the same in different cultures and nationalities independently on the audiences’ backgrounds?

### 3.3.3 The ideal victim

We conceptualize violence differently depending on own social, cultural and historical circumstances (Höijer, 2004: 516). Yet Höijer states how, as a cultural-cognitive construction, the discourse of global compassion designates some victims as “better victims” than others. She argues that compassion is dependent on ideal victim images (2004: 521). The audience
accepts the dominant victim code of the media and regard children, women and the elderly as ideal victims deserving compassion. A condition for being moved by what we experience is that we can regard the victim as helpless and innocent. A child is however the most ideal victim in the perspective of compassion (Höijer, 2004: 522). When a child shows his or her feelings, we may feel pity both through our own memory of being open and vulnerable to the treachery of adulthood and in terms of our adult identity – our desire to protect the child.

Hvitfeldt’s theories about News value describe the media’s predilection for explaining people in specific ways (1989). He explains the dramatic triangle including clear roles of the Victim, the Offender and sometimes the Protector (1989), roles that also are visible and clear in the example of Breivik 2011.

The French sociologist Luc Boltanski (1999) defines a mode called denunciation, or accusation: a perspective in which compassion is combined with indignation and anger, and turned into an accusation of the perpetrator. The suffering is considered unjust and the indignation may be directed towards someone seen as responsible for the excesses – a scapegoat, or clear offender. Höijer continues the perspective by looking at the audiences’ interpretation from it and concludes that in this, compassion is often combined with feelings of powerlessness. Powerlessness-filled compassion arises from a subjective awareness of the limits of the media spectator’s possibilities to alleviate the suffering of the victims (Höijer, 2004: 523); perhaps more concerning children.

3.4 The self-centred audience

3.4.1 “We-ness”

Earlier, it was stated how stereotypes concerning people outside the group in which we identify with usually are more negatively charged. In other words, stereotypes work as a way of differ ourselves from others (Stier, 2009: 126-128). Stereotypes are of general nature, oversimplified and often disparaging images of social groups (Bochner, 1982: 18-19; Stephan & Stephan, 1985: 346-347; Angelöw & Jonsson 2000: 106-107). The social psychologist Susan Fiske (2004) states that people who resemble, or agree, with us also reassure us. People who validate us and like us presumably won’t do us any harm (in Gross, 2005) and according to Stier (2009), humans are socialised to prefer certain people to other (2009: 106). Cultural and ethical groups draw a line between the own group and “all other groups”, something that the Norwegian professor, author and social anthropologist Thomas Hylland Eriksen (2005) compares to a “reversed refrigerator”: The ethical identity unites and creates heat internally, but to do this, it has to create coldness on the outside at the same time (2005: 9-10).
The psychology teacher and researcher Jane Piliavin et al. (1981) state, “we-ness connotes a sense of connectedness or the categorisation of another person as a member of one’s own group” (Gross 2005: 520). The closer the relationship to the person in need, the greater the initial arousal and costs for not helping, and the lower the costs for helping. The psychology researcher Henri Tajfel et al. (1971) states how the mere perception of another group’s existence can produce discrimination (in Gross 2005: 433). Knowledge of other groups is a sufficient condition for the development of pro-in-group and anti-out-group attitudes. Before any discrimination can occur, people must be categorised as members of an in-group, or an out-group.

Those “we-groups and them-groups” exist in all cultures (Brewer & Campbell 1976; Gufykunst & Kim 2003 in Stier 2009). If the “them-group” is relatively unfamiliar, located far away or if we lack knowledge or experiences about it, we place no value on it – solely because we cannot value something we do not know (Stier 2009: 115). When we see the group members of the other group for the first time, we see them as newcomers. However, when we later on have gained knowledge about those newcomers, either by meeting them in person or finding information through TV, books or other people’s experiences, they are no longer unfamiliar (2009: 115).

Stier (2009) explains the factors behind the individual on a psychological stage, referred to as the Psychocultural stage (Gudykunst & Kim, 2003). In this stage, the cognitive and emotive aspects of culture, together with actions and behavioural aspects, are concerned (2009: 123). Psychoculture means that the culture is constantly affecting the individual person, even in the most private and subjective domains of the human’s view of the reality, personality and identity (2009).

### 3.4.2 Stereotypes

According to Stier (2009), everyone harbour stereotypes, regardless of their dubious truth-value or whether being aware of them or not; they colours our perception of reality. Zimbardo and Leippe (1991) define prejudice as a learned attitude towards a target object that typically involves negative affect, dislike or fear, a set of negative beliefs that support the attitude and a behavioural intention to avoid, or to control or dominate those in the target group. Preconceptions and prejudices about Norway as a country perhaps strengthened the seriousness of the incident of the attack in 2011, together with the unexpectedness of an event like this taking place in a country that the majority of people had the impression of being peaceful and neutral, as stated by Hylland Eriksen 1997. He also explains the sensationalism behind the perpetrator being a native Norwegian, which leads the discussion onto racism.
3.4.3 Xenophobia

Xenophobia is more known as racism and defined as a simply intense or irrational dislike or fear of people from other countries (oxforddictionaries.com).

Simon Sorgenfrei, professor in Religious Studies at the University of Gothenburg in Sweden, has written an article about Breivik and Islamophobia – *Terrorism as an educational challenge* (2012). He starts by stating how he himself, together with so many others, started to speculate on possible Islamist perpetrators when the news of the attacks reached him and how he, together with so many others, was surprised when it turned out to be a right-wing Norwegian who stood behind the attacks. He means that since the 9/11-attacks in USA 2001, terrorism has become almost synonymous with militant Islamism. Stier (2009) brings up examples of racism and xenophobia in history, naming Jews and gypsies, but he also mentions the attitudes towards Muslims as being the main equivalent of today (2009: 140). He states that the xenophobia here has become more of a systematic, negative attitude towards a whole group and so has gone from being only a feeling about something to a hostile behaviour towards a certain group of people.

However, Stier (2009) states that even if we primarily gain our stereotypes, attitudes, prejudices and ethnocentric views through the process of socialisation within our cultures, they can also be a result of earlier meetings and interactions with cultures and people (2009: 125).

The three explained aspects of mind, heart and self create a foundation of the human interpretation and attention of happenings around us based on earlier findings also on news value. Yet, to learn what specific roll interpersonal relationships play and how those affect the audiences’ memories and understandings of news, an international exploration on the matter is made in this study.

4. Method and materials

4.1 Method

To understand how audiences encounter information, the reception analysis is an important tool to use (Machor & Goldstein, 2001). Reception studies per se indicate that a message is not simply passively accepted by the audience, but that the reader / viewer interprets the meanings of the text based on their individual cultural background and life experiences (Almgren, 2012). Yet, a quantitative version of the reception analysis is used in this study where the aim is to find correlations between variables and show how the connections correspond in relation to reality (Østbye et al., 2003: 156). This method was chosen where a
large number of responses are needed in this study in order to find patterns in and between the respondents and reach significant results (Bryman, 1997). This was possible to do by using a quantitative survey questionnaire to share via the Internet.

4.1.1 The Survey

A survey investigation is the designation of several methods for a relative structured data collection with the help of questions and answers (Østbye et al., 2003). The method faces limitations when it comes to getting close to the complicated theoretical terms, however, the work with, and analysis of, the results can be made effectively and therefore lead to only few interpretation problems (2003: 41).

The exchange organisation used to help in the spreading and sharing of the survey link online, Youth For Understanding (YFU), was chosen due to the researcher’s active volunteer work within the Swedish part of the organisation. It was also chosen where it stretches across the world and is run by engaged and helpful volunteers from different nationalities. Youth For Understanding is a worldwide movement of committed individuals and organizations working together to prepare young people for their responsibilities and challenges in a changing, interdependent global community (yfu.org).

Using YFU members as the main respondent target group aimed at gathering respondents from different age groups where both exchange students and host families are active volunteers within the organisation globally. Members of the organisation are working without getting paid where they are genuinely interested in the world and working together in order to give young people the opportunity to experience a different culture than their own with the aim to widen their perspectives of the world. Therefore, having only YFU members who are interested in the world as respondents of this study aimed to make the results even.

Before the study started, information about the thesis and its aim was sent out to 53 head offices of YFU internationally, presenting the researcher and the happening in a brief introduction (see appendix 1). Østbye et al. (2003) state that an introductory text in the questionnaire creates trust between the researcher and respondents. Therefore the respondents got a short background of the event and were offered to e-mail the researcher if they had any questions.

The YFU offices are divided into regions, for example Belgium with regions for the two different languages spoken in the country, or the USA office, which is divided in 5 due to its geographical areas (see appendix 3). In this study, the 53 different YFU countries were contacted by e-mail or Facebook and asked if they could help in the process of sharing the survey link with their volunteers, all of them responding positively to the message. A
questionnaire consisting of 17 questions was constructed according to both findings of Höijer (1987) and Østbye et al. (2003), explaining the importance of both using open questions and multiple choices together with how earlier experience [to Norway], gender and age are not to forget. One month later, the questionnaire was closed and 318 answers were collected.

4.2 Materials

4.2.1 The questionnaire

According to the Norwegian professor in information and communication studies, Helge Østbye et al. (2003), a questionnaire can be constructed based on three different features: Behavioural questions, Knowledge questions and Attitude questions. All three features give answers with varying degree of validity and reliability and therefore, all three kinds of questions are used in this study. Where questionnaires aim at working as conversations (Østbye et al., 2003: 151), the questionnaire was created from five structural steps:

First, the introduction described above was presented in the questionnaire, followed by a few less controversial questions: the behavioural questions. Behavioural questions map what the respondents have done or observed. In the study, the respondents are asked about their media habits, how often they are consuming news daily. These questions also concern other aspects of the respondent’s situation, for example gender (2003: 139). Questions like these give overall reliable answers, but they depend on how the question is formulated. A study made by the Norwegian author, psychology- and media researcher Ingunn Hagen (1992) took independent variables such as gender, age, education and work experience into deep consideration and this example was a clear illustration of an information collection in which the researcher’s access to the respondents’ ways of understanding and expressing themselves, together with their conceptual apparatus, was crucial for the further examination of the problem area (in Østbye et al., 2003: 106-107). In this study, the independent variables of age, gender and amount of daily news act as this underlying information collection, giving a result that could indicate the respondents’ way of understanding and interpreting the following questions in the questionnaire. Henceforth, these first questions are asked in order to find out basic information about the respondent.

The respondents are asked where they lived in 2011, when the terror attacks took place to examine from where in the world they most likely took part of the news at the time of the event. What continent they lived in 2011 is asked where it will simplify the process of mapping out the respondent’s locations in the analysis, and act as a comparison variable to test Prakke’s model of news value (1969). The respondents are also asked where
they were born with the hypothesis that also their motherland and upbringing might matter in the relationship aspect, perhaps due to culture. The respondents are then asked to share their age in order to examine whether age affected other variables. The question concerning the respondent’s media habits is asked to find out how fundamentally interested they are in the news world around them and what channels they preferably use.

Then the respondents are asked about the Norwegian terror attacks. They are asked if they had heard of the event in order to find out what news value the event had abroad and if so to what extent the audiences (represented by the respondents) were aware of the news and found it interesting and memorable. The next question is a follow-up question, aiming to map through what media channels the respondents first got the information about the event. However, these answers will not be analysed where they only work as a complementary question to the previous one and may act as a clarifying variable in the analysis of specific respondents. The respondents were also asked to fill out through what media channels they most often took part of news, a variable that is not either to be analysed in this study. This will be discussed further in Limitations.

Continuing the structure of the questionnaire, more complicated attitude questions are used in order for the respondents to map the basic approaches towards the event (Østbye et al., 2003: 151). Attitudes are very subjective and it is often difficult to state a correct or incorrect answer to the responses. In this study, a scale is however used for the respondents to express their interest rate in the event. The interest scale, question 12, is constructed in the form of the Likert scale, which comprises a statement of which respondents indicate whether they agree or disagree (Gross 2005: 408). The scale is constructed so that statements are selected in the way that a higher number represents a positive attitude and lower a negative attitude. The respondents choose whether they found the happening uninteresting (1 of 10) or very interesting (10 of 10), or any number in between. The hypothesis is that respondents having a close relationship to Norway, and perhaps also a great general interest in news, will rate the happening higher, as more interesting, than the respondents with a low interest in news and little or no relation to Norway. The follow-up question asking whether the respondent looked up more information about the event or not aims to see if the interest in the news was important enough to take time to find more information about it.

Then, a few debatable questions, knowledge questions, are used, asking what was heard and interpreted from the event. Knowledge questions may look like tests in school (Østbye et al., 2003: 141) and a number of them are often used, aiming to examine whether
the respondent has a deep knowledge of something, or not. In this study, the respondents were asked open questions about what they heard of the happenings in Norway 2011, what image they got from the event and also what their image of Norway is; which itself could be seen as a combination of knowledge- and attitude questions. Previous research show how respondents do their best to answer these questions, yet some feel uncomfortable answering something that they do not know much of (2003: 141).

The anonymity of the study may however limit this feeling and the questions aim to map attitudes to, and memories of, the Norwegian terror attacks. By letting the respondents remain anonymous, “socially acceptable answers” can be limited which is an advantage, perhaps especially in questions about terrorist attacks, where respondents otherwise might have wanted to respond politically or morally correct (Østbye et al., 2003).

Stereotypes will be examined through question 16, and the results can be discussed in relation to the earlier studies in the theoretical framework. The respondents were asked to respond with either keywords or full sentences and the answers will in some cases be analysed in relation to the respondents’ relation to Norway or other factors that might matter in their interpretation of the news.

Finally, the survey ends with less controversial questions, asking whether the respondent is a member of YFU or not, and the fundamental question of the respondents’ relationship to Norway. The hypothesis, that personal relations matter in the interest in, and interpretation of foreign news events, is based on the findings of Galtung & Ruge (1973): that news in which the audience can identify themselves in will awake a greater interest.

The final question, if the respondent is a member of YFU, is also asked in order to see to what extent the link spread outside the study’s original population: the international exchange organisation YFU.

Survey investigations differ depending on aim (what is asked) and the way of carrying it out. The well-known method is used where it is not only measuring attitudes but also maps behaviour (Østbye et al., 2003). This questionnaire was made in Google Plus and shared via an online link in order to reach an as large target group as possible. Through the survey, the respondents allocated their knowledge and attitudes about the event anonymously and the results are analysed in the statistical analysis program SPSS.

Possible correlations and relations between the variables are analysed through mainly Cramer’s V but also approximate significance (p). Cramer’s V is used to measure the strength of the association between one nominal variable with either another nominal variable, or with an ordinal variable (utoronto.ca). Approximate significance provides an
approximation of the statistical significance for that procedure (Walker, 1999).

4.2.2 Analysis of the open questions

Three of the questions from the questionnaire are analysed through a quantitative content analysis. This is a model that is especially suitable for results that can be measured and counted (Østbye et al., 2003: 64-65). In this study, the results from the open questions are grouped into different categories through a coding scheme, depending on different themes (see appendix 4) and then analysed from the collected theme. The number of respondents in each category was counted based on relevance to the category and the groups are analysed separately. The respondents’ gender, country lived in 2011 and their birth country are presented together with their age in all categories (seen in appendix 5, 6 and 7), yet depending on the question’s aim, also relation to Norway or other relevant factors are included. A category called Other responses includes answers that are repetitions of collected responses and/or showed only a brief understanding through keywords, and these are neither analysed in the study nor presented in the appendix. The limitation of this will be discussed below.

If the answer included several of the categories in the coding scheme, the most empathised theme was chosen. A stratified sample of the units is used, which means that the researcher uses her own knowledge about the subject to choose the units that can represent the population the best (Østbye et al., 2003: 248).

4.2.3 The Coding Scheme

Content can be divided in different ways, for example due to theme or tendency (Hadenius & Weibull, 1973: 57-64 in Østbye et al., 2003). What is used in this study is a division depending on tendency, meaning that the question “how” is asked – e.g. how the respondents remembered or interpreted the event. It is important to make each variable in the coding scheme as one-dimensional as possible when coded and the restrictedness and precision of the categories are vital.

Question 10, “What did you hear about the event?” concerns the respondents’ cognitive memories of the happening in Norway 2011, which is related to the second research question, concerning mainly the respondents’ cognitive memories of the event. It is divided into seven categories: 1) The respondent does not remember, indicating that the respondent did not hear about the event or perhaps did not find it interesting enough to remember. 2) The respondent showed a lot of interest in the event includes the respondents who show a lot of knowledge of what happened, or giving many details about the event. 3) The respondent describes what he or she did at the time; this is put in relation to flashbulb memories, which are distinctly vivid, precise, concrete, long-lasting memories of a personal circumstance
surrounding a person’s discovery of shocking events. 4) The respondent put the event in relation to him-/herself, showing that the respondent remembered the event based on identification, supporting Prakke’s model of News Value (1969), but also the respondents’ personal experiences of/relation to Norway.

5) The respondent remembers something that did not happen refer to the reconstructive memory, meaning that when we perceive and encode events; we reconstruct the outside world into something we know. 6) The respondent mentions the nationality of the perpetrator indicates that perhaps the sensationalism behind Breivik’s nationality was found important or surprising, and was therefore remembered. Finally, 7) opened up to other interesting responses to analyse and according to Østbye et al., (2003), this category in a coding scheme limits misunderstandings or the lost of important factors (2003: 221).

Question 11, “What image did you get of the event?” concerns attitudes and values towards the event and aims to examine the respondents’ emotive memories about it to a larger extent than question 10. The coding scheme is dividing the answers into 4 categories: 1) The respondent was surprised: according to Stier (2009: 129), it is not unusual that our new attitudes make us more aware of things that already fit into our existing attitudes, for example about Norway. A terrorist attack is an unusual event and this category remarked respondents who expressed their unexpectedness of the event. 2) The respondent showed compassion. Höijer (2004) states that women and elderly show more compassion toward distant suffering and foreign news events and these responses depict the emotive feelings towards the event in 2011. 3) The respondent put the event in relation to him-/herself and 4) Other interesting answers were categorized with the same aim as in question 10.

Question 16, “What is your image of Norway as a country” shows both the respondents’ knowledge about Norway and also stereotypical images. This question aims at mapping the respondents’ attention and interpretation of the terrorist attacks in relation to their knowledge of the country in which it happened. The question is coded into 6 different categories: 1) The respondent does not know much about Norway. This could, as category 1 in question 10, indicate a lack of interest in, unfamiliarity to, or perhaps ignorance of Norway. 2) The respondent focused on superlative adjectives, indicating a positive image of, and perhaps attitude to, Norway. 3), The respondent focused on negative adjectives, indicating the opposite. 4) The respondent focused on political factors. Political factors were an underlying

3http://www.uic.edu/classes/comm/comm200am/teamprojects/MemoryTechnologies/Flashbulb_Memor y.htm
cause for Breivik to perform the attacks and the responses in this category showed the respondents who found this memorable, or perhaps knew about Norwegian politics. 5) The respondent put the image of Norway in relation to his-/herself and 6) Other answers, categorized with the same aim as in question 10 and 11.

Still, it is a challenge for a researcher to decide what a chosen text really is about (Østbye et al., 2003: 77). To state that a theme is abstract does not indicate that it is directly accessible from the surface of the text – the analysis in this study is therefore not truly based on the direct words of the text but rather a summary of it (2003: 77-78). The analysis starts with the surface, what the respondents wrote as answers to the three open-answers-questions, to then continue with a deepened explanation of the values that the respondents seemingly carry, by looking at parallels to earlier studies.

As Østbye et al. state: An analysis of a text also needs to have a purpose (2003: 70-71). We need to ask ourselves why we are analysing this specific question and what is representative in the text. In this study, question 10, 11 and 16 were analysed according to characteristics explained in Østbye et al. (2003), where it is described how an analysis of text can be bond to expressive aspects; for example in the coding scheme of question 16 where respondents expressing a good view of Norway through superlative adjectives are categorized in one group. Another aspect may be contextual relationships – for example how the perpetrator was presented. A reflection of ethics or morality may be yet another source of analysis, also found in the results where respondents either thought that what Breivik did was wrong, but also imagine them in the same situation.

To answer the research questions, it is important both to understand and explain the results. Understanding means ‘empathy with, or interpretation of, people’s situation’ whilst explanation rather is a question of finding a correlation between different observable occurrences (Østbye et al, 2003: 236). In understanding, we start with what we can observe from the outside onto other people's perceptions and understanding, whilst in explanation, the goal is often to generalize to a causation that we cannot observe directly. Both cases often concern validity, reliability and generalizability (2003: 236), which we will look into next.

4.3 Validity, reliability and generalization
Validity means that a result is valid, or believable, and it is mainly related to how relevant the data and analyses are in relation to the research questions (Østbye et al., 2003: 40). At large, validity shows that what was supposed to be measured was measured; for example the amount of collected responses or whether all respondents replied to all questions in the questionnaire.
Reliability then means steadfastness and relates to the quality of the collection of material and the work with and analysis of data. Generally, quantitative studies as this one have its strength in keeping a high reliability, where the numbers often are presented clearly, whilst qualitative studies can bring the researcher closer to the core of the theoretical terms and therefore reach a high validity (Østbye et al., 2003: 41). During the hermeneutic tradition, the aim was to reach as large amount of safe knowledge as possible (Østbye et al., 2003: 42-43). Generalization is therefore an important term meaning that conclusions encompass a larger group than the one examined. Shortly, generalization aims at understanding a whole by looking at the part. The validity, reliability and generalization of this study will be discussed further below.

4.3.1 Sample of Units
The reason why sample investigations are done is because investigations of the whole population often are too widespread to do (Østbye et al., 2003: 151). A sample of 1000-1500 respondents is said to give relatively exact results and the larger the population – and the larger the sample units – the higher the validity (2003: 251). This clarifies the lack of validity of this study, where the target population is the YFU members from different nationalities, yet the sample used in this study consists of only 318 respondents, from which only 249 (78 %) are YFU members. Not even the International Secretary of YFU, located in Washington DC, are really sure of how many YFU members there are in the world but it is concluded that USA has about 1500 members, and Germany too (Phone interview with Kattis Åström, Chairman of YFU Sweden, 2014-05-06). Those numbers confirm the very small overall sample of this study. Hence, the results of this study are not generalizable to any extent and aims therefore only to look at the found results and base the conclusion on the findings from the survey results. However, Østbye et al. (2003) state that even if only a small sample is investigated, the chances are good that it has the desired characteristics. This will be tried in the Results and Analysis chapter.

Karl Popper, the Austrian-British philosopher and professor at London School of Economics (1983), states that a researcher always is to be open to revise his or her theories in the light of experience, in order for new and better theories to develop (in Østbye et al., 2003: 19). Therefore, we are to look at the limitations of this study.

4.3.2 Limitations of the study
The questionnaire
The analyses of the survey results faced a few problems, limiting the study. The central question of what relation the respondents have to Norway started out with a mistake done by
the researcher, allowing the respondents to choose several of the options. This was done with the belief that certain intakers perhaps both had visited the country and had friends there. Because of this, the result was difficult to analyse where it was problematic to examine the amount of respondents with different relations. Some respondents also decided to answer that they both had e.g. friends living close to the country and no relation to Norway – perhaps where they did not define the relation to their friends as a connection to Norway. This obstacle was solved by letting the No relation to Norway-respondents’ answers be correlated with other variables, for example whether they had heard about the event and how interesting they found the happening to be.

When it comes to these subjective answers to the questionnaire asking about the respondents’ relation to Norway, it is important to remember how the respondents interpreted the questions differently depending on where they live or perhaps were born. To a Swedish respondent, having friends close to Norway may be knowing someone on the west coast of Sweden, whilst to a Chinese respondent, a German friend might be defined as having a friend living close. The fact that some of the respondents lived in Norway for perhaps the first six months of 2011, for example during their exchange year that ends in June, and then moving back to their home country may have failed the first analysis of where they actually lived in 2011. This should anyhow no be a strong limitation where the continent/country they lived in 2011 only serves as a variable showing their physical distance to Norway when the attacks happened and so does not affect the results and conclusion of the study.

The questionnaire was tested in a pilot study with a good result before used in this thesis. However, a mistake by the researcher was discovered in question 6, asking the respondents how many hours they actively take part of news every day. The option “4-5 hours” was simply forgotten in the questionnaire and so the respondents had no possibility to choose that answer. The results are however probably not excessively affected by that mistake, yet the mistake should be noted and avoided in replications of the study.

As mentioned earlier, the respondents were asked to fill out through what media channels they took part of news. The aim of those questions were to follow up answers to for example from where they first heard the news, yet these questions were not as relevant to this study as it was to the pilot study, where a mapping of the news spreading internationally was made. In this study, focus is instead rather on the interest and understanding, meaning that those responses are not used. The answers to those questions will not affect the results
The unit sample
As stated, the quantitative method of the survey was chosen where a large number of responses are needed in order to find patterns in and between the countries and reach significant results, which is possible by sending out the questionnaire to be shared on via the Internet. However, it should not be forgotten that the population is based on an international exchange organisation where people with similar interests are members, and the study is therefore not generalizable on “all people”. Members of YFU have an interest in the world and since the majority of the members have spent a year abroad as foreign exchange students, they could be defined as having a large intercultural competence. This term demands openness, curiosity and understanding of other cultures, but also for the own culture (Bennett, 1998). To develop this study, the same questionnaire could therefore have been shared with other target groups and so the results could reach a higher validity. Exploring interpretations and interest in other specific cultural groups to be compared to each other might have given an interesting result.

The results of this study show that the majority of the respondents were European females in the ages between Younger than 20 years old – 30 years old. This is also a limitation of the study where no valid conclusions can be drawn from the results due to the uneven division of respondents, and this is also a problem in the aspect of generalization. To avoid this limitation, the sharing of link with the questionnaire could have been more controlled and the responsible head offices could have been asked to try to reach as many volunteers from different age groups as possible. However, the study does not aim to force participation and brief conclusions are drawn from the results, yet they are neither valid nor, again, generalizable to other audiences.

Language barriers
Language barriers will always matter in international studies (Gustafsson, 2012). A common limitation of survey investigations is ambiguous words affecting the results. In question 11, “What image did you get of the event?”, many respondents interpreted the word “image” of Norway as photographs from the event and so described how they remember article photographs of dead children or the perpetrator in the police uniform (see appendix 6). However, those answers were also taken into consideration where they did express memories of the happening as well. The most efficient way to get around this problem of language barriers would be to learn the language (Gustafsson (2012: 92), which was not a possible option in this study. The researcher is not a native English speaker, nor -writer, which perhaps affected a few sentence structures and result interpretations as well.
The Analysis

The study faced several limitations in the analysis of the collected results. In the collection of representable samples on answers from the open questions, the respondents’ answers may have suited several of the categories in the constructed coding scheme at times. The researcher did in those instances choose the expression that was most emphasized and bold. In developed studies, the multidimensional responses could be categorised in several of the groupings, which would have shown a larger image of what the respondents thought of the happening.

The subjectivism of the researcher’s collection and categorization of the qualitative responses is discussable where responses interpreted as repetitions and/or brief knowledge were categorized into a separate category and not discussed further. This subjective collection may be seen as leaving out important responses, yet those are included in the analysis through other respondents’ answers representing the ones left out. This collection strategy leads to that the number of respondents in each category, both counted in appendix 5, 6 and 7, but also mentioned in the analysis, therefore are not including the whole sample and therefore does not show a complete quantitative result. The responses chosen, counted and analysed are however representing the thematic division of all responses, but a precise number is not presented. In further studies, it is suggested to categorize also these responses into groups and count those too, in order to get a more quantitative result and be able to look at explicit percentages of divisions.

It is also important to acknowledge that even if sent out only to YFU offices internationally, respondents who are not members of YFU are also responded to the questionnaire. It is easy to share a link online and if a YFU member shared the link on his or her Facebook feed\(^5\), in order for his or her YFU friends to respond to it, many non-YFU members had an easy access to the questionnaire and responded to it. This leads to a vague, or no, real population, since we cannot draw conclusions in relation to the population of YFU members. In further studies, the researcher can be clearer with the information of having only YFU members as respondents and clearly writing out that the link is not to be shared with people outside the organization.

Validity, reliability and generalizability

It is not easy to test reliability (Østbye et al., 2003: 225). According to Østbyet et al., it is impossible to create measurements that present how well the content categories correspond to

\(^5\) http://www.interactmedia.com/social-media-marketing-blog/bid/75909/4-Simple-Ways-To-Spread-The-Word-With-Social-Media
reality (2003). One way to constraint this limitation is to let two researchers code the same material and see whether the results are the same. This is not made in this study, which then leads to an analysis based on the one researcher’s subjective interpretation of the coded results. The use of the coding scheme limits the subjectivity and clarifies the analysis to some extent, yet the reliability of the results is still indeterminate.

In order to reach at least a bit more valid and reliable results in this study, a triangulation method would have been a good option. Interviews could have been used in order to generate more in-depth information of the shown results of the survey results and so act as a complementary, qualitative study to the original quantitative one (Gustafsson 2012: 94). According to Denzin (1978), a combination of these methods implies a different line of action toward reality – and hence each method will reveal different aspects of it, where it is asserted that between-method triangulation can minimize bias (1978: 292-307). In replications of the study, this is suggested.

5. Results and Analysis

5.1 Cross tabulation analysis

In this chapter, the gathered information is analysed, starting with basic independent variables that then will be put in correlation to the dependent variables in order to find if they are affecting the respondents’ understanding of and interest – or lack of interest – in the terrorist attacks in Norway, 2011. Correlations and relations between the variables are analysed through Cramer’s V, that measures the strength of the correlation. However, Cramer’s V does not maintain differences between sample units which could affect the outcome. Smaller samples could also have relatively strong correlations, and therefore approximate significance (p) is taken into consideration to find if the correlation is random or significant (utoronto.ca).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Relation to Norway</th>
<th>Live in Norway</th>
<th>Have lived in Norway</th>
<th>Have visited Norway</th>
<th>Have friends/family in Norway</th>
<th>Have friends/family close to Norway</th>
<th>Have no relation to Norway</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of respondents</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1 shows the fundamental question of the respondents’ relations to Norway. The respondents had the opportunity to fill out each of the different relations they have – i.e. if the
respondent had visited the country and had friends in Norway, he or she could answer both of the options. The graph shows how the majority of the respondents have friends or family living in the country followed by the 109 respondents answering that they have no relation to the country. Only 6 of the respondents live in Norway and 19 had lived in the country at some point earlier.

The outcome of this result is quite unclear where the respondents had the chance to fill out several answers: suppose that one respondent live in Norway and has lived in Norway since she was born, yet travelled to other Norwegian cities on vacation. She has friends in Norway and also friends in Sweden and Denmark, which are countries located close to Norway – this means that she would fill out the majority of the offered answers to the question. However, looking at the graph we can see that a large group admits that they have no relation to Norway, which then becomes clear from having these options to choose from. Having no relation means that they perhaps only know some minor details about Norway (see results and analysis of question 16 below). The largest group seen in table 1 is the one concerning relations to Norway is respondents having friends or family in Norway. The high number of respondents knowing someone in Norway could be contingent on the respondents being YFU members, perhaps knowing follow YFU members from Norway from have participating in training sessions together, or have been in Norway themselves.

These two categories, the largest one of having friends/family in Norway, and those having no relation to Norway, will illustrate examples where relations are compared and contrasted in relation to other variables in the cross tabulations below.

Table 1 also shows how many respondents have a relation of some kind to Norway, which is interesting to analyse in relation to for example interest in and knowledge about the event (discussed below). This question discovered the number of respondents who themselves stated that they had no relation to Norway, which is an important factor in analysing the results where they are not only supposing that certain respondents had no relation to Norway, but actually having them conclude so themselves.
Table 2, Continent lived in 2011

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Continent</th>
<th>Europe</th>
<th>Asia</th>
<th>Australia</th>
<th>North America</th>
<th>South America</th>
<th>Africa</th>
<th>Antarctica</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of respondents</td>
<td>255</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>318</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2 gives a clear overview of the number of respondents who lived in the six continents (no respondents from Antarctica were collected) during the year in which the Norwegian attacks occurred, 2011. The vast majority of the respondents lived in Europe; however, the European units of the study are highly over representative, and accounts for 80.2% of the total sample. The low number of representatives in the whole study, yet more prominent in the samples from Asia, Australia, North- and South America and Africa, are preventing the results from being valid and generalizable. The collected information from the survey investigation will anyhow be representing the different continents and it is again important to remember that the results will only be based on the gathered information from this survey.

The reason why the majority of the respondents were European may depend on how the majority of YFU countries are European (yfu.org). 29 European countries are members of YFU compared to North America’s 3 (including Mexico, and 5 regions in USA, (see appendix 3)), South America’s 8, Asia’s 13, Africa’s 3 and Oceania’s 2. YFU has no head offices in Antarctica, explaining the lack of respondents from that continent.

Looking at the table above in comparison to number of contacted YFU countries, the numbers do appear logical seen to the number of respondents from each continent to some extent. However, only 8 Asians responded despite their 13 YFU countries and only 8 from the 8 South American ones. This could be related to Prakke’s model of news value where the event in Norway did not suit any of the axis in relation to Asia: The event took place far away, in a country with another culture and it happened a long time ago.

Using SPSS in the search for possible connections between variables of the study, we will now look into a possible correlation between respondents from different continents and their relations to Norway.
In Table 3, the respondents’ lack of relation to Norway is compared to the results of where they lived in 2011 with the aim to investigate if the respondents’ physical distance to Norway affected their relations to the country and to the event per se.

In the table above, the category of No relation to Norway is compared to “Some kind of relation to Norway”, which is a pooled group for the remaining relations to Norway, aiming to focus this correlation to the respondents with no relation to Norway. Table 3 shows how a total of 109 respondents stated that they have no relation to Norway, whereof 80 of these are European followed by 20 North Americans. From the collected information, it is shown that approximately one third of the Europeans had no relation to Norway together with half of the Asian, Australian, North American and African respondents. One third of the South American respondents had no relation to Norway. Cramer’s V shows 0.148: a very weak correlation. Due to the small sample of units in this study, we will also examine the approximate significance, p. P = 0.223, which shows that the connection is not significant either, using the significance level of 5 %.

Comparing this to the most common relation to Norway, the option of having friends/family in the country (see appendix 8 for cross-tabulation), we see how 113 of the 140 respondents knowing someone in Norway are European; which is approximately only a little less than half of the European sample. The Cramer’s V of this category shows a weak correlation with 0.062; this correlation is also stated to be nil. Through this, we note how the correlation could be random and that the sample units have no realistic connection to the population (utoronto.ca).
No valid conclusions can therefore be drawn from these results because of the uneven division of responses together with the small sample of units. Looking at Cramer’s $V$, the relationship is very weak and therefore not generally acceptable (utoronto.org). Relying only on the numbers from the collected data result, it is shown that it does not matter where the respondents lived in 2011 in order for them to have a relation to Norway. The overall result shows that relations to a country do not necessarily have to depend on where in the world one is located. The fact that many respondents did have a relation of some kind to Norway can be analysed in relation to Stier’s work in cultural studies (2009), where he states that we live in a more globalized and culturally heterogenic society and also that people, at least in the richer countries of the world, are travelling more often and further away (2009: 147). They are, continues Stier, more likely to study and work abroad and they simply live in a multicultural everyday reality to a larger extent than our ancestors. This means that relationships does not have to rely on where the person lives to the same extent as it did in 1969 when Prakke formed his model, but how they instead can be formed both by physical travels and face-to-face meeting with new friends on location or to make new relations online (Stier, 2009: 212).

**Table 3.1, Continent affecting interest rate**

In the questionnaire, the respondents filled out how interesting they found the event based on a Likert scale, in which they could grade the event from a 1 (the lowest interest rate) to a 10 (the highest interest rate). With the continent as the independent variable it is also interesting to explore whether the respondents’ location at the time of the event affected the respondents’ interest rate of the event is correlated to where they lived in 2011. The cross tabulation 3.1 is found in appendix 8 due to its size and the result shows how the majority of the 255 Europeans rated the event with a 10 (98 respondents), followed by a 9 (47 respondents), 8 (37 respondents) and 5 (31 respondents). In Asia, four of eight rated it a 10, two rated it a 5, one a 6 and the last one a 4.

The 5 is in this study the number in the middle of the possible options. A technique to avoid those “average” responses and see whether the respondent leans towards each or the other direction is not to give the respondents the opportunity to choose an average answer (Østbye et al., 2003). In this study however, the 5, middle number, could be interpreted as an uncertainty in the respondents or simply an indifference. Among the Asian respondents, we see how one graded it a 4 and another a 6, indicating that they were averagely interested yet one a little less and the other a little more.
Continuing to the four Australians, none of them found it interesting enough to rate it a 10: one gave it a 9 and one a 8, where the two others rated it a 1. The Australian respondents’ answers confirm Prakke’s axis of physical distance to a news event to some extent, yet of course the small sample is invalid. Among the second largest group, the 40 North Americans, 16 respondents rated it a 10 followed by 7 (8 respondents). Both 5 and 9 were chosen by 4 respondents each and from the 8 South Americans, the majority of 3 graded it a 10. From 3 Africans, 1 rated the event a 10, 1 a 9 and the last one a 7, showing a lot of interest in the news despite the continent’s location far away from Norway.

Finding that Prakke’s model only works to some extent in explaining the results found when analysing the impact of the continent in which the respondents lived in 2011, we need to look at other causations for the results.

Referring back to Stier’s work on cultural studies, we notice how the two largest units of Europeans and North Americans have similar cultures to Norway at large in comparison to Africa and Asia, and therefore perhaps find events happening in Norway more interesting. Also Galtung and Ruge’s claim that identification is a factor behind interest in news is relevant, considering North Americans being interested may depend on their previous experience of the terrorist attacks in 2001, perhaps causing a suspicion toward possible terrorist organizations and also feeling with the victims, where a tragedy also happened to them. The Europeans’ large interest in the event may depend on the physical closeness and similar culture to Norway but here, also the feeling of togetherness through the EU may be a reason – look at the results and analysis of question 16 in order to understand how membership in EU is brought up despite the fact that Norway is not a member of the European Union. The analysis of the interest rate brings us back to the relations to Norway, and we will now investigate if the respondents’ relation to Norway in any way affected whether they heard about the news event in the first place.
Table 4, Relations to Norway affecting awareness of the attacks

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents heard of the attacks</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>% within Relation to Norway</th>
<th>No Relation to Norway</th>
<th>Some kind of relation to Norway</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No relation to Norway</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>92,5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>94</td>
<td>86,2%</td>
<td>200</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8,3%</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
<td>5,0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I do not remember</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5,5%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td>2,5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Total                           | 109 | 100,0%| 209                         | 318                   |                               | 100,0%

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nominal by Nominal</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Approx. Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Phi</td>
<td>.177</td>
<td>.007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cramer's V</td>
<td>.177</td>
<td>.007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N of Valid Cases</td>
<td>318</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The aim of table 4 is to see whether the respondents’ relationship to Norway is a factor behind the respondent’s awareness of the attack’s occurrence by stating that they have heard of the attacks. The hypothesis is that the respondents who have close relationships to Norway would have heard of the event to a higher extent than the respondents who have no relation to Norway. The respondents who have no relation may therefore have forgotten seeing for example an article in the newspaper and just browsed on in the paper.

The table shows how 94 of the 109 respondents who did not have a relation still had heard about the attacks, which is a big number and a percentage of 86,2 %. 9 had not heard of it and 6 did not remember. From the respondents who in any way had a relation to Norway, 200 of the 209 had heard of it (95,7 %) whilst 7 had not and 2 had forgotten. Cramer’s V indicates that the correlation is minimally acceptable and the relation weak, and p=0,007; a strong connection to the population and the result is so significant. Let us now look at the respondents who had friends or family in Norway, as it being the most common relation to Norway in this study.

The results of the relation of having friends/family in Norway (found in appendix 8) show that from the 140 respondents who did have a relation to Norway through having friends/family in the country, 131 had heard of the attacks, which is 93,6 %. Only 7 of those having friends/family in Norway had not heard of it and 2 did not remember. We also see that from the total of 294 respondents who did hear of the event, this category of having friends/family in Norway contributed with 131 of these respondents (44,5 %). This would
look like a reasonably strong correlation, yet Cramer’s V shows instead the figure of 0.062, which is a very week and not generally acceptable relation between the variables. \( p = 0.546 \), being an irrelevant connection to the population, and so an insignificant result.

Relationships do consequently not seem to affect whether the respondents heard of the event or not according to Cramer’s V. The fact that not only those with a relation had heard of the event and did remember it now, almost three years after the attacks, may depend on the sensationalism of the event, explained by Hvitfeldt (1989/2004). Sensational news attracts our attention and includes often something surprising, something we did not expect. This will be discussed further in question 10 below.

Now that the respondents’ relationships are shown to have affected their awareness of the event only to some extent, we will look into how the interest rate is affected by the relations to Norway.

**Table 5, Relation affecting interest**

In table 5, again only the category of No relation to Norway is compared to “Some kind of relation to Norway”, the pool of the other categories, again to mainly focus on the respondents with no relation to Norway. However, due to its size, it is presented in appendix 8. In the analysis of table 5, we find that 30 from the 109 respondents with no relation to Norway (27.5%) rated the event a 10, the highest score, meaning that they found the event very interesting. This is followed by rate 9 (19.3%) and 8 (16.5%). Cramer’s V for the correlation between the variable between “Has/has not a relation to Norway” and “interest rate” is 0.247: a moderate and acceptable relation to the ones who have some kind of relation to the country. If we specify the “relation to Norway” by looking at the group of having friends/family in Norway (cross-tab found in appendix 8), it is found that from the 140 respondents in the category, 43.6 %, or 61 respondents, rated the event a 10 followed by 9 (17.1%), 8 (12.1%) and 5 (11.4 %). Cramer’s V for the variable “having/not having a relation to Norway” in relation to “Interest” is 0.209, a slightly lower yet also moderate and acceptable correlation to the ones who had no friends/family in Norway. \( p \) is low, \( p=0.022 \), indicating the connection to the population and so proves the result significant. There is thus a slight correlation between the respondents’ relations to Norway and their interest in the event.

Now that we have looked into how relationships to Norway affect the respondents’ awareness and interest, we will investigate whether respondents with a relation to Norway were interested enough to look up more information about the event.
Table 6, Relations affecting looking up more information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents looked up more info about the event</th>
<th>Relation to Norway</th>
<th>No relation to Norway</th>
<th>Some kind of relation to Norway</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>172</td>
<td>257</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% within Relation</td>
<td>78,0%</td>
<td>82,3%</td>
<td>80,8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% within Relation</td>
<td>22,0%</td>
<td>17,7%</td>
<td>19,2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>209</td>
<td>318</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% within Relation</td>
<td>100,0%</td>
<td>100,0%</td>
<td>100,0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nominal by Nominal</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Approx. Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Phi</td>
<td>-.052</td>
<td>.354</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cramer’s V</td>
<td>.052</td>
<td>.354</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N of Valid Cases</td>
<td>318</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6 explores how the respondents’ relation to Norway may affect whether they choose to look up more information about the event or not. Also here, No relation is compared to the other options. In the figure above, we see how 85 respondents from the 109 who had no relation to Norway did look up more information, which is 78%, compared to the 82,3% of the respondents who had some kind of relation to Norway who also looked up more information about the event. Cramer’s V shows 0,052 which is a very weak relation and from only looking at the data above, we see only a small difference between the two groups. $p = 0,354$ which shows a weak significant correlation between the variables.

The fact that not only respondents who had a relation to Norway found the news of the terrorist attacks interesting enough to rate it with high numbers and also look up more information about the event shows that the event must have included other news valuable factors in order to attract foreign audiences. Looking at Hvitfeldt’s developed study on factors behind news value (1989:64), we can relate his found factors of an event to reach a high news value in relation to the Norwegian attacks 2011. Hvitfeldt states that the event should 1) Concern politics and economics, as well as crimes and accidents. The attacks in Norway were based on political right wing extremism, yet that was not what was first noted about the happening. What the news concerned was a terrible crime, affecting the ideal victims of innocent children. 2) Be important or relevant. This is a very subjective statement in which the hypothesis of the relations as underlying factors for interest in, and interpretation of, news is shown.
Hvitfeldt continues with 3), Concern different sorts of deviances – referred to as Sensationalism, which will be discussed further later on. The act of dressing as a policeman and shooting innocent children in an island is not a normal behaviour, hence a source of news value. In Hvitfeldt’s statements of factors mattering in news value, number 4 agrees with Prakke in that the event should occur in a short distance in different dimensions to the spread of the media channel. This is the factor that this study challenges, due to the new globalized world mainly explained by Stier (2009).

Continuing Hvitfeldt’s list of factors behind news value, he states that the event should 5) Agree with the values of the journalists’ and audiences’ values, that will be analysed and discussed in depth in the analyses of the open questions below, and 6) Concern different kinds of elites. This is not clear in this case, where neither Breivik nor the victims were elites; however, the prime minister’s office was destroyed due to the bomb in Oslo, yet this is not something that the audiences emphasises in their responses and so have perhaps not paid much attention to. Hvitfeldt continues with 7) The event is understandable for the different medias audiences. As discussed in the theoretical framework chapter, the event taking place in Norway on July 22nd, 2011 was following the dramatic triangle including clear roles of the Victim, the Offender and the Protector. The audiences found it easy to clarify who was the offender and who were the innocent victims. Breivik became the Offender as soon as it was known that he was captured and guilty, and so the event agrees to Hvitfeldt’s factor. The last factor of Hvitfeldt’s research on News value, 8), explains how an event concerning individuals often reach high news value. Since Breivik stood as a lone accused and the continuous court proceedings on him also got a lot of media attention, the event therefore fits into this factor. Knowing this, we see how the event is interesting to several audiences and we will continue to the aspect of gender divisions.

Table 7, Gender divisions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Females</th>
<th>Males</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of respondents</td>
<td>234</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>318</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In table 7, the gender divisions among the respondents are presented. 234 of the 318 respondents are female whilst only 82 are male, and 2 responded with the option “Other”. Previous research on gender differences in response to paper- and web surveys also point at the fact that regardless of mode contact, women tend to display higher rates of response than men (Sax et al., Underwood et al., 2000).
Höijer (2004) argues that women are fostered to show more feelings and how women tend to focus on care than men (2004: 256), which perhaps lay behind the initial interest, or curiosity, in taking part of the shared questionnaire. Knowing that children are the ideal victims, and also the most affected in the Norwegian terrorist attacks, perhaps this study also primarily spoke more to women than to men, and maybe affected women to a larger extent as well (2004). Having these emotions toward the news event might have lead to a greater interest in responding to the questionnaire where women perhaps felt more affected by the event and wanted to share their memories and interpretations. Yet, since this study was originally conducted for YFU members only, the gender divisions of the original sample population are stated below.

### Table 7.1, Gender divisions of YFU members

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Females</th>
<th>Males</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>YFU member</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>251</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not a YFU member</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>234</strong></td>
<td><strong>82</strong></td>
<td><strong>2</strong></td>
<td><strong>318</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In table 7.1, we see how females are the most common gender also in the YFU sample. 186 of the 251 YFU respondents are female whilst the majority of non-members also dominate the result where 48 of 67 non-members are female. In this study however, the whole gender sample will be analysed and no specific attention will be paid to YFU members of different genders, except from the explicit YFU related cross tabulations below. Gender affecting relations and attitudes to Norway will be examined further in the analyses of the open questions below.

### Table 8, Gender affecting interest

The full table 8 is found in appendix due to its size. Here we once again see how women are representing 73,6 % of the respondents. However, we see that the majority of both men and women (36 and 85 respondents) considered the happening interesting enough to rate it with a 10. This number represents a little less than one third of the female respondents and a little less than half of the males. As the second most common interest rate, the women chose a 9 (47 of 234 respondents) while the males skipped the 9 and chose the 8 (12 of 82) followed by 5 (11 of 82). The women did instead continue from 9 to rate an 8 as the thirdly most common grade (28 of 234), followed by 5 (26). Seen to the two respondents choosing the option “other” for gender, one rated it a 10 and the other a 7. Cramer’s V is 0,177, which is a weak
and minimally acceptable relationship, and \( p = 0.342 \), indicating the same in the connection to
the population. Overall, this result confirms Höijer’s statement to some extent seen to only the
results of the table, where the majority of females rated the event with higher numbers than
the males did. No real correlation between gender and its causation of interest or relation to
Norway is found.

**Table 9, Age divisions**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Younger than 20</th>
<th>21-30</th>
<th>31-40</th>
<th>41-50</th>
<th>51-60</th>
<th>Older than 60</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of respondents</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>318</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 9 illustrates the basic foundations of the respondents through the factor of the age. The
results of table 9 show how the majority of the respondents are younger than 20 years old
(123 respondents) while the second largest age group is 21-30 years old (120). Only 5 of the
318 respondents were older than 60 years old. The uneven division of age groups in the study
do in this case perhaps depend on how a great number of active YFU members are younger
than 30 years old, possibly because a lot of volunteer activities and camps take place before,
during and after the exchange years, and on these, the majority of the active volunteers
participating and leading are younger than 30 years old (Phone interview with Kattis Åström,
2014-04-30). However, Åström underlines that this statement is valid to European volunteers
only; in the USA, the majority of the active volunteers are older than 40.

According to Åström, the European volunteers who are older than 30 often act
as host families instead, and are perhaps less likely to participate in e.g. the Facebook groups
through which this questionnaire was spread. A cross tabulation on how Continent lived in
2011 affects the age division is found in the appendix, showing that although Åström means
that the North American volunteers are older, the ones from the continent who are younger
than 20 (13 respondents) and 21-30 (14 respondents) together proves her statement wrong
seen to this study only, where only 2 North American respondents are 41-50 years old, 4 are
51-60 and 2 are older than 60, compared to Europe’s respondents, in which 12 are 41-50, 2
51-60 and 1 older than 60. We will now look at the fundamental question of whether age may
correlate to the respondents’ relation to Norway.
Table 10, Age correlating to relation to Norway

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Relation to Norway</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>% within Age</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No relation to Norway</td>
<td>Younger than 20 years old</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>39,0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>21-30 years old</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>33,3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>31-40 years old</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>14,9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>41-50 years old</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>53,3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>51-60 years old</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>50,0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Older than 60 years old</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>40,0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>109</td>
<td>34,3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some kind of relation to Norway</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>61,0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>21-30 years old</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>66,7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>31-40 years old</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>85,1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>41-50 years old</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>46,7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>51-60 years old</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>50,0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Older than 60 years old</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>60,0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>209</td>
<td>65,7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Approx. Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nominal by Nominal Phi</td>
<td>.198</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cramer’s V</td>
<td>.198</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N of Valid Cases</td>
<td>318</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 10 shows respondents from different age groups’ relations to No relation to Norway and the pooled rest. The table shows that the majority of the three youngest age groups have some kind of relation to Norway, yet the 15 respondents between 41-50 have a slightly higher percentage of No relation to Norway (53,3 %) and the 51-60 year olds have a 50 % relation to Norway. Cramer’s V shows a weak relation between the variables and so does the approximate significance, meaning that the age divisions have little to do with the respondents’ relations to Norway.

Höijer’s (2004) claim that young people often are occupied by their own development and identity formation, leads maybe in this process to a difficulty for them to engage in the suffering of distant others. Höijer means that elderly people are not symbolically threatened in their own identities by suffering others in the world, and they have a deeper knowledge of the world and greater life experience, on the contrary to younger (2004: 520). Based on this argument, we will take a look at the interest rate of the different age groups.

Table 11, Age affecting interest

Again, the 12th question of the questionnaire is analysed in order to map the respondents’ interest rate in the event, in the attempt to find what causes the interest. In table 11 (found in appendix 8 due to its size), age is the independent variable causing the interest in the Norwegian terrorist attacks, and we see how the vast majority of 38,4 % of all age groups found the event interesting enough to rate it a 10. Seen to age division, the youngest category,
under 20 years old, the ratings were fairly spread out, yet 10 was the most popular choice with 39 of 123 respondents, followed by 9 (20) and 8 (19). The second largest group of 21-30 year olds were even more interested where 40 %, or 48 out of 120 respondents, rated it a 10 with a gap down to the second most common rating, 9 (25 respondents, or 20,8%). From the 47 31-40 year olds, 48,9%, 23 respondents, gave it a 10 followed by number 9 and 5 with 7 respondents, or 14,9 %. In the “older” categories, almost every other respondent between 41-50 rated it a 10 and 50% of the 8 respondents between 51-60 years old rated it with the highest option, a 10.

Now, the only group which majority did not find the event as interesting were the 5 respondents older than 60 years old. The little majority of 2 respondents rated instead the event as a 1, the lowest score, whilst 1 gave it a 10, 1 a 9 and 1 a 7.

As a brief conclusion of table 11, we see that due to the uneven sample, a small relation between age and interest is displayed and Cramer’s V confirms an acceptable correlation with a moderate relationship whilst \( p= 0.000 \), which is significant where we find that different age groups do find news differently interesting. The results, from this table only, contradict Höijer’s statement of young audiences being less interested in the news, which indicates that other factors must play a larger role than age (2004).

The next question of asking the respondents how many hours they spent taking part of news on a daily basis was asked in order to map whether the time spent on news could affect the interest in the Norwegian attacks with the hypothesis that the more a respondent takes part of news, the more she or he is interested in the world around her or him. We will start by looking at the division of daily news intake and then see how it affects the respondents when compared to other variables.

**Table 12, Daily intake of news**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hours/day</th>
<th>Less than 1</th>
<th>1-2</th>
<th>2-3</th>
<th>3-4</th>
<th>5-6</th>
<th>More than 6</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of respondents</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>318</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Looking at the amount of daily actively intake of news in table 12, 129 of the respondents use less than 1 hour per day and 129 1-2 hours, which together makes the majority of the sample. The gap between 1-2 hours and 2-3 or more is large with 45 respondents spending 2-3 hours, 11 spending 3-4 hours and 3 5-6 hours. Only one respondent take part of news for more than six hours per day. The table shows that the most common time to spend taking part of news
every day is from less than an hour up to two hours, which will be fulfilled by only perhaps watching the late night news before going to bed.

However, it can be hard to define “active” intake of daily news where articles are circulating on Facebook feeds, on other social medias and constantly on news sites. The one respondent answering that he spent more than 6 hours per day taking part of news actively may perhaps have been working with news, hence spending that much time with it. Yet presumably, there could be some kind of correlation between the young age of the respondents and the few hours taking part of news daily where perhaps older respondents are more interested in what happens around them rather than inside of them, as Höijer argues compared to the younger audiences who are busy figuring out themselves (Höijer, 2004).

Table 12.1, Age affecting daily intake of news.
In appendix 8, a cross tabulation of how the age affects the respondents’ daily intake of news. The results show a quite weak correlation of 0,181 in Cramer’s V and p=0,001, indicating a significant connection to the population. Yet we see how the youngest category of respondents made up 49 % of the respondents taking part of news less than 1 hour per day. The 21-30 year olds subjugated the category of 1-2 hours daily with a percentage of 38 % of the results, and the same group also made up 46,9 % of the respondents taking part of news 2-3 hours/day.

Looking at the “older” respondents, 18 of the 47 respondents between 31-40 years old chose less than one hour and 18 1-2 hours. The only respondent taking part of news more than 6 hours daily was 41-50 years old and 50% of the respondents between 51-60 years old chose 1-2 hours/day. 3 of the 5 respondents who are older than 60 years old take part of news 1-2 hours/day whilst the other two chose 2-3 hours.
This result does confirm Höijer’s findings of young people being less interested in what went on around them, compared to older, but again, it is important to remember the unambiguity of the variable due to the difficulty to define the active intake of news on a daily basis.

However, when taking part of news several hours every day, the chance of hearing about foreign events are assumingly increasing the more time spent on news sites and so the hypothesis of the correlation between intake of news and hearing about the Norwegian news would be that the more time spent on daily news, the higher the chance that the respondent had heard of the event.
Table 13 demonstrates how the role of daily intake of news affects whether the respondents had heard of the Norwegian terrorist attacks or not in the first place. The table shows how 294 of the 318 respondents had heard of the event whilst 16 did not and 8 did not remember. From these 294 who heard of it, the majority of 121 respondents taking part of news 1-2 hours every day, closely followed by the 116 respondents who take part of news less than 1 hour per day. From less than one hour, the gap is big to the 15, 6%, or 46 respondents who spend 2-3 hours per day taking part of news and the only respondent taking part of news more than 6 hours every day also heard of the event.

Looking at the 16 respondents who did not hear of the event, 62, 5% take part of news less than 1 hour/day and 5 of them, 31, 3% 1-2 hours/day. Only one respondent who takes part of news 2-3 hours every day can not recall hearing about the event and none of the respondents who spend more than those 3 hours every day taking part of news do not remember it.

From the 8 respondents who do not remember, 3 take part of news less than one hour/day, 3 1-2 hours and 2 2-3 hours. The significance rate is minimally acceptable and the relationship is weak due to Cramer’s V; and also the numbers are vague in the tables. p=0.913, indicating an insignificant connection between the sample units and the population.

The first impression of the result is that the hypothesis seems correct where the majority of the ones who heard of the event at least spent a few hours taking part of news daily whilst the majority of the ones who did not hear of it spent less than an hour per day doing so, together with the ones who did not remember. However, Cramer’s V shows a very week and not generally acceptable relationship between the variables, yet seen only to the
results of this study, at least a pattern can be detected.

So it seems like daily intake of news does not affect the respondents’ awareness of the Norwegian news but in order to see if they were interested in it, we will look at the intake of news in relation to interest rate.

**Table 13.1, Intake of news affecting interest rate**
The cross tabulation is found in appendix 8 (13.1) and here, we see that the majority of the respondents rating the event with a 10 take part of news 1-2 hours every day (49, 2%), followed by less than 1 hour (32, 0%). Looking at the ones rating the event with the lowest score of 1, 2 of the 4 respondents take part of news less than 1 hour/day. The respondent who spends more than 6 hours/day taking part of new rated the event an 8. Also here, Cramer’s V shows a weak correlation but the approximate significance is high, p=0,152, showing that the correlation between the sample units and the population is significant. Having stated that the original sample of YFU members was loosened up where the link spread outside the organization, the results has so far been based on the whole collected sample units. Yet as a final glance of the results and analysis chapter, we will take a quick look at the YFU respondents’ relations to Norway and their interest in the event to see whether the original sample would have lead to significant correlations and connections.

**Table 14, YFU membership affecting relation**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Relation to Norway</th>
<th>YFU member</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No relation to Norway</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within YFU member</td>
<td>33,9%</td>
<td>35,8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some kind of relation to Norway</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within YFU member</td>
<td>66,1%</td>
<td>64,2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>251</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within YFU member</td>
<td>100,0%</td>
<td>100,0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Symmetric Measures**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nominal by Nominal</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Approx. Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Phi</td>
<td>-.017</td>
<td>.764</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cramer’s V</td>
<td>.017</td>
<td>.764</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N of Valid Cases</td>
<td>318</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 14 shows whether the YFU members had a relation to Norway or not. The other relation categories are found in appendix 8 (table 14.1). In the table above, we see how 33,9% of the YFU members did not have a relation to Norway compared to the 35,8 % who was not a member of YFU and had no relation. Cramer’s V shows a weak correlation and p= 0,764,
indicates that it is not a connection between these sample units and the full population. The same weak significance is seen in the category of YFU members who lived in the country (p= 0.189), who have visited Norway (p=0.672), who have a relation to Norway through knowing friends/family in the country (p= 0.889), who have friends/family close (p= 0.917) and Other (p= 0.730). At large, being a YFU member does not have a connection to the respondent’s relation to Norway in connection to the population. Continuing the examination of the membership’s affect, we will look at how the membership in YFU affects whether the respondents looked up more information about the attacks.

Table 14.1, YFU membership affecting looking up more information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents looked up more info about the event</th>
<th>YFU member</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within YFU member</td>
<td>80,1%</td>
<td>83,6%</td>
<td></td>
<td>80,8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Count</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>257</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within YFU member</td>
<td>19,9%</td>
<td>16,4%</td>
<td></td>
<td>19,2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Count</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>61</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>251</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>318</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Approx. Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nominal by Nominal Phi</td>
<td>-0.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cramer’s V</td>
<td>0.036</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N of Valid Cases</td>
<td>318</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 14.1 shows that the majority of both groups did look up more information about the happening: 201 out of the 251 YFU members and 57 out of the 69 non-members. From the 257 respondents who did look up more information about the event, 78 % were YFU members. However, from the 61 respondents who did not look up more information, 82 % were YFU members. Cramer’s V shows a figure of 0, 036 – a very week and not generally acceptable correlation and p shows a fairly low significant connection between the units and the population.

Table 14.1.2, YFU membership affecting interest

Table 14.1.2, YFU membership affecting interest

In appendix 8, table 14.1.2, the correlation between YFU members and interest scale is therefore tested, showing a value of 0,174 in Cramer’s V, being a minimally acceptable correlation, and p= 0,380, indicating on a significant connection between the units and the population. The tables show that being a YFU member or not does not matter in the aspect of whether the respondents looked up more information or not, neither their interest rate in the event. This can be explained once again by how all respondents found the event interesting
and looked up more information about it, independently of whether they belonged to YFU or not. The finding of the small difference between YFU members and non-YFU members is positive where the result then can be discussed in relation to a larger group of YFU members (the original population), which would not be the case if YFU members differed from the other group, where the result would be invalid in itself.

As a conclusion of 5.1, few statistically significant correlations between the variables are found, which may depend on the uneven divisions of gender, age and nationalities. Below, the three open questions are analysed based on a coding scheme. The division of categories are found in appendix 5, 6 and 7.

5.2 Analysis question 10
“*What did you hear about the event?*”

10.1, Respondents who did not remember
The purpose of the question is to see how many of the respondents who stated that they did not remember that the event took place, and also examine their relation to Norway.

In group 10.1, we find the 24 respondents who stated that they do not remember or know what they heard about the terrorist attacks in Norway 2011. Those are spread out over the world and include among others the only representatives from Indonesia, China, Mongolia and Paraguay; countries located far away from Norway. This does at first sight seem to confirm Prakke’s model of news value to a large extent, stating that audiences who are located far away from the event find it less interesting, hence a lower news value (Prakke, 1969). However, there are a few exceptions.

The fact that these respondents did not remember, know or wanted to share what they heard about the event show either unawareness of what happened, perhaps due to little media attention in their countries (this will be discussed further in 16.1). It could also depend on incomprehension of what happened in Norway 2011 do to the inability to relate to, or identify with, it, or it could just depend on lack of interest in Norway or foreign events at large.

Looking at the respondents’ relation to Norway, we see that 19 of the 24 respondents had no relation to Norway whatsoever, independently on what continent or country they lived in. Further, we can see how all but three respondents are younger than 30 years old, which could be put in relation to Höijer’s statement how younger people often show less compassion to events and also are more “blasé” where they are used to see unscrupulous things through the media to a larger extent (2004: 519). Of course, another
option is of course that the vast majority of the total sample units are younger than 30 years old. The Hungarian female, respondent number 96, is interesting to analyse where she states how she knows Norway through Norwegian YFU volunteers. This puts her in relation to Norway through YFU, which confirms the explanation of how the YFU volunteers have an interest in the world and get to know nationalities through the organization, as stated on YFU’s webpage (yfu.org).

The surprise of the results from 10.1 is a Swedish male, younger than 20 years old, who answered that he had not heard about the event. He takes part of news less than 1 hour per day but still, compared to the other Swedish respondents in other categories, we see that the media coverage in Sweden was extensive at the time and it is surprising to see that he has not noticed that something happened in his neighbour country. However, noting the respondent’s age where he is “younger than 20” may be a possible explanation to his unawareness of the event. Perhaps he is 13 years old now, being about 10 when the terrorist attacks happened? We can also see how this male states that he has no relation to Norway – not even friends living close to Norway even though he himself lives in Sweden. Could it be that he misinterpreted the question?

Except from this Swedish male, the result of question 10.1 confirms Prakke’s findings on how countries located far away from the event are less interested, and also Höijer’s findings that younger people show less interest in the event. However, looking back at the analyses in the previous chapter, we see how table 3 contradicts Prakke’s model of news value where respondents living in different continents 2011 did not show significant differences in relation to Norway, and the results also showed that the results had a connection to the population despite its small sample. This is also a limiting factor in the analysis of the open questions at large, where for example only 24 respondents in 10.1 are not giving a valid image of neither the sample units nor the population.

10.2, Respondents showing a great interest in the event

10.2 contains the 28 respondents who instead showed a lot of interest in the event, for example by stating many facts or describing how they actively took part of the news that day. The hypothesis of the question is to see whether the respondents’ relations to Norway affect their interest in, and memory of, the event.

In the results of 10.2, the statement of the previous question that confirmed Prakke’s study is immediately contradicted where the respondents chosen into the second category showed a great interest in the event and also are widely spread out over the world. On the contrary to the respondents whom had no awareness of the event presented above,
only 5 of the ones in 10.2 have no relation to Norway. The age groups also differ in this category where 8 respondents are older than 30 years old, and the relations to Norway differ from living in Norway to have hosted a Norwegian exchange student.

The theme of this question is that the respondents show a great interest in the event and this is defined as showing a great knowledge of what happened, for example stating that Breivik detonated a bomb at the government building before going to Utøya and stating his political beliefs that caused the attacks. Other factors seen in this category were details such as stating the political interest of the participants of the youth camp or explaining what they remember about the children trying to escape. Respondents who clarified from where they got the information and explaining how the news channels were tuned in all day are also categorized here. The result of this group show a deep awareness of the event and detailed memories from it; indicating that the event really caught their attention since they remember specifics about the reports now, almost three years after the event happened.

However, it must be taken into consideration that a factor behind their knowledge may be extensive media reporting not only about the event per se, but also perhaps from the trial. Books have been published about Breivik and many interested people have read his manifest all over the world, hence their memories may have been refreshed every now and then. However, seeing that many of the respondents’ nationalities are also visible in the other categories, this is not a limitation but instead shows how these individuals paid attention to the information.

10. 3, **Respondents describing their actions when the event took place**

In the results of question 10.3, we see how 14 respondents are grouped together in the category of describing or remembering what they did when they first found out about the attacks in Norway. These responses show the respondents’ memories of the event on a personal level, theoretically referred to as the Flashbulb memory; a special kind of episodic memory in which we can give vivid and detailed recollections of what we were doing when we first heard about some major public event (Brown and Kulik, 1977, in Gross 2005: 291). This is common in sensational events and also in news received as surprising. The respondents in this group mainly remembered what they were doing physically when they first found out something had happened in Norway: laying sick in her bed, returning home from a trip to Oslo, watching TV or being on vacation in Chile. One respondent remembers first hearing about the attacks from a friend asking him if his Norwegian friend knew

6 http://content.time.com/time/world/article/0,8599,2084901,00.html
anything – this asking friend might have wanted to get a relation to Norway himself.

The chosen respondents in this category chose to share their first memory from the event, on the contrary to for example the respondents in 10.2, focusing on what went on in Norway to a larger extent. Noticing how 7 of the 14 respondents are younger than 20 years old may again be a result of what Höijer (2004) explains where younger people often chose to focus on themselves rather than the world around them.

No countries in the eastern part of the world are describing what they heard of the event from a flashbulb memory perspective. This may be where the event was not as sensational for them as for the respondents in the western world. Earlier, we found how interpersonal relationships in western cultures also tend to be individualistic, voluntary and temporary, while those in non-western cultures are more collectivist, involuntary and permanent (Moghaddam et al., 1993, in Gross, 2005:470); and the results of 10.3 may prove this finding valid to this study as well.

10.4, Respondents putting the event in relation to themselves

10.4 focus on the self-centred audience, as explained mainly by Stier (2009). The aim of this question was to see to what extent respondents tried to reach relations to the event by using themselves as the source. There are seven respondents in this category, and the common theme for this group is that they all expressed a connection to the terrorist attacks. One respondent expressed how she was scared when she heard the news and a woman was terrified; but more accurate to the self-centred aspect is a Swedish female who wrote that she was not sure of whether Sweden should be scared or not. Since Norway is the neighbouring country to Sweden and has similar cultures, beliefs and values, perhaps she was scared that whomever was terrorising the Norwegians might do the same to the Swedes. Two respondents explained how their friends were Norwegians and one of them probably felt close to the event where he worked with Norwegians at the time, whilst the other respondent actually knew someone present at Utøya, hence he had a very close relation to the event. What those two respondents are expressing is a form of “we-ness”; being close to the affected group and as Piliavin et al (1981) stated, the closer the relationship to the person in need, the greater the initial arousal and costs for not helping, and the lower the costs for helping (in Gross, 2005: 520). Again, the western world-respondents dominated this category.

10.5, The respondent remembers something that did not happen

The category of respondents answering something that did not happen was gathered in order to see to what extent the reconstructive memory played a part in describing an event almost three years after it happened. As Bartlett (1932) found, interpretation plays a major role in the
remembering of stories and past events (in Gross 2005: 359) and Stier (2009) explained how people interpret, understand, sort, categorize and look for logical contexts and meanings in what they see and experience. What we do when facing a happening is therefore to make up stories to the “gaps” that we do not understand – we reconstruct the happening by trying to fit it into our existing understanding of the world.

22 respondents were collected in the category of remembering something that did not actually occur. As examples of this, we see how a terrorist group network called Lone Wolf is remembered, how Breivik attacked a party or that 11 people died. One respondent believed the victims were Muslims.

This category is difficult to analyse due to the language barriers that occur when both the researcher and the majority of the respondents do not have English as their mother tongue. Many of the responses in this group could therefore have several meanings; for example the festival could either be a reconstructive memory after having seen a lot of pictures of tents on Utøya, which were there since the youth labour party camped there – yet it could also be a language barrier trying to express the festival as people gathering to discuss – as the young people at Utøya did. In Höijer’s study about Global Compassion in the Kosovo war (2004), she found that pictures, or more precisely our interpretations of pictures, can make permanent impressions on our minds, and as a distant audience, we become bearers of inner pictures of human suffering (2004: 520).

One respondent wrote that it was a “Shooting at a lake”, which could be expressed where the respondent remembers seeing water in pictures or hearing about children swimming; yet an actual lake was not present in real life. Several respondents states that Breivik was mentally ill, something that was investigated in court7, but disclaimed. However, the memory might be a realistic solution in order to make the respondent make sense of the attacks – the perpetrator being insane would be a logical reason.

The fact that racism and Muslim people are brought up may be due to Breivik’s right wing extremism and the number of victims also vary from respondent to respondent. An interesting response is the one of respondent number 9, remembering that the offender shot several children from an elementary school. There was no school present in this event, nor were there elementary school-aged children. This might be a reconstructive memory or just a mix-up of other terrible events like this, for example the school shooting in Sandy Hook.

10.6, Respondents mentioning the nationality of the perpetrator

This category, 10.6, contains 9 respondents who remember the nationality of Anders Behring Breivik a little extra. Again, the issue of reconstructive memory might matter in the analysis of these chosen respondent’s answers in their assumptions that Islamist networks were responsible for the attacks. The first media updates about the event were examined in the pilot study, where it was found how speculations about those networks spread rapidly and that especially US media channels put emphasis on terrorism and drew parallels to Islamist terrorist networks.

Based on this and in memory of the terrorist attacks on the Twin Towers in New York City 2001, “blaming” terrorist networks subconsciously is perhaps a likely reconstructive memory to have (Sorgenfrei, 2012). This category also goes hand in hand with the aspect of sensationalism, explained by Hvitfeldt (1989/2004) and Galtung & Ruge (1973). Sensational news attracts our attention and often includes something surprising, something we did not expect. In this matter, a stereotype of Islamist networks behind terrorist attacks has etched into the international audience, and as Sorgenfrei wrote – also he suspected an Islamist network in Norway that day. Therefore, the fact that the perpetrator was “a white, native Norwegian” was surprising and so the news became “sensational”. Sensational news is also to be put in relation both to the earlier explained flashbulb memory due to the major event, but also to the reconstructive memory where we learn a new image of the world, different from the one we had before.

10.7, Other interesting answers

Category 10.7 contains 28 interesting responses due to either a summary of many respondents’ memories of the event, their inclusion of something special or something that contradicts other respondents’ answers.

A few respondents remembered how Breivik was dressed as a policeman. A total of 7 respondents mentions the police uniform that Breivik wore when going to Utøya and killing the victims. The fact that a police should help people and keep us safe is a probable cause for the respondents’ memory of it, where Breivik gathered the respondents of the labour party to update them on the situation in Oslo, as he stated, and then started shooting. The sensationalism of this may also be a triggering factor for a long lasting memory of the event.

---

9 http://www.aftonbladet.se/nyheter/article13364746.ab
Another common theme is the mentioning of Muslims, and mistakes by the police regarding transportation to Utøya\textsuperscript{10} are also remembered. Perhaps the respondents remember this as an upsetting factor where maybe children could have been saved if the police made it to the island quicker, and again, the police is the one to trust in situations as this one and not only was the perpetrator dressed as one – the real police were late.

One respondent remembers victims with influential parents. The researcher does however not know this, nor is information found on the Internet. This memory could be a reconstructive memory trying to explain why a perpetrator would attack children, who are the ideal victims (Höijer, 2004); and one explanation would be to make their influential parents suffer. Another possible explanation is that the respondent knew that politics was involved and therefore assumed that the children depended on their parents rather than being politically active themselves.

Respondent number 69 exemplifies the language barrier. She is a French woman, younger than 20 years old, who goes beyond the reconstructive memories when naming several news: “The volcano in island, confrontation in thailand between "red and yellow" about monarchie and democratie in 2008, war in syria, economic crisis, king in belgium.”. How is this a possible response to the question “What did you hear about the event?”? How could she have misinterpreted the question to the degree that she came up with this response? This must be due to a language barrier, yet the researcher has no clear idea of what the respondent may have thought.

What differed a few respondents’ answers were that some interpreted the question as the first thing they heard was asked for, while others just stated what they remembered, thinking back today. One respondent stated that they did not know who the killer was, which must be a referent to earlier news since the perpetrator’s name was known the latest one day after the event (found in the pilot study). Another respondent stated that the motive was unclear, yet Breivik’s political beliefs were displayed in the media fairly soon. We also notice how a respondent stated what had happened together with the total death toll, which took a number of days to reach.\textsuperscript{11}

A young Swedish female wrote that the victims were in her age and she was surprised of who the attacker was. This again indicated the sensationalism of the perpetrator being a native Norwegian, yet it also shows her identification to the victims through their age.

\textsuperscript{10} http://www.newsinenglish.no/2011/08/11/police-answer-terror-critics/
Respondent 77 simply wrote “kids” in what she remembers hearing from the event. The fact that the respondent is a woman, 41-50 years old, confirms Höijer’s theories about women being more compassionate about distant suffering (2004). The reason why those younger than 20 years old might show compassion to the victims may depend on their identification with the children whilst the “elderly” as such focus on families (Höijer, 2004) – maybe because they in their turn rather identify with the parents who lost a child in the attacks?

Another common theme along the responses is a summer camp. Summer camp of what was not stated as often, indicating that respondents perhaps only remembered children spending time on an island during the summer, assuming that they were on any camp. The political purpose of the camp was however mentioned less often. A Belgian male expressed his compassion toward the event by stating that it was “insane”. When it comes to compassion towards distant suffering and foreign news events, Höijer (2004) argues that women are more likely to express compassion than men are (2004: 526). She states that women focus on the humanitarian aspects of conflicts to a greater degree than men, and also make empathic interpretations, and this will be discussed further in the analysis of question 11.

According to Höijer, obvious social reasons for the gender differences are that women are fostered to show more feelings and mostly have the caring role in the family life (2004: 526). Höijer means that men as an audience must steel themselves in order to protect themselves against the myth of violence as a specific male characteristic, that is, against their fear of becoming a perpetrator of violence themselves. Could it in this way be that men are afraid to be able to identify with Breivik? Since forever back, people have been reserved and afraid of the unknown and to strangers, and those were early blamed for the bad things that happened and so seen as scapegoats (Stier 2009: 114). This may be a reason why men try to avoid identification with Breivik, the unblemished offender, and so keep him and the situation a stranger.

Yet on the contrary to males, Höijer continues, women are not threatened in their identities at all in the same way when confronted with documentary depictions of human suffering caused by some kind of violence (2004: 526). According to Höijer, women can therefore even be confirmed in their more positive self-conception, assured that violence is not part of feminine culture. Höijer also argues how the inner moral voice between women and men differ, giving different frames of references for interpreting a violent conflict. She refers to Gilligan (1982) in how women’s moral judgement focuses on care while men’s modal judgement focuses on justice.
A specific memory of respondent number 82 among many other respondents was how children were swimming, trying to escape, and Breivik kept shooting at them. This is of course a terrible memory, which also makes the news sensational. Respondent number 196 remembers Breivik’s “inability to understand what he did wrong”, almost showing compassion to the perpetrator, whilst 205 states that “He did not regret his actions” and it was stated that he “started to shoot for no reason”. Confirming how humans look for logic in an event (discussed in 10.5), respondent 28 remembered the first possible explanation to be a gas leak. Respondent 154 first remembers hearing about Utøya, then the bombs in Oslo, yet the events happened the other way around. This may be where she remembers what she found more interesting first and then knew that something also happened in Oslo and this may confirm Prakke’s axis of how time affects news value and how she valued the Utøya incident higher than the bombings in Oslo.

The fact that the Norwegians and royals came closer may be a memory of that all this terror lead to something slightly positive. Other respondents really confirm Galtung & Ruge’s findings of identification (1973) where two German respondents remember how a German tourist saved some of the victims on his boat. This was not noted in Scandinavia, yet must have been a source of high news value in Germany. The fact that a relative to Norway’s crown princess Mette Marit died in the shootings also seemed as a big news in Germany, showing that the event got much media attention in that country.

5.3, Analysis Question 11

“What image did you get of the event?”

Question 11 concerns attitudes and values towards the event and is mainly related to the question of respondents’ emotive memories of the event.

11.1, The respondent was surprised

In category 11.1, we find 45 respondents’ answers that express their shock, or unexpectedness of the terrorist attacks in Norway. We find respondents asking themselves how this could happen in Norway, how it felt unbelievable at first and that it was a horrible surprise.

According to Stier (2009: 129), it is not unusual that our new attitudes make us more aware of things that already fit into our existing attitudes, for example about Norway.

Respondents state how Norway is interpreted as a safe and peaceful country and so a terrorist attack was not expected and the news came as a shock. The unexpectedness of the perpetrator’s nationality is expressed also in question 11. The shock is also described as being caused by how children were the victims and how that made the event even more unbelievable. As found earlier, a child is the ideal victim independently of the audiences’ cultures or backgrounds. Finding that a native Norwegian man executed children in his own country in a secure country like Norway seemingly affected international audiences and the event per se was found sensational, as explained in the results of 10.6.

Some respondents also state that this was the proof of that terrorist attacks can happen everywhere in the world. Respondents from all nationalities were present in this category.

11.2, The respondent showed compassion

In 11.2, the 45 respondents who expressed compassion are categorized. As found earlier, Höijer (2004) states that women and elderly show more compassion toward distant suffering and foreign news events, and these responses depict the emotive feelings towards the event in 2011. In the results, we see how only six of these 45 are male. Nussbaum (2001) stated how compassion is “a painful emotion occasioned by the awareness of another person’s undeserved misfortune” (2001: 301), and the responses in this group include words such as horrible, terrible and tragedy. Respondents using solely the word Horrible or Terrible are yet grouped in the category Other responses, where they are not really expressing the respondent’s compassion in the same sense as the ones in this category and so will not be analysed further.

In the results of 11.2, we see how the few males express their compassion through words such as “Utterly inhuman” and “Devastating” whilst we in the female responses find more compassionate responses such as “All these people with no chance of survival”, “It must have been horror for all those people and families” or “Horrible, I was really shocked, upset and mad, and of course sad. I felt so sorry for all the kids and their family”, confirming Höijer’s findings. We see how the age differs among the female respondents but different age groups are represented in this category, both in females and males.

The western world is dominating the compassionate category. This result may depend on the similar cultures of the western world and how respondents from this “western culture” can identify and so feel for the victims to a larger extent. Stier (2009) states how there in different cultures are different foundations for compassion towards other people, and
they are built upon cultural aspects learned or received in our upbringings (2009: 77). The western world may have more similar foundations when it comes to the values, beliefs, norms, laws, habits, religious beliefs, political and economical systems, perception of time, image of the world, nature, life, death, honour and honesty, ethical and moral perceptions, work, authorities and justice that Stier explained. Norway is thus regarded as the “in-group” of the western world to a larger extent than to the eastern, or non-western, cultures and Stier continues by stating that if this “we-group” is relatively familiar, located close to us or if we have much knowledge or experiences about it, we place a higher value on it – solely because we can only value something we know (2009). However, we must not forget that respondents from the western culture also are the vast majority of the sample of units, and this may also affect the result.

Looking back at Piliavin et al. (1981) from the theoretical framework, we see how they state that we-ness connotes a sense of connectedness or the categorisation of another person as a member of one’s own group (Gross 2005: 520). The closer the relationship to the person in need, the greater the initial arousal and costs for not helping, and the lower the costs for helping. Regarding the relationships of those factors stated above, the western world might have a generally closer relationship to Norway and so identify more with the country, hence feeling more for them in tragedies as this in 2011.

11.3, The respondent remembers what she or he did at the time

11.3 categorizes the 8 respondents who choose to share what they did at the time they heard of the event rather than what image they got from it are grouped. Alike the similar category in 10.3, no eastern countries are sharing their actions at the time of the event and the same analysis can be made on 11.3, seen to the western individualistic world compared to the collectivist culture of the east, or non-western cultures. We find how the respondents here share flashbulb memories of how one was having lunch when he got the images; one flew to Oslo the day after and another swapped channels on the TV. However, the respondents also express the feelings they got at the time; a German female was shocked and a French had nightmares about the event.

11.4, The respondent put the event in relation to him-/herself

19 respondents are grouped in this category and alike 10.4, this question concerns the self-centred audience and we find how respondents from Germany, Sweden and Estonia were shocked it happened so close to their countries. One respondent first found out about the attacks from a survivor and she expresses her fear where she did not know if she knew any of the victims and another was scared where she had a lot of friends living in Norway.
Respondents expressing other feelings than shock are also part of this category where many wrote that they got scared and that the news was hard to understand. Three respondents compared the event to previous experiences of similar attacks; Erfurt in 2002, school terrorist attacks and “the attacks in European cities lately”. Those 19 respondents express their image of the event through their experience and emotions, and Stier (2009) states that no matter what perspective we choose to look at the world from, our reality will be coloured by the character of the relation between the world and ourselves.

11.5, Other answers, interesting to analyse

Category 11.5 contains 39 interesting responses again due to either a summary of many respondents’ images of the event, their inclusion of something special or something that contradicts other respondents’ answers.

The responses in this category differ a lot from each other. Some state their first image of the event being thinking that it was not so bad, that the media overrated the event or wondering how other people did not care about it and why it happened, whilst other expressed their fear of Breivik becoming a role model for others.

A common misinterpretation of the question’s wording is seen where many respondents interpreted “image of the event” being photographs, and so explain what they remember seeing. Østbye et al. (2003) stated that ambiguous questions might lead to misinterpretations, especially when used in international studies. Here it shows that one word can lead to different understandings. However, the result of Höijer’s study about pictures from the Kosovo war (2004), explained in 10.5 above, may show through this misinterpretation of the news and thereby confirm how her findings are applicable on this study. Pictures remembered were broken windows and people bleeding in the streets, young people in the water, a picture of “the island with Breivik looking over the rocks” or bodies lying on the outskirts of the island. Those powerful memories may also be possible to relate to sensationalism where they are shocking and unusual, and therefore easier to remember.

Also in the results of question 11, a few of the respondents stated that they did not remember their image of the event. From these, the majority were the same respondents as in category 10.1. However, it was also found how a handful respondents who did remember what they heard about the event then stated that they did not remember their image of it; and this may either depend on confusion about the unclear formulation of the question, or perhaps where the respondents simply lost interest in the questionnaire and wanted to finish up faster.

Many respondents also share their memories of thinking that, again, an Islamist network were behind the event. Initial confusion about the perpetrator is expressed together
with the perceived disclosure of surprise when Breivik was not a Muslim. An Austrian female thanked god the perpetrators were not international terrorists and a Swedish/Bolivian female expressed her disgust of “how the media assumed the killer was a non-white, constructed as the ‘terrorist’ when it was in fact a Christian white fascist neo-nazi”.

The political background was again noted among some respondents: Norway is indirectly being blamed for being racist, anti-immigration friendly and “very right-winged”. Again this might depend on the respondents’ attempts to make sense of the situation and the actual aim behind, or explanation of, the terrorist attacks.

Interesting to notice among these answers is that the Brazilian respondent stated that the event was all around the news in Brazil and respondent number 255 describes how “the news spread everywhere in the world (or at least Europe)”, compared to the Swedish male seen in category 10.1, who stated that he had not heard of the terrorist attacks. This clearly contradicts Prakke’s model of news value yet it does not directly supports the idea of relations either.

5.4, Analysis Question 16
“**What is your image of Norway as a country?**”
Asking the respondents what their image of Norway is aims to map stereotypes of Norway and examine how much basic knowledge the respondents have about the affected country.

16.1, The respondent do not know much about Norway
In category 16.1, the 11 respondents who expressed little or no knowledge about Norway were grouped. We find how 4 of these have a connection to Germany by either being born there or living there in 2011, and those respondents express how little news about Norway is published in Germany. From the 11 respondents in this category, only 1 has a relation to Norway through having friends/family in the country, the rest stated that they have no relation to Norway. This could be a reason for their little knowledge about it; they might simply not be interested in Norway. But all respondents who had little or no knowledge are from western countries; however, it is important to remember that despite what country one live in, cultures can vary due to our many multicultural societies and so it cannot be assumed that respondents living in western countries necessarily must be a part of western cultures.

Two respondents mention that they know a few YFU volunteers/exchange students from Norway, yet they state that they have no relation to Norway. This is a limitation of the study where the term “relation” is subjective to interpret where they, even when knowing YFU volunteers from Norway believe that they do not have a relation to the country.
However, those respondents show how YFU brings people together. A German female writes, “Unfortunately, I barely know anything about Norway. It is seldom the topic on television or on the Internet, and in school we haven’t learned anything about it.” This indicates how Norway normally gets little attention in Germany. One respondent writes that since she does not hear of Norway in the news, she supposes that it is neutral and stable and another writes that her image of Norway is generally nice, “but I have no relation to Norway, so don’t have more detailed ideas about it”. This is just what this study concerns. A woman who lived in USA in 2011 but was born in Germany then states that she has never been in Norway but supposes that it is beautiful. This leads us to the next category.

16.2, The respondent focused on superlative adjectives in the explanation: e.g. rich, beautiful, educated people.

In category 16.2, respondents from all over the world expressed a positive image of Norway. The majority wrote that Norway is peaceful and secure; it has a beautiful nature and educated people. Despite the attacks in 2011, many respondents wrote that it is a safe country to live in, in present tense. Oil and richness are brought up and interesting is to see how the Indonesian male whom so far only have expressed that he has no opinion about the event wrote that Norway is a beautiful country.

A few respondents state how Norwegian people help each other in hard situations and have a strong solidarity, which can be a result of the intense media reporting about the aftershocks of the event in contrast to the little information the foreign audiences are used to; when then hearing extensive reports from Norway, they may get the image that what they hear is how it normally is. However, the vast majority of the whole unit sample of respondents expressed this positive image of Norway, indicating that Breivik did not completely ruin Norway’s impression abroad by his actions.

We are not only finding that the respondents expressing this positive image of Norway is spread out over the world; we also see how all age groups and genders are represented and also all different kinds of relations to Norway. This shows that positive stereotypes such as these do not have to depend on relations. However, Zimbardo and Leippe (1991) defined stereotypes as often being a negative image of something, so now we will look into the negative image of Norway.

16.3, The respondent focused on negative adjectives in the explanation: e.g. cold, expensive, terrible weather.

From the 14 respondents having negative images of Norway, we see how many of them are located in Scandinavia. Scandinavians expressed their images such as Norway being rich and
isolated, expensive and “not good”, whilst a Norwegian himself is critical, stating, “The Kingdom of Norway has too high thoughts of itself”. From the other countries, we see how the most common impression is that it is cold, which does not necessarily have to be a very bad thing. How Norwegians are spoiled and “a bit depressed”, with a silly language are again purely subjective reactions and stereotypes.

We see how different relations are found in the results but however, 5 of the 14 are males, which to some extent is a large percentage due to the overrepresentation of women in this study. Höijer explained how males focus less on compassion (2004) and this might be an explanation behind their negative images – perhaps the women feel for the victims still and want to comfort themselves in some way by expressing a positive image?

16.4, The respondent focused on political factors

In 16.4, the 11 respondents focusing on political aspects are grouped and again, we see how the western world is represented in mentioning political factors as their image of Norway. Many respondents reacted on the fact that Norway is not a part of the EU, as negative and “isolative” aspect. Others stated the democratic, socialist and liberal country with human rights and welfare. Norway’s neutrality is noted, but immigration and right-wing “problems” are stated. The political views of Breivik as his own “justification” of his actions may have contributed to these images and noting how political factors were mentioned in other categories as well, the results indicate that respondents were aware of a political background of the event. Politics might perhaps also be an interest of some respondents, creating a relation to Norway and the event through that interest.

16.5, The respondent put the image of Norway in relation to him-/herself

16.5 categorized the respondents who put the image of Norway in relation to themselves and we clearly see how Swedish respondents were overrepresented in comparing Norway to Sweden; something that is natural where the two countries not only are neighbours but also have the same culture and similar languages. The Canadian respondents write that the countries are alike in their belief systems and Austrians have been to Norway and loved it. Again we are looking at identification, yet on a different level from the questions analysed above. Looking at relations to Norway, only 5 of the respondents do not have a relation to Norway and from this, we can see how perhaps similar belief systems or languages can be a source of identification and so interest, and relation.

16.6, Other answers, interesting to analyse

A South African female with no relation to Norway mentions the country’s interesting history, which again concerns interests as a source of relation, as mentioned in 16.5. Other
respondents refer to their previous experiences of Norway in it being their “home away from home”, or as the Venezuelan female state: “Norway is one of the best places on earth to live.” One Hungarian respondent supposes that it is a nice and tidy country, but another was told that it was actually not a good place to live in, however, she does not remember hearing about the news and she writes that she just knows some people from Norway as her relation to the country. When analysing answers like this among many others, a complementary qualitative interview would have clarified what they meant with their answers and perhaps what she heard about Norway that was not good.

A few respondents think of specific items or people when picturing Norway, for example the author Jo Nesbo, Vikings, fjords, knitted jumpers and the Nobel Prize. All these recognizable factors in an event may be causing interest in what happens in the country where an association can be interpreted as a relation.

Only two of all 318 respondents compared their image of Norway from before 2011 to after. One respondent writes that Norway is “Intolerant (before and after Breivik)”, while another states that she “still” has a positive image of the country, again confirming how the terrorist attacks did not change different nationalities image of the country. A Swedish respondent is however critical to the optimistic image of Norway and writes that “but I know that this is not the whole truth…!” Again, a complementary interview could have created a deeper insight in what the respondent meant and if this in any way perhaps was related to the terrorist attacks.

Seen to relations to Norway, a female writes that her relation to Norway is through her friends who have been to Norway and a respondent from New Zealand has “friends who has relation to Norway”. A Danish female states that “Norway is close and what happens affects us all”. This was also seen in 16.1 where a respondent stated that she did not have a relation to Norway, and therefore no more detailed ideas about it. These responses constitute the essence of the purpose of this thesis, leading to the discussion.

6. Discussion

The purpose of this study was to provide a new angle on the previous research in the area of reception studies through the aspect of relationships, and explore the role of audiences’ relationships in their interest in, and interpretation of, the Norwegian terrorist attacks in 2011. It is found that relationships do play a role in the interest in and understanding of what happened that day in Norway, July 22nd 2011, seen to the 318 respondents of this study. In
this discussion chapter, the findings are discussed in relation to news value and the aspects of head, heart and self of the participating audiences.

Driver (1996) discussed how audiences use cognitive attention mechanisms to sort out important information from the cluttered scenes of everyday life, mentioned in the introduction of this study. It was found how the respondents of this study paid attention to recognizable aspects of news, as seen in for example the German respondents who remembered a German tourist saving Norwegian children trying to escape from Utøya. Those respondents instantly had a relation to the event through their fellow citizen; and that also show how the attentive audience go hand in hand with news value.

Finding that identification to the event leads to a higher attentive response, how come different medias do not consider their specific audiences’ backgrounds in reporting foreign news events to an even larger extent? If different news sources internationally would angle their reported news their own audience, like the German news did in the example of the German tourist, would they not attract a larger audience due to this relation to the news as seen in the results of this study? And would this not then in its turn lead to a higher counter sale and benefit the source?

Local newspapers are examples of journalism angling events in order to reach their target group specifically,15 where news organisations do not only need to follow the developing technology but also present the exclusive information that the audiences want, as stated in the Swedish newspaper Svenska Dagbladet. The journalist concludes that no matter whom the reader is, she or he is looking for news “about their sphere”. What then “their sphere” is defined as is, according to this study, the audiences’ relation to the happening. Assume that newspapers abroad had found “their own” angle of the Norwegian terrorist attacks, for example by interviewing a national who perhaps just got back from a trip to Norway or someone having relatives in Oslo; the event would then, according to the results of this study, at once receive more attention by the audiences where they would feel related to the event to a larger extent.

This approach could subsequently complement Prakke’s model of news value (1969) in the sense that the developed technologies together with people’s increasing abilities
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to travel, work and study abroad would increase the opportunities for international medias to create a relation to a foreign event, as mentioned in the introduction of this study. Through this, the newfound “axis” of Interpersonal Relations could act as a contemporary supplement to Prakke’s findings from 1969 in a possible updated model as the one below.

Example of a possible “fourth axis” to Prakke’s model of News value (1969).

Returning to the identification to foreign news being angled toward their audiences, acknowledging the found aspects of head, heart and self, would this approach then contribute to a greater awareness of the world among different nationalities and make people feel for each other due to the new relations that will be created? Or would it instead give the opposite effect where Driver’s found cluttered scenes of everyday life would present more objects than we can respond towards simultaneously, and perhaps then lead to the opposite: making audiences become even more self-centred, extending the “reversed refrigerator” of Hylland Eriksen (2005)? A possible explanation for the limited usage of this approach could be financial and time issues where it would take time for the working journalists to investigate and find possible interviewees and angles, where they could rather focus on more local events which are easy to portray and known to be valued and interesting to the audience. However, seen to the developing technology and growing possible global communication, it would be interesting to further investigate the developing usage of the Internet in “local”, or recognizable news internationally.

Returning to this study’s results, the impact of relations of interest and, in the long term, (news) value has been explored. The researcher has summarised the large, fairly unexpected
outcome in a figure, constructed to clarify the three examined dimensions of relation influence, entitled the Relation Circle of News Interest; presenting how an event could contribute to either a relation to an event, leading to an interest; or it could also start with a relation to the matter, leading to a greater interest in the event due to identification or recognition; or thirdly begin with a brief interest in a matter, and with the help of an event with a high news value, indicating that it is important, one will learn more and so create a relation to the event. The shape of the circle is chosen where the three features are shown to work together in a continuous form, where it is possible to start the thread in any of them. The circle is presented below and a further explanation with examples follows.

The Relation Circle of News Interest.

The figure above consists of three dimensions: the Event, the Relation and the Interest, dimensions that are shown to go hand in hand: Beginning on the feature of the Event, followed by Relation and Interest, let us use Breivik and Norway as example for this matter as well.

The shootings (the event) take place and if the audience have a relation to the event, perhaps from have visited the affected country, knowing people there or having a similar culture, this makes us interested in the event and so we pay close attention to what we hear from it. This is what Prakke (1969), Galtung & Ruge (1973) and Hvitfeldt (1989) found and this is seen in the study’s results where western cultures seemed to identify more with the victims and where respondents who stated that they had a close relation to Norway showed a greater understanding of, and interest in, the event.

If the figure instead starts on the aspect of Relation, followed by Interest and finally Event, this study’s results show that having an initial relation to the event, here Norway, Norwegian culture or the Norwegians, matters: we become interested in something
we have a relation to and we want to learn more about it, which is accomplished by the event. Respondents of this study who have a relation to Norway became more interested in the event – in the study, the American respondent whose friend texted him and asked if his Norwegian friend knew more about what went on in Norway is suitable to use as an illustrating example of this: This American friend wanted to gain an “own” relation to Norway in order to learn more in the event.

Thirdly, beginning the circle on the feature of Interest, the study’s results show that if the respondent has an interest in something, for example Norwegian history, a specific author or the Nobel Prize mentioned, they become interested in events concerning the matter, which then can be presumed to provide them more knowledge to their existing interest and by binding it to the event, they have gotten a closer relation to the phenomenon.

To test this circle on other news events than the Norwegian terrorist attacks in 2011 in order to examine this results’ findings on other happenings, it is found to be effective – for example the more recent terrorist attacks in Nigeria on the 15th of April 2014: The Islamist network Boko Haram attacked the country’s only girl’s high school in Chibok, Borno. At least 16 were killed and more than 300 female students were kidnapped.16

Boko Haram acted from political views and the group is stated to be against "western immorality".17 This example is reminiscent, yet the complete opposite from the example of Breivik. It occurred in a different culture in a country located far away from Norway, yet the purpose was based on political views and the victims were children. The media attention in Norway or Scandinavia, or somewhere else in the world, may therefore have depended on the aspect of the victims with who we can perhaps identify with, where they were kidnapped only for going to school – something we see as a matter of course. We may also feel for the victims and point out the terrorist as the scapegoats, where the event also matches the dramaturgic triangle (Hvitfeldt, 1989).

However, in this study, interpersonal relations were investigated and examined, and if this study was to be replicated with the same unit sample, YFU members, perhaps we would have found a different result due to the simple fact that YFU has no office or members in Nigeria. So, how do we pay attention to Nigeria when few of us in the western world know anyone in the country, we live in different cultures (and are basically located far away from the event on all axes of Prakke’s model of News Value – both the one from 1969 and the

16 http://www.aftonbladet.se/debatt/article18846208.ab
updated version of this discussion) and so do not know who or what to relate to?
Celebrities.

Michelle Obama, Sean Penn, Ashton Kutcher, Justin Timberlake and Kim
Kardashian have taken a stand against Boko Haram’s actions by posting pictures of
themselves with the hashtag #BringBackOurGirls (svd.se). The hashtag has exploded in social
media and more than 190 000 Facebook users liked the Facebook page (May 17th, 2014) as a
protest against Boko Haram.\(^{18}\) Looking back at the constructed circle above, we see how the
audience now have received faces on the event. Our idols, or perhaps role models, care, and
therefore I should perhaps do the same? Now, the audiences have a relation to the event.

This conducted study, using the Norwegian terrorist attacks of 2011 as an illustrating example
therefore examined the features Event – Relation – Interest, where the attacks were put in
relation to the audiences’ relation to the country and event, leading to their interest. In the
Nigerian example we instead see Relation – Interest – Event, where our role models made us
interested in knowing more what happened in Nigeria.

As a third example, we can also discuss to what extent one’s interest in an event
can lead to a relation. In the analysis of question 16 and the respondents’ images of Norway,
we found how certain respondents associated the country to specific items and people; for
example the author Jo Nesbo, Vikings, fjords, knitted jumpers and Nobel Prize. From the
findings, it would be possible to argue that this interest leads to attention of the news from the
specific country and so creates a stronger relation to it where more knowledge is gained.

Despite the three years that have soon gone by since the attacks in Norway 2011, the majority
of the respondents remembered it. This can depend on the expressed sensationalism of the
event; many respondents remember being shocked by the event happening in Norway, which
was perceived as a nice and peaceful country by the majority of them. The nationality of the
terrorist Anders Behring Breivik was also acknowledged as a sensation, where many
respondents admitted how they thought that an Islamist network was responsible for the
attacks; alternatively the respondents expressed their relief when they found out that was not
the case. The Islamist parallels may be, as Sorgenfrei (2012) expresses, an effect of the
world’s relation to 9/11 and Al-Qaida’s attack on the Twin Towers.\(^{19}\)

Racism in this study is therefore not put in relation to Norway per se; what is

\(^{18}\) https://www.facebook.com/bringbackourgirls
\(^{19}\) http://www.history.com/topics/9-11-attacks
instead found is the Islamophobia, despite the perpetrator being a native Norwegian. Tajfel et al. (1971) state how the mere perception of another group’s existence can produce discrimination (Gross 2005: 433). With the previous experiences of perhaps 9/11 and the suicide attempt on Drottninggatan in Stockholm 2010, the respondents’ might agree with Sorgenfrei’s claim that since 9/11, terrorism has become almost synonymous with militant Islamism (2012). Also Stier (2009) explains the attitudes towards Muslims as being the main equivalent of Jews or gypsies today (2009: 140).

Different cultures and backgrounds are visual in the results of this study and this has been investigated in relation to interpersonal relationships. However, in this study, it was found how different cultures reacted differently on the Norwegian news and it was seen how cultures more similar to the Norwegian felt more for the victims and people than the ones who could not identify with the Norwegian population to the same extent. It was mentioned in the analysis that it is not to be forgotten how people with different cultures live together in the world, and this questions the definition of culture: Where we become global souls through travelling and meeting new people due to studies or work, will the cultures as phenomenon culminate where multicultural societies grow and foreign workfare bring and contribute with their cultures? Will children raised in cross-cultural homes develop new, “intercultural cultures” which will spread and integrate with others, doing the same? Will there be “established cultures” as we have today, in the future? If yes, how is this affecting news value and relations? These questions open up to a lot of interesting material to study further, as the technology continues to develop.

7. Summary and Conclusion

Starting with the cognitive findings of the respondents, it is found that the participations of this study primary express their first confusion of the news and their attempts to make sense of the event, followed by their initiate surprise by the sensationalism of the news – which also was easy to follow due to its dramaturgic triangle explained by Hvitfeldt (1989), where Breivik was easy to point out as the lone perpetrator and the ideal victims of children as the targets.

Interpersonal relations were mainly examined in this study. However, we find how several other aspects may affect audience’s interest in, and interpretation of, foreign news. Looking back at Piliavin et al. (1981), we see how the researchers state that “we-ness” connotes a sense of connectedness or the categorisation of another person as a member of
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one’s own group (Gross 2005: 520). The closer the relationship to the person in need, the
greater the initial arousal and costs for not helping, and the lower the costs for helping. Re-
garding the relationships, the western world might have a generally closer relationship to
Norway seen mainly to culture and so identify more with the country, hence feeling more for
the victims of the tragedy in 2011.

Independently on culture or nationality, the respondents had similar attitudes
about the event through shock and compassion. Above it was stated how beliefs represent the
knowledge or information we have about the world, incorrect or not, and in order to convert a
belief into an attitude, meaning how we relate to and think of something, a value ingredient is
needed. Value per se is the individual’s sense of what is good or bad. In the result of this
study, we simply see how due to the “utterly inhuman” act of Brevik killing the ideal victim
in a safe and secure country, all cultures go together against Breivik; independently on their
previous experiences, cultures or relations.

As an answer to the first research question, How are the respondents’ personal
relations to Norway affecting their attention and interpretation of the news?, we see that the
Norwegian terrorist attacks already included many factors that lead to a great international
news value where a clear wrongdoer to blame was presented, the victims were ideal and it
happened in a country which most of the respondents thought of as a safe, rich and good
country to live in. The sensationalism of the event is also large where the perpetrator turned
out to be a native Norwegian and so did not match the respondents’ first assumption of the
offender’s nationality. Because of this, we see that the majority of the respondents,
irrespective of YFU membership or relation to Norway, found the event interesting and
memorable. It was however also found that respondents’ with interpersonal relations to
Norway to some extent found the happening more interesting and showed a deeper
knowledge and more detailed memories from the event than the respondents with little or no
relation to Norway. This was seen when the respondents’ relations to Norway were compared
to awareness of the event, their interest in it and whether they looked up more information
about it. Many results did however only show small differences and weak relations between
the variables.

In the second research question asking What cognitive and emotive memories
are the respondents expressing?, the cognitive and emotive memories expressed by the
respondents were mainly found in the analysis of the open questions, which examined the
respondents’ memories but also their sometimes stereotypical images of Norway. The results
showed that compassion and attention, independently of culture or nationality, to a large
extent affected respondents’ memories of the event and how the respondents who remembered from where they first got the information or those feeling for the victims showed a deep understanding of the event. The majority of the respondents also had a positive image of Norway, which had not changed because of Breivik.

*Do the memories vary depending on relation to Norway?* Yes, to some extent. Respondents with close connections to Norway, for example from having hosted a Norwegian exchange student or having co-workers from Norway, expressed a deep and detailed knowledge about the event. The few respondents that instead stated that they had no relation to Norway showed less interest in the event, as seen through brief answers together with the fact that many of them did not remember hearing about the event at all.

Looking back at previous studies on news value, psychology and cultural studies, we see that much found in this study confirms earlier findings. However, where little academic attention has been on the audiences’ perspectives and their relations as put in focus seen to their interpretation of and interest in foreign news event, as stated by Tester (2001), this study contributes with a deeper insight in the matter of relations in the age of new technology and increasing knowledge of new cultures, countries and people.

The fundament of this investigation is that the globalizing world and the possibilities to travel, work abroad and meet new people and cultures contribute to an understanding of the world and each other in a way that was not possible to the same extent a few years ago. This study finds that relations can be interpersonal, caused by similar interests or experiences, or even initiated by a second- or third part; may it be friends, family or celebrities. The initial question of how we relate to happenings and people in the world through medias in the 2010s is thereby answered by this; how the new technology and access to travel the world makes it possible to expand our internal reference system and gain new experiences to decrease the stereotypes brought by unfamiliarity.

Therefore, as a conclusion of this study we can see that relations matter in audiences’ interpretation of, and interest in, foreign news event. However, many different types of relations beside the interpersonal relations are also found: interests, religion, previous experiences or political view can also be regarded as an interest and so lead to attention and interest in news. Audiences try to make sense of happenings and put themselves in relation to the event in order to understand it, and in order to catch the audiences’ interest, the news has to be recognizable to them. And how come we recognize ourselves in certain situations, places or people? We have a relation to them.
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Appendices

Appendix 1, Introducing letter to YFU

Hello!

My name is Stina Franzén and I am an active volunteer in YFU Sweden. I went to NC, USA in 2006-07 and have been helping out with interviews, workshops, camps and host family recruitment within the organization ever since. Now I am mainly working with our member’s magazine OPUS for YFU Sweden.

Apart from YFU, I am also studying Media and Communications at Stockholm University. YFU has opened my eyes to the world and made me interested in global questions concerning media, and how the relations we build up while travelling and meeting new friends matter in our understanding of what is going on in the world.

Now, I am starting on writing my Master’s thesis and I am focusing on relations as an underlying factor of interpreting news. I have put together a short questionnaire around the tragic event of the terrorist attacks in Norway 2011 (see below) and I aim to see how the news about it spread globally due to personal relationships of the audiences.

Supported by the Swedish YFU office in Stockholm, I am turning to you in YFU around the world, where I know that we – the YFU:ers – are people interested in the world, and its people. I would therefore like to ask you if you wanted to help me to spread the link among the YFU:ers of your country and ask if they would answer the questions in the survey? Perhaps you have a Facebook page or maybe some active volunteers who would like to share the link with their YFU friends?

Below, you will find the small introduction that YFU Sweden wrote when helping me share the link on our Facebook page, perhaps you could use the same with only a couple of small changes?

I would really appreciate your help and I am looking forward to find out how the “YFU family” around the world interprets international news :) Please contact me if you have any questions, or if you would like to take part of the result later on this spring!

Sincerely,
Stina Franzén
Appendix 2, Questionnaire

On July 22nd 2011, Scandinavia was struck by the breaking news of a terror attack taking place in Norway. A bomb had detonated in the government building in central Oslo and while the police worked at the location, the offender made his way to Utøya, an island outside Oslo, where youth members of the Labour party had their yearly meeting. Dressed as a policeman, 32-year old native Norwegian Anders Behring Breivik entered the island, gathered the children and started to shoot.

This questionnaire contains 16 questions concerning your interpretations of the Norwegian terror attacks and is a part of my MA thesis at JMK, Stockholm University in Sweden. The study aims to map what role relationships play in the spreading of news, and what makes a person interested in an event happening abroad.

Feel free to contact me at stina.fr@gmail.com at any time if you have any questions or wish to take part of the result. If you would like to discuss your answers further, let me know!

Thank you for your participation,
Stina Franzén

*Obligatorisk

1. In what continent did you live in 2011? *

2. In what country did you live in 2011? *

3. In what country were you born? *

4. Gender *
   ○ Female
   ○ Male
   ○ Other

5. Age *
   ○ Younger than 20 years old
   ○ 21-30 years old
   ○ 31-40 years old
   ○ 41-50 years old
   ○ 51-60 years old
   ○ Older than 60 years old
6. For how many hours per day do you actively take part of news? *
For example watching a news channel on tv, reading a newspaper or surfing on news webpages

- Less than 1 hour per day
- 1-2 hours per day
- 2-3 hours per day
- 3-4 hours per day
- 5-6 hours per day
- More than 6 hours per day

7. What media channel(s) do you use most often when taking part of news? *
You may choose more than one alternative

- Television
- The Internet
- Newspapers
- Radio
- Social Media
- Övrigt: _______________________

8. Have you heard about the attacks in Norway? *

- Yes
- No
- I do not remember

9. If yes, from where did you first get the information? *
Fill out the answer that is most likely if you do not remember

- Television
- The Internet
- Newspapers
- Radio
- Social Media
- Övrigt: _______________________

10. What did you hear about the event? *
Write what you can remember, you may write keywords or full sentences

11. What image did you get of the event? *
Write what you can remember, you may write keywords or full sentences
12. On a scale, how interesting did you find the news? *

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

Not interesting at all ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ Very interesting

13. Did you look up more information about the event? *
☐ Yes
☐ No

14. If yes, where did you get the information? *
You may choose more than one alternative
☐ Television
☐ The Internet
☐ Newspapers
☐ Radio
☐ Social Media
☐ Övrigt: [ ]

15. What is your relation to Norway? *
You may choose more than one alternative
☐ I live in the country
☐ I have lived in the country
☐ I have visited the country
☐ I have friends/family living in the country
☐ I have friends/family living close to the country
☐ I have no relation to Norway
☐ Övrigt: [ ]

16. What do you think of Norway as a country? *
You may write keywords or full sentences

Are you a member of the exchange organization YFU? *
YFU helped me to spread the link and I am interested to see if it spread outside the organization

Skicka
Appendix 3: Contacted YFU countries/regions
(yfu.org)

Africa:
Ghana
Liberia
South Africa

North America:
Canada
Mexico
USA
- Horizon District
- Founder’s District
- Heartland District
- Northeast District
- Southeast District

Europe:
Austria
Belarus
Belgium
- Belgium Flanders
- Belgium Wallonia
Bulgaria
Chez Republic
Denmark
Estonia
Finland
France
Germany
Greece
Hungary
Latvia
Lithuania
Moldova
Netherlands
Norway
Poland
Ukraine
Romania
Russia
Serbia
Slovakia
Sweden
Switzerland
Turkey

South America:
Argentina
Brazil
Chile
Colombia
Ecuador
Paraguay
Uruguay
Venezuela

Asia:
Azerbaijan
China
Georgia
India
Indonesia
Japan
Kazakhstan
Mongolia
Philippines
South Korea

Thailand
Turkey
Vietnam

= 53 countries
Appendix 4, Coding Scheme

**Question 10**
What did you hear about the event?

The answers were coded as follows:
10.1. The respondent does not remember
10.2. The respondent showed a lot of interest in the event
10.3. The respondent describes what he or she did at the time
10.4. The respondent put the event in relation to him-/herself
10.5. The respondent remembers something that did not happen
10.6. The respondent mentions the nationality of the perpetrator
10.7. Other answers, interesting to analyse
10.8 Other answers

**Question 11**
What image did you get of the event?

The responses were coded as follows:
11.1. The respondent was surprised
11.2. The respondent showed compassion
11.3. The respondent remember what she or he did at the time
11.4. Other answers, interesting to analyse
11.5 Other answers

**Question 16**
What is your image of Norway as a country?

The responses were coded as follows:
16.1. The respondent do not know much about Norway
16.2. The respondent focused on superlative adjectives in the explanation: *e.g. rich, beautiful, educated people.*
16.3. The respondent focused on negative adjectives in the explanation: *e.g. cold, expensive, terrible weather.*
16.4. The respondent focused on political factors
16.5. The respondent put the image of Norway in relation to his-/herself.
16.6. Other answers, interesting to analyse
16.7 Other answers
Appendix 5, Results Question 10

“What did you hear about the event?”

(The first respondent has identification number 2, due to the data collection)

10.1. The respondent does not remember
2) 31. Lithuania. Female, 21-30 years old. No relation to Norway. nothing
3) 40. Belgium. Female, younger than 20 years old. No relation to Norway. I can’t remember
4) 52. Paraguay. Male, younger than 20 years old. Has friends/family in Norway. nothing
5) 83. Australia. Female, 21-30 years old. No relation to Norway. I do not remember hearing about the event
6) 87. Australia. Female, older than 60 years old. Has friends/family living in and close to Norway. Rated it a 1.
Nothing
7) 93. Serbia. Female, younger than 20 years old. Wants to visit Norway. I didn’t.
8) 95. USA. Male, 31-40 years old. No relation to Norway. NA
9) 96. Hungary. Female, younger than 20 years old. Has no relation to Norway. I think I heard about the shooting, but I can’t remember much about it.
11) 104. Serbia. Female, younger than 20 years old. Has no relation to Norway. nothing
12) 106. Hungary. Female, 21-30 years old. Has friends/family in Norway. nothing
14) 116. “South America”. Female, younger than 20 years old. No relation to Norway. nothing
15) 121. Canada. Male, younger than 20 years old. No relation to Norway. I did not hear about the attacks in Norway
16) 132. Hungary. Female, younger than 20 years old. “Knows a few people from Norway”. –
18) 173. USA. Male, younger than 20 years old. No relation to Norway. Nothing
20) 218. USA. Female, younger than 20. No relation to Norway. Never heard of
21) 234. Switzerland. Female, younger than 20. No relation to Norway. I can’t remember
22) 236. Germany. Female, 21-30 years old. No relation to Norway. do not remember
23) 239. Germany. Female, 21-30 years old. No relation to Norway. dont reember

10.2. The respondent showed a lot of interest in the event
1) 5. Sweden/Switzerland. Female, Younger than 20. Has visited Norway.
That a crazy man shoot a lot of youths and that there was a bomb in Oslo. Later i found out that he was right wing extremist, the children where on a camp from the socialdemocrats party in norway.

2) 7. South Africa. Male, 21-30 years old. Has friends/family in and close to Norway.
It was mostly about the shootings of the school children and not the attack on the government. Also first that it was a religiously motivated attack or political attack. Many people were also just so surprised that this happened in Norway.

Norway, big shooting, a lot of children died, first about the bombattack in the centrum and then later, that this and the shooting on the island are connected

4) 16. Sweden. Female, 31-40 years old. Has visited, have friends/family in and close to Norway.
Live reporting on Swedish TV. Starting from when they first only had a few injuted and then we followed the reporting throughout the day. How they more and more realized how many injured/killed there really were.

5) 56. Belgium. Female, 31-40 years old. Has lived in Norway, have visited and has friends/family in Norway.
Bomb in regjeringsbygningen, then going by cat to utoya , talking himself on the ferrie and started shooting when exiting the boat, utoya is owned bij the arbeiderpartie and they had their leir there. So many youngsters were scared, killed and injured

Government building bombed. Young social democrats murdered. Nationalistic paranoid psychopat behind the deed.

7) 73. South Africa. Female, 51-60 years old. Has friends/family in Norway, hosted a student.
I heard exactly what happen first hand, how he shot them, how they try playing dead, how some of then climb of a cliff and swim into the sea while he was shooting at her.

All news channels were tuned in, people and reporters confused, people running away scared.

Couldnt believe it, got it twitter and facebook, but needed the national news show to believe it.

I remember about the massive headlines on the web about the students, photos of the attacker and the victims, the guessing about why he attacked them, i think at some point they also thought he was a part of a radical terrorist group.

A man, frustrated with the liberal immigration rules targeted a liberal youth camp as well as a site in the city. He wanted to raise awareness if the threat of immigration on national security. He claimed to be sane and requested the death penalty

12) 123. Hungary/USA. Male, 21-30 years old. Has visited Norway, has friends/family close to Norway.
Terrorism, extremist, socialist youth camp, anti-immigration, killed, death, Norway, Oslo, Breivik, island, detonation

13) 138. Sweden. Male, younger than 20 years old, has no relation to Norway.

14) 147. Austria. Female, younger than 20. Has friends/family in Norway.
bomb attack in the government quarter of Oslo, followed by an assassination on a group of children on a youth gathering on that island. several dozens/hundreds being killed and injured, some were able to hide themselves and/or flee. as soon as the responsible Anders Breivik had been identified, his mental health was questioned
and tested upon. I don't remember with which results, but I remember debates about how his mental health/illness should or should not affect the judgement and the range of his penalty.

15) **156. Austria.** Male, younger than 20 years old. No relation to Norway. Anders Breivik kills more than 80 kids on an island close to Oslo after setting off bombs in the centre of Oslo. It is mainly an act against immigrants and he wanted to show people that he did not like foreigners. It was also connected to right radical groups (national socialist).

16) **171. Denmark.** Female, younger than 20 years old. Has friends/family in and close to Norway. Lives in Scandinavia. "Norway is close and what happens effects us all"
Young social democrats shot on an island. Political terror attack.

17) **182. USA.** Female, 41-50 years old. Has friends/family in Norway.
That it started with a bombing in Oslo, where a few people were killed. Police thought it was a terrorist act until they heard of a shooting on a remote island a couple of hours later. A man dressed as a police officer approached students on a retreat, told them he was police and there to help them. Then he shot them. There were many students killed. He even shot kids as they tried to swim away from the island. Police took some time to get there and the first officers who arrived did not have the weapons needed to neutralize him, so had to wait for better armed officers.

18) **201. Denmark.** Male, 21-30 years old. Has visited Norway, has friends/family living in Norway.
First the bomb in Oslo. In the beginning there was much confusion about what had happened. Then the shooting, and the full scale of the event became clear.

19) **216. Austria.** Male, younger than 20. Has friends/family in Norway.
Anders Breivik first triggered a self-made bomb near a Norwegian government building and afterwards drove to a socialist youth camp on an island and shot almost everyone of them. He also wrote a manifest/book.

20) **223. Sweden.** Female, younger than 20 years old. Has visited, has friends/family in and close to Norway.
Everything, the radio was on the whole day. All about how many dead there was and what was going on

21) **225. Sweden.** Female, younger than 20 years old. Has friends/family close to Norway.
Bomb attack on the governmental building in Norway and some small indications that the police had recibed phonecalls from Utøya but the feeling was that that “wasn’t” a big thing. As the time passes it was more focus on Utøya.

22) **241. Germany.** Female, younger than 20. Has visited Norway, has friends/family living in Norway.
I heard that Breivik entered the island dressed as a police officer and started killing the children there who were there for some kind of political camp(?) . Most of the kids tried to swim away from the island or to hide somewhere. Then at some point "real" police officers arrived and captured Breivik.

23) **245. Germany.** Female, younger than 20. No relation to Norway.
The man was dressed like a policeman and told the kids to come together. They felt safe, but the he shot them. Many tried to escape and jumped into the water. Many died. Later in court, he said he had to isolate himself a couple of week before the shooting in order to be capable of doing that.

24) **251. Germany.** Female, 21-30 years old. No relation to Norway.
Who the victims were, especially the ones on the island(young people on a camp from the social democratic party), how many died, how the guy planned the attacks, where and when it happened, videos/photos, background information about the attacker, how the Norwegian public reacted

25) **285. Switzerland/Germany.** Female, 21-30 years old. Has visited Norway, has friends/family in and close to Norway.
terror, children died, island, political reasons, mad man, young people jumping into water, guy chasing after people, unclear situation overall, chaos, guy disguised himself to get on the island, terrible
At first I remember they did not connect the two incidents, but thought of them as separate acts. I heard about the bomb exploding close to the governing offices as well as the shooting of kids and youths on the island. I remember that when they caught ABB he was proud of what he did and had no regrets but not killing enough people. I also followed the legal proceedings afterwards and listened to the stories of all the young survivors of Utöya. It really hit me.

27) 292. Estonia. Female, 21-30 years old. Has lived in Denmark.
Attack against a youth camp in Norway (the government attack came later). Young people dead or hiding, messy information regarding who’s behind it or their motives. Norway in shock.

I heard that there had been an attack or that there was ongoing, fullblown attack on a Youth camp. At first I heard that the situation was not yet under control, that many people were killed or hurt and that the attacker was still around and shooting. I heard it was a camp by the Socialdemocratic Youth of Norway. I did not hear about the explosions in Oslo until some time that day later, looking back I have the impression that the German news concentrated on the events on the island.

10.3. The respondent describes what he or she did at the time
1) 18. USA/Sweden, female, younger than 20 years old.
I remember seeing pictures and getting very scared, so I looked up more serious articles.

2) 19. Sweden, female, younger than 20 years old.
(Researcher’s translation to English; for the Swedish version, see appendix X):
I was going to watch some other TV program but a sign rolled into the screen and it said that all TV programs were cancelled due to the explosion in Norway. They did not say anything about the shootings at that time.

3) 42. Norway, female, 21-30 years old.
My brother told me there had been a terrorist attack in Oslo, I didn’t believe him and he told me that a bomb had gone off at the Prime minister’s office. He later sent me a picture by SMS.

4) 70. Norway/Belgium, female, 21-30 years old.
I just moved back from Norway to Belgium and I saw that a lot of my friends wrote things about it on Facebook. So then I went to check the website of a newspaper to see what actually happened.

5) 133. Canada, male, 21-30 years old.
I read about it in the NYT, tragic, failure of counter-terrorism, seemed no protection in place at all.

6) 134. USA, male, 21-30 years old.
A friend texted me, asking if my friend from Oslo who was visiting me knew anyone involved.

7) 172. Denmark, female, 21-30 years old.
I was on holiday with my parents in Chile. They showed the event in the television at the cafe where we ate. We noticed it because it took place in Norway.

8) 174. USA/Denmark, female, younger than 20 years old.
My dad came in the morning of the 23th and updated me. It really touched my family.

My brother and I where watching TV when the program was stoped I think for extra news where they told about the terror attack, but this was still early in the day so first they only mentioned the bomb in the government building and first as we continued to watch we got to hear about what happens on Utöya.

My family and I had just returned home from a trip to Oslo, and a friend of mine wrote on my Facebook wall asking if I was okay. I didn't understand what he meant but than he told me and I went online to read about it...
what had happened.

11) **188. Sweden, female, younger than 20 years old.**
Lots of people killed on an island in Norway, and also an attack in Oslo. I saw pictures of utøya.

12) **220. USA, male, 21-30 years old.**
A Facebook post from an international friend.

13) **246. Germany, male, 21-30 years old.**
I’ve been driving to a restaurant and a friend told me that he read it in the news.

14) **300. Denmark. Female, 31-40 years old.**
Eye witness statements, speeches, reports, - I was in bed, sick, on the day so I watched the news over and over again.

10.4. The respondent put the event in relation to him-/herself

1) **11. Germany, female, younger than 20 years old.**
that a lot of young children died and i got a little bit scared to hear what happened in a children camp. One special thing i still remember was also the thing about his clothes, that the people thought he is a police man and came to help.

2) **14. Sweden, male, 21-30 years old.**
There has been a terrorist attack in Norway. Against the government and against a political youth camp. We had two Norwegian respondents at the camp where I was working, the information was much related to how to support the kids.

3) **24. Sweden, female, 21-30 years old.**
That there was a bomb in Oslo. That they did not know if it was terror by another country and that if Sweden [should] be scared.

4) **48. Sweden/Singapore, female, younger than 20 years old.**
Somebody had gone crazy and started to shoot people. Swa pictures fr.o.m. Oslo when the bomb had detonated it was uncomprehensible.

5) **111. Italy, female, 51-60 years old.**
I was terrified.

6) **198. Germany, female, younger than 20 years old.**
That people had been killed in a political party's youth camp (in which a friend took part).

7) **259. Norway/Switzerland, female, younger than 20 years old.**
That about seventy people were killed. Later I learned more because this happened about 20 days before I went to Norway for my exchange year.

10.5. The respondent remembers something that did not happen

1) **9. USA, female, 21-30 years old. No relation to Norway. Did look up more information.**
I heard that a man had set off a bomb in Oslo and had shot several children from an elementary school.

2) **29. Germany, female, 21-30 years old. Has friends/family in Norway, lived in Sweden. Did look up more information.**
shooting of young people at a festival in Norway.

3) **41. USA/Germany, female, younger than 20 years old. Wants to go to Norway. Did look up more information.**
bomb near governental district, then shooting on island with many young kids, about 70 dead people.
4) 44. Belgium/Sweden, female, 21-30 years old. Has visited Norway. Did look up more information. That there was a bombing in Oslo and a shooting incident on an Island.

5) 50. Serbia, female, 21-30 years old. Has no relation to Norway. Did look up more information. Breivik killed a lot of people during a massive attack in the capital of Norway.

6) 62. Estonia, female, 21-30 years old. Has visited Norway and have friends/family close. Did look up more information about the event. The shooting of muslim children by Breivik, around 70 dead.

7) 151. Austria, female, 41-50 years old. Has no relation to Norway, did look up more information. Bombs in Oslo and on that holiday island where student groups were staying, all details extensively covered by all media.

8) 160. Germany, male, 21-30 years old. Has no relation to Norway, looked up more information. Explosion in Oslo and shooting on an island. Plus a documentation a year afterwards.

9) 162. Germany, female, younger than 20. No relation to Norway, did look up more information about the event. A guy went to an island and killed a lot of people (students). Afterwards he went to a psychological department.

10) 168. Denmark/Greenland, male, 41-50 years old. Friends/family in Norway, looked up more information. The number of killed persons were 88 persons and that there was a bombing in Oslo and a massacre on the island Uttoya on mostly young persons attending a rally.

11) 209. Denmark, male, 21-30 years old. Has visited Norway and have friends/family there. Did look up more information. Casualties, Victims, Terrorattack, Bombs, Studentorganization, Politics.

12) 224. Turkey. Male, 21-30 years old. No relation to Norway, looked up more information. An anti government terrorist group called lone wolf did the act took place in Oslo and more than 70 people died.

13) 231. Switzerland, male, younger than 20 years old. Has friends/family close to Norway, did not look up more information. Someone with mental disorders shot a bunch of kids.

14) 233. Switzerland, female, younger than 20 years old. Has friends/family in the country, did not look up more information. An attack at a party nearby Oslo, Amoklauf.

15) 235. Switzerland, female, younger than 20. No relation to Norway but looked up more information about the event. That many young persons were killed and that Breivik has a psychological problem.

16) 237. Switzerland, male, younger than 20 years old. No relation to Norway, yet looked up more info. Racist Attack.

17) 240. Ecuador/Germany, female, 21-30 years old. Has visited Norway and looked up more info. Attack on an island, children where the victims, many wounded, 11 dead (?), the offender was obsessed with this ideology.

18) 250. Germany, male, younger than 20. No relation to Norway, looked up more information. That an psychological ill man shot many children who were at a camp at that time.
19) 252. USA/Germany, female, younger than 20. No relation, did not look up more information.
shooting at a lake, about 11 dead people

20) 255. Germany, female, younger than 20. No relation to Norway, looked up more information
Breivik had certain problems, victims were innocent, took place on an island, many dead

21) 256. Germany, female, younger than 20. No relation to Norway, looked up more information.
that breivik went by boat to the island and shot a lot of young (i think) muslime people

22) 289. Switzerland, female, younger than 20. No relation to Norway, looked up more information.
A man shot a big amount of young people on an island and he could not be stopped, they said he is ill

10.6. The respondent mentions the nationality of the perpetrator
1) 61. Bulgaria, male, 21-30 years old.
Bomb attack, later shooting at island, not sure if related, most probably attacker is of Arab descent

2) 97. Hungary, female, younger than 20 years old.
I heard that a Norwegian man shot a lot of Norwegian kids.

3) 103. Hungary, female, 21-30 years old.
I heard that a native Norwegian man shoot many schoolkids.

4) 149. Austria/Germany, female, 31-40 years old.
I cannot really remember clearly, but I do know, that in the beginning, people talked about a terrorist attack from the 'usual suspects' (meaning an attack from someone with f.ex. an islamic background) and even though it’s not very surprising if you’re a little up-to-date on today’s politics in Scandinavia, everyone was quite surprised, that it was actually someone like Anders Behring Breivik - meaning a guy from 'home', who did all this.

5) 158. Austria, female, younger than 20 years old.
shooting in norway, youth, terror attack, shopping center, religious background eventually,

6) 190. Canada/Denmark, male, younger than 20 years old.
that is was terrible. That he got caught. that it was not Taliban.

7) 297. USA/Denmark, male, younger than 20 years old.
Bombings in Oslo. Al-Qaeda was suspected.

8) 301. Estonia/Uruguay, male, 21-30 years old.
Terrorist attack, white man, norwegian offender, young victims, shooting

9) 308. Denmark, female, 31-40 years old.
I remember that everyone at first thought it to be a muslim attack. The images. The trouble with slow police response/ability to get to the island. The memorial. The Norwegian prime ministers speeches.

10.7. Other answers, interesting to analyse
1) 51. Belgium, female, younger than 20
I heard that a guy dressed as a police man shot poeple. It happened at an Island in Norway.

2) 57. Sweden, female, 21-30 years old.
terror attack, muslims, misstakes made by the police regarding transportation to Utøya

3) 58. Germany/Serbia, male, younger than 20
I heard that a terrorist attack happened and that many minors were either killed or wounded as well that most of them had influential parents, who are involved in politics.
4) **69. France, female, younger than 20.**
The volcano in island, confrontation in thailand between "red and yellow" about monarchie and democratie in 2008, war in syria, economic crisis, king in belgium.

5) **75. USA, female, 31-40 years old.**
That a man, wearing a police uniform, had gunned down a group of young people on an outing. I found out later, after linking to BBC articles about the bombing.

6) **76. Belgium, female, 21-30 years old.**
many people died. They were not sure yet how many people died and how many people were involved or who the killer was.

7) **98. Hungary, female, younger than 20 years old.**
Attack, terrorism, racism, he killed an immigrant students who were at this camp on the island, before the attacker went to the island he blew up a car in the centre of Oslo, his case was closed now and he was sentenced to prison for many years, more than 100 people were killed or were seriously injured

8) **176. Germany, female, 21-30 years old.**
Shooting of kids on an island, that the motives are unclear, a bomb in the parliament

9) **77. The Netherlands/Belgium, female, 41-50 years old.**
kids

10) **79. Belgium, female, older than 60 years old.**
mad shooter - killing people at a gathering - many dead and wounded - complete chaos

11) **80. Belgium, male, 21-30 years old.**
A bombing in oslo, a madmen on a summer camp, they were linked making it even more insane

12) **82. Belgium, female, 21-30 years old.**
bomb attack in Norway. children were swimming and he kept shooting

13) **91. USA/Germany, female, 21-30 years old.**
A gunman killed students that did an excursion to an island and he was dressed up like a police men. The man said he was acting according to some superior religion or so. He seemed mentally confused.

14) **142. Austria, female, 21-30 years old.**
Recounts of the attack by news anchors, eye witness accounts from the young people on the island, reports about the trial, the unmoved and unrepentant expression of the perpetrator

15) **144. Austria, female, younger than 20 years old.**
how many person were killed, when they sued him, that they were thinking about he may be mad or mentally ill, how the other one’s reacted ..

16) **154. Austria, female, younger than 20 years old.**
I first herd about the things happening in Utoya, later about the bomb in Oslo.

17) **155. Austria, female, younger than 20 years old.**
Utoya, death, youth, unlikely for norway, breivik, how the norwegians and the royals came closer

18) **192. Germany, male, 21-30 years old.**
government buildings, youth camp of a Norwegian social party, stepbrother of Mette Marit got killed, German rescuing people by boat and

19) **244. Germany, female, younger than 20 years old.**
Breivik, island, a saver was a german tourist with his boat, a lot of young people died (one was a relative of Mette Marit)
20) 196. Germany, female, 21-30 years old. 
Utoya, Breivik and his inability to understand what he did wrong, the youth camp/mourning people, the lawsuit and verdict

21) 205. Brazil, male, younger than 20 years old. 
I heard tha Breivik shot people as a terrorist attack and by the court he stated that he did not regret his actions.

22) 210. Sweden, female, 21-30 years old. 
Norway, young people - my age, camp, shooting, people were surprised the attacker was Norwegian...

23) 212. Denmark, male, younger than 20 years old. 
The killings on Utøya, took the police around 2 hours to get to Utøya IIRC. Breivik was pretty cold in the court afterwards, said he learned to kill in World of Warcraft. Didn't regret what he had done. Had made like a video on the internet explaining why.

24) 217. Slovakia, female, younger than 20 years old. 
I dont remember exactly but i do know that the information was changing each half hour. first thing was that there was an attack on some children in norway.

25) 258. Serbia, female, younger than 20 years old. 
News - only shortly about the attack on the island - that a man started to shoot for no reason a youth group

26) 275. Bulgaria, female, 31-40 years old. 
gunman, attack, breaking news, Norway

27) 294. Norway, male, 31-40 years old. 
The first SMS were about the explosion in Oslo, could it be a gas-leak? The next text were that is were a bomb - my wife replied that this is probably just the start. The next hours we were driving without any information. After entering the hotel in north-east Italy we got Wifi reception and saw on international news that Islamist had attacked Norway...

28) 298. Sweden, male, 21-30 years old. 
Explosion (then believed have been possible gas leak), gunshots in island
Appendix 6, Results Question 11

“What image did you get of the event?”

(The first respondent has identification number 2, due to the data collection)

11.1. The respondent was surprised

1) 2. Swedish female, 21-30 years old

Tragedy, chaos, “how could it happen in Norway?”

2) 14. Swedish male, 21-30 years old

It was a very surprising and big terrorist attack. If more attacks would happen was very uncertain in the beginning.

3) 17. Austria, female, younger than 20

It was a bit unbelievable at first because it was that terrible

4) 22. South African female, 41-50 years old

Horror, surprise,

5) 25. Germany, female, 21-30 years old.

Horrible, how could this happen, scary

6) 35. Germany/Serbia, female, younger than 20 years old

That it was a huge shock in Norway

7) 37. Swedish female, 21-30 years old

I was shocked, could not believe that it had happened

8) 39. Germany/Finland, female, younger than 20

Shocking, extremist,

9) 42. Norwegian female, 21-30 years old

I didn’t believe it, as it is my home town and I’ve always considered it to be the safest place on earth. When I got home from my holiday a week later the whole atmosphere in the city had changed.

10) 47. Swedish male, 21-30 years old

I thought it was a joke at first

11) 48. Sweden/Singapore, female, younger than 20 years old

Alien, like a dream can’t happen, too horrible

12) 55. Swedish female, 41-50 years old

Horrible, Hard to understand, chills

13) 59. Finland/Mexico, female, 21-30 years old

It was sad, unexpected, some people died.

14) 62. Estonian female, 21-30 years old

Unexpected tragedy

15) 70. Norway/Belgium, female, 21-30 years old

Scary, unbelievable, unreal, shocking

16) 96. Hungarian female, younger than 20 years old

I was shocked, especially because the event was against children.

17) 97. Hungarian female, younger than 20 years old
I was shocked that this kind of stuff happenped in a Scandinavian country as I always heard how peacefull people are here.

18) 102. Cyprus/Hungary, female, 21-30 years old
It was very shocking, especially that it happened in Scandinavia. (As I live in Denmark now, I have heard about this story in the last couple of months, since I live hear, so I am a bit confused what I thought about it all back then, when it happened)

19) 103. Hungarian female, 21-30 years old
I was amazed that something like that could happen in Scandinavia. First I thoguth it must have been a foreigner and not a native Norwegian.

20) 122. Australian female, 21-30 years old
I remember it being presented on media as Breivik being a mad, unhinged person, and it was an extremely tragic incident because he killed children. There was also shock at it happening in Norway, which is largely perceived as a very safe country.

21) 124. Finish female, 21-30 years old
It came from nowhere and nobody was prepared.

22) 131. Finish female, 21-30 years old
First it was "is this a joke?" or "are you kiddin' me", then it was "holy shit how can something like this happen in Norway!?". The image that stayed was that what happened was horrible, but at the same time there was this sense of disbelief.

23) 144. Austrian female, younger than 20 years old
well, i thought that he was mad, that this was crazy and that nobody can’t imagine when, where and why anything like that happens

24) 145. Austrian female, younger than 20 years old
NAZ! and racist attack, horrible, sad, how can that be possible?

25) 150. German female, younger than 20 years old
sad, surprising, terrifying

26) 152. Austrian female, younger than 20 years old
shocking, in such an peaceful and developed country,

27) 154. Austrian female, younger than 20 years old
I was shocked that something like that could happen in a country I consider as safe.

28) 155. Austrian female, younger than 20 years old
unbelievable for a country like norway,

29) 159. Austrian female, 41-50 years old
dreadful shock for the norwegian society

30) 174. USA/Denmark, female, younger than 20 years old
Terror-like shooting. Learned that terrorism can come from the inside of a country.

31) 185. Sweden/England, female, younger than 20 years old
That Norway was a country in chock, nobody had seen anything like this coming.

32) 203. Latvian female, 21-30 years old
They were terrifying news. I was shocked. I would never expect something like that could happen in Norway and done by a Norwegian person.
33) 210. Swedish female, 21-30 years old
that it was a horrible event, very sudden, nobody really knew what had happened at first

34) 222. India/Swedish female, younger than 20 years old
something out of the ordinary and very horrible.

35) 223. Swedish female, younger than 20
That it was terrifying, uncalled for

36) 228. Swiss male, 31-40 years old
It was amazingly planned with distractions and whatnot. It must have been a mastermind planing that.

37) 243. German female, younger than 20 years old
Pretty terrifying that a single person's sick mind can cause that many deaths in that short time.

38) 250. German male, younger than 20 years old
cruel, shocking, I couldn't believe it

39) 251. German female, 21-30 years old
I perceived it as very dramatic and tragic, as a real shock for the Norwegian people and the attack in the island almost as a slaughter

40) 259. Norway/Switzerland, female, younger than 20 years old
I couldn't believe it. Cruel, crazy, ununderstandable

41) 268. German other, younger than 20 years old
omg, what the hell is going on there

42) 292. Estonian female, 21-30 years old
That it was a shock to the nation who is used to their Lindgren-like Scandinavian security. The biggest image I can remember was the shock to me and also to the people in Norway. It is just not the country one would expect something like this to happen in. This was the biggest impression, the news carriers also seemed in shock.

43) 296. German female, 31-40 years old
At first I thought it was "another shooting" with "only" a few people dead. But relatively soon it turned into a very large-scale thing, something unthinkable. It was especially the image of so many young people, interested in society and politics, being massacred that was horrible.

44) 302. Danish female, 31-40 years old
Seemed unreal. Couldn't seem to put a picture into place.

45) 311. German male, 31-40 years old
It is a unbelievable

11.2. The respondent showed compassion
1) 7. South African male, 21-30 years old
It felt a lot like the school attacks that have happened in USA and even Finland. I could not really imagine how devastating it was.

2) 24. Swedish female, 21-30 years old
The realization of how quick your live can end

3) 29. German female, 21-30 years old
horrified, peaceful scandinavia being tortured at home ground, young people dead and a youth function, in nature
4) 43. Latvian female, younger than 20 years old
Crying teenager friends

5) 38. German female, younger than 20 years old
horrible tragedy, affects a whole nation, causes a lot of debates not only in Norway but also in other countries

6) 41. USA/Germany, female, younger than 20 years old
horrible, how someone can do something terrible like that

7) 43. USA female, 51-60 years old
Fear, Dismay and Sadness

8) 50. Serbian female, 21-30 years old
A terrible act of violence and many innocent victims.

9) 76. Belgian female, 21-30 years old
horrible! I was shocked

10) 100. Norwegian male, 21-30 years old
terrible, devastating, tragedy

11) 101. Norwegian male, 21-30 years old
Horrible ones

12) 105. Canadian female, 41-50 years old
Tragedy, senseless

13) 112. USA/Vietnam male, 31-40 years old
Utterly inhuman

14) 115. Canadian female, 51-60 years old
How very horrifying it was. All those young people with no chance of survival.

15) 125. Finish female, younger than 20 years old
Who does that? That is so awful

16) 128. Finish female, 21-30 years old
A great tragedy and lot of questions why and how. Norway handled the tragedy very well: comfort and help without anger. The event made the country stronger and more united. The media didn’t give the killer the satisfaction of ‘popularity’ and ‘fame’.

17) 130. Belgian female, 31-40 years old
It must have been horror for all those people and family's.

18) 140. Finish female, 21-30 years old
Dark and tragic, mixed with fear and anger.

19) 153. France/Austria, female, younger than 20 years old
Poor children; poor parents; I'm so sorry for what happened

20) 158. Austrian female, younger than 20
shocking, insane guy, attack, unbelievable, intolerance, who is able to do stuff like that?

21) 169. Danish female, younger than 20 years old
Horrible act of killing innocent people, confusing, madness
22) 176. German female, 21-30 years old  
horrible pictures of kids hiding, crying, and destroyed buildings

23) 179. Swedish male, 21-30 years old  
Chocking, frustrated and angry

24) 186. Swedish female, younger than 20 years old  
That is was horrible and terrifying for the kids and everyone else involved

25) 196. German female, 21-30 years old  
the terrible feeling of how everyone directly involved must have had; hatred for Breiviks views; how Norway kept its calm about anti-terrorism laws and such rash descisions

26) 202. Swedish female, 31-40 years old  
I pictured the poor young people lying on the ground..i will never forget one inteeview when a survivor telled of how she played dead under her dead friends so that he wouldnt kill her..so terrible:(

27) 211. USA female older than 60 years old  
A person with mental health issues taking innocent lives.

28) 213. Austria/German female, 21-30 years old  
it was horrible for all europeans but especially for norwegians

29) 215. German female, younger than 20 years old  
Fear, feeling sorry for the kids and parents, shocked

30) 216. Austrian male, younger than 20 years old  
Horrid fear and anger.

31) 217. Slovakian female, younger than 20 years old  
first i was confused and then i felt really sad that things like this happen.

32) 227. Sweden/Finland, female, 31-40 years old  
all colleagues crying lot people is dead

33) 229. Swiss female, 21-30 years old  
That it was really bad and I worried about the youth

34) 232. USA/Swiss female, younger than 20 years old  
that it was a really sad and tragic event, and that many families lost a member..

35) 235. Swiss female, younger than 20  
It's all breivik's fault.

36) 252. USA/German female, younger than 20 years old  
horrible event for everyone involved and others

37) 256. German female, younger than 20 years old  
I got an image that that would be one of the worst things which can happen to a country, losing so many people, so many young people. Everyone was in a shock and coulf not believe what happened. We saw that anything can happen anywhere!

38) 269. German female, 21-30 years old  
shocked, dont understand who would do such things

39) 272. German female, 21-30 years old  
terrible pictures of relatives who lost a child, remember pictures of the island, lots of police men
40) **283. Austrian female, 31-40 years old**
horrible images of someone murdering idealistic children and youth, the appeal that the prime minister addressed to youth: To young people that are trying to contribute to a better world, and how he talked very clearly about getting engaged in politics and his proclaimed support for free elections and democracy in general. the Reaction of AUF members and family.

41) **285. German female, 21-30 years old**
real horror! unbelievable, shocking, sad, bloody

42) **287. German female, 21-30 years old**
horrible events but big solidarity within the folk

43) **288. Brazil/Swedish female, younger than 20 years old**
That was horrible and loads of people had died or injured.

44) **289. Swiss female, younger than 20 years old**
horrible, I was really shocked, upset and mad..and of course sad, I felt so sorry for all the kids and their family

45) **293. German female, 31-40 years old**
terrible tragedy, so many young and active people murdered, planned and carried out by a fanatic

11.3 **The respondent remember what she or he did at the time**
1) **23. Sweden, male, younger than 20 years old**
The images I got was from the TV at the local restaurant when I was eating lunch

2) **8. German female, younger than 20 years old**
I was really shocked, because I flew to Oslo the next day and it seemed as nobody would have expected it, especially not in Norway.

3) **163. Canadian female, 51-60 years old**
Television showed area where the youth had been killed. I don’t remember seeing images of the bombing in Oslo

4) **197. Norway/Bosnia-Hercegovina, female, 21-30 years old**
Since I lived there, but was on vacation during that specific period, I had a hard time picturing it.

5) **204. France/Sweden, female, 21-30 years old**
Was horrified, had nightmares about it

6) **206. Swedish female, 31-40 years old**
Researcher’s translation: I was doing something else and didn’t understand the extent at first, where I was just swapped channels... I denied it or thought that they were making a hen from a feather.

7) **219. Swedish female, younger than 20 years old**
At first I thought that it was onlt the buildings that had been bombed. Then, after an hour or so we got more information from SVT. My family and I followed the new from the terrorist attacks very closely by watching the NRK which was sent by SVT that day and the following days after the attacks.

8) **253. German female, 21-30 years old**
I was very shocked to hear about it

11.4. **The respondent put the event in relation to him-/herself**

1) **11. German female, younger than 20 years old**
I am from Germany and I thought that this kind of things can not happen in countries in western or northern europe. I felt a little bit unsafe afterwards and that he was dressed as a police man shocked me a lot.
2) **12. USA/Sweden, female, 31-40 years old**
That it was against the Government, that it reminded me about the attempt in Sweden at the end of 2010.
That no country is safe from these attacks.

3) **16. Swedish female, 31-40 years old**
Hard to realize that it happened so close to Sweden. Lots of confusion in the reporting.

4) **45. Swedish male, younger than 20 years old**
That something terrible had happened - I got kind of scared.

5) **56. Belgian female, 31-40 years old**
bloody, scary, not knowing who I knew on the island, scared for the openness of a country a hold dear,...

6) **88. Swedish female, younger than 20 years old**
Horrible and shocking. Scandinavia is supposed to be a safe place.

7) **91. USA/German female, 21-30 years old**
The footage showed crying teenagers, ambulances and police. It seemed very tragic and I felt empathy with the people, especially because something like this happened in my hometown - Erfurt in 2002.

8) **113. French female, younger than 20 years old**
It was really violent, so many people got shot, scared me.

9) **114. USA male, 31-40 years old**
Island forest, bone chilling close up on perpetrators calm face.

10) **135. Estonian female, 21-30 years old**
It was a horrible attack that no one had seen coming, it scared and shocked a lot of people, because something this awful had happened not that far away from us.

11) **137. Swedish female, 21-30 years old**
Horrible, unbelievable, scary that it happened so close to Sweden.

12) **172. Danish female, 21-30 years old**
At first I thought it was in the middle east. I saw the pictures of Oslo at first, then I read the bar bellow saying Oslo. Since there were no sound of the television, we found an internet cafe to gather more information about the event, and to check if anybody we knew were hurt or affected by the attacks.

13) **188. Swedish female, younger than 20 years old**
It was hard to understand that something like that could happen so close. It felt unreal in some ways.

14) **225. Swedish female, younger than 20 years old**
i thought it was a sick joke. I could not understand that it was happening. Especially not sp "close".

15) **233. Swiss female, younger than 20 years old**
I was very scared, though I have some friends living there.

16) **262. Ireland/Sweden, female, 21-30 years old**
Mass murderer, to me it was similar to the school massacres.

17) **263. USA/Germany, male, younger than 20 years old**
i was thinking about a school terror attack or something but I didn't picture it as bad as it hapend.

18) **281. Danish female, 21-30 years old**
It's hard to remember now, but I guess I associated it with terror due to the other terrorist attacks in European cities in the last few years.
19) **286. Swedish female, 31-40 years old**
That it was a terror attack. At first I believed it was a large group of people who did this, but soon realised that this was the work of one man. I got really scared and it changed my world-view.

**11.4. Other answers, interesting to analyse**

1) **4. Swedish male, younger than 20 years old**
Wasn't that bad, unclear circumstances, not known how many who had died

2) **5. Swiss female, younger than 20 years old**
horrible, madness, extremist, he might be an example for other people,

3) **10. Danish female, 41-30 years old**
Broken windows and people bleeding in the streets

4) **19. Sweden, female, 21-30 years old.**
(Researcher’s translation): That it had been a big explosion and that many were hurt and some dead. It felt like the event had political intensions. I first thought it was a terrorist group that did it.

5) **20. Swedish female, 21-30 years old.**
That it was a terror-attack (at first) then media said it was a norweigan who had done it by himself

6) **36. Belgium female, 31-40 years old**
young people dived into the water trying to escape

7) **51. Belgian female, younger than 20 years old**
People that were trying to escape by jumping into the water.

8) **54. Spain/Swedish female, 21-30 years old**
It felt big and the feeling that it would get bigger

9) **57. Swedish female, 21-30 years old**
I don’t remember

10) **58. Germany/Serbia, male, younger than 20 years old**
They showed disturbing footages of bodies laying on the outskirts of the island.

11) **60. Swedish male, 31-40 years old**
Initial confusion - assumed islamist motifs. Tremendous fear. Unity.

12) **61. Bulgarian male, 21-30 years old**
Pictures of the bombing, the island, low-quality photos of the events

13) **69. French female, younger than 20 years old**
Bad images, media don’t really say the truth, they overdo it.

14) **72. South African female, 51-60 years old**
It was so intense, hearing it from the child as from the television news.

15) **75. USA female, 31-40 years old**
I saw no images.

16) **80. Belgian male, 21-30 years old**
the island with breivik looking over the rocks

17) **82. Belgian female, 21-30 years old**
image of the attack in the city center and maps to explain the way he took

18) **118. USA, other, 21-30 years old**
Anti-liberal attack

19) **129. Finish female, 21-30 years old**
bad, stupid, crazy man, should’ve gotten into a way worse prison

20) **147. Austrian female, younger than 20 years old**
seemed very arbitrary, cruel, desperation and irritation all over Norway and wider parts of Europe.

21) **149. Austria/Germany, female, 31-40 years old**
I believe it humbled Norway and Scandinavia in it's whole. What with being some of the richest countries in the world with not really that much of an immigration-problem, the politic had a very right-winged tendency. I'm actually not completely up to date on the current political state in Scandinavia, but I believe this event did certainly show, what a society that is well fed and rich can produce, if it feels even slightly endangered...

22) **151. Austrian female, 41-50 years old**
terrible attack, but thank god it's not from international terrorists, but only from one insane guy. Terrible for all the victims and family of course.

23) **178. Swedish female, younger than 20 years old**
I don't really understand the question, but it was terrible and since I have relatives from Norway we were all sitting together in silence flowing the news. It was a really sad day.

24) **182. USA female, 41-50 years old**
Kids in the water, who had been shot. Police arriving on boats. I don't remember seeing images of anyone on the ground at the camp shot. I do remember seeing lots of images of the gunman, as well.

25) **205. Brazilian male, younger than 20 years old**
Dreadfully sad, really! It was all around the news in Brazil.

26) **220. USA male, 21-30 years old**
Not enough information or from enough sources. I would further research it because with the information I've currently received, it sounds like it could be an attack against the people using guerrilla tactics, but I've just read one persons vague interpretation of the event.

27) **230. USA/Switzerland. Female, 21-30 years old**
the attacker was mentally ill

28) **231. Swiss male, younger than 20 years old**
Someone who had mental disorders had acces to things he shouldn't have had access to

29) **244. German female, younger than 20**
the act of terror was awful. And a lot of norwegian put roses, pictures and cards down.

30) **255. German female, younger than 20 years old**
catastrophe, news spread everywhere in the world (or at least Europe)

31) **258. Serbian female, younger than 20 years old**
horrible; surprising; other people didn't care about it and why did it happen

32) **273. Turkish male, 21-30 years old**
first i thought that was a terrorist attack from arabic countries, el-kaida or other islamic terrorist organizations

33) **276.Bulgaria/England, 21-30 years old**
A middle-aged maniac started a random shooting in a youth camp in Norway and killed around 80 young
people which were members of a political movement. Additionally, he planted a bomb in Oslo as far as I remember, but fortunately the blast did not kill anyone. Following his arrest there was news that he was obsessed with neo-nazistic ideas and was able to buy freely huge amounts of fertilizers to produce explosives. In the end, his sentence was ridiculous and everyone has seen the nice accommodations given to him in the prison. And yes, he kept complaining and demanding.

34) 278. Turkish male, 21-30 years old
Not always muslims though...

35) 284. Swedish male, younger than 20 years old
At first a possible religious terrorist attack (as seen during two towers..) Then it became more and more clear that the motives were racial and anti-immigration.

36) 301. Estonia/Uruguay, male, 21-30 years old
People reacted with high patriotism, norwegian flags

37) 306. Japan/Sweden, female, 31-40 years old
I do not remember

38) 316. Danish male, 31-40 years old
Destroyed building in Oslo, people trying to escape on Utøya

39) 317. Sweden/Bolivia, female, 31-40 years old
Confusion, tragedy, and I was disgusted how the media assumed the killer was a non-white, constructed as the "terrorist' when it was in fact a christian white fascist neo-nazi
Appendix 7, Results Question 16

“What is your image of Norway as a country?”
(The first respondent has identification number 2, due to the data collection)

16.1. The respondent do not know much about Norway
1) 38. German female, younger than 20 years old. No relation to Norway.
I don’t really have any image

2) 96. Hungarian female, younger than 20 years old. No relation to Norway.
I only know some very nice YFU volunteers from there, but don’t know much about the country itself.

3) 116. “South American” female, younger than 20 years old. No relation to Norway.
no idea about

Ok

5) 141. USA/Austria, female, 21-30 years old. No relation to Norway.
Don’t know a lot about it. I don’t hear a lot about it on the news. I like the sound of the language.

I have met some Norwegian exchange students who were really nice. Apart from that, I don’t not really have an image of Norway.

7) 150. Germany, female, younger than 20 years old. Has friends/family in Norway.
positive but not really profound because there are not too many things which are generally known about Norway

8) 151. Austria, female, 41-50 years old. No relation to Norway.
Generally nice, but I have no relation to Norway, so don’t have more detailed ideas about it.

9) 245. German female, younger than 20 years old. No relation to Norway.
Unfortunately, I barely know anything about Norway. It is seldomly the topic on television or on the internet, and in school we haven’t learned anything about it. Therefore, I don’t have an opinion on Norway. I don’t judge the country because of one event like that. It could have happened anywhere,

10) 269. USA/Germany, female, 21-30 years old. No relation to Norway.
i’ve never been there but i suppose it’s beautiful

11) 289. Swiss female, younger than 20 years old. No relation to Norway.
i don’t hear something about it in the news, so it seems to be neutral and stabil

16.2. The respondent focused on superlative adjectives in the explanation: e.g. rich, beautiful, educated people.

1) 2. Swedish female, 21-30 years old. Father lived there when he was 1-3 years old.
Stabile, rich, happy, skiing

2) 4. Swedish male, younger than 20 years old. Has visited Norway.
Rich, beautiful, peaceful

3) 7. South African male, 21-30 years old. Has friends/family in and close to Norway.
Rich, sophisticated, safe, well of politically, economically, socially. Generally a country that has very little to worry about.

4) 8. German female, younger than 20 years old. Has visited Norway.
I know, that Norway is a very rich country and it always seemed as all of the Scandinavian countrys are so peaceful, and all the people live in peace together.

5) 9. USA female, 21-30 years old. Has no relation to Norway
cold climate; friendly people; very modern; beautiful natural landscapes

Nature, expensive and tolerance

7) 11. German female, younger than 20 years old. No relation to Norway.
really advanced and actually a safe country to live in

8) 12. USA/Sweden, female, 31-40 years old. Has visited, has friends/family in and close to Norway, has co-workers from Norway.
Nice, friendly, open

9) 13. Danish female, 41-50 years old. Has visited, has friends/family in Norway
lovely, beautiful, peaceful holiday

10) 15. Netherlands, female, younger than 20 years old. Has visited, has friends/family in Norway
A beautiful country with very nice people

11) 16. Swedish female, 31-40 years old. Has visited, has friends/family in and close to Norway
Peaceful and openminded. Relaxful people.

12) 17. Austrian female, younger than 20 years old. Has no relation to Norway
it seems very social and has a good structure

13) 20. Swedish female, 21-30 years old. Has visited, has friends/family close
Beautiful, calm, secure

14) 25. German female, 21-30 years old, has visited, has friends/family in Norway
nature, peaceful, social

nice

16) 27. Scottish male, 31-40 years old. Has friends/family living close to Norway.
Positive, progressive

Safe, a lot of nature, rough, hilly, remote

peaceful nation, enjoying nature, and freedoms

19) 30. Indonesian male, 41-50 years old. No relation to Norway.
Beautiful Country

Clean, wealthy, calm, rich.

21) 32. Swedish female, younger than 20 years old. Has visited Norway.
Beautiful and loving country

22) 35. Germany/Serbian female, younger than 20 years old. Has visited Norway.
peaceful, beautiful, lovely people
cold good education nature

24) 40. Belgian female, younger than 20 years old. No relation to Norway. 
Nice, cold weather, wonderful nature

25) 41. USA/germany, female, younger than 20 years old. Wants to go to Norway. 
well structured, good school system, stable, friendly people, beautiful nature

26) 43. USA, female, 51-60 years old. Has visited Norway. 
peaceful, cold, beautiful, majestic

27) 44. Sweden/Belgium, female, 21-30 years old. Has visited Norway. 
That it's a very peaceful country with lots of solidarity, and a very wealthy country as well.

28) 45. Swedish male, younger than 20 years old. “Norway is Sweden’s neighborhood country...that’s why it was interesting” 
I think Norway seems to be a nice country with a democratic system and nice nature ;)

29) 48. Sweden/Singapore, female, younger than 20 years old. Has friends/family close to Norway. 
They are a proud people who helps each other during hard situations

30) 49. Japan/Swedish mae, 31-40 years old. Has visited Norway, has friends/family in and close to the country. 
Peaceful, friendly, beautiful, pricey

31) 50. Serbian female, 21-30 years old. No relation to Norway 
I find Norway a good country to live in, due to high standards, stability, gorgeous landscapes and culture.

32) 51. Belgian female, younger than 20 years old. No relation to Norway 
I think it is a beautiful country with a lot of nature and beautiful picturesque cities.

33) 53. Paraguay male, younger than 20 years old. Has friends/family in Norway. 
A very safe and very country to live

34) 54. Spain/Sweden, female, 21-30 years old. Has lived in Norway 
Calm, friendly

35) 55. Swedish female, 41-50 years old. Neighbour country to Norway. 
Beautiful, hard working, friendly

36) 58. German/Serbian male, younger than 20 years old. Has friends/family living close to Norway 
It is a wealthy country, which has high standard of living.

37) 59. Finland/Mexico, female, 21-30 years old. Has visited Norway and has friends/family there. 
it's a beautiful, wealthy scandinavian country. very high life standards. friendly norwegians. awesome nature.

38) 60. Swedish male, 31-40 years old. Has visited Norway and has friends/family there. 
A wealthy, well-functioning nation. Strong solidarity.

Wealthy, safe

40) 63. German female, younger than 20 years old. Has lived in Norway. 
very modern and safe country
41. The Netherlands/Oman, female, younger than 20 years old. Has visited Norway.
   Serene, desolate, beautiful nature

42. Serbian female, younger than 20 years old. Wants to study in Norway.
   Beautiful, calm, developed, nice people, nature, great weather.

   Clean, organized, rich

44. French female, younger than 20 years old. Has friends/family in Norway.
   Beautiful country, snow, beautiful language, nice people...

   Correct, respectable, friendly, honest

   Rich culture, rich in money, nature people, nature itself

   Beautiful, nice people, cold

48. USA, female, 31-40 years old. Had a Norwegian sociology teacher in College.
   I have always thought it was an advanced, socially conscious nation that treated its people well.

49. The Netherlands, female, 41-50 years old. No relation to Norway.
   Nature...peacefull...

50. Australia/Canadian female, 21-30 years old. No relation to Norway.
   Beautiful, peaceful

51. USA/Germany, female, 21-30 years old. No relation to Norway.
   Very focused on nature and sustainability. Strong economy and educated people. Royal family.

52. Serbian female, younger than 20 years old. Wants to visit Norway.
   Amazing country, nice people.

53. Norway/Mexico, male, 21-30 years old. Has lived in Norway.
   Beautiful, rich, cold, nice people

   Im a Norwegian living in Norway, like Norway a lot. A great country

   As a Scandinavian country, I think Norway is a safe, well-organised and democratic country.

56. USA/Vietnam, male, older than 60 years old. No relation to Norway.
   A peaceful country

57. USA/India, female, 31-40 years old. No relation to Norway.
   Clean, safe

   Safe, forward-thinking, gender equality, high quality of education, and a good attitude towards social problems

   Typical Scandinavian country with great gov programs, security, education, healthcare, judicial system, etc.
60) 175. Danish female, younger than 20 years old. Has visited Norway.
Very nice, snowy, lovely weather

Beautiful, open, many different nationalities.

Well, do you know the song "Mitt lille land"? That pared up with wealth, happiness and crazy/super nice people.

63) 273. Turkish male, 21-30 years old. Has lived in Norway.
one of the most peaceful countries in the world

64) 319. Belgian female, younger than 20 years old. Has visited Norway.
Beautiful and people there are very welcoming!

16.3. The respondent focused on negative adjectives in the explanation: e.g. cold, expensive, terrible weather.
33) 33. Latvian male, 31-40 years old. Has friends/family in Norway.
Nature is great, expensive country

Rich, isolated country

47) 47. Swedish male, 21-30 years old. Has lived in Norway and visited.
Expensive and wet version of Sweden

76) 76. Belgium, female, 21-30 years old. Has friends/family close to Norway.
It's cold in the winter and get's really dark. you can see the northern ligt. It's an expensive country.

80) 80. Belgian male, 21-30 years old. Has friends/family in Norway.
Cold, expensive, different customs than belgium (in belgium it's polite to ask if someone needs help, in norway it indicates that the other person is weak)

92) 92. Belgian female, younger than 20 years old. Has no relation to Norway.
cold, normally peaceful

104) 104. Serbian female, younger than 20 years old. No relation to Norway.
cold, nice nature, expensive

149) 149. Austria/Germany, female, 31-40 years old. Studied Scandinavian Studies.
It's 'the Swiss of the North' - meaning it's very rich and doesn't really need to care about the rest of the world.
It's very beautiful, but people in Norway are spoiled.

Cold!!( Temperature wise)

not good

Apart from the beautiful nature I have nothing in mind. At all, I would say that all Scandinavian people I know (including Norwegian) seem a bit depressed to me.

Researcher’s translation: Culturally the closest country to Sweden. Everything is more expensive and the language is silly.

A proportional representative constitutional democracy with an un-elected head of state. The kingdom of Norway in general have to high thoughts about itself.

Filthy rich and rather boring. Marvelous nature, terrible food, expensive like hell. Extremely nice people.

16.4. The respondent focused on political factors
1) 6. Swedish female, 31-40 years old. Neighbour country.
Rich beautiful not in eu

A rich, open-minded socialist country with a high level of educated people.

Liberal, human rights, welfare, neutral, rich, developed.

4) 39. Finland/Germany female, younger than 20 years old. Has friends/family close to Norway.
democratic, peacefull, rich

legally regulated by state

Good, should work more towards sustainable energy production and fight rasism. Don't like current governemtn in Norway.

7) 134. USA male, 21-30 years old. Has friends/family in Norway.
It seems to me that Norway has a lovely exterior, with serious problems (right-wing) brooding inside

8) 156. Austrian male, younger than 20 years old. No relation to Norway.
wealthy, well-educated, beautiful nature, modern cities, immigration is a bigger issue

9) 180. German female, 21-30 years old. No relation to Norway.
cold; a bit isolated; not part of the EU

10) 237. Swiss male, younger than 20 years old. Has no relation to Norway.
A typical capitalist europe country.. hyprotical like UNO

11) 251. German female, 21-30 years old. No relation to Norway.
Although, it is not a member of the European Union, Isee it as part of the community. I still perceive Norway as a very peaceful country and I really would love to visit it because of its beautiful landscapes if it wasn't so incredibly expensive.

16.5. The respondent put the image of Norway in relation to his-/herself.
It is a nice country quiet similar to Sweden.

2) 5. Swedish/Swiss female, younger than 20 years old. Has visited Norway.
Nice people, amost like Swedes, talk funny, very friendly, have all the oil

3) 18. USA/Sweden, female, younger than 20 years old. Has friends/family close to Norway.
It is very alike sweden in many ways, if it could happen there it could happen here.
4) **19. Swedish female, 21-30 years old. No relation to Norway.**
Researcher’s translation: Safe, rich and secure. Simply like a better version of Sweden.

5) **23. Swedish male, younger than 20 years old. Has friends/family in Norway.**
Not all too different from Sweden

6) **24. Swedish female, 21-30 years old. Has lived in Norway and has friends/family living there.**
Its a very nice country and I enjoyed living there

7) **37. Swedish female, 21-30 years old.**
Has lived in Norway and has friends/family living there.

8) **57. Swedish female, 21-30 years old.**
Has visited Norway.

9) **107. Hungarian male, younger than 20 years old. Has friends/family in Norway.**
People who I know from Norway are very kind.

10) **108. China/Canada, male, younger than 20 years old. No relation to Norway.**
Norwegians are great

11) **109. Canadian female, 51-60 years old. Has friends/family in Norway**
A wealthy, socialist country similar to Canada in their liberal belief system

12) **110. Canadian female, 21-30 years old. Has friends/family in Norway.**
That it is a wonderful country, much like Canada. We had an exchange student from Norway live with us when I was a teenager and she always described it in a positive way.

13) **127. The Netherlands, male, 21-30 years old. No relation to Norway.**
A people on it’s own, much like Switzerland

14) **154. Austrian female, younger than 20 years old. Has visited.**
I have been in Norway and really loved it! Everyone was friendly, beautiful landscape and do on. But it was also really expensive.

15) **155. Austrian female, younger than 20 years old. Has friends/family close to Norway.**
I lived in Sweden for a year, I guess Norway is pretty similar, but it is very hard to explain an image of a country in a few sentences, Scandinavian lifestyle and beliefs

16) **168. Denmark/Greenland, male, 41-50 years old. Has friends/family in Norway.**
Food is very expensive, the skiing is great and compared to Denmark it is very hilly

17) **188. Swedish female, younger than 20 years old. Has visited.**
That it is a lot like Sweden, definitely not a place where something like this could happen. I picture it as a rather peaceful country with nice people.

18) **206. Swedish female, 31-40 years old. Has lived in Norway.**
Researcher’s translation: A beautiful country with an amazing nature, I am proud to be neighbour to Norway. A rich country with down-to-earth people. A bit spoiled, and conservative in globalism, but proud.

19) **210. Swedish female, 21-30 years old. Has visited Norway.**
Similar to Sweden... more expensive, good skiing, nice people

20) **211. USA, female, older than 60 years old. Has friends/family in Norway.**
It is my paternal grandparents home land
21) 212. Danish male, younger than 20 years old. Has visited Norway.
Very nice country, been there fishing a couple of times. A bit cold, much like Denmark. People are nicer though.

22) 220. USA, male, 21-30 years old. Has friends/family living close to Norway.
I haven't kept up with Norway past the early 1800's. I've seen a few depictions at an international house in California but the majority of my knowledge of Norway comes from school projects as a child or family history from my grandparents. Mountains, fjords, sheep, goats, Vikings, paper clips, woods, fishing, and snow come to mind when I heard of, "Norway".

23) 223. Swedish female, younger than 20 years old. Has visited Norway.
Calm, friendly, neighbor

want to live there one day, beautiful, cold, dark, oil

25) 266. USA/German male, younger than 20 years old. Has friends/family in Norway.
I want to visit it bc I'm fascinated by the culture and the people

26) 267. Swiss female, younger than 20 years old. No relation to Norway.
for me it is similar to switzerland, secure

27) 278. Sweden/Turkish male, 21-30 years old. Has visited Norway.
Expensive village

28) 279. Swedish male, younger than 20 years old. Has visited Norway.
Rich liberal country, similar to Sweden

A country very similar to Denmark and danish mentality. Maybe that was why it was so easy to relate to this terrible terror attack.

30) 295. Swedish female, younger than 20 years old. Neighbour country.
safe, well off and similar to sweden

rich, much like dk, but more rational

Beautiful nature, colonial past but have recognized indigenous rights more than Sweden,Struggling with the same issues as many countries in Europe do now, racism and neo-nazis on the rise.

16.6. Other answers, interesting to analyse
Developed, interesting history, unique, culture

2) 42. Norwegian female, 21-30 years old, living in Norway.
I've always found Norway to be a safe and open environment. When I've been living abroad (Belgium, Germany, France and the US) I have always found things about those societies that I've felt restrictive after having lived most of my life in Norway.

beautiful, open in summer closed in winter, lovely, my home away from home, ...

4) 61. Bulgarian male, 21-30 years old. No relation to Norway.
Intolerant (before and after Breivik), EU-sceptic, snow, death metal
5) 67. Serbian female, younger than 20 years old. No relation to Norway.  
I've never been in Norway, but i would like to visit it. I don't have any prejudice, incidents may happen anywhere, so i'm neutral.

6) 68. Norway/Belgian female, 21-30 years old. No relation to Norway.  
United, beautiful, human, strong, interesting

7) 71. Venezuelan male, 21-30 years old. No relation to Norway  
One of the best places on earth to live

8) 84. New Zealand, female, older than 60 years old. Has visited Norway and has friends who has relations in Norway.  
Beautiful, green, sparsely populated.

9) 98. Hungarian female, younger than 20 years old. No relation to Norway  
It must be a nice and tidy county with lot of lakes and nice nature and also kind people

Rich, beautiful, safe, friendly people, scandinavian welfare country, clean, Jo Nesbo.

11) 129. Finland female, 21-30 years old. Has friends/family close to Norway.  
cool, good, pretty, similar to Finland

12) 132. Hungarian female, younger than 20 years old. Doesn't remember if hearing about the event. Knews a few people from Norway.  
modern, finds it important to work on social issues, but i was told that it is not actually a really good place to live in

A country with a very good quality of life, where even criminals are treated well.

Vikings

15) 139. Swedish female, younger than 20. Has visited and has friends/family in Norway.  
Cute language, fish, knitted jumpers, fjords

16) 144. Austrian female, younger than 20 years old. Has friends/family in and close to Norway.  
rich and safe country, beautiful and very good at wintersports

17) 145. Austrian female, younger than 20 years old. Has friends who have been to Norway.  
socialist, well developed, good social system and infrastructure,

18) 146. Austrian female, younger than 20. No relation.  
beautifull, peacefull, cold

19) 147. Austrian female, younger than 20 years old. Friends/family in Norway.  
prosperous and wealthy, very liberal but social way of economy and government

20) 171. Danish female, younger than 20 years old. Lives in Scandinavia. "Norway is close and what happens effects us all"  
Very much like Denmark. (prakke)

21) 178. Swedish female, younger than 20 years old. Has visited.  
I still have a positive image of the country as rish and beautiful.
22) 192. German male, 21-30 years old. No relation to Norway.
typical Scandinavian, like unspoiled and wide spread nature, friendly and honest but also reserved people.
cold-mild climate

Mostly as a clean and rich country with beautiful nature and patriotic happy people! But i know this is not the
whole truth...!

24) 205. Brazilian male, younger than 20 years old. Has visited, has friends/family in Norway, was an
exchange student in Sweden.
I think that just like Sweden or Denmark, Norway is a beautiful and culturally rich country, but I get the feeling
that sometimes some people in Norway tend to be a little over-nationalistic.
(kom detta före eller efter Breiviks agerande?)

a scandinavian country, where everything is expensive and people are hardworking

26) 240. Ecuador/Germany, female, 21-30 years old. Has visited Norway.
modern country, highly developed, wealthy, neutral, nature, Oslo, Nobelprize, Skiing

Now? As any other country - with good and bad people. Before? As an innocent and happy country with
endless resources and a joyful population.
Appendix 8, Cross-tabulations

Table 3. Continent affecting Relation

RelationFriendsFamilyThere * ContinentLived2011

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RelationFriendsFamilyThere</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>% within ContinentLived2011</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>44.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Asia</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>North America</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>South America</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Africa</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>55.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Asia</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>North America</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>South America</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Africa</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>178</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3.1. Continent affecting Interest

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interest scale</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>% within Continent lived in 2011</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Europe</td>
<td>Asia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0,4%</td>
<td>0,0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0,4%</td>
<td>0,0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0,4%</td>
<td>0,0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3,1%</td>
<td>12,5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12,2%</td>
<td>25,0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3,5%</td>
<td>12,5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8,6%</td>
<td>0,0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>14,5%</td>
<td>0,0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>18,4%</td>
<td>0,0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>38,4%</td>
<td>50,0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>255</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Symmetric Measures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nominal by Nominal</th>
<th>Phi</th>
<th>Approx. Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Phi</td>
<td>.062</td>
<td>.944</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cramer’s V</td>
<td>.062</td>
<td>.944</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N of Valid Cases</td>
<td>318</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4, Relation Having Friends/family in Norway affecting awareness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HeardOfAttacks</th>
<th>RelationFriendsFamilyThere</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>294</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% within RelationFriendsFamilyThere</td>
<td>93.6%</td>
<td>91.6%</td>
<td>92.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% within RelationFriendsFamilyThere</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
<td>5.1%</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I do not remember</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% within RelationFriendsFamilyThere</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>178</td>
<td>318</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% within RelationFriendsFamilyThere</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Symmetric Measures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nominal by Nominal</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Approx. Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Phi</td>
<td>0.673</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cramer's V</td>
<td>0.301</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N of Valid Cases</td>
<td>318</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Not assuming the null hypothesis.
b. Using the asymptotic standard error assuming the null hypothesis.
Table 5, Relations affecting interest

Interest rate*No relation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HowInterestingScale * Relation</th>
<th>No relation to Norway</th>
<th>Some kind of relation to Norway</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Interest scale 1</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% within Relation</td>
<td>2,8%</td>
<td>0,5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% within Relation</td>
<td>0,0%</td>
<td>0,5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% within Relation</td>
<td>0,0%</td>
<td>1,9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% within Relation</td>
<td>7,3%</td>
<td>1,9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% within Relation</td>
<td>11,9%</td>
<td>11,5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% within Relation</td>
<td>2,8%</td>
<td>3,8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% within Relation</td>
<td>11,9%</td>
<td>9,1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% within Relation</td>
<td>16,5%</td>
<td>10,5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% within Relation</td>
<td>19,3%</td>
<td>16,3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% within Relation</td>
<td>27,5%</td>
<td>44,0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>209</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% within Relation</td>
<td>100,0%</td>
<td>100,0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Symmetric Measures**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Approx. Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nominal by Nominal Phi</td>
<td>0.247</td>
<td>0.022</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cramer's V</td>
<td>0.247</td>
<td>0.022</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N of Valid Cases</td>
<td>318</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Interest rate*Friends/family there

**HowInterestingScale * RelationFriendsFamilyThere Crosstabulation**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HowInterestingScale</th>
<th>RelationFriendsFamilyThere</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% within RelationFriendsFamilyThere</td>
<td>0,7%</td>
<td>1,7%</td>
<td>1,3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% within RelationFriendsFamilyThere</td>
<td>0,7%</td>
<td>0,0%</td>
<td>0,3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% within RelationFriendsFamilyThere</td>
<td>2,9%</td>
<td>0,0%</td>
<td>1,5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% within RelationFriendsFamilyThere</td>
<td>2,9%</td>
<td>4,5%</td>
<td>3,8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% within RelationFriendsFamilyThere</td>
<td>11,4%</td>
<td>11,8%</td>
<td>11,6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% within RelationFriendsFamilyThere</td>
<td>2,1%</td>
<td>4,5%</td>
<td>3,5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% within RelationFriendsFamilyThere</td>
<td>6,4%</td>
<td>12,9%</td>
<td>10,1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% within RelationFriendsFamilyThere</td>
<td>12,1%</td>
<td>12,9%</td>
<td>12,6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% within RelationFriendsFamilyThere</td>
<td>17,1%</td>
<td>17,4%</td>
<td>17,3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% within RelationFriendsFamilyThere</td>
<td>43,6%</td>
<td>34,3%</td>
<td>38,4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>178</td>
<td>318</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% within RelationFriendsFamilyThere</td>
<td>100,0%</td>
<td>100,0%</td>
<td>100,0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Symmetric Measures**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Approx. Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nominal by Nominal Phi</td>
<td>.209</td>
<td>.128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cramer's V</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.209</td>
<td>.128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N of Valid Cases</td>
<td>318</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 8. Gender affecting respondent's interest rate

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interest scale</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>% within Gender</td>
<td>1,3%</td>
<td>0,0%</td>
<td>1,3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within Gender</td>
<td>0,0%</td>
<td>0,0%</td>
<td>0,3%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within Gender</td>
<td>0,4%</td>
<td>3,7%</td>
<td>1,3%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within Gender</td>
<td>4,3%</td>
<td>2,4%</td>
<td>3,8%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within Gender</td>
<td>11,1%</td>
<td>13,4%</td>
<td>0,0%</td>
<td>11,6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within Gender</td>
<td>4,3%</td>
<td>1,2%</td>
<td>3,5%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within Gender</td>
<td>10,3%</td>
<td>8,5%</td>
<td>50,0%</td>
<td>10,1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within Gender</td>
<td>12,0%</td>
<td>14,6%</td>
<td>0,0%</td>
<td>12,6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within Gender</td>
<td>20,1%</td>
<td>9,8%</td>
<td>0,0%</td>
<td>17,3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within Gender</td>
<td>36,3%</td>
<td>43,9%</td>
<td>50,0%</td>
<td>38,4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>234</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>318</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within Gender</td>
<td>100,0%</td>
<td>100,0%</td>
<td>100,0%</td>
<td>100,0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Symmetric Measures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Approx. Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nominal by</td>
<td>Phi</td>
<td>.342</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nominal</td>
<td>Cramer's V</td>
<td>.342</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N of Valid Cases</td>
<td></td>
<td>318</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 11. Age affecting interest rate

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interest rate</th>
<th>Younger than 20 years old</th>
<th>21-30 years old</th>
<th>31-40 years old</th>
<th>41-50 years old</th>
<th>51-60 years old</th>
<th>Older than 60 years old</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Count</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within Age</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>40.0%</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Count</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within Age</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Count</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within Age</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Count</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within Age</td>
<td>5.7%</td>
<td>4.2%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Count</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within Age</td>
<td>10.6%</td>
<td>11.7%</td>
<td>14.9%</td>
<td>13.3%</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>11.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Count</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within Age</td>
<td>7.3%</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Count</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within Age</td>
<td>10.6%</td>
<td>8.3%</td>
<td>12.8%</td>
<td>6.7%</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
<td>20.0%</td>
<td>10.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Count</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within Age</td>
<td>15.4%</td>
<td>10.8%</td>
<td>6.4%</td>
<td>20.0%</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
<td>20.0%</td>
<td>12.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Count</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within Age</td>
<td>16.3%</td>
<td>20.8%</td>
<td>14.9%</td>
<td>13.3%</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>17.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Count</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within Age</td>
<td>31.7%</td>
<td>40.0%</td>
<td>48.9%</td>
<td>46.7%</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
<td>20.0%</td>
<td>38.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>318</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 12.1, Age affecting daily intake of news

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Daily intake of news</th>
<th>Younger than 20 years old</th>
<th>21-30 years old</th>
<th>31-40 years old</th>
<th>41-50 years old</th>
<th>51-60 years old</th>
<th>Older than 60 years old</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than 1 hour per day</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within Age</td>
<td>52.0%</td>
<td>37.5%</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>6.7%</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>40.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-2 hours per day</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within Age</td>
<td>36.6%</td>
<td>40.8%</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>66.7%</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
<td>60.0%</td>
<td>40.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-3 hours per day</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within Age</td>
<td>8.9%</td>
<td>19.2%</td>
<td>19.1%</td>
<td>13.3%</td>
<td>25.0%</td>
<td>40.0%</td>
<td>15.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-4 hours per day</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within Age</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
<td>6.7%</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-6 hours per day</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within Age</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than 6 hours per day</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within Age</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>6.7%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within Age</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 13.1. Daily intake of news affecting interest

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interest scale</th>
<th>Daily intake of news</th>
<th>Less than 1 hour per day</th>
<th>1-2 hours per day</th>
<th>2-3 hours per day</th>
<th>3-4 hours per day</th>
<th>5-6 hours per day</th>
<th>More than 6 hours per day</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Count</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within Daily intake of news</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Count</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within Daily intake of news</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Count</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within Daily intake of news</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Count</td>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within Daily intake of news</td>
<td>7.0%</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Count</td>
<td></td>
<td>14</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within Daily intake of news</td>
<td>10.9%</td>
<td>9.3%</td>
<td>22.4%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>11.6%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Count</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within Daily intake of news</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
<td>3.9%</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Count</td>
<td></td>
<td>16</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within Daily intake of news</td>
<td>12.4%</td>
<td>9.3%</td>
<td>6.1%</td>
<td>14.3%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>10.1%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Count</td>
<td></td>
<td>13</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within Daily intake of news</td>
<td>10.1%</td>
<td>11.6%</td>
<td>16.3%</td>
<td>42.9%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>12.6%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Count</td>
<td></td>
<td>30</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within Daily intake of news</td>
<td>23.3%</td>
<td>14.7%</td>
<td>10.2%</td>
<td>14.3%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>17.3%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Count</td>
<td></td>
<td>39</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within Daily intake of news</td>
<td>30.2%</td>
<td>46.5%</td>
<td>38.8%</td>
<td>28.6%</td>
<td>66.7%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>38.6%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total Count | 129                       | 129                       | 49                | 7                 | 3                 | 1                 | 318                      |

Symmetric Measures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Approx. Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nominal by Nominal</td>
<td>Phi</td>
<td>.415</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cramer's V</td>
<td></td>
<td>.186</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N of Valid Cases</td>
<td></td>
<td>318</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 14, YFU membership affecting Relation

RelationLivedThere * YFUMember

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RelationLivedThere</th>
<th>YFUMember</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within</td>
<td>4.8%</td>
<td>9.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>239</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within</td>
<td>95.2%</td>
<td>91.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>251</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Symmetric Measures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nominal by Phi</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Approx. Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cramer’s V</td>
<td>,074</td>
<td>,189</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N of Valid Cases

318
RelationFriendsFamilyThere * YFUMember

### Crosstab

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RelationFriendsFamilyThere</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Count</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within YFUMember</td>
<td>43.8%</td>
<td>44.8%</td>
<td>44.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>178</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Count</td>
<td>56.2%</td>
<td>55.2%</td>
<td>56.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>251</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>318</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within YFUMember</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Symmetric Measures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Test</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Approx. Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nominal by Nominal Phi</td>
<td>-0.008</td>
<td>0.889</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nominal by Nominal Cramer's V</td>
<td>0.008</td>
<td>0.889</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N of Valid Cases</td>
<td>318</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

RelationFriedsFamilyClose * YFUMember

### Crosstab

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RelationFriedsFamilyClose</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Count</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within YFUMember</td>
<td>20.3%</td>
<td>20.9%</td>
<td>20.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>253</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Count</td>
<td>79.7%</td>
<td>79.1%</td>
<td>79.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>251</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>318</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within YFUMember</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Symmetric Measures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Test</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Approx. Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nominal by Nominal Phi</td>
<td>-0.006</td>
<td>0.917</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nominal by Nominal Cramer's V</td>
<td>0.006</td>
<td>0.917</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N of Valid Cases</td>
<td>318</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 14.1.2, YFU membership affecting interest rate

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>How interesting Scale</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>% within YFUMember</th>
<th>YFUMember</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1,6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0,0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1,3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0,0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1,5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0,3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0,8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3,0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1,3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4,4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1,5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3,8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>12,0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10,4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>11,6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3,2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4,5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3,5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>9,6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11,9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>10,1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>13,5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9,0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>12,6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>17,1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>17,9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>17,3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>37,8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>40,3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>38,4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total Count                   251 Yes | 67 No | 100,0% Total
Count % within YFUMember

Symmetric Measures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Approx. Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nominal by Phi</td>
<td>.174</td>
<td>.380</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nominal Cramer’s V</td>
<td>.174</td>
<td>.380</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N of Valid Cases</td>
<td>318</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

118