

AperTO - Archivio Istituzionale Open Access dell'Università di Torino

**Environment and health: Risk perception and its determinants among Italian university students**

**This is a pre print version of the following article:**

*Original Citation:*

*Availability:*

This version is available <http://hdl.handle.net/2318/1731752> since 2020-02-27T14:27:36Z

*Published version:*

DOI:10.1016/j.scitotenv.2019.07.201

*Terms of use:*

Open Access

Anyone can freely access the full text of works made available as "Open Access". Works made available under a Creative Commons license can be used according to the terms and conditions of said license. Use of all other works requires consent of the right holder (author or publisher) if not exempted from copyright protection by the applicable law.

(Article begins on next page)

# **ENVIRONMENT AND HEALTH: RISK PERCEPTION AND ITS DETERMINANTS AMONG ITALIAN UNIVERSITY STUDENTS**

Formattato: Allineato al centro

Formattato: Tipo di carattere: 14 pt, Grassetto

*A. Carducci, M. Fiore, A. Azara, G. Bonaccorsi, M. Bortoletto, G. Caggiano, A. Calamusa, A. De Donno, O. De Giallo, M. Dettori, P. Di Giovanni, A. Di Pietro, Facciola A., I. Federiqi, I. Grappasonni, A. Izzotti, G. Libralato, C. Lorini, M.T. Montagna, L.K. Nicolosi, G. Paladino, G. Palomba, F. Petrelli, T. Schilirò, S. Scuri, F. Serio, M. Tesauro, M. Verani, M. Vinceti, F. Violi, M. Ferrante*

Formattato: SpazioDopo: 10 pt, Interlinea: singola

Formattato: Tipo di carattere: Calibri, Non Grassetto, Italiano (Italia)

## **ABSTRACT [\(DA RIVEDERE\)](#)**

Among the determinants of environmental health risk perception, health literacy and social media messages have been generally neglected. This study details the environmental health risk perception and its determinants in Italian university students, including a measure of functional health literacy and an analysis of newspapers and social media. A cross sectional survey was carried out among students from 15 Italian universities and different disciplines (grouped into Scientific-Health and Humanistic-Legal-Social sectors) using a self-administered anonymous questionnaire, divided into six sections: socio-demographic characteristics, information on health and environment, environmental health risk perception, trust, attitudes and behaviors and functional health literacy. Local newspapers and tweets in the same areas and period were analyzed in relation to quantity, topics and tone. The study population included 4778 students (65.1% female) aged  $21 \pm 4.3$  years. functional health literacy was low (below the cutoff value) for 44.4% of students and high for 55.6%.

**A new outcome of the survey is that the detected association between high functional health literacy a higher global health risk perception and trust in institutions both as sources of information and as actors for protection against environmental risks.**

Formattato: Tipo di carattere: Grassetto

The Internet and social networks were the most frequently consulted sources of information (77.7%), which was predictive of a higher risk perception. The possible relation between environmental health risk perception and tweet communication was highlighted by a comparison between the two cities (Pisa and Modena) with more tweet registered. [INCLUDERE COSA MIGLIORARE](#)

To the best of our knowledge, this is the first study with such a wide sample and sampling area, taking into account functional health literacy and social media as determinants of environmental health risk perception and trust. The data obtained can thus be considered of high value, suggesting the inclusion of functional health literacy and social media in future surveys to improve environmental health risk perception evaluation.

## 30 **Introduction**

31 Risk communication is defined by WHO as an essential component of the risk analysis, strictly linked to the  
32 other two components of risk assessment and management, at the basis of public health prevention strategies  
33 (WHO, 2013; Covello and Allen, 1988). The environmental risk communications from public health institutions  
34 should be carefully programmed based on an accurate study of the context (Covello, 2003; Smillie and Blissett,  
35 2010), including the assessment of public risk perception and trust as well as their determinants.

36 According to the studies on environmental health risk perception (Sandman, 2003), it includes a combination of  
37 “hazard” (the risk evaluated by experts: probability times severity of harm) and “outrage” (a global emotional  
38 experience of fear, anger and concern, causing a feeling of injustice).

39 Various determinants of the outrage have been identified, including: voluntariness, control, fairness, process,  
40 morality, familiarity, memorability, dread, diffusion in time and space (Sandman, 1987, 2003). They mainly  
41 pertain to the nature of risk and the ways it is managed by institutions; however, an important role could also be  
42 attributed to people’s attitudes, trust and awareness and the media influence.

43 Health literacy and mass media/social media information are rarely considered in studies and guidelines  
44 (Kuroda et al., 2018), despite their proven representativeness of risk perception, awareness and behaviours in  
45 many contexts (Institute of Medicine, 2004; Bennet and Calman, 2010; Berkman et al., 2011; Kickbusch et al.,  
46 2013).

47 Health literacy was initially defined as “the capacity to obtain, process and understand basic health information  
48 and services needed to make appropriate health decisions” (Ratzan and Parker, 2000; Institute of Medicine,  
49 2004). It has subsequently been given a more complex definition, differentiating between functional,  
50 communicative and critical health literacy (Nutbeam, 2000, 2008), where functional health literacy represents  
51 the baseline individual literacy skills needed to read and understand health information.

52 The growing complexity of health-related information scenarios has led to further distinctions, defining e-health  
53 literacy (Kayser et al., 2018) and health literacy related to specific topics such as vaccine health literacy- (Lorini  
54 et al., 2018) or environmental health literacy- (Finn and O’Fallon, 2017). In studies where measurements of  
55 health literacy -have been included in surveys on attitudes and perceptions, they were found to be strongly related

56 to knowledge, health behaviors, health outcomes and medical costs (Institute of Medicine, 2004; Berkman et  
57 al., 2011; Kickbusch et al 2013). On the other hand, few studies have investigated the relationships between ~~HL~~  
58 [health literacy](#) and risk perception of environmental issues (Kuroda et al., 2018).

59 Mass media have a significant influence both on the knowledge and attitudes of people (Nelkin, 1987), as well  
60 as risk perception (Bennet and Calman, 2010). Studying mass media information is a useful means to understand  
61 social “sentiments” and tendencies in political debates (Scheufele, 2014). In addition, it has also been used to  
62 estimate the public risk perceptions regarding health-related topics, such as epidemics (Dettori et al., 2018),  
63 vaccines (Aquino et al, 2017) or environmental risks (Carducci et al., 2017; Dettori et al., 2019).

64 The aim of the present study was to give a broad picture of the environmental health risk perception and its  
65 determinants in university students in Italy, by analyzing 15 universities and students from different disciplines.

66 In response to the lack of information on the relations of health literacy and mass media/social media messages  
67 with environmental health risk perceptions as well as the lack of tools to investigate them, our study included  
68 factors such as functional health literacy, mass media and social media coverage.

69 Another specific objective was to propose a functional health literacy measure that would be easily applicable  
70 in environmental risks perception surveys. This is represented by a very simple test, which it is already used in  
71 previous studies for other topics and target population (Calamusa et al., 2012) and it is easily translatable in  
72 other languages without any cultural adaptation problems.

73

## 74 **Methods**

### 75 *Study population and data collection*

76 From November 2017 to January 2018 we conducted a survey among students attending courses in 15 Italian  
77 Universities: Bari, Camerino, Catania, Chieti, Florence, Genoa, Lecce, Messina, Milan, Modena, Naples, Padua,  
78 Pisa, Sassari, and Turin (Figure 1). Students were distributed in the sectors of Scientific-Health (biological and  
79 environmental sciences, biotechnology, medicine, pharmacy, physics, mathematics, civil and industrial  
80 engineering) and Humanistic-Legal-Social (sociology, political sciences, communication sciences, literature,  
81 philosophy, cultural heritage, business economics, economics and finance, law).

82 The survey instrument was a questionnaire, distributed by researchers in classrooms or study rooms,  
83 autonomously compiled by the students in the same places and collected immediately after compilation- in boxes  
84 to guarantee the anonymity (self-administered anonymous questionnaire). This modality configures the study as  
85 cross-sectional, and the measurements of risk perception as prevalence in a population which represents future  
86 adult leaders in scientific as well as humanistic sectors. Before the distribution, researchers explained to the  
87 participants that by filling out the self-administered questionnaire, informed consent was being given for the use  
88 of data for research purposes, according to the Law for Protection of Personal Data and the European Code of  
89 Conduct for Research Integrity (at [www.allea.org](http://www.allea.org)), established by the ALLEA (All European Academics). The  
90 questionnaire and the study protocol were approved by the Ethical Committee of the University of Milan.

91 The questionnaire was tested, adjusted and validated through a pilot study, carried out on a convenience sample  
92 of 362 students in seven universities (Bari, Catania, Chieti, Messina, Modena, Pisa, Sassari).

93 The internal consistency of the Risk Perception Index sections was assessed with Cronbach's alpha test.

94 The final questionnaire (available in the Supplemental Material A) consisted of 21 close-ended questions and  
95 was divided into six sections:

- 96 1) Socio-demographic characteristics: gender, age, [place-area](#) of residence and the sector of university degree  
97 course attended (Scientific-Health or Humanistic-Legal-Social);
- 98 2) Information: 1. Sources. 2. Trust in these sources. 3. Perceived quality of information. 4. Self-evaluation of  
99 knowledge on environmental health risks. The trust was measured by a Likert 4-point-scale (1=none,  
100 2=little, 3=limited, 4=a lot);
- 101 3) Environmental health risk perception was explored through five questions: 1. Estimation of burden of  
102 environmental diseases. 2. [Opinion on the association between environmental factors and some diseases \(6](#)  
103 [items\)](#). 3. Risk perception regarding environmental risks (25 items). [They were chosen to provide a list as](#)  
104 [wide as possible of the issues of concern for the population](#). 4. Risk perception of behavioral risks (5 items).  
105 5. [General environmental health risk perception and self-perception of their own health status \(6 items\)](#). 6.  
106 Smoking habits, to find relations with environmental risk perception. Except for questions 1 and 6, the  
107 answers were coded according to a Likert 5-point-scale (1=not important, 2=not very important, 3=quite

Codice campo modificato

Commentato [AC1]: Per rispondere al commento sui rischi considerati

Commentato [AC2]: "global risk perception" index spiegare

Commentato [AC3]: "general risk perception" index spiegare

108 important, 4=very important, 5=extremely important). For question 3 a “global risk perception index” was  
109 calculated summing the scores given to the single items (maximum=125). For question 5 scores to the items  
110 ..... were summed to calculate a “general risk perception index”;

111 4) Trust in different subjects: 1. Evaluation of the importance for pollution reduction and control (11 items: 6  
112 institutional and 5 ~~non~~-non-institutional subjects). 2. Evaluation of the extent to which these subjects fulfill  
113 pollution reduction and control. The answers were coded according to a Likert 5-point-scale (1=scarce,  
114 2=sufficient, 3=medium, 4=high, 5=very high). Global indexes of trust (for institutional and non-  
115 institutional subjects) were calculated by the sum of scores for the corresponding items;

116 5) Attitudes and behaviors in reducing and controlling environmental pollution (five questions): the answers  
117 to this section were not considered in the present paper and will be the subject-topic of a further publication;

118 6) Functional health literacy: to measure the ability to read and understand information related to health, a tool  
119 previously designed was used (Calamusa et al., 2012) in order to include this factor in KPAB (Knowledge  
120 Perceptions Attitudes and Behaviors) questionnaires on different themes. Briefly, the understanding of 12  
121 terms (chosen from a list of the most common words obtained through a computational linguistic analysis  
122 of a sample of information leaflets of the 38 bestselling over-the-counter medicines) was tested by asking  
123 participants to place them in the correct section of a stylized body divided into four sections.

#### 124 *Newspapers and social media analysis*

125 A search of articles published by local newspapers of the participating cities in the days immediately preceding  
126 and during the survey period (specific for each city) was carried out with three keywords (pollution, air pollution  
127 and smog). The articles were then examined by two independent reviewers in relation to the pertinence, topic  
128 and tone of the message. The tones of the messages were classified either as alarming or not alarming.

129 For the same periods, tweets with the same keywords were downloaded with NCapture (QSR© International  
130 Pty Ltd. NCapture Help.) and reviewed in terms of pertinence and topic and tone.

#### 131 *Data analysis*

132 The answers to the questionnaire were coded as qualitative data or scores, according to the question, and  
133 analyzed with SPSS 21.0 software (SPSS Inc., Chicago, IL, USA).

Commentato [AC4]: Per Maria Fiore: scusa, puoi recuperare questo dato?

134 The frequency of answers was compared with the chi-squared test and Cramers' V. For the Likert scales, the  
135 medians were calculated. For some questions (i.e. trust in sources of information, risk perception and trust in  
136 subjects for pollution control) a global score was calculated summing the single items. Global trust indexes were  
137 calculated separately for the institutional subjects (Ministries of Health and Environment, Public Health and  
138 Regional Environmental Agencies, Municipalities, Regions and Physicians) and for the non-institutional  
139 subjects ("ecolabel" industries, environmentalist associations, non-governmental organizations, local  
140 community stakeholders, and individual citizens).

141 For the functional health literacy, each answer was coded as 1 (correct) or 0 (missing or incorrect), and a total  
142 functional health literacy score was calculated (minimum 0, maximum 12). The total score was divided into two  
143 levels:  $\leq 9$  (low functional health literacy) and  $> 9$  (high functional health literacy) based on its median value  
144 (Calamusa et al., 2012).

145 A bivariate analysis was performed using Student's t-test or Mann-Whitney U test, as appropriate, whereas the  
146 multiple group comparisons were carried out with analysis of variance (ANOVA) or Kruskal-Wallis test.

147 A multiple logistic analysis was performed to find the determinants of risk perception and trust. The following  
148 variables were thus dichotomized (taking the median as the cutoff value): risk perception index (low =  $\leq 75$ , high  
149 =  $> 75$ ) and trust in institutional subjects (low =  $\leq 21$ , high =  $> 21$ ) and in non-institutional subjects (low =  $\leq 15$   
150 high =  $> 15$ ) as dependent variables, the internet and social media as sources of information (yes or no),  
151 functional health literacy (low =  $\leq 9$ , high =  $> 9$ ), gender, area of residence (centre-north and south-islands) and  
152 smoking habits as independent variables.

153 In order to evaluate the impact of newspapers and twitter information on risk perception, the correlation between  
154 the number of alarming articles and risk perception index for cities was investigated and the same was done for  
155 tweets. In the case of cities showing a peak of Twitter or newspapers articles, a more extensive analysis was  
156 planned to compare risk perception, globally and for a single risk factor.

157 The results obtained revealed a particular peak in Modena: the data from this city were compared with those  
158 from Pisa, which in turn shows a high number of tweets and is similar to Modena with regard to demographic  
159 characteristics (ISTAT, 2018).

Formattato: Tipo di carattere: 11 pt

Formattato: Colore carattere: Automatico

Formattato: Tipo di carattere: 11 pt, Colore carattere: Automatico

Formattato: Colore carattere: Automatico

160 All the statistical tests were two-sided and p-values were calculated to show the level of differences/associations.  
161 The most recent epidemiological tendencies suggest not to use p statistics to define significance because there  
162 is an intrinsic risk of misinterpreting the data, i.e. to give importance to information that have not and, vice versa,  
163 to neglect important data (Rothman et al., 2008; Wasserstein and Lazar, 2016). Nevertheless, we decided to  
164 highlight (with asterisks in the tables) the most relevant differences/associations in order to facilitate data  
165 interpretation.

166

## 167 **Results**

### 168 *Internal consistency of the questionnaire and response rate*

169 Cronbach's alpha reliability test showed a global value of 0.905, which highlights the very good internal  
170 consistency of the global risk perception index (25 items, values from 25 to 125).

171 Because the questionnaire was distributed and completed during lessons or study hours, the response rate was  
172 very high (over 99%). The main explanation reported for the non-respondents was a lack of time due to exam  
173 preparations.

### 174 *Study population: Socio-demographic characteristics and health literacy*

175 The study population included 4778 students (65.1% female) aged  $21 \pm 4.3$  years. A total of 2505 participants  
176 (53.2%) belonged to the scientific-health sector. Overall, 65.1% of students were following three-year degree  
177 courses (bachelor's degree). The mean functional health literacy level was  $10 \pm 3$ : functional health literacy was  
178  $\leq 9$  for 44.4% of students and  $> 9$  for 55.6%. The most represented area of residence was southern Italy, including  
179 Sicily and Sardinia which accounted for 57.1% of respondents, followed by the centre (25.0%) and the north  
180 (17.9%). Among the socio-demographic variables, functional health literacy was lower for people following  
181 three-year degree courses, and for the scientific health-sectors (Table 1).

182 A minor difference was found among areas of residence, with the highest percentage of functional health  
183 literacy  $> 9$  in the centre, followed by the south-islands, and finally by the north. No difference in Functional  
184 functional Health-health Literacy-literacy was observed between genders.

### 185 *Information*

Commentato [AC5]: TITOLO CAMBIATO PER  
RIORGANIZZARE LA DISCUSSIONE



186 The Internet-internet and social networks were the most frequently consulted sources of information (77.7%),  
187 followed by Newspapers and Weeklies (14.6%), TV and Radio (7.7%). A weak association was found between  
188 the sources of information and gender (e.g. Internet-internet and social networks: Female vs Male, 78.8% vs  
189 75.7%; Newspapers and Weeklies: Female vs Male, 13.6% vs 16.5%) and the sector (e.g. Internet-internet and  
190 social networks: Scientific-health sector vs Humanities sector, 73.7% vs 83.5%).

191 Information was considered “truthful, but incomplete” by 64% of the sample; the proportion was higher among  
192 functional health literacy > 9 students (62.5% vs 65.2%), in particular mainly in Milan (61.7 vs 67) and Turin  
193 (67.1 vs 79.3).

194 Regarding the self-evaluation of their own knowledge about environmental health risks, 29.1% of students  
195 considered it “satisfying”, with the main differences due to functional health literacy (<=9=25.8% vs >9=31.7%),  
196 above all in Catania, Chieti, Lecce, Messina and Milan, and to gender (Male 62.2% vs Female 58.4%).

197 Although most students consulted the Internet-internet and social media as the main source of information (78%),  
198 they placed “moderate” and “low” trust, respectively on these sources (internet vs social media, 48.6% vs 45.5%)  
199 regardless of the level of functional health literacy, gender and sector; whereas students with functional health  
200 literacy > 9 were more trusting than functional health literacy <= 9 in the Ministry of Environment (40.3% vs  
201 37.1%), Ministry of Health (44.2% vs 40.8%), Regional Environmental Protection Agency (34.3% vs 30.9%)

202 and University and Research Institutions (53.9%). On the other hand, students with functional health literacy <=  
203 9 were more trusting in social networks (9.1% vs 7.5%) and experts in alternative medicines (23.9% vs 20.5%).

204 The global trust index for institutional subjects– as sources of information was higher for functional health  
205 literacy > 9 (18 vs 17).

206 No important differences in global trust in sources of information were found according to the area of residence.

207 During the time period of the questionnaire distribution, the number of newspaper articles varied among the  
208 different cities (Figure 32), with a maximum in Turin (21), followed by Lecce (11), Padua and Milan (10),  
209 Sassari (8), Modena (6), Naples (5), Bari (4), Messina and Catania (3), and Pisa (2). In the remaining cities no  
210 pertinent articles were published. The most reported topics regarded air pollution (41.0% of articles), followed  
211 by traffic bans (14.5%), pollution in schools (6.0%) and other (38.6%), and the tone was mainly negative  
212 (78.3%).

Formattato: Tipo di carattere: 11 pt

Formattato: Tipo di carattere: 11 pt

Formattato: Tipo di carattere: 11 pt

Formattato: Tipo di carattere: 11 pt

Formattato: Tipo di carattere: 11 pt

Formattato: Tipo di carattere: 11 pt

Formattato: Tipo di carattere: 11 pt

Commentato [16]: le figure sono state spostate, le ho rinumerate

213 A positive trend was detected between the number of newspapers articles and the global risk perception index,  
214 although a statistical significance was not reached, which could be attributable to the small size of the dataset  
215 (number of cities concerned).

216 The quantitative analysis of tweets for the same cities and periods (Figure 43) showed a huge peak in Modena.  
217 In the figure, only cities with more than zero tweets are reported, according to social media analysis based on  
218 the defined keywords. The qualitative analysis indicated outdoor air quality as the most tweeted topic (70.56%),  
219 followed by car traffic (18.45%), exhaust and industrial emissions (2.82%), climate change (2.25), chemicals in  
220 food or drinking water (2.11%), pollution of coasts, rivers and lakes (1.41%), indoor air quality (1.13%), high-  
221 voltage lines, radio and TV repeaters, cellphones and pollution of groundwater (0.42%), heating systems and  
222 thermoelectric power plants and germs in food or drinking water (0.14%).

### 223 Risk perception

224 Only 17% of students estimated the global burden of diseases caused by environmental factors according to  
225 WHO (between 21 and 40%), with differences between functional health literacy levels (14.4 for functional  
226 health literacy  $\leq 9$  vs 16.5 for functional health literacy  $> 9$ ). Most students overestimated this burden (82.1%).

227 Respiratory diseases were considered to be mostly associated with environmental factors (89.2% of students  
228 answered “very” or “extremely important”) followed by tumors (87.3%), infectious diseases (77.7%), congenital  
229 malformation (61.9%), heart diseases (58.4%) and neurological disorders (38.9%). No differences were found  
230 in relation to socio-demographic variables, however some differences were detected for functional health  
231 literacy in some cities: for functional health literacy  $> 9$  a higher proportion of students answered “very” or  
232 “extremely important” in Bari and Padua regarding tumors, in Bari and Sassari regarding infectious diseases, in  
233 Firenze, Messina, Modena and Sassari regarding congenital malformation, in Bari regarding heart diseases, and  
234 in Genoa and Sassari regarding neurological disorders.

235 The risk perception in relation to specific environmental risks (Figure 24) was highest for the chemical pollution  
236 of water and food (median score 5) and the lowest for urban noise (median score 3). No differences were found  
237 for functional health literacy.

238 The perception of single risks was different among cities, above all for road accidents (perceived higher in Bari,  
239 Catania, Genoa, Lecce, Modena, Padua, Pisa, and Sassari), genetically modified food (perceived higher in

**Commentato [MV7]:** Ln271-273. This is most likely an expected conclusion, but could have been verified with a testable hypothesis with targeted hypothetical articles

**Formattato:** Tipo di carattere: 11 pt

**Formattato:** Tipo di carattere: 11 pt

**Formattato:** Tipo di carattere: 11 pt

**Formattato:** Tipo di carattere: 11 pt

**Formattato:** Tipo di carattere: 11 pt

**Formattato:** Tipo di carattere: 11 pt

240 Catania, Florence, Genoa, Modena, Padua, and Sassari), pollution of coasts, rivers and lakes (perceived worse  
241 in Chieti, Milan, Modena, Padua, and Turin). The highest number of perceived high risks was in Padua (7) and  
242 Genoa (9). In Naples, the perception was lower for five risks (nuclear facilities, exhausts and emissions from  
243 industries, chemicals in food or drinking water, germs in food or drinking water and traffic noise).

244 The global index of risk perception (calculated by summing the scores for the single risks), generally high  
245 (median ... with a maximum of 125) was higher for students with functional health literacy > 9 (functional  
246 health literacy ≤ 9 vs functional health literacy > 9, median: 95 vs 96), and those resident in Genoa, Turin,  
247 Sassari and Florence.

248 A general environmental health risk perception index was evaluated from the opinions on the pollution of water,  
249 air, soil and surrounding environments. This index was also positively associated with functional health literacy  
250 (functional health literacy ≤ 9 vs functional health literacy > 9, 95 vs 96).

251 The majority (43.8%) of students reported that they were able to control the risks to their own health and  
252 considered their health to be quite good (83.1%). These data were not influenced by functional health literacy,  
253 area of residence or gender.

254 Of the entire sample, 29.4% were smokers, with differences according to functional health literacy (functional  
255 health literacy ≤ 9 vs functional health literacy > 9, 33.1% vs 26.4%) and (slightly) area of residence (25.2% in  
256 the north, 30.4% in the centre, and 30.3% in the south and the islands).

257 Although the global risk perception index (high vs low) was not influenced by the smoking habits, differences  
258 were found between smokers and non-smokers in several questions of this section.

259 Regarding the importance of the environment as the cause of diseases, smokers considered it to be significantly  
260 stronger for tumors (88.4% vs 86.9%) and heart diseases (52.3% vs 51.5%), non-smokers for congenital  
261 malformation (59.7% vs 62.9%), and neurological disorders (38.1% vs 39.3%).

262 Among personal behaviors, students considered smoking as the most dangerous (89.9% answered “very” or  
263 “extremely important”), followed by inadequate food preservation (65.0%), misuse of chemicals for domestic  
264 purposes (house and garden) (63.1%), exposure to solar radiation without any protection (63.0%), and use of  
265 pellet stoves (27.4%). Smoking seems to be related to a different risk perception of these behaviors: smokers  
266 only attributed more importance to pellet use for global warming (27.6% of smokers answered “very” or

Commentato [I8]: da chiedere

Formattato: Tipo di carattere: 11 pt

Formattato: Tipo di carattere: 11 pt

Formattato: Tipo di carattere: 11 pt

267 “extremely important” vs 27.0% of non-smokers). On the other hand, non-smokers attributed more importance  
268 to smoke (non-smokers vs smokers: 90.9% vs 87.6%), solar UV exposure (65.0% vs 58.2%), food preservation  
269 (66.0% vs 62.4%) and misuse of chemicals (64.7% vs 59.1%).

270 The global risk perception index was also lower for smokers (median 95 vs 96).

271 The multiple logistic regression showed that the risk perception can be predicted by the use of ~~Internet~~-internet  
272 and social media as sources of information (Table 2).

273 The number of tweets for all cities was not associated with the ~~global-general~~ risk perception index.

274 However, there was a clear difference in this index between Pisa and Modena (median 93.5 vs 95.5), possibly  
275 related to the number of tweets. The specific risk perception was lower in Pisa than in Modena regarding nuclear  
276 plants, emissions from heating systems, discharges and emissions from industries, electromagnetic fields (high  
277 voltage lines, radio, TV and cell phone repeaters) and genetically modified food. Only for the industry emissions  
278 and discharges, the number of tweets was different between the two cities (20 in Modena and 0 in Pisa).

279 *Trust*

280 In general students considered “*institutional subjects*” (Ministries of Health and Environment, Public Health and  
281 Regional Environmental Agencies, Municipalities, Regions and Physicians) to be more important than “*non*  
282 *institutional*” ones (“*ecolabel*” industries, Environmentalist Associations, Non-Governmental Organizations,  
283 local community stakeholders and individual citizens) in terms of the protection against environmental risks  
284 (mean: 3.7 vs 2.9).

285 Institutional subjects were considered more important for students with functional health literacy > 9, for those  
286 who did not report the internet and social media as sources of information and for people from Genoa, Chieti,  
287 Pisa and Florence). On the other hand, students with functional health literacy ≤ 9 and those resident in Florence,  
288 Padua and Sassari considered ~~non-non~~-institutional subjects- to be more important.

289 The real fulfillment of actions against environmental risks was in general considered more effective for  
290 ~~institutional subjects~~ (mean: 2.6 vs 2.4). Students with functional health literacy > 9 were more trusting in the  
291 Ministry of Health and Public Health Agencies in terms of fulfillment, while students with functional health  
292 literacy ≤ 9 were more trusting in Regional Environmental Agencies, Municipalities, “*ecolabel*” industries,

**Commentato [19]:** c'era scritto global, ma credo sia un refuso, dovrebbe riferirsi al "general risk perception"

**Formattato:** Tipo di carattere: 11 pt

**Formattato:** Tipo di carattere: 11 pt

293 environmental associations, non-governmental organizations, local community stakeholders, and individual  
294 citizens. Finally, females were more trusting in physicians than males.

295 The multiple logistic regression showed that trust in institutional subjects can be predicted by functional health  
296 literacy and area of residence (Table 3), while no predictive variables were found for trust in non-institutional  
297 subjects.

298 The responses to the trust in information on health risks from different sources, the importance of different  
299 subjects in protecting the general population from environmental health hazards, and the evaluation of their  
300 fulfilment are reported for single source/subject in Figures B.1, B.2, B.3, respectively, of Supplemental Material  
301 B.

302

### 303 **Discussion and conclusion**

304 Environmental risk perception data have been studied for over 30 years, due to their importance in understanding  
305 people's attitudes and in planning information interventions (Covello, 2003). Nevertheless, our study shows  
306 various features that make it original and innovative: which mainly concern the broad population considered,  
307 the functional health literacy analysis and the study of mass media and social media coverage.

308 The survey design (in a short period of time in every city), and the instrument (with a high internal consistency)  
309 made the answers comparable among the different geographical areas and the administration method (in study  
310 classrooms, with the immediate collection after completing) guaranteed a very high response rate (99%)  
311 avoiding the selection bias based on the willingness to participate.

#### 312 *Study population: Socio-demographic characteristics and health literacy*

313 Studies on environmental health risk perception have often focused on specific groups of populations such as  
314 people living in polluted areas (Signorino and Beck, 2014; Coi et al, 2016; Kuroda, 2018), and high school or  
315 university students have also frequently been involved (Yapici et al., 2017; Durmuş-Özdemir and Şener, 2016;  
316 Weber et al, 2000; Bilgin et al., 2016; Young et al., 2015) . This is due to educational reasons and given that  
317 young people studying at a high level will likely be the future educators and decision makers. A detailed  
318 description of the surveys carried out among student populations is beyond the scope of the present study,

Formattato: Tipo di carattere: 11 pt

Commentato [AC10]: E' il caso di metterle?

Formattato: Tipo di carattere: 11 pt

319 however a literature review was performed in order to compare our study design and results with other studies,  
320 which is reported in Supplemental Material C. Briefly, in previous surveys among high school or university  
321 students, the questionnaires used have generally been based on multiple dimensions (i.e. demographic and social  
322 characteristics, awareness, attitudes and risk perception), and many risk factors have been considered. However,  
323 the aims, target populations and individual questions were different, so that our comparisons had to be limited  
324 to general aspects.

325 Studies considering such large populations and areas are very uncommon due to their complex organization.  
326 The majority of studies on students considered small numbers of people and limited geographical areas (see  
327 Table C.1), except for Weber et al. (2000), Altunoğlu and Atav (2016), and Young et al. (2015) who performed  
328 a nationwide survey enrolling numerous cities across the USA, Turkey and Taiwan, respectively.

329 Also, the survey carried out by Zhang and Fang (2013), Zhang et al. (2013) and Altunoğlu et al. (2017) included  
330 a large sample size, with more than 1000 students, but each study was limited to one city, thus lacking a broader  
331 vision of the whole country. Moreover, no one of these studies reached the dimension of our sample (4778  
332 students).

333 Our study analyzed a very broad population, distributed over an entire country. This revealed spatial differences,  
334 but also increased the variability of the studied population, thus highlighting the most important associations or  
335 differences that go beyond the geographical distribution and can thus be generalized.

336 In addition, we carried out the study during the same time period (about a month) in all cities, so that differences  
337 among universities could be attributed mainly to local situations and characteristics of the sample (gender, area  
338 of residence, degree course).

339 Considering the functional health literacy, although in the case of environmental risks, some authors (Kuroda et  
340 al., 2018) measured health literacy in its critical and communicative dimensions, in this work we decided to use  
341 a simple measure of functional health literacy. The current Italian validated functional health literacy  
342 measurement tools (Lorini et al., 2017; Biasio et al., 2018) seem too long and time-consuming to be used as  
343 items in more complex questionnaires on risk awareness and perception. Moreover, our test is also easy to  
344 translate and does not need a cultural adaption, in the hypothesis of use in multicultural populations.

345 In the studied population no differences were found in functional health literacy according to gender and  
346 geographical areas, while it was positively associated with the level of university degree (it was higher for  
347 master's degrees). These results are partially in accordance with scientific literature, in which the level of health  
348 literacy increased with the grade of school education (Zhang et al., 2016; Dolezel et al., 2018). Moreover, further  
349 positive associations were found according to female gender and high family income (Vozikis et al., 2014;  
350 Zhang et al., 2016; Sukys et al., 2017).

#### 351 *Sources of information and mass media and social media coverage*

352 As expected, the ~~Internet~~ internet and social networks were the most used sources of information, in agreement  
353 with other surveys on similar populations (Bilgin et al., 2016; Durmuş-Özdemir and Sener, 2016; Zhang et al.,  
354 2013). This predominance was even more evident for the humanistic sector students and for females, as reported  
355 in many studies (Escoffery et al., 2005; Fox, 2011; Rice, 2006; Horgan and Sweeney, 2012), although in the  
356 whole population and about health in general (EU, 2014) no difference were found by gender.

357 Nevertheless, the quality of information was not completely satisfying for the 64% of students: this percentage  
358 was quite similar to the one resulting from Eurobarometer (EU, 2014), where 73% of general population was  
359 “fairly satisfied” of the health information on internet.

360 The risk perception of environmental problems is often socially mediated by the mass media, especially when  
361 it is not directly experienced (Weber et al., 2000). Mass media, including digital and social media have been  
362 proven to have a significant influence both on the knowledge and attitudes of people (Nelkin, 1987). Considering  
363 environmental risks, the information in the press, on TV, websites and social media have been strongly  
364 associated with risk perception and sometimes considered as a determinant of conflict (Bennet and Calman,  
365 2010).

366 In the era of social networks, health-related information can be rapidly available, representing officially reported  
367 data with a good sensitivity. The social media information has recently been used for epidemiological  
368 surveillance, digital epidemiology (Khan et al., 2010; Salathe et al., 2012) and for environmental pollution  
369 research (geosocial search) (Carducci et al., 2017; Jang et al., 2015; Sammarco et al., 2016). Concerning  
370 geosocial search, it finds user activities advertised on Online Social Networks (OSNs), in a specific geographical  
371 area (Beckerman et al., 2008) and can be used to reveal alarming events and to follow how they are perceived

Formattato: Tipo di carattere: Non Grassetto

Formattato: Tipo di carattere: Non Grassetto

372 over time. Despite the recognized high potential of infodemiology, meaning the study of occurrence, distribution  
373 and content of electronic health information (Zeraatkar and Ahmadi, 2018), there are some limitation in its use  
374 to obtain epidemiological data: it tracks only the segment of population that uses the Web, that is often non  
375 uniformly distributed, it allows only a surface picture of a situation without any other individual health  
376 information and it does not allow to quantify the study population.

377 Our study had not an epidemiological aim, so it was planned without specific focus on a particular  
378 environmental risk nor disease. It was a tentative approach to investigate if the level of risk perception directly  
379 evaluated by a questionnaire, was related to measurable peaks of information, both on traditional mass media  
380 (newspapers) and social media (twitter). A further analysis of articles content in relations with health problems  
381 could be the aim of future development of this study.

#### 382 *Environmental risk perception*

383 Globally, the impact of environmental risk on health was over-estimated by the majority of students in  
384 comparison with the global burden of diseases attributed to the environment by the WHO (2016). The reasons  
385 of this discrepancy can be attributed to the lack of knowledge: in fact, a high functional health literacy was  
386 associated with a better estimation of the global burden of diseases attributed to the environment. Considering  
387 the importance of environment on specific health problems, the respiratory diseases were considered at the first  
388 place, followed by tumors, infectious diseases, congenital malformation, heart diseases and neurological  
389 disorders: the relative importance given to these diseases does not represent the one deriving from  
390 epidemiological studies at a global level (WHO, 2016).

391 To study the perception of health risk deriving from the environment, a wide list of specific issues of possible  
392 concern for people was included in the questionnaire: these were chosen on the basis of previous studies  
393 (Carducci et al., 2017; Zhang and Fang, 2013) and with the aim of representing a view of environmental health  
394 risks as much complete as possible, without any specific focus. So it was quite predictable that the top three  
395 environmental risks were “chemicals in food or drinking waters”, “pollution of groundwaters” and “outdoor air  
396 quality” that represent environmental matrices with the highest exposure by breathing or ingesting like ground  
397 waters that are frequently used for potable purposes and in the agri-food sector. Other environmental factors of  
398 growing concern such as climatic changes or contamination of sea, lakes and river water could have appeared

**Formattato:** Tipo di carattere: (Predefinito) Times New Roman, Inglese (Stati Uniti)

**Formattato:** Tipo di carattere: Times New Roman, Inglese (Stati Uniti)

**Formattato:** Tipo di carattere: Times New Roman, Inglese (Stati Uniti)

**Formattato:** Tipo di carattere: Times New Roman, Inglese (Stati Uniti)

**Formattato:** Inglese (Stati Uniti)

**Formattato:** Aggiungi spazio tra paragrafi dello stesso stile, Nessun controllo righe isolate, Non regolare lo spazio tra testo asiatico e in alfabeto latino, Non regolare lo spazio tra testo asiatico e caratteri numerici

**Formattato:** Tipo di carattere: Non Corsivo



399 less strictly related to health, even if they represent major environmental problems. Moreover, at least in the  
400 period of the survey, the information from mass media and social was focused on the problems of air or water  
401 pollution rather than the climate change.

402 In general, the environmental risk perception is strongly related to the contingent situation and some surveys  
403 have been designed to explore ~~the main risks of utmost interest based on the geographical area and the period for~~  
404 ~~an area and period of time~~. This is the case of surveys carried out in Turkey (Yapici et al., 2017) and Poland  
405 (Bilgin et al., 2016) where nuclear risks were mostly considered by several authors, and were ranked first among  
406 other risks, in coincidence with a public concern on this issue.

407 In our work, a wider list of environmental risk was investigated, also in order to evidence differences among  
408 cities. In fact, even if the risks mostly indicated as “very important” or “important” were related to chemical  
409 pollution of water and food everywhere, geographical differences were found for the perception of road  
410 accidents, genetically modified food, pollution of coasts, rivers and lakes. In Naples, the perception was lower  
411 for five risks (nuclear facilities, exhausts and emissions from industries, chemicals in food or drinking water,  
412 germs in food or drinking water and traffic noise). The different pattern of environmental health risks can be  
413 attributed to the environmental conditions of Naples, a city with significant waste management, air and noise  
414 pollution problems (Mazza et al., 2018), thus citizens tend to underestimate every-day-life risks as traffic noise  
415 or polluted air or waters.

416 The global risk perception index was generally quite high and higher in Genoa, Turin, Sassari and Florence.  
417 These differences may be attributed to the different environmental conditions, political debates, or media  
418 attention that change over time and space.

419 Our study investigated the role of functional health literacy as a determinant of environmental health risk  
420 perception as already demonstrated for other topics: i.e. it was found to be positively associated for over-the-  
421 counter drugs (Calamusa et al., 2012), and diabetes (Darlow et al., 2012), and negatively for teratogenic agents  
422 during pregnancy (Lupattelli et al., 2017) and for vaccines (Brewer et al., 2007). In fact, the risk perception can  
423 be also affected by psychological and social factors and can show a reciprocal influence with trust (Siegrist et  
424 al., 2005). Both the “global risk perception” and the “general environmental health risk perception” indexes  
425 were higher for the high functional health literacy students, thus confirming the influence of this determinant.

Formattato: Tipo di carattere: 11 pt

426 On the contrary, the self-perception of their own health was not influenced either by functional health literacy,  
427 or area of residence, or gender: it was generally good (83,1%) even higher than the one found in a nationwide  
428 survey on university students (77%) (de Waure et al., 2015).

429 Lifestyles are often synergistic with environmental pollution as risk factors for many diseases: among them  
430 smoking habit is the most representative. In our sample about 30% declared smoking, with a lower frequency  
431 for subjects with high health literacy and living in the North.

432 The obtained results are in accordance with Italian data on smoking habits (PASSI surveillance system, 2015-  
433 2018), with 28% and 31% of smokers in the 18-24 and 25-34 age groups, respectively, and the highest frequency  
434 in the regions of Centre and South. In similar populations the smoking habit was slightly higher among males  
435 (Teleman et al., 2016) while in our study no difference was found between genders.

436 The smoking habit influences the environmental health risk perception: ~~in fact more many~~ smokers consider the  
437 environment as cause of tumors and hearth diseases, that are, also, the most important diseases linked to smoke  
438 as reported in a recent report on smoking prevalence and attributable disease burden through the world (Reitsma  
439 et al., 2017). Accordingly, among personal behaviors, smokers tend to underestimate the importance of smoke  
440 as health hazard (EU, 2007). ~~The majority of researches investigated the association between smoking and this~~  
441 ~~result is confirmed also for Ita-~~ status and risk perception of smoking (Ferrante et al., 2010; Wagener et al.,  
442 2014), but there is still a lack of studies addressing smoking and risk perception of environmental health issues.

443 In our study, we observed a global risk perception index lower for smokers, suggesting that smokers are  
444 generally less afraid for factors that can affect their health: accordingly, several surveys on risky behaviors in  
445 young people demonstrated that dangerous lifestyles (smoke, drug addiction, gambling, etc.) are frequently  
446 associated (Rondina et al., 2007; Zuckerman and Kuhlman, 2000).

447 In our study, the ~~Internet internet~~ and social media as sources of information were predictive for a higher risk  
448 perception. ~~However, an analysis of the information from newspapers and tweets, there appeared to be no direct~~  
449 ~~influence on risk perceptions, probably due to the scarcity of collected data during the period of survey.~~

450 The peak of tweets for Modena was difficult to explain in terms of their topics and the simultaneous newspapers  
451 articles. However, a further comparison between two cities (Modena and Pisa) showed a significant difference  
452 between the global risk perception index. Among the single risks, a higher risk perception corresponding to a

Formattato: Non Evidenziato

Commentato [I11]: forse va rivisto l'inglese

453 higher number of tweets was found only for industry emissions and discharges.

#### 454 *Trust*

455 Trust in institutions is considered an important factor against the “outrage”. Some studies have demonstrated  
456 that in situations where an environmental problem occurs, it is very important a rapid response from institutions  
457 and the involvement of population (Sandman, 2003). Our study explored trust towards different subjects in  
458 informing correctly, in protecting general population from environmental health hazards and in really fulfilling  
459 their duties. On the whole, physicians were the most trusted for every of these aspects, confirming that they are  
460 still a reference about health, as demonstrated by numerous studies (Blendon et al., 2014). On the contrary, the  
461 second position was different according to the question: as information source, universities and research  
462 institution were more trusted than other public institutions. This result can derive from the study population  
463 represented by university students. Concerning the importance for the health protection from environmental  
464 risks, the second and third places were attributed to the involved Ministries (Health and Environment), but it is  
465 noteworthy the role assigned to individual citizens considered, “extremely important” or “very important” by  
466 the 57% of students. This indicates that the respondents give a high value to the action of general population,  
467 including themselves: some other surveys ~~indagated~~ investigated this aspect, referring to the “locus of control”  
468 that indicates the degree to which people believe that they have control over their lives and events (Rotter, 1954).  
469 There are some evidences that a higher internal locus of control is associated to a greater predisposition to pro-  
470 environmental attitudes and behaviours (Pavalache-Ilie and Unianu, 2012; McCarty and Shrum, 2001). The  
471 frequency of people recognizing their own importance in protecting the environment was explored in other  
472 surveys: it was 37 % in 1990 in USA (Roper Organization, 1990), 28 % in a similar population (GfK, 2011) and  
473 60% in an adult Italian population in ~~2018~~ 2016 (Carducci et al., ~~2018~~ 2017, MAPEC). On this question notable  
474 influences of sources of information, health literacy and area of residence were also detected. The lower use of  
475 ~~Internet~~ internet and social as well as the ~~higher~~ health literacy seems to increase the importance attributed to  
476 ~~Institutional~~ institutional subjects.  
477 The real fulfillment of actions against environmental risks was in general considered more effective for  
478 ~~Institutional~~ institutional subjects, mainly by students with functional health literacy > 9.

**Formattato:** Tipo di carattere: Corsivo

**Formattato:** SpazioDopo: 0 pt, Aggiungi spazio tra paragrafi dello stesso stile

**Formattato:** Tipo di carattere: (Predefinito) Times New Roman, 11 pt, Inglese (Stati Uniti)

**Formattato:** Tipo di carattere: (Predefinito) Times New Roman, 11 pt, Inglese (Stati Uniti)

**Formattato:** Tipo di carattere: (Predefinito) Times New Roman, 11 pt

**Formattato:** Tipo di carattere: (Predefinito) Times New Roman, 11 pt

**Formattato:** Tipo di carattere: 11 pt

479 The multiple logistic regression showed that trust in institutional subjects can be predicted by functional health  
480 literacy and area of residence. The functional health literacy was the only predictive factor for all the three  
481 aspects of trust in institutions: as sources of information, as important subjects -and as effective actors against  
482 environmental health risks.

483 The main influence of the area of residence was on the trust in the real action of institutions, which was  
484 significantly higher in the centre-north, in agreement with the well-known Italian social-economical differences  
485 geographical divide in Italy based on geographical pattern (Musolino, 2018).

### 486 Conclusions

487 The few studies that have evaluated the relationships between HL health literacy and risk perception in terms of  
488 environmental issues or trust (Kuroda et al., 2018); suggest that to plan effective risk communication strategies,  
489 the health literacy levels of target publics should be taken into account.

490 Our simple functional health literacy test may thus be useful in surveys on environmental health risk perception,  
491 attitudes and behaviors. It could be included in a more complex framework describing Environmental Health  
492 Literacy through related perspectives such as health literacy, risk communication, environmental health  
493 sciences, public health, and social sciences (Finn et al., 2017).

494 In our study, the functional health literacy, measured with our simple test resulted associated with many of the  
495 investigated aspects: preferred sources of information and relative quality, risk perception for singular risks and  
496 on the whole, trust in institutions.

497 In conclusion, we believe that our study is useful to better plan information and education programs: in  
498 particular, the level of functional health literacy should be increased at the general level including health  
499 information and education in school programs as soon as possible, to make the basis for further specific  
500 information. Moreover, the importance of mass and social media suggests to include including them in planning  
501 communication intervention and in verifying their results.

502 To the best of our knowledge this is the first study on environmental health risk perception and trust to show an  
503 association with functional health literacy, mass media and OSNs online social network. This highlights the need

Commentato [AC12]: QUALE TRUST? 2.4 4.1 o 4.2

Formattato: Tipo di carattere: 11 pt

Formattato: Tipo di carattere: 11 pt

Formattato: Tipo di carattere: Corsivo

Formattato: Tipo di carattere: 11 pt

Formattato: Tipo di carattere: 11 pt

504 to include these factors in such surveys, together with the importance of analyzing social networks in order to  
505 provide a timely measurement of public sentiment (Wu and Li, 2016).

506

507

508 **ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS**

509 We wish to thank to English for Academics (e4ac.com) for editing and proofreading the manuscript. We thank  
510 the Italian Society of Public Health for supporting the activities of the *Working Group of Health and*  
511 *Environment* that promoted this work.

512

513 **FUNDING**

514 This research did not receive any specific grant from funding agencies in the public, commercial, or not-for-  
515 profit sectors

516 **REFERENCES**

- 517 1) Altunoğlu, B.D., Atav, E., 2016. Determining the environmental risk perceptions of secondary education students.  
518 Fresen. Environ. Bull. 25(3),671-83.
- 519 2) Aquino, F., Donzelli, G., De Franco, E., Privitera, Lopalco P.L., Carducci, A., 2017. The web and public confidence in  
520 MMR vaccination in Italy. Vaccine 35(35), 4494-4498.
- 521 3) Bennett, P., Calman, K., Curtis, S., Fischbacher-Smith, D., 2010. Risk communication and public health, 2nd ed.  
522 Oxford, Oxford University Press.
- 523 4) Beckerman, B., Jerrett, M., Brook, J.R., Verma, D.K., Arain, M.A., Finkelstein, M.M., 2008. Correlation of nitrogen  
524 dioxide with other traffic pollutants near a major expressway. Atmos. Environ. 42(2), 275– 290.
- 525 5) Berkman, N.D., Sheridan, S.L., Donahue, K.E., Halpern, D.J., Viera, A., Crotty, K., Holland, A., Brasure, M., Lohr,  
526 K.N., Harden, E., Tant, E., Wallace, I., Viswanathan, M., 2011. Health literacy interventions and outcomes: An updated  
527 systematic review. Evid. Rep. Technol. Assess. 199, 1–941.
- 528 6) Biasio, L.R., Lorini, C., Abbattista, G., Bozzola, E., De Castro, P., Della Seta, M., Villani, A., Bonaccorsi G., 2018.  
529 Assessment of health literacy skills in family doctors' patients by two brief, self-administrated Italian measures. Ann.  
530 Ist. Super. Sanita 54(3), 214-222.
- 531 7) Bilgin, A., Radziemska, M., Fronczyk, J., 2016. Determination of Risk Perceptions of University Students and  
532 Evaluating Their Environmental Awareness in Poland Cumhuriyet University Faculty of Science. CSJ 37(4).
- 533 8) Brewer, N.T., Chapman, G.B., Gibbons, F.X., Gerrard, M., McCaul, K.D., Weinstein, N.D., 2007 Meta-analysis of the  
534 relationship between risk perception and health behavior: the example of vaccination. Health Psychol. 26(2), 36-145.
- 535 9) Brown, V.J., 2014. Risk perception: it's personal. Environ. Health Perspect. 122(10), 276-279
- 536 10) Calamusa, A., Di Marzio, A., Cristofani, R., Arrighetti, P., Santaniello, V., Alfani, S., Carducci, A., 2012. Factors that  
537 influence Italian consumers' understanding of over-the-counter medicines and risk perception. Patient Educ. Couns.  
538 87(3), 395–340.
- 539 11) Carducci, A., Donzelli, G., Cioni, L., Palomba, G., Verani, M., Mascagni, G., Anastasi, G., Pardini, R., Ceretti, E.,  
540 Grassi, T., Carraro, E., Bonetta, S., Villarini, M., Gelatti, U., 2017. Air pollution: a study of citizen's attitudes and  
541 behaviors using different information sources. Epidemiol. Biostat. Public Health 14(2). DOI:  
542 <https://doi.org/10.2427/12389>
- 543 12) Coi, A., Minichilli, F., Bustaffa, E., Carone, S., Santoro, M., Bianchi, F., Cori, L., 2016. Risk perception and access to  
544 environmental information in four areas in Italy affected by natural or anthropogenic pollution. Environ. Int. 95:8-15.

Codice campo modificato

Codice campo modificato

Codice campo modificato

- 545 13) Covello, V.T., 2003. Best Practices in Public Health Risk and Crisis Communication. *J. Health Commun.* 8(1), 148-  
546 151.
- 547 14) Covello, V.T., Allen, F., 1998. Seven Cardinal Rules of Risk Communication. Washington D.C., U.S. Environmental  
548 Protection Agency, Office of Policy Analysis.
- 549 15) Darlow, S., Goodman, M.S., Stafford, J.D., Lachance, C.R., Kaphingst, K.A., 2012. Weight perceptions and perceived  
550 risk for diabetes and heart disease among overweight and obese women. *Prev. Chronic Dis.* 9(81), 110-185.
- 551 16) Dettori, M., Arru, B., Azara, A., Piana, A., Mariotti, G., Camerada, M.V., Stefanelli, P., Rezza, G., Castiglia, P., 2018.  
552 In the Digital Era, Is Community Outrage a Feasible Proxy Indicator of Emotional Epidemiology? The Case of  
553 Meningococcal Disease in Sardinia, Italy. *Int J Environ Res Public Health* 15(7), 1512.
- 554 17) Dettori, M., Azara, A., Loria, E., Piana, A., Masia, M.D., Palmieri, A., Cossu, A., Castiglia, P., 2019. Population Distrust  
555 of Drinking Water Safety. Community Outrage Analysis, Prediction and Management. *Int. J Environ. Res. Public Health*  
556 16(6) pii: E1004. doi: 10.3390/ijerph16061004.
- 557 18) Durmuş-Özdemir, E., Şener, S., 2016. The Impact of Higher Education on Environmental Risk Perceptions. *China-  
558 USA Business Review* 15(9), 459-471.
- 559 19) Finn, S., O'Fallon, L., 2017. The emergence of environmental health literacy— from its roots to its future potential.  
560 *Environ. Health Perspect.* 125, 495–501.
- 561 20) Iizuka, M., 2000. Role of Environmental Awareness in Achieving Sustainable Development. Prepared for the project  
562 Enhancement of citizen's awareness in formulation of pollution. ECLAC (Economic Commission for Latin America  
563 and the Caribbean). Environment and Human Settlements Division of ECLAC, Santiago, Chile, 1-41.
- 564 21) ISTAT. 2018. Demography in figures. ISTAT - Istituto Nazionale di Statistica.  
565 [http://demo.istat.it/pop2018/index\\_e.html](http://demo.istat.it/pop2018/index_e.html). Last accessed 02/04/2019.
- 566 22) Institute of Medicine. 2002. Speaking of health: Assessing health communication strategies for diverse populations.  
567 National Academy of Sciences. Washington, DC: National Academy Press.
- 568 23) Institute of Medicine. 2004. Health literacy: a prescription to end confusion. Washington, DC: National Academies  
569 Press.
- 570 24) Jiang, W., Wang, Y., Tsou, M.H., Fu, X., 2015. Using Social Media to Detect Outdoor Air Pollution and Monitor Air  
571 Quality Index (AQI): A Geo-Targeted Spatiotemporal Analysis Framework with SinaWeibo (Chinese Twitter). *PLoS  
572 ONE* 10(10).
- 573 25) Kayser, L., Karnoe, A., Furstrand, D., Batheram, R., Christensen, K.B., Elsworth, G., Osborne, R., 2018. A  
574 multidimensional tool based on the ehealth literacy framework: development and initial validity testing of the ehealth



- 575 literacy questionnaire (eHLQ). *J. Med. Internet Res.* 20(2), 1-10.
- 576 26) Khan, A.S., Fleischauer, A., Casani, J., Groseclose, D.V.M., 2010. the next public health revolution: public health  
577 information fusion and social networks. *Am. J. Public Health* 100(7), 1237–1242.
- 578 27) Kickbusch, I., Pelikan, J., Apfel, F., Agis, T., 2013. Health literacy: the solid facts. 1st edn. Copenhagen: World Health  
579 Organisation Regional Office for Europe.
- 580 28) Kuroda, Y., Iwasa, H., Orui, M., Moriyama, N., Nakayama, C., Yasumura, S., 2018. Association between health literacy  
581 and radiation anxiety among residents after a nuclear accident: comparison between evacuated and non-evacuated areas.  
582 *Int. J. Environ. Res. Public Health* 15(7), 1463.
- 583 29) Lorini, C., Santomauro, F., Grozzini, M., Mantwill, S., Vettori, V., Lastrucci, V., Bechini, A., Boccolini, S., Bussotti,  
584 A., Bonaccorsi, G., 2017. Health literacy in Italy: a cross-sectional study protocol to assess the health literacy level in a  
585 population-based sample, and to validate health literacy measures in Italian language. *BMJ Open* 7(11).
- 586 30) Lorini, C., Santomauro, F., Donzellini, M., Capecci, L., Bechini, A., Bonanni, P., Bonaccorsi, G., 2018. Health literacy  
587 and vaccination: A systematic review. *Hum. Vaccin Immunother.* 14(2), 478–488.
- 588 31) Lundgren, R.E., McMakin, A.H., 1998. Risk communication. A handbook for communicating environmental, safety,  
589 and health risks. 5th Edition. Wiley-IEEE Press. ISBN: 978-1-118-45693-4.
- 590 32) Lupattelli, A., Picinardi, M., Einarson, A., Nordeng, H., 2014. Health literacy and its association with perception of  
591 teratogenic risks and health behavior during pregnancy. *Patient Educ. and Couns.* 96(2), 171–178.
- 592 33) Mazmanian, D., Morell, D., 1990. The 'NIMBY' Syndrome: Facility Siting and the Failure of Democratic Discourse.  
593 In: *Environmental Policy of the 1990s*, edited by Vig NJ, Kraft ME (Washington, D.C.: CQ Press).
- 594 34) Mitchell, G., Dorling, D., 2003. An environmental justice analysis of British air quality. *Environ. Plan. A* 35:909-929.
- 595 35) Musolino, D., 2018. The North-South divide in Italy: reality or perception? *European spatial research and policy* 25(1),  
596 29-53. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.18778/1231-1952.25.1.03>
- 597 36) Nelkin, D., 1987. *Selling science: how the press covers science and technology*. NewYork, NY, W.H. Freeman.
- 598 37) Nutbeam, D., 2000. Health literacy as a public health goal: a challenge for contemporary health education and  
599 communication strategies into the 21st century. *Health Promot. Int.* 15, 259–267.
- 600 38) Nutbeam, D., 2008. The evolving concept of health literacy. *Soc. Sci. Med.* 67(12), 2072-2078.
- 601 39) Ratzan, S.C., Parker, R.M., 2000. Introduction. In: *National Library of Medicine current bibliographies in medicine:*  
602 *Health literacy*, edited by Selden CR, Zorn M, Ratzan SC, Parker RM (Bethesda, MD: National Institutes of Health).
- 603 40) Rothman, K.J., Greenland, S., Lash, T.L., 2008. *Modern Epidemiology*. Published by Wolters Kluwer Health/Lippincott  
604 Williams & Wilkins. Philadelphia USA. ISBN: 9780781755641

- 605 41) Rudd, R.E., Comings, J.P., Hyde, J.N., 2003. Leave No One Behind: Improving Health and Risk Communication  
606 Through Attention to Literacy. *J. Health Commun.* 8(1), 104-115.
- 607 42) Salathe, M., Bengtsson, L., Bodnar, T.J., Brewer, D.D., Brownstein, J.S., Buckee, C., Campbell, E.M., Cattuto, C.,  
608 Khandelwal, S., Mabry, P.L., 2012. Digital Epidemiology. *PLoS Comput. Biol.* 8(7).
- 609 43) Sammarco, M., Tse, R., Pau, G., Marfia, G., 2017. Using geosocial search for urban air pollution monitoring. *Pervasive*  
610 *Mob. Comput.* 35:15-31.
- 611 44) Sandman, P., 1987. Risk communication: facing public outrage. *EPA Journal* 21–22.
- 612 45) Sandman, P., 2003. Responding to community outrage: strategies for effective risk communication. Edited by American  
613 Industrial Hygiene Association (Fairfax, Va).
- 614 46) Scheufele, D.A., 2014. Science communications as political communication. *Proc Natl Acad Sci USA* 16, 114.
- 615 47) Signorino, G., Beck, E., 2014. Risk perception survey in two high-risk areas. In: *Human health in areas with industrial*  
616 *contamination*, edited by Mudu P, Terracini B, Martuzzi M. (WHO Regional Office for Europe, DK).
- 617 48) Smillie, L., Blissett, A., 2010. A model for developing risk communication strategy. *J. Risk Res.* 13(1), 115-134.
- 618 49) Yapici, G., Ögenler, O., Öner Kurt, A., Koças, F., Sasmaz, T., 2017. Assessment of environmental attitudes and risk  
619 perceptions among university students in Mersin, Turkey. *J. Environ. Public Health.* 2017, Article ID5650926.
- 620 50) Young, L.H., Kuo, H.W., Chiang, C.F., 2015. Environmental health risk perception of a nationwide sample of Taiwan  
621 college students majoring in engineering and health sciences. *Hum. Ecol. Risk Assess.* 21(2), 307-326.
- 622 51) Wasserstein, R.L., Lazar, N.A., 2016. The ASA's Statement on p-Values: Context, Process, and Purpose. *The*  
623 *American Statistician* 70(2), 129 - 133
- 624 52) Weber, J.M, Hair, J.F., Fowler, C.R., 2000. Developing a measure of perceived environmental risk. *J. Environ. Educ.*  
625 32(1), 28-35.
- 626 53) WHO. 2013. Health and environment: communicating the risks. World Health Organization (WHO), Regional Office  
627 for Europe.
- 628 54) Wu, C.H., Li, T.Y., 2016. Social sensor: an analysis tool for social media. *IJECS* 7(1):77-94.
- 629 55) Zhang, L., He, G., Mol, A.P.J., Lu, Y.L., 2013. Public perceptions of environmental risk in China. *J. Risk Res.* 16(2),  
630 195-209.

631

632 Nuovi RB

- 633 1. [Dolezel, D., Shanmugam, R., Morrison, E.E., 2018. Are college students health literate? J. Am. Coll.](#)  
634 [Health. 20:1-8. doi: 10.1080/07448481.2018.1539001.](#)
- 635 2. [de Waure, C., Soffiani, V., Viridis, A., Poscia, A., Di Pietro, M.L., 2015. Italian university students' self-](#)  
636 [perceived health and satisfaction of life. Ann. Ist. Super. Sanità 51\(2\): 121-5. doi:](#)  
637 [10.4415/ANN\\_15\\_02\\_09.](#)
- 638 3. [GfK Roper Consulting Green Gauge. 2011. The Environment: Public Attitudes and Individual Behavior –](#)  
639 [A Twenty-Year Evolution. Available at: https://corp-ue1.azureedge.net/-/media/sc-johnson/our-](#)  
640 [purpose/social-responsibility/environment/sciandgfkropergreengaugesflb.pdf \(last accessed 2 July, 2019\)](#)
- 641 4. [PASSI surveillance system \(Progressi delle Aziende Sanitarie per la Salute in Italia - Progress by local](#)  
642 [health units towards a healthier Italy\). Surveillance results for smoking habits 2015 – 2018. Available at:](#)  
643 [https://www.epicentro.iss.it/passi/dati/fumo \(last accessed 2 July, 2019\).](#)
- 644 5. [Pavalache-Ilie, M., Unianu, E.C. 2012. Locus of control and the pro-environmental attitudes. Procedia -](#)  
645 [Social and Behavioral Sciences 33:198 – 202.](#)
- 646 6. [Reitsma, M.B., Fullman, N., Ng, M., Salama, J.S., Abajobir, A., Abate, K.H., Abbafati, C., et al. 2017.](#)  
647 [Smoking prevalence and attributable disease burden in 195 countries and territories, 1990-2015: A](#)  
648 [systematic analysis from the global burden of disease study 2015. The Lancet, 389 \(10082\), pp. 1885-](#)  
649 [1906. doi: 10.1016/S0140-6736\(17\)30819-X\)](#)
- 650 7. [Roper Organization, Johnson Wax, 1990. The Environment: Public Attitudes and Individual Behavior.](#)  
651 [The Roper Organization, Inc., 1990.](#)
- 652 8. [Sukys, S., Cesnaitiene, V.J., Ossowsky, Z.M., 2017. Is Health Education at University Associated with](#)  
653 [Students' Health Literacy? Evidence from Cross-Sectional Study Applying HLS-EU-Q. Biomed. Res. Int.](#)  
654 [2017:8516843. doi: 10.1155/2017/8516843.](#)
- 655 9. [Teleman, A.A., Iodice, L., Poscia, A., de Waure, C., Ricciardi, W., Di Pietro, M.L., 2016. Female-male](#)  
656 [differences in health-related behaviours in the Italian university student population: Perspectives from the](#)  
657 [“Sportello Salute Giovani” Project. Ital. J. Gender-Specific. Med. 2\(1\): 15-2](#)
- 658 10. [Vozikis, A., Drivas, K., Milioris, K., 2014. Health literacy among university students in Greece:](#)  
659 [determinants and association with self-perceived health, health behaviours and health risks. Arch. Public](#)  
660 [Health. 23:72\(1\):15. doi: 10.1186/2049-3258-72-15. eCollection 2014.](#)
- 661 11. [Zhang, Y., Zhang, F., Hu P., Huang, W., Lu, L., Bai, R., Sharma, M., Zhao, Y., 2016. Exploring Health](#)  
662 [Literacy in Medical University Students of Chongqing, China: A Cross-Sectional Study. PLoS One.](#)  
663 [11\(4\):e0152547. doi: 10.1371/journal.pone.0152547. eCollection 2016.](#)
- 664 12. [Escoffery, C., Miner, K.R., Adame, D.D., Butler, S., McCormick, L., Mendell, E., 2005. Internet use for](#)  
665 [health information among college students. J. Am. Coll. Health. 53\(4\):183-8.](#)
- 666 13. [Fox, S., 2011. The social life of health information 2011. Pew Internet and American Life Project 2011.](#)  
667 [Available at: www.pewinternet.org/reports/2011/Soical-Life-Of-Health-Information.aspx \(last accessed 2](#)  
668 [July 2019\).](#)
- 669 14. [Rice, R.E., 2006. Influences, usage, and outcomes of Internet health information searching: multivariate](#)  
670 [results from the Pew surveys. Int. J. Med. Inform. 75\(1\):8-28.](#)
- 671 15. [Horgan, Á., Sweeney, J., 2012. University students' online habits and their use of the Internet for health](#)  
672 [information. Comput. Inform. Nurs. 30\(8\):402-8. doi: 10.1097/NXN.0b013e3182510703.](#)
- 673 16. [EU, 2007. Attitudes of Europeans towards Tobacco. Special EUROBAROMETER 272c / Wave 66.2 –](#)  
674 [TNS Opinion & Social. European Union \(EU\) Publication.](#)
- 675 17. [EU, 2014. European citizens' digital health literacy – report. Flash Eurobarometer 404 - TNS](#)  
676 [Political & Social. European Union \(EU\) Publication. ISBN 978-92-79-43607-9. DOI 10.2759/86596](#)
- 677 18. [Mazza A., Piscitelli, P., Falco, A., Santoro, M., Colangelo, M., Imbriani, G., Idolo, A., De Donno, A.,](#)  
678 [Iannuzzi, L., Colao, A., 2018. Heavy Environmental Pressure in Campania and Other Italian Regions: A](#)

Formattato: Tipo di carattere: Times New Roman, Colore carattere: Nero

Formattato: Paragrafo elenco, Rientro: Sinistro: 0,12 cm, Numerazione automatica + Livello:1 + Stile numerazione: 1, 2, 3, ... + Comincia da:1 + Allineamento: A sinistra + Allinea a: 0,63 cm + Imposta un rientro di: 1,27 cm

Formattato: Non Evidenziato

Formattato: Tipo di carattere: Times New Roman, Colore carattere: Nero

Formattato: Tipo di carattere: Times New Roman

Codice campo modificato

Formattato: Tipo di carattere: Times New Roman

Formattato: Tipo di carattere: Times New Roman, Colore carattere: Nero

Formattato: Tipo di carattere: Times New Roman

Formattato: Non Evidenziato

Formattato: Tipo di carattere: Times New Roman

Formattato: Non Evidenziato

Formattato: Tipo di carattere: Times New Roman

Formattato: Tipo di carattere: Times New Roman, Inglese (Regno Unito)

Formattato: Tipo di carattere: Times New Roman

Formattato: Tipo di carattere: Times New Roman, Inglese (Regno Unito)

Formattato: Tipo di carattere: Times New Roman

Formattato: Tipo di carattere: Times New Roman, Grassetto

Formattato: Tipo di carattere: Times New Roman, Grassetto

Formattato: Tipo di carattere: Times New Roman

679 [Short Review of Available Evidence. Int. J. Environ. Res. Public Health. 15\(1\). pii: E105. doi:](#)  
680 [10.3390/ijerph15010105.](#)  
681 [19. McCarty, J.A., Shrum, L.J., 2001. The influence of individualism, collectivism, and locus of control on](#)  
682 [environmental beliefs and behaviour. Journal of Public Policy & Marketing, 20, 93-104](#)  
683 [20. Ferrante, M., Fiore, M., Leon, L., Constantidines, G., Castaing, M., Fallico, R., Sciacca S, Modonutti,](#)  
684 [G.B., 2010. Age of smoking initiation, tobacco habits and risk perception among primary, middle and](#)  
685 [high school students in southern Italy. Italian J. Public Health, 7\(3\):262–267.](#)  
686 [21. Zeraatkar, K., Ahmadi, M., 2018. Trends of infodemiology studies: a scoping review. Health Info. Libr. J.](#)  
687 [35\(2\):91-120. doi: 10.1111/hir.12216. Epub 2018 May 4.](#)  
688 [22. Rondina, Rde C., Gorayeb, R., Botelho, C., 2007. Psychological characteristics associated with tobacco](#)  
689 [smoking behaviour. J. Bras. Pneumol. 33\(5\):592-601.](#)  
690 [23. Zuckerman, M., Kuhlman, D.M., 2000. Personality and risk-taking: common biosocial factors. J. Pers.](#)  
691 [68\(6\):999-1029.](#)  
692 [24. Blendon, R.J., Benson, J.M., M.A., Hero, J.O., 2014. Public Trust in Physicians — U.S. Medicine in](#)  
693 [International Perspective. N. Engl. J. Med. 371:1570-1572](#)

694

Formattato: Non Evidenziato

Formattato: Tipo di carattere: Times New Roman, Italiano (Italia)

Formattato: Tipo di carattere: Times New Roman

**Table 1.** Descriptive statistics of socio-demographic variables according to Functional Health Literacy (N=4778). The sum of the numbers for some characteristic variables is less than the total due to missing values

Variables	Total N=4778 n (% on total)	Functional Health Literacy	
		Poor $\leq 9$ N=2122 n (row %)	Good $> 9$ N=2656 n (row %)
<b>Gender</b>			
Female	3107 (65.1%)	1372 (44.2%)	1735 (55.8%)
Male	1668 (34.9%)	749 (44.9%)	919 (55.1%)
Age (year) median (IQR)*	21 (20-24)	21 (20-24)	21 (20-24)
<b>Age year</b>			
$\leq 20$	1587 (33.2%)	704 (44.4%)	883 (55.6%)
$\geq 21$	3191 (66.8%)	1418 (44.4%)	1773 (55.6%)
<b>Area of residence</b>			
North	855 (17.9%)	393 (46.0%)	462 (54.0%)
Centre	1194 (25.0%)	518 (43.4%)	676 (56.6%)
South and Islands	2729 (57.1%)	1211 (44.4%)	1518 (55.6%)
<b>Degree course **</b>			
Three-year	3083 (65.1%)	1327 (43.0%)	1756 (57.0%)
Six/five-year	1652 (34.9%)	776 (47.0%)	876 (53.0%)
<b>Sector **</b>			
Science-Health	2505 (53.2%)	1151 (45.9%)	1354 (54.1%)
Humanistic-Legal-Social	2200 (46.8%)	938 (42.6%)	1262 (57.4%)

\*IQR: Interquartile range

\*\* Indicates important differences according to the bivariate analysis (Chi-square test and U Mann-Whitney test).

**Table 2.** ORs and 95% CI of risk perception determinants

Variables	Low risk perception n (row %)	High risk perception n (row %)	Crude OR (95% CI)	Adjusted OR <sup>1</sup> (95% CI)
Internet and social as sources of information **				
No	149 (14%)	915 (86%)	*	*
Yes	429 (11.6%)	3281 (88.4%)	0.803 (0.657-0.981)	0.801 (0.653-0.982)
Functional Health Literacy				
High (>9)	296 (11.1%)	2360 (88.9%)	*	*
Low (≤9)	285 (13.4%)	1837 (86.6%)	1.237 (1.040-1.472)	1.153 (0.965-1.378)
Gender				
Female	381 (12.3%)	2726 (87.7%)	*	*
Male	200 (12%)	1468 (88%)	0.975 (0.812-1.70)	0.988 (0.820-1.190)
Area of residence				
North-centre	240 (11.7%)	1809 (88.3%)	*	*
South-islands	341 (12.5%)	2388 (87.5%)	1.076 (0.903-1.284)	1.113 (0.929-1.333)
Smoking				
Never smoked	380 (11.5%)	2912 (88.5%)	*	*
Current smoker	176 (12.8%)	1194 (87.2%)	1.130 (0.933-1.377)	1.117 (0.922-1.354)

<sup>1</sup>Each odds ratio is adjusted for all other variables in the table.

\* Reference category.

\*\* Indicates important differences

**Table 3.** ORs and 95% CI of trust in institutional subject determinants

Variables	Low trust in institutional subjects n (row %)	High trust in institutional subjects n (row %)	Crude OR (95% CI)	Adjusted OR <sup>1</sup> (95% CI)
Internet and social as sources of information				
No	270 (25.4%)	794 (74.6%)	*	*
Yes	928 (25%)	2782 (75%)	1.019 (0.871-1.192)	1.013 (0.863-1.190)
Functional Health Literacy **				
High (>9)	606 (22.8%)	2050 (77.2%)	*	*
Low (≤9)	595 (28%)	1527 (72%)	0.759 (0.665-0.865)	0.780 (0.682-0.892)
Gender				
Female	800 (25.7%)	2307 (74.3%)	*	*
Male	401 (24%)	1267 (76%)	1.096 (0.954-1.258)	1.102 (0.956-1.269)
Area of residence **				
North-centre	490 (23.9%)	1559 (76.1%)	*	*
South-islands	711 (26.1%)	2018 (73.9%)	0.892 (0.781-1.019)	0.870 (0.759-0.996)
Smoking				
Never smoked	800 (24.3%)	2492 (75.7%)	*	*
Current smoker	345 (25.2%)	1025 (74.8%)	0.954 (0.824-1.103)	0.976 (0.843-1.129)

<sup>1</sup>Each odds ratio is adjusted for all other variables in the table.


\*Reference category.

\*\* Indicates important differences.

**Figure 1.** Location of the universities involved




**Figure 2.** Number of newspaper articles for each city in the time period of the questionnaire distribution






**Figure 3.** Quantitative analysis of tweets for each city



**Figure 2.** Risk perception regarding environmental factors



**Supplemental material for:**

**ENVIRONMENT AND HEALTH: RISK PERCEPTION AND ITS  
DETERMINANTS AMONG ITALIAN UNIVERSITY STUDENTS**

*A. Carducci, M. Fiore, A. Azara, G. Bonaccorsi, M. Bortoletto, G. Caggiano, A. Calamusa, A. De Donno, O. De Giglio, M. Dettori, P. Di Giovanni, A. Di Pietro, Facciola A., I. Federigi, I. Grappasonni, A. Izzotti, G. Libralato, C. Lorini, M.T. Montagna, L.K. Nicolosi, G. Paladino, G. Palomba, F. Petrelli, T. Schilirò, S. Scuri, F. Serio, M. Tesauo, M. Verani, M. Vinceti, F. Violi, M. Ferrante*

**List of contents:**

- A. Questionnaire administrated to Italian participants (translated in English).
- B. Trust in different sources of information and in different subjects
- C. Literature review on surveys carried out in student populations to investigate environmental risk perception

## A. Questionnaire administrated to Italian participants (translated in English)

AmbSal

### Questionnaire on environmental and health awareness and behaviour

Dear Students,

Citizens and politicians are interested in environmental pollution due to its multiple effects on the climate, economy, quality of life, and more specifically on health. The public debate on this issue is broad and widespread through many media and information sources.

Citizens have a very important role both in the production of pollution and in its reduction, by their behaviour and through the political pressures they can exert.

This study investigates the sources of information, risk perception, attitudes and behaviour towards environmental pollution, in order to promote information and educational interventions.

To help us, we would therefore like to ask you to answer these questions.

It should take you about 15 minutes to complete the questionnaire.

Thanks for your collaboration!

#### 1. SOCIO-DEMOGRAPHIC CHARACTERISTICS

Gender  M  F

Age (years)  Place of residence \_\_\_\_\_ Prov. \_\_\_\_\_

Degree course  Bachelor's degree  Master's degree

Sector  Scientific-Health  Humanistic-Legal-Social

..... In which city do you live? (may be different from the place of residence)

How long have you lived there?  Years  Months

#### 2. INFORMATION

##### 2.1 Where do you receive most of your information on the relationship between health and environment? (maximum two answers)

Newspapers  Internet  Weekly  Social networks  TV  Radio  Other

##### 2.2 How would you judge this information?

Truthful and complete  Not truthful or complete  Truthful, but incomplete  Don't know

##### 2.3 How do you evaluate your knowledge about the relationship between health and the environment?

Satisfying  Incomplete  Scarce

## 2.4 How much trust do you have in the information on health risks from the following sources?

1. None 2. Little 3. Limited 4. A lot 5. I don't use this source of information

	1	2	3	4	5		1	2	3	4	5
1. TV and radio						9. Local community stakeholders					
2. Newspapers and magazines						10. Municipalities					
3. Internet						11. Ministry of Environment					
4. Social network						12. Ministry of Health					
5. Friends and relatives						13. Regional Environmental Protection Agency					
6. Physicians						14. Public Health Agencies					
7. Alternative medicine experts						15. University and Research Institutions					
8. Environmentalist Associations						16. Industry					

## 3. RISK PERCEPTION

### 3.1 How important is the environment for the development of the following diseases?

1. Not important 2. Not very important 3. Quite important 4. Very important 5. Extremely important 6. Don't know

	1	2	3	4	5	6
1. Tumours						
2. Heart diseases						
3. Dementia and neurological diseases						
5. Congenital malformations						
6. Infectious diseases						
7. Respiratory diseases						

### 3.2 In your opinion, what is the percentage of diseases due to environmental pollution in the world?

0-20%  21-40%  41-60%  61-80%  > 80%  Don't know

### 3.3 How important is the health risk to the population resulting from the following?

1. Not important 2. Not very important 3. Quite important 4. Very important 5. Extremely important 6. Don't know

	1	2	3	4	5	6		1	2	3	4	5	6
1. Earthquakes and volcanic eruptions							14. Chemicals in food or drinking waters						
2. Hydrogeological instability and floods							15. Germs in food or drinking waters						
3. Climate change							16. Food additives						

4. Hole in the ozone layer								17. Shortage of water								
5. Road accidents								18. Pollution of groundwater								
6. Nuclear facilities								19. Pollution of coasts, rivers and lakes								
7. Car traffic								20. Outdoor air quality								
8. Heating systems								21. Indoor air quality								
9. Industrial discharges and emissions								22. Traffic noise								
10. Thermoelectric power plants								23. Waste and dirt in the streets								
11. Accidents in industrial plants								24. Landfills								
12. High voltage lines, radio and TV repeaters, mobile phones								25. Incinerators								
13. Genetically modified food (GMOs)																

**3.4 Can you quantify the importance of the health risk arising from the following behaviours?**

1. Not important 2. Not very important 3. Quite important 4. Very important 5. Extremely important 6. Don't know

	1	2	3	4	5	6
1. Exposure to sunlight without protection						
2. Smoking						
3. Use of wood or pellet stoves						
4. Improper use of chemicals in the home and in the garden						
5. Poor food storage						

**3.5 For each statement, please indicate whether your level of agreement with the following statements**

1. Strongly disagree 2. Disagree 3. Agree 4. Strongly agree 5. Don't know

	1	2	3	4	5
1. In the place where I live, the environment is a source of health problems					
2. I believe my local area is becoming a healthier place to live					
3. Soil, air and water are now more polluted than ever					
4. I can control my health risks					
5. Experts are able to make accurate estimates of health risks from chemicals in the environment					
6. I believe I am in good health					

#### 4. ATTITUDES

##### 4.1 How important are the following subjects in protecting the general population from environmental health hazards?

1. Not important 2. Not very important 3. Quite important 4. Very important 5. Extremely important 6. Don't know

	1	2	3	4	5	6		1	2	3	4	5	6
1. Ministry of Health							7. Physicians						
2. Public Health Agencies							8. "Ecolabel" industries						
3. Ministry of Environment							9. Environmentalist Associations						
4. Regional Environmental Protection Agencies							10. Local community stakeholders						
5. Municipalities							11. Individual citizens						
6. Regional governments							12. Non-Governmental Organizations						

##### 4.2 To what extent do the following subjects fulfil in protecting the population from environmental health risks?

1. Scarce 2. Sufficient 3. Medium 4. High 5. Very high 6. Don't know

	1	2	3	4	5	6		1	2	3	4	5	6
1. Ministry of Health							7. Physicians						
2. Public Health Agencies							8. "Ecolabel" industries						
3. Ministry of Environment							9. Environmentalist Associations						
4. Regional Environmental Protection Agencies							10. Local community stakeholders						
5. Municipalities							11. Individual citizens						
6. Regional governments							12. Non-Governmental Organizations						

##### 4.3 To what extent do you support the following measures to limit air pollution?

1. Strongly disagree 2. Disagree 3. Agree 4. Strongly agree 5. Don't know

	1	2	3	4	5
1. Limitation of vehicular traffic in the city					
2. Closure of the center to vehicular traffic					
3. Toll parking					
4. Alternative transport (cycle paths, public transport development)					
5. Temperature limit for domestic heating					
6. Decentralization of industries					

**4.4 In your opinion, how important are the following behaviours of citizens in the fight against pollution?**

1. Not important 2. Not very important 3. Quite important 4. Very important 5. Extremely important 6. Don't know

	1	2	3	4	5	6
1. Separate collection of waste						
2. Use less polluting fuels						
3. Buy products with low impact on the environment						
5. Reduce energy consumption						
6. Buy cars with low emissions						
7. Use public transport						

Formattato: Nessuna, SpazioPrima: 0 pt, Interlinea: singola, Non mantenere con successivo, Non mantenere assieme le righe

**4.5 Indicate your level of potential support for the following initiatives**

1. Very low 2. Low 3. Neither high nor low 4. High 5. Very high 6. Don't know

	1	2	3	4	5	6
1. A new incinerator in your municipality						
2. A new landfill in your municipality						
3. A new high voltage line within 500 m of your home						
5. An underground oil / gas pipeline within 1 km of your home						
6. A new highway within 1 km of your home						
7. Establishing a natural park around your home						

**5. BEHAVIOURS**

5.1 Do you smoke?  Yes  No

If YES: For how many years? [ ][ ], how many cigarettes do you smoke per day? [ ][ ]

(If occasional smoke indicate <1)

If NO:  How long ago did you stop? [ ][ ] Years [ ][ ] Months

have never smoked

Formattato: Nessuna, SpazioPrima: 0 pt, Interlinea: singola, Non mantenere con successivo, Non mantenere assieme le righe

**5.2 How often have you adopted the following behaviours?**

1. Never 2. Rarely 3. Yes, sometimes 4. Yes, always


	1	2	3	4
1. Separate collection of waste				
2. Use public transport				
3. Reduce energy consumption				
4. Use less polluting fuels (e.g. methane, electricity)				
5. Buy products with low impact on the environment (e.g. zero km, biodegradable)				

**5.3 What obstacles do you find in implementing them? (report obstacles, even more than one, for each behaviour)**

OBSTACLES BEHAVIOUR	Lack of support from institutions	Lack of support from family / neighbours / acquaintances	Lack of time	Mistrust in effectiveness	Costs
Separate collection of waste					
Use public transport					
Reduce energy consumption					
Use less polluting fuels (e.g. methane, electricity)					
Buy products with low impact on the environment					

**TEST FOR FUNCTIONAL HEALTH LITERACY**

Lastly, associate the words listed below with the corresponding body part.




- 1 Cold
- Headache     Meniscus
- Laxative     Rhinitis
- Emphysema     Hepatic damage
- Oral route     Alveoli
- Nephritis     Peptic Ulcer
- Constipation     Hematuria




## B. Trust in different sources of information and in different subjects


**Figure B.1.** Trust in information sources, obtained from the answers to the question “How much trust do you have in information on health risks from the following sources?”. The results were ordered from the answer “Much”



**Figure B.2.** Evaluation of the importance of different subjects in protecting the general population from environmental health hazards. The results were ordered from the answer “Extremely important”



**Figure B.3.** Evaluation of fulfilment of different subjects in protecting the population from environmental health risks. The results were ordered from the answer “Very High”



## **C. Literature review on surveys carried out in student population to investigate environmental risk perception (ERP)**

### **C.1 Methodology of literature search**

The literature search was conducted on April 3, 2019, using four databases that are considered a good combination to ensure an adequate literature coverage (Bramer et al., 2017): Scopus, Web of science, PubMed, Google Scholar. The searches were performed using the defined search terms listed below: “Perceived Environmental Risk” OR “environmental risk perception” AND students.

From the above database searches, 1147 hits were identified: 13 from Scopus, 25 from Web of Science, 444 from PubMed, and 665 from Google Scholar. Titles and abstracts of papers were initially screened for relevance, according to the following inclusion criteria: (1) primary focus on analysing environmental risk perception in student population through questionnaires, (2) original research articles or conference papers, (3) in English. Publications identified by the online search engine were first screened by two reviewers for the inclusion criteria based on title and abstract, and any doubt regarding the inclusion was resolved by one other reviewer. The screening process yielded a total of 16 studies.

### **C.2 Extraction of information**

The 16 selected studies were analysed in order to extract information on the study design: (1) location of the study area; (2) type of sampled population; (3) whether or not a pilot study had been carried out before the main survey; (4) sample size; (5) main goal of the study; (6) method for data collection survey on environmental risk perception; (6) sources of information on environment and health; (7) trust in Authorities; (8) main associations of ERP. The extracted information is summarized in Table S1, in comparison with our study.

**Table C.1.** Research design of the selected papers (ERP stands for Environmental Risk Perception)

	Study area	Sampled population and study courses	Pilot study	Sample size of the final survey	Aim	Data collection survey on ERP	Main sources of information on environment and health	Trust in the Institutions	Risks mainly perceived	Main associations
<b>Current study</b>	Italy (nation-wide study enrolling 15 cities across the country, in order to cover the 3 geographical regions of Italy)	University students (53% attending Scientific-Health sector, 47% attending Humanistic-Legal-Social one)	Yes, on a sample of 362 students from 7 Universities	4778 students	Investigate ERP, trust and attitudes, related to socio-demographic factors, Functional Health Literacy (FHL), mass-media and social-media coverage	25-items ERP scale developed by researchers	Internet e social	Directly correlated with FHL (Higher with FHL > 9)	- Pollution of groundwaters, - chemicals in food - chemicals in drinking waters	ERP with - FHL (higher for FHL > 9), - mass media (higher using internet and social).  Trust with - FHL (higher for FHL > 9), - area of residence (higher in North-Centre)
<b>Altunoğlu and Atav, 2016</b>	Turkey (nation-wide study enrolling 16 cities across the country, in order to cover the 7 geographical regions of Turkey)	High school students (sector not specified)	Yes, on a sample of 320 secondary school students	682 students	Investigate the effects of socio-demographic factors on perceptions regarding environmental risk.	23-items ERP scale developed by Slimak and Dietz (2006) divided into four domains (ecological, chemical, resource depletion, global risks)	NA	NA	Risk belonging to global risk domain: - greenhouse effect - radiation - hazardous waste areas	ERP with - geographical region (higher in Black sea) - gender (higher in female)
<b>Altunoğlu et al., 2017</b>	Turkey (one city)	Secondary School Students from Technical high school, and public high	No	1003 students	Investigate environmental risk perceptions and attitudes towards the environment	26-items ERP scale developed by Walsh-Daneshmandi and MacLachlan	NA	NA	- Impure drinking water, - Large fires, - Water shortage (e.g. drought, water depletion)	ERP with - gender (higher in female) - school type (lower in

		school				(2000), divided into three domains (industrial risk, natural disasters, everyday life risk)					technical high school)
<b>Anilan, 2014</b>	Turkey (two cities)	High school students from: Anatolian high schools, science high schools, general high schools	No	413 students from three different high school	Investigate ERP and awareness	20-items ERP scale developed by researcher	NA	NA	- active and passive smoking, - global warming, - HIV.	ERP with - gender (higher in males) - school type (greater in Anatolian and science high schools)	
<b>Bilgin et al., 2016</b>	Poland (one city)	University students in environmental and technological matters (sector not specified)	No	788 students	Investigate environmental, social and technological risk perceptions. In addition, also awareness was analysed	11-items social and environmental risk perception scale; 20-items ERP scale; 12-items technological risk scale developed by researchers	Internet (92%), followed by TV and radio	<b>Low trust</b> in authorities in case of environmental incidents	- Terrorism - Water, air, lakes and marine pollution, - nuclear power plants (51%)	NA	
<b>Cici et al., 2008</b>	Turkey (one city)	School population divided in: - Two groups of teachers (academicians and high school); - Two group of students (undergraduate	No	521 students and educators	Evaluate ERP in students and educators	8-items ERP scale developed by researchers	NA	NA	Environmental pollution is the highest risk factor for all four groups	ERP with profession (higher in high-school teachers)	

		and postgraduate)								
<b>Der-Karabetian et al., 1996</b>	USA (one city) and Britain (one city)	University students in science courses	No	215 students: 119 from USA and 96 from Britain	Evaluate ERP in different geographical areas, according to emotional and cognitive aspects	10-items emotional ERP scale developed by Maloney et al. (1975); 15-items cognitive ERP scale developed by researchers	NA	NA	NA	Lower ERP in British sample. ERP is associated with pro-environmental behaviours
<b>Der-Karabetian et al., 2014</b>	USA (one city), China (one city), Taiwan (one city)	University students in science courses	No	1122 students: 442 in USA, 516 in China, 164 in Taiwan	Evaluate ERP according to national or global belonging and world-mindedness	ERP scale based on Der-Karabetian et al. (1996) study	NA	NA	NA	Personal ERP and global belonging were significant predictors of sustainable behaviour
<b>Duan and Fortener, 2010</b>	USA (one city), China (one city)	University students with the majority from economics-related subjects	No	520 students: 240 in USA, 280 in China	Cross-cultural comparison to evaluate ERP in the western (USA) and eastern (China) cultures, and according to risk communication	34-items ERP scale developed by researchers and divided into five domains (traditional pollution-based environmental issues, natural disaster, human activities, resource shortage risks, global environmental issues)	NA	NA	Different between Chinese (i.e. human population growth, fresh water shortage) and American (i.e. hazardous chemical waste; species extinction) students	Chinese respondents have a higher ERP
<b>Durmuş-Özdemir and Sener, 2016</b>	Turkey (one city)	University students in Technical-Scientific sector (environmental	Yes, on a sample of 250 students	570 students	Evaluate the ERP according to environmental education	21-items ERP scale developed by researchers, based on Slimak and Dietz (2006)	Internet, TV, newspapers	NA	- Acid rain, - Ozone layer depletion - Increase in UV sunlight	ERP with environmental education (higher in students in environmental

		/ agricultural sciences, computer science, engineering)				study, with the scale divided into four domains (ecological, chemical, biological, global risks)				/ agricultural sciences)
<b>Hayran et al., 2015</b>	Turkey (one city)	University students attending faculty of Agriculture	No	73 students	Evaluate ERP in University students in faculty of Agriculture	24-items ERP scale developed by Slimak and Dietz (2006)	NA	NA	Risk belonging to global risk domain: - Hazardous waste sites, - global warming, - Radiation	ERP with age (higher in younger students)
<b>Sayan and Kaya, 2016</b>	Turkey (one city)	University students attending nursing course	No	778 nursing students	Evaluate ERP and environmental attitudes	23-items ERP scale developed by Slimak and Dietz (2006)	NA	NA	Risk belonging to chemical risk domain: - Radiation - Hazardous waste sites - Genetically modified agricultural products	ERP and attitudes with - gender (higher in female) - interest in environmental issues, - endorsement of the college course on environment as necessary, - participation in an environmental activity - awareness of non-government environmental organizations
<b>Weber et al., 2000</b>	USA (state-wide study)	School population (students and	Yes, on a sample of 288 people (67%	3400 students and	Evaluate ERP and awareness in different	32-items ERP scale developed by researchers	NA	NA	- Eating oysters caught in polluted waters	ERP with - age (higher in high school

		educators) from different degree of education (high-, middle-, elementary school) and from science and non-science matters	students, 33% teachers)	educators (79% students, 21% teachers)	group of school population				- Storage of chemicals in tanks or barrels that could leak. - Wastewater discharge into lakes and rivers	students) - profession (higher in teachers)
<b>Yapici et al., 2017</b>	Turkey (one city)	University students from Health Sciences, Science Engineering and Technology, Social Sciences, Educational Sciences	No	774 students	Evaluate ERP and environmental attitudes	22-items ERP scale developed by Slimak and Dietz (2006)	NA	NA	- Radioactive materials - Nuclear power generation	ERP with - course (greater in Health Sciences) - gender (greater in female)
<b>Young et al., 2015</b>	Taiwan (nation-wide study enrolling 13 cities across the country, in order to cover the 4 geographical regions of Taiwan)	University students attending Engineering and Health Sciences	No	1218 students (+ 35 college professor)	Evaluate ERP with respect to a wide variety of hazards	26-items ERP developed by researchers	NA	NA	- Hazardous waste - Virus infectious disease - Chemical contaminated food	ERP with - students' course (greater in technological college) - gender (higher in female)
<b>Zhang and Fan, 2013</b>	China (one city)	University students attending science and technology courses	Yes, three subsequent pilot studies in order to revise the questionnaire, each study with about 20	3079 students	Investigate perception of health risks	15-items ERP adapted from Dake et al. (1991) and divided into three domains (environmental, technological	NA	NA	- Motor vehicle accidents - Chemical pollution - Cigarette smoking	ERP with - geographical region (higher in students living in rural areas) - gender (higher in



			participants from the University			and social risks)				female)
<b>Zhang et al., 2013</b>	China (one city)	University students from social science, and engineering courses	No	1735 students	Investigate ERP and attitudes towards environmental risk management system	25-items ERP developed by researchers	Internet, followed by television, and newspapers	Environmental agencies and research institutes or universities considered the most reliable organizations for providing information in cases of environmental accidents	- Water pollution - Air pollution - Noise pollution	ERP with - personal experience with environmental accidents, - membership of environmental organizations, - education level (higher in master and PhD students)

### C.3 References

1. Altunoğlu BD, Atav E. 2016. Determining the environmental risk perceptions of secondary education students. *Fresen Environ Bull* 25(3):671-83.
2. Altunoğlu BD, Atav E, Sönmez S. 2017 The Investigation of Environmental Risk Perception and Attitudes Towards the Environment in Secondary School Students. *TOJET. Special Issue for INTE* 2017. 436-444
3. Anılan B. 2014. A study of the environmental risk perceptions and environmental awareness levels of high school students. *Asia-Pacific Forum on Science Learning and Teaching* 15(2):1.
4. Bilgin A, Radziemska M, Fronczyk J. 2016. Determination of Risk Perceptions of University Students and Evaluating Their Environmental Awareness in Poland Cumhuriyet University Faculty of Science. *CSJ* 37(4)
5. Bramer WM, Rethlefsen ML, Kleijnen J, Franco OH. 2017. Optimal database combinations for literature searches in systematic reviews: a prospective exploratory study. *Syst Rev* 6(1):245. doi: 10.1186/s13643-017-0644-y
6. Cici M, Deniz S, Şahin N. 2008. Environmental and health risk perceptions of students and educators. *IOSTE Symposium, The Use of Science and Technology Education for Peace and Sustainable Development*. September 21-26, 2008, Kuşadası / Turkey.
7. Dake K, Wildavsky A. 1991. Individual Differences in Risk Perception and Risk-Taking Preferences. In *The Analysis, Communication, and Perception of Risk*; Plenum Press: New York, NY, USA, 1991.
8. Der-Karabetian A, Stephenson K, Poggi T. 1996. Environmental Risk Perception, Activism and World-Mindedness among Samples of British and U.S. College Students. *Percept Motor Skills* 83:451-462.
9. Der-Karabetian A, Cao Y, Alfaro M. 2014. Sustainable Behavior, Perceived Globalization Impact, World-Mindedness, Identity, and Perceived Risk in College Samples from the United States, China, and Taiwan. *Ecopsychology* 6(4): 218-233.
10. Duan H, Fortnar R. 2010. A Cross-Cultural Study on Environmental Risk Perception and Educational Strategies: Implications for Environmental Education in China. *IEJEE* 1(1):1-19.
11. Durmus-ozdemir E, Sener S. 2016. The Impact of Higher Education on Environmental Risk Perceptions. *China-USA Business Review*. 15(9):459-471. doi: 10.17265/1537-1514/2016.09.005
12. Hayran H, Ugur T, Budak DB, Gult A. 2015. 2<sup>nd</sup> International Conference on Sustainable Agriculture and Environment (2<sup>nd</sup> ICSAE). September 30 – October 3, 2015, Konya, Turkey.
13. Maloney MP, Ward MP, Braucht GN. 1975. A revised measurement of ecological attitudes and knowledge. *American Psychologist* 30:787-790.
14. Sayan B, Kaya H. Assessment of the environmental risk perceptions and environmental attitudes of nursing students. *Contemporary Nurse*. 52(6):771-778.
15. Slimak W M, Dietz T. 2006. Personal Values, Beliefs, and Ecological Risk Perception. *Ris Anal* 26(6):1689-1705
16. Weber JM, Hair JF, Fowler CR. 2000. Developing a measure of perceived environmental risk. *J Environ Educ* 32(1):28-35
17. Walsh-Daneshmandi A, MacLachlan M. 2000. Environmental risk to the self: Factor analysis and development of subscales for the environmental appraisal inventory (EAI) with an Irish sample. *J Environ Psychol* 20(2):141-149.
18. Yapici G, Ögenler O, Öner Kurt A, Koças F, Sasmaz T. 2017. Assessment of environmental attitudes and risk perceptions among university students in Mersin, Turkey. *J Environ Public Health*. 2017, Article ID:5650926.

19. Young LH, Kuo HW, Chiang CF. 2015. Environmental health risk perception of a nationwide sample of Taiwan college students majoring in engineering and health sciences. *Hum Ecol Risk Assess* 21(2):307-326.
20. Zhang C, Fan J. 2013. A Study of the Perception of Health Risks among College Students in China. *Int J Environ Res Public Health*. 10:2133-2149.
21. Zhang L, He G, Mol APJ, Lu YL. 2013. Public perceptions of environmental risk in China. *J Risk Res* 16(2):195-209.