Table 4	Sentiment Analy	vsis—Behavioral	Comparison
Table 4.	Sentiment Anal	ysis—bellaviolai	Companison

		Positive	Negative	Neutral	Valid n
All participants		1228 (94.2%)	258 (19.8%)	1295 (99.4%)	1303
	Poor	44 (91.7%)	11 (22.9%)	48 (100%)	48
How would you rate your overall health?	Fair	208 (92.4%)	60 (26.7%)	225 (100%)	225
	Average	344 (94.5%)	82 (22.5%)	362 (99.5%)	364
	Good	498 (94.5%)	84 (15.9%)	522 (99.1%)	527
	Excellent	134 (96.4%)	21 (15.1%)	138 (99.3%)	139
	Sig.	0.52	0.004**	0.608	
How clearly can you imagine your future self generally?	Not at all clearly	111 (88.1%)	46 (36.5%)	126 (100%)	126
	Slightly clearly	309 (95.1%)	79 (24.3%)	325 (100%)	325
	Moderately clearly	453 (94.4%)	78 (16.3%)	476 (99.2%)	480
	Very clearly	238 (94.8%)	36 (14.3%)	250 (99.6%)	251
	Extremely clearly	117 (96.7%)	19 (15.7%)	118 (97.5%)	121
	Sig.	0.030*	<0.001**	0.036*	
How connected do you feel to your future self generally?	Not at all connected	138 (91.4%)	49 (32.5%)	151 (100%)	151
	Slightly connected	286 (92.9%)	73 (23.7%)	307 (99.7%)	308
	Moderately connected	396 (95.2%)	73 (17.5%)	412 (99%)	416
	Very connected	292 (95.1%)	46 (15%)	307 (100%)	307
	Extremely connected	116 (95.9%)	17 (14%)	118 (97.5%)	121
	Sig.	0.281	<0.001**	0.027*	121
	Not lonely	681 (95.9%)	106 (14.9%)	707 (99.6%)	710
Experience of	Lonely	547 (92.2%)	152 (25.6%)	588 (99.2%)	593
loneliness ¹	Sig.	0.005	<0.001	0.333	373
	Not experienced at all	44 (88%)	17 (34%)	50 (100%)	50
	A little experienced	256 (95.5%)	65 (24.3%)	267 (99.6%)	268
How would you rate	Somewhat experienced	435 (92.9%)	92 (19.7%)	465 (99.4%)	468
your overall level of experience with	Quite experienced	317 (96.1%)	51 (15.5%)	328 (99.4%)	330
technology?	Very experienced	176 (94.1%)	33 (17.6%)	185 (98.9%)	187
3,7	· '				107
	Sig. Very low trust	0.097	0.007**	0.877	44
	Low trust	37 (84.1%)	14 (31.8%)	44 (100%)	
How would you rate		160 (92.5%)	55 (31.8%)	173 (100%)	173
your overall level of	Some trust	657 (95.1%)	114 (16.5%)	689 (99.7%)	691
trust in technology?	High trust	291 (94.2%)	61 (19.7%)	304 (98.4%)	309
	Very high trust	82 (96.5%)	14 (16.5%)	84 (98.8%)	85
	Sig.	0.026*	<0.001**	0.089	110
	Not interested at all	102 (92.7%)	31 (28.2%)	110 (100%)	110
How interested are	A little interested	253 (92%)	70 (25.5%)	274 (99.6%)	275
How interested are you in learning about new technologies?	Somewhat interested	408 (95.1%)	73 (17%)	425 (99.1%)	429
	Quite interested	284 (95%)	54 (18.1%)	298 (99.7%)	299
	Very interested	181 (95.3%)	30 (15.8%)	188 (98.9%)	190
	Sig.	0.371	0.005**	0.617	
	Avoid as long as possible	111 (87.4%)	43 (33.9%)	127 (100%)	127
How would you rate	Try after most others have tried	316 (95.2%)	66 (19.9%)	331 (99.7%)	332
yourself as being an avoider or an early	Try after many others have tried	413 (95.2%)	78 (18%)	430 (99.1%)	434
adopter of new	Try after few others have tried	248 (95.4%)	51 (19.6%)	258 (99.2%)	260
technology?	Try as soon as possible	140 (93.3%)	20 (13.3%)	149 (99.3%)	150
	Sig.	0.011*	<0.001**	0.717	
Do you think your	Yes	308 (96.9%)	53 (16.7%)	312 (98.1%)	318
Do you think your retirement savings plan is currently on track?	No	422 (91.7%)	109 (23.7%)	459 (99.8%)	460
	Don't know	109 (94.8%)	21 (18.3%)	115 (100%)	115
	Sig.	0.012*	0.047*	0.020*	
	Not at all	106 (91.4%)	29 (25%)	116 (100%)	116
	A little bit	162 (91%)	41 (23%)	177 (99.4%)	178
To what extent have	Some	225 (94.5%)	55 (23.1%)	236 (99.2%)	238
you thought about saving for retirement?	A good deal	201 (95.7%)	34 (16.2%)	208 (99%)	210
	A great deal	145 (96%)	24 (15.9%)	149 (98.7%)	151
	Sig.	0.165	0.112	0.794	

Footnotes: Each cell shows the number of respondents, with percentage representing the proportion of the corresponding behavioral segment, that provided at least one word with the sentiment noted for each column. Significance values are based on a chi-square test of independence (*: significant at $\alpha = 0.05$, **: significant at $\alpha = 0.01$). ¹ Loneliness is determined using the 3-item Short Scale adaptation of the UCLA Loneliness Scale, which includes questions on relational connectedness, social connectedness and self-perceived isolation (Hughes et al. 2004).