

Framing effect in risk communication: a sociological perspective

Virginia Andrei

PhD Student, University of Bucharest, Faculty of Sociology

Abstract

The aim of this paper is to analyze framing as an instrument frequently used by people to understand and respond to risky situations. From a sociological perspective, I try to describe and analyze the mental process involved in risk perception and its root causes. Nowadays, risks are increasingly hard to identify, understand and analyze, especially by those who are not experts in this field. When asked to prioritize risk, most people tend to filter their knowledge about risky situations through personal, past experiences. When this happens, a proper, objective analysis of the risk is replaced by an emotional, subjective description, which is mostly done in negative terms.

For three months, I have conducted several focus group discussions and semi-structured interviews with subjects having different professions, being more or less familiarized with risk field.

My research's objective is to analyze how people perceive and assess risk, including the reasons of their judgments and the language used when referring to risks.

My study tries to approach different types of frames and processes used – especially by media - in order to portray an event or situation as being positive or negative, to imply possible solutions and to shape opinions. The main concepts addressed are risk, risk perception and risk communication.

Keywords: risk, risk perception, emotions, media, risk assessment

Introduction

People perceive risks in different terms, experiences, associations. One of the items involved into their individual assessment over the risks they face or could face in the near future is represented by media - divergent channels of communication, different style of writing and thinking of journalists. Framing media impact is not visible only when talking about risks, hazardous situations, but also within the discussions over the topics present on public agenda, main concerns or worries within a society. For example, disaster risk seems to be correlated, mostly by the people aged 40-45 years old with the major earthquake that took place in 1977 in Romania. They filter all the data received through this memory. Thus, every new piece of data, precaution measure or warning is analyzing and lived in the light of the major impact of the 1977 natural disaster. People fear the possibility of the earthquake to happen again and don't act as rational actors anymore.

From an economist's perspective, a financial crisis could be the major risk Romanian society could face in the near future. A historian talks more about the possibility for the communist regime to come back and a journalist may be concerned over the major negative issues on debate within media and perceive it as risky. These differences in risk perception were discovered within the focus-group and interview discussions I held from my research over risk communication.

In this paper, I try to analyze the individual perceptions over the term risk, the correlations made by individuals with some risks (such as democracy decay, economic crisis in Romania in the near future) and arguments delivered for prioritizing or perceiving some risks over others to be more important - through the concepts of frame and media frame. In other words, my objective is to analyze media impact on risk debates, within group discussions or interview discussions and also the frames (the arguments, the descriptions) used by the ones asked, in order to describe and analyze a risky event or situation.

The concepts I intend to define and exemplify in the following pages are the ones of risk, risk perception, risk communication, frame, media frame. I distinguish between the last two concepts because my research revealed individual frames and media frames as triggers for risk descriptions and subjective analysis. Individual frames refer to the way people talk about the risks perceived, the arguments, data used, together with personal or professional experiences that influence their risk assessments. Media frame refers strictly to a direct connection between responders' opinions to media content.

The methodology used is a qualitative one – group discussions and interviews conducted on risk communication topics, including risk associations, media impact, and risk scenario.

The main results of my research indicate the fact that issues strongly debated in online media, TV, radio, written media became worrying and feared by the public. Spontaneously mentioned risks and the correlations made with the democracy decay risk are strongly related to topics placed on public agenda.

More than media framing, I have identified individual frames used unconsciously over situations, events and topics, by the study participants. Thus, risk descriptions are made using the media content accessed, the subjects' personal opinions, the discussions held with friends or relatives and the studies accessed. There are different assessments on risk magnitude, due to different data owned, personal beliefs, fears and concerns.

Key-concepts

Risk, risk perception and risk communication

The concept of **risk** defines a negative possible event with direct consequences for one entity, individual, state, society. There are scientific processes applied by experts in order to analyze risks. The objective is to make recommendations according to the estimated level of probability and impact. Taking into account these evaluations, the entity or individual exposed to the risk in question can properly manage it and decide how to react in order to diminish or prevent possible damages. (Berg , 2010, pp. 83-85)

An objective analysis as the one mentioned above is not possible to apply by each one of us. Not only because we do not possess all the data required but because we can't be rationale in the middle of a risky situation. For example, put in a hypothetical state crisis – as part of a crisis management team, knowing there is possible for an earthquake to happen in Romania (50% chance to happen and 50% chances not to happen), in the following hours, some of the subjects interviewed admitted they wouldn't take a decision before safeguarding their own lives and the ones of their families. Moreover, they stated they would rather not inform the public about the possible disaster, even if this decision could help the people to manage the possible hazard.

They explained their decision (not to inform the public) by saying that this kind of information (50% chances for the earthquake to happen or not) can harm the people, not help them. They estimated there could be a chaos in the streets, markets and borders and a growing fear towards

the possible earthquake that could generate poor decisions and more victims than the disaster itself.

With other words, some of the subjects I interviewed understood the negative power of national warnings, mostly when there is not a certainty or a high probability for the risks to happen. They also reveal another dimension of the concept of risk (besides its rational approach)– the subjective one, directly connected with individual decisions, people managing a risky situation, under time pressure and having a lot of thoughts, worries and fears.

The subjective approach of risk is called in the literature **risk perception**. This means the same risk can have different meanings for individuals – more or less concerned about the risks they could face in the near future. Risk perception replaces the rationale and conscious answer to possible negative events and is merely expressed by past negative memories, feelings (mostly negative) and linked to familiar facts for the individual exposed to the risk. (Slovic , Finucane, Peters, & MacGregor, 2004)

For example, one of the subjects interviewed stated the more important risk in the near future – regarding its safety or the one of the people around, even the society is the risk of illness. Later in the conversation, the subject talked more about his profession – manager of a welfare organization, responsible of raising money for seriously ill children. There is an evident connection between the risk perceived by the subject and his profession. This is a clear example of perceiving a risk to be closer, due to individual experiences.

Another general perception the majority of the subjects interviewed had referred to the spontaneous and automatic association between risk and danger. Asked about their first thoughts, ideas about the concept of risk, they mentioned danger – a word that refers to a certain negative situation with severe consequences. Seeing risk as a danger, they tend to answer to the next questions having in mind not the proper meaning of risk but the correlation between risk and danger. Some of the risks mentioned by the participants as being important for our country were not placed into the future as possible events but were manifest or ongoing (for example political instability). Therefore, even if the term risk refers to a possible negative event, it turned, for some of the participants, into a manifest negative event. This tendency to talk about manifest risks led to exaggerated assessments regarding the risks debated and also to a focus on the negative impact of the risks and not on its probability.

The language of risk couldn't be complete without **risk communication**. Besides the studies developed over risk, risk analysis and risk perception, there is also a consistent research

on the impact of mass communication about wide spread risks on the public exposed to the risk messages. Together with the effects a risk communication could have on a targeted public, there are experts that analyze the content of a risk message or a risk communication campaign, with the objective of discovering the triggers that could influence risk perceptions or attitudes and even generate a certain behavior towards the risk communicated.

Not to be confused with persuasive campaigns, risk communication refers to messages designed to alert the people about the possible hazards, not too much and constantly trying to inform and not to startle, to suggest how to act and not to control their decisions and actions. (Fischhoff, 1994, pp. 90-94)

The studies developed over risk communication include wide spread public campaigns within a crisis (how to communicate efficiently before, during and after a crisis?), the effects of risk coverage in the media on individual risk assessments or the mental model approach. (Fischhoff, 1994, pp. 96-98) (Morgan, Fischhoff, Bostrom, & Atman, 2002)

Risk communication is mainly confused with crisis communication, lessons learned after a tsunami or an earthquake occurred, using social media within a crisis to communicate and alert over the magnitude of the disaster, developing skills to communicate with the ones damaged. But risk communication is not only about crisis communication but also about daily communication over risks – nationwide or individual events. Daily communication does not refer to risk warnings (of high severity impact), but also to general risks – familiar or unfamiliar to the public.

A widespread risk communication as a daily routine could have negative consequences over the audience – talking more about some risks than over others could influence perceptions and attitudes – this being one of the conclusions of the study developed by Paul Slovic. (Slovic, 1987, pg. 280-283)

In order to avoid misleading the public, the communicators – risk experts, political analysts, and journalists should use the same language when referring to the risks described or mentioned. Moreover, they should talk more about major risks (the ones with a high probability and impact) than about the most feared, with a high impact but low probability to happen. This is not the case for the way risks are communicated in Romanian media. Therefore, exaggeration of some risks and lack of attention towards others are attitudes developed by individuals not only through their personal experiences and opinions but also through the data disseminated by some communicators.

The effect media has on individual risk assessment is evident within the group discussions I conducted mainly because the arguments delivered by the participants include media coverage on the risk debated. For example, the debate developed in media during the period of the group discussions definitely had an impact mainly on the correlations made by the respondents with the risk of democracy decay. There were voices that concluded the risk of democracy decay to be probable in the near future because of the lack of positive results of the government or lack of collective actions done to draw attention to the major problems from Romania. These opinions reflect some of the media content over the political developments from Romania in January-February 2019 that criticized how the country is governed.

I also noticed a connection between the risks mentioned spontaneously by the respondents to be strongly related to media coverage at the time of the discussions. Risks frequently mentioned were ruining Romania image worldwide by the country's rulers, especially in the context of Romanian Presidency of the Council of the European Union, economic problems and possible economic crisis at a national level, the extent of corruption. At a quick search in media, we can conclude these subjects were continuously debated and maintained on the public agenda in Romania, at the time of the group discussions.

Asked what they think about the media coverage on the risk of economic crisis in Romania, in the near future, the majority of the subjects mentioned they are unsatisfied with the focus put by journalists on this topic. They would like to know more about the possible crisis, its implications, root causes, preventive measures. They also describe the risk as a major and real problem, not enough debated, analyzed within the public space.

Mental model of risk is an innovative approach within risk communication field. It defines the mental process or main correlations made by a targeted audience when describing a certain risk. On the basis of mental model, risk communication strategies can be developed. In other words, knowing how individuals think about one or more risks is useful in drafting risk messages and strongly needed for a successful communication campaign, mostly for the impact desired on people – to understand better risk information, to take decisions according to actual dimension of possible hazards. (Morgan, Fischhoff, Bostrom, & Atman, 2002)

Risk mental model begins with selecting the risks wanted to be investigated within a certain audience. The next step is to conduct interviews or group discussions with some representatives of the audience targeted and to create influence diagram over the risk debated. The influence diagram includes the items frequently linked by the participants with the risks – its

causes, consequences, implications, people, places, emotions or others. (Morgan, Fischhoff, Bostrom, & Atman, 2002) For example, a mental model of the risk of economic crisis in Romania in the near future include, according to the participants, high prices, poverty, lack of money for future retirement amounts, business cycle. Therefore, a widespread message used to communicate the risk of economic crisis should use the public's language in order to offer clarification. There should be developed clear messages, using common language and not the specialized one known only by experts.

Framing

According to Erving Goffman, when people perceive and explain events they actually use consciously or unconsciously one or more frameworks or interpretations of the situations they experience, see or hear about. Goffman talks about primary frameworks as the first rules, assumptions followed by an individual when describing an event or a situation, an expression of a group's culture, social connections and belief system. (Goffman, 1974, pp. 21-28)

More than a perceived description of an event or a situation, **framing** can be a result of an intentional attempt to induce a certain belief, feeling, perspective about the reality. (Goffman, 1974, p. 83) When this happens, it means the author aims to deceive the public, using socially constructed messages, stories or characters in a specific time and place and triggers like metaphors, key-words, catchphrases.

According to Robert Entman, to frame means promoting a perceived reality through causal interpretation, analysis and recommendations. In other words, it refers to deductive analysis in general, descriptions of facts and people, processes that could be defined as filtered realities. (Vliegenthart & Zoonen, 2011, p. 106)

A frame is a tool used in order to promote a specific reality that could take various forms, from critical approaches or intentionally incomplete analyses to extremely positive or negative descriptions. Framing effects can be noticed when analyzing the content of the informational products or the perceptions delivered by a targeted audience, exposed to the framing stimulus. (Vliegenthart & Zoonen, 2011, p. 110)

A framing process may be considered concluded when the effects are widely observed, mostly through sociological research (mostly qualitative) or social psychology methods (experiments). In other words, between the emitter and the respondents there is a continuous process of negotiation over meaning, a bidirectional one, which involves the content of the

message sent by the emitter, the influence and perspective given to it by its authors and also the way people perceive and understand it, through socio-cultural lens, political or economic context or through involuntary associations. The concept of frame could not exist without a context, a collective negotiation over meaning, multiple or interpersonal communication. (Vliegenthart & Zoonen, 2011, pp. 111-112)

Risk framing refers to communicating risks with the intention to deceive the audience by presenting a different reality, assessment, suggesting appropriate decisions. The main indicators that suggest one risk is framed could be the following: insufficient arguments outlined within the risk assessments, no experts mentioned or involved in analyzing the risk, personal conclusions disseminated together with the risk description, no assessment, only exaggerated data. In order not to be framed, every message or article about one risk that could have a major impact on people's lives or safety should include a brief risk analysis, experts or leaders that should talk rationally about the risk, its probability and negative implications.

Another dimension of risk framing is the correlations unconsciously made by the individuals interviewed between the term risk and the situations, events, topics they know and fear. The way they talk about the risks perceived, the arguments, data used are items that influence their opinions, assessments concerning major risks they or the entire society could face.

Media frame defines the process applied by a communicator in order to contextualize, analyze a topic, statement or event. It covers techniques like reference, incomplete description of the data provided to the public (emphasis framing), organize and correlate it, according to the opinions, objectives of the communicator, through a cause-effect rationale (equivalency framing). (D'Angelo, 2017, pp. 4-8)

A reference can be made to a statement, an event. The idea is to associate it with facts known or feared by the public. An example is a description to an accident near Romanian borders as a sign of war, even if the accident had nothing to do with a war, being part of a military exercise developed in Western Ukraine. (evz.ro, 2019) The journalists wanted to draw the attention of Romanian citizens in order to raise the number of views, not taking into consideration the implications of a false reference, interpretation of an event. By describing the accident as a sign of war, they completely changed the reality and described the event through the hypothesis of a possible war, starting from the title (Sign of war at Romanian borders? A Ukrainian army helicopter crashed. All passenger died), without having strong arguments for the chances of a possible Romanian-Ukrainian war.

From the previous example, we gather not only the process used by the authors in order to contextualize, describe or correlate an event, but also the possible impact of such piece of news on the public opinion. Without a careful reading, people may believe there is a risk of war, near Romanian borders, a false conclusion that could be drawn by every reader, mostly by the ones unfamiliar with the subject. This is possible by a false correlation, reference, a frame put to an event that does not indicate directly the possibility to generate a war, in the near future, between our country and the Ukrainian state.

Incomplete description refers to intentionally omission of relevant data in order to define the topic not concerning the reality, but the author's judgments and intentions over the messages and warnings revealed to public opinion. Describing the economic status of our country talking only about an official economic crisis, even if there are no arguments for it (evz.ro, 2019) – represents an example of opinions outlined as facts and also of incomplete information (the article is called: Is official! Romania has entered in economic crisis. Data confirmed. It's worse than ever). Disseminating this message by media could definitely influence behaviors or decisions in order to face a risky situation, outlined as a beginning of major losses for Romanian citizens. The effects are mainly negative and lead to the necessity to prevent loss of finances.

Media frame is mainly used by communicators in order to influence the readers to evaluate a topic according to the frame, reference, subjective perspective linked to the topic. It can be confused with persuasive messages or even being written and structured in order to act as persuasive messages. Media frame refers to structuring the meaning of a topic over time or a process constantly used in order to present events, people from a certain point of view. It can influence the readers' beliefs regarding public figures, even political figures and therefore leading people's choices for some party, leader or representative or even highlight public concerns over health, economic, regional issues.

Framing the content of an article implies not only choosing some arguments over others, but also a specific narrative. Words and expressions easy to remember, common for the public opinion, extremely negative or with an emotional substrate represent the best choice for describing a situation from a certain perspective, highlighting an opinion, false or exaggerated correlation and creating a persuasive communication. Examples of such words and expressions are: experts warn us, there is a huge risk of earthquake, be aware, danger, the worst that can happen.

One example of risk framed by media is the article with the title: Warning! Romania has entered in an economic crisis. Official data confirmed it! (www.capital.ro, 2019) We expect to read about the risk of economic crisis but instead we notice there is only one statement within the article that highlights labor shortage and its implications. Without explaining the reasons or the root causes of the economic crisis, the author quotes and explains the official statements made by the president of the national council of small and medium-sized enterprises. The framed consists in the lack of data, assessments about the economic crisis Romania experiences at the moment. Moreover, the warning from the title is an exaggeration, the idea in the article being the fact that the labor shortage can be considered to be an economic crisis. Talking about economic crisis in Romania media means not only to assess and explain the possibility for the crisis to happen in the near future but also to compare the actual situation with the last economic crisis that struck Romania few years ago. Every article, analysis, message on the topic is involuntary correlated with the previous episode of economic problems.

Methodology

The main instruments used in order to analyze media frames are content or discourse analysis, interviews or focus-groups, which means there is possible to investigate framing process and effects using qualitative or quantitative research, but having different objectives. Content or discourse analysis is commonly used in order to identify and analyze expressions, words, arguments, correlations made by the communicators in order to frame a topic meanwhile interviews or discussion groups are methods that highlight the impact of framing, its effects over the subjects of the study.

Semi-structured interviews consist in discussing with the subjects (chosen under relevant criteria for the study developed) following a set of questions but having the possibility to discuss more or less auxiliary topics, according to their experiences, expertise and willingness to talk.

Focus-groups talks are recommended for researches focused on analyzing people's perceptions, opinions on the topic investigated. The qualitative method focuses also on group dynamic and on the debate spontaneously generated between the participants, regarding the topics discussed. Being a face-to-face approach, it offers the possibility to obtain details strongly needed for the later analysis on the items studied.

The questions asked (both in group discussions and interviews) referred to perceptions over the subject's safety, the trust they have in Romanian media, the risks perceived as being

important, at a personal level and national one, the media content correlated with the risk debated, opinions and arguments related to certain risks discussed (such as democracy decay in Romania or economic crisis).

In the following pages, I aim to present the results of my own study over risk perceptions, communication, stressing the correlation between media framing and risk opinions, assessments and connections made by the subjects chosen. From January to March I conducted several interviews and group discussions with people from different age categories, cities, with different professions and concerns.

Main results

One of the first results of my research is that people tend to exaggerate some risks over others without paying attention to its probability, chances to happen in the near future, under the influence of subjective items, such as emotions, familiarity with the risk, data recently accessed. Therefore, media plays an important role in generating data for individuals concerned about possible negative outcomes with negative impact even on their lives. Moreover, media framing fill out the gaps for the ones more or less exposed to risks, having difficulties to analyze risky situations. The impact of media framing on individuals is obvious within the mental model expressed by them during group discussions, when they correlate the media content accessed with the risk debated.

There are few situations, during the focus group and interview discussions when media framing had a clear impact on individual risk assessment:

- within the debate over the democracy decay risk;
- regarding perceived major risks (national level);
- spontaneous associations with the risk term.

The democracy decay risk was assessed, within the debate, differently by the subjects involved into the study as being unlikely or less probable to happen (1 or 2 from 4) or having a medium probability (3 from 4). They had to choose from a 1 to 4 from a probability scale – 1 meaning unlikely to happen and 4 very likely for the risk to become manifest.

Regardless of their choice of probability, the participants assessed the risk talking about current issues within political or economic development. Issues strongly debated in online media, TV,

radio, written media which, due to their extension (in reality but also in media content) became worrying and feared by the public.

The ones who chose unlikely or less probable to happen explained their choices by talking about the main issues publicized during the time of the discussions in Romanian media: lack of independency of Romanian justice, raising corruption, diverging approaches between the President and Government over societal issues.

In other words, the people involved into the study felt the problems mentioned above as clear indicators of the probability of democracy decay in Romania. Their risk assessments depend on how much emphasis they put on the issues mentioned as arguments for risk probability, how concerned are about the political developments, how often they access media content and what kind of media. How media frames the issues and the risks is a key-element for their risk descriptions.

Medium probability is the choice made by few of the responders who talk about raising corruption, lack of results concerning Government's activity, no positive changes of mindset amongst society and political leaders.

One of the responders said democracy decay is directly linked to the raising corruption level from Romania, this issue being strongly publicized and criticized in Romanian media and abroad.

The pessimistic approach towards the democracy decay risk may be due to individuals' focus only or mostly on negative articles, opinions and analyzes over the main domestic issues within our country. The choice to read mostly negative content together with the ability to remember first the pessimistic data are risk biases studied in the literature that addresses this.

The subject's knowledge, their own definitions of democracy decay or the ones elaborated by media are drivers of their choices of risk probability. Lots of them mentioned to have read in online media about the lack of interest and professionalism of political leaders, their choice to protect own interests instead of the citizens' rights, political influence over justice system – these being part of their risk mental models, described within the group discussions.

In the responders' views, **major risks** (frequently mentioned) to Romania's welfare are: corruption, lack of the state's capacity to pay pensions and salaries, financial collapse, political

instability at European level, possible accidents due to infrastructure problems, the extend of lack of education within Romanian society.

Apart from personal experiences, emotions or fears generated by the risks mentioned above, the responders are clearly influenced by the data knew or accessed on media. Financial collapse is a rather feared risk whereas the lack of the state's capacity to pay pensions and salaries in the near future is definitely framed by the debate ongoing during the time of the discussions over the budget issues Romania state is facing, due to latest wage increases. The educational vulnerabilities, corruption level and infrastructure problems are topics constantly placed on public agenda. In other words, there is an evident correlation between the risks frequently mentioned by the responders and the risk's topics, covered by media – constantly or during the group discussions. Moreover, there are some opinions saying that the topics mentioned above were recently accessed in online media.

Frequently mentioned **associations with the term risk**, within interview discussions, were financial, economic issues, legislative changes, and financial collapse. Before talking about major risks to their safety and to Romania's welfare, some of the responders perceived their main concerns, latest media content accessed over widespread issues as being risky. Therefore, from this point, the interview was focused – by the responders – on the primary frameworks they mentioned. More than media framing, we can identify individual frames placed unconsciously over situations, events and topics. The most common correlations are made between risk and financial problems, accidents, casualties.

Conclusions

Is there a connection between media framing on some risks and the perception studied amongst my target audience? The answer is definitely yes. There are lots of references, during group or interview discussions, to the media content accessed by participants. Responders' opinions and risk assessments are definitely influenced by the data knew and recently learned, the articles or analyses read.

The debate over the risk of democracy decay revealed the use of frames amongst study participants. They talked about widespread issues, strongly debated within media, placed on public agenda at that time or about topics constantly placed on public agenda, in order to explain their opinions regarding the democracy decay probability and implications in the near future. Democracy decay is frequently correlated with legislative changes, lack of results of Romanian



Government's activity, raising corruption – items highly debated by media, social media, journalists, political analysts or public figures.

Another dimension of frame impact over risk perceptions refers to the way people perceive and analyze risks, using frames already publicized by media or by connecting data, facts and personal experiences.

Using frames, the ones interviewed try to make sense of reality, to understand risky situations from an individual point of view or widespread within the society. Some of the responders framed or defined risk as a financial issue, an accident, ongoing political instability. This means these individuals are mostly concerned about the topics associated when talking about possible future negative events, developments and are inclined to filter new information through their already formed opinions. In other words, the issues perceived as being important, negative outcomes or events feared or worrying for the people become risky, with or without the aid of media discourse.

The direct consequence of using frames in order to make sense of risky situations and events is the tendency of individuals to exaggerate some risks over others, not because they experienced something similar to the described risk but because the input received from media, the discussions held with friends, relatives may indicate the risk is important, probable to happen in the near future and possible to cause damages.

References

- Berg, H.-P. (2010). RISK MANAGEMENT: PROCEDURES, METHODS AND EXPERIENCES. RT&A, 79-95.
- D'Angelo, P. (2017). Framing: Media Frames. The International Encyclopedia of Media Effects, 1-10.
- evz.ro. (2019, 05 13). E oficial! România a intrat în criză economică! Datele confirmă. Este mai rău decât a fost vreodată. Retrieved 06 08, 2019, from evz.ro: <https://evz.ro/e-oficial-romania-a-intrat-intrat-in-criza-economica-datele-con.html>
- evz.ro. (2019, 05 30). Un elicopter militar Mi-8 s-a prăbușit miercuri seară în vestul Ucrainei, toți cei patru membri ai echipajului decedând, a anunțat joi armata ucraineană, transmit Reuters și AFP. Retrieved 06 08, 2019, from evz.ro: <https://evz.ro/ucraina-elicopter-armata-mi-8.html>
- Fischhoff, B. (1994). Risk Perception and Communication Unplugged: Twenty Years of Process. Risk Analysis, 87-104.
- Goffman, E. (1974). Frame Analysis. An Essay on the Organization of Experience. Boston: Northeastern University Press.
- Morgan, M. G., Fischhoff, B., Bostrom, A., & Atman, C. J. (2002). Risk Communication: A Mental Models Approach. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Slovic, P., Finucane, M. L., Peters, E., & MacGregor, D. (2004). Risk as Analysis and Risk as Feelings: Some Thoughts about Affect, Reason, Risk, and Rationality. Risk Analysis, 311-322.
- Slovic, P. (1987). Perception of Risk. Science 236, 280-285.
- Vliementhart, R., & Zoonen, L. (2011). Power to the frame: Bringing sociology back to frame analysis. European Journal of Communication, 101-115.
- www.capital.ro. (2019, 05 13). Alertă! România a intrat în criză economică! Datele oficiale confirmă! Retrieved 06 12, 2019, from www.capital.ro: <https://www.capital.ro/alerta-romania-a-intrat-in-criza-economica-datele-oficiale-confirma.html>