



Earthquake risk perception, communication and mitigation strategies across Europe
Piero Farabollini, Francesca Romana Lugeri, Silvia Mugnano (Eds.)

Geoscientists' voice in the media: framing Earth science in the aftermath of Emilia 2012 and Amatrice 2016 seismic crises

Andrea Cerase¹

Abstract

In the aftermath of an earthquake, broadcast and traditional media play a crucial role, fulfilling complex social and psychological functions. Geo-scientists are sought by the media to provide scientific assessments of seismic phenomena as to explain both what is happened and what is yet to come, also suggesting ways to mitigate risk at individual and societal level.

The visibility of scientist and their ability to spread their voice across the media is a very important aspect of disaster narratives, as it provides an opportunity to disseminate and receive relevant messages about hazard, risk mitigation and resilience. The genuine appetite for scientific knowledge (Wein et al., 2010) stresses the role of journalistic mediation along the whole risk / science communication process, as it improves newsmedia credibility along with public's understanding of both seismic phenomena and related risks.

The here presented research considered the media coverage of scientific issues during the Emilia 2012 and Amatrice 2016 seismic crisis by the four most circulating Italian national newspapers within the 31 days following the first earthquake shock. The comparative analysis of the two seismic crises considered 288 news stories, being analysed through content analysis, an empirical methodology that allows analysing media messages as well as other types of communicative texts, in order to formulate statistical inferences on their explicit meaning (Neuendorf, 2002).

The analysis made emerge two relevant points. First, media coverage of geo-science follows the 'typical' life cycle of news. Most of the articles are indeed concentrated in the very first days, rapidly decreasing in the following days till to disappear at the end of the month. Second, the daily amount of news story is significantly defined by three variables: the maximum magnitude of aftershocks in the previous day, the number of days after the 'zero event' and the degree of controversy / conflict that arises from scientific evaluation of the ongoing phenomena.

Keywords: Media; Earthquakes; Science Communication; Geoscientists; news framing, agenda building.

Works cited

Altheide, D., Snow, R., 1979, *Media logic*. Thousand Oaks: SAGE Publications.

Bolter, J. D. Grusin, R., 2000, *Remediation: Understanding New Media*. Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press.

Censis. 2018, *XV Rapporto sulla comunicazione. I media digitali e la fine dello star system*, Franco Angeli, Milano.

¹ Dipartimento di Comunicazione e Ricerca Sociale "La Sapienza" University of Rome, Istituto Nazionale Geofisica e Vulcanologia, Rome, e-mail: andrea.cerase@uniroma1.it.



Earthquake risk perception, communication and mitigation strategies across Europe

Piero Farabollini, Francesca Romana Lugerì, Silvia Mugnano (Eds.)

Cerese, A., 2018 “Re-assessing the role of communication in the aftermath of a disaster: case studies and lessons learned” in Antronico L., Marincioni F. (eds.), *Natural Hazards and Disaster Risk Reduction Policies*, Geographies of the Anthropocene book

Devès, M. H., Le Texier, M., Pécout, H., & Grasland, C., 2019, Seismic risk: the biases of earthquake media coverage *Geoscience Communication*, 2, pp. 125–141.

Dominici, P., 2010, *La società dell'irresponsabilità: L'Aquila, la carta stampata, i "nuovi" rischi, le scienze sociali*. FrancoAngeli, Milano.

Entman, R. M., 1993, Framing: Toward clarification of a fractured paradigm. *Journal of communication*, 43(4), 51-58.

Gaddy G. D, Tanjong E., 1986, Earthquake coverage by the western press. *Journal of Communication*, Vol. 36, (2), pp. 105–112.

Gamson, W. A., 1985. *Goffman's legacy to political sociology*. *Theory and Society*, 14(5), 605-622.

Hilgartner, S., & Bosk, C. L., 1988. The rise and fall of social problems: A public arenas model. *American journal of Sociology*, 94(1), pp. 53-78.

Houston, J. B., Pfefferbaum, B., & Rosenholtz, C. E. 2012, “Disaster news: Framing and frame changing in coverage of major US natural disasters, 2000–2010”. *Journalism & Mass Communication Quarterly*, 89(4), 606-623.

INGV (2016) DataBase dell'Istituto Nazionale di Geofisica e Vulcanologia, Centro Nazionale Terremoti (<http://cnt.rm.ingv.it/>)

Istat, 2019, *Annuario statistico Italiano* 2018, Istat, Roma, 2018, <https://www.istat.it/it/files//2018/12/C10.pdf>

Iyengar, S., 1990, “Framing responsibility for political issues: The case of poverty”. *Political behavior*, 12(1), 19-40.

Iyengar, S., 1991. *Is Anyone Responsible?* Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Jamieson, T., & Van Belle, D. A., 2018, Agenda setting, localisation and the third-person effect: an experimental study of when news content will directly influence public demands for policy change. *Political Science*, 70(1), pp. 58-91.

Jenkins H., 2006, *Convergence Culture: Where Old and New Media Collide*, New York: New York University Press.

Joffe, H., 2003, “Risk: From perception to social representation”, *British journal of Social Psychology* 42, 55–73

Joffe, H., 2012, “Thematic analysis”. *Qualitative research methods in mental health and psychotherapy*, 1.

Kasperson, R.E., Kasperson, J.X., 1996, “The social amplification and attenuation of risk”, in *The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, 545 (1), pp. 95-105.

Kasperson, R.E., Renn O., Slovic, P., Brown, H.S., Emel, J., Goble, R., Kasperson, J.X., Ratick, S., 1988, “The social amplification of risk: A conceptual framework”, *Risk Analysis*, 8 (2), pp. 177-187;

Kiousis, S. 2004, Explicating media salience: A factor analysis of New York Times issue coverage during the 2000 US presidential election. *Journal of Communication*, 54(1), 71-87.

Koopmans, R., & Vliegthart, R., 2010, Media attention as the outcome of a diffusion process - A theoretical framework and cross-national evidence on earthquake coverage. *European Sociological Review*, 27(5), pp. 636-653.

Krimsky, S., 2007, “Risk communication in the internet age: The rise of disorganized skepticism”, *Environmental hazards*, 7 (2), pp. 157-164.



Earthquake risk perception, communication and mitigation strategies across Europe

Piero Farabollini, Francesca Romana Lugerì, Silvia Mugnano (Eds.)

Krippendorff, K., 1980. *Content Analysis. An Introduction to its Methodology*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

Massey, K.B., 1995, "Analyzing the uses and gratifications concept of audience activity with a qualitative approach: Media encounters during the 1989 Loma Prieta earthquake disaster", *Journal of Broadcasting and Electronic Media*, 39 (3), pp. 328-349.

Mazzoleni, G. 2008, Media logic. In W. Donsbach (Ed.), *The international encyclopedia of communication* (pp. 2930–2932). Malden, MA: Blackwell, pp. 2930-2922.

Miles, B., Morse, S., 2007, "The role of news media in natural disaster risk and recovery", *Ecological Economics*, 63 (2), pp. 365-373.

Moscovici, S., 1981. "On social representations" in *Social cognition: Perspectives on everyday understanding*, 8(12), 181-209.

Moscovici, S., 1993, "Toward a social psychology of science". *Journal for the theory of social behaviour*, 23(4), 343-374.

Neuendorf, K.A., 2002, *The content analysis guidebook*. London, Sage.

Pantti, M., Wahl-Jorgensen, K., Cottle, S., 2012, *Disasters and the Media*, New York, Peter Lang.

Perez-Lugo, M., 2004, "Media uses in disaster situations: A new focus on the impact phase", *Sociological inquiry*, 74 (2), pp. 210-225.

Perry, R.W., Lindell, M.K., Tierney, K.J., 2001, *Facing the unexpected: Disaster preparedness and response in the United States*, Washington, Joseph Henry Press.

Peters, H. P. (1994). Mass media as an information channel and public arena. *Risk*, 5, 241.

Pidgeon, N., Kasperson, R.E., Slovic, P., 2003, *The social amplification of risk*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.

Roberts, C. 1997. *Text Analysis for the Social Sciences: Methods for Drawing Statistical Inferences from Texts and Transcripts*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Publishers. pp. 275–285

Scheufele, D. A., & Tewksbury, D., 2006, "Framing, agenda setting, and priming: The evolution of three media effects models". *Journal of communication*, 57(1), 9-20.

Scheufele, D. A., 1999, "Framing as a theory of media effects". *Journal of communication*, 49(1), 103-122.

Shoemaker, P. J., & Reese, S. D., 1996, *Mediating the message*, Longman, White Plains.

Singer, E., Endreny, P., & Glassman, M. B., 1991, Media coverage of disasters: effect of geographic location. *Journalism Quarterly*, 68(1-2), pp. 48-58..

Stallings, R.A., 1990, "Media discourse and the social construction of risk", *Social problems*, 37 (1), pp. 80-95.

Tuchman, G., 1978, *Making news: A study in the construction of reality*, New York: Free Press.

Turner, B.A., 1978, *Man-made Disaster*, Wykeham Publications, London.

Vasterman, P.L.M., 2005, "Media-Hype: Self-Reinforcing News Waves, Journalistic Standards and the construction of social problems", *European Journal of Communication*, 20 (4), pp. 508-530.

Wein, A., Potter, S., Johal, S., Doyle, E., Becker, J., 2015, "Communicating with the public during an earthquake sequence: Improving communication of geoscience by coordinating roles", *Seismological Research Letters*, 87, (1), pp. 1-7.