

Exploratory study on media in crisis communication

Vavecha Parul

Research Officer

Rashtriya Raksha University

Abstract

Disasters interfere with the functioning of society as a whole, such as pandemic diseases, natural, industrial, and terrorism-based disasters, as well as prolonged societal and political crises, and require rapid, proactive response. The news media occupies the central point of the management of crises, disseminating vital information, influencing public mood, and helping decision-making in emergency decisions. Nevertheless, concerns persist regarding the management of information in crises, propaganda, and the devaluation of public trust. This article examines critically the complex dynamics of media across the crisis management cycle-preparation, response, mitigation, and recovery-with a focus on global perspectives and also narrows down to the Indian context, drawing on a crisis communication framework and news media theories, and proposing a model of communication focused on crisis ethics and technological factors.

Keywords: media, crisis communication, propaganda, public perception

1. Introduction

Crises serve as leverage points and bring to light just how strong our systems are. Take the example of COVID-19, the Tsunami of 2011 in Japan, the Kerala floods of 2018, the Bhopal Gas Tragedy, or the 26/11 terrorist attack in Mumbai. It becomes evident that "the fluidity of information and communication plays a crucial role in deciding its effectiveness during a crisis situation" and that "a lot of information is more than the human brain can process" (Coombs, 2019). In the context of a crisis, information is no longer merely used to broadcast news through the media channels; instead, information becomes the governing mechanism—it is part of the entire structure that comprises the government and other entities such as NGOs and law enforcement agencies. This network of communications is the game-changer between the dissemination of right information at the right time and the success of crisis response.

The transition from the old-fashioned print and electronic media to online media and citizen journalism has accelerated the speed and spread of information. On one side, this has created opportunities for faster dissemination and wider inclusion, but on the other hand, the challenges include spreading wrong information, propaganda, and loss of confidence among the public in the provided information from the source (Palen & Anderson, 2016). The emergence of social media and user-created content has encouraged sharing but has made the task of verification more cumbersome and has led to the rapid spread of wrong information. During the COVID-19 period, the World Health Organization coined the term 'infodemic' (World Health Organization (2020): 'An 'infodemic' can be defined as a situation which has an overwhelming number of 'wrong, false, and inaccurate information which obstructs the public health action.

2. Review of Literature

Crisis communication and the role of the media are thus formed through a mix of different fields of study. These include communication studies, disaster studies, political science studies, sociology studies, security studies, and public policy studies. In literature, crises surrounding terrorist activity/militants as well as counter-

insurgencies may include natural disasters as well as public health crises. The significance of information dissemination is thereby heightened during such events.

From an empirical perspective, research has made it clear that, under the umbrella of emergency and security-related crises, the media play the major role as an information source. When faced with disasters, the public inevitably looks for information from the media. In this respect, the media act as the main link between the security forces and the public during disasters and other security incidents, for instance, during terrorist attack incidents and the launch of the government's operation to combat insurgents, as witnessed during the Mumbai incident of 2008. In this situation, the accuracy and immediacy of media reporting can lead to the provision of rapid and effective public cooperation and clarity as opposed to the effects of premature and inaccurate media reports, which can endanger public and operation safety and security. Public confidence and support provide the major underpinning for successful crisis communications.

Digital media, described by their rapidity, interactivity, and decentralization of information dissemination, have shifted the way in which conversations about crisis events occur and are handled. Social media allows for the rapid response to, rapid feedback on, and community engagement with crisis coverage by official authorities, media organizations, or private individuals. However, the pattern of research continues to demonstrate that in times of crisis, the algorithmic amplification of highly emotive or deceiving content only serves to promote polarization, fear, or disinformation.

Ethical issues related to crisis coverage continue to represent an important and challenging aspect. Good journalism requires accuracy and judgment, as well as respect for privacy and avoidance of harmful investigations. Irresponsible behavior includes dramatization through the use of graphic images and the invasion of privacy. Information manipulation and propaganda are evergreen issues that scholars deal with in emergencies. The government and politics might use agenda setting or selected framing. Even though this could be a strategy that aims at reducing panic, information manipulation could be a challenge when it comes to transparency.

Among the most emphasized aspects in the literature on crisis management, it can be argued that the most relevant key to success is communication. It relies on efficient information systems, crisis communications, or strong crisis communications to eliminate uncertainty by maintaining public order. Lack of communication or confusion through delays in communications or unclear crisis communications can increase the severity of the crisis, causing unnecessary societal disruption and government blunders (Boin, 2017).

The Indian media scenario reveals strengths as well as weaknesses. The strengths are that it has been a very effective tool for building public support and providing relief in times of disasters, for instance the Gujarat earthquake and the Kerala floods. However, there are marked weaknesses as well: it is evident from the evidence that there have been weaknesses in dealing with complex security and health issues. Issues such as the recent pandemic of the Covid-19 crisis, the 26/11 terror attacks, have raised the level of operational risks due to unrestricted live transmission, sensationalized coverage, and rapid dissemination of news/information through media.

3. The Modern Media Ecosystem in Crisis Communication

Today's crisis communication is set within a highly interconnected media environment. Government channels, social platforms, digital news, and traditional media interlock to make the diffusion of information faster and public engagement instant during times of crisis. That speed cuts both ways: updates come faster and reach wider audiences, but misinformation can spread just as quickly. So, effective crisis management relies on truthful information, verification, and the active participation of every media actor.

Traditional media, such as radio, TV, and newspapers, still provide the backbone of crisis communication, especially when digital systems fail or are less reliable. Radio remains a lifeline in the provision of official guidance and warnings due to its broad reach and relatively low power requirements, increasing access and resilience. Newspapers offer in-depth analysis and comprehensive documentation, while television lends visual and audio credibility. This is even as traditional sources command the highest public trust for critical information

during crises, even amid media convergence. Lived updates—through video, text, and audio—are augmented by online news sites and smart apps; this, in turn, enhances situational awareness in rapidly developing disasters. Online sources aggregate official information, expert input, and citizen reports, although the race for speed can clash with accuracy, underscoring the importance of quality control (Allan, 2013; Hermida, 2010).

With social media, compared to traditional outlets, it enables instant reporting and community feedback, many times even before official channels publish. This is a tremendous asset in crises but can also sow chaos by spreading false information. That is where official monitoring and the timely correction of misinformation keep the public informed and reduce uncertainty. According to Austin et al. (2012) and Vos and Buckner (2016), highly valued official sources include press conferences, government websites, targeted text messages, and toll-free lines. Consistent messages on various platforms will forge trust and compliance with emergency norms of persons in need, as underlined by Reynolds and Seeger (2005) and WHO (2017).

Global crises are also perceived in the context of international news agencies that filter the lens through which people observe crisis-related policies and responses. Journalistic discourse has the power to mobilize people in support of the crisis-stricken world, yet typically has the equal capacity to disseminate rumors and instill fear. Consequently, journalism that transcends international boundaries during crises needs to be cautious and fact-based (Cottle, 2009; Seeger et al., 2018).

4. Crisis Communication: Phases and Media Roles

Crisis communication is an essential aspect of crisis management and serves readiness, reaction, prevention, and recovery. In all phases, the media serves as an important intermediary between the public and government by disseminating information, affecting attitude and promoting a group response. Effective participation of the media before, during and after a crisis reduces uncertainty, creates public trust and increases social resilience (Coombs, 2015; Seeger et al., 2018).

During the preparation phase, the role of the media is to alert people to danger, sever harm before it occurs, and inform people of what is happening. Public service announcements coupled with news coverage inform people of possible danger as well as indoctrinate people prior to evacuees. Alerts regarding health danger warnings are couched as well. The role of this kind of communication is to alert people to danger, preventing harm by reducing people's vulnerability to danger (Reynolds & Seeger, 2005; WHO, 2017). In terms of response to a crisis event, the media plays a critical role as it can save lives through the dissemination of information as well as being timely as well as true. Information relative to where to go during evacuations as well as where relief centers are located as well as receiving emergency assistance will inform the public of being cognitively aligned with government policies (Austin et al., 2012; Seeger et al., 2018).

During the mitigation phase, it is imperative to embrace constant media coverage to improve long-term risk mitigation. At this stage, it is appropriate for the media to support efforts aimed at ensuring resilient infrastructure, environmental conservation, and preparedness culture by emphasizing learnings, decisions, and mitigation measures. At this stage of the post-crisis phase, media coverage shifts towards reconstruction and accountability to focus on moving towards a normal life.

5. Media Ethics in Crisis Reporting

It is upon media ethics that a good foundation for ethical journalism is built when crises occur. Whether it is an occurrence framed by nature, an epidemic, an attack, or a humanitarian crisis, the truth tends to be overtaken by the speed at which the news spreads, and this presents an ideal environment characterized by misinterpretation, fear, and violence. It is at this stage that ethical journalism plays its critical part.

Media guidelines for emergency reporting strongly encourage the need to verify information before disseminating it, especially when information can fuel public anxiety and confusion. Media representatives must learn to exercise care when interacting with the public, especially in emergency conditions, avoiding intrusive

questions that may only lead to a story in a quest for sensationalism. Sensational images must only be considered when the public genuinely needs information, not for the sake of public sensationalization. Media ethics in emergency reporting will, therefore, foreground the preservation of lives over ratings considerations. Vulnerable sections of societies, including minors, refugees, and indigenous communities, require extra sensitivity during emergency reporting due to the high risks they face

News professionals have to tread very carefully to report the situation without worsening the pain. The role of images is not only to raise the gravity of the situation but also to cause the family of the victims the agony of seeing a tragic scene. Live reporting makes the situation tougher, particularly the problem of the wrong crowd, which people have not forgotten from the Mumbai Terrorist Attacks in 2008. The family of the victims needs dignity when privacy is violated, UNESCO said in 2018.

The article refers to several of these ethical missteps and underlines how irresponsible crisis journalism can go wrong: whether it is the sensational coverage of the migrant situation in the COVID-19 era, which triggered fear and prejudice, or the live broadcasts during 26/11, which shared operational details that raised serious security concerns, or the numerous occasions when private grief has been televised without permission in many disasters, thus violating important ethical guidelines. In order to avoid these problems, guidelines laid down by organizations such as the Press Council of India and UNESCO recommend, *inter alia*, the avoidance of sensationalism, shunning stereotypes, verification of facts before publication, the sensitive handling of conflict reporting, and consultation with experts in explaining scientific or technical matters. Such guidelines, if abided by, not only add credibility but ensure that communities are not harmed and that journalists conduct their duties appropriately.

6. Media Propaganda, Public Perception, and Crisis Communication

In crisis situations, propaganda is the intentional, strategic use of information, which can be selective, emotional, and sometimes misleading, all in efforts to manipulate public opinion towards certain institutional, political, or ideological ends (Jowett, & O'Donnell, 2019). In a crisis, there is the induction of fear and anxiety, leading individuals to turn more to experts and to simple, straightforward communication, which in turn reduces their ability to scrutinize the information they are hearing (Ellul, 1965).

"Propaganda cloaked in crises appears in the realms of politics, public health, and global politics." Governments and politicians employ propaganda to demonstrate competence, attribute blame, and explain political maneuvers, usually to marginalize opposition (Entman, 2004; Herman & Chomsky, 1988). Within a health crisis, fear and mistrust are manipulated through misinformation and pseudoscience, often spreading virally on the internet and social media (Vosoughi et al., 2018). On the global political scene, global propaganda influences the perception of crises to formulate a public perception of wars and humanitarian disasters in a manner that satisfies political goals (Nye, 2004).

For the sake of making the dominant discourse and giving it greater credence, propaganda relies on the emotional appeal, selective information, repetition, and endorsement by influential people (Brader, 2006; Fazio et al., 2015; McQuail, 2010). Media frames, according to Kasperson et al. (1988), Frewer (2004), and Slovic (2000) *inter alia*, play a significant role in the formation of the public view regarding risk issues and can individually amplify or reduce risks, depending on minimization or sensationalization, and shape both behavior and policy actions of the general public and the policy-makers. Public trust in institutions is among the major determinants of compliance or defiance against false information, especially during the occurrence of disasters (Edelman, 2022).

Further, the social media platforms exacerbate the problems by preferring engagement with content to its accuracy and using their algorithms to promote content that has the potential to provoke or react (Bakshy et al., 2015; Sunstein, 2018). Media literacy, and educating people to think clearly and rationally about communications during a crisis, is an essential antidote (Livingstone, 2004).

7. Comparative Analysis: India and Global Crisis Media Systems

The nature of crisis media itself, its extent, its rules, its codes, its use of technology, is very different in each country. It has a massive reach in terms of its people, yet in spite of that, it has its own set of issues in communicating in crises in an efficient manner in relation to worldwide standards. This is simply because India has an extremely diverse platform in terms of its media, be it print media, radio media, TV media, and regional languages, trying its best to deal with communications in a crisis. The simple fact that important information can be disseminated very rapidly in cities as well as rural areas in regional newspapers and broadcasts, even when internet penetration may not be very widespread. Digital media and social networking sites have increased the efficacy of reporting in crisis situations.

Still, it must be pointed out that the Indian system has its own set of weaknesses. The market-driven sensationalism, political intervention regarding who controls the media, lack of truth verification, and a relaxed attitude towards ethical norms can result in hype, myths, and invasions of privacy during emergencies (Herman & Chomsky, 1988; Chadha & Koliska, 2015; Wardle & Derakhshan, 2017). Along with this comes a lack of specialized skills regarding crisis communication during emergencies (UNESCO, 2018). Other nations have developed more organized systems during emergencies. In New Zealand, the open communication system between the government and the media during large emergencies has enhanced cooperation and trust between the publics (Wilson, 2020). In Japan, the use of broadcasting media assists in disseminating immediate warnings through the media itself, thus reducing disaster risks (Aldrich, 2012). In South Korea, immediate information through organized government efforts with the media is a priority, especially during public health crises (Kim & Kreps, 2020). In the United Kingdom, Ofcom aims to maintain a balance between truth accuracy, public interest, and press freedom to efficiently disseminate information (Ofcom, 2023).

Taken together, research studies undertaken on inter-system comparisons indicate that it is necessary for there to be improved regulatory coherence, enhanced verification processes, and tightened ethical enforcement and training within the crisis media framework in India. This scenario is being stated, bearing in mind the existing expertise of the country in media reach and immediacy. Simply adopting some global best practices would result in a significant improvement in the crisis media system in the country.

8. Policy Gaps in India's Crisis Communication System

The media environment in India is quite diverse, but crisis situations expose the communication structure to deficiencies and lead to ineffective crisis management. This happens because of the lack of a common platform and the lack of focus on improvement of the crisis communication structure. This directly impacts the reporting of accurate news during a crisis. One of the critical policy areas that is not addressed is the absence of a crisis-media protocol at the national level that outlines responsibilities and procedures to be followed by the different media organizations during times of crisis and emergencies. This is because, unlike countries that have a central command during crisis communication, there are no standard procedures that are followed on matters such as press meetings and the dissemination of information during emergencies and crises (UNESCO, 2018).

One of the shortcomings that are evident in the crisis communication process is the lack of fact-checking. Social media and online news are effective platforms through which information is shared and amplified instantly. However, there is no official fact-checking process by which the information is verified before being made public. Rumors and misinformation through pictures and statements are common in emergencies because the fact-checking mechanism of the government is limited and reactive and does not work as a preventive measure (Wardle & Derakhshan, 2017). The situation deteriorates when there is lax enforcement of these ethical norms. Even though there exist ethical norms through bodies such as NBDSA and Press Council of India, most people follow these norms voluntarily, so there are no penalties for non-compliance. Therefore, even when there is a crisis, there are still ethics violated through sensationalized reporting, invasion of privacy, broadcasting graphic images, as well as trial-by-media, which scares the public (Chadha & Koliska, 2015).

The patchwork-like setup among federal, state, and local communication authorities has clear implications for policy gaps. Crisis communication in India is a combination of players, including national ministries, state governments, district administrations, disaster-management bodies, and all shades of media. However, the absence of a unified command at the top breeds multiple voices, delays in disseminating information, and public misunderstanding. When emergencies spread across jurisdictions, as in pandemics, cyclones, or major security-related incidents, the situation becomes all the more untenable (NDMA, 2019).

Finally, the training of journalists in crisis and disaster communication remains penetratively non-formal and unsystematic. Indian journalism education often prioritizes generic reporting skills over risk communication, trauma-informed reporting, scientific literacy, and ethical decision-making under pressure. Due to this, reporters may either misinterpret technical information or sensationalize human suffering with little regard for psychological impact on the audience. International entities have time and again highlighted the requirement for specialized training to protect the public and uphold media professionalism in periods of crisis.

9. Expected Outcomes of the Policy Framework

Through addressing the existing deficits, this policy framework is poised to greatly improve the state of crisis communication in India. One of the major areas that could be covered by this policy framework is minimizing false information by following proper channels and real-time checks, thereby preventing the growth and dissemination of false information during a crisis situation (Wardle & Derakhshan, 2017). The major aspect offered by this policy framework related to crisis reporting requires a proper focus on matters like responsibility, consistency, and transparency during the reporting stage, thereby increasing reliance and trust between the media and various government bodies (Edelman, 2022).

Additionally, the promotion of professionalism and the avoidance of sensationalism through this policy encourages honest and ethical reporting of news by the media. The media, being competent and honest, would be able to efficiently relay warnings and preparedness tips for disasters, hence making the community more ready for disasters. The final step would be the faster response and recovery of the crisis communication environment (UNESCO, 2018).

10. Conclusion:

Emergency communications demonstrate why the role of the media in responding to contemporary crises is more crucial and ever-evolving. The media and the press not only broadcast what is happening, but they also affect behavior and influence public opinion, sometimes in collaboration with the government, as happens when disasters occur. The presentation and dissemination of crisis information can also affect how risk is viewed and acted on by the public. Crisis communication can be life-preserving when professionally applied. Fear can also be reduced when helpful crisis information is circulated, and it can promote unity for crisis consolidation when it is accessible.

However, the other aspect is that careless reporting, sensationalized or misleading news, can sometimes be counterproductive to crisis situations through the excitation of panic, the confusion of truth, the obstructing of effective crisis management, and the degradation of trust. For the media to play a constructive role, the challenge requires the implementation of effective and ethical-cognizant policy structures through cooperation and media literacy. In the Indian scenario, where the media is highly developed and increasing, the potential exists to create an effective crisis communication system.

References

1. Aldrich, D. P. (2012). *Building resilience: Social capital in post-disaster recovery*. University of Chicago Press.
2. Allan, S. (2013). *Citizen witnessing: Revisioning journalism in times of crisis*. Polity Press.
3. Austin, L., Liu, B. F., & Jin, Y. (2012). How audiences seek out crisis information: Exploring the social-mediated crisis communication model. *Journal of Applied Communication Research*, 40(2), 188–207. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00909882.2012.654498>
4. Bakshy, E., Messing, S., & Adamic, L. A. (2015). Exposure to ideologically diverse news and opinion on Facebook. *Science*, 348(6239), 1130–1132. <https://doi.org/10.1126/science.aaa1160>
5. Boin, A., 't Hart, P., Stern, E., & Sundelius, B. (2017). *The politics of crisis management: Public leadership under pressure* (2nd ed.). Cambridge University Press.
6. Brader, T. (2006). *Campaigning for hearts and minds: How emotional appeals in political ads work*. University of Chicago Press.
7. Chadha, K., & Koliska, M. (2015). Newsrooms and innovation in India. *Journalism Studies*, 16(5), 760–777. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1461670X.2014.901783>
8. Cinelli, M., Quattrociocchi, W., Galeazzi, A., et al. (2020). The COVID-19 social media infodemic. *Scientific Reports*, 10, Article 16598. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-020-73510-5>
9. Coombs, W. T. (2015). *Ongoing crisis communication: Planning, managing, and responding* (4th ed.). Sage.
10. Coombs, W. T. (2019). *Ongoing crisis communication* (5th ed.). Sage.
11. Cottle, S. (2009). *Global crisis reporting: Journalism in the global age*. Open University Press.
12. Edelman. (2022). *Edelman trust barometer 2022*. Edelman.
13. Ellul, J. (1965). *Propaganda: The formation of men's attitudes*. Vintage Books.
14. Entman, R. M. (2004). *Projections of power: Framing news, public opinion, and U.S. foreign policy*. University of Chicago Press.
15. Fazio, L. K., Brashier, N. M., Payne, B. K., & Marsh, E. J. (2015). Knowledge does not protect against the illusory truth effect. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: General*, 144(5), 993–1002. <https://doi.org/10.1037/xge0000098>
16. Frewer, L. (2004). The public and effective risk communication. *Toxicology Letters*, 149(1–3), 391–397. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.toxlet.2003.12.049>
17. Herman, E. S., & Chomsky, N. (1988). *Manufacturing consent: The political economy of the mass media*. Pantheon Books.
18. Hermida, A. (2010). Twittering the news: The emergence of ambient journalism. *Journalism Practice*, 4(3), 297–308. <https://doi.org/10.1080/17512781003640703>
19. Jeffrey, R. (2000). *India's newspaper revolution: Capitalism, politics and the Indian-language press*. Oxford University Press.
20. Jowett, G. S., & O'Donnell, V. (2019). *Propaganda & persuasion* (7th ed.). Sage.
21. Kasperson, R. E., Renn, O., Slovic, P., et al. (1988). The social amplification of risk. *Risk Analysis*, 8(2), 177–187. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1539-6924.1988.tb01168.x>
22. Kim, D. K. D., & Kreps, G. L. (2020). An analysis of government communication in the COVID-19 pandemic. *Journal of Health Communication*, 25(11), 895–901. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10810730.2020.1845340>
23. Kovach, B., & Rosenstiel, T. (2021). *The elements of journalism* (4th ed.). Crown.
24. Livingstone, S. (2004). Media literacy and the challenge of new information and communication technologies. *The Communication Review*, 7(1), 3–14. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10714420490280152>
25. Liu, B. F., Austin, L., & Jin, Y. (2015). How publics respond to crisis communication strategies. *Public Relations Review*, 41(3), 345–353. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pubrev.2015.01.004>
26. McQuail, D. (2010). *McQuail's mass communication theory* (6th ed.). Sage.
27. Nair, S. (2020). Media, crisis reporting, and COVID-19 in India. *Economic and Political Weekly*, 55(20), 17–20.
28. National Disaster Management Authority (NDMA). (2019). *National disaster management guidelines*. Government of India.

29. Nielsen, R. K., & Graves, L. (2017). "News you don't believe": Audience perspectives on fake news. *Reuters Institute for the Study of Journalism*.

30. Nye, J. S. (2004). *Soft power: The means to success in world politics*. PublicAffairs.

31. Ofcom. (2023). *Broadcasting code*. Office of Communications, UK.

32. Page, D., & Crawley, W. (2001). *Satellites over South Asia*. Sage.

33. Palen, L., & Anderson, K. M. (2016). Crisis informatics—New data for extraordinary times. *Science*, 353(6296), 224–225. <https://doi.org/10.1126/science.aag2579>

34. Press Council of India. (2010). *Norms of journalistic conduct*. PCI.

35. Reynolds, B., & Seeger, M. W. (2005). Crisis and emergency risk communication as an integrative model. *Journal of Health Communication*, 10(1), 43–55. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10810730590904571>

36. Seeger, M. W., Sellnow, T. L., & Ulmer, R. R. (2018). *Communication and organizational crisis* (2nd ed.). Sage.

37. Siegrist, M. (2013). Trust and risk perception. *Risk Analysis*, 33(5), 880–891. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1539-6924.2012.01876.x>

38. Slovic, P. (2000). *The perception of risk*. Earthscan.

39. Sunstein, C. R. (2018). *#Republic: Divided democracy in the age of social media*. Princeton University Press.

40. Thussu, D. K. (2018). *News as entertainment: The rise of global infotainment* (2nd ed.). Sage.

41. UNESCO. (2018). *Journalism, fake news and disinformation*. UNESCO Publishing.

42. Vos, S. C., & Buckner, M. M. (2016). Social media messages in crisis communication. *Journal of Contingencies and Crisis Management*, 24(4), 193–203. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1468-5973.12119>

43. Vosoughi, S., Roy, D., & Aral, S. (2018). The spread of true and false news online. *Science*, 359(6380), 1146–1151. <https://doi.org/10.1126/science.aap9559>

44. Ward, S. J. A. (2010). *Global journalism ethics*. McGill-Queen's University Press.

45. Ward, S. J. A. (2015). *The invention of journalism ethics* (2nd ed.). McGill-Queen's University Press.

46. Wardle, C., & Derakhshan, H. (2017). *Information disorder: Toward an interdisciplinary framework*. Council of Europe.

47. Wilson, S. (2020). Pandemic leadership: Lessons from New Zealand's COVID-19 response. *Leadership*, 16(3), 279–293. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1742715020929151>

48. World Health Organization. (2017). *Communicating risk in public health emergencies*. WHO Press.

49. World Health Organization. (2020). *Managing the COVID-19 infodemic*. WHO.

