Index

Access issues, 53
Accuracy, 53, 57, 139
Accurate filtering, 50*n*2
Actancial model, 32
Active content creators, 109, 131, 158, 159
Active survivor
  model, 3, 84
  paradigm, 151
  perspective, 153
Active-audience theories, 45
Activism, 90, 96, 103, 112
  citizen, 159
  digital, 105
  online, 107
  political, 83
Administrative cost, 128–129
Advisory tweet, 9, 10
Age of population, 30
Agency's communication, 32
'Alt-Left' movements, 132
'Alt-Right' movements, 132
Alternative media ecosystem, 132
'Alternative' theories, 133
Ambiguous attitude, 50
American Red Cross, 66, 100, 119, 125
Attention, 7, 41, 105
  to audiences, 45
  to dialogue, 154
  public, 10
  systematic, 155
Attention, Interest, Desire, Action (AIDA model), 41
Attitude, 67, 86, 158
  broadcasting, 127
  controversial, 16
  of interviewees, 22
  positive, 13
  social, 51
Audience demographic perspectives, 55, 86
Audience-centric approaches, 123–124
  to crisis/disaster communication, 85–88
Audience-oriented approach, 83
Audiences, 82, 86
  citizens as, 46–53
  studies, 84, 112, 155
Automated natural language processing, 58
Automatic. *See Automatico*
Automatic methods, 139
Automatic processing, 141
Automatico, 62

Bar-chart, 38
Barriers, 24–26
  to collecting information through social media, 147
  to dissemination of information by social media, 30
  to gathering information from social media, 141–149
  limitations and barriers to social media adoption, 12–14

Behaviour, 6, 7, 45, 54, 67, 70–71, 100
  citizens needs and, 46–49
  communication, 119
  user communicative, 96
Behavioural response, 47
Benchmarking process, 62
Bio box, 39, 43
Black-or-white approach, 16
Blog, 11
Blood pressure, 42
Borkin's model, 42
Bottom-up communication practices, 105, 108–110
Bottom-up information, 114
  activities performed through social media, 145
  automated techniques to overcome misleading content and information overload, 138–141
  barriers to collecting information through social media, 147
  barriers to gathering information from social media, 141–149
  broadcasting attitude, 127–128
  citizen-generated information, 124–125
  citizen-generated information and situational awareness, 134–138
  to digital volunteers, 81–121
  emergency services, 125–127
  networked model, 123–124
  perceived usefulness of different technological features, 148
  from social media, 123
  social media barriers for gathering information, 128–134
  See also Top-down information
Bottom-up information sharing, 157
Bottom-up process, 1, 2, 81
Breakout, 39, 43
Brochures, 21

Cause–effect nexus, 38–39
Central-level institutions, 156
Centro Italia' 2016 seismic sequence, 133
Channel effect, 54
Citizen(s), 84, 161
  activism, 159
  as audiences, 1, 46
  citizen-generated information, 121, 123, 124–125, 129, 134–138
  communication, 45–46
  Italian National Survey on users information-seeking practices, 66–79
  needs and behaviour, 46–49
  quali-quantitative study on user comprehension of earthquake-related tweets, 57–66
  redefinition of communication model, 53–57
  relational networks, 45
  for top-down information, 49–53
Civic agency, 91
Closures tweet, 9
Co-creational framework, 87
Co-production landscape, 127
Collaborative reporting system, 106

Collective coping strategies, 87, 96, 108
Collective sensemaking, 96
Colorado Flash Floods (2013), 11
Command and control model, 3, 84, 126, 153
Common-based peer production, 93
Common/technical language, 61
Communication, 7, 20, 48–49
  channels, 20
  dynamics, 3
  with personal networks, 96
  practice, 52
  process, 124, 159
  redefinition of communication model, 53–57
  research, 151
  scientific information within digital media environment, 14–17
  theory, 45
  See also Crisis communication
Communicative activation, 73
Communicative ecosystem, 15
  of Italian Internet, 73–74
Communicative environment, 17, 121
Communicative processes, 81
Community-based phenomena, 84–85
Community-centric event, 85
Complex social agents, 136–137
Computational methods, 139
Confidence gap, 17
'Connected action' framework to participatory cultures, 90–93
Consolidation, 14
Conspiracy theories, 132, 133
Constraint recognition, 86
Contemporary media ecologies, 131
Contemporary societies, 89
Convenience, 97
Convergence culture, 85
Conversation-monitoring tools, 26
Conversational microstructure elements, 9
Conversational nature of social media, 5
Convincing theoretical framework, 55
Correction tweet, 9
Crafting of effective warnings message, 6, 14, 53, 57, 153
Crisis communication, 3, 49, 50*n*1, 81, 84, 152, 155
  scholars, 84
  theory, 98
  See also Communication
Crisis informatics, 3, 81–82
Crisis/disaster communication
  audience-centric approaches to, 85–88
  theories, 83
Crowdmaps, 103
Crowdsourcing, 92–93, 124–125, 140–141
Cultural considerations, 3, 129, 130
Culture
  convergence, 85
  of individualism, 89
  participatory, 92
'Culture, value and norms perspective', 55, 86

Dati preliminari, 62
Deficit model, 15
Diagrams, 43

Dialogic communication theory, 87
Digital divide, 52, 53
Digital environment, 86, 93, 108
Digital journalism, 37
Digital literacy, 52, 53
Digital media, 21, 85, 91, 92, 151
  communicating scientific information within digital media environment, 14–17
  ecosystem, 105
  networks, 92
  platforms, 105, 110
  See also Social media
Digital mourning, 108
Digital skills, 52, 53
Digital volunteering, 83, 90
Digital volunteers, 87, 98, 107
  activities, 106
  bottom-up information to, 81–121
  practices of, 110
Digitalisation, 15
Disaster, 47, 49, 138, 139
  disaster-related content, 103
  magnitude determination, 97
  management, 47, 126
  media representation of, 50*n*1
  reasons for not using social media in, 52–53
  research, 152
  title hashtag, 138
  types, 101–102
  See also Earthquakes
Disaster communication, 49, 81, 92, 151–153
  scholarship, 93–94
  social media platforms in, 110–112
Discrete crisis-related-affect perspectives, 87
Discursive/schematic format, 61
Disinformation, 17, 23, 131
Disinformation propagated through misinformation, 131
Disintermediation process, 15, 91
Disseminating effective warning messages, 6–7

Earthquake Alert and Report System (EARS), 141
Earthquake operational forecasting (EOF), 102*n*1
Earthquake(s), 41, 47, 48, 102
  early warning system, 14*n*1
  earthquake-related communication practices, 14
  earthquake-related domain, 136
  Italian citizens sharing practices in, 118–121
  magnitude, 59
  quali-quantitative study on user comprehension of earthquake-related tweets, 57–66
Easiness effect, 16
Echo chambers effect, 17, 131
Effective warning, 47
  crafting, 57, 66
  disseminating effective warning messages, 6–7
Effective warnings message crafting of, 6, 14, 53, 57, 153
Email, 20, 105
Emergency, 135
  activities performed through social media, 145
  communication, 152
  communicators, 130
  management, 84, 143
  managers, 22–23, 24, 130, 139

response hashtag, 138
services, 126
Emergency response hashtag, 138
Emergency situations, 137, 139, 160
analysis of institutions' communicative practices, 5–6
barriers to social media adoption, 24
institutions communicative practices, 7–11
study of people's sense-giving processes, 153
Emergent Norm Theory, 53
Emilia 2012 seismic sequence, tweeting in, 112–118
Emotional sharing to networked volunteers, 95
bottom-up communication practices, 108–110
information content, 99
information producing and sharing, 100–103
making sense of world through words, 103–108
motivations for social media, 96–97
review of relevant empirical studies, 98–99
social media platforms in disaster communication, 110–112
top-down communication, 95–96
Emotional support, 87
finding, 96, 97
Emotions, 107–108
emotion-driven perspective, 87
prevailing, 117–118
publics, 87
Empowerment, 91
Engagement, 91
Enthusiasm, 13
Esoteric community, 16
Evacuation tweet, 9
Event, 43, 51
Execution, 65
Eyewitness
information production, 100
tweets, 135

Face-to-face communication, 48, 90
Facebook, 1, 11, 20, 21, 58, 103, 112, 143, 144
Fake news, 129
False information, 130
Feelings, 107–108
Fema, 43
Filter bubbles, 17
'First-hand information' tweets, 118
Flow charts, 41, 43
Fly-sheets, 21
Forecasting, 65
earthquake, 63*n*5
Formal skills, 52–53
Fragmentation, 18
Free-source software development, 93
Fukushima nuclear reactor crisis, 54
Functionalistic approach, 96

Geo-localisation services, 26
Geographic spread, 138
Geolocalised tweets, 113, 114
Geophysical agencies, 31–32, 42
Geophysics, 45–46
Google Docs, 103
Google Plus, 144

Grassroots
communication, 94
communities, 85
information filtering activities, 58
Gratification approach, 45, 56
'Greimas' theory, 32, 33, 36

Haiti earthquake, 58, 105–106, 113, 132–133
Hashtags, 138
Hazard(s)
impact tweet, 9
paradigm, 152
warning, 46
Human
intelligence, 141
as sensors, 82
Humour, 52, 97
Hurricane Katrina, 107
Hurricane Sandy (2012), 57
Hybrid communicative subjects, 15
Hybrid crowdsensing, 141

ICT
in emergency response, 154
supported public participation, 154
Inaccurate information, 130
Incident Management Team (IMT), 11
Individual coping strategies, 96
Individualism
culture, 89
networked, 88
Individualized collective actions, 90
Influential social media creators, 109
Infographics, 37
formal definition and models, 37–40
lack of interactivity, 44
and pragmatic information, 42–44
and scientific information, 40–42
See also Social media; Twitter
Information, 111
credibility, 140
creator and propagator, 130–131
forms, 54
information-related citizen activities, 83
information-seeking activities, 45, 48–49
producing and sharing, 100–103
seeking and sharing, 96
sharing, 2
skills, 52, 53
tweet, 9
Information gathering, 2
practices, 144
processes, 100
and sharing, 96
Information overload, automated techniques to overcome misleading content and, 138–141
'Informative' messages, 99
Instagram, 20
Institutional communication, 21
attention to behaviour and strategies, 7
initiatives, 46
practices, 5
on social media, 18–19
strategy, 6, 32
Institutional messages, 66
Institutionalisation, 14
Institutions, 21–22, 26, 130
communication objectives, 56

communicative practices in emergency situations, 7–11
European, 10–11
Italian, 19
scientific, 15, 17
social media by, 6
Instrumental approach, 9
Integrated social media strategy, 11
Interactivity, lack of, 44
International time format (UTC), 64
Internet, 131
revolution, 88
studies, 84, 93
Interpersonal communication channels, 110
Interpersonal communication-related skills, 52–53
Interpretations, 86
Interviewees, 20, 25
Involvement level, 86
Istituto Nazionale di Geofisica e Vulcanologia (INGV), 15, 58, 133
geophysical agencies, 31–32
presentation on website, 32–34
quali-quantitative study on user comprehension of earthquake-related tweets, 57–66
and USGS communication strategies on web, 31
USGS presentation on website, 34–36
Italian citizens sharing practices in earthquake, 118–121
Italian civil protection system, 19, 142
Italian Geophysical Agency. *See* Istituto Nazionale di Geofisica e Vulcanologia (INGV)
Italian local-level institutions social media
qualitative study, 18–20
quantitative study, 26–31
Italian National Institute of Geophysics and Volcanology. *See* Istituto Nazionale di Geofisica e Vulcanologia (INGV)
Italian National Statistics Institution, 141
Italian National Survey on users information-seeking practices, 66–79
Italy, local-level emergency managers in, 141–149

Japanese Meteorological Agency (JMA), 15, 33
Joint effects, 55–56, 157

Knowledge, 33
black-or-white approach to, 16
communication of scientific, 15
deficiencies, 53
pragmatic, 42

L'Aquila seismic sequence case, 104
Language, 20
common/technical, 61
figurative, 38
verbal, 38
Large scale emergency response, 154–155
Laypeople, 16, 153
Legislative barriers, 25

Levity, 52, 97
Line-chart, 38
Linear communication model, 5, 151
Linear process, 151
Local representatives for emergency management, 23
Local-level emergency management, 3
Local-level institutions, 18, 21, 156
London Metropolitan Police Twitter communication, 9

Macroseismic intensity data, earthquake-related domain, 136
Mainstream platforms, 68–69
Man-made disasters, 15
Mass media system, 129
Mayor, 142
Media
  ecological approach, 94
  organisations, 58
  representation of disasters, 50*n*1
  scholars, 56
  studies, 83
Media ideologies, 56, 111
  from 'connected action' framework to, 90–93
  relating to idioms of practice, 95
Mercedes crisis, 54
Message, 55–56
  comprehension of institutional, 56
  encoding and decoding mass media, 56
  parsing brief and informal, 136
  text, 72
  warning, 6
Meteorological Service Act, 34
Military management processes, 153
Milling, 53, 101
  e-milling, 66, 153
  process, 153
Ministry of Land, Infrastructure, Transport and Tourism (Mlit), 34
Misinformation, 17, 130–134
  propagated through disinformation, 131
Misleading content, automated techniques to overcome, 138–141
Misleading information, 130–131
Monochromatic model, 42
Multi-platform approach, 103, 156

Narration
  aspect, 34
  style, 20, 23
Narrative Program, 32–33, 36
  'Research', 35
Narratological model, 32
Natural disaster(s), 15, 46, 81
  infographics and, 37–44
  social media activity, 95–112
Network society, 90
Networked Crisis Communication Model (NCCM), 55, 86, 88
Networked environment, 93
Networked individualism, 88, 90
  operating system, 2, 89, 90, 155
Networked model, 1, 2, 81–85, 123–124
  activities performed through social media, 145
  audience-centric approaches to crisis/disaster communication, 85–88

automated techniques, 138–141
barriers to collecting information through social media, 147
barriers to gathering information from social media, 141–149
citizen-generated information and situational awareness, 134–138
from 'connected action' framework to participatory cultures and 'media ideologies', 90–93
from emotional sharing to networked volunteers, 95–112
exploring affordances and constraints of social media platforms, 93–95
Italian citizens sharing practices in earthquake, 118–121
new social operating system, 88–90
perceived usefulness of different technological features, 148
social media barriers for gathering information, 128–134
tweeting in Emilia 2012 seismic sequence, 112–118
Networked sociability model, 88
Networked volunteers, emotional sharing to, 95–112
New social operating system, 88–90
Nixle, 11
Non-emergency information, 138
'Non-Firehose' assessment, 114*n*3
Non-informative phenomenon, 139
Non-profit organisations, 58
'Not informative' messages, 99
Numeric code, 65

Off-topic tweet, 9, 10, 98, 99
'On-topic' tweets, 98, 99
One-way information, 83
Online communication networks, 5
Online filtering algorithms, 131
Online information sources, 68
Open-peer production communities, 92
Open-source software development, 93
Operational skills, 52, 53
Operators' desiderata, 26
Optimistic approach, 16
Ordinary users, 115
Organisation-based adverse events, 85
Organisational barriers, 25
'Original tweet/retweet' ratio, 157–158

Participatory cultures
from 'connected action' framework to, 90–93
literature on, 108–109, 158
Passive audience, 83, 151
People's relational network, 48
Personal interaction, 131
Personal recommendations, 97
Personal social networks, 53
Personal/political communication, 21
Physical proximity, 48, 103
Polymedia, 56, 95

Popularisation of science, 16
Posters, 21
Practical-professional
  approach, 25
  attitude, 22, 23, 24
  narration style, 20
Practices-sharing information, 100
Pragmatic approach, 36
Pragmatic information, 42–44
Preliminare, 62
Preliminary. *See Preliminare*
Preliminary data. *See Dati preliminary*
Preliminary estimate. *See Stima preliminare*
Privacy and security fears, 53
Problem recognition, 86
Process diagrams, 41
Propagator, 131
Provisional estimate. *See Stima provvisoria*
Pseudo-science, 133
Public administrations, 127
Public attention, 10
Public communication, 127, 128, 158
  domain, 158
  literature, 123, 124–125, 126
Public debate, 6, 16, 17
Public Information Officers (PIO), 12
Public institutions, 26, 33, 101, 104, 126, 127, 141–142, 163
Public participation, 127
Public reporting hashtag, 138
Public(s) coping strategy, 87
Publics' emotions and coping, 87
Pure disinformation, 131
Pure misinformation, 131

Quali-quantitative approach, 10
  study on user comprehension of earthquake-related tweets, 57–66
Qualitative study of Italian local-level institutions social media, 18–20
Quantitative study of Italian local-level institutions social media, 26–31
Quasi-Twitter celebrity, 116
Queensland floods, 98, 101

Rainbow scheme, 42
Rational-Adaptive Model, 47–48
Real-time nature of social media, 49
'Real' world, 106
Reception studies approach, 56
Resilience, 35, 108
Respondents
  age, 28
  evaluation of information sources speed, 76–77
  geographical origins, 29
  level of education, 28
  perceptions, 146
  year of service, 29
Retweet, 9, 10, 117–118
Retweeters, 110
Rhetorical device, 46
Rumours, 130–134

Saturation, 42
'Savoir-faire', 42
'Savoir', 40, 42
Scholars, 1, 48, 101, 129, 131, 135, 139–141
  barriers to extensive social media usage, 124

classifications for users, 109–110
crisis communication, 84–85
crisis informatics, 82
disaster communication, 82, 85, 93–94
experimented with social-sensing processes, 135
extracting relevant information from social media, 139
importance of sharing feelings and emotions, 107
institutions and emergency managers rely on social media, 125
Internet, 82
internet, 82–83, 155
media, 56
role of citizen-generated information, 136
role or potential of social media in enhancing situational awareness, 134
social media, 82–83
taxonomies, 98
Scholarship
on disaster communication, 151
growing body of, 96
social media disaster-related scholarship, 110
social media scholarship, 111
Science
communication, 3, 15
confidence gap, 17
relationship with society and, 17
Scientific information, infographics and, 40–42
Scientific institutions, 17
Scientific popularisations, 15–16
Second-hand reporting, 8–9
Seismic
Italian National Survey on users information-seeking practices in seismic event, 66–79
networks, 114, 136
risk, 41
Self-mobilising tool, 51
Self-reliant stakeholders, 46
Sense of community, 97
Sense-making
processes, 87
of world through words, 103–108
Sentiment, 135
ShakeAlert, 14*n*1
Situational awareness, 134–138
Situational Crisis Communication Theory (SCCT), 86
Situational Theory of Publics, 86
Skype, 105
Social attitude, 51
Social Breakdown Model, 48
Social media, 1, 3, 5, 7, 8, 10–11, 17, 53, 54, 85, 131, 134, 146, 160
activities, 90, 145
barriers, 24–26, 128–134
classification in emergency situation, 51
communication practices, 49
credibility, 140
in disaster communication, 110–112
emergency communication, 142
emergency managers, 22–23
exploring affordances and constraints of, 93–95
followers, 110
inactives, 110

information, 46
limitations and barriers to adoption, 12–14
at local level, 22
in natural disaster, 95–112
news feeds, 131
operators desiderata, 26
platforms, 110, 143, 144
potential risk, 50–51
scholarship, 111
screening practices, 135
of user, 81
See also Infographics
Social mediated crisis communication model, 87
Social network, 88–89
analysis approach, 160
revolution, 88
Social norms, 97
Social support, 87
Social vulnerability, 152
Social-Mediated Crisis Communication Model (SMCC), 54
Social-sensing processes, 135
Society, 17, 88–89
Socio-behavioural phenomena, 151
Socio-political ecology perspective, 152
Sociological approach, 47
Sociology of disaster, 3, 84
Spectacular style, 61
Spontaneism, 31
Stakeholders, 31–32
Stealing thunder effect, 50, 54
Stima preliminare, 62, 65
Stima provvisoria, 62, 65
Strategic skills, 52
Subscriber-based notification service, 11
Sympathy and emotional support, 99
Syncretic texts, 39
System theory approach, 7, 47
Systematic analysis, 9

'Task-oriented' approach, 90
Technical resources, lack of, 24
Technological barriers, 146
Technological determinism, 83–84
Technology-oriented dimensions, 52
Terse messages, 10
Text messages, 20
Text-oriented risk, 45
Therapeutic sharing, 108
Timely information, 49, 50, 116
Top-down communication, 26, 95–96
Top-down information, 45, 156
citizens as audiences for, 49, 56
information seeking, 49–50
potential risk of social media, 50–51
reasons for not using social media in disasters, 52–53
sharing, 1, 156
social media in emergency situation, 51–52
Top-down information dissemination strategies, 5, 12
communicating scientific information within digital media environment, 14–17
communication channels, 20
disseminating effective warning messages, 6–7
disseminating top-down information at local level, 21–22

infographics and natural disasters, 37–44
INGV and USGS communication strategies on web, 31–37
institutional communication practices, 5–6
institutions communicative practices in emergency situations, 7–11
limitations and barriers to social media adoption, 12–14
policies type for, 31
qualitative study of Italian local-level institutions social media, 18–20
quantitative study of Italian local-level institutions social media, 26–31
social media at local level, 22–26
two different and alternative strategies, 36–37
Top-down process, 1, 2, 81
Top-down social media information, 55
Traditional command and control model, 153, 154–155
Traditional communication channels, 21
Traditional media, 54
Traditional model, 1–2, 88, 100
Traditional rainbow scheme, 42
Transformation rule, 38
Tweet, 63*n*5
content, 116
syntax, 60, 63, 64
types, 9
Tweet/retweet ratio, 100–101
Tweeting in Emilia 2012 seismic sequence, 112–118
Twitter, 11, 20, 58, 98, 103, 105, 112, 139
celebrities, 121
datasets, 109, 135
metrics, 100
twitter-based earthquake detector, 136
user activity, 81
See also Social media
Twitter celebrities, 116
Twitter Streaming API, 114
Two-way cocreational approaches, 87
Two-way communication, 8
environment, 82, 83
Two-way flow of communication, 48

Unfiltered information, 97
Unique information, 49, 97
United Nations Office for Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs (UNOCHA), 137–138
US USGS, 15
Use experiences, 86
User communication processes, 96
User-centric approach, 100
Users information-seeking practices
behaviour, 67–68, 70–71
channels trustworthiness, 75–76
communication, 78–79
communicative ecosystem of Italian Internet, 73–74
earthquake, 69
Italian Internet, 72–73
Italian National Survey on, 66

respondents evaluation of information sources speed, 76–77
seismic event, 68–69
sharing information, 71–72
trustworthiness, 74–75
user experience, 66–67
'Uses and Gratification' approach, 8
USGS communication strategies on web, 31
geophysical agencies, 31–32
INGV presentation on website, 32–34
USGS presentation on website, 34–36
Ushahidi platform, 106, 139

Verbal text, 43
Virtual operations support teams (VOSTs), 106, 146–147
'Virtual' world, 106
Volcanology, 33, 45–46, 56, 58–59

Warning messages, disseminating effective, 6–7
Warning system, 47
Web, INGV and USGS communication strategies on, 31
geophysical agencies, 31–32
INGV presentation on website, 32–34
USGS presentation on website, 34–36
WhatsApp, 20, 120
See also Social media
Witnessing function, 118, 121
Word-of-mouth communication, 54