**Appendix 1: Coding categories (adapted from Hughes et al. 2020) and descriptive statistics of analyzed media articles**

**Table S1: Secondary topics of articles on human-bear interaction**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Secondary topic** | **Number of articles** | **%** |
| Sighting of bears in proximity to human activity | 204 | 28.49 |
| Attack resulting in human injury | 166 | 23.18 |
| Property damage (e.g., livestock, crops, bee hives, orchards, tents, campers, house) | 145 | 20.25 |
| Encounters (does not result in contact with human) | 106 | 14.80 |
| Accidental bear death or injury due to vehicle/train collision | 46 | 6.42 |
| Fatal bear attack | 27 | 3.77 |
| Other/Topic not clear | 15 | 2.09 |
| Bear killed in self-defense | 7 | 0.98 |

**Table S2: Outcomes/proposed solutions from human-bear interaction articles**

| **Outcome / proposed solution** | **Number of articles** | **%** | **Abbreviation in MCA plot** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Outcome/proposed solutions not clear | 334 | 46.65 | s:unclear\_solution |
| Chasing bear out of the area by an official using rubber bullets, dogs, cars, noise, etc. | 117 | 16.34 | s:bear\_scared\_off |
| Relocation of a bear by officials | 60 | 8.38 | s: relocation |
| Hunting quota/hunt license for a specific bear | 39 | 5.45 | s:preventive\_quota |
| Medical care of the injured bear and relocation to a sanctuary | 34 | 4.75 | s:bear\_recovery\_centers |
| Wireless Emergency Alerts issued | 32 | 4.47 | s:emergency\_alert |
| Fines for feeding bears | 20 | 2.79 | s:fines\_artif\_feed |
| Accidental bear death or injury | 17 | 2.37 | s:bear\_killed |
| Euthanasia/hunt by an official | 15 | 2.09 | s: shoot |
| Raising awareness campaign | 14 | 1.96 | education |
| Mitigation techniques (e.g. electric fence, passage, warning signs) | 11 | 1.54 | s:electric\_fence |
| Compensation for damage | 10 | 1.40 | s: compensate |
| Bear killed in self-defense (e.g. shot the bear) | 7 | 0.98 | s:kill\_self\_defense |
| Temporary closure of an area | 6 | 0.84 | s:temp\_closing\_area |

**Table S3: Responsible for interaction event as discussed in human-bear interaction articles**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Responsible** | **Number of articles** | **%** | **Abreviation in MCA plot** |
| Unclear responsibilities | 489 | 68.30 | a:unclear |
| Human | 131 | 18.30 | a:people |
| Bear | 84 | 11.73 | a:bear |
| Combination of human and bear | 12 | 1.68 | a:both |

**Table S4: Attitude towards bears as resulted from reading human-bear interaction articles**

| **Attitude** | **Number of articles** | **%** | **Abreviation in MCA plot** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Negative | 380 | 53.07 | p:negative |
| Neutral | 264 | 36.87 | p:neutral |
| Moral | 64 | 8.94 | p:moral |
| Ecological | 4 | 0.56 | p:eco |
| Utilitarian | 4 | 0.56 | p:utilitarian |

**Table S5: Secondary topics of hunting/poaching articles**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Secondary topic** | **Number of articles** | **%** |
| Illegal hunting - poaching bears | 102 | 54.84 |
| Discussion on hunting, quota, hunting or hunting season (preventive quota) | 62 | 33.33 |
| Issuing permits to hunt aggressive bears (intervention quota) | 18 | 9.68 |
| Other/Topic not clear | 4 | 2.15 |

**Table S6: Attitude towards bears as resulted from reading hunting/poaching articles**

| **Attitude** | **Number of articles** | **%** | **Abreviation in MCA plot** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Moral | 86 | 46.24 | p:moral |
| Neutral | 63 | 33.87 | p:neutral |
| Negative | 33 | 17.74 | p:negative |
| Ecological | 4 | 2.15 | p:eco |
| Utilitarian | 0 | 0 | p:utilitarian |

**Table S7: Secondary topics of science-related articles**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Secondary topic** | **Number of articles** | **%** |
| Other threats to brown bears (e.g. poaching, climate change) | 7 | 24.14 |
| General information about the abundance of brown bear abundance in Romania | 6 | 20.69 |
| Habitat loss, degradation, or fragmentation of brown bear habitats | 6 | 20.69 |
| Need for research | 5 | 17.24 |
| Other/Topic not clear | 5 | 17.24 |

**Table S8: Attitude towards bears as resulted from reading science-related articles**

| **Attitude** | **Number of articles** | **%** | **Abreviation in MCA plot** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Ecological | 18 | 62.07 | p:eco |
| Neutral | 7 | 24.14 | p:neutral |
| Moral | 2 | 6.90 | p:moral |
| Negative | 2 | 6.90 | p:negative |
| Utilitarian | 0 | 0 | p:utilitarian |

**Table S9: Take-home messages suggested by human-bear interaction articles**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Take home message** | **Number of articles** | **%** | **Abreviation in MCA plot** |
| There is an urgency due to the increasing number of bears, habitat degradation, and conflict with people | 270 | 37.71 | th:urgency |
| Brown bears are a public safety threat | 196 | 27.37 | th:bear\_threat |
| No message suggested (objective news) | 126 | 17.60 | th:no\_message |
| No or minor issues with bears or their habitats (sighting of bears or non-conflictual encounters are normal) | 27 | 3.77 | th:mixed |
| Local people/tourists are responsible for conflicts with bears | 44 | 6.15 | th:people\_resp |
| Monitoring is needed to inform management decisions (e.g., when to hunt, how many bears should be hunted, when to feed bears in the forest) | 51 | 7.12 | th:monit |
| More scientific research is necessary to understand conflicts (e.g., why the interaction occurred, why the bear was aggressive) | 2 | 0.28 | th:research |

**Table S10: Take-home messages suggested by hunting/poaching articles**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Take home message** | **Number of articles** | **%** | **Abreviation in MCA plot** |
| Poaching is an act of cruelty, endangering both bears and people | 61 | 32.80 | th:poaching |
| There is an urgency due to the increasing number of bears, habitat degradation, and conflict with people | 37 | 19.89 | th:urgency |
| No message suggested (objective news) | 29 | 15.59 | th:no\_message |
| Monitoring is needed to inform management decisions (e.g., when to hunt, how many bears should be hunted) | 22 | 11.83 | th:monit |
| Brown bears are a public safety threat | 17 | 9.14 | th:bear\_threat |
| Other messages (e.g., hunting is a sport, hunting is necessary to maintain wildlife, hunting is an act of cruelty) | 10 | 5.38 | th:mixed |
| More scientific research is necessary to assess the size of the brown bear population size | 10 | 5.38 | th:research |

**Table S11: Take-home messages suggested by science-related articles**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Take home message** | **Number of articles** | **%** | **Abreviation in MCA plot** |
| Monitoring is needed to inform management decisions | 10 | 34.48 | th:monit |
| More research is necessary for solving the problems | 6 | 20.69 | th:research |
| There is an emergency due to the increasing number of bears, habitat degradation, and conflict with people | 4 | 13.79 | th:urgency |
| Other messages (e.g., information on movement ecology, information about a bear sanctuary, what to do in a forest) | 3 | 10.34 | th:mixed |
| No message suggested (objective news) | 3 | 10.34 | th:no\_message |
| Local people/tourists are responsible for conflicts with bears | 3 | 10.34 | th:people\_resp |
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