Advanced International Journal for Research (AIJFR)
E-ISSN: 3048-7641 ● Website: www.aijfr.com ● Email: editor@aijfr.com

Unreal Worries, Real Consequences: How Anticipatory Fear Restricts Human Living Despite Low Actual Risk

Ahmed F. Alanazi

Department of Social Studies
College of Arts
King Faisal University

Abstract

The twenty-first century presents a profound paradox: despite historic lows in objective measures of physical danger across Western societies, subjective reports of fear, anxiety, and worry have reached unprecedented levels. This integrative review examines the mechanisms, manifestations, and consequences of anticipatory fear, apprehension about potential future threats that persists even when actual risk is minimal. The researcher synthesizes evidence from cognitive psychology, affective neuroscience, risk perception research, and sociology to construct a comprehensive framework for understanding how unreal worries produce real restrictions on human living. The review first explores the neurocognitive mechanisms underlying anticipatory fear, including the roles of uncertainty, the amygdala-prefrontal circuitry, and cognitive biases such as covariation bias and the affect heuristic. Second, it examines the psychological amplification of risk through heuristics, media influence, and cultural processes of safetyism. Third, it documents the consequences of anticipatory fear across multiple domains: mental health disorders, behavioral avoidance and lifestyle constriction, and broader societal implications including political polarization and reduced social capital. Finally, the researcher proposes a cyclical model wherein unreal worries generate anticipatory fear, which produces avoidant behaviors that reinforce threat-oriented worldviews, creating a self-perpetuating cycle. This framework suggests that the greatest danger posed by low-probability threats may be the fear they generate rather than the threats themselves.

Keywords: anticipatory fear, risk perception, uncertainty, anxiety, safetyism, avoidance behavior, cognitive bias.

1. Introduction

Modernity was supposed to deliver humanity from fear. The epidemiological transition has brought infectious diseases under control; advanced technologies have made workplaces safer; data-driven governance has reduced violent crime; and medical progress has extended life expectancy dramatically (Pinker, 2011; Rosling, 2018). By any objective measure, an individual born in a developed nation today faces lower risks of premature death, violent victimization, and catastrophic loss than at any point in human history. Yet paradoxically, evidence suggests that subjective experiences of fear, worry, and

anxiety have not declined correspondingly, and may, in many populations, have increased (Twenge, 2017; Horwitz & Wakefield, 2012).

This paradox constitutes the central problematic motivating the present review. If fear is an adaptive response to genuine environmental danger, why does it persist, indeed flourish, in environments of relative safety? The answer, this researcher proposes, lies in understanding a specific form of fear: anticipatory fear, defined as apprehension about potential future threats that may never materialize. Unlike reactive fear, which responds to immediate present danger, anticipatory fear operates in the conditional mood, concerned with what might happen rather than what is happening (Barlow, 1988; Grupe & Nitschke, 2013). It is fear of the possible, not the actual.

The distinction carries profound implications. Reactive fear protects; it mobilizes the organism to confront or escape immediate threats. Anticipatory fear, by contrast, often constrains. It leads individuals to avoid situations that might contain danger, to forego opportunities that might entail risk, to restrict their movements, relationships, and aspirations in ways that cannot be justified by any sober assessment of probabilities (Seligman, 1975; Carleton, 2016). The worry is unreal, disconnected from actual danger, but the consequences are entirely real.

This integrative review examines the phenomenon of anticipatory fear operating in contexts where objective risk is low. The researcher synthesizes evidence from multiple disciplines to address three interconnected questions: First, what are the neurocognitive mechanisms that generate and sustain anticipatory fear? Second, how do psychological and cultural processes amplify perceived risk beyond actual danger? Third, what are the consequences of such fear for individual well-being, behavior, and social life?

The review makes several contributions. Theoretically, it integrates findings from affective neuroscience, cognitive psychology, and risk perception research into a unified framework for understanding anticipatory fear. Empirically, it synthesizes evidence from diverse literatures to document the mechanisms and consequences of such fear. Practically, it identifies targets for intervention at individual, institutional, and cultural levels.

The structure of the review proceeds as follows. Section 2 addresses methodological considerations for integrative reviews. Section 3 examines the neurocognitive foundations of anticipatory fear. Section 4 analyzes the psychological amplification of risk. Section 5 documents the consequences of anticipatory fear across multiple domains. Section 6 proposes a cyclical model synthesizing the reviewed evidence. Section 7 discusses implications and identifies directions for future research.

2. Methodological Approach: The Integrative Review

Before presenting the substantive review, it is necessary to clarify the methodological approach employed. The present work constitutes an integrative review, a methodology distinct from both narrative reviews and systematic reviews (Whittemore & Knafl, 2005). Unlike systematic reviews, which address narrowly focused questions through exhaustive searching and meta-analytic synthesis, integrative reviews aim to

synthesize evidence from diverse methodologies and disciplines to generate new conceptual frameworks (Torraco, 2005). Unlike traditional narrative reviews, integrative reviews follow explicit procedures for literature search, quality appraisal, and synthesis.

The integrative methodology is particularly appropriate for the present topic because anticipatory fear cannot be adequately understood within any single disciplinary framework. Its mechanisms are neurobiological; its manifestations are psychological; its amplifiers are cultural and communicative; its consequences are behavioral and social. An integrative approach allows the researcher to build bridges across these domains, constructing a coherent picture from disparate pieces of evidence.

The researcher adopted a methodology consistent with recent guidelines for integrative reviews (Valencia-Contrera et al., 2024). The process proceeded through several stages. First, the researcher formulated the guiding problematic: the persistence of fear in low-risk environments. Second, the researcher narrowed the inquiry to anticipatory fear specifically, distinguishing it from reactive fear and from generalized anxiety. Third, the researcher developed search strategies targeting multiple databases (PubMed, PsycINFO, Web of Science, Scopus) using combinations of terms including "anticipatory anxiety," "anticipatory fear," "uncertain threat," "risk perception," "safetyism," "cognitive bias," and "avoidance behavior." Fourth, the researcher executed searches iteratively, following citation trails and consulting experts in relevant fields. Fifth, the researcher appraised sources for relevance and quality, prioritizing peer-reviewed empirical studies, systematic reviews, and theoretical contributions from recognized experts. Sixth, the researcher reviewed and synthesized findings thematically. Seventh, the researcher developed an integrative framework synthesizing the evidence into a coherent model.

The goal throughout was not exhaustive coverage, the literature on anxiety, fear, and risk perception is vast beyond any single review's capacity, but rather conceptual integration: the construction of a framework that illuminates connections among previously disparate findings.

3. The Neurocognitive Foundations of Anticipatory Fear

3.1 Fear and Anxiety: Conceptual Distinctions

The scientific study of fear requires careful conceptual grounding. Fear and anxiety, though often used interchangeably in everyday language, refer to distinct phenomena with different neurobiological substrates and functional roles (Barlow, 1988; Grupe & Nitschke, 2013).

Fear is typically defined as a brief-duration defensive response to clearly identifiable impending danger. It is object-directed, phasic, and designed for immediate action: the fight-or-flight response mobilizes resources for confronting or escaping threats (LeDoux, 2012). The neural circuitry of fear is well-characterized, centering on the amygdala's role in threat detection and fear expression (Davis & Whalen, 2001; LeDoux, 2000).

Anxiety, by contrast, is a more sustained feeling of apprehension or dread about uncertain future threat (Grupe & Nitschke, 2013). It is not tied to a specific imminent danger but rather reflects a state of

heightened vigilance and preparatory readiness. Anxiety is future-oriented, diffuse, and often persists in the absence of any identifiable trigger.

Within this framework, anticipatory fear occupies an intermediate position. Like anxiety, it is future-oriented and concerned with potential threats. Like fear, it often has an identifiable object, the thing one fears might happen, even if that object is not presently present. Anticipatory fear thus represents apprehension about specific possible futures, distinguished from both generalized anxiety (which lacks specific content) and reactive fear (which responds to present danger).

3.2 Uncertainty as the Engine of Anticipatory Fear

A substantial body of evidence implicates uncertainty as the key psychological variable distinguishing anticipatory fear from reactive fear (Grupe & Nitschke, 2013; Carleton, 2016). When threats are certain, when one knows exactly when and how danger will arrive, the organism can mount a precisely calibrated response. When threats are uncertain, however, the brain must prepare for multiple possibilities, maintaining vigilance without knowing what to vigilantly await.

The aversiveness of uncertainty has been demonstrated across multiple paradigms. In a series of studies using the threat-of-shock paradigm, researchers have shown that uncertain anticipation of potential pain produces greater subjective distress and physiological arousal than certain anticipation of pain itself (Schmitz & Grillon, 2012; Grillon et al., 2004). Participants who know they will definitely receive a shock at a specific time show less anxiety than those who know they might receive a shock at any time. This counterintuitive finding, that uncertainty amplifies rather than diminishes distress, reveals a fundamental principle of the fear system: the unknown is often more frightening than the known negative.

Qiao and colleagues (2018) investigated the neural dynamics of uncertain threat anticipation using event-related potentials (ERPs). Their cue-picture paradigm presented participants with cues that either precisely forecasted the valence of subsequent images (negative or neutral) or left valence unpredictable. During the anticipation phase, uncertain cues elicited neural responses similar to certain-negative cues, both generated larger stimulus-preceding negativity (SPN) than certain-neutral cues. During affective processing, uncertainty amplified neural responses to both negative and neutral pictures. Behaviorally, participants reported more negative mood ratings for uncertain-neutral pictures than certain-neutral pictures and overestimated the probability of negative pictures following uncertain cues.

These findings illuminate a crucial mechanism: uncertainty not only intensifies anticipatory activity but also biases subsequent interpretation. When outcomes are unpredictable, the brain defaults to negative expectations, and neutral events are experienced as more negative than they would otherwise be. Uncertainty thus creates a self-fulfilling prophecy: expecting the worst, the organism finds evidence confirming its expectations.

3.3 Neural Circuitry of Sustained Anticipatory Anxiety

The neural substrates of sustained anticipatory anxiety have been investigated using functional neuroimaging. Whereas fear responses to discrete threats are associated with phasic amygdala activation, sustained anxiety involves different circuitry with different temporal dynamics.

A seminal study by researchers at the National Institutes of Health examined intrinsic functional connectivity during sustained anticipatory anxiety induced by unpredictable threat of shock (Gold et al., 2014). Using a within-subject design, participants underwent resting-state fMRI scans during periods when they were told they might receive shocks (threat condition) and periods when they were told they were completely safe (safe condition). The critical innovation was the task-independent approach: rather than responding to discrete threat cues, participants simply rested while remaining aware of the ongoing possibility of shock.

Results revealed that sustained anxiety increased positive coupling between amygdala activity and dorsomedial prefrontal cortex (DMPFC) activity. Moreover, individuals with higher trait anxiety showed greater amygdala-DMPFC coupling during threat. The researchers interpreted these findings as evidence that the DMPFC may serve as a functional homologue for rodent prefrontal regions that sustain defensive responses over time. While the amygdala initiates defensive responses to threat, it habituates rapidly; sustained anxiety requires prefrontal mechanisms that maintain the anxious state beyond the amygdala's temporal window.

This circuit-level understanding has been extended by subsequent research. Bijsterbosch and colleagues (2014, 2015), investigating vulnerability to anxiety, found that individuals high in trait anxiety showed reduced connectivity between ventromedial prefrontal cortex (vmPFC) and amygdala both at rest and during stress exposure. The vmPFC is implicated in emotional regulation and extinction of fear responses; reduced connectivity may indicate impaired top-down control over amygdala-generated threat responses. In patients with generalized anxiety disorder (GAD), resting-state connectivity within a limbic network including amygdala and vmPFC predicted attentional capture by threat distractors in subsequent tasks (Browning et al., 2015).

These findings suggest a dual-process model of anticipatory fear circuitry. On one hand, sustained anxiety involves positive coupling between amygdala and dorsomedial prefrontal regions that maintain defensive readiness. On the other hand, vulnerability to anxiety disorders involves reduced coupling between amygdala and ventromedial prefrontal regions that would normally regulate and extinguish fear responses. The balance between these circuits, between maintenance and regulation, may determine whether anticipatory fear remains adaptive or becomes pathological.

3.4 Cognitive Biases in Threat Estimation

The neurocognitive mechanisms described above do not operate in isolation but interact with cognitive processes that shape how individuals estimate threat probabilities. A substantial literature documents systematic biases in threat estimation that may contribute to anticipatory fear.

Covariation bias refers to the tendency to overestimate the association between fear-relevant stimuli and aversive outcomes (Tomarken, Mineka, & Cook, 1989; Amin & Lovibond, 1997). In typical paradigms, participants are exposed to fear-relevant stimuli (e.g., pictures of snakes or spiders) and fear-irrelevant stimuli (e.g., flowers or mushrooms) followed by aversive, neutral, or positive outcomes. Despite equal objective contingencies, individuals with specific phobias overestimate the contingency between phobic stimuli and aversive outcomes. Qiao and colleagues (2018) found that this bias extends to uncertain contexts: participants overestimated the probability of negative pictures following uncertain cues, and this overestimation was predicted by negative mood ratings and general arousal during anticipation.

Expectancy bias involves overestimating the likelihood that negative events will occur in specific situations (Butler & Mathews, 1983; Amin & Lovibond, 1997). Unlike covariation bias, which concerns perceived correlations, expectancy bias concerns subjective probability estimates. Individuals with anxiety disorders consistently overestimate the probability and cost of negative events (Butler & Mathews, 1983; Foa et al., 1996). These biased estimates may reflect the influence of affective states on cognitive judgments, a phenomenon captured by the affect heuristic.

The affect heuristic describes the process by which individuals consult their emotional feelings when making judgments and decisions (Slovic, Finucane, Peters, & MacGregor, 2002; Slovic et al., 2007). Rather than engaging in exhaustive rational calculation, people ask themselves: "How do I feel about this?" and use that feeling as information. When applied to risk perception, the affect heuristic implies that perceived risk is shaped by emotional responses to hazards rather than by objective probabilities. Hazards that evoke strong negative affect are judged as more risky, independent of their actual danger.

Vacondio (2023), in a comprehensive dissertation on risk and emotions, synthesizes evidence that affective reactions guide risk perception through multiple pathways. People store information about risky events tagged with affective valence; when subsequently assessing risks, they automatically consult these affective tags. Media communication influences both emotional reactions and risk perception, with implications for protective behaviors. During the COVID-19 pandemic, for example, different ways of presenting mortality information influenced citizens' emotional responses and subsequent health-related behaviors.

3.5 Trait Vulnerability and Individual Differences

The mechanisms described above vary across individuals. Some people are more vulnerable to anticipatory fear than others, and this vulnerability appears to reflect stable dispositional factors.

Neuroticism, the tendency to experience negative emotional states, is strongly associated with anxiety disorders and with anticipatory fear specifically (Spinhoven et al., 2017; Clark, Watson, & Mineka, 1994). In a large longitudinal cohort study, Spinhoven and colleagues (2017) examined experiential avoidance and related psychological constructs as predictors of anxiety disorder onset, relapse, and maintenance. Neuroticism uniquely predicted relapse of anxiety disorders over and above other cognitive constructs. Moreover, a latent factor of psychological vulnerability, loading strongly on neuroticism, experiential

avoidance, worry, rumination, and anxiety sensitivity, predicted onset, maintenance, and relapse of anxiety disorders.

Anxiety sensitivity refers to the fear of anxiety-related sensations, arising from beliefs that these sensations have harmful consequences (Reiss & McNally, 1985; Taylor, 1999). Individuals high in anxiety sensitivity interpret palpitations as signaling imminent heart attack, shortness of breath as indicating suffocation, and trembling as presaging loss of control. This fear of fear creates a positive feedback loop: anxiety symptoms generate fear, which amplifies symptoms, which increases fear. Spinhoven and colleagues (2017) found that anxiety sensitivity uniquely predicted maintenance of anxiety disorders over and above other cognitive constructs.

Intolerance of uncertainty has emerged as a transdiagnostic vulnerability factor for anxiety and worry (Carleton, 2016; Dugas, Schwartz, & Francis, 2004). Defined as a dispositional inability to tolerate the aversive response triggered by perceived absence of information, intolerance of uncertainty predicts worry in both clinical and nonclinical populations. Individuals high in intolerance of uncertainty find ambiguous situations threatening, regardless of objective probabilities. The neurocognitive mechanisms described in Section 3.2, the aversiveness of uncertainty, are magnified in these individuals.

4. The Psychological Amplification of Risk

The neurocognitive mechanisms described above explain how individuals generate and sustain anticipatory fear. But they do not, by themselves, explain why such fear often attaches to objectively low-probability threats. Understanding this disconnect requires examining how risk is psychologically amplified, how small dangers come to loom large in the imagination.

4.1 Heuristics and Biases in Risk Perception

The cognitive revolution in psychology, beginning in the 1970s, transformed understanding of how people judge probabilities. Daniel Kahneman and Amos Tversky's heuristics-and-biases program demonstrated that human judgment departs systematically from normative rational models (Kahneman, Slovic, & Tversky, 1982; Kahneman, 2011). These departures are not random errors but reflect mental shortcuts, heuristics, that are generally useful but produce predictable biases in specific contexts.

The availability heuristic describes the tendency to judge the frequency or probability of events by the ease with which instances come to mind (Tversky & Kahneman, 1973, 1974). Events that are easily imagined or recalled are judged as more common. This heuristic is generally adaptive: frequent events are usually easier to recall. However, it produces systematic biases when factors other than objective frequency affect availability. Vivid, dramatic, emotionally charged events are more available than pallid, mundane events, and are therefore judged as more probable.

The implications for risk perception are profound. Rare but spectacular causes of death, airplane crashes, terrorist attacks, shark attacks, are overestimated in frequency, while common but undramatic causes, heart disease, diabetes, stroke, are underestimated (Lichtenstein et al., 1978; Slovic, 1987). The

availability heuristic ensures that the risks that dominate news coverage become the risks that dominate subjective probability estimates.

The representativeness heuristic involves judging probability by similarity to stereotypes (Tversky & Kahneman, 1974). An event is judged probable to the extent that it resembles a typical example. This heuristic can produce biases when base rates are ignored. For example, people may judge that a particular stranger is likely to be a criminal because they fit the "criminal type," ignoring the low base rate of criminality in the population.

The affect heuristic, introduced above, operates alongside these cognitive heuristics. Slovic and colleagues (2002, 2007) have shown that affective responses to hazards guide risk-benefit judgments. When people like an activity, they judge its risks as low and benefits as high; when they dislike an activity, they judge risks as high and benefits as low. This inverse relationship between perceived risk and perceived benefit, which would not be expected on rational grounds, reflects the guiding role of affect.

4.2 Media and the Social Amplification of Risk

If cognitive heuristics explain how individuals process risk information, media explain what information they process. The social amplification of risk framework, developed by Kasperson and colleagues (1988, 2003), conceptualizes risk perception as emerging from interactions between psychological processes and social communication structures.

Risk signals, information about hazards, are transmitted through communication channels, including news media, social media, and interpersonal networks. These channels amplify or attenuate signals through various mechanisms: dramatization, symbolization, and the attachment of social meanings. An amplified risk signal may then trigger behavioral responses, economic impacts, and secondary consequences that feed back into the risk perception system.

Media coverage of risk exhibits systematic biases that amplify perceived danger. News values favor drama, novelty, and emotional impact (Galtung & Ruge, 1965; Harcup & O'Neill, 2017). Events that are unexpected, involve identifiable victims, and carry visual impact receive disproportionate coverage. Rare catastrophes thus generate more news than common tragedies; a single dramatic death may receive more coverage than thousands of undramatic deaths.

Xie, Li, and Yu (2008) experimentally investigated how different communication channels affect risk perception. Using actual environmental risk materials, they found that television evoked higher risk perception than web pages. The researchers also found that man-made risks aroused higher risk perception than natural risks, and that presentation of images increased risk perception. These findings suggest that the sensory richness of communication channels, the vividness of televised images compared to text, amplifies perceived risk independently of objective danger.

During the COVID-19 pandemic, these dynamics were clearly visible. Vacondio (2023) notes that media outlets presented growing numbers of deaths through numerical formats difficult for the general population to evaluate, without considering how this communication would influence protective

behaviors. Different ways of presenting mortality information, positive framing emphasizing recoveries versus negative framing emphasizing deaths, led citizens to different emotional and risk appraisals, which in turn affected their decisions to adopt preventive measures.

4.3 Cultural Processes: Safetyism and the Risk Society

Beyond individual cognition and media communication, cultural processes shape the landscape of fear. Sociologists and cultural theorists have documented a broad shift in how contemporary societies conceptualize and respond to risk.

Ulrich Beck's (1992) concept of the risk society captures a fundamental transformation in modernity. In industrial society, Beck argues, the central problem was the distribution of goods; in risk society, the central problem is the distribution of bads, the risks generated by modernization itself. Environmental pollution, nuclear threats, and technological hazards create a new politics of risk, in which questions of safety and danger pervade social life. The risk society is characterized by heightened awareness of and preoccupation with potential dangers.

Frank Furedi's (1997, 2002) work on the culture of fear examines how risk consciousness has expanded beyond genuine dangers. Furedi argues that contemporary Western societies are characterized by a disproportionate preoccupation with safety and security, often at the expense of other values. This culture of fear is sustained by institutional practices, professional expertise, and media discourse that constantly identify new threats requiring precautionary intervention.

The concept of safetyism has recently gained traction in public discourse. Jonathan Haidt and Greg Lukianoff (2018), in *The Coddling of the American Mind*, define safetyism as a culture or belief system in which safety has become a sacred value, one that must be protected at all costs and that often trumps other values such as exploration, independence, and resilience. Safetyism, they argue, has transformed childhood, education, and social life, creating generations ill-equipped to handle normal challenges and uncertainties.

Recent commentary illustrates these concerns. Television presenter Kirstie Allsopp was reported to social services in 2024 for allowing her 15-year-old son to travel in Europe with a friend, an activity that would have been unremarkable a generation ago. The ensuing controversy highlighted tensions between parental trust and risk-averse safeguarding culture. Commentators noted that "the more we try to 'protect' children from the dangers and pleasures of everyday life, the less we prepare them for the joys, challenges and responsibilities of adulthood" (Bristow, 2024).

Similarly, Gareth Parker-Jones, headmaster of Rugby School, has blamed a "culture of safetyism" and "mollycoddling" for creating an anxious generation. He argues that perceived risks in the real world have been greatly exaggerated while genuine risks of the online world have been ignored, producing children reluctant to take part in adventurous play or seize opportunities involving risk.

These cultural developments are not merely discursive; they have material consequences. Safetyism manifests in institutional policies: school playgrounds redesigned to eliminate all risk of injury; parental

practices that restrict children's independent mobility; legal frameworks that prioritize precaution over freedom. Each of these responses, ostensibly justified by concern for safety, carries its own costs, costs that are rarely weighed against the benefits they supposedly secure.

5. The Real Consequences of Anticipatory Fear

The preceding sections have examined how anticipatory fear is generated and amplified. This section turns to its consequences. The central argument of this review is that unreal worries produce real restrictions on human living. The evidence for these restrictions spans multiple domains.

5.1 Mental Health Consequences

The most direct consequence of anticipatory fear is its contribution to mental health disorders. Anxiety disorders are among the most prevalent psychiatric conditions worldwide, with lifetime prevalence estimates ranging from 15% to 25% (Kessler et al., 2005, 2012). These disorders impose substantial burden on individuals, families, and societies.

The relationship between anticipatory fear and clinical anxiety is reciprocal. Anticipatory fear is a central feature of many anxiety disorders, most obviously generalized anxiety disorder (GAD), characterized by excessive worry about multiple events or activities (American Psychiatric Association, 2013). But anticipatory processes also feature prominently in panic disorder (fear of future panic attacks), social anxiety disorder (fear of future social evaluation), and specific phobias (fear of future encounters with phobic stimuli).

Spinhoven and colleagues' (2017) longitudinal study provides evidence for the predictive role of cognitive-affective factors in anxiety disorders. Examining a large cohort of adults with past or current anxiety disorders, they found that experiential avoidance and anxiety sensitivity uniquely predicted maintenance of anxiety disorders, while neuroticism uniquely predicted relapse. These findings suggest that the tendency to experience negative emotions, evaluate these experiences as aversive, and engage in avoidant coping constitutes a transdiagnostic factor maintaining anxiety pathology.

The developmental trajectory of anxiety disorders is particularly concerning. Evidence suggests that anxiety disorders often emerge in childhood or adolescence and follow a chronic course (Pine et al., 1998; Beesdo et al., 2009). Early-emerging anticipatory fear may restrict developmental experiences, preventing children from acquiring the skills and confidence needed to navigate challenges. The safetyist parenting practices documented in Section 4.3 may thus inadvertently contribute to the very anxiety they aim to prevent.

5.2 Behavioral Consequences: Avoidance and Lifestyle Constriction

Beyond clinical disorders, anticipatory fear shapes everyday behavior in ways that cumulatively restrict human living. The central mechanism is avoidance: the tendency to evade situations, activities, or experiences perceived as threatening.

Avoidance is a core feature of anxiety disorders, but it also operates in nonclinical populations. People avoid flying because they fear plane crashes, despite flying being safer than driving. They avoid unfamiliar neighborhoods because they fear crime, despite crime rates being at historic lows in many cities. They avoid social situations because they fear embarrassment, despite having no evidence that embarrassment would be catastrophic.

The consequences of avoidance are not trivial. Avoidance prevents disconfirmation of threat beliefs (Rachman, 1976; Foa & Kozak, 1986). When one avoids flying, one never learns that most flights are uneventful; when one avoids social situations, one never learns that social interactions usually go well. Avoidance thus perpetuates fear by preventing the corrective experiences that would otherwise extinguish it.

Avoidance also constricts the life space, the range of activities, relationships, and experiences available to an individual. The concept of life radius captures this constriction: the geographical and social space within which an individual comfortably operates. For some individuals, this radius shrinks progressively as anticipatory fear identifies new threats requiring avoidance. The world becomes smaller, possibilities fewer, life more circumscribed.

In childhood and adolescence, these restrictions carry developmental consequences. Independent mobility, the freedom to move about one's neighborhood without adult supervision, has declined dramatically in recent decades (Hillman, Adams, & Whitelegg, 1990; Shaw et al., 2015). Children who are driven everywhere lose opportunities for exploration, problem-solving, and social interaction. They learn that the world is dangerous and that they are incapable of navigating it independently.

The "free-range kids" movement, initiated by Lenore Skenazy after she was branded "America's worst mom" for letting her 9-year-old ride the subway alone, represents a countermovement against these trends. Skenazy argues for "fighting the belief that our children are in constant danger from creeps, kidnapping, germs, grades, flashers, frustration, failure, baby snatchers, bugs, bullies, men, sleepovers and/or the perils of a non-organic grape" (Bristow, 2024).

5.3 Societal Consequences

The consequences of anticipatory fear extend beyond individuals to shape social and political life. Several interconnected effects merit attention.

Political polarization has been linked to fear-based processes. Fear of the "other", whether defined by ethnicity, religion, political orientation, or cultural identity, motivates defensive reactions that entrench group boundaries. Individuals who perceive the world as dangerous are more likely to support authoritarian policies, endorse punitive measures, and resist out-group contact (Jost, Glaser, Kruglanski, & Sulloway, 2003; Duckitt & Fisher, 2003). Anticipatory fear of what out-groups might do thus contributes to political hostility and gridlock.

Reduced social trust accompanies these processes. Trust requires willingness to make oneself vulnerable to others, a willingness that anticipatory fear undermines. If one constantly anticipates betrayal,

exploitation, or harm, trust becomes irrational. Declining social trust has been documented across Western societies (Putnam, 2000; Twenge, Campbell, & Carter, 2014), with implications for civic engagement, community cohesion, and democratic functioning.

NIMBYism ("Not In My Back Yard") reflects anticipatory fear applied to local development. Residents oppose housing projects, homeless shelters, group homes, and other facilities based on anticipated negative consequences, crime, property values decline, neighborhood character change. These anticipated consequences often fail to materialize, but anticipatory fear blocks projects that would benefit communities. The result is housing shortages, concentrated poverty, and reduced community integration.

Economic consequences follow from these patterns. Risk-averse decision-making extends to economic behavior, with individuals avoiding investment opportunities, entrepreneurial ventures, and career changes that involve uncertainty (Gennaioli, Shleifer, & Vishny, 2015). At the societal level, excessive precaution may reduce innovation, economic dynamism, and growth.

5.4 The Paradox of Safety Interventions

A final consequence warrants attention: the paradoxical tendency for safety interventions to increase rather than decrease overall danger. This paradox operates through multiple mechanisms.

Risk compensation describes the tendency for individuals to adjust their behavior in response to perceived safety (Wilde, 1982; Hedlund, 2000). When safety features are added, seatbelts, airbags, protective equipment, people may take more risks, offsetting some of the safety gains. The phenomenon reflects the fact that people have target levels of risk they are willing to accept; when objective safety increases, they increase risk-taking to maintain the target level.

Risk displacement occurs when interventions that reduce one risk inadvertently increase another. Banning playground equipment to prevent falls may reduce physical activity, increasing obesity-related health risks. Overprotecting children from strangers may prevent them from developing social skills, increasing vulnerability to genuine social dangers. The net effect may be no reduction, or even an increase, in overall harm.

The **precautionary principle**, which holds that action should be taken to prevent harm even when cause-and-effect relationships are not fully established, illustrates these tensions. While appealing in principle, in practice the precautionary principle can paralyze decision-making and block beneficial activities (Sunstein, 2005). Because any activity carries some risk, the principle can be invoked to oppose virtually anything, with the result that the risks of inaction are never weighed against the risks of action.

6. Toward an Integrative Model: The Anticipatory Fear Cycle

The evidence reviewed above suggests a cyclical model in which anticipatory fear perpetuates itself through multiple interacting mechanisms. This section proposes such a model, synthesizing the preceding analysis into a coherent framework.

6.1 The Cycle

The Anticipatory Fear Cycle comprises four stages:

Stage 1: Activation. The cycle begins when an individual encounters information suggesting potential threat. This information may come from personal experience, social learning, or, increasingly, media exposure. The threat information is processed through cognitive heuristics (availability, representativeness, affect) that amplify its perceived significance. Uncertain threats, which cannot be definitively dismissed, are particularly potent activators.

Stage 2: Elaboration. Activated threat representations trigger anticipatory processes. The individual mentally simulates possible futures in which the threat materializes. Neurocognitive mechanisms, amygdala-DMPFC coupling, sustained anticipatory activity, maintain the anxious state. Cognitive biases (covariation bias, expectancy bias) shape threat estimates, leading to overestimation of probability and cost. Uncertainty amplifies distress and biases interpretation of ambiguous information.

Stage 3: Avoidance. Anticipatory fear motivates avoidance of situations perceived as threatening. Avoidance may be behavioral (not flying, not visiting certain neighborhoods) or cognitive (not thinking about threatening topics). Avoidance provides immediate relief from anxiety, negatively reinforcing the behavior. However, it prevents exposure to corrective information that would disconfirm threat beliefs.

Stage 4: Consolidation. Because avoidance prevents disconfirmation, threat beliefs persist unchanged or may strengthen. The individual interprets the absence of harm as confirming the effectiveness of avoidance rather than as evidence that threat was low. The world continues to be perceived as dangerous; the self continues to be perceived as vulnerable. This consolidated threat worldview primes the individual for future activation, completing the cycle.

6.2 Amplifying Loops

The basic cycle is amplified by several feedback loops.

The cognitive loop: Avoidance prevents disconfirmation, maintaining biased threat estimates. Biased estimates increase anticipatory fear, which motivates further avoidance. The loop is self-perpetuating.

The neural loop: Sustained anticipatory activity may produce lasting changes in neural circuitry. Repeated amygdala-DMPFC coupling during anxiety may strengthen this pathway, making anxious states more easily triggered and maintained. Reduced vmPFC-amygdala coupling may reflect or cause impaired emotion regulation capacity.

The cultural loop: Individual avoidance behaviors aggregate into cultural patterns. When many parents restrict children's independent mobility, a culture of safetyism emerges. This culture shapes institutional policies, media discourse, and social norms, which in turn amplify individual risk perceptions.

The developmental loop: Children raised in safetyist cultures develop with limited opportunities for risk exposure and coping skill acquisition. They enter adulthood with heightened threat sensitivity and reduced confidence in their ability to handle challenges, making them more vulnerable to anticipatory fear.

6.3 Implications of the Model

The cyclical model has several implications for understanding and intervening in anticipatory fear.

First, it suggests that anticipatory fear is not simply a response to external threat but a self-perpetuating system. Interventions must therefore address multiple points in the cycle, not merely the initial activation.

Second, it highlights the importance of exposure and disconfirmation. Breaking the cycle requires opportunities to encounter feared situations safely and learn that anticipated catastrophes do not occur. This principle underlies effective treatments for anxiety disorders (exposure therapy) and has implications for parenting, education, and social policy.

Third, it suggests that cultural factors are not merely background but active contributors to the cycle. Efforts to reduce anticipatory fear must therefore engage with cultural narratives, media practices, and institutional policies that amplify risk.

7. Discussion and Implications

7.1 Summary of Findings

This integrative review has examined anticipatory fear in contexts of low objective risk. The researcher has synthesized evidence from multiple disciplines to construct a comprehensive framework for understanding how unreal worries produce real consequences.

The neurocognitive evidence establishes that anticipatory fear is supported by specific neural circuitry involving amygdala-prefrontal interactions. Uncertainty emerges as a key amplifier of anticipatory activity, biasing subsequent interpretation and estimation of threat probabilities. Individual differences in neuroticism, anxiety sensitivity, and intolerance of uncertainty predict vulnerability to anticipatory fear.

The risk perception literature demonstrates systematic biases in how individuals estimate threat probabilities. Heuristics, availability, representativeness, affect, produce systematic overestimation of rare dramatic dangers and underestimation of common undramatic dangers. Media coverage amplifies these biases through selective attention to vivid, emotionally compelling threats. Cultural processes of safetyism embed these dynamics in institutional practices and social norms.

The consequences of anticipatory fear extend across multiple domains. Mental health effects include anxiety disorders and related conditions. Behavioral effects include avoidance and constriction of life space, with developmental consequences for children and adolescents. Societal effects include political polarization, reduced social trust, NIMBYism, and potential economic impacts.

The proposed cyclical model integrates these findings, suggesting that anticipatory fear perpetuates itself through interactions among cognitive, neural, behavioral, and cultural mechanisms.

7.2 Theoretical Implications

The framework developed here has implications for multiple theoretical traditions.

For **affective neuroscience**, it suggests the importance of studying sustained anticipatory states rather than focusing exclusively on phasic fear responses. The amygdala-DMPFC circuit identified by Gold and colleagues (2014) represents a target for future research on anxiety maintenance and vulnerability.

For **cognitive psychology**, it highlights the interplay between automatic (heuristic) and controlled (analytic) processes in risk perception. The affect heuristic, in particular, appears central to understanding why emotional responses to hazards drive probability estimates.

For **risk communication research**, it underscores the need for communication strategies that account for psychological amplification processes. Simply providing accurate probability information is insufficient when heuristics and affect shape perception. Effective communication must engage with emotional responses and provide corrective experiences.

For **sociology**, it connects individual-level psychological processes to macro-level cultural patterns. The concept of safetyism provides a bridge between cognitive biases and institutional practices, suggesting how individual fears aggregate into cultural norms.

7.3 Practical Implications

The framework also suggests practical implications for intervention.

At the **individual level**, cognitive-behavioral interventions targeting threat overestimation and avoidance behavior have strong empirical support (Hofmann & Smits, 2008; Butler et al., 2006). Exposure-based treatments that provide opportunities for disconfirmation remain the gold standard. Mindfulness-based interventions may help individuals relate differently to fearful thoughts and sensations.

At the **family level**, parents can be supported in providing children with developmentally appropriate opportunities for independent exploration. The free-range kids movement offers resources for resisting safetyist pressures and fostering resilience.

At the **institutional level**, schools and other organizations can review policies that prioritize precaution over developmental benefits. Risk-benefit assessments should weigh the costs of restriction alongside the costs of potential harm. Playgrounds designed for challenge and manageable risk may better serve children than completely sanitized environments.

At the **media level**, journalists and editors can consider the psychological impacts of risk reporting. Balanced coverage that contextualizes risks and avoids dramatization may reduce unnecessary fear. Attention to the formats in which statistics are presented can improve public understanding.

At the **policy level**, regulators can consider whether precautionary approaches produce net benefits when indirect costs are included. Sunstein's (2005) critique of the precautionary principle highlights the need for balanced assessment of risks and countervailing risks.

7.4 Limitations and Future Directions

This review has several limitations that suggest directions for future research.

First, as an integrative review, it sacrifices exhaustive coverage for conceptual synthesis. Systematic reviews targeting specific relationships, between media exposure and anticipatory fear, between safetyist parenting and child anxiety, between cognitive biases and avoidance behavior, would complement the present framework.

Second, the review focuses primarily on Western societies. Cross-cultural research is needed to examine whether anticipatory fear operates similarly in different cultural contexts. Risk perception research has documented cultural differences (Weber & Hsee, 1998); extending this work to anticipatory fear would be valuable.

Third, the review emphasizes mechanisms and consequences but gives less attention to protective factors. Research on resilience, factors that buffer against anticipatory fear despite exposure to risk-amplifying environments, could inform preventive interventions.

Fourth, longitudinal research is needed to test the cyclical model proposed here. Does avoidance predict subsequent threat overestimation? Do safetyist cultural contexts predict individual-level anticipatory fear? Does exposure to manageable challenges during childhood reduce vulnerability in adulthood? These questions await empirical investigation.

Finally, intervention research could test whether breaking the cycle at multiple points produces synergistic effects. Combining individual-level cognitive-behavioral interventions with family-level support for independence and institutional policy changes might achieve more than any single intervention alone.

8. Conclusion

The argument of this review can be stated simply: the greatest danger posed by many low-probability threats is not the threats themselves but the fear they generate. Anticipatory fear, apprehension about what might happen, operates through neurocognitive mechanisms that amplify uncertainty, through cognitive heuristics that distort probability estimates, through media practices that dramatize rare dangers, and through cultural processes that elevate safety to a sacred value. The result is fear that persists despite safety, worry that restricts despite freedom.

The consequences are not trivial. Mental health suffers; life space constricts; social trust erodes; developmental opportunities are foreclosed. These are real consequences, measurable in human suffering and lost potential. They are consequences of fear itself, not of the dangers fear represents.

Recognizing this paradox does not imply that all fear is irrational or that genuine dangers should be dismissed. Fear serves vital functions; it alerts us to real threats and motivates protective action. But when fear becomes anticipatory, pervasive, and disconnected from actual risk, it ceases to serve these functions and begins to undermine the very well-being it evolved to protect.

The task ahead is both intellectual and practical. Intellectually, researchers must continue to elucidate the mechanisms that generate and sustain anticipatory fear, the pathways through which it produces consequences, and the factors that buffer against its effects. Practically, families, institutions, and societies must find ways to acknowledge genuine dangers while resisting the amplification of unreal worries. The goal is not a world without fear, an impossible and perhaps undesirable aim, but a world in which fear is proportionate to danger and does not unnecessarily restrict human living.

The stakes are high. How societies answer the question of which fears are worth attending to and which can be safely ignored will shape the lives of individuals, the character of communities, and the possibilities for human flourishing. This review has aimed to provide a framework for addressing that question, not by prescribing answers but by illuminating the processes through which answers are formed and the consequences that follow from them.

References

1. American Psychiatric Association. (2013). Diagnostic and statistical manual of mental disorders (5th ed.). Arlington, VA: American Psychiatric Publishing.
2. Amin, J. M., & Lovibond, P. F. (1997). Dissociations between covariation bias and expectancy bias for fear-relevant stimuli. Cognition and Emotion, 11(3), 273-289.
3. Barlow, D. H. (1988). Anxiety and its disorders: The nature and treatment of anxiety and panic. New York: Guilford Press.
4. Beck, U. (1992). Risk society: Towards a new modernity. London: Sage Publications.
5. Beesdo, K., Knappe, S., & Pine, D. S. (2009). Anxiety and anxiety disorders in children and adolescents: Developmental issues and implications for DSM-V. Psychiatric Clinics of North America, 32(3), 483-524.
6. Bijsterbosch, J. D., Smith, S. M., Forster, S., John, O. P., & Bishop, S. J. (2014). Resting state correlates of subdimensions of anxious affect. Journal of Cognitive Neuroscience, 26(4), 820-831.
7. Bijsterbosch, J. D., Smith, S. M., & Bishop, S. J. (2015). Functional connectivity under anticipation of shock: Correlates of trait anxious affect versus induced anxiety. Journal of Cognitive Neuroscience, 27(9), 1840-1853.
8. Bristow, J. (2024). Kirstie Allsopp is right about parental safetyism. UnHerd, August 25, 2024.

9. Browning, M., Behrens, T. E., Jocham, G., O'Reilly, J. X., & Bishop, S. J. (2015). Anxious individuals have difficulty learning the causal statistics of aversive environments. Nature Neuroscience, 18(4), 590-596.
10. Butler, A. C., Chapman, J. E., Forman, E. M., & Beck, A. T. (2006). The empirical status of cognitive-behavioral therapy: A review of meta-analyses. Clinical Psychology Review, 26(1), 17-31.
11. Butler, G., & Mathews, A. (1983). Cognitive processes in anxiety. Advances in Behaviour Research and Therapy, 5(1), 51-62.
12. Carleton, R. N. (2016). Into the unknown: A review and synthesis of contemporary models involving uncertainty. Journal of Anxiety Disorders, 39, 30-43.
13. Clark, L. A., Watson, D., & Mineka, S. (1994). Temperament, personality, and the mood and anxiety disorders. Journal of Abnormal Psychology, 103(1), 103-116.
14. Davis, M., & Whalen, P. J. (2001). The amygdala: Vigilance and emotion. Molecular Psychiatry, 6(1), 13-34.
15. Duckitt, J., & Fisher, K. (2003). The impact of social threat on worldview and ideological attitudes. Political Psychology, 24(1), 199-222.
16. Dugas, M. J., Schwartz, A., & Francis, K. (2004). Brief report: Intolerance of uncertainty, worry, and depression. Cognitive Therapy and Research, 28(6), 835-842.
17. Foa, E. B., & Kozak, M. J. (1986). Emotional processing of fear: Exposure to corrective information. Psychological Bulletin, 99(1), 20-35.
18. Foa, E. B., Franklin, M. E., Perry, K. J., & Herbert, J. D. (1996). Cognitive biases in generalized social phobia. Journal of Abnormal Psychology, 105(3), 433-439.
19. Furedi, F. (1997). Culture of fear: Risk-taking and the morality of low expectation. London: Cassell.
20. Furedi, F. (2002). Paranoid parenting: Why ignoring the experts may be best for your child. London: Allen Lane.
21. Galtung, J., & Ruge, M. H. (1965). The structure of foreign news. Journal of Peace Research, 2(1), 64-91.
22. Gennaioli, N., Shleifer, A., & Vishny, R. (2015). Money doctors. Journal of Finance, 70(1), 91-114.
23. Gold, A. L., Morey, R. A., & McCarthy, G. (2014). Sustained anxiety increases amygdala–dorsomedial prefrontal coupling: A mechanism for maintaining an anxious state in healthy adults. Journal of Psychiatry and Neuroscience, 39(5), 321-329.
24. Grillon, C., Baas, J. P., Lissek, S., Smith, K., & Milstein, J. (2004). Anxious responses to predictable and unpredictable aversive events. Behavioral Neuroscience, 118(5), 916-924.
25. Grupe, D. W., & Nitschke, J. B. (2013). Uncertainty and anticipation in anxiety: An integrated neurobiological and psychological perspective. Nature Reviews Neuroscience, 14(7), 488-501.
26. Haidt, J., & Lukianoff, G. (2018). The coddling of the American mind: How good intentions and bad ideas are setting up a generation for failure. New York: Penguin Press.
27. Harcup, T., & O'Neill, D. (2017). What is news? News values revisited (again). Journalism Studies, 18(12), 1470-1488.
28. Hedlund, J. (2000). Risky business: Safety regulations, risk compensation, and individual behavior. Injury Prevention, 6(2), 82-90.

29. Hillman, M., Adams, J., & Whitelegg, J. (1990). One false move: A study of children's independent mobility. London: Policy Studies Institute.
30. Hofmann, S. G., & Smits, J. A. (2008). Cognitive-behavioral therapy for adult anxiety disorders: A meta-analysis of randomized placebo-controlled trials. Journal of Clinical Psychiatry, 69(4), 621-632.
31. Horwitz, A. V., & Wakefield, J. C. (2012). The loss of sadness: How psychiatry transformed normal sorrow into depressive disorder. New York: Oxford University Press.
32. Jost, J. T., Glaser, J., Kruglanski, A. W., & Sulloway, F. J. (2003). Political conservatism as motivated social cognition. Psychological Bulletin, 129(3), 339-375.
33. Kahneman, D. (2011). Thinking, fast and slow. New York: Farrar, Straus and Giroux.
34. Kahneman, D., Slovic, P., & Tversky, A. (Eds.). (1982). Judgment under uncertainty: Heuristics and biases. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
35. Kasperson, R. E., Renn, O., Slovic, P., Brown, H. S., Emel, J., Goble, R., ... & Ratick, S. (1988). The social amplification of risk: A conceptual framework. Risk Analysis, 8(2), 177-187.
36. Kasperson, J. X., & Kasperson, R. E. (2003). The social amplification and attenuation of risk. In N. Pidgeon, R. E. Kasperson, & P. Slovic (Eds.), The social amplification of risk (pp. 13-46). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
37. Kessler, R. C., Berglund, P., Demler, O., Jin, R., Merikangas, K. R., & Walters, E. E. (2005). Lifetime prevalence and age-of-onset distributions of DSM-IV disorders in the National Comorbidity Survey Replication. Archives of General Psychiatry, 62(6), 593-602.
38. Kessler, R. C., Petukhova, M., Sampson, N. A., Zaslavsky, A. M., & Wittchen, H. U. (2012). Twelve-month and lifetime prevalence and lifetime morbid risk of anxiety and mood disorders in the United States. International Journal of Methods in Psychiatric Research, 21(3), 169-184.
39. LeDoux, J. E. (2000). Emotion circuits in the brain. Annual Review of Neuroscience, 23(1), 155-184.
40. LeDoux, J. E. (2012). Rethinking the emotional brain. Neuron, 73(4), 653-676.
41. Lichtenstein, S., Slovic, P., Fischhoff, B., Layman, M., & Combs, B. (1978). Judged frequency of lethal events. Journal of Experimental Psychology: Human Learning and Memory, 4(6), 551-578.
42. Pine, D. S., Cohen, P., Gurley, D., Brook, J., & Ma, Y. (1998). The risk for early-adulthood anxiety and depressive disorders in adolescents with anxiety and depressive disorders. Archives of General Psychiatry, 55(1), 56-64.
43. Pinker, S. (2011). The better angels of our nature: Why violence has declined. New York: Viking.
44. Putnam, R. D. (2000). Bowling alone: The collapse and revival of American community. New York: Simon & Schuster.
45. Qiao, Z., Geng, H., Wang, Y., & Li, X. (2018). Anticipation of uncertain threat modulates subsequent affective responses and covariation bias. Frontiers in Psychology, 9, 2547.
46. Rachman, S. (1976). The passing of the two-stage theory of fear and avoidance: Fresh possibilities. Behaviour Research and Therapy, 14(2), 125-131.
47. Reiss, S., & McNally, R. J. (1985). Expectancy model of fear. In S. Reiss & R. R. Bootzin (Eds.), Theoretical issues in behavior therapy (pp. 107-121). New York: Academic Press.

48. Rosling, H. (2018). Factfulness: Ten reasons we're wrong about the world—and why things are better than you think. New York: Flatiron Books.
49. Schmitz, A., & Grillon, C. (2012). Assessing fear and anxiety in humans using the threat of predictable and unpredictable aversive events (the NPU-threat test). Nature Protocols, 7(3), 527-532.
50. Seligman, M. E. (1975). Helplessness: On depression, development, and death. San Francisco: W. H. Freeman.
51. Shaw, B., Bicket, M., Elliott, B., Fagan-Watson, B., Mocca, E., & Hillman, M. (2015). Children's independent mobility: An international comparison and recommendations for action. London: Policy Studies Institute.
52. Slovic, P. (1987). Perception of risk. Science, 236(4799), 280-285.
53. Slovic, P., Finucane, M. L., Peters, E., & MacGregor, D. G. (2002). The affect heuristic. In T. Gilovich, D. Griffin, & D. Kahneman (Eds.), Heuristics and biases: The psychology of intuitive judgment (pp. 397-420). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
54. Slovic, P., Finucane, M. L., Peters, E., & MacGregor, D. G. (2007). The affect heuristic. European Journal of Operational Research, 177(3), 1333-1352.
55. Spinhoven, P., van Hemert, A. M., & Penninx, B. W. (2017). Experiential avoidance and bordering psychological constructs as predictors of the onset, relapse and maintenance of anxiety disorders: One or many? Cognitive Therapy and Research, 41(6), 867-880.
56. Sunstein, C. R. (2005). Laws of fear: Beyond the precautionary principle. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
57. Taylor, S. (Ed.). (1999). Anxiety sensitivity: Theory, research, and treatment of the fear of anxiety. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
58. Tomarken, A. J., Mineka, S., & Cook, M. (1989). Fear-relevant selective associations and covariation bias. Journal of Abnormal Psychology, 98(4), 381-394.
59. Torraco, R. J. (2005). Writing integrative literature reviews: Guidelines and examples. Human Resource Development Review, 4(3), 356-367.
60. Tversky, A., & Kahneman, D. (1973). Availability: A heuristic for judging frequency and probability. Cognitive Psychology, 5(2), 207-232.
61. Tversky, A., & Kahneman, D. (1974). Judgment under uncertainty: Heuristics and biases. Science, 185(4157), 1124-1131.
62. Twenge, J. M. (2017). iGen: Why today's super-connected kids are growing up less rebellious, more tolerant, less happy—and completely unprepared for adulthood. New York: Atria Books.
63. Twenge, J. M., Campbell, W. K., & Carter, N. T. (2014). Declines in trust in others and confidence in institutions among American adults and late adolescents, 1972-2012. Psychological Science, 25(10), 1914-1923.
64. Vacondio, M. (2023). Risk and emotions: An analysis of the effect of risk perception, emotions, and emotional intelligence on protective and investment decisions (Doctoral dissertation). University of Klagenfurt.
65. Valencia-Contrera, M., Febré, N., Cancino Jiménez, D., Rivera-Rojas, F., Villa-Velasquez, J., Vallejos Vergara, S., ... & Valenzuela-Suazo, S. (2024). Integra methodology for the development of integrative reviews: Origins, guidelines, and recommendations. Data and Metadata, 3, 401.

66. Weber, E. U., & Hsee, C. (1998). Cross-cultural differences in risk perception, but cross-cultural similarities in attitudes towards perceived risk. Management Science, 44(9), 1205-1217.
67. Whittemore, R., & Knafl, K. (2005). The integrative review: Updated methodology. Journal of Advanced Nursing, 52(5), 546-553.
68. Wilde, G. J. (1982). The theory of risk homeostasis: Implications for safety and health. Risk Analysis, 2(4), 209-225.
69. Xie, X.-F., Li, J., & Yu, Q.-Y. (2008). How can a risk be increased? An analysis of risk communication channels. Acta Psychologica Sinica, 40(4), 456-465.