

Communicating the Social Sciences: A Specific Challenge?

Angela Cassidy, Department of History, King's College London

Contact: angela.cassidy@gmail.com

Abstract

This chapter reviews developing debates around the public communication of the social sciences and humanities (PCSS). While drawing valid comparisons between PCSS and natural scientific communication is problematic, existing studies suggest that that these disciplines receive extensive media coverage, which differs markedly in how research findings and expert sources are discussed. This may be due to overlaps between the human subject matter of these disciplines, and the experiential knowledge of everyday life. PCST researchers need to address reflexively the public communication of their own work, in order to improve the advice given to others about how scientific communication works.

Public communication across the academy

Despite the continuing expansion of PCST research since the first edition of this Handbook was published in 2008, research on the public communication of the social sciences (PCSS) has not seen corresponding growth. 'Science communication' in both research and practice tends to imply the physical, chemical and biological sciences, sometimes alongside fields such as medicine, mathematics and engineering. However relatively little attention has been paid by PCST researchers to how other academic fields such as the social sciences, arts and humanities are discussed in the broader public sphere (Schafer, 2012). The research literature on PCSS continues to be relatively sparse and scattered across many disciplinary areas: therefore this chapter will also discuss the public role of arts and humanities disciplines. The historical impetus for research into science communication and the 'public understanding of science' came from concerns about the public position of the natural sciences and this limited remit has influenced the subsequent development of the field. However, the research itself was and is largely conducted by social scientists and historians of science, and it is these academic traditions that generated the classic critiques of 'deficit' approaches to PCST. In this light, it is curious that PCST researchers have rarely conducted studies of PCSS, or applied these critiques to communicating with nonspecialists about their own findings. While the lack of attention to social sciences in related fields such as science and technology studies may also contribute to the problem (Camic, Gross and Lamont, 2011; Dennell et al, 2013), these legacies cannot fully account for the continuing low profile of PCSS as a research topic.

Most international media have specialist science output, such as TV and radio programmes about science, science sections in newspapers and 'popular science' as a publishing genre. Science journalism

is a well-recognised and respected journalistic specialism, and such professionals provide content for both specialist science and mainstream media output. Most of this coverage tends to be of natural science disciplines, although social sciences such as psychology do receive some specialist attention. Particularly in English-speaking media, there is little or no corresponding journalistic specialisation for the social sciences or humanities, and the tendency of PCST research to focus on science, medical and environmental *specialists* may also be a factor in the weakness of PCSS research. However, this does not mean that these fields do not attract much media coverage or public attention – in fact they are covered widely across the broader, non-specialist media and form a major contribution to the content of specialist areas such as political, economic and lifestyle journalism. Crime figures, demographic census data, opinion polls, educational research, economic analysis, psychological studies and political theory are all examples of social science research which contribute to the core day to day content of contemporary media coverage. Social researchers frequently provide policy, personal and lifestyle advice across many fora, and the much discussed role of the 'public intellectual' is one generally occupied by social science and humanities scholars. Social research forms the core activity of many think-tanks, active by definition in the public sphere, as does the work of most policymakers in government and in NGOs. In the UK in particular, social scientists have been instrumental in the development of both science communication and public engagement as research fields, as well as initiating widespread change in the policy and practice of academic, governmental and scientific institutions in these areas. I will now review what is currently known about PCSS, highlighting areas of change since 2008, and ask the associated question of why social scientists, particularly those researching PCST itself, have paid so little attention to the public communication of their own work.

Research literature on social sciences and the media

The disparate nature of PCSS research can make it particularly difficult to find relevant studies in citation databases: as well as the generic nature of relevant search terms, they can turn up large numbers of articles on conflating topics such as '*social science approaches to science communication*', or '*the economics of the media*'. However, when looked at together, the work that has been done suggests some tentative trends and insights. Research directly addressing PCSS includes quantitative and qualitative analyses of media content; interviews and surveys conducted with academics and journalists; theoretical analysis, personal experiences and material addressing the public promotion of social science, including 'how to' guides for academics interacting with mass media. Of these, the latter few are most commonplace, recalling the literature on PCST prior to critiques of the deficit model. As with PCST, PCSS research is dominated by studies based in the USA and UK, and this bias has important implications for our understanding of social science communication. In English-speaking countries, strong distinctions are drawn between the natural sciences and social sciences/humanities (studies of the human and social), with 'science' generally considered to include the former but not the latter disciplines. Furthermore, popular ideas about the nature of science reinforce the status of subjects which use quantitative, experimental or statistical methods, such as economics and many areas of psychology. In continental Europe and perhaps elsewhere in the world, such distinctions are less starkly

drawn, and conceptions of science can include all forms of scholarly research in their remit, as conceptualised in the German term *wissenschaft* (although see Sala, 2012 for further discussion). This alongside my own language constraints have led to an Anglocentric bias in this review, which means any conclusions drawn will be inevitably limited. Where possible, I have referred to as global a range of studies as possible, but considering the paucity of the literature as a whole, much more work is needed before we can have a coherent understanding of the effect of cross-cultural differences on the public communication of the social sciences.

A great deal of PCSS literature is still written by social scientists drawing upon their own communication experiences, and often resembles older PCST literature in the emphasis on how to get the 'correct message across' (e.g. Grauerholtz and Baker-Sperry, 2007; Stockelova, 2012). The public image problems of social science are discussed and strategies for improvement still tend to centre on upbraiding journalists for sensationalism and inaccuracy, and/or publics for their incorrect understandings of social science research (Kendall-Taylor 2012; Seale, 2010). Social science funding bodies and professional associations are taking relationships with mass media increasingly seriously, with resources and information increasingly available for both researchers and journalists (e.g. LSE Public Policy Group, 2011; ESRC, 2013). In 2008, I observed that this area of activity was somewhat dominated by psychologists, perhaps due to the discipline's borderline status straddling the natural and social sciences: now professional associations across the social sciences employ media relations professionals and issue press releases on a routine basis. However, the overriding concern remains with the *promotion* of the social sciences, rather than reflective engagement with why this should be done: this has been greatly accentuated by contractions in research funding and pressures for academics to establish the 'impact' of their research on society.

A second area of literature, in places closely related to the above, consists of content-analysis studies of social science media coverage. Weiss and Singer (1988) carried out an extensive study of the American news media during the 1980s, comprising parallel content analysis and interview studies. They found that the majority of coverage was framed as stories about the research topic (e.g. crime, parenting, relationships), with the research itself appearing in an ancillary role. Furthermore, only seven per cent of the stories found were written by specialist science journalists, with most coverage authored by generalists, or specialists in other areas. The coverage was analysed by content theme rather than disciplinary area, but it is still plain from this that economics commanded the largest share of coverage in the US media. A similar approach, using a broader sweep of methods, was taken in researching the UK situation in the following decade (Fenton et al., 1997; 1998) and this study reveals an interesting pattern of similarities and differences between the USA and UK. As in the USA, social science was rarely covered by science journalists in the UK: in fact only one such example was found in the entire sample studied. Instead, named journalists writing on specific topics produced the majority of the coverage, with the rest specialists in other areas. In contrast to the US study, social issues provided the largest proportion of the coverage, with economics coming next, and psychology was the most frequently represented discipline. Fenton et al (1997; 1998) reported that social research did provide the main focus of most

stories in the UK, rather than ancillary mentions in stories on other topics. Most of the social science coverage analysed appeared as features rather than news articles, and social scientists more often appeared reactively as commentators and advisers on specific issues according to the news agenda, rather than being the principal source of stories.

Both these studies looked at how much, and where, media coverage of social science appeared, and again transatlantic differences emerge. In the USA, coverage was distributed evenly across all forms of media, and levels of reporting found were far higher than in the UK, where coverage was heavily concentrated in the broadsheet (or quality) press. However, without meaningful comparisons, it is difficult to draw useful conclusions from these figures: are they high or low, and in what terms? Similarly, it is difficult to distinguish whether many of the issues raised by these studies are specific to the social sciences, or are broader concerns shared in the public communication of all research. A study by Evans (1995) deals with this problem by directly comparing US media coverage of social and natural science. Of the total sample of research coverage, 36 per cent was of social science subjects, although this was not broken down into disciplinary groupings. The Science Museum Media Monitor (Bauer et al, 1995), one of the largest studies of its kind, took a continental European definition of 'science' including the social sciences, and reported a gradual increase in the proportion of social science coverage over the second half of the twentieth century, eventually reaching similar levels to that found by Evans. A smaller study carried out by Hansen and Dickinson (1992) found only 15 per cent of coverage was of social sciences, but related topics such as market research, human interest and science policy/education were separated out from this, leading to a combined figure of 28 per cent. Overall, these studies suggest that the social sciences provide a substantial proportion of media coverage of research in both the US and UK, overtaken only by health and biomedicine. Böhme-Dürr (1992) reported that social sciences in the German media were relatively underrepresented; by contrast Šuljok and Vuković (2013) report higher coverage levels and higher quality reporting of social sciences in Croatian media, which they attribute in part to post-socialist state legacies of media bias towards these disciplines.

Despite such variations, these findings do point towards important differences in how natural and social science is covered by mass media, particularly in the US/UK. Evans (1995) reported that social science was much less likely to appear in newspaper science sections than natural science, and more likely to be in general news coverage, confirming the idea that science journalists rarely cover the social sciences. In interviews Dunwoody (1986), found that US science journalists typically look down on social science research as less scientific, express little interest in it, and regard it as requiring little specialist training to report. Similarly, both Schmierbach (2005) and Seale (2010) observe that disciplines employing quantitative and/or experimental methods, such as psychology, economics or social statistics are more likely to be taken seriously by journalists. Evans (op cit.) also found that social scientists were accorded a lower epistemological status in media reports, with natural scientists more often referred to as 'researchers' or 'scientists', and social scientists more likely to be referred to in terms such as 'the authors of the study'. He notes the lack of credible, centralised journalistic sources for media coverage of social science research, compared to the roles played by major scientific journals such as *Nature* and

Science. Organisations such as the UK based Science Media Centre (established in 2002) tend to focus on quantitative social science, reinforcing this tendency.

In a study of UK newspaper coverage of evolutionary psychology comparing it with evolutionary biology, the field was covered less often by science journalists, more by non-specialists, appeared more frequently in features, supplements and commentary pieces, and rarely in specialist 'science' sections (Cassidy, 2005). Fenton et al's (1997, 1998) research also investigated relationships between social scientists and media professionals; they note that social science was not usually covered by correspondents with any in-depth knowledge of research, that it was rarely newsworthy in its own right, and instead is covered as part of broader news agendas. Furthermore, they describe the relationship between academics and the media in this area as formal, distant and highly reliant on the role of facilitators (Fenton et al, 1998; p 70). Thirty per cent of the researchers they interviewed had worked with media only via communications professionals, a pattern reflected in interactions between researchers and journalists at academic conferences. However, a more recent study by Peters (2013) looking at social science and humanities academics in Germany, found less strict demarcations between professional and popular communication and much higher rates of interaction with journalists than natural science scholars. Several studies have explored these apparent contradictions by looking not just at the appearance and location of social scientists in media, but also the roles they play as experts. Albeik et al (2003) and Wien (2013) both found that social scientists are more likely to act as commentators on pre-existing news stories across a range of topics, rather than be the originators of coverage via the publication of research findings. This suggests that a fruitful point of further enquiry could be to explore the literature on so-called 'soft news' (Reinemann et al, 2012) and the roles played by experts therein (Lester and Hutchins, 2011). Finally, a single study by Sjöström et al (2013) investigated German audiences' views of social science in the context of the 'violent videogames' debate. These audiences recognised the high visibility of social scientists within this coverage, and felt that they had made important and legitimate contributions to the debate.

Reflexive sciences?

So why do journalists, editors and audiences seem to have such a different relationship with social science and humanities disciplines compared to the natural sciences? Paying attention to the subject matter of these disciplines offers important clues towards understanding how and why they are communicated and understood. Because they investigate the realm of the human - people, their minds, societies, money, politics, histories and so on - the subjects, investigators, communicators and audiences of social science tend to merge into one another. Unlike most natural sciences, where the specialist training, knowledge and equipment of scientists grants them largely uncontested expertise, social scientists' expertise is often about matters of everyday experience and common-sense knowledge. This impacts on how highly that expertise is regarded. For example, Evans (1995) reported that US journalists made strong demarcations between natural science and social science, between natural science and lay opinion, but not between social science and lay opinion. As psychologists McCall and Stocking (1982;

p988) put it:

Everyone, including journalists and editors, fancies himself or herself something of a psychologist, but not an astrophysicist. Results from psychology, but not physics, must therefore square with experience to be credible.

Fenton et al. (1998) found that news media audiences also do this in framing their understandings of social science research findings. They discuss the overlaps that result between the professional roles social scientists and journalist, and argue that this resulted in further under-reporting of social science, as journalists often felt it was little different from their own work. More recently, Cooper and Ebeling (2007) studied the working practices of financial and science journalists and similarly argued they have a great deal in common with the analytical processes of sociology.

Similar issues of the legitimacy of social science expertise have also been seen in studies of social scientists' role as expert witnesses. Particularly in the USA, legal definitions of 'science' tend to be heavily traditional, positivist ones, leading at times to non-natural science expertise being judged as questionable or even inadmissible (Lynch and Cole, 2005; Lynch, 2010). However, these overlaps between social science, journalism and everyday knowledge, which Fenton et al (1998; 102) refer to as 'epistemological consonance', and following the work of historian of psychology Graham Richards (2009; p7, 399) I have described as 'reflexive science' (Cassidy, 2003, p236), can have positive implications for PCSS¹. The same media news values which result in natural science struggling to gain media coverage can work in favour of social science. Examples include the news values of relevance (to daily life), consonance (with existing beliefs), topicality, controversy, and of course human/personal interest (Weiss and Singer, 1988: 144-9; Fenton, et al., 1998: 103-13; Gregory and Miller, 1998: 110-4). Considered in this light, it becomes less surprising that the social sciences and humanities tend to have a widespread presence in mass media.

These reflexive properties can also help explain media attitudes that journalists do not require specialist training to report social science, ironically also increasing the chances of social science research being reported in the first place. As described above, generalists tend not to have training in either natural or social science, and neither do editors, ironically increasing the chances that social science will make it through the editorial process. This could clearly be seen in mass media coverage of popular evolutionary psychology, which tended to be covered by generalist news and 'soft' journalists, and gained media coverage by keying into topics of general appeal at the time, such as gender, sexuality, centre-left politics, and the role of the biosciences in society (Cassidy, 2005, 2007). However, this also meant that evolutionary psychology claims were contested by a range of actors including academics, but

¹ Unlike many philosophers of social science, I do not think that these properties signal a fundamental division between the natural and human sciences. It is clear that some social science disciplines are more profoundly shaped by reflexive overlaps than others, while on the other hand many natural science topics involve important experiential, political and ethical contributions and contestations (e.g. Kent, 2003; Moore and Stilgoe, 2009; Spence et al, 2011).

also 'lay' commentators and journalists; while all sides drew on personal experience and common sense knowledge to support their arguments. Indeed this kind of challenge can come not only via the media but also directly from publics and research participants themselves, leading at times to uncomfortable challenges for social scientists (Breuer, 2011). This highlights the double-edged nature of reflexive science, and at times social scientists can take advantage of this to engage in strategic boundary-work, emphasising the similarities or the differences between their research and common sense according to particular rhetorical purposes (Derksen, 1997; Shapin, 2007). Park (2004) compared the contemporary discourses of popular psychiatrists with those of psychoanalysts, arguing that the two groups strategically position themselves against each other, as medical or scientific specialists versus broader intellectual authorities. He relates these opposing, yet complementary strategies to the differing forms of 'public intellectual' visible in contemporary popular culture.

Disciplinary status and public expertise

As we have seen, social research is often regarded as less authoritative than natural science research, and social scientists often struggle with the epistemological status of their disciplines, particularly when attempting to communicate about new research findings. However, we can see that social scientists also take on a range of expert roles in society unavailable to many natural scientists. Social science and humanities academics are often called upon to provide commentary and analysis on the events and news of the day, and can find themselves with a head start when looking for audiences for popular communication. Albaik et al (2003), as well as Bentley and Kyvik (2010) found that researchers in these fields tend to be more active in popular communications than their colleagues in natural science, medical and technical subjects. A good example of such a role is described by the largely US based literature on popular and self-help psychology. Considering the obvious popularity of these texts evidenced by their vast sales not only in the USA but globally, this work gives an insight into an arena where social science is highly influential on ordinary people's lives. Indeed there is currently a lively debate within psychology about the efficacy of self-help and its adoption as a serious therapeutic technique (Cuijpers et al, 2010). Others have taken a more critical approach to self-help, analysing the rhetorical messages embedded in pop psychology discourses, with a particular focus on the normative regulation of gender and/or sexual relationships in these texts (e.g. Koeing et al, 2010). Other work has addressed the social and political contexts of self-help, showing how these ideas relate to social movements such as feminism or the 'New Age' (Askehave, 2004) and the broader values of modern liberal democracies (Philip, 2009). However, research in audience studies has shown that, as with many media forms, readers of self-help do not simply absorb these messages but instead use them as a starting point for discussing, negotiating and challenging the claims experts make about their life experiences (George 2012).

The literature on 'the public intellectual' - broadly understood as a person of learning, not necessarily an academic, who uses their knowledge to engage with society via the public domain (Small, 2002) has greatly expanded in recent years. This conversation has largely been an academic one located in

humanities and social science disciplines, and still has had relatively little connection with PCST or the literature on (natural) scientists as public experts (e.g. Peters, this volume). Examples of public intellectuals could include the late Edward Said, Noam Chomsky, and given his participation in debates about religion and society, Richard Dawkins. Most public intellectuals tend to be social science or humanities scholars, unsurprising given their media role as generalised experts and commentators. Debates in this area have moved on from discussions of charismatic individuals to address the role of various disciplines in society, spurred on in particular by the sociologist Michael Burawoy and his influential calls for 'public sociology' (2005), and similar calls for public geographies (Ward, 2006). Prior to Burawoy, similar conversations have occurred about 'public anthropology' (Borofsky, 1999) and preceding the PUS movements of the 1980s, 'public history' (Kelly, 1978). Burawoy's call involved a vision of public sociology as politically engaged, and much of the subsequent debate has turned on whether and how social scientists should contribute to debates about social justice and inequality (Gattone, 2013; Jeffries, 2009). However, it is noticeable that the massive growth in academic citations in this area has not been reflected in an equivalent increase in public visibility for the social sciences. This may be in part because the literature on public sociology tends to use academic, rather than everyday language, highlighting a further issue with PCSS. Social psychologist Michael Billig's recent challenging critique of writing traditions in the social sciences argues that these disciplines actively encourage wordiness, neologism and obscurantism, impeding the clear communication of ideas (Billig, 2013). Stephen Turner's work on the history of American sociology (2012) supports this idea by demonstrating how sociologists actively turned away from public debates during the second half of the 20th century in order to boost their intellectual status within the academy. Coming at the issue from a very different angle, a recent bibliometric analysis of journal articles (Okulicz-Kozaryn, 2013) found much higher proportions of adjectives and adverb usage in social sciences disciplines.

Other models for 'public social science' include the turn towards more applied modes of research, actively oriented to the needs of social movements, policymakers, and industry (Kropp and Blok, 2011; Perry, 2012). Such approaches also have their drawbacks, as seen in ongoing controversies over the mobilisation of field anthropologists by the US Army in Iraq and Afghanistan (Forte, 2011). An alternative version of what it means for a discipline to be 'public' has been offered by researchers drawing on traditions of participatory action research and public engagement. Rather than further advocating social scientists' role as authoritative experts, instead the idea is to undertake research *in public*. This often involves open processes of data collection and analysis, alongside direct collaborations with research participants, local communities, or media organisations, and is often associated with public history, anthropology and geographies research. Finally, the growth in cross, multi or inter-disciplinary research across academia has led to social scientists working with natural scientists perhaps more than ever before. This has necessitated a debate about how researchers can communicate across the natural/social science divide, highlighting a similar set of issues faced when communicating with journalists or publics, particularly around the status and methods of social science (Barry and Born, 2013). Similarly, some have suggested taking a more 'open' approach to research practice, making it possible for partners from different disciplines to understand each other's work at an

earlier stage of the research process, enabling the generation of shared research goals, aims and questions (e.g. Phillips et al, 2012).

Public social sciences in the changing academy

To summarise, the literature on PCSS continues to be sparse, scattered across many disciplinary areas, and despite the knowledge gaps outlined here, has still rarely been investigated by PCST scholars. With so little work done, it is difficult to reach firm conclusions about social science communication, and so any assertions made here are by necessity provisional, opinionated and definitely subject to further investigation. Despite this, one thing seems clear: social science and humanities research appears to be both 'everywhere and nowhere' in public communication. Social sciences have a lower status than natural sciences, are less likely to prompt original news coverage via their findings, do not merit media or journalistic specialisation, and at times are seen as little different from journalism itself. At the same time, social science topics constantly generate new coverage, are seen as relevant to audiences, easy to understand, and appear throughout the media rather than being confined to an area of special interest. As such, social scientists play important roles as commentators and advisers in media and public life on a wide range of social, political and personal issues. Beyond these rather broad-brush assertions, it is still difficult to draw any more nuanced conclusions about PCSS. The criteria used to define 'science' in PCST studies tend to be so variable that it is difficult to draw meaningful comparisons across the literature (Schafer, 2012). Studies including social science and/or humanities disciplines either focus on specific cases, or have been conducted across different countries and time periods, using a wide range of methodologies. Differences in research findings about PCSS may be due to cross-cultural differences, changes over time or methodological artefacts. However, without further studies taking a more consistent and preferably comparative approach, looking across a broad spread of disciplines, we cannot reach a better understanding of how disciplinary topic affects how that research is communicated in public. The widespread reporting of social science by non-specialists highlights the fact that very work has been done on how generalist and non-science specialist journalists understand and report academic research. The reflexive nature of social science, and the idea that this is what makes PCSS so different from PCST, is one that also requires further investigation and analysis. This may also cast light on what makes communicating natural science so difficult at times, particularly in those topics very far from human experience; as well as in highly controversial and contested scientific issues.

While social scientists have started to discuss the roles that their disciplines can and should play in wider society, via debates over the 'public intellectual' and 'public social science', these have been driven by bigger changes in the relationship between society and academia in general. Firstly, drives towards research assessment via metrics and widespread contractions in research funding have led to increased pressure for all academics to justify the importance of the work they do, often in the language of 'impact' (Buchanan, 2013; LSE Public Policy Group, 2011). Secondly, movements advocating 'open science' and 'open access' publishing may be fundamentally changing research communications in the social science and humanities (Vincent and Wickham, 2013). Finally, further movement towards online

modes of communication and the uptake of social media has facilitated and accentuated the above trends (e.g. Kitchin, 2013). It is noticeable that, in the UK for example, efforts to advocate and promote the social sciences (e.g. Brewer, 2013; Campaign for Social Sciences, 2011; LSE Public Policy Group, 2011) became much more prominent following the announcement of contractions in higher education funding affecting those disciplines (Richardson, 2010). While there has been some discussion of the 'impact of impact' (Brewer, 2011) and advocacy for more collaborative models of public social science (e.g. Flyjberg et al, 2012), much of this debate continues in what PCST scholars would describe as a 'deficit' or 'diffusion' communications model.

This raises the question of why few thinkers in the social sciences seem to have turned to PCST or STS scholars to learn more about the public role of their research disciplines. In part, this is clearly because PCST scholars have not been that interested in PCSS, and raises further questions about our own abilities as public communicators. In the previous version of this chapter I presented a challenge to researchers and practitioners in PCST: how do we communicate about our work on communication, and publicly engage about public engagement? The extra levels of reflexivity introduced in PCST work (communicating about research which is about communicating about research?) are hardly compatible with media news values. Some STS scholars have experimented with communicating in the mode of the public intellectual, with variable consequences (e.g. Fuller, 2009; Latour and Sánchez-Criado, 2007). A few PCST researchers have reflected on these challenges, particularly in terms of the interactions of PCST research with the scientific and policy debates being studied (Chilvers, 2012; Kahan, 2013) and on engaging, interacting and learning from publics as we do it (e.g. Horst, 2011; Michael, 2011). An urgent challenge for PCST is to start looking for the answers to these questions; both through further research, and by communicating clearly and openly about that research. If we aim to advise other researchers, policymakers, journalists and publics about these issues, then surely we must practice what we preach?

Key questions

- How might public communication vary across different academic disciplines?
- How is the content, practice and communication of research affected by interactions with experiential and common-sense knowledge?
- Are there important differences between the public roles of social scientists and arts and humanities scholars?
- How can scholars of PCST improve their own communications *practice* and engage more productively with other disciplines and civil society?

Suggested further reading

Brewer, J. D. (2011) The impact of impact. *Research Evaluation*, 20(3), 255–256.

Evans, W. (1995) The Mundane and the Arcane: Prestige Media Coverage of Social and Natural Science

Cassidy, A. (2008; 2014) 'Communicating the Social Sciences' Ch. 14, p186-197 in Bucchi, M. & Trench, B. (2014) (eds.) *Routledge Handbook of Public Communication of Science and Technology, 2nd Edition*, Routledge:
<http://www.routledge.com/books/details/9780415834612/>

Preprint (final unformatted author's draft), as sent to publishers on 13/03/14

Journalism and Mass Communication Quarterly, 72: 168-177.

Gattone, C. F. (2012). The Social Scientist as Public Intellectual in an Age of Mass Media. *International Journal of Politics, Culture, and Society*, 25(4), 175–186.

Horst, M. (2011). Taking our own medicine: on an experiment in science communication. *Science and engineering ethics*, 17(4), 801–15.

Philip, B. (2009). Analysing the politics of self-help books on depression. *Journal of Sociology*, 45(2), 151–168.

Richards, G. (2009). *Putting Psychology in its Place, 3rd Edition: Critical Historical Perspectives*. Routledge.

Wien, C. (2013). Commentators on daily news or communicators of scholarly achievements? The role of researchers in Danish news media. *Journalism*, 1464884913490272–. doi:10.1177/1464884913490272

Useful online resources for PCSS, public and digital social science

LSE Impact of Social Sciences project: <http://blogs.lse.ac.uk/impactofsocialsciences/>

Ethnography Matters: <http://ethnographymatters.net/>

The Sociological Imagination: <http://sociologicalimagination.org/>

Campaign for Social Science (UK based): <http://campaignforsocialscience.org.uk/>

History and Policy: <http://www.historyandpolicy.org/>

The Cultural Cognition Project: <http://www.culturalcognition.net/>

Other References

Albaek, E., Christiansen, P. M., & Togeby, L. (2003). Experts in the mass media: Researchers as sources in Danish daily newspapers, 1961–2001. *Journalism & Mass Communication Quarterly*, 80(4), 937–948.

Askehave, I. (2004). If language is a game - these are the rules: a search into the rhetoric of the spiritual self-help book *If Life is a Game - These are the Rules*. *Discourse & Society*, 15(1), 5–31.

Barry, A., & Born, G. (2013). *Interdisciplinarity: Reconfigurations of the Social and Natural Sciences*. Routledge.

Bauer, M., Durant, J., Ragnarsdottir, A. and Rudolfsdottir, A. (1995) *Science and Technology in the British Press 1946-1990: A Systematic Content Analysis of the Press (vols. I IV)*. London: Science Museum.

Bentley, P., & Kyvik, S. (2010). Academic staff and public communication: a survey of popular science publishing across 13 countries. *Public Understanding of Science*, 20(1), 48–63.

Billig, M. (2013) *Learn to Write Badly: How to Succeed in the Social Sciences*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Böhme-Dürr, K. (2009). Social and Natural Sciences in German Periodicals. *Communications*, 17(2): 140-277.

Borofsky, R. (1999) Public anthropology. *Anthropology News*, 40(1), 6-7.

Brewer, J. D. (2011) The impact of impact. *Research Evaluation*, 20(3), 255–256.

Cassidy, A. (2008; 2014) 'Communicating the Social Sciences' Ch. 14, p186-197 in Bucchi, M. & Trench, B. (2014) (eds.) *Routledge Handbook of Public Communication of Science and Technology, 2nd Edition*, Routledge:
<http://www.routledge.com/books/details/9780415834612/>

Preprint (final unformatted author's draft), as sent to publishers on 13/03/14

- Brewer, J. D. (2013) *The Public Value of the Social Sciences: An Interpretive Essay*. Bloomsbury Academic.
- Breuer, F. (2011) The "other" speaks up. When social science (Re)presentations provoke reactance from the field. *Historical Social Research*, 36(4), 300–322.
- Buchanan, A. (2013). Impact and knowledge mobilisation: what I have learnt as Chair of the Economic and Social Research Council Evaluation Committee. *Contemporary Social Science*, 1–15.
doi:10.1080/21582041.2013.767469
- Burawoy, M. (2005). For public sociology. *American Sociological Review*, 70(1), 4-28.
- Camic, C., Gross, N., & Lamont, M. (2011). *Social Knowledge in the Making*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Campaign for Social Science (2011) *Campaign for Social Science Annual Report 2011*. London: Academy of Social Sciences. [Online] <http://campaignforsocialscience.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2012/12/Annual-Report-20111.pdf>
- Cassidy, A. (2003) *Of Academics, Publishers and Journalists: Popular Evolutionary Psychology in the UK*. PhD thesis, University of Edinburgh [Online]
https://www.academia.edu/383966/Of_Academics_Publishers_and_Journalists_Popular_Evolutionary_Psychology_In_the_UK
- Cassidy, A. (2005) Popular evolutionary psychology in the UK: an unusual case of science in the media? *Public Understanding of Science*, 14, 115-141.
- (2007) The (Sexual) Politics of Evolution: Popular controversy in the late twentieth century UK. *History of Psychology*, 10(2): 199-227.
- Chilvers, J. (2012). Reflexive Engagement? Actors, Learning, and Reflexivity in Public Dialogue on Science and Technology. *Science Communication*, 35(3), 283–310.
- Cooper, G., & Ebeling, M. (2007). Epistemology, structure and urgency: the sociology of financial and scientific journalists. *Sociological Research Online*, 12(3)8, [Online]
<http://www.socresonline.org.uk/12/3/8.html>, doi:10.5153/sro.1558
- Cuijpers, P., Donker, T., van Straten, A., Li, J., & Andersson, G. (2010). Is guided self-help as effective as face-to-face psychotherapy for depression and anxiety disorders? A systematic review and meta-analysis of comparative outcome studies. *Psychological medicine*, 40(12), 1943–57.
- Danell, R., Larsson, A., & Wisselgren, P. (2013). *Social Science in Context: Historical, Sociological, and Global Perspectives*. Lund: Nordic Academic Press.
- Derkson, M. (1997) Are We Not Experimenting Then? The Rhetorical Demarcation of Psychology and Common Sense. *Theory and Psychology* 7(4): 435-456
- Dunwoody, S. (1986) The Science Writing Inner Club: A Communication Link Between Science and the Lay Public. p155-169 in: Friedman, SL, Dunwoody, S and Rogers, CL (eds.) *Scientists and Journalists: Reporting Science as News*. New York: Macmillan.
- ESRC (2013) *Impact Toolkit*. [Online] <http://www.esrc.ac.uk/funding-and-guidance/impact-toolkit/index.aspx> Swindon: Economic and Social Research Council.
- Evans, W. (1995) The mundane and the arcane: Prestige Media Coverage of Social and Natural Science *Journalism and Mass Communication Quarterly*, 72: 168-177
- Fenton, N., Bryman, A., Deacon, D. and Birmingham, P. (1997) Sod off and find us a boffin: journalists

- and the social science research process. *Sociological Review*, 45(1): 1-23.
- Fenton, N., Bryman, A., Deacon, D. and Birmingham, P. (1998) *Mediating Social Science*. London: Sage.
- Flyvbjerg, B., Landman, T., & Schram, S. (Eds.). (2012). *Real Social Science: Applied Phronesis* (p. 308). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Forte, M. C. (2011). The Human Terrain System and Anthropology: A Review of Ongoing Public Debates. *American Anthropologist*, 113(1), 149–153.
- Fuller, S. (2009) Science Studies Goes Public: A Report on an Ongoing Performance. *Spontaneous Generations: A Journal for the History and Philosophy of Science*, 2(1), 11-21 [Online] <http://spontaneousgenerations.library.utoronto.ca/index.php/SpontaneousGenerations/article/view/5069>
- Gattone, C. F. (2012). The Social Scientist as Public Intellectual in an Age of Mass Media. *International Journal of Politics, Culture, and Society*, 25(4), 175–186.
- George, K. C. (2012). Self-help as women's popular culture in suburban New Jersey: An ethnographic perspective. *Participations: Journal of Audience and Reception Studies*, 9(2), 23-44 [Online] <http://participations.org/Volume%209/Issue%202/3%20George.pdf>
- Grauerholtz, L. and Baker-Sperry, L. (2007) Feminist research in the public domain: Risks and Recommendations. *Gender and Society*, 21(2): 272-294.
- Gregory, J. and Miller, S. (1998) *Science in Public: Communication, Culture and Credibility*. New York: Plenum Trade.
- Hansen, A. and Dickenson, R. (1992) Science coverage in the British mass media: media output and source input. *Communications*, 17(3): 365-77.
- Horst, M. (2011). Taking our own medicine: on an experiment in science communication. *Science and engineering ethics*, 17(4), 801–15.
- Jeffries, V. (Ed.). (2009). *Handbook of Public Sociology (Google eBook)* (p. 464). Rowman & Littlefield Publishers.
- Kahan, D. (2013, July 2) Does communicating research on public polarization polarize the public? *Cultural Cognition Project Blog*, [Online] <http://www.culturalcognition.net/blog/2013/7/2/does-communicating-research-on-public-polarization-polarize.html> Yale Law School.
- Kelley, R. (1978). Public History: Its Origins, Nature, and Prospects. *The Public Historian*, 1(1), 16-28.
- Kendall-Taylor, N. (2012). Conflicting Models of Mind: Mapping the Gaps Between Expert and Public Understandings of Child Mental Health. *Science Communication*, 34(6), 695–726.
- Kent, J. (2003). Lay experts and the politics of breast implants. *Public Understanding of Science*, 12(4), 403–421.
- Kitchin, R., Linehan, D., O'Callaghan, C., & Lawton, P. (2013). Public geographies through social media. *Dialogues in Human Geography*, 3(1), 56–72.
- Koeing, J., Zimmerman, T. S., Haddock, S. A., & Banning, J. H. (2010). Portrayals of Single Women in the Self-Help Literature. *Journal of Feminist Family Therapy*, 22(4), 253–274.
- Kropp, K., & Blok, A. (2011). Mode-2 social science knowledge production? The case of Danish sociology between institutional crisis and new welfare stabilizations. *Science and Public Policy*, 38(3), 213–224.
- Latour, B. and Sánchez-Criado, T. (2007) Interview: Making the 'Res Public'. *Ephemera: theory & politics*

- in organization*, 7(2): 364-371 [Online] <http://www.ephemerajournal.org/contribution/making-res-public>
- Lester, L., & Hutchins, B. (2011). Soft journalism, politics and environmental risk: An Australian story. *Journalism*, 13(5), 654–667.
- LSE Public Policy Group (2011) *Maximizing the Impacts of Your Research: A Handbook For Social Scientists (Consultation draft 3)*. London: London School of Economics and Political Science. [Online] http://www.lse.ac.uk/government/research/resgroups/LSEPublicPolicy/Docs/LSE_Impact_Handbook_April_2011.pdf
- Lynch, M. (2009) Going Public: A Cautionary Tale. *Spontaneous Generations: A Journal for the History and Philosophy of Science*, 3(1) [Online] <http://spontaneousgenerations.library.utoronto.ca/index.php/SpontaneousGenerations/article/view/6085>. Date accessed 04 Sep. 2013.
- Lynch, M. and Cole, S. (2005) Science and Technology Studies on Trial: Dilemmas of Expertise. *Social Studies of Science*, 35: 269-311.
- McCall, R.S. and Stocking, S.H. (1982) Between scientists and public: communicating psychological research in the mass media. *American Psychologist*, 37: 985-95.
- Michael, M. (2011). "What Are We Busy Doing?": Engaging the Idiot. *Science, Technology & Human Values*, 37(5), 528–554.
- Moore, A., & Stilgoe, J. (2009). Experts and Anecdotes: The Role of 'Anecdotal Evidence' in Public Scientific Controversies. *Science, Technology & Human Values*, 34(5), 654–677.
- Okulicz-Kozaryn, A. (2013). Cluttered writing: adjectives and adverbs in academia. *Scientometrics*, 96(3), 679–681.
- Park, D.W. (2004) The Couch and the Clinic: The cultural authority of popular psychiatry and psychoanalysis. *Cultural Studies*, 18(1): 109-133.
- Peters, H.P. (2013) Gap between science and media revisited: Scientists as public communicators. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* 110.Supplement 3: 14102-14109. [Online] http://www.pnas.org/content/110/Supplement_3/14102.full
- Peters, H.P. (2014) Scientists as Public Experts: Expectations and Responsibilities. Ch. 6, this volume.
- Perry, R. K. (2012). The politics of applied black studies: An historical synthesis for understanding social science impact. *Journal of Applied Social Science*, 6(1), 53–64.
- Philip, B. (2009). Analysing the politics of self-help books on depression. *Journal of Sociology*, 45(2), 151–168.
- Phillips, L., Kristiansen, M., Vehviläinen, M., & Gunnarsson, E. (2012). *Knowledge and Power in Collaborative Research: A Reflexive Approach (Routledge Advances in Research Methods)* Routledge.
- Reinemann, C., Stanyer, J., Scherr, S., & Legnante, G. (2012). Hard and soft news: A review of concepts, operationalizations and key findings. *Journalism*, 13(2), 221–239.
- Richards, G. (2009). *Putting Psychology in its Place, 3rd Edition: Critical Historical Perspectives*. Routledge.
- Richardson, H. (2010, 26 October) Humanities to lose English universities teaching grant. *BBC News Online*, <http://www.bbc.co.uk/news/education-11627843>

- Schäfer, M. S. (2012). Taking Stock: A meta-analysis of studies on the media's coverage of science. *Public Understanding of Science*, 21(6), 650–663.
- Schmierbach, M. (2005) Method Matters: The Influence of Methodology on Journalists Assessments of Social Science Research Science. *Communication*, 26(3): 269-287.
- Sala, R. (2012). One, Two, or Three Cultures? Humanities Versus the Natural and Social Sciences in Modern Germany. *Journal of the Knowledge Economy*, 4(1), 83–97.
- Seale, C. (2010). How the mass media report social statistics: a case study concerning research on end-of-life decisions. *Social Science & Medicine*, 71(5), 861–8.
- Shapin, S. 2007. Expertise, common sense, and the Atkins diet. In *Public Science in Liberal Democracy*, ed. J. Porter and P. W. B. Phillips, 174-193. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
- Sjöström, A., Sowka, A., Gollwitzer, M., Klimmt, C., & Rothmund, T. (2013). Exploring Audience Judgements of Social Science in Media Discourse. *Journal of Media Psychology: Theories, Methods, and Applications*, 25(1), 27–38.
- Small, E (2002) (ed.) *The Public Intellectual*. London: Blackwell.
- Stockelova, T. (2012). Social technology transfer? Movement of social science knowledge beyond the academy. *Theory & Psychology*, 22(2), 148–161.
- Spence, A., Poortinga, W., Butler, C., & Pidgeon, N. F. (2011). Perceptions of climate change and willingness to save energy related to flood experience. *Nature Climate Change*, 1(1), 46-49.
- Šuljok, A. and Vuković, M.B. (2013) How the Croatian Daily Press Presents Science News. *Science & Technology Studies*, 26(1), 92-112
- Turner, S. P. (2012). De-intellectualizing American sociology: A history, of sorts. *Journal of Sociology*, 48(4, SI), 346–363.
- Vincent, N. and Wickham, N. (eds) *Debating Open Access*. [Online] <http://www.britac.ac.uk/openaccess/debatingopenaccess.cfm> London: British Academy
- Ward, K. (2006). Geography and public policy: towards public geographies. *Progress in Human Geography*, 30(4), 495.
- Weiss, C.H. and Singer, E. (1988) *Reporting of Social Science in the National Media*. New York: Russell Sage Foundation.
- Wien, C. (2013). Commentators on daily news or communicators of scholarly achievements? The role of researchers in Danish news media. *Journalism*, 1464884913490272–. doi:10.1177/1464884913490272