Dominique Brossard

List of Publications by Year
in descending order

Source: https://exaly.com/author-pdf/6792489/publications.pdf

Version: 2024-02-01

115 papers	7,151 citations	61984 43 h-index	64796 79 g-index
118 all docs	118 docs citations	118 times ranked	5038 citing authors

#	Article	IF	Citations
1	The â€œNasty Effect:â€•Online Incivility and Risk Perceptions of Emerging Technologies. Journal of Computer-Mediated Communication, 2014, 19, 373-387.	3.3	514
2	Scientific knowledge and attitude change: The impact of a citizen science project. International Journal of Science Education, 2005, 27, 1099-1121.	1.9	464
3	Science, New Media, and the Public. Science, 2013, 339, 40-41.	12.6	269
4	Framing Science. The International Journal of Press/Politics, 2003, 8, 36-70.	1.2	265
5	New media landscapes and the science information consumer. Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America, 2013, 110, 14096-14101.	7.1	265
6	Social Structure and Citizenship: Examining the Impacts of Social Setting, Network Heterogeneity, and Informational Variables on Political Participation. Political Communication, 2004, 21, 315-338.	3.9	263
7	Knowledge, Reservations, or Promise?. Communication Research, 2002, 29, 584-608.	5.9	262
8	Are Issue-Cycles Culturally Constructed? A Comparison of French and American Coverage of Global Climate Change. Mass Communication and Society, 2004, 7, 359-377.	2.1	257
9	Fact-checking as risk communication: the multi-layered risk of misinformation in times of COVID-19. Journal of Risk Research, 2020, 23, 1052-1059.	2.6	238
10	Religiosity as a perceptual filter: examining processes of opinion formation about nanotechnology. Public Understanding of Science, 2009, 18, 546-558.	2.8	233
11	Democracy Based on Difference: Examining the Links Between Structural Heterogeneity, Heterogeneity of Discussion Networks, and Democratic Citizenship. Journal of Communication, 2006, 56, 728-753.	3.7	198
12	Media Coverage of Public Health Epidemics: Linking Framing and Issue Attention Cycle Toward an Integrated Theory of Print News Coverage of Epidemics. Mass Communication and Society, 2008, 11, 141-160.	2.1	196
13	Interactions with the Mass Media. Science, 2008, 321, 204-205.	12.6	182
14	Reporting a Potential Pandemic. Science Communication, 2007, 28, 429-454.	3.3	148
15	Toxic Talk: How Online Incivility Can Undermine Perceptions of Media. International Journal of Public Opinion Research, 2018, 30, 156-168.	1.3	115
16	U.S. attitudes on human genome editing. Science, 2017, 357, 553-554.	12.6	104
17	Building Buzz. Journalism and Mass Communication Quarterly, 2014, 91, 772-791.	2.7	101
18	Coverage of emerging technologies: A comparison between print and online media. New Media and Society, 2012, 14, 1039-1059.	5.0	97

#	Article	IF	Citations
19	Uncivil and personal? Comparing patterns of incivility in comments on the Facebook pages of news outlets. New Media and Society, 2018, 20, 3678-3699.	5.0	97
20	Science-Media Interface. Science Communication, 2008, 30, 266-276.	3.3	95
21	An Overview of Attitudes Toward Genetically Engineered Food. Annual Review of Nutrition, 2018, 38, 459-479.	10.1	95
22	Are Social Norms Campaigns Really Magic Bullets? Assessing the Effects of Students' Misperceptions on Drinking Behavior. Health Communication, 2003, 15, 481-497.	3.1	94
23	Pathways to Political Participation? Religion, Communication Contexts, and Mass Media. International Journal for Quality in Health Care, 2003, 15, 300-324.	1.8	94
24	Believing and sharing misinformation, fact-checks, and accurate information on social media: The role of anxiety during COVID-19. New Media and Society, 2023, 25, 141-162.	5.0	87
25	Promises and perils of gene drives: Navigating the communication of complex, post-normal science. Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America, 2019, 116, 7692-7697.	7.1	86
26	The Role of Media and Deference to Scientific Authority in Cultivating Trust in Sources of Information about Emerging Technologies. International Journal of Public Opinion Research, 2012, 24, 225-237.	1.3	81
27	Social norms and expectancy violation theories: assessing the effectiveness of health communication campaigns. Communication Monographs, 2004, 71, 448-470.	2.7	73
28	Public communication of science 2.0. EMBO Reports, 2014, 15, 749-753.	4.5	72
29	YouTube, Social Norms and Perceived Salience of Climate Change in the American Mind. Environmental Communication, 2017, 11, 1-16.	2.5	72
30	Interpersonal Amplification of Risk? Citizen Discussions and Their Impact on Perceptions of Risks and Benefits of a Biological Research Facility. Risk Analysis, 2011, 31, 324-334.	2.7	71
31	Analyzing public sentiments online: combining human- and computer-based content analysis. Information, Communication and Society, 2017, 20, 406-427.	4.0	71
32	Scientistsâ€™ incentives and attitudes toward public communication. Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America, 2020, 117, 1274-1276.	7.1	71
33	The Soul of a Polarized Democracy. Communication Research, 2009, 36, 315-340.	5.9	69
34	Rethinking Social Amplification of Risk: Social Media and Zika in Three Languages. Risk Analysis, 2018, 38, 2599-2624.	2.7	69
35	The changing information environment for nanotechnology: online audiences and content. Journal of Nanoparticle Research, 2010, 12, 1083-1094.	1.9	62
36	Do They Know What They Read? Building a Scientific Literacy Measurement Instrument Based on Science Media Coverage. Science Communication, 2006, 28, 47-63.	3.3	61

#	Article	IF	Citations
37	(Mis)informed about what? What it means to be a science-literate citizen in a digital world. Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America, 2021, 118, .	7.1	60
38	Media, Social Proximity, and Risk: A Comparative Analysis of Newspaper Coverage of Avian Flu in Hong Kong and in the United States. Journal of Health Communication, 2011, 16, 889-907.	2.4	56
39	The Role of Perceptions of Media Bias in General and Issue-Specific Political Participation. Mass Communication and Society, 2011, 14, 343-374.	2.1	55
40	Partisan amplification of risk: American perceptions of nuclear energy risk in the wake of the Fukushima Daiichi disaster. Energy Policy, 2014, 67, 727-736.	8.8	55
41	Science News Consumption Patterns and Their Implications for Public Understanding of Science. Journalism and Mass Communication Quarterly, 2015, 92, 597-616.	2.7	54
42	Do Citizens Want to Have Their Say? Media, Agricultural Biotechnology, and Authoritarian Views of Democratic Processes in Science. Mass Communication and Society, 2003, 6, 291-312.	2.1	50
43	Information-Sharing and Community-Building: Exploring the Use of Twitter in Science Public Relations. Science Communication, 2017, 39, 569-597.	3.3	48
44	Inequalities in Scientific Understanding. Science Communication, 2014, 36, 352-378.	3.3	47
45	Selecting Our Own Science. Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science, 2015, 658, 172-191.	1.6	46
46	Tweeting nano: how public discourses about nanotechnology develop in social media environments. Journal of Nanoparticle Research, 2013, 15, 1.	1.9	45
47	Effects of Journalistic Adjudication on Factual Beliefs, News Evaluations, Information Seeking, and Epistemic Political Efficacy. Mass Communication and Society, 2014, 17, 615-638.	2.1	42
48	Opposing ends of the spectrum: Exploring trust in scientific and religious authorities. Public Understanding of Science, 2018, 27, 11-28.	2.8	41
49	What we know about effective public engagement on CRISPR and beyond. Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America, 2021, 118, .	7.1	40
50	Disentangling the Influence of Value Predispositions and Risk/Benefit Perceptions on Support for Nanotechnology Among the American Public. Risk Analysis, 2014, 34, 965-980.	2.7	37
51	Value predispositions as perceptual filters: Comparing of public attitudes toward nanotechnology in the United States and Singapore. Public Understanding of Science, 2015, 24, 582-600.	2.8	37
52	Following the Leader: Using Opinion Leaders in Environmental Strategic Communication. Society and Natural Resources, 2013, 26, 1438-1453.	1.9	31
53	Precision of Information, Sensational Information, and Selfâ€Efficacy Information as Messageâ€Level Variables Affecting Risk Perceptions. Risk Analysis, 2012, 32, 155-166.	2.7	28
54	Engaging the Public at a Science Festival. Science Communication, 2017, 39, 250-277.	3.3	28

#	Article	IF	Citations
55	Distinguishing scientific knowledge: The impact of different measures of knowledge on genetically modified food attitudes. Public Understanding of Science, 2019, 28, 449-467.	2.8	28
56	Of Society, Nature, and Health: How Perceptions of Specific Risks and Benefits of Genetically Engineered Foods Shape Public Rejection. Environmental Communication, 2020, 14, 1017-1031.	2.5	28
57	MEDIALIZED SCIENCE?. Journalism Practice, 2013, 7, 413-429.	2.2	27
58	Conflict or Caveats? Effects of Media Portrayals of Scientific Uncertainty on Audience Perceptions of New Technologies. Risk Analysis, 2016, 36, 831-846.	2.7	27
59	Are attitudes toward labeling nano products linked to attitudes toward GMO? Exploring a potential â€˜spilloverâ€™ effect for attitudes toward controversial technologies. Journal of Responsible Innovation, 2019, 6, 50-74.	4.9	27
60	Deference and decision-making in science and society: How deference to scientific authority goes beyond confidence in science and scientists to become authoritarianism. Public Understanding of Science, 2020, 29, 800-818.	2.8	27
61	The Polls Trends: Public Reactions to Global Health Threats and Infectious Diseases. Public Opinion Quarterly, 2007, 71, 671-692.	1.6	26
62	â€œSplit Screensâ€•and â€œSpin Roomsâ€• Debate Modality, Post-Debate Coverage, and the New Videomalaise. Journal of Broadcasting and Electronic Media, 2009, 53, 242-261.	1.5	26
63	The case of #arseniclife: Blogs and Twitter in informal peer review. Public Understanding of Science, 2017, 26, 937-952.	2.8	25
64	Narrowing the nano discourse?â€ â€This material is based upon work supported by the National Science Foundation (Grant No. DMR-0832760). Any opinions, findings, and conclusions or recommendations expressed in this material are those of the authors and do not necessarily reflect the views of the National Science Foundation.. Materials Today, 2010, 13, 52-54.	14.2	22
65	Mapping the Landscape of Public Attitudes on Synthetic Biology. BioScience, 0, , biw171.	4.9	22
66	The science of YouTube: What factors influence user engagement with online science videos?. PLoS ONE, 2022, 17, e0267697.	2.5	22
67	Whose AI? How different publics think about AI and its social impacts. Computers in Human Behavior, 2022, 130, 107182.	8.5	21
68	Seeing through risk-colored glasses: Risk and benefit perceptions, knowledge, and the politics of fracking in the United States. Energy Research and Social Science, 2019, 55, 168-178.	6.4	20
69	Societal Debates About Emerging Genetic Technologies: Toward a Science of Public Engagement. Environmental Communication, 2020, 14, 859-864.	2.5	20
70	Attitudes about Food and Food-Related Biotechnology. Public Opinion Quarterly, 2017, 81, 577-596.	1.6	19
71	The effect of comment moderation on perceived bias in science news. Information, Communication and Society, 2019, 22, 129-146.	4.0	19
72	National Academies of Sciences, Engineering, and MedicineÂreport on genetically engineered crops influences publicÂdiscourse. Politics and the Life Sciences, 2018, 37, 250-261.	0.7	17

#	Article	IF	Citations
73	What Do We (Not) Know About Global Views of Human Gene Editing? Insights and Blind Spots in the CRISPR Era. CRISPR Journal, 2020, 3, 148-155.	2.9	17
74	Misperceptions in Polarized Politics: The Role of Knowledge, Religiosity, and Media. PS - Political Science and Politics, 2014, 47, 654-661.	0.5	16
75	Using a Deliberative Exercise To Foster Public Engagement in Nanotechnology. Journal of Chemical Education, 2014, 91, 179-187.	2.3	14
76	Attitudinal gaps: How experts and lay audiences form policy attitudes toward controversial science. Science and Public Policy, 2016, 43, 196-206.	2.4	14
77	News coverage of controversial emerging technologies: Evidence for the issue attention cycle in print and online media. Politics and the Life Sciences, 2012, 31, 87-96.	0.7	13
78	Mapping Neuroscientistsâ€™ Perceptions of the Nature and Effects of Public Visibility. Science Communication, 2016, 38, 170-196.	3.3	13
79	Public attitudes toward urban foxes and coyotes: the roles of perceived risks and benefits, political ideology, ecological worldview, and attention to local news about urban wildlife. Human Dimensions of Wildlife, 2020, 25, 405-420.	1.8	13
80	â€œSharedâ€•Information in the Age of Big Data. Journalism and Mass Communication Quarterly, 2016, 93, 430-445.	2.7	12
81	Saw It on Facebook: The Role of Social Media in Facilitating Science Issue Awareness. Social Media and Society, 2020, 6, 205630512093041.	3.0	11
82	The chronic growing pains of communicating science online. Science, 2022, 375, 613-614.	12.6	11
83	Ukrainian nationalist parties and connective action: an analysis of electoral campaigning and social media sentiments. Information, Communication and Society, 2019, 22, 1376-1395.	4.0	10
84	The Role of News Media in the Social Amplification of Risk. , 2015, , 69-85.		10
85	There Is Water Everywhere: How News Framing Amplifies the Effect of Ecological Worldviews on Preference for Flooding Protection Policy. Mass Communication and Society, 2011, 14, 553-577.	2.1	9
86	Pink slimed: Media framing of novel food technologies and risk related to ground beef and processed foods in the U.S.. Meat Science, 2018, 143, 242-251.	5.5	9
87	Political and personality predispositions and topical contexts matter: Effects of uncivil comments on science news engagement intentions. New Media and Society, 2021, 23, 894-919.	5.0	9
88	Polarized platforms? How partisanship shapes perceptions of â€œalgorithmic news biasâ€• New Media and Society, 2023, 25, 2833-2854.	5.0	9
89	Protective Progressives to Distrustful Traditionalists: A Post Hoc Segmentation Method for Science Communication. Environmental Communication, 2018, 12, 1023-1045.	2.5	8
90	Development of an interdisciplinary, multi-method approach to seasonal climate forecast communication at the local scale. Climatic Change, 2020, 162, 2021-2042.	3.6	8

#	Article	IF	Citations
91	Publicsâ€™ Support for Novel and Established Science Issues Linked to Perceived Knowledge and Deference to Science. International Journal of Public Opinion Research, 2021, 33, 422-431.	1.3	8
92	Public engagement: Faculty lived experiences and perspectives underscore barriers and a changing culture in academia. PLoS ONE, 2022, 17, e0269949.	2.5	8
93	Whatâ€™s in a name? How we define nanotech shapes public reactions. Journal of Nanoparticle Research, 2013, 15, 1.	1.9	7
94	Medialisierung der Neurowissenschaften. , 2013, , 311-336.		7
95	Advocating for controversial issues: The effect of activism on complianceâ€gaining strategy likelihood of use. Communication Studies, 2003, 54, 265-281.	1.2	6
96	Stimulating Upstream Engagement: An Experimental Study of Nanotechnology Information Seeking. Social Science Quarterly, 2011, 92, 1191-1214.	1.6	6
97	News coverage of controversial emerging technologies: Evidence for the issue attention cycle in print and online media. Politics and the Life Sciences, 2012, 31, 87-96.	0.7	6
98	Channeling Science Information Seekers' Attention? A Content Analysis of Top-Ranked vs. Lower-Ranked Sites in Google. Journal of Computer-Mediated Communication, 2014, 19, 562-575.	3.3	6
99	Elevating the conversation about GE crops. Nature Biotechnology, 2017, 35, 302-304.	17.5	6
100	The Values of Synthetic Biology: Researcher Views of Their Field and Participation in Public Engagement. BioScience, 2018, 68, 782-791.	4.9	6
101	Modeling Risk Perceptions, Benefit Perceptions, and Approval of Releasing Genetically Engineered Mosquitoes as a Response to Zika Virus. Environmental Communication, 2020, 14, 933-953.	2.5	6
102	Social Challenges. , 0, , 17-31.		5
103	Policy decision-making, public involvement and nuclear energy: what do expert stakeholders think and why?. Journal of Responsible Innovation, 2015, 2, 266-279.	4.9	5
104	The state of GMOs on social media. Politics and the Life Sciences, 2021, 40, 40-55.	0.7	5
105	Information snapshots: What Google searches really tell us about emerging technologies. Nano Today, 2012, 7, 72-75.	11.9	4
106	The (Changing) Nature of Scientistâ€“Media Interactions. , 2017, , .		4
107	How do policymakers and think tank stakeholders prioritize the risks of the nuclear fuel cycle? A semantic network analysis. Journal of Risk Research, 2018, 21, 599-621.	2.6	4
108	How institutional factors at US land-grant universities impact scientistsâ€™ public scholarship. Public Understanding of Science, 2023, 32, 124-142.	2.8	4

#	Article	IF	Citations
109	New Media Audiencesâ€™ Perceptions of Male and Female Scientists in Two Sci-Fi Movies. Bulletin of Science, Technology and Society, 2015, 35, 93-103.	2.9	3
110	Enhanced threat or therapeutic benefit? Risk and benefit perceptions of human gene editing by purpose and heritability of edits. Journal of Risk Research, 2022, 25, 139-155.	2.6	3
111	Disconnected discourses. Materials Today, 2014, 17, 48-49.	14.2	2
112	Selective perception of novel science: how definitions affect information processing about nanotechnology. Journal of Nanoparticle Research, 2017, 19, 1.	1.9	2
113	CiÃ¨ncia, pÃºblic i nous mitjans. ReflexiÃ³ sobre el present i el futur de la divulgaciÃ³ cientÃfica. Metode, 2014, .	0.1	1
114	Scientistsâ€™ and the Publicsâ€™ Views of Synthetic Biology. Risk, Systems and Decisions, 2020, , 371-387.	0.8	1
115	The risk of relocation: risk perceptions and communication surrounding the tradeoffs between floods and economic opportunities in Iquitos, Peru. Journal of Risk Research, 0, , 1-16.	2.6	0