Dietram A Scheufele

List of Publications by Year
in descending order

Source: https://exaly.com/author-pdf/7140277/publications.pdf

Version: 2024-02-01

194	18,261	22099	15218
papers	citations	h-index	g-index

209	209	209	8728
all docs	docs citations	times ranked	citing authors

#	Article	IF	Citations
1	Framing as a Theory of Media Effects. Journal of Communication, 1999, 49, 103-122.	2.1	2,238
2	French Abstract. Journal of Communication, 2007, 57, 9-20.	2.1	912
3	Framing, Agenda Setting, and Priming: The Evolution of Three Media Effects Models. Journal of Communication, 2007, 57, 9-20.	2.1	766
4	Agenda-Setting, Priming, and Framing Revisited: Another Look at Cognitive Effects of Political Communication. Mass Communication and Society, 2000, 3, 297-316.	1.2	667
5	What's next for science communication? Promising directions and lingering distractions. American Journal of Botany, 2009, 96, 1767-1778.	0.8	667
6	Community, Communication, and Participation: The Role of Mass Media and Interpersonal Discussion in Local Political Participation. Political Communication, 1999, 16, 315-336.	2.3	662
7	The â€œNasty Effect:â€•Online Incivility and Risk Perceptions of Emerging Technologies. Journal of Computer-Mediated Communication, 2014, 19, 373-387.	1.7	514
8	Science audiences, misinformation, and fake news. Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America, 2019, 116, 7662-7669.	3.3	449
9	The Public and Nanotechnology: How Citizens Make Sense of Emerging Technologies. Journal of Nanoparticle Research, 2005, 7, 659-667.	0.8	422
10	The End of Framing as we Know itÂâ€¦Âand the Future of Media Effects. Mass Communication and Society, 2016, 19, 7-23.	1.2	411
11	Connecting News Media Use with Gaps in Knowledge and Participation. Political Communication, 2000, 17, 215-237.	2.3	395
12	Public Attitudes toward Emerging Technologies. Science Communication, 2005, 27, 240-267.	1.8	322
13	Science, New Media, and the Public. Science, 2013, 339, 40-41.	6.0	269
14	Social Structure and Citizenship: Examining the Impacts of Social Setting, Network Heterogeneity, and Informational Variables on Political Participation. Political Communication, 2004, 21, 315-338.	2.3	263
15	Knowledge, Reservations, or Promise?. Communication Research, 2002, 29, 584-608.	3.9	262
16	Religiosity as a perceptual filter: examining processes of opinion formation about nanotechnology. Public Understanding of Science, 2009, 18, 546-558.	1.6	233
17	TWENTY-FIVE YEARS OF THE SPIRAL OF SILENCE: A CONCEPTUAL REVIEW AND EMPIRICAL OUTLOOK. International Journal of Public Opinion Research, 2000, 12, 3-28.	0.7	229
18	Examining Differential Gains from Mass Media and their Implications for Participatory Behavior. Communication Research, 2002, 29, 46-65.	3.9	227

#	Article	IF	Citations
19	Effects of Value Predispositions, Mass Media Use, and Knowledge on Public Attitudes Toward Embryonic Stem Cell Research. International Journal of Public Opinion Research, 2008, 20, 171-192.	0.7	215
20	Personality Strength and Social Capital. Communication Research, 2000, 27, 107-131.	3.9	212
21	Religious beliefs and public attitudes toward nanotechnology in Europe and the United States. Nature Nanotechnology, 2009, 4, 91-94.	15.6	212
22	Democracy Based on Difference: Examining the Links Between Structural Heterogeneity, Heterogeneity of Discussion Networks, and Democratic Citizenship. Journal of Communication, 2006, 56, 728-753.	2.1	198
23	Understanding Deliberation. Communication Research, 1999, 26, 743-774.	3.9	189
24	Examining Differential Gains From Internet Use: Comparing the Moderating Role of Talk and Online Interactions. Journal of Communication, 2005, 55, 71-84.	2.1	175
25	Science communication as political communication. Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America, 2014, 111, 13585-13592.	3.3	163
26	Nonparticipation as Self-Censorship: Publicly Observable Political Activity in a Polarized Opinion Climate. Political Behavior, 2006, 28, 259-283.	1.7	155
27	Scientists worry about some risks more than the public. Nature Nanotechnology, 2007, 2, 732-734.	15.6	149
28	Communicating science in social settings. Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America, 2013, 110, 14040-14047.	3.3	138
29	Being a Citizen Online. The International Journal of Press/Politics, 2002, 7, 55-75.	1.2	129
30	Media Effects on Political and Social Trust. Journalism and Mass Communication Quarterly, 2000, 77, 744-759.	1.4	120
31	Political Talk as a Catalyst for Online Citizenship. Journalism and Mass Communication Quarterly, 2004, 81, 877-896.	1.4	119
32	Talk or Conversation? Dimensions of Interpersonal Discussion and Their Implications for Participatory Democracy. Journalism and Mass Communication Quarterly, 2000, 77, 727-743.	1.4	115
33	Toxic Talk: How Online Incivility Can Undermine Perceptions of Media. International Journal of Public Opinion Research, 2018, 30, 156-168.	0.7	115
34	U.S. attitudes on human genome editing. Science, 2017, 357, 553-554.	6.0	104
35	Building Buzz. Journalism and Mass Communication Quarterly, 2014, 91, 772-791.	1.4	101
36	From enabling technology to applications: The evolution of risk perceptions about nanotechnology. Public Understanding of Science, 2011, 20, 385-404.	1.6	98

#	Article	IF	Citations
37	Coverage of emerging technologies: A comparison between print and online media. New Media and Society, 2012, 14, 1039-1059.	3.1	97
38	Uncivil and personal? Comparing patterns of incivility in comments on the Facebook pages of news outlets. New Media and Society, 2018, 20, 3678-3699.	3.1	97
39	Science on Television in the 21st Century. Communication Research, 2011, 38, 754-777.	3.9	95
40	Pathways to Political Participation? Religion, Communication Contexts, and Mass Media. International Journal for Quality in Health Care, 2003, 15, 300-324.	0.9	94
41	Explicating Opinion Leadership: Nonpolitical Dispositions, Information Consumption, and Civic Participation. Political Communication, 2006, 23, 1-22.	2.3	92
42	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.	3.1	87
43	Effects on risk perception of media coverage of a black bear-related human fatality. Wildlife Society Bulletin, 2005, 33, 507-516.	1.6	85
44	Finally Informing the Electorate? How the Internet Got People Thinking about Presidential Politics in 2004. The International Journal of Press/Politics, 2007, 12, 96-111.	1.2	82
45	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.	0.7	81
46	Real Talk. Communication Research, 2001, 28, 304-324.	3.9	80
47	The Influence of Knowledge and Deference toward Scientific Authority: A Media Effects Model for Public Attitudes toward Nanotechnology. Journalism and Mass Communication Quarterly, 2006, 83, 819-834.	1.4	80
48	Of risks and regulations: how leading U.S. nanoscientists form policy stances about nanotechnology. Journal of Nanoparticle Research, 2009, 11, 1573-1585.	0.8	80
49	Making sense of policy choices: understanding the roles of value predispositions, mass media, and cognitive processing in public attitudes toward nanotechnology. Journal of Nanoparticle Research, 2010, 12, 2703-2715.	0.8	78
50	Value Predispositions, Mass Media, and Attitudes Toward Nanotechnology: The Interplay of Public and Experts. Science Communication, 2011, 33, 167-200.	1.8	78
51	Food nanotechnology in the news. Coverage patterns and thematic emphases during the last decade. Appetite, 2011, 56, 78-89.	1.8	71
52	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.	1.5	71
53	Analyzing public sentiments online: combining human- and computer-based content analysis. Information, Communication and Society, 2017, 20, 406-427.	2.6	71
54	The Soul of a Polarized Democracy. Communication Research, 2009, 36, 315-340.	3.9	69

#	Article	IF	Citations
55	Rethinking Social Amplification of Risk: Social Media and Zika in Three Languages. Risk Analysis, 2018, 38, 2599-2624.	1.5	69
56	Is Facebook Making Us Dumber? Exploring Social Media Use as a Predictor of Political Knowledge. Journalism and Mass Communication Quarterly, 2018, 95, 404-424.	1.4	67
57	The Emergence of Nano News: Tracking Thematic Trends and Changes in U.S. Newspaper Coverage of Nanotechnology. Journalism and Mass Communication Quarterly, 2011, 88, 55-75.	1.4	66
58	Who Cares about Local Politics? Media Influences on Local Political Involvement, Issue Awareness, and Attitude Strength. Journalism and Mass Communication Quarterly, 2002, 79, 427-444.	1.4	65
59	The Science of Science Communication II. Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America, 2014, 111, 13583-13584.	3.3	64
60	Web vs campus store? Why students buy textbooks online. Journal of Consumer Marketing, 2002, 19, 409-423.	1.2	63
61	The changing information environment for nanotechnology: online audiences and content. Journal of Nanoparticle Research, 2010, 12, 1083-1094.	0.8	62
62	Labeling renewable energies: How the language surrounding biofuels can influence its public acceptance. Energy Policy, 2012, 51, 673-682.	4.2	62
63	Trends: Attitudes about Agricultural Biotechnology and Genetically Modified Organisms. Public Opinion Quarterly, 2001, 65, 267-281.	0.9	60
64	Public Diplomacy, Television News, and Muslim Opinion. The International Journal of Press/Politics, 2004, 9, 11-37.	1.2	60
65	Measuring risk/benefit perceptions of emerging technologies and their potential impact on communication of public opinion toward science. Public Understanding of Science, 2012, 21, 830-847.	1.6	59
66	Public attitudes toward biofuels: Effects of knowledge, political partisanship, and media use. Politics and the Life Sciences, 2012, 31, 36-51.	0.5	58
67	DELIBERATION OR DISPUTE? AN EXPLORATORY STUDY EXAMINING DIMENSIONS OF PUBLIC OPINION EXPRESSION. International Journal of Public Opinion Research, 1999, 11, 25-58.	0.7	55
68	The Role of Perceptions of Media Bias in General and Issue-Specific Political Participation. Mass Communication and Society, 2011, 14, 343-374.	1.2	55
69	Factors influencing public riskâ€“benefit considerations of nanotechnology: Assessing the effects of mass media, interpersonal communication, and elaborative processing. Public Understanding of Science, 2013, 22, 606-623.	1.6	55
70	Partisan amplification of risk: American perceptions of nuclear energy risk in the wake of the Fukushima Daiichi disaster. Energy Policy, 2014, 67, 727-736.	4.2	55
71	Television Use and Social Capital: Testing Putnam's Time Displacement Hypothesis. Mass Communication and Society, 1999, 2, 27-45.	1.2	54
72	Perceptions of 'Public Opinion' and 'Public' Opinion Expression. International Journal for Quality in Health Care, 2001, 13, 25-44.	0.9	54

#	Article	IF	Citations
73	Science News Consumption Patterns and Their Implications for Public Understanding of Science. Journalism and Mass Communication Quarterly, 2015, 92, 597-616.	1.4	54
74	Perceived familiarity or factual knowledge? Comparing operationalizations of scientific understanding. Science and Public Policy, 2012, 39, 761-774.	1.2	52
75	Framing as a Theory of Media Effects. , 0, .		50
76	Examining Differential Gains From Mass Media and Their Implications for Participatory Behavior. Communication Research, 2002, 29, 46-65.	3.9	49
77	Information-Sharing and Community-Building: Exploring the Use of Twitter in Science Public Relations. Science Communication, 2017, 39, 569-597.	1.8	48
78	Another (methodological) look at knowledge gaps and the Internetâ€™s potential for closing them. Public Understanding of Science, 2014, 23, 376-394.	1.6	47
79	Inequalities in Scientific Understanding. Science Communication, 2014, 36, 352-378.	1.8	47
80	Selecting Our Own Science. Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science, 2015, 658, 172-191.	0.8	46
81	Tweeting nano: how public discourses about nanotechnology develop in social media environments. Journal of Nanoparticle Research, 2013, 15, 1.	0.8	45
82	Beyond the Choir? The Need to Understand Multiple Publics for Science. Environmental Communication, 2018, 12, 1123-1126.	1.2	45
83	New Voters, New Outlook? Predispositions, Social Networks, and the Changing Politics of Gay Civil Rights[*]. Social Science Quarterly, 2011, 92, 324-345.	0.9	44
84	Cross-pressuring conservative Catholics? Effects of Pope Francisâ€™ encyclical on the U.S. public opinion on climate change. Climatic Change, 2016, 139, 367-380.	1.7	43
85	Public attitudes toward biofuels: Effects of knowledge, political partisanship, and media use. Politics and the Life Sciences, 2012, 31, 36-51.	0.5	41
86	Opposing ends of the spectrum: Exploring trust in scientific and religious authorities. Public Understanding of Science, 2018, 27, 11-28.	1.6	41
87	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, .	3.3	40
88	How do U.S. state residents form opinions about â€˜frackingâ€™ in social contexts? A multilevel analysis. Energy Policy, 2017, 106, 345-355.	4.2	39
89	(Escaping) the paradox of scientific storytelling. PLoS Biology, 2018, 16, e2006720.	2.6	39
90	Public views about editing genes in wildlife for conservation. Conservation Biology, 2019, 33, 1286-1295.	2.4	39

#	Article	IF	Citations
91	The Politics of Emotion: News Media Attention, Emotional Responses, and Participation During the 2004 U.S. Presidential Election. Mass Communication and Society, 2012, 15, 25-45.	1.2	38
92	Disentangling the Influence of Value Predispositions and Risk/Benefit Perceptions on Support for Nanotechnology Among the American Public. Risk Analysis, 2014, 34, 965-980.	1.5	37
93	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.	1.6	37
94	Presidential Campaign Dynamics and the Ebb and Flow of Talk as a Moderator: Media Exposure, Knowledge, and Political Discussion. Communication Theory, 2009, 19, 89-101.	2.0	36
95	Being a Citizen Online: New Opportunities and Dead Ends. The International Journal of Press/Politics, 2002, 7, 55-75.	1.2	34
96	Moral Politicking. International Journal of Press/Politics, 2009, 14, 186-211.	3.0	33
97	My Friend's Enemy: How Split-Screen Debate Coverage Influences Evaluation of Presidential Debates. Communication Research, 2007, 34, 3-24.	3.9	29
98	Getting Citizens Involved: How Controversial Policy Debates Stimulate Issue Participation during a Political Campaign. International Journal of Public Opinion Research, 2010, 22, 181-203.	0.7	28
99	Engaging the Public at a Science Festival. Science Communication, 2017, 39, 250-277.	1.8	28
100	The Pollsâ€"Trends. Public Opinion Quarterly, 0, , .	0.9	28
101	Distinguishing scientific knowledge: The impact of different measures of knowledge on genetically modified food attitudes. Public Understanding of Science, 2019, 28, 449-467.	1.6	28
102	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.	1.2	28
103	Who Cares About the Issues? Issue Voting and the Role of News Media During the 2000 U.S. Presidential Election. Journal of Communication, 2005, 55, 103-121.	2.1	27
104	The State of Framing Research. , 2014, , .		27
105	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.	2.3	27
106	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.	1.6	27
107	Misinformation about science in the public sphere. Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America, 2021, 118, .	3.3	27
108	The Polls Trends: Public Reactions to Global Health Threats and Infectious Diseases. Public Opinion Quarterly, 2007, 71, 671-692.	0.9	26

#	Article	IF	Citations
109	Misinformed about the â€œinfodemic?â€•Scienceâ€™s ongoing struggle with misinformation.. Journal of Applied Research in Memory and Cognition, 2021, 10, 522-526.	0.7	26
110	Leading US nano-scientistsâ€™ perceptions about media coverage and the public communication of scientific research findings. Journal of Nanoparticle Research, 2011, 13, 7041-7055.	0.8	25
111	The case of #arseniclife: Blogs and Twitter in informal peer review. Public Understanding of Science, 2017, 26, 937-952.	1.6	25
112	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.	8.3	22
113	Public opinion about biofuels: The interplay between party identification and risk/benefit perception. Energy Policy, 2014, 73, 344-355.	4.2	22
114	Mapping the Landscape of Public Attitudes on Synthetic Biology. BioScience, 0, , biw171.	2.2	22
115	The science of YouTube: What factors influence user engagement with online science videos?. PLoS ONE, 2022, 17, e0267697.	1.1	22
116	Scientists Joking on Social Media: An Empirical Analysis of #overlyhonestmethods. Science Communication, 2018, 40, 314-339.	1.8	21
117	Whose AI? How different publics think about AI and its social impacts. Computers in Human Behavior, 2022, 130, 107182.	5.1	21
118	Opinion Leaders in Online Cancer Support Groups: An Investigation of Their Antecedents and Consequences. Health Communication, 2017, 32, 142-151.	1.8	20
119	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.	3.0	20
120	Engagement present and future: Graduate student and faculty perceptions of social media and the role of the public in science engagement. PLoS ONE, 2019, 14, e0216274.	1.1	20
121	Societal Debates About Emerging Genetic Technologies: Toward a Science of Public Engagement. Environmental Communication, 2020, 14, 859-864.	1.2	20
122	Tweeting disaster: an analysis of online discourse about nuclear power in the wake of the Fukushima Daiichi nuclear accident. Journal of Science Communication, 2016, 15, A02.	0.4	20
123	Diversity of Television Exposure and its Association with the Cultivation of Concern for Environmental Risks. Environmental Communication, 2010, 4, 54-65.	1.2	19
124	Attitudes about Food and Food-Related Biotechnology. Public Opinion Quarterly, 2017, 81, 577-596.	0.9	19
125	The effect of comment moderation on perceived bias in science news. Information, Communication and Society, 2019, 22, 129-146.	2.6	19
126	Gender-Biased Data in Survey Research Regarding Wildlife. Society and Natural Resources, 2007, 20, 373-377.	0.9	18

#	Article	IF	Citations
127	Structure or Predisposition? Exploring the Interaction Effect of Discussion Orientation and Discussion Heterogeneity on Political Participation. Mass Communication and Society, 2011, 14, 502-526.	1.2	18
128	The â€œInfodemicâ€•Infodemic: Toward a More Nuanced Understanding of Truth-Claims and the Need for (Not) Combatting Misinformation. Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science, 2022, 700, 112-123.	0.8	18
129	Five lessons in nano outreach. Materials Today, 2006, 9, 64.	8.3	17
130	The Current Status and Future Direction of Nanotechnology Regulations: A View from Nanoâ€scientists. Review of Policy Research, 2013, 30, 488-511.	2.8	17
131	National Academies of Sciences, Engineering, and MedicineÂreport on genetically engineered crops influences publicÂdiscourse. Politics and the Life Sciences, 2018, 37, 250-261.	0.5	17
132	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.	1.4	17
133	The Trust Fallacy. American Scientist, 2021, 109, 226.	0.1	17
134	Heritable Human Genome Editing: The Public Engagement Imperative. CRISPR Journal, 2020, 3, 434-439.	1.4	17
135	The role of presence awareness in organizational communication: An exploratory field experiment. Behaviour and Information Technology, 2007, 26, 377-384.	2.5	16
136	Misperceptions in Polarized Politics: The Role of Knowledge, Religiosity, and Media. PS - Political Science and Politics, 2014, 47, 654-661.	0.3	16
137	Characteristics and classification of nanoparticles: Expert Delphi survey. Nanotoxicology, 2011, 5, 236-243.	1.6	15
138	Scientistsâ€™ Ethical Obligations and Social Responsibility for Nanotechnology Research. Science and Engineering Ethics, 2016, 22, 111-132.	1.7	15
139	Classifying US nano-scientists: Of cautious innovators, regulators, and technology optimists. Science and Public Policy, 2012, 39, 30-38.	1.2	14
140	Attitudinal gaps: How experts and lay audiences form policy attitudes toward controversial science. Science and Public Policy, 2016, 43, 196-206.	1.2	14
141	The Science of Science Communication III. Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America, 2019, 116, 7632-7633.	3.3	14
142	Support for the Death Penalty and Rehabilitation: Question Order or Communication Effect?1. Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 2001, 31, 2230-2255.	1.3	13
143	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.	0.5	13
144	Communicating data: interactive infographics, scientific data and credibility. Journal of Science Communication, 2018, 17, A06.	0.4	13

#	Article	IF	Citations
145	â€œSharedâ€•Information in the Age of Big Data. Journalism and Mass Communication Quarterly, 2016, 93, 430-445.	1.4	12
146	Think about Him This Way: Priming, News Media, and South Koreans' Evaluation of the President. International Journal of Public Opinion Research, 2010, 22, 299-319.	0.7	11
147	Commentary: Online News and the Demise of Political Disagreement. Annals of the International Communication Association, 2013, 36, 45-53.	2.8	11
148	Agenda Setting in the Internet Age: The Reciprocity between Online Searches and Issue Salience. International Journal of Public Opinion Research, 2016, 28, 440-455.	0.7	11
149	Saw It on Facebook: The Role of Social Media in Facilitating Science Issue Awareness. Social Media and Society, 2020, 6, 205630512093041.	1.5	11
150	News Selectivity and Beyond: Motivated Reasoning in a Changing Media Environment. , 2015, , 83-104.		11
151	Television Use and Social Capital: Testing Putnam's Time Displacement Hypothesis. Mass Communication and Society, 1999, 2, 27-45.	1.2	11
152	The chronic growing pains of communicating science online. Science, 2022, 375, 613-614.	6.0	11
153	Ukrainian nationalist parties and connective action: an analysis of electoral campaigning and social media sentiments. Information, Communication and Society, 2019, 22, 1376-1395.	2.6	10
154	Disagreement and Value Predispositions: Understanding Public Opinion About Stem Cell Research. International Journal of Public Opinion Research, 2013, 25, 357-367.	0.7	9
155	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.	2.7	9
156	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.	3.1	9
157	Polarized platforms? How partisanship shapes perceptions of â€œalgorithmic news biasâ€• New Media and Society, 2023, 25, 2833-2854.	3.1	9
158	Laboratory Safety and Nanotechnology Workers: an Analysis of Current Guidelines in the USA. NanoEthics, 2016, 10, 5-23.	0.5	8
159	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.	0.7	8
160	Thirty years of scienceâ€“society interfaces: Whatâ€™s next?. Public Understanding of Science, 2022, 31, 297-304.	1.6	8
161	Public engagement: Faculty lived experiences and perspectives underscore barriers and a changing culture in academia. PLoS ONE, 2022, 17, e0269949.	1.1	8
162	Whatâ€™s in a name? How we define nanotech shapes public reactions. Journal of Nanoparticle Research, 2013, 15, 1.	0.8	7

#	Article	IF	Citations
163	Communicating Chemistry through Cooking and Personal Health: Everyday Applications Increase Perceived Relevance, Interest, and Self-Efficacy in Chemistry. Journal of Chemical Education, 2021, 98, 1852-1862.	1.1	7
164	Stimulating Upstream Engagement: An Experimental Study of Nanotechnology Information Seeking. Social Science Quarterly, 2011, 92, 1191-1214.	0.9	6
165	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.	0.5	6
166	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.	1.7	6
167	The Values of Synthetic Biology: Researcher Views of Their Field and Participation in Public Engagement. BioScience, 2018, 68, 782-791.	2.2	6
168	The Science of Open (Communication) Science: Toward an Evidence-Driven Understanding of Quality Criteria in Communication Research. Journal of Communication, 0, , .	2.1	6
169	Policy decision-making, public involvement and nuclear energy: what do expert stakeholders think and why?. Journal of Responsible Innovation, 2015, 2, 266-279.	2.3	5
170	Policymakers and stakeholders' perceptions of science-driven nuclear energy policy. Nuclear Engineering and Technology, 2018, 50, 773-779.	1.1	5
171	The state of GMOs on social media. Politics and the Life Sciences, 2021, 40, 40-55.	0.5	5
172	Fake News. , 2019, , 58-78.		5
173	Emerging Agendas at the Intersection of Political and Science Communication The Case of Nanotechnology. Annals of the International Communication Association, 2010, 34, 143-167.	2.8	4
174	Information snapshots: What Google searches really tell us about emerging technologies. Nano Today, 2012, 7, 72-75.	6.2	4
175	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.	1.4	4
176	How institutional factors at US land-grant universities impact scientistsâ€™ public scholarship. Public Understanding of Science, 2023, 32, 124-142.	1.6	4
177	Nano doesn't have a marketing problemâ€¦ yet. Nano Today, 2007, 2, 48.	6.2	3
178	Perceptions and actions: relationships of views on risk with citation actions of nanotechnology scientists. Research Evaluation, 2011, 20, 377-388.	1.3	3
179	New Media Audiencesâ€™ Perceptions of Male and Female Scientists in Two Sci-Fi Movies. Bulletin of Science, Technology and Society, 2015, 35, 93-103.	1.1	3
180	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.	1.4	3

#	Article	IF	Citations
181	Reflections on a Legacy: Thoughts from Scholars about Agenda-Setting Past and Future. Mass Communication and Society, 2022, 25, 500-527.	1.2	3
182	31. Media effects on political behavior. , 0, , .		2
183	Public Perceptions of Steroid Use in Sport: Contextualizing Communication Efforts. International Journal of Sport Communication, 2008, 1, 444-457.	0.4	2
184	Disconnected discourses. Materials Today, 2014, 17, 48-49.	8.3	2
185	Nanoscientists and political involvement: Which characteristics make scientists more likely to support engagement in political debates?. Science and Public Policy, 0, , scw065.	1.2	2
186	Selective perception of novel science: how definitions affect information processing about nanotechnology. Journal of Nanoparticle Research, 2017, 19, 1.	0.8	2
187	What is the field of communication? Seeking answers from a survey of scholars â€¦ and â€“ more importantly â€“ from Klaus SchÃ¶nbach. , 2009, , 73-84.		2
188	Morgan, M. Granger, Fischhoff, Baruch, Bostrom, Ann, & Atman, Cynthia J. (2002). Risk communication: A mental models approach. New York: Cambridge University Press, 366 pp., ISBN 0-521-80223-7 (cloth) 0-521-00256-7 (paper).. International Journal for Quality in Health Care, 2003, 15, 102-104.	0.9	1
189	Understanding and Overcoming Fear of the Unnatural in Discussion of GMOs. , 2017, , .		1
190	(New) political interfaces in the life sciences. Politics and the Life Sciences, 2018, 37, 78-87.	0.5	1
191	Scientistsâ€™ and the Publicsâ€™ Views of Synthetic Biology. Risk, Systems and Decisions, 2020, , 371-387.	0.5	1
192	Understanding (Perceptions of) Emerging Information Ecologies. Journalism & Communication Monographs, 2022, 24, 141-145.	0.0	1
193	Conclusionâ€”On the Horizon. , 2017, , .		0
194	U.S. News Coverage of Neuroscience Nanotechnology: How U.S. Newspapers Have Covered Neuroscience Nanotechnology During the Last Decade. , 2013, , 67-78.		0