Dietram A Scheufele

List of Publications by Year
in descending order

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	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
2	Polarized platforms? How partisanship shapes perceptions of â€œalgorithmic news biasâ€• New Media and Society, 2023, 25, 2833-2854.	3.1	9
3	How institutional factors at US land-grant universities impact scientistsâ€™ public scholarship. Public Understanding of Science, 2023, 32, 124-142.	1.6	4
4	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
5	Whose AI? How different publics think about AI and its social impacts. Computers in Human Behavior, 2022, 130, 107182.	5.1	21
6	The chronic growing pains of communicating science online. Science, 2022, 375, 613-614.	6.0	11
7	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
8	Thirty years of scienceâ€“society interfaces: Whatâ€™s next?. Public Understanding of Science, 2022, 31, 297-304.	1.6	8
9	Understanding (Perceptions of) Emerging Information Ecologies. Journalism & Communication Monographs, 2022, 24, 141-145.	0.0	1
10	The science of YouTube: What factors influence user engagement with online science videos?. PLoS ONE, 2022, 17, e0267697.	1.1	22
11	Public engagement: Faculty lived experiences and perspectives underscore barriers and a changing culture in academia. PLoS ONE, 2022, 17, e0269949.	1.1	8
12	Reflections on a Legacy: Thoughts from Scholars about Agenda-Setting Past and Future. Mass Communication and Society, 2022, 25, 500-527.	1.2	3
13	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
14	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
15	The state of GMOs on social media. Politics and the Life Sciences, 2021, 40, 40-55.	0.5	5
16	The Trust Fallacy. American Scientist, 2021, 109, 226.	0.1	17
17	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
18	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

#	Article	IF	Citations
19	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
20	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
21	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
22	Societal Debates About Emerging Genetic Technologies: Toward a Science of Public Engagement. Environmental Communication, 2020, 14, 859-864.	1.2	20
23	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
24	Saw It on Facebook: The Role of Social Media in Facilitating Science Issue Awareness. Social Media and Society, 2020, 6, 205630512093041.	1.5	11
25	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
26	Heritable Human Genome Editing: The Public Engagement Imperative. CRISPR Journal, 2020, 3, 434-439.	1.4	17
27	Scientistsâ€™ and the Publicsâ€™ Views of Synthetic Biology. Risk, Systems and Decisions, 2020, , 371-387.	0.5	1
28	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
29	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
30	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
31	Public views about editing genes in wildlife for conservation. Conservation Biology, 2019, 33, 1286-1295.	2.4	39
32	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
33	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
34	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
35	The effect of comment moderation on perceived bias in science news. Information, Communication and Society, 2019, 22, 129-146.	2.6	19
36	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

#	Article	IF	Citations
37	Fake News. , 2019, , 58-78.		5
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	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
40	Scientists Joking on Social Media: An Empirical Analysis of #overlyhonestmethods. Science Communication, 2018, 40, 314-339.	1.8	21
41	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
42	(New) political interfaces in the life sciences. Politics and the Life Sciences, 2018, 37, 78-87.	0.5	1
43	Policymakers and stakeholders' perceptions of science-driven nuclear energy policy. Nuclear Engineering and Technology, 2018, 50, 773-779.	1.1	5
44	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
45	Toxic Talk: How Online Incivility Can Undermine Perceptions of Media. International Journal of Public Opinion Research, 2018, 30, 156-168.	0.7	115
46	Opposing ends of the spectrum: Exploring trust in scientific and religious authorities. Public Understanding of Science, 2018, 27, 11-28.	1.6	41
47	Rethinking Social Amplification of Risk: Social Media and Zika in Three Languages. Risk Analysis, 2018, 38, 2599-2624.	1.5	69
48	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
49	Beyond the Choir? The Need to Understand Multiple Publics for Science. Environmental Communication, 2018, 12, 1123-1126.	1.2	45
50	(Escaping) the paradox of scientific storytelling. PLoS Biology, 2018, 16, e2006720.	2.6	39
51	The Values of Synthetic Biology: Researcher Views of Their Field and Participation in Public Engagement. BioScience, 2018, 68, 782-791.	2.2	6
52	Communicating data: interactive infographics, scientific data and credibility. Journal of Science Communication, 2018, 17, A06.	0.4	13
53	Opinion Leaders in Online Cancer Support Groups: An Investigation of Their Antecedents and Consequences. Health Communication, 2017, 32, 142-151.	1.8	20
54	Analyzing public sentiments online: combining human- and computer-based content analysis. Information, Communication and Society, 2017, 20, 406-427.	2.6	71

#	Article	IF	Citations
55	The case of #arseniclife: Blogs and Twitter in informal peer review. Public Understanding of Science, 2017, 26, 937-952.	1.6	25
56	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
57	Selective perception of novel science: how definitions affect information processing about nanotechnology. Journal of Nanoparticle Research, 2017, 19, 1.	0.8	2
58	Engaging the Public at a Science Festival. Science Communication, 2017, 39, 250-277.	1.8	28
59	Information-Sharing and Community-Building: Exploring the Use of Twitter in Science Public Relations. Science Communication, 2017, 39, 569-597.	1.8	48
60	U.S. attitudes on human genome editing. Science, 2017, 357, 553-554.	6.0	104
61	Attitudes about Food and Food-Related Biotechnology. Public Opinion Quarterly, 2017, 81, 577-596.	0.9	19
62	Understanding and Overcoming Fear of the Unnatural in Discussion of GMOs. , 2017, , .		1
63	Conclusionâ€”On the Horizon. , 2017, , .		0
64	â€œSharedâ€•Information in the Age of Big Data. Journalism and Mass Communication Quarterly, 2016, 93, 430-445.	1.4	12
65	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
66	Attitudinal gaps: How experts and lay audiences form policy attitudes toward controversial science. Science and Public Policy, 2016, 43, 196-206.	1.2	14
67	Laboratory Safety and Nanotechnology Workers: an Analysis of Current Guidelines in the USA. NanoEthics, 2016, 10, 5-23.	0.5	8
68	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
69	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
70	Scientistsâ€™ Ethical Obligations and Social Responsibility for Nanotechnology Research. Science and Engineering Ethics, 2016, 22, 111-132.	1.7	15
71	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
72	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

#	Article	IF	Citations
73	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
74	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
75	Selecting Our Own Science. Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science, 2015, 658, 172-191.	0.8	46
76	Science News Consumption Patterns and Their Implications for Public Understanding of Science. Journalism and Mass Communication Quarterly, 2015, 92, 597-616.	1.4	54
77	News Selectivity and Beyond: Motivated Reasoning in a Changing Media Environment. , 2015, , 83-104.		11
78	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
79	Building Buzz. Journalism and Mass Communication Quarterly, 2014, 91, 772-791.	1.4	101
80	Misperceptions in Polarized Politics: The Role of Knowledge, Religiosity, and Media. PS - Political Science and Politics, 2014, 47, 654-661.	0.3	16
81	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
82	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
83	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
84	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
85	Inequalities in Scientific Understanding. Science Communication, 2014, 36, 352-378.	1.8	47
86	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
87	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
88	Public opinion about biofuels: The interplay between party identification and risk/benefit perception. Energy Policy, 2014, 73, 344-355.	4.2	22
89	Disconnected discourses. Materials Today, 2014, 17, 48-49.	8.3	2
90	The State of Framing Research. , 2014, , .		27

#	Article	IF	Citations
91	Science, New Media, and the Public. Science, 2013, 339, 40-41.	6.0	269
92	Tweeting nano: how public discourses about nanotechnology develop in social media environments. Journal of Nanoparticle Research, 2013, 15, 1.	0.8	45
93	Whatâ€™s in a name? How we define nanotech shapes public reactions. Journal of Nanoparticle Research, 2013, 15, 1.	0.8	7
94	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
95	Disagreement and Value Predispositions: Understanding Public Opinion About Stem Cell Research. International Journal of Public Opinion Research, 2013, 25, 357-367.	0.7	9
96	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
97	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
98	Commentary: Online News and the Demise of Political Disagreement. Annals of the International Communication Association, 2013, 36, 45-53.	2.8	11
99	U.S. News Coverage of Neuroscience Nanotechnology: How U.S. Newspapers Have Covered Neuroscience Nanotechnology During the Last Decade. , 2013, , 67-78.		0
100	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
101	Coverage of emerging technologies: A comparison between print and online media. New Media and Society, 2012, 14, 1039-1059.	3.1	97
102	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
103	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
104	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
105	Public attitudes toward biofuels: Effects of knowledge, political partisanship, and media use. Politics and the Life Sciences, 2012, 31, 36-51.	0.5	58
106	Classifying US nano-scientists: Of cautious innovators, regulators, and technology optimists. Science and Public Policy, 2012, 39, 30-38.	1.2	14
107	Labeling renewable energies: How the language surrounding biofuels can influence its public acceptance. Energy Policy, 2012, 51, 673-682.	4.2	62
108	Public attitudes toward biofuels: Effects of knowledge, political partisanship, and media use. Politics and the Life Sciences, 2012, 31, 36-51.	0.5	41

#	Article	IF	Citations
109	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
110	Perceived familiarity or factual knowledge? Comparing operationalizations of scientific understanding. Science and Public Policy, 2012, 39, 761-774.	1.2	52
111	Information snapshots: What Google searches really tell us about emerging technologies. Nano Today, 2012, 7, 72-75.	6.2	4
112	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
113	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
114	From enabling technology to applications: The evolution of risk perceptions about nanotechnology. Public Understanding of Science, 2011, 20, 385-404.	1.6	98
115	Food nanotechnology in the news. Coverage patterns and thematic emphases during the last decade. Appetite, 2011, 56, 78-89.	1.8	71
116	Perceptions and actions: relationships of views on risk with citation actions of nanotechnology scientists. Research Evaluation, 2011, 20, 377-388.	1.3	3
117	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
118	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
119	Stimulating Upstream Engagement: An Experimental Study of Nanotechnology Information Seeking. Social Science Quarterly, 2011, 92, 1191-1214.	0.9	6
120	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
121	Characteristics and classification of nanoparticles: Expert Delphi survey. Nanotoxicology, 2011, 5, 236-243.	1.6	15
122	Value Predispositions, Mass Media, and Attitudes Toward Nanotechnology: The Interplay of Public and Experts. Science Communication, 2011, 33, 167-200.	1.8	78
123	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
124	Science on Television in the 21st Century. Communication Research, 2011, 38, 754-777.	3.9	95
125	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
126	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

#	Article	IF	Citations
127	The changing information environment for nanotechnology: online audiences and content. Journal of Nanoparticle Research, 2010, 12, 1083-1094.	0.8	62
128	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
129	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
130	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
131	Diversity of Television Exposure and its Association with the Cultivation of Concern for Environmental Risks. Environmental Communication, 2010, 4, 54-65.	1.2	19
132	What's next for science communication? Promising directions and lingering distractions. American Journal of Botany, 2009, 96, 1767-1778.	0.8	667
133	The Soul of a Polarized Democracy. Communication Research, 2009, 36, 315-340.	3.9	69
134	Moral Politicking. International Journal of Press/Politics, 2009, 14, 186-211.	3.0	33
135	Religiosity as a perceptual filter: examining processes of opinion formation about nanotechnology. Public Understanding of Science, 2009, 18, 546-558.	1.6	233
136	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
137	Religious beliefs and public attitudes toward nanotechnology in Europe and the United States. Nature Nanotechnology, 2009, 4, 91-94.	15.6	212
138	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
139	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
140	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
141	Public Perceptions of Steroid Use in Sport: Contextualizing Communication Efforts. International Journal of Sport Communication, 2008, 1, 444-457.	0.4	2
142	The role of presence awareness in organizational communication: An exploratory field experiment. Behaviour and Information Technology, 2007, 26, 377-384.	2.5	16
143	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
144	My Friend's Enemy: How Split-Screen Debate Coverage Influences Evaluation of Presidential Debates. Communication Research, 2007, 34, 3-24.	3.9	29

#	Article	IF	Citations
145	The Polls Trends: Public Reactions to Global Health Threats and Infectious Diseases. Public Opinion Quarterly, 2007, 71, 671-692.	0.9	26
146	Gender-Biased Data in Survey Research Regarding Wildlife. Society and Natural Resources, 2007, 20, 373-377.	0.9	18
147	Nano doesn't have a marketing problemâ€¦ yet. Nano Today, 2007, 2, 48.	6.2	3
148	Scientists worry about some risks more than the public. Nature Nanotechnology, 2007, 2, 732-734.	15.6	149
149	Framing, Agenda Setting, and Priming: The Evolution of Three Media Effects Models. Journal of Communication, 2007, 57, 9-20.	2.1	766
150	French Abstract. Journal of Communication, 2007, 57, 9-20.	2.1	912
151	Explicating Opinion Leadership: Nonpolitical Dispositions, Information Consumption, and Civic Participation. Political Communication, 2006, 23, 1-22.	2.3	92
152	Five lessons in nano outreach. Materials Today, 2006, 9, 64.	8.3	17
153	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
154	Nonparticipation as Self-Censorship: Publicly Observable Political Activity in a Polarized Opinion Climate. Political Behavior, 2006, 28, 259-283.	1.7	155
155	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
156	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
157	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
158	The Public and Nanotechnology: How Citizens Make Sense of Emerging Technologies. Journal of Nanoparticle Research, 2005, 7, 659-667.	0.8	422
159	Effects on risk perception of media coverage of a black bear-related human fatality. Wildlife Society Bulletin, 2005, 33, 507-516.	1.6	85
160	Public Attitudes toward Emerging Technologies. Science Communication, 2005, 27, 240-267.	1.8	322
161	Public Diplomacy, Television News, and Muslim Opinion. The International Journal of Press/Politics, 2004, 9, 11-37.	1.2	60
162	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

#	Article	IF	Citations
163	Political Talk as a Catalyst for Online Citizenship. Journalism and Mass Communication Quarterly, 2004, 81, 877-896.	1.4	119
164	Pathways to Political Participation? Religion, Communication Contexts, and Mass Media. International Journal for Quality in Health Care, 2003, 15, 300-324.	0.9	94
165	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
166	Being a Citizen Online. The International Journal of Press/Politics, 2002, 7, 55-75.	1.2	129
167	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
168	Examining Differential Gains from Mass Media and their Implications for Participatory Behavior. Communication Research, 2002, 29, 46-65.	3.9	227
169	Web vs campus store? Why students buy textbooks online. Journal of Consumer Marketing, 2002, 19, 409-423.	1.2	63
170	Knowledge, Reservations, or Promise?. Communication Research, 2002, 29, 584-608.	3.9	262
171	Examining Differential Gains From Mass Media and Their Implications for Participatory Behavior. Communication Research, 2002, 29, 46-65.	3.9	49
172	Being a Citizen Online: New Opportunities and Dead Ends. The International Journal of Press/Politics, 2002, 7, 55-75.	1.2	34
173	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
174	Real Talk. Communication Research, 2001, 28, 304-324.	3.9	80
175	Trends: Attitudes about Agricultural Biotechnology and Genetically Modified Organisms. Public Opinion Quarterly, 2001, 65, 267-281.	0.9	60
176	Perceptions of 'Public Opinion' and 'Public' Opinion Expression. International Journal for Quality in Health Care, 2001, 13, 25-44.	0.9	54
177	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
178	Media Effects on Political and Social Trust. Journalism and Mass Communication Quarterly, 2000, 77, 744-759.	1.4	120
179	Personality Strength and Social Capital. Communication Research, 2000, 27, 107-131.	3.9	212
180	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

#	Article	IF	Citations
181	Connecting News Media Use with Gaps in Knowledge and Participation. Political Communication, 2000, 17, 215-237.	2.3	395
182	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
183	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
184	Framing as a Theory of Media Effects. Journal of Communication, 1999, 49, 103-122.	2.1	2,238
185	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
186	Television Use and Social Capital: Testing Putnam's Time Displacement Hypothesis. Mass Communication and Society, 1999, 2, 27-45.	1.2	54
187	Understanding Deliberation. Communication Research, 1999, 26, 743-774.	3.9	189
188	Television Use and Social Capital: Testing Putnam's Time Displacement Hypothesis. Mass Communication and Society, 1999, 2, 27-45.	1.2	11
189	31. Media effects on political behavior. , 0, , .		2
190	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
191	Mapping the Landscape of Public Attitudes on Synthetic Biology. BioScience, 0, , biw171.	2.2	22
192	The Pollsâ€”Trends. Public Opinion Quarterly, 0, , .	0.9	28
193	The Science of Open (Communication) Science: Toward an Evidence-Driven Understanding of Quality Criteria in Communication Research. Journal of Communication, 0, , .	2.1	6
194	Framing as a Theory of Media Effects. , 0, .		50