

Interactive comment on “Geoscience on television: a review of science communication literature in the context of geosciences” by R. Hut et al.

F. McAuliffe (Referee)

fergus.mcauliffe@icrag-centre.org

Received and published: 9 February 2016

General comments

This is well written and informative manuscript. The six themes outlined are well discussed in the context of television using the method of opening description, case study, and reflection. This consistent structure aids to understanding. Some minor revisions are recommended.

Specific comments

Page 12 – line 6: use of the word “outreach”. In my experience, this word, has come to mean “teaching children about science” in the eyes of some scientists/geoscientists.

Full screen / Esc

Printer-friendly version

Discussion paper



For this reason, I have moved away from using this term, and moved towards “engagement” which is a better catch all term for connecting with many audiences, from children up to retirees. Suggest changing “outreach” to “engagement activities/efforts/initiatives” throughout.

Page 12 – line 6: “intended audience”: having covered target audiences in section 3 it might be more appropriate to stick with this terminology in the rest of the article. Suggested change from “intended audience” to “target audience”. Also agree with the comment of Anonymous Referee #2 about the need for a definition of target groups to be included in section 3. Including a definition here will aid understanding when target groups are referred to later in the article.

Page 12 – lines 19-21: you have mentioned that the difference in pyramid layout between the convention and the Stewart and Nield (2013) paper is interesting. Consequently, why it is interesting needs to be explained here.

Page 16 – the idea of the role of the scientist in the media changing from discussing their own research to interpreting complex issues for society is an important idea. This is a big barrier to getting scientists to engage in non-scripted media interactions, for fear of being asked to comment on something outside of their own area of expertise (which is in fact becoming increasingly more refined). Some scientists now feel that they must have published (extensively) on a very particular topic, before they will even attempt to answer media questions about it. A nice link is made in this section between the work of Albeak (2011) and the consequences of this for scientists. While the point is made that the role of scientists in the media has changed, can this point be linked to any literature on whether scientists are actually aware of this change?

Page 18 – line 26: “Something similar happened to Stoof”. This is a bit blunt. Suggest changing to “Stoof had a similar experience”.

Page 19 - line 2 – When was Hoe?Zo! on Dutch national TV? It would be good to have a date here for context.

Full screen / Esc

Printer-friendly version

Discussion paper



Page 30 – Figure 2: the use of parenthesis is somewhat confusing here. Use of “(the bottomline)”, where the parenthesis is used to direct readers’ attention to a specific layer of the pyramid is fine. However, the second use of parenthesis “(narrowing down of the triangle)” caused me to initially try to find the layer labelled as “narrowing down of the triangle” within the pyramid. Suggest changing the second sentence to “In the inverted pyramid, conclusions (the bottomline) are presented first, followed by further details i.e. narrowing down of the pyramid.” This suggested change can also be reflected in the third sentence. Avoid inter-changing “pyramid” and “triangle”.

Technical corrections

Page 13 – line 23: change from “Pulitzer-prize winning” to “Pulitzer prize-winning”

Page 15 – lines 8 and 9: “someone” is singular, so it is likely that it is a singular scientist that is being referred to in line 9:

Page 16 – line 12: change from “data is published” to “data are published”

Page 18 – line 21: change from “this image still persist as” to “this image still persists as”

Page 18 – line 24: change from “newspaper the Guardian” to “the Guardian newspaper”

Page 20 - line 4: change from “only 30% is female” to “only 30% are female” as earlier in the same sentence “42%” is followed by “are”.

Page 21 – lines 16-21. Sentence is too long and needs to be broken. Suggest breaking after “applicable to the geosciences”.

Page 22 – line 14: change from “little information” to “small amounts of information”

Page 22 – line 23: change from “KRO-NRCVfor” to “KRO-NRCV for”

Page 28 – Table 1: change from “Number of views on Youtube” to “Number of views

Full screen / Esc

Printer-friendly version

Discussion paper



on YouTube”.

Interactive comment on Hydrol. Earth Syst. Sci. Discuss., doi:10.5194/hess-2015-518, 2016.

HESD

Interactive
comment

Full screen / Esc

Printer-friendly version

Discussion paper

