# Article information:

What can we learn from 25 years of PUS survey research? Liberating and expanding the agenda
<https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/epdf/10.1177/0963662506071287>

# Article summary:

1. The paper reviews the development of public understanding of science (PUS) research over the past 25 years, tracing it through three paradigms: science literacy, public understanding of science, and science and society.

2. The polemic over the "deficit concept" in PUS research is discussed, with the authors arguing that it has confused the issue with methodological protocol. They suggest that this fallacious link should be severed to liberate and expand the research agenda in four directions: contextualizing survey research, searching for cultural indicators, integrating datasets and doing longitudinal analysis, and including other data streams.

3. The paper highlights the need to move beyond the automatic equation of particular agendas with specific research protocols in PUS research. It argues for a more open approach that allows for different presumptions and methodologies, anticipating a fertile period for survey research on public understanding of science.

# Article rating:

May be slightly imbalanced: The article presents the information in a generally reliable way, but there are minor points of consideration that could be explored further or claims that are not fully backed by appropriate evidence. Some perspectives may also be omitted, and you are encouraged to use the research topics section to explore the topic further.

# Article analysis:

这篇文章探讨了公众对科学的理解（PUS）研究领域在过去25年中的关键问题。文章指出，PUS研究已经通过三个范式的发展来改变对大规模调查公众感知的讨论：科学素养、公众对科学的理解和科学与社会。每个范式以不同方式框定问题，提出特定问题，提供首选解决方案，并展示相对于前一个范式的“进步”的修辞。作者认为，“赤字概念”的争论表达了专家之间普遍存在的一种常识概念的有效批评，但将问题与方法论协议混淆了。这种错误的联系限制了PUS研究，作者主张应该断开这种错误联系，以解放和扩大研究议程。

然而，这篇文章存在一些潜在偏见和片面报道。首先，在讨论“赤字模型”时，文章没有提供足够的证据来支持其观点。它只是简单地声称“赤字模型”是一种普遍存在的共识，并且没有考虑到其他可能解释公众对科学理解不足的因素。

其次，在讨论不同范式时，文章没有平等地呈现双方的观点。它将“赤字模型”描述为一种被批评的方法，而将“关键”研究描述为更好的选择。然而，这种描述忽略了“关键”研究可能存在的局限性和缺点。

此外，文章没有探讨可能存在的风险和负面影响。它只是简单地提出了一些扩展研究议程的建议，但没有考虑到这些建议可能带来的问题或挑战。

最后，文章没有提供足够的证据来支持其主张。它只是基于作者对PUS研究领域发展的观察和推测，而没有引用相关研究或数据来支持其论点。

综上所述，这篇文章在讨论公众对科学理解研究领域中存在一些潜在偏见和不足之处。它需要更多的证据和平衡来支持其观点，并更全面地考虑到可能存在的风险和挑战。

# Topics for further research:

* Public understanding of science research
* Criticisms of deficit model
* Alternative perspectives on public understanding of science
* Limitations of deficit model
* Risks and challenges in expanding research agenda
* Evidence supporting claims in the article
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