

Alma Mater Studiorum Università di Bologna  
Archivio istituzionale della ricerca

“Visual Science Literacy”: Images and Public Understanding of Science in the Digital Age

This is the final peer-reviewed author’s accepted manuscript (postprint) of the following publication:

*Published Version:*

Bucchi, M., Saracino, B. (2016). “Visual Science Literacy”: Images and Public Understanding of Science in the Digital Age. SCIENCE COMMUNICATION, 38(6), 812-819 [10.1177/1075547016677833].

*Availability:*

This version is available at: <https://hdl.handle.net/11585/727380> since: 2022-02-28

*Published:*

DOI: <http://doi.org/10.1177/1075547016677833>

*Terms of use:*

Some rights reserved. The terms and conditions for the reuse of this version of the manuscript are specified in the publishing policy. For all terms of use and more information see the publisher's website.

This item was downloaded from IRIS Università di Bologna (<https://cris.unibo.it/>).  
When citing, please refer to the published version.

(Article begins on next page)

This is the final peer-reviewed accepted manuscript of:

**[Massimiano Bucchi, Barbara Saracino, *Visual Science Literacy: Images and Public Understanding of Science in the Digital Age*, in “Science Communication”, Volume: 38, Issue: 6, page(s): 812-819]**

The final published version is available online at:

**[\[https://doi.org/10.1177/1075547016677833\]](https://doi.org/10.1177/1075547016677833)**

Rights / License:

The terms and conditions for the reuse of this version of the manuscript are specified in the publishing policy. For all terms of use and more information see the publisher's website.

*This item was downloaded from IRIS Università di Bologna (<https://cris.unibo.it/>)*

***When citing, please refer to the published version.***

# **“VISUAL SCIENCE LITERACY”: IMAGES AND PUBLIC UNDERSTANDING OF SCIENCE IN THE DIGITAL AGE**

**Massimiano Bucchi<sup>1</sup> and Barbara Saracino<sup>2</sup>**

<sup>1</sup> Department of Sociology, University of Trento, Italy.

<sup>2</sup> Department of Social Sciences, University of Naples Federico II, Italy.

The authors contributed equally to this work.

Corresponding author: Massimiano Bucchi, Department of Sociology, University of Trento, via Verdi 26, Italy. Email: [massimiano.bucchi@unitn.it](mailto:massimiano.bucchi@unitn.it)

## **Abstract**

Since its very beginning, modern science has put images at the center of its communicative processes: drawings, diagrams, schemes and later photographs, satellite images, film. In the age of digital communication, specialists and publics live constantly immersed in a visually dense environment, particularly when it comes to science and technology content. Do we have the competence to decipher all these images, often complex and elaborate? If the so-called “science literacy” has become a standard dimension of public understanding of science at the international level, much less studied so far is visual science literacy. We tested empirical indicators of visual science literacy in the context of three surveys (2014, 2015, 2016) of public perception in Italy on a representative sample of the population. The results show that respondents fare generally better in recognizing images related to science than in responding to textual questions. Images could offer relevant opportunities for greater public engagement with scientific results.

## **Keywords**

Visual science literacy, images, science communication, public understanding of science, science in society.

Since Robert Hooke's *Micrographia* – a collection of drawings, mostly from observations at the microscope, that astonished readers when it appeared in 1665 – modern science has put images at the center of its communicative processes: drawings, diagrams, schemes and later photographs, satellite images, film. In the age of digital communication, specialists and publics live constantly immersed in a visually dense environment, particularly when it comes to science and technology content (Barrow, 2008; Bucchi & Canadelli, 2015; Pauwels, 2006).

The quality – and sometimes even the beauty – of images has acquired great importance in order to publish papers in academic journals in areas like the physical, astronomical and life sciences (Madhusoodanan, 2016; Nelkin, 1994; Rödder, Franzen, & Weingart, 2012). In the popular domain, a pervasive role is played by the presentation of data in sophisticated/interactive form which has become commonplace for leading digital outlets (Tufte, 1997; Tufte, 2002). Do we have the competence to decipher all these images, often complex and elaborate?

The so-called “science literacy” (Miller, 1983; Miller, 1992; Bauer, 1994) has become a standard dimension in studies and discussion of public understanding of science at the international level; longitudinal trends, comparison across different publics and countries have also been extensively used to invoke policies and strategies for public engagement with science (Bauer, Shukla, & Allum, 2012; Bucchi & Trench, 2014; Bucchi & Trench, 2016). However, science literacy has so far always been defined in terms of the ability of respond to questions about scientific content, largely neglecting the fact that the visual has historically been central to science communication; this is even more so in the context of contemporary circulation of information through digital media (Frankel & DePace, 2012; Ione, 2004; Struken & Cartwright, 2009; Bucchi, 2016). One methodological reason for this limitation might have been the fact that during the past decade, many surveys of public understanding of science were conducted through CATI (Computer Assisted Telephone Interviewing) techniques (Allum et al., 2008; Bauer, Allum, & Miller, 2007; Bauer & Falade, 2014).

We tested empirical indicators of visual science literacy in the context of the three latest editions (2014, 2015 and 2016) of a long term, periodical survey of public perception and opinion about science and technology conducted since 2003 on a cross-sectional, representative sample of 1,000 Italian citizens aged over 15 years

(Bucchi & Saracino, 2016). The sample is designed to represent the Italian population by gender, age, area of residence and educational level.

Through CAWI (Computer Assisted Web Interviewing), in each edition of the survey a portion of respondents (30% in 2014 and 2015, 60% in 2016) were asked to recognize images related to science; in 2016, images of visible scientists were also introduced. The selection of proposed images to be tested for recognition by interviewees followed the same principle that historically guided the definition of traditional indicators of science literacy, i.e., submitting items that can be considered part of the broad science culture. In visual terms, this means looking for classical images that have become standard references – if not “icons” – of science communication in the public arena. As for textual items used as traditional indicators of science literacy, empirical testing could also help identify those images whose recognition appears robust enough across different samples or data collections, as well as those which can be better used to assess different degrees of visual literacy among the population.


The results indicate that an image like the “double helix” of DNA – originally drawn by Francis Crick’s wife, Odile, for the 1953 *Nature* paper by James Watson and Francis Crick – and the image of the Earth taken during the NASA (National Aeronautics and Space Administration) Apollo 8 mission of 1968 are familiar to most respondents (respectively 94% and 95%, a consistent result both in 2014 and 2015 surveys). About 8 and 7 respondents out of 10 are also able to recognize, respectively, an image of a comet surface taken during the recent ESA (European Space Agency) “Rosetta” mission (81% in 2016), and a widespread (yet anonymous) image of IVF (80% in 2015 and 70% in 2016). Other images, like Niels Bohr’s original model of the hydrogen atom (proposed in the 2015 survey), appear much less familiar to the public (44%). With regard to familiarity with visible scientists (items introduced only in 2016), not surprisingly, more than 90% correctly recognize the face of Albert Einstein. It seems more noticeable, however, that a high proportion of respondents are also familiar with the portrait of physicist and CERN (European Organization for Nuclear Research) Director Fabiola Gianotti (76%) and two-thirds with Nobel laureate in physics and chemistry Marie Curie (Figure 1). The relevant role of images is also confirmed by the fact that before actually seeing her portrait, only 57% of respondents declared they were familiar with the name of Gianotti.

If we compare results from items about visual science literacy with results from standard science literacy questions, the difference is quite remarkable. Although science literacy as measured by textual questions has slightly improved in recent years, in 2014 16% of interviewees could not respond correctly to any of the standardized textual items seeking to assess science literacy. With regard to visual science literacy, in the same year only 0.8% of respondents could not recognize correctly any of the submitted images; this percentage has dropped to almost zero (0.1%) in 2016 when scientists' portraits were included (Figures 2 and 3).


It is also interesting to note that visual science literacy and 'traditional' science literacy do not depend in the same way on the respondents' socio-demographic features. Both dimensions of science literacy increase with the general education level: 50% of interviewees with a university degree could correctly recognize all five visual items submitted in 2016. Traditional science literacy significantly correlates with age as well: the highest percentage of respondents failing to answer correctly all textual items set to measure traditional science literacy is concentrated among citizens aged over 60 and with low education. The same does not hold for visual science literacy, which appears rather homogeneously distributed across age groups.

Of course recognizing an image associated with science like the DNA double helix or Einstein's face does not necessarily imply conclusions on specific knowledge of content on the part of interviewees. Still, familiarity with science images could provide a relevant hook for science communication strategies, by anchoring more substantial information to already familiar images across different sectors of the general public.


We see our study mainly as a preliminary methodological exercise, aiming at sparking discussion on indicators of visual science literacy and at stimulating other empirical studies that could help develop, as for traditional science literacy, standardized and robust items that could be used internationally to monitor differences and trends in visual science literacy. Such indicators appear increasingly needed in the visually dense – and visually challenging – communicative environment of contemporary science communication.

	A virus under the microscope	2014	2015		A desert surface at night	2016
		0.9	0.9			9.5
	<b>The structure of DNA</b>	<b>94.1</b>	<b>94.4</b>		The South Pole surface	9.2
	A spiral staircase	5.0	4.7		<b>A comet surface</b>	<b>81.3</b>
		2014				2016
	<b>The first nuclear test</b>	<b>83.7</b>			Margherita Hack	19.8
	A volcanic eruption	3.2			Rosalind Franklin	15.0
	A cloud in the shape of mushroom	13.1			<b>Marie Curie</b>	<b>65.2</b>
		2014				2016
	A balloon	0.4			<b>Fabiola Gianotti</b>	<b>75.9</b>
	The Moon seen from Earth	4.4			Samantha Cristoforetti	9.9
	<b>The Earth seen from the Moon</b>	<b>95.2</b>			Elizabeth Blackburn	14.2
		2015				2016
	A geometrical demonstration	9.1			<b>Albert Einstein</b>	<b>91.1</b>
	A solar system representation	46.7			Niels Bohr	4.8
	<b>Bohr's model of hydrogen atom</b>	<b>44.2</b>			Giulio Natta	4.1
		2015	2016			
	<b>In vitro fertilization</b>	<b>79.9</b>	<b>70.0</b>			
	Stem cell injection	16.4	28.0			
	A drop of water under the microscope	3.7	2.0			

**Figure 1 Familiarity with some images related to science (% of valid responses; 2014: n=240; 2015: n=244; 2016: n=525)**



**Figure 2 Standard science literacy items: % of correct answers (2007: n=988; 2008: n=996; 2009: n=1,020; 2010: n=985; 2011: n=1,001; 2012: n=995; 2013: n=1,005; 2014: n=1,040; 2015=999; 2016: n=1,002)**



**Figure 3 Science literacies compared: % of 0 correct answers (2014: n=1,040; 2015=999; 2016: n=1,002)**



## **Declaration of Conflicting Interests**

The author(s) declared no potential conflicts of interest with respect to the research, authorship, and/or publication of this article.

## **Funding**

The author(s) received no financial support for the research, authorship, and/or publication of this article.

## **Acknowledgements**

Data collection was conducted within the context of Observa Science in Society Monitor, with the support of foundation Compagnia di San Paolo.

## **References**

- Allum, N., Sturgis, P., Tabourazi, D., & Brunton-Smith, I. (2008). Science knowledge and attitudes across cultures: a meta-analysis. *Public Understanding of Science*, 17, 35-54.
- Barrow, J. D. (2008). *Cosmic Imagery: Key Images in the History of Science*. London: The Bodley Head.
- Bauer, H. H. (1994). *Scientific Literacy and the Myth of the Scientific Method*. Champaign: University of Illinois Press.
- Bauer, M. W., Allum, N., & Miller, S. (2007). What can we learn from 25 years of PUS survey research? Liberating and expanding the agenda. *Public Understanding of Science*, 16, 79-98.
- Bauer, M. W., & Falade, B. A. (2014). Public understanding of science: survey research around the world. In Bucchi, M., & Trench, B. (Eds.) *Handbook of Public Communication of Science and Technology*. 2nd ed. London and New York: Routledge, pp. 140-159.
- Bauer, M. W., Shukla, R., & Allum, N. (Eds.) (2012). *The Culture of Science: How the Public Relates to Science Across the Globe*. London and New York: Routledge.
- Bucchi, M. (2016). Editorial, Science in Society Research: Trends and Challenges. *Public Understanding of Science*, 25, 264-268.
- Bucchi, M., & Canadelli, E. (2015). *Nature Immaginate. Immagini che hanno cambiato il nostro modo di vedere la natura*. Sansepolcro: Aboca Edizioni.
- Bucchi, M., & Trench, B., (Eds.) (2014). *Handbook of Public Communication of Science and Technology*. 2nd ed. London and New York: Routledge.
- Bucchi, M., & Trench, B. (2016). *The Public Communication of Science*, 4 vol. set: *Critical Concepts in Sociology*. London and New York: Routledge.
- Bucchi, M., & Saracino, B. (2016). Scienza, tecnologia e opinione pubblica in Italia nel 2015. In Pellegrini, G., & Saracino, B. (Eds.) *Annuario Scienza Tecnologia e Società 2016*. Bologna: Il Mulino, pp. 11-37.

- Frankel, F. C., & DePace, A. H. (2012). *Visual Strategies: A Practical Guide to Graphics for Scientists and Engineers*. New Haven and London: Yale University Press.
- Hooke, R. (1665). *Micrographia*. London: Jo. Martin and Ja. Allestry, Printers to the Royal Society.
- Ione, A. (2004). *Innovation and Visualization: Trajectories, Strategies, and Myths*. Amsterdam and New York: Rodopi.
- Madhusoodanan, J. (2016). Science illustration: Picture perfect. *Nature*, 534, 285-287.
- Miller, J. D. (1983). Scientific literacy: a conceptual and empirical review. *Daedalus*, 112, 29-48.
- Miller, J. D. (1992). Towards a scientific understanding of the public understanding of science and technology. *Public Understanding of Science*, 1, 23-30.
- Nelkin, D. (1994). Promotional metaphors and their popular appeal. *Public Understanding of Science*, 3, 25-31.
- Pauwels, L. (ed.) (2006). *Visual Cultures of Science: Rethinking Representational Practices in Knowledge Building and Science Communication*. Lebanon: University Press of New England.
- Rödder, S., Franzen, M., & Weingart, P. (Eds.) (2012). *The Sciences' Media Connection: Public Communication and its Repercussions*. Dordrecht: Springer.
- Struken, M., & Cartwright, L. (2009). *Practices of Looking: An Introduction to Visual Culture*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Tufte, E. R. (1997). *Visual Explanations: Images and Quantities, Evidence and Narrative*. Cheshire: Graphics Press.
- Tufte, E. R. (2002). *The Visual Display of Quantitative Information*. 2nd ed. Cheshire: Graphic Press.
- Watson, J. D., & Crick, F. H. C. (1953). A Structure for Deoxyribose Nucleic Acid. *Nature*, 171, 737-738.

## Methodology

*Period during which survey was conducted:* from 02/04/2014 to 14/04/2014, from 09/04/2015 to 14/04/2015, from 12/04/2016 to 29/04/2016.

*Geographic coverage:* Italy.

*Data collection methods:* CATI (Computer Assisted Telephone Interviewing) for 30% of the sample and CAWI (Computer Assisted Web Interviewing) for the remaining 70% in 2014 and 2015; CATI (Computer Assisted Telephone Interviewing) for 40% of the sample and CAWI (Computer Assisted Web Interviewing) for the remaining 60% in 2016.

*Sampling:* sample proportional to Italian population aged 15 or older by gender, age class and area of residence.

*Representativeness of results:* representative sample of the corresponding population.

*Units interviewed:* 1060 cases (2014), 1011 cases (2015), 1013 cases (2016); the total number of cases becomes 1040 (2014), 999 (2015), 1002 (2016) after statistical weighting applied in order to for the sample structure to correspond to that of Italian population with regard to gender, age and education level.

*Supplementary Materials:* Requests for other materials and data should be addressed to the authors.

### **Author Biographies**

**Massimiano Bucchi** is Professor of Science and Technology in Society and of Science Communication at the University of Trento, Italy and has been visiting professor in academic and research institutions in Asia, Europe, North America and Oceania. He is the author of several books (published in Italy, Brazil, Finland, China, Korea, UK and USA, Spain and Latin America) and papers in journals such as *Nature* and *Science*. He is the editor of the journal *Public Understanding of Science*.

**Barbara Saracino** is research fellow at the Department of Social Sciences, University of Naples “Federico II” and collaborates with the Department of Political Sciences, University of Florence and the Department of Sociology, University of Trento. She is member of Observa Science in Society steering committee. Her main research interests deal with social methodology, history and sociology of science.