Biotechnology-the Making of a Global Controversy

Biotechnology is one of the fastest growing areas of scientific, technical and industrial innovation; it is also one of the most widely publicised new technologies. Innovations as varied as the development of genetic testing and therapies, genetically modified food crops, animal and stem-cell cloning have given rise to increasingly prominent public debates. Genetically modified soya and Dolly the sheep – to mention the two most prominent events – led to world-wide controversies. While the biotechnology industry initially assumed that regulatory processes were the sole hurdle, it is now apparent that a second hurdle, national and international public opinion, must be reckoned with. *Biotechnology* – *the Making of a Global Controversy* brings together key findings from a comparative study of public perceptions, media coverage and regulatory frameworks of a newly emergent technology. With chapters from leading international experts in the field, the book contributes important empirical and conceptual analyses to this crucial public debate.

Martin W. Bauer is Senior Lecturer in Social Psychology at the London School of Economics and Research Fellow at the Science Museum London. He co-coordinated the research presented in this volume. His research interests are the functions of resistance in social processes; longitudinal indicators of public understanding of science through media and survey research; the changing representations of science and technology in texts and images. His publications include *Resistance to New Technology: Nuclear Power, Information Technology, Biotechnology* (Cambridge, 1995).

George Gaskell is Professor of Social Psychology at the London School of Economics and Director of the School's Methodology Institute. His research interests include risk as a representation; expert and lay understanding of risk and uncertainty; the structure of public perception of biotechnology; how public opinion is shaped by and shapes policy and regulation; public opinion and regulation; and the democratisation of science and technology policy. He is currently coordinator of the research project 'Life Sciences in European Society', funded under the European Commission's 5th Framework Programme.

The coordinators' co-publications include Qualitative Researching with Text, Image and Sound (2000), Biotechnology 1996–2000: the Years of Controversy (2001) and Biotechnology in the Public Sphere: a European Sourcebook (1998).

Cambridge University Press 978-0-521-77317-1 - Biotechnology – The Making of a Global Controversy Edited by M.W.Bauer and G.Gaskell Frontmatter More information Cambridge University Press 978-0-521-77317-1 - Biotechnology – The Making of a Global Controversy Edited by M.W.Bauer and G.Gaskell Frontmatter More information

Biotechnology – the Making of a Global Controversy

edited by M. W. Bauer and G. Gaskell



Published in association with the Science Museum, London

CAMBRIDGE UNIVERSITY PRESS Cambridge, New York, Melbourne, Madrid, Cape Town, Singapore, São Paulo, Delhi, Tokyo, Mexico City

Cambridge University Press The Edinburgh Building, Cambridge CB2 8RU, UK

Published in the United States of America by Cambridge University Press, New York

www.cambridge.org Information on this title: www.cambridge.org/9780521773171

© Board of Trustees of the Science Museum 2002

This publication is in copyright. Subject to statutory exception and to the provisions of relevant collective licensing agreements, no reproduction of any part may take place without the written permission of Cambridge University Press.

First published 2002

A catalogue record for this publication is available from the British Library

Library of Congress Cataloguing in Publication Data Biotechnology : the making of a global controversy / M. W. Bauer & G. Gaskell, eds. p. cm. Includes bibliographical references and index. ISBN 0-521-77317-2 – ISBN 0-521-77439-X (pb.) I. Biotechnology – Europe – Public opinion. 2. Mass media – Europe. 3. Biotechnology – Social aspects. I. Bauer, Martin W. II. Gaskell, George. TP248.23.B563 2002 660.6 – dc21 2001052636

ISBN 978-0-521-77317-1 Hardback ISBN 978-0-521-77439-0 Paperback

Cambridge University Press has no responsibility for the persistence or accuracy of URLs for external or third-party internet websites referred to in this publication, and does not guarantee that any content on such websites is, or will remain, accurate or appropriate. Information regarding prices, travel timetables, and other factual information given in this work is correct at the time of first printing but Cambridge University Press does not guarantee the accuracy of such information thereafter.

Contents

	List of plates List of figures List of tables List of contributors Acknowledgements	page viii ix xi xiii xvii
1	Researching the public sphere of biotechnology MARTIN W. BAUER AND GEORGE GASKELL	1
Part I	The framing of a new technology: 1973–1996	
2	Promise, problems and proxies: twenty-five years of debate and regulation in Europe HELGE TORGERSEN, JÜRGEN HAMPEL, MARIE-LOUISE VON BERGMANN-WINBERG, ELEANOR BRIDGMAN, JOHN DURANT, EDNA EINSIEDEL, BJÖRN FJÆSTAD, GEORGE GASKELL, PETRA GRABNER, PETRA HIEBER, ERLING JELSØE, JESPER LASSEN, ATHENA MAROUDA-CHATJOULIS, TORBEN HVIID NIELSEN, TIMO RUSANEN, GEORGE SAKELLARIS, FRANZ SEIFERT, CARLA SMINK, TOMASZ TWARDOWSKI AND MERCI WAMBUI KAMARA	21
3	Media coverage 1973–1996: trends and dynamics JAN M. GUTTELING, ANNA OLOFSSON, BJÖRN FJÆSTAD, MATTHIAS KOHRING, ALEXANDER GOERKE, MARTIN W. BAUER AND TIMO RUSANEN. WITH THE FURTHER COOPERATION OF: AGNES ALLANSDOTTIR, ANNE BERTHOMIER, SUZANNE DE CHEVEIGNÉ, HELLE FREDERIKSEN, GEORGE GASKELL, MARTINA LEONARZ, MILTOS LIAKOPOULOS, ARNE THING MORTENSEN, ANDRZEJ PRZESTALSKI, GEORG RUHRMANN, MARIA RUSANEN, MICHAEL SCHANNE, FRANZ SEIFERT, ANGELIKI STATHOPOULOU AND WOLFGANG WAGNER	95

v

vi	Contents	
4	The institutions of bioethics JEAN-CHRISTOPHE GALLOUX, ARNE THING MORTENSEN, SUZANNE DE CHEVEIGNÉ, AGNES ALLANSDOTTIR, AIGLI CHATJOULI AND GEORGE SAKELLARIS	129
5	Controversy, media coverage and public knowledge MARTIN W. BAUER AND HEINZ BONFADELLI	149
	II Public representations in 1996: structures unctions	
6	Traditional blue and modern green resistance TORBEN HVIID NIELSEN, ERLING JELSØE AND SUSANNA ÖHMAN	179
7	The structure of public perceptions CEES MIDDEN, DANIEL BOY, EDNA EINSIEDEL, BJÖRN FJÆSTAD, MILTOS LIAKOPOULOS, JON D. MILLER, SUSANNA ÖHMAN AND WOLFGANG WAGNER	203
8	European regions and the knowledge deficit model NICK ALLUM, DANIEL BOY AND MARTIN W. BAUER	224
ç	Pandora's genes – images of genes and nature WOLFGANG WAGNER, NICOLE KRONBERGER, NICK ALLUM, SUZANNE DE CHEVEIGNÉ, CARMEN DIEGO, GEORGE GASKELL, MARCUS HEINBEN, CEES MIDDEN, MARIANNE ØDEGAARD, SUSANNA ÖHMAN, BIANCA RIZZO, TIMO RUSANEN AND ANGELIKI STATHOPOULOU	244
Part	III The watershed years 1996/97: two case studies	
10	Testing times – the reception of Roundup Ready soya in Europe JESPER LASSEN, AGNES ALLANSDOTTIR, MILTOS LIAKOPOULOS, ARNE THING MORTENSEN AND ANNA OLOFSSON	279
11	Brave new sheep – the clone named Dolly E DNA EINSIEDEL, AGNES ALLANSDOTTIR, NICK ALLUM, MARTIN W. BAUER, ANNE BERTHOMIER, AIGLI CHATJOULI, SUZANNE DE CHEVEIGNÉ, ROBIN DOWNEY, JAN M. GUTTELING, MATTHIAS KOHRING,	313

	Contents	vii
	MARTINA LEONARZ, FEDERICA MANZOLI, ANNA OLOFSSON, ANDRZEJ PRZESTALSKI, TIMO RUSANEN, FRANZ SEIFERT, ANGELIKI STATHOPOULOU AND WOLFGANG WAGNER	
Part IV	The transatlantic puzzle	
12	Worlds apart? Public opinion in Europe and the USA GEORGE GASKELL, PAUL THOMPSON AND NICK ALLUM	351
Part V	Towards a social theory of new technology	
13	The biotechnology movement MARTIN W. BAUER AND GEORGE GASKELL	379
	Index	405

Plates

9.1	Photo of tomato in Austrian newspaper	page 259
	Source: Reprinted from Salzburger Nachrichten,	
	19 March 1997, © Erwin Johann Wodicka.	
9.2	Photo of 'Belgian Blue'	260
	Source: Helsingborgs bild AB/Scanpix Sverige AB.	
11.1	Dolly, the cloned sheep, facing the world's media	
	cameras	320
	Source: Murdo Macleod, February 1997	
	(M@murdophoto.com).	
11.2	Professor Wilmut contemplating a test tube	322
	Source: Reuters ROS06 25FEB97 file: PP.Medical.exp).
11.3	Cover page of Der Spiegel, 3 March 1997	337

viii

Figures

3.1	Themes in the coverage of modern biotechnology	
	across Europe, 1973–1996	page 103
3.2	Actors in the coverage of modern biotechnology	
	across Europe, 1973–1996	106
3.3	Reported locations of modern biotechnology activity	
	across Europe, 1973–1996	109
3.4	Relation between negative or positive coverage of	
	modern biotechnology and public attitude and	
	knowledge across Europe	115
4.1	Ethics as a theme in the press coverage of	
	biotechnology, 1973-1995	131
5.1	Biotechnology as a topic of conversation by 1996	163
5.2	Knowledge gap, 1996, and level of polity activity,	
	1985–1998	166
5.3	Political polarisation and knowledge gap, 1996	167
6.1	Anticipated effects of new technologies in the next	
	twenty years: EU 15, 1996	181
6.2	General expectations about biotechnology in the	
	next twenty years: the balance of opinion in the EU,	
	1978–1996	182
6.3	Expectations about biotechnology in the next twenty	
	years across nations, 1996	183
6.4	The sceptics' arguments	190
7.1	General attitudes to six different technologies	204
7.2	Specific attitudes to six applications of genetic	
	technology	206
7.3	Mean aggregate attitudes across Europe	208
7.4	A structural model representing antecedent factors	
	of attitudes toward biotechnology	213
7.5	Country differences in average attitude extremity	217
7.6	Country differences in knowledge: correspondence	
	analysis, canonical normalisation	219

ix

x List of figures

8.1		
	attitudes to biotechnology in relation to GDP per head	229
8.2	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	
	with biotechnology and patterns of regional	
	development across Europe	237
9.1	Evaluations and topics mentioned by respondents	
	from ten European countries when asked about	
	biotechnology: correspondence analysis,	
	canonical normalisation	247
9.2	Scatterplot of European countries by average level of	
	textbook knowledge and average level of having heard	
	or read about biotechnology	251
9.3	Correspondence analysis of open question for	
	countries, evaluative tone and images	266
12.1	Mean support for five applications of biotechnology:	
	Europe and USA	353
12.2	Number of articles about biotechnology in	
	opinion-leading press, 1984–1996	357
13.1	The biotechnology movement	388
13.2	Challenge and response within the movement	389
13.3	The technology movement reaching out to the public	391
13.4	The three arenas of the public sphere	392
13.5	European elite press coverage of biotechnology,	
	1973–1996	396
13.6	The movement mobilising milieus in the three arenas	398

Tables

2.1	General issues in the biotechnology debate	page 24
2.2	Definitions of terms	25
2.3	Phases in the debate about biotechnology	27
3.1	Number of articles and distribution across Europe by	
	octade, 1973–1996	102
3.2	Journalistic framing of modern biotechnology in the	
	opinion-leading press across Europe, 1973–1996	111
3.3	Spearman rank order correlations across countries	
	between public perception and knowledge, with	
	positive or negative overall characteristics of the	
	coverage of modern biotechnology, and themes,	
	actor groups and location of activity	114
3A.1	Main characteristics of the research material	120
3A.2	Main themes in the coverage of modern	
	biotechnology across Europe: trends, 1973-1996	122
3A.3	Main actors in the coverage of modern biotechnology	
	across Europe: trends, 1973–1996	124
3A.4	Main location of reported activity in the coverage	
	of modern biotechnology across Europe: trends,	
	1973–1996	126
5.1	Knowledge levels and knowledge gaps in different	
	countries	157
5.2	Relevance of biotechnology and level of education	
	by country	159
5.3	Message discrimination by level of education and	
	relevance	160
5.4	Interpersonal communication by level of education	
	and relevance	164
5.5	Knowledge levels by education and message	
	discrimination	165
5.6	Knowledge gaps, changes in knowledge gaps,	
	intensity of media coverage, and trends in coverage	168
		xi

xii	List of tables	
5A.1	Knowledge indicators by level of education	173
6.1	Profiles of 'blue' and 'green' opponents in five	
	European countries, 1996	186
6.2	Valuation of biotechnology by the 'blue' and 'green'	
	segments in Sweden	194
7.1	Positive and negative expectations about biotechnology	209
7.2	The positions of European countries in terms of	
	evaluative consistency	209
7.3	Relation between knowledge and general and specific	
	attitudes	219
8.1	Public understanding of science in the transition from	
	industrial to post-industrial society	226
8.2	The variables used in the analysis of the multilevel	
	model groups	231
8.3	The variance explained in the multilevel models	234
8.4	Some European regions classified by economic	
	dynamism	236
9.1	Comparison of the analysis results of the open	
	question responses for six European countries	249
9.2	Main characteristics of data sets and results of analyses	274
11.1	Dolly day by day, 24 February – 5 March 1997	326
11.2	Dolly: type of benefit and risk evaluations	335
11.3	Dolly: the image of science	335
12.1	Three common logics in relation to attitudes to five	
	applications of biotechnology	354
12.2	Distribution of logics for five applications of	
	biotechnology: Europe and USA	355
12.3	Content of press coverage in the USA and Europe	359
12.4	Trust in the US Department of Agriculture and the	
	federal Food and Drugs Administration	373
13.1	The operating principles of the three arenas of the	
	public sphere	394

List of contributors

- AGNES ALLANSDOTTIR Department of Communication Science, University of Siena, Italy
- NICK ALLUM Methodology Institute, London School of Economics and Political Science, UK
- *MARTIN W. BAUER Department of Social Psychology, London School of Economics and Political Science, UK
- MARIE-LOUISE VON BERGMANN-WINBERG Faculty of Interdisciplinary Research, Mid Sweden University, Oestersund, Sweden
- ANNE BERTHOMIER Laboratoire Communication et Politique, Centre National de la Recherche Scientifique (CNRS), Paris, France
- HEINZ BONFADELLI Institute of Mass Communication and Media Research, University of Zürich, Switzerland
- DANIEL BOY Maison des Sciences de l'Homme, Centre d'Études de la Vie Politique Française (Cevipof), Paris, France
- ELEANOR BRIDGMAN Public Understanding of Science Group, Science Museum, London
- AIGLI CHATJOULI Department of Biological Research and Biotechnology, Office of Science Communication and Bioethics, National Hellenic Research Foundation, Athens, Greece
- SUZANNE DE CHEVEIGNÉ Laboratoire Communication et Politique, Centre National de la Recherche Scientifique (CNRS), Paris, France
- CARMEN DIEGO Department of Sociology, ISCTE, University of Lisbon, Portugal
- ROBIN DOWNEY Faculty of General Studies, University of Calgary, Canada

* Co-ordinators of the project

xiii

xiv List of contributors

- JOHN DURANT Director, At-Bristol, Bristol, UK
- EDNA F. EINSIEDEL Faculty of General Studies, University of Calgary, Canada
- BJÖRN FJÆSTAD Mid Sweden University, Stockholm, Sweden
- HELLE FREDERIKSEN Department of Communication, Education and Computer Science, Roskilde University, Denmark
- JEAN-CHRISTOPHE GALLOUX University of Versailles Saint-Quentin and Director of the Centre de Recherche en Droit de Technologies de l'Information et du Vivant (CRDTIV)
- *GEORGE GASKELL Methodology Institute, London School of Economics and Political Science, UK
- ALEXANDER GOERKE Faculty of Social and Behaviour Sciences, Friedrich Schiller University, Jena, Germany
- PETRA GRABNER Department of Political Science, University of Salzburg, Austria
- JAN M. GUTTELING Department of Communication Studies, University of Twente, Enschede, The Netherlands
- JÜRGEN HAMPEL Centre of Technology Assessment in Baden-Württemberg, Stuttgart, Germany
- MARCUS HEINBEN Centre of Technology Assessment in Baden-Württemberg, Stuttgart, Germany
- PETRA HIEBER Department of Social and Economic Psychology, University of Linz, Austria

ERLING JELSØE – Department of Environment, Technology and Social Studies, Roskilde University, Denmark

- MERCI WAMBUI KAMARA Department of Environment, Technology and Social Studies, Roskilde University, Denmark
- MATTHIAS KOHRING Department of Media Science, Friedrich Schiller University, Jena, Germany
- NICOLE KRONBERGER Department of Social and Economic Psychology, University of Linz, Austria
- JESPER LASSEN Department of Development and Planning, Aalborg University, Denmark

List of contributors

- MARTINA LEONARZ Institute of Mass Communication and Media Research, University of Zürich, Switzerland
- MILTOS LIAKOPOULOS Europäische Akademie zur Erforschung von Folgen wissenschaftlich-technischer Entwicklungen, Bad Neuwahr-Ahrwiler, Germany
- FREDERICA MANZOLI Department of Communication Science, University of Siena, Italy
- ATHENA MAROUDA-CHATJOULIS Institute of Applied Psychology, Department of Communication and Mass Media, University of Athens, Greece
- CEES J. H. MIDDEN Department of Technology Management, Eindhoven University of Technology, The Netherlands
- JON D. MILLER Centre for Biomedical Communications, Northwestern University, Chicago, USA
- ARNE THING MORTENSEN Department of Communications, Roskilde University, Denmark
- TORBEN HVIID NIELSEN Centre for Technology and Culture, University of Oslo, Norway
- MARIANNE ODEGAARD Centre for Technology and Culture, University of Oslo, Norway
- SUSANNA ÖHMAN Mid Sweden University, Oestersund, Sweden
- ANNA OLOFSSON Mid Sweden University, Oestersund, Sweden
- ANDRZEJ PRZESTALSKI Institute of Sociology, Adam Mickiewicz University, Poznan, Poland
- BIANCA RIZZO Department of Communication, University of Siena, Italy
- GEORG RUHRMANN Department of Media Science, Friedrich Schiller University, Jena, Germany
- MARIA RUSANEN Department of Social Sciences, University of Kuopio, Finland
- TIMO RUSANEN Department of Social Sciences, University of Kuopio, Finland

GEORGE SAKELLARIS – Institute of Biological Research, National Hellenic Research Foundation, Athens, Greece

xv

xvi List of contributors

- MICHAEL SCHANNE AGK Communication Consulting, Zürich, Switzerland
- FRANZ SEIFERT Institute of Advanced Studies, University of Vienna, Austria
- G. CARLA J. SMINK SWOKA Institute for Consumer Research, The Netherlands
- ANGELIKI STATHOPOULOU Department of Qualitative Research, Metron Analysis S.A., Athens, Greece
- PAUL THOMPSON Department of Philosophy, Purdue University, Lafayette, Indiana, USA
- HELGE TORGERSEN Institut für Technikfolgen Abschätzung, Österreichische Akademie der Wissenschaften, Vienna, Austria
- TOMASZ TWARDOWSKI Institute of Bioorganic Chemistry, Polish Academy of Sciences, Poznan, Poland
- WOLFGANG WAGNER Institut für Pädagogie und Psychologie, Johannes-Kepler-University, Linz, Austria

Acknowledgements

The research for this book was funded by the Fourth (EU) RTD Framework, Concerted Actions BIO4-CT98-0488 (DG12) and BIO4-CT95-0043 (DG12-SSMA), granted to John Durant at the Science Museum, London, UK. The book was written with the support of the European Commission, Research Directorate (QLRT-1999-00286). The authors and contributors acknowledge a debt of gratitude to John Durant, who played a vital role in the research but who has moved on to new challenges. Thanks also to Jane Gregory for her English language work on the chapters.

Additional funding was received from the following institutions:

- Austria: Österreichischer Fonds zur Förderung der wissenschaftlichen Forschung, P11849-SOZ, and Institute of Technology Assessment, Austrian Academy of Sciences.
- Canada: Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council (Science and Technology Policy Strategic Grants Program).
- Denmark: Danish Social Science Research Council for research within the project 'Biotechnology and the Danish Public'.
- France: Ministry of Agriculture (DGAL), INRA and CNRS (SHS and Programme 'Risques collectifs et situations de crise').
- Germany: Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft (DFG), contracts 467/2-1 and 467/2-2.

Poland: Polish State Committee for Research.

- Sweden: Mid Sweden University, the Freja Foundation, the Erinaceidæ Foundation, the Megn Bergvall Foundation and the Swedish Natural Science Research Council.
- United Kingdom: Leverhulme Trust, contract F/4/BG, 'Biotechnology and the British Public'.

The publisher has used its best endeavours to ensure that the URLs for external websites referred to in this book are correct and active at the time of going to press. However, the publisher has no responsibility for the websites and can make no guarantee that a site will remain live or that the content is or will remain appropriate.

xvii