Note: All use of this data should be properly cited. Data based on current dissertation work, to be published by Paige Brown Jarreau. Survey funding via Experiment.com, https://experiment.com/projects/something-is-wrong-on-the-internet-what-does-the-science-blogger-do.

Methodology

Survey Procedure and Pilot Testing

An online survey, administered via Qualtrics in a mobile-friendly format, was distributed via web-based channels targeting active science bloggers. The online survey consisted of both close-ended and open-ended items designed to investigate blogging roles, practices, values, editorial processes and content decisions. While some items were adapted from previous surveys of science bloggers (Lenhart & Fox, 2006), most items were informed by insights gleaned from previously conducted qualitative interviews with science bloggers. The survey data collection and analysis protocol was reviewed and approved by the Institutional Review Board at Louisiana State University, Protocol #E9033.

Funding for the online survey, which translated into a $7.00 Amazon e-card survey completion reward for the first 200 survey participants, was provided by a crowd-funding project at Experiment.com,[1] a platform for enabling scientific funding through individual donations. The Experiment.com project for this study, titled 'Something is wrong on the Internet! What does the Science Blogger do?' received $1,525.00 in pledges from 42 backers, and was successfully funded on November 14, 2014. According to the terms of the funded Experiment.com project for this study, all survey results are to be made openly accessible online and/or through peer-reviewed publication in an open access medium. The Experiment.com project page for this study

[1] https://experiment.com/projects/something-is-wrong-on-the-internet-what-does-the-science-blogger-do

also provides a blog-like section for research updates, titled 'Lab Notes,'[2] which I plan on updating regularly through at least May, 2015. As of January 14, 2015, this Experiment.com project has received 15,349 total page views from 43 different traffic sources.

Amazon.com e-card survey rewards, funded through Experiment.com, were distributed manually to a subset of the first 200 vetted science bloggers who fully completed the online survey. Each of the first 200 qualifying participants, who were vetted based upon providing a valid e-mail address and sensible open-ended question responses,[3] were prompted to indicate in a section at the end of the survey whether they would like to a) receive their $7.00 reward via a designated e-mail address, or b) donate their reward back to the researcher to fund subsequent research on this topic or pay for open access publishing fees, etc. This option was provided considering early project feedback from some science bloggers indicating they would rather volunteer their time without getting paid, or they would rather not have to report the reward to their universities, etc. Of the first 200 qualifying participants, 130 selected to receive the $7.00 reward, while 70 chose to donate the reward back to the researcher. This choice was recorded for use as a control variable during survey data analysis if deemed necessary. All other survey participants received a non-cash reward for survey completion in the form of a complimentary full-resolution download of a nature landscape photograph (my original work).

Prior to wide-scale distribution of the survey, a survey pilot test was conducted among a population of 20-30 SciLogs.de science bloggers (during a SciLogs.de science blogger meeting

[2] https://experiment.com/projects/something-is-wrong-on-the-internet-what-does-the-science-blogger-do/updates

[3] A large number of spam or 'bot' survey responses required manual validation for distribution of e-card rewards. Participants who did not complete any open-ended questions, or who provided non-sense answers in open-ended question boxes, were determined to be spam or bot participants attempting to 'cheat' the survey in order to receive the $7.00 e-card. This likely occurred as a byproduct of the widespread distribution of my survey in public social media channels.

in Deidesheim, Germany). The pilot survey was also sent directly to 5 hand-selected science bloggers known to have experience in survey-based social science research. The latter science bloggers were asked via e-mail to provide feedback on survey length, whether any survey items were unclear, and whether multiple-choice question options seemed adequate, mutually exclusive and exhaustive. Response data from the pilot study and requested feedback from select participants was used to revise the questionnaire as appropriate prior to broader distribution. Revisions made after pilot testing included the addition of definitions for select multiple-choice question options (e.g. when asked to rate his use of traditional news values, one pilot testing blogger was unfamiliar with the term "completeness") and the addition of two open-ended questions about personal/professional benefits and drawbacks of blogging. The average time required for survey completion observed during pilot testing was 27 minutes. I believed this to be a reasonable amount of time to expect from a population that tends to be highly motivated to engage in research directed at its own practices and impacts.

Sampling and Data Collection

The online survey was distributed via a Bit.ly shortlink (http://bit.ly/MySciBlog) to a variety of social media channels, listservs and personal contacts. The survey was given the title of #MySciBlog Survey for ease of discussion and promotion on social media. The survey launched on November 28, 2014 and closed on December 19, 2014. As of January 2015, the survey Bit.ly shortlink had received 2,590 clicks and was included in 82 tweets / retweets on Twitter. Social media channels used to distribute the survey included Twitter (@FromTheLabBench), LinkedIn, Google+, Reddit and Facebook. Several prominent science blogging and science writing accounts tweeted or retweeted the survey on Twitter, including

ScienceSeeker (@SciSeeker), a science blog aggregator site[4] associated with ScienceOnline, *Scientific American* magazine (@SciAm, @SciAmBlogs), Science Borealis (@ScienceBorealis), Research Whisperer, SciencePress (@SciencePresse, a French science writing organization), RealScientists.org (@RealScientists), National Association of Science Writers (@ScienceWriters), and a large number of popular science bloggers' personal Twitter accounts. The online survey was also distributed to several popular science writing and science communication listservs, including the National Association of Science Writers listserv NASW-talk,[5] the Psci-com science communication resource database listserv,[6] the International Network on Public Communication of Science and Technology listserv[7] and the Australian Science Communicators ASC-list Digest listserv.[8] The survey link and a call for participation was shared to several Google+ science and science writing groups (including Science on Google+ and ScienceOnline), and to several science, psychology and sociology sub-Reddit threads. Blog post calls for participants were published on the researcher's blog at SciLogs.com,[9] on Experiment.com project's Lab Notes page, on Medium.com,[10] on the renowned LSE Impact of Social Sciences blog,[11] on The Research Whisperer blog,[12] at ScienceSeeker.org[13] (which

[4] http://scienceseeker.org/
[5] http://www.nasw.org/nasw-talk
[6] https://www.jiscmail.ac.uk/cgi-bin/webadmin?A0=psci-com
[7] http://lists.pcst.co/cgi-bin/mailman/listinfo/network
[8] http://www.asc.asn.au/?option=com_content&task=view&id=97&Itemid=115
[9] http://www.scilogs.com/from_the_lab_bench/mysciblog-survey-of-science-bloggers-take-and-share/
[10] https://medium.com/science-and-its-communication/mysciblog-survey-of-science-bloggers-76796ff139e3
[11] http://blogs.lse.ac.uk/impactofsocialsciences/2014/11/11/science-of-science-blogging/
[12] https://theresearchwhisperer.wordpress.com/tag/paige-brown-jarreau/
[13] http://scienceseeker.org/post/453628

maintains a database of roughly 2,000 science blogs), at Science 2.0,[14] at Strange Biology[15] and at The Finch&Pea.[16] A call for survey participation was also distributed by request to the blogger back-forum at *Scientific American*'s blogging network, and was sent to digital/blog editors (via e-mail and directed tweets) at *Popular Science* magazine, *Discover* magazine, *National Geographic* magazine and several other popular blog networks.

Finally, to ensure survey distribution beyond the researcher's own social network ties, a direct request for survey participation was tweeted at or emailed to a systematic random sample of the 2,122 blogs indexed at ScienceSeeker[17] (every 10th blog, based on a random start, selected from an alphabetical list of all 2,122 blogs). If the listed blog had a single author, the Twitter handle (primary mode of contact) or e-mail address (secondary mode of contact) of the author was located via the blog homepage or a Google search, and a direct request for survey participation was sent to the author directly from the researcher's Twitter handle (@FromTheLabBench) or school e-mail address. If the listed blog had multiple authors, the request for survey participation was directed at each author individually, or at a group blog Twitter handle or email address / contact form if available. Direct contact via these modes of communication was possible for the vast majority of blogs sampled from the ScienceSeeker index. For a small number of blogs, I could not locate a Twitter handle, e-mail address or blog contact form. Combined with widespread distribution of my survey across the science blogging community present in various social networking channels, I believe this strategy of directly contacting a systematic sample of blogs indexed at ScienceSeeker provided a very robust sample

[14] http://www.science20.com/paige_brown_jarreau/blog/something_is_wrong_on_the_internet_what_does_the_science_blogger_do-147799
[15] http://strangebio.com/post/105421232819/survey-for-science-bloggers
[16] http://thefinchandpea.com/2014/12/08/survey-says/
[17] http://scienceseeker.org/index

of the English-speaking science blogger population. Given a survey response on the order of >610 valid and complete survey responses, I am currently unaware of any other survey of science bloggers that has achieved this kind of response from the science blogging community. My sampling procedure prevents me from reliably calculating a survey response rate. However, if we take the robust ScienceSeeker science blog index, project of the former ScienceOnline organization, to include anywhere from 50-70% of all English-based science blogs on the web, then the response rate for this survey can be estimated to be between 14% and 20% (counting number of blogs vs. number of bloggers). However, it is highly improbable that all potential English-based science blogs received the call for participation. If we estimate a contact rate of 20% of all potential science blogs in the sample, the estimated response rate shoots up to 72-100%. These are very rough and unreliable estimates. However, they give some context to the relevance of data provided by this survey of science bloggers.

The results of this survey are not representative of the broader science blogging population, and the final sample does not represent a random or representative sample.

Survey Respondent Criteria and Measures

Upon visiting #MySciBlog Survey link, potential participants were greeted with a personable introductory message and directions for optimal survey performance. Potential participants were informed of the goal of the survey, to ask science bloggers about their blogging practices. An inclusive description of what counted as a science blog was also included, in line with this study's objective of surveying a diverse sample of bloggers who write predominately about science, broadly speaking:

> Please take this survey if you consider yourself to be a science blogger. […] A science blog may feature content that disseminates, explains, reports, comments upon, investigates, aggregates or otherwise deals with science, scientific research, science communication, science policy, science in society, science in academia, and/or other

> science-related concepts or events. Not all science blogs look the same, and not all science blogs cover science all the time.

If participants clicked past the introductory message page, they were greeted with the study informed consent form prior to proceeding through the main survey. The full survey questionnaire and topline results are found below.

Survey Data Preparation and Analysis

Data analysis of #MySciBlog survey was conducted in IBM's SPSS software version 22. Due to a significant number of spam/bot survey responses, likely due to the presentation of a cash e-card reward for survey completion, survey responses were vetted manually. This resulted in a total of 610 valid and complete survey responses from science bloggers. In SPSS, all unfinished survey responses (several hundred cases, variable Finished = 0) were removed, except those that by visual inspection were significantly complete enough to warrant inclusion in data analysis. Survey responses were also sorted by completion time – all survey responses under 5 minutes were removed, as by manual inspection these responses appeared to be spam/bot responses with no blog name or blog URL provided. All survey responses under 10 minutes which contained invalid (duplicated text, nonsense answers, etc.) or blank open-ended responses were also removed. In all cases of removed survey responses, a blog name or URL was not given, further leading me to be confident that these were spam/bot or otherwise invalid survey responses. Several response cases in which survey completion time exceeded 10 minutes were removed due to obvious spam answers for blog name | url (e.g. "Angela | Angela"). For all remaining response cases where a blog name and/or URL was not provided (84 cases), careful analysis revealed a number of cases where no open-ended responses were provided, or where nonsensical responses were provided (e.g. listing 'Justin Timberlake' and 'Daniel Tosh' for the BlogsRead survey item, or listing the exact same generic text in multiple boxes). These cases

were all deleted unless there was significant indication that they were not spam, e.g. a recognized e-mail address, to prevent spam/bot responses from biasing survey results. A vast majority of the science bloggers participating in this survey listed their blog name and URL, and fully completed all close-ended and open-ended survey items in detail. After survey data cleaning, 610 valid and complete survey responses were available for data analysis.

Topline Questionnaire (Topline Frequencies)

About Your Blog

BlogName. What is the name and URL of your MAIN science blog, where you post most frequently or prominently, or that you usually claim to be your MAIN blog? *Note: Your blog name and URL will not be associated with your individual answers to survey questions, to preserve the anonymity of your answers. However, you may choose to skip this question if you prefer not to supply this information.* [open-ended]

BlogLocat. Where is your MAIN blog located, currently? (You may select more than 1 category)

Your own independent blog site (for example: self-hosted Wordpress, wordpress.com, blogspot.com, etc.)	**400**
A social network (for example: LinkedIn, Tumblr, etc.)	**39**
A government (.gov) website (for example: NASA blog)	**5**
Discover blogs	**5**
Guardian Science blogs	**10**
National Geographic blogs	**1**
Nature (editorial) blogs	
Science 2.0	**1**
Scientific American blogs	**13**
ScienceNews	**1**
Scientopia	**2**
SciLogs (all languages)	**15**
Science Borealis	**12**
ScienceBlogs	**9**
PLOS blogs	**5**
Popular Science blogs	**6**
Wired blogs	**4**
Other non-profit organization website (for example: Planetary Society blogs, AGU blogs, etc.)	**30**

Other traditional media organization staff blog (for example: a New York Times blog, etc.)	**11**
Other alternative media platform (for example: Medium.com, etc.)	**9**
Other blogging network	**44**
Other	**24**

AudienceT. What *best* describes your MAIN blog's TARGET audience?

Non-specialist general audience	**117**
Science-interested non-specialist general audience	**321**
Primarily students	**18**
Primarily policy-makers	**5**
Primarily scientists (including Ph.D. students and post-docs)	**100**
Primarily my friends/family	**3**
Other [please specify]	**41**
I don't know/Undecided	**4**

PageViews. How many page views does a new blog post on your MAIN blog typically get, within the first 1-2 days of posting?

Less than 100	**240**
100- 500	**202**
500 - 1,000	**59**
1,000 - 5,000	**40**
5,000 - 10,000	**13**
10,000+	**10**
Don't Know	**40**

YearBlog. What year did you first start science blogging?

2014	**70**
2013	**110**
2012	**93**
2011	**63**
2010	**86**
2009	**39**
2008	**44**
2007	**23**
2006	**20**
2005	**22**
2004 or before	**39**

YearMAIN. What year did you first start blogging where your MAIN blog is currently?

2014	**112**
2013	**146**
2012	**105**
2011	**71**
2010	**68**
2009	**34**
2008	**28**
2007	**13**
2006	**7**
2005	**7**
2005 or before	**17**

PseudoNow. Do you currently blog under a pseudonym (a fictitious name, screen name, etc. not publicly tied to your identity) on your MAIN science blog?

Yes	**78**
No	**532**

Pseudo. [If no to previous question] Have you ever blogged under a pseudonym in the past?

Yes	**135**
No	**475**

PseudoO. [If yes to either of previous 2 questions] If you have ever blogged under a pseudonym, or if you currently blog under a pseudonym, please describe your motivations for blogging pseudonymously, any benefits and drawbacks you see for doing so. [open-ended]

Authors. For your MAIN science blog, are you the only author, or are there multiple authors?

Only author	**478**
Multiple authors	**131**

Multiple1. [IF multiple authors] How many authors are there on your multiple author MAIN science blog?

2	**27**
3	**22**
4	**14**
5	**11**
6	**5**
7	**4**
8	**7**
9	**3**
10+	**37**

Multiple2. [IF multiple authors] On your multiple author blog, is there a person or group of persons in charge of editing all blog posts prior to their online publication?

Yes	**77**
No	**54**

Multiple3. [IF multiple authors] How often do you coordinate with the other blog authors in making content decisions?

Never	**12**
Rarely	**32**
Sometimes	**40**
Often	**28**
Always	**19**

Multiple4. [IF multiple authors] How often do you coordinate with the other blog authors in deciding when (dates/times) to post your content??

Never	**23**
Rarely	**22**
Sometimes	**40**
Often	**22**
Always	**24**

Multiple5. [IF multiple authors] Please describe any benefits, and any drawbacks, that you've experienced in writing for a multiple author science blog. Note: *If you prefer not to answer, please skip this question*. [open-ended]

Pay. Do you currently earn any money for blogging on your MAIN blog?

Yes	**86**
No	**519**

Amount. [If yes to Pay] Approximately how much money do you earn blogging on your MAIN blog?

< $100/month	**20**
$100 - $250/month	**21**
$250/month - $500/month	**11**
$500 - $1000/month	**11**
> $1000/month	**15**

PayMeans. [If yes to Pay] How are you paid?

A flat rate per month	**19**
A flat rate per X number of posts	**13**
Based on traffic	**18**
Through advertising (Google Adsense, etc.)	**17**
Through voluntary reader contributions	**1**
Other [Please specify]	**18**

PayAim. [If no to Pay] If you don't currently make any money from your MAIN science blog, do you aim to make any money from it in the future?

Yes	**82**
No	**435**

Blogging Roles

How often would you say *you personally* engage in the following roles as a science blogger?

[An explainer / science communicator] I explain or translate scientific information from experts to non-specialist publics.

Never	Rarely	Sometimes	Often	Always
12	**35**	**123**	**260**	**180**

[A public intellectual] I synthesize a range of complex information about science and its social implications – in which I have a degree of specialization - and present this information from a distinct, identifiable perspective.

Never	Rarely	Sometimes	Often	Always
35	**100**	**193**	**204**	**74**

[An agenda-setter] I identify and call attention to important areas of research, trends and issues, (hopefully) for further coverage by mainstream media.

Never	Rarely	Sometimes	Often	Always
89	**156**	**203**	**131**	**27**

[A watchdog] I hold scientists, scientific institutions, industry and policy-orientated organizations to scrutiny.

Never	Rarely	Sometimes	Often	Always
155	**209**	**139**	**76**	**25**

[An investigative reporter] I carry out in-depth journalistic investigations into scientific topics, especially where science meets public affairs.

Never	Rarely	Sometimes	Often	Always
257	**186**	**114**	**38**	**9**

[A civic educator] I inform non-specialist audiences about the methods, aims, limits and risks of scientific work.

Never	Rarely	Sometimes	Often	Always
59	**99**	**213**	**180**	**52**

[A curator] I gather science-related news, opinion and/or commentary and present it in a structured format, with some evaluation, for audiences.

Never	Rarely	Sometimes	Often	Always
90	**154**	**165**	**138**	**59**

[A convener] I connect and bring together scientists and various non-specialist publics to discuss science-related issues in public, either online or physically.

Never	Rarely	Sometimes	Often	Always
282	**157**	**95**	**47**	**20**

[An advocate] I report and write driven by a specific worldview or on behalf of an issue or idea, such as sustainability or environmentalism.

Never	Rarely	Sometimes	Often	Always
131	**144**	**168**	**121**	**43**

[A media critic] I take news reports about science and show where they were right, where they were wrong, what else is important to the conversation, etc.

Never	Rarely	Sometimes	Often	Always
128	**181**	**172**	**96**	**29**

Blogging Content Decisions

In answering these questions, please think about your MAIN science blog:

Approach. How often would you say you use the following approaches in your blogging?

Journalistic (Reporting on science in a more traditional fashion, often interviewing researchers and getting outside comment)

Never	Rarely	Sometimes	Often	Always
188	**214**	**117**	**68**	**22**

Editorial (Presenting your opinion on an issue/event, as well as factual information)

Never	Rarely	Sometimes	Often	Always
21	**71**	**216**	**248**	**52**

Translational/Explainer (Translating or explaining science based on your own knowledge, often in the absence of traditional journalistic reporting / interviewing)

Never	Rarely	Sometimes	Often	Always
9	**43**	**114**	**311**	**129**

Curation (Curating information, often linking to diverse sources, with or without adding commentary yourself)

Never	Rarely	Sometimes	Often	Always
76	**147**	**174**	**162**	**49**

Analysis (Collecting, creating and/or analyzing data, may involve calculation, analysis of patterns or trends, etc., typically involves creation of some original content/data)

Never	Rarely	Sometimes	Often	Always
91	**157**	**189**	**136**	**31**

Length. How long is your typical (written) blog post?

< 500 words	**122**
500 - 1,000 words	**349**
1,000 - 2,000 words	**120**
More than 2,000 words	**19**

PostFreq. How often do you typically post new material on your blog?

Multiple times a day	**17**
Every day of the week	**20**
Multiple days a week	**99**
About once a week	**122**
Multiple days a month	**155**
About once a month	**128**
Less than once a month	**69**

HowLong. Approximately how long do you spend working on a typical blog post prior to publication (may include planning, outlining, reading, interviewing, analysis, writing, etc.)?

Less than 1 hour	**54**
Between 1 and 5 hours	**323**
Between 5 and 24 hours	**127**
Between 1 and 3 days	**62**
Between 3 and 7 days	**29**
Between 1 and 2 weeks	**8**
Between 2 weeks and 1 month	**4**
More than 1 month	**3**

Factors. How important are <u>each of the following to *you*</u> when deciding if a particular scientific paper, discovery, event, issue, something in the news, etc. is worth blogging about?

That I be able to blog about it before many others

Not at all Important	-	-	-	-	-	Extremely Important
147	**132**	**77**	**79**	**114**	**47**	**13**

That it be something others are currently talking or writing about

Not at all Important	-	-	-	-	-	Extremely Important
80	**121**	**100**	**134**	**114**	**44**	**16**

That it be something I think deserves more media attention than it is getting

Not at all Important	-	-	-	-	-	Extremely Important
27	**37**	**49**	**87**	**137**	**187**	**84**

That it be relatively straightforward to explain

Not at all Important	-	-	-	-	-	Extremely Important
80	**130**	**123**	**111**	**84**	**49**	**31**

That it be something that fits my blog theme or topic very well

Not at all Important	-	-	-	-	-	Extremely Important
17	**25**	**38**	**50**	**125**	**200**	**153**

That it be something of particular importance or relevance to my readers

Not at all Important	-	-	-	-	-	Extremely Important
12	**33**	**33**	**85**	**144**	**205**	**95**

That it be related to something I am passionate about

Not at all Important	-	-	-	-	-	Extremely Important
3	**11**	**13**	**50**	**95**	**215**	**223**

That I be able to add context to it

Not at all Important	-	-	-	-	-	Extremely Important
3	**15**	**15**	**63**	**147**	**238**	**126**

That it be within my own realm of scientific expertise

Not at all Important	-	-	-	-	-	Extremely Important
22	**43**	**43**	**92**	**146**	**167**	**94**

That I have a personal experience related to it that I can share

Not at all Important	-	-	-	-	-	Extremely Important
70	**84**	**76**	**101**	**136**	**90**	**51**

That I can add of a new angle, spin or twist on it

Not at all Important	-	-	-	-	-	Extremely Important
19	**48**	**64**	**103**	**172**	**139**	**65**

That I have strong opinions about it

Not at all Important	-	-	-	-	-	Extremely Important
42	**76**	**68**	**136**	**135**	**103**	**47**

That it be accompanied by strong visuals (images, video, etc.)

Not at all Important	-	-	-	-	-	Extremely Important
79	**109**	**77**	**101**	**106**	**63**	**72**

That it be related to something I'm known for blogging about or have blogged about in the past

Not at all Important	-	-	-	-	-	Extremely Important
51	**72**	**68**	**112**	**153**	**115**	**38**

That blogging about it would be useful for my work/research outside of blogging

Not at all Important	-	-	-	-	-	Extremely Important
96	**95**	**63**	**81**	**129**	**96**	**50**

FactorsO. Are there any other factors that are important to you in deciding whether to blog about a particular scientific paper, discovery, event, issue, something in the news, etc? Please describe any that come to mind. [open ended]

Q59. How often do you… ?

blog about soft topics in science (work-life balance, gender issues, life in academia, etc.)?

Never	Rarely	Sometimes	Often	Always
152	**177**	**148**	**111**	**22**

blog about personal topics?

Never	Rarely	Sometimes	Often	Always
144	**199**	**156**	**89**	**20**

blog about new (published within the last month) scientific research papers?

Never	Rarely	Sometimes	Often	Always
57	**125**	**204**	**195**	**29**

write blog posts in response to what you perceive as poor media coverage of a scientific paper?

Never	Rarely	Sometimes	Often	Always
103	**141**	**224**	**128**	**14**

write blog posts where the primary purpose of the post is to correct some piece of current misinformation?

Never	Rarely	Sometimes	Often	Always
76	**177**	**235**	**114**	**8**

write blog posts in response to posts/stories by other science bloggers

Never	Rarely	Sometimes	Often	Always
134	**211**	**210**	**51**	**3**

Controversy1. How often would you say you write about controversial topics (or topics seen by others as controversial)?

Never	Rarely	Sometimes	Often	Always
24	**117**	**166**	**82**	**8**

Controversy2. When it comes to blogging about controversial topics (or topics seen by others as controversial), how concerned are you about the following?

Receiving hostile comments from readers

Not at all Concerned	-	-	-	Extremely Concerned
199	**191**	**100**	**83**	**33**

Having readers attack my credentials or expertise

Not at all Concerned	-	-	-	Extremely Concerned
206	**176**	**99**	**86**	**39**

Attracting disapproval from other science writers/bloggers

Not at all Concerned	-	-	-	Extremely Concerned
144	**169**	**140**	**124**	**28**

Attracting disapproval from my work colleagues

Not at all Concerned	-	-	-	Extremely Concerned
149	**139**	**141**	**126**	**50**

Attracting disciplinary action from my employer or violating my employer's social media policies

Not at all Concerned	-	-	-	Extremely Concerned
248	**150**	**72**	**84**	**50**

Alienating a part of my blog audience

Not at all Concerned	-	-	-	Extremely Concerned
147	**173**	**137**	**102**	**45**

Having an undesired effect on my readers

Not at all Concerned	-	-	-	Extremely Concerned
109	**140**	**155**	**133**	**65**

Sources of Information/Story Ideas

StoryIdeas. How often do you write blog posts based on information/ideas you get from the following sources?

Press release (includes press release aggregator sites such as ScienceDaily)

Never	Rarely	Sometimes	Often	Always
172	**164**	**168**	**101**	**4**

Press conference

Never	Rarely	Sometimes	Often	Always
334	**155**	**86**	**31**	**1**

Scientific conference

Never	Rarely	Sometimes	Often	Always
74	**135**	**251**	**139**	**7**

Professional/Other conferences (e.g. ScienceOnline)

Never	Rarely	Sometimes	Often	Always
193	**133**	**178**	**87**	**8**

Peer-reviewed journal table of contents

Never	Rarely	Sometimes	Often	Always
225	**129**	**121**	**110**	**14**

Peer-reviewed journal article(s) (via a Google / library search, etc.)

Never	Rarely	Sometimes	Often	Always
62	**96**	**198**	**205**	**40**

Peer-reviewed journal article(s) (via a media / social media link, etc.)

Never	Rarely	Sometimes	Often	Always
67	**96**	**217**	**208**	**20**

Direct suggestions or requests by others

Never	Rarely	Sometimes	Often	Always
105	**165**	**212**	**113**	**11**

Print news media

Never	Rarely	Sometimes	Often	Always
193	**165**	**141**	**94**	**11**

Online news media

Never	Rarely	Sometimes	Often	Always
80	**127**	**201**	**175**	**24**

Twitter

Never	Rarely	Sometimes	Often	Always
84	**109**	**204**	**189**	**18**

Other social network site

Never	Rarely	Sometimes	Often	Always
142	**176**	**196**	**81**	**9**

Blog by a working scientist

Never	Rarely	Sometimes	Often	Always
101	**172**	**225**	**98**	**11**

Other blog

Never	Rarely	Sometimes	Often	Always
128	**179**	**209**	**73**	**11**

Your own scientific research

Never	Rarely	Sometimes	Often	Always
125	**118**	**164**	**157**	**44**

Coursework/Textbook

Never	Rarely	Sometimes	Often	Always
272	**149**	**107**	**67**	**11**

Other non-news media (books, movies, entertainment, etc.)

Never	Rarely	Sometimes	Often	Always
122	**190**	**215**	**75**	**7**

PR-Paper. How often do you blog about scientific papers that (to your knowledge) have been covered by a press release?

Never	Rarely	Sometimes	Often	Always
65	**144**	**246**	**101**	**5**

Access. Do you have regular access to closed-access peer-reviewed journal articles, for example through your library at your workplace or through other means?

Yes	**507**
No	**102**

Access2. [If No to Access] How much is a barrier is getting access to closed-access peer-reviewed scientific literature for you?

Not a barrier	Somewhat of a barrier	Moderate barrier	Extreme barrier
20	**30**	**33**	**14**

Access3. [If No to Access] Do you have any strategies for working around limited access to peer-reviewed scientific literature? Please describe any strategies that you use. [Open-ended]

OpenAccess. How often do you blog about scientific research published open-access (e.g. open-access peer-reviewed journal articles, such as PLOS ONE papers)?

Never	Rarely	Sometimes	Often	Always
58	**109**	**264**	**128**	**15**

Embargo. Do you have access to embargoed papers with issued press releases (such as embargoed information via EurekAlert)?

Yes	**126**
No	**278**
Don't Know	**205**

EmbargoWant. Would you WANT access to embargoed papers with issued press releases (such as embargoed information via EurekAlert)?

Yes	**111**
No	**96**
Don't Know	**70**

Editorial Control

In answering these questions, please think about your MAIN science blog:

Control. How much editorial control do you usually have over your blog content?

None at all	Not much	Some	A great deal	Complete
11	**5**	**18**	**88**	**480**

Guidelines. Please describe any blogging guidelines or outlines you may have been given by your blog network, editor, group manager, etc., to steer the structure or content of your blog posts. *Note: If you are an independent blogger and you blog completely for yourself, you can skip this questions*. [Open-ended]

OptionEdit. How often do you voluntarily, of your own initiative, send blog post drafts to peer(s) (colleague(s), other writer(s)/blogger(s), etc.) for review/editing?

Never	Rarely	Sometimes	Often	Always
198	**182**	**128**	**60**	**37**

Editor. Do you currently have an editor, blog manager, blog network community manager, or someone in a similar role?

Yes	**145**
No	**461**

EditorRel. [If Yes to Editor] How would you describe your relationship with this editor or blog manager with regards to your blogging decisions? Is it generally supportive? Hands-off? Is there mutual trust? Are there every any issues? Would you change anything about it? *Note: If you prefer not to answer, please skip this question. The anonymity of your response will be strictly preserved*. [open ended]

Editing1. [If Yes to Editor] How often do you send this editor, blog manager, blog network community manager, etc. blog content for review before you publish it?

Never	Rarely	Sometimes	Often	Always
40	**25**	**18**	**22**	**38**

Editing3. [If Yes to Editor and not Rarely to Editing1] Are you *required* to send all draft blog posts to this editor or blog manager for editing?

Yes	**54**
No	**51**

Editing2. [If Yes to Editor and not Rarely to Editing1] Of the times you've sent this editor or blog manager content for review/editing before you published it, how often have you received feedback that in your opinion helped make your content better?

Never	Rarely	Sometimes	Often	Always
4	**4**	**23**	**34**	**38**

Pitch. [if Yes to Editor] Are you *required* to pitch your blog post ideas to this editor or blog manager before writing them?

Yes	**22**
No	**122**

PitchFdback. [If Yes to Pitch] How often does this editor or blog manager give you feedback on a blog post pitch that makes you take it in a different direction than you originally intended?

Never	Rarely	Sometimes	Often	Always
	4	**6**	**9**	**2**

<u>News Values</u>

NewsValue. Please indicate how important the following are *to you*, as general guiding principles in the production of your blog content. *Note: Many of these values may be important to you, but please avoid automatically marking all of them as extremely important. Mark as "extremely important" only those that you feel are extremely important in guiding what and how you blog.*

Factual accuracy

Not at all Important	-	-	-	-	-	Extremely Important
			10	**31**	**112**	**457**

Attribution (ascribing information, images, etc. to original authors/creators)

Not at all Important	-	-	-	-	-	Extremely Important
1	**3**	**10**	**25**	**64**	**169**	**334**

Completeness (telling the full story, avoiding errors of omission, etc.)

Not at all Important	-	-	-	-	-	Extremely Important
2	**5**	**21**	**63**	**125**	**242**	**151**

Transparency (disclosing one's identity/stance, one's information sources and data, etc.)

Not at all Important	-	-	-	-	-	Extremely Important
5	**12**	**12**	**53**	**113**	**206**	**207**

Fairness to different views

Not at all Important	-	-	-	-	-	Extremely Important
13	**35**	**60**	**127**	**147**	**146**	**80**

Pluralism (incorporating a diversity of views)

Not at all Important	-	-	-	-	-	Extremely Important
25	**76**	**101**	**112**	**137**	**110**	**48**

Impartiality (writing in a way that transcends personal biases, etc.)

Not at all Important	-	-	-	-	-	Extremely Important
16	**52**	**69**	**109**	**148**	**133**	**79**

Interactivity (eliciting and incorporating reader interaction)

Not at all Important	-	-	-	-	-	Extremely Important
21	**81**	**92**	**129**	**129**	**96**	**58**

NewsValue2. Please indicate how important each of the following factors *to you* in terms of deciding whether or not something is worth blogging about. *Note: Many of these values may be important to you, but please avoid automatically marking all of them as extremely important. Mark as "extremely important" only those that you feel are extremely important in guiding what and how you blog.*

Timeliness

Not at all Important	-	-	-	-	-	Extremely Important
25	**56**	**65**	**104**	**178**	**142**	**37**

Proximity / Local angle

Not at all Important	-	-	-	-	-	Extremely Important
124	**114**	**95**	**93**	**97**	**66**	**19**

Relevance to readers

Not at all Important	-	-	-	-	-	Extremely Important
12	**29**	**25**	**98**	**141**	**199**	**106**

Educational value

Not at all Important	-	-	-	-	-	Extremely Important
11	**15**	**22**	**54**	**138**	**195**	**173**

Impact to society

Not at all Important	-	-	-	-	-	Extremely Important
26	**46**	**62**	**92**	**153**	**165**	**65**

Scientific relevance (important to the advancement of science)

Not at all Important	-	-	-	-	-	Extremely Important
12	**34**	**36**	**104**	**136**	**201**	**86**

Novelty

Not at all Important	-	-	-	-	-	Extremely Important
26	**47**	**48**	**97**	**185**	**164**	**43**

Surprise factors (spectacular, unusual, unexpected)

Not at all Important	-	-	-	-	-	Extremely Important
39	**52**	**49**	**92**	**169**	**155**	**53**

Currency / Presence of a “news peg” or tie to current event

Not at all Important	-	-	-	-	-	Extremely Important
51	**91**	**72**	**112**	**138**	**120**	**25**

Controversy

Not at all Important	-	-	-	-	-	Extremely Important
84	**112**	**102**	**130**	**104**	**64**	**13**

Ability to provide a human angle

Not at all Important	-	-	-	-	-	Extremely Important
63	**74**	**67**	**105**	**123**	**114**	**62**

Your own personal interest

Not at all Important	-	-	-	-	-	Extremely Important
7	**9**	**8**	**30**	**89**	**200**	**266**

Use of Social Media

How often do you get feedback from readers on your *published* blog posts via the following mediums?

Facebook (public)

Never	Rarely	Sometimes	Often	Always
127	**106**	**170**	**139**	**63**

Twitter (public)

Never	Rarely	Sometimes	Often	Always
44	**75**	**189**	**219**	**80**

LinkedIn (public)

Never	Rarely	Sometimes	Often	Always
377	**113**	**74**	**33**	**6**

Google+ (public)

Never	Rarely	Sometimes	Often	Always
305	**149**	**89**	**43**	**19**

Reddit (public)

Never	Rarely	Sometimes	Often	Always
387	**108**	**69**	**24**	**12**

Blog comments (public)

Never	Rarely	Sometimes	Often	Always
54	**137**	**233**	**121**	**64**

E-mail (private)

Never	Rarely	Sometimes	Often	Always
129	**200**	**203**	**55**	**20**

Private messaging (Twitter DM, Facebook IM, etc.)

Never	Rarely	Sometimes	Often	Always
232	**186**	**133**	**43**	**11**

Discussion. How often do you engage in sustained discussion (more than a single reply or simply thanking a reader) with readers about your *published* blog posts?

Never	Rarely	Sometimes	Often	Always
68	**229**	**203**	**80**	**23**

Sentiment. With regard to sentiment toward your content, how would you describe the feedback you get from readers about your *published* blog posts?

Mostly positive	**470**
Mostly neutral (neither positive nor negative)	**32**
Mostly negative but constructive	**6**
Mostly negative and unconstructive	**9**
Similar amount of positive and negative	**35**
Too little feedback to say	**56**

Sentiment2. With regard to sentiment toward your content, how would you describe the feedback you get *from other science writers* about your published blog posts?

Mostly positive	**329**
Mostly neutral (neither positive nor negative)	**34**
Mostly negative but constructive	**7**
Mostly negative and unconstructive	**3**
Similar amount of positive and negative	**8**
Too little feedback to say	**233**

NegAffect. Have you ever been personally affected by critical or negative feedback from another science writer?

Yes	**87**
No	**522**

NegAffectO. [If Yes to NegAffect] If you feel comfortable, please write about the experience. Has it affected your blogging since? *Note: If you prefer not to answer, please skip this question. The anonymity of your response will be strictly preserved*. [Open-ended]

<u>News Habits</u>

News. How often do you get your own science news from the following places?

Newspapers (print)

Never	Rarely	Sometimes	Often	Always
215	**196**	**121**	**66**	**8**

Newspapers (online)

Never	Rarely	Sometimes	Often	Always
22	**94**	**216**	**226**	**50**

Television

Never	Rarely	Sometimes	Often	Always
230	**216**	**114**	**43**	**5**

Magazines

Never	Rarely	Sometimes	Often	Always
129	**180**	**185**	**99**	**14**

The radio

Never	Rarely	Sometimes	Often	Always
173	**183**	**146**	**93**	**12**

Podcasts

Never	Rarely	Sometimes	Often	Always
202	**152**	**138**	**100**	**16**

Blogs

Never	Rarely	Sometimes	Often	Always
6	**55**	**177**	**313**	**56**

Email newsletters or listservs

Never	Rarely	Sometimes	Often	Always
108	**125**	**191**	**139**	**32**

Scientific organization or government websites

Never	Rarely	Sometimes	Often	Always
47	**104**	**218**	**196**	**41**

Other online news sites

Never	Rarely	Sometimes	Often	Always
73	**101**	**181**	**193**	**35**

Other [Please specify]

NewsImpact. How many times do you write a blog post that it gets picked up, re-posted or mentioned by other media outlets?

Never	Rarely	Sometimes	Often	Always
176	**217**	**157**	**44**	**6**

BlogsRead. Please list the top three science blogs (blogger name, blog title and blog URL if possible) that you read on a regular basis. [open-ended]

BlogsInspr. If applicable, please list the top three science bloggers (blogger name, blog title and blog URL if possible) that have particularly inspired your own blogging content or style.

<u>Motivations to Blog</u>

Finally I'm going to ask you open-ended questions about your motivations to blog. Please think about your motivations and goals when you first started blogging versus your motivations and goals now:

Start_Open. Please describe the major motivations you had to start your science blog. [open-ended]

Continue_Open. Now please describe the major motivations you have to continue science blgoging today. [open-ended]

Benefits and Drawbacks

The following section includes two supplemental open-ended questions about professional and/or personal impacts you might have experienced on account of your blogging. Please answer these questions if you have time; otherwise, continue to the next page.

Benefits. Has your blogging had any notable benefits or positive impacts for YOU, either professional, personal or both? If so, please describe these below. [open-ended]

Drawbacks. Has your blogging had any notable disadvantages or negative impacts for YOU, either professional, personal or both? If so, please describe these below. [open-ended]

Demographic Info

Gen. What is your sex?

Male	**345**
Female	**256**

Age. What is your age?

18 to 24 years	**55**
25 to 34 years	**228**
35 to 44 years	**165**
45 to 54 years	**95**
55 to 64 years	**46**
Age 65 or older	**13**

Ethnicity. Would you describe yourself as (mark one or more):

African American/Black	**14**
American Indian or Alaska Native	**1**
Hispanic/Latino	**26**
Asian Indian	**22**
Chinese	**16**
Japanese	**1**
Korean	**2**
Vietnamese	**1**

Other Asian	**8**
Pacific Islander	**1**
Caucasian/White	**455**
Some other race	**21**
Prefer not to answer	**27**

Language. What language(s) do you blog in? (List up to top 3. #1 should be the primary language of your MAIN blog.)

Employ. What best describes your current occupational status? (Select all that apply)

Employed for wages full time (more than 30 hours a week)	**337**
Employed for wages part-time (less than 30 hours a week)	**39**
Self-employed/Freelance (full time)	**59**
Self-employed/Freelance (part time)	**41**
Carer (of home, family, etc.) (full-time)	**9**
Student (full-time)	**125**
Temporarily unemployed (but actively seeking work)	**14**
Retired	**15**
Other permanently unemployed	**4**
Prefer not to answer	**5**

Area. What best describes your primary occupational area?

Academic research	**288**
Non-academic research	**32**
Education (teacher, instructor, etc.)	**49**
Medicine/Public health	**17**
Engineering	**14**
Public/Media relations	**17**
Journalism	**28**
Science writing	**50**
Scientific publishing	**9**

Scientific outreach	**23**
Other professional communication or technical writing	**5**
Other	**58**

PrevWork. In the last five years, you've worked as a… (please select all that apply)

Freelance writer	**116**
Press / public information officer	**26**
Professional science communicator	**81**
Editor	**61**
Broadcast journalist (staff)	**13**
Print/online journalist (staff)	**20**
Freelance journalist	**49**
Researcher	**269**
Science teacher/professor	**173**
Science journalism teacher/professor	**12**
Graduate student	**177**
Undergraduate student worker	**63**
For a science museum/exhibition/event	**43**
Other	**94**

Research. If you conduct academic or non-academic research, please describe your research area [Open-ended]

SciComm. Do you have any formal education or training, including workshops, etc., in science communication?

Yes	**246**
No	**355**

Educ. What is the highest degree or level of education you have completed?

High school graduate - high school diploma or the equivalent	**6**
Completed some college	**18**
Associate degree (for example: AA, AS)	**5**

Bachelor's degree (for example: BA, BS)	**89**
Completed some postgraduate	**44**
Master's degree (for example: MA, MS, MEng, MBA)	**130**
Doctorate degree (for example: Ph.D.)	**290**
Professional degree (for example: MD, DDS, DVM)	**11**

Degree. Which field(s) do you have formal degree(s) in? Please select all that apply.

Agriculture, Forestry, Horticulture, Environmental sciences	**51**
Business, Finance, Marketing, Accounting, Economics or related field	**12**
Computer/Information science	**17**
Education	**20**
Engineering	**20**
Law	**3**
Liberal Arts - English/Literature, Visual/Performing arts, Languages, History, Architecture, Music, Philosophy/Religion, etc.	**55**
Life science, Health science or Medicine	**235**
Mass Communication – Journalism	**28**
Mass Communication - Public Relations, Advertising, Strategic communication, etc.	**13**
Mathematics/Statistics	**32**
Physical science - Astronomy, Atmospheric science, Chemistry, Earth science, Physics, etc.	**170**
Psychology/Behavioral science	**36**
Other Social Science	**31**
Other	**28**

SciWri. Do you currently do any science writing or science communication work in other than blog form?

Yes	**408**
No	**196**

SciWri2. [If yes to SciWri]: In which of these media does your science writing currently appear on at least a semi-regular basis? Please select all that apply.

Print (newspaper)	**47**
Print (magazine)	**99**
Web story (newspaper)	**62**
Web story (magazine)	**116**
Radio/Audio podcast	**77**
Video podcast (YouTube, etc.)	**36**
Television	**26**
Academic/institutional press releases	**80**
Corporate press releases	**11**
Book(s) (fiction)	**12**
Book(s) (non-fiction)	**70**
Scholarly journal	**114**
Wikipedia	**24**
Science museum/exhibition/event	**42**
Non profit press releases/outlet	**36**
Other	**58**