

REFERENCES

AC Nielsen Media Index, Jan – Dec 2010

Academy of Sciences. (1998). The Malaysian Nobel Laureate Programme. www.akademisains.gov.my (accessed on 31 May 2012)

Agensi Inovasi Malaysia (2011). <http://www.innovation.my/programmes/wealth-creation/bio-mass/> (accessed on April 2012)

Altimore, M. (1982). The Social Construction of Scientific Controversy. *Science, Technology, & Human Values* 7:24-31.

Amin, L. (2007). Public Attitude towards Modern Biotechnology In Malaysia: A Study In The Klang Valley Region. Thesis submitted in fulfilment for the degree of doctor of philosophy. Pusat Pengajian Siswazah. Universiti Kebangsaan Malaysia, Bangi, Malaysia.

Amin, L., M.J. Jamaluddin, R.M.N. Abdul (2007). Malaysian Public Awareness and Knowledge on Modern Biotechnology. *J. Pengajian Umum*. Vol: 8: 195-204.

Amin, L., A.A. Noor Ayuni, H. Mohd Fadhli, Samian, A.L. (2011). Awareness and Knowledge on Modern Biotechnology. *African Journal of Biotechnology*. Vol. 10 (58): 12448-12456.

Amor, A.J. (1984). Asian Science and the Asian Media. *In Seminar on Communication of Scientific Information for Development*. 8-10 Oct, 1984

Anderson, D., K. Lucas., I. Ginns., and , L.D. Dierking. (2000). Development of Knowledge about Electricity and Magnetism during a Visit to a Science Museum and Related Post-visit Activities. *Science Education*. Vol 85(5): 658-679

Anderson, A., S. Allan, A. Petersen. and Wilkinson, C. (2005). The Framing of Nanotechnologies in the British Newspaper Press. *Science Communication*. 27(2): 200-220

Arcand, K. and Watzke, M. (2010). Bringing the Universe to the Street. A Preliminary Look at Informal Learning Implications for a Large-scale Non-traditional Science Outreach Project. *Journal of Science Communication*. Vol 9(2): 1-13

Asia Private Equity Review. (2002). June issue.

Asian Food Information Centre (2008) (AFIC). Clear Support for Food Biotech by Consumers in the Philippines.

Audit Bureau of Circulation, 2010

BABAS (1999). Ethical Aspects of Agricultural Biotechnology. Report of EFB Task Group on Public Perceptions of Biotechnology. Cambridge Biomedical Consultants: The Hague.

Barnes, E. (2006). Captain Chemo and Mr. Wiggly: Patient Information for Children with Cancer in the Late Twentieth Century. *Social History of Medicine*. Vol 19 (3): 501-519

Barns, I. (1989). Interpreting Media Images of Science and Technology. *Media Information Australia*. 54 (22).

Basalla, G. (1976). Pop Science: The Depiction of Science in Popular Culture. In G. Holton and W. Blanpied (Eds), *Science and its Public* (pp. 261-278). Boston: Beacon

Bartan, R. (1998). Just before Nature: The Purposes of Science and the Purposes of Popularisation in some English Popular Science Journals of the 1860s. *Annals of Science*. Vol 55: 1-33

Bauer, M., Durant, J., Ragnarsdottir, A. and Rudolphsdottir, A. (1995). Science and Technology in the British Press, Research Report, 1946-1990. London: Science Museum

Bauer, M.W., K. Petkova, P. Boyadjieva, and G. Gornev. (2006). Long-term Trends in the Public Representation of Science across the 'Iron Curtain': 1946-1995. *Social Studies of Science*. Vol 36: 99-131

Bensaude-Vincent, B. (2001). A Genealogy of the Increasing Gap between Science and the Public. *Public Understanding of Science*. Vol 10, pp 99-113.

Berita Harian, 11 Feb 2012

Berkowitz, D. (1992). Who Sets the Media Agenda? The Ability of Policymakers to Determine News Decisions. In *Public Opinion, the Press, and the Public Policy*. (Ed) J.D. Kenamer, pp 81-102. Westport, CT: Praeger

Besley, J.C. and Shanahan, J. (2005). Media Attention and Exposure in Relation to Support for Agricultural Biotechnology. *Science Communication*. Vol 26: 347-367

BIO Website. www.bio.org (accessed June 2012)

Bodmer, W. (1985). *The Public Understanding of Science* (London: Royal Society)

Borchelt, R.E. (2001). Communicating the Future: Report of the Research Roadmap Panel for Public Communication of Science and Technology in the Twenty-First Century. *Science Communication*. Vol. 23: 194-211

Bos J.W.M., Kloet, R.R., Koolstra, C.M. and Willems J.T.J.M. (2009). Getting Adolescents to Inform Themselves about Ecogenomics: A Dutch Case Study. *Journal of Science Communication*. Vol 8(3): 1-11

Bourgerly, M. and G. Guimaraes (1993). Global ads: Say it with Pictures. *Journal of European Business*. Vol 4(5): 22-26

Brecht, B. (1979/80). Radio as a Means of Communication – A Talk on the Function of Radio. *Screen*. Vol 20 (3-4). 24-28.

- Brossard, D. and Shanahan, J. (2006). Do They Know What They Read? Building a Scientific Literacy Measurement Instrument Based on Science Media Coverage. *Science Communication*. Vol 28: 47-63
- Brossard, D. and J. Shanahan (2007). Perspective on Communication about Agricultural Biotechnology. *In The Public, the Media & Agricultural Biotechnology*. (Eds) D. Brossard, J. Shanahan and T.C. Nesbitt, pp 1-20. CABI
- Brown, C.P., Propst, S.M., and Woolley, M. (2004). Report: Helping Researchers Make the Case for Science. *Science Communication*. Vol 25: 294-303
- Bryant, C. (2003). Does Australia Need a More Effective Policy on Science Communication? *International Journal for Parasitology*. Vol 33: 357-361.
- Bucchi, M. and Mazzolini, R.G. (2003). Big Science, Little News: Science Coverage in the Italian Daily Press, 1946-1997. *Public Understanding of Science*. Vol 12: 7-24
- Burns, T.W., O'Connor, D.J., & Stockmayer, S.M. (2003). Science Communication: A Contemporary Definition. *Public Understanding of Science*. Vol. 12, pp 183-202
- Carter, H.A. (1988). Chemistry in the Comics. *Journal of Chemical Education*. Vol 65 (12): 1029-1036
- Checkoway, B. (2001). Renewing the Civic Mission of the American Research University. *The Journal of Higher Education*. Vol 72: 126-147
- Chong Kah Kiat (2001). Speech by the Right Hon. Chief Minister of Sabah, Datuk Chong Kah Kiat at the International Conference on Public Understanding of Science and Technology 2001 (PUSAT 2001), Hotel Promenade, 20 Sept 2001. www.sabah.gov.my/press/docs/2001001840.htm. (accessed 6 Jan 2011)
- Clark, F. and Illman, D. (2001). Dimensions of Civic Science. *Science Communication*. Vol 23: 5-27
- Christensen, L.L. (2007). *The Hands-on-Guide for Science Communicators. A Step-by Step Approach to Public Outreach*. New York: Springer. p.8
- Corfield, V.A. (2003). Can Scientists and the Media Find Common Ground in Science and Technology Communication? A Scientist's Perspective. www.pub.ac.za/resources/does/paper_vcorfield_2003.pdf in Sept 2008 (accessed July 2009)
- Cormick, C. (2011). Understanding the Target Audience for Better Communication. *In Communication Challenges and Convergence in Crop Biotechnology*. (Eds) Navarro, M, J., and R.A. Hautea. Pp 43-80. International Service for the Acquisition of Agri-biotech Applications (ISAAA): Ithaca, New York, USA and SEAMEO Southeast Asian Regional Center for Graduate Study and Research in Agriculture (SEARCA): Los Banos, Laguna, Philippines.
- Cutler, M. (1996). Pupil Researcher Initiative Conferences. *Education in Science*. September.

- Datson, L (1991). The Ideal and Reality of the Republic of Letters in the Enlightenment. *Science in Context*. Vol 4: 367-386
- Davies, R. (1963). Scientists and Engineers: The Public's Image. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Society for Engineering Education, Philadelphia, PA
- Davies, S.R. (2008). Constructing Communication: Talking to Scientists about Talking to the Public. *Science Communication*. Vol. 29: 413-433
- Dennis, E. And J. McCartney (1979). Science Journalists on Metropolitan Dailies. *Journal of Environmental Education*. Vol. 10: 10-11
- Department of Statistics, Malaysia. (2010)
- Devos, Y., P. Maesele, D. Reheul, S. Van Speybroeck, and D. Dewaele. (2007). Ethics in the Societal Debate on Genetically Modified Organisms: A (Re) Quest for Sense and Sensibility. *Journal of Agricultural and Environmental Ethics*. Vol 21(1): 29-61.
- DiBella, S.M., A.J. Ferri, and A.B. Padderud. (1991). Scientists' Reasons for Consenting to Mass Media Interviews: A National Survey. *Journalism and Mass Communication Quarterly*. Vol 68: 740-749.
- Duke, S. (2002). Wired science: Use of the World Wide Web and E-mail in Science Public Relations. *Public Relations Review*. Vol 28: 311-324
- Dunwoody, S. And M. Ryan. (1985). Scientific Barriers to the Popularization of Science in the Mass Media. *Journal of Communication*. Vol. 35: 26-42.
- Dunwoody, S. (1999). Scientists, Journalists, and the Meaning of Uncertainty. In *Communicating Uncertainty: Media coverage of new and controversial science*. (Ed) S.M. Friedman, S. Dunwoody, and C.L. Rogers, 59-79, Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Durant, J.R., G.A. Evans, and G.P. Thomas. (1989). The Public Understanding of Science. *Nature*. Vol 340, July 6: 11-14.
- Durant, J., W. Bauer, and G. Gaskell. (1998). *Biotechnology in the Public Sphere: A European Source Book*. Science Museums Publications, London.
- Economic Planning Unit (2006). Ninth Malaysia Plan, Malaysia
- Edwards, C. (2004). Evaluating European Public Awareness of Science initiatives. *Science Communication*, Vol 25 (3): 260-271
- Einsiedel, E.F. (1997) *Biotechnology and the Canadian Public: Report on a 1997 Survey and Some International Comparisons*. University of Calgary, Alberta.
- Ernst and Young Report (2011). *Beyond Borders: Global Biotechnology Report 2011*.

- European Commission (2001a). Science and Society Action Plan, *COM 714 final* (4/12/2001). Brussels. European Commission.
- European Commission (2001b). European Governance: A White Paper, *COM 428* (25/07/2001). Brussels: European Commission.
- European Commission (2002) Research: Science and Society Portal. http://europa.eu.int/comm/research/science-society/index_it.html (accessed Feb 2008)
- European Commission (2005). Special Eurobarometer: Social values, science and technology. www.eu.nl/public_opinion/archives/ebs/ebs_225_report_en.pdf. (accessed March 2009)
- Falk, J.H. (2002). The Contribution of Free-choice Learning to Public Understanding of Science. *Interciencia*. Vol 27(2): 62-65
- Falk, J.H. and L.D. Dierking. (2000). Learning from Museums: Visitor Experiences and Making of Meaning. Walnut Creek, CA: AltaMira Press.
- Falk, J.H., M. Storksdieck, and L.D. Dierking (2007). Investigating Public Science Interest and Understanding: Evidence for the Importance of Free-Choice Learning. *Public Understanding of Science*. Vol 16: 455-469.
- Fells, I. (1994). 20 seconds, Professor and No Long Words. *Science and Public Awareness* (Spring): 33-37
- Felt, U. (2003). "O.P.U.S. Optimising Public Understanding of Science and Technology". Final report
- Field, H. and P. Powell. (2001). Public Understanding of Science Versus Public Understanding of Research. *Public Understanding of Science*. Vol 10: 421-426.
- Fink, W. and M. Rodemeyer. (2007). Genetically Modified Foods: US Public Opinion Research Polls. In *The Public, the Media & Agricultural Biotechnology*. (Eds) D. Brossard, J. Shanahan and T.C. Nesbitt, pp 1-20. CABI
- Fresco, L.O. (2003). A New Social Contract on Biotechnology. Food and Agriculture Organisation of the United Nations. <http://www.fao.org/ag/magazine/0305sp1.htm> (accessed on 30 May 2012).
- Friedman, S. 1986. The Journalist's World. In *Scientists and journalists: Reporting science as news*. (Ed) S.M. Friedman, S. Dunwoody, and C.L. Rogers, 17-41. New York: Free Press
- Fritz, S., D. Husmann, G. Wingenbach, T. Rutherford, V. Egger, and P. Wadhwa. (2 Jan 2012). Awareness and Acceptance of Biotechnology Issues Among Youth, Undergraduates, and Adults. *AgBioForum*. Vol 6(4): 178-184.
- Galtung, J. and Ruge, M. (1965). The Structure of Foreign News: The Presentation of the Congo, Cuba and Cyprus Crises in Four Norwegian Newspapers. *Journal of International Peace Research*. Vol 1: 64-91

- Gandy, O.H., Jr. (1982). *Beyond Agenda-Setting: Information Subsidies and Public Policy*. Norwood, NJ: Ablex.
- Gascoigne, T.H. and Metcalfe, J.E. (1997) Incentives and Impediments to Scientists Communicating Through the Media. *Science Communication*, Vol 10 (3).
- Gaskell, G., M.W. Bauer, N. Allum, N. Lindsey, J. Durant, and J. Lueglinger. (2001). United Kingdom: Spilling the Beans on Genes. *In: Gaskell, G. M.W. Bauer. (eds). Biotechnology 1996-2000. The Years of Controversy*. Science Museum, London.
- Gerbner, G., Gross, L., Morgan, M., & Signorelli, N. (1981). Scientists on the TV Screen. *Culture and Society*. Vol 42: 51-54
- Goodman, D. (1994). *The Republic of Letters: A Cultural History of the French Enlightenment*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press
- Gott, M. and V. Monamy. (2004). Ethics and Transgenesis: Towards a Policy Framework incorporating Intrinsic Objections and Societal Perceptions. *ATLA 32 Supplement*. Vol:1: 391-396.
- Gouthier, D. (2005). Understanding Science Publics. Review. *Journal of Science Communication*. Vol 4(1): 1-6
- Greenberg, M.R., P.M. Sandman, D.B. Sachsman, and K.L. Salomone. (1989). Network Television News Coverage of Environmental Risks. *Environment*. Vol 31(2): 16-20, 40-43
- Greenfield, S. (2003). The Guardian. 10th April 2003. www.guardian.co.uk/education/2003/apr/10/science.highereducation1_in_Aug_2008 (accessed on July 2009)
- Greenwood, M.R.C. and Riordan, D.G. (2001). Civic Scientist/Civic Duty. *Science Communication*. Vol 23: 28-40
- Gregory, J. and Miller, S (1998). *Science in Public: Communication, Culture and Credibility*. New York: Plenum, p247
- Gross, A.G. (1994). The Roles of Rhetoric in the Public Understanding of Science. *Public Understanding of Science*. Vol 3: 3-23
- Gunter, B., J. Kinderlerer, and D. Beyleveld. 1999. The Media and Public Understanding of Biotechnology: A Survey of Scientists and Journalists. *Science Communication* 20(4): 373-94.
- HMSO (1993). *Realising Our Potential* (London)
- Halberstam, D. (1994). The Education of a Journalist. *Columbia Journalism Review*. Vol 33(4): 29-34
- Hall, S., Critcher, Ch., Jefferson, T., Clarke, J. and Roberts, B. (1978). *Policing the Crises: Mugging, the State, and Law and Order*. London: Macmillan

- Hamlett, P.W. (2002). Technology Theory and Deliberative Democracy. *Science, Technology & Human Values*. Vol 28(1): 112-140
- Hansen, A., and R. Dickinson. (1992). Science Coverage in the British Mass Media: Media Output and Source Input. *Communications* Vol 17(3): 365-377
- Hansen, A. (1994). Journalistic Practices and Science Reporting in the British Press. *Public Understanding of Science*. Vol 3: 111-114
- Hartz, J., and R. Chappel. 1997. Worlds apart: How the Distance between Science and Journalism Threatens America's Future. Pp. 117. Nashville, TN: First Amendment Center
- Harvey, M. (1999). Genetic Modification as a Bio-Socio-Economic Process. (CRIC Discussion Paper No. 31). CRIC, University of Manchester, Manchester, UK.
- Hayes, A. F. (2005). *Statistical Method for Communication Science*, Vol. 1. Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc, New Jersey, USA
- Hazen, R.M. (November 2002). Why Should You be Scientifically Literate? www.actionbioscience.org/newfrontiers/hazen.html. American Institute of Biological Sciences. (accessed on Aug 2008)
- Hijmans, E., Pleijter, A., and Wester, F. (2003). Covering Scientific Research in Dutch Newspaper. *Science Communication*. Vol. 25: 153-176
- Hilgartner, S. (1990). The Dominant View of Popularisation: Conceptual Problems, Political Uses. *Social Studies of Science*. Vol 20: 519-539
- Holsti, O.R (1969). *Content Analysis for the Social Sciences and Humanities*. Reading, M.A. Addison-Wesley Publishing Company
- House Committee on Science, *Unlocking our Future: Toward a New National Science Policy*, Report to Congress, September 24, 1998.
- House of Lords, "Science and Society (Science and Technology – third report)", (London: Her Majesty's Stationery Office, 2000).
- IFIC website. www.ific.org (accessed June 2012)
- Imura, H. (1999). Science Education for the Public. *Science*. Vol 284: 1771
- ISAAA & The University of Illinois at Urbana Champaign (UIUC) (2003). *The Social and Cultural Dimensions of Agricultural Biotechnology in Southeast Asia Report*.
- International Service for the Acquisition of Agri-Biotech Applications (2006), Q&A: Questions and Answers about genetically modified crops, Pocket K No. 1, ISAAA Global Knowledge Center on Crop Biotechnology; www.isaaa.org/kc (accessed Aug 2008)

- Inspiring Australia: A National Strategy for Engagement with the Sciences. (2010) Department of Industry, Innovation, Science, Research and Tertiary Education, Australia.
- Ireland, D.C., C, Cormick, Hine, D. (2007). Is Anyone Listening? *Journal of Commercial Biotechnology*. Vol 13: 86-98.
- James, C. (2011). Global Status of Commercialised Biotech/GM Crops: 2011. ISAAA Brief No 43. ISAAA. Ithaca. NY.
- Jasanoff, J. (1990). *The Fifth Branch*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University, Press.
- Jasanoff, S. (2005). *Designs on Nature? Science and Democracy in Europe and the United States*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press
- Jasanoff, S. (1997). Civilization and Madness: The Great BSE Scare of 1996. *Public Understanding of Science*. Vol 6(3): 221-232.
- Joly, P. (2005). Debates and Participatory Processes: Lessons from the European Experiences. Presentation at the Science in Society Forum, OECD, Brussels, 9-11 March 2005
- Jones, D. and J.K. Stein. (2005). *The Flandrau Science Center Front-End Evaluation*. Technical Report. Annapolis, MD: Institute for Learning Innovation.
- Joss, S (1998). Participation in Parliamentary Technology Assessment: From Theory to Practice. *In Parliaments and Technology: The Development of Technological Assessment in Europe*. (ed). Vig, N.J. and Paschen, H. (Albany, NY: New York State University Press)
- Joss, S. (1999). Public Participation in Science and Technology (Special Issue). *Science and Public Policy*. Vol 26(5): 290-373.
- Joubert, M. (2001). Report: Priorities and Challenges for Science Communication in South Africa. *Science Communication*. Vol 22: 316-333.
- Juanillo, N.K. (2003). *The Social and Cultural Dimensions of Agricultural Biotechnology in Southeast Asia: Public Understanding, Perceptions, and Attitudes towards Agricultural Biotechnology in Malaysia*. University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign and International Service for the Acquisition of Agribiotechnology Applications.
- Juanillo, N.K. (2003). *The Social and Cultural Dimensions of Agricultural Biotechnology in Southeast Asia: Public Understanding, Perceptions, and Attitudes towards Agricultural Biotechnology in the Philippines*. University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign and International Service for the Acquisition of Agribiotechnology Applications
- Juanillo, N.K. (2003). *The Social and Cultural Dimensions of Agricultural Biotechnology in Southeast Asia: Public Understanding, Perceptions, and Attitudes towards Agricultural Biotechnology in Indonesia*. University of Illinois at Urbana-

Champaign and International Service for the Acquisition of Agribiotechnology Applications

Juanillo, N.K. (2003). The Social and Cultural Dimensions of Agricultural Biotechnology in Southeast Asia: Public Understanding, Perceptions, and Attitudes towards Agricultural Biotechnology in Thailand. University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign and International Service for the Acquisition of Agribiotechnology Applications.

Juanillo, N.K. (2003). The Social and Cultural Dimensions of Agricultural Biotechnology in Southeast Asia: Public Understanding, Perceptions, and Attitudes towards Agricultural Biotechnology in Vietnam. University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign and International Service for the Acquisition of Agribiotechnology Applications.

Kalaizandonakes, N. and J. Bijman (2003). Who is driving biotechnology acceptance. *Nature Biotechnology*. Vol 21(4): 366-369.

Kalleberg, R. (2000). Universities: Complex Bundle Institutions and the Projects of Enlightenment. *Comparative Social Research*. Vol. 19:219-255

Khanna, J. (2001). Science Communication in Developing Countries. *Science Communication*. Vol 23:50-56

Kim, H-S., R.F. Carter, and K.R. Stamm. (1996). Developing a Standard Model of Measuring the Public Understanding of Science and Technology. *Journal of Science and Technology Policy*. Vol 7 (2): 51-78

Kim, H-S. (2007). PEP/IS: A New Model for Communicative Effectiveness of Science. *Science Communication*. Vol. 28: 287-313.

Kolodinsky, J. (2007). Biotechnology and Consumer Information. *In The Public, The Media & Agricultural Biotechnology*. 161-178. (Ed). Brossard, D., Shanahan, J. and Nesbitt, T.C. CABI

Korpan, C.A., Bisanz, G.L., Bisanz, J., Boehme, C. and Lynch, M.A. (1997). What Did You Learn Outside of School Today? *Science Education*. Vol 81: 651-662

Kriehbaum, H. (1967). Science and the Mass Media. New York: New York University Press

Kua, E., R. Michael, Gossel, M.J. (2004). Science in the News: A Study of Reporting Genomics. *Public Understanding of Science*. Vol 13: 309-322

Kyvik, S (2005). Popular Science Publishing and Contribution to Public Discourse among University Faculty. *Science Communication*. Vol. 26:288-311.

LaFollette, M.C. (1990). Making Science our Own: Public Images of Science. pp 1910-1955. Chicago: University of Chicago Press

- Lane, N. (1999). The Civic Scientist and Science Policy. *In*. Science and Technology Policy Yearbook. (Ed) American Association for the Advancement of Science. Chapter 22. Washington D.C
- Lassen, J., A. Allansdottir, M. Liakopoulos, A.T. Mortensen, A. Olofson. (2002). Testing Times – The Reception of Roundup Ready Soya in Europe. *In*: Bauer, M.W. and G. Gaskell (eds) *Biotechnology: The Making of a Global Controversy*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, UK.
- León, B. (2008). Science Related Information in European Television: A Study of Prime-Time News. *Public Understanding of Science*. 17:443-460
- Levy-Leblond, J. (1992). About Misunderstandings about Misunderstandings. *Public Understanding of Science*. Vol 1: 17-21.
- Lewenstein, B.V. (1989). Magazine Publishing and Popular Science after World War II. *American Journalism*. Vol 6: 218-234
- Lewenstein, B. (1995). Science and the Media *in* Handbook of Science and Technology Studies. (Ed) Jasanoff, S; Peterson, J; G. Markle, G & Pinch, T. Beverly Hills, CA: SAGE Publications
- Lewenstein, B. (2003). Models of Public Communication of Science and Technology. www.dgdc.unam.mx/Assets/pdfs/sem-feb04.pdf. (accessed 21 March 2012)
- Liakopoulos, M. (2002). Pandora's Box or Panacea? Using Metaphors to Create the Public Representations of Biotechnology. *Public Understanding of Science*. Vol 5(1): 5-32
- Libutti, L. and Valente, A. (2006). Science Communication and Information Dissemination: The Role of the Information Professional in 'Perception and Awareness of Science' Project. *Journal of Information Science*. Vol 32: 191-197.
- Long, M. & Steinke, J. (1996). The Thrill of Everyday Science: Images of Science and Scientists on Children's Educational Science Shows in the United States. *Public Understanding of Science*. Vol 5: 101-120
- Lujan, J.L. and O. Todt (2007). Precaution in Public: The Social Perception of the Role of Science and Values in Policy Making. *Public Understanding of Science*. Vol 16: 97-109
- Magni, F.E. (2002). The Theatrical Communication of Science. *Jekyll.com* 1
- Malaysian Agricultural Biotechnology Sector (2009). Report by Frost and Sullivan. Malaysian Biotechnology Corporation.
- Malaysian Industrial Biotechnology Sector (2009). Report by Frost and Sullivan. Malaysian Biotechnology Corporation.
- Malaysian Medical Biotechnology Sector (2009). Report by Frost and Sullivan. Malaysian Biotechnology Corporation.

- Malaysian Science and Technology Information Centre (MASTIC) (2005). Public Awareness of Science and Technology in Malaysia.
- Malone, R.E, E. Boyd, and L.A. Bero. (2000). Science in the News: Journalists' Constructions of Passive Smoking as a Social Problem. *Social Studies of Science*. Vol 30: 713-735
- Martín-Sempere. M.J., Garzón-García, B. and Rey-Rocha, J. (2008). Scientists' Motivation to Communicate Science and Technology to the Public: Surveying Participants at the Madrid Science Fair. *Public Understanding of Science*. Vol17: 349-367
- Massarani, L. (2004). Challenges for Science Communication in Latin America. Science and Development Network, 12 July 2004
- Mayer, S. and Stirling, A. (2004). GM Crops: Good or Bad? European Molecular Biology Organization. Vol 5(11): 1021-1024
- Matterson, C. (2006). Engaging Science: Creative Enterprise or Controlled Endeavour? *In Engaging Science: Thoughts, Deeds, Analysis and Action*. (Ed) Turney, J. pp 4-7. London: Wellcome Trust
- Whalen, M.D. and Tobin, M.F. (1980). Periodicals and the Popularisation of Science in America, 1860-1910. *Journal of America Culture*. Vol 3(1): 195-203
- McComas, K., and J. Shanahan. (1999). Telling Stories about Global Climate Change: Measuring the Impact of narratives on Issue Cycles. *Communication Research*. Vol 26(1): 30-57
- Mead, M., & Metraux, R. (1957, August 30). Image of the Scientist among High School Students. *Science*. Vol: 126. pp 384-390
- Medlock, J; Downey, R and Einsiedel, E (2007). Governing Controversial Technologies: Consensus Conferences as a Communications Tools. *In The Public, The Media & Agricultural Biotechnology*. 161-178. (Eds). Brossard, D., Shanahan, J. and Nesbitt, T.C. CABI
- Meredith, R. F., G. Mullins. (1997). Model of Affective Learning for Nonformal Science Education Facilities. *Journal of Research in Science Teaching*. Vol 34(8): 805-818.
- Metcalf, J. and Gascoigne, T. (1995). Science Journalism in Australia. *Public Understanding of Science and Technology*. Vol 4. pp 411-428
- Miller, J.D. (1983). Scientific Literacy: A Conceptual and Empirical Review. *Daedalus* 112 (2): 29-48
- Miller, J.D., R. Pardo, and F. Niwa. (1997). Public Perceptions of Science and technology: A Comparative Study of the European Union, the United States, Japan, and Canada. Madrid: BBV Foundation.

- Miller, J.D. (1998). The measurement of Civic Scientific Literacy. *Public Understanding of Science*. Vol. 7, 203-223.
- Miller, J.D. (2004). Public Understanding of, and Attitudes toward, Scientific Research: What We Know and What We Need to Know. *Public Understanding of Science*. Vol. 13: 272-294
- Miller, S. (2001). Public Understanding of Science at the Crossroads. *Public Understanding of Science*. Vol. 10: 115-120.
- Miller, M. and B.P. Riechert. (2000). Interest Group Strategies and Journalistic Norms: News Media Framing of Environmental Issues. *In Environmental Risks and the Media*. (Eds) Allan, S., B. Adam. and C. Carter. pp 45-54. London: Routledge
- Ministry of Agriculture and Agro-based Industry (1998). Third National Agriculture Policy. Malaysia.
- Ministry of Science, Technology and Innovation (2005). National Biotechnology Policy, Malaysia
- Ministry of Science, Technology and Innovation (2012). Bioeconomy Initiative Malaysia.
- Mitsuishi, S., Kazuto, K., and Nakamura, K. (2001). A New Way to Communicate Science to the Public: The Creation of the Scientist Library. *Public Understanding of Science*. Vol 10, 231-241
- Nagata, R. (1999). Learning Biochemistry through Manga – Helping Students Learn and Remember, Making Lectures More Exciting. *Biochemical Education*. Vol 27(4): 200-203
- National Fatwa Council (2011). <http://www.e-fatwa.gov.my/fatwa-kebangsaan/hukum-memakan-makanan-terubahsuai-genetik-genetic-modified-food>. (accessed on July 2011).
- National Research Council (2009). A New Biology for the 21st Century. Washington DC: The National Academies Press.
- National Science Board (2000). Science and Engineering Indicators – 2000. NSB-00-1. Arlington, VA: National Science Foundation.
- National Science Foundation (2006). Science and Engineering Indicators.
- Navarro, M.J., D.B. Malayang., and J.A. Panopio (2011). Media Representation of Science: How the Philippine Press Defines Biotechnology. *Journal of Media and Communication Studies*. Vol: 3(9): 281-288
- Navarro, M.J. and R.A. Hautea. (2011). Communication Challenges in Crop Biotechnology: The Asia Pacific Experience. *Asia Pacific Journal of Molecular Biology and Biotechnology*. Vol 19(4): 131-136.

- Navarro, M.J. (2009). *Communicating Crop Biotechnology: Stories from Stakeholders*. ISAAA Brief. No. 40. ISAAA: Ithaca, NY
- Naylor, S. and B. Keogh (1999). *Science on the Underground: An Initial Evaluation. Public Understanding of Science*. Vol 8: 105-122.
- Nelkin, D. (1984). Background Paper. *In Science in the street: Report of the twentieth century fund task force on the communication of scientific risk*. 21-84. New York: Priority Press
- Nelkin, D. (1995). *Selling science: How the Press Covers Science and Technology*. New York: W.H. Freeman.
- New Straits Times*, 3 Feb 2012
- Nielsen Mobile Insight Malaysia 2010 report
- Nielsen Radio Audience Measurement (RAM), 2011.
- Nielsen, K.H. (2005). Between Understanding and Appreciation. *Current Science Communication in Denmark. Journal of Science Communication*. Vol 4(4): 1-9
- Nisbet, M. (2005). The Multiple Meaning of Public Understanding: Why definition Matters to the Communication of Science.
- <http://www.csicop.org/scienceandmedia/definitions/> (accessed on Dec 2008).
- Nisbet, M.C., and B.V. Lewenstein. (2002). Biotechnology and the American Media: The Policy Process and the Elite Press, 1970 to 1999. *Science Communication*. 23 (4): 359-91
- Nisbet, M.C. (2005). The Competition for Worldviews: Values, Information, and the Public Support for Stem Cell Research. *International Journal of Public Opinion Research*. 17(1), 90-112
- Nisbet, M.C. and Goidel, R.K. (2007). Understanding Citizen Perceptions of Science Controversy: Bridging the Ethnographic survey Research Divide. *Public Understanding of Science*. Vol 16: 421-440
- Norton, M. and Nohara, K. (2009). Science Cafes. Cross-cultural Adaptation and Educational Applications. *Journal of Science Communication*. Vol 8(4): 1-11
- Office of Science and Technology and Wellcome Trust, "Science and the Public. A Review of Science Communication and Public Attitudes to Science in Britain". (London: 2000), pp137.
- Palen, J. (1994). A Map for Science Reporters: Science, Technology, and Society Studies Concepts in Basic Reporting and New Writing Textbooks. *Michigan Academician* 26: 507-519
- Panopio, J.A., and Navarro, M.J. (2011). Drama and Communication behind Asia's First Commercialised Bt Corn. *In Communication Challenges and Convergence in*

Crop Biotechnology. (Eds) Navarro, M, J., and R.A. Hautea. Pp 43-80. International Service for the Acquisition of Agri-biotech Applications (ISAAA): Ithaca, New York, USA and SEAMEO Southeast Asian Regional Center for Graduate Study and Research in Agriculture (SEARCA): Los Banos, Laguna, Philippines.

Parsons, W (2001). Scientists and Politicians: The Need to Communicate. *Public Understanding of Science*. 10: 303-314.

Pearson, G. (2001). The Participation of Scientists in Public Understanding of Science Activities: The Policy and Practice of the U.K. Research Councils. *Public Understanding of Science*. Vol 10:121-136

Petersen, A., A. Anderson., Allan, S., and Wilkinson, C. (2008). Opening the Black Box: Scientists' View on the Role of the News Media in the Nanotechnology Debate. *Public Understanding of Science Online First*. Published on Oct 1, 2008: 1-19

Pew Initiative on Food and Biotechnology (PIFB) (2001, 2003, 2004, 2005). Public Sentiment about Genetically Modified Food.

PNS 2067:2008. Providing Guidance on the Treatment of Genetically Modified Foods (GMF) and Requesting the Department of Trade and Industry to Review the Halal Food General Guidelines Otherwise known as PNS 2067:2008. National Halal Accreditation Board of the Philippines Incorporated

Poliakoff, E. and Webb. T.L. (2007). What Factors Predict Scientists' Intentions to Participate in Public Engagement of Science Activities? *Science Communication*. Vol: 29: 242-263

Poortinga, W. and N. Pidgeon (2007). Public Perceptions of Agricultural Biotechnology in the UK: The Case of Genetically Modified Food. *In The Public, the Media & Agricultural Biotechnology*. (Eds) D. Brossard, J. Shanahan and T.C. Nesbitt, pp 1-20. CABI

Postgate, J. (1995). Public understanding, Did You Say? *Science and Public Awareness*. (Spring): 8-10

Potts, R., & Mertinez, I. (1994). Television Viewing and Children's Beliefs about Scientists. *Journal of Applied Development Psychology*. 15, 287-300

Prewitt, K. (1982). The Public and Science Policy. *Science, Technology & Human Values*. Vol 36: 5-14

PricewaterhouseCoopers (2006-2008). From Beijing to Budapest: Winning Brands Formats. 4th edition.

Priest, S. (2001). Misplaced Faith: Communication Variables as Predictors of Encouragement for Biotechnology Development. *Science Communication*. Vol. 23(2): 97-110

- Priest, S.H., H. Bonfadelli, M. Rusanen. (2003). The 'Trust Gap' Hypothesis: Predicting Support for Biotechnology Across National Cultures as Function of Trust in Actors. *Risk Analysis*. Vol 23(4): 751-766
- Ramanathan, Sankaran (1984) Coverage of Science Information in the Malaysian Mass Media. *In* Seminar on communication of scientific information for development. 8-10 Oct 1984, Petaling Jaya, Malaysia
- Radford, T. (2002). *Telling It Like It Is. Media, Science and the Public*. Wellcome Trust. UK
- Raffensperger, C. and J. Tickner. (1999). *Protecting Public Health and the Environment: Implementing the Precautionary Principle*, Washington, DC: Island Press
- Reed, R. (2001). (Un-)Professional discourse? Journalists' and Scientists' Stories about Science in the Media. *Journalism*. Vol. 2(3): 272-298
- Riise, J. (2006). When the Place has a Role. *In* at the Human Scale: International Practices in Science Communication. (Eds) Donghong, C., Metcalfe, J. and Schiele, B. pp 83-91
- Robinson, G. (1997). Genetically Modified Foods and Consumer Choice. *Trends in Food Science and Technology*. Vol 8(3):84-88
- Rodari, P. (2009). Learning Science in Informal Environments: People, Places and Pursuits. A Review by the US National Science Council. *Journal of Science Communication*. Vol 8(3): 1-5
- Rogers, C. (1999). The Importance of Understanding Audiences. *In* Communicating Uncertainty: Media Coverage of New and Controversial Science. (Eds) S.M. Firedman, S. Dunwoody and C.L. Rogers, pp 179-200, Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum
- Royal Society (2002). "Statement on COPUS by the British Association, the Royal Institution and the Royal Society.
- Royal Society (2006). Survey of Factors Affecting Science Communication by Scientists and Engineers. Final Report: London
- Ruth, A., L. Lundy, R. Telg, and T. Irani. (2005). Trying to Relate: Media Relations Training Needs of Agricultural Scientists. *Science Communication*. Vol 27: 127-145
- Sagar, A., A. Daemmrich, and M. Ashiya. (2000). Transparent Communication Strategy on GMOs: Will it Change Public Opinion? *Biotechnology Journal*. Vol 2: 1141-1146.
- Samani, M.S., N.I. Rezali, L. Amin, & Z. Hassan. (2011). Biotechnology Issues in four Malaysian Mainstream Newspapers. *African Journal of Biotechnology*. Vol. 10 (58): 12497-12503.
- Scarce, C. (Sept 2007). Scientific Literacy. *ProQuest*. Discovery Guides

- Schaffer, S (1996). Babbage's Dance and the Impresarios of Mechanism. *In: Cultural Babbage: Technology, Time and Invention*, (Eds) F. Sufford and J. Uglow, pp 53-80, London: Faber and Faber
- Schnabel, U. (2003). God's Formula and Devil's Contribution: Science in the Press. *Public Understanding of Science*. Vol 12: 255-259
- Schuurbiens, D., Blomjous, M. and Osseweijer, P. (2006). "Imagine": Sharing Ideas in Life Science. *In: At the Human Scale: International Practices in Science Communication*, (Eds) Chen Donhong, J. Metcalfe, B. Schiele. Science Press Beijing.
- Sclove, R. (1995). *Democracy and Technology*. New York: Guilford.
- Secretariat of the Convention on Biological Diversity (2000) Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety to the Convention on Biological Diversity: Text and Annexes. Secretariat of the Convention on Biological Diversity, Montreal, Canada.
- Select Committee on Science and Technology Third Report. www.publications.parliament.uk/pa/ld199900/ldselect/ldsctech/38/3805.htm (accessed on 3 Jan 2011).
- Sheets-Pyenson, S. (1985). Popular Science Periodicals in Paris and London: The Emergence of a Low Scientific Culture. *Annals of Science*. pp 1820-1875
- Shermer, M. (1997). *Why People Believe Weird Things: Pseudoscience, Superstition, and Other Confusions of Our Time*. New York: W.H. Freeman and Company.
- Shortland, M. (1988) Mad Scientists and Regular Guys: Images of the Expert in Hollywood Films of the 1950s. Proceeding of the Joint Meeting of the British Society for History of Science and the History of Science Society, Manchester, England
- Shortland, M. and Gregory, J. (1991) *Communicating Science*, Longman, New York.
- Shults, A (2008). Objectives and Tools of Science Communication in the Context of Globalization. PhD dissertation. Universitat des Saarlandes
- Sigal, L.M. (1973). *Reporters and Officials: The Organization and Politics of Newsmaking*. Lexington, MA: D.C. Heath.
- Simmons, P. and Weldon, S. (2000). The GM Controversy in Britain: Actors, Arenas and Institutional Change. *Politeia*. Vol 16(6): 53-67
- Sobian, A. and S.F. Abdul Rahman. (2003). The Understanding and Acceptability of Biotechnology among Muslim Community. Paper presented at the International Seminar on the Understanding and Acceptability of Biotechnology from the Islamic Perspective on 9-10 September 2003, Kuching, Sarawak, Malaysia.
- Soloski, J. (1989). Sources and Channels of Local News. *Journalism Quarterly*. Vol 66: 864-870

Stocklmayer, S., Bryant, C., and Gore, M. (2002). *Science Communication in Theory and Practice*. Dordrecht, Kluwer Academic Publishers, The Netherlands

Stringer, S. and J. Thomson. (1999). *Defining Agricultural Issues: Daily Newspaper Editors' Perspectives*. Paper presented at Agricultural Communicators in Education/National Extension Technology Conference, Knoxville, TN, June.

Sturgis, P. & Allum, N. (2004). Science in Society: Re-evaluating the Deficit Model of Public Attitudes. *Public Understanding of Science*. 13 (1), 55-74

Sulaiman, A. R. (1984). The Role of Journalists in Popularizing Science. *In Seminar on Communication of Scientific Information for Development*. 8-10 Oct 1984, Petaling Jaya, Malaysia

Tatalovic, M. (2009). Science Comics as Tools for Science Education and Communication: A Brief, Exploratory Study. *Journal of Science Communication*. Vol: 8 (4):1-17

Ten Eyck (2005). The Media and Public Opinion on Genetics and Biotechnology: Mirrors, Windows, or Walls? *Public Understanding of Science*. Vol 14: 305-316

Ten Eyck, T.A., and M. Williment (2004). The National Media and Things Genetic: Coverage in the New York Times (1971 – 2001) and the Washington Post (1977-2001). *Science Communication*. 25 (2): 129-52

Teng, P.S. (2008). *Bioscience Entrepreneurship in Asia: Creating value with biology*. World Scientific.

Tesh, S.N. (2000). *Uncertain Hazards: Environmental Activists and Scientific Proof*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press

The Borneo Post, 11 Feb 2012

The Star, 2 Feb 2012

The University Act (2003). Act no. 403 of 28 May 2003. <http://www.vtu.dk/fsk/div/unisojlen/ActofUniversities2003.pdf>. (accessed Dec 2008).

Todt, O. (2003). Designing Trust. *Futures*. Vol 35: 239-251

Torres, C., M. Suva, L. Carpio, and W. Dagli. (2006). Public Understanding and Perception of and attitude Towards Agricultural Biotechnology in Indonesia. International Service for the Acquisition of Agri-biotech Applications, SEARCA, and College of Development Communication, University of the Philippines, Los Banos, College, Laguna, Philippines.

Treise, D. & Weigold, M. (2002). Advancing Science Communication: A survey of Science Communicators. *Science Communication*. Vol. 23: 310-322.

Trench, B. (2008). Towards an Analytical Framework of science Communication Models. *In*: Cheng, D., M. Claessens, T. Gascoigne, J. Metcalfe, B. Schiele, and S.

Shi. (Eds). *Communicating Science in Social Contexts: New Models, New Practices*. Springer Netherlands. Pp 119-138.

UNICEF. http://www.unicef.org/infobycountry/malaysia_statistics.html (accessed 31 May 2012)

Utusan Malaysia, 11 Feb 2012

van Dijck, J (2003). After the “Two Cultures”: Toward a “(Multi)cultural” Practice of Science Communication. *Science Communication*. Vol 25: 177-190

Valenti, J.M. (1998). Ethical Decision Making in Environmental Communication. *Journal of Mass Media Ethics*. Vol. 13(4): 219-231.

Valenti, J.M. (1999). Commentary: How Well do scientists Communicate to Media? *Science Communication*. Vol 21, pp 172-178

Valenti, J.M. (2000). Improving the Scientist/Journalist Conversation. *Science and Engineering Etjics*. Vol 4(3): 543-548.

Valenti, J.M., and G. Tavana. (2005). Report: Continuing Science Education for Environmental Journalists and Science Writers: In Situ with the Experts. *Science Communication*. 27: 300 – 310

Valenti, J.M. and L. Wilkins. (1995). An Ethical Risk Communication Protocol for Science and Mass Communication. *Public Understanding of Science*. Vol 4: 177-194.

Wagner, W. (2007). Vernacular Science Knowledge: Its Role in Everyday Life Communication. *Public Understanding of Science*. Vol 16: 7-22.

Weigold, M.F. (2001). Communicating Science: A Review of the Literature. *Science Communication*. Vol 23: 164-193

Weitkamp, E. and Burnet, F. (2007). The Comedian Brings Laughter to the Chemistry Classroom. *International Journal of Science Education*. Vol 29(15): 1911-1929

Wellcome Trust (2000). *The Role of Scientists in Public Debate*. Full report. London.

Wynne, B. (1989). Sheep Farming After Chernobyl: A Case Study in Communicating Scientific Information. *Environment Magazine*. Vol 31(2): 10-15, 33-39.

Wynne, B. (1992). Misunderstood Misunderstanding: Social Identities and Public Uptake of Science. *Public Understanding of Science*. Vol 1, 281-304

Whitley, R. (1985). Knowledge Producers and Knowledge Acquirers: Popularisation as a Relation between Scientific Fields and Their Publics. *In* Forms and functions of popularisation. (Eds) T. Shinn and R. Whitley, 3-28. Dordrecht, the Netherlands. Reidel

Wilkes, J. (1998). Making Science Writers out of Scientists. Paper presented at PCST Conference, Berlin, 1998

- Wilkins, L. (1987). *Shared Vulnerability: Media Coverage and Public Perception of the Bhopal Disaster*. Westport, CT: Greenwood
- Willems, J. (2001). Science Writing Courses Identify Journalists among Student. *Public Understanding of Science*. Vol 10: 293
- Wilson, A. 1998. *Handbook of Science Communication*. CRC Publication.
- Wolfendale, A. (1995). Report of the Committee to Review the Contribution of Scientists and Engineers to Public Understanding of Science, Engineering and Technology (London: Her Majesty's Stationary Office).
- Wynne, B. (1989). Sheep Farming after Chernobyl: A Case Study in Communicating Scientific Information. *Environment Magazine*. Vol 31(2): 10-15, 33-39.
- Wynne, B. (1992). Misunderstood misunderstanding: Social Identities and Public Uptake of Science. *Public Understanding of Science*, 1, 281-304
- Ziman, J. (1991). Public Understanding of Science. *Science, Technology, and Human Values*. Vol. 16(1): 99-105.

APPENDIX I

INTERVIEW QUESTIONS FOR BIOTECHNOLOGY COMMUNICATORS

Journalists/Editors

1. Is there is science desk in your newsroom?
2. Who writes science news for your paper?
3. Are they trained in science journalism or have basic science degree?
4. Is any in-house training provided to cover science news?
5. Is biotechnology given priority in your newspaper?
6. What is your source of information for your biotechnology news? (local biotechnology personality, wire service, internet, etc)
7. How do you explain the large number of science/biotechnology news that is sourced from wire service?
8. Do your editors encourage you to write biotech news?
9. What are the challenges in reporting biotechnology news?
10. How can these challenges be addressed?
11. How do you explain the very low number of biotechnology news in your newspaper?
12. How many biotechnology news do you write on an average in a month?
13. Do you think media play an important role in communicating biotechnology to the public?
14. Do you think media should play a role on this aspect?
15. How would you rate your knowledge on biotechnology? Good/Fair/Poor
16. Do you think biotechnology knowledge is important for journalists like you?
17. Do any government agencies take initiatives to enhance biotechnology understanding journalists?

Scientists:

1. How long have you been involved in communicating biotech?
2. Is public understanding of biotechnology part of your job?
3. Do you have special grants for it?
4. Who are your target audience?
5. What are your objectives?
6. What are your communication strategies?
7. Do you get support from your management?
8. What are your constraints in dealing with the media? How can these be overcome?
9. Does the corporate affairs office assist you in engaging with the public and the media?
10. Is any training provided for you or your staff to engage with the public and media?
11. What are the challenges? Why you think the scientists shy away?
12. What are your suggestions to overcome the challenges?

13. Do you think communicating biotechnology to the public should be made part of the job?

Public Affairs Officers at Research Institutes

1. What is your/your office role in communicating the research work at your institute to the public?
2. What is your objective in communicating biotechnology?
3. Who are your target audience?
4. Does your office repackage biotechnology/research to simple language for awareness purposes?
5. Does your office assist scientists in public understanding of biotechnology?
6. What are your constraints you face in dealing with the scientists?
7. What are the other constraints in communicating biotechnology?
8. How can the constraints be overcome?
9. Does your office support scientists in handling the media?
10. Is there grant for scientists to carry out awareness programme to enhance biotechnology literacy?
11. Does your office provide any training for scientists in communicating biotechnology?
12. How do you think we can increase biotechnology news in the media?
13. Do you have trained science communicators in your team?

Non-Research Organisations

1. Why is communicating biotechnology important to your organization?
2. What is your objective in communicating biotechnology? What do you want to achieve?
3. Who are your target audience??
4. What are your strategies in communicating biotechnology?
5. Do you have trained science communicators in your team?
6. Is training provided for your team to communicate biotechnology?
7. Does your office repackage biotechnology/research to simple language for awareness purposes?
8. What are your constraints in dealing with the media?
9. What are the other constraints in communicating biotechnology? How can the constraints be overcome?
10. Where does your fund come from for public awareness?
11. Do you rebut misinformation in the media? Why not?
12. Do you deal with religious/ethical issues and address them? Why? How?
13. Do you engage religious authorities and scholars in communicating science?

Religious Leaders

1. How would you rate your knowledge on biotechnology? Good/Fair/Poor
2. What are the key biotechnology issues of relevance to you?
3. Do religious leaders play a role in communicating issues about biotechnology to their followers? Do you think they should play a role? (Given that biotechnology has strong impact on most aspects of our lives such as health, food, feed, environment, ethics)
4. Do government agencies involve religious leaders as part of the biotechnology awareness programme?
5. Do government agencies consult religious leaders on the effective strategies to reach out to your followers on issues related to biotechnology?
6. Do any government agencies take initiatives to enhance biotechnology understanding among religious leaders?
7. What are your sources of information on biotechnology?
8. Does biotechnology require religious interpretation before it can be declared as permissible in your religion?
9. If yes, how do you play a role to guide your followers?
10. What are the challenges in communicating biotechnology to your followers?
11. How can these challenges be addressed?
12. Do you think it is important for you as a religious leader to have knowledge on biotechnology?
13. Do you think it important for followers of your religion to have knowledge on biotechnology?
14. Do you think followers of your religion look up to religious leaders to address queries/concerns on biotechnology?
15. Have you discussed any issues relating to biotechnology with your followers, in the past two years or so?
16. What are your suggestion to empower religious leaders as science/biotechnology communicators?

APPENDIX II

SURVEY QUESTIONS FOR MALAYSIAN PUBLICS

Name: _____

Gender: Male _____ Female _____

State of residence: _____

Race: _____

1. Do you understand the term biotechnology enough to explain it to a friend.
Please tick ✓

Yes _____

No _____

A little _____

2. Which area of biotechnology interests you most? Please tick ✓

Agriculture _____

Medical _____

Industry _____

Environment _____

None _____

3. Where do you get your information on biotechnology from? Please tick ✓

i) Newspapers _____

ii) TV _____

iii) Radio _____

iv) Internet _____

v) Science Centres _____

vi) Others _____

4. Please indicate your level of satisfaction on the coverage given to biotechnology news in the media. Please tick ✓

| | | | |
|-------------|-----------|----------------|------------|
| Newspapers: | _____ Low | _____ Moderate | _____ High |
| TV: | _____ Low | _____ Moderate | _____ High |
| Radio: | _____ Low | _____ Moderate | _____ High |

5. Which of the following source is the your most credible source for biotechnology news? Please tick ✓

| | |
|---------------------|----------------------|
| Media | _____ |
| Scientists | _____ |
| NGOs | _____ |
| Industry | _____ |
| Government agencies | _____ |
| Others | _____ Please specify |

6. Do you think it is important for the public to have basic knowledge on biotechnology?

| | | | |
|-----|-------|----|-------|
| Yes | _____ | No | _____ |
|-----|-------|----|-------|

7. If yes, please indicate why? Please use a scale of 1-10, 10 is the most important and 1 is the least important.

To make well-informed decisions on nutrition, medical needs, environmental care

To ensure we are able to inculcate the interest on biotechnology among our children

To ensure we are able to participate in government policies/direction and provide input

To take advantage of the business opportunities in this sector _____

Others. Please specify

APPENDIX III

INTERVIEW QUESTIONS FOR BIOTECHNOLOGY COMMUNICATORS IN THE USA, UK, PHILIPPINES, AUSTRALIA AND SINGAPORE

1. What are the main agencies you are aware of that are involved in communicating about biotechnology, in agriculture, health and medicine or other areas, in your country?
2. Who are the target audiences of the agencies?
3. How effective do you think the programs of each agency is in reaching their target audiences?
4. How much of a role do the mainstream media play in effective communication of biotechnology?
5. How would you rate the impact of mainstream media and new media, in communicating about biotechnology?
6. Is there a national science or biotech communication policy in your country?
7. Are there national strategies on communicating science or biotechnology in your country? Are these run by any particular agency?
8. Has the government allocated specific funds to support science or biotechnology communications policies and or strategies in your country?
9. How good is the existing science/biotechnology communication strategies that are in place in your country?
10. What can be improved? And what is not working well currently?
11. Please briefly describe the NGO activism and public attitude towards biotechnology in your country that drives the need for active biotechnology communication.
12. What inhibits effective communications about biotechnology in your country, and what do you suggest could be done about it?
13. What are your suggested best practices for effective biotech communication?
14. What are the key elements in a biotech communication model?