

# HPSCGA49: Science Policy in an Era of Risk and Uncertainty

View Online



1.

Arnoldi J. Risk: an introduction. Cambridge: Polity; 2009.

2.

Gigerenzer G. Risk savvy: how to make good decisions. New York: Viking; 2014.

3.

Lupton D. Risk [Internet]. Second edition. Abingdon, Oxon: Routledge; 2013. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781135090326>

4.

Burgess A, Alemanno A, Zinn J. Routledge Handbook of Risk Studies. Florence: Taylor and Francis; 2016.

5.

Bammer G, Smithson M. Uncertainty and risk: multidisciplinary perspectives. London: Earthscan; 2008.

6.

Ulrich Beck. Risk society: towards a new modernity. London: Sage; 1992.

7.

Jasanoff S. Designs on nature: science and democracy in Europe and the United States. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press; 2005.

8.

Nowotny H. The cunning of uncertainty. Cambridge: Polity; 2016.

9.

Slovic P. The perception of risk. London: Earthscan; 2000.

10.

Gilberto C. Gallopin, Silvio Funtowicz, Martin O'Connor, Jerry Ravetz. Science for the Twenty-First Century: From Social Contract to the Scientific Core. International Social Science Journal [Internet]. 2001 Jun;53(168):219-229. Available from: <https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/toc/14682451/2001/53/168>

11.

Gibbons M, Limoges C, Nowotny H, Schwartzman S, Scott P, Trow MA. The new production of knowledge: the dynamics of science and research in contemporary societies [Internet]. London: SAGE Publications; 1994. Available from: <http://ebookcentral.proquest.com/lib/ucl/detail.action?docID=1024114>

12.

J.R. Ravetz. What is Post-Normal Science. Futures:The journal of policy, planning and futures studies [Internet]. Elsevier Science Ltd.; 1999;31(7):647-653. Available from: <https://www.sciencedirect.com/journal/futures/vol/31/issue/7>

13.

Jerome R Ravetz, Ziauddin Sardar. Rethinking science. Futures:The journal of policy, planning and futures studies [Internet]. Elsevier Science Ltd; 1997 Aug;29(6):467-470. Available from: <https://www.sciencedirect.com/journal/futures/vol/29/issue/6>

14.

Deborah Dixon, Harriet Hawkins, Mrill Ingram. Art: Blurring the boundaries. Nature [Internet]. Nature Publishing Group.; 2011 Apr 28;472(7344):417–417. Available from: <https://www.nature.com/>

15.

C. J. Fearnley, W. J. McGuire, G. Davies, J. Twigg. Standardisation of the USGS Volcano Alert Level System (VALS): analysis and ramifications. Bulletin of Volcanology [Internet]. 2012 Nov;74(9):2023–2036. Available from: <https://link.springer.com/journal/445/volumes-and-issues/74-9>

16.

Carolina Garcia, Carina J. Fearnley. Evaluating critical links in early warning systems for natural hazards. Environmental Hazards [Internet]. 2012 Jun;11(2):123–137. Available from: <https://www.tandfonline.com/toc/tenh20/11/2>

17.

Bruno, Latour. On actor-network theory: A few clarifications. Soziale Welt [Internet]. Nomos Verlagsgesellschaft mbH; 1996;47(4):369–381. Available from: <https://www.jstor.org/stable/40878163>

18.

Mileti DS. Disasters by design: a reassessment of natural hazards in the United States. Washington, D.C.: Joseph Henry Press; 1999.

19.

Vaughan D, American Council of Learned Societies. The Challenger launch decision: risky technology, culture, and deviance at NASA [Internet]. Chicago: University of Chicago Press; 1996. Available from: <http://hdl.handle.net/2027/heb.01159>

20.

Day S, Fearnley C. A classification of mitigation strategies for natural hazards: implications for the understanding of interactions between mitigation strategies. *Natural Hazards*. 2015 Nov;79(2):1219–1238.

21.

D. Jamieson. Scientific Uncertainty and the Political Process. *The ANNALS of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* [Internet]. 1996 May 1;545(1):35–43. Available from: <https://journals.sagepub.com/toc/anna/545/1>

22.

D. J. Spiegelhalter, H. Riesch. Don't know, can't know: embracing deeper uncertainties when analysing risks. *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society A: Mathematical, Physical and Engineering Sciences* [Internet]. 2011 Dec 13;369(1956):4730–4750. Available from: <https://royalsocietypublishing.org/toc/rsta/2011/369/1956>

23.

Andrew, Stirling. Risk, precaution and science: towards a more constructive policy debate. Talking point on the precautionary principle. *EMBO reports* [Internet]. 2007 Apr;8(4):309–315. Available from: <https://www.embopress.org/toc/14693178/2007/8/4>

24.

Stirling A. Risk, precaution and science: towards a more constructive policy debate. Talking point on the precautionary principle. *EMBO reports*. 2007 Apr;8(4):309–315.

25.

Douglas M, Wildavsky AB. Risk and culture: an essay on the selection of technical and environmental dangers [Internet]. Berkeley: University of California Press; 1982. Available from: <https://www.jstor.org/stable/10.1525/j.ctt7zw3mr>

26.

Thomas F. Gieryn. Boundary-Work and the Demarcation of Science from Non-Science: Strains and Interests in Professional Ideologies of Scientists. *American Sociological Review* [Internet]. 1983;48(6):781–795. Available from: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/2095325>

27.

Knight FH. Risk, uncertainty and profit. London: Forgotten Books; 2015.

28.

Mayo DG. Error and the growth of experimental knowledge [Internet]. Chicago: University of Chicago Press; 1996. Available from:  
<https://www.vlebooks.com/Vleweb/Product/Index/467948?page=0>

29.

Wisner B, editor. At risk: natural hazards, people's vulnerability, and disasters [Internet]. Second edition. Abingdon, Oxon: Routledge; 2014. Available from:  
<https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203714775>

30.

N. Pidgeon, M. O'Leary. Man-made disasters: why technology and organizations (sometimes) fail. Safety Science [Internet]. 2000 Feb;34(1):15–30. Available from:  
<https://www.sciencedirect.com/journal/safety-science/vol/34/issue/1>

31.

Mitchell M. Complexity: a guided tour [Internet]. New York: Oxford University Press; 2009. Available from:  
<https://ebookcentral.proquest.com/lib/UCL/detail.action?pq-origsite=primo&docID=472328>

32.

H. Nowotny. The Increase of Complexity and its Reduction: Emergent Interfaces between the Natural Sciences, Humanities and Social Sciences. Theory, Culture & Society [Internet]. 2005 Oct 1;22(5):15–31. Available from: <https://journals.sagepub.com/toc/tcsa/22/5>

33.

Ziauddin Sardar, Jerome R. Ravetz. Complexity: Fad or future? Futures [Internet]. 1994 Jul;26(6):563–567. Available from: <https://www.sciencedirect.com/journal/futures/vol/26/issue/6>

34.

Taylor PJ. Unruly complexity: ecology, interpretation, engagement [Internet]. Chicago, [Ill.]: University of Chicago Press; 2005. Available from: <http://www.vlebooks.com/vleweb/product/openreader?id=UCL&isbn=9780226790398>

35.

J. Urry. The Complexity Turn. Theory, Culture & Society [Internet]. 2005 Oct 1;22(5):1–14. Available from: <https://journals.sagepub.com/toc/tcsa/22/5>

36.

Peter, Adey, Ben, Anderson. Event and anticipation: UK Civil Contingencies and the space – times of decision. Environment and Planning A [Internet]. 2011;43(12):2878–2899. Available from: <https://journals.sagepub.com/toc/epna/43/12>

37.

J. Burgess, A. Stirling, J. Clark, G. Davies, M. Eames, K. Staley, S. Williamson. Deliberative mapping: a novel analytic-deliberative methodology to support contested science-policy decisions. Public Understanding of Science [Internet]. 2007 Jul 1;16(3):299–322. Available from: <https://journals.sagepub.com/toc/pusa/16/3>

38.

Jasanoff S. Designs on nature: science and democracy in Europe and the United States [Internet]. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press; 2005. Available from: <https://www-jstor-org.libproxy.ucl.ac.uk/stable/j.ctt7spkz>

39.

Paul, Slovic, Baruch, Fischhoff, Sarah, Lichtenstein. Why Study Risk Perception? Risk Analysis [Internet]. 1982 Jun;2(2):83–93. Available from:

<https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/toc/15396924/1982/2/2>

40.

Michael S. Carolan. Science, Expertise, and the Democratization of the Decision-Making Process. *Society & Natural Resources* [Internet]. 2006 Aug;19(7):661–668. Available from: <https://www.tandfonline.com/toc/usnr20/19/7>

41.

H.M. Collins, Robert, Evans. The Third Wave of Science Studies. *Social Studies of Science* [Internet]. 2002 Apr;32(2):235–296. Available from: <https://journals.sagepub.com/toc/sssb/32/2>

42.

Jasanoff S. *States of knowledge: the co-production of science and social order*. London: Routledge; 2004.

43.

Lash S, Szerszynski B, Wynne B. *Risk, environment and modernity: towards a new ecology* [Internet]. London: Sage; 1996. Available from: <https://ebookcentral.proquest.com/lib/ucl/detail.action?docID=1023984>

44.

G. A. Bradshaw, Jeffrey G. Borchers. Uncertainty as Information: Narrowing the Science-policy Gap. *Conservation Ecology* [Internet]. 2000;4(1). Available from: <https://www.ecologyandsociety.org/vol4/iss1/>

45.

John R. Durant, Geoffrey A. Evans, Geoffrey P. Thomas. The public understanding of science. *Nature* [Internet]. 1989 Jul 6;340(6228):11–14. Available from: <https://www.nature.com/>

46.

Culture, Media, Language [Internet]. Abingdon, UK: Taylor & Francis; 1980. Available from: <http://www.tandfebooks.com/action/showBook?doi=10.4324/9780203381182>

47.

G. Rowe. A Typology of Public Engagement Mechanisms. *Science, Technology & Human Values* [Internet]. 2005 Apr 1;30(2):251–290. Available from: <https://journals.sagepub.com/toc/sthd/30/2>

48.

S. Shackley, B. Wynne. Representing Uncertainty in Global Climate Change Science and Policy: Boundary-Ordering Devices and Authority. *Science, Technology & Human Values* [Internet]. 1996 Jul 1;21(3):275–302. Available from: <https://journals.sagepub.com/toc/sthd/21/3>

49.

Deborah Trumbull et al. Thinking scientifically during participation in a citizen-science project. *Science education* [Internet]. Wiley; 84(2):265–275. Available from: [http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1002/\(SICI\)1098-237X\(200003\)84:2%3C265::AID-SCE7%3E3.0.CO;2-5/abstract](http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1002/(SICI)1098-237X(200003)84:2%3C265::AID-SCE7%3E3.0.CO;2-5/abstract)

50.

J. Burgess, A. Stirling, J. Clark, G. Davies, M. Eames, K. Staley, S. Williamson. Deliberative mapping: a novel analytic-deliberative methodology to support contested science-policy decisions. *Public Understanding of Science* [Internet]. SAGE; 2007 Jul 1;16(3):299–322. Available from: <https://journals.sagepub.com/toc/pusa/16/3>

51.

Shane J. Cronin, David R. Gaylord, Douglas Charley, Brent V. Alloway, Sandrine Wallez, Job W. Esau. Participatory methods of incorporating scientific with traditional knowledge for volcanic hazard management on Ambae Island, Vanuatu. *Bulletin of Volcanology* [Internet]. Springer; 2004 Oct;66(7):652–668. Available from: <https://link.springer.com/journal/445/volumes-and-issues/66-7>

52.

George E. Marcus. Ethnography in/of the World System: The Emergence of Multi-Sited Ethnography. *Annual Review of Anthropology* [Internet]. Annual Reviews; 1995;24:95-117. Available from: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/2155931>

53.

Andrea J. Nightingale. A Feminist in the Forest: Situated Knowledges and Mixing Methods in Natural Resource Management. *ACME: An International E-Journal for Critical Geographies* [Internet]. 2003;2(1):77-90. Available from: <http://hdl.handle.net/1842/1405>