

HEALTH ENGINEERING AND SOCIETY SERIES
COMMUNICATION AND HEALTH SET



Volume 2
Health Experts in the Media

*Between
Legitimacy and Controversy*

Edited by
Laurence Corroy
Christelle Chauzal-Larguier
Aurélie Pourrez

ISTE

WILEY

Health Experts in the Media

Communication and Health Set

coordinated by
Laurence Corroy and Christelle Chauzal-Larguier

Volume 2

**Health Experts
in the Media**

Between Legitimacy and Controversy

Edited by

Laurence Corroy
Christelle Chauzal-Larguier
Aurélie Pourrez

ISTE

WILEY

First published 2024 in Great Britain and the United States by ISTE Ltd and John Wiley & Sons, Inc.

Apart from any fair dealing for the purposes of research or private study, or criticism or review, as permitted under the Copyright, Designs and Patents Act 1988, this publication may only be reproduced, stored or transmitted, in any form or by any means, with the prior permission in writing of the publishers, or in the case of reprographic reproduction in accordance with the terms and licenses issued by the CLA. Enquiries concerning reproduction outside these terms should be sent to the publishers at the undermentioned address:

ISTE Ltd
27-37 St George's Road
London SW19 4EU
UK

www.iste.co.uk

John Wiley & Sons, Inc.
111 River Street
Hoboken, NJ 07030
USA

www.wiley.com

© ISTE Ltd 2024

The rights of Laurence Corroy, Christelle Chauzal-Larguier and Aurélie Pourrez to be identified as the authors of this work have been asserted by them in accordance with the Copyright, Designs and Patents Act 1988.

Any opinions, findings, and conclusions or recommendations expressed in this material are those of the author(s), contributor(s) or editor(s) and do not necessarily reflect the views of ISTE Group.

Library of Congress Control Number: 2024939838

British Library Cataloguing-in-Publication Data
A CIP record for this book is available from the British Library
ISBN 979-1-78630-976-1

Contents

Author Presentation	ix
Preface	xv
Laurence CORROY and Christelle CHAUZAL-LARGUIER	
Part 1. Experts Involved in Public Health Controversies	1
Chapter 1. The Pharmaceutical Treatment of Premature Ejaculation: “Gray-Zone Communication”	3
Stéphanie DEBRAY and Lucile DESMOULINS	
1.1. Introduction.	3
1.2. The ambiguities and controversies regarding dapoxetine	5
1.2.1. Semantic ambiguities surrounding PE.	5
1.2.2. Therapeutic and etiological ambiguities surrounding dapoxetine	7
1.3. A textbook case study of a gray-zone communication strategy	9
1.3.1. The “scientification” effect and the erasure of the psychological and social dimensions of PE	9
1.3.2. Ambiguous figures of expertise and experts between science, medicine and marketing of influence.	11
1.4. Conclusion	14
1.5. References	16
Chapter 2. Battle of Expertise and Experts in the Media: The Case of Glyphosate (2000–2020)	19
Baptiste SCHUMMER	
2.1. Introduction.	19
2.2. Battles of expertise in the media	20
2.2.1. Lay experts versus GMOs (2000–2011)	21

2.2.2. An outcry against Roundup! The Séralini affair: putting a health threat on the media agenda (2012–2014)	22
2.2.3. From Roundup to glyphosate: expertise and counter-expertise (2015–2018).	23
2.3. Experts in media battles	25
2.3.1. Lay expertise as anti-glyphosate evidence	26
2.3.2. Academic expertise as the sinews of journalistic warfare	27
2.3.3. Expertise as a Trojan horse for ideology	30
2.4. Conclusion	32
2.5. References	33
Chapter 3. The Influence of Opinion Leaders on Health Shows: <i>L'Amour en Questions</i> (1994–1998)	37
Sylvie PIERRE	
3.1. Introduction.	37
3.2. The expert as both an “authority figure” and an “influencer”	39
3.3. The “controversial” expert	45
3.4. The “engaged” expert	46
3.5. Conclusion	49
3.6. References	49
Chapter 4. The Case of the Belgian Medical Reform Group and the Media (1964–1990)	53
Alexandra MICCICHE	
4.1. Introduction.	53
4.2. GERM (1964–1990)	56
4.3. A group of experts... who communicate	58
4.3.1. Thierry Poucet’s “unconventional” journalistic path to journalism	59
4.3.2. A group of “legitimate” experts?	60
4.4. GERM on the small screen.	61
4.5. Conclusion	64
4.6. References	65
Part 2. Lay Expertise versus Scientific Expertise	69
Chapter 5. Presenting the Expert’s Ethos in the Magazine Press: “Dr. H’s Column”	71
Laurence CORROY and Émilie ROCHE	
5.1. Introduction.	71
5.2. When medical expertise is embodied: the case of Dr. H	72

5.3. Asymmetry in doctor–patient discourse 74
 5.4. Vulnerable pregnant women 76
 5.5. The midwife, or the temptation of the creator? 78
 5.6. The father’s role 81
 5.7. The limits of medical power 82
 5.8. Conclusion 82
 5.9. References 83

Chapter 6. Caregivers in the Media: What is the Legitimacy in Their Expertise? 87

Christelle CHAUZAL-LARGUIER and Alexis MEYER

6.1. Introduction. 87
 6.2. Caregivers and their lay expertise in the media. 91
 6.2.1. Lay experiential expertise 91
 6.2.2. Demonstrative relevance in the media space 94
 6.3. The legitimacy of caregivers’ expertise 96
 6.3.1. The legitimacy of expertise 96
 6.3.2. Non-media coverage of the caregiver’s expertise 99
 6.4. Conclusion 100
 6.5. References 101

Chapter 7. The Long Covid Patient: Legitimizing Patient Experience 105

Corinne ROCHETTE

7.1. Introduction. 105
 7.2. The emergence of legitimate expert knowledge 107
 7.2.1. From lay knowledge to expertise: the role of empowerment 107
 7.2.2. Legitimizing lay knowledge 110
 7.3. Methodology 114
 7.4. Results. 115
 7.4.1. Getting to know oneself and being recognized: avoiding invisibility 115
 7.4.2. Stages in the legitimization process 116
 7.5. Discussion 119
 7.6. Conclusion 120
 7.7. References 121

Chapter 8. Patient Influencers: Towards a Double Layer of Expertise	127
Oihana HUSSON	
8.1. Introduction	127
8.2. Literature review and research questions	127
8.3. Methodology	129
8.4. Discussion of results	130
8.4.1. The importance of legitimacy	130
8.4.2. Building influence: from lay expertise to peer support	131
8.4.3. The professionalization of influencers as content creators	133
8.4.4. Features specific to the healthcare sector	133
8.4.5. Instrumentalization of influence in the service of other professional projects	135
8.5. Conclusion	136
8.6. References	137
Chapter 9. Legitimizing Lay Expertise: The Contribution of Terminology	139
Emma THIBERT, Aurélie PICTON, and Valérie DELAVIGNE	
9.1. Introduction	139
9.2. Contextualization	140
9.2.1. Terminology	140
9.2.2. The changing medical paradigm: new grounds for terminology	141
9.2.3. Diabetology: a suitable field for a case study	143
9.3. Methodology	144
9.3.1. Hybrid data	144
9.3.2. A contrastive analysis	145
9.3.3. A tool-based approach	145
9.4. Analysis and initial results	146
9.4.1. Field-specific terminology in patient discourse	146
9.4.2. The absence of knowledge-rich contexts	147
9.4.3. The similarity of syntactic specificities	149
9.5. Conclusion	152
9.6. References	152
List of Authors	157
Index	159

Author Presentation

Christelle Chauzal-Larguier

Christelle Chauzal-Larguier is an Associate Professor of Management Sciences at the Clermont Auvergne University and a member of the *Laboratoire communication et sociétés* (EA 4647). Her research focuses on corporate communication and corporate social responsibility (CSR), including solidarity policy, which she explored from the perspective of paid family caregivers and the schemes devised to help them¹.

Laurence Corroy

Laurence Corroy is a Professor of Information and Communication Sciences at the *Centre de recherche sur les médiations* (CREM, UR 3476) at the University of Lorraine. Her work focuses on two main areas of research: first, critical media literacy, including digital technology and information literacy, and the communicative practices of young people; second, health education, particularly how health issues are formed in the public arena, television dramas and by related media discourse and representations.

Stéphanie Debray

Stéphanie Debray got her PhD at the University of Lorraine and is an associate member of the Archives Henri-Poincaré – Philosophie et

¹ Chauzal-Larguier, C. and Rouquette, S. (2018). *La solidarité, une affaire d'entreprise ?* Presses universitaires Blaise-Pascal, Clermont-Ferrand.

Recherches sur les Sciences et les Technologies (AHP-PreST) research team. Her thesis investigates the demarcation problem between scientific and non-scientific productions, and the question of values in science in the field of the philosophy of science. Her research focuses on the distinctions between science and pseudoscience, scientific misconduct and other dark practices. She holds a temporary teaching and research position at Gustave Eiffel University as part of the university's Information and Communication Sciences research team (2021–2023). Her dual disciplinary grounding enables her to study issues linked to the production, dissemination and impact of science in society, and to analyze its epistemic, methodological, communicational and organizational aspects, particularly where scientific activity involves different and competing actors (e.g. citizens, advocacy NGOs or industry representatives).

Valérie Delavigne

Valérie Delavigne is an Associate Professor in Linguistics at Sorbonne Nouvelle University and a member of the laboratory CLESTHIA (EA 7345). She has worked for several years with the Institut National du Cancer, which offers an information platform and for which she directed the online dictionary for patients. Concerned by linguistics in touch with reality, her research focuses on the uses and social circulation of terminologies and on the forms of scientific, technical and medical popularization, in line with research into socioterminology. She is currently working on a critical dictionary on ecology, while continuing her research into the language aspects of medical expertise.

Lucile Desmoulins

Lucile Desmoulins is an Associate Professor of Information and Communication Sciences at Gustave Eiffel University and a member of the DICEN-Idf research team. Her research focuses on ICS and cognitive approaches to public policy, more precisely the links between organizational communication and influence, lobbying as well as scientific advocacy strategies. She questions for instance the hybridity of organizational and managerial forms and discourse. She also studies the methods and tools of influencer marketing, notably, through the discursive and organizational

dimensions of identity and authority in the digital age and social media. As the head of the master's program in business intelligence (BI), influence, lobbying and social media influence strategies (M2IE-ILMS), she analyzes the evolution of professional deontological standards and codes of ethics, focusing on dark BI and public relations digital methods and strategies.

Oihana Husson

Oihana Husson is a PhD candidate in Information and Communication Sciences at the University of Burgundy and a member of the CIMEOS (Communications, Mediations, Organizations, Knowledge, EA 4177) research unit. Her research focuses on healthcare expertise on social media and the professionalization of social media influencers.

Alexis Meyer

Alexis Meyer is the Manager of Bourbon-Lancy's Tourist and Spa Information Office (*Office de tourisme et du thermalisme*) and an Associate Professor/Lecturer at the Clermont Auvergne University. After studying strategic information and international market policy, he first worked in the marketing department of a Lyon-based retail group, before taking over the management of Bourbon-Lancy's Tourist and Spa Information Office. His research focuses mainly on institutional/corporate communications, with an emphasis on support in relation to strategies applied to the spa/wellness and tourism sectors.

Alexandra Micciche

Alexandra Micciche is a PhD student of Contemporary History at the Université Libre de Bruxelles (ULB) and the University of Namur, and works with ULB's *Mondes modernes et contemporains* (MMC) research center and the University of Namur's *Histoire, sons et images* (HiSI) research group. As part of her doctoral project, she is studying the mobilizations of medical and nursing staff in their relationship with Belgian public television programs between 1964 and 1989.

Aurélie Picton

Aurélie Picton has been an Associate Professor in the Department of Translation Technology (TIM) at the University of Geneva since 2011. She teaches terminology, lexicology and language resources, language for special purposes and the use of corpora for translation. She obtained her PhD in Linguistics in 2009 from the University of Toulouse, co-funded by the French National Centre for Scientific Research (Laboratoire CLLE-RSS, CNRS, UMR 5263) and the French National Centre for Space Studies (CNES). She is also an associate member of the *Observatoire de linguistique Sens-Texte* (OLST) at the University of Montreal. Her main research interests concern the analysis of dialectal variation in specialized discourse, from a textual and socioterminological perspective. She is also interested in the impact of technologies on the practice/s of language professionals (e.g. the ANR CRISTAL project, 2012–2016). Since 2005, she has been involved in a number of applied projects on terminological variation and term circulation, particularly in the fields of space, humanitarian studies, particle physics and medicine.

Sylvie Pierre

Sylvie Pierre is a Professor of Information and Communication Sciences at the *Centre de recherche sur les médiations* (CREM, UR 3476) at the University of Lorraine. Her main research interests concern the history, actor's strategies and ethical issues of television. In the past, she was the editor head of the health and education department at *La Cinquième Chaîne, Chaîne du savoir et de la connaissance* from 1994 to 1998.

Aurélie Pourrez

Aurélie Pourrez is an Associate Professor in information and communication sciences at the University of Lorraine and a researcher at the *Centre de recherche sur les médiations* (CREM, UR 3476). Her work focuses on health communication and environmental communication. She also works on the social, environmental and ethical responsibility of organizations, as well as on communication implemented for the safety and

health of employees. She directs the ANR GwadaSafeMeat project to reduce chlordecone contamination in the population via the informal beef circuit in Guadeloupe.

Émilie Roche

Émilie Roche is an Associate Professor at the Sorbonne Nouvelle University's *Centre de recherche sur les liens sociaux* (CERLIS, UMR 8070). Her work examines the media coverage of violence (terrorism, war, urban and police violence), health, the environment and presidential campaigns.

Corinne Rochette

Corinne Rochette is a Professor at the Clermont Auvergne University's School of Management (IAE) and a member of its CleRMa (*Clermont recherche management*) research center. She designed a master's degree in Public Management, as well as one in the management of medico-social and healthcare organizations, and is co-founder and holder of the Health and Territories research chair of Clermont Auvergne University Foundation. She is Academic President of the International Association of Public Management Research and an expert for several public organizations, including the French Public Health Council. She studies the transformations of public organizations and services, as well as access to care, innovative organizational systems, governance and patient pathways. She is currently supervising six theses. Her research output amounts to some 100 academic contributions, including articles and conferences.

Baptiste Schummer

Baptiste Schummer is a PhD student in Political Science at the *Centre d'études de recherches administratives politiques et sociales* (CERAPS, UMR 8026) at the University of Lille. He is currently writing his thesis, under the supervision of Jean-Gabriel Contamin and Nicolas Kaciaf, comparing French media coverage of glyphosate and violence against women between 2000 and 2020. As an extension of his PhD project, he recently published an article, "*Le glyphosate et les journalistes en France: la construction sociale d'un problème public médiatisé (2000–2020)*", in the

journal *Sur le journalisme*, Volume 11, no. 2, 2022. He has also published in the journal *Politiques de Communication*, “*Durer dans le champ médiatique. La carrière d’Alain Duhamel*”, Volume 13, no. 2, 2019, which drew on his master’s thesis on the sociology of journalism (Sciences Po Lille).

Emma Thibert

Emma Thibert has worked as a Research and Teaching Assistant at the Department of Translation Technology (TIM) at the University of Geneva since June 2019, after having completed her master’s degree in Translation and Technology at the university’s Faculty of Translation and Interpreting. She collaborated on the Humanitarian Encyclopedia project, coordinated by the Geneva Centre for Education and Research in Humanitarian Action (CERAH), before joining the university’s terminology team, where she started working on her PhD thesis, under the supervision of Aurélie Picton (TIM-FTI) and Valérie Delavigne (CLESTHIA, Sorbonne Nouvelle University), in 2021. Her fields of interest are textual terminology, socioterminology, variation in specialty languages, corpus linguistics and term circulation.

Preface

For a long time, expertise has primarily been used by policy makers. They have made use of expertise to provide a “rational” basis for policy decisions. To this end, public health policies are no exception. The relationship between health authorities, as the holders of knowledge-based expertise, and the State, as the centralized power, has long been imbued with it, maintaining its ambiguous nature (Tabuteau 2010). In recent decades, the practice of consulting experts has become more widespread, and “the challenge of expertise is all the more problematic given that the term has become more used and widespread and that times have transformed the learned and professional institutions that gave the expert their title in the 18th and (especially) 19th centuries” (Berrebi-Hoffmann and Lallement 2009, p. 6). It is no longer solely public authorities or academic circles that lay claim to the figure of the expert; now, experts are widely consulted by the media, for the purpose of informing the public and making expertise publically available, which has sparked debate over the content of “expert” knowledge, and the role and place of these experts (Collins and Evans 2007). The practice of consulting experts “whose research focus is conditioned by the imperatives of action and reform” (Delmas 2011, p. 16) is thus aimed at new objectives.

The term “expert”, deriving from the Latin *expertus*, means “one who has proven themselves”. According to the *Dictionnaire de l’Académie* (1687), in the 17th century, an expert was defined as “well-versed in/adept at some art that can be learned by experience”, such as surgery. At the same time, Richelet’s dictionary defined an expert as a “savant, adept and accomplished

in something; experienced”. This two-pronged meaning was more explicitly divided in the 19th century, as evident in *Litttré* (1863): on the one hand, the expert refers to an individual “who has, through experience, acquired great skill in a profession” and, on the other, one “who, having acquired knowledge of certain things, is appointed to verify and decide on them”. In the field of health, a distinction is made between expert appraisals, such as psychiatric appraisals, carried out by doctors, and psychological appraisals carried out by health professionals or medical specialists who are not doctors in a variety of circumstances (e.g. personal follow-up of the patient, legal cases, administrative litigation, etc.).

The expert and their expertise are the subject of increasing attention in academic research, giving rise to an abundance of publications. Researchers from various disciplinary fields have sought to gain a better understanding of expertise and have drawn on different approaches to develop methods of analysis, such as psychology and its individual approach, sociology opting for a more contextualized approach, or management sciences and their organizational angle. In information and communication sciences, researchers seek to understand the communicational, political and heuristic dynamics of the practice of consulting of experts, particularly by the media. Today, society’s many developments in the field of health and communication are renewing interest in experts and the questions they arouse. This book sets out to examine in detail the widespread use of experts, who are positioned as informants, authority figures or interpreters of current events (Campion and Van Wynsberge 2017), by journalists, their presence in traditional and digital media and the pliable definition of expertise, among other issues.

The media coverage of health experts’ words highlights the difficulty recipients have in assessing legitimacy and the trust that can be placed in them. There is an element of vagueness and ambivalence in the notion of expertise as it is conceptualized by the media that needs to be investigated further. This can be seen in examples of experts’ (sometimes conflicting) opinions on recurring topics in public health – health crises, vaccinations, end of life care, chronic care pathways – as well as well-being-related matters and factors (sexuality, nutrition, environment, etc.) for a healthy life. The proliferation of the media, news channels and digital offerings, while at the same time the increase in life expectancy – which has doubled in the space of a century – poses new medical challenges, has led to a growing

demand for expert advice, which in recent years has become increasingly complex and protean.

The very identity of the expert called upon to deal with medical issues is not self-evident, since real-life experience, scholarly knowledge or media coverage seem to justify their presence, depending on the case. Who qualifies as a health expert?

The complex figure of the health expert

The figure of the health expert, as consulted by the media, is neither subject to the same standards of transparency, nor required to meet the same criteria of competence as when they are consulted by policy makers (Joly 1999; Bérard and Crespin 2010). As such, the aim of this book is to study the health expert in the media in order to understand the complexity of their role, question their legitimacy and to better understand the controversies they can provoke. Generally speaking, legitimacy can be defined as a “generalized perception or supposition that an entity’s actions are desirable, and appropriate within a socially-constructed system of norms, values, beliefs and meanings” (Suchman 1995, p. 574).

A person with a particular kind of institutionally recognized (and therefore legitimate) expertise may be presented as an expert in a completely different context. Today, the expert has many facets, adaptable or even shaped to suit the context, and can in turn take on “the features of the consultant proposing reforms”, don “the clothes of the evaluator and auditor”, propose indicators and assume “the role of the scientist” analyzing the risks incurred by the population (Berrebi-Hoffmann and Lallement 2009, p. 6). This can fuel mistrust or suspicion of manipulation of opinions¹, but it can also influence and, in some cases, overturn the relationship between the media and “experts”. While the intent here is not necessarily to sway public opinion, the tendency to call on experts for matters that fall outside of their recognized field of expertise has led to the spread of a buzzword that has become fashionable since the Covid-19 pandemic: ultracrepidarianism, which involves giving our opinion on subjects despite lacking the

¹ We can point to the manipulation of the Tobacco Industry Research Committee as the root of this mistrust. Dr. Clarence Cook Little was put in charge of the research group that was supposed to be studying the causality of tobacco in lung cancer, but he was actually receiving funding to study the genetic factor in the onset of cancer from 1959 to 1964.