

---

## Contents

---

<b>Author Presentation</b> . . . . .	ix
<b>Preface</b> . . . . .	xv
Laurence CORROY and Christelle CHAUZAL-LARGUIER	
<b>Part 1. Experts Involved in Public Health Controversies</b> . . . . .	1
<b>Chapter 1. The Pharmaceutical Treatment of Premature Ejaculation: “Gray-Zone Communication”</b> . . . . .	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
<b>Chapter 2. Battle of Expertise and Experts in the Media: The Case of Glyphosate (2000–2020)</b> . . . . .	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
<b>Chapter 3. The Influence of Opinion Leaders on Health Shows: <i>L'Amour en Questions</i> (1994–1998).</b> . . . . .	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
<b>Chapter 4. The Case of the Belgian Medical Reform Group and the Media (1964–1990)</b> . . . . .	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
<b>Part 2. Lay Expertise versus Scientific Expertise</b> . . . . .	69
<b>Chapter 5. Presenting the Expert’s Ethos in the Magazine Press: “Dr. H’s Column”</b> . . . . .	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
<b>Chapter 6. Caregivers in the Media: What is the Legitimacy in Their Expertise?</b> . . . . .	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
<b>Chapter 7. The Long Covid Patient: Legitimizing Patient Experience</b> . . . . .	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

<b>Chapter 8. Patient Influencers: Towards a Double Layer of Expertise</b> . . . . .	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
<b>Chapter 9. Legitimizing Lay Expertise: The Contribution of Terminology</b> . . . . .	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
<b>List of Authors</b> . . . . .	157
<b>Index</b> . . . . .	159