



Universiteit
Leiden

The Netherlands

In a state of superposition: exploring (in)effective public communication about quantum technology

Meinsma, A.L.

Citation

Meinsma, A. L. (2026, January 28). *In a state of superposition: exploring (in)effective public communication about quantum technology*. Retrieved from <https://hdl.handle.net/1887/4288270>

Version: Publisher's Version

License: [Licence agreement concerning inclusion of doctoral thesis in the Institutional Repository of the University of Leiden](#)

Downloaded from: <https://hdl.handle.net/1887/4288270>

Note: To cite this publication please use the final published version (if applicable).

In a State of Superposition:
Exploring (In)Effective Public
Communication About Quantum
Technology

Aletta Lucia Meinsma

Cover photograph © Walter Schlundt Bodien

The research in this dissertation was supported by the Dutch Research Council (NWO) through a Spinoza Grant awarded to R Hanson (Project Number SPI 63-264) and the Dutch National Growth Fund (NGF), as part of the Quantum Delta NL programme.

In a State of Superposition: Exploring (In)Effective Public Communication About Quantum Technology

Proefschrift

ter verkrijging van
de graad van doctor aan de Universiteit Leiden,
op gezag van waarnemend rector magnificus,
volgens besluit van het college voor promoties
te verdedigen op woensdag 28 januari 2026
klokke 10.00 uur

door

Aletta Lucia Meinsma
geboren te Nieuwegein
in 1996

Promotor:

Prof.dr.ir. I. Smeets

Co-promotores:

Dr.ir. J. Cramer

Dr. W.G. Reijnierse (Vrije Universiteit Amsterdam)

Promotiecommissie:

Prof.dr. K.E. Schalm

Prof.dr.ir. S.J. van der Molen

Prof.dr. I.B. van Vulpen

Prof.dr.ir. R. Hanson (Technische Universiteit Delft)

Prof.dr. S. Kruikemeier (Wageningen University & Research)

Dr. R. Pilgram

Contents

1	Introduction	1
1.1	The field of quantum science and technology	3
1.1.1	Technology of the second quantum revolution	4
1.2	The field of science communication in quantum developments	7
1.2.1	Public engagement with quantum science and technology	7
1.2.2	Frames	9
1.2.3	Metaphors	10
1.2.4	Call for research	11
1.3	Outline of the dissertation	12
2	Is Everything Quantum ‘Spooky and Weird’? An Exploration of Popular Communication About Quantum Science and Technology in TEDx Talks	15
2.1	Introduction	17
2.2	Theory	18
2.2.1	The importance of connecting with societal actors in the development of emergent technologies	18
2.2.2	Science popularisation in TEDx talks	19
2.2.3	Potential issues in popularising quantum science and technology	20
2.3	Methods	23
2.3.1	Data selection	24
2.3.2	Coding	26
2.3.3	Intercoder reliability	27
2.4	Results	28
2.4.1	Descriptive data	28
2.4.2	The spooky and enigmatic frame	29
2.4.3	Explanation of underlying quantum phenomena when mentioning quantum 2.0 technology	29

2.4.4	The economic development/competitiveness vs social progress frame, and benefits vs risks frame	30
2.4.5	Technology applications of quantum science	31
2.4.6	Comparison between quantum experts and non-experts	31
2.5	Discussion	33
2.5.1	Spooky and enigmatic frame: apparent but not dominant	33
2.5.2	Explanations of underlying quantum phenomena: mostly given by experts	34
2.5.3	Narrow vs wider public good frame: over six times more benefits than risks	35
2.5.4	Quantum science applications: a focus on quantum computing	36
2.6	Conclusion	36
3	Quantum in the Media: A Content Analysis of Dutch Newspapers	39
3.1	Introduction	40
3.2	Theory	41
3.3	Methods	45
3.3.1	Sample collection	45
3.3.2	Codebook	46
3.3.3	Coding procedure and reliability	47
3.4	Results	48
3.4.1	Amount of coverage	48
3.4.2	Frames	49
3.5	Discussion	51
3.5.1	First-level agenda setting: how often is quantum technology written about?	51
3.5.2	Second-level agenda setting: how is quantum science and technology written about?	52
3.5.3	Limitations	53
3.5.4	Practical implications	53
4	The Effect of Frames on Engagement with Quantum Technology	55
4.1	Introduction	56
4.2	Theory	57
4.2.1	Scientific engagement	57
4.2.2	The effect of frames on engagement	58
4.2.3	The enigmatic frame	58
4.2.4	The explanation frame	59
4.2.5	The benefit, risk and balanced frames	60

4.2.6	Research questions	62
4.3	Method	62
4.3.1	Independent variables	63
4.3.2	Dependent variable	63
4.3.3	Analysis and statistical procedures	64
4.4	Results	64
4.4.1	Descriptives	64
4.4.2	Significant contributors to the regression models	65
4.4.3	MANOVA	66
4.5	Discussion	66
4.5.1	No effect of the enigmatic frame on engagement	66
4.5.2	The explanation frame affects general interest	68
4.5.3	The benefit frame increases internal efficacy, whereas the balanced frame decreases perceived knowledge	68
4.5.4	Limitations of this study	69
4.5.5	Practical implications	70

5 Like a Coin Spinning in the Air: The Effect of (Non-) Metaphorical Explanations on Comprehension and Attitudes Towards Quantum Technology 71

5.1	Introduction	73
5.2	Theory	74
5.2.1	Incomprehensible quantum science could limit public en- gagement	74
5.2.2	Effect of metaphor on comprehension	75
5.2.3	Effect of metaphor on attitude	76
5.2.4	Effect of comprehension on attitude	76
5.2.5	Metaphors in communication about quantum technology .	77
5.3	Methodology	78
5.3.1	Materials	78
5.3.2	Design and procedure	82
5.3.3	Participants	82
5.3.4	Dependent variables	83
5.3.5	Control variables	84
5.3.6	Analysis and statistical procedures	84
5.4	Results	85
5.4.1	Main effects on the dependent variables	85
5.4.2	Mediation effects	85
5.5	Discussion	90

5.5.1	Effects of explanation type on comprehension	90
5.5.2	Effects of explanation type on attitude	91
5.5.3	Comprehension as a mediator between explanation type and attitudes	92
5.5.4	Resistance to metaphor	92
5.5.5	Practical implications	93
6	Conclusion	95
6.1	Introduction	95
6.2	Summary of the insights of this dissertation	95
6.2.1	Occurrence of four potential popularisation issues	95
6.2.2	Effect of frames on people’s engagement with quantum technology	98
6.2.3	Effect of metaphors on comprehensibility of quantum phe- nomena, and their (subsequent) effect on attitudes	99
6.3	Implications of the insights of this dissertation	101
6.3.1	Implications for the science communication research field	101
6.3.2	Practical implications for science communicators	103
6.4	Limitations and future research avenues	104
6.4.1	A focus on one-way communication	105
6.4.2	Predefined set of frames	105
6.4.3	Experimental limitations	106
6.4.4	A quantum technology hype	107
6.4.5	Perspectives from the Global South	108
6.5	Connecting quantum technology and society	108
	Bibliography	111
	Appendix	127
A1	Appendix I	127
A1.1	Reasons for deleting transcripts in step 4 of the data collection	127
A1.2	Low Krippendorff’s α in Phase 2 for codes with low pre- valence	127
A1.3	The origins of the TEDx talks in our dataset	129
A1.4	Comparison between experts and non-experts	130
A1.5	The complete coding scheme	131
A2	Appendix II	140
A2.1	The hybrid automatic-manual process to detect duplicates	140

A2.2	Reasons for discarding newspaper articles as irrelevant or unsuitable for the analysis	141
A2.3	Data of the sample	143
A2.4	Intercoder reliability results	144
A2.5	Analysis plan	145
A2.6	Prominence of frames in news reports and features	145
A2.7	Additional figures	146
A3	Appendix III	148
A3.1	Rationale for the 2 x 2 x 4 between-subjects design	148
A4	Appendix IV	155
A4.1	Text of stimulus material and different conditions	155
A4.2	Intercoder reliability on actual comprehension	159
A4.3	Control variables	159
A4.4	Expert insights study	162
A4.5	The variety of explanations from experts for their rankings	166
A4.6	Tables for the mediation analyses	171
	Samenvatting	174
	Summary	179
	Acknowledgements	184
	Curriculum Vitae	186
	List of publications	187

