The humanities appear to the public to be siloed in universities (unlike the sciences).

The media views humanities fields such as literature, history, and philosophy as primarily all about the university. That’s the conclusion that can be drawn from our Collection 21 of 28,957 articles mentioning the “humanities” or “science(s).” In a topic model of these articles, humanities fields blur together interchangeably in the same topics about academic programs.

For example, topic #74 in our model (a high-frequency topic) comes up in articles where the top ten recurring words are students, education, humanities, courses, college, course, science, programs, history, skills. Similar is topic #100, which is about announcements, obituaries, and other notices related to the humanities. It isolates the humanities in a world whose top ten words are professor, harvard, university, research, studies, humanities, academic, department, faculty, teaching. Looking for specific humanities fields such as literary studies or philosophy turns up the same set of topics. (See representative articles: a, b)

By contrast, the sciences have a different public profile. Science of course does show up in academic contexts. But it more often appears in the form of specific rather than commingled fields (e.g., astrophysics, climate science, stem-cell science, marine science), each covered for its objects of discovery, not in terms of academic programs. (See our key finding KF-5-7 on the identification of science with distinct fields, and also KF-5-4 on media coverage of science “objects.”)

So here is an important question for the humanities: how can they also bridge outwards to other areas of public interest and not stay locked up in the academy? (For possible answers, see our key findings KF-5-TBD and KF-5-TBD.)