

swissuniversities

ScienceComm 21

Ooops! What's wrong? Wenn Wissenschaftsvermittlung scheitert

Beispiel CH

Josefa Haas, Leiterin Kommunikation swissuniversities

Beispiel: Susi Kriemer

Susi Kriemer

<https://www.srf.ch/play/tv/tagesschau/video/tagesschau-vom-09-09-2021-mittagsausgabe?urn=urn:srf:video:a1d05a7e-60d2-43da-a685-36dbbc44cdc6>

Wir haben ein natürliches Experiment: Zwei Drittel, die das repetitive Testen durchführen, ein Drittel der Schulen, die es nicht tun.

die positiven Kinder aussortiert...

[#LongCovidKids](#)-Experimente an den Zürcher Schulen? Susi Kriemer: „Ich glaube wir können jetzt dieses Experiment wirklich laufen lassen...um auch etwas abzuschätzen ob wir damit mehr oder weniger Long Covid kreieren bei Kindern. Das sind ein paar wenige Prozent.“

Matthias #GetVaccinated Egger

@eggernsf

Leider ein sehr lehrreiches Beispiel für misslungene Wissenschaftskommunikation. Das kann allen passieren, und wir können alle daraus lernen, zum Beispiel in Bezug auf Wörter, die man unbedingt vermeiden sollte.

#SciComm

#TeachingExample

Five rules for evidence communication

Avoid unwarranted certainty, neat narratives and partisan presentation; strive to inform, not persuade.

Offer balance, not false balance: We can't inform people fully if we don't convey the balance of relevant evidence.

Disclose uncertainties: Part of telling the whole story is talking about what we don't know.

State evidence quality: Audiences also judge the credibility of information based on the quality of the underlying evidence, more than its clarity, the usual priority for a communications.

State evidence quality:

Inoculate against misinformation: Prebunking requires anticipating potential misunderstandings or disinformation attacks, and that means understanding the concerns of the audience. department.

<https://www.nature.com/articles/d41586-020-03189-1>

Quick tips for sharing evidence

- *Address all the questions and concerns of the target audience.*
- *Anticipate misunderstandings; pre-emptively debunk or explain them.*
- *Don't cherry-pick findings.*
- *Present potential benefits and possible harms in the same way so that they can be compared fairly.*
- *Avoid the biases inherent in any presentation format (for example, use both 'positive' and 'negative' framing together).*
- *Use numbers alone, or both words and numbers.*
- *Demonstrate 'unapologetic uncertainty': be open about a range of possible outcomes.*
- *When you don't know, say so; say what you are going to do to find out, and by when.*
- *Highlight the quality and relevance of the underlying evidence (for example, describe the data set).*
- *Use a carefully designed layout in a clear order, and include sources.*

The aim is to 'inform but not persuade', and — as the philosopher of trust Onora O'Neill says — "to be accessible, comprehensible, usable and assessable".