

RECONTEXTUALIZING KNOWLEDGE



SITUATION IN SCIENCE COMMUNICATION

Abstracts Session One

Rhetoric of Recontextualization

Chairs: Dr. Thomas Susanka, Prof. Dr. Joachim Knape

Prof. Dr. Kris Rutten
A Rhetorical Approach to the Public Understanding of Behavioural Science

Mon, 2.30 pm

Science communication plays an important role in shaping the public understanding of science and as such creates a context for socio-ethical debates about the application and development of scientific research. However, the communication of science is always inevitably partial and this partiality raises issues of authority, creates potential misunderstandings and complicates the public debate about science.

There is an entangled and reciprocal relationship between science and society and therefore there is a need for a better understanding of the accommodation of scientific findings from experts to lay audiences and of the different positions in the scientific and the public debate.

In this paper, the aim is to explore rhetoric as an innovative approach to study the public understanding of science and to study how particular framings of scientific discussions influence the socio-ethical debate. I will focus on the public debate about mental health in relation to confronting positions within the behavioural sciences. Furthermore, I will discuss the educational implications of a rhetorical approach to this topic. I will argue that despite the growing body of scholarship on the rhetoric of science, there is a need for further development of rhetoric as a framework for the public understanding of (behavioural) science, specifically given the increasingly mediated public debate in an expert-dominated society.

Bio: Kris Rutten studied Art History and Comparative Cultural Studies, and obtained a PhD in Educational Sciences with a dissertation on the rhetorical and narrative turn in education. He is currently working as professor (Tenure Track) at the Department of Educational Studies of Ghent University and specifically within the research group Culture & Education. His main research interests are (new) rhetoric, cultural studies, literacy studies, educational theory and the rhetoric of science. He received the KBS Emerging Scholar Award at the 9th triennial conference of the Kenneth Burke Society (St. Louis, July 2014) and he is a member of the Executive Board of the Rhetoric Society of Europe.

Prof. Dr. Olaf Kramer
Making Facts Count. Recontextualization in Knowledge Communication

Mo, 3.15 pm

Recently we have heard media declaring the post-truth era and complaining about the success of alternative facts in political communication. These developments show that an argument, which relies on facts and empirically tested theories, does not automatically gain popular acceptance. Facts and theories, even if they are checked with highest scrutiny, do not convince people in and by themselves – even though enlightenment and rationalism promised so and even though the natural sciences clinched to this belief strongly ever since. From a rhetorical perspective, it is necessary for a successful knowledge transfer to interest and motivate the addressee, to make facts count by a complex process of recontextualization that turns mere data into relevant information. Promoting the incorporation of new information into individual systems of knowledge and understanding is to be understood as a complex rhetorical process, as I will show with regard to examples from popular discourse on scientific innovations.

Bio: Olaf Kramer is professor of rhetoric and science communication, and head of the Presentation Research Center at Tübingen University. His most important areas of research comprise literary aesthetics around 1800, communicative competence and continuing education, political communication and strategic positioning, as well as rhetoric education and virtual reality.

Markus Gottschling
Creating a Rhetorical Situation: Kevin Esvelt's Call for Open and Responsive Science

Mo, 4.30 pm

Scientists are used to act as communicators in the dissemination of their insights to colleagues as well as the public. In trying to reach their audiences, they use techniques of recontextualization (Linell 1998). However, debating the possible consequences of scientific breakthroughs, for example in synthetic biology or genetic engineering, shifts those operations to an uncertain future and thus towards the field of politics and deliberative speech. Engaging in or even starting such debates means that scientists participate in or even create rhetorical situations, possibly precontextualizing their own research, "legitimizing future discourse" and with that setting "the stage for the material

consequences of that discourse.” (Oddo 2014, 26) With regard to a call for ‘Open and Responsive Science’ by geneticist Kevin Esvelt, this paper wants to analyze techniques of recontextualization and precontextualization in science communication – within the scientific community as well as in its communication with journalism and the public.

Bio: Markus Gottschling is a member of the Presentation Research Center at Tübingen University. He received his M.A. in German Literature, English Literature and Rhetoric from Tübingen University. His fields of research include rhetoric of presentation, science communication and rhetorical situation, theory of space and narration.

Dr. Sophia Hatzisavvidou
Green Arguments: Scientific Evidence and Political Persuasion

Mo, 5.15 pm

Scientists are the first-point communicators of developments with regard to changes in the earth system. Their findings, observations, and assessments appear primarily in scientific journals, where they address a specific audience of similar educational background and are present-

ed following the particular rules of publishing scientific papers. But scientific evidence and argument also appear in reports prepared and circulated by international organisations, in order to provide the background for policy design and implementation; and increasingly they also appear in more popular and mainstream formats, such as newspaper articles, blog entries, TED presentations, and broadcasted shows, with the intent to inform and educate the wider public in a more accessible manner. It seems that scientific argument can be adapted to different situations and play diverse roles in the communication of knowledge and the formation of judgement.

The purpose of this paper is to sketch the effect of context change on the communication of scientific evidence. Employing the methodology of rhetorical analysis, the paper discusses how the common topic of “sustainability” has shifted contexts and sometimes also content and has evolved into a key element of environmental discourse and politics in the last 20 years. More specifically, the discussion focuses on three diverse contexts, namely scientific papers, policy documents and popular articles in the press and maps changes in the usages of the concept of “sustainability” in these different rhetorical situations. The value of a rhetorical analysis of the usage of this essential component of environmental discourse is that it enables us to explore continuity and transformation

in environmental policy disputes, as well as the rhetorical reconfiguration of green and anti-green ideologies. The paper, then, demonstrates how certain aspects of scientific discourse have been strategically used to create and enhance political consensus.

Bio: Sophia Hatzisavvidou is a Leverhulme Early Career Fellow at the School of Politics, Philosophy, Language and Communication Studies, University of East Anglia (2016-2019). She holds a PhD in Political Theory and between 2013-2016 she was a Lecturer at Goldsmiths, University of London. Her current project studies the effect of green rhetoric on political ideologies, as well as the rhetorical construction and reproduction of the relation and interaction between human and nonhuman environments.

Dr. Suzanne Lane, Dr. Andreas Karatsolis
Disciplinary Reasoning Diagrams as a Model for Analyzing Rhetorical Situations

Tue, 9.00 am

Scientific research is imbued with meaning in many contexts, but often, due to the advanced or technical nature of the work, researchers speak primarily with other scientists, and often focus narrowly on methods, tools, or

complications in data. Thus, when researchers want to address a broader audience, they often struggle to connect such specialized local concerns with a broader context outside of the lab. Recontextualizing knowledge for diverse real-world purposes requires a rhetorical understanding of the inter-relationship between purpose, audience, and genre, as well as a flexibility in identifying different explanatory pathways through the research.

In this paper, rather than closely analyzing one specific situation in science communication, we will present a framework for linking, and thinking through, the relationships between audience, genre, discourse, and the reasoning that underlies the research. We call our framework a “reasoning diagram,” and for the past two years have been creating such diagrams as discipline-specific maps that visualize relationships between concepts and the reasoning patterns that connect them. These reasoning patterns are identifiable as stases—questions of fact, definition, causation, value, or policy—and as such, can be used as a model to consider which reasoning patterns need to be explained for different purposes, audiences, and contexts, and which can be assumed “closed” because the audience already knows and understands them. Because these diagrams are visual and schematic, they can be remembered easily, and thus aid not only in the preparation for communicating to a specific audience

and context, but also in improvising or adapting to audiences in live situations.

Bio: Dr. Suzanne Lane is a Senior Lecturer in Rhetoric and Communication in the department of Comparative Media Studies.Writing at MIT. She directs the Writing, Rhetoric, and Professional Communication (WRAP) program, and heads, with Andreas Karatsolis, the related research group, ArchiMedia. ArchiMedia studies how developments in digital media are changing scientific and professional communication, and also designs new media tools for teaching students how to communicate effectively. Prior to directing WRAP, Dr. Lane taught at Harvard, where she researched how science students learn to write, as part of the Harvard Study of Undergraduate Writing.

Dr. Andreas Karatsolis is the Associate Director of Writing, Rhetoric, and Professional Communication at Massachusetts Institute of Technology (MIT) and has also taught at Carnegie Mellon University in Qatar (2008–2013). His disciplinary training includes a Ph.D. in Rhetoric and Communication with an emphasis on technical/professional communication in science-related fields, which is at the core of his teaching efforts, as he is primarily interested in designing curricula and tools that can help engineers and

scientists develop lifelong competencies in communication. In the past seven years, Dr. Karatsolis has also been the lead or co-principal investigator (PI) in projects related to the design, implementation, and assessment of learning technologies, especially in the domains of language learning, health communication, and public discourse.

Dr. Thomas Susanka
Overcoming Monologue: Questions from a Muted Audiences

Tue, 9.45 am

Science communication often takes place in communicative situations that enforce monologue, virtually muting the audience and by this potentially limiting their cognitive engagement. While situations pose powerful constraints (as argued by Bitzer, 1968), speakers can also devise communicative techniques to counter these limitations. Radioshows or podcasts are extreme cases for muted audiences. By looking at the example of the science related podcast Radiolab, I will try to show how science communicators overcome monologue by making use of storytelling, virtual audiences, and questions as devices for engaging the audience.

Bio: Dr. Thomas Susanka is member of the Presentation Research Center, Tübingen. M.A. in American Studies and Rhetoric (University of Tübingen). Dissertation on “The Rhetoric of Photography – James Nachtwey’s War Photography” (in German). Research interests include: Visual rhetoric, esp. rhetoric of the image, authenticity, ambiguity, rhetoric of science, rhetoric and cognitive psychology.

Prof. Dr. Sara D. Hodges

Getting to You Through Me: Where Perspective Taking Can and Cannot Take Us

Tue, 11.00 am

Taking another person’s perspective is sometimes presented as the royal road to prosocial behavior. Indeed, perspective taking has been linked to happy outcomes such as greater understanding, reduced prejudice, and altruistic behavior. Perspective taking is a strong and flexible social tool – but one with important limits and even the potential to backfire, making people less (not more) prosocial under certain circumstances. First, people may not have the capacity or desire to take someone else’s perspective. Taking another person’s perspective is ef-

fortful, and becomes all the more effortful – possibly even cognitively impossible – as more variables need to be changed to adopt the different perspective. In addition, people may actively resist other perspectives that run counter to their own beliefs. Thus, perspective taking may be most likely to fail us when we could most use its help: when taking the perspective of others who are different from us on multiple dimensions. Second, perspective taking’s strength – allowing us to see things in a novel way – can also be its downfall, if the new perspective reveals unwelcome and threatening new information about ourselves or other people. These ideas will be explored using examples from empirical social psychology and from the 2016 U.S. presidential election.

Bio: Sara Hodges is professor of Psychology at the University of Oregon, where she also currently serves as Associate Dean of the Graduate School. Her research focuses on the self in social cognition, with a particular interest in social comparisons between the self and others; perspective taking in social interactions; and how accurate people are at inferring others’ thoughts – what predicts that accuracy and which social outcomes, including other aspects of empathy, are related to it.

Abstracts Session Two

Settings of Science Popularization

Chair: Markus Gottschling

Prof. Dr. Joachim Kimmerle
Motivated Processing of Medical Information on the Internet: Empirical Findings on Cognitive and Affective Processes

Tue, 11.45 am

The search for health-related information on the Internet is a self-regulated process in which medical laypeople can freely decide which information they choose, consider, memorize, and share. Since health-related information is mostly of great personal relevance for individuals, the handling of medical information on the Internet can be strongly influenced and biased by the respective motives of the persons involved. This talk will present empirical findings from laboratory experiments and online studies, in which cognitive and affective aspects of motivated information processing were investigated. On the one hand, I will describe the effects of pre-existing individu-

al perceptions and convictions. In this context, we have examined the role of individual health concepts, epistemological beliefs, and personal opinions. Among other things, we found that individuals considered information to be more relevant when it was presented in accordance with their own perception of health. Moreover, we found that laypeople were less critical toward medical information when they had a positive opinion on the subject. On the other hand, motivated information processing also depends on affective processes. Against this background, I will discuss the extent to which health-related information on the Internet can trigger fear among medical laypeople. Empirical results suggest that a high degree of personalization has a negative impact on people's well-being. For example, the use of patients as protagonists in scientific journalistic texts led to more negative feelings among the recipients than the use of physicians as protagonists. In summary, the talk will discuss how motivated information processing may interact with characteristics of the presented information.

Bio: Joachim Kimmerle is Deputy Head of the Knowledge Construction Lab at the Leibniz-Institut für Wissensmedi-
en. Prior to his current position, he was an Assistant Professor in the Department of Applied Cognitive Psychology and Media Psychology at the University of Tübingen.

He is a Principal Investigator in a research project on science communication and the Coordinator of a research consortium on open digital teaching, both funded by the Federal Ministry of Education and Research. He is also a Work Package Leader in an EU-funded project (Horizon 2020) and a Collaborator in an Insight Grant funded by the Research Council of Canada.

Dr. Philipp Niemann, Philipp Schrögel, Christiane Hauser

Cognition, Emotion, Discovery: The Reception of Science Slams

Tue, 2.00 pm

Ten years ago, the Science Slam was invented in Darmstadt, Germany. Its core elements haven't changed since then: scientists present their research to a lay audience, as comprehensibly and entertainingly as possible (Eisenbarth/Weißkopf 2012). However, with the ongoing spread of this popular scientific presentation form and the positive resonance with the audience, critical voices emerged as well, questioning the appropriateness of Science Slams for science communication (Hill 2014).

The junior research group "Science in Presentations" at the Karlsruhe Institute for Technology (KIT) deals with dif-

ferent formats of presenting scientific insights to the broad public, from lecture series to interactive scientific posters (Niemann/Hauser/Schrögel 2016). One key aspect of this research lies in analyzing the reception of Science Slams. As entertainment is a crucial element in this form of science communication (Hill 2014, 128), investigating the potential for knowledge dissemination is an important aspect in the research. Moreover, the audience's general expectations towards Science Slams are analyzed as well as the audience member's concrete reception of individual presentations. Using a combination of surveys and eye-tracking, the research wants to analyze typical patterns of perception in this multimodal form of science communication. Eye-tracking data is used as an indicator of the recipient's attentional processing (cf. Bente 2004, 298). The paper will present results from the first data acquisition which took place at two Science Slams in December 2016.

Bio: Philipp Niemann is a junior research group leader at the Department of Science Communication at Karlsruhe Institute of Technology (KIT). His current work focuses on researcher's presentations of their scientific content to broader audiences (project „Science In Presentations“). His research interests include multimodal media commu-

nication, audience research, science communication and political communication.

Philipp Schrögel is a researcher in the junior research group “Science In Presentations” at Karlsruhe Institute of Technology (KIT). He also works as a freelancer in science communication. His focus in research and practice lies on participatory and creative approaches to science communication, from science slams to hackathons or science comics.

Christiane Hauser is a researcher at the Department of Science Communication at Karlsruhe Institute of Technology (KIT) where she works in the junior research group „Science in Presentations” addressing the role of scientists as communicators. Furthermore she is interested in science communicators as intermediate actors. Throughout all projects she has a strong focus on quantitative and qualitative empirical methods and their assessment.

Martijn Wackers

**Memorable Messages in (Popular) Science?
How Speakers Use Rhetorical Retention
Techniques in Research Presentations and
TED Talks**

Tue, 2.45 pm

In today's knowledge societies, with a variety of information and messages only clicks away, one of the most important aims for public speakers is to ensure the audience will remember (parts of) their message. What rhetorical techniques to influence audience information retention are in a speaker's toolbox? For researchers and scientists, who often want to convey a complex message, this is a question not easily answered. To obtain an overview of current ideas on 'retention techniques', a corpus of 80 English-language and Dutch-language public speaking textbooks was analyzed. Then, it was investigated how frequently advised retention techniques such as the anecdote and summary are used in research presentations and popular online TED talks (N=32). How do modern (scientific) presenters apply these techniques? And how can we use these results to obtain more evidence-based insights into retention effects?

Bio: Martijn Wackers MA is lecturer in communicative skills at the Centre for Languages and Academic Skills at Delft University of Technology in The Netherlands. He received Master's degrees in Rhetoric & Argumentation and Journalism from Leiden University. His current PhD research at Leiden University focuses on the influence of rhetorical techniques on the audience's information retention. He is co-author of a Dutch-language textbook containing evidence based presentation advice (Presenteren: wat werkt echt en wat echt niet?, 2012).

Kristin Raabe

Scientists on the Hero's Journey – Storytelling in Different Communicative Situations

Tue, 4.00 pm

Harry Potter, Pretty Woman, Star Wars or The Jungle Book – all these movies have one thing in common: Their stories fit into the pattern of the hero's journey, which was originally introduced in 1949 by Joseph Campbell. We believe that many topics of science communicators fit well into this story pattern (Campbell 1949). Like the hero on his journey, the scientist leaves the ordinary world and is entering a new region, where he has to face all kinds of challenges until he or she finally discovers the solution of

the problem, that helps the people in the ordinary world. And if the hero's journey doesn't fit, you can certainly find other storytelling patterns that would fit. Although science communicators have all the materials they need, to create a great story, they rarely use this way of communication. But science itself is now delivering enough conclusive evidence, that storytelling really works. The research of psychologists and neuroscientists like Susan Weinschenk und Paul J. Zak has shown, that listening to stories doesn't just activate speech and information processing areas in our brain, it also activates neuronal networks involved in empathy and emotion. This might explain why information, which is delivered in a story, will be better remembered.

In this talk I will demonstrate how a story can be created by using a press release or a scientific paper and how this story needs to be changed according to the communicative situation it will be told in. In a talk for the children's university for example you might need a different main character than in a video for the institute's YouTube channel. I will point out the elements of the story that need to be adjusted for a specific communicative situation.

Bio: Kristin Raabe has studied philosophy and biology in Cologne and Berlin. She graduated in neurophysiology in 1996 and then started working as a science journalist

11 Abstracts Session Two

for national public radio and tv programmes. She soon became a senior author for the science show "Quarks & Co", where she started to implement story telling approaches in her work as a documentary filmmaker. In 2007 she was awarded the "Georg von Holtzbrinck-Preis for Science Journalists". In 2009 she started teaching "TV-Science Journalism" at the Ruhr-University Bochum. Her first popular science book about Wisdom "Oma Hilde, Sokrates and the Dalai Lama – Was wir von weisen Menschen lernen können" was published in 2010. Since 2015 she is a lecturer at the National Institute of Science Journalism in Karlsruhe.

Abstracts Session Three

Processes of Knowledge Transfer

Abstracts Session Three

Processes of Knowledge Transfer

Chair: Friederike Gräber

Prof. Dr. Nina Janich
Science revisited – Scientific knowledge
in children's books about the
'Kinderuni' of Tübingen

Wed, 9.00 am

Bei der Frage nach dem Verhältnis von Wissenschaft und Öffentlichkeit wird die Zielgruppe Kind stark vernachlässigt. Dass Wissens- UND Wissenschaftsvermittlung für Kinder, gerade in außerschulischen Kontexten, jedoch ein wichtiges gesellschaftliches Thema ist, zeigen nicht nur journalistische Initiativen, sondern auch die große und erfolgreiche Verbreitung von Kinderunis. Der Beitrag fokussiert nun die journalistische Aufbereitung ebensolcher Kinderuni-Vorlesungen und prüft, wie wissenschaftliches Wissen hier für Kinder wissenschaftsjournalistisch und in Sachbuch-Form rekontextualisiert wird: Auf die Gründung der ersten Kinder-Uni in Tübingen folgten

2003-2011 einige hochgerühmte und zum Teil vielfach übersetzte Buchpublikationen, in denen Wissenschaftler (in der Regel aber nur als Gewährsleute für die als Autoren fungierenden Wissenschaftsjournalisten) alltagsrelevante und alltagsnahe Fragen für 8-12-Jährige beantworteten. Diese Bücher sind explizit als Antworten der Wissenschaft konzipiert, haben in ihrer Darstellung von Wissenschaft aber noch durchaus mit verbreiteten Stereotypen von (seltsam ritualisierter) Universität und ihren (überraschend zugänglichen und offenen) Professoren zu kämpfen.

Im Vordergrund des Beitrags soll die Frage stehen, wie das hier vermittelte Wissen als ein (sicheres vs. unsicheres vs. kontroverses) "wissenschaftliches" Wissen rekontextualisiert wird. Erste Ergebnisse zeigen beispielsweise, dass Geistes- und Sozialwissenschaften als Wissenschaften anders, in jedem Fall mit weniger expliziten Bezügen auf Forschung oder einzelne konkrete Wissenschaftler dargestellt werden als die naturwissenschaftlichen Disziplinen. In den naturwissenschaftlichen Texten tauchen nicht nur sehr viel mehr Personalisierungssphänomene – nicht selten in Verbindung mit wunderbaren Rätseln, wegweisenden Entdeckungen oder mutigen Experimenten – auf, sondern überhaupt mehr Verweise auf die wissenschaftliche Herkunft dieses Wissens. Für die vorliegende Tagung soll unter anderem genauer auf

die sprachlichen Muster geachtet werden, mit denen wissenschaftliches Wissen und Nichtwissen als solches markiert wird, ob und wie Desiderate oder Kontroversen der Forschung kenntlich gemacht werden und welche Rolle überhaupt das noch fehlende und ungewisse Wissen in den Kinderuni-Büchern spielt.

Bio: Prof. Dr. Nina Janich. Studium der Germanistik, Mittleren und Neueren Geschichte, Publizistik und Philosophie an den Universitäten Marburg, Mainz und Regensburg. Promotion (1997) und Habilitation (2003) in Germanistischer Sprachwissenschaft an der Universität Regensburg. Seit 2004 Professorin für Germanistische Linguistik an der Technischen Universität Darmstadt. Forschungsschwerpunkte: Fach- und Wissenschaftskommunikation, Werbelinguistik und Unternehmenskommunikation, Sprachkultur – Sprachkritik – Sprachpolitik, Text- und Diskurslinguistik.

Julia Siebert

Jointly Creating Knowledge: The Transformative Potential of Participatory Research in High School Education

Wed, 9.45 am

The specialization and complexity of today's research hampers access of citizens and policymakers to science. Often, they receive output that is shortened and simplified to be effective as publicity, but the process of research, which is crucial for deeper understanding, remains untold. Thus, we need new and innovative forms of knowledge transfer to tackle global challenges and pave the way for scientific discourse to enter social and political domains.

Participatory approaches like Citizen Science hold an untapped potential to integrate citizens and let them actively participate in the research process – from phrasing research question to interpreting results. This leads to a new communicative situation where knowledge is not just presented and open for exploration, but active participation enables scientific topics to become an integral element in the reality of people's lives. At the same time, socially relevant topics are highlighted for the scientific community, encouraging a scientific culture that carries out research with and for society.

In this context, schools represent a pivotal point of knowledge exchange and social transformation. By integrating Citizen Science in high school education, scientific literacy as well as media and societal competences can be enhanced to prepare pupils for their future role as citizens and potential scientists. By integrating the perspectives of learners, teachers and researchers, traditional boundaries become blurred, which opens up new possibilities to integrate knowledge domains by enabling exchange on an equal footing. This talk will demonstrate the transformative potential of participatory research in high school education and present a vision how we can jointly create knowledge with new learning environments.

Bio: Julia Siebert is a doctoral researcher at the German Centre for Biodiversity Research (iDiv) Halle – Jena – Leipzig, studying global change effects on soil organisms and ecosystem functioning. With a study background in biology, philosophy, and rhetoric, she is particularly interested in working at the interface of natural sciences, humanities and society. Recent topics included science communication, paradigm shifts and evidence in biology. A new project focuses on the transformative potential of participatory research in high school education in Germany.

Dr. Christoph Kulgemeyer:
Explaining Physics: What Is Good Explaining and What Skills Does an Explainer Need?

Wed, 11.00 am

Explaining is often considered to be a core skill of physics teacher. Also, students highly value good explaining. In this talk, I will start by distinguishing two notions of explaining: (1) scientific explanations (explaining from a philosophical point of view) and (2) science teaching explanations (explaining from a communicative point of view). I will focus on the latter and present a model on explaining physics from a constructivist point of view. This model has been applied in different empirical studies concerning academic teacher education. A core question for teacher education is whether or not the skills and the knowledge acquired actually affects teaching quality. With respect to explaining as one particular teaching situation, I am going to present data from a large-scale assessment of teacher trainees at German universities that researched the impact of pedagogical content knowledge and content knowledge on explaining performance.

Bio: Christoph Kulgemeyer is a science education researcher at the University of Bremen, Germany. After completing his Masters in Physics, German Language and Literature and Pedagogy he obtained a PhD in physics education for his thesis on “Empirical Studies on Secondary Students’ Science Communication Competence“. Afterwards he completed his education as a secondary school teacher (“second state examination“) and worked as a deputy professor of physics education in Osnabrück and Kassel before he returned to Bremen. His main research interest are physics teachers’ explaining skills. In 2017 he received his “Habilitation“ in physics education.

Hagen Schick
Knowledge Between Decontextualization and Recontextualization. A Critical View at the Concept of ‘Knowledge Management’ and Related Approaches

Wed, 11.45 pm

Processes of decontextualization and recontextualization of knowledge have recently not only been discussed in communication, psychology, education, and computer science, but also in economic fields such as business administration and management theory. A prominent ap-

proach, which is known under the terms of ‘knowledge management’ and the ‘learning organization’ is dealing with the question: How can we identify, acquire, develop, and disseminate knowledge in more and more complex environments to help keeping organizations competitive? What may look, at first glance, like a quality-driven shift in management science – namely the shift from a cost-based materialistic view to a knowledge-based cognitivist view – rests on a few ‘embedded’ theoretical prerequisites that are worth critical inquiry. Amongst them is the view of knowledge as representation along with the concept of knowledge as an immaterialistic economical ‘resource’. Certain thoughts on intervention and ‘knowledge sharing’ might require to be reviewed, too.

The paper aims at showing the ‘blind spots’ of the academic discourse on knowledge management, and pleading on a revision of certain key notions by discussing not alternate facts, but alternate theoretical concepts. Therefore, some notoriously overlooked aspects of human communication will be restored by promoting a future model of knowledge management as strategic communication management.

Bio: Hagen Schick studied Rhetoric, German, and French along with business administration at Tübingen and Stuttgart Universities. During his studies, he has been working

as an editor in the public relations industry. He founded his own consulting service in 1998. From 2005 to 2010 he worked as a project manager within the e-learning-project 'Virtuelle Rhetorik' at Tübingen University. Hagen specializes on interaction in the fields of training, teaching, and coaching, along with strategic communication processes at the intersections of corporate marketing, management, and the public, on which he also focuses as a lecturer at Tübingen's Seminar für Allgemeine Rhetorik.