



KOMMUNIKATIONSLABOR

Begleitdokument & Promptbibliothek



VON LARA WÜSTER

Structure

<i>Introduction</i>	1
<i>How does the chatbot work?</i>	2
<i>Data & Prompts</i>	4
<i>Event Format and Context</i>	5
<i>Role Reflection, Bias & Values</i>	6
<i>Identifying your goals</i>	6
<i>Strategy Development</i>	10
<i>Resilience training & test scenarios</i>	11
<i>Practical support</i>	12
Detailed outline.....	12
Content preparation for various formats.....	12
Presentation support	14
<i>Sources</i>	14

Introduction

The aim of the chatbot is to help you prepare for an academic event (e.g. a lecture, an appearance on a talk show or similar, a panel discussion) from an ethical, strategic, content-related and practical perspective. This companion guide provides some background information on the bot, whilst also offering a number of prompts that can be used to prepare specifically for a particular area.

The chatbot is based on a piece of academic research I conducted: ‘(Human) Sciences in Public Discourse: A Practice-Oriented Guide for Political Talk Shows such as “Hart aber Fair”’ (2024). With the help of Roger Pielke’s book **The Honest Broker** (2007) and numerous other sources, I have developed a strategy for academics to participate meaningfully in relevant discourses on socially relevant, scientific and political issues. I have argued that the communication of scientific knowledge is important in a democratic public sphere, and that experts should present and discuss their research despite numerous hurdles.

With the Communication Lab, I want to help overcome one of the biggest hurdles: the huge amount of preparation time required. Appearances – often unpaid – in various formats, ranging from television to universities, should be able to be prepared with as little effort as possible (in under 30 minutes). In doing so, participants should be made aware of and prepared for as many potential difficulties as possible, such as the framing of topics in the public media or critical questions regarding their own arguments. Furthermore, the chatbot offers the opportunity to reflect on one's own role as a researcher and, depending on the defined main objective, to develop a strategy for the event. The bot is also designed to help users prepare concretely and practically in terms of content using slides, index cards or similar materials.

The bot has obvious and less obvious limitations, which I encountered time and again during its development. Results often depend on the user's proficiency with ChatGPT, and whether they are using the paid or free version. I look forward to your feedback (lara.wuester@profil.lmu.de).

The project was developed as part of the Bavarian AI Tutor Project.

How does the chatbot work?

Objective: To assist with academic communication and event planning.

The bot operates through the interaction of three main components:

1. Request

- A user asks a question or gives an instruction.
- This request is processed and converted into a format the system can understand.
- Data is entered and uploaded

2. Knowledge base

In addition to the general knowledge already possessed by the underlying language model, uploaded documents, scientific articles or position papers are used to provide specific information. The bot has two main sources in its knowledge base:

- Science Council (2021). Science Communication: Position Paper by the German Science Council. Drs. 9367-22, October 2021.
 - Addresses the framework conditions, challenges and recommendations for science communication in Germany.
- Wuester, Lara (2024). (Humanities) Science in Public Discourse: A Practice-Oriented Guide for Political Talk Shows such as ‘Hart aber fair’. Unpublished manuscript. Humboldt University of Berlin.
 - Analyses the role of scientists in public debates and offers strategies for science communication in political talk shows.

3. ChatGPT LLM (Large Language Model)

- The language model analyses the user’s query and combines general language understanding with specific information from the uploaded documents.
- In doing so, it extracts relevant information, summarises it and formulates it in clear language.
- Where necessary, the model asks follow-up questions to clarify any ambiguities or to provide a more detailed response.

Interaction between these components:

- For example, a user asks: “How do I prepare for an academic panel discussion?”
- The model identifies relevant information from the knowledge base.
- The response is formulated on the basis of academic findings and web research, and enriched where necessary with insights from the provided documents.
- If further clarification is needed, the model requests additional information (e.g. regarding the event’s target audience or the user’s role).
- The answer is formulated in clear yet precise language to ensure scientific accuracy whilst remaining easily understandable.

In addition, the chatbot can:

- Take context from previous questions into account to ensure consistency in communication.
- Ask questions in a logical order to facilitate structured responses.

- Analyse specific documents to back up answers with original sources.

This system enables interactive, context-aware and accurate support for science communication, argumentation strategy and event planning.

Data & Prompts

The user is asked to fill in this table to the best of his abilities:

1	Your name and field of expertise	
2	Format of the planned event (panel discussion/keynote speech etc., and online/in-person/hybrid)	
3	Total duration of the event	
4	Overall theme of the event	
5	Target audience of the event (students, specialist audience, educated public etc.)	
6	Topic of my talk/presentation	
7	Duration of my talk/presentation	
8	Participants in the event (if relevant, e.g. for a panel discussion)	
9	What do you hope to achieve with your contribution? (Inform, educate, debate, raise awareness, exert political influence, etc.) ¹	
10	Do you represent an institution, or are you appearing as an individual?	
11	Would you like help in developing a strategy for the role you will play as a researcher?	

¹ If you do not yet know the personal and/or institutional goal of the research you are working on, find prompts to find out below.

12	Would you like help in defending your arguments against those of others, using a mock scenario?	
13	Please state briefly and specifically what else you would like for your preparation. (PowerPoint slides, index cards, handouts, etc.)	
14	Do you have any specific uncertainties or concerns regarding a public appearance or the format in general?	
15	Any other comments (e.g. how to refer to additional information material or uploaded files)	

Once the table containing all the completed information has been copied into the chatbot and all the relevant documents have been uploaded, the following prompts can be used (if desired) to steer the conversation in the desired direction:

Event Format and Context

Prompt 1:

Please analyse how I can adapt my communication to suit the format. What specific challenges does this format present (e.g. framing in the public media or at the university regarding a political issue, or the presenter's stance), and how can I structure my content so that it is clear and effective?

Prompt 2:

I am appearing on the talk show [Name]. Please analyse the framing of the talk show and its discussion conditions, and suggest how I can prepare for this.

Role Reflection, Bias & Values

Prompt 1: Role Reflection

Please help me to reflect clearly on my role, drawing on your knowledge base: How can I convey my message convincingly without compromising my scientific credibility? What challenges might I face in my role, and how can I address them? What risks and opportunities does this role entail? Are there situations in which I should adapt my role flexibly? Please help me to reflect consciously on this decision.

Prompt 2: Value Reflection

Values underpin all communication. I would like to reflect on which values shape my scientific communication and my public presence. Please help me to identify what my core message is and on which values it is based.

Prompt 3: Bias

Analyse my research for potential cognitive, methodological and communicative biases. In doing so, examine the research question, data, methodology, interpretation and public communication. If you are missing any information, please ask me a few brief follow-up questions first. Then show me which bias risks are plausible, how they might be identified, why they would be problematic and how I can mitigate them. Pay particular attention to confirmation bias, framing, selection bias, overconfidence, illusory precision, authority bias, automation bias and the conflation of facts and value judgements. Conclude with the three most significant risks and three specific improvement measures. Please refer to:

https://upload.wikimedia.org/wikipedia/commons/6/65/Cognitive_bias_codex_en.svg

Identifying your goals

You may not yet be entirely sure of your goal, or you may feel uncertain. Use the following prompt to identify your personal and institutional goals.

Prompt 1: Personal objective

The user is asked to answer a question about the personal objective of their own research, but may not yet know exactly what this is. Please help them to develop an honest and provisional answer through a brief, reflective conversation.

Important:

- Ask only one question at a time.
- Explicitly invite the person to say “I don’t know”.
- If there is uncertainty, offer 2–3 plausible interpretations or phrasing options.
- Make a clear distinction between:

1. the subject matter of the research,

2. the personal concern or motivation,

3. the desired contribution or hoped-for impact.

- Help the person not only to describe what they are researching, but also why it is important to them.
- Pay attention to reflection on roles, values and impact.
- The tone should be warm, but not overly flattering or clever; serious, but not patronising.

Possible guiding questions:

- What interests you personally about this topic?
- What do you hope to better understand, improve or highlight through your research?
- What would you find regrettable or problematic if no further research were carried out on this topic?
- Are you more interested in generating knowledge, solving problems, protecting people, providing guidance, improving technology or bringing objectivity to debates?
- What kind of contribution would you like to make yourself?
- What would you personally consider a good outcome of this research?

- Are there values that are particularly important to you in this context, such as fairness, safety, autonomy, sustainability, transparency or social responsibility?
- If the person remains unsure, help them with phrases such as:
 - “Perhaps your goal isn’t entirely clear yet, but it could be moving in the direction of ...”
 - “It sounds as though it’s particularly important to you that ...”
 - “Perhaps your personal goal is less the project itself than the contribution it can make.”

At the end, please summarise in this format:

- Preliminary personal goal:
- What is still unclear about this:
- An honest one-sentence formulation for the questionnaire:

Prompt 2: Purpose of the unit

The respondent should describe in the questionnaire the purpose of the research group, institute or unit they represent. This may not be entirely clear. Please help them to formulate a plausible and honest answer through a brief, thoughtful conversation.

Important:

- Start by reassuring them: they don’t need to come up with the perfect institutional wording straight away.
- Ask only one question at a time.
- Explicitly invite the person to say “I don’t know”.
- If there is uncertainty, help by offering 2–3 plausible hypotheses or phrasing options.
- Make a clear distinction between:

1. the official or formal objective of the unit,

2. the practical problem it is addressing,

3. the social, political or scientific contribution it aims to make.

- Help the person not just to list buzzwords, but to make the actual purpose clear.
- Be sure to distinguish between the institution's objective and the person's personal objective.
- The tone should be warm, precise, thoughtful and not patronising.

Possible guiding questions:

- What is your group or institute fundamentally working on?
- Which problem is this research intended to help better understand, address or solve?
- Who stands to benefit from this work?
- How would one know that the group's work has been successful?
- Is the focus more on gaining knowledge, technological development, risk reduction, social orientation, supporting political decision-making, or practical application?
- What contribution does your unit aim to make to science, society or politics?
- Which values or goals seem to particularly shape the unit's work, for example safety, innovation, sustainability, resilience, responsibility or the common good?

If the person remains unsure, help them with phrases such as:

- "It could be that your unit's objective is, on a formal level ..., but on a practical level"
- "Perhaps the actual objective is not just to conduct research, but ..."
- "It sounds as though your group's main aim is to help ensure that ..."

At the end, please summarise in this format:

- Likely objective of the unit represented:
- What this objective entails in practice:
- What remains unclear:
- An honest one-sentence formulation for the questionnaire:

Strategy Development

As public appearances often involve high expectations, emotionally charged debates and manipulative discourse strategies, it is essential to be well prepared. The rules of discourse hygiene play a central role in this.

Prompt 1:

Please develop a communication strategy that supports my objectives, addresses my audience effectively and skilfully navigates potential challenges.

Prompt 2:

My main message is: [key message to be conveyed]. I anticipate the following critical counter-arguments or challenges: [possible counter-arguments, misunderstandings, controversial questions].

Please develop a communication strategy that ensures my messages are conveyed clearly, persuasively and resiliently. Consider:

- Framing strategies: How can I introduce my topic in a way that is understandable and effective?
- Emotional resilience: How can I respond to provocations or emotional backlash?
- Principles of discourse hygiene: How do I remain objective, fact-based and constructive, even in heated debates?
- Rhetorical devices: Which argumentation and language strategies will help me to convince my audience?

Prompt 3:

Please develop a strategic communication plan that ensures I:

- Remain fact-based without resorting to technocratic language.
- Make scientific uncertainties transparent without jeopardising my credibility.
- Recognise and defuse manipulative rhetoric without allowing myself to be drawn into destructive debates.
- Adhere to the rules of discourse hygiene:
 - No unnecessary emotionalisation or dramatisation.
 - No personal attacks; instead, focus on the factual level.
 - Clear separation between facts, opinions and normativity.
- Am prepared for potential attacks or misunderstandings: What pitfalls might there be, and how can I prepare for them?

Resilience training & test scenarios

Prompt 1:

Please simulate a challenging Q&A session by asking me critical questions and pointing out weaknesses in my arguments. I also need a strategy for remaining composed in the face of provocative or unfair attacks.

Prompt 2:

Please ask me a series of critical or provocative questions for which I should be realistically prepared.

Various types of counter-reactions should be taken into account:

- Sceptical follow-up questions (scientific criticism)
- Emotional attacks (e.g. “Your research is out of touch with reality!”)
- Manipulative questions (e.g. leading questions, straw men)
- Political exploitation (e.g. “Aren’t you simply biased?”)

After each question, provide me with an ideal response strategy that remains objective whilst also strengthening my argument.

Practical support

Detailed outline

Prompt 1:

Example based on a presentation: Please create a detailed table for my outline with the following columns:

1. Time (from – to)
2. Content heading (e.g. Introduction, Key Theses, Practical Example, Summary)
3. Content bullet points (main statements, arguments, references to academic research)

Special requirements:

- The introduction should provide a strong introduction to the topic.
- The main content should be structured and supported by clear arguments.
- The conclusion should provide a summary with a call to action or a conclusion.
- The Q&A section should take into account various response strategies (e.g. for critical questions).

Create the table in such a way that it makes optimal use of the available time and has a fluid, effective flow.

Content preparation for various formats

Prompt 1:

I need a detailed outline for my presentation. Please create a precise outline for my speech, including an effective introduction, key arguments and a compelling conclusion. Ensure a clear line of reasoning, academic rigour and an engaging narrative style.

Prompt 2:

Please create a detailed presentation structure for me, based on my paper, with the following components:

1. Presentation outline:

- A clear structure with time allocations, divided into introduction, main body and conclusion.
- Each section should have a clear content objective.
- If relevant: references to interactive elements or visual aids.

2. Speaking notes per section:

- Key messages formulated in concise sentences.
- Academic statements should be explained clearly but in an accessible manner.
- References to important sections from my paper that should be particularly emphasised.

3. Simplified explanation for a non-specialist audience:

If my target audience is not technically versed, a version with simplified explanations, analogies and practical examples.

4. Dealing with critical questions and counter-arguments:

- A list of potential critical questions with factual, convincing answers based on my paper and current research findings.
- Tips for responding confidently during the Q&A session.

5. Conclusion & Call to Action:

- How can I conclude my presentation with a concise summary or an open-ended question to encourage my audience to reflect further?
- If relevant: suggestions for a call to action or a recommendation for my audience.
- Please ensure that the presentation summarises the content of my paper as accurately as possible, whilst also making it accessible and engaging. If certain passages are particularly complex, please help me to present them in a way that is easy to understand!

Presentation support

Prompt 1:

Please give me recommendations for a compelling visual design, an engaging narrative style and an effective delivery. What rhetorical devices should I use? What points should definitely be included in the presentation? The presentation should have the following structure:

1. Title and introduction slide (topic, name, event details)
2. Agenda slide (overview of the presentation)
3. Main slides with key content (max. 1 message per slide, clear structure, supporting visuals)
4. Summary/conclusion slide
5. Call to action or next steps (if relevant)

Create the following content for each slide:

- Slide title: Clear, concise heading
- Key points (bullet points, not full sentences)
- Recommended visuals (e.g. diagrams, icons, images, graphics)
- Notes for my presentation delivery (Important supplementary information that should not appear on the slide)

The slides should be minimalist and visually appealing, so no walls of text, but clear key points with visual support. If you have ideas for particularly effective presentations (e.g. metaphors, storytelling elements), please feel free to incorporate them.

Sources

Badr, H. *Framing von Terrorismus im Nahostkonflikt. Studies in International, Transnational and Global Communications*, Springer Fachmedien Wiesbaden GmbH, 2017.

- Breitner, Pauline. "Anne Will & Co.: Wie viel Geld erhalten Talkshow-Gäste für ihren Auftritt?" *finanzen.net*, 16. März 2023, www.finanzen.net/nachricht/geld-karriere-lifestyle/anne-will-und-co-anne-will-co-wie-viel-geld-erhalten-talkshow-gaeste-fuer-ihren-auftritt-10024982. Letzter Zugriff: 23. Juli 2024.
- Brennan, Jason. "Does Public Reason Liberalism Rest on a Mistake? Democracy's Doxastic and Epistemic Problems." *Political Epistemology*, herausgegeben von Elizabeth Edenberg und Michael Hannon, Oxford UP, 2021, S. 135-155.
- Brister, Evelyn. "The Value of Public Philosophy." *A Companion to Public Philosophy*, erste Auflage, herausgegeben von Lee McIntyre, Nancy McHugh und Ian Olasov, John Wiley & Sons, Inc., 2022, S. 41-51.
- Bundeszentrale für politische Bildung (bpb). "Krieg in der Ukraine." *bpb.de*, 15. März 2023, www.bpb.de/themen/europa/krieg-in-der-ukraine/. Letzter Zugriff: 20. August 2024.
- "Deutschland unterstützt die Ukraine langfristig." *Deutscher Bundestag*, 15. März 2024, www.bundestag.de/dokumente/textarchiv/2024/kw11-de-ukraine-992936. Letzter Zugriff: 20. August 2024.
- Edenberg, Elizabeth, und Michael Hannon, Herausgeber*innen. *Political Epistemology*. Oxford UP, 2021.
- Görke, Alexander. "Journalismus und Wissenschaft." *Handbuch Journalismustheorien*, herausgegeben von Martin Löffelholz und Liliane Rothenberger, Springer Fachmedien, 2016, S. 683-698, DOI:10.1007/978-3-531-18966-6_42.
- Jaster, Romy, und Geert Keil. "Wen sollte man nicht an die Universität einladen?" *Wissenschaftsfreiheit im Konflikt*, herausgegeben von E. Özmen, Springer, 2021, S. 141-159, SpringerLink, https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-662-62892-8_9.
- Jun, Uwe, und Karsten Grabow. "Mehr Expertise in der deutschen Politik? Zur Übertragbarkeit des 'Evidence-based Policy Approach'." *Zukunft Regieren: Beiträge für eine gestaltungsfähige Politik*, Bd. 1, Bertelsmann Stiftung, 2008.
- Lambrecht, Christine. "Rede von Christine Lambrecht im Bundestag." *Bundesministerium der Verteidigung*, 23. März 2022, www.bmvg.de/de/aktuelles/rede-christine-lambrecht-bundestag-5379970. Letzter Zugriff: 23. Juli 2024.
- Landeszentrale für politische Bildung Baden-Württemberg (LpB BW). „Ukraine-Konflikt.“ *lpb-bw.de*, <https://www.lpb-bw.de/ukrainekonflikt>. Letzter Zugriff: 20. August 2024.
- Leiter, Brian. "The Paradoxes of Public Philosophy." *Indian Journal of Legal Theory*, Bd. 1, 2016, S. 51-66.

- Mouffe, Chantal. "Deliberative Democracy or Agonistic Pluralism?" *Social Research: Prospects for Democracy*, Bd. 66, Nr. 3, 1999, S. 745-758.
- Pielke, Roger A. *The Honest Broker: Making Sense of Science in Policy and Politics*. Cambridge UP, 2007.
- "Putin droht und spioniert: Wie wehrhaft ist Deutschland?" *Hart aber fair*, 8. Mai 2023, ARD Mediathek, <https://www.ardmediathek.de/video/hart-aber-fair/putin-droht-und-spioniert-wie-wehrhaft-ist-deutschland/das-erste/Y3JpZDovL3dkci5kZS9CZWl0cmFnLXNvcGhvcmEtM2VmMjViNGItNmFiYi00NGE1LTk3ZmYtMmQZTU0NjdjMDBl>. Letzter Zugriff: 20. August 2024.
- Rawls, John. *Political Liberalism*. Columbia UP, 1993.
- Rovelli, Carlo. *Reality Is Not What It Seems: The Journey to Quantum Gravity*. Übersetzt von Simon Carnell und Erica Segre, Riverhead Books, 2017.
- Trench, Brian. "Towards an Analytical Framework of Science Communication Models." *Communicating Science in Social Contexts: New Models, New Practices*, herausgegeben von Donghong Cheng, Michel Claessens, Toss Gascoigne, Jenni Metcalfe, Bernard Schiele und Shunke Shi, Springer Netherlands, 2008, S. 119-138, ISBN 978-1-4020-8597-0.
- Westdeutscher Rundfunk (WDR). "Louis Klamroth, Der Moderator." *Hart aber fair*, WDR, 2024, <https://www1.wdr.de/daserste/hartaberfair/ueberuns/hartaberfairmoderator100.html>. Letzter Zugriff: 23. August 2024.
- Wissenschaftskommunikation: Positionspapier*. Wissenschaftsrat, Okt. 2021, <https://www.wissenschaftsrat.de/download/2021/9367-21.pdf>.
- Vowe, Gerhard. "Massenmedien." *Bundeszentrale für politische Bildung (bpb)*, 2018, <https://www.bpb.de/kurz-knapp/lexika/handwoerterbuch-politisches-system/202067/massenmedien/>. Letzter Zugriff: 23. August 2024.