

學術對談

資深傳播學者對年輕學人的忠告與期望

對談人：克勞斯·克里彭多夫、李金銓、柯林·斯巴克斯、
大衛·韋佛

統稿：蘇鑰機

翻譯：胡攀峰、艾民偉、蘇鑰機

校對：程曉萱



克勞斯·克里彭多夫教授
(Prof. Klaus Krippendorff)



李金銓教授
(Prof. Chin-Chuan Lee)



柯林·斯巴克斯教授
(Prof. Colin Sparks)



大衛·韋佛教授
(Prof. David Weaver)

蘇鑰機，香港中文大學新聞與傳播學院教授。研究興趣：香港報業、新聞的社會及政治學、引文分析、內容分析、傳播學發展。電郵：clementso@cuhk.edu.hk

摘要

這個學術對談緣自2018年蘇鑰機和克勞斯·克里彭多夫教授在《傳播與社會學刊》的一個對談，當時蘇鑰機準備了一些問題，克里彭多夫教授的回應頗為詳細，但由於篇幅所限，未能將所有問題和答案都包括在文章內。當中有關對年輕學人的建議未能採用，甚為可惜。

蘇鑰機覺得，可以進一步探討這個題目及相關回應，於是設計了四條問題，邀請另外三位知名學者一起探討大家如何進入傳播研究的領域，並能有所建樹。

為了得到多元的看法，邀請對談的幾位學者分別來自美國、歐洲和亞洲。他們有相異的背景和研究興趣，分別屬於量化、質化及批判傳統。他們都有多年的教學經驗，從不同角度對傳播研究作出了重要貢獻，可以將自己的經驗與智慧傳給新一代的研究者。

克里彭多夫教授在德國出生，於美國獲得高等學位並任教數十年，其研究興趣包括內容分析、資訊理論、控制論、社會建構現實、設計。李金銓教授是華人學者，在美國大學任教多年，先後到過香港不同大學工作，他的研究包括全球傳播、傳媒政治經濟學、大中華地區傳播。柯林·斯巴克斯教授是英國學者，在英國任教多年，近年到了香港任教，研究興趣主要在媒體與民主、媒介的全球化、互聯網對大眾媒介的影響。大衛·韋佛教授是美國學者，在美國大學任教多年，學術生涯專注縱向記者調查、傳媒議題設定、民意、投票行為。

四位教授的不同背景和學術貢獻，使他們對四條問題的回應百花齊放，給讀者多元而精闢的見解。雖然經歷不同，他們的建議卻有頗多相同之處，只是重點有若干差異。例如他們都強調科技的重要性，但不要忘記更廣闊的社會議題及人文追求。在研習技術和方法時，不忘培養批判和自省的能力，並在實證基礎下努力研究。他們同意傳播學者要立足傳播視角，並善用其他學科的理論取向和方法，為傳播研究加添養分。

這個學術對談旨在啟發年輕學人，讓他們在其學術旅程上少走彎路。對較有經驗的研究者而言，這些資深學者的討論也可能讓他們獲益良多。由不同視角反思自己的學術旅程永不太遲，相關理念的對

資深傳播學者對年輕學人的忠告與期望

談，可以鼓勵年青學者在不同地方泛起學術漣漪。這種學術對談不僅可以和學術文章互相輝映，更可以促進廣闊的視野，日後不妨再次進行。

Dialogue

Senior Communication Scholars' Advice to and Expectation of Young Researchers

Discussants: Klaus KRIPPENDORFF, Chin-Chuan LEE, Colin SPARKS,
David WEAVER

Editor: Clement Y. K. SO

Translators: Panfeng HU, Minwei AI, Clement Y. K. SO

Abstract

This “multilogue” has its roots in a dialogue in *Communication & Society* with Prof. Klaus Krippendorff in 2018. At that time Clement So prepared a number of questions to which Prof. Krippendorff gave detailed answers. Regrettably, space limitation prevented the inclusion of his answers to questions for advice to aspiring communication scholars.

Clement So thought that his answers deserved further attention and invited three other prominent scholars to respond to a set of four questions about entering and succeeding in the field of communication research.

To assure a diversity of views, the invited scholars were from the U.S., Europe, and Asia. They had different backgrounds and their research followed various quantitative, qualitative, and critical traditions. They had many years of teaching in common, had made significant contributions to understanding communication, albeit from different perspectives, and were therefore qualified to pass their experiences to a new generation of researchers.

Prof. Krippendorff was born in Germany, received his advanced degrees in the U.S. and has taught there for decades. His research interests include content analysis, information theory, cybernetics, social constructions of reality, and

Clement Y. K. So (Professor). School of Journalism and Communication, The Chinese University of Hong Kong. Research interests: Hong Kong press, sociology and politics of news, citation analysis, content analysis, development of communication studies.

Senior Communication Scholars' Advice to and Expectation of Young Researchers

design. Prof. Chin-Chuan Lee is a Chinese scholar who taught in the U.S. for many years and was also stationed at different universities in Hong Kong. His research covers global communication, political economy of the media, and Greater China studies. Prof. Colin Sparks is of British origin and taught in the U.K. for many years before moving to teach in Hong Kong. His research interests include media and democracy, globalization of media, and internet's influence on the mass media. Prof. David Weaver is an American scholar who taught in the U.S. for many years. He is famous for his longitudinal surveys of journalists, as well as studies of media agenda setting, public opinion, and voting behavior.

The diverse backgrounds and scholarly contributions of these four professors account for answering the four questions posed to them differently, offering readers alternative views. However, despite drawing from different experiences, their recommendations have much in common, differing mainly in emphasis. For example, the importance of technology appears in most suggestions, subsumed under the larger umbrella of broader social concerns and humanistic endeavors. Skills and methods need to include critical thinking and reflexive abilities. Solid empirical grounding of research is also essential. There is agreement on the need of communication scholars to adopt a communication perspective while simultaneously making productive use of the theoretical orientations and methods from other fields. After all, scholars in other disciplines communicate and publish as well and make use of what communication scholars explore.

This academic dialogue is intended to inspire young researchers to pursue their academic journeys and avoid distractions by fruitless paths. More experienced scholars can learn something from their discussion as well. It is never too late to reflect on one's own journey from different perspectives. Dialogues of ideas can encourage unexpected academic ripples in different places. Dialogues of this kind are valuable additions to written research results as they encourage larger perspectives and may be organized again in the future.

Citation of this article: So, C. Y. K. (Ed.) (2019). Senior communication scholars' advice to and expectation of young researchers. *Communication & Society*, 49, 1–41.

《傳播與社會學刊》，(總)第49期(2019)

對談人簡介

克勞斯·克里彭多夫教授 (Prof. Klaus Krippendorff)，伊利諾伊大學博士、賓夕法尼亞大學安那伯格傳播學院 Gregory Bateson 榮休教授。他當選國際傳播學會院士 (ICA Fellow)，並於1984–1985年擔任該會的會長；1982年獲選為 American Association for the Advancement of Science (AAAS) 院士；2012年獲瑞典 Linneaus University in Kalmar/Växjö 頒發榮譽博士。他在不同領域有很多著作，其中享有盛名的 *Content Analysis: An Introduction to Its Methodology* 一書於2004年獲ICA院士圖書獎。他的研究焦點包括社會建構現實中語言和對話的角色、解放知識論和科技設計、內容分析和語義學、對話理論和資訊理論、控制論等。

李金銓教授 (Prof. Chin-Chuan Lee)，台灣國立政治大學學士、美國夏威夷大學東西中心碩士、密西根大學博士。香港城市大學講座教授，創立媒體與傳播系與傳播研究中心，2018年成為榮休教授。他在明尼蘇達大學新聞與大眾傳播學院任教22年，現為名譽教授。曾任香港中文大學講座教授、台灣國立政治大學客座講座教授、中央研究院客座教授，最近獲選為台灣最高學術榮譽的玉山學者。李金銓教授當選國際傳播學會院士 (ICA Fellow) 並獲費雪導師獎 (B. Audrey Fisher Mentorship Award)。他是國際中華傳播學會 (CCA) 創會會長，獲頒終身成就獎。研究領域包括媒介帝國主義、全球傳播、傳媒政治經濟學，以及社會理論與傳媒研究的互動。

柯林·斯巴克斯教授 (Prof. Colin Sparks)，英國伯明翰大學當代文化研究中心博士，1974–2011年執教於英國威斯敏斯特大學，任該校媒體、藝術與設計學院教授、傳播與媒體研究所所長。2011年起出任香港浸會大學傳理學院講座教授，兼媒介與傳播研究中心主任。他多年來致力於批判立場的媒介研究，主要研究領域為媒體與民主、媒介的全球化、互聯網對大眾媒介的影響，其著作也包括報業、記者和大眾文化等議題。憑藉對社會變遷中的媒介角色一貫的興趣，他長期致力於對中東歐地區的後共產主義國家，以及發展中的中國社會的學術研究。他是學術期刊《媒體、文化與社會》 (*Media, Culture & Society*) 的創刊人之一，也是該刊長期活躍的編委會成員。

資深傳播學者對年輕學人的忠告與期望

大衛·韋佛教授 (Prof. David Weaver)，美國印第安納大學學士及碩士、北卡羅來納大學博士，在1974年起於印第安納大學任教，直至2011年榮休。他對記者調查、媒介的議題設定研究很有貢獻，並就民意、選民投票、傳媒偏向、報章閱讀、外國新聞報道、新聞教育等方面的研究均著力甚深，其美國記者研究書籍系列曾經獲獎。自1988年起至其榮休，韋佛教授是印第安納大學 Roy W. Howard 講座教授，並於2010年被授予傑出教授榮銜。他在2009年獲美國新聞及大眾傳播教育學會 (AEJMC) 頒發終身研究成就獎。他曾於1987–1988年度擔任新聞及大眾傳播教育學會會長，及於1986–1987年度擔任中西部民意研究協會會長。

KK：克勞斯·克里彭多夫

CL：李金銓

CS：柯林·斯巴克斯

DW：大衛·韋佛

問題一：未來的傳播學者將會探討什麼議題和面對哪些挑戰？

KK：我們要知道，真正的傳播研究是在二次大戰後才開始，其歷史很短。現在我們有點不知所措地發現，大家生活在一個高度依賴傳播科技的社會，而且當中涉及複雜的媒介，這給傳播研究帶來重大的挑戰和機會。

傳播科技的出現很重要，就如從狩獵採集的部落生活形式，走向農業社區形式，再轉向工業革命。後者為我們提供了原以為可讓生活變得更輕鬆的技術，但代價是我們要接受物質分配不平等、不公平的社會階級結構、被限制的意識形態、毀滅性的戰爭，以及對稀有自然資源進行不負責任的開發，好像未來是沒有限制的。

電腦被稱為工業時代的桂冠科技，它以新穎的方式把人們連結起來，但從而開始削弱電腦賴以存在的社會基礎結構。印刷、廣播、電視、電話等大眾傳播產生的影響，已經被電子郵件、社交媒體和互聯網所顛覆。社會組織正在變得分散和全球化，各種邊界受到挑戰，工作的概念及人們如何參與社會也在改變。

《傳播與社會學刊》，(總)第49期(2019)

需要主動面對技術帶來的挑戰

在科技的支持下，異質和彈性的連繫網絡正取代以往的科層組織結構；人們應用新獲得的技能來經營其社區甚至整體社會。這些變化帶來一些後果，傳播學者在當下需要面對這些挑戰。現代傳播形式已經削弱了一些不受欢迎的政府形式。但是，我們現有的理論未能說明，這些新的組織形式將引導我們走向何方。我們已經看到了不想見到的後果。傳播學者正努力了解一些反社會的傳播形式，包括仇恨言論，種族、性別、教育和經濟偏見，限制別人進行傳播的政治利益集團，和提供破壞性資訊、惡意軟體、間諜軟體和假新聞的互聯網平台。工業時代的社會歧視，被新形式的數字鴻溝取代。

傳播研究的一項重要任務，是探討傳播日益重要所帶來的後果。然而，傳播學者不能從他們研究的現象中抽離。畢竟傳播學所發表的研究成果，會被對傳播感興趣的人所悉。它傳播的正是關於傳播本身。傳播研究的社會意義是它會影響那些被研究者，及其他想了解的人。換句話說，重要的傳播研究可以影響它研究的事物，而且在研究者眼前發生。傳播學者不僅要知道新興的社會形式，他們一定要參與塑造其研究的事物。

CL：傳播學還像以往一樣邊緣化。只有少數傳播學者走出學科範圍之外尚有人知。我們這個學科整體上經歷格爾茨 (Clifford Geertz) 所說的「內卷化」(involution) 過程，盡在內部細節求發展，或展示炫目的技術能力，卻犧牲了概念創新、大膽實驗和開放變革。幾十年來，這個領域以為已經自給自足了，逐漸只向內引述本行文獻，無顧於更宏大的社會科學文獻，以至於顧影自憐，概念近親繁殖。分析一些瑣碎的問題，技術上再怎麼細緻得一絲不苟，卻只是強固了一種虛假的安全意識，徒然築起利益領地的學術圍牆，支離破碎，向內看，阻礙了新鮮和大膽的思想，整個學科既不積極參與也不公開爭論宏大議題。

缺乏廣闊視野的「內卷化」過程

坦白說，美國主流研究的問題是：背負太多熟悉的「變項」，

機械式地排列組合，分析套路幾乎可以預測，缺乏想像力，只追求「大數字」，卻沒有產生真正的視野。例如「議程設置」，經過50年的累積，發表高達600篇文章，應該算是顯學了，但比起李普曼 (Walter Lippmann) 在將近100年以前所出版的《輿論》，這些文章究竟增加多少洞見實在令人懷疑。其他熱門的研究，情況恐怕更糟。

由於極端的實證主義、科學主義及米爾斯 (C. Wright Mills) 所說的「抽象經驗主義」長期當道，造成主流傳播研究文獻的歷史真空和國際真空。我們一味宣稱這個學科必須取得「科學」的地位，於是一徑以為橫切面的社會科學研究才是「硬的」，探索過去之常與變的歷史研究則是「較軟的」，無端把它們分離開來，我們喪失了從人文學科的恆久價值和智慧中得益的機會。

美國主流傳播研究幾乎脫離國際思潮和全球關注。比較式、跨文化和跨境的研究很少。從本體論和方法論來看，世界不啻是「美國的放大版」。更糟的，整個世界簡直被視為美國傳播在海外的概念延伸和經驗印證，制度差異和文化差異似乎無關宏旨。發展傳播和創新擴散就是兩個好例子，說明西方導師和海外學徒達成霸權的共識，導致毫無批判的接受這些「學說」。

我們亟需把這個學科從國際真空中拯救出來。我試圖從韋伯和舒爾茨 (Weber-Schultz) 的思路啟發下，發展一個現象學的論點：一開始我們應該從在地和文化經驗著手，省察它的內在邏輯和意義，然後拾級上升到更高的抽象層次，最終連繫到合適的普世理論。這種取向反對把某些理論 (無論是議程設置，還是創新擴散) 視為當然，而在海外尋求印證。相反地，我們應該優先考慮文化自主性，並在大同的精神下促進各種文化社群生動活潑的對話。

有一種新的迷思，儼然以「新媒體」研究為救主，冀望它為傳播研究注入新活力，甚至是凝聚社會科學研究的焦點。目前的技術狂熱，我擔心會重演宣偉伯 (Wilbur Schramm) 在1950年代對傳播研究狀況所做的惡評：在這個十字路口，「很多人路過，很少人逗留」。

《傳播與社會學刊》，(總)第49期(2019)

CS：在世界各地尤其是發展中國家，傳播學者面對的重要問題是「去西方化」。「去西方化」顯然仍未結束，在某些地方甚至可能尚未開始。在20年前，當柯倫和派克 (Curran & Park, 2000) 創造這個術語時是這樣，現在依然是這樣。當數字革命改變了媒體業時，未來的情況恐怕也會如此。我會在中國的背景下游論這個問題，因為我目前住在此地。可以肯定的是，很多發展中國家也面臨相似的情況。「去西方化」的挑戰，可以有三個層面。

「去西方化」是一個問題

第一個是經驗的層面。有關中國媒體的大量資訊仍未為人所知，這不單是在國外，在國內也是如此。我相信世上幾乎每個傳播學者都知道一點HBO，以及它在美國電視業的角色。但我猜很少中國以外的學者可以在地圖上找到湖南衛視的所在地，更不用說它在中國電視業的角色。要改變這些奇怪的資訊不平衡情況，將是漫長、艱巨但重要的過程。

其次是理論層面的挑戰。用來解答傳播問題的很多理論工具，都是源於美國或西歐。某些理論在這些社會很有解釋力，人們也自然覺得它們既然適用於柏林、伯明翰或波士頓，也應同樣適用於北京。其中一些確是如此，但有些概念需要修改、放棄或被替代，以解釋發生在中國社會的傳播現象，畢竟它的社會關係和西方不同。對年輕學者來說，批判地審視已經建立起來的理論並不容易，這可能不是促進事業發展最好的做法。將老師的想法應用在不同的社會情境，或許是更佳的方式。走哪條路是學者的個人選擇，但如果不是有人有足夠勇氣去做這種批判性的重要項目，我們的理論工具會嚴重不足。

第三個層面是政治性的。想要發表關於中國的研究並不容易。無疑作品本身的素質是一個問題，但另一個更嚴重的問題關乎期刊編輯和審稿人的「正常」假設。看看傳播學的主要期刊，你會發現大部分的文章都是關於發達國家的媒體。如果想在這些期刊中發表來自中國的研究，你就無可避免被問到為何要討論中國。我已經厭倦為了發表而在每篇文章的開頭寫這樣一段話：

資深傳播學者對年輕學人的忠告與期望

「中國是世界上第二大的經濟體，它的媒介系統是發達國家市場主導模式的最大的替換選擇。」我還沒有在國際的傳播期刊中，讀到一篇文章是這樣開頭的：「儘管它日漸式微，美國仍是世界上最大的經濟體，其媒介系統還代表著世界上最大的市場主導模式，它和中國模式的特色頗為不同。」我不認為編輯這種態度會在一夜之間轉變。如果你想在這些期刊發表，除了忍受他們傲慢的態度和在你的文章中作出他們要求的修改外，我想不到其他可能。

DW：最顯而易見的挑戰，是社交媒體給新聞業、記者以及受眾和政府官員帶來的影響。儘管已有很多深入的研究分析傳統記者、新聞媒體和公職人員的關係，但有關社交媒體與政界人士和公眾人物如何相互影響的研究仍然不多。我們似乎有頗多圍繞社交媒體如何影響受眾的研究，但社交媒體對社會最重要的影響，可能是有關政治和傳統新聞業，以及社交媒體與這兩者之間的關係。

社交媒體的影響和經濟模型的需要

我們還需要研究有哪些不同的經濟模型，可以支持媒體對政府及商業進行獨立報道。由於廣告收入被社交媒體侵蝕，全球有多家新聞媒體不得不辭退大量記者。我們需要研究如何支持這些機構，否則我們將失去獨立報道帶來的益處，因為它們可以關注各種社會問題、公共事務、腐敗及不法行為。一旦失去獨立的調查報道，民主政體就無法正常運作。

問題二：要貢獻社會及成為一個公共知識分子，需要掌握哪些技巧、方法和能力？

CL：傳播研究一旦在公共話語和公民參與缺席，喪失其關鍵角色及重大貢獻，便可能淪為學術圈內人常聘和升遷的遊戲。我們未必是政治活躍分子，更未必是意識形態狂熱者，但必須牢記學術事業的公共目標，以指引我們提出的問題。我的老派想法總認為，好的學術可以揭示社會現實更深層、隱藏的、複雜的甚至矛盾的維度，增進啟蒙和解放的話語。

《傳播與社會學刊》，(總)第49期(2019)

以好奇的心智參與有意義的學術對話

學者必須磨礪一種永遠求知、好奇、覺醒、有良知的心態和情操，不斷尋找創新的思想，同時堅實立足於經驗現實。正如韋伯(Max Weber)所說的，學術是一種志業(vocation)，而不僅是一份糊口的工作。研究技巧再重要，也不是為了炫技，或為了待價而沽，而是為了解開對人類有重要意義的知識之謎。我們對學術的承諾當然是最重要的。我們不應有社會特權，但必須有責任以公民身分，運用專業知識，為有質素的公共對話作出貢獻。

CS：這個問題可以分為兩個部分。首先是成為學者，其次是成為公共知識分子。學者和公共知識分子顯然是不同的。有很多傑出的學者並不足以成為公共知識分子，不少公共知識分子也並非學者。學者透過創造新知識來貢獻社會，他們培養教育新一代，後者繼續服務未來社會。成為公共知識分子要和學術界以外的人互動，這種互動也可以對社會有貢獻。

需要批判性的反思能力和持續的努力

關於如何成為學者的問題，相信答案會和詢問者本身的特點有關。我是一名批判學者，背景在文化研究，我的主要研究工作屬於政治經濟學範疇。任何批判學者的出發點都離不開那個宏大的啟蒙主題，即是貫穿英國皇家學會的「沒有空話」(*Nullius in verba*)，康德的「敢於認識」(*Sapere aude*)，以及馬克思的「懷疑一切」(*De omnibus dubitandum*)。這些過去的歐洲語言所傳達的格言，它們的意義是說明批判學者不完全接受任何權威所說的看法，無論這位權威有多傑出。概念、方法、資料和結論在未經批判審視前，都不應被信納。這是任何批判研究的起點。

其實研究媒體和傳播的合適方法是很容易說明的。正規點說，方法是回答研究問題的工具，不同的問題需要不同的方法。分析廣告符號學的方法，不會比測量受眾對廣告反應所用的方法更好或更壞。它們只是不同而已，所提供的是不同類型的知識。有關量化研究/質化研究、觀察法/實驗法的爭論，都是對錯了焦點。這些方法都能幫助我們了解這個世界。

資深傳播學者對年輕學人的忠告與期望

一個學者需要的主要能力不是超凡的智力，它甚至可能是一種障礙。最關鍵的能力是努力、持之以恆及全神貫注地工作。

公共知識分子與學者都擁有清晰的思路，但諸如嚴謹、有效、可靠和客觀等特徵，就不是對公共知識分子的要求。一名學者可以是公共知識分子，他可選擇將其學術研究成果向非學術界的公眾講述。多年前我年紀尚輕，並不是個成功的公共知識分子。公共知識分子要面對的壓力很不同，相關的工作誘因也不一樣。他要和公眾溝通，給公眾傳達重要訊息，而關乎公眾的重要訊息往往是有爭議性的，那就要用最具說服性的方式傳達想法。我認為扮演好這個角色所需要的主要技能，是要掌握有說服力的修辭工具。

我個人的經驗是，成為公共知識分子的重要能力，是要比學者有更大的能耐，去努力、持之以恆及全神貫注地工作。

DW：這些技巧包括廣泛閱讀、清晰的文筆和持之以恆的決心。我們不僅在學術期刊上發表研究成果，也要在政策制定者和大眾可以看到的地方發表。作為學者，我們的主要任務是通過研究和教學創造新知識；但作為公共知識分子，我們的目標應是確保可以簡明地將這些知識傳遞給公眾和政策制定者。

使用系統方法來研究重要議題

此外，公共知識分子要加入和自己研究與教學有共同關注的團體，但不應太強烈宣導某個特定方案，來解決社會問題或政治議題。使用系統方法長期了解一些議題，對持續保持學者和公共知識分子的信譽至關重要。

作為公共知識分子，要選擇關注一些很多人都認為重要的議題。如果你只關心那些鮮有人在意或奇怪的議題，那麼你很難成為一名公共知識分子。

KK：關注更大社會議題的傳播學者，需要做好準備去回應、超越當前傳播實踐活動的一些大膽問題。他們必須思考一般人未能理解的系統，並想出一些方法來聆聽不同的聲音，而不是支持其中一種聲音來反對另一種，至少在開始時不應是這樣。這就需

《傳播與社會學刊》，(總)第49期(2019)

要有一些超越普通人的能力，去分析大量資訊、開展調查、舉行焦點小組訪談和田野工作、追蹤相關網絡、設計平台來和被研究者溝通。

有理論意義的統計能力、批判和反思能力

懂得運用統計是有幫助的，但如果統計只是為了計算，而忽略了在概念上有意義的模式 (pattern)，就顯得不足了。網絡內容分析、系統理論和電腦模擬技術變得愈來愈重要。演算法 (algorithm) 正在取代很多行政工作，它令社會機構趨向穩定，並涉及更多社會生活的管理。為了理解演算法的運作，傳播學者必須懂一點程序設計知識。

所有調查方法都有其局限。從其他學科引入有用的方法到傳播研究中，會同時輸入這些方法本身在認識論上的偏向。如果只是使用其中一種方法，又會限制了我們如何理解傳播本身的特徵。傳播學者要能批判性地審視借過來的方法。在我看來，傳播研究已經發展出兩種自己的方法：內容分析和網絡分析。面對快速變化的傳播實踐，我們需要更多的新方法。

可能傳播學最重要的方法取向是反思 (reflexive)。傳播對相關的人都是重要的。當傳播學者發表研究成果時，他們不能只是著眼使用那些傳統的表達方式 (如代表性樣本、相關性、觀測的對應性)。例如我們發現某一少數群體的智商持續偏低，事實上可能是真確的，但如果簡單接受了這種想法，就可能令這個群體失去教育和工作的機會。作為公共知識分子，傳播學者應盡其所能，揭露那些自我應驗的科學偽測量 (mismeasure)，及指出一些研究者不願公布結果所帶來的後果。

問題三：傳播學和其他研究領域有何分別？在追求知識時，我們應如何處理或善用它們之間的關係？

CS：首先值得注意的是，這個問題使用了「領域」(field)一詞，而避開了「學科」(discipline)的陷阱。媒體與傳播研究並不是像化學或地理一樣被稱為「學科」。它是一個非常寬闊的領域，其界限並非

資深傳播學者對年輕學人的忠告與期望

由學術因素來決定，而是透過一些聘任傳播研究者的學術部門在歷史上的偶然因素而形成的。有些學系源於人文學科，另一些則在社會科學當中，它們的工作反映了傳播學不同的系譜。有些人喜歡畢生專注研究一個細小的領域，其他人則隨自己的技能與興趣，在傳播領域中到處漫遊。

是自由涉獵還是聚焦某處？

我已發表作品的題材廣泛，包括好萊塢音樂劇和英國廣播節目等。如果我的合著者能夠應付她第一份大學工作的要求，我甚至將會和她發表有關當代中式婚禮的研究。所以我明顯支持自由涉獵不同研究領域的做法。當然這種選擇容易導致膚淺的危險，至於我的作品是否如此，就要交由別人評議。但這樣做可以讓人從別的領域得到啟發，並用於另一領域的研究當中。

我舉一個例子來說明更廣闊的視角有何好處。絕大部分的新聞學研究都集中在「嚴肅」的新聞領域。這似乎對很多新聞學者而言是正常不過的，他們發表了大量優秀而且有趣的政治和經濟新聞研究。但是作為一個文化研究學者，看到大多數研究都聚焦於報紙、電視或數字媒體的逐漸減少的一小部分內容，我感到非常震驚。新聞學研究亟待重新定位，這並不是說不再研究新聞業與社會管治這些重要問題，而是需要增加一些對時尚、名人及娛樂新聞的認真研究來作補充。

DW：傳播學比大部分其他研究領域更廣泛，變化速度也更快。但政治學、經濟學、社會學和心理學等領域，能夠提供重要的理論視角。借用其他領域的理論並應用於傳播問題和過程的研究中，可以令我們更了解這些過程及其影響。將其他領域的研究方法應用在傳播研究中，也能有所收穫。但這不是說我們只應依賴其他領域的理論和方法。

借用其他學科來幫助自己的研究

我們當然要嘗試走自己的路，但要避免重新創造其他領域已經使用的理論和方法。我們應向其他領域取經，以便更好地理解傳播過程和效果。傳播學作為交叉學科，其學者應該廣泛涉獵其

《傳播與社會學刊》，(總)第49期(2019)

他領域的期刊和出版物。但隨著傳播學本身的期刊與著作數量增加，要做到這一點也愈來愈困難。

KK：根本而言，傳播是人類共同生活的一種方式。它不同於體力勞動、暴力行為和各種決定論。社區成員之間有不同互動，他們協調自己的生活，教育下一代，雖然他們可能無法構想出未來的全貌，但他們仍希望未來會變得更好。相比之下，生物學關注的是活的有機體，物理學關注的是沒有人類參與的大自然，語言學關注的是句子的語法和語義，政治學關注的是政府，社會學關注的是社會分工、權力關係、社會制度和組織形式。這些學科都試圖理解並理論化那些普遍存在的事物及其運作機制。

研究新的公共生活方式作為傳播視角

傳播學術不應停留在目前的現狀。它必須聚焦傳播的意義，及了解不斷出現的新共同生活形式。舉例說，真正的對話永遠不會重複，因為其參與者可以在互動中學習。對話是我所知道最有效的進化活動，新事物就在回應內容時出現。它的價值經過大家協商，對話過程的結果不能只是由某一個參與者擁有。最近有一本名為《知識幻覺》的書，其副題是「我們人類不能獨自思考」(Sloman & Fernbach, 2017)。

由於傳播學的這些特性，傳播學者不應把他們研究的主體寄存於其他科學(例如工程學或生物學)的認識論當中。傳播科技既促進又限制我們的互動方式，我們自己一定參與其中，但人類傳播不能只被科技和生物學來解釋。例如種族可能有生物的成分，但過分強調這種成分就忽視了傳播的源頭。「種族」起初是一個字詞。「種族主義」卻是一種實踐，它在語言上對人類外表進行分類，並賦予其不變的生物特性。如果相信這些不變特性，就會製造社會陷阱，令人難以擺脫這些陷阱。用物理學中的權力隱喻來解釋社會關係，會造成人們無法從隱含的決定論中解放自己。依靠電腦隱喻來研究人類認知，人工智能將人類視為一種自動裝置。人類的思維卻是我們在進化過程中獲得的珍貴禮物。然而，如果大腦不與其環境互動，特別是不與其他人的言行有持續的交流，它只是一個空洞的器官。

資深傳播學者對年輕學人的忠告與期望

傳播學者不能將其研究的事物視為獨立於研究本身而存在。他們在學術過程中，產生及塑造了研究的對象、發表的文章和傳播的內容。這就引發了倫理責任，但很多其他科學性質的學科就不必考慮這方面。

CL：本質上，傳播學是跨學科和通貫性的。它應該是一種視野，一個爭取權力和理解的場域，一個表達和爭論的平台，以及一個包括現在和過去社會生活的過程。它連繫社會參與者、活動和結構各方面，在這過程中揭示不同層次、豐富多彩、活生生的人類意義和謎團。傳播是整合社會不同組成部分的樞紐。因此我認為，躲在真空中，或以固步自封的角度研究傳播——這可能是當前大量研究的寫照——必是徒勞的，因為這樣做無法與更大的政治、經濟和文化脈絡建立有機的連繫。

跨學科和通貫性的傳播學

換句話說，我們必須一方面從更廣泛的脈絡審視傳播的議題，另一方面試圖回饋並闡明傳播對這些脈絡的意義。這不意味我們必須落在一個膚淺的領域，也不是自甘平庸。所謂「跨學科」，不是在傳播「和」其他東西（例如電視和兒童、廣告和健康、媒體和政治）之間安插一個鬆散的連接詞。現代學術以問題為導向，傳播研究應該牢牢地建基於一些概念和理論視角，這些視角應包含、連繫傳統學科的邊界，進而吸收它們的理論卓見。

問題四：如果有意成為一個學者，你個人有甚麼忠告？

DW：選擇一個自己感興趣的領域，長期進行研習，並將它納入教學當中，甚至用它來貫串自己的整個學業生涯。要在前人及自己的工作基礎上，建立自己的研究。想成為一個專家，唯一路徑是長期鑽研一個領域或一種理論取向，及將自己的研究建基於前人的研究。

長時間研究同一個領域

在合適的學術期刊上發表你的研究，並在各種學術會議上展示你的研究成果，這是有必要的。其他學者將會注意到，並開始

《傳播與社會學刊》，(總)第49期(2019)

在他們的研究與教學中引用你的成果。如果你想成為某一領域的專家，就要避免在不同的領域之間遊移不定。很多時研究當下正在發生的事件往往是很吸引人的，但從一個事件或題目跳到另一個事件或題目，卻沒有一個統一的理論或方法取向，是不可能成為知名學者的。

可能的話，你的教學和研究應該互相補充。選擇研究興趣時，記得反問自己，其他人是否也覺得這個題目重要。這些人不僅是來自傳播學領域，還要包括傳播圈子以外的人。一些學者選擇十分狹窄甚至冷僻的研究領域，大部分人對這些領域並不關注。如前所述，想要成為著名的傳播學者或公共知識分子，這並非有效的做法。

KK：成為學者有很多途徑。我畢業於一所短暫存在的前衛學校，這所學校讓我接觸到很多理論和思維方式，使我能夠走出自己的道路。它讓我有機會認識傳播研究。與那些被約束要遵守一種理解方式的學生相比，我很幸運。

擁有多科際視角、了解自己話語的後果

我認為多學科的視角，對於理解社會中不斷演變的人類傳播現象至關重要。沒有一門社會科學——包括社會心理學、人類學、社會學、經濟學、政治學等——能夠單獨處理這樣的形態演化過程，儘管它們可能提供一些解釋的變項。科技肯定是牽涉其中的。科技可以讓不同學科之間互相學習，如果當代傳播學者沒有使用傳播科技的能力，就可能會茫然若失。

我提到過演算法，它們正在接管很多日常的社會實踐。通過演算法，可以在互聯網傳播資訊和搜索巨大的資料庫，大家的常見反應是接受其計算結果。然而，在不清楚演算法是如何產生的情況下採用它們，相當於盲目地將人類的主導權拱手讓給機器。這是服從一個沒有智能和無處不在的權威的現代版本。而且這個權威沒有自己的意圖，它無法解釋自己為何要做所做的事，及它是由很多機器無形地連繫而成的。為了保持大家的主導性，傳播學者和使用者需要發展和掌握全新的技能，以批判的立場探究使用演算法的歷史和社會後果。

資深傳播學者對年輕學人的忠告與期望

我對未來傳播學者最重要的建議是，要認識到自己的話語（discourse），並對自己的話語所帶來的後果負責。我們都說一種語言，但主要是「關於」我們生活中的世界。通過不在意地談論和寫作，我們往注意識不到語言的使用分散了我們的注意力，無法看到我們是在建構自己生活的世界。為了要與我們習慣使用的語言保持一定距離，學習另一種語言有很多好處。這不是要學習一門外語課程，而是通過在國外生活一段時間，體驗語言如何構成不同的社會存在形式。學習用一種陌生的語言進行交流，敞開心扉體驗文化衝擊，有助於人們意識到自己使用了本土術語、不可譯的隱喻，以及與人相處的不同方式。傳播學者在研究過程中，正需要批判性地審視和重新引入這些經歷。

傳播學者不應該害怕用新的角度探索問題、提出困難的問題，並挑戰一些先入為主的想法。如果傳播學者能夠提出新的詞彙來豐富人們對傳播實踐的表達方式，能夠將社區從概念束縛中解放出來，並提高他們的能力來批判地審視自己對他人生活的貢獻，傳播學者就應該慶祝了。要做出這樣的貢獻的話，傳播學者需要成為日常傳播實踐的概念領導者。

CL：我衷心贊同米爾斯的明智忠告：任何好學者都要時常把個人關注聯繫到公共問題，從而形成一個同心圓，結合生命和學術追求。為此，我們必須找到一組持久的關注，彷彿「在腹中燃燒的一把火」。從這些關注出發，努力培養知識的敏感度和直覺，化為學術研究，從而對更大的關懷作出貢獻。

關注公共議題、培育敏感性、提出好問題

我相信最好找幾本（不要太多）經典著作（不僅限於傳播領域）——所謂經典著作，就是不但經得起時間的考驗，每一輪閱讀都為「現實」帶來新的亮光，而且即使不完全同意它的深刻視野，卻也繞不過它——沉浸其中，直到我們覺得已經自然地內化了這些「偉大心靈」的視野，學到他們對世界提問的方式以及他們追尋答案的方式。沒有比這方法更能培養判斷和品味的標準了。

實際研究工作這才開始。我們要努力問一些好問題，可能具有廣泛理論意義的具體問題。由於是具體的問題，才容易有切己

《傳播與社會學刊》，(總)第49期(2019)

之感，但除非賦予普遍意義，它們不過是狹隘的關懷。這說明為何必須發展一種能力，在抽象階梯上下自如，以連接經驗證據和理論概念。每個研究領域都有一組重要的文獻，必須徹底了解它的語言、景觀、邏輯和範式，然後我們才可以耳聰目明，知道如何同各種不同的(多半是衍生的，不是原創的)的研究打交道。

CS：第一個要回應的問題是：現今我是否會建議別人去當學者？這個行業顯然正在經歷深刻而且偏向負面的變化。50年前我還是一名本科生，當時學者的工作較為穩定，待遇也較佳，而且享有更多自由。(那時他們大多數是白人和男性，今天學者的背景就比較多元化，所以也不全是消極的。)在發達國家的現代大學，學者面臨沒有太大保障的合約、偏低的收入、更重的教學負擔、巨大的研究壓力和官僚的細節管理。現時學者的工作時數，就連農民也會吃一驚。

在著名大學盡快獲得學位

個人而言，當熱心的年輕學生來問我如何成為學者時，我第一個反應是問他們是否渴望將來會有些成就。如果他們仍很堅持，我就會這樣建議：竭盡全力進入最著名的大學。不要考慮那些研究排名很高的學系，這幾乎是沒有用的。影響你事業發展最重要的因素，是授予你博士學位的大學招牌。我就有痛苦的個人經歷。在英國時，我曾在公認為國內排名頂尖的媒體研究中心工作，我們的博士生很難在優秀的大學找到工作，因為我們這所卓越的中心是設在一所排名較低的大學。來自更著名大學的學生，雖然他們身處學系的研究排名只是很一般，但他們總是比我們的校友更易獲得青睞。這是一個鐵律，在歐洲、美國和中國都是如此。

大學之間是有排序的。一位睿智的中國學者曾經向我抱怨：你不能逆流而上，畢竟潮流來自美國。除了倫敦政治經濟學院和阿姆斯特丹大學等少數精英大學，即使是一所很普通的美國大學，其畢業生在工作時，都會比歐洲或澳大利亞大學的畢業生更受未來僱主重視。從一所美國大學拿到博士學位，你可以在香

資深傳播學者對年輕學人的忠告與期望

港找到工作。在香港拿到博士學位，可以在大陸找到工作。有大陸的博士學位卻只能讓你在大陸找到工作。雖然你有很多學術著作，其重要性都比不上你所畢業大學的名字。

當你進入一所優秀大學，我的建議就很簡單和耳熟能詳。盡快拿到學位，不要浪費時間到處找樂子。做學問要很努力，所以從第一天起就要開始。在寫任何東西前，包括功課、學期論文甚至洗衣清單，都要問自己我可以在哪裡發表。這個問題的正確答案永遠是：在SSCI期刊，或是中國的CSSCI期刊，其影響因子愈高愈好。最好是做第一作者，但任何署名都會有些幫助，所以如果你自己不是正在寫論文，就和你的同事合作一起去做。

以前我會建議年輕學者找一個他們感興趣的題目。如果不喜歡你的工作，為何要當學者呢？今天我就不太確定了。我會補充說，有些課題較容易獲得更多研究經費，可能這些課題是最佳的選擇。一直以來，健康傳播、兒童與媒體以至在大陸研究習近平思想，可以找到更多研究經費支持。在世上很多地方，批判學者要與行政型的學者相比，能夠獲得經費的機會更為有限。

說完上面的話，作為一個學者，至少從批判學者的角度看，肯定是世界上最好的事業。儘管有種種限制、不穩定的因素和你永遠不會致富，但你可以思考、研究和寫你想寫的東西。世界上沒有其它工作可以提供這樣的自由，它付薪水讓你去思考。所以你在了解清楚之後，就去做一個學者吧。

參考文獻

- Curran, J., & Park, M. J. (Eds.). (2000). *De-Westernizing media studies*. London; New York: Routledge.
- Sloman, S., & Fernbach, P. (2017). *The knowledge illusion: Why we never think alone*. New York: Riverhead Books.

《傳播與社會學刊》，(總)第49期(2019)

本文引用格式

蘇鑰機(編)(2019)。〈資深傳播學者對年輕學人的忠告與期望〉。《傳播與社會學刊》，第49期，頁1-41。

Academic Dialogue with **Klaus Krippendorff, Chin-Chuan Lee, Colin Sparks, and David Weaver**

Senior Communication Scholars' Advice to and Expectation of Young Researchers

KK: Klaus KRIPPENDORFF

CL: Chin-Chuan LEE

CS: Colin SPARKS

DW: David WEAVER

Question 1: What are some of the issues and challenges that future communication scholars might want to address?

KK: We have to realize that serious communication research started only after WWII. It has a short history. Now we are overwhelmed by the recognition that we are living in a society that is constituted by the human reliance on communication technologies beyond simple media. This amounts to enormous challenges as well as opportunities for communication scholarship.

Its emergence is as fundamental as is the transition from hunting-gathering tribal forms of living, to agricultural-communal forms, and to the industrial revolution. The latter provided us with technologies that promised to make life easier but only at the expense of accepting material inequalities, submission to hierarchical social structures, confining ideologies, devastating wars, and ecologically irresponsible exploitations of scarce natural resources—as if the future would be unlimited.

Computers, billed as the crown technology of the industrial era, began to undermine its foundational structures by connecting people in novel ways. The influence of mass communication—print, radio, and television—paralleled by the telephone, has become subverted by email, social media, and the internet. Social organizations are becoming decentralized and global, boundaries are challenged, and so are the conceptions of work, and how people participate in society.

Communication & Society, 49 (2019)

Need to be proactive in facing technology-led challenges

What communication scholars are challenged to address are the consequences of replacing established hierarchical organizational structures by technologically supported heterogeneous and flexible networks of coordination and novel competencies of people that utilize them and contribute to their communities and society as a whole. Modern forms of communication have undermined undesirable forms of government. But we do not have adequate theories of where these new forms of organization will lead us to. We have already experienced several unwelcome consequences. Communication scholars are trying to come to grips with anti-social forms of communication: hate speech; ethnic, gender, educational and economic biases; political interests in restricting access to communication; and internet platforms that enable the unchecked spread of disruptive messages, malware, spyware, and fake news. The social discriminations of the industrial era are replaced by new forms of digital inequalities.

Understanding the consequences of the increasing dominance of communication is an important task of communication research. However, scholars of communication cannot extract themselves from the phenomena they study. After all, communication scholarship is published and read by people interested in communication. It communicates about communication. If it is of any social significance, it can be expected to affect those studied as well as those actively interested in those studied. In other words, significant communication scholarship can affect its objects of attention, changing it right in front of a researcher's eyes. Not only do communication scholars need to be aware of the emerging social forms, they cannot avoid participating in shaping what they study.

CL: Communication remains as marginalized as ever. Only a small number of communication scholars are recognized beyond our field of specialty. The field overall suffers from what Clifford Geertz calls the process of "involution," which is the introversive tendency toward internal elaboration of details and the dazzling display of technical virtuosity at the expense of conceptual innovation, bold experiment, and open change. Over the decades we have seen the field tending toward self-referencing our own work under the pretense of disciplinary self-sufficiency, instead of cross-referencing the larger

Senior Communication Scholars' Advice to and Expectation of Young Researchers

social science literature, thus resulting in a culture of self-absorption and conceptual inbreeding. Technical hairsplitting on trifling problems serves to fortify the false security of various fragmented, inward-looking interest ghettos and erect academic walls against fresh and bold ideas; consequently, our field is insulated from active engagement with an open contestation over big issues.

Process of “involution” without broader perspectives

Bluntly put—here I speak primarily of the mainstream U.S. literature—we are too often saddled with almost predictable and unimaginative permutation of familiar variables to get “big numbers,” but without producing real perspectives. It seems dubious, for example, as to the amount of insights that the “agenda-setting” hypothesis, after 50 years of active research cumulative with a presumably coveted record of 600 published articles, has been able to add to what Walter Lippmann offered in *Public Opinion* almost a century ago. Many other streams of busy research, I am afraid, fare even worse.

As extreme forms of positivism, scientism, and what C. Wright Mills calls “abstracted empiricism” reign supreme, the mainstream communication literature further suffers from historical vacuum and international vacuum. Hard-nosed claims to “scientific” status of the field unnecessarily cut off “hard” social science-based and often cross-sectional study of today’s society from the presumably “softer” historical study of its past, continuities and rupture, not to lament over the loss of opportunity to benefit from the enduring values and wisdom of the humanities.

Much of the mainstream U.S. communication scholarship has been conducted largely in isolation from the international currents of thought and global concerns. Comparative, cross-cultural, and border-crossing research is few and far in between. The world amounts, ontologically and methodologically, to “America writ large.” Worse yet, the world is taken as conceptual extension and empirical application of U.S. communication, as if systemic and cultural differences did not matter. Development communication and diffusion of innovations were prime examples in which uncritical acceptance occurred through the process of hegemonic consent between Western tutors and their overseas disciples.

Communication & Society, 49 (2019)

It is important to rescue the field from its international vacuum. I have tried to develop a phenomenological argument, inspired by the Weber-Schultz line of thought, that research should start with reflections on the internal logic and meaning of local and cultural experiences, work toward a higher level of abstraction, and ultimately relate those reflections to suitable cosmopolitan theories. This approach opposes taking certain theories for granted (be it agenda-setting or diffusion of innovations) and then proceeding to seek validation overseas. Instead, we should give premium to cultural autonomy while promoting a lively and fruitful dialogue between various cultural communities in the cosmopolitan spirit.

There is somehow a new myth that looks to “new media” studies as a savior to vitalize communication research and even to serve as a rallying cry of social science inquiries. I fear that the current technological fad promises to be a repeat of what Wilbur Schramm said despairingly in the 1950s of the status of communication: a crossroads where “many tarry, few stay.”

CS: The major issue facing communication scholars, anywhere in the world but particularly in the developing world, is obviously the unfinished, indeed almost un-started, business of “de-Westernization.” This was true two decades ago when Curran and Park (2000) coined the term, it is true today, and it will be true when the digital revolution has transformed the entire media. Here, I shall talk about problems arising from the Chinese context, because that is where I live, but the situation almost certainly has similarities in many developing countries. “De-Westernization” is a challenge at three levels.

“De-Westernization” as an issue

The first is empirical: a huge amount of information about the media in China remains unknown—certainly outside of the country but also, very often, inside the country as well. I am sure almost every communication scholar in the world knows at least something about HBO and its role in U.S. television, but my guess would be that very few outside of China could find the home of Hunan TV on a map, let alone say much about what its role in Chinese television has been. Changing those grotesque knowledge imbalances will be a long and arduous, but essential, task.

Senior Communication Scholars' Advice to and Expectation of Young Researchers

The second challenge is theoretical. The bulk of the theoretical apparatus we bring to bear on problems of communication was developed either in the U.S. or in Western Europe. In those societies some of it has been very powerful and it is certainly tempting to think that the concepts that worked so well in Berlin, Birmingham or Boston, will work just as well in Beijing. Some of them, of course, will work perfectly well but others may need to be modified, abandoned, or replaced to account for communication phenomena in a society in which social relations are very different. Critically interrogating theories that are well-established in the scholarly field is not an easy task for a junior scholar. Indeed, sometimes it may not be optimal career-enhancing behavior: better, one might think, simply to apply the ideas of one's teachers in different circumstances. Which route to take is a choice for individual scholars, but there is no doubt that unless some people have the courage to pursue this critical project then our theoretical apparatus will be seriously deficient.

The third challenge we might say is, in a very general sense, political. Getting work about China published is not easy. Some of that problem is, no doubt, connected to issues of quality, but there is another, more serious, issue involving the "normal" assumptions of editors and reviewers. If you look at most leading journals in communication, you will notice that the majority of their articles are about the media in the developed world. If you try to publish using material from China in those journals, you will invariably be asked to justify why it is important to discuss China. I am sick and tired of having to write a passage that runs: "China is the world's second largest economy and its media system represents the largest alternative to the market-dominated model of the developed world" at the start of every article as a condition of publication. I have yet to read an article in an international communication journal that begins: "Despite its manifest decline, the U.S. is still the world's largest economy and its media system represents the largest market-dominated model in the world, being quite different in character from that prevailing in China." I don't think this sort of attitude is going to change overnight, and, if one wishes to publish in these journals, I can't see any alternative but to tolerate their patronizing attitudes and make the changes they demand as the price of entry.

Communication & Society, 49 (2019)

DW: One of the most obvious challenges is the impact of social media on journalism and journalists, as well as on audiences and government officials. While we have many insightful studies of the relationship between traditional journalists, news media and public officials, we don't have very many that focus on how social media influence and are influenced by politicians and public figures. We seem to have more studies on the impact of social media on audiences, but the most consequential effects of social media for societies may be on politics and traditional journalism—and on the relationship between them.

Impact of social media and need for economic models

We also need more studies of different economic models that could be used to support independent reporting on government and business. Many news organizations around the world have had to make drastic cuts in journalists because of the loss of advertising revenue to social media. We need to study ways of supporting these organizations or we will all lose the benefits of independent reporting to shine a light on various social problems and public issues, and on corruption and wrongdoing. Without such independent investigative reporting, democratic forms of government cannot function well.

Question 2: What are some of the skills, methods, and capabilities needed to make a contribution to society and to become a public intellectual?

CL: If the study of communication should lose its crucial role in and its big contribution to public discourse and citizen engagement, it may risk being degenerated into an insider's game for nothing but academic tenure and promotion. One does not have to be a political activist, much less an ideological zealot, but the public aims of academic enterprise should be kept in mind to inform the questions we ask. I am old-fashioned enough to hold the view that good scholarship may reveal the deeper, hidden, complex, and perhaps contradicting dimensions of social reality, with a view to enhancing the discourses of enlightenment and emancipation.

To join meaningful discourse with inquisitive mindset

A scholar must sharpen a mindset and an ethos that are forever inquisitive, curious, aware, conscientious, and always on

Senior Communication Scholars' Advice to and Expectation of Young Researchers

the lookout for innovative ideas, while also solidly grounded in empirical reality. Intellectual work is, as Max Weber proclaims, a vocation, not a mere job to earn one's keeping. Research skills, however important, should be honed neither for their own sake nor put up for sale, but to untangle true intellectual puzzles that are of central importance to the meaning of humanities. Our first order of commitment is, of course, to scholarship. Further, while not entitled to special social privilege, we do have the obligation to contribute to informed public discourses in the capacity of engaged citizens, albeit with specialized expertise.

CS: This question comes in two, quite distinct, parts. The first is about being a scholar. The second is about being an intellectual. The two are most certainly not the same thing. Many very eminent scholars do not qualify as intellectuals and, certainly, many intellectuals are not scholars. Scholars make a contribution to society through establishing new knowledge, and by training a new generation in accomplishments that are necessary and valuable to the future of society. Being a public intellectual is to be someone who engages with an audience beyond the academy, and such an engagement can sometimes be a contribution to society.

Need for critical reflection and consistent hard work

Any answer to the question about being a scholar will depend largely on the characteristics of the scholar answering it. I am a critical scholar, my background is in cultural studies, and the bulk of my current work is located in political economy. The starting point of any critical scholar has to be that grand Enlightenment theme that runs through the Royal Society's "*Nullius in verba*" and Kant's "*Sapere aude*" to (at least) Marx's "*De omnibus dubitandum.*" What all those mottoes in a dead European language mean is that the critical scholar takes nothing simply on authority, however eminent that authority may be. Concepts, methods, data, conclusions can never be trusted without critical reflection. That must be the starting point of any critical enquiry.

The appropriate methods for researching media and communication are much easier to specify: anything goes. More formally, methods are techniques for answering research questions and different questions demand different methods. The methods

Communication & Society, 49 (2019)

needed to analyze the semiotics of an advertisement are not better or worse than the methods needed to measure the audience response to an advertisement: they are simply different and they provide different kinds of knowledge. Arguments about quantitative versus qualitative, observational versus experimental, and so on are simply misplaced: they all help us find out about the world.

The main capability that a scholar needs is certainly not a brilliant intellect: that can be a hindrance. The essential capability is the capacity for hard, consistent, concentrated, work.

The public intellectual shares with the scholar clarity of thought, but concepts like rigor, validity, reliability, objectivity, are not part of the basic job description. A scholar can also be a public intellectual—I was a very unsuccessful one for many years in my youth—but, except in so far as she is articulating her scholarly findings for a non-academic audience, the public intellectual is operating under different pressures and responding to different incentives. Since one is communicating with the public, presumably to inform them of something of importance, and since matters of public importance are usually contested, then one must try to present one's ideas in the most persuasive way possible. I suppose the primary skill necessary to play this role is a mastery of the rhetoric of persuasion.

In my experience, the essential capability for a public intellectual is to have an even greater capacity for hard, consistent, concentrated, work than does the scholar.

DW: These skills include wide-ranging reading, clear writing, perseverance over long periods of time, and publishing findings of research not only in academic journals but also in places where policy makers and more general publics will see them. As academics, our main mission is to create new knowledge from our research and in our teaching, but as public intellectuals our goal should be to make sure that this knowledge is presented concisely and clearly in places where publics and policy makers will see it.

Use systematic methods to study important issues

Another aspect of becoming a public intellectual is to become

Senior Communication Scholars' Advice to and Expectation of Young Researchers

involved in groups that are concerned with the issues and problems addressed in your own research and teaching, without becoming too strong an advocate for a certain solution or approach to solving social problems or resolving political issues. Using systematic methods over time to shed light on issues and problems is essential for continued credibility as a scholar and public intellectual.

Another important aspect of becoming a public intellectual is to choose issues and problems that are considered important by large numbers of people. It is difficult, perhaps impossible, to become a public intellectual if you focus on esoteric problems and issues that are of concern to very few people.

KK: Communication scholars, concerned with larger social issues, need to prepare themselves to answer audacious research questions that go beyond the ongoing communication practices. They have to conceptualize systems larger than what their human constituents understand and develop methods of listening to different voices without siding with one against the other – at least not to begin with. This calls for abilities, exceeding that of ordinary folks, of analyzing large bodies of messages, conducting surveys, focus groups, and field work, tracing networks of connections, and designing platforms to communicate with those they wish to study.

Theoretically informed statistical competencies, critical and reflexive abilities

Statistical competencies are helpful but can become inadequate when they omit conceptually important patterns for the sake of counting. Networked content analyses, systems theories, and computer simulations have become increasingly important. To understand the working of algorithms, which are in the process of replacing many administrative jobs, stabilizing social institutions, and expanding governance of nearly all spheres of social life, communication scholars would have to have at least a modicum of programming experiences.

All investigative methods have their limitations. Importing successful ones from other scientific disciplines carries their epistemological biases into communication scholarship, and

Communication & Society, 49 (2019)

specializing in the use of any one of them is sure to limit understanding the larger systemic features of communication. Communication scholars need to be able to critically examine the methods they adopt from elsewhere. In my opinion, communication research has developed two indigenous methods, content analysis and network analysis. The rapidly changing communication practices call for more innovations.

Possibly the most important methodological commitment of communication scholarship is to be reflexive. Cognizant that all communications matter to those involved, when communication scholars publish their findings they cannot limit themselves to the use of methods that merely establish classical representational truths (representative samples, correlations, and correspondences with observations of what exist). For example, finding a particular minority to have persistently low intelligence may be factually correct but merely demonstrates that taking such beliefs into consideration denies this minority education and jobs. As public intellectuals, communication scholars ought to do everything in their power to reveal such self-fulfilling mismeasures of science by researchers who are blind to the consequences of communicating their results.

Question 3: How does communication differ from other fields of research? How shall we deal with or make use of the relationship between them in the pursuit of knowledge?

CS: The first thing to note is that this question uses the term “field” and avoids the pitfalls of “discipline.” The study of media and communication is not a “discipline” in the way that chemistry or even geography might claim to be. It is a field, but a very, very, wide field whose boundaries are determined not by intellectual considerations but by the accidents of the history of the various departments and faculties that house the practitioners. Some such departments have their origins in the humanities and others in the social sciences and their work reflects those different genealogies. Some individuals are content to work away in one narrow furrow in the field for their entire careers, others roam about wherever their skills and interests take them.

Senior Communication Scholars' Advice to and Expectation of Young Researchers

To roam freely or to focus narrowly?

I have published on, among other things, Hollywood musicals, British broadcasting, and I shall, if my co-author ever recovers from the shock of her first university job, publish on contemporary Chinese wedding practices. I therefore obviously favor the roaming option. Of course, that option always carries the risk of superficiality, and whether that charge sticks in my case is for others to judge, but it does allow one to take insights from one furrow and use them to illuminate problems in another.

An example of how this broader perspective might help is that the overwhelming majority of research into journalism concentrates on “serious” journalism. This does not seem to strike most journalism scholars, who unquestionably produce very good and interesting work about political and economic journalism, as at all remarkable. For a scholar trained in cultural studies, however, this overwhelming concentration on a small, and shrinking, portion of what appears in newspapers, on television, and in digital form is astonishing. There is an urgent need to re-orient journalism studies, not away from the grand questions of the adequacy of journalism to the governance of society, but to supplement that concentration with some serious studies of, for example, fashion, celebrity, and entertainment journalism.

DW: Communication is broader than most other fields of research and it changes at a faster rate, but other fields such as government, economics, sociology and psychology can provide important theoretical perspectives. Borrowing theory from other fields and applying it to communication problems and processes can increase our understanding of these processes and effects. It is also productive to consider the methods used in other fields and to try to employ them in studying communication. This is not to say that we should rely only on theories and methods from other fields.

To borrow from other fields in own pursuit

Of course we should be trying to develop our own theories and methods, but we should avoid reinventing theories and methods already used in other fields, and we should take what we can from other fields that will help us better understand

Communication & Society, 49 (2019)

communication processes and effects. As an interdisciplinary field, communication requires wide-ranging reading of journals and publications from other fields. This is more difficult as the number of journals and books focused on communication increases.

KK: Fundamentally, communication is a way of humans living together. It differs from manual work, engaging violence, and all kinds of determinisms. It is evident in mediated interactions among members of communities who coordinate their lives, educate their members, and aim at futures they hope to be better but may not be able to conceptualize fully. By contrast, biology is concerned with living organisms, physics with nature absent of human involvement, linguistics with the syntax and semantics of sentences, political science with government, and sociology with social divisions, power relations, social institutions and forms of organization. They all seek to understand, and theorize what exists generally and how it works most of the time.

Studying new forms of living together as communication perspective

Communication scholarship should not remain stuck in what presently exists. It has to focus on the implications of communication, on the emergence of new forms of living together. For example, genuine conversations never repeat themselves. Their participants learn from each other interactively. Conversations are the most efficient evolutionary practices I know. Newness emerges in responses to what was said. Its worthiness is negotiated and the outcomes of the process cannot be owned by any one participant. A recent book on *The Knowledge Illusion* has the subtitle *We, Humans, Cannot Think Alone* (Sloman & Fernbach, 2017).

Given these properties of what communication does, it would be a mistake for communication scholars to surrender their subject matter to the epistemologies of other sciences, for example of engineering or biology. While communication technologies do facilitate as well as limit how we interact and our body is always involved, this does not justify relying on technological and biological explanations of human communication. For example, race may well have biological components, but highlighting them

Senior Communication Scholars' Advice to and Expectation of Young Researchers

hides its communicative origin. “Race” is a word to begin with. “Racism” is the practice of linguistically categorizing human appearances and attributing invariant biological qualities to them. Belief in these invariances creates social traps that make escaping from them difficult. Using the metaphor of power from physics to explain social relations creates subjects who cannot liberate themselves from the implied determinism. Relying on the computer metaphor in studying the human cognition, artificial intelligence renders human beings as automata. Surely, the human mind is a precious gift of our evolutionary history. However, it is an empty organ without being in interaction with its environment, especially without being in constant communication with what fellow human beings say and do.

Communication scholars cannot afford to take their object of study as existing independent of being studied as such. Their scholarship creates and shapes what it studies, publishes, and informs. This invokes ethical responsibilities that most other scientific disciplines do not see the need to consider.

CL: Communication is, by its very nature, interdisciplinary and connective. It is best seen as a field of vision, a site of struggle for power and understanding, a platform for expression and arguments, as well as a process of living and lived social life that altogether reveal layers of rich and lively human significance and mysteries, by virtue of its potential ability to connect various sectors and facets of social actors, activities, and structures. It is, as such, a vital link that integrates different constituent parts of society into the whole. I believe therefore it is futile to study communication in vacuum or even in its own narrow terms (which may characterize a good deal of current practice), without making organic connections to the larger political, economic and cultural contexts.

Communication as interdisciplinary and connective

In other words, we must examine the issues of communication in and from the broader contexts on the one hand, while on the other trying to feed back to and illuminate the implications of communication for such contexts. By no means does this imply, however, that we must settle for a shallow terrain or yield

Communication & Society, 49 (2019)

to mediocrity; true “interdisciplinary” efforts cannot be achieved by superficially inserting a loose conjunctive word between communication “and” something else (for example, TV and children, advertising and health, media and politics). Rather, modern scholarship being problem-oriented, the study of communication should remain firmly anchored in a set of conceptual and theoretical perspectives that nonetheless encompass and correlate a range of theoretical insights across various borders of traditional disciplines.

Question 4: What is your personal advice on how to become a scholar?

DW: Select an area of interest and keep studying it and teaching about it over a long period of time, even during your entire academic career. Build on the work of previous scholars of your area and on your own work as well. The only way to become an expert is to focus on an area or theoretical approach over a long time and to do studies that build on previous work.

Keep working in an area over long time

Publishing your studies in appropriate scholarly journals and presenting findings at various academic meetings is necessary for getting other scholars to notice your work and to begin to cite it in their research and teaching. It is generally a mistake to move often from one area of interest to another if you want to become well known as an expert in a certain area. There is often a temptation to study timely events, but moving from one event or topic to another without a unifying theoretical or methodological approach is not the way to become a well-known scholar.

If possible, your teaching and research should complement and reinforce each other. In choosing an area of interest, remember to ask yourself if it will be considered important by others, not only those in communication but also those outside the field. Some scholars choose very narrow and even esoteric areas of interest that are of interest to very few people. As mentioned above, this is not a productive strategy for becoming a well-known scholar in communication or a public intellectual.

KK: There are numerous paths to becoming a scholar. I graduated first

Senior Communication Scholars' Advice to and Expectation of Young Researchers

from a short-lived avant-garde school that exposed me to numerous theories and ways of thinking which allowed me to create my own path. This gave me access to communication studies. I was lucky by comparison to students who were disciplined to conform to one way of understanding.

Go multidisciplinary and understand consequence of own discourse

I am suggesting that multi-disciplinarity is crucial in tackling the continuously unfolding social phenomena of human communication. None of the social sciences—social psychology, anthropology, sociology, economics, political science, etc.—can handle such morphogenetic processes on its own although most of them may contribute explanatory variables. Technology is most certainly implicated. Without competencies in using the communication technologies by which different disciplines learn from each other, contemporary communication scholars would be at a loss.

I already mentioned algorithms which are in the process of taking over many routine social practices. Disseminating information, for example through the Internet, and searching huge data bases probably are the least problematic consequence of algorithmization. The common and convenient response to the algorithms we face is to accept their computational results. However, acting on them without a clue of how they came about amounts to the blind surrendering of one's human agency to machines. This is a modern form of submission to an unintelligent and omnipresent authority, one that has no intentions of its own, cannot explain why it does what it does, and is invisibly networked over numerous machines. To retain their agency, communication scholars and users need to develop and master entirely new competencies of inquiring into the history and social consequences of algorithmization—without abandoning their critical stance.

My most important recommendation to future communication scholars is to become cognizant of and accountable for what their own discourse does. We all speak a language, but mostly “about” the world in which we live. By mindlessly speaking and writing about things, we tend not to recognize how that use of language distracts us from seeing how we construct the worlds we live in. To gain some distance from habitual uses of the language we grew up

Communication & Society, 49 (2019)

with, there are considerable benefits in learning another one—not by taking a foreign language course but by living abroad for a while and experiencing how language constitutes different social forms of being. Learning to communicate in a language that constitutes unfamiliar realities and opening oneself up to experiencing culture shock encourages an awareness of one’s own use of indigenous terms, untranslatable metaphors, and diverse ways of living with people. These experiences are what communication scholars need to critically examine and reintroduce in the very communication processes they are examining.

Communication scholars should not be afraid of pursuing problems that have not yet been recognized as such, asking research questions that are difficult to answer, and coming to conclusions that challenge common preconceptions. They should celebrate when their vocabularies enrich the communication practices of people beyond those they studied, liberate communities from unwanted conceptual confinements, and enhance their ability to critically examine their own contributions to the lives of others. To make such contributions, communication scholars need to be the conceptual leaders of everyday communication practices.

CL: I heartily endorse C. Wright Mills’ sage counsel that any good scholar must always attempt to relate his or her own personal concerns to public issues, thus forming a concentric circle of life and academic pursuits. To that end, it is imperative that we all identify a set of enduring concerns that burn like “fire in the belly.” Take pains to nurture intellectual sensibilities and intuition surrounding those concerns while trying to knock them into shape in ways that inform our research programs, all contributing coherently to larger significance.

Relate to public issues, nurture sensibilities and ask good questions

I believe we would do well by looking for a few (not too many) classics (not restricted to the field of communication)—by which I mean the treatise that not only withstands the test of time to throw fresh light on “reality” with each round of reading, but also offers an inspiring perspective that may be disputed but not bypassed—and immerse in them, until we feel we have naturally

Senior Communication Scholars' Advice to and Expectation of Young Researchers

internalized the horizon of vision of such “great minds” (thus picking up their way of asking questions about the world and their way of approaching answers for some of those questions). There is no better substitute for fostering a higher standard of judgment and taste.

This is where the actual research work may begin. Always try to ask what may be regarded as good questions. They are likely to be questions that focus on concrete problems, but of broader theoretical significance. Concrete problems bear on our deeply felt concerns, but they are only parochial unless brought to the level of general implications. This speaks to the importance of developing an ability to traverse (and connect) empirical evidence and theoretical concepts on the ladder of abstraction. We must then thoroughly familiarize ourselves with the language, outlook, logic and paradigm of a coterie of literature essential to our research landscape. Having done so, we could be in a more enlightened position to negotiate with a wide range of disparate research findings, many of which may probably be of derivative nature.

CS: The first problem to address here is: would I advise anyone to become a scholar today? The occupation is clearly undergoing profound, and mostly negative, changes. When, 50 years ago, I was an undergraduate student, scholars were more secure, better paid, and certainly enjoyed much more freedom than they do today. (They were also overwhelmingly white and male: today there is somewhat greater diversity, so it is not all loss.) The modern university, at least in the developed world, is dominated by insecure contracts, low pay, increased teaching loads, enormous research pressure, and bureaucratic micro-management of every aspect of education. Academics work hours that would make a farmer wince.

Finish your degree quickly in a prestigious university

Personally, when eager young students come to ask my advice about becoming a scholar my first response is to ask if they have any idea about what they aspire to. If they persist, then I give them this advice: move heaven and earth to get into the most prestigious university you can. Forget about the department with the best research record: that counts for almost nothing. It is the

name of the university that grants your doctorate that will shape your career. I say this from bitter personal experience. Back in the U.K., I used to work in what was officially rated as the country's top research center in media and communication. Our doctoral students struggled to get jobs in elite universities because this excellent department was in a low-status university. Students from more prestigious universities with departments whose research ratings were, frankly, mediocre, were invariably preferred over our alumni. This is an iron law, true in Europe, the U.S. and China.

It is also true that there is a pecking order in the location of a university. The most brilliant Chinese scholar I know told me bitterly: you can't swim against the tide, and the tide is from the U.S. Outside of a few elite universities like LSE and Amsterdam, even a mediocre U.S. university will be taken more seriously by prospective employers than anywhere else in Europe or Australia. A doctorate from a U.S. university will get you a job in Hong Kong. A doctorate from Hong Kong will get you a job in the mainland. A doctorate from the mainland will get you a job only in the mainland. However extensive your publication record, it will not outweigh the name of your university.

Once you are in an elite university, then the advice is simple and familiar. Finish as quickly as possible: don't mess around having fun. Scholarship is hard work—very hard work—so get started from day one. Never write anything—essay, term paper, laundry list—without asking yourself: where can I publish this? The right answer to that question is always: in an SSCI journal, or perhaps in China in a CSSCI journal, and the higher the impact factor, the better. First authorship is best, but any authorship counts for something, so work with your colleagues on joint projects if you don't have a paper of your own to finish.

Once upon a time, I would advise young scholars to work on a topic that interested them. After all, why become a scholar and not enjoy your work? Today, I am not so sure. I would certainly add to my advice the fact that certain topics attract more research funds than others and perhaps they represent better career options. Traditionally, and still I think today, health communication, children and media and, in the mainland, the great insights

Senior Communication Scholars' Advice to and Expectation of Young Researchers

into communication to be gained from the study of Xi Jinping Thought, attract funding and support. Being a critical scholar, anywhere in the world, makes your chances of funding and success relatively limited compared to those of an administrative scholar.

Having said all that, being a scholar, or at least being a critical scholar, must be the best career in the world. Despite the restrictions, despite the insecurity, despite the fact that you will never get rich, you can think, research, and write whatever you want. There is no other job in the world that offers such freedom—that pays you to think for yourself—so, with eyes wide open, become a scholar.