新聞業、新聞記者與全球比較研究

對談人：托馬斯·漢尼馳、李立峯
統稿：李立峯
翻譯：李耘耕

托馬斯·漢尼馳教授
（Prof. Thomas Hanitzsch）

「新聞業是一個向社會提供特殊服務的社會制度。為了在概念上成為一個『記者』，一個人必須在特定的新聞業制度框架中行動，有特定的規範和實踐。這個定義可以靈活地回應新聞這社會制度的變化。部分公民記者可能因此被算作記者（如果他們服膺於新聞的制度框架），而另一些可能不算。亦即是說，公民記者（或者任何普通人）都要為自己『掙得』能被視為『記者』的權利。」

李立峯，香港中文大學新聞與傳播學院教授及研究學部主任。研究興趣：政治傳播、媒體與社會運動、新聞學、民意和輿論研究。電郵：francis_lee@cuhk.edu.hk

Journalism, Journalists and Global Comparative Studies

Discussants: Thomas HANITZSCH, Francis L. F. LEE
Editor: Francis L. F. LEE
Translator: Yungeng LI

Abstract

Professor Thomas Hanitzsch, a leading scholar in the field of comparative journalism studies and initiator-cum-coordinator of the Worlds of Journalism Study project, shares in this dialogue his academic trajectory and views and experiences on comparative journalism research. He discusses how the practices of comparative studies can alleviate the problem of ethnocentrism in journalism and communication studies, and how comparative studies have informed his own conceptual thinking about certain core issues facing the changing field of journalism, such as theorization of journalism culture, typology of journalism's social and professional roles, and the very basic question of definitions of "journalist" and "journalism."

Francis L. F. LEE (Professor, Head of Graduate Division). School of Journalism and Communication, The Chinese University of Hong Kong. Research interests: political communication, media and social movements, journalism studies, studies of public opinion and public discourse.

托馬斯‧漢尼馳教授簡介

托馬斯‧漢尼馳教授目前為德國慕尼黑大學傳播研究與媒介研究中心主任。他的教學及研究興趣聚焦於新聞學及比較媒介研究。漢尼馳教授於1990年代曾擔任記者，並先後於德國萊比錫大學、印尼加查馬達大學學習新聞學、阿拉伯研究、東方哲學及印尼研究。2004年，漢尼馳教授於德國伊爾梅瑙理工大學獲得博士學位，並先後於瑞士蘇黎世大學及德國慕尼黑大學任教。漢尼馳教授自2012年起擔任SSCI期刊 *Communication Theory* 主編，這本期刊由國際傳播學會（ICA）出版，在傳播研究領域享有盛譽。漢尼馳教授編寫、出版了包括 *Handbook of Journalism Studies*（Routledge, 2009）、*Handbook of Comparative Communication Research*（Routledge, 2012）在內的六本專著，並在 *Communication Research*、*Communication Theory*、*European Journal of Communication*、*International Communication Gazette*、*International Journal of Press/Politics*、*Journal of Communication*、*Journalism & Mass Communication Quarterly*、*Mass Communication & Society*、*Media, Culture & Society* 等期刊上發表學術論文。此外，漢尼馳教授亦是ICA新聞研究分會的創立者並曾擔任主席。目前，漢尼馳教授擔任歐洲傳播研究與教育學會新聞研究分會主席。

TH: Thomas Hanitzsch
FL: 李立峯

FL: 讓我們從您較早期作品，關於印尼的和平新聞的研究開始。您是怎麼開始對「和平新聞」這概念感興趣？為何特別關注印尼？關於和平新聞的概念，我注意到您對「新聞業可扮演宣揚和平的角色」這一觀念相當批判。您是否可以向讀者解釋下您的相關立場？

TH: 我對「和平新聞」的興趣始於2002年，那時我剛剛開始在德國伊爾梅瑙科技大學的學術生涯。我的導師正準備建立一個研究衝突和媒介這一領域的學者的國際網絡。他讓我為他編寫的《戰爭作為媒介事件》（德文題目是 *Krieg als Medienereignis*）一書貢獻一個有

關和平新聞的章節。一開始，我想撰寫一個和平新聞相關話語的
文獻綜述，但隨著我閱讀越多文獻，我愈來愈對這一概念變得批
判。

我並不是給予印尼特殊關注，而是在我的一些發表中用到了
這個國家的例子。我使用印尼的例子的主因，是我曾分別作為學
生和研究者在這個國家待過五年。在我逗留印尼期間，受亞洲金
融危機和蘇哈托政權倒台的餘波影響，種族和宗教衝突在不同的
地方頻生。

需要指出的是，我從沒有在一般意義上反對和平這理念或以
和平為旨趣的傳播。我批判的是被許多支持者提倡的「和平新聞」
的概念。我批判這一概念的其中一個原因，可能源自我個人作為
記者的經驗。我試著把自己放在一個居住在飽受種族衝突撕扯的
社區中的印尼記者的立場。這個記者不太可能是一個旁觀者或者
外部觀察家，而是參與到衝突之中的某一種族部落的一員。試著
成為一個和平記者或許是一個高尚的目標，但是在這種情況下卻
很難達到。這個記者的讀者們希望他或她的報道會偏向於「他(她)
們的」的觀點，如果這個記者不能迎合這些期待，讀者可能會遠
離甚或敵視這個記者。

我認為許多和平新聞的支持者傾向於一個關於媒介報道的
天真的認識論觀點，正如他們常說，傳統的戰爭報道導致了現實
的扭曲呈現。我認為這些抱怨失焦了。新聞不是現實的「鏡子」，
而是世界的再現。並且正如大多數其他再現一樣，它不可避免
地是有篩選的。似乎對我來說，和平新聞的鼓吹者仍需要確定
他們的認識論基礎。這一基礎可能可以由立場認識論（standpoint
epistemology）提供。這一哲學陣營緣起於女性主義對客觀性概念
的批判。

更進一步，和平新聞的觀念和它的實踐意義常常建基於一個
極度個體性的和自願性的視角之上。隱藏在它背後的觀點是記者
只需要更加「勇敢」，這樣他們就能寫出擁抱和平新聞之價值的衝
突報道。但這是一個幻覺。有許多結構性的束縛形塑並限制記者
的作品。鑒於時間、空間和資源都非常有限，記者需要將複雜

的衝突解構為能被讀者輕易理解的完整敘事。沃爾夫斯費得（Wolfsfeld）說得更進一步。他堅持和平進程本身的需要與新聞的基本原則在結構上不兼容。所有這些都指向同一結論，就是和平新聞的操作並非個人權衡的問題。

　　和平新聞運動的另一個問題，是他們對媒介一面倒的批評並沒有注意到新聞業和新聞實踐裡的各種細微差異。與戰爭報道的常規類似，媒介批評傾向犧牲掉正常的和積極的方面，而強調那些異常的，奇觀式的以及負面的方面，從而得出關於「媒介」的普遍性結論。鑒於媒介評論家傾向於關注常規的新聞報道和報章中傳統的新聞版面，他們忽略現存媒介渠道的多元性和另類選擇，有時甚至是反霸權形式的報道，比如新聞特稿、紀錄片以及特刊。這些形式更詳盡地探討了衝突的形成和暴力的真實原因。

　　另外，在一些和平新聞的鼓吹者中似乎存在著一種高估新聞的力量的趨勢。儘管新聞不可否認地對人們產生影響，但記者極少超越他們所身處和工作之社會的文化共識。與慣常所相信的相反，記者和媒體對政治領袖和決策者的影響其實很有限。更進一步，公共關係變得越來越專業化，相比於過去的幾十年更多地被使用。

FL: 對其他學者所支持和發展的和平新聞的概念，這是一個全面的批判和再思考。但到最終，您是否認為和平新聞的理念是有用的？也就是說，媒介是否需要一個特別的概念去描述他們在報道戰爭和衝突時的適合的角色及實踐。儘管被其他學者發展出來的和平新聞這一概念具有局限性，但也可能有某種和平新聞的概念可以有用。

TH: 這是一個極好的問題。我越多思考這個問題，我越覺得我們有必要區分在涉及和平新聞這一概念時的兩種視角—即學術的和專業的視角。在有關新聞及其不同形式的學術話語的語境中，我依然傾向認為和平新聞的諸原則已經被既有的甚麼是「好新聞」的規範性觀念所包含。這裡，和平新聞的觀念僅僅是在重申一些關於好新聞的廣泛共識。

然而與此同時，我相信和平新聞在實踐領域的積極力量。在世界上還有很多地方，記者的工作實質性加劇和煽動了衝突。在諸多此類案例中，專業實踐的訓練，以及催生煽動性報道可能的後果的意識，有可能改善現有狀況。

但話說回來，在諸多案例中，「戰爭新聞」的原因是結構性的。這意味著是用「和平」還是「戰爭新聞」的方式報道衝突，不取決於記者自己的自由選擇。驅動的因素可能超出記者個人的掌控（缺乏資源、時間壓力、編輯政策和管理、能否接觸到信息渠道和進入特定地點、讀者的期待等等）。然而在另一些案例中，比如盧旺達仇恨廣播的效果，它大大地驅動了種族暴力，這是編輯和記者的明確選擇，去擴散煽動性內容並妖魔化衝突中的另一方。在這樣的情況下，媒介協助計劃作用相當有限。

FL: 在處理和平新聞的概念數年後，您曾發表過關於「新聞文化」概念的理論文章。如果我的理解正確，這是您之後世界新聞業調查研究的理論基礎。您怎麼會從對和平新聞的關注轉向關注新聞文化？換句話說，這是您研究軌迹中的一次斷裂，還是說兩種關注是有聯繫的？

TH: 對衝突新聞和新聞文化的關注是我研究中兩條相互獨立的線索。對新聞文化的關注誕生於我對我自己最早做的記者比較研究之不滿。在我的博士論文中，我在 2001 至 2002 年間訪問了 385 位印尼的記者。我論文的主要關注點是一個由威權體制向過渡性民主快速轉變的國家中，記者們的專業和倫理觀念。

有段時間，我想把我印尼記者的研究和其他國家使用相似（儘管並非相同）方法的研究做比較。在我第一批向國際期刊《新聞與大眾傳播季刊》（*Journalism & Mass Communication Quarterly*，張讚國是我的編輯）投稿的文章中，我試圖比較印尼記者和他們在其他國家的同行。我這樣做是為了把我的研究發現放進某個背景中，因為我研究的國家跟這個期刊的讀者——多是美國讀者——沒有太多聯繫。來自兩個審稿人的評價令人疑惑：一個審稿人建議我刪掉比較分析的部分，並聚焦於印尼的案例（編輯也同意這一建議）；另一個審稿人希望我將比較分析的部分變成

文章的焦點。在我的修改稿中，我最終決定跳過比較的部分，聚焦於印尼記者。編輯拒絕了我的投稿，儘管他事實上鼓勵我將這個文章聚焦於印尼。

儘管我對《新聞與大眾傳播季刊》最終的編輯處理感到失望，我還是學到了一個重要的教訓。我們只能比較那些真正具有可比性的東西。張讚國自己 2001 年發表在《國際傳播學報》(*International Communication Gazette*) 的文章讓我在這問題上開了眼界。大多數湧現在千禧年之後的，有關記者專業觀念和文化的成果，是運用二手數據進行比較，他們的概念與方法前設都大大不同。事實上這些研究在研究人口的定義上 (亦即誰是記者)、樣本和抽樣策略、測量、量表，或者數據收集方法上都很少共通點。我們很難從這些比較分析中判斷這些國家之間的差異是否有確鑿證據，或者是否至少部分是方法不同而產生的後果。

這是為什麼我開始思考，如果我們去做相關領域的比較研究，我們必須要做得對。在 2005 年，我開始著手一個七個國家 (巴西、中國、德國、印尼、俄羅斯、烏干達，以及美國) 比較的前測研究計劃。這個研究基於一個共同的概念和方法論框架。這個研究最終被德國研究基金 (German Research Foundation) 資助。而且由於我將這個項目推廣到學術社群中，很多其他國家的同事都參與到這個研究中。

FL: 對新聞文化進行理論化時，您指出機構角色、認識論以及倫理意識形態是三個新聞文化的根本構成要素。這三個構成要素又被進一步劃分為七個維度——介入主義 (interventionism)、權力距離 (power distance)、市場傾向 (market orientation)、客觀性 (objectivism)、經驗主義 (empiricism)、相對主義 (relativism)，以及理想主義 (idealism)。這是個有力的概念框架。然而，這七個新聞文化的維度似乎遺漏了專業記者和「人民」的關係，不論後者被理解為受眾、市民，還是公眾。如您所知，記者和受眾之間的關係是圍繞公共新聞這一概念爭論的焦點。公共新聞在 1990 年代的美國非常熱門。變化中的記者和受眾之間的關係也是公民新聞和其他有關數字媒體發展的當代討論中的其中一個核心問題。

TH: 你談論的是我於 2007 年發表在《傳播理論》（*Communication Theory*）期刊的關於新聞文化的最初模型。我一直將這個模型視為一個起點，而不是旅途終點。這篇文章吸引了一些關注（事實上，它是至今為止我發表的文章中被引用最多的），這很可能是因為它出現在一個對這一問題有很大需求的時刻。

　　的確，我認為是時候重新思考這個最初的模型了。忽略了記者和受眾之間的關係可能是這個模型最大的疏漏。我可以爭辯說記者看待他們受眾的方式多少已融入到機構角色（如介入主義、權力距離，和市場傾向）的概念化中。一如新聞在社會中的地位與功能，記者的角色也總是在新聞規範和受眾期待的情境中運作。我和我的同事兼朋友蒂姆·沃斯（Tim Vos）一起，正在撰寫兩篇重新把記者角色概念化的論文。我希望將來某日我可以以之完善我們對新聞文化的理解。

FL: **在你那一篇新聞文化的論文的結尾，你承認了一個難以回避的問題。你指出新聞文化的各維度構成要素大多基於英文文獻。接著你提到，作為國際合作工程的「世界新聞業調查研究」（WJS），能幫助我們處理在之前的概念化中可能存在的民族中心主義。你能夠向我們的讀者介紹一下 WJS 的背景嗎？你怎麼會提出這一想法，並實際上推動已經包含 18 個國家的第一波研究？實質上講，在第一波的 WJS 之後，你怎麼總結源自此項目最重要的洞見？這個項目的經驗和發現有否促使你去修正或調整你新聞文化的概念？**

TH: 這個研究在 2006 年夏天，我拿到一筆（比原項目小得多的）前測項目的經費時才「正式」誕生。之後，這個項目吸引了諸位來自其他國家的同事的興趣。在我調到蘇黎世大學（University of Zurich）之後，我拿到了另一筆能讓我把更多國家納入研究的經費。

　　第一波調查於 2007 至 2011 年間進行，最初計劃是做一個前測研究。這個項目包含了來自 21 個國家的研究者。作為一個網絡，我們訪問了這些國家超過 400 個新聞機構中 2,100 位記者。問卷聚焦在新聞文化（角色感知、認識論傾向，和記者的倫理觀）的異同，同時也關注新聞工作者對新聞的影響的認知以及對公共機構的信任。

　　到了2010年，我們決定將這個項目轉化為一個持續的計劃。從那時開始，這個項目被命名為「世界新聞業調查研究」（WJS）。受世界價值觀調查研究（World Values Survey）的啟發，我們創立了一個內部管理結構（包括區域協調者、一個執行委員會，以及一個科學顧問委員會）去處理這個項目日益增長的內部複雜性。隨著我們在添加的國家中徵召合作者，這個研究日益壯大。我們也在這個項目中引入了一個民主因素：區域協調者和WJS執行委員會的成員由這個網絡中的成員選舉產生，而非由我指定。

　　隨著這些改變，這個項目的使命亦被重新界定。項目網站上是這樣寫的：「世界新聞業調查研究是一個定期評估全世界新聞業狀態的學術項目。這個研究的首要目標是幫助新聞研究者、從業者、媒介管理者，和政策制定者更好地理解記者的世界觀和記者的職業傾向正在發生的轉變，理解他們所身處的條件和局限，同時也理解在一個變化的世界中新聞的社會功能。」（http://www.worldsofjournalism.org/）

　　我們竭盡全力清除前測研究中存在的民族中心主義的部份。我們通過將國際學者的學識和專長囊括進這個項目的各個層次來實現這一目標，包括總體管理、關鍵概念的概念化、方法框架的創制，以及研究發現的分析和發表。來自全世界的學者都在所有的進程中有發言權。然而，就像其他有益的嘗試一樣，我們也不能完全擺脫研究中存在的民族中心主義風險。學術研究的全球政治經濟結構不可避免地在概念知識、方法技巧、研究資源，以及學者的流動性方面製造不平等。我們嘗試通過為所選取國家的學者提供研究和旅途經費來彌補這些問題，但是相比於其他大規模調查而言，我們的資金卻相當有限。

　　基於第一次研究，我們發表了大量期刊論文來公布我們的發現。總結所有的發現可能無異於寫一本書。簡要來說：就新聞文化而言，我們的發現指出疏離、非介入、提供政治信息，和監督政府在全球都被認為是根本的新聞功能。不偏不倚、可信賴程度、信息的事實性，還有遵守普遍的倫理原則亦被全世界所珍視。不過，不同國家的記者對這些功能的重要性的認知有差別。

另一方面，介入主義、客觀性，和區分事實和觀點的重要性，則在不同文化中認知迥異。西方記者普遍反對任何特定價值、觀念和社會變革的主動推廣。同時，他們在進行倫理抉擇時更堅持普世原則。相反，非西方的記者的角色認知更偏向介入主義，在倫理觀念上也更講求彈性。

進一步說，通過因子分析，我們可以識別出一個有關記者對甚麼力量在影響新聞的認知結構。它由六個領域組成：政治的、經濟的、組織的、專業的，和程序的影響，還有參照群體。在所有被調查的國家中，這六個維度被證明可以建立起一個垂直的結構。在此結構中，組織的、專業的，和程序影響被認為是比政治和經濟影響更強而有力的限制。影響的不同領域趨向打破新聞編輯室的組織邊界。進一步的分析確認，政治和經濟因素影響有多大，最能看得到記者的影響認知的跨國差別。

最後，由於新聞媒介經常被指責在侵蝕公共機構的信心方面扮演了關鍵角色，我們探討了記者對政治社會制度和機構的信任。我們發現全世界的記者的確對政黨和政客幾無信任，這是個全球驚人地一致的發現。然而，這裡也存在一些明顯的差別：西方國家的記者普遍比非西方國家的記者對制度有更多信任。更進一步分析顯示，記者對制度的信任水平，跟一些政治及經濟表現的重要指標緊密關聯，最明顯的是公眾對一個國家的經濟和政治狀況的滿意度。另外，非西方國家的記者比普通公眾對公共機構有更少信任。而受調查的西方國家中，沒有一個國家中的記者比一般公眾對公共機構更少信任。

經過一段時間後，世界新聞業調查研究已經逐漸遠離2007年提出時的原初的新聞文化模型。其中一個方法論的原因是：由於我們需要對我們的核心概念進行簡化測量（問卷相當長），我們沒有足夠的問卷問題去為複雜的概念構建可信度很高的測量。

與此同時，我的確認為新聞文化模型在我們的諸多分析中都十分有用。機構角色三個維度中的兩個（介入主義和權力距離）尤其能幫助我們理解各國新聞文化中的差異。同時，我們概念化記

者倫理意識形態的方式，提供了一個創新並且充實的視角，讓我們為記者的倫理觀念建立分析模型。

FL: 讓我進一步推進比較研究中概念的普遍適用性的問題。你早先提到你正著手重新概念化記者角色，因此讓我以此為例。在現有文獻中，韋弗（Weaver）和維爾霍特（Wilhoit）提出的信息擴散、闡釋、倡導和敵對的角色，是現時相關實證研究中的主流。但舉例說，「政府喉舌」的角色經常被有關中國新聞業的研究提及。在世界新聞業調查研究的語境中，怎麼處理普遍適用性的問題？在你近期的研究中，你怎麼突顯在記者角色的概念化中普遍適用性的問題？

TH: 在最近一波的 WJS 研究中，我們試圖通過合作改進問卷來處理在之前前測研究中存在的歐洲中心主義的傾向。現在的問卷是由我牽頭的一個國際研究者隊伍起草。問卷的早期版本在所有合作者的圈子裡傳閱並充分商議。我依舊記得為了梳理問卷問題和措辭，我們組織了很多次悠長的會議。在這一階段，我們的工作依舊是歸納性的，通過在來自全世界的諸多研究，看角色概念是如何被操作化的。事後看來，我很後悔我們沒有一個可以作為角色的操作化基礎的理論或模型。

　　在我目前與蒂姆·沃斯（Tim Vos）合作的概念化工作中，我因此退一步去看在很多不同的文化語境中和新聞相關的各種角色和公共期待。這樣做之後，我們最終可以提出一系列綜合的角色。每一個都對應了社會上和公眾中特定個體成員特定的需求。有趣的是，在我們的模型中，在中國和其他社會的「喉舌」角色和韋弗及維爾霍特所描繪的「擴散者」的角色驚人相似。

FL: 利用以記者為對象的問卷調查去研究新聞業是一個始於 1970 年代的傳統。這些年，新聞業版圖變化飛快。新聞機構正在向網絡進軍，例如公民新聞等新現象的顯現亦促使人們重新思考「誰是記者」這一問題。這些發展會對世界新聞業調查研究帶來什麼樣的挑戰？

TH: 很多。儘管除了事實上在許多國家，記者越來越不願意參與到調

查中去，我不認為相較於 1970 年代，今天調查方法會給我們帶來更大的挑戰。記者的定義的確是一個移動的靶子。經典的定義，就如其中一個被美國記者系列 (你們可能知道是從約翰斯通 [Johnstone]、斯拉沃斯基 [Slawski]、鮑曼 [Bowman] 等人最初於 1970 年代所做的美國記者研究中借用的) 使用的，就以記者所做的事情定義他們。

我們試圖通過一種制度取向的視角來規避這些及其他與定義相關的問題。從這個角度看，新聞業是一個向社會提供特殊服務的社會制度。為了在概念上成為一個「記者」，一個人必須在特定的新聞業制度框架中行動，有特定的規範和實踐。這個定義可以靈活地回應新聞這社會制度的變化。部分公民記者可能因此被算作記者 (如果他們服膺於新聞的制度框架)，而另一些可能不算。亦即是說，公民記者 (或者任何普通人) 都要為自己「掙得」能被視為「記者」的權利。

我明白這只是一種定義「新聞業」或者「記者」的方式，許多讀者可能未必同意。無論如何，我非常相信任何關於這些概念的定義應該始於社會層面，接著下降到個人層面。這意味著為了對研究做出有益貢獻，「新聞業」的定義問題必須在「記者」的定義問題前回答。

FL: **您認為在不同國家，新聞的制度框架有何實質的差異？**

TH: 其實存在很多差異，討論這些差異可以填滿一本書。從我的觀點看，最令我驚訝的是記者有多大程度上主動參與公共話語並表達立場，我將之稱為「介入主義」。在西方新聞文化中，介入者是廣被詬病的。但它卻是阿拉伯新聞專業意識形態中一個與生俱來的部分。在這些地區，記者不將自己視為「觀察家」和「旁觀者」，而是把自己視為「變革的主體」。其使命是貢獻一個更好的社會。

FL: **在過去的三年左右，您統籌了 WJS 第二波的研究，囊括了大約 60 個國家。但與此同時，在 2015 年 2 月初您造訪香港中文大學，出席比較傳播研究的國際會議，您提出這個領域實際上需要規模更小但概念化更好的比較研究。您是否可以闡釋下這個觀點？另外，這觀點對於我們應怎樣處理一個像 WJS 這樣的大規模跨國數**

據的啟示是什麼？

TH: 世界新聞業調查研究已經成為最近的一些相似研究的一個藍本。僅僅想下克勞迪婭·梅拉多 (Claudia Mellado) 的「全球新聞業的角色表現」項目和弗克·漢紐什 (Folker Hanusch) 組織的「全球新聞學學生」的研究。還有其他很多研究一起，我們正要生產出有關這個星球上新聞業狀況、有關不同新聞文化間的相似和差異的豐富知識。這些研究會令我們可以看到一個「大圖景」，並可將我們自己的新聞文化放在一個比較的大背景下去審視。

然而，我們仍然需要的是更小規模的聚焦性比較，這會令我們去強調「為什麼」和「怎樣」的問題。為什麼即使在相似的條件下，一些新聞文化會發展出不同的軌迹？在多大程度上，亞洲和非洲價值真正地在驅動本地新聞文化？在多大程度上美國新聞文化真的是一個西方新聞業的「典型案例」，或者正相反，是一個西方規範的例外？我認為這些問題都可以在更小規模的聚焦性比較中找到最好的解答。

總的來說，不同比較策略的問題並非「非此即彼」的問題。小規模和大規模兩種策略相互補充。在世界新聞業調查研究中，我們甚至可以結合兩種策略。我們可以這樣想，涵蓋60個國家的數據可以產生相當數量的小規模比較研究。

FL: 第二波 WJS 研究的大部分調查工作已經完成。我們是否可以很快看到由此產生的各種成果？

TH: 很快。第一批結果會在今年春天和夏天的 ICA 與 IAMCR 年會上呈報。相關的一本書預計會在2017年出版，而另一些期刊的專刊也在製作中。

托馬斯·漢尼馳著作選

Hanitzsch, T., Hanusch, F., & Lauerer, C. (2016). Setting the agenda, influencing public opinion, and advocating for social change: Determinants of journalistic interventionism in 21 countries. *Journalism Studies*, *17*(1), 1–20.

Hanitzsch, T., & Rosa, B. (2012). Explaining journalists' trust in public institutions across 20 countries: Media freedom, corruption and ownership matter most.

Journal of Communication, *62*(5), 794–814.

Hanitzsch, T., Hanusch, F., Mellado, C., Anikina, M., Berganza, R., Cangoz, I., Coman, M., Hamada, B., Hernandez, M. E., Karadjov, C. D., Moreira, S. V., Mwesige, P. G., Plaisance, P. L., Reich, Z., Seethaler, J., Skewes, E. A., Noor, D. V., & Yuen, K. Y. (2011). Mapping Journalism Cultures across Nations: A Comparative Study of 18 Countries. *Journalism Studies*, *12*(3), 273–293.

Hanitzsch, T., Anikina, M., Berganza, R., Cangoz, I., Coman, M., Hamada, B., Hanusch, F., Karadjov, C. D., Mellado, C., Moreira, S. V., Mwesige, P. G., Plaisance, P. L., Reich, Z., Seethaler, J., Skewes, E. A., Noor, D. V. & Yuen, K. W. (2010). Modeling perceived influences on journalism: Evidence from a cross-national survey of journalists. *Journalism & Mass Communication Quarterly, 87*(1), 7–24.

Hanitzsch, T. (2006). Mapping journalism culture: A theoretical taxonomy and case studies from Indonesia. *Asian Journal of Communication*, *16*(2), 169–186.

本文引用格式

李立峯 (編) (2017)。〈新聞業、新聞記者與全球比較研究〉。《傳播與社會學刊》，第 39 期，頁 1–27。

Academic Dialogue with **Thomas Hanitzsch**

Journalism, Journalists and Global Comparative Studies

TH: Thomas HANITZSCH
FL: Francis L. F. LEE

FL: **Let's begin with your earliest work on peace journalism in Indonesia. How did you become interested in the concept of "peace journalism" and why did you focus on Indonesia in particular? And on the concept of peace journalism, I note that you were rather critical toward the idea that journalism has a role to advocate for peace. Can you explain your position on the issue to our readers?**

TH: I got interested in the notion of "peace journalism" in 2002, when I started my academic career at Ilmenau University of Technology in Germany. My mentor, who was about to establish an international network of researchers in the area of conflict and media, asked me to contribute a chapter on peace journalism for a book he edited on "war as media event" (*Krieg als Medienereignis*, German title). In the beginning I wanted to write a literature overview of the discourse about peace journalism, but the more I engaged with the literature the more I turned critical toward the concept.

I did not focus on Indonesia in particular but used examples from this country in several of my publications. The major reason for drawing on examples from Indonesia was that I had spent five years in the country, as a student and later as researcher, and I was there when ethnic and religious conflicts broke out in various places in the aftermath of the economic crisis in Asia and the collapse of the Suharto regime.

It is important to mention that I was never generally opposed to the idea of peace or communication in the interest of peace. Rather, I was critical toward the concept of "peace journalism" as advocated by many of its proponents. One of the reasons why I turned critical was perhaps my own experience as journalist. I tried to put myself

into the shoes of an Indonesian journalist who lives in a community torn by ethnic conflict. This journalist is most likely not a bystander and external observer but a member of one of the ethnic communities participating in the conflict. To try to be a peace journalist may be a noble goal but hard to attain under these circumstances. The audiences of this journalist expect his or her coverage to be biased to "their" perspective, and if the journalist does not cater to these expectations, the audience may turn away from or even hostile to the reporter.

I think that many proponents in the peace journalism discourse subscribe to a naïve epistemological view on media coverage, as they often argue that traditional war reporting results in a distorted representation of reality. I think that these complaints miss the point. The news is not a "mirror" of reality but a representation of the world, and as most other representations, it is inevitably selective. It seems to me that peace journalism advocates still have to define their epistemological foundation. Such a basis may be provided by standpoint epistemology, a philosophical camp that originated with the feminist critique of the objectivity concept.

Furthermore, the idea of peace journalism as well as its practical implications are often based on an overly individualistic and voluntaristic perspective. The implicit argument is that journalists only need to be more "courageous," and as a result, they will produce conflict coverage that embraces the values of peace journalism. But this is an illusion. There are many structural constraints which shape and limit the work of journalists. To the extent that time, space and resources are so limited, journalists need to deconstruct complex and complicated conflicts in terms of ready-made narratives which are easily understood by their audiences. Wolfsfeld goes even further and maintains that the needs of a peace process are structurally incompatible with the imperatives of journalism. All this clearly suggests that the conduct of peace journalism is not a matter of individual leeway.

Another problem of the peace journalism movement is that their sweeping media criticism fails to take notice of the various nuances of journalism. Similar to the routines of war reporting, media criticism tends to highlight the exceptional, spectacular and negative

at the expense of the ordinary and positive, and then making generalizing conclusions about "the media." To the extent that media critics tend to focus on regular news broadcasts and the traditional news sections of newspapers, they ignore the existing diversity of media outlets and alternative, sometimes even counter-hegemonic forms of reporting, such as news features, documentaries and specials, which explore conflict formations and the true causes of violence in much greater detail.

In addition, there seems to be a tendency among some peace journalism advocates to overestimate the power of journalism. Although journalism does undeniably have an impact on the people, only rarely can journalists move beyond the cultural consensus of their societies in which they live and work. And contrary to what is commonly believed, the influence journalists and the media have on political leaders and decision makers tends to be limited. Moreover, public relations has become much more professionalized and utilized these days than in previous decades.

FL: **This is a thorough critique and reconsideration of the notion of peace journalism as developed and advocated by other scholars. But in the end, do you think the very idea of peace journalism is useful at all? That is, do the media need a distinctive conception of their proper roles and practices when it comes to the reporting of wars and conflicts? It is possible that, despite the limitations of the concept of peace journalism as it was developed by others, some conceptions of peace journalism would be useful.**

TH: This is an excellent question. The more I think about it the more I feel we need to distinguish between two perspectives when it comes to the notion of peace journalism—that is, an academic and a professional perspective. In the context of academic discourse about journalism and its different forms, I still tend to think that the principles of peace journalism, as advocated by most of its proponents, is already accounted for by antecedent normative ideas of what it takes to perform "good journalism." Here, the idea of peace journalism is merely reiterating widely consensual ideas of excellence in journalism.

At the same time, however, I have come to trust in the positive

power of peace journalism in the practical domain. There are places in the world where journalists have substantively contributed to the instigation and intensification of conflict. In many of these cases, practical professional training and the creation of awareness of the consequences of inflammatory reporting may help improve the situation.

That being said, the reasons for "war journalism" are structural in many cases. This means that reporting conflict in either a "peace" or "war journalism" fashion is not entirely, or not at all, the journalist's own free choice. Driving factors may well be beyond the individual journalist's reach (lack of resources, time pressures, editorial policy and management, access to sites and information, audience expectations, etc.). Yet in other cases, such as those connected to the effects of hate radios in Rwanda, which substantially contributed to ethnic violence, it was the explicit choice of editors and journalists to spread inflammatory content and demonize the other side in the conflict. Under such circumstances, media assistance programs may be of rather limited use.

FL: **After working on the concept of peace journalism for several years, you published a theoretical piece on the notion of "journalism culture," which, if I understand correctly, would later serve as the theoretical basis for the design of the Worlds of Journalism Study. How did you move from a concern with peace journalism to a concern with journalism cultures? That is, was it a "break" in your research trajectory or were there linkages between the two concerns?**

TH: The focus on conflict journalism and journalistic cultures are two lines of research that I pursued largely independent from one another. The interest in journalism cultures was born out of my dissatisfaction with my own initial comparative work on journalists. For my PhD dissertation, I had conducted interviews with 385 Indonesian journalists between 2001 and 2002. The main focus of my dissertation was the professional and ethical views of journalists in a country that was rapidly transforming itself from an authoritarian system into a transitional democracy.

At some point I wanted to compare the findings from my study of Indonesian journalists with studies in other countries that used

similar (though not identical) measures. In one of my first article submissions to an international journal—to *Journalism & Mass Communication Quarterly* with Tsan-Kuo Chang serving as acting editor for my submission—I tried to compare Indonesian journalists with their colleagues from other countries. I did so in an attempt to contextualize evidence from a country that was of presumably limited relevance to the journal's—mostly American—audience. The feedback from the two reviewers was confusing: one reviewer suggested deleting the comparative section altogether and focusing the article more strongly on the Indonesian case (a suggestion the editor endorsed); the other reviewer wanted me to put the comparison in the article's focus. In my revision, I eventually decided to skip the comparative section to focus the article on Indonesian journalists. The editor rejected the submission—despite the fact that he had actually encouraged me to center the piece on Indonesia.

My disappointment with the editorial treatment provided by JMCQ notwithstanding, I had learnt an important lesson from this exercise. One can only compare what is actually comparable. TK Chang's own article, which had appeared in the *International Communication Gazette* in 2001, was eye-opening to this effect. Most of the comparative work on journalists' professional views and cultures available shortly after the Millennium was based on "second-hand" comparisons of country studies based on conceptual and methodological premises that differed widely. There was in fact little agreement on populations (the definition of who is a journalist, most notably), samples and sampling strategies, measures, scales, or methods of data collection. It was hard to tell from these comparisons whether the differences between countries were substantively grounded in evidence, or at least partly a methodological artifact.

This is why I came to think that if we are to carry on with comparative research in the area, we have to do it right. In 2005, I started working on a research funding proposal for a comparative pilot study in seven countries (Brazil, China, Germany, Indonesia, Russia, Uganda, and the U.S.) that was based on a common conceptual and methodological framework. The study got eventually funded by the German Research Foundation, and as I promoted the project to the scholarly community, colleagues from a number of additional countries became involved in the study.

FL: **In your theorization of journalism culture, you identified institutional roles, epistemologies, and ethical ideologies as the three essential constituents. The three constituents are further divided into seven dimensions—interventionism, power distance, market orientation, objectivism, empiricism, relativism, and idealism. This is a powerful conceptual framework. However, the seven dimensions of journalism culture you identified seem to have left aside the relationship between the professional journalists and "the people," no matter whether the latter was understood as the audience, citizens, or the public. As you know, the question of journalist-audience relationship was central to the debate surrounding the concept of public journalism, which was quite prominent in the U.S. in the 1990s. The question of changing journalist-audience relationship is also central to contemporary discussions of citizen journalism and other developments related to the advance of digital media. I wonder what you think about the place of "journalist-audience" relationship in a journalism culture.**

TH: You are referring to my initial model of journalism cultures, published 2007 in *Communication Theory*. I have always understood this model as a start rather than the end of a journey. The article has garnered quite a bit of attention (in fact, it is by far the most-cited work I have ever published), most likely because it came out at a time when there was a great demand for it.

Indeed, I do think that it is time to reconsider the initial model. The omission of the journalism-audience relationship is perhaps its greatest oversight. One could argue that the way journalists look at their audiences is somewhat implicitly built into my conceptualization of institutional roles (interventionism, power distance, and market orientation), as journalistic roles always operate in the context of normative and audience expectations as to the place and function of journalism in society. Together with my colleague and friend Tim Vos, I am currently working on two essays that focus on a (re) conceptualization of journalistic roles that at some point I hope will feed back into our understanding of journalistic cultures.

FL: **Toward the end of your article on journalism culture, you acknowledged the rather inevitable problem that the dimensional components of journalism culture you identified was based mostly on the Anglo-Saxon English-language literature, and then you mentioned the Worlds of Journalism Study (WJS) as an international collaborative effort that might help address the possible ethnocentrism existing in the earlier conceptualization. Can you introduce the background of the WJS to our readers? How did you come up with the idea and actually pull off the first wave of the study, which already included 18 countries? And substantively speaking, after the first wave of WJS, how would you summarize the most important insights derived from the project? Do the project's experiences and findings probe you to revise or adjust your conceptualization of journalism culture?**

TH: The study was "officially" born in summer 2006, when I received funding for a—much smaller—pilot project. Over time, the project attracted the interest of several colleagues from a number of additional countries. After my move to the University of Zurich, I received another research grant that allowed me to include several more countries in the study.

The first wave of surveys, which was originally planned as a pilot study, was carried out between 2007 and 2011. The project involved researchers from 21 countries. As a network, we had conducted interviews with 2,100 journalists from more than 400 news organizations in these nations. The questionnaire focused on similarities and differences in journalism cultures (the role perceptions, epistemological orientations and ethical views of journalists), as well as on perceived influences on the news and journalists' trust in public institutions.

In 2010, we decided to turn the project into an enduring endeavor that since then carries the name "Worlds of Journalism Study" (WJS). Inspired by the World Values Survey, we created an internal management structure (including Regional Coordinators, an Executive Committee, and a Scientific Advisory Committee) to cope with the growing internal complexity of the project. The study grew as we solicited collaborators in additional countries. We also

introduced a democratic element in the project: Regional Coordinators and members of the WJS Executive Committee were elected by the members of the network rather than appointed by me.

The project's mission was reframed to account for these changes. On the website it says: "The Worlds of Journalism Study is an academically driven project that was founded to regularly assess the state of journalism throughout the world. The Study's primary objective is to help journalism researchers, practitioners, media managers and policy makers better understand worldviews and changes that are taking place in the professional orientations of journalists, the conditions and limitations under which they operate, as well as the social functions of journalism in a changing world." (http://www.worldsofjournalism.org/)

We tried hard to shake off the ethnocentric legacy of the pilot study. We did so mostly by incorporating international scholarly expertise on all levels of the project, including the overall management, conceptualization of key terms, creation of the methodological framework, and analysis and publication of findings. Researchers from all around the world had a say in all these processes. However, as many other noble attempts, we were not fully successful in avoiding the risks of research ethnocentrism. The global political economy of research inevitably creates inequalities in terms of conceptual knowledge, methodological skills, access to research resources, and mobility of researchers. We tried to remedy these problems by providing research funding and travel grants to scholars from selected countries, but our financial resources were rather limited compared to other large-scale surveys.

We have published findings from the first study in numerous, mostly journal article publications. To summarize all of them would perhaps mean to write a book. In brief: With regards to journalism cultures, our findings indicate that detachment, non-involvement, providing political information and monitoring the government were considered essential journalistic functions around the globe. Impartiality, the reliability and factualness of information, as well as adherence to universal ethical principles were also valued worldwide, though their perceived importance varied across countries. Various aspects of interventionism, objectivism and the importance of separating facts and opinion,

on the other hand, seem to play out differently across cultures. Western journalists were generally less supportive of any active promotion of particular values, ideas and social change, and they adhered more to universal principles in their ethical decisions. Journalists from non-western contexts, by way of contrast, tended to be more interventionist in their role perceptions and more flexible in their ethical views.

Furthermore, through means of factor analysis, we were able to identify an empirical structure of perceived influences on the news consisting of six distinct domains: political, economic, organizational, professional and procedural influences, as well as reference groups. Across all investigated countries, these six dimensions turned out to build up a hierarchical structure where organizational, professional and procedural influences are perceived to be more powerful limits to the journalists' work than political and economic influences. The various domains of influence tend to cut across the organizational boundaries of the newsroom. Further analysis confirmed the expectation that political and economic factors are clearly the most important denominators of cross-national differences in the journalists' perceptions of influences.

Finally, since the news media are often accused of playing a key role in the erosion of confidence in public institutions, we had explored journalists' trust in institutions. We found that journalists around the world have indeed little trust in political parties and politicians—a finding that is strikingly consistent globally. However, there is also some considerable variation: Journalists in western nations are generally more trustful than their colleagues in non-western countries. Closer analysis showed that journalists' trust levels were significantly associated with some important measures of political and economic performance, most notably with public satisfaction with a country's economic and political situation. Furthermore, journalists in non-western countries were indeed less trustful of public institutions than the general publics, while in none of the investigated western countries turned journalists out to be less trusting than the general population.

Over time, the Worlds of Journalism Study had gradually moved away from the initial model of journalism culture as proposed in the 2007 article. One reason was methodological: Since we needed to

work with parsimonious measures for our central constructs (the questionnaire was quite long), we simply did not have enough questionnaire items to build reliable measures.

At the same time, I do think the journalism culture model proved helpful in many of our analyses. Two of the three dimensions of institutional roles (interventionism, and power distance) especially helped us understand the differences between national journalism cultures. Also, the way we had conceptualized ethical ideologies of journalists provided an innovative and fruitful perspective to modelling journalists' ethical views.

FL: **Let me try to further pursue the question of generalizability of conceptualizations in comparative research. You mentioned earlier that you are working on a reconceptualization of journalistic roles, and so let me take journalistic roles as the example. In the extant literature, Weaver and Wilhoit's typology of information dissemination, interpretation, advocacy, and adversarial role is pretty dominant. But researchers from different contexts may see the need of adjustment or addition. For instance, the "government mouthpiece" role is often included in studies on Chinese journalism. In the context of the Worlds of Journalism Study, how are issues of generalizability tackled? And how would you address this issue of generalizability of the conceptualization of journalistic roles in your own recent work?**

TH: In the recent wave of the WJS, we tried to tackle the Eurocentrist tendencies from the pilot study early on through collaborative development of the questionnaire. The current questionnaire was drafted by an international team of researchers, coordinated by me. Early versions of the questionnaire were circulated among all collaborators and extensively deliberated. I still remember the many long meetings we had in order to sort out various issues with questions and wording. At this stage, our work was still very inductive by looking at the way role conceptions were operationalized in a number of studies from around the world. In hindsight, I regret that we didn't have a theory or model on which to base our operationalization of roles.

In my current conceptual work with Tim Vos, I therefore went

one step further back by looking at the various roles and public expectations tagged to the idea of journalism in a great number of cultural contexts. In so doing, we eventually managed to come up with a fairly comprehensive array of roles, each of which addressing specific needs of society and individual members of the public. Interestingly, in our model, the "mouthpiece" role identified in China and other societies turned out to be strikingly similar to the "disseminator" role described by Weaver and Wilhoit.

FL: **Using surveys of journalists to study journalism is a tradition developed in the 1970s. These days, the journalism landscape is changing fast. News organizations are moving online, and new phenomena such as citizen journalism is urging people to reconsider the question of who is a journalist. What kinds of challenges would these developments present to the Worlds of Journalism Study project?**

TH: Many, though I don't necessarily think the survey methodology presents us with greater challenges today compared to the 1970s—except for the fact that in many countries, journalists are increasingly less willing to participate in surveys. The definition of "journalist" is indeed a moving target. Classic definitions, as the one used in the American journalist series (which you may know is borrowed from the original "American journalist" study by Johnstone, Slawski and Bowman back in the 1970s), define journalists by what they do.

We are trying to circumvent these and other definition-related issues by using an institutionalist perspective. Journalism, in this view, is a social institution that provides a specific service to society. In order to count as a "journalist" conceptually, one has to operate within the specific institutional framework of journalism, with particular norms and practices. Such a definition can flexibly respond to changes within the institution of journalism. Some citizen journalists may thus count as "journalists" (if they subscribe to the journalism's institutional framework), while others may not. As a consequence, citizen journalists (or any lay person) has to "earn" the right to call her or himself a "journalist."

I recognize this is one way of defining "journalism" or "journalists," and many readers may disagree. Either way, I strongly

believe that any useful definition of these terms should start at the societal level and then move "down" to the individual level. This means that in order to make for a useful contribution to research, the definition of "journalism" must forego the definition of "journalist."

FL: **Do you see substantial variations in the institutional framework of journalism in different countries?**

TH: There is a good number of differences, and it would fill a book to discuss all of them. What is most striking from my point of view is the extent to which journalists actively engage and take position in public discourse, which I can "interventionism." While an interventionist stance of widely discredited in most Western journalism cultures, it is an inherent part of journalism's professional ideology in the Arab and large parts of the Islamic world. In these regions, journalists don't see themselves as "observers" and "bystanders" but consider themselves as "agents of change" whose mission is to contribute to the betterment of society.

FL: **In the past three years or so, you have been coordinating the second wave of the WJS study, which will probably include around 60 countries. But at the same time, in early February 2015, when you visited the Chinese University of Hong Kong for our international conference comparative communication research, you offered the opinion that the field actually needs comparative studies that are of smaller scale but with better conceptualization. Would you elaborate on this view? And what is the implication of the latter argument on how, in your opinion, one should approach a big transnational data set such as that to be derived by the WJS?**

TH: The Worlds of Journalism Study has become a blueprint for similar studies that are underway recently. Just consider Claudia Mellado's "Journalistic Role Performance around the Globe" project and the study "Journalism Students around the Globe," coordinated by her and Folker Hanusch. Together with a number of other studies, we are about to generate a wealth of knowledge about the state of journalism on this planet, and about similarities and differences between journalistic cultures. These studies will allow us to see the "big

picture" and to contextualize our own journalism cultures against a comparative backdrop.

What is still needed, however, are small-scale focused comparisons that allow us to address the "why" and "how" questions. Why have some journalism cultures taken different trajectories despite them operating under similar conditions? To what extent are Asian or African values really driving local journalistic culture? To what extent is American journalism culture really a "typical exemplar" of western journalism or, rather, an exception from the rule? These are questions that I think can best be addressed by small-scale focused comparisons.

Overall, the issue of different comparative strategies is not an either-or question. Both strategies, small-scale and large-scale, complement each other. In the Worlds of Journalism Study, we might even be in the position to combine the two strategies, as one could argue that the coverage of more than 60 countries does allow for quite a great number of small-scale comparisons derived from the overall data set.

FL: **Most of the survey fieldwork of the second wave of the WJS study has already been completed. So we will be seeing various outputs very soon?**

TH: Very soon. First results will be presented in spring and summer this year, at the annual conferences of the ICA and IAMCR. A book is planned for publication in 2017 and several special journal issues are currently underway.

Selected Works by Thomas Hanitzsch

Please refer to the end of the Chinese version of the dialogue for Thomas Hanitzsch's selected works.