

學術對談

組織傳播、全球化與學術共同體

對談人：辛西婭·史托爾、汪子怡、邱林川



辛西婭·史托爾教授
(Prof. Cynthia Stohl)

「我認為學術影響力體現在這樣的時刻：一些多年前完成的作品在發表後很長時間仍引發各種意料不到的討論，就像一個能折射各類時代問題的稜鏡。」

辛西婭·史托爾，加州大學聖塔芭芭拉分校傳播系傑出教授，國際傳播學會(ICA)前任主席。研究興趣：組織傳播、群體傳播、全球化與國際組織、網絡、集體行動。電郵：cstohl@comm.ucsb.edu

汪子怡，新加坡國立大學傳播與新媒體系博士候選人。研究興趣：信息與傳播技術(ICTs)和社會變遷、草根創業與數位勞動、組織傳播、中國和東南亞的數字經濟。電郵：wziyi27@u.nus.edu

邱林川，新加坡南洋理工大學黃金輝傳播與信息學院邵氏基金會媒體技術講座教授。研究興趣：信息與傳播技術、科技與社會變遷、階級、數位勞動、亞洲、全球南方。電郵：jacklqiu@gmail.com

Dialogue

Organizational Communication, Globalization, and Scholarly Communities

Discussants: Cynthia STOHL, Ziyi WANG, Jack Linchuan QIU

Abstract

This dialogue features Professor Cynthia Stohl, a distinguished scholar in organizational communication. Professor Stohl reflects on her academic journey into communication studies. Since her early study of a day care center, she explores the phenomenon of organizing beyond interorganizational networks and cross-cultural perspectives to studying globalization dynamics and emerging technology. Professor Stohl discusses her numerous works since 1981 that have enjoyed much academic influence, including works on memorable messages, the networks of terror and human rights networks, disciplining organizational

Cynthia STOHL (Distinguished Professor). Department of Communication, University of California, Santa Barbara; Past President of the International Communication Association (ICA). Research interests: organizational communication, group communication, globalization and international organizations, networks, collective action.

Ziyi WANG (Ph.D. Candidate). Department of Communications and New Media, National University of Singapore. Research interests: ICTs (information and communication technologies) and social change, grassroots entrepreneurship and digital labor, organizational communication, e-commerce in China and Southeast Asia.

Jack Linchuan QIU (Shaw Foundation Professor in Media Technology). Wee Kim Wee School of Communications and Information, Nanyang Technological University. Research interests: ICTs, science technology and social change, social class, digital labor, Asia, Global South.

Organizational Communication, Globalization, and Scholarly Communities

communication, bona fide groups, et cetera. She sheds light on her views on future directions of organizational communication, especially how we understand organizations, corporate social responsibility, and the influence of new communication technology. As a former president of ICA, Professor Stohl recalls her experiences and priorities in the leadership position, including the ICA affiliate journals initiative. Lastly, she gives valuable advice to young scholars on how to carry out intercultural, interdisciplinary and intersectoral collaboration.

Citation of this article: Stohl, C., Wang, Z., & Qiu, J. L. (2023). Organizational communication, globalization, and scholarly communities. *Communication and Society*, 63, 1–31.

《傳播與社會學刊》，(總)第63期(2023)

辛西婭·史托爾教授簡介

辛西婭·史托爾(Cynthia Stohl)是加州大學聖芭芭拉分校(University of California, Santa Barbara, UCSB)傳播系特聘教授，UCSB信息、技術與社會中心前主任。在2002年加入UCSB之前，她是Margaret Church特聘教授和普渡大學傳播系系主任。史托爾教授的工作涉及了組織傳播和群體傳播的多個領域。她關注在全球合作溝通過程內部和外部的關係。她早期的研究重點是全球製造集團的溝通網絡和工作場所的民主問題，隨後也拓展到了工人、管理層、社區以及公民和跨國組織之間不斷變化的溝通夥伴關係。她近期的工作涉及各類網絡和集體行動組織，重點關注新興傳播科技在其中扮演的角色、企業的社會責任以及可見性管理。史托爾教授曾獲得多個學術獎項，她的兩本書《組織傳播：行動中的連接性》(Sage出版社)和《技術改變時代的互動與參與》(劍橋大學出版社，與B. Bimber和A. Flanagin合撰)曾獲得1995年和2012年美國國家傳播協會組織傳播分部的傑出書籍獎。在2019年，她的論文〈通過社交媒體政策規範組織邊界〉(與S. Banghart和M. Etter合撰)也獲得《管理溝通季刊》年度論文獎。

CS：辛西婭·史托爾

JQ：邱林川

ZW：汪子怡

JQ：您是如何開始您的傳播學之旅的？您為什麼會選擇成為一位組織傳播學者，並致力於研究全球化、集體行動以及數字和傳統網絡等問題？

CS：其實，我並非有計劃而為之。我非常喜歡從事研究工作，我也非常感激在傳播學領域的發展歷程，但是這些都是我未曾預料到的。在大學時，我主修英語文學和基礎教育專業，在我那一代的人裡，成為一名公立學校的教師是許多女性的共同期許，尤其是我們這些父母或祖父母都沒有上過大學的移民。因此，大學畢業後我成為了一位五年級的小學老師，而我丈夫繼續攻讀博士學位

(值得稱讚的是，他當時鼓勵我做同樣的事情，但我真不知道我想學什麼)。我喜歡青少年教育的工作，但當我懷著第二個孩子時，我發現我很羨慕我丈夫的職業生活。因此我決定拓展我的視野，進入研究所並且專注於研究我做老師時關注的社會問題。

最初，我考慮進入社會學系，是因為我對學校和體制結構感興趣，以及他們是如何經常限制而非促進兒童發展和教師效能。我想知道我們如何才能實現組織和社會變革？我也曾想過進入心理學領域，因為我與學生家庭之間的經歷與我從小到大的經歷截然不同。他們讓我充滿了對社會化、文化和能力發展的疑問。但是在做了一些初步調研之後，我發現了傳播學領域和普渡大學的傳播系。修辭學、政治學、人際傳播和組織傳播都與我對結構、文化和人類效能的興趣有關，都提出了如何產生社會變革，制度如何實現積極的人類發展的相關問題。傳播學的視角增強了我已有的批判政治研究偏好，強調了對話、信息、解釋、網絡和集體行動的重要性。這些也構成了後來我的第一本書：《組織傳播：行動中的連接性》(1995年出版，令人驚訝的是這本書仍在印刷出版)。

我的論文受到Piaget、Durkheim、Dell Hymes和網絡學者如Mark Granovetter和Peter Monge的影響，我專注於研究幼兒在日托中心溝通能力的發展。具體來說，我研究了生活在單親家庭中社會經濟地位較低的兒童，並探索家庭網絡結構(包括人際間和組織間)對兒童的溝通能力發展的影響。出乎意料的是，我發現那些被捲入高度密集和支持性網絡(這些網絡裡家庭成員、朋友和老師們相互認識，並且在日托中心外頻繁溝通)的孩子，在溝通能力上不如那些與網絡脫節的孩子。在密集的網絡中，這些非常年幼的孩子在日托中心表達他們需求的動機比較小。例如，如果他們對某些東西過敏或害怕，那麼這些信息已經在整個網絡中共享，而家庭網絡與學校不重疊的孩子則必須直接與老師溝通，而這對他們的發展有利。明確的是，日托中心內外的網絡結構以一種未能被解釋的方式影響著組織行為和個人發展——如果我們只看組織內部或家庭網絡——這是當時組織和網絡傳播研究使用的主要方法，這也體現在我們現在所說的「容器隱喻」中。

《傳播與社會學刊》，(總)第63期(2023)

為了進一步追求這些網絡有關的理念，我去了新西蘭，在那裡我研究了質量圈。這是一種源於日本的志願團體，鼓吹不僅能加強製造業的質量控制，並且能夠鼓勵員工發展和工作場所的民主。儘管研究背景發生了變化，從美國中西部的日托中心到跨國輪胎製造廠(一家美國所有和管理的公司，使用日本管理技術，工人來自新西蘭和太平洋島嶼國家)，從學齡前兒童轉向工會工人，同樣的網絡現象仍然是顯而易見的。內外部網絡連接性對工人的能力和管理態度與評估的重要性，在調查結果中比比皆是。但是在橡膠廠的這一年也讓我意識到，研究全球新興的組織部門間緊張關係的重要性，這些緊張的關係出現在關係性數據、生產結果、工人問卷和訪談中。我需要一個超越網絡的理論框架來解釋這些現象。

那時是1983年。如果你回看我們當時的領域，我們寫的是組織中的跨文化視野，但我們並沒有關注全球組織的興起過程，這些過程正在迅速地改變組織格局。然而，輪胎工廠就處在科技、經濟和政治上的快速變化中，所有的一切都是由傳播過程塑造。1990年，我做了一個題為「擴大組織視野：IGOs(國際政府組織)、INGOs(國際非政府組織)和BINGO(商業國際非政府組織)」的演講。我的論點涉及組織傳播學者全球化視野的重要性，不僅僅是國際化的視野、探索所有類型的組織，也不僅僅是企業傳播。我已經在發表於《和平和改革》(1984)的論文中，在學校和兒童的研究語境裡提出了類似論點。我的另一篇論文〈政治經濟學與味覺：向小學生教授政治經濟學〉詳細介紹了我作為小學老師所做的一個項目，該項目關注與促進對全球視野的欣賞和發展。

JQ：您能介紹您最有影響力的作品嗎？影響力可以通過引用量衡量，或者其對政策制定的影響，或者任何其他的指標？您是如何想到這些研究問題的？他們為什麼有影響力？

CS：我不是各類影響因子的忠實粉絲。當然，H-index或者引用數據非常有用，我們也總是為獲得行業的研究獎項和認可而自豪。但是對我而言，硬指標並不總是能讓我們找到答案的地方，即人們是否覺得你的工作有趣和具有啟發性，或能幫助他們產生新的想

法。例如，我與 Shiv Ganesh 共同撰寫在國際化手冊裡關於全球化的章節，引發了許多（並且可能更多）有趣和富有成效的討論，儘管這些文章具有更強的引用指數。一個簡單地看待影響力的方式，是我從不認識的人那裡收到的郵件，說他們在研究生論壇和會議報告上讀了我的研究，並希望和我討論。研究生們通常很害怕給學者發郵件或在會議上接近他們，但是從學術角度看，這通常是最好的肯定，最能說明我們的研究所產生的影響。

至於具體地有影響力的作品，在 1981 年，Mark Knapp、Kathleen Reardon 和我在《傳播學期刊》上發表了一篇關於人們回憶對他們的生活產生重大影響的令人難忘的信息的文章。1986 年，我接著寫了一篇關於員工難忘的信息的文章並涉及組織社會化和文化。從那時起，這個概念就開始有了自己的生命；有超過 250 篇涵蓋教育、體育、人際交往、政治、組織、跨文化和媒體傳播等方面的文章討論了令人難忘的信息。現在，我有一位多年前在 UCSB 的研究生，他邀請我撰寫一系列關於有色人種在新興的全球大學中難忘的信息的文章。我們剛剛在《國際傳播協會年鑒》上發表了一篇文章，我也知道一些在其他領域發表的關於令人難忘信息的文章。我對志願團體的研究也是如此。這些在 1990 年代早期發表的觀點繼續在家庭、組織、人際關係、健康、媒體、政治和體育傳播方面產生研究，我認為學術影響力體現在這樣的時刻：一些多年前完成的作品在發表後很長時間仍引發各種意料不到的討論，就像一個能折射各類時代問題的稜鏡。

JQ：稜鏡，您指的是比引用指數更不可預測的東西，它會比你原來想像的更多彩多姿，對嗎？

CS：是的，沒錯。Michael Stohl 和我在恐怖主義網絡和人權網絡方面所作的工作正是如此。我們將這些視為理論論文，它們在新的背景下重新定義各種網絡概念。但就我們理論的實際意義和社會科學可以作出的貢獻而言，這些作品似乎持續地引起了共鳴。它的影響超出了當代對恐怖主義、人權和網絡的關注，也討論了我們學術界內部的擔憂，以及我們如何讓自己的理論與現實具有相關性。

《傳播與社會學刊》，(總)第63期(2023)

1996年，我與Dennis Mumby在《管理傳播季刊》上發表的一篇文章〈組織傳播學的學科領域〉的文章引發了廣泛關注。這篇文章從一開始就有爭議，最近也被批評沒有從全球視角的多樣性思考組織傳播。26年後重讀它，我認為這是一個合理的考量，如果在今天我肯定會寫出一篇不一樣的文章，但是至少這篇文章繼續在組織傳播是什麼以及它能成為什麼的思考中扮演著重要角色。

最後，還有我在集體行動、全球化和新興技術方面的工作。Bruce Bimber、Andrew Flanagin和我在我們2012年的書中提到的，以及我和Shiv Ganesh一起撰寫的許多實證文章和書籍章節，都影響了我們對數字技術的普遍性、集體行動、參與和網絡的看法——這些作品不僅顛覆了關於工作、員工和組織成員身份的核心假設，同時也與一些關鍵的組織維度，如組織形式、協調、控制、傳播和小組內以及組織間的鏈接相關聯。

ZW：非常感謝史托爾教授。您如何看待當今組織傳播的研究前景？最引人注目和最有前景的研究問題是什麼？

CS：我發現當今組織傳播最令人興奮的面向之一，是一種強烈的想法讓我們不再關注正式的組織，而是關注組織現象。我認為在數字技術無處不在的時代，組織實踐需要我們研究新的、混合的、無定式的組織形式，即意想不到的相互作用的結構，這些結構是流動的、跨部門的，通常是短暫的、短期內的。當然，這並不意味著傳統和網絡式的組織結構會被必然取代或消除。但是，隨著組織傳播學者們努力解決當代問題，我們關於組織結構和利益相關者的看法將變得更加的廣闊。我認為用常見的西方/非西方二分法討論組織傳播的研究會逐漸減少，但會有更多的研究開展對文化、公民的和經濟體系作為在全球化背景下為眾多利益相關者提供服務和協作的新興組織形式。最近傳播學關於COVID的研究就採用了這種方法。

一些超越傳統部門劃分的新組織形式，也讓我意識到企業的社會責任(CSR)以及一些更重大的問題，例如組織在我們應對毀滅性的全球健康、環境、社會問題時扮演的角色。在我們的領

域，組織的社會責任通常被放置在公司自願的框架內。隨著我們的學術工作越來越涉及到組織在社會中角色的根本假設，我認為傳播學研究中一個有前景的領域，就是探索立法和其他強制性法規在經濟體系中的發展和角色。我的意思是，正式的、基層的、制度的和人際的溝通如何跨越日益模糊的文化、區域和部門界限，共同解決我們如今面臨的十分迫切的問題。

我認為，這些變化背後的原因是技術和社會政治變革促成的人類行為的迅速數字化。數字傳播技術給人們和組織「看到」和「被看到」的能力帶來了翻天覆地的變化。雖然上個世紀的大多數傳播理論都建立在傳播讓看不見的東西可被看見的前提上，但是今天的情形已經從不可見轉變為可見——因此傳播不一定是讓我們自己和組織行為更加透明，或者至少是可見的，而是管理那些由數字痕跡呈現出的可見性水平。我很榮幸能夠成為國際學者網絡中的一員，包括Mikkel Flyverbom、Claartje ter Hoven、Jeff Teem、Paul Leonardi、和Shiv Ganesh，他們正在努力解決這種不斷變化基本情況的影響，我也認為未來的學術研究將深入探索提高可見性的方式，不僅為了更好的信息交換，而且為社會公正和個人、團體和機構之間的權力平等作出貢獻。

ZW：您還在組織研究中採用了批判性的方法，例如，您與Sotirin和Mumby合作的關於缺席與控制的文章指出，話語和權力是相互依存的。隨著泰勒主義在世界各地的傳播，其科學管理的話語在企業間、社會間廣泛傳播，您是如何看待這一現象的？

CS：制度理論強調了一種趨同機制，專注於全球組織在結構和過程上變得越來越相似的機制。事實上，隨著時間的推移，關於效率、放鬆監管、私有化和市場經濟等新自由主義話語已經主導了全球商業話語和媒體對當代組織的描述。但是，關於零工的規範和組織透明度的辯論和活動，還包括各種可持續發展的論述，對強調效率和技術合理性的想法提出了挑戰，並通過新形式的集體行動對其予以反擊。這並不意味著我認為我們都要成為批判的理論家或者活動家，但當然，作為傳播學者，我們需要採取批判的立

《傳播與社會學刊》，(總)第63期(2023)

場，創造新的空間，讓以往被忽視的另類的聲音被聽到和賦權。我們可以通過我們的研究實踐、我們的教學活動、我們的公共服務和對社區的服務來實現這一點。

ZW：您的研究揭示了全球人權制度的發展與人們對CSR（企業社會責任）日益增長的興趣之間強烈的協同性。您認為商業風險框架會壓倒人們對CSR的考量嗎？CSR在怎樣的情況下才能在企業全球化過程中保持其應有的作用？

CS：我也希望能夠給出一個簡單的答案。人權的國際視野是我們在思考CSR時應該重點關注的。否則，鼓勵組織自願對社會產生正面影響（CSR讓商業變好）的框架，與認為CSR能夠提高組織盈利能力（CSR對商業有利）的商業框架之間，始終存在不可調和的衝突。為了讓CSR成為所有企業活動（從董事會決議到僱主/員工和社區關係）的必要組成部分，而非僅僅是一個會輕易消失的附加條款，我和許多學者的研究提議，CSR的話語需要體現和援引在世界人權宣言和其他全球協定中已闡明的具體的權利和價值觀念（個人自由，如言論自由、結社自由、同工同酬；以及集體自由，如在安全和健康環境下生活的自由）。將基本人權視為企業建立的基礎，就是需要轉變CSR作為一個自願性的、慈善性的概念，而是認識到其作為基本權利並且是基於社會正義的概念。只有這樣，CSR才能在企業全球化中保持其應有的作用。

JQ：作為ICA（國際傳播學會）的前任主席，近年來您在塑造廣泛的傳播學研究領域上做得比大多數同事更多。當您在擔任ICA主席時，您的首要任務是什麼？您是如何確定這些首要任務的？您遇到了什麼障礙或阻力？您是如何克服它們的？

CS：我要說的是在ICA執行委員會與這些卓越的同事一起工作的五年，是意義非凡的。我未曾想到它會如此的充實、迷人和有趣。我在主席競選聲明中使用了如「建設社區，加強參與，全球的連通性和國際夥伴關係」之類的短語。這些仍然是我整個任期內的優先任務。我是如何確立這些優先任務的？它們顯然來自於我自己的研究和價值觀，同時也來自我最早在1980年作為ICA董事會

學生成員的經歷。在那次會議上，董事會正在決定第五次ICA會議舉行的地址。當時ICA每五年會選擇在一個非美國的城市舉行。我們1980年的會議在墨西哥阿卡普爾斯舉行，我們當時正計劃1985年在太平洋地區舉行國際會議。人們提了許多提議，包括日本、中國大陸和香港。然後，夏威夷出現了。夏威夷是太平洋上一群可愛的島嶼。但是我發表了一個慷慨激昂的演講，解釋了為什麼會議不應該在夏威夷舉行。我說了一個很基礎的觀點——夏威夷是美國的一部分！在座的每個人都點了點頭。我認為，如果ICA想成為一個國際性的組織，而不是一個擁有一些國際成員的美國組織，我們就需要增加我們的國際會議地點的頻率，而非減少。當我競選主席時，說服董事會失敗的那一幕就在我的腦海中（編者註：1985年的ICA會議最後在夏威夷舉行）。

當我2010年競選主席時，ICA已經是一個很不同的組織了。我們有更多的國際成員，我們經常在美國之外的地點舉行會議。但我們仍然只用英語發表文章，我們在會議上不為非英語母語的參與者提供任何便利，當涉及到「規則」時，我們也非常缺乏靈活性，我們的委員會沒有顯示出我們社區的全球性，ICA的研究員也沒有。因此，建立我們的全球社區成為我的首要任務，也是我們在鳳凰城會議的主題。可以肯定的是，一個全球化的社區不僅僅依靠增加代表不同國家的成員數量。一個全球性的學術社團是一個讓擁有不同經驗、不同工作方式和不同興趣愛好的不同群體聚集在一起，相互理解和學習的團體。我們需要更好地反映我們的價值觀和我們對全球化的承諾。

我和執行董事會的其他成員想要解決的社區基本問題，是拓展和增加能提出ICA缺乏的聲音和想法的渠道與機會。這個想法後來演變成幾項措施，包括ICA附屬期刊計劃和會議的擴大會議，在這些會議上我們不僅可以向同事學習，還可以用新的形式和他們一同學習，從而能夠以多種多樣的方式分享不同的聲音。鳳凰城會議是第一個允許分部的會議時長達到2.5小時的會議，這使得會議能夠超越典型的四或五篇論文/回應者模式。我們也

《傳播與社會學刊》，(總)第63期(2023)

遇到了來自不願意改變的人的一些實際性的困難和阻礙，一些分部起初沒有反應(他們擔心自己會失去會議席位)。但是我們的當務之急是讓每個分部的成員都有機會以一種不那麼受約束的方式交流思想和專業知識，並為新加入的和有經驗的ICA成員提供更多的機會開展合作，讓論文能夠以兩種語言發表，採用非西方中心的學術報告模式，並以新的方式讓更大的社區參與進來。這種結構上的變化現在已經成為ICA會議不可分割的組成部分，許多分部為這些延長會議制定了新的規範。我們的同事們以令人興奮和充滿創意的方式參與到這些會議中，遠遠超出了最初加強社區的願景。

JQ：您會如何回憶《傳播與社會學刊》成為首批非英語ICA附屬期刊的起因？您能告訴我們您是如何說服ICA開展這項新舉措的嗎？您認為ICA附屬期刊未來的願景是什麼？他們應該集體努力做些什麼，以便在未來的10年或20年內實現一些確實的變革？

CS：其實，Jack，你在其中扮演了很重要的角色，因為是你第一次來找我詢問《傳播與社會學刊》是否能成為ICA的官方刊物。有很多原因讓這件事很難實現(包括財務和人員配備問題)，但我不想直接拒絕，這是一個如此令人興奮和重要的想法。讓高質量的期刊和ICA建立聯繫，正是我在確定優先事項時所設想的。所以我回答說「也許」，並且我們計劃了《傳播與社會學刊》編輯和一些ICA執行委員會成員的會面。那次會議非常富有成效，我們討論了好幾個選項，並且萌生了非英語期刊的想法，這些期刊獲得了ICA的認可，但並不是官方期刊(我們當時還沒有給它命名)。

後來我回到了ICA總部，與執行主席Michael Haley、執行委員會成員和出版委員會進行了交談。我們意識到這是一項比一開始看起來要複雜得多的工作。所以我們擴大了對話範圍，把ICA內外部的人都拉進來，我們認為他們能給我們提供出版上的見解，包括財務上，編輯要求上，以及我們對這樣一本期刊的期望等等。我們最終成立了一個「附屬期刊委員會」以指定該計劃目標的詳細聲明，其中包括一套標準，如申請程序、申請和接受後每

年的評估模板，以及該計劃的戰略規劃。我們制定了成為ICA附屬期刊的一系列嚴格的標準，包括在同行評議、拒絕率、機構支持、區域聲望、期刊排名和每年發表的期刊數量等方面。我們還制定了一套後續評估期刊能否繼續參加該計劃的標準。Jack，如果你還記得，我們探討了《傳播與社會學刊》的編委會，我們需要來自其他國家的審稿人，不僅是中國的，還有世界其他地方的。我們希望確保我們的附屬期刊與ICA官方期刊具有同樣高的水平。委員會還決議要求附屬期刊需要提供英文和當地母語的目錄，要加上英文的擴充摘要，並且每年至少發表一篇英文文章，以便ICA成員造訪該期刊發表的研究成果。

在我們的附屬期刊計劃獲得了為期五年的試用期後，我們就開始廣泛徵集附屬期刊提案。我們收到了來自《傳播與社會學刊》、《傳播與媒體研究》以及一些其他機構的提案。委員會評估了所有的提案，並且非常高興地選定了我們第一批附屬期刊，是這兩個分別用中文和德文發表的高質量期刊。我們有許多來自這些區域的成員，他們正在用自己的語言進行出色的工作，而迄今為止大多數ICA成員都無法使用這些語言。法國傳播協會也表達了興趣，在項目開始三年後，*Revue Française des Sciences de l'Information et de la Communication* 也成為了ICA附屬期刊。就在去年，我們增加了一個西班牙語的附屬期刊*Cuadernos.info*。我很期待看到下一個加入我們的期刊。

你問我對未來的展望。首先，我想說的是，我很高興看到附屬期刊委員會和新任主席帶來的成果。我知道編輯們對擴大和豐富這個項目有很多有趣的想法。不過很明顯，在讓ICA成員了解這些期刊方面我們還有更多的工作要做。年度報告顯示，閱讀量和提交量都有所增加，但是我們的確需要做得更好。無論是讓會議上有來自期刊的頂尖論文，ICA通訊簡報故事和利用社交媒體等，都是我們讓ICA會員更加了解這些期刊的渠道。我期待閱讀即將出版的COVID聯合特刊，我們一定會在ICA網站等渠道向所有會員宣傳。我很樂意看到附屬期刊之間做更多的努力，無論

《傳播與社會學刊》，（總）第63期（2023）

是特刊還是會議活動。ICA也可以與附屬期刊做更多的合作，例如《ICA年鑒》可以從全球視角的特定主題與附屬期刊合作。附屬期刊編輯們的能力和投入給我留下了深刻的印象。我認為我們正處在一些令人激動倡議的開端。

ZW：我想為閱讀《傳播與社會學刊》的青年學者們和研究生們提這個問題：我們應該如何跨越文化邊界開展合作？有哪些關鍵因素可以促進來自不同國家、不同學科（如工程學、數據科學）和不同部門（如民間社會組織、盈利性公司）的團隊成員間開展富有成效的學術合作？

CS：有很多方法可以談論這個問題。讓我試著給出一個簡單直接的答案：保持ALIRT。首先是A——*Associate* 建立聯繫。對於年輕學者而言，與其他跨國界的新學者或經驗豐富的學者建立聯繫是非常重要的。當你去參加會議時，不要只在自己的專業，而是與其他的組織建立聯繫。第二件事是L——*Listen* 傾聽。當你處在一個令人困惑的新環境時，這是很難的。但是當你身處在一個由來自不同國家學者組成的新環境時，嘗試用一種主動的方式傾聽——你可以提出這樣的問題：你為什麼會作出這樣的假設？你說的這個或那個是什麼意思？合作需要建立在理解的基礎上。當你的合作者來自社會的非學術領域時，這點尤為重要。第三件事是I——*Immerse* 沉浸，讓自己沉浸在未來合作者的作品中。全球學術採用了許多不同的和不熟悉的理論和方法論，每個人可能對什麼屬於數據以及如何收集數據有不同的理解。研究對象的許可，包括研究對象的期望和關注點在不同的國家間也有很大的差異。因此，讓自己沉浸在他人的研究視野中也非常重要。很多研究由於最基本的誤解而沒有任何進展。第四件事是R——*Reading* 閱讀。當你在開展國際合作時，閱讀你的同事發表的期刊是非常重要的。要熟悉你所合作的非政府組織的非學術出版物，閱讀合作發生地的報刊。最後是T——*Talk* 表達。我認為，一些母語不是英語的人經常讓「母語者在討論中佔主導，儘管我們每個人都可以作出自己的貢獻」。你需要確保自己的立場和想法被聽到。

組織傳播、全球化與學術共同體

除此之外，玩得開心、喜歡和了解你的同事，分享你的文化和想法。我必須說，我最親密的一些友誼就是在全球合作中發展起來的。我們非常幸運地身處在傳播領域，特別是在這個全球動盪和聯繫日益緊密的時代，我們的領域指向著未來，而未來的方向取決於青年學者們塑造的道路。

JQ & ZW：非常感謝！

辛西婭 · 史托爾教授著作選

- Bimber, B., Flanagin, A. J., & Stohl, C. (2005). Reconceptualizing collective action in the contemporary media environment. *Communication Theory, 15*(4), 365–388.
- Bimber, B., Flanagin, A., & Stohl, C. (2012). *Collective action in organizations: Interaction and engagement in an era of technological change*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University
- Ganesh, S., Stohl, C., & James, S. (in press). Generational shifts: The emergence of visibility in globalization research. In V. Miller & M. S. Poole (Eds.), *The handbook of organizational communication theory and research*. Berlin, FRG: DeGruyter.
- Ganesh, S., & Stohl, C. (2010). Qualifying engagement: A study of information and communication technology and the global social justice movement in Aotearoa New Zealand. *Communication Monographs, 77*(1), 51–74.
- Knapp, M. L., Stohl, C., & Reardon, K. K. (1981). “Memorable” messages. *Journal of Communication, 31*(4), 27–41.
- Mumby, D. K., & Stohl, C. (1996). Disciplining organizational communication studies. *Management Communication Quarterly, 10*(1), 50–72.
- Putnam, L., and Stohl, C. (1990). Bona fide groups: A reconceptualization of groups in context. *Communication Studies, 41*(3), 248–265.
- Stohl, C. (1986). The role of memorable messages in the process of organizational socialization. *Communication Quarterly, 34*(3), 231–249.
- Stohl, C. (1987). Bridging the parallel organization: A study of quality circle effectiveness. *Annals of the International Communication Association, 10*(1), 416–430.
- Stohl, C. (1992). *Exploring the new organizational horizon: IGOS, INGOs, and BINGOs*. Paper presented at a conference on New Directions for Organizational Communication, Tempe, AZ.
- Stohl, C. (1993). International organizing and organizational communication. *Journal of Applied Communication Research, 21*(4), 377–384.
- Stohl, C. (1995). *Organizational communication: Connectedness in action*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Stohl, C., & Stohl, M. (1984). Political economy and the palate: Teaching global political economy concepts. *Peace and Change, 9*, 49–58.
- Stohl, C., & Cheney, G. (2001). Participatory processes/paradoxical practices: Communication and the dilemmas of organizational democracy. *Management Communication Quarterly, 14*(3), 349–407.
- Stohl, C., & Stohl, M. (2007). Networks of terror: Theoretical assumptions and pragmatic consequences. *Communication Theory, 17*(2), 93–124.

組織傳播、全球化與學術共同體

- Stohl, C., Stohl, M., & Leonardi, P. (2016). Managing opacity: Information visibility and the paradox of transparency in the digital age. *International Journal of Communication*, 10(2016), 123–137.
- Stohl, C., Etter, M., Banghart, S., & Woo, D. (2017). Social media policies: Implications for contemporary notions of corporate social responsibility. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 142, 413–436.
- Yang, Y., & Stohl, C. (2020). The (in) congruence of measures of corporate social responsibility performance and stakeholder measures of corporate social responsibility reputation. *Corporate Social Responsibility and Environmental Management*, 27(2), 969–981.

本文引用格式

辛西婭·史托爾、汪子怡、邱林川 (2023)。〈組織傳播、全球化與學術共同體〉。《傳播與社會學刊》，第63期，頁1–31。

Communication and Society, 63 (2023)

Academic Dialogue with **Cynthia Stohl**

Organizational Communication, Globalization, and Scholarly Communities

CS: Cynthia STOHL

JQ: Jack Linchuan QIU

ZW: Ziyi WANG

JQ: How did you start your journey in communication studies? Why have you chosen to become an organizational communication scholar, working on issues of globalization, collective action, and networks both digital and traditional?

CS: Well, I did not choose to do it in the sense of having had a plan. I very much enjoy doing research and appreciate where my career in the field of communication has taken me, but I never would have predicted it. In college I was an English literature and elementary education major — becoming a public school teacher was expected for so many women in my generation — especially those of us whose parents or grandparents were immigrants and never went to college. As a result, after graduating from college I became a fifth-grade school teacher while my husband went on and got a Ph.D. (to his credit he had encouraged me to do the same thing at that time but I didn't really know what I wanted to study). I enjoyed teaching young children, yet when I was pregnant with our second child, I found myself looking enviously at his professional life, and decided I was ready to expand my horizons and pursue grad school to concentrate on the social issues and ideas that I found so important as a teacher.

Initially I thought about going into sociology because I was interested in schools and institutional structures and how they more often constrained rather than facilitated children's development and teacher effectiveness. I wanted to know how could we enact organizational and social change? I also thought about going into

Organizational Communication, Globalization, and Scholarly Communities

psychology because my experiences with the students' families were so unlike the ones I grew up with. They filled me with questions about socialization, culture, and the development of competence. But then after doing some preliminary research, I discovered the field of communication and the Department of Communication at Purdue. The courses in rhetoric, political, interpersonal, and organizational communication all related to my interests in structure, culture, and human efficacy, addressing questions related to how can social change happen and how institutions may enable positive human development. A communication perspective enhanced my already critical political predilections, emphasizing the importance of dialogue, messages, interpretation, networks, and collective action. Not surprisingly my first book (1995, which amazingly is still in print), is titled *Organizational communication: Connectedness in action*.

In my dissertation, strongly influenced by Piaget, Durkheim, Dell Hymes and the works of network scholars, like Mark Granovetter and Peter Monge I focused on young children's development of communicative competence in day care centers. Specifically, I studied children of lower socioeconomic status who lived in single-parent households, exploring whether family network configurations (both interpersonal and organizational) affected children's communicative development. Counter-intuitively I found that children who were enmeshed in highly dense and supportive networks (where family members, friends, and teachers knew each other and were in frequent communication outside the daycare center) were less competent communicatively than those who had fairly disconnected networks. In dense networks, these very young children had less incentive to articulate their needs at the daycare center. For example, if they were allergic to or fearful of something that knowledge was already shared across the network, whereas the child whose family network did not overlap with the schools had to communicate directly with the teachers — and that was developmentally advantageous. What was clear was that network configurations both inside and outside the daycare affected organizational behavior and individual development in ways that were not accounted for if we looked only at intraorganizational or familial networks — that was the predominant

approach in organizational and network communication studies at the time, embodied in what we now refer to as the “container metaphor.”

To pursue these network ideas further I traveled to New Zealand where I studied quality circles, Japanese inspired voluntary groups touted to not only enhance quality control in manufacturing but encourage employee development and workplace democracy. Although the research context changed, from a Midwestern American day care center to a multinational tire manufacturing plant (using Japanese management techniques with a New Zealand and Pacific islander workforce, owned and managed by an American company), moving from preschool kids to union workers, the same network phenomena were apparent. The significance of internal and external network connectivity on worker’s competencies and managerial attitudes and assessment permeated the findings. But what also emerged from my year in the rubber factory was the importance of the tensions associated with emerging global connectedness across organizational sectors that appeared in the relational data, the production outcomes, worker surveys, and the interviews. I needed a theoretical framework beyond networks to explain the phenomena.

That was 1983. If you look at our field back then, we were writing about cross-cultural perspectives in organizations, but we were not focusing on the emerging processes of global organizing that were rapidly changing the organizational landscape. Yet the tire factory was immersed in rapid change, technologically, economically, and politically, all shaping and being shaped by communication. In 1990 I gave an address titled *Expanding the organizational horizon: IGOs (International governmental organizations), INGOs (International nongovernmental organizations), and BINGOs (business International nongovernmental organizations)*. My arguments related to the importance of organizational scholars taking on a global not just an international perspective, exploring all types of organizing, not just corporate communication. I had already made similar arguments in the context of schools and children, publishing an article in *Peace and change* (1984). The paper “Political economy and the palate: Teaching political economy to elementary school children” detailed a project I did as an elementary school teacher focusing on facilitating an appreciation and development of a global perspective.

Organizational Communication, Globalization, and Scholarly Communities

JQ: Could you tell us about your most impactful works: impact measured by citations, or influence on policymaking, or any other indicator? How did you come up with the ideas? Why are they influential?

CS: I am not a great fan of all these impact metrics. H-index or citation measures are useful and of course, one is always proud of research awards and recognition from our peers. But for me, the hard metrics are not where we can always find the answer as to whether people find your work interesting and provocative or helps them generate new ideas. For example, the chapters I have written with Shiv Ganesh on globalization in international handbooks have generated many (and possibly more) intriguing and productive discussions than our globalization journal articles, although the articles have stronger citation metrics. One simple way I view impact is the emails I get from people I do not know who read my work in their grad seminar or heard a conference presentation wanting to discuss my work. Grad students are often afraid to send emails to scholars or approach them at conferences, but from a scholarly perspective that is often the best affirmation and the most indicative of the impact we are having.

As for specific impactful pieces, in 1981, Mark Knapp, Kathleen Reardon and I published an article in the *Journal of Communication* on the memorable messages people recall that have had a strong influence on their lives. In 1986, I wrote a follow-up article on employees' memorable messages related to organizational socialization and culture. Since then, the concept has taken on a life of its own... with more than 250 articles covering memorable messages in health, sports, interpersonal, political, organizational, intercultural, and media communication. Right now I have a former graduate student from UCSB many years ago, who has invited me to work on a series of articles related to memorable messages in the context of students of color in the emerging global university. We just had an article published in the *Annals of the International Communication Association* and I know of several other memorable message pieces that have just come out in other contexts. The same is true of my work on bona fide groups. Those ideas published in the early 1990's continue to generate studies across family, organizational, interpersonal, health, media, political and sports communication, I think scholarly impact is seen in something

Communication and Society, 63 (2023)

you write early on that takes on all kinds of unexpected frames, like a prism that reflects the issues of the time.

JQ: By *prism* you mean something more unpredictable than the metrics, and more colorful than you can imagine yourself, right?

CS: Yes, exactly. It's the same with the work that Michael Stohl and I did in terms of networks of terror and human rights networks. We saw these as theoretical papers, reconceptualizing various network concepts in new contexts. But these pieces seem to continue to resonate in terms of the practical implications of our theories and the contributions social science can make. The impact went beyond contemporary concerns about terrorism, human rights, and networks, but addressed our internal concerns in the academy, and how we can make our theories relevant.

An article I did with Dennis Mumby in *Management Communication Quarterly* in 1996 "Disciplining organizational communication" has also garnered a lot of attention. This piece was controversial from the very start and has most recently been critiqued for not addressing organizational communication from a diversity of global perspectives. Rereading it twenty-six years later I think that is a legitimate concern, and I would certainly write a different article today, but at least it continues to play a serious role in the evolution of our thinking about what the field of organizational communication is and what it could be.

Finally, there is my work on collective action, globalization, and emerging technologies. The ideas Bruce Bimber, Andrew Flanagin, and I presented in our 2012 book and the many empirical articles and book chapters I have written with Shiv Ganesh have influenced how we think about digital ubiquity, collective action, participation, and networks — these pieces have not only upended core assumptions about jobs, employees, and organizational membership, but are also linked to key organizing dimensions of organizational form, coordination, control, communication, and in-group and interorganizational linkages.

ZW: Thank you Professor Stohl. How do you see the research landscape of organizational communication nowadays? What are the most compelling and promising issues?

Organizational Communication, Globalization, and Scholarly Communities

CS: I find that one of the most exciting aspects of organizational communication today is the compelling notion that we no longer focus on formal organizations, but rather on the phenomenon of organizing. I think organizing practices in the digitally ubiquitous era demands we study new hybrid forms as well as formlessness, that is, unanticipated interactional structures that are fluid, cross-sectoral, often ephemeral, and short-lived. Of course, this doesn't mean that there will be an inexorable replacement or elimination of the study of traditional or network forms of organizing. But rather, as organizational communication scholars grapple with contemporary issues, our ideas related to organizational structures and stakeholders will become more expansive. I imagine fewer organizational communication studies that operate within the familiar western/nonwestern organization dichotomy, but a greater number of studies that simultaneously explore cultural, civil, and economic systems as collaborative emergent forms of organizing serving a multitude of stakeholders within a globalized context. Some of the recent communication work on COVID embraces this approach.

The new forms of organizing that transcend traditional sectoral distinctions also suggests to me that there will be a greater emphasis on Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR) and larger questions associated with the role of organizations in solving the devastating health, environmental, and social problems we face across the planet. In our field, the social responsibility of organizations has typically been situated within a voluntary corporate framework. I think a promising area for communication research will involve exploration of the development and role of legislation and other mandatory regulations across economic systems as our scholarship more fully engages in questions related to fundamental assumptions of the role of organizing in society. By that I mean how formal, grassroots, institutional and interpersonal communication collectively address the pressing problems we face today across the ever blurring cultural, regional, and sectoral boundaries.

Underlying these changes, I believe is the rapid digitization of human behavior enabled by technological and socio-political transformations. Digital communication has brought about a seismic

Communication and Society, 63 (2023)

shift in people's and organization's ability to see and be seen. Whereas most communication theory over the last century is grounded in conditions where communication makes the invisible visible, today the default state has shifted from being invisible to being visible — hence communication is not necessarily about making ourselves and organizational behavior more transparent, or at least visible, but rather to manage the level of visibility that is already present through digital traces. I am privileged to be part of an international network of scholars including Mikkel Flyverbom, Claartje ter Hoven, Jeff Teem, Paul Leonardi, and Shiv Ganesh who are grappling with the implications of this changing default and I see future scholarship exploring the ways increased visibility is not only enabling information exchange but contributing to social inequities and power imbalances among individuals, groups and institutions.

ZW: You also took a critical approach to organizational study, e.g., your collaborations with Sotirin and Mumby on absence and control, showing that discourse and power are interdependent. As Taylorism spreads around the world, its discourse of scientific management has also diffused widely, among corporations, even societies. How do you see this phenomenon?

CS: Institutional theory addresses mechanisms of convergence, focusing on the mechanisms through which global organizations become more and more similar in terms of structure and processes. And indeed, over time neoliberal discourses of efficiency, deregulation, privatization, and the benefits of a market-driven economy have dominated global business discourse and media portrayals of contemporary organizing. But embedded in debates and activities regarding the regulation of gig work and organizational transparency for example, as well as the various sustainability discourses being enacted, are challenges to the emphasis on efficiency and technical rationality and countered through new forms of collective action. I am not espousing that we all need to be critical theorists or activists but certainly, we, as communication scholars, need to take a critical stance, creating new spaces for alternative and previously ignored voices to be heard and empowered. We can do that through our research practices, our teaching, our public outreach, and our service to our communities.

Organizational Communication, Globalization, and Scholarly Communities

ZW: You have demonstrated strong parallels between the growth of the global human rights regime and the burgeoning interest in CSR (Corporate Social Responsibility). Do you think the business risk frame will overpower CSR considerations? Under what circumstances can CSR maintain its essential place in corporate globalization?

CS: I wish I could give an easy answer to that. The international visioning of human rights is a place for us to look when we are thinking about CSR. Otherwise, there is an irreconcilable clash between the idea of CSR as encouraging organizations to voluntarily make positive impacts on society (CSR makes business good) and the business frame which focuses on CSR as a means to improve the profitability of an organization (CSR is good for business). For CSR to become an integral part of all corporate activity (from board room decisions to employer/employee and community relations) and not just an add-on that can easily disappear, my work and that of many other scholars suggests CSR discourse needs to embody and invoke the specific rights and values (individual freedoms such as freedom of speech, freedom of association and equal pay for equal work and collective freedoms such as the freedom to live in a safe and healthful environment) enshrined and articulated in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and other global agreements. Making fundamental human rights the foundation upon which corporations are built entails a shift from a conception of CSR as voluntary and philanthropic to a conception of CSR as basic rights and justice-based; only then will CSR maintain its essential place in corporate globalization.

JQ: As Past President of ICA, you have done more than most colleagues in shaping the broad field of communication studies in recent years. What were your priorities when you were ICA President? How did you arrive at those priorities? Any obstacles or pushbacks? How did you overcome them?

CS: I will say that those five years of being on the ICA Executive Committee working with such extraordinary colleagues were fantastic. I never imagined it would be as fulfilling, as interesting, and as much fun as it was. My presidential campaign statement contained phrases like “building community, enhancing participation, global connectivity

Communication and Society, 63 (2023)

and international partnerships”. Those remained my priorities throughout my tenure. How did I arrive at those priorities? Clearly from my own research and values but also, they came out of one of my earliest experiences as the student member on the ICA board in 1980. It was the meeting where the board was deciding where the next 5 ICA conferences would be. At that time ICA chose a non-US city every fifth year. We were in Acapulco Mexico in 1980 and now we were planning the international conference in the Pacific region for 1985. People proposed many locations including Japan, Mainland China, and Hong Kong. And then Hawaii came up. Hawaii is a set of lovely islands in the Pacific Ocean. But I gave an impassioned speech for why the conference should not be in Hawaii. Everybody around the table nodded as I made my point including the most basic — Hawaii is part of the United States! If ICA wants to be an international organization, not an American organization with some international members, I argued, we need to increase the frequency of our international conference sites not decrease them. My abject failure to convince the board was in my head when I was running for President. (Editors’ note: ICA 1985 finally went to Hawaii.)

By 2010, when I ran for President ICA was a very different organization. We had many more international members and we regularly had our conference in non-US venues. But we still only published in English, we made no accommodations for our non-native English language participants at our conferences, we were highly inflexible when it came to “rules,” our committees did not reflect our global community, nor did the ICA fellows, amongst other things. And so building our global community became my priority and the theme of the conference I organized in Phoenix. And to be sure, globalizing our community was not just about increasing the number of members representing a large number of countries. A global academic community is one where different groups with different experiences, ways of doing, and interests come together to learn about, from and with others. We needed to do a better job reflecting our values and our commitment to globalization.

Access and opportunity to present ideas reflecting voices that were typically absent from ICA was a fundamental issue of

Organizational Communication, Globalization, and Scholarly Communities

community that I along with the rest of the executive board wanted to address. And this idea morphed into several initiatives, including the ICA-affiliated journal program and extended sessions at our conferences where we could not only learn from our colleagues but learn with them in new formats that would enable multiple voices being shared in multiple ways. The Phoenix conference was the first to enable divisions to have slots up to 2.5 hours, enabling conference session to move beyond the typical four or five paper/respondent model. There were many pragmatic obstacles and pushback from those who didn't want change and some divisions were not very responsive at first (they were concerned that they were losing conference slots). But the priority was to give every division the opportunity for members to exchange ideas and expertise in less constrained manner, and provide more opportunities for new and experienced ICA members to come together to work collaboratively, to enable papers to be presented in two languages, engage non-Western centric modes of scholarship presentation, and involve the larger community in new ways. This structural change has now become a natural part of ICA conferencing, and many divisions have created new traditions for these extended sessions. Our colleagues have used these sessions in exciting and innovative ways that far surpass the original vision of enhancing community.

JQ: How would you recall the origin of *Communication and Society (C&S)* being one of the first non-English ICA affiliate journals? Could you tell us how you convinced ICA to embark on this new initiative? What is your vision for ICA affiliated journals to achieve in the future? What should they strive for collectively, to achieve some tangible change in, for instance, 10 or 20 years?

CS: Well, Jack, you were a big part of that, because you first came to me and inquired whether *C&S* could become an official ICA journal. There were a lot of reasons why that would be difficult (including financial and staffing issues amongst others) but I did not want to just say no, it was such an exciting and important idea. Having high-quality publications associated with ICA that were non-English based was exactly the type of thing I had envisioned when I set out my priorities. So I said maybe and we planned a meeting in Hong Kong

Communication and Society, 63 (2023)

with the *C&S* editors and a few members the ICA Executive Board. And that meeting was extremely productive. We discussed several options and the idea of non-English language journals that had the imprimatur of ICA but not be an official journal (we didn't have a title for it then) emerged.

I went back to ICA headquarters and talked with the executive director, Michael Haley, the executive board members and the publication's committee. We realized this was a far more complex undertaking than it seemed at first. So we expanded the conversation by pulling in anybody in and outside ICA whom we thought would give us insight into the financial aspects of publishing, the editorial constraints, the expectations we would have for such a journal, etc. We eventually formed an "affiliate journal committee" to develop a detailed statement of goals for the program, a set of standards for such a journal, an application procedure, an evaluation template for both the applications and each year after it was accepted, and a strategic plan for building the program. We made the conditions for being accepted as an ICA affiliates journal quite rigorous, in terms of peer review, rejection rates, institutional support, regional prestige, journal rankings, number of published issues per year, etc. and developed a set of standards that the journal had to meet to continue in the program. If you remember, Jack, we talked about the *C&S* editorial board and that we needed reviewers from other countries, not only China but the rest of the world. We wanted to make sure that our affiliate journals were of the same high quality as the official ICA journals. The committee also decided to ask affiliate journals to have the table of contents in English as well as in the home language, add extended abstracts in English and have at least one English-language article published per year so that the research published in the journal would be accessible to ICA members.

Once we got the affiliate journal program approved for a trial period of five years we put out a call for affiliate journal proposals. We got proposals from *C&S* and *Studies in Communication and Media*, and a few others. The committee evaluated all the proposals and were very pleased that these two high-quality journals published in German and Mandarin were our first affiliate journals. We had many

Organizational Communication, Globalization, and Scholarly Communities

members from these regions and they were doing outstanding work in their own languages that had heretofore not been accessible to most ICA members. The French communication association also expressed interest, and three years after the program began the *Revue Française des Sciences de l'Information et de la Communication* became an affiliate journal. And just last year we added a Spanish language affiliate journal *Cuadernos.info*. I look forward to seeing what the next journal to join us will be.

You ask about my vision for the future. First, let me say that I am excited to see what the Affiliate Journal committee and the new chair bring forward. I know the editors have lots of interesting ideas on how to expand and enrich the program. Clearly though, we have more work to do in terms of making ICA members aware of the journals. The annual reports say readership and submissions have increased but we do need to do better. Conference sessions with top papers from the journals, ICA newsletter stories, utilizing social media etc. are just a few of the ways we can make ICA members become more aware of the journals. I look forward to reading the forthcoming joint special issue on COVID, we will be sure to advertise the issue to all our members on the ICA website, etc. And I would love to see more collective efforts among the affiliate journals whether it be special issues or conference activities. And ICA journals also could be doing more with the affiliate journals. For example, *Annals of the ICA* could certainly collaborate with affiliate journals on developing specific themes from a global perspective. I have been so impressed with the competence and commitment of the editors of the affiliate journals. I think we are at the cusp of some very exciting initiatives.

ZW: I ask this question on the behalf of young scholars and graduate students reading C&S: how should we collaborate across cultural boundaries? What are the key elements that contribute to productive scholarly collaboration among team members from different countries, different disciplines (e.g., engineering, data sciences), and different sectors (e.g., civil society organizations, for-profit corporations)?

CS: There are so many ways to talk about this. Let me try to give a simple straightforward answer: Be *ALIRT*. First is A – *Associate*. It is

Communication and Society, 63 (2023)

important for young scholars to associate with other new or experienced scholars across borders. When you go to conferences, do not always go to your specialties but go and associate with other groups. The second thing is L – *Listen*. This is hard when you are in a new and confusing environment. But when you are in a new environment, comprised of scholars from different countries, listen in a way that is not passive — You could raise questions like: why do you make that assumption? What do you mean by this or that? Collaboration needs to be based on understanding. And when your collaborators come from non-academic sectors of society this is particularly important. The third thing is I — *Immerse* yourself in the literature from the locations of your future collaborators. Global scholarship takes on different and unfamiliar theoretical and methodological approaches, individuals may have different understandings of what counts as data and how you collect data. Human subjects’ approval is very different across national boundaries as are the expectations and concerns of study participants. So immersing yourself in the research enterprise of others is very important. A lot of collaborations do not go anywhere because of basic misunderstandings. The fourth thing is R – *Reading*. It is always important when you are doing an international collaboration to read the journals that your colleagues are publishing in, familiarize yourself with the nonacademic publications from an NGO you are working with, read the newspapers from the places where the collaboration is happening, And finally T – *Talk*. I think that those of us whose first language is not English often let the “native speaker take the lead in discussions despite the contributions that each of us could make”. You want to make sure that your position and your ideas are heard. Beyond all this, have fun, enjoy getting to know your colleagues, share your culture and your ideas. I must say that some of my closest friendships developed from global collaborations. We are so incredibly lucky to be in the field of communication, especially at this time of global upheaval and increased connectedness. Our field embodies the future, and it is up to junior colleagues to shape where we go.

JQ & ZW: Thank you very much!

Organizational Communication, Globalization, and Scholarly Communities

Selected Works by Cynthia Stohl

Please refer to the end of the Chinese version of the dialogue for Cynthia Stohl's selected works.