學術對談

跨學科的傳播學經典演繹[1]

艾利休‧凱茨 (Elihu Katz)

「傳播研究定然是一個交叉學科的領域，依我看來，它總是面臨分崩離析的危險。一方面，文化研究趨向於人文傳統和人類學，不再聚焦傳媒；另一方面，主流的影響研究以社會心理學和政治學為根基，而制度分析正在重返社會學。傳播研究領域所面臨的挑戰是將這些成份捏合在一起，並且教育學生去整合它們，而不是任其分流。來自這些分離傾向的最糟糕因素是這樣一種錯誤的信念，即不同的問題必然限定了不同的研究方法，似乎文化研究只能是質化的，影響研究只能是量化的。」

艾利休‧凱茨生平簡介

艾利休‧凱茨 (Elihu Katz) 是位社會學家，在其學術生涯中卻一直從事傳播研究。1955年，他與導師保羅‧拉紮斯費爾德合著了《人際間的影響》(*Personal Influence*, 1955)。這是凱茨的第一本學術著作，現已成為傳播研究的經典之一。沿著該著作所呈現的路線，他繼續探討大眾傳播與人際傳播之間在不同領域的互動，包括早期與著名社會學家詹姆士‧柯爾曼 (James Coleman) 等合作，探討創新的擴散，以及最近以法國社會心理學家伽畢瑞爾‧塔德 (Gabriel Tarde) 關於媒介、交談、輿論和行動之間關係的理論探討公共領域的構成。他的學術研究還拓展到其他領域。在1960和1970年代，他接受以色列政府邀請，在以色列從事引入電視廣播的規劃和研究，並在此後受英國曼賈斯特大學邀請，展開第三世界國家引入廣播和BBC廣播接收與效果的研究。與此同時，他還探討了從傳播效果到傳媒使用的理論轉向。其後，他的研究更深入到文化和社會的變遷、媒介事件與文化構成和再現之間的關係、媒介文本的跨文化解讀，以及傳播學的基礎建設等領域。他在這些領域的一些著作，已經為傳播學界所熟知，包括《大眾傳播的使用》(*The Uses of Mass Communications*, 1974)、《休閒的世俗化》(*The Secularization of Leisure*, 1976)、《大眾傳媒與社會變遷》(*Mass Media and Social Change*, 1980)、《媒介事件》(*Media Event*, 1992)、《意義的輸出》(*The Export of Meaning*, 1990)，和《媒介研究的奠基文獻》(*Canonic Texts in Media Research*, 2003) 等。

在其半個多世紀的學術生涯中，凱茨先後任職於美國芝加哥大學、南加州大學和賓夕法尼亞大學，以及以色列希伯萊大學和耶路撒冷大學，並與不同學科 —— 包括社會學、社會心理學、政治學和傳播學 —— 的眾多學者合作。他的研究曾得到美國國家科學基金會、以色列國家藝術發展委員會的資助。自1992年起，他受聘為美國賓夕法尼亞大學校董講座教授，同時兼任以色列耶路撒冷大學社會學和傳播學教授及應用社會研究所所長 (現已從該大學退休)。

凱茨是參與早期哥倫比亞傳播研究而至今仍活躍於學術第一線的唯一學者，他的學術活動跨越多個社會科學領域，整合社會科學與人文學科的取向，縱貫微觀 (如個人態度和選擇的形成) 和宏觀 (如文化的變遷) 的分析層次，他的活動領域包括歐、亞、美三大洲的眾多國家。他的學術成就不僅凸顯了傳播學作為一門交叉學科的特徵，而且反映了傳播學研究應有的全球視野。基於他的學術成就，凱茨曾獲聯合國科教文組織－加拿大麥克魯漢獎、德國博達 (Burda) 媒介研究獎，根特、蒙特利爾、巴黎、海法等大學的榮譽學位，並被選為美國藝術與科學院院士。

CS： 傳播與社會學刊

EK： 艾利休‧凱茨

CS： 您是哥倫比亞學派建立的參與者。您如何講述這個學派建立的故事？您如何看待這個學術傳統、一些後來的學者們對它的批判，以及這個傳統對進一步發展傳播學的意義？

EK： 在1930年代離開維也納之前，保羅‧拉紮斯費爾德就開始了對大眾傳播的開創性研究。他的研究著重四個相互關聯的方面：(1) 個人的決策，諸如消費選擇、職業選擇等等；(2) 廣播 —— 在當時屬於新媒體 —— 的潛在影響；(3) 探討這些過程的實證研究方法和工具；及 (4) 持續這些研究所必須的學術「實驗室」。綜合這些方面的一項研究是他與貝雷爾森 (Barnard Berelson) 和高德 (Hazel Gaudet) 合作展開的跟蹤問卷調查研究，目的是考察在1940年總統大選中，美國選民如何選擇候選人。由於哥倫比亞大學應用社會研究所 (Bureau of Applied Social Research) 的建立，拉紮斯費爾德有了他的學術「實驗室」，使得1940年的大選研究以及後續的一系列研究得以展開。這些研究項目相互關聯，均以發掘和解釋決策過程中各種影響的流動為目標。這 (哥倫比亞研究傳統的建立) 是社會科學中罕見的從事持續和累積性社會研究的案例，它建立了傳播研究的基礎。

　　吊詭的是，這個成就受到了批判。批判者認為這個傳統的研究削弱了大眾傳媒的力量。他們誤以為，拉紮斯費爾德發現了媒介在「說服」和「(創新) 擴散」過程中作用有限之後，他和他所領導的研究所也如此看待所有大眾傳播的課題。其實，即便在他探討人際交流與大眾傳播在決策中的短期互動作用時，拉紮斯費爾德就清醒地意識到媒介所有可能的影響，其中包括那些他不曾研究的影響。他與默頓 (Robert Merton) 合作的論文以及他的其他論文清楚地表達了這一點。五十年後的今天，哥倫比亞學派是支撐我們這個領域的一個支柱，無論就其理論還是方法而言都是如此。與它並舉的當然還有其他學派和傳統。

CS： 您自1955年發表了《人際間的影響》之後，又繼續從事創新擴散的研究。您如何看擴散模式所體現的社會和傳播活動的形象？您覺得我們應當如何理解媒介與人際關係網路？您覺得在多媒體時代，或者說在大眾和人際傳媒之間的區別日益模糊的時代，擴散模式有哪些適用的理論洞見？

EK： 拉紮斯費爾德發現，大眾傳媒網路與人際影響交錯在一起。這一發現 —— 至今仍然未得到充分的認識 —— 是重新鏈結傳播研究與其他社會科學和人文研究的重要一環。它將關注點從研究媒介的直接説服效果轉移到研究觀點如何在一段時間內流動於社會網路之中，並經受過濾和詮釋。各種社會科學，包括宗教史學、流行病學，以及二者之間所有的社會科學類別，都關注這一擴散的過程。確實，新媒體在這一擴散圖景中扮演著重要角色，同時，電腦也使得擴散研究者可以模擬和追蹤影響的流動，這在四、五十年前幾乎無法想像。有些新媒體確實在克隆大眾傳媒，也有些在促進人際交流。一個有待考察的大問題是：這麼多的新媒體，配以傳統媒體的分眾化 (segmentation of audience)，是否終會瓦解民族－國家 (nation-state)，而偏好「地方的」或全球的社區。類似這種遠瞻型的問題一向是傳播技術理論家們的聚焦點，也應該受到我們所有人的關注，無論我們自己喜好談論的「效果」是甚麼。

CS： 您與英國學者布魯默 (Jay Blumler) 於1974年導入了「使用與滿足」的理論觀點。目前這方面的研究狀況如何？這個觀點與英國文化研究傳統內發展起來的「新受眾研究」之間的關聯是甚麼？它們如何豐富了我們對「主動的受眾」的理解？

EK： (使用與) 滿足研究是在人們開始質疑傳媒與受眾之間的力量均衡問題之際登上舞臺中心的。一旦人們意識到受眾具有「能動性」(agency) —— 他們既能動 (proact) 也受動 (react)，關注點便轉向了使用與滿足。哥倫比亞學派其實為這個取向騰出了理論空間，這尤其反映在拉紮斯費爾德和斯坦頓 (Frank Stanton) 所編輯的論文系列中。這個傳統仍然健在，雖然其理論建樹繼續欠發展。哥倫比亞學派的批評者認為這些受眾能動性的研究解除了媒體的道德承

擔，似乎媒體內容生產者無須為某些年輕人模仿媒體所呈現的行為而承擔責任。具有諷刺意味的是，這些批判者中的一些人也將他們的關注轉向了一些類似的問題，以「接收研究」或「受眾研究」的名義聲稱發現了「主動的受眾」。就我個人來說，我看不到「滿足」和「接收」這兩個傳統之間有何根本區別。當然，(英國學者) 索尼婭‧利文思頓 (Sonia Livingston) 提出，「滿足」研究重在「使用」，「接收」研究重在「意義」(meaning)。這說法有一定道理。

CS： 在90年代，您與塔瑪‧李布思 (Tamar Liebes) 採用「接收分析」的方法考察受眾對美國電視連續劇《達拉斯》的跨文化解讀。您覺得這條路線的研究如何幫助我們理解全球化的過程，尤其是本土和輸入文化、文化保護與開放、文化多元與同質之間的關係？

EK： 「接收」確實是個湊巧吻合的概念，我與李布思採用了它，以考察風行一時的電視片《達拉斯》在全球的使用和意義，當然還有「滿足」。我們感興趣的是在這過程中是否有「文化帝國主義」的影響，美國的意識形態訊息如何得到傳播。雖然我們發現幾乎所有的受眾都驚歎該片所展示的生活水準，但是也看到了他們對其中隱含的價值觀的抵制。當然，該片的製作者並沒有將企業家 —— 該片的英雄人物 —— 表現為道義的典範。我們發現，趨於傳統的觀眾尤其抗拒片中所呈現的錦繡豪華，受眾對該劇的理解也有差異，更有意義的是，有些群體顯示出對該劇及其意圖的相當老道的批判能力。

　　但是，應當指出的是，幾乎所有受眾中模擬一種角色和關係的風氣，也許是嵌入人們意識的一個楔子，通過它，該片所宣揚或表達的價值 (無論這價值的內容是甚麼) 潛移默化地滲入受眾的思想和生活。《達拉斯》的啟示是，全球發行的媒體內容並不能自動地將不同的受眾群體同質化；同時，不可忽略的事實是，在很多國家，從電視誕生之時起，進口的美國節目就佔據了突出地位，原因在於，當媒體無法迴避地 (也是很不明智地) 作出24小時全天播出的決策時，他們就發現從國外進口比自產節目在經濟上更划算，更何況本土藝術人才通常不敷需求。在我與喬治‧維德

爾 (George Wedell) 合著的《第三世界的廣播》(*Broadcasting in the Third World*, 1977) 一書中，我們提出了將傳統價值觀和藝術形式引入電視媒體的種種問題，預想到在本土藝術創作價格高昂的情況下，進口電視節目與本土藝術創作之間的各種張力和衝突。目前，(電視內容的生產) 看來更加開放，包括容納本土節目，並向各地移民社區輸送這類節目；現在 (全球) 有多個內容生產中心，多條產品流通的管道。

CS： 1970年代，您與麥克爾‧葛維奇 (Michael Gurevitch) 等合作研究媒介與社會變遷，其中一個成果是1976年出版的著作《休閒的世俗化：以色列的文化與傳播》。為甚麼傳播學者要研究「休閒」？您覺得「休閒的世俗化」是否具有超越以色列的普適意義，能夠幫助我們在理論上理解包括東歐和中國在內的轉型社會？

EK： 文化可以稱作是休閒的「內容」。如果媒介在大多數社會中佔據了三分之二的休閒時間，那麼傳媒學者顯然應當考察在這些時間內文化是如何得以傳遞和體驗的。除此之外，這樣的考察還可與其他有意義的問題相聯繫，如休閒與工作；尤其值得關注的是不同職業和階層選擇媒介內容與休閒活動的差異。

　　葛維奇和我將該書命名為《休閒的世俗化》是因為我們認為，當代休閒為社會提供了各種休閒活動的選擇，可以取代構成傳統社會的節日和儀式等休閒方式。比如，西方電視如何處理安息日，即如何按照安息日的傳統文化而調整電視節目，是一個特別令我感興趣的課題。

CS： 1992年，您與戴揚合作出版了《媒介事件》一書。「媒介事件」如何構成了我們的文化、歷史和社會經驗？這個概念如何幫助我們理解全球化的性質、麥克魯漢的「媒介即資訊」的宣稱，以及媒介與社會和文化之間的關係？

EK： 所謂「媒介事件」，即電視媒體隆重慶祝一些民族性或國際性「競賽」、「征服」和「加冕」儀典的方式。它們 (媒介事件) 體現了電視媒體的威力，可以將重大的歷史時刻同步和直接地傳遞給「每一個

人」，令麥克魯漢的「全球村」意念成為現實。它們證實了電視廣播具有這份能力，儘管其他類型的電視節目 ——包括《達拉斯》這類全球轟動的電視系列片 —— 未能做到這一點。在此，我應當指出，破壞式的事件，如恐怖活動、災難、戰爭等，正在日漸突出，令慶典式的事件不再獨佔鰲頭(參見凱茨和李布思，2007年，「和平不再」，載電子版《國際傳播輯刊》第一期，http://ijoc.org/ojs/index.php/ijoc)。

　　媒介事件是個理想的案例，顯示儀式的傳統形式如何可以創造性地轉換為廣播的語言。(前埃及總統)薩達特帶去耶路撒冷的和平姿態、波蘭裔教皇帶給華沙的挑戰等之所以改變了世界，原因在於這些事件向世界的(電視)實況轉播；奧林匹克運動會和世界盃錦標賽的確擁有聯合世界的力量，皆因全球能夠共同欣賞和接受競賽的規則。這些確實都是全球化的力量。通過實況轉播的放大，這些事件的內容產生了巨大的影響，它們並非如麥克魯漢所想像的來自技術設備自身的影響。

CS： 您長期探討伽畢瑞爾·塔德的理論，以此出發探討交談在傳播和輿論的形成，以及二者與民主之間的關係。您如何看哈貝馬斯「公共領域」這個概念的理論貢獻？您如何看近年來學者們熱衷於「商議」和「商議民主」的研究？

EK： 哈貝馬斯的「公共領域」概念大體上表達了早他五十多年的伽畢瑞爾·塔德的見解。塔德的模式描述了這樣一個過程，即印刷媒體為西歐咖啡館提供關於時事的「功能表」，激起交談的恣意汪洋，並因此構築起一定的公共輿論，為民主政府提供回饋。哈貝馬斯哀歎平等涉足和開放的公共空間正在萎縮，因此挑起近年來的各種理論爭論，包括對非正式政治交談的現狀(羅伯特·普特南)和交談在民主政治中的核心地位(麥克爾·利德遜)等的爭論。我與兩位同事在美國從事了一項全國範圍的問卷調查，試圖實證地考察塔德/哈貝馬斯模式(媒介－交談－輿論－行動)的運作。我們發現，政治交談與人們對政治媒體的關注高度相關，通過交談形成一定的政見(雖然這些政見並不一定具有內在的一致)、持有意見

　　　　並意識到他人意見的個人更傾向參與政治。這一模式有待實證考
　　　　察的部分是輿論如何回饋到政府及其決策者。我同意有關「商議」
　　　　和「代議」民主的紛爭有整合之必要。

CS： 總結您的學術生涯，您如何看待傳播研究作為一個交叉學科的研
　　　　究領域？

EK： 傳播研究定然是一個交叉學科的領域，依我看來，它總是面臨分
　　　　崩離析的危險。一方面，文化研究趨向於人文傳統和人類學，不
　　　　再聚焦傳媒；另一方面，主流的影響研究以社會心理學和政治學
　　　　為根基，而制度分析正在重返社會學。傳播研究領域所面臨的挑
　　　　戰是將這些成份捏合在一起，並且教育學生去整合它們，而不是
　　　　任其分流。來自這些分離傾向的最糟糕因素是這樣一種錯誤的信
　　　　念，即不同的問題必然限定了不同的研究方法，似乎文化研究只
　　　　能是質化的，影響研究只能是量化的。

對談中提及的著作

Blumler, J. G., & Katz, E. (Eds.). (1974). *The uses of mass communications: Current perspectives on gratifications research*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

Dayan, D., & Katz, E. (1992). *Media events: The live broadcasting of history*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Katz, E., & Gurevitch, M. (1976). *The secularization of leisure: Culture and communication in Israel*. London: Faber & Faber.

Katz, E., & Lazarsfeld, P. F. (1955). *Personal influence: The part played by people in the flow of mass communications*. Glencoe, IL: Free Press.

Katz, E., Peters, J. D., Liebes, T., & Orloff, A. (Eds.). (2003). *Canonic texts in media research: Are there any? Should there be? How about these?* Cambridge, UK: Polity.

Katz, E., & Szecsko, T. (Eds.). (1980). *Mass media and social change*. London: Sage.

Katz, E., & Wedell, G. (1977). *Broadcasting in the Third World: Promise and performance*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Liebes, T., & Katz, E. (1990). *The export of meaning: Cross-cultural readings of Dallas*. New York: Oxford University Press.

ACADEMIC DIALOGUE WITH ELIHU KATZ

Interdisciplinary Studies in Communication[2]

CS: Communication & Society

EK: Elihu Katz

CS: You were a participant of the Columbia School's research program. How would you tell the story of that research program? Some have characterized Lazarsfeld as "a tool maker" and others have criticized "the dominant paradigm" in media sociology that he shepherded. What was Paul Lazarsfeld like? Over the years, you have written about Lazarsfeld's "media effect matrix" (2001) and included an appraisal of Lazarsfeld's seminal 1948 paper with Robert Merton in the edited volume on the "canonic texts in media research." What in your view is the long-lasting legacy of Lazarsfeld and the Columbia School? How do you think our understanding of this legacy help the discipline of communication move ahead?

EK: Paul Lazarsfeld's pioneering research in mass communication even before he left Vienna in the 1930s — consists of four interlocking elements: (1) an interest in individual decision-making, whether consumer choices, occupational choices, etc.; (2) a fascination with the potential influence of the then-new medium of radio; (3) a methodological tool kit for the empirical study of these processes; and (4) the need for an academically-based "laboratory" to assure the continuity of such work. The culmination of these elements may be seen in Lazarsfeld's panel study (with Berelson and Gaudet) of how a sample of American voters made up their minds during the 1940 presidential campaign in the U.S. Thanks to the establishment of the

---

[2] Academic Dialogue with Elihu Katz Group Members: Zhongdang Pan and Joseph M. Chan

Bureau of Applied Social Research — his academic "laboratory" at Columbia University — the 1940 study led to a whole series of subsequent studies, each building on its predecessors, aimed at tracing the flow of influence in different realms of decision-making. This was a rare case of continuity and cumulation in social research that is recognized as foundational for the study of communications.

Ironically, this achievement was also criticized by those who thought that the power of the mass media was diminished thereby, as if Lazarsfeld and his Bureau were attributing the limited role of the media in "persuasion" and "diffusion" to the whole of the problematics of mass communications. In fact, Lazarsfeld himself agreed with these critics. Even while he focused his work on the interplay of mass and interpersonal communication in the making of short-run decisions, he was perfectly aware of the full gamut of media effects — including those he had not studied. His early papers with Merton, and others of his writings, make this clear. Fifty years later, the Columbia School is one of the important legs on which the field stands, both theoretically and methodologically. Competing Schools have flourished alongside.

CS: You published the classic work with Lazarsfeld, *Personal Influence* (1955) at an early stage of your life. Subsequently, you continued your sociological work on diffusion with James Colemen and others. In 1957, you wrote to update the two-step flow of communication. How do you think the diffusion model depicts the images of society and communicative activities that constitute a society? How do you think we should conceptualize the relationship between large-scale media-sustained or media-enabled information flow and interpersonal networks? What do you think are the theoretical insights that we can make use of in studying communication in today's multi-media age, when the distinction between mass media and person-to-person media is increasingly blurred?

EK: Lazarfeld's discovery that the mass media networks are intersected by interpersonal influence was a major step — not fully recognized even now — in reconnecting communications research with the rest of the social sciences and the humanities. It shifted attention from study of the

direct, persuasive effects of the media to the idea that influence takes time and travels through social networks that both filter and interpret. Diffusion processes of this kind are of high interest to disciplines ranging from the history of religion to medical epidemiology and all the social sciences in-between. It is true that the new media technologies are now (rightly) claiming a share in these mappings of diffusion, but it is also true that the computer enables students of diffusion to simulate and trace the flow of influence in ways that could hardly be imagined forty or fifty years ago. Some of these new media are indeed cloning the mass media; others are perhaps enhancing interpersonal communication. The Big Question is whether the array of new media, and the segmentation of audiences for the traditional media, will ultimately undermine the nation-state in favor of "local" or global communities. It is long-run processes of this kind which technological theorists of communication have rightly kept in focus and now demand the attention of all of us, whatever our favorite theories of "effect."

CS: In 1974, you worked with Jay Blumler to usher in the uses and gratifications perspective. Where are we with this research tradition? Does it meet the criteria for being a "paradigm" in the research on mass communication? How have this perspective and the "new audience analysis" growing out of the British Cultural Studies tradition enriched our understanding of "active audiences"?

EK: Gratifications research took center stage at the moment when the balance of power between media and audiences was called into question. When it became clear that audiences have "agency" — that they proact as well as react — attention turned to processes of uses and interpretations. The Columbia School made room for these studies — notably in the series edited by Lazarfeld and Stanton — and the tradition has continued to flower, although it is still largely unformed theoretically. Again, critics of the Columbia School saw these studies of audience agency as relieving the media of moral responsibility, as if it were no fault of the producers that some young people freely chose to model their behavior on behavior portrayed in the media. Ironically, some of these very critics have turned their attention to a similar set of

problems under the heading of "reception studies" or "audience research," claiming to have (re)discovered the active audience. Personally, I fail to discern any basic difference between the traditions of "gratification" and "reception," although Sonia Livingstone has proposed — with some justification — that the emphasis of gratification research is on "uses," while the emphasis of reception is on "meaning."

CS: In 1990, you collaborated with Liebes in carrying out the "reception analysis." One of the products that came out of this line of work is your 1990 book *The Export of Meaning: The Cross-cultural Readings of Dallas*. In what ways do the resources utilized, scripts invoked, and rules applied by the viewers of *Dallas* in different cultures tell us about the interactions between a culture and a globally marketed media product? How do you see the values of this line of work in our understanding of globalization as a multi-faceted process? How would you talk about the tensions between indigenous and imported cultures, between cultural preservation and openness, between cultural diversity and homogeneity?

EK: The concept of "reception" does seem a felicitous one, and so Liebes and I adopted it in our study of the "uses" and "meaning" and, of course, "gratifications" associated with viewing of the world-wide hit, *Dallas*. We were interested in whether "cultural imperialism" was in evidence here, in the sense that one could show that an ideologically American message was being propagated. While we found near-universal awe over the standard of living portrayed in this nighttime soap opera, we also found considerable resistances to the values embodied in the program; indeed, the businessman — hero of the story is hardly presented as a model of virtue by the producers themselves. We found the more traditional viewers were especially resistant, even to the glamour. There were also examples of differentiation in the very understanding of the program, and — most interesting of all — a sophisticated critical ability among certain groups in the interpretation of the program, and its intent.

It must be added, however, that the virtual "trying on" of roles and

relationships — practiced by almost everybody — may have served as a wedge through which the values of the program (whatever they are) unconsciously invaded the minds and lives of viewers. The lesson of *Dallas* is that globalizing media content does not automatically impose uniformity on diverse viewing communities. On the other hand, it is also true that imported American programming has, from the outset, dominated the television and movie screens in very many countries. Once producers make the inevitable (and unwise) commitment to broadcasting around the clock, they find it far less expensive to import materials from abroad. Moreover, indigenous talent is often in short supply. In our book, *Broadcasting in the Third World*, George Wedell and I expressed particular concern over the problems of translating traditional art-forms and values into the medium of television, and anticipated the major tensions that arise in programming imported culture alongside indigenous creativity, especially when the latter is so much more expensive to produce than the former. There appears to be greater openness, nowadays, to the incorporation of indigenous programming and to making such programming available to expatriate and diaspora communities. There are also many more centers of production than there used to be, and many more outlets of distribution.

CS: In the 1970s, you worked with Michael Gurevitch and others to study media and social change. One of the many publications resulted from your work is the 1976 book entitled *The Secularization of Leisure: Culture and Communication in Israel*. Why should communication scholars study "leisure"? Or, in what ways leisure constitutes a fruitful analytical point of entry? Do you think "secularization of leisure" tells us something that goes beyond the experiences in Israel? What theoretical insights can we gain from such research about the process of social change and human experiences in transitional societies such as Eastern Europe and China?

EK: Culture may be said to be "content" of leisure. If the media occupy some two-thirds of available leisure time in most societies, it seems obvious that media scholars should be interested in the ways in which culture is transmitted and experienced during these hours. Additionally,

there are interesting questions to be asked about the relationship between leisure and work, especially about occupational and class differences in the selection of media content and leisure activities generally.

Gurevitch and I called our book "The Secularization of Leisure" because we thought of modern leisure as offering a choice of activities to displace the holidays, rituals, etc. which were prescribed form of leisure in traditional societies. The question, for example, of how Western television coped with the Sabbath — in an effort to attune its programming to the traditional culture of the Day of Rest is especially interesting to me.

CS: In 1992, you published the collaborative work with Dayan entitled *Media Events: The Live Broadcasting of History*. In what ways "media events" constitute our historically conditioned socio-cultural experiences? In what ways do you think studying media events helps us understand (1) the nature of globalization, and (2) the heuristic values of McLuhan's dictum, "The medium is the message"? In what ways do you think studying media events helps to reproblematize the relationships between media and society (as well as culture)?

EK: "Media events" are television's way of celebrating national or international "contests," "conquests," and "coronations." They embody television's promise to bring historic occasions to "everybody" both simultaneously and without other mediation and they live up to McLuhan's idea of "global village." They prove that television broadcasting is, indeed, capable of this feat — even though no other genre — even best-sellers like *Dallas* — have ever done this. In this connection, it should be added that, recently, disruptive events such as terror, disaster and war, are catching up with the more ceremonial ones (See "No More Peace" by Katz and Liebes in Vol. I of the new on-line *International Journal of Communication*).

Media events also serve as an ideal example of how traditional forms of ceremony can be translated, creatively, into the language of broadcasting. The gesture of peace that Anwar Sadat brought to Jerusalem, or the gesture of defiance that the Polish Pope brought to

Warsaw changed the world, because they were broadcast live on television. The Olympic Games or the World Cup do have the power to unite the world, in shared mutual appreciation and in shared acceptance of the rules of the game. These are indeed globalizing forces. Their content, as amplified by broadcasting, is what counts, and their effect is not technological alone as McLuhan seemed to be suggesting.

CS: One of your long-term interests has been in Gabriel Tarde's work. In 1992, you published a piece entitled "On Parenting a Paradigm: Gabriel Tarde's Agenda for Opinion and Communication Research." In 1994, you wrote about "conversation as a building block of democracy." Then, you published several empirical studies with Robert Wyatt and others on political talk, opinion expressions, and their inhibitions. What do you think are the contributions of Habermas's concept of the public sphere? What do you think about the frenzy in recent years over "deliberation" and "deliberative democracy"? In your thinking along this line, how do you see the ways in which public's thinking, talking (deliberative or not), and acting may be conceptualized in an integrated fashion for us to understand our experiences of the public life in a democratic society (including citizenship and democratic experiences)?

EK: Habermas's "public sphere" echoes much of what Gabriel Tarde said some fifty years earlier. Tarde conceived of the press as delivering a current-affairs "menu" to the coffee-houses of Western Europe, thereby provoking myriad conversations which led to the structuring of public opinion, and its feedback on democratic governments. Habermas bemoaned the decline of equal access to the public sphere, and his analysis provoked widespread debate over the current state of informal political talk (Putnam) and second thoughts about its centrality in democratic politics (Schudson). In a national survey in the United States, Kim, Wyatt and Katz attempted an empirical test of the actual workings of the Tarde/Habermas model (media-conversation-opinion-action), finding that political talk and attention to political media are highly correlated, that talk leads to the holding of political opinions (though not necessarily consistent ones), and that having opinions and awareness of others' opinions lead to political participation. The

question left open in these models is how public opinion feeds back to government and other decision-makers; this process urgently needs study. And, yes, I agree that the debate between "deliberative" and "representative" democracy needs to be reconciled.

CS: As a distinguished scholar, you intellectual work encompasses many substantive areas and methodological traditions. We see your very fruitful intellectual journeys that brought you to connect and integrate a number of dichotomies, including humanistic and social scientific orientations, quantitative and qualitative methodologies, explanatory and interpretive modes of scholarly discourses. Would you talk about how to work with and through the intersections between each of these pairs based on your research experiences? To what extent do you consider communication to be an interdisciplinary study?

EK: Communication is definitely an interdisciplinary enterprise, and, in my opinion, is in constant danger of splitting apart. Thus, cultural studies is oriented towards the humanities and anthropology and is no longer focused on the media; mainstream studies of influence are anchored in social psychology and political science; and institutional analysis is gradually finding its way back to sociology. The challenge of communications research is to hold these elements together and educate students who can integrate them rather than keep them apart. The worst of these centrifugal pulls comes from the confusing belief that these different problems call for different methodologies, as if cultural studies are inherently qualitative and influence studies inherently quantitative.