“全球传播论坛”文库（三）

Communication in e-Society: Innovation, Collaboration & Responsibility

e社会传播：创新、合作与责任

主　编　张国良

上海人民出版社
Shanghai People's Publishing House

图书在版编目（CIP）数据

e社会传播：创新、合作与责任/张国良主编.
上海：上海人民出版社，2010
（“全球传播论坛”文库；3）
ISBN 978-7-208-09523-6

Ⅰ. ①e… Ⅱ. ①张… Ⅲ. ①传播学—研究—现代
Ⅳ. ①G206

中国版本图书馆CIP数据核字（2010）第174163号

责任编辑　郭立群
封面装帧　傅惟本

·“全球传播论坛”文库（三）·
e社会传播：创新、合作与责任
主　编　张国良
副主编　王昊青　姚欣保　姚君喜
世纪出版集团
上海人民出版社出版
（200001　上海福建中路193号　www.ewen.cc）
世纪出版集团发行中心发行　常熟新骅印刷厂印刷
开本720×1000　1/16　印张33.25　插页6　字数660,000
2010年9月第1版　2010年9月第1次印刷
ISBN 978-7-208-09523-6/G·1384
定价 58.00元

2009 中国传播学论坛暨第三届全球传播论坛
组委会

主　　任： 张　杰
副 主 任： 郑成良　胡正荣　帕翠斯
塞　弗　张国良(执行)
委　　员： 葛卫华　李本乾　姚欣保　王昊青

2009 中国传播学论坛暨第三届全球传播论坛
支持媒体

新华社上海分社　新华网　解放日报报业集团　文新报业集团
上海文广新闻传媒集团　青年报社　分众传媒　中华传媒网

《e 社会传播：创新、合作与责任》
编委会

主　　任： 张国良
副 主 任： 姚欣保　王昊青　姚君喜
委　　员： 陈怀林　陈先元　陈嫣如　戴元光　段京肃　葛　岩
姜进章　刘士林　罗文辉　龙　耘　邵培仁　单世联
吴　飞　谢金文　谢耘耕　薛　可　严三九　殷晓蓉
(以上按姓氏拼音排列)
编辑助理： 王积龙

序

张国良

以推动中国传播学研究的国际化、规范化、前沿化为己任的上海交通大学全球传播研究院，继2007年、2008年连续成功召开首届、第二届"全球传播论坛"后，再接再厉，又于2009年与中国传播学会(CAC)、国际传播学会(ICA)、美国普渡大学传播系合作，隆重举办了"2009中国传播学论坛暨第三届全球传播论坛"。

那是一个秋高气爽的收获季节、美好时分——2009年10月30日至31日，来自中国内地、香港、澳门、台湾，美国，德国，韩国，新加坡等地区及国家的60多家院校、机构的300多名学界精英、业界翘楚、莘莘学子，汇聚上海交大闵行校区，盛况空前，切磋交流，新朋老友，不亦乐乎。

本届论坛与前两届相比，又有一些特点和亮点。

其一，广泛性。本届论坛以"e社会传播：创新、合作与责任"为总题，以"理论探索与历史回顾"、"政治文明与社会变革"、"经济效能与管理对策"、"文化变迁与意义反思"、"技术进步与数字革命"、"受众分析与效果研究"、"媒介环境与制度建设"为分题，收到150多篇海内外来稿，经过专家匿名评审，从中选出80余位作者执笔的80多篇论文予以发表。无论作者、单位数，还是宣读论文数，都明显多于以往(前两届论坛均为60余位作者、近30家单位、约60篇宣读论文)。同时，研究题材的丰富性、多样性，也超过历届。

其二，创新性。更令人欣喜的是，论文质量不断提升，规范性、创新性逐年加强，不仅海外、境外的作品在总体上仍体现出较高水准，而且，本土、内地的许多成果也可圈可点，对于这一评价，相信各位读者从本论文集的披阅中不难体悟，由此折射出中国大陆传播学界近年来的可贵努力和可喜进步。为奖掖先进，本届论坛还特意首次设置了优秀论文奖，根据专家匿名评审的结果，评选出获奖论文20篇(其中，教师12篇，学生8篇；内地14篇，境外/海外6篇。详见附录)，并在闭幕式上以文艺晚会的形式予以颁发，广受好评。

其三，实践性。与上两届类似，本届论坛同样致力于消除产学之间的樊篱，促进学界创新和业界创意的深度融合，不同的是，更重视技术和艺术的结合与展示，专设为期半天的"数字媒体艺术论坛"，邀请了一批来自新媒体最前沿的企业高管和政府部门领导，与听众分享实战经验，为研究提供宝贵启迪，声影光电纷呈，反响十分热烈。

总之，本届论坛可称是又一次与国际接轨、与业界互动、与时代对话的成功尝试。

一次规模较大的学术盛会的策划和举行，看似简单，其实牵涉到大量人力物力，个中甘苦，非亲身经历者无以体验。借此机会，我谨代表“两院”——上海交通大学全球传播研究院、媒体与设计学院，再次向全体与会的领导、嘉宾、老师、同学以及工作人员，致以深深的谢忱！

尤其需要感谢拨冗莅临、为论坛致辞和演讲的以下人士：上海交通大学校长张杰院士、上海交通大学副校长郑成良教授、上海市经济和信息化委员会副主任邵志清先生、教育部社科委员丁淦林教授、中国传播学会会长胡正荣教授、中国社会科学院新闻与传播研究所所长尹韵公研究员、IBM中国研究院副院长陈滢先生、国际传播学会会长帕翠斯教授、美国传播学会会长塔格芭女士、台湾政治大学传播学院院长钟蔚文教授、香港中文大学新闻与传播学院院长苏钥机教授，以及中华人民共和国工业与信息化部电信经济专家委员会杨培芳秘书长、艾瑞咨询集团创始人杨伟庆先生、德国汉堡DFI国际传播艺术学院汉可斯副教授、韩国NCsoft中国区华宏伟总经理、香港城市大学创意传媒学院刘志强教授、“绿豆蛙”创始人施功晨先生、上海数字内容产业促进中心罗海蛟主任、“水晶石”公司叶峰艺术总监、香港动漫娱乐协会于积理会长、台湾利达数字影音科技公司雷金崇经理、幸星数字娱乐科技公司王利峰总裁。

“天地交而万物通也，上下交而其志同也”——在本届论坛开幕式上致欢迎辞的张杰校长，以《周易》里的中国古代智慧，来重新诠释传播在当代社会变革中的重要作用，以及大学在国家发展进程中的神圣使命，发人深省。谨以此箴言，与同道共勉。

2010年7月25日

写于文化花园明珠苑

此为试读，需要完整PDF请访问：www.ertongbook.com

CONTENTS
目 录

序 张国良 1

一、e社会传播的理论探索与历史回顾

Self-monitoring and Social Networks: A Critical Review 3
政党为体,党报为用
——孙中山辛亥革命时期党报思想述评 15
民国前期关于出版自由研究的重要成果
——对王世杰两篇文章的讨论 24
全球化对于中俄大众传媒影响异同的对比分析 37
唐前文化传播媒介发展综论 49

二、e社会传播的政治文明与社会变革

Collaborative Research in Global Contexts: Ethical, Institutional and Academic Synergies 69
全球传播时代的民族文化复兴与国家认同
——"国学热"的文化政治学解读 85
社交网站使用维度与青少年公民参与之关系初探
——以中国南部大学生为例 95
公民新闻与专业媒体新闻的传播特性、传播效果比较
——以"央视大火"报道为例 116

三、e社会传播的经济效能与文化变迁

e社会跨国公司之危机语艺研究
——台湾麦当劳公司的个案研究 127

全球金融危机背景下专业电视财经媒体的收视现状、问题及对策
——基于艾杰比尼尔森第一财经频道收视数据的实证分析 156
不同媒体沟通形态对团队合作绩效的影响研究 179
媒介化社会环境下危机传播的公众需求与应急传播机制构建
——以2008年"5·12"汶川地震为例 191
后现代传播状况 211
微博客(Twitter)的用户扩散模型及其商业模式研究 227
网络媒介的文化解放价值
——一种基于媒介传播偏向的研究 241
刻板印象下的语言期望偏差
——NBC版北京奥运会开幕式解说词的跨文化解读 250

四、e社会传播的技术进步与数字革命

E-Work and E-Research: Findings from a Study on Temporary Virtual Teams and Reflections on Conducting Research Across Geographic and Temporal Boundaries 263
眼动实验法在平面与网络媒体设计研究中的应用现状及展望 283
虚拟世界里的群氓时代
——网络"人肉搜索"的传播学解读 292
汉字的传播偏向
——一种在E时代背景下解读汉字的方法 302
开放性互动多媒体在世博公共空间的应用 315
媒介融合与范式转移：中国电视新闻全球传播的文化范式 320

五、e社会传播的受众分析与效果研究

A Rhetorical Analysis of the 2001 Emergency Landing on Hainan Island, China by a U.S. Surveillance Plane 331
实证探索争议性事件的解读框架对受众态度的影响
——上海和广州市民如何解读北京奥运会开幕式的"代唱"事件 341
认知、评价与使用：P2P网络电视的受众研究及产业启示 355
现代传媒中的女性形象生产
——对《中国妇女》杂志(1990—2007年)的内容分析 369

网络论坛对传统媒体的议程设置现状研究
——以上海地区《解放日报》、《新闻晚报》为例 379
中国大学生 3G 业务认知与需求调查分析
——以上海交通大学为例 391
网络"客"文化的传播特征研究
——以"播客"为例 410

六、e 社会传播的媒介环境与制度建设

Brand Placement and Ethical and Legal Implications: A Comparative Review 425
论我国 3G 移动传播监管领域的六大主题 443
网络灾害新闻报道的框架解读
——汶川大地震的灾害观分析 456
企业博客能做什么?
——以 Adidas 为例的实验性研究 474
传播学者责任:政治经济学的视野 482
广电集团发展的中国道路:反思与期待 494
网络暴力、信息自由与控制
——传播速度的视角 501
论媒介技术作用于媒介制度变迁的机制 510

附录:2009 中国传播学论坛暨第三届全球传播论坛优秀论文奖名单 520
后记 522

一、e社会传播的理论探索与历史回顾

Self-monitoring and Social Networks: A Critical Review

Zhu Xiumei

Introduction

Why do some people get ahead in the race for life's prizes? Sociologists ask why some people achieve higher social economic status than others. Organizational researchers ask why some people outperform other peers in the same organization. In response to this enduring concern, research focusing on structural positions has emphasized the importance of social networks, "being in the right place"(Brass, 1984), or "It is not what you know, but who you know!" According to the social network perspective, some individuals occupy more advantageous positions in the informal social networks within their organization or possess a social network that is richer in resources or bridging structural holes(Burt, 1992; Freeman, 1979; Granovetter, 1973; Lin, 2001). These structural positions provides access to diverse new information and critical support, and power and control, resources that allow individuals to find a job, get things done, generate innovative ideas, and facilitate resource flow and information sharing across the organization. Consequently, individuals are rewarded by higher performance rating, faster promotions and overall social economic status.

How do individuals acquire advantageous network positions? Compared to the numerous studies that examined the consequence of "being in the right place" or bridging structural holes, theory and empirical research addressing this question is very limited (Klein, Lim, Saltz, & Mayer, 2004; Oh & Kilduff, 2008). Given the sociological and anthropological roots of social network research (Wasserman, Faust, & Zaheer, 1994), demographic

此为试读,需要完整PDF请访问: www.ertongbook.com

attributes such as gender and age, family social economic status, and relational properties such as geographic proximity and similarity in demographic attributes have figured prominently in explaining the formation of social network (Blau, 1977; Lin, 2001; McPherson, Smith-Lovin, & Cook, 2001). The fact that individuals with the same demographic attributes or geographic location may differ radically from each other in the extent to which they occupy advantageous network positions is largely ignored.

Social psychologists and organizational researchers have recently taken note of this limitation. As Robins(2008) pointed out, "... social network studies typically pay little attention to the motivated social cognition of individuals, and thereby risk a seriously under-theorized account of a system of human social actors." Mehra and colleagues(2001) pinpointed two theoretical issues relevant to personality, "... the network position occupied by individuals might be influenced by their psychology ... personality and social network position might combine to influence important outcomes such as work performance." Kalish and Robins(2006) stress that at the very basic level of a social relationship between two individuals, psychological predispositions are likely to play a substantial role. To bring individual agency back in, a small but growing body of literature has theorized on and empirically studied the impact on individual social networks of personality traits that are considered to influence individual functioning in social interactions.

This paper has two primary objectives. First, I review psychological research on self-monitoring and social interactions, and existing studies on self-monitoring and social networks. Second, I discuss areas in need of future research. My discussion focus on three of the most studied characteristics of individual ego network, or network position, namely, network diversity(Lin, 2001), structural hole (Burt, 1992), and network centrality (Freeman, 1979).

The impact of self-monitoring on social interaction

Self-monitoring has been considered as one of the most important personality orientation that influences how individual behaves in social interactions. The construct is basically concerned with individuals' "active construction of

public selves to achieve social ends" (Gangestad & Snyder, 2000: 546). It distinguishes between those who are especially attuned to the role expectations of other people(high self-monitors) and those who insist on being themselves despite social expectations(low self-monitors)(Day, Schleicher, Unckless, & Hiller, 2002; Gangestad & Snyder, 2000; Snyder, 1974). While low self-monitors(individuals with low scores on the Self-Monitoring Scale) "are controlled from within by their affective states and attitudes"(Snyder, 1979, p. 89), chameleon-like high self-monitors(individuals with high scores on the Self-Monitoring Scale) use cues from others as guidelines for regulating and controlling their verbal and nonverbal self-presentation (Snyder, 1979, p. 89). Consequently, high self-monitors are "highly responsive to social and interpersonal cues of situationally appropriate performances," while the behavior of low self-monitors reflects "their own enduring and momentary inner states"(Snyder & Gangestad, 1986: 125). In short, while high self-monitors are concerned about presenting socially appropriate self image, low self-monitors are concerned with presenting who they are.

An important implication of the concern for the appropriateness of social behavior is that high self-monitors are interpersonally competent(Furnham & Henderson, 1982; Snyder, 1987). Compare to low self-monitors, high self-monitors are more likely to initiate conversation with peers (Ickes & Barnes, 1977), and seek out mentoring relationship with higher-level managers(Turban & Dougherty, 1994). They are also able to use a rich set of interpersonal strategies that lubricate social interactions(Snyder, 1987). Empirical evidence has shown that high self-monitors can appropriately pace conversations (Dabbs, Evans, Hopper, & Purvis, 1980), employee conversational overtures to bread periods of science(Ickes & Barnes, 1977), and use humor to lighten up the social conversation(Turner, 1980). They are give the other person (and other people) more attention rather than talking about themselves (Ickes, Reidhead, & Patterson, 1985) cited from Mehra et al 2001, and at the same time reciprocating self-disclosures(Shaffer, Smith, & Tomarelli, 1982). Finally, high self-monitors are more likely to solve conflict through collaboration and compromise(Baron, 1989).

Additionally, high self-monitors are more adept at gaining approval and

respect from others. Their sensitivity to social cues may help them discern the needs of other people. Indeed, it has been reported that high self-monitors are more aware of the thoughts and feelings of others in their social networks(Ickes, Stinson, Bissonnette, & Garcia, 1990). Strongly motivated to act upon social cues in ways that cultivate a positive public image, high self-monitors are also more likely to respond to the need of others appropriately (Day, et al., 2002). Additionally, high-self monitors are particularly attuned to status dynamics in dyadic exchange relations. A recent study(Flynn, Reagans, Amanatullah, & Ames, 2006) found that high self-monitors are more inclined to provide help when they are asked for it, but less likely to seek help from others. By avoiding the negative effect that being indebted to others can have on their reputation and cultivating the image of a generous helper, high self-monitors are able to acquire elevated status.

In short, high-self monitors are motivated to tailor their behaviors to different people and social environments, and are able to employee interpersonal strategies and appropriately respond to others' need. As a result, high-self monitors are well-positioned to cross social boundaries(e.g. demographic, organizational, or cultural) and relate to people with different background from different social circles. Flynn, Chatman and Spataro (2001) found that individuals who are demographically different from their coworkers engendered more negative impressions than did more similar coworkers, but the relationship between demographic difference and negative impression disappeared for when the demographically different individual is a high self-monitor. Research has provided some evidence that high self-monitors tend to belong to a number of different social groups for their different interests and strivings, while low self-monitors tend to belong to a single homogeneous clique regardless of the activity domain(Snyder, 1987; Snyder, Gangestad, & Simpson, 1983).

Empirical research on self-monitoring and social networks

The literature investigating psychological antecedents of social networks is growing but remains very limited(Brown & Miller, 2000; Burt, Jannotta, & Mahoney, 1998; Kadushin, 2002; Kalish, 2008; Klein, Lim, Saltz, &

Mayer, 2004; Robins & Kashima, 2008). Only a handful of studies have built on the rich psychological literature on self-monitoring reviewed above, and attempted to link this personality orientation to the positions individuals occupy in networks within organizations or to the structure of individual ego networks.

Mehra et al(2001) was the first to link self-monitoring to the position an individual occupies in the organizational network. They collected data on the friendship network and workflow network of 116 members of a high-technology firm. Their analysis suggests that high self-monitors have more contacts in the workflow network, and tend to occupy more central positions(measured as betweenness centrality) in the friendship network, particularly when they have longer tenure in the organization. Betweenness centrality captures the frequency with which an individual falls between on the shortest paths connecting pairs of other individuals in the network, and is considered to indicate the extent to which the occupants act as potential go-betweens for those not connected with each other(Freeman, 1979; Mehra et al, 2001). Higher betweenness centrality in informal communication networks has been linked to greater social influence(Brass, 1984).

Oh and Kilduff(2008) collected sociometric data on the acquaintance network(often considered as weak tie, see Lin, 2001) among 162 Korean expatriate entrepreneurs in a Canadian urban area. They found that high self-monitors tend to occupy direct brokerage position(i.e., have network contacts that are disconnected), as well as indirect brokerage position(measured by betweeness centrality). They also employed position-generator technique (Lin, 2001) to gather data on network range outside of the Korean community(also called network diversity), i.e. the extent to which an individual is connected to a diversity of other actors(Burt, 1983, p.176) or to a diversity of occupants of social positions(Erickson, 1996). They reported a stronger positive association between self-monitoring and network range for entrepreneurs with more recent tenure in the community than that for old timers. In other words, high self-monitoring allows entrepreneurs who are relatively new to the community to rapidly establish network ties to non-Koreans occupying diverse occupations that possess expertise and resources valuable to the Korean

entrepreneurs. However, this advantage associated with high self-monitoring disappears among entrepreneurs with a longer tenure in the community.

Kalish and Robins(2006) examined psychological antecedents of network size, density, constraint and efficiency(Burt, 1992, 2000) using ego-network data from 127 first-year psychology students of the university of Melbourne. They did not find any significant association between self-monitoring and any of the four ego-network structural characteristics. In their study on structural holes and network learning(Janicik & Larrick, 2005), Janick and Larrick reported correlations between self-monitoring and structural hole(measured as the number of disconnects in ego networks). Data were connected at four separate times on MBA students, and a correlation was computed for each time point. Three out of the four correlations are insignificant, while the last one is significant but the direction of the correlation is opposite to expectation.

Critique and directions for future research

Reconciling inconsistent results

Results from Mehra et al(2001), and Oh and Kilduff(2008) are consistent in that high self-monitors were found to occupy more central position(betweenness centrality) in the organizational or community network, thus providing one piece of suggestive evidence in support of the argument that self-monitoring has an impact on social networks. Both studies reported a significant interaction between self-monitoring and tenure in the organization or community, however the directions of the interaction are different across the two studies. Additionally, while Oh and Kilduff found a positive association between self-monitoring and structural hole(what they call direct brokerage), yet both Kalish and Robins(2006), and Janick and Larrick(2005) fail to document any significant result. In sum, while results from the former two studies are quite encouraging, results from the latter studies are not at all motivating.

Differences in research settings and methodology across these studies suggest possible reasons for the striking inconsistency. Mehra et al(2001), and Oh and Kilduff(2008) are both field studies focusing on the position an

individual occupies in a network with clearly define boundaries. Kalish and Robins(2006), Janick and Larrick(2005), however, are both experimental studies focusing on the ego network of student participants. It is possible that work or business settings, compared with school settings, provide greater motivation for networking as working or doing business often requires information and resources, and collaboration from others. High self-monitors are more motivated to respond to the contextual requirement, and their superior social skill can be put to use to develop diverse contacts. In contrast, within little motivation for networking in schools, the social network of high self-monitors might not be very different from that of low self-monitors.

Additionally, the field studies present results on networks that carry a single relationship content: friendship or workflow network in Mehra et al, and acquaintance network on Oh and Kilduff, whereas the experimental studies combined networks with different relationship content. Kalish and Robins collapsed network contacts important for general university life, scholastic achievement, socializing and political activities. The network important for university life in general may contain ties used for both instrumental and/or expressive purposes. Scholastics achievement network may be more instrumental than expressive, while socializing and political activities are more expressive. It is possible that self-monitoring personality orientation is connected to networks with different relational content in different ways.

Furthermore, the sociometric method used in the two field studies help participants to recall both strong tie and weak tie contacts. Oh and Kilduff (2008) even explicitly instructed participants to include weak ties, as they focused on acquaintance network. The position generator employed by Oh and Kilduff(2008) is also better at eliciting weak ties(Lin, 2001). In contrast, the name generator approach adopted by the two experimental studies are more likely to generate strong ties as closely connected contacts are more salient in human memory and are easier to recall. Note that weak ties are more likely to bridge structural holes and connect to individuals from different social circles. It is therefore possible that the network data collected in the two experimental studies have limited variation in the dependent variable,

此为试读,需要完整PDF请访问: www.ertongbook.com