

分辨「假新聞」

Differentiating Real from Fake News

鄭格 整理 温芯佳 中譯 Compiled by Zheng Ge Chinese translated by Xinjia Wen



新冠疫情對全球人類生活各方面都造成 嚴重衝擊,帶來的亂象之一是假新聞更加 猖獗。舊金山州立大學語言學教授李文肇 於2021年9月12日,應邀於萬佛聖城週日線 上講座系列主講「同溫層、假新聞與真理 探索」,向大家介紹讀、看新聞時,如何 能夠A真正得到訊息,以及避免被假新聞誤 導的要點。李教授在舊金山州大開設的課 程有「語言學」、「翻譯」以及「新聞寫 作」。他自己在新聞領域的工作經驗,是 1990年代在倫敦的英國廣播公司世界廣播 網服務。當時他擔任中文時事製作人,那 段工作經驗給了他系統化的專業訓練,也 讓他知道新聞應該如何正確報導。在英國 廣播公司工作之後,他在台灣和美國都教 過平面和電子媒體的新聞寫作。

李教授認為,當今媒體業為何假新聞充 斥?主要有五個因素:新聞報導方式產生 重大改變;新聞價值的腐蝕;記者與讀者

COVID-19 has greatly wreaked havoc in every aspect of our lives throughout the entire world. Part of the chaos that has ensued has been that fake news has become increasingly rampant. Dr. Chris Wen-chao Li, a professor of linguistics at San Francisco State University where he teaches classes on linguistics, translation and news writing, gave a talk titled "Truth, Echo Chambers, and Fake News: A Personal View" on September 12, 2021, as part of the online Sunday evening lecture series hosted by the City Ten Thousand Buddhas (CTTB), to share his recommendations to help attendees stay well-informed when consuming the news today and to avoid being misguided by fake news. His work in journalism goes back a long time. He received his formal training in journalism when he worked for the British Broadcasting Corporation's (BBC) World Service in London in the 1990s. Working with the BBC during that time period gave him systematic professional training as a Chinese language current affairs producer and informed his values of how journalism should be properly practiced. After working at the BBC, he

的角色轉變;新聞讀者和觀眾的改變;最後,前面四個因素所形成的氛圍,造成假新聞大量增加。他首先解釋說,公元2000年之前,新聞是非常專業化的行業,而且進入這個行業並不容易。公元2000年中期,這種情況迅速轉變,因為當時部落格、播客、社群媒體大量興起,專業媒體受到網路新聞的打擊甚大。2007年他所使用的教科書中,甚至說隨著時光流逝,線上媒體日益受到重視,公民記者(一般人親眼目睹新聞事件,寫下自己見聞者)可望取代專業記者。

時間快轉到2021年,那本教科書中的 某些預測已經言中,但也有些預測並不正 確。專業新聞媒體並未由公民記者壟斷, 我們還是有很多專業記者,但這些專業記 者也常採用手機錄下的視頻,並接受公民 記者的爆料。看新聞的民眾當中,很多 已不再看平面媒體,而是越來越依賴網 路媒體。2021年丕優研究中心的調查顯 示,52%美國人主要的新聞來源是電子平 台,35%看電視,7%聽收音機,5%才是 看平面出版品。86%的美國人現在經常或 有時是從智能手機、電腦、或平板電腦 讀、看新聞;32%的美國人則是從印刷平 面媒體閱讀新聞。若從年齡層來分析,遠 離平面媒體的趨勢就更為明顯。42%以上 的年輕人(18至29歲)是從社群媒體獲 得新聞;50歲以上的人則只有15%是從社 群媒體獲得新聞。丕優研究中心的另一項 調查日報數量的研究顯示,1985年到2017 年之間,全美的日報報社從六萬餘家銳減 至大約三萬家。經營報紙的公司也一樣, 從2000年的6000多家減少到2013年的4500 家。這些轉變已經衝擊到記者如何尋找和 報導新聞。

因為讀者閱讀新聞方式改變,記者報 導新聞也遠離客觀平衡的報導,遠離傳統 的報導。傳統的報導是很清楚、根據事實 提供訊息,針對議題客觀報導各個面向, 並且仔細區分新聞報導和評論,而非夾敘 夾議。記者的報導要提供足夠訊息,以便 taught news writing for print and broadcast, first in Taiwan and later in the United States.

Professor Li pointed out that the reason readers nowadays are inundated by fake news is a result of five factors which include: significant changes in journalistic practice, erosion of journalistic values, changes in the roles of reporters and readers, shifts among news audiences, and finally, these previous four factors have created a climate which feeds the proliferation of fake news.

He began by explaining that prior to the 2000s, the news industry was highly specialized, professional skills were required, and difficult to enter. The situation shifted significantly in the mid-2000s when blogs, podcasts, and social networking sites (aka social media) grew in vast numbers, and professional media became substantially disrupted by online forms of delivery of news content. The textbook he was using at the time to teach his classes in 2007 actually stated that it was likely that citizen journalists (ordinary people who see news happening and then write about it) were likely replace professional journalists as time went on with an increased emphasis on online media.

Fast forward to 2021 and the predictions in that textbook were right in some areas and wrong in others. The professional media is not dominated by citizen journalists, we still have many professional reporters, but they do use many cellphone videos and accepts many tips from citizens. The majority of the news audience, has an increased reliance on online media, and has moved away in vast numbers from printed news. According to The Pew Research Center in 2021, 52% of Americans get their primary news sources from digital platforms, 35% from television, 7% from radio, and 5% from print publications. Up to 86% of Americans overall now get news from a smartphone, computer, or tablet often or sometimes versus 32% who get news from print publications. This change away from print is emphasized even more when you observe how different age groups get their news. Over 42% of younger adults (ages 18 - 29) get their news through social media sites versus less than 15% of those over the age of 50. We can also see in another study from the Pew Research Center on the number daily newspapers in the USA that during the period from about 1985 to 2017, they dropped from over 60,000 daily newspapers in circulation to around 30,000. The number of 讀者能自己下結論,並作價值判斷。2020 年尼瑪實驗室宣稱兩邊平衡報導的新聞已 經死亡。這顯示很多人已不再對平衡、不 偏頗報導時事的新聞觀點那麼感興趣了。

越來越多新聞來源讓記者主動在新聞中,針對真相、正義以及其他價值判斷,加入記者自己的意見。但李教授問道:「誰來決定真相?誰來決定正義?你信任記者為你決定真相和正義嗎?身為讀者,我們可以同意客觀的事實,但對於什麼是真相,什麼是正義,就不見得都能同意。」如果記者寫的報導帶有偏見,對於議題只報導一面之詞,就會產生「同溫層」效應,真相和正義會有不同的版本,而且彼此競爭。如此一來,人口中的不同群組,將各自靠攏反映他們意見和價值觀的新聞來源,但對於真正發生過的客觀事實可不一定同意。這樣就很難將真相、正義和客觀的事實分開。

如果每個讀者都能謹慎選擇新聞,假新聞 就會越來越少

李教授建議大家根據以下的步驟,從 全球時事的新聞報導中,篩選出客觀事 實:

首先要有數字和基本統計學的概念, 能夠了解取樣是否妥當,以及不同群體之 間的統計差異是否顯著;並且要小心根據 這些數據所作的論述。例子之一就是拒打 疫苗的訊息。

拒打疫苗的某些理由包括:

- 朋友(乃至朋友的朋友)打疫苗後 病重、或者情況很糟糕,所以不想打。
- 有些人打了疫苗後,還是感染病毒,其中還有人死亡。
- 自己打了第一針後,很不舒服,不想再打第二針。
- ·看到著名醫生寫的文章,教大家別 打疫苗,所以我不想接種疫苗。

李文肇質疑説:「你所根據的數據在哪裡?取樣有效嗎?朋友和朋友的朋友並

newspaper firms likewise reduced from over 6,000 in the year 2000 to around 4,500 in 2013. These changes have impacted how journalists approach and report the news.

With the changes in how news is accessed by readers, journalists have moved away from taking an objective and balanced approach to news reporting with an emphasis on providing clear, factual information which objectively encompasses all sides of an issue, and which also traditionally required a careful separation of commentary provided in the editorial sections and news reporting. Reporters were required to report the news to provide readers with enough information to reach their own conclusions and value judgements. In 2020, Nieman Lab reports the death of "bothsidesism." Indicating that there are many who are no longer that interested in balanced and impartial perspectives from reporters reporting on current events.

More and more news sources have reporters that actively insert their own opinions regarding truth, justice, and other value judgements. But Professor Li asks, "Who is to decide what is truth? Who is to decide what is justice? Do you trust reporters to do this for you? As readers, we can agree on objective facts, but we cannot always agree on what is truth and what is justice." If reporters write articles in a biased fashion, where they cover only one side of an issue, then "echo chambers" are created where different versions of truth and justice compete against each other. Thus, different segments of the population will gravitate towards news sources that generally reflect their opinions and values, but don't actually agree on objective facts what actually occurred. Then, it is very difficult to separate objective facts from truth and justice.

If every reader can choose news carefully, fake news will become less and less.

Professor Li suggested the following steps to being well-informed by gleaning objective facts from news stories on current events in the world today:

First of all, readers and viewers need to have numerical literacy including basic statistical methods so that they can know if the population sampling is proper and the differences between groups are statistically significant.

One example where numerical and statistical literacy is

不是龐大的取樣群體,這樣推論,並 非有效的支持數據。」

關於新冠疫苗是否有效的問題, 藥廠生產疫苗,要通過好幾輪的測 試。第一階段測試疫苗安全性,取樣 數至少20到100人,觀察打疫苗和注 射安慰劑(不打疫苗)的組別之間, 有沒有顯著差異。第二階段測試疫苗 有效性,取樣數為數百人。第三階段 測試疫苗有效性和潛在副作用,取樣 數在幾百人到三千人之間。他們用這 種非常嚴謹的方式,對嚴格控制變因 的族群做研究。疫苗是不是百分之百 安全有效?不是。但是安全和有效的 程度,已使疫苗副作用出現的機率, 遠低於不打疫苗而患重病的機率。

除了要有數字概念之外,還要小心論述,論述是反應、倡導特定的觀點或價值觀。看新聞時不要去看簡化的新聞,或是摻入某種意識型態的新聞,現在這類新聞極為常見。論述通常會選擇性的使用數據,他們不會把所有的事實都給你看,他們運用大數據,從中選擇對他們有利的數據,進而佐證他們的觀點。

其次,讀者要具備批判思考的能力。也就是要能運用邏輯推理,並避免邏輯謬誤。批判性思考常提到的一點是:相關並不代表因果;當兩者有相同趨勢時,並不意味著其中之一是原因。有人說,注射麻腮風(麻疹、腮腺炎、風疹)三聯疫苗會引發自閉症。資料顯示,注射麻腮風三聯疫苗升高時,自閉症的比例確實也升高。但是,除非能找到致病原因,否則我們只能說,兩者相關,但沒有因果關係。

另一個常見的謬誤,是訴諸人身 的謬誤。也就是將特定觀點和你所喜 歡或不喜歡的人物相結合,但和命題 的真偽並無關聯。也就是說,送信人 是誰和信中內容的真假並沒有關係。 helpful is with regard to reading data related to the Covid vaccine. Some of the reasons people hesitant to be vaccinated might include:

- My friend (or a friend of a friend) became seriously ill or was in very bad shape so I won't get vaccinated.
- Some people still get the virus after becoming vaccinated, and some of them have died.
- I felt terrible after the first injection, so I'm not going to do that again.
- I read a renowned doctor's article telling people not to be vaccinated, so I won't.

Professor Li asked, "Where is the data? What data is based on? Is your sampling valid? A friend or a friend of a friend is hardly a large population. The conclusion you are reaching using this anecdotal method is not going to be valid."

For context around the issue of the efficacy of Covid vaccines, drug companies that produce them must go through several phases of testing. In phase one, there are 20 to 100 participants randomly divided to vaccine group and placebo group for safety testing. In phase two, there are several hundred participants for testing the effectiveness of the vaccine. Phase three, several hundred to 3,000 participants are recruited for effectiveness and potential side effects testing. They use this rigorous scientific approach to conduct research on groups that are under strict control of variances. Are vaccines 100% safe and effective? No. But the safety and efficiency of the drug is high enough that the chances of getting something terrible happen to you after getting the vaccine are very small compared with the harm that can happen to you if you don't get vaccinated.

In addition to numerical literacy, you need to be aware of narratives which reflect and promote a particular point of view or set of values. When you read news, you don't want to read simplified news or news imbued with certain ideology that happen a lot nowadays. Narrative news tends to cheery-pick the facts. They don't give you all the facts. They look at big data and pick out the parts that support them. And using the data, they go on to promote certain points of view.

Second, as a reader, you need to be able to think critically which is to reason logically and avoid logic fallacies. One thing often mentioned in critical thinking is correlation does not imply causation. Just because two things share a similar trend, it doesn't mean that one causes the other. Some people suggested that getting the MMR (measles, mumps, and rubella) vaccine results in autism. Data shows the rise in getting the MMR vaccine is in line with the

但很多人就是利用讀者對某人的喜歡 或不喜歡,來讓讀者相信或不相信某 一句話。

第三,要揪出偏見。讀新聞時要自問:「這則新聞報導是否客觀?記者是否在報導中加入自己的意見或判斷價值?牽涉到不同觀點時,這則新聞是否平衡報導?新聞中是否呈現各方不同的觀點?記者有沒有扭曲某一方的觀點?記者是否想要説服你接受某種特定觀點?」如果答案是肯定的,這代表報導中有偏見,你必須小心。

讀者還要特別小心某些新聞的寫作方式,在網路新聞時代,聳人聽聞的新聞有時被稱為「標題黨」,他們之所以要用這種寫作方式引誘你,就是希望你因為好奇而去點擊他們的鏈接,他們就能根據點擊數賺到廣告商的錢。某些網站就是以「標題黨」看不提供答案,抓住你的好奇心,讓你點擊他們的鏈接。你必須點擊進去看,才能知道答案是什麼;跟傳統媒體在標題中就說清楚的報導方式不同式,可以要想到他們的新聞大概不是很可靠。

最後,負責的讀者要檢查新聞來源。當你看新聞又不確定其有效性時,記者的報導不要照單全收,要去追蹤最原始的消息來源,或者證實消息來源正確無誤。在某些特殊情況下,記者可以不說消息來源,但這些情況很罕見。多數情況下,如果沒有清楚交代消息來源,例如只報導某大學教授說,但沒有說明是哪一所大學的哪位教授,就有可能純屬捏造。此外,也可以比較不同媒體對同一則新聞的報導,有沒有什麼主要的不同。

由於社群媒體中的真假新聞數量不斷增加,年輕讀者很多,因此以

rise in autism. But without a clear mechanism of causation, we don't believe one causes the other.

Another common logical fallacy is "ad hominem fallacy." The truth of certain statement has nothing to do with the person who is delivering the statement. We need to separate the message from the messenger. However, people often get you to believe a certain statement more true or less true based on how much you like (or dislike) the messenger.

Third, readers need to identify bias. When you read a piece of news, ask yourself, "Is this piece of news objective? Is there an insertion of opinion or value judgements? When it comes to different points of view, is it a balanced news story? Are there different points of view presented in the news? Are all points of view objectively presented? Is the reporter trying to push you toward a certain point of view rather than a different one?" If so, there is a bias in the news story being reported, and you need to be aware of it.

You also want to be aware of certain types of writing, especially sensationalized writing. In this age of online news, it is often referred to as "clickbait." The purpose of this way of writing is to get you curious to click on their link. And by clicking on their link, they make money according to the number of clicks they receive. Certain websites are notorious for this practice. They dangle sensational headlines to grab your attention so that you really want to click their link to find out what is going on. This is different from traditional news writing which clearly states the issue in the headline. When you see this type of sensationalized writing, it's normally not a good sign when it comes to journalistic integrity.

Lastly, it is essential that responsible readers check the sources of the facts presented. When you read a piece of news that you aren't sure about its validity, don't take all the information for granted, go to the original news source, verify the source is true. Under special circumstances, a reporter may need to protect a news source, but that happens only in extremely rare cases. In most cases, if a reporter gives a vague source or unnamed sources, such as "a university professor said this," but doesn't say who this professor is, be suspicious, because the information could be an utter fabrication. Additionally, you can also compare the same news story as it is reported by different media outlets to see if there are major differences in reporting.

Because of the increasing quantity of news stories, both true and false, shared through social media sites, especially by young 下的呼聲也跟著不斷增加: 臉書、推特這些社群媒體應該負起守門人的角色, 過濾假新聞。李文肇教授不以為然,他 說,臉書、推特如果還要為讀者過濾新 聞,那和威權政體控制下的媒體有何不 同?

他認為讀者應要求從高品質的新聞媒體、有操守又能將事實報導和評論分開的記者獲得客觀的報導。因此辨別新聞 真假的責任,應該由讀者自己負責。

李教授認為,杜絕假新聞有幾項重 點:

- 選擇平衡各方面、比較客觀的報導,避免那些迎合你既定立場的新聞。
- 走出舒適圈,閱讀與自己立場不同的報導。
- ·不要追求快速、簡單的答案,因為 這樣的答案通常不正確。事實往往複雜 多面,讀者要自己得出結論,不要指望 媒體提供「真理」,否則很容易待在「 同溫層」,只接收自己想要的意見和消 息。

李教授最後總結說:「以上這幾點若 能做到,我不敢保證你所得到的消息百 分百正確,但是會更接近事實。用這些 方式讀、看新聞,不但是幫助自己,也 是幫助改善媒體環境。」\$ people. There have been increasing discussions that social media such Facebook, Twitter, should serve as "gatekeepers" to monitor and filter out fake news. However, Professor Li doesn't agree with this. He pointed out that if Facebook, Twitter filter out news then they are no different from media controlled by an authoritarian government. He felt that it is the responsibility of readers to demand objective reporting from high quality news sources from ethical journalists who clearly distinguish factual reporting from editorial commentaries to distinguish fake news from true news.

Professor Li suggested that readers can follow a few steps to counteract fake news:

- Read news with greater objectivity and balance. Avoid news that panders to your perceived notions of truth and justice.
- Read news that is outside your comfort zone that targets the opposite point of your view.
- Don't expect quick, simple answers which are often inaccurate. Facts are messy, you need to come to your own conclusion. Don't expect to be shown "truth," or else you'll fall victim to the "echo chamber effect."

Professor Li concluded his talk by saying, "If you can do all of these, I cannot guarantee 100% that you will get accurate news, but it will be close enough. And if you consume news this way, you are not just helping yourself, but helping to change the media environment."

芳佛城室劉義崔編 蓋 VAJRA BODHI SEA

訂閱萬佛城月刊 〈金剛菩提海雜誌〉 附上支票乙紙,抬頭:D.R.B.A.

I am enclosing a check made to D.R.B.A. for a subscription to VAJRA BODHI SEA for:

- □ 一年美金四十五元 US\$45.00 / 1 year
- □ 二年美金八十五元 US\$85.00 / 2 years
- □ 三年美金一百十元 US\$110.00 / 3 years

歡迎投稿,稿件請寄 vbs@drba.org We welcome articles. Please send suggestions or submissions for review to vbs@drba.org 歐美地區 In the United States & Europe, please send to: Gold Mountain Monastery

800 Sacramento Street, San Francisco, CA 94108 Tel: (415) 421-6117 Fax: (415) 788-6001

亞澳地區 In Asia & Australia, please send to: Dharma Realm Guan Yin Sagely Monastery 161, Jalan Ampang, 50450 Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia

Tel: (03)2164-8055 Fax: (03) 2163-7118 Email: vbs@drba.org

臺灣 In Taiwan 請寄法界佛教印經會 臺北市忠孝東路六段八十五號十一樓

電話: (02) 2786-3022 傳真: (02) 2786-2674

訂閱單 Subscription Form

姓名 Name:
地址 Address:
電話 Tel. No.: