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Abstract: Hermeneutics is a theory and method of interpretation. Originally, Hermeneutics was used to interpret scripture, such as the Bible. Now, as time goes by, Hermeneutics was not only used to interpret the scriptures but other general texts. It is in the study of communication relating to the message (meaning), allowing relevance to Hermeneutics’ emergence as a message interpretation approach. This is because a text is a medium to convey a communication message. This article aims to explain that there is a potential for Hermeneutics in contemporary communication studies. The focus of this article review is Gadamer’s Hermeneutics. It is an effort to improve communication studies’ knowledge, besides, to study in Indonesia on Content Analysis, Framing Analysis, and Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA). This article found that the study of hermeneutics studies has not been widely used to analyze communication issues & contemporary media. In this context, Hermeneutics requires an understanding of an interpretive dialogue that does not end up in communication (messages). Then, Hermeneutics can be used to gain a Hermeneutics understanding and to interpret texts, such as magazines, books, poems, speeches, songs, movies, reports, documents/articles, or news texts in print or online. This will be a starting point of hermeneutics to understand the reality of communication phenomena.
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INTRODUCTION

Hermeneutics is perceived as an interpretation method. It is an effort to interpret and understand the literal meaning. Moreover, hermeneutics tries to reveal meanings of horizons covering the text; the author’s horizon, the reader’s horizon, or the text’s horizon itself (Rahardjo, 2016).

Several predecessor studies have used the hermeneutic approach to analyze texts, such as interpretations of the Scripture, Bible (O’Kane, 2010; Longxi, 2018), literature text analysis (Smythe & Spence, 2012; Ningsih, 2013), Sunan Kalijaga’s puppet meaning analysis as a da’wah method (Hasanah, 2017), and text analysis of Hujan Bulan Juni novel by Sapardi Djoko Darmono (Mulyono, 2017). There were also song lyrics analyses from music Kelompok Musik Seringai, Efek Rumah Kaca, and Homicide (Anwar, 2017), hermeneutics analysis on Rondo Kempling songs by Manthou’s & Cak Diqin (Candraningtyas, 2017). In the movie industry, hermeneutics was also used to understand Islam’s overall message and Western dialogues of the “99 Cahaya di Langit Eropa” movie (Muamaroh, 2016).

Meanwhile, there was also a study which emphasized on analyzing the headline text regarding President SBY using the Gadamer’s hermeneutic approach. From this analysis, President SBY’s illustration as a figure with a high percentage of negative titles. There was a third party of ideology that covered the texts. The theoretical contribution was aimed at communication science development, especially for study development on communication advance.
through the hermeneutic approach (Muhaimin, 2012).

Media studies in hermeneutics, as far as the researcher’s search, have not been conducted by communication researchers. Studies using text analysis in online media reporting by hermeneutics approach were conducted only by Muhaimin (2012) and Prakoso (2010). However, studies regarding text content (meaning) analysis, such as music, movies, books, or historical literature review and hermeneutics thinking were found numerously (Kerr, 2019; Bhattacharya & Kim, 2018; Nyholm et al., 2018; Hasanah, 2017; Candraningtyas, 2017; Mulyono, 2017; Anwar, 2017; Crowther et al., 2016; Muamaroh, 2016; Sikh & Spence, 2016; Hamlin, 2015; Saputra, 2014; Prihananto, 2014; Ningsih, 2013; Putra, 2012; Muhaimin, 2012; Smythe & Spence, 2012; Martineau, 2012; O’Kane, 2010; Rahardjo, 2005). This study can be said as a novel study, and other studies regarding media texts using the hermeneutic approach are necessary.

Dilthey investigated that understanding objectivity will happen when the interpreter has a communicative dialogue (Safrudin, 2004). It means, in a similar interpretation, hermeneutics requires an understanding of never-ending interpretive dialogues of communication meaning (messages). It follows Gadamer’s view that hermeneutics happens all the time. Communicative efforts through languages are interactions (interpreter’s dialectics) between texts and interpreters. It also shows that communication studies with hermeneutics approach have capabilities and potential to be reviewed further. Therefore, the key focus in communication studies is the message (meaning) in texts. In this context, intertwining with the hermeneutic approach that has a primary task of interpreting texts. Hence, the hermeneutic approach emerges in interpreting messages in a text with specific meaning and historical contexts (Prakoso, 2020; Putra 2014; Martineau, 2012).

The same thing applies to Habermas, who stated that hermeneutics is a part of communication contexts. It is an idea delivering process from one subject to another and interpreting it. According to him, this creative process is not just a fact, but the subject who delivers the message has a particular meaning, so that, in the end, gives guidelines/direction for the interpreter. Also, hermeneutics becomes an interpretation that enables the emergence of understandable communicative actions (Sugiharto, 1996) (in Safrudin, 2004)

Based on this background, this article wants to show the potential of the hermeneutic approach in communicative studies. Hence, in the researcher’s search, communication researchers often conducted communication studies using content analysis, critical discourse analysis, and framing analysis. Based on data from Garuda (Garba Rujukan Digital) of the Ministry of Study, Technology, and Higher Education of the Republic of Indonesia, analysis studies were conducted using content analysis for 69,857 documents, framing analysis (221 documents), and critical discourse analysis (222 documents). These data obtained from the Garuda portal of 2010-2020 from the total 991,895 indexed articles in the Garuda portal (Garuda, 2020)

Meanwhile, another website, Rama Repository, a website of Indonesian students and lecturers studies results managed by the Ministry of Study, Technology, and Higher Education of the Republic of Indonesia, showed studies with a keyword of content analysis for 738 documents, framing analysis of (642 documents), and discourse analysis of (265 documents). These data were obtained from 662,503 documents in the
Rama Repository (Rama, 2020). On the other hand, Neliti, a searching engine of studies in Indonesia, with a period range of 2010-2020, found studies with keywords of content analysis (967 documents), framing analysis (199 documents), and critical discourse analysis (92 documents) (Neliti, 2020).

Therefore, the researcher focused on Gadamer’s hermeneutic approach. A reading towards Gadamer’s hermeneutics is vital because Gadamer has developed his hermeneutics theory and thought to be applied in general texts. Gadamer’s hermeneutics is an interpretation theory in philosophy that views an action’s meaning (text or action) is unavailable in action itself. Instead, it should be searched through others as its communication partner and is relative to the interpreter. As stated by Rahardjo (2007), to see the true meaning of discourse or talk is how the communication partner interprets it. Hence, in this case, the key to emerge communication message understanding is participation and openness, not manipulation and control.

**METHOD**

This study aimed to describe and study Gadamer’s hermeneutics review in communication studies. In achieving the study goal, this article used a qualitative method with a literature review approach. It aimed to obtain a qualitative description (theoretical-conceptual) more-in-depth through interpretation, understanding, and investigation processes in reviewing Gadamer’s hermeneutics in communication studies.

**RESULT AND DISCUSSION**

**Historicity of Hermeneutics**

Etymologically, hermeneutics came from Greek, *hemeneuein*, which means to reveal one’s thoughts in words. This verb is also defined as “translating” and “interpreter.” Then, hermeneutics term has etymology association with Greek’s god, Hermes, who has duties to deliver and translate Gods’ message to humans in humans’ language with the help of humans’ words (Gadamer, 1977: 98-99; Vollmer, 1990: 1) (Bleicher, 1980: 11) (in Rahardjo, 2007).

Jean Grondin (1994) stated that in historical records, as an interpretation method, hermeneutics could be tracked for its emergence from at least the Patristic period, if not in the Stoicism philosophy that enhances allegorical interpretation towards myths, or even on the Ancient Greek’s literature tradition. Nevertheless, hermeneutics as an interpretation method was expanding since the 17th century. The hermeneutics model before the 17th century was not definitively called as hermeneutics and has not philosophically featured (Rahardjo, 2016).

Then, regarding the hermeneutics term itself, historically first emerged in a work of Johann Konrad Dannhauer, a Deutsch theologian, titled *Hermeneutica Sacra, Sive Methodus Exponendarums Sacrarum Litterarum* written in 1654. As a theologian, hermeneutics discussed in the book limited the discussion to interpret Bible texts (Palmer, 1969: 34) (in Rahardjo, 2016).

Over time, Schleiermacher and Wilhelm Dilthey’s thoughts emerged, and new hermeneutics took different features from its antecedent. Motives of hermeneutics emergence in early times were the interpretation of scriptures and tended to philology. In Schleiermacher’s hand, hermeneutics tended to be a discipline discussing general interpretation principles. This idea climaxed in the thought of his student, Dilthey, who implemented hermeneutics as a methodology foundation for human sciences.

Then, in Rahardjo’s (2016) record, stated that hermeneutics by Heidegger and Gadamer experiences changed to
In their thinking, Hermeneutics, initially reflected as an epistemology understanding in their thoughts, was sharpened and deepened on the ontology side.

Hermeneutics was initially growing in churches as an exegesis movement (religious texts interpretation). It then developed to be an “interpretation philosophy” of social lives (Babbie, 1999: 260). F.D.E. Schleiermacher is considered as “Father of Hermeneutics. Then, hermeneutics was further developed by figures such as Wilhelm Dilthey, who initiated hermeneutics as a base for humanity studies (Geisteswissenschaften), then Gadamer developed it to a philosophical method. This development was then continued by contemporary philosophers, such as Paul Ricoeur, Jurgen Habermas, and Jacques Derrida. (Rahardjo, 2007).

Reviewing Gadamer’s Dialogic Hermeneutics

His full name is Hans-Georg Gadamer. The second child from the couple of Emma Caroline Johanna Gewiese (1869-1904) and Dr. Johannes Gadamer (1867-1928). Gadamer was born in Marburg, a city in southern Germany. In 1922, Gadamer studied at the University of Marburg and achieved a doctoral degree with his dissertation titled “The Nature of Pleasure According to Plato’s Dialogues” under philosopher Paul Natorp. After finishing his education at the University of Marburg, Gadamer tried to take a job as a private lecturer (privatdozent), which required him to finish Habilitation Schrift first. Towards the Habilitation, Gadamer attended Martin Heidegger’s lecture in 1923 at the University of Freiburg. Over time, Gadamer received a position as a new lecturer from August 1953 at the University of Marburg (Muzir, 2012).


As an interpretation method, hermeneutics is not only looking at texts but also try to dive into its literal meaning. However, based on Rahadjo’s (2007) review, on Gadamer’s hermeneutics, the meaning is searched, constructed, and reconstructed by the interpreter according to the context where the interpretation was created that the text meaning will never be standardized. Therefore, the texts’ meaning is continuously changing depending on how, when, and who is the reader. In line with Gadamer’s understanding (1975), hermeneutics is based on subjects and objects. The subject is the interpreter, while the object is the interpretative goal. The subject’s role on the object is defining what the object means. Understanding is emphasized in the structure of experience. The structure of an experience is a dialectic effort. Experience dialectic is not only knowing, but about openness towards free-played experiences by the experience itself. This process became the pioneer of a concept called the fusion of horizons.

The process of finding understanding
upon text interpretation by an interpreter is the core of Gadamer’s hermeneutics. However, according to Gadamer (Bleicher, 2007), an understanding gap may occur due to figures who pay full attention to an ‘understanding.’ Gadamer highlighted awareness idea, text interpretation, and phenomena, and investigated philosophical problems as ontology development.

There are two reasons why Gadamer emphasizes the importance of understanding as comprehension or approval; first, to find an understanding means to reconstruct, without siding the favourable meaning to the author (Chalik, 2010: 28) (in Hasanah, 2017; Maimunah, 2004). Comprehension is a process to understand each other to come to an understanding (Gadamer, 1975: 280) (in Hasanah, 2017; Maimunah, 2004). To understand, according to Gadamer, is articulating meaning, something, or an event to sentences and is closely related to language. Second, approval means emphasizing facts that readers or interpreters have the same basic approval and understanding of the text. Approval aims to emphasize what the interpreter talks about through language, dialogue, or conversation, and utter it by words (Hasanah, 2017; Maimunah, 2004). It shows Gadamer’s hermeneutics as dialogic hermeneutics.

According to Gadamer, the interpreter’s positions are the main operational to find the meaning of a text. It is following the explanation of hermeneutics as an ontology. Gadamer suggested that the interpreter can reveal new meanings by interpreting a text that dialectic with the text itself. This meaning determines the ontology position in the interpreter (Gadamer, 2004).

**Hermeneutics Potential in Communication Studies** 

Hermeneutics has potential regarding communication studies in America. “Hermeneutics offers an alternative perspective to the reductionist approach of a natural science grounded in a realist epistemology. Hermeneutics also has the potential to fulfill this same role concerning contemporary approaches in American communication studies (Carey, 1977; Deetz, 1973, 1977) (in Radford, 1991). For the researcher, this framework is interesting to be studied in the scope of contemporary communication related to text analysis using hermeneutics as a theory or method. This hermeneutics study can contribute to contemporary communication science study development.

In this article, the researcher is based on the hermeneutics study developed by Hans-Georg Gadamer because Gadamer’s hermeneutics is one of the hermeneutics that opens an understanding path on general texts. Gadamer is so different from his predecessors. Gadamer tried to build his hermeneutics with a popular concept called the fusion of horizons.

Moreover, in understanding Gadamer’s hermeneutics, the understanding process is conducted by aiming to truth disclosure that can be understood as changing, non-stagnant, and dynamic life experiences according to the interpreter’s experiences (Moules, 2002). It is principally conducted to reveal new thought horizon by digging meanings and considering horizons covering the text, namely interpreter’s horizons and the text’s horizon itself (Gadamer, 1975, Siswanto, 2016, Rahardjo, 2016, Hardiman, 2015. Here is the Gadamer’s dialogic hermeneutics model (Maulidin, 2003, in Rahardjo, 2016).

To generate a hermeneutics understanding, as shown in FIGURE 1, Gadamer explains that interpreting meaning requires own assumption, in this case, personal (the interpreter) assumption into the situational context.
The interpreter is related to tradition, practical interest, language, and culture. Meanwhile, the text always includes its historical relation and context. The real meaning achievement of the observed object is never finished—Gadamer considers it as an infinite process (Gadamer, 1989) (in Martineau, 2012).

In understanding a text’s meaning in hermeneutics study, there are two primary reasons for hermeneutics exploration: (1) there is a text to be explored and explained; (2) meaning related to phenomena is identified as unclear, or unclear phenomena (Sikh & Spence, 2016). Based on those reasons, in achieving the understanding process of hermeneutic interpretation, here are operational steps of Gadamer’s hermeneutics method in communication studies:

• First, exploring general texts: magazines, books, poetries, songs, movies, reports, documents/articles, and printed or online texts.
• Second, based on the explored text, the next step is to find the text comprehension using the interpreter’s interpretation analysis. The process to achieve comprehension of the text’s meaning is by sharing viewpoints/horizons and interpreters’ approaches according to tradition, practical interest, language and communication, ideology, experience, socio-politics relationship, interaction process, technology, and culture.
• Third, creating a comprehension over the fusion of interpreters’ horizons (understanding as a ‘fusion of horizons’). From these interpreters’ meaning results, the text meaning can be found; 1) identification of findings, i.e., interpretations of text’s interpreters, and 2) results of understanding, i.e., interpretation understanding of interpreters’ dialogue findings.

Technically, the researcher illustrates the operational steps of Gadamer’s hermeneutics method more-in-depth as follows:

In FIGURE 2, Gadamer’s hermeneutics method is explained. There are two crucial elements to understand Gadamer’s hermeneutics, i.e., horizon or so-called text’s horizon and interpreter’s horizon. Text’s horizon, for Gadamer, is something to be interpreted. Substantially, hermeneutics study is based on text problems so that text is the initial operation to start the interpreting process. The text mentioned by Gadamer is language as the
media used in hermeneutics (Gadamer, 2004).

Second, there is an interpreter’s horizon. The interpreter’s horizon is the side of a person interpreting (the interpreter) the text. In the effort of interpreting, the interpreter is covered by influence, traditional background, practical interest, language, culture, ideology, experience, socio-politics relationship, interaction process, technology, and more. This is what Gadamer explains how the interpreter conducts dialectic, interactive discourses of all things covering the interpreter to understand the various meanings. From texts, there are various meanings—in deepening the meaning understanding in Gadamer’s hermeneutics approach—following the viewpoint of Nyholm et al. (2018), stating that it is possible to generate a deeper, more dynamic understanding, and enhance the opportunity of new meaning understanding. This is also the case in Spence’s (2001) understanding (in Sikh & Spence, 2016) that stated the possibility of understanding expansion. Therefore, a never-ending interpretation process may occur because interpretation is dynamic. The process of this condition is called the hermeneutic cycle or Fusion of Horizons.

Hermeneutics in Interpretive Paradigm

When a theory emerges and develops, a clear methodology principle must be understood and used for theoretical and methodical bases. One of the methodology principles is a study paradigm. Denzin & Lincoln (1998) defined paradigm as a basic belief system that guides the researcher to conduct a study, not only in choosing a method but also ontologically and epistemologically fundamental ways. “Basic belief system or world view that guides the investigator, not only in choices of a method but in ontologically and epistemologically fundamental ways.” In this meaning, the paradigm can be understood as a viewpoint based on assumption, concept, and proposition, so that the researcher’s thought process is directed and comprehensive in viewing reality.

Paradigm is also a study’s perspective used by the researcher, containing how the researcher views the reality (world views), how to learn phenomena, methods used in the study, and methods used in expressing findings (Gunawan, 2016). In this context, the paradigm used in communication studies is Gadamer’s hermeneutics as theory and method and called an interpretive paradigm. It is even possible to be included as a critical paradigm.

Theoretical reasons why hermeneutics are included as interpretive paradigm refer to Neuman (2016), who explained that interpretative social

![FIGURE 2. Operational of Gadamer’s Hermeneutics Method (processed by the researcher)](image-url)
science corresponds to hermeneutics, symbolic interaction. The interpretive paradigm has several variations, such as constructionism, ethnomethodology, cognitive, idealist, phenomenologist, subjectivist, and qualitative sociologist. It aims to understand the social meaning in its context. The suitable condition with the social creature that interacts and creates reinforces each of their interaction (Neuman, 2016). This framework is following the hermeneutics core discussed interaction and meaning understanding (message/text).

Some experts/thinkers view the interpretive paradigm, which in many cases, also called the constructivism paradigm, emphasizes that a study is conducted to understand the world’s bare reality. It is an understanding of the social world’s fundamental characteristics on subjective experience level. It is an understanding that emphasizes the social order, consensus, social integration and cohesion, solidarity, and actuality. Moreover, the interpretive paradigm that roots from this German though tradition includes vast philosophical and sociological thoughts, but has the same effort characteristics to understand and explain the social world. This similarity originated from the viewpoint that an actor is directly involved in a social process. Therefore, in constructing social science, one should not focus on structural analysis because the social world is a non-independent reality of a human’s framework as a social actor. Thoughts included in this interpretive paradigm are hermeneutics, solipsism, phenomenology, symbolic interactionism, ethnomethodology, and ethnography (Burrell & Morgan, 1979).

Interpretive viewpoint in several aspects, generally following a non-positivism viewpoint. Specifically, the researcher identifies study characteristics in the interpretive paradigm as seen on TABLE 1 (Salim, 2001).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Interpretive</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Study objective</td>
<td>Conducts understanding, interpretation, and reconstruction of social acts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role of theory</td>
<td>As the step to arrange description and understanding to groups of society to be studied</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Characteristics of knowledge</td>
<td>A reconstruction of an individual’s thought which then developed to society consensus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role of common sense</td>
<td>The power of a theory comes from daily life that should be utilized by society maximally</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accumulation of knowledge</td>
<td>More reports from thought reconstruction; as if coming from own experiences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scope of explanation</td>
<td>Ideography</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>True explanation</td>
<td>Conformity of goodwill to those who realize they are learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good evidence</td>
<td>Implanted in the context of social interaction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality criteria</td>
<td>Trustworthy and genuine and can contain misunderstandings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Value and ethics</td>
<td>Values are an integral part of social interactions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voice</td>
<td>“Passionate participant” as a facilitator with many choices and the ability to reconstruct</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Hermeneutics: Study Methodology

In this context, when talking about a theory, a study paradigm, it is now necessary to identify the method used for hermeneutics. Methodologically, a study in communication studies using Gadamer’s hermeneutics, is more dominant with a qualitative approach. Because, in general, a qualitative approach, namely, the researcher tries to understand and describe reality in depth (Barlian, 2016; Kriyantono, 2010). The characteristic of a qualitative study is that it does not focus on the population’s size or sampling; even the population or sampling is minimal. If there is data collected in-depth and can explain what is being studied, then there is no need to look for another sampling. In this case, the emphasis is on the issue of data depth (quality), not on the amount (quantity) of data (Kriyantono, 2010).

Qualitative study, according to Moleong (2007), is study that aims to try to understand the phenomenon of what study subjects experience holistically, and by means of descriptions in the form of words and language, in a special natural context and by utilizing various scientific methods. (Rosyidi et al., 2010) this meaning, hermeneutics in seeking a deep, comprehensive understanding. Maka, secara prinsip-metodologis, hermeneutika Gadamer senada dengan penelitian yang bersifat kualitatif. Sebab, untuk menemukan pemahaman mendalam, diperlukan penggalian penafsiran secara kualitatif; penjelasan dengan deskripsi-deskripsi.

Furthermore, after understanding hermeneutics within the study scope with a qualitative approach, a data source or data collection technique is currently needed. Sources of study data in communication studies using hermeneutics are; documentation/literature study and in-depth interviews. According to Arikunto (2000), documentation study is looking for data about things or variables in the form of notes, transcripts, books, newspapers, magazines, inscriptions, and more.

Meanwhile, according to Soehartono (1999), documentation study is a data collection technique that is not directly addressed to the study subject. However, the documents understudy can be in various forms, not only official documents. Then, the study of documentation points to obtaining direct data from agencies/institutions, including books, reports on activities in agencies/institutions relevant to the study (Riduwan, 2012).

From the mentioned view, hermeneutics, in the investigation of understanding, texts, such as books, newspapers, magazines, reports, or documents, even music, films, and other texts, are needed. These texts are an essential source of data for study studies of communication with hermeneutics.

Second, interview. In-depth interviews (in-depth interviews) are a way to obtain study data that begins by asking questions orally (verbal communication) to informants/data sources and informants responding (answers) to questions raised by researchers. In-depth interviews are used to get direct data (information) and want to get the depth of data from the source (Barlian, 2016; Nurdin & Hartati, 2019).

Therefore, it is in line with a communication study that uses hermeneutics, namely, by using in-depth interview data sources, with the reason to find the understanding of the interpreters (sources, informants) of a message/text to be studied. This shows that the purpose of the interview is to find interpretations of a particular problem/phenomenon/reality, including a text, where the interviewee is asked for his opinion and ideas (interpretation) in-depth to find the meanings of ‘understanding.’
CONCLUSION

In this study, as an alternative theory and method in developing communication studies, hermeneutic positions emerge and produce a deeper, more dynamic understanding, and increase the chances of understanding new interpreters’ interpretations. Hermeneutic manifestations are dynamic, contextual interpretations by the interpreters of a text. An interpreter to build a hermeneutical understanding cannot be separated from tradition, practical interests, language and communication, ideology, experience, socio-political relations, interaction processes, technology, culture. In practical terms, referring to hermeneutic understanding is very relevant to the study of communication. It is hoped that this article will contribute to the improvement of the treasures of contemporary communication. On the other hand, there are deficiencies in this article in the form of the absence of a detailed explanation of previous studies of communication studies through Gadamer’s Hermeneutics.

Recommendations from the results and discussion of this article are that further study is needed on conceptual study or the results of a field study on communication studies, regarding the analysis of text content in the media; headlines in online or print media using other contemporary hermeneutic approaches, such as Jacques Derrida’s hermeneutic deconstruction. Besides, it is hoped that further study can use other online media with two comparisons, namely speeches, books, novels, even contemporary songs or poetry content. Through qualitative data sources from two different media in one topic of discussion aims to get a more comprehensive understanding process, enable exciting findings, and are up to date, not only focusing on one point of view of the object of study. This is because the process of understanding in hermeneutic studies will not stop at a single conclusion, and intertwine by making it possible to create new understandings. In the end, this will be a challenge for future communication thinkers.
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