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The field here means research on

- Mainly mass communication including journalism, press, radio, television, film and the public spheres they facilitate
- Not speech, organizational communication, PR, advertising or other institutions facilitated by non-mass communication
- Internet-based “social communication” emerged as a new area falling both within and outside public communication

Let’s now rehearse its history, first before the 1960s
The State of Communication Research

BY BERNARD BERELSON

From time to time the Public Opinion Quarterly reviews the progress that has been made in one of the fields of research within its ken and surveys the current status of work in that field. Without waiting to publish a special issue, it presents in the following article and discussion a review of communication research which is of modest dimensions but unusual significance.

Bernard Berelson is Director-Designate of the Bureau of Applied Social Research at Columbia University. He is now Professor of the Behavioral Sciences at the University of Chicago and Director of the Study of Graduate Education. His article is based on a paper he presented at the 1959 Conference of the American Association for Public Opinion Research. It is discussed by Wilbur Schramm, Director of the Institute for Communication Research at Stanford University, David Riesman, Professor of Sociology at Harvard University, and Raymond A. Bauer, Ford Foundation Visiting Professor at the Graduate School of Business Administration, Harvard University.

My theme is that, as for communication research, the state is withering away.

The modern version of communication research began about twenty-five years ago with the development of both academic and commercial interest—the former largely coordinated, if not stimulated, by the Rockefeller Foundation seminar of the late 1930's and the latter developed in response to radio's need to prove its audience. Since then there has been a great deal of research activity on both fronts, so much so that for a time the field exhibited many of the characteristics of a scientific fad. What has it all come to and where do we now stand?

THE PAST

In the past twenty-five years or so, there have been four major approaches to communication research, and perhaps six minor ones. The four major approaches are so well characterized by their leading proponents that it is convenient and revealing here to identify them by name, as in the chart below. In my view, the major lines of inquiry have been the political approach, represented by Lasswell; the sample survey approach, represented by Lazarsfeld; the small-groups approach, represented by Lewin; and the experimental approach, represented by Hovland. (Whether Lewin really should be counted as a student of “communication research” is a matter of definition with which I am not particularly concerned here.) Lasswell, with his interest in broad socio-political considerations, represents a macrocosmic line: Lazarsfeld and
out direct and immediate regard to the detailed, empirical underpinning. David Riesman and others have made important contributions along this line already, as a counter-balance to the minute and atomistic inquiry, and I look forward to more such studies in the future.

5. Popular culture. Some interests that earlier would have been called communication are now being followed up under this heading. With aesthetic aspects emphasized, the field has a chance to get some help from humanistic studies, and the cooperation ought to be stimulating. Communication problems have been reflected on a great deal in the past—by very good minds—and such reflection should have a good deal to say to the modern empirical researcher.

6. Mass communication. Such “new generation” sociologists as James Coleman and William McPherson tell me that the first word needs more emphasis relative to the second. Their position is that the field is better seen as one of a variety of mass activities and that headway will be made by stressing the similarities of such mass phenomena rather than the particularities attaching to a mass communication system. That is, the oblique attack may yield more than the frontal.

7. Practical affairs. One way an intellectual field can advance is by dealing directly with the theoretical problems of the discipline itself. Another is by dealing with practical problems to which the discipline can contribute answers. The former is the academic approach and the latter the professional. Of our four major figures, Lasswell, Lewin, and Hovland were primarily concerned with academic matters, and only Lazarsfeld was sometimes concerned with professional problems. A practical, or more professional, turn may now be indicated.

In sum, then, it seems to me that “the great ideas” that gave the field of communication research so much vitality ten and twenty years ago have to a substantial extent worn out. No new ideas of comparable magnitude have appeared to take their place. We are on a plateau of research development, and have been for some time. There are two ways to look at this phenomenon, assuming that it is correctly gauged. One is to regret that no new “breakthrough” has developed in recent years; the other is to be grateful that the field has a period of time to assimilate, incorporate, and exploit the imaginative innovations of the major figures. The reader reads the journals; he can take his choice.

COMMENTS BY WILSUS SCHRAMM

When one has been pronounced dead, it is ungracious to rise and make comments. Indeed, it shows a certain lack of faith in the attending physician. Nothing is farther from my wishes than to show any lack of faith in my friend Bernard Berelson, and therefore if he pronounces us dead I am content to believe him.

But it is a somewhat livelier condition than I had anticipated. I have just come from the doctoral examination of a young man who demonstrated depth in psychology, sociology, mathematics, and research method, as well
The Beginnings of Communication Study in America
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by Wilbur Schramm

Edited by Steven H. Chaffee and Everett M. Rogers
Forefathers in USA

- Political scientist Harold Lasswell
- Sociologist Paul Lazarsfeld
- Psychologist Carl Hovland
- Social psychologist Kurt Lewin

Other North American traditions

- Chicago school (John Dewey – Walter Lippmann)
- Frankfurt school (Theodore Adorno, Eric Fromm et al)
- Toronto school (Harold Innis, Marshall McLuhan)
Marshall McLuhan (Toronto, April 1967)
Forefathers in Europe

• Communication and change: Karl Marx (1818–1883)
• Nerves of society: Albert Schäffle (1831–1903)
• News of society: Karl Knies (1821–1898)
• Press as commerce: Karl Bücher (1848–1930)
• Mirrors of society: Ferdinand Tönnies (1855–1936)
• Consciousness of society: Max Weber (1864–1920)

Other European traditions

• Germany: Zeitungswissenschaft, Publizistik (Dovifat)
• France: Filmologie, structuralism (Barthes)
• Britain: Cultural studies (Williams, Hall)
Prehistory

- Enlightenment and democracy with freedom of opinion and press, public debate (18th Century)
- Catholic church propaganda (17th C)
- Greece philosophers Plato, Aristotle (3-4th C BC)
- Chinese philosopher Confucius (5th C BC)
- Arab and Persian cultures
Development since the 1950s

- Media and its study becomes *popular* as shown above
- Media and the field turns *political*: Lerner (1950-55), UNESCO (1970-80s), WSIS (2003-05)
- The field gets *diversified*
  - by focus: production, content, audience…
  - by approach: social scientific, political economy, cultural studies…

Let’s now recall cases of the field turning *political*
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Lerner in Preface to the paperback edition (1964)

A decade of effort went into the studies from which this book was made. Another half-decade has passed since the book appeared. These fifteen years have witnessed the passing of traditional society from every continent. No area of the world has resisted the attractions, despite the increasingly evident risks, of modernization. The emerging nations have hastened to become new states and emulate the ways of modern societies.

Haste has made waste; risks have turned into losses. The “want: get ratio” has been upset – since people have learned to want for more than they can get. As a result, the “revolution of rising expectations” we celebrated so confidently fifteen years ago has, in many places, become a “revolution of rising frustrations.” Modernization is harder than one supposed...
WHOSE FREEDOM? WHOSE ORDER?

A Plea for a New International Information Order by Third World

D. R. Mankekar
NEW

INTERNATIONAL INFORMATION AND COMMUNICATION ORDER
SOURCEBOOK

INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATION OF JOURNALISTS
PRAGUE 1986
Geneva 2003 & Tunis 2005
Let’s now turn to the field getting *diversified* as demonstrated by samples of...

- scholarly journals – dominated by American publishers and English language
- contemporary books
- international association sections and interest groups
Health Communication in Africa

Review Article:

How effective is HIV and AIDS communication in Africa?
Eliza M. Govender,
University of KwaZulu-Natal, Durban, South Africa

Newspaper coverage of health issues in Nigeria
Vitalis Tonwell and Coboh Rodney
Benue State University, Makurdi, Nigeria

The failure of radio to communicate knowledge of sickle cell
disorder in Nigeria
Edidiong Umana and Ayobami Ojebode
University of Ibadan, Ibadan, Nigeria

Ethnicity and doctor-patient communication in Kenya
Ann Neville Miller
University of Central Florida, Orlando, Florida, USA

How participatory is “participatory communication” for
HIV/AIDS awareness in South Africa
E.M. Govender, E. Durden, and S. Reddy
University of KwaZulu-Natal, Durban, South Africa

The effectiveness of interpersonal communication for
HIV/AIDS positive persons in Tanzania
Noel Joram
St. Augustine University of Tanzania

Applying health communication strategies to the classroom in
South Africa:
A values-based entertainment education approach
Amy Chesser, Wichita State University, Wichita, Kansas, USA
Top 20 countries of authors in 43 journals

1: Number of articles  
2: Share of articles  
3: ICA conference attendance  
4: Population size  
5: Visibility correlation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>US</td>
<td>3,225</td>
<td>66.2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UK</td>
<td>642</td>
<td>13.2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Netherlands</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>China and Hong Kong</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Israel</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>.9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Korea, Rep. of</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>.9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>.8</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>.8</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finland</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>.7</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spain</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>.6</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belgium</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>.6</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>.6</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Zealand</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>.6</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Switzerland</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>.5</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taiwan</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>.5</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denmark</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>.4</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>4,875</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Spearman’s correlation of visibility with population is .51 and with conference attendance .85.

(Lauf 2005, 144)
THE GEOPOLITICS OF REPRESENTATION IN FOREIGN NEWS

Explaining Darfur

BELLA MODY

Foreword by Mukesh Kapila
Cosmopolitan Communications
Cultural Diversity in a Globalized World
Media and Participation
A site of ideological-democratic struggle
Nico Carpentier
The Handbook of Media Audiences
Sections & interest groups in associations focus on

- Audience
- Community
- Education
- Environment
- Ethnicity and race
- Gender
- Health
- History
- Intercultural & international
- Interpersonal & speech
- Islam
- Journalism
Sections & interest groups, cont.

- Law and policy
- Management and economics
- Organizations
- Philosophy
- Political economy
- Politics
- Popular culture
- Production
- Public relations
- Religion
- Sports
- Visual culture
Associations reflect and consolidate the field nationally, regionally & internationally

- National associations in speech and journalism studies since the 1910s
- International association in communication and media pushed by UNESCO since 1946
- International Association for Mass Communication Research (IAMCR) in 1957
- Regional centres and associations in Asia (AMIC) and Latin America (CIESPAL) in the late 1960s
International Association for Mass Communication Research (IAMCR) founding fathers in late 1957, when IAMCR was founded

From the left: Francesco Fattorello (Italy), Fernand Terrou (France), Evgeniy Khudyakov (USSR), Jacques Leaute (France) and Mieczyslaw Kafel (Poland).
What has the field achieved?

- Contributed to modernization plus post-industrial, postmodern society and globalization
- Constructed the hubris of media independence and Information Society
- Integrated social sciences and humanities while delinking from their roots
- Created interdisciplinary specialities highlighting new phenomena and canonizing them
- The expanded field became more and more differentiated, with new media & Internet boosting specialities, which easily gained the status of another major subject and discipline in the academic nomenclature
What should be done?

• It is deceptive to celebrate popularity of the field with the distinction of new disciplines

• Be open to novelties but do not let them carry you to a “surfing syndrome” whereby one eclectically combines features without in-depth analysis

• With such a trend the field is both losing its healthy roots to basic disciplines (sociology, political science, linguistics, literature, etc) and it is also turning more and more dependent on empirical and practical aspects of reality – typically applied research serving existing institutions, i.e. administrative instead of critical research
• Respect diversity but not at the expense of coherence
• I call for serious soul-searching and critical examination of the identity of the field, by
• studying the history of ideas in the field to understand how communication and media study has evolved and how it relates to other fields of inquiry
• pursuing research on research to deal with the concepts of communication and mediation in relation to the system of sciences
• Welcome to fascinating realm of self-reflection of the field!
FERMENT IN THE FIELD:
NOTES ON THE
EVOLUTION OF
COMMUNICATION
STUDIES AND ITS
DISCIPLINARY NATURE

KAARLE
NORDENSTRENG

Abstract

One of the questions addressed by the colloquium
focused on the changing status and character of
communication and media studies in universities. This
article follows that institutional perspective about
communication research in general and critical media
studies in particular. First the evolution of the field since
the 1950s is reviewed through a number of stages,
which coincide with the history of leftist thinking – six
ferments, one for each decade. Then the disciplinary
nature of the field is discussed, with special reference
to the ongoing reform of higher education in Europe
known as the “Bologna process.” An illustrative case is
provided by a survey of the field in the Scandinavian
countries. The conclusion is that there is a need for
radical reflection about the discipline in the contempo-
rary world, calling for an approach to media studies in
terms of the philosophy of science. The article presents
notes for further thought rather than suggests final
scenarios, and this is done from an admittedly personal
and national perspective – as a veteran of the field and
as a member of the Finnish community.

Kaarle Nordenstreng is
professor of Journalism
and Mass Communication
at the University of
Tampere, Finland, e-mail:
kaarle.nordenstreng@uta.fi.
Discipline or Field?

*Soul-searching in Communication Research*

KAARLE NORDENSTRENG

Abstract
The terms of (mass) communication research and media studies are widely used to refer to an academic discipline, usually established in universities as a major or minor subject, a department or institute and sometimes even a school or college. It is implied that this young field is by now a discipline in its own right alongside such traditional disciplines as history, literature, sociology or political science. However, the nature of the discipline often remains unclear, while its identity is typically determined by administrative convenience and market demand rather than analysis of its historical development and scholarly position within the system of arts and sciences. This chapter discusses the nature and terminology of the discipline, with examples of Finland and other Nordic countries, and it advocates the need for a continuous self-assessment of the research community.

Key Words: communication research, media studies, academic disciplines, philosophy of science, Nordic research conferences

Introduction: The Field Expanded and Diversified
Throughout the past 50 years, the field of communication research has expanded perhaps more than any other academic field apart from computer science and biomedicine. Its status next to the old established fields has been consolidated, but its expansion has also led to friction and conflict between the old "ivy league" sciences and this new and popular "Mickey Mouse studies", as it is called by opponents in the UK debate (a regular topic in the British The Times Higher Education Supplement). The conflicts are not based on mere prestige and jealousy, but literally on the vital prospects of each field – not least the old and established – in the middle of the so-called structural adjustment of universities.

In its expansion, the field has become more and more diversified. Different media (newspapers, magazines, radio, television, cinema, etc.) and different aspects of communication (journalism, visual communication, media culture, media economy, etc.) have emerged as more or less independent branches of the field. This multiplication process has not been halted by the convergence development brought about by the digitalisation of media production and distribution. On the contrary, new media, Internet, etc., have entered as further specialities in media studies, often gaining the status of another study programme, major subject or even a discipline of its own.

Placed in a broader perspective of the history of science, such multiplication is quite problematic. The field is both deserting its roots in such basic disciplines as psychol-
Chapter 16

Media studies as an academic discipline

Kaarle Nordenstreng

The concept of 'media studies' or 'media and communication' is widely used in referring to an academic discipline established in universities as a major or minor subject, a department or institute and sometimes even a school or college. It is typically implied that this relatively young field is by now a discipline in its own right alongside such traditional disciplines as history, literature, sociology and political science. However, the nature of the discipline remains unclear, while it is determined by administrative convenience and market demand rather than analysis of its historical development and scholarly position within the system of arts and sciences. This chapter discusses the nature of the discipline, using examples from Finland and other Nordic countries.

The field expanded and diversified

Throughout the past fifty years, the field of media studies has expanded perhaps more than any other academic field, apart from computer science and biomedicine. This may be a wild generalization — not based on systematic data covering all disciplines around the world (hardly available anywhere) — but it is supported by other colleagues (notably Donsbach quoted below). In any case, the status of media studies has been consolidated, next to the old-established fields, but its expansion has also led to friction with the old 'ivy league' sciences, which often view this rising and popular field as 'Mickey Mouse studies' (see the British debate in the Times Higher Education Supplement). The conflicts are not just based on prestige and jealousy but literally on the vital prospects of each field — not least the old and established — in the midst of the so-called structural adjustment of universities.

In its expansion, the field has become more and more diversified. Different media (newspapers, magazines, radio, television, cinema, etc.) and different aspects of communication (journalism, visual communication, media culture, media economy, etc.) have emerged as more or less independent branches of the field. This multiplication process has not been halted by the convergence brought about by the digitization of media production and distribution.
LOST IN ABUNDANCE?

Reflections on disciplinarity

Kaarle Nordenstreng

In 1959, Bernard Berelson announced that communication research was “withering away.” His obituary of the field turned out to be so fundamentally mistaken that it stands out as a monument in the historical landscape of communication research. Coincidentally, the same gallery of 1959 monuments includes the setting of the foundation stone for the Annenberg School for Communication (ASC), which since then has been a central source of scholarship proving Berelson wrong. As someone who has been active in the field during its predicted period of decimation, both attending the school’s conferences since the early 1970s and publishing in its journal since the mid-1970s, I use this chapter to offer some reflections about the overall profile of the field of communication, with a focus on media studies as a window on the field’s disciplinary status.

Development of the field: expansion, diversity, ferment

Over the fifty years, the associated fields of communication and media studies have expanded perhaps more than any other academic field apart from computer science and biomedicine. Evidence of this growth is supported by the data presented in Figure 19.1.

Although the validity of the database and its categories may be debatable, the overall picture they provide is unequivocal: communication and media studies have grown over the past half-century, moving from the margins into a distinguished class alongside other modes of inquiry, including psychology, and surpassing sociology (the peak in computer science was obviously caused by the millennium bug). By the end of the twentieth century, the status of communication and media studies had gained a firm footing next to older, more established fields. Their rapid expansion also led to friction with many of the old “Ivy League” sciences, which challenged the rising and popular area of inquiry to the extent that The Times Higher Education Supplement dubbed them “Mickey Mouse studies.” The conflicts were based not merely on jealousy,
Thank you!
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