Making the University Matter

Making the University Matter investigates how academics situate themselves simultaneously in the university and the world, and how doing so affects the viability of the university setting.

The university stands at the intersection of two sets of interests, needing to be at one with the world while aspiring to stand apart from it. In an era that promises intensified political instability, growing administrative pressures, dwindling economic returns and questions about economic viability, lower enrollments, and shrinking programs, can the university continue to matter into the future? And if so, in what way? What will help it survive as an honest broker? What are the mechanisms for ensuring its independent voice?

Barbie Zelizer brings together some of the leading names in the field of media and communication studies from around the globe to consider a multiplicity of views from across the curriculum on making the university matter, including critical scholarship, interdisciplinarity, curricular blends of the humanities and social sciences, practical training, and policy work.

The chapters are organized into the following six sections:

- On teaching and learning
- Models of intellectual engagement
- Making intellectual work public
- Economies of knowledge
- Institutionalization and technology
- Default settings and their complications

The collection is introduced with an essay by the editor. Each section has a brief introduction to contextualize the chapters within it and highlight the issues they raise.

Barbie Zelizer is the Raymond Williams Professor of Communication and Director of the Scholars Program in Culture and Communication at the University of Pennsylvania's Annenberg School for Communication.
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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 19.1.5

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.”6 The conflicts were based not merely on jealousy,

but on the survival prospects of each field—least the old and established—at a time when the universities themselves were being streamlined more and more according to market demands.

While expanding, the field of communication and media studies became more and more diversified. The ascent of different media (print, electronic, online) and different aspects of communication (journalism, visual communication, media economy) emerged and developed into more or less independent branches. This process of proliferation was in no way halted by the convergence brought about by the digitalization of media production and distribution. Taken together, the expansion and diversity of the field made it overabundant. Placed in a broader perspective of the history of science, such proliferation is not only normal, but problematic. Communication and media studies are today so abundant that the field runs the risk of both losing sight of its scholarly roots and embracing only the surface of the realities it investigates.

The problematic that arises here has been debated before. I addressed it in my response to Brenda Dervin’s 2004 question “How do you account for the field’s many approaches, foci, methodologies, methods? Is this diversity strength or weakness?”7 In 2004, I argued that it was both. Nowadays, as then, I am concerned with its weaknesses. I am particularly concerned with the possibility of diversity turning into
surging. The rapidly expanded field has become so differentiated, buttressed by convergence, that new media such as the Internet have given extended grounds for highly specialized and often unconnected focal points of interest in communication and media studies. With such a development, the field is both losing its healthy roots in the more basic disciplines that have retained a definitive core — sociology, political science, linguistics, and literature — and is becoming more dependent on the empirical and practical dimensions of reality. This means that applied research is increasingly being used to service existing institutions in the field, and we are back in the old division between administrative and critical research.

Thus we may be fooling ourselves by celebrating the popularity of communication and media studies at the expense of a legitimate concern for the ill-focused development of the discipline, or, worse yet, the development of several unconnected disciplines. I thereby call for serious soul-searching and a critical examination of the identity of the field. It is time again to return to the crossroads suggested so many years ago.

I refer here to the crossroads question highlighted in 1959 by Wulff-Schämm at his response to Berelson: is mass communication research really a discipline or just a field? Mobilizing, years later, an exercise in clarifying the "ferment in the field," in the *Journal of Communication* in the early 1980s, the uncertainty over communication being either a discipline or a field gave way to a widespread review of the field's major research paradigms and their challenges — not least the challenges posed by leftist-critical thinking. The resulting special issue served as a timely reminder of the need to stand back periodically and review what we are doing. A second look at the ferment in the field was taken up by the same journal ten years later, but that turned out to be just another overview between fragmentation and cohesion (the issue title). More of such ferment was since exposed by other histories of the field, which looked at the international landscape, focused on particular regions, or targeted specific areas of scholarship, as well as providing context for anthologies of the classics.

A crucial ingredient of the ferment that began during the 1980s was the fact that the mainstream scholarly tradition, dominated by logical positivism and quantitative methods, was challenging by critical schools of thought both from Marxist/materialist and humanistic quarters. One point, often forgotten, is the tremendous tension that had built up across generations along with the field's expansion in the 1970s. It was not always an easy and natural development that growth was accompanied by diversity; in reality, the diversity often had to break in through bitter struggles — both intellectual and political — opening wounds that took decades to heal. The histories of national and international research associations may tell exciting stories of this.

A landmark in this regard was the International Communication Association (ICA) annual convention in 1985 in Honolulu, where then president-elect Brenda Dervin staged "paradigm dialogues" with Stuart Hall and Anthony Giddens, both of whom spoke for the anti-hegemonic traditions. After the event, Dervin received anonymous poison-pen letters for inviting these "Marxists" to destabilize the field's normality and to "fracture ICA's center." Accordingly, diversity represented a challenge to the paradigmatic status quo and political conservatism, advocating change and instigating polarization. But history shows that this ferment was an indispensable stage of development. It led to the development of more qualitative approaches in the field, embodied in the establishment of new institutional divisions of ICA, such as those representing philosophy of communication and feminist scholarship. The two volumes of *Rethinking Communication* that resulted from this convention initiative, co-edited by Dervin with Grosberg, O'Keefe and Wartella, stand as a milestone next to the *Journal of Communication* 's earlier "ferment in the field."

More recently, a useful overview of the present global landscape of communication and media studies — and its disciplinary tensions — was provided by Wolfgang Donsbach in his presidential address to the 2005 ICA conference in New York. His first thesis was that communication as a research field had seen the greatest growth of probably all academic fields over the previous thirty years. His counter-thesis, however, was less celebratory, problematizing that same growth: "Communication still lacks, and even loses, identity," he noted, based on a survey of ICA members, arguing that "the field increasingly suffers from epistemological erosion." Donsbach's third thesis went even further: "We have precise and sound knowledge in many areas — but (counterthesis) we tend to lose normative orientation in empirical research." I fully agree with all of these points, and I argued for the last one already in the late 1960s (see note 9).

The big picture over the past fifty years, then, is that communication and media studies have indeed undergone an impressive expansion and consolidation. Instead of withering away, we have witnessed a phenomenal growth, which has brought them to the centre of contemporary paradigms of socio-economic development, embodied most explicitly in notions of the information society. As expressed in the editor's epilogue to the ferment issue of 1983, "if Marx were alive today, his principal work would be entitled *Communications* rather than *Capital.*" At the same time, however, this growth has brought its own problems, which raise questions about the very core of the field that growth was supposed to strengthen.

I have mixed feelings about this success story. I perceive that the field, with all its abundance, runs the risk of becoming professionally self-centred and scientifically shallow. What I call the "paradox of communication and media studies" suggests that our task in communication and media studies should be to deconstruct the naive view that communication is the core of society, and that we thus need to specialize in undoing media inuas. If we do not, I worry that we are just continuing to feed an already combustible bubble. Journalism has a special tendency to mystify its profession within a fortress sheltered by the constitutional freedom of information. Accordingly, there are good grounds to search for the identity of the field. Moreover, in addition to these reasons for soul-searching, which stem from the field itself, Europe faces an additional challenge, seen in the reform of its higher education system, the so-called Bologna Process.

**Nature of the field: doubts, disciplines, interdisciplinary studies, science studies**

As suggested in my response to Brenda Dervin's survey above, a lack of scientific depth follows all too easily from an eclectic and multidisciplinary approach to inquiry.
Both are important for the healthy evolution of a discipline, but when rapidly
developed, they may become excessively dominant and offset the foundations of the
body of knowledge. Such a “surfing syndrome” is particularly risky in studies of
fashionable topics such as information technology. In fact, information technology
tends to lead not only to excessive eclecticism, but also to the neglect of other phe-
nomena. I have introduced the term “Nokia syndrome” to refer to these risks of
being dominated by technology.  

As typically understood in the field, communication and media studies is taken as
the constituting factor of a large rubric of related studies and disciplines, whereby
various aspects of human communication — speech, organizational communication,
journalism, and mass communication, as well as the new “social media” — are driven
by their own specialized knowledge. However, it is by no means self-evident that
communication should be taken as the core of these related disciplines. True, com-
munication may be understood as the essence of social relations, and society may be
understood not only as something held together by the “glue” of communication,
but as something that is itself made up of communication. On the other hand,
however, communication can be seen as a mere camouflage, which diverts attention
from the more fundamental structures related to economics or sociopolitical power.
This latter perspective does not support the idea of communication and media studies
as an independent discipline united by the foundational concept of communication.
Rather, it takes communication as a complementary aspect of more fundamental
circumstances.

There are further questions about whether or not communication and media studies
can be seen as a discipline. By discipline, we typically refer to a relatively independent
and discrete area of creating knowledge, with its own research object, concepts, and
methods, as well as its own experts, publishing channels, and institutional homes. The
Institute for Scientific Information (ISI)  

lies about 300 disciplines with some 9000
subfields. These can be grouped in different ways to larger categories of sciences, such
as these four: formal sciences (from automation to statistics); natural sciences (from
acoustics to zoology); social sciences (from anthropology to women’s studies); and
humanistic sciences (from arts to theatre).

How does the field of communication and media studies fit into this picture?
A concise roadmap of the landscape of the field is provided by Robert Craig in his
contribution to The International Encyclopedia on Communication:

Formation of the communication field has resulted from a partial convergence of
various disciplines and lines of research that intersect in complex ways, all
somehow related to the phenomenon of “communication,” but have never
been tightly integrated as a coherent body of thought. [ … ] As it was estab-
lished, the field constructed an eclectic theoretical core by collecting ideas
relevant to communication from across the social sciences, humanities, and
even engineering and the natural sciences. [ … ] This body of knowledge has
no universally accepted overall structure. Sub-fields and topics can be grouped
and organized in various more or less systematic ways for different purposes.

[ … ] With the development of modern research universities since the nineteenth
century, the notion of a discipline has evolved in relation to specific institu-
tional and professional structures (university faculties, scholarly societies, peer
reviewed journals, funding agencies, etc.) that interact in complex ways with
conceptually defined categories of knowledge.  

Craig concluded that not even scholars in communication and media studies today
universally regard it as a discipline. Hence the state of the art is itself ambiguous
regarding the question of its shared scientific status. Yet it is worth recalling that
already in the early 1960s, Schramm called an anthology of the rising field The Science
of Human Communication,  

and in the late 1980s Charles Berger and Steven Chaffee edited a Handbook of Communication Science, with an introduction entitled “The study
of communication as a science.”  

This “communication science model” of communication did not endure through the ferment discussions of the 1980s, and its
Diminishment eventually led to “intellectual poverty.”  

A contemporary summary of the status of the field is offered by Craig in the
concluding paragraph of his above-quoted article:

No matter how intellectually or institutionally well established the discipline of
communication may become, many areas of the field continue to be highly
interdisciplinary. Contextually focused areas like health communication and
political communication inherently straddle disciplinary boundaries. Study of
the media as social institutions is unavoidably a multidisciplinary endeavor
involving psychology, sociology, economics, legal and policy studies, technol-
ology studies, etc. The question is not whether communication will continue to
be an interdisciplinary field, as it certainly will. The open question is whether
communication may also have a theoretical core that enables communication
scholars to approach interdisciplinary topics from a distinct disciplinary viewpoint
that adds real value to the interdisciplinary enterprise.

Craig’s observations are made more relevant when one considers the different degrees
of interdisciplinarity that exist. These range from multidisciplinary research, where a
common topic is studied by parallel disciplines, to transdisciplinary research, with a
shared frame of reference and a common research problem.  

An examination of thousands of scholarly journals shows that 56 per cent of articles published in engi-
neering and biomedicine journals belong to more than one discipline, whereas only
11 per cent of articles in the humanities journals are interdisciplinary, and the social
sciences not far from that.  

At the same time, the natural growth of science points to the establishment of more and more disciplines and their subfields, meaning a frag-
mentation of the overall science landscape. This, in turn, leads to the integration of
the disparate specialties with interdisciplinarity as a way to achieve it.  

Additionally, beyond integration and interdisciplinarity there are also older disciplines
that should not be underestimated. As Thomas Kuhn pointed out, especially in natural
sciences, a scholar must first fully and uncritically master the theories and practices of
a single discipline; in these “mature sciences” one cannot achieve new results without thorough knowledge of earlier achievements. It is necessary to be deeply rooted in normal science, and crossing disciplinary borders succeeds only when one knows where they are. This tension between tradition and innovation suggests that an ideal scholar should be both a conservator of tradition and an iconoclast.

All this reminds us that the question about the nature of communication and the related problem of discipline versus field is far from resolved. Therefore it should be actively discussed, not pushed under the carpet, either by neglect or by addressing it with clichés. This leads us to the philosophy of science, asking how scientific knowledge is constructed and organized, and what are the principles that designate sciences and disciplines.

We are faced with the well known distinction between basic and applied research. Whereas basic sciences are supposed to describe, explain, and help to understand, applied sciences are supposed first and foremost to predict; the basic sciences tell us what is and predictive applied sciences tell us what will be. In addition, there is a particular form of applied sciences that tells us what ought to be so that we can attain a given goal. These “design sciences” are not supposed to produce true or false knowledge, nor correctly to predict what will happen, but to enhance human skills and generate instrumental knowledge for the production and manipulation of both natural and artificial systems—something that is highly relevant in communication and media studies.

Consequently, I make a strong claim for the science studies in order to deal with the concept of communication and its relation to the system of sciences. At the same time, I call for a continuous study of the history of ideas in the field. However young the field, and however burning the issues of the day, it is vital to realize how communication and media studies has evolved and how it relates to other fields of research. Accordingly, all master’s-level degree programs in communication and media studies should have a module on the history of the field and on the nature of the discipline. Likewise, all established institutions of communication and media studies should pursue some research on research, not only by mapping out the development of their research agenda, both in terms of topics and underlying paradigms, but also by examining the very nature of the field.

Organizing academic disciplines

In universities throughout the world, the field of communication and media studies is typically manifested in colleges or schools of communication, which include departments of speech, journalism, radio/TV, and PR; and in the USA also advertising. In Finland, the idea of communication as a unifying concept in higher education and research is quite concretely suggested by the fact that there are several different kinds of university department concerned with communication and media studies at the graduate and postgraduate level—over twenty units in ten universities—and that these departments have established a network for cooperation, the University Network for Communication Sciences.

However, this national network has flourished only as long as the government has financed it with its own budget line. In 2010, now that Finnish universities have become non-governmental public institutions with only a lump subsidy for each institution, the future of this and other discipline-based networks looks bleak indeed. Networks no longer have central funding, but instead have to be voluntarily organized by individual universities. And the universities are under extreme pressure to complement state funding with contract-based revenues from public and private foundations, companies, etc. The university is turning from an idyllic “nest of science” into a hectic “project mill,” as suggested by a national survey conducted by the research group for science, technology, and innovation at my university.

The field has also given rise to a growing number of researchers and associations at national as well as international level. The European Communication Research and Education Association’s president, François Heinderyckx, has aptly characterized the field by dividing its scholars into two camps: “communication natives,” who were trained by communication and media studies departments in their major subject; and “communication migrants,” who were trained in other disciplines and brought to communication and media studies by their research interests and projects. Five decades after Berelson’s obituary of communication research and Schramm’s defence of the field’s vitality, the president of a rapidly growing European association reminds us that the field not only has survived and developed into a distinct area of scholarship, but also remains a crossroads for migrants from various other fields. As a whole, the research community in communication and media studies is “an open club,” and becoming part of it is “a self-affiliation process.”

Heinderyckx points out that being a communication scientist does not constitute a recognized category, and that even the “natives” are far from a coherent and homogenous group. “In fact, communication may not be a discipline in the classic institutional sense of the word, not even in the making.” Instead, the field suffers from “an academic identity crisis.” The crisis is both intellectual, given the internal divisions of a multidisciplinary field, and administrative, given its underdog position when competing with the established disciplines for funding. The identity crisis may be a permanent feature of the field, and can even be seen as “the secret of our remarkable capacity to innovate, to renew research and to keep pace with the rapid evolution of our objects.” On the other hand, such a field is particularly susceptible to the current general trend towards applied research, with short-term benefits, and researchers expected to behave “more and more as experts and less and less as scholars.”

Thus we are back to the “Nokia syndrome.” But we are also back to the conflict between “Ivy League” disciplines and “Mickey Mouse” studies. And this conflict is not only about the struggle over resources and students, but is fundamentally about the power to determine what is, and what is not, a legitimate academic discipline. Cultural studies—a still younger candidate joining the family of arts and sciences—has encountered similar resistance from the established disciplines. A series of testimonies on cultural studies and the politics of disciplinarity provide a telling story of how “disciplines police their boundaries, by training their members to internalize them, neutralize them, and then fancy themselves free as birds.”
While communication and media studies, like cultural studies, exemplifies a more general question regarding the nature of academic cultures as “tribes” defending their disciplinary territories, the basis for defining disciplines is naturally in the intellectual realm of scientific inquiry and the system of sciences. But in addition to these substantive arguments, disciplines are determined by administrative powers based on “tribal” interests and increasingly following market forces – student demand, employment prospects, research funding, etc. In such a crude reality, the disciplinary landscape is shaped by “academics as social animals”:

The tribes of academe, one might argue, define their own identities and defend their own patches of intellectual ground by employing a variety of devices geared to the exclusion of illegal immigrants. [ ... ] To be admitted to membership of a particular sector of the academic profession involves not only a sufficient level of technical proficiency in one’s intellectual trade but also a proper measure of loyalty to one’s collegial group and of adherence to its norms.

Nevertheless, disciplines are not completely determined by powers outside. Although shaped by power games with political and commercial factors, academic disciplines still retain a more or less pure intellectual rationale. Admittedly, this rationale is not based on a transcendental interest in universal truth, but is historically constructed to generate knowledge for a particular stage of socio-economic-cultural development, notably modernization in the Western world from the eighteenth century until the present time. But all the same academic disciplines represent a degree of intellectual autonomy, which leaves some ground for academic idealism and reforms instead of surrendering to defeatism and reductionism.

Communication and media studies thus has a fairly advantageous position in the middle of this conflict-ridden landscape. Despite pressures from the “Ivy League” disciplines, communication and media studies has enough scientific substance to defend its existence in the intellectual realm. It is undeniably a mixed bag with a rich multidisciplinary legacy, but nobody can deny its centrality in the social sciences and humanities. It also draws much attention from university administrators, who see its popularity, especially among the younger generation, and its resonance within the media industry, as a bonus. Even if debates of old keep reasserting themselves, each time they do so, the field of communication and media studies takes up a new position on the academic landscape.
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