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Preface

‘Mapping Communication and Media Research’ is a project of the Communication Research Center (CRC, University of Helsinki) that examines the contents and trends of the current communication and media research in nine countries. These countries include Finland, the U.S.A., Germany, France, Japan, Estonia, Australia, Belgium and the Netherlands. Research on these individual countries was conducted between 2006-2008 and issued in a series of country specific reports. The research project was funded by Helsingin Sanomat Foundation, which has also funded similar reports at the University of Jyväskylä on communication and media research in South Korea and the United Kingdom.

The focus of the project was on mass communication research. The objective of the project was to provide a general overview of current communication and media research in the previously mentioned countries. The project mapped the main institutions and organisations, approaches and national characteristics of the communication and media research in each country. The focus of the project was on recent years. The main research questions of the project were: What kind of communication and media research is carried out in a specific country? How do different approaches relate to each other? How is communication and media research focused in each country and to where is research directed in the future?

Each country constitutes a unique context for communication and media research. Thus, research was organised in varying ways in the different examined countries. Nevertheless, in order to enhance meaningful comparability between the sub-reports, the research questions, research principles and the structure of the text were common for every report. Clearly, it has been impossible to portray all communication and media research in the various countries studied. The goal of each country specific report was to provide a useful overview of the contemporary communication and media research in each particular country. In this sense, these reports constitute a significant addition to our knowledge of the contemporary ‘state of the field’.

However, as Averbeck notes, our knowledge of international comparison of communication studies is still limited. There are some studies that deal – in a more or less isolated fashion – with single countries, but an international comparative perspective remains lacking (Averbeck 2008, 2). This report, ‘Mapping Communication and Media Research: Paradigms, Institutions, Challenges’, therefore aims to provide an analytic overview of the
research results attained in the reports on communication and media studies in Germany, France, Belgium, the Netherlands, Estonia, the United Kingdom, Australia, the USA, Japan and South Korea. Several preliminary features should be noted regarding the organisation of the material and research methodology adopted in this report:

First, we have used extensively materials from each of the individual country reports. Rather than burdening this summary report with copious notes indicating citation or paraphrase of these texts, we have preferred to present a seamless integration of this material with our own analytic and critical comments. Researchers and assistants on the individual country reports are acknowledged as contributors to this report on the title page, though we obviously accept responsibility for our own selections and judgements in the organisation of the material into an analytic summary. We hope to have provided a critical overview of a collective intellectual project that in its turn will constitute a foundation for future collaborative research.

Second, while the country specific reports contained some material on the media systems and contexts in which communication and media studies operatives in the respective countries, this report focuses only upon research institutions and practices. This limitation was adopted due to the fact that, while there exist several recent comparative overviews of different media systems, a similar ‘map’ of the institution of communication and media research is lacking. We have nevertheless referred frequently to particularly pertinent facts regarding media systems in the respective countries, as they impact upon research activities. Readers are referred to the individual country reports and to Daniel C. Hallin and Paolo Mancini’s *Comparing Media Systems* (2004) for more extensive analyses of individual media environments and classifications.

Third, we have focused only upon academic research institutions in the respective countries and have therefore excluded private media research companies and institutions from our analysis. Academic study and research of media and communications remains the ‘fundamental infrastructure’ of the field in all countries: it elaborates the most comprehensive research paradigms, trains the majority of researchers and initiates new research initiatives. In this sense, work conducted in universities exerts ‘hegemony’ over the field in general, including research conducted in private and industry based foundations and institutions (the overwhelming majority of whose practitioners have received their training in academic centres, with which they often maintain official or unofficial contact in their subsequent professional work).
Fourth, as Juha Herkman notes,

“The target countries do not constitute any homogenous group, quite the contrary. They are located far from one another, they represent various languages and cultures and in some cases their connections to media and communication research do not appear self evident. The choice of target countries was originally made by the project’s sponsor, Helsingin Sanomat Foundation. [...] The selection of countries indicates the interests of the Foundation, which is no doubt interested in ‘new innovative media markets’ in South Korea and Japan, the ‘world’s leading media market’ – the U.S. –, various examples of the ‘Old World’ (France, Germany, Great Britain), and the relationship of these countries to the ‘domestic context’ (Finland) and its close neighbour (Estonia)” (Herkman 2008, 146f).

Nevertheless, we have attempted to organise the country specific material in this report into representative groupings in each of the chapters, which deal with significant institutional dimensions of communication and media research. These groupings are continental Europe (Germany, France, Belgium, the Netherlands, Estonia), the Anglophone world (UK, Australia, USA) and East Asia (Japan, South Korea). Each chapter concludes with a comparative perspective on the Finnish situation. We believe that this organisation provides a useful perspective on the different institutional legacies and challenges in the different cultural zones.

Fifth, as will become evident in this study, media and communications research is a highly contested field, both internationally and in any given national context. Not only the available data, but also the very definitions and conceptualisations of communication and media research vary significantly according to contexts and countries. Meaningful comparison of research in different countries has therefore proven to be a difficult task. This paper does not provide statistically comparable data on the communication and media research of the target countries. Similarly, we have not aimed to provide an exhaustive perspective on media and communications research in the different countries in relation to the themes of each individual chapter. Rather, we have attempted to provide different analytic perspectives, highlighting the features of each country that we believe to be most significant for an international comparison of the different institutional configurations of the field. We have been concerned above all to delineate significant
tendencies and initiatives that we believe will continue to have a large impact upon future of study and research in the field.

Sixth, finally, as we have already noted, the selection of countries in this study is by no means exhaustive. A genuinely internationalist survey of media and communications research remains to be undertaken. Adequate analysis of Latin America, Africa, India, the Arab world and the countries of the former Soviet Union and Eastern Bloc are the most obvious additional materials required in order to gain an overview of the contemporary state of media and communication research, in its variation and unity, nationally and internationally. However, the necessity for further study of cultural zones already included in this project should also not be overlooked: a deeper comparative perspective on the predominantly northern European contexts treated in this study could be provided by studies of ‘Southern Europe’, or the Mediterranean countries of Italy, Greece and Spain, notably absent from this study; the analysis of Japan and South Korea would benefit from the additional perspective of recent developments in the People’s Republic of China, alongside transformations in the media systems and academic institutions of countries such as Vietnam, Indonesia and the Philippines; the Anglophone world, the predominant centres of which are treated in this study, would similarly appear in a different light with the inclusion of such countries as South Africa and Canada.

While the extent of the work that remains to be done in order to gain a genuine international view of the field of media and communication research may appear to be daunting, it nevertheless remains a necessity for the future development of a field of intellectual practice that remains in flux, between contradictions and critical challenges. We believe that it represents the possibility for an intellectually ambitious collective research project, to which we hope to have made a small, initial contribution in the following report.

Juha Koivisto and Peter Thomas
1 Introduction: an Institutional Success

“I remember one day,” said Paul Lazarsfeld, “a friend of mine, in 1937 or so, introduced me to a group of colleagues and said, ‘this is a European colleague who is an upmost authority on communication research,’ and saw that no one was particularly impressed, so he wanted to press the point and said, ‘as a matter of fact, he is the only one who works in this field’” (Morrison 1978, 347).

Viewed from the perspective of the success of media and communication study and research in universities around the world today, Lazarsfeld’s story can perhaps seem almost hard to believe. Indeed, as Craig and Carlone have maintained, this field has witnessed an “explosive growth” which is almost unrivalled by any other inhabitant of the modern university (1998, 67). Wolfgang Donsbach, in his recent presidential address at the Annual Conference of the International Communication Association (ICA), aptly summarised recent developments with a thought provoking metaphor: “There are only few other fields with same dynamics in the last 10-30 years: maybe biotechnology or computer sciences” (Donsbach 2006, 437). A similar judgment has been expressed by a veteran cosmopolitan voice from Finland, that of Kaarle Nordenstreng – though Nordenstreng casts his glance even further back than Donsbach, arguing that there has been record growth of communication and media studies and research in comparison to other disciplines over the last 50 years (2007, 211). Similar voices can be found in many of the individual countries surveyed in this report. Patrick Rössler, for example, the head of the German communication researchers’ organisation DGPuK, described the situation in Germany as characterised by “enormous dynamic of the developments in this scientific field”, a “multiplicity of concepts and research so extensive that it is difficult to survey”, alongside an explosion in terms of study courses (Rössler 2008, 3).

The success story is indeed impressive. Although attention, both within the field and without, has only recently turned to consider the exceptional nature of recent growth in academic media and communication study and research, it is possible to detect the preconditions for this success in previous developments – albeit with the benefit of a certain retrospective advantage. Various ‘streams of thought’ in different national traditions can be regarded as the intellectual and institutional precursors of contemporary developments. In social philosophy in the USA at the end of the nineteenth and beginning of the twentieth century, for example, there was a social-
ecological tendency of communications research, which emerged from the intersection of studies on transport modalities, journalism and urban lifestyles. A vital contribution to this development was made by Robert Ezra Park, who had done doctoral work in the early years of the century in Heidelberg, Germany, on the theme of ‘masses and the public’, as well as by Charles Horton Cooley, who wrote important texts on the significance and growth of communication and the relation of its modern forms to individuality as well as superficiality (Cooley 1909/1962, 61-103). Similarly, a sometimes overlooked precursor of the contemporary field can be found in the figure of the democratic pragmatist philosopher John Dewey, for whom communication was crucial for democratic social organisation (on Cooley, Park and Dewey see Czitrom 1983, 91-121). Perhaps even more significant, however, was an older, and for many years largely “buried tradition” (Carey 2001, ix) of social and theoretical thinking on communication and the press in the German linguistic zone, recovered in Hanno Hardt’s *Social Theories of the Press* (2001).

Despite these intimations of future developments, however, the early theoretical explorations did not lead to the foundation of modern communication studies in an institutional sense. The emergence of the field as a legitimate academic activity occurred according to other, more ‘pragmatic’ imperatives. Decisive here was the role played by the association of the academy with the training and promotion of the distinctively modern art and science of journalism. Formal education in journalism was established as early as the 1870s in several US colleges and universities. Kansas State College provided instruction from 1873, the University of Missouri in 1878, and the University of Pennsylvania from 1893. Until the 1920s most of these journalism education programs were either adjuncts to English or philosophy departments, or they originated in them and remained largely directed by them in institutional and administrative terms. Missouri in 1908 and Columbia University in 1912 set a pattern, followed by others, by establishing an independent professional school of journalism within the larger university setting (Willnat and Weaver 2006, 39).

The first European university courses in journalism were held in Paris as early as 1899. Further courses evolved in the second decade of the twentieth century: 1916 in Jena; 1917 in Warsaw with the founding of the Institute for Journalism at Warsaw University; 1919 in the UK, with the establishment of a training program for journalism at King’s College at the University of London; 1920 at the University of Moscow; and, in Italy, in 1929 with the foundation of a Professorship of Journalism at the University of Perugia (Schorr 2003, 21).
It was perhaps in Germany that there occurred the first attempts to define the fledgling new academic programmes in terms of a ‘discipline’ of proper academic standing. This is perhaps not surprising given the strong institutional traditions of university research and education in the Germanic world. The first professorship devoted to mass communication research was established in 1916 in Leipzig under the heading *Zeitungskunde*. Yet for over half a century there were only a few universities where new professorships were established or where there was more than one professorship dedicated to communication subjects. There was a clear institutional upswing for the field during the NS-years, but this in its turn led to a certain discrediting of the field after the war and all but three institutes – München and Münster restarted in 1946, Berlin in 1948 – were closed down. It was difficult to find suitable ‘uncontaminated’ professors and this led to recruiting also from other disciplines, among non-habilitated people or outside the universities. Between 1945 and 1965 there was not a single successful *Habilitation* in the field of communications research. The discipline was “found not to be dignified enough” to produce its own professors (Meyen 2004, 200). It was only in the 1970s and 80s that there was a clear expansion of the institutions and resources, strengthening dynamics that had got underway during the tumultuous years of social transformation and contestation of the 1960s.

The impact of what some historians have defined as the ‘second thirty years war’ and the sometimes instrumental role of various media and communication institutions within it perhaps also contributed to a relative ‘modesty’ for a long period of communications and media researchers in nominating their field as clearly demarcated from more traditional academic disciplines. It is notable that even in the mid-fifties, “the word “communication” was still rarely used in Europe” (Vroons 2005, 495). Indeed, “the now richly seeded field of communication studies (...) was still an unploughed arable land in Europe during the 1950s” (ibid., 514). This situation was quite different from that in the USA, where communications research enjoyed growing prestige in the post-war period (cf. Peters 1986, 533ff for a summary of these developments; Simpson 1995 and Glander 2000 provide information regarding military funding of communication research in the context of the beginning of the cold war). Institutional and intellectual measures concurred; communication research was emerging as a significant dimension of the new society and values that would become central to the growth of the USA into a world hegemonic power in the second half of the twentieth century.

Despite these advances, it was not long before Bernard Berelson, one of the central figures on the field, became very sceptical. Already in 1959, he stated: “My thesis that, as for
communication research, the state is withering away” (1). Intellectual exhaustion and failure to renew a unified and coherence body of researchers in tune with the expansion of the field seemed to lie behind the malaise: “the innovators have left or are leaving the field” (4), In fact, in some respects it was precisely the success of the field that led Berelson to speak in such pessimistic tones:

“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 ideas of comparable magnitude have appeared to take their place” (6).

Berelson’s concerns, therefore, were fundamentally motivated by the perception of an increasing lack of intellectual and theoretical dynamism of the field. In a certain sense, communications study and research had become a victim of its own success, the early ambitious initiatives of a new research paradigm struggling to establish itself and to conquer new territory giving way to a comfortable occupation of established academic enclaves.

However, alternative voices soon registered dissent with such Cassandra-like predications, buoyed up by precisely the ongoing institutional expansion of the field that had prompted Berelson’s untimely meditations. Wilbur Schramm, for example, the leading figure in institutionalising the field who founded communication research institutes in Illinois (1948) and Stanford (1955-56), responded to Berelson by telling of his own busy institutional schedule with meetings, supervising students, seminars, and so on. He added that he couldn’t “find the rigor mortis in this field” conjectured by Berelson, continuing that he wondered “whether Dr. Berelson might have missed a tiny surge of pulse in the body, or even examined the wrong victim” (1959, 7). In the event, it was Schramm’s more institutional perspective that won the field; the continuing and increasingly rapid increase in the sheer number of departments and course offerings in the USA in particular did not prove conducive to voices urging a more reflective and self-critical perspective on the field’s intellectual and theoretical coordinates.

The decisive move in the ‘institutional war of manoeuvre’ – in the USA, at any rate – was the delinking of communication research from the departments of journalism that had provided it with its first academic home. As Schorr notes,
“In parallel [to academic journalist education] – and this is a specialty of the U.S. American tradition in the discipline – quasi in the lee winds of success and with increasing public recognition by empirical communication research, a second tradition of training was established at the undergraduate level as part of the liberal arts curriculum” (Schorr 2003, 22).

This moved against the earlier tendency, in which the institutional expansion of course offerings across the liberal arts and sciences had not been accompanied by a corresponding growth of institutional autonomy and self-governance for researchers in the field. Again, Schorr notes that

“At the undergraduate level it was easy to offer subjects communication or media studies successfully from different disciplinary perspectives. Communication was not seen as a discipline in its own right. For this reason, American universities did not establish independent departments of communication until late in the 50s of the 20th century” (Schorr 2003, 22).

With the establishment of autonomous departmental bodies, the status of communications research was assured of growing prestige – not only in institutional terms, but crucially, intellectually and theoretically as well, as a new component of the modern academic division of labour. In appearance – and often, in effect – a new science was born: Mass Communication. The field then continued to grow, both in the USA and elsewhere, benefiting in particular from the expansion and reforms of the universities in the 1960s (in Germany, for instance, the first chair in a general ‘communications science’ [Kommunikationswissenschaft] – as opposed to earlier, more narrowly focused Publizistik orientations – was founded in 1964, at the University of Erlangen-Nürnberg).¹

¹ The decisive influence of North American concepts of Mass Communication on the German context should not be underestimated; As Averbeck notes, ‘Nowadays, German Kommunikationswissenschaft has to be described mainly as empirical social research on mass communication with strong input from the ‘classical’ US-American tradition (Lasswell, Hovland, Lewin, Lazarsfeld). In my opinion, the orientation of German Kommunikationswissenschaft towards the US was also a remedy to forget the Nazi past as soon as possible, and to find out how to measure ‘reality’ (and not to built up ideologies...). The rich culturalistic tradition in the field of communication studies in the US came to Germany only from the 1980s onwards or later, when the empirical social science attitude had been tightened. German Kommunikationswissenschaft mainly consists of empirical social research in the fields of the uses and effects of mass communication, with a strong impact on quantitative content analysis’ (Averbeck 2008, 2-3).
As Nordenstreng has recently noted,

“Instead of its withering away as suggested by Berelson in the late 1950s, we have seen an impressive growth of the field, which has brought communication and media studies to the centre of contemporary paradigms of socio-economic development – the Information Society” (Nordenstreng 2007, 219).

Using statistics compiled by Craig and Carlone (1998, 71-3), Neuendorf et al. and Schorr similarly make a convincing case for the genuinely exceptional and in many respects unprecedented success of this academic new-comer in the post-war period. As the former authors argue, communications research,

“was not even recognized as a field of study by the Department of Education until 1966. The three decades to follow witnessed a 534% growth rate in the number of communication degrees awarded, during which time the journalism/mass communication subfield grew 1,500%” (Neuendorf et al. 2007, 25).

“American universities have conferred over 50,000 communication degrees per year since the mid-1990s”; communication is now ranked “among the eight largest nationally in BA graduate production each year” (Neuendorf et al. 2007, 25, 35).

Schorr argues in a similar fashion:

“the number of bachelor degrees across the communication disciplines rose by 534% between 1968 and 1993. This is more than six times the amount of bachelor degrees than in all other academic disciplines (all fields: 84%). The number of master’s degrees increased by 288% (all fields: 109%)” (Schorr 2003, 23).

Neither has this success been limited to the USA; other zones of the Anglophone world have witnessed a similar expansion. According to the Universities and Colleges Admission Service (UCAS 2008) in the United Kingdom, there are total of 96 British universities offering 983 media related undergraduate courses in 2008/2009. In addition, according to Graduate Prospects
(Graduate Prospects 2008) there are 619 taught postgraduate courses in Media Studies and Publishing. The field has grown rapidly in Australia as well: in 1987, journalism was taught in only 11 universities, while students who wish to study Journalism in Australia today have 25 universities from which to choose. Media and communication studies, in the term’s wider meaning, are represented in 37 universities. Only two Australian universities do not have this area in their curricula.

While such an expansion could be attributed to dynamics specific to the USA and its immediate linguistic zone of influence, it only requires a quick glance at some of the other countries and national traditions treated in this report to begin to suspect that the growth of communications and media research in the post-World War Two period constitutes an ‘international enigma’. Countries and traditions quite distant from and often resistant to the dominant Anglophone models, such as France, or those with strong traditional academic structures and traditions that are often resistant to change, such as Germany, display similar features of unstoppable growth of communications research and study, at all levels of academic activity.

In France, the growth of the discipline of Infocom (the French equivalent of communications and media studies) can be seen in the growth of the number of teacher-researchers over the last 35 years. There were few teachers or researchers in the field in 1975, reflecting the lack of implantation of communications and media research in an academic environment dominated by more traditional disciplines. However, from 1977 to 2005 the number of posts in Infocom has augmented annually by 10%, starting from 43 teacher-researchers in 1977 up to 663 in 2005 (521 maitre de conferences and 142 professors, see Figure 1). Astoundingly, the number of academic posts in Infocom has surpassed such fields as philosophy and political science, and is close to sociology and linguistics (Cardy & Froissart 2006, 261-262). Admittedly, a curious feature of the French context is that despite this success, there are still fewer professorial posts (21% of all posts) compared to the average (31%), for all disciplines, which presumably hinders to some extent the elaboration of long-term research projects. Paradoxically, however, such a statistic also indicates another strength: the lower number of professorial posts means that the majority of practitioners are engaged extensively in teaching, which in turns drives the further growth of the field in terms of reaching a critical mass of students and trained graduates (ibid., 267).
Similarly, the German context demonstrates a rapid expansion, particularly over the last decade. The number of students in media science courses has almost doubled from the academic year 1995/6 to 2005/6, from 28 000 students to 55 000. This represents a clearly greater degree of growth than has been the case in other study courses in the period (Wissenschaftsrat 2007, 27). The following chart represents the development in the field of communications and media science in comparison to developments in the other humanities disciplines and the total student population over the last ten years.
These examples represent merely the tip of the iceberg; in Belgium and the Netherlands, just as in Japan and South Korea, the tale of the institutional establishment and growth of communications and media studies has been nothing but a happy one. Clearly, the situation has become very different from Lazarsfeld’s tale of solitude and isolation. How are we to account for this spectacular reversal of fortunes, and in particular, what were the preconditions for this emergence of a dynamic new academic field in a period in which many traditional disciplines in the university have witnessed much more modest gains, if not indeed stagnation and decline?

Craig and Carone provide an interesting perspective that helps us to place these reflections in a deeper optic than the frequently heard assertion of increased student demand and the supposed ‘relevance’ of the object of study of communications and media research to the contours of the ‘information society’. They write that in the USA the institutional expansion of communications and media research
“has not occurred within a fixed structure of categories that constitutes ‘the field’ as an unchanging entity. Rather, the categories themselves have evolved, and the field has grown perhaps as much by redefinition and expansion of its subject matter as by quantitative accumulation. Central to this evolution has been the increasing salience and richness of the term ‘communication’ itself” (Craig – Carone 1998, 78).

In this perspective, we can turn to consider the coordinates of this process of ongoing ‘redefinition’ and ‘expansion’. Has this process been merely one of ‘quantitative’ growth of the field through the inclusion of new objects of study – in effect, the ‘colonisation’ of areas of study previously assigned to other disciplines, now in a period of institutional decline? Or has process involved ‘qualitative’ shifts, ruptures and turning points, reconfigurations of the internal articulation of the field itself, permitting a more intense elaboration of its study and research programmes? If so, what have been the research paradigms and intellectual orders that have contributed to this development? Above all, how are we to characterise a research paradigm that continually redefines and reorganises its internal determinants at the same time as it successfully engages with new and different external academic institutional conditions and objects of study? Can communications and media research be regarded as a ‘discipline’ or even ‘field’ in a traditional academic sense, or are we in the presence of a different type of intellectual and institutional formation that calls for alternative categories in order to comprehend its distinctive features?
Finland

College-level, practically oriented instruction in *Zeitungswissenschaft* or Journalism started in Finland in 1925, a first in the Nordic countries. A chair in ‘newspaper science’ was established in 1947. At the beginning of the 1960s the tradition of newspaper science was overshadowed by American mass communication research, imported via representatives of sociology and political science trained in the USA with the help of Fulbright scholarships. The second professorial chair in the field, focusing on broadcasting, was established in 1969. In the late 1960s and early 1970s the emerging field gained important support from the Finnish Broadcasting Company. In recent decades the growth has been impressive\(^1\); Nowadays, for example, the university network for communication sciences, a national organisation for cooperation of university departments, includes 22 member units in the field of communication, media and information studies in ten Finnish universities. The network is multidisciplinary in nature: it encompasses a wide area, ranging from information studies to journalism, speech communication, organizational communication, media studies, visual communication and graphic design.

2 Shifting Intellectual Orders: Discipline or Field?

The ‘explosive’ success story of communications and media research that we examined in the previous chapter has often been narrated in overwhelmingly positive terms, for reasons that are not difficult to discern. In a period of institutional reform and transformation of university systems around the world, in which many more traditional disciplines have struggled to maintain their programmes of research and, above all, their prestige in the wider society, the ‘new-comer’ of communications and media study has gone from strength to strength. It has succeeded in articulating its concerns in ever-wider circles of institutional and intellectual influence, consolidating foundational themes and progressively drawing in new concerns to its field of reference and competence. In this sense, the ‘success story’ outlined in our introduction has been a source of confidence for many practitioners in the field, providing support for further expansive initiatives on both the institutional and intellectual terrain.

However, as we have seen, the history of communications and media research has also included other voices, more cautious and circumspect, sometimes sceptical or even pessimistic regarding the longer terms potential ‘costs’ of such a triumphant narrative. One moment of such reflections coincided with what can legitimately be regarded as the founding years of the modern, post-war discipline or field, in the 1950s. More recently, the very ‘explosive’ growth of course offerings and research projects of the last 20 years has prompted further musing of this type. Paradoxically, the expansion of the field has led to what some scholars in Germany have described as the ‘Unübersichtlichkeit’ of the field, perhaps best translated into English as a ‘lack of clarity’, or the inability to gain a comprehensive survey over the entire field, in its internal unity and contradiction.

This lament has become a familiar topos at the beginning of articles trying to depict the situation of media and communication studies in Germany. Werner Wirth gave his article (2000) dealing with the current situation and institutional structures of German media and communication studies the title *Wachstum bei zunehmender Unübersichtlichkeit*, that is ‘growth with increasing lack of clarity’. For Edmund Lauf (2002, 6), Communication Studies have become so “unclear [unübersichtlich]” that “it is difficult today even for professors” to assess the number of relevant existing study courses in Germany. “The growing number of readers, conference proceedings and monographs has led to an almost unreviewable mass of literature” (ibid., 7). The same topos is repeated in Wolfram Preiser, Matthias Hastall, and Wolfgang Donsbach’s article
discussing the “very unclear” (2003, 311) situation of communication studies in Germany on the basis of an enquiry among those researchers who have organised themselves in the Deutsche Gesellschaft für Publizistik und Kommunikationswissenschaft (DGPuK), the major scholarly body in the field in Germany. For Preiser, Hastall and Donsbach, there are several factors (great differences between various approaches, differences in relation to media practices, more than a few research objects) that “make this discipline wider and more diffuse that most others”. Despite these differences, “something like a mainstream has emerged”. However, “this characteristic, functional in a professionalisation process, also represents at the same time the central problem” for those who feel they belong to a minority (ibid., 332). More recently, the theme has been reiterated in an influential scholarly study – significantly, produced by experts from outside the field, who might be expected to be able to adopt a more impartial and therefore totalising perspective, beyond disciplinary specialisations:

“Recommendations for the further development of communications and media sciences in Germany are dealing with a very heterogeneous, extremely dynamic and thus partially also unclear scientific field” (Wissenschaftsrat 2007, 11).

Similar voices are increasingly heard in other countries as well. In the USA, Craig and Carlone felt the need to confess already ten years ago that “we no longer understand the field very well ourselves” (Craig and Carlone 1998, 67). They concluded that the field has “amorphous”, perhaps even menacing, “contours” (Craig and Carlone 1998, 68). In the UK, Boyd-Barrett has argued that any overview of contemporary communications and media research has “to accept at the outset that the ‘field’ of communication media research is somewhat nebulous” (Boyd-Barrett 2006, 235).

Wolfgang Donsbach’s previously cited presidential address at the Annual Conference of the International Communication Association (ICA) is perhaps representative of the presence of this perspective at the international level, even among those who have been impressed by the significant successes of the field and, significantly, particularly among those researchers best placed to gain an international overview of work in the field. He stated that the “field grows faster than the capacity of the average scholar to process and digest new information and thus keep an overview” (Donsbach 2006, 437). This situation led Donsbach to lament that “we have no clear identity. Our departments have many different names even within one country. And we
do many different things” (Donsbach 2006, 439). Clearly, such a lack of disciplinary identity has the potential to harm the further development of the field: lacking any clearly defined disciplinary boundaries, objects of study or methods of research, the field risks falling into eclecticism, swayed by the latest fashions but lacking its own guiding ‘rudder’. With such a perspective, it may perhaps respond to short-term pressures successfully, but it will progressively become less able to elaborate the longer-term projects and programmes that are essential for any real scientific progress.

Donsbach, however, shrewdly notes that the identity or coherence of the field is also important for more immediately pragmatic and ‘short-term’ reasons. As he notes, a clear disciplinary identity, in intellectual terms, is also important in order “to justify the existence and growth of our field to deans and provosts when we negotiate resources” (Donsbach 2006, 442). In other words, some of the historical factors that marked the slow emergence of communications and media research from the tutelage of other disciplines may still be at play in this period of ‘explosive’ expansion, impacting upon the field in both intellectual and, crucially, also institutional terms. Just as the academy’s hesitancy to recognise communication as a discipline in the past may have stemmed in part from the fact that few academic units in communication used the same name (e.g., journalism vs. [mass] communication; communication vs. speech), so the lack of a ‘common denominator’, within individual countries and internationally, may continue to impede further progress. What are some of the strategies that have been deployed historically in order to address this problem – and challenge – of heterogeneity and pluralism? Do they still constitute a realistic or fruitful response today?

One of the fundamental ‘vehicles’ for the creation of coherence of the field that has been used historically, particularly in the USA but also in many of the other countries surveyed in this report, to a greater or lesser extent, has been the concept of ‘communication’. Indeed, this is the term most commonly used as an ‘umbrella category’ in order to group together different strands of the field, even those that do not use the term in their own self-description and self-comprehension (e.g. the term ‘journalism’, in its original sense, is at a remove from the active dimension of transferral implied in most concepts of ‘communication’). ‘Communication’, of course, also constitutes one of the key unifying concepts of this research project and its institutional basis, including the title of this summary report. What are the origins of this ubiquitous, everyday word, and how did it come to designate the specific practices and institutions studied in a particular field of academic activity, demarcated from others?
Raymond Williams, an important voice from the founding years of the field in the UK and one whose perspectives continue to reverberate in certain tendencies of contemporary research, provides an important historical perspective on the concept of ‘communication’. He writes that “Communication in its most general modern meaning has been in the [English] language since the fifteenth century. … Communication was first this action [of making common to many, imparting], and then, from the late fifteenth century, the object thus made common: a communication. This has remained its main range of use. But from the late seventeenth century there was an important extension to the means of communication, specifically in such phrases as lines of communication. In the main period of development of roads, canals and railways, communications was often the abstract general term for these physical facilities. It was in the twentieth century, with the development of other means of passing information and maintaining social contact, that communications came also and perhaps predominantly to refer to such media as the press and broadcasting, though this use (which is earlier in USA than in UK) is not settled before the mid-twentieth century. The communications industry, as it is now called, is thus usually distinguished from the transport industry; communications for information and ideas, in print and broadcasting; transport for the physical carriage of people and goods” (Williams 1983/1988, 72).

Williams’s deeper historical perspective should give us reason to pause before too confidently asserted the term of ‘communication’ as a solution to more recent problems of disciplinary coherence in the academy, whatever ‘common sense’ usages of the term today may suggest to us. As Williams makes clear, historically, the very meaning of ‘communication’ has constituted a problem intimately bound up with the emergence of modern industrial society, its distinctive division of labour and organising principles of market-based relations. The internal transformation of the term – from a ‘making common’ and thus aggregation of disparate elements to a ‘transportation’ from one discrete instance to another and thus reinforcement of existing divisions – constitutes, rather than a solution, a problem to be analysed. Its uncritical deployment in what remains a limited field of academic activity risks effacing the extent to which the activities we today group together under the heading of ‘communication and media’ research
are not external to this dynamic, but, in a complicated way, constitute one of the effects of this more general problematic.

John Durham Peters, in an influential history of the idea of communication, specifies the way in which the contestation of the sense of communication was further complicated by the emergence of a theory of communication, now conceived as an activity according to the coordinates delineated by Williams. Peters argues that

“the notion of communication theory is no older than the 1940s (when it meant a mathematical theory of signal processing), and no one had isolated ‘communication’ as an explicit problem until the 1880s and 1890s” (Peters 1999, 9-10).

Peters further notes some of the difficulties involved in the simultaneous limitation and expansion of the term communication to designate those institutions engaged in the professional production and distribution of various forms of ‘information’ that characterise modern social formations, in one of their significant productive dimensions. Foremost among these is the arbitrariness of the application of the concept of communication as a designation for information systems. Communication, understood in this broader sense, is in fact to be found everywhere, in all systems of human social and communal life, from ‘biological’ systems to ‘mechanical’ operations dependent upon the coordination of a multiplicity of factors and actors (Peters 1986, 538-40). However, not only ‘information’ is communicated, in this wider sense, but also emotions, affects, values and a range of other human signifying and evaluative practices. In other words, as a human practice, communication can in no sense limited to the activities now studied under its heading in universities, namely, the industrial organisation and distribution of knowledge and experiences in ‘official’ institutions subjected to political and/or economic regulation. These are in fact more accurately seen as socially and historically limited forms of organisation of the broader impulse of humans to ‘share in’ or ‘make common’ a variety of historically determined experiences and meanings.

Often, the limitation has involved the assertion – less often supported with rigorous theoretical or empirical argumentation – of a ‘technical’ model of communication, conceived a ‘transmission’ by a ‘sender’ of a ‘message’ that then encounters a ‘receiver’. There are many variations of this basic model, but all share the feature of abstracting from the ensemble of social practices and the contested social production and circulation of meanings they entail. A similar
reduction – though in a somewhat ‘milder’ or ‘softer’ form – occurs also in more humanistic or hermeneutic approaches to communication that focus solely on shared ‘language’, ‘code’ ‘discourse’ or ‘culture’, etc. In both cases, the very attempt to specify the concept of communication, in order to define a discrete field of academic inquiry, results it making it more – not less – amorphous and unable to provide a distinct object of academic study. Communication and media research seems to be caught in an ‘infinite regress’, where any attempt to resolve its definitional disputes in fact opens up more problems than it settles.

One of the strategies deployed in order to overcome this dilemma was the limitation of the concept of communication to human or social communication. Here, the concept of communication is closely articulated with a concept of meaning, in either an intentional or unconscious form. The signification of the world and the establishment of frames of reference and the diffusion of shared understandings therefore become central. However, this then led to a further problem, in many respects similar to the wide applicability of the more general concept of communication: namely, the fact that meaning as such – the act of signification and its social diffusion and acceptance – pervades all social relations. An important tendency of recent social theory has argued for precisely such a notion, positing various concepts of communication as keys to unlocking the enigmatic nature of an increasingly complex modernity. This sense of the term ranges from Habermas’s ‘communicative action’ to the systems-theoretical approach of Luhmann. Further a field, philosophers such as Balibar have argued that Spinoza’s theory of the emotions constitutes a ‘philosophy of communication’, positing a dynamic process of the constitution of individuality through the communication of meanings and experiences. One could even view Marx’s labour theory of value, with its decisive intermediary of money, as a paradigm of ‘meaningful’ communication, or the transposition of values from one social context to another. It is difficult to see how a notion of ‘meaningful’ communication could provide a centre to a specific academic research programme, without very rapidly expanding beyond its borders to encompass all areas of study in the modern academy.

A further difficulty with the notion of meaningful communication consists in the way it posits a division between the ‘raw material’ of social interactions and the actions or agents that only subsequently ‘encode’ them with a particular meaning prior to ‘transmission’ to another participant in the social formation. Yet as Raymond Williams noted in a critique of reductive and mechanical versions of Marx’s metaphor of the base and superstructure of a social formation, it is not true that social life can be usefully divided into a foundational or first-order element, on the
one hand, and a ‘merely’ secondary or derivative moment of reorganisation of the ‘primary material’. He argued against “mechanical formulations … in which the inherent role of means of communication in every form of production, including the production of objects, is ignored and communication becomes a second-order or second stage process, entered into only after the decisive productive and social-material relations have been established” (Williams 1978, 53).

The practical consequence of this problematisation of the applicability of the concept to the type of academic research treated in this report was, historically, the specification of the particular form of communication propagated by various media institutions: namely, mass communications. As have seen, this transition played a decisive role in the post-war years in the USA, when the field established its institutional autonomy, albeit tentatively, and become the foundation for further developments throughout the 1960s and up until the present day. To a greater or lesser extent, this focus was then ‘translated’ internationally and now constitutes the unifying feature of an otherwise heterogeneous international constellation of disparate elements and perspectives. ‘Communication and Media research’ studies not all instances of human communication, but only those embodied in specific institutions with relations to larger political and/or economic mechanisms, usually in the form of (nation) states, political parties and formations and the market imperative of privately organised commodity production.

Nevertheless, recent developments of communicative practices on a ‘mass’ basis have also thrown this seemingly more promising and stable concept into crisis. A notion of ‘mass communication’ is clearly premised upon a distinction of ‘mass vs. individual’. Only those practices that have transcended the sphere of the individual and entered into the institutional forms provided by modern societies for ‘mass’ phenomena fall within the range of this field of study. However, the very development of institutions of ‘mass’ communication in the new ‘information society’ increasingly reveals this to be an arbitrary assertion, contradicted by the porous borders between the ‘mass’ and ‘individual’ dimensions of social practices in particular historical conjunctures. Perhaps the most significant example of this tendency has been the explosive growth of the Internet. Seemingly a form of ‘mass communication’, in terms of its standardised forms and techniques of transmission, our short historical experience with the social dimensions and ramifications of ‘Internet culture’ has made it more than apparent that this new technology is simultaneously a new form of social practice. On a ‘mass’ basis, it opens up new avenues to indivividuation, and thereby blurs the distinction on which the paradigm of ‘mass communications’ was founded. Developments in mobile telephony have similarly opened up new
vistas, interacting with older informational and communicative practices and often transforming them. New spaces of the ‘private’ and ‘public’ are being defined, which are likely to make it necessary to reconsider and reformulate many of the most basic categories used in social scientific research. Increasingly, concepts such as ‘mass communication’ are being revealed for what they are: expressions of particular, previous historical conjunctures, or modes in which a phase of modern social organisation that is now being transformed attempted to comprehend its own determinants. The academic study of these phenomena would be well advised to attend to these transformations and modify its own conceptuality accordingly.

There have of course been precedents for this development in prior phases of modernity’s reorganisation of public and private spaces. As we have seen, in many respects the field of communications and media research has gained a certain chronological continuity precisely by its ability to adapt to these changes in the societies they study by reformulating its object of study. In the current phase of social reorganisation, a particularly promising category – including the strengths of an ‘instrumental’ or ‘technical’ concept of communication, while specifying it in certain key institutional and technological respects – seems to have emerged in the ongoing redefinition of the concept of ‘media’.

The term ‘media’ also has a long history of transformation in modern societies. It originally signified only a ‘medium’ employed by or for something else, a channel of transmission of an independent content or a form that provided temporary ‘shelter’ for something on its way to somewhere else. In this sense, its meaning was fundamentally neutral and ‘content-free’. However, just as the concept of communication grew from signifying an institution in which certain activities occurred to mean a certain ‘authorised’ version of the activity itself, the concept of media was also expanded to signify a very particular mode of transmission. This development occurred from the nineteenth century onwards, solidifying into its still current common usage in the twentieth century. The concept of media functions as a ‘meta-concept’ for a means of communication and the communicative relations that structure it. It thus allows ‘communication’ to return to its prior wider meaning, while it isolates and valorises the particular instrumentalist sense that had been ascribed to communication in the sense of a regulated system of transmission.

However, remarkably, the same problems soon arise also with this redefinition, namely, the tendency to an overly general concept whose very strength of wide applicability turns out to be a weakness in terms of establishing the boundaries for an academic research programme. A
‘medium’ can ‘signify a specific system of symbols or signs (language, writing, picture, sound) or a specific type of expression (the medium of literature, in distinction from the medium of art). The expression [in either the singular or plural, as ‘media’] can be used for the material bearers of communicated messages (from papyrus to the internet) [to] the totality of social and technical systems of modern mass communication (Wissenschaftsrat 2007, 11). In fact, there can be no communication without corresponding ‘media’ that constitute its ‘material or social form’, just as there can be no society or culture without communication. Thus, when investigated rigorously and coherently, ‘media’ turns out to be a concept just as wide as that of communication, potentially capable of including a range of practices and institutions that are not limited to the transmission of ‘information’, ‘meaning’ or ‘code’, but which also includes such generalities as language (conceived as a medium for the creation of human community) or even money (conceived as the concrete medium for the establishment of a relationship of exchange of values).

As in the case of an ‘instrumentalist’ or ‘technical’ concept of communication, some of the more widespread ‘common sense’ notions of ‘media’ potentially end up obscuring precisely that which they should have clarified, namely, the social reality that underlies the various institutional forms assumed in concrete historical conjunctures. Its usefulness in establishing a rigorous and critical field of social scientific research, beyond temporary and ultimately inessential questions of institutional concurrence, should therefore be treated with some caution, if not scepticism.

The various problems with notions of ‘communications’ and ‘media’ that we have been discussing find their institutional expression in the form of the debate regarding the precise status of communication and media research. Is it a ‘discipline’, in a strict and traditional academic sense, or a looser ‘field’, the amalgamation or maybe only modus vivendi or a variety of disciplinary approaches? This constitutes an old debate – perhaps the foundational debate – of academic communication and media research. As Donsbach notes,

“This identity crisis has been with us for as long as we have existed in academia. When claims were made to establish communication (then called ‘press research’ or ‘Zeitungsforschung’) alongside sociology in the German academic system, the president of the German Sociological Association, Ferdinand Toennies, said at the association’s 1930 annual conference, ‘Why would we need press research within sociology? We don’t need a chicken or duck science within biology’. His point really hit communication researchers hard and still does today” (Donsbach 2006, 439).
There have continually been attempts to establish the ‘field’ as a ‘discipline’, with its own objects of research, methodology and protocols distinct from those of other social and human sciences. However, these have all run up against the real empirical variety and multiplicity of approaches and perspectives that constitute the everyday reality of research projects. Even Schramm, one of the pioneers of institutionalisation, acknowledge the inevitability of settling for a ‘less rigorous’ notion of communications and media research, valorising its interdisciplinary dimensions as a positive gain for a distinctively modern form of academic practice. In the early years of institutional establishment, he poignantly wrote that “communication research is a field, not a discipline. In the study of man, it is one of the great crossroads where many pass but few tarry” (Schramm 1959, 8).

A consensus seems to have been reached early on, which continues to this day: Communications and media research is essentially an inter- or intra-discipline, and rather than lamenting this fact, it should embrace the notion of a ‘field’ of research as a liberating and enabling institutional category, albeit one not without challenges in terms of how the field negotiates its relations with other, more traditional disciplines and their own claims to always limited resources within the overall setup of the modern university. (In this sense, communications and media research displays similar contours to those of ‘cultural studies’, itself originally conceived as an ‘interdiscipline’, which has also played an important role in recent communications research). This tendency has been particularly strong in the USA, in both positive and negative dimensions. Kellner adopts a ‘realist’ perspective, arguing that

“The boundaries of the field of communications have been unclear from the beginnings. Somewhere between the liberal arts/humanities and the social sciences, communications exists in a contested space where advocates of different methods and positions have attempted to define the field and police intruders and trespassers. Despite several decades of attempts to define and institutionalize the field of communications, there seems to be no general agreement concerning its subject matter, method, or institutional home. In different universities, communications is sometimes placed in humanities departments, sometimes in the social sciences, and generally in schools of communications. But the boundaries of the various departments within schools of communications are drawn differently, with the study of mass-mediated communications and culture, sometimes housed in Departments of Communication,
Radio/Television/Film, Speech Communication, Theatre Arts, or Journalism departments. Many of these departments combine study of mass-mediated communication and culture with courses in production, thus further bifurcating the field between academic study and professional training, between theory and practice” (Kellner 1995, 152).

Grossberg, on the other hand, emphasises its more problematic dimensions, albeit ones with hidden possible benefits in terms of spaces for critical perspectives, arguing that “Communication as a field in the United States is something of an assemblage struggling to continually constitute its fragile unity” (Larry Grossberg in Dervin and Song 2004).

Similarly anxieties are registered in many of the other countries surveyed in this report. It is notable that in all of them the consensus of a ‘field’ conception of communications and media research constitutes an often-unstated precondition of continuing research practice (Germany perhaps constitutes an exception in this regard, where pressures of traditional academic conceptions have tended to promote attempts to define a stricter sense of ‘discipline’; even here, however, the ‘field’ conception seems to constitute the practical reality of the everyday working of the institution). It is a consensus, however, which is not without its disturbing and uncomfortable elements, contradicted sometimes in practice or only approximated as an ‘ideal type’, depending on varying relations of institutional force and power in different countries.

Japan presents perhaps most extreme example of the difficulty of establishing even a sense of a ‘field’ of communication and media studies. There, media and communication research has been and still is dispersed in different universities and into different disciplines, rarely having a department or faculty of its own. Consequently, in Japan the ‘field’ is in reality constituted only at the level of academic and scholarly associations that create a space for dialogue for researchers who can now be understood – in retrospect, precisely on condition of their participation in these associations – as working in the same ‘field’.

French communication and media research presents an even more heterogeneous picture, despite its firmer institutional bases. According to one expert, communication theory in France is, in disciplinary terms, merely “communication philosophy mixed with semiotic and/or discourse analysis” (Averbeck 2008, 9). In France, the combination of information, documentation, and library sciences with communication and media studies, including all of its various approaches, makes the field a patchwork. Some experts argue that, should the French
scholars of Infocom move into the international Anglo-American world, they would be dispersed among such disciplines of information science, media studies, communication science, cultural studies, sociology, political science, literature studies or semiotics (cf. Jeanneret 2001, 5).

A typical issue brought up in the interviews with the French Infocom scholars conducted for the French report in this project was the status of the discipline (cf. also Averbeck 2005, 7). There was no disagreement about the multidisciplinary and transversality of the approaches to Infocom, nor on the importance of the question of communication in the contemporary global world. But the debate is evolving around whether Infocom should be a) an independent discipline with pluralistic roots and multidisciplinary approaches, or b) a phenomenon to be seen merely as an object of research that could be studied by all the traditional disciplines (such as sociology, political sciences, philosophy, etc.). On the one hand, defenders of the independent discipline view say that Infocom can and should consist of multidisciplinary theories and approaches, but there is a particular angle of communication on all the issues. This is what Bernard Miège calls “la pensée communicationelle” (2005). This perspective argues that “Infocom research should not be a reproduction of what is done elsewhere and simply applied to a new object of research”. Other voice, however, argue that Infocom is not a discipline, but rather, an object of research. They argue that to gain a theoretically and methodologically solid education, a researcher must have the education of one ‘mother-discipline’, such as sociology, history, or political science. Even now many of those who work in the field of Infocom have backgrounds in some other discipline (cf. Cardy & Froissart 2002, 354).

The United Kingdom displays similar hesitancies and doubts, and a similar broad conception of a ‘field’ rather than discipline. The UK report in this project reported that many scholars thought that ‘media studies’ can be understood as anything and everything from filmmaking to journalism, production design to discourse analysis. Indeed, its multidisciplinary nature was also seen as an asset, something that should be further strengthened rather than ignored. Typical comments included the following:

“The more one can draw from multiple disciplines (...) the better off we are”.

“We just have to remember it’s only a topic, it’s only a subject, it’s not a discipline and it gets its real intellectual gravity from its parent disciplines”.
Australia also displays a tendency towards a field in which numerous disciplinary perspectives cohabitate, even if they do not amalgamate. In this sense, Australian communication and media research exhibit clearly a tendency that can be found in many of the other countries studied in these reports. Among the popular research paradigms in Australia can be found a political economy focus, cultural studies, variations of US inspired empirical research, Western Marxist conceptualisations and structuralist, post-structuralist and semiological studies. It is notable that one of the initiatives that has a claim to being a genuine Australian contribution to the field internationally – namely the, cultural policy studies approach and the related later creative industries perspectives that emerged from the close integration of researchers with the Laborist governments of the 1980s and 1990s – has been criticised precisely due to its attempt to push communication and media studies in a more strictly disciplinary direction, with the de facto exclusion of alternative perspectives that this would entail. A ‘pragmatic pluralism’ remains the order of the day.

Nevertheless, despite the international popularity of a ‘field’ approach, as peaceful and pragmatic resolution to border disputes that would otherwise bog down very quickly into ‘disciplinary trench warfare’, even this perspective does not enjoy unanimous consent. We see here how the uncertainty over definitions of the intellectual constitution of the objects of study intensifies and overdetermines the institutional anxiety. At precisely the moment when a field definition, focused upon a particularly object of study rather than disciplinary methodology or approach, begins to gain the upper hand, disciplinary concerns return to question even the possibility of demarcating the distinct object required in order to establish the borders of a field. Donsbach once again formulates the issue with admirable clarity.

“Some say we are a ‘field’ rather than a discipline, defined by a common object -- namely communication. But I doubt that we have even a well-defined object! ‘Communication’ as the object is much too broad; almost everything in life involves communication” (Donsbach 2006, 439)

We can thus see that communication and media research is characterised internationally by a curious ‘dialectic’, or what we have referred to as an ‘infinite regress’. Each attempt to establish a theoretical foundation for the field, in terms of basic concepts, soon runs up against its own limits and contradictions; indeed, even the notion of a ‘field’ itself, insofar as it presupposes a
basic conceptuality, is revealed to be much more problematic than it appeared at first sight. Given such heterogeneity, how is it possible to gain an accurate picture of the state of communication and media research in any one given country, let alone in an international comparative perspective?

Our guiding perspective in this analytic overview of communication and media research in different countries has been that the ‘field’ is defined on a social and institutional level, not at the level of ‘basic concepts’ or disciplinarily, and not even in terms of a supposed common object of study. As we have argued, these perspectives more often than not are less reflective of any real intellectual coordinates than they are expressions of particular institutional and historical conditions, hypostasised into institutional forms, which then react back upon the organisation of ongoing study and research, sometimes in a negative fashion. We agree with Peters when he argues that “‘Communication’ has come to be administratively, not conceptually defined” (Peters 1986, 528). What is the best way to grasp this social determination and definition of communications and media study and research, in both any given national environment as well as in an international comparative perspective?

This question can only be adequately answered after we have reviewed the materials assembled in this study. However, some preliminary theses may help us to guide this investigation from the outset, as perspectives that provide us with a critical approach. We have argued that the notion of a general ‘field’ of study, united by common objects of research, despite its flexibility, in fact contains more hidden contradictions than is often recognised. Might the notion of discourse, as elaborated in recent post-structuralist approaches, prove to be more fruitful?

There are decisive and immediate benefits associated with such an approach. Rather than positing an originary unity, founded upon a common object of study or shared conceptuality, the notion of discourse would allow us to valorise the contingent and ongoing ‘dialogue’ of communications and media research as, precisely, a strength of the field. Freed from the need for foundations, scholars working in the field would be free to pursue the different approaches in their own research, which would only then be subsequently unified in the ‘discourse’ of communications and media studies according to their ability to find a resonance in other projects, or to ‘communicate’ fruitfully with them.

However, a second glance at such an eventuality reveals some of its potential problems. The notion of ‘discourse’ runs the risk of unifying the real heterogeneity in the field, subsuming
various voices into one ‘dialogue’ or ‘conversation’ which may not in fact be there own. This is to say that there are decisive questions of power and influence that lie behind a notion of discourse, as its preconditions, establishing a certain ‘discursive field’ in which some voices have a greater validity or purchase than others. Other than on purely pragmatic grounds that refer us to themes well beyond those of discourse theory strictly conceived (‘communication and media studies is the discourse affirmed by those working in the field as their own’, thus raising the question of who affirms such ‘ownership’ or participation), it is hard to see how such a notion would not in effect end up, once again, positing precisely that which is yet to be established: namely, a unity where there is none, or rather, a unity that only emerges from a complex series of mediations, rather than constituting an originary ground.

An alternative, taking into account the real differential power relations that traverse communication and media studies just as any other field of academic research – or, indeed, any other modern social practice – might be found in the notion of an ‘institution’. In this sense, communication and media studies could be defined as a particular institutional formation including a variety of perspectives in a heterogeneous dispositif, but one that is structured according to determinate power relations and interests. This approach might also seem to overcome some of the theoretical difficulties we have discussed. Unlike notions like ‘discipline’ that implicitly assert a conceptual order as an ‘essence’ present in all activities characterised as communication and media research, the concept of an ‘institution’ would permit a focus on the contingent power relations and force fields that are only retrospectively unified in a coherent ensemble by collective and individual interests, as they are established in a given social formation. Similarly, unlike the notion of a ‘field’, an ‘institution’ does not presuppose a unity of content or objects demarcated off from other objects; an institution ‘merely’ includes those elements that are regulated by it, a contingent gathering of elements that becomes necessary only in a retrospective sense. Finally, the notion of an institution would help us to avoid some of the difficulties we have identified in an overly general notion of discourse, precisely because it emphasises the material embodiment and organisation of power relations in concrete social formations, intersected by conflicting interests and values. In this sense, it would help us to pose the question of the particular ways in which the discourse of contemporary communication and media research is structured, directed and finalised according to particular interests and values, including those operative well beyond the clear demarcations of the ‘field’.
Nevertheless, the notion of ‘institution’ also seems to us to be inadequate to capture the dynamic field of forces and interests that make up contemporary communication and media research. There is the risk that a solely ‘institutional analysis’ would focus on an ‘interior arrangement’ to such an extent that the interaction of this institution with other disciplines, fields and institutions – its ‘exterior’ – might be neglected. In other words, the notion of ‘institution’, though in a way different from that of the notions of ‘discipline’, ‘field’ or ‘discourse’, also asserts an identity, rather than making possible an analysis of the processes by means of which such ‘identity’ is formed and maintained. However, as we will see in this report, contemporary communication and media research is constituted – in both a passive and active sense – precisely as the interaction and intersection of various ‘institutions’ or ‘fields’.

In this perspective, another possible research hypothesis might be Bourdieu’s attempt to elaborate a sophisticated ‘field theory’ that combines the strengths of both discursive and institutional paradigms. “Bourdieu’s field theory follows from Weber and Durkheim in portraying modernity as a process of differentiation into semiautonomous and increasingly specialized spheres of action” (Benson – Neveu 2005, 2-3). The role of analysis for Bourdieu is then that of analysing the internal arrangements and forces that go together to make up a given field as a contested terrain or Kampfplatz. He argued that “in a field, agents and institutions constantly struggle, according to the regularities and the rules constitutive of this space of play (and, in given conjunctures, over those rules themselves)” (Bourdieu – Wacquant 1992, 102). This would seem to be a very promising concept to help us to understand the active dimensions of contestation and struggle that we find to be very present in the materials gathered together in this report.

However, as Couldry argues, precisely “how the fields interrelate has always been a difficult question for a research program whose first concern is always with the internal workings of particular fields” (Couldry 2003, 659). Bourdieu tried to overcome this problem by developing a multi-levelled concept of different types or forms of ‘capital’ (economic, cultural etc) that united disparate fields. He himself, however, was aware of the abstract and inadequate nature of this solution, noting that “the question of the interrelation of different fields is an extremely complex one. It is a question that I would normally not answer because it is too difficult” (Bourdieu – Wacquant 1992, 109). Above all, Bourdieu’s articulated field theory runs the risk of describing existing arrangements, rather than providing an analysis of their causes, effects and potentials for transformation. As we will argue in this report, however, it is precisely this constellation of
‘external’ fields and their mutual interpenetration that requires both explanation and, in our view, transformation.

In this report, we have thus adopted the notion of a ‘hegemonic apparatus’ of Antonio Gramsci as a particularly efficacious concept that has the potential to include conceptually all the elements we believe are necessary to comprehend the articulations of contemporary communication and media research in different countries, in their national particularity and international interactions. A ‘hegemonic apparatus’ is a field of conflicting forces and organisational forms, which, however, also includes a strong element of ‘direction’ and ‘leadership’ (cf. Bollinger - Koivisto 2001). It is ‘internally’ organised at a certain level of coherence, constituting a discrete social element or ‘instance’, in the perspective of providing direction and guidance to particular social practices; but as one element or ‘apparatus’ of an overall social project, it also acknowledges the ‘external’ determinants of this organised form, as merely one ‘instance’ within a larger social formation directing and shaping it, which it directs, shapes and concretises in its turn. Gramsci’s notion of a ‘hegemonic apparatus’ includes the strong emphasis upon struggle and contestation found in Bourdieu’s field theory, acknowledging the always-unfinished nature of consolidated institutions and relations. It also similarly includes an emphasis upon the concrete materiality and experiential nature of a social formation. It goes beyond it, however, by insisting upon the way in which any given ‘field’ is internally fractured by other ‘fields’, thus introducing a dynamic dimension of changing social relations. For this reason, we believe it constitutes the most adequate analytical category for comprehending the determining features of an historical conjuncture, such as our own, of widespread transformation.

As we will see in this report, contemporary communication and media research and study is constituted as a ‘hegemonic apparatus’ precisely in this sense, as the intersection of competing values, interests and forces that have attained to a certain level of articulation and coherence, but remain determined by other social instances in crucial respects. To understand this ‘unity’, one needs to understand that which lies ‘beyond’ it – or rather, that which is already ‘within’ it in complex forms. We believe that it is only by acknowledging this complex dialectical process of direction, influence, formation, consolidation and transformation that we will be able to comprehend not merely the processes of contemporary reality and their impact upon our activity as researchers, but also, crucially, to understand the causes of this reality and thus be better able to make a contribution towards its improvement.
3 Patterns of Research Institutions and Organisations

In this chapter we provide an analytic overview of key aspects of communication and media research institutions and organisations in each of the countries studied in the country specific reports. These key aspects are:

Departments, Professorships and Research Paradigms
Doctoral Studies
Position of Women
Research Funding
Internationalisation and Dispositifs of Publishing

We hold these to be key indices of the development of communication and media research, permitting meaningful comparisons to be made across national and cultural borders in terms of the ‘internal’ organisation of communication and media research and its ‘external’ relations with other ‘disciplines’, ‘fields’ and the broader academic landscape. As we noted in the preface to this report, the available data for each country in relation to each theme varied widely; while some themes were treated extensively in one country specific report, they played a lesser role in other national contexts. This is to be expected given that, as we have argued, communication and media research is primarily constituted discursively and institutionally, and is therefore highly culturally dependent and context specific. We have thus not aimed at an exhaustive treatment of each key aspect in each country. Rather, we have attempted to indicate some of the most significant tendencies and initiatives that define each of these themes in any given national context. Such an approach allows us to gain a clearer picture of the field of forces and interests that traverse and define communication and media research in its institutional unity and discursive multiplicity at the national level. However, it also forms the foundation for a genuinely inter-national perspective, insofar as it draws our attention to the social, political and institutional causes of the similarities and differences that we can subsequently note between communication and media research in the various individual countries.
3.1 Departments, Professorships and Research Paradigms

This sub chapter provides an outline of the organisation of academic communication and media research in each of the studied countries, providing an overview of the various institutional structures and resources that constitute the ‘material forms of existence’ of communication and media research in the respective university systems. We find that many of these have been strongly determined by national histories and characteristics of a more general import, as is to be expected in institutions integrated with national markets and governance strategies. For example, it is notable that communication and media research in countries with traditions of strong academic structures and hierarchies (e.g. Germany, France and, to a lesser extent, the Netherlands) are shaped by dominant institutional elements; in a country such as Belgium in which linguistic divisions play such a central role, the organisation of communication and media research is similarly strongly determined by differences in language and culture; research in a country such as Estonia arguably remains open, like many other ‘new’ disciplines in that country, to new developments and expansion to a greater extent than is the case in more established academic settings; research in East Asia in the field is heavily shaped by more general relations with the ‘West’; and finally, a view of communication and media research in the Anglophone world reveals both its integration with the particular market forms characteristic of those economies and also a remarkable set of ‘elective affinities’ with other academic disciplines and practices in those national contexts.

This initial survey of the organisational form of communication and media research provides strong support for our guiding research thesis regarding the lack of coherence of this ‘non-discipline’ and its primary determination by existing institutional-academic and extra-academic social and political formations, primarily at the nation state level, even and especially in its international dimensions. The kaleidoscopic perspective presented in this chapter further confirms the need for more concrete and expansive research into the various levels of institutional ‘embedding’ in each particularly country in order to gain an accurate picture of the primary causes and operative tendencies in communication and media research today. Further sub chapters take up this task in relation to particularly significant indices of the potential for future growth and transformation.
Germany

Precisely how many professorships and professors there are in communication and media studies in Germany is somewhat difficult to answer in any simple way. The emergence of such fields of study as media psychology, media pedagogy, media sociology, media politics, media aesthetics, media history, film studies, media economy, media law, media management, media design, media technology etc., has complicated the picture considerably. There are two basic strategies for resolving this problem. One is to count all the professorships that show a clear connection to communication or media studies in their title. The other is to try to identify a certain institutional “core” area amidst all the confusing new titles. As will become clearer further on, this also has something to do with inner relations of the field, reflected also in partly rivalling researcher associations.

The first strategy has been followed by Ruhrmann et al. (2000). They found relevant professorships in 52 universities, technical universities and Künstlerische Hochschule (but not Fachhochschule) and compared the situation in 1987 and 1997. In 1987, there were 97 professorships in communication and media studies whereas in 1997 the number had increased to 204, including planned professorships. The increase is impressive. Whereas in 1987 there were only 26 higher education institutions where communication and media studies were represented, in 1997 there were 52 of them. In both cases, Nordheim-Westfalen was the leading Land in professorships. In 1997, Berlin had lost its second place to Thüringen. The results are presented graphically on the following maps.
Figure 3; Communication and media professorships in Germany in 1987 (From Ruhrmann et al. 2000, 286)
Figure 4; Communication and Media professorships in Germany in 1997 (from Ruhrmann et al. 2000, 287)
A closer look at the profiles of the professorships reveals that over half of the professorships had a rather general profile of communication or media studies or journalism. The rest is divided between smaller groups: visual communication (including film studies) had a share of 11%, Media design 9%, Multimedia 7%, and the history and aesthetics of media 6%; Media law, Media economy, Media management, Media technology, Media pedagogy, Media psychology, and Specialised journalism \([\text{Fachjournalismus}]\) all gained less than 5%. These results are summed up in the following chart.

Figure 5; Development of Communication and Media Studies in Germany

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Land</th>
<th>1987</th>
<th>1997</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number of universities</td>
<td>Number of universities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schleswig-Holstein</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bremen</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hamburg</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Niedersachsen</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nordheim-Westfalen</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hessen</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rheinland-Pfalz</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baden Württemberg</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bayern</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saarland</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berlin</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brandenburg</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mecklenburg-Vorpommern</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sachsen-Anhalt</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thüringen</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sachsen</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>altogether</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>97</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(based on Ruhrmann et al 2000, 289)
Ruhrmann et al. (ibid., 290) do not hesitate to speak about a “boom” of Communication and Media studies. They see several reasons for this. First, there is the change in information and communication technologies, linked to the growing technical convergence, economic growth potential and increasing daily presence and new political potentials of media in its different forms. All these developments lead to an increase of qualified personnel.

However, they do not hesitate to say that is also question of a “cost-neutral profile formation of universities, but also of ministries, with a discipline whose image is positively occupied”. They add that “in the process, also structural problems of existing disciplinary branches, faculties and institutes are covered over”, not unlike the “redesign of existing social scientific offerings under the euphonic label of ‘cultural studies’” (ibid., 293).

Meyen follows another strategy in his study on the recruiting of professors in Communication studies and Journalism (where the absence of Media studies should be noted). He asks “whether the opportunity for professionalisation linked to the expansion of positions and increasing kudos has been used”, or are we still dealing with a discipline where “above all those without an Habilitation and journalists have an opportunity?” Meyen wants to find out “if a tendency in the direction of unitary, systematic education in the patterns of entrance to the profession can be recognised, from which one could deduce a common professional identity and common ideas of values?” (2004, 195).

Meyen rejects the approach of Ruhrmann et al. (2000) because their “broad understanding of Communication Studies does not appear to be meaningful for the interests pursued here, because it programmes a heterogeneous personnel structure of the disciplinary representatives”. Thus he wants to focus his study on the “‘core’ of the discipline”, which he admits is problematic in the sense that the “ideas about what belongs to this ‘core’ naturally contradict each other”. To tackle this problem, he proposed to utilise initially the lowest common denominator, which meant in this context focusing on those institutions that are listed as supporting the publishing of the journal Publizistik. After some further addition and subtraction of institutions (with “course offerings oriented towards artistic, aesthetic, pedagogic, philosophical or political scientific dimensions”) he ends up with 25 institutions and their 85 professors (2004, 197).

In Meyen’s sample the growth after 1990 is “be attributed above all to the new foundations in the “new” Bundesländer i.e. states of the former GDR]” (ibid., 198). In western Germany there were only 8 new professorships between 1990 and 2002. Whereas in 1970 86% of the professors had journalistic experience, nowadays only one third of them have it. Yet Meyen writes that the
academicisation of Communication studies has not kept pace with growth of the discipline. There are still many non-habilitated scholars who have gained professorships and the time between Habilitation and the first professorship is short, unlike in other disciplines. An interesting result is also that less than one-third of the professors had studied communication studies as their main subject. Most of those professors who had studied communication as their main subject were male. He would have defended his dissertation around the age of 30 and the Habilitation nearly ten years later (ibid., 200-2).

Figure 6: Professors of Communication Studies and Journalism in Germany

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Professors</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-women</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Habilitation</td>
<td>33% (3)</td>
<td>57% (7)</td>
<td>51.9% (52)</td>
<td>57.8% (83)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-practical media experience</td>
<td>66% (3)</td>
<td>86% (7)</td>
<td>36.7% (49)</td>
<td>33.7% (83)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dissertation at the age of Habilitation</td>
<td>23.6 (3)</td>
<td>27.7 (7)</td>
<td>30.0 (50)</td>
<td>30.7 (77)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Habilitation at the age of</td>
<td>38 (1)</td>
<td>34,5 (4)</td>
<td>37,0 (27)</td>
<td>38,9 (48)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waiting time between Habilitation and professorship</td>
<td>5 (1)</td>
<td>10,75 (4)</td>
<td>2,9 (27)</td>
<td>2,8 (48)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age at first professorship</td>
<td>46 (3)</td>
<td>45 (7)</td>
<td>40,4 (52)</td>
<td>41,5 (79)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main subject</td>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>(7)</td>
<td>(54)</td>
<td>(85)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Communication Studies</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>27</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Economics</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Philology</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Law</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-History</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Sociology</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Psychology</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Political Science</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-other</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(based on Meyen 2004, 199. Numbers in brackets: number of cases on which the figures are based)
According to Meyen, the discipline is dominated by institutes in Mainz, Berlin, München and Münster. Of the teachers that have studied communication at least as a minor subject, 80% come from these four institutes. The relatively new institute in Mainz – founded first in the mid 1960s – has surpassed the three institutes that survived the war. This becomes even more evident if we look at the professors that have been born after 1945. Here we have seven from Mainz against four from Berlin. These two institutes are also the leaders when it comes to universities where people have studied communication and defended their Habilitationen.

![Figure 7: Institutes in which German professors studied](based on Meyen 2004, 202)

Because of the “growing lack of clarity” of communication and media studies in Germany, manifested in all the new titles of the study programmes and professorships, Wirth proposes a statistical approach that tries to find common patterns among all these confusing titles and differences. He notes that there is no “generally shared understanding of Communication and Media Studies” (2000, 37). On the one hand, we are experiencing a period of growing “mediatisation” of society and promising occupational prospects; on the other hand, the “ministerial red pen threatens” all disciplines showing signs of weakness. Thus “study course with ‘Media’ or ‘Communication’ in the title spring up that often have a very different focus from the
traditional ‘old’ institutes in Munich, Mainz or Berlin, which perhaps can be drawn upon as reference points” (ibid.).

Based on surveys and Internet research, Wirth comes to the conclusion that there are 131 study programmes for communication or media studies in the institutions of German higher education. These programmes are divided between those offering it as a main subject and those where it is present only as a minor subject:

Figure 8; Places of study in Germany

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study programme</th>
<th>number</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>main subject at a university</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>43.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- of these at a CMS department or faculty</td>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>main subject at a Hochschule</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- of these at a CMS department or faculty</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main subject at a Fachhochschule</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- of these at a CMS department or faculty</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Only as minor subject (all are in universities)</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>15.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Only as an added study element</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>21.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(based on Wirth 2000, 41)
The majority of the programmes (87) are located in universities or technical universities, 30 in Hochschulen and the rest (14) in other more vocationally oriented institutions of higher learning. According to Wirth (ibid., 38) these programmes are “extremely heterogeneous”. Some kind of humanistic (geistewissenschaftliche) emphasis is usual (38%), with a focus on media, literary, linguistic or historical studies. Next comes a social scientific orientation (30%). Strongly presented are also programmes with links to aesthetic and artistic orientations, as well as programmes with an economic, technical, journalistic, or design orientation:

Figure 9; Scholarly Orientation of Complete (n=73) and Partial (n=58) Study Programmes in Germany in Percentages

(from Wirth 2000, 39)
Wirth tries to refine his results with a cluster analysis that results in four groups. The first cluster (41%) is formed by humanistically oriented study programmes. The second cluster (28%) is formed by artistic and design oriented studies. The third cluster (19%) is best described as interdisciplinary with an emphasis on the social sciences. The smallest cluster (12%) is formed by journalistically oriented programmes with an increasingly technical emphasis in recent years:

Figure 10; Typology of Study Programmes in Germany

(from Wirth 2000, 41)

Wirth estimates that there are 269 professors and 390 other scientific staff in communication and media studies. An average institute has 3.6 professors and 5.5 other scientific staff. However, 35% of all institutes have only one professorship and a further 22% only two professorships. Only five institutes have more than 10 professorships. The biggest one is the Hochschule für Film
and Fernsehen in Postdam, followed by Kunstwaldschule für Medien in Köln, Hochschule für Film und Fernsehen in München, Freie Universität Berlin and Universität Leipzig. Whereas in universities there are on average 2.9 Professorships, the Hochschulen have on average 6 of them (ibid., 41-42).

According to Wirth (ibid., 44) the best student/professorship ratio of 45 to 1 is found in courses with a heavy emphasis on one’s own artistic production or design. However, only 2650 students fall into this category. For the 4000 students working for a Diplom, the ratio is 208 to 1; for the 16 000 students doing their Magister exam, the situation is the worst, with a ratio of 232 to 1.

Rössler (2004) comes up with some later related data. According to him, there are circa 20 000 students of media and communication studies in Germany (if we do not distinguish between those who study it as their main subject and those for whom it is a minor subject). More than half of the students are concentrated in six universities: Leipzig, Düsseldorf, München, Münster, Bochum and Göttingen. In these six universities there are altogether 39 professorships in this branch of studies, i.e. 270 students per professorship. Countrywide, the ratio is 174 students per professorship in media and communication studies. To characterise this situation as an “overload” (ibid., 20) is perhaps not an overstatement. Even in more journalistically oriented programmes, the ratio is 50 to 1. However, all these figures also seem to highlight the major role of the non-professorial staff in the daily work of the institutes.

The yearly figure of those starting their studies was 3900 whereas the number of those graduating was 1700. There were 23 000 applications in 2003. However, there are far fewer actual persons behind these applications. Due to the lack of any centralised or synchronised application system, it is difficult to give any exact figures, but it has been estimated that each applicant sends his or her papers to perhaps some five or seven universities. This actually means that everybody wanting to study this field would be able to start his or her studies at some university. At most of the universities, the criteria for intake is a combination of student exam and the time the applicant has been waiting for a place (ibid.).
France

Academic research in media and communication in France takes place in universities and polytechnical schools (grandes écoles). Both are public-funded institutions, but the polytechnical schools are fewer in number and often have a higher status. University is open to all citizens, whereas the polytechnical schools are able to select their students, and therefore able to limit the number of students per teacher. The faculty in both universities and polytechnical schools conduct both teaching and research. The higher university posts are called professeurs des universités. Most of the post doctoral posts are teacher-researchers (enseignant-chercheurs), which are called maître de conference. Moreover, there are assistant posts such as ATER (Attachés temporaires d'enseignants et de recherche), which are reserved for doctoral and post doctoral students.

The French universities, academic research groups, and laboratories are financed and regulated by the Ministry of Research (Ministère de l'Education, l'enseignement supérieur et de la recherche), which defines and institutionalises all the scientific disciplines through a national council of universities called Le conseil national des universités (CNU).

Separated from the universities are the public scientific research centres, EPSTs (Etablissements public, scientifiques et techniques), whose purpose is to focus only on research. One of the main EPST’s is the National Centre for Scientific Research (Centre National de la Recherche Scientifique, or CNRS). It is a government-funded research organisation under the administrative authority of France's Ministry of Research. It is the most valued research institution in the land and has a total of 30,000 researchers in six research departments, two national institutes, 19 regional offices to ensure decentralized direct management of laboratories, and 1,256 research and service units (90% of which are joint laboratories) (http://www2.cnrs.fr).

CNRS is composed of sections in which most academic disciplines are represented. “This breakdown is adapted regularly to changes in science and disciplinary fields via adjustments to the number of sections, and their headings. There have been 40 sections since 1991. The 40 sections evaluate the work of researchers and research units” (ibid.). However, information and communication sciences do not have a section within the CNRS.

Often university teachers and professors have an affiliation to one of the research laboratories of CNRS through their research interests. Faculty are employed directly by their universities but for collaborative research they use the laboratories of the CNRS. There are also so-called mixed research units (Unité mixte de Recherche, or UMR), in which the staff and funding
are drawn from various resources. The research laboratories are often “les laboratoires mixte” financed by several institutions. Some research laboratories are recognised by the CNRS, which gives them some funding and research staff. There are also researchers who are employed directly by the CNRS, who do not have any teaching obligation. This is considered a good position, since it enables individuals to focus on scientific research and publishing. But in the teaching posts contact with students is also valued.

At the institutional level the history of communication studies is relatively short in France. The birth of the discipline was connected to the development and increase in the professions of information and communication at the beginning of the 1970s (Jeanneret 2001, 5). However, research in communication emerged already in the 1960s, thanks to a few pioneers such as Georges Friedman, Roland Barthes, and Edgar Morin. Friedman studied technological means of communication and mass media culture; Roland Barthes analysed advertisements and mass media semiotically; and Edgar Morin begin studying the cinema and cultural industries from a sociological point of view. In 1962 the three of them created a centre for studying mass communication named *Le Centre d’études des communications de masse* (CECMAS) within the famous *École des Hautes Études en Sciences Sociales* (EHESS) in Paris (Morin 2004, 77-78; Averbeck 2005, 3).

Even before CECMAS, the first of the forerunners in the institutional field was the *Institut Français de Presse* (IFP) at the University of Assas, also in Paris, which was founded in 1951. The IFP had its origins in historical and juridical background and focused on a social science approach to communication studies beginning in the 1970s, whereas CECMAS developed a semiotic and culturalist approach. The CECMAS approach has significantly influenced and given emphasis to contemporary communication research (Averbeck 2005, 3).

In the 1970s a group of founders of the academic discipline of information and communication started seeking institutional recognition for a certain number of teachers working in the field. Among the pioneers were Robert Escarpit, Jean Meyriat, Roland Barthes, Fernand Terrou, and Abrahama Moles, a group representing diverse scientific fields. On their initiative the CNU, which then was called CCU (*Conseil consultatif des universités*), started preparing for the founding of a new section in the council of academic disciplines. Meanwhile, the scholars held their founding meeting in February 1972 in the *Maison des sciences de l’homme* (MSH). In this meeting it was decided to call the field *Sciences de l’Information et de la Communication* (SIC or Infocom), Information and Communication Sciences. After several institutional procedures Infocom was officially established as an academic discipline by the CCU in January 1975.
(Averbeck 2005, 3; Boure 2006, 251; Lancien et al. 2001, 37-38; for more on the history of Infocom, see Boure 2005 and 2006b).

Shortly after the new discipline of Infocom was founded the first universities implemented teaching programmes at the graduate level. These universities were l'EPHE (which is now called École des hautes études en sciences sociales), Bordeaux III, Grenoble III (GRESEC), Paris II (IFP), and Nice. The University of Bordeaux was the first one to give the maîtrise degree in communication, in 1971. The doctoral diploma had to wait, until 1984, when the third cycle of Infocom became institutionalised (Lancien et al. 2001, 37-38; Cardy & Froissart 2006, 259).

In 1978 the research association in the field, Société française des sciences de l'information et communication (SFSIC), was founded. Since then, the SFSIC has organised conferences every second year to bring together researchers, teachers, professionals, and doctoral students of Infocom (Lancien et al. 2001, 39).

Nevertheless, the research on Infocom was quiet throughout the 1970s and 1980s. In 1982 two French researchers, Armand Mattelart and Yves Stourdézé, raised the question the delay in carrying out French communication research compared to the Anglo-Saxon countries. They made a report, entitled Technologie, culture et communication, on the state of Infocom in France, which had been commanded by the Ministry of Research and Industry. The authors complained that despite all the economic, industrial, and cultural input, the field of communication was still hardly visible in the organisational structure of French academia. This absence was contrasted to the pervading presence of communication and new information and communication technology in contemporary society, in political debates, and in everyday life. The researchers expressed concern over the technological hype taking over serious reflections on social implications of technology. The authors proposed a series of suggestions for organising the field (Lancien et al. 2001, 39; Pineau 1999, 6; see further Mattelart 2001).

Ten years later, in 1993, the evaluation report on the field of Infocom by Le Comité national d'évaluation (CNE) claimed that progress had been made, despite the scattering of research over several sections and the refusal of the national research centre CNRS to provide any place for researchers in information and communication. The number of researchers and university departments had augmented. But even today the CNRS has not recognised communication as an independent field of research among its disciplinary sections. The importance of communication has not been ignored, but media and communication have continued to serve as objects of research for many studies within several traditional research disciplines rather than as a discipline
in itself (Lancien et al. 2001, 39).

Within the CNRS there has been research in the field of communication, for example, since 1988 in the Laboratoire communication et politique of CNRS, and between 2001 and 2006 in Sciences et techniques de l'information et de la communication (STIC) (ibid. 39-40). At first the focus of STIC was to explore the issues of communication from the technological point of view, but in 2006 the laboratory began cooperation with the Social Studies and Humanities Department of CNRS, and became called GDR TICS (Science de Technologie de l'Information et de la Communication et Société). Recently, in October 2006, the new Institut des sciences de la communication du CNRS (ISCC) was inaugurated (www.iscc.fr_eng.html.) However, many distinguished scholars in the field are not satisfied with creation of the institute, which has a lesser status than a laboratory. There is still debate around the full recognition of Infocom, which emphasises the social and humane aspects of information and communication.

CNU - Le Conseil National des Universites

Before applying for doctoral posts (maître de conférences, professeur des universités) in the universities or research centres, French doctorates have to pass a qualification examination given by the national council of universities, Le Conseil National des Universités (CNU). The CNU members are designated by the Ministry of Higher Education, Ministère de l'enseignement supérieur. The task of this council is to define the existing academic disciplines and to accept the teacher-researchers to each field of science. The CNU has 77 sections representing all the academic disciplines, out of which Sciences de l'Information et de la Communication is the 71st. The council of the 71st section is responsible for defining the field of Infocom selecting the teacher-researchers on the basis of their applications. The CNU then gives a certification or proficiency rating to each applicant, so that they can apply for posts as maîtres de conférences or professors (CP-CNU 2006, 4). This means that the doctorates cannot apply for the academic posts in France without certification rating from the CNU. The certification is valid for four years; if the applicant does not find a post, then she/he has to reapply for the certification.

In 2006 there were 230 applications for the certification of maîtres de conférences and 60 were accepted. The same year there were 41 applicants for the proficiency rating for professorships and 13 were accepted (ibid, 10). This shows that the selection is strict and creates competition among the applicants. To be qualified, the applicants must pass two “filters”: first, the
certification for the discipline (Is the applicant’s research to be defined as communication research or research in another discipline?). Second, the applicant’s research qualifications are evaluated. The definition of the discipline and the criteria for evaluating the qualifications of the different levels of teacher and researcher posts are open to the public at the website of the 71st section of CNU.

According to the document on the qualification session in 2007, the discipline of Infocom is defined as follows:
- studies of information and communication, the nature of phenomena and its practices, and the various approaches that are applied to research in the areas including process, production, usage, consumption, and reception of information and communication, processes of mediation and mediatisation;
- studies of the individual and institutional actors in the field of information and communication, the professionals (the journalists in particular), and their practices;
- studies of information, its contents and systems and from the angle of representations, significations or practices connected to them;
- studies of the various aspects of media, communication, and the cultural industries.

The field is defined as interdisciplinary, and thus the methods and approaches may be diverse. But every study should be based on one of the already defined and existing methodologies. It is not enough that the researcher uses media or communication products as research data or material, but the composition of the study needs to have an angle specific to information and communication studies. Neither does any practical work on media and communication as such qualify as research in Infocom (CP-CNU 2006, 2; CNU 71 Sciences de l’information et de la communication 2007).

The board of the Infocom section of CNU consists of 24 persons. Two-thirds of the board members are elected by those on the list of the syndicates of national education. There are quotas for sex, geographical region, different sectors of the discipline, and also different types of academic institutions. The remaining one-third of the board members are nominated by the Ministry of Higher Education and Research. However, the academics charge that these nominations often vary, depending on the political orientation of the French government. The CNU has been created to fulfil the function of protecting the university system from favouritism, nepotism, and localism. But governmental politics influence the functioning of the CNU and
indeed, all fields of research. Owing to the political nominations, the representativeness of the quotas of the CNU councils are not always balanced; moreover, critics say that personal contacts influence the Ministry’s nominations, and the persons elected often have a visible weakness in the scientific arena. The last presidents of the 71st Section of CNU, Bernard Miège, Jean François Tétu, and the current president Viviane Couzinet, have been working to make the process of evaluation more transparent. Infocom has not been indexed in the national research databases; therefore the current president, Couzinet (who comes from information sciences) is working to have the publications of Infocom indexed in INIST (l’Institut pour l’information scientifique et technique), which produces databases for all the research in France.

It is a French peculiarity that the information sciences and a range of culturalist traditions are combined in media and communication studies. This causes a great heterogeneity in the field and complicates its definition. Therefore, to clarify, research on the following topics is included in the domain of Infocom: economic intelligence, territorial intelligence, collective intelligence, medical information, geographical information, automatic data processing of languages, lexicography, infometrics, online services (e-learning, e-commerce, e-governing, etc.), man-machine interfaces, the semantics of the Web, statistics management etc., cinema, audiovisual spectacles, arts, literary products, editing, design, etc., museums, libraries, archives, other cultural institutions etc (CP-CNU 2006, 3).

It is usual for communication research to be found in many departments and research centres that do not have communication as their main focus. The fields that touch upon the questions of communication range from humanities to engineering sciences; they can be found among the disciplines of social studies, political science, history, economy, law, anthropology, literature studies, industrial arts, educational sciences, geography, philosophy and psychology (see ibid. 43). Such variety makes an exhaustive mapping of the research institutions impossible and only some of the most important institutions are presented here.

Important Academic Research Institutions

Many of the universities and research institutions are centred in the capital area, as is usual in many other countries. But there are quite a few important research units in other parts of France as well. The leading institution in the field of information and communication, the laboratory of GRESEC, is located in the city of Grenoble, which is situated in the Alps region. Bordeaux has
the longest tradition of higher education in communication, and there are lively research groups in the universities of Avignon, Caen, Lille, Lyon, Metz, Nice, Rennes, and Toulouse.

The national research centre CNRS has several laboratories that are involved in communication research. Most of them are situated in the capital area of Paris. GDR TICS (Technologies de l'Information et de la Communication et Société) is a research group focused on technologies of information and communication, which takes into account social practices. This group was created as a joint venture of the departments of SHS (Sciences Humaines et Sociales) and STIC (Sciences et Technologies de l'Information et de la Communication) in 2002 and was re-organised in 2006. Its goal is to facilitate interdisciplinary exchange between the social and technical sciences; it also analyses the economic and social transformations associated with the diffusion of technology of information and communication.

Other laboratories for example, include ITEM (UPR 7, L’Institut des textes et manuscrits modernes), which uses the approach of linguistics and literature studies, and LAU (UPR 34 Laboratoire d’Anthropologie urbaine), which focuses on urban anthropology and communication studied as part of urban culture and society. There is also some research on information and communication sciences in the laboratory of Politique, pouvoir et organisation.

French communication scholars had been expecting CNRS to establish a laboratory for information and communication ever since the 1980s. In November 2006 L’Institut des sciences de la communication du CNRS (ISCC) was finally established. The new institute of communication has set itself a goal of developing the field of research in communication studies, creating posts, and research laboratories in connection with French and international universities, and supporting and validating the previous research on communication without disciplinary status. On the institute’s web site it is stated that communication concerns the great majority of scientific departments of CNRS and that social and humanist sciences have an active role to play in this research. The five main focus areas proposed for the institute are:

1. Language and Communication
2. Political Communication, Public Sphere and Society
3. Globalisation and Cultural Diversity
4. Scientific and Technological Information
5. Science, Technology and Societies
(for a more detailed account of the focal areas, see http://www.iscc.fr/index_eng.html)

**Departments and research groups at universities and polytechnics** in the Paris region are several.

The French press institute IFP (Institut Français de Presse) in Université Assas-Paris 2 is the oldest research institution focused on media in France. The institution’s main focus was on journalism, but since 1951 the focus has been broadened to other genres and more broadly on mass media (TV, radio, new media, and communication technology), all the media phenomena. The IFP has five disciplines law, economy, sociology, history, and semiology, therefore, the curricula and the research approaches used interdisciplinary. The institution has several master’s programmes that follow the main focus of the research; they also have a professional master’s programme in journalism. IFP also has a research laboratory CARISM (Centre d’analyse et de Recherche interdisciplinaires sur les medias), which has the status of équipe d’accueil, funding standard recognised by the Ministry of Research. The laboratory unites 25 teacherResearchers from IFP, researchers with external funding, and approximately 100 doctoral students.

The university of Paris Nord (Paris 13) has a department of Sciences de la communication, Sciences humaines et des humanités, which is considered one of the most important institutions of Infocom in France. Its focal areas are communication, cultural industries, public space, media and the information society. Its director, Pierre Moeglin, is one of the pioneers in Infocom.

The CEMTI research group combines researchers and teachers from MSH, Paris 8, and other institutions, e.g., Paris 13, as well as researchers from foreign countries. CEMTI emphasises analysis of media and communication within a social context and from multiple perspectives).

The Université Sorbonne Nouvelle (Paris 3) has three departments in the field of communication studies: communication, arts & culture, and cinema. The research group of CIM (Communication, information, media) is a équipe d’accueil recognised by the Ministère de la Recherche (Ministry of Research) since 1994. CIM unites researchers and doctoral students from the department of communication, other academic institutions, and other research centres. CIM’s profile is broad and it also combines other disciplines (such as psychology, semiology, philosophy), which deal with communication questions. The crossing of disciplines is encouraged and the main topics of research are, among others history, geopolitics, media education, identities, the traditional and new media, representations, reception, communication aesthetics,
and languages of communication.

Communication studies are also represented in the department of English within the section language and area studies in Sorbonne 3. The department has a long tradition of film studies and recently it has broadened its perspective into communication studies, the focus being on a cultural approach to media. The department also has a highly international profile compared to many other French institutions.

CELSA (École des hautes études en sciences de l'information et de la communication) was created in 1957. It functions as a polytechnical institution within the University of Paris-Sorbonne (Paris 4). The objective of CELSA is to train media professionals that possess a broad knowledge base in humanist and social sciences. The curriculum is designed for professional as well as academic needs. CELSA grants diplomas for students up to the doctoral level and has a staff consisting of a total of 800 persons who carry out both teaching and research.

The École des Hautes Études en Sciences Sociales has a research centre CEMS (Centre d'étude des mouvements sociaux), which mainly focuses on questions of public space, collective action, and social relationships. CEMS also conducts research that is considered important in the field of communication, for example, the studies of television and television audiences.

Outside the capital of France, the most well-known research institution is situated in Grenoble: the laboratory of GRESEC (Groupe de recherche sur les enjeux de la communication). The laboratory is part of the Institut de la Communication et des Médias (l'Unité de Formation et de Recherche (UFR) des Sciences de la communication) within the Université Stendhal, Grenoble 3. The institute was officially founded in 1975, when Infocom was established as a discipline by the CNU. The most famous professor of GRESEC is recently retired Bernard Miège, who is among the most cited of Infocom scholars in France and who is also known abroad in the field of cultural industries. The laboratory has about 30 teacher-researchers (5 professors, 25 maîtres de conférence), 60 professional teachers (intervenants), 600 students and doctoral students (60). The main orientation of GRESEC follows the emergence, development, and social implications of modern communication media. This orientation also takes into account the changes in the social and cultural mediations that are increasingly commercial and industrial, interactivity, multi-modality, and the signification of devices offered to user-consumers. The laboratory is organised around four main focus areas:

1) Industrialisation of information and culture (ICI). The evolution of information and culture from various aspects (cultural, socio-political, social, and economic), the social logic directing the
social actors. The progressive emergence of the networks of communication accelerated by the movement of industrialisation and branding.

2) Changes in the public space: communication, territories, and organisations (MEP). Public space, techniques of politics of communication. The field work is varied, ranging from local media to political communication of territorial collectivities to scientific communication and corporate communication.

3) Multimedia and interactive writings: production and uses (EMIPU). Digital technology of information and communication (TICN), especially the domain of learning.

4) Information and communication (CRISTAL). Automatic processing of language, essentially French, linguistic approach (http://w3.u-grenoble3.fr/gresec/).

In the city of Lille, the Université Charles de Gaulle has an interdisciplinary research group around questions of communication, called GERIICO (Groupe d'études et de recherche interdisciplinaire en information communication). The research centre (équipe d'accueil) combines teacher-researchers, researchers, and doctoral students from three departments within the Université Charles de Gaulle, Lille 3. These departments are UFR l'Information et Communication, UFR IDIST Information, documentation and UFR Arts et Culture. GERIICO is composed of 33 teacher-researchers, 36 doctoral students, and 25 associated members from other universities.

The area of Lyon has several universities where communication research is taking place. At L'Université Jean Moulin, (Lyon3), Faculté des Lettres et Civilisations, Information-Communication hosts a research group (équipe d'accueil), called UFErics (Unité fédérative d'équipes de recherche en sciences de l'information).

In Toulouse there is a research group (équipe d'accueil) known as LERASS (Laboratoire d'études et de recherches appliqués en sciences de la société) within the university of IUT Paul Sabatier, Toulouse 3. LERASS unites researchers in Infocom in the region of Toulouse. It involves 80 people divided into six research teams, three of which are focused on information and communication. The other three teams are in the fields of economics, social psychology, and one is a multidisciplinary unit. The three groups studying Infocom are:
- Media polis: focuses on communication and territories; the public sphere, informational and communicational media, symbolic mediations;
- CTPS (communication, work, social practices): focuses on communication, articulation, public debates, risks;
- MICS (Médiations en information et communication spécialisées): focuses on informatics from a communication perspective. Areas of emphasis include: interaction of actors in specialised information; networks of scientific media and professional media; documents, images, and mediation; expertise and risk.

LERASS publishes a social sciences journal, Sciences de la société, supported by CNRS and the Centre National du Livre. The journal is known for having many articles in the domain of Infocom.

In Provence L’Université d’Avignon has a research laboratory called Culture et Communication, which carries out research on the forms of cultural mediation. The laboratory works on various types of cultural institutions (live performances, cinema, books, multimedia, expositions, cultural heritage, museums, etc.), studying their organisation, texts, uses, and modes of reception by audiences. The laboratory of Culture and Communication is connected with the departments of the UFR (Sciences et Langages Appliqués, or SLA) and the Département Sciences de l’Information et de la Communication. The main focal areas are: Cultural heritage and objects; mediations of knowledge, culture and their interpretations; the forms and publics of festivals and cinema; epistemological and methodological reflections on the communication approach. The laboratory publishes a journal entitled Culture et Musées.
Belgium

The Belgian university systems are administratively as well as financially handled according to the linguistic division that defines the particularity of the country more generally. Flanders area has an inter-university council (VLIR – Vlaamse interuniversitaire Raad), which supervises the teaching and research in the Flemish universities. In a similar way in the Wallonian region there is a Council of Rectors of the French-speaking universities (CREF -Le Conseil des Recteurs des Universités Francophones de Belgique).

In both Flemish and Wallonian universities the funding is mainly public, and the principal budgetary costs are for teaching. Belgian universities are open to all citizens and students are selected by grades if they wish to proceed through the curriculum to higher stages to attain an academic degree.

Even though the country is mainly secular, many of the universities are marked by a religious background. The network of Catholic universities is strong, and as a counterweight, there are two universities in Brussels “free” of religion, the Flemish and French-speaking Free Universities.

The Belgian university system follows the Bologna treaty of the European Union in terms of curriculum by providing degrees at three levels: bachelor’s, master’s and doctoral. The Bologna process, which was supposed to harmonise European university curricula as a whole, has actually had the opposite effect in Belgium. In French-speaking Belgium the bachelor’s (BA) degree takes three years to complete and master’s (MA), two years, as elsewhere in the Europe. But Flemish Belgium has system of three years for BA and one year for MA, which is similar to the Netherlands. This is because there was a concern that a large number of Flemish students would go to Holland to pursue the same degrees in a shorter time. However, this will be a salary problem in the future in Belgian industry because the Walloon MA diploma holders must spend more time getting their education.

The defining characteristics of media and communication research in Belgium are the relatively numerous and small institutions due to linguistic and regional divisions, and the distinction between faculties of the humanities and social sciences between and within those divisions.
Universities in Flanders

The Flanders universities’ communication Departments are based on the “generalist model”, each having several focal areas of research and staffs specialised in different fields and approaches. The diverse perspectives and interdisciplinary crossing-overs are generally valued, yet each university has its special areas of expertise. The Flemish Inter-university Council VLIR has conducted an outside evaluation of the Flemish communication institutions in bachelor and master education (2007). The best marks in VLIR’s report were given to the BA and MA programmes in the Free University of Brussels (VUB), an institution that is also very dynamic in research, especially in the areas of new technologies and methodologies of the Political economy of communication and cultural studies. The VUB and the Catholic University of Leuven (KUL) have the longest traditions in media and communication in the Flanders region. The University of Leuven has the biggest Department of communication in Belgium, with an orientation towards traditional Anglo- American mass communication research and studies of media effects. Another strong university with a long tradition is the University of Ghent, which is known for its film studies and more recently, for its applied research on ICT’s. The Communication Department in Antwerp is younger and smaller than the others, but it is active and growing, its speciality being, among other things, television studies. The Flemish community of communication scholars in Belgium is fairly small, but the university communication Departments and some polytechnics are grouped in loose cooperative networks. The universities of Ghent, Brussels, and Antwerp have a joint association. The University of Leuven is part of the association of Catholic universities.

Universiteit Antwerpen (UA) has a Department of Communication Sciences, with eight professors, seven to eight lecturers, and several assistants and researchers. Communication Studies in Antwerp has grown significantly during the past seven years, and the number of lecturers has doubled. Student numbers are very high, considering the size of the staff: the number of students has nearly doubled in recent years. The Department provides three master’s programmes as well as doctoral education. The first, the Master in Communication Sciences, has two specialist orientations: strategic communication on the one hand, and visual studies and media culture on the other. In both orientations the students have a choice of either an academic or a professional emphasis. The second MA programme, the Master in Political Communication, is a joint cooperation with the Department of Political Sciences; it is the only MA programme in
the area of political communication in Belgium. The third programme is the Master of Film Studies and Visual Culture.

In general, qualitative research approaches are dominant in the Department of Communication in Antwerp. The focal areas of research are structured around five research groups:

1. Political communication: special emphasis on psychological and linguistic aspects of politics and communication.
2. Media, policy and culture: the approaches of political economy (globalisation, concentration, convergence and commercialisation), and audiovisual media culture (cultural studies, e.g., media and identity, representation and reception).
3. Visual culture and communication: both basic and applied research in visual communication (e.g., scientific data gathering and communication, entertainment, education and news reporting). A wide range of media (film, television, print, Internet), and aspects (production processes, representational issues, context of use).
4. Strategic communication for the information society: special emphasis on telework and e-government, international projects (e.g., Allinclusive@work, DITO).
5. Language, media and socialisation: fundamental and applied research, special emphasis on interaction between language use and social-psychological factors.

**Vrije Universiteit Brussel (VUB)**, the Free University of Brussels, is a non-religious university, founded by three Freemasons. The ideology of the University is to be free from political and religious dogma. The Department of Communication Studies, part of the faculty of humanities, differs from similar departments in the other universities by its emphasis on a critical research orientation. Methodologically, the qualitative research approach is dominant. The Department provides BA, MA and PhD programmes in communication sciences. The alternative orientations in the MA are media and culture, information and globalisation, organisational communication and marketing.

The department has three research centres: Cemoso (Centre for Media Sociology), SMIT (Studies on Media, Information and Telecommunication), and research centre on Marketing and Public Relations Research, with an Economics approach.
The research centre Cemeso focuses on media and culture. The profile of Cemeso is distinguished by three domains: economy, culture and politics. Moreover, three focal points guide the actual research agenda: 1) media, politics and citizenship (including journalism) 2) cultural and creative industries and policy and 3) media content, meaning and audiences (including critical approaches and discourse analysis). Cemeso’s main theoretical and research focus is the role of media in the transformation of the public sphere. The centre has carried out a number of empirical projects on signification processes and the public sphere, journalism and the public sphere, ideology and the public sphere and intercultural communication.

The focus of the research centre SMIT is on interdisciplinary social scientific research in media, and on information and communication technologies, including, for example, the uses and adoption of ICT. The research centre is mainly funded by projects of the IBBT, the newly established Interdisciplinary Institute for Broadband Technology in Flanders. The majority of the research conducted in SMIT is applied research commissioned by governmental institutions and industries. Counting those involved in projects the total number of staff is around 40-45. The number of projects and staff has grown significantly during the past five years due to the Flemish government subsidising of the cooperative research between industry and the universities, especially in the area of ICTs. SMIT is organised methodologically into three main research areas: policy research, user research and business models. Thematically, SMIT works on e-culture, e-citizenship and e-democracy, mobile communication and new media.

Universiteit Gent (UG), The Department of Communication Sciences is located in the Faculty of Political and Social Sciences. In 1964 communication research started in Ghent with research areas in press and audio-visual media. In recent years the Department has broadened to include media culture, film studies, corporate communication, media law, media policy, new media and advertising. The Department has therefore adapted a generalist model and has six to seven professors. It offers study programmes in communication sciences at the BA, MA and PhD levels. The master's programme has three fields of specialisation: communication management, film and television studies and media and social sciences. Ghent university also offers a separate master’s programme in journalism. As part of the Department of Communication Sciences, operates a coordinating research centre OMC (Media and Communication). OMC carries out basic as well as applied research, with a focus on the usages of and the demand side of ICT applications. The centre cooperates with hardware manufacturers, content providers and software producers (in the media, healthcare and mobility sectors) and also
with government bodies and policymakers. The methodological approaches vary from qualitative to quantitative. The OMC research centre studies different sectors within the media: press, film, radio, television, advertising and new communication technologies. Focal areas of research include:

1. Media policy: Policy orientated, preparatory and supporting research on behalf of those responsible for policy, in the media and the government.
2. Media sectors: Investigation of media sectors, in particular with regard to their development, structure and functioning.
3. Media messages: Form and content analysis of media messages, selection processes, representation, discourse, and so on.
4. Public investigation: Media possession and use, reading, watching and listening behaviours, reception of new media, media influence.
5. Media and copyright law: Advice on and investigation of legal aspects of media, communication and journalistic ethics.
6. Persuasive communication: Corporate and marketing communication management investigation.

The OMC has two research groups: MICT (Media and ICT) and a network of film studies and it coordinates researchers from the Flemish universities. Moreover, professor and head of the Department Daniël Biltereyst leads an informal network called Babylonia, which draws together researchers orientated towards cultural studies and media culture. The MICT places importance on framing the ICT research in a societal context. The working group Film and Television Studies focuses on the social role of film, television and other audiovisual products from a critical perspective. The group is one of the main partners of the Ghent University film club Film-Plateau, which functions as pedagogical forum and a site for the International Flanders Film Festival and the documentary film festival Viewpoint.

**Katholieke Universiteit Brussel (KUB)** had a small Department of Communication Sciences, located in the Faculty of Political, Social and Communication Sciences, until September 2007. Although the Department received fairly good marks in its recent evaluation by VLIR, it was closed due to the restructuring policy of departments within the network of Catholic universities of Flanders.
The KUB Communication Department had only one full-time professor and two part-time professors. The Department’s focal areas were varied and the approach, interdisciplinary. The strong area was international and intercultural communication and development communication (including projects in Russia and India).

Katholieke Universiteit Leuven (KUL) is a key institution in the network of Catholic universities in Flanders. Within its faculty of social sciences is the oldest and largest Department of Communication in the Flanders area. The Department is divided into two research groups and teaching programmes: the School for Mass Communication Research; and the Centre for Media Culture and Communication Technology. The two groups work together in teaching four different MA programmes: media culture, ICT management, marketing communication and media effects. There are eight professors working full-time. The School for Mass Communication Research focuses on the following areas: media and health, media and violence, media and schools, media and family, cultivation research, uses and effects of ICT and audience research. The orientation of cultivation research (a tradition started by American scholar George Gerbner) is based on sociological and psychological approach to communication. The Department in Leuven has long had a close relationship to North American theory and North American universities. There is a strong emphasis on quantitative methods and media effects. The methodological approaches are mainly large quantitative surveys and experimental settings for testing large processes. The other research group in Leuven, the Centre for Media Culture and Technology, has as its focal areas popular culture, technology and audience research. Popular culture is broadly defined, and includes, for example, the music industry, film studies and television studies (involving news production, news evaluation, content analysis). The technology research team is mainly business-orientated; for instance, it makes analysis of usability (of web sites and video games and the design of new technologies) for industry purposes. The main difference between the two research centres in Leuven is that the Centre for Media Culture and Technology takes its influence from cultural studies in the British traditions, whereas the School for Mass Communication Research is more sociologically or psychologically orientated, taking its influences from American research.
Universities in Wallonia

Three of the biggest universities in the Wallonian region provide research in the field of media and communication: Université Catholique de Louvain (UCL), Université Libre de Bruxelles (ULB) and Université de Liège (ULg). The universities have recently launched a joint doctoral school with a number of other smaller universities. A significant share - two thirds - of the doctorates of Francophone Belgium graduate from UCL. The Wallonian universities are grouped into three federations. The first, the Academy of the Universities of Louvain, is composed of the large university of UCL and a few smaller ones: Facultés Universitaires Saint-Louis (FUSL), Facultés Universitaires Notre-Dame de la Paix (FUNDP) and Facultés Universitaires Catholiques de Mons (FUCAM). The second federation is the Academy of Wallonia-Brussels, composed of ULB and the University of Mons-Hainaut (UMH) and Faculté polytechnique de Mons (FPMs). These institutions have a pool with five smaller Wallonian scholarly institutions. The third federation, Academy of Wallonia-Europe, includes University of Liège and Faculté Universitaire des Sciences Agronomiques de Gembloux.

Université Catholique de Louvain (UCL), located in Louvain-la-Neuve, hosts the most prominent Department of communication in the Wallonia region. The Department of Communication was founded in 1946 and has around thousand students in study programmes at all levels (BA, MA and PhD). The Department maintains three master’s degrees in information and communication in order to educate students as journalists for print and audiovisual media, as communication and PR officers, for human resources, as specialists of “popularisation of science” (e.g. in the educational or cultural sector or as concept designers for multimedia). The Department of Communication of UCL has also started a School of Journalism (Ecole de Journalisme de Louvain), granting BA and MA degrees to journalists. The Department has some 15 professors, 15 “aspirants” (young researchers or researcher-teachers) and 30-40 PhD students. It is divided into two operational units called RECI (Analyse du récit médiatique) and RECO (Recherche en communication). RECI is organised around three methodological axes: socio-economic studies, a narratological approach and an ethno-sociological approach. RECO has its emphasis on the semiotics of social and cognitive processes. The two operational teaching and research units host three research groups:
1. **Observatoire du Récit Médiatique** (ORM): Journalism, press and media analysis of mediated narratives, both fundamental and applied research in terms of punctual analysis of mediated phenomena.

2. **Laboratoire d’Analyse des Systèmes de Communication des Organisations** (LASCO): Organisational communication and PR, studies of the internal, external and strategic communication in organisations.

3. **Groupe de Recherche en Médiation des Savoirs** (GReMS): Research on the mediation of knowledge in various fields, also communication in cultural and museum sectors and expositions.

The Department publishes a journal, *Recherches en Communication*, with articles mainly in French and appearing two to three times a year. The ORM research centre also publishes another journal, *Médiatiques*, focused on the analysis of journalism and press.

**Université Libre de Bruxelles (ULB)**, the Faculty of Arts and Humanities hosts the Department of Information and Communication Sciences, which was created in 2004. The Department unites the previously separate units of journalism (created in 1945) and corporate communication, information and documentation (created in 1977) with the performing arts and cinema. The Department offers master and doctoral programmes in several fields: information and communication (journalism and corporate communication), information and communication sciences and technologies, the performing arts and cinema and multilingual communication. The staff includes seven professors and 25 researchers and assistants; there are around one thousand students enrolled in the programmes. The research profile of the Department emphasises on information and communication technology, which is studied in terms of media, audience research and corporate communication. The research activities include the study of the consequences of evolution and technological innovations, including information and communication technologies, on the media and their audience, (for example, studies of users in interactive contexts such as Web forums, blogs or newsgroups). Another central research activity is the development of new technologies and tools to optimize all stages of the information and knowledge management, (for example, the design of topic-specific meta-data schemes and document analysis software development). Among the other focal research areas are journalism, audience research, semiotics, performing arts, cinema and scriptwriting.

**Université de Liège (ULG)** is situated in the southeast of Belgium. The University has a Department of Arts and Communication Sciences located in the faculty of humanities. The staff
of the Department includes eight professors and 21 researchers and PhD students. The Departments offer three MA programmes: 1. Arts and spectacle (cinema); 2. Information and communication, with two orientations a) Press, journalism and audiovisual media, and b) Cultural production and mediation; 3. Sciences and technologies of information and communication. The orientation of the communication research in Liège is closely connected to the humanities traditions, mainly philosophy and literature. The emphasis is on cultural dimensions of communication with a critical approach. The focal areas of research are defined as follows:

1. Critical information theory (the Frankfurt school, theories of Bourdieu, philosophical media theory, discourse theory); 2. Communication theories, sociological orientation (e.g., Bateson, Palo Alto); 3. Aesthetic orientation (reception studies); 4. Anthropological analysis of images (e.g., question of nature vs. culture).

Four research groups including doctoral work are formed in cooperation with other departments of the ULg University:

1. Unité de recherche en théorie critique de l’information. Esthétique, rhétorique, institutions, éthique. Critical information theory, aesthetics, rhetoric, institutions and ethics (together with Department of Romantic Languages and Literature and Department of Philosophy).
2. L’Unité de recherche mediation culturelle. Cultural mediation (together with Department of Romantic Languages and Literature, Department of History and Department of Philosophy).
3. L’Unité de recherche en Études cinématographiques et audiovisuels. Film and audiovisual studies (together with Department of Romantic Languages and Literature and Department of History).
4. L’Unité de recherche en Sciences du livre et de l’édition. Science of the book publishing (together with Department of Romantic Languages and Literature, the Central Library of University of Liège).

The Departments of Communication in Liège emphasise basic research, but some small-scale applied research is being made. The PhD students have an active network, Intersection, in the domain of philosophy and literary studies. The University of Liège is known for its emphasis on film studies, the two main axes are documentary cinema and images of the new media technology.

Facultés Universitaires Notre-Dame de la Paix (FUNDP) is situated in the city of Namur in southern Belgium. FUNDP has three research centres which conduct communication related research: the Interdisciplinary Research Group in Communication and Internet – GRICI
(Groupe de Recherche Interdisciplinaire Communication & Internet), the Research Centre in Information and Law – CRID (Centre de Recherches Informatique et Droit), and the Interdisciplinary Cell of Technology Assessment – CITA (Cellule Interfacultaire de Technologie Assessment).

GRICI is a new interdisciplinary research group created in 2005. It focuses on studies in the use in new technologies of information and communication from a cultural point of view. The group unites researchers from various disciplines who all share an interest in the Internet as a communicative space that generates new forms of social identities and narrations of the self. The aim is to analyse and popularise the phenomena created by the Web: the uses, the contents, the practices, the techniques, the social evolutions and the rules. CRID is focused on European law and foreign law dealing with matters of privacy and copyright. The Centre conducts both basic and applied research into electronic commerce, electronic communication, the information society, intellectual property, and technology and security. Among the focal research areas is “regulation of infrastructures and content”, which involves research into the legislation on racism, pornography, cyber-harassment and Internet and Youth. CRID also conducts research on the regulation of a journalistic milieu, how it can adapt to new actors in journalism such as citizen journalists and how this kind of journalism should be regulated. The CRID conducts research on the responsibility of such actors as search engines, hosts and portals, cyber criminality, and finally the regulation of Internet with presence in global processes such as the World Summit on the Information Society (WSIS) and Internet Governance Forums (IGF).

The research centre CITA specialises in the assessment of new technologies, especially ICT. CITA’s research is financed by the federal office for scientific, technical and cultural affairs (OSTC) in the framework of the PAI-IUAP IV programme and the telecommunications programme, by the Walloon region (DGRNE), by the Federal Department of Internal Affairs and by the European Commission. The Centre has five research fields: technology assessment, uses analysis in a social-shaping perspective, organisational analysis, technology policy (innovation policy, information society policy) and ethics of computing (ethic codes, uses of self-regulation, child pornography on the Internet). CITA works in partnership with a number of other research institutions at regional, federal and international levels.

Facultés Universitaires Catholiques de Mons (FUCaM) offers degrees in management, political science and communication. FUCaM was created in 1896, and since then the emphasis has been on international education (for example, students are encouraged to spend one year of
their curriculum abroad). FUCaM offers three BA and MA university programmes in management, business engineering and political science. Since 2004, FUCaM has also offered a BA degree in communication in cooperation with the Catholic University of Louvain, which leads to the master’s degree in this field. FUCaM has a research group in Consumer Behaviour Laboratoire d’Analyse du Comportement du Consommateur (LABACC) (which conducts research on such topics as advertising).

Facultés Universitaires Saint-Louis (FUSL) is located in Brussels. Information and communication have long been subjects in the curriculum, taught by visiting lecturers and teachers. But in October 2007 a full-time professor was hired in this area. Now FUSL is investing in developing teaching and research in the fields of media and communication. The institution offers the BA degree, a MA degree in European studies and various complementary MA degrees and PhD programmes. In spring 2008 a research centre in communication, Pôle de Recherches sur la Communication et les Médias (PReCoM), was established. PReCoM is developing interdisciplinary research in close collaboration with other research centres in FUSL, such as the CReSPo (Centre de recherches en sciences politiques) and the CES (Centre d’études sociologiques). Current research projects focus on the mobility, temporality and spatiality regarding the ICTs (in other words, from a sociological point of view: how media and communication technologies are used by people in inhabiting spaces and to be mobile). The focal areas and methodological approaches are a combination of influences drawn from French and British research traditions: British audience research and uses of media technologies from ethnographic and political approaches; French theory of the sociology of uses, i.e., social uses of media and ICT’s; anthropology of communication; interpersonal group studies, sociology and anthropology of spaces; spatial theories vis-à-vis the media; sociology of mobility and temporalities.
Netherlands

The origins of media and communication research in the Netherlands date back to the studies on public opinion processes driven by mass media campaigns shortly after World War II. The first Lector in Press Propaganda and Public opinion was appointed at the University of Amsterdam in 1947, which can be regarded as the start of communication research in Holland. Chairs of press journalism were established at the then Catholic University of Nijmegen (now Radboud University) (1950) and at Free University of Amsterdam (1958) (Communication Research in the Netherlands 2001-2007, iii-iv).

Many of the first generation researchers and teachers were editors of newspapers. They were also influenced by the German ‘Science of the Press’, Zeitungswissenschaft. By the late 1970s and mid-1980s communication science gained an official position as discipline. The second generation of communication scholars were ‘full academics’, who had received a formal education in communication sciences. They were informed by American empirical research and to a lesser extent also by the qualitative French influence. An important platform for Dutch communication research was Tijdschrift voor Communicatiewetenschap, the Dutch journal for Communication Science, which is still the only Dutch-language journal in the field in the Netherlands and in Flanders, Belgium.

During that time the universities were separated from religion. By the 1980s the ideological atmosphere in the universities changed. Nijmegen, originally a Catholic institution, was inclined more to the right, while Amsterdam tended more to a leftist ideology, with a mixture of socialism and liberalism. The University of Amsterdam has supported the critical perspective and has had relations with the city and the society. However, nowadays three-quarters of MA students chooses the commercial communication programme and one-quarter chooses the socially oriented communication research (public opinion, political communication, entertainment). Research on organisational and corporate communication is also active. Additionally, in Nijmegen there is more interest among students in media business. The empirical social scientific research tradition is still strong in both universities, when compared to the UK, which is more textually and qualitatively oriented.

Until the 1980s teaching and researching communication and media was conducted within established academic disciplines such as psychology, sociology, literature studies and linguistics. Since the 1980s, these fields have quickly become independent and separate disciplines in Utrecht
In the 1990s new communication departments were also founded at the University of Twente (UT) and Free University of Amsterdam (VU).

In the faculties of art and humanities in Utrecht, Nijmegen and Amsterdam, the areas of film theory and history had been studied since the 1980s, usually within the department of theatre studies. Since the beginning of the 1990s, film studies, combined with television studies, have been independent study programmes at the University of Amsterdam and University of Utrecht. In the new millennium, the new media (www, digital games, web-based media) have entered into study programmes. Film and Television studies have been renamed to “Media Studies” and “Media and Culture”.

Research Institutes and Schools of Communication Research: an Overview

Media and communication research in the Netherlands is divided into two main fields. On the one hand, communication science is to be found in the faculties of social and behavioural science; on the other hand, media studies are located in the faculties of humanities and arts. The tradition of communication research (previously called mass communication) in the Netherlands is older than research on media. There is very little collaboration between these two fields.

The division between communication science in the faculties of social and behavioural sciences and media studies in the faculties of arts and humanities is still clear-cut, but recently there has occurred some crossing of the borders of academics and co-operation between the fields. The whole field of media and communication research and education has gone through a significant expansion during the last 10 years. First, there was a major expansion of students in the 1990s in the field of communication, and then during the last eight years there has been professionalisation and internationalisation of research.

All in all, the departments in the field of media and communication research that are located in Amsterdam teach almost 50 per cent of all communication students in the Netherlands.

The following chart gives an overview of the most important research institutes and schools in both communication research (social sciences) and media studies (humanities) at the national and local level. The most important research schools are subsequently described in more detail.
**Communication research** | **Media studies**
---|---
**National research schools** | (No national research schools, but Media Studies represented in several interdisciplinary research programmes)
NESCoR – Netherlands School of Communication Research | - Communications, management and policy
- Media, entertainment and culture
- Persuasive communication
- Political communication and journalism
**Local research institutes**
ASCoR - The Amsterdam School of Communications Research (UvA) | - Persuasive communication
- Media, journalism and public opinion
- Media entertainment and popular culture
Department of Communication Science (VU) | - Communication: message characteristics and receiver process
TWICoR - Twente Institute for Communication Research (UT) | - Marketing communication and consumer psychology
- Media, communication and organization
- Psychology and communication on health and risk
- Technical and professional communication
Department of organization communication (RU)
- Professional communication
- Persuasive and instructional documents
- Professional communication in foreign languages

Local interdisciplinary research institutes, with separate communication and media programmes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NISCO – Nijmegen Institute for Social and Cultural Research (RU)</th>
<th>ASCA – Amsterdam school for cultural analysis (UvA)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Media and Culture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Transnationalism and multiculturalism</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IBR – Institute for behavioural research (UT)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mansholt Graduate School for Social Sciences (WU)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Communication and space for change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| ILLC - The Institute for Logic, Language and Computation (UvA) |

(Based upon Verkenningscommissie Media- en Communicatiestudies 2007)

National Research Schools

NESCoR - The Netherlands School of Communications Research is the national communication science research school and Ph.D. programme in communication science, which was launched in 1999. NESCoR unites the Dutch Universities offering teaching programmes in communication science that share the orientation of social and behavioural traditions. The research school includes the Free University Amsterdam (VU), the University of Amsterdam (UvA), the Radboud University Nijmegen (RU) and the University of Twente (UT). NESCoR is thereby related to all bachelor, master, and research master programmes in communication science in the Netherlands; all together, they teach on average 2500 graduate and undergraduate students. In 2000, the joint effort of the universities was accredited by the Royal Dutch Academy
of Arts and Sciences KNAW, as local universities would not be able to receive recognition on their own.

NESCoR provides a network in both national and international academic communities. It aims at fostering collaboration between the universities. For example, NESCoR is one of the organisers of the annual Dutch language conference in communication science, the ETMAAL. The school has over 90 full members, who are all researchers in communication science with a publication track record in international journals and books. The main activity of NESCoR is the English-language Ph.D. programme, which includes some 70 students. On average, 15 dissertations are defended annually. Approximately 40% of the PhD students of NESCoR are from the two universities located in Amsterdam. The school receives funding from the Dutch national science foundation NWO as well as a number of other science foundations. It also conducts contract research for a number of governmental and non-governmental organizations.

Media Studies does not have a national research school or institute and thus research is conducted within the departments or local research institutes, e.g. Huizinga Institute – Research Institute and Graduate School of Cultural History (Media scholars participate in the following research programmes: Conceptual history; identity and representation, political culture, cultural processes in context).

Local Research Schools in Communication Research (Social Sciences)

ASCoR - The Amsterdam School of Communications Research, a research institute connected to the Department of Communication Science at the University of Amsterdam (UvA), is the largest institute of its kind in Europe. ASCoR was founded in 1997, and today more than 40 senior researchers are permanently associated with ASCoR. Moreover, its English-language PhD programme hosts more than 20 PhD students (in 2007, 28 students). ASCoR offers a four-year international PhD programme in Communication Science.

The ASCoR Research Programme 2006-2010 uses a tripartite division in research domains, based on primary functions of information and communication, namely: 1) to inform, b) to persuade, and c) to entertain. Thus, research is carried out in three research programmes: Media, Journalism and Public Opinion, Persuasive Communication, and Media Entertainment and Popular Culture. Each of these research programmes covers a variety of research projects.
The programme *Media, Journalism and Public Opinion* addresses the information function of communication. It studies how news and other information are produced, their content, how audiences use and process this content, and what effects it has on individuals, groups and society. The programme contains two main research areas: 1) *Production and content of news and other societal information*. Besides looking at the meaning that is constructed in the media and to what extent it represents the diversity of opinions and issues in society, this approach also addresses how media policies and economic and managerial conditions foster or impede the organisation of a public communication system for an open and informed society. 2) *Uses and effects of news and information*. Research within this area studies how citizens, organisations and institutions use media and communication and what effects it has on individuals and groups.

The programme *Media Entertainment and Popular Culture* addresses the entertaining role of communication. The programme’s orientation is interdisciplinary (combination of communication theory, psychological, sociological, and cultural theories) and its approach is multi-methodological (for instance, experiments, content analysis, surveys, focus groups, participant observation). The core questions of the programme are 1) which factors explain people’s use, attention and attraction to entertainment media and popular culture, 2) what are the patterns of use and consequences of media entertainment and popular culture, and 3) how are cultural identities and citizenship articulated in entertainment and popular culture? The programme has three shared themes: a focus on entertainment media content (for instance, reality TV, games, sports, friend networking sites), a concern about ‘vulnerable’ audiences (for instance, children, ethnic minorities), and a focus on exploring the processes underlying the uses, appeals and reception of everyday entertainment and popular culture.

The programme *Persuasive Communication* addresses those communication processes that are intended to achieve persuasive goals, such as marketing communication, health education and public information campaigns. The research is aimed at understanding the processes, uses and effects of mediated persuasive communication: factors that explain individuals’ selection, attention and attraction to commercial and public information. Three projects of the programme are 1) *media strategies in campaigns* (e.g. mixing persuasion with entertainment, multimedia campaigns), 2) *message strategies in mass media campaigns* (studying conditions under which message strategies such as persuasion are effective), and 3) *effects of reception contexts* (for instance, intercultural aspects, social influence by peer groups and family communication, personality traits).
The approaches in ASCoR research programmes are multidisciplinary: key theories of communication science are combined with methods and theories from, for example, political science, sociology, psychology and history. At the core of the research agenda is developing and empirically testing theory.

**Communication Science** at the **VU University of Amsterdam** is organised in a single programme within the Department of Communication Science at the faculty of social sciences. The Department was established as an independent unit in January 2003. Most of the researchers previously worked in other departments at VU studying issues related to media and communication and were then united in the new department. The Department has grown rapidly; it has a staff of some 20 persons.

The VU Department of Communication Science is known for its special interest in political communication and its emphasis on the approach of media psychology. The focal areas of the department are identified as: media and social interaction, political communication, emotion and communication (emotion theory, social psychology), entertainment research, marketing and new technology, health communication, organisational communication, motivational processes (motivation research on human behaviour). The areas of expertise are: 1) Automatic content analysis, 2) Social psychological approach to media related phenomena, and 3) New media and new technology.

The research programme of the VU Department of Communication Science focuses on two aspects of communication: *message characteristics* and *receiver processes*. The first research line of *message characteristics* investigates how people are influenced by media content (primarily on political issues), with an agenda setting and framing approach. The second research line of *receiver processes* is focused on micro-level effects of communication by analysing psychological processes in receivers in both individual and group interaction settings. The central research methods are content analysis and experimental studies.

The Department of Communication Science does not have a separate research institute in communication science, but it hosts an interfaculty institute **CAMeRA@VU** (Center for Advanced Media Research Amsterdam) within the Free University of Amsterdam. Among the founding faculties are: social sciences, humanities, psychology and pedagogy, and science. There are some 30 researchers in the member faculties connected to CAMeRA@VU. The organisational structure is loose and only four people are working in the management. The institute is a mixture of basic and applied research.
CAMeRA@VU is focused on (new) media developments, and the psychological approach is dominant. The purpose is to combine new media research with the areas of learning and entertainment, language use and multimodal communication, emotion regulation, health, social interaction and psychological wellbeing. The focus in terms of types of media is on digital games, multimedia, virtual reality, intelligent bots and agents and mobile and static interactive systems. Examples of the ongoing projects include: in the fields of health communication and computer sciences, a project on developing artificial medical doctors and therapeutic personnel as avatars; in the field of research on entertainment, the detrimental effects of video games; new modes of PR and internet advertising.

University of Twente is another small university with a department of Communication Science. Research is organised in The Twente Institute for Communication Research (TWICoR), which has recently witnessed rapid growth, with a doubling of the number of tenured staff and a trebling of the number of PhD candidates between 2001-2007. In 2004 it was incorporated into The Institute for Behavioural Research (IBR), a new institute that employs both basic and applied interdisciplinary research in the context of problem solving for the “knowledge society”. Within this new structure, TWICoR functions as a research platform and maintains its membership of NESCoR.

TWICoR aims to investigate the effects of human communication on individuals and groups in their social context, as well as the determinants of these effects. The focal areas include: new media, marketing, organisational communication, health and risk communication (psychological orientation), textual analysis and usability research (linguistic orientation).

Several research programmes in the TWICoR research platform in the IBR deal directly with communication research. Programme 1, Communication and Social Influence. This programme deals mainly with the determinant social psychological processes of communication effects. Behavioural theories are applied to various fields of communication, including health care communication, risk communication and marketing and consumer behaviour. Empirical research and surveys constitute an important research instrument of this programme. Programme 2, Design, Implementation and Use of Communication Means. It focuses on communication means and processes, the effectiveness of communication means for individuals, organisations and societies. There is a particular focus on organisations. The programme adopts an interdisciplinary conception of communication science and aims to further develop theoretical approaches in the
field, as well as to contribute to debates about the role of new communications means in society (Communication Research in the Netherlands, 2001 – 2007).

Local Interdisciplinary Research Institutes

NISCO – Nijmegen Institute for Social and Cultural Research is a research institute in the faculty of social sciences of the Radboud University Nijmegen (RU), one of the oldest and most important universities in the Netherlands. In 2000, the Communication programme of RU was ranked second in the national research evaluation. Communication researchers increasingly cooperate with other NISCO members who represent other disciplines of social sciences, and all recently started PhD projects are supervised by at least one NISCO staff member outside the Communication programme.

In line with the NISCO mission statement, the Communication programme of RU aims to explain the role of mediated communication with regard to the general NISCO themes of cohesion and inequality. In relation to the theme cohesion, three questions are central for the NISCO communication programme: How do media representations reflect the society? What are the possible consequences of these representations for society? What is the impact of media policy on media representations (e.g. studies on the performance of public broadcasting)? Two questions are relevant for the theme of inequality. The first question concerns access to media and use of media by specific groups in society. The second question addresses the way in which societal groups are represented in the media (studies on the representation of asylum seekers and ethnic minorities). To answer these questions the Communication programme has employed a variety of research designs. The main designs are content analyses, surveys and interviews.

Comparative research has been strongly encouraged in this programme. Examples of comparative study include the study of developments in European television news, of children and European media environments, of the portrayal of Germany and The Netherlands in regional newspapers between 1946 and 2000, and the development of sensationalism in Dutch Television News between 1995-2001.

Research within the Communication programme has been conducted in three lines of research: 1) media use in everyday life, 2) the role of media in society and culture, and 3) media campaigns. These three research lines correspond to the research interests of the four chaired professors of the department of Communication Science of RU.
Media use in everyday life research line takes the social action model of mass communication as a starting point. The model considers the audience as a central element in the mediated communication process. In addition, communicators such as journalists are seen as important participants in communication processes on the basis of their specific objectives, intentions and interests. The main research issues are routines in media use, the use of television news, and media use by ethnic minorities. Studies on routines have drawn attention to the embeddedness of media behaviour in the context of daily life. Accordingly, research on television news has pertained to watching television news in everyday settings. Research on ethnic minorities has addressed the media experience of these groups.

The role of media in society and culture: A common denominator in the research projects of this line is the idea of mass communication as a cultural phenomenon: communication is considered to be the core element in collective meaning-construction processes. Furthermore, media texts and production and reception dynamics are considered to be strongly dependent on each other as well as central elements in the on-going maintenance and transformation of culture (i.e. collective beliefs, values, norms and behaviours). Specific research projects in this line focus on the media and identity, cultural consequences of media (studies on, for instance, values and norms in story lines in television drama and scientific coverage in Dutch newspapers), and media and community (studies on ‘virtual’ communities and professional communities within organisations).

Media campaigns: The third line of research investigates mediated communication processes that are designed to achieve changes in knowledge, attitudes and behaviour of the target groups. Specific studies address the topics of health information campaigns and advertising brands.

Communication Strategies Group is located at Mansholt Graduate School for Social Sciences, which is part of Wageningen University (WU). The Communication Strategies Group focuses on the role of communication in processes of change. Research approach is interdisciplinary, including communication studies, (rural) sociology, social psychology and anthropology. The research topics range from technical innovations to social change, in the thematic areas of agriculture, health and environmental management – in countries of the south and north. The research group aims at improving problem solving capacity of individuals, groups and communities in relation to individual and collective problems. The objective is to generate scientific knowledge that contributes to scientific discussion and improves professional practice.

Amsterdam School for Cultural Analysis (ASCA) is located within the faculty of humanities at the University of Amsterdam (UvA). This interdisciplinary research institute
brings together scholars active in literature, philosophy, visual culture, religious studies, film and media studies, argumentation theory and science dynamics. The ASCA curriculum provides PhD training with a broad vision of cultural phenomena and a specialised knowledge of underlying philosophical issues. ASCA conducts research on media within two programmes Transnationalism and Multiculturalism and Media and Culture.

One of the projects within Programme I Transnationalism and Multiculturalism is called Transnational Media, and it focuses on the role of transnational media (especially film and television) in a globalised and multicultural world. The project study for example the questions of identities formed in the context of multiple intercultural encounters and multicultural societies. The sub-projects investigate the media landscape in diasporic communities in various postcolonial counties and in the Western world (especially the Netherlands).

Programme IV, Media and Culture has seven projects which all investigate media in its larger cultural context.

Project 1 Digital Ontologies deals with digital technologies and computers, which have become ubiquitous in all social areas. The project outlines questions on “new media” theory vs. media theory as whole: what new cultural forms and formats does “new media” generate? How are network cultures (through internet, LANs, wireless networks, cell phones etc.) constituted, and how do they operate? The five areas of the programme are: 1. media theory, 2. digital games, 3. interface: visualisation, 4. network cultures and 5. sound technologies.

Project 2 Photography, Film & Displacement brings together interdisciplinary research projects concerned with still and moving images and their production, circulation and presentation in contemporary culture. Areas and topics are diverse, such as photographic and audiovisual archives and their use in research; the recontextualisation of film and photography documents into museum artefacts; visual anthropology and issues of representation; film and digitisation; and documentary practices.

Project 3 The Rhizotorium looks at audiovisual images from a ‘rhizomatic’ perspective starting from the theories of Gilles Deleuze. The concept of the rhizome is understood as a metaphor for the grass-like network structure of the organisation of the brain, which is seen as the junction between art, philosophy and science, the three domains of thinking.

Project 4 Cinema Europe focuses on Europe and its cinema(s). The research touches the questions of e.g. “the nation” (as in “national cinema”) and the idea of the artist as creator of a unique vision (as in ‘auteur-cinema’).
Project 5 *Imagined Futures* is concerned with the conditions, dynamics and consequences of rapid media transfer and transformation. Media encompassing all imaging techniques and sound technologies are studied in historical perspective. The project is composed of three strands: 1. historical, 2. theoretical, and 3. ‘applied’ (product- and practice-oriented covering all applications of (media) technologies, ranging from social issue uses, locative media projects, to commercial schemes, military applications, and public space projects).

Project 6 *Television & Popular Culture* aims to understand contemporary television in its present textual, affective, technological, and institutional dimensions. The project studies three types of practices: 1. practices of production, 2. practices of reception, and 3. practices of critique. These practices involve all aspects of television and popular culture: specific texts, the producers and users, and their contexts from a Cultural Studies approach.

Project 7 *The Structure and Rhetoric of Multimodal Discourse* looks into multimodal means of various media (for example, websites and blogs combine verbal information with visuals and sounds, often providing considerable freedom in the order in which information is accessed). The central areas are: Multimodal metaphor, Relevance Theory, Graphic design, the role of language in films, within the genres of documentary, comics and animation films, and advertising.

**ILLC - The Institute for Logic, Language and Computation** at the University of Amsterdam (UvA) combines researchers from the faculty of science and the faculty of humanities for interdisciplinary projects. The disciplines involved include logic, mathematics, computer science, linguistics, cognitive science, artificial intelligence and philosophy. ILLC focuses on studies of fundamental principles of encoding, transmission and comprehension of information. Emphasis is on natural and formal languages, but also other information carriers, such as images and music, are researched.

**OGC – The Research Institute for Culture and History** at the University of Utrecht (UU) includes one project group dedicated to media studies. The group’s research focuses on the cultural construction of media. The project has a strongly historical and comparative approach and it attempts to bring together different dimensions (economic, socio-cultural, technological, aesthetic), particularly in terms of media interactions with audiences.
Communication Departments (without specified research schools in communication or media studies)

The Free University Amsterdam also has teaching and research in the field of media and communication in the faculty of arts. The faculty offers BA and MA programmes in Communication and Information Studies and have research groups on language system and use, and mediation. The dominant research approach is mainly cognitive linguistics (combination of linguistics and psychology) with a quantitative methodology.

The University of Utrecht has a Department of Media Studies with an international MA programme in media studies. The department also has a strong research profile with the common nominator of cultural construction of media. The focal areas of research are noted as emerging media (cinema studies, television history, and research on digital media), comparative media studies (historical, thematic, and inter-medial comparison), media cultures and media dispositifs (discursive constructions, economic strategies, and socio-cultural functions, as well as technological factors, modes of audience address, and aesthetic norms). The Media Studies Department at Utrecht has a broad historical approach and comparative research design.

Erasmus University Rotterdam, faculty of history and arts, has recently launched the Department of Media and Journalism. The new department has two professors, and one assistant professor. The department does not have organised research teams, nor does it offer PhD education, since the main activities are so far concentrated around teaching the bachelor’s and master’s programmes. The focal areas of the master curriculum are: Media and Society, and Media as Cultural Industry. The department is growing and has dynamic international networks. The University of Rotterdam also has a research centre of corporate communications that conducts academic and applied research.

The University of Groningen has a department of Communication and Information Studies that offers BA and MA programmes in Communication and Information Sciences, Information Science/Humanities Computing, and Journalism.

At the University of Leiden, the Department of Rhetoric has recently started a programme of journalism and new media. The MA programme and research conducted by the small staff (10 persons of which 4 full-time) is focused on journalism and new media work. The programme of journalism aims to bring a more practical point of view to the faculty of arts and therefore most of the part time teachers of the programme are journalists, copywriters or similar. The areas of
the research range from argumentation, rhetoric, media industry, media work, media hypes, urban legends and criminal journalism to representation of ethnic minorities. As methods the researchers rely on surveys, content analysis of, for example, websites, discussion groups and TV programme surveys, media effects approach. There are no large research projects going on but the researchers are active in organising symposia and conferences (Crime Media, New Journalism for Digital Media, Rhetoric and Society).

The Radboud University Nijmegen also has a recently established department of Comparative Arts and Cultural Studies, in the faculty of arts. One of the interdisciplinary research areas of the Department is visual culture and film studies.

Polytechnics

Christelijke Hogeschool Windesheim Polytechnic in the city of Zwolle has a Faculty of Journalism and Communication that has study programmes on Communication Studies and Journalism. The polytechnic trains students to work on newspapers and magazines or as reporters or programme makers for radio, television and the Internet.

The faculty has a staff of 250 and 1800 students. In 2004 Windesheim created an alliance with the VU University of Amsterdam, as part of the governmental policy of locating more research in polytechnics and bringing a practical orientation to the universities. A few university researchers from VU work part time professors at the polytechnics and give MA courses on research, theory and methods. The master students of the universities are also participating in the practical courses of media and journalism at the polytechnics.

Hogeschool Utrecht’s Research Centre for Communication and Journalism has also hired a research professor from the University of Amsterdam who is leading research group Cross Media Content of seven researchers. The research group focuses on journalism, development of quality journalism, research journalism, development of new digital forms of journalism, convergence, multitasking, multiskills, digital publishing. The approach is empirical research that is applied to how journalists work, and how they teach and train future journalists. The research centre is a mixture of basic and applied research connected to the industry of journalism and media. The theoretical and methodological background of the research is in the framework of political economy, economic theories, methodologies of social sciences, quantitative approach (statistics on market shares etc., readership data, circulation, surveys).
Estonia

In Estonia there are two main universities where the study of social sciences and humanities is conducted: The University of Tartu and Tallinn University.

The University of Tartu has long historical traditions and is one of the oldest universities in Europe. It was founded in 1632 by the King Gustavus II Adolphus of Sweden under the name Academia Gustaviana or Universitas Dorpatensis. After having been closed for a long period due to the Great Northern War, the University reopened in 1802 as Kaiserliche Universität zu Dorpat, and made a great contribution to the development of natural and medical sciences as well as other sciences in the 19th Century. In 1919 the University became the first Estonian-language university. The University of Tartu (UT) has nowadays eleven faculties, three research institutes and six colleges with more than seventy departments, institutes and clinics. The total number of students is over 18,000, with a teaching staff of 1,300.

At the start of the 21st Century the academic landscape of Estonia changed considerably with the foundation of Tallinn University through the merger of several existing universities and research institutes in Tallinn as well as the Estonian Academic Library in 2005. Tallinn University was established as the result of a merger of several universities and research institutes in Tallinn as well as the Estonian Academic Library. Its main strengths lie in the fields of humanities and social sciences, but it also has a strong and constantly growing component of natural and exact sciences, as well as a notable tradition of teacher training and educational research. At present, there are around 7000 students as well as more than 400 faculty members and research fellows; leading to it being the fastest growing university in the country.

After a short period of tension between the two national universities, research networks and co-operation between them started to emerge. As Professor Marju Lauristin described her vision of the future of Estonian academic landscape:

“The future shall probably be such that we will have a national network of universities, like in, for example California. There is one umbrella term like “University of Estonia” and universities of Tartu and Tallinn are parts of that. I think that will be the only possibility in a small country if we want to stay and function in Estonian”.
Academic Programmes in Media and Communication

In Estonia there are a total of 11 programmes containing higher educational courses in media, journalism, communication, communication management and other related subjects. The only PhD programme in Media and Communication is at the University of Tartu, Faculty of Social Sciences, Department of Journalism and Communication. Research activity within these educational units is often secondary to teaching and administration: an additional task to be squeezed in by staff between numerous other activities. Nevertheless, a considerable amount of research is produced and research projects are conducted annually in various departments.

In order to become a valid educational and/or research unit, each programme has to pass international accreditation. The institution of higher learning and its curricula are accredited by the Higher Education Quality Assessment Council, which is appointed by the government and which operates under the jurisdiction of the Ministry of Education. Accreditation is an exercise during which an institution of higher learning is assessed to determine whether the institution and its curricula meet the requirements laid out in relevant legislative and regulatory documents.

The standard of higher education is a set of regulations instituted by the Estonian Government. It specifies the purpose of a given programme of instruction leading to a certification of trade, vocational, or professional competence; the list of trades and occupations to which its regulations apply; and the general requirements that curricula must meet.

The current total of 30 academic staff oversees 321 students in different bachelor level programmes, 56 students in master level programmes, and 30 students in doctoral level programmes. 1957 – 2005: 609 students gained a university degree, at one level or another, in Journalism. 1999 – 2003: 78 students gained a degree in the field of Public Relations. 1993 – 2006: 54 Masters’ theses and 8 doctoral dissertations have been defended.

In 2005 the Council of the University of Tartu decided to establish an interdisciplinary Centre for Cultural and Communication Studies. The aim of creating the Centre is based on the need for an integration of research in humanities and social sciences due to societal development. The Centre was initiated by the Department of Journalism and Communication, and the Department of Semiotics, and the Centre will be under the Faculty of Social Sciences. The goal of the Centre is to develop basic research in culture and communication, to organize relevant doctoral studies and to initiate discussions involving public participation.

The Baltic Film and Media School (BFM) was founded by Tallinn University in 2005 as
an independent educational and academic institution. BFM started its academic activity in 2006 when Tallinn University’s Film and Video Department (launched in 1992) and the Media School of Audentes University (launched in 1997) were merged. There are two chairs in the Media Department: Chair in Television and Audiovisual Media and Chair of Communication Management. There are over hundred students on the BA level (Media), and around twenty on the MA level (Communication Management).

The Department of Estonian Language in the Faculty of Philology launched a MA programme in Communication under the Chair of General and Applied Linguistics (CGAL) in 2002. Its foundation was motivated by the need to broaden career opportunities for graduates from philological BA specialities as well as to strengthen media education for the students preparing to become mother tongue teachers. CGAL has a strong interdisciplinary emphasis on integrating communication studies with mother tongue didactics (media literacy) as well as with sociolinguistics studies of language contact in Estonia.

The Department of Slavonic Languages in the Faculty of Philology offers a BA programme in Journalism (Russian Media) since 1996. The number of students currently enrolled is 80.

The Department of Informatics in the Faculty of Mathematics and Natural Sciences has offered a MSc programme in Interactive Media and Knowledge Environments (IMKE) since 2006, there are currently 5 students in the programme. The special focus of the IMKE curriculum is on knowledge environments, that is, digital interactive environments that host and facilitate individual and shared knowledge construction, in contexts such as educational environments, e-service environments, e-participation environments and game environments.

The Department of Advertising and Media in the Faculty of Social Sciences has been offering a curriculum in Publicity and Imagology since 1995. There are both Estonian and Russian groups and the number of students is about 200. Since the programme received conditional accreditation in 2004, it is possible that it will be restructured in the future.
Britain

According to the Higher Education Funding Councils of England, Wales and Scotland and Northern Ireland’s Department of Employment and Learning, there were 106 universities and a total of 168 higher education institutions in the whole of the United Kingdom as of August 2007 (Universities UK 2008a). This list excludes foreign universities operating in the UK; additionally, the universities of London (including the London School of Economics and Political Science, University College London, King’s College, etc) and Wales are counted as one. The number of students studying in higher education institutions in the academic year 2004/2005 stood at almost 2.5 million (Higher Education Statistics Agency 2008b).

Hierarchical divisions. The division of British universities according to their age is important for the reason that a university’s reputation and prestige are often defined by its historical status, and the quality of its teaching and research is often seen as correlating with its age and traditions. This may have serious implications in the discipline of media and communication studies, since these subjects are not favoured in the traditional universities.

Many of the scholars interviewed for this study believed that appreciation of media and communication studies amongst the public and within academia might well grow in the future. One indication of this could be that The London School of Economics and Oxford University have both established media research institutions within past five years. The emergence of these prestigious universities in media research could put the whole field in turmoil as their reputation makes it easier for them to find money and collaborators for their projects. As one interviewee said: “Today the most prestigious universities are beginning to engage in media studies. And I guess, the centre of gravity will move from these rather utilitarian (...) institutions into much more elite institutions, eventually to Oxford and Cambridge. (...) Those institutions will survive. Just as it took them a long time to discover sociology, it will take them a long time to discover media studies. And in the end they will dominate it, because they dominate the society. They are the best, they get all those grants (...) The way he [the Director of the Oxford Internet Institute] operates is completely different to the way in which we can operate, because he can ask people for millions of pounds and they give it to him, because it’s Oxford. I can go to ask someone for 50 quid and they’re like… fuck off. (...) It will make it much more difficult for us to recruit
students, it will make it more difficult for us to hire high quality teachers, and it will make it much more difficult for us to hold on to teachers’.

**RAE Assessment.** The Research Assessment Exercise is conducted approximately every five years on behalf of the United Kingdom higher education funding councils. Until now they have evaluated research quality by means of a peer-to-peer review panel. The latest RAE in 2001 considered the work of almost 50,000 scholars from 173 higher education institutions (Research Assessment Exercise 2008). The ratings that the universities receive directly affect the funding coming to them from the councils through so-called quality-weighted research funding (Research Assessment Exercise 2008). This funding forms a large part of a university’s total research funding, and thus according to many interviewees the RAE ranking is very significant, especially to the pro-vice chancellors and heads of departments. The review is conducted subject by subject, and the results are combined into subject tables as well as into university tables. One can examine the results either by university, which shows what ratings the different subjects within the university have received, or by subject, which shows what ratings different universities have received in that particular subject. The scale of the RAE is from 1 to 5*, with 1 meaning that no significant study has been made on the subject in the respective university, and 5* indicating international excellence in research in a particular subject.

The RAE is partly based on the number of works published in scientific journals by the professors and lecturers of each department. It has gathered a lot of criticism in the academic world, particularly as it seems to favour publications in specialist journals rather than more popular organs.

The next RAE will be published towards the end of 2008. After that the method of evaluating research and allocating funding is likely to be changed to a metric-based system which is still under construction but which, according to some interviewees, would be based on the number of citations in scientific publications. This change is especially likely in the fields of science, technology, engineering and medicine, but the peer-review system will probably remain in the humanities, social sciences and arts. The planned changes to the RAE, especially making it a citation-based evaluation system, are drawing criticism from scholars: some of those interviewed feared that counting citations does not offer an accurate description of a university’s academic quality, and the quality of its staff.
Foreign students. The UK has a long history of welcoming foreign students. Nowadays there are 1.6 million undergraduate students in British universities, of whom 99,000 are international students (UCAS 2008). The number of non-EU students is projected to grow by four percent until the year 2019 at the same time as the EU and the UK are experiencing a downturn in the number of native 18 to 20 year olds (Universities UK 2008b). Attracting international students has been a financial strategy for many UK universities. In 2007/2008 the universities could charge undergraduate students who come from EU countries a maximum of £3,075 per year (British Council Finland 2008), but this set maximum does not apply to non-EU-citizens. This means that universities are able to charge them fees that are closer to the actual costs of teaching. In 2007 undergraduate students from outside the EU were charged between £6,700 and £12,800 per year (Universities UK 2007).

Journalism and Media Studies in British Universities

According to the Universities and Colleges Admission Service (UCAS 2008), there are total of 96 British universities offering 983 media related undergraduate courses in 2008/2009. In addition, according to Graduate Prospects (Graduate Prospects 2008b) there are 619 taught postgraduate courses in Media Studies and Publishing. These normally lead to a Master’s degree or a diploma. In addition there are 133 research programmes that normally lead to either a Master’s degree or to a PhD.

Media and communication studies can be divided into two or three different sub-fields, namely media studies, communication studies, and journalism. Media and communication studies are more common since, according to Graduate Prospects, out of 607 communication and media courses offered in 2008, only 125 are concentrated on journalism. Of the almost 2.5 million students in higher and further education in the UK, approximately 2 percent study mass communication and documentation subjects. (Higher Education and Research Opportunities 2005).

In Britain media subjects are often traditionally frowned upon by the public, and therefore they also tend to be looked down on by traditional academia. According to some interviewees, this is mainly due to the fact that vocational subjects were often taught in polytechnics, which became universities in 1992 and are nowadays often considered weaker universities. In addition, it is a new subject that is still trying to fight its way in the academic world, and people are not
fully aware what is done in communication and media studies departments. As one interviewee observed: “It [media and communication research and studies] is an upstart tradition. Or at least, it still has strong critics (...) but (...) it has become big partly because it’s been attacked (...) There’s a contrarian tradition amongst young people, they are quite deliberately doing things that they’re told not to do. And they do media studies and cultural studies, of course”. Many interviewees draw the conclusion that media studies has taken up the role of the “whipping boy” from sociology: “Sociologists were always picked on, the long-haired pinkos, Marxists, living off public money”.

Key paradigms and institutions

The following selection of highly ranked and new departments within the field of communication and media research provides an overview of significant tendencies and research paradigms. The institutions selected are: Cardiff University, Goldsmiths College, London School of Economics, The Oxford Internet Institute, The University of East Anglia, The University of Warwick and the University of Westminster.

Cardiff University is renowned for its studies in journalism and journalist training, which have existed since the 1970s. The School of Journalism, Media and Cultural Studies (JOMEC) has received over 40 awards over the years. JOMEC is best known for its research on journalism and news. Other research areas include media coverage of health, risk and science, race, representation and cultural identity, children and media, media audiences, media and cultural policy and media, conflict and war.

Goldsmiths College is situated in London, and is one of the best known departments in Media and Communication studies. The University has a new Centre for the Study of Global Media and Democracy, which is a highly interdisciplinary undertaking as it brings together researchers from three departments: Media and Communications, Sociology, and Politics (Goldsmiths College 2008a). In addition it plans to develop inter-disciplinary research bids, and it accepts students from any discipline. The research topics for the first two years (the Centre was founded in September 2007) include ‘National media and the construction of ‘the citizen’ and ‘the human’, ‘Neoliberal discourse and the public realm’, and ‘Global governance, the state and cultural politics’ to name but a few. Research projects in Goldsmiths include for example studying the impact on journalism of the new media and web magazine openDemocracy. In
addition, Goldsmiths conducts a research project on media reporting and public knowledge in different countries (the US, Finland, Denmark, and the UK). The project’s goal is to study what gets reported in the main news programmes and leading newspapers in each country. Follow-up projects to this research are already planned.

The London School of Economics and Political Science formed a Department of Media and Communications officially in 2003. Before that there had been an interdisciplinary programme in the school spread between sociology and social psychology, as well as joint programmes including the study of law, gender and information systems. The research conducted in the department is now highly interdisciplinary in that it focuses on wider problems such as globalisation, inequality, and changing identities, and incorporates media research in to those questions. In addition it addresses industrial, political and economic issues. The research is organised according to five themes: 1) Innovation, Governance and Policy; 2) Democracy, Politics and Journalism Ethics; 3) Globalisation and Comparative Studies; 4) Media and the New Media Literacies; and 5) Communication and Difference (London School of Economics 2008). The Innovation, Governance and Policy theme encompasses such research areas as international governance of the new media, intellectual property rights, and public service regulation along with financial market regulation. Democracy, Politics and Journalism Ethics is based on research conducted on participation in global social movements, and the mediation of suffering and journalism ethics, for example. Global trends in media representation as well as the television and film industries in India and China are just some examples studied under the theme Globalisation and Comparative Studies, whereas Media and the New Media Literacies focuses on such research areas as adult and youthful responses to mediated risks and opportunities. The research projects under the theme Communication and Difference examine culture and everyday life, the politics of otherness, and the production of exclusion as explored post-colonial and innovation studies. Recent research projects in the department that have won acclaim include for example one called Social Contexts and Responses to Risk and Digital Business Ecosystem (DBE) (London School of Economics 2008). The variety of research areas and the interdisciplinary approach are reflected in the fact that the research methods applied in the department are varied, and there is no single methodological approach which would necessary be favoured over others.

The department has also established Polis, a joint initiative with the London College of Communication. Polis is intended primarily to provide journalists and the wider public with a
place for public discussion and policy intervention on key issues of journalism. In addition its aim is to produce outstanding research in the field, especially on the impact of mediation and journalism in different societies. Polis was established in 2006 (Polis 2008a).

The Oxford Internet Institute was founded in 2001 in response to the demand by parliament for Oxford to conduct research in areas concerning the dot-com phenomenon and the internet in general. Funding for the Institute comes from both government and private industry. Unlike many other departments of internet studies, the Oxford Internet Institute decided not to focus on technology hardware, software, application development or business development. Instead, Oxis is studying the social implications of the internet, what it means for people, businesses and governments. The best known research project carried out by the Institute is the Oxford Internet Survey, which has thus far been conducted three times every two years. It is carried out by door-to-door interviewing of approximately two thousand people about their internet usage. It tries to give researchers a picture of how, why, when and how much people actually use the internet. The survey is part of a research area called Everyday Life one of the four main research areas in the Institute. Current projects in Everyday Life include ‘Me, My Spouse and the Internet: Meeting, Dating and Marriage in the Digital Age’, ‘Digital Choices and the Reconfiguring of Access’, and ‘Cybertrust: The Tension between Privacy and Security in an e-Society’. The first of these is supported by an online matchmaking company, e-Harmony, and tries to look at how the internet has affected intimate relationships in the modern world (Oxford University Internet Institute 2008c). The ‘Digital Choices and the Reconfiguring of Access’ project looks at how the outcomes of internet usage are shaped by many overlapping arenas and strategic choices in everyday life (Oxford University Internet Institute 2008b), while the ‘Cybertrust’ project tries to examine the perception of trust in online activities (Oxford University Internet Institute 2008a). The other three research areas are ‘Governance and Democracy, Science and Learning, and Shaping the Internet’ The Governance and Democracy research area is concerned mainly with the relationship between governments and the internet. It examines both how governments use the internet and how the public uses government-provided internet services. For example, a project called ‘Government on the Web’ aims to improve understanding of e-government and the impact web technologies have on governments (Government on the Web 2008). The Science and Learning area, on the other hand, is concerned with how the internet can be used in learning and research. It examines the possibilities of e-learning and e-research. Finally, subjects as varied as internet governance and stopping the
expansion of so-called badware (i.e. spyware, malware, and deceptive adware) are covered in the third research area, ‘Shaping the Internet’.

The University of East Anglia is located two miles from Norwich, in Eastern England. Its School of Film and Television Studies, which includes the East Anglian Film Archive, is one of the longest-established film and television studies programmes in the UK. The school is known for its research into, for example, British and American film history and gender and representation studies. Current research projects include for example ‘The Post-Apocalyptic TV Drama in the UK and US’, which analyses dramas within a wider socio-cultural and historical context; ‘Experiencing Anime: Anime Culture in Contemporary Japan’; and ‘Entertaining Television: British TV, the BBC and Popular Programme Culture in the 1950s’ (University of East Anglia 2008).

The Department of Film and Television Studies of the University of Warwick is renowned for being the first free-standing department of film and television studies in the UK (University of Warwick 2008a). The university is located in Coventry, about 37 kilometres from Birmingham. Its current research areas include television genres, everyday television, the history and future of the study of television and representation of gender. An ongoing project is ‘The Cult of the Duce: Mussolini and the Italians, 1918–2005’, which aims to study the cult of Mussolini and its consequences until today. Mussolini used visual arts and the media to his own advantage in ruling the country, to reinforce the support he wanted for his rule (University of Warwick 2008b).

Many of the interviewees mentioned the University of Westminster as one of the leading universities for media and communication research. The university specialises in media policy and economics. The other research areas include BBC history, media policy and regulation, media audiences and global media. The School of Media, Arts and Design’s Research Centre contains two major research groups: the Communication and Media Research Institute (CAMRI), and the Centre for Research and Education in Art and Media (CREAM). CAMRI has research interests for example in global and transnational media as well as in Indian and African media. Members of the Institute are editing six scholarly journals, and are the founding editors of Media, Culture and Society. In addition, the Institute includes the China Media Centre and the Arab Media Centre. CREAM, on the other hand, concentrates on research into ceramics, visual arts, photography, film, digital media, and fashion.
Australia

Media and communication studies are represented in 37 Australian universities. In fact, only two Australian universities do not have this area in their curricula. According to staff information on the universities’ webpages, there are roughly 400 media and communication academics working in Australian universities. It is difficult to determine the exact number, because many scholars work in areas that belong partly to media and communication and partly to some other discipline, such as literary studies, creative writing, media arts, and cultural studies. The universities with biggest programs, RMIT University and the University of Queensland, have 40–50 academics working in the area of media and communication studies, although most universities have 10–20.

One characteristic feature of Australia media and communication research is the divide between journalism studies and media studies (cultural studies). The conflict between the two was highlighted in the 1990s, at a time of rapid expansion of journalism education in Australian universities. On 27 November 1998 at Queensland University of Technology there was a seminar called Media Wars: Media Studies and Journalism Education. One of the speakers was journalist Keith Windschuttle, who had criticised media and cultural studies. According to Windschuttle, there was a need to return to the “Holy Trinity” of journalism education: an empirical method and “realist” worldview; an ethical orientation to audiences and the public interest; and a commitment to clear writing. The debate was largely around the question of whether media and cultural studies have something to offer journalism education and vice versa (Flew & Sternberg 1999, 9). Despite some anti-theorist arguments, it seemed inescapable that in order to be in the academy, journalism needed theory.

Media and communication research in Australia is dominated by universities. The following list shows all Australian universities in which these fields are represented. The universities with the five biggest journalism programmes are mentioned first, but the rest are not in any specific order.
Figure 12: *Australian universities with media and communication research/education*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of the university</th>
<th>Home city and state</th>
<th>Where media and communication research is located</th>
<th>Areas of media and communication research/education</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The University of Queensland</td>
<td>Brisbane, Queensland</td>
<td>School of Journalism and Communication, Centre for Critical &amp; Cultural Studies, School of English, Media Studies and Art History, School of Business</td>
<td>Journalism, communication, cultural studies, media studies, film and television, public relations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RMIT University</td>
<td>Melbourne, Victoria</td>
<td>School of Applied Communication</td>
<td>Journalism, media, public relations, editing and publishing, professional communication, communication design, communication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deakin University</td>
<td>Melbourne, Victoria</td>
<td>School of Communication &amp; Creative Arts</td>
<td>Journalism, media and communication, film and video, animation and digital media, photography, interactive media, public relations, creative and professional writing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Queensland University of Technology</td>
<td>Brisbane, Queensland</td>
<td>Creative Industries Faculty</td>
<td>Journalism, media and communication, film and TV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Technology Sydney</td>
<td>Sydney, New South Wales</td>
<td>Faculty of Humanities &amp; Social Sciences, Faculty of Creative Industries</td>
<td>Journalism, media arts &amp; production, public communication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bond University (private)</td>
<td>Gold Coast, Queensland</td>
<td>School of Communication and Media, Centre for New Media Research and Education</td>
<td>Journalism, multimedia design, public relations, film, television and creative arts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Murdoch University</td>
<td>Perth, Western Australia</td>
<td>School of Media Communication &amp; Culture</td>
<td>Media and multimedia theory and production, journalism, cultural studies, interactive TV research, media arts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name of the university</td>
<td>Home city and state</td>
<td>Where media and communication research is located</td>
<td>Areas of media and communication research/education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Griffith University</td>
<td>Brisbane and Gold Coast, Queensland</td>
<td>School of Arts, Centre for Public Culture and Ideas</td>
<td>Journalism, film and television studies, popular culture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Wollongong</td>
<td>Wollongong, New South Wales</td>
<td>School of Social Sciences, Media &amp; Communication, School of Journalism and Creative Writing</td>
<td>Journalism, Media and cultural studies, creative writing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Western Australia</td>
<td>Crawley, Western Australia</td>
<td>School of Social and Cultural Studies</td>
<td>Communication studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of the Sunshine Coast</td>
<td>Maroochydore, Queensland</td>
<td>School of Communication</td>
<td>Journalism, communication, public relations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of South Australia</td>
<td>Adelaide, South Australia</td>
<td>School of Communication</td>
<td>Journalism, communication, public relations, Media Arts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Tasmania</td>
<td>Hobart, Tasmania</td>
<td>School of English, Journalism and European Languages</td>
<td>Journalism, media and communications</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of New England</td>
<td>Armidale, New South Wales</td>
<td>School of English, Communication &amp; Theatre</td>
<td>Film and TV, radio and print media, new media</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victoria University</td>
<td>Melbourne, Victoria</td>
<td>School of Communication, Culture and Languages</td>
<td>Communication and Media Studies, Public Relations, Multimedia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charles Darwin University</td>
<td>Darwin, Northern Territory</td>
<td>School of Creative Arts &amp; Humanities</td>
<td>Communication and cultural studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James Cook University</td>
<td>Townsville and Cairns, Queensland</td>
<td>School of Humanities, School of Creative Arts</td>
<td>Journalism, new media arts, creative industries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The University of Melbourne</td>
<td>Melbourne, Victoria</td>
<td>School of Culture and Communication</td>
<td>Journalism, media and communication, public relations, film and TV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monash University</td>
<td>Churchill, Victoria</td>
<td>School of Humanities, Communications and Social Sciences</td>
<td>Journalism, communication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>La Trobe University</td>
<td>Melbourne, Victoria</td>
<td>School of Communication, Arts and Critical Enquiry</td>
<td>Media studies, film and TV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The University of Southern Queensland</td>
<td>Springfield, Queensland</td>
<td>Faculty of Arts</td>
<td>Journalism, communication and media studies, editing and publishing, media production, multimedia, public relations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edith Cowan University</td>
<td>Perth, Western Australia</td>
<td>School of Communications and Contemporary Arts</td>
<td>Journalism, media and cultural studies, public relations, advertising, film and video, interactive media</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name of the university</td>
<td>Home city and state/territory</td>
<td>Where media and communication research is located</td>
<td>Areas of media and communication research/education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curtin University of Technology</td>
<td>Perth, Western Australia</td>
<td>Faculty of Media, Society &amp; Culture</td>
<td>Journalism, film and television, internet studies, media studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charles Sturt University</td>
<td>Bathurst, New South Wales</td>
<td>School of Communication</td>
<td>Journalism, public relations and organisational communication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Australian National University</td>
<td>Canberra, Australian Capital Territory</td>
<td>College of Arts and Social Sciences</td>
<td>Film studies, new media arts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Australian Catholic University</td>
<td>Melbourne, Ballarat, Victoria</td>
<td>School of Arts &amp; Sciences</td>
<td>Media</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Queensland University</td>
<td>Rockhampton, Queensland</td>
<td>School of Arts &amp; Creative Enterprise</td>
<td>Journalism, film and television studies, multimedia, publishing, public relations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swinburne University of Technology</td>
<td>Melbourne, Victoria</td>
<td>Faculty of Life &amp; Social Sciences</td>
<td>Media and communications</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The University of Adelaide</td>
<td>Adelaide, South Australia</td>
<td>School of Humanities</td>
<td>Journalism, media studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southern Cross University</td>
<td>Lismore, Coffs Harbour, New South Wales</td>
<td>School of Arts &amp; Social Sciences</td>
<td>Journalism, multimedia arts, screen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The University of Ballarat</td>
<td>Ballarat, Victoria</td>
<td>School of Behavioural and Social Sciences and Humanities</td>
<td>Film and media studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The University of Canberra</td>
<td>Canberra, Australian Capital Territory</td>
<td>School of Creative Communication, School of Professional Communication</td>
<td>Media and multimedia production, PR, journalism, advertising, creative writing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The University of New South Wales</td>
<td>Sydney, New South Wales</td>
<td>School of English, Media and Performing Arts</td>
<td>Media production, new media</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The University of Newcastle</td>
<td>Newcastle, New South Wales</td>
<td>School of Humanities and Social Science, Cultural Institutions and Practices Research Centre</td>
<td>Media and popular culture, film and television studies,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The University of Notre Dame Australia (private)</td>
<td>Fremantle, Western Australia</td>
<td>School of Arts &amp; Sciences</td>
<td>Journalism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The University of Sydney</td>
<td>Sydney, New South Wales</td>
<td>School of Letters, Art &amp; Media</td>
<td>Journalism, digital media production, public relations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The University of Western Sydney</td>
<td>Penrith, New South Wales</td>
<td>School of Communication Arts</td>
<td>Journalism, communication</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Sources: Australian Education Network, Internet pages of the universities, interviews and e-mail questionnaires with scholars, Adams & Duffield 2006, Putris et al. 2002*
USA

The fundamental issue dominating communication and media research and study in the United States is the same as that which dominates the higher education sector in general – the commodification of university study. The vast majority of students (up to 70%) lack the financial resources to pay tuition and must rely on student loans and scholarships from their university, the federal government, or a private lender. All but a few charity institutions charge all students tuition, although scholarships (both merit-based and need-based) are widely available. Generally, private universities charge much higher tuition than their public counterparts, which rely on state funds to make up the cost difference. Because each state supports its own university system with state taxes, most public universities charge much higher rates for out-of-state students. Annual undergraduate tuition varies widely from state to state, and many additional fees apply. A typical year’s tuition at a public university (for residents of the state) is $5,000. Tuition for public school students from outside the state is generally comparable to private school prices, although students can generally get state residency after their first year. Private schools are typically much higher, although prices vary widely. Depending upon the type of school and programme, annual graduate programme tuition can vary from $15,000 to as high as $40,000. Note that these prices do not include living expenses or additional fees that schools add on such as “activities fees” or health insurance. These fees, especially room and board, can range from $6,000 to $12,000 per academic year.

Communication is one of the most popular areas of study for students in the U.S. According to the U.S. Department of Education’s Center on Educational Statistics, in 2002–03 there were approximately 69,792 communication majors pursuing four year undergraduate degrees and 6,893 seeking graduate degrees in communication (2006). Using the profiles of more than 1,400 schools listed in America’s Best Colleges 2005 (published by U.S. News & World Report), the NCA identified over 300 colleges where communication was among the five most frequently selected undergraduate majors for the class of 2004. At 25 of these colleges, communication was the single most popular major. In all, the NCA lists about 400 U.S. colleges or universities with communication major for undergraduates.

The U.S. communication education landscape is characterised by two main branches: schools of communication studies that examine the various aspects of communication from a
research perspective and journalism/mass communication schools that aim at preparing students for professional careers in the industry. In most cases, the two branches operate separately, even when located in the same university. The divide can be traced back to the origins of the discipline. However, as Delia (1987, 73) pointed out, past the initial consolidation of the field, “no process has been more important to the development of the field than its integration into journalism schools and speech departments”.

Traditionally, communication has not enjoyed the same prestige as some of the more traditional areas of study (e.g., natural sciences). This is apparent when examining some of the most prestigious research universities, including such Ivy League schools as Harvard, Yale, and Princeton (Columbia and Cornell as exceptions) that do not offer degrees in communication. Yet recently, even the elite are realising the importance of communication, and especially journalism, and are integrating scholarship into their curricula. Yet, as one of the interviewees noted, instead of founding a separate department or school for journalism, “they are coming in the side doors. Elite institutes are realizing that journalism is quite an important thing in society, we need to get involved in that”. For example, Harvard is actively involved in some state-of-the-art communication projects, such as the Carnegie Knight Initiative on the Future of Journalism Education, in which the Shorenstein Center on the Press, Politics and Public Policy is one of the major players together with four major university graduate schools of journalism. Accordingly, an examination of Ph.D. programmes suggested that “[o]rganisationally, most of the programmes reside in a college or school within their university, suggesting relative prominence for the programme within the academic community” (Shaver et al. 2006, 24; “college “being the largest entity, followed by “school,” “department,” and “institute”).

Content. A recent examination of course offerings in four-year colleges and universities in the U.S. (Wardrope 1999) revealed that Interpersonal Communication is the most commonly offered course within U.S. communication departments (NCA Directory 1997) More than a half the departments examined also offered a course in Group Discussion, Communication Theory, Organisational Communication, Public Speaking, Persuasion, Argumentation and Debate, and Multicultural Communication. Communication and New Technology was the most commonly identified special topic course followed by Conflict Management, Communication and Gender, and Health Communication. Family communication was indicated as the course most desired by the department heads, followed by courses in Political Communication, Health Communication and Research Methods.

The *National Communication Association* has even more distinctively defined thematic divisions (44 in total), including (in addition to divisions that basically correspond to those of the ICA), African-American Communication and Culture Division, Asian/Pacific American Communication Studies Division, Communication and Aging Division, Communication and the Future Division, Communication Assessment Division, Elementary and Secondary Education Section, Environmental Communication Division, Family Communication Division, Freedom of Expression Division, Gay/Lesbian/Bisexual/Transgender Communication Studies Division, Latino/Latina Communication Studies Division, Nonverbal Communication Division, Peace and Conflict Communication Division, Spiritual Communication Division, and Theatre Division. Despite the diversity, as described above, many interviewees noted that given the current transitional state of the media’s role in the U.S. (and globally), various fields of communication research are becoming more acknowledged and more highly recognised.
Mass Communication

Overall, mass communication still dominates the field. A recent analysis of books on communication (Chung et al. 2005) found that most volumes published in the U.S. between 2002 and 2004 were mainly related to the area of mass communication followed by Internet/communication technology, advertising/public relations, intercultural communication, journalism, interpersonal communication, and organisational communication.

Figure 13; Communication Books Published in the U.S. by Area, 2002 to 2004

(Chung et al. 2005)
Further, an analysis of the major mass communication journals over the past 20 years indicated that a vast majority of the articles (42%) dealt with broadcasting, followed by print (29%) (Kamhawi & Weaver 2003).

Currently, the field is so fragmented and the theoretical bases so distant from each other that the field itself is not benefiting from the growing body of research. In fact, an analysis of the major mass communication journals over the past 20 years indicated that only 39% of the articles referred to a theory. Information processing theory was the most frequently employed framework (16%), followed by uses and gratifications (12%), media construction of social reality (10%), and the Hegemony theory or Media as maintainer of the status quo (10%) (Kamhawi & Weaver 2003). Bryant and Miron analysed over 1800 articles published in Journalism & Mass Communication Quarterly, Journal of Communication, and Journal of Broadcasting & Electronic Media from 1956 to 2000. According to their results less than 32 % of the articles ‘included some theory’ (2004, 664). However, almost half (48 %) of the citations of theories, paradigms, and schools of thought utilised in these articles were mere references; more than a quarter (26 %) simply provided a theoretical framework. Figures were quite low for comparison of two or more theories (8 %); critique of a theory or theories (4 %); proposing a theory (3 %); testing a new theory (3 %); integrating theory (2 %); or expanding theory (2%) (ibid., 666).

The primary schools of thought cited were British Cultural Studies, Chicago School, Frankfurt School, and Vienna Circle. Again, the overwhelming majority of the citations were mere references. A dramatic peak of the otherwise rare citations occurred in 1983 thanks to the “Ferment in the Field” issue of Journal of Communication (ibid., 671). The most popular theories were uses and gratifications, agenda setting, and cultivation theory, each being cited around 60 times. Next most frequently cited theories were social learning and Marxism both with 34 citations within the sample of 1806 articles (ibid., 673-674).

U.S. communication research is dominated by quantitative research, and the U.S. is among the top nations in the quality of quantitative research. Reviews of the last contents of journals from the few decades’ reveal that quantitative studies dominated, especially within the mass communication. An analysis of the major mass communication journals over the past 20 years indicated that over 70% of the articles used quantitative methodology, whereas only one fourth could be classified as qualitative (Kamhawi & Weaver 2003).
Organisational Communication Approach.

Historically the modern study of organisational communication dates from the late 1930s and early 1940s. According to Tompkins (1967), a top-down management focus dominated the early research. In particular, Tompkins divided the major empirical research studies into (1) formal and informal channels of communication and (2) superior-subordinate relations (Tompkins & Wanca-Thibault 2001). Similarly, Jablin (1978) noted that during the first few decades, “scholars tended to explore many similar research topics and issues: characteristics of superior-subordinate communication, emergent communication networks and channels, and components and correlates of communication climates” (Tompkins & Wanca-Thibault 2001, xx). Many of the same issues remained the major foci of organisational communication scholars during the 1980s and 1990s (ibid.).

Redding and Tompkins (1988) divided the period from 1900 to 1970 into three approaches: (1) the formulative-prescriptive relied primarily on the development of sets of rules or common-sense prescriptions (based on traditional rhetorical theory) for effective business communication; (2) the empirical-prescriptive relied on anecdotal or case study data to offer prescriptions; and (3) the applied scientific represented the traditional forms of scientific
measurement used to explore organisational issues “objectively” (Tompkins & Wanca-Thibault 2001, xxiii).

Figure 15; Past Priorities in Organisational Communication Research: 1940s-1970s

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Era</th>
<th>Predominant Research Questions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1940s</td>
<td>What effects do downward directed mass media communications have on employees? Is an informed employee a productive employee?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1950s</td>
<td>How do small-group communication networks affect organisational performance and member attitudes and behaviours? How can emergent communication networks in organisations be measured? What are the relationships between organisational members' attitudes and perceptions of their communication behaviour (primarily upward and downward) and their on-the-job performance? What is the relationship between the attitudes and performance of workers and the feedback they receive? Is a well-informed employee a satisfied employee?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1960s</td>
<td>What do organisational members perceive to be the communication correlates of “good” supervision? To what degree is superior-subordinate semantic-information distance a problem in organisations? What is the relationship between subordinates' job-related attitudes and productivity and the extent to which they perceive they participate in decision-making? In what ways do the actual and perceived communication behaviours of liaison and nonliaison roles within organisational communication networks differ?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1970s</td>
<td>What are the components and correlates of superior-subordinate, work group, and overall organisational communication climates? What are the characteristics of work-group and organisational communication networks (and in particular, the distribution of “key” communication roles)?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Tompkins and Wanca-Thibault, 2001; originally adapted from Jablin, 1978)

Redding and Tompkins (1988) divided the period after 1970 into modernistic, naturalistic, and critical. Wert-Gray et al. (1991) found that five topics accounted for over 65% of the articles published in 15 communication journals from 1979 to 1989: (1) climate and culture, (2) superior-subordinate communication; (3) power, conflict, and politics, (4) information flow; and (5) public organisational communication (Tompkins & Wanca-Thibault 2001, xxv). Methodologically, “only 2.1% manifested a critical approach” (ibid., xxv).

A more recent review of the field (Putnam et al., 1996), which categorized organisational communication research in metaphor clusters, found that “the conduit and the lens metaphors are the primary ways that organizational scholars treat communication” (396). However, a follow-up study (Putnam & Boys 2006) revealed that there has been a significant paradigm shift from a
linear communication view to “the way that social interaction, discursive processes and symbolic meanings constitute organizations” (541). In their extensive review of organisational communication research of the last decade, Putnam and Boys (2006) noted that “Interpretive, critical and postmodernist studies have become widely prevalent in organizational communication research within the last decade” (565).

The change and interest in organisational communication can also be seen in the sheer volume of organisational communication literature. Putnam and Boys found “well over 200 articles” published in communication and management journals and books during the past ten years. The same trend can also be seen from our own analysis. The progress has been extraordinary, especially coming into the 2000s, as the Figure 3.3 depicts. Issues of management and organisation are being examined over wide range and the volume of research is now bigger than ever.

Figure 16; Organisational Communication Keyword Frequencies in ComAbstracts, 1981 to 2005
Technological Approach.

The technological approach to communication study, as defined by the Communication and Technology Division of the ICA, “focuses on information and communication technology in relation to communication issues from a psychological or sociological view. Specifically it addresses human-computer interaction, computer-mediated communication, social interaction and networking, group dynamics, organizational contexts and societal/cultural contexts” (ICA). Similarly, the Human Communication and Technology Division of the NCA conducts research on various communication technologies “including computer-mediated communication systems and other means of technologically-mediated human communication” (NCA).

According to Lievrouw et al. (2001), “[e]arly communication technology studies…tended toward technological determinism (i.e. emphasizing the effects or ‘impacts’ of ICTs on users, organizations, or society)” (272). This perspective assumes that “technologies have a direct causal influence on people, organizations, and society” (Poole & Walther 2001, 25). According to Lievrouw et al. (2001, 272), this tradition is still influential; however, “contemporary researchers consider both impacts and the ways in which individuals, groups, and institutions influence and reshape technologies in use”. Poole and Walther call this “the emergent perspective,” which “acknowledges the role of technologies in triggering organisational changes but also explicitly incorporates the organizational imperatives that might moderate the influence of the technology” (2001, 26).

According to Lievrouw et al. (2001, 271), “[c]ommunication and technology (CAT) is concerned with the development, uses, and consequences of information and communication technologies (ICTs) across all types of social, cultural, and institutional settings”. Broadly defined, “the technological approach to communication study can be construed to include even traditional areas such as television and the newspaper, telecommunications technologies such as the telephone, wireless services, and videoconferencing, and information/communication technologies such as the Internet, groupware, and virtual reality” (Poole & Walther 2001, 6).

However, some scholars go even further, claiming that “largely due to the Internet, the field of communication and technology can be said to be as large and broad as the field of communication, as communication technology has touched in real ways phenomena in each of the discipline’s subfields or professional association divisions” (Walther et al. 2005, 633).
A large part of the research on communication and technology has dealt with diffusion of technologies. According to Poole and Walther (2001, 24), “[s]ome 4,000 studies of diffusion” had been completed by 2001, “mainly dealing with the diffusion of technological innovations”. The growth of the research of technology has been evident especially in recent years: “Research on the use and implications of information and communication technologies (ICT) has burgeoned over the past decade, in parallel with the development of ICTs themselves” (733). Another evidence of the growth within this area is the availability of journals dedicated to research on new media (e.g., Journal of Computer-Mediated Communication, Journal of Electronic Publishing, Behavior and Information Technology, The Information Society; see Jones et al., 2004).

An analysis of communication literature revealed that the interest in technology grew steadily until the 1990s, when the curve took a drastic turn upwards (Figure 3.4). Similarly, an explosion of Internet research in the late 1990s has continued to expand exponentially.

Figure 17; Technological Approach Keyword Frequencies in Com.Abstracts, 1981 to 2005
In a 2002 meta-analysis of communication research about the Internet, the most common research topics were law and policy issues, uses and perceptions of the Internet, and economic issues such as e-commerce, advertising and marketing. Cultural or social issues, historical or philosophical discussions, and effects of the Internet on individuals and organisations were among the least studied topics.

Chung et al. (2005) found that while mass communication dominates communication research in the U.S., current U.S. research shows increasing interest in the Internet. Internet literature is somewhat multifaceted; the emphasis is on the effects of the Internet as well as on cultural, social, and educational issues. According to the study, economic issues such as e-commerce, advertising and marketing, and technical issues were also common topics in communication books.

According to Chung et al. (2005) U.S. communication researchers still focus on research about the Internet itself and its technical applications instead of more mature aspects of the Internet such as identifying the uses and the users of the medium (Phase II), various effects of the medium on people, organisations, and society (Phase III), and possible conceptual and theoretical improvements of the medium and its practical applications (Phase IV). In their study, Chung et al. used Wimmer and Dominick’s (2000) four-phase model of communication research development and found that the first phase dominates Internet research in the U.S. (32.5%). However, they also found that some research is simultaneously being conducted in the second (17.5%), third (27.8%), and fourth (22.2%) phases.

Approaches Illustrated: An Analysis of the ICA and NCA Journals.

In the USA project a case study was conducted by Katy Pearce and Ronald E. Rice to further extend the outlook on current research foci and approaches and to illustrate the kinds of research efforts recently conducted. A look at 13 key, U.S.-based journals, published by the International Communication Association (ICA) and the National Communication Association (NCA) was conducted. The journals, in accordance with the mission and divisions of the associations, address different fields of communication research, from cultural and media studies to education and speech communication. The journals thus provide one outlook on the kind of work fostered by the associations:
The latest full year of the journals was chosen for the illustrative outlook on kinds of research efforts currently conducted. Accordingly, 135 abstracts from those 13 journals in 2006 were first content-analysed quantitatively for their primary orientation towards mass media or interpersonal communication; their emphasis on content, effects or use; theoretical orientation; methodology; and geographic scope.

The main finding is that the majority, some 70% of the studies, address communication as mass media communication exclusively, and practically all studies include mass communication as an orientation. Combinations of mass media and health communication, and of mass media and interpersonal communication, account for over 10% of the orientation in the articles. Combinations of mass media with political communication, organisational communication, and group communication remain relatively small.

**Topics** in the ICA and NCA journal articles of 2006 varied widely. The most popular topic was television, studied in some 10% of the articles; news, film, and advertising with almost 7% of articles each; and video games with some 4%. Current media-related research is studying new technologies, often associated with the Internet. Almost 25% of the articles published in 2006 define media as an internet-based technology of some type.
The theoretical orientation of the studies from 2006 is primarily on social science (57%), critical (31%) and cultural studies (12%) (The latter two are seen as separate categories, although in the interviews they were often discussed as one approach). Consequently, the social science dominance, mentioned in many interviews, was not as clearly echoed in the journals.

The methodologies used in the 2006 articles varied widely. Reflecting the prominence of effect studies, one third of the studies utilised an experiment, while others used content analysis (21.2%), and still, others, surveys (16.2%). 20% of the articles advanced or developed theory. A small number used ethnography (7.5%) as well.

The geographic scope of the 2006 articles was not defined in over half of the studies. Those that did have a geographic limitation were from international (outside of the U.S.) sources (27%) and specifically from the United States (17%). Those that did not define a geographic scope, however, were often written by U.S.-based scholars, and it can be assumed that the studies were conducted in the U.S. Comparative analyses were rare.

Examples of significant schools

Annenberg School for Communication at the University of Pennsylvania is among the most well known communication departments in the U.S. Founded in 1959, it draws from both social sciences and humanities in theories and methods used. Although the department states that “any significant research question is fair game (...) if it concerns communication behaviour, its social or institutional dimensions, its modalities (...) or media”, the school lists as its special emphasis the following areas: Children and Media; Culture, Society and Communication; Global Communication; Health Communication; Media Institutions; New Media and Information Technologies; Political Communication; Visual Communication It hosts numerous centres and projects. The faculty includes over 20 professors and assistant professors, several “secondary faculty” members, “researchers” and “visiting scholars” from abroad. The school also includes numerous adjunct professors and faculty associates on its staff. The basic funding for the school originates from the private Annenberg funds (Foundation), originally designated to established the school, by the late diplomat Walter Annenberg.

The Norman Lear Center, based at the University of Southern California, is a multidisciplinary research and public policy centre that was founded in 2000. Its mission is to explore the “implications of the convergence of entertainment, commerce, and society”. The
Lear Center is located at the USC Annenberg School for Communication and “builds bridges between eleven schools whose faculty study aspects of entertainment, media, and culture. Beyond campus, it bridges the gap between the entertainment industry and academia, and between them and the public”. According to the Chair of the Normal Lear Center Martin Kaplan, the Lear Center considers itself as somewhat non-conventional academic institution, which to make an impact on society, in addition to the traditional academic publication venues utilises various means such as popular print media, film and video, roadshows, and artworks. Currently, the centre is involved in 13 different projects (according to the centre’s Internet page), such as the Grand Avenue Intervention, a public engagement campaign with the Los Angeles Times; Hollywood Health & Society, funded by the Centers for Disease Control & Prevention; and Reliable Resources, which administers the Walter Cronkite Award for Excellence in Broadcast Political Coverage.

**The Social Science Research Council**, based in New York City, is an independent research organisation founded in 1923. Being non-profit, its mission is to mobilise “researchers, policymakers, professionals, activists and other experts from the private and public sectors to develop innovative approaches to issues of critical social importance”. The core idea is that social science can be done for the “public good” and contribute to the “necessary knowledge” that citizens and policymakers need in order to contribute to a democratic society. The organisation’s basic commitments include “fostering innovation”; investing in the future (e.g., supporting young scholars by different means); working internationally (currently, approximately 60% of SSRC’s activities are outside the U.S.) and democratically; combining urgency and patience (a combination of urgent issues and long-term goals); and “keeping standards high” (i.e., engaging in important public questions with high standards of scholarly work and critical analyses). The media is only one part of the SSRC’s activities. The broad programme areas are Global Security and Cooperation, Migration, Knowledge Institutions, and The Public Sphere. “The Necessary Knowledge for a Democratic Public Sphere” sub programme supported by the Ford Foundation concentrates on media regulation and ownership issues. “[We] will seek ways to have the thinking of those developing theoretical and research agendas directly informed by the kinds of concerns driving practical action and arguments before courts and regulatory bodies. The point is not to determine the results in advance of scientific work, but to make sure there is a constituency for the results of scientific work” (Calhoun 16). A key role of the SSRC in these specific media-related questions is to act as an intermediary by fostering research, data access and links among
academics, advocates and activists, media practitioners, and decision-makers in regulatory bodies and corporations. The SSRC has been and is funded by numerous private and public sources, such as the Rockefeller and Ford Foundations, several foreign ministries, and the agencies of the United Nations. It disseminates research not only through exchange programmes, conferences and the like, but by active publication activities (books, online forums and essays, and a quarterly that is also available online).

The Project for Excellence in Journalism (PEJ) was originally an initiative affiliated with the Columbia University Graduate School of Journalism, with a double mission to evaluate the press and to help journalists clarify their principles. The latter task was the responsibility of a group of professionals, the Committee for Concerned Journalists. Since 2006, the organisation has belonged to an independent, non-profit “Fact Tank” called the PEW Research Center (funded by the PEW Charitable Trust). While the PEW Center hosts a number of projects, some of which bear great relevance to communication and the media (e.g., PEW Research Center for People and the Press; the PEW Internet and American Life project), the PEJ is now more data-driven rather than producing commentary on the press. The flagship of the PEJ, the State of the News Media report (heavily used in the context section of this study), is one of the main efforts of the project, for which it consults academic scholars. In addition, the PEJ conducts “opportunistic” studies on current issues (e.g., elections, or gender and sourcing), and publishes on its website a Daily Briefing on news issues. The scope of research activities is expanding to include more analyses on industry trends and content studies of the news agenda. Also, the PEJ is increasingly looking into international dimensions for its studies. Currently, the organisation employs over 10 staff members, including researchers and methodologists, plus numerous coders for content analyses.
Japan

Media and communication research as an academic discipline in universities is still mostly to be established in Japan. Considering the vastness of the media industry in Japan, or even the amount of research done in private organizations, the volume of academic research is quite modest, as is the number of doctoral degrees in the field. There are only a few departments of journalism, media studies or communication in universities in the entire country, and they are mainly in private universities. Academic research on media is being conducted in various “research rooms” (kenkyushitsu), institutes and graduate schools. In many cases faculty members interested in the media work at departments of sociology, political studies, economics, psychology, informatics, anthropology, literature or philosophy, rather than having a department focusing exclusively on media and communication. Because of the scattered nature of academic media and communication research, the importance of research associations is emphasized. The largest one is the Japan Society for Studies in Journalism and Mass Communication (Nibon Masukomi Gakkai) with about 1400 members. There are at least twelve relevant associations in Japan, with various focuses, membership profiles and functions. Through these associations scholars doing research in the fields of media, communication, information society etc. meet and form various study groups. The journals of the associations are important publishing channels for research in the field. Research in media and communication outside the academic community is abundant and rich. Most television companies, newspapers and advertising agencies have their own research units or subsidiaries, which most commonly focus on audience and/or marketing research aimed at developing the business of the companies. In addition to these research institutions there are some public and private independent research institutes or think tanks focusing on media, and often on media policy issues or issues concerning technological development.

Despite the fact that there are only a few departments in the field of media and communication studies in the universities, there are about 230 universities providing education in the field. The undergraduate courses provide instruction in different media-related professions, while the quality of education varies greatly, as well as the taught courses. Education in journalism at universities is mostly theoretical, and the industry has called for revamping of the courses. Among the 53 universities with graduate programs in media and communication, 39
have both master level and doctoral level education. Of these universities, 15 belong to the best Japanese universities, six national and nine private (Sogo Janarizumu Kenkyujo 2004). Only a few have high research profiles in media and communication research or actually focus on research. Of the national universities, University of Tokyo has had and still has institutionalized conditions for research of media and communication. Of the private universities, the strongest profiles in this field are at Keio University and Sophia University. Waseda University has undergraduate teaching but has shifted into more technological orientations in the research. Waseda is also known for being the alma mater of many journalists and, because of this, has the image of being a school of journalism. Hokkaido University has a new graduate program at the Research Faculty of Media and Communication.

**Historical Context**

*Zeitungswissenschaft*, or “Studies of the Newspaper” was the beginning of media studies in Japan, as it was in Finland. Focusing not only on the newspaper but also on journalism, Professor Hideo Ono established the research field in Japan at the turn of the 1920s and 1930s. At the time studies in social sciences were modelled mostly after influences in Germany in the fields of philosophy, politics, economics and sociology (Tamura 2004).

A small research group was established at Tokyo University in 1929 and similar ones at Sophia University and Meiji University in 1932. Professor Ono was instrumental in establishing all three. After the Second World War, journalism education was established at Waseda University, Doshisha University, Nihon University and Tohoku Gakuin University. In these four institutions, the focus has been in the undergraduate programs rather than on research. The whole education system of Japan was renewed during the US occupation after the Second World War. Education of journalism was no exception. Theoretical approaches, methodology, teaching methods and curricula were modelled after American empirical science and positivism. In studies of communication, this led to a shift from journalism to mass communication and from studies of the newspaper to studies of mass media. New theories of “the mass”, “public opinion” and “effectiveness function” were introduced to Japan (Tamura 2004). Ishikawa (1998, 60) states that scientific mass communication research in Japan began in 1951 with the establishment of The Japanese Society for the Study of Journalism and Mass Communication. Survey, content analysis methods, as well as effect research were introduced into Japanese mass communication research.
in 1950s. The Japanese public broadcasting company Nippon Hoso Kyokai established the Broadcasting Culture Research Institute in 1946. Technological innovations and changes in communication technologies began to bring new challenges for research and education in the 1980s. Transitions in market economy, innovations in the newspaper technologies, development of radio and television and the appearance of telecommunication called for new perspectives and methods. Most of Japanese education and research institutions were thus reorganized and the focus shifted by 1990s from newspapers to the information and communication or to the studies of mass communication. In many countries, faculties of newspapers studies were reorganized into wider communication orientation by the 1970s. In Japan, reorganization of the curriculum started, however, as late as the 1990s. In terms of research, communication had been studied with a wide spectrum even before the official changes in curriculum or faculty structures. Through the reorganization processes in the 1990s “study of newspapers” as a discipline disappeared from curricula. It was not abolished, however, but divided into studies of journalism, media, communication and mass communication (Tamura 2004).

**Significant Centres**

**University of Tokyo.** Interdisciplinarity is the underlying trend of the whole history of media and communication research at the University of Tokyo. Tokyo Imperial University established a small “research room for newspaper study” (shimbunboku kenkyushitsu) in 1929. The research room was located at the Department of Literature and it was an interdisciplinary academic group consisting of three professors, one each from the Departments of Law, Literature and Economics. The group was privately funded by the newspaper industry and financial circles. The initiative for establishing the research field came from the industry. Initially the university was reluctant to establish a research unit in this field, as it was not considered an academic subject. This is the reason why the beginning was with a “research room” orkenkyushitsu-structure and not an independent department or institute. After the Second World War the US occupation General Headquarters (GHQ) suggested, that the University of Tokyo should establish a school of journalism after the example of American universities. However, again the university navigated external influences and instead established in 1949, The Institute of Journalism and Communication Studies. The founding father of the discipline in Japan, Professor Hideo Ono was still working with the university, and tried to maintain some of the Zeitungswissenschaft
tradition, even with the American influences. The Institute of Journalism and Communication Studies gradually broadened its focus from newspaper and journalism. In 1957, it was organized internally into five research divisions focusing respectively on "mass-communications theory", "mass-communications history", "communication processes", "mass-communications media", and "public opinion". In the years that followed, divisions of "broadcasting" (1963), “information society” (1974) and "socio-information systems" (1980) were added. The institute established a reputation as a leading centre for research on mass communications and the social aspects of information. It was the only one within Japan’s national universities focusing specifically in this field of investigation. The next big reorganization took place in 1992, when the department was reorganized into three internal divisions: “Information and Media”, “Information and Behaviour”, and “Information and Society". The new institution was called the Institute of Socio-information and Communication Studies, and it studied, among other things, the information society, including a three-year project supported by the Japanese governmental program for "Key Research Areas" entitled "Information Society and Human Beings". In 2004, the Institute of Socio-Information and Communication Studies merged with the Interfaculty Initiative of Informatics (III) or Joho Gakkan, combining the earlier social science and humanistic approaches with natural sciences. The III is a network initiative, where part of the faculty is always visiting from the other departments and institutes of the University of Tokyo on 3 – 7 year terms. Interfaculty Initiative of Informatics maintains the Graduate School of Interdisciplinary Information Studies. The graduate school has three courses: “Cultural and Human Information Studies”, “Socio-Information and Communication Studies” and “Interdisciplinary Information Studies”. The 50 faculty members are mostly working within these three categories. The graduate school has about 200 master’s degree students and 100 students aiming at doctoral degrees. The intake of doctoral students has been on the decrease since academic employment opportunities have declined.

The University of Tokyo has been the most influential research institute in this field. The number of faculty members active in research is also high compared with other universities. The Japan Society for Studies in Journalism and Mass Communication used to have its permanent office at the University of Tokyo. Nowadays, however, the universities rotate turns in maintaining the office. The University of Tokyo has also often been the place where international trends of research have first appeared in Japan. For instance the current dean of III, Professor Shunya Yoshimi has been among the active researchers who have brought cultural studies to
Japan in the mid-1990s, despite the fact that he has remained critical towards “the global, fashionable” research tradition (Yoshimi 1998). With the current structure that combines humanistic and social scientific traditions with natural science, the III aims at maintaining and developing the influential status of the University of Tokyo in this field. The approach is new and bold, and the new generations educated within the new structure can find innovative perspectives for their research.

However, there are concerns that digital media, net environment and information society dominate as research subjects and that research on journalism and mass communication are fading away. To avoid this from happening, the following measures are suggested (Yoshimi 2007): - Re-establishing journalist education in the university as an undergraduate program - Cooperation of journalism undergraduate course and studies of media contents - Cooperation with media educational courses - Invitations to lecturers from outside the university to give graduate courses - Collaboration with media companies and reporters - International cooperation with universities especially in Asia and Australia Accordingly, the III is very active in the discussions underway about founding an academic School of Journalism. Asahi Shimbun founded its own Institute of Journalism for education of in-house journalists in 2006, because of the theoretical nature of university education. Nevertheless, even it would ultimately like the education to be conducted at universities. There are discussions taking place among some Tokyo area universities and media companies to establish a more practically oriented school of journalism within the university system, III being central in the process.

The III publishes three journals. In Johogaku kenkyu faculty papers and refereed papers by graduate students and faculty members are published mostly in Japanese, but sometimes also in English, Chinese or Korean. Chosa kenkyu kiyo is a refereed journal. It publishes “research survey reports” based on doctoral dissertations and other research projects. All articles should be based on empirical work. The journal is published in Japanese. Review of Media, Information and Society is published in English and includes writings by faculty members or commissioned work by scholars outside of III. It does not publish work by doctoral candidates.

**Keio University.** The Institute of Media and Communication Research (MediaCom) was established in 1946, under the name of “research room for newspaper study” (shimbungaku kenkyushitsu). The current name was taken into use in 1996 to celebrate 50 years of the research institute’s existence. Keio University is one of the most prestigious private universities in Japan. It is famous for independent research institutes rather than undergraduate education, which is the
focus of most universities in Japan. Many of the research institutes in different fields of research at Keio are utilized by the ministries and decision makers for expertise and research for policymaking. This is the case also with MediaCom, which not only has governmentally funded projects, but also has active professors who participate with different ministries in policymaking processes and act as consultants for the decision makers. Currently MediaCom is involved in projects that study e.g. journalism and political power, formation of civic participation and “electric networks”, information systems and safe society, convergence and digitalization, and change of media environment. MediaCom takes part in the MEXT-funded Center of Excellence (COE) at Keio University, focusing on media content analysis, forming e.g. the Media Content Analysis Unit at the COE. The Unit focuses on both the print and broadcasting media and studies on how social attitudes are influenced by information from the mass media.

MediaCom is located at the Mita campus of Keio University. It has eight faculty members and 4 – 5 support staff members. After 2004 when The University of Tokyo merged the Institute of Socio-Information and Communication Studies with the Interfaculty Initiative of Informatics, Keio’s MediaCom has been the only research institute focusing solely on humanistic and social scientific research on media and communication. MediaCom focuses purely on research and does not have an undergraduate program, although it gives undergraduate courses to about 150 students studying in other majors at the university. Although MediaCom does not have a graduate program itself, it is closely involved with the Graduate School of Media and Governance located at the Shonan Fujisawa Campus. The graduate program was established in 1994. MediaCom is one of the most international research units in Japan. It has an active policy of promoting the international exchange of faculty members and students, as well as accepting international visiting scholars and students. There are also several active professors with internationally well-known careers. It has published a journal in English for 25 years. Keio Communication Review has been available on the Internet since 1999. MediaCom also publishes an annual journal in Japanese, called Media Communication.

Sophia University is one of the oldest private universities in Japan and one of the Catholic universities founded by the Jesuits in 1913. It has one of the oldest Departments of Journalism, founded 1932, as a part of a special section in the university focusing on organizing courses in the evenings. In 1948, the university was reorganized after the American model, and the Department of Journalism was included into the Faculty of Humanities. Graduate programs were established in the 1970s: a Master’s program in 1970 and a Ph.D. program in 1974. By 2003, about 200
master level graduates and 11 PhDs had graduated Sophia University’s Department of Journalism. The department has eight faculty members, and the main focus in research is in journalism, while research of media policy, digital media, public service broadcasting and media theory also is conducted. A considerable amount of the research focus on phenomena outside Japan, mainly in Asia, but often also on the United States and European countries, since many of the doctoral candidates come from abroad. The Institute for Communications Research within the Department of Journalism at Sophia has published the annual journal *Communications Research* (in Japanese) since 1971. The journal also acts as an annual report, since it contains information of the past year’s theses and dissertations, as well as seminar reports and speeches. In 2005 – 2006, articles mostly focus on media structures, especially on broadcasting.

**Doshisa University** maintains the Doshisa Center for Media and Communication Research with seven faculty members. The centre was founded after the Second World War to study newspapers and their role in Japanese militarism. The largest research project of the centre is “comparative study of world media laws and ethics and proposal for improving media quality”. Research of media ethics, information democracy and online journalism are included in the scope Doshisa’s research. The centre publishes the journal *Doshisa Journal of Media & Communication Research*.

**Tohoku University** is a national university, traditionally and internationally strong in natural sciences. It has also carried out some interesting attempts in multi-disciplinary approaches. The Graduate School of Information Sciences (GSIS) (*Daigakuin Joikagaku Kenkyuka*) was founded in 1993. The core of the school is in the computer sciences, but it also has laboratories in information mathematics and information physics. There are also studies of intelligent robotics. However, GSIS also focuses on human and social sciences, civil engineering and the biological sciences in order to study the interdependent relationships between “information and information technology” and “human and society”. GSIS, thus, focuses on the meaning of information, recognition of information, reaction to information and social effects of information technology. The ambitious aim of the school is to create “new information science” by encouraging collaboration among the different fields of information sciences. Media and Information Science is located in the Department of Human-Social Information Sciences, which is one of the four departments at the Graduate School of Information Sciences. It was founded in 2001 and has two small research laboratories: one focusing on Media and Culture and the other focusing on Media Semiotics. The aim of the institution is to promote research activities in
both theory and practices. Since 2002, the Media and Culture laboratory has run a “Media Literacy Project”, which involves local citizens and aims at encouraging “Civic Media” activities. The Media Semiotics laboratory focuses on two research areas: Media and Semiotics and Media and Pop-Culture. GSIS publishes the journal *Interdisciplinary Information Science*, which mostly focuses on computer sciences and information technology.

**Hokkaido University** founded the Research Faculty of Media and Communication (FRMC) and the Graduate School of International Media and Communication in 2000. The university does not have an undergraduate program. The doctoral course started in 2002. The School was reorganized into Graduate School of International Media, Communication and Tourism studies in April 2007. Hokkaido University appears to be the only national university that has recently established a faculty for research of media and communication. Since 2003, FRMC has published an Internet-journal called International Media and Communication Journal, which, because of restructuring of the institute, was unavailable in English during spring 2007, but was available in Japanese. The small unit has still to strengthen its reputation as a research facility.

**Waseda University** is one of the highest-ranking private universities in Japan. A “research room” for newspaper studies was established at Waseda in 1932 by Professor Ono. Undergraduate courses continue at the School of Culture, Media & Society, founded under this name in April 2007. However, Waseda does not have any research units particularly focusing on media and communication research, and neither does it have graduate school for the field. As noted, the university is still famous as the alma mater of journalists, who have graduated various programs at Waseda, such as law, economics or international relations. There are also institutes and graduate schools that do research related to media and communication. For instance at the Information Technology Research Organization (ITRO) there are projects including network society, content applications and digital archives and social aspects of Internet usage. However, the main focus for the ITRO is in technology and natural scientific projects such as communication between people and humanoids, and basic computing technologies. Waseda also has a system of changing project institutes, which also include themes of media and communication.

Global Information and Telecommunication Institute (GITI) promotes interdisciplinary research, and administers joint research projects with academia, enterprises, the government and different research institutions in Japan and overseas. The institute aims at a leading position in
information and communication research in Asia. It has wide international cooperation and receives researchers, educators and students from abroad, including Finland. GITI mostly focuses on technological research of the information and communication system (wireless, satellite communication modes, digital broadcasting, networking architecture, information and communication network and multimedia). However, there is also research on topics of media art, including expression in cyber space, expression of multimedia, image processing and media design. Within GITI functions the Graduate School of Information and Telecommunication Studies (GITS), founded in 2000. GITS focuses on Computer Systems and Network Engineering, Multimedia Science and Arts and Info-Telecom Socio-Economics, Network Business and Policy. The journal of the institution is *GITI /GITS Research Bulletin*. 
South Korea

In Korea there are over a hundred universities of which twenty-one are national universities funded by the government and two city universities (Seoul and Incheon) with municipal funding. The rest and the majority are private universities. The distinct top three universities of Korea are the so-called SKY universities, Seoul National University (SNU), Korea University (KU) and Yonsei University (YU), all located in Seoul. Until the turn of the millennium the leading position of Seoul National University remained unchallenged whereas today the other SKY universities have proved to be equal to SNU in various fields of research and teaching. Moreover, Ewha Women’s University, the biggest women’s university in the world also located in Seoul has both extensive and strong communications department.

Most universities in Korea teach communication or its subdisciplines at least for BA degree. Of the subdisciplines taught in Korean universities mass communication is the most popular and is often accompanied by journalism, public relations and advertising. Communication is almost in all universities taught under social sciences. Only a few universities have it under humanities or liberal arts. Post-graduate programs are significantly rarer and special communication studies doctoral programs have been arranged only in a few universities. Virtually all professors of Korean major universities have received their PhD abroad, mainly in the American universities. Although doctoral degrees can be achieved in many Korean universities, the prestige of a degree received in the U.S. is very high, undermining the value of Korean PhDs. Many Korean researchers today call for more self-sufficient knowledge production in their academic system and, thus, wish for greater interest and infrastructural development of doctoral programs in Korea.

There are several significant communication research institutes in different universities. Most of the institutes focus on communication in general or mass communication, although some of them have other interesting compositions like the Research Center for Media and Cultural Contents Strategy of Hongik University and the Public Opinion and Relations Research Institute of Kyungpook University. Two the most prestigious institutes are the Mass Communication Research Institute of Korea University and Institute of Communication Research of Seoul National University. Korean Broadcasting Institute is one of the major Korean institutes organizing and financing communication research outside universities. The institute publishes an annual report on Korean broadcasting industry, with an emphasis on the market,
policies and strategies of the industry. The institute also supports field research of relevant policy implementations of broadcasting companies, program contents research and operational models in different countries. Moreover, theoretical research on communication and broadcasting is also supported. Korea Research Foundation and Korea Foundation fund and support various disciplines and Korean and foreign scholars with a focus on Korea, including communication research. Korean Press Foundation funds and promotes more concrete aspects of communication, mainly the training of journalists, but also arranges research and survey projects on contemporary Korean media. LG Sangam Press Foundation functions likewise.

Interestingly, in contemporary Korean social sciences there seems to be slight tendency to ignore the possibilities introduced by the national or governmental statements, speeches, reports and definitions of policies. For one example, the ‘Dynamic Korea’ discourse of the government has attracted surprisingly little interest. The official Korean discourse about the nation as the promoter of ubiquitous social development and the significance of technological advances would offer a number of interesting aspects for communication study. Although one cannot predict the future, it is safe to say that although diversification is bound to increase in the future, Measures, statistics and quantity remain in the core of Korean communication research, defining and reinforcing its characteristics as a pragmatic, empirical and problem-based field of study.
**Finland**

**Research in Finland: A Synthetic Overview**

Research on journalism has become an increasingly strong tradition in Finland. Since the 1980s new professorships focusing on journalism research have been established both in the universities of Tampere and Jyväskylä, which has naturally increased output in this area. In the following chart, based on data (keyword abstracts) gathered by NORDICOM, we can compare the popularity of journalism as a research topic in Nordic countries during 1975-1999. After a belated start Finland became the biggest producer of research on this topic:

Figure 19; *Research on journalism in the Nordic countries 1975-1999*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Norway</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>232</td>
<td>209</td>
<td>683</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>207</td>
<td>779</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finland</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>233</td>
<td>321</td>
<td>873</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denmark</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>602</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>total</td>
<td>263</td>
<td>465</td>
<td>583</td>
<td>786</td>
<td>840</td>
<td>2937</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>keywords</td>
<td>(6 %)</td>
<td>(8 %)</td>
<td>(8 %)</td>
<td>(13 %)</td>
<td>(13 %)</td>
<td>30003</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Poteri 2004, 6)

Feminist perspectives found their way into Finnish communication and media studies effectively first in the 1980s, somewhat later than in other Nordic countries. The first feminist issue of *Tiedotustutkimus*, the research journal of the field, was published in 1986. In the 1990s this perspective established its position.
Communications research has often been criticized for its theoretical emphasis. However, as can be seen from Nordic comparative statistics, the overwhelming majority of the academic research has been empirical, with only a very small proportion of the total number of publications concentrating on a purely theoretical approach.
According to Herkman and Vähämäa (2007), nowadays the most common topic in Finnish communications research is the study of media culture and popular culture. Contrary to their hypothesis, journalism was not the biggest subfield of research, but comes only second. However, a closer look reveals that journalism is still the most popular field of research in the biggest departments (in Helsinki, Jyväskylä and most of all in Tampere). Third is the study of organizational communications, while societal and political media research is fourth.

Figure 22; Most common topics of communications research in Finland through 2000-2007 (N= 2289)
All in all, a closer look at the table below reveals the multiplicity of Finnish communications research; media economics, theoretical studies and media education also have their share in this research. Even media performance, the study of human performing behavior in media, counts for almost five percent of all publications.

Herkman and Vähämää’s data provides an interesting fact about Finnish communications research: the vast majority of original research is empirical (See Chart 2). Communications research has often been criticized for its theoretical emphasis. The majority of the academic research proves to be empirical, with only a very small proportion of the total number of publications employing a purely theoretical approach. This finding debunks the myth of theoretical bias in academic research.

Figure 23; Division between theoretical and empirical research orientations in Finland in the period 2000-2007. (N=2069)
As Chart 3 shows, journalism research was classified into three major categories based on what the research was concentrated. These categories were 1) journalistic working procedures, 2) media products and 3) visual journalism. ‘Journalistic working procedures’ denotes the study of reporting conventions, procedures that reporters employ in their daily work and the ways news organizations are run. ‘Media products’ is a category that denotes the study of journalistic texts and discourses (presented in both print and electronic forms). ‘Visual journalism’ denotes those studies which take photography and other journalistic images, such as representation on television programs, as their primary focus. Data shows that there are surprisingly many academic theses that provide information on journalistic working procedures. However, there seems to be a substantial lack of studies with a focus on visual journalism. Given the fact that the average Finn spends almost three hours every day watching television, it is surprising how little research focus there is on the visual elements of journalism. On the contrary, Finns spend daily only about an hour and a half with newspapers and other printed media.

Media products are the major concern in the study of journalism. These studies are concentrated on the textual side of the journalistic material. Thus, it can be said that, on the whole, Finnish journalism research has a significant textual focus.
Figure 24; Focuses of journalism research in Finland (N=370)
The Finnish interviewees expressed concerns regarding the national characteristics of communications research. Many were worried about the lack of national line(s) of research that would unify the field. It seemed that many were in two minds about the lack of a clear national profile in the communications research field. On the one hand, it was considered good that research is pluralistic. The interplay of different theoretical positions and methodologies was seen as contributing to lively academic discourse. On the other hand, the lack of national unity in research was seen as a threat to the development of academic traditions in communications research. Many criticized the current situation in the field for its lack of historical orientation. The whole field of communications research was thus considered too sporadic to produce a sense of a historical accumulation of knowledge for the discipline. Many also criticized communications research for being too provincial in its array of research topics and themes, forgetting the linkages to global developments. It was suggested that research was more international in its orientation in the 1970s and beginning of 1980s. There were thus hopes for increasing international research cooperation and for a greater focus on global problems and issues related to the media.
University Departments and Professorships

There are three large and three average-sized communications faculties in the universities in Finland. The larger ones are located at the University of Jyväskylä, the University of Helsinki and the University of Tampere, while the average-sized faculties are at the University of Vaasa, the University of Turku and the University of Lapland at Rovaniemi.

Figure 25; Most important university units of communication research in Finland

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>University</th>
<th>Subject of study, department, or unit</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>University of Helsinki</td>
<td>Department of Communication</td>
<td>Focus on changing public sphere and media landscape, journalism, and organizational communication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Communication Research Centre</td>
<td>Research unit of the Department of Communication specialised in acquiring outside funding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swedish School of Social Science</td>
<td>Department of Speech Sciences Institute for Arts Research</td>
<td>Speech communication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(University of Helsinki)</td>
<td>Journalism</td>
<td>Film and television studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Tampere</td>
<td>Department of Journalism and Mass Communication</td>
<td>Focus on learning practical skills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Subject of Media Culture</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Journalism Research and Development Centre</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Department of Speech Communication and Voice Research</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Department of Information Studies</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Jyväskylä</td>
<td>Journalism</td>
<td>Focus on media Communication in and between organizations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Organizational Communication and PR</td>
<td>Focus on personal interaction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Speech Communication</td>
<td>Focus on intercultural communication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Intercultural Communication</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Turku</td>
<td>Media studies</td>
<td>Situated at the School of Art Studies. Focus on media cultures and technologies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Åbo Akademi (Turku)</td>
<td>Political Science with Mass Communication</td>
<td>Located in Vaasa, focuses also on media and politics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Information Studies</td>
<td>Information management, including library and information services in the private and public sectors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Vaasa</td>
<td>Department of Communication Studies</td>
<td>Applied linguistics (specialised languages, technical communication), media studies, multimedia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Oulu</td>
<td>Department of Information Processing Science</td>
<td>Includes studies on digital media and mobile services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Information Studies</td>
<td>Focus on the production, circulation, acquisition, and management of information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Joensuu</td>
<td>Media culture and communication</td>
<td>Separate MA programme in Cultural Studies established in 2006. Also BA teaching</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Lapland</td>
<td>Audiovisual Media Culture</td>
<td>At the crossroads of art, science and technology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Graphic Design</td>
<td>Different areas of graphic design and visual communication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Media Education</td>
<td>Study subject in the Faculty of Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Art and Design</td>
<td>School of Visual Culture</td>
<td>Art, environmental art in particular, graphic design, and photography</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Media Lab</td>
<td>Teaching and study of new media in content provision, ‘information design’, interactive narrative, virtual environments and media solutions of the future</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helsinki University of Technology</td>
<td>School of Motion Picture, Television and Production Design</td>
<td>Institute for training the makers of Finnish feature-length films</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helsinki School of Economics</td>
<td>Department of Media Technology</td>
<td>Research on new media technology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Department of Languages and Communication</td>
<td>Research in languages and business communication</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
At the Universities of Helsinki, Tampere and Jyväskylä there are independent research units which each conduct original research on communications related topics. The Journalism Research and Development Centre at the University of Tampere and the Communication Research Centre at the University of Helsinki are academic research units whose funding derives primarily from non-academic sources. The Research Centre for Contemporary Culture at the University of Jyväskylä is more academic in the sense that it receives funding both from the university and from outside. In contrast to those in Helsinki and Tampere, the Jyväskylä research unit also features an educational curriculum.

The Helsinki and Tampere units, as well as several polytechnic institutes across Finland, conduct lots of research and development work in association with media companies, governmental organizations and certain NGOs (including private foundations).
3.2 Doctoral Studies

This subchapter provides an overview of the different forms of organisation of doctoral education and research in the various countries. Once again, we observe that there is much less unity in communication and media studies internationally than is often thought to be the case. On the contrary, doctoral studies are more determined by specific national academic traditions than they are by any sense of disciplinary regulation. As a consequence, doctoral studies in communication and media research in each individual country display more significant similarities with doctoral programmes in other disciplines and fields in their own national contexts than they do with each other internationally. We therefore dedicate attention to these more general constraints in some of the country-focused sections in order to indicate the main structures shaping contemporary doctoral work in communication and media studies.

Nevertheless, recent transformations of university study and research internationally has introduced greater uniformity among the different countries at the general level of academic standards and accreditation. Communication and media research is therefore undergoing an international ‘institutional’ rather than ‘disciplinary’ standardisation. The main issues to be noted in this subchapter involve the impact of various university reforms and the consequences of a growing academic professionalism in the field. It is an era of transformation for doctoral studies, in communication and media studies just as much as in other areas of academic activity. This transformation is experienced in both positive and negative forms. Among the most significant elements that we note are the ongoing impact of older hierarchical structures, the role of doctoral education in labour market supply and the ‘commodification’ of the PhD, difficulties gaining funding for doctoral research, the threat to academic autonomy posed by integration with government and industry programmes (often on the basis of financial constraints), and the role of the ‘foreign’ PhD in communication and media research internationally. The future evolution of doctoral studies in this area of academic activity will to a large part depend on the ways in which current and future students negotiate older national and newer international pressures.
Germany

The most significant factor impacting upon doctoral studies in communication and media research is the formal nature of the German academic hierarchy. In Germany the formal selection process in the education system starts early at the level of choosing the lower secondary school (more vocationally or generally oriented) at the age of around 10 and, later, the upper secondary school (a vocational school - Berufschule or a general school - Gymnasium). The prerequisite for starting a course of study at the university or at an equivalent institution is the university entrance qualification (Allgemeine Hochschulreife or the Fachgebundene Hochschulreife - depending on the kind of secondary school courses attended). Its holders have basically the right to enter any university and any course of their choice without any special admission procedures. There has been little room left for a university to choose its own students. For the majority of courses of study, there has not existed any nation-wide restrictions on the number of applicants admitted.

However, in some highly demanded courses (for example medicine, veterinary medicine, dentistry, architecture, business management and psychology, media and communication studies - this may vary from semester to semester), there are nation-wide quotas (Numerus clausus) due to the large numbers of applicants and the insufficient number of equivalent places available (Majcher 2002, 9-10).

A key feature of the German university is its hierarchical structure in which the position of professor gives much power over persons who in other academic cultures would be have already gained a more independent or equal standing. The roots of this phenomena lie in history and in the two stages, dissertation and Habilitation, of the postgraduate qualification process. The idea of university as “a guild-style community of masters and journeymen – with the Habilitation as the individual’s ‘masterwork’” (Bultmann 1996, 339) has been prevalent in Germany.

The historical Ordinarienuniversität was organised around chairs, whose few occupiers were ordentliche Professoren. They represented the unity of research and teaching, decided over the curriculum, took charge of the supervision and recruiting of their successors and monopolised the self-governing bodies in the universities.

Assistants were introduced as a body of personnel who helped professors in running the institutes. As part of an Ordinarienuniversität in Germany an assistant has traditionally been very closely linked and subordinated to his (or more rarely her) supervising professor. Another
important group was formed by Privatdozenten who were unsalaried lecturers, hoping to become professors. The institution of PD started at the beginning of the 19th century and became established around 1860. The heyday of the PD lasted approximately from 1900 until 1968, when hardly a university professor in a normal field was appointed who had not been a Privatdozent. A limited number of “Junior Professorships” were introduced in 2002 as fast-track, time-limited positions to qualify for regular professorships. This is often seen as the “beginning of the end” of Privatdozenten, though “critiques of the new procedure convincingly argue that junior professorships are also used for covering budget-cuts” (Göztepe-Çelebi et al. 2002, 15, cf. Reitz 2002, 366). However, it is still possible - and necessary for an academic career in many subjects - to undertake an Habilitation. Even “junior professors, despite their quasi-professorial status, are nevertheless expected to write a ‘second book’ as a functional equivalent of the former Habilitation” (Göztepe-Çelebi et al. 2002, 15).

A new twist in this history came in 2004 as the Bundesverfassungsgericht decided that “through the introduction of the junior professor position, the Bund has overstepped its competence as a legislativing body. […] Politically, the judgement, reached with a 5:3 majority, yields three consequences: first, it has stopped the reform of the personnel structure of the Hochschulen, initiated after decades of debate, before it really came into effect; second, it has extremely de-legitimised the claims of the Bund to shape Hochschule politics; and third, it has given grist to the mill of those who have been insisting for years on the introduction of student fees” (Keller 2004, 1038).

Habilitation was and is earned after taking a doctorate and it requires the candidate to write a second dissertation, reviewed by and defended before an academic committee in a process similar to that for the doctoral dissertation. Whereas for example in the United States, the United Kingdom and many other countries, the doctorate is sufficient qualification for a faculty position at a university, in Germany and some other countries only the Habilitation qualifies the holder to supervise doctoral candidates. Besides that, “only the scholar with Habilitation is considered as an independent researcher and teacher” (Majcher 2002, 11). In other words, this means that during this long process of Habilitation, finalised on average at the age of around 40, the younger researcher is still dependent on his or her professor. Thus, in the humanities and social sciences German researchers are in the most cases “living in relationships of personal dependence until well into their forties”. By the time they finally complete the Habilitation, over one third of them are unemployed (Reitz 2002, 365).
Brenner writes (1993, 331) that Habilitation does not encourage scientific originality, which is always linked to being an outsider. Instead, he argues that it promotes selection and integration into the existing structures. It thus also endorses a “strategy of risk avoidance” where “the occupation of niches through hyperspecialisation is conspicuous and promising of success (ibid., 340). It has also been noted that the institution of Habilitation leads to a situation where “the institution providing the candidate judges the suitability of a scholar for the vocation of University lecturer – unlike the internationally norm, where the institution accepting the new scholar reaches such an assessment’ (Keller 2004, 1039).

After service as a Privatdozent, one may be admitted to the faculty as a professor, a position equivalent to a “full professor” in the USA. The professors are usually life-long civil servants appointed by a ministry responsible for science and universities in the respective Bundesland. The minister is then given a list with three candidates selected by the university boards or commissions, from which one is selected. The ministry can even reject the entire list, but has to give its reason for this decision. In this case, the call for a new search has to be announced. As can be seen, political administration has a de facto veto right concerning appointments to professorship – which in turn may reinforce certain conformist tendencies in the universities.

A Habilitation thesis can be either cumulative (based on previous research, be it articles or monographs) or monographical, i.e. a specific, unpublished thesis, which has the tendency to be very long indeed. While cumulative Habilitationen are predominant in some fields (e.g. medicine, natural sciences), they are almost unheard of in others. Usually only those candidates who receive the highest or second-highest grade for their Ph.D. thesis are encouraged to proceed to the Habilitation.

Since 2006 there are new legal restrictions in some federal states of Germany that allow only people with excellent Ph.D. evaluations to undertake the Habilitation process.
France

France displays a similar traditional academic structure for doctoral studies to that observed in Germany. Before applying for doctoral posts (maître de conferences, professeur des universités) in the universities or research centres, French doctorates have to pass a qualification examination given by the national council of universities, Le Conseil National des Universités (CNU). The CNU members are designated by the Ministry of Higher Education, Ministère de l'enseignement supérieur. The task of this council is to define the existing academic disciplines and to accept the teacher-researchers to each field of science. The CNU has 77 sections representing all the academic disciplines, out of which Sciences de l'Information et de la Communication is the 71st. The council of the 71st section is responsible for defining the field of Infocom selecting the teacher-researchers on the basis of their applications. The CNU then gives a certification or proficiency rating to each applicant, so that they can apply for posts a maîtres de conferences or professors (CP-CNU 2006, 4). This means that the doctorates cannot apply for the academic posts in France without certification rating from the CNU. The certification is valid for four years; if the applicant does not find a post, then she/he has to reapply for the certification.

In 2006 there were 230 applications for the certification of maîtres de conferences and 60 were accepted. The same year there were 41 applicants for the proficiency rating for professorships and 13 were accepted (ibid, 10). This shows that the selection is strict and creates competition among the applicants. To be qualified, the applicants must pass two “filters”: first, the certification for the discipline (Is the applicant’s research to be defined as communication research or research in another discipline?). Second, the applicant’s research qualifications are evaluated.

At the undergraduate-level, French university teaching in the fields of social sciences and humanities is based mainly on mass lectures and courses. There is a lack of resources in undergraduate level teaching, while the numbers of students are large. The university’s focus is on fostering and developing the doctoral education. Ph.D. students pursue their dissertation work under the supervision of professors; thus maîtres de conferences do not have the right to supervise doctoral students (this situation is different from other countries). There are particular workshops and symposia organised for doctoral students. In some departments the doctoral students may get financial help to attend national or international doctoral summer schools or conferences. There are only a few academic posts for doctoral students (e.g. the post of monitorat, equivalent to
a research associate), and the doctoral students employed by the university do a lot of teaching besides working on their Ph.D. research. Scholarships are rare, but some private firms give grants or employ doctoral students in company projects. Also the departments and research laboratories may apply for projects in the national or international calls for bids and hire doctoral students. In general, the French scholars interviewed say that it is difficult to find financing for doctoral dissertation work, and the financial circumstances of Ph.D. students are often unstable and insecure. Some of the doctoral students work in the industrial sector at the same time they pursue their dissertations. But the university fees are very low since the universities are funded by the state. The number of doctoral and post doctoral students has augmented in the field of Infocom. The writing of the dissertation is expected to take three years, but for many, four to six years are needed.

Belgium

Doctoral education in Belgium is similar to that in Germany and France. Traditionally, doctoral education in communication and media studies has not enjoyed a high profile. However, three of the biggest universities in the Wallonian region, Université Catholique de Louvain (UCL), Université Libre de Bruxelles (ULB) and Université de Liège (ULg), have recently launched a joint doctoral school research in the field of media and communication with a number of other smaller universities. A significant share - two thirds - of the doctorates of Francophone Belgium graduate from UCL. Between 2000 and 2005 there were 39 doctorates (an annual rate of 8; UCL - 24, Liege - 7, ULB - 7). During the same time there were 68 doctoral students working on dissertations. Careers in communication research and obtaining a PhD do not attract as many students in Francophone Belgium as in the Flemish parts of the country. However, the doctoral degree has begun to be more valued in industry. Belgium provides a good case study of a system of doctoral study in evolution, determined by past traditions (particularly in terms of the country’s cultural and linguistic divide) but increasingly coming under pressure from internationalising imperatives.
Netherlands

An impressive element of doctoral education in the Netherlands is its firm institutional basis. There are a number of established centres. **NESCOr - The Netherlands School of Communications Research** is the national communication science research school and Ph.D. programme in communication science, which was launched in 1999. NESCOr unites the Dutch Universities offering teaching programmes in communication science that share the orientation of social and behavioural traditions. The research school includes the VU University Amsterdam (VU), the University of Amsterdam (UvA), the Radboud University Nijmegen (RU) and the University of Twente (UT).

NESCOr has an important role in gaining funding for doctoral work. In the year 2007, 16 NESCOr doctoral students defended their theses. The PhD students are trained as researchers, and they are encouraged to start publishing in journal articles already while working on their dissertation. The recommended time span for the doctoral dissertation work is 4 years, but the median is around 4.5 years. Doctoral education is well structured and there is a more solid basis for funding doctoral work in the Netherlands compared to other European countries.

**ASCoR - The Amsterdam School of Communications Research**’s English-language PhD programme hosts more than 20 PhD students (in 2007, 28 students). ASCoR offers a four-year international PhD programme in Communication Science.

**University of Twente** is another small university with a department of Communication Science. Research is organised in **The Twente Institute for Communication Research** (TWICoR), which has recently witnessed rapid growth, with a doubling of the number of tenured staff and a trebling of the number of PhD candidates between 2001-2007.

**NISCO – Nijmegen Institute for Social and Cultural Research** is a research institute in the faculty of social sciences of the **Radboud University Nijmegen** (RU), one of the oldest and most important universities in the Netherlands. In 2000, the Communication programme of RU was ranked second in the national research evaluation. Communication researchers increasingly cooperate with other NISCO members who represent other disciplines of social sciences, and all recently started PhD projects are supervised by at least one NISCO staff member outside the Communication programme.

The main sources of funding are the universities’ grants and NWO grants for projects that often include PhD work. The doctoral students are fairly well paid: the salary is around 1700–
2500 Euros/month, the wage increasing progressively if the work is progressing as planned. The students receive a bonus of 3000 Euros if they finish the dissertation in 4 years. Moreover, a 1100 Euros grant is given for publishing the dissertation and for promotional purposes. The PhD students in the graduate schools are required to reserve 15% of the working time for teaching in the department. The PhD students are also funded for participating in national and international conferences once a year.

The Dutch doctors in the field of media and communication have very good chances in finding employment at the level of their degree. As an example, there is a zero unemployment rate for ASCoR PhD students; 60% of ASCoR PhD graduates are employed as academic faculty.

**Estonia**

Doctoral education in communication and media research has only recently begun to expand in Estonia. The only PhD programme in Media and Communication is at the University of Tartu, Faculty of Social Sciences, Department of Journalism and Communication. There have been two parallel curricula at the Doctoral level: Media and Communication and Journalism. However, from the start of 2006/2007 study year it has been possible to enter only one curriculum – Media and Communication. The graduates obtain the Ph.D. degree in Media and Communication. The duration of the Doctoral studies (160 CP) is four years and the programme consists of obligatory and optional courses (total 40 CP) and doctoral dissertation (120 CP) that will be publicly defended. The coming years will be decisive in terms of forming Estonian communication research’s doctoral system. It is expected that international imperatives will play a large role in this process, as in Estonian higher education more generally.
UK

Perhaps the most significant element of doctoral education in the UK is the predominance of ‘foreign’ students. In 2006/2007 only about a half of the nearly 500 PhD students in the fields of media studies and journalism were UK residents before entering PhD programmes. The British PhD programmes in media studies and journalism were especially popular with students from United States, China, Germany, South Korea, Greece, India and Canada (Higher Education Statistics Agency 2008a). This has had an impact upon the nature of doctoral education. In many departments one of the reasons for adding on training in methodology and theory is the increasing number of international PhD students, and the assumption that many of these have not received an adequate exposure to the scientific literature throughout their undergraduate degrees.

According to the academics interviewed, the growing proportion of foreign PhD students reflects the lack of funding for doctorates for British students. It was suggested that the scrapping of the grant system and the introduction of tuition fees has made British students less likely to continue their studies after graduating with a Bachelor’s degree, as further education would require additional debts.

“British middle class families pay for their kids’ education – up to BA, that is. After that they’re on their own. (…) the appreciation of Master’s degrees is not very high. People find jobs without it. That’s why it’s getting rare that a Brit would do a Master’s degree. The same applies to the PhD students. Almost all of them are non-Brits”.

Same of the same conditions can also be observed in doctoral education in the other Anglophone countries surveyed in this report. While the status of foreign students may vary, a common factor in these countries is the increasing ‘commodification’ of the PhD. Given the international dominance of these academic environments, this is bound to have a major impact upon the development of communication and media studies in other countries – in both a positive and negative sense.
USA

Increase in doctoral programmes. In the past several years, there has been an increase in the number of doctoral programmes in Communication. In all, there are 93 Ph.D. programmes in American universities (104 if joint programmes are included). Yet the exact number of programs is not uncertain. According to NCA’s web page, there are 74 schools with 132 doctoral programs in Communication. In general, the Ph.D. programmes in communication are small in size. Most of them are “niche” or “boutique” programmes (as characterised by an interviewee) that concentrate on few areas of communication. For example, in Texas A&M University, the Communication Department is located within the College of Liberal Arts and specializes in four major areas: Rhetoric & Public Affairs, Organisational Communication, Telecommunication & Media Studies, and Health Communication. However, there are about a dozen schools that offer a wide variety of concentration areas. For example, the University of Texas at Austin has a separate College of Communication that offers majors in more or less all the areas of communication (i.e., Advertising, Communication Sciences and Disorders, Communication Studies, Public Relations, Radio-Television-Film, and a School of Journalism. The general magnitude of the programmes can be illustrated by looking at mass communication Ph.D. programmes that had on average 30 Ph.D. students and 22 graduate faculty members (of a total of 33 faculty members) in 2004. Also, there were no major differences between regions:

Figure 26; Regional differences among U.S. Ph.D. programmes, 2004

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Midwest</th>
<th>West</th>
<th>Northeast</th>
<th>South</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Programme Age</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Faculty</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grad. Faculty</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty/Student Ratio</td>
<td>.67</td>
<td>.73</td>
<td>.55</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Shaver et al., 2005)
Course Offerings. Within mass communication, most of the Ph.D. programmes can be characterised as generalised; 85% of the programmes offer more than four potential areas of specialisation. The most widely offered area of specialisation is Communications Effects/Theory, followed closely by Political Communication, Cultural Studies and Communication Technology/New Media (ibid.). Health/Science/Environmental Communication, Media Studies and Visual communication are the least frequently offered specialisations within Mass communication programmes. Communications Technology/New Media, International Communications and Public Relations were expected to attract increased student interest in the next five years, while interest levels in most other disciplines were expected to remain relatively flat.

Interdisciplinarity. The roots of communication research are highly disciplinary. “In fact, across the century communication has been fractured into myriad conceptual fragments and research practices” (Delia 1987, 22). The early scholars applied theoretical and methodological approaches from sociology, political science, and psychology, and the spectrum has continually broadened. In addition to absorption of various theoretical and methodological stances, interdisciplinarity is manifested in many other ways.

First, a large proportion of the faculty in the US communication departments comes from outside the discipline. For example, several interviewees detained their doctorate degrees from outside the communication discipline. The same scholars also tended to value interdisciplinarity for the future, for example, in hiring practices. In fact, one interviewee, involved in hiring new faculty, noted that he would not hire people in his department who were not “truly interdisciplinary”. Second, both communication departments and scholars are widely involved in interdisciplinary research projects. A lot of this research is conducted in research institutions and centres at universities that are not concerned with the conventional boundaries of discipline. A representative of such an institution noted that, “[w]e do not have to think about the issues of discipline when designing research projects,” but “just appropriate ways to conduct a study”. One interviewee stressed that true interdisciplinary research goes beyond the disciplines of the social sciences. According to him, communication scholars should collaborate boldly with scholars from the hard sciences, for example, neuroscientists. As a result, new research ideas and questions arise that may provide a fresh view of existing theories and empirical evidence in the field of communication.

Views from Academia. According to several scholars, Ph.D. level communication
education in the U.S. is flourishing. Scholars agree that Ph.D. programmes generally give students broad knowledge and solid skills in theory and methodology. One of the interviewees called the Ph.D. education system a “well-oiled machine” that efficiently produces scholars that fit the system and prepares students for successful careers. One indicator is the fact pointed out by several scholars that students are publishing more than before.

Yet there were also opposing views. According to one interviewee, the field of communication is not on the same level as some other social sciences: “The standards of research are still not as high as they are in other areas of academia. A lot of the work that would be considered acceptable in other social sciences would think of it as pretty superficial”. In addition, some scholars expressed their concern about the narrowness of focus in Ph.D. programmes. That is, the academic system tends to encourage specialisation and training in a particular theoretical perspective or methodology. One interviewee noted, “You could have two students who got a Ph.D. in communication and they never took a course in common. I cannot think of another discipline that is this way”.

Some scholars attributed the problem to the design of the whole system. That is, the system is largely based on and measured by counting the number of journal article publications, which, in many cases, leads to repetition of quantitative studies that do not contribute to the field as whole. One of the interviewees attributed this to a need to demonstrate “academic machismo”, that is, a focus on quantity to raise the status of an otherwise small and young discipline. As one of the interviewees put it, “It is a system like our factories that reward us as economic individuals, not as members of the intellectual community”. Also, some scholars noted that communication research has traditionally focused too much on an individual level of examination. According to them, communication research and education concentrates extensively on psychological-level analysis and outcomes, instead of on the bigger picture. “Not that the individual level is not important, but it would be useful to put individuals in the context of social and cultural units”.

Assessment of Communication PhD Programmes

The 2004 NCA Doctoral Reputational Study assesses the reputation of U.S. doctoral programmes in communication. The study was received with mixed emotions across the field and was criticised from many angles. In general, as one interviewee pointed out, because the study
was conducted by the NCA, by the Association that is relatively “humanistically” oriented, “people rooted in a more social science perspective tended not to think that the study had a bearing on who they were and what they were doing”. One interviewee noted that reputation is a rough equivalent to the social network of the faculty rather than a fair measure of the quality of the programme. In addition, according to Bunz (2005), departmental reputations “are often formed based on their graduates’ or employees’ success and visibility in the discipline (Edwards & Barker 1983), and this success and visibility are often measured by the number of publications in a limited set of journals, as is the case in NCA’s evaluation of doctoral programmes’ reputations” (706).

In sum, the study should not be considered a valid measure of the quality of the programmes; however, it works well as a starting point from which to examine the programmes more thoroughly. Nevertheless, some scholars admitted that the top programmes of each specialty area represent quite well the top quality in those areas. The study is used in this report to illustrate some of the quality programmes within each specialty area. Three programmes of each area are listed. Only the areas that were reportedly offered by at least 15 participating programmes were selected for the study. The rationale for drawing the line at 15 was that “it was believed that areas offered by 15 or more programmes reflected disciplinary rather than more local emphases” (Hollihan 2004, 2). Thus, the nine areas also can be argued to give a general overview of the U.S. communication research scene. Nine specialty areas were included in the study: Communication and Technology, Critical/Cultural Studies of Communication/Media, Health Communication, Intercultural/International Communication, Interpersonal/Small Group Communication, Mass Communication Research, Organizational Communication, Political Communication, and Rhetorical Studies. Several other areas were also mentioned, but fell short of the required 15 programme threshold (such as Advertising, Applied Communication Studies, Communications Policy Studies, Media History, Media Law, and Public Relations).
Figure 27; U.S. Doctoral program descriptions

### Area 1: Communication and Technology

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>University of Southern California, Annenberg School for Communication</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Concentration areas:</strong> Information and Society; Interpersonal and Health Communication; Media, Culture and Communication; Organisational Communication; Rhetoric and Political Communication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Degree Programs:</strong> Bachelor of Arts in Communication; Progressive B.A. in Communication; Master of Communication Management Minor in Communication and the Entertainment Industry; Minor in Interactive Media and the Culture of New Technologies; Minor in Professional and Managerial Communication; Minor in Communication Law and Media Policy; Minor in Global Communication; Minor in Health Communication; Minor in Cultural Studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master of Arts in Global Communication; Master of Arts in Communication; Master of Communication Management; Master of Public Diplomacy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctor of Philosophy in Communication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dual Degree in Law (J.D.) and Communication Management (M.C.M.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dual Degree in Communication Management/Jewish Communal Service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>School of Journalism Degree Programs:</strong> Bachelor of Arts in Print Journalism; Bachelor of Arts in Broadcast Journalism; Bachelor of Arts in Public Relations Minor in Advertising; Minor in News Media and Society</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master of Arts in Journalism; Broadcast Emphasis; Master of Arts in Journalism; Print Emphasis; Master of Arts in Journalism; Online Emphasis; Master of Arts in Strategic Public Relations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Number of communication faculty:</strong> 79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Number of communication graduate students:</strong> 504</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Number of communication undergraduate majors:</strong> 1377</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Academic positioning within the university:</strong> Professional School</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Michigan State University, College of Communication Arts &amp; Sciences</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Concentration areas:</strong> Advertising; Public Relations, and Retailing; Communication; Communicative Sciences and Disorders; Telecommunication, Information Studies, and Media; School of Journalism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Degree programs:</strong> Bachelor of Arts in Advertising; Bachelor of Arts in Communicative Sciences and Disorders; Bachelor of Arts in Communication; Bachelor of Arts in Journalism; Bachelor of Science in Retailing; Bachelor of Arts in Telecommunication, Information Studies, and Media</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master of Arts in Advertising; Master of Arts in Public Relations; Master of Arts in Communicative Sciences and Disorders; Master of Arts in Communication; Master of Arts in Journalism; Master of Arts in Telecommunication, Information Studies and Media; Master of Arts in Health Communication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctor of Philosophy in Communicative Sciences and Disorders; Doctor of Philosophy in Communicative Sciences and Disorders - Urban Studies; Doctor of Philosophy in Communication; Doctor of Philosophy in Media and Information Studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Number of communication faculty:</strong> 113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Illinois, Urbana-Champaign</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concentration areas:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Degree programs:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of communication faculty:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of communication graduate students:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of communication undergraduate majors:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic positioning within the university:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of Liberal Arts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concentration areas:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Degree programs:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of communication faculty:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of communication graduate students:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Area 5: Interpersonal-Small Group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>University of California, Santa Barbara, Department of Communication</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All Aspects: (see above)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Degree programs: BA, PHD</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>University of Illinois, Urbana-Champaign, Department of Speech Communication</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All Aspects: (see above)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pennsylvania State University, Dept of Communication Arts and Sciences</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All Aspects: (see above)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Area 6: Mass Communication

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>University of Pennsylvania, Annenberg School for Communication</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All Aspects: (see above)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stanford University, Department of Communication</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Concentration areas: Communication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Degree programs: BA, Co-Terminal MA, PHD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of communication faculty: 16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of communication graduate students: 30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of communication undergraduate majors: 100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic positioning within the university: School of Humanities and Sciences</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Michigan State University, College of Communication Arts &amp; Sciences</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All Aspects: (see above)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Area 7: Organisational Communication

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Texas A&amp;M University, Department of Communication</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Concentration areas: Rhetoric &amp; Public Affairs, Organisational Communication, Health Communication, Telecommunication Media Studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Degree programs: BA, BS, MA, PHD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of communication faculty: 21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of communication graduate students: 37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of communication undergraduate majors: 962</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic positioning within the university:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Area 8: Political Communication

**University of Pennsylvania, Annenberg School for Communication**

- All Aspects: (see above)

**Stanford University, Department of Communication**

- All Aspects: (see above)

### Area 8: Rhetorical Communication

**University of Texas, Austin, Communication Studies Department**

- Concentration areas:
  - Interpersonal Communication, Organisational Communication, Rhetoric and Language
- Degree programs: BA, MA, PhD
- Number of communication faculty: 19
- Number of communication graduate students: 110
- Number of communication undergraduate majors: 700
- Academic positioning within the university: Own college

**University of Georgia, Department of Speech Communication**

- Concentration areas:
  - Political rhetoric/public address, social movement and change, rhetoric of science, feminism
- Degree programs: BA, MA, PhD
- Number of communication faculty: 16
- Number of communication graduate students: 34
- Number of communication undergraduate majors: 400
- Academic positioning within the university: Franklin College of Arts and Sciences

**University of Texas, Austin, Communication Studies Department**

- All Aspects: (see above)

**Pennsylvania State University, Department of Communication Arts and Sciences**

- All Aspects: (see above)
There is also a recent study on ranking of U.S. Communication programs that offer a doctoral degree (Neuendorf et al. 2007). It is a Survey study among faculty members from U.S. universities and chairs of communication departments in the U.S.:

Figure 28; Rankings of communication Programmes that offer PHD in the U.S.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Communication program</th>
<th>Faculty score (rank)</th>
<th>Chair score (rank)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. University of Wisconsin, Madison</td>
<td>126 (1)</td>
<td>9 (8, tie)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. University of Texas at Austin</td>
<td>93 (2)</td>
<td>25 (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. University of Pennsylvania</td>
<td>77 (3)</td>
<td>10 (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Michigan State University</td>
<td>70 (4)</td>
<td>B 3 (4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. University of Iowa</td>
<td>69 (5)</td>
<td>12 (5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Stanford University</td>
<td>69 (6)</td>
<td>9 (8, tie)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Northwestern University</td>
<td>60 (7)</td>
<td>10 (7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill</td>
<td>56 (8, tie)</td>
<td>14 (5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. University of Illinois, Urbana-Champaign</td>
<td>56 (8, tie)</td>
<td>11 (6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Purdue University</td>
<td>53 (10)</td>
<td>NS (-)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. University of Southern California</td>
<td>48 (11)</td>
<td>1 (20, tie)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Penn State University</td>
<td>32 (12)</td>
<td>1 (20, tie)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. University of California, Santa Barbara</td>
<td>26 (13)</td>
<td>3 (16)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. University of Arizona</td>
<td>20 (14, tie)</td>
<td>NS (-)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. University of Minnesota</td>
<td>19 (14, tie)</td>
<td>5 (13, tie)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. University of Missouri</td>
<td>17 (16, tie)</td>
<td>8 (12)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Ohio University</td>
<td>17 (16, tie)</td>
<td>2 (17, tie)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. University of Florida</td>
<td>16 (18)</td>
<td>9 (8, tie)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. University of Utah</td>
<td>14 (19)</td>
<td>1 (20, tie)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. University of Kansas</td>
<td>11 (20, tie)</td>
<td>2 (17, tie)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. Texas A &amp; M University</td>
<td>11 (20, tie)</td>
<td>5 (13, tie)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. Arizona State University</td>
<td>10 (22, tie)</td>
<td>3 (11)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. Indiana University</td>
<td>10 (22, tie)</td>
<td>NS (-)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. University of Maryland</td>
<td>10 (22, tie)</td>
<td>NS (-)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. University of Massachusetts</td>
<td>8 (25)</td>
<td>NS (-)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. Regent University</td>
<td>7 (26)</td>
<td>NS (-)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. University of Georgia</td>
<td>6 (27, tie)</td>
<td>4 (15)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. Ohio State University</td>
<td>6 (27, tie)</td>
<td>2 (17, tie)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Rankings were determined by using a weighted points system. Each time a program was ranked in number one, it received three points. Second place rankings translated into two points each, while each third place ranking counted for one point. The total scores for each program at each level (first, second and third) were summed; the final figures are represented by the points shown in the table. For example, the University of Wisconsin–Madison was called the top doctoral program in communication by 20 faculty respondents, the second best program by 25 faculty respondents, and the third best by 16 faculty respondents. Thus, Wisconsin–Madison received 60 first place points (20 × 3), 50 second place points (25 × 2), and 16 third place points. Wisconsin's total score for the faculty sample, therefore, was 126 points (60 + 50 + 16), the figure shown in the table. The numbers in parentheses represent rankings of the programs among members of the faculty and chair samples, respectively. "NS" indicates that the program received zero points and thus no score. Programs that received fewer than six total points in the faculty ranking are not shown. A separate ranking for institutions not granting the Ph.D. is available from the first author.

(Neuendorf 2007, 36)
It should be noted that the results of this study results show a high degree of correspondence between faculty and administrator evaluations on curricular factors, and lower levels of agreement on program rankings and evaluation criteria for doctoral program quality (Neuendorf et al. 2007, 35).

Japan

Media and communication research as an academic discipline in universities is still mostly to be established in Japan. Considering the vastness of the media industry in Japan, or even the amount of research done in private organizations, the volume of academic research is quite modest, as is the number of doctoral degrees in the field. In general, a doctoral degree in humanistic and some social scientific areas has been rare in Japanese universities until recently, as it was previously not required even for professorships. The amount of doctoral dissertations in last two years is not very great. Depending on search methods there are only about 70 – 100 doctoral dissertations of the field that were accepted at different universities in Japan. Media and communication related research is also conducted in abundance within the industry, thus making it possible to create careers within media and communication research without academic degrees. Another reason is the difficulty for finding funding for dissertation work.

As the national university funding system is not tied to the numbers of graduating students (like in Finland), the amount of master's degree and doctoral students has recently been cut. The number of faculty positions in the field is not increasing and job prospects for those with doctoral degrees in particular are grim. At e.g. Sophia University, the amount of good applicants has been decreasing, thus leading to diminishing student intake.

Among the 53 universities with graduate programs in media and communication, 39 have both master level and doctoral level education. Of these universities, 15 belong to the best Japanese universities, six national and nine private (Sogo Janarizumu Kenkyujo 2004). Only a few have high research profiles in media and communication research or actually focus on research.

Japanese doctoral students in media and communication studies have a difficult time funding their research. Foundations or funding organizations for independent dissertation work within Japan are practically non-existent. Professors can apply for money for research projects and groups and then assign graduate students to these projects. In stark contrast, funding for
graduate studies abroad or for foreign graduate students studying in Japan is abundant. For this reason, a significant proportion of doctoral dissertations finished in Japan are by Asian doctoral candidates and about subjects involving Asian media and societies. In the social sciences and humanistic fields, many Japanese have written their dissertations outside of Japan, mostly in the US.

**South Korea**

“Although I fear to say it, it seems most social science [...] research in South Korea can be classified within the imposition model. Master’s theses and doctoral dissertations in particular often seem to borrow problematics directly from the West” (Kang 2004, 259).

Doctoral education in Korea displays many of the characteristics already observed in Japan, particularly in terms of the dominance of western models and ‘foreign’ PhDs. Most professors of leading Korean universities have received their doctorate in a university in the United States as American university degrees are highly valued in Korea. Some have graduated from Japanese, European or Australian universities. Interestingly, the prestige of American diploma can bee seen in the fact that in most Korean University websites introducing faculty often mention the American university where the professor has received his or her PhD.

Post-graduate programs are significantly rarer and special communication studies doctoral programs have been arranged only in a few universities. Although doctoral degrees can be achieved in many Korean universities, the prestige of a degree received in the U.S. is very high, undermining the value of Korean PhDs. Many Korean researchers today call for more self-sufficient knowledge production in their academic system and, thus, wish for greater interest and infrastructural development of doctoral programs in Korea.

In 2004, the top five destination countries for tertiary level Korean students studying abroad (total 95 885) were U.S. (52 484), Japan (23 280), Germany (5 488), UK (3 482) and Australia (3 915) (*Global Education Digest* 2006, 133).
Finland

In recent years more and more people have gained doctorates in media and communication studies in Finland. The yearly average is now clearly above 10 doctorates per year. Doctoral students are largely dependent on outside funding in the form of grants – or they try to live by gaining some short term teaching or research jobs. A more stable form of funding is provided by doctoral schools, a system established in Finland in the 1990s, which provide, at best, four years of moderate funding for doctoral students. However, the overwhelming majority of doctoral students must gain their funding from somewhere else.

The Doctoral School of Communication Studies CORE is a national, multidisciplinary doctoral school including the whole field of communication, media and information studies. CORE is coordinated by the Department of Speech Communication and Voice Research of the University of Tampere. CORE concentrates on three themes based on changing communication: changes in communication; changes in information and communication practices; communication and changing values. The nine members and ten associate members were selected by the Executive Board of the Doctoral School of Communication Studies. Applications for CORE totalled 54.

Elomedia is a doctoral school of audiovisual media. Is financed by the Ministry of Education during the years 2006 – 2009. Research in Elomedia focuses on film, television, multimedia, computer games, digital post-production, network based products, mobile services, virtual scenography, light and sound design as well as broadcasting, audio communication and radiophonic expression.
3.3 Position of Women

The position of women in any field of academic endeavour, above and beyond its obvious social importance, is a useful indicator of the extent of reforms to traditional university structures and the capacity of a discipline or field to respond to social pressures and movements. It has been difficult to gain a precise sense of the relative position of women in communication and media studies in the different countries because many reports did not include material dealing explicitly with this issue; in some reports it was entirely lacking. (In this regard, the lack of adequate material on the position of women in the Anglophone countries constitutes a noticeable absence, particularly as we could expect the USA, the UK and Australia to demonstrate both greater labour market parity than their Continental or East Asian counterparts, on the one hand, while also giving further evidence of the depth and resilience of gendered institutional spaces, discourses and structures, on the other). Nevertheless, the available material suggests that international communication and media studies and research, like many fields of academic endeavour, still has some way to go in terms of guaranteeing equal access to both genders. In short, gender representation and differential social and institutional power remain problems that the institution as a whole, on both national and international levels, must urgently address.

Many of the difficulties with the relative position of women in communication and media research arise from broader institutional problems, primarily in terms of academic hierarchies, access to adequate funding, and recognition of different career paths and expectations. Additionally, there are problems that are specific to communication and media research to a lesser or greater extent, particularly the identification of communication and related concepts with a more or less ‘gendered’ public sphere that remains, despite the advances of the last 40 years, predominantly ‘masculine’ if not entirely male in its key determinants.

In our view, the relative lack of participation and representation of women in communication and media research, particularly at higher institutional levels, can only be adequately confronted in a larger theoretical perspective that poses the difficult question of the institution’s own involvement in a broader network of disempowering social relations. The material presented in this sub chapter provides some sense of the difficulties we presently encounter in individual countries, as well as the necessity for further research into the real causes and effects of gender imbalances in communication and media studies as a whole.
Germany

The main problem regarding the position of women in media and communications research in Germany is related to a more general problem in the German university system. The German university was for a long time a male domain. Women were granted the right to study in the universities first in 1900 and the right to undertake the Habilitation in 1918. The first female professor was nominated in 1923. Germany has had one of the lowest levels of female participation in higher education and on the academic labour market in Europe. Nowadays, women constitute 48% of the German graduate students, 38% of the new doctor’s degree awardees and 22% of the new Habilitation awardees. Merely 9% of the C4 professors and 13% of C3 professors – the top rank positions in German academia - are women (Prommer et al. 2006, 68). Women also rarely reach the top management positions, e.g. in 1998 only 11 out of 222 rectors were female (5.0%); similarly, only 4 out of 75 presidents (5.3%) and 30 out of 277 chancellors (10.8%) were female (Majcher 2002, 6-7). According to Majcher “women’s position in academia could best be described in terms of subordination, marginalisation and segregation” (ibid., 15).

In Germany, combining work and family life is a problem, which hinders women’s entry into academia. West Germany, unlike many other West European countries, developed a welfare regime based on a model of the male-breadwinner, strongly supported by traditional value systems and gender relations. As a result, German welfare regulations used to offer few incentives for an egalitarian family model. Promotion of women on the labour market and childcare facilities were hardly a social policy priority. Summarising several comparative studies, Majcher (2002, 20-21) writes that concerning German professors in the late 1980s, 60.9% of the women did not have any children (while this was valid only for 18.6% of the men) or had them later in life (after doctorate or even Habilitation). Also, many more women professors than their male colleagues are single or divorced. Such a wide discrepancy is not found e.g. in the case of American academics, but it is valid also for German women in high positions in private business, when compared to their Swedish counterparts. Interestingly the topic of Habilitation also turns up frequently in the discussion of women’s position in academia: the “drawn-out procedure and the extreme dependency upon the ‘Habilitations-Vater’ and the faculty in which the Habilitation is conducted leads to an infantilisation of grown ups and contains furthermore the danger that precisely the researches keen upon innovation will be excluded” (ZE-Frauen 1995, 11).
Habilitation is “considered a structural barrier for women who often complete their Habilitation at an even later point in their careers than men, if ever” (Majcher 2002, 11). Furthermore, “the candidate is totally dependent on her/his mentor and normally starts an academic career as his/her assistant, if invited to do so. There is no systematic documentation of a student’s performance, the mentor may or may not, will be able or unable to introduce his/her protégé into informal networks, which seem to be a precondition for a successful career. Women may encounter more problems in getting into the system, and as “newcomers” in science, negative experiences may discourage them more easily” (ibid., 19). Relying on her interview material, Andresen (2001, 100) sums up the situation of the women undergoing Habilitation as follows: “Consistently, the support of somebody with kudos, power and influence in the discipline in general and the specific subject area in particular is seen as a decisive precondition for attaining one’s qualification and professional goals. […] Even though the problematic of personal dependence and the fixing of the discipline’s content is also noted, there is an enormous expenditure of energy to establish such an hierarchical ‘paternal’ relationship, because similarly effective realistic alternatives don’t exist for the interviewees”.

Position of women in Communication studies

“Women in Communication Studies: Under-represented – but advancing quickly” was the optimistic title of the article published by Romy Fröhlich and Christina Holtz-Bacha in 1993. According to Prommer et al. (2006, 69), their “optimistic expectations” were based on the hope that the increasing number of female students would eventually lead to a major increase in the number of female assistants and professors. The claim of Prommer et al. is very problematic since Fröhlich and Holtz-Bacha explicitly warn that, as the example of the USA shows, “even a very strong growth in the number of women in the student body alone still lead to a corresponding representation of women in research and teaching” (1993, 527). Fröhlich and Holtz-Bacha also write in opposition to any linear schemes; as their data shows, the increase of women’s share of post-Habilitation posts does not show any path of “continuous development” (ibid., 540). It seems their analysis was a cautious one, based on factual analysis.

In contemporary Germany, between 60% and 75% of the new university students in communication and media studies are female, depending on the university. In this field (Publizistik, Kommunikationswissenschaft, Medienwissenschaft and Journalistik), the female share of the
students that completed their studies was 64%. Thus – as Prommer et al. describe this situation (2006, 68) – the male teachers face lecture halls full of women.

Women presented 41% of the new dissertations in Communication studies. However, the Bundesamt für Statistik does not provide further data regarding how many Habilitationen there were by women or how many professorships were occupied by them in this discipline. Instead, on this level data is provided on groups of disciplines; in this case, Communications studies have been coupled with Library science. In 2004, there were altogether 14 Habilitationen in these disciplines and four of them were by female researchers, which constitutes 29% of the total. In these disciplines, 42% of the researcher and teacher staff below professorial level was female. In Fröhlich and Holtz-Bacha’s data from 1991, their share was 32% (1993, 528), so there was some increase. 13% of current professors are female. However, there was no exact data on how their professorships are distributed into various subcategories (C2, C3 and C4) with their different prestige and wage. Yet some idea can be gained by looking at the class “Languages and Sciences of Culture” (which includes besides Communications and Media Studies and Library science also Philosophy, Theology, Languages, History, Psychology and Pedagogy): the result is that even here there are still fewer women at the top (Prommer et al. 2006, 70). These results and a comparison with other university branches are provided in the following chart:
Prommer et al.'s numbers can be compared with some other studies. In an earlier study, Wirth found that in Communication and Media studies there were 269 professors, 45 of which were women, i.e. 16.7%. Among the researcher and teacher staff below professorial level, their share was 42.8% (2000, 42). In her study of the DGPuK membership structure, Klaus (2003, 5) found that 40% of the members who had not yet presented their dissertations were women. Of the members who had passed Habilitation, only 27% were women.

Donsbach et al. studied the authors of the journals Publizistik and Medien & Kommunikationswissenschaft, the principal journals of German Communication studies. Their results show a growing share of female authors:
Eberwein and Pöttker studied the reviews in *Publizistik* with the following results concerning women. From today’s perspective, so often tainted by a certain lack of historical perspective, the most surprising result is perhaps the knowledge there were so many female authors and editors already at the end of 1950s:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>1983-87 (n=246)</th>
<th>1988-92 (n=263)</th>
<th>1993-97 (n=207)</th>
<th>1998-03 (n=240)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Women</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(based on Donsbach et al. 2005, 62)
Prommer et al.'s study (2006, 75) shows that the working conditions of the young female researchers were in certain respects worse than those of their male counterparts. Men had more often (39%) full time posts compared to women (29%). Their posts were also of longer duration: 58% of the men had a contract for two or more years, whereas among the women the same was true for 45%. Indeed, one third of the women felt that they have been strongly (14%) or partly (18%) discriminated against (ibid., 85).

In most cases, the children of the young male researcher are cared for during the day by
their partners (71%). Female researchers, on the other hand, have mostly (69%) had to find other solutions: day-care, grandparents or a babysitter (ibid., 74). No wonder there is a considerable difference in how male and female doctoral students view the obstacles to having a university career leading to a professorship:

Figure 32; Reasons blocking the path to a professorship in Germany

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason</th>
<th>women</th>
<th>men</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>too few chances to obtain finally a professorship</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>too rigid hierarchy at the universities</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>too protracted career</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>does not agree with a wish for a family or children</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>demands sacrificing private life</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>overload of work at the universities</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Based on Prommer et al. 2006, 84)

Nowadays four out of five doctoral students are supervised by a male *Doktorvater* (the equivalent of a dissertation supervisor in the Anglophone academy, though with stronger paternalistic cultural associations). The relationship between the doctoral students and their supervisors show several gendered aspects. Female doctoral students feel that they do not receive supervision by male professors of the same level as the male students. Female doctoral students who have female a professor supervising them felt instead considerably better: 55% of them are content with their supervision by female professors, whereas only 38% of them are content with the supervision they receive from their male professors. As many as 42% of female doctoral students are explicitly dissatisfied with their male supervisors. The dimensions most felt to be lacking are
support in “networking” and planning of the career. There is not the same kind of difference among male students: around half of them are content with their supervisors, be they male or female professors. Yet there is not a simple line of confrontation: 38% of female students were content with their male professors and 29% of the female students were dissatisfied with their female professors (ibid., 80-82).

France

The French situation once again demonstrates similarities with its German counterpart. As to gender in the academic posts of Infocom, in 2005 52% of teacher-researchers were male and 73% professors were male. Thus, female professors are in the minority (27%). Yet, this is still closer to equality than the median in French universities.

The question of gender is not evident in the field of Infocom in France, although it is remarkable elsewhere, e.g., in the field of cultural studies in Anglo-Saxon research. But in reviewing the Infocom journals during the past few years, a gender studies approach seems to be emerging. (However, the question of gender is already a field of research within the other French social studies, such as sociology and anthropology). Future advances will undoubtedly be dependent upon broader academic institutional reform.

Japan

The gender question has had very little impact on Japanese communication and media research, just as it has remained marginal until recently in other areas of the Japanese academy. The Gender in Communications Network (GCN) was very active in both research and action programs during the 1990s, but has been less so recently. Currently the network is planning new activities. GCN has focused exclusively on women, and its members are predominantly female. Recently especially within cultural studies, research of men and masculinities in media has received some attention, but is still mostly a small area of research.
South Korea

Women and gender in general have become increasingly popular subjects of research in Korean communication studies. However, female journalists are still a rare phenomenon in Korea and the traditional Korean woman is still raised to be a wife and a mother, not a person to pursue a career. For example, Kim Kyung-Hee has studied women in journalism and, although there is slight increase, the proportion of high-ranking women in news organizations is still very small, under ten percent even in the most gender equal organizations. Kim sees the situation as due to the patriarchal system – perhaps with some links to Confucian traditions – and, interestingly, to capitalism. Kim laments the fact that the number of female journalists has not increased “even though the demand for soft news (i.e. more casual content, such as culture, well-being or family issues, compared to ‘hard’ news stories related to politics, national issues or economics), which is generally considered as being appropriate for female journalists to write about, has increased”.2

According to Kim’s data, women journalists have to imitate aggressive male behaviour in order to survive in the business. Moreover, the questionable ethics of male journalists causes problems to women as they, for example, are not as prone to take bribes and are less likely to integrate socially with male colleagues in the after-work context. Obviously, journalism is still a man’s world in Korea, as are many other sectors of work. Thus it is not surprising that critical gender issues have become more popular and most likely will be even more popular in the future of Korean communication research.

Mass media and patriarchal knowledge/power production in Korea have been analyzed from the Gramscian and Foucauldian views, and the gender-representations (female body, sex roles, autonomy, sexuality etc.) in the media have been studied with various methods, including psychoanalysis, postcolonial theories and, obviously, feminist studies. The results have revealed that Korean popular culture still reverts to patriarchal view of the role of women in the society and denies women more masculine roles. Women are symbolically subdued by men and they are objects of male desire and images of their guarded pureness can even be harnessed to support nationalism. Women in the role of men are portrayed either as comical or immoral. For example, according to a study on women represented in magazine, even female politicians are portrayed

---

2 Kim, K.-H. 2006, 123-125. Perhaps the writer’s view that women are more fluent in reporting “soft news” could also be interpreted as a patriarchal view on gender. See also Kim, K.-M. & Kim, Y.-J.2005 on gender differences in news-production in Korea. See also Im, Kim & Park 2004; Jang 2004 and Im & Kim 2006 on career paths in Korean journalism.
more as women, not politicians. In a male politician’s life two worlds, the private and public are integrated whereas in that of a female politician, the worlds are in conflict (Yang 2006). However, there are also studies that see women’s position in the Korean society in a more positive light. These studies are often affiliated with the use of the new media technology by women. Although women and gender in the Confucian/patriarchal context have been studied in Korean communication, sexuality - not to speak of sexual minorities - have not been studied very much, although some interesting studies do exist (see e.g. Kim, Y.-Y. - Kim 2004; Ha 2003; Joo 2003 and Kim, G.-H. 2002). One might predict that in the course of globalization and the strengthening of women’s movement and the abating of dominant patriarchal value-structures, research concentrating on gender will proliferate, even dramatically. Nevertheless, it is clear that much work still remains to be done to address traditional structures and systemic problems, both academic and social.
Finland

Women seem produce more research publication in Finnish media and communication studies than in some other countries. However, this calculation Poteri 2004, 3) also includes masters theses in a student population where the majority are women:

Figure 33: Author's gender in Finnish media and communication studies

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>408</td>
<td>44 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>510</td>
<td>56 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>918</td>
<td>100 %</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The statistics on the yearly intake of students reveal that the female majority will prevail also in the foreseeable future. It remains an open question, however, how, besides masters theses, this will be reflected in the other categories of publications. Studies on gender equality at the universities have revealed a phenomenon called 'gender scissors'. What it means can be studied in the following chart depicting the respective share of female and men on their academic ladder in Finland in 2005:
The diminishing share of women and growing share of men on the academic ladder is usually a surprisingly constant phenomena no matter what academic institution is under scrutiny. At the Department of Journalism and Mass Communication at the University of Tampere, the only Finnish communication department to have produced a study focusing on these matters (Nikunen 2006), the phenomena look like this:
Unlike in Tampere, there are currently several female professors in the other communication and media departments in Finland. The situation in Tampere, however, where there is a strong focus on journalism research, seems to display a curious affinity with the culture prevailing in newspapers; *Helsingin Sanomat* (27.7.2006) reports that "of 33 newspapers none has a female editor-in-chief". One of Nikunen's interviewees commented on this issue by stating that "critical research seems to get more marginal the further it distances itself from the applied journalism research" (Nikunen 2006, 72). Clearly, the Finnish situation regarding the position of women in communication and media research is very similar to the general picture in many other countries – some progress, but much that remains to be done.
3.4 Research funding in comparative perspective

Funding for research – or rather, the difficulty of gaining funding for research – constitutes a common problem for communication and media research in all the countries studied in this report, to a lesser or greater extent. There has indeed been an increasing amount of money invested in ‘communication research’, broadly conceived, in some countries in recent years (notably, primarily by the private sector, rather than national governments or other political institutions). However, much of this money, with some notable exceptions, has gone not to universities but to private research companies. In terms of public funding, communication and media research projects are confronted by fierce competition for a share of an increasingly smaller pie. While there have been some success stories, the overall picture gained from this overview of very different national and academic environments is that there is a lack of funds for professionally conducted research projects. Reasons suggested for this situation vary: one may be that communication and media research is not yet seen as a serious force in academic institutional politics; another, related to the first, is that, as a relatively new ‘discipline’, it is expected to ‘wait’ its turn; yet another, perhaps operative in both of the former, may be that the lack of ‘disciplinary coherence’ of the field impacts upon its relative prestige in the competition for increasingly limited funds for research across the university systems as a whole.

Whatever the reasons may be in individual countries or internationally, the conclusion is clear: academic research in communication and media studies is not adequately funded. There is a systematic and structural underfunding of the basic research infrastructure of the entire field. We have already observed a clear instance of this with the case of the funds available for doctoral studies in most countries. Another element can be observed in the fact that research is often done in ‘spare time’, after university academics have fulfilled an already demanding teaching and administrative burden, with obvious negative impacts upon the quality of the research. Insofar as the academic research units are usually the sites of education even – and especially – of future researchers for private enterprises, this lack of funding impacts not only upon the academic environment but also upon the quality of work done across the whole spectrum. While there are no easy resolutions to this problem, the international and general nature of these difficulties suggests that communication and media researchers would be well advised to look collectively for structural solutions on both a national and international level that go beyond current strategies of short term adjustments and compromises.
Germany

The most important and prestigious source of external funding for research is the Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft (DFG) with some 1.3 billion Euros per year. It has been said that the number of proposals from communication researchers is “quite modest” and the approval rates are “low, though the chances are not so bad” (Jarren 2002, 3). In 2004, DFG changed its operation by leaving behind the committees based on single disciplines and moved to bigger committees that cover several disciplines. The review and approval processes of the applications were also separated in the sense that the multidisciplinary committee approves or disapproves the proposals on the basis of statements written by external reviewers. DFG has in recent years received yearly some 20 research proposals from communication researchers. Between one third (33%) and half of them (53%) have been accepted each year for financing (Pfetsch – Krotz 2006, 5). The relatively small number of applications – especially considering the size of Germany – reveals that it is question of large projects. However, communication researches seem to write fewer proposals than researchers in other social sciences. Besides other things, this indicates that they have other important sources of external financing. Besides various foundations, such a source is in particular the Landesmedienanstalt. The Landesmedienanstalt are public organisations, financed by around 2% share of the broadcasting fees. They survey the private media business in their respective Länder. This is similar to public broadcasting in Germany, which is also organised in this kind of decentered way.

Since 1987, Landesmedienanstalt have financed over 400 research projects. However, not all financing has been for academic projects: for example, studies on viewer figures are also conducted by private research companies. Yet “a large part of this unjustified money goes to institutes and professorships in our discipline. Quick proposals, short research time, quick processing – and at least, seemingly, without any further costs, the publication. […] It is good that there is this money. But who is actually served by these projects? What research structures could be built up with them? In all cases many are occupied with these projects and all are thus strongly linked to deadlines” (Jarren 2002, 3). Yet they are not very long-term projects: the research projects have usually been relatively short-term. Only one in ten has lasted more than two years. A serious problem has also been that the research questions have been defined by very practical, instrumental and short term needs (Weiss 2006, 7-9; cf. Jarren 2005, 4-5). The landscape of German foundations has been described as a jungle (Waldherr 2006, 9). At the very
least, it is certainly lacking in “transparency and a clear overview [Übersichtlichkeit]” as Seifert – Emmer, who provide a useful list of possible financial sources, put it (2006, 3). These descriptions are perhaps not without some justification: in 2005, the Bundesverband deutscher Stiftungen had a membership of 11 000 foundations. Only 13.6% of them financed scientific research, but that still leaves us with one and half thousand foundations. Characteristic for the foundations that have background in media is that they do not concentrate on communication and media research: The Zeit-Stiftung finances 16 million Euro and the much bigger Bertelsmann Stiftung, the “most influential foundation in the country” (Handelsblatt) or “the largest and most influential Politikberater in the country” (Wernicke 2007a, cf. Wernicke – Bultmann 2007 and Wernicke 2007b), provides annually 42 million Euro of research funds.

A very important financier of social scientific research in Germany is the Volkswagenstiftung, which is among the ten largest foundations in Europe. Different political parties also have their own foundations that support research. Since these foundations are important political-cultural actors in German society, it is useful to know them and their affiliations:

Friedrich-Ebert-Stiftung (SDP)
Friedrich-Naumann-Stiftung (FDP)
Hanns-Seidel-Stiftung (CSU)
Konrad-Adenauer-Stiftung (CDU)
Heinrich-Böll-Stiftung (Die Grünen)
Rosa-Luxemburg-Stiftung (Die Linke)

An important financial source for building up international contacts is the Deutscher akademischer Austauschdienst (DAAD). It finances various visits and projects abroad by German researchers as well as visits and projects by foreign researchers in Germany.
France

French university teacher-researchers need to fulfil five aspects of academic activity: research, teaching, popularisation of science, service to public institutions, and collaboration with the economic domain. All of these aspects should be taken into consideration in the work of academic institutions and a certain balance found with each of them. The financing of academic research in information and communication sciences mainly comes from three sources: the state, calls for bids, and research contracts with public or private organisations.

Public Funding. The Ministry of Higher Education makes the decisions about annual budgets for university departments, polytechnics, research groups, and CNRS laboratories on the basis of the ratings given by an evaluation committee composed of academic and political members. The CNRS laboratories are in a privileged situation with a permanent budget, and the academic research groups labelled *équipe d'accueil* also receive financing from the Ministry. However, the size and constitution of the research group is defined in a way that favours uniting several teams under the same administrative umbrella. Often an *équipe d'accueil* combines researchers and doctorants from several universities and institutions within the field. Governmental policy seems to be geared to cutting down the multiplicity and heterogeneity of the diverse research groups.

A common complaint of French scholars in Infocom is that research financing is not sufficient – this is a common problem in every discipline. The poor financing of research is visible especially the fields of social sciences and humanities. One of the researchers interviewed says that there is a silently accepted culture of poverty, “*La culture de pauvreté*”, among university researchers in France, which means that scholars in the humanities and social sciences accept the underfinancing of the university sector: It is a double bound system. First, the social studies and humanities are underfinanced compared to other disciplines. Second, the researchers think that this is normal, and they accept it. For an outsider the hierarchical distinction between social studies and humanities versus the natural and technological sciences is strikingly visible in terms of the architecture of the buildings, and the spatial working conditions of teachers and researchers. Similarly, there is a clear difference between polytechnical schools and mass universities.

Calls for Bids. Trends in the development of the financing system is towards diminishing State funding and encouraging research institutions to seek external funding through national and
international calls for bids. Two years ago the French government started the ANR - l’Agence national de la recherche, a new institution of public administration for financing research projects (somewhat equivalent, for example to the Academy of Finland). ANR was officially launched in January 2007. The ANR works under the supervision of Ministry of Research and the political framework of the French government, and its objective is to increase the number of research projects in all domains of academic research. The purpose of ANR is to promote the development of basic academic research as well as applied research, innovation, and application of technologies and to foster partnership cooperation between the public and private sectors.

The institution annually organises thematic calls for projects, and projects are evaluated and selected on the basis of applications. ANR grants funding for both public research institutions and companies, with a double mission to produce new knowledge and promote the interaction between public and private research laboratories. For the year 2007 ANR has allocated 825 million euros for research projects whose maximum duration is four years. ANR launches approximately 40 projects every year, and its thematic calls for research projects are divided into seven scientific fields. The research on communication can mostly be found in the section of humanist and social sciences, or of matter and information (Matière & Information); the former has had seven research calls for bids since the year 2006 and the latter, 28 (www.agence-nationale-recherche.fr).

French university scholars see many opportunities for working in European research projects with EU funding. But many complain about the heavy administrative paperwork, which makes them reluctant to participate, especially since working in international projects is not required for establishing a reputation in the field, since publications in languages other than French do not increase the merits of scholars seeking to apply for academic posts in France from the CNU. This policy is not encouraging French scholars to focus on international projects, a policy completely contrary to some other European countries, Finland included. Still, researchers who have experience in EU projects have found them to be useful at the level of intellectual exchange. One of them says, “We have a formidable field for collaboration and discussion with colleagues in different countries, just to see why they view things differently, and why they do research differently. I think it’s great. It is a true European co-operation”.

However, the researchers also say that application procedures for such projects are very long and that schemes for the bids are often quite narrow, or very pragmatic – with expectations of direct results, or without any epistemological approach. “The problem is that the costs are
narrowed to meet the first objective of the bid. The system does not take advantage of the richness and multiplicity of the research in European universities and research groups”. Finally, French scholars believe that EU funding has not significantly improved the situation of academic financing in their country. As the amount of state funding of universities diminishes research financing will become less and less automatic and based more on projects channelled through institutions such as ANR and CNRS. CNRS is also an important financing organisation that sets up calls for bids for researchers working outside CNRS; meanwhile the new institute for communication, ISCC, has recently announced its first call for projects. INA is also important in the domain of audiovisual media, while CSA functions as a funding organisation for academic research projects. Moreover, the importance of contract research is growing.

**Contract Research.** The third portion of financing for research institutions comes from research contracts, an issue not without problems in the world of French intellectuals, most of whom would prefer that the French university financing system remain public. The idea of the independent academic intellectual is strong in France, and the notion that the public financing of academic research secures a researcher’s freedom to be an objective critic of society is deeply rooted. “The contract is also a constraint”, says one head of a research group. Thus, there is some reluctance to undertake research in co-operation with external partners and especially with the business world. Scholars emphasise the importance of the exchange between research and society, and between theory and practice, not only for financial but also for intellectual reasons.

Academic culture is changing, and the number of contract researches has been growing, especially during the last ten years. It has become more or less routine in all the laboratories to develop a policy on contract research. This is partly due to the criteria set forth in the evaluations of the Ministry of Education (made every four years), where co-operation between public and private sectors is recommended. Contract research has proven to be necessary in obtaining funding for doctoral research. It enables the young researchers to professionalise their research and gives them better chances to find jobs. However, companies often prefer more technical or practical dissertations, and they also need to be convinced that it is necessary to make theoretical analyses of the process of communication.

Compared to other disciplines Infocom has been founded to respond to social problems, so it is naturally less well financed for theoretical and philosophical projects than other disciplines such as philosophy and sociology. But Infocom is evolving and nowadays it is easier for its researchers to find financing. Still, the majority of research contracts to universities in the field of
Infocom are made by institutions in the public sector and by the state administration. There is much less contract research in the private sector, and it is biased towards certain fields where the traditions have been most firmly established, such as telecommunications. But increasingly the growing field of organisational communication is arranging contracts with the private sector.

Some important applications of academic research in France are made in the domains of cultural industries and internationalisation. The issue of cultural politics is also significant big in public discussion, to which the research of Infocom has made a contribution and whose debate has influenced research. Important applications of research have also been made in the fields of audience studies, social appropriation, and media usages. Scholars emphasise the need for academics to have opportunities for both applied and basic research. There is a general consensus, however, that practical research needs to be strongly anchored in theoretical knowledge in order to prevent it from losing intellectual rigour and accountability.
Belgium

The core functions of teaching media and communication in institutions of higher learning in Belgium are all publicly funded. There are three categories of financing for academic research: the first is the universities' own research funds; the second is public research foundations; and the third is the contract research with public or private institutions. There is some research cooperation among broadcasting media, public institutions and private companies, but the substantial financing comes from the first and second categories of research funding. The second category - public funding institutions - is separate for Wallonia and Flanders regions. Among the few institutions that finance research in both language groups are the Brussels city government, the federal government’s funding organisation Belgian Science Policy and the King Baudoin Foundation. The federal funding institutions endeavour to bring together the Flanders and Walloon researchers and create a sense of unity within the Belgian federation. Yet their policy follows the rule to respect the linguistic and cultural differences from community to community. The main funding institution for media and communication research in Flanders is Fonds Wetenschappelijk Onderzoek (FWO). There are also a few new organisations for financing specialised research on information and communication technologies (the third category). The public funding institution in the Wallonia region is Fonds de la Recherche Scientifique (FNRS).

Research Funding in Flanders. The main sources of research funding in the Flanders region are universities and public funding institutions. The universities receive their annual budget from the state. The majority of this funding goes to salaries for the teaching staff, and a small portion is reserved for the universities’ own research funds. A professor’s contract usually specifies 40% teaching and 60% research. Professors are paid for full-time work, but the salaries of the research team and money for conducting such things as surveys has to be found outside the university budget. External funding has increased over the past ten years, and in some fields of research, external sources provide the majority of the funding.

The Bologna reform in the curricula (from a four year track to a five year track) has caused restrictions within the universities. The Flemish universities are under pressure to seek external funding for new projects, and this has stiffened the criteria for employing researchers (international peer-review publications carry more weight than before; also number of PhD students and research projects counts, whereas earlier one could make a career on individual publications).
Fonds Wetenschappelijk Onderzoek – Vlaanderen (FWO) Research Foundation – Flanders is the most important public research funding institution in the Flemish academic community. FWO was founded in 1928 on the initiative of King Albert I, and its goal is to promote the cultural value of the Flemish community. Funding for FWO is given by the Flemish Community, the federal authorities and various private patrons. The Foundation finances basic research in all disciplines in the Flemish universities and in affiliated research institutes. FWO supports individual researchers (for example, giving grants for doctoral theses or postdoctoral research) and research teams. Research project teams and individuals can apply for funding for a period of two to four years. Moreover, the FWO supports national and international scientific mobility, for instance, by establishing scientific research networks to promote coordination and national and international contacts and by providing grants for researchers’ participation in international conferences and for study and training periods abroad. FWO is managed by a Board of Trustees, which consists of representatives from the Flemish universities, the Flemish and national authorities and the Flemish socio-economic world. And the selection and evaluations of the research results are carried out by scientific committees composed of Belgian and foreign experts based on external referee reports.

FWO has always been seen as an integrated component in the financial structure (the second category) of basic academic research funding. University budgets are mainly spent on teaching staff, although most departments are understaffed in relation to the numbers of students and the number of courses (a common problem in all European public universities). There is no significant difference between university research funding and FWO, but the competition for FWO money is stiffer. Usually, the universities require the researchers first to apply for FWO funding for research projects; then if the funding is not granted and if the research fits the agenda of the local research council, then the university will consider financing the project from its own research budget. Now that the universities are encouraged to undertake more applied research, FWO is viewed as protecting basic research. It is said to be stable and reasonably well structured (it was restructured and regionalised some eight years ago). But its vulnerability is that it is the only such foundation (whereas in other countries there are several).

The Institute for Broadband Technology (IBBT) is a recently created research institute and funding organisation established by the Flemish government. The main objective of the IBBT is to stimulate ICT innovation. The Flemish government invests in multi-disciplinary broadband research and has as its objective “to make Flanders a leading and internationally
IBBT brings together companies, authorities and non-profit organisations to join forces on research projects. Therefore, the emphasis is on applied, business-orientated research. IBBT provides specialists in different aspects of broadband technology. It carries out multidisciplinary research for the Flemish business community and the Flemish government. This includes all technological, legal and social dimensions of the development and exploitation of broadband services. IBBT unites more than 600 researchers from numerous Flemish universities and knowledge centres. Each research group is specialised in one or more of the basic competencies of IBBT, which address current social and economic issues: eHealth (ICT applications for the healthcare sector), new media, mobility and logistics (ICT applications that enhance the mobility of people and goods), enabling technologies (various applications) and eGovernment (ICT applications for public authorities). IBBT has a significant role in coordinating the research funds of industry-driven projects in the three research centres of MICT (in Ghent), SMIT (in Brussels) and the research centre in Leuven. For example, SMIT has many projects in ICT-related applied research, but it is not easy to find funding for basic research.

Institute for the Promotion of Innovation by Science and Technology in Flanders (IWT) is another funding organisation that also has as its focus stimulating and supporting innovation. The organisation grants financial support to companies and research institutes as well as individual researchers. Companies are provided with financial support to conduct industrial research and development projects. Research institutes (universities, polytechnics, research centres) can apply for projects in strategic basic research, collective research and technology transfer. Individual researchers can apply for support for their doctoral and postdoctoral research. Moreover, IWT works to facilitate networks between enterprises and technological partners in Flanders and at the European level.

The Flemish government’s recent restructuring policy in universities and polytechnics offers another source of funding for academic research. The universities are expected to form associations (or federations) with a number of polytechnics, and additional research money is provided for cooperative research projects. These projects are intended to increase the research capacity at polytechnics, which earlier had focused on professional education. For example, VUB has associations with Erasmus polytechnics (UAB, the University Association in Brussels), and the Catholic University of Brussels (KUB) has an association with two polytechnics. This association structure is granted money, which is redistributed among all the
members.

The Flanders ministries have a few resources for research projects (Ministry of Culture, for example, has funded some projects in Cemeso, VUB). The European Union framework programme is also an important source of funding for research projects in media and communication. The universities in Brussels have the advantage of the EU headquarters located nearby, which also has an influence on the communication needs of the Brussels city government.

There are no private funding organisations in Belgium, but the universities’ research centres and groups carry out applied research projects with the commercial sector. The researchers and research groups often have small collaborative projects with public and private companies and also with some associations or NGO’s, but these are mostly individual projects based on personal networks and not on permanent contracts. The most widely available funding for PhD dissertations is the individual grants given by FWO and IWT. PhD students also work as assistants in research projects funded by FWO, IWT or IBBT. There are also policy-orientated PhD tracks funded by the Flemish, the federal and the Brussels governments. (For example, in SMIT there are doctoral dissertations being prepared on global cities in relation to innovation and ICT policy).

Research Funding in Wallonia. There is fewer research funding organisations in the Wallonian region than in Flanders. The major funding source for media and communication research is the regional public organisation called FNRS, Fonds de la Recherche Scientifique. FNRS provides three types of funding contracts for researchers:

1. PhD scholarship, 4 years, “aspirant” (requirement: 80% of grades to be above the average).
2. Post-doctoral contracts, “chargé de recherche”.
3. Research associate, “Chercheur qualifié”, full-time and permanent researcher contracts. Moreover, FNRS provides financial support for organising scientific meetings, to increase international mobility. The decision-making of the distribution of grants within FNRS is made by the Commission of Rectors of Universities.

Personal applications are introduced by a certain university and a department in which the researcher is expected to work. In some cases FNRS finances a post for a certain period of time; thereafter, the university is expected to continue paying the researcher’s salary. FNRS research
associate works at the department and teaches two courses (the main responsibility is research). (The difference from CNRS of France is that Belgium’s FNRS is not a research centre, but only a funding organisation; the researchers are placed in existing university Departments or research centres).

For example, UCL provides facilities for the research staff, but the research budget given by the university is very small. The research money is sought from general calls for research projects of the FNRS. UCL Communication department also has some research contracts with public and private companies; they are at present, for example, preparing a report on the politics of television for the Belgian CSA (Conseil superieur d’audiovisuel – for media regulation). The Department also has contracts with some media companies. In ULB less than 20% of all research is applied, and all PhDs are supported by public funding. Applied research projects are not very popular because they require more administrative work, have tighter deadlines and other drawbacks. But there is some small scale contract research with the public institutions.

The city of Brussels has a funding programme for capital region development that is significant for such local universities as FUSL and ULB. The Walloon and Brussels region also grants some research funds in the area of information technologies. But there is no equivalent to IBBT in Flanders. Applied research is funded much less frequently in Wallonia than in the communication departments of Flemish universities; nevertheless, the public funding is not increasing and the departments are under pressure to seek external support. European Union funding (COST, 6th and 4th programmes) is also considered an important source of research support. The most important grant for the Francophone doctoral students in Belgium is FNRS, and there is stiff competition for the grants. There are not many opportunities for a scholarship for doctoral work. But there are a few assistant posts at universities and in research projects. Assistants are hired for both basic and applied research projects; they usually have a contract for three to six years, and sometimes their work includes half project research or pedagogical work and the other half PhD research. Because theirs is not permanent job, there are some who leave before the contract ends if they find permanent, full-time work in industry. It is usual that PhD students write their dissertations while working full-time or half-time as journalists, press officers or such. A few industry-orientated programmes such as FRIA and FIRST by the Wallonia region give grants for PhD work.
Netherlands

The Dutch media and communication research is well financed by the universities and foundations when compared to other fields of science. Directly ‘applied’ or ‘business orientated’ research is not dominant in the academic communication research in the Netherlands, but it is typical for researchers to have strong ties to media and communication practices outside the academy. Scholars sometimes co-operate with media companies or public organisations.

The research funding of the Dutch media and communication research is divided into three categories: the first category is the university funding; the second, the public foundations research project funding and individual grants (for example, for PhD students); the third category includes contract research with private or public institutions or companies. The universities’s operation costs and research in the Netherlands are mainly funded with public money from the first and second category. The third category is not very common in the field of media and communication but it is increasing in particular at the independent research institutes.

The substantial funding source for research in the field of media and communication is the Netherlands Organisation for Scientific Research (NWO). NWO is a general funding organisation for all academic disciplines of research. Researchers can apply for subsidies within research programmes as defined by NWO or as apart of a Free Competition (the research object is put forward by the researcher). Personal grants are intended to support researchers in different stages of their scientific career. The most prominent and highly esteemed is the Innovation Research Incentives Scheme, consisting of Veni grants for researchers who have recently taken their PhD, Vidi grants for researchers who want to develop their own innovative line of research and appoint one or more researchers, and Vici grants for senior researchers to build their own research group.

The science foundation money is increasing and the universities budgets are decreasing. The graduate schools need increasingly to seek for money from foundations or elsewhere. The major research centre at the University of Amsterdam, ASCoR, has received much funding for its projects from the NWO; therefore, partnerships with industry are less important in this context. They are in a situation where they can choose the applied projects that are interesting and also beneficial for their interests in basic research. In ASCoR half of PhD students (about 15 of circa 30) are funded by the university (first category), about 10 receive funding from the science foundation or, for example, EU research council projects, and the last part of the projects (5 PhD
students) are sponsored by media corporations, which are chosen according to their relevance in terms of the focal research areas of ASCoR. Some projects are also funded by the Royal Science Academy, European framework programmes, EU research council and networks of excellence like COST. Many of the research schools like NESCO\textsubscript{R} were founded in order to join the forces of a number of universities for applying for funding for PhD education. The second stream of funding has increased significantly during the past years, as communication studies has become an established field in the Netherlands. The polytechnics are receiving an extra budget from the government in order to increase research. The first category of funding is therefore most significant at present. For example, the Cross Media Content research group in Utrecht Polytechnics has two types of research. The first is independent academic research, which, however, has a practical orientation and empirical focus. The second type of research is contract research that is funded by industry (for example, a newspaper or media company, or governmental organisation). But the purely applied and business oriented research is quite rare in the Netherlands in the field of media and communication (which is different compared to e.g. Flanders, where they have an important branch of business-oriented research mainly coordinated by the IBBT). In general, Dutch communication scholars consider contact with the industries of media and journalism to be very important; revealingly, there is a significant amount of research with a practical orientation without any significant financial ties.
Estonia

Only a small portion of current research in Estonia is supported through the universities’ basic funding. Often the research is carried out as part-time activity, on the side of normal teaching and administration obligations. The sectors of Social Sciences and Humanities are clearly underfinanced and this hinders the formation a larger research community with long-term funding.

Most of the academic research is funded by the state through two different types of funding instrument. Targeted funding is based on competition in which different projects applications are screened and the most relevant, according to academic assessment criteria, are funded. Funding is also granted by the Estonian Science Foundation to individual scholars. That funding is often used to cover research expenses whilst the research itself is done as part of the daily work at the university.

Against international norms, Estonian investment in scientific research and development is still fairly modest. With Nordic countries aiming at 4 per cent of their respective GDPs, Estonia still has less than a single percentage share of GDP. According to the academic experts the state is both unable and unwilling to fund social sciences or humanities in the way that it would support the growth of research units within universities. The Estonian funding system also favours natural sciences giving almost four times the monthly salary to a natural scientist than that of a colleague from social sciences and humanities. The trend of increasing investment in natural sciences and technology is notable in Estonia, with humanities and social sciences producing less than half the number doctoral graduates as technology, engineering and physical sciences.
UK

The main sources of funding for academic media research in Britain are public research councils that distribute government money. There are seven councils arranged around different areas of science. Most media researchers apply for grants from either the Arts and Humanities Research Council (AHRC) or the Economic and Social Research Council (ESRC).

In matters of funding, the social sciences and humanities receive only a fraction of the money that the hard sciences get. For example, the Engineering and Physical Sciences Research Council (EPSRC), which also funds media and communication research projects that involve ICT elements, has a budget of £500 million (about 630 million euros) to distribute each year (Engineering and Physical Research Council 2008). In comparison, the 2007/2008 budget for the Economic and Social Research Council (ESRC) is £181 million (228 million euros) (Economic and Social Research Council 2008) and for the Arts and Humanities Research Council (AHRC) £75 million (94.5 million euros) (Arts and Humanities Research Council 2008).

The application process for Research Council funding is regarded by many of the academics interviewed as difficult and frustrating. The grants are awarded by a peer review panel, which according to several interviewees leads to the exclusion of the most critical and morally charged proposals. Furthermore, some types of media and communication research were seen as not really fitting clearly in either AHRC’s or ESRC’s area of expertise. The government has also indicated that it might in the future concentrate its funding on the larger research institutions, which some interviewees find worrying.

Other sources of research funding include: the British Academy, which grants government money for post-graduate level small-scale research; Foundations e.g. the Leverhulme Trust, the Joseph Rowntree Foundation, the European Science Foundation (ESF); the media industry; NGOs; The European Commission (EC)/European Research Council; UN agencies, World Bank, OECD; Ofcom; UK and foreign government departments; local authorities (e.g. the mayor of London, regional development agencies).

Many interviewees said the proportion of media industry money in media research is relatively small at the moment. One person pointed out, however, that in his experience, many of the projects funded by the industry are confidential in nature and therefore people do not even know how much of it takes place.
**Internationalising Funding.** The fact that more and more UK research projects are international in nature is at least partly a result of the European Commission’s policy, which has emphasised international collaboration. This has led to studies comparing media-related phenomena in different countries and joint projects involving scholars from two or more countries. One separate sector within media research is capacity-building projects. Capacity building refers to assistance that is directed towards improving society’s competence, usually in the context of a developing country. The media research capacity building projects usually revolve around democracy issues such as citizen participation, journalist training and freedom of expression.

‘**ICT gets the Money**’. When asked to list topic areas in media and communication research that do particularly well in terms of funding, the interviewees mentioned most often those associated with ICT: the internet, interactivity, mobile phones, virtual reality, e-society and edemocracy. This applied to both research councils and the private sector. ICT-related research is funded by e.g. Fujitsu, Sony, Nokia, Hewlett Packard and British Telecom. Some more practice-oriented media departments also received grants from both the private and public sectors for the digitalisation of different kinds of archives. Another area that has recently been doing well in terms of funding is health. Projects on health communication and 3D animation receive money from the medical industry.

**Towards ‘Knowledge Transfer’.** The Knowledge Transfer initiative is part of the government’s so-called innovation strategy. For the academic community the new policy has meant that the research councils nowadays prefer funding projects with practical, generally economic, applications. Buzzwords are ‘user engagement’ and ‘policy relevance’. One of the interviewees described the situation aptly:

“Never has applied social research been so valued. (...) Can it actually help the economy, can it (...) solve political problems. (...) The government has put money in there and the government actually wants the money back”. The interviewees predicted that this knowledge transfer policy will have its winners and losers. Amongst the winners they thought would probably be numbered the expolytechnics, which have always been more engaged with the industry and applied science. London-based institutions might also find it easier to build networks with the media industry, which is concentrated on the capital. The name of the university or of the department, which works as a kind of brand name,
and is already regarded as a key element in getting funding and networking, is likely to become increasingly important in the future”.

Other interviewees expressed the concern that less conventional and more critical research questions, “questions that question the nature of the way the political establishments understand the world” are not likely to get funded in the current climate:

“I mean questions like what is the impact of advertising on the way we understand the world. (...) A research council might fund that but (...) the advertising industry isn’t going to fund that, why would they. And actually probably nor is the television industry who get their money from advertising, why would they want to ask such a question. The BBC might be kind of vaguely interested but it doesn’t really affect them”.

There are several obstacles to the use of knowledge transfer in the field of media and communication studies. Even if the topics of interest to the media industry and the academic world are becoming more similar, the industry still operates on a different logic and a different time-span than university departments. According to some of the academics interviewed, the industry wants mainly two things of them: vocational training for future media professionals and information on their audiences. “By and large the media industry – most research they want, they want to know about audience and consumption – there are specialist agencies who can do it much better than we can”. On the other hand one of the interviewees thought that particularly in the new media area, companies are using “ethnographic techniques and sociologists” in order to understand user preferences and interfaces.

The ongoing change in the media landscape is worrying the British media industry. Despite the obvious differences in approaches, the media industry’s research 78 units are nowadays to some extent interested in the same sort of issues as academic media research. Shared topics of interest emerging from this ongoing change include e.g. media convergence, fragmenting audiences, diminishing readerships of newspapers, digitalisation and social websites. As a part of its knowledge transfer policy the government is also encouraging research to be oriented towards solving political problems, thereby further tying research funding for academic work to external imperatives.
Australia

The most important source of funding is the Australian Research Council (ARC). It is a statutory authority within the Australian Government's Education, Science and Training portfolio. The ARC supports both fundamental and applied research. The average grant size is nearly 300,000 Australian dollars (180,000 euros). The success rate is around 20 per cent.

There are many other grants currently available in the field that do not appear under the Discovery Grants – the biggest research scheme of the ARC – in the designated code called Journalism, Communication and Media. However, the ARC does not have a policy to prioritise particular areas within media and communication research. Much of the audience research is sponsored by the Australian Broadcasting Control Board/Tribunal/Authority (nowadays Australian Communications and Media Authority), and its history is as long as television’s (McKee 2001, 312). Media companies, both print and electronic, spend a lot of money for their own audience research.

The media industry in Australia is not famous for its generous research funding. “We find it very hard to get research funding from media companies”, says journalism Lecturer John Harrison from the University of Queensland. Harrison is not alone. “Media companies in Australia are notoriously suspicious of the tertiary sector”, confirms Professor Mark Pearson, Head of journalism at Bond University. Stuart Cunningham argues that “there is a long tradition in Australia that media companies don’t fund academic research. Industry takes the graduates but puts very little back to the journalism academy”. Stephen Lamble, Head of the School of Communication at University of the Sunshine Coast, confirms the general picture: “Most of my research I have done on my own time, on Fridays, weekends, five weeks leave from work. You really just have to grab your time from other duties”. Finally, Bond University Professor Mark Pearson observes that in Australia a great deal of money goes to media research, but not so much to media researchers. Media is a very popular topic within other areas of research, and much of the funding allocated to media research goes to people who are not full-time media researchers.
In general, universities in the U.S., being tuition-based to some extent, even in state schools, are relatively well-resourced. The trend, however, is towards privatisation.

“[T]hroughout the country, public universities are absorbing a larger percentage of the cost of higher education, a trend that is escalating pressure on colleges, departments and individual faculty members to both increase revenue and reduce costs…in most research-intensive universities, faculty members are being ‘encouraged’ to seek external funding for their scholarly work” (Salmon et al. 2006, 4).

Universities’ external funding comes from three sources:

1) Government agencies (the biggest being the Department of Education, the National Endowment for the Humanities, the National Institutes of Health, and the National Science Foundation).

2) “Philanthropist” foundations (such as the Ford Foundation which is geared towards development, and grass roots activism; the Pew Charitable Trust devoted to informing the public, and advancing policy solutions, supporting civic life; the Knight Foundation; and the Carnegie Foundation).

3) The media industry, either through commissioned studies or sponsorship (e.g., MIT Media Lab sponsorship for intellectual property rights on research conducted).

Cry for Money. Compared to other social sciences, communication has traditionally received less funding. Kamhawi and Weaver (2003) noted that “overall funding for mass communication remains low; there has been a steady decline in proportions of funded research from the early 1980s to the late 1990s…While mass communication has been growing in terms of more and new media channels, a larger labour force, and more colleges offering mass communication education, there has been no corresponding increase in the proportion of funded research” (20). Similarly, only one-fourth of studies reported in Journalism Quarterly and Public Opinion Quarterly from 1954 to 1978 acknowledged funding, while in psychology, sociology, and political science journals the average rate was more than half (Kamhawi & Weaver 2003). The same trend has
been observed also in more recent reviews of mass communication literature (Zhu & Swiencicki 1995). Kamhawi and Weaver attribute the lack of funding in mass communication to the failure of government agencies to recognize mass communication as an academic discipline. According to various interviewees, the same trends apply to the communication discipline as a whole. In particular, as one interviewee noted, “there is almost no funding for humanities, critical and cultural scholarship”.

In many cases, communication is just a piece of the larger research effort. Some interviewees stressed the importance of collaborating with other disciplines when designing research projects and applying for grants. Such collaboration seems to be in the interests of the sponsors. As a representative of a health funding organization noted, “We see the application of communication and marketing as being a very multidisciplinary activity that is actually informed by many, many disciplines, including everything in communication from interpersonal to mass to visual, in marketing everything from branding to market research to campaigns, journalism, and PR, and psychology, social psychology, sociology, and economics, all of those things, we think, come together, to allow for effective applied health communication and marketing”.

Of all the areas in communication, health communication seems to be one of the rare areas that are doing well in funding. Practically all interviewees mentioned health communication when asked about areas that are receiving research funding. According to sponsors, communication-related research is still very marginal compared to the overall funds for health research, but the interest in the area has been growing and will continue to grow in the future: “Our organization believes strongly that we need to increase the science and evidence based health communication, marketing and media work. These fields are growing and expanding, there is much more attention and recognition that this work is very important, but we do not have as strong, organized, and synthesized evidence base for the work we do”. In addition to health communication, interviewees mentioned such areas as media, new technology, and virtual environments that are receiving above-average funding from different groups.
Japan

Research funding in Japan is in many respects illustrative of the state of the field internationally. The fact that universities have to compete for public research funding and to find external sources for funding research has forced researchers to formulate their thinking into understandable and sellable projects.

The general principle is that the closer the research approach comes to information communication technology and new media, the easier it is to find funding for a project. Japanese doctoral students in media and communication studies have a difficult time funding their research. Foundations or funding organizations for independent dissertation work within Japan are practically non-existent. Professors can apply for money for research projects and groups and then assign graduate students to these projects. In stark contrast, funding for graduate studies abroad or for foreign graduate students studying in Japan is abundant. For this reason, a significant proportion of doctoral dissertations finished in Japan are by Asian doctoral candidates and about subjects involving Asian media and societies. In the social sciences and humanistic fields, many Japanese have written their dissertations outside of Japan, mostly in the U.S.

Together with changes in the university system, Japan has increased competitive research funding while decreasing the amount of direct research funds to universities. The main funding organization is Japan Society for Promotion of Science (JSPS, Nihon Gakujutsu Shinkokai), which is an independent administrative institution.
South Korea

Communication studies are becoming increasingly popular among Korean students, leading to an increase in research funding. It is uncertain at this stage whether this is adequate for the future growth of the field.

Korean Broadcasting Institute is one of the major Korean institutes organizing and financing communication research outside universities. The institute publishes an annual report on Korean broadcasting industry, with an emphasis on the market, policies and strategies of the industry. The institute also supports field research of relevant policy implementations of broadcasting companies, program contents research and operational models in different countries. Moreover, some theoretical research on communication and broadcasting is also supported.

Korea Research Foundation and Korea Foundation fund and support various disciplines and Korean and foreign scholars with a focus on Korea, including communication research. Korean Press Foundation funds and promotes more concrete aspects of communication, mainly the training of journalists, but also arranges research and survey projects on contemporary Korean media. LG Sangam Press Foundation functions likewise.
Finland

Only a small part of Finnish communications research is funded by the academic faculties. Their basic funding covers mostly teaching and basic facilities with very little left for actual research expenses. Most research funding comes from various foundations, corporations, the Finnish ministries and the EU. The Finnish government, however, allocates funding to research through the Finnish Academy and Tekes (Technology oriented research fund). These funds also contribute to communications research. On top of these funding institutions, there are several private funds which contribute to communications research. A newcomer, but a substantial supporter of the field, is the Helsingin Sanomat Foundation. This foundation, established in 2006, annually allocates around 4 million euros towards communications research. With this sum, the Foundation is the largest single funder in the field. Other funding bodies annually allocate around 3 million euros to communications research. (In comparison Nokia spent 3,9 billion Euros in 2006 solely on research and development). Researchers say that private funders and ministries prefer short term research projects rather than more demanding studies and that the preferred topics are lacking in historical perspective. This mode of operation where the rapidly changing topics of research are decided by outside financiers does not effectively support long-time development of research skills and programmes required for genuine scientific advances.
3.5 Internationalisation and the Dispositifs of Publishing

This sub chapter deals with the phenomenon of the internationalisation of communication and media research. The principle vehicle by which this has occurred has been the organisation of publishing of scholarly research, which has been heavily dominated by Anglophone and in particular US publishing practices and institutions. This has occurred in a period of increasing commodification of scholarly publishing in the US and the Anglophone world more generally (on recent developments in Anglophone scholarly publishing, cf. Miller 2007, 126-7).

According to Edmund Lauf (2005, 148) “the dominance of the U.S. in communication journals has been much greater than in journals of other disciplines”. Most major communication journals are edited and published in the U.S. and – more importantly – all international communication journals are published in English. While scholars from non–English-speaking countries must publish articles both in English and in their mother tongue, scholars from the U.S. and the U.K. “have barely any publications in other than English language journals” (van Leeuwen, Moed, Tijssen, Visser, & van Raan 2001, 345). There is a valuable summarising figure by Lauf (2005, 144), based on his analysis of 43 communication journals, with the following columns of information:

1. Number of authored or co-authored articles

2. Share of authored or co-authored articles in %

3. Attendance of International Communication Association conferences

4. Size of population

5. Correlation of visibility
As Lauf’s results show, researchers from the U.S. authored two out of three articles, thereby clearly dominating communication journals. Also “the percentage of authors from the U.S., the U.K., Canada, and Australia cumulated to 86. That these countries ranked on positions 1 to 4 in terms of author visibility strongly confirms the expectation that authors from native English-speaking countries are most prominent”. Besides that, “authors from the 20 most visible countries could be found in 96.4% of all articles. Authors from the remaining countries worked in New Zealand as an additional native English-speaking country or – with the exception of Israel and Switzerland – EU-member states or developing Asian countries” (2005, 145).

Lauf also studied the proportions of editors not from the U.S., the national diversity score, the percentage of authors from the U.S., and authors from English-speaking countries per journal. Diversity reflects here the probability that two randomly selected addresses came from different country clusters. (“Six groups were distinguished: the U.S. (69.8%); the U.K. (11.3%); Australia, Canada, and New Zealand (6.5%); the EU (10.1%); Asia (China, Hong Kong, India,
Japan, Korea, and Taiwan: 3.5%); and other countries (5.2%). ‘Other countries’ comprises a diverse group of non-EU Western European countries (Norway, Iceland, or Switzerland), other Asian countries, Eastern Europe, South and Central America, Africa and the Middle East”).

According to Lauf’s results (2005, 145), summarised in the figure on the next page, “at least five journals scored high on all indicators of internationality: They had a high percentage of non-U.S. editors (at least 75%), a diversity score above .90, less than 50% authors from the U.S., and less than 80% authors from English-speaking countries. Sixteen journals are somewhat international (diversity between .50 and .89). Most journals ($n = 20$), however, held a diversity score less than .50, with 80% or more U.S. editors and U.S. authors”.

Clearly, then, Anglophone and US publishing practices have exerted an increasing hegemony over research in communication and media studies in other countries. While we will note some significant exceptions to this rule (e.g. to a certain extent, Germany and France, insulated by stronger national traditions), the general tendency, particularly for smaller countries, has not been towards internationalisation in a genuine sense; rather, it has been towards an increasing ‘provincialisation’, as a hegemonic centre progressively transforms and reshapes its peripheries in its own image. Given the reliance of communication and media studies upon national traditions in other areas, this development raises troubling questions about the capacity of contemporary research projects to play an active role in their contemporary societies, above and beyond standards imposed by an artificial ‘international’ bench mark.
Figure 37; Internationalisation in articles published between 1998 and 2002 in communication journals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Journal</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>% Non-U.S. eds</th>
<th>% Diversity</th>
<th>% Authors from English-lang. countries</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Discourse &amp; Society</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>.96</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Javnost—The Public</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>.95</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language &amp; Communication</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>.92</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Understanding of Science</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>.92</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Media Culture &amp; Society</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>.91</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telecommunications Policy</td>
<td>223</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>.91</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cyberpsychology &amp; Behavior</td>
<td>199</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>.88</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research on Lang &amp; Social Interaction</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>.81</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>European Journal of Communication</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internatl Jnl of Public Opinion Research</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Narrative Inquiry</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>.78</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Publishing Research Quarterly</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>.76</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learned Publishing</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>.70</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journal of Media Economics</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>.66</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science Communication</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>.64</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internatl Jnl of Lang &amp; Comm Disorders</td>
<td>211</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>.63</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political Communication</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>.62</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journal of Advertising Research</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>.61</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harvard Internatl Journal of Press Politics</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>.60</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Journal of Conflict Mgt</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>.57</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jnl of Social and Personal Relationships</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>.56</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Culture</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>.53</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journal of Health Communication</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>.48</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Media Psychology</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>.46</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jnl of Broadcasting &amp; Electronic Media</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>.42</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication Research</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.41</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journal of Advertising</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.40</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journal of Communication</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>.39</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Written Communication</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>.39</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Relations Review</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>.36</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical Communication</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>.35</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Communication</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>.33</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jnl of Applied Comm Research</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.29</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Opinion Quarterly</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>.27</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journalism &amp; Mass Comm Quarterly</td>
<td>219</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Communication Research</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jnl of Business and Technical Comm</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication Theory</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Critical Studies in Media Communication</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication Education</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication Monographs</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Western Journal of Communication</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quarterly Journal of Speech</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Germany

An obvious dimension that poses a serious future challenge for the Communication and Media Studies in Germany is internationalisation. Several studies (cf. Lauf 2001, Rische 2005a, and 2005b) show that much is to be desired in this respect. According to Winfried Schulz (2006, 95) “what is deplorable” in his native Communication and Media Studies is that “German-speaking community is to a certain degree secluded and self-sufficient”.

For example, Eberwein’s and Pörtker’s study on the books reviewed in Publizistik also contains interesting information about the origins of these books. According to their data, compressed in the following chart, the level of internationalisation in German Communication Studies in rather low also in light of books reviewed.

Figure 38; Country of publication of the books reviewed in ‘Publizistik’ (in %)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Volume</th>
<th>D/GDR</th>
<th>USA</th>
<th>CH</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>NL</th>
<th>other</th>
<th>Multinational Publisher</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1958</td>
<td>78.9</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1963</td>
<td>69.0</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>10.3</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>10.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1968</td>
<td>89.4</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1973</td>
<td>81.9</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>6.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1978</td>
<td>70.5</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>11.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1983</td>
<td>60.6</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>22.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1988</td>
<td>71.1</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>18.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1993</td>
<td>82.4</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>13.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td>76.3</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>15.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>73.3</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>14.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(average 73.5 2.8 2.2 2.1 1.3 1.1 3.5 13.5)

(based on Eberwein-Pörtker 2006, 57)
It is perhaps surprising that the share of books stemming from the USA is so low, although it is probably true that German Communication research is more orientated towards the USA than towards any other country: “Our perspective is still very much focused on the American scene” writes Schulz (2006, 95) who laments that “many interesting and innovative developments in other countries not published in English never reach the attention of German-speaking scholars. […] Most of Europe – not only Scandinavia – is unknown territory to someone like me”. Besides the very low share of French books, the total absence of the UK in Eberwein and Pöttker’s results is particularly surprising. Could it be that precisely British books are included in the section called “multinational publisher” since many British publishers operate nowadays in the USA as well?

However, Eberwein and Pöttker write (2006, 57) that “only a fraction” of the books in this section are really published internationally since “many publishing enterprises based in Germany give small foreign firm branches as the place of appearance on the title page, due to reasons of prestige”. Whereas between 62% and 65% of all the articles in the *Publizistik* between the years 1956 and 1995 constantly dealt with the Federal Republic, between 1996 and 2003 this share rose suddenly up to 72.7%. Eberwein and Pöttker draw from this the conclusion “that the inability or the unwillingness of German Communication Studies to look beyond their own national horizons has even increased since the middle of the 1990s” (ibid., 57-58). According to their chart, even research literature from Austria and Switzerland receives relatively little attention, though language should not be such barrier here. Thus Eberwein and Pöttker write that “German language Communication Studies is not only not taken seriously internationally; considering its own appreciation of foreign research literature, it evidently leads an island existence, which has been little changed by the growing together of Europe and the globalisation process” (Eberwein-Pöttker 2006, 57).

In a survey of the GGPuK members, conducted in July 2006, we can find interesting results concerning the journals that the members find most important for scientific discussion in the discipline as well as – crucially, also from the standpoint of furthering one’s career – forums for publishing one’s work. 95% of the respondents say that *Medien & Kommunikationswissenschaft* as well as *Publizistik* are “quite” or “very important” for them in these two respects. For *Media Perspektiven*, the result was 81% and for *Medienspsychologie* 73%. However, revealingly, the third and fourth highest ranked German journals were *Journal of Communication, European Journal of Communication*, and *Communication Research* (Wolling 2006, 12).
France

Academic journals in the field of information and communication were rare in France before the 1990s but since that time the number has expanded. Of the pioneering journals, *Communications* was founded in 1962 by the famous semioticians Roland Barthes, Claude Brémond, and Edgar Morin. Today the range of journals in the domain is broad and they are mainly focused on special research orientations, apparently due to the heterogeneity of the field. There are no equivalents to the such well-known generalist international reference journals as the *Journal of Communication, Media, Culture and Society* or *Communication Research*. A lot of the French research on communication is also published in the journals of several other disciplines (Meadel 1999, 17-18).

An interesting aspect of the French publishing scene are several journal projects that are often professor led and more or less centred around the person who functions as an editor-in-chief (cf. in German ‘Herausgeberzeitschriften’). Among the most significant are the following:

The social sciences journal *Réseaux – Communication, Technologie et Société* was launched in 1983 by Paul Beaud from the University of Lausanne, Switzerland, and Patrice Flichy, head of the sociology lab at CNET France Télécom. The home base of the journal was the CNET until 2001, with Flichy being the editor-in-chief. Réseaux is focused on the broad field of communication and in particular on telecommunications and social practices related to technology. The journal covers topics in mass media (particularly television), informatics, new media theories, history of technology, interpersonal communication, media strategy, etc. There are both French and international members on the editorial board. Moreover, Réseaux tried out an English language version called *The French Journal of Communication* in 1993-1998. It was published by Luton University Press and appeared twice a year with selected and translated articles from the original journal (Flichy 2007). Réseaux is one of the most well-established French journals in the field of communication, even though its bias is sometimes considered more towards sociology than towards Infocom.

*Quaderni* is published by the Département des Sciences Politiques, at the University of the Sorbonne-Panthéon Paris1, and since 1987 has been directed by Professor Lucien Sfez. The journal promotes the idea of communication as the “new religion” of contemporary society; therefore the focus is on communication and its connections with technologies and power.

*Hermès – Cognition, Communication, Politique* started as a publication of the CNRS laboratoire Communication et Politique. Dominique Wolton, who became the head of the new CNRS Institute
for Communication Sciences in 2006, has been the editor since 1989. Hermès is an interdisciplinary publication with the following focal areas: public arena, theory of political communication, identity in communication, audience reception and intelligence, communication in political theory and the complex relationships between individuals and the masses, and the growing complexity of intercultural processes.

Les Enjeux de l'information et de la communication is an online journal published by GRESEC, a laboratory of the University of Stendhal-Grenoble 3. The journal publishes ten articles more or less a year, and there is open access to the full texts on its website. The themes of the articles are specialised in the field of information and communication with an orientation towards the new communication media within their social contexts. The editor-in-chief is Bernard Miège.

However, the most significant journals are those that are essential to building a career. The 71st section of CNU has a list of journals that are acknowledged as journals of reference in the discipline of information and communication. Articles published in these journals are counted in the evaluation of candidates applying for qualification for Maître de Conferences and Professeur des Universités. The journals are in two categories: the first includes academic referee journals, and the second contains professional journals that publish scientific articles.

The first group of scientific journals are the following: Communications; Communication et langages; Communication et organisation; Culture et muse; Études de communication; Hermès; Les enjeux de l'information et de la communication; MEI; Mots, les langages du politique; Protée; Questions de communication; Recherches en communication; Réseaux; Revue canadienne de Sciences de l'information et de bibliothéconomie; Sciences de la société. The second group of professional journals is mainly for the information and library sciences included in the field of Infocom: Documentation et bibliothèques (comité de lecture; Documentaliste – Sciences de l'information (comité de lecture); Revue des revues (comité de lecture); Argus; BBF (Bulletin des Bibliothèques de France).

The articles published in the acknowledged journals are used as criteria to ascertain whether a candidate possesses sufficient knowledge of the field of Infocom and has visibility within the French community of Infocom. In principle, publications in foreign journals are counted as meritorious as well. However, some French academics criticise of the evaluation system based on CNU list for discouraging scholars from publishing in other languages and for contributing to the insularity of the French scientific community.

There are some journals of other Francophone countries included in the CNU list that may be considered international publications. The Belgian journal Recherches en communication is edited in
the département de communication de l’Université catholique de Louvain, and the journal’s broad scope covers the area of Infocom. There is the Canadian Revue canadienne de Sciences de l’information et de bibliothéconomie. Not included on the list but often found in university libraries in Infocom departments is the Canadian journal Questions de Communications. Journals of film studies, including such classics as Les Cahiers de l’Audiorisuel and Cahiers du cinema, belong to the area in their own, which, in France, is a separate field of research from Infocom.

Nevertheless, despite this strong national basis, it remains a great frustration to have to use English to gain access to the international community. As one professor says: “We read the Anglo-American literature but they don’t read us”. But in truth, translation seems to be a problem in both directions. Not many works of French scholars have been translated into English, and there is not much foreign literature being translated into French. The scholars admitted that they are not visible in international journals, but neither are French journals read by English-speaking researchers.

In French university libraries it is clearly visible that few books in the English language are available. The exceptions are the libraries of language departments, which have developed their international research cooperation much further than others. Communication and media are especially studied within English departments, as the language and cultural symbols are the basic components of the media culture. Also, there are a few exceptional scholars, such as Armand Mattelart and Bernard Miège. Mattelart (who is actually Belgian) started his career in Chile. His works have spread to many countries and have been translated into many languages, including Spanish, English, and even into Finnish. Miège is definitely more widely known in the Francophone world, but he too has participated in several international co-operative projects and quite a few of his works have been translated into other languages.

French scholars are eager to give reasons why the majority of French researchers resist writing, speaking or publishing in English or other foreign languages. Among the most common reasons given are the following:

First, it is claimed that there are the cultural differences: the language is connected to the culture and also structures ways of thinking and doing research. The differences in theoretical orientations are seen as obstacles to mutual understanding between the French and their foreign colleagues. Many of the French scholars say that Infocom in France is not comparable to other countries, that the structure of the discipline and the theoretical basis are different, and therefore it is hard to have an intellectually rewarding dialogue. “For example, the Germans’ approaches
are different, emphasising more the theory of media”. By contrast, structuralism and discourse analysis are the important issues in France. The scholars say that universities’ international cooperation usually works well at the level of student exchange and in the pedagogic area, but there is no true intellectual scientific exchange. “The exchange is instrumental and artificial; people keep on talking their own scientific language even though they verbalise the same spoken language”. Even those French scholars who have a lot of experience at international conferences say that “the English language in conferences allows us to know who’s researching what, but that is all”. And sometimes international conferences are just “a form of academic tourism”.

The second group of reasons why French university researchers publish very little in foreign languages is institutional. In many French universities there is no policy or budget for translations. Moreover, publishing in a foreign language does not really bring the scholars any credit when they apply for posts within French academia. The evaluation criteria set by the CNU emphasise national research, and there have even been applicants who have been rebuked for having too many publications in English or in other countries (even if written in French) and not enough in France.

A third reason is structural: the French Infocom is not known around the world because it is so young. It was only recently that research started developing in France, and then scholars of Infocom have been busy building up the discipline inside French universities. Their priority has been to develop curricula, educate students, set up research projects, and organise the scientific community. Therefore, a number of French scholars of Infocom have published a good deal in their own language, but they have not yet had the energy to bring their ideas to the international community.

The fourth argument is that the Francophone world and culture is already large enough and strong enough to stand on its own, with a large scientific community and great theoreticians. As one professor says:

“The French are to a certain extent isolated from the Anglo-Saxon world because of the simple fact that their language area is big enough that they can live without speaking English. French researchers can go to Belgium, Quebec, Switzerland, and they are not obliged to speak English. It’s a French micro-world”. 
However, there are signs that this situation is changing with the younger generation, more instinctively cosmopolitan in its tastes and habits. The attitude towards internationalisation is also changing at the institutional level. Nowadays in ministerial assessments, French scholars are expected to show publications in other languages and international exchanges. The new funding agency ANR has also called for some projects in English, while universities have started setting language requirements for students: for the last four or five years the University of Avignon has imposed on its Master and Doctoral level students a requirement for a minimum of 30% of English references in their thesis and dissertations.
Belgium

The cleavage between the French- and Flemish-speaking universities applies in most parts of the country. Yet the capital area of Brussels is different. It is an area where the two language groups meet, and nowadays the universities of different language groups there have some interaction. In Brussels collaboration take place between French- and Dutch-speaking scholars. There was a time when all the Flemish were fluent in French, but nowadays the second language for both groups is English. The Dutch are still supposed to have basic skills in French and can understand it, and many of the French are able to speak Flemish if necessary. But usually the Flemish and French speak English when interacting with each other, since English is the international lingua franca in academia. In Brussels researchers of either language might even be invited to give lectures at universities of the other language group. For example, a Flemish professor who teaches in FUSL, says that with the administration he speaks French, in the classes he lectures in English, and conversations with the students may take place in any one of the three languages. Many of the Walloon researchers in Brussels speak English and also have international networks outside the French community. But half an hour’s train ride to the south, in Louvain-la-Neuve at UCL, the French are more closed within the French language area.

French-speaking Belgian communication research is more open to influences from many different places, since it is a very small community. It is more open to Anglo-American influences than the French, and more apt to sense and react rapidly to the development of these traditions. A Walloon professor says that the question of language is different for different generations. The older generation is still quite Francophone, but the younger generation is much more Anglophone; “they are obliged to be”, says a Walloon professor. There are already masters and doctoral courses in English, and in the fields of economics and administration many dissertations are written in English. French is still an important language, and there are still many important French journals in France and in Belgium. Today even in Francophone Belgium, publishing in English-language journals is highly valued, because there are no French-language Belgian journals in the area of media and communication rated in the international journal indexes (although there are in other areas). The Walloon researchers’ image of Flemish research is based on the Flemish scholars’ articles in English-language journals and other publications in English. The Flemish also read articles by Walloon researchers only if the material is published in English. Nowadays French speaking researchers also attend international Anglophone conferences, and this is where
the Walloons and Flemish meet. Very seldom are there joint Belgian conferences that unite both language groups to the exclusion of the outside world. Being international comes very naturally to Belgians, because they do not have to cross the borders of their own country to have intercultural relations. Therefore, the mental step needed to go outside Belgium is not a large one. There are both young Walloon and Flemish researchers who have been doing research in the US or the UK or written their dissertation in one of those countries.

The Flemish community and especially the community of communication and media scholars, on the other hand, are very small in number, but they are well known for their international networking. Flemish communication scholars are active and visible in international English-language conferences, and the Belgians are also active in international associations (ECREA, IAMCR, ICA). French and Flemish researchers in academic institutions in Brussels are the most open to working together across the borders of cultural groups and countries. The attitude is clearly visible on the management board of the European Communication Research and Education Association (ECREA), which is dominated by Belgians from various cultural groups.

The communication scholars in Flanders universities have international contacts with Dutch, German, British and Scandinavian countries. European networking is also increasing all over the continent. However, since the 1990s the cooperation with the Dutch has lessened, because Flemish and Dutch researchers are expected to publish in English and not in their own native language – as is the case in other small European countries. Still, some of the Flemish researchers participate in the annual Dutch-language conference ETMAAL in the Netherlands. The significance of this conference has diminished as international conferences have become more and more important. Many of the conference papers in ETMAAL are given in English so that they can be expanded into articles for international journals. The most visible national characteristic of Belgian media and communication research is its openness to international interaction, perhaps due to longer traditions of cross-cultural contacts within the country itself. There is no fear of losing the national or cultural identity by being open to foreign research traditions. Quite the contrary: the multitude of perspectives and ideas seems to be highly valued.
Netherlands

Dutch scholars are visible in the international research community. They are regular writers in prestigious international journals and members of editorial boards of major journals. They are often seen in international conferences presenting papers, giving talks, chairing panels, and even organising big international conferences. Considering the small number of the population, the Dutch are still more numerous in the international conferences than researchers from large population countries like France and Germany. The Dutch are active in the international research associations such as ICA (International Communication Association), IAMCR (International Association for Media and Communication Research) and ECREA (European Communication Research and Education Association). Moreover, Dutch universities display great hospitality for visiting and permanently residing international academics.

Typically, Dutch communication scholars publish the results of their research in English more than in Dutch. Between the years 1988 and 2006, the amount of publishing in international peer-reviewed journals increased circa two per cent per year (Van den Besselaar, 2007). Communication scholars publish more in ISI-journals than media scholars, who hold books in higher esteem (than communication scholars). This is because in communication science the books or non-English language publications are not counted as ‘outputs’. These differences in output criteria are also a clear indication of the fact that communication scholars and media scholars speak different theoretical and methodological ‘languages’.

Dutch scholars read mainly research written in English, but also some in German. Earlier the Catholic University of Leuven published a Dutch-language journal, Communicatie, but it was discontinued a few years ago. A still-existing journal is Tijdschrift voor CommunicatieWetenschap, which serves media and communication scholars in both the Netherlands and Flanders. There is also a journal focused on media history, Tijdschrift voor Mediageschiedenis. In general, the Dutch market for communication journals is not big enough for many publishers, and the researchers publish a great deal in international, peer reviewed English language journals.

Many of the master courses are taught in English in order to attract international students and to prepare Dutch students for English speaking academic work. ASCoR at the University of Amsterdam ranks first in Europe in terms of number of English language ISI-ranked articles in the category of publications by a European research institute in communication over the past ten
years. Also, some of the ASCoR’s English-language articles are among the most highly cited in the field. On the other hand, it is still considered important for the researchers to participate in national public discussions, to give interviews to the national media, to hold public talks and so on. Generating new knowledge is the primary work of a researcher, but getting publicity is considered important as well.

Most Dutch researchers do not have reservations about the English language dominance. They are proud that most of their publications are in English. But others ponder the negative effects of the English language dominance, arguing that it is made for the academic community but is not useful for the field of media institutions or the general Dutch public. Some emphasise that it would be important to serve also the national community and not only publish in English. Academics who only communicate with the international scientific arenas are often quite irrelevant for the professional communication and media practitioners. There is an exception with the practical oriented projects, in which the reports are written in Dutch, but the researchers use the same research data to publish articles in English-language in refereed journals in order to gain the scientific merit. However, it is double work for the academic to publish in international journals in English and also publish in Dutch in order to maintain contact with the journalists, media institutions, citizen and other relevant groups.
USA, UK, Australia

As we have argued, the USA today represents the hegemonic centre of communication and media research in very concrete and institutional terms; in particular, communication and media research in the UK and Australia, despite possessing their own traditions, are increasingly drawn into the orbit of North American academia. Worldwide, communication and media research is a growing field with nearly 190 journals; the number is continually increasing. In addition, a major proportion of communication and communication related research is published in journals outside the field. The exact number of U.S.-based journals is difficult to determine; however, it is somewhat safe to say that the U.S. is the leading nation in the number of communication journals. “Though there are several prestigious journals that are either published by regional communication associations (e.g. Communication Quarterly, published by the Eastern Communication Association) or by publishing houses unaffiliated with academic associations (e.g. Communication Research, published by Sage), the ‘top’ and often perceived as most desirable publication outlets are the journals published by the International and National Communication associations” (Bunz 2005, 705).

Another way of evaluating journals is by comparing their impact factors. (Impact factor is a measure of the frequency with which the ‘average article’ in a journal has been cited in a particular year or period). At the top of the top ten list (by an eight-year mean; see table) is Public Opinion Quarterly (published on behalf of The American Association for Public Opinion Research), followed by Communication Research (Sage), and Journal of Communication (ICA). Another ICA journal, Human Communication Research, is also included in the top-ten citation impact list. In sum, it can be seen that the top communication journals cover a wide range of topics and disciplines.
Figure 39; *Ranking of the Top 10 Communication Journals by Citation Impact, 1998-2002, 2004 and 2005* (thanks to Sam Luna at ICA for the 1998-2002 rankings)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Public Opinion Quarterly</td>
<td>1*</td>
<td>9**</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Comm Research</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. J Comm</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Media Psychology</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>9.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Discourse Soc</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Human Comm Res</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1*</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>10.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Cyberpsychol Behav</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>11.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Public Culture</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>12.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Poli Comm</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>12.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: The citation impact factor is computed by adding up numbers of citations from all journals in the current year to those in articles published in the journal of interest over the two previous years and dividing that total by the number of "scholarly" items published by the journal of interest in the previous two years.

An examination of ICA’s three printed journals revealed that those journals (JoC and HCR, in particular) are embedded in a dense and diverse network of citing journals (Rice 2007). However, the citation network is mostly woven around “the core communication journals” (such as CR, JoC, HCR, and CM). The phenomenon was particularly apparent when examining those whom the journals site. For example, most of Communication Theory’s citations come from the NCA journal Communication Monographs. In sum, despite the fragmentation of the field and the big number of communication journals worldwide, the discipline seems to revolve around a few central journals and associations, at least from the publishing perspective.
Japan

Japanese research of media and communication has international roots, but it has been fairly domestic. However, in recent years research in the field has internationalized from two directions. Firstly, Japanese researchers have started to publish more in English and for the international audience. Secondly, the Japanese media has become an interesting topic for researchers outside Japan because of the popularity of Japanese contemporary culture, the rapid development of the Japanese mobile sector, and interesting future visions and strategies about the market, technology, products and contents by different Japanese actors related to the media industry. The increasing integration of Japanese Communication and Media research is to be expected in the future.

South Korea

Korea is still ethnically one of the most homogeneous societies in the world, which adds a distinct nuance to the cultural, societal, political and communicational elements revolving around the dual phenomenon of Korean localization/globalization. The information society has met with the Confucian society and the Hermit Kingdom has turned into Dynamic Korea, producing a unique infra- and superstructure with a multitude of possible future scenarios for societal development and, further, for social science research. Obviously, much of the future research within the area of communication studies depends on the paradigmatic movement on the axis of indigenization and internationalization, which, fortunately, are not in a dichotomous or bipolar relationship and hence enable great variety inside the discipline. However, many scholars claim that the indigenization project has lost steam as the dominant influence on Korean academics today is something more like engineering-minded rationality.

One might predict that the trends of globalization will affect Korean academics in a way that leads the fields of research towards more eclecticism. Whether this happens more under duress or electively depends on various factors like the consensus and hegemony of the Korean scientific community, the import and export of Korean and foreign scholars, university economics and even the general political atmosphere of Korea.

As general trends of globalization affect also Korea and its academics, there is increasing
movement, especially among young scholars, towards publishing in international academic journals, although considerably large proportion of Korean communication research is still published in domestic, Korean-language journals. As many Korean scholars study and make their career abroad, mostly in American universities, it is not surprising that various studies have been made about Korean Americans and are being published in international journals. Moreover, many second-generation Koreans abroad often find it natural to return to their roots and do communication research in the Korean context.

In the inaugural article of *Asian Communication Research*, change in communication theory construction and the questioning of its Western origins are most strenuously demanded, because

“[w]ith this seeming wholesale adoption of theories from the West comes tacit acceptance of the sorts of epistemological and metatheoretical intellectual infrastructure that has been derived from philosophers and theorists with Western mindsets. […] If you compare and contrast the essential philosophical and theological works, the arts and crafts, and the great literature of the East and the West, a substantial number of obtrusive differences routinely occur. This would seem to speak against wholesale adoption, without modification, of many communication theories” (Bryan & Yang 2004, 146).

According to the writers change should be attained by establishing a routine that would challenge the adoption of communication theories “derived from Western mindsets without reconciliation of any parts of the theory or model that are not concordant with Eastern ways of knowing, thinking, symbol making, and action” (ibid.). It should be noted though that there are opposite views that demand restructuring of communication studies towards a more Western-like system. Despite the attention that the former may receive in international gatherings, institutionally, it is the latter that perhaps represents the most expansive tendency.
Finland

Finnish researchers publish mostly in Finnish and 95% of the texts produced are published in Finland. However, the surprisingly low figure concerning publishing outside Finland is slightly affected by the fact that texts published in other Nordic countries are not included in the particular data from the year 2002 gathered by Nordicom and analysed by Poteri (2004). The share of English is 19% and that of Swedish 5%. Besides them the role of other languages is minimal.

Figure 40; Language of publication (Finnish media scholars)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Finnish</td>
<td>596</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swedish</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>others</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>total</td>
<td>798</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 41; Place of publishing (Finnish media scholars)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Place</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Finland</td>
<td>760</td>
<td>95%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>outside Finland</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>total</td>
<td>798</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(both charts Poteri 2004, 2)
The book has not lost is importance as a form of publication among Finnish communication scholars. Even if unpublished masters thesis are left out, books are more popular than journal articles. The majority of the books are edited collections of articles.

Figure 42; Type of publication (Finnish media scholars)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Publication</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Monographies</td>
<td>317</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- MA thesis</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- other monographies</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Article in an edited book</td>
<td>292</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Article in a journal</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internet publication</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>total</td>
<td>798</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Poteri 2004, 3)

The most important native journals for Finnish media and communication scholars are the *Tiedotustutkimus* ja *Lähikuva*. The former journal has just this year reached its 30th volume. Its perspective is more social scientific compared to Lähikuva’s more humanistic perspective on popular and media culture.
4 Challenge of the new University Reforms

University reforms in recent years have constituted a challenge for almost all university systems around the world, redefining our sense of the established fields of human knowledge and their institutional articulations in their relationships with other social and political institutions. In their turn, these reforms have had a profound impact upon the humanities and social sciences in particular in many countries, albeit in different ways that depend upon the particular national traditions and their relationship to this globalised wave of neo-liberal reform of academia. Communication and media study and research has not been preserved from the impact of this tsunami; indeed, in many respects, it has been one of the areas of academic practice most transformed in the current conjuncture.

In this chapter we first examine some of the general coordinates of the process of university reform, in both its country specific dimensions and its overarching international logic. We then turn our attention to the impact of these transformations upon communication and media studies in select countries, arguing that the relative institutional instability and disciplinary ‘incoherence’ of the field position it on the front line of current struggles to define and redefine the role of knowledge production and scholarly research in our societies. These challenges have both negative and positive dimensions: on the one hand, the risk of an increasing instrumentalisation of academic communication and media research in the interest of short term market imperatives; on the other hand, a growing awareness of the responsibility of the field to adopt a critical perspective on its own material conditions of existence in the interests of long term acquisition and elaboration of knowledge.

The current phase of university reforms, increasing in intensity with each passing year particularly in Europe as a function of EU integration, has certain precedents, both in terms of governance strategies and the response of the scholarly community. Schlesinger argues that “the way social science has sold itself for the past couple of decades” has been the effort to “become part of the heroic effort to engage in global competition in the so-called knowledge society” (Schlesinger 2001, 179). After all, “another key purpose of doing research” is “securing funds” (ibid., 181). However, the relation has not been purely instrumental because such ideas “embed themselves in every practice and also enter deeply into our self-conceptions” (ibid., 180); in other words, they become substantial, not merely exterior or temporary compromises with unpropitious circumstances, but redefining the ‘interior’ of the research paradigm itself.
According to Schlesinger “paying lip service has by the way of repetition turned into uneasy worship” (ibid., 181).

This process is perhaps particularly noticeable in the UK. Academic research in this country today is dominated by rituals of verification and evaluation.

“The drive to continually asses us means that research prowess, in one key respect, has suffered from a goal displacement and a revaluation: it’s arguably less to do with the creation of knowledge and understanding than with demonstrating that you can meet criteria of high quality in order to generate income. [...] The audit mentality of the past two decades has had a profoundly damaging impact on ideas of academic autonomy and cycles of academic creativity” (ibid.).

The Research Assessment Exercise (RAE) “has made more academics produce more publications more efficiently” and “redefined for us what it is to be an academic and what constitutes valued intellectual practice”. At the same time, it has “badly injured collegial behaviour, induced paranoia, insecurity, fear and anxiety” (ibid., 181-182).

Since the 1990s “economic efficiency” has became the key word of higher education politics also in Germany. The economic rationalisation of the higher education agenda was enforced by the trends summarised under the concept of “New Public Management” (NPM), originating in the United Kingdom, New Zealand and Australia. The core of the neoliberal New Public Management approach is the introduction of management instruments from the private sector into public organisations.

“Posed a bit cynically, the new question was thus: How can the public be reassured that the quality of German higher education is assured if public funding declines and the participation rates increase?” (Göztepe-Çelebi et al. 2002, 13).

Yet to consider all this just from the perspective of cost saving (and the opportunities it creates for conservative roll-backs) would be short sighted. As Torsten Bultmann has noted (1996, 346), a new articulation between individual behaviour in education, universities and their resources, as well as the neoliberally regulated markets, is currently being constructed. As a result,
“students must, for example, calculate the future ‘returns’ of their student fees more exactly; they thus must necessarily think more seriously about the job market and established social career patterns. This mechanism is even further strengthened if, as can be assumed, the majority of them will be able to raise their student fees only by means of credit mechanisms of pre-financing, almost as an anticipation of future earnings” (ibid., 347).

These changes in the dispositif of universities can also paradoxically strengthen some established features. As Bultmann again notes,

“To the extent that elements of political direction of Hochschule tasks, be it via parliaments or ‘interest-pluralistic’ groups, are relativised in their function of determining goals in favour of moments of economic self-regulation, this means above all a strengthening of groups that traditionally, at any rate, have authoritatively decided about scientific courses: consequently, what is released is merely mechanisms of strengthened self-identification of the ‘scientific community’ in their trusted paradigms” (ibid., 349).

Stated in other words, what we have here again is the “old boys network” (ibid., 35). Despite the rhetoric of liberalisation and new opportunities, the result of recent reforms has more often than not been the consolidation of existing power divisions within academic institutional structures.

A clear example of this process is provided by the conjuration of the notion of “elite universities”, particularly important in the German process of reforms but also noticeable in other continental countries such as Belgium and the Netherlands and, further afield, even in the traditionally egalitarian Australian higher education system. Hectic competition between the universities over the status of “elite university” and the money that comes with it began in Germany in Autumn 2006. More than 70 universities all over Germany with over 300 projects participated in this first preliminary round. In this first round of the so-called excellence initiative two technical universities (TU München and TU Karlsruhe) and one ‘full’ university (Ludwig-Maximilians-Universität in Munich) achieved the coveted elite status. However, after the announcement of the results of this first round in January 2007, 35 universities with 96 projects could still continue into the second round. Rapidly prepared and polished new applications (incidentally, written once again in English) had to be handed in by April. Besides that, 26
universities produced 44 applications in the competition concerning the best graduate schools. 28 universities or high schools with 40 projects are competing to attain the status of the best excellence cluster that binds together universities, outside institutions and companies (Finetti 2007b). In the first round applications “those from the humanities and social sciences hardly had a chance” in this competition (Nida-Rumelin 2006).

In any case, the state financing of the universities will be much more selective than before. The strong ones will be stronger and the weaker will be weakened. Here it is not just a question of the 1.6 billion Euro of the Excellence competition but also of linking the public financing more closely to “performance criteria”, not least in the search for external funding. Part of the picture is that the successful universities will be able to choose their own students while the ”losers” have to deal with the rest. It has been said that

“practically, according to experiences from the elite higher education institutions in other countries, that means above all one thing: in the first place, the children of the bourgeoisie and other ‘educationally oriented’ social strata will study at the elite and research universities, due to their better achievements (thanks to essentially more favourable learning conditions) and due to selection criteria related to personality” (Hartmann 2006).

The German situation also provides a clear example of the impact of privatisation and the introduction of student fees, a movement that has been underway in other countries, particularly the UK and Australia, for some time now. Studiengebühre (student fees) were also introduced in Germany in Autumn 2006. The way for its political implementation was opened by decision of the Bundesverfassungsgericht two years ago (see Bultmann 2005). In the Spring of 2007 already more than half, i.e. more than one million of the 1.9 million German higher education students, were paying for their studies. In Autumn 2006 the effect was a reduced number of students. It is probable that this trend will continue (Finetti 2006a).

However, it has been claimed that the most important effect of the student fees is not so much that it will make entrance to higher education more difficult.
“That will also be the case – the higher the student fees, the more difficult will it be [for people from lower socio-economic backgrounds] – but more important is another point, usually neglected: the differentiation of the fee amounts” (Hartmann 2006).

Hartmann here touches upon a crucial but often neglected issue. The universities that emerge as winners from the current competition for elite status will indeed be able to select the social background of their students not only through the academic selection procedure, but directly, according to the amount of the student fees. Students will be encouraged to regard their University studies as an “investment in oneself” and the student should consider her- or himself as an “Ich-AG” (cf. Bultmann 2005; Achelpöler 2005), which could be translated into English as me inc. At the same time, the differentiation of fee amounts will create distinctions within and between disciplines, fields and research programmes in the university. A relative ‘new comer’ such as communication and media studies, despite its seemingly promising position of social prestige and ‘cutting edge’ technological status, may find itself once more relegated to a institutional corner by such market hierarchies internalised and transmuted into new forms of academic power and competition between research paradigms.

The third important recent development since 2006 in Germany has been the so-called Föderalismusreform, the reform of federalism in higher education. In practice, this aims to dispense with the federal Hochschulrahmengesetz regulating higher education (see Finetti 2007c). It would mean “leaving behind the principle of co-operative federalism operative until now” and is predicted to produce “dramatic consequences” (Viotto 2007). The goal of creating common formal and qualitative standards in higher education in Germany, or to put it in another way, the goal of creating equal living standards in higher education, recedes into the background. This occurs despite the fact that in international comparisons the quality of German higher education units, standardised at least to a certain extent, has been assessed more as an asset. However, these developments were anticipated by Bultmann when he wrote that “the production of an unequal environment among institutions of higher education is precisely the declared goal of direction by market imperatives” (1996, 349).

There also seems to be an interesting tension between these inner-German developments of neoliberal deregulation and the Bologna process of creating harmonised European higher

---

3 Another translation of this term, following the use of “ego” in English for Freud’s “das Ich”, would be “ego inc”. On this highly symptomatic concept of “Ich-AG” and its history in recent German political debates and social legislation, see Kleyboldt 2004.
education standards that promote mobility among university students and staff (cf. Enders 2002). The impact of this process can be observed also in Belgium. There, the Bologna reform in the curricula (from a four year track to a five year track) has caused restrictions within the universities. The Flemish universities are under pressure to seek external funding for new projects, and this has stiffened the criteria for employing researchers (international peer-review publications carry more weight than before; also number of PhD students and research projects counts, whereas earlier one could make a career on individual publications). For smaller countries, the drive to ‘competitiveness’ is in fact making it harder to compete.

Also in Finland the advance of Neo-Liberalism in higher education policy was apparent already in beginning of the 1990s; the title of Marja Alestalo’s article in the journal Science Studies was aptly titled “The Rise of Neo-Liberalism in Finland: From the Politics of Equal Opportunity to the Search for Scientific Excellence” (1993). From the 1960s through until the end of the 1970s, there occurred a period of very rapid, geographically decentralised growth of Finnish higher education. Developing welfare and deepening democracy were important policy objectives for science management at that time. In the 1980s the focus was on technology policy and basic research supporting it. Since the end of the 1980s the national innovation system, i.e. the state managed linking of science and technology for supporting the competitiveness of the Finnish companies on international markets, became the dominant goal. This policy has meant the tighter linking of the Finnish universities to the national innovation system and increasing competition for state managed resources between universities, departments and individual scholars.

Lest it be thought that these developments are confined to the European Union integration process or the ‘mature’ neo-liberal heartland of the Anglophone world, it is instructive to observe the situation in East Asia. The university system in Japan has also been undergoing a thorough reorganization. Starting from the academic year 2004, two national universities were made into “independent administrative institutions”. Previously they had been directly under the control of The Ministry of Education, Culture, Sports, Science and Technology (MEXT). At the same time, universities under local governments were also given the option to make similar changes, while private schooling institutions, including private universities, also began restructuring their organizations. The university reform of 2004 provided the universities with more independence and the possibility to define allocation of funding themselves. Universities issue 6-year plans to the ministry and are externally evaluated after the six-year period. Future funding is defined based on external evaluation. Although the budget is still executed for one fiscal year, the universities
have the option to shift funding to the next year, providing that the project in question continues. Should the universities have surplus funds due to increases in self-revenue or expenditure reductions, under special conditions, it is possible for the universities to allocate the surplus funds to uses stated in advance in the 6-year plan (MEXT 2003). As the national university funding system is not tied to the numbers of graduating students (like in Finland), the amount of master’s degree and doctoral students has recently been cut. The amount of faculty positions in the field is not increasing and job prospects for those with doctoral degrees in particular are grim.

Compared to such disciplines as Philosophy, Latin, Philology, etc., Communication and Media Studies are perhaps not so much in danger because of its reproductive function for the labour force. “Communication and Media Studies, since the beginning of their expansion in the 1970s, has been appreciated primarily for its achievements in educating new recruits”, writes Jarren (2002, 2). But while, on the one hand, “the discipline is still legitimated above all by its competence in providing education and training for media professions”, on the other hand fewer and fewer professors nowadays have experience of working in the media, which may produce some “potential for conflict” (Meyen 2004, 204). Yet according to Jarren, “there is a lack of fundamental research”.

“I think that the research achievement on public communication as a total achievement of the discipline is not very high, at least in regards to what you can call the fundamental or theory-relevant research. [...] the discipline still has a way to go in the research field if it wants to have a noticeable voice in the concert of the (social) scientific disciplines and to claim university status” (2002, 2).

However, starting from the idea of the “unity of research and teaching”, Jarren also comes to the conclusion that “there is also a lack of political or business-oriented research and advisory institutions of any weight” (ibid.). He obviously means that such “advisory institutions of any weight” cannot be attained without investment in basic research. It remains to be seen what kind balance or imbalance the new developments in higher education will produce in this respect; yet the prospects for a broad and intensive development of basic research do not look very favourable. Indeed, nowadays also in Communication and Media studies there is a “struggle over securing resources which at the moment is occurring in almost all institutions” (Rössler 2004, 19).
This situation will undoubtedly have an impact upon the capacity of communication and media studies to reproduce itself in generational terms.

The impact of the university reforms has been wide reaching, particularly in the humanities and social sciences, which find it harder to adopt to market imperatives than disciplines more directly linked to technical procedures of production and consumption of commodities. The result of this transformation of the institutions of knowledge and education in our society, conducted under the aegis of freedom, autonomy and growth, has arguably been a contraction, great degree of constraint upon intellectual research programmes and, institutionally, a reduction in autonomy. Many trained “researchers” (i.e. holders of PhDs or Habilitationen) today rarely have the time to conduct any real independent research, in comparison to the growth of administrative tasks and teaching loads that have accompanied the stream lining processes. It is always someone else who holds the keys (i.e. the money) that open the way to the time necessary for autonomous research projects, leading to increasing frustration for individuals and an anti-collegial competitiveness for scarce resources collectively. While some voices in the field of communication and media research confidently assume that it will remain immune to the worst excesses of the new system, other perspectives remind us of the precarious position occupied by the still young enterprise. Communication and media research is caught in a difficult position between conflicting short term demands and an ethics of responsibility to the longer term perspective of its own growth and consolidation. As Carlsson argues,

“An attunement of research to the agendas – and even the interests – of external financiers (‘marketization’), and furthermore, new structures for higher education have thrust scientific enquiry into a period of change. Research tends to be more administrative, and short-term perspectives prevail – at the expense of the long-term accumulation of knowledge. The pressures at play in this overall trend may well have more far-reaching consequences for a relatively ‘new’ field of research like media and communication than in older and more established disciplines” (Carlsson 2005, 543).
5 Conclusion: Future Challenges and Opportunities

We began this report by noting the great institutional success of communication and media studies and research in recent years (cf. chapter 1). We immediately noted, however, that despite this success – or rather, perhaps precisely connected to it – this area of scholarly activity lacks any clear scientific identity. Neither ‘discipline’ nor even clearly demarcated ‘field’, communication and media research seems to have been placed under a permanent question mark, even by its most able practitioners. Nordenstreng provides a characteristically reflective note:

“I have mixed feelings about this success story. My second thought – more and more even the first one – is that the field, with all the expansion and diversity, runs the risk of becoming professionally self-centred and scientifically shallow” (Nordenstreng 2007, 219).

For Ulla Carlsson, long active in NORDICOM and with a good overview of Nordic research, communication and media research

“is variegated in the extreme, and few syntheses embrace the field as a whole. The field is broad, specialities are many, with new ones appearing from time to time. Witness the proliferation of commercialized journals! Indeed, the field can give the impression of incoherence. Specialization, which is not always solidly founded in theory or methodology, may cause the field to disintegrate into small groups, each a discursive community unto itself. Members’ credibility within the community increases, all the while their work is marginalized in relation to the research community at large” (Carlsson 2005, 545).

Must we therefore conclude that contemporary communications and media research is constituted, as Karl-Erik Rosengren has provocatively suggested, by “a number of isolated frog ponds with no friendly croaking between the ponds” (Rosengren 1993, 9)? Or can we not rather detect some similarity and unity between the developments of this ‘discourse’, ‘institution’, ‘articulated field’, or, as we argued in chapter 2, ‘hegemonic apparatus’, across the world?
Our review of the varying situations in the different countries studied in specific reports would seem to confirm that communication and media research is only united in its distinction from itself. The field “does not possess any profile that is generally acknowledged from within” (McQuail 2007, xvi); it suffers from a fundamental lack of disciplinary coherence, and it is therefore difficult to gain any clear view of the whole at an international level – if indeed such a whole does exist. For both Väliverronen (2000) and Pietilä (2005), the rapid growth of media and communication studies has been characterised by it dispersion into co-existing – but not so much fiercely competing – strands of research. In Finland, according to Väliverronen (2000, 87), the older generation seem to be content to leave behind the paradigm struggles of the 1970s, while a younger generation of researchers concentrates on cultivating its own specialised fields of expertise. The university political pragmatism and the administrative identity that accompanies it have been strengthened considerably since the 1990s and the various departments of media and communication research have created a common network as well as common PhD research programmes in many countries. Particularly in Finland, the field has grown steadily as there has been increasing demand for qualified work force in the media (ibid.). As we have observed in the preceding chapters, a similar story can be told, with nationally specific characteristics and variations, regarding many other countries.

‘Disciplinary coherence’, that is, has been created primarily by ‘institutional’ rather than intellectual or scholarly means, with varying means depending upon the specific field of existing forces out of which communication and media studies emerges. In its turn, this institutional coherence has then been comprehended in a speculative fashion, mistaking effects for causes, and a self-image of the research programme is then reflected, or retrospectively constituted, back across the distinct practices and perspectives that can now be regarded as ‘unified’. Pietilä captures something of the complex dialectic movement that at decisive historical moments has checked a tendency to ‘infinite regress’ and solidified communication and media studies into a manageable field of intellectual activity and institutional arrangements.

“Academic institutes in different parts of the world have guaranteed the field’s survival as a social institution, but at the same time it has become, cognitively, more dispersed than ever. This dispersal has occurred despite the fact that there have been periods when a given cognitive form has seized a hegemonic position, as with the spread of American behavioural mass communication research in the 1950s and 1960s. These centrifugal
tendencies have, now and then, prompted the field’s representatives to demand that the field be rendered more coherent or, in other words, institutionalized cognitively on a higher level” (Pietilä 2008, 218).

If we consider the international and national developments depicted in the previous chapter, what are the current prospects for communication and media research? It seems to us that the reduced autonomy of researchers will necessarily lead to further reduction in the very ‘basic’ or ‘fundamental’ research that could help to initiate another positive phase of the dialectical movement described by Pietilä. Paradoxically, focusing on short term and instrumental projects may have the effect of increasing, rather than diminishing, the lack of disciplinary coherence of the field. In the absence of an internally derived intellectual unity, motivated by the identification and valorisation of genuine intellectual problems held in common by researchers, the relative level of coherence necessary for the day to day functioning of academic departments and research programmes will once more be provided by ‘external’ institutional forces. As we have seen in this report, this is occurring both on the national level, through the different national traditions derived from the past, and at an international level, by means of the imposition of common neoliberal programmes of ‘governance’. Only a dedicated project of critical ‘basic’ research into the fundamental presuppositions of communication and media studies would be able to check this ‘infinite regress’; but it is precisely that which, in the current political and institutional conjuncture, seems to be lacking (cf. critical remarks on this dimension in Wissenschaftsrat 2007, 75; Donsbach 2006, 447).

There are indeed other ‘countertendencies’ that might check this process and provide some – albeit tentative and temporary – unity to the disparate activities conducted under the name of communication and media research. One of this might be the relatively international unity progressively gained through the continuing ‘Anglo-Americanisation’ of publishing practices. Such a *lingua franca*, however, as we have seen, is no guarantee of the disciplinary coherence for which practitioners in the field are searching. Indeed, it is the very heterogeneity of the ‘Anglophone’ itself that is one of the most noticeable elements of this report; to a much greater extent than, for example, France or Germany, communication and media research in the Anglophone countries exists as an uneasy *modus vivendi* between very different approaches. Another countertendency might be regarded as the unification of ‘social scientific’ and ‘humanistic’ perspectives on communication and media, thereby overcoming some of the most
divisive methodological issues that characterise different research traditions, often in the same national formation. However, such a process has to a certain extent already occurred, as Carlsson notes; rather than overcoming divisions, its result was to transfer them to another level, unresolved but dormant. Carlsson argues that

“The ‘cultural turn’ represented a development that brought social scientists and their colleagues in the humanities closer. Scholars in the field increasingly trained their focus on the roles media play in cultural processes, on the media’s potential to create meaning in a broader sense, and on the adaptation of media messages to modes of understanding commonly applied to cultural phenomena. Nowadays it is no longer always easy to tell the difference between work in the two traditions. The concept of text became central in almost every sense of the word. We may speak of a process of hybridization in some regions of the field. The ‘cultural turn’ has had a far stronger impact on media studies than on many other fields” (Carlsson 2005, 544).

However, she continues arguing that

“The outcome … has not been greater unity of focus, but rather the opposite, and in retrospect we may ask: in an era when issues relating to the power and morality of media institutions were more urgently important than ever before, where were the social scientists – why were they so quiet? Was it because they were busy pursuing consensus in the field, or was it because of ‘marketization’? For a young discipline in which most researchers nowadays have their background solely in media and communication research and where contacts with early media research and work in neighbouring disciplines are few, ‘trends’ can have an exceedingly strong impact and may lead to widespread conformism. Some critics have lamented the lack of historical perspectives in much of contemporary media and communication research. The wheel has been reinvented, time and again. Researchers tend to develop a nose for trends and for what is politically correct. In this way, it is entirely possible for a field of research to be characterized at once by conformism and multidisciplinarity or, perhaps more aptly, eclecticism” (Carlsson 2005, 544-545).
This topic of conformism, this ‘other side of the coin’ when it comes to self-reflection, has been noted also by other scholars who have characterized the Nordic scene as displaying a “tendency toward conformity which”, quite remarkably, “fully equals the conformity we observe in the media” (Ekcrantz 1998, 13). Some even speak in disparaging terms of a “conformist mentality” (Kivikuru 1998, 7). According to Väliverronen, those features that have been regarded as weaknesses of the field (relatively unestablished and weak scientific identity, very strong and flexible relation to practice, division into several independent sub-fields, eclecticism and location on the no-man’s-land between humanities and social sciences) may in fact have been beneficial for its growth and accommodation to the new research culture characterised by the stress on applied research (Väliverronen 2000, 89-91): a case of ‘anything goes’.

In our opinion, the alternative to this ‘lack of clarity’ in the field is for contemporary communication and media scholars to accept the challenge – and the opportunity – of the need for basic, theoretical research, reflecting on the primary determinants of communication in the widest sense in its role as a constitutive element of modern society. The materials gathered in this study provide enough evidence that the short-term pressures and temptations to compromise in instrumentalist versions of scholarly inquiry are many. Equally, however, a closer analysis of the different constellations in which communications and media studies is conducted in each of the countries treated here and internationally has indicated that they are not written in stone: they are the historical products of identifiable political and social processes. The critique of these processes, including the proposition of alternative forms of institutional organisation and paradigms of intellectual investigation, is a legitimate and necessary element of the overall field of forces that go to make up communication and media studies and research in its present form. Carlsson provides some valuable initial methodological guidelines for the commencement of such a project, necessary collective in form and unfinished in nature. She argues that

“what we need is a good dose of critical self-examination, where we consider the relevance of the questions we formulate, where we are more judicious in our choice of theoretical perspectives and more conscious of the ontological and epistemological underpinnings of the methods at hand, and that we evaluate the validity of our findings and the conclusions we draw from them. The overall objective must be to enable our research field to answer questions about the role of media with regard to the distribution
of power and influence in our societies, in addition to questions relating to media content and the role of media in everyday life” (Carlsson 2005, 545-546).

These questions relating to the role of media and its contents in everyday life are not mere ‘sociological’ additions to the properly ‘hard core research programme’ of day to day work in the field. On the contrary, it is precisely in these everyday practices that the role of media and communication research with regard to the distribution of power and influence in our societies is realized. As a ‘hegemonic apparatus’, or a field of conflicting forces and organisational forms, communication and media studies performs an eminently practical role, as a mode of comprehension of some of the basic processes and fundamental institutions of modern social life. We hope to have made a case in this report for the necessity to transcend the stale division between (underfinanced and often devalorised) “basic research” and (administratively oriented) “applied research”, or between “theoretical” and “empirical” approaches, in order to recommence the project of elaborating practically relevant communication and media studies, in the inspiring words of Gripsrud, as a genuine ‘theory of society worthy of the name’ (Gripsrud 1998, 22) and adequate to our times.
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