

FULL PAPER

**100 years communication study in Europe:
Karl Bücher's impact on the discipline's reflexive project**

**100 Jahre Kommunikationswissenschaft in Europa:
Karl Büchers Einfluss auf das reflexive Projekt der Disziplin**

Thomas Wiedemann, Michael Meyen & Iván Lacasa-Mas

Thomas Wiedemann, Institut für Kommunikationswissenschaft und Medienforschung, Ludwig-Maximilians-Universität München, Oettingenstr. 67, 80538 München, Germany; Contact: [wiedemann\(at\)ifkw.lmu.de](mailto:wiedemann@ifkw.lmu.de)

Michael Meyen, Institut für Kommunikationswissenschaft und Medienforschung, Ludwig-Maximilians-Universität München, Oettingenstr. 67, 80538 München, Germany; Contact: [meyen\(at\)ifkw.lmu.de](mailto:meyen(at)ifkw.lmu.de)

Iván Lacasa-Mas, Departamento de Ciencias de la Comunicación, Universitat Internacional de Catalunya, Immaculada, 22, 08017 Barcelona, Spain; Contact: [lacasa\(at\)uic.es](mailto:lacasa(at)uic.es)

100 years communication study in Europe: Karl Bücher's impact on the discipline's reflexive project

100 Jahre Kommunikationswissenschaft in Europa: Karl Büchers Einfluss auf das reflexive Projekt der Disziplin

Thomas Wiedemann, Michael Meyen & Iván Lacasa-Mas

Abstract: Grounded in Giddens' structuration theory and using Bourdieu's analytical tools this paper argues that Karl Bücher's launch of Europe's first communication department at Leipzig University in 1916 had a structural impact on the discipline's development across the continent, which goes far beyond content or citations. The evaluation of the literature on the field's history reveals that Bücher was the starting point of the discipline's isomorphic structuration, since he designed the look and orientation of European communication study with large consequences on its position in the academic field. This included, first, the requirement of meta capital to implement the discipline in academia. Furthermore, the launch of communication study was also strongly linked to the socio-political climate and the ongoing media expansion. Consequently, the practical application was the most important orientation pattern for a long time. However, to get recognition at university, the discipline finally had to focus on purely academic approaches. All these dimensions were already on the map when the discipline's institutionalization process in Europe began 100 years ago. Therefore, Bücher's launch of the communication department at Leipzig University can still be considered as a key element of the field's reflexive project.

Keywords: History of the field, communication study in Europe, Karl Bücher, structuration, reflexivity, Giddens, Bourdieu

Zusammenfassung: Gestützt auf Giddens' Strukturierungstheorie und die Analysewerkzeuge Bourdieus argumentiert dieser Beitrag, dass Karl Büchers Gründung des Leipziger Instituts für Zeitungskunde (der ersten kommunikationswissenschaftlichen Einrichtung an einer Universität in Europa) im Jahr 1916 einen strukturellen Einfluss auf die Entwicklung der Disziplin auf dem ganzen Kontinent hatte, der weit über Inhalte oder Zitationen hinausgeht. Die Analyse der Literatur zur Fachgeschichte zeigt, dass Bücher Gestalt und Ausrichtung der Kommunikationswissenschaft als Universitätsdisziplin in Europa vorzeichnete – mit weitreichenden Konsequenzen für ihre Position im wissenschaftlichen Feld. Dieser strukturelle Einfluss beinhaltete zunächst die Notwendigkeit von beträchtlichem Metakapital, um entsprechende Fachinstitute an der Universität zu verankern. Außerdem stand die Gründung der Disziplin immer in enger Beziehung zum soziopolitischen Klima der Zeit und zum Stand der Medienentwicklung. Wenig überraschend stellte demzufolge die praktische Anwendbarkeit lange das wichtigste Orientierungsmuster dar. Um jedoch als eigenes Feld wahrgenommen zu werden, musste die Kommunikationswissenschaft schließlich auf wissenschaftliche Anerkennung setzen. All diese Dimensionen waren bereits auf dem Tisch,

als der Institutionalisierungsprozess der Disziplin in Europa vor 100 Jahren begann. Büchers Gründung des Instituts für Zeitkunde in Leipzig kann somit immer noch als Kernelement des reflexiven Projekts Kommunikationswissenschaft gelten.

Schlagwörter: Fachgeschichte, Kommunikationswissenschaft in Europa, Karl Bücher, Strukturierung, Reflexivität, Giddens, Bourdieu

1. Scope

At first glance, there is nothing left of the European field's first university institute founded by Karl Bücher (1847–1930) at Leipzig University in 1916. Needless to say, in Leipzig, there is still an institute dedicated to media and communication research. This is the place where the German national communication association celebrated its 2016 annual conference on '100 years Communication Study in Germany: From a Specialty to an Integrating Discipline.' As it seems, there is a continuous line between Karl Bücher and the current scientific community, which even includes the Third Reich and the German Democratic Republic (GDR) where political interests moulded the discipline (cf. Simonson & Peters, 2008).

However, beyond anniversaries and the need to be legitimized by tradition, Karl Bücher, his doctoral students in *Zeitungskunde* (newspaper studies), and his early successors in *Zeitungswissenschaft* (newspaper science, the early German term for communication study) such as Erich Everth (professor in Leipzig from 1926 to 1933), Emil Dovifat (professor in Berlin from 1926 to 1959), or Karl d'Ester (professor in Munich from 1924 to 1953) are forgotten. They are not being cited any more, and today's students do not even know what these distant ancestors were dealing with. Of course, beginning in the mid-1950s, the shift to an empirical social scientific discipline changed terminology, theories, research objects, and methods (cf. Löblich, 2007). For empirical oriented European communication scholars, the US became the most important point of reference. Additionally, and this applies not only to Germany either, the distance to the field's ancestors was amplified by communication study's historiography, which focuses on intellectual origins (cf. Hardt, 2001; Park & Pooley, 2008; Peters, 1986, 1999; Rogers, 1997), on "milestones" (Lowery & DeFleur, 1983), on edited collections of key or canonic texts (cf. Katz et al., 2003; Peters & Simonson, 2004), and on biographical myths about the founding fathers (such as Carl Hovland, Harold D. Lasswell, Paul F. Lazarsfeld, and Kurt Lewin) that also have been criticized as "thin hagiography" (Pooley & Park, 2008, p. 4) and 'great-men-make-history' tales (cf. Löblich & Scheu, 2011; Simonson, 2008). These approaches hardly reveal analogies in the conceptual work of installing a new discipline in academia. More precisely, except for the recognition of Wilbur Schramm's performance at Iowa, Illinois, and Stanford (cf. Chaffee & Rogers, 1997; Rogers, 1997), institutional aspects are still a blind spot in the history of the field, especially in Europe. This also includes the research on the continent's first institution builder Karl Bücher, which both in the German context (cf. Kutsch, 1997, 2002a, 2002b, 2010; vom Bruch, 1980) and at international level (cf. Hardt, 2001, pp. 99–131) emphasizes his intellectual assumptions, whereas his institutional work at Leipzig

University is, with few exceptions (cf. Koenen, 2016a; Wilke, 2016), broadly neglected.

This paper pleads for reconsidering Bücher's role and assumes that his launch of the Leipzig institute had an impact on the discipline's branch that goes far beyond specific content or citations – not only in Germany, but also in Europe. Grounded in Anthony Giddens' structuration theory, we argue that this impact is primarily structural. More precisely, the institutional model created by Bücher at Leipzig University is supposed to be the starting point of communication study's isomorphic structuration that designed the discipline's look and orientation around the continent with large consequences on its position in academia. To retrace these assumed structuration effects, the paper evaluates the literature on communication study's history based on Pierre Bourdieu's analytical tools of habitus, capital, and field. Where did the discipline's pioneers in Europe come from and what power resources did they have? What was the social context that afforded to the launch of communication departments at European universities and which factors were the driving forces? Moreover, what were the principles and orientations that guided the early figures' work and which strategies did they adopt to get legitimacy and to grow as an academic discipline? To make the point, were there similarities or shared features between the launch of the continent's first communication department at Leipzig University and the discipline's development? Of course, outlining Bücher's institutionalization effort and its implicit structuration effects on the European field cannot only be linked to the research on the origins of communication as an academic discipline (cf. Averbeck, 2008; Delia, 1987; Glander, 2000; Simonson & Park, 2016; Wahl-Jorgensen, 2004). It rather focuses on connections between research communities (cf. Koivisto & Thomas, 2010; Löblich & Averbeck, 2016) as well as on the field's identity (cf. Donsbach, 2006; Hardt, 2008; Pooley & Park, 2013) and contributes to its reflexivity (cf. Bourdieu, 2004; Wahl-Jorgensen, 2000; Wiedemann & Meyen, 2016) or, as Giddens (1991, p. 36) would say, to the transformation of "practical consciousness" into "discursive consciousness."

To meet these expectations, the following chapter starts with an introduction to the main sociology of science ideas that guided the analysis. Then, chapter 3 takes a closer look at the figure of Karl Bücher and provides insights into his founding of the Leipzig institute. With a chain of arguments and focusing on highlights of the discipline's development (in Germany, but also, for example, in Spain, in the Netherlands, in Belgium, in Switzerland, or in Austria), chapter 4 finally discusses the structural impact of Bücher's performance on the reflexive project of communication study in Europe. Although the geographical sweep does not allow referring to all European countries and the sometimes diverse nature of the discipline even within one region, the findings indicate that Bücher can be considered as a point of reference of communication study's collective identity – not so much because of his intellectual groundwork, but rather because of his predefinition of what the discipline was all about.

2. Theoretical background and research design

The paper starts from the sociology of science approach's implicitness that the development of an academic discipline is the product of cognitive and social parameters (cf. Kuhn, 1962; Weingart, 2003). Simultaneously, it is assumed that this development reflects the background of its most important figures and the structures they were confronted with. It is easy to link these ideas with Giddens' (1984, 1991) duality of structure concept. Giddens describes every kind of practice as an experience-based stream of behaviour, which reproduces and modifies social structures, defined as "recursively organized set of rules and resources" (1984, p. 25). Said otherwise, agents establish structures, and at the same time are constrained as well as enabled by those structures. What is more, they have a reflexive self-control and their "capacity to keep a particular narrative going" (Giddens, 1991, p. 54) is aimed at creating a continuum that serves as a "self-display" (Giddens, 1991, p. 27) and as a framework of orientation and identification. In other words, structuring properties "make it possible for discernibly similar social practices to exist across varying spans of time and space" (Giddens, 1984, p. 17). Undoubtedly, this reflexive process is also relevant for an academic discipline whose members are permanently contributing to a collective "story about the self" (Giddens, 1991, p. 54), which helps them to sort who they are, what they are dealing with, where they are coming from, and where they are going to. Moreover, it can be assumed that the need for interpreting one's own origin and structuring self-identity was particularly important for communication study, which remained barely developed and without major prestige for the most of the 20th century (cf. Abbott, 2002; Meyen, 2015) and was above all a product of external influences (cf. Glander, 2000; Pooley, 2008). Therefore, with Giddens' structuration theory, the launch of European communication study's first institute in Leipzig can be understood as a historical structure that served as an unconscious blueprint for the founding and establishment of communication departments at universities all over the continent. At this point, it is fruitful to line the argumentation with the concept of institutional isomorphism set by Paul J. DiMaggio and Walter W. Powell (1983). Referring to Giddens' structuration theory, significantly, DiMaggio and Powell argue that once a set of organizations emerges as a field, individual efforts to deal rationally with uncertainty and constraints make these organizations increasingly similar – with the aggregate effect of lessening the field's diversity. Thereby, this "inexorable push toward homogenization," which "goes largely behind the back of groups" (DiMaggio & Powell, 1983, pp. 148, 157), is explained by three isomorphic mechanisms: coercive authority stemming from influences of other organizations or expectations in society, mimetic processes resulting from standard responses and (unintentional) imitations, and normative pressures forcing the organization's members to "establish a cognitive base and legitimation for their occupational autonomy" (DiMaggio & Powell, 1983, p. 152). Of course, it can be assumed that these processes also play out in the development of an academic enterprise. Following the sociology of science approach, structuration dimensions could point to the social structure of a discipline's representatives, to stable interfaces with other disciplines or fields in

society, and to principles that guide the remit of a scientific community including the strategies of ensuring resources and reputation (cf. Kuhn, 1961; Weingart, 2003). Moreover, from the structural differentiation perspective, internal homogenization is operating in science as soon as new disciplines appear, organized between cognitive inequalities and socio-structurally identical elements (cf. Stichweh, 1994). Going back to the structuration of communication study, it is even likely that comparable mechanisms were working in all social sciences during their institutionalization (cf. Wagner et al., 1991).

To scrutinize similarities or shared features between the Leipzig institute and communication study's institutionalization in Europe, the paper draws on the analytical tools of Bourdieu (1975, 2004), who also starts from a circular relationship between subjective and objective structures. Following Bourdieu, academic practice is, at a first level, closely linked to the ruling habitus patterns (both as *opus operatum* and *modus operandi*) and the promising capital mixtures in the field. These well-known concepts refer, on one hand, to the socialized subjectivity of agents (their origin, socialization, and experience), which guides their worldview and behaviour (commitments, patterns of thought, self-concept), and describe, on the other hand, all types of (economic, cultural, social, and symbolic) power resources for a successful position in the social space. However, at a second level, the benefit of field members' habitus and capital is then determined by the structure and logic of the academic universe. Bourdieu described the scientific field as a social microcosm with hierarchies and constraints (2004, pp. 40–44), which is shaped by the “competitive struggle” for “scientific authority” (1975, p. 19) and reflects external effects from higher ranked fields that limit its autonomy.

In this spirit, assuming an implicit structuration process in the development of communication study in Europe, which already started with Bücher's launch of the Leipzig *Zeitungskunde* Institute, has to explore, first, which habitus patterns, capital mixtures, and power structures were at play when Bücher designed the continent's first communication department. Second, it has to examine whether these dimensions, at least in some key aspects, remained effective during the institutionalization process of communication study at European universities. To make it very clear at this point: According to the theoretical perspective, the goal of this paper is not to prove a direct link between Bücher's Leipzig launch and the founding and establishment of other communication departments in Europe via citations or archival references. Instead, with an extensive survey of the literature on the field's history in Europe, the paper emphasizes isomorphic structuration elements of the discipline's practical (“pre-discursive”) consciousness across the continent, which nevertheless would be, with Giddens, a strong argument for considering the field's birth in 1916 as crucial for its identity until today.

3. Karl Bücher and the foundation of the Leipzig *Zeitungskunde* Institute

The foundation of the Leipzig institute in 1916 was the last stage of Karl Bücher's professional career. Bücher was born in Kirberg (Duchy of Nassau). Despite his modest family background (his father was a brush maker), he studied history, philology, and economics at the University of Bonn and received his doctoral de-

gree in history in 1870. Having worked as an upper secondary school teacher (in Dortmund, Amsterdam, and Frankfurt) and as a freelance journalist of the *Frankfurter Zeitung*, the editor of this liberal and middle-class daily newspaper, Leopold Sonnemann, engaged him in 1878 and put him in charge of the social and economic department. There, Bücher got in touch with the economist Albert Schäffle who inspired him to strive for a position in academia. Thanks to his mentor, Bücher could soon submit a habilitation thesis (about the medieval population statistics in Frankfurt) to the economist Alphons Helferich at the University of Munich. In 1881, he received his *venia legendi* in economics and statistics, and from then on, things went rather quickly. He became professor of economics at the universities of Dorpat (1882), Basel (1883), and Karlsruhe (1890), and finally was appointed to a full professorial chair at Leipzig University in 1892 (cf. Hardt, 2001). Shortly after, he was elected dean of the philosophical faculty and rector of the university. During the first decade of the 20th century, Bücher was not only recognized as one of the leading protagonists in the field of economics (both in the German Reich and abroad), but also because of his commitment in the Royal Saxon Society for the Sciences. His reputation as a world-famous scholar attracted numerous students from all over the globe including the later socialist politicians Friedrich Stampfer and Hermann Duncker, and the later ministers of foreign affairs, Gustav Stresemann and Michail Iwanowitsch Tereschtschenko (cf. Kutsch, 2002a).

As economist, Bücher belonged to the so-called Historical School, an approach that emerged in the 19th century in Germany and regarded history as a key source of knowledge in economic matters. In this context, three points are important. First, if one follows the Historical School's reasoning that every development depends on time and space, statements about reality need to be rooted in empirical data resulting from historical research or surveying. Within this school, economics was seen as a social science establishing general laws via in-depth studies. Second, the German Historical School was normative. This included both public criticism and advice to politics and economy. Third, closely linked to that, state and government played important roles in the school's conception of economy and society. Put differently, the well-being of the community cannot be guaranteed by the market (cf. Backhaus, 2000; Pearson, 2002).

All these habitus patterns can be found in Bücher's thinking on newspapers and his conception of the *Leipzig Zeitungskunde* Institute. From the beginning of his academic career, press and journalism were part of his writing and teaching (cf. Kutsch, 2010). Yet, in 1884 he started regular lectures on this topic and developed his press statistics paradigm which inspired major follow-up studies (cf. Kutsch, 2002a). The former journalist Bücher was equally well-known for his criticism of the press. He called for the lifting of journalists' anonymity and the breaking down of the big news agencies' monopoly. He also argued against the mixing of journalistic texts and ads (cf. Meyen, 2002), which he regarded as dangerous to "the innocent reader" (Bücher, 1926a, p. 397). In this context, one should consider that Bücher's own journalistic career ended right before the rise of the mass press in Germany. Until his death, he could not understand the readers' interest in, for example, sports and local police news (cf. Meyen, 2002).

However, it is not just Bücher's experience in journalism, his academic work on the topic, and his position as a press critic that predestined him for the foundation of the field's first university institute. Furthermore, he was a pioneer of profession-oriented academic education and training (cf. Kutsch, 2002a). In his *Rektoratsrede* (directorship speech) at the University of Leipzig on 31 October 1903 he already named journalism as one of the socially highly relevant fields, which should be added to the canon of academic disciplines, and exhorted the students to serve the common good rather than Mammon (cf. Kutsch, 2002a). As a young man, he promoted a traineeship reform, and in Leipzig, he was a driving force behind the foundation of the new practice-oriented commercial college in 1898 (cf. Kutsch, 2002b).

For all these reasons, Bücher's claim for the academic training of journalists did not come unexpected. In 1909, the year of the 500th anniversary of Leipzig University, being rector again, he wrote an editorial on journalism education at university published in the *Leipziger Tageblatt*. Therein, he was against a new academic discipline, but also refused the idea that journalists just need talent. Like any other mental job, this profession would have clear rules one could learn. Consequently, Bücher (1909) proposed lectures on press history, organization, technology, and statistics as well as practical seminars held by journalists (cf. Hardt, 2001; Kutsch, 2010).

For this appeal, the *Leipziger Tageblatt* special issue on the jubilee was the perfect place of publication. With 15,000 copies read by the Saxon elites, the newspaper was small but powerful. Furthermore, the publisher of the mass-circulation competition paper *Leipziger Neueste Nachrichten*, Edgar Herfurth, donated Leipzig University 15,000 Mark for journalism research and teaching in the anniversary year (cf. Kutsch, 2002a). Probably, not only Bücher but also Herfurth knew about both the journalism schools founded at Midwestern US public universities and the Pulitzer donation on journalism education (cf. Kutsch, 2010). Even more important is the alliance for the future institute: Karl Bücher, with the capital of a world-famous economist, known as experienced journalist and long-standing press critic, and at the peak of his academic career, elected the university's anniversary rector, was backed by the leading Saxon newspapers and, therefore, by the published opinion.

This strong support from other social fields was necessary since the established academic disciplines did not see the need to initiate academic training courses and institutions for journalists in Germany. Moreover, especially the popular press was considered as a tool of national dulling not worth any research effort. Additionally, rooted in a role perception, which included advising political decision makers and stimulating debates, many scholars regarded journalists and dailies as rivals in the battle for interpreting public events. Therefore, both criticism of the press and disregard for journalists and journalistic writing style were the order of the day at German Empire universities (cf. vom Bruch, 1980). It thus hardly seems unexpected that Bücher's regular lectures on press and journalism provoked astonishment. Yet, thanks to books such as *Arbeit und Rhythmus* (Work and rhythm, six editions from 1896 to 1924) and *Die Entstehung der Volks-*

wirtschaft (The emergence of national economy; 17 editions between 1893 and 1926), his reputation was not harmed (cf. Meyen & Löblich, 2006).

When Bücher finally proposed the foundation of the Leipzig *Zeitungskunde* Institute in 1915, he was almost 70 and ready to retire. These conditions lowered the resistance against the new field of research and teaching. Bücher did not want a professorship but an old man's toy (cf. Meyen & Löblich, 2006). He had a donor (the publisher Edgar Herfurth) and new patriotic arguments drawn from the war experience. According to Bücher (1915b), the German press had failed during the first years of battle. He criticized the sensational rather than factual coverage (cf. Meyen, 2002) and claimed that this was the major reason for the animosity toward Germany in the neutral countries. In his submission to the Saxon ministry of education and cultural affairs, he proposed academic education and training of journalists as a way out of the current low level (cf. vom Bruch, 1980). Bücher's (1915a) curriculum converted the ideas outlined in the *Leipziger Tageblatt* editorial including disciplinary studies in the aspirated field of coverage (for economic editors, for example, economics, statistics, administration, law, and technology), lectures on press and journalism based on his own model, and practical training done by practitioners.

In literature on the German field's origins, there is a dispute about Bücher's true motives. The most debated issue concerns whether the Leipzig institute was just about journalism education (cf. Hardt, 2001; Kutsch, 2002a, 2002b; vom Bruch, 1980) or, further, about the foundation of a discipline (cf. Koenen, 2015a, 2015b; Meyen, 2002; Meyen & Löblich, 2006). Although Bücher (1926b) himself stressed that his initiative only aimed at creating a university-level program for the preparation of future journalists, there are good reasons for interpreting his statements as tactical in light of the pressure he was confronted with on behalf of the established disciplines. Especially the humanities at that time worried about falling behind the growing number of new specialized programs (cf. vom Bruch, 1980). Moreover, Bücher used his power resources to make the birth of this new academic enterprise go smoothly. Being aware that academic research on press and journalism would only be possible with PhD students on the subject, he got the right to award doctorates in 1921 and supervised altogether 24 dissertations based on social scientific methods (mostly surveys and statistics, but even content analyses; cf. Meyen, 2002). At all other German universities, the students of *Zeitungswissenschaft* had to wait until the Third Reich in order to graduate – if they did not want to do their exams elsewhere. Besides, although he had long been retired, Bücher launched a new publication series at the Leipzig institute (cf. Kutsch, 2002b). Additionally, against the background that in his eyes, the Leipzig colleagues in history wanted to absorb the financially well-appointed institute after his leaving (cf. Kutsch, 2002b), he started two habilitation procedures to have a promising candidate for the desired professorship. While the first procedure failed (Johannes Kleinpaul), the second was successful in 1922 (Walter Schöne). However, Leipzig's first chair holder became the journalist Erich Everth (cf. Koenen, 2015a, 2016c).

4. Isomorphic structuration effects on the European communication field

This chapter is organized into four theses. It retraces isomorphic structuration effects in institutional features and decisions during communication study's development across Europe, which were already predefined by Karl Bücher's performance at the Leipzig *Zeitungskunde* Institute. Thereby, the following perspectives are distinguished: agents (habitus as *opus operatum* and capital of the field's pioneers), surrounding social structures (configuration of the social space), research and teaching program (habitus as *modus operandi*), and reputation strategies (to get recognition as a university discipline). As said, to make the institutional argument comprehensible, the arguments focus highlights in the field's history. These highlights, however, can easily be linked to developments of academic communication research we do not mention in this paper. The fact that some national scenarios might seem overrepresented has a simple reason: The German discipline, for example, has the longest tradition, is the most differentiated around Europe and is also well-explored by the field's historiography, whereas research on the much younger history of communication study in France is still rather exceptional (cf. Averbeck-Lietz, 2010; Löblich & Averbeck-Lietz, 2016) and literature on the discipline's institutionalization in some smaller countries does not even exist.

Thesis 1 (agents): The founding of communication departments at European universities was the work of long-time professionals in fields related to public affairs (journalism, publishing, and politics) who transferred their expertise and reputation to academia. Meta capital in the public sphere (such as conduct, experience, network, and prestige) proved more useful than academic qualifications to convince decision makers of the need for a university-based research and teaching in press and journalism.

Undoubtedly, Karl Bücher's journalistic experience and his academic career in economics, but also his prestige as a well-known intellectual figure and especially his contacts to Saxon society's elite were key factors of the successful founding of the Leipzig institute, even if some scepticism on behalf of the older disciplines remained.

To stay in Germany, it is not an accident that the art historian Erich Everth also looked back on 17 years of journalism when he became Bücher's successor in 1926. Significantly, Everth had made a name for himself as chief editor of the *Leipziger Tageblatt* (cf. Koenen 2015a, 2015b, 2016b, 2016c). Except for the Munich *Zeitungswissenschaft* Institute founded in 1924 and led by Karl d'Ester who held a *venia legendi* in newspaper studies and was the German field's first full professor, all university institutes or lectureships related to press and journalism lay in hands of communication professionals at this stage. In Berlin, for example, the launch of the German Institute of Newspaper Studies (*Deutsches Institut für Zeitungskunde*) in the mid-1920s was the work of the former journalist and press officer of the Prussian ministry of culture, Martin Mohr, until Emil Dovifat, chief editor of *Der Deutsche*, the publication platform of the Christian trade union, got in charge few years later. Obviously, placing emphasis on agents with professional experience, networks, and social reputation was the best argu-

ment for university decision makers to accept a discipline dealing with press and journalism, although, as will be outlined, high-profile journalism posts did not automatically go along with academic legitimacy for the new-born discipline.

This structuration pattern becomes even clearer having a look at the discipline's reestablishment after the Third Reich when the field's recognition was at stake again and just a few one-man departments remained. Their protagonists hardly stood out because of in-depth knowledge of academic matters, but drew on practical skills and "meta capital" in the public sphere (cf. Couldry, 2012, p. 240) to ensure the discipline's further existence. Walter Hagemann became director of the Muenster *Publizistik* Institute (this was the new term for *Zeitungswissenschaft*) in 1946 thanks to his position as Catholic daily *Germania's* chief editor and his contacts in political Catholicism. Although a dissertation in history from 1922 was his only academic reference, he briefly was appointed to an extraordinary professorship and praised as the discipline's "naturally born representative" (Wiedemann, 2016, p. 116). When he left the field a decade later, the University of Muenster 'imported' the Dutch Henk Prakke, mainly renowned because of being director of the publishing house Van Gorcum. At the other two departments overcoming World War II, the strategies to find the appropriate successors of Emil Dovifat and Karl d'Estes were very similar. Appointments in Berlin and Munich show what decision makers in science policy valued most: practical experience in journalism. In Berlin, Fritz Eberhard (social democratic, general director of the public broadcasting *Süddeutscher Rundfunk*) and Harry Pross (chief editor of the broadcasting station *Radio Bremen*) were appointed in 1961 and 1968. In Munich, *Süddeutsche Zeitung's* theatre critic Hanns Braun and Catholic weekly *Rheinischer Merkur's* chief editor Otto Roegele were appointed in 1955 and 1963. In addition, going beyond habitus and capital of high-status journalists, Elisabeth Noelle-Neumann became director of the new *Publizistik* department at the University of Mainz in 1965 not so much because of her dissertation (at least within the discipline). More important was her fame as founder of the Allensbach Institute for Public Opinion Research, which helped her even to establish a number of professorships (in the same way as Roegele did in Munich; cf. Meyen, 2007).

In other European countries, the scenarios pointed out to be similar. In Switzerland, for example, during the pre-institutionalized period of communication as an academic discipline, Oskar Wettstein and Michael Bühler, who had both studied law, were active politicians and journalists, while they gave lectures of newspaper studies at the Zurich Journalistic Seminar and the University of Bern. Then, Karl Weber was the first to hold a (titular and then extraordinary) professorship of journalism in Zurich around 1940. To make this step, he benefitted from his practical knowledge as an editor of the *Basler Nachrichten* and the *Neue Zürcher Zeitung* as well as from being a member of the Swiss Press Association. Weber's successor was Siegfried Frey who had started out in journalism, too (cf. Vroons, 2005). In the Netherlands, the discipline's institutionalization process took more time. After *De Standaard's* chief editor Abraham Kuyter had pleaded for the launch of journalism studies at universities and organized early training seminars in Amsterdam from 1912 to 1916, the two journalists Antonius Johannes Lieve-

goed and Willem Nicolaas van der Hout gave journalistic lectures at the universities of Leiden and Utrecht in the 1930s. In the post-war era, the spots of inspiration were located in Amsterdam and Nijmegen. In 1948, the emigrated German journalist Kurt Baschwitz, who would found the *International Communication Gazette* in 1955 (cf. Wieten, 2005), became professor of press, propaganda, and public opinion at the Dutch Institute for the Science of the Press which belonged to Amsterdam University's Faculty of Political and Social Sciences (although it could not offer main courses for students). Ten years later, he was followed by the economist Maarten Rooij who brought in his conduct and experience as chief editor of the *Nieuwe Rotterdamse Courant*. In Nijmegen, the *Instituut voor de Katholieke Journalistiek* founded in 1947 was first headed by the journalist Hans Hermans. In 1950, it was taken over by the former Catholic daily newspaper *De Tijd's* chief editor Leo Schlichting who had studied law and held a professorship of political science. Having been rector of the university in 1960, Schlichting successfully tackled the route for the *Instituut voor Massacommunicatie* which should become a driving force for officially implementing communication study at Dutch universities in the 1980s (cf. Hemels, 2015).

Without going into details, the habitus and capital of other founding fathers of the discipline in Europe confirm our thesis: In Flanders, the Catholic University of Leuven's *Dagbladwetenschap* was the pioneer project of the Franciscan priest Nabor Devolder since 1946. At that time in Italy, Rome's *Instituto Italiano di Pubblicità* was led by the historian and man of letters, Francesco Fattorello, the Italian doyen of academic press and journalism studies. In France, the council of the *Institut Français de Presse* in Paris consisted of academic and press representatives who designed research and teaching in 1953. In Spain, Alfonso Nieto, the director of the journalism institute at the University of Navarra, used his governmental contacts to install a major during the 1960s. Ten years later, not only in Navarra but also in Madrid and Barcelona, the admission of information science faculties went along with hiring communication professionals (cf. Ribeiro, 2016), whereas academic curricula only played a secondary role and qualifications in the discipline itself were not needed at all.

Thesis 2 (structures): From its beginning, European communication study was closely linked to the socio-political climate and the ongoing media expansion. Whereas the discipline's founders argued with the societal relevance, politicians and stakeholders from the public sphere considered the field as a vehicle for their own interests (in order to influence public opinion or to meet the growing need of communication professionals). Consequently, the discipline's autonomy remained low and normative approaches were dominating.

As shown, Karl Bücher used a strong argument in his call for a university-based research and teaching of press and journalism stating an alleged failure of the German press during World War I. Accordingly, his journalism education and training had a clear mission. However, the Leipzig *Zeitungskunde* Institute's launch was also favoured by the political climate and coming social changes in Germany at that time: the looming military defeat heralding the end of the imperial era, the rise of the mass press, and a political debate on how to raise journal-

ists' effectiveness in the fight for public opinion. Another impetus for creating a communication and journalism discipline came from publishers and journalists' associations, which, again, reflects the high degree of external influences on the conception of the field.

In the US, the implementation of communication disciplines was forwarded by World War II with its interdisciplinary work on propaganda conditioned by the Rockefeller Foundation's support, military, CIA, and State Department funding (cf. Pooley, 2008). These agents also sponsored the search for effective propaganda designs in the early Cold War (cf. Glander, 2000; Simpson, 1994). Quite the same set of external effects from other social fields can be found in Europe. In Flanders, for example, the Belgian Press Union had pushed the formation of communication study already during the 1920s. Then, the social impact of the press and the urge to understand the propaganda use of media were Devolder's main arguments for justifying a discipline with the public function of journalism and ethical premises at its core (cf. Van den Bulck & Van den Bulck, 2017). As to Austria, the Vienna institute, which was created in 1942 under the rule of the Nazis, reopened in 1946. Headed by the politician Eduard Ludwig, member of the Austrian People's Party, the institute had a clear focus: the observation of press policy and the journalism education, both with the goal of strengthening democracy (cf. Thiele, 2016).

At that time in post-war Germany, the ex-journalist Walter Hagemann, motivated by the goal to equip the new generation with intellectual and professional knowledge, also pleaded for the education of journalists at university. Just like in the Austrian context, the "desperate situation of public life" would need "young people standing up for a better, real democratic, and ambitious journalism," he argued (Hagemann, 1947). Hagemann's willingness to prepare his students for professions in the public sphere had a strong ally: UNESCO's Clearing House of the Department of Mass Communication which interfered in the debate on the media's moral significance in industrial societies. In 1956, UNESCO organized an international expert meeting in Paris where the promotion of media research was recommended, referring to universities as providers of facilities for journalism education and training (cf. Vroons, 2005). Of course, UNESCO also supported the foundation of the International Association for Mass Communication Research (IAMCR) in 1957. Nevertheless, European communication study's further institutionalization had to wait one more decade until the media expansion triggered the needs for applicable knowledge, trained students, and a public debate on the societal consequences of commercial media products. This structuration effect was also operative regarding the beginning of a university-based communication discipline in the Nordic countries (cf. Pietilä et al., 1990; Slaatta, 2016) or, for example, the birth of media and communication research in the UK, even if this was not rooted in newspaper studies (cf. Lodge, 2016). In fact, besides the University of Birmingham's Centre for Contemporary Cultural Studies founded by Richard Hoggart (1964), James Halloran's establishment of the Centre for Mass Communication Research in Leicester (1966) and Jay Blumler's launch of the Centre for Television Research in Leeds (1968) were linked to broadcasting institutions. However, although researchers had diverging disciplinary back-

grounds, they shared a “concern with the social change,” and focused on “effect changes to television, to media or more broadly popular culture had on society” (Noonan & Lohmeier, 2017; cf. Blumler, 2012). As to France, sciences of information and communication (SIC), also quite distinct to the field in other European countries at first glance, were accepted as an academic discipline in 1975. Thereby, key institutionalization factors were the normative pressure and the political target to prepare universities for the so-called ‘information society.’ More precisely, the “need for practical aims in journalism training and for scientific analysis and prognosis in times of the rise of media technologies was a helpful coincidence” (Löblich & Averbek-Lietz, 2016, p. 39). As a result, in light of the post-1968 modernization and the growing media sector, the SIC were put into charge to implement education programs oriented toward communication professions and fulfilled a societal task (cf. Averbek, 2008).

Being aware of the socio-political influence on European communication study’s establishment, which also included politically motivated appointments, as the example of West Germany shows (cf. Meyen, 2007), it is not so far off to line the argumentation with parallel field developments in non-democratic systems. Whereas traditions of German *Zeitungswissenschaft* dating back to the interwar years coexisted with dominant Marxist tendencies in the more open national contexts of South Eastern Europe such as Yugoslavia (cf. Peruško & Vozab, 2016), GDR’s only Faculty of Journalism was founded in 1954 (significantly, at Leipzig University) according to the Soviet model and renamed Journalism Section as part of the higher education reform in 1969. Like in other national environments, its founding figures were renowned practitioners. Hermann Budzislawski, for example, had written for the left-wing intellectual magazine *Die Weltbühne* during the Weimar Republic, been at the head of the anti-Nazi magazine *Die neue Weltbühne* during exile in Prague, and spent several years in the US, working, among others, as a ghost writer for Dorothy Thompson, before he became the faculty’s first dean. However, GDR’s field of journalism studies was subjugated to strong interferences from the communist party that spread its concept of research on mass media and its ideas on how to educate journalists. Therefore, East German communication scholars were primarily party functionaries paid by the government to form communication professionals who would fit into the steered media (cf. Meyen, 2014). The case of Leipzig’s journalism faculty/section exemplarily stands for the discipline’s heteronomous position in the social space of socialist countries in Europe (cf. Jiráč & Köpplová, 2008), but also in Spain under the rule of Franco, the structuration scenario was similar. Influenced by Italian fascism, Madrid’s national school of journalism (*Escuela Oficial de Periodismo*) founded in 1942 was part of the media steering program guaranteeing the journalistic profession’s ideological assimilation (according to the Press Law for the control of information and communication media which converted the press into a state institution; cf. Lacasa-Mas, 2017). Not surprisingly, the before mentioned switch to information science faculties in the early 1970s and the discipline’s consolidation (cf. Alsina & García Jiménez, 2010) came along with liberalization tendencies and the country’s economic upturn. In Portugal, despite of the journalist union’s firm battle for the creation of a journalism school inside a higher edu-

cation institution, university-based education and research in the subject was not promoted by Salazar's *Estado Novo* regime. As a consequence, the first university degree in social communication (at the New University of Lisbon) was established as late as 1979, five years after the implementation of democracy. Of course, in light of the triumphal procession of audio-visual mass culture, it aimed to train any kind of professionals in the media and communication sectors (cf. Ribeiro, 2016). Whereas on the Iberian Peninsula, communication study experienced a boom after the 1970s, when democracies supplanted fascist regimes, in large parts of Eastern Europe, the discipline took off after the fall of communism and the unlocking of restrictions, another indicator for the field's interaction with social structures.

Thesis 3 (program): Besides the historical research of the press, European communication study's agenda was oriented toward practical application since the beginning. The combination of research with journalism education not only included the urge for professors and lecturers with practical experiences, but also journalistic training seminars and the permanent contact with communication professionals. Additionally, empirical studies should equip practitioners with academic knowledge.

Of course, the conception of the Leipzig *Zeitungskunde* Institute reflected Bücher's habitus and capital as an experienced journalist, an economist belonging to the Historical School, and a severe press critic, as well as the socio-political climate at that time (with an emerging belief in the potential of a communication discipline in the fight for public opinion and a better image of press and journalism). As shown, the result was a research and teaching agenda with profession-oriented journalism education and a focus on empirical studies based on social scientific methods. However, in light of the disregard for press and journalism at German universities, this practice-oriented agenda could hardly weaken the pressure Bücher was confronted with and solve the new discipline's lack of academic legitimacy.

Exactly these structuration parameters remained in vigour throughout European communication study's development during the 20th century. To start again in West Germany after World War II, the reestablishment of *Zeitungswissenschaft* as a rudimentary social scientific discipline called *Publizistikwissenschaft* was mainly the work of Walter Hagemann at Muenster University and then became a role model for the post-war field in several Western European countries (cf. Wiedemann, 2016). Although Hagemann did not give up historical perspectives, his habitual performance was, above all, marked by the effort to increase the discipline's practical application. The classes at the *Publizistik* Institute should prepare the students for future positions in the public sphere. Moreover, to establish a link between theory and practice, Hagemann used his contacts and encouraged networking (arranging, among others, internships and trainings to come from press professionals). His research program was aimed at reconnecting the *Publizistikwissenschaft* to social sciences (especially sociological perspectives had gotten lost during the Third Reich; cf. Averbeck, 2001) and underlining its practical relevance regardless of the astonishment he provoked within the traditional disciplines. Ten years before Elisabeth Noelle-Neumann finally converted West Ger-

man communication study into a social scientific discipline (cf. Löblich, 2007), Hagemann already led some empirical studies, mostly content analyses and surveys, as well as a press statistic which critically scrutinized concentration processes (cf. Wiedemann, 2016).

In East Germany, the design of Leipzig's Faculty/Section of Journalism was oriented toward practical matters, too. Whereas (critical) research played a minor role due to primacy of politics, teaching was focused on journalism education, which required recruiting personnel more in light of professional needs than with the goal of achieving academic input. In addition to the main courses including journalistic methodology and stylistics, journalism training was established in 1969, which lasted up until the section's closure in 1990. The initiator of lessening the curriculum's overload with history was Emil Dusiska. He had belonged to the communist party's mouthpiece *Neues Deutschland's* leadership in the 1950s, was appointed full professor in 1965, and became section director two years later.

In the non-socialist countries, with the ongoing diversification of the media system and further media expansion during the 1970s, the orientation toward practical matters became even more significant. Besides the discipline's general growth (being mainly the consequence of the high number of students and the demands for applicable knowledge), this period was marked by the broader establishment of journalism training at universities, which had also been on the agenda of IAMCR since its beginning (cf. Nordenstreng, 2008). Whereas the field's link to the education of communication professionals abated in the 2000s particularly in Germany, Austria, Belgium, the Netherlands, and Scandinavia (as will be shown, a consequence of the discipline's search for purely academic recognition), this remit is still characteristic in Southern Europe. In line with the early information science faculties in Spain offering journalism, advertising, and public relations degrees (cf. Barrera, 2012), there are, for example, 50 Spanish universities today with communication programs targeted on the formation of journalists, PR editors, consultants, and media managers. Apparently, this practice-oriented conception of the discipline with curricula that are more focused on the ability to find and prepare information rather than on classic academic skills corresponds to the wishes of both media industry and university administrations (cf. Fernández-Quijida & Masip, 2013).

Thesis 4 (reputation): Whereas at the beginning, meta capital in the public sphere and satisfying political or economic demands proved useful to launch European communication study at universities, in a second state, only a shift to academic legitimacy strategies was appropriate to get recognition as a distinct disciplinary field on the road to more autonomy.

Although there is no final evidence that Karl Bücher wanted to found a new discipline, his performance at the Leipzig institute was not only about enhancing professional knowledge. In light of the established disciplines' scepticism toward a new practice-oriented field of research and teaching in the area of press and journalism, Bücher tried to increase the *Zeitungskunde's* reputation by following the academic logic. As outlined, this included, among others, his successful struggle for the right to award doctorates and his supervising two dozen empirical dissertations.

Not only in the US but also in Europe, communication study was the late-comer of social sciences (cf. Meyen, 2015). Whereas sociology, economics, anthropology, psychology, and political science were institutionalized in the first half of the 20th century, the discipline needed the ongoing media expansion and the students' growing interest for its implementation as an academic field. Nevertheless, due to the strain on resources, the emphasis on practical training, and the threat of co-optation by commercial interests, its status in the struggle for authority at universities remained contested (cf. Lodge, 2016) and its founding fathers' meta capital definitely could not solve this problem, either. Put otherwise, external contexts and expertise, first, were crucial in getting communication departments launched and receiving the necessary outside funding. But, after having formed these 'beachheads' at universities, post-establishment survival and growth required a clear focus on academic reputation and a de-emphasis on the practical orientation that motivated the original enterprise. More concretely, although communication study always had to justify its existence via the "employability" agenda within teaching and the impact agenda within research (Thornham & O'Sullivan, 2004), the path to more recognition was mapped along intellectual emancipation instead of embracing politicians and practitioners. To mention just the example of West Germany again, *Publizistikwissenschaft* only solved its legitimation crisis by the shift to an empirical social science importing mainstream US mass communication research and drawing on quantitative methods and sophisticated data analysis (cf. Löblich, 2007). This orientation, which became the field's key identity element in many European countries, promised a "defence against the possible suspicion by higher levels of academic review" and a personal security for the newcomers at universities (Meyen, 2012, p. 2389). The exceptions here include journalism study in Eastern Europe rooted in Marxist-Leninist traditions, British cultural studies with its focus on power, the discipline's post-semiotic or semio-pragmatic design in France, and the Southern European concept of communication study being primarily a technical, skills-, or service-oriented discipline. Anyway, besides the right to award doctorates, the launch of book series and peer-review journals as well as, more recently, efforts that increase competitiveness via international visibility were isomorphic strategies to receive academic reputation and to upgrade the position in the scientific field. The latter (competitiveness at international level) puts some national fields (especially the Dutch, the Belgian, and the Scandinavian) on the fast track of academic growth. Speaking more generally, this structuration effect refers to a habitual process, during which the university transforms its invader in its own image over time.

5. Conclusion

The section above leaves no need for an extended summary. Grounded in Giddens' structuration theory and using Bourdieu's analytical tools, the paper makes an institutional argument and links Karl Bücher's launch of Europe's first communication department at Leipzig University in 1916 with the field's institutionalization across the continent. It reveals that the discipline's design and focus were, in certain key aspects, already predefined by Bücher' *Zeitungskunde* Insti-

tute 100 years ago. In other words, the legacy of Bücher as a pioneer in European communication study is not so much the influence of his ideas or those of his successors. Instead, it is his role as an institution-builder, since the structural model he created in Leipzig was mimicked around the continent and, therefore, can be considered as a kind of hidden substrate of the field's organizational form. Most notably, this model included the requirement of social reputation and meta capital in the public sphere (such as press and politics-borrowed prestige and *bona fides*) in order to found and establish communication departments at universities as well as arguing with the societal need for an academic discipline that deals with communication matters and public opinion (in light of war propaganda, social movements, changes of political systems, or the development of the media landscape). Additional habitus factors were, not only in Leipzig, the combination of research with the education of journalists or communication professionals and, closely linked to that, the urge for professors with practical experience. However, since the strategy of practical application of these 'beachhead' departments was just partially appropriate to achieve a reputed position in academia, communication study finally shed its original orientation and followed the way of intellectual emancipation via purely academic approaches – a process, during which the university transformed the invader discipline in its own image over time.

Of course, arguing that these four dimensions were already on the map when the discipline's institutionalization process began 100 years ago at Leipzig University does not automatically neglect other isomorphic structuration effects deriving from unexplained shared conditions, which do not necessarily spring from Leipzig. Equally, considering that Bücher's performance served as a not remembered, rarely acknowledged key element of European communication study's "self-display" (Giddens, 1991, p. 27) does not mean that the field was always a homogeneous entity – especially when comparing the traditions of the discipline for example in France or in the UK, which are quite distinct to the Leipzig model. But interesting enough, given the challenges of installing a new discipline at university, similar structuration processes were also working in the neighbouring social sciences, where early protagonists of both political science and sociology, for example, were side-entrants to academia, received hostility at university, and had to fulfil a clear political mission for most of the 20th century, too (cf. Hartmann, 2003; Korte, 2017).

Today, communication study in Europe is not contested any more. All over the continent, it successfully tackled the route toward an autonomous discipline following its own logic of reputation, even though, as shown, it also became subject of a kind of 'academic ingestion.' Nevertheless, given the growing funding outside the academic realm and the increasing importance of external evaluation, but also further differentiation and integration processes, recent tendencies are about to change the field (cf. Wilke, 2016) – and make it even more necessary to strengthen the discipline's self-reflection. Maybe this could also give momentum to reintegrate communication study's early institution builders in the discipline's collective identity in a more explicit way. Therefore, considering Karl Bücher's structural impact on the field's reflexive project starting in Leipzig 100 years ago is the logical first step.

References

- Abbott, A. (2002). *Chaos of disciplines*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Alsina, M. R., & García Jiménez, L. (2010). Communication theory and research in Spain. *European Journal of Communication*, 25(3), 273–286.
- Averbeck, S. (2001). The post-1933 emigration of communication researchers from Germany. *European Journal of Communication*, 16(4), 451–475.
- Averbeck, S. (2008). Comparative history of communication studies. *The Open Communication Journal*, 2, 1–13.
- Averbeck-Lietz, S. (2010). *Kommunikationstheorien in Frankreich* [Communication theories in France]. Berlin: Avinus.
- Backhaus, J. G. (Ed.) (2000). *Karl Bücher*. Marburg: Metropolis.
- Barrera, C. (2012). Transatlantic views on journalism education before and after World War II. *Journalism Studies*, 13(4), 534–549.
- Blumler, J. G. (2012). There are values at stake. *International Journal of Communication*, 6, 1498–1506.
- Bourdieu, P. (1975). The specificity of the scientific field and the social conditions of the progress of reason. *Social Science Information*, 14(6), 19–47.
- Bourdieu, P. (2004). *Science of science and reflexivity*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Bücher, K. (29 July 1909). Vorbildung für den Journalistenberuf an deutschen Universitäten [Journalism education at German universities]. *Leipziger Tageblatt*, pp. 1–2.
- Bücher, K. (1915a). Akademische Berufsbildung für Zeitungskunde [Academic education in newspaper studies]. *Mitteilungen des Vereins Arbeiterpresse*, 16(136), 3–5.
- Bücher, K. (1915b). Krieg und Presse [War and press]. In K. Bücher, *Unsere Sache und die Tagespresse* (pp. 16–64). Tübingen: Mohr.
- Bücher, K. (1926a). *Gesammelte Aufsätze zur Zeitungskunde* [Collected writings in newspaper studies]. Tübingen: Laupp'sche Buchhandlung.
- Bücher, K. (1926b). Zeitungskunde [Newspaper studies]. *Deutsche Presse*, 16(50/51), 5–6.
- Chaffee, S. H., & Rogers, E. M. (Eds.). (1997). *The beginnings of communication study in America*. Thousand Oaks: Sage.
- Couldry, N. (2012). *Media, society, world*. Cambridge: Polity.
- Delia, J. G. (1987). Communication research. In C. R. Berger & S. H. Chaffee (Eds.), *Handbook of communication science* (pp. 20–98). Newbury Park: Sage.
- DiMaggio, P. J., & Powell, W. W. (1983). The iron cage revisited: Institutional isomorphism and collective rationality in organizational fields. *American Sociological Review*, 48(2), 147–160.
- Donsbach, W. (2006). The identity of communication research. *Journal of Communication*, 53(3), 437–448.
- Fernández-Quijida, D., & Masip, P. (2013). Three decades of Spanish communication research. *Comunicar*, 21(41), 15–24.
- Giddens, A. (1984). *The constitution of society*. Cambridge: Polity.
- Giddens, A. (1991). *Modernity and self-identity*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.
- Glander, T. (2000). *Origins of mass communication research during the American Cold War*. Mahwah: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Hagemann, W. (1947). Theorie und Praxis [Theory and practice]. *Neue Deutsche Presse*, 1(7), 1–3.

- Hardt, H. (2001). *Social theories of the press*. Lanham: Rowman & Littlefield.
- Hardt, H. (2008). Foreword. In D. W. Park & J. Pooley (Eds.), *The history of media and communication research* (pp. xi–vii). New York: Peter Lang.
- Hartmann, J. (2003). *Geschichte der Politikwissenschaft* [History of political science]. Stuttgart: Leske + Budrich.
- Hemels, J. (2015). Kommunikationswissenschaft in den Niederlanden [Communication study in the Netherlands]. In M. Meyen & T. Wiedemann (Eds.), *Biografisches Lexikon der Kommunikationswissenschaft*. Cologne: Halem. Retrieved from <http://blexkom.halemverlag.de/niederlande/>
- Jiráček, J., & Köpplová, B. (2008). Communication as an academic field. In W. Donsbach (Ed.), *The International Encyclopedia of Communication* (pp. 609–614). Malden: Blackwell.
- Katz, E., Peters, J. D., Liebes, T., & Orloff, A. (Eds.). (2003). *Canonic texts in media research*. Cambridge: Polity.
- Koenen, E. (2015a). 100 Jahre kommunikationswissenschaftliche Fachtradition in Leipzig [100 years communication study in Leipzig]. *Medien & Zeit*, 30(3), 15–31.
- Koenen, E. (2015b). Erich Everth. In M. Meyen & T. Wiedemann (Eds.), *Biografisches Lexikon der Kommunikationswissenschaft*. Cologne: Halem. Retrieved from <http://blexkom.halemverlag.de/erich-everth/>
- Koenen, E. (Ed.). (2016a). *Die Entdeckung der Kommunikationswissenschaft* [The discovery of communication study]. Cologne: Halem.
- Koenen, E. (2016b). Ein Journalist wird in Leipzig erster ordentlicher Professor für Zeitungskunde [A journalist becomes Leipzig's first chair holder of newspaper studies]. In E. Koenen (Ed.), *Die Entdeckung der Kommunikationswissenschaft* (pp. 125–155). Cologne: Halem.
- Koenen, E. (2016c). Erich Everth – Wissenstransformationen zwischen journalistischer Praxis und Zeitungskunde [Erich Everth – knowledge transformations between journalistic practice and newspaper studies]. *Medien & Zeit*, 31(3), 93–102.
- Koivisto, J., & Thomas, P. (2010). *Mapping communication and media research*. Tampere: Tampere University Press.
- Korte, H. (Ed.). (2017). *Einführung in die Geschichte der Soziologie* [Introduction to the history of sociology]. Wiesbaden: Springer VS.
- Kuhn, T. S. (1962). *The structure of scientific revolutions*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Kutsch, A. (1997). Historisch-ethisch vs. empirisch-soziologisch fundierte Zeitungswissenschaft [Historical-ethically vs. empirical-sociologically grounded newspaper science]. In M. Haller (Ed.), *Tatsachen und Meinungen* (pp.18–35). Leipzig: Institut für Kommunikations- und Medienwissenschaft.
- Kutsch, A. (2002a). Karl Bücher und seine akademischen Schüler [Karl Bücher and his academic successors]. In E. Koenen & M. Meyen (Eds.), *Karl Bücher* (pp. 11–48). Leipzig: Leipziger Universitätsverlag.
- Kutsch, A. (2002b). Zum Verhältnis zwischen Karl Bücher und Karl d'Ester [The relationship between Karl Bücher and Karl d'Ester]. In U. Nawratil, P. Schönhagen, & H. Starkulla Jr. (Eds.), *Medien und Mittler sozialer Kommunikation* (pp. 125–153). Leipzig: Leipziger Universitätsverlag.

- Kutsch, A. (2010). Professionalisierung durch akademische Ausbildung [Professionalization through academic education]. In T. Eberwein & D. Müller (Eds.), *Journalismus und Öffentlichkeit* (pp. 427–453). Wiesbaden: Springer VS.
- Lacasa-Mas, I. (2017). Die spanische Kommunikationswissenschaft auf dem Weg zu internationaler Anerkennung [Spanish communication studies on the road to international reputation]. In S. Auerbeck-Lietz (Ed.), *Kommunikationswissenschaft im internationalen Vergleich* (pp. 185–210). Wiesbaden: Springer VS.
- Lodge, P. (2016). U.K. communication study and the challenges of institutionalization. In P. Simonson & D. W. Park (Eds.), *The international history of communication study* (pp. 192–212). New York: Routledge.
- Löblich, M. (2007). German Publizistikwissenschaft and its shift from a humanistic to an empirical social scientific discipline. *European Journal of Communication*, 22(1), 69–88.
- Löblich, M., & Auerbeck-Lietz, S. (2016). The transnational flow of ideas and Histoire Croisée with attention to the cases of France and Germany. In P. Simonson & D. W. Park (Eds.), *The international history of communication study* (pp. 25–46). New York: Routledge.
- Löblich, M., & Scheu, A. M. (2011). Writing the history of communication studies. *Communication Theory*, 21(1), 1–22.
- Lowery, S. A., & DeFleur, M. L. (1983). *Milestones in mass communication research*. New York: Longman.
- Meyen, M. (2002). Die Leipziger zeitungskundlichen Dissertationen [The Leipzig dissertations in newspaper studies]. In E. Koenen & M. Meyen (Eds.), *Karl Bücher* (pp. 135–200). Leipzig: Leipziger Universitätsverlag.
- Meyen, M. (2007). Die “Jungtürken“ der Kommunikationswissenschaft [“Young turks” of communication science]. *Publizistik*, 52(3), 308–328.
- Meyen, M. (2012). International Communication Association fellows. *International Journal of Communication*, 6, 2378–2396.
- Meyen, M. (2014). IAMCR on the East-West battlefield. *International Journal of Communication*, 8, 2071–2089.
- Meyen, M. (2015). Communication research and media studies, history of. In D. Wright (Ed.), *International Encyclopedia of the Social & Behavioral Sciences* (pp. 278–283). Oxford: Elsevier.
- Meyen, M., & Löblich, M. (2006). *Klassiker der Kommunikationswissenschaft* [Classical writers of communication science]. Konstanz: UVK.
- Noonan, C., & Lohmeier, C. (2017). From cultural studies to impact factor. In S. Auerbeck-Lietz (Ed.), *Kommunikationswissenschaft im internationalen Vergleich* (pp. 33–52). Wiesbaden: Springer VS.
- Nordenstreng, K. (2008). Institutional networking. In D. W. Park & J. Pooley (Eds.), *The history of media and communication research* (pp. 225–248). New York: Peter Lang.
- Park, D. W., & Pooley, J. (Eds.). (2008). *The history of media and communication research*. New York: Peter Lang.
- Peruško, Z., & Vozab, D. (2016). The field of communication in Croatia. In P. Simonson & D. W. Park (Eds.), *The international history of communication study* (pp. 213–234). New York: Routledge.
- Pearson, H. (2002). The German historical school of economics. In H. H. Nau & B. Scheffold (Eds.), *The historicity of economics* (pp. 23–43). Berlin: Springer.

- Peters, J. D. (1986). Institutional sources for intellectual poverty in communication research. *Communication Research*, 13(4), 527–559.
- Peters, J. D. (1999). *Speaking into the air*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Peters, J. D., & Simonson, P. (2004). *Mass communication and American social thought*. Lanham: Rowman & Littlefield.
- Pietilä, V., Malmberg, T., & Nordenstreng, K. (1990). Theoretical convergences and contrasts. *European Journal of Communication*, 5(2), 165–185.
- Pooley, J. (2008). The new history of mass communication research. In D. W. Park & J. Pooley (Eds.), *The history of media and communication research* (pp. 43–60). New York: Peter Lang.
- Pooley, J., & Park, D. W. (2008). Introduction. In D. W. Park & J. Pooley (Eds.), *The history of media and communication research* (pp. 1–15). New York: Peter Lang.
- Pooley, J., & Park, D. W. (2013). Communication research. In P. Simonson, J. Peck, R. T. Craig, & J. P. Jackson Jr. (Eds.), *The handbook of communication history* (pp. 76–91). New York: Routledge.
- Ribeiro, N. (2016). Communication studies on the Iberian peninsula. In P. Simonson & D. W. Park (Eds.), *The international history of communication study* (pp. 151–170). New York: Routledge.
- Rogers, E. M. (1997). *A history of communication study*. New York: Free Press.
- Simonson, P. (2008). Writing figures into the field. In D. W. Park & J. Pooley (Eds.), *The history of media and communication research* (pp. 291–230). New York: Peter Lang.
- Simonson, P., & Park, D. W. (Eds.). (2016). *The international history of communication study*. New York: Routledge.
- Simonson, P., Peters, J. D. (2008). Communication and media studies, history to 1968. In W. Donsbach (Ed.), *The International Encyclopedia of Communication* (pp. 765–771). Malden: Blackwell.
- Simpson, C. (1994). *Science of coercion*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Slaatta, T. (2016). Early Nordic media research and the special case of Norway. In P. Simonson & D. W. Park (Eds.), *The international history of communication study* (pp. 171–191). New York: Routledge.
- Stichweh, R. (1994). *Wissenschaft, Universität, Professionen* [Science, university, professions]. Frankfurt/Main: Suhrkamp.
- Thiele, M. (2016). Female academics in communication science and the post-war-reconstruction generation in Austria and Germany. In P. Simonson & D. W. Park (Eds.), *The international history of communication study* (pp. 130–150). New York: Routledge.
- Thornham, S., & O’Sullivan, T. (2004). Chasing the real. *Media, Culture & Society*, 26(5), 717–736.
- Van den Bulck, J., & Van den Bulck, H. (2017). Communication sciences in Flanders. In S. Averbeck-Lietz (Ed.), *Kommunikationswissenschaft im internationalen Vergleich* (pp. 93–111). Wiesbaden: Springer VS.
- Vom Bruch, R. (1980). Zeitungswissenschaft zwischen Historie und Nationalökonomie [Newspaper science between history and economics]. *Publizistik*, 25(4), 579–605.
- Vroons, E. (2005). Communication studies in Europe. *International Communication Gazette*, 67(6), 495–522.
- Wagner, P., Wittrock, B., & Whitley, R. (Eds.). (1991). *Discourses on society: The Shaping of the social science disciplines*. Dordrecht: Kluwer.

- Wahl-Jorgensen, K. (2000). Rebellion and ritual in disciplinary histories of U.S. communication study. *Mass Communication and Society*, 3(1), 87–115.
- Wahl-Jorgensen, K. (2004). How not to found a field. *Journal of Communication*, 54(3), 547–564.
- Weingart, P. (2003). *Wissenschaftssoziologie* [Sociology of science]. Bielefeld: Transcript.
- Wiedemann, T. (2016). Practical orientation as a survival strategy. In P. Simonson & D. W. Park (Eds.), *The international history of communication study* (pp. 109–129). New York: Routledge.
- Wiedemann, T., & Meyen, M. (2016). Internationalization through Americanization. *International Journal of Communication*, 10, 1489–1509.
- Wieten, J. (2005). Kurt Baschwitz and the founding of Gazette. *International Communication Gazette*, 67(6), 523–530.
- Wilke, J. (2016). Von der Zeitungskunde zur Integrationswissenschaft [From newspaper studies to an integrated science]. *Medien & Kommunikationswissenschaft*, 64(1), 74–92.