Media and Communication Studies in Sweden

Disciplinary Boundary Construction-
a theoretical contribution to Theory of Science

Oscar Westlund

Media and Communication Studies in Sweden

Disciplinary Boundary Construction -
a theoretical contribution to Theory of Science

Oscar Westlund

Förord.

Medie- och kommunikationsvetenskap är ett förhållandevis ungt ämnesområde vid svenska universitet och högskolor. Det har sina rötter i det tidiga 1970-talets akademiska informationsutbildningar och fick sina första professurer i början av 1980-talet. Framväxten av medie- och kommunikationsvetenskapen är särskilt intressant eftersom den växte fram i gränslandet mellan samhällsvetenskap och humaniora med anknytning till såväl statsvetenskap och sociologi som litteratur- och språkvetenskap.

Medie- och kommunikationsvetenskapens förhållande till andra discipliner har därför varit ett återkommande tema för diskussionen inom ämnesområdet. Det finns ett flertal analyser som syftar till att karaktärisera, och avgränsa, medier och kommunikation som vetenskaplig disciplin. Gränsdragningsfrågorna har i detta sammanhang tilldragit sig ett särskilt intresse.

Föreliggande magisteruppsats i vetenskapsteori vid Göteborgs universitet författad av Oscar Westlund, sedan 2005 doktorand i journalistik och masskommunikation, är tänkt som ett bidrag till ämnesdiskussionen. Magisteruppsatsen ger flera intressanta inblickar i hur ämnesområdet 'konstruerades'. Detta är anledningen till att Institutionen för journalistik och masskommunikation valt att ge ut den som en intern arbetsrapport.

Uppsatsen har i denna version förkortats något. Den fullständiga magisteruppsatsen finns att tillgå från avdelningen för vetenskapsteori. För slutsatserna i rapporten svarar författaren ensam.

Göteborg i januari 2006

Lennart Weibull
Professor i massmedieforskning

Table of contents

Introduction

This report will report on the historical development and construction of the scientific discipline Media and Communication Studies in Sweden. The report gives detailed insights in the development of the work processes in constructing and forming of a scientific discipline and should be interesting in two ways. First of all it should appeal to the members of the Media and Communication Studies (MCS) field in Sweden who seek an historical understanding of their discipline. Second, the report contributes also to the field of theory of science as the study has been carried out with a theoretical battery and approach with its roots in social constructivism. This report is based upon a more theoretically detailed Master Thesis in the field Theory of Science.[1] But since the results of Master Thesis are of interest also for the actors in the field of Media and Communication Studies, I have chosen to rewrite the thesis to a report with the members of Media and Communication Studies field in mind. The report is now written in such a way were I have assumed that the empirical object of Media and Communication Studies is most interesting, and that the readers are less familiar to the theoretical frameworks within theory of science. Keeping this in mind I have designed the report in such a way that the empirical part, "The construction of a discipline", can be read and comprehended also if the reader chooses not to read the theoretical framework.

However, I believe the report will be most appreciated seen in the light of the theoretical framework of social constructivism. Theory of science is a broad field that has designated itself to study the activities of researchers in many areas and scientific fields for many decades now. Issues that give fuel to the research are many and examples of such issues concern the nature of knowledge. In what way is scientific knowledge different from other forms of knowledge and why it has gained such a great influence and status. Most of the studies in theory of science have focused at the natural science; the study of the practices in the humanities and social science is not as common. One reason is that the disciplines in the humanities do not raise the same claims of truth and objectivity as the natural sciences. Some theorist of science have an aim to criticize scientific procedures by revealing all the uncertainties, which is not as rewarding if the scientist reveal those uncertainties themselves. However, Hallberg among others argues that there is a need for studies of the scientific practice of the humanities and social sciences within the field of theory of science. Such studies might be how disciplines change over time, which also could be related to processes outside the discipline itself.[2] This report brings many contributions to the field of theory of science, one being that by examining the emergence of the Media and Communication Studies discipline in Sweden, the object of study is less common.

In the remainder of this introduction I will discuss more thoroughly why it is interesting from a researchers stance to study scientific disciplines from a social constructivist perspective within theory of science. First of all I believe it's necessary to discuss what characterizes a scientific discipline as it's a term closely related to the terms academic subjects and research areas, and therefore easily can bring some confusion. The discussion of definitions is based upon non-constructivist sources and theorists, however I do not believe this is a problem. Even though those theorists and sources may not share the same views on science as the constructivist, their definitions of disciplines and research fields should be compatible.

---

[1] Westlund Oscar, *Disciplinary Boundary Construction - The case of Media and communication studies in Sweden, Master Thesis in Theory of Science*, Gothenburg University, spring of 2005
[2] Hallberg Margareta, *Symmetri & reflexivitet, sociala studier av humanvetenskapens villkor*, Göteborg, 1997, p 78

Discipline as a term derives from the Greek pedagogic term *didasko* which means to teach, and the Latin terms *(di)disco* which means to learn, and *disciplina* has the meaning of knowledge and power.[3] According to Nordstedts Swedish dictionary,[4] a discipline refers to a research field which is demarcated by theoretical and practical boundaries and which have clear rules which its members should subordinate themselves to. Jansson writes that a discipline is characterised by explicit boundaries in terms of study object and methodological approaches. Shumway and Messer-Davidow writes that a discipline is a community of individuals who seek to establish some degree of authority over the standards of inquiry. However, a discipline is more than an administrative category in the academic system since it is not contained only by single universities.[5] A research field however is less formal, and is fluent between many disciplines.[6] I consider a research field as a broader field, still demarcated, but where boundaries have less sharpened edges. Whitley argues that research areas are characterised by a shared commitment of research practices and techniques, which are more or less clearly formulated.[7] Nordstedts defines a subject as a field in which knowledge is accumulated and taught, and which has been demarcated in some way.[8]

So what can we conclude from those definitions? I argue that a research field is at the most general level among the three, in other words, where boundaries are the least demarcated. I have in this report chosen to use the term discipline for my object of inquiry, Media and Communication Studies, as I believe it transforms from being a research field to a more demarcated discipline. This happens because actors with similar interests belong to different disciplines, and want to change their conditions in doing scientific work. Meantime, MCS also becomes an academic subject within the organisational boundaries of the Swedish university system. However, as it's very diverse among different seats of learning, I argue that a discipline rather than subject, manages to describe the wholeness of the study object. Disciplines are interesting to study as they are different in epistemology, in what is considered as knowledge, as well as what is important to study.

Furthermore I find MCS an interesting field of study as a discipline also because of many other reasons. MCS has developed from many disciplines within both the traditions of the humanities and the social sciences, and has managed to integrate those quite different ways. From the perspective of theory of science it is also generally interesting to study the emergence and stabilization of disciplines, as it contributes with important knowledge about specific dimensions of the powerful academic area. Furthermore, I find MCS interesting because there have been an intense construction process which can be analyzed through theoretical perspectives within theory of science such as boundary-work. Gieryn writes that intellectual fields or spaces are continuously reconstituted in discursive practices; they are seldom stable and firm, though they might achieve it during periods.[9] I have taken a constructivist stance since I believe that the establishment of knowledge is being affected and structured in some ways by social interests, values, actions, institutions and so on. The belief

---

[3] Shumway David & Messer-Davidow Ellen, *Disciplinarity – an introduction*, Poetics today, vol.12, No 2, Disciplinarity, 1991, p 202

[4] *Nordstedts svenska ordbok,* 1999

[5] Shumwayr David & Messer-Davidow Ellen, *Disciplinarity – an introduction*, Poetics today, vol.12, No 2, Disciplinarity, 1991, p 207f

[6] Jansson André, Mediekultur och samhälle, Lund, 2002, p 13

[7] Whitley Richard*, Umbrella and polytheistic scientific disciplines and their elites*, Social studies of science, 6, 1976, p 472

[8] *Nordstedts svenska ordbok,* 1999

[9] Gieryn Thomas, *Boundaries of science*, in Jasanoff S, et al, "Handbook of Science and Technology Studies", Thousand Oaks, 1995, p 419

that something is socially constructed means that it is not determined to become something by itself. Hallberg writes that constructivist believes that the knowledge that the researchers believe is knowledge simply should not be questioned. Rather it should be asked why it came to be viewed as knowledge.[10]

In this report I have certainly not sought to value the research and claims of knowledge in the MCS discipline, but rather to investigate how the MCS discipline has been constructed. I do not intend to carry out a traditional description of MCS history, but rather an analysis of how the discipline actively seeks clarity and progress. In terms of approach to presenting the empiric results I have chosen to make a chronological presentation, divided into different time periods. The presentation of time periods are of course a result of my own scientific constructions. The reader will probably notice that me as an author is quite invisible in the empiric text, except for some interpretations of boundary-work, mostly at the end of each time period. This is a choice I've made in order to let the reader interpret the material herself. The comprehension of the empirical results I suggest can take different forms, depending whether the reader is interested in the theoretical framework I present or not. I have rather concentrated the boundary-work analysis to the last paragraphs of each period, and the final analysis. As I have a constructivist approach I do hope that it will become clear that the emergence of the discipline is under no conditions predetermined, but for sure an active construction process.

When approaching an object of study it is always necessary to make delimitations. Baldursson discusses the organisation of the Swedish research system in broad terms and he makes a distinction into three levels. The first level is predominantly political, and concerns the planning, co-ordination and drafting of goals that takes place in the government and institution. At next level the civil service departments, the research councils and other authorities and firms granting appropriations. It is at the third level we find the actors who carry out the research, which is the level represented by the universities and their departments.[11] I have narrowed this report to concentrate my focus to study the third level. Still many aspects from the other levels are interesting and relevant in order to understand the development at the third level. From a meta-theoretical level I should not only analyze the internal[12] factors of the MCS discipline, Hallberg suggest one should also consider external aspects such as politics or transformations of the society,[13] as actors within a discipline usually produces texts that reflect upon the discipline only from internal aspects of change, for example how theories analysis and methods are becoming better.[14] Fuller argues that the analysis of a discipline needs an external approach where it's studied how the knowledge is adapted to the changing world, and an internal approach about how knowledge and its methods have grown.[15] However, I must conclude that most of my analysis has been rather limited to the internal processes of MCS. I have tried to embrace the broader external

[10] Hallberg Margareta, *Symmetri och reflexivitet – sociala studier av humanvetenskapens villkor*, Göteborg, 1997, p 52ff

[11] Baldursson Eirikur, *Om forskningspolitiska system,*, red Bärmark Jan, i "Forskning om forskning", Lund, 1984, s 191ff

[12] The use of the terms internal/external might be perceived as problematic as STS-research has shown that what's defined as internal/external changes over time and place. I do believe those terms are justified to apply in this context.

[13] Hallberg Margareta, *Etnologisk koreografi*, Göteborg, 2001, s 134

[14] Hallberg Margareta, *Symmetri och reflexivitet – sociala studier av humanvetenskapens villkor*, Göteborg, 1997, p 134

[15] Fuller Steve, *Disciplinary boundaries and the rhetoric of the social sciences*, Poetics Today, Vol 12, No 2, Disciplinarity, 1991, p 302

circumstances, but those have been much more difficult to identify. As most research projects are restricted, I do not claim in this report to fully understand the processes in the emergence of the MCS discipline, as it then would be suitable to compare with other disciplines. For example, do comparisons of the success in receiving funds and professorships, or to study the establishment of periodicals or how the relations between nearby disciplines change. Even though this report is concentrated to the internal factors of the development, I feel it analyzes and describes the development process of MCS quite well. However, the amount of empiric data will not determine whether a study in science studies is representative. It must be emphasized that from a relativistic stance, all forms of knowledge is in some way or another insecure. There are, in other words, indicators of difficulties in conducting an analysis of an emerging discipline.

Aim.

There are two different aims of this report, one theoretical and one empirical. The theoretical aim is to develop a specimen of boundary-work which helps to analyze disciplines. This specimen will however, of natural reasons, be applicable to all kinds of disciplines. The empiric aim is to analyze and describe the construction process of the Swedish MCS discipline, embracing both the establishment and the maintenance. From the empiric aim, there are certain issues I will look closely at, those are:

- *What actors and factors made the institutionalization of MCS possible in 1991?*
- *Once established, how was MCS constructed through boundary-work, and what boundaries have been considered as important?*
- *Do the issues of boundary-work change over time since the establishment? In what ways?*
- *What is the core of MCS, and how extensive has it become?*

Methodological approach.

My methodological approach for the theoretical aim has been to study, analyze, develop and refine the theoretical framework of boundary-work. This has of natural reasons involved much literature studies. My approach for the empiric case study has been to carry out literature review of documents, articles and other texts where actors reflect upon MCS. Such texts should depict the visions and perspectives of the actors and also head of departments.[16] I have looked through all the issues of Nordicom-Information and Nordicom Review since their start in the seventies, as well as many other texts. I'm aware that in such studies, the theorist of science becomes affected of the material. All of the texts are constructed descriptions of MCS, for an example the evaluation report from the Swedish National Agency for Higher Education. The outcome of the report has been dependent in many ways of my success in finding documents that are relevant to the objectives. I have tried to closely examine the documents with an eye of sound criticism, but in the end this is of course a subjective matter. This goes hand in hand with Kjörups belief that a description always will be subjective in some aspect.[17] Colleagues, theories as well as the availability to time and literature have affected my construction of the MCS discipline. I believe that only by exploring empirically the circumstances that shape science, one can fully understand it. Furthermore, when I initiated the report work I was planning to conduct interviews with informants, i.e. people

---

[16] Hallberg Margareta, *Etnologisk koreografi*, Göteborg, 2001, s 70
[17] Kjörup Sören, *Människovetenskaperna*, Lund, 1999, s 169

with good insight in the topic of the matter, for example head of departments at different chairs of learning. However, since I realized that there are fair amounts of documented information already, I felt that there was no need for interviews to fulfil the aim of the report. I have also chosen not to use other methods such as observations or surveys as I believe it would not have been rewarding in relation to the aim of the report and it's time limits.

Irrespective of the point of departure in texts or interviews, I can be said to have followed the actors, to express it with ANT-terminology. One might interpret that I claim the role as a predecessor for the MCS area when I make my interpretations of the material, even though I have not enrolled and mobilized the MCS actors in my construction. However I regard this Report as one interpretative construction among several possible about the MCS area. I wish to bring new ideas and insight to the MCS area by supplying an outsider account from a meta-theoretical stance. It can probably not be elucidated enough that I consider this report as a personal construction, of a construction process in the MCS field. Just as MCS itself could have been constructed in many ways, my constructed description of MCS depends upon the theoretical framework I apply, my aim, the issues I've raised and what material I find and use.

My position.

It should be mentioned that I have some insight in the Swedish MCS field as I hold a Masters degree in the subject and in the fall of 2005 I also initiated my doctorate candidate studies in the field. My background has helped me in many ways when conducting this report, for example, the fact that I already from start knew quite well where to find information in databases and literature. I believe that my starting position should benefit this report. I could be criticised for having a personal involvement in the discipline, which could affect the way I write about MCS. However, I'd like to stress the fact that my aim and writing style is to describe and analyze the discipline, not to evaluate. Even though I have a background in the discipline, I firmly believe that through my studies in theories of science I now approach the MCS field from a very different position. (I also hold a Masters degree in theory of science) I now add an outsider's account, describing the discipline from a meta-theoretical level. There have not been any reports about the MCS field from this stance. Some might find it problematic that I base an outsider's account upon the MCS actor's own internal descriptions and discussions. My starting point though, is that science is what scientist's are doing and thinking as a collective. This report should catch how the MCS actors themselves construct their view of the discipline, and therefore I need to consider their descriptions. But even when I build my description of the MCS discipline upon mainly references from within the discipline, I believe I add to the account also an outsider's construction.

Theoretical platform.

From the wide range of theories within theory of science I have found boundary-work especially interesting and useful. Boundary-work therefore forms the backbone in my theoretical platform. The choice of using boundary-work has become clearer and clearer during the course of progress, as my insights in the empirical object of study has grown. My consideration set of theories has continually decreased. Wallén writes that theories will affect the choice of problems and methodology, but that all those starting points might change during the course of the process.[18] However, as I came to know the empirical object of study better and better, I concluded that an analysis using boundary-work would be more interesting than social worlds. Gieryn discusses four different specimens in boundary-work. As none of them embraces the emergence of disciplines I chose to construct a fifth specimen, which I call *Disciplinary Boundary Construction*. This specimen will embrace the boundary-work taking place when disciplines emerge. I have given lots of room in this report for this specimen, but as it should be seen as within the concept of boundary-work I find it reasonable. I will leave those theoretical approaches for now, as I will discuss them in detail later in this chapter. Also, I want to make an introduction to theory of science before discussing boundary-work and presenting *Disciplinary Boundary Construction*. This introduction will hopefully help to put boundary-work into a theoretical context.

The field of theory of science has grown much since Kuhn and the sixties. During the seventies some sociologist in the United Kingdom formed the Sociology of Scientific Knowledge (SSK) and the Strong Programme, focusing at symmetry, giving social explanations a central role. SSK influence was once very present, but is nowadays rather in the periphery of Science and Technology Studies (STS), the most extensive research field in theory of science. Within STS, the Actor-Network-Theory (ANT) has become very popular. ANT originates from two Frenchmen, Michel Callon and Bruno Latour, who started building their theories in the late seventies, and have had wide acceptance since the eighties. ANT argues that the dynamics of a network includes several dimensions of transformation and translation. This process includes not only human actors but also non-humans, as nature and technology. There have been intense discussions concerning the symmetry of SSK in relation to the symmetry of ANT, as they are formed so differently. Central ideas in ANT are that within scientific processes, actors need to enrol and mobilise other actors to achieve their own goals. In the translation of interests, the associations of a network might be established, weakened or strengthened. Scientists often strive to establish an environment that enables them to carry out their work and get recognition from others in the scientific community, as well as other parts of society.[19] Relations, references, movement and dynamics are central existences in ANT. STS is a broad research field where many theories in some way or another have been inspired by the work of SSK and/or ANT.

This report has a marked constructivist approach, a term that should be discussed. Hess writes that from an STS-perspective, social constructivism labels studies that examine how patterns of choices and how research is done are shaped by social variables. Philosophers rather tend to use the term constructivism when referring to the idea that scientists construct and make the world, not discovering it.[20] Before the constructivist approach was established within STS

---

[18] Wallén Göran, *Om fallstudiemetodik i forskning om forskning*, red Bärmark Jan, i "Forskning om forskning", Lund, 1984, s 48
[19] Latour Bruno, *Pandora's hope*, Cambridge 1999
[20] Hess J David, Science studies – an advanced introduction, New York, 1997, p 34f

there were other forms of studies of disciplines. During the sixties and seventies, some of those were bibliometrics (the measurement of patterns in written communication) and scientometrics (the quantitative study of science, science policy and communication in science.) Those genres focused at the institutionalization processes, the patterns of scientific publication and co-operations. The studies were often of historical or sociological character, and identified prominent figures in the research fields. A broad genre was the institutional sociology; with its main spreading in the United States. For example at the Columbia school with prominent figures such as Robert Merton and Harriet Zuckerman, who viewed science as an institution that worked well. Within institutional sociology of science there were studies of "invisible colleges" and "communication networks" that focused at informal organisations and networks within science.[21] I want to make clear that my constructivist approach is dissociated from institutional sociology of science, since it's problematic for a modern constructivist approach. I will now discuss theoretical framework of boundary-work, a contribution to science studies by Thomas F Gieryns, who in fact was a student of Merton,

Boundary-work.

I'm interested in how the MCS actors have carried out boundary-work to profile the discipline. Boundary-work simply concerns how actors, groups and organisations draw boundaries and makes demarcations. I want to stress the fact that the boundaries I will discuss in this report have little basis in reality, even though much in our society depends on the fact that we treat them as if they were real. Boundary-work is a concept that was developed in the early eighties in discussions between Woolgar[22] and Gieryn. Later Gieryn has developed and applied the concept in several texts. Boundary-work is an anti-essentialist approach to see norms as resources and understanding authority. Norms are interpreted and used to stabilize and destabilize science.[23] Boundary-work occurs within disciplines and between disciplines, in institutions as well in the structures of the society. Boundary-work can show how actors work to gain influence in areas of knowledge, how they strive to legitimize their claims of knowledge. Hallberg writes that boundary-work occurs both in disciplines and between them.[24] Fischer adds that boundary-work is a process that involves individuals, as well as organisations and larger structures.[25] Within studies of boundary-work one can also focus on the differences between science and technology or other forms of knowledge in the society. Gieryn writes that; "pragmatic demarcations of science from non-science are driven by a social interest in claiming, expanding, protecting, monopolizing, usurping, denying, or restricting, the cognitive authority of science." [26]

Boundary-work raises questions of what makes one party different from another. It also concerns how one part might try to distance it from, or associate itself to, the other part, and why this is done. Whether or not science can distance itself from other forms of knowledge has been intensively debated in the science wars. That topic could be a matter for a report itself but is not the object of my study. However, one conclusion is that we learn about

[21]Hess J David, *Science studies – an advanced introduction*, New York, 1997, chapter 3

[22] Steve Wolgar discussed boundary-work in"Playing with relativism", 1981. Gieryn used it officially first two years later.

[23] Sismondo Sergio, *An introduction to Science and Technology Studies*, Malden, USA, 2004, p 31

[24] Hallberg Margareta, Etnologisk koreografi, Göteborg, 2001, s 139

[25]Fischer Donald, *Boundary-work and science, the relation between power and knowledge*, in Cozzens Susan E. & Gieryn F Thomas (eds), "Theories of Science in Society", Indiana University Press, 1990

[26] Gieryn Thomas, *Boundaries of science*, in Jasanoff S, et al, "Handbook of Science and Technology Studies", Thousand Oaks, Sage, 1995, p 405

science by seeing what's far from it. Jasanoff writes that boundary-work is usually most politically successful when room is left for agencies to negotiate the meaning and location of the boundaries. Still, politicians might need to draw rather sharp boundaries between science and policy, to keep the notion of autonomy and objectivity. [27]

Boundary-work also concerns to identify who is doing it, and why they do it. It's important to understand the interest's actors have in establishing and maintaining certain boundaries. Barnes, Bloor and Henry conclude that the boundaries of science are defined and maintained by social groups from their interests in, for example, economy, power or politics.[28] Interests have, as I see it, driven scientist to construct a beneficial position of epistemic authority by demarcating science from other forms of knowledge through boundary-work. Gieryn discusses his view on science, he writes; "When considered as a cultural space constructed in boundary-work, science becomes local and episodic rather than universal, pragmatic and strategic rather than analytic or legislative; contingent rather than principled, constructed rather than essential".[29]

Boundary-work is strategic practical action to secure academic respectability, externally by demarcating itself from other forms of knowledge, but also by distinguishing itself from other disciplines and departments. When actors try to draw boundaries they seek to achieve goals and interests for themselves, their stakeholders and audience. Gieryn writes that scientist might conduct boundary-work to gain material resources and the effects are quite opposite from when the goal is protection of autonomy. Instead of purifying science, it rather tends to erase the borders between truth and policy when striving to attract material resources for research, instruments or personnel. Gieryn writes that social change and interests are important factors to understand the boundary-work that is carried out. Gieryn highlight the fact that interests tend to change over time.[30] My belief is that one interesting question concern how the boundaries of science change depending on the ambitions of the actors.

Gieryn discusses four different specimens of boundary-work, those are *expulsion, expansion, protection of autonomy*,[31] and also *monopolization*.[32] The specimen of *monopolization* concerns the contests for cultural authority, often between two parts, and where there is only one winner. *Expulsion* describes the circumstances when different actors fight each other in their competition for scientific claims. The actors strive to show clearly that their own claims are truly scientific and correspond well to the nature and truth. Meanwhile they also try to show that competing actors in fact are not worthy of the scientific status. Boundary-work can also take the form of *expansion* when two or more rival epistemic authorities compete for jurisdictional control in a domain. In this case only one actor try to distinguish science from other forms of knowledge, while the other, like religious or political groups, seeks to show that science is no more reliable or truthful than other forms of knowledge. Gieryn also discusses *protection of autonomy* that is the boundary-work needed to make sure that science doesn't become a handmaiden to market or political ambitions. Therefore scientists try to make sure they choose the topics of research themselves.

---

[27] Jasanoff Sheila, *The fifth branch – science advisers as policymakers*, London, 1990, p 236
[28] Barnes Barry, Bloor David & Henry John, *Scientific knowledge*, London, 1996, s 168
[29] Gieryn Thomas, *Cultural boundaries of science*, Chicago, 1999, p 27
[30] Ibid, p 23f
[31] Ibid, , p 15ff
[32] Gieryn Thomas, *Boundaries of science*, in Jasanoff S, et al, "Handbook of Science and Technology Studies", Thousand Oaks, 1995, p 424ff

Disciplinary Boundary Construction.

The reason I have chosen to construct a fifth specimen was that I felt that the studies of how disciplines emerge was clearly related to boundary-work, but wasn't embraced by Gieryns four specimens. This specimen is the outcome from combining boundary-work with concepts and ideas from nearby theorists in fields such as disciplinarity and professionalism. These theories have different outlooks and origins, but I argue that they all make a contribution to the understanding of boundary-work, and the development of the Swedish MCS discipline. Perspectives from the sociology of professions bring ideas about for example why actors feel a need of unification and development. Also I believe the general knowledge about disciplines will bring understanding to why and how actors seek to construct disciplinary boundaries. The specimen of *Disciplinary Boundary Construction* will be refined in the final analysis, as I then can add from my insights from the case study. I should emphasize that I'm aware that the specimen *Disciplinary Boundary Construction* should not be generalized to analyze all disciplines as it builds upon the emergence of only one discipline. I believe however, that I in this report will manage to build the foundation of a boundary-work specimen from which the analyst will find useful perspectives when analyzing how disciplines emerge.

I will now outline the framework of *Disciplinary Boundary Construction* by building from findings and ideas of boundary-work, in combination with insights and perspectives from studies in disciplinarity, standardization and the sociology of professions. The framework of *Disciplinary Boundary Construction* presented here is however a shortened version. For a more detailed understanding I recommend reading the Master Thesis this report is based upon.[33] The boundary-work specimen of *Disciplinary Boundary Construction* focuses at how boundaries are constructed, both between disciplines, as well as within them. It is also important to investigate who is conducting the boundary-work, and to have in mind that it might be individuals as well as groups and organisations. *Disciplinary Boundary Construction* concerns the understanding of why and how actors strive to establish disciplinary boundaries. The study should identify actors who have had influence on the process, and those actors can be not only individuals but also groups or organisations. *Disciplinary Boundary Construction* describes the circumstances when different actors fight each other in their competition in the construction process of a discipline, for example in trying to define the core of a discipline. *Disciplinary Boundary Construction* include the understanding of how actors carry out boundary-work to make clear which theories, concepts, methods and objects of study that should be part of the discipline. Who, how and why does actors carry out boundary-work in order to encircle what makes the identity and unity of the discipline, as well as what makes it different from nearby disciplines? Freidson writes:

> The formation of boundaries or exclusive jurisdictions allows members to focus on a common body of formal knowledge and skill, or discipline. Without boundaries, nothing that could be appropriately called even an occupation, let alone a formal discipline, could exist. Those boundaries create a mutually reinforcing social shelter within which a formal body of knowledge and skill can develop, be nourished, practiced, refined and expanded.[34]

From Freidson's arguments I conclude that the establishment of boundaries is important for members of any field. Shumwayr & Messer-Davidow argues that disciplines establish boundaries to mark it as a territory to be possessed by its owners, but once established, the

---

[33] Westlund Oscar, *Disciplinary Boundary Construction - The case of Media and communication studies in Sweden, Master Thesis in Theory of Science*, Gothenburg University, spring of 2005

[34] Freidson Eliot, *Professionalism – the third logic*, Cambridge, 2001, p 202

boundaries may be redefined if the discipline is attempting to expand into new territory.[35] Hallberg concludes that when a discipline advances to an area which is little studied by other disciplines, the boundary-work is also less associated with power struggles in the actors strive for legitimacy.[36] Fuller believes disciplinary boundaries provide the structure needed to allocate cognitive authority and material resources.[37]

There are two main phases of *Disciplinary Boundary Construction;* establishment and maintenance. The first phase of establishment concerns the boundary-work carried out in order to establish a discipline. The interest might then concern simply to build an organisational structure. There can be researchers in many diverse disciplines that conduct research about a certain object of inquiry. Those researchers work might form a research field, and the researchers want to establish it as a discipline and also academic subject. The researchers might hope that the disciplinary status will result in increased financial support and better academic recognition. Fuller writes that once the boundaries of a discipline have been set, its practitioners must define the normal state of objects.[38] For articles about the construction process I recommend articles about the construction process of *famology,*[39] *demography,*[40] and *African American studies.*[41] Small writes that the definition and conception of an emerging intellectual enterprise in a department to a large extent depends upon their boundary-work, as they must obtain resources as material, capital, political support, and academic recognition from specific constituencies.[42] Nam argues that the unification of a discipline relies much upon if it recognizes departmental status in the universities.[43] As part of the institutional process it is also important for the discipline to succeed in enrolling both students as well as junior and senior scholars. Many of those processes are obviously related to boundary-work.

The second phase is called maintenance and analyzes the boundary-work taking place once the discipline has been established. I believe it's very important to stress that there are many boundary-work processes taking place also after the discipline has been established, although many of them change in character. The outcome of the discipline must be actively constructed and is the result from actor's boundary-work, and their responses. Some forms of boundary-work that are likely to occur during the second phase are that actors strive to demarcate the discipline from other nearby disciplines. This boundary-work is done by establishing a core identity, as the boundaries of the discipline are sharpened. It might concern methods, theories and especially what topics and issues are being studied and taught within the discipline. The conditions of a discipline will of course depend to some extent of the boundary-work carried out in the establishment phase, but can of course be refined during the maintenance phase.

---

[35] Shumwayr David & Messer-Davidow Ellen, *Disciplinarity – an introduction*, Poetics today, vol.12, No 2, Disciplinarity, 1991, p 209

[36] Hallberg Margareta, *Etnologisk koreografi*, Göteborg, 2001, p 136

[37] Fuller Steve, *Disciplinary boundaries and the rhetoric of the social sciences*, Poetics Today, Vol 12, No 2, Disciplinarity, 1991, p 302

[38] Fuller Steve, Disciplinary boundaries – a critical synreport, Pittsburgh, 1986, p 5

[39] Burr R Wesley & Leigh K Geoffrey, *Having a family discipline means we need a new bottle for the new wine, a case study in boundary clarification*, Journal of marriage and the family, vol 46, no 2 (May, 1984), p 265f

[40] Nam, B Charles, *The progress of demography as a scientific discipline*, Demography, Vol 16, No 4, (Nov 1979) p 485-492

[41] Small L Mario, *Departmental conditions and the emergence of new disciplines: Two cases in the legitimation of African-American Studies*, Theory and Society, Vol 28, No.5, Oct 1999

[42] Ibid, p 661f

[43] Nam, B Charles, *The progress of demography as a scientific discipline*, Demography, Vol 16, No 4, (Nov 1979) p 487

Whitley discusses that the difficulties of the differentiation process of a discipline is worsened as staff move between positions in older established disciplines and newer disciplines, often without changing the type of work they do.[44] The conception of a discipline might have to be clarified if it's going to obtain institutional stability and independence.[45] When disciplines emerge it is likely to be a problematic relation between two sets of interests. On the one hand the building of autonomy and a core in the discipline. On the other hand trying to have an open-minded relationship to other disciplines, allowing what is called xenogamy. Concerning the first alternative, Nilsson writes that in most sciences there is a degree of autonomy, problems and methods are decided in the tradition of the research program.[46] Concerning the second alternative, Hallberg discusses that xenogamy tend to erase the boundaries between disciplines, for example when theorist freely use theories from many other disciplines.[47]

Bowker and Star discusses that sometimes categories are not mutually exclusive and objects do not fit neatly into a category. There might be disagreement about the membership of an object in a category.[48] *Disciplinary Boundary Construction* can benefit from Shumwayr & Messer-Davidow conception that boundaries of a discipline may have two characteristics. The *impermeable* discipline is characterised as stable, tightly knit and with high coherence. *Permeable* boundaries on the other hand, are rather less stable and coherent, and more fragmented.[49] In the Master thesis I also discuss how theories from the sociology of professions contributes to *Disciplinary Boundary Construction*, see for example studies by Abbott[50] and Freidson.[51] To continue, also the concepts and theories from the field of disciplinarity are beneficial to *Disciplinary Boundary Construction*. For example, Bauer views disciplines as separate cultures that seek knowledge. Applying this perspective, one recognizes that methods, theoretical approaches and knowledge cannot be separated.[52] Hallberg writes that scientist's conception of their discipline doesn't come from a vacant place, but through experiences, the views of the constitution process of knowledge as well as the interaction with other disciplines.[53] I believe that a discipline and its boundaries will always be under construction, due to non-controllable macro factors and other external circumstances, but also internal changes I argue that when applying *Disciplinary Boundary Construction,* one should ask if all actors are striving to construct the same boundaries or if there are negotiations between them. Furthermore, how is the boundary-work done, and to who it's being directed? The methods used to study the boundary-work of *Disciplinary Boundary Construction* are many can vary from interviews/surveys with informants or literature review. In the later the researcher looks for different texts in which actors conducting the boundary-work reflect upon the discipline, for example in articles, forewords, books, research applications, lobbying letters to politicians or proclamations of services such as professorships and so on.

---

[44] Whitley Richard*, Umbrella and polytheistic scientific disciplines and their elites*, Social studies of science, 6, 1976, p 476

[45] Small L Mario*, Departmental conditions and the emergence of new disciplines: Two cases in the legitimation of African-American Studies*, Theory and Society, Vol 28, No.5, Oct 1999, p 670

[46] Nilsson Ingemar, *Vetenskapshistoria,*, red Bärmark Jan, i "Forskning om forskning", Lund, 1984, s 134

[47] Hallberg Margareta, *Etnologisk koreografi*, Göteborg, 2001, s 139

[48] Bowker C Geoffrey & Star Leigh Susan, *Sorting things out*, Cambridge 1999, p 11f

[49] Shumwayr David & Messer-Davidow Ellen, *Disciplinarity, an introduction*, Poetics today,vol.12,No 2,Disciplinarity, 1991,p 209

[50] Abbott Andrew, *The system of professions*, Chicago, 1988

[51] Freidson Eliot*, Professionalism – the third logic*, Cambridge, 2001

[52] Bauer H Henry, *Science, Technology & Human Values*, Vol.15, No1 (Winter 1990), p 110f

[53] Hallberg Margareta, *Symmetri och reflexivitet – sociala studier av humanvetenskapens villkor*, Göteborg, 1997, p 68

The construction of a discipline.

xxxx-1991; Boundary-work to establish a new discipline.

This first empiric chapter will deal with the establishment phase of *Disciplinary Boundary Construction.* The studies of media, journalism and communication have a long history. From a humanistic starting point, there were studies carried out during the 19th century of the expanding Swedish media system. Those studies focused on periodic literature, including newspapers and periodicals. During the 1920s, the research field expanded as researchers became interested for what economical and political factors directed the development of the Swedish press industry. At this time, the studies where often carried out by researchers from disciplines such as history and literature, with influences from Germany as well as Anglo-Saxon countries. The traditions of social sciences were introduced during the fifties and sixties, mainly through American researchers specialized in mass-communication studies. The impact of social sciences in Swedish media and communication studies has grown since, for example through tendencies towards more quantitative methods and objective views on science.[54] Weibull writes that there were many reasons that social scientists started to interest themselves for research in media and mass communication. One reason was that media started to gain power as an independent actor in society, another reason was that many topical questions became emphasized on the research agenda, and the media industry was growing rapidly in the sixties, for example through the introduction of Swedish television.[55] During the sixties there were, however, little studies of media, mass-communication and communication within the national borders of Sweden. In Nowak's overview of the Swedish research field of mass communication he concludes that in 1963 there is no department that has profiled itself towards mass communication research. Mass communication is rather being studied from many disciplines and is therefore said to be extensive, but still very vaguely defined missing out of a unifying theoretical platform. At this time, there were only smaller groups of researchers at the universities in Stockholm, Lund and Gothenburg.[56]

Some important macro factors which affected the development were for example that during the last decades of the 20th century, there was a rapid expansion of the university sphere in Sweden. There was growth in the amount of students and teachers, as well as the number of disciplines and the extent of research. This process was certainly affected by the politics in Sweden, which in turn were influenced by international trends. The expansion of the university sphere, in combination with an enormous growth of media in our society, both influenced the interest and possibilities for research in areas related to media as well as communication. Those areas undertook a great expansion during the seventies and eighties in all the Nordic countries, partly because of an emerging commercial interest. As the width of media and communication related research was continually increasing, Nordicom[57] was formed in 1972 as an attempt to get a general view of the research field. [58] The first Nordicom

---

[54] Weibull Lennart, *Masskommunikation som ämnesområde*, in "Forskning om journalistik,medier & kommunikation,ämnesområdet idag och i framtiden,Red.Carlsson Ulla & Lindblad Anders 1992,Göteborg,p 30ff

[55] Weibull Lennart, *Forskaridentitet i förändring,* in "Mångfald i medieforskningen, Red. Ulla Carlsson, Göteborg 2003, p 59

[56] Nowak Kjell, *Masskommunikationsforskning i Sverige,* Stockholm, 1963, p 11f

[57] Nordic central for documentation of mass communication research. (Nordiska dokumentationscentralen för masskommunikationsforskning.)

[58] Weibull Lennart, *Masskommunikation som ämnesområde*, in "Forskning om journalistik,medier & kommunikation,ämnesområdet idag och i framtiden,Red.Carlsson Ulla & Lindblad Anders 1992,Göteborg,p 24

paper was published in 1976.[59] Hadenius argues that the increasing support for media and communication research from the Swedish government can be derived from the increasing power and influence media has in the society.[60]

There was a set of prominent and pioneering researchers in Sweden who came to influence the progress quite a bit. The pioneers had their roots in such diverse areas as economy, history, political science and so on. A common denominator for them all was that they paid more and more attention to media and communication from different research perspectives. Some of those pioneers should be mentioned; Kjell Nowak contributed with his knowledge in economical psychology to the studies of the effects of advertising. The historian and political scientist Stig Hadenius formed the studies of the functions of the press. The sociologist Karl Erik Rosengren contributed lots to the establishment of research concerning mass media use. The economist Karl Erik Gustafsson has introduced theories of the economics of mass media, for example analysis of the financial situation of the press in relation to concentration and competition. Also the political scientist Lennart Weibull can be seen in the background of the establishment movement of the discipline in the seventies. Since the eighties Weibull has become a key player in the formation and maintenance of the discipline.

Besides the pioneers, there was an organisation formed in 1977, partly by some of those pioneers, which came to be important. The organisation was named The Association of Swedish Mass Communication Researchers (FSMK)[61] and was established to create a forum for interdisciplinary intellectual exchange in the media and communication area. Later the association has worked to establish the area as a discipline, and when this happened they changed their name to the Association of Swedish Media and Communication Research[62], still with the Swedish nickname FSMK. The main aims of the organisation were to stimulate and develop the MCS research area, as well as the conditions-, education- and general interest for it. FSMK started seminars in mass media in the late seventies and also lobbied politicians and officials, passing resolutions.[63] FSMK started seminars in mass media in the late seventies and also lobbied politicians and officials, passing resolutions.[64] FSMK viewed media research as a relevant issue for universities and colleges in all parts of Sweden. If there was to be created a new research area, then it should be represented at all universities. The first attempt to establish a discipline was presented 1977, in the government official report on mass media research, but the outcome was viewed as a failure by FSMK.[65]

In 1978 FSMK already had 87 members and arranged a symposium, focusing at how the research of mass communication should be organized. The conclusion was that there were some possible alternative routes. The first one was to create sub-categories within existing disciplines, allowing researchers to specialize, but staying within their discipline. The second route was to integrate different perspectives on media and communication, but keeping their own points of departure. A third route meant even greater integration; both theories and

[59] Nordicom-nytt, no 1, Gothenburg, 1976
[60] Hadenius Stig, *Den nödvändiga journalistikforskningen*, in "Forskning om journalistik,medier & kommunikation,ämnesområdet idag och i framtiden,Red.Carlsson Ulla & Lindblad Anders 1992,Göteborg,p 71
[61] Föreningen för Svenska Mass Kommunikationsforskare - FSMK
[62] Föreningen för Svensk Media & Kommunikationsforskning - FSMK
[63] Kleberg Madeleine, *Välkomna till 25 år med SMASSK*, in "Mångfald i medieforskningen, Red. Ulla Carlsson, Göteborg 2003, p 10ff
[64] Kleberg Madeleine, *Välkomna till 25 år med SMASSK*, in "Mångfald i medieforskningen, Red. Ulla Carlsson, Göteborg 2003, p 10ff
[65] Weibull Lennart, *Forskaridentitet i förändring,* in "Mångfald i medieforskningen, Red. Ulla Carlsson, Göteborg 2003, p 60

methods were to be developed towards one uniform direction, leading into one research field.[66] In 1979, Nowak and his colleagues from FSMK argued that the research in mass media and mass communication should be integrated into a new discipline. This can be done at many different levels, FSMK argues for interdisciplinary rather than multidisciplinary.[67] Therefore FSMK initiated the interdisciplinary mass media seminars. At the fourth Nordic mass communication conference in Umeå in 1979, it was commonly argued that the research field of mass media and communication needed its own departments at Swedish universities. It was furthermore argued that there is a need of continuity, social security for the researchers, and freedom in research.[68] Actually, by the end of the seventies, mass communication and mass media were to a much greater extent seen as an independent research field. However, Weibull writes that during the end of the seventies and during all the eighties, there was a continuing discussion about whether it's useful to establish a uniting discipline for the diverse groups of media, mass-communication and journalism researchers. The dividing line in the discussions separates those, often representing steadily established disciplines, who argue that the field in the future should continue to be studied from those disciplines. The counterpart argued that there is a theoretical core, which motivates the establishment of a new discipline.[69] Further it can be said that by the end of the seventies there are about 20 academic subjects that study mass media and mass communication. Most of the research is carried out at some prominent departments. In fact, the most is actually done at the department for audience and program research at Swedish Radio.[70]

In 1980 FSMK called on Jan Erik Wikström, the minister of education and cultural affairs, as well as Bert Levin, the under-secretary of State. FSMK laid claims that research about mass communication should be established as a subject at Swedish universities and colleges. FSMK also proposed that research and undergraduate studies should be well intertwined. Furthermore, FSMK also demanded that the government should increase the financial aid by establishing six professorships by 1985, sponsoring the mass media seminars and the publication of Nordicom-Nytt/Sverige[71] The government didn't respond to all the demands of FSMK, but at least to some of them and both the pioneer researchers and FSMK sure influenced the politicians through lobbying.[72] One example is a letter responding to the government's proposition in 1981/82:100, attachment 12 for the department of education. Gustafsson and von Feilitzen then stress the need for a professorship in Lund by 1982/83.[73]

In 1981 Weibull argues that there is lack of contact between undergraduate studies and research in mass communication since it hasn't been established as an academic subject. The researchers express an increasing interest in establishing undergraduate studies to stimulate recruitment of doctoral candidates. A work process has been initiated to establish a new interdisciplinary subject that is supposed to embrace not only mass communication but also

[66] Kleberg Madeleine, *Välkomna till 25 år med SMASSK*, in "Mångfald i medieforskningen, Red. Ulla Carlsson, Göteborg 2003, p 17
[67] Nowak Kjell (Editor), *Att studera massmediernas effekter,* Stockholm, 1979, p 5
[68] From a verbal discussion about the conference with Ulla Carlsson, 2006-01-09
[69] Weibull Lennart, *Masskommunikation som ämnesområde*, in "Forskning om journalistik,medier & kommunikation,ämnesområdet idag och i framtiden,Red.Carlsson Ulla & Lindblad Anders 1992,Göteborg,p 24f
[70] Nowak Kjell (Editor), *Att studera massmediernas effekter,* Stockholm, 1979, p 4 + p 21
[71] Kleberg Madeleine, *Välkomna till 25 år med SMASSK*, in "Mångfald i medieforskningen, Red. Ulla Carlsson, Göteborg 2003, p 10ff
[72] http://www.jmg.gu.se/fsmk/SIDOR/historik.html
[73] *Masskommunikationsforskningen i statsverkspropositionen 1981/82*, Nordicom-nytt,Gothenburg, No 1 ,1982 p 14

journalism and information technology.[74] Weibull writes that the institutionalization process by the end of the eighties took clear organisational steps, due to the demands from the undergraduate education programs. The undergraduate and postgraduate levels moved closer to each other, especially at the related departments in Gothenburg and Stockholm.[75] In 1982 there were intense discussions whether studies in mass-communication and media should be designed as preparatory for professions or as a pure academic subject. The later was chosen, with a positioning towards the science of communication studies.[76]

To carry on, Weibull reveals that there was a process of disciplinary professionalism led by Finland, Denmark and Norway, which also affected Sweden. In Finland the discipline was established during the seventies. The field was also established institutionally at universities; in 1980 there was a professorship in massmedia research established at Gothenburg University due to a political decision.[77] In 1980, also the centre for mass communication research was established at Stockholm University, a centre that explicitly expressed ambitions to integrate the humanistic and the social science traditions.[78] In December 1985 a professorship in sociology directed towards massmedia research was announced locally at Lund University. There were two applicants, Karl-Erik Rosengren and Lowe Hedman. Actually Lowe Hedman applied only on after the encouragement of Karl-Erik Rosengren that it would look good if there were more applicants.[79] During the same year, Umeå University established a department for communication studies.[80] However the professorship in Umeå wasn't installed until early nineties, and nowadays they have one of the two female Swedish professors in the subject.[81] In comparison to other Nordic countries, it can be said that Anita Werner became the first female professor in mass communication research in Norway in 1988.[82] This happened at a time when, in other words, there were only two professorships in total in Sweden. The following year, in 1989, there was a new professorship installed at the School of Business, Economics and Law at Gothenburg University. The pioneer Karl-Erik Gustafsson, associate professor and leader of the information and massmedia-group since 1968, then became a full professor. The professorship was sponsored by Carl-Olof och Jenz Hamrins Stiftelse and based in Gothenburg until late 2003, and was then moved to Jönköping University.[83]

However, soon things would turnout different also in Sweden. Through the governmental research political bill in 1990 the political interests in the field were confirmed and the economic possibilities for development increased significantly. The bill made possible new professorships and in the early nineties professorships in journalism or masscommunication were installed in Gothenburg, Stockholm, Umeå and Lund. Stockholm and Gothenburg thereby had two professorships each.[84] The professorships at the different seats of learning

---

[74] Weibull Lennart, *Forskningsanknuten utbildning i masskommunikation – erfarenheter från utvecklingsarbete i Göteborg*, in "Nordicom-nytt", Gothenburg, No 2-3, 1981, p 7ff

[75] Weibull Lennart, *Ett försök till empirisk bestämning*, JMG, Arbetsrapport nr 12, Göteborg, 1991, p 5

[76] (UHÄ-rapport 1982:35)

[77] Carlsson Ulla, *Masskommunikationsforskning i Sverige 1977-1987. En översikt*, in "Masskommunikation och kultur", Nordicom-Nytt, Nr 1-2/1988, Kungälv, 1988

[78] Von Felitzen, Cecilia, *Den kulturella vändningen – och sedan…?*, in "Kommunikationens korsningar", Nordicom Gothenburg, 1994, p 9

[79] Conversation with Lowe Hedman 2006-01-13

[80] Nordicom-nytt, Gothenburg, No 1, 1986, p 5

[81] E-mail from Umeå University Professor Inga-Britt Lindblad, 2006-01-15

[82] *Medier, människor, samhälle*, Nordicom-Nytt Sverige, 3-4, 1990, Kungälv, 1991

[83] E-mail from Jönlöping University Professor Emeritus Karl-Erik Gustafsson, 2006-01-13

[84] Utvärdering av medie- och kommunikationsvetenskapliga utbildningar vid svenska universitet och högskolor, Högskoleverkets rapportserie 2001:25 R, see chapter "Vad är medie- och kommunikationsvetenskap?

were organisationally installed at different faculties; those in mass communication were mainly placed under the faculty of the arts (humanistic), which was the case for the universities in Stockholm and Umeå. The professorships in massmedia research were installed within the social science faculty; those were the universities of Lund, Uppsala and Gothenburg. During the seventies there was a survey-study directed at mass communication researchers and their self-conception, about half expressed that they belonged to the traditions of social science, the other half felt their roots were in the humanistic field.[85] The departmental conditions are very important in the process of boundary work, and I will discuss this later. During the eighties there were about 130 active researchers and a great nuance of research projects.[86] There were about 20 disciplines at almost 40 departments, who conducted research focused at mass communication.[87] It may seem like the research field was quite diverse, but most of the research was actually rather concentrated too few universities. It can also be added that until the end of eighties, the recruitment of researchers in mass communication was mostly from sociology, literature, Nordic languages, history and political science.[88]

We can see that the media-related research field showed few signs of stability, and could rather be characterized as continually evolving, taking new paths as new actors were enrolled. During the seventies, eighties and early nineties, there was a shift from narrower studies of audiences and media contents, to more broad approaches; as the studies of structure, the role and conditions of media. There were also trends for studies of what determines the development of media, both the content and the structure. The view of media was broadened as it started to be seen as a part of society and culture.[89] Carlsson writes that an important research trend in the eighties was to view mass communication as part of culture.[90] By the end of the eighties, the research in mass communication is mainly focused at the structure and the audience of the mass media, mass communication and its culture, journalism and planned communication.[91]

To summarize the development for the past decades, Weibull writes that the research in mass communication was much divided in the sixties, during the seventies it was under a process of interdisciplinary development work, which resulted in that there was an organisational consolidation during the eighties.[92] During the eighties the financial aid for the field escalated, as well as the demands for a discipline. Different actors have had many different interests in the direction of development of media-related research in Sweden, putting in efforts of boundary-work to achieve their different goals. Common denominators of their goals have been to gain legitimacy, power and economical resources for research in mass-communication and media studies. We can now move onwards into the nineties. Rosengren writes that the journalism, media and communication field had a great breakthrough in 1990,

---

[85] Kronvall Kaj, *Massmedieforskning i Sverige*, DSN 1979:15, Stockholm, 1976
[86] Weibull Lennart, *Masskommunikation som ämnesområde*, in "Forskning om journalistik,medier & kommunikation,ämnesområdet idag och i framtiden",Red.Carlsson Ulla & Lindblad Anders 1992,Göteborg,p 24
[87] *Masskommunikationsforskning i Sverige 1985*, Nordicom-nytt, No 1-2, Gothenburg, 1985
[88] Kleberg Madeleine, *Kommentar till forskningsöversikten*, in "Masskommunikation och kultur", Nordicom no 1-2, Göteborg, 1988, p 37
[89] Weibull Lennart, *Masskommunikation som ämnesområde*, in "Forskning om journalistik,medier & kommunikation,ämnesområdet idag och i framtiden,Red.Carlsson Ulla & Lindblad Anders 1992,Göteborg,p 28f
[90] Carlsson Ulla, *Masskommunikationsforskning i Sverige 1977-1987, en översikt*, in "Masskommunikation och kultur", Nordicom no 1-2, Göteborg, 1988, p 22
[91] Weibull Lennart, *Ett försök till empirisk bestämning*, JMG, Arbetsrapport nr 12, Göteborg, 1991, p 19f
[92] Weibull Lennart, *Masskommunikationsforskningen i Sverige*, Arbetsrapport 5,Göteborgs Universitet,1985, p4

a statement Kleberg concurs with.[93] They argue there was a breakthrough because the government introduced a bill where they explicitly announced that they were going to invest big resources in developing the research area of mass media. The government kept their promise, as the number of professorships in Sweden soon had increased to nine, from which six were state-sponsored. Rosengren also writes that the research area of mass media more and more got intertwined with journalism and information technology. [94] The efforts of the pioneers and FSMK can certainly be said to start bear fruits as politicians and others are increasing their support.

To round off this time period I will now analyze the establishment period closer through boundary-work and Disciplinary Boundary Construction. We have seen that the interests for research in mass communication and media as well as in establishing a discipline continually have increased since the seventies. I have identified that especially the pioneer researchers have conducted boundary-work to develop the research area of mass communication and media. Many of the pioneers were involved in establishing FSMK and enrolling new members, increasing the organisations power to influence politicians and others to raise the support. The pioneers, FSMK and others have themselves given many reasons why they wanted to achieve certain goals, such as establishing a discipline. Can boundary-work and Disciplinary Boundary Construction give us a further understanding of their reasons and interests? From those perspectives I believe it can be said that there was a great interest in cooperation between researchers and that they wanted to unite. Their interest in unification was expressed by the formation of FSMK, the seminars and the conferences. Establishing a discipline where they felt belonging was probably a natural process for their personal development as researchers. This goes hand in hand with their expressed interests in social security, continuity, freedom in research. The interests have also been of organisational character, that a discipline would make it easier to integrate research with undergraduate studies. I believe one underlying cause in establishing the discipline is to gain academic status and recognition. Through boundary-work they seek to improve the field and one issue that was discussed concerned that the formation of an academic subject is necessary to improve the schooling of doctorate candidates. I find it interesting to conclude in most issues there seem to have been quite little negotiation among the actors. They rather seem to have had the same interests, and what does this consensus mean? For example that FSMK was established with the objectives of stimulate the intellectual exchange and interest for media and mass communication, as well as establishing a discipline. I believe that consensus among smaller groups conducting boundary-work increase their possibilities for success in a broader arena.

1991-1994; Constructing the disciplinary identity of MCS.

The institutional and editorial chief of Nordicom, Ulla Carlsson, discusses that the many actors were interested in establishing a discipline since it then would be easier to develop common traditions of methods, traditions and starting points, thereby creating a research field.[95] It was because of the developing institutionalization through the establishment of several new professorships, that the research field felt a need of integration and uniformity. At a conference for information technology and communication in 1991 it was jointly decided that the recognized term for all the diverse studies in the former fields of mass-

[93] Kleberg Madeleine, *Välkomna till 25 år med SMASSK*, in "Mångfald i medieforskningen, Red. Ulla Carlsson, Göteborg 2003, p 16

[94] Rosengren Karl Erik, *Medie- och kommunikationsvetenskap*, in "Forskning om journalistik, medier & kommunikation, ämnesområdet idag och i framtiden,Red.Carlsson Ulla & Lindblad Anders 1992,Göteborg,p 7f

[95] Carlsson Ulla, *Några inledande ord*, in "Mångfald i medieforskningen, Red. Ulla Carlsson,Göteborg 2003,p 8

communication, information-knowledge and media from now on should be Media and Communication Studies[96] (MCS)[97]. Weibull argues that mass communication associates too much to the traditions of social science and other definitions of media, therefore the term MCS should be used, as it is associated with media as part of a communication process.[98] MCS became the new generic term that could represent all the former diverse research areas it had emerged from. Therefore I consider 1991 as a year which marks the initiation of a new era. MCS became the name of a new academic subject and discipline, but how should it be formed? It should be emphasized that there were a great number of different paths MCS could have developed, as it is a construction by actors conducting boundary-work.

Rosengren writes that the name for the discipline MCS was jointly taken by most seats of learning soon after the conference in Umeå in1991. Rosengren believe it's very important to gather many different education and research programs within the MCS discipline, and still not losing intellectual resources. Rosengren assumes that the term MCS will prevail for several decades ahead.[99] Nordicom Information changed their subtitle from "About Mass Communication Research in North" in 1993 to "About Media and Communication Research in the North". The MCS term for the discipline is a very important aspect for the future development since it will help to make clear what methods to use, which theories to apply, and what objects to study. The establishment is also related to which journals that should be read, from which funds to apply for grants. However, many of those aspects are not at all predestined, but are constructions by the actors within and nearby the discipline. It's this construction that now starts in 1991. Nowak observes with delight that in 1992, MCS has become a common term, which embraces the field of information, communication and media studies. Nowak writes that more and more related departments at universities have changed their names to MCS from for example mass-communication research. Nowak argues that MCS is a broader term which comprises both social sciences and the humanities, and not only mass media but also other forms of media.[100]

One conclusion so far is that researchers from many diverse disciplines have managed to establish a new discipline called MCS, which embraces the broad and nuanced research field of media and communication. However, the direction of MCS is in the hands of the people involved as MCS is being created through boundary-work. Rosengren emphasizes that science is not static, but rather tends to continually change, similar to trailing plants that develop wherever possible, and where they hopefully do good. Rosengren argues that the MCS discipline is much diversified, and that there are hundreds of possible disciplines to which it can be directed, within the social sciences and the humanities. Rosengren also writes that the MCS discipline stretches over time and space, at individual-, group- and higher levels, along with many other disciplines, intersecting with others.[101] It can also be discussed and questioned if the definition of MCS as a discipline is correct since it has different departmental roots at different seats of learning.

---

[96] Weibull Lennart, *Masskommunikation som ämnesområde*, in "Forskning om journalistik,medier & kommunikation,ämnesområdet idag och i framtiden,Red.Carlsson Ulla & Lindblad Anders 1992,Göteborg,p 21ff
[97] Medie- och kommunikationsvetenskap (MKV) is the Swedish term.
[98] Weibull Lennart, *Ett försök till empirisk bestämning*, JMG, Arbetsrapport nr 12, Göteborg, 1991, p 24
[99] Rosengren Karl Erik, *Medie- och kommunikationsvetenskap*, in "Forskning om journalistik, medier & kommunikation, ämnesområdet idag och i framtiden,Red.Carlsson Ulla & Lindblad Anders 1992,Göteborg,p15ff
[100] Nowak Kjell, *Forskning om medier och kommunikation*, in "Forskning om journalistik,medier & kommunikation,ämnesområdet idag och i framtiden,Red.Carlsson Ulla & Lindblad Anders 1992,Göteborg,p 37f
[101] Rosengren Karl Erik, *Medie- och kommunikationsvetenskap*, in "Forskning om journalistik, medier & kommunikation, ämnesområdet idag och i framtiden,Red.Carlsson Ulla & Lindblad Anders 1992,Göteborg,p 12f

Weibull holds the belief that the motives for the institutionalization of MCS were to emphasize its importance, and also to place it on the Swedish maps for academic disciplines. Actors tended to demarcate those within MCS from others as MCS wanted to profile itself and departmentalize its work. In other words, boundary-work was an important aspect, and the interests of those with sympathetic views to the institutionalization were opposed by some actors from established departments, especially at the universities.[102] Jansson writes that one important aspect in the understanding of the establishment of MCS is that individual actors have sought and set up positions. The identity-building process of the individual researcher is influenced by the structures of both the discipline and the department and university to which she belongs, but also by other people in the researcher's network.[103] Esaisson writes that the future of a discipline often lies in the hands of the actors, and how good they are at establishing fruitful relationships with those people with power. Often the future direction of the discipline is indirectly decided by a small amount of people: the professors, directors of studies and people responsible for research grants and doctorate studies.[104]

Weibull states that when MCS started taking form, Swedish media and communication research entered a new era. Weibull relates to the history of American mass-communication research, highlighting that he sees signs of the same trends in Sweden. Weibull concludes that one important aspect by establishing the discipline is that in the near future MCS will produce graduates with MCS as their original master subject, and later also examine dissertation of doctoral candidates. This should stimulate the discipline further.[105] However the boundaries of MCS still had to be constructed, therefore actors sought to form it through boundary-work. Most of the people involved in MCS, as for example the professors, were interested in discussions about the future of the discipline and sought cooperation between different seats of learning.

Nowak writes that the development of MCS depends upon trends in local departments, even upon individual researchers. Nowak argues that MCS would benefit from a closer relationship to other disciplines that study media and communication from an array of perspectives. MCS need to establish a common theoretical and methodological platform by integrating the different traditions that MCS has emerged from. Simultaneously MCS would benefit from preserving and developing an exchange of knowledge with other related disciplines. There should be an intellectual openness, and Nowak argues that the discipline should take form slowly, allowing local variances and profiles, still connected to the core base of the discipline.[106] Weibull´s arguments are similar to Nowak, emphasizing that it's important that the MCS discipline establish a specific core, as well as allowing fruitful influences from other disciplines. When the core of the discipline is being developed one should consider its objects, central questions and the methodology.[107] Ekencrantz argues for an MCS discipline with a more defined theoretical core, and that MCS should strive for better dialogues with

---

[102] Weibull Lennart, *Forskaridentitet i förändring,* in "Mångfald i medieforskningen, Red. Ulla Carlsson, Göteborg 2003, p 60

[103] Jansson André, *Tids nog märker man att man vill göra något eget*, in "Mångfald i medieforskningen, Red. Ulla Carlsson, Göteborg 2003, p 100ff

[104] Esaiasson Peter, *Omedvetna kommunikationsforskare?*, in "Mångfald i medieforskningen, Red. Ulla Carlsson, Göteborg 2003, p 36

[105] Weibull Lennart, *Masskommunikation som ämnesområde*, in "Forskning om journalistik,medier & kommunikation,ämnesområdet idag och i framtiden,Red.Carlsson Ulla & Lindblad Anders 1992,Göteborg,p 30

[106] Nowak Kjell, *Forskning om medier och kommunikation*, in "Forskning om journalistik,medier & kommunikation,ämnesområdet idag och i framtiden,Red.Carlsson Ulla & Lindblad Anders 1992,Göteborg,p 54f

[107] Weibull Lennart, *Masskommunikation som ämnesområde*, in "Forskning om journalistik,medier & kommunikation,ämnesområdet idag och i framtiden,Red.Carlsson Ulla & Lindblad Anders 1992,Göteborg,p 24f

other disciplines. Therefore Ekencrantz argues for attempts to leave the distinction between the humanities and the social sciences, as the boundaries set by organisations to a great extent determine the research trends.[108] Nowak writes that most researchers in MCS tend to strive for integration between the humanistic and social science tradition. Nowak write that especially the social scientists are open-minded in applying the theories and methods used in the humanistic tradition.[109] Weibull also writes that it's fruitful to treat the MCS discipline as an entirety where researchers from both the humanities and social sciences can travel alongside each other. That these traditions do not have to exclude, but should rather be able to complement each other.[110] We can remind ourselves that FSMK from start made sure to enrol researcher representatives from both the humanistic as the social science tradition.[111]

Rosengren express that even if it's good if MCS make a boundary to other disciplines, MCS need to use not only their own theories and methods. Rosengren argues that MCS need xenogamy, which concerns different forms of cross-fertilizing, in order to adopt influences from other disciplines in the humanities and social sciences. Although Rosengren believe the MCS discipline has managed to do this well so far, it's a process that is problematic since there is a risk for fragmentation and intellectual stagnation. Rosengren writes that to avoid fragmentation it's of great importance that the researchers can keep moving between different fields such as between the humanities and the social sciences, between journalism, mass media and mass-communication research. Ekencrantz writes that the institutionalization of the MCS discipline seem to have resulted in less openness to nearby disciplines. That most of the cross-fertilization comes from students, doctorate candidates and teachers who have their origins in other disciplines.[112]

Rosengren further argues that to avoid intellectual stagnation it's necessary to establish a minimum level of size to stimulate competition. The size of the MCS discipline in Sweden has, according to Rosengren, managed to reach this level through the establishment of several new professorships in the early nineties. Rosengren further argues that it's necessary to cooperate internally in the discipline through research programs, but also external cooperation with adjacent discipline, as well as internationally both internally and externally. Rosengren argues that it's important to strive for homogeneity, but still not losing the heterogeneity of the actors in the discipline. This work has to be carried out by many, but mainly by head of departments, director of studies as well as teachers. Another problem, Rosengren argues, is that different departments, professorships and education programs related to the new MCS discipline are described in many different ways. Rosengren supposes that's a problem the discipline has to face and deal with, since it's common in many disciplines. He also concludes that there will always be studies of media and communication in many other disciplines than MCS, and that's necessary not bad for MCS. Rosengren stresses that an important task for the MCS discipline is to facilitate transfers between different seats of learning at both

---

[108] Ekecrantz Jan, *Medier, kommunikation och social kritik*, in "Kommunikationens korsningar", Nordicom Gothenburg, 1994, p 12

[109] Nowak Kjell, *Närmandet mellan samhällsvetenskap och humaniora – Medie- och kommunikationsforskningen i Norden*, Nordicom Information, No 1-2, Gothenburg, 1994 p 41

[110] Weibull Lennart, *Masskommunikation som ämnesområde*, in "Forskning om journalistik,medier & kommunikation,ämnesområdet idag och i framtiden,Red.Carlsson Ulla & Lindblad Anders 1992,Göteborg,p 30

[111] Von Felitzen, Cecilia, *Den kulturella vändningen – och sedan...?*, in "Kommunikationens korsningar", Nordicom Gothenburg, 1994, p 9

[112] Ekecrantz Jan, *Medier, kommunikation och social kritik*, in "Kommunikationens korsningar", Nordicom Gothenburg, 1994, p 11

undergraduate and postgraduate levels. Therefore it's necessary to decide upon similar courses for the first 60 points of MCS.[113]

We can see that there are two essential topics in focus, which also interfere with each other. First, one concern is to establish a core of contents and direction in the MCS discipline. Second, there is an interest in xenogamy with other disciplines, which is only possible if the boundaries of the discipline are loose in the edges, allowing for the actors to adopt theories and methods from other disciplines. The discussions of how to draw boundaries are in general terms kept at wide perspectives. Rosengren argues that when demarcating MSC, there are two main topics too focus at, on the one hand about the disciplines relation to theories of science, on the other about the more practical institutional work.[114] However there are some detailed attempts of clarification. One example is when Weibull discusses how to draw demarcation lines for the MCS discipline. Weibull argues that the term mediated communication need to be clearly expressed, and distinguished from a broader approach in communication, so it demarcates itself from, for example, personal communication.[115]

During the first years succeeding 1991 the actors forming the discipline were not only trying to set the direction for the discipline but also to establish MCS among other stakeholders in the scientific community, among the public, in the political sphere as well as among different sponsors. MCS have had to create their own profile in relation to some of the disciplines and such as history, journalism, political science, economy, sociology and so on, from which the discipline has emerged. For example, there have been discussions concerning the relation between research in mass-communication and journalism. It has been argued that journalism is part of the broader field of mass-communication,[116] but some others disagree.[117] Hadenius argues that Sweden needs research in journalism based on a theoretical and empirical platform of its own.[118] MCS also had to profile themselves in relation to professions in the media industry. MCS clearly has an interest in adapting ideas, theories, methods and results from other disciplines, but will at the same time need to clearly distance themselves from them. However, some people question how fruitful the establishment of the MCS discipline was for the exchanges and communication between disciplines concerning media and communication research. When the MCS discipline was established, there were still many researchers, carrying out media and communication related research, which stayed with their mother discipline. In the early nineties it was believed this was fruitful for MCS, since there was a lot of exchange, but the xenogamy seems to have decreased. Sjölander contributes with a relevant example; she writes that when Umeå University established a separate department for MCS in 1993, many of the fruitful interdisciplinary exchanges with other researchers decreased drastically.[119] Hallberg discusses interdisciplinary similarities between subjects[120]. When this

---

[113] Rosengren Karl Erik, *Medie- och kommunikationsvetenskap*, in "Forskning om journalistik, medier & kommunikation, ämnesområdet idag och i framtiden,Red.Carlsson Ulla & Lindblad Anders 1992,Göteborg,p15ff
[114] Rosengren Karl Erik, *Medie- och kommunikationsvetenskap*, in "Forskning om journalistik, medier & kommunikation, ämnesområdet idag och i framtiden,Red.Carlsson Ulla & Lindblad Anders 1992,Göteborg,p15ff p 7f
[115] Weibull Lennart, *Masskommunikation som ämnesområde*, in "Forskning om journalistik,medier & kommunikation,ämnesområdet idag och i framtiden,Red.Carlsson Ulla & Lindblad Anders 1992,Göteborg,p 25
[116] Se; *Pressens Årbog*, Tema journalistikforskning, 1983:2, samt *Nordicom-information*, Nr1-2, 1989, Göteborg
[117] Asp Kent, *Journalistik som forskningsområde*, in "Forskning om journalistik,medier & kommunikation,ämnesområdet idag och i framtiden,Red.Carlsson Ulla & Lindblad Anders 1992,Göteborg,p 67
[118] Hadenius Stig, *Den nödvändiga journalistikforskningen*, in "Forskning om journalistik,medier & kommunikation,ämnesområdet idag och i framtiden,Red.Carlsson Ulla & Lindblad Anders 1992,Göteborg,p 71
[119] Sjölander Annika*, Kärnproblemen och medie- och kommunikationsvetenskapen*, in "Mångfald i medieforskningen", Red. Ulla Carlsson, Göteborg 2003, p 89 and p 97
[120] Hallberg Margareta, *Etnologisk koreografi*, Göteborg, 2001, s 138

happens, xenogamy is clearly possible, and often also favourable. The development of MCS was helped by political factors; one very important political decision took place in 1993 when the Swedish government decided to carry out a university reform that decentralized the whole university system. The government then started to reimburse the seats of learning based upon the number of students they provided education. In other words, MCS would benefit from growing, as the funds changed in relation to the number of students.

How has the research trends in MCS changed? Weibull writes that it became popular to conduct research projects that stretch over time, allowing analysis and comparison from different years. Another trend was the shift from studies related mainly to politics and society, to questions of the culture of society, lifestyles and subcultures.[121] Nowak also argues that one trend is the growing relation between media and culture, and emphasizes the increasing interest for questions of meaning and interpretation.[122] Von Felitizen writes that there is an increasing interest in conducting MCS research over time.[123]

Before continuing to the next time period I will now analyze the first phase of the maintenance period of Disciplinary Boundary Construction. The MCS members discussed and constructed the boundaries of MCS intensely at conferences, seminars and in books, reports and articles. I believe they showed clearly that the MCS discipline will have no predestined content and outlook, but rather have to be constructed. Although there were many contributions to the boundary-work process, most of them were mostly adding to the consensus. The majority of MCS members seemed to agree at an early stage that MCS need to develop a clearly defined core of theories, methods and objects of study to make sure MCS can demarcate itself from nearby disciplines. Also there was a consensus that MCS should integrate the traditions of social science and the humanities, as well as stimulating xenogamy. The discussions rather concerned the details of how to draw the specific boundaries. I find it interesting that there was such consensus about what issues that was important to construct boundaries about, that the negotiation mostly concerned how to do it. I believe that the fact that there was a conference arranged where the representatives from different seats of learning decided upon the MCS-term and transformed this into action, shows quite well that there was a great interest in unification.

1994-2005; Disciplinary boundaries on the slide.

In this chapter I will continue the description of how MCS develops, and the discussions that have occurred. As we have seen there were much boundary-work to establish MCS as a discipline, and during the following years there were intense discussions about the core of the discipline, and how to integrate the discipline with other disciplines, as well as the integration of the humanities and the social sciences. As we will see, there are ongoing discussions about all of those three themes also during this time period. But the actors also bring out new issues for discussions, and the processes of boundary-work continue. Carlsson writes that just as many other subjects and disciplines, the character and meaning of MCS have changed over time through social processes.[124] In this chapter I will also discuss the economical and social conditions of the discipline. What is MCS like nowadays, and how is it different at the great

---

[121] Weibull Lennart, *Ett försök till empirisk bestämning*, JMG, Arbetsrapport nr 12, Göteborg, 1991, p 15f

[122] Nowak Kjell, *Forskning om medier och kommunikation*, in "Forskning om journalistik,medier & kommunikation,ämnesområdet idag och i framtiden,Red.Carlsson Ulla & Lindblad Anders 1992,Göteborg,p 40

[123] Von Felitizen, Cecilia, *Den kulturella vändningen – och sedan...?*, in "Kommunikationens korsningar", Nordicom Gothenburg, 1994, p 10

[124] Carlsson Ulla, *Några inledande ord*, i "Mångfald i medieforskningen, Red. Ulla Carlsson, Göteborg 2003, p 7

amount of seats of learning established? Much of this information is gathered from the websites of the seats of learning, as well as from an extensive evaluation analysis of the MCS field carried out by the Swedish national agency for higher education. (HSV)[125] I will start this chapter with the discussions and boundary-work that have occurred and round it off by describing the situation of MCS. I believe this arrangement is most fruitful for the reader in order to understand what has happened.

In the boundary-work of the MCS discipline the past decade there have been many issues. Most actors seem to agree that MCS is a discipline as it is being studied at some level at most Swedish colleges or universities. One example which insinuates that MCS has gained stability as a discipline is when Bruhn Jensen writes in the Nordic journal Nordicom Review; "In terms of the frameworks that produce scientific continuity – departments, journals, conferences, and consultancy to public and private clients – the field of media and communication research is now a de facto discipline in the Nordic countries, boasting academic presence as well as public legitimacy."[126] However, not everyone seem to agree as Falkheimer expresses uncertainty whether MCS is a discipline or not, and argues that it's better to view MCS as an academic subject within a research field.[127] Lindstedt and Reimer discuss whether MCS is a discipline or a research field. They also discuss how to make the boundaries if MCS should be called a discipline. There is a need for boundary-work for the relation between the humanities and social sciences, science and culture, quantitative and qualitative, theory and practice and so on. Lindstedt and Reimer argue that it' very difficult to demarcate MCS in theoretical and empirical terms as much of the knowledge has been borrowed from other disciplines.[128]

We know that MCS have been influenced by several well-established disciplines throughout the years such as sociology, political science, history and economics. As many disciplines are have emerged during the nineties and beginning of the twenty-first century, there are now others to consider. Falkheimer writes that disciplines as informatics and science of systems have moved closer to MCS, and the studies where computer mediated communication are at focus.[129] This has happened especially in the nineties. Jansson discusses that MCS lately has been influenced by literary studies, studies in film, anthropology, ethnology, cultural geography and studies in art. Jansson also states that the boundaries are especially fluent in the field of cultural studies within MCS, since those hermeneutic perspectives usually represent an integrative view on science.[130] Just as during other eras, the actors' stresses that MCS will benefit from xenogamy, meaning the cross-fertilization with other disciplines. Lindstedt and Reimer, for example, argue that MCS need exchanges with other disciplines, but also stresses that MCS should widen its horizons and boundaries, to keep developing.[131] MCS relation to nearby disciplines moves us onward to their boundary-work to establish a core identity, which has taken more specialized steps.

---

[125] In Sweden it's named Högskoleverket, HSV

[126] Bruhn Jensen Klaus, *The 14th Nordic conference on Media and Communication Research,* in Nordicom review, Carlsson Ulla (Editor), Gothenburg, No 2, 2000, p 24

[127] Falkheimer Jesper, *Medier och Kommunikation*, Lund, 2001, p 19

[128] Lindstedt Inger & Reimer Bo, *Medier och den tredje kulturen*, Nordicom Information, No 4, Gothenburg, 1999, p 101

[129] Falkheimer Jesper, *Medier och Kommunikation*, Lund, 2001, p 19

[130] Jansson André, *Mediekultur och samhälle,* Lund, 2002, p 17

[131] Lindstedt Inger & Reimer Bo, *Medier och den tredje kulturen*, Nordicom Information, No 4, Gothenburg, 1999, p 103

Falkheimer writes that still in 2001, the actors of MCS are having difficulties in explaining to others what MCS is really about.[132] Many believe that MCS is still trying to establish its core. Some compare MCS to a chocolate doughnut, as it seems like there is no core.

Many have concluded that since communication is a very broad phenomenon, it's not surprising that it is being studied from many different perspectives in several disciplines, as well as in many countries. However, this makes it difficult in the MCS education programs, since many departments use different theoretical frameworks. Jansson writes that MCS can be characterised as very broad in the sense that there are many profiles concerning objects of study and methodology.[133] The Swedish National Agency fo Higher Eduscation, (HSV) concludes that MCS has had, and still have, a dilemma in establishing a solid core, and still keep open to nearby discipline, which for example is being argued by Weibull. [134] Ever since the establishment of MCS, a prominent argument has been that MCS need to co-operate well with other disciplines, as it's important to broaden the perspectives and enrich the development of theories and methods. I find it interesting that the Swedish MCS discipline have shown a much greater interest in establishing a core, in comparison with other countries in Scandinavia. Still in 1999 there was internal boundary-work in the MCS discipline concerning the development of a core profile. There were several conferences that aimed to discuss and formulate the core, led by a group of professors. The conclusions from the conferences in Gävle and Örebro in 1999 resulted in this description of the MCS field (my translation);

MCS includes studies of mass media such as press, radio, TV as well as different kinds of computer-related media. MCS also includes techniques and strategies for mediated communication in different social and cultural contexts. Furthermore MCS is about the conditions of media and communication, including their conditions of production, content and forms of expressions, as well as their impact on society and people's thinking and daily lives.[135]

However, not everyone think that MCS is still looking for its core. Bolin expressed his belief in 2001 that the MCS search for an identity seems to be finished, that the discipline is well established in the Swedish academic system. However there is still a lot of ambivalence in the MCS discipline. Bolin discusses that keeping a uniform core sense of the MCS of course involves the media it's studying, and that the media remains a study object in many other disciplines.[136] Then there are those, as Jansson, who argue that the boundaries of the MCS discipline are blurrier than clear and even questions whether MCS is the right term for the discipline. Jansson stresses that the internal discussions of how much focus should be put on Media, and the amount focused on Communication, never seem to come to an end. Jansson finds it likely that the boundaries of MCS will become even more uncertain in the future, as a trend is that the meaning of central terms in MCS, such as medium, audience and information, no longer are clear.[137] It has also been argues that another trend causing uncertainties is that most seats of learning's have created their own profiles of MCS, which brings confusion about what MCS should represent. However it should be said that many argue that MCS need more width, plurality and exchanges, something made possible partly through universities different profiles. Carlsson argue that there is a need to encourage more exchanges with other

---

[132] Falkheimer Jesper, *Medier och Kommunikation*, Lund, 2001, p 15
[133] Jansson André, *Mediekultur och samhälle*, Lund, 2002, p 13
[134] Weibull Lennart, *Forskaridentitet i förändring,* in "Mångfald i medieforskningen, Red. Ulla Carlsson, Göteborg 2003, p 62
[135] Utvärdering av medie- och kommunikationsvetenskapliga utbildningar vid svenska universitet och högskolor, Högskoleverkets rapportserie 2001:25 R, p 27
[136] Bolin Göran, *Medieforskning mellan kultur och samhälle,* in "Mångfald i medieforskningen, Red. Ulla Carlsson, Göteborg 2003, p 71f
[137] Jansson André, *Mediekultur och samhälle*, Lund, 2002, p 203

disciplines as well as with other countries, or the MCS discipline risk to become marginalized. Carlsson also stressed that MCS need different profiles, therefore theoretical and methodological pluralism should be encouraged.[138] This encouragement is seen as important as the exchanges with other disciplines have declined as a side effect of the new situation where most new researchers in MCS have also done their undergraduate studies within MCS.

To continue, the discussions about the conflict between the humanities and social sciences in MCS proceed. Many Swedish universities actually have problems dealing with disciplines such as MCS because of its roots in both the humanities and social sciences.[139] Sörlin even argues that MCS develops along two axes, through quantitative traditions in the social sciences and through cultural studies in the qualitative tradition of the humanities.[140] This is a very important dilemma in terms of *Disciplinary Boundary Construction*. In Sweden there are nowadays about twenty seats of learning and their departmental conditions vary both organisationally and by name. For a detailed description, please see the supplement.[141]

Esaiasson argues that MCS should profile itself more towards the social sciences, meaning that the MCS research should be related to the political and social spheres. Esaisson writes that questions raised within the humanities also should have a role within MCS, but in the periphery. Esaisson further stresses that the MCS research clearly should have an intimate connection to questions with obvious relevance to society.[142] Viscovi argues that MCS should be a social science in the sense that the research is being related to and analyzed in relation to socio-cultural processes.[143] Höijer writes that since the seventies the perspectives from the humanities and social sciences have melted together within the media and communication related research, and a new trend is the openness to influences from the natural sciences.[144] Falkheimer also adds that there are dualities within MCS between the social sciences and cultural science, between mediated and interpersonal communication, between theory and practice and between strategic communication and media studies.[145]

To round off the description of the discussions I'd like to mention some other issues of MCS that have been raised. Höijer writes that MCS have four main problems to deal with; the first problem is that it's a science that depends much upon other sciences for theories and methods. A second problem is the eclectic width of perspectives, which Höijer believes leads to superficial knowledge, the students and researchers have problems finding time to dig deep into the field. Höijer also believes that the methodological demands seem to continually decrease and at the meantime there should be more independence in how research topics are

[138] Carlsson Ulla, *Några inledande ord*, in "Mångfald i medieforskningen", Red.Ulla Carlsson,Göteborg 2003,p 8f

[139] Bolin Göran, *Medieforskning mellan kultur och samhälle,* in "Mångfald i medieforskningen, Red. Ulla Carlsson, Göteborg 2003, p 75

[140]Sörlin Sverker, *De osynliga medieforskarna*, in "Mångfald i medieforskningen, Red. Ulla Carlsson, Göteborg 2003, p 29ff

[141] Supplement 1 -

[142] Esaiasson Peter, *Omedvetna kommunikationsforskare?*, in "Mångfald i medieforskningen, Red. Ulla Carlsson, Göteborg 2003, p 35f

[143] Viscovi Dino*, Kommunikation och praxis*, in "Mångfald i medieforskningen", Red. Ulla Carlsson, Göteborg 2003, p 148

[144]Höijer Birgitta*, Mångfald i medievetenskapen,* in "Mångfald i medieforskningen", Red. Ulla Carlsson, Göteborg 2003, p 64

[145] Falkheimer Jesper, *Medier och Kommunikation*, Lund, 2001, p 20

chosen, that there is too much conformism in both research topics as choice of theories.[146] Höijer in other words argues that MCS need to improve by developing more and better theories and methods, stressing a need for width and depth in research. Kivikuru writes that the MCS research has become more minimalist and conformist than pluralistic. Those MCS researchers put more efforts into methods than thinking and theories; that the researchers tend to believe they are only observers, not actors.[147]

I will now make a shift, and end this chapter with a description of how MCS has emerged the last decade. In 2001 there were a total of 10 professorships in Sweden in journalism, media and communication.[148] MCS has become a popular discipline among students as there are about 4000-5000 students at about 20 different seats of learning. In 2002, six universities offered doctoral studies in MCS, those were Lund, Gothenburg, Stockholm, Umeå, Uppsala and Örebro,[149] and nowadays Linköping also offers doctoral studies.[150] There are about 150 active researchers in MCS.[151] In Sweden there is no journal in MCS, but many read the Nordic journals; Nordicom-Information and Nordicom Review. Denmark, Norway and Finland have their own journals though, and there are also plenty in Europe and the U.S. There are many signs of stability of the MCS discipline. There are now three generations of researchers in MCS; the first ones are those who originally received a doctor's degree in another subject but nowadays conduct research within MCS. The second generation were those who did their undergraduate studies in other subjects, and perhaps also started their doctoral studies in other subjects, but finished them as a degree in MCS. Finally, the third generation has studied MCS both at undergraduate and doctorate level. FSMK nowadays have about 300 members. The aims of the organisation have not changed much, as focus still today is to stimulate and develop the research area-, conditions-, education- and general interest for MCS. [152] FSMK has had much help by Nordicom to develop the MCS discipline. Nordicom has by now existed for more than thirty years, working with two journals and an extensive database. Nordicom defines its aim as to "establish and strengthen links between the Nordic research community and colleagues in all parts of the world, both by means of unilateral information flows and by linking individual researchers, research groups and institutions."[153]

In terms of growth, it might seem like the MCS discipline has been successful. Indeed the discipline has grown both in the amount of students as well as the number of departments. This is of course related to the 1993 governmental bill, which started to reimburse the seats of learning based upon the number of students they provided education. Based upon this model, MCS would benefit from growing, as the funds changed in relation to the number of students. However, in reality, the figures for reimbursement have not inclined as much as the number of students and there has in fact been a decline in financial aid. Not in total numbers, but in reimbursement per person, as the total amount has been divided upon more people. The departments have had to adjust to a degrading economical situation. Many departments argue

---

[146] Höijer Birgitta, *Mångfald i medievetenskapen,* in "Mångfald i medieforskningen", Red. Ulla Carlsson, Göteborg 2003, p 65-69

[147] Kivikuru Ullamija, *Finns det kommunikationsforskning?*, in Nordicom Information, Gothenburg, No 3, 1998, p 5ff

[148] *Utvärdering av medie- och kommunikationsvetenskapliga utbildningar vid svenska universitet och högskolor*, Högskoleverkets rapportserie 2001:25 R, p 20

[149] Nordicom Information, *Medie- och kommunikationsforskning i Norden 2002*, No 4, 2003, p 111

[150] http://www.tema.liu.se/tema-k/forskutb/index.html

[151] Hadenius Stig & Weibull Lennart, *Massmedier*, Falun, 2003, p 465

[152] Kleberg Madeleine, *Välkomna till 25 år med SMASSK*, in "Mångfald i medieforskningen, Red. Ulla Carlsson, Göteborg 2003, p 10ff

[153] Carlsson Ulla (Editor), *Mass communication*, in Nordicom review, Gothenburg, No 1, 1998, p 1

that their quality levels of education have been worsened, for example by larger groups and smaller amounts of lecture, counselling and seminar time.[154]

The MCS discipline has become more and more dependent upon external financial aid for research and doctoral studies. Some departments have developed a very close relationship to organisations and companies, often in the media industry, and thereby receive grants for research. Other departments have not managed, or wanted, to enrol those actors for financial aid. It is of course important for the departments to make sure they maintain a reasonable balance of external and internal financial aids, as well as make sure they keep their critical stance in the research, not becoming a handmaiden for the financers. The result is that the most competent actors at the departments often spend much time writing fund applications; while the teaching is taken care of by other members, often with less qualification. The amount of post-graduate posts is unfortunately unsatisfactory few in relation to the number of students, especially at the older departments. Also, there are bad possibilities to acquire a post-doc service, which are an important element in building competence in a field. HSV argues that it's very important to establish a co-operation between the doctoral programs of the universities, as a part of the essential development of fruitful research environments in the MCS discipline. When MCS moved into the new millennia, the discipline had substantial problems in keeping high levels of quality in teaching. Those problems are due to economical difficulties, which have led to problems in hiring a satisfactory level of staff. There has been a positive institutionalization in the MCS discipline. Student exchanges as well as guest researchers and lecturers and many departments have been enrolled to networks and research programs, some of international character.

MCS is a discipline with lots of width in the undergraduate courses, but this width is not kept at research level. MCS might need more competition to stimulate pluralism in theories and methods, and therefore it's considered as good that local departments have profiled themselves.[155] MCS has problems to enrol students for its Master courses, which is a warning signal since the formal requirements of knowledge are lower than other Nordic countries. The Master degree is seen as a strategy for the departments, signalling a step towards a doctoral programme of their own, while the formal requirements for doctoral studies stay at bachelor level. However, HSV believes that many of the Swedish colleges do not meet the requirements to transform to university standard, and thereby develop doctoral programs. HSV argues that a too fast development could lead to worsening standards. Kleberg argues that one can see, ten years after the establishment of MCS that the discipline has become narrower, as the extent of disputations and post-docs are quite limited.[156]

---

[154] *Utvärdering av medie- och kommunikationsvetenskapliga utbildningar vid svenska universitet och högskolor*, Högskoleverkets rapportserie 2001:25 R, p 17
[155] *Utvärdering av medie- och kommunikationsvetenskapliga utbildningar vid svenska universitet och högskolor*, Högskoleverkets rapportserie 2001:25 R, p 19
[156] Kleberg Madeleine, *Välkomna till 25 år med SMASSK*, in "Mångfald i medieforskningen", Red. Ulla Carlsson, Göteborg 2003, p 16

Summarizing analysis.

This report has described the emergence of the MCS discipline using the concept of boundary-work and the specimen of *Disciplinary Boundary Construction*. The disposition of this summarizing analysis follows; I aim to summarize the discussions and actions through the different time periods, as this will help to make things clearer. Simultaneously I strive to take the analysis one step further using boundary-work. I will in the end also discuss some findings that I argue will add to the specimen of *Disciplinary Boundary Construction,* which was discussed and formed earlier in the report.

During the decades preceding 1991 there were individuals, groups and organisations that carried out boundary-work in order to establish a discipline. The reasons to this common interest were many. As the media industry grew, there was an increasing interest and demand for research in mass media and mass communication. The researchers who pioneered in the field of media and mass communication were scattered among several different disciplines. During the seventies there were formation of organisations such as FSMK and Nordicom that became very important for the institutionalization process that accelerated in the eighties as the lobbying started to bear fruit. The actors initiated seminars in mass media and Nordic conferences and journals. By the end of the seventies there were intense discussions whether it was fruitful to establish a discipline or not. Most argued an establishment would be preferable, but some who felt comfortable in their already established disciplines believed it was best to keep things as they were. Those discussions continued during the eighties in journals, books and at seminars and conferences. There were also discussions about how an eventual discipline should look like as well as discussions about the need of integrating undergraduate studies with doctoral studies. The institutionalization in the eighties meant the establishment of the first professorships and heavily increased financial support. However the financial and organisational breakthrough occurred in the beginning of the nineties, when nine professorships were established. One can also say that the boundary-work had resulted in an organisational breakthrough as the actors decided to establish a new discipline called MCS. This meant a gathering organisation for the actors. An organisation that enabled the teaching and examination of its own graduates, at Bachelor & Master degree levels, as well as PhD.

Once established as a discipline, I argue that the boundary-work changed character. Instead of mainly concentrating to the boundary-work in order to establish a discipline, the arguments became more manifold. The boundary-work came to concern how the discipline should be constructed. Some of those discussions of course took place also before the discipline was established, but now they became more intense and detailed. Many actors stressed that the boundaries of MCS should be broad and gather many education and research programs, from both the humanities and social sciences. There seemed to be a consensus that MCS should strive to integrate the traditions of the humanities and the social sciences within MCS, that these traditions should complement each other. I find this very notice worthy as the humanities and social sciences have, for more than a century, been set apart by their views on epistemology, knowledge and methodology.

Another aspect that became important for the actors to discuss and construct boundaries around was the core of the discipline. MCS needed to make clear which theories and methods to use, and what the study objects should be. I found that the actors seemed very aware of the boundary-setting construction process. During the first years following the establishment, the actors expressed that MCS should strive for homogeneity, allowing transfers between

different seats of learning. Meanwhile, it was also argued that MCS should not loose the heterogeneity, wherefore different profiles should be allowed. This is of course a delicate problem within boundary-work, as there must be a fine line of consensus about the core, in order to know how far away different seats of learning can travel and still be home. Another such example is the case of xenogamy. It has often been argued that MCS is interdisciplinary; some have also argued that it's a multidisciplinary discipline. Many MCS members have suggested that they should strive for xenogamy with other disciplines. There is of course a dilemma in establishing a core in a discipline when much of the theories and methods are adapted from other disciplines. Actually, some actors started to question how good the establishment of a discipline was for the exchange with other disciplines. It was argued that many actors decreased their creativity in freely crossing disciplinary boundaries.

The discussions about the complexities of xenogamy, the relation between the humanities and social science as well as the establishment of a core, have continued throughout the nineties and also during the new century. There were several conferences during the end of the nineties where the head of departments tried to define the core contents of MCS. There were however also several new issues in MCS during the later half of the nineties and the introducing years of the 21st century. The financial situation was worsened, and therefore also the quality of education. MCS became more dependent upon external financial aid, which is needed to stimulate a good research environment. The width of MCS research is said to have decreased and it's being argued that competition is needed to stimulate pluralism in theories and methods. However, it can be mentioned that within MCS there are about 4000-5000 students at about 20 seats of learning, most of them have very different profiles. This will certainly add to the heterogeneity of the discipline. Some argue that it's unfortunate that there still are low numbers of post-graduate posts, especially in relation to the amount of students.

It has also been said that MCS can be characterised as dependent in many aspects, as MCS depends quite a bit upon other sciences for theories and methods, and the dependence upon financial aid is worsening. Some actors have started to question whether MCS is the right term, as the discussions about the core and profiling never seem to end. However, most MCS members seem to believe that the boundaries of the MCS discipline has become more and more visible and permanent. In Shumwayr & Messer-Davidow terms, the boundaries of the MCS discipline are rather *Permeable,* meaning that they are not very stable and coherent but rather fragmented. We can also conclude that the boundary-work has occurred not only within the MCS discipline, but also towards politicians and the legal arena when for example FSMK lobbied for more professorships. From the MCS case study we can see that the actors have shown social interests in claiming, expanding and protecting their authority of science through the establishment and maintenance of a discipline. We have seen in this case study actors who have strived to claim and maintain authority applying to a belief of the scientific rationality. We have seen that the interpretation of norms has been flexible, allowing actors to make interpretations that serve their goals. We have also seen that boundary-work is a very broad phenomenon, as the arrays of activities that are embraced are numerous. Finally it can be said that the MCS discipline will be going through the Bologna process, which is a change that will affect the whole Swedish University system. It is likely that the need to offer Master's degrees and an education with more preparatory courses for a coming professional career leading to proficiency will lead to changes in the profiles of the MCS programs at different seats of learning. The seats of learning might have to create new solutions where they use their collegial competences in order to construct new educational programs that attract students and also possible employers.

Theoretical reflections

Elsewhere I have said that after discussing my findings, I will add conclusions to the specimen of *Disciplinary Boundary Construction* as sketched in the chapter of theoretical framework. *Disciplinary Boundary Construction* focuses upon the understanding of why and how actors strive to establish disciplinary boundaries. We have through the case study of MCS seen that the interest in establishing a discipline comes from the improved organisational and financial situation it often results in. The actors have expressed interest in a discipline to enable integration of undergraduate and postgraduate studies, which helps in the further recruitment of doctorate candidates. Through the establishment of a discipline the MCS could integrate the research area. The discipline also received increased financial aid through instalment of professorships, and MCS could raise the standards of research quality. The way the actors carried out boundary-work was through arranging seminars and conferences to discuss their issues. Those concerns were also expressed in journals, reports and books. The study of *Disciplinary Boundary Construction* should also identify actors who have had influence on the process, and those actors can be not only individuals but also groups or organisations. I believe that I in this report have managed to let many actors "speak". I conclude that FSMK and the pioneers had the most influence in the boundary-work in order to establish the discipline. Then in the succeeding boundary-work there have been new actors, as new academics become prominent and influent.

I have not sought to point out some actors as more important than others; I believe that the reader will be able to draw those conclusions herself. *Disciplinary Boundary Construction* include the understanding of how actors carry out boundary-work to make clear which theories, concepts, methods and objects of study that should be part of the discipline. Who, how and why does actors carry out boundary-work in order to encircle what makes the identity and unity of the discipline, as well as what makes it different from nearby disciplines. In this report I have only briefly discussed the theories, concepts, methods and objects of study in MCS, and rather concentrated at the boundary-work about those issues. For example, I have described the issues of how the core of MCS should be constructed, which of course is all about theories, concepts, methods and objects of study. Other such examples, which have shown to be important, are MCS relation to other disciplines and xenogamy, as well as how to integrate the humanistic and social science tradition. One conclusion from this report is that there are many of issues that are associated with boundary-work when establishing and maintaining a discipline. In the case of the MCS discipline we can see that most of the issues change from the period prior to the establishment, in comparison to the maintenance. However, it's worth paying attention to the fact that some issues, such as the discussion of integrating the humanities and social sciences, never seem to end.

Finally, I believe I should make clear in what ways I think the specimen *Disciplinary Boundary Construction* has contributed to the analysis in this report. Also why I chose to include the concepts and ideas from the fields of disciplinarity and professionalism, as this report predominantly have used the theoretical framework of boundary-work and the construct of the specimen *Disciplinary Boundary Construction*. First I will shortly discuss the contribution of the specimen *Disciplinary Boundary Construction*. I believe that this specimen brings the main framework of how to approach the emergence of a discipline. That it's important to study not only the boundary-work in order to establish a discipline, but also how the actors redefine and protect those boundaries during the maintenance period. *Disciplinary Boundary Construction* gives the studies of disciplines a special context within

boundary-work, a context that examines the why, who and how of boundary-work issues for disciplines.

So why did I choose to use other theoretical perspectives than boundary-work when developing the specimen of *Disciplinary Boundary Construction?* My perception is, and has been all along, that boundary-work itself is a good analytical tool for cases where actors seek to establish and maintain boundaries. However, it didn't bring satisfactory insights about the nature of disciplines. I want to stress the fact that disciplinarity have its natural relevance for the studies of disciplines. General insights and knowledge about disciplines should bring understanding to why and how actors seek to construct disciplinary boundaries, for example the importance of disciplinary boundaries for the allocation of cognitive authority and material resources. Second, the sociology of professions is a theoretical framework I noticed in Gieryns texts, and chose to examine closer. It should also be emphasized that within the sociology of professions, parts of the terms used in boundary-work are applied. The sociology of professions should bring an understanding about why actors feel a need of unification and development. Professionalism is also about the boundary-work in deciding who is qualified to perform a defined set of tasks, and also to prevent all others from performing that work. One very important aspect of professionalization is the coalescence into a group

Supplement 1 – Departmental conditions

In order to bring insight in the extent of MCS discipline in 2005 I have visited all the websites of Swedish universities and colleges. There are eighteen seats of learning that offer undergraduate studies and bachelor degrees in MCS, a few additional ones who offer one or two separate courses. Of those seven who offer doctoral studies, limited economical resources accompany many. At some seats of learning, doctoral studies are offered on an occasional level. Perhaps only one or a few are accepted over some years at a seat of learning. By visiting the websites of all those seats of learning, there are apparently several different profiles and niches within the discipline. Most seats of learning consider MCS as an academic subject, but some argue their studies are preparatory, as for example at Kalmar and Malmö College and Luleå University. Lindstedt and Reimer at Malmö College write that they think it's most fruitful to include preparatory courses within MCS.[157]

The majority of seats of learning in MCS express in their profile that both "Media" and "Communication" is being studied. However, as implicitly expressed, not all of seats of learning are studying both aspects, and thereby distancing themselves from the general guidelines of the core of the discipline. I will now discuss how the seats of learning have profiled themselves. Among those seats of learning that study both "Media" and "Communication" is Lund, which express a focus towards both mass media as strategic communication. Umeå University emphasizes its profile towards how society is influenced by media as well as how society shapes media, and that research should focus on both current trends and historical perspectives. University of Karlstad focus at the meaning of media and communication in society, organisations, culture and for individuals. Gävle College has profiled themselves towards political communication, pedagogy and aesthetics in media as well as communication in organizations. The universities of Linköping and Gothenburg on the other hand study different forms of mass media such as press, radio and TV, but also other forms of public communication as literature, film and electronic media. The approach of the University of Uppsala is very broad as they say they include all the discussed aspects of media and communication in their studies. Uppsala also profiles themselves towards the application of digital techniques in different media worlds, as well as the consequences of its use.

Then we have several seats of learning, the universities of Stockholm and Örebro and the college in Dalarna, which profile themselves towards the study of "Media". This approach is often associated with a social scientific approach, as for example at Stockholm University, who interest themselves primarily for the role of media in society, their conditions of production, content and the audience. Örebro University profile themselves towards the conditions of new media techniques and content in different forms of multimedia, and journalism genres. In the studies of media within MCS, there are three main areas that are studied. Those areas are the content of media, the conditions of production and audience research. There are also seats of learning that have chosen to profile themselves towards "Communication", these are for example the University in Växjö and the colleges in Jönköping Trollhättan/Uddevalla. At focus are theories of communication related to society, institutions, groups, organisations and at an individual level. It includes in other words both mass communication and personal communication, but also aspects such as strategic- and political communication. The

---

[157] Lindstedt Inger & Reimer Bo, *Medier och den tredje kulturen*, Nordicom Information, No 4, Gothenburg, 1999, p 103

majority of seats of learning expresses that MCS is an academic subject and not to be seen as preparatory for certain occupations. Some seats of learning however, expresses that studies of MCS can become preparatory in combination with other subjects. The seats of learning in Sundsvall, Luleå, Uppsala and Kalmar however, do express that their MCS programs are preparatory for occupations, as they also offer training that can be directly applied in occupations.

In this context I feel that it's relevant to discuss the backgrounds of the different seats of learning, and what they have chosen to call themselves. I have collected the information from the websites of the seats of learning, and unfortunately half of them do not describe their background at all. Then there are six seats of learning that express that they come from a mix of the traditions of the humanities and social science. Gothenburg University express their background as from the social sciences.[158] The college in Dalarna come from a combination of the humanities and theology,[159] and the college in Halmstad is described as routing from the field of communication,[160] which is not easily fitted into the main two traditions that other seats of learning have discussed. When considering the range of terms to describe the departments in which the subject MCS has fallen into among Swedish colleges and universities one will encounter a great pluralism. Seven departments have "Media" included in the name, which I interpret as a sign of successful boundary-work. At the college in Södertörn the department is called *"Media, arts and philosophy"*;[161] at the University of Stockholm it's called *"Journalism, media and communication"*[162]. At the University of Gothenburg, MCS is studied at the department of *"Journalism and mass communication."*[163] Furthermore, Luleå University calls its department for *"Media and music"*[164] and the department at the college of Mitthögskolan in Sundsvall/Härnösand is called *"Information technology and media"*[165]. The college of Dalarna writes *"Culture, media and computers"*[166] and at Kalmar college *"Science of media and journalism"*[167] Five seats of learning use the terms "humanities" or "social sciences" in their description of the departments. Those are the universities in Umeå[168], Växjö[169] och Örebro[170] and the colleges in Gävle[171] and Halmstad[172]. To carry on, at the university of Lund, MCS is part of the sociological department,[173] in Uppsala it's called *"Science of information"*[174] and at the university of Karlstad "Culture and communication"[175] The departments of Linköping University[176] and the college in Jönköping[177] are called TEMA and HLK.

[158] www.jmg.gu.se
[159] www.du.se
[160] www.hh.se/net
[161] http://webappl.web.sh.se/
[162] www.jmk.su.se
[163] www.jmg.gu.se
[164] www.ltu.se
[165] www.mkv.mh.se/
[166] www.du.se
[167] www.imj.hik.se
[168] www.umu.se/kultmed/utbildning/mkv/
[169] http://194.47.70.15/utb/kurser.lasso?ID=AM1034
[170] www.oru.se
[171] http://www.hig.se/
[172] www.hh.se/net
[173] www.mkv.lu.se
[174] www.dis.uu.se/mkv/
[175] www.kk.kau.se

Now we have come to the end of this chapter, as well as the end of the empiric presentation of the MCS discipline. I will discuss and analyze the Disciplinary Boundary Construction of the MCS discipline during the last maintenance period. There are many issues that still are discussed, something I interpret that those issues are very important, but also that they either are difficult to agree upon, or that the actors believe they should be expressed over and over again because of their importance. Such issues are wish to define a core of theories, methods and objects of study, the xenogamy dilemma and the balance between the humanities and the social science. I find it interesting that instead of an increasing stability and consensus, some MCS members actually indicates that MCS is moving the other direction. There are about twenty seats of learning, all with somewhat different profiles, both from each other, and from the overall definition of the core. The members have for a long time expressed that different profiles and xenogamy is fruitful for the discipline, but now some rather express that MCS still is missing out of its core, and that those discussions never seem to end. I believe that some MCS actors have interests in that the core is very loosely defined, as their profiles of MCS are truly on the margin. They have then also obviously an interest in making sure that MCS allows different profiles.

---

[176] www.tema.liu.se/tema-k/medievet
[177] http://www.hlk.hj.se/doc/257

References.

Printed material.

Abbott Andrew, *The system of professions*, Chicago, 1988

Asp Kent, *Journalistik som forskningsområde*, i "Forskning om journalistik,medier & kommunikation, ämnesområdet idag och i framtiden,Red.Carlsson Ulla & Lindblad Anders 1992,Göteborg

Baldursson Eirikur, *Om forskningspolitiska system*, red Bärmark Jan, i "Forskning om forskning", Lund, 1984

Barnes Barry, Bloor David & Henry John, *Scientific knowledge*, London, 1996

Bauer H Henry, *Science, Technology & Human Values*, Vol.15, No1 (Winter 1990)

Bowker C Geoffrey & Star Leigh Susan, *Sorting things out*, Cambridge 1999

Bruhn Jensen Klaus, *The 14th Nordic conference on Media and Communication Research,* in Nordicom review, Carlsson Ulla (Editor), Gothenburg, No 2, 2000

Bolin Göran, *Medieforskning mellan kultur och samhälle,* i "Mångfald i medieforskningen, Red. Ulla Carlsson, Göteborg 2003

Burr R Wesley & Leigh K Geoffrey, *Having a family discipline means we need a new bottle for the new wine, a case study in boundary clarification*, Journal of marriage and the family, vol 46, no 2 (May, 1984)

Carlsson Ulla (Editor), *Mass communication*, in Nordicom review, Gothenburg, No 1, 1998

Carlsson Ulla, *Masskommunikationsforskning i Sverige 1977-1987, en översikt*, in "Masskommunikation och kultur", Nordicom no 1-2, Göteborg, 1988

Carlsson Ulla, *Några inledande ord*, i "Mångfald i medieforskningen", Red. Ulla Carlsson, Göteborg 2003

Ekecrantz Jan, *Medier, kommunikation och social kritik*, in "Kommunikationens korsningar", Nordicom Gothenburg, 1994

Esaiasson Peter, *Omedvetna kommunikationsforskare?*, i "Mångfald i medieforskningen", Red. Ulla Carlsson, Göteborg 2003

Falkheimer Jesper, *Medier och Kommunikation*, Lund, 2001

Fischer Donald, *Boundary-work and science, the relation between power and knowledge*, in Cozzens Susan E. & Gieryn F Thomas (eds), "Theories of Science in Society", Indiana University Press, 1990

Freidson Eliot, *Professionalism – the third logic*, Cambridge, 2001

Fuller Steve, *Disciplinary boundaries and the rhetoric of the social sciences*, Poetics Today, Vol 12, No 2, Disciplinarity, 1991

Fuller Steve, Disciplinary boundaries – a critical synreport, Pittsburgh, 1986Fuller Steve, Disciplinary boundaries and the rhetoric of the social sciences, Poetics Today, Vol 12, No 2, Disciplinarity, 1991

Garrety Karin, *Social worlds, actor-networks & controversy; the case of cholesterol, dietary fat and heart disease*, "Social studies of science", Vol 27, no 5, Oct 1997

Gieryn Thomas, *Boundaries of science*, in Jasanoff S, et al, "Handbook of Science and Technology Studies", Thousand Oaks, 1995

Gieryn Thomas, *Boundary-work and the demarcation of science from non-science; strains and interests in professional ideologies of scientists*, American sociological review 48 (8), 1983

Gieryn Thomas, *Cultural boundaries of science*, Chicago, 1999

Hadenius Stig, *Den nödvändiga journalistikforskningen*, i "Forskning om journalistik,medier & kommunikation,ämnesområdet idag och i framtiden," Carlsson Ulla & Lindblad Anders (eds)1992, Göteborg

Hadenius Stig & Weibull Lennart, *Massmedier*, Falun, 2003

Hallberg Margareta, Etnologisk koreografi, Göteborg, 2001

Hallberg Margareta, Symmetri och reflexivitet – sociala studier av humanvetenskapens villkor, Göteborg, 1997

Hess J David, Science studies – an advanced introduction, New York, 1997

Höijer Birgitta, *Mångfald i medievetenskapen,* i "Mångfald i medieforskningen, Red. Ulla Carlsson, Göteborg 2003

Jansson André, *Mediekultur och samhälle*, Lund, 2002

Jansson André, *Tids nog märker man att man vill göra något eget*, i "Mångfald i medieforskningen, Red. Ulla Carlsson, Göteborg, 2003

Jasanoff Sheila, The fifth bransch – science advisers as policymakers, London, 1990

Kjörup Sören, Människovetenskaperna, Lund, 1999

Kleberg Madeleine, *Kommentar till forskningsöversikten*, in "Masskommunikation och kultur", Nordicom no 1-2, Göteborg, 1988

Kleberg Madeleine, *Välkomna till 25 år med SMASSK*, i "Mångfald i medieforskningen, Red. Ulla Carlsson, Göteborg 2003

Kivikuru Ullamija, *Finns det kommunikationsforskning?*, in Nordicom Information,Gothenburg, No 3, 1998

Kronvall Kaj, *Massmedieforskning i Sverige*, DSN 1979:15, Stockholm, 1976

Latour Bruno, *Pandora's hope*, Cambridge 1999

Lindstedt Inger & Reimer Bo, *Medier och den tredje kulturen*, Nordicom Information, No 4, Gothenburg, 1999

Medier, människor, samhälle, Nordicom-Nytt Sverige, 3-4, 1990, Kungälv, 1991

Nam, B Charles, *The progress of demography as a scientific discipline*, Demography, Vol 16, No 4, (Nov 1979)

Nilsson Ingemar,*Vetenskapshistoria,*Bärmark Jan,(ed),in"Forskning om forskning",Lund,p 84

Nordicom Information, *Medie- och kommunikationsforskning i Norden 2002*, No 4, 2003

Nordicom Information, Nr1-2, 1989, Göteborg

Nordicom-nytt, Gothenburg, No 1, 1986

Nordicom-nytt, no 1, Gothenburg, 1976

Nordicom-nytt, Masskommunikationsforskningen i statsverkspropositionen 1981/82, Gothenburg, No 1, 1982

Nordicom-nytt, *Masskommunikationsforskning i Sverige 1985,* No 1-2, Gothenburg, 1985

Nordstedts svenska ordbok, 1999

Nowak Kjell (Editor), *Att studera massmediernas effekter,* Stockholm, 1979

Nowak Kjell, *Forskning om medier och kommunikation*, i "Forskning om journalistik,medier & kommunikation,ämnesområdet idag och i framtiden,Red.Carlsson Ulla & Lindblad Anders 1992,Göteborg

Nowak Kjell, *Masskommunikationsforskning i Sverige,* Stockholm, 1963

Nowak Kjell, Närmandet mellan samhällsvetenskap och humaniora – Medie- och kommunikationsforskningen i Norden, Nordicom Information, No 1-2, Gothenburg, 1994

Pressens Årbog, Tema journalistikforskning, 1983:2

Rosengren Karl Erik, *Medie- och kommunikationsvetenskap*, i "Forskning om journalistik, medier & kommunikation, ämnesområdet idag och i framtiden,Red.Carlsson Ulla & Lindblad Anders 1992,Göteborg

Shumwayr David & Messer-Davidow Ellen, *Disciplinarity, an introduction*, Poetics today,vol.12,No 2,Disciplinarity, 1991

Sismondo Sergio, *An introduction to Science and Technology Studies*, Malden, USA, 2004

Sjölander Annika*, Kärnproblemen och medie- och kommunikationsvetenskapen*, i "Mångfald i medieforskningen, Red. Ulla Carlsson, Göteborg 2003

Small L Mario*, Departmental conditions and the emergence of new disciplines: Two cases in the legitimating of African-American Studies*, Theory and Society, Vol 28, No.5, Oct 1999

Sörlin Sverker, *De osynliga medieforskarna*, i "Mångfald i medieforskningen, Red. Ulla Carlsson, Göteborg 2003

Timmermans Stefan & Berg Marc, *The gold standard*, Philadelphia, 2003 Bowker C Geoffrey & Star Leigh Susan, *Sorting things out*, Cambridge 1999

UHÄ-rapport 1982:35

Viscovi Dino*, Kommunikation och praxis*, i "Mångfald i medieforskningen, Red. Ulla Carlsson, Göteborg 2003

Von Felitzen, Cecilia, *Den kulturella vändningen – och sedan…?*, in "Kommunikationens korsningar", Nordicom Gothenburg, 1994

Wallén Göran, *Om fallstudiemetodik i forskning om forskning*, red Bärmark Jan, i "Forskning om forskning", Lund, 1984

Weibull Lennart, *Ett försök till empirisk bestämning*, JMG, Arbetsrapport 12, Göteborg, 1991

Weibull Lennart, *Forskningsanknuten utbildning i masskommunikation – erfarenheter från utvecklingsarbete i Göteborg*, in "Nordicom-nytt", Gothenburg, No 2-3, 1981

Weibull Lennart, *Forskaridentitet i förändring,* i "Mångfald i medieforskningen, Red. Ulla Carlsson, Göteborg 2003

Weibull Lennart, *Masskommunikationsforskningen i Sverige*, Arbetsrapport 5, Göteborgs Universitet, 1985

Weibull Lennart, *Masskommunikation som ämnesområde*, i "Forskning om journalistik,medier & kommunikation,ämnesområdet idag och i framtiden,Red.Carlsson Ulla & Lindblad Anders 1992,Göteborg

Weibull Lennart, *IV Nordiska Masskommunikationsforskarkonferensen*, Nordicom-nytt, No 4, Gothenburg, 1979

Whitley Richard*, Umbrella and polytheistic scientific disciplines and their elites*, Social studies of science, 6, 1976

Utvärdering av medie- och kommunikationsvetenskapliga utbildningar vid svenska universitet och högskolor, Högskoleverkets rapportserie 2001:25 R

Internet.

http://194.47.70.15/utb/kurser.lasso?ID=AM1034
http://webappl.web.sh.se/
www.dis.uu.se/mkv/
www.du.se
www.hig.se
www.hh.se/net
www.hlk.hj.se/doc/257
www.imj.hik.se
www.jmk.su.se
www.jmg.gu.se
www.jmg.gu.se/fsmk/SIDOR/historik.html
www.kk.kau.se
www.ltu.se
www.mkv.lu.se
www.mkv.mh.se/
www.oru.se
www.tema.liu.se/tema-k/medievet
www.umu.se/kultmed/utbildning/mkv/

Other.

E-mail from Jönlöping University Professor Emeritus Karl-Erik Gustafsson, 2006-01-13
E-mail from Umeå University Professor Inga-Britt Lindblad, 2006-01-15
Conversation with Lowe Hedman 2006-01-13