

## Recognition and Development of Communication Science in the Netherlands

**Prof. dr. Joan Hemels\***

---

\* Joan Hemels is a professor emeritus of communication science, especially communication history, at the University of Amsterdam. In addition, he was guest professor at the KU Leuven (1988-1993) and at the University of Antwerpen (1998-2007). And further he was teaching in Salzburg, Bochum, Eichstätt, Mainz, Siegen, Vienna and Leipzig. Since he received emeritus status in 2009, he is honorary fellow at the research institute The Amsterdam School of Communication Research (ASCoR) at the University of Amsterdam.

Translation - with additions - of Joan Hemels (2017), *Die Anerkennung und Entwicklung der Kommunikationswissenschaft in den Niederlanden. In: Stefanie Aeverbeck-Lietz (Hrsg.), Kommunikationswissenschaft im internationalen Vergleich. Transnationale Perspektiven*, Wiesbaden: Springer VS.

The author would like to thank prof. dr. Stefanie Aeverbeck-Lietz (University of Bremen) for her help in final editing of the German version, and Carolin Ischen and Dr. Sandra Zwier (University of Amsterdam) for their help in translating this text.

## **Introduction: A delayed institutionalization and its pioneers**

*"Many other disciplines – in the humanities as well as in the behavioral sciences – contain a chapter on communication. Publicistics per se, however, is not one of their chapters but has become – up to a certain point – a melting pot of all chapters on communication, exchanging information and integrating those aspects that touch its own, autonomous field of theory and research" (Henk Prakke, 1971)<sup>1</sup>.*

In the beginning of the 1980s, a group of students of the institute for media studies at the University of Münster showed interest in the development of media- and communication science. Since 1979 their field of study was called *"Publizistik- und Kommunikationswissenschaft"* instead of *"Publizistik"*, to translate as *"Publicistics"* (English) and *"Publicistiek"* (Dutch). Based on archival research and literature study and supplemented by interviews, the collective released the first issue of the *Journal für Publizistik & Kommunikation*, in which Ralf Herpolsheimer and Regina Urban (1982) dedicated an article to the Dutch Henk Prakke (1900-1992) to point out his importance for the discipline of media studies for Münster and beyond (see also Hemels et al., 2000).

Prakke was publisher, printer and bookseller for the publishing house *"Koninklijke Van Gorcum & Comp."* in Assen and taught publicistics as media studies at the *"Rijksuniversiteit Groningen"*. He came to Münster as a ‘trouble shooter’ on 1 May 1960. When he left in 1969, he left behind a department well-prepared for the future (Lerg, 1980, p. 338). For the young generation of communication scientists, the theory building of the Dutchman at the German department can be seen as one of the “classics of communication science” (Meyen & Löblich, 2006).

With approval of Prakke, the above mentioned authors Urban and Herpolsheimer took a look at the “history of the discipline as a didactic model” and state at the end of their review: “First, the study of the personal environment of the discipline and the tradition of the institute could lead to a less diffuse start for prospective media science students. Second, the experience of the history of the institute as a basis for the existing could make it easier to communicate the systematics and dynamics of the discipline, its different branches, and scientific methods and tools.” (Herpolsheimer & Urban, 1982, p. 52).

This point of view is in accordance with a variety of publications, in which communication scientists in Germany review the milestones of the discipline in the 20<sup>th</sup> century – with the Nazi regime as the lowest point (Kutsch, 2006). The research can be

divided into two lines of development, which became interconnected more and more. In the beginning, importance was mainly attached to biographical and institutional aspects. After the reconstruction of those aspects, the development of theory building and the choice of research methods was at the center of attention (see also Löblich & Scheu, 2011).

Furthermore, at the end of the 20<sup>th</sup> century, the expert representatives presented as "nestors" looking back "autobiographically" on the metamorphosis of the German so called "*Publizistik(wissenschaft)*" or "*Publicistics*" towards communication science in the 1970s (Kutsch & Pöttker, 1997).

In the Netherlands unfortunately, these kind of reviews from personal perspectives of Dutch pioneers of communication science are missing. "When there is no water, no skipper can go by boat": With this slogan science historians, as well as their readers, must be satisfied. In this study, the results of a detailed investigation based on source research<sup>2</sup> are presented.

### ***The pioneers before the Second World War***

Someone who spends time studying the development of communication science in the Netherlands might have the feeling that (s)he is doing a pioneer's job. There is no systematic reflection in research about the development from an "arising" to an "established" discipline (Wilke, 2006). To understand the Dutch *state of the art* for the development into a modern social science, it is important to take the geographical location of the Netherlands between the Anglo-Saxon and German academic culture into consideration.

In 1932, Hugo Samkalden (1906-1943) published his dissertation about public opinion in relation to journalism and the democratic functions of a state. To contribute to the sociology of the daily newspaper business ("*Sociologie van het dagbladwezen*"), he studied the sociological and journalistic literature in German-speaking countries.

With the same amount of precision Nicolaas Jan Derk (Nico) Versluys (1910-1970) worked on his dissertation about journalism and science published in 1936. During this process, he was aware of relevant publications in France and Great Britain. Even for that time, both authors were young for being doctoral students. For theory building in the pre-communication science area of the social sciences they mainly relied on foreign authors. Versluys (1936, p. 167-168) does not only focus on specific media or the interconnection between those, but he also advocates a so called "*Publicistics*" as a "science of publication". He argues for the acceptance of the "*Openbaarmakingswetenschap*", a name for a branch of study which might be rather unusual in the Netherlands.

At that time it was mandatory – while it is no longer mandatory nowadays – to add theses for potential defense to a dissertation. The second thesis that Versluys uses in his dissertation is as follows: “Communication studies as part of social sciences, which study the relationship between human society and publication in any form, should be given more attention in this country”. Therefore, he can be seen as a pioneer of the study field in the Netherlands (Hemels, 1972, p. 82). Petra Klein, who looked in her dissertation in Leipzig at the person and influence of Prakke, acknowledges Samkalden and Versluys, “even if they did not immediately establish an independent tradition of the discipline” (Klein, 2007, p. 138).

The process of the scientific institutionalization before the Second World War was not established enough to offer positions at universities to both PhDs or one of them. Samkalden died in 1943 in the concentration camp Mauthausen (Austria). While working on his PhD dissertation, Versluys – who completed the university study program in social geography – worked as a journalist. Afterwards he taught in Indonesia and later as a professor in Athens, California<sup>3</sup>. Two former journalists, Antonius Johannes Lievegoed (1880–1946) and Willem Nicolaas van der Hout (1883–1963), were appointed to give lectures about journalism to students of different disciplines at the University of Leiden (at that time “*Rijksuniversiteit Leiden*”) and the University of Utrecht (at that time “*Rijksuniversiteit Utrecht*”) in 1931. They had the title “*privaatdocent*”, which was given to an (unpaid) external university lecturer who did not have a chair (Hemels, 1972, 1993). However, an educational program for journalists was not established at a university until the last decade of the 20<sup>th</sup> century. On the one hand, the former university lectures about the importance of the press for society were able to give the journalistic profession a certain prestige. On the other hand, they could be in the interest of academic professionals, for instance by giving law students an insight into journalistic work. But apart from that, the work of Lievegoed and Van der Hout is rather typical for a stage of an “amateur science”.

Following Terry N. Clark, Jürgen Wilke (2006, p. 318) distinguishes five stages of development of a science field. First, certain people look independent from each other at particular aspects of a science. In the second stage, these pioneers remain amateurs in the sense of being more or less motivated and interested, working on their own publications and spending limited time on giving talks. Adapting these stages to the mentioned first steps in the Netherlands, we have to notice a difference. In the Dutch first stage, Lievegoed and Van der Hout were pioneering “amateurs” who without any academic study lost themselves - not without merit - in mainly the meaning of journalism for society. On the contrary, Samkalden and Versluys were promising scientists of the younger generation, who should have merited a

university career in a pre-communication science, for example as part of a social science. However, it was too early for a full development of the second stage.

In Clark's third stage of an emerging academic science, professors start to do research and teach at universities. This stage started in the Netherlands after the Second World War with (Siegfried) Kurt Baschwitz (1886–1968) becoming professor at the University of Amsterdam (“*Universiteit van Amsterdam*”) (Dovifat, 1966, 1968). Without doubt, Baschwitz could have been already in the 1930s the best representative of the second stage, but he had to be satisfied since 1935 with the role of "*privaatdocent*". And so the Dutch pre-communication science needed for the third stage of an establishing discipline the period roughly between 1948 and 1980, before the fourth stage of a real communication science could make a successful start. The fifth stage, containing an advanced research- and educational program, has been reached only by the end of the 20<sup>th</sup> century. Nowadays, most of the characteristic aspects of the fifth stage of a *big science* are completely developed, namely increasing size and internal differentiation. A predominant example is the University of Amsterdam, where communication science acquired a leading role, also in the international scientific community, in the last decade.

The achievement of building up a scientific community in communication science in the Netherlands cannot be denied and its right to exist nowadays is acknowledged by its neighboring sciences (social) psychology, sociology and political science. But it took a very long time, as will be made clear in the next paragraph. It is a matter of fact that Baschwitz has stood at the beginning of this development of more than seventy years now, when he was appointed as a "*privaatdocent*" in 1935 at the University of Amsterdam, after coming from Germany to the Netherlands as a Jewish refugee two years before. In the period of German occupation he was not allowed to work, and in 1942 he had to go into hiding. After the liberation of the Netherlands, he started again in his old role, but in 1946 he was appointed lecturer ("*lector*"), and one year later extraordinary professor in the field of press, propaganda and public opinion. The crown on this late, but steep academic career was the upgrade to a full professorship from the first of August 1952. His official teaching and research task ("*leeropdracht*") mentioned since 1950 already the addition "press science and mass psychology" (Hemels, 1972, 1993; Klein, 2007).

One of the characteristics of Baschwitz as one of the leading personalities during the third stage of establishing several branches of pre-communication science was his goal to promote the national appraisal and the international reputation of the discipline after the period of occupation. Therefore, he founded an English-language European centered journal,

the *Gazette*, in 1955 (Wieten, 2005; Bohrmann, 2006a, p. 293). One year later the German journal *Publizistik* was founded. In the first years, *Gazette* – at that time with the subtitles "International Journal of the Science of the Press" and "*Revue Internationale de Science de Presse*" – also published French and German-language articles with English abstracts, even if the majority of articles were in English (Bohrmann, 2006b, p. 39). Half a century after he passed away, Baschwitz will be honored with the publication of the first biography on his stirring personal life and his scientific merits for the establishment of communication science later on. His biographer, Jaap van Ginneken (\*1943) was until he retired one of few scholars at the University of Amsterdam who were teaching and researching in the field of psychology of collective behavior (mass psychology) in the context and organizational setting of communication science.

### ***A long journey to recognition of communication science***

Whichever way you look at it, the formation process of communication science as an academic discipline took extraordinarily long in the Netherlands. Until the early 1980s, courses were taught in newspaper and press studies, public relations ("*Publiciteitsleer*"), mass psychology, mass communication, publicistics (*Publicistiek*), film studies, broadcasting studies, information studies ("*Voorlichtingskunde*"), sociology of mass communication, psychology of mass communication and since 1971 communication science, at different universities, mainly in the humanities and after the Second World War in social sciences departments. In the late 1960s and early 1970s, so called free study disciplines<sup>4</sup> were designed at the University of Nijmegen and at the two universities in Amsterdam ("*Universiteit van Amsterdam*" and "*Vrije Universiteit*"). Additionally, elective courses and minor studies of this kind were developed at other universities under different names (Hemels, 1972, pp. 136–151).

The established social sciences sociology, psychology and political science denied the emerging interest of the young generation of scientists in the phenomenon of public communication and its appropriateness in journalism (newspapers, magazines and broadcasting). Also neglected fields such as advertising, public relations, corporate communication and public communication in governments, ministries, provinces and municipalities could be added. The three mentioned traditional disciplines had more or less the potential of "mother disciplines" for free study programs, but these developing, sometimes experimental programs were still embedded in and subordinate to them. For the development of a self-concept according to Clarks' stage model, this starting position for an

integrated objective of the developing field of communication science was inhibiting, sometimes paralyzing. The fact that lecturers educated in communication science were missing and the resources for the new discipline were limited, gave the pioneers until the end of the 20th century a hard time.

In the beginning of the 1970s, inter-university considerations arose in Dutch society – caused by media developments – to recognize communication science as an independent discipline. Those who addressed societal and therefore public communication in their teaching at universities and – to a lesser extent – in their research, were challenged to establish an integrated discipline characterized by interdisciplinarity. The initiative for a coordinated action plan to recognize communication science in the Netherlands was set on the agenda of different relevant committees within and outside of university. This originated substantially from the engagement of the former journalist and extraordinary lecturer<sup>5</sup> press science Evert Diemer (1911-1997). On 1 January 1971, he was appointed as a full lecturer in communication science at his university: the “*Vrije Universiteit*” in Amsterdam, which was Christian-protestant at that time (Hemels, 2011). With this development, the term communication science has been introduced for the first time at a university in the Netherlands and became so little by little more common.

Diemer himself was a friendly but also pragmatic personality used to cope with difficult organizational tasks in the newspaper business. Thinking strategically, he noticed the possibility to unite university colleagues with different interests under the umbrella term communication science - in order to reach a common goal. Through Diemer's engagement, the initiative of an inter-university deliberation committee on the acknowledgement of communication science (“*Interacademial Overleg Communicatiewetenschap*“, IOC) was established in 1971. Aims were to write papers about for instance the state of the art of communication science in foreign countries, to make a plea for the necessity of the discipline in the Netherlands in front of media institutions and media representatives and to organize lobbying activities in science policy-making circles.<sup>6</sup> Further, the IOC-members used the argumentation for the recognition of communication science at their own universities and faculties. This was a difficult and often frustrating exertion. After the establishment of the IOC-circle, it still took eleven or fourteen years until students could register for communication science, first at the University of Nijmegen (since 1982) and then at the University of Amsterdam in 1985.<sup>7</sup>

### **The long journey of the initiators through the institutions**

By Royal Decree (administrative act of the government) of 24 May 1982, communication science in the end was included in the academic statute ("*Academisch Statuut*") upon the recommendation of the academic council ("*Academische Raad*") and was therefore *de facto* officially recognized as a new academic discipline. The mentioned advisory council of the government had a key position in this process, on the one hand in advising the universities and on the other hand in communicating between the academic world and the Ministry of Education and Science responsible for higher education. By including communication science in the abovementioned statute, a long-standing desire became reality after more than ten years of writings reports, making pleas and intensive lobbying activities. Key-positions in this process had James Stappers from the University of Nijmegen, and Frans Bergsma and Frans Kempers from the University of Amsterdam.

The introduction of a propaedeutic course within the new education policy of the government was of great influence for the design of the new discipline of communication science. With the beginning of the academic year 1982/1983, a two-phase structure of academic teaching was introduced by law. This structural change included a one-year propaedeutic course for each study program. The intermediate exam after three years (the "*kandididaatsexamen*") was abolished. When the University of Nijmegen announced the start of the study program in communication science in the beginning of the academic year 1982/1983, only students with a completed first year in a discipline of the faculty of social sciences could *de facto* register for communication science. The reasons why the University of Amsterdam had to miss that opportunity in 1982 and felt disadvantaged, will be explained in the following.

At the same time as the introduction of the two-phase system at the universities took place, dark clouds were gathering over Dutch education policy. The universities were confronted with recommendations for improvements of efficiency per 1 September 1982, which led to sharp financial cutbacks. Responsible for the reconstruction plans of the entire academic world was the Christian Democrat Wim J. Deetman, who became minister for education and science on 29 May 1982. He strongly influenced education policies until 14 September 1989. The distribution of study programs across different universities was seen critically at Deetman's ministry. On the basis of negotiations and agreements of the university boards, often based on random criteria, an allocation of fewer disciplines to fewer universities took place. The assignment of tasks across universities caused an unprecedented process of concentration, which was partially reversed later on. This interference, called



"*Taakverdelings- en Concentratie-Operatie*" (TVC), led to anxiety at the universities and was intensively covered by the media.

The entire reorganization and rearrangement of several branches of study took more than two years and was discussed at the highest level of political decision making, the Dutch "second chamber" (Parliament).<sup>8</sup> Minister Deetman, responsible for task distribution and concentration processes at universities, published the draft of his political plan on 17 May 1983. He pointed out having taken the proposals of the universities into account. One of his plans referred to communication science. It became apparent that the minister planned to establish "this field of study" solely at the University of Nijmegen. Planning over the head of the University of Amsterdam, minister Deetman surprised the scholars of this university who were already engaged in communication studies with his point of view, their study programs should be assigned to the field of political science. Both universities in Amsterdam, the Protestant-Christian one and the "neutral" institution, without the supply of an independent department of communication science? Without taking into account a sense of achievement at these universities, Deetman's intention exceeded the imagination - and this not only of insiders.

Regardless of the academic holidays in July 1983, the stubbornness of the minister led to massive protests of those who supported the establishment of the free study discipline mass communication at the faculty of social sciences ("*Faculteit Sociale Wetenschappen – Algemeen*", FSW-A) and since the academic year 1977/1978 the free study discipline of press history, propaganda and public opinion at the University of Amsterdam. Although the latter was part of the faculty of humanities, the courses for the major and partly for the minor studies were taught by the group *mass communication* of the faculty of social sciences. Until the introduction of a one-year propaedeutic course in September 1982, students could apply for the free study discipline after finishing three years of study, passing an intermediate exam in one discipline of the faculty of the respective free study discipline. The two above mentioned free study disciplines contained a study program of two years with at least two minor subjects and one internship of three to four months in preparation for professional practice in media, public relations, advertising, applied sciences and so on. The change from the intermediate exam after three years to a one-year propaedeutic course involved a massive shortening of the standard study period and was therefore criticized as a cost-cutting measure.

***Communication science – only at the University of Nijmegen?***

A split between the University of Amsterdam and the University of Nijmegen was threatening after a long collective effort to establish communication science in the Netherlands, because minister Deetman did not aim at equality between both universities. In addition, it seemed that the university in the eastern part of the country, which was preferred by the minister, made a solo effort without showing consideration for the inter-university deliberation committee on communication science IOC. Since 1967, the free study discipline publicistics ("*Publicistiek*") existed at the University of Nijmegen and until 1969 besides an institute founded in 1947 for a two-year part-time study program in journalism for prospective journalists and university students. This "*Instituut voor de Katholieke Journalistiek*", since 1 January 1955 "*Katholiek Instituut voor de Journalistiek*", was an independent foundation with an own legal status, but was *de facto* closely connected to the university. The educational aim of this institute in Nijmegen was much the same as the intention of the institute for press science ("*Instituut voor Perswetenschap*") that opened the doors at the beginning of 1948 at the University of Amsterdam. It was integrated in the recently founded political and social faculty ("*Politiek-Sociale Faculteit*", PSF) of the University of Amsterdam, the so called 'seventh faculty'. At the University of Nijmegen, a similar initiative in the year 1947 should create an interdisciplinary field of political and social sciences, with among others press studies and later publicistics as electives. This new set of study programs was not successful and was abolished before a faculty or special department could be founded (Hemels, 1972, pp. 89-102).

In the beginning of the journalism institute and the experimental social-political study program in Nijmegen, Dr. Hans Hermans (1908-1993) was as university lecturer ("lector") responsible for teaching science of the newspaper ("*Dagbladwetenschap*"). After a career as a parliamentary journalist he could boast of some experience in public administration - with all the qualities of a spin-doctor. His academic career was of short duration. After him, the jurist and former chief editor of the catholic daily newspaper *De Tijd*, professor Leo G.A. Schlichting (1898-1968) taught, from 1950 until 1960 under different descriptions of this field of study, political science. Since early 1951, on an interim basis he took over the teaching task of Hermans who suddenly had left his lectureship. Between 1953 and his unexpected death at the age of 70 years in 1968, Schlichting was in charge of both disciplines, since 1960 in the summarized and modern version *science of politics and publicistics* ("*Wetenschap der politiek en Publicistiek*"). Uncertainty about the official descriptions of fields of study is typical of the stage of emerging, not yet established disciplines.

As a scholar, the gentleman Schlichting, who spent some years abroad in the *corps diplomatique* before his appointment in Nijmegen, was not a match for his colleagues and at the same time friends Baschwitz and Prakke. But in the capacity of teacher he could make his students enthusiastic for studying actual events in an historical perspective and help them to discover their professional ambitions. Schlichting also founded the institute for mass communication ("*Instituut voor Massacommunicatie*") in 1961 to push the study program in public communication and mass media within the University of Nijmegen forward. In the faculty of social sciences, established from 1964, publicistics could have been the cradle of a new successful discipline of (public) communication in Nijmegen. However, there was a hindering combination of negative factors. First of all, one has to consider the systematic underestimation of the functions of mass media in society and the meaning of human communication for mankind, outside but also inside the universities. Further, one has to remember the science policy-related reasons why the representatives of established social sciences were not willing to give way to a new-comer. In conclusion, in the faculty of social sciences in Nijmegen there was talk of an insuperable *incompatibilité des humeurs* of the most important key actors. It prohibited at the end of the 1960s and afterwards a cooperation of the younger generation of sociologists and psychologists who had an interest in one department and a common study program with relation to the in several countries emerging communication science.

A *liber amicorum* was dedicated to Schlichting after his death (Duynstee et al., 1968). The "science of politics" became independent in 1969 as political science ("*Politicologie*"). The full professorship was appointed to professor Andries Hogerwerf (\*1931) from the Vrije Universiteit in Amsterdam. Schlichting's succession for the part of publicistics was a complicated story, which ended as *a narrow escape with a happy end* for the above mentioned James Stappers. The psychologist had been Schlichting's assistant in publicistics since 1959. The head of the review committee and culture- and religion sociologist, Osmund Schreuder, was searching for one of the three excellent scholars who were assisting Prakke to bring him from Münster to Nijmegen. However, Prakke's own professorship was drawing to an end and the favorite successor for his own position was Winfried B. Lerg (1932–1995). Prakke did not hesitate to make the headhunter from Nijmegen clear that he only could choose between two other members of his team. Therefore, Schreuder wanted to be informed by Prakke in detail, in writing and verbally, about Michael Schmolke (\*1934) and Franz Dröge (1937–2002).

Schreuder felt most comfortable with the latter empirical-sociology focused scientist and supported him as his favorite candidate for the position of professor in Nijmegen. Others involved in the decision making process at the faculty felt duty-bound to not ignore Stappers. In that time, the phenomenon of an “internal appointment” (*Hausberufung* in the German language) without interference of an advisory appointment committee was taken under fire but thanks to proper arguments still appropriate at that time. At the same time, the final decision was influenced by the beginning democratic process of the so called "radenuniversiteit", the university of councils on every level with representatives of teaching and administrative staff, but also of students (Schreuder, 1998, pp. 90–120; 2003, pp. 93–123). Because so many persons had a say in the matter on the agenda, the common confidentiality in the appointment procedure was not always guaranteed. By a majority of only one vote, Stappers was in the end suggested by the faculty council to the "College van Curatoren" to be appointed. - Until the introduction by law of the “*College van Bestuur*” in 1972 the mentioned executive board was the highest administrative body of the university<sup>9</sup>.-

But there was a snag in it: Stappers was not appointed as a full professor, the highest academic function, but as a lector. Moreover, the faculty persisted in its attempt to develop the field on a broader basis in connection to related disciplines in social sciences, against the will of the small department of "publicistics". Necessity knows no law, and in this dramatic case it was necessary to force a solution independent of the main actors. After longstanding disputes, the representatives of publicistics, sociology of mass communication (a rather extended section of Sociology) and psychology of mass communication (a one-person section of Psychology) were compelled to work together under the pressure of the faculty board of social sciences, with full support of the central board ("*College van Bestuur*") of the university. Dr. Gerard W. Marsman (1934-2014) represented the sociology group without having a lectorship or professorship and Jacques H. Ex (1922-1995) was since 1969 extraordinary professor in psychology of mass communication.

The faculty of social sciences decided halfway through the year 1980 to establish an experimental study program in communication science with a duration of three years. From a legal perspective, it was not an independent, officially recognized study program with a degree, but an integrated study program in communication science in extension of the three already existing programs in a new form and constellation. Nevertheless, in the academic year 1980/1981, a joint study program with a communication science focus was established at the University of Nijmegen. The target group were students who completed a three year program in social sciences with an intermediate exam (the above mentioned

"*kandidaatsexamen*""). The chosen quasi-voluntary cooperation of three parties in the field of teaching turned out to be not the right solution for the still existing issues. Since the cooperation did not go as well as expected, an evaluation commission suggested to the faculty in 1982 to abrogate the three pre-communication science groups of publicistics, sociology of mass communication, and psychology of mass communication and to establish a new section for education and research in the field of communication science. This advice was followed in 1982. Ex now persisted in his refusal to participate in the new constellation. With the foundation of the combined group of teachers and researchers under the new heading of communication science, a difficult integration process of 15 years was completed, albeit under enormous pressure.

The new generation of young communication scientists and their students encouraged the merging of different approaches and several aspects of public and interpersonal communication, including the (mass) media used, slowly but surely in the new field of communication science. A feeling of being the new pioneers was in the air. However, sociological and psychological views of individual actors were still apparent and the development of a structure for the desired cooperation needed some time. The lectorship of Stappers, who had been responsible for education and research in the field of publicistics since 1970, changed to the chair of communication science in 1986. - From the beginning of the 1980s, every lector with a doctoral degree could opt for a professorship at the same salary and Stappers had taken this opportunity. - The arrangement of the curriculum and the official name "*Communicatiewetenschap*" were integrated in the academic statute on 24 May 1982. Until 1992, it was a so called "*bovenbouwstudie*", a study program built on a one-year propaedeutic course. Mostly students with a completed first year in political science, sociology or psychology registered. As already stated, the intermediate exam after three years was replaced by a one-year propaedeutic course in the academic year 1982/1983 through the legal reconstruction of university programs. Looking back at the developments at the University of Nijmegen, it has to be observed that the prospects for communication science were quite promising in 1982. For the time being, the University of Amsterdam had to worry to be let down by the responsible minister Deetman and his policies. Unfortunately, he had put the group in charge of the study programs mass communication and history of the press, propaganda and public opinion at this university into an awkward position.

***The discipline as controversial point of political decision making***

The intention to treat the non-ideological University of Amsterdam and the catholic University of Nijmegen unequally regarding the allocation of communication science, put minister Deetman in a delicate position as of mid-1983. He was publicly accused to not be neutral in this matter. Although this accusation was without justification, the minister gave a wrong impression, which made him politically vulnerable. The University of Amsterdam with its two free study disciplines at two faculties felt ignored and this turned out to be a political issue for the minister. Political parties, interest groups in the media field and journalists were mobilized by several actors within and around the University of Amsterdam during summer and early autumn to ensure that communication science was not exclusively taught at a catholic university in the Netherlands, although this institution had been influenced by secularization and the process of so-called "depillarization" ("ontzuiling").

On 12 September 1983, representatives of the three biggest parties, the Cristian Democrats, the Social Democrats and the Liberals, filed a motion in Parliament about the plans of minister Deetman regarding communication science. In this proposal, the minister was asked to take "the need for ideological pluralism in education and research", "the societal relevance of the study discipline" and the estimates of the number of prospective students into account and to offer the study program in communication science at the University of Amsterdam as well.

However, the situation and the perspective of communication science in Nijmegen as well as in Amsterdam was at risk to get worse at the beginning of the academic year 1983/1984. On 30 September 1983, Deetman decided to ask the academic council for a recommendation.<sup>10</sup> He wanted to know what the council thought about the plan to reintegrate the controversial discipline into social sciences and incorporate it "in for instance political science, sociology or psychology". The academic council already suggested on 17 December 1982 to establish communication science as an *independent* discipline at the University of Nijmegen as well as at the University of Amsterdam, even if without a separate propaedeutic course, but with the already established one-year propaedeutic course in one of the social sciences as a basis.

The three biggest political parties at that time, the Social Democrats, the Christian Democrats and the Liberals adhered to their unanimous request to treat Nijmegen *and* Amsterdam *equally* regarding communication science. They carried the motion in the session of Parliament on 15 November 1983 and used it as political leverage to put pressure on the minister. Nevertheless, the Ministry of Education and Science sent a letter to the boards of each university the same day, although perhaps before the motion was requested. In this

letter, the decision of the minister to remove the study program in communication science from the academic statute and the possibility to establish a study program within the social sciences with a focus on communication science was announced.

### *Equality for Nijmegen and Amsterdam as a compromise*

The ministerial suggestions caused increased frustration among politicians and the involved external parties since mid-November 1983; they were faced with a new consultation round in different committees within and outside of the eight involved or interested universities. The different sectors and levels of the democratized administrative structure at universities did not only have a say, they also had a right of co-determination. In a letter of 24 January 1984, the university board of the University of Nijmegen pointed out that, as expected, “no changes have to be made in the statute of the study program communication science”. Therefore, the academic statute did not have to be changed on that point either. The letter of Nijmegen starts with the sentence that the continuation of the discussion about the local determination of communication science “is of great importance for our university as the only location of this study program until now”.

It is noteworthy that in the letter of the executive board of the University of Nijmegen no plead is made for a second location at the University of Amsterdam. This is also not the case in the letter of 12 January 1984, which the board of the former university received from its faculty of social sciences regarding this issue. However, in a letter of 6 January 1984, addressed to the dean of the above mentioned faculty, the chair of the already existing section communication science, Stappers, supported the colleagues in Amsterdam. In his considerations, he noted as a second point: “Because monopolies are not desired in social sciences, a second location at the University of Amsterdam is not only accepted, but appreciated, which also ensures the equality taken for granted by the minister.”<sup>11</sup> In his position as a long-standing president of the inter-university deliberation committee on communication science (IOC), no other opinion could be expected. But his argument was not accepted by the (executive) boards on the middle and upper levels of the University of Nijmegen. It was an exceptional position for this university, since the executive boards of the other universities worked along similar lines by sustaining the interest of the University of Amsterdam in this case.

At the end, the warlike minister Deetman agreed under high pressure of Parliament to the demand of the almost entire academic community to treat Amsterdam and Nijmegen "equally". But there was some doubt what the practical outcome of this intention could be.

That the affair ended in the best imaginable solution is probably due to a commission under leadership of Ruud A. de Moor (1928-2001), sociologist and education scientist. De Moor was a prestigious professor at (today's) Tilburg University, who was positive towards the academic acknowledgement of an independent communication science. The commission was asked for help by the academic council, even before the hopeless situation of the minister was clear, and published a report about the entire social sciences on 30 December 1983.

Representatives of the section communication science at the University of Nijmegen and colleagues of the two pre-communication science education programs at the University of Amsterdam had written a document, in which they agreed on starting points and final objectives with relation to the adjudication of communication science. In this statement they repeated the most important arguments for an independent program in communication science. Undoubtedly also on the basis of this summarizing explanation of experts from the two universities, the commission-De Moor based its work on the assumption that communication science deals with "an own study field from an own perspective" and that it is recognized as an independent discipline in foreign countries without any doubt. The commission-De Moor agreed completely with Prakke's point of view from 1971 regarding the independence of education and research in the field of mass communication and communication (Prakke, 1971).

The decisive parts of the report "Social Sciences" of De Moor and the members of the commission can be read as a testimonial for how communication science was carried out in Belgium, Germany, Austria, Switzerland, France and the United States. The commission pointed out in their report that the field had been recognized as independent in those countries for a longer time. Education in (practical) journalism was not considered in the report, because it was not an option to introduce such a program at a university - under the umbrella of communication science. Journalism could be studied at applied universities - at first since 1966 in Utrecht. At the same time, the commission-De Moor expressed confidence that the foreign examples of communication science programs could be copied in the Netherlands. For the "development of a systematic study program of the phenomena of mass communication", an independent position within academic teaching was needed as the commission-De Moor pointed out. It was stressed that this consensus had existed in the Netherlands since the last few years.

With a delay of almost a year, the hot issue of communication science gained momentum on the political level in autumn 1984, after it had been slow in getting started until then. On 5 October 1984, minister Deetman gave an overview of his plans and



interventions regarding the establishment of communication science in a retrospective presentation in front of Parliament – still quite untidy in the fundamental parts. However, in a letter addressed to Parliament of 11 October 1984 it becomes apparent that he wanted to pave the way for the study field of communication science at the University of Nijmegen as well as at the University of Amsterdam, indeed as a "*bovenbouwstudie*" built on a propaedeutic course in a social science.

### **The protagonists at the Universities of Nijmegen and Amsterdam**

The postwar generation of sociologists and psychologists in the Netherlands focused more on the Anglo-Saxon than on the German academic world. Furthermore, for the pre-communication science oriented scholars another consideration was important: They observed the establishment of empirical research with applied results in the United States, but they perceived the interest in Germany as more oriented towards theory building with an ideal-typical objective. To integrate those two science cultures in teaching was a major concern for Stappers in the 1960s already, as I could experience myself as one of at that point only a few students in his university seminars and also before as a participant of his courses on Saturday at the above already mentioned journalism institute. Marten Brouwer, his colleague in the role of critical opponent at the University of Amsterdam, was focused on the American way of furthering the study of human and public communication.

#### ***James Stappers between German and Anglo-Saxon traditions***

The future publicistics and communication scientist James Stappers (1930-2014) studied psychology at the University of Nijmegen. In his dissertation in 1966 he focused on Prakke's theory of "functional publicistics", but also took communication models of prestigious American social scientists into account. This comparative approach can already be derived from the title of his dissertation *Publicistiek en communicatiemodellen* ("Publicistics and models of communication"). Through intensive contact with Lerg in Münster, Stappers knew that this colleague – supported by Prakke – focused on theory building and the research results of American academics. According to Petra Klein (2007, p. 197), communication was seen "at an exposed position as a two-sided interdependent process" at Prakke's institute for publicistics at the Domplatz in Münster.

In regards to his background in psychology, Stappers stressed the process character of communication and mass communication as public communication. He questioned whether

the sociological and system-theoretical based concepts of the colleagues in Münster were flexible enough to meet the emphasized dynamics and characteristics of a "communication event" ("*communicatiegebeuren*"). Stappers divided this "*communicatiegebeuren*" in a communication process on the one hand, seen from the perspective of the intentions of the sender, and an information process on the other hand, seen from the perspective of the receiver and his expectations. This bipartite division of the term "*communicatiegebeuren*" led to a dual use of the term "communication", namely as a component of the "communication event/*communicatiegebeuren*" on a higher level and as a component of the "communication process" on a lower level. As a speck on its elegance, this ambiguity in defining communication and information and the (inter)relationship between both key notions caused some criticism and even the reproach of confusion of thought. In connection with this debate one has to consider that designing, criticizing and rejecting definitions and models - not only of communication - in the 1960s was a favourite occupation of scientists of all establishing social sciences. However, Stappers' trick enabled the use of two perspectives without destroying the relationship between the constituting elements. The paradigm shift from "What are people doing with the media?" to "What are the media doing with people?" could take place. The door for the uses-and-gratifications approach had been opened in Nijmegen, before the term was common under communication scientists.

Although Stappers – as a publicistics and communication scientist at the University of Nijmegen –with his adaption of functional publicistics focused on models developed in Münster, he also took a systematic look at the models of communication published in the United States. His role model was undoubtedly George Gerbner (1919-2005). Although Stappers criticized the field model of mass communication of the German psychologist Gerhard Maletzke (1922-2010) published in 1963, they agreed on an important approach: Maletzke saw publicistics as a science of targeted public communication. According to his point of view, communication is *targeted*, because it aims to reach a certain goal. And as he pointed out in his *Psychology of mass communication*, communication is *public*, because it does not address – in contrast to private communication – a limited number of recipients, but addresses an "audience", that means everyone who is able to receive the message (Maletzke, 1963). Stappers phrased his definition of mass communication as public communication in exactly the same way in his dissertation three years later. Without neglecting the intentional character of communication – as it was phrased later in the sense of Jürgen Habermas – according to Stappers the receiver is "emancipated" more and more in his actions from the by him perceived power of the sender or sender organization (Klein, 2007, pp. 268-270).

### ***Marten Brouwer searching for renewal in theory building***

At the University of Amsterdam there was basically only demand for the German tradition, as it was advanced by Baschwitz mainly in regards to mass psychology in the post-war era. According to Marten Brouwer (1929-2001), who followed the footsteps of Baschwitz regarding parts of his professorship in 1971 (Hemels, 1993, pp. 98-99), the critical merits of his teacher were neither in empirical research in social sciences nor in his longstanding historical research, but in the theory building involved. In the 1920s already, the German scientist published papers about mass psychological mechanisms, especially in regards to public opinion. According to Brouwer (1998, p. 32), Baschwitz put the recipient in the center of interest in connection with studies of the press and other mass media. Baschwitz' statement "The most important part of a newspaper is its readership" is well known. It is the first sentence of his book *De krant door alle tijden* ("The newspaper through all ages"), published in 1938 (reprinted 1949).

Baschwitz did not have a good knowledge of English and his key-publications were not translated into English. His contribution to theory building was therefore not perceived and recognized by the Anglo-Saxon academic world. Furthermore, he had to go underground in the period of German occupation and had to pause his academic work (see Anschlag, 1990). In 1968 Brouwer defended his doctoral thesis *Stereotypen als folklore* (Stereotypes as folklore) at the University of Amsterdam. His central theme was the importance of informal communication for mass communication, from rumor to two-sided conversations as interpersonal communication. He contributed to communication theory with the "myceliummodel" in pointing out the influence of interpersonal networks on opinion formation. In contrast to public mass media messages, the informal communication patterns are as invisible as the mushroom threads in their entirety, which can merge to a tight network at the bottom side of a mushroom (mycelium or fungus) (Brouwer, 1968). In this regard Brouwer came close to Stappers' view, however he would not admit this. Stappers saw "publicistics" as a multidisciplinary and integrated science, which is an independent part of communication science. He differentiated between the research objective of publicistics and mass communication, defined as public communication and its "modalities" journalism, advertising, propaganda and so on.

Brouwer studied in the best traditions of Baschwitz and H.C.J. (Bert) Duijker (1912-1983) (mass)psychology at the University of Amsterdam. Quite early he became familiar with the state of the art of *communication science* in the United States because he got a

fellowship for the United States. There he got the opportunity to work with Lee Thayer, born in 1927, who was already becoming a distinguished expert in the field of communication studies, especially organizational communication. In the sixth edition of the handbook *People, society and mass communications*, edited by the political scientist Lewis Anthony Dexter (1915-1995) and David Manning White (1917-1993) of the gatekeeper theory (1964) – used at the University of Nijmegen in the early 1960s – an article by Brouwer about the low interest in mass communication as a research field within social sciences was published. Although Brouwer was a nephew of Prakke, he did not feel connected to his theory building of functional publicistics and his cultural-historical approach (see also Hemels, 1990; 1999/2000). Quite the contrary: He had an excellent knowledge of the methods and techniques of research in social sciences and was an expert in statistical data handling.

Brouwer held on to his point of view that the theory of mass communication is not limited to the mass media, but has to be extended to communication phenomena within the invisible mass. For theory building one of Brouwer's main ideas is of remaining importance. It is the realization that the effects of mass communication through mass media can be better understood if researchers take a closer look at informal communication processes and structures. In 1971, Brouwer became full professor of psychology of collective behavior at his own university. From 1991 until he received the emeritus status, his professorship was focused on political psychology. This new task led to a second inaugural lecture in 1992 about among others xenophobia and descent with the provocative title *Het eigen volk* (One's own people) (Brouwer, 1992). Two years later Brouwer got the emeritus status.

### ***Anne Willem van den Ban in the footsteps of Everett Rogers***

Brouwer followed an approach with his mycelium model in which the sociologist and communication scientist Elihu Katz (born in 1926) together with the sociologist Paul F. Lazarsfeld (1901-1976) connected *personal influence* with the role that individuals play *in the flow of mass communication* (Katz & Lazarsfeld, 1955). Furthermore, he was ambitious in developing an alternative for the *two-step-flow model*, that Anne Willem van den Ban (1928-2016) had introduced from the United States in the Netherlands in the 1950s to explain the role of *opinion leaders* for the effectiveness of agricultural education of farmers at today's Wageningen University and Research Centre [official name, shortened: Wageningen University or WUR].

In 1964, Van den Ban became the first professor of information studies ("Voorlichtingskunde") in the Netherlands and founded a working group of the same name,

which received the more formal status of a department in 1971. He is known as the founder of this specialization in the Netherlands and is still associated with Wageningen as a founding father of communication studies at this university with a history of agricultural sciences. He got a fellowship in the United States and became acquainted with Everett M. Rogers (1931-2004), the author of the classical handbook *The diffusion of innovations*, first edition published in 1962. Therefore it was not surprising that the term "Voorlichtingskunde" for information studies in 1998 was replaced by "Communication and innovation studies" („Communicatie en innovatiestudies“) by Van den Ban's successor, at first Niels Röling (\*1937) and later on Cees M. J. van Woerkum (\*1947). One of the reasons of changing the former name of the discipline was the problem how to translate "Voorlichtingskunde" into English. From 2002 to 2011 Van Woerkum was in charge of "Communication strategies" as a new field of study. It was the second chair of the section communication sciences at Wageningen University. From 2003 the Bachelor program was called "Communicatiewetenschappen" (plural form!). Instead of this program of three years in 2017 the new Bachelor program "Communication and Life Sciences" was introduced. At the same time the two-year master program "Communication, Health and Society" with the specializations "Communication and Innovation" and "Health and Society" replaced the Master program "Applied Communication Science". The special tradition of Wageningen University of applying scientific knowledge to connected professional activities in society is still apparent.

The field of Applied Communication Science developed since 1993 at the University of Twente as well. It was continued since 2008 as Communication Science (Bachelor) and Communication Studies (Master) in the department of communication science in the faculty of social sciences of this university for technical sciences. Nowadays, the one-year Master offers three specializations: Corporate and organizational communication, Technical Communication, and Marketing communication. Special attention is paid to science communication. Since 2000, the sociologist Jan van Dijk (\*1952), appointed for sociological aspects of the information society, is one of the outstanding professors of the mentioned department and founding father of the Centre for E-Government Studies (Van Dijk, 2012).

After the first and second stage of the development of pre-communication science took place, Baschwitz and in a broader sense also Prakke - however he was after the 1950s at a chair abroad - were involved in the third stage of the "developing" science in the Netherlands. Schlichting's role on the background as quartermaster in Nijmegen shall also be mentioned,

although he was not a theorizing professor. Brouwer and later especially Denis McQuail shaped the development of the discipline at this stage at the University of Amsterdam, as well as Stappers in Nijmegen and Van den Ban in Wageningen. The new study program "History of the press, propaganda and public opinion" was developed since 1977 by Maarten Schneider with the indispensable support of Jan Wieten (\*1940). Schneidertook over this field of study in 1959 - three years after the retirement of Baschwitz.

From the 1st of January 1958, not Prakke but Maarten Rooij (1906-1986) succeeded Baschwitz at the University of Amsterdam as a professor for teaching the theory of communication media, especially the press ("*Leer van de communicatiemiddelen, in het bijzonder van de pers*") (Hemels, 1972; 1993; Brouwer, 1998; Vroons, 2005). Prakke was not on the short list for the appointment by the municipality of Amsterdam - until 1971 the organ of authority of the also "Municipal University" ("*Gemeentelijke Universiteit*"), now called University of Amsterdam. Rooij and Schneider were the candidates for the chair. Rooij, who was appointed, had been chief editor of the quality newspaper *Nieuwe Rotterdamse Courant* before. Between Baschwitz' retirement and his appointment on January 1st 1958, Rooij defended his doctoral thesis on as good as all aspects of the newspaper industry - including the role of journalists and the functions of journalism in society. During many years it was a undisputed standard work (Rooij, 1956). As a professor he developed into a typical press scientist with a background in economics and law.

The question may be asked whether Rooij was a representative of the second or the third stage in the development of communication science. In my opinion, it would be a mistake to assign him the role of an advanced pioneer in the second stage, because the scientific quality of his publications exceeds the work of the non-theoretical original pioneers to a great extent. Between the end of the era-Baschwitz in 1956 and the beginning of the era-McQuail in 1977, the descriptive-analytical work of Rooij, as well as the theorist and empiricist Brouwer at the University of Amsterdam, built a bridge between two epochs in the development of pre-communication science education and research towards an independent and recognized communication science. In contrast to Nijmegen, the approach by Prakke was not considered in Amsterdam.

### **The constitution of communication science in Amsterdam**

Rooij received the emeritus status in 1972 and to find a successor was very difficult. Candidates with a doctoral degree related to the field of public communication or mass media

studies were white crows in the Netherlands. A German speaking candidate was still a bridge too far for faculty members. Therefore, for Brouwer the call for an American communication scientist was obvious, but those asked were not interested. The already mentioned Thayer became a guest professor, but he did not stay. It must have been a lucky brain-wave, to consider Denis McQuail (1935-2017) for the position that was five years vacant. He was British with a background in social history and sociology and had already worked as a professor at the University of Southampton. By his own account, he came to Amsterdam in 1977, because with the position as a professor of mass communication there, he was able to focus on (mass) media research. McQuail's appointment was a great enrichment for the program of the free study programs in mass communication (since 1976) and history of press, propaganda and public opinion (since 1977) in Amsterdam.

### ***Denis McQuail's in the academic environment of Amsterdam***

In accordance with the academic tradition at Dutch universities, McQuail gave his inaugural lecture only one year after his appointment. Especially because communication science was still not established as fully independent of traditional social sciences in the Netherlands, the topic of his speech – *The historic roots of a science of mass media* – was chosen very well (McQuail, 1978). McQuail's science-theoretical argumentation supported those who had already fought for an independent study program since years. According to him, communication science is highly influenced by other sciences such as social psychology, sociology and political science, but is not dependent on them. McQuail's conclusion reminded of Maletzke's views in 1967: "Even if publicistics could be divided without any remains, there is still no argument against the right of publicistics to exist as an independent academic discipline. Rather is the science of a targeted public communication the reason for an independent existence of publicistics" (Maletzke, 1967, p. 9).

In his first years at the University of Amsterdam, McQuail taught as the only full professor in harmonious cooperation with a relatively small team. The optional subjects of film studies were part of the faculty section mass communication (the "*Vakgroep Massacommunicatie*"). Until 1982, Jan Marie Lambert Peters (1920-2008) was part-time professor for film studies at the University of Amsterdam. From 1959 to 1965, film studies also was an elective course at the University of Nijmegen, lectured by the former journalist and critic Adrianus van Domburg (1895-1983) who had the academic position of a 'lector'. Peters was founder and first director (1958-1967) of the "*Nederlandse Filmacademie*" in Amsterdam and since 1963 guest professor at the KU Leuven (Belgium). From 1968 until he

received the emeritus status in 1985, he was professor for literature and audiovisual communication at this university (Hesling & Van Poecke, 1985). In the academic year 1982/1983, Jan Hes (1925-1991) took over the lectures of the special field film studies/audiovisual communication, even if not as a professor or lecturer but as a university teacher ("*docent*"), until he retired in 1990. Afterwards film and television studies as well as theater studies developed towards a "*bovenbouwstudie*" in "*Media studies*" at the faculty of humanities, which is comparable to the study program in "*Medienwissenschaften*" in Germany.

The initiator of the free study discipline in history of press, propaganda and public opinion, Dr. Maarten Schneider (1913-1998), retired in 1982 after twenty-three years (Hemels, 1993, p. 43-45; 1999). Joan Hemels (\*1944) of the University of Nijmegen, who was professor of communication science at the Paris Lodron University in Salzburg (1979-1980) and at the Ruhr University in Bochum (1982), became Schneider's successor - for the time being on a temporary basis and without the title of professor. After his inaugural lecture in 1987 he was appointed as a part-time professor for communication science, in particular communication history. Until the "*bovenbouwstudie*" Media studies developed, he also taught at the faculty of humanities just as Schneider did before.

On the occasion of the 25-year anniversary of the first publication of the Dutch introduction to publicistics, namely Prakke's *De samenspraak in onze samenleving* ("The dialog in our society"), Hemels published *Massamedia als medespelers* ("Mass media as fellow-players") in 1982 as a new textbook for propaedeutic students. Prakke pointed out in the preface of this edition that he enjoyed "the personal contact with prospective scientists, who wanted to think things through" while teaching in Groningen, Münster, Bologna and Iowa City (Prakke, 1982, p. 8). His students confirmed this friendly connection time and time again (Hemels, 1990; 1999/2000; Hemels et al., 2000). After communication science was recognized in 1984 and started one year later in Amsterdam as well, the lectureship<sup>12</sup> of Hemels became a part-time professorship for the history of press, propaganda and public opinion in 1986. As he held his inaugural speech in 1987, his professorship was renamed to communication science, especially communication history. He kept the professorship in communication science in part-time until he received his emeritus status in 2009 (Hemels, 2010; Kutsch et al., 2014; Meyen, 2014).

McQuail took the scientific leadership of the still rather small group of mass communication scholars at the University of Amsterdam after his appointment as a full professor. The start of the "*bovenbouwstudie*" communication science in the academic year



1985/86 led to a merger of the group around McQuail and the Baschwitz Institute for Mass Psychology - sometimes with the addition "and Public Opinion" ("*Baschwitz Instituut voor Massapsychologie [en Publieke Opinie]*") founded by Brouwer in 1972. Brouwer took the management tasks instead of the intellectual leadership of the extended and more various group in the "Oost-Indisch Huis", the building with a colonial distant past that was the location of the (pre-)communication scientists from 1978 to the midst of the year 2014. After a short transition period in which both areas were part of the group's name, the label "communication science" was chosen for the unity of education, research and administration. In the early years of communication science, the students could choose -after finishing the propaedeutic course in one of the social sciences or under special conditions until 1992 in the humanities – one of the following specializations for the final exam: social-cultural communication ("*Sociaal-culturele communicatie*"), formation of public opinion ("*Openbare meningsvorming*"), organizational aspects of the mass media ("*Mediaorganisatie*") and history of communication ("*Communicatiegeschiedenis*") (N.N., 1986). In 1992, the study of information in all its dimensions ("*Informatiestudies*") was added to the meanwhile existing specializations media studies ("*Mediastudies*"), media policy ("*Beleidsstudies*") and audience studies ("*Publieksstudies*").

The mentioned name "Informatiestudies" can hardly be translated with "information studies". This implies the supply of and demand for information in a societal, medial and technological context. The head of the department of communication science at that time, Jan J. van Cuilenburg (1946-2016) found topics such as *Access to information*, *Diversity in information provision*, *Information overload*, *Information gap* and *Information age* especially important (compare: Van Cuilenburg, 1998). The preference for using the term *studies*, which is not the common usage of the plural form of "*studie*" in Dutch, indicated a tendency towards the Anglo-Saxon approach at Dutch universities, in fact ten years before the Bachelor/Master system was introduced in the Netherlands in 2002. At the same time, the specialization "Communication history" was changed into a special study program („*vrij doctoraal*") with a special final examination under the auspices of the faculty of political and social-cultural sciences. This arrangement remained until the introduction of the Bachelor-/Master-structure for communication science in the academic year 2003/2004.

The repeatedly changed, often discussed division of the study program according to rather controversial specializations ended with the start of the Bachelor-/Master-structure. At the same time, the "*Media & Communicatie Instituut*" ("Institute for media and communication") was founded for the teaching of communication science in the academic

year 2002-2003. This new institution took over the organization of and responsibility for the program communication sciences from the "*Onderwijsinstituut voor Politieke en Sociaal-Culturele Wetenschappen*" ("Institute for teaching political and social-cultural sciences") of the "*Faculteit der Maatschappij en Gedragwetenschappen*" („Faculty of social and behavioral sciences”). After twelve years, this faculty had replaced the "*Faculteit der Politieke en Sociaal-Culturele Wetenschappen*" ("Faculty of political and social-cultural sciences"). After these organizational changes, communication science could finally be considered as entirely independent within the faculty. The development towards the independence of communication science had already reached a first milestone when the "own" propaedeutic course was introduced in 1992.

Only seven years after its formation, the institute for media and communication ceased to exist. The newly formed *College "Communication Science"* took over the responsibilities for the three-year Bachelor program per 1 February 2010. The master program in communication science with a duration of one year and the two-year Research Master program in communication science were offered by the "*Graduate School of Communication Science*" from then on. Jan A. de Ridder (\*1955), who came in 1988 with the team of Van Cuilenburg from the "*Vrije Universiteit*", was an expert in continuously developing and restructuring the study program of communication science. From 2002 to 2009 he was director of the mentioned Institute for media and communication. After a one-year period of being head of the department, he accepted the high position of director of the Audit-Office of the Metropolitan Amsterdam ("*Rekenkamer Metropool Amsterdam*").

### ***The importance of Denis McQuail for communication science***

Denis McQuail stayed true to the University of Amsterdam for twenty years until he reached emeritus status in 1997. His importance for communication science was recognized far beyond the Dutch borders: His reputation reached a European, even a worldwide dimension. His introduction to communication science, *Mass communication theories. An introduction* (McQuail, 1983), published in its first edition in 1983, became a brand as *McQuail's mass communication theory* in 2000. When the core textbook was published in its sixth edition in 2010 (McQuail, 2010), the publishing house *Sage* announced to have sold 80.000 copies worldwide. The *European Journal of Communication*, in 1986 founded on initiative of McQuail and Els De Bens of the University of Ghent, noticeably contributed to the strengthening of communication science in Western Europe. By working together with

professor De Bens, McQuail "discovered" the community of Flemish communication scholars. The mentioned university honored him with an honorary degree.

When McQuail passed away on 25 June 2017, he was 82 years old. Immediately, many obituaries were published, beginning with digital tributes to 'this 'British social scientist and foundational theorist in mass communication' (Michael Todd, 2017). Peter Golding stressed his many kindnesses as follows: '(...) many in the field will remember Denis best for his personal qualities. He was the most charming and amusing of companions, and endlessly generous in support, advice and help to younger colleagues and peers alike' (Golding, 2017)

The existence of an "own" *European Journal of Communication* contributed to the fact that young communication scientists from McQuail's social environment started to publish in English to participate in international communication scientific discussions. Further, they were motivated to present their research results at international conferences and to publish in journals with international reputation. As a consequence, communication science at the University of Amsterdam was acknowledged by the international *scientific community* quite early. International students and PhD students have chosen Amsterdam as a place for studying more often in the last twenty years. Thus, among others, Claes de Vreese (\*1974) from Denmark, since 2005 professor of political communication, and Jochen Peter (\*1972) from Germany, since 2011 professor of media entertainment, came to Amsterdam. Prestigious foreign communication scientists were willing more than ever to apply for a position. Among these were in 1995 professor Holli A. Semetko (\*1958) from the United States and in 1998 Klaus Schönbach (\*1949) from Germany, but also esteemed *senior associates* and *associate professors* as well as many *postdoctoral fellows*.

Through the experience that had been gained in the mid-1970s with the two free study disciplines (mass communication since 1976 at the faculty of social science and history of press, propaganda and public opinion since 1977 at the humanities), communication science could rely on a solid, diverse theoretical basis since 1985, thanks to McQuail's prolific work. McQuail's bestseller in introduction to communication science has been compulsory reading for first semester students since 1983 (McQuail, 1983). It has to be recognized that the key term in the book's title is *mass communication*. McQuail never requested a change in his professorship of mass communication towards (general) communication science, although it would have been a feasible idea since the mid-1980s. His chair was still called "*Massacommunicatie*", but in English-speaking publications McQuail is almost unexceptionally introduced as the first professor of *general communication science* in Amsterdam. He had knowledge of a broad, even though not the entire, field of the discipline,

as can be inferred from his *reader* published in 2002 (McQuail, 2002). McQuail characterized his self-chosen position as one of an observer in the center of the discipline with a broad overview of communication science. The way he dealt with the diversity of theories and approaches relevant for science in his *Introduction* shows his ability to look at the development of the discipline from a birds' eye view and also to examine it critically. His last book before he died on 25 June 2017 is on journalism and society, one of his preferred subjects. Considering the bibliography of McQuail, his creativity and endeavors to discover and assess new topics and views is impressive.

The Briton teaching in Amsterdam had less affinity with the continental German tradition of publicistics and communication science than with the Anglo-Saxon *communication science(s)*. It can be regretted that he never became a member of the *Deutsche Gesellschaft für Publizistik- und Kommunikationswissenschaft* (DGPK), the German society of communication scientists. His German was not good enough and colleagues in Germany started to publish articles in English quite late. McQuail's undogmatic approach promoted a liberal research atmosphere, but also led to a fragmentation of research projects and results. It was typical for his liberal attitude that he did not have the ambition to found a school. Until the Amsterdam School of Communications Research (ASCoR)<sup>13</sup> – in the beginning intended for PhD students – was founded, the choice of research topics was based on personal interests of professors, other lecturers, and graduates with dissertation projects. The head of the department communication science at that time, Van Cuilenburg, can be seen as the *founding father* of the research institute, which was successful within a few years. He considered it necessary to coordinate research programs to strengthen the position of communication science in-between the older social sciences, especially psychology, sociology and political science. His expectations to obtain third-party funding for bigger projects and more doctoral students through a more intense cooperation and focus on special research areas were met. As a result, the degree ceremony in the Auditorium of the University became business as usual instead of a rarity.

When ASCoR and the ASCoR research program were officially presented to the public in September 1997, this event was at the same time the occasion for the *scientific community* of the Dutch and Flemish communication scientists to say goodbye to McQuail with a symposium. The *Proceedings of the ASCoR opening conference* was the first publication of the new research institute (Van Cuilenburg & Zwier, 1998), followed by the first *Annual report* in 1999 - with information on the development of ASCoR, reviews of research, of the Ph.D. program, of contract research, of personnel, of finances, and of future

policy. In appendices one can find the scientific output of 1997 and 1998 (N.N. Annual report, 1999). This report shows that the end of the 20th century was the time of take-off of an established discipline of communication science at the University of Amsterdam with unsuspected research capacities.

McQuail, the professor emeritus, returned to Great Britain but visited Amsterdam still several times for academic events, until reaching the age of 70 in the position of supervisor and supporter of graduate students. He was invited all over the world to give lectures, attended international conferences and was publishing as before. In Amsterdam he was the first *Honorary Fellow of ASCoR*. These honorary fellows are "senior researchers with a strong international reputation". They have a temporary affiliation with ASCoR and work with ASCoR faculty members on research projects, publications, and PhD candidate supervision. On 18 July 2017, the following professors were ASCOR Honorary Fellows: J.L.H. (Jo) Bardoel, K.L.K. (Kees) Brants, A.E. (Fred) Bronner, Wouter van der Brug, Marijn de Bruin, Cees van der Eijk, Cees Hamelink, Joan Hemels, Loet Leydesdorff, Klaus Schönbach, Holli Semetko and Ed Tan. Most of them are retired professors.

### **The establishment of a mature discipline in the Netherlands**

The journey towards the recognition of communication science in the Netherlands had a brilliant start, but through the related public attention, there was great pressure on the representatives of the new academic discipline. Furthermore, the minister did not provide additional financial means for research and education in communication science. The cooperation of scientists with diverse backgrounds in a joint effort was therefore necessary in Nijmegen as well as in Amsterdam. One of the first challenges was in compiling a well-balanced study program for the three-year studies following a propaedeutic course in another discipline. This gradually led to a definite empirical-analytical change in the social sciences – with the psychologists as pioneers in the 1960s. The sociologists followed soon.

The “empirical turn in social sciences” (Löblich, 2010) was also changing the discipline of publicistics in the three decades after the end of the Second World War. Within the established discipline of communication science of the 1970s in Germany, Switzerland, and Austria the historical-descriptive approach of the humanities tradition was more present than in the Netherlands but at the University of Amsterdam this approach was still represented until the end of the first decade of the 21<sup>st</sup> century. The “certainly viable relics of the humanities” (Schmolke, 2010, p. 321) were in danger of disappearing when

communication science was understood and classified only as a social science. On the one hand, the communication scientists were challenged to work on the same empirical, quantitative basis as the main stream of social sciences. On the other hand, they had to find a balance between the aspiration of being generalists in teaching and the necessity to be specialists as researchers. Ideally, a specialization process emerges when a science reaches the stage of establishment, after the stage of an emerging discipline. Regarding communication science, it can be concluded that the circumstances led to the empirical turn and to a specialization process in research of its own. Since the foundation of ASCoR, its researchers were very eager to compete with social scientists of other branches for contract research. This mostly meant that they had to work on a strong empirical basis. Because most of the ASCoR-researchers from the beginning were interacting with the institutions responsible for teaching tasks within the curriculum in communication science, they enriched the courses with their special knowledge, based on research. When the Bachelor-Master structure was introduced in 2003, the Bachelor curriculum got a more general character, whereas the Master and Research Master curricula gave room to specialization.

In implementing the new discipline in the second half of the 1980s, the pioneers remained still connected with the specializations and interests of their original study discipline. However, already in the 1990s, they took the communication science context into account. This attitude led sooner or later to a full engagement in communication science - sometimes with new, adapted specializations. A good example is the internationally known Cees J. Hamelink (\*1940). From a Lutheran theologian with international experience in broadcasting and media policy he developed since 1983 within communication science of the University of Amsterdam towards a critical engaged specialist in the field of international communication. The associated and assistant professors, appointed since the foundation of ASCoR, studied with only a few exceptions communication science or a close-related social science.

One can ask if the general communication science missed out because of the outlined consolidation of the discipline after the era of McQuail in Amsterdam and Stappers in Nijmegen. In the meantime, in Amsterdam as well as in Nijmegen, younger male and more and more female are full professors, who studied communication science themselves and did their doctorate in this area. One can think of Edith Smit (\*1967), and Rens Vliegthart (\*1980). Smit was from 2006 during four years professor of Customer media (an endowed professorship) and now she is full professor of Communication and persuasion. Vliegthart was appointed in 2013 for Media and Society. In 2016 the Amsterdam Center of Health

Communication has been founded with Julia van Weert, since 2015 professor of Health communication, as director. New is also the Center of Political Communication, founded and managed by De Vreese. The aim of these centers is to provide a forum for scholars, students, journalists, actors and others interested in the field of the center. Together with unnamed former and present professors, including those on endowed chairs during many years, they followed and still follow the founding fathers at a distance - under present-day conditions, with new challenges and within a internationalized scientific community.

### *ASCoR-research with a mission statement in a broad sense*

Considering the adjusted understanding of the most efficient way of academic research, so that the Netherlands can compete with foreign universities, it was decided on the highest level of political decision making to introduce an institutional separation of educational and research tasks. Those two fields of work of an academic at university had always been connected, so that the decision was accompanied by far-reaching consequences. No discipline could withstand the trigger: The allocation of research funds was made dependent of achievements. In the beginning, there was a debate if this policy should be seen as a means of pressure to intensify the acquisition of (external) projects. However, after some years of try-outs the outcome of the system was striking.

In 1997, communication science at the University of Amsterdam had a vanguard role through the foundation of a research school. It was decided to not cooperate with sociology, political science and cultural anthropology, which had already founded a joint research school at the faculty. That communication science started ASCoR of its own was a signal of being convinced to succeed, even if the study program had 400 or more new students every year. In 1992, communication science had finally obtained its desired propaedeutic course, which was also a milestone in the process of reaching an independent status and strengthening confidence as a recognized social science. But the immense growth in enrolment meant a great burden in terms of teaching, while the allocation of staff hours was not extended. At the end of the millennium, there was a ratio of one teaching staff member for 92 students. Nevertheless, this circumstance was no obstacle to push forward ASCoR-activities. The solo effort to found a research school may be explained by the fact that communication science often felt marginalized by other social sciences. Feelings of being placed at a disadvantage within the faculty of political and social-cultural sciences ("*Politieke en Sociaal-Culturele Wetenschappen*", PSCW), founded in 1987, were still alive when the

already mentioned Faculty of Social and Behavioral Sciences started in 1999. As a conclusion, the option of a voluntary cooperation was not yet viable when ASCoR was planned, even though reasons were present to consider a joint *body of knowledge* of social sciences, a joint training in research methods and techniques, and open access to optional courses for PhD candidates, et cetera.

The head of the department of communication science at that time, Van Cuilenburg, was an dynamic university professor with impressive management qualities. He had come in 1988 from the "Vrije Universiteit" in Amsterdam to the University of Amsterdam. He had worked at 'his' "Vrije Universiteit" since 1969, at first as a professor's assistant and after finishing his study political science in 1972 as the first member of the team that the already mentioned Diemer was building up as a specialization connected with political science. In 1981, Van Cuilenburg was Diemer's successor as professor of communication science. It was one of the miracles of political decision making in the first years of the 1980s that communication science in 1984 was not assigned to the "Vrije Universiteit". Van Cuilenburg's team members Otto Scholten and Jan de Ridder followed him - just as Peter Neijens (\*1951) of the department of research methods for social cultural sciences. These three scholars made successful efforts to develop their focus areas in education and research – media policies, information issues, methods of research and political communication – complementary to the *body of knowledge* of the professional group in communication science at the University of Amsterdam. An introduction to communication science, first published in 1984, was edited several times (Van Cuilenburg et al., 1996). Compared with McQuail's worldwide used *Introduction*, this alternative textbook was less theoretically structured and more focused on the media in the Netherlands - with all its implications. In 2000, a reader with a broad overview of the field of study in the Netherlands was published (Van Cuilenburg et al., 2000).

On 18 and 19 September 1997 “The Amsterdam School of Communication(s) Research” (ASCoR) was officially opened with a conference in the Royal Dutch Academy of Sciences ("Koninklijke Nederlandse Akademie van Wetenschappen", KNAW). On the second day, the valedictory ceremony in honour of McQuail was held in the Auditorium of the University of Amsterdam. His speech on *Theory as compass: competing lodestones for communication research* was not only the concluding contribution to the conference but also the valedictory lecture of the honorably retired professor who had brought communication science in Amsterdam so much. From the beginning, English was the working language for everyone



who had anything to do with ASCoR. The *mission statement* was as follows: “ASCoR conducts research at an advanced level into the political, social, psychological, cultural and economic aspects of communication infrastructure, contents, and effects. Research addresses the role of media and (tele)communications, nationally and internationally, from the perspective of democracy and processes of opinion and identity formation. As an institute for academic research and training in the field of communications, ASCoR is also a meeting place for scholars, students and policymakers” (ASCoR, Annual report 1997/1998, p. 3).

### ***The rise of ASCoR-research during the first twenty years***

It was a daring initiative, but ASCoR was a resounding success. As a leading figure of ASCoR, Van Cuilenburg, assisted by Sandra Zwier, recognized that academic research was more and more dependent on external financing. Successfully defended doctoral theses brought extra funds, so that it was seen as desirable to raise the number of PhD candidates. In 2001, Van Cuilenburg took over the chairmanship of the Dutch supervisory board for media (“*Commissariaat voor de Media*”) on a nearly full-time basis. From 1998 to 2005 and from 2011 to 2012 the above mentioned Peter Neijens, in the meantime an expert in the field of persuasive communication, served as scientific director of ASCoR. In the first period of his directorate, he succeeded soon in bringing forward the expansion of the research institute. His directorship was characterized by the successful acquisition of research funds and the keyword internationalization. Neijens’ accomplishments for the development of communication science were acknowledged by the Dutch and Flemish colleagues through the “NeFCA Senior Career Award for a life-time of scholarly achievement in communication science”, awarded in 2013 by The Netherlands Flanders Communication Association (NeFCA<sup>14</sup>).

Thanks to the appointments of the already mentioned professors Semetko in 1995 and Schönbach in 1998, communication science at the University of Amsterdam had a network in the United States as well as in the German-speaking countries, also after McQuail received the emeritus status. For promising foreign doctoral candidates and guest professors, this was very important. After Semetko was appointed for a position at Emory University (Department of Political Science) in the United States (Atlanta, GA) in 2002 and Schönbach in Vienna in 2009, Claes de Vreese energetically and successfully continued the two professors’ work in the field of political communication and formation of public opinion. From 2005 to 2011 he

served ASCoR as its scientific director. In 2013, Jochen Peter (\*1972) took over this leading position from Neijens who was scientific director twice, as has been mentioned above.

The *ASCoR Annual report 2012* reads as follows: „It [ASCoR] is the largest research institute of its kind in Europe and is among the largest worldwide. More than 55 senior researchers are permanently associated with ASCoR and its English-language PhD program hosts more than 40 candidates“ (ASCoR, 2013, p. 13). In regard to research fields it mentions: "ASCoR research concentrates on the production, uses, and consequences of information and communication in informing, persuading, and entertaining citizens. The approach is multidisciplinary: Core theories of communication science are combined with theories and methods from other social sciences, political science, sociology, psychology, economics, history, and information sciences“ (ASCoR, 2013, p. 13). This citation shows the disappearance of the reserved attitude toward the neighbor sciences within and outside of social sciences. It also gives evidence of confidence and openness and therefore the willingness to cooperate with various partners. The research focus is empirical, qualitative and quantitative at the same time (ASCoR, 2013, p. 13).

Every year, a detailed annual report is published. For the research program from 2006 to 2010, ASCoR chose “a tripartite division in research domains”, a division, which is based on the three primary functions of “information and communication”, namely “to inform, to persuade, and to entertain” (ASCoR, 2007, p. 8). Consequently, the three “*research priority areas*”, organized as "program groups" with their own directors, were: „Persuasive Communication”, “Media, Journalism and Public Opinion” and “Media Entertainment and Popular Culture” (ASCoR, 2007, p. 11). For the period of 2010 to 2015, the division according to the three functions of communication – *entertainment*, *persuasion* and *information* – was maintained, but the topics of the program groups were named as follows: “Persuasive Communication (*to persuade*)”, “Political Communication & Journalism (*to inform*)” and “Youth & Media Entertainment (*to entertain*)” (ASCoR, 2014, p. 13). The program group "Corporate Communication" was founded in 2013; program group director became the newly for the field of Media and society appointed Vliegenthart.

Since 2003, ASCoR interacts with the Bachelor, Master, and Research Master curricula in communication science. These programs attracted at the beginning of the year 2017 more than 1600 graduate and undergraduate candidates. At the same time, ASCoR started implementing a new research program for the next five years. On the one hand, this program is to stimulate ASCoR members to continue with their 'high-quality, relevant, and viable' research and on the other hand it is to sharpen ASCoR's profile as an internationally oriented

research school that pioneers in the identification and investigation of theoretically relevant and practically important topics. (Peter, 2016, p. 5). Of particular importance will remain 'the identification of already existing, as well as just emerging, developments in the field of communication (technologies) along with the pertinent societal trends, both at a national and an international scale (Peter, 2016, p. 10). In the meantime, the total research staff of ASCoR exists of more than sixty full-time equivalents.

Patti M. Valkenburg (\*1958) may be the first ASCoR scholar after McQuail, who reached within less than a decade an international reputation in her field of study. At the University of Amsterdam, Valkenburg got an endowed professorship for education and research in the area of youth and media in 1997. Since then, she developed an international highly valued research program and founded the "Center for Research on Children, Adolescents, and the Media" (CcaM) in 2003. No other communication scientist has been awarded that many times: In 2001 she got the -with EUR 2.5 million endowed- Spinoza prize and in 2008 she was the first Dutch member of the International Communication Association (ICA) awarded the Lifetime Achievement Award. The above mentioned Hamelink, who taught international communication at the University of Amsterdam from 1983 until 2005, became the second Dutch "ICA Fellow" in 2013. The University of Amsterdam granted Valkenburg the highly honorable position of "universiteitsprofessor" (*distinguished university professor*). The professor of Child and media research is also a distinguished research professor at the Faculty of Social and Behavioral Sciences of her university.

Valkenburg had two colleagues in the field of Youth and Media Entertainment. Jochen Peter, mentioned above, and Ed Tan (\*1951). From 2002 to 2017 he was professor of Media entertainment (Tan, 2003). Like Valkenburg, he also served the self-regulation institution NICAM in developing "*Kijkwijzer*" as member of the scientific board. In ASCoR he dealt with the cognitive, emotional, and behavioral responses to entertainment media - in his case especially moving images. For example, he studied how users experience media entertainment in terms of (aesthetic) pleasure and how people entertain virtual action tendencies towards film protagonists.

Since 2005 the ASCoR Baschwitz Article of the Year Award is given for the best article published by an ASCoR staff member in a peer-reviewed journal in the previous year. The ASCoR Baschwitz Award for Young Researchers was awarded for the first time in 2005. This award is meant as an incentive to ASCoR PhD candidates, and given for the best article published by an ASCoR PhD candidate in a peer reviewed journal in the preceding year. Not only the distinguished scholar of the beginning of academic education and research in the

field of pre-communication science is remembered up to know by these Baschwitz Awards. McQuail was already during his lifetime honored with an prestigious Award. Since the academic year 2007-2008, the ASCoR Dennis McQuail Award is offered for the best article advancing communication theory published in a peer reviewed journal in the previous year. An international Award Committee, chaired by McQuail until his dead in 2017, makes the selection. The award goes to all listed authors of the article chosen. The first author is McQuail Honorary Fellow for one year, and is invited to give the McQuail Lecture.

### *Communication science research at the University of Nijmegen*<sup>15</sup>

Part of the tradition of the Faculty of Social Sciences in Nijmegen founded in 1964 was to connect research projects to the respective resident professors. This research strategy was followed for a couple of decades. When in 1971 in the small municipality of Melick and Herkenbosch volunteers started with the production and distribution of cable television programs and this illegal experiment two years later got a State-aided official status, Stappers' institute of mass communication was asked to follow the development in order to evaluate the effects. Until the 1980s, Stappers encouraged research in the field of public and interpersonal communication in the local communities, especially with regard to the functioning of the local democracy. Accompanying research regarding local mass media and cable television raised questions whether local identity can be influenced by the new possibilities for communication and which consequences local broadcasting could have for print media in the area of local communication (Van der Linden et al., 1994).

In the 1980s, Stappers' name is more connected to the research area *Communication, culture and community*. In education and research, he paid attention to the importance of communication for culture, for *cultivation and message systems* in relation to communication and culture, and further to the importance of *community communication*. Educated in psychology, he was – together with a small research group – oriented towards the approach of *cultural indicators*, propagated by George Gerbner (1919-2005) (Stappers, 1984a, b).

Since 1986 and until he received his emeritus status in 2009, Karsten Renckstorf (1945-2013) developed the research area *Media use and social action*. The choice of this focus led to a great variety of publications about television and social behavior (Arts et al., 1990; Frissen, 1992; Hendriks Vettehen, 1998; Renckstorf and Wester, 2001; Huysmans, 2001; Schaap, 2009); the question how people use information, which they get through *public information campaigns* (Renckstorf et al., 1996); edia use of “media-makers” such as

journalists and program directors (Hermans, 2000); and the use of broadcasting news by the receiver (Huysmans, 2001; Schaap, 2009).

Renckstorf was working at the "*Hans-Bredow-Institut*" in Hamburg, before he became the second professor of communication science in Nijmegen in 1986. One of the largest projects of the *Media-Use-as-Social-Action*-group that he started was the large-scale field research project MASSAT, which was carried out in 1989, 1994 and 2000 (Arts et al., 1990; Hendriks Vettehen et al., 1995; Konig et al., 2005). Renckstorf worked together with the political scientist Leo B. van Snippenburg (\*1942). He was professor of communication science from 1996 to 2002, in fact as the successor of Stappers, who received the emeritus status in 1995. Van Snippenburg's working field was mainly focused on the political-economic development, sociocultural changes, and media use in regards to information acquisition and political communication.

From 2002 until 2011, Hans (Johannes) W. J. Beentjes (\*1955) was professor of communication science at the University of Nijmegen, before he became professor of general communication science at the University of Amsterdam. With regard to teaching and research projects he is an expert in the field of media effects, especially the media use of children and adolescents. He started his academic career as a psychologist at the University of Leiden, where he was cooperating with Tom H.A. van der Voort, who founded in 1986 the Center for Child and Media Studies to do research and offer courses about the role played by media in children's development and socialization. The center was working with a psychological and pedagogical research perspective. Beentjes has been scientific advisor of Sesamstraat, and since the start of the self regulation institution NICAM with the "*Kijkwijzer*" in 2001, he is one of the experts who is sustaining this unique service with his expertise in rating audiovisual products and in furtherance of media competence.

After becoming a professor of communication science in 2003 and until he received emeritus status in 2012, the mentioned Fred P. J. Wester (\*1947) continued working in the research area "*Broadcasting as social behavior*". During his whole career at the University of Nijmegen, he had a reputation of being an expert in social science methodology (Wester, 1995; Wester et al., 2012). In his research as a professor, Wester was inspired by two important traditions in communication science. On the one hand theory building in the area of *agenda setting*, conceptualized by Maxwell E. McCombs (\*1938) and Donald L. Shaw (\*1936) in 1972, and on the other hand the cultivation theory of Gerbner, already mentioned above. Publications with results of qualitative and quantitative research were the outcome.

The focus of the research was on the quality of news within journalism, "*representation*" and the development of stereotypes, also in relationship with minorities.

Communication science in Nijmegen had during one decade a tradition in teaching and research in the area of media policy. From 1990 to 2000, the sociologist and broadcasting expert Kees van der Haak (1937-2015) was the first professor on this endowed chair ("bijzondere leerstoel"), followed by the sociologist and communication scientist with special expertise in the fields of media policy and journalism research Jo Bardoel (\*1951) from 2002 to 2010. From 2008 to the autumn of 2010, the historian and journalist Ben Knapen (\*1951) was teaching on media and quality of journalism. He decided to go into politics and was after his professorship during two years secretary of state ("staatssecretaris") for foreign affairs. The appointment of Bardoel in 2009 as a full professor of journalism and media at the University of Nijmegen led to the research project "Journalism and media policies" to follow up the research in the period of Renckstorf's professorship on media use and "media-makers". Through Bardoel education in journalism received new impulses. At the end of 2014 he said goodbye with a farewell lecture.

In 2012, Moniek Buijzen (\*1973) became professor of persuasive and strategic communication at the University of Nijmegen, department of communication science. At the University of Amsterdam, she focused already on the processes and effects of advertising, social marketing, and family and peer group communication about consumer matters. Furthermore, she is interested in research questions and research methods that can explain the positive effects of media, including social media, on the behavior of adolescents (key word: *prosocial behavior*). In cooperation with Simone de Droog she developed "De Wereld van de Groentefroetels" ("The world of the vegetable-animals") to convince children in a playful way to eat vegetables and fruits (Tinbergen, 2014). The research area *Media & influence*, built by Beentjes in Nijmegen, was further developed by her. Buijzen came from the research group of Valkenburg and she is still a member of Valkenburg's Center for Research on Children, Adolescents, and the Media (CcaM) at the University of Amsterdam.

### ***Communication science back at the "Vrije Universiteit"***

In this article, attention was dedicated especially to the development of communication science at the University of Nijmegen since 1982 and the University of Amsterdam since 1985. In regards to the Wageningen University and Research Centre and the University of

Twente it was noted that the field of study at these universities proceeded from (some form of) Applied communication science. In addition, the rebirth of communication science in the academic year 2002-2003 at the "*Vrije Universiteit*" Amsterdam should be noted. In 1984, no independent study program in communication science was allocated to the "*Vrije Universiteit*", but the field was maintained as a part of political science.

The department of administrative and communication sciences founded in 2001 was divided two years later. Thereby, communication science became an independent department and responsible for newly founded Bachelor- and Master study programs (Bak, 2013). Jan Kleinnijenhuis (\*1954), who was appointed as a professor for general communication science in 1998, built bridges between communication scientists and political scientists as a recognized expert in the field of politics and communication. His expertise is especially involving behavior and the role of media in regards to political opinion formation. His leitmotif is as follows: "In media research, questions are discussed which are only little or not addressed in other disciplines" (Kleinnijenhuis, 1994, p. 63). Kleinnijenhuis was the successor of Wim (G.W.) Noomen (\*1944) who succeeded the above mentioned Van Cuilenburg in 1988. From 1996 to the end of 2005 he was chair of the executive board of the "*Vrije Universiteit*", the university he served nearly forty years.

### ***A conclusion with an open end to the future***

As a conclusion concerning the development of communication science in the Netherlands in the last decades, one could unreservedly copy a citation and agree with the results of a bibliometric study about Denmark, Finland, Iceland, Norway and Sweden. Instead of "Nordic", one only has to read "Dutch". The respective sentence is as follows: "The results of the present study indicate that communication research carried out by Nordic scholars is becoming increasingly international, and the past decade can be considered a golden one" (Fernández-Quijada, 2014, S. 147).

It cannot be denied that especially communication science at the University of Amsterdam significantly influenced the "golden decade". Looking back on the fact that exactly this university was almost ignored in the allocation of the new study field thirty five years ago, one can be happy with the new energy after the *narrow escape*. Luckily, there is no monopoly position of Amsterdam, and communication science is developing at other Dutch universities in a great diversity. The questions "Where do we stand today? Where do

we want to be" are still current and the necessary elements for the ongoing identity debate (Schulz et al., 2009). Apart from the relationship of communication science to other disciplines, factors have to be identified and discussed that helped paradigms to achieve a breakthrough, to establish schools and to promote the building of myths, or conversely hindered their establishment.

---

## Literature

- Anschlag, D. (1990). *Wegbereiter im Exil. Kurt Baschwitz: Journalist und Zeitungswissenschaftler*. Mit einem Vorwort von Joan Hemels. *Journal für Publizistik & Kommunikation, Exkurse 4*.
- Arts, K., Hollander, E., Renckstorf, K., & Verschuren, P. (1990). *Grootschalig onderzoek naar media-uitrusting, media-exposure en mediagebruik in Nederland in 1989*. Nijmegen: Instituut voor Toegepaste Sociale Wetenschappen (ITS).
- ASCoR. (1999). *The Amsterdam School of Communications Research. Annual report, September 1997-December 1998*. Amsterdam: ASCoR, Universiteit van Amsterdam.
- ASCoR. (2007). *The Amsterdam School of Communications Research. Annual report 2006*. Amsterdam: ASCoR, Universiteit van Amsterdam.
- ASCoR. (2013). *The Amsterdam School of Communication Research. Annual report 2012*. Amsterdam: ASCoR, Universiteit van Amsterdam.
- ASCoR. (2014). *The Amsterdam School of Communication Research. Annual report 2013*. Amsterdam: ASCoR, Universiteit van Amsterdam.
- Averbeck-Lietz, S. (2010). *Kommunikationswissenschaft in Frankreich. Der epistemologische Diskurs der Sciences de l'information et de la communication 1975–2005*. Berlin: Avinus.
- Bak, P. (2013). *Gedonder in de sociale. Vijftig jaar sociaal-culturele wetenschappen aan de Vrije Universiteit 1963–2013*. Zoetermeer: Uitgeverij Meinema (= 'Historische Reeks VU', vol. 14).
- Baschwitz, K. (1940 [1949]). *De krant door alle tijden*. Amsterdam: Keesing.
- Bohrmann, H. (2006a). Kommunikations- und Mediengeschichte. In C. Holtz-Bacha, A. Kutsch, W. R. Langenbacher, & K. Schönbach (eds.), *50 Jahre Publizistik* (pp. 290-300). Wiesbaden: VS Verlag.



- Bohrmann, H. (2006b). Der Markt der publizistik- und kommunikationswissenschaftlichen Zeitschriften. In C. Holtz-Bacha, A. Kutsch, W. R. Langenbacher, & K. Schönbach (eds.), *50 Jahre Publizistik* (pp. 33–46). Wiesbaden: VS Verlag.
- Brouwer, M. (1964). Mass communication and the social sciences. Some neglected areas. In L. A. Dexter & D. M. White (eds.), *People, society, and mass communications* (pp. 559–579). New York: Free Press.
- Brouwer, M. (1968). *Stereotypen als folklore Vinkeveen: Uitgeverij Fringilla*, Dissertation Universiteit van Amsterdam.
- Brouwer, M. (1992). Het eigen volk. Iets over de ‚roots‘ van politieke psychologie & iets over de politieke psychologie van ‚roots‘. In M. Brouwer & L. Jacobs (eds.), *Onuitgesproken redes. Met een voorwoord van dr. Richter Roegholt* (pp. 5–32). Amsterdam: Gieben.
- Brouwer, M. (1998). Kurt Baschwitz. Een weldenkend geleerde. In J. Goudsblom, P. de Rooy, & J. Wieten (eds.), *In de zevende. De eerste lichting hoogleraren aan de Politiek-Sociale Faculteit in Amsterdam* (pp. 24–36). Amsterdam: Uitgeverij Het Spinhuis.
- Cuilenburg, J. van, & Zwier, S. (eds.). (1998). *Proceedings of the ASCoR opening conference 1997*. Amsterdam: The Amsterdam School of Communications Research (ASCoR)/Het Spinhuis.
- Cuilenburg, J. van (1998). Access and diversity in communications and information: Some remarks on communications policy in the information age. In J. van Cuilenburg & S. Zwier (eds.), *Proceedings of the ASCoR opening conference 1997* (pp. 69–82). Amsterdam: The Amsterdam School of Communications Research (ASCoR)/Het Spinhuis.
- Cuilenburg, J. van, Scholten, O., & Noomen, W. (G.W.) (1996). *Communicatiewetenschap*. Bussum: Uitgeverij Coutinho.
- Cuilenburg, J. van., Neijens, P. C., & Scholten, O. (eds.). (2000). *Media in overvloed. (Boekaflevering bij Mens & Maatschappij 1999)*. Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press.
- Dovifat, E. (1966). Kurt Baschwitz 80 Jahre (mit einer Bibliographie der selbständigen Veröffentlichungen von K. Baschwitz). *Publizistik*, 11(1), 67–69.
- Dovifat, E. (1968). Kurt Baschwitz †. *Publizistik*, 13(4), 372–373.
- Duynstee, F. J. F. M., et al. (1968). *Massamedia en politiek. 24 essays ter nagedachtenis aan prof. mr. Leo Gerhard Anton Schlichting*. Utrecht: Ambo.
- Dijk, J. van (2012). *The network society. Social aspects of new media*. London: Sage Publications.

- Fernández-Quijada, D. (2014). A golden decade. Exploring internationalization in Nordic communication research. *Nordicom Review*, 35(1), 135–152.
- Frissen, V. (1992). *Veelkijken als sociaal handelen. Een empirisch onderzoek naar het verschijnsel veel televisiekijken in Nederland*. Dissertation Katholieke Universiteit Nijmegen. Nijmegen: Instituut voor Toegepaste Sociale Wetenschappen (ITS).
- Golding, P. (2017). A tribute to Denis McQuail (1935-2017).  
<http://www.ecrea.eu/news/articl/id/300> (12-9-2017).
- Ginneken, Jaap van (in press: 2017/2018). *Kurt Baschwitz. A pioneer of communication studies and social psychology*. Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press.
- Hemels, J. (1972). *De journalistieke eierdans. Over vakopleiding en massacommunicatie*. Assen: Koninklijke Van Gorcum & Comp.
- Hemels, J. (1982). *Massamedia als medespelers. Toegang tot het studieveld van de massacommunicatie*. Utrecht/Antwerpen: Uitgeverij Het Spectrum (= 'Aula Paperback', nr. 74).
- Hemels, J. (1990). Henk Prakke und die Entwicklung der historischen Kommunikationsforschung in den Niederlanden. Ein Glückwunsch zur Vollendung seines 90. Lebensjahres. *Publizistik*, 32(2), 147–161.
- Hemels, J. (ed.). (1993). *Kwartiermakers voor communicatiegeschiedenis. Een hommage aan dr. Maarten Schneider bij gelegenheid van zijn tachtigste verjaardag*. Amsterdam: Otto Cramwinckel Uitgever.
- Hemels, J. (1999). Maarten Schneider, Keulen 31 maart 1913 - 's-Gravenhage 25 april 1998. *Jaarboek van de Maatschappij der Nederlandse Letterkunde te Leiden, 1997–1998*, 151–160.
- Hemels, J. (1999/2000). Hendericus Johannes Prakke. *Jaarboek van de Maatschappij der Nederlandse Letterkunde te Leiden 1999/2000*, 110–128.
- Hemels, J. (2010). *Een journalistiek geheim ontsluit. De Dubbelmonarchie en een geval van dubbele moraal in de Eerste Wereldoorlog. Met bijdragen van E. van Bochove, S. de Boer, H. van der Meulen, J. de Ridder, G. Schöttler, M. Schmolke en K. Schönbach. Met een curriculum vitae van J. M. H. J. Hemels en een bibliografie van zijn publicaties onder eindredactie van Jan van de Voort*. Apeldoorn: Spinhuis Uitgevers.
- Hemels, J. (2011). Evert Diemer (1911–1997). In G. Harinck (ed.), *Mijn protestant. Persoonlijke ontmoetingen* (pp. 60–62). Amsterdam: Historisch Documentatiecentrum voor het Nederlands Protestantisme (1800-heden).

- Hemels, J. (2015). Die Etablierung als erwachsene Disziplin. In Michael Meyen & Thomas Wiedemann (eds.), *Biografisches Lexikon der Kommunikationswissenschaft*. Köln: Herbert von Halem. <http://blexkom.halemverlag.de/erwachsene-disziplin/> (12-9-2017).
- Hemels, J. (2017). Die Anerkennung und Entwicklung der Kommunikationswissenschaft in den Niederlanden. In S. Averbek-Lietz (ed.), *Kommunikationswissenschaft im internationalen Vergleich. Transnationale Perspektiven*. (pp. 53-92). Wiesbaden: Springer VS.
- Hemels, J., Kutsch, A., & Schmolke, M. (eds.). (2000). *Entgrenzungen. Erinnerungen an Henk Prakke. Mit einer Bibliografie*. Assen: Van Gorcum.
- Hendriks Vettehen, P. (1998). *Conceptualisering en operationalisering van het begrip "motief" in uses & gratifications onderzoek*. Dissertation Katholieke Universiteit Nijmegen. Nijmegen: Instituut voor Sociale Wetenschappen (ITS).
- Hendriks Vettehen, P., Need, Y., Renckstorf, K., Snippenburg, L. van, & Vos, B. de. (1995). *Media use in the Netherlands 1994. Documentation of a national survey*. Nijmegen: Instituut voor Sociale Wetenschappen (ITS).
- Hermans, L. (2000). *Beroepsmatig handelen van journalisten. Een kwalitatief onderzoek bij een televisienieuwsredactie*. Dissertation Katholieke Universiteit Nijmegen. Amsterdam: Thela Thesis.
- Herpolsheimer, R., & Urban, R. (1982). Publizistik als liberaler Markt: Hendricus Prakke (\*1900). *Journal für Publizistik & Kommunikation*, 1, 45–53.
- Hesling, W., & Van Poecke, L. (eds.). (1985). *Communicatie: Van teken tot medium. Liber amicorum professor J. M. Peters*. Leuven: Universitaire Pers.
- Huysmans, F. (2001). *Mediagebruik en de temporele organisatie van het dagelijks leven in huishoudens*. Dissertation Katholieke Universiteit Nijmegen. Amsterdam: Thela Thesis.
- Katz, E., & Lazarsfeld, P. F. (1955). *Personal influence. The part played by the people in the flow of mass communication*. New York: Free Press.
- Klein, P. (2007). *Henk Prakke en de functionele publicistiek. Henk Prakke und die funktionale Publizistik. Über die Entgrenzung der Publizistik – zur Kommunikationswissenschaft*. Assen: Koninklijke Van Gorcum.
- Kleinnijenhuis, J. (1994). Methodologie van de communicatiewetenschap. In F. van Raaij, G. Schuijt, J. Stappers, J. Wieten, C. van Woerkum, & C. van der Linden (eds.), *Communicatie en informatie. Een stand van zaken* (pp. 60–88). Houten: Bohn Stafleu Van Loghum.

- Konig, R., Jacobs, H.-J., Hendriks Vettehen, P., Renckstorf, K., & Beentjes, H. (2005). *Media use in the Netherlands 2004. Documentation of a national survey*. Nijmegen: Instituut voor Sociale Wetenschappen (ITS).
- Kutsch, A. (2006). Verdrängte Vergangenheit. Darstellungstechniken und Deutungen der Fachgeschichte im „Dritten Reich“ in den Personalien der „Publizistik“. In C. Holtz-Bacha, A. Kutsch, W. R. Langenbacher, & K. Schönbach (eds.), *Fünfzig Jahre Publizistik* (pp. 73–112). Wiesbaden: VS Verlag.
- Kutsch, A., & Pöttker, H. (eds.). (1997). *Kommunikationswissenschaft – autobiographisch. Zur Entwicklung einer Wissenschaft in Deutschland*. Wiesbaden: Westdeutscher Verlag.
- Kutsch, A., Averbek-Lietz, S., & Eickmans, H. (eds.). (2014). *Kommunikation über Grenzen. Studien deutschsprachiger Kommunikationswissenschaftler zu Ehren von Prof. Dr. Joan Hemels*. Berlin: LIT.
- Lerg, W. B. (1980). Publizistik in Münster. In H. Dollinger (ed.), *Die Universität Münster 1780–1980* (pp. 337–338). Münster: Aschendorff.
- Linden, C. van der, Hollander, E., & Vergeer, M. (1994). Recent onderzoek naar een theorievorming over kleinschalige massacommunicatie. In F. van Raaij, G. Schuijt, J. Stappers, J. Wieten, C. van Woerkum, & C. van der Linden (eds.), *Communicatie en informatie. Een stand van zaken* (pp. 89–106). Houten: Bohn Stafleu Van Loghum.
- Löblich, M. (2010). *Die empirisch-sozialwissenschaftliche Wende in der Publizistik- und Kommunikationswissenschaft*. Köln: Halem.
- Löblich, M., & Scheu, A. M. (2011). Writing the history of communication studies: A sociology of science approach. *Communication Theory*, 21(1), 1–22.
- Maletzke, G. (1963). *Psychologie der Massenkommunikation. Theorie und Systematik*. Hamburg: Hans Bredow-Institut.
- Maletzke, G. (1967). *Publizistikwissenschaft zwischen Geistes- und Sozialwissenschaften. Zum Standort der Wissenschaft von der öffentlichen Kommunikation*. Berlin: Spiess.
- McQuail, D. (1978). *The historicity of a science of mass media. Time, place, circumstances and the effects of mass communication* (Inaugural Lecture Universiteit van Amsterdam).
- McQuail, D. (1983). *Mass communication theory. An introduction*. London: Sage Publications.
- McQuail, D. (2002). *McQuail's reader in mass communication*. London: Sage Publications.
- McQuail, D. (2010). *McQuail's mass communication theory*. London: Sage Publications.
- McQuail, D. (2013). *Journalism and society*. London: Sage Publications.

- Meyen, M. (2014). Joan Hemels: ‚Ich habe immer versucht zu vermitteln‘. In M. Meyen & T. Wiedemann (eds.), *Biografisches Lexikon der Kommunikationswissenschaft*. Köln: Halem. <http://blexkom.halemverlag.de/vermitteln/> (22-07-2014).
- Meyen, M., & Löblich, M. (eds.). (2006). *Klassiker der Kommunikationswissenschaft. Fach- und Theoriegeschichte in Deutschland*. Konstanz: UVK.
- N.N. (1986). *Communicatiewetenschap*. (Brochure der) „Subfaculteit der Algemene Politieke en Sociale Wetenschappen“ (Universiteit van Amsterdam).
- N.N. (1999). *Annual report* [of The Amsterdam School of Communications Research, ASCoR], *September 1997-December 1998*. Amsterdam: ASCoR.
- Peter, J. (2016). Introduction by the scientific director. In *ASCoR annual report 2015*, pp. 4-6 [The Amsterdam School of Communication Research, ASCoR]. <http://ascor-annual-report-2015.pdf> [ascor.uva.nl] (10-9-2017).
- Prakke, H. (1971). Towards a philosophy of publicistics. Center for the Advanced Study of Communication 1. (Occasional Paper).
- Prakke, H. (1982). Woord vooraf. In J. Hemels, *Massamedia als medespelers. Toegang tot het studieveld van de massacommunicatie* (pp. 7–9). Utrecht: Uitgeverij Het Spectrum.
- Renckstorf, K., & Wester, F. (2001). The ‘media use as social action’ approach: Theory, methodology, and research evidence so far. *Communications*, 26(4), 389–419.
- Renckstorf, K., McQuail, D., & Jankowski, N. (eds.). (1996). *Media use as social action. A European approach to audience studies*. London: Libbey.
- Rooij, M. (1956). *Het dagbladbedrijf in Nederland. Een economisch-sociaal beeld*. Leiden: Stenfert Kroese.
- Samkalden, H. (1932). *Publieke meening, pers en staat. Een bijdrage tot de sociologie van het dagbladwezen*. Dissertation Rijksuniversiteit Leiden. Leiden: Ginsberg.
- Schaap, G. (ed.). (2009). *Interpreting television news*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Schmolke, M. (2010). [Book review of] Maria Löblich (2010). Die empirisch-sozialwissenschaftliche Wende in der Publizistik- und Kommunikationswissenschaft. *Publizistik*, 55(3), 320–323.
- Schreuder, O. (1998). *Proeven van eigen cultuur. Vijfenzeventig jaar Katholieke Universiteit Nijmegen 1923–1998. Deel 2: 1960–1998*. Nijmegen: Valkhof Pers.
- Schreuder, O. (2003). *Argonauten aan de Waal. Sociologen en het gulden vlies*. Nijmegen: Valkhof Pers.
- Schulz, P. J., Hartung, U., & Keller, S. (eds.). (2009). *Identität und Vielfalt der Kommunikationswissenschaft*. Konstanz: UVK.

- Stappers, J. G. (1966). *Publicistiek en communicatiemodellen*. Dissertation Katholieke Universiteit Nijmegen. Nijmegen: Drukkerij Busser.
- Stappers, J. (1984a). De eigen aard van televisie. Tien stellingen over cultivatie en culturele indicatoren. *Massacommunicatie*, 12(5–6), 249–258.
- Stappers, J. (1984b). Cultural indicators: A possible source of confusion. In G. Melischek, K. E. Rosengren, & J. G. Stappers (eds.), *Cultural indicators, an international symposium* (pp. 105–110). Wien: Akademie der Wissenschaften.
- Tan, E. (2003). *Het plezier van media-entertainment*. Amsterdam: Vossiuspers UvA (Inaugural Lecture, 10th September 2003).
- Tinbergen, M. (2014). Kleuters eindelijk aan de wortels. (Interview with Moniek Buijzen) *Radboud Magazine*, 40(17).
- Todd, Michael (2017). *The theorist of mass communication: Denis McQuail, 1935-2017*. <http://www.socialsciencespace.com/2017/07/theorist-mass-communication-denis-mcquail> (12-9-2017).
- Van den Bulck, J., & Van den Bulck, H. (2017). Communication sciences in Flanders: A history. In S. Aeverbeck-Lietz (ed.), *Kommunikationswissenschaft im internationalen Vergleich. Transnationale Perspektiven* (pp. 93-111). Wiesbaden: Springer VS.
- Versluys, N. J. D. (1936). *Journalistiek en wetenschap. Een studie van de betrekkingen tussen journalistiek en sociale wetenschap*. Amsterdam: Uitgeverij H. J. Paris.
- Vroons, E. (2005). Communication studies in Europe. A sketch of the situation around 1955. *Gazette*, 67(6), 495–522 (Special issue 50th anniversary of Gazette).
- Wester, F. (1995). *Strategieën voor kwalitatief onderzoek*. Muiderberg: Coutinho.
- Wester, F., Renckstorf, K., & Scheepers, P. (2012<sup>2</sup>). *Onderzoekstypen in de communicatiewetenschap*. Amsterdam: Adfo Groep.
- Wieten, J. (2005). Kurt Baschwitz and the founding of Gazette. *Gazette*, 67(6), 523–530 (Special issue 50th anniversary of Gazette).
- Wilke, J. (2006). Von der „entstehenden“ zur „etablierten“ Wissenschaft. Die institutionelle Entwicklung der Kommunikationswissenschaft als universitäre Disziplin. In C. Holtz-Bacha, A. Kutsch, W. R. Langenbacher, & K. Schönbach (eds.), *Fünfzig Jahre Publizistik* (pp. 317–338). Wiesbaden: VS Verlag.

---

## NOTES

- 
1. Typoscript of Henk Prakke with the title *Declaration of Independence of the discipline of "publicistics" as an autonomous field of theory and research* (Hemels, 1972, p. 167). Invited by Hanno Hardt, Prakke wrote this declaration in preparation for a visiting professorship at the University of Iowa (USA) in 1971. The topic of this citation was addressed in Prakke's *inaugural address* (1971).
  2. The materials used for this article are located in original and copy in the archive of the author in the Netherlands. For further information, his e-mail address (joanhemels@caiway.net) can be used.
  3. Thankfully, Miss Wieke van Dorsser provided genealogical information about the family Versluys via e-mail on March 8, 2014.
  4. A free study discipline ("*vrije studierichting*") with a certain final exam and later a free study discipline leading to a final exam ("*vrij doctoraal*"), can be seen as an independent study program within a certain discipline. The study program had to be authorized by the relevant faculty or by the recognized and independent discipline, which was accountable for the final exam. After establishing the Bachelor/Master system in the Netherlands in 2002, this option was no longer possible.
  5. A lecturer ("lector") was a subordinate position as a university teacher, who was not allowed to have the title "hoogleraar" (professor), but was responsible for education and research in a certain field or a subfield of a discipline. Those who were lecturers with a PhD degree per January 1, 1980, could be named university professor of the (new introduced) category A without rise in salary, but with the title and all rights of a professor as bonus, if they wanted to opt this opportunity. Since the late 1990s, universities of applied sciences ("*hogescholen*") have used the title "lector" for teachers responsible for the support of applied research. Dutch applied universities do not use the term professor. Currently, the title "lecturer" is sometimes used in English-language job advertisements of Dutch universities, especially for practice oriented lecturers for instance in the field of public relations.
  6. This happened in the same time in France, where the discipline was institutionalized in 1975 (Averbeck-Lietz, 2010).
  7. The name „*Rooms(ch)-Katholieke Universiteit Nijmegen*“ of the non-governmental, foundation-grounded, catholic university in Nijmegen changed in 1961/1962 to „*Katholieke Universiteit Nijmegen*“ and in 2004 to „*Radboud Universiteit Nijmegen*“. Nowadays, there is the tendency to strike out the name of the city. In this work, the university will be named University of Nijmegen.
  8. When one thinks about the heated discussions and their results in these times, the mental image of a raffle comes to mind.
  9. The executive board of a university ("College van Bestuur"), which mostly consists of three members, includes a president, a member and the principal ("rector magnificus") of the university
  10. Until 1986 the academic council ("Academische Raad") was the umbrella organization of the universities, having advisory competence for all matters regarding university.
  11. In a book about the recognition and development of communication science in the Netherlands that will be published later on, more precise references will be given to the sources of parliamentary discussions, reports and correspondence. They are located in my archive in Malden, the Netherlands.

- 
12. This was a quite odd teaching role at a university called "houder van een onderwijsopdracht" (instead of "leeropdracht", the term used for professors), which was connected to the salary, but not to the title of a professor.
  13. In 2009, the s in "Communications" was omitted and this part of the name was written "Communication" from then on.
  14. See also the article *Communication sciences in Flanders: A history* of Hilde Van den Bulck and Jan Van den Bulck (2017)
  15. I would like to thank Prof. Dr. em. Jo L.H. Bardoel, Dr. Paul W. M. Nelissen and Prof. Dr. em. Fred P. J. Wester for the important advice and elements for the development of communication science research in the 1990s and changes in the educational program afterwards in Nijmegen.