

International Communication Association Fellows: A Collective Biography

MICHAEL MEYEN
University of Munich

This article aims to reveal the structure of the academic field of communication by portraying the people at its dominant pole. The study is based on the sociology of Bourdieu and 57 personal interviews with International Communication Association (ICA) fellows. It shows that the communication field's legitimization problem is intensified by social climbers' prevalence at the field's power pole. These first-generation college graduates were raised to value education, hard work, and a certain type of public conduct. They entered the field when they realized that it matched their habitus, as communication attracted people with both an affinity for natural sciences and the wish to make a difference. Quantitative methods and psychological approaches promised scientific authority as well as knowledge for the outside world.

The idea of this article is pretty simple: to reveal the structure of the communication field by portraying the people at its dominant pole. Anyone wishing to link the article's scope and title will probably ask for the empirical and theoretical background: Why ICA, and why the fellows? Why a portrait including the origin environment, for example, instead of canonic texts? These questions are addressed in the introduction to the *International Journal of Communication (IJOC)* special feature in which the 57 interviews with ICA fellows are also accessible. The following discussion will focus on analysis of the material, asking: Who are the ICA fellows—the men and women who have received the "most distinguished award" (fellow Akiba Cohen) that one of the world's leading associations in the field of communication has to offer? Where do those people come from, and how did they get into academia? From whom did they learn to do good science, and what are the principles and orientations that guide their work?¹

To translate these questions into Bourdieu's language: This chapter investigates the logic of the field by asking about the habitus and capital of its most successful scholars. ICA fellows are winners in the "competitive struggle" for "scientific authority" and thereby have the "socially recognized capacity to

Michael Meyen: meyen@ifkw.uni-muenchen.de

Date submitted: 2011–12–22

¹ Read the 57 interviews in *IJoC's* features at <http://ijoc.org/ojs/index.php/ijoc/article/view/1650/764>

speak and act legitimately” in communication matters (Bourdieu, 1975, p. 19). Among others, the agents portrayed in the *IJoC* special feature define what the field is all about: the questions, theories, and methods that are regarded as legitimate, as well as the evaluation criteria of scientific practices. ICA fellows’ strong influence over both the present situation and the future of the discipline is thus twofold: First, as role models they show the next generation what a successful communication scientist looks like; second, they are important decision makers in hiring, tenure, and promotion cases. Who are the agents that rule the field, how does their habitus fit in, and what does “good science” in communication mean right now? Where do those academic leaders see skyscrapers, construction sites, and fire trenches within the field, what do they think about its future, and what do these views mean to research and teaching? What kind of capital was (and is) necessary to advance professionally? What kind of character traits and role perceptions are expected of the young, and what kind of, for example, statistical and analytical expertise? According to Bourdieu (1988, 1990), habitus plays an important role in the search for the up-and-comings. Working (and living) with people whose backgrounds, attitudes, and behavior patterns are similar to one’s own is much easier than trying the reverse. “We found each other,” Bradley Greenberg said of his graduate students. “Anybody who asked me to work with them knew what to expect if I said yes. So students without the same work ethic never worked with me.”

Here, the way to the target is a collective biography, an analytical tool that is well-known in both the science of history and the social sciences (especially sociology and political science). Normally, collective biographies are based on large collections of data that are analyzed quantitatively and fitted into a kind of “norm” (Jones, 2001; Stone, 1971): How old are “typical” communication scholars upon entering the field? What are their qualifications and family relationships? When did they get tenure, and when were they promoted to full professor? What was the situation in 1970, 1985, and 2000? Averages such as these are then applied to categorize and assess individuals’ career paths. When should a leading scholar expect to become an ICA fellow? Is it okay to get that award at the age of 60, or is this rather late? Here, I deviate from this process for two reasons. First, this is not a collective biography of faculty members in communication. With a sample of 57 active ICA fellows, there was no need for a quantification strategy and multiple regressions. And second, collective biographies also always attempt to expose attitudes and behaviors (Jones, 2001) beyond quantifiable data. What is the work ethic of Bradley Greenberg based on, and where did his ideas about mentoring come from? In the interview, he mentioned both the Orthodox Jewish family environment he grew up in and the impact of his father (“The standard was a 12-hour day, six days a week. It was much later that I discovered that it was not the norm.”). How did those values fit in the communication field—and at Michigan State University, which consistently supported Greenberg and his work? What about other ICA Fellows? Did they have similar childhood experiences and examples to live up to, or is Bradley Greenberg an exception?

Where statistics fail, even interviews help only to a limited extent because they do not answer all questions and are shaped by current interests. Those who are still active at their universities and within the field describe their lives differently than those who have already retired. A second challenge is associated with the material used in this analysis. Collective biographies aim at the average, but there is no common thread in 57 life histories. In other words, there is always an exception. Where quantitative research establishes correlations statistically, a qualitative approach such as this one argues by way of general patterns that lack proof, apart from a theoretical background (in this case, Bourdieu’s concepts of

field, habitus, and capital) that frames the direction of correlations and interpretation, quotations from the collected material, the entire body of material itself, and knowledge about the field's history and structures. Therefore, this article should be taken for what it is: primarily a summary of the interviews presented in *IJoC's* special feature that allows recognition of commonalities and specificities in each individual narrative as well as current trends in communication, and secondarily an interpretation that could help to explain why the field is as it is.

Geography of the Field

The academic discipline of communication is (still) a U.S.-centered enterprise with strong pillars at the Big Ten universities and on the West Coast. Only 10 of the 57 interviewees have home universities outside the United States. Even those 10 have strong ties to their U.S. colleagues, and most of them are heavily influenced by the North American research traditions. Akiba Cohen (Israel) was born in Detroit, Cindy Gallois (Australia) in Washington, DC, and Janet Bavelas (Canada) in Portland, Oregon. All three of them got their PhDs at U.S. universities. James Taylor (the second Canadian) worked as a lecturer at the Annenberg School in Philadelphia in the 1960s and got his PhD there, perhaps belatedly, in 1978. Jay Blumler (UK, but born in New York and still a U.S. citizen) graduated from Antioch College in Yellow Springs, Ohio, and later held positions at both Leeds and the University of Maryland. Youichi Ito (Japan) received a master's degree from Boston University and did a fellowship at Tufts University in the 1970s. Osmo Wiio (Finland) met Percy Tannenbaum while attending "the American seminar in Salzburg, Austria" in the late 1950s and thereafter developed strong contacts with U.S. universities. Some 20 years later, he even "had an invitation to Buffalo with a possibility to continue there." Wolfgang Donsbach (Germany) is a student of Elisabeth Noelle-Neumann (1916–2010) who both received a scholarship to the Missouri School of Journalism in 1937/38 and was a regular visiting professor at the University of Chicago between 1978 and 1991. The "self-made woman" Patti Valkenburg was unable to find any media psychology when she became an assistant professor of communication at the University of Amsterdam: "In the Netherlands there were no colleagues with whom I could talk about my interests." So ICA became her home, and Joanne Cantor from Wisconsin her "mentor right from the start." In the ICA leadership, the only alien to the system may be Sonia Livingstone (UK), who was trained in "this traditional psychology department in Oxford" and has been a professor at the London School of Economics and Political Science since 1990; though even Sonia mentioned two ICA fellows (Jay Blumler and Elihu Katz) as major influences. However, her feelings about the U.S. are still those of "an outsider looking in." She spent half a year at the University of Illinois and tried to internationalize the ICA as its president. In the interview, she complains about American scholars who "seem so grounded in America" and "don't see the questions about other cultures." "In America, my work would be so different. I don't think I could do there what I can do here" (in London).

Two other British psychologists had no trouble leaving the United Kingdom for communication departments in the U.S. Steve Duck met Gerald Miller (an ICA fellow and the 1979 ICA president) in the early 1980s at one of the first conferences he ever attended in America, discovered the area of interpersonal communication there, and reinterpreted some of his earlier work along interpersonal lines. "Then the job came up at Iowa," he remembers, which offered "lots of stimulation and lots of people to write papers or share ideas with." Howard Giles reported very similar experiences ("very gratifying";

"meeting a new community I didn't know existed"). Though the "cultural move" was bigger than Giles had assumed and some Californians still think he is not a citizen ("To this day, people ask, 'How long have you been here professor?'"), at least there was no language barrier.

The language barrier is only one reason for the quite different experience of three other U.S. immigrants in the sample. Young Kim (Korea), Klaus Krippendorff (Germany), and Dafna Lemish (Israel) did their early studies in their native countries, but unlike Duck and Giles, all three of them went on to doctoral programs at schools in the heartland of communication (Northwestern University, the University of Illinois at Urbana–Champaign, and The Ohio State University). This was by no means coincidental, for in all three cases, ties to American culture can be traced back into childhood. For example, Krippendorff's father "went to the U.S. as a work-study student" in the 1920s. "When I grew up, I always heard about Niagara Falls where my parents got engaged, the Grand Canyon and Yellowstone Park. So I was pretty much primed to be interested in the United States." Young Kim was inspired at a very young age by one of her brothers, who became a medical doctor in the United States and is now a professor at Johns Hopkins. Dafna Lemish "got acquainted with American life" at the age of five, when her father went "on a Jewish Agency mission in New York for two years." In Hebrew, moving to Israel is called "going up" and leaving the country is "going down"; however, in the field of communication it seems to be precisely the other way round. Lemish left Tel Aviv University for the United States in 2010 because "being here allows me to do things that I couldn't do in Israel because the industry and the global connections are here."



Figure 1. Communication's geography in the United States.

Home universities of living ICA Fellows (2010).

Smallest dot: 1 fellow; small: 2; middle: 3; large: 4; largest: 7.

One need not be a profound connoisseur of the matter to grasp communication's position in the larger scientific field with a glance at the map of ICA fellows' home bases. Moving to the United States is nearly the same as moving to the top of academia—but only nearly. "There are no communication programs at most Ivy League schools and other top-tier U.S. universities," said Charles Berger, echoing many of the interviewees. "There are programs at Penn, Cornell and Stanford, but there are none at Harvard, Yale, Princeton or Chicago." Seven of the active ICA fellows work at the University of Pennsylvania (Cappella, Hornik, Jamieson, Katz, Krippendorff, Turow, and Zelizer), and one (Reeves) is at Stanford University. Nathan Maccoby (1912–1992), a professor of communication at Stanford from 1959 to 1977, and George Gerbner (1919–2005), dean of the Annenberg School at Philadelphia from 1964 to 1989, could be added to this tier. With three interviewees (Ball-Rokeach, Gross, and Monge) and a fourth ICA fellow elected in 2011 (Fulk), the other Annenberg School at the University of Southern California in Los Angeles is the third exception to the rule that the heart of communication beats not at private schools but at the large public research universities.

"There is a lot of strength in the land-grant institutions, particularly in the Big Ten," said Barbara Wilson, who came from Santa Barbara to the University of Illinois in 2000. "As a department head, I spent a lot of time thinking about recruiting and about our competitors. There is strength in California, in Texas and in North Carolina, for example, but the geographical hotspot is probably in the Midwest." *IJoC's* special feature is proof of this. Almost a quarter of the interviewees are from one of the Big Ten: Illinois (Delia, Poole, and Wilson), Indiana University Bloomington (Lang and Weaver), the University of Iowa (Duck), Michigan State University (Atkin and Greenberg), Ohio State (Slater), Pennsylvania State University (Nussbaum), and the University of Wisconsin at Madison (Cantor and McLeod). This list becomes almost twice as long if it includes Samuel Becker (Iowa), Brenda Dervin (Ohio), the now deceased Brant Burluson, Charles Redding (both Purdue University), James Carey (Illinois), and Gerald Miller (Michigan State), as well as with James Dillard (Penn State) and Patrice Buzzanell (Purdue), who were both elected in 2011. Outside of the Big Ten, the two Annenbergs, and maybe, for historical reasons, Stanford, there are two more hotspots in the field of communication: Santa Barbara and Austin. The University of California at Santa Barbara now has five active ICA fellows (Giles, Putnam, Rice, and Seibold, who are portrayed in this special feature, as well as Cynthia Stohl, elected in 2011 and ICA president in 2012), and the University of Texas at Austin four (Daly, Hart, Knapp, and McCombs). Adding both James Bradac (1944–2004), who came to Santa Barbara in 1980 and was present at the creation of the graduate program, and Steven Chaffee (1935–2001), who was there for his last months after retiring from Stanford in 1999, UCSB is on equal terms with Penn now.

In contrast, the "golden era at Stanford" seems to be over. According to eyewitness Everett Rogers (1997, pp. 458–459), it was not so long ago ("from roughly 1955 to 1970") that Stanford University "dominated the field" and its PhDs in communication were in great demand. Little remains from that period. Today, Stanford has only "a tiny number of people" from the discipline, who "don't really get involved in the communication field" (Charles Atkin from Michigan State, the rival "seed institution for communication study"; Rogers, 2001). According to Byron Reeves, a Michigan State graduate at Stanford since 1986, "We just do human-computer interaction and mass media studies. We don't really have interpersonal, organizational or international here now."

Agents at the dominant pole of the communication field are well aware of the historical narrative that explains the field's geography and is, at least in this case, quite similar in both the journalism- and speech-derived traditions (Cohen, 1994; Pooley, 2008; Rogers, 1997): As seen through the eyes of ICA fellows, the development of the communication field is inseparably entwined with the history of U.S. universities. As the journalism professor David Weaver put it, the "land-grant schools were established to help develop the new territories of the US. In these universities, practical things are more respected." And the other root of the discipline does not really differ: "Speech started in the land-grant schools with the idea that farm kids deserve a chance to compete with the rich kids from Harvard or Yale," said John Daly, famous for his work on individuals' communication skills. "Standing up and effectively talking to a group of people could really make a difference in your life." The focus on practical activities attracted a certain type of student. "European immigrants, especially, wanted their kids to learn English well," said Joseph Turow. "Speech and rhetoric became part of what it meant to be an educated American." As an undergraduate at the Annenberg School in Philadelphia, Turow would have had no chance of finding even "a single course called rhetoric." "When the elite universities in the early 1900s repositioned themselves along the lines of science, instrumental tasking was left out. Places like Penn got rid of it."

All of the quotes above fit into Klaus Krippendorff's construction of communication's early days at that university.

Walter Annenberg was the owner of *The Philadelphia Inquirer* and wanted to pay for a school that would create professionals that could work in his newspaper. The University of Pennsylvania didn't want to have a narrow professional focus but liked the idea of a communication school.

Consequentially, after a trial under the deanship of Gilbert Seldes (1893–1970) ("a media philosopher without scientific interests," according to Krippendorff), the Annenberg School focused almost exclusively on research. James Taylor, who was a lecturer there in 1966, talked about "a big shift about two years before I went there": "When George Gerbner came in he said we do science." The strong position of the Annenberg Schools at Penn and USC within the communication field is not just a legacy of Gerbner or a function of the commercial context surrounding the schools. "One of our strengths was financial," said Klaus Krippendorff. "Walter Annenberg provided ample resources." Even in academia, the best go where the money is. "It's a very supportive and congenial environment," said Larry Gross, one of Gerbner's collaborators, who is familiar with both Annenberg East and Annenberg West. "I've liked both schools. Even academic administration is rewarding and enjoyable when you have resources. We would propose a project and the Annenberg Foundation would say yes and give us the money."

In the case of Stanford, reputation takes precedence over mere dollars. Everett Rogers (1997, p. 477) first listed the eight most prestigious U.S. schools (they "tend to be private, old, and resistant to radical educational innovations") and then celebrated, logically from his point of view, "Schramm's move to Stanford University in 1955 and the founding of the doctoral program there" as "the key event in gaining acceptance of communication study in American universities." However, more than half a century later, Byron Reeves, Schramm's successor's successor, still has to fight for the reputation of the discipline:

Everybody is always asking what communication is and why they don't have communication departments at Harvard, Princeton, and Yale. That's where the peers for most of the other social sciences departments live. I note that we like the fact that Penn has a communication program.

Both the geography of the field and its roots in more practical skills such as journalism and speech have implications for communication's position in the larger scientific field that go far beyond salaries, resources for current research projects, or the "utterly outstanding students" (Sandra Ball-Rokeach) attracted by schools like USC, Penn, and Stanford. Robert Craig of the University of Colorado at Boulder observed that "in universities like this, many of the faculty after all were trained in the Ivy League where communication still wasn't recognized as a discipline. They brought those assumptions with them." Judee Burgoon of the University of Arizona at Tucson gave just one more example of the authentication and legitimation problems the discipline faces to this day:

As a discipline, we continue to struggle not to be seen as only a service department handling a lot of undergraduates and not necessarily as belonging at the table with all the other major players on campus. We have no presence at the Ivy League schools. That's where many people get their models of who 'belongs' in academia.

Habitus as *opus operatum* and Capital of ICA Fellows I: Family Backgrounds

Family background and academic socialization explain why ICA fellows are (and have been) highly motivated to climb the social ladder and therefore possess the very strong work ethic and skills necessary to succeed in the larger academic context. Because the agents at the dominant pole of any given social field define the rules that ultimately determine success or failure, and because they tend, accordingly, to choose their respective successors, the next generations of faculty members in communication are likely to have quite similar personality traits.

But the following portrait starts with the milieu of origin. If there is such a thing as a "typical" ICA fellow, he (more likely than she) was born into a family of nonacademics, probably first- or second-generation children of immigrants for whom religion was an important fact of life. The father and sometimes the mother may have had some experience in higher education, but even without a university degree the family environment placed high value on social mobility and education as the respective tool to accomplish it. The parents of Lawrence Grossberg, for example—a policeman who attended a university for a year but did not continue, and a housewife, both born in Europe—demanded that two of their boys read a book each week and write a report on it for them. Howard Giles' mother "wanted to be a nurse but the family couldn't afford for her to have the education. My uncle got educated. She was always bitter about it." As a consequence, she became "very ambitious" for both her son and her husband, even requiring little Howard to take up piano (though as Giles admitted, "I did not have great aural facilities" and "got a D in music").

The will to succeed is not simply embedded in the genes of ICA fellows. Almost all of them grew up in a quite religious environment that emphasized a certain work ethic. Religion here means more than

just going to church. The interviews are replete with reports of religious schools, high schools, and colleges. Whether Jews or Catholics, Presbyterians or Methodists, the fellows revealed that a shared value persisting to this day "was certainly hard work" (Bradley Greenberg). Greenberg also mentioned obedience to his parents and his "conduct in public." Gail Fairhurst likes to joke about her "compulsive personality." "That's because I have way too many nuns in my background. They are very good with discipline." Even the exceptions within the sample are not really exceptions to the rule. Ronald Rice said,

In our family, it was a sort of a joke that we didn't need to be like Protestantism or Jewish because my mom was so highly successful in inducing a sense of responsibility. She was a stronger force than any religion could be.

Apart from the desire for upward mobility and certain work habits, a third part of habitus that is traceable to the family environment of many ICA fellows is, to a certain degree, also connected with the religious education many of them received: public responsibility. Akiba Cohen's father was a social worker, as were both of Michael Slater's parents and the mother of Joanne Cantor. The parents of Larry Gross, Sonia Livingstone, Jay Blumler, Janet Bavelas, and Cindy Gallois were quite left-wing, and Rod Hart described his as "Democrats to the core." Dafna Lemish's father was "an active Labour Party member" who held major administrative positions in Israel. Wolfgang Donsbach's grandfather was the president of a pensioners' association ("as a schoolboy, I helped him to do the clerical work"), Judee Burgoon's father was elected to the state legislature in Iowa, and Jack McLeod had an influential uncle who was originally a communist. Later, this aspect of the fellows' heritage would prove a good fit with the "empowering background" that John Daly associated with communication's beginnings at U.S. universities.

Although a qualitative study like the one presented here cannot establish statistical proof of a link between origin and position in the social space, it is more than plausible that female ICA fellows on average started out with more education in the family background than their male colleagues. In other words, a woman needs more economic, cultural, and social capital than a man to get to the top in the field of communication. At least that was the case from the 1960s to the 1990s, the period when the current cohort of ICA fellows passed through the various stations of an academic career. To put it pointedly, being a woman was (and maybe still is) linked to a lack of symbolic capital (reputation). To compensate for that setback, the female professors in the sample had to bring in more of the other forms of capital. According to Bourdieu, the starting position in the social space (i.e., the capital that all people inherit from their parents) shapes the trajectory of life. Every starting position is connected to a certain range of positions that are achievable in the end. For example, the children of a modern Rockefeller are unlikely to become construction workers or end up in the gutter. Similarly, it would be astonishing to find a philosopher's son in a Ferrari on a motor racing circuit and the daughters of prisoners or homeless in the Oval Office.

Of course, the sample contains some male professors who had a head start. Charles Atkin's father Kenward taught advertising at Michigan State. John Daly, a son of two university graduates, had the chance to work on Capitol Hill at a very young age because the family's neighbor in Washington was a congressman. The respective fathers of Steve Duck and Youichi Ito were a journalist and the president of a city hospital, and those of Joseph Turow and Klaus Krippendorff were a famous chemist forced to leave the Soviet Union and an engineer who worked abroad for several years. Larry Gross comes from an elite

leftist family. Given that background, it is unsurprising that brothers of Atkin, Gross, and Krippendorff became professors, too. David Gross was even awarded the 2004 Nobel Prize in physics.

But the men just mentioned are all exceptions in the large group of male ICA fellows with rather humble beginnings. On the other hand, only 5 of the 17 interviewed women (Fairhurst, Jamieson, Putnam, Valkenburg, and Wartella) had no university graduates in their family environment. Most of the female ICA fellows enjoyed very promising beginnings, whether their fathers were politicians (Burgoon and Lemish), scientists and professors (Ball-Rokeach, Graber, Lang, and Livingstone), bankers (Kim and Wilson), journalists (Gallois and Bavelas), a Cornell graduate with golf connections to "all the Jewish Congressmen and Cabinet officials" (Cantor), or even a rabbi (Zelizer). While several of their male colleagues reported falling almost by chance into academia, the material holds much evidence that almost all of the women grew up in supportive, demanding environments. They were surrounded not only by abundant education and other forms of cultural capital (for example, Doris Graber's mother "was a very accomplished painter," and Annie Lang's was "a commercial artist, a water-color painter") but also a constant push against the limits for women that this collective biography will discuss later on. "I'm the oldest of three girls. I was raised to believe that girls could do anything," said Barbara Wilson. In the then very traditional Korean society, Young Kim's father was "very progressive," too. "He always emphasized I should dream big." And this attitude applied not only to the girls from the upper-middle class: "In the family, I felt absolutely adored," said Ellen Wartella, daughter of a grocery store and apartment building owner. "I grew up thinking that I could be anything that I wanted to be."

Habitus as *opus operatum* and Capital of ICA Fellows II: Education

Kim and Wartella are also good examples of the (not particularly surprising) thesis that the later professors did well in school. "I was identified young as being bright," said Ellen Wartella. "In public school I was in special classes." And Young Kim noted, "I got awards and so on. When you get rewarded like this then you shape your ideas of the future in a different way." Still less surprising, most of the ICA fellows discovered certain talents and interests in writing and (public) speaking very early on. Frank Dance did children's magic shows when he was in high school ("I was a performer"), Gail Fairhurst "always leaned towards a career with a lot of writing involved" (as did Dafna Lemish and Sonia Livingstone, among others), and Rod Hart assumed he would become a lawyer: "I was good in speech and debate." According to Bourdieu, all people (consciously or unconsciously) assess their skills and abilities to find a social field where their talents promise the most generous success in gaining capital. Along with magic shows, many other communication activities drew the involvement of the ICA fellows in early youth. When he was four or five years old, Alan Rubin was a member of the Peanut Gallery on the *Howdy Doody Show*. Charles Berger became an amateur radio operator at age 11, as a teen Judee Burgoon wrote campaign speeches for her politicking father, Joseph Turow read books about advertising as a little boy and began subscribing to the magazine *Advertising Age* when he was 17, and Max McCombs was on the school newspaper staff.

Besides being interested in some kind of communication skills, many of the young ICA fellows cultivated a second talent: ability in mathematics and the natural sciences. Not only was Joseph Cappella a physics major (common in the community) before he became a communication professor, but Charles Berger started off in electrical engineering and Klaus Krippendorff even worked first as an engineer ("I was

good in math and could calculate anything.”). In his early teens, Michael Slater wanted to be a theoretical physicist. Ronald Rice “took all the advanced math courses” in high school and first applied to college as a math major. Scott Poole went to Michigan State for a degree in biochemistry: “That was the topic I emphasized all the way through high school. I went to an international science fair twice as a finalist.” While the just-mentioned ICA fellows are well-known for their quantitative approaches to the social sciences, perhaps combining talents in communication and science, even philosophers and theoreticians within the discipline reported early proximity to scientific thinking. Stan Deetz started out in chemistry and ended up with his first degree in economics. “It was a place where I could use my math and still get out of the lab.” Like Scott Poole, Lawrence Grossberg assumed he would become a biochemist. “When I was in high school, I won an NSF award and spent a summer doing research at Yale on messenger RNA,” he related. But at Rochester, Grossberg had the same experience James Taylor described in his own beginnings: “I was pretty good in both math and in literature. The math teacher wasn’t inspiring; the literature professor was flamboyant and fun.”

Even so, it must be stressed that communication is by no means a field dominated by intruders from other academic sub-areas. Only 12 out of 57 interviewed ICA fellows got their PhDs in disciplines other than communication (in all senses of the word—speech, mass communication, etc.). Even that figure is somewhat misleading because 4 of the 12 aliens (the two political scientists Graber and Blumler, the sociologist Katz, and the social psychologist McLeod) are now older than 80 and thus number among the six old-timers in the sample. When these four went to university, even with a strong interest in media and journalism, it was not really possible to find a well-rounded communication-related doctoral program. Among the other immigrants, the sociologist Ball-Rokeach is a special case. Bavelas, Duck, Gallois, Giles, Gross, and Livingstone are all native psychologists. Bavelas got her master’s in mass communication at Stanford and then switched back to psychology. Patti Valkenburg worked in an education department at Leiden and was trained in research design, which helped her become a media psychologist later on. Obviously, the field of communication is closer to psychology than to sociology or any other academic discipline. Sandra Ball-Rokeach became an ICA fellow in her late 60s (more than 20 years after attending the highly recognized Annenberg School at USC) and is very aware of that time lag: “The initial group was a little more insular than it is now. It was less receptive to people who came from other fields.”

The glut of native communication experts in the sample is a function of both the professional interests the future professors developed before they entered academia and the characteristics of the field. To start with the latter: Where should first-generation college graduates born to immigrants go, other than to a discipline that was originally founded for people like them? Here it becomes clear that the backgrounds of the future ICA fellows had a palpable homology with the field. Even the brand-new research enterprise of communication, raised upon the old foundations of speech, rhetoric, and journalism, had rather low hurdles to access. For example, the English major Ronald Rice was first accepted into Columbia University’s graduate school in literature. “There you need very good language skills and things like Middle-French. I didn’t have those.” So he decided not to go, applied at business and communication schools, and finally got a full research fellowship at Stanford. Joanne Cantor has a similar story: She read about Marshall McLuhan and communication while working in Paris at 20th Century Fox France. “They had no undergraduate prerequisites for applying because the field was so new. That’s how I ended up at Annenberg.”

Two major traditions of the field are also reflected in the ICA fellows' initial communication activities, which mostly guided their choice of subdiscipline as well. The sample holds 21 former journalists and 13 debaters. To these may be added eight persons with professional interests in other communication- and media-related areas, such as the movie company secretary Joanne Cantor or the would-be advertiser Joseph Turow. The main exceptions to this rule are the people who entered communication coming from psychology. Although some of the field's historians do not see similarities in the two strands of interpersonal and mass communication (Pooley, 2008, p. 45; Rogers, 1997, p. 494), almost the exact opposite seems to hold in the case of the fellows' first job motivations and their scientific training. At least in the 1950s and 1960s, young journalists and young debaters alike went out into the world to make a difference. "Debating is all about influencing each other," said Mike Roloff. So it "was an easy transition" for him to start out in research on social influence and attitude change. Like many other debaters, Roloff also considered being a teacher or an attorney. Setting aside the required argumentation skills, these professional ambitions are easily explained: First-generation college kids have little personal experience with a wide range of academic careers.

The focus on making a difference was even further strengthened by the values instilled by a religious education and the idea of contributing socially, learned early in life. It is thus unsurprising that some of today's ICA fellows (e.g., Delia, Donsbach, Gross, Putnam, Wartella, and Wiio) started out as political activists. Male (and to some extent even female) Americans born in the late 1930s and 1940s, who made up the vast majority of interviewees, faced another major influence in late adolescence. "Vietnam was all throughout those first years of my career," said Jim Anderson, born in 1939, who talked about both the draft and "all the troubles" and "riots" at universities. When Robert Hornik, seven years younger, was in college and graduate school, "there was a lot of activism going on." Hornik was involved in some demonstrations against the war. Working at a college radio station, he "became conscious of the fact that the news we are getting was taking on a particular point of view." He consequently applied to Stanford's PhD program with the image of "being a professional using media for development." The anti-Vietnam protests and other happenings in the 1960s also affected career decisions, especially those of scholars torn between humanistic and social scientific approaches. During the protests, "science seemed less relevant than human beings," said Scott Poole.

Whether implemented in former journalism schools or speech departments, the graduate programs in communication emphasized quantitative empirical work. Rogers (1997, pp. 460–480) describes the not just epistemological conflict between the nonscientific "Green Eyeshades" ("oriented to the profession of journalism rather than to the new science of communication") and the "Chi-Squares," who survived in the end because their scholarly approach fit with the norms of research universities—after all, the media industry was not alone in becoming engaged in polling and market research (Löblich, 2007; Rogers, 1997, p. 463). The students experienced a kind of epiphany that matched their habitus. As a journalism major at Wisconsin, Jack McLeod took a course in methods from Malcolm MacLean (1920–1974), who "was convinced that there were essentially new methodological and statistical techniques whose answers would influence journalists and others." Wolfgang Donsbach, who also started out as a journalist, remembers "the Hollerith machine in the basement" of the Mainz institute in Germany. "We worked with punch cards. It was amazing to prove every hypothesis immediately." Once he "started to think in falsifications, proofs and inferences," Donsbach "was lost for journalism." In the speech branch of

the field it was quite similar. Judee Burgoon's MacLean was Brad Lashbrook. "When I first had to learn methods as a master's student, Brad said to all of us, 'I'm going to bring you screaming and kicking into this world.' And he did."

To be sure, not all of the graduate students had to be beaten. For example, the psychologist Charles Berger knew he wanted to become a scientist before 1964, when he arrived at Michigan State's doctoral program to work with David Berlo, Hideya Kumata, and Erwin Bettinghaus, who all had been trained at Illinois, and Gerald Miller, a PhD from Iowa. "There was a big social science push," said Berger. "Those people were infused with a quantitative, social science vision of the field. In their view, the humanities approach in rhetoric and traditional speech was doomed." Berlo (1929–1996) was "one of the first individuals to receive a PhD degree in the new field of communication," founded the department at Michigan State, and continued as chair—starting before his 30th birthday—for its first 14 years (1957–1971). According to Rogers (2001), Berlo saw "that training large numbers of doctoral students was the route to implementing a social science conception of communication." To Gordon Whiting, whose prior training was in speech and rhetoric, Berlo would say, "We are making a scientist out of you." Rogers, who came "from an established department at Ohio State (in sociology)," found the "the close-knit nature of faculty relationships" at Michigan State somewhat novel and later traced it, as well as the quantitative orientation, back to "the high degree of uncertainty about the new field of communication study." As chair, Berlo perceived that his department was at risk and would "convince his faculty to pull together against a hostile environment." Rogers' memoir also contains a brief glance at Berlo's "bodily hexis" (Bourdieu, 1990, p. 70): a body weight of over 270 pounds, hidden in "well-tailored dark suits" and so pretending establishment (Rogers, 2001).

Undoubtedly, the Michigan State habitus began to rule the field quickly. Its strengths were its strong emphasis on quantitative research, including statistical methods and sophisticated data analysis; the "high degree of male bonding"; the notion that communication was an academic underdog; and the feeling that the resultant methodological orientation was superior to all other approaches. That habitus, promising "a defence against the possible suspicion by higher levels of academic review that communication was not rigorous enough" as well as personal security for newcomers to the university, survives to this very day. Eight of the interviewed ICA fellows (Berger, Cappella, Cohen, Craig, Monge, Reeves, Roloff, and Seibold) got their PhDs at Michigan State, a further four are strongly affiliated with that department (the three faculty members Atkin, Burgoon, and Greenberg, and Scott Poole, who did his master's there), and at least three other fellows (Duck, Hart, and Kim) mentioned Michigan State-trained scholars as important mentors. The remaining pillars of the field are but faint rivals in this ranking. Six of the interviewees (including the Michigan State stars Atkin, Greenberg, and Poole) got their PhDs at Wisconsin, four at Stanford, and three each at Illinois, Penn, Purdue, and Columbia (Graber, Gross, and Katz).

In many of the interviews, Michigan State is an important point of reference. For example, Jack McLeod disliked the "dynamics of the place." "Everyone up there" would be "ruled by terror" and driven by the desire to be better than Berlo's two "rivals": George Gerbner, who was first at Illinois (1956–1964) and then dean at Penn for a quarter century, and Percy Tannenbaum (1927–2009), a PhD in communication from Illinois (1953) who worked at Wisconsin, Penn, and Berkeley. When McLeod was

finishing his PhD, he "turned down a job offer at MSU." Stan Deetz "was committed to break the Michigan State hold" on the fellowship award, and Howard Giles literally had to bleed against the "Michigan mafia" for his presidency. The habitus developed by Berlo and his followers even ruled the conference routines for a while. "When I first went to ICA meetings I was shocked," said the sociologist Sandra Ball-Rokeach. "I had never seen people dressed in three-piece suits at a professional meeting. It looked more corporate than anything academic." But those who shudder at that memory can switch to focus on another part of the Michigan State habitus: dedication to the field of communication. Especially the former Michigan State students associated that passion with the name of Donald Cushman, whose work at the time as a debate coach got them interested in the field (Cappella et al., 1986).

To sum up this line of reasoning, not a few ICA fellows found themselves called to the field of communication. Products of family backgrounds that encouraged social advancement, education, hard work, and to some degree even political activities, many of them discovered the joy of doing research and teaching as graduate students. Phil Tompkins, whose "first dream was to be a writer" and next to be a lawyer ("help people"), recalled his first two years as a teacher and debate coach at the University of Kansas: "It was such a stimulating environment and experience that I said, 'I can find no better customers in the world.'" He and his ICA fellow colleagues embraced the calling of communication with intense passion because not only did the field fit their talents and skills, but it was also rather unsettled and therefore a real challenge. Part of the makeup of all the fellows trained in communication, per se, was the notion that they grew in a rather devalued discipline. The path to more recognition was mapped along the lines set by the natural sciences at the power pole of the academic field. The hard-core theoreticians and supporters of qualitative methods among the ICA fellows can be counted quickly: Lemish, Grossberg, Zelizer, Craig, and Deetz. Quantitative methods promise recognition in both academia and industry and therefore more symbolic capital than purely theoretical pieces or a study based on in-depth interviews only. Rod Hart, for example, "was really pleased" when he became an ICA fellow in 1993. "I started as a language major and even though I do computerized language analyses, I'm more of a humanist than a traditional behavioral scientist. I think I was the very first fellow who came in as a humanist." In his mid-60s now, Hart would like to know more statistics. "I didn't know that I would need it."

Habitus as Modus Operandi, or the Field Today and Tomorrow

The academic activities of today's ICA Fellows are only partially a blueprint for the generations entering the field right now. *IJoC's* special feature portrays people who started out in communication's early days. Many of them reported that their areas of interest did not yet exist when they became graduate students or assistant professors. The most important foundation for their success was carving out a personal research line matching habitus and cultural capital. Asked about pride and glory, many of the interviewees pointed in that direction. David Weaver hopes that his successors at Indiana keep his studies of U.S. journalists going, and Annie Lang, hardly a stone's throw away, said: "I did it my way."

Lang, with her psycho-physiological approach, said she had "always been on the outside" of the discipline: "At every stage it made it a horror to get published." She was not alone: similar stories were told by Jennings Bryant about the early days of media psychology, Steve Duck about relationship work, Lawrence Grossberg about both cultural studies and rock music, and Dafna Lemish about her topics as

well: "When I was developing my career, I had to struggle to make the point that children and gender are very important issues and should be considered seriously." Although those pioneering days are over, one lesson remains to be learned by the young. The careers of the agents just mentioned show how to establish an area of research and thereby the scholar(s) who work(s) in that area. Steve Duck's path is virtually a textbook case in this regard. He first launched a series of international conferences on personal relationships. Next he founded a journal and an international network, and finally he edited a handbook (Duck, 1988). "There was no master plan except to get the field recognized," he recalled. "That was the driving force."

Many ICA fellows share a second quality that aspirants to advancement at today's universities are advised to emulate: persistence. "If you want to make a contribution, you have to stick with a topic over a long period of time," said David Weaver. The exceptions to that rule are almost exclusively professors belonging to the first communication generation—people such as Elihu Katz, born in 1926; Bradley Greenberg, born in 1934 ("I tried to study areas that had not been well studied before and not studied at all"); Osmo Wiio ("I've been interested in all kinds of communication research"); and Mark Knapp, born in 1938 ("I always taught courses that I invented"). Some slightly younger interviewees had had such advisers but took a different turn. "When I was starting out, there hadn't been enough people in our field who had sustained study of an area so that they could become an expert in it," said Ellen Wartella, born in 1949, who started studying children and media in graduate school. "People would jump around. That's not the career I wanted. I wanted to know something deeply and well."

Wartella's statement reveals another (expected) insight into ICA fellows' habitus: they care about the field of communication and its symbolic capital with every fiber of their beings. Even without personal interviews, it is widely known (and therefore in the introduction mentioned above) that these scholars have served the discipline as presidents of its associations, editors of its journals, or public spokespersons, sometimes even "at some of those policy tables" in Washington and elsewhere (Wartella). But far less visible than research and institution building within the field are the "teaching records" (Daly) and major campus positions held by many leaders in communication. Those "jobs" are linked to the talents and abilities they brought to the game from the very beginning: communication and negotiation skills, as well as insights into a variety of neighboring areas in the larger academic field. "We teach better," said Mike Roloff, talking about the situation at Northwestern. Maybe even more crucial than satisfied students are leadership positions. "It's good for communication people to be in these roles," said Barbara Wilson, a vice provost at Illinois. "On this campus, we have had a legacy of really strong leaders from communication. Jesse Delia or David Swanson, for example, who moved into the provost's office. These strong individuals have helped the campus to understand communication." The same holds for schools beyond Urbana-Champaign. An incomplete list features Jim Anderson, who was President of the Academic Senate at the University of Utah; Cindy Gallois, President of the Academic Board at the University of Queensland; Annie Lang, Associate Dean for Research and Sciences at a college with more than 750 faculty members; and Ellen Wartella, Provost at the University of California at Riverside. According to Scott Poole, this record is explained by the habitus of communication scholars. "We can plan and manage things. There is nothing like a dean from communication who can understand what's going on in sociology." The interview material suggests that university positions are also seen as an indicator of a discipline's reputation. Larry Gross and Robert Hornik upheld the image of the two Annenberg Schools with references to the many past and

present offices and committees chaired by their faculty. No serious research is available on the situation in the other social sciences, but it seems rather unusual that the leading researchers in an academic discipline are the leading university managers as well.

The situation therefore seems quite paradoxical. On the one hand, the majority of the world's most prolific communication scholars, born as academic have-nots, are likely easily recognized as such by scions of families with long university traditions and should thus reinforce the discipline's position at the bottom of the scientific field. On the other hand, the very same habitus is linked to a strong work ethic as well as skills and abilities that benefit the reputation of the communication field. Most of the interviewees are aware of that paradox. They are proud of the work done in the field but at the same time concerned about its longevity. "When tough economic times like these arise, administrators would not give a thought to eliminating the philosophy department," Charles Berger put it. "So they go down that list of the must-have departments. Communication departments have to get themselves on that list." Critics such as the trained psychologist Berger have asked whether people in communication can "bring unique insights to the table when dealing with important issues" or are "simply engaging in derivative scholarship and drawing on theories developed in cognate areas." Steve Duck, a psychologist as well, pointed out that "people think communication studies must not be difficult. The larger the number of students that want to take it, the easier it must be." Moreover, at many institutions communication is still viewed as primarily a technical skills- or service-oriented field, not a social science. It is far from accidental that the above-mentioned pillars (universities with many ICA fellows) focus almost exclusively on research. "Our department is avowedly a social science department," said Ronald Rice from Santa Barbara. "There is no professional production or anything like that." Citation patterns are an indicator of the field's position at large. "It's true that more established subjects do not do a good job in searching valuable literature from communication," said Young Kim. In the opinion of Sonia Livingstone, "this is a real threat to our field": "A typical political scientist might study the impact of the Internet for political processes, without ever reading a communication journal."

All parallels to Sisyphus aside, there is hope for the field. Communication has grown vastly all over the world, and there is tremendous demand for undergraduate places. As a result, the discipline gets the best students and therefore probably the best future faculty on the market. Akiba Cohen said of the situation in Israel: "They all have to take the psychometric exam, which is weighted with their high school grades. Some years, we had 1,200 or 1,400 applicants for about 150 or so places. The cut-off gives us really bright students." On "the trend for strengthening and growing media and communications departments," Londoner Sonia Livingstone observed, "that expansion would give us visibility and then maybe political scientists and sociologists will cite us back."

A second market force working for communication is the increasing influence of economic principles in higher education. "For stature in academia right now, having funding is the coin of the realm," said Judee Burgoon, concurring with many of the interviewees. "If you are in a discipline that does not obtain outside funding, you are not really seen as a first-class citizen in academia." ICA fellows seem to be the best proof of communication's advancement in that regard. Jon Nussbaum even used the word "fantastic" to describe how "communication scholars are now being awarded funding from the National Science Foundation, the National Institutes of Health, and many other prestigious external granting

agencies." In Europe (and probably beyond), Patti Valkenburg is the undisputed grant queen. In 2010, she received the ERC Advanced Investigators Grant, sponsored with 2.5 million euros. "In ERC you are not competing with communication scientists but with psychologists and so on. These kinds of grants demand respect."

Admittedly, there is reason to doubt that communication, of all disciplines, will become the champion of grants. Being rather small and at the same time very broad, the field "doesn't have the same aura like established disciplines," Ronald Rice concedes: "the social science aspect that would be like these other traditional disciplines is only a quite small component." The American Political Science Association, founded in 1903, serves more than 15,000 members (www.apsa.org); the American Sociological Association, only two years younger, has more than 21,000 members (www.asanet.org); and the American Psychology Association (APA), a dinosaur born in 1892, has more than 150,000 members today (www.apa.org). The comparison falls short in that at least APA combines scientific and professional interests, but these Goliaths nonetheless dwarf the younger communication studies network. Yet this David has everything a subject needs to succeed in times like these: strong motivation to climb the ladder, strong work ethic, dedication to the research problems addressed, a fast-growing societal interest in communication issues, and finally a dominant pole governed by scientists oriented to the proper methodology. "What gets supported with external funds?" Bradley Greenberg asked, then answered: "Typically not the arts programs and typically not the humanities, but rather the quantitative social sciences and the physical sciences." Grant money is not just economic and symbolic capital, but a way of increasing research quality. Joseph Cappella pointed out that "a grant allows you to do something that you could not otherwise do," and Michael Slater noted that with a grant, "you can pursue research with a kind of sophistication that we often do not have. You also get to work with cutting-edge methodologists and statisticians" and can thereby "study theory better."

Access to external funding is changing the field right now and will shape its future structures, too. This is true on both the individual level and for whole sub-areas of research. A prime example of the ongoing changes is the rise of health communication, but there are other winners as well. "Organizational communication and new media are up there because both of them are valuable across the discipline," said Jim Anderson, with whom nearly all interviewees would agree. "Both have a clear avenue towards grants either from private foundations or from government organizations." Organizational communication in particular is no longer "the shame of speech communication" (Ellis, 1982) but "a stronghold in the field" (Linda Putnam)—and, along with technology, a potential candidate for a division breakoff from ICA. Naming the losing side is more difficult. "I would rather not be too specific because I value my friendships," Larry Grossberg hedged after saying that some questions "are disappearing and with them some areas." Jim Anderson pointed to rhetoric and cultural studies because "they don't really bring money from the outside." Scholars working in interpersonal, nonverbal, or everyday communication are also familiar with this problem. "Grants are rare" in those areas, said Steve Duck: "That's why social psychologists work on health or other fundable research." ICA fellows such as Burgoon, Daly, Dance, Knapp, and Tompkins have become more identified with the National Communication Association (NCA) in recent years, and Charles Berger called it "a disaster" that people no longer study "the romantic relationships of undergraduates or family communication," . . . "if the area is not fundable."

One obvious consequence of the orientation toward grants is the promotion of research on children and media and hence the success of strong women. Communication has ceased to be a male-dominated field. *IJoC's* special feature documents the increase in women's power: slightly more than half of the 17 interviewed female ICA fellows got the award between 2006 and 2010, and four of them (Lemish, Livingstone, Valkenburg, and Wilson) do research with kids. "It's thriving and really fundable," said Joanne Cantor, ICA fellow in 1999. This was not always as self-evident as it is today. At the beginning of the interview, Ellen Wartella said she "really thought it was a devalued area." She told "a little story" from a past not so far away: "When I was on my way to be a full professor, a very famous man came up to me at an ICA meeting and said, 'You know, Ellen, you seem really bright. Why do you do research on kids and media?'" Of course, women's success does not hinge in this topic alone. "Women's organizations within the ICA and feminist positioning in communication were way behind those in psychology and sociology," said Sandra Ball-Rokeach. "When I went to graduate school I had no role models. There were no women and those women that I tried to look at as role models didn't want to mentor a young woman when I actually met them." Today, however, there seems to be a kind of agreement: women at the top of the field support other women. "I nominate women for fellows and positions," Wartella declared. "I take that very seriously."

There is every reason for this behavior. It is not just that the university is still "a damn sexist place" (Annie Lang) or that a woman faces extra challenges in an academic career (Dorsten, 2012). Today's powerful women have survived tough times. "Things that would be crimes now were going on routinely then," said Joanne Cantor, born in 1945.

When I was an undergraduate, people felt women were taking up space that a man could put to better use because we were supposedly only there to find a husband. Then in graduate school, many people didn't believe that women would actually go on to be professors.

When she joined Wisconsin in 1974, Cantor was the only female faculty in the department. She had tenure by the time her son was born: "That made it easier." In the UK, it was the same. "In the early days, it was very hard to make any public mention of having children," said Sonia Livingstone, born in 1960, who kept going to interviews while pregnant in the late 1980s.

I felt I had to work very hard to say my brain has not turned into porridge, I'm still a serious academic. So it was a point of pride to me that you could not see on my CV when the children came.

Listening to Doris Graber, born in 1923, one gets a vision of the road already taken. "As a matter of fact for some of my earliest work, I just used my initials. I have run up against gender issues. I wanted my Bachelor degree under my maiden name but they wouldn't give it to me. They said you are a married woman. That's the way it has to be." Graber had five children and became a role model for the next generations of female academics. "I've done a lot of professional things because I wanted to show that women can do it, especially women with a large family."

Doris Graber also embodies the way the vast majority of ICA fellows perceive their role: to "leave the world a better place." The (social and sometimes even political) mission they embarked on while still very young transformed into dedication to teaching, mentoring, and research (in that order but inseparably combined). Many interviewees stated their main goal using the very same phrase: to make a difference. This explains, first, why critics such as Charles Berger or Jim Anderson are seen as "missing the impact of our work," and second, why Ellen Wartella at the policy table and TV celebrity Kathleen Jamieson were often named as role models. Media presence is part of an ICA fellow's habitus. "Communication researchers need to be good communicators," said Joanne Cantor. If they don't share their knowledge, "somebody else will advise the public based merely on intuition." Jennings Bryant, a cohort of Cantor in the doctoral program at Indiana, also spends "a lot of time doing newspaper or TV interviews": "I quickly learned that I had the ability to do sound bites and I knew from looking at people like George Gerbner that it was essential to do that." One more example is Wolfgang Donsbach's talk show on a local TV channel in Dresden: "It's part of my personality: that I am outgoing, is also a way to transfer our doing to the rest of society."

By far the most rewarding part of an academic career seems to be mentoring and working with graduate students—at least in the field of communication, ruled by scholars who want to make a difference and, logically, start with the people around them. Given the nature of the fellowship, which requires "distinguished scholarly contributions" (www.ica hdq.org), the calm and experienced tone the interviewees took in talking about the impact of their research output is quite surprising. "We would all like to have some lasting ideas," said Joseph Cappella. "I'm not naïve enough to believe that anything but a few ideas will have a long-term shelf life." The students and the student's students, however, will be there. "I have letters from people who I taught and have now retired," said Frank Dance, born in 1929. "They told me it was the most important course they took. That's a pretty good heritage." On the one hand, this focus on mentorship strengthens the choice of ICA fellows as the sample because their students, grand-students, and even great-grand-students (e.g., in the case of Joanne Cantor) are now faculty members in the field as well and will certainly gain influence in the future. On the other hand, it bears mention that the sample exhibits a certain range of role perceptions.

Some of the interviewees put more emphasis on teaching, some stressed research, and some most appreciate "exactly the combination" (Sonia Livingstone) of the different roles a university job offers. In a qualitative analysis, the appropriate tool for explaining such differences is a typology, but in the case of ICA fellows, that tool failed. Teachers, for example, are found in both major strands of the field. They are male and female, older and younger, rich and poor in birth capital. The primary orientation may be a function of personality traits, too. Some professors are cheered by the crowd, while some—even among the most prolific—are not.

There is one final question: Where do the leading scholars see the field in 2030? Or, what will the next special feature on communication's dominant pole look like? The answer is threefold. The first attitude is that of Charles Atkin: "Things won't be much different. I've been through two of those 20-year cycles already." However, and second, the discipline is going international. China, China, China was the refrain heard throughout the interviews, but there are many other construction sites outside the United

States as well. Finally, although “futures are to be made, not predicted” (Stan Deetz), the frame has already been set by the people that “helped the discipline mature” (Jennings Bryant).

References

- Bourdieu, P. (1975). The specificity of the scientific field and the social conditions of the progress of reason. *Social Science Information, 14*(6), 19–47.
- Bourdieu, P. (1988). *Homo Academicus*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.
- Bourdieu, P. (1990). *The logic of practice*. Cambridge, UK: Polity Press.
- Cappella, J. N., Cegala, D. J., Farrell, T. B., McPhee, R. D., Monge, P. R., Poole, M. S., Smith, T. J., & Woelfel, J. N. (1986). Donald Cushman: Larger than life. *Communication Quarterly, 34*, 379–388.
- Cohen, H. (1994). *The history of speech communication: The emergence of a discipline, 1914–1945*. Annandale, VA: SCA.
- Dorsten, A. (2012). “Thinking dirty”: Digging up three founding “matriarchs” of communication studies. *Communication Theory, 22*, 25–47.
- Duck, S. W. (1988). *Handbook of personal relationships: Theory, research and interventions*. London, UK: Wiley.
- Ellis, D. (1982). The shame of speech communication. *Spectra, 18*(3), 1–2.
- Jones, D. K. (2001). Researching groups of lives. *Qualitative Research, 1*, 325–346.
- Löblich, M. (2007). German “Publizistikwissenschaft” and its shift from a humanistic to an empirical social scientific discipline. *European Journal of Communication, 22*, 69–88.
- Pooley, J. (2008). The new history of mass communication research. In D. W. Park & J. Pooley (Eds.), *The history of media and communication research* (pp. 43–69). New York, NY: Peter Lang.
- Rogers, E. M. (1997). *A history of communication study*. New York, NY: Free Press.
- Rogers, E. M. (2001). The department of communication at Michigan State as a seed institution for communication study. *Communication Studies, 52*, 234–248.
- Stone, L. (1971). Prosopography. *Daedalus, 100*, 46–79.