COMMUNICATION & SOCIETY

Iván Lacasa-Mas
lacasa@uic.es
Assistant Professor. Faculty of Communication Sciences. Universitat Internacional de Catalunya. Spain.

Michael Meyen
meyen@ifkw.lmu.edu
Full Professor. Department of Communication Science and Media Research. Ludwig-Maximilians-Universität. Munich. Germany

Maria Löblich
loeblich@ifkw.lmu.edu
Assistant Professor. Department of Communication Science and Media Research. Ludwig-Maximilians-Universität. Munich. Germany

Interactions among life, scientific work and academic structures. The case of Gerhard Maletzke

Abstract

From the perspective of the sociology of science, this paper explains why the German communication scholar Gerhard Maletzke (1922-2010) could not fulfill his dream of becoming a professor, despite the success of his ideas in relation to the theories of many of the scholars of his time. We have evaluated the scientific work of Maletzke, biographical material, contemporary witness accounts and protocols of several interviews with Maletzke and some of his peers. The analysis of this material has confirmed the interdependence between the evolution of theories, discipline and the media and the importance of reviewing a scientific study in the context of the biography of its author and the structures of science, which should be applicable to many—local and global—figures in the history of communication science.

Keywords

Gerhard Maletzke, sociology of science, communication science, history of the discipline, communication theory, communication models.

1. Introduction

When the German Institutes for Communication composed a common list of literature in 1967, only two books were included by unanimous decision: Emil Dovifat's *Zeitungslehre* and *Psychology of Mass Communication* by Gerhard Maletzke (Wilke, 1998). Although *Zeitungslehre* appeared for the first time in 1937, it was edited a sixth and last time after the death of Dovifat in 1969 (Wilke, 1976). This work disappeared from the canon of German science of communication many years ago. Conversely, *Psychology of Mass Communication* (*Psychologie der Massenkommunikation*) continues to be included in the basic curriculum of the majority of students in this field. The book, which was first published in 1963, was reprinted twice without modifications (1972 and 1978); its content was subsequently adapted by Roland Burkart and Walter Hömberg to the era of "electronically mediated social communication" (1998). Both authors published this version in 2004 in the book *Kommunikationstheorien*, which was reprinted four times, with the last printing in 2014. Textbooks rarely disregard Maletzke's model or

his definitions of mass communication and media effects (Beck, 2007: 123-126; Bentele & Nothhaft, 2005: 219; Bonfadelli, Jarren, & Siegert, 2010: 88-90; Burkart, 2002: 499-501; 2003: 184; Kunczik & Zipfel, 2005: 49-56; Pürer, 2003: 80; Schmidt & Zurstiege, 2007: 70; Stöber, 2008: 42-45).

Although the classic status of the model that constitutes the core of *Psychology of Mass Communication* has not been disputed, the author achieved minimal success in the academic world. The highest positions occupied by Maletzke included an honorary professorship (from 1983 onward at Hohenheim) and a visiting professorship (1991 to 1994 in Leipzig). When Gerhard Vowe attempted to portray five "canonized saints" of Communication Sciences in a "biographical kaleidoscope" at the Annual Congress of the German Communication Association (*Deutsche Gesellschaft für Publizistik- und Kommunikationswissenschaft* - DGPuK), held in 2011 in Dortmund (Germany), Emil Dovifat, Paul Lazarsfeld, Elisabeth Noelle-Neumann, Jürgen Habermas and Niklas Luhmann were included, but Gerhard Maletzke was overlooked (Vowe et al., 2012).

2. Problem statement, theoretical background, methodology and sources

Why did the discipline embrace the book but prevent the author from achieving his life goal? From a sociology of science perspective, this paper attempts to explain why Gerhard Maletzke (1997: 110) was unable to fulfill his dream despite the success of his ideas compared with the majority of academics who attained professorships. Our approach is based on the sociology of science and the sociology of authors such as Pierre Bordieu (1984, 1988), Karl Mannheim (1929/2010), Wolf Lepenies (1981), Stefanie Averbeck and Arnulf Kutsch (2002), Mary Löblich and Andreas Scheu (2011) or Peter Weingart (2003). We summarize our approach using two assumptions:

- First, similar to the "intellectual content", scientific work is influenced by the social location of thinkers. The book *Psychology of Mass Communication* and the criticism of the discipline by Maletzke can only be understood based on his biography: the personal background, social origin and socialization, life experiences, academic training, professional itinerary, and the paradigms he followed.

- Second: scientific evolution proceeds as a result of social factors. The "survival" of an author's thoughts is dependent on the possibility of its institutionalization and the structures of the particular academic discipline: its breadth, its reputation in the academic world and in society, its autonomy and logic, and its internal hierarchies and distribution of power, as well as the position of the author within that field. In science it is not (exclusively) through one's own merits that one becomes a classic, but rather through the need of colleagues and successors to establish symbolic figures in order to legitimize their own position and differentiate themselves from competitors.

Both assumptions—and the two groups of categories in which we have just deployed them—have prompted our selection of sources and the analysis of their contents. We analyzed Maletzke's scientific work: a publication in honor of his 75th anniversary (Fünfgeld & Mast, 1997); the short biographical notes from the academic journal *Publizistik* on his 60th, 70th, 75th and 80th anniversaries and on the occasion of his death; the memories of contemporary witnesses (Jörg Aufermann, Hans Bohrmann, Dieter Ross, Manfred Ruh and Winfried Schulz) and different studies of the history of the discipline. In addition, we examined five in-depth interviews performed by Dorothee Stommel at the end of 2005 under the direction of Michael Meyen, who is one of the authors of this study, in the context of an undergraduate thesis (Stommel, 2006). In one of these interviews, Gerhard Maletzke discussed his life during two sessions that endured several hours. Four additional people who had worked with him were also interviewed:

- Karl Friedrich Reimers (1935): at the end of 1950s, he attended Maletzke's seminars in Hamburg; in the mid-1970s, he invited Maletzke to teach seminars at the *Hochschule für Fernsehen und Film München* (College of Television and Film in Munich); and at the beginning of the 1990s, he invited him to be a teaching partner in Leipzig.
- Rüdiger Steinmetz (1952): Reimers' student, who was also appointed a professor in Leipzig on September 30, 1992, which overlapped with Maletzke,
- Wolfgang Hoffmann-Riem (1940): similar to Reimers, he studied in Hamburg at the end of the 1950s,
- Claudia Mast (1952): her professorship at the University of Hohenheim (Stuttgart) became the academic home of Gerhard Maletzke.

Despite the problems that (auto)biographical materials entail (gaps in memory, reconstruction of the past according to current interests, and self-legitimization) (Wilke, 2011), the detailed analysis of the content provided by these sources combined with the study of the secondary literature has enabled us to reconstruct the life trajectory of Gerhard Maletzke (section 2) and contextualize both his scientific work (section 3) and its reception in the scientific community (section 4)[1].

Three reasons prompted us to focus more on Gerhard Maletzke and the history of how his work was received than on the conceptual content that is developed in it. First, Maletzke's example is especially suitable for investigating the relationships between the evolution of theories and discipline and media and for reviewing a scientific work in the context of its author's biography and the structures of science. This approach should be applicable to many other figures in the history of communication sciences on a local and global level. Second, Maletzke's career prompts a reflection on the importance of institutional success in the progress of research, in Germany or any other country. Third, we have endeavored to employ sources that provide new material because we take for granted that anyone engaged in communication sciences is aware of Maletzke's work or the model that he proposed.

These three reasons justify the international interest of this study. In addition, although Gerhard Maletzke's personal and professional life were closely linked to German language spaces, the international reach of his main ideas made him a leading figure in the global history of the sciences of communication who deserves considerable attention. *Psychology of Mass Communication* was translated into various languages (Japanese, Spanish and Portuguese),[2] and the model that constituted the core of this book soon became a point of reference in the English-speaking world[3].

3. Biographical Outline

Gerhard Maletzke (1922-2010) was born on January 6 in Neustettin (then Germany, now Poland), and he was the second (and last) son of a primary school director. The two brothers grew up in Kolberg on the shores of the Baltic Sea. In the 2005 interview, Maletzke spoke of a "wonderful childhood" and a "white sand beach," but he also spoke of the many soldiers

---

[1] This point is especially valid for the content provided by the interviews. While we have intensively evaluated and employed these contents using the same categories of analysis that were employed for the remaining sources, we have only moderately cited them in the text due to limited space.

[2] In Spanish, the book was re-edited five times (the first time in 1965; the fifth and last, in 1992). While completing this study, we have consulted the second, fourth and fifth editions.

[3] Referencing all authors in the Spanish-speaking world who have cited Maletzke is not feasible. Some examples include Benito, 1973; Carrera, 2008; Guinsberg, 2005; Moragas, 2011; Pelayo & Cabrera, 2002; Rodrigo, 1995; Saperas, 1992; and Valbuena, 1997. The same notion applies to authors who have cited Maletzke in English, such as Fawkes, 2007; Fawkes & Gregory, 2000; McQuail & Windahl, 1993; Paton, 2011; Rush, 2013; Watson & Hill, 2012; Wilson, 1999; and Windahl, Signitzer & Olson, 2009.

who formed a part of this landscape for as long as he could remember. From his father Walter, who died in 1926, he retained some "blurry memories", an extensive collection of books, and contact with former coworkers who described his father as "ingenious and full of humor".

The two brothers were raised by their mother, who was a devout person of Evangelical faith who came from a Berlin craftsmen family and did not remarry. Maletzke retrospectively spoke of a "German-nationalist" education: "Where I was, up there in Prussia, people thought in a nationalist/non-nationalist manner. That included thinking of the German Reich as the best". He was initially as "excited" as "anyone else" with "Hitler and the new era". "Each one of us was unhappy with the Treaty of Versailles. Hitler exploited this situation in his speeches." The enthusiasm encouraged the Maletzke brothers to become members of the Hitler youth ("at the time, that was what you had to be") and war volunteers.

Gerhard Maletzke became a soldier assigned to the Western Front in December 1939, shortly before his 18th birthday, without having ever taken the university entrance exam. Sixty years later during the 2005 interview, his war recollections remained intact. "I saw much misery. Many dead. I was wounded on three occasions. I suffered a severe arm paralysis and burns on the thigh (...). In addition, I was buried alive, although only for half an hour. I had terrible panic attacks and even lost consciousness. Fortunately, my companions unearthed me. Objectively considered, none of it was that dramatic, but it has haunted me throughout life."

In the interview with Karl Friedrich Reimers, Reimers ventured that the empiricist Gerhard Maletzke was born in the trenches. "He wanted to find out why human beings behaved the way they did during the Second World War." He had had been such a "convincing" scientist because he had to assimilate "the fundamental experience of national socialism". The protocols of Maletzke's interview show that Reimers's idea is credible. In response to the first question, which generally addressed childhood memories, Maletzke took the opportunity to reflect on his "position regarding Jews". In high school, he had never "deeply looked" at the exhibitors of the anti-Jewish publication *Der Stürmer* nor gave much importance to the fact that "the Jewish boy" in his class "was suddenly not there anymore". In addition, he "didn't mull over the matter" ("simply, it was better this way"). After the war, Maletzke began to reflect "intensively on those times". Although many of his contemporaries hid from the memories of their experiences, he read "numerous biographies of Hitler" and concluded "that we were guilty ones in that war" and that "we must always remember that". He had been particularly struck by the "openness of the Americans", who "helped the Germans a very short time later" in spite of everything that happened: "Right from the start, for me, the United States was something impressive and fascinating".

Gerhard Maletzke did not immediately discover the two themes of his life. After five and a half years of war, marrying and fathering a son, he did not have the slightest idea of "what he should study". He was "the first enrolled student" to be accepted in Hamburg. He satisfied the "five points" that were required to obtain admission: he was a soldier and a refugee, had children, was seriously injured and "above all, free of charges from the national socialist period". Because he had no prior training of any type, it seemed to him that he could only attempt "general disciplines in humanities".

After four trimesters as a literary science student, Maletzke approached Hans Wenke (1903-1971), who had been appointed professor at the University of Hamburg in 1947. Wenke became his "substitute father" ("a very cultivated and frequently wise man, who took me by the hand intellectually and showed me the path to follow"). As Eduard Spranger's student and assistant, Wenke was primarily an educator and a philosopher. However, he also ventured into psychology in Hamburg ("at the time it was common for these disciplines come together in one person"). Reflecting on his interview, Gerhard Maletzke also attributed

his change in discipline to the book *Menschenkenntnis und Menschenbehandlung* (Müller-Freienfels, 1940), which he "studied in-depth". His first incursion in psychology was modest because Wenke had "a humanistic perspective" and was skeptic about the subsequent irreversible "trend toward an empirical social science", which occurred in this discipline (Meyen & Löblich, 2007: 159).

After meeting Hans Wenke, Maletzke's path to communication media was accessible. Wenke was regarded as a builder of bridges among the university, youth training activities, and radio broadcasting. The Hans-Bredow-Institut in Hamburg had commissioned him with conducting different organizational and operational designs in collaboration with Nordwestdeutscher Rundfunk (NWDR) public radio and television (Schneider, 2007, pp. 100-106). Based on Maletzke's responses during the 2005 interview, he remembered a working group on radio broadcasting and he soon became the "right hand [of Wenke] for all matters relating to the radio". The title of his undergraduate thesis (*Diplomarbeit*) was *Radio broadcasting in the acoustic world of modern man* (1949). This work was partially published in the *Rundfunk und Fernsehen* scientific journal, which appeared in 1948 as a precursor to the current *Medien und Kommunikationswissenschaft* (Maletzke, 1984: 9).

For his doctoral thesis, Maletzke extended his undergraduate thesis with an empirical study (Maletzke, 1950). Later, he proposed that media-related topics were "unusual in German higher education in those years". Many teachers would have considered that "to deal with the press, cinema, and radio" entailed sullying one's hands (Maletzke, 1984: 9). During the interview, Maletzke explained that Hans Wenke succeeded in imposing the thesis topic in the Department of Psychology with the help of a stratagem: he argued before his colleagues that the thesis did not primarily address the media but dealt "with certain very important mental functions that could be explained particularly well by example of the radio".

In the inventory of his life, which he presented in the interview, Gerhard Maletzke named a second academic mentor, in addition to Hans Wenke, who "deeply impacted" him: Curt Bondy (1894-1972), who was a pupil of the prestigious William Stern (1871-1939). Bondy, who had emigrated to the United States in 1939 after a brief internment in the Buchenwald concentration camp, was appointed professor of psychology in Hamburg during the second semester of 1950 (Kersting, 1994: 750-755). He brought "quantitative empirical research" to Germany. Maletzke became his assistant until 1952. He was introduced to the "positivist social science" and began to move away from "what [at that time] was seen as *Publizistikwissenschaft* in Germany[4]. Maletzke was his assistant until 1952, which marked the beginning of when the "positivist social sciences" when he began to move away from "what [at that time] in Germany was understood as journalism science". This move "had nothing to do with what I did. It was not in vain that I then became first and foremost a psychologist". Thus, Maletzke experienced the "turn toward empirical social sciences" prior to the broad shift that would transform the *Publizistikwissenschaft* into the communication sciences (*Kommunikationswissenschaft*) during the 1960s and 1970s (Löblich, 2010).

In 1952, Gerhard Maletzke was appointed scientific collaborator in the Hans-Bredow-Institut due to Hans Wenke's recommendation to Egmont Zechlin (1896-1992), who was director of the institution. In 2005, Maletzke explained that he had counted on acquiring this position when the Institute was founded but that he was "too young" and that the statutes stipulated that a professor be selected for the role. Despite this situation, the activities of the Hans-Bredow-Institut during the 1950s and early 1960s can be easily attributed to Maletzke.

---

[4] The term *Publizistikwissenschaft* had been used since 1945 and referred to a phenomenological and historical discipline that had its focus solely on mass media and on public communication (*Publizistik*). Changing the title to *Kommunikationswissenschaft* in the 1970s meant that the discipline's reach could now include any form of communication processes, and from a more psychological and sociological perspective.

During his interview, Wolfgang Hoffmann-Riem said that Zechlin had no interest in the media. Similar to Dieter Ross, who arrived at the institute one year after his departure in 1965 (Meyen & Löblich, 2007: 157), Maletzke stated that he had "great freedom" because Zechlin "had barely ventured" into the *Publizistikwissenschaft* and because, besides himself, no person existed "who would scientifically address the problems related to the media".

Among the "positive reactions" that encouraged Maletzke to take his licensing exam were the reactions experienced during a teaching assignment at the University of Hamburg. In the 2005 interview, Karl Friedrich Reimers summarized his impressions using the word "clarity". According to Reimers, "all the steps in the reasoning" of Maletzke were understandable and linked to a "view of life filled with humor". Wolfgang Hoffmann-Riem attended the seminar *Television Critique* in the first semester of 1959/60. In the seminar, students discussed television programs and received "very exhaustive" corrections (Maletzke, 1957). In 1961, Gerhard Maletzke visited the *University of Southern California*, Los Angeles for three months. As Maletzke explained in the interview, he foresaw the opportunity "to carry the foundations of the doctrine from the USA to Germany", which was something "that he took very seriously" and that became the focus of his postdoctoral thesis.

He regularly reported the status of his work—*Psychology of Mass Communication*—to Hans Wenke and to Peter R. Hofstätter (1913-1994). The latter, who came to Hamburg in 1959 as the successor of Curt Bondy, "always acted as if this were not problematic in the least" ("that was the most wretched part") and subsequently claimed that he was not interested in the topic, as Maletzke explained in the interview. "Just like this the whole thing was ruined, without even having been brought before a commission." In the 2005 interview, Karl Friedrich Reimers spoke of Hofstätter's "territorial behavior". According to Reimers, Hofstätter's plans only entailed attracting and training students who would seek their doctorates after working with him from the beginning; thus, he ultimately did not want to have anything do with Maletzke's postdoctoral thesis and regarded him negatively.

Despite this setback, Gerhard Maletzke continued to think that "at some point he would secure a university professorship". Via his contacts in Berlin, Hans Wenke attempted to "clear the way [for him] with a kind of express licensing process", presumably to succeed Fritz Eberhard (1896-1982) in Berlin. Eberhard belonged to the Sozialdemokratische Partei Deutschlands - Social Democratic Party of Germany (SPD) and had been director of the radio and television station *Süddeutscher Rundfunk* in Stuttgart from 1949 to 1958. He had taught classes as honorary professor at the Institute for Media and Communication Studies of the Freie Universität of Berlin since 1961 and had succeeded in providing Maletzke, who was someone he "often invited home", with a teaching assignment at the university since 1965. In 1968, Maletzke participated in the professor appointment procedure.

According to Hans Bohrmann, who was an eyewitness to the procedure, Maletzke taught a "very strong class on his model of communication" (Meyen & Löblich, 2007: 349). He had no opportunity to succeed Eberhard in this position because the psychology professors at this institution knew what happened in Hamburg and would not let someone that had previously been considered unfit to become a professor in Berlin teach (Meyen & Löblich, 2007: 349).[5] Maletzke even went to the Senate of Berlin to attempt to bring to fruition his desire of getting a professorship. The dominant party in this institution was the SPD. With his second wife, who was a psychologist he had met at NWDR public radio and television, Maletzke joined this party ("by sheer conviction") and became involved in Willy Brandt's electoral campaign in Berlin, working with Gunter Grass among others. The reactions after his departure from the party at the end of the 1970s demonstrated that he

---

[5] Psychology of mass communication had not been considered inadequate in Hamburg: due to Peter R. Hofstätter's position, it was never formally evaluated.

was more than a mere member: the morning after his departure, Peter Glotz (1939-2005), who was general secretary of the party, called him to find out what had happened.

After that failed attempt, Maletzke worked for the Friedrich-Ebert Foundation for four years (1972 to 1976) in the Asian Mass Communication and Information Centre in Singapore. He had already encountered international and intercultural communication issues at the *Deutsches Institut für Entwicklungspolitik* (German Development Institute), where he was a scientific collaborator (1964-1969), and at the *Wissenschaftszentrum Berlin für Sozialforschung*, which was a center for social research funded by the State (1969-1972) (Maletzke, 1966). The work in Singapore consisted of "investigating media in different Asian countries".

When Maletzke returned to Germany in 1976, he did not have a job ("partially due to imprudence") and had the feeling that his career "was slowly reaching its end". Hertha Sturm (1925-1998) helped him. In 1945, Sturm had selected Hans Wenke—as previously explained, Maletzke's first academic supporter—as final year examiner for her graduation in the psychology program in Erlangen (Mahler, Meyen, & Wendelin, 2008: 123). In 1972, she met Maletzke during a DGPuK conference in Constanza. They developed a close friendship and promised to "help each other" with their problems. Beginning in 1974, Sturm was a professor in Munich and director of IZI—an international center that explored TV, youth, and education for the *Bayerischer Rundfunk* radio and television broadcaster. In his interview, Maletzke stated that he "phoned Hertha" and that "the next day" he was able to begin working with her at IZI.

Maletzke was also invited by Karl Friedrich Reimers, who was a professor at the *Hochschule für Fernsehen und Film München* (College of Television and Film in Munich) since 1975 and a contributor to the *Institut für Kommunikationswissenschaft (Zeitungswissenschaft)* of the Ludwig-Maximilians-Universität (currently the *IFKW, Institut für Kommunikations-wissenschaft und Medienforschung,* Department of Communication Studies and Media Research), to teach at these two centers. In the 2005 interview, Reimers narrates that he had previously allied with Sturm, Otto B. Roegele and Hans Bausch (1921-1991) when Maletzke "was faced with nothing". Together, they worked to secure a position for him in the research department of the *Süddeutscher Rundfunk* radio and television station in 1978. Bausch, who had obtained his doctorate while performing historical research on radio broadcasting (1956) and was a member of the Christian Democratic Union (CDU) of Germany, became director of the station in 1958. He tried to retain this position and maintain contact with communication sciences. The creator of the *Süddeutscher Rundfunk* research center had been Hansjörg Bessler. Since 1965, Bessler had worked with Franz Ronneberger (1913-1999) and written a dissertation entitled *The construction of theories in mass communication research* (Bessler, 1968). The title belies a closeness with Maletzke. In the previous year, Bessler and Frank Bledjian had published a *Systematics of mass communication research.* At the beginning of this paper, the author indicated that the study was primarily based on the book *Psychology of Mass Communication* (Bessler & Bledjian, 1967: 12).

In 1980, Maletzke failed in his attempt to secure a professorship in Göttingen. Although he ranked first in the official list of candidates, Hansjürgen Koschwitz was eventually appointed (Meyen & Löblich, 2007: 294). In Maletzke's point of view, this decision was rooted in political reasons because both of his colleagues from the university and Hans Bausch had asked him to apply for the position via the selection process. Because he "had a bad reputation of being an old social democrat" and the president of the federal state, Ernst Albrecht ("from the CDU, one who was quite right wing") would have indicated to his Minister of Culture "to name a candidate called Hansjürgen Koschwitz, instead of me". This version is also supported by Hans Bausch, who according to Maletzke, "unofficially phoned" his "former colleague" Albrecht in Hannover to mediate in favor of Maletzke. Only the records may provide definitive evidence on this matter.

In 1983, Maletzke was appointed honorary professor of journalism studies at the University of Hohenheim. Since 1976, his director was Manfred Rühl (born: 1933). 1933. Similar to Hansjörg Bessler—who was previously mentioned for having favored Maletzke's employment in the media research department at *Süddeutscher Rundfunk*—Rühl came from the Nürnberg school of Franz Ronneberger. From 1969-70, he had completed postdoctoral research at the Annenberg School in Philadelphia based on Maletzke's recommendation ("I introduced him to George Gerbner around then") (Meyen & Löblich, 2007: 91).

When Karl Friedrich Reimers became founding dean of the *Institut für Kommunikations- und Medienwissenschaft* (Institute of Communication and Media Studies) in Leipzig in 1991, he immediately referred to Maletzke as his "father in media research" and gave him the same volume of teaching as the remaining lecturers to bring the new faculty up to speed (Reimers, 1997). Paradoxically, Maletzke was also a member of all Professor appointment committees at the institute. While Reimers admitted that he sought his advice during each of these procedures ("I don't think I would have given my vote to someone that Maletzke did not approve of"), Rüdiger Steinmetz also expressed in his interview that the founding dean benefited from Maletzke's "outstanding reputation", which functioned as a "protective shield against any attack from the outside" ("it is well known that there were attempts from Mainz to interfere politically in the evolution" of the institute).

While taking stock of his professional life during the 2005 interview, Maletzke stressed that he has exceptional memories of the years in Stuttgart and Leipzig. As a radio researcher, he had the opportunity of "taking advantage of a few personal resources that until then I didn't know I possessed". When he saw the *Institut für Kommunikations- und Medienwissenschaft* (Institute of Communication and Media Studies) in Leipzig, which is currently known as IfKMW, he "felt some pride for having laid its foundations". His worst memory was the failed selection process in Göttingen.

4. Scientific Work

His undergraduate thesis (*Diplomarbeit*) and doctoral thesis demonstrate the *spagat* between the method of working in the human sciences and the positivist sciences in terms of the scientific orientation of Gerhard Maletzke. In the summer of 1949, he interviewed almost 500 inhabitants of Friedrichstadt (Schleswig-Holstein) for his doctoral thesis on radio. He concluded that people had adopted this new device in their lives in a completely different manner than the process imagined by its inventors. People's external behaviors had not changed and only a few people used to listen to radio programs without multi-tasking (Maletzke, 1950: 73, 76).

To conduct this study, Maletzke moved to Friedrichstadt to ensure that his arguments would be based on the study of a reality that was both quantitatively and qualitatively assessed. This situation was the case for Lazarsfeld's group in the Marienthal study in the early 1930s or that which occurred with Hans Amandus Münster's (1901-1963) students in the *Institut für Zeitungswissenschaft* in Leipzig (Maletzke, 1950: 41; Jahoda, Lazarsfeld, & Zeisel, 1933; Schmidt, 1939). Maletzke's methodology also followed the footsteps of social demography, with the exception that he could take a representative sample ("municipal listings"). Maletzke combined data collection using a questionnaire and "free conversations" and detailed the limitations of "mass surveys". He believed that this latter method would enable the capture of the "rough state of things", such as "facts" or "standard behaviors", but the capture of motives or that "which is favored by mental reference" was not feasible (Maletzke, 1950: 42-50).

This early work explains Maletzke's ambivalent posture regarding quantitative procedures. For this reason, he faced resistance in the field of psychology, which was increasingly guided by the ideal of the positive sciences. This fact should have softened

Peter R. Hofstätter's criticisms. Hofstätter was criticized for not considering Maletzke's work during the latter's stay in the United States, for being selfish by pronouncing an "incorrect judgment" on *Psychology of Mass Communication* and for frustrating Maletzke's licensing exam (Pöttker, 2002: 221).

Maletzke's doctoral thesis also shows that this author remained faithful to his argument in his empirical studies and his writings on the politics of the discipline. In an investigation on "television in the lives of young people", which was conducted at the end of the 1950s at the Hans-Bredow-Institut, Maletzke produced both qualitative and quantitative data (in-depth interviews, focus groups, and representative surveys). In this manner, he opposed any "method-based fighting" and centered his "attention on the qualitative procedure" as the only possible way to investigate "the background and mental motivations of certain reactions and behaviors" (Maletzke, 1959: 84-87).

Two decades later, Maletzke again expressed his strong favorable opinion of qualitative procedures in *Kommunikationsforschung als empirische Sozialwissenschaft* (*The investigation of communication as an empirical social science*), which was conceived as a contribution to "self-reflection" in the discipline. In addition, he censored the "radical and unbridgeable dichotomy" that some colleagues wanted to build (Maletzke, 1980: 35-38). Regarding research on media, he attempted to "connect both approaches"—the quantitative approach and the qualitative approach—at the *Süddeutscher Rundfunk* radio and television station (his objective was to "not to rely exclusively on pure quantities"). In 2005, he spoke with enthusiasm about radio producers who, due to the qualitative tool of focus groups, "could finally listen directly to their listeners". In the early 1950s, he had used the "program analyzer" quantitative tool that Lazarsfeld and Stanton had developed in the USA in the late 1930s (Bessler, 1980: 58).

During this time, the basis of his "model of communication" was developed and published in the domestic edition of the Hans-Bredow-Institut *Rundfunk und Fernsehen,* which was primarily based on American literature (Maletzke, 1954, 1955). Prior to his tenure as a researcher in Los Angeles, he endeavored to develop a "Social Psychology of Mass Communication" and a "comprehensive, systematic and empirical form of research with accepted methods" (Maletzke, 1954: 316). In retrospect, the author classified one of these articles as a "very tentative attempt" to develop "the terminology necessary" and "provide a degree of order" to the chaos. He simultaneously spoke about "some ideas" that were "emotionally new" at that time and proposed to revisit the text (Maletzke, 1984: 26).

This return to his own ideas was present in many of Maletzke's work after 1963. Even after the failure of his plans to become a professor and the incorporation into the field of development politics, he continued to promote his perspective on the process of mass communication using some of the same formulations (Maletzke, 1964, 1967, 1976, 1980, 1981, 1998). Efforts to improve his own position within the discipline were reflected in an anthology from 1984, in which Maletzke reissued thirteen of his articles (Maletzke, 1984). This work shows that his career change allowed him to enter a new field: intercultural communication (Maletzke, 1996). With the article *Interkulturelle Kommunikation und Publizistikwissenschaft* (*Intercultural communication and Publizistikwissenschaft*) from 1966, Maletzke appeared for the first time in the official organ of the discipline *Publizistik*—in the special issue in honor of Fritz Eberhard—after 15 years of activity in the field of media research.

We do not need to describe Maletzke's "classic" work (1963) in this paper because it is well known and we have presented its background. He developed the four "fundamental factors of mass communication" (*Grundfaktoren der Massenkommunikation*) based "on a frequently mentioned Lasswell formula" (Maletzke, 1963: 34). He employed reasons of systematic design to justify his "communication model" with one less factor than the United States model (Who says *what in* which *channel, to whom*, with what *effect*?). Even when

Maletzke considered that the matter of effect was "the central question in mass communication", this thinking did not indicate that it should be separated from the "receiver factor" (*Faktor Rezipient*) at the systematic level by "equating it to the remaining fundamental factors" (1963: 11, 34). Maletzke defended his terminology with pragmatic arguments and claimed that the concepts "communicator" (*Kommunikator*) and "medium" (*Medium*) were the "most common in English language" (Maletzke 1963: 35-37). "*Massenkommunikation*" was a "direct translation of the Anglo-American term *mass communication*", which had been "widely implemented" in German-speaking countries (Maletzke, 1963: 14). Maletzke had already begun with Lasswell and the American literature in the 1950s; however, at that time, he still spoke of "producer" (*Produzent*), "content" (*Inhalt*), "consumer" (*Konsument*) and, alternately, "mass communication media" (*Massenkommunikations-Medien*) or "means of transmitting the message" (*Aussagemitteln*) (Maletzke, 1954, 1955). In these articles, he was not certain that he could refer to "the totality of the receivers" (*die Gesamtheit der Empfänger*) as "mass" (*Masse*) (Maletzke, 1954: 306; 1955: 125). In 1963, he applied the concept "dispersed public" (*disperses Publikum*) relying on an example in American literature (Maletzke, 1963: 28; Lang & Lang, 1961: 423).

In the 1950s, Maletzke had already tried to express the "complex nature" of his object of study with the concept of "field" (*Feld*) (Maletzke, 1955, 1963: 11). To avoid explaining interactions in the field of mass communication "using the cause-effect model", he adopted the "category of interdependence" from cybernetics. Because factors are mutually "directed, controlled, corrected and regulated", individual items can only be examined if researchers do not lose sight of the functional interconnection with the remaining factors (Maletzke, 1963: 19). The "comprehensive" orientation that was repeatedly considered by Maletzke in his writing about the politics of the discipline is first established here.

5. Reception in the scientific community

Gunter Kieslich (1924-1971) reviewed *Psychology of Mass Communication* in the *Publizistik* journal. Kieslich had been Walter Hagemann's (1901-1964) assistant in Münster. He went with Emil Dovifat to Berlin, where he failed in his attempt to complete a postdoctoral thesis and receive a professorship (Groos, 2001: 265). When this review was written, he worked as press officer in the conference of Education ministers of the federated states and as a *Publizistik*'s co-editor (with Dovifat and Wilmont Haacke). Kieslich's opinion of Maletzke's book was positive. He praised the "impressive methodical and systematic clarity", the "beneficial specification of the theory via practical models and the findings of specific research", and "the accurate examination of foreign literature". He also hoped that the book "would boost" research on communication (Kieslich, 1964: 184). Kieslich, who was appointed professor at the new Universität Salzburg years later, included Maletzke's communication model in his syllabi.

Kieslich was not the only person who served an important role in the dissemination of *Psychology of Mass Communication*. At the beginning of the 1960s, journalists who received professorships and were responsible for guiding the discipline toward empirical social sciences (Löblich, 2010) also served a significant role. Fritz Eberhard, Otto B. Roegele and Franz Ronneberger found what they needed in Maletzke: some clear concepts and a summary of the status of research in the United States. Maletzke only partially cited German predecessors. He cited them when, for example, he needed to collect previous attempts to define certain concepts (Maletzke, 1963: 15, 24). Dietrich Berwanger (born: 1938), who studied in Berlin beginning in 1959, tells the story of how English literature suddenly arrived at the institute in the hands of Fritz Eberhard. Maletzke's book kept the seminar of doctoral students busy during "multiple sessions" (Berwanger, 2001: 23). This situation also occurred in Munich. Otto B. Roegele, who had been editor-in-chief of the newspaper *Rheinischer*

Merkur prior to his appointment as professor and who had studied medicine and history, speaks of his "constant gratitude" to Gerhard Maletzke "both as student and teacher" (Roegele, 1997: 21).

Academics who grew up with the old definitions reacted less effusively to Maletzke's book because Maletzke continuously spoke of a new discipline and they did not want to favor any type of relationship between journalism science and "research in communication as a social empirical science" (Maletzke, 1966: 318; 1997: 111). Wilmont Haacke, who wrote his habilitation thesis in the field of *Zeitungswissenschaft* in Prague in 1942 and who was a professor in Göttingen beginning in 1963, always considered Maletzke's concepts as "fortunate distillations of the Anglo-American literature he analyzed" (Haacke, 1966: 82). Elisabeth Noelle-Neumann, who was Emil Dovifat's doctoral student, and Henk Prakke, who was an admirer of his predecessor Walter Hagemann, created their own schools in Mainz and Münster (Meyen & Löblich, 2006: 239-276). Although Maletzke's book was mandatory reading in the 1960s in Mainz (Meyen & Löblich, 2007: 236), Maletzke has served either no role or only a secondary role in the textbooks created by these institutes until currently (Merten, 1999: 75; Merten, Schmidt, & Weischenberg, 1994; Noelle-Neumann, Schulz, & Wilke, 2002).

The example of Munich shows that the disparity in the reception of *Psychology of Mass Communication* even occurred within the same institute. Although Erhard Schreiber's (1935-1993) *Repetitorium Kommunikationswissenschaft*, which was reedited three times between 1980 and 1990, had many passages based on Maletzke's theory (Schreiber, 1990), Hans Wagner (birth: 1937) bluntly rejected the "model of models" (Wagner, 1998: 202). Schreiber had a doctorate in philosophy and arrived at the Institute in Munich in 1971 by Roegele's hand. Conversely, Wagner had begun his studies in *Zeitungswissenschaft* in 1957, and as an assistant and professor, he attempted to merge the theoretical principles of Karl d'Ester (1881-1960), Bernd Maria Aswerus (1909-1979) and Otto Groth (1875-1965).

He necessarily collided with Maletzke because his definition, which was completely different from the definition of Wagner, had already become a "widespread teaching formula" (Wagner, 1974: 161). Wagner wrote that Maletzke's model was "representative" of the state of the art, which did not say much about its "utility and even less about its accuracy". "The illustration of the model" did not make any reference to mass communication, which could only be seen by reading the text panel. The fact that the four key factors did not reproduce anything more than "any rhetorical situation" may cause people to think that the communicator created his or her messages "totally and solely on his or her own" (Wagner, 1998: 202-204). Gerhard Maletzke had established the difference between communication and mass communication as "the means of communication situated between the parties" (Maletzke, 1963: 34). Wagner spoke of "colloquial frivolousness" and criticized Maletzke for characterizing in a "scientifically (…) completely unsustainable" way; direct communication as "not mediated" when in any conversation language was the "essential medium of social communication" (Wagner, 1998: 206).

Similar to Wagner, Klaus Merten analyzed the "tacit equating" of communication and mass communication and wondered what transpired between the communicator and the receiver and ultimately defended systemic theory (Merten, 1999: 76). Heinz Pürer, who had attended Günter Kieslich's courses, took the structure of his program as a reference and assigned Maletzke a prominent place in his book *Einführung in die Publizistikwissenschaft*. This book was published for the first time in 1978 and had virtually no competition in the textbook market until the 1990s. It was not till the fourth edition of his textbook that he criticized—cautiously—that Maletzke did not emphasize "political and economic conditions" "with the desirable clarity" (Pürer, 1990: 139). Unlike Maletzke, Henk Prakke highlighted the relationship between the development of society and the media in his "functional journalism" and suggested investigating the publication process from a social dependence

standpoint. Prakke spoke of a "cultural system" and regarded the "sum of social, economic, political and cultural systems of a society that are correlated with its communication system" (Prakke et al., 1968: 160).

6. Conclusions

The current *Kommunikationswissenschaft* (communication studies) in German-speaking countries is difficult to understand without the work of Gerhard Maletzke. This statement refers not only to the history of the discipline in which Maletzke's name represents empirical sociological change and the international opening of the discipline (Löblich, 2010) but also to the present. Beyond the specific objects of study, the 1963 book established standards that remain applicable in Germany, even among academics who are unaware of Maletzke's definitions and ideas. Without knowing it, they have been socialized to Maletzke's work and have internalized his method of working. According to these standards, first, the object of study should be defined; second, "the variety of relevant factors and relationships or interdependencies" (Schenk, 2007: 16) should be considered; third, this variety is ideally merged into a model; fourth, the current state of research in the United States should be considered; and last, a person should proceed empirically.

Anyone can summarize Maletzke's history within the science of communication using the English term *timing.* His book *Psychology of Mass Communication* appeared in 1963 at the right time. The discipline was divesting itself from its past, in relation to both people and content, and discovered in Maletzke everything it needed to take on a new direction: a presentation of the status of research and the terminology from the United States model. Maletzke was aware of this in his old age; in the 2005 interview, he realistically evaluated the success of the book: "It is not surprising, as there had been nothing else." Maletzke not only provided a language for the science of the German communication but also gave it a portrait. His model enabled us to understand this discipline. Similar to Lasswell's formula, his model offered the possibility of dividing and organizing the field of research.

From the point of view of his personal career, the *timing* was not favorable for Maletzke. He frequently found himself in the wrong place at the wrong time: at the end of the 1950s and early 1960s, when he attempted to complete his habilitation process, he had an extensive understanding of empirical research performed by the social sciences and a topic related to the media in the context of a psychology (Hamburg) that was "exercised in a very positivist, a very empiricist" manner, as Hoffmann-Riem emphasized. At the end of the 1960s, he was a foreigner without a significant mentor in a *Kommunikationswissenschaft* that offered little to candidates who, like Maletzke, already failed. It was a discipline that had not yet freed itself from party politics. In 1980, he was a sexagenarian member of the SPD in a federal state in Göttingen, where the wind had just begun to blow in favor of the CDU.

The case of Gerhard Maletzke teaches that reading works or selecting texts of the various authors is insufficient when writing the history of a discipline. If a person wants to truly understand an academic's ideology, regardless of the country, the focus of research should be expanded and include the author's personal background, social origin and socialization, life experiences, academic training, professional itinerary and paradigms that guided his or her life. The structures and breadth of the scientific discipline where the author belonged, its reputation in the university world and in society, its autonomy and logic, its internal hierarchies and the distribution of power, as well as the position of the author, should be considered. How the *habitus* of an author fits into the events surrounding him or her, which agents served a role, what *capital* was necessary for him or her to professionally advance in the discipline, and how this affected research and teaching should be explored regarding the problems, theories and methods employed at a particular time in the field of research in communication. We would not have understood the case of Gerhard

Maletzke if we had disregarded, for example, the size (small, with few positions) of the discipline in Germany, the level of politicization (association with a party was almost more important than academic performance or the reception of a person's colleagues), or the debates between scientific paradigms, which were important factors.

The history of the reception of Maletzke's writings highlights the importance of success at the institutional level for scientific work. Without a professorship, Maletzke did not have the space or time that was required to develop his own corpus. None of Maletzke's numerous monographs was as influential as *Psychology of Mass Communication* in Germany or elsewhere. In the *Publizistik* journal, his subsequent books were harshly criticized (Haacke, 1966; Kubler, 1982) or ignored, or their critiques were delegated to beginners or people outside the discipline, even the programmatic writings or studies intended to provide an extensive perspective (Kiefer, 1980; Otto, 1968; Teusch, 1988). Without a professorship, Maletzke did not have the opportunity to train disciples that could build the posthumous fame of their professor. In 2005, he expressed his regret for not developing any relationships with "young people" for collaboration on his arguments and ideas. "When you really have the advantage of a professorship, a real one that is officially established, it only takes a few years to write the 16 books that I have written in 50 years of effort and struggle. That is something I have never experienced."

References

Averbeck, S., Kutsch, A. (2002). Thesen zur Geschichte der Zeitungs- und Publizistikwissenschaft 1900–1960. *Medien & Zeit 17*(2/3), 57-66.

Bausch, H. (1956). *Der Rundfunk im Kräftespiel der Weimarer Republik. 1923–1933*. Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr.

Beck, K. (2007). *Kommunikationswissenschaft*. Konstanz: UVK.

Benito, A. (1973). *Teoría general de la información. I. Introducción*. Madrid, Barcelona: Guadiana de Publicaciones.

Bentele, G., Nothhaft, H. (2005). Kommunikation/Massenkommunikation. In J. Hüther, B. Schorb (Eds.), *Grundbegriffe der Medienpädagogik* (pp. 210-221). München: Kopaed.

Berwanger, D. (2001). Die Ankunft am Berliner Institut. In B. Sösemann (Ed.), *Fritz Eberhard. Rückblicke auf Leben und Werk* (pp. 19-23). Stuttgart: Steiner.

Bordieu, P. (1984). *Distinction*. Cambridge, UK: Polity.

Bordieu, P. (1988). *Homo Academicus*. Standford, CA: Standford University Press.

Bessler, H. (1968). *Zur Theoriebildung in der Massenkommunikationsforschung*. Universität Nürnberg-Erlangen: Dissertation.

Bessler, H. (1980). *Hörer- und Zuschauerforschung*. München: dtv.

Bessler, H. (1982). Gerhard Maletzke 60 Jahre. *Publizistik 27*, 176-179.

Bessler, H., Bledjian, F. (1967). *Systematik der Massenkommunikationsforschung*. München: Ernst Reinhardt.

Bonfadelli, H., Jarren & O., Siegert, G. (2010). *Einführung in die Publizistikwissenschaft*. Bern: Haupt.

Burkart, R. (2002). *Kommunikationswissenschaft*. Wien: Böhlau.

Burkart, R. (2003). Kommunikationstheorien. In G. Bentele, H-B. Brosius & O. Jarren (Eds.), *Öffentliche Kommunikation* (pp. 169-192). Wiesbaden: Westdeutscher Verlag.

Burkart, R., Hömberg, W. (1998). Elektronisch mediatisierte Gemeinschaftskommunikation. In R. Pfammatter (Ed.): *Multi Media Mania* (pp. 19-36). Konstanz: UVK.

Burkart, R., Hömberg, W. (Eds.) (2007). *Kommunikationstheorien*. Wien: Braumüller.

Burkart, R., Hömberg, W. (Eds.) (2014). *Kommunikationstheorien*. Wien: new academic press.

Carrera, P. (2008). *Teoría de la comunicación mediática*. Valencia: Tirant lo Blanch.

Dovifat, E. (1937). *Zeitungslehre*. Berlin: de Gruyter.

Fawkes, J., Gregory, A. (2000). Applying communication theories to the Internet. *Journal of Communication Management 5*(2), 109-124.

Fawkes, J. (2007). Public relations models and persuasion ethics: a new approach. *Journal of Communication Management 11*(4), 313-331.

Fünfgeld, H., Mast, C. (Eds.) (1997). *Massenkommunikation*. Opladen: Westdeutscher Verlag.

Groos, P. (2001). Vision oder Zwangslage? Fritz Eberhards Positionierung in der akademischen Publizistik an der Freien Universität Berlin. In B. Sösemann (Ed.), *Fritz Eberhard* (pp. 257-271). Stuttgart: Steiner.

Guinsberg, E. (2005). *Control de los medios, control del hombre. Medios masivos y formación psicosocial*. México, D.F.: Plaza Valdés.

Haacke, W. (1966). Gerhard Maletzke: Grundbegriffe der Massenkommunikation. Rezension. *Publizistik 11*, 81-82.

Heintz, B. (1993). Wissenschaft im Kontext. *Kölner Zeitschrift für Soziologie und Sozialpsychologie 45*, 528–552.

Jahoda, M., Lazarsfeld, P. & Zeisel, H. (1933). *Die Arbeitslosen von Marienthal*. Leipzig: Hirzel.

Kersting, Ch. (1994). Erziehungswissenschaft in Hamburg nach 1945. *Zeitschrift für Pädagogik 40*(5), 745-763.

Kiefer, H. J. (1980). Gerhard Maletzke: Kommunikationsforschung als empirische Sozialwissenschaft. Rezension. *Publizistik 25*, 377–380.

Kieslich, G. (1964). Gerhard Maletzke: Psychologie der Massenkommunikation. Rezension. *Publizistik 9*, 181-184.

Kübler, H.-D. (1982). Gerhard Maletzke: Medienwirkungsforschung. Rezension. *Publizistik 27*, 211–212.

Kunczik, M., Zipfel, A. (2005). *Publizistik*. Köln: Böhlau.

Lang, K., Lang, G. E. (1961). *Collective dynamics*. New York: Crowell.

Lepenies, W. (1981). Einleitung. In W. Lepenies (Ed.), *Geschichte der Soziologie, Band 1* (pp. I-XXXV). Frankfurt/Main: Suhrkamp.

Löblich, M. (2010). *Die empirisch-sozialwissenschaftliche Wende in der Publizistik- und Zeitungswissenschaft*. Köln: Halem.

Löblich, M., Scheu, A. (2011). Writing the History of Communication Studies: A Sociology of Science Approach. *Communication Theory 21*(1), 1-22.

Mahler, M., Meyen, M. & Wendelin, M. (2008). „Empirifizierung" als Nebenwirkung. Die Berufung der Psychologin Hertha Sturm (1925 bis 1998) auf eine Professur für empirische Kommunikationsforschung, In M. Meyen, M. Wendelin (Eds.), *Journalistenausbildung, Empirie und Auftragsforschung* (pp. 116-149). Köln: Halem.

Maletzke, G. (1950). *Der Rundfunk in der Erlebniswelt des heutigen Menschen*. Universität Hamburg: Dissertation.

Maletzke, G. (1954). Zur Sozialpsychologie der Massenkommunikation. *Rundfunk und Fernsehen 2*, 305-317.

Maletzke, G. (1955). Der Mensch im publizistischen Feld. *Rundfunk und Fernsehen 3*, 118-131.

Maletzke, G. (1957). Kritik und Analyse von Fernsehsendungen. *Rundfunk und Fernsehen 5*, 184-197.

Maletzke, G. (1959). *Fernsehen im Leben der Jugend*. Hamburg: Hans-Bredow-Institut.

Maletzke, G. (1963). *Psychologie der Massenkommunikation. Theorie und Systematik*. Hamburg: Hans-Bredow-Institut.

Maletzke, G. (1964). *Grundbegriffe der Massenkommunikation unter besonderer Berücksichtigung des Fernsehens*. München: Institut für Film und Bild in Wissenschaft und Unterricht.

Maletzke, G. (1966). Interkulturelle Kommunikation und Publizistikwissenschaft. *Publizistik 11*, 318-331.

Maletzke, G. (1967). *Publizistikwissenschaft zwischen Geistes- und Sozialwissenschaften*. Berlin: Spiess.

Maletzke, G. (1969). Sicología de la comunicación colectiva. Quito: CIESPAL.

Maletzke, G. (1976). *Ziele und Wirkungen der Massenkommunikation*. Hamburg: Hans-Bredow-Institut.

Maletzke, G. (1980). *Kommunikationsforschung als empirische Sozialwissenschaft*. Berlin: Spiess.

Maletzke, G. (1981). *Medienwirkungsforschung*. Tübingen: Niemeyer.

Maletzke, G. (1984). *Bausteine zur Kommunikationswissenschaft 1949-1984*. Berlin: Spiess.

Maletzke, G. (1996). *Interkulturelle Kommunikation*. Opladen: Westdeutscher Verlag.

Maletzke, G. (1997): Erlebte Kommunikationswissenschaft im Rückblick. In A. Kutsch, H. Pöttker (Eds.), *Kommunikationswissenschaft – autobiographisch* (pp. 110-119). Opladen: Westdeutscher Verlag.

Maletzke, G. (1998). *Kommunikationswissenschaft im Überblick*. Opladen: Westdeutscher Verlag.

Mannheim, K. (2010). *An Ideology And Utopia: An Introduction To The Sociology Of Knowledge*. New York: Kessinger Publishing.

McQuail, D., Windahl, S. (1993). *Communication Models for the Study of Mass Communications*. London: Longman.

Merten, K. (1999). *Grundlagen der Kommunikationswissenschaft*. Münster: Lit.

Merten, K., Schmidt, S., J. & Weischenberg, S. (Eds.) (1994). *Die Wirklichkeit der Medien*. Opladen: Westdeutscher Verlag.

Meyen, M., Löblich, M. (2006). *Klassiker der Kommunikationswissenschaft*. Konstanz: UVK.

Meyen, M., Löblich, M. (2007). *„Ich habe dieses Fach erfunden". Wie die Kommunikationswissenschaft an die deutschsprachigen Universitäten kam*. Köln: Halem.

Moragas, M. (2011). *Interpretar la comunicación. Estudios sobre medios en América y Europa*. Barcelona: Gedisa.

Müller-Freienfels, R. (1940). *Menschenkenntnis und Menschenbehandlung. Eine praktische Psychologie für Jedermann*. Berlin: Deutscher Verlag.

Noelle-Neumann, E., Schulz, W. & Wilke, J. (Eds.) (2002). *Fischer Lexikon Publizistik Massenkommunikation*. Frankfurt/Main: Fischer Taschenbuch.

Otto, U. (1968). Gerhard Maletzke: Publizistikwissenschaft zwischen Geistes- und Sozialwissenschaft. Rezension. *Publizistik 13*, 94-95.

Paton, E. (2011). Communication and Creativity: How Does Media Usage Influence Those Who Create Media Texts? *International Journal of Communication 5*, 101-116.

Pelayo, N., Cabrera, A. (2002). *Lenguaje y comunicación*. Caracas: CEC.

Prakke, H., Dröge, F., Lerg, W. B. & Schmolke, M. (1968). *Kommunikation der Gesellschaft*. Münster: Regensberg.

Pöttker, H. (2002). Gerhard Maletzke zum 80. Geburtstag. *Publizistik 47*, 221-222.

Pürer, H. (1990). *Einführung in die Publizistikwissenschaft*. München: Ölschläger.

Pürer, H. (2003). *Publizistik- und Kommunikationswissenschaft*. Konstanz: UVK.

Reimers, K. F. (1997). Gemeinsame Zeitquartiere. In H. Fünfgeld, Mast, C. (Eds.), *Massenkommunikation* (pp. 15-17). Opladen: Westdeutscher Verlag.

Rodrigo, M. (1995). *Los modelos de la comunicación*. Madrid: Tecnos.

Roegele, O. B. (1997). Dank an einen großen Vermittler. In H. Fünfgeld, C. Mast (Eds.), *Massenkommunikation* (pp. 19-21). Opladen: Westdeutscher Verlag.

Rush, M. (2013). *Politics & Society. An Introduction to Political Sociology*. New York: Routledge.

Saperas, E. (1992). *La sociología de la comunicación de masas en los Estados Unidos. Una introducción crítica*. Barcelona: PPU.

Schenk, M. (2007). *Medienwirkungsforschung*. Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr.

Schmidt, A. (1939). *Publizistik im Dorf*. Dresden: Dittert.

Schmidt, S. J., Zurstiege, G. (2007). *Kommunikationswissenschaft*. Reinbek: Rowohlt.

Schneider, I. (2007). Spuren einer Wissenschaft der Medien. Zur Gründungsgeschichte des Hans-Bredow-Instituts. In I. Schneider, I. Otto (Eds.), *Formationen der Mediennutzung II* (pp. 93-111). Bielefeld: Transcript.

Schreiber, E. (1990). *Repetitorium Kommunikationswissenschaft*. München: Ölschläger.

Stöber, R. (2008). *Kommunikations- und Medienwissenschaften*. München: Beck.

Stommel, D. (2006). *Gerhard Maletzke. Eine Wissenschaftlerbiographie*. Unpublished master's thesis for master's degree, Ludwig-Maximilians-Universität, München.

Teusch, U. (1988). Gerhard Maletzke: Kulturverfall durch Fernsehen? Rezension. *Publizistik 33*, 698-700.

Valbuena, F. (1997). *Teoría General de la Información*. Madríd: Nóesis.

Vowe, G., Langenbucher, W. R., Ruß-Mohl, S., Kepplinger, H. M., Wessler & H., Marcinkowski, F. (2012). Gelebte Synthesen von Theorie und Praxis. Ein biographisches Kaleidoskop. In S. Fengler, T. Eberwein & J. Jorch (Eds.), *Theoretisch praktisch!? Anwendungsoptionen und gesellschaftliche Relevanz der Kommunikations- und Medienforschung* (pp. 273-300). Konstanz: UVK.

Wagner, H. (1974). *Die Partner in der Massenkommunikation*. Unpublished habilitations thesis, Ludwig-Maximilians-Universität, München.

Wagner, H. (1998). Das Fachstichwort: Massenkommunikation. In O. Groth, *Vermittelte Mitteilung* (pp. 187-240). München: R. Fischer.

Watson, J., Hill, A. (2012). *Dictionary of Media and Communication Studies*. London: Bloomsbury Academic.

Weingart, P. (2003). *Wissenschaftssoziologie*. Bielefeld: transcript.

Wilke, J. (Ed.) (1976). *Emil Dovifat: Zeitungslehre I*. Berlin: de Gruyter.

Wilke, J. (1998). Standardwerk oder Materialsammlung ohne wissenschaftlichen Anspruch? Emil Dovifats „Zeitungslehre" und die Entwicklung der Zeitungswissenschaft in Deutschland. In B. Sösemann (ed.), *Emil Dovifat* (pp. 267-288). Berlin, New York: de Gruyter.

Wilke, J. (2011). Autobiographien als Mittel der Journalismusforschung. In O. Jandura, T. Quandt & J. Vogelgesang (Eds.), *Methoden der Journalismusforschung* (pp. 83-105). Wiesbaden: VS Verlag.

Wilson, T. D. (1999). Models in Information Behaviour Research. *Journal of Documentation 55*(3), 249-270.

Windahl, S., Signitzer, B. & Olson, J.T. (2009). *Using Communication Theory: An Introduction to Planned Communication*. London: SAGE.