

DIFFERENTIATION OF SCIENTIFIC DISCIPLINES: CAUSES AND CONSEQUENCES

Rudolf Stichweh

University of Lucerne, Lucerne, Switzerland

Keywords: scientific discipline, classification of knowledge, communication system, function system, scientific community, publication, educational system, professionalization, interdisciplinarity, unity of teaching and research

Contents

1. Introduction
 2. Unit Divisions of Knowledge: Classificatory and Archival Functions of Disciplines
 3. Disciplines as Production and Communication Systems
 4. The Modern System of Scientific Disciplines
 5. The Future of the Scientific Discipline
- Glossary
Bibliography
Biographical Sketch

Summary

The scientific discipline as the primary unit of internal differentiation of science is an invention of nineteenth-century society. There exists a long semantic prehistory of *disciplina* as a term for the ordering of knowledge for purposes of instruction in schools and universities. But, only the nineteenth century establishes real disciplinary *communication systems*. They are based on specialization of scientists, on role differentiation in the organizations of science, the emergence of standard forms of scientific publication and the rise of the research imperative which demands an incessant search for novelties. All these structural changes coalesce to the disciplinary community as a new type of communication system in science. After having been established, the discipline functions as the unit of structure formation in the social system of science; in systems of higher education, as subject domain for teaching and learning in schools; and finally as designation of occupational and professional roles. Although processes of differentiation of science have been going on ever since, the scientific discipline as a basic unit of structure formation is stabilized by these plural roles in different functional contexts of modern society. Finally, each individual discipline is embedded into an internal environment of other disciplines. The continuous mutual observation and interaction of these disciplines is the most important factor in the dynamics of modern science.

1. Introduction

The scientific discipline functions as the primary unit of internal differentiation in science. In this function, the scientific discipline is an invention of nineteenth-century society. There exists a long semantic prehistory of *disciplina* as a term for the ordering of knowledge for purposes of instruction in schools and universities. But only in the

nineteenth century did academics establish real disciplinary *communication systems*. After that, the discipline functions as the unit of internal differentiation in the social system of science, in systems of higher education, as subject domain for teaching and learning in schools, as designation of occupational and professional roles and as *address* for knowledge demands from other functional contexts in society. Although processes of differentiation of science are going on all the time, the scientific discipline as a basic unit of structure formation in science is stabilized by these plural roles in different functional contexts of modern society.

2. Unit Divisions of Knowledge: Classificatory and Archival Functions of Disciplines

Disciplina is derived from the Latin *discere* (learning), and it has been used since late antiquity and the early Middle Ages as one side of the distinction *disciplina* vs. *doctrina*. Both terms meant ways of ordering knowledge for purposes of teaching and learning. Often they were used synonymously. In other usages, *doctrina* is more intellectual and *disciplina* more pedagogical, more focused on methods of inculcating knowledge. A slightly later development among the church fathers adds to *disciplina* implications such as admonition, correction, even punishment for mistakes. This concurs with recent interpretations of discipline, especially in the wake of Michel Foucault, making use of the ambiguity of *discipline* as a term always pointing to knowledge and to disciplinary power at the same time. A last relevant context is the role differentiation of teaching and learning and the distinction *doctrina/disciplina* was obviously correlated with it, *doctrina* being prevalent on the side of the teacher, *disciplina* being more necessary on the side of the pupil.

One can still identify the same understandings of *doctrina* and *disciplina* in the literature of the eighteenth century. But what had changed since the Renaissance is that these two terms no longer referred to very small particles of knowledge. They pointed much more frequently to entire systems of knowledge. This went along with the ever more extensive use by early modern Europe of classifications of knowledge and encyclopedic compilations of knowledge in which disciplines functioned as unit divisions of knowledge. The historical background to this was the growth of knowledge related to societal developments such as the invention of printing, the intensified contacts of Europe to other world regions, economic and population growth, and their correlates such as mining and building activities, exploring previously unknown strata of Earth. But, in these early modern developments, there still dominated the *archival function of disciplines*. The discipline was a place where one deposited knowledge after having found it out, but it was not an active system for the production of knowledge.

-
-
-

TO ACCESS ALL THE 9 PAGES OF THIS CHAPTER,
Visit: <http://www.eolss.net/Eolss-sampleAllChapter.aspx>

Bibliography

Bazerman C. (1988). *Shaping Written Knowledge: the Genre and Activity of the Experimental Article in Science*. Madison, WI: University of Wisconsin Press. [This book describes the history and sociology of the scientific publication.]

Cambrosio A. and Keating P. (1983). The disciplinary stake: the case of chronobiology. *Social Studies of Science* 13, 325–353. [This is a case study on the rise of disciplines from interdisciplinary fields.]

Haskell T.L. (1984). Professionalism versus Capitalism: R.H. Tawney, Émile Durkheim and C.S. Peirce on the Disinterestedness of Professional Communities. *The Authority of Experts—Studies in History and Theory* (ed. T.L. Haskell), pp. 180–225. Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press. [This article represents sociological theory on professional communities.]

Hoskin K.W. (1993). Education and the Genesis of Disciplinarity: The Unexpected Reversal. *Knowledges: Historical and Critical Studies in Disciplinarity*, (eds. E. Messer-Davidow, D.R. Shumway, D.J. Sylvan), pp. 271–305. Charlottesville, VA: University Press of Virginia. [This article describes educational systems in the rise of disciplinary systems, from a Foucauldian perspective.]

Marrou H. I. (1934). „Doctrina“ et „Disciplina“ dans la langue des pères de l’église. *Archivus Latinitatis Medii Aevi* 9, 5–25. [This is a conceptual history of the terms around “discipline.”]

Messer-Davidow E., Shumway D.R., and Sylvan D.J. (1993). *Knowledges: Historical and Critical Studies in Disciplinarity*. Charlottesville, VA: University Press of Virginia. [This is a collection of studies about disciplinarity in different fields.]

Ong W.J. (1958). *Ramus, Method, and the Decay of Dialogue*. Cambridge MA: Harvard University Press. [This is an excellent overview of Renaissance theory of science and principles of classification of scientific knowledge.]

Stichweh R. (1984). *Zur Entstehung des modernen Systems wissenschaftlicher Disziplinen—Physik in Deutschland 1740–1890*. Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp. [This is a history and sociology of the modern system of scientific disciplines; with a case study on physics.]

Stichweh R. (1996). Science in the system of world society. *Social Science Information* 35, 327–340. [This article discusses science in global society and disciplinary differentiation.]

Storer N.W. and Parsons T. (1968). The disciplines as a differentiating force. *The Foundations of Access to Knowledge. A Symposium* (ed. E.B. Montgomery), pp. 101–121. Syracuse, NY: Syracuse University Press. [This is a sociological analysis of the modern system of scientific disciplines.]

Swoboda W.W. (1979). Disciplines and interdisciplinarity: a historical perspective. *Interdisciplinarity and Higher Education* (ed. J.J. Kockelmans), pp. 49–92. London: University Park. [This article discusses the history and sociology of interdisciplinarity.]

Biographical Sketch

Rudolf Stichweh, b. 1951; studies of sociology and philosophy in Berlin and Bielefeld; Dr. rer. soc. 1983 at University of Bielefeld; 1985-9 Max-Planck-Institut fuer Gesellschaftsforschung, Koeln; 1987 Maison des Sciences de l’Homme, Paris; 1989-94 Max-Planck-Institut fuer europaeische Rechtsgeschichte, Frankfurt a.M.; 1994-2003 professor for sociological theory, University of Bielefeld; 2000 guest professor at École des Hautes Études en Sciences Sociales, Paris; 2001 guest professor at University of Vienna; 2003- professor for sociological theory, University of Lucerne; 2005-06 fellow at Wissenschaftskolleg zu Berlin.

Major areas of research: Theory of world society; sociology of strangers and migrations; sociology of early modern and modern science and universities; theories of sociocultural evolution; sociology of friendship and kinship.

Main publications: Zur Entstehung des modernen Systems wissenschaftlicher Disziplinen. Physik in Deutschland 1740-1890, Suhrkamp 1984; Differenzierung und Verselbständigung. Zur Entwicklung gesellschaftlicher Teilsysteme (zus. mit R. Mayntz, B. Rosewitz, U. Schimank), Campus 1988; Der frühmoderne Staat und die europäische Universität: Zur Interaktion von Politik und Erziehungssystem im Prozeß ihrer Ausdifferenzierung (16.-18. Jahrhundert), Suhrkamp 1991; Études sur la genèse du système scientifique moderne, Presses Universitaires de Lille 1991; Wissenschaft, Universität, Professionen: Soziologische Analysen, Suhrkamp (stw 1146) 1994; Die Weltgesellschaft. Soziologische Analysen, Suhrkamp (stw 1500) 2000; Inklusion und Exklusion. Studien zur Gesellschaftstheorie, Transcript 2005.

UNESCO – EOLSS
SAMPLE CHAPTERS