Chapter 5.

Social sciences disciplines in complex development contexts – the professional dimension of reputation management[1]

Tom Christensen and Lars Klemsdal

Introduction.

Universities are typically characterized as loosely coupled systems (Weick, 1976), or organized anarchies (Cohen, March and Olsen, 1972). That is, organizations where the operative units, i.e the local organization of disciplines (for instance departments), are granted relative autonomy in conducting their operations (Christensen & Gornitzka, 2017). They form multiple centers of the university, where multiple stakeholders are connected and catered to, ranging from members of and potential faculty, partners in the international disciplinary community of scholars, students and potential students, financing authorities, actors in the labor market etc. Even the administrative center of the university can, from this perspective, be perceived as a separate stakeholder to be catered to at this level. Subsequently, we will argue that it is on this 'local' level the organizational reputation, understood as the 'set of beliefs about an organization's capacity intentions, history, and mission that are embedded in a network of multiple audiences' (Carpenter & Krause, 2012, 26), most significantly can be managed.

However, there has been limited focus in the literature on how universities manage their reputation on this operational level. Our purpose in this chapter is to contribute to the understanding of how the dynamics of reputation management unfolds at the operational level of universities. We will make a comparative analysis of how the local disciplines of political science and sociology at the University of Oslo have presented and tried to position themselves in relation to their multiple audiences historically. In none of these cases, the organizations have presented formal plans or strategies for reputation management. However, following Carpenter and Krause (2012) and Carpenter (2010), we perceive reputation management as less of an explicit standardized strategy, and more as an integral part of public organizations themselves in need of maintaining legitimacy among their multiple stakeholders through the "presentation of self" in Goffmanesque terms (Goffman, 1959). We explore traces and signs of reputation management at the department level at the university, focusing on the professional dimension (cf. Carpenter, 2010). We also identify explanations for variations in strategies and tactics of reputation management between the two disciplines, as well as within them, respectively, in

---

different historical periods. This resonates with Carpenter and Krauses' (2012, 31) call for further exploration within the reputation management field on "how reputational considerations affect administrative behavior in the presence of functional rival agencies engaged in the same set of tasks, yet confronting different institutional incentives and organizational environments". However, our contribution reveals that such a neo-institutional perspective must be supplemented with a classical cultural-institutionalist perspective (cf. Selznick, 1957), in order to account for the complexity of the dynamics of reputation management at the operational level of agencies.

We ask, what are the concerns and profiles of the departments' reputation management over time and which are their significant audiences or stakeholders? In order to answer these questions we combine two approaches. On the one hand, we make an indepth analysis of the process of reforming the study programs of the two local disciplines in a presumptive formative period of their history, around 1970. This period was marked by the transition of the university and the disciplines from "elite to mass" institutions in the context of the emergence of the so-called postindustrial knowledge society (Bell, 1999). By analyzing the processes of designing more professionally oriented study programs[2], we disclose how the two disciplines choose different strategies for presenting themselves as professional disciplines, for various reasons and towards various stakeholders. The reforms of study programs are thus interpreted as a project connected to establishing a "salutary organizational reputation" among a multiplicity of audiences both internally and externally to the local disciplines boundaries (cf. Carpenter and Krause, 2012, 28). On the other hand, we analyze the yearly reports and websites from a selection of the last twenty years, in order to discover historical traces as well as developments in presentation of selves. Explanations for these variations are searched by combining an instrumental, cultural and symbolic perspective on organizational choice and action (Christensen et al. 2007).

We will first outline some analytical distinctions and how the different perspectives may be used to analyze the professional aspects of university disciplines. This is followed by a description and analysis of the history of the two disciplines, in particular related to how the educational profile has been organized and developed and what this suggests about the professional dimension.[3] Third, it's described and analyzed how the two disciplines have

---

[2] By professionally oriented it's alluded to both orienting the study programs towards handling tasks outside of the university, in the professional sector, so to speak, as well as structuring and standardizing the programs more thoroughly seen from an internal perspective.

[3] We perceive the design of their education programs as a significant means of profiling the local disciplines in their professional dimension.

reported their professional-oriented activities and created their websites in this respect, every tenth year since 1996. Finally we will discuss what we learn from these analyses about the dynamics of reputation management at the operational level of the university.

Theoretical framework

Professionalized and hybrid disciplines and their practical-professional relation to society

Carpenter (2010, pp. 45-46) makes the distinction between four types of the reputation of public organizations – the *performative, moral, technical/professional* and *procedural* (cf. the presentation of the dimensions in chapter 1). We will focus on the professional one, but the other three will be related to implicitly. The *technical* or *professional dimension* relates to a backbone of public organizations, i.e. their knowledge base, professional competence and professional capacity they use to deal with advanced and complex tasks and their complex environment. Universities alluding to this dimension in their reputation management will potentially combine many elements, like stressing that they have recruited good professors and students, that the research resources and conditions are good and responsible, that teaching has high quality, and not at least that their knowledge and candidates are relevant and useful for the society.

We might assume that university departments will profile and position themselves in different ways and with reference to various bases of legitimacy of the professional dimension. For instance, within the sociology of science, university disciplines have been classified in terms of whether they base their activities on internal or external criteria or premises (Barnes, 1974; Blume, 1985). Internal criteria refer to that problems as well as the cognitive orientation and profile of the disciplines are based on interests and expectations formulated within the disciplinary community itself. External criteria refer to that problems and cognitive profiles are chosen and shaped based on expectations from external audiences and stake-holders, such as founding authorities and the labor market.

Another distinction, related to the above, but that must not be conflated with it, is between professions on the one hand and academic disciplines, in terms of arts or sciences on the other. On the one hand, professions are traditionally characterized by having monopoly on providing knowledge and competency to certain positions within institutionalized social sectors such as medicine and law (Abbot, 1993; Pavalko, 1971). The university departments are formally authorized/accredited by superior public authorities to provide education and research connected to the professional activity. On the other hand, the sciences and the arts, as academic disciplines, have traditionally had a rather weak link to specific institutionalized tasks and

functions in society. Their basis of legitimacy refers to contributing to the cultural development in society, rather than more specific institutionalized functions. To put it in Bourdieu's (1988) terms, it's their cultural value rather than their societal that is the primary basis of legitimacy.

However, this does not necessarily mean that the activities of professions primarily are based on external criteria and the arts and sciences on internal ones. Rather, enjoying a strong basis of legitimacy in terms of providing knowledge and competency to specific institutionalized tasks and functions or not does not easily translate into external/internal criteria or professional premises. Since professions often enjoy legally defined monopoly over their knowledge areas, they might also enjoy a larger degree of control and thus autonomy over their activities, compared to the less professionalized disciplines. Further, several disciplines that do not qualify as 'pure' professions in the strict sense, will still be faced with expectations of providing useful knowledge as well as educate useful candidates within certain sectors of society. It could be the humanities providing knowledge and competency to be used in the school system, or social sciences for maintaining functions within the public administration etc. When academic disciplines orient themselves towards such expectations they might be classified as hybrid disciplines[4]. In their external orientation, they might experience less autonomy than more professionalized disciplines (Boys et al. 1988).

Thus, we might say that university disciplines might be societally oriented trough two ideal typical models. On the one hand, the model of the profession, typically characterized by a clearly defined knowledge area oriented towards a clearly defined societal area with clearly defined tasks and functions, that the discipline itself to a large degree control. The link between the scientific basis of the discipline and the practice within the labor market is strong and well defined. Disciplines that are not formally authorized as a profession might still attempt to position and profile themselves in line with the profession model. Such attempts will be characterized by trying to define and scienticize the knowledge base and boundaries as well as jurisdictional area of their practitioners' occupational roles, as this represent the essential feature, so to speak, of the profession model.

On the other hand, we have the hybrid model, characterized by the discipline being more loosely coupled to the labor market and the potential societal tasks and functions. The internal control of the practitioners is low and the tasks they perform in the labor market less clearly

---

[4] Compared with the profession model, characterized by being internally defined, autonomous etc. vis a vis society (it fulfils societal functions that is defined from within the profession so to speak), the alternative model is characterized by being less predefined, more diffuse, but thereby also potentially more flexible and adaptive to expectations or societal needs experienced or formulated by external stakeholders.

defined. Rather it is the labor market that defines the occupational role and the use of knowledge, which requires that the discipline must adapt to external expectations in order to provide what is seen as useful knowledge.

These two models - the profession model and the hybrid model - can be used to classify and distinguish different approaches or strategies that university departments can enact, when maintaining or managing their reputation related to the professional dimension. In these efforts, they may draw on how the international discipline in general is profiled, but we might just as well expect that this work relates to local circumstances and contingencies.

Perspectives on the professional dimension of reputation management.

Our analysis will proceed from the threefold set of perspectives on organizational choice and action: an instrumental, a cultural-institutional and a symbolic or neo-institutional perspective (Christensen et. al., 2007), that may explain how and why university disciplines choose to present or position themselves within this continuums of internal/external, profession/hybrid (cf. chapter 1 for a closer presentation of the perspectives).

There are diverse potential dynamics between university reputation profiles and reputation management when using these perspectives together. A natural point of departure is to emphasize that managing the disciplines' professional reputation might be perceived as an instrumental affair, where the organization unit containing it aim to present and position itself as a professional organization, with its distinct capacity for providing a relevant and unique contribution of high quality vis a vis its significant audiences and stakeholders. But heterogeneous disciplines and sub-specialities may find it difficult to have a clear and unified profile (cf. Wæraas & Maor, 2015).

Instrumental control of reputational profile, however, comes with certain constraints. This is assumed to depend on how a discipline historically has developed certain cultural and cognitive traits, including norms of quality and relevance, as well as intellectual organization (cf Becher, 1989; Klemsdal, 2013; Whitley, 1984). But, also the expectations and norms dominating the institutional environment or the institutional field of the discipline are important (DiMaggio and Powell, 1983). Drawing on Selznick's (1949) classical notion of institutionalization, we will characterize this as the disciplines' local institutional traits comprising of internal norms and values, their content, as well as their degree of internal cohesion and integration. For instance, Whitley (1984) has pointed out how the institutional traits of university disciplines differ depending on the degree of task uncertainty and degree of

mutual dependence within the discipline, resulting in more or less divergent or convergent cultures and cognitive profiles.

Finally, university departments and their disciplines need to cater to several audiences when operating in their professional dimension. On the one hand, the departments may seek recognition from what could be characterized as the academic field, in Bourdieu's (1988) terms. That is, other local manifestations of related disciplines, which they are usually compared with, and with which they compete for achieving recognition in terms of legitimacy and influence. On the other hand, they need to maintain a favorable reputation vis a vis audiences external to academia, such as the funding authorities, which in Norway is equivalent to the political authorities; the student population, or prospective students more widely, and the labor market. In this endeavour, the use of established and legitimate symbolic forms is an important measure.

Methods

The units of this study are the local manifestations of the disciplines of political science and sociology, primarily at the departments of political science and sociology at the University of Oslo. Thus the units of analysis are the departments themselves, or the formal organization of the disciplines of political science and sociology respectively, but also including the whole constellation of actors associated with these departments (for instance researchers employed in the applied research sector, students and their associations, as well as the local associations of the political scientists and sociologists), All these elements are constituting the organization of the local university disciplines.

Our empirical analysis is based on two different sets of data. On the one hand, we will establish the historical trajectories of the two organizations by focusing on critical events in their development history with high significance for their professional dimension. We will provide an analysis of the deliberations behind reforms of study programs that the two organizations enacted as part of their response to the massification of the Western higher education system around 1970. This represented an important formative period within the history of the two local disciplines: the transition from elite education for few select students following a research oriented study program, towards mass education, meeting expectations from stakeholders such as founding authorities and emerging labor markets of providing useful knowledge and competency for society. Thus, we use the local reforms of education programs as a prism for analyzing how the local discipline focus as well as profile their professional activity. The analysis of the deliberations about the choices and the designs of more

professionally oriented education programs as exposed in documents and through interviews with involved actors at the time, displays the strategies and concerns behind how the two local disciplines manage and enhance their reputation in the professional dimension, as professional enterprises. This part of our study draws on an earlier study done by one of the authors, reported in Klemsdal (2001a, 2001b), and covers the period from the mid 1960s to around 1990.

The second period we focus on is 1996-2016. With that, the empirical approach is to study how the two local disciplines presents themselves in their yearly reports/plans and through their websites, which were gradually established from about 1996 and onwards. We have accessed these sources of information through the search engine "Wayback machine", where we found electronic versions of the yearly reports and plans stored, as well as earlier versions of the websites. We have chosen to focus on the years 1996/97, 2006/07 and 2016/17. The reason for restricting ourselves to three points in time with approximately ten years between, is that we assume that the timespan makes the differences between the reports and websites more distinct, allowing for comparison without drowning in details. The reasons for choosing wider points in time (two-year range, e.g. 1996/97) is that it increases our ability to get access to valid information. The yearly reports are retrospective, while when the university change into presenting yearly plans instead of reports, the perspective changes to future perspectives. We therefore needed broader categories of points in time to report from. As much as possible, we tried to access the websites via Wayback machine around the same month (February) at all three points in time (1996, 2006 and 2016). In contrast to the first historical period studied, we do not have access to background information about the choices made. We therefore have to interpret and classify the 'presentations of self' in terms of concerns and audiences addressed at face value.

For both types of data, we have broadly coded our analysis in line with our problem statement and research questions related to professionalization of the departments and searching for concerns and addressed audiences in the professional reputation management, and in line with our theoretical framing, in terms of internal and external concerns/audiences, respectively. The two parts are connected in the way that the analysis of the historical path of the educational programs works as a background for signaling a professional profile; profiles that are either weakened or enhanced seen through the reputation management analysis of yearly reports and websites during the last two decades.

Historical trajectories of sociology and political science.

Context: Main development features of the process of educational reforms 1965 – 1972.

Our approach to establishing the historical trajectories of how Political Science and Sociology at the University of Oslo manage their professional reputation is first to follow the choices and developments of the organization of their educational programs.

Whereas the bachelors/masters degrees system has become the dominant cultural form of higher education programs worldwide during the last decades, it came rather late to Norway with the reform in 2003. The prior Norwegian university degree system comprised of a multitude of degrees and programs, developed locally within the Norwegian context. Thus, during key phases in the development of local university disciplines, including political science and sociology, the choice of study degree forms represented a significant element in how the local disciplines/departments shaped their professional profile as well as positioned themselves as a professional activity in relation to their significant stakeholders and audiences (Klemsdal 2001a, 2001b). In this case, we argue that reforms of the study degrees can be perceived as an important aspect of managing reputation in the professional dimension at a time when they were going through a constitutive process of professionalization of the local discipline.

Up until the mid 1960s, the two local disciplines had a profile largely as academic studies, with a heavy emphasis on research-based education within the general degree of *magister artium*. This was followed by a reform phase from 1965 to 1972 where they tried to reorient and profile their study programs more practically directed. The reforms can generally be perceived as a response to the massive expansion of student populations at all Western universities towards the end of the 1960s and beginning of 1970s (Bleiklie, 1996; Gibbons et al, 1994), when the two local disciplines took their share. From 32 registered students in sociology and 98 in political science at the University of Oslo in 1963, the numbers had grown to respectively 675 and 358 ten years later.[5] However, the reforms can be interpreted more specifically as a response to the expectations of the Norwegian authorities to the transition from elite to mass higher education through appropriate reforms of the study programs. This response is characterized by more practically oriented profiles, catering to the needs of the now expanding Norwegian welfare state for qualified competency within social science disciplines, and more generally the emerging postindustrial knowledge and service society (Bell, 1999).

---

[5] University of Oslo. Yearly Reports. 1963 – 1973. The numbers represent an average between the fall and spring terms.

In their attempts to respond to these expectations, the two local disciplines were facing a choice between two different templates of how to organize a profile more adapted to societal expectations and needs, a choice that might be treated as a prism for illustrating their approach towards managing their professional reputations. One option was to follow the established profession-oriented template particular to the organization of the traditional professions such as medicine, law, theology, and also characteristic of newer disciplines within the Faculty of Social Sciences, including economic sciences, psychology, pedagogy etc. This template was strongly associated with what we previously defined as the "profession model" of a practical relationship between the discipline and society, requiring specialization within the main discipline of the profession for five to six years before entering specialized roles and functions in society, some even further protected by public certification requirements, etc.

The alternative or hybrid template emphasized an interdisciplinary basis for the first four years, followed by specialization for an additional two years within the main discipline, and finalizing with a master thesis. This template was also the one preferred by the public authorities, particularly the interdisciplinary basis which was perceived as more flexible in relation to the variety and change of social scientific competency expected from the expanding knowledge society (cf. for instance by committees appointed by the Norwegian government delivering their report in the beginning of the 1960s (Ministry of Education, 1960)). This inter-disciplinary based template is associated more closely to what we characterize as a non-profession model of a practical relationship between discipline and society. We call this model a hybrid, because it combines interdisciplinarity with specialization. Thus, while the interdisciplinary non-profession template was the favored template by external stakeholders, while the differentiated, specialized study programs still represented a dominant and symbolic form of educational programs among several departments in the social sciences at the University of Oslo.

At the end of the day, sociology choose to adopt the specialized profession oriented template while political science choose to adopt the more interdisciplinary template associated with a hybrid model, yet retaining a practical profile.[6] The important question in our context is what do these different choices tell us about the way the two organization handled the professional dimension of their reputation management?

---

[6] The later story about the various study program templates is that while political science stayed with the cand. polit. template, strengthening its position as a deliverer of broad professional competency for the welfare state apparatus etc., sociology was eventually at the beginning of the 1990s forced to change their template from the specialized to the more hybrid cand. polit. degree.

Main features of the processes of internal disciplinary development.

When reading the white papers from the two departments of the respective disciplines, it is clear that the official reasons for reforming the study programs was to cater to the needs for both sociologists and political scientists in the labor market (Department of Political Science, 1965, 3; Department of Sociology, 1965, 4-5). This optimistic view of the societal needs for knowledge and competence with respect to sociology and political science was also supported by general views among the funding authorities. One such example can be seen in a statement by the minister of education in 1963, when he said that the social sciences should help democracy through increasing knowledge of the measures of the welfare state (Bagge, 1996, p. 618).

Further, this view on the importance of providing practical knowledge (in terms of applied research) and competence was in line with the disciplinary profiles of the social sciences in Norway at the time. Just as the economic sciences (then headed by the famous economist and Nobel laureate, Ragnar Frisch) defined their purpose as providing the political authorities with measures, knowledge and competence to govern the economic development actively (Bergh and Hanisch 1984, 181), the local disciplines of sociology and political sciences defined themselves on practical premises.

A dominating approach within Norwegian sociology at the time was conceptualized as "problem-oriented empirism" (Aubert 1985b, 216), with an emphasis on doing sociology that was practically relevant for the society. However, this purpose was explicitly formulated in opposition to the economists as not on the premises of the establishment. This approach was in line with Robert Merton's "middle range theory", emphasizing building theories from empirical analysis and thereby contributing to social engineering (Merton, 1968; Mjøset, 1991, 45), and had been influential in Norwegian sociology prior to 1970 (Engelstad, 1996; Kalleberg, 1994). As for political science, one of the leading Norwegian professors of the time, Stein Rokkan, saw the development of the scientific discipline and the professional discipline as essentially interlinked (Thue, 1997, 200). As he put it:

> "Neither as academic discipline, nor as research activity, could such a science develop in vacuum: its growth had to be a function of prevalent needs either manifest or latent, for information and analyses, for training and education." (Rokkan, 1972, 26, our translation from Norwegian)

Still, by studying closer why the two local disciplines choose different templates of study programs, we can see how they emphasized different concerns and addressed different

audiences in their profiling of their professional dimension. In a 1965 reform paper it is emphasized that the choice of a specialized and thus concentrated study program was about enhancing and promoting the local disciplinary identity. As formulated in the paper, it is about 'creating a program that makes it possible to develop a stock of students with solid knowledge about the main features of the sociological architectonics' (Department of Sociology, 1965, 6, translated from Norwegian). One explanation for this priority and thus signal of what was important concerns of the practical positioning of sociology is that the local discipline/ organization was struggling with weak cognitive integration and a weak disciplinary identity. This was a situation shared with the international discipline after the faltering of what Giddens have called the orthodox consensus of the structuralist-functionalist school (Giddens, 1984, p. xv), that was challenge by the micro-sociologists as well as "the new left" during the 1960s (Gouldner, 1970). It was necessary that this problem be solved in order for sociology to enter a more practical relation to society (Klemsdal, 2001a, 2001b) and be able to maintain the discipline's critical attitude towards the establishment, which was considered important in order not to lose its soul, so to speak (Klemsdal, 2001a, 57).

Further, several sociologists argued that to choose a separate, specialized educational program was to align with an already well established and successful way of organizing more practically oriented educational programs among the social sciences in Oslo. As one of the leading professors in sociology, Ørjar Øyen, puts it in an interview:

> "The candidatus sociologiae–program must be perceived as an imitation of the model of the economics; a monolithic silo. […] The general opinion was that the monolithic structure gave more prestige.[…] In this period, sociology together with other social science disciplines saw the opportunity to compete effectively with the social economists at arenas where the latter had been dominant together with the legal profession, for instance in the ministries " (Klemsdal, 2001a, 65).

Thus, rather than catering to the political authorities and the labor market, addressing concerns about the students' opportunities for choice as well as the labor market's need for flexible labor within social science, sociology addressed concerns about internal disciplinary development as well as external positioning within the academic field, thereby catering to academic audiences within the discipline of sociology as well as among other disciplines within the local academic field (Bourdieu, 1988).

However, it does not follow that the local discipline of political science by the choice of the interdisciplinary template *only* catered to the political authority and the labor market with concerns about the labor market's need for more general competency and students' need for a

flexible knowledge basis. Rather, political science saw the opportunity to differentiate itself through the candidatus rerum politicarum program as it reflected the social organization and cognitive profile of political science as an inherently interdisciplinary discipline, systematically organized in four distinct sub-fields (political theory, international relations, comparative politics, and public administration and policy). In the reform paper from Department of Political Science (1965), the committee explicitly referred to the cognitive character of political science as *heterogeneous*, an argument in favor of the interdisciplinary cand. polit.-degree, as it was more adapted to political science than the other social sciences: 'The committee is aware of that in a heterogeneous discipline as political science, there are no conflict between disciplinary concentration and a flexible program of education' (Department of Political Science, 1965, p. 6a). Thus, the organized heterogeneity of the discipline of political science seemed to fit and even take cognitive advantage over the hybrid template. Thus, through the choice of the interdisciplinary template, political science signals concerns about differentiating and thus positioning itself as a distinct discipline towards both internal disciplinary audiences as well as audiences within the academic field, in addition to maintaining an image of being responding to the concerns of the students, labor market and political authorities.

1970 – 1990: the triumph of the hybrid template

How then, did the two local disciplines manage their professional reputation through their respective templates of study forms? This question may be answered with reference to different parameters, for instance through following the students through the programs and into working life. In line with our ongoing methodology, we will answer it by looking into how the two templates survived.

The end of the specialized profession-oriented study program of sociology came when the department was forced to end it in early 1990s, replacing it with a program based on the hybrid template, in line with what political science had already chosen as early as 1965. Thus, it appears that the template of political science ended up as the more successful template for maintaining a practical relation to society. Throughout the 1970s and 1980s the specialized study program of sociology was continuously challenged by the central university. The local disciplinary organization had challenges, since the idea of what a distinct practical sociological enterprise was supposed to be, differed strongly among the internal stakeholders of the local discipline (Klemsdal, 2001a, pp. 91 - 116). Thus the main reason for choosing a profession oriented program, to enhance the substance of sociology as a distinct professional activity that

could support a sociological identity among its practitioners, failed. Thereby, sociology did not manage to maintain their professional reputation in line with a profession model of organizing the study program. In this way, sociology did not manage to build legitimacy for maintaining a specialized profession-oriented study program (Klemsdal, 2001b). In parallel to this internal development of the local discipline, the university sector entered from the late 1960s a 'deflation circuit' (Parsons and Platt, 1973). Throughout this period, the universities in Norway were losing their attractiveness to students as well as in the eyes of the funding authorities, especially by comparison with the emerging sector of university colleges, which were offering shorter interdisciplinary study programs (Kyvik & Skoie, 1982). This strengthens the position of the interdisciplinary based cand.polit model of political science as a legitimate cultural form within the field of social sciences and weakens further the position of the specialized degrees.

This development, however, can also be interpreted as a sign of the increasing pressure towards standardization of how university disciplines were supposed to organize their educational activities in a more externally adapted direction, responding to expectations of complying with being formal organizations (Ramirez, 2006a). In 1987, a committee was established at the Faculty of Social Sciences, mandated to clean up the messy variety of study programs offered at the faculty. The conclusion they reached was that the different social science disciplines shall offer study programs in line with the interdisciplinary template of the cand. polit. (Klemsdal, 2001, 92). However, it is important to note that while sociology has to close down its profession-oriented program, the more established professional disciplines such as law and economics, continued with their programs, suggesting that processes of standardization was not all-encompassing in this period. Sociology was the only discipline which had to sacrifice its own specialized model, suggesting that sociology was struggling with maintaining its reputation as a distinct profession-oriented discipline. Some possible explanations for why that might have been the case are explored in the following section.

Interpretations seen through the different perspectives

From an instrumental perspective, both political science and sociology can be interpreted as addressing the achievement of public goals, such as relevant education, and more particularly societal needs for knowledge. However, when inquiring into the deliberations behind the decision processes of the respective choices of the two organizations, we find that both disciplines employed new study programs in order to develop, position and present themselves as professional disciplines on their own cultural institutional premises, even though they both

had American cultural cultural roots. But, the anchoring and balancing of internal and external concerns were different in the two disciplines.

From a cultural perspective, it appears that the various choices for reforming the educational programs, in line with the two models for a more practical and professional relation between discipline and society, was in both cases more a matter of developing and consolidating local disciplines in their own right, than a matter of adaptations to external expectations. This feature was stronger in the case of sociology.

When assessing the deliberations from a symbolic perspective, we can see how the respective departments choice of forms of study program also can be explained by how the different degrees was perceived as legitimate forms within the respective social fields of the two organizations. As already mentioned, the profession-oriented template was established as a dominating template for organizing more practical oriented educational programs within the field of social sciences in Oslo. The discipline of social economics thus becomes both a symbolic role model as well as the main incumbent to be challenged by the upcoming discipline. Sociology's choice of a profession-oriented template, can thus be perceived as an imitation of a symbolic valuable form, in order to differentiate the professional dimension of the discipline as a distinct alternative to the established professions.

Turning to political science, the same analysis from a symbolic perspective does not hold as well. The symbolic features of the cand. polit. degree are less prominent within the academic field of the social sciences at this time, meaning more ambiguity. But the interdisciplinary model was recognized as the legitimate form among the external stakeholders and audiences, particularly among the founding authorities, as well as in the labor market. In this way, the two templates also signaled different symbolic meaning and value. In light of a symbolic perspective, it appears that the choice of a non-professional program can be understood as a strategic act to position and differentiate a niche for a practical activity sphere for social scientists. Thus by 'complying' with a preferred template of organizing the educational program among the authorities, political science could promote their internally defined disciplinary project in disguise of a wanted practically oriented education program.

The change of the degree profile of sociology in the late 1980 can be seen both as an instrumental choice, adapting to the wishes of the leadership of the faculty, but also as a break with the professional path-dependency (cf. Kingdon, 1984). However, the problems of cultural cohesion internally within the local disciplines, might also be considered an important contingency, making it difficult for the organization to consolidate around a choice that was considered ambiguous by the administrative authorities. From a symbolic perspective it also

appears that sociology by changing into the cand. polit. program., imitatied a template that was proved successful by political science.

How are sociology and political science presenting their professional profile the last 20 years?

So far, we have analyzed how the two local disciplines tried to maintain their professional reputation by positioning themselves as distinct disciplines through the choice of templates for organizing their study programs, in the local field of social sciences during the 1960s and 1970. Now we turn to their respective reputation management in the period 1996 – 2016. As the study programs finally became standardized, first according to the interdisciplinary template and since 2003 through the international templates of bachelors/masters, the choice and design of study programs is no longer a significant prism for how the disciplines managed their professional reputation. We thus change our empirical approach to studying how the two local disciplines presents themselves in their yearly reports/plans and through their websites, which were gradually developed and published since about 1996 and onwards. We first perform a descriptive comparative analysis of the yearly reports/plans and the web sites, respectively, before interpreting the results based on the three perspectives (instrumental, cultural and symbolic).

Analysis of the yearly reports/plans.

Department of sociology and human geography. A main issue of the yearly report of the department from 1996, is the merger of the former separate departments of sociology and human geography[7] into one department. Even though the merger is mentioned in positive terms, it is emphasized that the cooperation between the two disciplines presupposes that their distinct disciplinary identities are maintained, echoing what appears to be a prevailing historical concern among the sociologists.

The report refers to that an ongoing 'reorganizing of study programs that from 1997 – 1998 will entail more intensive teaching and improved conditions for students to accomplish their education within expected time frames', i.e. an instrumental effectiveness view but with a professional flavor. Another strategic development issue referred to are supportive measures meant to enhance the ability to publish and network internationally. It is also pointed out that one of the main challenges in the coming years is increased internationalization, particularly in

---

[7] Human geography is a branch of geography that deals with the study of people and their communities, cultures, economies, and interactions with the environment by studying their relations with and across space and place.

terms of exchanging students. Finally, it is briefly mentioned that the department must be productive within all areas. Not at least, the department is said to enjoy an organizational, scholarly and faculty-vice basis for a positive future development. Overall, the yearly report seems to indicate a concern with internal professional identity, effective student production, and with professional development in line with international trends.

Around 2006, the university on the whole decided to replace the "yearly reports" with "yearly plans" suggesting a forward-looking and strategic orientation of the self-presentation activities of the departments. This could be seen as signaling that they would like to be seen as formal organizations, or part of a large entity, with related management features. Interestingly however, in 2006, the two departments choose to formulate their respective plans quite differently. The yearly plan of the sociology department in 2006 states clearly its purpose when describing the priorities within research, education and popular publication/contact with society. The general priorities were in line with ones from the Faculty of Social Sciences, which facilitated research activities that would promote internationally renowned research, increase the quality of scientific publications and enhance the international cooperation around research and student exchange. Consolidating the work of establishing a more conscious research profile at the department is singled out as a specific goal, i.e. typical professional feature. Measures to promote this is identification of core areas of the research portofolio, which for the sociology was 'culture' - social stratification/inequality, and 'gender' - everyday life and close relations.

As for the category of education, the plan refers to the quality reform of 2003 and the opportunity to establish new disciplinary centered programs at the BA level. In addition, the department established the inter-disciplinary program titled "Culture and Communication" and offered courses that could fit into other interdisciplinary programs. A consequence of the reform was a faster production of BA-students, a significant increased popularity of the BA programs in terms of students applications, generating more resources. At the same time, it conceded that the throughput at the higher order level/MA was more of a challenge. It's clearly referred to how the efforts to solve this would be based on the generally available quality systems such as the "quality system" of the university. For instance, it's mentioned: "In line with overall strategic plans at the University of Oslo, the department will continue to develop flexible educational forms/learning forms as part of the teaching. This happens first of all through the SMIL-project (Social science methodology in IKT-based environments of learning)" (p. 3). Finally, it is emphasized that the department has made several exchange agreements with foreign universities, both in Europe and in the US. It's prioritized to increase the level of exchange through development of the exchange portfolio.

Overall, the yearly report of 2006 shows some typical changes. One is that the focus is more aspirational, i.e. what the department would like to achieve in the future, whether in research programs or educational profile, than reporting what has actually been achieved. This shows a typical feature of reputation management, trying to create a positive external image. Second, the formal organizational features are more evident, in the way that the department refers to the central university level and the Faculty of Social Sciences to anchor its plans and strategies, which can be seen as a standardization feature. Taken together, the department seems to look outward in its professional profile.

The yearly plan from 2016 has a two to three year outlook. In the introduction, it's clearly stated that the priorities are in line with the University of Oslo's priorities as decided by the board of the university, which governs the priorities at the level of faculties and departments. Quality in research and teaching is the main goal for the faculty and constitutive of all other activities. The presentation of priorities seems more general and standardized for university departments, than specifically addressing particular challenges or aims in sociology.

The goal of the research activity is high quality publications, with high impact and relevance for society. Measures to achieve this is increased administrative support for searching external funding, increased focused on internal development of research groups, enhanced PhD education as well as measures that might facilitate international mobility among faculty. The goal of the teaching activity is to offer research based and societally relevant teaching according to high international standards. Some measures are briefly mentioned, mostly focused on how to recruit more applicants as well as increase the throughput of the students. The increase of new methods of teaching focused on activating the students is mentioned. In addition, internationalization in terms of student exchange, as well as enhanced coupling between the studies and working life through establishment of an "actualization seminar" is mentioned. Under the category 'societal contact, popular communication and innovation', it is emphasized that the department through various publication channels increasingly shall communicate the research activities of the department. They also recommend the establishment of a Facebook (home)page for the department.

Overall, the report shows a further development in the formal organizational features, meaning that the increasing emphasis on strategies and management features on the central level should be mirrored at the department level, which gives less leeway for a specific professional profile. It seems somewhat contradictory at the same time to move towards more emphasis on social media, but this seems to have a more narrow profile towards the students, which may couple the professional and moral dimensions of reputation management. A second

feature is that the professional profile of the department increasingly seems to be anchored in international standards of excellence.

Department of Political Science. The yearly report of 1996 from the department starts off with stating that the department 'also in 1996 continues to be one of the biggest departments at the university, measured in number of enrolled students'. Further, 'the research production has likewise been very extensive, comprising a significant number of publications, also published internationally'. The popular communication has also increased significantly, according to the report. It is also clearly stated that the international activity has been extensive both through the departments engagement in hosting conferences as well as through exchange among faculty and students. The rest of the report consists of presentation of numbers, names and titles. Compared to the similar report from sociology, political science seems much more oriented towards what had been achieved and less bothered by identity questions and the future developments.

Many of these features changed with the new format of the *yearly plan* of 2007, formulated in 2006, which was divided into three sections: research, education/teaching and organization. As for research, it is said that the main goal of Department of Political Science is to be the best scholarly community within political science in Norway, both in breadth and in depth. The department also wishes to compete on an international level, making the research activity of the department more visible nationally and internationally through stimulating international exchange among faculty as well as international publication of scientific results.

As for education, it is said that the main goal of the department is to secure that students achieve the promised competency, that candidates are attractive at the labor market and that our courses and study programs are popular among the students at the university in general. The three sub-goals are to secure good quality and management of resources within the study programs, increase the throughput of students within the normal timeframes, and make the teaching activity and educational services more visible and distinct both nationally and internationally. Finally, under the category "organization" it's said that the main goal is to achieve an optimal organization, where both administrative and faculty as well as students and visitors thrives and becomes inspired.

Overall, the plan shows the same change towards aspirational features as in sociology, but these features are even stronger, with a moral blend of the professional reputation management profile and mentioning of attractiveness on the labor market. It's also emphasized more the quality aspects of research and teaching, but less the organizational features.

As for the yearly plan for 2016-2018, it has some of the same organizational features as in sociology. It's said to provide the strategy for the long-term development of the department of political science, prioritized goals and measures. Further, it is stated that the yearly plan is directive for the decisions made by the management of the department. It will contribute to put the work of the individual employees in context and function as a common frame for the activities of the department. The plan also provides an external image of the activities of the department. Finally is it stated that the yearly plan is based on the Faculty of Social Sciences and the yearly plan of the University of Oslo. This clearly signals the tendency of centralization of the reputation management of the local discipline, as mentioned above for sociology.

Like sociology, the plan for political science consists of four subcategories: research, education, societal connections and popular communication, and organization and work environment. Under the rubric research, the report presents the number of faculty in full and temporary positions and the number of registered scientific publication in the Norwegian database for statistics within higher education in 2014. Then under the headline "Goal", it is said the department aims to be "the leading community of scholars within political science among the Nordic countries". "The employees of the department are expected to compete on a high international level in their research at the same time as the department as a whole shall offer research based education within all the main areas of political science...The department will participate in research cooperation with other units at the University of Oslo, and with researcher and researcher communities and networks at other higher education and research institutions".

Under the rubric 'Education', the report presents the eight study programs provided by the department. It's also noted that there are 1100 students enrolled at the programs of the department, somewhat more than the size of sociology. The goal of the education is that the study program shall hold high scholarly and pedagogically standards and together offer students on all levels courses covering all the main areas of the discipline of social science. Furthermore, it is stated that the department shall offer education that is relevant to the labor market, thereby make sure that the candidate have good opportunities for relevant careers; make sure that resources are used efficiently; formulate clear expectations and goals for students on every level; stimulate master students participation in ongoing research projects; and make sure that PhD students demonstrate progression throughout their study period and contribution to the scholarly discourse in this work, thereby securing their opportunity for a researcher career after the defense of their dissertations.

'Societal contact and popular communications' is a new category since 2006. Under this rubric it is stated that there are extensive interests for the research field of political science in the Norwegian public sphere, and that faculty are highly requested as commentators within the public media. Then it is added that this activity "demands modesty in relation to the role as a researcher". It is emphasized that that such forms of popular communication of research results should be considered an integral part of the research process among all employees. It's added that the department are striving to develop a common attitude among the staff based on sound principles for researcher representations in the media. This signals clearly that participation in public media and popular communication is an activity that the department work actively to professionalize. Under organization and work environment, we find the same goal as formulated in 2006: they aim for optimal organization, where both administrative and faculty as well as students and visitors thrive and are inspired. Added now is that the department shall have an efficient organizing of student administration and research support.

Overall, political science seems to 'brag' more about its achievements and research, societal relevance and student environment than sociology, and puts more weight on communicating this externally. It also seems to be more united in its professional profile and one indication of this it that its internal sub-fields are not mentioned. They seem to be more 'modern' than sociology in focusing more on individual research careers and student careers than the more traditional focus on collective purposes. Even though one can see a development in the direction of strategies, plans and anchoring on the higher level at the university, these organizational features seems somewhat weaker than in sociology.

Websites of the departments.

While the yearly reports/ plans seem to address the central organization of the university as well as funding authorities as its main audience, the web sites are more clearly oriented towards prospective (potential) students.

Department of Sociology and Human Geography. In 1997, the department did not have a well-developed website. No presentation of the department or of the discipline of sociology as such was found, other than a list of links to the single faculty members. The webpages indicate that they were in the works at that time.[8]

---

[8] https://web.archive.org/web/19970705043551/http://www.iss.uio.no:80/isswww/iso.html

In 2006, the website becomes more a presentation of the discipline of sociology and what kind of professional tasks candidates might expect to engage in by attending this program. Under "Bachelor program" there is a distinct link 'for new applicants', clearly addressing potential students as audience. The study program is presented through a list of different subjects classified as "key words. There are 11 such key words, including 'gender and society', 'identity and culture', 'welfare and society', 'work life and organization', etc,

Under the headline "What do you learn?" it is emphasized that sociology provides "general and applicable competency within social science", and "analytical, conceptual and methodical tools that make you able to engage in and solve new problems and tasks." Under the headline "Opportunities for work," it is emphasized that the study of sociology is holistic oriented in a way that makes it particularly suitable for analyzing the coordination problems that emerge between different sectors in a modern service and organizational society. They also include a list of current workplaces for sociologists, listing both private and public sector opportunities, including municipalities, ministries, enterprises and NGOs, as well as teaching on all levels and research and consultancy work.

Overall, the main feature of this presentation is how much emphasis the department put on stressing the job opportunities for their students, in other words how societal relevant it is. But it also presents its cognitive profile as holistic and generalist, thereby providing capacities to handle coordination at the macro level of a modern service and organizational society, i.e. suggesting a professional function that builds on the cognitive and disciplinary basis of sociology.

To reach the webpage of sociology in 2016, one need to enter 'About University of Oslo' and then navigating to the "Organization" subheading that leads to a list of departments. Again, this seems to indicate the central anchoring and the organizational features mentioned above. The first page of the department[9], presents links to the different studies in addition to news about research and publications. This is a very professional website communicating a viable research community, including a long list of different research areas, altogether 13 areas.

Under the category "About the department", found on the main menu, there are links to "Organization", cooperation, strategy and history, that says something about how the local discipline and the department wants to present themselves. Under «About the department» and «organization» it says that the Department of Sociology and Human Geography is the most important school in the discipline, providing research, education and popular communication

---

[9] https://web.archive.org/web/20160131033956/http://www.sv.uio.no/iss/

at the highest level, by highly qualified researchers. It is also emphasized that gender balance as well as societal relevance is other significant characteristics of the activities of the department. Under a separate link, the history of the local discipline is briefly mentioned, since its establishment in 1950. The golden age of the so-called "problem-oriented empirism" as a significant research strategy for the local discipline is highlighted, mentioning a range of names associated with the development of this style. It is also mentioned that in an international evaluation, the research of the department is seen as of high quality, which makes it attractive both for students, researchers and teachers.

The local discipline is also presented under the headline "Study programs", where sociology is characterized as navigating differences and complexity, studying humans and groups living together, "and trying to put together the puzzle that you and I are part of". Thus, this presentation is distinctively non-academic, addressing young potential students, presumably at high school level. Under the standard category "work and further studies" it is similarly as for political science presented a list of bullet points of work areas, characterized as extensive and various job opportunities within private and public sector. The presentation is less verbal than in 2006, more factual in terms of lists of work places with referring to further webpages through hyperlinks etc.

Overall, the focus on attracting students and showing them job opportunities is strengthened in the webpages for the department in 2016. Even though the glorious history of the discipline is alluded to, the quest for integration and promoting a disciplinary identity seems to be less of a concern here. And the connections to standardized features of the university on the central level is more obvious.

Department of Political Science. The 1997 webpages of the department is characterized by factual presentations of the studies offered, the research activities in terms of list of researchers with interests, lists of publications etc. There is also a page presenting political science as a discipline and what kinds of study programs that are offered at the local department. In the presentation of "what political science is" the critical and academic dimension is heavily emphasized:

> "The study does not only provide facts about political affairs, but also insight into correlations and probable effects that is contrary to common expectations. If you approach the study as a source of a robust basis of own political opinions you might be disappointed. Many discover the more you learn, the clearer you see what you do not understand. The discipline does not provide keys and solutions to questions that

politicians easily respond to. In many situations the analyses of political science will reveal dilemmas and choices, where it is not possible to achieve all good things at the same time. The insight into these dilemmas that the analyses provide will give a more robust basis for decision-making".

It's interesting that this presentation portrait the discipline as critical, academic and research oriented, instead of containing recipes, clear answers and practical tools, i.e. a broad and reflective notion of the professional profile. Political science is presented as societally relevant, because it provides insights into the political dynamics, it surveys public opinion and the shifting contingencies of politics, and provide basis for enhanced rationality within political discussions, organizing and decision-making".

Under the headline 'vocational opportunities for students of political science', there is presented a list of different areas political scientists work, mostly within public sector, and with emphasis on tasks as analysis, case processing and administration, typically found in education, research and public administration. However, it is added that during "the last years", private sector enterprises as well as NGOs and third sector organizations has become employers of political scientists.[10]

Overall, political science has a much more advanced presentation in 1996/97 than sociology that had yet to develop their websites at the time. Political science provide a self-reflective presentation of the professional profile, emphasizing, distinctive characteristics of their professional activities, in line with disciplinary academic characteristics.

On the websites from 2006/2007, the presentation of political science as a discipline is removed. Apart from factual information about research (publications) and studies and employees, we find a presentation of the local discipline of political science, which is celebrating 60 year anniversary in 2007 and 50 years as a separate department at UiO. The historical exposition is short and sketchy, leaving important issues aside, and it ends with bragging about the level of recognition the department enjoys at present time, ranged as number 1 among the Nordic countries, 11 in Europe and 52 in the world. This alludes to the performative dimension of reputation management.

The most thorough presentation of political science is now provided under the headline "studies" in accordance with a standardized scheme where the different studies at the university

---

[10] Dated 23.10.96

are presented to potential or actual students under the 'what is political science'; the content of this presentation is less academically oriented than the presentation in 1997. Now it focuses more on the subject of the discipline, "the study of politics". Furthermore, several motives are now presented in more descriptive terms such as interests in historical events, or on how political decision-making are happening and how one might influence them. It's also mentioned that one enhance one's abilities to reflect on political ideas and ideologies.

The cooperative dimension is emphasized: 'The department cooperate with experts from different research milieus in Norway and abroad[11]. Several external partners participate in teaching and supervision activities at the masters level. The teachers of the department participate extensively in public medias and discussion foras'. It is also emphasized how the department actively work to make political science and the study of it highly relevant for the every day political and societal discussions in Norway.

In general, we can say that the presentation of political science online clearly addresses students, and focuses on relevance. Even though the academic merits also are emphasized, the framing has distinctively changed since 1996/97. In this respect, it's more like the one from sociology and definitely more standardized and formal.

The webpage from 2016 has a very descriptive presentation of the department under the category of "Organization". It says that the department of political science is doing research and teaching, and popular communication on the subject of political science. It's mentioned that the teaching activity is organized in five sections: public administration, comparative politics, political theory, international relations and research methods. It is shortly summarized the facts of the study program, that it contains all together 1,000 students at bachelor, masters and PhD. levels within the discipline of political science. In addition, it mentions interdisciplinary bachelor and master degrees that it associates with. Three major research projects that the department is hosting are mentioned, associated with prestigious research subjects.

Under the link "Studies" we find presentations of the study programs of political science as an answer to the question "Why choose this program?" Here it says that political science ask how politics are made, shaped and affect us in everyday life. Then a list of questions are mentioned such as 'should 16 year olds have the right to vote?' and 'what are the consequences of EU for Norway?' etc.

---

[11] This relates to the horizontal engagement contacts analyzed in chapter 2.

There are many features listed that the department can brag about, everything from being the oldest department in Norway, the best on research in the Nordic countries, the one producing central politicians, etc. Under the headline "Work and further studies", they offer a long list of types of jobs across various sectors. This again alludes to the perfprmative dimension of reputation management.

Overall, the 2016 webpage presentation underlines the difference between political science and sociology in the way that political science is bragging more about its history, achievements and relevance. Still as we saw it, sociology also started bragging in a similar way in its 2016 webpages. Their presentations have also clear similarities in catering to the students in different ways.

Interpreting the presentations.

There are a lot of common features in the presentations of the two disciplines, seen through the yearly reports/plans and the websites. First, there is a marked difference between the two media of presentation. The yearly reports/plans address more the central administration of the university and funding authorities, while the websites address primarily the students and increasingly so as the years go by. Seen from an instrumental perspective, this shows a differentiation, where the yearly report/plans are aiming primarily at internal stakeholders, while the websites more are aiming outwards. Reports are not much visible for external stakeholders, while webpages are, i.e. the latter is better at symbolic presentations. However, the external audiences addressed is primarily students, not so much funding authorities, potential collaborators or funding authorities.

Second, we find several tendencies to standardize the presentation, whether reports or websites, and adapt the presentations to a general template provided by the central university, something that seems to prevail at the cost of specific cultural traits of the respective disciplines. This impression is increasingly valid as the years go by. The presentations are more and more organized according common categories of research, education, organization and public/ popular communication. And within research and education, there are generally emphasized that the important concerns of disciplinary development and success is related to increased internationalization in terms of students and faculty exchange, as well as publications, and thus increasingly concerned with anchoring the professional profiles of the local disciplines in international standards of excellence, and thus international competition of reputation. The central decision of leaving the yearly report format and replacing it with yearly plans, is another manifestation of this tendency, suggesting that the two disciplines are forced to align with

central requirements of appearing as formal organizations. However still, in 2006, the yearly plans are formulated quite differently within the two disciplines, something that has changed when we compare the reports of 2016, where the homogenization of concerns has increased. Also, the organization of the web sites, particularly in 2016, underpins our general interpretation of centralization of the governance of the university and the increasing organizational features mentioned above. And the websites is much more professionally designed, but also more standardized.

We can understand this as a process of increasing formalization and standardization, showing clear elements of developing the departments as formal organizations, where culturally based differentiation is not wanted by the central leadership of the university. Symbolically, the university should have a common external reputation profile'.

Third, the websites for both departments become more and more geared towards the students. This focus represent a mix of different reputation dimensions. The performance and professional dimensions are activated, through showing research excellence and professional quality, something that is combined with sound organizational routines for ensuring a good student and working climate (moral dimension), and hopeful prospects for the labor market. This is combining, being a professional organization, with being socially relevant and appropriate.

Fourth, there are also, however, clearly distinctive features in the presentations from the departments or local disciplines. Sociology seems more concerned with disciplinary identity, than political science, especially as expressed in the yearly reports. Compared to the similar report from sociology, political science seems much more oriented towards what is achieved and less bothered by identity questions and the future developments, this is particularly clear in the yearly reports of 1996. This must reflect the path-dependency presented in the historical analysis, where sociology is more heterogeneous and 'soul-searching', while political science is surer about its professional identity.

Fifth, the presentation of the disciplines are different, as seen from the websites. The websites of sociology in 2006 present its cognitive profile as holistic and generalist, thereby providing practitioners capacities to handle coordination at the macro level of "a modern service and organizational society". This is a clear break with the more inward-looking concerns of the period around 1970, where the emphasis was on establishing a counter cultural and critical profile of the sociological professionals as "the bad consciousness of the welfare state". The presentation of "what political science is" at the websites of the department of political science in 1996, the critical and academic dimension is heavily emphasized. It's interesting that this

presentation portrait the discipline as critical, academic and research oriented, instead of containing recipes, clear answers and practical tools, i.e. a broad and reflective notion of the professional profile. Again, symbolically this sounds good, but is more reflecting the 68-generation notion of the university than a modern, pragmatic and labor market oriented department. Then again, in the later websites (2006/07 and 2016/17) this aspect is diminished, as is the case for sociology.

Sixth, overall political science seems to brag more about its achievements and research, societal relevance and student environment than sociology, and put more weight on communicating this externally, both in the yearly reports/plans and at the websites. However, in 2016, sociology follow up in this direction by presenting the local discipline as having superior qualities compared with other local organizations of the discipline in Norway, as focusing on identity issues such as the particular history of the local discipline, presented in a rather glorious perspective. This may reflect historically more of a common direction of what is good research and more success on the labor market. The catching up of sociology in the bragging as of 2016, may represent what we can label a 'symbolic standardization' in communicating influence by common university strategies.

Discussion

What can we learn about the dynamics of reputation management at the operational level of the university from our comparative historical analysis of the local disciplines of sociology and political science at the University of Oslo, in the period 1965 - 2016?

Central concerns for the professional reputation management within both disciplines seem to be concerns about maintaining disciplinary integrity and identity when facing expectations of providing practically oriented capacities to society. This can be tracked both in terms of how the internal cultural features are emphasized as important to maintain when choosing study programs, but also in terms of how the choice of study programs is argued to position the two disciplines in relation to competing disciplines within the academic field.

However, the integrity/identity issue is much more precariously treated within sociology than in political science. While sociology address this concern as critical to maintain and enhance in order to enter a more interactive relation to society as a professional activity, political science seems more united, relaxed and settled on this issue, signaling that inter-disciplinary cooperation is not considered a threat to the internal integration, but rather underpinning the internal cultural and cognitive character of the discipline. In this way, political science manage to promote internal concerns for disciplinary integrity and identity, by

appealing to central values promoted by the significant external audiences, such as the political authorities and also partly the labor markets expectations. Sociology, though, chooses to oppose explicitly the expectations from the significant external audiences in order to maintain their disciplinary integrity/identity, eager to promote/present sociology as an integrated discipline with a distinct autonomous professional project as critical towards the establishment.

Thus, sociology tries to establish a particular reputation among internal and external audiences through choosing a profession model. In line with what Carpenter and Krause (2012) points out when it comes to how public agencies embedded in a set of multiple audiences with a diverse and altogether complex and thus ambiguous set of expectations, we find that the profession model is perceived as a measure that can cater both internal audiences within the disciplines and at the same time be used as a measure to integrate and thus increase a weak sense of identity, that again can be communicated more distinctively to external audiences.

But in the long run sociology does not manage to maintain this identity vis a vis external audiences and stakeholders. Sociology is being challenged by traditional professions for not being a "real profession", and due to lack of internal agreements as towards what a distinct professional sociological activity was supposed to be, they fail to defend their profession model. Finally, they are forced to give up their specialized study program and align with the hybrid template that political science chose early on.

Thus, the differences between the two local disciplines in concerns and audiences addressed in their reputation management, are most significant in their early formative years, when establishing a professional profile was an entrepreneurial task. The differences of the disciplines, however, suggests that, the dynamics of reputation management is less explained by this stage of development of the local discipline than by the context of their respective larger international disciplines, creating differences in cognitive and cultural situations (Whitley, 1984; Becher, 1989). This has also consequences for how the two local disciplines choose to respond to the expectations of the institutional environment or institutional field they were embedded in.

The effect of this internal cultural disciplinary dynamics is, however, weakening as the years go by. There is a general trend evolving within the university sector that partly explains the development within sociology, and that becomes even more clear as we look into how the two disciplines manage their professional reputation in the period 1996/97 – 2016/17, in the yearly reports/plans and at the websites. The concerns presented becomes more and more standardized in line with the general norms and values of the university. Internationalization, both in terms of student exchange, faculty exchange, research excellence and international

'league tables' are external concerns that come to the forefront, together with increased administrative formalization and professionalization (Ramirez 2006). An important explanation for this homogenization of reputation management approaches, are thus found in the increasing influence of the central organization of the university, posing increasing expectations towards the disciplines in complying with general templates of organization in their reputation management. We thus see a standardization of concerns as well as audiences to be addressed, mainly students on the one hand and the central authorities at the University of Oslo, on the other.

Thus, we find that the dynamics of reputation management is thus contingent upon cultural and cognitive traits as well as institutionalized expectations in the environment. However, we see a clear tendency that the cognitive and cultural traits become less important, while the institutionalized expectations of the environment primarily mediated through the central administration of the university, becomes increasingly dominant in their respective reputational management. This means that the dynamics of reputation management at the operational level of university must be explained and understood on a broader basis than a neoinstitutional one as Carpenter and Krause (2012, 31) suggests when they claim that the important aspect for further exploration within the reputation management field is "how reputational considerations affect administrative behavior in the presence of functional rival agencies engaged in the same set of tasks, yet confronting different institutional incentives and organizational environments". The neo-institutional analysis holds for explaining the selection of concerns and audiences for the later historical period. However, for understanding the dynamics of the earlier period we need to include perspectives able to capture cultural and cognitive features, in order to account for the choices and actions made. This suggests that a neoinstitutional analysis of the dynamics of reputation management should be supplemented with a classical institutional or cultural analysis, in order to reveal the complexity of the dynamics at stake.

Conclusion

In this chapter our aim has been to contribute to the understanding of how the dynamics of reputation management unfolds at the operational level at the university. For both the local disciplines it appears that what the sociologists of science characterize as internal concerns and audiences, are emphasized in the early period, when the two disciplines work to establish themselves as more practically and professionally oriented enterprises. Even though they choose different strategies, both organizations prioritize to position themselves as distinct

enterprises in their reputation management. However, we also find that the local disciplines of sociology and political science at the University of Oslo, embedded in the same social and political context, still display varying concerns as well as cater to different audiences when managing their reputational profile. Thus, we find that the dynamics of reputation management at the local operational level of university disciplines are contingent upon their local institutional environment, but also on their general disciplinary cultural and cognitive traits.

However, in the later period (1996 – 2016) the internal concerns and audiences are replaced by more externally oriented and standardized concerns in line with general institutionalized expectations of being university studies in general (Christensen 2011). Thus, as we move historically from the 1966 to 2016, we also find that the effect of the disciplinary cultural and cognitive traits fades in favor of the local institutional environment and specifically the institutionalized expectations of appearing as organizations, as factors explaining their respective strategies of reputation management.

References

Abbott, A. (1993). The sociology of work and occupations, *Annual Review of Sociology. 19*, 187-209.

Aubert, V. (1985). Om metoder og teori i sosiologien (About methods and theory in sociology). In V. Aubert, *Det skjulte samfunn (The hidden society).* Oslo: Universitetsforlaget.

Bagge, S. (1996). Samfunnsvitenskapenes historie (The history of the social sciences). In *Universitetet i Bergens historie (The history of the University of Bergen)*, no. 2. Bergen: University of Bergen.

Barnes, B. (1974). *Scientific knowledge and sociological theory.* London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.

Becher, T. (1989). *Academic Tribes and Territories.* Milton Keynes: Open University Press.

Bell, D. (1999). *The coming of post-industrial society.* New York: Basic Books

Bergh, T. & Hanisch, T.J. (1984). *Vitenskap og politikk. Linjer i norsk sosialøkonomi gjennom 150 år (Science and politics. Development features in Norwegian national economy during 150 years).* Oslo: Aschehoug.

Bleiklie, I. (ed.) (1996). *Kunnskap og Makt. Norsk høyere utdanning i endring (Knowledge and power. Changes in Norwegian higher education).* LOS series. Oslo: Tano Aschehoug.

Blume, S.S. (1985). After the darkest hour. Integrity and Engagement in the Development of University Research. In B.Wittrock & A.Elzinga (eds.), *The University Research*

System. The public policies of the home of scientists. Stockholm: Almqvist & Wiksell International.

Bourdieu, P. (1988). *Homo Academicus.* Cambridge:Polity Press.

Boys, C.J., Brennan, J., Henkel, M., Kirkland, J., Kogan, M., & Youll, P. (1988). *Higher Education and the Preparation for Work.* London: Jessica Kingsley.

Carpenter, D. (2010) Reputation and Power: Organizational Image and Pharmaceutical Regulation at the FDA. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Carpenter, D. & Krause, G.A. (2012). Reputation and Public Administration. *Public Administration Review 72* (1), 26-32.

Christensen, T. (2011). University governance reforms: potential problems of more autonomy? *Higher Education, 62*(4), 503-517.

Christensen, T. & Gornitzka, Å. (2017). Reputation Management in Complex Environments. A Comparative Study of University Organizations. *Higher Education Policy*, *30*, 123-140.

Christensen, T., Lægreid, P., Roness, P.G., & Røvik, K.A. (2007). *Organization Theory and The Public Sector. Instrument, Culture and Myth.* London and NY: Routledge.

Cohen, M.D., March, J.G & Olsen, J.P. (1972). A Garbage Can Model of Organizational Choice. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, *17* (1),1-25.

Department of Political Science (1965). Innstilling om innføring av embetseksamen i statsvitenskap.26/11-1965. In *SV-fakultetet v/ UiOs arkiv. Diverse: Om embetseksamen III 1948-75*. Oslo The Norwegian State Archive.

Department of Sociology (1965). Innstilling om embetseksamen i sosiologi ved UiO. 2/12-1965. In *SV-fakultetet v/ UiOs arkiv. Diverse: Om embetseksamen II 1958-68.*. Oslo: The Norwegian State Archive.

DiMaggio, P. J., & Powell, W.W. (1983). The Iron Cage Revisited: Institutional Isomorphism and Collective Rationality in Organizational Fields. *American Sociological Review*, *48* (2), 147–160.

Engelstad, F. (1996). Norsk sosiologi siden 1969: problemer og utfordringer (Norwegian sociology since 1969: problems and challenges). *Tidsskrift for samfunnsforskning 37*(2), 224 - 252.

Eulau, H., & March, J.G. (1972). What Political Science is about. In H.Eulau & J.G.March (Eds.) *Political Science.* Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, Inc.

Gibbons, M., Limoges,C., Nowotny,H., Schwartzman,S., & Scott,P. (1994). *The new production of knowledge.* London: Sage Publications.

Giddens, A. (1984). *The Constitution of Society. Cambridge:* Polity Press.

Goffman, E. (1959). *The Presentation of Self in Everyday Life*. New York: Achor Books.

Gouldner, A.W. (1970). *The Coming Crisis of Western Sociology*. New York, London: Basic Books Inc.

Kalleberg, R. (1994). Et fag mellom tradisjon og visjon. Institutt for sosiologi 1963-1993 (A discipline between tradition and vision). In *SV-fakultetet ved Universitetet i Oslo 1963-1993 (Faculty of Social Sciences, University of Oslo, 1963-1993).* Report 13, Oslo:Department of Sociology, University of Oslo.

Klemsdal, L. (2001a). *Visjoner og praksis : en studie av studiereformer i sosiologi og stats-vitenskap ved UiO, 1964-1992 (Vision and practice: a study of educational reforms in sociology and political science).* University of Oslo: Forum for universitetshistorie.

Klemsdal, L. (2001b). Visjoner og praksis: Da sosiologi skulle bli profesjonsstudium i Norge (Vision and practice: when sociology should be a professional education in Norway). *Sosiologisk tidsskrift*, *10*(01), 48-74.

Klemsdal, L. (2013). From Bureaucracy to Learning Organization: Critical Minimum Specification Design as Space for Sensemaking. *Syst Pract Action Res, 26* (1), 39-52.

Kyvik, S., & Skoie, H. (1982). Recent trends in Norwegian higher education. *European Journal of Education, 17*(2), 183-192.

Merton, R.K. (1968). On sociological theories of the middle range. In R. K. Merton, *Social Theory and Social Structure.* (pp.39-72). *New York:* The Free Press.

Ministry of Education (1960). *White Paper on the Expansion of the Universities and Colleges in Norway from The appointed University and College committee* (also called the Kleppe-committee). Oslo: Ministry of Education.

Mjøset, L. (1991). *Kontroverser i norsk sosiologi (Controversies in Norwegian sociology).* Oslo: Universitetsforlaget.

Parsons, T. & Platt, G. M. (1973). *The American University*. Cambride, Mass.: Harvard University Press

Pavalko, R. M. (1971). *Sociology of Occupations and Professions.* Illinois: F. E Peacock Publishers Inc.

Ramirez, F.O. (2006). The Rationalization of the University. In M.-L. Dejelic & K. Sahlin-Anderson (Eds.). *Transnational Governance: Institutional Dynamics of Regulation.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press

Rokkan, S. (1972). Statsvitenskap og political science. In *Nordisk håndbok i Bibliotek-kunnskap*. Oslo: Universitetsforlaget.

Selznick, P. (1949). *TVA and the Grass Roots.* Berkeley: University of California Press.

Selznick, P. (1957). *Leadership in Administration*. New York: Harper & Row.

Thue, F.W. (1997). Statsvitenskapen 50 år - et kapittel av norsk samfunnsvitenskaps historie (Political Science 50 years – a chapter of the history of social sciences). *Norsk statsvitenskapelig tidsskrift*, *3*(13): 187-214.

Weick, K. E. (1995). *Sensemaking in Organizations.* Thousand Oaks: SAGE.

Whitley, R. (1984). *The Intellectual and Social Organization of the Sciences*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Wæraas, A., & Maor, M. (2015). Understanding Organizational Reputation in a Public Sector Context. In A. Wæraas & M. Maor (Eds.). Organizational Reputation in the Public Sector, New York: Routledge.