Boundary work and normativity in research communication across time

Mette Andersson[1]

Department of Sociology and Human Geography, University of Oslo, Norway

This paper looks at how research communication in Norwegian migration and diversity research has changed over time. The main themes in the analysis are researchers' motivations to enter the field and their experiences of, and reactions to, critique from colleagues and other audiences. Theory about credibility contests and boundary work on the interface of the academia and media, along with ideas about explicit and implicit normativity, inform the analysis. A main conclusion is that, as the field has matured, contests over normativity have changed from internal contests over implicit normativity to external charges of explicit normativity. The empirical analysis builds on 31 interviews with Norwegian researchers about their experiences of, and views on, public research communication in newspapers, social media, radio, TV and face-to-face panel debates. The interviewed researchers are of different age, gender, and ethnicity and they work in 10 different universities and research institutes across Norway.

Introduction

How do researchers in a politically contested research field like migration and diversity practice and reflect on research communication? And, how does normativity relate to researchers' motivations and their public identities as academic experts? These questions invite broader debates about changes in the public sphere and the role of public intellectuals and scientific experts therein.

Migration and diversity research is a relatively young and increasingly important research field in Europe, covering the social and humanistic sciences. The research field has been characterized by its applied and interdisciplinary nature, by contributing to heated public debate and by being normatively loaded (Bommes and Thränhardt 2010; Bommes and

---

[1] Mette Andersson, mette.andersson@sosgeo.uio.no

Morawska 2005a). In this paper, I interpret the media, the academy and politics as distinct social fields marked by different rules, status hierarchies and ideals for how researchers should act. Recent commercial, technological and ideological changes in mass media and journalism, and the increasing relevance of social media as a research communication platform, represent important changes which influence communication and the reception of research knowledge. Research communication further depends on reward systems and expectations towards researchers from academic institutions and political authorities. In Norway, where this study is located, informing the public about research is one of three pillars defining the duties of regular academic staff (alongside research and teaching) (Kalleberg, 2016).

Much research on the science-public interface has focused on research communication in politically contested research areas such as genetics, epidemics and climate, and on the relationship between scientists and different publics. Such studies have, with a few exceptions (see, e.g., Lamont [2009]; Camic, Gross and Lamont [2011], Danell, Larsson & Wesselgren 2013), focused on the natural and life sciences. There has been some recent research on the reception of migration research in Europe (cf. Boswell, 2009; Boswell, Geddes & Scholten, 2011, Jørgensen, 2011). This research has provided valuable knowledge about how politicians and bureaucrats relate to evidence from migration research and on how national traditions concerning research-politics relations vary. This paper adds to this research by exploring migration and diversity researchers' own experiences and reflections on research communication to different audiences.

The two questions in the introduction are answered by the use of data from qualitative interviews with Norwegian migration and diversity researchers. Different positions in earlier debates among researchers and variety across academic institutions, ages and media experiences were the central criteria for the sampling of potential interviewees. The potential interviewees were first phoned and asked if they would contribute to the study and later sent an email describing the purpose of the research and the thematic interview guide. Three of the contacted researchers were not interested in participation, and were replaced by others who wanted to take part. The interviews were informed by a thematic interview guide focusing on five wide themes: researcher career and choice of research theme; experiences with dissemination in mass media (as source, op-ed article author or debate participant); reactions from discipline and research field colleagues to one's dissemination; reactions to one's dissemination from other citizens or groups; and opinions on one's role as researcher and

societal responsibility. The interviewees were asked to describe concrete practices and experiences, formulated in questions like, 'What do you do when journalists call?'

Altogether 31 qualitative thematic interviews with migration scholars in 10 Norwegian academic institutions, four universities and six research institutes were conducted in autumn 2013, lasting between 1½ and 3 hours each. The number of interviewees constituted approximately a quarter of the migration and diversity research community at the time of interviewing. The sample stretches from publicly well-known professors who have made their career in the field to younger PhD-students and researchers with less time spent in this research field. All interviewees have experiences with dissemination to mass media. The age of the interviewees ranged from early 30s to mid-80s, and their disciplinary background spanned social anthropology, sociology, political science, economy, social geography, history and ethnology. The gender composition of the sample is 17 women and 14 men, and three of the 31 interviewees had an ethnic minority background. Due to anonymity concerns, the quotes in this article are not identified in terms of workplace, gender, age or names. Anonymity concerns also prevent me from linking interview data about experiences of specific events and attacks to media stories and social media debates about the same episodes.

After a section on some characteristics of migration research, a theoretical introduction to boundary work and normativity in social science follows. The next part of the article looks at researchers' motivations for entering this specific research field, focusing on common traits and different forms of argumentation. Following this, the lens of boundary work and normativity is used to analyze credibility contests between Norwegian migration researchers and vis-à-vis the media and different audiences. In the conclusion, the results are framed within a broader discussion of normativity in politically sensitive areas.

Norwegian migration research

The Norwegian development of migration and diversity research resembles the general pattern of development of research in this field in Europe (Bommes and Morawska 2005a). From the start it was financed by political authorities in need of knowledge. The field had low academic status and most research was of an applied nature. In Norway, as in the UK, anthropologists came earlier to the field than in several other countries (Schönwalder 2010; Small and Solomos 2006; Morawska 2005). However, Norway is similar to the rest of Europe in that, after 2000, migration and diversity increasingly became recognized as interesting and 'hot' topics in most social science disciplines.

Migration research was from its beginnings in Europe associated with normativity and with blurring the boundary between politics and science (Bommes & Tränhardt 2010; Schönwälder 2010; Freeman 2005). This was also the case in Norway, marking internal discussions between researchers and the research-public interface more generally. Critique of research for being politically correct or allied to various political positions has been raised both in academic conferences and academic publications, and not least through reviews and op-ed articles in mass-media outlets throughout the 1990s and the early 2000s (Brochmann 2011, 209-223; Andersson 2005, 5-11; Hagelund 2004, 9-11; Lithman 2004).

In this period certain researchers and research groups at universities and research institutes were accused of only studying the exclusionary aspects of Norwegian politics, public debate and cultural traditions and focusing exclusively on themes such as marginalization, racism, and Otherness. Others were accused of only prioritizing intra-ethnic networks among minorities or immigrants' traditional cultures and focusing on themes such as patriarchy, gender roles and restrictive religious repertoires. Such distinctions, in some instances, crosscut research groups and disciplines, making internal co-operation, as well as taking independent positions, difficult. Characterizations of researchers as being 'advocates for the state' or 'advocates for immigrants' started to be applied in this period.

This climate troubled some of the young researchers entering the field, as was the case with one of my interviewees who argues that 'it felt incredibly tough to be in the field at that time.' This researcher describes the field in the late 1990s and immediately after the millennium as marked by 'ditchdiggers' and 'border guards', as well as by general cowardice among most researchers. Another researcher entering the field in the same period says that 'when you opened your mouth, you were put in a position'. Such polarization is not unusual in science more generally, but in a research area marked by political and public contention, and in young or new fields challenging established disciplinary traditions, the stakes may be higher.

The tense public debate around migration and diversity is, as we shall see later, also a central motivation for many of the researchers in the field. For all the researchers I interviewed dissemination and sharing to wider publics is seen as an essential part of the researcher role, whether they formulate this as a duty, a responsibility, or a component of a wider societal contract. This finding supports earlier research suggesting that Norway, compared with many other countries, has a relatively strong tradition of research dissemination in printed media, radio and orally as well with the aim of reaching specific

professions, users more generally, bureaucrats and politicians (Kalleberg 2016; Andersen and Hornmoen 2011; Kyvik 2005; Eide 1992).

Boundary work and normativity

Thomas Gieryn (1999) aligns the territory of science with the territory constructed by geographical maps. Based on several case studies of famous historical scientific debates, he argues that the concepts 'credibility contest', 'epistemic authority' and 'boundary work' are central to understanding how science relates to the wider public, and how scientists compete with each other in addressing similar and different audiences or publics. Mass media and cyberspace are according to him 'fat with credibility contests' where 'experts bearing science are enlisted everywhere to defend all sides and all opinions with putatively objective, reliable, and accurate facts' (Gieryn 1999, 2). Paradoxically such credibility contests work to strengthen the epistemic authority of science, as science is the valid reference for contesting claims from opposing parties.

According to Gieryn (1999, 15-18), credibility contests among researchers and over research more generally divide into three genres, each an occasion for different types of boundary work. The first genre is 'expulsion' defining a contest between rival authorities each of whom claims to be scientific. In credibility contests within the 'expulsion' genre, boundary work is characterized by scientists aiming to demarcate 'real science' from 'not-so real science'. Boundary work is here internal to the scientific community but plays out on a wider public arena. The pitting of orthodox science against heterodox, mainstream against fringe, established against revolutionary, are typical examples of this type of boundary work. The main issue at stake here is who properly belongs inside and who inhabits the fringes of the scientific community. My argument is that such credibility contests are also contests over *implicit normativity* in research fields. They are competitions between researchers holding different epistemological and ontological perspectives, which further privilege specific normative horizons.

The second genre of credibility contest characterizes situations where two or more rival epistemic authorities square off for jurisdictional control over a contested ontological domain. Gieryn labels this genre of credibility contest 'expansion' and exemplifies the type of boundary work related to it with cases where science is compared to or mixed with other forms of knowledge based on, for instance, religion, politics, ethics or common sense. The

main issue at stake in this type of boundary work is to distinguish science from non-science and from other less relevant sources of knowledge.

The third and last form of credibility contest concerns the 'protection of autonomy' from scientists exposed to efforts from outside powers to exploit their authority in ways that compromise their material and symbolic resources inside the scientific community. One example of this genre of credibility contest is the reaction of scientists confronted with legislators or corporate managers seeking to make science a handmaiden to political or market ambitions. Another example is the boundary work of scientists in situations when mass media take upon themselves the task of distinguishing genuine scientific knowledge from putatively less responsible claims.

Credibility contests of the expansion and protection of autonomy type highlight the position of science as the most objective and truest form of knowledge. The question of normativity is here *explicit* in the comparison of scientific knowledge with political knowledge, common sense knowledge, or religious knowledge. So, whereas expulsion contests are battles over the implicit normativity of different positions within research fields, the two other types of credibility contests are struggles over the explicit normativity of science. In the latter types of boundary work, scientists work, for instance, to defend science from accusations of politicized research and undue pressure from politicians, activists and others interested in specific research results. The parties in these contests can be social scientists alone, but more often also include politicians, journalists, social movement groups, and laypersons.

On another and more general note, sociologist Andrew Abbott (2015) uses a drawing on a wall as an example to illustrate the difference between empirical and normative statements in social science. To state that there is a drawing on the wall is to give an empirical statement. To state that this drawing is a piece of graffiti, a piece of art, an expression of vandalism or a sign of youth resistance or deviance, is to make a normative statement. The categorization of the drawing depends on viewpoint, on a mix of theoretical and normative grounds. It is generally agreed that some scientific perspectives have a clearer normative grounding than others – for example Marxism and feminism – but also putatively neutral concepts and theories may be associated with specific political content when communicated to different publics.

The history of the scientific concept 'multiculturalism' illustrates the varying normative connotations of a concept over time, and across science/media/politics boundaries. In the 1990s, the concept of multiculturalism was typically understood and used as a concept

defining governmental policy towards minorities in countries with old ethnic groups or/and new immigrant-based minority groups (Kymlicka 1995). The concept pointed to a policy where distinct minority rights in areas such as religion, ethnicity, language and school curricula were supposed to secure democracy and to balance the power of the majority to decide through sheer force of numbers. A fierce intra-academic debate over the concept of multiculturalism in the 1990s resulted in the coining of alternative concepts such as 'everyday multiculturalism', 'critical multiculturalism', and 'liberal multiculturalism' (see for example Goldberg 1994). With Gieryn we could characterize this debate as a credibility contest within the expulsion genre. Boundary work was carried out internally, pitting different academic parties and concepts against each other. A mix of normative and descriptive arguments characterized this debate over the implicit normativity of the research field.

In the 2000s, and specifically in the aftermath of 9/11, the concept of multiculturalism was, however, met by increasing critique from areas outside social science (Titley and Lentin 2011). It now increasingly came to be associated with an apologetic, politically correct and naïve position towards the integration of immigrants. This critique of the scientific concept, thus illustrates the second genre of credibility contest, expansion, where science is compared to other knowledge claims, here politics and common sense. Politicians from both right-wing and more moderate parties accused social scientists and other politicians using this concept of being normative, naïve and not 'realistic enough' with regard to the future of migration and diversity within Europe. The result of this explicit normative critique of a scientific concept and its associated policy is that few academics now insist on using it, although they argue that diversity policies seen as multiculturalist in the 1990s not have changed greatly since 2001.

Motivations for migration research

There is yet little international research on why researchers become attracted to the field of migration and diversity research in the first place. What we do know, from research based in specific countries such as France and Germany is that this research field had low status when it first started at universities and research institutes (Amiraux and Simon 2006, Bommes and Morawska 2005b). With the Norwegian interviewees entering the field from the mid-1970s until recently, motivations for engaging with migration and diversity research naturally vary somewhat over time – according, for instance, to the marginality of the field in the early days and its increasing centrality over the years. In the mid-1980s, for example, a period where research in this field was still minimal, one researcher was advised against writing a master's

thesis on migration. Her supervisor argued that migration was 'extremely special', and that a choice of this theme for the master's thesis would close her future career possibilities within the Academy. Although a few state that they entered the field almost 'by accident' (the availability of research funds etc.), it is poignant that most argue that their interest for the field relates to its centrality in public debate and politics. Such an argument is found across the material, from researchers who invented the field in Norway to researchers who recently entered it.

The difference between generations of researchers relates primarily to how they experienced the debate in the field, and further to how such debate influenced their own scientific disciplines and/or host institutions. One of the first sociologists doing research on labour migrants in the 1970s describes her experience as a pioneer in the field as 'overwhelming'. She recalls a huge demand for research-based knowledge among politicians, professional workers and mass media, along with an equally huge demand for help from the migrants themselves. She also states that few of her research colleagues understood what she was involved in, referring to a lack of knowledge on the theme and to specific challenges stemming from doing fieldwork with newly-arrived male workers who did not speak Norwegian. Inspired by action research, a research approach that influenced several Norwegian social science settings in the 1970s, this researcher describes her motivation as 'curiosity-driven' and marked by a dual motivation to understand human issues and to spur the authorities to develop better policy in the field.

Arguments that migration and diversity were 'new and exciting', 'in the time', or possessed 'societal relevance' are, as mentioned above, typical in stories about the general, more abstract reasons for doing research in this field. Researchers who only point at this type of general reasons differ from researchers who also add personal and more concrete motives among the reasons for why they become interested in the field. The first type of researchers, those who only stress general, abstract reasons for engagement, can for example point at the urgent need to acquire correct knowledge in order to facilitate evidence-based policy development as a central motive. These researchers also often stress their aim to be neutral and objective, and they may dismiss particular other researchers, and even whole disciplines, as normative, politically engaged, and not thoroughly balanced. Thus, their retrospective motivation stories are shot through with their opinions about other researchers in the field, and illustrate internal academic credibility contests related to trustworthiness vis-à-vis external audiences. They typically argue that the field of migration research is too normatively loaded,

and they stress that this research field is more important to society than to themselves privately.

Although the interviewees agree about several of the general reasons to engage in migration research (e.g. new and exciting field, important for future), many also add motivations closer to personal experience. Several of the interviewed researchers had experience with various forms of political and civil society engagement prior to their choice of migration and diversity as a research field. Many were engaged in international questions and some had an initial interest in development studies. A few had been engaged in party politics, and some in student politics. Some – notably the youngest researchers – also had experience from work in asylum centres or as refugee consultants, and some were interested in the field because they had friends who had migrated or they had been migrants themselves.

Some tell about their own difficult experience from being a stranger in a foreign country or their frustration stemming from working within the immigration authorities as major reasons for entering this research field:

> I experienced myself how it was to be a stranger and an immigrant. I grew up as an expat child in another country. So, in a way, I think I know how it is to be different and have another religion.

> I was sincerely engaged in the fate of these people. I was frustrated about the categorical way of thinking in the state department.

Other interviewees tell about how this research field engages them in an existential and emotional sense and that this makes it hard to be neutral:

> You work with something that touches, it is a nerve there making it feel important to write. I believe many are driven by this – they get very touched.

> I don't think you choose this field if you don't have an engagement from the very start.

The last quote here – 'have an engagement from the very start' – indirectly refers to that most researchers have a personal engagement in migration and diversity issues. As described above, some do not seem to have this type of personal engagement as they give only general utility-oriented reasons for their engagement, and are critical to researchers they think have a

biased approach to research. Among the researchers who do stress experience-near reasons, however, there is agreement that working on themes not considered meaningful on a private level is less attractive. These researchers admit that it is very hard to keep the descriptive and the normative dimensions in their work apart, but that they aim to do decent research and to follow the established methodological and ethical principles anchored in their respective disciplines and perspectives. A third group state openly that they have political motives for doing research in this field, but that their political motives not are allowed to interfere with their researcher handicraft. Such researchers may deny the possibility of having a non-normative perspective in this field, and are skeptical of researchers who claim a universal perspective, or a perspective from nowhere. They state that you have to be clear about your theoretical and normative position in order to do good research.

Across the different attitudes to whether or not social science should be normatively guided, and to what degree – and perhaps even enlivened by such debates – some point out that this field is specifically intellectually rewarding. They relate this both to hard theoretical challenges and to normative issues such as the potential to harm minorities or other parties through their own research.

> It is difficult. There is always another angle. One more way to look at it, one other argument somewhere, so it never adds. It is exciting, right, both because it is intellectually terribly difficult, and also because there is a moral obligation here. And those two issues don't always talk nicely to each other, that is the normative and the descriptive.

> It is a difficult and therefore incredibly interesting field.

> Why I have continued with research in this field, it is because….yes I admit it, I am attracted to somewhat controversial research themes. Because I feel they are so sharpening. You cannot just, like if I had thrown a comment I did not have backing for, I definitely would have heard it.

Researchers coming from other fields of research into migration and diversity research stress the political attention given to these issues in general public debate and specifically to the dissemination of research findings. They describe this field as different from other fields they have worked in, and also different from other research fields concerning politicized subjects such as climate research. The existential dimension of migration and diversity is emphasized:

I hear people compare the immigration debate with the climate debate, and it does not fit quite well, because climate researchers are not faced with the same threats and the same hate as migration researchers, where the hate is very existential and often very personal. So you find yourself somewhere between a public sphere not always liking what you have to say and on the other side academia where the tendency is to keep your path clean and not dirty yourself with societal engagement, often with a normative side to it.

As this last quote illustrates well, migration researchers must manage boundary work vis-à-vis colleagues and vis-à-vis other publics. Both of these types of boundary work are challenging, and there are overlaps between them. Cognitive and behavioral research shows that people tend to seek out information, including scientific results that 'fit' with their own pre-formed opinions. As shown, Norwegian migration and diversity researchers are well aware of the difficult balance between facts and values, or between the descriptive and the normative, in their field. Some are even attracted to the field because of this challenging task. Internal boundary struggles, credibility contests of the expulsion type, typically centre on the normative dimension. Researchers may describe each other as "too normative" – meaning too left-bent – or as "upholding objectivity as ideal yet disclosing normative positions". Such internal characteristics may overlap with the labelling of researchers as either working for the state or for immigrants. They are expressions of boundary work related to implicit normativity in the research field.

Boundary work in research communication

The two quotes below illustrate experience-based views on how normativity sticks to research communication to external audiences:

What is important to consider concerning the intersections or the boundary surfaces between research and the public sphere, is that we are continuously within such boundary surfaces and that nothing we do is morally neutral.

If you think you will be treated as a researcher out there in the big public space, you are in a way missing something. In the political picture everything said or written is controversial – black and white. If you don't manage to relate to that, you cannot go on stating things publicly. The larger breakthrough you make, the tougher it is.

These quotes stand out as examples of the attitudes of those who most often participate in public debate, write op-ed articles and comment on radio and television. The awareness that the boundary between social science and public debate easily becomes blurred and politicized when science enters public debate, is based on a wide experience and a willingness to take the risk of participating in public debate. Both of the researchers cited here have received hate-mail, anonymous post-cards, and threats of various sorts. Researchers who are very careful not to say anything beyond their very specific research expertise (out of different reasons), and who closely monitor their public texts for any normative message, more seldom experience this. But also within this category, if research results contradict certain opinions or political attitudes, attacks may come.

As described above, one researcher experienced that her wish to do research on migration in the 1980s was met with doubt about the possibility of pursuing an academic career within this theme. Colleagues viewed it with skepticism. Some of the pioneers in the field recall that others saw their work as politically motivated. Other indicators of what Gieryn terms expulsion contests among researchers in that period and later are blurred or restrictive messages from colleagues and/or the leadership of one's department about what one could or could not say publicly about migration. Although the most usual stories about reactions from colleagues on one's research communication is that they stay silent or give support, researchers who were active in the 1990s and early 2000s report harsher and more frequent criticism in that period compared with today. In the early period of Norwegian migration research, some researchers were exposed to ostracism by colleagues at their work-place and branded as activists or 'politicians'.

Such exclusion is on a general note often related to the fact that the theme one writes about is new, gets funding, is seen by others as difficult to relate to (for instance racism or Islam), or as breaking with, criticizing or challenging established theoretical perspectives in the field. One researcher explains that his experience of this was 'probably due to that the field at the time wasn't mature enough for research on such a controversial issue'. When the leadership of his home institution in addition started to draw attention to his political past, this researcher decided to continue his academic career within other research fields. Another researcher explains how a similar experience of being 'frozen out' made her stop disseminating from this research field. Although stories of ostracism here being the strong case, and stories about blurred messages about what one could or could not say about migration publicly a weaker one, both cases exemplify internal boundary work and contests over the implicit normativity of the research field.

Academics are used to internal critique, but accusations of having a political motivation beyond improving society based on research, can be crushing, especially for early-career researchers. Accusations of politicized research are, in essence, claims about an unhealthy expansion of social science, or about explicit normativity. Credibility contests of the 'expansion' genre compare scientific knowledge to other forms of knowledge. Here, science is on trial due to accusations of an explicit inclusion of, mixing with, or cooperation with, specific political parties, common sense perspectives or research subjects. Examples of this type of credibility contest are accusations of taking party lines and being normative on behalf of the group one studies. In these situations, as one researcher describes: 'you have to break down so many thoughts before you start building up. You talk and talk, but you are not heard'. The boundary work vis-à-vis- audiences is here determined by how the same audiences view specific themes, but also in some cases, how they view entire disciplines and research networks.

Across the material, migration researchers from the discipline of social anthropology report credibility contests of the expulsion type and accusations of expanding science to other domains more often than their colleagues from other disciplinary backgrounds do. When asked to comment on their experience with interdisciplinary research, a few researchers from other disciplines say they regard social anthropologists as among 'the least objective' in the research field. Typically, they argue that a relativist perspective marks out this discipline, further implying a tendency among anthropologists to identify too closely with the subjects under study. Thus, from this perspective, anthropologists come out as heterodox when compared with normal science and guilty of expanding science to other areas. Some anthropologists answer such accusations by counter-accusations – that others misunderstand their approach, or think that it is possible to work from a 'nowhere' approach. More typical, however, is to state that they make a strong effort to distance themselves from such normative connotations, and some explicitly criticize a position that can be construed as taking the voice of one's study subjects. In this connection, it is noteworthy that Norwegian anthropologists have been central internationally in debating the link between social science and normativity, and in developing a debate on the public usefulness of academic knowledge (Bangstad 2017; Howell 2010; Eriksen 2006).

The boundary work involved in research communication is also constrained by concerns over assumed neutrality from the perspective of prospective commissioners of research in the future. Most interviewees argue, for instance, that being a member of a political party is problematic for how others view their researcher role. After the internet

revolution, with the rise of web-papers with anonymous comments, social media and websites and blogs centred on anti-immigration and/or anti-Islam messages, this has become even more relevant, as researchers are easily searchable. One researcher explains that he once was accused of being the chief ideologist of a leftist political party and that a Norwegian MP accused him of conscious cheating with the data. His actual political career was restricted to being a deputy leader of a party in a part of a city in the mid-1980s.

> [..] and to what degree one then should shun all political activity in order to remain trustworthy, I don't know. Anyway, I can't shun away from my political activity back in the '80s.

Many researchers have been accused of being politically driven, either from people seeing their position as linked to the left, or as linked to the right, or in some cases both. When such critique comes out in printed mass-media, for instance from op-ed piece writers associating themselves with one of the polarities in the migration debate, or by being exposed by journalists on front pages or in large articles in the nationwide printed press, it is experienced as tough. When it comes out as anonymous comments in web-papers, or in specific web-sites and blogs for activist groups, it is experienced as less serious. After the mass murder in Oslo on the 22nd of July 2011, however, such outing tended to be seen as more serious, especially if one's name had been placed on so-called 'traitor lists' on web-pages and could be spread to other sites. It is their children that the researchers worry about most, a worry that intensifies for those who have received post-cards or mails with expressions such as 'we know where you live'.

The last genre of credibility contest described by Gieryn is 'protection of autonomy' from scientists exposed to efforts from outside powers to exploit their authority in ways that compromise the material and the symbolic resources of scientists inside the scientific community. A relevant issue here is when other parties use researchers as truth witnesses for the core claims of right-wing populist parties or fundamentalist movements of different sorts. Accusations of exploiting one's scientific expertise and taking the much broader role of a public intellectual comprise another relevant issue. Colleagues, citizens in general, and opinionated pundits can all draw attention to what they see as misuse of scientific expertise, which harms individual scientists' reputation and the general reputation of social science. A third relevant dimension in this type of boundary work is interaction with journalists and media who, according to researchers, not always accept their academic autonomy and/or

misuse their autonomy. This relates, for instance, to weak practices of quote correction, which almost all interviewees demand, but also to sudden changes of headlines or lead paragraphs at the newspaper desks. It also covers the earlier mentioned examples where researchers are branded as politicized on front-pages or in the commentary sections of newspapers. A fourth dimension is when funders of research try to restrict publication and demand corrections in research reports; an experience that some of the research institute-based researchers have had.

In different periods of the development of the Norwegian migration and diversity research field, certain disciplines dominated in setting the agenda for relevant issues and research questions. In Norway, social anthropology was the discipline that most shaped early research on migration. In the 1990s the major debates between migration researchers were between social anthropologists who disagreed strongly about how migration research should be pursued (Fuglerud 2001, 130-142). Later, social anthropologists became more exposed to critiques from other researchers and from funding agencies for being partisan and expanding science into the political domain. Apart from the rise and fall of certain disciplines and certain researchers, a general finding is that researchers entering this field in its early days were more exposed to threats of expulsion than researchers entering it later on.

Conclusion: from implicit to explicit normativity contests

The empirical analyses of motivation and of researchers' boundary work in communication illustrate the normative labels attached to researchers, and often to the research field itself. They show that some researchers are very motivated by what they see as a difficult interaction of the normative and the empirical in this research field, while others find the field too normatively loaded, or conversely, too constrained by objectivity or neutrality. The analyses also show that to some researchers, the choice of migration as a field is more personal and/or political than to others. These different attitudes are interpreted as contests over the implicit normativity of the research field.

The 1990s and early 2000s were a period of credibility contests between researchers who accused each other of normativity or being advocates for different parties in the wider migration debate. A polarized research milieu overlapped with an increasingly polarized public debate. In this period, the implicit normativity of the research field; the normative attachments to different themes and theoretical perspectives, was widely mediatized. Competing perspectives on diversity and migration within the Academy became visible to outsiders who often interpreted the internal researcher conflicts as expressions of the explicit

normativity of party politics and political cleavages in wider society. As the field of migration and diversity research matured, and became established in the universities and in the wider research milieu, boundary work within the Academy became more relaxed and more aligned with the regular boundary work of everyday researcher life. Meanwhile interaction with other publics outside the academy became more challenging. The Internet revolution, with anonymous comments on several websites and forums for anti-immigration as well as pro-immigration activists, made many researchers hesitate to go public with controversial research results. This situation became worse after the 22nd of July 2011, when Breivik killed in the name of anti-Islam and anti-political correctness. Although web-based critique of migration and diversity research at this point was common knowledge among researchers, they now became more concerned about the potential spread of their names to people who could turn threats into actual violence.

Rumours about threats and harsh verbal attacks against other researchers may lead many to think twice about whether to reply to journalists, and in what way. What can be characterized as an increased awareness of the personal consequences of disseminating to the general public also relates to what many see as a tendency to trigger polarized debate on the part of the political and debate editors of major newspapers. Demands, for example, that researchers take positions in ongoing political debates if they want to be published are a sign of explicit normativity pushing researchers into 'protection of autonomy' stances.

As the field has matured, the boundary work within the Academy has become more relaxed, and threats of expulsion and battles over implicit normativity less frequent (see also Midtbøen 2017). Internal conflicts over normative issues still exist, but they do not dominate researchers' everyday activity any longer. The boundary work vis-à-vis mass and social media, by contrast, has become tenser, and accompanied by suspicion and attacks from outside parties against migration researchers for being explicitly normative.

These developments, which relate to the increase in political attention to migration and diversity, the normalization of migration and diversity as an academic research area, and to the spread of the internet, demand that we think more about how we can reach people with our results and support each other in our communication efforts. The trustworthiness of scientific knowledge from the migration and diversity field depends on researchers who insist on the nuances of empirical research and who distance themselves from black-white thinking and a naive insistence on absolute objectivity. The fact that scholars have different theoretical and methodological lenses that in the next turn lead to different thematic priorities and sometimes to different empirical results should be communicated to audiences. This is part of

everyday life in most academic areas, and we must communicate this to avoid faulty accusations of politicization. Building solidarity networks to support fellow researchers exposed to hate and threats, and to stimulate further discussion about the relationship between research and its reception are other potential strategies to aid communication. In times where rightwing populism and extremism win terrain by criticizing migrants, minorities and their religions, it is essential that nuanced migration and diversity research is represented in public and political debate.

Aknowledgements

References

Amiraux, Valérie, and Patrick Simon. 2006. "There are no Minorities Here. Cultures of Scholarship and Public Debate on Immigrants and Integration in France". *International Journal of Comparative Sociology* 47 (3-4): 191-215.

Andersen, Elisabeth K. and Harald Hornmoen. 2011."Mediating science in Norway: practices and transformations in major newspapers". *Media Transformations* 5: 88-104. doi: http://hdl.handle.net/10642/1026

Andersson, Mette. 2005. *Urban multi-culture in Norway. Identity formation among immigrant youth.* Lewiston: Edwin Mellen Press.

Bangstad, Sindre, ed. 2017. *Anthropology In Our Times: From A Series In Public Anthropology.* London: Palgrave.

Bank, Roland and Dirk Lehmkuhl. 2005. "Law and Politics and Migration Research: On the Potential and Limits of Interdisciplinarity". In *International Migration Research. Constructions, Omissions and the Promises of Interdisciplinarity,* edited by Michael Bommes and Ewa Morawska, 155-178. Surrey: Ashgate.

Bommes, Michael and Ewa Morawska, eds. 2005a. *International Migration Research. Constructions, Omissions and the Promises of Interdisciplinarity.* Surrey: Ashgate.

Bommes, Michael and Ewa Morawska. 2005b. "Introduction". In *International Migration Research. Constructions, Omissions and the Promises of Interdisciplinarity*, edited by Michael Bommes and Ewa Morawska, 1-18. Surrey: Ashgate.

Bommes, Michael and Dietrich Thränhardt. 2010. "Introduction: National Paradigms of Migration Research". In *National Paradigms of Migration Research*, edited by Dietrich Tränhardt and Michael Bommes, 9-41. Osnabrück: V&R unipress Universitätsverlag Osnabrück.

Boswell, Christina. (2009). "Knowledge, Legitimation and the Politics of Risk: The Functions of Research in Public Debates on Migration". *Political Studies* 57 (1): 165–186.

Boswell, Christina, Andrew Geddes and Peter Scholten. (2011). "The Role of Narratives in Migration Policy-Making: A Research Framework". *The British Journal of Politics and International Relations* 13 (1): 1–11.

Brochmann, Grete. 2011. "Citizenship and Welfare in the Norwegian Nation State. The Immigration Challenge". In *Welfare citizenship and welfare nationalism*, edited by Andrzej M. Suszycki, 193-226. Helsinki: NordWel Studies in Historical Welfare State Research 2.

Burawoy, Michael. 2005. "2004 American Sociological Association presidential address: For Public Sociology". *The British Journal of Sociology* 56 (3): 417-432.

Camic, Charles, Neil Gross, and Michèle Lamont, eds. 2011. *Social knowledge in the making*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

Danell, Richard, Anna Larsson, and Per Wesselgren, eds. 2013. *Social Science in Context. Historical, Sociological, and Global Perspectives.* Lund: Nordic Academic Press.

Eide, Martin, ed. 1992. *Til Oppslag. Samfunnsvitenskap, forskningsformidling og massekommunikasjon*. Oslo: Noras.

Entzinger, Han and Peter Scholten. 2013. "The Interplay of Knowledge Production and Policymaking. A Comparative Analysis of Research and Policymaking on Migrant Integration in Germany and the Netherlands". *Journal of Comparative Policy Analysis: Research and Practice.* Doi: 10.1080/13876988.2013.834674.

Eriksen, Thomas Hylland. 2006. *Engaging Anthropology. The Case for a Public Presence*. London: Bloomsburt Academic.

Essed, Philomina and Kwame Nimako. 2006. "Designs and (Co)Incidents. Cultures of Scholarship and Public Policy on Immigrants/Minorities in the Netherlands". *International Journal of Comparative Sociology* 47 (3-4): 281-312.

Fuglerud, Øivind. 2001. *Migrasjonsforståelse. Flytteprosesser, rasisme og globalisering.* Oslo: Universitetsforlaget.

Gieryn, Thomas F. 1999. *Cultural Boundaries of Science: Credibility on the Line*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

Goldberg, David Theo, ed. 1994. *Multiculturalism: A Critical Reader.* Oxford: Blackwell.

Grosfoguel, Ramón and Eric Mielants. 2006. "Introduction. Minorities, Racism and Cultures of Scholarship". *International Journal of Comparative Sociology* 47 (3-4): 179-189.

Hagelund, Anniken. 2004. "Anstendighetens utside: 'Rasisme' i norsk innvandringspolitisk diskurs". *Tidsskrift for samfunnsforskning* 45 (1): 3-29.

Halfmann, Jost. 2005. "Challenges to Theoretical Concepts of Political Sociology". In *International Migration Research. Constructions, Omissions and the Promises of Interdisciplinarity*, edited by Michael Bommes and Ewa Morawska, 129-154. Surrey: Ashgate.

Howell, Signe. 2010. "Norwegian Academic Anthropologists in Public Spaces". *Current Anthropology* 51 (S2): S269-S277.

Jørgensen, Martin Bak. 2011. "Understanding the Research-Policy Nexus in Denmark and Sweden: The Field of Migration and Integration". *The British Journal of Politics & International Relations* 13 (1): 93-109.

Kalleberg, Ragnvald. 2016. "The Role of Public Intellectual in the Role-Set of an Academic". In *Knowledge for Whom? Public Sociology in the Making*, edited by Christian Fleck and Andreas Hess, 253-274. London: Ashgate.

Kymlicka, Will. 1995. *Multicultural Citizenship.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Kyvik, Svein. 2005. "Popular Science Publishing and Contributions to Public Discourse among University Faculty". *Science Communication* 26 (3): 288-311.

Lamont, Michèle. 2009. *How Professors Think. Inside the Curious World of Academic Judgment*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Lithman, Yngve. 2004. "When researchers disagree. Epistemology, multiculturalism, universities and the state". *Ethnicities* 4 (2): 155-184.

Løvhaug, Johannes W. 2011: "Overlæreren i rampelyset: Universitetet i mediesamfunnet 1970-2011. In *Universitetet i Oslo: Samtidshistoriske perspektiver. Bind 7*, edited by John P. Collett et.al., 367-509. Oslo: Unipub.

Midtbøen, Arnfinn. 2017. "Innvandringshistorie som faghistorie: kontroverser i norsk migrasjonsforskning». *Nytt Norsk Tidsskrift* 34 (2): 130-149.

Morawska, Ewa. 2005. "The Sociology and History of Immigration: Reflections of a Practitioner". In *International Migration Research. Constructions, Omissions and the Promises of Interdisciplinarity*, edited by Michael Bommes and Ewa Morawska, 203-242. Surrey: Ashgate.

Schönwälder, Karen. 2010. "Beyond the Race Relations Model: Old Patterns and New Trends in Britain". In *National Paradigms of Migration Research,* edited by Dietrich Tränhardt and Michael Bommes, 109-126. Osnabrück: V&R unipress Universitätsverlag Osnabrück.

Small, Steven and Johns Solomos. 2006. "Race, Immigration and Politics in Britain. Changing Policy Agendas and Conceptual Paradigms 1940s-2000s". *International Journal of Comparative Sociology* 47 (3-4): 235-257.

Solomos, John and Les Back. 2000. "Introduction: Theorising race and racism". In *Theories of Race and Racism. A Reader*, edited by Les Back and John Solomos, 1-28. London: Routledge.

Thränhardt, Dietrich and Michael Bommes, eds. 2010. *National Paradigms of Migration Research*. Osnabrück: V&R unipress Universitätsverlag Osnabrück.

Titley, Gavan and Alana Lentin. 2011. *The Crisis of Multiculturalism: Racism in a Neoliberal Age.* London: Zed Books.