



Nordic Journal
of Science
and Technology
Studies

2019 | Volume 7 | Issue 1



Elephant in the room by AnnaSofia Määg. ICEHOTEL 2016, www.icehotel.com
Photo credit: Asaf Kliger



Volume 7, issue 1

Editorial

- Tension 3
by Jenny M. Bergschöld and Roger A. Søraa

Articles

- Stories of creation:
Governance of surrogacy through media? 4
by Nora Levold, Marit Svingen and Margrethe Aune

- Struggles over Legitimate Science:
Science Policy Ideals of Excellence within the Field of Sociology 18
by Johanna Hokka

- Inclusive physical, social and digital spaces
in vocational rehabilitation 32
by Gunnar Michelsen, Tor Slettebø and Ingunn Brita Moser

- Happiness Studies:
Co-Production of Social Science and Social Order 42
by Margareta Hallberg and Christopher Kullenberg

Book Review

- Digital Music Distribution:
The Sociology of Online Music Streams by Hendrik Storstein Spilker 51
by Raphaël Nowak

About the Cover Artist

- AnnaSofia Mååg 53
by Lina Ingeborgrud

Editors in chief:

Roger Andre Søraa
Jenny Melind Bergschöld

Editorial team:

Tanja Plasil
Marius Korsnes
Lina H. Ingeborgrud
Maria Hesjedal
Ingvild Firman Fjellså
Martin Anfinsen
Maria Kirpichenko
Kristine Ask

Editorial Board:

Hilde G. Corneliussen
Aud Sissel Hoel
Lene Koch
Eric Monteiro
Jane Summerton
Knut H. S. rensen
Nina Wormbs

International Advisory Board:

Wiebe Bijker
Lisa Cartwright
Sampsa Hyysalo
Mikael Hørd
Dolly Jørgensen
Donald MacKenzie
Mike Michael
Andrew Pickering
Brian Wynne

Layout: Camilla Trønnes

Contact:

Department of Interdisciplinary
Studies of Culture
Norwegian University of
Science and Technology
7491 NTNU, Trondheim, Norway

Published with the support of the
Norwegian Research council
and the Norwegian University
of Science and Technology.

ISSN: 1894-4647

nordicsts.org

EDITORIAL

Tension

By Jenny M. Bergschöld and Roger A. Søråa

Tension has always been at the heart of STS studies, which is interested in power relations, synergies and dichotomies. Looking out the window at the current struggle between winter and spring here in Norway it seems fitting that tension is also at the heart of this issue of NJSTS.

The cover art of this issue is designed by AnnaSofia Mååg and features a four meter tall ice sculpture of an elephant, aptly named "The Elephant in the Room", that Mååg designed for the ice hotel in Jukkasjärvi, Sweden. In describing this sculpture, Mååg states:

"At some point we all face an issue or situation that is commonly called 'the elephant in the room': an obvious truth that is either being ignored or not addressed. The elephant situation is adaptable on so many topics in our present world: from a large global scale down to a more personal one. To choose not see the obvious truth can turn into a hard lesson. So, do you have any elephant in your room? Open your eyes, what do they tell you? To look at something is not the same as to actually see something. But it is a good start."¹

Taking this to heart, the first article in this issue "Stories of creation: Governance of Surrogacy through Media?" written by Nora Levold, Marit Svingen and Margrethe Aune deals with tension by analyzing the Norwegian media debate on surrogacy from 2010-2013 and discusses how this debate informed proposed revisions to the Biotechnology Act.

Similarly, the second article in this issue: "Struggles over Legitimate Science: Science Policy Ideals of Excellence within the Field of Sociology", written by Johanna Hokka, deals with tension by looking at the struggles over legitimate science and science policy ideals of excellence within the field of sociology in Finland and Sweden. This is done through analyzing how the internal discursive struggles between scientific elites (here represented by sociology professors) show how different ideals for "excellence" are met in various, conflicting ways.

The third article, "Inclusive Physical, Social and Digital Spaces in Vocational Rehabilitation", written by Gunnar Michelsen, Tor Slettebø and Ingunn Brita Moser, also deals with tension by discussing how job seekers with cognitive impairments are meeting difficulties in job markets by looking at vocational rehabilitation programs and working environments promoting inclusion. They do this by applying a social constructivist analysis through imagined future working situations scenarios and by looking at computer rooms as affinity spaces.

After tension comes release, and the fourth article, "Happiness Studies: Co-Production of Social Science and Social Order", written by Margareta Hallberg and Christopher Kullenberg, deals with the growth and establishment of the interdisciplinary research field "Happiness Studies". This article focuses on how research on happiness has become a quickly growing and successful field and what it says about both the social sciences and contemporary social order.

Finally, we round off the issue with a book review where Raphaël Nowak reviews "Digital Music Distribution: The Sociology of Online Music Streams", written by Hendrik Storstein Spilker. The book explores how digital music distribution has not been unprecedented, but how it has been shaped by many years of uncertainty due to actors' decisions, inventions and the imposition of new models and standards.

We hope that you will enjoy reading the issue, perhaps taking a brief pause from navigating the tensions in your own academic context, wherever you are.

Jenny M. Bergschöld & Roger A. Søråa
Co-editors in chief

¹ <http://www.annasofia.se/portfolio-item/elephant-in-the-room>

STORIES OF CREATION: GOVERNANCE OF SURROGACY THROUGH MEDIA?¹

by Nora Levold, Marit Svingen and Margrethe Aune

This article discusses the Norwegian media debate on surrogacy from 2010–2013. The debate was initiated by the 'Volden-case' where a Norwegian woman who had travelled to India to have surrogate twins could not return to Norway because the Norwegian authorities refused to give the children passports. At that time in 2010, surrogacy was not explicitly regulated by the existing Norwegian Biotechnology Act. According to the Norwegian Child and Parents Act of 1982, the woman who physically gives birth is the mother of the child. It soon became clear that, because this case existed in regulatory limbo, it required a legislative solution. At the time there was an intense and heated media debate. This was resolved when a temporary law was passed in 2013, pending a more permanent Biotechnology Act. During the process of revising the new Biotechnology Act in 2017–2018, we anticipated a continuation of the intense debate that occurred earlier. Surprisingly, this did not happen. In this article we aim to explain why. By analyzing the original 2010–2013 media debate using Hajer's concepts of 'discourse coalitions' and 'storylines' (Hajer 2003), we identified three discourse coalitions which gathered around three storylines: the 'storyline of biological parenthood', the 'storyline of equality' and the 'storyline on human trafficking'. The analysis demonstrated that the 'storyline on human trafficking' gained strength during the 2010–2013 debate, ultimately becoming hegemonic at the end of this period. Surprisingly, the other two discourse coalitions did not appear much in the media debate prior to the new law. This article discusses the lack of these discourse coalitions and concludes that the hegemonic nature of the 'storyline on human trafficking' may explain why the new Biotechnology Act did not spark heated debate.

Keywords: Surrogacy, storylines, discourse coalitions, media debate

Author: Nora Levold, Professor, Centre for Technology and Society
Department of Interdisciplinary Studies of Culture
Norwegian University of Science and Technology

Marit Svingen, PhD Candidate, Centre for Technology and Society
Department of Interdisciplinary Studies of Culture
Norwegian University of Science and Technology

Margrethe Aune, Professor, Centre for Technology and Society
Department of Interdisciplinary Studies of Culture
Norwegian University of Science and Technology

Licensing: All content in NJSTS is published under a Creative Commons Attribution-ShareAlike 4.0 license. This means that anyone is free to share (copy and redistribute the material in any medium or format) or adapt (remix, transform, and build upon the material) the material as they like, provided they follow two provisions:
a) attribution - give appropriate credit, provide a link to the license, and indicate if changes were made.
b) share alike - any remixing, transformation or building upon the material must itself be published under the same license as the original.

¹ We want to direct a thank you to researcher Sara Heidenreich and research assistant Alexander Myhre for obtaining and preparing the empirical material from the newspapers.



Introduction

The desire to have a child of one's own is a significant life decision and, for many individuals, a 'natural wish' (Ravn 2005, Ellingsæter et al. 2013). The number of individuals using Assisted Reproductive Technologies (ARTs) because they cannot fulfill this wish has increased steadily. In Norway, these reproductive practices are regulated through the Biotechnology Act, which has raised a number of complex questions. Since the 1980s, there have been numerous, intense debates around the different practices enabled by these emerging reproductive technologies (Kvande 2008, Levold 2014). Norway's first Biotechnology Act was adopted in 1994 and revised in 2003, but a third version has been long coming. The Law of 2003 was meant to be evaluated and revised in 2008, but it took almost 10 years before the shifting governmental coalitions in Norway managed to agree on suggestions for revisions. This delay demonstrates how tense and difficult it is to respond to these types of issues in Norway. An evaluation report of the Biotechnology Act was presented in 2017 as a white paper (Meld. St. 39 (2016–2017)) and was followed by a two-day hearing in the Parliament in January 2018. In May 2018, the debate and parliamentary voting took place.

Our focus in this article is the media debate on surrogacy between 2010 and 2013 and how this debate informed the 2018 debates and result associated with the proposed revisions to the Biotechnology Act. Because of the controversy surrounding the 'Volden case' only a few years before the completion of the evaluation report white paper, many expected surrogacy to again dominate the discussions and generate media attention. Therefore, it was surprising that this did not happen. The debate in the media ahead of the governmental proceedings hardly mentioned surrogacy, but focused instead on egg-donation and single women's rights to ART. Proposed revisions to the Biotechnology Act, which banned surrogacy all together, passed with very little public participation and media involvement.

Surrogacy 'came' to Norway in 2010 when the story of Kari Ann Volden, a woman detained in India with twins, caused massive media attention and debate (Andersen 2013, Stuvøy 2018). Volden had entered into a surrogacy agreement with an Indian clinic, allegedly not realizing that Norwegian laws would not recognize her as the children's legal mother. According to Norwegian law², the twins' surrogate mother was seen as the only possible mother, due to the fact that she had given birth to them. No Norwegian law at that time addressed the phenomenon of surrogacy explicitly. In India, by contrast, Volden was seen as the twins' legal mother, and therefore the twins were not granted Indian citizenship (Andersen 2013, Svingen 2017).

The Volden case was resolved through a temporary law passed in 2013 that granted these twins and other living 'surrogacy children'

legal rights as Norwegian citizens. The broader question of how to regulate surrogacy arrangements in Norway and for Norwegians abroad was, however, left as an open question. At the time, the Norwegian government pointed to the upcoming process of defining a new biotechnology act, and there were expectations that surrogacy would be a central part of the coming public debate. However, while it took another four years before the politicians agreed on a new act, it passed with little debate about or focus on surrogacy.

What happened to the topic that only a few years before had generated so much public emotion and media controversy? In this article, we will investigate this issue by analyzing the media debate on surrogacy from 2010, when the discussions were initiated by the Volden case, through 2013 when the politicians decided to enact the temporary law. Which issues did the participants focus on, what characterized the arguments for and against surrogacy, and how was the debate presented in the news media? Can the development of the debate over these three years contribute to explaining why a 'hot' topic like surrogacy disappeared from the political agenda only to be regulated with hardly any notice or discussion?

In a regulatory process, politicians produce an understanding of the phenomenon they regulate; however, they do not do this in a vacuum. Input from different experts and lay people are an important source of knowledge (Irwin 2008, Jasanoff 2004, 2012, Latour 2004). Biotechnology has proven to be specifically interesting for groups outside the traditional political arena, and research shows that the possibility to use media to present an argument, and as an arena for debate between interest groups, has had a significant influence on policy decisions in Norway (Antonsen 2014, Brekke and Sirnes 2011, Levold 2014b, Melhuus 2012). Thus, it is relevant to analyze the surrogacy controversy in the media, since it contributes to constructing an emotional and moral phenomenon and mediates between different participants as this phenomenon develops.

This article investigates the previous media discourses through Hajer's concepts of 'storylines' and 'discourse coalitions'. Through this perspective, we will identify who the media debate constructs as affected by surrogacy and in what way (cf. Jasanoff 2011, 2016) so as to understand how the debate forms and transforms surrogacy as a practice as well as a moral phenomenon. An identification of storylines can accordingly provide a broader understanding of the current situation and explain the unexpected turns in the process of regulation. The article is organized in three sections: (1) an explanation of surrogacy as a procedure, (2) a discussion of the regulations of biotechnology and previous research on surrogacy within the Norwegian context, and (3) an analysis of the empirical material before closing with a discussion.

² <https://lovdata.no/dokument/NL/lov/1981-04-08-7> (Lov om barn og foreldre – The Law of Children and Parents)



The surrogacy practice

The term 'surrogacy' describes the practice wherein a woman carries and gives birth to a baby for someone else. The person or people who are meant to receive the baby are often referred to as the intended parent(s). Surrogacy can take place in different forms, and with different incentives. Eggs can come from the intended mother, surrogate mother or donor, and they are fertilized with semen from the intended father or donor sperm through in vitro fertilization (IVF). The embryo is then inserted into the surrogate mother, who carries the child. For infertile women and gay men, this is an opportunity to have children who are genetically related to themselves or their partner. When the surrogate mother or surrogate clinic receives money from the intended parents, it is called 'commercial surrogacy.' When the surrogate mother does it as charity (a favor without payment), it is called 'altruistic surrogacy.' In such cases, the surrogate mother may still be compensated for expenses and strain related to pregnancy.

Norwegian studies of surrogacy have focused on topics like gender, ethics, kinship, money, legal rights, discrimination, and exploitation (Andersen 2013, Førde 2017, Melhuus 2012, Stuvøy 2018). Melhuus (2015) argues that Norwegian law practices gender discrimination, since legal fatherhood automatically goes to the sperm donor, while legal motherhood does not automatically go to the egg donor. Therefore, if the sperm donor is Norwegian, the child is granted Norwegian citizenship. For the egg donor, however, this is not the case – the mother has

to adopt the child to secure the same rights for it. Stuvøy (2016) has also been engaged in these equality questions. She has shown through the Volden case and the political debate that followed how discourses on surrogacy and (gender) equality were co-produced and has analyzed various economical aspects related to surrogacy arrangements (2018a, 2018b). Both Andersen (2013) and Førde (2017) discuss how surrogacy debates have resulted in the victimization of different groups. Andersen's analysis of the media coverage of the Volden case demonstrates how, at the time, different actors defined themselves and their children as victims of strict Norwegian regulations while the surrogate mothers from India and the United States were neither perceived nor identified themselves as victims. Førde has challenged the understanding of surrogacy as a win-win situation as well as the narratives of surrogacy as exploitation and the victimization of Indian mothers.

Like Andersen (2013), our article uses media as a point of departure, but our focus is not on surrogacy practices and why individuals choose them. Instead, we are interested in the media debates as a source for political regulation by analyzing storylines in this debate from 2010 to 2013. Specifically, we ask: What can the various storylines tell us about the construction of surrogacy as a moral, emotional and practical phenomenon? Our aim is to get a better understanding of how the debate developed in major national newspapers in Norway, and, through this understanding, reflect on the lack of controversy in the regulation process in 2018.

The Norwegian context

The development of new reproductive technologies has created new possibilities concerning both the methods used to conceive a child and who can become parents. Methods of conception like surrogacy "confront governments with complex new questions about family law, legal access to parenthood, and filiation" (Lie and Lykke 2016: 87) and create regulatory challenges for governments across Western Europe that have been met with varying responses (Engeli and Allison 2016). Within the Nordic region, policy regulations generally coincide, but there is a divide in terms of biotechnology legislation, particularly when comparing Norway with the other Nordic countries. Sweden, Denmark, Finland and Iceland all passed laws that permit egg donation nearly two decades ago – the most recent of which was Sweden in 2003. Most of these countries had, in the period we are studying (2010–2013) started preparations for legislation that legalized altruistic surrogacy. Meanwhile, during this same period, Norway adopted on both accounts restrictive regulations that have proven to be some of the most conservative laws on assisted reproduction in Europe

(Levold 2014, Melhuus 2012, Nordic Committee on Bioethics 2017). The proposals included in the new Biotechnology Act are more liberal than in prior versions – for example, the donation of eggs will now be allowed – but all forms of surrogacy will remain forbidden in Norway³. The temporary act from 2013 that guarantees no persecution for people using surrogacy arrangements abroad will remain in place.

As mentioned, novel biotechnological practices have historically been framed primarily as ethical concerns in Norway (Antonsen 2017, Antonsen and Levold 2011, Hviid-Nielsen 2000, Levold and Kvande 2014). Politicians have played a particularly large role in this framing, leaving deliberations up to the 'expert opinions' of ethical boards and committees (Antonsen and Levold 2014). It is therefore interesting to see whether this ethical framework is still present in the media debate, and, if so, whether it is possible to provide a more thorough picture of the content of this ethical perspective. In comparison, debates in Denmark concerning various biotechnological

³ Since the original version of this text was written, the Norwegian government is supplemented with representatives from the Christian Democrats (KrF). As a consequence of this, the decision of allowing donation of eggs will most likely be postponed.



practices include clear economic considerations in the debate about fetal diagnostics and selective abortion (Koch 1995, Nielsen et al 2000, Kvande 2008). In Norway, the debate has rather focused on how technological possibilities will lead to a 'Sorteringsamfunn'⁴ ('the exclusion society'). In Sweden, surrogacy-debates have been more concerned with technical factors (Kvale 2016). As both the issue and the solution in Norway are posed as ethical dilemmas, these other

potential concerns and means of governance are, according to Antonsen (2017), excluded from the debate.

Our analysis of how this plays out in the public media debate on surrogacy between 2010 and 2013 will draw on Hajer's theoretical framework of storylines and discourse coalitions to analyze the empirical material (Hajer 1995, 2003, Hajer and Wagenaar 2003).

Storylines and discourse coalitions

Hajer (1995, 2003) argues that politics and policymaking are being reinvented in our contemporary 'network society.' This network society has a fragmented institutional landscape, which causes political conflict and value pluralism (Hajer 2003), which represents a change in the practice and formation of politics and a transformation towards 'constitutive politics'. This shift is marked by a change in vocabulary, with terms such as governance, trust, and deliberation replacing once dominant terms such as the state, government, and authority. Hajer and Wagenaar (2003) posit "Whereas the institutional language implies stability, networks imply fluidity" (5).

According to Hajer (1995), classical-modernist political institutions are not always sufficiently powerful to provide solutions, so new political practices emerge between the traditional institutions of the state. These new forms of policy deliberations require that the policymaking process itself is seen as constitutive of politics, such that solutions are provided by "transient and informal arrangements" rather than by "conventions among states, directives or authoritative decisions" (ibid.). Hajer continues by asserting that citizens play a major role in these practices as "political activists on standby, waiting to be ignited" (2003:88), suggesting a move away from representational politics, towards "subtle democratic dimensions of these spontaneous, often innovative, bottom up events" (2003:89). These actors' participation in policy discourse are also constitutive of political identity. The media can accordingly be seen as an important setting for the practice of politics in the network society, where the public's "awakened political activism" can find outlet and be distributed.

Understanding how such networks influence the regulation of surrogacy requires an examination of these actors and how they organize themselves through the media because the "effectiveness and legitimacy of political interventions" depend on the actors of the public (Hajer 2003:89). Hajer's (2003) approach draws on social psychology in an attempt to trace policymaking in its new form. Individual discourses that operate in distinct areas of a field draw upon each other and form 'discourse coalitions' with

a shared storyline in the debate: "The argumentative approach conceives of politics as a struggle for discursive hegemony in which actors try to secure support for their definitions of reality" (Hajer 1995:59).

The analytical concept of the storyline can be summarized as a gathering of actors with similar articulations of a phenomenon, thereby forming a discourse coalition. The actors form 'storylines' in order to convince others of the superiority of their technological and conceptual interpretations. The storyline serves as a tool to create an understanding of the phenomenon and also convinces and enlists other actors, serving as a 'social reality', where actors share a common understanding through a set of symbolic references (Hajer 1995). By forming a particular storyline, actors position themselves and others, while attributing ideas of 'blame', 'responsibility', 'urgency' and responsible behavior (Hajer 1995:65). When analyzing the surrogacy debate, we will look for different discourse coalitions and the storylines that are created through the actors' arguments: To what extent and why is surrogacy problematic or not? At the same time, we will investigate how surrogacy as an ethical phenomenon is co-produced with dissimilar possible practices.

A critical point is that these actors need not share ideas or interests on matters other than this particular sociotechnical practice. The strength of using storyline as an analytical tool is that it captures exactly this dimension, in which actors with different views share an understanding of a specific technology, and form somewhat unique coalitions. In the case of surrogacy, politicians, medical and legal experts, journalists, feminists, parents and interest organizations can share storylines, despite the fact that they differ in opinions or interests in other political matters. By narrating this controversy through storylines, we can narrate a story about how these coalitions work to determine, maintain and disseminate their definitions of surrogacy. The different narratives compete over the power of definition in regard to the new technology, and, as we shall see, they fight over the power to define the phenomenon.

4 'Sorteringsamfunnet' is a specific Norwegian concept, which explicitly emphasizes how knowledge about the embryo/fetus can result in unethical selections. For instance, there are economic arguments connected to children with disabilities that are viewed as highly unethical (Kvande 2008, Melhuus 2012, Solberg, 2004, 2008).



Methods and sources

We have analyzed a part of this debate by studying articles from a sample of Norwegian newspapers in the time frame of February 2010 – July 2013. We gathered a total of 304 articles through the web data base Retriever (www.retriever.no) that addressed the topic of surrogacy. These empirical texts were collected from six major national newspapers, Klassekampen, Morgenbladet, Aftenposten, Dagbladet, VG, and Vårt Land, covering a wide range of political and religious affiliations.⁵ The texts comprise

news articles, editorial contributions and letters to the editor (opinion pieces/commentaries). Their content has been coded based on the following categories: the actors involved, the arguments presented, and the emotional rhetoric attached to these arguments. These categories provide the outlines of the three most significant storylines that frame and contribute to the general understanding of surrogacy.

Storylines of surrogacy

In this analysis, we traced storylines by investigating individual contributions about surrogacy in the media debate. We have looked at ways of debating, arguments used and how actors draw upon each other to define a 'common reality'. As we will see, the actors can come from areas with clashing traditions or values but still manage to form a discourse coalition because of the common understanding of what surrogacy enables. The shared storylines make it possible to present coherent arguments and create networks which, according to Hajer (1995), represents a new practice of politics.

Through the analysis, we trace three prominent discourse coalitions sharing storylines: (1) the storyline of (biological) parenthood, (2)

the storyline of equality, and (3) the storyline of human trafficking. Each of these articulate, portray and shape surrogacy in different ways, thereby mobilizing and enrolling a diverse set of actors in the discourse coalitions. The results are variations in what we in our analysis perceive as the core of the debate, implying a disagreement about what is at stake and what should be debated to resolve the problems concerning the regulation of surrogacy. This disagreement also revolves around the extent to which and the reason surrogacy is problematic and raises the question as to whether the storylines and discourse coalitions (which co-produce each other) are stable or change over time if something in the context changes?

The storyline of biological parenthood

We start by examining the discourse coalition centered on biological parenthood. In this storyline, surrogacy represents a new and threatening way of thinking about parenthood that is detached from biology and challenges traditional views of parenthood, with a practice that offers new categories and definitions. The central issues at stake for this discourse coalition are who can and should be considered as parents and the dangers that surrogacy present to biological parenthood. Vårt Land quote a medical doctor as saying:

"In the discussion on what should be allowed, there are often used words and expressions that can be hurtful and seductive. Examples of the latter can be to transform the understanding of the term father and mother. In connection with sperm donation you see new expressions such as 'social father' and 'co-mother'. These are constructions to avoid a biological reality (...): a mother that is the origin of the egg cell and a father that is the origin of the sperm" (02.11.2013).

The arguments of this coalition create a storyline about surrogacy as a problematic practice that challenges traditional values concerning who can become and be considered as parents. Their argument is formulated as a question of what is in the 'child's best interest', and the storyline consists of arguments that strongly focus on biological factors. A child knowing and being brought up by a mother and a father who also are its genetic parents is more important to the child than social factors, such as intent and ability to care for the child. This argument is also used to push forward the belief that parenthood should be limited by 'natural laws,' as the absence of either the biological mother or father leaves the child lacking. This emphasize the traditional and often religious undertone of this storyline, yet the arguments can be based also on science, law or personal emotions. As an anonymous woman expresses,

"Two men who undertakes an absurd biological experiment to become fathers to a child, they do the child a terrible wrongdoing by denying the child a mother (...). Children are

⁵ All the quotes from the newspapers have been translated from Norwegian by the authors.



being made, that defy both the laws of biology and the (biblical) story of creation" (Vårt Land 06.09.2011).

This coalition views it as both ideal and necessary for a child to grow up with its biological parents, facilitating a practice that contradicts this belief is seen as highly amoral because it is considered both 'unnatural' and damaging to the child. The emotional and moral strength in the debate is in other words strong. A priest argues that surrogacy should be banned in all shapes and forms because it is harmful for an individual's identity as well as society in general:

"To set aside the biological principle as the basis and fundamental norm for family law, attitudes and practice will in the long run change society on many levels. The TV-program, 'Tore på sporet',⁶ ('Tore on track') can be held as an account of parents and relatives being fundamental for individuals and society. Biological parenthood, relatives and being connected by blood forms the basis of people's identity and the society's structure" (Aftenposten, 21.06.2013).

The child as victim

The storyline of (biological) parenthood is constructed by a wide variety of actors who see traditional parenthood as the main issue, and as what needs to be addressed and discussed in order to reach an effective regulation of this biotechnological practice. There is furthermore a unity in the discourse coalition, considering 'the child' to be the vulnerable party. These actors fear that the child can be damaged by removing biological ties or knowledge of its mother. A female philosopher comments in Vårt Land (05.07.2011):

"Children have already according to the Norwegian Children's Act §4a lost their right to a father, now it's (the right to a) mother that is next in line, in a few year it's of course both parents. When strangers can replace both mother and father, all strangers can replace both. Most people can portray themselves as good nannies in the media."

The Storyline of Equality

The second coalition is gathered around the issues of fairness and equality, and we have defined this as the storyline of equality. This coalition sees surrogacy as a justified solution for infertile or 'childless' people who cannot conceive a child in other ways. Surrogacy provides 'the childless' with assisted reproduction in the same manner as other groups in society – this is a right they argue for based on egalitarian notions. In their narrative, surrogacy is a battle they are fighting, equal to battles for rights that have been played out and won in the past. As a gay father through surrogacy wrote,

This particular concern is shared and articulated by another philosopher, in an interview:

"Surrogacy is almost unnatural because we take away the feeling of support and connection between mother and fetus that we would otherwise encourage strongly" (Aftenposten 20.03.2011).

The strength of this storyline becomes exactly this: the child is constructed as a victim. The argument of a complete ban on surrogacy being 'in the child's best interest' holds a strong ground in Norwegian culture, and this coalition also has allies within the institutionalized politics, as this particular family politics is high on the agenda of the Norwegian Christian Conservative Party (see also Svingen 2017). Therefore, this storyline controls much of the formal political debate around surrogacy, as the child, who is projected as a vulnerable part, gains leverage for traditional ideas about family.

The storyline of biological parenthood, like Hajer (2003) suggests, "ha[s] the functional role of facilitating the reduction of the discursive complexity of a problem and creating possibilities for problem closure" (63). Though the actors within the coalition acknowledge that surrogacy is a complex practice, they simplify this complexity through a narrative that rationalizes their perception of surrogacy as something opposed to their values. Biological parenthood becomes a symbolic reference that bind these actors together, and that suggests a closure to the overall controversy.

However, by examining the second storyline we have traced, we begin to understand why the first coalition does not achieve the closure and solution their storyline could provide. Specifically, the institution of parenthood is stabilized through its drawn-up boundaries between a right way and a wrong way of becoming parents because the way one becomes a parent determines the parenthood. Surrogacy, in other words, destabilizes the family institution, sets it in play, and leaves it open for redefining (see also Andersen 2014, Edwards and Salazar 2009, Spilker 2008, Thompson 2005).

"The development carries with it a line of ethical dilemmas, like the question of the right to abortions was controversial back when it was being fought for. For some of us the biotechnological development gives opportunities to establish a family. (...) We act on instinct when our perception of reality is being challenged on how the core family can be created. That's why it's been a battle for lesbian couples to get acknowledgement so that they together can have a child. That's why it's been a battle for gay people to get married. That's why it's a battle when childless couples and single people choose to have a child by using a surrogate abroad" (Klassekampen, 08.07.2010).

6 A TV show where a person is trying to find his/her biological relatives.



Consequently, fairness and equality are the common symbolic references that tie the actors of this coalition together and construct this storyline. They discursively argue for legalizing surrogacy since the authorities have a moral obligation to provide justice for all groups who want children (see also Lie and Lykke 2017, Ravn et al. 2016). The intention and the wish to have and take care of children are seen as equally important factors in becoming a parent – in contrast to solely biology as in the first storyline. They therefore serve as an opposing discourse and the two storylines provide a particular controversy between them in the debate. Another gay father through surrogacy voices this in a newspaper comment:

"Just so it's clear, my children are in no sense strangers to me or the rest of their family. I am every bit as much their father, my sister is every bit as much their aunt and my parents every bit as much their grandparents, as they would be if the child was born in a different way. Children born through surrogacy should not have to put up with adult strangers making them any different or any less than other children in this manner" (Dagbladet, 11.07.2011).

The social family attachment is lifted as the most important factor for a child's well-being and awarded the same importance as the biological family attachment. Emphasis is on the strong wish to become parents, a wish that, for this discourse coalition, is 'naturalized' and hence so deterministic that it is beyond regulation by the authorities. As an infertile woman and doctor puts it into words,

"The wish to have children is very fundamental, and the experience of being a mother and father to someone, is a social and emotionally essential position that it takes a lot to deny people" (Klassekampen 27.11.2010).

The storyline of equality, therefore, questions whether the government has any chance of preventing Norwegians from using surrogacy, both abroad and in Norway. They argue for allowing surrogacy for that same reason, because the wish to have children surpasses any regulation. The regulation of assisted reproduction and adoption is in itself given as a reason for emergence of the practice of surrogacy. The above-referenced woman argues further:

"You give up, [you] can't be bothered any more. That's what has happened with those who end up going to India. Surrogacy has pushed its way into existence because people can't stand to deal with the enormous bureaucratic processes and waiting. The system closes, and people are sick and tired of being confronted with such a big skepticism to that which is a completely ordinary wish [to have children]" (Klassekampen 13.11.2010).

In contrast to the actors representing the storyline of biological parenthood, the actors in this coalition think that in order to

determine surrogacy as right or wrong, the main issue to discuss is whether or not it discriminates to permit or refuse the practice of surrogacy. We trace moral co-productions in this storyline too, but none are attached to biology or the traditional family as in the previous storyline. Instead, the ethical construction is attached to justice and discrimination. Being able to refer to 'nature' seems important for both coalitions. However, the first coalition refers to biological nature, while the second coalition argues that it is psychologically 'natural' to have a child of one's own.

The childless as victims

The second coalition's narrative therefore revolves around the (childless) parents as vulnerable victims, where the intended parents are denied their given right to have children. They render questions about rights, and whether surrogacy helps or hurts those rights. This is particularly the case for those who already became parents through surrogacy, and now have found themselves caught in the legal dilemma that had surfaced in the aftermath of the Volden case. A gay father through surrogacy says,

"In the eagerness to prevent the exploitation of poor women, the Norwegian Authorities make it difficult for parents to create a stable and predictable family situation for their children" (Klassekampen 04.08.2010).

A central aspect to this debate is whether or not having children is a given right. Nobody argues directly for such a right, but there are critical voices that argue that gay people and infertile women claim such a right by using or being in favor of surrogacy arrangements. This especially relates to gay people's rights to have children. The gay actors in the debate answer back with arguments of discrimination, asking to be treated equally to others, but also with a deep, natural wish to have a child. It becomes evident that claiming the right to have children is somewhat of a taboo, as nobody actually claims this right. Their claim is instead narrated through this story about equality, where their right is not to have children per se, but to be treated the same as others – something that indirectly translates as a right to have children.

Assisted reproduction offers help to some, and the storyline of equality underlines that who this help is offered to is negotiable. Consequently, this storyline takes the form of a negotiation about whether or not infertile women and gay men are entitled to an equal treatment as others, such as heterosexual couples and lesbians.⁷ This question of equality does not only relate to homosexuals compared to heterosexuals, but also to discrimination between women and men, and female and male gametes. Non-anonymous sperm donation is permitted in Norway, but when this debate was going on, egg donation was not. With egg donation being a prerequisite for performing surrogacy, the surrogacy debate takes a similar shape to the previous Norwegian debates on egg donation (Lie and Spilker 2011, Spilker and Lie 2007). Actors who are

⁷ Lesbians received the right to sperm donations when equal sex marriages were permitted in Norway in 2009.



opposed argue that if we are to allow egg donation, it is a slippery slope down to surrogacy.

The storyline of equality connects gay individuals and their interest groups as well as feminists who care about the rights of Norwegian women, and females who themselves are infertile. In addition, we find interest groups speaking on their behalf, such as an interest group for childless persons (an organization called 'Ønskebarn'). The Norwegian newspaper *Dagbladet* is an actor and mediator in this storyline, narrating this storyline through opinion pieces and editorials. The minority part of *Bioteknologirådet*⁸ also voices a permissive stand towards surrogacy, which is founded in (and forms) this storyline. The coalition makes use of laws and institutions, such as international agreements concerning acknowledgement of one another's laws and verdicts, and ethics with particular emphasis on a 'public morale' relating to the egalitarian Norwegian society/ethics. Equal opportunities serve as an important argument, but, as Stuvøy (2016) points out, this is a fleeting category which can be produced and voiced in many ways. Central Labor Party politicians also share this narrative, and, in this respect, this coalition also has allies within the formal

institutional politics. Despite the Labor Party being reluctant to voice this narrative as much in formal political proceedings as in the media, the institutional support they provided can still be considered relevant for this coalition in achieving a certain leverage concerning a solution for their vulnerable victims. In this storyline, the parents were labeled as victims. A temporary solution for them was reached in 2012 as the government passed a temporary bill on the "Acknowledgement of paternity for children born by a surrogate mother abroad" (2012). This coalition reached a solution they seemed satisfied with as it resolved the case for the children already born. The storyline of equality was also present in the 2012 Parliamentary debate about the temporary law. The questions then were whether the parents coming home to Norway with surrogate children should be penalized or not (Svingen 2017). The deep and natural wish to become a parent was strongly emphasized in this debate, as something so 'natural' could not be penalized. Hence, the coalition in one sense achieved a second victory: they were able to continue seeking surrogacy arrangements abroad.

However, surrogacy arrangements abroad are controversial, and this topic unites the discourse coalition in the third storyline.

The Storyline of human trafficking

The third discourse coalition we have traced tells stories of money and human trafficking. This discourse enables different aspects of commerce, and the actors form a discursive unity that agree on the commercial aspect of surrogacy as central to the debate. This storyline forms a particular dismissive narrative about on-going surrogacy practices with a financial variation to the narratives (cf. Førde 2017, Stuvøy 2018b). While some fear surrogacy as a whole because it enables a tabooed relationship between reproduction, body and money, others only find the commercial aspect problematic when surrogacy is performed in poor countries by poor women.⁹ In other words, while some actors want to prohibit the exploitation of poor women, others want to prohibit the commercialization of the reproductive process. This means that while some want to prohibit surrogacy all together, others argue that Norway should permit surrogacy as a means of prohibiting the exploitation of poor women in, for instance, India.

Our third storyline not a traditional storyline as such. While the former two storylines represent common understandings of whether surrogacy is right or wrong, thus forming two clear discourse coalitions, our third storyline is based on a discourse controversy. Some fear that paying a woman to carry a child

makes conception into a business venture, suggesting that the problematic factor is the financial dimension, rather than the definition of parenthood, as in the two previous storylines. According to a doctor and ethics researcher quoted in the Christian newspaper *Vårt Land*,

"[But] commercial surrogacy is more serious. There is a buyer, a seller and traffickers involved. There is a contract entered into, and money being paid, that is why it is difficult to get past that the child has become a commodity" (18.02.2013).

Statements like these indicate that the woman's motivation is the central point of concern. When a woman is motivated by money, the surrogacy process is more problematic than when she does it out of empathy, as in altruistic surrogacy: "Altruistic surrogacy or other forms of donation of genes via egg or sperm I regard as OK, because the human value is not buried in genetics" another doctor writes in an opinion piece in *Klassekampen* (12.01. 2013).

Others fear that the value of human life is in fact at stake and that the commercial surrogacy process objectifies the child and makes children into a commodity. According to an ethicist interviewed by *Vårt Land*,

⁸ A public information and advisory board for biotechnology questions

⁹ See Stuvøy (2018b) og Ength Førde (2017) on research and discussions on commercial surrogacy



"Once the child is made into a product or a commodity, you are inside the production way of thinking with metaphors from industry. (...) The child comes into being under a completely different way of thinking than when it is being conceived the normal way. This production logic can be unhealthy for society because it can change the way we think about children" (18.02.2013).

This fear is particularly strong amongst actors with Christian conservative values. However, even those from the completely opposite political side see the human trafficking aspect as critical, and so they join forces with the Christian conservatives. Feminists and far-left politicians are united in their view that commercial surrogacy is extremely hazardous for the surrogate mother, especially when she comes from poor countries such as India:

"The debate on surrogacy abroad can in simple terms be portrayed like this: Shall we, in the rich part of the world, buy our way out of the risk that a pregnancy implies? Shall poor women carry our children for money? My answer is no", says a politician (Dagbladet 31.08. 2011).

The exploitation of already suppressed women is of great concern, and this storyline presents the woman, the surrogate mother, as the vulnerable victim in the surrogacy debate. The financial dimension makes her a means to an end, in which money is central to hiring or buying her bodily services in a similar fashion to prostitution:

"It is necessary to talk about the divide we do between the renting of a vagina from prostitutes, which is forbidden, and the rental of a uterus from 'surrogate mothers', which is not illegal for Norwegian citizens if this happens abroad. (...) Can we really separate between which organs one can rent?" a man comments in Aftenposten (10.04.2013).

The underlying issue rendered by this storyline is the view that

paying money to become parents is something very wrong (see also Svingen 2017, Stuvøy 2018). The question hence posed by surrogacy was that of "What means are legitimately used to become parents?" Interestingly enough, there is no such debate in Norway concerning the money paid for adopting a child.

While the financial dimension is agreed upon within this coalition there is disagreement over whether surrogacy in principle is wrong. While some view surrogacy as ART if it is performed as altruistic surrogacy and only perceive commercial surrogacy as human trafficking, others in this group argue that all forms of surrogacy are unacceptable. Human trafficking and the entering of money into reproduction still forms a common symbolic reference, which, in our material leading up to 2013, achieves a form of hegemony in the debate. Gradually this became the storyline that by far was the most portrayed in the media. As such, the media both embraced this storyline as well as took part in making it. In 2010, everyone was focused on the 'victim' Volden and demanded a solution for her and other, mainly male homosexual, couples that came forth in the media as victims to the Norwegian legislation. Meanwhile, by 2013, the debate had been transformed into a debate about human trafficking. The actors used media to narrate their stories of money and trafficking, all the while producing another victim: the surrogate mother. She was more or less involuntarily made into a means to an end – she was used and exploited, lured into selling her body for money.

During 2012, there was consequentially a shift in the political debate, as demonstrated by Svingen (2017). Surrogacy, which previously had been articulated by the politicians on the liberal left as a form of assisted reproduction, was increasingly addressed as something opposed to assisted reproduction. This transformation underlines the discursive hegemony that this storyline had managed to obtain, namely surrogacy as a human trafficking discourse. This resulted eventually in the regulation of 2018 which without much or any debate ended in a complete ban on all forms of surrogacy.

Discussion

In this article, we have investigated the surrogacy debate in Norwegian news media from 2010 through 2013. We addressed the following questions: What did the participants in the debate focus on, what characterized their arguments for and against surrogacy, and how was the debate presented in the news media?

We have shown how the media resulted in three discourse coalitions and three storylines. These three coalitions all contributed to shaping the discourse on surrogacy, which in this analysis is presented as three storylines, and in turn both influenced how surrogacy was defined and how it should be regulated in the Norwegian legislation. Two of the network coalitions we traced in the media debate drew ties to the institutionalized

policy, as members of the Christian Party took part in producing the 'storyline of biological parenthood' while members of the Labor party in the 'storyline of equality.' Their participation in these coalitions took place in the media and outside of formal political arenas. The formal political constellations forged different coalitions and other considerations (such as voters, the 2013 election, personal friendships and laws), which contributed to a much more moderate debate, as seen in Svingen (2017). The absence of a parallel within the formal policy-making forum is a potential reason it has taken so long to revise the third Biotechnology Act, suggesting that the network coalitions play a major role in shaping the debate and phenomenon. In this respect the networks can be said to drive the policy process towards



regulation. In the following table, we have summed up the three storylines we have traced, with emphasis on what issues the participants focused on, and what characterized the arguments

for and against surrogacy. The question we wish to extend from this is: How can these storylines explain the lack of focus on and interest in surrogacy in the 2018 evaluation?

Storylines of:	Biological Parenthood	Equality	Human Trafficking
<i>Main arguments</i>	Nature has created biological (mother) parenthood. Knowledge of biological parents necessary for a child's healthy (psychological) upbringing	Love and care is not a matter of biology. Wanting a child is part of human (psychological) nature	Economic exploitation of poor mothers
Victims in the storylines	The child	Infertile or childless persons	The surrogate mother
Principal stand	The principal of biology 'Nature' as biology	The principal of equality 'Nature' as psychology	The principal of humanity
<i>Ethics focused on:</i>	The state should regulate biotechnological techniques to maintain the 'natural' traditional family institution	The state should regulate biotechnology to grant all citizens equal opportunities and rights. The "Star family" (Andersen 2014) is equally relevant	The state should regulate biotechnology to prohibit commercialization of children

Table 1: These storylines are analytical constructions and are to some extent formatted by three actor groups: The contributors of the debate, the editors and journalists in the selected newspapers and the authors of this article. Our point is however to demonstrate the political effects of this formatting, not the media debates as a phenomenon.

The network colations' formatting of the surrogacy phenomenon

As the table shows, the three storylines illustrate the surrogacy debate in Norway in the time between 2010 and 2013. The three storylines were however, not equally present throughout the period we have analyzed. We observed a shift from a focus on the intended parents and their children, where the parents and the children respectively were presented as victims. In the third storyline it was the surrogate mother who was presented as the victim. The debate focused more and more around human trafficking where the payment for the 'use' of the surrogate mother's body and reproductive capacity was the shared problematic aspect.

This change of focus appeared during 2012, just after the Government had decided on the temporary law resolving the problem of already born children. The Volden case and her twins were no longer the only focus of attention. Her case was followed by several well-known Norwegians who were portrayed in the media as victims together with their children who were born through surrogacy. The media attention brought to the surface that the lack of regulations regarding surrogacy made it possible to question the legal parenthood as well as the citizenship of the children already born by surrogacy abroad. The dilemma reached its peak after it was revealed that the Police director Øystein Mæland and his partner had used surrogacy in the US which could

be viewed as a criminal act. This 'delicate' situation may have forced a quick decision to establish a temporary law providing citizenship and legal parents to children already born (cf. Svingen 2017). The argument for this temporary solution was that surrogacy as a reproduction practice in general, would be addressed and regulated in the new biotechnology act in the Parliament.

Therefore, in the preparations to the revision of the Biotechnology Act in May 2018, we expected the intense and highly emotional debate we had traced in the period between 2010 and 2013 to resume. Contrary to people's expectations, none of the coalitions from the early debate made any major attempts to initiate debate, not in media, nor in the Parliament. The Parliament resolution, which is the foundation for the Bill that will make surrogacy explicitly banned, was passed unchallenged, with the argumentation for doing so rooted predominantly in the ethically problematic aspect of money and commercialization: "It is not ethically acceptable that the act of carrying and giving birth to a child becomes an act which can be carried out for payment" (Meld.St.39 (2016-2017)).

Altruistic surrogacy had been pushed forward by a few actors in the aftermath of the first surrogacy debate, with the Left Party being the



first political party that announced support for altruistic surrogacy that year. A minority of The Norwegian Biotechnology Advisory Board had in an official statement additionally suggested in 2015:

“(T)hat the authorities would investigate the terms for altruistic surrogacy in Norway. It is difficult to deny someone to help other people, given that both parts understand the risk and consequences attached to the action. To allow domestic altruistic surrogacy can also reduce the demand for commercial surrogacy abroad” (The Norwegian Biotechnology Advisory Board 2015).

Altruistic surrogacy was thus a potential regulatory solution, but surprisingly it was not debated in the parliamentary proceedings at all.¹⁰ We suggest that the discursive hegemony gained by the human trafficking storyline contributed to pushing altruistic surrogacy as an alternative regulatory solution out of the debate, as the monetary and commercial aspect of reproduction struck a nerve in Norwegian culture. Through this storyline, the commercial aspect and the role of money in surrogacy arrangements were elements that defined surrogacy in commercial terms associated with a monetary transaction. Furthermore, the dominating human trafficking discourse eliminated altruistic surrogacy from the debate all together. The boundaries between compensation and payment to surrogate mothers were portrayed as vague and non-existent, and this human trafficking dimension proved to be an effective stabilizing instrument (see Jasanoff 2004). A buyer and seller perspective on reproduction infringes upon what in Norway has long affiliated with legitimate parenthood due to cultural norms, count as legitimate means of becoming a parent (also see Stuvøy 2018b). We suggest that the connection between money and the human body became so problematic that the third network coalition was able to gain hegemony with surrogacy as illegitimate human trafficking rather than as a legitimate means to become a parent (like for instance IVF). Hence, the ‘storyline of human trafficking’ gradually came to dominate the debate.

Surrogacy moved from being an invisible practice that was indirectly restricted in the Norwegian legislation to being more

visible and illegitimate due to the monetary aspect.

Svingen (2017) has shown how the parliamentary politicians went from trying to include this practice in the collective term ‘assisted reproduction’, to making a point of isolating it from the established practices of assisted reproduction. This did not mean that all members of the coalition shared the perception of surrogacy as human trafficking. However, the monetary aspect provided a cultural taboo once it was the very definition of surrogacy, which also made it difficult to talk about surrogacy as a legitimate offer. The taboo is related not only to a traditional view on family life, but also on a traditional view on the connection between money and the body (Svingen 2017; see also Stuvøy 2018).

The tension between the illegitimate monetary perspective and the legitimate desire to have children might be central to understanding why surrogacy become so controversial in Norway. We suggest that the coalitions and the temporary leverage they gained in the course of the first surrogacy debate paved the way for an easy solution for the Parliament’s discussion in 2018 on the revision of the Biotechnology Act. The temporary act on surrogacy in 2013 provided an opportunity to establish parenthood to children already born, all the while ‘keeping up’ the surrogacy tourism abroad, without facing the same legal dilemmas as the ones surfacing in 2010. The coalition and ‘storyline of equality’ had in other words achieved two important goals that can explain the low participation in the media debate in 2018. The victims produced by the equality coalition, the intended parents, still did not have all the legal rights they wanted. However, it is easier to avoid the cultural taboo around money and body by seeking surrogacy agreements abroad than to challenge the human trafficking aspect and continue this debate.

Since the result of the Parliamentary discussion was a complete ban of surrogacy arrangements, the coalition and ‘storyline of biological parenthood,’ also achieved the solution they had worked for even if the main argument for this solution was human trafficking and not biology or nature.

Victims

As demonstrated, the different storylines produced multiple vulnerable victims. We can consequently say that the Norwegian debate was dominated by an overarching narrative about discrimination and wrongdoing of these victims: The three storylines all tell different stories about certain groups or actors who are discriminated against, either by allowing surrogacy or by not allowing it. The discrimination discourse is therefore a common ground for the debate, yet there is disagreement between and

within storylines as to who is being discriminated and hence get the role of ‘victim.’ The ‘storyline of biological parenthood’ produced the moral aspect in such a way that made it difficult to legalize any sort of surrogacy practices. The storyline shaped a victim that can be described as relatively powerful, in the sense that a child as a victim often has an impact on our culture. As Andersen (2013) notes, however, the position as a victim can be paradoxical, as in the case of surrogacy. In the storyline drawing upon equality, we

¹⁰ Cf. Parliamentary debate May 15th 2018.



see that the actors actively produced themselves as victims. They did this by demonstrating that they were without legal rights and victims of great injustice because they were denied the right to have assisted reproduction in Norway. This victim position also has a certain resonance in Norway, where considerations concerning identity politics holds a strong position in (parts of) the public. This storyline hence coproduces justice as the object of morale, with an appeal for finding a practice which also favors gay men's and infertile/sick women's right to parenthood, drawing upon the equality to lesbian women's right to have sperm donated.¹¹

The third and last storyline differs from the other two in the sense that while the actors agree on the problem regarding the monetary

and commercial aspect, they do not agree on what the solution of the controversy should be. The coalition formatted surrogacy as ethically and morally wrong due to the human trafficking aspect and portrayed the surrogate as the victim. However, finding a solution, i.e. co-producing this aspect into a relevant practice, became impossible. There were conflicting solutions produced in this storyline, where a complete ban or altruistic surrogacy altered as desired regulatory outcomes. Thus, the third storyline took more the shape of a discursive controversy than a discursive coalition. This storyline in particular show that various actors who often disagree strongly in politics and on other specific matters can share a common perception of a phenomenon that consequentially produces a strong and influential discursive hegemony.

The Storyline of human trafficking effect

Our findings indicate that the very creation of network coalitions has affected the formal policy regulation, both in terms of its processes and the outcome. As we argued in the introduction, the network coalition's strength is that it unites a variety of actors who together develop a common storyline that drives the debate, hence influencing opinions and the agenda. However, their direct influence on the regulation itself, is determined by a number of factors. The third coalition in our study, represented by the 'storyline of human trafficking,' appeared to be the most influential, and we argue that two key factors determine its success. Over the course of the three years it took to solve the legal and ethical issues around the existing surrogacy children through

a temporary bill, this storyline transformed the phenomenon in such a way that a majority of actors, including those outside the original coalition and storyline, agreed that surrogacy was solely an illegitimate form of human trafficking. In previous debates about ART, when revising the Biotechnology Act (2003, with revisions in 2004, 2007), network coalitions arguing for rights and justice typically have gained leverage. In 2018, surrogacy was separated from previous debates on ART and converted to a debate about human trafficking. Regarding reproduction, the discussion about the new Biotechnology Act continued as a debate on equality and justice in regard to allowing egg donation and single women's rights to have assisted reproduction.

Conclusion

We argue that the heterogeneous nature of the network coalitions provides its strength through a storyline which is grounded in many and various actors. The heterogeneity and the lack of a correspondingly heterogeneous institutional political coalition does however make it difficult to reach common ground and pass laws on such practices, as we have seen in the case of the revising of the Biotechnology Act. We argue that one potential consequence of the hegemonic leverage gained by the 'storyline of human trafficking' is that it provided a solution for the ethically challenging aspects, which furthermore provided the solution for the institutional policy regulation.

Does this imply that network coalitions hold greater power than the institutional policy regulation? Our findings indicate a form of co-production. The discourse coalitions put forth a specific problem (the Volden case) that the institutional politics (Parliament) had to solve in 2013. Since the core of the problem represented in storyline 1 and 2 was solved, these two coalitions did not have to reignite in the fight. Consequently, the 'storyline of human trafficking' framed the phenomenon successfully and the Parliament took over. This demonstrates how network coalition and institutional politics worked together and co-produced a new policy.

References

Andersen, Unn Conradi. 2013. "Offerposisjonens paradoks – Offentlig debatt om surrogati." *Tidsskrift for samfunnsforskning* 54 (01):31-62.

Andersen, Unn Conradi. 2014. "Når margin blir mainstream. Forhandlinger av ekteskap, foreldreskap og slektskap i mediene." Doctoral thesis, Department of Sociology and Human

¹¹ After the revision of the Norwegian marriage law which allowed same sex marriage lesbian women achieved the rights to sperm donation like other married women (Lov om ekteskap of 2009).



- Geography, University of Oslo.
- Antonsen, Marie Auensen. 2017. "(U) Mulige medborgere: Engasjement, etikk og emosjoner i styring av human bioteknologi i Norge." Doctoral thesis, Department of Interdisciplinary Studies of Culture, Norwegian University of Science and Technology.
- Antonsen, Marie Auensen, and Nora Levold. 2014. "Bioteknologinemnda og jakten på hybride praksiser." In *Biopolitikk: Kropp, kunnskap og politikk*, edited by Nora Levold, 97-127. Bergen: Fagbokforlaget.
- Antonsen, Marie. 2014. "Å styre gjennom å føle? Emosjonenes politikk i debatten om tidlig ultralyd i Norge 2011-2012." In *Biopolitikk: Kropp, kunnskap og teknologi*, edited by Nora Levold, 129-160. Bergen: Fagbokforlaget.
- Bioethics, Nordic Committee on. 2017. *Legislation on biotechnology in the Nordic countries – an overview 2017*. edited by Sirpa Soini. Oslo: NordForsk.
- Bogner, Alexander, and Wolfgang Menz. 2005. "Bioethical controversies and policy advice: The production of ethical expertise and its role in the substantiation of political decision-making." In *Democratization of expertise?*, 21-40. Springer.
- Bogner, Alexander, and Wolfgang Menz. 2010. "How politics deals with expert dissent: The case of ethics councils." *Science, Technology & Human Values* 35 (6):888-914.
- Edwards, Jeanette, and Carles Salazar. 2009. *European kinship in the age of biotechnology*. Vol. 14: Berghahn Books.
- Ellingsæter, Anne Lise; Jensen, An-Magritt and Merete Lie, ed. 2013. *The Social Meaning of Children and Fertility Change in Europe*. London and New York: Routledge.
- Engeli, Isabelle, and Christine Rothmayr Allison. 2016. "When doctors shape policy: The impact of self-regulation on governing human biotechnology." *Regulation & Governance* 10 (3):248-261.
- Førde, Kristin Eng. 2017. "Intimate Distance. Transnational, Commercial Surrogacy in India." Doctoral thesis, Institute of Health and Society, University of Oslo.
- Hajer, Maarten. 1995. *The politics of environmental discourse: ecological modernization and the policy process*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Hajer, Maarten. 2003. "A frame in the fields: policymaking and the reinvention of politics." In *Deliberative policy analysis: Understanding governance in the network society*, 88-110. Cambridge University Press.
- Hajer, Maarten, and Hendrik Wagenaar, eds. 2003. *Deliberative policy analysis: understanding governance in the network society*, *Theories of Institutional Design*: Cambridge University Press.
- Jasanoff, Sheila. 2004. *States of knowledge: the co-production of science and the social order*: Routledge.
- Jasanoff, Sheila. 2011. *Reframing rights: Bioconstitutionalism in the genetic age*: MIT Press.
- Jasanoff, Sheila. 2012. *Science and public reason*: Routledge.
- Jasanoff, Sheila. 2016. *The ethics of invention: technology and the human future*: WW Norton & Company.
- Koch, Lene. 1995. "Forplantning, køn og teknologi." In *Fosterdiagnostikk og risikotænkning*, edited by Bente and Robin May Schott Rosenbeck. København: Museum Tusulanums forlag.
- Kvale, Halvard, 2016: "Mor med annens livmor", i *Gen-i-alt*, <http://www.bioteknologiradet.no/2016/08/mor-med-en-annens-livmor/>.
- Kvande, Lise. 2008. "Bilete av svangerskap - bilete av foster: ultralyddiagnostikk i norsk svangerskapsomsorg 1970-1995." Doctoral thesis, Department of Interdisciplinary Studies of Culture, Norwegian University of Science and Technology.
- Kvande, Lise, and Nora Levold. 2014. "Klinisk bruk av ultralyddiagnostikk på 1980-tallet: medisinske, politiske eller etiske?" In *Biopolitikk: Kropp, kunnskap og teknologi*, edited by Nora Levold, 33-60. Bergen: Fagbokforlaget.
- Levold, Nora, ed. 2014. *Biopolitikk: kropp, kunnskap og teknologi*. Bergen: Fagbokforlaget.
- Levold, Nora. 2014. "Å sortere eller ikke sortere - er det spørsmålet: kontroverser om prenatal diagnostikk i norsk bioteknologilovgivning." In *Biopolitikk: Kropp, kunnskap og teknologi*, edited by Nora Levold, 61-96. Bergen: Fagbokforlaget.
- Levold, Nora, and Marie Antonsen. 2011. "Effektive representasjoner? Forventninger til og bekymring for forskning på befruktede egg." *Etikk i praksis - Nordic Journal of Applied Ethics* 5 (1):97-125.
- Lie, Merete, Malin Noem Ravn, and Kristin Spilker. 2011. "Reproductive imaginations: Stories of egg and sperm." *NORA - Nordic Journal of Feminist Gender Research* 19 (4):231-248.
- Lie, Merete; Lykke, Nina, ed. 2017. *Assisted reproduction across borders: feminist perspectives on normalizations, disruptions and transmissions*. Vol. 19, *Routledge Advances in Feminist Studies and Intersectionality*. New York: Routledge.
- Lov om ekteskap [ekteskapsloven] av 2009, Barne og likestillingsdepartementet. <https://lovdata.no/dokument/NL/lov/1991-07-04-47>.
- Meld. St. 39 (2016-2017) Evaluering av bioteknologiloven, Helse og omsorgsdepartementet. 2017. <https://www.regjeringen.no/no/dokumenter/meld.-st.-39-20162017/id2557037/>.
- Melhuus, Marit. 2012. "Hva slags mening gir sorteringssamfunnet? – En hendelse og noen refleksjoner omkring kunnskap, likhet, valg, individ og samfunn i Norge." *Norsk antropologisk tidsskrift* 23 (01):33-47.
- Melhuus, Marit. 2012a. *Problems of conception: Issues of law, biotechnology, individuals and kinship*: Berghahn Books.
- Melhuus, Marit. 2015. "Hva er lov? Bioteknologi, lovgivningsprosesser og slektskap. Noen antropologiske perspektiver (foredrag på møte i Bergen 5.11.2015)." In *Det norske vitenskapsakademi - årbok 2015*.
- Nielsen, Torben Hviid, Arve Monsen, Tore Tennøe, and Are Eriksen. 2000. *Livets tre og kodenens kode : fra genetikk til bioteknologi : Norge 1900-2000*. Oslo: Gyldendal akademisk.
- The Norwegian Biotechnology Advisory Board. 2015. *Bør surrogati være tillatt i Norge? Evaluering av bioteknologiloven, kapittel 2*. <http://www.bioteknologiradet.no/filarkiv/2015/06/Uttalelse-om-surrogati.pdf>.
- Ravn, Malin. 2005. "A matter of free choice? Some structural and cultural influences on the decision to have and not to have children in Norway." In *Barren states. The population 'implosion'*



- in Europe, edited by Carrie; Lewis Douglass, Jane, 29-48. Oxford and New York: Berg. Rothman, Barbara.
- Ravn, Malin Noem, Kristensen, Guro Korsnes; Sørensen, Siri Øyslebø; Spilker, Kristin H. 2016. *Reproduksjon, kjønn og likestilling i dagens Norge*. Bergen: Fagbokforlaget.
- Solberg, Berge. 2004. "Fosterdiagnostikk og respekten for funksjonshemmede mennesker." In *Med Downs gjennom livet: Etikk og menneskeverd knyttet til mennesker med Downs syndrom*, edited by K; Weitmeyer Bogen, M; Aalandslid, M, 55-71. Høvik: Kolofon forlag.
- Solberg, Berge. 2008. "Frykten for et samfunn uten Downs syndrom." *Etikk i praksis - Nordic Journal of Applied Ethics* 2 (1):33-52.
- Spilker, Kristin. 2008. "Assistert slektskap: Biopolitikk i reproduksjonsteknologienes tidsalder." Doctoral thesis, Department of Interdisciplinary Studies of Culture, Norwegian University of Science and Technology.
- Spilker, Kristin; Lie, Merete. 2007. "Gender and Bioethics Intertwined." *The European Journal of Women's Studies* 14 (4):327-340.
- Stuvøy, Ingvill. 2016. "Surrogati: Reproduksjon i globalt farvann." In *Reproduksjon, kjønn og likestilling i dagens Norge*, edited by Ravn, Malin Noem; Kristensen, Guro Korsnes; Sørensen, Siri Øyslebø; Stuvøy, Ingvill. 2018. "Accounting for the money-made parenthood of transnational surrogacy." *Anthropology & Medicine* 25:1-16.
- Stuvøy, Ingvill. 2018. "Parenthood at a price: Accounting for the viability of transnational surrogacy." Doctoral thesis, Department of Sociology and Political Science, Norwegian University of Science and Technology.
- Svingen, Marit. 2017. "Legitimt foreldreskap? Forhandlinger om betydning, implikasjon og regulering av surrogati i Stortinget 2010-2013." Master's thesis, Department of Interdisciplinary Studies of Culture, Norwegian University of Science and Technology.
- Thompson, Charis. 2005. *Making parents: The ontological choreography of reproductive technologies*: MIT press.



STRUGGLES OVER LEGITIMATE SCIENCE:

Science Policy Ideals of Excellence within the Field of Sociology

by Johanna Hokka

In several countries, national governments have implemented science policy reforms to elevate research excellence and to promote managerialist principles with an aim to gain success in the global knowledge-based economy. This qualitative study explores discursive responses to the current science policy reforms in Finnish and Swedish sociology. Drawing on a Bourdieusian perspective and a two-country research context, the research scrutinises the dynamics between the field of sociology and science policy paying particular attention to how the science policy ideals on excellence appear in the internal discursive struggles surrounding legitimate science among professors of sociology, who are conceived as a scientific elite. The results show that the excellence ideals are met in various, conflicting ways in sociology. Furthermore, there are national differences as Finnish sociology expresses more compliance towards science policy reforms than its Swedish counterpart, which seems more able to distance itself from these ideals and cherish traditional academic values. These findings evince that although science policy trends are becoming increasingly global, national university traditions and political cultures entail a slightly different national shape to seemingly similar reforms, which again, shapes the way the science policy incentives are made sense of at the grassroots level of academia, even within this particular discipline.

Keywords: Science policy, excellence, sociology, legitimate science, scientific capital

Author: Johanna Hokka, Phd student
Research Centre for Knowledge, Science, Technology and Innovation Studies (TaSTI),
Tampere University, Finland.

Licensing: All content in NJSTS is published under a Creative Commons Attribution-ShareAlike 4.0 license. This means that anyone is free to share (copy and redistribute the material in any medium or format) or adapt (remix, transform, and build upon the material) the material as they like, provided they follow two provisions:
a) attribution - give appropriate credit, provide a link to the license, and indicate if changes were made.
b) share alike - any remixing, transformation or building upon the material must itself be published under the same license as the original.



Introduction

Global competition has increased European universities' commitment to excellence as an all-embracing objective. The promotion of excellence discourse has been accelerated by the policy convergence prompted by supranational organisations such as the OECD and European Union (EU). At the EU-level, the Bologna Process ensuring high-quality standards and facilitating the comparability of qualifications throughout Europe and the establishment of the new funding mechanism, the European Research Council (ERC), have played a crucial role in defining the notions of excellence in the European context. The ERC has promoted competition as a core mechanism to distribute funding for the most excellent research and the use of international peer review as a criterion for evaluating excellence. At the national level, excellence rhetoric has guided reforms in funding allocation systems and the construction of research evaluation systems in order to achieve 'world-class' research. (Wedlin and Hedmo 2015.) Also, the rise of New Public Management (NPM) doctrines in recent decades has increased the use of steering mechanisms, especially performance-based funding to ensure the productivity and efficiency of universities (Elzinga 2012; Slaughter and Leslie 1997). These reforms have aimed to enhance competitiveness, improve academic performance and increase the internationalisation of national science systems (Pinheiro et al. 2014; Sørensen et al. 2016). However, despite the stated policy convergence, the different national governance models and different university traditions generate national variations in the ways in which NPM reforms are put into practice (Bleiklie et al. 2017).

The concept of excellence and attempts to implement and operationalise it have been the object of considerable criticism. The performance measures are seen to cause unintended consequences (Weingart 2005); they are blamed for focusing too much on quantity rather than quality of research (Gläser et al. 2002) leading to a reification of individual performance measures (Burrows 2003). Additionally, since research excellence is often paralleled with English-language publications and the indicators are calculated for journals indexed in the mostly English-language Web of Science (WoS), these measures are considered inadequate for addressing the social sciences and humanities (SSH), which produce more native-language publications for national audiences (Hicks et al. 2015). Furthermore, whilst policy declarations have promoted excellence, they have also highlighted the need to foster social relevance in research, which in turn, has created tensions in universities as they struggle to find a balance between global academic excellence and direct contributions to local and national economic development and relevance (Pinheiro et al. 2014). Notwithstanding these criticisms, some scholars argue that the current indicators, while providing transparent rules, democratised the previous, potentially more 'nepotistic' method of evaluating scholars (Fochler and de Rijcke 2017).

Despite strong interest in the influence of science policy reforms in academic contexts, less attention is paid to how the science policy incentives are made sense of at the grassroots level of academia. The existing body of literature has shown that academics in general either support, comply with or resist the reforms by appealing to traditional academic values (Santiago and Carvalho 2012; Ylijoki 2014). Additionally, few studies examining the epistemic effects of performance metrics from the micro-level perspective have focused on analysing life sciences (Fochler et al. 2016; Müller and de Rijcke 2017) and arts and humanities (Hammarfelt and de Rijcke 2016). These studies demonstrate that the performance measures have become a dominant way of ascribing worth to academic practices in life sciences, and the development of publication patterns have followed the formal policy measures in humanities. However, previous studies have not taken into account the internal variance of disciplines and conflicts in terms of what is conceived as 'good' science. Drawing on a Bourdieusian perspective, this study zooms in on the complex dynamics between the disciplinary field and science policy by examining how the science policy ideals on excellence appear in the internal struggles surrounding legitimate science among the scientific elite of sociology in Finland and in Sweden. As alluded to before, although science policy trends are becoming increasingly global, national university traditions and political cultures still give slightly different national shapes to seemingly similar reforms, which makes national contrasting important. This study, by combining a Bourdieusian framework and a two-country research context, contributes to a deeper understanding of the sense-making at the grassroots level by showing the various, conflicting ways of receiving the excellence discourse within sociology, and the apparent differences between the dynamics of sociology and science policy in these two national contexts.

Sociology serves as an especially interesting case to analyse since, in recent years, it has gone through a process of fragmentation, which is often discussed under the rubric of 'crisis' because it is seen to erode the disciplinary coherence of sociology. Some scholars say that this fragmentation makes sociology especially vulnerable to the current metric culture making it unable to sustain its critical sensibility (Holmwood 2010). According to Burawoy (2005), today's competitive university context forces sociologists to focus only on earning academic credentials through highly-ranked scientific journals for peers at the expense of disseminating the ideas of democracy and humanism to lay society. This, in turn, marginalises the core mission of sociology, that is, the defence of humanity. However, Burawoy's (2005) contention represents only one of the many visions of the mission of sociology. Previous studies have shown that there is no shared understanding of legitimate sociology inside the field but multiple, even conflicting views on what 'good' sociology ought to be (Abend 2006; Hokka 2018).



By focusing on the identification of discursive responses to conditions and dynamics in the current science policy regime, the research questions guiding the study are: What kinds of discourses on legitimate science are used among the scientific elite of sociology in Finland and in Sweden? What kind of stance is

taken towards science policy ideals related to excellence? How do the discourses differ between the Finnish and Swedish contexts?

Next, I will expand on the Bourdieusian perspective applied in the study before considering the cases themselves and discussing my findings.

The Theoretical Frame

For Bourdieu (1988, 1999), the social space is composed of hierarchically structured, semiautonomous fields that function in accordance with their own internal logic, rules and practices. A field is an arena in which actors struggle for power. Since the struggles usually take the form of competition regulated by field-specific rules, Bourdieu uses a game metaphor to illustrate the actions in a field. In a scientific field, the struggles surround power to determine what is conceived of as legitimate science. Thus, the struggles also determine the conditions under which the actors will be accepted in the field, as well as the dominant forms of scientific capital associated with the production of 'good' science. Any property of knowledge production or dissemination, professional trajectory or other aspect of scientific practice can become a form of capital if it is widely valued. Whether a given property gains a high or low volume of capital depends on the recognised value it obtains in the scientific struggle. In these struggles, distinctions serve as practice to separate properties with high capital volume from those with low capital volume (Bourdieu 1984, 1993).

As the fields are only relatively autonomous, the more autonomy a field has, the more capacity it has to establish and uphold its rules. With regard to the scientific field, science policy, by managing resources and institutions of the academic domain, extends its power over the scientific field; therefore, the degree of autonomy of the scientific field is in the hands of science policy. According to Bourdieu, when the autonomous functioning of a field is defied by an external field, struggles within the field grow even more ferocious. Then, those actors who are comfortable with the emerging rules clash with those who are attached to the past. Through strategies, the actors either oppose or embrace the new rules of the game and simultaneously strive to discredit the forms

of capital upon which their opponents rest to valorise the species of capital that they possess in greater measure. (Bourdieu and Wacquant 1992.)

Previously, the Bourdieusian perspective has been applied in analysing sociology in the face of science policy demands concerning the social utility of academic research. Albert (2003) demonstrated that despite the increasing science policy demands, field-specific internal dynamics still determine what is conceived of as legitimate in Canadian sociology. Conversely, Kropp and Blok (2011) demonstrated that scientific practices in Danish sociology have been strongly imposed upon by science policy. In this study, Bourdieu's theory serves as a 'hermeneutic tool' to analyse what kind of discursive strategies the field of sociology occupied with different visions of legitimate science adopts to address science policy ideals of excellence. The interest lays in how the ideals of excellence shape the symbolic value of the various forms of scientific capital, and how, through distinctions, the actors strive to accumulate the recognized value of those forms of scientific capital that mesh with their vision of legitimate science. In addition, I will scrutinise whether the strategies used in sociology have national particularities. Considering a two-country research context provides the opportunity of attending to and making some claims about the autonomy of the field in two distinct national contexts.

Next, I will present the higher education systems and recent science policy incentives in Finland and in Sweden to illuminate which properties hold symbolic value in the current science policy regime and what rules science policy invites or compels sociology to adopt.

Finnish and Swedish Science Policy Context

Finnish and Swedish higher education (HE) systems are often described as being part of a single 'Nordic model' founded on a strong welfare state and the emphasis it places on equality and democratic values (Elken et al. 2016). With both countries becoming increasingly positioned in the international context, these values have, however, given way to the ideals of competitiveness, efficiency and excellence (Pinheiro et al. 2014). In fact, due to the great share of competitive, external funding, Finland with fifty-eight percent and Sweden with fifty-five percent (in 2015), these

two countries represent one of the most competitive funding systems in Europe (Jacob 2015; Saarnivaara 2015).

When taking a more detailed look at the HE systems in the two countries, Finland has a dual system, consisting of universities and twenty-four universities of applied sciences, whereas Swedish HE is composed of forty institutions in which twelve are older and four are newer universities, five are university colleges, and the rest are private higher education institutions. The older



universities receive about ninety percent of all research funding, while the rest focus on education, which makes the Swedish system stratified (Ljungberg et al. 2010).

In both countries, the funding systems have been renewed to better measure scientific performance and to support excellence. In 2013, the Finnish government introduced a funding formula that aimed to create 'high-quality, profiled and effective international university' (MEC 2011). The model highlights scientific output and external funding as core indicators since scientific publications account for thirteen percent and external funding, nine percent of the model. The renewed model also introduced 'internationalisation' as a new indicator that includes international teaching and research personnel and PhD degrees awarded to foreign nationals. (Kivistö et al. 2017.) The share of funding based on publications has constantly increased, being 0.3 percent in 2007–2009 and 1.7 percent in 2010–2012, but in 2013, the share increased considerably, to thirteen percent. Also, a new way of calculating scientific publications was implemented in 2013. The funding of scientific publications has been tied to the scheme known as the 'Publication Forum' in which peer-reviewed publications are divided into a three-level categorisation based to their evaluated scientific relevance with level three representing the 'top', level two 'leading' and level one representing 'basic'. Publications are also awarded points based on publication channels so that monographs in the third level receive the highest score. The Publication Forum has been frequently criticised for not taking into account SSH fields since Finnish language publications are mostly ranked at levels one or two; level three includes only international outlets. According to critiques, the SSH fields are undervalued and are in a disadvantaged position in the funding model. (Pölönen et al. 2018.)

In Sweden, the goal of the renewed funding model, introduced in 2009, was to 'work more actively with research quality' (Government Bill 2008–2009) and to enhance the internationalisation of research. Previously, the institutional block grant was allocated on a historical basis, that is, the government subsidised each domain. The current model is based on two quality indicators, research publications/citations and external funding, each accounting for ten percent. The research publications and citations are calculated on the basis of bibliometric indicators gathered via the WoS. Also in Sweden, the system of calculating publications was found disadvantageous for SSH because less than ten percent of the publications from the SSH fields are visible in WoS. Therefore, a sophisticated field-weighted measurement system was launched. (Jacob 2015.)

Data and Methods

Two datasets constitute the study's empirical base: ten interviews with Finnish professors of sociology and ten with Swedish professors.

In both countries, declarations of science policy have cited issues of social relevance and the utility of academic research as important, but during the time when the interviews were gathered, the national funding models in both countries lacked policy instruments that support social relevance.¹ However, the public funding bodies (the Academy of Finland and the Swedish Research Council, which allocate grant money on competitive basis for the research of the 'highest quality'), besides emphasising scientific quality, innovativeness, international visibility, international collaboration and mobility, also highlight the social relevance of research in their funding criteria (Aksnes et al. 2012).

Despite similarities, some national differences exist. The clear difference between Finland and Sweden is that Sweden has not carried the national funding model over as-is into universities' internal allocation schemes (Hammarfelt and Åström 2015), whereas in Finland, universities have proactively copied the funding model's fundamental principles into their own allocation systems (Kallio and Kallio 2014). According to Auranen and Nieminen (2010), this makes the Finnish system more competitive than its Swedish counterpart. In fact, it is argued that the Finnish model is one of the most performance-oriented funding models in Europe (de Boer et al. 2015). Furthermore, Finland has been more radical in modernising its HE according to NPM principle than Sweden, and the shift towards market-oriented HE was exceptionally rapid and profound. In Finland, the reforms have been strongly politically steered and state-led, whereas in Sweden, the shift towards NPM principles has been more moderate (Auranen and Nieminen 2010; Pelkonen and Teräväinen-Litardo 2013). This is illustrated, for instance, by the change in the legal statuses of universities in Finland and Sweden. In Finland, the status of universities changed from state administrations to public corporations strengthening their financial and administrative autonomy and abolishing the status of employees as civil servants in 2010. In Sweden, however, despite the government's efforts to invite universities to apply to leave the civil service and reconstitute themselves as public foundations, the majority of universities refused, and they remained government agencies with their staff retaining their status as civil servants. (Jacob 2015; Pinheiro et al. 2014.)

When discussing the study's results, I will examine the place of these policy incentives, the reforms in funding allocation systems and the internationalisation targets motivated by excellence in the sense-making of Finnish and Swedish sociology.

The interviewees, all in their fifties and sixties, represented a wide array of research orientations and epistemological styles. Only

¹ In Sweden from 2018, allocation is based on three criteria: performance in attracting project funding, publications and co-operation with companies and society.



three of the interviewees were women (two Swedish, one Finnish), reflecting the male dominance of Finnish and Swedish sociology in general. Finland has forty-four professors of sociology, less than a third of whom are women (Vipunen 2016); the corresponding number in Sweden is nearly double that at eighty, with about one-quarter being women (UKÄ 2011). The sociology departments chosen for this study are nationally leading departments located in established and research-intensive universities.

The purpose was to trace the discursive responses of sociology to the science policy reforms from the point of view of informants with a very special speaker positions in the field (Alasuutari 1995), not to capture the sense-making of the field in general. The informants were selected for their standing in the field. They are full-time professors with permanent positions and eminent scholars having attained scientific renown nationally and internationally through their research. Furthermore, they hold major positions in decision-making bodies through which they control internal reproduction and serve as gatekeepers to knowledge and reputation in the field (Bourdieu 1988). Hence, they can be conceptualised as scientific elite. From this elite position, they have the power to 'delineate and embody the values of [their] discipline[s]' (Becher 1989: 3) and to make decisions about what constitutes legitimate science in the field (Bourdieu 1988). This renders the sense-making of these carefully selected informants especially relevant.

The interview themes ranged from daily work practices and personal career trajectory to broader themes related to the transformation of the university sector and its effects on the status of sociology. As for the analysis, I used discursive reading

to trace the relatively coherent cultural sense-making structures that captured the distinct visions of legitimate science in sociology (Chouliaraki and Fairclough 1999). In the analysis process, I first read through all of the data several times and then selected all extracts that pertained to the relevant aspects of science policy in one way or another. From these selected extracts, I inductively generated data-driven classifications denoted as discourses. Besides manifesting a certain kind of vision of legitimate sociology, the discourses also serve as discursive strategies to respond to the science policy ideals on excellence. To unravel the internal dynamics in each national context, I examined relationships among the discourses in each nation's data through a context-sensitive close reading. I also paid close attention to the pervasiveness of the discourses in the sense that if some discourse penetrated the whole data, it served as dominant discourse. The discourses are named on the basis of the stance towards the science policy ideals (supporting, opposing and complying). Each discourse was utilized by more than one professor, and individual professors could commit to multiple discourses.

To assure anonymity, neither personal identifiers nor institutional backgrounds are exposed. The interviewees are represented with a code composed of a country indicator (FIN for Finland and SWE for Sweden) plus a unique distinguishing number. In the analysis section, I have indented longer quotations, while shorter extracts have been enclosed in quotation marks. In the following section, I will scrutinise the discourses through four dimensions: publishing, internationalisation, competition for funding and socialisation of PhD students. These dimensions are data-driven since they were frequently brought up by the interviewees.

The Supporting Discourse

In this discourse, the recent science policy reforms are portrayed as a clear improvement over the 'old' logic of the field, that is, they are supported. This discourse is grounded in a vision in which research that meets international scientific standards and is internationally competitive represents legitimate science. Furthermore, an efficient, determined and competitive approach to research work is deemed valuable. Hence, the current science policy incentives, which bring productivity, internationalization and competitiveness, are embraced. This discourse is frequently used in the Finnish data but only rarely, if at all, in the Swedish data.

With regard to publishing, today's performance indicators, with their tallying of publications in highly-ranked journals, are deemed favourable for research quality since they encourage striving to be 'at the top' internationally. According to this discourse, the international scientific community is the arena where 'real' science takes place. Earning one's spurs and winning prestige among one's peers occur through international publishing as 'certainly international publishing is the most... appreciation comes namely through that' (FIN4). Thus, scientific capital is displayed via international top-tier articles, and they

possess high symbolic value, which is brought out through a distinction against monographs written in the author's native language:

Before, there was a strong idea of sociology as national discipline with [a] national mission. The studies were written in Finnish, and the most valued form of publication was monograph. It was a strong way of thinking then but not anymore. At least it does not prevent writing in English for an international audience. (FIN1)

This distinction presents a conception of monographs as an out-of-date publication format that belongs to the sociology of times gone by. This statement implies that times have changed; sociology has cut its ties to the nation state and simultaneously the dominance of books written in the native language has diminished.

Not only international publishing but also the demands of science policy for productivity and efficiency in terms of publishing are seen as increasing the quality of research. Efficiency is depicted as going hand in hand with research quality:



Research rarely becomes better if you just keep harping on it. (FIN3)

If there are no criteria for anything, then...I saw that many of my older colleagues spent time on futile rumination and dawdling and the results were still not so good. (FIN1)

According to this discourse, academia enjoyed a far too privileged position previously since there were no clearly-defined targets set for scholars. This lack of systematic steering is seen as having caused irresponsibility since 'everyone did what they felt like' (FIN1). Because the current system calls for a determined, well-directed way of conducting research, it 'lops off the slackness that once was called academic freedom' (FIN3). To highlight the virtue of efficiency, academic freedom is expressed here in terms of looseness and laxity, even laziness.

Internationalisation as a science policy aim is supported since participating in the international arena raises evaluation standards and thereby improves research quality. Previously, it was 'enough' to operate in the national sphere, but today scholars are expected to be active on the international stage. According to this discourse, the value of internationalisation does not, however, seem evident to everyone in the field. Some are presented as reluctant to accept that the game now calls for internationalisation. This can be seen in the data in characterisations of obstructionists who must be 'dragged' or 'pushed' into the international arena:

Internationality forces one to put one's own work into perspective so that one does not get stuck in a rut of a single national theme and write about it for decades. Instead, it forces thinking about its significance in a broader sense and forces to create networks. (FIN1)

Probably there are those who think that it is not nice to write in English for the international publication forums, and they do not want to do that on principle. While we have been planning to establish a new journal, there have been those who ask, 'Aren't there enough international journals? Why can't we publish in [the] publication series of the department?' So there occurs that kind of critique and suspicion of the prevailing publication trend and the properties through which to gain merits. (FIN2)

By pointing the finger at those who must be forced to step out of their comfort zone in the national sphere onto the international level or those 'suspicious' scholars who reject the features now determining one's professional trajectory as 'unpleasant', this discourse creates a distinction from actors who do not dare or care to become international. The expressions used suggest that 'those others' are too comfort-loving, even cowardly, whereas the actors who are involved with internationalisation are brave enough to expose themselves internationally. Above all, according to this discourse, those who withdraw from internationalisation will not be recognised as competent players in the field.

Similarly, to the demand for productivity in publishing, the competitive funding system is presented as sharpening and boosting activity in sociology:

There is always competition for funding, and it really pisses me off when all sorts of lousy scholars get money for all sorts of silly projects. So there is constant complaint about that: 'Oh, he/she got it, and we didn't.' But that kind of jealousy only keeps up the pace. (FIN3)

Those who oppose the competitive funding system are portrayed as complainers who do not seem to understand reality. 'People are complaining; [there's] too much competition. Why can't I have funding?' (SWE3). Besides 'keeping the wheels turning', competition separates the wheat from the chaff and hence represents a rational tool to ensure that the most qualified research gets funding; otherwise, the distribution of funding would be arbitrary and ineffective:

I find the competitive funding system good because then we do not have lazy money in the sense that there would be money for all the silly ideas. So in terms of quality assurance and in sifting the 'top' from the rest, the competitive funding system is an excellent way to allocate money. (FIN4)

According to this discourse, competition encourages scholars to put forth more effort, which, in turn, leads to better research. While funding represents scientific capital, it becomes evident that not any kind of funding will do; some funding sources carry a higher volume of scientific capital than others, as is evident in this comment: 'With my level of ambition, it is miserable that I do not have an EU project. I should absolutely have an EU project' (FIN10). This reflects science policy's push to apply for money from the EU. The reference to 'ambition' implies that getting an EU grant is associated with scholarly proficiency and, thereby, represents a high volume of scientific capital.

The determined, competitive and effective orientation towards research that is valued in this discourse becomes most apparent with regard to PhD students. Those doctoral students who are active and alert in adopting the prevailing assessment criteria are seen as competent players. They are the kind 'you do not have to push and pull along' (FIN1), and they are familiar with today's productivity demands:

PhD students should publish regularly. It is not enough [to say] 'okay; at the moment, I'm doing my thesis'. Instead, while writing their theses, they should also make plans for the future so that there won't be any breaks in their research work. (FIN1)

I have PhD students who have created international networks for themselves. That is very respectable. (FIN10)



To succeed in the game, PhD students must be prepared to construct their scientific careers determinedly and ambitiously from the very early stages. They should write solely in English and create international networks right from the beginning. The target, then, is to ensure that the next generation is at ease in the international arena, is internationally mobile and has built credible international networks.

In sum, in drawing a distinction from actors who still operate with the 'old' logic of the field of sociology, this discourse advocates

science policy ideals of excellence. It depicts them as revising and upgrading the prior rules and logic. According to this discourse, previously sociology did not strive to be at the forefront internationally. Today, in contrast, prevailing science policy incentives are transforming sociology into something more upright, determined and ambitious. It is evident that international activity in the form of international publishing, international networks and international funding are desirable. These features are critical if the actor is to be recognised as a competent player in the field.

The Opposing Discourse

In this discourse, the current science policy incentives are expressed as putting research quality under threat by interfering with the practices of knowledge production in sociology. This discourse grounds its vision of legitimate science in traditional academic values associated with Humboldtian principles, which emphasise extensive freedom in academic research. In this view, a university should act as an alma mater, a collegial space for cultivating the human mind and dedicating one's time to deep reflection and civilisation. Furthermore, the fruits of intellectual endeavours should not be restricted to the academic sphere; they ought to be distributed to an extra-scientific audience with enlightenment shared with laypersons as well. Although concerns about science policy ideals related to excellence are expressed in both datasets, the Finnish and Swedish data differ in the space depicted as existing in relation to these ideals.

The prevailing performance indicators for scientific publishing are criticised greatly for prioritising international peer-reviewed articles at the expense of books. Carrying a 'personal, intellectual style' and exerting 'a long-lasting influence' (SWE4), books represent a high volume of scientific capital in this discourse while today's performance indicators are likely to render books 'an underrated form of publication'. To boost books' symbolic value, the opposing discourse draws a distinction between books and articles wherein 'writing a book is much more demanding and is much more difficult than writing four articles' (SWE2). The strict structure of article format compels the scholar to present studies in a simplified, less rich way, making them 'boring' and 'foreseeable' and rendering in-depth discussion of the phenomena impossible.

Besides performance indicators favouring articles, the science policy demands for productivity and efficiency in publishing are presented as having detrimental effects on the knowledge-production practices of sociology. In the opposing discourse, this 'quantitative spirit' leads academics to strive merely to maximise the number of articles they produce. That can lead to foul play and unethical research practices, as evidenced for instance, in recycling work or 'slicing' a research topic into smaller and smaller parts to generate more articles:

You do one article. Then you change a heading and some variables and do another article. In that way, you can produce five or six articles. You can notice it in the doctoral students by observing how narrow the area they are dealing with. This leads to knowledge that is trivial. (FIN1)

Well, what we laughed about earlier, that 'publish or perish', I... joke about it; nowadays there isn't one single article where you have more than one table, because if you have two tables, you can make two articles of it. (SWE7)

According to this discourse, since an article is designed to deal with a tiny and very specific part of a research phenomenon, knowledge is depicted as becoming detached from the wider historical and contextual background. The current system leads to 'article-milling' and tends to create a kind of ethos in which 'it is not important to understand the world and phenomena, but it is important to have these articles published because otherwise you don't rank so high' (SWE4). Accordingly, here it is only quantity that matters, not thorough reflection and truth-seeking. Unlike the supporting discourse, wherein efficiency is depicted as enhancing the quality of research, in this discourse an ostentatious emphasis on productivity tends to de-intellectualise academia.

Since this discourse is focused on enlightening people, including laymen and political decision-makers, the books that contribute to the extra-scientific audiences possess a high volume of scientific capital. Writing books in one's native language is presented as problematic, however, because of the strong science policy push for international publishing:

There has been a downsizing of the importance of sociology for a while. This demand comes very much from the political sphere to publish in so-called international journals. And those politicians, they never read those journals. This makes us more and more uninteresting for national politics. It is mainly political scientists and economists who are publicly relevant as regards to political issues. (SWE5)

I think it is bad that we are not writing in Finnish. If we are



writing increasingly in English and less in Finnish, that will increase alienation. The social sciences, however, are national disciplines that have a national mission. They say that you may treat research themes related to the Finnish context in the international articles, but that is not true. And if we look at the social discussions, it is the economists who dominate there, and the influence of sociology is rather small. (FIN7)

Because the current reward system prioritises international scientific peer-reviewed articles, communication with the political decision-makers and a lay audience is rendered difficult. Through this lack of communication, sociology is cast as losing its social relevance. According to this discourse, sociologists once had great influence on socio-political discussions, but now economists have unseated them as the social experts. On one hand, there seems to be some sort of ambivalence in science policy declarations; while preaching the importance of the social impact of research, science policy with its actual incentives puts strong emphasis on international publishing. At the same time, the argument that economics dominates current socio-political discussions brings out the power dynamics among the various disciplines. It is argued that the ruling governmental power favours economics since knowledge from that domain meshes better into their political agenda whereas 'the social demand for sociological knowledge has decreased' (FIN6).

Science policy's push for internationalisation, at least with regard to publishing, is depicted as having gone too far, with writing in English becoming an end in itself:

If you are writing in Swedish, it is not especially valued. But if you write [the] same thing in English, it is [a] good international publication. [laughs] (SWE3)

The common conception seems to be that everything written in English for an international forum is inevitably considered valuable and qualified, irrespective of how solid the research is in reality; whereas research reported upon in Finnish/Swedish is disregarded. According to the opposing discourse, the attitude towards internationalisation is thus presented as naïve; science policy overemphasises the value of internationalisation thereby encouraging pretence and artifice in sociology.

With respect to the competition for funding, this discourse presents the competitive funding system as reducing diversity in science. The peer-review panels of the research-funding agencies tend to be conservative in their funding decisions since they are not willing to provide grants for research that go beyond the existing trend. At the level of individual scholars, this means that it is more lucrative for scholars to prove their expertise in a very narrow area of research and specialise heavily rather than delve into whole new research areas. It is stated that no space remains for 'brave, new openings or individuals who challenge the normative science' (FIN8) or for ground-breaking research.

In general, this discourse presents the all-encompassing competition as corrupting academic practices. To manage well in the competitive research environment, everyone must concentrate on his or her personal reputation-building and profit-seeking. The competitive spirit calls for 'calculation' and 'opportunism'. Scholars begin to manoeuvre, picking peers with whom it seems worthwhile to co-operate and determining which tasks are profitable to engage in and which are not. Hence, increasing competition feeds greedy and egoistic work practices, which act against Humboldtian values of collegiality. This concern about competition and a 'fistfight' for positions and funding is expressed most visibly among PhD students, since they are put under heavy pressure in relation to competition. It is argued that PhD students 'have very limited freedom, and they must take up a very serious attitude towards their work' (FIN6). Because of the tight competition, present-day doctoral students do not have space to conduct research carefully, engage in profound enquiry or set ambitious targets such as creating far-reaching knowledge for the ages:

When I was a new researcher thirty years ago, it was still uncertain but I could say, 'I write for the library. If my text has any worth, the next generations will find it'. You can't do that if you are young today. You will have your first research project but [you] won't have anything else if you try to say something like that. I think that the mature individual should have time and resources for reflection. (SWE7)

Because of the performance indicators, the worst possible idea at the moment is to create a sophisticated monograph in Finnish about a topic that would be extremely important for the development of Finnish society. If you want to build a career in academia, do not write a sophisticated monograph in Finnish. Do not dig into the topic profoundly. It would be a terrible mistake. Instead, you must write three or four articles promptly and publish them in esteemed journals that are classified in the political system called Publication Forum. (FIN8)

To become mature, highly civilised intellectuals and to find new paths of thinking, PhD students should go through a trial-and-error process. This process would necessitate academic freedom in terms of space and time to reflect on things at one's leisure, but the competitive research environment and productivity expectations does not allow that.

In both datasets, this discourse displays anxiety surrounding science policy and how it tends to alter the logic of the field of sociology, but the Finnish and Swedish data differ in how much leeway exists in relation to science policy instruments. In the Finnish data, politically-loaded expressions such as 'capitalism comes and vandalises' (FIN6) and 'the tyranny of international academic arbitrariness' (FIN7) reflect anger and bitterness toward the policy incentives. Instead of being an alma mater, the university is described as a greedy employer that, in response to strict profit targets, forces one to carry out research 'half-arsed'



or 'not so properly', implying that sociology is under the yoke of market forces:

When I was recruited for university, sociology was associated with positive openness. There was more variety in what sociology could be. That was then. Today, 'caterpillar sociology'—a kind of sociology that is extremely serious, very discipline-respectful, and focused on internationality—rules. Of course, now I'm in a position where I must participate in the decision making where money is involved. Maybe therefore I see more severity and rigidity in relation to what sociology ought to be. (FIN10)

Here, strictly-set profit targets erode diversity in sociological thinking and thereby narrow the spectrum of legitimate sociology. Extracts such as these suggest that there is nothing to be done in the face of current regulations, since 'money talks', and the current system does not really leave any space for the autonomous functioning of sociology.

In the Swedish data, irrespective of the concerns expressed in relation to science policy incentives, some space seems to remain for acting in line with Humboldtian values. In the extreme form, a department or a unit's well-established position allows liberty from current demands:

Being at this institution is a privilege. Of course, we have to apply for research money, but we are not heavily dependent on external money. We have an opportunity here to sit half a year

and just read and look into things and to understand things in new ways. So if I want, I can sit here as I do right now and then maybe publish two books at the same time almost. (SWE5)

A financially secure position enables some distance from the policy instruments and provides an opportunity to do research 'as usual'. While the Swedish data do present the policy incentives as 'in the air' and affecting one's work in some sense, they show the actors as successfully ignoring them:

We have a conference on how [the] changed university system means changed sociology. It probably means a lot that it could be good to bring up those points of criticism. A sort of neoliberal kind of ranking, effective instrumental, non-intellectual. But I feel I can be intellectual still. (SWE4)

In conclusion, the opposing discourse is based on a vision of legitimate science that is rooted in traditional academic values. By blaming the science policy incentives for reducing research quality in sociology, the opposing discourse takes a stance completely antithetical to the supporting one. The prevailing performance indicators are depicted as decreasing the symbolic value of those properties (such as book writing, deep reflection and devotion to research) that afford conducting legitimate science and accord value instead to properties such as producing scientific journal articles, which are inadequate for meeting the criteria for real quality. Furthermore, this discourse depicts current science policy aims to boost efficiency and productivity as feeding unethical practices.

The Complying Discourse

The final discourse supports traditional academic values, as manifested in the opposing discourse, but it also acknowledges that one who wishes to keep up in the game must adjust to the science policy ideals. Thus, this discourse articulates a balance between the other two. In essence, the complying discourse expresses the view that, since most scholars are following the new rules of the game, opposition to those rules would mean academic suicide and exclusion from the field. To be recognised as a competent player, one must learn to play by the prevailing rules, even if those rules are not always consistent with one's personal vision of legitimate science. The complying discourse is manifested rather similarly in the two national contexts, but some differences between the Finnish and Swedish versions are evident in terms of the degree of manoeuvring room in upholding the rules of the game.

The change in the publication practices of sociology, the shift from writing books to writing articles as the most favourable format, is referred to in a rather neutral manner:

Since these indicators for quality and productivity give preference to international publications, I have focused on writing them. If there weren't that kind of steering, I would publish more in Finnish.

Then again, it would be stupid to assume...[that] since people are substantially reading books and articles in English, why wouldn't they participate in the discussions that they draw from? (FIN2)

When I wrote my PhD degree, not many of my elderly colleagues were publishing in English. They wrote monographs. All of my fellow PhD students also wrote monographs. This has been a dramatic change in favour of writing a compilation of articles. You are expected to publish in English since the university counts publications. So we need to publish internationally, and sociology is indeed an international subject. (SWE3)

These expressions imply that a book written in the native language is still seen as a potentially viable publishing format. Hence, in contrast both to the supporting discourse, which paints scientific capital as displayed solely through articles, and to the opposing discourse, in which books hold high symbolic value, this discourse values articles and books alike. However, writing international peer-reviewed articles in English is a 'rational' thing to do, since 'everyone' is writing them. This implies that the recognised symbolic value of articles is higher than that of books and that they possess a higher volume of scientific capital than books. Under the prevailing rules



of the game, being recognised as a competent player demands that one must focus on writing international peer-reviewed articles rather than books.

As for the science policy push for internationalisation, this discourse depicts internationalisation as something that has always been part of the research work:

International publishing is emphasised. On the other hand, I have always published internationally even before these changes. The research work as such has not changed. For instance, the international projects I've been involved in, started before these reforms. (FIN9)

According to this discourse, scholars have always participated in international conferences, carried out international projects, and published in international forums, so nothing new is wrought by science policy incentives that promote internationalisation. Instead, the complying discourse seems to present a sense of continuity in terms of internationalisation.

The competition for funding is regarded as a thing that 'has to be done' to ensure sufficient financial resources even if that competition may be burdensome:

We as the majority are engaging in this system. We just must engage in it so that we can get money for the PhD students, that we will keep up in internationalisation and that we can be part of this and that. We have put ourselves on this treadmill. If one opts out of the competition, one simultaneously opts out of many other things too. (FIN4)

No, I don't think that we have any counter-strategies. Conversely, the strategy is that you must be active, you must apply for money. We are [an] old, traditional university. We must keep the pace. I think it would be very unwise to have some kind of protest strategy because that would be kind of [an] isolated, marginal thing to do. (SWE3)

Refusal to engage in the competition would be risky, even irrational, since those in opposition may be discriminated against and eventually excluded from the field. Accordingly, the complying discourse articulates that actors who wish to ensure their legitimate position in the field must participate in the competition for funding as 'everyone is participating in it' (SWE3). Success in the competition for funding is essential for earning recognition among peers. Thus, funding is assigned a high volume of scientific capital. Failing to secure funding would mean that 'you end up being a loser' (SWE1). That said, the intensified competition for funding does not mean that scholars should adopt ready-made research problems set by the funders or abandon their personal research interests for the sake of funding:

Before, I tried to adjust to whatever I thought that the research foundation was funding. But I wasn't successful. I just came to

a point where I thought 'I'm going to do what I really want to do'. I decided to learn the skill of writing funding applications in [such a] way that it links up with policy and whatever. So I wouldn't say that I have done certain kind of research only to attract funding. (SWE2)

I have somewhat tuned the applications, but I haven't engaged in anything that I would not find interesting simply to get money. (FIN8)

Mastery of writing funding applications consists of knowing and using the right words, that is, the vocabulary used by the funding bodies for appealing to them effectively while still representing one's own, unique research interests in the application. The art of grant writing enables a scholar to gain material resources while simultaneously staying loyal to traditional academic principles such as practising curiosity-driven research and thereby gaining prestige in the field.

As for PhD students, in the complying discourse, they must 'construct their career more consciously in terms of international merits' (FIN10) than previous generations did. This, however, is denoted concisely by stating that times have changed and the rules of the game have altered:

I am a professor, so I don't have to fight for new positions anymore and care about the new rules, but the younger colleagues have to be more conformant to the NPM rules. (SWE10)

The terms of the competition have changed. I wrote my thesis in Finnish. It was rational then and politically important. But now I do not recommend writing the thesis in Finnish to anyone. If you want to stay in academia, you must write international peer-reviewed articles. (FIN10)

Since this is the name of the game, PhD students must be prepared for the new rules—whether those rules are good or not. Writing an article-based doctoral dissertation in English is a must if one wants to build a career in academia. It would be 'unwise' and irresponsible to direct a PhD student to do otherwise.

Although the complying discourse is very much the same across the Finnish and Swedish data, there are slight differences in the range admitted for compliance and in the extent to which the changes in science policy are characterised as having altered the rules of the field. This is most apparent in the context of publishing. In the Finnish data, the expressions imply that the conditions of today's competition are fundamentally changing the scientific practices in sociology:

The superficial spirit of the present-day university shows in such a way that the scholar who cobbles together a paper on the stuff that is in the air and is productive is the one who succeeds. That is not what we really value here, but that is what is rewarded. (FIN10)



Of course, the current evaluation criteria have an effect. Because of them, I deal with much smaller pieces of themes than [I did] ten years ago. Before, I did not pay any attention to the language of publications, but now I have been trying to write in both Finnish and English. And the prevailing market-like ideology...of course has an effect on everyone's life—whether you want it to or not. (FIN7)

These quotations specify that in-depth reflection and writing in the native language would still be valued were it not for the harsh reality of the current system, which makes the actors adopt those scientific practices that are required. Thus, this discourse acknowledges that the current rules are here to stay, and they simply have to be accepted if one wants to be part of the game.

In the Swedish version, although the science policy incentives are seen just as clearly as exerting effects on the knowledge-production practices of sociology, the complying discourse seems to delineate some space and looseness in terms of the existing evaluation criteria:

In between, there are lot of papers and they I cannot care less. They are like ideas going out in various directions. But the book is the main thing. That's the kind of result, the 'amen'. The rest

is there to feed into that. (SWE6)

It seems like you are supposed to publish in peer-reviewed journals with the big impact. But I've been doing that to some extent anyway, so I don't care about it very much. Now I'm working on two books and I have [a] third one coming out in two months. (SWE10)

The articles are defined as a necessary evil that must be endured if one is to reach the main target, which is writing a book. The greatest difference here is that, besides books still seeming to possess a high volume of scientific capital in the Swedish data, there appears to be more space to choose between publishing books and articles than in the Finnish setting.

The complying discourse can be summarised as taking a rather pragmatic stance on the science policy incentives, regarding them as a factor to which one must adapt. Though it reproduces the view that participating in the game necessitates accepting the new rules, it does not reject the field's 'old' logic. In a way, this discourse serves as an articulation of common sense, a balance between the other, conflicting discourses. While not completely enraptured with the science policy ideals, as the supporting discourse is, it recognises a compulsion to comply with them.

Conclusion

This study set out to explore how the ideals of science policy related to excellence are made sense of among the scientific elite in the field of sociology in Finland and in Sweden. The three discursive strategies found in this study are very much in line with the previous studies in which the current science policy regime is either supported, resisted or complied with (Santiago and Carvalho 2012; Ylijoki 2014). This study, however, shows the existence of these different stances within one discipline, even within this limited group of eminent professors, and makes the conflicting and tentional relations between these discursive strategies visible. The most conspicuous was the juxtaposition of the supporting discourse and the opposing discourse. For the supporting discourse, science that meets today's international standards and is internationally competitive is legitimate. While this discourse assigns a high volume of scientific capital to such elements as top-tier articles, global networks and EU grants, through distinctions, it aims at showing the lack of ambition and quality within the 'old' rules of the game manifested in the opposing discourse. In contrast, the opposing discourse proceeds from a vision of legitimate science as aligned with traditional academic values. Scientific capital is accorded to books written in one's native language, on enlightenment of the wider public and on deep devotion to one's research work, whereas a distinction is drawn from scientific practices and orientation valued in the supporting discourse by deeming them unintellectual and deprived. Finally, the complying discourse strikes a balance between the

two by upholding traditional academic values and simultaneously providing a pragmatic stance towards external demands.

As for the dynamics between the inner scientific struggles of sociology and science policy, the supporting discourse and the complying discourse, while adopting the current excellence rhetoric, are playing the game in a way that goes along with the demands of science policy. Certainly, it could be argued that professors, within their position of being in charge of accumulating financial resources for their research units, do not have any other option than to follow the current rules. Conversely, the resistance raised by the opposing discourse could be interpreted as an attempt to conserve the old order, that is, the values and distribution of capital that has ensured the professors' dominant position in the field (Bourdieu 1999). According to Hammarfelt and de Rijcke (2015), current evaluation standards have been beneficial for the less powerful actors in the field since, due to the international peer-reviewed evaluation system, these actors are less dependent on the national elite who have previously controlled the national reward systems. From this standpoint, the opposition could be seen to embody the nostalgic yearning of the 'good old times' when the professors enjoyed rather sovereign status in the field, which is now challenged by external demands (Ylijoki 2005). On the other hand, the resistance expressed by the well-established professors may as well convey that while holding a dominant position, they



have more leeway in terms of the prevailing rules than scholars in subordinate positions (e.g., early-career researchers or scholars with teaching positions). In that sense, the internal dynamic of sociology could have been rather different if the data being used had also included other ranks.

When contrasting the internal dynamics of sociology in these two national contexts in more detail, the complying discourse was dominant in both countries. It also became evident that the opposing and compiling expressions frequently occurred simultaneously. Thus, it can be argued that while articulating the current science policy regime, neither Finnish nor Swedish sociology scholars can completely ignore the prevailing rules, and participation in the game requires at least some kind of adoption of the excellence incentives.

However, striking national differences were observed. In the Swedish data, the opposing expressions had a stronger presence than in Finland where compliance penetrated the entire data set. The most conspicuous finding was, however, that in the Finnish data, the supporting discourse was robust, whereas the Swedish data displayed almost no signs of the supporting discourse. The insignificance of the supporting discourse and the strong foothold given for the traditional academic values in the Swedish data may evince the well-established stratification of the Swedish HE system. Hallonsten and Holmberg (2013) state that irrespective of the extensive restructuring of academia, classic academic norms and ideals have remained strong in Sweden, namely because of the dominance of the old universities. According to Pinheiro et al. (2014) as well, in Sweden, not only are academic freedom and collegiality constantly discussed, they are also fiercely protected by the old universities. By contrast, in Finland, there are hardly any status hierarchies between the universities, and the universities are rather equalitarian (Kivistö and Tirronen 2012). However, in Finland, the shift towards NPM practices has been more pronounced (Pinheiro et al. 2014). Despite the increase in the procedural autonomy of Finnish universities, this has not led to a reduction in state control regarding substantive autonomy (Pinheiro et al. 2014); in fact, the reforms have been strongly state-led and politically steered (Pelkonen

and Teräväinen-Litardo 2013). Furthermore, the national funding allocation model that penetrates institutional and departmental levels, makes the Finnish system highly competitive (Auranen and Nieminen 2010). Hence, the findings of this study imply that regardless of the seemingly similar reforms, due to the differences in governance models and national university traditions, there seem to be national differences in how much power and autonomy the scientific elite in sociology have, and consequently, how much power they possess to express resistance or to distance themselves from the excellence objectives. As Naidoo (2004) points out, the elite research-intensive institutions, holding a dominant position in the HE system, have a better position from which to resist the pressures of the science policy. In the light of this study, it seems that the scientific elite of sociology in Sweden 'can afford' to sustain a certain kind of distance towards the science policy incentives and thus, possess more autonomy than its Finnish counterpart.

Despite the differences, the common feature in the Finnish and Swedish data is that the PhD students are said to be strongly affected by the excellence rhetoric. As in previous studies (Fochler et al. 2016; Müller and de Rijcke 2017), which showed that the performance metrics have narrowed the assessment criteria of junior researchers, a narrowing seemed visible in this data. Müller and de Rijcke (2017) argue that, in the context of performance indicators, the societal or community relevance of research in valuing academic work is becoming harder to maintain or introduce. If one of sociology's missions has been engagement in democratic and humanist endeavours by distributing emancipatory knowledge to wider audiences (Hokka 2018; Burawoy 2004), how shall the next generation, who are expected to publish in top-tier scientific journals and to communicate solely with the international scientific community, uphold this calling? In light of these concerns, a worthy goal for future research would be to examine further how junior academics experience the excellence ideals. Overall, as this study focused on capturing the sense-making of the scientific elite, it would be important to examine how other ranks, for instance scholars in teaching positions, make sense of the excellence objectives.

References

- Abend, G. 2006. Styles of sociological thought: Sociologies quests for truth. *Sociological Theory* 24(1): 1–41.
- Aksnes, D. W., Benner, M., Borlaug, S. B., Hansen, H. F., Kallerud, E., Kristiansen, E. and Sivertsen, G. 2012. Centres of Excellence in the Nordic countries. A comparative study of research excellence policy and excellence centre schemes in Denmark, Finland, Norway and Sweden. Working Paper 4/2012. Oslo, NIFU.
- Alasutari, P. 1995. *Researching culture: Qualitative method and cultural studies*. London: Sage.
- Albert, M. 2003. *Universities and the market economy: The differential impact on knowledge production in sociology and economics*. *Higher Education* 45(2): 147–182.
- Auranen, O. and Nieminen, M. 2010. University research funding and publication performance—An international comparison. *Research Policy* 39(6): 822–834.
- Becher T. 1989. *Academic tribes and territories: Intellectual enquiry and the cultures of disciplines*. Milton Keynes: Open University press.
- Bleiklie, I., Enders, J. and Lepori, B. 2017. *Managing universities: Policy and organizational change from a Western European comparative perspective*. New York, NY: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Bourdieu, P. 1988. *Homo academicus*. Cambridge, UK: Polity Press.



- Bourdieu, P. and Wacquant, L. 1992. *An invitation to reflexive sociology*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Bourdieu, P. 1999. The specificity of the scientific field. In *The science studies reader*, edited by M. Biagioli, 31–50. New York: Routledge.
- Burawoy, M. 2005. For public sociology. *American Sociological Review* 70(1): 4–28.
- Burrows, R. 2012. Living with the h-index? Metric assemblages in the contemporary academy. *The Sociological Review* 60(2): 355–372.
- Chouliaraki, L. and Fairclough, N. 1999. *Discourse in late modernity: Rethinking critical discourse analysis*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- de Boer, H., Jongbloed, B., Benneworth, P., Cremonini, L., Kolster, R., Kottmann, A. and Vossensteyn, H. 2015. *Performance-based funding and performance agreements in fourteen higher education systems*. Enschede: Center for Higher Education Policy Studies, University of Twente.
- Elken, M., Hovdhaugen, E. and Stensaker, B. 2016. Global rankings in the Nordic region: Challenging the identity of research-intensive universities? *Higher Education* 72(6): 781–795.
- Elzinga, A. 2012. Features of the current science policy regime: Viewed in historical perspective. *Science and Public Policy* 39(4): 416–428.
- Fochler, M., Felt, U. and Müller, R. 2016. Unsustainable growth, hyper-competition, and worth in life science research: Narrowing evaluative repertoires in doctoral and postdoctoral scientists' work and lives. *Minerva* 54(2): 175–200.
- Fochler, M. and De Rijcke, S. 2017. Implicated in the indicator game? An experimental debate. *Engaging Science, Technology, and Society* 3: 21–40.
- Government bill 2008–09. Ett lyft för forskning och innovation, 2008/09:50. Stockholm, Swedish Government. Available from www.regeringen.se/rattsliga-dokument/proposition/2008/10/prop.-20080950/.
- Gläser, J., Laudel, G., Hinze, S. and Butler, L. 2002. Impact of evaluation-based funding on the production of scientific knowledge: What to worry about, and how to find out. Expertise for the German Ministry for Education and Research. Advisory report, 1–40.
- Hallonsten, O. and Holmberg, D. 2013. Analyzing structural stratification in the Swedish higher education system: Data contextualization with policy-history analysis. *Journal of the American Society for Information Science and Technology* 64(3): 574–586.
- Hammarfelt, B. and De Rijcke, S. 2015. Accountability in context: Effects of research evaluation systems on publication practices, disciplinary norms, and individual working routines in the faculty of arts at Uppsala University. *Research Evaluation* 24(1): 63–77.
- Hammarfelt, B. and Åström, F. 2015. The multi-layered and multilevel use of bibliometric measures in Swedish universities: Isomorphism, translation and strategic choice. In *The 20th international conference on science and technology indicators*, Lugano 2–4 September, 2015.
- Hicks, D., Wouters, P., Waltman, L., De Rijcke, S. and Rafols, I. 2015. Bibliometrics: the Leiden Manifesto for research metrics. *Nature* 520:(7548).
- Hokka, J. 2018. What counts as 'good sociology'? Conflicting discourses on legitimate sociology in Finland and Sweden. *Acta Sociologica*. Available from <https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/abs/10.1177/0001699318813422>.
- Holmwood, J. 2010. Sociology's misfortune: Disciplines, interdisciplinarity and the impact of audit culture. *The British Journal of Sociology* 61(4): 639–658.
- Jacob, M. 2015. RIO country report Sweden 2014. JSR science for policy report. Brussels: Publications Office of the European Union.
- Kallio, K. and Kallio, T. 2014. Management-by-results and performance measurement in universities—implications for work motivation. *Studies in Higher Education* 39(4): 574–589.
- Kropp, K. and Blok, A. 2011. Mode-2 social science knowledge production? The case of Danish sociology between institutional crisis and new welfare stabilizations. *Science and Public Policy* 38(3): 213–224.
- Kivistö, J. and Tirronen, J. 2012. New elitism in universal higher education: The building process, policy and the idea of Aalto University. In *Higher education research in Finland*, edited by S. Ahola and D. M. Hoffman, 69–87. Jyväskylä: University of Jyväskylä, Finnish Institute for Educational Research.
- Kivistö, J., Pekkola, E. and Lyytinen, A. 2017. The influence of performance-based management on teaching and research performance of Finnish senior academics. *Tertiary Education and Management* 23(3): 260–275.
- MEC 2011. Laadukas, kansainvälinen, profiloitunut ja vaikuttava yliopisto—ehdotus yliopistojen rahoitusmalliksi vuodesta 2013 alkaen. Available from <http://urn.fi/URN:ISBN:978-952-263-086-5>.
- Müller, R. and de Rijcke, S. 2017. Exploring the epistemic impacts of academic performance indicators in the life sciences. *Research Evaluation* 26(3): 157–168.
- Naidoo, R. 2004. Fields and institutional strategy: Bourdieu on the relationship between higher education, inequality and society. *British Journal of Sociology of Education* 25(4): 457–471.
- Pelkonen, A. and Teräväinen-Litardo T. 2013. Convergence and divergence in research in higher education and innovation policies: An analysis of nine European countries. In *Global university rankings: Challenges for European higher education*, edited by T. Erkkilä, 53–75. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Pinheiro, R., Geschwind, L. and Aarvaara, T. 2014. Nested tensions and interwoven dilemmas in higher education: The view from the Nordic countries. *Cambridge Journal of Regions, Economy and Society* 7(2): 233–250.
- Pölonen J., Auranen O., Engels T. and Kulczycki E. 2018. Taking national language publications into account: The case of the Finnish performance-based research funding system. STI 2018 Conference Proceedings, 204–211.
- Saarnivaara, V-P. 2015. Country report Finland 2014. JSR Science for Policy Report. Brussels: Publications Office of the European Union.
- Santiago, R. and Carvalho, T. 2012. Managerialism rhetorics in Portuguese higher education. *Minerva* 50(4): 511–532.
- Slaughter, S. and Leslie, L. L. 1997. *Academic capitalism*. Politics,



- policies Entrepreneurial University. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Sørensen, M. P., Bloch, C. and Young, M. 2016. Excellence in the knowledge-based economy: From scientific to research excellence. *European Journal of Higher Education* 6(3): 217–236.
- UKÄ. 2011. Statistical database. Swedish Higher Education Authority. Available from <http://statistik.uka.se/>.
- Wedlin, L. and Nedeva, M. 2015. *Towards European science: Dynamics and policy of an evolving European research space*. Cheltenham: Edward Elgar Publishing.
- Weingart, P. 2005. Impact of bibliometrics upon the science system: Inadvertent consequences? *Scientometrics*, 62(1), 117–131.
- Vipunen. 2016. Statistical database. Ministry of education and culture and national board of education. Available from <http://vipunen.csc.fi/>.
- Ylijoki, O-H. 2005. Academic nostalgia: A narrative approach to academic work. *Human Relations* 58(5): 555–576.
- Ylijoki, O-H. 2014. University under structural reform: A micro-level perspective. *Minerva* 52(1): 55–75.

INCLUSIVE PHYSICAL, SOCIAL AND DIGITAL SPACES IN VOCATIONAL REHABILITATION

by Gunnar Michelsen, Tor Slettebø and Ingunn Brita Moser

This paper describes and discusses factors related to the working environment that promote the inclusion of job seekers with cognitive impairments. Vocational rehabilitation for job seekers with cognitive impairments is undertaken in adapted working environments. The working environment is a synthesis of the practices that are developed in the enterprise, in physical premises and digital spaces.

Job seekers with cognitive impairments, for example Asperger's syndrome and/or ADHD, have greater challenges in entering the labour market compared with other groups with impaired functional capacity (Hansen 2009). The importance of social skills, a more complex and dynamic working life and modern methods of organizing work, such as groupwork or teamwork in smaller groups with a flat structure, constitute some of the reasons for these challenges (Hawkins 2004, Attwood 2007).

This paper builds on research following two adapted rehabilitation programmes for job seekers with cognitive impairments. Empirical data were collected through ethnographic/praxiographic fieldwork in enterprises offering the rehabilitation programmes (duration 24 months) (Mol 2002). The empirical material from this multiple case study is discussed using the concepts of 'scenario' (Callon 1987), and 'affinity space' (Gee 2004) from Geography and Science, Technology and Society studies (STS).

The paper describes how the rehabilitation scenario in the enterprises is constructed to help participants to work on something that interests them, in a space where they can develop coping strategies and with access to technology that can enable them to find work as IT professionals in the future. Further, the study points to how development of an individually adapted and familiar digital interface, as well as access to a digital space in which the job seekers can be relatively autonomous, were crucial.

The study finds that factors such as job tasks, the community of a shared diagnosis and interests, and the fact that the working environment includes physical space that can be characterized as affinity space, contribute to inclusion and the development of coping strategies.

Keywords: Inclusion, vocational rehabilitation, affinity spaces, scenario, praxiographic fieldwork

Author: Gunnar Michelsen, Senior Adviser,
Nordland Assistive Technology Centre.

Tor Slettebø, Professor of social work,
VID Specialized University in Oslo, Norway.

Ingunn Moser, Professor of sociology and Social Studies of Science, Technology and Medicine,
VID Specialized University in Oslo, Norway.

Licensing: All content in NJSTS is published under a Creative Commons Attribution-ShareAlike 4.0 license. This means that anyone is free to share (copy and redistribute the material in any medium or format) or adapt (remix, transform, and build upon the material) the material as they like, provided they follow two provisions:
a) attribution - give appropriate credit, provide a link to the license, and indicate if changes were made.
b) share alike - any remixing, transformation or building upon the material must itself be published under the same license as the original.



Introduction

Young adults with cognitive challenges associated with diagnoses such as ADHD or Asperger's syndrome constitute a group that faces difficulties in entering the labour market. Their experienced functional impairments are often reported to entail challenges with regard to concentration, self-organization, and executive functions. Vulnerability to stress, cognitive fatigue, procrastination, and problems with social interaction, but also related mental conditions such as depression, cause many to drop out of education and face problems finding a job (Anker, Halmøy and Heir 2018). The labour force participation rate for adults (16–66 years) with Asperger's syndrome in Norway has been estimated at 15% (Steindal 2010), while the rate for the population as a whole is 75% (Bø 2014). The equivalent participation rate for adults with ADHD has been estimated at 22% (Gjervan, Torgersen, Nordahl and Rasmussen 2012). Estimates of labour force participation in the USA for people with cognitive problems are similarly low (McDonough 2010, Taylor and Seltzer 2011, Shattuck et al., 2012). Compared to other groups of job seekers with functional impairments, such as musculoskeletal afflictions and mild mental disorders, cognitively challenged young adults also face greater challenges in entering the labour market (Hansen 2009).

This is also reflected in a recent statistics report from the Norwegian Directorate for Work and Welfare (NAV 2019), which points to the fact that the proportion of young people (20–29 years) who are outside working life is increasing, and that in this age segment, the group of men categorized as suffering from mild mental and cognitive disorders, including ADHD and Asperger's syndrome, is expanding. Further, there is also an increase in men in this age group who remain outside working life on lasting benefit schemes, on disability benefits (ibid). Likewise, a recent OECD-report (OECD 2018) raises concerns about increases in so-called NEET youth (not in employment, education or training) in Norway and longterm sustainability of welfare services. It suggests that Norwegian authorities take action to include these groups into working life.

All of this implies that vocational rehabilitation programmes and participation for this group of cognitively challenged young people is of vital importance, on an individual level as well as on a societal level. One symptom thereof is that the increase in job seekers with cognitive difficulties who want work-oriented rehabilitation has increased dramatically in recent years (Chen et al., 2014).

However, participation in work rehabilitation programs does not always lead to inclusion into working life. Research on the inclusive effects of work rehabilitation programs in related fields of disability studies shows that on a more general level people with disabilities tend to become permanently excluded from working life after completion of work rehabilitation (Wendelborg, C. & J. Tøssebro, 2018).

The effect of participation in such inclusive measures and programmes is thus unclear (Berg and Gleinsvik 2011). It is recommended that, in general, vocational rehabilitation for this group of young adults with cognitive impairment be undertaken gradually (Hawkins 2004). The quality of a rehabilitation programme is commonly highlighted as a dimension that promotes transition to working life. Customized programmes can provide high quality rehabilitation for this group of job seekers. Media reports, case presentations in conferences, and the websites of stakeholder organizations have suggested that various customized rehabilitation programmes have helped some young people with Asperger's syndrome or ADHD find work.

This is the backdrop against which the research reported in this article sets off. The research project investigates vocational rehabilitation practices oriented towards cognitively challenged young adults, with specific regards to the values and roles of new technologies therein. In this article we will describe and discuss how the broader scenario and the more specific design thereof in the working environment in vocational rehabilitation may promote inclusion of job seekers classified with cognitive impairments. The empirical data underpinning the article is based on two years of fieldwork in two vocational rehabilitation enterprises offering customized programmes for young people with Asperger's syndrome or ADHD. These two case enterprises have, for many years, helped more than half of their participants enter working life.

The working environment is defined here as a synthesis of the social, technical and professional practices that have been developed within the two vocational rehabilitation programmes and the physical environments in the locations where the vocational rehabilitation is being done. In order to capture such complex practices and their situated relations with the physical working environments, we draw on insights and theoretical resources from the interdisciplinary field of studies of science, technology and society (STS). Along these lines, the analytical approach can be described as sociomaterial or sociotechnical (Law 2004), and the methodological strategy as ethnographic, or even more precisely, praxiographic (Mol 2002). This body of work argues that it is only for analytical purposes it is relevant to distinguish between social, material, technical, legal and economic aspects of a practice or reality. In practice, and for all practical purposes, they are closely intertwined and can best be described as constituting a 'seamless web' in which changes in one part or element leads to a simultaneous change in other parts. The technical and the social develop in tandem or are 'co-produced', and our methodological strategies and conceptual tools should help us to 'attune to' tracing their intertwining and connections (Asdal et al 2007, Hughes 1986, Suchman 2003, Mort et al 2013).



In the following we first introduce the empirical field and account for the methodical and analytical framework. Secondly, we present the findings and analyse them in terms of three versions of working space environments. Finally, we discuss what factors related to the design of the working environment helped promote inclusion of job seekers with cognitive impairments in working life, and reflect upon dilemmas and contradictions involved in strategies for inclusion and compensation.

The empirical field

As working life has become more complex and dynamic social skills have become more important; this is one reason adults with Asperger's syndrome often have difficulty remaining employed (Hawkins 2004). Modern forms of work organization, such as group work or teamwork in smaller groups with a flat hierarchy, are especially challenging for people with Asperger's syndrome (Attwood 2007). Modern recruitment methods may also be an obstacle that prevents people who have problems communicating, act differently in social settings, and do not appear to be especially flexible from being offered a job (Richards 2015). Working in an open office landscape with few opportunities for personal adaptation, such as screening off noise, light, or smell, may also cause employees with special needs to have difficulty remaining employed (ibid). This is the kind of working life with which cognitively challenged young adults participating in vocational rehabilitation programmes are being trained to cope.

The two rehabilitation enterprises in which the two years of fieldwork were undertaken sell rehabilitation services to the Norwegian Labour and Welfare Administration (NAV). The fieldwork involved following participants, managers and employees associated with the 'Work placement in sheltered enterprises (APS)' programme in both enterprises. To be admitted to the APS programme, the job seeker must have a reduced work capacity, be deemed to have especially tenuous vocational qualifications and be in need of comprehensive and close follow-up for a period of up to two years (NAV 2016). One enterprise had 25 APS places (Enterprise 1) while the other had eight (Enterprise 2). Nearly 80% of the participants were men. The age spread was considerable, with the youngest in their early 20s and the oldest in the early fifties. Most participants were between the ages of 25 and 40 years old.

Methodical and analytical framework

The study takes a praxiographic multiple-case approach based on fieldwork that followed two rehabilitation programmes over 24 months. We have chosen a praxiographic approach because our focus is first and foremost on following and describing sociomaterial practices. A multiple-case approach was chosen as the research design to make it possible to describe and reflect different practices (Yin 2014). The selection criteria for the strategically chosen cases

The admission requirement is based on an assessment of work capacity and is independent of any diagnosis. Most of the participants in both enterprises were described as having a reduced work capacity, primarily linked to cognitive impairments associated with Asperger's syndrome and/or ADHD, but often in combination with additional issues such as mental conditions, dyslexia and addiction problems. For this group, the rehabilitation literature describes common challenges as involving rapid cognitive fatigue; executive problems; problems organizing themselves and their work; hypersensitivity to noise, light and smell; concentration and memory problems; and difficulties with social interaction (Bye and Sagstad 2016). Further, it is reported that in working life, adults who have difficulty interpreting social contexts may cause misunderstandings, irritation and other unfortunate social complications. Other idiosyncratic features include preoccupation with personal interests in a manner that may be perceived as intense, and reduced impulse control (Hawkins 2004, Hoem 2008, Nadeau 2015).

In both enterprises, the rehabilitation programmes were established as a comprehensive service for adults with cognitive problems. This means that the enterprises' value basis, the staff recruitment, the organization of the modes and hours of work, and the design of the physical and digital working environments were tailored to this target group. The objective of these customized rehabilitation schemes was to prepare and qualify the participants for a job in the ICT industry. Emphasis was placed on establishing a working environment where participants could practise coping with the challenges of working life.

Both rehabilitation enterprises are ICT companies that develop software and web solutions for commercial and public agencies. All staff members possess the ICT skills required to deliver these services and products, in addition to being educators and/or social workers.

Programme participants work on projects alongside other participants and employees, or they work on their own ICT development or service solutions for external clients. The practical work involves tasks such as writing web pages, writing code, writing documentation for solutions, and testing software applications. The case-companies are here superficially described due to anonymity reasons.

were as follows: 1) The rehabilitation enterprises had to market themselves as enterprises that emphasize the use of technologies in their social work practices; 2) All participants had to fulfil the admission requirements for an APS programme; 3) The staff of the case enterprises had to include information and communications technology (ICT) experts with skills in technological adaptation. 4) The enterprises had to be able to document that more than 50% of



programme participants had been transitioned to working life over the previous three years.

The method used in the fieldwork in both case enterprises was interactive observation (Tjora 2012). In addition, interviews were conducted with thirteen participants in the rehabilitation programmes, the enterprise directors, and five employees; two group interviews with employees were also conducted. Practical arrangements for the fieldwork, consent from all employees and participants, and declarations of confidentiality were agreed upon with the enterprises more than six months prior to the first observation phase. No personal data were collected, and the study was approved by the Norwegian Social Science Data Services (NSD).

The case enterprises were provided with observation memos, transcripts of interviews, proposals for analyses and a draft of this article. A recurring question for the case enterprises during this iterative process concerned whether the descriptions and analyses made sense to them. This process also constituted a response validation and a means of taking into account challenges in terms of research ethics, as well as of helping maintain transparency in the research project (Slettebø 2008, Fangen 2010:241). The case study is delimited in time and place and by those who undertook the fieldwork. The transfer value of knowledge from this study must be seen in light of these factors (Asdal, Brenna, and Moser 2007). As a researcher, we have followed both case enterprises closely over time. We met with representatives of the enterprises at regular intervals to discuss the implementation of the fieldwork in all activities.

Analytically, this study is situated within a social constructivist research tradition and in the framework of studies of science, technology and society (STS) (ibid.). The data material is discussed using the concepts of 'scenario' and 'affinity spaces' taken from the STS tradition. The term 'scenario' is used to bring out and describes the imagined future working situations on which the rehabilitation enterprises build when designing and adapting the working environment in the rehabilitation programme for this group (Callon 1987). This understanding of scenario also includes people, technologies, organizations, modes of work, and expertise,

Findings and analysis

To present this comprehensive working environment, we can for analytical purposes subdivide it into three constructed, yet intertwined elements: the physical space, the social working environment, and the digital space. In reality, these three elements continuously interact with each other and with the actors present in and the practices constitutive of these spaces. In the case enterprises

and the interaction between all these agents. The design of the sociomaterial spaces and the practices being developed in these spaces are both relevant to provide a comprehensive description of the scenario that the rehabilitation enterprises claim will provide the best rehabilitation arena for the participants.

The analytical concept of 'affinity spaces' (Gee 2004) is used here to describe the scenography, the physical, social and digital spaces within which much of the rehabilitation programme took place in the rehabilitation enterprises. The concept of 'affinity spaces' is transferred and translated for our purposes from the digital world where it is mostly used to describe virtual spaces such as Internet forums, MMORPG (Massively Multiplayer Online Role-Playing Games) or social media. It can however also be used to describe physical places where people meet face-to-face to participate in individual activities (ibid.), as well as combinations or hybrids of such activities, their spatial conditions and their co-production.

Gee (Gee 2005, 225-228) defines affinity spaces as spaces where, among other things:

- The participants strive for the same goal.
- Race, class, gender, or disability is not the primary shared trait.
- There is room for newbies, masters, and everybody else.
- Individual skills and knowledge are valued.
- There is large variation regarding how the participants came to this space.
- Leadership is fluid and leaders are resources.

In the following, 'technologies' is used as a collective term for all types of ICT used at the case enterprise. It includes the production and interaction tools that are used by the enterprise in a professional capacity as well as the ICT solutions that the job seekers use to maintain or improve their competitiveness (De Jonge, Scherer, and Rodger 2007). Such technologies are also referred to as cognitive support technologies (CST) (Scherer, Hart, Kirsh and Schulthesis 2005, Scherer 2005). In this context, the concept also includes technologies that help participants remain or become motivated to attempt to cope with an activity or life situation.

and in the rehabilitation programmes that the participants followed there were numerous spaces. The spaces described and discussed here have been identified as the most important ones through engagement with and analysis of the empirical data, based on the participants' narratives of how they worked and produced in the digital space while physically sitting in the 'computer room'.



The physical space – ‘the computer room’

We have chosen to refer to the space that the participants identified as their workplace as ‘the computer room’. This is a collective designation and an interpretation of the premises, because the computers used by the participants constituted the defining object in both enterprises. The computers served as production equipment and the interaction and organization technology to which all participants and staff members related throughout their working hours, with the exception of the lunch break. In Enterprise 1, the space was referred to as ‘the project room’ and in Enterprise 2 as ‘the work room’. The rooms were different in size and layout but shared certain features in terms of their function, social rules, and equipment.

In Enterprise 1, the project room was also the large room where the approximately 25 participants and staff members met every morning for a roll call and to review the assignments. This was the room that most of the participants entered first after arriving for work at 8:30 a.m. Before entering, they said hello to the receptionist, punched in, left their jackets in the cloakroom, and said hello to those standing at the coffee machine and in the corridor. Greeting everybody when coming to work had been introduced as a social rule.

There were 20 desks and comfortable office chairs with wheels in the room. All workstations were placed along the walls to give the room an airy ambience. Half of the desks and chairs were grouped in twos and fours. The rest stood alone. The room had a large whiteboard, a projector, and a screen. In this room, the work manager had a permanent work station with multiple monitors and desktop PCs. Some of the participants had fixed places and marked them by leaving behind personal objects at the end of the working day. Some participants worked exclusively on private computers, although most of them used laptops belonging to Enterprise 1. Personal headphones were frequently used.

In Enterprise 1, the participants and staff members used the computer room to collaborate on development or service projects for external clients. Short courses in the use of applications were also held there, as were reviews of updates and system training. The project room can be described as an office landscape in a workplace where the participants are expected to communicate and include each other in the assignments undertaken.

In Enterprise 2, the work room was reminiscent of a small cave in the large office complex. All participants went directly there after having punched in. It could just about encompass the eight desks placed along three of the walls. The desks were facing the wall, with a desktop PC on each. Some of the participants had their own private laptop next to the computer monitor. All participants

sat with their backs to the centre of the room, and most of them had their headsets over their ears or around their necks. The room appeared dark. There were two windows in the room, both well covered with curtains. In addition, the room was provided with a projector, a screen and a large whiteboard. The atmosphere in the room was convivial; the participants would sporadically exchange small talk about their assignment, while others kept working undisturbed, shielded by their headphones and the partitioning walls between the desks. Most of their attention was focused on what was happening on the computer monitors. The participants talked about virtually everything, but it mostly tended to be related to ICT or technology.

When the work manager or an educator was present in the room, everybody turned away from the monitors to face the room to follow what was presented on the screen or the whiteboard. All participants sat on comfortable office chairs with wheels.

In both enterprises, the job assignments were not of such a nature that the participants needed to be physically present in the computer room. It was technically possible for the participants to work on most of their assignments from home (programming, web design etc.). The participants reported that they had access to computer equipment at home, sometimes even more sophisticated equipment, and many of them were engaged in their own computer projects in their leisure time. One of the participants in Enterprise 1 told us that ‘being here in the enterprise is an alternative to sitting at home. I do much of the same things here as I do at home’. Only exceptionally did the participants work at home in agreement with the management, for health reasons or on a specific day of the week.

In interviews, the participants described concentration problems and challenges associated with social interaction. Given that the enterprises recruited numerous participants with cognitive impairments, these challenges were as expected. It might seem paradoxical that both case enterprises had organized their primary work premises as an open office. The most common objections to open office landscapes are that they cause concentration problems and constitute a difficult social setting. In the interviews, the participants were asked to recount their experience of working in the case enterprises’ open office landscapes. This quotation summarizes the general opinion that it is demanding when there are many people present at work, but otherwise quite enjoyable, and that it tends to be quiet and calm:

Yes, I sit there with the others, and I’m quite used to sitting in open landscapes. Yes, I’m all for people being able to work in the way they want, in a closed office if need be. Otherwise it’s nice



to sit in the project room. I'm used to sitting in a cowshed, as I call it. But there are no problems here. It's calm and quiet. No phones, nothing at all.

In Enterprise 2, the participants were informed that the entire floor was to be reorganized, and that the computer room in which

they had been sitting for more than a year was to be moved. In a joint letter, the participants pleaded to keep the room as it was. Their arguments included that they had settled in well there. Their plea was heard, and the computer room remained their permanent workplace for the duration of the rehabilitation programme.

The social working environment

The social aspect and the time available for socializing often featured in the participants' descriptions of their experience of working in the computer room. They reported having plenty of time to complete their assignments, which led to the tendency to become 'rather laid-back', in the sense that they would chat about every imaginable topic and play computer games with the others. Many of them told us that they had hit it off with other participants with whom they shared interests, such as a knack for technology or cars. The participants occasionally alluded to their own diagnosis during their conversations in the computer room. In both case enterprises they had their own training courses and conversation programmes about what it is like to have a diagnosis of Asperger's syndrome and/or ADHD. In the interviews, the participants noted that they felt it was liberating and relaxing to have these topics addressed as part of the rehabilitation programme. To quote one participant, 'Then everybody will know what it means not to be neurotypical'. The way in which the participants referred to diagnoses when chatting in the computer room was characterized by this awareness.

In both case enterprises, well-being was regularly mapped in surveys and performance interviews. These mappings, which were presented by managers at management meetings, showed that the participants generally were comfortable there. Observations from the fieldwork, a low rate of attrition, a high rate of attendance and statements from the participants confirm that in general, the participants enjoyed the programme. The participants highlighted the social working environment in the computer room. Here, they could meet others who shared their interests, and they could learn new ICT skills. The participants and the staff members alike emphasized how well-being was associated not only with the social aspects of the programme, but also the opportunity to acquire new skills and work with real work assignments. For example, they were trained in using key ICT development tools and programming languages, as well as software validation and web publishing tools. They also acquired useful skills in computer security, digital interaction and presentation techniques.

To the extent that the participants had any critical remarks about the enterprises, these were related to a lack of real assignments.

Because of this lack, the participants would periodically work on 'exercise' assignments that were perceived as not all that important.

The social interaction patterns differed between the two case enterprises. In Enterprise 1, where there were more staff and participants and more comings and goings, there was more social interaction between the participants. In Enterprise 2, where there was a permanent group of eight participants, the social interaction changed in character and scope over the two years they spent there. At start-up, most of the interaction was initiated by the supervisors. Over time, the participants started to interact when the supervisor was not present. One participant describes the change in forms of social interaction thus:

We're not all such chatty types. During our first weeks here, or even the first months, there was a really strong wish, almost a demand, for all of us to have lunch together, and then there was a fixed arrangement that we should meet in the lunch room at 11:30 and one of the teachers would sit there with us and strike up a conversation. On the occasions when the teacher wasn't there, we could sit together for 25 minutes without exchanging a single word. And I can imagine that many people would feel uncomfortable about this, sitting there at a lunch table without anyone saying anything. But none of us seemed to care that it was quiet, and I too felt that this was totally okay. But gradually we have got more used to each other. This programme has been good practice in becoming a little more used to relating to others, in being able to converse and initiating chit-chat, and it has worked really well, I'd say. Otherwise we just sit in the workroom and do our own things. And we don't exchange all that many words during the working day. But I feel that there's a good atmosphere there anyhow.

Participants in both case enterprises reported liking that collaboration on assignments was organized with the aid of a digital project management system. Collaborative interaction, such as allocation of assignments, definition of project roles, consultation of progress reports, was primarily undertaken in the project management tools. These tools could also be used to request guidance from other participants or professionals.



The ever-present digital space

Most of the production of goods and services in the case enterprises takes place in the digital space. Observations of how the participants worked with the digital interface (screens, menus, accounts etc.) showed that each had his or her own individually adapted digital working environment. All participants had their own accounts in the enterprises' internal production systems. The participants organized the menus and the visual digital interface to their own liking. They adapted functionalities and organized file structures, adjusted the responsiveness of the keyboard and

the mouse, and changed the resolution and the colour scheme. Gradually, all participants created their own unique digital interface. In addition, they had access to private accounts on the Internet and in the 'cloud', such as Google, Facebook, Dropbox etc. These private digital interfaces had been individualized to suit the needs and tastes of each and every participant. The design of such personal interfaces was also a topic in the social interaction between the participants.

Discussion

Tolerance for private digital interfaces

The computer rooms in the case enterprises were only partially designed in accordance with a scenario of how employees should work in an ICT enterprise: systematically, in a structured fashion, primarily in front of a monitor, and in response to clear orders from a digital project management tool. The computer rooms were adapted to a scenario that represented both a challenge and a form of cognitive support for participants with cognitive impairments. The challenge consists in the use of an open office landscape. The permission to have an individualized interface and the opportunity to withdraw digitally or to engage in social interaction with others as well as work in isolation are supportive elements. The computer room is a hybrid between the efficient and exacting aspects of working life and the familiar 'boys' room', in which the participants reported spending quite a lot of time. It is recommended that employees with cognitive challenges, and those with Asperger's syndrome in particular, should have an opportunity to withdraw for a 'time-out' when experiencing cognitive fatigue (Hawkins 2004). A 'time-out' would normally mean leaving the room or withdrawing from a challenging social situation to seek out a place with no social obligations or expectations. In the enterprises observed, only a few participants made use of the opportunity to withdraw to a closed office or a vacant meeting room.

Having access and the opportunity to relate actively to a private digital space may function as a 'mini time-out'. Because they were permitted to organize or bring their own digital space into the job, the participants gained access to a space where they enjoyed both autonomy and control. The fact that many participants used headphones while sitting in the computer room may also have helped reinforce the 'time-out' effect. They could also access digital organizational tools to help them cope with daily life. The properties and content of the digital space that helped each participant cope with the challenges associated with being in the socially demanding computer room varied. These included the opportunity to immerse themselves in private interests on the Internet, interact with others in web forums or by playing games, or just surf the web. In many workplaces these would be

regarded as 'private' activities and would normally be inaccessible, being blocked by the management or socially frowned upon by colleagues and managers.

Inclusive affinity spaces

The computer rooms in the two rehabilitation enterprises can be characterized as affinity spaces (Gee 2004). In both enterprises, the employed ICT professionals and the participants all had their workplaces in the computer room. The room did not distinguish between ICT novices and professionals. In one of the enterprises, the work manager, who was also the professional in charge of most of the ICT training courses, had a permanent workplace in the computer room. In the other enterprise, the ICT instructor had a permanent desk in the computer room. Moreover, everybody in the room was working in their own way towards the same goals, i.e. to develop ICT solutions. Irrespective of what component of an ICT system they were working on, they all strived to create the best possible products and to learn as much as they could in the process. This also applied to the staff members. The staff helped in the process of tailoring unique products for the customers, and each project was a source of new skills for the employees as well. Finally, because of the way in which the practice in the computer room had developed, those who occupied it did not need to work in the same way or simultaneously, and they would often work independently of others. In the physical affinity space, the computer room, the participants were free to be continuously in the shifting social space while also remaining within their individually structured, logical, stable and reliable digital universe.

The fact that the computer room can be characterized as an affinity space makes it inclusive through its high tolerance of parallel activities and the degree of social involvement. In this affinity space of "the computer room" a kind of situational symbolic community was developed to some extent (Tjora 2018).

A community of interest and diagnosis

The fact that 'all' participants were part of a 'diagnosis community' was highlighted as an advantage by the interviewees. This confirms findings that among adults with Asperger's syndrome, participation



in such homogenous groups is regarded as a relief as well as an asset (Steindal 1994, Schäfer 1997). Establishing a rehabilitation scenario with participants who share many of the same challenges and qualities has created a place where the participants thrive and develop, but it is also the mode of work that helps participants find a job. Both enterprises recruit participants who wish to work in the ICT industry, and the participants can thus meet others who share their interests. The programmes are designed in line with a rehabilitation scenario guided by values such as coping and skills development, competence with regard to the target group, and inclusion through a specialized programme for a group with special needs. Work routines, the use of technology, and a sense of security and coping, exemplified by the fact that the participants managed to stay in the computer room, may have been factors in the enterprises' success in helping so many to be included in regular working life.

The case enterprises demonstrated their interest in the participants' ICT skills by mapping these prior to admission as well as during the introductory weeks. The participants received recognition for their interest in ICT from staff members, customers, and fellow participants. For many participants, ICT-related activities were a leisure activity that they brought with them into the rehabilitation programme. The participants reported that their activities during the rehabilitation programme were largely similar to what they previously did at home. They also reported receiving recognition for their ICT skills at the case enterprise, which was not the case for their own projects at home. Moreover, they reported perceiving that their ICT skills were valued when being charged with real assignments paid for by external clients. The participants distinguished clearly between 'exercise assignments' and 'real

commissions', and the opportunity to work on real commissions was what motivated them the most.

The case enterprises, as transformation agents, train and prepare for inclusion of the participants in the labour market, and as such create the conditions for 'normalization' through participation in the ordinary labour market (Moser 2006). One of the inclusion paradoxes is that the participants' entry into an inclusive vocational rehabilitation programme goes through workplace exclusion, defined as; a variety of diagnoses, classification as neurodivergent adults, a mixture of disabilities and categorization as persons with particularly difficult opportunities/challenges in the labour market. The case enterprises however create room for the participants' specific qualities, personal behaviour and challenges, while at the same time focussing on what normally causes an employer to buy labour; the employee's ability to conscientiously carry out work satisfactorily in quality. They knew that participants' opportunity to be included in the workplace lay in their ICT competence and interest. These are general inclusion requirements in ICT industry. In this way, the enterprises' staff found themselves constantly balancing and negotiating difference and normality, and difference and equality.

There is an increasing understanding that all employees need some form of facilitation of the work place; temporary, physical or psychosocial. Facilitation in the workplace is about to become the new normality, and most employees have expertise in their own adaptation needs. Through the vocational rehabilitation program, the participants' facilitation needs were uncovered, and the participants awareness of what kind of facilitation in the workplace he or she needs to deliver on an equal footing with everyone else, were strengthened.

Summary

The fieldwork conducted in these specialized rehabilitation practices brought out three particular factors related to the design of the working environment that may help promote inclusion of job seekers with cognitive impairments in working life:

- A design that results in a community of interest and diagnosis;
- The presence of sociomaterial spaces that can be characterized as affinity spaces;
- Permission to access individually adapted and familiar digital interfaces and spaces.

All three factors appear to have an inclusive effect in the two delimited rehabilitation practices that have been observed. The work assignments, the community of interest and diagnosis, and the inclusive working environment in the computer rooms appeared to have such a motivational effect that the participants requested permission to work at home only in exceptional cases.

The rehabilitation effort that was observed took considerable time – up to two years. Defining the computer room as an affinity space made it possible to include participants who were at varying stages of the rehabilitation process.

The rehabilitation scenario in these case enterprises has been designed to permit the participants to work on something that interests them, in spaces where they can develop coping strategies and with access to technology that can help them work as ICT professionals in the future. The study has described a path to work inclusion based on the participants' interests as well as on professional competence in functional impairment and individual adaptation in the rehabilitation enterprise. The dilemma of the described practices is that inclusion still seems to be implied in and resting upon exclusion. It implies an original or initial exclusion in the form of a definition of difference, for instance in the form of diagnosis. This is also reflected in the fact that the enterprises



have inclusion in the workplace as a common goal, but that the arena for these efforts at inclusion, the rehabilitation enterprises, is a somewhat parallel universe to the ordinary labor market. It

is however possible to think that this detour into the protected labor market is necessary for some groups of job seekers, who are statistically excluded from the ordinary labor market.

References

- Anker, E., Halmøy, A., & Heir, T. 2018. Work participation in ADHD and associations with social characteristics, education, lifetime depression, and ADHD symptom severity. *ADHD Attention Deficit and Hyperactivity Disorders*, 1-7. doi: [10.1007/s12402-018-0260-2](https://doi.org/10.1007/s12402-018-0260-2)
- Asdal, Kristin, Brita Brenna, and Ingunn Moser. 2007. *Technoscience : the politics of interventions*. Oslo: Unipub.
- Attwood, Tony. 2007. *The complete guide to Asperger's syndrome*. London: Jessica Kingsley.
- Berg, H., and A Gleinsvik. 2011. "Virkning av arbeidsrettede tiltak for personer med nedsatt arbeidsevne : en litteraturstudie." In. Oslo: Proba samfunnsanalyse.
- Bye, K. M., and K. Sagstad. 2016. "I arbeid og høyere utdanning med kognitive vansker." NAV HJELPEMIDLER OG TILRETTELEGGING www.kunnskapsbanken.net/i-arbeid-og-hoyere-utdanning-med-kognitive-vansker/.
- Bø, Tor Petter. 2014. "Funksjonshemma på arbeidsmarknaden i 2014 (The Disabled in the Labour Market in 2014)." In, ed. Inger Håland. Oslo: Statistisk sentralbyrå.
- Callon, Michel. 1987. "Society in the making: The study of technology as tool for sociological analysis." In *The Social Construction of Technological Systems*, edited by W BIJKER, T. HUGHES AND T. PINCH, 83-103. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- De Jonge, Desleigh, Marcia J. Scherer, and Sylvia Rodger. 2007. *Assistive technology in the workplace*. St. Louis, Mo.: Mosby Elsevier.
- Fangen, Katrine. 2010. *Deltagende observasjon (Participant observation, 2nd edition)*. 2. utg. ed. Bergen: Fagbokforl.
- Gee, James Paul. 2004. *Situated Language and Learning : A Critique of Traditional Schooling*, Literacies. London: Routledge.
- Gee, James Paul. 2005. "Semiotic social spaces and affinity spaces." In *Beyond communities of practice language power and social context*, edited by & K. Tusting D. Barton, 214-232. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Hansen, I.L.S. 2009. "IKT – et underutnyttet potensial i strategien for et inkluderende arbeidsliv?" In *Funksjonshemming – politikk, hverdagsliv og arbeidsliv*, edited by J. Tøssebro. Universitetsforlaget.
- Hawkins, Gail. 2004. *How to find work that works for people with Asperger syndrome : the ultimate guide for getting people with Asperger syndrome into the workplace (and keeping them there!)*. London: Kingsley.
- Hoem, Sverre. 2008. *ADHD : en håndbok for voksne med ADHD*. 2. utg. ed. Oslo: Gyldendal Akademisk.
- Law, John. 2004. *After method mess in social science research*. London New York: Routledge.
- McDonough, J.T and G. Revell. 2010. "Accessing employment supports in the adult system for transitioning youth with autism spectrum disorders." *Journal of Vocational Rehabilitation* 32:89-100. doi: [10.3233/JVR-2010-0498](https://doi.org/10.3233/JVR-2010-0498).
- Mol, Annemarie. 2002. *The body multiple : ontology in medical practice, Science and cultural theory*. Durham: Duke University Press.
- Nadeau, Kathleen G. 2015. *The ADHD Guide to Career Success : Harness your Strengths, Manage your Challenges*. 2nd ed. ed, ADHD Guide to Career Success: Taylor and Francis.
- NAV. 2016. *Kravspesifikasjon for tiltak i skjermet virksomhet (Specifications for Measures in Sheltered Workshops)*.
- Richards, J. 2015. "Asperger syndrome and employment inclusion: Towards practices informed by theories of contemporary employment." *Interdisciplinary Perspectives on Equality and Diversity* 1. ¹
- Scherer, M. J., T. Hart, N. Kirsch, and M. Schulthesis. 2005. "Assistive technologies for cognitive disabilities." *Critical Reviews™ in Physical and Rehabilitation Medicine* 17 (3):195-215.
- Scherer, Marcia J. 2005. "Assessing the benefits of using assistive technologies and other supports for thinking, remembering and learning." *Disability & Rehabilitation*, 2005, Vol.27(13), p.731-739 27 (13):731-739. doi: [10.1080/09638280400014816](https://doi.org/10.1080/09638280400014816).
- Schäfer, Susanne. 1997. *Stjärnor, linser och äppeln : att leva med autism*. Stockholm: Cura.
- Shattuck, P. T., S. C. Narendorf, B. Cooper, P. R. Sterzing, M. Wagner, and J. L. Taylor. 2012. "Postsecondary education and employment among youth with an autism spectrum disorder."

¹ In line with this, we have started not from diagnoses, but from the challenges people experience in their daily lives. Diagnosis is not a criteria for inclusion in the rehabilitation programs we have followed and neither has it been a criteria for inclusion in this study. We have not asked for or registered any diagnoses, everything that is said about diagnoses has been part of what employees, management and some participants have shared and reflected upon, in general terms, in interviews and conversations. Accordingly, we have chosen to adopt an agnostic position with regard to truth claims about the realities versus socially constructed nature of diagnoses. Arguments about social construction are not necessarily opposed to reality claims about the challenges people experience, but rather emphasize how socially constructed categories and classifications such as diagnoses work in practice, and the dilemmas and contradictions they often imply. In our empirical data and analyses issues to do with how diagnoses work in practice, and with how participants relate to them, appear on several occasions. But for reasons to do with space, time and resources, it has not been possible to follow the line of research and questions to do with the actual construction of diagnoses in this ph.d.-project. See however the interesting work of Tjora & Levang (2016) on ADHD and society in a Norwegian context and Per Måseide as an example of medical sociology on categorization (1987), as well as the related literatures on categorization and standardization in STS by i.e. Bowker and Star (1999).



- Pediatrics 129 (6):1042-9. doi: 10.1542/peds.2011-2864.
- Slettebø, Tor. 2008. Foreldres medbestemmelse i barnevernet : en studie av foreldres erfaringer med individuell og kollektiv medvirkning, Doktoravhandlinger ved NTNU. Trondheim: Norges teknisk-naturvitenskapelige universitet, Fakultet for samfunnsvitenskap og teknologiledelse, Institutt for sosialt arbeid og helsevitenskap. elektronisk ressurs.
- Steindal, Kari. 1994. Aspergers syndrom: hvordan forstå og hjelpe personer med Aspergers syndrom og høytfungerende personer med autisme. Oslo: Landsforeningen for autister.
- Steindal, Kari. 2010. Arbeidstakere med Asperger syndrom. Metodeutvikling og kompetanseheving i NAV. Et samarbeidsprosjekt mellom NAV og Nasjonal kompetanseenhet for autisme. Slutt-rapport. (Employees with Asperger's. Methodological development and competence building in the Norwegian Labour and Welfare Administration (NAV). A collaborative project between NAV and the Norwegian Resource Centre for Autism, ADHD, Tourette Syndrome and Narcolepsy. Final Report). . edited by Oslo Universitetssykehus Nasjonal kompetanseenhet for autisme: Nasjonal kompetanseenhet for autisme, Oslo Universitetssykehus.
- Taylor, J. L., and M. M. Seltzer. 2011. "Employment and post-secondary educational activities for young adults with autism spectrum disorders during the transition to adulthood." *J Autism Dev Disord* 41 (5):566-74. doi: 10.1007/s10803-010-1070-3.
- Tjora, Aksel Hagen. 2012. Kvalitative forskningsmetoder i praksis (Qualitative Research Methods in Practice. 2nd edition.). 2. utg. ed. Oslo: Gyldendal akademisk.
- Yin, Robert K. 2014. Case study research : design and methods. 5th ed. ed. Los Angeles, Calif: SAGE.

HAPPINESS STUDIES:

Co-Production of Social Science and Social Order

by Margareta Hallberg and Christopher Kullenberg

This article is about the growth and establishment of the interdisciplinary research field "Happiness Studies". This article focuses on how research on happiness has become a quickly growing and successful field within western societies and what it says about both the social sciences and contemporary social order. The concept of co-production, as defined by Sheila Jasanoff, is used to show how science and society interact and influence each other. Hence, we show how happiness has become a significant topic for empirical studies and the way interdisciplinary research is intertwined with what is perceived as both challenging and worth striving for in society and culture.

Keywords: Co-production, happiness studies, social sciences

Author: Margareta Hallberg, Professor, Ph.D.
Dept. of Philosophy, Linguistics and Theory of science
University of Gothenburg

Christopher Kullenberg*, Associate Professor, Ph. D.
Dept. of Philosophy, Linguistics and Theory of science
University of Gothenburg

*Corresponding author: University of Gothenburg, Box 200, 405 30 Gothenburg, Sweden, christopher.kullenberg@gu.se

Licensing: All content in NJSTS is published under a Creative Commons Attribution-ShareAlike 4.0 license. This means that anyone is free to share (copy and redistribute the material in any medium or format) or adapt (remix, transform, and build upon the material) the material as they like, provided they follow two provisions:
a) attribution - give appropriate credit, provide a link to the license, and indicate if changes were made.
b) share alike - any remixing, transformation or building upon the material must itself be published under the same license as the original.



Introduction

In the recent decades, empirical studies on happiness have increased significantly (Kullenberg and Nelhans 2015). Several social science disciplines, such as psychology, economics, public health, political science, and to some extent also sociology, have participated in this surge. Research on happiness has rapidly grown even in fields like philosophy, psychiatry, cognitive neuroscience and gerontology, indicating a broad academic engagement in how people's feelings and expectations are expressed in different life situations. There are various ways to understand and/or explain this increase, both internal and external. In this article,¹ the purpose is to analyse the growth and stabilisation of the interdisciplinary field happiness studies through the crucial idea of co-production, as developed within science and technology

studies (STS) (Latour 1993; Jasanoff 2004).

We will begin by presenting our analytical approach based on co-production. Thereafter, we will connect this perspective with research on the conditions of social knowledge in particular, as our focus is on a multidisciplinary field that has grown out of sociology, psychology and economics. This way we can proceed to our analysis of the making of a science of happiness, which, we argue, has made an impact on how culture and identities are shaped in contemporary societies and, in turn, contribute to configuring society and its institutions in a particular way. Finally, we will discuss these findings in relation to the role of happiness studies in the social sciences.

Analytical approach: co-production

For several decades and in numerous studies, STS have convincingly shown the mutual interdependency between science/technology and society (Felt et al. 2017). It is claimed that scientific and/or technological developments cannot be understood without relating them to the social context in which they flourish. In other words, the claim is that science is a social activity and should be analysed as such. In 2004, Sheila Jasanoff edited the book *States of Knowledge*, in which she elaborated on the concept of co-production and its usefulness when trying to learn how the natural and social orders are being produced together. The idiom of "co-production" was introduced to avoid possible reductionist accounts, (i.e. both natural and social determinism). According to Jasanoff, '[...] co-production is shorthand for the proposition that the ways in which we know and represent the world (both nature and society) are inseparable from the ways in which we choose to live in it'. (2004, 2). Co-production thus signifies that science and technology constitute the world around us at the same time as they are embedded in the social.

The idiom of co-production helps demonstrate how new objects and phenomena come into existence, how controversies are created and resolved, how knowledge becomes stabilised, and how science and technology are made legitimate and meaningful. Jasanoff covered opposing trends within STS itself, under the umbrella concept of co-production, indicating a possible synthesis of common orientations, although with different emphasis. Even though STS are her main area of interest, she also addressed traditional social sciences and, to some extent, the humanities with the same concept. Co-production 'fits most comfortably with the interpretative turn in the social sciences, emphasising dimensions of meaning, discourse and textuality' (Jasanoff 2004,

4). What is more, co-production offers new ways of thinking about power, structures, expertise, knowledge, and relations of authority. Thus, it is an encompassing concept, useful for most analyses of knowledge and social order and of the complex processes producing both.

With the emphasis of co-production, it becomes clear that the way we speak of science and society matures. Often, science is said to speak to power, where a move from scientific results to the surrounding society is presupposed. For a long time, science has been regarded as one of the central forces for industry, innovation, welfare, medical care, higher education, and so on, and the course has generally been thought of as leading from science to society. Although various groups have recently started to question the reliability of facts, for decades the image of science as the major knowledge-producer has been quite solid.

What is not equally recognised, apart from by STS scholars and those acquainted with this body of knowledge, is how much society in turn influences science. Science has been put on pedestal as an entity, separate from other institutions and with no other goals than a search for truth. However, likely many of the problems that ordinary citizens experience regarding, for instance, occupational, relational, technical, environmental and health matters have an impact on what scientists choose to explore. Alarming issues tend to attract diverse efforts from knowledge-based expertise to help in overcoming difficulties, threats and dangers. Moreover, politicians and decision-makers take a strong interest, at least for their purposes, in research that is useful for solving or helping solve emerging problems.

¹ This article was written within the research project "The Co-production of Social Science and Society: The Case of Happiness studies", which was funded by the Swedish Research Council (grant number 2012-1117). It should be noted that neither the research project, nor this article are about happiness itself. It is not an analysis of what happiness entails, nor of what might make people happy, which concept of happiness is preferable, if happiness correctly captures a mental state, or whether it is shallow or misguided. A substantial amount of literature exists in which happiness as such is dealt with; it is thoroughly discussed by Jonathan Haidt, 2006. Instead, here, we look at how research on happiness has become a quickly growing field within modern western societies and what that says about both the social sciences and contemporary social order.



Science and society are never separated, always interacting; thus, power and people also speak to science. The co-production idiom highlights the interdependency between science and society and between the various actors in both.

This article suggests that co-production is a valuable analytical concept for identifying how research, politics and people together shape the world because the notion turns our attention in a specific direction towards the seamless web of conscious and unconscious ambitions and strives to unite people and institutions in common aims. This makes the concept of co-production a useful concept

Social Knowledge/Social Order

The impact of the social sciences on society is sometimes explicit, for instance, when social scientists produce government white papers or make policy recommendations to politicians, public authorities and decision-makers. Sometimes, the effects are implicit or even hidden but still real.

The social sciences take part in defining what society is, what it can be like, and what it ought to be like. Many issues tend to emerge from below, from experiences and challenges in real life. People look for knowledge about the world they live in to make it comprehensible and sometimes even bearable because the social world is filled with paradoxes. This is manifested in, for example, the numerous and best-selling self-help books on happiness (see for example, Lyubomirsky 2007; Dolan 2014). When people find human behaviour hard to immediately understand or feel sympathy for, both the social sciences and the humanities may assist in sorting things out, at least indirectly. Ideally, politicians, decision-makers and civil servants turn to the knowledge producers to find support for their actions or to find guidance in difficult matters. There is movement back and forth between the political level and ongoing research, notably within the social sciences and humanities, as they appear to be closer to the citizens than many natural sciences.

Findings from the social sciences are sometimes regarded as being 'softer' because in comparison with the natural sciences, they lack material technologies that are stable over time. Paradoxically, however, the knowledge production of quantitative social sciences has made a deep imprint in modern societies (Desrosières 1998; Horn 1994; Kullenberg 2010; Patriarca 1996; Porter 1995). Consequently, the average conception of social sciences seems to be contradictory to say the least. Findings that appear as soft still have hard effects on the organisation of modern societies,

The making of a science of happiness

Empirical research on happiness started on a small scale in the 1970s and 80s (Veenhoven 1988). Previous research on the development

for understanding how the research-based knowledge and social order of happiness studies has grown.

In the co-production framework, one considers four well-documented pathways along which co-production occurs: the making of identities, institutions, discourses and representations (Jasanoff 2004, 38). A major task is to investigate the interconnected relationship between the production of scientific knowledge and social processes at various levels (i.e. how science interacts with societal and cultural practices, ideas, ideologies and/or other salient, public themes).

especially as they make possible a calculus of happiness in 'society as a whole' (Latour et al. 2012), or as Verran puts it, numbers are *performative* as they enact a 'whole-part' relation as they generalise the (in our case social-) world (Verran 2013, 28).

The wishes and claims of people and policymakers create images of what matters in specific times and hence influences what social scientists put on their agendas to research. Professionals, such as clinical psychologists, social workers, physicians and police officers, need to base their practices on, or let themselves be guided by, defensible results in order to continue to be respected and regarded as reliable in society. The community, in turn, wants professionals to act in a competent and informed manner.

Similarly, priorities and goals change in accordance with new challenges, hopes and wishes, which, in turn, have effects on "what knowledge of what" is expected from the researchers and the specialists. Academics are encouraged to reach out to the public and prove the value of their research and also to listen to what people require. The evaluations and assessments of social science research results are intended to provide the best possible knowledge in order to influence or dictate the direction chosen. There is a loop or a circle integrating research, politics, citizens and social order. This does not mean that one causes the other or is fundamental, rather that there is an interrelated process through which the human world is shaped and 'society cannot function without knowledge any more than knowledge can exist without appropriate social supports' (Jasanoff 2004, 2–3).

As the social sciences produce knowledge essential to both politics and people, they have power to change human life, including how such a phenomenon as human happiness is rendered knowable and, consequently, acted upon.

of this area of study has shown that a focus on happiness grew progressively in several scientific disciplines, in particular, since the



year 2000, with an immense increase in the number of publications on the topic in recent decades (Kullenberg and Nelhans 2015, 619). Many concepts are used to study states of mind akin to happiness: "subjective well-being", "positive affect", "life satisfaction" and sometimes the more general notion of "quality of life".

Happiness has existed, one might argue, for long as an emotional state and an everyday word. The question of what makes people happy has occupied the human mind for thousands of years, and philosophers and prophets have concerned themselves with happiness throughout history (Haidt 2006). However, in the western philosophical tradition, two points of reference are often made, either in Aristotle's *Nicomachean Ethics* (1991) or Jeremy Bentham's *An Introduction to the Principles of Morals and Legislation* (1879[1789]), both of which resonate with contemporary research, often under the terminology of "eudaimonic happiness" (see for example, Ryff 1989) and "hedonic happiness" (see for example, Kahnemann et al. 1997). Jeremy Bentham's vision of finding an exact measurement of happiness that would work as a well-honed instrument for determining the correct form of government – one that rested firmly on the principle of utility – could, of course, not be simply transferred from its eighteenth century conception and become instantly inflated into contemporary research (Zevnik 2014, 105-119). The enlightenment idea of a political arithmetic based on a felicific calculus has to be co-produced both as a science and as a political programme simultaneously. However, Bentham's vision was not realised during his lifetime. As an object for empirical studies, happiness is a latecomer.

Early surveys of happiness, such as Beckham's (1929) study "Is the Negro Happy?", Watson's (1930) "Happiness Among Adult Students of Education" and Hartmann's (1934) "Personality Traits Associated with Variations in Happiness", began to use simple scales for measuring self-reported levels of happiness to work in "real" surveys, mostly among student populations. These pioneering empirical studies did not have well-defined terminology of what happiness was, nor had they established any form of standardised scales. Nonetheless, they were beginning to struggle progressively with the ordeals of questionnaires and sample sizes. In 1967, psychologist Warner Wilson summed up the primary results of a number of studies conducted from the 20s and onwards. He concluded that happiness could be correlated with age, health, education, income, religiosity, marriage, etc. (Wilson, 1967). Wilson's synthetic meta-study reported on empirical facts of 'avowed happiness', and it glimpsed with fresh eyes into the question of what were the causes of human happiness. Unlike the case of the nineteenth century utilitarians, happiness could finally be *measured* as a practical felicific calculus, with the cold sobriety of statistical association being put to use in real surveys. Wilson was able to conclude that knowledge about human happiness had accumulated; thus, the first steps towards an emerging field called 'happiness studies' had been taken.

However, the hedonic conception of happiness has both co-existed and sometimes competed with the notion of eudaimonic

happiness, derived from Aristotle's ancient works. In the 1980s, a number of psychologists wanted to turn the attention to the realisation of the individual's true potential as an essential component of happiness (or Eudaimonia) 'in the sense of an excellence, a perfection toward which one strives, and it gives meaning and direction to one's life' (Ryff 1989, 1070). Rather than striking a balance between pleasure and pain, as Bentham defined happiness, this Greek ambition towards self-realisation and strive towards living a "full" life resonates with what Foucault called "the care of self", in his seminal work of the third volume of *The History of Sexuality* (1986[1984]).

The practice of measuring happiness continued progressively. Notable large-scale surveys that include subjective measurements of happiness and well-being were the World Values Survey (1981), Eurobarometer (1973) and a large number of national surveys.

During the 1980s, there were several attempts to measure happiness, life-satisfaction and subjective well-being, methods that are used frequently within several disciplines today. The two most notable examples, as well as the most cited references in happiness studies, are the works of psychologists Diener et al. (1985) and Watson et al. (1988). They introduced and defined specific measurement scales, the *Satisfaction With Life Scale* (SWLS) and the *Positive and Negative Affect Schedule* (PANAS), respectively. These scales measured life satisfaction and affect, a combination which covered one of the most central concepts in contemporary happiness studies: *Subjective well-being* (SWB). Psychologist Ed Diener (see especially Diener 1984; Diener et al. 1999), who is also the single most cited author in the field of happiness studies (Kullenberg & Nelhans 2015), is perhaps the best-known advocate of the concept of SWB. In a 1984 article, he defined SWB as consisting of two entirely subjective aspects: *satisfaction with life* and *positive affect*. Diener explicitly distanced himself from any 'normative standards' that are implicated in, for example, Aristotle's *eudaimonia* (1984, 543).

However, these recent ways of measuring happiness fall back on a set of older scales that date back to the 1960s, when subjective indicators were first being discussed seriously. Bradburn (1969) conducted an early study that measured positive and negative affects in a similar way as Watson et al. (1988). Moreover, Andrews and Withey's "Social Indicators of Well-being" (1976) is a large-scale survey that pioneered the measurement of well-being, using the 'Delighted-Terrible Scale' (DT). In Cantril's ambitious cross-national study "The Pattern of Human Concerns" (1965), the 'Self-Anchoring Striving Scale' was defined to measure satisfaction and dissatisfaction among people. Finally, we end with the 'Life Satisfaction Index' by Neugarten et al. (1961), which comprises two major scales for measuring self-perceived life satisfaction.

In addition to the opposition between hedonic and eudaimonic happiness, there is also a tension between so-called subjective and objective indicators in happiness studies that are particularly



spelled out in sociology (Kullenberg & Nelhans 2017). It signals a contrast that social scientists make between, on the one hand, the subjective experience of satisfaction, happiness, sadness or any other emotional state, and, on the other hand, the objective, material aspects of everyday life such as housing, child mortality or nutrition. This tension depends in part on different knowledge traditions in the disciplines engaged in the field and in part on the relationship between a given discipline and the state.

In accordance with the assumptions in their respective specialty, researchers tend to emphasise either individuals' own experiences or social/cultural surroundings and structures. Subjective indicators (i.e. how persons estimate his/her level of happiness) could be measured more or less out of context through questions about feelings, family, friends, hopes and fears. In addition, the level of happiness might be valued as high by persons living in objectively poorer circumstances. Nor do objective indicators necessarily capture how satisfied an individual is with his or her life. Income and other economic factors, political rights, living area, status of health and so on are relevant for an overall picture of life conditions in a given society, regardless of how each individual feels about them. In 1974, the economist Richard Easterlin was already arguing that empirical data showed that economic growth only increased happiness up to a certain level. He showed that the populations of rich countries had higher degrees of happiness compared to those in poor countries. He also showed that if only the rich population was accounted for as an isolated unit of analysis, the increase in economic growth did not seem to increase the levels of happiness (1974, 118). Moreover, American economist Tibor Scitovsky, Easterlin's contemporary, published *The Joyless Economy* in 1976, which had a similar critique of thinking of populations as mere rational consumers, overlooking any psychological needs that went beyond simple consumer decisions. Scitovsky argued that the hard-working American population had begun consuming more and more, but had not become happier. Rather, despite the material successes, they had instead become unhappy (Scitovsky 1976).

The use of objective indicators has long been standard in the so-called welfare states, particularly, the Scandinavian countries. In the 1960s, before empirical research began on happiness, Swedish sociologists and political scientists were conducting surveys on levels of living, based exclusively on objective indicators (see Noll & Zapf 1994). By then, social scientific knowledge had been co-produced with political imaginaries of what constitutes values in a welfare state. A close relationship between the state and parts of the social sciences has endured in Scandinavia, although the ideal of a free and independent role for scientists has rarely ever been questioned (Fridjonsdottir 1991, Erikson & Uusitalo 1987). Still, politicians continuously point out areas in need of further knowledge and often turn to social scientists to assist with research.

In happiness studies, quantitative research is conducted more frequently, with surveys playing an important role, while the number of qualitative methods is scarce. The main reason for this is, as Kullenberg and Nelhans have shown, that disciplines with a strong tendency towards quantitative methods, especially psychology, medicine and quantitative sociology, have come to dominate happiness studies (Kullenberg & Nelhans 2015). Viewing this tendency through the lens of co-production, our conclusion is that precisely these disciplines are particularly convincing at meeting society's need for generalisable quantitative data, and this partially explains the uptake of happiness studies in broader social contexts.

Moreover, one perceived advantage of collecting quantitative data is the assumed possibility of making comparisons. A starting point in making comparisons is to find out more about what makes people satisfied with life, in terms of different countable variables. Education, profession, living conditions, economic standing, family size, friendships, health conditions and so on are quite convenient to study through questionnaires and then relate to questions of subjective life satisfaction. When a great number of happiness studies reaches the same results as to which nation scores the highest in happiness, it is possible to further analyse what matters most to its inhabitants. As always with surveys, without direct contact with the respondents it is hard to know whether the answers are accurate, the categories are exhaustively structured, or the comparisons between countries or nations are sufficiently refined.

While the scales that were discussed during the 1980s are still widely used, there have been recent suggestions for measuring happiness, for example, Lyubomirsky and Lepper (1999) and Kahnemann et al. (2004), where the former is a brief scale for measuring 'subjective happiness' (SHS) and the latter designates the 'Day Reconstruction Method' (DRM), in which respondents are asked to reconstruct their experienced feelings on a daily basis.²

Since the turn of the millennium, journals with a happiness theme or focus has increased in general social science publications. In addition, the establishment of special journals directly addressing research on quality of life demonstrates how this subject becomes of greater interest in different research fields. In 2000, the interdisciplinary *Journal of Happiness Studies* was founded, followed by *Health and Quality of Life Outcomes* in 2002, *Journal of Positive Psychology* in 2003, *Applied Research in Quality of Life* in 2003, *British Journal of Wellbeing* in 2010, *Psychology of Wellbeing* in 2011, *International Journal of Wellbeing* in 2011, *International Journal of Happiness and Development* in 2012, and *Journal of Happiness and Well-Being* in 2012.

Today, various measurements of happiness are frequently used in cross-national comparisons outside academic research, for

² Unfortunately, we are unable to analyse these two scales in this short article. Lyubomirsky et al. is interesting because it is a light-weight scale that connects to the field of positive psychology. The Day Reconstruction Method of Kahneman et al. is also relevant because Kahneman (Kahneman et al. 1997) has made explicit attempts elsewhere to connect his concept of 'experienced utility' to Bentham's original vision. Nevertheless, it is our intention to return to them in-depth elsewhere.



example, in the *United Nations' Human Development Report* (UNDP 2013) and the *World Happiness Report* (Helliwell et al. 2012), a trend which dates back to the first interim report by the United Nations in 1961, where new indicators of welfare were established, including subjective measurements. Happiness and well-being are becoming increasingly important issues in policymaking, which could be regarded as a return of the 'greatest happiness principle', as outlined by Jeremy Bentham and John Stuart Mill in the nineteenth century. In the UK, the Office for National Statistics provides regular nation-wide measurements of various aspects of well-being and happiness, as a complement to GDP (Powell 2014).

The questionnaires are designed to capture both positive and negative conditions and experiences. The results can be compared across a wide range of categories, such as generation, gender, class, education and countries, allowing the level of happiness in one context to be contrasted to another. Since 2012, *The World Happiness Report*, published by the Sustainable Development Solutions Network, has annually ranked the happiness levels of 155 countries. Countries scoring high on these measures are considered as inhabiting a happy population, or at least a happier one than those scoring lower. Measurements of subjective well-being have multiplied after the turn of the millennium, and prominent organisations such as the OECD

(2015) and the United Nations (Helliwell et al. 2012) have not only begun measuring various subjective aspects of well-being, but they also actively promote it as an important value in societal development.

In looking at the growth and establishment of happiness studies, the use of the co-production concept sheds new light on how the multi-disciplinary increase in studies of happiness occurred. Following the co-production concept, both the emergence and stabilisation of a new phenomenon and the modification of the cultural practices where research on the new phenomenon is done are of significance. Happiness has emerged and been stabilised through academic (and also societal, see below) processes. Happiness now has a significant identity in many social sciences, as being possible and valuable to measure. The social sciences, as institutions, take on the representation of this identity through various discourses: journals, conferences, seminars, results and outreach. Hereby, the cultural practices within the social sciences are modified (i.e. the representation of the happy identity and the ascending discourses create possibilities for new academic posts, externally funded projects and individual career building). The rise of happiness as a researchable identity has been well received in influential areas of the social sciences and brought about a new research object. However, some reluctance still remains, particularly among sociologists and critical scholars.

Happiness, identity and culture

Equally important as the emergence of a science of happiness is that during recent decades, happiness has apparently come to the forefront in contemporary society and culture. Conceived as being the opposite to suffering, happiness is thought of as worth striving for, in most parts of the globalised world. This turn to happiness in our culture has been critically analysed by Ahmed (2010). She argues that happiness is a promise that directs us towards certain life choices and away from others, particularly in popular culture and discourse.

Furthermore, popular culture and mass media widely report on happiness. They offer magazines and books with appealing titles on how to have a happy life, become a more satisfied person and achieve fame, wealth or power, thereby representing what a happy identity is. Happiness signals success: white teeth, healthy cooking, close relationships and a slim body are presented as means to come closer to a happier self. The beauty industry is keen on helping with smart advertisements on anti-ageing substances or even plastic surgery to model the body, to feel better and to gain a younger and more pleasant look. Although the products and practices are often expensive, sales of them seem to be flourishing.

Mental and psychological states are particularly visible in the popular happiness culture. There is even an International Day of Happiness, March 20, which is celebrated in many parts of the world. One finds a wide range of (westernised) Buddhist thoughts in both philosophical and more popular writings and on websites, and in commercial advertising, where inner peace, meditation and mindfulness are all related to the road to happiness (Haidt 2006). In the western world, yoga has become popular and also an industry with its focus on bodily control, meditation and balance, attracting both men and women (Singleton 2010). In contrast, but with the same goal of achieving happiness, there has been recent bestseller literature written by academic researchers on systematic and evidence-based methods of changing one's life to become happier. Notable examples include Sonja Lybomirsky "The How of Happiness" (2007), which is marketed as drawing 'on her own groundbreaking research with thousands of men and women'³ and Paul Dolan's "Happiness by Design" (2014), which 'combines the latest insights from economics and psychology to illustrate that in order to be happy we must behave happy.'⁴ Thus, feeling well and being satisfied with one's life situation seems like a prerequisite to a happy identity, regardless of whether you turn to meditation and yoga or research-driven self-help books.

³ <http://thehowofhappiness.com/> (retrieved 2018-05-08)

⁴ <https://www.amazon.co.uk/Happiness-Design-Change-What-Think/dp/150463243X> (retrieved 2018-05-08)



In addition, workplaces and employers support the ideal of happy, successful people. Managers encourage fitness and well-being and having employees stay in good physical and psychological shape to cope with what is often expressed as increasingly demanding jobs. The opposite, unhappiness and suffering, indicates difficulties, for people dealing with challenges both at work and possibly in life. People with unfortunate life conditions, combined with having anger management problems or depression, risk having long periods of sick leave and perhaps no final cure. Research has shown that happiness makes people more productive, and lower level of happiness is systematically associated with lower productivity (Oswald et al. 2015). According to Oswald et al., there is a link between human well-being and human performance. It is possible that employers who learn about the suggested connection between happiness and efforts at work would pay more attention to both the working environment and individual prevention, but also avoid taking on unhappy people.

As a consequence, there is a message in the focus on happiness and the matching ideals and slogans about being of sound mind and body because a social order always entails norms about right and wrong, good and bad. Thus, the outcome of the push for a happy identity also has a disadvantage to those not fulfilling the norm. Subsequently, we are all told one way or another from several sectors in society that happiness is a desirable state of mind and that we will be better off in life if happy rather than sad. For those who fail and do not have the cultural markers of success, life could be harsh and miserable.

The joint process in which social science interacts with political, professional and individual motives makes it possible to construct happiness as an identity, as represented by the social sciences' discourses in popular culture and demands from work places and the political sphere. Happiness studies have evolved and become stabilised because they have moved through a receptive culture, one which agrees that happiness is important to achieve. There are many signs that the empirical object of happiness, and the sciences engaged in studying it, has developed in a context where there is a 'constant interplay of the cognitive, the material, the social and the normative' (Jasanoff 2004, 38).

Discussion

The orientation towards individual success encourages people to learn how to become happy, reach physical and psychological well-being, balance emotions, have a long and healthy life, nourishing relationships, and so on. At the same time, governments want to control the societal costs for life-long comfort and satisfaction, so they support people who can make knowledge-based recommendations on how to reach a good life through changes in

Studies of happiness are not limited to a certain age group. The earliest quantitative analyses of well-being were developed within gerontology, where the imaginative concept of "successful ageing" was launched (Neugarten et al. 1961). In most parts of the modern world, ageing populations are regarded as an acute problem for social policy and stability; moreover, ageing is regarded as a problem for elderly people themselves. Within gerontology, medical research looks for new and seemingly more effective drugs, new and better investigation methods and treatments of health-related problems, and more effective preventive measures. Yet, ageing means more than physical decline and difficulties related to failing health. Through happiness studies, a certain space for collecting data on how elderly people live, feel and experience their lives opens up, and the results from these studies are expected to add valuable knowledge to society.

From these studies, a possibility arises that those who are part of the socio/science interventions can have a change in identity. On the one hand, it seems plausible to suggest that persons who attract interest from researchers and are objects for improved measures of life conditions will feel more included and empowered than when given little societal attention. People's self-image largely depends on the way others look at them and how their position counts in the culture they are a part of. On the other hand, being referred to as a social problem that must be dealt with, does not likely result in one becoming happier. In addition, there is a normative element in the making of a happy identity, say, for example, for the elderly, and accentuating how to be better off through an active life, a close circle of friends, a healthy living, and so on. Those who do not live up to the norms might feel devalued.

Because they add special knowledge, society may benefit from the outcomes of happiness studies. Benefits could be gained, in terms of developing prevention measures and providing care and in planning for housing, social work and daily activities in a community. Conceived as an urgent social problem, ageing populations have to be addressed, and both research and social institutions will have to co-operate. Thus, a new social order concerning elderly care might appear, if the results from these studies have any impact. Whether happiness will increase among the elderly people is, of course, an open question.

lifestyle or other personal efforts.

Happiness studies have grown notably in both number and power during the last two decades. From other research fields, it is well-known that changes in the world, due to natural disasters, epidemics, floods, financial crises, war, migration, and so on, require social interventions based on experience

5 Ageing is but one example of how the co-production process between social science and social order occurs and has impact on identities. Modern society is full of such examples to explore, for example, psychiatric diagnoses, transgender politics, immigrants, refugees and unemployment.



and knowledge and normative regulations adherent to correct processes. Society wants knowledge for many reasons, one is to guide in making difficult decisions, and with few exceptions the production of knowledge needs social support. Different sectors in society experience and face different challenges and if scientific support, evidence, results from research on a particular challenge exists, society wants it. Co-production is a general way of describing and understanding these processes, but, like any other analytical concept, it needs concrete examples to show its empirical usefulness and value. The growth and stabilisation of the interdisciplinary field of happiness studies have served to illustrate how ideals, norms and requirements in society interact with what researchers put on their agendas. Without public-, political- and peer support, there would be no respect for the research, nor for its results, and therefore no funding.

'Co-production is something that is going on in the world, like it or not', as expressed by Jasanoff in an interview ten years after *States of Knowledge* was published (Turney 2014).⁶ Science and society, knowledge and social order are constantly intertwined and cannot be separated if we are to fully understand the world we live in. The idiom of co-production has served us well in analysing happiness studies; it is an assemblage of interdisciplinary research, where the sciences involved in interaction with society co-produce knowledge and social order. Both within and outside the research community, there is an attractive force in happiness.

Still, there are some internal disciplinary differences and tensions among those sharing engagement in happiness studies, which arguably escape the co-production umbrella. One example is the above-mentioned tension between objective and subjective indicators. Another wider discussion is whether *measuring* happiness is good or bad or done well enough to capture what makes people happy, which is a different issue; furthermore, the practice has both advocates and critics within various research groups. Exactly why disciplines have evolved, having a preference over one or the other indicator and why different disciplines put more or less emphasis on identity remains unclear. Among the social sciences, economists and psychologists, in particular, have produced a significant body of knowledge on the topic, while sociologists, with some notable exceptions, have so far been more reluctant to embrace the measuring of happiness (Bartram 2012).

Sociologists' reluctance to study happiness might have to do with the sociological tradition, which has long been concerned with social facts, (i.e. social and economic life conditions, independent of individual experiences). Classical sociology, in the vein of Durkheim, has maintained the classic divide between facts and values. Moreover, deeply rooted in sociology is a practice of suspicion.

Things may not always be what they appear to be. For these reasons, happiness, if not directly rejected as a relevant research object, has probably attracted few sociological analysts.

One well-recognised opponent to the happiness trend in the social sciences is the Polish sociologist Zygmunt Bauman. In a conversation with Michael Hviid Jacobsen, published in the *Journal of Happiness and Well-Being* in 2014, Bauman discussed the merits and pitfalls of happiness studies and critically diagnosed the contemporary culture of happiness. Here, Bauman stated: 'Happiness is anything but an exception among the objects of sociological inquiry', and he referred to sociology as the social science of social facts. According to Bauman, the notion of happiness is not a social fact but rather refers to an individual experience, feeling, state of mind, psyche, emotion, hence fully and truly an individual phenomenon (87).

Bauman is not alone among sociologists on this view, as pointed out by Hviid Jacobsen (2014) and similarly by Bartram (2015). Yet, despite the cautiousness among sociologists about studying happiness, as social scientists they are well aware of what goes on at the policy level. As a result, when the public discourses move in a certain direction and influence political outcomes and processes and the reverse happens, and happiness becomes both an optional and a desirable object in our common culture, sociologists, to a higher degree than before, might include empirical studies of happiness in their range of concerns.

The answer as to why economics, cognitive science, psychology and so on, have developed into specific academic fields, and why other disciplines in the social sciences have remained reluctant requires further analysis. Some of these fields are all more or less close to politics and power, sometimes arbitrarily, sometimes due to beliefs about how the world is and how it therefore should be explored. Their histories will tell which one of them, if any, have been more closely connected to the state, and in the end how the co-production of a particular social science and social order comes about.

Our article on happiness studies set out to find out more about the interplay between social science and society. Without using co-production, we would have missed identifying the mutual links that occur between knowledge, people, professionals and power when happiness advanced in both science and society, in short, how science and social order encountered and strengthened each other. Expanding knowledge and insights from STS to the social sciences and humanities is of fundamental relevance for understanding how identities, institutions, discourses and representations shape the world we share.

⁶ <http://www.futureearth.org/blog/2014-jul-23/be-inclusive-you-need-more-voices-qa-sheila-jasanoff>



References

- Ahmed, S. 2010. *The Promise of Happiness*. Durham and London: Duke University Press.
- Aristotle 1991. *Nicomachean Ethics*, Translated by W. D. Ross, New Jersey: Princeton University Press.
- Bartram, D. 2012. Elements of a Sociological Contribution to Happiness Studies, *Sociology Compass* 6/8.: 644-656.
- Bentham, J. 1879. *An Introduction to the Principles of Morals and Legislation*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, first published 1789.
- Desrosières, A. 1998. *The Politics of Large Numbers: A History of Statistical Reasoning*. Cambridge, Mass: Harvard University Press.
- Dolan, P. 2014. *Happiness by design: change what you do, not how you think*. New York: Hudson Street Press.
- Easterlin, R. A. 1974. Does Economic Growth Improve the Human Lot? Some Empirical Evidence. *Nations and Households in Economic Growth: Essays in Honour of Moses Abramovitz*. New York: Academic Press Inc.
- Erikson, R. and Uusitalo, H. 1987. The Scandinavian Approach to Welfare Research. In *The Scandinavian Model: Welfare States and Welfare Research*, edited by R. Erikson, E. J. Hansen, S. Ringen, and H. Uusitalo, 177-193. Armonk, NY: M. E. Sharpe.
- Felt, U., Fouché, R., Miller, C. A., & Smith-Doerr, L. 2017. *The Handbook of Science and Technology Studies*. Fourth edition. Cambridge, Mass: The MIT Press.
- Fridjonsdottir, K. 1991. Social science and the "Swedish Model": sociology at the service of the welfare state. Wagner, I P. *Discourses on society: the shaping of the social science disciplines*. Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic Publishers.
- Haidt, J. 2006. *The Happiness Hypothesis*, London: Arrow Books.
- Helliwell, J., Layard, R. and Sachs, J. 2012. *World Happiness Report*.
- Horn, D. G. 1994. *Social Bodies: Science, Reproduction, and Italian Modernity*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Jacobsen, M. H. 2014. *Sociology and Happiness: An interview with Zygmunt Bauman*, *The Journal of Happiness & Well-Being*, 2(1), 85-94.
- Jasanoff, S. ed. 2004. *States of Knowledge. The Co-production of Science and the Social Order*. London: Routledge.
- Jasanoff, S. 2014. <http://www.futureearth.org/blog/2014-jul-23/>
- Kahneman, D., Wakker, P.P and Sarin, R. 1997. Back to Bentham? Explorations of Experienced Utility. *The Quarterly Journal of Economics* 112(1): 375-406.
- Kullenberg, C. 2010. Sociology in the Making: Statistics as a Mediator between the Social Sciences, Practice and the State. In *The Mutual Construction of Statistics and Society*. Routledge.
- Kullenberg, C. and Nelhans, G. 2015. The happiness turn? Mapping the emergence of 'Happiness studies' using cited references. *Scientometrics*, 103:615-630.
- Kullenberg, C. and Nelhans, G. 2017. Measuring Welfare beyond GDP : 'Objective' and 'Subjective' Indicators in Sweden, 1968-2015. *Valuation Studies* 5 (1).
- Layard, R. 2005. *Happiness – Lessons from a new science*. London; Allen Lane.
- Lybomirsky, S. 2007. *The How of Happiness: A New Approach to Getting the Life You Want* (Reprint edition). New York, N.Y.: Penguin Books.
- Neugarten, B.L, Havighurst, R.J., & Tobin, S. S. 1961. The measurement of life satisfaction. *Journal of Gerontology*, 16(2), 134-143.
- Noll, H., and Zapf, W. 1994. *Social Indicators Research: Social Monitoring and Social Reporting*. In *Trends and Perspectives in Empirical Social Research*, edited by Ingwer Bork and Peter Ph. Mohler. Berlin, New York: W. de Gruyter.
- Oswald, A. J. et al. 2015. *Happiness and Productivity*. *Journal of Labour Economics*, Volume 33, No. 4.
- OECD. 2015. *Health at a Glance 2015: OECD Indicators*, OECD Publishing, Paris. DOI: http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/health_glance-2015-en
- Patriarca, S. 1996. *Numbers and Nationhood: Writing Statistics in Nineteenth-century Italy*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Porter, T. M. 1995. *Trust in Numbers: The Pursuit of Objectivity in Science and Public Life*. Princeton: Princeton Univ. Press.
- Powell, T. 2014. National well-being measures. March 2014, Office for National Statistics, http://www.ons.gov.uk/ons/dep171766_355476.pdf. Accessed 10 June 2014.
- Ryff, C. D. 1989. Happiness is Everything, or is it? Explorations on the Meaning of Psychological Well-Being. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 57(6), 1069-1081.
- Scitovsky, T. 1976. *The Joyless Economy: An Inquiry into Human Satisfaction and Consumer Dissatisfaction*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Singleton, M. 2010. *Yoga Body: The Origins of Modern Posture Practice*. Oxford; Oxford University Press.
- Turney, J. 2014. "'To be inclusive, you need more voices' - Q&A with Sheila Jasanoff", *Future Earth*, <http://www.futureearth.org/blog/2014-jul-23/be-inclusive-you-need-more-voices-qa-sheila-jasanoff>, retrieved 2019-02-08.
- United Nations. 1961. *International Definition and Measurement of Levels of Living - An Interim Guide*. E/CN.3/270/Rev.1, E/CN.5/353.
- Verran H. 2013. Numbers Performing Nature in Quantitative Valuing. *NatureCulture* 2: 23-37.
- Veenhoven, R. 1988. The Utility of Happiness. *Social Indicators Research*, vol. 20, pp. 333-354.



BOOK REVIEW

Digital Music Distribution: The Sociology of Online Music Streams

Hendrik Storstein Spilker, Routledge, 2017

Reviewed by Raphaël Nowak, Griffith University

It took me a very long time to read and review Hendrik Storstein Spilker's 2017 book *Digital Music Distribution: The Sociology of Online Music Streams*. I would like to blame the range of work demands that are known to every scholar. Truth is, this also has to do with the book itself. *Digital Music Distribution* covers many configurations of digital music distribution and consumption. Spilker provides with this book what is close to an encyclopaedic knowledge. As a result, it is a book that I have picked, read 20 pages of, put down, and come back to much later. Sometimes I went back, or even *had* to go back, to some of the chapters I had already read. Some chapters took me a long time to read and process. That is so because the book is incredibly comprehensive in its historical, economical, social, and cultural treatment of the digital age of music distribution and consumption. This leads me to a first observation about the book. On the one hand, Spilker does an amazing job at retrieving a broad range of sources and accounts from different disciplines and at compiling them to discuss every possible aspect related to digital music distribution. On the other hand, the book can be hard to follow at times because of the amount of sources, stories, and details about each aspect of the distribution and consumption of music in the digital age, which can disrupt the narrative of the whole book, even if the final chapter is a very good attempt at bringing it all back together.

The book is inherently tied to Spilker's academic career which started back in 1997. The author thus goes back to the 1990s as a way to account for how the contemporary digital music distribution not only finds itself in an unprecedented state, but also that this very state results from many years of uncertainty, characterized by actors' decisions or indecisions, attempts at inventing and imposing new models and standards, and so on. Or, in the words of Spilker, the project is set out to analyse the 'disruptive and unpredictable character of the forces that have been and are at work in the shaping of digital music landscape' (p. 170). He does so by offering a book that '... is the only monograph that analyses digital music distribution both from the consumption and production side in a combined effort' (p. 3). To the author, it is critical to explore the structures and social actors, as well as issues of power, because they ultimately all partake in 'some of the great – and some of the smaller – changes that have occurred in the music world in the last 20 years' (p. 170). Spilker works with the assumption that anybody could have had a role to play in the shaping of contemporary music distribution. That is why the book provides a meticulous investigation of '[the] crucial interplay between technological, economic, legal and cultural forces' (p. 6; see also pp. 7-9). In that

regard, Spilker collects insightful knowledge about for instance the intricacies of the 'hacker punk' culture (chapter 4) or with his thorough analysis of the press coverage of the *Piracy Kills Music* campaign (chapter 8), which contribute in explaining how we got where we are now. In his own words, 'A basic premise for my research has been that there is nothing self-evident about digital music – nothing inevitable, nothing obvious, nothing irresistible, nothing relentless' (p. 5).

The book is composed of 10 carefully-crafted chapters, which at first seem a bit disconnected. Each chapter is in fact a piece of the jigsaw puzzle of the theoretical 'folding' landscape that Spilker aims to capture. Many of Spilker's claims are both theoretically rich and empirically informed through historical analysis, textual analysis, statistics/surveys, and interview material. The book rightly rejects all the absolutist theories about the supposed revolutionary nature of transformations that occurred since the early 2000s, and it is instead anchored within a sociological approach. Drawing on science and technology studies (STS) and more specifically actor-network theory (ANT), Spilker develops the concept of 'folding', which aims to provide an explicative framework that traces techno-cultural, social processes of the digital age of music distribution and consumption. He writes:

The concept of folding, applied to interactions between humans and technology, is meant to highlight the non-linear, non-determinist character of technology appropriation. It helps us envision the outcome as entangled and twisted arrangements of social and material elements – where one otherwise could be tempted to predict obvious and determined courses of development. (p. 72)

This approach recalls that of Anja Hagen who argues that, in the contemporary age of streaming platforms, 'the uses and experiences flow into another' (2016: 239-40). However, Spilker goes further by incorporating fields (architecture and material arrangements, laws, markets, social norms, and literacy, see pp. 7-8) that are often explored separately. The structure of the book also clearly indicates that both distribution and consumption, in the variety of forms they have taken over the last 20 years or so, are accounted for in the overall analysis.

I found chapter 4, about 'the rave scene, the goth subculture and the punk movement' (pp. 8-9), to be theoretically less convincing than the rest of the book, probably because the terms 'scene', 'subculture', 'movement' tend to be used interchangeably and the



literature on the topic is missing (see for example Bennett, 2011). As it is a sociological perspective, some could regret that music is *not quite there*, in a sense that Spilker does not engage with the cultural and textual features of (popular) music and how they impact upon, or are impacted upon by, the technological transformations brought about by the digital age, which is a phrase that we often hear/read in critiques of any sociological work on music. Maybe Spilker could have engaged a bit more with the work of DeNora (2000), Bull (2007), and Hesmondhalgh (2013) to discuss where music fits in all of this. Others might be more critical of the focus on STS and ANT, which tends to place individuals at the core of the analysis, particularly through Spilker's focus on 'networks' throughout the book, and which, for some (see Hesmondhalgh, 2002), would be equivalent to ignoring the 'structural' and 'systemic' processes

at play in issues of distribution and consumption. However, to come back to my earlier point – the book is very comprehensive as is. Its conceptual framework, which rejects extreme positions on technological transformations, is very welcome, especially considering that this topic has somehow been populated by many *prophecies* about the 'revolution' that would have happened since the advent of Napster. The book will be of interest to all who want to gather a thick understanding of what happened in the last 20 years in digital music distribution. Although the narrative is hard to follow at times, I have no doubt that Spilker's concept of 'folding' will be of great use for scholars in the fields of cultural/digital sociology in providing a complex, nuanced, and uncertain depiction and conceptualization of the music distribution and consumption landscape in the digital age.

References:

- Bennett, A. (2011). 'The Post-Subcultural Turn: Some Reflections 10 years on', *Journal of Youth Studies*, 14(5): 493-506.
- Bull, M. (2007). *Sound Moves: iPod Culture and Urban Experience*, London: Routledge.
- DeNora, T. (2000). *Music in Everyday Life*, London: Oxford University Press.
- Hagen, A. N. (2016). 'Music Streaming the Everyday Life', in R. Nowak and A. Whelan (eds), *Networked Music Cultures: Contemporary Approaches, Emerging Issues*, London: Palgrave MacMillan, pp. 227-45.
- Hesmondhalgh, D. (2002). 'Popular Music Audiences and Everyday Life' in D. Hesmondhalgh and K. Negus (eds.), *Popular Music Studies*, London: Arnold, pp. 117-30.
- Hesmondhalgh, D. (2013). *Why Music Matters*, Oxford: Wiley Blackwell.
- Spilker, H. S. (2017). *Digital Music Distribution. The Sociology of Online Music Streams*, London: Routledge.

ABOUT THE COVER ARTIST

AnnaSofia Mååg

By Lina Ingeborgrud

In the small village of Jukkasjärvi in the northern part of Sweden lies a fairytale-like hotel and art exhibition made from scratch out of ice and snow. It was founded in 1989 and is reborn every winter. The structure of the ice hotel remains below freezing, around minus 5 °C, and the hotel lasts from December to April when it melts away and finds its way back to the nearby Torne River. The architecture of the hotel varies from year to year, but it consistently features a church, reception area, and unique suites for guests. A jury selects artists by application and they are invited to Jukkasjärvi in November to work for an intense and limited period.

Swedish artist AnnaSofia Mååg has been translating her ideas into ice and snow in the hotel almost every winter since 2006. Here, she has created six different art suites on her own, and her plan for Elephant in the Room was chosen for an art suite during the winter season of 2015/2016. The work is a life size (three-meter tall) African Savannah Elephant hand carved out of snow and ice. Mååg says the following about the process of making this piece of art on her website:

"During a sculpture process like this, I always get connected with my piece. The passion of sculpting grabs me and I get lost in time. In this case, I could feel the majestic elephant, how it moved, its sounds, the flapping of its ears, the sway of the trunk, the soft imprint and weight changing through the body when it sets down its foot... It is a she. She comes from the African Savannah and her name is Betsy."

Mååg explains that working with ice as a medium is different in several ways. For instance, you cannot add material to the sculpture in the same way as when working with materials such

as clay. With ice, you have to work your way into the block, removing the material that is not to be part of the sculpture. Further, ice is transparent, which creates a completely new set of possibilities and challenges. In particular, working with ice requires particular conditions such as stable low temperatures – like those found in the village of Jukkasjärvi.

Mååg's sculptures give an immediate impression that always conceals another movement; a silent and obtrusive worry. They deal with the tension between what is hidden and what is revealed, between what is expressed and what remains silent. An 'elephant in the room' is an English-language metaphorical idiom for an obvious problem or risk that no one wants to discuss. Betsy is an elephant in a very particular type of room – she is removed from her normal habitat and transplanted into a frozen Nordic context, making her presence even more intrusive. Moreover, much like the other sculptures at the ice hotel, Betsy is a transient piece of art. She will melt away in the end, but the issues she represents may not disappear. As such, Betsy materialises issues not properly acted upon, like those of climate change and the preservation of endangered species.

AnnaSofia Mååg works in the fields of sculpture, ceramics, ice and snow, and her art has been exhibited in Sweden as well as abroad. Her work is included in the permanent collections of the National Museum of Fine Arts in Stockholm, the Röhss Museum in Gothenburg, Sweden, and the Icheon World Ceramic Center in South Korea.

To learn more about AnnaSofia Mååg and her work, visit her website: <http://www.annasofia.se/>