

# NAVF'S

UTREDNINGSINSTITUTT

NORGES  
ALMENVITENSKAPELIGE  
FORSKNINGSRÅD

## 1975: 8

Studies in Research  
and Higher Education

HANS SKOIE AND ARILD STEINE

### **Some Notes on Norwegian Social Science**

Development and Utilization considered  
in a Scandinavian Context

INSTITUTE FOR STUDIES IN RESEARCH  
AND HIGHER EDUCATION

The Norwegian Research Council  
for Science and the Humanities

**1975: 8**

Studies in Research  
and Higher Education

HANS SKOIE AND ARILD STEINE

**Some Notes on  
Norwegian Social Science**

Development and Utilization considered  
in a Scandinavian Context

## P R E F A C E

Last year Hans Skoie and Arild Steine of the Institute staff were asked by OECD to prepare in a private capacity a paper within the framework of the OECD project on "the development and utilization of the social sciences". Their paper was circulated at the beginning of this year as a document from the Directorate for Science, Technology and Industry (DSTI/SPR/75.4). However, the report does not necessarily represent the views of the OECD.

Due to the increasing interest in research policy issues in Norway, the Institute is publishing this paper in a slightly modified version in order to make it available to a larger audience. The points of view put forward by the authors in this paper are their own, and not necessarily those of the Institute. We hope that this paper will stimulate the present debate on research policy, including the extremely delicate questions bearing on the relationship between the social sciences and society at large.

Oslo, August 1975

Sigmund Vangsnes  
Director

P R E F A C E

B Y   T H E   A U T H O R S

This essay is the result of an invitation to submit a paper as a contribution to the current OECD project on "the development and utilization of the social sciences". OECD wanted material illuminating the Scandinavian situation.

Scandinavian social science comprises a wide range of traditions, attitudes, and present trends. Giving a reasonably adequate and balanced treatment of this area in a relatively short time is an extremely difficult task. We therefore submit our contribution with a great deal of modesty. A heavily Norwegian-oriented material has of course distinct drawbacks when serving as evidence in an appraisal of Scandinavian social science.

We would like to emphasise the essayistic and impressionistic character of this paper. It is intended as a personal evaluation and expression of opinion. We have, however, profitted from discussions with a number of Norwegian academics and civil servants. We greatly appreciate their comments and advice. Needless to say, we remain responsible for all evaluations and opinions. We are grateful to Sveinung Lökke for his efforts to put our English into more lucid shape.

## C O N T E N T S

	<u>page</u>
1. SOME INTRODUCTORY NOTES	9
2. THE STRUCTURE OF SOCIAL SCIENCE IN SCANDINAVIA	11
2.1 A brief outline.	11
2.2 The social sciences at the universities.	17
2.3 The institute sector of social science research.	20
2.4 The government apparatus - funding mechanisms.	21
2.5 Events and issues of policy-making in the development of the social science system.	22
3. SOME NOTES ON INFLUENCE AND APPLICATIONS OF THE SOCIAL SCIENCES	30
3.1 Experience from various research areas.	30
3.1 General remarks.	30
3.2 Research areas and traditions.	30
3.2.1 Economics and National Planning.	30
3.2.2 Production of National Statistics - another monopoly for the economists?	35
3.2.3 Educational Research - Legitimation only?	39
3.2.4 The rise of a research generation - the Institute of Social Research in Oslo.	44
3.2.5 The criminologist - poet or technician?	45
3.3 Research programmes and projects.	49
3.3.1 The Nord-Odal project - intended programme evaluation in the social policy area.	49
3.3.2 The Case of Norwegian Alcohol Research - Ignorance due to unwanted results?	51
3.3.3 Industrial democracy - but how?	54
3.3.4 Social science research and public policy - Government expectations from social science research run high.	57
4. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS	61
APPENDIX: Institutes with Social Science Research outside the Universities	70
LITERATURE AND REFERENCES	76

## 1. SOME INTRODUCTORY NOTES

At an early stage in the post World War II period, the Scandinavian countries Denmark, Norway, and Sweden were regarded as welfare-states, or at least as being well on their way to this state. The social democrats were particularly influential in this development, regularly reporting progress in their pragmatic efforts to change society. State intervention and public planning, particularly economic planning, were regarded as necessary tools in this development, especially in Norway and Sweden. The Scandinavian countries are generally recognized as being strongly influenced by egalitarian values. On this background, social sciences in general and applications of them in particular might obviously be considered important tools in generating social change toward an improved welfare state. This paper is a modest effort at assessing to what extent they have contributed to the post-war development in Scandinavia.

First of all we may point out that it is not at all obvious to whom the social sciences may be of particular relevance. This has been a recurring topic in the debate on research policy in these countries during recent years, and possibly more often in connection with the social sciences than with other fields. Some observers hold the social sciences to be of greatest value to the political and administrative establishment, increasing their potential for manipulating society. Others point to the tendency of these sciences to illuminate many social ills in a critical way, thereby complicating the process of government. In this paper we shall concentrate on the social science contribution to the framing of public policy - directly or indirectly. By direct contributions we shall understand evidence provided by social science influencing the political or administrative leadership. An instance of this could be the recognition of the relevance of a certain research programme to present policy. A research project might also be initiated in order to apply the results in a particular policy situation i.e. what James Coleman has called policy research. Indirect influence is here understood as social science influence on the general public, mass media, etc. eventually bringing about a change of attitudes and values - a process possibly resulting in a change of policy. Harold Orlans has pointed out that "a major function of applied social research is not, as academic men imagine, to discover the "truth" (which historians will continue to debate for centuries), but rather to change the distribution of knowledge and opinion, informing a wider circle of what a few people already know and believe."<sup>1)</sup>

---

1) Orlans, p. 30.

Generally speaking, the influence of the social sciences may be perceived as significant and insignificant. A distinction may be drawn between permanent and temporary insignificance. Some observers point out that when in due time we come to reorganize the relations between the social sciences and the administrative branches of Government, or when the disciplines become more mature, the political significance of the social sciences will increase substantially. If public authorities increasingly recognize social science as a relevant tool, sophisticated channels of communication with the research community and bodies to initiate and maintain communication will probably be developed.

The concept of use or utilization of social science is imprecise. Impact, influence or function have a similar but broader meaning. Use suggests a direct application of research findings while the other terms encompass both direct and indirect or unintended influence of research and researchers. Secondly, an important distinction may be made between different sources of social science influence; it may come from social science research, from the social science researcher or other social science professionals in general (including application of the social science techniques by anyone).

The selection of cases in which we shall consider possible contributions of social science to policy-making, are most made with reference to instances of external demands and expectations, especially from public authorities. The discussion does therefore not intend to cover all areas of possible contribution. Due to the limitations mentioned above and our limited knowledge, the various social science disciplines are discussed in varying degree. On the other hand we will argue that our cases give examples of general problems and possibilities of utilization of social science research in decision-making. To some extent they point to the more general impact of this kind of research.

We have limited ourselves to discussing the organizational and financial pattern in the social sciences, and general policy issues. A discussion of disciplinary development are not included.

## 2. THE STRUCTURE OF SOCIAL SCIENCE IN SCANDINAVIA

### 2.1. A brief outline.

The organizational and financial set-up for social science research in the Scandinavian countries is not radically different from the rest of the R&D systems in these countries. By and large the social sciences are also considered a part of these systems and not as being completely different from the natural sciences as is more the case in the Anglo-American tradition. The tradition of the German concept of *Wissenschaft* in these countries has obviously contributed to this development.

The social sciences were for instance included in the important establishment of Research Councils in all the countries. In Norway a special social science council was formed as a parallel to separate councils for natural sciences, medicine and the humanities within the Norwegian Research Council for Science and the Humanities (NAVF) in 1949. In Sweden, a Social Science Council was established in 1948 - shortly after the setting up of councils for medical research, agricultural research and natural science research.

In Denmark, the National Foundation of Science was established in 1952, partly functioning as a small research council and including a section for the social sciences. In 1968 this was replaced by regular research councils - for social science and for natural science - medicine, humanities and agriculture.

The importance of the social sciences has been increasingly emphasized in Government documents on general research policy, perhaps most often in Norway and more rarely in Sweden. Social scientists have also been appointed to advisory positions in central science policy advisory bodies in these countries. However, this is less pronounced in Sweden than in the two other countries (the influence of these bodies is a different matter).

In the mass media and among the general public there seems to have been a considerable acceptance of the social sciences. The economists and their models were to some extent criticized in the early post-war period, and today the pedagogical establishment as well as psychologists are often regarded in a critical way. A lot of research reports and individual researchers have stirred controversies. However, the social sciences as such have not been vigorously attacked in public debate or in Parliament. The universities and the students in particular have perhaps lost much of their traditional esteem in recent years. This is partly because of student activism, which has often had a stronghold in the social sciences, particularly in the departments of sociology.



Today the main bulk of social research (as well as almost all higher education) is publicly financed in the Scandinavian countries - either through the ordinary budget of the researchers' institution, through grants from the Research Councils or through contract work for various agencies.

The post-war period - particularly the sixties - has been a tremendous growth period for the social sciences in these countries. Entirely new disciplines have been introduced, and several new institutions have been established. In Denmark and Norway, R&D statistics in fact show a greater growth rate in the social sciences than in any other fields.

Student enrollments in the social sciences have also increased dramatically, and new professions have been established. Perhaps this expansion has been unduly accelerated, particularly in Sweden, where the job market could not swallow up the recent output of graduates.

Expansion in research has taken place at the universities as well as in the heterogeneous sector of independent research institutes, research departments and sections within agencies etc. (See Appendix). The main bulk of research in this sector is multidisciplinary or clearly problem-oriented, while the research activities at the universities by and large are more discipline oriented. We shall consider these sectors separately below.

A distinction between disciplinary research, emphasizing the theoretical development of the discipline and other types of research primarily focusing on the relevance of the research work to social problems is not an easy one to make. A similar, more operational distinction has been drawn between research projects defined and initiated by users of research and those defined by researchers. One obvious limitation of these concepts is that disciplinary, theoretical research might also prove useful to policy-making even if this is not intended from the outset. However, for a long time this has constantly been a line of conflict in much of the development of organizational structures in Scandinavian social science research. We shall return to this theme below.

Remarkable differences exist between the Scandinavian countries in the social science area. To some extent they are due to variations in national R&D systems, university policies and other general policies. However, some striking differences cannot be explained in this way. In our judgement, the notion of a Scandinavian research community is an exaggeration, though some cooperation does exist, as pointed out below.

The Research System - Resources and Financial Pattern.

Unfortunately, R&D statistics in Sweden do not at present cover the social sciences. A comprehensive picture of the size of social science research in all three countries is hard to draw. Both Denmark and Norway have R&D expenditure of approximately 50 Mill.Kr. in national currencies in 1970. Norwegian resources are somewhat more concentrated in the university sector than they are in Denmark.

Table 2.1. R&D manpower in Denmark and Norway in the social sciences in 1970. University trained personnel involved and estimated number of full time equivalents in R&D (in brackets).

	Universities	Institutes	Total
Denmark	420 (200)	240 (120)	660 (320)
Norway	600 (270)	240 (190)	840 (460)

The manpower data indicate that more university trained personnel are involved in R&D in Norway than in Denmark. The salary level for academics is higher in Denmark than in Norway. This probably accounts for the fact that expenditures do not differ substantially. In relation to the total R&D activity the social sciences account for 4-9% depending on what measure is applied.

We believe that the relative level of Swedish R&D expenditure and manpower in the social sciences is probably lower than that of Norway. Furthermore, due to strong Swedish investment in the natural and medical sciences and in technology, we may pretty safely say that the proportion of R&D resources that is devoted to social science is definitely smaller than it is in Norway.

In all Scandinavian countries, the Government is the dominant source for social science research funds. In the case of Norway this is clearly shown in table 2.2 below.

Contributions from private funds as well as from foreign sources have been diminishing in the last few years. Such money can of course still be of great significance in certain particular cases.

Table 2.2. The current R&D expenditures (including equipment) in the Social Sciences in Norway 1972 by source of funds.

Source	Mill.N.kr.	Percent
Government grants:		
State budget	67.0	79
Research councils	12.4	15
(NAVF)	(10.4)	(13)
(NLVF)	( 1.1)	( 1)
(NTNF)	( 0.9)	( 1)
County and municipal funds	1.2	2
Industry	1.2	1
Abroad	1.1	1
University funds	1.0	1
Private funds	0.8	1
Total	84.7	100

The channels through which social science is financed are also important. In the last few years contract work has been introduced more often by public authorities in Norway and Sweden - as we shall return to below.

The university system differs surprisingly from one Scandinavian country to another. Degrees and specializations vary greatly, affecting the professionalization of the various disciplines. We shall not go into details here, but just emphasize the importance of this fact for manpower comparisons. We may also add that the strong tradition in Sweden of a first degree after 3-4 years of study should be noted when the employment situation for graduates is discussed. The student usually includes 2-4 subjects in this degree. It is at this level that the number of students has been particularly high in Sweden, causing a lot of unemployment in recent years.

Manpower data for all the three countries are not available, but we include a table showing the stock of Norwegian university graduates and the number engaged in R&D by field of specialization. This does

not add up to the total number of researchers in the social sciences. Foreign degrees are not included, and a great many researchers, particularly in the institute sector, do not hold a degree in social science.

Table 2.3. The stock of graduates from Norwegian universities by field (1972).

Field	Total number	In R&D	%
Psychology	700	130	19
Education	300	53	18
Business Administration	3 100	62	2
Economics	1 200	84	7
Sociology	120	54	46
Law	6 700	67	1
Political Science	200	56	27
Ethnography	20	8	42
Unknown field of study	-	6	
B.A., B.Sc.(econ.)	740	28	4
Total	13 080	548	

The international orientation.

The international network of contacts in social science research has obviously been of substantial importance in many fields in Scandinavia - particularly for the university research community. The contacts have mainly been Western European and American. In the post World War II period the U.S. contacts have been increasingly frequent. A study of the tenured faculty of the University of Oslo showed that 60% of the social scientists had paid at least one visit of one term's duration to North America. The comparable figures for visits to the other Nordic countries were 13%, and elsewhere in Europe 31%<sup>1)</sup>.

Most Scandinavian institutes have had visitors from abroad, and again the Americans have been the most frequent guests. At the Institute

---

1) Skoie, p. 418.

for Social Research in Oslo, the foreign contacts were for a long time a particularly important bridge to the international research community - especially the American. The visit by Paul Lazarsfeld as well as researchers from the Survey Centre in Ann Arbor have repeatedly been pointed out as particularly important to the development of Norwegian sociology and political science. Probably due to the smallness of the country, international contact with a particular scholar or Research Center has often had a strong influence in the Norwegian research community. They have sometimes been regarded as representatives of a homogeneous foreign tradition rather than as representatives of a particular school or tradition within a large and pluralistic community.

The travel activity as well as the number of foreign visitors may have been relatively more frequent in Norway than in the other two countries. This country seems to have a long tradition of not feeling sufficiently self-contained. Generally speaking, leave of absence has been easy to obtain. American sources as well as a rather generous policy in the Research Council in this respect have contributed to this development. Young university graduates have often taken the opportunity to do graduate work abroad, and a significant number have earned a Ph.D. from a good American university.

This has also led to international cooperation on particular research projects - to the extent that a few Norwegian sociologists and political scientists definitely belong to "the international jet set of airport dons". (e.g. Galtung and Rokkan.)

A Scandinavian Research Community, defined as researchers cooperating actively or at least being informed of the professional activities of their colleagues, exists only to a limited extent. In certain areas cooperation does occur: some Scandinavian journals exist, and professional conferences are convened regularly or occasionally. Maybe the most important instance of communication is the fact that professors from the other Scandinavian countries usually sit on commissions advising on academic appointments and doctoral dissertations.

The Research Councils meet regularly twice a year, though mainly to exchange information. From the early 1950's, the Nordic Summer University obviously contributed to developing research contacts between the countries. The young social science disciplines accounted for the greater part of activities, and interdisciplinary work was particularly encouraged. However, strikingly few instances of exchange of graduate students and faculty occur. The number of joint projects and research programmes is also very limited, and researchers are often remarkably uninformed as to the activities of their colleagues in other Scandinavian countries. Going abroad on a professional basis usually means going somewhere outside Scandinavia.

## 2.2. The social sciences at the universities.

Most of the social science disciplines are rather young as university disciplines in Scandinavia. Economics and psychology were usually the earliest to be taught, while sociology and political science departments were first introduced in the late 1950's. In Norway the early introduction (1921) of a special research degree - magister - has definitely been of great general importance to the introduction of new disciplines and specializations. It meant a flexible addendum to the more traditional and profession-oriented degrees aimed at civil service and secondary school teaching etc. This reform was practiced in a liberal way; the introduction of rather "esoteric subjects" was not regarded as a real threat to anyone. The social science pioneers in Norway (though not the economists) obtained this degree, and the requirements gave ample opportunity for in-depth specialization and concentration.

The early establishment of social science research councils in Norway and Sweden was also important to the development of the social sciences - it meant recognition and better possibilities for research. Perhaps the strong investment in a fellowship program in Norway turned out to be particularly important. Young magister graduates were quite often awarded fellowships. These were planned to be renewed annually within a 3-5 year limit, but because of the lack of positions at the universities and other research establishments, the Council rather wisely prolonged the fellowship period for several years. When the university expansion in the sixties came about, many professors could be recruited directly from this stock of fellowship holders. They had had ample opportunity for research, many were heavily committed to it, and this attitude was often maintained in the new university departments.

Except for psychology and business administration at some universities, there has so far been no numerous clausus on student enrollment in the social sciences in the Scandinavian countries. The student interest in social science courses has dramatically increased. At times some departments have been swamped with students. The increasing number of students led to expansion in terms of new university positions and new buildings. However, personnel policy during this expansion was different in each country.

In Norway permanent positions were established at the universities and the number of positions was enlarged also at the top level, that of full professor. The old chair system of one and only one full professor in each subject was to a large extent abandoned in Norway, and a system closer to the American department system was introduced. In Sweden, Government authorities were more restrictive; the number of full professors was kept low, and a great many non-tenured univer-

sity lecturers with a heavy teaching load were appointed. Many of them have been fired during the last few years because of a declining enrolment in the social sciences. In Norway, too, the number of university lecturers has increased more than the number of full professors, but they received permanent positions, and enjoy a lower teaching load than their Swedish colleagues. This group can therefore by and large be compared to assistant professors in the U.S., aside from the fact that they also have tenure.

Studying the extent to which the chair system has been abandoned, we find that except for economics, the Swedes still have only one full professor at each university in disciplines like sociology, political science, and anthropology. In Denmark and Norway this is not so. At the University of Oslo, for instance, we find 5 full professors in the Department of Sociology, 4 in the Department of Political Science and 6 in the Department of Psychology.

Graduate and post-graduate research training has been rather weak in all Scandinavian countries. The faculty traditionally pays most attention to regular university education, and graduate students and holders of fellowships are very much left to themselves, for good and for bad. One consequence has been a research training which is strongly individualistic and oriented toward a university career. In Sweden, a degree reform was introduced in the early seventies in order to organise a graduate education more along the lines of the American Ph.D. system. However, our impression is that this system has been only a moderate success - particularly because of lack of resources for courses and supervision.

The opportunities for research work at the universities are influenced by several factors, including the amount of time which can be devoted to research, the availability of research assistance and facilities and the general attitude towards research in the institution. There has been much criticism of these matters in the countries, but in our judgement there seems to be somewhat less reasons for complaint in Norway than in the two other countries.

The time available for research is much influenced by the teaching load, and the student/staff ratio. On these criteria the situation has been more favourable in Norway than in Sweden and Denmark, as pointed out above. With regard to research facilities (computer time etc.) and research assistance, the lack of Research Council funds up to the late sixties has probably been a handicap in Denmark. The relatively late growth in the number of social science students in Norway, and the NAVF fellowship policy meant that new faculty recruits relatively often had extensive research experience before taking up teaching duties.

New universities have been founded in all three countries in the post-war period. This has probably meant most in Denmark and Norway, where a single university in the capital had a dominating position. Several universities give room for different specialities and schools of thought. Particularly in the cases of Roskilde and Tromsø, the desire for alternatives to the present system was emphasized from the outset.

Table 2.4. R&D expenditures for social research at universities in Norway by discipline and financial source. 1972.

Disciplines	Current expenditures (including equipment)					Mill. N.kr.
	Institution budget %	Research Council %	Other public funds %	Other funds %	Total %	
Law	78	8	4	10	100	4,9
Economics	84	5	5	6	100	8,9
Cultural geography and economic geography	84	14	-	2	100	1,6
Sociology	59	23	17	1	100	5,3
Political science	77	17	5	1	100	3,6
Ethnography	84	13	3	-	100	2,1
Psychology	71	27	1	1	100	9,2
Pedagogics and educational research	76	11	13	0	100	5,6
Other/common subjects in social science	72	12	7	9	100	8,3
Total	75	15	6	4	100	49,5



R&D statistics show that 75% of social science research at the Norwegian universities was financed over the university budget in 1970. The research councils financed 15%, and other public funds, essentially contract funds, financed 6%. A breakdown by discipline reveals the fact that "other public funds" contribute most in sociology - 17%. The equivalent percentage for educational research is 12%, while psychological research has the lowest percentage - only 1%. This is 1972 data. (Cf. table 2.4.) In the last three years, public contract funds have increased more than NAVF funds.

### 2.3. The institute sector of social science research.

As we have already pointed out, social science research outside the universities is rather heterogeneous in all Scandinavian countries. The research activities are by and large multidisciplinary and clearly oriented towards social needs and problems. A large proportion of the research staff often have their university degrees in disciplines other than the social sciences (35% in Norway in 1970). This is partly a consequence of a shortage of qualified social scientists up to now, but probably also due to the pragmatic and ad hoc development of this sector in Scandinavia.

However, certain institutes are more strongly linked to a particular discipline than others. Economics is for instance the major discipline at some institutes in all three countries. However, this is more pronounced in Denmark and Sweden than in Norway. Political science and sociology are represented at institutes for peace research, foreign affairs and social research, which exist in all Scandinavian countries.

Institutes in this sector vary a great deal in size, several are quite small - especially those consisting of research sections within larger institutions. A list of institutes is included in an Appendix. It reveals that the majority - in all countries - are public or Research Council institutes. The public ones are in most cases attached to a ministry, but there are considerable variations in the intimacy of this connection: some institutes are only financed from a Ministry's budget, otherwise enjoying an independent position, other institutes have Ministry representation on their board, or are intended to be more of an instrument of the public authority's policy. Regarding the private institutes, we may add that in many cases they receive considerable financial support from the state.

Because of its size and research activities, the Danish National Institute of Social Research stands out in many respects. The

institute has a central position in Danish social science, in fact a monopoly in certain areas. This is partly because of large-scale empirical projects and partly because of the rather weak university departments of Sociology in Denmark. Established by the Government in 1958, the institute is attached to the Ministry of Social Affairs. The comparable institutes in Norway and Sweden were established at a considerably later date<sup>1)</sup>. The Danish institute is much larger than the other two. Including funds provided by contract research, its budget for 1973/74 is approximately 10 mill.D.kr., and in Sweden much less.

In Norway, the Institute of Social Research in Oslo is of particular interest. Since its inception in 1950, it has influenced the development of social science research considerably, particularly in the fields of sociology and political science. The institute is a private one, but the staff and the research projects have enjoyed support from several sources, especially NAVF. It has maintained very "academic" standards of independence and scientific approach, and is in this respect atypical in the institute sector. A substantial proportion of the staff (none had tenure) have in fact become university professors.

#### 2.4. The government apparatus - funding mechanisms.

The introduction of Research Councils has probably been a particularly important factor in the development of the social sciences in Norway and Sweden, and more recently also in Denmark. In all three countries they have enjoyed a large degree of autonomy, and their impact has been larger than their modest budgets might indicate. The funds have been of crucial importance for the starting of several projects, and they have directly or indirectly contributed greatly to setting research standards and norms. As national councils they have functioned as advisory bodies in several cases. Generally speaking, the Norwegian council seems to have been the most influential, both in economic terms and otherwise.

Besides the support to social science research from research councils and similar institutions, various ministries, directorates and public committees have shown an increasing interest in social science research projects as an aid in illuminating specific problem areas, sectors or public programmes. In the Scandinavian countries this

---

1) The Norwegian Institute of Applied Social Research (INAS) started research activities in 1968. The Institute of Labour Relations (Sweden) was established in 1966. The activities of the institute were redefined in 1972, and it is now called the Institute of Social Research (SOFI).

approach to the organisation of research has been called sectorial science policy. Various research fields and activities are not evaluated against each other, but compared to alternative measures towards solving a particular problem. This means that it is up to the ministries and committees in each sector to decide to what extent they want to support or initiate research projects. Decisions are based on judgements as to the usefulness of programmes to policy-making. An important element in this system is the increasing use of contract research, though this funding mechanism is not a necessary consequence of sectorial policy. Funding by contract was first introduced in Sweden, where the National Board of Education started to use contracts in 1962. Since then it has been of growing importance. Introduced rather later, it has gained momentum in Norway too. In Denmark, however, this approach seems to be of much more modest influence.

We will later discuss the extent to which this arrangement has adequately linked research projects in Norway and Sweden to political and administrative decision-making.

## 2.5. Events and issues of policy-making in the development of the social science system.

The development of the social science research systems in the Scandinavian countries is not the result of any explicitly formulated research policy in this field. To a large extent it is a result of plans and policies in other fields. In the university sector, the development of the social sciences has been strongly influenced by general university policies. In the institute sector, a very pragmatic and particularistic approach has dominated - the sector has seldom been seen as a whole. Interest has usually been focused on one institute at a time. Particularly the Swedish research system has often been significantly influenced by contract work for public commissions.

In this paragraph, we shall mainly look at organizational and financial events in the process of policy-making bearing on the relevance and application of social science research. The post-war Scandinavian, and particularly the Norwegian development in this area comprises several significant events and issues illuminating a continuous debate or conflict between the university researchers and the Government. However, this tension has remarkably seldom been explicitly formulated. The academics have fought for as much autonomy as possible. Some of them may also have had doubts about the applicability of the social sciences.

We find a growing governmental interest in social science research. The reason for this is a relatively widespread awareness of the

shortcomings of existing policies and a search for new tools for policy making. This has in turn led to changes in the organizational and financial infrastructure of social science research. The growing awareness of social problems, as well as the desire for more funds, has also caused a strengthened concern among social scientists about the possible relevance of their research in combatting social ills. This concern has probably also been a driving force behind the action research approach, which we will return to below.

### The Ministries and Social Science Research in Norway.

Although up to now nearly all Norwegian social science research has been financed by public funds, the central administration has on the whole had limited influence on research activities in this field. This is partly a consequence of a set policy: public authorities should not influence research. In some cases the Government has declined to exercise its influence.

This has been particularly pronounced with regard to the universities, being in line with their traditional autonomy. The council for social science in the NAVF has also by and large been in the hands of professors following mainly disciplinary criteria in their allocation policy. This can be explained by the fact that the NAVF was in fact originally established as a research council supporting basic research at the universities. The public institutes and the research council institutes have stronger organizational links to the ministries. Most of them have boards appointed by the Government, or civil servants from the ministries on the board. In addition, the Government has been directly involved in establishing the institutes and in defining their general research areas. However, this does not imply that research activities are directed by the ministries. Interviews with directors and other representatives of these institutes indicate that Government institutions have rarely "interfered" in institute research. General research areas have been laid down in somewhat vague terms of reference. Research initiatives have by and large come from the researchers themselves, and not from the boards of the institutes. However, the institutes obviously often try to guess what kind of research the ministries prefer.

The lack of civil servants familiar with social science research and the research community in particular is probably the main factor determining this ministerial inactivity. Having a staff capable of initiating and developing research programmes is obviously an essential condition for influencing research. Linking research projects to public planning and solving of problems is also of crucial importance. Economics is about the only social science in which the

Norwegian civil service for years has had members capable of cooperating actively with researchers. Here we have seen quite a close cooperation between economists in various institutes and agencies. Until recently this well-developed cooperation within a well-developed profession has been the only organized interaction between administrators and representatives of behavioral sciences. Traditionally the ministries have largely recruited law graduates, and the administrative approach to problems have mainly been a legalistic one.

We shall examine some efforts in Norway at initiating research of particular relevance to policy-making. As early as at the establishing of the NAVF in 1949, a special problem-oriented council was set up within the NAVF family. Despite good intentions, this subcouncil for psychology, education, and juvenile problems did not develop into a policy-oriented body, and was considered only moderately successful. The Ministry of Education, which ~~was instrumental~~ in establishing this particular subcouncil, turned out to be dissatisfied with its performance.

A much stronger initiative in applied social research was the proposal for a special institute for applied social research in the early 1960's. The initiative probably came from two young Labour Party economists, one of them turned out to be the present Minister of Finance, Mr. Per Kleppe, working in the Joint Council of the Norwegian Research Councils. The Ministry of Education asked them and some others to form a committee to examine the need for applied social science research. The committee proposed that the institute, besides conducting research, should also assist the ministries in communicating with the social science research system. In order to secure for the government continuous influence on activities, the committee proposed that the ministries should appoint three of the members of the board of the institute. The Ministry of Education agreed to this. However, when the proposal came up in Parliament in 1962, this particular proposition was rejected. The Committee for Educational Affairs stated: "Concerning the board of the institute, the committee holds that it is natural that the board is appointed by various scientific institutions in this field, as the institute should be an independent research institute".

Mostly due to lack of competent scientific manpower and some resistance from the social science establishment, the institute did not start activities until six years after its formal establishment in 1962. Up to 1973, the ministries had only one representative (actually appointed by the NAVF) on the board. Until recently, the ministries as well as the INAS have in fact opted for an autonomous role for the institute. In our opinion, this can only be explained in part by the premises laid down by Parliament (see quote above).

In the end of the 1960ies, Norway got an early "Rothschild" recommendation. The ministries were to have money for research, studies and experiments which could be of special relevance for their administrative areas. The origin of this concrete proposal is not quite clear. However, both within the administration and in the Central Committee for Research such a policy was recommended, and has gradually been introduced in the last few years. In retrospect it is rather surprising that this policy did not encounter resistance in academic research circles (which were strongly represented in the Central Committee). Some academics probably did not care to object as long as the policy was formulated in general terms, and others felt this to be the only way to go in order to expand the research system. However, a good many researchers failed to see the implications of this proposal.

Within the Social Science Council in NAVF, the leadership probably saw a danger in this development. They seem to have opted for "cooptation" rather than confrontation in this situation. They assumed that additional public spending on social science research would be channelled through the ministries. Influencing the allocation on projects was consequently very important. During the process of rewriting the terms of reference of the Council, an extended social science council was proposed, including representation from the research community as well as extended representation from the ministries. It was designed to have a consultative role in the allocation process. More or less simultaneously, the NAVF opposed a suggestion, mentioned in Parliament, of a new research council for social science and social planning. The Council stated that applied social research could also be taken care of by the NAVF. In the 1969 revision, it was emphasized that the mandate of the NAVF covered evaluation of the social need for research - i.e. its role should be broader than supporting basic research.

The Government budget of 1971 allocated for the first time funds directly to the NAVF in addition to profits from football pools, etc. The budget proposal from NAVF for 1974 stated that it was a task for the council to support research "based on an assessment of scientific merit, and concentrating research efforts to those areas of social life that will derive the greatest benefit from such activities". This is obviously a vague statement. However, interpreting it as extending the scope of the NAVF beyond the limits of traditional disciplinary research does not seem unduly far-fetched.

In the early seventies, the social science area has caused several problems for the NAVF. The reorganisation of the Council in 1969 as well as the availability of new funds for social science research from the ministries has caused several discussions within the council on the criteria for allocating research funds. "Scientific merit"

and "relevance to social problems" might be used as key-words denoting the types of approach dominating the debate.

The council has to some extent been asked to advise on what projects should benefit from contract money through the ministries. The relationship has not been entirely without problems. This probably partly explains the following statement in the Government's long term programme of 1973 underlining the objectives pursued by the ministries when supporting research projects:

Priority should be given to research projects in proportion to their assumed contributions to the ministry's efforts. Research and experimental work should primarily assist in selecting problems and tasks to be given priority, and they should contribute towards an efficient administrative process. This objective requires scientific evaluation of the various projects. However, criteria and emphasis must be adapted to this major objective.

#### The Ministries and Social Science Research - a New Situation?

In addition to the efforts mentioned above, several ministries have built up planning divisions during the sixties and early seventies. However, the Labour Party did not consider these efforts adequate. Before the 1973 election they put forward a proposal of a new Research Council for Social Planning, designed to meet some of the needs they see for research relevant to public planning and decision-making.

It seems obvious to us that most members of the social science council in the NAVF are against the proposal. The new council is perceived as a threat to parts of their own activity and budget as well as a "lost possibility" for expansion. They also oppose the idea of having two rather similar bodies supporting social science research. Per Kleppe is clearly the man behind the concept of a research council for planning. He has stated more or less straightforwardly that the proposal is a consequence of the failure of the existing research system in linking research activities to important social goals, and in initiating research useful to planning and decision-making.

The "new" council is probably also meant to improve the coordination of the ministries' special funds for contract research. These funds were designed to enable the ministries to initiate and finance research and studies of special relevance to their areas of responsibility. Research has often a wide perspective and relevance, going beyond the area of responsibility of a single ministry. Some ministries have worked out a research programme as a guideline for the allocation of funds. However, most initiatives for projects have so far come from the research community.

In addition to the opposition to the proposed Council for Social Planning, misgivings have been voiced by some of the parties in Parliament. The Conservatives regard the new council as an attempt at using research as a tool in the process of transforming society in a socialist direction. The left-wing socialists argue that such a council would be a step towards an increasingly technocratic process of government. Several officials in various ministries obviously dislike this proposal. A new council may for instance limit their use of contract money for research.

Even if the council does not materialize, the relations between government and social science research in Norway will probably be vigorously discussed in the future. Whether new forms of funding mechanisms and social science application in policy and administration will be established remains to be seen.

#### The case of Sweden.

Until recently, the Swedish development seems to have been less influenced by concrete conflicts between "the autonomous researchers" and the authorities. This is probably due to the fact that the Social Science Council has been left more alone. The authorities have cared less about the development of the social sciences as such. The ad hoc use of social science research and expertise in connection with commissions advising on social reforms has been more important. (The early introduction of sectorial funds in the educational area may be an exception.)

The role of social sciences was to some extent discussed in connection with the establishment of the Tercentenary Fund in 1965. Which fields of research the new fund should support became an issue of public debate. The importance of the social sciences was stressed by many. The Prime Minister emphasized their relevance for solving problems of modern society. Actually, social science projects got 30-50 per cent of the total allocation from the Tercentenary Fund in the first period.

The first director of the Fund was a sociologist, Professor Zetterberg. He had an extensive U.S. experience, and, more important, he admired the entrepreneurial role of the private American foundations. He attacked the traditionally passive role of Swedish research agencies: they relied too much on grant applications. Research councils ought to take initiatives themselves, initiating and stimulating research. His views led to tension with the Board, and he soon left.

The Board of the Tercentenary Fund includes as many MP's as professors. Still, observers usually point out that the parliamentarians do not play an active role within the organization. This may have been



influenced by the unique position of Professor T. Segerstedt, Chairman of the Board and Government-appointed chairman of the Social Science Council for more than 20 years as well. Additionally, the respect for professors and "freedom of research" seems to be even stronger in Sweden than in the other Scandinavian countries.

During recent years, there has been a significant increase in contract funds allotted to some Swedish ministries and agencies. At present, the allocation of 4 mill.kr. to the Secretariat of Future Studies in the Prime Minister's Office may be particularly significant. This agency is a result of a committee report on the organization of future studies in Sweden, and is headed by a young social democrat, Dr. Lars Ingelstam. The idea of the P.M.'s Office initiating and supporting research has recently met with heavy criticism from the parliamentary Opposition.

#### Action Research - a New Strategy for Social Science Research.

We would like to add a few words in this chapter on an emerging strategy for parts of social science research - action research. This type of research has stirred substantial interest in recent years, particularly in Denmark and Norway, and influenced social science research in several fields.

We shall briefly describe and comment on two social science projects, the Nord-Odal project and the joint industrial project, in which the researchers have tried to integrate their findings into a broader process of social change. Both projects were initiated in order to create or illuminate specific problems, and in both projects the researchers tried to initiate new solutions based on their research results. However, the initiatives for new solutions are not merely reflections of the research results. The researchers' personal orientation and evaluation of their research have obviously had an impact on the direction and content of their initiatives. One further characteristic of these projects is the cooperation between the researchers and the people with whom the research work is concerned.

This approach has been termed action research, due to the intended integration of research and more or less immediate practical initiatives and action. Action research is not easily distinguished from the more traditional and vague "applied research". Some observers would even say it is "old wine in new bottles" - and sometimes an easier way to get data that otherwise would be difficult to obtain.

However, we feel that action research is noteworthy. It has been motivated by a lucid perception of the relationship between the social sciences and society at large. Traditionally, academic research has been separated from implementation. This relates to

the distinction between science and politics and analogous distinctions, and also to the "ivory-tower" problem and the autonomy of universities. According to the traditional philosophy, the research institutions are to carry out research, not to draw or to initiate practical conclusions. Action research may to some extent be seen as a orientation away from such an attitude.

A perhaps more important motivation for action research has been the "crisis of the welfare state", and the need for alternative policies. A great deal of action research, including the Nord-Odal project, has pointed out and analyzed conditions that may generate social problems and tried to initiate alternative solutions. Although action researchers have questioned "ivory-tower research", it is important to notice that they have preserved their autonomy - their projects have by and large been carried out on their own terms.

In our judgement, a great deal of the action research movement may be seen as an effort of the research community to pursue research relevant to social problems, and to generate social change with a minimum of interference from and cooperation with the central public authorities. The "grassroot" contacts are the most important ones. In the Nord-Odal report, Professor Löchen remarks that research of this type should not be financed from the Ministry's budget<sup>1)</sup>.

Finally, we may stress that such research has been very much oriented towards economically, socially and politically weak groups in society. By this we observe a continuation of the traditional concern of Norwegian sociologists for the under dog.

Action research will probably be more valuable in the general debate in society than in administrative problem-solving. This view is supported by the fact that the greater part of this research concludes by emphasizing the need for alternative value priorities in society. However, action research may influence public policies in specific areas where new efforts are demanded.

In the 1960ies, Associations for Penal Reform (KRUM, KRIM, and KROM) were founded in all Scandinavian countries, drawing participation from radical social scientists involved in action research. Today, these interesting organizations seem more like organizations for political action only.

---

1) Midré, p. 242-243.

3. SOME NOTES ON INFLUENCE AND APPLICATIONS OF THE SOCIAL SCIENCES

3.1 Experience from various research areas.

3.1 General remarks.

In this chapter we shall try to approach problems related to the impact of social science research by considering some research areas and projects.

In the first section, we shall focus on economics and national planning, national statistics, and educational research. In all these areas, public authorities have deliberately tried to link up research efforts to the decision-making process. We also include a brief presentation of an important research tradition in Norway, developed at the Institute for Social Research in Oslo. Generated primarily in sociology and political science, this tradition is strongly characterized by independence and a deliberate detachment from decision-makers. Some comments on Scandinavian criminology by Professor Nils Christie further illuminates the issue of to whom social science research should be of use.

In a second section we comment on some research programmes or projects which are related to general social policy, alcohol policy, industrial democracy, and living conditions (including special studies of youth and the distribution of power). These projects were initiated by the Government in order to assist public planning and decision-making.

We do not pretend to give a thorough report on these cases - much less on the social sciences in general. The limitations implicit in heavily Norwegian-oriented material are evident. However, we think that these cases exhibit some general problems and opportunities for social science research.

3.2 Research areas and traditions.

3.2.1 Economics and National Planning.

Economic research and university education in Norway have been strongly influenced by one particular school of thought generated at the Department of Economics at the University of Oslo. Until recently, this was the only economics department. Professors Frisch, Haavelmo and Johansen have set the tone in a strongly

econometric fashion. Ragnar Frisch, Nobel Laureate in Economics, and founding father of the Econometric Society, built up a small and decidedly mathematically and statistically oriented department in the 1930's and the early post-war period. His strong personality and charismatic leadership vitally contributed to this development, setting its mark on teaching and graduates. Frisch was convinced that an economic theory based on empirical and statistical facts would be an important tool in improving economic policy and welfare in society. A scientific approach was necessary. He convincingly taught this lesson to his students, who due to a degree reform of great significance at the same time were kept under the Department's umbrella for five to six years. A new degree was introduced (cand.oecon.), concentrating exclusively on economics and including a generous number of courses in statistics and mathematics. This gave ample opportunity for a strong university education and specialization quite different from the Swedish and Danish system in this field. In addition, the mathematics requirement at the outset of the course resulted in a somewhat select student enrolment.

In the early post-war period, his message soon attracted a fairly large following among young students. It motivated them for public service, and the Labour Government got competent and enthusiastic assistance from a young profession.

The economists soon made their mark in the Labour Government documents in the early post-war period. A national budget and a national accounting system were developed as early as in 1945-46, based on work done mainly during the war at the Department of Economics at the University of Oslo and the Central Bureau of Statistics. The system covered the entire economy, and the national budget was introduced in a separate appendix to the Government's Budget for 1945-46. Through this work a new economic terminology invaded the political vocabulary, despite fierce criticism from the famous leader of the Conservative Party, C.J. Hambro, who scorned the new "language" and the Government's efforts at introducing a "planned economy".

Particularly through its forceful and competent member Mr. Brofoss, the Government soon succeeded in enlisting substantial economic expertise of the "Frisch brand" to take on the new assignments. Mr. Brofoss also made an interesting move in order to implement the national budget. An entirely new Ministry was created, partly in order to build up a department of competent economists and partly to avoid the civil servants in the Ministry of Finance. (When the national budget was successfully established, the Budget division was transferred to the Ministry of Finance again.)

The apparatus which was set up in connection with the national budget was also of particular significance. A civil service committee, the National Budget Committee, was formed in 1947 to coordinate and prepare the budget. This committee included representatives from most ministries and some public agencies like the Central Bureau of Statistics. A subcommittee was also formed, playing an important role in forming economic policy. This committee may in fact be regarded as a Council of Economic Advisors. At present, the Director of Research at the Central Bureau of Statistics, Dr. Aukrust, sits on this committee, which comprises members of the most relevant divisions in the Ministry of Finance etc. The committee is part of the "closed politics" which is so important in forming the Government's economic policy - e.g. the advice given is not made public. It goes without saying that the civil servants headed by Mr. E. Erichsen of the Ministry of Finance are influential in this process. The national budget - dealing with the total economy of the country - is discussed in Parliament twice a year, including a revised draft at midterm. Obviously this is an important document, which by now is also accepted by the non-socialists. We also notice that there still exists direct contact between this work and that of the research community. The Annual Economic Survey by the Research Division in the Bureau of Statistics represents an important link, and so does the Annual Speech by the Director of the Bank of Norway.

The development of econometric models has been a major accomplishment of Norwegian economists. Professor L. Johansen, who has participated vigorously in these efforts, notes:

To some extent the models and the methods presented are different from the standard models in the literature on econometrics and planning, particularly perhaps in that they sacrifice some statistical sophistication while on the other hand emphasize the importance of tailoring the models and the computational arrangement in such a way as to make the models suitable for application in close contact with, and partly integrated in, the actual economic-political decision process. 1)

The most significant developments are the MODIS (several versions exist) for short and medium term economic simulation, MSG for long term, and PRIM, especially representing simulation of wages and

---

1) Johansen et.al. Preface.

prices. They have been developed in close cooperation between the Ministry of Finance, the Central Bureau of Statistics, and the academic community. The Ministry of Finance has for instance appointed a special task force for discussions on model development.

The economic planning apparatus was completely accepted by the non-socialist Government taking over in 1965. The use of economic expertise was even strengthened when the Prime Minister called on Dr. Aukrust and two university professors to sit on a committee with this assignment:

to present a survey of recent production and wage development, and in addition supply material which might provide a foundation for evaluation of what may be termed the real economic basis for the income settlement of 1966. 1)

The economists soon constructed an econometric model (PRIM) in order to evaluate how changes in agricultural prices and wage rates influence other economic quantities. This so-called technical committee has been retained ever since, and has obviously been accepted by the parties in the negotiations of wage disputes and agricultural subsidies. However, the committee has changed. Today, the Labour Unions as well as the Conference of Employers participate, while the university professors have left. A recent effort to strengthen the coordination between income policy and general economic policy has so far been shelved. A commission headed by Mr. Skånland of the Bank of Norway proposed a broadly composed Council for Income Policy. The potential political power of the proposed council has been stressed in the public debate. So far it has not been accepted as an acceptable measure in fighting inflation.

Economic planning may seem to be highly developed in Norway. Obviously, economic expertise is centrally located and involved in the framing of economic policy, but the importance of the Norwegian planning system may also have been overrated. The present Director of Planning in the Ministry of Finance wrote an interesting article in 1967, "The Myth of Planning"<sup>2)</sup>, in which he played down the role of economic planning in Norway, and also hinted that the Labour Governments had deliberately overstated what was

---

1) Johansen et.al. p. 57.

2) Schreiner, Kontrast 1967.

actually done in order to give the impression of a modern planned economy. An enthusiastic profession may have contributed to this.

The relationship between the economic expertise and important segments of the political leadership - particularly in the Labour Party - was notably strained during the debate on the proposal for Norwegian membership in the Common Market. The Labour Government proposed membership, while a substantial number of the economic experts in the various committees and divisions of the civil service mentioned above were strongly against it for various reasons. Some of them also pointed out that the ordinary econometric apparatus (models and agencies) had not been used to try to bring up support for the assumption of stronger economic growth within the Market than outside it.

In recent years the environmental and zero-growth movements have to some extent attacked the economic expertise. However, this has hardly been a main topic in public debate. On the other hand, some professions among social sciences would obviously like to conquer the strong positions held by economists in the civil service.

The economists have had considerable influence as advisors and as civil servants in the other Scandinavian countries as well, though probably less, or in a different way than in Norway. The Ministry of Finance in Sweden is extremely powerful. However, this power is partly due to the remarkable personal position of the incumbent secretary, who has held this office for years. The strongly centralized character of decision-making in matters of great national importance in Sweden is also important in this respect. Denmark is definitely less favourably inclined towards public planning in general - the overnight political compromise has been the rule for a long time. However, econometric models and long term planning are gaining ground in both countries and have become part of the political debate.

The economists in Denmark and Sweden have been less influenced by one particular school, compared to the way econometricians have dominated the profession in Norway. Their university education has also been quite different, and lacking extensive specialization as is the case in Norway. This has made for broader contacts between economists and other professions. However, Swedish long term planning, particularly the last programme, has been heavily attacked in public debate. It has been accused of seeing social development in far too narrow, economic terms, and of being heavily biased toward industrial interests.

The present initiatives concerning future research - mentioned elsewhere - are also to some extent seen as a tool for modernizing the Swedish planning system.

### 3.2.2 Production of National Statistics - another monopoly for the economists?

For more than a hundred years, production of regular statistics in the Scandinavian countries has largely been centralized in the national Bureaus of Statistics. However, regular statistics had been collected in several fields much earlier, through national census and an elaborate reporting system by local Government officials and Church authorities.

Due to these traditions, as well as the smallness of the countries, the national statistics have by and large been regarded as solid and reliable by international standards. However, the scope of recurrent statistics varies over time and among the countries.

In Norway, we may look at the following periods: a) before the 1930's, b) the 1930's-1960's, and c) the last ten years.

The second period was characterized by a marked increase in macro-economic statistics. The "Keynesian revolution", accompanied by the strong development of econometrics in Norway, and the "Frisch brand" of education in economics soon had a tremendous impact on the Central Bureau of Statistics.

A new system of national budgeting and accounting was developed mainly during World War II. It was employed as a central tool in economic policy by the Labour Government in 1945 - an early date by international comparison.

The new economic profession soon gained a dominant position in the Bureau. Their mode of thinking and enthusiasm in taking on the task of giving substance to a novel economic theory and policy of reconstruction, led to changes in economic statistics as well as in the work of the entire Bureau.

A special research department was also set up in this period. Concentrating on economic analysis and the construction of macroeconomic models, it has been closely linked to the inner circle of economic planning and economic policy. The analyses in the department's annual publication Economic Survey have seldom deviated far from the basic assumptions behind the Government's policy.



Starting in the early sixties, the Bureau has gradually rediscovered the desirability of a national statistical service comprising much more than macroeconomic statistics. Several statistical areas of great importance in a modern welfare state had been poorly developed during the "econometric period".

We deliberately use the term "rediscovered", as the Bureau covered a remarkably wide range of statistics before World War II - that is, before the econometricians took over. In the early twenties, statistics on the social conditions of underprivileged groups like housemaids, handicapped people and pension and welfare recipients were often elaborate and extensive, including analyses and comment. The census of 1930 provides a good example. Interestingly, the research function of the Bureau was emphasized very early, and the importance of the social sciences was particularly noted.<sup>1)</sup>

The Bureau has to some extent tried to come to grips with the changing priorities of the last 10-15 years. A lot of statements have been made by the Bureau and in the Governments' long term programmes emphasizing the need for a better and more comprehensive national statistical service. In our judgement the degree of success so far has been moderate. An adequate range of statistics has hardly been attained.

However, some changes and improvements have been made. An interview and survey organization has been developed. A personal identification number following the individual from birth to death, and to a large extent through public and private agencies, was introduced quite early. The potential of this system is so far not fully exploited.

All the same, shortcomings are obvious to anyone examining the production of statistics in Norway today. The quality of employment and educational statistics have deteriorated. Following a major 1970 reform in the social security system, a well developed reporting procedure concerning the regional employment situation was suddenly eliminated, and no satisfactory substitute has so far been found. In the field of education, the time lag in statistics has increased. Improvements based on an educational register of individual data have also come slowly into effect. The abolition of reports on family background (i.e. social class) of gymnasium graduates has recently been noticed. In this particular case, the Bureau is clearly not solely responsible. Other agencies are in-

---

1) Central Bureau of Statistics through 75 years.

volved as well. However, this happens at the very same time that politicians talk of promoting equal educational opportunity, and may be an illustration of the lack of a comprehensive national statistical policy.

In recent years the Bureau has sought to hire staff with non-economic degree backgrounds. Until recently this policy has been hampered by the general shortage of competent social scientists which is an unfortunate result of the rapid university expansion.

The Bureau has occasionally complained about recruitment problems. At the establishment of Norwegian Institute of Applied Social Research, they pointed out the danger of the new institution developing at the cost of existing social science institutes. They shared this fear with several others. However, the Bureau has obviously had an intention of linking a substantial component of applied social science to its production of statistics.

These efforts have sometimes led to tension between the Bureau and the research community. The accessibility and the cost of services over which the Bureau holds a monopoly have often added to this tension. Many investigators have felt that the Bureau is not always sufficiently service minded, efficient or able to understand their data requirements and problems. However, the Bureau has always emphasized its responsibility for observing strict standards of discretion and a high response rate. To date it has not been involved in serious controversies or complaints about abuse of confidentiality.

Up to the present, the statistical policy of the country has not been widely discussed. The Bureau is directly attached to the Ministry of Finance, having no Board with representation from various agencies or larger segments of society. This organisational setting goes a long way towards explaining the fairly autonomous position of the Bureau. We have the impression that the research community as well as ministries other than Finance sometimes have great difficulties when trying to influence its priorities and practices. This issue seems to be a ripe one, and may surface in the near future.

In Denmark and Sweden, the statistical agencies have been less influenced by the economic profession. At any rate, the training and professional attitudes of their economists differ from the Norwegian brand. (See discussion above.) For this reason the Danish and Swedish Bureaus have not such a strong reputation in the field of macroeconomics. However, they have probably been more successful in other areas in the postwar period - particularly the Swedish one.

The Bureaus in these countries are also attached to the Ministries of Finance. In Sweden, the link to other ministries and agencies seems much stronger than in the other countries. The Bureau is fairly responsive to the various needs for statistics put forward. This is partly accomplished through a program budget, an influential Board and a Scientific Advisory Committee.

Some years ago, the Swedish Bureau was doing a substantial amount of contract work for public agencies, industry, and private interests. These services often involved special analyses of its growing stock of individual data files. This practice was criticized because of its threat to privacy, and the supplying of information to all who pay for it. This criticism led to a much more restrictive policy on commercial services.

In 1974, a new law dealing with the use of individual data has also come into force, giving every citizen an extensive right to request a transcript of the information collected on him. A separate public agency, The Board of Data Inspection, has been set up to authorize and control the use of registers of individual data. No data file (including the Bureau's own) may be established without approval from this Board. The Board has been very active and their policy seem so far to have been rather restrictive. The Bureau has already appealed a major Board decision to the Government, and extensive discussions have taken place between these agencies.

The budget of the Swedish Bureau is far larger than that of the other two bureaus, especially in contract funds (Table 2.5).

Table 2.5 The annual budgets for the Scandinavian Bureaus in 1974 - regular budget as well as contract money. (Mill.kr. - national currencies)

	Regular budget	Contract money (estimated)
Denmark	48.0	1.5
Norway	46.3	3.0
Sweden	119.0	13.0

### 3.2.3 Educational Research - Legimitation only?

In recent years, the economic, cultural and social importance of education has been emphasized all over the world. The Scandinavian countries are no exception to this. Education is generally believed to contribute to self-realization of individuals, economic growth, and distribution of knowledge as a political and social resource. In the Scandinavian countries after World War II, the second and third of these intended goals have been particularly stressed. Education has consequently become an important part of the public sector. In Norway, 12% of the 1975 Government Budget is allocated to education, which gets more than any other programme area. This more or less goes for Sweden and Denmark as well. Governments have paid great attention to educational problems, and reforms in the educational sector have been initiated. The organization of education as well as class-room problems are areas of concern. We shall briefly discuss the extent of Scandinavian efforts at initiating and utilizing social science in this sector.

It is difficult to estimate the total expenses in this research area. For one thing, the area itself is hard to define. Secondly, what is to be included in the concept of research in this sector? If we include practical experiments and apply a relatively broad definition of educational research, the expenses in 1973 are approximately as follows:

- Sweden: about 40 million S.kroner
- Norway: close to 30 million N.kroner, and
- Denmark: probably somewhat less than Norway.

These figures are rather rough estimates and should not be compared directly to figures from other research areas.

The Scandinavian countries have carried out a considerable number of educational reforms since 1945, for example the extension of compulsory school attendance to the ninth grade. The Social Democrats have been the dominant political party in all three countries in this period. To manage educational experiments and evaluation of reform programmes, they established central machineries attached to the ministries of education. In Sweden, research and experiments earlier became an important tool in this area compared to what it did in Denmark and Norway.

The principal institutions responsible for educational R&D are:

Norway:

1. The National Council for Innovation in Education (NCIE), which directs experiments in the elementary and secondary school system. The council is attached to the Ministry of Education.
2. The National Council for Science and the Humanities (NAVF), which comprises a sub-council for the social sciences.
3. The Ministry of Education, whose annual budget since 1970 provides funds for educational research and experiments conducted by contract.
4. The universities.

Sweden:

1. The National Board of Education (NBE) attached to the Ministry of Education, which has a special bureau for educational research and experiments.
2. The Swedish Social Science Council, which has a special sub-council for educational research.
3. The Bank of Sweden's Tercentenary Fund.
4. The National Board of Higher Education, which has an intermediary position between the universities and the Ministry of Education.
5. Universities and graduate teacher training colleges.

Denmark:

1. The Pedagogical Institute of Denmark.
2. The National Council for Innovation in Primary Education.
3. The Social Science Research Council.
4. The universities.

The institutions mentioned above have different functions and support different kinds of research and practical experiments. Sweden and Norway have national boards for innovation and experiments in education (the NBE and the NCIE), receiving 70-75% of national funds. Denmark does not have a central machinery for educational developments. On the other hand, the Pedagogical Institute of Denmark is the only Scandinavian institute in this field outside the university sector. The institute has a staff of about 20 researchers, which is quite considerable when compared to similar institutes in Scandinavia.

Sweden started educational reforms and experiments soon after the war. In 1962 the NBE established a special bureau for pedagogical development and experiments. In Norway, heavy investments in practical experiments through the NCIE have come as late as the last 7-8 years. Public funds increased from about 3-4 mill. N.kr. in 1967 to close to 30 mill. N.kr. in 1973, most of it channelled through the NCIE. A common feature of the NBE and the NCIE is their almost exclusive support of practical experiments and investigations, usually bound up with school reforms under implementation.

The social science research councils are more oriented towards developing and strengthening the various research disciplines than towards utilization of research. This implies a somewhat restrictive attitude towards practical experiments. This attitude in the research councils is to some extent accepted by the authorities, but it is part of the background for alternative ways of financing research and experiments. In 1970, the Norwegian Ministry of Education introduced an earmarked budget for contract research. This innovation can be interpreted as an instance of new needs demanding new financial sources, but also as a negative attitude towards the theoretical and disciplinary approach at the academic institutions.

Most of the projects financed by the ministry are related to problems and innovations in the elementary and secondary schools. The ministries of education in Sweden and Denmark also finance projects by contracts, but this funding system seems to be more formalized and get more money in Norway.

Discussing initiation and utilization of research and experiments in the education sector, we would like to point out that a sub-council for research in education and the problems of young people was included at the establishment of the NAVF as early as in 1949. A couple of central political and administrative representatives were members of the council from the outset. Later about half of

the council was recruited from the administrative or political sector. On the other hand, the Ministry of Education left the council very much to itself. Our experience is that the council only to a limited extent fulfilled the active and policy-oriented role that was intended for it, and functioned more or less like an ordinary discipline-oriented body, restricting its activities to responding to applications. The council was integrated with the rest of the social sciences in NAVF in 1969. As far as we know, few protests were heard on this occasion.

At about the same time a committee comprised of representatives of the NAVF and the NCIE was formed to consider the need for "educational research". The committee opted for a separate educational R&D budget of the Ministry of Education. In 1970 funds were made available this way. The joint committee of the NAVF and the NCIE continued as an advisory body on priorities among projects. In 1972, the Ministry transferred this function to policy councils in the educational sector, maintaining that the joint committee had given priorities on scientific criteria only, and paid insufficient attention to the needs of the ministry.

The activity of the Ministry has increased considerably lately. For 1975 the Ministry has defined nine quite broad problem areas of special interest, such as "the school in the local community" and "sex differences in education". There is a clear tendency to break away from the research tradition in pedagogics oriented to the individual only.

#### Utilization of educational research - or what?

To us, educational research and experiments do not appear to have been an important factor in the major reforms in the educational system that have taken place in the Scandinavian countries. Thus the extension of compulsory school attendance to the ninth grade that was introduced in Sweden in the early fifties, in Norway some ten years later, and in Denmark at the end of the 1960's, had clear-cut political origin and purpose. The ruling Social Democratic parties had political and social motives for the reform. Two separate types of schools were integrated, regarded by these parties as an inheritance from times when theoretical knowledge was considered superior to practical training. The reform was advocated in party programmes before experiments began. However, Sweden and Norway have invested a great deal through the NBE and the NCIE to put the system in operation. This large-scale investment in school and class-room experiments has involved large numbers of professio-

nal staff (R&D personnel, teachers and others). Rather than developing major new programmes, their function has been to make government programmes operational.

In our opinion, the authorities have a need for professional assistance. However, the activities of the central machinery for educational innovation can also be regarded as a device for legitimating and professionalizing political reforms. The introduction of professionals has often tempered potential political conflicts. Conscious of the policy implications of this central machinery, the various Norwegian governments have followed the most important experiments closely. Obviously, the NCIE director has not been selected without political considerations.

Another illustration of the political dimension of educational reform occurred in the recent Norwegian debate on the integration of gymnasiums and vocational schools for the 16-19 age group. Proponents argued that this integration would improve the status of vocational training and give a more efficient administration. The proposal was defeated after a parliamentary debate in which neither proponents nor opponents referred extensively to evidence from research and experiments. This also seems to hold for Denmark, where a similar discussion is going on.

We are not arguing that every major educational reform should necessarily be tested in advance. On the contrary, our main point is that some questions are by and large political and not easily researchable. Starting from a given political premise is often needed in order to investigate such questions in a fruitful way. On the other hand, research is a time-consuming activity and can be used to delay political decisions in "difficult" cases. Research and experiments in this field (as in others) are often not open for straightforward application or utilization.

This coincides with a more or less open conflict in Norway on the general role of educational research. The partly natural science-inspired and individual-oriented approach of the educational research establishment is challenged by a humanistic and hermeneutic approach greatly concerned with the function of education in society. "Social pedagogics" as a university subject has now been introduced at the University of Oslo. A similar development can be observed in Denmark, where the students at an early stage in their course participate in projects such as "the role of education in society".



### 3.2.4 The rise of a research generation - the Institute of Social Research in Oslo.

Before World War II, economics, pedagogics, and psychology were by and large the only fields of social science in Norway. In the early post war period, a rapid growth of disciplines like sociology, political science, and social psychology took place. A rather unique group of young people affiliated to the new Institute of Social Research in Oslo were extremely important in this development. Arne Næss, Professor of philosophy at the University of Oslo, influenced this group very much and became a generous intellectual sponsor of this new brand of social science research in Norway.

The emerging empirical research tradition in American social science research soon had a strong impact - as seen from Paul Lazarsfeld's influential visit to Oslo in 1948 (lecturing on "What is sociology"). The U.S. contacts were soon well developed and led to project co-operation. In those days, barriers among the disciplines involved were low. A multidisciplinary approach was appreciated, leading to cooperation on larger projects.

The entrepreneurial director, Erik Rinde, managed to build up an important infrastructure for social science research, including pioneering competence in data processing. He also managed to base the institute on a private donation. Such funds are quite rarely a principal financial source in Norwegian research. Substantial support also came from the NAVF and from foreign sources. The institute was strongly research-oriented, and a great part of the research effort was intended as a contribution to the building of a better world. At the outset, major projects on nationalism, aggression, and the authoritarian personality were started.

The institute soon became a very academic type of institution - far from day-to-day party politics and civil service bureaucracy. Intellectual contacts to the emerging economics profession were more or less non-existent. The institute actually became the nucleus of a separate research tradition and a research generation which may be compared to the University of Oslo economists (discussed elsewhere).

Several young graduates who later joined university faculties spent long fellowship periods at the institute. They brought with them their professional values and early research interests, strongly influencing several new departments and institutions. Actually, ~~some~~ research groups at the institute have been established as separate institutes. The Peace Research Institute in Oslo is noteworthy in this respect.

Foreign observers<sup>1)</sup> have pointed to the extent to which research activities were directed toward "the underdogs" of society. What Selznic has called "the sentimental trend in sociology" gradually became strong in this generation - i.e., ambivalence and distance to "the applied" and planning in particular.

The institute activities were often individualistic and oriented toward academic standards and a university career. In fact, the early generations at the institute succeeded to a large extent along this line. This may have reinforced their strong tendency to be less than concerned with applied research. They even failed to recognize a need for other institutions working on applied social science, and ignored or did not see the pragmatic development of such research in other institutions, for instance within the technological research council. This has obviously contributed to a certain cleavage apparant even today between the research communities working in the applied areas and the academic milieus.

The Institute of Social Research has also had a definite influence outside the research community; first and foremost an indirect impact on the public at large, particularly on the political left. Today, the institute is much less conspicuous in the research community. Financial problems and the lack of tenured positions as well as the development of many other research centres contribute to this.

In 1975, the institute for the first time got a small grant from the national Budget. In this connection, the Ministry of Church and Education stated its intention of "working towards a permanent funding mechanism, having the relations between the institute and other social science milieus in mind". The future role of the institute consequently depends a lot on governmental policy.

### 3.2.5 The criminologist - poet or technician?

In a survey of Scandinavian criminology in 1971, professor Christie<sup>2)</sup> observes that Scandinavian criminology has been a great disappointment to many legal officials. He adds:

Compared to the harmonious relationship in the old days between lawyers and psychiatrists, criminologists have created conflicts and refused to keep in line. Very often we have transmitted the criminal offenders' point of view of society and often we have also agreed with him, and furnished him with new ammunition. (p. 140).

---

1) Allardt, Zetterberg.

2) Christie.

As Christie is fairly representative of early ideology among sociologists in Norway, we shall quote extensively from his interesting article. In a paragraph dealing with the issue of which authorities the criminologist should be useful to, he notes:

Even restricting ourselves to national customers of criminological knowhow is far from unproblematical. It is a well-established tradition to perceive administrators as the major customers of criminological knowledge. But then, which administrators? Police chiefs, prison directors, administrators within the Department of Justice? Most of us do believe that crime is a by-product of our total social organization; that it tells us something about our societies in general. And that it can only be rationally handled by being understood in its broadest perspective. If we have any customers it ought to be the total society, and the officials responsible for the economy of that total society. It is not only a task for the specialists within the limited sector of law and social control.

Administrators within the legal framework have, of course, special problems and quite extraordinary responsibilities. They represent one of the most important groups of customers. But again, it seems essential not to jump too fast into any proposed type of interaction. In particular, it seems essential not to start working too fast with research problems as formulated by the administration. (p. 141).

Furthermore:

We might in the long run prove more useful to society - at least to society at large - by being outsiders than by being too obedient insiders.

This point must not, however, be stretched too far. The prison administrator is still left with his prison, and he has a right to be helped. Even if we have no optimism with regard to the possibilities offered by prisons for curbing recidivism, we might prove useful with ideas - and the testing out of these ideas - on how to make prisons better to live in. The growing amount of knowledge on total communities gives an equal amount of knowledge on how to reduce their totalitarian character. It is next to impossible for the criminologist to remain as the balanced observer. The obvious lack of defenders of the weak will - in an egalitarian culture - force the researcher into that role. It will force him to speak out on behalf of criminals, pointing to circumstances leading to their situation, trying to communicate their point of view, attempting to eradicate the stigma, often claiming that other types of behaviour ought to be met with the sanctions now meted out to these unfortunates. I agree with Gouldner: We have to protect our

freedom vis-à-vis the clients. Our obligation is to develop a science of man, to give the total picture, not only the partial one, as seen through the eyes of the criminal. In the long run, that might also lead to opening the way for much more fundamental structural changes of society. We strive to live according to that text, but we will never achieve it. Never completely. (p. 143).

Regarding the contribution from researchers, he stresses the fact that criminologists work in an area in which values are at stake, and where pressure runs high. He adds:

The severity in this situation is somewhat reduced by three phenomena:

First: We have so few propositions to offer potential customers at the world market.

Second: Most of our few potential pieces of advice will be of a character which most people would ignore anyway. Even if we become aware of the costs, we are still not willing to change the basic social arrangements that imply these costs - since they also lead up to effects which we evaluate as highly desirable.

Third: Most of our insight is at a rather general level. I think it is fair to say that criminology - and certainly the criminology I appreciate - consists more of broad cultural views of society and its deviance, than of concrete applicable techniques. It is more a perspective on crime and social control - new ideas for factors to be studied, and maybe slightly more sophistication with regard to methods. But this is at the same time a perspective which demands a highly educated group of consumers, and we are thereby, to a certain extent, protected both against abuse of our know-how and of repercussions because of our lack of any. (p. 144).

His final conclusion is as follows:

Our weakness is our protection. But this might easily turn out to be a frail armour for those among us who have internalized other peoples' expectations. They will experience the limitations as defeat. This, however, is because their frame of reference is mistaken. In our eagerness to please customers (and receive power and funds), we have not made clear that our role as criminologists is not first and foremost to be perceived as useful problem-solvers, but as problemraisers. Let us turn our weakness into strength by admitting - and enjoying - that our situation has a great

resemblance to that of artists and men of letters. We are working on the culture of deviance and social control. We are making attempts to create distance, perceive the essential elements, confront society with dilemmas, and suggest some tentative solutions. Changing times create new situations and bring us to new crossroads. Together with other cultural workers - because these fields are central for all observers of society - but equipped with our special training in scientific method and theory, it is our obligation as well as pleasure to penetrate these problems. Together with other cultural workers, we will probably also have to keep a constant fight going against being absorbed, tamed, and made responsible, and thereby completely socialized into society - as it is. The life style of the Bohemians, the solitude in the monasteries, or the slightly deviant value system within the ivory tower might all prove to be helpful devices in the struggle for remaining somewhat outside the major system. Some will claim that we are useless embroideries (or even worse than that) on the affluent societies. The same can be said about most cultural workers. A completely stable society, one with a strong will and the ability to remain so, would probably do away with most of such useless activities. Some societies have done so. But if the concrete situation as well as the ideology is one of open acceptance of change, then the need for some 'irresponsible dilemmaraisers' seems pretty well established. (p. 145).

Professor Christie has recently been a member of a Government committee on law enforcement. On one vote involving the treatment of violent criminals he disagreed intensely with the committee majority. In this particular case he referred extensively to criminological research findings.

### 3.3 Research programmes and projects.

#### 3.3.1 The Nord-Odal Project - intended programme evaluation in the social policy area.

The Nord-Odal project is an example of a project based on a contract between researchers and a ministry. The intention of this system of financing is to give ministries opportunities for initiating research relevant to their areas of responsibility.

Tracing down who came up with the first initiative is difficult. Professor Yngvar Löchen, one of the most experienced Norwegian sociologists in the social policy area, was asked by the Ministry of Social Affairs to run a project aimed at meeting "the administration's need for knowledge about the existing social needs, as well as the effect of the public programmes going on". 1) The research team was also asked to suggest alternative social policy programmes beyond this general starting point in directions indicated by their discoveries. The Ministry did not formulate more specific problems or wishes as to what kind of information the project should aim at obtaining. The researchers got free hands in specifying aims and methods of the project. The team had extensive discussions with the Ministry, and initiatives from the researchers on what to describe and analyse were to a large extent accepted by the Ministry.

The project went on for approximately 3 years. The research team consisted of ten persons: three sociologists, one political scientist, one social worker, one dentist, and three craftsmen. The direct expenditure amounted to approximately 250.000 N.kr. a year. In addition there were indirect expenditures, particularly the salaries of faculty members. The fact that the project team had several sources of funds is worth noting. The Ministry financed the greater part of the direct expenditures, and the social science council of the NAVF contributed with considerable resources. This multiple funding may have given the project team freedom and opportunity to broaden not only the size but also the scope of the project.

The project team decided to restrict the study to one municipality (Nord-Odal, 100 miles north of Oslo), in order to look thoroughly at the socio-economic conditions and the need for and results of

---

1) Midré, p. 16.

public programmes. The researchers were especially interested in analysing the labour market, the use of insurance benefits, the community social welfare, housing standards, dental health, and the problems of old people. Eventually the team started a local handicraft centre. Their intention was to meet in part the need for neighbourhood jobs, and to "design social settings that are adapted to the maintenance of human qualities of life".

The project is an example of "action-research". Not always well defined, action research is aimed at an integration of research and action. In order to achieve this, the researchers in the Nord-Odal project provided some services for the local inhabitants. In addition to the handicraft centre they provided dental service, assisted the social welfare board and advised on how to obtain various social benefits. The researchers also encouraged people working outside the municipality, most of them in Oslo, to organize a commuter organization. Long-distance commuting is an increasing problem in Norway. Due to the lack of local jobs it has hit Nord-Odal very hard.

These activities are characteristic of action research as an emerging social science research strategy. In addition, they exemplify the tradition of Norwegian social scientists (especially sociologists) of regarding the people under inquiry as the most important users of research results.

The task set by the Ministry of Social Affairs was formulated in social policy terms. The purpose of the project was to study social needs, and, if possible, propose alternative social programmes. In our judgement the project team has to a large extent succeeded in describing the social and economic problems in Nord-Odal. They convincingly point out the failure of existing public social programmes in solving e.g. the increasing commuter problem, in improving housing conditions and so forth. The team does not, however, propose specific alternatives to existing programmes.

This fact makes the direct utilization of the results difficult, as they prescribe few specific courses of action related to traditional social policy. On the other hand, the analysis of the Nord-Odal community might give an impetus to the general political debate, and thus have an indirect impact on attitudes concerning fundamental social conditions.

Indeed, the team challenged the value of social programmes as a means of dealing with social problems:

The Nord-Odal project has convinced us that it is impossible to build a social aid programme with sufficient capacity keep pace with the existing development of social problems

in society. It is therefore absolutely necessary to emphasize strongly the description of conditions in society causing social problems<sup>1)</sup>.

The project team makes a case for new political priorities, raising questions which transcend the areas of responsibility of the agency which commissioned the project, the Ministry of Social Affairs.

### 3.3.2 The Case of Norwegian Alcohol Research. Ignorance due to unwanted results?

The National Institute for Alcohol Research was established by Parliament in 1959. The institute's tasks were primarily restricted to social science approaches. The medical aspects of the alcohol problem were not included. From the outset, the institute has been financed from the budget of the Ministry of Social Affairs, and receives only a minor portion of its funds through contracts. The board is composed of seven members: two nominated by the Ministry of Social Affairs, four by the Research Council for Science and the Humanities, the Institute Director being the seventh member.

Although the problems of alcoholism were widely recognised in Norway, it was not easy to decide with which central organization the institute should be affiliated. Three successive committees discussed the need for an alcohol research institute and the organizational set-up. The first committee was formed as early as 1947. The alternatives were an institute linked to the Ministry of Social Affairs, the University, the State Council for Sobriety or loosely attached to the Research Council for Science and the Humanities (the NAVF). Eventually the new institute was affiliated with the Ministry and the Research Council.

The politicians as well as the civil service regarded the establishment of the institute as an important initiative. Contributions to alcohol policy were expected. However, they were not specific on this point, and the institute got a free hand to develop its own research programme.<sup>2)</sup> It should also be mentioned that the temperance movement was a strong supporter, perhaps an initiator of the establishment of an institute for alcohol research.

In other words, the institute's main assignment was to cover a rather specific area of social policy. It was expected to provide relevant data about drinking behaviour in various social, cultural, and geographical contexts, and suggest useful courses of public action to relieve problems of alcohol abuse.

---

1) Midré, p. 243.

2) There were 11 persons (10 social scientists) with university degrees at the institute in 1972.



Several modifications in Norwegian alcohol policy have occurred since 1959. To what extent has the institute contributed to new policies? The Director stated in 1970:

Alcohol research and alcohol-policy, has, however, not interacted enough to be worth speaking of. Our relationship to the administration and to social policy is good. We hardly notice it.<sup>1)</sup>

This statement was made at a conference in 1970, and may have pushed the matter to extremes. However, the important fact of the matter is that the institute has to a very small degree been consulted on decisions bearing on alcohol policy, or generated changes in policy. Interaction between staff and government officials has been slight, even though this has improved during the last years.

Naturally, there are exceptions to this picture. After a study of abuse of alcohol among young Norwegian sailors, the researchers recommended a number of remedial measures on the basis of the research results. None of these recommendations were seriously considered by the policy-makers. However, the report also contained a short chapter concerning the relation between the age of signing on and alcohol problems. There was a slight tendency indicating that the youngest sailors had the more serious problems. This point was not stressed in the report, and the researchers regarded it as marginal. However, this was the only part of the study which was directly utilized. Referring to it, Parliament raised the minimum age for signing on in the merchant marine from 15 to 16.<sup>2)</sup> The members of Parliament apparently decided to raise the minimum age for other reasons than the research results. However, the study conveniently supplied evidence in support of Parliament's decision.

The institute has undertaken several studies indicating that alcohol consumption is little influenced by the existence of nearby liquor stores. This is contrary to widespread assumptions. Other socio-economic and cultural factors were found to be much more important. These results have, however, not affected the policy on the sale of liquor and beer. (Local governments determine whether liquor and beer may be sold.) What kind of impact these results should have on regulations is on the other hand a very complex question.

1) Sosialpolitikken og samfunnsforskningen, p. 95.

2) Sosialpolitikken og samfunnsforskningen, p. 97.

A public committee assigned to review wide aspects of alcohol policy did neither consult the institute nor explicitly discuss its work. This was probably not due to ignorance of existing research, but more to the fact that the institute's work might cast doubt on the committee's recommendations by indicating that they would have little effect on alcohol consumption.

The institute has provided convincing data showing how much alcohol consumption is due to illicit distilling. This research has obviously contributed to the recognition, if not to the reduction of this problem. According to the institute, illicit distilling is an important reason why new liquor stores do not considerably increase alcohol consumption.

The institute is fairly well known in the general public debate. The Director, Dr. Sverre Brun Gulbrandsen, has from time to time been involved in debates in the mass media. The temperance movement, initially supporting the institute, has disagreed with his arguments and the findings of the institute.

In our opinion, this short outline of the relationship between the institute and policy-makers indicates that the research conducted by the institute has not been influential in a direct sense. Generally speaking, the research results have not been used as background material for decisions. The work of the institute may still have influenced Norwegian alcohol policy, by providing data and establishing relations with indirect impact on the attitudes influencing alcohol policy.

Alcohol policy is a sensitive issue in Norwegian politics. The debate and attitudes are more polarized in this than in most other fields, and emotions run high on both sides. Research results quite often support one side or the other, and this obviously influences the evaluation of findings. Supporters of both liberal and restrictive attitudes are found on all levels in most parties. Norwegian alcohol policy has been considered rather restrictive. The research results of the institute have not provided substantial arguments for such a policy. The lack of application of the institute's results may be due to this fact.

### 3.3.3 Industrial democracy - but how?

One of the very first serious efforts to apply social science in Norway is the joint programme on industrial democracy between the Norwegian Trades Union Congress and the Confederations of Employers.

In 1961 these organizations appointed a special committee to study the problem of industrial democracy. The committee was to consider how the individual employee's participation in management might be strengthened. Especially since World War II, this issue has been much debated in Norway. Until the beginning of the 1960's, the emphasis was placed on the formal representation of workers in decision-making bodies in industry, and how to set up joint labour/management committees at the factories.

Both committees recommended a social science inquiry before further steps were taken. The Institute for Industrial Social Research at the Norwegian Institute of Technology in Trondheim was asked to carry out such a study. The two federations formed a joint committee for this research programme and in cooperation with the institute the assignment was outlined as follows:

Phase A: A study of current Norwegian and foreign experience with arrangements giving employees top-level representation in industrial concerns.

Phase B: A study of industrial democracy developed through better conditions for individual participation and influence on the work situation.

The joint committee and the researchers very quickly agreed that phase B was to be the more important one. They found it likely that the ways in which employees participate in everyday decisions concerning work routines etc. greatly influence their use of formal arrangements for representation and cooperation. They agreed that the researchers should not be confined to analyzing the present experiences. They should also conduct more or less controlled experiments in the enterprises in order to develop new conditions for worker participation. The committee also stressed that the experiments should be followed up by analyses of actual influence of the new methods on satisfaction and interest in the work situation. The agreement on investigating the development in productivity during the experiment period is worth noting. None of the parties concerned would accept solutions threatening economic growth.

It is interesting to note that although the formal initiative for a scientific illumination of the concept of industrial democracy came from the two federations, the Institute for Industrial Social Research greatly influenced the design of the project. The introduction of the second phase is obviously an idea of Dr. Thorsrud's. He had done some research on these problems before the project was started. Similar ideas and research strategies had been developed at the Tavistock Institute of Human Relations in London, and Dr. Thorsrud and his associates cooperated closely with this institution, particularly in the early period of the project.

The purpose of the programme was condensed in a few words: "Under what specific working conditions is it possible to reduce the feeling among the employees of being remote from or little engaged in the purposes and activities of the enterprise? In other words, how is it possible to reduce or avoid the "alienation" that exists to a great extent in modern industry?"<sup>1)</sup>

Initially, the project was carried out at the Institute for Industrial Social Research in Trondheim. When the research director, Dr. Einar Thorsrud, was appointed research director at the Institute of Industrial Psychology in Oslo in 1967, the project was transferred to this institution.

The project teams were multidisciplinary. Some of the researchers were social scientists (psychologists and sociologists), but most of the staff were engineers (at least in the first 3-4 years).

At the outset, the projects were financed by the two federations. From 1964, however, national authorities contributed 1/3 of the funds. In the period 1968-1973 they financed the entire project, at a cost of about 2.5 mill.kr.

The second phase of the project started in 1964 with experiments in the engineering and wood product industries. During the next seven years experiments and studies were carried out at eight different factories. The results of these projects have been transferred to other parts of industry through seminars, information bulletins and new experiments.

---

<sup>1)</sup>Thorsrud, p. 16.

It would take us too far to go into detail on the approach and content of the different projects in the programme. In short, the experiments are based on a socio-technical approach, focusing on the "interaction" between man and machine. The traditional industrial organization is based on technical rationality, and implies extensive specialization. The researchers tried to design new technical solutions in order to reduce this specialization. One effort was to broaden the area of responsibility. Each worker was for instance trained to operate several machines. This was meant to create a more flexible organization on the "floor", giving the workers opportunities for more varied tasks.

Another distinctive feature of the traditional industrial organization is its hierarchical structure, in which supervision is a substantial element. This has been regarded as an important condition for high productivity. According to the project team, this structure barred workers from identifying with their jobs. New organizational principles were tried out, the most important being the "partly autonomous working group". These groups were responsible for a certain set of functions, and one of their immediate purposes was to dissolve the role of the foreman.

In the last three years the ideas and experiences of the "joint project" have been transferred to the service sector. The Institute for Industrial Psychology has carried out experiments in a hotel, an oil company and a bank. The initiatives for these projects have come from the companies themselves. Experiments in this sector continue, but on a smaller scale.

The direct utilization of the programme is hard to assess fully. "Socio-technical" solutions surviving the experimental period have been developed. However, our impression is that in many cases the solutions have not become permanent. Nevertheless, the project has provided evidence indicating possible changes in the traditional organizational structure and the lay-out of jobs in industry.

The joint project has also received considerable international recognition, especially through Dr. Thorsrud's publications etc. The fact that the Trades Union Congress and the Confederation of Employers jointly supported the programme has also contributed to make it well known abroad.

The purpose of the programme was to develop new organizational solutions in order to allow the workers a more real participation in and influence on their working conditions. These efforts were additionally expected to stimulate worker participation in industrial management through representation in decision-making

bodies. A systematic evaluation of the programme does not exist. The present debate and decisions concerning industrial democracy have not, it seems, discussed or utilized the experience from the joint project directly. On the other hand, public debate has been more concerned than previously with the conditions of employees (in a wider sense than just the physical). It is reasonable to believe that the joint project has contributed to this development.

### 3.3.4 Social science research and public policy - Government expectations from social science research run high.

During the last ten years the governments of Norway and Sweden have initiated some important and highly conspicuous special social science research studies. The intention has been to illuminate political, social or economic relations in society. We shall in this paragraph briefly outline these investigations.

#### The Swedish low income study - a beating for the Social Democrats?

In 1965, the Swedish Government initiated a so-called "low income study". The purpose was to obtain an extensive survey of the actual living conditions in Sweden with particular emphasis on the lowest income strata. A secretariat was set up, and studies were initiated with the purpose of illuminating:

- the concept of welfare and methodological problems of assessing welfare
- the income level
- employment and the conditions of employees
- the standard of health and nutrition
- education
- child rearing and family life

In 1970-71 more than 10 reports were published, all described as preliminary, and as working documents for the examiners. Several of them drew a lot of public attention in the media as they revealed quite severe problems in several areas of the Swedish welfare state. A great many Swedes were found to have a surprisingly low income, and this group had grave problems, for instance of health. The survey also showed that two thirds of the employees in the country had actually a working day of more than 9 hours due to commuting etc. The reports were soon criticized by the employer organizations, and even by members of the Government.

The Special Examiner, Dr. Meidner, was supposed to come up with a final analysis as well as a set of recommendations. However, when Dr. Meidner took up a job in the Swedish TUC one year ahead of schedule, the Government stated that a successor could not be appointed at this late stage and the study was terminated. The concluding recommendations were to be worked out in a special group attached to the Prime Minister's Office. The Prime Minister maintained that the time was ripe for recommendations and political actions based on the findings. The mere production of a survey was not sufficient, and a strong link to politics was now to be established.

The decision was heavily attacked in the political debate (though not from the Conservative Party). Even the leading Social Democrat newspaper Aftonbladet voiced misgivings.

Alternative explanations have been suggested. The discoveries were obviously embarrassing to the Social Democrats. They had been in power for years, but were on the defensive at the time. They had no control of the timing of the reports, and the prospect of a concluding report being published on the eve of an important election was not an appealing one. Taking initiatives at the right time, suggesting reforms and political action is always of crucial importance in politics.

According to other observers, the secretariat set up for the study had in fact been asking for trouble. They had largely chosen to go for a "high profile" type of presentation of the various reports. Consequently confrontations with the Government who had designed their task could hardly be avoided. The survey has also been criticized on account of intellectual shortcomings: a lack of theoretical framework and comparative approach.

Obviously, definite conclusions are extremely hard to draw. However, in our judgement the study is significant in several ways. First of all, it definitely revealed problems of the welfare state: a conclusion drawing increasing support afterwards. Secondly, it also showed that such evidence is by no means neutral. It can immediately be taken into party politics and the struggle for power in a parliamentary democracy. Furthermore, this study has obviously stimulated other projects of a similar character. Today some replication studies are carried out in Sweden.

Living conditions, the situation of young people and the distribution of power in Norway.

At the beginning of the seventies the Norwegian Labour Party Government initiated three broad, long term programmes heavily based on social science research: The Youth Investigation, The Investigation into the Distribution of Power, and The Investigation into the Conditions of Living.

The Investigation on the Distribution of Power is designed to describe and analyse aspects of power relations in Norway, such as economic power and the distribution of wealth, the public sector in power relations, the mass media and the power of foreign and multinational companies. The Investigation on the Conditions of Living, inspired by the Swedish Low Income Study, has a broad term of reference, ranging from distribution of wages, working and housing conditions to political participation. Both inquiries have terms of reference explicitly restricting their analyses to descriptive aspects.

The youth and power investigations are administratively connected to the Prime Minister's Office. The Conditions of Living Investigation is affiliated to the Ministry of Consumers Affairs and Public Administration.

The Power and the Conditions of Living Investigations are conducted by university staff with outside secretariats. The research teams have been directly appointed by the Labour Party Government, and not, for instance, by the universities or the research council. Part of the work is sub-contracted to other researchers.

The investigations have a total budget for 1973/1975 of 2.5 mill. N.kr. The final report from the Conditions of Living Investigation is scheduled for the end of 1975, while the Power Investigation intend to come up with their final report in 1976.

Advisory bodies of twelve to twenty-four members have been established for each programme. These are comprised of people from various political parties and interest organizations, and are not responsible for the research itself. They are designed to support, advise, and comment on the activities. In practice this has only happened to a very limited degree.

The Youth Committee, on the other hand, is a policy committee designed to come up with recommendations on problems pertaining to young people. In addition to discussing existing empirical evi-



dence, the committee has initiated and funded ten small-scale studies of various youth problems. These have been carried out by teams of teachers and students in teacher training colleges and regional colleges in various parts of the country. Up to now, three reports have been published, concentrating on education, leisure and work.

We would like to stress the fact that these investigations were initiated by the Labour Government to obtain relevant information for subsequent political action. The other political parties took note of this. The Conservatives opposed the power investigation, characterizing its term of reference as less than precise. Finding the study obviously politically motivated, they questioned the feasibility of investigating power relations scientifically. In Parliament, no one disagreed on this point. Labour members replied, however, that the researchers were to describe and analyse. Political proposals were not invited. This restriction was also emphasized in the Conditions of Living programme.

The divergence in scope can be attributed to the different degrees of political importance of the studies. The Power and Conditions of Living programmes have obviously been perceived as more important political issues in present-day Norway than the youth research programme. All three studies have drawn a lot of public attention. Their results will probably be regarded as an indicator as to what extent social science, and sociology and political science in particular can be utilized in a direct sense in the policymaking process.

#### 4. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS.

Social science research is now well established in all Scandinavian countries, and the growth rate in number of institutions, personnel and expenditure has been substantial in the post-war period. We find, however, major differences among research fields as well as among the three countries. We have sketched some of these differences regarding intellectual traditions and emphasis, training and organization.

The concept of a Scandinavian Research Community in the social sciences is an exaggeration. Cooperation and exchange among these countries do exist, but the international orientation is more often toward the USA than another Nordic country. The empirical tradition of American research has had an obvious impact on much of Scandinavian social research in recent years.

Mainly caused by exploding student enrolments, the university expansion has been a driving force behind the expansion in social science research. The introduction of social science research councils has also meant a great deal, particularly to the academic institutions.

In the 1960's we increasingly saw a parallel, pragmatic development of special institutes and programmes. Initiated by public authorities, they primarily aimed at generating research of particular relevance to social and administrative development. Problems in the modern welfare state have in recent years led to increasing interest in social science research, and particularly in research explicitly directed toward such problems. This is a major theme in research policy discussions in all three Scandinavian countries today. The latest report from the National Council for Scientific Policy and Planning in Denmark and the proposal of a Research Council for Social Planning in Norway are evidence of this. In Sweden, the activities of the Secretariat for Future Studies as well as the commission evaluating the research council structure point in the same direction.

This development has led to tensions between the university-oriented research community and public authorities over the control of research funds and institutes. The Norwegian experience probably supplies the best evidence. The establishment of the Institute of Applied Social Research, the ministries' implementation of the contract research system and the present proposal of a Research Council for Social Planning are all good examples.

The social scientists seem to accept to a surprising extent the idea that their disciplines may make a major contribution to solving social problems, but they often dislike a substantial increase in "user influence". The political and administrative establishment increasingly

ask for assistance from the social sciences. This tendency is especially strong in the Labour Party in Norway, where some influential people seem to have an unhappy love relationship with the social sciences. Criticizing much of present work, they profess high esteem for the potential value of the social sciences, pointing out the definite need for new organizations in order to achieve improvements.

So far, few efforts have been made at evaluating the actual influence of social science research. Of course, this is an extremely complex and difficult question. Influence may be defined in several ways, as we touched upon in the introduction to this paper. In present debate, however, expectations seem to go in the direction of a rather direct influence and application of social science research. The frequent desires for changes in research organization, the demand for more "relevant" research as well as the action research movement may to some extent be seen as indications of disappointment with much social science so far.

Obviously, the social sciences have not been the driving force behind major social changes in the Scandinavian countries in the last 30-40 years. The influence of the Keynesian revolution and a growing economic profession are to some extent an exception. By and large, Scandinavian social reforms have been based on personal grassroots experience among politicians, particularly the social democrats. They had a strong perception of what where required social changes.

Furthermore, utilization of social science research seems to be difficult in areas where consensus is severely lacking, at least in the short run. The example of alcohol research in Norway as well as the field of criminology may illustrate this. Even the economists were not mobilized by the authorities in the hard political fight over Norwegian EEC membership. Their profession was divided on this particular issue.

Social science research may also generate conflict. Many people support in principle research illuminating a particular problem area. Confronted with the results, however, they may easily turn away because of dislike for the information brought up. They may even question the whole idea of further spending in such cases, as for instance the Conservatives now do with regard to peace research and the study of power relations in Norway. In a parliamentary democracy, research projects can also be particularly valuable or harmful in party policies. The Low Income Study in Sweden may be an instance of this.

Today research is in danger of becoming an excuse for lack of administrative and political action based on present knowledge. Government

documents increasingly include a paragraph stating the importance of further research, "we do not know enough in this area". This may of course be true. However, it may also be important to consider to what extent the area is "researchable", and to what extent research results can possibly influence a decision. A small survey will perhaps reveal a lot of existing knowledge in the area in question. According to the Study Group on Living Conditions<sup>1)</sup> in Norway, this applies to knowledge about the living conditions of the Lapps. When recently asked to initiate a special study on this group, they drew up a list of 125 reports related to this subject, adding:

Comprehensive research material on this ethnic group already exists. A lack of public efforts benefiting the Lapps cannot be ascribed to deficient information concerning their living conditions.

We find another example in a report on "Traffic security", Appendix 7 to the Norwegian Long Term Programme of 1974-77, which states: "Research is a prerequisite for further improvement in this area".

So far, few members of the Scandinavian research communities have warned against uncritical enthusiasm for 'relevant social research' which has surfaced in recent years, the example concerning the Lapps being a rare exception. The Central Committee for Norwegian Research, including several prominent social scientists, has advocated the relevance of the social sciences to the solution of problems in modern society. However, these recommendations have been of a rather general nature. By and large, specific advice has not surfaced as to what particular problems they have in mind. Neither have examples of successful application of such research, or where applicable knowledge exists. When the Committee recently came out against the Government's proposal of a separate Research Council for Social Planning, they did not challenge the need for such research, only the need for a separate Council.

Is there anything in the Scandinavian societies facilitating the application of, and the exertion of influence by the social sciences? This topic may of course be turned the other way around. Is the Scandinavian brand of social science particularly applicable in society? Has it got special traits and qualities generating social influence?

Some characteristic features of the Scandinavian societies have already been pointed out; the welfare state approach excluding nearly nothing from public concern, commitment to planning, and the influence of egalitarian values. We may also emphasize the important role of public

---

1) Feature article by Stein Ringen in Dagbladet, August 29, 1973.

committees, commissions and councils in the political process. Often these institutions contribute to the analysis of a problem at an early stage of its way through the process of policy-making. Extensive documentation is often included in reports and Government white papers. This way, research and statistical evidence is to some extent channeled into the political process. (The real impact of this is a different matter.) In Sweden, such committees have provided new evidence by initiating studies and significant research projects, and the reports have been published in a special series for more than 50 years (SOU). This is a fact in Denmark and Norway as well, but on a smaller scale.

The Scandinavian countries are small and have overlapping elites. Their members are personally acquainted or belong to the same circles. This probably makes for less overt confrontation: one might run into adversaries on social occasions. The researchers, including the social scientists, belong to some extent to this elite. This is part of the reason why the way of thinking in civil service and research circles is not all that different. In the Scandinavian countries there is usually no broad cleavage giving a deep feeling of "them" and "us".

A great many members of the Scandinavian social science research communities participate in the public debate through newspaper articles, books intended for a general public, and party politics (particularly left wing). However, contributions of this kind perhaps more often represent the point of view of researchers than research findings as such. The press has to a large extent published social science contributions, often actively searching for material of this kind. The largest national newspaper reports on all doctoral dissertations, a tradition reflecting respect for and interest in research. Hard as well as soft data studies have often been reported and discussed publicly. Social science concepts and terminology have invaded common language - for good and bad. The shortcomings of the Scandinavian welfare states have notoriously been pointed out in recent years. Early in this development, a political scientist, K.D. Jacobsen, stated: "The idea that we have a welfare state, is in itself the greatest obstacle on the way towards a welfare state". Sociological and psychological research in Norway have traditionally been extensively concerned about the problems of the underdog. In a traditionally egalitarian society, this has made for sympathy towards the research community. Usually such research has not represented a threat to larger and more powerful social groups.

However, beyond the area of major political events, the social sciences have obviously been of significance in terms of influencing both the political-administrative elite and the public at large. An instance of this is the fact that in the machinery of public planning

contact with and references to research activities have gradually increased. So has the number of social scientists other than economists in administrative positions etc.

The social sciences have of course had influence outside the area of public policy, e.g. influencing the way of thinking, attitudes and values in society at large. What really causes changes in this area, is, however, extremely hard to come at.

At this stage, we may stress the point of view put forward by Christie in his discussion on the influence of Scandinavian criminology. Regarding criminologists more as poets than as technicians, he emphasized their resemblance to artists and men of letters. Among leading Norwegian sociologists such a point of view has to a large extent been quite common during a great part of the post-war period. Serious doubts persisted as to the possible contributions from sociological research to solving social problems. The sociologists have by and large addressed the public at large rather than the bureaucrats. Some see this as a modest and natural attitude in the early days of a discipline. They even suggest that Swedish sociology would have been better off today had not the discipline been so entangled in several practical and policy-oriented studies at an early stage of development.

Today the attitude among sociologists towards the possible applicability of their discipline may be somewhat more optimistic. There is a feeling that more should be done to relieve the obvious social ills of the welfare state. The discipline of sociology has become more mature, and there is a desire to generate a job market for a new profession. However, the emphasis in recent years on action research may indicate a continuing ambivalence in the sociological profession towards public authorities.

#### Recommendations.

Turning explicitly to the question of what should be done with regard to the development and use of the social sciences, we would like to stress the importance of the following in Scandinavia today.

#### I. A more sophisticated understanding of the usefulness of social science research is needed.

Expectations of the social sciences often seem unrealistically high today, particularly concerning research directly relevant to public policy. More often than not, contributions from this type of research seem to be of a rather general nature, and of greater value to the long-term public debate than to solving

day-to-day problems. To avoid unnecessary disappointments, the time perspective should be emphasized more strongly. We fully support Amitai Etzioni, who recently pointed out in an editorial in Science (6th September, 1974) that:

Our capacity to engineer society is at a relatively early and primitive stage. The cliché "If we can put a man on the moon, we should be able to ..." holds only as an aspiration for the farther future. For the near one, humility is of the essence. A scientific orientation to our societal problems is essential, but first of all in the sense of a rational, open-minded, empirical orientation, rather than one which relies on a priori beliefs and assumptions. The easy optimism that goes with the assumption that we can design a quick cure for most things that ail us is not called for. It results in an oversell of what science and technology can do for the highly intricate, societal world, whose dynamics we are only slowly learning to understand.

II. More research is not necessarily what is needed in public policy and administration.

- a) At present, the problem may not be "researchable" at all, i.e. no further evidence is likely to bring a solution closer.
- b) Sufficient knowledge may already exist - reading or "briefing" may be what is needed. It should not be forgotten that the point of policy research is not "to feed more social scientists".
- c) Research should not become an excuse for inaction - a suave and fashionable way of getting out of a politically tight spot. Initiating research may serve as an easy way out when faced with a particular problem.

III. What is essential is the application of policy research, not the administration of it.

Obviously, policy research may be appropriate in many areas. However, the essential task for research of this kind is to bring contributions into the policy process at the appropriate time. Unfortunately, this simple fact often seems to be ignored. Insufficient attention is paid to the process of bringing research evidence into the decisionmaking process. The danger of some Norwegian ministries becoming too strongly involved in administration of research instead of application of research is an instance of this. They lack sufficient capacity for initiating relevant research projects and for interpreting reports of their own as well as of other projects.

IV. New organizations are not necessarily the best solution to malfunctions in the present system.

An old structure considered de facto insufficient is often duplicated by a new organizational machinery. This is sometimes done with too much haste - inadequate performance may be due to objectives which social sciences in the present state of their development are unable to cope with. Furthermore, Governments seem strikingly deficient in using the scope for influencing research offered by the established apparatus. Officials often fail to consider change of statute, financial directives, head of the agency, members of the board, and instructions to these people as alternatives to forming new institutes, councils etc.

V. The development of a pluralistic research structure is of great importance.

- a) Public authorities should have possibilities for initiating research projects and programmes. However, funds available for such initiation should not dominate the university system. In fact, government influence on the research community may diminish if these funds increase substantially, as the researchers' bargaining position with the bureaucrats will improve.

In addition to the system of contract money, public authorities should have a particular responsibility for building and maintaining some strong research institutions in areas which can benefit greatly from continuous and cumulative research and statistical surveillance. The need for improvements in this respect is noteworthy today. The ministries often pay insufficient attention to public institutes of this type.

- b) A strong sector of social science research essentially controlled by researchers should be maintained. This need not lead only to research of a theoretical character, but also to research relevant to public policy-making. Building up a relatively independent research expertise is important. In a substantial part of the research community the researcher should be able to keep both his job and his conclusions without compromising.
- c) The Scandinavian countries are small, and often no really alternative research expertise has been at hand. The national expertise is often trained in one particular school of thought or concentrated at one single institute. The authorities should become more aware of this. Sometimes projects and programmes might possibly be deliberately duplicated.



VI. More attention should be paid to the research infrastructure.

Much of the present research policy debate is focused on organizational issues - including the important issue of who should set the priorities. However, the well-being of the present research infrastructure is to some extent ignored. A flexible research organization which can be geared to public needs also has its costs. "Contract hunting" is time-consuming for researchers and research directors. An extensive use of multiple sources for research funding may have disintegrating effects on the institutes, particularly in a long term perspective, as no single authority assumes full financial responsibility for the institute.

An extensive use of contract research may endanger job security in the research sector. A "proletariat of researchers" could be the result.

Research training at the universities should take into account the fact that a larger proportion of future graduates will take up jobs in the areas of applied social science. The need for senior staff capable of managing research teams and projects should also be attended to. Recruitment of research staff should be better planned in order to avoid the present imbalance between supply and demand for such personnel. (A surplus in several fields due to recent cut-backs in the hiring of new research staff and civil servants.)

VII. More attention should be paid to the policy behind the production of national statistics.

The kind of information available in regular series of national statistics is seldom publicly discussed. The evident importance of such material makes this rather surprising. Statistical bureaus ought to be responsive to various requirements concerning statistical information, and public authorities should be given appropriate opportunities to influence the production of national statistics. This topic is included in a discussion on long term policy in social science research for two reasons: There is a need for improved coordination of data collection and the use of data files. Secondly, several ad hoc studies should be followed up by regular statistical series or other types of permanent surveillance. (In fact, several studies may have been initiated because of lack of relevant statistical series.)

VIII. An uneasy partnership between social science research and the Government should be expected.

There is reason to believe that the relevance of the social sciences to public policy will be an increasingly controversial issue in the years to come. The decreasing consensus on central objectives and values in modern society - including the Scandinavian societies - may add to such a development. An easy partnership between social science research and the Government or the public at large should therefore not be expected. Realism on this point may in fact in the long run be beneficial to the development and utilization of the social sciences.

INSTITUTES WITH SOCIAL SCIENCE RESEARCH OUTSIDE THE UNIVERSITIES

NORWAY

A. Public institutes.

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| The Ministry of Church and Education:        | - Institute for Foreign Policy  |
|  | - Institute for Applied Social Science  |
|  | - The National Council for Innovation in Education                            |
| The Ministry of Local Government and Labour: | - Institute for Occupational Psychology                                       |
|  | - The National Institute of Gerontology                                       |
| The Ministry of Social Affairs:              | - The National Institute for Alcohol Research                                 |
| The Ministry of Agriculture:                 | - Norwegian Institute of Agricultural Economics                               |
|  | - Agricultural Budget Commission  |
| The Ministry of Finance:                     | - Central Bureau of Statistics  |
| The Ministry of Defence:                     | - Psychological Division, Norwegian Armed Forces                              |
| <u>B. Municipalities:</u>                    | - School Administration, City of Oslo, Department for Pedagogical Development |

B. Research Council Institutes.

The Norwegian Council for  
Scientific and Industrial  
Research:

- Institute of Transport Economy
- Norwegian Institute of Urban  
and Regional Research
- Norwegian Building Research  
Institute

The Norwegian Research Council  
for Science and the Humanities:

- Institute for Studies in  
Research and Higher Education

C. Private institutes.

- Institute of Social Research
- International Peace Research  
Institute
- The Fridtjof Nansen Foundation  
at Polhøgda
- The Christian Michelsen  
Institute, Department of  
Humanities
- Institute for Industrial  
Social Research
- The Engineering Research  
Foundation at the Norwegian  
Institute of Technology,  
Division for Hospital Research

SWEDEN

A. Public institutes.

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs: -

Stockholms International Peace  
Research Institute

- The Ministry of Education: - The Institute for Social Research
- The Ministry of Housing: - The National Institute for Building Research
- The Ministry of Social Affairs: - The Swedish Planning and Rationalization Institute of the Health and Social Services
- The Ministry of Commerce: - The National Institute for Consumer Information
- The Ministry of Industry: - The National Institute for Enterprise Development
- The Ministry of Communication: - The National Road and Traffic Research Institute
- The Ministry of Finance: - National Central Bureau of Statistics  
- The National Institute for Economic Research
- The Ministry of Defence: - The Military Institute for Psychology

B. Municipalities:

- The Center for Pedagogical Development, the School Administration of Stockholm

- The Departments of Pedagogical Innovation, the school administrations of Eskilstuna, Uppsala, Västerås and Göteborg

C. Private institutes.

- The Swedish Retail and Wholesale Research Institute
- The Industrial Institute for Economic and Social Research
- The Council of Staff Management
- Scandinavian Institute for Administrative Research
- The Institute for Foreign Policy
- The National Agricultural Research Institute
- The Institute for Latin-American Research
- The Nordic Institute for African Studies

DENMARK

A. Public institutes.

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs: - Institute for Foreign Policy

The Ministry of Justice: - Special Institution for Detention of Psychopats  
- Advisor to the Prison Authorities concerning general medical and hygienic affairs

- The Ministry of Education: - Pedagogical Institute of Denmark  
- The National Pedagogical Centre in Rødovre
- The Ministry of Cultural Affairs:- The Danish National Business History Archives
- The Ministry of Labour: - The Office of the Adviser to the Danish Ministries of Labour and Social Affairs on Economics and Statistics  
- The Directorate of Labour
- The Ministry of Housing: - The Danish National Institute of Building Research  
- The National Planning Committee
- The Ministry of Social Affairs: - The Danish National Institute of Social Research
- The Ministry of Commerce: - Jylland Technological Institute, Department of Management and Department of Industrial Training  
- The Institute of Technology, Department of Management
- The Ministry of Agriculture: - The Institute of Farm Management and Agricultural Economics
- The Ministry of Economy and Budget: - The Secretariat of the Council of Economic Advisers  
- The Statistical Bureau of Denmark
- The Ministry of Defence: - The Danish Armed Forces, Psychological Division

Municipalities:

- The Statistical Office of the City of Copenhagen

B. Private institutes.

- Institute for Peace and Conflict Research
- Institute for Development Research
- The Institute of Mental Health Research

INTER-NORDIC INSTITUTES

- Nordic Institute for African Studies
- The Nordic Institute for Urban and Regional Planning



L I T E R A T U R E

GENERAL

- Arbeidsforskningsinstituttene: Arbeidspsykologisk institutt,  
(The Institutes of Industrial prosjekter 1964-72. Oslo, 1973.  
Psychology) (Projects 1964-72.)
- Allart, Erik: Scandinavian Sociology. Social  
Science Information, Volume Aug.  
1967, p.p. 233-246.
- Aubert, Vilhelm (ed.): Sosiologen i samfunnet. Oslo,  
Universitetsforlaget, 1973.  
(The Sociologist in Society.)
- Christie, Nils: Scandinavian criminology facing  
the 1970's, Scandinavian Studies  
in Criminology, Volume 3, Oslo  
1971, p.p. 121-149.
- Coleman, James S.: Policy Research in the Social  
Sciences, Morristown, N.J., Reprint  
Series, General Learning Press, 1972.
- Lingås, Lars Gunnar (ed.): Myten om velferdsstaten. Oslo, Pax,  
1970. (The Myth of the Welfare State.)
- Løchen, Yngvar: Sosiologens dilemma. Oslo,  
Gyldendal, 1970)  
(The Sociologist's Dilemma.)
- Mathiesen, Thomas: The Politics of Abolition.  
Scandinavian Studies in Criminology,  
Volume 4, Oslo, Universitetsforlaget,  
1974.

- OECD: Case Studies of Educational Innovation I:  
At the Center Level. Paris, 1973.
- Orlans, Harold: Social Science Research Policies in the  
United States. Minerva, Volume IX,  
No. 1, 1971.
- Segerstedt, Torgny: Det samhällsvetenskapliga området i  
"Vetenskapen i framtidens samhälle".  
Publ. by Wenner-Gren Center. Stockholm,  
Norstedt, 1963.  
(The area of social science in "science  
in the Society of the future".)
- Zetterberg, Hans L., Bank of Fördeling av Forskningsmedel, Stockholm.  
Sweden Tercentenary Fund: (Allocating Funds for Research.)
- Zetterberg, Hans L.: Traditioner och Möjligheter i Nordisk  
Sociologi, Sociologisk Forskning, No. 1,  
1966.  
(Traditions and Options in Nordic Sociology.)
- Sosialdepartementet: Sosialpolitikken og samfunnsforskningen.  
(The Ministry of Social Affairs) Oslo, Universitetsforlaget, 1970.

#### DENMARK

- Færgeman, Ole et al: Forskning og samfundsudvikling.  
København, Fremad, 1973.  
(Research and Social Development.)

Planlægningsrådet for forsk-  
ningen:

(The Council for Research  
Planning)

Indstilling angående udbygning af  
nogle samfundsrelevante forsknings-  
områder. København, 1974.

(A Report on the Development of some  
Research Areas of Social Relevance.)

Salomonsen, Per og  
Olsen, Erling:

Styr på forskningen, København,  
Fremad, 1973. (Managing Research.)

Socialforskningsinstituttet:  
(The Institute for Social  
Research)

Beretning 1971-1973, København, 1974.  
(Report 1971-73.)

Statens samfundsvitenskabelige  
forskningsråd:

(The Danish Research Council  
for Social Science)

Aspects of the organization of social  
science research in Denmark.

København, 1974.

Statens samfundsvitenskabelige  
forskningsråd:

(The Danish Research Council  
for Social Science)

Samfund og fremtid, København, 1973.  
(Society and Future.)

Statens samfundsvitenskabelige  
forskningsråd:

(The Danish Research Council  
for Social Science)

The utilization and the development  
of the social sciences as they affect  
the public sector. København, 1974.

NORWAY

- Axelsen, Thorbjørn (ed.): Aksjonsforskning i teori og praksis.  
Oslo, Cappelen, 1973.  
(Theory and Practice of Action Research.)
- Dale, Erling Lars: Pedagogikk og samfunnsforandring,  
Oslo, Gyldendal, 1972.  
(Pedagogics and Social Change.)
- Dalin, Åke (ed.): Samfunnsforskning og næringsliv.  
Oslo, Universitetsforlaget, 1970.  
(Social Research and Industry.)
- Dalseth, Eivind: Sosiologi og filosofi.  
Oslo, Universitetsforlaget, 1972.  
(Sociology and Philosophy.)
- Eide, Kjell: Planlegging og organisasjon.  
Oslo, Universitetsforlaget, 1973.  
(Planning and Organization.)
- Emery, Fred E.: Form and content of industrial  
democracy. By Fred E. Emery and  
Einar Thorsrud. London, Tavistock, 1969.
- Frøyland, Egil: Verpekassen - tre akter i norsk  
akademisk pedagogikk, Oslo, Pax, 1974.  
(Three Stages of Norwegian Academic  
Educational Research.)
- Gustavsen, Bjørn: Autonomous groups and Employee  
Participation in Norway (Paper  
presented at ILO symposium 20th-  
30th Aug.), 1974, Oslo.

- Johansen, Leif et al (eds.): Economic planning in Norway.  
Oslo, Universitetsforlaget, 1970.
- Mathiesen, Thomas: The Politics of Abolition. Essays in Political Action Theory, Scandinavian Studies in Criminology, Volume 4. Oslo, Universitetsforlaget, 1974.
- Midré, Georges (ed.): Samfunnsendring og sosialpolitikk. Rapport om Nord-Odal-prosjektet. Oslo, Gyldendal, 1973.  
(Social Change and Welfare Policy. Report on the Nord-Odal Project.)
- NAVF:  
(The Norwegian Research Council for Science and the Humanities) Rapport fra NAVF's forskningsseminar 1970. Oslo, Universitetsforlaget, 1971.  
(Report from the NAVF seminar on research policy in 1970.)
- Datautvalget  
Norges offentlige utredninger  
(The Public Commission on Data Files and Privacy. Norwegian Government Reports) Offentlige persondatasystem og personvern. (NOU 1975:10) Oslo.  
(Public data files on citizens and the protection of privacy.)
- Nordenstam, Tore og Skjervheim, Hans: Philosophy of science in Norway. Zeitschrift für allgemeine Wissenschaftstheorie VI/I (1973) p.p. 147-164.
- Norsk Pedagogisk Tidsskrift  
(Norwegian Journal of Education) No. 6-7, 1974.
- Quale, Thoralf U: Autonomous work groups and participation - a report on evaluation of the Norwegian industrial democracy programme. (Paper presented at ILO symposium 20th-30th Aug., 1974, Oslo.)



- Torgersen, Ulf: Svensk samfunnsforskning gjennom 20 år. Forskningsnytt, No. 1, 1970.  
(Twenty Years of Swedish Social Research.)
- Østerud, Ø.: Samfunnsplanlegging og politisk system.  
Oslo, Gyldendal, 1972.  
(Social Planning and Political System.)
- Ås, Dagfinn (ed.): Twelve years of social science research, 1950-62. Oslo, Institutt for samfunnsforskning, 1962.
- SWEDEN
- Annerstedt, Jan: Makten över forskningen, Lund, Cavefors, 1972.  
(The Control over Research.)
- Arbetsgruppen för framtidsstudier:  
(The Commission for Future Studies) Att välja framtid. Stockholm, 1972,  
(SOU 1972:59).  
(Choosing the Kind of Future We Want.)
- Arbetsgruppen för Låginkomsfrågor:  
(The Commission for Studies of Low Income Groups) Kompendium om Låginkomstutredningen.  
Stockholm, 1971.  
(A Compendium on the Study of Low Income Groups.)
- Arbetsgruppen för Låginkomsfrågor:  
(The Commission for Studies of Low Income Groups) Rapport. Stockholm, 1972,  
(Report.)

- Forskningsberedningen:  
(Science Advisory Council) Samhällsforskning. Lund, Student-  
litteratur, 1968.  
(Social Research in Sweden.)
- Foyer, Lars: The Social Sciences in Royal Commission  
Studies in Sweden, Scandinavian Political  
Studies, Vol. 4, Oslo, 1969, p. 183-203.
- Lewin, Leif: Planhushållningsdebatten. Stockholm,  
Almqvist & Wiksell, 1967.  
(The Planning Debate in Sweden.)
- Organisationskommittén för ett  
institut för social forskning:  
(The Committee for an Institute  
for Social Research) Mål och riktlinjer för verksamheten vid  
ett institut för social forskning.  
Stockholm, 1971.  
(Guidelines and Objectives for an  
Institute for Social Research.)
- Riksdagens revisorers kanseli:  
(The Government Board of  
Auditors) Den statliga forskningsverksamheten.  
(Granskningspromemoria No. 8/1972),  
Stockholm, 1973.  
(Government Activities in Research.)
- Socialdepartementet. Utred-  
ningsgruppen för SFOU:  
(The Ministry of Social Affairs,  
the task force for research) Resurser och organisation för forskning  
och utvecklingsarbete inom socialsektorn.  
Delrapport I. Stockholm, 1973.  
(Resources and Organization for R&D in  
the Area of Social Welfare.)
- Socialpolitiska kommittén 1964:  
(The 1964 Commission on Social  
Policy) Ett socialpolitisk utredningsinstitut.  
(SOU 1964:59).  
(An Institute for Studies in Social  
Welfare.)
- Statens råd för samhällsforsk-  
ning:  
(The Swedish Council for  
Social Research) Social science research in Sweden.  
Stockholm, 1972.



- Statens råd för samhällsforskning:  
(The Swedish Council for Social Research)
- Statsrådsberedningen. Sekretariatet för framtidsstudier:  
(The Secretariat for Future Studies)
- Utredningen angående den tillämpade beteendevetenskapliga arbetslivsforskningen:  
(The Commission for Applied Behavioral Science Research in Industry)
- Utredningen angående forskningsverksamheten inom arbetsmiljöområdet:  
(The Community for Research Activities in the field of Industrial Environment)
- 20 års samhällsforskning. Stockholm, P.A. Norstedt & Söner, 1969.  
(Twenty Years of Social Research.)
- Människan i framtidens kommunikations-samhälle (ett symposium). Stockholm, 1973.  
(Man and the Communications of the Future.)
- Beteendevetenskaplig arbetslivsforskning.  
(SOU 1973:55)  
(Behavioral Research in Industry.)
- Forskningsverksamheten inom arbetsmiljöområdet. Stockholm, 1972  
(Research Activities in the Field of Industrial Environment.)