Course: SKOM12
Term: Spring 2022
Supervisor Cecilia Cassinger
Examiner Henrik Merkelsen

Translating science in consultancy practice: a study of communication practitioners

AMANDA NILSSON

Lund University
Department of strategic communication

Master’s thesis

Abstract

Translating science in consultancy practice: a study of communication practitioners

Studies conducted within the field of Strategic Communication have often had communication practitioners working within organizations as the object of investigation. Communication consultants, however, is a professional role within Strategic Communication that needs further investigation. The profession is characterized by a certain ambiguity, as it rarely involves demand on higher education, certification, or research-based decisions, which is characteristic when speaking of professionalism. However, studies investigating this relation between academic science and practice regarding communication consultancy, are sparse. Moreover, a theoretical framework of communication consultants has described their function as being that of translators, who spans the organizational boundaries. Therefore, the purpose of this thesis is to increase knowledge of how communication consultants make sense of science in practice, by investigating how communication science is understood and translated by communication consultants into everyday work practice. The empirical material consists of 12 semi-structured in-depth interviews. With a social constructivist understanding of reality, the study makes use of the theoretical frameworks of sensemaking and translation theory in analysis. The results indicate a certain ambiguity regarding how science is understood by communication consultants as some deem communication as not scientific, too descriptive as well as too time-consuming to be relevant. While others understand science as something which helps them make sense of their identity, motivate their actions and legitimize their professional role. The consultants showcase their translation strategies by acknowledging the differences between science and practice, understanding their client as well as simplifying and adapting science creatively by referring to their own experiences and surroundings. Science is also translated through a collaborative process with the client, which helps enable new ideas and insights to practice.

Keywords: Communication Consultants, Translation, Sensemaking, Science in Practice, Communication Science.

Wordcount: 19946

Acknowledgements

Firstly, I want to express my gratitude for and thank all the consultants who took time from their busy schedules to answer my questions. Without you, this thesis would not have been possible. Your knowledge of and passion for the profession of communication consultancy is truly admirable, and I am so very grateful for having been able to take part of it. Secondly, I want to thank my supervisor Cecilia Cassinger for her guidance, in helping me to find the right path, her enthusiasm for the topic of my thesis, as well as her patience with and belief in me. Thirdly, I want to thank my family, friends, and classmates for their never-ending support. Especially, I want to thank Väntrummet, I can’t imagine ever doing this without you.

Lund, June 2022 Amanda Nilsson

Table of contents

List of Tables

1. Introduction

Despite a rise in communication consultancy firms and the need for communication consultants, there is sparse research on their role and function from a strategic communication perspective (Frandsen, et al., 2013). Studies within strategic communication have focused on communication practitioners within organizations (Von Platen, 2015). This is interesting because few other professions possess such obscure and varied definitions as consultancy, which could be because of the dissolute nature of the title *consultant* (Röttger & Preusse, 2013; Von Platen, 2018). However, one definition is provided by Von Platen (2018) in the *International Encyclopedia of Strategic Communication:*

> [the communication consultant] ...acts as an agent and provides a principal (e.g., a client organization or a person) with advice on communication-related matters or otherwise enables communication processes. The communication issue at hand is often goal-oriented and relates to strategic action or goal attainment at a personal or organizational level on behalf of the principal. (p.1)

As opposed to a communication practitioner hired by one organization, the communication consultant works with several different organizations and their industries and possesses a very broad and diverse experience (Wright, 2013). However, a knowledge-intensive consultancy profession such as communication struggles greatly in areas of legitimation and professionalism (Von Platen, 2018). Similar can be argued for the communication practitioners and their profession in general within organizations (Heide & Simonson, 2021; Falkheimer et al., 2016; Heide et al., 2018a). A reason for this could be the lack of traditional aspects of professionalism, such as lack of science-based and abstract knowledge in practice, lack of traditional education, as well as the lack of demand of certification and legitimization of the role (Von Platen, 2018). Rather, as opposed to scientific knowledge, it is argued that communication consultancy is essentially a practice based on competencies of experience, sectoral knowledge, flexibility, and availability (Von Platen, 2018; Johansen, 2017). However, I argue that such conclusions are based on a lack of knowledge about communication consultants' relationships, understanding, and view of communication science. Especially since there is an overall general lack of empirical research on the profession (Frandsen et al., 2013; Von Platen, 2018). Some researchers have partly investigated how communication consultants view and use communication science in practice, but it has been only one of several other variables in focus in those studies (Pang et al., 2013; Johansen, 2017). This is not nearly enough empirical material to be able to maintain a full understanding of the phenomena that is the relationship between communication science and communication consultancy.

Regarding the ever-ongoing discussion on the relationship between science and practice (Cornelissen, 2000; Cornelissen & Lock, 2005; Åge, 2014), which is the main foundation for professionalism (Brante, 2009), I argue that the communication consultants are an interesting example of investigation. Von Platen (2015) has deemed the function of communication consultants as being that of translators, who spans the organizational boundaries for their clients. This involves the translation of everything from knowledge, fashions, and practices to ideas between different organizations, which is always done with change or transformation of these. The sentiment of translators is interesting because it raises the question whether this knowledge, these ideas, or practices, ever involves aspects or insights from communication science. Interestingly, Cornelissen (2000) argues that the act of translating science is the most effective and common way to use science in practice, meaning it is never used without being changed or altered. Whereas Von platen (2015; 2018) mainly talks about the translation between different organizations which the consultants work with, I am instead interested in whether these translation skills are used in communication science. Which, one could argue, is a part of an organization itself as it stems from research within academic institutions of universities and higher education.

To understand whether and how communication consultants use science in practice is interesting and relevant research for several reasons. Firstly, communication consultants work as advisors towards their clients and their current problems or challenges, by providing a diagnosis and suitable treatment (e.g. advice, strategy, or action). Therefore, it is imperative that they, like doctors or medics, work with evidence-based decisions. Knowledge is based on research (Baba & HakemZadeh, 2012), and not only an experience or gut feeling (Cornelissen, 2000). The later provides a great risk in terms of providing poor or insufficient advice, which could make the communication consultancy profession (and the communication profession overall) questionable in terms of its reliability and credibility. Therefore, we must gather more knowledge regarding the current state of the relationship between communication science and communication consultants. Secondly, this kind of study is relevant due to the practitioner perspective being rather neglected within the research of the relationship between science and practice in communication research (Cornelissen, 2000: Cornelissen, 2002: Cornelissen & Lock, 2005). Thirdly, studies on the relevance of science for practice are more prominent within the field of marketing (Cornelissen, 2002: Cornelissen & Lock, 2005; Ankers & Brennan, 2002; Roberts et al., 2014; Hughes et al., 2018), whereas studies within Public Relation or Communication professional in general, and communication consultants particularly, is sparse or nonexistent. Lastly, the theory of communication consultants as translators lacks empirical foundation in terms of only having been looked at from the client perspective through interviews (Von Platen, 2015), as well as observations of consultants and their clients in workshops (Kantanen, 2017). Therefore, the perspective of the communication consultant and their translator skills, needs further research. By investigating how science is translated to practice by communication consultants, such knowledge and insights can be obtained.

Strengthening the relationship between science and practice is therefore a matter of great importance, as it will help develop the profession and practice in communication (Cornelissen, 2004). One could argue that the discussion of the "gap" between science and practice is not a problem, as the two parties so far have managed on their own. However, it is also up to researchers to question those systems and structures in society that do work, to find further possibilities for improvement. Strategic Communication is a young but expanding field in terms of research and education. Therefore, it is important to establish and maintain a relationship with practice, to obtain a more respected and recognized position of communication professionals. For such an establishment to be possible, we must begin with investigating the current situation in terms of practitioners' reasoning and usage of communication science in practice. Hence, this study is of an exploratory nature, and will provide both insights regarding the communication consultant's function as translators, as well as how communication science is used in practice. Both which in turn will present interesting implications for the field of strategic communication regarding its practitioners as well as how the produced research of the field is used in practice.

1.1 Aim

The aim of this research is to increase the knowledge of the relationship between science and practice within strategic communication, by looking at how communication consultants make sense of science in their everyday work practice. Taking inspiration from Von

Platen's (2015) understanding of communication consultants as translators, this study will investigate how science is translation in practice by communication consultants. Drawing on theoretical insights of sensemaking and translation, the study explores how communication consultants' reason around communication science. Through this study, I aim to contribute with knowledge of the role of communication science in consultancy work, as well as the communication consultants function as translators of science. To fulfill this aim, the study pose the following research questions:

RQ1: How is communication science understood by communication consultants?

RQ2: How is communication science translated into practice by communication consultants?

The study withholds a social constructivist understanding of reality and is based on qualitative interviews with communication consultants working within consultancies established in Sweden. In terms of delimitation, the study examines Swedish consultants, as well as consultancy firms that work with communication strategy. Thus, the research seeks to understand how communication consultants themselves resonate, in terms of understanding and using communication science in practice. To clarify, this study understands science as; "[...] the pursuit and application of knowledge and understanding of the natural and social world following a systematic methodology based on evidence" (Science Council, n.d.).

2. Literature Review

This chapter review the existing literature on how communication science is used in practice, as well as the role and function of communication consultants. If we are to understand how communication consultants make sense of and use science in their practice, it is imperative that we understand the purpose and function of their role. The chapter also presents the literature on science use in practice within the field of communication, to gather an understanding of what previous studies have found in and outside the context of communication consultants.

2.1 The relationship between science and practice

At the start of the 21th century, Cornelissen (2000; 2002; 2004), as well as Cornelissen and Lock (2002; 2005) articulated the need for further studies on the relationship between academic theory and practice in communication. Despite being a popular topic of discussion very little research has been conducted on the matter (Cornelissen, 2000; Hubbard, 2018). Cornelissen (2000) argued that few studies have investigated how science is *used* in practice, how practitioners partake and understand new research insights, and how such insight transforms to action, as well as the emergence of knowledge from such processes. Cornelissen (2000), and Cornelissen and Lock (2002, 2005) have provided a theoretical framework for how communication practitioners can use science in practice. They present four models of science in use; *Instrumental, Conceptual, Symbolic* and *Translational.*

Instrumental use views science as an objective truth, providing practitioners with direct and concrete solutions to match their problems better than experience or intuition ever could. *Conceptual use,* views academic knowledge as having a abstract purpose, by providing the practical field with generalization and concepts to enable ideas and tools for understanding and defining a problem (Cornelissen, 2000). *Symbolic use* is about using science for symbolic and rhetoric purposes, to legitimize actions and roles (Cornelissen & Lock, 2005). Lastly, *Translational use,* which recognizes that science is rarely used without interpretations, adaptation, and reframing into the specific context of usage. Following Cornelissen's and Lock's call for further studies on the practitioner's point of view of science usage in practice, I will now present the existing research which has answered these wishes.

2.1.1 The usage of communication science by practitioners

In terms of science usage in practice, some empirical studies have been conducted on the matter within both Public Relations, Marketing and Management communication research. To begin on a larger scale, Volk and Zerfass (2020) conducted a quantitative study by having 125 German communication professionals answer a survey, regarding their usage of communication tools (e.g. models, theories, frameworks, procedures) in the analysis, planning, implementation and/or evaluation of communication practice. The result showed that very few communication tools are used in practice, some have never even been heard of at all among the informants (Volk & Zerfass, 2020). However, as the study limits itself to specific tools, it might miss other more implicit aspects of how science is used in practice. From a qualitative point of view, both Ankers and Brennan (2002) and Alpert et al. (2021), rather looked at what relevance science has for marketing practitioners, through qualitative interviews. Both found that science had little or no relevance at all for the practitioners, which suggests that not much has changed over almost twenty years. The practitioners did not believe that the academic world understood their reality, and they themselves were not up to date with the latest research made (Ankers & Brennan, 2002). Some even struggled to understand what it is the academics do, viewing their work as being outdated and way too time consuming, where practice moves in a much higher (and cost oriented) pace (Alpert et al., 2021). Frankly, they preferred to turn to consultants who they argued had a better understanding of business reality, whereas the world of science is simply too slow to keep up (Ankers & Brennan, 2002). This finding is interesting to my study, as I seek to look at how communication consultants understand and use science practice for their clients. Similar results can also be found with Claeys and Opgenhaffen (2016) who looked at crisis communication science in practice, interviewing both in-house communication managers and PR consultants. Likewise, the practitioners found theory too abstract and too difficult to be used in practice. However, even if they argue "gut-feeling" to be their main source of reliability during a crisis, they also explained that it is not only rooted in experience but also their theoretical background in higher education. Likewise, Hubbard (2018) found through qualitative interviews with advertising professionals, that their *work philosophies* to some extent overlap with academic research within advertising. However, the results also showed a clear differentiation in terms of what terminology is used by the two groups (practitioners and researchers). It is the opinion of Hubbard (2018) that until the two groups (practice and science) speak the same language, they cannot communicate. Though, I argue that this understanding could hinder the progress of ever being able to close the gap between science and practice, as they will probably never speak the same language. Rather it should be a question of translation between these languages, and therefore a question of translation skills amongst those involved. Even if the academic world would benefit from opening its boundaries (Claeys & Opgengafften, 2016), not all the responsibility should be laid on them. The practitioners should also be expected to engage, which a study by Åge (2014) has shown to be very much possible.

Using the theoretical framework provided by Cornelissen and Lock, Åge (2014) looked at how managers adopted a business-to-business model to practice (The BM-Model), using observations, focus groups and interviews. The findings support the notion of conceptual and translational use, where the practitioners used the BM-model in a creative and action-oriented manner where their experience and input are as much valuable as the model itself. This creative step then facilitated both instrumental and symbolic use (Åge, 2014). Unlike other studies, Åge (2014) found that when abstractness of the theory was met by the practitioner's creativity, it resulted in a translatory process from which new and innovative ways of using the model emerged. Ultimately, the findings argue that practitioners should view themselves on equal footing with the researcher and be an active interpreter of theirwork. Likewise, researchers should humble themselves and encourage their work to be interpreted and creatively translated (Åge, 2014). Of course, the study by Åge (2014) shows a more positive side of science in use since it looks at organizations which in fact use a scientific model. However, the result provides an interesting perspective because it sets apart from the other studies, which is that the practitioners are more equal to the researcher in terms of allowing themselves to be creative in their usage of science. While the other findings by Alpert et al. (2021) and Claeys and Opgengafften (2016), suggest that it is up to the academic world to bridge the gap between practice and academia, Åge (2014) argues that the practitioners have every opportunity to partake in this process. It is a question of attitude towards the task.

Regarding usage of science by communication consultants however, which is the focus of this study, the research is sparse or barely existent. Some studies on crisis communication consultants (Pang et al., 2013; Johansen, 2017) touches upon the subject of usage of academic research in crisis communication consultancy practice. Only a fraction of the questions asked were focused on this aspect, with answers indicating that science was rarely ever used in practice. Johansen (2017) argued that consulting might rather be about selling “experience-based-practice” (p. 116). With only two studies having looked at the subject superficially and not as its focus, it is an area in need of further research. Therefore, this study seeks to contribute with knowledge of how communication consultants make sense of science in their everyday practice. However, to do so I will now also present the current existing literature regarding communication consultants’ role and function.

2.2 The purpose and function of communication consultants

The communication consultants work under rather precarious circumstances, as opposed to in-house practitioners, as they are meant to provide advice and guidance within several different industries and organizations. The understanding of what communication consultants are meant to be is everything from experts, implementers, advisors, critiques, teachers to supporters. As the research on communication consultants is still rather sparse (Frandsen et al., 2013, Von Platen, 2018), the research and knowledge are somewhat scattered in terms of defining their role and functions. However, some patterns have been identified, which I believe will provide important insight to this study. Especially, I will present the understanding of communication consultants as translators, which is the framework that this study aims to complement with further empirical contributions.

2.2.1 Communication consultants function as translators, co-creators, and gatekeepers

Consultants have been understood as “disseminators” of knowledge, fashions, ideas and so on, where these have traditionally been conceptualized as processes of *transmission*. Von Platen (2015) suggests that, based on Scandinavian institutional theory and their studies of transmission as means of translation, that communication consultants rather should be understood as translators of such aspects. Von Platen (2015) suggests a model which showcases how communication consultants perform certain translations “...on a scale of interpretive freedom that ranges from a rather neutral transmitter to an inventive sense-giver.” (p.154). On the one side of the spectrum, the communication consultant function is that of a *Transcoder*, where he/she moves information between different contexts with small, but unavoidable changes. Next, the *Re-interpreting translator*, where the function lies in being a sense-maker by using their language skills and previous experiences of other organizational cultures. Hence the information is more altered and adapted, than in the previous function. Lastly, we have the *Freely creative translator*, who works as a sense-giver in terms of interpreting and redefining knowledge (Von Platen, 2015). Moreover, the translator must also gain knowledge of and understand the source to which translation is aimed (e.g. the clients), if the translation is to be successful. The translator role does not seek to replace those roles identified in the consultancy literature (knowledge actor, corporate performer, fashion setter and social psychologist). Rather, it should be viewed as a second dimension to all, as translation is a recurring task in all dimensions of consulting (Von Platen, 2015).

This theoretical framework by Von Platen (2015) has been used in a study by Kantanen (2017). With the aim of examining the value co-production through external communication consulting, Kantanen (2017) combined Von Platen´s (2015) three translator roles and tasks of the translator, with Ranjan and Read (2016, as cited in Kantanen, 2017) identified dimension of *value co-creation*. Something which requires dialogic interaction and equity (Kantanen, 2017). The study examined the value of co-production in workshops between a mid-sized company and their hired consultants. In their result they confirmed both the consultant roles as transcoders and re-interpreters, but not as freely creative translators (however, solutions might have been created afterwards). Instead, they identified another consultancy role of *"co-creator"*, which is when the consultant repeats or confirms the value of something that the client has said in relation to the communicative problem (Kantanen, 2017).

Kantanen's study steem from the understanding of communication consultancy as being a *collaborative process between consultants and client*, as opposed to a more *functional perspective* where the consultants are seen as providing concrete suggestions and advice to passive clients (Von Platen, 2011). The functionalist perspective has not been as used in studies of communication consultancy (Von Platen, 2018). The c*ollaborative perspective*, however, is also shared by Hoffjan et al. (2020). With a focus on contingency dimension of the client and consultant relationship, Hoffjan et al. (2020) argues that the communication consultant function is that he/she "opens the decision-related contingency and thus creates additional options for managing the communicative relationships with internal and external target groups before helping to close the decision-related contingency" (p. 6). In this process, as external advisors, consultants can see more causes and solutions than the client is able to and therefore helps to open and expand the contingency (Hoffjan et al., 2020). In the closing aspect, the consultant helps to evaluate the alternatives and provide recommendations. Hoffjan's (2020) quantitative data result shows that both parties find the closing dimension important, where the consultant should have an active role. While in terms of the opening dimension, it is rated more important by the clients. Here the client wished for the consultants to ask more questions, as well as present them with more options. While the consultants preferred to focus on one option (Hoffjan, et al., 2020). This ambiguity between clients and consultants is also an interesting topic within communication consultants and showcases a certain contradiction regarding the expectations of the consultancy role, which I will now present further in the next section.

2.2.2 The contradicting role and expectations on communication consultancy

Röttger and Preusse (2013) differentiate between action and advice and argue that the ideal communication consultants help the client to help themselves and engage in "[...] neither decision-making nor implementation" (p.112). This is referred to as *process consulting*, whereas traditional *expert consulting* is more oriented towards concrete suggestion, engaged problem solving and decision making (Röttger & Preusse, 2013; Zerfass & Franke, 2013; Hoffjan et al., 2020). Both Hoffjan et al. (2020) and Röttger and Preusse (2013) argue that communication consultancy practices tend to be a hybrid of the two. Rather, the value of communication consulting lies in their ability to be *second order observants*, as they can provide an external critical understanding of an organization that the inhouse communication department cannot (Röttger & Preusse, 2013). Similarly, Hoffmann et al. (2011) argues that the ultimate value of public affairs consultants is to challenge the in-house personnel with innovative ideas based on an *outside view*. However, in a more recent interview study on communication consultants in Colombia, this notion is contradicted (Preciado-Hoyos, 2020). The result showed that communication consultants are often involved in decision making as well as offer more technical or operative services, since this is something that is requested by clients (Preciado-Hoyos, 2020). Likewise, Hoffjan et al. (2020) found that clients often use communication agencies for expansion of capacity and implementation, not for "pure consulting" (p.14). According to Röttger and Preusse's (2013) communication consultants risk lose their relevance and *autonomy* - if they get too involved in their clients' processes and lose their outside perspective.

Although communication consultants should provide an outside perspective, it is also an important aspect that they understand and know their clients business and industry (Verčič et al., 2018; Von Platen, 2015). Hoffjan et al. (2020) looked at the proximity and distance between clients and communication consultants. The result identified a paradox; clients are interested in critical consultants, which requires distance, while at the same time favoring long term relationships and relevant expertise in a particular industry, which requires proximity. Since clients primarily hire communication consultancies for extra sets of hands, they don't want to separate between implementation and consulting (Hoffjan et al., 2020). The relationship and expectations between communication consultancies and their clients have an immense impact on the actual communication consultant role and function. Both Verčič's et al. (2018) and Hoffjan et al. (2020) investigated this effect further. Verčič's et al. (2018) conducted a large-scale survey on public relation agencies and clients. The survey looked at both parties' opinions regarding their expectations on the collaboration as well as the sources of conflicts between the two. In terms of expectations, public relation consultants overestimate their helping function for their client (for example: creativity, innovation, expertise, strategic insight), while underestimating the value client saw in "Additional arms and legs" and "Cheaper than adding staff; saving money". Similar results were found by Hoffjan et al. (2020), where communication consultants deemed the capacity-enhancement function significantly less important than the client did, and the client valued the objective-function much higher than the consultant. Likewise, the other result from Verčič's et al. (2018) study, regarding sources for conflict, clearly differed between clients and consultants. Out of eight alternatives, clients ranked "Lack of knowledge of the client's business and processes" as the most important reason for conflict, while consultants ranked it 6th. Clients also scored high on low performance and mistakes, as well use of junior consultants, which consultants oppositely deemed the lowest (Verčič' et al., 2018). Although, it should be stated that both the study by Hoffjan et al. (2020) and Verčič et al. (2018) look at clients that work in communication practitioner's role. If the client were to be CEO:s or board members, the result might differ. Ultimately, these findings further indicate communication consultants are more often hired for the purpose of implementation-oriented sales service, which heightens the risk of communication consultants losing their autonomy (Hoffjan, et al., 2020; Röttger & Preusse, 2013).

3. Theory

Since this study seeks to examine how communication consultants understand and translate science into practice, it is evident that the analysis builds on theories of sensemaking and translation. Moreover, since this research is conducted from a social constructivist perspective, it also further motivates the use of sensemaking, as both sensemaking and social constructivism understand language as constitutive of reality. Sensemaking and translation theory share the similar understanding of the individual interpreting reality and creating meaning in a certain context. In fact, they are intertwined processes, in the sense that nothing can be translated before it makes sense to the translator.

3.1 Sensemaking

According to Weick et al. (2005) sensemaking is a *retrospective* process through which we create reasonable images that help us justify our actions. Which means that, whenever we encounter something new or unknown to us, we try to understand it, we try to *make sense* of it to know what to do (*how to act*). By extracting certain cues of the phenomena, this is done by referring to our previous experiences (*retrospectively*) that serve as guiding frameworks to which we compare this new phenomenon. In combination with other factors such as social and cultural surroundings, we form these *plausible images* to help us motivate our actions as being the most rational alternative (Weick et al., 2005). However, sensemaking is not about finding an absolute truth, "Instead, it is about continued redrafting of an emerging story so that it becomes more comprehensive, incorporates more of the observed data, and is more resilient in the face of criticism." (Weick et al., 2005, p. 415). Sensemaking is an ever-ongoing process where meaning is *materialized*, which then either informs or constraints our actions and identity. Through communication, interactions with others, where language creates symbolic representations of the circumstance in focus; meaning materializes. Therefore, Weick et al. (2005, p. 412) argues that: "Situations, organizations, and environments are talked into existence".

Weick especially studies sensemaking in organizations. The understanding that organizations are created through sensemaking as a talkative activity, also suggests that organizing is made up by actions and conversations that occur in relation to a *presumed* organizational and social structure (Weick et al., 2005). Weick et al. (2005) argue that the sensemaking and organizations constitute one another, in that organizations are emergent through the process of sensemaking. The essential purpose of organization is to gather and organize human action, shape it towards a certain direction by deciding on certain rules and meanings (Weick et al., 2005). As mentioned, the need for sensemaking occurs when there is *disruption* of what we expect to be the current state of the world. Sense-making therefore starts with *noticing and bracketing* a potential disturbance. Something is not as it normally is or has never been experienced in this manner before. In other words, it does not exist in our mental models (Weick et al., 2005). Sensemaking is retro-spective in that when we discover a disturbance, it is not discovered per say in that mo-ment. It is instead *created,* by us looking back at previous experiences for comparison and from which we draw the conclusion (create) that it is a disturbance (Weick, et al., 2005). Sensemaking is retrospective as it is also *presumptuous.* When referring to our experiences of a certain phenomenon, we also make assumptions of potential outcomes of the phenomena, before it has even happened (Weick et al., 2005).

In an organizational context, when disturbance occurs, we look for *reasons* that will help us return to action. Such reasons in organization are often plans, institutional constraints or inherited experience from predecessors (Weick et al., 2005). Hence, *label-ing* is also an important aspect of sensemaking. It is about categorization of certain events that suggest reasonable outcomes (based on our experiences) and how they can be man-aged. Organization starts immediately when the label is set, in the sense that people find common ground (Weick et al., 2005). Therefore, sensemaking is not only achieved at an individual level, but is also dependent on *social factors,* such as colleagues, clients, or managers. In the process of sensemaking, several systems (for example departments, stakeholders, management) within an organization are engaged (Weick et al., 2005).

3.1.1 Sensemaking and action

Sensemaking occurs in situations where we lack the proper motivation of how to act. In fact, sensemaking is about the relationship between action and interpretation. It is not about somebody making the wrong choice in a situation where they have acted (Weick et al., 2005). Rather, we look at someone having trouble to make sense of (*interpret*) a situ-ation where they have acted (Weick et al., 2005). To make sense of something, action and talking are cycles that alternate one and other. Evidently Weick (1995) argues that action is in fact a crucial aspect of sensemaking. Even so, action does not play a more vital role than talk. Because without talking to *bracket* meaning, action does not make sense (Weick et al., 2005). However, this does not mean that we cannot act until we fully have made sense of a phenomenon. People can solve a problem without understanding it fully. It's enough to have made sense of the circumstance in a way that moves them toward the long-term goal (Weick et al., 2005). In fact, for sensemaking to take place, action needs to be taken even if the current image is not yet that comprehensible. Action-taking will create circumstances for dialogue and negotiations that will help the participants to better form a understanding of what is going on (Sutcliffe 2000, as cited in Weick et al., 2005). Sensemaking is a never-ending process of evaluating, testing and re-evaluate sensible images for understanding a phenomenon to act. The process is never a question of accuracy, rather a one of ambiguity; "...interdependent people search for meaning, settle for plausibility, and move on (Weick et al., 2005, p. 419).

3.1.2 Sensemaking and identity

Sensemaking of identity can be summarized as follows; "how can I know who we are becoming until I see what they say and do with our actions?" (Weick et al., 2005, p. 416). Identities are created through interactions, where different interactions help to create and mold different identities (Weick, 1995). Since sensemaking is retrospective, it draws highly from our *personal experiences*. Hence, we try to make sense of an ambiguity in ways that correspond with our identity, which also implies that the process of sensemaking is influential on our self-esteem. In fact, people discover and learn more about their identity "...by projecting them into an environment and observing the consequences." (Weick, 1995, p. 23) Organizational identity in sensemaking is about the very core and distinctiveness of the organizational character (Albert & Whetten, 1985, as cited in Weick et al., 2005). Who we believe ourselves to be as organizational actors, impact our assumptions and interpretations. That in turn affects how the outside world of the organization views and treats us. Depending on how that view and treatment changes, will either stabilize or destabilize our organizational identity (Weick et al., 2005). We constantly imagine how other judge us, and in turn let that affect how we feel about ourselves (Weick, 1995), which means that "Who we are lies importantly in the hands of others…" (Weick et al., 2005, p. 416). There is a close link between individual character and organizational images in terms of how the individual views its own identity (Weick, 1995). Which means that individual members of an organization presumably are motivated to maintain, or repair if needed, a good image of the organization they work for (Dutton & Dukerich, 1991, as cited in Weick, 1995). This is a very complex aspect of sensemaking, since in the process of shaping the image of the outside world, we react to it as well. In other words, cues are collected from how we believe others see and view us, while we at the same time try to influence this very image (Weick, 1995).

Whereas sensemaking will play a vital part in the analysis of this study, it is not enough as a theoretical concept to analyze the empirical material. The study is also interested in the process of what happens to the knowledge that is made sense of, how it is translated into practice. Therefore, the theory of translation is necessary to include, to complement the theory of sensemaking.

3.2 Translation theory

The traditional view of how ideas, knowledge and practices circulate amongst organizations, has initially been understood as a process of *diffusion* (Czarniawska & Joerges, 1996). Diffusion theory is a mechanical view on how ideas and practices are spread and moved between contexts. However, ideas do not travel through non-friction processes, there are obstacles, interferences, and changes along the way (Czarniawska, 2005a). Latour (1986) suggested that diffusion should be exchanged for the term of *translation*, given the meaning and association that the word implies (Czarniawska & Sevón, 1996; Czarniawska & Sevón, 2005). The theory of translation, or the sociology of translation, has therefore its origin in writing by Latour (1986) and Callon (1986) within their studies of science and technology. The central aspect of both Latour's and Callon's understanding of translation is that it is a process of *association* (Røvik, 2007). A process which does not result in similarities. Rather the process of translation is affected by the people and circumstances surrounding it, and is therefore deflected, modified, and added to (Latour, 1986). Built on this understanding by Latour, Czarniawska and Sevón introduced translation theory to organizational studies of organizational change (Czarniawska & Sevón, 1996; Czarniawska & Sevón, 2005; Røvik, 2016). The translation theory that will be used in this study is based on Scandinavian institutionalism, which views organizational life being a combination of both stability and change, where the act of translation plays a vital role (Czarniawska & Sevón, 1996).

The focus of translation theory lies in the process of how ideas and practices are translated into a recipient unit (Røvik, 2016). Meaning, that organizations are not viewed as passive adopters of practices and ideas. Rather they are viewed as active interpreters, translators and editors of external ideas, fashions, and models (Hwang & Suarez, 2005). The translation process ensures that idea is translated to fit the specific organization's needs, wishes and circumstances (Hedmo et al., 2005). Translation in this context has more than a linguistic purpose, since it also means *transformation* and *transference*, which articulates that if something is moved from one place to another, it is never without change or alteration (Czarniawska & Sevón, 2005). Translation is a term which both describes something that exists and something that is created (Czarniawska & Sevón, 1996). The concept of translation is therefore simultaneously symbolic and material, because; “only a thing can be moved from one place to another, and from one time to another.” (Czarniawska & Sevón, 2005, p. 9). Words, images, ideas or even institutions are not physically capable of traveling or being moved until they have been materialized in an individual's mind. It is after this materialization, that translation is possible. Since materialization is a process highly dependent on symbolic cues, translation is therefore also symbolic (Czarniawska & Sevón, 2005). Since this materialization takes place in an individual’s mind, translation is a process of polysemic nature, because the outcome is highly dependent on what is translated, where it is translated and by who it is translated (Erlingsdóttir & Lindberg, 2005). Evidently, the translation agent, may it be a consultant or an organizational member, plays an important role in translation (Czarniawska & Sevón, 2005). The translation process is therefore interactive, in the sense that it involves both the translator and the translated, where both parts are inevitably transformed (Erlingsdóttir & Lindberg, 2005). It is this “friction” or change, which emerge when ideas are transported from one context or person to another, that is the very essence of translation. These changes do not necessarily mean that the translation is distorted or misleading, even if that is a risk that needs to be overseen, rather it can evolve and enrich the idea that was translated in the first place (Czarniawska, 2005a).

Similar, Cornelissen (2000), proposes a translation perspective on how science could be used in practice. Like translation theory, the translation model understands that science (knowledge) is rarely used without interpretations, adaptation, and reframing into the specific context (Cornelissen, 2000). Researchers and pretensioners are seen as equals. Practitioners should not be understood as passive receivers of scientific knowledge, but as active interpreters as well as experts, possessing practical expertise and knowledge which will help develop new ideas and insight (Cornelissen, 2000). However, the translation model also presents a risk in the sense that when science is selectively interpreted and translated, it risks losing its “original science conceptualisation” and becoming commodified (Cornelissen, 2000, p. 321). Sufficient translation skills are necessary for any translation to be as equitable as possible (Røvik, 2016). However, besides the translator, there are other factors which influence how something is translated and what is translated. Czarniawska and Sevón (2005) state that the force which drives the process of translation, depends on two main aspects: *Imitation* and *Fashion*.

3.2.1 Imitation and fashion

Imitation is the “engine” for translation (Czarniawska & Sevón, 2005, p.10). Imitation is a process of self-recognition as well as an understanding of what one wishes to become. Where we (or organizations) imitate those to whom we can identify with and who possess attributes which match those requirements of what we wish to become (Hedmo et al., 2005). It is an active process which can be played out in three modes; (1) *The broadcasting mode*, where the imitation is based on a specific idea, practice, or model. (2) *Chain mode of imitation*, which refers to imitating something that is already imitated per say, meaning that the core idea is not necessarily known. (3) *Mediated by other organizations and actors*, which is when there is a mediator between the imitated and those imitating (Hedmo et al., 2005). In this last mode, these mediators can be understood as editors since they are no passive actors. Rather, editors are actively changing and reformulating the knowledge they pass on. The concept of editing leaves room for the translation to adapt a more creative process in terms of the translation per say becoming almost unrecognizable (Shalin-Andersson, 1996).

Czarniawska and Sevón (2005b) also proclaim that *fashion* is the “steering wheel” for what is translated amongst organizations (p.10). Fashion can explain why a certain human expression becomes popular and used widely, only to later becoming unpopular or unfashionable - in that sense, it is dynamic (Røvik, 1996). Fashion should be viewed as inseparable from institutionalism, even though they are in fact quite opposite. While institutionalization is the symbol of stability, fashion symbolizes temporality and change (Czarniawska & Joerges, 1996; Czarniawska, 2005b). However, both steem from the very same core, which is that they are both a social construction of reality (Røvik, 1996). Fashion both threatens the stability of the institution, while at the same time offering a playfield of new practices and ideas. Which could become institutionalized and therefore change the existing order of things (Czarniawska & Joerges, 1996). When fashion is internalized, it affects the organizations *values,* as in what is considered good, and *habits,* in terms of expectations and presumed facts (Røvik, 1996). Fashion comes and goes, where the introduction of new fashions ultimately resolves in discharge of older ones.

3.3 Instrumental translation theory

According to Røvik (2016), translation theory has not been recognized for its full potential. Latour (1986) and Callon (1986) defines translation as being a process of endless possible association, where it is almost impossible to assume the outcome it, as it is viewed as too transformative in nature. This notion is criticized by Røvik (2007) on two levels. Firstly, he argues that analysis of several translation processes one could identify patterns and similarities, which could serve as a base for theorizing. Secondly, Latour's and Callon's understanding does not acknowledge the fact that translation could also be performed as copying (or more correctly semi-copying), as it is a very common way of knowledge transfer between organizations. It is the opinion of Røvik (2016) that translation theory could be used to guide intentional effort to transfer knowledge between a source and recipient to achieve a desired end. Røvik (2016) presents a cross-disciplinary perspective to translation theory, by taking inspiration from *translation studies* and *knowledge transfer theories*. Translation studies should not be confused with translation theory, as they are in fact two different schools of thought (Røvik, 2016). Translation theory mainly focuses on the process of translation of general ideas to a *recipient unit* (ei. an organization), whereas Røvik (2016) is interested in the entire process of knowledge-transfer. More attention needs to be put on the *source unit* (the origin of the idea or knowledge) in the translation of knowledge-transferring processes. Knowledge transfer between organizations should be understood as a rule-based process, to achieve a desired end, involving both source unit, translator, and recipient unit. Of which a successful translator must have good knowledge and understanding of them all (Røvik, 2016). This translational perspective on knowledge transfer, identifies two main phases; *decontextualization,* the process of an idea or knowledge being identified in an organization with the aim to reformulate into an abstract repetition, and contextualization which is the process of making an abstract reparation into a materialized practice in a new context (Røvik, 2007; Røvik; 2016). These phases are highly abstract, because decontextualization often occurs without knowing what context the idea is meant to be translated to. Often, ideas and practices are translated into a new context without the people involved knowing that they in fact came from another organization (Røvik, 2007). This process could be made more deliberate if the translator withholds a certain *translation competence.* By having good knowledge of both the recipient and source units, as well as the rules of translation, the translator performs translations on the scale from clear copying to creative transformation (Røvik, 2007).

The theoretical framework of instrumental translation theory is built on three modes of translation; *Reproducing, Modifying* and *Radical*, which are all accompanied by in total four different rules. Moreover, all these are influenced by the conditional or contextual variables: *Translatability, Transformability and Similarity*. (1) *Translatability:* refers to how much of an idea or practice can be changed or altered without losing its original functions. Which in turn depends on the complexity, embeddedness and explicitness of the idea or practice in focus. Translatability becomes *Complex* when the practice in focus requires a certain set of human specific skills or technology, or the level of ambiguity "...between observed results and underlying practices…" (Røvik, 2016, p. 294). *Embeddedness* refers to how embedded or anchored a practice is within a specific organization, versus it being scattered amongst several networks dependent on each other, where the former makes the practice more translatable. Lastly, *Explicitness*, refers to how verbalized or articulated a practice is, as opposed to being non-verbalized and implicit knowledge. The more explicit a practice is, the higher translatability (Røvik, 2007). (2) *Transformability:* refers to how much freedom the translator has in changing the idea or practice (e.g., constructed knowledge). The transformability of such a construct depends on two aspects. Firstly, how much the construct is dependent on a certain technology, where a high dependence results in a lower degree of transformability. Secondly, in some knowledge transfers, the presence of certain standardized authorities is required, which leaves less room for transformability. (3) *Similarity*: the more similar the recipient unit and source unit are, the easier the translation. The more similarities there are between the two units, the greater the importance of knowing which rules of translation should be applied; *Copying, Addition, Omission* or *Alteration* (Røvik, 2016).

3.3.1 The reproducing mode: rule of copying

The reproducing mode refers to a translation process where the goal is two reproduce or copy a specific practice or idea from one organization into another (Røvik, 2016). Inevitably, the rule of translation becomes *copying*. In the process of copying, the idea per say is taken from the source unit, put into an abstract representation, and then placed in the recipient unit with no, or as little changes as possible from its origins (Røvik, 2007). However, there are aspects which impact how easy it is to apply the rule of copying in translation. Firstly, the higher translatability of the idea, the more fitting is the rule application of copying. Secondly, the less transformable the idea is, the more appropriate is the rule of copying. And lastly, the more similar the source and recipient units are, the easier is the application of copying.

3.3.2 The modifying mode: rule of addition & omission

The modifying mode occurs in situations where the translator must to some extent modify the ideas, practice or knowledge that is meant to be translated. It is a pragmatic positioning in the sense that the translator must stay true to the originality of the idea, while still having to adapt the material to the recipient unit's context (Røvik, 2007). The rules of the modifying mode are Addition and Omission, meaning either adding or subtracting certain elements to or from the idea in focus (Røvik, 2016). The rule of Addition involves two aspects. Firstly, explicitation of certain elements in the translated version, which were more implicit in the original one. Secondly, combination, which is the addition of elements already existing in the recipient unit to the newly constructed knowledge (Røvik, 2016). In turn Omission involves action of subtraction of or making certain elements less explicit in the translated version. The rules of Addition and Omission have different contexts where they are appropriately used. First, in context of low translatability in terms of non-explicit the rule of addition, in particular explication, will suffice. Secondly, in cases of medium transformability is equivalent to the modifying mode, which makes the rule of addition the most relevant. Lastly, in cases of medium dissimilarities, the rules of Omission and Addition are both deem fitting translation rules.

3.3.3 The radical mode: rule of alteration

In the radical mode of translation, the translator deems themselves free of any restraints when translating an idea or knowledge to the recipient unit. In fact, the source unit may as well be understood as a source of inspiration, from which the translation only borrows certain frames or elements which are then transformed into a new version of the original idea or practice (Røvik, 2007). Here, the appropriate rule of translation is in fact Alteration, which refers to a severe change and transformation of the idea or practices original shape. Ultimately, the recipient unit receives a unique version of the translated idea (Røvik, 2016). Alteration is used in contexts where; the less translatable (the more complex, tactic and embedded) a practice or idea is, the more fitting is the rule of Alteration. Secondly, the more transformable the idea or practice is, the more Alteration will suffice. Thirdly, the more dissimilar the source and recipient units are, the greater need for Alterations (Røvik, 2016).

4. Method

In this section, the research strategies of the study are presented. This chapter involves a description of my ontological and epistemological understanding of reality. Likewise, the chosen method of qualitative semi-structured in-dept interviews, quality of the study, interview proceedings, ethical consideration and at last the analysis method of the study.

4.1 Social constructivism

Following the chosen theoretical framework of sensemaking and translation, this study has a social constructivist ontology and epistemology. Social constructivism understands reality being individually constructed and interpreted, there is not one true reality, rather reality is constructed in an ongoing process. Knowledge is therefore something that is also socially constructed, created, and gained through interactions with others (Prasad, 2017: Berger & Luckmann, 1991). Since this research is interested in how communication consultants understand and translate communication science in everyday work practice, a social constructivist point of view is necessary. With this perspective I want to emphasize my understanding of knowledge as being constructed through interactions. I do not believe science to be completely copied to practice, as it is a process of interpreting information. This means, that it will undergo change, through transformation and translation, since there is no absolute common reality or truth. Therefore, sensemaking and translation theory is essential to understanding this process if we are to gain more knowledge of the reality of communication consultants. These intersubjective interpretations are, according to Prasad (2017) a very centralized part of human life since they often become so concrete and fixed in our consciousness. Eventually, they become the very understanding of reality we believe in, what we consider to be truth (Prasad, 2017). What the participants say during the interview of this study, is their understanding of reality, and can therefore not be considered the absolute truth – as it is simply intersubjective. Lastly, I want to emphasize that this study produces its results and knowledge based on how I as a researcher interpret these constructed realities of the communication consultants in this study. Knowledge, of the phenomena is therefore constructed by me in collaboration with the interviewees.

4.2 Qualitative Method

This study seeks to gain knowledge of how communication consultants make sense of science in everyday work practice. As this is a phenomenon that has not previously been researched in the context and perspective of communication consultants, makes this study exploratory, by investigating and describing a new area of research. This is a strong aspect of qualitative inquiry (Brinkman & Kvale, 2015). Qualitative inquiry is captivated by researching the meaning of a phenomena, "...the meaning in context" (Merriam, 2009, p. 2). It is naturalistic in the sense that it takes place in the real world, one which the researcher tries to not manipulate (Patton, 2002). The research interest of qualitative inquiry lies in understanding how people construct their own realities, interpret, and create meaning from their experiences (Merriam, 2009). This study has investigated the individual experiences, thoughts and understanding of communication consultants regarding their understanding and translation of science in practice. Qualitative inquiry is the ultimate research method to allow such empirical material to be collected, which is descriptive and storytelling in the sense that it allows us to understand the world through somebody else's eyes and in their own words (Patton, 2002).

4.2.1 Semi-structured in-depth interviews

Since this study was interested in analyzing how science is made sense of in practice, it had to obtain the individual articulations and formulation by the consultants. For this, qualitative interviews were the best option. Qualitative interviews are open-ended questions which provide us with in-depth responses and direct quotations from the participants regarding their thoughts, experience, feelings, and knowledge on a certain phenomenon (Patton, 2002). Things that have already happened, or merely exist within the subject's head cannot be observed, they need to be asked about (Patton, 2002). Since the theory of *sensemaking* plays a vital part in the analysis of the empirical material, it also affected how the interview was conducted. As sensemaking is retrospective (Weick et al., 2005), the interviewing process per say became a form of sensemaking for the interviewees. For example, when asked whether they do in fact use communication science in their everyday work, the interviewees were also asked to provide an example of such a situation. This means that not only do the participants have to look back at their experiences, but they also need to clarify, make sense, for themselves what they determine to be science and science used in practice. For such a process to be possible, the method chosen is *semi-structured interviews*.

Semi-structured interviews allowed me as an interviewer to both conduct the interviews with a more open minded and flexible approach, while simultaneously making sure that all interviewees answered a specific set of questions (Merriam, 2009). Given the studies explorative approach, this was necessary to capture aspects which I as a researcher had not anticipated. The interview guide (See Appendix 1) contains questions which were asked to all informants, some more open-ended, and follow up questions on topic recurring during the interviews that I felt necessary to obtain information on (Merriam, 2009). Prior to the interview, the participants were not given a detailed description of the study's purpose. They were told that the study aims to examine what communication consultants base their strategic decisions on. Informing the participants too much about the purpose of the research could affect the way they answer the interview questions (Brinkmann & Kvale, 2015). The aim was to retrieve their spontaneous answers, by letting them know the full purpose of the study during the interview. Such an interview technique can be called a "funnel-shaped", where the subject is gradually narrowed down to the more exact purpose of the study (Brinkmann & Kvale, 2015, p. 94). The initial questions of the interview guide asked the interviewees to describe their work process and what they based those decisions on. It was only further into the interview, that questions which involved communication science, were asked. After the interviews had been conducted, the participants received a "debriefing" with a full explanation of the study purpose (Brinkmann & Kvale, 2015, p. 94), to make sure that they both felt fully informed about and still comfortable with their participation.

4.2.2 Selection criteria of interviewees

The sampling method chosen for this study was that of *purposeful sampling*. Purposeful sampling is a non-probability sampling method in qualitative research, which is used when the aim of research is to understand and gain insight of a specific phenomenon (Merriam, 2009). As this research is interested in how communication consultants understand and translate science in practice, a purposeful sampling method is required to have "information-rich cases", which means that the study collects in-depth empirical material from a specific type of context, individual or profession (Patton, 2002, p. 230). Simply put, people who are not working as communication consultants cannot provide as rich empirical data as those who do. Especially, this research has made use of *criterion sampling*, which is when certain predetermined criteria of importance determine the sample of the study (Patton, 2002). In total, 26 Swedish communication consultancy firms were contacted via email during February and March 2022. The firms that were chosen all articulated skills and services such as advising, planning, and creating; "strategic communication"," strategy" and "communication". The reason for this delimitation was to avoid consultancies that were only oriented towards for example advertising, web analysis or graphic design. Communication and strategy had to be a part of their consultancy services. By using *purposeful criterion sampling*, a certain quality can be assured of the collected empirical material, as it received from informants that are in fact relevant for the studies purpose (Patton, 2002). For this study, three main criteria have been assessed:

(1). The consultant work at consultancy firm which provide services for their client in matters of communication strategy.

(2). The consultant has a more senior role in terms of strategy work, and not only work with matters such as content creation.

(3). The consultant have worked at least one year as a consultant to have a certain amount of experience in the field to which he/she can refer.

In total, 18 of the contacted agencies answered the emails, and a total of 12 said yes to participating in the study. To determine the sample size in qualitative inquiry is one of the most ambiguous aspects (Patton, 2002). However, according to Brinkmann and Kvale (2015), this number of interviews fit within their provided frame which is "...around 15 +/- 10" interviewees (p. 140). They articulate the impact that time and resources have on the number of interviewees (Brinkmann & Kvale, 2015). Likewise, Brinkman and Kvale (2015) argue that at some point, more interviews will not provide any more findings. In fact, a lot of studies would benefit from less participants, and instead put more energy into conducting good qualitative interviews (Brinkman & Kvale, 2015). I conducted 12 interviews, which I argue a suitable amount of empirical material to provide a full and detailed analysis. The informants consist of 7 women and 5 men, all between the ages of 31-60, and have the titles of everything from CEO to Senior Consultant (See Table 1). Despite the different titles, they were all active in providing strategic advice regarding communication matters towards their customers. The consultancy firms vary in terms of both size and orientation, as they range from being just one person to being thirty employees, as well as being specialized in everything from social issues, environmental questions, to building brands.

Consultant number & Title	Age	Gender	Education
1. CEO & Project Manager	47	Woman	Set Design & Decor Painting
2. CEO	60	Man	BSc Economic History and Political Science
3. CEO & PR- communication consultant	52	Man	BSc Political Science & Journalism
4. Managing Partner: Strategic Communication	58	Man	Engineering & MSc Economics
5. CEO & Partner	47	Woman	MSc Economics & Organizational Theory
6. Senior Consultant	45	Man	MSc Political Science.
7. CEO & Project Manager	50	Woman	MSc Economics
8. Manager	31	Woman	MSc Political Science
9. Communication consultant	38	Woman	MSc International Marketing & Brand Management
10. Communication Strategist	37	Woman	Sales and Marketing
11. Communication Strategist	46	Woman	BSc Media & Communication Science
12. CEO & Design - and Brand Strategist	47	Man	MSc Economics & Advertising Communication

(*Table 1 – Interviewees)*

4.2.3 Interview proceedings

The interviews took place individually over the course of five weeks, from the beginning of March to the middle of April 2022. All interviews were conducted over a digital video-meeting platform such as Teams or Google Meets and lasted between 43-73 minutes. The choice to conduct the interviews digitally was based on three aspects. Firstly, because it made it possible to interview communication consultants who were based in another location than my own (Thunberg & Arnell, 2021; Gray et al., 2020). Secondly, the Covid-19 pandemic have enabled technical skills development amongst organizational members (such as consultants), who have had to work digitally from home (Thunberg & Arnell, 2021). Thirdly, studies show that the quality of the digital interviews is either only partly, or not at all, different from those interviews conducted in-person (Thunberg & Arnell, 2021). In total 10/12 participants had their cameras on during the interview, which means that visual cues were to some extent obtained, though it is one of the limitations of digital interviews (Thunberg & Arnell 2021). During two interviews, the cameras stopped working, due to technical difficulties. However, it only took a few minutes for me and the informant to adapt to our situation and continued the interview successfully. I took certain measures to smoothen such technical difficulties. For example, the informants were offered to have a say in what platform they wanted to meet on, to pick one more familiar to them (Gray et al., 2020). We also exchanged phone numbers prior to the interview, where I would be able to reach the participant if the technical aspects failed (Gary et al., 2020).

After each interview was finished, I discussed the purpose of the study with the participants and asked them if I was allowed to contact them with further questions if needed. Afterwards, I checked the recording to make sure it worked and had good enough quality to be transcribed. All recordings were transcribed within 1-3 days, except for two that took a bit longer. Transcribing the interviews close to the conduction of them, meant that I familiarized myself with the empirical material while my memory from the interviews were still fresh (Merriam, 2009). The researcher must take as stance in how the transcription is conducted in terms of either a verbatim approach by for example including stammers and pauses in detail, or in a formal and more written style (Brinkman & Kvale, 2015). This research does not investigate linguistic aspects of how the consultants articulated their thoughts, rather it is interested in the meaning behind them. Therefore, the transcription was made in attempt to resemble the recordings as much as possible, without including every stammer or pause. However, when presented in analysis, the quote from the transcriptions were changed into a more written form to be more easily understood (Brinkman & Kvale, 2015).

4.2.4 Quality criterias of the study

Qualitative method is described by Brinkmann and Kvale (2015) as a craftsmanship, where the validation of the study is something which should be embedded in every stage of the interview inquiry. Validation can be seen as a process of checking, questioning, and theorizing, where validity is characterized by transparency (Brinkmann & Kvale, 2015). By providing clear descriptions of the study's purpose and transparent presentation of its proceeding, I argue that I do showcase such a process of validity. I have checked and questioned my research by adapting a more critical role in analysis and making a clear distinction between my opinions of the empirical material, and the empirical material itself. Likewise, the problematization and research questions are answered, with the empirical material collected through a suitable method (Brinkmann & Kvale, 2015). Lastly, in terms of theorizing, I argue that the obscurity of the phenomena makes it suitable for qualitative method, as the strength of qualitative research is to picture and question the social reality we live in (Brinkmann & Kvale, 2015)

4.3 Ethical considerations

Brinkmann and Kvale (2015) propose three guidelines regarding ethical consideration in qualitative research: informed consent, confidentiality, and the role of the researcher. Firstly, the participants signed or verbally consented to an *Informed Consent Form* (See Appendix 2). Informing them of the studies overall purpose, the handling of their personal information, as well as their free will to withdraw from the study at any time (Brinkmann & Kvale, 2015). Secondly, for confidentiality, all participants were anonymous in the study. Their personal information was kept within password protected programs and folders. Including recordings, transcriptions, and contact information, which was then deleted at the end of the study. Thirdly, I was transparent an open towards the informants regarding my role as a researcher. I gave a short presentation of myself and my background, to make sure that the participants were not alone in providing information about themselves (Fangen & Sellerberg, 2011). After the interview, I further explained to the participants the full purpose of the study, to ensure their understanding.

4.3.1 Translation of empirical material

All the interviews with the communication consultants were conducted in Swedish because I did not want to hinder the consultant in their ability to express their thoughts and ideas (Cassinger, 2014). None of the informant native language was English, and their ability to express themselves in such would be both varying and somewhat limited compared to speaking Swedish. This does make it necessary to point out the translation aspect on selected quotes in the analysis. Translation is never done without change or alteration, and the researchers own individual understanding of the text translated is inseparable from the finished translation (Latour, 1986; Czarniawska & Sevón, 2005). It is dependent on norms and the individual understanding of the world, and therefore the interview quote is context bound, collectively created by the interviewee and interviewer (Cassinger, 2014). With this in mind, the quotes have been, to the best of my ability, as accurately translated as possible.

4.4 Analytical process

Since my research is exploratory in nature, the analytical process of the empirical material was initiated with the aim of maintaining an open-minded approach, while simultaneously searching for aspects such as translation and sensemaking of communication science. This called for a more “freer” approach when analyzing, and therefore abduction as an analysis method was chosen (Brinkman & Kvale, 2015). This is a more dynamic proceeding when analyzing the empirical material, by letting the codes and categories emerge ad hoc, through a combination of theory as well as the interviews own expression and articulations (Brinkman & Kvale, 2015). This made it possible for me to adapt a combination of data-driven coding, where codes emerged from the imperial material, as well as concept driven coding where codes were inspired from theory (Brinkman & Kvale, 2015). In my study, this means that I have both created codes which emerged from the empirical material per say in terms of opinions, contradictions, or patterns in relation to the research questions. However, I have also searched for expressions which are connected to the theoretical framework of translation and sensemaking and applied that to my empirical material to see how it is expressed. This is also one of the reasons for having chosen the theory of translation, since I early on, during interviews was able to identify aspects which were related to it. This analysis process can be described as a bricolage method of analysis, where the researchers move freely between empirical material, theory and thematizing - and use whatever tool he/she finds available and deemed fitting (Brinkman & Kvale, 2015). Therefore, after an initial reading of the transcriptions, the coding and thematizing of the data was a back-and-forth process between writing the analysis and going back into the empirical material several times.

Rennstam and Wästerfors (2018) describes the importance of sorting the empirical material and codes found, several times to discover different patterns of categorizations. To begin with, my codes were sorted almost in a yes, maybe and no pile in terms of understandings and usage of science. However, by continuing the sorting process, I was able to see how these understandings contradicted each other, even within a certain standpoint or opinion. At this stage, the codes and categories were far too many, which did give me a clear overview of the empirical material but was not specific or clear enough to put into analysis. Thus began the process of reduction, which is when the researcher needs to reduce that which is to be presented in analysis (Rennstam &Wästerfors, 2018). In qualitative research, we cannot present everything found, and the researcher therefore needs to make it more comprehensible for the reader, by presenting those categories which best represent both the empirical material as well as the purpose of the study (Rennstam &Wästerfors, 2018). Therefore, in the process of reduction I had to go back to the research questions and focus solely on those categories which answer them best (See Appendix 3 for coding sheet). Ultimately, this led to the identification of three themes: (1) The ambiguous relationship to communication science. (2) Different levels of translation strategies by communication consultants. (3) Communication science for value creation. Themes that in the analysis is put through the process of argumentation, when set into relation with theory (Rennstam &Wästerfors, 2018).

5. Analysis

This chapter aims to provide insight to how communication science is made sense of in practice by communication consultants. The coding and categorization process has allowed for three themes to be identified. Firstly, *the ambiguous relationship to communication science,* which describes the differentiating, and two-sided view and understanding of communication science in practice. Secondly, *different levels of translation strategies by communication consultants,* which illustrates the translation skills regarding science amongst the consultants. And thirdly, *communication science for value creation*, which refers to how communication consultants translate science as means for providing new ideas and knowledge. These themes will now be presented in the following text.

5.1 The ambiguous relationship to communication science

The understanding of science in practice differed between the consultants. In term of taking part of communication science, the consultants answered “Yes, we are updated on what is going on”, “occasionally, but not as a routine”, “rarely, almost never” and some said, “can't think of a situation where I have”. Given this variation in terms of how often they look at science, some struggled to express their understanding of it, while others where able to formulate them very clearly.

5.1.1 Communication is not science

When asked about how they understand communication science in their everyday work, there was almost pervading hesitation amongst the consultants. Some immediately asked me to define what I meant with communication science, and when I asked them to explain what they understood it to be, the answers varied to a great extent. While some argued that it was research regarding human interaction and dialogue, with the purpose of improving communication strategies, others argued that communication science should not be considered science at all. In the first half of the interview, I asked the consultants to explain how they motivated their advice and solutions to their clients. Two of the consultants brought the topic of science up themselves, although from entirely different viewpoints.

> "Not everything can be validated if you know what I mean, [...] I can only give you an argument as to why I came to that view. But I cannot, I cannot like…. this is not *science* if you understand what I mean." (Consultant 2)

> "Because it is very easy for marketing, communication to not be understood as *science*. You shrug your shoulders a little, but if the truth is to be told, everyone needs all this, there is no brand that can stand completely without communication. So, I think the more fact-based you can be today, that is, based on what we know and no guesses." (Consultant 7)

These quotes showcase a certain dichotomy regarding whether communication is to be considered science or not, by two consultants who both possess higher education, though not in communication. Similarly, to the first quote, consultant 3 argues that communication is not something which you can measure through quantitative means, as it is too abstract. Instead of communication science, the consultants argue that they turn to statistical data from governmental reports or market surveys, to motivate their actions to their clients. Communication science and academia, in contrast, is not viewed as being commercially oriented enough for practice. Consultant 2, who has been working closely with universities as a guest lecture, says: "*I have hired quite a few from the university, but the academic world is still too far away from the commercial world. That is the problem, the commercial thinking is too far away*." What is contradicting here is that while on one hand they argue that communication is not a scientific matter, they also proclaim their affection for statistical data, which they use to support their advice or solutions for their clients. To base their advice on facts, is proclaimed one of the most important aspects. Though, these facts often rely from governmental reports, market surveys or consumer behavior reports, which are not necessarily to be considered scientific sources. These are understood by the consultants as being more meaningful in the context of the client to motivate certain communicative actions, compared to scientific research. A certain paradoxical aspect can be identified, as there seems to be both an idea of communication as not being something which is scientific, while at the same time in practice, trying to make communication more measurable and statistical in presentations for the clients and therefore striving towards a positivistic tone. Something which indicates an uncertainty regarding their professional role. Like consultant 7 articulates in the quote above, there seems to be a tendency amongst the clients to view communication as something unimportant. A way to meet that understanding is to make communication more scientific, or based on facts and research, which is one of the main reasons for several of the consultant's usage of it (as will be discussed later in the analysis). Another aspect is that communication consultants understand science as not being able to provide the necessary knowledge to enable change or drive. Consultant 3 argues:

> "Communication science studies that which *is*. It does not drive anything forward. [For example] If we look at other disciplines, let's say chemistry. Here you do not do research in order to say that something is in a particular way. Rather, you look at what you can do in the future. Because that is the difference, that is not communication science which is, like all other social sciences, more descriptive." (Consultant 3)

Consultants 3, who has a higher education in political science and journalism, argues that communication science is only descriptive in its nature and does not provide indications which pushes practice forward in terms of what to do or how to act. Therefore, he later adds, he does not find communication science helpful or valuable in the work and services he provides for his clients. It appears that consultant 3 does not believe that science provide clear enough labels to enable him to act upon them, as they are to descriptive and theoretical. However, unlike informant 3, this descriptive nature of communications science is what some other consultants found the most valuable. Consultant 7 describes how they use scientific models:

> "Then you will not miss anything either because then you check like: Oh! We have not filled this in, what should we put here? What's going on top? Like in brand pyramids with hierarchies of different kinds, or you decide like what's important, prioritize. Yes, there are a lot of different good models that we use for this." (Consultant 7)

Consultants 7 describes how these models helps them to label, and therefore navigate and understand certain processes or struggles in their work and priorities their actions (Weick et al., 2005). Normally, one talks of experience when mentioning labeling, but one could also understand it as science providing the label for the consultants to understand a certain outcome of the process that they are in. Interestingly, among the other consultants, it is rather argued that science is the thing which drives the field of communication forward by describing (labeling), and therefore helping to understand (make sense) of their situation (Weick et al., 2005). One does not have to fully have made sense to know how to act (Weick et al, 2005). Therefore, even if science does not provide hand-on instructions, the consultants still where able to start making sense of the problem, and therefore begin their path of actions. To view science as non-practical or not action driven, shows another aspect of the consultants understanding, which is that communication science is time consuming.

5.1.2 Communication science as time consuming

> "As a consultant, preferably, all hours should be paid. Then it's like a battle, to both take in knowledge and be one step ahead, while also making sure that what you do pulls in jobs. It's not easy. You constantly feel that you are behind." (Consultant 1)

Here consultant 1 highlights a very interesting aspect regarding their professional role, which is that consultancy is dependent on time and money. As is explained by consultant 3, the communication consultants often work on an hourly basis for their clients, where every hour needs to provide an income to be sufficient. Consultant 3 later reasoned that science is therefore not effective, as it takes too much time to comprehend and make relevant. It is also argued that in their high pace industry of communication, science does not keep up and is viewed as being too slow to still be relevant for practice. Time seems to be a reoccurring reason for not taking part of "original" science sources. The constant "feeling that you are behind" thus enables the consultants to search for meaning and plausible images which result in quick effective sensemaking to become able to act (Weick et al., 2005). Therefore, as science is understood as time consuming, it is then optioned out. Moreover, as is explained by consultants 8 and 9, they do put a lot of time into reading scientific research reports, but that is more often related to the industry of the client, rather than communication science. Consultant 9 also point out the expectations on the role: "*Consultants have a very great burden on their shoulders in terms of both having to be up to date with the communication industry [...] as well as having to be up to date with every client's challenge, future, and contexts*". This tells us that it's not necessarily the contents or quality of communications science per say that stops the consultants from using it, but the time pressured circumstances which is their everyday work environment and role expectations. Therefore, to take time to understand science is an effort that is pushed aside, as there are other matters deemed more important. However, consultant 1 also describes: "*If I have a project, and I find [an academic report], then its like 25 pages just about how the report is structured… just,oh no God, get to the point!"*. This quote rather illustrated that it is the construction of scientific report or journals that the consultants find challenging, as they provide a lot of information that is perhaps not as valuable for them, for example how they are constructed. Due to understanding scientific journals as time consuming to take part of, the consultants have found other ways to take part of science. Several of the consultants argue that they partake of science in a more implicit manner and perhaps not in the form of academic books or scientific journals. One reason for this argument, could be that they want to be accommodating to my questions, since they all had already put great emphasis on their advice not being only based on "make believe", but on facts and evidence. Therefore, it would be understandable that when asked if they ever use communication science, this is something they feel obligated to respond to in a positive manner. Nevertheless, it is done of different levels of awareness amongst the consultants. Consultant 7 says:

> "I believe we do take part of [communication science] a great deal, but I believe that we do it in a more popularized version, when we go to seminars for example. Obviously, all of this has its origins somewhere, but it is not always a scientific research study we look at, rarely in fact." (Consultant 7)

Whereas reading an academic journal requires more time, a popularized industry report is more easily consumable. Others also explain that it could be through their industry magazines, books, podcasts or even TED-talks through which they obtain communication science, but in a "popularized" version. Along with all the other scanning of the surrounding world they do, they believe science to somehow reach the corner of their eye. Therefore, their sensemaking and understanding of science is a very implicit one, and which could be the reason why it is so difficult for many of the consultants to provide examples of when they have implemented science into practice. One example is provided, where a popularized scientific report "The Communicative Organization" (Heide et al., 2018b) was found via the industry organization "Sveriges Kommunikatörer". The report is a summary of several scientific research studies within strategic communication, formatted as an industry adapted (popularized) report. This provides an example of how the communication consultants wish to receive scientific information in a more simplified and hands-on manner, in the sense that it connects its findings to, and provides implications for, practice. This way, the popularized version already provides meaning to certain actions which will result in a presumed outcome (Weick et al., 2005). One can argue that the consultants therefore do not need to make sense of the scientific knowledge to their practice, to the same extent as they would have when reading the original version.

5.1.3 Communication science for identity and action

Contradictory to the understanding of science as not being enabling, other consultant understands communication science as something which can help them broaden their knowledge. Consultant 1, who has no higher education, argues:

> "I see it as a super important part [science], all the time, to reassure that you do not get stuck in one mindset. That you find new ways of looking at it, that you question your own ideas and thoughts and preceded arguments. I would say that I use it because it is probably a requirement for our company to continue existing, it is important that we are always open to take in and reflect and so on." (Consultant 1)

Consultant 1 acknowledges the risk of constraining oneself as a consultant to a certain type of reality. A way for her to broaden, question and somewhat make sense of her identity as consultant, as well as the reality of "consultancy" she lives in, is to turn to science. Weick (1995) argues that others play a vital role in how we look at and understand ourselves, a complex process where we collect outside perspective while simultaneously wanting to influence it. In this context, the "others" could be understood as science and the "identity" as the consultancy and practitioner role. Consultant 1 understands science as something which questions her own identity as a consultant and practitioner in terms of her experience and knowledge. While she simultaneously tries to influence the other (science) in terms of adapting it to her reality (which will be explained later in this chapter). Science serves as a mechanism for some of the consultants to question and therefore develop their own identity as consultants (Weick, 1995). However, Consultant 1 later also acknowledges how keeping up with and reading science risk a certain skewed agenda in terms of only looking for answers which matches one's own theories or understandings. Even if this of course contradicts the very idea of science to question and develop identity, it also showcases another understanding of science as an argument for action. Consultant 7 describes how they collect such a vast amount of information in their initial research phase, where science plays a role in analyzing and navigating amongst this information. She explains how scientific models can help them filter information to clarify what is the most important aspects:

> "We do not sit down and freebase everything, of course we lean towards different analysis [models] in how you do your analysis in different steps. How do you develop insights, what types of components need to be included in this, how do you work with, for example, content." (Consultant 7)

This quote also illustrates how science provide a certain guidance and support, in terms of using science as an argument, something to lean on as a base. Sensemaking occurs in situations where we lack the correct motivation on how to act (Weick et al., 2005). In the context of the consultants, this applies for both them and their clients. It appears as if communication science or models enacts as guiding principles, a plausible image which motivates the consultant's actions (Weick et al., 2005). Not only for the consultants themselves, but the clients as well. The expression "not only make-believe" is used by the consultants, where they acknowledge the importance of their advice and strategies being based on something, especially for their clients. Science per say is almost described as a rhetorical tool, to provide weight to the advice presented. One could then assume that the understanding of science as an argument is a way for the consultant to help the client make sense of (and accept) their advice. The scientific evidence becomes a materialization of the advice given, an example of what the advice will implicate and result in (Weick et al., 2005). The matter of being able to motivate their advice and strategies is something all the consultants see as something of great significance, regardless of their understanding of science (as some argue other sources of knowledge provide such bases). However, because of this articulation there appears to be a need for the consultants to constantly confirm their actions as being legitimate, ultimately showing an uncertainty in their profession.

5.1.4 Professionalism

Another aspect of how communication consultants understand science, is that it has to do with legitimizing their role and profession. When asked about the client's thoughts on consultants using communication science in their work, consultant 11 answered that she believed them to view it as professional and trustworthy. When I asked her to elaborate, she replied:

> “The existence of science, says something about the profession, that it's not just about relying on your gut-feeling, it’s a kind of fact. And that is a challenge with communication. Many people find it difficult to measure the value of it, to translate it to revenue, unlike many other efforts made in the organization. Like Return of Investment and all that. So that's why you must, I think it is important, to demonstrate that there is knowledge that gives facts, that gives me relevance and strength. To my profession, my professionalism.” (Consultant 11)

Science is understood by the consultants as something which strengthen their professionalism, in that their professional role is grounded in a scientific discipline. Consultant 11 finds it to be especially important given that communication efforts are very difficult to measure compared to other aspects of an organization. Therefore, a base in scientific research could serve as a booster of trust, when numbers and measures can’t suffice. Some clients seem to struggle to see the true value of communication in an organization, and, as is put by consultant 3; “I think many of our customers think that what we do is a bit spaced-out, but that it is very profitable to listen to us, sort of!”. Likewise, some of the consultants also acknowledge a current debate in Sweden regarding communication practices in the Public Sector, particularly municipalities, and what purpose they have. Here consultant 11 explains it as communication in general not having been a profession for that long and is now perhaps where HR was 15-20 years ago when they struggled to make their profession legitimized. It therefore describes as a problem of society having not fully understood the role of the communication professional (including consultants), and what purpose and value they have. Although, a lot has happened in just few years, there is still not a full and clear understanding. Therefore, as I interpret the consultant, there is belief that science is to play a part in helping the profession gain its legitimacy. In a way, it's about making communication practice make sense to society, by using scientific inquiry as an example to how evidence has been obtained of how certain communication actions play out, and therefore make it a meaningful way to act (Weick et al., 2005). Along with this enforcement of trust, comes other benefits as well, as is described by consultant 5:

> "Such a thing [communication science] can actually raise the status of the entire communication profession, the communication practitioner roles. The fact that you get an even stronger credibility with the research backing you up. Which maybe even could make it possible to charge better for your services too if you have that strength with you. [...] The value somehow increases, but above all the credibility and thus also the value. I think it's like a comparison with certification. There are no certified communication advisors today. But maybe we can use communication science to somehow create a certified role. It also increases competence, which makes one become a more qualified advisor." (Consultant 5)

Like informant 11, consultant 5 identifies another aspect of understanding communication science, which is in fact that it might make the role more credible and therefore valuable in terms of charging and price. They as consultants would have knowledge which not all others possess, which makes the skills more sought after. This is another problem identified by some of the consultants. While there is still some part of society and their clients which seem to view their communication profession as unclear, there is also another aspect of total opposite implication. Namely, as more and more organizations begin to understand the value of communication, the more knowledgeable clients become, and the more communication professionals are hired in-house at organizations. This means that the client possesses a threat to the communication consultant in terms of being more aware or being professionals themselves. The consultants argue that it is important that they keep themselves up to date with the communication industry, including science, to keep themselves more knowledgeable than their clients.

5.2 Different levels of translation strategies by communication consultants

Communication science is translated into communication consultancy practice in different ways because science is variously used by the consultants. Some used expression such as translation, adaption, and simplification, without having been informed of this theoretical framework. Their translation skills seemed to vary depending on whether they talked about science, client's business or other kind of ideas or practices. These skills were apparent in three aspects; their ability to acknowledge differences between source and recipient unit, making the client understand by understanding the client, and act of simplification and adaptation.

5.2.1 Acknowledging differences between source and recipient unit

The reason for why several of the communication consultants struggle or do not choose to use communication science, is because it is simply too different from practice. According to the consultants, this difference lies in the fact that science is not customer oriented, it is understood as too abstract, too theoretical, and not applicable to practice. Hence, the communication consultants showcase an awareness that is similar to the translation rules of; the more differences between the recipient unit and source unit, the more difficult it is to translate knowledge (Røvik, 2016). Several of the consultants struggle to bring the discussion any further than proclaiming this differentiation between science and academia, and therefore do not acknowledge translation as a radical mode of creative change, where the translated idea can be altered and changed to something almost completely different from its origins (Røvik, 2007). Rather, they seem to only understand the process of reproducing, and therefore copying, which is very difficult when the source and recipient unit are very different (Røvik, 2016), which is what the consultants describe science to be. However, when talking about knowledge and ideas beside science, a more elaborated dynamic awareness was detected. For example, consultant 3 talks about taking their experiences and ideas from one client to another:

> That is a greeeat way to work, we do those kinds of comparisons all the time. [For example] we tried something which worked great in that industry, they really elevated their business and got tons of attention. Should we not try this in another field, as no one else is doing it? That is the best way to innovate! Of course, it's not entirely the same, you have to reflect on how it’s going to work. But yes, it does work. It does not differ that much [between industries], it is just different cultures and ways of working. (Consultant 3)

Consultant 3 showcases an understanding of translating knowledge and ideas between different contexts and industries as something that is very much possible, but more importantly, as a process with friction that will enable new ideas and knowledge (Czarniawska, 2005a). He also says it is something which is also dependent on cultural and structural differences, which need to be considered if the translation is to work (Røvik, 2016). It is therefore interesting that there seems to be a sort of reluctance amongst some of the consultants to make such a translation between communication science and practice. It is deemed both different and distant, but also as something which is perhaps not meant for them. I have earlier talked about the consultants turning to popular science to take part of it in a more time efficient manner. In a way, this is also a form of a translation strategy, as they do not need to be translators of original ideas or knowledge per say. Rather they engage in *a chain mode of imitation*, or when it is *mediated by other actors or organizations* (Hedmo et al., 2005). Nevertheless, the aspect of popular science is also something that consultants 6 describes as being what they do in practice, compared to the scientific researchers. While arguing that they make use of scientific methods in their own research and analysis, he also says that as it becomes more practically oriented, it changes (is translated) into a more popularized version (Røvik, 2007). Popular science, however, is not something which is necessarily understood as positive by the consultants. Consultant 9, who has an MSc in Brand Management, describes the following:

> "There is a very great integrity in the research world. Where you express yourself in certain ways, as in almost technical terms. There is an academic language that is not completely understandable to all groups. So, when that transfer then goes from a journal or a publication, a standard which is to be translated by a communicator along the way, it can screech a little. Where the professors then, as I understand it, often feel that there will be a diminishing of their research. Where we try to make it more popular science and…. yes, yes there is something ugly about that, that transfer." (Consultant 9)

Once again, the academic language is pointed out as an obstacle for communication science to be used in practice, but here consultant 9 describes with her own words how communicators translate this knowledge. She also articulates, with the word screech, that this is a process which involves change and transformation (Czarniawska & Sevón, 2005). It is however the notion of researchers and academics as being negatively oriented towards having their work becoming popularized, that I find so interesting. There seems to be a struggle in terms of *translatability*, as the consultant understands science as being both very *embedded* and *non-explicit* (Røvik, 2016). One could argue that it becomes a question of approachability of that which is to be translated, in the sense that the researchers do not appear to be keen on having their work changed. The fact that consultant 9 has a higher education within communication science, means that even as an educated student, she feels this disapproval regarding change. Moreover, one could also argue that this is a question of hierarchy, as practice is considered popularized science and popular science is considered “ugly”. It could be the reason why some of the consultants struggle to translate science, whether they have a higher education or not, as it appears too theoretical, too complicated, and too superior for practice, not to be changed or altered. Though, there are those of the consultant which can describe otherwise.

5.2.2 Make the client understand by understanding the client

The consultants have very different descriptions in terms of their clients view on using science in their work. Some argue that their clients have never expressed such a demand and therefore do not use science, while others argue that they use it even if the client has not demanded it but perhaps in a more implicit way. This is dependent on both whether the client has interest in or knowledge of the matter. As is explained by consultant 4, when asked what he believed the client opinion was on communication science:

> “It all depends on who is at the steering wheel [...] If you have an entrepreneur who started a company straight out of high school, that today has a revenue of a couple of billion. Then they do not think that the research is very relevant for them, to be successful. On the one hand, they have no understanding of academic education, and it may at best be a bit of an inferiority complex. But they are hands-on women and men who know the way forward themselves, obviously haha! Then you have to fit in there and then you have to try and manage what they point out to be something good in communication.” (Consultant 4)

As consultant 4 articulates, the opinion of the client does not necessarily affect what they base their decisions on, but it alters how they present their advice. It's a question of changing the knowledge and information so that the recipient unit (client) understands and is open to that information (Røvik, 2016). Consultant 4 then later describes that this is a process of changing expressions or concepts to something that the client finds more recognizable and approachable. Hence, it is ultimately a process of translation (Czarniawska & Sevón, 2005). Then there are other consultants proclaiming their client’s non-interest in science, and rather argue that it is their experiences which has made the client come to them in the first place. It makes me wonder whether there are consultants who tend to focus too much on the clients wishes, and therefore perhaps do not broaden the advice and knowledge brought into the collaboration. Afterall, consultancy is a profession which deals with the dilemma of providing a service to a client who could choose to withdraw its purchase at any time. Still, despite their opinions regarding communication science, all the consultants articulate the importance of truly knowing and understanding the client, their business and industry, as is described by consultant 2:

> “We need to do our homework. Much like if you were to ask me to advise you on your future career. I cannot advise you until I know exactly who you are. What you have done, what you stand for, your values, your friends, what you feel and so on. When I do know that, that’s when I can recommend you […]. I'm skeptical of industry gurus who knows everything. I know nothing, I have to learn everything from the beginning every time! Well, of course, you have your experiences with you as well as your collogues with different expertise” (Consultant 2)

Even if consultant 2 does not mention either translation of science, it is still clear that he understands the value of knowing the recipient unit when translating knowledge (Røvik, 2016). As a consultant, he cannot advice (e.g. provide knowledge, whether its experience or science) without understanding that which he is meant to advice. He also critiques those which underestimates this part of the process and argues that he has to re-learn (understand the client) every single time. Certain translation skills can be identified, as Consultants 2 argues that their main functions is to be able to transfer this knowledge by understanding their clients, how they are able to receive it, and what they are able to do with it (Røvik, 2016).

5.2.3 Simplification and adaptation

When speaking of using communication science, a common example among the consultants was to discuss the usage of scientific models. The models provide the consultants with implications and suggestions as to how a certain process can proceed, and therefore make it easier for them to navigate their own (e.g. the clients) processes. However, these models are rarely used in their original form, as is explained by consultant 4:

> “Then of course one has to take science into a more practical mode. You can't just take and use scientific models as they are, because they need a bit of adjustment. [A scientific model] is a great model if you are proficient in brand

> and strategy work. But if you are a part of the board, or if you are the CFO, it is very complex to understand. So, with a point of departure from the model, you are able to simplify it and work in a more different manner, but the content and result is pretty much the same. [...]. You can combine certain concepts, or maybe take some away, and make it less complex so to speak. I feel like it is easier for our clients to understand our version of the model" (Consultant 4)

Again, to truly know and understand the client is something the consultants deem one of their most important tasks, if they are to be able to provide good and sufficient advice (Røvik, 2016). This consultant 4 points out when referring to their client knowledge and understanding of the matter and arguing that the model per say requires certain knowledge or skill. Therefore, consultant 4 ultimately proclaims the *translatability* of the model as a *complex* matter (Røvik, 2016). In circumstances of low translatability, Røvik (2016) argues that the attempt to copy is ruled out by addition, omission, and alteration. Similarly, consultants 4 describe how he makes the scientific model simpler by combining or removing certain concepts (addition through combination, and omission), ultimately using the model as a base of inspiration to construct their own version. Likewise, consultant 9 describes finding the "essence" of the model, and then creating their own. Ultimately, this showcases that the consultants translate science in both a modifying and radical mode, given it severe difference from practice (Røvik, 2016). However, consultant 4 later also proclaims that this is something that needs to be done with care, as simplification also means a risk of losing the quality of what is simplified. He acknowledges the importance of understanding the different ways of working, both in the source and recipient unit (Røvik, 2016). When translating scientific knowledge, there is always a risk of losing its original conceptualization (Cornelissen, 2000). Similar to the pragmatic positioning of modifying mode, where the translator must stay true to the original idea while still adjusting it (Røvik, 2016). Therefore, the awareness of such risks is significant to not cross that line. While consultant 4 articulated knowing the client as an important aspect of how science is simplified and adapted, consultant 10 describes how she determine what parts of a scientific idea or models get "picked":

> "While I'm reading, I write it down, and then I think and reflect while writing my own notes and so on. And then I kind of try to somehow incorporate it into my processes, into my way of working. If I think it makes sense, or if it can give me something. It is so easy to just read a book to put it down, and then

> you have forgotten it [...].It becomes a combination of what I have learned through experience, but also that there is someone else who has also come to the conclusion that this is a way to do it, and that it is a good way to get a result.” (Consultant 10)

To truly understand the scientific knowledge or model is something that consultant 10 describes as an internalizing process. She emphasizes that one can not only read about the concept or idea for it to be useful, but there also must be a deeper understanding. According to Røvik (2016), for a translation to be successful, one must truly understand the source unit. This is not done by consultant 10 for the purpose of being able to copy it, but to be able to connect it to her own and her clients' context. To use it as a base or essence of inspiration, as was described by consultant 4 and 9. The consultants do not view themselves as passive recipients of scientific knowledge, but as active interpreters and translators that produce new and valuable insight (Cornelissen, 2000). As several of the consultants describe it, this ultimately results in a combination of experience and science, where they can use their own knowledge to influence the scientific knowledge. Another aspect which determines this change is also illustrated in the quote by consultant 10, it is about incorporating the scientific knowledge into the context that they are in. Which in other words can be described as *adaptation*. The consultants put great value in their task of being the eyes and ears of their client in terms of scanning the outside world for implications which could impact the client’s business. This effort itself also impacts how they translate communication science, as is explained by consultant 9:

> “Because the outside world is changing, or a situation where it [scientific model] is not precisely applicable here and now. Instead, we have to wrench it a bit, and that is something one does all the time, I think. And it's very much from the outside, what we have for external factors that affect us, what kind of trends or behavioral changes makes it necessary for us to adjust this model so that it should be more relevant for us. [For example] Maslow's pyramid of needs, which you have probably heard of. For one context, these areas can alter a little, or even switch places, depending on what is happening in the outside world.” (Consultant 9)

Consultants 9 describes science as never being directly applicable to practice since the world is simply changing too fast for it to be able to do so. Though, this does not mean it could not be of use, as she describes it is just in need of a “wrench”. The word wrenching is a recurring word amongst the consultants and can be viewed as a metaphor for describing the communication consultant as a craftsman, who rebuilds or renovates the scientific model to fit its new context. This is done by adapting the model to both the client's business (recipient unit), but also the contemporary world around it. She evidently describes a process of *contextualization*, where an abstract representation (scientific model) is materialized into practice (Røvik, 2016). Through these processes, the consultants can translate scientific models by anchoring and adapting them into the contemporary world around them. There seems to be a consensus among those consultants that can describe these processes that: yes, science is different from practice, but that does not mean it cannot provide useful implications. They view themselves, their knowledge and experience, leveled with the scientific knowledge or model in focus (Cornelissen, 2000). It appears to be a matter of daring to change and simplify what is presented by science and use one's own experiences and expertise to do so.

5.3 Communication science for value creation

The final theme of how communication science is translated into practice is related to value creation between clients and consultants. It appears as that it is not only the consultant who is a non-passive receiver of scientific knowledge, but their client as well. The relation between consultant and clients is described as an active one.

5.3.1 Collaborative process of translation

When asked to describe a situation where she had used communication science in practice, consultant 9 talked about a client who wanted to develop their city center. During the insight and research phase, consultant 9 said that they turned to academic studies that focused on tourism and communication, and then explained how those insights where used:

> “A lot is about discussing with the client. […] It is about reasoning with the client, where are we in this area? This is said by research, how do we reason with that? Should we not submit to this trend or the fact that science deems this an important matter? Or is it in fact something we need to work more on together? So, it is about using it as discussion material with the client.” [*And later in the interview ads*]; “Sometimes we are the ones who actually translate to the customer in different ways. So, we have that role, but it could also be

> that of informing them about the latest findings in research and the interpret it together. Or like, trying to discuss and understand how it is relevant for us [the client], and therefore it becomes a way of interpreting it together" (Consultant 9)

Even if consultants 9 articulates it as them translating to the client, it appears that they do so on two levels. Firstly, they keep up with and navigate the latest findings in communications science and choose to present that which they believe to be the most relevant to the client. As translation is a process of association (Latour, 1986: Røvik, 2007) the translation has already begun as the consultants have firstly tried to understand the new findings and then reviewed them against the client's context. However, as is described by consultant 9, they also bring this somewhat translated information to the client with the intention of molding it further. Together, they sit down and try to further translate this information terms of trying to understand how it could affect their work. To involve the customers in this process of translation is perhaps necessary, as science tends to maintain such a high level of abstraction (Cornelissen, 2000). Therefore, those involved must have very sufficient knowledge of the recipient unit (Røvik, 2007), which the consultants will never have as much as the client themselves do. The involvement of the client can therefore be seen as necessary to translate science in an effective and successful way. As the quote describes, to collaborate becomes a process of interpreting it together. Like consultants 9, consultant 11 also brings up the notion of "discussion material", in a workshop she held for communication practitioners within a municipality.

> "It does not result in any particular learning, nothing happens within the client, if I only stand there and preach. Rather, it is about them being able to talk and reflect together. It could be that I show them a quote, or some numbers, based on studies. And then you have to discuss that, and re-set into your own practice, your business. That's when things start to happen! So that is one way to do it, to use examples which we believe are fitting for this organization. Something which could provide some kind of enlightenment, a different perspective, or reassurance, or maybe even something provocative. And that's when you get a conversation going, a conversation where there is engagement" (Consultant 11)

Later, consultant 11 also clarifies that she to partakes in these discussions. Once again, we see science as a means for making sense of a situation or context. But more importantly, this showcases science as part of a value creating process, amongst the collaboration between client and consultants. Consultant 11 describes how the presentation of science can both be reassuring, but also provocative and challenging of the client perspective. But it does not stop there, science is not only presented and accepted, it is internalized and processed. For something to be translated, it needs to be understood, materialized, in someone's mind, which means that the outcome is always change to some extent (Erlingsdóttir & Lindberg, 2005). This is the very essence of translation, this "friction" (change) that enables new ideas (Czarniawska, 2005a). I argue that consultants 11 expression "that's when something happens" describes such a process, the emergence of new ideas and knowledge, where science has acted as a facilitating tool to do so. Hence, both the consultants and the clients are seen as active translators and facilitators of new perspectives on knowledge, based on the scientific knowledge at hand (Cornelissen, 2000). Therefore, science is translated by the consultants to both understand practice, but also a tool which helps enable a collaborative process of value creation between the two parties. It therefore also becomes a process of creativity, where the translators (client and consultant) let themselves change and alter that which is to be translated freely (Røvik, 2016; Cornelissen, 2000).

5.4 Summary

The analysis has identified three main themes in the empirical material. Firstly, the ambiguous relationship to communication science. The consultants' understandings are presented in a two-sided argument, where one side understands communication as non-scientific, too descriptive, and time-consuming. While the other side argues that it is something that strengthens and guides both their identity and actions as consultants, as well as legitimizing their professional role. Secondly, I presented the different levels of translation strategies by communication consultants. These are shown through their acknowledgment of the differences between the source and recipient unit, their articulation of how important it is to get to know and understand the clients, and through their creative process of simplification and adaption in relation to their experiences and surroundings. Lastly, I go through communication science for value creation, which presents the translation of science as a joint achievement between the consultants and their clients, through which new ideas, practices, and knowledge is produced. Now we move on to the final chapter, where the conclusions of the study are presented.

6. Conclusion

The purpose of this study is to gain an understanding of how communication consultants make sense of and translate communication science in practice. The problematization acknowledges lack of studies that look at the relationship communication professionals have to communication science in practice. Moreover, the study seeks to further the knowledge of communication consultants as translators, by analyzing how apparent and aware such skills are amongst the consultants. Through answering the research question: (1) How is communication science understood by communication consultants? (2) How is communication science translated into practice by communication consultants? The study has contributed to a deeper level of understanding regarding how communication science is made sense of in practice. This chapter presents conclusions, limitations of the study, and suggestions for future research within the field.

6.1 Contributions of this study

Firstly, the findings showcase an ambiguous relationship and therefore understanding of communication science. In line with previous studies, the result indicates that in general, communication consultants have difficulties understanding science in practice, and some even consider science to be non-relevant for them (Pang et al., 2013; Johansen, 2017; Ankers & Brennan, 2002; Volk & Zerfass, 2020; Alpert et al., 2021). The struggle to understand what communication science is can also be found in the studies by Alpert et al. (2021) where the participants even struggled to understand what academics do. Moreover, the paradoxical aspect of not understanding communication as a science, while still arguing for the importance of facts and statistics in their work, shows an uncertainty regarding the professional role of communication consultants. Since they feel the need to support and prove their advice and solutions to their clients, but do not understand science as being able to do that. Turning to other types of source's risks making the role of communication consultants more ambiguous, since it is presented as being more positivistic (in terms of numbers and statistics), while not taking part of a scientific field of communication. Similar to previous studies, there is an expectation among the consultants that it is the responsibility of academics and researchers to make science relevant for practice (Alpert et al., 2021: Claeys & Opgengafften, 2016). The consultants argue that its easier for them to understand science through a popularized format, like reports that researchers have made more practice-oriented, since the consultants time-pressured work environments require more hands-on and fast information (Alpert et al., 2021). The findings also suggest a contradicting view to the previous research presented, in terms of those consultants who understand science as something that provides weight to their arguments, and credibility to their profession. Where science acts as a legitimizing tool for their identity and action. The results indicate that consultants who have this understanding of science, showcase more diverse translation skills.

While previous studies argue that consultancy is sought after because of its experience-based practice, and non-scientific knowledge (Pang et al., 2013; Johansen, 2017), the findings of this study suggest that is a combination of the two. Through the perspective of translation theory, the findings indicate that science serves as a base for inspiration, to which the consultants personal experience and surrounding context is applied to make it more relevant for practice. The consultants do not view themselves as passive receivers, but as active interpreters and translators (Cornelissen, 2000). Such creative actions are results which can also be found in the more controlled study by Åge (2014). Moreover, this is also showcased in the finding of the process of using science as means for value creation, in terms of it inspiring both the consultants and their clients to new ideas and practices. A finding which is relatable to the understanding and study by Kantanen (2017), in terms of viewing the relationships between the consultant and client as a value-creating. This study has also provided further empirical material to the theoretical understanding of communication consultants as translators for their clients (Von Platen, 2015). To my knowledge and understanding, this theoretical concept has not been approached from the perspective of communication consultants, in terms of analyzing their ways of reasoning and expression. I argue that the consultant showcases a high-level translation skill in term of the rules provided by Røvik (2016), as they both present examples of acting *as Transcoders*, *Re-interpreting* translators and *Freely creative* translators (Von Platen, 2015). Especially, they all proclaimed the importance of truly knowing and understanding their clients if they are to be able to advice (translate knowledge) properly (Von Platen, 2015). However, the consultant showcases these skills on different levels depending on what is to be translated. While some adapted the *Re-interpreting* translator and *Freely creative* translator when translating science, others simply proclaimed the source and recipient unit too different in that area. This is, on its own, a showcasing of translation awareness as such differences does make it more difficult to translate (Røvik, 2016). However, in terms of translating knowledge and ideas between clients and industries, the consultant where more prone to adapt all the translator roles. The findings also suggests that this dynamic of translation skills is somewhat dependent on the translators understanding towards what is to be translated. Those that deemed science useful to challenge one's beliefs and as a source of inspiration, had a more creative approach, whereas those that deemed science too descriptive and theoretical, only acknowledge that the difference was too great between science and practice.

Ultimately, these findings provide two important insights, both to the consultancy practice and the academic. Consultants should to a greater extent evaluate the possibility of using science through translation, where their knowledge and experiences are to be seen as tools for making this translation. Skills which they possess in other areas of their work. In that way, they will both develop their own skills and knowledge, but also their professional role as whole. The communication consultant can be understood as an important actor for the field of strategic communication, as they embody the translator role of communication science into the everyday practice of different organizations and industries. Moreover, strategic communication is still a very young field of science and should therefore seek to seize the opportunity of practitioners showing interest in their work. Therefore, I argue that researchers should help them clarify the ambiguity of what communication science is. Preferable in a more consumable (translated) from, that will benefit both the consultants time restrained work environment, as well as the quality of the translated material that is the work of the researchers. Otherwise, practitioners will continue to turn to other sources of knowledge in trying to legitimize their professional role, which will result in continued ambiguity not only for strategic communication practice, but for its scientific discipline. After all, for what is the point of science if not seeking to increase our knowledge of, and therefore improve, the everyday social world of people's lives?

6.2 Limitations and Suggestions for Future Research

The study is limited to the description and opinion of the communication consultant, and therefore without observations to confirm that of which the consultants speak of. To observe how science is used in practice, is evidently an aspect that would be interesting to investigate in future studies. Though, I argue it to be just as valuable to understand how the consultants themselves understand, reason with their usage of science, if we are to truly understand their perspective on the relationship.

Since this study has been explorative in its nature, there is still a lot of empirical material that needs to be collected to broaden our understanding of both communication consultants and communication science role in practice. Firstly, I urge for a more large-scale interview study on a similar outline to maintain a fuller description and perspectives of communication consultant sensemaking and usage of science. Secondly, a quantitative study would be useful to find patterns in for example educational background or differences between private and public organizational clients in terms of science role in practice. Thirdly, in terms of the client's active role in the sensemaking process of science in use, I call for observatory studies where clients and consultants are provided scientific material to solve a problem, to further understand how the collaborative process produces value for both parties.

References

Alpert, F., Brown, M., Ferrier, E., Fernanda Gonzalez-Arcos, C., & Piehler, R. (2021). Branding's academic–practitioner gap: managers' views. *Journal of Product & Brand Management, 31*(2), 218–237. https://doi.org/10.1108/JPBM-09-2020-3105

Ankers, P. & Brennan, R. (2002). Managerial relevance in academic research: an exploratory Study. *Marketing Intelligence & Planning*, 20, (1),15-21. DOI: 10.1108/02634500210414729

Baba, V.V., & HakemZadeh, F. (2012). Toward a theory of evidence based decision making. *Management Decision, 50,* 832-867.

Berger, P. L., & Luckmann, T. (1991). *The social construction of reality : a treatise in the s ciology of knowledge* (Repr.). Penguin.

Brante, T. (2009). Vad är en profession? Teoretiska ansatser och definitioner. I L. Maria (Eds.), *Vetenskap för profession* (p.15-34). Högskolan i Borås.

Brinkmann, S. & Kvale, S. (2015). *InterViews: Learning the craft of qualitative research i terviewing*. Sage Publications.

Callon, M (1986). Some elements of a sociology of translation; domestication of the scallops and sherman of St Brieuc Bay. In Law, J. (Eds). *Power, Action and Belief*. (196-232). Routledge.

Cassinger, C. (2014). Tvärkulturella intervjuer - översättningens problematik. In J. Eksell & Å. Thelander (Eds.*), Kvalitativa metoder i strategisk kommunikation* (Rev. ed.). Studentlitteratur.

Claeys, A-S. & Opgenhaffen, M. (2016) Why practitioners do (not) apply crisis communication theory in practice. *Journal of Public Relations Research, 28*(5-6), 232-247. DOI: 10.1080/1062726X.2016.1261703

Cornelissen, J.P, Lock A.R. (2005). The uses of marketing theory: Constructs, research propositions, and managerial implications. *Marketing Theory, 5*(2), 165-184. doi:10.1177/1470593105052469

Cornelissen, J. (2004*). Corporate communications: Theory and practice*. Sage.

Cornelissen, J.P. (2002). 'Academic and Practitioner Theories of Marketing', *Marketing Theory, 2*(1), 133–43.

Cornelissen, J.P & Lock, A.R (2002). Advertising Research and its Influence on Managerial Practice. *Journal of Advertising Research*, *42*. 50-55. 10.2501/JAR-42-3-50-55.

Cornelissen, J.P.(2000). Toward an Understanding of the Use of Academic Theories in Public Relations Practice. *Public Relations Review, 26*(3), 315-326. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0363-8111(00)00050-3

Czarniawska, B. (2005a). *En teori om organisering*. Studentlitteratur

Czarniawska, B. & Sevón, G. (2005). Translation is a Vehicle, Imitation its Motor and Fashion Sits at the Wheel. In Czarniawska, B. & Sevón, G. (Eds.), *Global ideas: how ideas, objects and practices travel in the global economy*. (p. 7-12) Liber & Copenhagen Business School Press.

Czarniawska, B. (2005b). Fashion in Organizing. In Czarniawska, B. & Sevón, G. (Eds.), *Global ideas: how ideas, objects and practices travel in the global economy*. (p. 129-146) Liber & Copenhagen Business School Press.

Czarniawska, B. & Joerges, B. (1996).Travel of Ideas. In Czarniawska, B. & Sevón, G. (Eds.), *Translating Organizational Change* (p. 13-48) Walter de Gruyter & Co.

Czarniawska, B. & Sevón, G. (1996). Introduction. In Czarniawska, B. & Sevón, G. (Eds.), *Translating Organizational Change* (p. 1-12) Walter de Gruyter & Co.

Erlingsdóttir, G. & Lindberg, K. (2005). Isomorphism, Isopraxism, and Isonymism: Complementary or Competing processes? In Czarniawska, B. & Sevón, G. (Eds.), *Global ideas: how ideas, objects and practices travel in the global economy*. (p. 47-70) Liber & Copenhagen Business School Press.

Falkheimer, J., Heide, M., Simonsson, Zerfass, A., &Verhoeven, P.(2016). Doing the right things or doing things right?: Paradoxes and Swedish communication profe sionals' roles and challenges. *Corporate Communications: An International Journal*, *21*(2), 142–159. https://doi-org.ludwig.lub.lu.se/10.1108/CCIJ-06 2015-0037

Fangen, K. & Sellerberg, A. (2011). *Många möjliga metoder*. Studentlitteratur.

Frandsen, F., Johansen, W. & Pang, A. (2013). From Management Consulting to Strategic Communication: Studying the Roles and Functions of Communication Consulting. *International Journal Of Strategic Communication, 7*(2). 81-83. DOI: 10.1080/1553118X.2013.765439

Gray, L., Wong, G., Rempel, G., & Cook, K. (2020). Expanding Qualitative Research Interviewing Strategies: Zoom Video Communications. *The Qualitative Report, 25*(5), 1292–1301. https://doi.org/10.46743/2160-3715/2020.421

Hedmo, T., Sahlin-Andersson, K., & Wedlin, L. (2005). Field of Imitation: The Global Expansion of Management Education. In Czarniawska, B. & Sevón, G. (Eds.), *Global* *ideas: how ideas, objects and practices travel in the global economy*. (p. 190-212) Liber & Copenhagen Business School Press.

Heide, M., Simonsson, C., Nothhhaft, H., Andersson, R., & Von Platen, S. (2018b). *Den kommunikativa Organisationen*. Sveriges Kommunikatörer. https://sverigeskomun katorer.se/globalassets/dokument/forskningsrapporter/slutrapport_den_komm nikativa_organisationen.pdf

Heide, M., von Platen, S., Simonsson, C., & Falkheimer, J. (2018a). Expanding the Scope of Strategic Communication: Towards a Holistic Understanding of Organizational Complexity. *International Journal of Strategic Communication*, *12*(4), 452–468. https://doi-org.ludwig.lub.lu.se/10.1080/1553118X.2018.1456434

Hoffjann, O., Hoffstedde, K. and Jaworek, F. (2020). Ready for the unexpected: theoretical framework and empirical findings on communication consulting. *Journal of Communication Management*, *25*(1), 1-17. https://doi.org/10.1108/JCOM-10-2019-0139

Hoffmann, J., Steiner, A. & Jarren, O. (2011). The inimitable outsider: contracting out public affairs from a consultant's perspective. *Journal of Communication Management,15* (1), 23-40.

Hubbard, K. (2018). The Academic–Practitioner Gap … Is It as Vast as It Sounds?: A Creative Perspective. *Journal of Current Issues and Research in Advertising*, *39*(3), 272–288. https://doi.org/10.1080/10641734.2018.1502103

Hwang, H. & Suarez, D. (2005). Lost and Found in the Translation of Strategic Plans and Websites. In Czarniawska, B. & Sevón, G. (Eds.), *Global ideas: how ideas, objects and practices travel in the global economy*. (p. 71-93) Liber & Copenhagen Business School Press.

Johansen, W. (2017). Understanding and practicing crisis consulting: A study of public relations and communications firms. *Journal of Communication Management, 21*(2), 106–123. https://doi-org.ludwig.lub.lu.se/10.1108/JCOM-12-2016-0104

Kantanen, H. (2017). Value co-production through external communication consulting. Corporate Communications: *An International Journal, 22*(4), 455-470. https://doi-org.ludwig.lub.lu.se/10.1108/CCIJ-02-2016-0019

Latour, B (1986). The power of associations. In Law, J. (Eds). *Power, Action and Belief.* (264 - 280) Routledge.

Merriam, S.B. (2009). *Qualitative research: A guide to design and implementation.* (2. ed.) Wiley & Sons.

Patton, M. Q. (2002). *Qualitative Research & Evaluation Methods.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Pang, A., Frandsen, F., Johansen, W. & Yeo, L.S. (2013). A Comparative Study of Crisis Consultancies Between Singapore and Denmark: Distant Cousins of the Same Destiny? *International Journal of Strategic Communication, 7*(2), 149-164, DOI:10.1080/1553118X.2013.765880

Prasad, P. (2017). *Crafting qualitative research: Beyond the post-positivist traditions.* M.E. Sharpe.

Preciado-Hoyos, A. (2020), Strategic communication practices by consultants in Colombia. *Corporate Communications: An International Journal, 25*(2), 227-242. https://doi-org.ludwig.lub.lu.se/10.1108/CCIJ-06-2019-0066

Rennstam, J., & Wästerfors, D. (2018). *Analyze! Crafting your data in qualitative research*. Studentlitteratur AB.

Roberts, J.H., Kayande, U. & Stremersch, S. (2014) From academic research to marketing practice: Exploring the marketing science value chain. *International Journal of Research in Marketing, 31*(2), 127-140. DOI: 10.1016/j.ijresmar.2013.07.006

Röttger, U. & Preusse, J. (2013). External Consulting in Strategic Communication: Functions and Roles Within Systems Theory. *International Journal of Strategic Communication*, *7*(2), 99-117, DOI: 10.1080/1553118X.2013.765437

Røvik, K.A. (2016). Knowledge Transfer as Translation: Review and Elements of an Instrumental Theory. *International Journal of Management Reviews 18*, 290–310.DOI: 10.1111/ijmr.12097

Røvik, K.A. (2007). *Managementsamhället. Trender och idéer på 2000-Talet*. Liber

Røvik, K.A. (1996). Deinstitutionalization and the Logic of Fashion. Czarniawska, B. & Sevón, G. (Eds.). *Translating Organizational Change* (p. 139-172), Walter de Gruyter & Co.

Sahlin-Andersson, K. (1996). Imitating by editing success: the construction of organizational fields. in Czarniawska, B. & Sevón, G. (Eds). *Translating Organizational Change*. (p. 69-92),Walter de Gruyter & Co.

Science Council (n.d). *Our Definition of Science*. https://sciencecouncil.org/about-sc ence/our-definition-of-science/

Simonsson, C., & Heide, M. (2021). Developing a Communicative Logic –The Key to Co munication Professionalism. *International Journal of Strategic Communication*, *15*(3), 253–273. https://doi.org.luwig.lub.lu.se/10.1080/1553118X.2021.1906682

Thunberg, S. & Arnell, L. (2021) Pioneering the use of technologies in qualitative research – A research review of the use of digital interviews, *International Journal of Social Research Methodology*. DOI: 10.1080/13645579.2021.1935565

Verčič, D., Tench, R., & Verčič, A.T.(2018). Collaboration and conflict between Agencies and clients. *Public Relations Review, 44*(1), 156-164. 10.1016/j.pubrev.2017.11.001

Volk, S.C. & Zerfass, A. (2020). Management tools in corporate communication: a survey about tool use and reflections about the gap between theory and practice. *Jounal of Communication Management, 25*(1), 50–67 https://doi.org/10.1108/JCOM02-2020 0011

Von Platen, S. (2018). Communication Consulting and Consultancies. In R.L. Heath & W. Johansen (Eds). *The International Encyclopedia of Strategic Communication.* (1th ed.) (p 1-9). John Wiley & Sons, Inc.

Von Platen, S. (2015), "The communication consultant: an important translator for communication management". *Journal of Communication Management, 19* (2), 150-166. https://doi-org.ludwig.lub.lu.se/10.1108/JCOM-06-2013-0049

Von Platen, S. (2011). Klienten, konsulten och kommunikationsindustrin, in Heide, M. and Falkheimer, J. (Eds), *Strategisk Kommunikation. Forskning och Praktik,* 325-344. Studentlitteratur

Weick, K. E., Sutcliffe, K. M., & Obstfeld, D. (2005). Organizing and the Process of Sens making. *Organization Science, 16*(4), 409–421. https://doi.org/10.1287/orsc.1050.0133

Weick, K. E. (1995). Sensemaking in organizations. Sage.

Wright, D.K. (2013). Structure and Development of the Public Relations Agency Industry in the United States: Operational Structure, Clients, Fees, and Talent. *International Journal of Strategic Communication, 7*(2), 136-148, DOI:10.1080/1553118X.2013.766193

Zerfass, A. & Franke, N. (2013). Enabling, advising, supporting, executing: a theoretical framework for internal communication consulting within organizations. *International Journal of Strategic Communication, 7*(2) 118-135.DOI: 10.1080/1553118X.2013.765438

Åge, L.J., (2014). How and Why Managers Use Conceptual Devices in Business-to-Business Research. *Journal of Business & Industrial Marketing, 29*(7-8). https://doi.org/10.1108/JBIM-10-2013-0221

Appendix 1

Interview Guide

Intervju-guide	
Syfte	**Frågor**
Demografi	• Professionell titel • Ålder • Hur många år inom branschen och på nuvarande arbetsplats Utbildning
Beskrivning av arbetsprocess	**Beskriv hur ett samarbete med en kund brukar se ut?** ○ Hur brukar första första mötet med en kund se ut? ○ Vad brukar kunderna vilja ha hjälp med? ○ Vilka förväntningar har kunderna på dig som konsult? ○ Vad för ansvar har du som konsult gentemot dina kunder? ○ Vad brukar vara dina arbetsuppgifter? ○ Vad för värde är det du som kommunikationskonsult bidrar med gentemot kunderna? **Hur brukar processen för att skapa en kampanj/strategi åt en kund se ut?** ○ Vilka är de viktigaste stegen i processen, från början till slut? ○ Hur kommer du fram till de ideer som presenteras för kunden? ○ När du bestämmer dig för en vissa strateg, vad baserar du de besluten på? ○ Hur motiverar du dina råd och förslag för era kunder? ○ När du inte vet hur du ska lösa ett kommunikativt problem en kund har, vad gör du då? ○ Hur ser du till att kunderna förstår de råd och förslag du ger, eller vad du har producerat åt dem?
Användning av kommunikationsvetenskap	**Använder ni någonsin kommunikationsvetenskap i ert arbete?** ○ Kan du berätta om ett tillfälle då du har använt vetenskap i ditt arbete? ○ Varför använder du vetenskap?

	○ Varför använder du inte vetenskap? ○ Vad betyder användandet av vetenskap i arbetet för dig? ○ Om du skulle använda dig av vetenskap, hur tror du att du skulle kunna göra det?
Innebörden av kommunikationsvetenskap	**Vad är kommunikationsvetenskap enligt dig?** ○ Vad betyder kommunikationsvetenskap för dig? ○ Vad tycker du vetenskap har, eller bör, ha för syfte? ○ Hur tar du del av vetenskap? ○ Hur ser du på vetenskap inom kommunikation? ○ Brukar du ta del av akademisk forskning inom kommunikation? (varför/varför inte?) ○ Känner du ett behov av att ta del av vetenskap? (varför/varför inte?)
Yrkessrollen	• **Hur ser du på vetenskap gentemot kommunikationskonsultyrket?** ○ Hur tror du att vetenskap påverkar, eller kan, påverka bilden av dig som konsult? ○ Hur tror du att kunderna ser på användandet av vetenskap i ert arbete? ○ Hur ser du på framtiden kring kommunikationskonsulter och forskning?

Appendix 2

Informed Consent Form

Informed Consent Form

Preliminary Title of Study: Communication consultants in practice

This consent form is part of the process required for ethical treatment of participants in research. It should give you the basic idea of what the research is about and what your participation will involve. If you would like more detail about the research process or procedures, please ask. However, the researcher will not present in too much detail what the research aims to investigate, as it will risk affecting the outcome of the results. Please note, that you will always be free to discontinue participation at any time, and all data collected up to that time as a result of your partial participation will be destroyed without being used in the study.

Research Purpose

The aim of this research is to further investigate the practice of communication consultancy . This research is conducted by Amanda Nilsson, for her Masters Thesis in Strategic Communication at Lund University during the spring of 2022. This paper looks at the practice of communication consultants, particularly what communication consultants base their decision on when planning and creating communication strategies for their clients (Note, clients are not the focus of the study, and do not need to be mentioned by name).

Research Method

If you decide to participate in the study, I will invite you to participate in a semi-structured in-depth interview. For example, you will be asked: *What are the most important steps when planning a communication strategy for your clients?.* Please note that there are no right or wrong answers to this study, try instead to the best of your ability to answer as honestly as possible. Your answers will be reported together with data from other research participants. The interview will be recorded via the researchers mobile, and the recording will be deleted as soon as the study is complete (read more in: Confidentiality - Anonymity - Security).

Benefit

By participating in this study, you will contribute to research that aims to deepen the knowledge on communication consultancy as practise. Likewise, you will receive the result of the study, which can provide interesting implications for your organization.

Confidentiality - Anonymity - Security

Your identity as a participant in this study, and any other personal information gathered about you during the study, will be kept strictly confidential and will never be made public. All data containing personal information from which you could be identified will be deleted after the data analysis. This also includes the company that you work for and represent. Electronic data will be password protected. When the study is completed, all data containing personal information will be destroyed. The published results of the study will contain only data from which no individual participant or company can be identified.

What Your Signature Means

Your signature on this Consent Form indicates that you have understood to your satisfaction the information regarding participation in this research project and agree to willingly participate as a participant. You are free to withdraw from the study at any time, without any consequences. Your continued participation should be informed as your initial consent, so you should feel free to ask for clarification or new information throughout your participation.

____

Signature of Participant
Date

____

Print Name

____

Signature of Investigator (Amanda Nilsson)
Date

Contact Information
Amanda Nilsson
Mobile: 0708-785282
E-mail: amandalouicenilsson@gmail.com

Appendix 3

Coding Sheet

Blue = Codes emerging from the
Red = Inspired from Theory

Theme	Category	Code
The Ambiguous Relationship to Communication Science	Communication is not science	Communication is not scientific Communication is not considered science by clients Use of non scientific statistics The importance of facts Science too theoretical Science as only descriptive Science as labeling Science is not client oriented
	Communication Science as Time Consuming	Time vs Cost Effective Time Pressure as Consultant Up-tp date with client and Industry Science is to slow Popularized Science Popularized Science to enable action Science is out to date
		Science as Motivation

	Communication Science for Identity and Action	Science for Confirmation Science as Argument for Action Science for Questioning Identity Science as Challenging
	Professionalism	Science as Legitimizing Science for Credibility Increase status of Profession Science as increasing value Fuzzy profession Up-to date with Science To make sense for Society Clients becoming knowledgeable To know More than the Client
	Acknowledging Differences	Science to different from practise Differentiation Source and Recipient Science too Theoretical Translate Between clients Translation for Innovation Popular Science as Secondary Translation

		Practise is Popularized Scientists reluctance to Popular Science Approachability to Science Popular Science seen as negative
Different levels of Translation Strategies by Communication Consultants	Make the Client Understand by Understanding the Client	Clients Interest Clients Experience Understanding the Recipient Adapt Translation to Recipient Getting to Know the Client Research Clients Industry
	Simplification and Adaptation	Adapting Models Adapting Science Simplify Science Translate Complexities Make Science Relevant for Practise Experience Change Science Understanding the Source Unit Connect to Surrounding Environment Science for Inspiration
		Discussing with the Client

Communication Science for Value creation	Collaborative Process of Translation	Client Engagement Science as Discussion Material Science to Enable New Ideas Translation for new ideas Translate to the client Association Science for evolvement Science as questioning Shift in Generation Higher demand of Science