

THE CHALLENGES AND REFLEXIVITY OF THE KNOWLEDGE  
SOCIETY – THE CASE OF THE INTERNATIONALIZATION  
OF ROMANIAN SOCIOLOGY AFTER 1989

DELIA BĂDOI\*

ABSTRACT

The article starts with a discussion detached from the premises about relevancy and reflexivity of sociological knowledge for the social development of contemporary society (Coleman, 1990). The challenges of “the new social structure” dedicated the so-called “knowledge society”, in which scientific knowledge is shaping individuals, developments, institutions but also creates societal risks generated by recent science and technology innovations. The social significance of this topic consists in the answer given to the question: What kind of sociological knowledge is most proper for the actual social construction in Romania? The hypothesis of the article is that the scientific production of sociology at this moment is unable to contribute to the use of its own results, because of the lack of a truly interested audience in both academic and extra-academic sphere. The arguments that I want to demonstrate contain, on the one side, critical explanations about the current issues of the “knowledge society” (Coleman, 1990) or about the “risk society” (Beck, 1986), and on the other side, they refer to the relevancy of the scientific production of sociology in a modern “reflexive society” (Giddens, 1990). The article also includes references to the “division of sociological labor” (Burawoy, 2004), a concept which introduces a critical perspective on the idea of the “Romanian public sociology” in the post-communist society. From an epistemological perspective, the interest in exploring concepts like “internationalization” and “institutionalization” belonging to the sociology developed after 1989 in Romania is an important objective in order to formulate explanations about the challenges of the *new knowledge society* and the answers given by sociologists.

**Keywords:** Romanian sociology, knowledge society, the division of labor, circulation of ideas, post-communism.

INTRODUCTION

The topics of this article originate in the specific interest of promoting a comparative analysis between different ways of studying the challenges of the internationalization of Romanian sociology after 1989. The objective of this critical

---

\* University of Bucharest, Department of Sociology, Schitu Magureanu 9, Bucharest, Romania; e-mail: [delia.georgiana.badoi@gmail.com](mailto:delia.georgiana.badoi@gmail.com).

review also consists in highlighting the importance of debating on the public presence and role played by Romanian sociology in a knowledge-based society; and then in identifying the epistemological frameworks of contemporary sociology by comparison with other social sciences. The presentation of these scientific controversies refers to the academic community of the Romanian sociologists who have contributed to the institutional reconstruction of sociology after 1989.

My aim in the article is to develop a critical analysis of the process of the internationalization of sociology in Romania after 1989 and to identify “international patterns” concerning the division of Romanian sociological labor in today’s institutional development. By mapping the history of national traditions of sociology in Western and Eastern societies I aim to analyze several indicators concerning the comparative development of “international” key concepts and theories which are practiced in today’s sociology, with reference to the process of “globalization”, “circulation of ideas” or “internationalization”. In this context, I propose to extend the idea of a *global sociology* by discussing five topics: (1) the consistency of social theory and the debate about the knowledge society; (2) the division of sociological labor with reference to the idea of the “*Romanian public sociology*”; (3) the internationalization of sociology in Romania after 1989; (4) the problem of the public reception of Romanian sociology in the international context; (5) the institutionalization of sociology as an academic discipline after 1989.

In order to reach the topics that I aim to develop in this article, an important objective is to explore the international circulation of sociological knowledge in the perspective of the recent “*knowledge society*” (Coleman, 1990). The statement of this article is that the recent sociological theories of Western sociology show the utility of the participation of sociology in the configuration of the knowledge regarding contemporary society. The concept of “reflexivity” that frequently appears in the discourse of sociologists (Gouldner, 1970; Touraine, 1978; Beck, 1986; Coleman, 1990; Giddens, 1990) raises the question of the relevancy of the sociological knowledge in the functioning of the contemporary society and also in the practical knowledge of the everyday life of individuals. In this context, I support the fact that the analysis of the public expression of sociology could become an emerging research topic in Romanian sociology.

In order to identify relevant information about the understanding of internationalization of sociology in Romania after 1989, we consider the hypothesis that sociology, by its scientific output, is unable, for the moment, to change in such a way as to become a discipline with instrumental knowledge and scientific results able to lead to the development of a public and social policy. The division of the sociological labor it refers to is represented by two types of audience (academic and extra-academic). These two audiences create a gap between different types of knowledge which have been partially adapted to the demands of institutional actors or individual needs. In fact, there is no clear and equal distribution of sociological knowledge in society and frequently sociology

does not respond to the demands of public or social policy. Consequently, the transfer of the discussion on the presence of a relevant public and on policy sociology in Romania remains rather sensitive and marginalized.

#### 1. THE CONSISTENCY OF THE SOCIAL THEORY AND IDEA OF A “KNOWLEDGE SOCIETY”

The actual context of contemporary society produces many challenges within the social and the humanities sciences (SSH) concerned with a new knowledge society. Today's society requires of sociology to be a science concerned with the knowledge about individuals' daily needs (in this respect we speak about *a cognitive sociology* – Cicourel, 1974), and also about the social developments and science innovations we all witness. Thus it becomes obvious that the role of sociology in the construction of the *new social structure* cannot be challenged. Social theory should be subject to the exercise of reflective consistency, because “the potential role of sociological knowledge is inevitable for the functioning of society”. (Coleman, 1990: 610) Moreover, the further directions of social theory and research need not to be guided by the unsolved problems as defined by current “fashions” in the field, but they could be better replaced by the emerging issues of contemporary societies. First of all, in the vision of Coleman, the idea of sociological knowledge production and the study of the “new social risks” in the contemporary society should be guided by a clear perspective “of the current and potential role of sociological knowledge for society”. (Coleman, 1990: 614) This statement brings in the analysis of the importance of sociological knowledge for the actual society and also “a self-conscious examination” of the very role of this knowledge production, with specific reference to the need of reflexive sociology.

Secondly, the role of sociological knowledge framed in what Ulrich Beck (1986) called *the risk society* is challenged by the incessant progress of science and technology social scientists cannot control without clear strategies provided by a policy-orientated research. According to Ulrich Beck “the scientific knowledge production becomes a partial cause and a possible solution to the source of risks”. (Beck, 1986: 341) In this stage of the reflexivity of scientific knowledge, which is the object of investigation in “the knowledge society”, sociology confronts above all itself, its own problem of knowledge production. This theoretical model includes an evolving concept of how sociology “should solve” social problems, not only from the position of a social science concerned to find solutions to problems, but also from the position of a reflexive science concerned with its own way of responding to them. Thus, Beck's hypothesis regards the relationship between the public and the practices of social sciences, because social sciences are sometimes like “mirrors” showing “the image of their own promises unfulfilled”. (Beck, 1986: 341) This argument reveals the causes “of the scientific progress on

empowerment” and the problematic aspects that emerged “unexpectedly” in the reflexivity process of knowledge, seen as a consequence of scientific development. In Beck’s terms the “*reflexive scientification*” opens to the “users of science” new opportunities to influence and trigger the process of production and use of scientific results”. (Ibidem)

Finally, the implication of sociology in the knowledge society refers to the process of self-knowledge which is specific to social sciences and which now seems to be a “natural” process to make a theory of sociological knowledge. One can begin discussing this context by analyzing the formation of the discipline of sociology, the creation of a division of sociological labor and its influence to the internationalization of sociology in Romania.

## 2. THE DIVISION OF LABOR AND THE ISSUE OF A ROMANIAN PUBLIC SOCIOLOGY

In my demonstration I use two perspectives of analysis: the construction of the notion of public sociology by a division of labor; the social and political uses of the scientific production of Romanian sociology after 1989. First, the function of a division of labor is to create social order and solidarity (Durkheim, [1893] 1933) in the modern societies. Nevertheless, it is also important to specify how the division of labor also maintains and supports inequalities and social differences which also lead to tensions, risks and conflicts in the social structure of modern society. Then, the idea of knowledge society, as a consequence of the division of labor, generates societal risks through science and technology innovations which sociologists are interested in. “Durkheim, in a great intellectual *tour de force*, expropriated it and demonstrated that it could serve sociological theory even better than it could Utilitarian self-interest”. (Kemper, 1972: 739) On the contrary, as Kemper argues, sociologists have manifested little research interest in the study of the division of labor as an intellectual paradigm in explaining the social changes of modern societies.

In this case, we may refer first to the division of *sociological labor* in the very process of the institutional reconstruction performed in Romania after 1989 reflecting the change inside the various branches of sociology, but also to the research interests of institutional and corporate actors involved in the study of Romanian society. Secondly, in order to assess a *division of sociological labor*, we refer to the processes of the professionalization of sociology in the academic area by developing various types of study. The professionalization of sociology refers to the institutional reconstruction of Romanian society achieved by the creation of new public and private university departments of sociology in Bucharest, Iași, Cluj-Napoca and of new research institutes of sociology and social sciences in the Romanian Academy too. The professionalization of the sociological discipline also reflects the research interests of international organizations like the World Bank,

Soros Foundation, the PHARE program, etc., which emerged from the distribution of economic and political power in the branches of social research. The aim of these international organizations was to finance studies about the problems of Romanian transition and then to develop their foundational implication in public and social policies; however, the last point remains a topic in discussion. Moreover, the institutional development of sociology in Romania has determined changes in the professional sociology in domains like marketing research, public opinion studies, evaluative research, thus generating a situation which creates a different audience interested in the sociological knowledge.

To better express the changes which appear in the formation of sociology after 1989, we propose to analyze the possibility to divide the discipline of sociology into two types of audience: academic and extra-academic. This also indicates some characteristic traits of the academic sociology and policy-orientated sociology. For sustaining this statement, we consider the scheme of division of sociological labor invented by Michael Burawoy in his presidential address “*For public sociology*” (2004). This scheme corresponds to four sociology types made to contribute to the construction of a “strong” discipline: *professional sociology*; *critical sociology*; *public sociology* and *policy sociology*.

The formation of the discipline demands an instrumental type of knowledge necessary for the institutional functioning of society and also orientated to practical research and policy sociology. This kind of reflexive knowledge is also suited to the recent period which is generating sociological knowledge for the functioning of society. At the same time, in this process this type of knowledge has become more critical and has turned its role into “*public knowledge*”. The reflexive knowledge is indicated by Calhoun (2008) in what is called “*social science for public knowledge*”, an action of sociology as a social science conceived to be in close connection with the public problems (such as the public agenda) and which is also interested to be publicly understood and comprehensive. In this context, social sciences should be responsible for public problems which make the subject of the debates or contribute to the construction of public policy. (Calhoun, 2008: 3–5)

For this reason, *public sociology* is a relevant component of the division of sociological labor and leads to the development of sociology, whose results become public through direct involvement in the development of a policy-based research. By integrating public sociology in this division, the presence of sociological knowledge in society becomes more and more visible, accessible and useful for the practical needs of individuals, and also “ready” to meet the institutional and corporate actors’ demands. In this sense, the sociology’s output creates a permanent dialogue between the different types of the active public. To reach the hypothesis of this article, we proposed two questions about the reflexivity and relevance of sociological knowledge: (1.) *Sociological knowledge for whom?* (2.) *Sociological knowledge for what?*

The main premise developed by Michael Burawoy (2004) is that sociology plays a role in informing the public about social problems, thus meeting the challenges created by social changes and the increased risks of science and technology fast developing in the nowadays societies. This call for “public sociology” has encouraged the discipline to get engaged in a division of labor but also in the “political and public debate, with emphasis on public policy”. (Burawoy, 2004) Burawoy commented that “sociology should be understood as *a division of labor and as a field of power*. The expectations from public sociology are very high, but the implementation of its conclusions is difficult because sociology has moved to the left while the world moves to the right”. (Burawoy, 2004: 5) The interest in promoting sociology as a public discipline lies in reacting to and responding to the problems of contemporary society and here we detect the paradox Burawoy refers to: the break between the sociological ethos and the world that social scientists want to study creates barriers for sociology in the study of social problems. The disciplinary division of sociological labor reflects the importance of symbolic power the disciplines of social sciences have acquired after 1989 in Romania. On the one hand, the symbolic power refers to the changes in higher education at the institutional level and, on the other hand, to the reformation of sociology as an academic discipline after 1989.

### 3. THE INTERNATIONALIZATION OF SOCIOLOGY IN ROMANIA AFTER 1989

The knowledge production of a science depends on the international and national circulation of ideas which are developed in various cultural contexts that could be detected in the process of “internalization” of the ideas. The process of internationalization demands comparative studies on the exchange of theoretical patterns in the branches of sociology in Eastern and Western Europe, but also in the US. In today’s social research, the interest to study the process of internationalization seems to be only a part of the work of social scientists and not a general issue. Before 1989, social sciences and humanities studies (SSH) referred to the international context with reference to the notions of “*globalization*” and “*global world*” but without a direct connection to the circulation of theoretical ideas, to the feedback effects, or to the transfer of concepts in the international context.

In contemporary Romanian sociology, the study of the circulation of ideas and of the theories developed by key Romanian thinkers has been connected to the process of internationalization. It helps in showing how sociological knowledge circulates beyond the initial setting of production (in time, place, institutions, national brand etc.). One example could be the study of the translation of books and articles (*sociology of translation*<sup>1</sup>, Callon 1986) as a social and cultural

---

<sup>1</sup> “Sociology of translation is an analytical framework that is particularly well adapted to the study of the role played by science and technology in structuring power relationships”. (Callon, 1986:1)

phenomenon<sup>2</sup>. (Sapiro, 2008; Heilbron, 1999) By analyzing translations, for example, Heilbron considers that some “questions can be raised about the way in which cultural goods circulate outside their context of production” and that they can reveal “the relationship between different countries and cultures”. (Heilbron, 1999: 431) First, the study of translation of books is an important indicator of the reception of key sociological thinkers around the world and also represents a good start in discovering the impact of sociology on global markets. Secondly, the books that are translated in various languages denote the influence and the reputation of a science or a thinker. The reputation of a thinker could be seen as a consequence of the circulation of translated books. In this article we stress upon the importance of studying the so-called “*openness sociology*”<sup>3</sup> which is involved in the process of internalizing the major theories and contributions of key thinkers across the nations. As the discussion about “globalization” has not been a recent theme for sociologists, instead of studying this process we simply propose a different perspective by including a division of sociological labor with two types of knowledge (instrumental and reflexive) valid for contemporary society. An example of a sociological concept which is shaping the national contexts could be the *public sociology* component promoted by Michael Burawoy.

Nevertheless, it is very difficult to analyze the process of internationalization of sociology, because Romanian sociology has not followed a straight development path in its history but was submitted to some radical changes through time. Moreover, we consider that it has a different scientific and academic background as compared to American sociology and Western sociology. After 1944, Romanian sociology took a controversial step, especially when the status of sociology as a discipline began to be uncertain, and the institutional position of the sociological profession changed too. As we shall see, sociology first emerged as a science of the nation, this evolution having been exemplified by Romanian sociologist Dimitrie Gusti.

Romanian sociology experienced a major expansion due to the contributions brought by Dimitrie Gusti in the School of Sociology of Bucharest (1925–1948) in the interwar period. In this sense, Romanian sociology followed the national model that Gusti wanted to develop with a view to achieve a study of the Romanian people, especially by laying emphasis on its own character, in search of “*the soul of the people*”. This nationalist vision led to the creation of a “sociology of the nation” (*sociologia militans*, 1934) in which Gusti included: “the nations that are determined by laying factors: the nature (earth), life or biological time (the historical context) and the soul”. (Gusti, 1946: 190) Dimitrie Gusti is recognized

---

<sup>2</sup> “Considered from a sociological perspective, translations are a function of the social relations between language groups and their transformations over time”. (Heilbron, 1999: 430)

<sup>3</sup> In the sense of a global sociology which was involved in the process of understanding how the local related to the global interconnected world.

for having created an *active sociology* and a science that was able to meet the challenges of the Romanian society, such as the agrarian problem, and thus to develop national interests and contribute to the development of Romanian villages. For Gusti, sociology is a vocation of the commitment to study social realities (Gusti, 1934) on the basis of the law of sociological parallelism which was considered to be the only way suited to establish trends in the evolution of social units.

*The historical turn* of the relative “isolation” of Romanian sociology because of the establishment of communism in the countries of Eastern Europe marked a break in the sociological profession: the critical and scientific vision of sociology as an academic discipline disappeared, while it was gradually replaced by historical materialism (the Marxist-Leninist doctrine). The marginalization of sociology in Romania began in 1978 when it was forbidden in universities and the practice of profession ceased until the fall of communism in 1989. The 1989 revolution found sociology in a marginalized institutional position and it is only after that date that it started to develop within the Romanian higher education system, especially due to the contributions of the sociologists that laid the basis of this discipline between 1970 and 1980. (Larionescu, 2002) Because of these reasons for the contemporary Romanian sociologists it is rather difficult to study the recent problems of Romanian society (such as the social change, the process of transition etc.) according to the new Western models implemented in Romania too.

After 1989, the international institutional actors have had a major role to play in the formation of sociology as a scientific discipline, especially in what regards the development of the studies about the Romanian transition. The new sociological approaches have analyzed the social conditions of the transition in Romania by focusing on the social and political identities, but also on institutional structures. (see also Zamfir 2004; Vlasceanu, 2001; Sandu 1996; Verdery 1996) Larionescu (2002) shows that in Romania the transition has been one of the most studied topics after 1990, and consequently the sociology of transition has developed as a subchapter of the sociological discipline. These topics included: “the process of post-communist underdevelopment, social and symbolic capital, the premises of postmodernism, poverty, the middle class, the perception of corruption, trust in public institutions etc.” (Larionescu, 2002: 509) After 1990, the research institutions have acquired more and more freedom to study and conduct research on emerging themes in Romanian society and “the beneficiaries of research budgets for the various topics included the following institutions: the Ministry of Education and Research, the Romanian Academy, the Ministry of Labor and Social Solidarity, the Ministry of Youth and Sport, the Ministry of Culture, the National Council for Academic Scientific Research, the World Bank, the Soros Foundation and the New Europe College etc.” (Larionescu: 510)



#### 4. THE PUBLIC RECEPTION OF ROMANIAN SOCIOLOGY

The sociological labor division contains a component that deals with audiences. It creates a dialogue between the public and the sociologists, and also focuses on the public reception of sociology. From this point of view, a part of this analysis will concentrate on the possible “impact” of sociological knowledge on the public sphere measured by the expansion of academic institutions after 1990 and of the scientific journals with sociological content created in the same period.

The Romanian sociologists began to study the Romanian society issues after the communist period, but they worked with the funds and the help of some international organizations. Even if the interest in studying Romanian society was very high at that time in both the Romanian and the international organizations, the research output of the sociological projects was more or less restricted to “the specific rules” of the financiers. Finally, the integration of Romania in the European Union in 2007 has brought a great interest from European institutions running programs specialized in conducting sociological research in collaboration with public institutions in Romania on issues related to education, identity, regionalization, equal opportunities, gender studies, quality of life etc. However, there is a lack of specific information about the impact of these research projects after 1989. The subject of Romanian society in a transitional period came mainly from public institutions in Romania, as well as from institutions abroad which supported Romanian sociologists by funding the sociological research regarding the topics mentioned. The position of sociology in the public sphere has started to acquire notoriety and expansion, especially after the proclamation of the Bologna process in 2005 which coincided with an increase of BA students in sociology. Nevertheless, the institutional expansion has also caused saturation in what concerns sociologists’ positions on the labor market as a consequence of the increase of the number of students getting specialized in sociology in the Romanian higher education system.

On the other hand, the presence of Romanian sociologists in the public sphere has been perceived as being rather vague and uncertain. Sociologists were in the position to legitimate their profession and to choose between “the ethical neutrality and the involvement in politics”. The mass media reception of sociological research has been made especially by public opinion polls like Eurobarometer (BOP–1994), political polls and hearings which finally have not led to a dialogue between the community of social scientists and the public. (Larionescu, 2002)

Despite the positive reception of sociology immediately after 1989, today there is still enough ambiguity about the sociological profession and the reception of sociological knowledge by the extra-academic audiences.

## 5. THE INSTITUTIONALIZATION OF SOCIOLOGY AS A DISCIPLINE AFTER 1989

In order to study the institutionalization of sociology after 1989 in Romania, we refer to the creation of new private and public research institutions and centers concerned with the study of the specific new themes emerging in the Romanian post-communist society. This process also includes a discussion on the new sociology departments in the Romanian universities and the growing number of students in sociology graduating after 1994. Secondly, an important indicator for the professionalization of Romanian sociologists regards the community of sociologists involved in the professional Association of Romanian Sociology – ARS (created in 1991) which has run the legitimatization of the sociological profession at the institutional level. More recently, a new initiative to create a sociological association started in 2008 at the University of Bucharest when the representatives of the departments of sociology of the universities in Cluj, Iași and Bucharest met to develop together the Society of Romanian Sociologists (SSR). Other institutions created after 1990 also reflect the research activity and the sociological knowledge produced by the new scientific journals of Romanian sociology founded around the Romanian Academy and also around the research centers of the public universities.

Sociology has been well received as a discipline and a curriculum in academic areas over the fall of the communist regime. Thus, between 1990 and 1994 in the higher education system one could notice an optimistic growth of the new specializations in sociology around the university centers of Timișoara, Brașov, Craiova, Sibiu, Constanța etc. At the same time, the programs in sociology were then restored in the universities of Bucharest, Cluj and Iași. Private higher education has also expanded the specialization of BA in sociology, especially around the major academic centers of Bucharest and Cluj (for example, Spiru Haret University; Hyperion University in Bucharest; Avram Iancu University in Cluj-Napoca etc.).

Regarding the institutional position of the sociological profession after 1990, on the one hand, it was supported by the generations of sociologists trained in the 1960s, who were “inspired by the enthusiasm of the period of the opening of the communist political system and the occupation of a professional position of prestige, also connected to the Western World” (Zamfir, 2009); and, on the other hand, the profession was kept within universities by the sociologists with qualifications who graduated in sociology between 1970–1977 and who were able to find research fields and teaching positions in universities for a short time. However, after the interdict of sociology as an academic discipline in 1978, no sociologist could fill in new positions in teaching or research in Romanian institutions.

The research institutes created after 1990 corroborated with the founding of the Romanian Association of Sociology in 1991 have also led to the promotion of sociology as a discipline and science in the public and institutional spheres. The

institutes of the Romanian Academy and of other private centers – for example, the Institute of Sociology, the Research Institute for the Quality of Life, the Center for Urban and Regional Sociology (CURS), the Institute of Public Opinion Polls and Marketing (IMAS) etc. – have contributed to the expansion of research activities in Romanian sociology. As such, the founding of the community of Romanian sociologists consists of four important temporal steps (Zamfir, 2009): *a.* the 1970s – when the first generation of sociologists with a degree in sociology appeared in Romania (1970); *b.* the year 1978 – when the students who were part of the sociology program lost their titles and the professional practices of sociologists were forbidden; *c.* the 1990s which marked the renaissance of sociology in the higher education system; *d.* finally, 1994 is the year when a new generation of sociologists graduated after approximately 27 years since the previous generation trained in sociology appeared.

In the research institutes and academic centers important journals of sociology were created, among which we mention: *Sociologie românească* (“Romanian Sociology”), 1990, published by the Romanian Association of Sociology, *Revista de cercetări sociale* (“The Journal of Social Research”), 1990, integrated into *Revista de sociologie românească* (“The Romanian Sociology Journal”) after 2003, *Revista română de sociologie* (“The Romanian Journal of Sociology”), 1972, published by the Institute of Sociology of the Romanian Academy, *Calitatea vieții* (“The Review of Research on the Quality of Life”), 1990, published by the Institute for the Quality of Life of the Romanian Academy, *The Romanian Journal of Sociology* (1990), published by the Institute of Sociology of the Romanian Academy, *Studia Universitatis, Analele de Sociologie* (*Studia Universitatis, the series of Sociology*), 1970, published by the Babeș-Bolyai University of Cluj-Napoca (according to <http://www.arsociologie.ro/sociologieromaneasca>).

The publishing opportunities have increased after 1990, and this has concerned both journals and books. A possible explanation for the growth of publications is due to the institutional development of sociology as an academic discipline in the new research institutes which were created after 1990 in the universities that have established new programs in social sciences (sociology). The growth of scientific production of sociological publications can be also explained by the opportunities published contributions gave their authors to accede to higher positions in education and scientific research fields. The year 2007 marked the integration of Romania into the European Union and this fact may have also influenced the development of scientific publications. The research topics selected to meet conditions so as to receive funding from European sources have had priority. The indicator of sociological research funding after 1990 is correlated to the “internationalization” of sociology by the funding sources available for research which influenced the growth of institutional level of sociological knowledge production.

The re-establishment of the Romanian sociology after 1990 has brought a variety of research topics that concern the emerging phenomena of post-communist Romanian society: the transition in our country, poverty, quality of life, social economy, the development of social policy, the problem of Roma population etc. These topics have also constituted the main interest of both national and international research institutions interested in the study of post-communist societies.

### SEVERAL CONCLUSIONS

The implications we dealt with in this article show precisely the difficulty of making a clear and precise analysis of the process of internationalization of sociology in Romania after 1989. First, the article debates the problem of a *Romanian public sociology* and the division of labor with four different components in which sociology should provide answers to the emerging social problems of a society, of communities, groups or individuals. “*Sociological knowledge for whom?*” and “*Sociological knowledge for what?*” are the two epistemological questions of this article, considered in order to describe the current topic of internationalization of the Romanian sociology after 1989. One conclusion is that the call for a public sociology promoted especially in American sociology will not change the problem of academic institutionalization of sociology in the societies of Eastern Europe. If sociology cannot be seen as a relevant discipline in today’s world, the hypothesis about the lack of both the reflexive and the policy-orientated sociology cannot be verified in the case of knowledge society (as Coleman believes). In this case, the knowledge production process cannot be seen as having become an internationalized one because the foreign interpretations of Romanian sociology reflect the national patterns of the institutionalization of sociology as a discipline which during the communist period survived only in the academic area.

The demonstration of this article demands a comparative analysis of the development of sociology in Eastern European countries during the communist period. In the study of the process of internationalization the language of publications is also an important indicator. In this respect we can notice that in the case of Romanian sociology most of the scientific journals created after 1990 have been published in Romanian (in English and French too, but less often).

As at the present moment there is a notable lack of Romanian studies about the post-communist development of sociology after 1989, we can state that the topics regarding the internationalization of sociology in Romania have a great potential in the development of research and critical analysis of the history of sociology in post-communist countries. In this article we express our hope that future research would contribute to the possible explanation of the national patterns of Romanian sociology viewed in its relationship with other cultural and social

contexts existing in the other Eastern European countries. The development of public sociology in Romania can also offer explanations of the involvement of sociological knowledge in society, especially into the public space, although Burawoy's theory of the new public engagement of sociology would be difficult to implement in the Romanian sociology. The call of public sociology should be analyzed through the professional practices of sociologists, as well as the utility of the research output for the implementation of public policies, including the academic and the extra-academic audiences (NGOs, associations, institutions or private actors).

To conclude, the new "knowledge society" requires social theories which can provide studies about the knowledge that shapes individuals' daily life, social developments, science innovations, but also about new societal risks. Coleman (1990) explains that the social role of sociology in a *new social structure* lies in explaining the functioning of today's society. In order to discover how society functions, it is necessary to contribute to "the application" of theoretical knowledge.

The reflexivity of sociology and its public role are both nationally and universally bound, and are integrated in a process of internationalization. This process includes transnational exchange but also international cooperation achieved by the circulation of the ideas and theories of key thinkers. Global sociology is addressing numerous publics existing concomitantly in the academic and extra-academic areas. While contemporary sociology is engaged in a division of labor, the main problem for the Romanian sociology is related to the institutional reconstruction of Romanian society and to the need of foundational research on public and social policies.

#### REFERENCES

1. BECK, U. [1986] (2001). *La société du risque. Sur la voie d'une autre modernité*. Paris: Alto Aubier.
2. BURAWOY, M. [2004] (2005). For Public Sociology. *American Sociological Review*, Vol. 70, No. 1, 4–28.
3. BURAWOY, M. (2005). Response: Public sociology: populist fad or path to renewal? *The British Journal of Sociology*, Vol. 56, Iss. 3.
4. COLEMAN, J. S. (1990). *Foundations of Social Theory*. Cambridge: The Belknap Press of Harvard University Press.
5. CALHOUN, C. (2008). in Kalleberg, R., Eliaeson, S. 2008. *Academics as public intellectuals*. Newcastle, Cambridge Scholars Publishing.
6. CALLON, M., (1986). *Some elements of a sociology of translation: domestication of the scallops and the fishermen of St Brieuc Bay* in J. Law. *Power, action and belief: a new sociology of knowledge?* London, Routledge, pp.196–223.
7. DURKHEIM, E. [1893] (1933). *The Division of Labor in Society*. New York: Free Press.
8. GIDDENS, A. (1990) (2000). *The Consequences of Modernity*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.
9. GOULDNER A. (1970). *The Coming Crisis of Western Sociology*. New York: Basic Books.

10. GUSTI, D. (1946). *Opere vol. IV. Sistemul de sociologie, etică și politică*. București.
11. HEILBRON, J. (1999). Towards a sociology of translation: Book translations as cultural world system. *European Journal of Social Theory*, 2(4), 429–444.
12. KEMPER, T. (1972). The division of labor: a Post-Durkheimian analytical view. *American Sociological Review*. Vol. 37, 739–753.
13. LARIONESCU, M. (2002). *Sociology – Romania*, in Kaase, M. et al. (eds.), *Tree social science disciplines in Central and Eastern Europa: handbook on economics, political science and sociology (1989-2001)*. At <http://www.ssoar.info/ssoar/handle/document/28123> 20.06.2014.
14. Report Task Force on Institutionalizing Public Sociology: “*Public sociology and the roots of American sociology: re-establishing our connections to the public*” ASA Council 2005. at <http://www.asanet.org/images/asa/docs/pdf/TF%20on%20PS%20Rpt%20%2854448%29.pdf>
15. SANDU, D. (1996). *Sociologia tranziției. Valori și tipuri sociale în România*. București: Staff.
16. SAPIRO, G. (2008). *Translatio. Le marché de la traduction en France à l’heure de la mondialisation*, Paris: CNRS Editions.
17. TOURAINÉ, A. (1978). *La voix et le regard*. Paris, Editions du Seuil.
18. TOURAINÉ, A. (2013). *La fin des sociétés*. Paris, Editions du Seuil.
19. TURNER, J. (2005). *Is Sociology such a good idea?* *The American Sociologist*, 36, 3–4, 27.
20. VERDERY, K. (1996). *What Was Socialism and What Comes Next?* Princeton University Press.
21. VLĂSCEANU, L. (2001). *Politică și dezvoltare. România încotro?* București, Editura Trei.
22. ZAMFIR, C. (2004). *O analiză critică a tranziției*. Iași, Editura Polirom.
23. ZAMFIR, C. (2009). *O istorie subiectivă în sociologia românească, din 1944 până în prezent*. Iași, Editura Polirom.