

A history of the Institute for Advanced Studies (IHS) in Vienna based on its key figures

Andreas Huber, Thomas König*

Abstract

The IHS was established in Austria with funds from an American foundation. With the intention to introduce modern empirical social and economic sciences to Austria (and Central Europe). After initial resistance, the institute was embraced by national political elites: in addition to providing postgraduate education for emerging scholars, it also functioned as a scientific think tank conducting applied, policy-relevant empirical research. This text provides a narrative account of the Institute's development and transformation, relying on specific metrics systematically evaluated from accessible sources, particularly annual budgets and staff composition. It portrays an organization consistently challenged by diverse expectations and grappling with the organizational and strategic limitations of deriving concrete objectives from this.

Introduction

The formal establishment of the *Institute for Advanced Studies* (IHS) in Vienna in 1963 explicitly aimed at bringing Austria up to international standards in economics and social sciences. It was, thereby, also intended to provide an impetus for the modernization of the country. With the support of the *Ford Foundation*, as well as Austrian institutions (Austrian Central Bank, Federal Government, City of Vienna), the institute established itself as a renowned postgraduate training center within a few years. It remains the largest social science research center outside of universities in Austria. From its beginning, the institute was strongly internationally oriented, attracting academic elites from around the world to Vienna. The two-year postgraduate program, spanning from 1965 to 2015, saw the participation of over 1,000 scholars and was a pioneering initiative in Europe.

Aspects of the history of the IHS have already been described in detail. There are accounts on the conflict-ridden founding years (Fleck 2000; Kramer 2002; König 2012a); in addition, there are

* This preprint is the English translation of a chapter originally written in German, and which will be published in spring 2024 as part of an edited volume on “Organisationsformen der Erkenntnisgewinnung”, in the book series “Organization & Public Management” (Springer). We are grateful to Clelia Castellucci for the first translation, which she conducted with the help of deepl.

analyses based on specific, valuable archival collections (Raith 2001; Fleck 2017a). At the institute, research on the state of social sciences in Austria (Knorr et al. 1974; Knorr, Haller, and Zilian 1981; Müller 1988; 2008) inevitably also revolved around the institute, with a spin-off project offering an early analysis of the organizational structure of the IHS (Marin 1978).

An anthology from the early 1990s with various contributions commemorating the institute's 30th anniversary may no longer align entirely with current research standards (Felderer 1993). Other (later) texts partially fulfil the aim of providing an overview but predominantly concentrate on what is now commonly referred to as the “governance” of the institute, focusing on specific periods (Fleck 2017b; 2018). Only in exceptional cases is the role of the IHS attempted to be contextualized from a more epistemological-historical perspective (König 2012b).¹

Despite the numerous inspections mentioned above, two gaps persist. The first gap is the absence of a comprehensive historical account of the IHS's history, and the second is the lack of an analysis of what this institute has actually achieved in terms of knowledge transfer and knowledge production over its approximately 60 years of existence.

While the present text can be viewed as an early outcome of a project aiming to address the second question,² it primarily focuses on the first gap — the comprehensive portrayal of the institute's history as an organization. It provides a narrative of the development and transformation of the IHS over the course of the first five decades of its existence. It is to be acknowledged as an obvious limitation of the present text, that without having analyzed and factored in the actual output in terms of research as well as graduates, such a comprehensive account cannot be deemed complete. Instead, this text brings together several time series that highlight continuities and ruptures in the institute's history.

Why has an institute that is relatively small and can only claim to have achieved a certain supra-regional significance in academic terms within the German-speaking region attracted so much attention to date? It is likely that the incentive to delve into the institute's history is rooted not only in its academic standing but also in the high expectations and aspirations associated with the institute from the very beginning. In fact, this is a consistent motif along which the history of the institute can be written, as we will conclude towards the end of this text.

The following text is structured as follows: first, we briefly discuss the time series underlying this text, which we have compiled from institutional sources. These time series only gain significance when considered in conjunction with, on the one hand, the analysis of historical sources— in the

¹ It is worth noting, as a footnote, that the attention devoted to the history of the IHS in research suggests that the institute itself can be described as a “model case”, as proposed by Monika Krause—namely, a “privileged material research object” to which a certain significance is attributed due to repeated analyses from various perspectives (Krause 2021).

² Specifically, the text was written as part of the research for the project “Survey of IHS graduates 1965-2015”, which is funded by the OeNB's Anniversary Fund (project number 18727).

case of this text specifically, the minutes of the meetings of the board of trustees (*Kuratorium*)—and, on the other hand, the science policy context in Austria. Through such interpretation, these time series enable the identification and empirically plausible understanding of continuities as well as breaks in the institute's history.

We identify breaks in the form of definable periods in the history of the institute, which we explain in more detail in the following sections. The presentation of these periods constitutes the main part of the text. Finally, and as an outlook, we look at the continuities that can be identified at the IHS over the period under investigation. In doing so, we differentiate between continuities concerning the organizational structure, continuities in terms of research, and continuities regarding the position of the IHS within the Austrian research landscape. We will conclude by discussing some of the findings.

Time series of the institute's history

Previous accounts of the history of the IHS have either focused on the analysis of sources (especially minutes of the board meetings, the reception of the IHS in the media, the directors' policies, etc.) or on the scientific output achieved at the institute. In other words, they are based on archival and data sources commonly used in organizational history, and undoubtedly of crucial importance to historical research. However, given that the research object is a specific organization and its development over several decades in a specific (and changing) context, these sources may not necessarily contribute to gaining a comprehensive understanding of the stability or dynamics of this organization, and of the underlying patterns or changes over the time. In contrast, our analysis is based on time series, i.e., historical data that is (largely) complete for the period from the founding of the institute in 1963 to the present.

Four dimensions of the organization's development are of interest; fortunately, the underlying time series can be reconstructed from available archival records. Those time series are the institute's budget (derived from annual financial statements); the headcount of the staff; the visiting professors (both extracted from annual reports); and the members of the board of trustees and of the institute's management. The present text focuses on a narrative representation of the institute's development and transformation; it does not provide an in-depth analysis or a reflection on these time series.³ Nevertheless, a brief overview of each of the four-time series is provided at the outset in order to capture the key insights from their development.

³ For a more detailed examination of these time series, we refer to a separate working paper explicitly prepared for this purpose, which is currently in the process of publication (König and Huber, forthcoming). Many insights in this regard have been drawn from the literature on the "historical turn" discussed in organization studies (Rowlinson, Hassard, and Decker 2014; Godfrey et al. 2016; Decker, Hassard, and Rowlinson 2021).

In terms of *funding*, it is evident that the IHS has had a fairly stable funding base over the six decades. The basic subsidy accounts for the largest share for most of this period (except for the brief phase from 1970 to 1973). It was early on financed from the Austrian federal budget, which was doubled in the early 1970s and then remained at a largely consistent level until the end of the study period. This can also be attributed to gradual withdrawal of other (public) funders, leaving the Ministry of Science and the National Bank as the main subsidizers; with only the entry of the Ministry of Finance as a funder representing a shift in the opposite direction. However, this new source only compensates for the reduction of funds by the Ministry of Science during that time (until 2011 when the Ministry of Finance definitively takes on the role of the primary financier). The overall increase in annual budgets from the early 1990s is almost exclusively explained by the influx of third-party funds in the form of projects, which became a steady source and accounted for nearly 45 percent—a notably high proportion.

In terms of *staff*, the absolute number of academic staff and their distribution across various status groups (scholars, assistants, department heads) can be taken into account. For the most part the number of staff at the institute remained largely the same, apart from a staff cut shortly after the institute's founding, which was quickly compensated for. From the 1990s onwards, the staff size increases significantly. In terms of departmental allocation, the three core departments – Sociology, Political Science, and Economics – remained largely equal in size until the end of the 1980s. It was from the growth in the 1990s onwards that Economics gained a disciplinary dominance, experiencing a significant growth in personnel. The department of Sociology also grew, but only moderately; the department of Political Science remained on the same level as before.

The institute had a strong international focus and invited scientific elites from all over the world to come to Vienna as *guest professors*. During the founding phase, the institute's management was able to attract renowned scholars such as the political scientist Jean Blondel, the political scientist and later US Secretary of State Henry Kissinger, the sociologist Talcott Parsons and the economist Martin Shubik for a stay of one or more months in Vienna. The prominence of the visiting professors is evident in the number of (later) Nobel Prize winners. Of the 92 economists who have received the Alfred Nobel Memorial Prize in Economic Sciences since its introduction in 1969, 15 have taught at the IHS.⁴ The highest density of later Nobel Laureates was recorded in the founding phase. In the 1960s (1963/64 to 1969/70), the institute had six later Nobel Laureates, in the 1970s just as many, including Kenneth J. Arrow and John R. Hicks, both laureates in 1972. The count dropped to zero in the 1980s but rebounded in the 1990s with another six visits from future Nobel

⁴ Four others had been invited. James Tobin was listed in both the budget and the curriculum for the academic year 1967/68, but ultimately did not appear to have come to Vienna. Similarly, Robert Aumann, Ragnar Frisch and Richard Stone had also received an invitation for the 1963/64 academic year.

laureates, including Ben Bernanke in June 1995, who last received the prize in 2022 (jointly with two other economists).⁵ After the turn of the millennium, there was a renewed decline. Also: those who had already received the Nobel Prize no longer came to the institute. For example, Arrow, who taught at Harvard University, had been at the IHS just a year before receiving the prize, with the institute incurring a cost of around 50,000 Schilling for his visiting professorship.⁶

Legally, the institute was set up as an association (“Verein”). It was headed by a *board of trustees* as the institute's most important decision-making body; for a considerable period, its powers included even staff appointments. The board consisted of an average of around 15 individuals from politics, academia, business, and the banking sector. On the one hand, the status of the various members of the Board of Trustees within their respective sector (from Austrian politics, for example, the Federal Chancellor alongside members of the Parliament, while from the private sector, CEOs from banks as well as industrials) is of interest. On the other hand, it is also relevant to which extent the mentioned sectors were represented in the oversight body. Interestingly, though not surprisingly, there is a general tendency that the members of the board of trustees progressively included fewer political top decision-makers.

The board convened for the first time on January 31, 1963, a day officially recognized as the founding date of the IHS. The initial seven members of the board were: President of the Austrian National Bank (ÖNB) Reinhard Kamitz, the Federal Minister for Foreign Affairs Bruno Kreisky, the Minister of Education Heinrich Drimmel, the Mayor of Vienna Franz Jonas, the former President of Bennington College in Vermont Frederick Burkhardt, the President of the Association of Austrian Industrialists Franz Josef Mayer-Gunthof and the lawyer and constitutional judge Wilhelm Rosenzweig. In the academic years 1968/69 and 1969/70, the number of members doubled, primarily due to the inclusion of general managers from the banking sector and university professors. This was intended to give the IHS more clout and secure its financial basis. However, the number of members of the Board of Trustees remained relatively stable in the following decades and only fell to less than ten in 2016.

1979/80 was a turning point in that only one member of the OeNB was represented on the Board of Trustees, compared to three previously (this only changed again under Director Felderer). Politics, business and banking continued to be represented on the Board of Trustees by their highest-ranking representatives, including the Federal Chancellor and the Federal Minister of Science in the 1970s. However, from the academic year 1994/95 onwards, neither the Federal

⁵ The results are based on multiple mentions. A few scientists came to the institute a second time, which is why the 15 Nobel laureates account for 18 guest professorships.

⁶ That's around 20,000 euros in today's purchasing power.

Minister of Education nor the Federal Minister of Science was present on the board. A decade later, active federal politicians had also disappeared from the board of trustees.

Over the six decades of the institute's history, a total of 78 men and women were elected to the Board of Trustees. 32 of them, (more than 40 per cent) were professionally involved full-time in politics, either before or during their tenure at the IHS. The proportion of former politicians never fell below one-third in any year, and from the academic years 1979/80 to 1993/94, it was consistently at least 60 percent. Almost half of these 32 politicians were affiliated with the two major (former) political parties, ÖVP (Austrian People's Party) and SPÖ (Social Democratic Party of Austria) – indicating that, for many years, appointments were made in line with the proportional representation system (“Proporz”).

Periodization of the institute's history

If we superimpose the different time series from over 50 years of the institute's history, notable changes and discontinuities occurred at closely spaced or even overlapping points in time (see Figure 1). It's obvious to conclude that these points in time represent (relatively short) transition phases. The (longer) phases in between these transitions, on the other hand, can be assumed to have been relatively stable periods. Each of these periods can be further characterized: from 1958 to 1970, a period of protracted establishment; from 1970 to 1979, a period of upswing; followed, from 1980 to 1991, by a period of stagnation; from 1991 to 2000, a renewed consolidation; from 2000 to 2011, a period of boom years. This was followed (relatively abruptly) by a phase of disorientation, which ended, at least formally, in 2015 with a fundamental reform of the organization and statutes (simultaneously ending the period under consideration).

Protracted establishment (1958 to 1970)

In the initial years of setting up and formally constituting the institute – with its official founding on January 31, 1963 – were characterized by a consecutive number of interruptions. The first director, Slawtscho Sagoroff, had to leave the IHS prematurely in 1965 due to internal disputes with the board, prompting economist Oskar Morgenstern to assume leadership. Simultaneously, the IHS experienced a significant decline in personnel – a consequence of the somewhat chaotic staff recruitment during the founding period. Issues such as assistants working full-time at the University of Vienna, earning a second salary without being physically present, were just one of several concerning occurrences. The institute's income also experienced a crisis, decreasing sharply in 1965/66. In 1967/68, the Ford Foundation's subsidies for the IHS were running out; eventually, the Republic of Austria, through the Ministry of Education, stepped in as a financier.

By the end of the 1960s, the situation gradually began to stabilize. The staff numbers recovered from 1967/68 onward, reaching the mid-1960s level again by the fall of 1969. Simultaneously, the institute's Board of Trustees managed to improve the financial situation. The budget still experienced significant fluctuations from 1967/68 to 1970/71. Consequently, the late 1960s (1967/68 to 1969/70) marked something akin to a second founding phase. Unlike in 1965, this period did not end with the removal of a director; this time, the stage was set for what – from an external perspective – could be considered a successful further development.

Upswing (1971 to 1979)

By 1970/71, the Board of Trustees had expanded, growing from seven to ten members. It included representatives from the highest echelon of government: Hertha Firnberg, the first female Minister of Science in Austria (the ministry had been established in 1970), and Bruno Kreisky, former Minister of Foreign Affairs and now Federal Chancellor. Additionally – and for the first time - two general directors of Austrian banks played a role in steering the institute's development: Franz Ockermüller from the *Österreichische Länderbank* and Josef Taus from the *Girozentrale* and *Bank der österreichischen Sparkassen*. From the academic year 1971/72 onward, the institute's financial situation stabilized, and subsidies remained constant in real terms for the following two decades.

The 1970s also brought some media attention. With the help of an IBM computer system, the IHS not only laid the foundation for comprehensive empirical social science research in Austria but also enabled election predictions. From the 1970 national elections onwards, director Gerhart Bruckmann presented these predictions to a million-strong audience on the Austrian Broadcasting Corporation (ORF). During the Bruckmann era (1968–1973), two new departments were established at the institute: Business Administration/Operations Research and Mathematical

Methods and Computer Techniques (MMC). The latter was a consolidation of the data center with the Department of Formal Sciences, with the label being the only truly new aspect.

Students aiming for postgraduate education at the IHS could now choose from five departments when applying, each with its own department heads, assistants, and guest professors responsible for their education. Following Bruckmann, former IHS scholar Gerhard Schwödianer headed the institute for six years. At the level of the directorate at least, a degree of stability had been established, contrasting with the initial five years after the official founding when there had been four directors in office.

Stagnation (1980 bis 1991)

Based on the entries in Figure 1, the 1980s appear to be a relatively quiet phase. Significant changes in revenues and personnel were not evident, and the internal structure of the IHS with its five departments remained unchanged. The only noticeable change was a brief decline in the number of scholars, but fluctuations in the number of trainees, all of whom had to pass an entrance examination, were not unusual in the history of the institute. However, changes can be observed in the governing bodies and among the visiting professors: by the end of the 1970s (1979/80), members of the *Österreichische Nationalbank* largely withdrew from the Board of Trustees. OeNB President Stephan Koren remained, serving as the president of IHS Board of Trustees. When he passed away in January 1988, 25 years after the institute's founding, someone from outside the Central Bank assumed the presidency for the first time: Heinrich Neisser, then still the Federal Minister for Federalism and Administrative Reform in the Federal Chancellery from the ÖVP.

The decline in visiting professorships from the USA and Canada can be interpreted as a sign of stagnation, if not even as an indication of loss of significance. In the 1960s still a unique feature of the IHS (with sometimes 50 percent of guest professors coming from overseas), now often only a fifth or fewer academics was coming from universities and other institutions in North America. This development was not gaining any publicity, of course; rather, the premature departure of systems scientist Anatol Rapoport attracted attention. However, this was probably not an issue for the public, but rather the premature departure of systems scientist Anatol Rapoport. Against his will, the Board of Trustees removed him from the position of director on December 31, 1983, and appointed former State Secretary in the Ministry of Finance Hans Seidel as his successor.⁸ Against his will, the Board of Trustees dismissed Rapoport as director on 31 December 1983 and appointed the former State Secretary in the Ministry of Finance, Hans Seidel, as his successor. The fact that

⁸ Cf. IHS Archive, minutes of the first meeting of the Board of Trustees of the 6th term of office on 9 November 1983.

many suspected a set-up behind this was probably not unfounded (Fleck 2018, 1004-5). In the following years, Seidel focused on managing the status quo.

Consolidation (1992 bis 2000)

After about a decade of stagnation and disorientation, the early 1990s witnessed the most significant upheavals in the institute's history to date. These changes were closely linked to the new director, Professor of Economics Bernhard Felderer, who, incidentally, moved from the University of Cologne to the Ruhr-University Bochum in the year of his appointment. Under Felderer's leadership, changes occurred in all the dimensions discussed here. Subsidies, but especially project funds, increased significantly in the second year of his directorship, mainly due to increased acquisition activities. The academic year 1992/93 marked the end of the Department of Business Administration/Operations Research; it was followed by MMC at the end of 1997/98. Instead, the Applied Economics program was introduced. Students of this program joined as a new group of trainees alongside scholars. Although the Applied Economics program was short-lived (until 1996/97), its introduction set the direction for the years to come: a focus on economics.

While the three core departments of Economics, Political Science, and Sociology had been roughly equally staffed for decades, from the 1990s onward, the pendulum swung in favor of Economics. The group of academic staff began growing in number from the academic year 1992/93 onwards. Two years later, the number of scholars was also increased, although they were, by now, far less well compensated in comparison to the early years of the institute. Starting from 1998/99, economics was equipped with a second department (“Applied Economics”, while the other one was now called internally “Teaching Economics”). It was probably not a coincidence that, from 1994/95 onwards, the National Bank once again engaged with three representatives in the Board of Trustees. For the first time in the institute's history, notably, no government member belonged to the Board of Trustees.

The increasing share of third-party funds in subsidies – from one-third in 1996/97 to 40 percent in 1998/99 – benefited not only the economics departments. With some delay, namely in the second half of the 1990s, Sociology also found its way into the new research environment and was able to significantly increase its personnel. Political Science, on the other hand, stagnated, meaning that the number of staff remained constant, but clearly losing significance in the context of the other departments. Increasingly, it led a niche existence at the IHS; maybe this was related to changing priorities at that time, but the departures of personnel in the academic years 2002/03 and 2007/08 likely also contributed to this.

Boom Years (2000-2011)

A closer look at the individual dimensions reveals growth that seemed almost unstoppable beyond the turn of the millennium. From the mid-2000s onwards, the number of scholars increased one last time, but interns, trainees, and student assistants were also increasingly used at the institute – especially, it can be assumed, in the context of project funding – to support its operations. Did the IHS overreach itself with this continuous expansion, particularly in the area of research staff? The ceiling for income was reached in the 2009/10 academic year, and first cracks in the teaching realm had already become apparent before then. While the IHS had been able to continue the tradition of attracting high-ranking university professors from North America to the institute in the 1990s, this changed in the early 21st century. By the academic year of 2004/05 at the latest, it was increasingly scientists from Austrian institutions who were responsible for giving the majority of courses in the postgraduate programs.

IHS employees also played an increasingly important role in this regard. For the academic year 2011/12, the decline of the training function is clearly evident from the graphs; the postgraduate programs were then formally discontinued in 2015. This year also marks the peak of the dominance of economists: no less than 71 percent of the scientific staff (excluding assistants and trainees) were affiliated with economics – a record that would not be surpassed thereafter.

Disorientation (2011 bis 2015)

The most recent phase in the history of the Institute for Advanced Studies was marked by controversies regarding conflicting expectations for the institute, leading to several years of disorientation. Christian Keuschnigg, who succeeded Felderer, resigned early after just over two years. Under financial pressure, he had proposed a new direction for the institute. Keuschnigg's plan was to eliminate the Sociology and Political Science departments and continue the institute as a research institute focused on economics. Theoretically, this aligned with the development of the previous two decades under Felderer; yet it faced internal opposition within the institute and did not convince the majority of the members of the Board of Trustees.

In 2015 and 2016, interim directors were appointed (first Sigurd Höllinger, then Thomas Czypionka). Eventually, a comprehensive realignment of the institute took place, albeit different from Keuschnigg's initial proposal. The postgraduate training programs (“scholarship program”) was discontinued, and the discipline-oriented departments were replaced by interdisciplinary, theme-oriented research groups. In mid-2016, Martin Kocher, coming from the University of Munich, took over the newly structured institute. He also introduced behavioral economics as a new research area. Kocher assumed leadership of the institute in its new building after the old location had to be finally abandoned, with the building dilapidated.

The changes were not yet complete: a new association statute was adopted, and the Board of Trustees was fully reconstituted—entirely new for the first time in its history: No member from the academic year 2012/13 remained in office by the end of 2016. Heinrich Neisser resigned as president and was succeeded by former federal and European politician Franz Fischler; Caspar Einem assumed the position of vice president. For the first time since 1967/68, the Board of Trustees had fewer than ten members. Bankers and university professors lost prominence, while the proportion of high-ranking civil servants increased. Yet even after almost 60 years, the percentage of board members with a political background remained high—in 2016, it was just under half.

Continuities

Organizations can be characterized by the way they distinguish themselves from the environment—both from other organizations and from the fuzzy area that the literature terms non-organizational.⁹ For a research organization, two dimensions are relevant in this regard: one is related to content (i.e., what is done or intended to be done at the institute in scientific terms), and the other to organizational structure. We would like to end this article by briefly noting the most significant continuities in relation to these two dimensions. In doing so, we also raise questions that must remain the subject of further, in-depth analysis of the institute's history.

In terms of content, the following continuities can be identified: the Institute's consistent focus on postgraduate training and the disciplinary orientation of its research and academic activities. With regard to training, it can be stated that, with considerable certainty, this was the essential defining and distinguishing feature of the institute vis-à-vis the academic environment (specifically, those Austrian universities where economics and social sciences were taught). This is true especially for the first three decades of its history. The relevance of the training function decreased in the later decades, but it likely retained a high identity-forming effect for the institute. In any case, it remained a continuous element until it was quite abruptly terminated in 2015. At the same time, it should be noted that there were drafts for the reorientation and strategic development of the institute in the management protocols, starting from the 1960s, which require a separate diachronic analysis.

The disciplinary orientation of the Institute's research and academic activities also represents continuity. It cannot be definitively stated to what extent this was due to the training program. Since the internal structure itself was organized into disciplinary departments, it is likely that resource conflicts at the institute might have been expressed in the form of epistemic disputes, which, in turn, may not have been conducive to internal cohesion.¹⁰ Conversely, it is noteworthy that – during the period of investigation - there were apparently very few attempts or initiatives to establish a common, conceptual, or theoretical foundation that went beyond the disciplines. Were there any such initiatives or attempts at all, in what context, and how were they received?

In terms of the organizational structure of the IHS, at least three continuities can be highlighted: the disciplinary internal structure of the institute, the role of the director as the institute's leader, and the changing composition of the Board of Trustees. In fact, while the institute has occasionally

⁹This general statement can be asserted not only for functionalist approaches, but also for systemic (Simon 2015), and neo-institutionalist (Brunsson 2020) approaches in organizational theory.

¹⁰The longevity of such attributions should be noted in passing. To this day, it is customary at the Institute to speak of “the” economists, “the” sociologists and “the” political scientists, even though the corresponding departments have not existed for more than seven years now.

expanded or dissolved departments within its internal structure during the investigation period, no alternative was considered. It was apparently taken for granted that the discipline-oriented departments, along with the library service (and later the IT department), would fulfil the central tasks of the IHS. The question to be clarified here is to what extent the opening and closing of departments was based on fundamental strategic considerations – and to what extent it was perhaps simply due to opportunity.

As far as the role of the director is concerned, there have been modifications in the distribution of work (initially, it was a two-person team, and from 1984 onwards, it became a single leadership position). However, the outstanding organizational significance of this leadership role has never been altered. This certainly aligns with the organizational self-image of many scientific institutions in general. What is notable about the IHS, however, is that there have been recurring multi-year phases characterized by the search for a suitable leader - both in the 1960s, in the late 1980s and at the end of our study period (from 2012 to 2016). It is no coincidence that the phases of a stable, multi-year directorship have also become defining periods, but from an historical perspective, these interim phases require an explanation: Why was it so challenging to fill this position with a person considered suitable during these times?

One reason could have been the presence of numerous (and perhaps insufficiently specified) expectations for this leadership position. This brings us to the third continuum, the Board of Trustees, which, among other responsibilities, oversees the appointment of the director. Over the period of investigation, we observe that the Board of Trustees is composed of high-profile individuals from the Federal Republic, with changes occurring. Initially, it consisted mainly of top politicians; later, bankers and industrialists were also involved. In recent decades, there is an increasing presence of former politicians and senior civil servants. However, there are no international figures on the Board of Trustee. It is noteworthy that the Board, as a group, undergoes changes in size without apparent strategic considerations – as if immediate (perhaps even political) reasons were sufficient. If this finding is reinforced by further source analysis, it once again points to a certain weakness in the overall organizational structure of the institute.

Summary and Outlook

Reflecting on the role of the institute in the historical context of Austria, it becomes evident that it held a prominent position in academic, political, and media contexts throughout the described periods. This was true regardless of the actual scientific productivity of the research conducted at the institute. How can this be explained? The desiderata formulated in the previous section not only serve the purpose of guiding further historical analysis of the IHS but also provide insights

into the institute's role in the science policy context of the Second Federal Republic from the 1960s onwards. It is not coincidental that during this period, science policy emerged as an independent policy field.

The IHS was a (still early) attempt at establishing a non-university institute in Austria after 1945, particularly notable in the context of the Second Republic.¹¹ It can be characterized as an early, and admittedly flawed, endeavor in scientific organizational founding within the then relatively limited landscape of research institutions. This explains the initially prominent composition of the Board of Trustees, as well as the procedural errors in organizational development: a politicized oversight body that, perhaps as a result, was unable to provide the institute with a realistically implementable mission; consequently, an unclear objective; and an apparently randomly formed internal structure, at least not evident from the available sources. However, this only partially explains why the institute perpetuated these errors and evolved as outlined above. It will be necessary to delve into the dynamics that the organizational development brought about and how the changing discourse in science policy influenced the institute.

As a result of the present depiction, a fundamental motive emerges for a historiography of the IHS. The institute was (and remained) equally a projection surface for high (though often diffuse) expectations and an organization that was overwhelmed with the tasks assigned to it. The former implies that the institute was repeatedly the object of different (and sometimes contradictory) academic and science policy expectations—and above all, it continued to be so. This affected members of the Board of Trustees, influential figures from academic and political circles, as well as staff members. The scientific goals of the institute were seldom explicitly formulated and even less frequently the subject of strategic planning and implementation. As a result, it was often unclear what “mission” (using the semantics of contemporary organizational development) the institute actually had. At the same time, this ambiguity itself provided grounds for further projections.

Simultaneously, the actual organization of the IHS struggled in many phases of its existence because it could not, at its own discretion, fulfill the – often only implicit - goals and tasks pursued by different actors with the available resources. This sense of organizational overwhelm is objectively understandable. To name just three of the most obvious poles that were consistently present within the institute: Should the institute focus on teaching or research? Should it engage in applied research or basic research? Should it concentrate on specific disciplines or operate in an interdisciplinary manner? Each of these poles provided points of connection for creating new projection surfaces, and (until 2015), no clear decision was made regarding where priorities should be set. This

¹¹ In his study on science policy in the early years of the Second Republic, König (2012a, 112–13) argues that Lazarsfeld and Morgenstern's strategy to establish the IHS as a non-university institute should also be understood against the backdrop of previous unsuccessful attempts to establish empirical social research within universities.

observation is made without diminishing the actual research achievements that were accomplished at the institute during this time.

A reason for the ambivalence and ambiguity regarding what the institute should achieve is embedded in its name: the designation *Institut für Höhere Studien und wissenschaftliche Forschung* (“Institute for Advanced Studies and Scientific Research”) practically invites a multitude of expectations. Those familiar with the Anglo-American system may – as early as the 1960s – have thought of Princeton and its “Institute for Advanced Studies”. Others may have taken the name literally: are “advanced studies” meant to be pursued here, or perhaps more valuable studies? The addition of “scientific research” also allows room for interpretation; which research directions are implied? The fact that there was no consistent answer to these questions remained a constitutive element of the IHS's history until 2015.

Literatur

- Brunsson, Nils. 2020. “Institution Und Organisation. Zur Gegenüberstellung von Zwei Schlüsselkonzepten.” In *Neo-Institutionalismus: Kritik Und Weiterentwicklung Eines Sozialwissenschaftlichen Forschungsprogramms*, edited by Raimund Hasse and Anne K. Krüger, 53–74. Sozialtheorie. Bielefeld: Transcript.
- Decker, Stephanie, John Hassard, and Michael Rowlinson. 2021. “Rethinking History and Memory in Organization Studies: The Case for Historiographical Reflexivity.” *Human Relations* 74 (8): 1123–55. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0018726720927443>.
- Felderer, Bernhard, ed. 1993. *Wirtschafts- und Sozialwissenschaften zwischen Theorie und Praxis. 30 Jahre Institut für Höhere Studien in Wien*. Heidelberg: Physica Verlag.
- Fleck, Christian. 2000. “Wie Neues Nicht Entstanden Ist. Die Gründung Des Instituts Für Höhere Studien in Wien Durch Ex-Österreicher Und Die Ford Foundation.” *Österreichische Zeitschrift Für Geschichtswissenschaften* 11 (1): 129–78.
- . 2017a. “Oskar Morgenstern Und Das Wien Nach 1945.” In *Return from Exile: Exiles, Returnees and Their Impact in the Humanities and Social Sciences in Austria and Central Europe = Rückkehr Aus Dem Exil*, edited by Waldemar Zacharasiewicz and Manfred Prisching, 431–56. Sitzungsberichte / Österreichische Akademie Der Wissenschaften, Philosophisch-Historische Klasse, 885. Band. Wien: Verlag der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften.
- . 2017b. “Warum Wien nicht zum mitteleuropäischen (Ausbildungs-)Zentrum der empirischen Sozialwissenschaften wurde.” In *Wissenschaft, Technologie und industrielle Entwicklung in Zentraleuropa im Kalten Krieg*, edited by Wolfgang L. Reiter, Juliane Mikoletzky, Herbert Matis, and Mitchell G. Ash, 155–208. Ignaz-Lieben-Gesellschaft: Studien zur Wissenschaftsgeschichte 1. Wien: LIT Verlag. http://www.litwebshop.de/index.php?main_page=product_info&products_id=13421.
- . 2018. “Geschichte Des Instituts Für Höhere Studien in Wien.” In *Handbuch Geschichte Der Deutschsprachigen Soziologie: Band 1: Geschichte Der Soziologie Im Deutschsprachigen Raum*, edited by Stephan Moebius and Andrea Ploder, 997–1007.

- Springer Reference Sozialwissenschaften. Wiesbaden: VS Verlag für Sozialwissenschaften. <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-658-07614-6>.
- Godfrey, Paul C., John Hassard, Ellen S. O'Connor, Michael Rowlinson, and Martin Ruef. 2016. "What Is Organizational History? Toward a Creative Synthesis of History and Organization Studies." *Academy of Management Review* 41 (4): 590–608. <https://doi.org/10.5465/amr.2016.0040>.
- Knorr, Karin, Max Haller, and Hans-Georg Zilian. 1981. *Sozialwissenschaftliche Forschung in Österreich. Produktionsbedingungen und Verwertungszusammenhänge*. Wien: Jugend und Volk.
- Knorr, Karin, Max Haller, Hans-Georg Zilian, Viktor Manhart, Stefan Mikinovic, Hermann Strasser, and Wolfgang Zehetner. 1974. "Situation der sozialwissenschaftlichen Forschung in Österreich." Vienna: IHS. <https://irihs.ihs.ac.at/id/eprint/343/>.
- König, Thomas. 2010. "'Konserven des Geistes': Semantischer Wandel in den hochschulpolitischen Debatten der frühen 1960er Jahre in Österreich." In *Tagungsband zum 7. Österreichischen Zeitgeschichtetag*, 64–71. Innsbruck; Wien; Bozen: Studienverlag.
- . 2012a. *Die Frühgeschichte des Fulbright Program in Österreich: transatlantische 'Fühlungsnahme auf dem Gebiet der Erziehung'*. transatlantica 6. Innsbruck: Studienverlag.
- . 2012b. "Vom Naturrecht zum Behaviorismus und darüber hinaus. Konzeptionelle Grundlagen der Disziplin Politikwissenschaft in Österreich." *Österreichische Zeitschrift für Politikwissenschaft* 41 (4): 419–38.
- . 2021. "Krise und neue Anforderungen. Das österreichische Hochschulregime 1920–1960 und die Kritik der frühen 1960er-Jahre." *zeitgeschichte* 48 (S1): 15–34. <https://doi.org/10.14220/zsch.2021.48.S1.15>.
- König, Thomas, and Andreas Huber. forthcoming. "The Case of the IHS. Reflections on Writing Organizational History." Vienna: IHS.
- Kramer, Helmut. 2002. "Wie Neues doch entstanden ist. Zur Gründung und zu den ersten Jahren des Instituts für Höhere Studien in Wien." *Österreichische Zeitschrift für Geschichtswissenschaften* 13 (3): 110–32.
- Krause, Monika. 2021. *Model Cases: On Canonical Research Objects and Sites*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press. <https://press.uchicago.edu/ucp/books/book/chicago/M/bo88749683.html>.
- Marin, Bernd. 1978. *Politische Organisation sozialwissenschaftlicher Forschungsarbeit: Fallstudie zum Institut für Höhere Studien, Wien*. Wien: Braumüller.
- Müller, Karl H. 1988. "Hochzeit der Sozialwissenschaften 1871-1938." In *Geschichte der österreichischen Soziologie: Konstituierung, Entwicklung und europäische Bezüge*, edited by Josef Langer, 51–69. Wien: Verlag für Gesellschaftskritik. <http://www.gesis.org/sowiport/search/id/iz-solis-90123813/>.
- . 2008. "Vier Etappen in der Entwicklung von Wissenschaft und Gesellschaft in Österreich seit 1918." In *Staat, Universität, Forschung und Hochbürokratie in England und Österreich im 19. und 20. Jahrhundert*, edited by Johann Dvorák, 115–74. Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang.
- Raith, Dirk. 2001. "Wien darf nicht Chicago werden. Ein amerikanischer Soziologe über Österreich, die Nazis und das IHS." *Österreichische Zeitschrift für Soziologie* 26 (3): 46–65.
- Rowlinson, Michael, John Hassard, and Stephanie Decker. 2014. "Research Strategies for Organizational History: A Dialogue Between Historical Theory and Organization

Theory.” *Academy of Management Review* 39 (3): 250–74.
<https://doi.org/10.5465/amr.2012.0203>.

Simon, Fritz B. 2015. *Einführung in die systemische Organisationstheorie*. 5th ed. Heidelberg: Carl-Auer Verlag GmbH.