

PUBLICATIONS OF THE ACADEMY OF FINLAND 2/12

RESEARCH PROGRAMME ON  
POWER AND SOCIETY IN FINLAND  
(VALTA) 2007–2010

EVALUATION REPORT



ACADEMY OF FINLAND

PUBLICATIONS OF THE ACADEMY OF FINLAND 2/12

RESEARCH PROGRAMME ON  
POWER AND SOCIETY IN FINLAND  
(VALTA) 2007–2010

EVALUATION REPORT

Members of the Evaluation Panel

Professor Marja Järvelä (chair)

Professor Jussi Hanhimäki

Professor Peter Kivisto

Dr Sakari Taipale (scientific secretary)

# ACADEMY OF FINLAND

The Academy of Finland is a leading public funding agency for cutting-edge scientific research in Finland. We finance high-quality and innovative research aiming at scientific breakthroughs, act as a science policy expert and strengthen the position of science and research.

The Academy has several funding opportunities to support researchers at different stages of their career. We also encourage researcher mobility in a number of ways: between universities and research institutes, within public administration and business and industry, and internationally as well. Our cooperation with research organisations and funding agencies in other countries is active and fruitful.

Academy funding is based on open competition and independent peer review. In 2012, we will make funding decisions worth about EUR 320 million. Each year, some 6,000 people work on Academy-funded projects.

The Academy of Finland is an agency within the administrative branch of the Ministry of Education, Science and Culture.

For more information, go to our website at [www.aka.fi/eng](http://www.aka.fi/eng)

ISSN 0358-9153

ISBN 978-951-715-824-4 (print)

ISBN 978-951-715-825-1 (PDF)

Page layout: DTPage Oy

Kopio Niini Oy, 2012

# CONTENTS

<b>1 The VALTA programme</b> .....	9
1.1 Introduction .....	9
1.2 Final evaluation procedure .....	13
<b>2 Evaluation</b> .....	14
2.1 Planning .....	14
2.2 Implementation .....	16
2.3 Researcher training .....	17
2.4 Collaboration and networking.....	18
2.5 Applicability of research and its importance to end-users.....	20
2.5.1 Policy-makers and policy debates .....	20
2.5.2 Public outreach .....	21
2.6 Recommendations .....	21
<b>Appendices</b>	
1 List of research projects and their funding .....	24
2 Steering Groups .....	27
3 Assignment letter of the evaluation panel.....	28
4 Programme for the evaluation panel meeting.....	30
5 Self-evaluation questionnaire .....	31

## DESCRIPTION

Publisher	Academy of Finland	Date	28 March 2012
Author(s)	Evaluation panel		
Name of publication	Research programme on power and society in Finland (VALTA) 2007–2010 Evaluation Report		
Abstract	<p>On 15 November 2005, the Academy of Finland Board, on a proposal by the Research Council for Culture and Society, decided to launch the Research Programme on Power and Society in Finland (VALTA). One goal of the programme was to produce broad-based research on power and its changes in Finland. Studies executed in other Nordic countries had shown that there was a real need for this kind of research in terms of research, public debate and international comparison. Another key goal was to produce new empirical findings on concrete processes of power. Moreover, the programme put an emphasis on the empirical study of power processes required in the examination of power mechanisms. After all, power is almost always exercised in concrete ways. In addition to scientific research on power, the programme encouraged high-profile multidisciplinary research as well as comparative perspectives. Also, it strengthened national and international networking and cooperation among researchers. Special attention was paid to the exchange of information and the reporting on research results. The programme also actively participated in public debate on power in Finland.</p> <p>With the VALTA programme, the Academy granted funding to 21 research projects for the period 2007–2010. The total funding amounted to 6.5 million euros.</p> <p>After the completion of the programme, an international evaluation panel of three experts assessed its success in attaining the objectives defined in the programme memorandum. The task of the panel was to assess the programme as a whole, and to reflect particularly on the following issues: programme planning; success in implementing the programme's goals and objectives; contribution to researcher training, domestic and international collaboration and networking; applicability of the research; and its importance to end-users (e.g. policy-makers, media, NGOs, citizens). Moreover, the panel was asked to provide recommendations for the further development of the Academy's programme activities. The scientific quality and impact of the programme were not assessed.</p> <p>The panel concludes that the programme had a distinct profile in comparison to other Nordic power programmes. The aim to cover as much of the thematic scope of the programme as possible resulted in a relatively large number of projects with scarce financial resources. Owing to the diversity of project topics, spontaneous networking and collaboration took place only to a minor extent. The panel considers the coordination of the programme successful. Among other recommendations, the panel suggests that the Academy consider incentives that would encourage researchers to view the research programmes as a step towards further research and not strictly tied to the period for which funding was awarded.</p>		
Keywords	power, society, research programme, research funding, evaluation		
Name and number of series	Publications of the Academy of Finland 2/12		
ISSN	0358-9153		
ISBN	Print 978-951-715-824-4	PDF	978-951-715-825-1
Number of pages	33		
Distributed by	Academy of Finland, POB 131, FI-00531 Helsinki, <a href="mailto:viestinta@aka.fi">viestinta@aka.fi</a>		
Published by	Academy of Finland		
Place and date of printing	Kopio Niini Oy, 2012		
Other information	<a href="http://www.aka.fi/publications">www.aka.fi/publications</a>		

# KUVAILULEHTI

Julkaisija	Suomen Akatemia		Päivämäärä
			28.3.2012
Tekijä(t)	Arviointipaneeli		
Julkaisun nimi	Research programme on power and society in Finland (VALTA) 2007–2010 Evaluation Report		
Tiivistelmä	<p>Suomen Akatemian hallitus päätti 15.11.2005 kulttuurin ja yhteiskunnan tutkimuksen toimikunnan esityksestä käynnistää Valta Suomessa -tutkimusohjelman. Ohjelman yhtenä tavoitteena oli tuottaa laaja-alaista tutkimusta vallasta ja sen muutoksista Suomessa. Muut pohjoismaiset tutkimukset olivat osoittaneet tällaisen valtatutkimuksen tarpeellisuuden niin tutkimuksen, kansalaiskeskustelun kuin kansainvälisen vertailtavuudenkin kannalta. Tutkimusohjelman toinen keskeinen tavoite oli tuottaa uutta empiiristä tietoa konkreettisista valtaprozessista. Tutkimusohjelmassa korostettiin vallan mekanismien selvittämisen edellyttävän ennen kaikkea valtaprozessien empiiristä tutkimista, sillä valta toteutuu lähes aina hyvin konkreettisella tavalla. Tieteellisen valtatutkimuksen ohella tutkimusohjelmassa rohkaistiin poikkitieteellisiä ja vertailevia näkökulmia, sekä tutkijoiden ja tutkimushankkeiden kansallista ja kansainvälistä yhteistyötä. Erityishuomiota kohdistettiin tiedonkulkuun ja tutkimustuloksista tiedottamiseen. Tutkimusohjelma osallistui aktiivisesti yhteiskunnalliseen keskusteluun vallasta Suomessa.</p> <p>Suomen Akatemia myösi Valta-ohjelmalla rahoitusta 21 tutkimushankkeelle vuosiksi 2007–2010. Ohjelmalle myönnettiin rahoitusta yhteensä 6,5 miljoonaa euroa.</p> <p>Tutkimusohjelman päätyttyä kolmesta asiantuntijasta koostuva kansainvälinen arviointipaneeli arvioi ohjelman onnistumisen ohjelmamuistioon kirjattujen tavoitteiden saavuttamisessa. Paneelin tehtävänä oli arvioida ohjelma kokonaisuudessaan kiinnittäen erityistä huomiota seuraaviin seikkoihin: ohjelman suunnittelu, ohjelman (ohjelmamuistioon kirjattujen) tavoitteiden saavuttaminen, panos tutkijakoulutukseen, kansallinen ja kansainvälinen yhteistyö ja verkottuminen, tutkimuksen sovellettavuus ja sen merkitys käyttäjille (esim. päätöksentekijät, media, kansalaisjärjestöt, kansalaiset). Lisäksi paneelilta pyydettiin suosituksia Suomen Akatemian tutkimusohjelmatoiminnan kehittämiseksi. Ohjelman tieteellistä laatua ja vaikuttavuutta ei arvioitu.</p> <p>Paneelin mukaan ohjelmalla oli muihin pohjoismaisiin valtatutkimusohjelmiin verrattuna oma erityinen luonteensa. Paneeli totesi, että pyrkimyksestä kattaa mahdollisimman paljon ohjelmamuistion temaattisista alueista oli seurauksena verraten suuri määrä niukasti rahoitettuja hankkeita. Hankkeiden aiheiden moninaisuudesta johtuen luontevaa ja omaehtoista verkottumista ja tutkimusyhteistyötä esiintyi vain vähän. Ohjelman koordinaation paneeli arvioi onnistuneeksi. Suosituksissaan paneeli mm. ehdottaa Suomen Akatemian harkittavaksi kannustimia, jotka rohkaisivat tutkijoita suunnittelemaan tutkimuksiansa ohjelmien rahoituskausia pidemmälle.</p>		
Asiasanat	Valta, yhteiskunta, tutkimusohjelma, tutkimusrahoitus, arviointi		
Julkaisusarjan nimi ja numero	Suomen Akatemian julkaisu 2/12		
ISSN	0358-9153		
ISBN	Painetulle kirjalle annettu tunnus 978-951-715-824-4	Pdf-versiolle annettu tunnus 978-951-715-825-1	
Sivumäärä	33		
Julkaisun jakaja	Suomen Akatemia, PL 131, 00531 Helsinki, <a href="mailto:viestinta@aka.fi">viestinta@aka.fi</a>		
Julkaisun kustantaja	Suomen Akatemia		
Painopaikka ja -aika	Kopio Niini Oy, 2012		
Muut tiedot	<a href="http://www.aka.fi/julkaisut">www.aka.fi/julkaisut</a>		

# PRESENTATIONSBLAD

Utgivare	Finlands Akademi	Datum	28.3.2012
Författare	Utvärderingspanel		
Publikationens namn	Research programme on power and society in Finland (VALTA) 2007–2010 Evaluation Report		
Sammandrag	<p>Beslutet att starta forskningsprogrammet Makten i Finland fattades av Finlands Akademis styrelse den 15 november 2005 på förslag av Akademins forskningsråd för kultur och samhälle. Ett syfte med forskningsprogrammet var att initiera övergripande forskning kring makten och dess förändringar i Finland. Motsvarande undersökningar som gjorts i andra nordiska länder hade visat att en sådan maktstudie var viktig med tanke på såväl själva forskningen, medborgardebatten som internationella jämförelser. Ett annat viktigt syfte med programmet var att ta fram ny empirisk kunskap om konkreta maktprocesser. Därför betonade programmet att en utredning av maktens mekanismer framför allt förutsätter empiriska studier av maktprocesserna, eftersom makt nästan alltid tar sig uttryck i mycket konkreta former. Förutom vetenskaplig maktforskning skulle programmet också uppmuntra tvärvetenskapliga och jämförande forskningsgrepp samt främja nationellt och internationellt samarbete mellan forskare och forskargrupper. Programmet skulle särskilt intensifiera informationsutbytet och spridningen av forskningens resultat samt påverka den samhällsdebatten om makten i Finland.</p> <p>Akademien beviljade inom forskningsprogrammet finansiering till 21 forskningsprojekt för åren 2007–2010. Den sammanlagda finansieringen var 6,5 miljoner euro.</p> <p>Efter att programmet avslutats utvärderade en internationell panel bestående av tre experter programmets resultat i förhållande till de mål som ställts i den ursprungliga programbeskrivningen. Panelen hade som uppgift att utvärdera programmet i sin helhet och fästa särskild uppmärksamhet vid följande: programplaneringen, hur programmets mål uppnåtts, insatser på forskarutbildning, nationellt och internationellt samarbete och nätverksarbete, forskningens tillämpbarhet och betydelse för användare (beslutsfattare, medier, medborgarorganisationer, medborgare). Panelen skulle också komma med rekommendationer för att utveckla Akademins programverksamhet. Utvärderingen gällde inte programmets vetenskapliga kvalitet och genomslag.</p> <p>Programmet hade enligt panelen en alldeles egen karaktär jämfört med liknande forskningsprogram i de övriga nordiska länderna. Panelen konstaterar att strävan att täcka så många av programbeskrivningens temaområden som möjligt ledde till ett förhållandevis stort antal projekt med knappa medel. Temanas mångfald gjorde också att det förekom mycket lite naturligt och spontant forskningssamarbete. Panelen anser däremot att programkoordineringen lyckades bra. Panelen rekommenderar bl.a. att Akademien överväger att införa incitament som skulle uppmuntra forskare att planera sina projekt på ett mer långsiktigt sätt och inte bara för en viss finansieringsperiod.</p>		
Nyckelord	makt, samhälle, forskningsprogram, forskningsfinansiering, utvärdering		
Seriens namn och nummer	Finlands Akademis publikationer 2/12		
ISSN	0358-9153		
ISBN	Tryck 978-951-715-824-4	Pdf 978-951-715-825-1	
Sidantal	33		
Distribution	Finlands Akademi, PB 131, 00531 Helsingfors		
Förlag	Finlands Akademi		
Tryckeri/tryckningsort och -år	Kopio Niini Oy, 2012		
Ytterligare information	<a href="http://www.aka.fi/publikationer">www.aka.fi/publikationer</a>		

# 1 THE VALTA PROGRAMME

## 1.1 Introduction

### Background

Finnish society and its power structure – the political system, economy, justice system, culture and public administration – have changed significantly over the past few decades. Finland has become a member of the European Union and the European Monetary Union, Finnish companies have become increasingly international, and the Finnish economy is now thoroughly integrated into the global economy. Finnish power and democracy face new external and internal challenges. International actors, such as in the EU, as well as the process of Europeanisation, have a major impact on Finnish power inquiries. Moreover, the Finnish power structure has changed from within. Finland has enacted a new constitutional law, updated its central agency system, increased the economic decision-making power of municipalities, and updated executive and administrative protocols for public administration. The state ownership policy has undergone a major paradigm shift. The importance of different institutions has fluctuated considerably in various historical situations. In the Finnish power structure, organisations and associations, such as political parties, trade unions, sports associations and the church, have traditionally played a key role in elite recruitment and in legitimising power. The use of power in Finland has also been shaped by differences in income, work, geography, religion, gender and ethnicity. The power structures of the Finnish welfare state and its consensus politics are under pressure to change.

The Nordic countries Sweden, Denmark and Norway have examined the national impact of these changes by conducting extensive scientific power inquiries. In Sweden, several power inquiries have been carried out, the most recent of which began in 1997. In Denmark and Norway, the respective parliaments initiated five-year power inquiries in 1998. These Nordic studies on power have produced new knowledge at the conceptual and empirical level, which inspired both national and international debate. The results of research conducted in these countries have also been easily comparable. However, no such power inquiries had been lately conducted in Finland, and no parliament-funded inquiry was initiated, despite the major restructuring of various key institutional elements in society.

Given this background, it was found crucial to ask, in a conventional sense, who has power, and in the spirit of new theories on power, how power produces these differences and what their meaning is within and for Finnish society. Also, it was regarded important to examine how social differences, such as in income and education, result in different positions and opportunities in relation to power. For Finland, the study of these complex processes relates to the above mentioned Nordic studies on power, but it also produces new knowledge on the specific characteristics and historical differences of Finnish power structures as compared to those of the other Nordic countries.

Even though there had been some heated debates on some of the individual processes described above, the broader



policy changes had been largely enacted without an extensive public debate. Therefore, one goal of the Academy of Finland's Research Programme on Power and Society in Finland (VALTA) was to produce this kind of broad-based research on power and its changes in Finland, and act as one starting point for further analyses of power. The other key goal of the research programme was to produce new empirical findings on concrete processes of power. As stated in the programme memorandum, the main goals were: (1) to support top-level research groups and encourage high-profile multidisciplinary power research; (2) to strengthen national and international networking and cooperation for researchers and research projects and to consolidate new forms of cooperation between research groups; (3) to conduct comparative research on power in Finland, thus shedding light on the specific characteristics of Finnish power structures and power mechanisms, as well as giving thought to their similarities and differences in relation to other countries and cultures; (4) to promote the application of new perspectives and research methods for power research; (5) to promote the international mobility of researchers; and (6) to improve the exchange of information and reporting of research results among researchers, decision-makers, interest groups and the public at large, and influence the public debate on power in Finland.

The programme encouraged the use of various approaches in the research of power because, first of all, according to current thinking, the concept of power is complex, and secondly, only by utilising different approaches will it be possible to produce new knowledge about power in Finland. According to the programme

memorandum, research efforts were focused on the following six themes, the choice of which was based on the above mentioned international developments, national changes and research conducted in other Nordic countries.

(1) *International system, power in Finland and Finnish power.* Research on this theme was meant to focus on questions such as "What are Finland's possibilities for operating in an increasingly integrated world and Europe?" and "Who has the power to control these processes?" These inquiries did not focus exclusively on political and economic issues. In contrast, they were also approached in such areas as human rights, culture, justice and morality systems, and religious phenomena.

(2) *Power in the state and state power.* Key questions on this theme were the following: What changes are apparent in power relations between different institutions?; How have elite structures changed?; How has the significance of expertise become emphasised?; What significance do these changes have on democracy?; What are the legal impacts of internationalisation, i.e. how have international agreements and EU legislation affected the power structures and mechanisms in Finland?

(3) *Economy and power.* Economic globalisation has created an image of economic power extending nearly everywhere. Hence, the following key questions were raised: What are the dimensions of power and impact of the global economy, integrated markets, new market areas, the increased importance of international competitiveness and a tightening EU on changes to economic power?; What kind of upheaval has the Finnish economic system experienced?;

and Is economic power expanding?  
Economic power is also used by labour market organisations at the national and EU level. Therefore, another key question was: How have the power they exercise and their operating methods changed?

(4) *Citizens and civil society.* With regard to this theme, the research programme was expected to provide answers to the following kinds of questions: How can power be located and conceptualised from the point of view of citizen participation?; What will the citizen participation that is currently undergoing a process of change look like in the future?; What are the possibilities for citizen participation and social movements in 21<sup>st</sup>-century Finland?; Are there societal factors that constrain citizen participation?; and What is the organisational power of the trade union movement? It was pointed out that gender, generations and age, as well as ethnicity and different identities, shape citizen participation in important ways. Moreover, questions concerning the impact and influence of citizen participation were found to be crucial: Does citizen participation have any power in today's Finland?; What kinds of alternatives does it provide for the current political structures?; What kind of interaction does it enjoy with the traditional political system?; How is citizen participation portrayed in the Finnish public and the public forum?; What is the interplay between citizen participation and the media?; and How about the significance of counter publicity? Furthermore, attention was directed to passivity and non-participation – not all members of society necessarily want to be involved. What does passivity signify in Finland, what are the reasons for it and what does it include? How are non-participation and

discrimination related to one another?  
How can one exercise power by refusing to participate in social movements, other forms of organisation or citizen participation as defined by society? The above mentioned questions could also be approached from the perspective of historical change.

(5) *The media and power.* When it comes to power inquiry, the restructuring of the Finnish media, its relationship to other sectors of the power structure and media operating principles were regarded as crucial areas. What is the significance of the media economy, changes in ownership structures, consolidation, the formation of chains and convergence in relation to power? What impact does commercialisation, the internationalisation of ownership, increase in output expectations, tabloidisation and sensationalism have on the media's exercise of power? Are claims that the media distorts reality at the expense of public image true and is the media too eager to take sides on issues? How does the media operate in power relationships? Does it passively reflect power structures or is it actively creating them? In what ways does the media play a lesser role or have no importance whatsoever?

(6) *Gender and power.* In this theme, the major challenge was to explain and understand how power is gendered in Finland. Central issues were changes in society's prevailing gender order and its gender contract, as well as the gendered impact of the retrenchment of the welfare state. The deconstruction of concepts such as "Finnish equality" was also seen important when studying gender and power.

## Preparation and organisation

The need for a thorough analysis of various elements of power in Finnish society was discussed initially at the Academy of Finland's Research Council for Culture and Society in February 2004 as one possible field to explore for a larger research programme of the Academy. Many scientific associations and communities found this question equally worth exploring, and in spring 2004 the Westermarck Society issued an initiative to the Academy on launching a research programme on the Finnish power system. In September 2005, the Research Council for Culture and Society decided to propose that the Power in Finland Research Programme be initiated, and in February 2005, the Board of the Academy issued negotiation authority to the Research Council to prepare the programme. On 15 February 2005, the Academy also set up a working group consisting of members of the Research Council for Culture and Society and added members to it on 20 May 2005. Also, it set up a working group including the following members: Professor Kyösti Pekonen (Chair), Professor Anne Kovalainen (Vice Chair), Research Professor Matti Heikkilä, Adjunct Professor (Docent) Päivi Hovi-Wasastjerna, Professor Juha Sihvola and Professor Pasi Puttonen.

In May 2005, the working group organised an exploratory workshop in Helsinki. In all, 180 participants attended this event. The discussion was opened by a panel of six members, representing public administration, the political system, business, culture, the science community and the media. Thereafter, the participants divided into six thematic groups and prepared a presentation on research needs. The working group used the feedback

from the exploratory workshop in making the programme memorandum.

The Research Council for Culture and Society decided at its meeting on 16 September 2005 to propose that the Power in Finland Research Programme be started, and on 15 November 2005, the Board of the Academy of Finland decided on the budget allocation and programme implementation for the years 2006–2010.

## Selection and funding of projects

For the selection of projects to be funded, a programme sub-committee was appointed. It included Professor Kyösti Pekonen as Chair (Research Council for Culture and Society), Professor Pasi Puttonen as Vice Chair (Research Council for Biosciences and Environment) and Professors Eila Helander and Anne Kovalainen as members (both from the Research Council for Culture and Society).

The programme's steering group included all members of the sub-committee, as well as the following experts: Research Professor Matti Heikkilä (Research Council for Culture and Society), Professor Michele Micheletti (Karlstad University), Professor Matti Pohjola (Helsinki School of Economics), Professor Øyvind Østerud (University of Oslo) and Professor Juha Tolonen (University of Vaasa). The tasks of the steering group were to prepare the programme and submit to the programme sub-committee a proposal on projects to be funded; to manage the programme and answer for the programme follow-up; to be responsible for the final evaluation; and to supervise the coordination of the programme. (For details concerning the Steering Group, see Appendix 2.)

The application process was divided into two stages. At the first stage, expiring on 31 January 2006, applicants were invited to submit their letters of intent on the proposed research. Altogether 114 applications were submitted, and the sub-committee selected 55 of them for the second round of the call. The full applications were collected by 28 April 2006 and evaluated in September, in an international panel of seven experts: Professor Jean-Pascal Daloz (CNRS), Professor Gerd Kopper (TU Dortmund University), Professor Gregor McLennan (University of Bristol), Professor Mårten Palme (Stockholm University), Professor Judith Squires (University of Bristol), Professor Bo Stråth (European University Institute) and Professor Kay Lawson (University of Paris 1).

On the basis of these evaluations, the programme sub-committee granted altogether EUR 6.5 million to 21 research projects on 23 October 2006 (see a list of all funded projects in Appendix 1). The four-year funding period started at the beginning of January 2007.

## 1.2 Final evaluation procedure

After its completion, the research programme was evaluated by an international panel of experts. The panel was chaired by Professor Marja Järvelä (University of Jyväskylä) and its members were Professors Jussi Hanhimäki (University of Geneva/FiDiPro Professor

at University of Tampere) and Peter Kivisto (Augustana College/FiDiPro Professor at University of Turku). Dr Sakari Taipale (University of Jyväskylä) acted as the scientific secretary of the panel (see Appendix 2). The panel was expected to assess the programme as a whole, not any individual projects, and to reflect especially on the following issues:

1. Planning of the research programme
2. Success of the implementation of the programme goals and objectives (as laid out in the programme memorandum)
3. Contribution to researcher training
4. Collaboration and networking within the programme and internationally
5. Applicability of research and its importance to end-users (policy-makers, the media, NGOs, citizens etc.)

What is more, the panel was asked to propose recommendations for the future planning and implementation of Academy of Finland research programme activities.

The basis of the evaluation was formed by the final reports of the funded projects, the researchers' self-evaluations and other materials directly related to the activities of the programme, such as a media analysis prepared by the Academy of Finland Communications Unit. Moreover, in its meeting in Helsinki on 25–26 October 2011, the panel interviewed a number of the programme's key persons.

## 2 EVALUATION

### Authors

Professor Marja Järvelä (chair), Professor Jussi Hanhimäki, Professor Peter Kivisto, Dr Sakari Taipale (scientific secretary)

### Abstract

The Research Programme on Power and Society in Finland (VALTA) was launched in 2005 and ran for four years from 2007 to 2010. The principal aim of the programme was to produce “broad-based research on power and its historical changes in Finland”. It was the first research programme with power as the focus since the 1970s in Finland, while in other Nordic countries similar programmes, although with a specific focus on parliamentary power, had been implemented more recently. The Academy of Finland allocated funding for altogether 21 research projects with a total sum of EUR 7 million.

The task assigned to the evaluation panel was to assess the planning and implementation of the programme, how the programme contributed to researcher training, collaboration and networking (both within the programme and internationally), to evaluate the applicability of research, and to propose recommendations for future research programmes. The scientific quality and impact of the programme were not assessed.

The panel concluded that the programme managed to build a distinct profile in comparison to other Nordic power programmes. The ambitious aim to cover as much of the thematic scope of the

programme memorandum as possible resulted in a relatively large number of projects with scarce financial resources. Owing to the diversity of project topics, spontaneous networking and collaboration between projects took place only to a minor extent. However, the panel considered the coordination of the programme successful, although most of the steering committee members appear to have played a decreasing role during the course of the programme. Among other recommendations, the panel suggests that the Academy of Finland consider incentives that would encourage researchers to view the research programmes as a step towards further research and not strictly tied to the period for which funding was awarded.

### 2.1 Planning

The atmosphere was in general favourable for the planning of the programme. No research programme with a similar focus had been launched in Finland since the 1970s. Studying power was therefore expected to pose a significant challenge for researchers as concerns theory, methods and empirical inquiries. Some recent experiences of programmes with a power focus were found in other Nordic countries, but the ambition was to build a programme with its own profile rather than replicate some other programme. More specifically, it was thought that the Academy of Finland would be in the best position to contribute to the knowledge on power by launching a research programme with a strong basic research profile that would be highly independent from the current parliamentary bodies or other decision-making powers.

The Academy's Research Council for Culture and Society endorsed the programme initiative by launching an exploratory workshop to discuss the main topics. Many potential applicants were involved and it seemed that this procedure was generally experienced positively as it worked in a bottom-up manner and raised interest among the relevant experts. According to some perceptions, the workshop already gave impetus to a few central topics. On the other hand, some doubts were raised as to the reach of the invitation. This critical point was particularly made with reference to the idea that the exploratory workshop, in fact, was seen to give some advantage to the participants with an early overview of the application process.

The rather open preparation process advanced by the workshop was, perhaps, also a factor that contributed to the idea of keeping the scope of the programme relatively broad. However, this seemed also to be the intention of the Research Council for Culture and Society. The Research Council seemed eager to give space for new conceptual entries and empirical focuses instead of delimiting the scope to the more conventionally understood power studies. A second motivation apparently lies in the fact that, in a small country, it is difficult to create real competition among applicants if the programme is too rigorously defined.

In planning the programme, some further challenges for the Research Council were set by the general norms pertaining to research programmes, namely multidisciplinary and international networking. Firstly, there are no traditions of power studies in Finland that would consistently cross the boundaries of the Academy's four Research Councils. The

members of the Research Council for Culture and Society were, however, looking for such transposing and found some promising channels to reach out towards the Research Council for Biosciences and Environment. In this way the requirement of multidisciplinary was met even on the trans-council level. Nevertheless, the challenge of multidisciplinary remained important also within the social sciences where different conceptual and empirical traditions in power studies had developed in parallel without entering much into discussion with each other over the last few decades. Even international networking represented a conspicuous challenge because one of the main interests was to contribute systematically to the knowledge about Finnish society. Further, it could be expected that the heretofore established international networks of the potential applicants were in many cases rather sporadic instead of being carefully and steadily organised over time.

One consequence of the broad scope of the programme entailed the problem of balanced project selection. Even if the scientific quality of proposals stood out as the most legitimate basis to fund a project, another significant aim seemed to be to cover as much of the thematic scope of the programme memorandum as possible. Since the disbursement for the programme was constant, the aim of covering the entire breath of the memorandum led to difficulties in adequately funding all of the selected projects.

A further point of interest is the timing of the programme. The effective period of funding was four years, which seems reasonable for carrying out scientifically valuable research projects. However, with the planning and selection of projects, the

actual life span of the programme was at least six years. This is a considerable investment in terms of time and money, and it is worthwhile to ask what the eventual measures were to make use of the results. From the point of view of the programme management, it seems that no clear plan was made for the post-programme time period.

## 2.2 Implementation

According to the programme memorandum, the EUR 7 million reserved for funding a variety of projects germane to the topic at hand would be allocated for a period of up to four years, with other related Academy-funded projects having the ability to being annexed to VALTA projects if such annexation was deemed advisable by the steering committee. This was one of the duties of the steering committee, the range of which was summarised as follows:

- to prepare the programme and submit to the programme sub-committee a proposal on projects to be funded
- to manage the programme and answer questions for the programme follow-up
- to be responsible for the final evaluation
- to supervise the coordination of the programme.

For their part, project principal investigators were not only responsible for the general ongoing administration and oversight of their projects, but for insuring that their respective projects operated in terms of the overall goals of the programme. Two specific expectations identified in the programme memorandum were: (1) that PIs were to insure that members of their research teams actively participated in events scheduled by the programme coordinator; and (2) that the PIs were to engage in sustained contact with their Nordic counterparts, including

both individual researchers and research institutions.

It would appear that the steering committee played an active role during the gestation and initial phase of the programme, including the efforts made to insure that information about programme objectives and goals were widely disseminated in the draft stage in an attempt to insure that researchers throughout Finland interested in various ways in the topic of power would both know about the planning phase and have an opportunity to provide input into the ultimate design. However, that role appears to have tapered off once the programme was up and running, and in particular as it entered its later stages. This meant, for example, that some of the tasks it had been charged to oversee were left to the programme coordinator, who in the panel's opinion did a commendable job, but no doubt would have benefited by additional support.

One of the recurring concerns or complaints raised by those selected to participate in the programme was that their funding had in most instances been cut, often substantially, from the levels requested in their applications. This was done in order to include as many projects as possible, a decision made necessary by the initial choice of casting a very wide and inclusive net in terms of what sorts of projects qualified, articulated in the identification of seven themes that the Academy of Finland wanted addressed by one or more projects. Seeking to do something different from power studies conducted in the other Nordic countries, which tended to focus solely or primarily on a more conventional political power, this was perhaps inevitable. In order to insure that research on power in other arenas of social life were covered

adequately, it was deemed necessary to fund a relatively large number of projects, and given that the total allotment of funds for the programme was not increased, cuts were necessary. Thus, the dissatisfaction with funding levels on the part of project PIs was predictable from the outset.

Furthermore, in order to insure coverage of all of the areas that the programme memorandum identified, project selection could not simply rely on the respective rating each application received by its outside reviewers. On the contrary, the final ratings of some applicants who were ultimately rejected were higher than some who were selected. Although the three applications that received the highest mark of 5 were included, three applicants who received scores of 4 were rejected while five applications with scores of 3 were selected. This is at least in part a reflection of the fact that the number of applications for each of the seven themes varied considerably, ranging from only three for both “The Media and Power” and “Culture and Power” to a high of 22 for “Power in the State and State Power”. The extent to which this situation contributed to the unevenness in results, such as the difference between those projects that published a lot and published in high-impact venues versus those that published considerably less and in less influential outlets is difficult to determine, but it can be assumed that it probably played a role.

### 2.3 Researcher training

Researcher training was not the first priority identified in fulfilling the programme’s objectives. This was obvious because other major measures had recently been taken in Finland for endorsing doctoral studies. During the last decade, considerable effort had been made at the national level to build up both disciplinary

and thematic PhD training programmes, and apparently there were even new major plans being considered to strengthen the role of the universities in embarking on their own programmes. Simultaneously, due to the considerable number of completed doctoral degrees, it has been acknowledged that there is a great need to increasingly invest in the postdoctoral careers of young researchers, since the universities have resources for guaranteeing uninterrupted careers only to very few young researchers at the postdoctoral phase. Therefore, basic research funding sources, and the Academy of Finland in particular, have recently acquired a major role in enhancing postdoctoral research careers.

In spite of the recent changes in the medium of organising doctoral studies in Finland, it seems that the research projects in the VALTA programme were still providing a considerable number of opportunities for pursuing doctoral studies. In fact, the majority of the projects had hired one or more students at least for part of their effective life span. Simultaneously, there were, however, also many young researchers employed who had already reached the doctoral diploma. It is difficult to say whether the balance between the two should be considered appropriate, but in any case the great number of PhD students – some of them funded for a very short period – reflected to some extent the transition towards a new positioning of researcher training as described above.

Considering the number of postgraduate students in the programme, it is important to ask what the main advantages of having these students participate in the projects were. According to the interviews performed by the panel, the advantages were to some extent seen differently



depending on the interviewee's professional category. However, principal investigators had mutually divergent views on whether PhD training should be a vital task of the programme. On the other hand, the PhD students interviewed expressed very clearly and unanimously that being part of a major research programme was a great source of inspiration to them and made an important channel of access to academic life. The programme gave them a touch of the "real world", which is to say, a hands-on perspective concerning what academic practices are all about, whether this involves thinking about writing articles, defending arguments in workshops or conferences, or speaking to different audiences.

With regard to scientific output, it is interesting to consider how the academic writing efforts of the PhD students or young researchers in general were integrated to the overall scientific achievements of the projects. It is obvious that disciplines have different traditions in academic writing, and working in interdisciplinary teams entails an extra challenge to all those participating in these writing teams. The programme provided a great variety of opportunities for young researchers to learn through joint efforts with more experienced colleagues and to improve their writing skills. On the other hand, there is a long-term tradition of solo writing in social sciences, however, with supervision by seniors. Hence, many PhD students delivered as sole authors papers that were accepted as international peer-reviewed articles, some of them with the purpose of including them as part of their PhD thesis. Thinking of their future careers, this can be commendable, yet, the other alternative of writing as a member of the group is also highly appropriate from an educational perspective.

One important issue related to the advantages of researcher training in the programme was the opportunities made available for academic mobility. It seems that the programme provided quite a few opportunities for young researchers for international networking and, in the best case, an opportunity to stay for a few months in universities outside Finland where regular cooperation had already been established by the research team. These students probably benefited most, as they no doubt made contacts that could be very helpful during their future careers. Unfortunately, the period of working abroad was usually short, often less than six months. Further, there were hardly any examples of similar academic mobility to Finland. Even if this results mostly from the fact that Finnish society had been defined as the main focus of the programme, it is recommended that the Academy of Finland try to find effective measures to improve the balance of academic exchange in researcher training.

In all, the panel concluded that well organised projects with good international networks can contribute substantially even to researcher training without needing to abandon any of the core activities of their scientific work.

## 2.4 Collaboration and networking

The 21 discrete projects funded by the Academy of Finland in the VALTA programme were located in separate departments or research units at eight institutions and each project was designed to be a free-standing initiative constructed around its own set of research questions, data, methodology and theoretical perspective. At the same time, in seeking to achieve what has been described as the "value added" dimension to the overall project, the goal was to arrive at the end of

the programme with its overall results being more than the sum of the achievements of each individual project. One way of promoting this goal was to encourage collaboration within the programme itself – or in other words among various projects – and with relevant international counterparts.

From the planning stage to near the end of the programme, the Academy undertook initiatives intended to stress to project participants the fact that their projects were located within a larger programme and that the objectives of the former should be seen as being linked to the latter. The rationales for this approach include the following: (1) Collaboration across units and disciplines is a way to encourage and enhance interdisciplinary research; (2) The act of working with colleagues from differing departments and institutions amounts to the beginning of forging networks that can serve researchers well in future endeavours; and (3) Similarly, collaboration with international scholars is crucial to creating, sustaining and enhancing scholarly networks connecting Finnish researchers to international researchers. The Academy expended considerable time driving home the idea that collaboration and networking were crucial to the programme design. To that end, Academy staff sponsored a series of meetings both before the official launch of the programme and once the individual projects were up and running. It also produced a book in 2010, *Valta Suomessa*, edited by Petteri Pietikäinen. The book contains eleven articles based on research summaries of a selection of projects. This was less about promoting collaboration as revealing it near the end of the programme. Although it is not entirely clear who the intended audience of the book was thought to be or who has actually read it, nonetheless it was a successful effort

insofar as it did succeed in highlighting some of the quality work that emerged out of the VALTA programme. In combination, the varied initiatives undertaken by the Academy were commendable.

This, however, does not mean that the programme achieved the actual levels of collaboration and networking that were sought. In terms of the programme itself, there was relatively little self-generated networking, with the exception of the cluster of projects devoted to gender. It is not clear why similar inter-project activities did not occur within the other clusters, but in some instances, it may be that some of the clusters were quite small (at the extreme, there was only one project devoted to media, so project and cluster were one and the same). In this regard, whether it would have been advisable from a practical standpoint to have had fewer topical areas than the seven that were ultimately chosen remains an open question. There are no doubt other factors that worked against more active networking, including the fact that some projects had a more strictly “pure” knowledge orientation, while others were framed in terms of the potential policy implications of their findings. It is also true that the desideratum of interdisciplinary collaborative efforts often comes up against methodological or theoretical differences that serve as significant impediments to its realisation.

If the amount of networking within Finland was limited, even more limited were parallel efforts at the international level, aside from the role that the various projects played in offering graduate students and postdoctoral researchers various opportunities for international networking (discussed under 2.3, Researcher training). One possible reason

for this outcome might be that the programme's focus was on power in Finland. If there is one thing that is shared by the vast majority of VALTA projects – regardless of whether they focused on political power in conventional political science terms or on power in other arenas of social life – it is that they studied power in Finland in isolation. Not only was there remarkably little attention devoted to comparative studies (e.g., comparing developments in Finland to the other Nordic countries, to OECD countries, etc.), but there was equally little looking at Finland in a transnational perspective. One might have expected, for example, to see more attention devoted to Finland since it has joined the EU, to consider its role in global bodies such as the UN, to examine changes in the national economy due to the increased penetration of the forces of economic globalisation, and likewise to explore cultural changes brought about by the intensification of cultural exchange and diffusion across borders. To the extent that there were instances in which a framework outside of the nation proper was considered, it tended to be the other Nordic countries that constituted that frame, and not the rest of Europe or a broader global perspective.

Related to this lack of international networking, although admittedly a separate topic, is the fact that there was considerable variation in publishing results. Some projects produced a considerable number of publications, while others produced relatively few. Moreover, some projects made a clear effort to publish results in international as well as domestic publishing venues. A number of projects published quite a lot in non-Finnish venues, while at the extreme one project only published their articles, scientific monographs and research reports in Finnish outlets. In the case of Swedish-

language publications, many of the publications counted as international, not surprisingly, were published in Sweden. In short, if one goal of Academy-funded research is to advance the international visibility of Finnish scholarship, the overall results of VALTA suggest that additional efforts need to be undertaken in the future to promote the idea that publishing in languages accessible to larger audiences (with English being the most obvious, but not the only option) is deemed important.

## 2.5 Applicability of research and its importance to end-users

Generally, given its national focus, the VALTA programme was mainly of interest to Finnish audiences and stakeholders. Measured in terms of media interest, the programme was more visible in Finland than many other programmes funded by the Academy of Finland. However, this comparatively high visibility tended to be limited to selected projects rather than the programme as a whole.

### 2.5.1 Policy-makers and policy debates

It is difficult to judge (or measure) the exact nature of the programme's impact on policy-makers. For example, one of the tangible outcomes of the programme was the edited book noted above, *Valta Suomessa*, which was widely distributed among policy-makers (in particular key members of Parliament). There is no first-hand evidence, however, that the book as such would have been used as part of legislative processes or as evidence in debates about policy decisions.

Nevertheless, specific projects did have an impact on legislative processes as a tool for policy-makers (if not as a means of initiating legislation as such). A specific example of this type of impact was the

project Perceptions of Power in Finnish Forest and Nature Conservation Policy. The results of some other specific projects also seem to have had an influence on general debate about policy-relevant matters; the projects focusing on gender and power as well as on income distribution can be singled out in this respect.

### 2.5.2 Public outreach

During the duration of the programme, the Academy of Finland organised several press conferences, including three separate events for key journalists that highlighted specific projects (e.g., Power and Fear; Media, Citizenship and Circuits of Power; Governance of Finnish Energy Policy-Making). There were several other media appearances (television and radio) by individual researchers and principal investigators that attracted particular interest (such as a historical study of Finnish elites).

While there was notable media interest, it tended to focus on specific projects rather than on the programme as a whole. To be sure, the publication of *Valta Suomessa* in 2010 prompted a series of reviews in major newspapers and, thus, focused attention to the overall programme. But most of the media coverage was limited to projects that were connected with current policy debates and issues. Thus, in addition to energy policy, leadership and fear, projects on gender and power tended to attract the interest of the Finnish media. Other projects – on the EU as an international actor, for example – remained, perhaps surprisingly, unnoticed by the media.

It should also be noted that media interest outside Finland was extremely limited. This can probably be explained by a combination of factors, but mainly as a

result of the national focus of the programme.

Most of the events organised in the context of the VALTA programme were oriented towards scholars. However, the programme also organised two public events on regional networks of power open to citizens: one in Mikkeli in 2007 and the other in the Kainuu region in 2008. Importantly, both of these events involved upper secondary students.

Overall, it would be difficult to argue that the VALTA programme had a highly developed outreach or media strategy. While the programme coordinator clearly did make an effort to reach out to as many stakeholders as possible, the projects themselves were oriented mainly towards completing their research plans.

## 2.6 Recommendations

Based on the evaluation presented here, the panel has made general recommendations about continuing programmes like the VALTA programme. Each recommendation is accompanied with a brief rationale.

1. *Continuation and follow up: the Academy of Finland should consider incentives that would encourage researchers to view the programme as a step towards further research and not strictly tied to the period for which funding was awarded.* During the course of the evaluation, it became clear that many of the stakeholders regarded the funding as a “one-off” case without the possibility of further funding beyond the time frame of the VALTA programme. This was understandable as the follow-up after the initial funding decisions did not imply a possibility for an extension.

2. *The steering committee's role needs to be more clearly defined. The committee could perhaps play a role in assessing which projects could be considered for post-programme funding.* Most of the steering committee members appear to have played a decreasing role during the course of the programme. Again, as in the case of the researchers, there was no clearly identified way in which they could influence the programme's direction following the initial funding decisions.
3. *Limit the number of projects funded and base the selection more clearly on scientific merit.* The panel's sense was that the large number of projects – while perhaps justified by inclusiveness – translated into more limited funding for each of the ones that were selected and may have led several projects to cut back on their ambitions. An unfortunate outcome may have been that, to some extent, quality may well have been sacrificed by quantity. Indeed, some projects that received funding appear to have been awarded lower scientific scores at the proposal stage than some of the ones that were denied funding. Given that not all projects “performed”, it is worth considering the selection criteria and process more carefully.
4. *Pool projects into thematic sub-groups to increase networking opportunities within the programme.* While the call and the scientific review process grouped projects into thematic groups, this division was not reflected in the way in which the programme was administered. While informal networking evolved (e.g., among the projects dealing with gender issues), such internal connections between projects could have been organised more efficiently and consistently in order to maximize “cross-fertilisation”. In a programme with a large number of projects, it seems unrealistic to expect that all projects will be equally interested in all other projects or that networking will automatically emerge.
5. *Promote programmes that have higher potential for international collaboration and outreach.* Even given the “national” nature of the VALTA programme, the obviously comparative theme of “power” should have provided more opportunities for linkages with projects outside Finland. Yet, with the exception of some Nordic links – many of them pre-existing – the international exposure remained limited.
6. *Programme outreach needs to be more proactive, more interactive and more internationally oriented.* While the programme coordinator did organise events in Finland, the project principal investigators themselves seemed to be quite passive in their outreach efforts. Naturally, the limited funding played a role in this regard.
7. *Networking expectations need to be made clearer from the outset.* This is closely related to the above three recommendations (4–6). But, the impression was that project members did not view networking and seeking to create interdisciplinary connections as major goals, and that to some extent the major accomplishment in this regard was to strengthen existing networks rather than to establish new ones.

8. *Exploratory workshops should be more inclusive.* While most of the stakeholders interviewed seemed to be satisfied with the manner in which the programme's preliminary stages were organised, there was also a sense that, whether formally or informally, some major stakeholders had been identified early on, allowing them to set much of the programme's overall research agenda.
9. *Collaboration in publications.* Aside from the VALTA book, there was limited collaboration – between projects or with “external” researchers – that ultimately led to publications. It seems that an interdisciplinary opportunity may have been lost.
10. *Encourage more comparative work.* This is a general comment that relates to many of the above recommendations and was reflected in the feedback from participants.

## APPENDIX 1. List of research projects and their funding

### Academy of Finland Research Programme on Power and Society in Finland (VALTA)

The Academy of Finland funded the projects mentioned below with a total of EUR 6.5 million.

1. Eriksson, Marja (University of Tampere): *Leadership, Power and Fear*  
1 Jan 2007–31 Dec 2010  
EUR 307,450
2. Heiskala, Risto (University of Jyväskylä): *Power Elites and the Concepts of Power: Governing the Finnish Market Regime*  
1 Jan 2007–31 Dec 2010  
EUR 313,160
3. Heiskanen, Tuula (University of Tampere): *Diversed Power in Gendered Corporation: Workplaces and Gender Equality*  
1 Jan 2007–31 Dec 2010  
EUR 269,510
4. Helkama, Klaus (University of Helsinki): *Perceptions of Power in Finnish Forest and Nature Conservation Policy: A Political Psychology Application*  
1 Jan 2007–31 Dec 2010  
EUR 328,920
5. Karvonen, Lauri (Åbo Akademi University): *Citizen Power in Representative Democracy*  
1 Jan 2007–31 Dec 2010  
EUR 333,730
6. Kauppi, Niilo (University of Helsinki): *Governing Competition Society – The Finnish Market Regime in Comparative Perspective. S3: Political Institutions.*  
1 Jan 2007–31 Dec 2010  
EUR 293,510
7. Kivikuru, Ullamaija (University of Helsinki): *Media, Citizenship and Circuits of Power*  
1 Jan 2007– 31 Dec 2009  
EUR 280,010
8. Kraus, Peter (University of Helsinki): *Challenging Power: Equality, Diversity and the Integration of Ethnic and National Minorities in Finland*  
1 Jan 2007–31 Dec 2010  
EUR 368,250

9. Lapintie, Kimmo (Helsinki University of Technology): *Knowledge/Power in Urban Development*  
1 Jan 2007–31 Dec 2010  
EUR 304,010
  
10. Lassila, Jukka (Research Institute of the Finnish Economy): *Pension Power in Finland*  
1 Jan 2007–31 Dec 2010  
EUR 327,550
  
11. Lehtonen, Mikko (University of Tampere): *The Power of Culture in Producing Common Sense*  
1 Jan 2007–31 Dec 2010  
EUR 304,500
  
12. Nousiainen, Kevät (University of Helsinki): *Paradoxes of Finnish Gender Power Order: A Research Project on Law, Politics and Multilevel Governance*  
1 Jan 2007–31 Dec 2010  
EUR 325,270
  
13. Paavonen, Tapani (University of Turku): *The Triumph of Competition: Deregulation and Institutional Change in the Finnish Economy 1960–2005*  
1 Jan 2007–31 Dec 2010  
EUR 330,300
  
14. Rinne, Risto (University of Turku): *Power, Supranational Regimes and New University Management in Finland*  
1 Jan 2007–31 Dec 2010  
EUR 358,890
  
15. Ruostetsaari, Ilkka (University of Tampere): *Governance of Finnish Energy Policy-Making: From Governmental Control and Regulation to Market-Based Domination?*  
1 Jan 2007–31 Dec 2010  
EUR 290,300
  
16. Stark, Laura (University of Jyväskylä): *Strategic Practices: Hidden Histories of Gender in Finland 1880–2005*  
1 Jan 2007–31 Dec 2010  
EUR 288,350
  
17. Tiilikainen, Teija (University of Helsinki): *The European Union as an International Actor: Analysing the EU's External Policies from the Perspective of a Small Member State*  
1 Jan 2007–31 Dec 2010  
EUR 281,390



18. Tuomala, Matti (University of Tampere): *Public Economics, Economic Power and Distribution*  
1 Jan 2007–31 Dec 2010  
EUR 257,150
19. Vahtola, Jouko (University of Oulu): *Forcing the Way: Women in Professional Networks of Power and Knowledge in 20th-Century Finland*  
1 Jan 2007–31 Dec 2009  
EUR 297,150
20. Viljanen, Veli-Pekka (University of Turku): *Transformations in Law and Power*  
1 Jan 2007–31 Dec 2010  
EUR 332,020
21. Widgrén, Mika/Vartiainen, Hannu (Research Institute of the Finnish Economy): *The Reproduction of Power Structures in Finland 1660–2005*  
1 Jan 2007–31 Dec 2010  
EUR 308,580

## APPENDIX 2. The steering committees

### 1.1.2006–31.12.2006

Chair: Professor *Kyösti Pekonen*, Research Council for Culture and Society

Vice Chair: Professor *Pasi Puttonen*, Research Council for Biosciences and Environment

Members:

Docent *Matti Heikkilä*, Research Council for Culture and Society

Professor *Eila Helander*, Research Council for Culture and Society

Professor *Anne Kovalainen*, Research Council for Culture and Society

Expert members:

Professor *Michele Micheletti*, University of Karlstad

Professor *Matti Pohjola*, Helsinki School of Economics

Professor *Juha Tolonen*, University of Vaasa

Professor *Øyvind Østerud*, University of Oslo

### 1.1.2007–31.12.2009

Chair: Academy Professor *Anne Kovalainen*, Research Council for Culture and Society

Vice Chair: Professor *Jouni Häkli*, Research Council for Biosciences and Environment

Members:

Professor *Pertti Haapala*, Research Council for Culture and Society

Professor *Marja Tuominen*, Research Council for Culture and Society

Professor *Jan-Ola Östman*, Research Council for Culture and Society

Expert members:

Professor *Michele Micheletti*, University of Karlstad

Professor *Matti Pohjola*, Aalto University School of Economics

Professor *Juha Tolonen*, University of Vaasa

### 1.1.2010–31.12.2011

Chair: Academy Professor *Anne Kovalainen*, Turku School of Economics

Vice Chair: Professor *Jouni Häkli*, Research Council for Biosciences and Environment

Members:

Professor *Lüisa Laakso*, Research Council for Culture and Society

Professor *Jan-Ola Östman*, Research Council for Culture and Society

Expert members:

Professor *Michele Micheletti*, University of Karlstad

Professor *Matti Pohjola*, Aalto University School of Economics

Professor *Juha Tolonen*, University of Vaasa

## APPENDIX 3. Assignment letter of the evaluation panel

SUOMEN AKATEMIA

ASETTAMISKIRJE

2.3.2011

Dnr

Jakelussa mainituille

### TUTKIMUSOHJELMAN ARVIOINTIPANEELIN ASETTAMINEN

Suomen Akatemian hallitus päätti kokouksessaan 15.11.2005 Valta Suomessa -tutkimusohjelman toteutuksesta vuosina 2007–2010. Ohjelmaan osoitettiin vuoden 2006 myöntämisvaltuutta 6,5 miljoonaa euroa. Ohjelmassa rahoitettiin 21 hanketta.

Tutkimusohjelma arvioidaan sen päätyttyä. Arviointi tuottaa tietoa ohjelman tavoitteiden toteutumisesta, onnistumisesta uuden tiedon tuottamisessa sekä ohjelman aikaansaamasta lisäarvosta. Arvioinnilla pyritään myös saamaan palautetta ohjelmaprosessista ja koordinaatiosta sekä muuta tietoa tiedepoliittisen suunnittelun ja päätöksenteon pohjaksi.

Tutkimusohjelman loppuarviointia varten asetetaan arviointipaneeli, jonka tehtävänä on

- 1) arvioida tutkimusohjelman suunnittelua
  - ohjelman valmistelu ja sisällöllinen suunnittelu
  - rahoituspäätökset ja rahoitetut hankkeet ohjelman edellytysten luojina
- 2) arvioida tutkimusohjelmatoiminta ja tulokset
  - tieteellinen laatu ja tulokset
  - ohjelman tavoitteiden toteutuminen
  - ohjelman tuottaman lisäarvo
  - koordinaatiotoiminta ja tulokset suhteessa resursseihin
- 3) antaa suosituksia perusteluineen.

Valta Suomessa -tutkimusohjelman arviointipaneelin jäseninä toimivat seuraavat henkilöt:

puheenjohtajana  
professori Marja Järvelä, Jyväskylän yliopisto

ja jäseninä

professori Jussi Hanhimäki, Graduate Institute of International and Development Studies, Geneva & FiDiPro -professori Tampereen yliopistossa 2007–2011  
professori Peter Kivisto, Augustana College, USA & FiDiPro -professori Turun yliopistossa 2008–2012

Arviointipaneelin työ päättyy viimeistään 31.12.2011. Arviointipaneelin jäsenille toimitetaan yksityiskohtaiset ohjeet arvioinnin suorittamista varten ja heille maksetaan Akatemian ohjeiden mukainen palkkio. Tulokset julkaistaan Valta Suomessa - ohjelman loppuarviointiraportissa.

Pääjohtaja

Markku Mattila

Ylijohtaja, tutkimus

Riitta Mustonen

Jakelu

Kulttuurin ja yhteiskunnan tutkimuksen toimikunta  
Ylijohtaja, hallinto  
Hallintoyksikkö  
Talousyksikkö  
Ohjelmayksikkö

## APPENDIX 4. Programme for the evaluation panel meeting

### PROGRAMME FOR THE EVALUATION PANEL OF POWER IN FINLAND RESEARCH PROGRAMME

24.–26.10.2011

- 24.10. Arrival of the panelists
- 25.10. Panel meeting at the Academy of Finland (7th floor)  
Hakaniemenranta 6, 1st floor (Muikku), 00530 Helsinki
- 9–9.15 General info on the panel work and the guidelines, Risto Vilkkö
- 9.15–10 Opening discussion
- 10–11 Interviews of researchers:  
– Johanna Kantola (Univ. Jyväskylä, Prof. Nousiainen's project)  
– Olli-Pekka Ruuskanen (Univ. Tampere, Prof. Widgren's project)  
– Tapio Rantala (Univ. Helsinki, Prof. Helkama's project)  
– Eerika Koskinen-Koivisto (Univ. Jyväskylä, Prof. Stark's project)
- 11–11.30 Discussion
- 11.30–12.30 Lunch
- 12.30–13.30 Interviews of PI's  
– Prof. Laura Stark, University of Jyväskylä  
– Prof. Ilkka Ruostetsaari, University of Tampere
- 13.30–14 Discussion
- 14–14.15 Interview of Dr Arja Kallio, Director of the Programme Unit,  
Academy of Finland
- 14.15–14.45 Interview of Prof. Petteri Pietikäinen, University of Oulu  
(former Project Manager of VALTA)
- 14.45–15.15 Interview of Academy Professor Anne Kovalainen, University of Turku,  
Chair of the Steering Committee
- 15.15–16.30 Discussion
- 26.10.
- 9–10 Conclusions
- 10–12 Discussion
- 12–13 Lunch
- 13–15 Final discussion

## APPENDIX 5. Self-evaluation questionnaire

### VALTA Programme Self-evaluation questionnaire

#### Introduction

After the completion of each research programme, it will be evaluated by a group of experts. As part of the final evaluation of VALTA programme, researchers are asked to reply to this questionnaire, which will be used by the evaluation panel. As this is an official part of the evaluation, which follows the guidelines of the Programme Memorandum, filling in this questionnaire is mandatory.

You can reply anonymously, but you may also give your personal information at the end of the questionnaire. Sections A – C are meant for all VALTA researchers, section D only for project leaders. Deadline for replies is 3 June 2011.

To project leaders: you can submit your final reports through Academy's online services from early May onwards. Deadline for reports is 30 June 2011.

About this questionnaire, there are two kinds of questions in it:

1. Multiple choice questions. The response options are 1-5,  
1= not at all; 5=very much
2. Open comments and answers

This is an important document in the final evaluation of VALTA programme, so please reserve a few minutes to fill in the questionnaire. Thanks / kiitos!

#### Questions A: General

##### 1. Please estimate

- a. Were the objectives of the VALTA programme overall relevant?
- b. Were the objectives of the VALTA programme overall achievable with regard to the programme funding available?
- c. Did VALTA programme enhance multidisciplinary research in your research area?
- d. Did VALTA programme enhance the development of your research area?

Open space for comments

#### Questions B: Concerning coordination

2. a. Did the coordination help your project to achieve its objectives?
- b. Did the coordination contribute efficiently to the overall integration of the VALTA programme?
- c. Please specify what were the most useful aspects of the programme coordination

Open space for answer

### **Questions C: Specific to your own personal research (career related questions)**

3. a. Please estimate to what extent did you reach your own personal objectives
- Scientific goals
  - Networking
  - Training

b. What were your main objectives? (briefly, 1-2 sentences)

Open space for answer

4. **Please estimate how much the following factors enabled your research?**

Institutional/university support

National collaborations

Availability of qualified research personnel

Other sources of funding

5. **Did the programme bring about cooperation with researchers from other countries that you would not have had without this funding?**

Yes

No

If yes, please name the country/countries

Open space for answer

### **Questions D: To project leaders only**

6. **Please estimate**

a. How essential was VALTA funding for your research?

b. Has the VALTA funding promoted research careers in your project?

c. Was your project funding sufficient compared to your research plan?

d. How well were you able to follow the original research plan

e. Could the project have achieved its goals without being part of the VALTA programme?

Open space for comment

7. **How big a portion was VALTA funding of your total funding in 2007–2010**

a. 76–100%

b. 50–75%

c. 26–49%

d. less than 25%

**8. To what extent has your project benefited from engaging with VALTA programme regarding:**

Scientific results  
National collaboration  
International collaboration  
Researcher training  
Mobility of researchers  
Visibility in the public media

Open space for comment

**9. Please estimate the applicability of your research**

In short term (1-5 years)  
Long term (6 years or more)  
Describe in what field your results are applicable and/or give at least one concrete example

Open space for answer

**10. Please indicate how stakeholders listed below were/are involved in your research**

Study stakeholders (who are formally listed in the grant application)  
Other researchers/academics  
Policy makers  
Government experts and officials  
NGOs  
Private business organizations  
Media  
Civil society at large

**11. What do you consider the main result of your project?**

**Please answer briefly in 2–3 sentences?**

Open space for answer

**12. What do you consider the main publication of your project?**

**Specify the category (monograph, peer-reviewed article in journal, chapter in edited peer-reviewed volume etc.)**

Open space for answer

**General Evaluation of the VALTA Programme (all open-ended questions)**

**13. What were the strengths of the VALTA programme**

**14. What were the weaknesses of the VALTA programme**

**15. How could the VALTA programme have been improved**

**16. What are your recommendations for the future programmes (e.g. funding, scope, length, interdisciplinarity)?**



In 2007, the Academy of Finland launched the Research Programme on Power and Society in Finland (VALTA). The aims of the programme were to support multidisciplinary power research, to consolidate new national and international forms of research cooperation, to conduct comparative research on power in Finland, to promote the application of new perspectives and research methods, to promote the international mobility of researchers, and to improve the exchange of information between different stakeholders, thus influencing the public debate on power in Finland.

After the completion of the programme, it was evaluated by an international panel of experts. The task of the panel was to evaluate the programme as a whole, and to reflect especially on the planning of the programme, the success of the implementation of the objectives of the programme, its contribution to researcher training, collaboration and networking, and the applicability of the research results and their importance to policy-makers, the media, NGOs, citizens etc. Moreover, the panel was expected to propose recommendations for the future planning and implementation of Academy of Finland research programme activities. This report documents the results of the evaluation, as well as the recommendations of the evaluation panel.



**ACADEMY OF FINLAND**

Hakaniemenranta 6 • PO Box 131, 00531 Helsinki  
Tel. +358 9 774 881 • Fax +358 9 7748 8299  
[www.aka.fi/eng](http://www.aka.fi/eng) • [viestinta@aka.fi](mailto:viestinta@aka.fi)