

PUBLICATIONS OF THE ACADEMY OF FINLAND 2/13

RESEARCH PROGRAMME ON THE FUTURE OF
WORK AND WELL-BEING (WORK)
2008–2011

EVALUATION REPORT



ACADEMY OF FINLAND

PUBLICATIONS OF THE ACADEMY OF FINLAND 2/13

RESEARCH PROGRAMME ON THE FUTURE OF
WORK AND WELL-BEING (WORK)
2008–2011

EVALUATION REPORT

Members of the Evaluation Panel

Professor Staffan Marklund,
Karolinska Institute

Research Director Tuula Heiskanen,
University of Tampere

Ministerial Counsellor for Finance
Arto Koho,
Ministry of Social Affairs and Health

Journalist Ulla Järvi, Finnish Medical Journal

Scientific Secretary: Robert Arnkil

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 2013, we will make funding decisions worth about EUR 317 million. Each year, some 5,000 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.

ISSN 0358-9153

ISBN 978-951-715-848-0 (PDF)

Page layout: DTPage Oy

CONTENTS

1 The WORK research programme	9
1.1 Introduction	9
1.2 Final evaluation procedure	13
1.3 Summary of evaluation results	14
2 Evaluation	16
2.1 Planning	16
2.2 Implementation	17
2.2.1 Funding and coordination	17
2.2.2 Application of new methods in the field of work and wellbeing.....	18
2.2.3 Activating an interdisciplinary and transdisciplinary approach in the field	18
2.2.4 Promoting international researcher mobility	19
2.2.5 Supporting researcher training.....	19
2.2.6 Coordinating scattered research environments and research capacities	20
2.2.7 Intensifying the flow of information and the dissemination of research results	20
3 Recommendations	22
Appendices	
1 List of research projects and their funding	23
2 The steering groups	25
3 Assignment letter for evaluation panel.....	27
4 Programme for evaluation panel meeting	31
5 Self-evaluation questionnaire	32

DESCRIPTION

Publisher	Academy of Finland	Date	15 February 2013
Author(s)	Evaluation panel		
Name of publication	Research Programme The Future of Work and Well-Being (WORK) 2008–2011. Evaluation Report.		
Abstract	<p>On 14 November 2006, the Board of the Academy of Finland decided to launch the research programme The Future of Work and Well-Being (WORK). The programme's overall aim was to gain a deeper interdisciplinary understanding of the relationships between work, welfare and wellbeing, and to develop new innovations that could help resolve problems in these relationships. At the macro level, one of the key concerns was how economic and employment growth could be reconciled with social cohesion. The programme promoted the application of new research methods. Other aims of the programme were: activating an interdisciplinary approach in the field; promoting international researcher mobility; supporting researcher training; coordinating scattered research environments; and intensifying the flow of information and the dissemination of research results.</p> <p>As part of the preparations for the programme, two major reviews were conducted on current research by Tarja Heponiemi and Krista Pahkin. Additionally, the Finnish Ministry of Social Affairs and Health published a survey entitled Research on Well-being at Work in Finland (2005). These reviews provided the preparatory working group with a broad and comprehensive overview of research conducted in the field, the remaining problem areas and the need for new knowledge. Transcending the boundaries between research in the humanities, social sciences, economics, psychology and health areas, as well as strengthening multidisciplinary research into work and wellbeing, were recognised as challenges for the programme. Moreover, research was focused on new problem areas.</p> <p>Within the WORK programme, the Academy granted funding to 19 research projects for the period 2008–2011. The total Academy funding amounted to EUR 8 million. Additional funding for the programme was granted by the Ministry of Education and the Finnish Work Environment Fund.</p> <p>This evaluation report presents an international expert panel's assessment of the programme's 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 implementation, contribution to researcher training, domestic and international collaboration, and societal impact of the research results. Moreover, the panel was asked to provide recommendations for the further development of Academy programmes. The scientific quality of the programme was not assessed. According to the panel, the programme was most successful in its aims to support researcher training and promote international researcher mobility. The coordination of the programme was considered successful. Among the panel's recommendations is a suggestion to improve the selection criteria as well as enhance clarity in defining the central notions in the programme memorandum.</p>		
Keywords	work, wellbeing, society, research programme, research funding, evaluation		
Name and number of series	Publications of the Academy of Finland 2/13		
ISSN	0358-9153		
ISBN	Print	PDF	978-951-715-848-0
Number of pages	35		
Distributed by	Academy of Finland, POB 131, FI-00531 Helsinki, viestinta@aka.fi		
Published by	Academy of Finland		
Place and date of printing			
Other information	www.aka.fi/publications		

KUVAILEHTI

Julkaisija	Suomen Akatemia		Päivämäärä	15.2.2013
Tekijä(t)	Arviointipaneeli			
Julkaisun nimi	Research Programme The Future of Work and Well-Being (WORK) 2008–2011. Evaluation Report.			
Tiivistelmä	<p>Suomen Akatemian hallitus päätti 14.11.2006 käynnistää ”Työn ja hyvinvoinnin tulevaisuus” tutkimusohjelman. Ohjelman yleisenä tavoitteena oli lisätä tieteidenvälistä ymmärrystä työn ja hyvinvoinnin suhteesta, sekä kehittää uusia innovaatioita työn ja hyvinvoinnin ongelmien ratkaisemiseksi. Makrotasolla ohjelman tavoitteena oli talouden ja työllisyyden kasvun yhdistäminen sosiaaliseen koheesioon. Ohjelmassa edistettiin uusien tutkimusmenetelmien soveltamista työ- ja hyvinvointitutkimuksen alalla. Sen muita tavoitteita olivat tieteidenvälisen ja poikkitieteellisen lähestymistavan aktivoiminen, tutkijoiden kansainvälisen liikkuvuuden edistäminen, tutkijankoulutuksen tukeminen, hajallaan olevien tutkimusympäristöjen lähentäminen ja tutkimuskapasiteetin tiivistäminen, sekä tiedonkulun ja tutkimustuloksista tiedottamisen tehostaminen.</p> <p>Ohjelmavalmisteluun tueksi teetettiin kaksi selvitystä alan nykytutkimuksesta (Tarja Heponiemi, Stakes; Krista Pahkin, TTL). Niiden lisäksi sosiaali- ja terveystieteiden tutkimuskeskus julkaisi vuonna 2005 selvityksen ”Työhyvinvointitutkimus Suomessa”. Nämä selvitykset tarjosivat ohjelman valmisteluryhmälle yleiskuvan suomalaisesta työstä ja työelämää käsittelevästä tutkimuksesta, sen ongelmakohdista ja uuden tiedon tarpeista. Ohjelman haasteeksi todettiin humanistisen, yhteiskuntatieteellisen, taloustieteellisen, psykologisen ja terveyden tutkimuksen välisten rajojen ylittäminen, sekä monitieteisen työ- ja hyvinvointitutkimuksen edistäminen. Lisäksi tutkimusta pyrittiin kohdistamaan uusille ongelma-alueille.</p> <p>Suomen Akatemia myönsi WORK-ohjelmalla rahoitusta 19 tutkimushankkeelle vuosiksi 2008–2011 yhteensä 8 miljoonaa euroa. Ohjelman muut rahoittajat olivat Opetusministeriö ja Työsuojelurahasto.</p> <p>Ohjelman päätyttyä kansainvälinen asiantuntijapaneeli arvioi ohjelman onnistumisen ohjelmamuistioon kirjattujen tavoitteiden saavuttamisessa. Paneelin tehtävänä oli arvioida ohjelma kokonaisuudessaan ja kiinnittää erityistä huomiota seuraaviin seikkoihin: ohjelman suunnittelu, tavoitteiden saavuttaminen, panos tutkijakoulutukseen, kansallinen ja kansainvälinen yhteistyö, tutkimustulosten näkyvyys ja yhteiskunnallinen vaikuttavuus. Lisäksi paneelilta pyydettiin suosituksia Akatemian tutkimusohjelmatoiminnan ja ohjelman alaan kuuluvan tutkimuksen kehittämiseksi. Ohjelman tieteellistä laatua ei arvioitu. Paneelin mukaan ohjelma onnistui tavoitteissaan parhaiten tutkijakoulutuksen ja kansainvälisen tutkijaliikkuvuuden edistämässä. Ohjelman koordinaation paneeli arvioi onnistuneeksi. Suosituksissaan paneeli mm. toivoo entistä parempaa selkeyttä valintakriteerien ja ohjelmalle keskeisten käsitteiden määrittelyssä.</p>			
Asiasanat	Työ, hyvinvointi, yhteiskunta, tutkimusohjelma, tutkimusrahoitus, arviointi			
Julkaisusarjan nimi ja numero	Suomen Akatemian julkaisuja 2/13			
ISSN	0358-9153			
ISBN	Painetulle kirjalle annettu tunnus	Pdf-versiolle annettu tunnus 978-951-715-848-0		
Sivumäärä	35			
Julkaisun jakaja	Suomen Akatemia, PL 131, 00531 Helsinki, viestinta@aka.fi			
Julkaisun kustantaja	Suomen Akatemia			
Painopaikka ja -aika				
Muut tiedot	www.aka.fi/julkaisut			

PRESENTATIONSBLAD

Utgivare	Finlands Akademi	Datum	15.2.2013
Författare	Utvärderingspanel		
Publikationens namn	Research Programme The Future of Work and Well-Being (WORK) 2008–2011. Evaluation Report. [Utvärderingsrapport på forskningsprogrammet Arbetets och välfärdens framtid (WORK) 2008–2011]		
Sammandrag	<p>Finlands Akademis styrelse beslutade den 14 november 2006 att inleda forskningsprogrammet Arbetets och välfärdens framtid. Programmets allmänna mål var att öka den interdisciplinära förståelsen om förhållandet mellan arbete och välfärd och att ta fram innovativa lösningar på olika arbets- och välfärdspå problem. På makronivå var ett mål att kombinera dels ekonomisk tillväxt och förbättring av sysselsättningen, dels social kohesion. Programmet främjade tillämpningen av nya forskningsmetoder inom arbets- och välfärdsforskning. Övriga mål var att lyfta fram en interdisciplinär och tvärvetenskaplig approach; att främja forskarnas internationella mobilitet; att stödja forskarutbildningen; att för samman spridda forskningsmiljöer och koncentrera forskningskapaciteten; samt att främja informationsutbyte och kommunikation.</p> <p>Som stöd för programberedningen lät beredningsgruppen göra två omfattande utredningar av den nuvarande forskningen på detta område (Tarja Heponiemi, Stakes; Krista Pahkin, Arbetshälsoinstitutet). Utöver dessa två utredningar publicerade social- och hälsovårdsministeriets arbetarskyddsavdelning 2005 en utredning om finländsk forskning i arbetshälsa och dessa prioriteringar ur hälso- och säkerhetsperspektiv. Med hjälp av dessa utredningar kunde beredningsgruppen skapa sig en heltäckande översiktsbild av de senaste årens forskning i arbete och arbetsliv samt av problemen och informationsbehoven på detta område. En viktig utmaning för programmet var att överbrygga gränserna mellan humanistisk, samhällsvetenskaplig, psykologisk och hälsovetenskaplig forskning och därigenom skapa ett starkare multidisciplinärt grepp inom arbets- och välfärdsforskningen. Förutom detta hade forskningsprogrammet som mål också att inrikta forskningen på nya problemområden.</p> <p>Akademin beviljade sammanlagt 8 miljoner euro till 19 projekt inom programmet för åren 2008–2011. De andra programfinansierarna var undervisningsministeriet och Arbetarskyddsfonden.</p> <p>Forskningsprogrammets genomförande och resultat utvärderades av en internationell expertpanel. Denna rapport presenterar resultaten av utvärderingspanelens arbete. Panelen skulle utvärdera programmet i sin helhet samt fästa särskild uppmärksamhet vid följande faktorer: planeringen; hur väl målen hade uppnåtts; insatser i forskarutbildning; nationellt och internationellt samarbete; samt resultatens synlighet och genomslag. Panelen fick också i uppgift att ge rekommendationer för hur Akademiens programverksamhet och forskningen på området kunde förbättras. Programmets vetenskapliga kvalitet utvärderades inte. Enligt panelen lyckades programmet bäst med att främja forskarutbildning och internationell forskar-mobilitet. Programkoordinationen fick också bra betyg. Panelen efterlyser bl.a. mer klarhet i definitionen av urvalskriterier och centrala programkoncept.</p>		
Nyckelord	arbete, välfärd, samhälle, forskningsprogram, forskningsprogram, utvärdering		
Seriens namn och nummer	Finlands Akademi publikationer 2/13		
ISSN	0358-9153		
ISBN	Tryck	Pdf 978-951-715-848-0	
Sidantal	35		
Distribution	Finlands Akademi, PB 131, 00531 Helsingfors, viestinta@aka.fi		
Förlag	Finlands Akademi		
Tryckeri/tryckningsort och -år			
Ytterligare information	www.aka.fi/publikationer		

1 THE WORK RESEARCH PROGRAMME

1.1 Introduction

Background

At the beginning of the 21st century, the continuity of the current Finnish system for organising work and wellbeing had come under pressure from three escalating trends: globalisation, ICT development and population ageing. Together with the continuing development of technology, increasing economic openness and international competition had led to rapid changes in various fields of production. Not only the nature of work, but also the organisation of work and the ways in which labour was used in the workplace had all been changing. Jobs had been relocated in foreign countries and the labour market as a whole had become less stable. The rapid ageing of the population adversely affected the dependency ratio and increased the need for healthcare and social services as well as informal care. These developments revealed inflexibilities in the existing social security system in terms of its ability to guarantee a subsistence income to all citizens. They also raised concerns about the continuity of welfare state funding and prompted calls for a higher employment rate and higher labour productivity in the national economy.

The traditional model of employment and welfare was found to be under pressure from a number of changes. The demand for labour had changed, and structural unemployment had increased. Fixed-term employment was increasing, and it had become much harder for young people to get onto the first rung of the career ladder.

Increasing job demands, the reorganisation of social care services and expectations of equal participation by men and women in both wage employment and in the care of children and other family members all had an impact on reconciling work and welfare. With the growth of life expectancy, it was seen that people would also be spending more and more years in active employment, even though the significance of wage employment and the appeal of working life in general was dwindling. At the same time, the traditional model was coming under increasing pressure with the breaks and shifts caused by education and training, unemployment, family leave or rehabilitation. People's life courses used to be very straightforward and homogenous; people went to school, moved on to wage employment and then retired, but all that was now seen to have become more fragmented and diversified. At the same time, inequality among citizens was increasing. All these phenomena were found to put an ever increasing pressure on today's welfare and health policies.

The concept of work, as defined for the purposes of the WORK research programme, was taken to comprise all kinds of formal work, such as wage work, entrepreneurship and self-employment, as well as informal work, such as unpaid caring and voluntary work. Moreover, it was also understood as comprising other activities that are crucial to the continuity of society but not normally regarded as work, such as studying.

The concept of working life refers to gainful employment as a sphere of everyday life distinct from other life

spheres, such as family life, civic action or personal leisure time. At the level of working life, the individual employee's and the workplace community's actions are framed and their wellbeing is influenced by the ways in which work is organised, by management and the work processes, structures and social systems of working life. Important factors in terms of wellbeing are the sense of trust and confidence between different parties in working life, the rewards of the job, perceptions of the fairness of those rewards and the individual employee's opportunities to exert influence as well as the opportunity for self-expression. In today's society of wage labour, an individual's life course is typically divided into three stages:

1) schooling and education in childhood and youth; 2) active and continuous participation in the labour market during working age; and 3) withdrawal from working life at retirement. These life stages and the transitions from one stage to the next have been distinguished from one another and institutionalised predominantly in wage labour terms via the welfare state's education, labour and social security and retirement policies. However, the WORK programme was grounded in the assumption that, in the future, there will be more movement over the individual's life course between different forms of work and individuals will move between market work, informal work and other forms of work, such as education, throughout their life. In research, this was found to require a broader perspective on the relationship between work, welfare and wellbeing, on the individual's life course and on the challenges of developing welfare policy. According to the programme memorandum, research efforts were focused on the following six themes:

1. *The changing relationships between work, livelihood and the life sphere.* The key concern in this thematic area was with the way that relationships between life course, work and welfare have changed and with how these relationships could be organised in a socially, economically and ethically sustainable way. Other key questions in this theme were:

- How are people's life courses diversifying and what kinds of transitions are occurring in the life courses? Can differences be seen between men and women with regard to these transitions?
- What are the underlying reasons for these life course transitions and the possible risks with respect to the welfare and wellbeing of citizens? How does people's wellbeing behaviour change during the transitions?
- What are the possible new models for organising work, other life spheres and welfare?

2. *The appeal of working life.* One of the starting points for this research theme derived from the "Finnish dilemma" of national economy: Wage employment holds little appeal among citizens, who want to withdraw from work and working life before their official retirement age. At the same time, though, the macroeconomic imperative has gathered strength, which requires that citizens should work harder and remain in wage labour longer. Key questions in this theme were:

- How can a changing working life maintain an employee's health and wellbeing?
- How should working life take employee groups of different cultural background, age and functional capacity into consideration? How can we better maintain the working capacity of ageing and disabled people and develop the

functional capacity of all people of working age?

- How can management and work cultures be developed in a manner that promotes work motivation and wellbeing?
- What kinds of new solutions can be achieved via intervention studies in work organisations?

3. *Diversifying of labour*. The most important ongoing changes reflecting on the quality and structure of labour are ageing, the growth of multiculturalism and the rising level of education. There is reason to assume that as population growth comes to a halt and reverses, changes in the supply and demand of labour will play an even more critical role. These factors will also influence the availability and activity of labour in the public and private sectors. Key questions in this theme were:

- What are the impacts of the amount, structure and diversity of the population on labour, the labour market and welfare policy?
- How can the integration of immigrants to Finland and working life be developed and multicultural working life supported?

4. *Structural unemployment and the precariate*. The major problems in the labour market are a long-term high level of structural unemployment and the continuing increase in atypical employment contracts. This poses a host of tough challenges to labour and social policy: How can a just distribution of work, income and welfare be guaranteed in the future? Key questions in this theme were:

- What are the labour and social policy options available to help alleviate long-term unemployment and, on the other

hand, the reasons for and consequences of fixed term employment?

- How should social policy be developed to better respond to the social security and other problems that uncertain fixed term employment causes for the employee?
- What kind of labour market model would provide companies with enough flexibility in labour use while ensuring that employees have sufficient security in their lives?

5. *Wellbeing, health and work*. In the WORK programme, the relationship between wellbeing, health and work was examined from the vantage point of work: How work and working conditions and the psychosocial working environment affect the wellbeing of employees, their health and health behaviour? The interplay between wellbeing, health and work can also be examined from the opposite angle, that is, in terms of how living habits, health behaviour and exposure-related risk factors impact people's working and functional capacity. Key questions in this theme were:

- Which working life factors impact the health of employees and how do they affect the various transition periods in working life?
- What connections do health behaviour, occupational health and physical exercise have to wellbeing at work and labour productivity? The programme will emphasise the impacts of physical exercise in terms of working life and wellbeing.

6. *Work as an economic foundation of welfare*. The changes caused by globalisation, information technology development and the current demographic trends in production, the economy, work, the labour force and the labour market call for an analytical examination of the

economic foundations of welfare. The key question is how to maintain and sustain GDP and labour productivity growth as well as the current system for financing the welfare state in a globalising economy in which the role of companies is changing. Furthermore, it is important to explore the legal foundations of industrial relations and how they correspond to the changes that have happened in work and in the labour market. Other key questions in this theme were:

- What kinds of international models exist for reconciling working life and wellbeing and which of them could be applied in Finland?
- What are the impacts of globalisation on tax competition and risk adjustment in welfare states and on the financing of a welfare state?
- What is the significance of market wage work and basic subsistence to the income of individuals and households?
- What economic and social policy means can ensure the productivity and continuity of service and care-giving professions?

Preparation and organisation

In autumn 2003, the Board of the Academy of Finland granted a negotiation mandate on the start-up of a research programme under the title of Occupational Medicine and Cultures in Working Life. Preparations for the programme were jointly undertaken by the Research Council for Culture and Society and the Research Council for Health. During the preparations, the topic was expanded to include more general issues of wellbeing. On 15 February 2005, in connection with its action plan and budget, the Academy Board decided to grant this extension. On 16 June 2005, a

preparatory working group was appointed and charged with drafting a proposal for the start-up of the programme and exploring the possibilities of additional funding from other national or international organisations.

The preparatory working group was chaired by Professor, Director General Matti Heikkilä (Research Council for Culture and Society). Vice Chair was Professor Kalervo Väänänen (Research Council for Health). The other members of the working group were Professor Helena Leino-Kilpi (Research Council for Health) and Professor Anna Raija Nummenmaa (Research Council for Culture and Society); and from outside the Academy, Asko Aalto, Ministerial Adviser in Medical Affairs (representing the Ministry of Social Affairs and Health), Senior Research Fellow Anna-Liisa Elo (Finnish Institute of Occupational Health), Director Mikael Fogelholm (UKK Institute for Health Promotion Research), Director Matti Salmenperä (Ministry of Labour) and Research Liaison Officer Ilkka Tahvanainen (Finnish Work Environment Fund). Professor Pertti Koistinen was consulted as an outside expert, and the working group's secretary was Senior Assistant Tapio Rissanen from the University of Tampere.

The Academy hosted an exploratory workshop in preparation for the research programme on 18 January 2006. More than 100 researchers in the field took part in the workshop. Materials from the workshop have been used in preparing the programme and in writing up this report. During the preparation of the programme, a large number of interest groups were consulted on research needs and future challenges in the areas concerned.

Selection and funding of projects

For the selection of projects to be funded, a programme subcommittee was appointed. It included Professor Kalervo Väänänen (Research Council for Health, chair of the committee), Deputy Director General Matti Heikkilä (Research Council for Culture and Society), Professor Kirsti Husgafvel-Pursiainen (Research Council for Health) and Professor Anne Kovalainen (Research Council for Culture and Society).

The programme's steering committee included all members of the subcommittee, as well as the following experts: Professor Kaj Husman (Ministry of Education), Ombudsman Ilkka Tahvanainen (Finnish Work Environment Fund), Professor Anna-Liisa Elo (University of Jyväskylä), Professor Annika Härenstam (Gothenburg University) and Professor Peter Nolan (Leeds University).

The tasks of the steering committee were to prepare the programme and submit to the programme subcommittee a proposal on projects to be funded; to manage the programme and answer for the follow-up; to be responsible for the final evaluation; and to supervise the coordination of the programme. (For details concerning the steering committee, see Appendix 2.)

The application process was divided into two stages. At the first stage, expiring on 31 January 2007, applicants were invited to submit their letters of intent on the proposed research. Altogether 103 letters of intent were submitted, and the subcommittee selected 44 of them for the second round of the call. The full applications were collected by 27 April 2007 and evaluated in September, in an

international panel of eight experts: Professors Arne Kalleberg (University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, USA, chair of the panel), A. J. van der Beek (VU University Medical Centre, The Netherlands), Jan Holmer (Gothenburg University, Sweden), Kerstin Isaksson (Mälardalen University, Sweden), Bengt Järvholm (Umeå University, Sweden), Ilona Koupil (Karolinska Institute, Sweden), Theo Papadopoulos (University of Bath, UK) and Stephen J. Wood (University of Sheffield, UK). Also, the evaluations included a number of other experts external to the panel.

On the basis of these evaluations, the programme subcommittee granted altogether EUR 8 million to five consortia and 14 individual research projects on 17 October 2007 (see a list of funded projects in Appendix 1). The four-year funding period started at the beginning of January 2008. The other funding organisations of the programme were the Ministry of Education and the Finnish Work Environment Fund.

1.2 Final evaluation procedure

After its completion, the WORK research programme was evaluated by an international panel of experts. The panel was chaired by Research Director Tuula Heiskanen (University of Tampere) and its members were Professor Staffan Marklund (Karolinska Institute), Ministerial Adviser Arto Koho (Finnish Ministry of Social Affairs and Health) and Journalist Ulla Järvi (Finnish Medical Journal). Dr Robert Arnkil (University of Tampere) 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 programme
2. Implementation of the programme, i.e., success in achieving the goals and objectives of the programme
3. Contribution to researcher training
4. Domestic and international collaboration and networking
5. Societal impact of the research results and their influence on the surrounding society (e.g. policy-makers, media, NGOs and citizens)
6. Foresight (recommendations for the future).

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 24–25 September 2012, the panel interviewed a number of the programme's key persons.

1.3 Summary of evaluation results

The programme's overall aim was to gain a deeper interdisciplinary understanding of the relationships between work, welfare and wellbeing and to develop new innovations that can help resolve problems in these relationships. Related to this, according to the Programme Memorandum, the more specific overall aims of the programme were:

- to promote the application of new research methods in the field of work and wellbeing
- to activate an interdisciplinary and transdisciplinary approach in the field
- to promote international researcher mobility
- to support researcher training
- to coordinate scattered research environments and research capacities
- to intensify the flow of information and dissemination of research results among researchers and between researchers and different stakeholder groups (business companies, public organisations, policy-makers, the media and citizens)

Table 1. An overview of evaluation results of implementation and recommendations

Evaluation topic	Main findings	Rating 1 (low) – 5 (high)
Application of new methods in the field of work and wellbeing	Solid scientific methods were applied in the research and the programme was seminal in broadening the scope of research, but there is not a strong message coming of actually applying <i>new</i> methods.	3.5
Activating an interdisciplinary and transdisciplinary approach in the field	The existing state of interdisciplinarity of the various research institutions varies to a great degree (multidisciplinary, centres of excellence, individual faculties), so the meaning of new collaboration also varies. An overall judgement is that the programme was clearly seminal in promoting practical interaction between different disciplines, but not in a radical or deep sense.	3 +
Promoting international researcher mobility	Promotion of international mobility was clearly stated in the programme, and it was used positively and to varying degrees reflecting the needs, existing practices and connections of the different research units.	4
Supporting researcher training	Academy funding has played a highly seminal role for both postdoctoral and doctoral training.	4 +
Coordinating scattered research environments and research capacities	As with interdisciplinarity, the points of departure of networking and the degree of 'scattering' differ greatly according to the field and actors. The research institutions seem to rely mostly on their existing networks. An overall judgement is that the programme has, particularly through its seminars and coordination, played a positive role in promoting networking and coordinating scattered research.	3 +
Intensifying the flow of information and the dissemination of research results	Dissemination was targeted mainly at the research community, but it has been rather vague and weak towards other stakeholders. Despite good examples both in terms of seminars, publications and dissemination in individual projects, this is a weak aspect of the programme, and could be considerably improved.	3 -
Recommendations	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Improving selection criteria and process to gain a balanced outcome of the programme 2. Inviting to be more explicit about setting goals on new methods in project plans 3. Inviting to be more explicit about new steps in interdisciplinarity against the existing state of the applicant 4. Inviting to be more explicit about new steps in networking against the existing state of the applicant 5. Clearly improving and being more explicit in communication and dissemination strategies and practices 	

2 EVALUATION

Authors

Tuula Heiskanen, Staffan Marklund,
Arto Koho and Ulla Järvi
Robert Arnkil (scientific secretary)

2.1 Planning

The preparation of the WORK research programme was undertaken jointly by two Academy of Finland research councils: the Research Council for Culture and Society and the Research Council for Health. The preparatory group reviewed earlier research and utilised the results of a workshop with some 100 participants. As a consequence of these preparations, the topic was broadened to include more general issues of wellbeing as was the negotiation mandate on the start-up.

The evaluation concludes that the Programme Memorandum is comprehensive, insightful and relevant against the existing and especially the future challenges of work in Finland. The Memorandum invites a broad perspective and a broad set of research to address these challenges, and it was developed via a collaborative seminar process.

The evaluation concludes that this broad approach of the research programme was justified, and that it has played a seminal role in promoting interdisciplinarity and joint efforts in research. However, within a general judgement of success, this has not been executed without tensions and shortcomings. Reaching interdisciplinarity poses, of course, a challenge for selection, which in turn is prone to reflect the

paradigms and disciplines represented in the selection panel.

The Memorandum covers six main themes. Comparing the Memorandum and its themes against the funded projects or consortia, it is noteworthy that some of the themes have received less weight than others. Theme 5.5, *Wellbeing, health and work*, was by far the most dominant among the funded projects, whereas themes 5.2, *Appeal of working life*, and 5.6, *Work as an economic foundation of welfare*, received an unexpectedly low representation. Further, the WORK project list in phase one – including all plans of intent – included seven plans in which economic and social policy research was a leading nominator, but none of those received funding. Also, traditional employment and labour law studies remained in a residual position in the outcome of the programme.

The title of the research programme refers to the future of work and wellbeing. However, looking at the final reports and the results of the projects, it is evident that the future aspect is not so apparent, as was perhaps anticipated and intended in the planning of the programme. It is evident that there were very few intervention projects in the programme, the bulk consisting of epidemiological and related approaches. Work as a cause for ill health is well represented, but the lack of work as a health problem is much less in focus. Also, work is mostly considered from the point of view of posing problems, and not so much from the point of view of possibilities. This is particularly visible in the definitions of wellbeing as a symptom

of illness and stress instead of a multifaceted view of welfare and wellbeing including economic aspects, social relations and participation in society. Research on social policy was scarcely represented and very few projects dealt with work and welfare from the point of view of work organisations, companies, public organisations or trade unions. Also, the focus in the studies is mostly on individuals. To be sure, this individual focus has contributed to an increase in knowledge. However, the organisational level, such as well-grounded suggestions for management practices, is not represented to the extent one could expect on the basis of the objectives spelled out in the Memorandum.

Thus, the outcome of the selection of projects does not reflect the themes of the Memorandum in a balanced way, but is skewed towards health issues, at the expense of social and employment issues. It is also skewed in the sense that research involving different stakeholders was rare, and the organisational level is weakly represented. The dissemination of research results thus became predominantly an internal academic matter. The outcome is nevertheless solid research. One factor here might be the time of selection, just before the global economic crisis, perhaps underplaying the importance of employment issues. Another factor, at the end of the day an unavoidable one, is the difference in levels of establishment and capabilities of research institutions in presenting proposals.

For future Academy research programmes, it is advisable to be more sensitive to the selection process, so that the outcome of funding is as balanced as possible, reflecting the scope of the programmes.

2.2 Implementation

2.2.1 Funding and coordination

The Board of the Academy of Finland earmarked EUR 8 million for the WORK research programme. The funding period was four years. The Academy had national funding cooperation with the Ministry of Education and the Finnish Work Environment Fund. According to the plan, the programme was to have cooperation also with the Economic and Social Research Council (UK). However, this funding cooperation was not implemented. The other funding agencies followed their own criteria in the evaluation of the potential funding recipients. The failure with an international partner suggests that, in future programmes, it is important to ensure that the topic is of real interest for the partners. For example, in issues related to work and wellbeing in the Nordic countries, there are to a reasonable extent both similarities and differences that might invite fruitful scientific debate.

The steering committee consisted of Academy research council members, representatives of other funding bodies participating in the programme and expert members. The composition of the committee changed with the election of the new research councils. The primary role of the committee was related to ensuring a wide dissemination of information about the programme and selecting the evaluation panel and the projects to be funded. At the later stages, the steering committee's role was less vital, albeit constructive. The support for the coordinator in the planning of the seminar contents was considered especially valuable.

In the interviews, there were examples of programmes where the activeness of the

steering committee had decreased after the selection of the projects. The role of the WORK steering committee is profiled more positively. The committee had nine meetings. The panel considers it important that in the Academy's future programmes coordinators have support for their work also through the course of the programme.

The coordinator took care of the mutual interaction between the projects through the course of the programme. The main means for the interaction were different kinds of seminars in the organisation of which the coordinator played a key role, together with principal investigators. The schedule included ten seminars, varying from methodological topics through content-specific seminars to annual seminars with international keynote speakers. The coordinator's role and way of working with the researchers was appraised in all of the evaluation material the panel had at its disposal. It is clear that the positive evaluation by the principal investigators and researchers of the programme is also to a great extent thanks to the activeness of the coordinator.

2.2.2 Application of new methods in the field of work and wellbeing

The methods applied in the research derive from the ongoing research practices and traditions of the research institutes, and as such are of a high quality. What characterises many of the studies is the use of register-based data or extensive surveys and epidemiological methods in data analysis. The positive signal from this is that Finland has high-quality and extensive datasets collected by publicly funded research institutes and ministries that are available for a wider range of researchers. Some of the funded projects are without doubt at the international forefront in their

adaptation of methodologies. The limitation from the point of view of the programme is that some other research methodologies, which might have been especially relevant to the objectives of the programme, were almost non-existent. This refers for example to intervention studies. However, it is worth mentioning that in some projects there were trials of multi-method approaches.

In conclusion, the programme was seminal in broadening the scope and aims of research, but there is not a strong message of actually applying *new* methods in the field of work and wellbeing. Therefore, goal attainment in this implementation topic can be regarded as positive, but falling short of an ambitious goal of completely new methodological innovations.

For future Academy research programmes, it might be advisable to be clearer about the goals the applicants set for actually devising new methods and/or to what extent the goal is applying existing methods in new settings or frameworks.

2.2.3 Activating an interdisciplinary and transdisciplinary approach in the field

Concerning interdisciplinarity and transdisciplinarity, the existing points of departure of the participating research institutions, at entry to the programme, vary to a great degree. There are multidisciplinary units, such as the National Institute for Welfare and Health, the Finnish Institute of Occupational Health, centres of excellence and individual faculties, so the needs and possibilities of interdisciplinarity are naturally different, and impossible to judge in detail. For an interdisciplinary unit, already having a tradition of addressing interdisciplinarity,

the zone of proximal development is naturally different from an individual faculty or discipline, which is for the first time prompted by the programme to connect with other disciplines.

With these reservations, the evaluation material and interviews with project implementers clearly suggest that the programme has been seminal in promoting practical interaction between different disciplines. It is obvious from the self-evaluations that the research groups had a very positive view of how the programme coordinator organised joint seminars and meetings as well as the collaborative final report in the form of an edited book. These activities have broadened the view of addressing work and wellbeing. As one principal investigator said, “It has been positive, but not really deep,” which seems to give the gist of it.

The evaluation panel took a closer look at the consortia and projects in terms of devotion of manpower resources in the projects.

In the consortia and the projects, most time in terms of manpower seems to have been spent primarily on researchers representing medicine and public health research. Psychology and sociology were represented quite often as well.

A ‘normal project’ seemed to cover three subject areas in most cases, but mainly inside the principal researchers’ own disciplines or quite close to them. Public health or medicine and social science were quite often combinations for welfare studies or for work-related studies in these kinds of research programmes. In the WORK programme, the social sciences seem to have planned their own projects alone or with less assistance than other

disciplines. It seems that there were no really radical science combinations supported in the programme.

The evaluation panel concludes that interdisciplinary approaches could have been developed further. For future research programmes, it might be advisable to be clearer about the points of departure of the different institutions concerning interdisciplinarity, and to invite them to describe their points of departure and their ‘next step’ goals explicitly in their proposals. This should be included in the selection criteria.

2.2.4 Promoting international researcher mobility

The WORK programme is clear about the importance of international researcher mobility. The actual practical execution of mobility seems to reflect the existing and ongoing needs, opportunities and density of international exchange in the individual research projects. In the documentation, Finnish researchers seem to have been more mobile to foreign countries than foreign researchers have been in coming to Finland. Two attempts to organise cooperation with British and Swedish research funding agencies did not materialise, despite a strong effort from the Academy of Finland. Overall, the outcome can be regarded as positive.

2.2.5 Supporting researcher training

Training in the research programme was provided principally in the form of seminars, where researchers could hear what other projects were doing. A junior researcher’s statement highlights a dilemma in the principles of Academy funding: “I liked the sense of community at the WORK events. It is important for graduate

students to feel part of something valuable. In that respect, it is unfortunate that the Academy nowadays stresses postdoc funding and is less inclined to fund the work of graduate students in Academy research projects.”

Academy funding has played a crucial role for both postdoctoral and doctoral training. In some institutions, the emphasis was more on postdoctoral training, but most used some kind of mixture. In the light that the emphasis of the programme was on postdoctoral training, it is noteworthy that the possibility for doctoral trainees to participate in senior-junior research groups, and in exchange with international colleagues, was highly regarded in all of the evaluation material, including the interviews.

2.2.6 Coordinating scattered research environments and research capacities

The main elements of programme coordination were the seminars and the work of the coordinator. Both were unequivocally and highly regarded in all comments concerning the programme, and this points to future opportunities in enhancing networking and coordination via strengthening and enriching these elements. The working methods, dialogue and communication at the seminars and virtual communication could be further enriched in order to strengthen the cross-pollination of research.

The national and international contact network of the applicant research team/consortium was one of the selection criteria. The research institutions seem to have relied mostly on their existing networks. The message coming from the project implementers was that one in fact must already have a functional network

when entering the programme and that there is no time to launch something completely new. This poses somewhat of a dilemma, trying to establish new coordination and networking effects. In future Academy programmes, it might be advisable to address this through a stepwise/two-step selection process, where new networking linkages would be promoted after the first step.

As in interdisciplinarity, for future programmes it might be advisable to be clearer about the points of departure of the different institutions concerning networking, and to invite them to describe their points of departure and their ‘next step’ goals explicitly in their proposals. This should be included in the selection criteria.

2.2.7 Intensifying the flow of information and the dissemination of research results

The aim of the WORK research programme was to intensify the flow of information and the dissemination of research results among researchers and between researchers and different stakeholder groups (business companies, public organisations, policy-makers, the media and citizens). However, presenting a communication and dissemination strategy and practice was not included in the selection criteria and was not considered as such in the selection process. All in all, in terms of communication and dissemination, for the most part, the programme and the communication of research results seem to have been run in a rather traditional way.

Dissemination was mainly internal, oriented towards the research community, in the traditional sense of publishing articles and findings, and has been less

impressive and influential externally, towards other stakeholders and in describing results. Despite the fact that some of the research groups have done excellent research with important practical implications, there are few examples in the self-evaluation of efforts by the researchers to translate and communicate the research to stakeholders. There are also examples of efforts in communicating with outside stakeholders, for example with representatives in Parliament, ministries, trade unions and relevant institutions and organisations, but overall they are rather vague in terms of the definition of relevant target groups and the forms and contents of the dissemination. There are also programme-assisted efforts in describing results. Here, it is worth mentioning in particular the two books published for the general public. These were highly regarded in the interviews with and the self-evaluations of the project representatives. It is noteworthy, however, that translating research findings to these readable and accessible texts for non-research audiences took a lot of editing effort, which again points to a considerable need to invest sufficiently in these efforts.

Communication as such was considered to be important both by the interviewed senior and younger scientists, but innovative responsibility or effort has been rather scarce. The research institutions and the researchers seem to have relied mainly on their existing, rather traditional one-way channels of publishing. Media relations as a whole can be regarded as modest. There was not much activity in

contacts with journalists and young scientists did not receive any media training. It seems that researchers seldom found active contacts with journalists, although in some instances projects received noticeable attention in the press. Social media was hardly used at all and the skills to harness them seemed to be insufficient. In the self-evaluation summary, some researchers mentioned a need for social media skills, but nothing really materialised.

Despite good examples both in terms of seminars, publications and dissemination in individual projects, this is the weakest aspect of the programme, one that could be considerably improved. A number of studies ended up saying that the results have practical relevance, for example, in counselling, education or interventions, but they were not sufficiently involved in conveying results into practice.

For future programmes, it is advisable to be explicit in the call for letters of intent and research plans and in the selection criteria about detailed communication and dissemination plans. It might be advisable to have a separate rating for the scientific content and the communication-dissemination plan. Dissemination models could be enriched to include more overlap between the research period and presentation and debate of results. Dissemination could be further enhanced by providing special training and good practice examples in the run-up of the programme and in programme events.

3 RECOMMENDATIONS

1. *The selection criteria and process should be improved.* In future research programmes, it is advisable to be more sensitive to the selection process, in order to secure as balanced an outcome as possible of funded projects reflecting the scope of the programmes.
2. *Goals on new methods should be set more explicitly.* Future research programmes should be clearer about the applicants' goals concerning devising new methods and about to what extent the goals would apply existing methods in new settings or frameworks.
3. *New steps in multi- and interdisciplinarity should be more explicit.* In individual scholarships, discipline-based criteria are the primary basis of evaluations. In programmes, however, the objective of multidisciplinary is – and should be – explicitly written in the Programme Memorandums. Future Academy research programmes should be clearer about the points of departure of the different institutions concerning interdisciplinarity and invite them to describe their points of departure and their 'next step' goals explicitly in their proposals. This should also be included in the selection criteria.
4. *More explicitness is required as to new networking steps.* As in interdisciplinarity, future research programmes should be clearer about the points of departure of the different institutions concerning networking and invite them to describe their points of departure and their 'next step' goals explicitly in their proposals. This should also be included in the selection criteria.
5. *Communication and dissemination needs to be improved and made more explicit.* Future research programmes should be explicit in the call for letters of intent and research plans and in the selection criteria about communication and dissemination plans. It might be advisable to have a separate rating for the scientific content and the communication-dissemination plan. Dissemination could be further enhanced by providing special training and good practice examples in the run-up of the programmes and in programme events.

APPENDIX 1. List of research projects and their funding

Research Programme

The Future of Work and Well-Being 2008–2011

1. **Arajärvi, Pentti**, University of Joensuu, *Judicial Restraints against Exclusion* (consortium), €173,720
Other members:
Antikainen, Ari, University of Joensuu, €100,580
Miettinen, Tarmo, University of Joensuu, €302,870
Mäkinen, Eija, University of Vaasa, €100,580
Niiranen, Vuokko, University of Kuopio, €118,870
2. **Elovainio, Marko**, National Research and Development Centre for Welfare and Health (STAKES), *Uncertain Work and Well-being: Psychosocial and Individual Resources and Untypical Work Contracts among Physicians and Nurses in Finland*, €200,000 € (Finnish Work Environment Fund)
3. **Hearn, Jeff**, Swedish School of Economics, *The Quest for Well-being in Growth Industries: A Comparative Study in Finland and Scotland*, €218,350
4. **Heinonen, Jarna**, Turku School of Economics, *Entrepreneurship, Work and Well-being in the Life Course Perspective*, €371,450
5. **Helve, Helena**, University of Kuopio, *The Changing Life-Styles and Values of the Young Short-termed Unemployed in the Different Labour Markets of Finland*, €448,000
6. **Kinnunen, Ulla**, University of Tampere, *Are Temporary Workers a Disadvantaged Group? Comparisons of Different Types of Temporary Workers with Permanent Workers in Psychological and Social Outcomes* (consortium), €249,160
Other members:
Mauno, Saija, University of Jyväskylä, €134,880
Nätti, Jouko, University of Tampere, €173,720
7. **Korvajärvi, Päivi**, University of Tampere, *Gender Inequalities, Emotional and Aesthetic Labor and Well-being in Work*, €400,020
8. **Kröger, Teppo**, University of Jyväskylä, *Working Carers and Caring Workers: Making Paid Employment and Care Responsibilities Compatible?*, €450,300
9. **Luoto, Riitta**, UKK Institute, *Impact of Lifestyle Modification on Pregnant Women's Workability, Sickness Absence and Return to Employment*, €142,870
10. **Martikainen, Pekka**, University of Helsinki, *The Effects of Labour Market Change on Well-being and Health: Longitudinal Analyses of Individuals, Families and Establishments* (consortium), €443,440
Other members:
Jääntti, Markus, Åbo Akademi University, €205,720

11. **Melin, Harri**, University of Turku, *Successful Organisations and Employee Well-being in Knowledge-intensive Work: Contradictions and Challenges*, €450,300
12. **Nätti, Jouko**, University of Tampere, *Between Employment and Unemployment. Involuntary Part-time and Temporary Work in the Nordic Countries: Extent, Explanations, Transitions and Well-being Outcomes*, €450,300
13. **Prättälä, Ritva**, National Public Health Institute, *Impact of Work and Socioeconomic Circumstances on Physical Activity and Fitness at Different Life Stages*, €402,300 (Ministry of Education)
14. **Raitakari, Olli**, TYKS, *Role of early life risk factors in associations between work, cardiovascular disease and depression: A life course approach based on two prospective cohorts* (consortium), €182,310
 Other members:
 Kivimäki, Mika, Finnish Institute of Occupational Health, €144,590
 Keltikangas-Järvinen, Liisa, University of Helsinki, €182,310
 Telama, Risto, LIKES Research Center, Jyväskylä, ---
15. **Salmi, Minna**, STAKES, *The Consequences of Work Insecurity on Work-family Relations and Well-being in Two Welfare Regimes*, €450,300
16. **Stenberg, Tarja**, University of Helsinki, *Sleep and Health: Coping with Irregular Working Hours* (consortium), €1,840
 Other members:
 Härmä, Mikko, Finnish Institute of Occupational Health, €149,160
 Kukkonen-Harjula, Katriina, UKK Institute, €320,020
 Paunio, Tiina, National Public Health Institute, €333,720
17. **Suikkanen, Asko**, University of Lapland, *Spatial Citizenship in European Labour Markets*, €450,310
18. **Vahtera, Jussi**, Finnish Institute of Occupational Health, *Determinants of Early Exit from Work Force: An International Multi-Cohort Study*, €450,300
19. **Vuori, Jukka**, Finnish Institute of Occupational Health, *Promotion of Resources and Well-Being in Work Transitions*, €400,010

APPENDIX 2. The steering groups

8.2.2007-2.1.2008

Chair: Professor Kalervo Väänänen, Research Council for Health
Vice Chair: Research Professor, Deputy Director General, Matti Heikkilä,
Research Council for Culture and Society

Members:

Professor Kirsti Husgafvel-Pursiainen, Research Council for Health
Professor Anne Kovalainen, Research Council for Culture and Society
Professor Kaj Husman, National Sports Council, Ministry of Education
Ombudsman Ilkka Tahvanainen, Research Liaison Officer, Finnish Work
Environment Fund

Expert members:

Professor Anna-Liisa Elo, Finnish Institute of Occupational Health and
University of Tampere
Professor Annika Härenstam, National Institute for Working Life, Gothenburg
University, Sweden
Professor Peter Nolan, Leeds University Business School, UK

3.1.2008-31.12.2009

Chair: Professor Kalervo Väänänen, Research Council for Health
Vice Chair: Professor Anne Kovalainen, Research Council for Culture and Society

Members:

Professor Kirsti Husgafvel-Pursiainen, Research Council for Health
Professor Katariina Salmela-Aro, Research Council for Culture and Society
Professor Kaj Husman, National Sports Council, Ministry of Education
Ombudsman Ilkka Tahvanainen, Research Liaison Officer, Finnish Work
Environment Fund

Expert members:

Professor Anna-Liisa Elo, Finnish Institute of Occupational Health and
University of Tampere
Professor Annika Härenstam, National Institute for Working Life, Gothenburg
University, Sweden
Professor Peter Nolan, Leeds University Business School, UK

2.2.2010-31.12.2012

Chair: Professor Pauli Niemelä, Research Council for Culture and Society

Vice Chair: Professor Kirsti Hugafvel-Pursiainen, Research Council for Health

Members:

Professor Olli Mäenpää, Research Council for Culture and Society

Professor Tuula Tamminen, Research Council for Health

Professor Kaj Husman, National Sports Council, Ministry of Education

Ombudsman Ilkka Tahvanainen, Research Liaison Officer, Finnish Work
Environment Fund

Expert members:

Professor Anna-Liisa Elo, Finnish Institute of Occupational Health,
University of Jyväskylä

Professor Annika Härenstam, National Institute for Working Life,
Gothenburg University, Sweden

Professor Peter Nolan, Leeds University Business School, UK

APPENDIX 3. Assignment letter for the evaluation panel

10.8.2012

Dnr

Tutkimusohjelman arviointipaneelin asettaminen

Suomen Akatemian hallitus osoitti päätöksellään 8.1. 2007 yhteensä 8 miljoonaa euroa käytettäväksi *Työn ja hyvinvoinnin tulevaisuus* (WORK) tutkimusohjelman hankkeiden rahoitukseen vuosina 2008-2011. Tutkimusohjelma oli Suomen Akatemian, opetusministeriön ja Työsuojelurahaston rahoittama. Opetusministeriön rahoitusosuus oli 770 000 euroa ja Työsuojelurahaston 340 000 euroa. Ohjelmassa rahoitettiin viisi konsortiota ja 14 yksittäistä hanketta.

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

Tutkimusohjelman loppuarviointia varten asetetaan arviointipaneeli, jonka tehtävänä on arvioida:

- (1) ohjelman suunnittelua
- (2) ohjelmalle asetettujen tavoitteiden saavuttamista
- (3) ohjelman panosta tutkijakoulutuksen edistämiseen
- (4) ohjelman kotimaista ja kansainvälistä yhteistyötä ja verkostoja
- (5) ohjelmassa saavutettujen tutkimustulosten yhteiskunnallista vaikuttavuutta

sekä antaa suosituksia Suomen Akatemian tutkimusohjelmatoiminnan ja ohjelman alaan kuuluvien tutkimusalojen kehittämiseksi.

WORK-tutkimusohjelman arviointipaneelin jäseninä toimivat seuraavat henkilöt:

puheenjohtajana
tutkimusjohtaja Tuula Heiskanen, Tampereen yliopisto

ja jäseninä
professori Staffan Marklund, Karolinska Institutet
neuvotteleva virkamies Arto Koho, sosiaali- ja terveysministeriö
toimittaja Ulla Järvi, Suomen Lääkärelehti

Arviointipaneelin työ päättyy viimeistään 31.12.2012. Arviointipaneelin jäsenille toimitetaan yksityiskohtaiset ohjeet arvioinnin suorittamiseksi ja heille maksetaan Akatemian ohjeiden mukainen palkkio. Arvioinnin tulokset julkaistaan WORK-ohjelman loppuarviointiraportissa.

Pääjohtaja



Heikki Mannila

Ylijohtaja, tutkimus



Riitta Mustonen

10.8.2012

Dnr

Jakelu

Kulttuurin ja yhteiskunnan tutkimuksen toimikunta
Terveystutkimuksen toimikunta
Ylijohtaja, hallinto
Talousyksikkö
Ohjelmayksikkö

FINAL EVALUATION OF THE WORK-PROGRAMME

EVALUATION PANEL MEMBERS:

1. Professor Staffan Marklund, Karolinska Institutet
2. Research Director Tuula Heiskanen, University of Tampere
3. Ministerial Adviser Arto Koho, Ministry of Social Affairs
4. Journalist Ulla Järvi, Finnish Medical Journal

Scientific Secretary: Robert Arnkil

RATIONALE:

The aim of the process is not a scientific evaluation of the programme. Rather, it is the aim of the panel to assess how the programme succeeded in producing “added value” to current research on the future of work and well-being, how it was received in the media, whether it has stimulated societal discussion, and how the researchers experienced their participation in the programme.

TASK:

The panel shall read and analyze the final reports of the WORK-projects, the researchers’ self-reflections (Webropol-questionnaire), media analysis, as well as other materials directly related to the programme. In its meeting in Helsinki, the panel will conduct interviews with the programme manager (Petteri Pietikäinen, Risto Vilkkö), the Chair of the Steering Group (Pauli Niemelä), Director of the Academy of Finland Programme Unit (Arja Kallio), 2-3 Principle Investigators of WORK-research projects, and 2-3 other researchers.

The panel is expected to assess the programme as a *whole*, not the individual projects, and to discuss especially the following issues:

1. Planning of the programme
2. Implementation of the programme, i.e., success in achieving the goals and objectives of the programme (cf. the Programme Memorandum). In particular, has the programme succeeded in:
 - activating interdisciplinary approaches and thus gaining deeper understanding of the relationships between work, welfare, and well-being?
 - in developing new innovations (“success stories”) that can help resolve problems in these relationships?
 - promoting the application of new research methods?
 - coordinating scattered research environments and capacities?
3. Contribution to researcher training.
4. National and international collaboration and networking.
5. Societal impact of the research results and their influence on the surrounding society. In other words, has the programme succeeded in intensifying the dissemination of research

- results among researchers and between researchers and different stakeholder groups (e.g. business companies, public organizations, policy-makers, the media, citizens)?
6. Foresight. Recommendations for the development of the Academy of Finland research programme activities, as well as research in the field of work and wellbeing.

REPORT

The evaluation report will be written by the panel in English and edited/finalized by the panel secretary. The report should be a short and explicit strategic tool for the development of research programme activities in the Academy of Finland (for the benefit of the Academy of Finland Programme Unit, Research Councils, and the Board of the Academy).

SCHEDULE

- April: “get-together” meeting in Helsinki
- May: on-line self-evaluation questionnaire to the WORK-projects (Webropol)
- June: collection of final reports
- August: all relevant evaluation materials sent to the members of the panel
- September: two day panel meeting in Helsinki; interviews and preparation of the report
- October/November: preparation of the final report (panel secretary)
- December: publication of the report

PRACTICAL MATTERS

Each panel member will receive an honorarium (EUR 1700, tax will be deducted). Also the panel secretary receives an honorarium. All travelling expenses (economy class) and accommodation will be reimbursed.

CONTACT

Risto Vilkkö, Programme Manager
Programme Unit
Tel. +358-9-77488 232
E-mail: risto.vilkkö@aka.fi

Ritva Helle, Project Officer
Programme Unit
Tel. + 358 40 586 4679
E-mail: ritva.helle@aka.fi

Academy of Finland
PO Box 131 (Hakaniemenranta 6)
FIN-00531 Helsinki, Finland

www.aka.fi
www.aka.fi/work

APPENDIX 4. Programme for evaluation panel meeting

Evaluation Panel of the Academy of Finland Research Programme

The Future of Work and Well-Being (WORK)

Panel Programme

- 24.9.** Panel meeting at the Academy of Finland
Meeting room Nevanlinna 7110 (7th floor), Hakaniemenranta 6, Helsinki
- 10.00-10.15 General information and guidelines, Programme Manager Risto Vilkkio
- 10.15-11.00 Opening discussion
- 11.00-12.00 Interview with researchers:
Mirka Hintsanen (Univ. Helsinki, Prof. Raitakari's project)
Saara Koikkalainen (Univ. Lapland, Prof. Suikkanen's project)
Sampsa Puttonen (Finnish Institute of Occupational Health,
Prof. Stenberg's project)
Pasi Pyöriä (Univ. Tampere, Prof. Melin's project)
- 12.00-12.30 Discussion
- 12.30-13.15 Lunch
- 13.15-14.15 Interview with Principle Investigators
Prof. Jarna Heinonen, Univ. of Turku
Prof. Pekka Martikainen, Univ. of Helsinki
Prof. Ritva Prättälä, National Institute for Health and Welfare
- 14.15-14.45 Discussion
- 14.45-15.15 Interview with the Chair of the Steering Committee, Prof. Pauli Niemelä,
Univ. of Eastern Finland / Academy of Finland Research Council for
Culture and Society
- 15.15-15.45 Interview with the former Programme Manager of WORK,
Prof. Petteri Pietikäinen, Univ. of Oulu
- 15.45 -16.15 Interview with the Director of the Academy of Finland Programme Unit,
Dr Arja Kallio
- 16.15-17.00 Discussion
- 25.9.**
- 9.00-10.00 Conclusions
- 10.00-12.00 Discussion
- 12.00-13.00 Lunch
- 13.00-15.00 Final discussion

APPENDIX 5. Self-evaluation questionnaire

Academy of Finland Research Programme *The Future of Work and Well-being (WORK)*

Introduction

Academy of Finland research programmes are evaluated by a dedicated international group of experts after the end of the programme funding period. For this purpose, the researchers of the WORK programme are asked to fill in the following self-evaluation questionnaire, which will provide important material for the evaluation group. This self-evaluation is an official part of the evaluation. Therefore filling in the questionnaire is mandatory. **Please provide answers in English.**

Replies can be given anonymously. However, personal information may be included in the end of the questionnaire. Sections A–C are directed to all researchers of the WORK programme, section D only for the principle investigators. **Deadline for replies is 8 June 2012.**

Let it be noted, that the principle investigators are expected to submit their final reports to the Academy of Finland online services by 15 June 2011.

The questionnaire includes two kinds of questions:

1. Multiple choice questions with numerical scale 1-5,
1= not at all; 5=very much
2. Open comments and answers (free text)

Thank you for your help for the best of the evaluation of the WORK programme!

Questions A: General issues

- a. Were the objectives of the WORK programme overall relevant? (1-5)
- b. Were the objectives of the WORK programme overall achievable with regard to the programme funding available? (1-5)
- c. Did the WORK programme promote multidisciplinary research in your research area? (1-5)
If possible, give example (Open space for an answer)
- d. Did the WORK programme promote the development of your research area? (1-5)
If possible, give example

Open comments on general issues:

Questions B: Coordination of the programme

- a. Did the coordination of the programme help your project to achieve its objectives? (1-5)
- b. Did the coordination contribute efficiently to the overall integration of the WORK programme? (1-5)
- c. Please specify what the most helpful aspects were of the programme coordination: (Open space for an answer)
- d. How did your project collaborate with other WORK projects?
If only occasionally or formally, on what reasons that occurred?
(Open space for an answer)

Open comments on coordination of the programme: (Open space for an answer)

Questions C: Personal research and career related experiences

Please estimate to what extent you were able to promote your personal

Scientific goals (1-5)

Networking (1-5)

Training (1-5)

Please briefly describe your personal main objectives? (Open space for an answer)

Please estimate how much the following factors supported your personal research?

Institutional/university support (1-5)

National collaboration and networks (1-5)

International collaboration and networks (1-5)

Availability of qualified research personnel (1-5)

Other sources of funding (1-5)

Did the programme generate international research cooperation that you would not have had without this funding? Yes/No

If yes, please name the country/countries

Open comments on personal experiences: (Open space for an answer)

Questions D: for the Principle Investigators of the projects

- a. How essential was the WORK funding for your research? (1-5)
- b. Did the WORK funding promote research careers in your project? (1-5)
- c. Do you consider your WORK funding sufficient with respect to your original research plan? (1-5)
- d. To what extent were you able to execute your original research plan in the time available? (1-5)
- e. Could your project have achieved its goals without being part of the WORK programme? (1-5)

To what extent did your project benefit from being a part of the WORK-programme in relation to:

- Scientific results (1-5)
- National collaboration (1-5)
- International collaboration (1-5)
- Researcher training (1-5)
- Researcher mobility (1-5)
- Visibility in media (1-5)

Please list all your activities in public media presenting results in the WORK-programme. (Newspaper articles, TV and radio interviews etc.) You may provide links to publications and activities. (Open space for an answer)

Have you made use of social media to promote your research results or engaged in public discussion (e.g. Facebook, blogs, etc.). (Open space for an answer)

From the research point of view, how do you see the main opportunities and challenges in dealing with the media and wider public? (Open space for an answer)

Please estimate the practical applicability of your research

- In the short term (1-5 years) (1-5)
- In the long term (6 years or more) (1-5)

Please provide examples of how your research results could lead to practical applications. (Open space for an answer)

Please provide examples of how your research results have led to practical applications. (Open space for an answer)

Please indicate to what extent the following stakeholders were involved in your project

- Research partners (as listed in the grant application) (1-5)
- Other researchers and academic stakeholders (1-5)
- Policy makers (1-5)
- Government experts and officials (1-5)
- NGOs (1-5)
- Business organizations (1-5)
- Public organizations (local authorities, hospitals etc) (1-5)
- The media (1-5)
- Civil society at large (1-5)

What do you consider the main result or highlight of your WORK-project

- a. scientific
(Open space for an answer)
- b. for private or public work-life organizations
(Open space for an answer)
- c. for public media and wider society
(Open space for an answer)

Which type of publication do you consider the most important for your project?
(Monograph, article in a peer reviewed journal, chapter in an edited volume, paper in a conference proceedings, etc.) (Open space for an answer)

General Evaluation of the WORK Programme (free text)

What were the strengths of the WORK programme? (Open space for an answer)

What were the weaknesses of the WORK programme? (Open space for an answer)

How could the WORK programme have been improved? (Open space for an answer)

Do you have recommendations for the development of the Academy of Finland research programme activities (e.g. funding, scope, duration, multidisciplinary)?
(Open space for an answer)

Voluntary information:

Name of the respondent: (Open space for an answer)

Title of the WORK-project: (Open space for an answer)

Organization: (Open space for an answer)

Department: (Open space for an answer)

Email: (Open space for an answer)



ACADEMY OF FINLAND

Hakaniemenranta 6 • POB 131, FI-00531 Helsinki
Tel. +358 29 533 5000 • Fax +358 29 533 5299
www.aka.fi/eng • viestinta@aka.fi