

Publications of the Academy of Finland 4/08

Research Programme on Social Capital and Networks of Trust 2004-2007 (SoCa)



Evaluation Report



ACADEMY OF FINLAND
RESEARCH FUNDING AND EXPERTISE

RESEARCH PROGRAMME
ON SOCIAL CAPITAL
AND NETWORKS OF
TRUST (SoCa)

2004–2007

Evaluation Report

Members of the Evaluation Panel

Professor Peter Nolan,
University of Leeds (Chair)
Professor Fiona Devine,
University of Manchester
Professor Sokratis Koniordos,
University of Crete
Professor Susana Narotzky,
University of Barcelona
Professor Sverker Sörlin,
Royal Institute of Technology,
Stockholm
Professor Michael Woolcock,
University of Manchester/
World Bank

ACADEMY OF FINLAND IN BRIEF

The Academy's mission is to finance high-quality scientific research, act as a science and science policy expert and strengthen the position of science and research. The Academy's activities cover all scientific disciplines.

The main focus of the Academy's development activities is on improving opportunities for professional careers in research, providing resources and facilities for high-profile research environments and making the best possible use of international opportunities in all fields of research, research funding, and science policy.

The Academy has a number of funding instruments for various purposes. In its research funding, the Academy of Finland promotes gender equality and encourages in particular women researchers to apply for research posts and research grants from the Academy.

The Academy's annual research funding amounts to more than 280 million euros, which represents some 15 per cent of the government's total R&D spending.

Each year Academy-funded projects account for some 3,000 researcher-years at universities and research institutes.

The wide range of high-level basic research funded by the Academy generates new knowledge and new experts. The Academy of Finland operates within the administrative sector of the Ministry of Education and receives its funding through the state budget.

For more information on the Academy of Finland, go to www.aka.fi/eng.

CONTENTS

Preface	8
1 The SoCa Programme	11
1.1 Background	11
1.2 Objectives	12
1.3 Basic information on the programme.....	13
2 Evaluation Procedure	15
3 Overall Evaluation of the SoCa Programme	16
3.1 Strategic planning of the programme	16
3.2 Creating the necessary preconditions for the programme.....	16
3.3 Scientific quality and results	17
3.4 Success of the implementation of the programme goals and objectives.....	19
3.5 Added value of the programme.....	22
3.6 Programme coordination and activities	23
4 Conclusions and Recommendations for the Future	24
Annex 1 SoCa Steering Committee and sub-committees 2001–2008	26
Annex 2 Tasks of the Steering Committee, Programme Coordinator and Principal Investigators	28
Annex 3 List of the SoCa programme projects and their funding	30
Annex 4 SoCa self-evaluation form for projects	35
Annex 5 Material for the evaluation	38
Annex 6 Agenda of the Evaluation Panel meeting	39
Annex 7 Panel assignment	41

Description

Publisher	Academy of Finland	Date 18 June 2008
Author(s)	Evaluation Panel	
Title	Research Programme on Social Capital and Networks of Trust (SoCa) 2004-2007. Evaluation Report.	
Abstract	<p>The Academy of Finland Board decided on 13 November 2002, on proposal by the Research Council for Culture and Society and the Research Council for Health, to launch the Research Programme on Social Capital and Networks of Trust. The scientific challenge of the programme was to explain and understand how and where social capital is created, how social trust evolves and transforms, how innovation potential is created and becomes networked in action, and how social capital can be measured. The scientific goals were set to attract research on social capital, arising from different traditions. The aim was to promote scholarly expertise in social and cultural studies, establish high-level disciplinary research teams and encourage particularly the establishment and promotion of interdisciplinary teams.</p> <p>Funding was granted to 31 research projects for 2004-2007 by the Academy of Finland, Tekes, the Finnish Work Environment Fund and the Ministry of Social Affairs and Health. The funding of the programme totalled 7.5 million euros, of which Academy funding was six million euros.</p> <p>After the completion of SoCa, an Evaluation Panel of six international 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 reflect particularly on the following issues: planning and scientific quality of the programme, success of the implementation of the programme objectives, contribution to researcher and expert training, collaboration and networking, applicability of research as well as recommendations to the Academy for future programmes. This report includes the results of the Panel's evaluation.</p> <p>The Panel paid attention to the ambitious goals of the programme. According to the Panel, SoCa had achieved many of the set goals, though the amount of funding and the duration of the funding period were seen as insufficient in terms of the set scientific goals. The Panel felt that the scientific quality of the results greatly varied between projects. The Panel noted that teams that were granted a smaller amount of funding than they had applied for had to re-adjust the goals defined in their research plan after receiving the funding decision. The Panel also felt that it was too early to assess the results so soon after the completion of the programme. According to the Panel, SoCa succeeded in attracting junior researchers to research this thematic area, promoting networking and encouraging debate among researchers of different disciplines. The Panel felt that the Programme Coordinator was very successful in this by creating opportunities for researcher networking.</p>	
Key words	SoCa, social capital, capital, trust, networks, research programme, research funding, evaluation	
Name and number of series	Publication of the Academy of Finland 4/08	
ISSN	0358-9153	
ISBN	Print 978-951-715-696-7	Pdf 978-951-715-697-4
Number of pages	42	
Distributed by	Academy of Finland, POB 99, FI-00501 Helsinki, viestinta@aka.fi	
Published by	Academy of Finland	
Place and date of printing	Edita Prima, 2007	
Other information	www.aka.fi/publications	

Kuvailulehti

Julkaisija	Suomen Akatemia	Päivämäärä	18.6.2008
Tekijä(t)	Arviointipaneeli		
Julkaisun nimi	Research Programme on Social Capital and Networks of Trust 2004-2007 (SoCa). Evaluation Report		
Tiivistelmä	<p>Suomen Akatemian hallitus päätti 13.11.2002 kulttuurin ja yhteiskunnan tutkimuksen toimikunnan sekä terveyden tutkimuksen toimikunnan esityksestä käynnistää Sosiaalinen pääoma ja luottamusverkostot -tutkimusohjelman. Ohjelman tieteellisenä haasteena oli selittää ja ymmärtää, miten ja missä sosiaalista pääomaa syntyy, miten sosiaalinen luottamus muotoutuu ja muuttuu, miten innovaatiopotentiaalia syntyy ja verkostoituu sekä miten sosiaalista pääomaa voidaan mitata. Tieteelliset tavoitteet asetettiin siten, että ne kutsuivat erilaisista traditioista nousevaa sosiaalisen pääoman tutkimusta. Ohjelman tavoitteena oli virittää laajasti yhteiskunnan ja kulttuurin tutkimuksen asiantuntemusta, muodostaa laadukkaita tieteen-alaperustaisia tutkimusryhmiä sekä rohkaista erityisesti tieteiden välisten ryhmien syntyä ja kehittämistä.</p> <p>Suomen Akatemia, Tekes, Työsuojelurahasto sekä Sosiaali- ja terveysministeriö myönsivät rahoitusta 31 tutkimusprojektille vuosiksi 2004–2007. Ohjelmalle myönnettiin rahoitusta yhteensä 7,5 miljoonaa euroa, josta Akatemian osuus oli 6 miljoonaa euroa.</p> <p>Tutkimusohjelman päättyessä kuudesta kansainvälisestä asiantuntijasta koostuva arviointipaneeli arvioi ohjelman onnistumisen ohjelmamuistioon kirjattujen tavoitteiden saavuttamisessa. Paneelin tehtävänä oli arvioida ohjelma kokonaisuudessaan kiinnittäen erityistä huomiota seuraaviin seikkoihin: tutkimusohjelman valmistelu ja ohjelman tieteellinen laatu, ohjelman tavoitteiden saavuttaminen, panostus tutkijankoulutukseen, yhteistyö ja verkottuminen, tutkimustulosten merkittävyys sekä suositukset Suomen Akatemialle tulevien ohjelmien varalle. Tämä raportti sisältää arviointipaneelin työn tulokset.</p> <p>Tuloksissaan paneeli kiinnitti huomiota ohjelman kunnianhimoisiin tavoitteisiin. Paneeli arvioi SoCa:n saavuttaneen monet sille asetetut tavoitteet, vaikkakin rahoituksen määrän ja rahoituskauten pituuden arvioitiin olleen riittämättömät suhteessa ohjelman tieteellisiin tavoitteisiin. Tulosten tieteellisen laadun katsottiin vaihtelevan suuresti projektien välillä. Paneeli arvioi haettua rahoitusta pienemmän tutkimusmäärärahan saaneiden joutuneen asettamaan tutkimussuunnitelmassa esitetyt tavoitteet uudelleen rahoituspäätöksen saatuaan. Paneeli totesi lisäksi, että tulosten arvioiminen nopeasti ohjelman päättyttyä on ennen aikaista. Paneeli arvioi, että ohjelman tärkeä anti oli nuorten tutkijoiden tuomisessa tämän aiheen piiriin, heidän verkottamisessaan sekä tutkijoiden totuttamisessa keskusteluun eri tieteenalojen edustajien välillä. Ohjelman koordinaattorin katsottiin erittäin onnistuneesti luoneen tilaisuuksia tutkijoiden verkottumiseen tämän tavoitteen saavuttamiseksi.</p>		
Asiasanat	SoCa; sosiaalinen pääoma; pääoma; luottamus; verkostot; tutkimusohjelma; tutkimusrahoitus; arviointi		
Julkaisusarjan nimi ja numero	Suomen Akatemian julkaisuja 4/08		
ISSN	0358-9153		
ISBN	Painetulle kirjalle annettu tunnus 978-951-715-696-7	Pdf-versiolle annettu tunnus	978-951-715-697-4
Sivumäärä	42		
Julkaisun jakaja	Suomen Akatemia, PL 99, 00501 Helsinki		
Julkaisun kustantaja	Suomen Akatemia		
Painopaikka ja -aika	Edita Prima, 2008		
Muut tiedot	www.aka.fi/julkaisut		

PREFACE

The preparation of the SoCa Research Programme had started in 2000, and was followed by the call for proposals in April 2003. The original idea leading to the SoCa programme was actually conveyed by the Research Council for Culture and Society of 1998–2000 to the next Council that took up this idea enthusiastically. At the closer look the concept of social capital appeared both inspiring and challenging since there were different schools of thought and the concept had been in active use by a variety of academic and non-academic circles both in Finland and abroad. Anyhow, the concept of social capital seemed to organise, and also to some extent integrate, ongoing academic debates aiming at better understanding contemporary social change and its preconditions.

Moreover, the concept of social capital was expected to fit well experiments on interdisciplinary approaches addressing social phenomena, and therefore to provide an interesting and appropriate framework even for international comparison. Thus, the Steering Committee of the SoCa programme appointed by the Academy of Finland engaged itself in a vivid discussion covering a variety of disciplinary and interdisciplinary approaches as well as academic traditions across different nations and continents. Trust and networks were at the core of these debates. Therefore, the programme was finally launched with the title ‘Research Programme on Social Capital and Networks of Trust’.

As a result of this preparatory work preceded by an exploratory workshop (2001) assembling many researchers and stakeholders, a Memorandum was written defining the content of the programme. The Steering Committee was pursuing the ambitious aim of including research ideas quite extensively across disciplines in order to raise interest in the research community at large. We believed that in this way the call for proposals would be competitive enough to result in a selection of high-quality projects with significant capacities for collaboration both nationally and internationally. Indeed, the initial set of proposals included 156 plans of intent. After two phases of assessment, the final selection was made yielding the selection of 31 projects that set out for work at the beginning of 2004.

The SoCa programme has been coordinated by Dr Pertti Jokivuori at Agora Center of the University of Jyväskylä from the very start to the end. There have been successively three Steering Committees nominated by the Academy of Finland with varying combinations of Research Council members, academic experts and representatives of allied funding organisations, some of the members keeping up their involvement for the whole effective period of the SoCa programme during 2004–2007. The programme has facilitated several workshops and many courses for PhD students with the contribution of the Steering Committee, the Principal Investigators of the projects and invited lecturers. As the Chair of the Steering Committee I feel very grateful for the highly dedicated and successful coordination of the SoCa programme by Dr Jokivuori and for the excellent management by Ms Päivi Messo-Lindén (Science Adviser at the Academy of Finland). I am also delighted with the opportunity to carry on with the programme in different roles sharing this delightful

experience with other Steering Committee members from the very start until the final evaluation of the programme. What made this participation so worthwhile is that in many Steering Committee meetings we did not only manage routine tasks but often our discussion covered topical issues of current academic debate. I wish to extend special thanks to all Steering Committee members and, in particular, to Professor Reino Hjerppe, who was among the first initiators of the programme and has been an active member of the Steering Committee through all these years.

Obviously, the main role in successfully carrying out the SoCa programme has been with the Principal Investigators and their research teams. Moreover, the future accomplishments of the research field concerned are mainly in their hands. Throughout the programme many young researchers found peers with similar interests, and senior researchers had an opportunity to test their views against research experience from another intellectual perspective. May all this activity encourage SoCa programme members to consolidate further networking and collaboration within academia and with end-users of the research results.

At the end of the programme an international evaluation team was invited by the Academy of Finland to assess the scientific contribution of the work done. The team consisted of distinguished scholars who have all contributed in different ways to the knowledge and understanding of social capital in their respective fields. The members of the Evaluation Panel are:

Professor Peter Nolan, University of Leeds (Chair)
Professor Fiona Devine, University of Manchester
Professor Sokratis Koniordos, University of Crete
Professor Susana Narotzky, University of Barcelona
Professor Sverker Sörlin, Royal Institute of Technology, Stockholm
Professor Michael Woolcock, University of Manchester/World Bank

The Panel was expected to assess the programme as a whole and reflect especially on the following issues: planning and scientific quality of the research programme, success of the implementation of the programme goals and objectives, contribution to researcher and expert training, collaboration and networking, applicability of research and importance to end-users as well as recommendations for the future. The entire report of the Evaluation Panel is presented in this publication. The report shows that while there are commendable results of the SoCa programme – and still more to be expected e.g. in forthcoming international publications – there are also some shortcomings of organisation and management impeding full success and effective use of the entire intellectual capacities involved in this programme. Some of these deficiencies most probably are not characteristic of the SoCa programme only. Therefore, this report may serve as material even for more general reflection as concerns the present funding instruments of the Academy of Finland.

I take this opportunity to express my gratitude to all members of the Evaluation Panel who have kindly agreed to share their scholarly expertise and their very valuable opinions to the benefit of the academic research community in Finland.

Finally, it is my sincere hope that the achievements reached until now by the SoCa programme will lead to further academic work creating new collaboration nationally and internationally. I also wish that the many young researchers who have enjoyed the facilities, the intellectual atmosphere and the academic community provided by the SoCa programme will keep on building their careers by profiting from this unique experience. In all, it has been a great pleasure to participate in this ambitious scholarly enterprise, and I trust to share this feeling with all those who have actively contributed to the success of the SoCa programme.

Jyväskylä, 18 June 2008

Marja Järvelä

Chair of the Steering Committee

I THE SoCa PROGRAMME

1.1 Background¹

The Academy of Finland Research Council for Culture and Society received in 2000 an initiative for a research programme on Social Capital, Innovations and Welfare, which was entered in the action plan and budget of the Research Council that ended its term on 31 December 2000. The new Research Council that began its term at the beginning of 2001 continued work to make preparations for the programme and appointed a Steering Committee to prepare the programme (see Annex 1, SoCa Steering Committees and sub-committee 2001–2008).

The Steering Committee organised in November 2001 an international exploratory workshop on the subject. Some 70 researchers – mainly from universities but also sectoral research institutes and other stakeholders – took part and come up with ideas for research topics. In March 2002, the Steering Committee invited Dr Jouko Nikula to serve as its expert secretary.

At the programme drafting stage it was noted that the concept of social capital was developed more or less independently along somewhat different lines in two separate research traditions. In the Anglo-American tradition, the concept of social capital was employed to ask questions about cooperation and mutual trust among community members, with social capital interpreted as a collective resource in the community. In the French tradition, on the other hand, social capital was seen as a means of power and used to explain the emergence of social differences and conflicts. The Steering Committee found it important to ask whether social capital is a culturally bound concept that has been shaped in different ways by the different challenges faced by American and French society.

The Steering Committee did not commit itself to either of these schools of social capital research. Instead, the Committee considered it important to raise question as to whether and how different methodological approaches can be fruitfully combined in the programme. Another relevant question was whether it was necessary to adapt the concept of social capital according to the distinctive characteristics of Finnish society. The Committee found that the subject can be approached from various different angles, but it was not at all clear which of them would be the most relevant to information needs. On the basis of its discussions the Steering Committee settled on the programme title, “Social Capital and Networks of Trust”. As well as presenting a scientific challenge in its own right, it was hoped the title would take into account national information needs in a globalising information society and leave the ground open for the application of different theoretical premises.

The Steering Committee completed its preparatory work in September 2002 and the Research Council for Culture and Society submitted to the Board of the Academy of Finland a request for the necessary funding for the research programme. The Board decided on 13 November 2002 to earmark six million euros for purposes of supporting the research programme from 2003. The Ministry of Social Affairs and

1 Sections 1.1 and 1.2 are taken from the Programme Memorandum 2003.

Health, the National Technology Agency Tekes, the Ministry of Labour and the Finnish Work Environment Fund also committed themselves to supporting the programme with additional funding.

The Academy of Finland launched a call for programme coordinator in January 2003. The Programme Steering Committee interviewed three applicants and selected Dr Pertti Jokivuori from the Agora Center, University of Jyväskylä, who started as Programme Coordinator at the beginning of May 2003. (See Annex 2 for tasks associated with key programme staff.)

1.2 Objectives

Why a research programme on social capital?

The initial Programme Steering Committee wrote:

From a social policy point of view there certainly are good grounds for launching the research programme. International, European and global pressures of change are calling for local solutions and innovations. National, regional and human welfare cannot be based on technological development and economic growth alone. The growth of social capital may also be a precondition for economic development and an innovative society. Multidisciplinary research in social capital is also interested in opening up better prospects for a better future, such as for sustainable development and a sense of moral responsibility for the promotion of social justice and equality.

The research programme on social capital aims to inspire a wide range of expertise in the study of culture and society. The programme lends itself excellently to comparative research at home as well as in international settings. The purpose is to set up high-quality research teams within individual disciplines and to encourage researchers to join forces in interdisciplinary groups. It is particularly important to transcend the boundary line between the humanities and social sciences and between social studies and economics.

The scientific challenge

The scientific challenge is to try to explain and understand how and where social capital is created. The aim is also to explore the innovation and welfare potential as well as the conditions for the emergence of such potential that can be mobilised by synergy that is generated in the study of culture, working life and the economy. A second challenge is to explore the impacts of social capital upon economic development, the capacity for change in the labour markets as well as the implementation of political reform. Furthermore, it is important to study the dysfunctions related to social capital, such as exclusion from the social fields, obstacles to social innovation or structural and cultural changes that undermine social security. The concept of social capital shall be understood as an integral part of the structures of political, social and cultural power and the practices of the new economy.

The research programme is expected to provide answers to the question of how social trust evolves and transforms, how innovation potential is created and becomes networked in action. The question of trust as an element of social capital can be approached not only at the level of institutions and organisations,

including comparative analyses, but also at the level of society as a whole. The definition of the content of social capital is itself a challenging task. Social capital can be analysed into various different categories which vary in terms of their weight and significance in different social arenas; their birth-places and growth-places can be traced and identified from global to local. Ultimately it should be possible to see how social capital compares in terms of its explanatory power with such rival concepts as cultural capital, human capital, social cohesion, social innovation capacity or community and individual welfare resources.

A further object of the research programme is to develop research methods and know-how that will allow for an empirical analysis of social capital and networks of trust and their manifestations. This will require the development of new methods of data collection with which information can be obtained on networks. On the other hand, new kinds of tools are needed for analysing the material describing network structures. In general it is important to know how social capital can be measured.

1.3 Basic information on the programme²

Organisation

The Academy research programmes are overseen by Steering Committees composed of Academy of Finland Research Council members, representatives of other funding organisations and external experts. There were three Programme Steering Committees and sub-committees associated with the SoCa programme (see Annex 1, SoCa Steering Committees and sub-committees 2001–2008). Sub-committees, which make final decisions, are composed of Programme Steering Committee members, who are members of Academy Research Councils. The Programme Coordinator is the secretary to the Steering Committee, while the Academy science adviser is secretary to the sub-committee³.

Application process

The programme application call was launched in April 2003 as a two-stage process. The deadline for applications (plans of intent) was May 15, 2003. Altogether 156 plans of intent were received. The Programme Steering Committee recommended that the Programme Steering sub-committee invite full applications from 58 initial applicants.

The second round deadline in September 2003 yielded 63 full applications (including five split consortia applications from the previous round). These applications were evaluated by two external expert panels in October 2003. The panel members were in:

SoCa Panel 1

Chair: Professor Ben Fine, Dept. of Economics, School of Oriental and African Studies, London, UK; Professor Barbara Misztal, Dept. of Sociology, University of Leicester, UK; Professor Prorector Vadim Radaev, State University Higher School of Economics, Moscow, Russia; and Professor Kerstin Sahlin-Andersson, Dept. of Business Studies, University of Uppsala, Sweden.

2 This section was written with Science Adviser Päivi Messo-Lindén.

3 The tasks of the Steering Committee, Programme Coordinator and Principal Investigator are listed in Annex 2.

SoCa Panel 2

Chair: Professor Bo Rothstein, Dept. of Political Science, Göteborg University, Sweden; Professor Fiona Devine, Dept. of Sociology, University of Manchester, UK; Professor Torkel Jansson, Dept. of History, University of Uppsala, Sweden; and Professor Frédéric Lebaron, European Sociology Centre, France.

The panel gave a grade for each application for relevance of the project to the research programme and their scientific merit. On the basis of these evaluations, the Programme Steering Committee proposed 27 projects to be funded by the Academy of Finland. Four other projects were selected in the programme if granted funding by other funding bodies: three projects by Tekes (Finnish Funding Agency for Technology and Innovation) and one by TSR (Finnish Work Environment Fund). Tekes and TSR also provided additional funding to some projects funded by Academy. The Ministry of Social Affairs and Health participated in funding one Academy project (see Annex 3, List of SoCa programme projects and their funding.)

Finally, the programme started on 1 January 2004 with 31 projects. In most cases, Academy funding lasted until 31 December 2007, with extension of some projects until the end of 2008 or 2009 (due mainly to absences associated with maternity leave during the project).

Programme funding

The total funding of the programme was 7,552,700 euros. Academy funding was six million euros (including 422,300 euros for coordination activities); Tekes funding amounted to 1,162,700 euros, TSR to 340,000 euros and the Ministry of Social Affairs and Health to 50,000 euros (see Annex 3, List of SoCa programme projects and their funding).

Some projects were successful in finding external funding during the programme. In 2006, the Programme Coordinator reported that approximately 1.9 million euros had been secured from external funding sources, mainly from private foundations but also from the Academy of Finland.

2 EVALUATION PROCEDURE

The Steering Committee established a scientific evaluation of the programme at the beginning of 2008. The Evaluation Panel members were: Professor Peter Nolan, Leeds University, UK (Chair); Professor Sverker Sörlin, Royal Technical University, Sweden (Vice Chair); Professor Fiona Devine, University of Manchester, UK; Professor Sokratis Koniordos, University of Crete, Greece; Professor Susana Narotzky, University of Barcelona, Spain; and Professor Michael Woolcock, University of Manchester, UK.

The Steering Committee was responsible for the general planning of the evaluation. The Programme Coordinator organised the programme's self-evaluation and compiled self-evaluation data. The researchers who took part in the programme assessed the programme's general success as well as their own contribution with self-evaluations (see Annex 4, SoCa self-evaluation form for projects). In addition, the researchers submitted final reports to the Academy of Finland. Academy officials compiled data on Academy research reports. The deadline for report material was February 13, 2008.

The Evaluation Panel had access to the documentation produced on the programme and the reports of each project (see Annex 5, Material for the evaluation). The material for the evaluation was sent to the Panel members in April 2008. The Evaluation Panel met at the Academy of Finland in May 2008. For this meeting, each project was assigned to two evaluators and this material was used as a basis for discussions and interviews. Two separate interview sessions with six Principal Investigators and four senior researchers were organised during the Evaluation Panel meeting. A discussion meeting was also held with the Programme Coordinator and two members of the Steering Committee. (See Annex 6, Agenda for Evaluation Panel meeting.)

The aim of the evaluation was to estimate the extent to which the SoCa research programme had succeeded in fulfilling its original objectives. The evaluation also aimed to provide feedback on the success of the programme and its coordination as well as other information that is useful for purposes of science policy planning and decision-making. The Panel was expected to assess the programme as a whole and reflect especially the following issues: **planning of the research programme, scientific quality of SoCa, success of the implementation of the programme goals and objectives, contribution to researcher and expert training, collaboration and networking, applicability of research and importance to end-users and recommendations for the future** (see Annex 7, Panel assignment).

3 OVERALL EVALUATION OF SoCa PROGRAMME

3.1 Strategic planning of the programme

The strategic planning of the programme was extensive and thorough. The Panel noted that the Steering Committee had sought from the outset to engage the research community and key policy stakeholders. An exploratory workshop was convened to examine core concepts and established theoretical positions, and to assist in the definition of the programme's shape, core themes and research questions. The Steering Committee completed its preparatory work in September 2002.

The resulting programme specification had two central objectives: to contribute to international scholarly debates about social capital and networks of trust; and to address these issues with specific reference to developments in Finland. The Panel noted that these two objectives may not always have been compatible. The Memorandum stated that the aim of the programme was 'to produce information that can help to gain a better understanding of the processes of change under way in Finland as part of a process of European integration and globalisation' (p. 5). Comparative research was a clear aspiration, but the urgent need to generate new work on social capital and the formation of networks of trust in Finland dominated the selection of projects.

The Panel felt that while there was clear evidence that the second objective of the programme had been successfully achieved, there was less evidence that the programme had succeeded in addressing the wider international debates on social capital and networks of trust. It was felt that some of the objectives outlined in the initial programme specification may have been too ambitious. Examples include the challenge 'to know how social capital shall be measured' and how 'social capital compares in terms of its explanatory power with such rival concepts as cultural capital, human capital, social cohesion, social innovation capacity or community and individual welfare resources' (Memorandum, p. 3). The Panel took the view that such major questions are likely to require a longer period of sustained engagement and theoretical reflection. As such, it was the consensus view of the Panel that the Academy may wish to consider programme timeframes beyond the current four-year cycle. These issues are elaborated upon below.

3.2 Creating the necessary preconditions for the programme

The call for applications by the Academy in April 2003 produced a very positive response, yielding 156 outline proposals. The Programme Steering Committee invited full applications from 63 research teams including five consortia applications. These applications were evaluated by two expert international panels in October 2003, and resulted in the selection and funding of 27 projects by the Academy of Finland and a further four by external agencies. The high number of applications reflected a strong latent demand for research on social capital.

One of the Academy's central goals was to transcend the boundary lines between the humanities and the social sciences. Applications came from a wide range of social science disciplines (including public health specialists) and from the humanities (philosophy and history). Included in the final 27 projects were a significant number that actively embraced the interdisciplinary challenge. Accordingly, Panel members felt that the Academy's interdisciplinary objective had been partially achieved at the programme level (see below), and commended the decision to support projects that integrated scholars from the humanities and social sciences. Feedback from the Principal Investigators confirmed that the inclusion of a broad range of disciplines had enhanced the scientific quality and depth of the programme.

The Panel was impressed by the highly competitive nature of the application process, but was concerned that the funding decisions resulted, in virtually all cases, in a substantial gap between the funding that had been sought by Principal Investigators and the monies awarded. There was a concern that the overall budget may have been spread too thinly over the 27 projects and that the revisions to project design and implementation that the funding decisions entailed may have weakened the scientific content of the research. The Principal Investigators reported that the budgets awarded did not enable them to meet all of their original aims and objectives. Some researchers had devoted considerable time to searching for other monies to retain research staff and execute the research design. The Panel considered this matter carefully and felt that the Academy may in the future wish to consider fully funding fewer projects.

It was noted that the Academy does not fund Principal Investigators. The latter reported that they did not have adequate time to devote to their projects. The Panel felt that this may have been detrimental to one of the key objectives of the programme, namely to contribute to the wider international theoretical and policy debates on social capital, networks and trust. The research carried out by the project team members, particularly the Masters and PhD students, needed to be placed in the broader intellectual context. Doing so, however, required the allocation of time for Principal Investigators to make a substantive input. They needed this time to reflect on the wider implications of the research, attend international meetings and contribute papers to refereed journals with international standing. The Panel felt that the Academy may wish to revisit this policy in the future.

3.3 Scientific quality and results

It was somewhat difficult for the Panel to assess the broader scientific quality of the research projects, given that Panel members were primarily drawing their conclusions from summary evaluation forms containing brief discussions of key findings and implications⁴, and with little information pertaining to the methodological procedures deployed and indeed actual results achieved. Nevertheless, some journal article publications which were early products of the project were provided, and these, by definition, indicated that high quality work had been undertaken by many of the teams. However, since the programme had only recently concluded (at the end of

4 It was noted in some instances that the summary of the results replicated the original aims and objectives from the proposals rather than explicitly presenting final results.

2007), and as there is inherently a long time lag between submission of journal articles and their appearance in print⁵, it is perhaps too soon to make a definitive declaration on the overall scientific merit of the research—this will only become clear as more publications appear and as the PhD students become leading full-time researchers.

The Panel noted the high volume of outputs produced across the programme, and the clear attention to methodological training given to members of the research teams. However, there was a concern that there was a great deal of variability with respect to the quantity of outputs, with some teams publishing a considerable amount and others much less so, and that among the publications themselves there was also considerable heterogeneity with regards to their quality and accessibility. With respect to accessibility, there are two issues: firstly, many of the publications were only available in Finnish, and secondly, many of the outputs were not in the wider public domain. While this variability is normal, the preponderance of publications appearing only in Finnish means that even the strongest ones are unlikely to realise their full impact on the international stage.

As noted elsewhere in this report, the nature of the funding arrangements appeared to inhibit the full participation of the PIs. In this instance, the Panel concluded that this factor – in conjunction with the fact that projects were largely under-funded and completed primarily by PhD and Masters students – likely contributed to a situation in which the full scientific potential of the overall programme was not fully realised. Many of the PIs did not get an opportunity to reflect more broadly and deeply on the findings of their projects (e.g., to consider wider theoretical, methodological and policy issues). Another consequence is that while most of the projects had a focus on empirical work in Finland, there was not always adequate consideration of the implications of this work for the larger international debates on social capital (of which there are many) and thus fewer than expected (or hoped for) opportunities to build on, refine, or qualify previous work. That said, it is clearly of considerable scientific importance that a rising generation of Finnish scholars of social capital have been educated as a result of this programme. This will doubtless generate multiple benefits, not only to scholarship within the social sciences but to the broader quality of discourse on civil society and state-society relations in Finland.

Going forward, the Academy of Finland might want to develop a view of what it expects of researchers with regards to the balance between publishing in Finland and publishing outside Finland (and most likely in the English language). Clearly research findings are likely to have the largest domestic impact when they are available in Finnish, but the findings themselves are much more likely to have broader resonance and stature when they have withstood rigorous international scrutiny. One resolution of this dilemma might be to encourage international publication (where appropriate), but also require shorter dissemination pieces in Finnish for policymakers, practitioners and the media. The Panel fully recognised that the Academy's primary responsibility is to Finnish scholars and citizens, but felt that both constituencies (and associated end-users) are best served by evidence and arguments meeting the highest standards of quality and accessibility. Achieving the Academy's broader mission to

5 The Panel observed that several of the teams included journal articles that were published at the very outset of the project.

contribute to European and international research requires a clearer statement and concrete guidelines on how the balance between local and international publications can best be attained.

3.4 Success of the implementation of the programme goals and objectives

Inter- and transdisciplinarity

There was clear evidence of interdisciplinarity in the programme. In discussions with the Programme Coordinator and researchers, it became readily apparent that a high value was placed on interdisciplinarity. Philosophers were engaged in discussions with political scientists, for example, about the conceptualisation of social capital, trust and responsibility and its measurement in empirical research of a quantitative nature. Sociologists were involved with academics in the related fields of social policy, social work and education. In bringing grant-holders together, the meetings and seminars organised under the auspices of the programme facilitated interdisciplinarity. These gatherings were especially important for Masters, PhD and postdoctoral students who were exposed to different ways of thinking about social capital and networks of trust.

Two observations should be noted, however. First, much of the interdisciplinary activity was between social scientists from neighbouring disciplines rather than between the social sciences and the humanities (e.g., linguists). It was recognised that the achievement of interdisciplinarity is inherently difficult. The Panel received evidence that genuine efforts were made to cross disciplinary boundaries, but concluded that the present incentive structure (like those elsewhere) rewarded *ex ante* promises rather than *ex post* performance. Project time horizons beyond three or four years may help to sustain more constructive engagement between different disciplines. Second, the aspiration to cross the boundaries between the social sciences and mainstream economics was frustrated by the under-representation of economists at the initial stage. Thus a number of projects were funded on changing workplace and innovation within firms, but these were usually undertaken by social scientists with sub-disciplinary interests in the labour market, employment, business innovation research and so forth. The difficulties of engaging economists in interdisciplinary work are not unique to this programme, however.

Networking and collaboration

The Panel drew a distinction between networking and collaboration; both are important, and networking was generally seen as a precursor to effective collaborative activity. There was evidence of networking across the projects supported by the meetings and seminars that were organised on a regular basis throughout the four years of the programme. Perhaps not surprisingly, there was a clustering at these meetings of project participants with similar substantive interests and/or methodological foundations that facilitated active dialogue. Some collaborative efforts may have existed prior to the programme, but the PIs reported that the SoCa programme was instrumental in formalising these existing contacts, enabling some of them to become the basis for collaborative work in the future. For the younger generation of researchers, such networking will be something they will undoubtedly practice in future research activities. The Panel recognised the value of the

collaborative efforts that resulted in edited collections drawn from the results of different research projects, but evidence of new collaborative efforts within the programme was inherently harder to discern.

International cooperation

The Research Programme Memorandum expressed a high level of ambition as regards international cooperation.⁶ It suggests a number of ways this may be achieved.

International cooperation was evident in the planning of the programme, where foreign experts were called as advisors, external review panel members, and participants in workshops and the major final congress in 2007. Comparative research carried out through international consortia or networks, international workshops, and researcher visits to/from Finland was also encouraged. The Panel noted that international cooperation had taken place. Of the 31 projects (including the four projects funded agencies other than the Academy of Finland), 16 report international collaborations and visits abroad by research staff. The Panel observed that the bulk of the international cooperation occurred with the Anglo-American countries.

There is also evidence of international collaboration with respect to published work. One exceptional project, with an emphasis on public health, published widely in international journals and involved a wide range of collaborating institutions in half a dozen countries. Other projects had very little to show in this respect. The Panel acknowledged that this to some extent reflects behavioural differences rooted in disciplinary cultures and possibly also in national tradition.

The Academy of Finland has a commendable goal of contributing to European research cooperation, but achieving this will require bold new initiatives from the senior leadership of the Academy. Such an undertaking cannot be left to programme coordinators (as it was in this instance), nor can it be sustained through a programme that primarily funds graduate student research. Foreign partners are unlikely to find this attractive. More appealing will be initiatives that explicitly provide resources for senior academics to get involved in both local projects (as argued above) and international efforts. This underscores the Panel's broader concerns about the status of and support for Principal Investigators within the structure of Academy programmes; as things currently stand, Principal Investigators cannot adequately participate in the serious substantive work required to make important intellectual contributions.

In summary, the Panel notes that the *modus operandi* of the programme has made the international cooperation less of a priority than would otherwise have been the case. This has inevitably also affected the international impact of the programme which on the current timescale is modest, although it may grow with time as the new cohort of PhDs make their careers and continue to do research on social capital and networks of trust.

6 The Panel was advised that there are (and were in the case of the SoCa programme) no technical obstacles to the submission of applications from the research community beyond Finland. However, in practice, foreign scholars would not succeed in securing funding from the Academy without clear evidence of close cooperation with Finnish teams.

Contribution to researcher training and mobility

The programme has made a concerted effort to build a cohort of scholars fully versed in scholarship pertaining to social capital and wider issues of trust, responsibilities, reciprocity, and networks. The Panel recognised that the SoCa programme provided a unique opportunity for young scholars to work alongside senior mentors as part of a large, vibrant and high-profile research community. As noted, the programme afforded multiple opportunities for foreign visits and research exchanges; without these opportunities it is difficult to envision how such levels of mobility could have been obtained. The Panel anticipated that the early exposure of young researchers to international collaborative work will have an enduring impact and will likely be one of the signature legacies of the programme. After four years, half of the students who started PhDs have defended their theses and the rest plan to follow during 2008 or 2009. This is an impressive record, and clearly represents excellent value for money.

Communication

The inter-project communication was greatly facilitated by the Programme Coordinator. In fact, the Programme Coordinator did an exceedingly good job in communicating and liaising whenever that was necessary among and between the project's main researchers. He organised 16 meetings and catered to the needs of teams in relation to the overall project, set up a number of methods seminars, and organised an important and well-attended international conference that thematically cohered with the SoCa programme.

There has been an effort to disseminate information about the SoCa programme to specific constituencies, and also to the popular media. While the SoCa programme has contributed to the public discourse on issues of social capital and trust, it came to the Panel's attention, however, that more could have been done in relation to the overall internal reporting procedures from individual projects. The reporting forms, in some instances, did not reveal as much about the individual projects as we would have liked. This delimits the possibility of communicating all the achievements of the SoCa programme and the capacity of the Panel to assess the results of the individual projects.

In this sense, it would be highly desirable to have a synthetic report on the programme's key findings and results. Such a report would be of indispensable value to the researchers involved, to the funding body (i.e., the Academy of Finland), allied funding bodies such as Tekes, and to the end-users (including the wider academic community and the public at large). Such a report should be produced when all the projects have been completed.

Socio-economic impacts

The main impact of the SoCa programme is likely to be domestic, since most projects focused upon processes of social change within Finnish society (as outlined in the Memorandum). At the programme level, it has been reported that the Programme Coordinator received many invitations from various audiences to speak on social capital and trust. Thus, the importance of trust has been of interest to labour organisations (particularly local trade unions) and youth groups, and to an extent

among employers too. These interventions and others related to individual projects of the SoCa programme indicate that research on social capital and trust will have contributed to the wider recognition of these issues in Finland.

The SoCa programme's international impact may be less tangible at this juncture, but we anticipate that it will be a reference point for related projects in other countries in the future. Some individual projects are publishing or intend to publish the outcomes of their research in peer reviewed international publications (books and articles). These have the potential to reach international academic audiences and have a broader impact. Such a development, which is already unfolding and is expected to continue over the next two years or so, is very much in line with the original objectives of the SoCa programme.

3.5 Added value of the programme

The programme's initial objectives were extremely ambitious and wide ranging, including "to explain and understand how and where social capital is created", "to explore the innovation and welfare potential [of social capital]", to explore "the conditions for the emergence of such potential that can be mobilised by synergy that is generated in the study of culture, working life and the economy", "to explore the impacts of social capital upon economic development", "to develop research methods and know-how", [to develop] new methods of data collection ... [and] to know how social capital shall be measured" (Memorandum, p. 30–31).

It is difficult to evaluate the 'added value' of the programme in relation to the production of such different objectives, particularly taking into account the time lag of scientific output through publication, as well as the diversity of dissemination efforts by the different projects.

Nevertheless, the Panel is in a position to highlight some of the accomplishments that may be considered as an 'added value' of the programme.

1. Through the research meetings and seminars, particularly those focused on methods that were organised by the Programme Coordinator, the Panel believed that useful dissemination and discussion of research methods was achieved.
2. The programme has enhanced the awareness of the need for interdisciplinary approaches to the themes and problems that have been the object of study of the various projects. As such, the concept of social capital has been a key element in raising this awareness.
3. The perhaps most salient 'added value' relates to the enhancement of research capacity. The Panel observed the extremely positive effects for young researchers of participating in a wider programme around a central theoretical and methodological debate.
4. The Panel recognised the long-term formative aspects of the programme. Some members of this cohort of students will be future leaders in academic and policy fields, and they will be cognizant of issues pertaining to social capital and trust.
5. The promotion of networks in the research community is another clear contribution. The programme facilitated the formalisation of networks of senior scholars and created new networks for junior academics.

6. For many of the Principal Investigators the programme heightened their awareness of a significant set of conceptual tools that could be fruitfully put to use in the analysis of problems that constituted both their established and emerging research agendas.

3.6 Programme coordination and activities

The Panel considered the Programme Coordinator's contribution in light of evidence received from project evaluation forms, from the meetings with Principal Investigators and the Programme Steering Committee, and a searching meeting with Dr Jokivuori on the first day of its visit. It examined his performance with reference to three distinct roles – integrator, organiser and ambassador. He had brought teams together in pursuit of a shared approach to research methodology; had organised and administered (as noted above) a popular and successful programme of methodology workshops targeted at staff engaged in advanced degrees and pre- and postdoctoral research; and he had succeeded in becoming the public voice and face of the programme. None of these achievements should be taken for granted: researchers must develop these attributes, often 'on-the-job'. The Panel noted that winning the respect of large teams of researchers and, in particular, the senior established academic investigators, requires dedication, inspiration and sensitivity. The Panel concluded that Dr Pertti Jokivuori had demonstrated these qualities and had discharged his duties assiduously, enthusiastically and effectively.

4 CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS FOR THE FUTURE

In reaching its conclusions, the Panel considered a wide-range of documents, interviewed key personnel involved in conceptualising, establishing and executing the programme, and reflected upon the design, operation and impacts of similar research programmes elsewhere. It recognised that the programme had produced many outputs and had succeeded in adding significantly to the evidence base in respect of social capital, networks and trust in Finland.⁷ Its deliberations produced the following connected recommendations.

1. Funding of Principal Investigators was deemed essential to enhance the tangible international impact of Academy programmes. As stressed elsewhere in this evaluation, the Panel received representations that highlighted both the strength and limits of the SoCa programme. Strengths included the enhancement of future research capacity, and the weaknesses included the missed opportunities for Principal Investigators to fully engage with primary research and the theoretical and policy significance of the research that they were directing. This is a needless waste of high-level intellectual capital and the policy should be re-visited.
2. The Panel saw real difficulties created by the practice of partial funding for research projects. It observed that *ex ante* and *ex post* aims differed and that the latter were frequently trimmed to reflect budget realities. The modification of *ex post* research designs may well have led to underachievement with regard to initial project conceptions and that such deviations from initial planning may be damaging to the scientific quality of the research and its policy impact.
3. Designating funds, or tangible competitive incentives, to assist in rendering findings more accessible and increasing impact should be considered by the Academy. There was a fear on the part of the Panel that the focus and lasting impetus of the programme might soon dissipate as researchers, and particularly Principal Investigators, moved rapidly on to their next priority projects. Sifting the findings for their key theoretical and empirical messages would be a valuable activity in its own right, but requires support and the full commitment of the Academy to a planned and realistic programme of dissemination.
4. An important step towards addressing this concern would be for the Academy to seriously consider the adoption of a more flexible approach to programme funding. Its current adherence to a four year cycle (we were advised that it was previously a three-year cycle) seems needlessly damaging and restrictive. A more flexible approach would, the Panel believes, generate increasing returns to base funding.
5. The Panel felt strongly that the Academy should take steps towards a more comprehensive peer review process of completed individual projects. The documentation that the Panel received was notable for its lack of peer review input and this is out of line with best practice in the international research community. Emphasis on reporting and accountability would also imply incentives to make findings more accessible both within Finland and to the wider international academic community (as noted in Point 3 above).

⁷ Added value of the programme, see Section 3.5.

6. The Academy should consider the benefits of having a longer lag between the formal completion of research projects and the evaluation of the programme. There would be many potential benefits: a longer period for publications to emerge, time for the researchers to reflect on their achievements and the gaps left by their research, and time for the international community to become fully acquainted with the achievements of the programme.

May 27th, 2008

Professor Peter Nolan, University of Leeds (Chair)

Professor Fiona Devine, University of Manchester

Professor Sokratis Koniordos, University of Crete

Professor Susana Narotzky, University of Barcelona

Professor Sverker Sörlin, Royal Institute of Technology, Stockholm (Vice Chair)

Professor Michael Woolcock, University of Manchester/World Bank

ANNEX I

SoCa STEERING COMMITTEES AND SUB-COMMITTEE 2001–2008

Preparatory programme groups 2001 and 2002

Professor **Marja Järvelä, Chair** (Research Council for Culture and Society)

Professor **Elina Hemminki** (Research Council for Health) 2002–

Professor **Erno Lehtinen** (Research Council for Culture and Society)

Professor **Paavo Okko** (Research Council for Culture and Society)

Professor **Juha Sihvola** (Research Council for Culture and Society)

Director-General **Reino Hjerppe** (Government Institute for Economic Research VATT)

Director **Hannu Uusitalo** (Central Pension Security Institute)

Co-operating partners 2002:

Matti Heikkilä (Stakes), Markus Koskenlinna (Tekes), Juho Saari (Ministry of Social and Health Affairs), Matti Salmenperä (Ministry of Labour), Jussi Simpura (Statistics Finland), Ilkka Tahvanainen (Finnish Work Environment Fund)

The first Steering Committee 2003

Professor **Marja Järvelä, Chair** (Research Council for Culture and Society)

Professor **Elina Hemminki, Vice Chair** (Research Council for Health)

Professor **Erno Lehtinen** (Research Council for Culture and Society)

Professor **Paavo Okko** (Research Council for Culture and Society)

Professor **Juha Sihvola** (Research Council for Culture and Society)

Professor **Markku Alén** (Research Council for Health)

Research Director **Eija Ahola** (Tekes)

Chief Counsellor **Juho Saari** (Ministry of Social and Health Affairs)

Director **Matti Salmenperä** (Ministry of Labour)

Director **Riitta-Liisa Lappeteläinen** / Research Ombudsman **Ilkka Tahvanainen** (Finnish Work Environment Fund)

Standing expert:

Director-General **Reino Hjerppe** (Government Institute for Economic Research VATT)

Programme Steering Sub-committee 2003

Academy of Finland Research Council members, Professors Marja Järvelä (Chair), Elina Hemminki (Vice Chair), Markku Alén, Erno Lehtinen, Paavo Okko and Juha Sihvola

The second Steering Committee 2004–2006

Professor, Director-General **Matti Heikkilä**, **Chair** (Research Council for Culture and Society)

Professor **Helena Leino-Kilpi**, **Vice Chair** (Research Council for Health)

Professor **Anne Kovalainen** (Research Council for Culture and Society)

Professor **Juha Sihvola** (Research Council for Culture and Society)

Research Ombudsman **Ilkka Tahvanainen** (Finnish Work Environment Fund)

Chief Counsellor **Juho Saari** (Ministry of Social and Health Affairs)

Research Director **Eija Ahola** (Tekes)

Standing experts:

Director-General **Reino Hjerppe** (Government Institute for Economic Research VATT)

Professor **Marja Järvelä** (University of Jyväskylä)

Director **Matti Salmenperä** (Ministry of Labour)

The third Steering Committee 2007–2008

Professor **Marja Järvelä**, **Chair** (University of Jyväskylä)

Professor **Pekka Ruohomäki**, **Vice Chair** (Research Council for Culture and Society)

Professor **Pertti Haapala** (Research Council for Culture and Society)

Professor **Tuula Salo** (Research Council for Health)

Research Director **Eija Ahola** (Tekes)

Research Ombudsman **Ilkka Tahvanainen** (Finnish Work Environment Fund)

Professor **Juho Saari** (University of Kuopio, representing the Ministry of Social Affairs and Health)

Standing expert:

Professor **Reino Hjerppe** (Director-General emer. of the Government Institute for Economic Research VATT)

Programme Section

Programme Coordinator **Pertti Jokivuori** (University of Jyväskylä) 2003–2008

Programme Coordinator **Floora Ruokonen**, preparation of evaluation publicity, summer 2008

Programme group expert secretary **Jouko Nikula** 2002

Representatives of the Academy staff

Research Council for Culture and Society:

Science Advisers **Päivi Messo-Lindén** 2001–2003, 2006–2008,

Raija Matikainen 2004–2005

Research Council for Health:

Science Advisers **Anna-Liisa Kauppila** 2001–2003 and **Saara Leppinen** 2004–2008

ANNEX 2

TASKS OF THE STEERING COMMITTEE, PROGRAMME COORDINATOR AND PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATORS

The Steering Committee

- to steer the programme;
- to draw up a plan for the follow-up and evaluation of the programme;
- to prepare the review process of applications;
- to submit to the Academy sub-committee and possible other funding organisations a proposal of the projects to be funded;
- to propose, when needed, to the Research Councils and other funding organisations supplementary application rounds and/or additional funding;
- to submit proposals on projects or project entities to be later incorporated into the programme as well as to decide on incorporation of a project or a project entity as part of the programme, provided that these already have funding for it;
- to answer for the monitoring of the programme;
- to answer for the preparations for the evaluation of the programme;
- to steer and support coordination;
- to perform other tasks related to the preparation and implementation of the programme, e.g. tasks related to the component carried out as international funding cooperation.

Programme Coordinator

- to support communication and cooperation between research teams involved in the programme;
- to organise researcher meetings and seminars;
- to promote contacts and visits of domestic and international researchers as well as researcher mobility;
- to organise cooperation with domestic and international research programmes most relevant to the programme;
- to monitor the programme and provide guidelines to the projects involved for reporting on their research results;
- to maintain active contact with other funding bodies and end-users of the research results;
- to promote the practical application of the results and compile syntheses of the results with a view to their effective integration;
- to organise the programme's internal and external communication in close collaboration with the Academy of Finland's Communications Unit; and
- to make preparations for and organise the international evaluation of the programme.

Principal Investigator

- to assume responsibility for and report on the scientific progress of the projects as well as on the application of funds in accordance with the guidelines issued by the coordinator and funding bodies;
- to attend all meetings, seminars and workshops organised by the programme coordinator and ensure the attendance of all other members on their teams;
- to take part in work to produce reviews, summaries and information materials related to the research programme; and
- to actively disseminate information in scientific as well as general-interest publications on how the programme is progressing.

ANNEX 3

SOCIAL CAPITAL AND NETWORKS OF TRUST

List of SoCa Programme Projects and their Funding

Airaksinen, Timo,

University of Helsinki, Department of Social and Moral Philosophy
In Institutions We Trust – A Philosophical Study of the Key Concepts of the SoCa Programme

Programme funding:

Academy of Finland	171,450 €	1 Jan 2004–31 Dec 2007
--------------------	-----------	------------------------

Anttonen, Anneli,

University of Tampere, Department of Social Policy and Social Work
Social Capital, Trust and Care (SoTCa) – The formation and distribution of informal and formal care capital in welfare societies

Programme funding:

Academy of Finland	275,500 €	1 Jan 2004–31 Dec 2008
--------------------	-----------	------------------------

Autio, Erkko,

Helsinki University of Technology, Department of Industrial Management
Creation of Firm-level Social Capital, Technological Innovation, and the Effectiveness of National Technology Programs

Programme funding:

Academy of Finland	200,550 €	1 Jan 2004–31 Dec 2007
Tekes	264,000 €	

Did not participate in the SoCa programme.

Blomqvist, Kirsimarja,

Lappeenranta University of Technology, Department of Knowledge Management
Collaborative Innovation – Trust and Cross-border Virtual Teams as Key Elements of Innovation Networks

Programme funding:

Academy of Finland	160,350 €	1 Jan 2004–31 Dec 2007
--------------------	-----------	------------------------

Elovainio, Marko,

National Research and Development Centre of Welfare and Health
Building Trust in Organizations: Organizational Justice, Team Climate and Job Involvement as Determinants of Quality and Effectiveness in Nursing Homes

Programme funding:

Academy of Finland	143,000 €	1 Jan 2004–31 Dec 2007
--------------------	-----------	------------------------

Grönlund Kimmo I., Åbo Akademi University, Department of Social Science History
Initial principal investigator: **Anckar, Dag**
Social Capital and Democracy
Programme funding:
Academy of Finland 275,500 € 1 Jan 2004–31 Dec 2008

Helve, Helena, University of Helsinki, Department of Comparative Research
Behind the Scenes of the Society: Young people, Identity and Social Capital (BeSS)
Programme funding:
Academy of Finland 203,440 € 1 Jan 2004–31 Dec 2007

Hjerppe, Riitta, University of Helsinki, Department of History and Archaeology
Managing Social Capital in a Changing Economy: Communities, Neighbourhoods and Associations in Nineteenth- and Twentieth-century Finland
Programme funding:
Academy of Finland 250,000 € 1 Jan 2004–31 Dec 2007

Häkli, Jouni,
University of Tampere, Department of Regional Studies and Environmental Policy
The Constitution of Social Capital in Place: A Comparative Analysis of Urban Actor Networks in Finland and Italy
Programme funding:
Academy of Finland 133,000 € 1 Jan 2004–31 Dec 2006

Jakobsson, Gunbor, Åbo Akademi University, Institution of Social Politics
In Search of Social Capital: The Case of the Swedish-speaking Finns
Programme funding:
Academy of Finland 275,500 € 1 Jan 2004–31 Dec 2009

Julkunen, Raija, University of Jyväskylä, Department of Social Sciences and Philosophy
Volatile Bodies in Working Life. Aging, Anger, and Professional Burn out – Breakdowns of Trust
Programme funding:
Academy of Finland 200,810 € 1 Jan 2004–31 Dec 2008

Kangas, Olli, University of Turku, Department of Social Policy
Social Capital and the Logic of Collective Action
Programme funding:
Academy of Finland 200,010 € 1 Jan 2004–31 Dec 2007
Ministry of Social Affairs and Health 50,000 €

Kettunen, Pauli, University of Helsinki, Department of Social Science History
The Making of the Finnish Wage-Work Society. Social Cohesion and Economic Rationalization in the Post-World-War II Finland
Programme funding:
Academy of Finland 200,030 € 1 Jan 2004–31 Dec 2007
Finnish Work Environment Fund 50,000 €

Kiander, Jaakko, Labour Institute for Economic Research

Initial principal investigator: **Pekkarinen, Jukka**

Social Capital, Wage Bargaining and Economic Performance in Finland

Programme funding:

Academy of Finland	158,310 €	1 Jul 2004–31 Dec 2007
Finnish Work Environment Fund		50,000 €

Kivimäki, Mika, University of Helsinki, Department of Psychology

Social Capital, Health and Well-being in the Context of Work Life

Programme funding:

Academy of Finland	150,510 €	1 Jan 2004–31 Dec 2007
Finnish Work Environment Fund		80,000 €

Kivinen, Osmo, University of Turku, Research Unit for the Sociology of Education

Trust, Social Networks and Institutional Division of Responsibility

Programme funding:

Academy of Finland	200,590 €	1 Jan 2004–31 Dec 2007
--------------------	-----------	------------------------

Korvajärvi, Päivi, University of Tampere, Department of Women's Studies

Gendered Work Communities, Conflicts and Social Capital

Programme funding:

Academy of Finland	200,980 €	1 Jan 2004–31 Dec 2008
--------------------	-----------	------------------------

Lilja, Kari, Helsinki School of Economic and Business, Department of Management

Managerial Teams in Corporate Networks: Uncovering Social Capital in Radical Innovations

Programme funding:

Academy of Finland	170,530 €	1 Jan 2004–31 Dec 2007
--------------------	-----------	------------------------

Melin, Harri, University of Turku Department of Sociology

Social Capital, Networks and Organizational Change

Programme funding:

Academy of Finland	200,020 €	1 Jan 2004–31 Dec 2007
--------------------	-----------	------------------------

Nurmi, Jari-Erik, University of Jyväskylä Department of Psychology

Social Capital and Networks in the Socialization into Working Life: Combining Individual and Organizational Viewpoints

Programme funding:

Academy of Finland	260,600 €	1 Jan 2004–31 Dec 2007
--------------------	-----------	------------------------

Ojala, Jari, University of Jyväskylä, Department of History and Archaeology

Formation of Trust and Reputation in Organisations – Creation and Change of Social Capital over the long Term

Programme funding:

Academy of Finland	200,010 €	1 Jan 2004–31 Dec 2007
--------------------	-----------	------------------------

Rostila, Ilmari, University of Tampere, Department of Social Policy and Social Work
Local Community and School as Sources of Trust and Social Support of Adolescents

Programme funding:

Academy of Finland 263,940 € 1 Jan 2004–31 Dec 2007

Sabour, M'Hammed, University of Joensuu, Department of Sociology
Social Capital and Social Space: Positions, Dispositions and Collective Action.

Programme funding:

Academy of Finland 219,330 € 1 Jan 2004–31 Dec 2007

Siisiäinen, Martti,

University of Jyväskylä, Department of Social Sciences and Philosophy

Initial principal investigator: **Ilmonen, Kaj**

Free Associations and Trust in Institutions

Programme funding:

Academy of Finland 200,000 € 1 Jan 2004–31 Dec 2008

Sotarauta, Markku,

University of Tampere, Department of Regional Studies and Environmental Policy

Co-evolution of Firms, Individuals and City-Regions: Creative Capital and Social Capital Directing the Processes of Interactive Strategic Adaptation

Programme funding:

Academy of Finland 148,010 € 1 Jan 2004–31 Dec 2008

Vainio-Korhonen, Kirsimarja, University of Turku, Department of History

Competition, Cooperation and Social Capital: Structure and

Change in Business 1800–2000

Programme funding:

Academy of Finland 350,000 € 1 Jan 2004–31 Dec 2007

Other SoCa Research Programme Funding

Järvenpää, Sirkka, Helsinki University of Technology, TAI Research Centre
Collaboration, Coevolution and Competitiveness – The Essence of Social Capital in Organisational Networks

Programme funding:

Tekes 170,200 € 1 Jan 2004–31 Dec 2005

Keskinen, Soili, University of Turku, Department of Teacher Education

Business Co-evolution – Innovations Mechanisms in Network Economy

Programme funding:

Tekes 300,100 € 1 Jan 2004–30 Jun 2007

Miettinen, Reijo, University of Helsinki, Department of Education

The Dynamics of Trust and Social Capital in Innovation Networks

Programme funding:

Tekes 332,800 € 1 Jan 2004–31 Dec 2007

Pirttilä, Ilkka, Finnish Institute for Occupational Health
Social Capital and Well-Being in Work Organisations
Programme funding:

Finnish Work Environment Fund 160,000 € 1 Jan 2004–31 Dec 2006

Social Capital and Networks of Trust – Research Programme Funding

31 projects

Academy of Finland funding, total 6,000,000 €
27 research projects total: 5,577,700 €

Lyytinen, Heikki

Coordination: 422,300 €, 1 May 2003–31 Dec 2008,
University of Jyväskylä, Agora Center

Other funding

Tekes funding, total 1,162,700 €

partial funding besides Academy of Finland funding in five projects,
Tekes funding only in three projects

Finnish Work Environment Fund, funding total 340,000 €,

partial funding besides Academy of Finland funding in three projects,
Finnish Work Environment Fund funding only in one project

Ministry of Social Affairs and Health funding total 50,000 €,

partial funding besides Academy of Finland funding in one project

ANNEX 4

SoCa SELF-EVALUATION FORM FOR PROJECTS

This is a self-evaluation form of the Academy of Finland

Social Capital and Networks of Trust Research Programme for your individual research project. It complements the Academy research project report submitted in the Academy's online services.

Please return this form by Wednesday 13 February 2008 as an email attachment to Programme Manager Pertti Jokivuori (email: pertti.jokivuori@jyu.fi).

Project director: _____

Name of project: _____

Academy number of project: _____

Funding period: 1 Jan 2004–31 Dec 2007 or

Other funding period: _____

A. Self-evaluation of the individual research project

1 Progress of the individual research project

1.1 Has the research work proceeded as planned? Have the goals of your project been achieved? Please use the scale 1–5 (1=poor, 2=satisfactory, 3=good, 4=excellent and 5=outstanding).

Score: _____

1.2 If the goals have not been achieved what were the main obstacles?

1.3 What are the main discoveries/innovations of the project related to the social capital?

1.4 Has your project advanced the development of research competencies of young researchers? Please use the scale 1–5 (1=poor, 2=satisfactory, 3=good, 4=excellent and 5=outstanding).

Score: _____

1.5 What kind of contacts/cooperation did the project have with other domestic and international units or research groups outside the SoCa Programme? See also 6.3. Describe briefly.

2 Cooperation with end-users of your research results

(E.g. schools, parents, associations, public administration/policy-makers, companies/industry; other researchers)

2a Who are the possible end-users of your results?

2b Have the end-users participated in the research process?

Any comments concerning end-users:

3 Dissemination and impact on society

3a What kinds of social impacts does your project have?

3b Who do you expect to be interested in the results of your project?

4 Plans or submissions for publication

Publications already published are to be listed on the Academy report.

Please list the *expected publications* here under the following titles:

4.1 Publications accepted for publication but not yet published

4.2 Publications in the referee process

4.3 Publications under preparation

Please use the following order:

1) Articles in refereed scientific journals

2) Articles in refereed scientific edited volumes and conference proceedings

3) Monographs

4) Other scientific publications

5) Textbooks and other research-related books

5 Dissertations in the research project

Please give the names of students and an estimate of project funding proportion of the degree (0–100%)

5.1 Doctoral degrees/names of students, funding prop.

5.1.1 Completed

N.N. 80%

5.1.2 Expected in 2008 or 2009

M.M. 40%

X.X. 20%

5.2 Licentiate degrees/names of students, funding prop.

5.2.1 Completed

5.2.2 Expected in 2008 or 2009

5.3 Master's degrees /names of students, funding prop.

5.3.1 Completed

5.3.2 Expected in 2008 or 2009

B. Evaluation of the SoCa Programme

6 Coordination and cooperation

6.1 How has the coordination of the research programme managed its task?

Please use the scale 1–5 (1=poor, 2=satisfactory, 3=good, 4=excellent and 5=outstanding).

Score: _____

Any comments:

6.2 How has the SoCa Programme promoted scientific cooperation?

Please use the scale 1–5 (1=poor, 2=satisfactory, 3=good, 4=excellent and 5=outstanding).

Score: _____

Any comments:

6.3 What kind of contacts/cooperation did the project have with other SoCa projects? (List e.g. bilateral meetings, training days, publications, joint research, joint conference presentations, exchange of information etc.)

7 Have your project members participated in congresses organised by the SoCa Programme?

8 Have your project members participated in method training organised by the SoCa Programme?

9 Have your project members participated in publishing activities organised by the SoCa Programme?

10 What have been the benefits of participating in the SoCa Programme?

11 In what ways did the research programme generate *new cooperation among researchers*? Did it generate new cooperation between researchers and other actors in the innovation system? Did you establish any other kind of new cooperation?

Scientific output of the programme upon completion

12 What added value has the programme generated?

What has been achieved compared to the situation if no such programme had ever been launched? Did something unexpected or brand-new information or understanding emerge?

13 How the concept and theory of the social capital has remodelled the theoretical starting points of your research?

14 What kinds of...

a) future plans do you have concerning the social capital research area?

b) specific plans do you have concerning social capital research?

c) ideas do you have related to this field of research in the future?

Please feel free to give any additional comments.

Date of report

Report was written by/name/:

ANNEX 5

MATERIAL FOR THE EVALUATION

General information on the Academy of Finland

Academy of Finland Annual Report 2007

Academy of Finland key figures

Academy of Finland strategy

Civilisation cannot be imported. Researcher commentary on the impact of cultural and social research. Publications of the Academy of Finland 3/07.

SoCa programme information

- SoCa Programme Memorandum 2003
- Compilation of individual projects and funded in the programme 2004–2007, reported outputs
- Programme coordination report 2008
- Summing up of the questionnaires to and results from individual projects 2008:
 - Self-evaluation, compilation of results
 - Results, as reported by individual projects
- Original paper copy research proposals (full proposals) from 2003
- SoCa websites
- Self-evaluation reports 2008:
All individual self-evaluation reports written by Principal Investigators
- Academy reports 2008:
All individual reports submitted to the Academy of Finland by Principal Investigators.
- Early history of the programme sum-up with enclosures:
 - List of Programme Steering Committee meetings 2001–2008
 - An early draft for programme contents in 2001
 - Workshop programme, 5 Nov 2001
 - List of all applications on the 1st round (plans of intent)
 - List of all applications (application proper) 2nd round with overall grades from the expert panel
- Summary of key outcomes of the programme as seen by the Programme Coordinator, 12 May 2008
- List of publications submitted for the Evaluation Panel
- Publications

ANNEX 6

AGENDA OF THE EVALUATION PANEL

MEETING 13–15 MAY 2008

Academy of Finland,
Helsinki, Vilhonvuorenkatu 6

Hosts: 13 May 2008: Programme Coordinator Pertti Jokivuori,
14–15 May 2008: Science Adviser Päivi Messo-Lindén

Tuesday, 13 May

Arrival to Helsinki, informal dinner at Restaurant Kuu at 19:00 with Steering Committee members

Wednesday, 14 May

- 9:00 Kick-off of the Panel meeting
- Introductions of Panel members and staff
 - Presentation of the Academy, Academy programmes and research programme evaluation (Jaana Roos, Programme Unit)
 - Organisation of panel work (Chair, Panel)
- 10:00 Presentation of the SoCa, programme and results (Pertti Jokivuori, Programme Coordinator)
- around 11 Discussion: panel strategy, questions to Programme Coordinator, deciding on interviews with researchers
- 12:30–13:15 Lunch at the Academy restaurant
- 13:30– Interviews with researchers: Two parallel groups meet:

Group ‘Capital’

Peter Nolan
Sverker Sörlin
Michael Woolcock

SoCa researchers:

Kaisa Herne/Grönlund project
Antti Häkkinen /Hjerppe project
Pauli Kettunen
Kari Lilja
Jari Ojala

Group ‘Trust’

Fiona Devine
Sokratis Koniordos
Susana Narotzky

SoCa researchers:

Helena Helve
Päivi Korvajärvi
Pekka Mäkelä/Airaksinen project
Tuula Oksanen/Kivimäki project
Martti Siisiäinen

- ca 15:30 Reporting discussions to the other group,
Interview of Programme Coordinator and discussion
Buffet at the Academy
- ca 17:45(- 20) Panel discussions, summary of day one, drafting of
the evaluation report

Thursday, 15 May

- 9:00–12:30 Panel discussions, writing of the evaluation report
- 12:30–13:30 Lunch at the Academy with interviews of Steering Committee
Chair Marja Järvelä and Reino Hjerppe
- 13:30(–16:45-22) Panel discussions, writing of the evaluation report
Summary of the Panel and feedback to the Academy;
agree on the delivery of the evaluation report

ANNEX 7

PANEL ASSIGNMENT

C. Evaluation of the Social Capital and Networks of Trust Research Programme (SoCa)

The Academy of Finland has launched the evaluation process of the Social Capital and Networks of Trust Research Programme. The scientific evaluation of the programme will be carried out by an international evaluation panel. The members of the evaluation panel are Professor **Peter Nolan** from Leeds University, UK, (Chair); Professor **Sverker Sörlin**, Swedish Institute for Studies in Education and Research, Sweden (Vice Chair); Professor **Fiona Devine**, University of Manchester, UK; Professor **Sokratis Koniordos**, University of Crete, Greece; Professor **Susana Narotzky**, University of Barcelona, Spain; and Professor **Michael Woolcock**, The World Bank/University of Manchester.

With this assignment we, on behalf of the Academy of Finland, confirm your membership in the evaluation panel of the Social Capital and Networks of Trust Research Programme.

The objective of the evaluation is to estimate to which degree the SoCa research programme has succeeded in fulfilling the objectives originally set for it in the Programme Memorandum. Of specific interest are the programmatic approach, added value and programme impacts, interdisciplinarity, applicability of research, networking and dissemination of results.

In the Evaluation Report, the panel is expected to assess the programme as a whole and reflect especially the following issues:

1. Planning of the research programme

- Preparation of the programme and planning of the content of the programme
- Research projects funded and funding decisions in creating the necessary preconditions for the programme

2. Scientific quality of SoCa

- Scientific quality and innovativeness of the research
- Scientific competence of the consortia
- Contribution to the deepening of understanding how and where social capital is created

3. Success of the implementation of the programme goals and objectives

- Concordance with the objectives of the research programme
- Functioning of the programme
- Added value of the programme
- Contribution to enhancing inter- and multidisciplinary in research
- Scientific and administrative coordination

4. Contribution to researcher and expert training

5. Collaboration and networking

- Collaboration within the programme
 - Collaboration with other Finnish groups
 - International cooperation
 - Collaboration with end-users
- 6. Applicability of research and importance to end-users**
- Contribution to promoting the applicability of research results
 - Relevance and importance to end-users
 - National and international impact of the programme
- 7. Recommendations for the future (including the justification for the recommendations)**

The time and place for the panel work have been decided to be 14–15 May 2008 in Helsinki at the Academy of Finland, Vilhonvuorenkatu 6. The *preliminary* schedule for the panel is as follows:

- * 13 May Arrival in Helsinki

 Get-together dinner at 7.00 pm with the Programme Steering Committee
- * 14–15 May Panel meeting at the Academy of Finland

 14 May: discussions, examination of the reports and assessments, possibly interviews with researchers
 15 May: preparation and drafting of the Evaluation Report
- * 15 May Departure from Helsinki – late flights, after 6 pm

Prior to the meeting, panel members should assess the relevant material sent to them. The work will include examination of the reports, self-evaluation assessments and other products of the programme and discussions with the Programme Steering Committee, researchers, and programme coordination during the panel’s meeting. There will also be periods reserved for the intensive work of the panel including the preparation and drafting of the Evaluation Report. Technical assistance will be provided during the visit.

Further details of the meeting will be sent to you later.

Helsinki, Finland, 19 December 2007

Dr Pirjo Hiidenmaa
Director, Culture and Society Research Unit
Academy of Finland

Päivi Messo-Lindén
Science Adviser, Culture and Society Research Unit
Academy of Finland

The Research Programme on Social Capital and Networks of Trust was launched by the Academy of Finland for the years 2004–2007. The scientific challenge of the programme was to explain and understand how and where social capital is created, how social trust evolves and transforms, how innovation potential is created and how social capital can be measured. Funding was granted to 31 research projects.

The research programme and the success of the programme in attaining the objectives set for it in the programme memorandum were evaluated by an international panel. This report includes the results of the evaluation and the recommendations of the panel.



ACADEMY OF FINLAND

Vilhonvuorenkatu 6 • PO Box 99, 00501 Helsinki
Tel. +358 9 774 881 • Fax +358 9 7748 8299
www.aka.fi/eng • viestinta@aka.fi