



TIEDOTUSLEHTI 1/2011

ISSN 1799-7801

Sisältö

Päätoimittajien palsta	3
VÄITÖKSIÄ	4
Caught between standardization and Complexity. Study on the institutional ambiguities of agri-environmental policy implementation in Finland (Minna Kaljonen)	4
Governance theory as a framework for empirical research : a case study on local environmental policy-making in Helsinki, Finland (Arho Toikka)	8
TIEDOTTEITA	13
Community divided - Adaptation and Aversion towards the Spent Nuclear Fuel Repository in Eurajoki and its Neighbouring Municipalities (Mika Kari – Matti Kojo – Tapio Litmanen)	13
Tieto hallinnassa: tietokäytännöt suomalaisessa yhteiskunnassa (Toim. Alastalo Marja & Åkerman Maria)	14

PÄÄTOIMITTAJIEN PALSTA

Vuoden 2011 ensimmäinen tiedotuslehti sisältää Minna Kaljosen ja Arho Toikan valmistuneiden väitöskirjojen esittelyn lisäksi Tapio Litmasen johtaman tutkimushankkeen raportin ja Marja Alastalon ja Maria Åkermanin toimittaman kirjahankkeen esittelyt.

Enemmänkin mahtuisi.

Seuraava tiedotuslehti ilmestyy joulukuussa 2011, mitä varten tiedotteita kaikenlaisista YHYS:n alaan kuuluvista asioista voi toimittaa sähköpostissa allekirjoittaneelle pitkin syksyä.

Mukavaa kesää.

Miikka Salo
tiedotuslehden päätoimittaja
miikka.salo@jyu.fi

VÄITÖKSIÄ

Caught between standardization and Complexity. Study on the institutional ambiguities of agri-environmental policy implementation in Finland.

Minna Kaljonen's Lectio Praecursoria, 8.4.2011
Opponent. Dr. Carrol Morris, University of Nottingham
Kustos: Professor Yrjö Haila, University of Tampere

Thesis is published by the Tampere University Press. Acta Universitatis Tamperensis 1594. University of Tampere. Juvenes Print, Tampere.

<http://acta.uta.fi/english/teos.php?id=11425>

Agriculture's pressure on the environment poses a major challenge to environmental policy. The situation in the River Paimionjoki makes this very plain. The River Paimionjoki, which is located in south-western Finland, is one of the main sources of phosphorous leaching into the Archipelago Sea, which is suffering from severe eutrophication. The phosphorous in the river arrives primarily from agricultural lands, which are mainly of clay – high in nutrients by nature and fertile for agricultural production. In the River Paimionjoki it has been very difficult to get the phosphorous load under control. The monitoring results from the lower course of the River report no major changes in the concentrations over the last two decades.

This, despite the major changes that have taken place in the agri-environmental policy. Agri-environmental schemes, which came into force in 1995 when Finland entered the European Union, introduced a major shift to the Finnish agri-environmental policy. They suggested that farmers should be paid for providing environmental goods and practising environmentally sound farming. In Finland farmers are offered two kinds of contracts. When enrolling to General Protection Scheme one agrees to follow rather detailed agreements on basic farming operations, such as fertilising, tilling or plant coverage. The Special Protection Scheme, on the other hand, offers support for more targeted environmental actions.

In terms of coverage the General Scheme has been a great success. From the very beginning more than 90% of Finnish farmers have found it worthwhile to be part of it. The finance distributed via the schemes has been yearly circa 300 million €, slightly increasing lately. This is almost one third of the total Finnish state budget for environmental protection. The use of fertilisers has decreased in total and buffer strips have appeared along water courses.

These are huge numbers, in general terms. However, despite all this money, resources and time spent, the nutrient loads have not decreased as was hoped for. The River Paimionjoki represents the worst case. In addition, the recovery in biodiversity has been slow.

We are here today to examine my thesis, where I address this dilemma. A decade ago, when I started the research, the political compromises made regarding the content of the programme were largely seen as a cause for the low impact of the policy. The measures included in the programme were regarded as too modest for mitigating the environmental impacts; the schemes were just seen as another way of re-distributing income support to farmers. In general scheme the income element is indeed central, which also largely explains the high participant numbers. Farmers were just seen enjoying the benefits of the support and being reluctant to really change their farming practices.

At that time, I was not entirely happy with these explanations. They tend to order the world into overly linear assumptions about human behaviour, environmental change and policy impact. The fact that the General Scheme was used as a means to compensate for the decline in farming income -- caused by Finland entering the common European markets -- is surely one part of the dynamics, but it does not explain it all.

At that time – and today even more so – I was convinced that finding resolutions to agri-environmental problems requires much more effort than just waiting for the right measures to be applied universally on farms and waiting for the attitudes to change.

The agri-environmental schemes are in principle voluntary. They seek to govern individual actors and their active interference with nature through farming practices. In such a case the implementation phase may turn critical for the policy outcome. The way in which schemes are integrated with production practices on individual farms, and how they are co-ordinated at a local and regional level, will evidently have a direct effect on the surrounding environment: be it a river that flows further to the Baltic Sea or a habitat, which constitutes part of a larger ecological structure or landscape.

In my thesis I claim that the implementation phase has become critical in another sense, as well. My empirical results highlight that during implementation actors not only try to find the best applications for given policy measures; at the same time, they also negotiate what it means to commit to environmental management, what legitimate policy intervention is and how institutional rules of action should be developed.

Political scientist Maarten Hajer has argued that the resolution of environmental problems is nowadays often confronted with institutional ambiguity. With this, he means that the currently established political institutions lack the power to deliver the required policy results on their own; new institutional rules, practices and systems of meaning need to be invented. In such a situation, the policy process itself may become an important site at which these rules are tested and negotiated about.

In my thesis I argue that if we are to capture such emerging new meanings; we need to open the policy process to empirical scrutiny again. The hierarchical concepts of the classic top-down policy model, which start with the political goal definition and the design of means, and end with implementation, do not simply hold anymore. We need new vocabularies and new methodological tools.

In my thesis I explore these vocabularies by engaging with practice. I do an ontological shift by examining how conditions for agri-environmental management emerge as policies are put to practice. I follow how agricultural and environmental officials and advisors translate the policy goals into practice, how their practices co-evolve as they interact; how farmers translate the schemes into farming practices and how these various actors are brought together to deliberate upon agri-environmental management. Physically these translations took place in South-Ostrobohnia and in South-western Finland.

My results highlight that the implementation of the schemes has indeed become a central site of politics. By emphasising standardised management procedures and income support, the schemes have questioned the values of good farming, the basis of farm livelihood, farmers' experiential knowledge and care for the land. These values have become endangered attachments, which require active commitment. These commitments regard environmental management as something which builds upon the potentials available at a particular farm in a given socio-material environment.

Such a situated and material basis of commitments is currently given too little attention in the design and implementation of the schemes. During implementation I, however, detected certain practices that have tried to get a hold of the situated basis of commitments. The practices of local rural officials and advisors have become important in translating the policy standards into practice. The local plans and projects, in their part, have tried to link the farm-level actions to environmentally effective collective action. These practices have become central in mitigating the friction between universal and local accounts of agri-environmental management as well as in building trust amongst the various actors.

The empirical results, however, strongly stress, that if we are to understand the challenges posed by the resolution of environmental problems, we should not only analyse how new institutional rules and commitments are deliberated upon, but also how policy practices turn into routines and how these routines relate to past practices and actor positions. In this respect, I think, the case of Finnish agri-environmental policy is highly interesting. It draws attention to the specific and active role of policy tools in this dynamic.

In the implementation of the schemes the agricultural administration has taken the ownership of the General Scheme, which stresses the welfare and income effects on a national scale; whereas the actions of environmental administration concentrate on the Special Protection Scheme implemented on a plot scale. These policy measures are designed at the national level, but as they become routine as part of implementation practice, they have a tendency to reinforce the division between the income and environmental concerns built within the policy. It is the tight association built between the vertical policy measures and the horizontal implementation networks that enacts this division ever again -- whilst at the same, time maintaining the continuums with the past policies and actor positions.

Understanding how certain material arrangements employed at various stages of policy process maintain, question or renew the institutionalised ways of action is essential for understanding the successes or failures within environmental policy. It is essential also for developing a more responsive environmental policy.

The recently approved river basin management plans suggest a more cost-efficient allocation of the agri-environmental measures for the resolution of nutrient problems in the River Paimionjoki. The better allocation of measures is also offered as a solution for increasing the effectiveness of agri-environmental schemes. However reasonable these solutions may sound, the results of my study indicate that some risks may lie therein. Unless the policy instruments are radically changed, the allocation efforts may end up reinforcing the division between income and environmental concerns in the agri-environmental policy even further. The results also remind us that a better allocation of measures requires that the situated basis of commitments is taken seriously in the policy design. There simply cannot be one without the other. This also means that environmental policy needs to become more responsive to the changes taking place in agricultural markets and in profitability.

Practical solutions to agri-environmental problems should be seen as gatherings, whose quality and durability depend on the form of the process in which they are created. This viewpoint radically changes our view of the policy process. We should start to see environmental policy as a collective experimentation where actors work together to try out new political forms and new forms of co-existence with nature. This kind of ontological shift requires a lot of effort not only from environmental policy, but also from the social sciences studying it. I hope that my study has given some modest input to this major endeavour.

Governance theory as a framework for empirical research : a case study on local environmental policy-making in Helsinki, Finland

Arho Toikka

Helsingin yliopisto, valtiotieteellinen tiedekunta, sosiaalitieteiden laitos

Yhteenveto on saatavana osoitteessa <https://helda.helsinki.fi/handle/10138/24938>

Lectio Praecursoria

Networks have become one of the most fashionable buzzwords in social sciences in the past few decades. Within political science, a major focus has been on the role of networks of organizations participating in policy-making. The work discussed here develops these network concepts through an empirical case study from right here in Helsinki. The responsibility for the development of an environmental policy programme was given to a mix of public and private organizations. I use the process that unfolded to illustrate networked policy making and develop network concepts and methods for their analysis.

Due to the overwhelming popularity, there are multiple interrelated but distinct network discourses and definitions. Sometimes networks are something very concrete, such as social networking websites. Sometimes they may refer to fluid forms of organization – a company that does away with some hierarchical systems. In some discussions, networks are something highly abstract or metaphorical. They might refer to a network society, where electronic communication and freedom of movement change the whole morphology of our societies.

Between the highly theoretical and the almost mundane discussions, a theory of networks with associated research methods has been developing. Simply called social network theory, this approach aims to build a systematic manner for the study of all network phenomena. The substance matter can vary, but now the definition of networks is different. Any system consists of parts and their interactions. Any situation where the interactions and their patterns are interesting can be conceptualized as a network for network analysis. Social network theory defines networks simply as a set of nodes – these may be persons, businesses, or even books – that are connected to each other through connections or ties. A single network is the collection of all instances of a particular type of tie between all pairs of nodes. Not all pairs of actors are connected – some have many connections, while others are peripheral and are only connected to few others. Not everybody has access to everybody, and simple membership in the network does not grant all the benefits of inclusion.

In political science, then, a network is neither a club nor an era, but simply a situation where more than one actor is deemed responsible for decision-making or policy implementation. Almost all decision-making situations do include multiple actors. Sometimes they are officially networks and labeled as such: a governmental body nominates a group of persons for a task. But in other contexts, they are ad hoc, open networks – groups of organizational representatives with shared interests coming together to reach a goal. From the point of view of social network theory, both forms of network

are equally interesting. In any of these settings, participants are communicating and establishing connections and partnerships with others. For the single actor, these connections are often made for the simplest of reasons – but this can lead to complexity at the higher, macrolevel.

For example, the observation that you are more likely to be friends with somebody your friend knows than a random guy on the street is almost trivial. Another similar observation is that you will probably still have a random friend somewhere outside your immediate circle. When these two are combined, we have a social mechanism for complex network generation. These two simple mechanisms can build up network structures that might seem completely random to the casual observer.

In this entanglement of connections, patterns start to emerge. This leads to the buildup of network structures. These structures can be as simple as highly-connected cliques – groups of friends, for example. They may be more complex, like the patterns connecting these groups of friends to other groups via acquaintances. At the most complex, they may be even global – the well-known social network theorem states that everybody in the world is only six steps away in a chain of friend-of-a-friend -connections from everybody else. All these examples are results of fairly simple local or personal tendencies in choosing network partners.

Social network analysis is a toolkit for analyzing such simple mechanisms and observing how they result in the messy real world networks. After a network – a set of nodes or actors and the ties between them – has been observed and relevant data collected, social network analysis is bundle of methods that let us dissect the structures in the network. The network can be summarized by a variety of metrics describing individual network positions, network subgroups as well as the whole network. These include measures on central or peripheral positions, cohesion in groups and a variety of roles, such as the role of an information broker or gatekeepers. These metrics have been developed in a variety of social sciences. They originated in anthropology but were quickly adopted by sociologists, social psychologists - as well as political scientists.

In political science, social network theory developed into the notion that policy decisions are not exclusively made by the formal government who signs them, but by a variety of organizations and actors. During 1980s and 1990s a research tradition in policy networks was developed. Early renditions of this tradition were typologies of interest intermediation models in societies. A polity might be described as a closed policy community or an open issue network. For example, the closeness of connections between industry and policy-makers was a categorizing feature. The policy networks perspective was quickly criticized as being solely descriptive or little more than an atheoretical metaphor. As the tradition was not able to integrate a theory of politics and satisfactory ontological and epistemological demands with network concepts, interest waned. The concept peaked around 1997, with a quick downturn after that, according to the Google Books ngram, a tool for analyzing word trends in the literature corpus.

Networks related to political decisions, on the other hand, definitely did not peak and wane, but rather exploded in the real world as well as in new research traditions. Networked decision-making started to be understood through the theories of governance. Within political science, political sociology and administrative science the concept of governance came to refer to decision-making situations where public and private organizations together plan and implement policy decisions. Governance was often a historical change in the process of decision-making. Governments were losing their control over decisions, and the most enthusiastic commentators spoke of a system of governance completely eclipsing the traditional government. The new era was characterized by complicated problems, forcing the breaking of boundaries between public and private. An ideological shift occurred as well, as increased direct participation into the political process came to be sought after. This new era of governance has policy controlled by networks, such as public-private partnership.

The literature on governance also faced fierce criticisms – this time the most nascent ones focusing on the empirical realism of the claims: the government is still central to any decision-making that results in policy. There is no challenging the inclusion of private actors, but the critics argued that the government is still in there, pulling the ropes. The question became whether it is government or governance. The importance of state became an implicit or explicit assumption, leading researchers starting with different assumptions to divergent paths.

But within the eclectic and disjointed governance literature, there is more informed nugget of thought for somebody who is interested in looking at how decisions really are made. Irrespective of the degree of historical change in the process, policy-making does involve a variety of actors. These actors have the ability to communicate with others involved in the process and exchange ideas and resources – and they do use it. The reasons organizations choose to communicate are varied, but just as in a groups of friends, the governance communication emerges into a complicated network structure.

The combination of social network analysis, policy networks and governance theory provides insights into this structure and the process of decision-making. Social network analysis supplies the general toolkit for analysis: the canvas that fits networks of any size, type, and features. Governance makes simple assumptions that enable the painting of that canvas. A governance network is made of organizations who communicate with at least some degree of autonomy. Policy network tradition points out certain methods in the social network analysis body that particularly fit the policy-making setting. The three strains of literature have always been close and built on each other, but no general synthesis has been made. It could move the debate beyond the government versus governance arguments as we do not need a theoretical model of power assignment, and enlighten the micro- or actor-level issues that form the grand scheme of governance.

Empirical and theoretical research working on this synthesis is now being done. My work here is one attempt of this. I analyze a single local network – at the city of Helsinki – in the field of environmental policy-making using mechanisms derived from the observations of the governance literature. Local environmental politics is a particularly

salient example for governance. At the local level, the inclusion of private actors in decision-making has long been understood to be important. For example, urban regimes have been used to analyze the connections between policy-makers and local economic elites. The geographical proximity of organization provides a basis for lively networking, as well as a basis for decisions that actively account for unique conditions in very specific cases. Environmental politics also always include actors from a number of fields with different bases of expertise, as decisions affect all sectors of society and responses are more complex and multi-leveled than in many other fields.

In my work, I analyze the network that resulted when the city of Helsinki needed to build a new ecological sustainability policy. The city board explicitly called for public and private organizations to participate and network. In doing so, it granted the network a certain amount of autonomy over the policy. The organizations complied and got to work, formulating earlier policy goals into concrete policy prescription, changing them slightly and amending them to fit the resources at hand. The policy document developed by the network of administrative organizations, companies and NGOs was later handed to the city board for formal declaration – which they did, with little discussion and unanimous vote to accept the document as the network had prepared. The process was thus a salient example of a governance network at work.

The inner working of governance networks is not yet well understood. My work aims to contribute to this understanding by using social network analysis methods to describe what happened in the policy preparation process. The governance processes are built drawing from earlier descriptive work on policy networks while formulating them as statements based on the governance literature. These statements look at individual positions of organizations, at the role of subgroup cohesion, and the development of the whole network structure based on the micro-level actions of individual communication events.

The analysis of individual positions focused on two issues: centrality and control of information flow. Centrality metrics measure, roughly, the popularity of actors, whether directly or as key players with actors to yet more communication partners. Governance theory suggests autonomy and self-organization over hierarchy. Helsinki Environmental policy agrees: differences in communication partners are overcome by local bridges, or less connected organizations with partners on the opposite side of the network. Simply being popular or well connected did not matter much – it was the ability to act as a gatekeeper between subnetworks that was important. Different organizations took these positions in different situations. Major administrative players did it as well, but opportunities were also available to minor private actors involved. My results suggest that local or small-scale patterns are more interesting than trying to find out who governs.

Tight, cohesive subnetworks with just a few organizations maintaining linkages out of the group resulted in productive, efficient policy-making. Organizations benefited from a focused group, as long as there was an actor that could pass on and convey information, but the importance of direct influence to other parts of the network did not easily correlate with either policy satisfaction or policy production. This is in contrast to many

network-building activities in many local governance regimes, where open conferences or round-tables are called upon to build the network.

At the global level of the complete network, I model the emergence of network structures based on the characteristics of individual organizations and the network positions they occupy. This relates the study to the fundamental debate in governance: are networks really autonomous, self-organizing structures, or could they just appear so, with the government in reality still in control? A statistical model of communication ties suggests that network structures are the driving force behind the network. When an organization is looking to establish a new communication tie, it focuses more on the network position of the potential partner than on the partner itself. Observed expertise matters, as does similarity in organization function, but these are overshadowed by the preference to fill out gaps and build dense subgroups.

In my work, I argue that there is a reasonably coherent governance theory, even if hidden under grand proclamations at times. Governance is often discussed at a higher level – as a grand theory of society, where the existence of networks is regarded as a change in how the world works. I see governance as an empirical, organizing framework that can help cast light on phenomena that are hard to conceptualize otherwise. It is fairly obvious that networks of organizations have some importance in policy-making. Supplementing the governance statements about this importance with social network analysis methods gives us tools for establishing how these networks function. I hope my work under discussion today helps build this toolkit.

TIEDOTTEITA

Mika Kari – Matti Kojo – Tapio Litmanen

COMMUNITY DIVIDED

Adaptation and Aversion towards the Spent Nuclear Fuel Repository in Eurajoki and its Neighbouring Municipalities

Tiivistelmä

Eurajoki oli ensimmäinen kunta maailmassa, joka hyväksyi käytetyn ydinpolttoaineen loppusijoituksen alueelleen. Tämä raportti esittelee Eurajoella ja sen naapurikunnissa toteutetun käytetyn ydinpolttoaineen loppusijoitusprojektia koskevan mielipidekyselyn tuloksia. Lisäksi raportissa käsitellään myös kahta erilaista lähestymistapaa, joiden avulla voidaan tulkita ydinteollisuuspaikkakunnan suhdetta loppusijoitukseen. Ydinkeidas - lähestymistapa esittää, että paikallinen hyväksyntä käytetyn ydinpolttoaineen loppusijoituslaitokselle perustuu pienen, syrjäinen kunnan suureen riippuvuuteen voimakkaasta ydinvoimateollisuudesta. Haastava teollisuustietoisuus -näkökulma tulkitsee valmiutta hyväksyä loppusijoituslaitos kulttuurisen sopeutumisen näkökulmasta. Yhteisöllä ja sen asukkailla on läheiset suhteet ydinvoimateollisuuteen, mikä synnyttää kulttuurista sopeutumista, integroitumista ja ymmärrystä ydinteollisuuden toiminnalle.

Tulokset osoittavat, että ne Eurajoen asukkaat, jotka kokevat loppusijoituslaitosprojektin vaikutukset myönteisiksi kunnan yleiselle sosio-kulttuuriselle kehitykselle, ovat valmiimpia hyväksymään käytetyn ydinpolttoaineen loppusijoituslaitoksen Olkiluotoon. Taloudellisten ja työllisyys tekijöiden havaittiin olevan merkittäviä hyväksynnän kannalta, mutta näiden tekijöiden painoarvo oli heikompi kuin yleisten sosio-kulttuuristen tekijöiden. Tämän kaltaiset havainnot puhuvat teollisuustietoisuus-lähestymistavan puolesta. Todellisuus on kuitenkin monimutkaisempi, koska asukkaiden kulttuurinen sopeutuminen ei etene harmonisesti, ilman säröjä, eikä levittäydy tasaisesti.

Tutkimuksessa havaittiin piilevä sosiaalinen jakautuneisuus. Tämä tarkoittaa, että piilossa oleva jako erottelee jäsenet kahteen leiriin tai ryhmään, joiden välillä on olemassa konfliktin mahdollisuus. Esimerkiksi naisten ja miesten mielipiteet eroavat useimpien loppusijoitusasioiden suhteen. Puoluepoliittisesta näkökulmasta tulokset viittaavat siihen, että loppusijoitukseen suopeasti suhtautuvia löytyy todennäköisimmin Kansallista Kokoomusta, Suomen Keskustaa ja joissakin tapauksissa myös Suomen Sosialidemokraattista Puoluetta kannattavien riveistä. Loppusijoitukseen kielteisesti suuntautuvia asukkaita löytyy todennäköisemmin Vihreän liiton ja Suomen Kristillisdemokraattien kannattajien joukosta. Aineiston analyysi osoittaa myös, että suurempi tuloisten, paremmin koulutettujen ja paremmassa ammattiasemassa olevien asenteet ovat huomattavasti myönteisempiä loppusijoitusta kohtaan kuin heidän, joilla on matalammat tulot, alhaisempi koulutustaso ja heikompi ammattiasema. Jossain tapauksissa erot ovat todella huomattavia. Henkilöt, joilla on suuremmat tulot, näyttävät

kieltävän tai sietävän loppusijoituksen riskit tai jossain tapauksissa epäröivän riskien suhteen.

Sekä Säteilyturvakeskus (STUK) ja ydinvoimateollisuus ovat onnistuneet vakiinnuttamaan melko luotetun aseman tiedonlähteinä paikallistasolla, mutta silti edellä mainittu sosiaalinen jako voidaan havaita myös tiedon vastaanottajien keskuudessa. Tämä tarkoittaa sitä, että paikallisissa asukkaissa on myös niitä, jotka eivät luota näihin toimijoihin tiedonlähteinä. Kun nykyisiä havaintoja verrataan vuonna 1994 tehdyn kyselyn havaintoihin, voidaan todeta että tiedon tarve näyttää siirtyneen turvallisuusasioista ympäristö- ja terveysvaikutusten suuntaan.

Raportti perustuu kesäkuussa 2008 toteutettuun asukaskyselyyn (Otos 3000, vastausprosentti 20%, N= 606). Tutkimusprojektia rahoitti Kansallinen ydinjätetutkimusohjelma, KYT2010 (www.ydinjätetutkimus.fi).

Avainsanat: *Käytetty ydinpolttoaine, ydinjäte, loppusijoitus, mielipiteet, Eurajoki, Suomi.*

Koko raportti: <http://urn.fi/URN:ISBN:978-951-39-4149-9>

Tieto hallinnassa: tietokäytännöt suomalaisessa yhteiskunnassa (Toim.) Alastalo Marja & Åkerman Maria

Mikä yhdistää liito-oravien papanoita tarkkailevat luontoharrastajat elinoloilastojen laatijoihin tai OECD:n varhaiskasvatuksen asiantuntijoihin? Kuinka virheellinen laskelma kenkien hinnoista voi aiheuttaa paineen nostaa keskuspankin ohjauskorkoa?

Julkista hallintoa ja politiikkaa luonnehtii tarve perustella ratkaisuja faktoilla. Suuri osa hallinnon voimavaroista käytetään informaation keräämiseen kansalaisista, luonnonvaroista, talouden muuttujista ja ympäristön tilasta. Maailmaa hallitaan indikaattoreilla sekä rekisteri-, luokitus-, ja seurantajärjestelmillä. Näin tietokäytännöt määrittävät merkittävästi yhteiskunnan valtasuhteita.

Tieto hallinnassa valaisee, miten tietokäytännöt ja niiden kyseenalaistaminen ovat muokanneet yhteiskuntapolitiikan ongelmien aseteluja ja toiminnan mahdollisuuksia Suomessa. Kirjaan on koottu eri alojen tutkimusta tietokäytännöistä, jotka ovat viime vuosikymmeninä muokanneet ymmärrystämme suomalaisesta yhteiskunnasta. Käsiteltäviä teemoja ovat elinolot, kulutus, terveyspolitiikan tavoitteet ja keinot, varhaiskasvatus, uuden teknologian riskit, ympäristömuutos ja luonnonvarojen käyttö.

Kirjan sisältö

Saatteeksi: Miksi tietokäytäntöjen politiikasta on syytä puhua?

Marja Alastalo & Maria Åkerman

I Muokkaavatko standardit meitä vai me standardeja?

Tietokäytännöt ja hallinnan politiikka

Marja Alastalo & Maria Åkerman

Miten kansalliset kehityspolut yhtyvät? Esimerkkinä varhaiskasvatussuunnitelmien kotouttaminen

Pertti Alasuutari

Liito-oravan jäljillä: kansalaiset luonnonsuojelun tietokäytännöissä

Ari Jokinen

Muuntogeeniset koivut ja riskinarvioinnin politiikka

Helena Valve

II Tiedosta yhteiskuntapolitiikkaan – ja takaisin

Miten riskitieto alkoi ohjata terveystietoa: tilastolliset tutkimusmenetelmät sydäntautien hallinnassa

Mikko Jauho

Kulutuksen hallinta, tilastotieto ja muuttuva kuluttajuus

Kirsti Ahlqvist

Miten muodostui tahto tilastoida väestön elinoloja

Marja Alastalo

III Hankalasti hallittava maailma

Roskapuuta vai raaka-ainetta? Laskelmien ja luokittelujen metsäpolitiikkaa

Taru Peltola & Maria Åkerman

Kirkkojärvi karkaa luokituksesta: asiantuntijatiedon haavoittuvuus

Helena Leino