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ABSTRACT

The emergence of informational network societies and globalisation have posed new challenges to regional development and its evaluation. One of the strategies to meet the challenges is the creation of development networks of competitiveness by the “big actors”, such as universities, enterprises, and the public institutions. Even the actors of everyday-life, women, the young and elderly people, have began to construct networks, not of competitiveness but those of social cohesion. Both types of networks share an involvement in the new knowledge or learning economy as well as the application of management tools that enable the monitoring and self-evaluation of the intended progress. The latter also serves as a tool for capacity building of and voice for the participants. The aim of the article is to discuss some concepts and methodology of a type of assessment called network evaluation from the everyday life perspective. It is based on personal experience with several assessments and on a meta-analysis of a case study on a regional youth network, in the Finnish North Karelia.

NETWORKING FOR SOCIAL COHESION

Women and men of the Western industrialised world are increasingly living in informational network societies. Castells (1996) and Hardt & Negri (2000) state that the latter are characterised by the spaces of global flows of information, finances, and technology which subjugate localities and places. This means that new challenges are posed to urban and rural policies, planning and development included. Localities are increasingly seen as part of regions which are forced to compete with one another in order to become an attractive space for desired flows. According to Kotler et al. (1999), the competition among urban regions or cities on the world-wide market can be labelled as a global place war.

The winners of this war are those who have the know-how to take advantage of the opportunities of globalisation. One of the strategies that has been applied in the endeavours to succeed in the competition for economic survival is the building of regional development networks (Kostiainen, 2002). The latter might ultimately turn into lucrative regional innovation systems that will bring forth new economic activities and the consequent material gains. The actors in these networks of competitiveness are usually “big players”, such as enterprises, public institutions, financial agents, and universities (Cook et al. 2000).

The losers in the globalisation game are those who are not able to cope with the negative impact of globalisation, such as the lack of control and voice in local matters. The negative effects can be felt not only in the developing countries but also in many Western nations, especially in the everyday lives of children, young and elderly people, and many women.
Whether the strategies for fighting the exploitative aspects of globalisation are top-down or bottom-up, there is a great need for creative economic, social, and cultural responses to the new challenges. In fact, several citizen groups, especially among the women’s movement in both Europe and on other continents have striven to find out new solutions as they have been tacitly mainstreaming gender and intergenerational equality in planning and development for the past twenty years (Horelli, 1998; 2001; 2002a). Mainstreaming equality in urban planning and development can be defined as the application of a set of gender and age sensitive visions, concepts, strategies, and practices in the different phases and arenas of the development and evaluation cycle (cf. Horelli, 1997; European Commission, 2000). The following brief description of the visions, models of action, and strategies of the women’s movement in the creation of human settlements illustrates, how the actors in the networks of social cohesion seem to proceed:

“The Nordic women’s approach of the 1980s, not only comprised a critique of the present conditions but also a vision of a harmonious, creative, and just society. It was inspired, in addition to the early utopians and American material feminists (Hayden, 1982), also by the critical texts of Gortz (1980) and Lefebvre (1971).

The model of action that the Nordic women applied in their decade long project is the collaborative creation of a supportive infrastructure of everyday life. The latter means that the locality should offer opportunities to integrate dwelling, work and care in a viable way (Forskargruppen, 1987). The central concept is the creation of an intermediary level between the private households and the public and commercial world of enterprises. The intermediary level is a new structure in the neighbourhoods comprising environmentally friendly housing, services, employment, and other activities which support the residents irrespective of age and gender (Horelli & Vepsä, 1994). Originally, the intermediary level referred only to a structure in the neighbourhood or in the housing area, but as European women started to participate in the EU funded regional development the intermediary level was expanded to mean even supportive structures, such as networked resource centres in the regions (Gilroy & Booth, 1999; Horelli, 2002a).

The most recent strategies for creating the conditions and content of supportive networks in the 21st century have been accelerated by women’s place-based politics. Politics of place is “place-based but not place-bound” (Harcourt & Escobar, 2002). It implies a vision of politics that includes projects that are embedded, contextualised and localised but also linked, networked, and meshworked (meaning non-hierarchical, informal networking). In fact, it is a “politics of becoming” which presupposes the application of innovative, hybrid strategies. The latter consist of (Horelli, 2002a):

- The construction of motivating visionary narratives in which women and men, young and old from different contexts emerge as agents of their everyday lives who pursue social justice and conviviality
- The adoption of “swarming”-like tactics (Horelli et al., 2000; Arquilla & Ronfelt; 2001) that comprise the recognition of multiple, situated, and relational knowledges, the production of dialectical and empowering concepts as well as the application of a set of enabling tools and techniques. This includes the managing of the different local and specific knowledges which might nurture the viability of community economies and even alternative regional innovation systems
- The sensitive organising of networks and meshworks around “glocalities” and other supports that enhance the mastering of global/local tensions. The organising also comprises the networking of the body, home, the community and the public space on the local,
national, and global level, assisted by a conscious application of information and communication technology

- The recognition of the role of conflicts and power issues inherent in the place-based politics.

As the EU regional policy and the structural fund interventions are based on two contradictory ideologies and principles, competitiveness and social cohesion, the construction of both networks of competitiveness and those of social cohesion, is vital. Irrespective of the type of network, the survival in the network society and globalisation seem to require on-going innovations through the participation of diverse stakeholders in the economic processes. Both types of networks seem to share two characteristics, namely the participation in the emerging pluralistic economic paradigm, called knowledge or learning economy, and the application of an on-going feedback system. The new learning economy is based on intangibles – multiple knowledges, capacity building, creativity, networks, learning organisations, intellectual and social capital, as well as participatory knowledge management. According to Zaoual (forthcoming), an ethical precondition for meaningful economic practice is the respect for situated people in their universality and diversity. This means that formal and informal economies are integrated in local social and physical spaces. Economic factors are interwoven with social codes that mobilise the implicit meanings of local and regional practices. Consequently, the new economy is the result of ways of behaviour in which notions of quality, trust, relationships, and networks become essential. Most of these qualities are necessary, not only for the development networks of competitiveness (Kostiainen, 2002), but also for the endeavours of citizen groups who seek to develop supportive networks of social cohesion.

The other shared prerequisite of successful networking is the application of an on-going monitoring and self-evaluation system which provides the necessary feedback for the co-ordination and management of the network. Empowerment through evaluation seems especially important for the actors of everyday life, who will simultaneously get a chance to learn and build their capacity. However, network evaluation is a genre of assessment that is still being constructed. Several researchers and evaluators have sought to appropriate the complex phenomenon of networks through varying approaches, such as cluster, chaos or complexity theories (cf. Hummelbrunner, 2000; Arnikil et al., 2002; Davies, 2002; Potter, 2002; Sanderson, 2002). The aim of this paper is to discuss some concepts and methodology of a type of assessment called network evaluation from the everyday life perspective. It is based on personal experience with several assessments and on a meta-analysis of a case study on a regional youth network, in the Finnish North Karelia.

FRAMING THE APPROACH TO NETWORK EVALUATION

Network analysis from the everyday-life perspective refers here to a type of empowerment evaluation in which the participants, whether young or old, women or men, experts or lay people, are involved in the planning, development and evaluation process of a network-project. According to Fetterman (2001,3), empowerment evaluation is a genre of evaluation that uses evaluation concepts, techniques, and findings to foster improvement and self-determination by using both qualitative and quantitative methods. It is a collaborative activity with participants at all levels of the organisation. Although the context may be a project, an institute or a community, the focus is usually on the improvement and development of programs. The role of the professional evaluator resembles a facilitator or a coach rather than an outside expert who assesses the worth of the end-results. Advocacy is a natural by-product of the self-evaluation process but “only if the data merit it” (Fetterman (2001, 5). Thus, the credibility of the data that has been negotiated with the
stakeholders, is one of the key issues, almost like in the fourth generation evaluation of Guba & Lincoln (1989). The negotiations take place as a capacity building process, which is enhanced by three steps: the establishing of the mission of the program, taking stock of the main activities, and charting the course for the future. In addition to theory-oriented evaluations (Stame, 2002), empowerment evaluation also provides an alternative way to open the “black box” of the programme as it either creates the programme with the participants or tailors it to their needs. Provided of course that a meta-evaluation of the empowering results will take place.

As empowerment evaluation has not focused on the development of networks, it is complemented here by the theories of collaborative planning (Healey, 1997) and co-operative learning (Johnson & Johnson, 1990). Citizen groups tend to see participatory planning and development as a form of empowerment. Participatory planning is defined here as “a social, ethical, and political practice in which women and men, children, young and elderly people take part in varying degrees in the overlapping phases of the planning and decision-making cycle that may bring forth outcomes congruent with the participants’ needs, interests, and goals” (cf. Horelli, 2002b).

Figure 1. A schema of the methodological approach to participatory planning in which co-operative learning and capacity building take place through an on-going monitoring and self-evaluation system.

Figure 1 describes the methodological schema of participatory planning that has been developed on the basis of projects with women, children, and young people (Horelli, 2002b). At the centre of the diagram lie the communicative transactions of the participants in a specific environmental, organisational, economic, cultural, and temporal context. The various transactions are supported by
a multitude of enabling tools during the overlapping and iterative phases of the planning and development process – initiation, planning, design, implementation, evaluation, and maintenance. An on-going monitoring and self-evaluation provides the participants with feedback on the quality of the change process and its results. The monitoring and self-evaluation can also be organised as a “knowledge management system” which focuses on the externalisation, systematisation, and exercising of local and situational knowledges (cf. Nonaka et al. 2000). The assessment of the results include both tangible products, services and innovations as well as intangible first, second and third order effects (Innes & Booher, 1999). The latter also comprise the learning and capacity building of the participants, and the emergence of diverse economies. Evaluation might also take the form of research in which the impact of participation can be examined in depth. Research is then conducted from a chosen theoretical perspective in accordance with the problem in question.

APPLYING NETWORK EVALUATION IN A CASE STUDY

The application of the chosen framework to network evaluation from the everyday-life perspective is illustrated by a description of the North-Karelian Youth Forum-project, which also was a case study, funded by the Finnish Academy.

Constructing a multi-dimensional monitoring and self-evaluation system

North-Karelia (170,000 residents) is the easternmost region in Finland (and in the EU), which has a 300 km long common border with Russia of. The region is sparsely populated with vast areas of forests and lakes. Currently, the formerly agrarian region has several well-functioning clusters in forest- and metal industries as well as several high-tech centres. Most municipalities provide the residents free access to internet services and capacity building for e-citizenship skills. Nevertheless, the unemployment rate is high, around 15% in general, and especially alarming among young people. Thus, the latter are increasingly moving to the more prosperous parts of the country. Although the Regional Council had been aware of the youth problem for a long time, it took three years to negotiate a special project that would seek to create supportive local and regional networks for and with the youth. In the autumn of 2001, the North-Karelian Youth Forum-project (NUFO) was granted 500,000 euros from the European Social Fund and three municipalities (Joensuu, Kitee and Lieksa). This made it possible to hire four young people to co-ordinate and manage the project for two years. They began to mobilise the network, consulted by an evaluator-researcher and the steering committee. The latter comprised the major partners, such as representatives from the Regional council, the municipalities, some schools, the Bic, several citizen organisations, and the young people themselves.

The vision of the project, which was created together with the participants, became crystallised as “A joyful North-Karelia with survival opportunities for young people”. The aim of NUFO was to create with young people a supportive network that will provide arenas for meeting face to face and virtually. The objectives also implied opportunities for work, collaboration in projects, enjoyable events, having a say in local and regional development, and sustainable mobility.

The mobilisation of the network followed roughly the pattern and logistics in Figure 1. A great variety of enabling methods were applied in the various phases of the development cycle. One of the most important techniques was the organising of participatory workshops in schools to launch the project. Each event mobilised around 100 young people who had the opportunity to discuss their ideas and visions for improving the region with decision makers (who sat in a panel). The girls and
boys who were interested in continuing to participate were organised into local or thematic groups. They started to plan and implement events, happenings, and new projects.

Viable co-ordination and managing of the project implied the answering of the following questions: How is the network being mobilised? What elements of and connections in the network are being nurtured and cared for? What are the outcomes of the network? In order to answer the critical questions, a multi-dimensional, partly digitalised monitoring and self-evaluation system was carefully built with the participants. The monitoring instruments consisted of

- a weekly self-assessment sheet for the local project managers
- a monthly self-assessment sheet for the members of local and thematic teams
- a monthly self-assessment sheet for the steering committee
- the monitoring sheet of the process and outcomes of the workplan for the co-ordinator
- the monitoring sheet of the budget for the co-ordinator

The collective assessment of the evolvement of the network took place through consultative evaluation sessions. According to the complex adaptive systems theory (CAS; Axelrod et al. 1999; Burt, 2000; Barabasi, 2002; cited in Davies, 2002), many parallel and consecutive interactions transform the structure of the network. Thus the trajectory of change can be seen as a series of consecutive states in the network as a whole. Therefore, every second months, the evaluator-researcher and the project managers mapped and discussed the process and outcomes in order to gain more insight into the evolving network patterns. The methods of the collective self-assessment comprised:

1. a metaphorical and structural assessment of the emerging network. As the supportive network was considered a hybrid that consists of people, activities, technology, services, events, institutional actors, concrete and virtual places (cf. Latour, 1993), the nature and inter-connections of the nodes of the hybrid were assessed through critical dialogue
2. a spatial assessment of the emerging network. The emerging nodes of the network were put on the local and regional maps which disclosed the scope and distribution of the support system
3. a temporal assessment of the emerging network. Instead of using a specific software for the process mapping (cf. Davies, 2002), a collective memorising of the significant events of the “history of the network” was organised after one year. The events were written on stickers, which were arranged chronologically on the wall and evaluated with the story-line technique (i.e., the events were assessed on a five point scale in terms of importance)
4. analytic assessment of the learning and the needs of capacity building. A matrix was constructed of the network actors in terms of their competences which disclosed where and what type of training was needed. The key partners were also invited to discuss the progress of the learning of the network (cf. Table 1).

The methodological package above made it possible to follow and gain understanding how the network was evolving and were the caveats were. In addition to the on-going monitoring and assessment, surveys (questionnaires and interviews) were conducted with young people during various events, meetings, and activities. The learning of the individual participants which emerged during the cycle of the project appeared, among other things, as the know-how of the young to implement their own projects or the increased awareness of the adults of their own competences in terms of how to provide support for the young participants.
The development of networks for social cohesion tend to start off from a situation (step 0) in which local and regional actors with varying skills exist as a pool of invisible actors. The partly visible and interconnected network that is able to act in terms of organising events, applying for new projects etc., can be regarded as the first step of progress (step 1) on the scale of development of supportive networks (cf. Figure 2; Horelli, 2002c). This is currently the case with two out of the three municipalities in the NUFO-project. The network has gathered altogether nearly 2000 young and adult participants over 70% of whom are under 25 years old. 450 persons are active agents (two thirds of them are women) who have the potential to react or pro-act when something happens or is needed to do in the region.

Another year or two usually passes before a more sustainable structure, such as a resource centre or a “regional intermediary level” (step 2) will be attained (Horelli & Sotkasiira, 2000). The third step, which implies the construction of an innovation system of local and regional actors, requires several years and great organisational skills (cf. Gustavsen, 2001).

![Figure 2](image_url)

**Figure 2**. Steps of progress in the development of networks in terms of time and maturity of organisation.

Figure 2 is an easily understandable (symbolic) way to communicate progress to the participants. It is based on a traditional network analysis of the matrixes of actors which allows to tap the changes in the structure of the network.

**Assessment of the learning of the network**

The fourth question that was being monitored and assessed in the project was, how to create a learning network and how the learning of the network was taking place. As mentioned earlier, the whole development initiative was organised as a collaborative learning process. Collaborative
learning refers to the organizing of interactions with people through shared goals and supported activities in order to create cognitive, emotional, and behavioural learning mechanisms in specific contexts (cf. Johnson & Johnson, 1990). Gustavsen (2001,186) points out that “working together in a development program with a broad range of actors has to do with much more than the achievement of short- or middle term outcomes. It has to do with certain links, ties and relationships between actors, with developing competence to work across organisational boundaries and with the creation of new arenas where this work can be performed”. The evaluation and especially the research task is then to understand, not only the actors and their individual learning, but the process, dynamics, and the learning of the network.

The Japanese theorist of organisational learning, Ikujiro Nonaka, has created with his colleagues (Nonaka et al.,2000) a set of concepts and a methodology to enhance and assess the knowledge-creation process of an organisation. According to Nonaka, knowledge is dynamic, since it is created in social interactions amongst individuals and organisations. Knowledge is also context-specific as it depends on particular time and space (Nonaka et al.,2000,7). The knowledge creation process can be intentionally enhanced, if specific spaces, places or platforms (BA in Japanese), where people meet and interact, are constructed for different types of knowledges in an organisation. Tacit knowledge emerges in places where people socialise informally, such as cafes or concerts, whereas the sharing of and externalising the tacit knowledge into explicit knowledge presupposes spaces for creative interaction and dialogue, such as brainstorming, etc. The systemising of knowledge and transforming it into guidelines, models or even prototypes require more stable kind of arenas, such as research, resource centres, etc. The last step in the elaboration of knowledge is the turning of knowledge into creative know-how and its application in practice. After exercising the know-how, the spiral of knowledge-creation goes on with the nurturing of new tacit knowledge and its externalisation.

The knowledge creation approach was applied in the development of NUFO and its assessment as a learning network. Instead of using the Japanese BA, the concept of ‘node’ was utilised. Thus, the assessment question was, how were the nodes for learning originated, interacted, systemised, and exercised. Various enabling methods were applied in the facilitation of both the network mechanisms of change and learning. Table 1 illustrates, what actions and methods have so far been taken and what the future steps (marked with an asterix) will eventually be.

Table 1 illustrates that several types of nodes and modes of learning have been originated and made interactive during the first year of the project. Some of the nodes have been systemised or institutionalised through organising the activities into associations. However, the knowledge creation and learning has not yet reached the stage of “exercising the nodes” in practice. The analysis of progress in the learning of the network was discussed with the managers of the project and the key partners. Table 1 had an immediate impact on the choice of interventions for the future of the network.
Table 1. The application of enabling methods and special activities in order to facilitate the change mechanisms and the emerging learning of the NUFO-network (cf. Kickert et al. 1997; Nonaka et al. 2000).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ORIGINATING THE NODES</th>
<th>INTERACTING THE NODES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>participatory workshops</td>
<td>self-assessment sessions of the co-ordination team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>events</td>
<td>role-playing events of the regional council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>an interactive website</td>
<td>follow-up participatory workshops</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>collaboration with the youth councils</td>
<td>facilitated web-sessions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>local youth/adult teams</td>
<td>the media</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EXERCISING THE NODES</th>
<th>SYSTEMISING THE NODES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>networking with the partners</td>
<td>action research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*working patterns of the regional youth-forum</td>
<td>founding of the regional youth forum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*mentoring the youth-cafe enterprises</td>
<td>founding of the youth-housing association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*working models and patterns of the local resource centres</td>
<td>founding of the youth-band association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>*founding of youth-resource centres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>*networking youth-cafes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>*founding of a regional competence centre</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

WHAT IS NETWORK-EVALUATION FROM THE EVERYDAY-LIFE PERSPECTIVE?

Evaluations are never context-free. Their nature and results depend on their purpose and the perspective from which they are being conducted. According to Chelimsky (1997, 10) evaluations seem to fall naturally into three general perspectives or categories. These categories are used here to examine what network evaluation from the everyday-life perspective is, and to show how it differs from empowerment evaluation:

- **Evaluation for development** (e.g., the improvement of programs, the strengthening of institutions or the creation of the network)
- **Evaluation for accountability** (e.g., the measurement of results, efficiency or appropriateness; cf. Sanderson, 2002)
- **Evaluation for knowledge** (e.g., the acquisition of a more profound understanding in some area, field or substance matter).

**Evaluation for development**

Network evaluation from the everyday-life perspective belongs, like empowerment evaluation (Fetterman, 2001), to the category of development as it focuses on the improvement and strengthening of the networks of social cohesion. Because of its complex target and subject matter, network evaluation differs from empowerment evaluation in the sense that the on-going monitoring and self-evaluation system is perhaps more multi-dimensional and vital for the existence of the endeavour than is the case with empowerment evaluation.

Both types of evaluations can be regarded as consulted internal evaluations (Love, 1991; Horelli & Roininen, 2000). However, (action) research tends to play a more significant role in the network evaluation than in the empowerment one. Research is an integral part of the monitoring system as it
provides, not only the necessary meta-analysis of what type of change mechanisms are taking place but also, through specific surveys, the experiences of those actors who do not have the opportunity and motivation to be present in the sometimes strenuous assessment sessions (the perspective of the young people in the local and thematic teams and other events will be reported in a forthcoming article).

Evaluation for accountability

Like empowerment evaluation, network evaluation is not at its best in the category of accountability. Nevertheless, evaluation for accountability is an issue of life and death for network

Table 2. A tentative opening of the concepts and issues around diverse economies (based on Gibson, 2002; Graham, 2002; Henderson, 1996; Horelli, 2002c; Zaoual, forthcoming).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MECHANISMS OF ECONOMIC EXCHANGE AND COORDINATION</th>
<th>REMUNERATION OF LABOUR</th>
<th>ORGANISATIONAL FORM</th>
<th>ASSETS &amp; RESOURCES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>(Open) market</strong></td>
<td>Wages</td>
<td>Capitalist (enterprises and jobs)</td>
<td>Monetary resources: profits from selling. Organisational resources: physical, human, social, structural, and digitalised capital.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Publicly or State Administered market</strong></td>
<td>Wages for public and semi-public service employees, and the third sector actors</td>
<td>Public administration or enterprises (office and commissions at local, national and international public administrations)</td>
<td>Monetary resources: direct and indirect taxes; transfers between administrations; selling of services for the market. Org. resources as above:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public administration; Third sector initiatives</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Alternative market</strong> (Flee markets, local trading systems; LETS, co-op exchange, partnerships; black market)</td>
<td>Wages and additional income for the third sector employees (NGOs, associations, coop labour). Alternative paid (alternative currencies, indentured, in kind, etc.)</td>
<td>Ecologically and socially responsible organisations; co-operatives, mutuals, associations, resource centres, non-profit organisations (self-employment) and the varying states of the network.</td>
<td>Monetary resources: Donations, public subventions. Organisational resources: Physical, human, social, structural, and digitalised capital.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Non-market</strong> (Barter, household flows, gifts, indigenous exchange)</td>
<td>Unpaid (Volunteer, housework, family care)</td>
<td>Non-capitalist: Households and families, communities (self-employment)</td>
<td>Ecological, human and social capital (popular know-how; natural resources, etc.)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
evaluation from the everyday-life perspective, because the results and efficiency legitimise the future funding of the network. The problem is that networks of social cohesion, whose aim generally is to provide supportive structures for the community, tend to produce fuzzy outcomes, such as invisible meshworks or social capital (Burt, 2000; Whiteley, 1999). The latter are difficult to measure with traditional quantitative indicators, such as new enterprises and jobs. The outcomes of the interacting network agents can be defined as collective constructions (cf. Davies, 2002). Thus the information about impact should, especially if the CAS analysis is applied, be treated as a symptom of the state of relationships involved between the concerned and the target of their concern. Consequently, there is a great need for indicators of “weak signals” or “symptoms” that make the fuzzy results visible and demonstrate the progress of the development work (cf. Table 2).

A group of researchers has worked with the concepts and issues around diverse economies in order to make space for alternative indicators that might make the weak signals visible and legitimate in a wider economic context. The dominant new liberal economic thinking is only the “icing of the economic cake” (Henderson, 1996). Table 2 demonstrates that a diversity of economies exists. Its mechanisms of exchange and co-ordination do not only take place via open markets but via different kinds of markets and even non-markets. The remuneration of labour, the organisational forms and assets take varying forms depending on what mechanism of exchange is actualised (Note that the lines of the boxes in Table 2 are not rigid but overlapping). Thus, the traditional EU indicators of enterprises and jobs that can be found in the first row and the third column of the table, belong to the open market exchange and capitalist form of organising. The outcomes of NGOs and citizen groups often belong to other forms of diverse economies. Their indicators are mostly qualitative. The weak signals or symptoms (marked with italics) could, for instance, be measured by indicators which show the changing states of the network as a whole or in relation to the scale of development (cf. Figure 2). Indicators for impact could be measured by the increase in organisational resources, such as physical, human, social, structural, and even digitalised capital (Märsky, 2001). However, the forging of the weak signals into legitimate indicators is problematic, because tapping them requires, epistemologically and technically, a proxemic approach which is in contradiction to the distal way of constructing indicators on the European level (Sauli & Simpura, 2002; Horelli, 2002c).

**Evaluation for knowledge**

Unlike empowerment evaluation, network evaluation produces a great deal of pragmatic knowledge of how to mobilise and care for networks of social cohesion, due to the vital role of (action) research in the monitoring and self-evaluation of the proces. However, knowledge creation is also an integral part of the survival of citizens in the learning economy.

An interesting question is, whether networks for social cohesion will contribute to the third step of development in Figure 2, namely the creation of regional innovation systems. And, if they will, what type of regional innovations will emerge and with what consequences. It takes a long time, even for the development networks of competitiveness to become regional innovation systems, because the latter presuppose not only the production of human capital but also the dissemination of competences between individuals and organisations, in addition to the transferring of the learning and the competences into praxis (Ritsilä, forthcoming). Kostiainen (2002, 627) points out that post-modern regional development is a polyphonic process. Success hides in the strategies of multiplicity and determination of doing things in parallel, in many fields, and in the fusion of cultures. Will the youth, NGOs, and other non-formal agents, who manage a great number of sustainable development projects, become significant players in new kinds of innovation systems, remains to be seen.
Advocacy

Advocacy refers to the enhancement of position on behalf of some group. It also deals with the balancing of power, tensions, and conflict. As advocacy is similarly pertinent to both empowerment and network evaluation from the everyday-life perspective, it merits to be examined as a category of its own. Advocacy is a natural by-product of the self-evaluation process “if the data merit it”, Fetterman (2001,5) states. In network evaluation advocacy is not that simple. In an open utilisation-focused evaluation (Patton,1997) it is relatively easy to advocate for the different interests of varying stakeholders, although the balancing of the interests of the representatives within the “system” or the establishment and those of the life-world (Habermas, 1984) remains problematic. Advocacy becomes even more difficult, when both the system and the life-world are represented by young people, as was the case in the NUFO-project (cf. Horelli & Roininen, 2000). The young co-ordinator and managers, whose task was to promote networks of social cohesion for and with the young, were not always aware of whether they should act on behalf of the “system” or on that of the young people. The balancing of power relations and conflicts in advocacy seems to require a sharp analysis of the situation and the application of expressive methods, such as role-playing and socio-drama, which enhance the treatment of problematic emotional issues (cf. Innes & Booher, 1999).

CONCLUSIONS

It is finally time to answer, what network evaluation from the everyday-life perspective is. It seems to be an emerging hybrid that comprises a blurring of multiple dimensions and levels, processes and outcomes, formative and summative activities, internal and external assessments, participatory and non-participatory approaches in which special attention is paid to the issues of learning, capacity building, and the balancing of conflict and power. Network evaluation is definitely oriented towards the development and improvement of the collective endeavour, whether a process, project or institutional activities. It is also about creating knowledge of the development process as well as that of the outcomes. Network evaluation also seeks to deal with accountancy, although the results in terms of efficiency may be different from the traditional (economic) ones. The weak signals or symptoms of diverse economies that were brought forth in the evaluation of the case study, indicate that the outcomes of networks may contribute to the sustainable human development, in the true sense of the word.
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