

GEXcel Work in Progress Report Volume XIV



Organising an International Collegium for Advanced Transdisciplinary Gender Studies – Exploring Models

Edited by
Björn Pernrud

Centre of Gender Excellence – GEXcel

**Towards a European Centre of Excellence in
Transnational and Transdisciplinary Studies of**

- Changing Gender Relations
- Intersectionalities
- Embodiment

Institute of Thematic Gender Studies:

Department of Gender Studies, Tema Institute,
Faculty of Arts and Sciences, Linköping University

Division of Gender and Medicine,
Faculty of Health Sciences, Linköping University

&

Centre for Feminist Social Studies (CFS), School of Humanities,
Education and Social Sciences (HumES), Örebro University

Gender Studies, School of Humanities,
Education and Social Sciences (HumES), Örebro University



The publication of this report has been funded with the support of the Swedish Research Council: Centres of Gender Excellence Programme

GEXcel Work in Progress Report Volume XIV:
Organising an International Collegium for Advanced Transdisciplinary Gender Studies – Exploring Models

Copyright © GEXcel and the authors 2012

Print: LiU-tryck, Linköping University
Layout: Tomas Hägg
Linguistic revisions: Elizabeth Sourbut

Tema Genus Report Series No. 18: 2011– LiU
CFS Report Series No.20: 2011 – ÖU

ISBN 978-91-7519-977-1
ISSN 1650-9056

ISBN 978-91-7668-854-0
ISSN 1103-2618

Addresses:

www.genderexcel.org

Institute of Thematic Gender Studies, LiU-ÖU
– an inter-university institute, located at:

Department of Gender Studies
Linköping University
SE 581 83 LINKÖPING, Sweden

Division of Gender and Medicine
Department of Clinical and Experimental Medicine
Faculty of Health Sciences
SE 581 85 LINKÖPING, Sweden

&

Center for Feminist Social Sciences (CFS)
School of Humanities, Education and Social Sciences (HumES)
Örebro University
SE 701 82 ÖREBRO, Sweden

Gender Studies
School of Humanities, Education and Social Sciences (HumES)
Örebro University
SE 701 82 ÖREBRO, Sweden

Contents

CENTRE OF GENDER EXCELLENCE GENDERING EXCELLENCE – GEXCEL <i>Nina Lykke</i>	5
EDITOR'S FOREWORD	13
CHAPTER 1 A REVIEW OF DISTINGUISHED RESEARCH CLUSTERS <i>Björn Pernrud</i>	15
CHAPTER 2 SOME REFLECTIONS ON CHOICES IN DEVELOPING COLLABORATIVE NETWORKS <i>Sanne Bor</i>	51
NOTES ON CONTRIBUTORS	59

Centre of Gender Excellence Gendering Excellence – GEXcel

Towards a European Centre of Excellence in
Transnational and Transdisciplinary Studies of:

- Changing Gender Relations
- Intersectionalities
- Embodiment

Nina Lykke

Linköping University, Director of GEXcel

In 2006, the Swedish Research Council granted 20 millions SEK to set up a Center of Gender Excellence at the inter-university Institute of Thematic Gender Studies, Linköping University and Örebro University, for the period 2007-2011. Linköping University has added five million SEK as matching funds, while Örebro University has added three million SEK as matching funds.

The following is a short presentation of the excellence centre. For more information contact: Scientific Director of GEXcel, Professor Nina Lykke (nina.lykke@liu.se), Administrator, Berit Starkman (berit.starkman@liu.se), or Research Coordinator: Dr Ulrica Engdahl (coordinator@genderexcel.org).

Institutional basis of GEXcel

Institute of Thematic Gender Studies, Linköping University and Örebro University

The institute is a collaboration between:

Department of Gender Studies, Linköping University
Centre for Feminist Social Studies, Örebro University

Affiliated with the Institute are:

Division of Gender and Medicine, Linköping University
Centre for Gender Studies, Linköping University

GEXcel board and lead-team

– a transdisciplinary team of Gender Studies scholars:

- Professor Nina Lykke, Linköping University (Director) – Gender and Culture; background: Literary Studies
- Professor Emerita Anita Göransson, Linköping University – Gender, Organisation and Economic Change; background: Economic History
- Professor Jeff Hearn, Linköping University – Critical Studies of Men and Masculinities; background: Sociology and Organisation Studies
- Professor Liisa Husu, Örebro University – Gender Studies with a Social Science Profile; background: Sociology
- Professor Anna G. Jónasdóttir, Örebro University – Gender Studies with a Social Science; background: Political Science, Social and Political Theory
- Docent Katarina Swahnberg, Linköping University – Gender and Medicine; background: Medicine

International advisory board

- Professor Karen Barad, University of California, St. Cruz, USA
- Professor Rosi Braidotti, University of Utrecht, The Netherlands
- Professor Raewyn Connell, University of Sydney, Australia
- Professor Emerita Kathleen B. Jones, San Diego State University, USA
- Professor Elzbieta Oleksy, University of Lodz, Poland
- Professor Berit Schei, Norwegian University of Technology, Trondheim, Norway
- Professor Birte Siim, University of Aalborg, Denmark

Aims of GEXcel

- 1) to set up a temporary (5 year) Centre of Gender Excellence (Gendering EXcellence: GEXcel) in order to develop innovative research on changing gender relations, intersectionalities and embodiment from transnational and transdisciplinary perspectives.
- 2) to become a pilot or developmental scheme for a more permanent Sweden-based European Collegium for Advanced Transnational and Transdisciplinary Gender Studies (CATSgender).

A core activity of GEXcel 2007–2011

A core activity is a visiting fellows programme, organised to attract excellent senior researchers and promising younger scholars from Sweden and abroad and from many disciplinary backgrounds. The visiting fellows are taken in after application and a peer-reviewed evaluation process of the applications; a number of top scholars within the field are also invited to be part of GEXcel's research teams. GEXcel's visiting fellows receive grants from one week up to twelve months to stay at GEXcel to do research together with the permanent staff of the Gender Studies professors and other relevant local staff.

The Fellowship Programme is concentrated on annually shifting thematic foci. We select and construct shifting research groups, consisting of excellent researchers of different academic generations (professors, post-doctoral scholars, doctoral students) to carry out new research on specified research themes within the overall frame of changing gender relations, intersectionalities and embodiment.

Brief definition of overall research theme of GEXcel

The overall theme of GEXcel research is defined as transnational and transdisciplinary studies of changing gender relations, intersectionalities and embodiment. We have chosen a broad and inclusive frame in order to attract a diversity of excellent scholars from different disciplines, countries and academic generations, but specificity and focus are also given high priority and ensured via annually shifting thematic foci.

The overall keywords of the (long!) title are chosen in order to indicate currently pressing theoretical and methodological challenges of gender research to be addressed by GEXcel research:

– By the keyword “*transnational*” we underline that GEXcel research should contribute to a systematic transnationalising of research on gender relations, intersectionalities and embodiment, and, in so doing, develop a reflexive stance vis-à-vis transnational travelling of ideas, theories

and concepts, and consciously try to overcome reductive one-country focused research as well as pseudo-universalising research that unreflectedly takes, for example, “Western” or “Scandinavian” models as the norm.

– By the keyword “*changing*” we aim at underlining that it, in a world of rapidly changing social, cultural, economic and technical relations, is crucial to be able to theorise change, and that this is of particular importance for critical gender research due to its liberatory aims and inherent focus on macro, meso and micro level transformations.

– By the keyword “*gender relations*”, we aim at underlining that we define gender not as an essence, but as a relational, plural and shifting process, and that it is the aim of GEXcel research to contribute to a further understanding of this process.

– By the keyword “intersectionalities”, we stress that a continuous reflection on meanings of intersectionalities in gender research should be integrated in all GEXcel research. In particular, we emphasise four different aspects: a) intersectionality as intersections of disciplines and main areas (humanities, social sciences and medical and natural sciences); b) intersectionality as intersections between macro, meso and micro level social analyses; c) intersectionality as intersections between social categories and power differentials organised around categories such as gender, ethnicity, race, class, sexuality, age, nationality, profession, dis/abledness etc); d) intersectionality as intersections between major different branches of feminist theorising (for example, queer feminist theorising, Marxist feminist theorising, postcolonial feminist theorising).

– Finally, by the keyword “embodiment”, we aim at emphasising yet another kind of intersectionality, which has proved crucial in current gender research – to explore intersections between discourse and materiality and between sex and gender.

Specific research themes of GEXcel

The research at GEXcel focuses on a variety of themes. The research themes are the following:

Theme 1: Gender, Sexuality and Global Change

On interactions of gender and sexuality in a global perspective.

Headed by Anna G. Jónasdóttir.

Theme 2: Deconstructing the Hegemony of Men and Masculinities

On ways to critically analyse constructions of the social category ‘men’.

Headed by Jeff Hearn.

Theme 3: Distinctions and Authorisation

On meanings of gender, class, and ethnicity in constructions of elites.

Headed by Anita Göransson.

Themes 4 and 5: Sexual Health, Embodiment and Empowerment

On new synergies between different kinds of feminist researchers' (e.g. philosophers' and medical doctors') approaches to the sexed body.

Headed by Nina Lykke and Barbro Wijma.

Theme 6: Power Shifts and New Divisions in Society, Work and University

On the specificities of new central power bases, such as immaterial production and the rule of knowledge.

Headed by Anita Göransson.

Themes 7 and 8: Teaching Normcritical Sex – Getting Rid of Violence. TRANSdisciplinary, TRANSnational and TRANSformative Feminist Dialogues on Embodiment, Emotions and Ethics

On the struggles and synergies of socio-cultural and medical perspectives taking place in the three arenas sex education, critical sexology and violence.

Headed by Nina Lykke and Barbro Wijma.

Theme 9: Gendered sexual transnationalisations, deconstructing the dominant: Transforming men, 'centres' and knowledge/policy/practice.

On various gendered, sexual, intersectional, embodied, transnational processes, in relation to contemporary and potential changes in power relations.

Headed by Jeff Hearn.

Theme 10: Love in Our Time – a Question for Feminism

On the recently arisen and growing interest in love as a subject for serious social and political theory among both non-feminist and feminist scholars.

Headed by Anna G. Jónasdóttir.

Themes 11 and 12: Gender Paradoxes in Changing Academic and Scientific Organisation(s).

Theme on gender paradoxes in how academic and scientific organizations are changing and being changed.

Headed by Liisa Husu.

In addition, three cross-cutting research themes will also be organised:

- a) Exploring Socio-technical Models for Combining Virtual and Physical Co-Presence while doing joint Gender Research;
- b) Organising a European Excellence Centre – Exploring Models;
- c) Theories and Methodologies in Transnational and Transdisciplinary Studies of Gender Relations, Intersectionalities and Embodiment.

The thematically organised research groups are chaired by GEXcel's core staff of six Gender Studies professors, who together make up a Transdisciplinary team, covering humanities, the social sciences and medicine.

Ambitions and visions

The fellowship programme of GEXcel is created with the central purpose to create transnational and transdisciplinary research teams that have the opportunity to work together for a certain time – long enough to do joint research, do joint publications, produce joint international research applications and do other joint activities such as organising international conferences.

We build on our extensive international networks to promote the idea of a permanent European institute for advanced and excellent gender research – and in collaboration with other actors try to make this idea become real, for example, organisations such as AOIFE, the SOCRATES-funded network Athena and WISE, who jointly are preparing for a professional Gender Studies organisation in Europe. We also hope that collaboration within Sweden will sustain the long-term goals of making a difference both in Sweden and abroad.

We also hope that a collaboration within Sweden will sustain the long-term goals of making difference both in Sweden and abroad.

We consider GEXcel to be a pilot or developmental scheme for a more long-term European centre of gender excellence, i.e. for an institute- or collegium-like structure dedicated to advanced, transnational and transdisciplinary gender research, research training and education in advanced Gender Studies (The GEXcel International Collegium). Leading international institutes for advanced study such as the Centre for the Study of Democracy at the University of California Irvine, and in Sweden The Swedish Collegium for Advanced Studies (SCAS at Uppsala University) have proved to be attractive environments and creative meeting places where top scholars in various fields from all over the world, and from different generations, have found time for reflective work and for meeting and generating new, innovative research.

We would like to explore how this kind of academic structures that have proved very productive in terms of advancing excellence and high level, internationally important and recognised research within other areas of study, can unleash new potentials of gender research and initiate a new level of excellence within the area. The idea is, however not just to take an existing academic form for unfolding of excellence potentials and fill it with excellent gender research. Understood as a developmental/pilot scheme for the GEXcel International Collegium, GEXcel should build on inspirations from the mentioned units for advanced studies, but also further explore and assess what feminist excellence means in terms of both contents and form/structure.

We want to rework the advanced research collegium model on a feminist basis and include thorough reflections on meanings of gender excellence: What does it mean to gender excellence? How can we do it in even more excellent feminist innovative ways?

Editor's Foreword

In 2006, Vetenskapsrådet [the Swedish Research Council] granted funding for the development of three Swedish Centres of Gender Excellence; the recipients were Uppsala University, Umeå University and the inter-university Institute for Thematic Gender Studies between the Universities of Linköping and Örebro. As a result, with the Institute of Thematic Gender Studies as its base, GEXcel: Gendering Excellence – Centre of Gender Excellence was launched in 2007. GEXcel is a five-year collegium-like excellence centre for Advanced Gender Studies. Its principal hub is a Visiting Fellowship Programme, where international researchers are invited to join any of twelve different research themes.

From the outset, a long-term aim of GEXcel has been to develop a permanent Swedish-based collegium for advanced gender studies that will be launched after GEXcel's five-year term. Clearly, existing international excellence centres and institutes for advanced study, such as Harvard's Radcliffe Institute, Stanford's Michelle Clayman Institute, Berlin's Wissenschaftskolleg and Uppsala's Swedish Collegium for Advanced Study can provide important clues about how to organise a permanent advanced gender studies collegium. Nevertheless, it will not suffice to simply adopt an existing organisational model; not only does a Swedish-based gender studies collegium have to be developed to fit its Nordic and European context, but it is essential that it is organised in ways that suit the special requirements of gender studies, and so that it retains the crucial insights of feminist scholarship.

In order to pave the way for the opportunity to realise the long-term goal of developing a permanent, Swedish-based gender studies collegium, GEXcel has implemented a cross-cutting research theme dedicated to matters of academic organisation: *Organizing a European Excellence Centre – Exploring Models*. The ultimate aim of this theme is to provide a forum to explore what academic excellence may mean from a feminist point of view, and what would be required of an organisational structure to support and stimulate excellent gender studies research. The following Work in Progress Report contains initial steps towards a feminist analysis of models of and for excellence: here, a largely descriptive overview of available ways of organising excellence is provided, and significant organisational differences and similarities are identified and assessed.

Björn Pernrud's paper *A Review of Distinguished Research Clusters* is based on an overview of collegium-like research institutions internationally, concentrating especially on gender studies centres and institutes, and providing brief descriptions of about 60 centres. The paper also con-

siders the academic, political and economic motives underlying efforts to organise research into large-scale centres. Finally, three centres are examined more closely in order to provide a more detailed picture of different models for organising large research milieus.

While Pernrud's paper concentrates on the internal organisation and structure of research centres and institutes, Sanne Bor explores how collaborative relations can be established between research institutions. In a paper entitled *Some Reflections on Choices in Developing Collaborative Networks*, Bor identifies and analyses five especially important points where significant choices have to be made as collaborative relations are established. Accordingly, Bor puts forward a number of questions that anyone seeking to initiate a network has to take into consideration, and she discusses how different answers to these questions lead to different forms of networks.

Together, Pernrud's paper provides a basis for beginning to compare and analyse ways of organising a permanent collegium for advanced gender studies in Sweden, and Bor's paper contains insights into the conditions and possibilities for such a successor to GEXcel to enter into productive relations with other gender studies centres around the world. This volume is published in the hope that it will contribute to the further institutional development of gender studies in Sweden and beyond.

A very warm thank you to Elizabeth Sourbut, who made the linguistic and stylistic revisions with much patience and a subtle sense for language.

Björn Pernrud



Chapter 1

A Review of Distinguished Research Clusters

Björn Pernrud



1. Introduction

In recent years, research policies have increasingly emphasised competition, specialisation and size as conditions for achieving high quality in research. Research funding bodies such as *Vetenskapsrådet (VR)* [the Swedish Research Council], *VINNOVA*, *Stiftelsen för strategisk forskning (SSF)* [Swedish Foundation for Strategic Research], and the European Commission's Framework Programme, have executed funding schemes to support large-scale, centralised and specialised research projects.¹ In this context, efforts to concentrate economic and infrastructural resources for research under the same physical or virtual roof are becoming increasingly important. More than just a matter of creating the basis for

1 In Sweden, the emphasis on large-scale and strong research milieus started to become especially prominent during 2003 and the following couple of years. VR, for instance, implemented the *Linnaeus Support Programme* to support strong basic research milieus in any academic area. Linnaeus centres are awarded 5 – 10 million SEK annually for five years. SSF created a programme for funding *Strategic Research Centres*. Strategic research centres are problem-solving research collaborations in the sciences, technology and medicine, and they are awarded between 6 and 12 million SEK annually for about five years. VINNOVA began to support *VINN Excellence Centres*, where needs-driven research is carried out. In contrast to the VR and SSF funding schemes, VINNOVA requires that non-university, and particularly small and medium size enterprise, participants are active in the research and innovation projects. While VINNOVA contributes with up to 7 million SEK annually over 10 years, other sources are expected to add up to 14 million SEK annually. For accounts and critical analyses of Swedish research funding regarding large-scale and strong milieus see for instance: Fridholm, Tobias (2010) *Working Together: Exploring Relational Tensions in Swedish Academia* Uppsala, Dissertation; Vetenskapsrådet "Vetenskapsrådets satsning på starka forskningsmiljöer 2004" [The Swedish Research Council's 2004 investment into strong research milieus]; Sandström, Ulf et al. (2010) "Hans Excellens: om miljardsatsningarna på starka forskningsmiljöer" [His Excellence: concerning the billion SEK investment into strong research milieus] Stockholm: Delegationen för jämställdhet i högskolan. For a gender studies critique of life within a few selected excellence centres, see Lindgren, Gerd et al. 2010 "Nördar, nomader och duktiga flickor – kön och jämställdhet i excellenta miljöer" [Nerds, Nomads and Good Girls – Gender and Equality in Excellent Milieus] Stockholm: Delegationen för jämställdhet i högskolan.

academic renown, or for optimising the conditions for publishing and creating impact, the organisation of research into *distinguished research clusters* is becoming a question of ensuring that important research questions continue to receive recognition in the future.²

The notion of a *distinguished research cluster* is here used as an attempt to describe in inclusive terms academic organisational phenomena such as Centres of Excellence, Institutes for Advanced Study and Networks of Excellence, all of which – in different ways – manage to align a number of distinguished researchers, and become well known in their field. With many applicants for scholarships and research positions, they can afford to be highly selective, and because they produce a significant number of publications that other researchers cite, they are regarded as bases for high class research. And, of course, they have secured sufficient funding to devote a good deal of time to research. In this review, this brief characterisation will be extended, provided with greater depth and detail, and, in certain respects, problematised.

The overall purpose is thus to provide a review of a selection of distinguished research clusters. Specifically, this review will be structured around three aims, concerning *the what*, *the why*, and *the how* of distinguished clusters:

- The first aim is to present a descriptive **overview** that demonstrates briefly what kinds of distinguished research clusters exist, and the activities that constitute them.
- The second aim is to consider the different **motives** for organising research into different forms of distinguished research clusters.
- The third aim is to explore **models** for how different clusters are organised, considering in particular matters of funding, infrastructure and staff.

Although it is largely the clusters themselves that will be discussed, a funding bodies' perspective will be taken into consideration where it is possible and relevant. Moreover, as the reason for this review is to gain insight and gather examples of best practice useful for the continued development of *GEXcel: Gendering Excellence – Centre of Gender Excellence* at the Universities of Linköping and Örebro, the selection of clusters will be made with the intention of highlighting the conditions for gender, intersectional and transdisciplinary research. Due to the geo-

2 Utbildningsdepartementet (2004) "Finansiering av starka forskningsmiljöer – en internationell utblick" [Financing strong research milieus – an international outlook] Ds 2004: 21.

graphical location of GEXcel, Swedish and Nordic-based centres will be over-represented.

This review will be based largely on information available on the different clusters' web pages, and many of the clusters included have been identified with the help of Internet search engines. This data collection method has both benefits and limitations. Most importantly, it has made it possible to consider a wide range of clusters. However, the information available is sometimes rather limited, and it largely demonstrates how the clusters choose to present themselves. For instance, in many cases there is not sufficient information to determine by which criterion each cluster describes itself, in terms of *advanced* or *excellent*. However, for the purposes of the initial overview, even basic information about the clusters has sufficed, and there are cases where clusters have made documents such as annual reports and self-evaluation available on their websites; such documents have been particularly useful in the later sections of this review.

In the initial overview, about 65 different clusters will be considered. For the most part, the information provided will be basic, aiming to demonstrate how long clusters have been active, their size and what their core activities are. Based on this information, the overview also seeks to demonstrate a method for sorting clusters into different types. This typology will then serve as a background when considering different motives for centralising research into clusters. Finally, a selection of clusters will be studied more closely with regards to how they are organised, staffed and funded.

2. Overview

2.1 Excellent and Advanced

Most of the clusters included in this overview describe themselves either as achieving *Excellence* in research, or as conducting *Advanced Studies*. Whereas notions of *excellence* have become widespread fairly recently³, the term *Advanced Study* has been used to characterise research institutions for quite some time.

2.1.1 *Advanced Clusters*

The first Institute for Advanced Study (IAS) was founded in Princeton in 1930, emphasising its dedication to foundational, curiosity-driven research. Princeton IAS involves researchers at postdoc levels from the

³ In Sweden, Centres of Excellence began to develop in 2003. See Fridholm, Tobias (2010).

social and natural sciences as well as humanities, and in 2009 it had 29 permanent faculty members and nearly 200 researchers from around the world have been awarded fellowships to visit.⁴ In 1954, a second Centre for Advanced Study (CASBS) was established at Stanford University, this time with a more limited focus on behavioural science. Within this scope however, CASBS, similarly to Princeton's IAS, maintains a commitment to basic, allegedly unrestrained, research. At the core of CASBS is a fellowship programme; invitees from all around the world come to the Centre to spend a year "where they are freed from deadlines, teaching responsibilities, committee assignments, hierarchies and the constraints of disciplinary silos".⁵ In the academic year 2008-09, about 40 scholars were given this opportunity.

In Europe, the first institutes for advanced study began to be established during the 1960s and early 1970s. The Netherlands Institute for Advanced Study in the Humanities and Social Sciences (NIAS) has a disciplinary scope similar to CASBS, and a fellowship programme that is slightly larger in volume, inviting 50 – 60 international researchers per year.⁶ In Edinburgh an IAS exclusively for the humanities (IASH) was established in 1969.⁷ The IASH is considerably smaller than CASBS and NIAS, with about 15 to 20 invited scholars active at any one time.⁸

Since the 1980s, new institutes for advanced study have continued to emerge with increasing frequency. In Berlin an IAS that, similar to the one in Princeton, invites researchers from the entire spectrum of academic disciplines, was established in the early 1980s. The Berlin IAS, however, is a significantly smaller institute than its counterpart in Princeton, in 2009 engaging nine permanent, about 40 long-term and 20 short-term fellows⁹. Collegium Budapest was established in 1993¹⁰, the Swiss Collegium Helvetica began in 1997¹¹ and IAS Bologna opened in 2001¹². In 2003, the IAS Lancaster was established, with the objective of "consolidating Lancaster as a leading centre of excellence in the United Kingdom

4 <http://www.ias.edu/> ; <http://www.ias.edu/about/mission-and-history>

5 <http://www.casbs.org/> ; <http://www.casbs.org/index.php?act=page&id=105>

6 <http://www.nias.knaw.nl/en/>

7 <http://www.iash.ed.ac.uk/>

8 <http://www.cas.uio.no/> The early development of IAS is described further in Witrock, B. (2002) "A Brief History of Institutes for Advanced Study" in *CAS Oslo 1992-2002. Advanced Study in a Norwegian Context*, Oslo

9 <http://www.wiko-berlin.de/> ; <http://www.wiko-berlin.de/index.php?id=7&L=1>

10 <http://www.colbud.hu/main.shtml>

11 <http://www.collegium.ethz.ch/en/welcome.html>

12 <http://www.ias.unibo.it/ISA/default.htm>

for interdisciplinary and postdisciplinary research, and to raise the international profile of the university in this regard.”¹³

Other institutes have followed paths that are markedly different from those of their early US predecessors, which have otherwise inspired much of the development of research clusters for advanced study. The IAS Vienna, established in 1963, does not entertain a fellowship programme, and a significant amount of its research is applied, and commissioned¹⁴. The German Centre for Interdisciplinary Research (ZiF) at Bielefeld University was established in 1968. In its commitment to interdisciplinarity, it has chosen not to invite individual scholars, but instead to invite projects¹⁵. The Centre for Advanced Study Sofia, founded in 2000, rather than organising fellowship programmes, “encourages the dissemination of knowledge through public events, publication programmes and discussion forums /.../ [and it organises] foreign guest-lecture series and workshops by leading senior scholars, international conferences and seminars, as well as cultural events, literary readings, exhibitions, etc.”¹⁶ Collegium de Lyon, established in 2006 as a multidisciplinary IAS focusing on social science, has a primary ambition beyond the research conducted; rather than knowledge to satisfy curiosity, Collegium de Lyon emphasises “the diffusion of knowledge for action”, and aims to act as “an intermediary between the research sphere and political and social issues.”¹⁷

In the Nordic countries, institutes for advanced studies have existed since 1985, when the Swedish Collegium for Advanced Study (SCAS) was established in Uppsala.¹⁸ SCAS, like CASBS, is mainly concerned with the social and human sciences, and currently about 40 international researchers are enrolled in the fellowship programme. In 1992, another centre for advanced study was established in Oslo (CAS Oslo). This centre had a rocky start, as it had difficulties with funding, and was met with scepticism from several Norwegian universities, but five years after it was initiated, the centre was favourably evaluated by the Norwegian Research Council.¹⁹ CAS Oslo, like ZiF at Bielefeld University, does not invite individual researchers, but instead hosts research projects. In the

13 <http://www.lancaster.ac.uk/ias/about/mission.htm>

14 <http://www.ihs.ac.at/vienna/About-IHS-3/Profile-2.htm>

15 [http://www.uni-bielefeld.de/\(en\)/ZiF](http://www.uni-bielefeld.de/(en)/ZiF)

16 <http://www.cas.bg/en/general-info.html>

17 http://www.collegium-lyon.fr/33954937/0/fiche___pagelibre/&RH=IEA_020300ANG&RF=IEA_010000ANG

18 <http://www.scass.uu.se/index.html>

19 Jøssang, T. and Vigdis Ystad (2002) “The Phase of Construction” in *CAS Oslo 1992-2002: Advanced Study in a Norwegian Context*, Oslo; <http://www.cas.uio.no/>

three projects simultaneously active, there are about 50 researchers involved. In 2001, Helsinki Collegium for Advanced Study was initiated, aiming at “enhancing scholarly excellence within humanities and social sciences”.²⁰ In comparison with other IAS, it is fairly small, appointing between 10 and 20 fellows each year. Besides the Helsinki Collegium, Finland is also home to the Turku Institute for Advanced Studies (TIAS). TIAS concentrates on humanities and social sciences and is still establishing itself, with its first fellows having only arrived in March 2009.²¹

2.1.2 Excellence Clusters

Although notions of excellence are commonly employed to characterise medical and technological research, there are several excellence clusters concentrating on or including research in the humanities and social sciences. However, even though humanities and social science clusters constitute only a small proportion of the clusters characterised in terms of excellence, the notion is still used to describe a rather diverse range of ways of organising research and research-related activities. One clear difference can be found between *Networks of Excellence* (NoE) and *Centres of Excellence*.

To begin with, NoEs emerged as a result of a funding instrument introduced by the European Commission in the 6th Framework Programme (FP6) for Research, as a way of overcoming the alleged fragmentation of European research. A NoE is an organisation of participants, usually university research institutions, that aims to achieve a “programme of jointly executed research”, and to implement a structure and shape, on a European scale, to how research is carried out on a certain topic.²² Fourteen NoEs were awarded EU funding within FP6, Social Science and Humanities (SSH), and although NoE is still active as a funding instrument in FP7, no such calls have yet been made in the social sciences or humanities.

Among FP6 SSH NoEs, the different networks involve between 9 and 49, and on average 31, institutional partners²³. Research topics include:

20 http://www.helsinki.fi/collegium/english/about_the_collegium/about.htm

21 <http://www.utu.fi/sivustot/collegia/tias/>

22 FP6 Task Force, European Commission (2003) “Provision for implementing networks of excellence”.

23 Directorate-General for Research (2008) “Social Sciences and Humanities in FP6 – all calls.”

sustainable development²⁴, law²⁵, governance²⁶ and the role of knowledge in processes of social and economic change and development²⁷. A couple of projects are concerned with the meaning of welfare, quality of life and social cohesion.²⁸ One of these is “Economic Change, Quality of Life and Social Cohesion,” which is coordinated by the Swedish Institute for Social Research, at Stockholm University²⁹. Two networks are concerned with humanities³⁰: “Creating New Links” and “Innovative Overviews for a New History Research Agenda for the Citizens of a Growing Europe”. Finally, the topic of diversity, integration and language issues engages three projects³¹. Like most of the NoEs, the project “International Migration, Integration and Social Cohesion” has recently reached the end of its EU funding. To continue its activities beyond the EU funding, an independent network has been established, and will carry out research, training and dissemination³².

Certain examples of Centres of Excellence (CoE) have, in some respects, much in common with Institutes for Advanced Study. For instance the Icelandic Equality, Diversity, Development, Advancement (EDDA), an interdisciplinary Centre of Excellence, has recently begun hosting a fellowship programme, currently enrolling about fifteen research fellows at predoctoral, PhD, and postdoctoral levels.³³ In Canada, the Atlantic Metropolis Centre is a centre of excellence for research on immigration,

24 Project title: “Sustainable Development in a Diverse World”, <http://www.feem.it/getpage.aspx?id=186&sez=Research&padre=18&sub=70&idsub=126&pj=Ongoing>

25 Project title: “Joint Network on European Private Law”, <http://www.copecl.org/>
This project has been concluded.

26 Project titles:

“Global Governance, Regionalisation & Regulation: The Role of the EU” <http://www.garnet-eu.org/>, “Connecting Excellence on European Governance”, <http://www.connex-network.org/>, and “Civil Society and New Forms of Governance in Europe” <http://www.cinefogo.org/>

27 Project titles: “Dynamics of Institutions and Markets in Europe” <http://www.dime-eu.org/> and “Policies for Research and Innovation in the Move Towards the European Research Area”, <http://www.prime-noe.org/index.php>

28 Project title: “Reconciling Work and Welfare in Europe”, <http://www.recwowe.eu/>
29 <http://www.equalsoc.org/2>

30 Project title: “Network of Research Centres in Human Sciences in the Mediterranean Area” <http://ramses2.mmsh.univ-aix.fr/> and “Creating New Links and Innovative Overviews for a New History Research Agenda for the Citizens of a Growing Europe”, <http://www.cliohres.net/>

31 Project titles: “Language in a Network of European Excellence”, <http://linee.info/linee/home2.html> and “Wider Europe, Deeper Integration?”, <http://www.eu-consent.net/DEFAULT.ASP>

32 <http://www.imiscoe.org/about/future/index.html>

33 <http://www.edda.hi.is/>

integration and cultural diversity. It was launched in 2004, and one of the research domains hosted is “Gender, Migration and Diversity/Immigrant Women”. The centre involves not only researchers, but also NGOs and government representatives, and it aims to conduct policy-relevant research and activities.³⁴

The recently instituted CoE DialogueEurope at Sofia University³⁵, and The Centre for Excellence in the Arts and Humanities (CEAH) at Iowa State University, are similar to EDDA and the Institutes for Advanced Study in that they have a broad scope in their scholarly focus. However, at least in the latter case, the centre does not host a fellowship programme, but instead has as its mission the support of “public engagement and distinction in humanistic scholarship and artistic creation at Iowa State University. The Centre promotes literacy in the intellectual, historical, and artistic foundations of culture, advocating the arts and humanities as essential components of the university’s mission to advance both research and education.”³⁶

In contrast to the broad focus of, for example, EDDA and CEAH, The Nordforsk-financed *Nordic Centres of Excellence* “NordWel – The Nordic Welfare State – Historical Foundations and Future Challenges”³⁷, and “Reassess – Reassessing the Nordic Welfare Model”³⁸ operate with a narrower research focus. Moreover, both NordWel and Reassess are virtual centres, organised as cooperations between several partner institutions, and neither host fellowship programmes.

2.1.3 *Not quite one thing or the other*

Apparently, clusters describing themselves in terms of either advanced studies or excellence come in many shapes. Sometimes it is not entirely obvious what the difference is between being advanced and being excellent, other than terminology, or indeed, what different excellence centres actually have in common. Taking a step back from issues of terminology, however, what the clusters mentioned thus far seem to have in common is an ambition to stand out in their field or their region; moreover, to accomplish this they have gone beyond conventional academic departments, institutions and subjects, to organise research and research-related activities in ways that more effectively serve their objectives. Importantly, though, this is true for other types of clusters as well, that do not subscribe to notions of being advanced or excellent.

34 http://www.atlantic.metropolis.net/index_e.html

35 http://dialogueeurope.org/en_US/za-instituta/

36 <http://www.public.iastate.edu/~ceah/about.htm>

37 <http://blogs.helsinki.fi/nord-wel/>

38 <http://www.reassess.no/index.gan?id=14497>

The Centre for Research in the Arts, Social Sciences and Humanities, located in Cambridge, serves as a clear example. The centre was established in 2001 with a mission “to promote collaborations across the Arts, Social Sciences and Humanities, and beyond their edges, in order to stimulate innovative and interdisciplinary thinking and dialogue and to reach out to new networks of interest and new publics.”³⁹ Like most institutes for advanced study and centres of excellence, one of its core activities is a fellowship programme. Similarly, the Centre for the Study of Democratic Politics, established in 1999 at the University of Princeton, is host to a concentration of research, and a fellowship programme.⁴⁰ Compared to the Princeton Institute for Advanced Study, however, the fellowship programme is small scale; five scholars are awarded fellowships each year. Over the years though, many of these have been senior researchers.⁴¹ The University of California, Irvine, also hosts a Centre for the Study of Democracy. The centre has developed since 1990, and is now home to a fellowship programme accepting about five fellows each year, with more than fifty members on its affiliated faculty.⁴²

In a Swedish context, the Swedish Institute for Social Research, SOFI, at the University of Stockholm should be mentioned. SOFI was established in 1972, and although it does not run a fellowship programme, it is home to a considerable amount of research, and is coordinator for one of the Networks of Excellence mentioned above.⁴³ In total, about 70 people are employed at the institute, and of these, eight are full professors. Also based in Sweden, the Stockholm International Peace Research Institute, SIPRI, runs several research programmes, involving about 50 people. The institute is also host to several databases that hold information relating to peace, conflict and military issues. SIPRI was established in 1966 and is organised as an independent foundation.⁴⁴

2.2 Where is Gender Studied?

Most of the clusters encountered thus far are broad in their research approaches. The Institute for Advanced Study at Princeton, for instance, is open to any discipline or research topic, and the Swedish Collegium for Advanced Study in Uppsala, as well as the Helsinki Collegium for Advanced Study, invite researchers from the social sciences and the humanities at large. Accordingly, gender studies research could surely be

39 <http://www.crassh.cam.ac.uk/>

40 <http://www.princeton.edu/csdp/>

41 <http://www.princeton.edu/csdp/people/previous-scholars/>

42 <http://www.democ.uci.edu/>

43 “EQUALSOC”, <http://www.equalsoc.org/2>

44 <http://www.sipri.org/about>

expected in any of the clusters above, and, as in the case of EDDA, it may even be a major concern. In this subsection however, attention will be directed primarily towards clusters that explicitly and actively specialise in gender studies, holding gender studies as basic to their purpose and mission. Here, such clusters will be described, still in the manner of an overview, but in slightly greater detail than the clusters presented above.

The Radcliffe Institute for Advanced Study at Harvard University, established in 1999, understands its mission as “to create an academic community where individuals can pursue advanced work in any of the academic disciplines, professions, or creative arts. Within that broad purpose, it sustains a continuing commitment to the study of women, gender, and society.”⁴⁵ The commitment to women’s and gender studies is evident not only in the institute’s research programme, where many projects bring gender issues to the fore in a variety of contexts, but in addition, the institute hosts an annual conference open to issues regarding women’s access to power, money and recognition, and it is also home to the Schlesinger Library, specialising in women and history, and holding collections from Charlotte Perkins Gilman, Adrienne Rich and Betty Friedan, among others.⁴⁶

A more specialised institute can be found at the University of Santa Cruz; here, the Institute for Advanced Feminist Research was established in 2002. The institute is currently organised around a large-scale research project on Transnationalizing Justice, spanning more than three years, and involving around 60 researchers from UC Santa Cruz, the Department of Feminist Studies, and other US universities.⁴⁷ It is worth mentioning that the University of Santa Cruz’ Department of Feminist Studies has had an extensive undergraduate programme since 1974, but currently, no graduate students are enrolled⁴⁸. The department has a large affiliated faculty, including and apart from the six members of its core faculty, it currently has one researcher employed.⁴⁹

The Michelle R. Clayman Institute for Gender Research was also founded in 1974, at Stanford. The institute is currently academic home to five senior scholars, and hosts a fellowship programme for about 15 visiting fellows and postdoc researchers at a time. More than to research, the institute is devoted to accomplishing changes designed to promote

45 <http://www.radcliffe.edu/>

46 <http://www.radcliffe.edu/about/today.aspx>

47 <http://iafr.ucsc.edu/transnationalizing-justice/faculty-participants>

48 http://feministstudies.ucsc.edu/graduate/graduate_students.php

49 <http://feministstudies.ucsc.edu/directory/>

gender equality, and invitations to participate in the institute's different event extend beyond academia.⁵⁰

Specialised institutes and centres have been established at several US universities. At Columbia, for instance, the Institute for Research on Women and Gender was established in 1987. It hosts an associated faculty with around 50 members, and offers an undergraduate degree programme, as well as graduate certification in feminist scholarship.⁵¹ At New York University, the Centre for the Study of Sexuality and Gender was established in 1999/2000, hosting a fellowship programme.⁵² Since 1977, the City University of New York has hosted the Centre for the Study of Women and Society, with an extensive associated faculty.⁵³

At the University of California, Berkeley, the Centre for Race and Gender was established in 2001. The centre operates broadly through supporting community-based research, facilitating faculty-based research, stimulating collaboration and sponsoring graduate students' research on issues relating to the intersection of gender and race. The centre's associated faculty involves more than 75 members.⁵⁴

At the London School of Economics, to return to the European context, the Gender Institute was established in 1993. The institute works with an interdisciplinary approach, and is concerned largely with questions regarding globalisation and inequality, social justice and representation and cultural change. It has an academic faculty of its own, including both researchers and teaching positions. The institute runs a visiting fellows programme, currently hosting five invited scholars.⁵⁵

Both Oxford and Cambridge host centres for gender research. At Oxford, the International Gender Studies Centre was established in 1983, and is home to a visiting fellows programme, inviting about five scholars each year to facilitate their research and giving them access to libraries and the centre's seminar and workshop series. The centre has just over ten members.⁵⁶ At Cambridge, the Centre for Gender Studies runs seminars, symposia and an invited speaker series, and through cooperation with both departments at Cambridge and networks of gender scholars elsewhere, the centre strives to facilitate gender research.⁵⁷

In the UK, there are also a couple of centres of sexuality studies that are worth mentioning; in Essex, the Centre for Intimate and Sexual

50 <http://www.stanford.edu/group/gender/Events/index.html>

51 <http://www.columbia.edu/cu/irwag/index.html>

52 <http://www.csgsnyu.org/>

53 <http://web.gc.cuny.edu/womenstudies/index.htm>

54 <http://crg.berkeley.edu/>

55 <http://www.lse.ac.uk/collections/genderInstitute/Default.htm>

56 <http://users.ox.ac.uk/~cccrw/index.html>

57 <http://www.gender.cam.ac.uk/>

Citizenship was established in 2009 and organises a seminar series to support interdisciplinary, critical and global research on sexuality.⁵⁸ The University of Exeter hosts the Centre for the Interdisciplinary Study of Gender and Sexuality in Europe and has about 25 members from different academic areas.⁵⁹ At the University of Manchester, the Centre for the Study of Sexuality and Culture was established in 2003, and has a 50-member affiliated faculty.⁶⁰

At the Humboldt University in Berlin, the Zentrum für transdisziplinäre Geschlechterstudien (ZtG) acts as a meeting place for gender researchers from the Humboldt University as well as internationally; it supports the organisation of conferences, workshops and lectures, and offers advice on research grants and publishing. ZtG has more than 50 members from different departments.⁶¹ At the University of Frankfurt, the Cornelia Goethe Centre for Women's and Gender Studies was founded in 1997. The centre stimulates cooperation between gender researchers from different projects and departments. It arranges conferences and workshops, and co-organises undergraduate and doctoral course programmes.⁶² At the Central European University in Budapest, a Department of Gender Studies, with a faculty of its own and an extensive PhD programme enrolling more than 25 candidates, was instituted in 2001.⁶³

At the University of Adelaide, Australia, The Fay Gale Centre for Research on Gender was established in 2009, to give support to and strengthen gender research initiatives at the university. Moreover, the centre works for the promotion of justice and equality at the university and in relation to the general community, and it hosts a fellowship programme, currently with five invited scholars. The centre has about 20 affiliated faculty members, and brings together researchers from the social sciences and humanities, as well as from health sciences.⁶⁴

In Pakistan, two centres of excellence in women's and gender studies have been established. At the University of Karachi, the Centre of Excellence for Women's Studies was founded in 1989, partly as an effort to accomplish gender mainstreaming. To that end, the centre seeks to create debate about gender issues, and gain recognition and legitimacy for women's studies within Pakistani higher education.⁶⁵ Moreover, the

58 <http://www.essex.ac.uk/sociology/cisc/index.html>

59 <http://www.sall.ex.ac.uk/centres/cissge/>

60 <http://www.arts.manchester.ac.uk/subjectareas/englishamericanstudies/research/cssc/>

61 <http://www.gender.hu-berlin.de/eng/center/>

62 <http://www.cgc.uni-frankfurt.de/english-cgc-home.shtml>

63 <http://www.gend.ceu.hu/index.php>

64 <http://www.adelaide.edu.au/gender/>

65 http://www.uok.edu.pk/research_institutes/Women_Studies/index.php

centre has entered a staff exchange programme with the University of East London.⁶⁶ The second centre, the Centre of Excellence in Gender Studies, is situated at the University of Islamabad^{67, 68}.

In addition to the clusters presented above, there is a gender studies centre at the University of Granada⁶⁹, and an inter-university centre for women's and gender studies, distributed between seven Catalan universities, including the University of Barcelona⁷⁰. At the University of Vienna, there is a Centre for Advanced Gender Studies, *Gender Kolleg*. However, the webpage has not been updated since 2007, suggesting that activities at the center are currently low.⁷¹

2.3 Distinguishing between Clusters

In an effort to sum up the overview, I will here suggest a few ways to differentiate between types of clusters. The point here is not to provide an exact typology, but to highlight important features that can illustrate substantial differences and similarities in the ways in which clusters operate. In general terms, what all the clusters above seek to do in one way or another, to different degrees and with different ambitions, is to coordinate research within their operational scope.

The *operational scope*, to begin with, varies significantly between different clusters. The centre for excellence at Iowa State University⁷² operates mostly within its own host university. Partly, this is the case also for the University of Karachi's Centre of Excellence for Women's Studies⁷³. These examples are centres at their own universities, so to speak, and they seek to support research about, promote recognition for and stimulate interest in their respective topics within their own organisations.⁷⁴ In contrast, the Princeton Institute for Advanced Study, the Swedish Collegium for Advanced Study in Uppsala, and the International Gender Studies Centre at Oxford University, to name a few, strive to be international, even global, centres, rather than centres in their own univer-

66 http://www.uok.edu.pk/research_institutes/Women_Studies/Research_Info.php

67 <http://www.qau.edu.pk/institute/inst.php>

68 The Islamabad centre does not have a homepage of its own, and the information on the Karachi centre homepage is very sparse.

69 <http://www.ugr.es/~iem/>

70 <http://www.iiedg.org/>

71 <http://www.univie.ac.at/gender-kolleg/about/info-english.htm>

72 <http://www.public.iastate.edu/~ceah/about.htm>

73 http://www.uok.edu.pk/research_institutes/Women_Studies/index.php

74 A similar commitment can also be seen at the Fay Gale Centre <http://www.adelaide.edu.au/gender/>

sities.⁷⁵ Accordingly, it is within their operational scope to approach an international research community in search of – and in competition for – recognition, citations and applicants to calls for visiting fellowships.

Several clusters work on more of a middle range; they do not seek to operate internationally as such, but they have a larger scope than their own host organisations. In this space in between, their operational scope covers public outreach, taking part in the cultural life of their communities, or affecting politics and policy making. Stanford's Michelle R. Clayman Institute, with its ambition to stimulate changes towards greater gender equality,⁷⁶ and as the host of projects that seek to increase the impact of gender studies in public debates, serves as an example.⁷⁷ The Collegium Lyon also seeks to operate as an intermediary between policy and research⁷⁸, and the Centre for Advanced Study in Sofia emphasises its role in the dissemination of knowledge, and in operating as a cultural actor.⁷⁹

So far, I have highlighted how different clusters, in their efforts to coordinate research, display major differences regarding their operational scope. From another angle, it is also possible to see significant variations in the scope of the coordinated *research*. At one end of the spectrum, centres such as the Nordforsk centres of excellence NordWel⁸⁰ and Re-assess⁸¹, both investigating notions of Nordic welfare, conduct research that responds to rather specific issues. Similarly, the European Commission Networks of Excellence are results of a top-down approach to posing research questions, where the basic questions the researchers deal with are more or less pre-defined. At the Institute of Advanced Studies, Vienna, for example, 40% of the research is commissioned, for instance by banks, interest groups and governmental functions.⁸²

The Vienna IAS, as well as the Institute for Advanced Feminist Research (IAFR) in Santa Cruz, organised around a single joint research programme⁸³, are exceptional in comparison to many other institutes for advanced study. Often, these give priority instead to a bottom-up approach, basic and curiosity-driven research, either entirely irrespective

75 <http://www.ias.edu/> ; <http://www.scass.uu.se/index.html> ; <http://users.ox.ac.uk/~cccrw/index.html>

76 <http://www.stanford.edu/group/gender/>

77 <http://www.stanford.edu/group/gender/ResearchPrograms/OpEd/index.html>

78 http://www.collegium-lyon.fr/33954937/0/fiche___pagelibre/&RH=IEA_020300ANG&RF=IEA_010000ANG

79 <http://www.cas.bg/en/general-info.html>

80 <http://blogs.helsinki.fi/nord-wel/>

81 <http://www.reassess.no/index.gan?id=14497>

82 <http://www.ihs.ac.at/vienna/IHS-Activities-2/Applied-and-Basic-Research.htm>

83 <http://iafr.ucsc.edu/>

of topic⁸⁴, or within whole areas of research, such as the behavioural and social sciences⁸⁵, and⁸⁶/or the humanities⁸⁷. A similar broad openness to research topics can also be found in some excellence centres, such as EDDA at Reykjavik University,⁸⁸ Dialogue Europe at Sofia University,⁸⁹ and Iowa State University's Centre for Excellence in the Arts and Humanities.⁹⁰

With the exception of the IAFR, Santa Cruz, and the Radcliffe Institute for Advanced Study at Harvard, where gender studies are especially supported although not an exclusive concern, gender studies clusters appear, in their research scope, to be a combination of the relatively narrow focus of the Nordforsk centres or the networks of excellence, and the nature of institutes open to allegedly unrestrained basic research. On the one hand, all research tied to a gender cluster is of course thematically limited. On the other hand, within this limitation it is not given what research questions need to be addressed. Rather, generating these questions is an indispensable part of the research process. Hence, unlike, for example, NordWel, which could be understood as organising research within a conclusive project, gender studies clusters need to be inclusive about their ultimate trajectory and their time limits. Within their limited field of inquiry, then, these clusters are concerned with basic research.

Moving on from variations in operational and research scope, perhaps the most substantial differences between clusters, at least from an organisational point of view, become evident when considering variations in the means, methods and resources employed to *coordinate* research. What is it that different clusters do, in order to actually be able to act as clusters?

It is possible, I think, to distinguish two levels of coordination; at a more basic level, coordination is achieved through activities that facilitate research, research collaborations and networking. Typically, these clusters achieve coordination by identifying researchers, mostly at their host universities, with shared research interests. By making them aware of each other, through web page presentations, in seminars, workshops or lectures, and inviting them to become members of an affiliated faculty at the centre, it has been possible to achieve a greater coherence in

84 <http://www.ias.edu/>; <http://www.cas.uio.no/> The Norwegian name for the institute means the Institute for Basic Research.

85 <http://www.casbs.org/>

86 <http://www.iash.ed.ac.uk/>

87 <http://www.iash.ed.ac.uk/>

88 <http://www.edda.hi.is/>

89 http://dialogueeurope.org/en_US/za-instituta/

90 <http://www.public.iastate.edu/~ceah/>

research, and opportunities are created for participating researchers to enter into collaborations.⁹¹

Moreover, this type of cluster organises larger conferences and provides support to affiliated researchers in the form of, for instance, grant writing and publishing advice, and career management projects. Most of the gender studies clusters centre around activities that facilitate research, networking and collaborations, as do the Networks of Excellence, albeit on a much larger scale. In some cases, these clusters also support research mobility, by offering office space, access to cluster activities, or library facilities to researchers visiting from other universities. The International Gender Studies Centre at Oxford, and LSE's Gender Institute⁹², for instance, both host these kinds of fellowship programmes. Here, visiting fellows, although becoming part of an intellectual and administrative environment, and perhaps having costs for accommodation and travel covered by the host, are expected to have their actual research funded from other sources. At this level, the resources that go into achieving coordination come from both the cluster's organisation and its associated researchers. While the clusters provide an infrastructure, the time it takes to do actual research has to be funded from other sources located by researchers.

If at a more basic level clusters aim at facilitating research, a large part of the mission of more elaborate clusters is to produce research. Although some of the gender studies clusters have a research faculty of their own,⁹³ it is only at the Radcliffe Institute and the Michelle R. Clayman Institute that most of the direct outcomes of cluster activities are coordinated research. These institutes, then, are typical elaborate clusters, because, like most of the institutes for advanced study and centres of excellence in this overview, they undertake the responsibility for all the tasks necessary to achieve coordinated research. To that effect, in addition to facilitating activities, they achieve coordination through fellowship programmes entirely financed by the cluster organisation, and associated researchers are provided with everything, including salary, that they need in order to conduct their research.

Thus far, I have been concerned with the first specific aim of this review; to present a descriptive overview that demonstrates briefly what kinds of distinguished research clusters exist, and what activities consti-

91 See for instance <http://www.columbia.edu/cu/irwag/index.html>; <http://web.gc.cuny.edu/womenstudies/index.htm>

92 <http://www.lse.ac.uk/collections/genderInstitute/> ; <http://users.ox.ac.uk/~cccrw/index.html>

93 See, <http://www.lse.ac.uk/collections/genderInstitute/> ; <http://users.ox.ac.uk/~cccrw/index.html>; <http://www.columbia.edu/cu/irwag/index.html>

tute them. In the first subsections, I gave short descriptions of about 65 clusters, indicating their core activities and their size and direction, and in this concluding subsection I have explored ways of sorting clusters into different types based on what they do, thus trying to highlight important differences and similarities between them.

3. Motives

Efforts to centralise research into clusters seem to be informed by the notion that more (as in more researchers, more time, more developed infrastructure...) is better (as in better ideas, better publications, better applications...). Clearly, this notion has sometimes been called into question. For instance, it has been argued that tendencies towards large-scale research are at risk of rendering the research process too top-down. Although I think it is important to mention that clustering tendencies are not always uncritically embraced, the point here is not to debate or evaluate research policies. Rather, I wish to demonstrate more concretely the various ways in which *more* is assumed to be *better*, for various things. Hence, in this section, and in line with the second aim of this review, I will consider the motives behind organising research in different forms of clusters.

When considering how different clusters present themselves, as well as how funding bodies and research policy makers discuss the role of large-scale research institutions, three groups of motives underlying the formation of clusters can be discerned, having to do with: *efficiency*, *critical mass* and *sustainability*.

3.1 Efficiency

In a communication [departementsskrivelse] from the Swedish Ministry of Education, about research funding, efficiency is pointed out as a central political motive behind research policies promoting clustering. As background, a fragmented research landscape is described, where it is too common for many individual researchers, more or less unaware of each other, to devote their time to similar questions, and sometimes the same problems. Here, it would be more efficient for these efforts to be coordinated, so that researchers can better share their results with each other, and divide the problems between them.⁹⁴

The EU Commission's investment in Networks of Excellence is motivated in a similar manner; here it suggested that the European Research Area is displaying too much fragmentation:

94 Utbildningsdepartementet (2004).

Networks of excellence are therefore an instrument designed primarily to **overcome the fragmentation of European research where the main deliverable consists of a durable structuring and shaping of the way that research in Europe is carried out [a] on particular research topic.**⁹⁵

Accordingly, with this structure in place, research on specific topics would be carried out more efficiently, and, it could be added, more efficiently disseminated.

It is not only on a policy level that efficiency is a motive for clustering. Several of the centres for gender studies included in the overview above could be understood to be addressing fragmentation in gender studies, and pursuing a more efficient use of the resources over which gender studies scholars have control. In many cases these clusters have drawn together large affiliated faculties, often with members from many different departments and subjects, at their host universities. In this vein, gender studies centres connect researchers with each other, thus improving the conditions under which they can coordinate their research, their results, their expertise and their resources.

It is not only through a less fragmented and more coherent research landscape that clustering would promise a more efficient use of resources. Research and researchers rely on the existence of an adequate infrastructure, and benefit from a developed support and service organisation. In addition to general infrastructure and support, such as office facilities and basic administrative support, which would cost the same in any case, clustering is an opportunity to make cost-effective investments into more dedicated infrastructural facilities, such as a specialised library with subscriptions to databases and scholarly journals.⁹⁶

Moreover, in a clustered environment, there would be a large enough basis to develop a more qualified service organisation, prepared to provide specialised advice on external funding and grant application writing, as well as on publishing strategies and academic writing. Here, formalised connections with publishers could be entertained, and expertise on dissemination and public outreach could be provided, as well as resources dedicated to managing intersectoral collaborations with commercial partners, NGOs, public service organisations or other non-academic actors. Although a qualified service organisation is not entirely essential for carrying out research in the short term, it could help to ensure that the

95 FP6 Instruments Task Force, European Commission (2003) p. 1 [emphasis in original].

96 See for instance <http://www.radcliffe.edu/> and its collection in the Schlesinger Library.

research undertaken actually reaches out and has impact; accordingly, clustering contains the conditions for effectively achieving research that comes to good use.

In the conclusion to the previous section, different ways of distinguishing between clusters were suggested. One distinction was based on the research scope; some clusters operate with a narrower top-down approach, others support basic research irrespective of topic, and some, such as the gender studies clusters, are concerned with basic research, albeit within a limited field of inquiry. Efficiency, in the form of a coherent and complementary research landscape, is I think most clearly a motive with regards to the first and third kinds of clusters. For clusters supporting broad basic research, it would seem that coherence is not a goal, and could even be interpreted as a limitation upon the allegedly unrestrained curiosity that stands as an ideal for good basic research.⁹⁷

Another distinction was made, suggesting that two types of clusters could be discerned based on the means employed for achieving coordination: on the one hand, there are clusters that aim to facilitate research, and on the other, there are clusters that achieve coordination through fully financed fellowship programmes, where associated researchers are provided with everything they need in order to carry out their research. Efficiency, the search for coherence and opportunities to develop shared infrastructure and service organisation are, I think, motives to form clusters of both these types. I am pointing this out because later on in this section it will be clear that some motives are more specific, mostly applying to only one of these types of clusters.

3.2 Critical Mass

Often, reaching critical mass in academic settings is seen as important in order to ensure that enough researchers can come together to engender a vibrant environment for intellectual exchange. Clearly, clustered settings would indeed promise critical mass; they provide the conditions for a dynamic seminar culture, and people are given frequent opportunities to debate theoretical matters at the lunch table or in the smokers' corner. Seeking to achieve an environment characterised by critical mass could indeed be understood as a strong motive for clustering, especially in relation to research topics or fields where the researchers concerned would otherwise lack formal and institutionalised bases for connecting with each other. Here, critical mass would motivate actions such as organising conferences, seminar series and other activities that facilitate opportunities for researchers to meet, learn from each other and collaborate.

97 Cf. for instance <http://www.ias.edu/about/mission-and-history>

Critical mass could also be understood in a more far-reaching sense; more than just a characteristic of the environment, it could also be understood, and sought for, as a characteristic of research projects and programmes. In the communication from the Swedish Ministry of Education regarding funding to stimulate centralisation in research, it is emphasised that the complexity of many contemporary research problems requires the collaboration of a broad array of competencies. And indeed, many clusters in the overview above are careful to emphasise that they are multi- or interdisciplinary research organisations.⁹⁸ Against this background, clustering could be seen as motivated by the importance of achieving multi- or interdisciplinarity in research addressing complex questions.⁹⁹

Reaching critical mass in the form of interdisciplinary research projects requires a high level of coordination of the research carried out. Typically, it seems that this is most likely to be accomplished in fully funded, top-down clusters.¹⁰⁰ If the complexity of the research problem is the background that makes clustering necessary to achieve critical mass, clustering occurs, it would seem, in a top-down manner against the background of an idea of what skills and competencies are needed in order to be able to adequately address the problem. Moreover, by providing funding, conditions are created for carrying out this research in the form of a single coherent project, without having to rely on the possibility of harmonising the project plans and responsibilities of several individual, separately funded projects.

In this context, the Centre for Interdisciplinary Research at Bielefeld University (ZiF)¹⁰¹, and the Centre for Advanced Study at the Norwegian Academy of Science and Letters (CAS Oslo)¹⁰² are especially worthy of mention. These clusters are committed to a bottom-up approach, inviting research on any topic, in any field. To both centres, however, only projects and research groups, rather than individual researchers, involving researchers from diverse academic backgrounds, are invited to apply, thus making interdisciplinarity a structural condition for the research carried out. The ZiF and the CAS Oslo demonstrate, I think, that it is not only top-down funding schemes that can accomplish strongly coordinated large-scale projects, but that bottom-up clusters can also give priority

98 See for instance http://collegium-lyon.ens-lsh.fr/33954937/0/fiche___pagelibre/; <http://www.edda.hi.is/>; <http://www.crash.cam.ac.uk/> ; <http://www.stanford.edu/group/gender/>

99 Utbildningsdepartementet (2004).

100 E.g. <http://www.reassess.no/index.gan?id=14497> and <http://blogs.helsinki.fi/nordwel/>

101 [http://www.uni-bielefeld.de/\(en\)/ZIF/](http://www.uni-bielefeld.de/(en)/ZIF/)

102 <http://www.cas.uio.no/>

to these kinds of projects. For this to be viable, however, participating researchers must already have had the opportunity to begin coordinating their research interests and expertise.

3.3 Sustainability

If clustered and large-scale research projects benefit from participants having had opportunities to coordinate their research interests and expertise during the preparatory phases, this demonstrates that clusters can serve as the basis for further clustering. That is, clusters that stimulate networking and the initiation of collaborative efforts, and that support application writing, can engender further funded projects, or be developed into clusters carrying out, rather than merely facilitating, research. Hence, an important motive for clustering can be to attract further funding, especially as large research environments are more likely to be successful in grant applications¹⁰³. In more general terms, this is also an example of how clustering can serve the sustainability and continued development of a research field, or a research environment.

Also, when considering centres that devote substantial resources to carrying out research, and operate with fully funded fellowship programmes, sustainability could be understood as having been an important motive for clustering. This is particularly the case against the background of recent tendencies in the way organisational conditions for research, researchers and academic career paths have developed. It has been argued that researchers are able to devote less and less time to actual research, firstly because the externally-funded research is often underfunded, making it necessary to devote a larger amount of time to applying for additional money.¹⁰⁴

Moreover, the number of administrative and managerial tasks is increasing, and much time goes to memberships on advisory boards, thesis evaluation committees, and peer review tasks.¹⁰⁵ Often, women devote even more time to these kinds of tasks than men; boards and committees commonly strive for equal representation between women and men, but at the same time, there are fewer women than men in professorial, assistant professorial and other researchers' positions to recruit from. In this context, the fact that clusters can offer undisturbed research time becomes important in order to ensure, for the individual researchers, and in particular for women, as well as for a research community as a whole, that there still is time for creativity, reflection and for rethinking and

103 Utbildningsdepartementet (2004).

104 Utbildningsdepartementet (2004).

105 Grimm, Dieter (2008) "Evaluation of the Netherlands Institute for Advanced Study in the Humanities and Social Sciences 2002 – 2007".

thoroughly revising research approaches and explanatory models.¹⁰⁶ Accordingly, clustering can be important for the sustainability of fields of research, by providing the conditions for their long-term development.

Moreover, the labour market for researchers, especially during the years after they finish their PhD and before they reach professorial or associate professorial levels, is rather unpredictable. Competition is fierce, and the relatively few positions that exist are often short term. In this unwelcoming climate, there is a risk that important research competencies may be lost, and that talented researchers will leave universities for other career options. Clusters that offer fellowship programmes targeting junior researchers could be understood as responding to a demand for more structured and predictable postdoc conditions; satisfying this demand is, in turn, important in order to guarantee a broad and sustainable skills and competencies provision for future academic research.¹⁰⁷

3.4 Conditions for Quality and Distinction

The overall motive for organising research in clusters is, I think, the assumption that clustering is a way to increase the quality of research, and to achieve distinction within specific fields, or in a particular region. In the considerations above, I have sought to demonstrate more concretely how different aspects and forms of clustering contribute in different ways to quality and distinction. Here, I have pointed to how, from a researcher's perspective, clusters promote research quality by providing a stimulating environment and, in many cases, optimal intellectual conditions. In addition, from a researchers' community perspective, clusters promise quality by maintaining the long-term conditions for innovativeness and for careful evaluation and re-evaluation of basic theoretical and explanatory frameworks and, finally, from a political and funding perspective, clustering ensures high quality investments, with a good probability that each invested SEK/Euro pays back in the form of unique results and findings.

4. Models

As mentioned in the introduction, one purpose of this review is to find examples of clustering that might be useful in the continued development of *GEXcel* into a more permanent centre for gender research. This overall purpose has guided the decisions about which clusters to include in the overview, and it will also guide which clusters will be considered

106 Grimm, Dieter (2008).

107 Helsinki Collegium for Advanced Study (2007) "Target Program of the Helsinki Collegium for Advanced Studies for 2007-2009."

more closely in this section. Here, the third aim will be addressed and, on the basis of an exploration of selected centres, I will seek to demonstrate viable models for organising distinguished research clusters. To this end, I will consider in detail The Radcliffe Institute for Advanced Study (RIAS) at Harvard, at times in comparison with Stanford's Michelle Clayman Institute and Adelaide's Faye Gale Centre. Moreover, I will also take a closer look at The Centre for Advanced Study in Oslo (CAS), and the Turku Institute for Advanced Studies (TIAS).

RIAS is included because it is a prominent gender studies cluster, which can give insights into the specificities and possibilities of organising gender studies research and related activities. Comparisons with Michelle Clayman and Faye Gale are included in order to bring further depth and nuance to these insights. CAS is included primarily because it is Nordic-based, and can give examples of how this policy context can be approached. A second reason to consider CAS more closely is that, in contrast to many other clusters with fellowship programmes, it invites only projects and research groups. I believe that this way of implementing interdisciplinarity merits closer consideration. TIAS, finally, is included because it is still being established; whereas many other clusters have been active as such for quite some time, TIAS can demonstrate the organisational challenges facing clusters in the earliest phases of their activity.

Clearly, as will become evident, these clusters that I have chosen for closer consideration operate under very different conditions, not least financially. Where CAS Oslo and TIAS have government and university funding, RIAS is privately owned, and financed largely by income from an endowment fund, with a budget ten times the size of those of CAS Oslo and TIAS. Seemingly, this would make other comparisons between the US and Nordic clusters difficult. However, my purpose in including these clusters, even though they operate under very different conditions, is to consider differences and similarities of a principal nature, regarding their understanding of what is required in order for a cluster to be distinguished.

Initially, I will consider what it is that each cluster offers to its visiting researchers and other affiliates, as well as what the clusters demand in return. In the second subsection, I will direct attention towards organisational matters, in the form of the clusters' management and staffing models, and I will consider issues pertaining to funding, and strategies for securing funding.

4.1 Capabilities and Requirements

RIAS, CAS and TIAS have been selected for closer review largely because they all offer elaborate fellowship programmes. Hence, rather than facilitating research, these clusters coordinate it by producing original research. Clearly though, there are significant and important differences between the size and organisation of their fellowship programmes. At the recently instituted TIAS, five postdoctoral researchers and five so-called Collegium researchers are enrolled in the fellowship programme. While the postdoctoral positions are filled by researchers who have recently been awarded their PhD, the Collegium researchers' positions are intended for more experienced researchers, to give them the experience required to proceed to advanced positions. Postdoctoral as well as Collegium researchers' positions are for three years full time, and of this time, the appointed researchers are required to teach for 5%.

RIAS has appointed about 50 fellows during recent fellowship years, but compared to TIAS's three-year appointments these are only one-year fellowships.¹⁰⁸ Although RIAS does not distinguish between junior and senior researchers, unlike TIAS, this institute offers a few other ways to apply, besides as an individual researcher. Here, RIAS offers fellowships in creative arts to musicians, writers, artists etc. Applicants in creative arts do not need to have a PhD, but instead they are required to have published works of fiction, to have had a screenplay produced, or their work displayed at exhibitions or film festivals. Art is also an important part of the Michelle Clayman Institute. Here, the *Art at the Institute* programme invites artists who are critically concerned with gender to exhibit their work.¹⁰⁹ RIAS also offers the possibility to apply to visit as a group of researchers or artists.¹¹⁰ Roughly every tenth fellow at RIAS is an independent artist in the creative arts, and usually there is one group applicant appointed each fellowship year. RIAS groups tend to comprise 2 – 4 members. All RIAS fellowships are residential, and thus, fellows are expected to reside in Boston, and contribute fully to academic life at the institute.

In comparison to the research groups at RIAS, the groups that are appointed to visit CAS Oslo are considerably larger. In total, about 40 – 45 researchers visit each year (in 2010 – 2011, this number is closer to 55), as part of one of the three research groups selected in each of the fields of Natural Sciences/Medicine/Mathematics, Humanities/Theology and Social Sciences/Law. Senior group members often visit CAS for the whole

108 Currently, the size of the stipend is up to \$ 65 000 per year, with some additional funding for project expenses and relocation costs.

109 <http://www.stanford.edu/group/gender/Art/index.html>

110 <https://radcliffe.onlineapplicationportal.com/misc/guidelines/>

year, while other members have short fellowships. Prior to starting a fellowship as a CAS Oslo research group, there has been a three-year-long nomination, application, selection and preparation process. First is the nomination of group leaders; deans, heads of departments and, to some extent, individual professors from Norwegian universities suggest names of prospective group leaders to a board at CAS. A selection of the nominees is then asked to proceed by presenting more detailed descriptions of their CAS projects. On the basis of these descriptions, the board considers which projects would be especially suited for a CAS visit, and selects about three projects in each of the three fields to hand in more detailed proposals. Only after these proposals have been subjected to international peer review by experts in each field are the final appointments made.

Team members should have already been suggested during the application process, and by the time the detailed proposal for international peer review is submitted, a number of senior team members should have agreed to become part of the project. Now, once a project has been selected for a CAS fellowship, the research group has about two years before arriving at CAS, to further prepare for their fellowship period.¹¹¹ Accordingly, it would seem that at the beginning of a CAS fellowship, a significant amount of the work has already been accomplished as part of the application and preparation process. In a sense, arriving researchers have already contributed to the projects with their own time, and even projects that are not selected could be seen as adding to the total volume of research carried out in Norway, as important steps towards networking and initiation have to be taken in order to complete the CAS application.

TIAS and CAS are both almost exclusively concerned with research. Visitors are offered a research milieu, and they come mostly to conduct research. In contrast, although research is of course the dominant concern, RIAS, as well as the Michelle Clayman Institute, hosts a substantial number of activities, possibilities and resources going beyond research.

I have already mentioned the creative arts programmes which can be found at both institutes. Moreover, an important part of RIAS is the Schlesinger Library, specialising in women's studies, gender and feminism, and where a major collection relating to the history of women in the US is maintained and continuously expanded.¹¹² Through the *Radcliffe Magazine*¹¹³, RIAS entertains an accessible forum for public outreach, reporting from institute symposia, research and other activities. At the Clayman Institute, a number of residential research projects serve as

111 <http://www.cas.uio.no/about/nomination.php>

112 <http://www.radcliffe.edu/schles/about.aspx>

113 http://issuu.com/radcliffeinstitute/docs/magazine_summer2010?mode=a_p

the basis for policy making, transformative action and efforts to change practice regarding the gender order in universities, business and industry. In their practical consequences, these projects are largely about the gendered conditions of careers and recruitment in high status, power intense settings.¹¹⁴ In a sense, it could be suggested that the Michelle Clayman Institute seeks to institutionalise a link between gender research and the transformative application of the insights of gender analysis.

4.2 Management, Staff and Finances

Since 1999, when Radcliffe and Harvard merged, RIAS has been an institute at Harvard University. Prior to this merger, Radcliffe was a separate college, albeit with close connections to Harvard. CAS Oslo is run as a private foundation, established by the Norwegian Academy of Science and Letters, and it has nine partner universities and research institutes in Norway, which support CAS by funding some of their own outgoing researchers when they visit CAS. TIAS was founded in the merger between the University of Turku, and the Turku School of Economics, at the same time as Turku Collegium for Science and Medicine. A closer look at the way the clusters are managed and administered can clarify important differences with regard to their priorities, their relation to host universities/organisations, and what is seen as being required from within the clusters, to ensure that they can continue to function in the long term.

Between TIAS and CAS Oslo on the one hand, and RIAS on the other, there is a striking difference in the size of the managerial and administrative organisation. Both CAS Oslo and TIAS operate with boards, which are responsible, among other things, for the application and review process before fellows are appointed. Besides their boards however, these centres function with a small administrative staff. At TIAS, the administration consists of only one position, in the form a TIAS co-ordinator, held by an adjunct professor¹¹⁵. CAS Oslo has a slightly more elaborate administrative structure, with four positions, one of which is the scientific director who is also the academic leader of the centre. In addition, there is one office manager, and two higher executive officers. CAS also hires IT services from the University of Oslo for 1.5 days per week.

When comparing CAS Oslo and TIAS, the differences in the size of the administrative staff could be explained by differences in the volume of research conducted at each cluster. TIAS, with only one position in the administrative staff, also has only ten active fellows, whereas CAS Oslo's four-person management and administration normally services around

114 <http://www.stanford.edu/group/gender/ResearchPrograms/index.html>

115 <http://www.utu.fi/sivustot/collegia/tias/administration/>

40–45 researchers during the course of one year. TIAS, being in its start-up phase, may very well need to expand its administration if more fellows are appointed during future stages of its operations.

The fellowship programme at RIAS, with 50 fellows each year, is not much larger than CAS Oslo's; nevertheless, at RIAS, management and administration comprises over 80 positions. About 10% of these are in leadership, almost 40 are engaged in the Schlesinger Library, and the remainder include mail service positions, financial administration, maintenance workers, human resource management and, of course, academic and research administration. In a sense, in comparison to TIAS and CAS, a look at the RIAS staff directory gives a more adequate picture of what is actually needed in terms of staff and services to run a research institution.¹¹⁶ At RIAS, the institute hires its own library staff, and it has dedicated employees for building maintenance, handling the mail and human resource management. At TIAS and CAS, these services are debited as indirect costs, and provided by the host organisations.

There are a couple of positions on RIAS's staff that are specifically engaged in finances and fundraising. Unlike TIAS and CAS Oslo, it seems, RIAS has to invest money to manage, and search for, continued and/or new funding. This, I think, partly reflects the fact that TIAS and CAS are funded from single sources, whereas RIAS is funded in a more complex way, and partly that RIAS has ten times the turnover compared to CAS. CAS is funded by a state grant from the Norwegian Ministry of Education and Research¹¹⁷, and TIAS is funded by the consortium following the merger of the University of Turku and the Turku School of Economics. Of RIAS's total revenue of almost 27.5 million USD during 2008/09, 24.5 million (89%) came from endowment fund income, 1.5 million (6%) from gifts, and 1 million (5%) from other sources. Here, managing the endowment fund and finding gift givers is indeed work that costs money, even though in the end, of course, more money comes back.

At the Fay Gale Centre for Research on Gender at the University of Adelaide, another example can be found of a way to increase the level of funded research, albeit on a smaller scale, by institutionalising a strategy that uses money to make money. Here, individual researchers can seek support in the form of funding for writing grant applications for projects involving gender-related research.¹¹⁸ In this way, it is possible to give several researchers the opportunity to find funding at the same cost as it takes to fully fund a single project.

116 http://www.radcliffe.edu/about/staff_directory.aspx

117 In 2008, 15 million NOK.

118 <http://www.adelaide.edu.au/gender/research/>

4.3 Substantial Differences

Many of the differences between the clusters that I have considered are of a rather technical nature, and depend on outside forces, such as local research policies, and the economic situation at large. However, there are also differences reflected in the way the clusters are organised and staffed, between clusters' approaches to research and their understanding of research excellence. That CAS Oslo and TIAS dedicate their funding largely to direct research, while a relatively smaller part of RIAS funding (even if the Schlesinger staff is not counted) goes to direct research, reflects a difference in priorities.¹¹⁹ That is, RIAS could afford a more elaborate fellowship programme and more research, but has instead chosen to provide room for other activities as well. A six-person-strong communications department, for example, demonstrates that, from the point of view of RIAS, public outreach and accessible research communication are considered to be important functions of an advanced research institution.

Moreover, the fact that both RIAS and the Michelle Clayman Institute, in addition to being centres for research, also function as cultural centres and centres for political action, is significant. Here, the emphasis on creative arts, public outreach and research that can be enrolled in the service of practical change and political transformation could be understood as shaped by the fact that both are gender studies clusters. Here, many of the activities and efforts are animated by a commitment to accomplishing change, and they are organised with a readiness to challenge traditional authority structures enacted through the boundaries between science and art, and between academia and activism.

5. Concluding Remarks

In this final section, I will briefly discuss the points arising in this review that I think it could be particularly important to consider further in the process of developing GEXcel into a permanent distinguished research cluster for gender studies. Initially I will direct my attention to the overview, and then I will consider the sections on motives and models.

What I think is the most important conclusion that can be drawn from the overview is that a gender studies cluster based in Sweden, that can offer a substantial, fully financed fellowship programme in an inter-

119 In 2008/09, RIAS, spent 25% [5.4 million USD] of its total expenses on the fellowship programme. At CAS, almost 60% [10 million NOK] went to the fellowship programme during 2008. See the "Annual report 2008 – 2009", Radcliffe Institute of Advanced Study, and the "Annual report 2009", Centre of Advanced Study – Senter for Grunnforskning.

national academic milieu, would be unique in Europe. Although there are quite a few gender studies clusters internationally, it is only the Radcliffe Institute for Advanced Study and the Michelle Clayman Institute that provide researchers with the opportunity and financial means to conduct research under their own roof. In other cases, gender studies clusters function as support structures and nodal points in networks, but in terms of research, the results as well as the researchers ultimately have their institutional home elsewhere.

This is not to say that functioning as a support structure and a nodal point in a network lacks merit. On the contrary, as has been indicated in the section on motives, it could be claimed that clusters providing support structures constitute a promising developmental stage, opening up the possibility of maturing into a cluster that also invites scholars to carry out research. In that light, the notion that clustering is a way to accomplish further, even more ambitious clustering, could serve as a viable motive when approaching a host university for funding. The possibility that clustering will lead to more clustering, promises the development of a centre that will be of greater value to the host university than the cost of its investment.

One way that a support structure may yield funded research in this manner could be drawn from the Fay Gale example; researchers are offered funding and advice to support the writing of grant applications. For instance, support could be offered on the condition that, if successful, applicants place the project at the cluster in question. In this way, at a fairly low cost, several researchers can be invited in the short term to work on their grant applications, and the chances are good that one or more of them will be successful, and will therefore come back, with funding and a team, for a longer period of time. Here, as funding is limited, investments are made into activities that can generate additional funding, rather than into direct research.

More generally, with regard to infrastructure, the models section suggests that it is strategic to reserve a relatively substantial part of funding for qualified administrator(s), even if this obviously means that a relatively smaller part is dedicated to the fellowship programme and to direct research. Compared to TIAS and CAS, RIAS has control over more of the managerial functions and administrative services necessary for running a research institution. This not only grants a greater autonomy to the cluster, but makes it less dependent on and sensitive to outside forces; a small administration may very well do an excellent job in handling business-as-usual, but a more solid administrative staff can ensure that the cluster also persists through crises and set-backs. For instance, a cluster without staff dedicated to public outreach would be left without

channels for publicity, public relations and professional research communication if the host organisation were to downsize its communications department. And, should the University of Turku/Turku School of Economics consortium have to restrict the funding that goes to TIAS, the administration, consisting of a single co-ordinator, would have a hard time finding other sources of funding. That is, even if a more elaborate administration is more costly, it can also produce value in the form of services and fund raising, rendering the cluster more self-reliant.

In the previous section, RIAS and the Michelle Clayman Institute were considered strong examples of organisations that incorporate a wider range of activities that go beyond what is traditionally considered academic research. In these examples, the fact that the range of projects extends to include more than what is commonly considered as academic research clearly has pragmatic benefits; it opens up a wider range of potential stakeholders who may be interested not only in taking part in the results, but also in providing funding and support. Moreover, having partners and a network that extends outside of academia is an advantage when applying for funding from the EU framework programme. RIAS and the Clayman Institute have significantly more money at their disposal than TIAS and CAS, and they can more easily afford to host a broader range of activities. However, despite this difference, there is also, I think, a difference in principle. Where TIAS and CAS Oslo base their claims to excellence exclusively on research, the fact that RIAS and the Clayman Institute have methods in place for research results and knowledge to be engaged socially, practically and for transformative purposes could be seen as following from, and enacting an understanding of, research excellence that emphasises practical relevance as a condition for quality.

6 References

6.1 Bibliography

- Centre for Advanced Study – Senter for Grunnforskning (2009) “Annual report 2009”. Available electronically from http://www.cas.uio.no/Publications/report/Annual_report_2009.pdf [2011-09-02].
- Directorate-General for Research (2008) “Social Sciences and Humanities in FP6 – all calls”. Available electronically from: http://ec.europa.eu/research/social-sciences/pdf/ssh-project-synopsis-fp6_en.pdf [2011-09-02].

- FP6 Instruments Task Force, European Commission (2003) “Provision for Implementing Networks of Excellence – Background Document”. Available electronically from: <http://cordis.europa.eu/documents/documentlibrary/66621951EN6.pdf> [2011-09-02].
- Fridholm, Tobias (2010) *Working Together: Exploring Relational Tensions in Swedish Academia*, Uppsala: Department of Social and Economic Geography, Uppsala University.
- Grimm, Dieter (2008) “Evaluation of the Netherlands Institute for Advanced Study in the Humanities and Social Sciences 2002 – 2007”. Available electronically from http://www.knaw.nl/content/internet_KNAW/instituten/bestanden/Rapport_Evaluatiecommissie_NIAS_2008.pdf [2011-09-02].
- Helsinki Collegium for Advanced Study (2007) “Target Program of the Helsinki Collegium for Advanced Studies for 2007-2009”. Available electronically from http://www.helsinki.fi/collegium/english/about_the_collegium/Target%20program%202007-2009.pdf [2011-09-02].
- Jøssang, T. and Vigdis Ystad (2002) “The Phase of Construction” in Centre for Advanced Study, CAS Oslo 1992-2002. *Advanced Study in a Norwegian Context*, Oslo.
- Lindgren, Gerd et al. (2010) “*Nördar, nomader och duktiga flickor – kön och jämställdhet i excellenta miljöer* [Nerds, Nomads and Good Girls – Gender and Equality in Excellent Milieus] Stockholm: Delegationen för jämställdhet i högskolan. Available electronically from <http://www.doktorandhandboken.nu/download/18.328ff76512e968468bc80003454/DJ-kon-jamstalldhet-excellent-miljoer.pdf> [2011-09-02].
- Radcliffe Institute for Advanced Study (2009) “Annual report 2008 – 2009”. Available electronically from <http://www.radcliffe.edu/documents/annualreport2009.pdf> [2011-09-02].
- Sandström, Ulf et al. (2010) *Hans Excellens: om miljardsatsningarna på starka forskningsmiljöer* [His Excellence: about the billion SEK investments into strong research milieus] Stockholm: Delegationen för jämställdhet i högskolan. Available electronically from http://www.jamst.uadm.uu.se/aktiviteter/Hans_Excellens%5Brapp%5D.pdf [2011-09-02].
- Utbildningsdepartementet (2004) “Finansiering av starka forskningsmiljöer – en internationell utblick” [Financing strong research milieus – an international outlook]. Available electronically from <http://www.regeringen.se/content/1/c6/02/20/24/d5534c9e.pdf> [2011-09-02].

Vetenskapsrådet (2005) “*Vetenskapsrådets satsning på starka forskningsmiljöer 2004*” [The Swedish Research Council’s 2004 investment into strong research milieus] Available electronically from http://www.cm.se/webbshop_vr/pdf/P_0013.pdf [2011-09-02].

Wittrock, B. (2002) “A Brief History of Institutes for Advanced Study” in Centre for Advanced Study, *CAS Oslo 1992-2002. Advanced Study in a Norwegian Context*, Oslo.

6.2 – Electronic Resources: Alphabetical listing of clusters

Cluster	Webpage
Atlantic Metropolis Centre, Centre for Excellence for Research on Immigration, Integration and Cultural Diversity	http://www.atlantic.metropolis.net/index_e.html
Centre for Advanced Study [Oslo]	http://www.cas.uio.no/
Centre for Advanced Study [Sofia]	http://www.cas.bg/en/index.html
Center for Advanced Study in the Behavioral Sciences [Stanford]	http://www.casbs.org/
Center for Excellence in the Arts and Humanities [Iowa State University]	http://www.public.iastate.edu/~ceah/homepage.html
Centre of Excellence in Gender Studies [Islamabad]	http://cegs.edu.pk
Center of Excellence for Women’s Studies [Karachi]	http://www.uok.edu.pk/research_institutes/Women_Studies/index.php
Centre for the Interdisciplinary Study of Sexuality and Gender in Europe [Exeter]	http://www.sall.ex.ac.uk/centres/cissge/
Centre for Intimate and Sexual Citizenship [Essex]	http://www.essex.ac.uk/sociology/cisc/index.html
Center for Race and Gender [Berkeley]	http://crg.berkeley.edu/
Centre for Research in the Arts, Social Sciences and Humanities [Cambridge]	http://www.crassh.cam.ac.uk/
Center for the Study of Democracy [University of California, Irvine]	http://www.democ.uci.edu/
Center for the Study of Democratic Politics [Princeton]	http://www.princeton.edu/csdp/

Center for the Study of Gender and Sexuality [New York University]	http://www.csgsnyu.org/
Centre for the Study of Sexuality and Culture [Manchester]	http://www.arts.manchester.ac.uk/subjectareas/englishamericanstudies/research/cssc/
Center for the Study of Women and Society [City University of New York]	http://web.gc.cuny.edu/womenstudies/index.htm
Centre for Gender Studies [Cambridge]	http://www.gender.cam.ac.uk/
Collegium Budapest	http://www.colbud.hu/main.shtml
Collegium de Lyon	http://www.collegium-lyon.fr/33954937/0/fiche__pagelibre/
Collegium Helveticum	http://www.collegium.ethz.ch/en/welcome.html
Cornelia Goethe Center for Women's and Gender Studies [Frankfurt]	http://www.cgc.uni-frankfurt.de/english-cgc-home.shtml
Department of Feminist Studies [Santa Cruz]	http://feministstudies.ucsc.edu/
Department of Gender Studies [Central European University]	http://www.gend.ceu.hu/
Dialogue Europe – Centre of Excellence [Sofia]	http://dialogueeurope.org/en_US/za-instituta/
Edda – Centre of Excellence [Reykjavík]	http://www.edda.hi.is/
Fay Gale Centre for Research on Gender [Adelaide]	http://www.adelaide.edu.au/gender/
Gender Institute [London School of Economics]	http://www2.lse.ac.uk/genderInstitute/home.aspx
Gender Kolleg [Vienna]	http://www.univie.ac.at/gender-kolleg/index.htm
Helsinki Collegium for Advanced Studies	http://www.helsinki.fi/collegium/english/index.htm
Institute for Advanced Feminist Research [Santa Cruz]	http://iafr.ucsc.edu/
Institute for Advanced Studies in the Humanities [Edinburgh]	http://www.iash.ed.ac.uk/

Institute for Advanced Studies [Lancaster]	http://www.lancaster.ac.uk/ias/index.php
Institute for Advanced Studies [Vienna]	http://www.ihs.ac.at/vienna/index.php
Institute for Research on Women and Gender [Columbia, NYC]	http://www.columbia.edu/cu/irwag/index.html
Institute of Advanced Studies [Bologna]	http://www.ias.unibo.it/ISA/default.htm
Institute for Advanced Study [Princeton]	http://www.ias.edu/
Institutos de Estudios de la Mujer	http://www.ugr.es/~iem/
Institut Interuniversitari d'Estudis de Dones i Gènere	http://www.iiedg.org/
Michelle R. Clayman Institute for Gender Research [Stanford]	http://www.stanford.edu/group/gender/index.html
Netherlands Institute for Advanced Study in the Humanities and Social Sciences	http://www.nias.knaw.nl
<i>Nordic Centre of Excellence: "The Nordic Welfare State – Historical Foundations and Future Challenges"</i>	http://blogs.helsinki.fi/nord-wel/
<i>Nordic Centre of Excellence: "Reassessing the Nordic Welfare Model"</i>	http://www.reassess.no/id/14497
<i>Network of Excellence: "Civil Society and New Forms of Governance in Europe"</i>	http://www.cinefogo.org/
<i>Network of Excellence: "Connecting Excellence on European Governance"</i>	http://www.connex-network.org/
<i>Network of Excellence: "Creating Links and Innovative Overviews for a New History Research Agenda for the Citizens of a Growing Europe"</i>	http://www.cliohres.net/
<i>Network of Excellence: "Dynamics of Institutions and Markets in Europe"</i>	http://www.dime-eu.org/
<i>Network of Excellence: "Economic Change, Quality of Life and Social Cohesion"</i>	http://www.equalsoc.org/2

<i>Network of Excellence: Global Governance, Regionalisation & Regulation: The Role of the EU</i>	http://cordis.europa.eu/search/index.cfm?fuseaction=proj.document&PJ_RCN=7975223
<i>Network of Excellence: “International Migration, Integration and Social Cohesion”</i>	http://www.imiscoe.org/about/future/index.html
<i>Network of Excellence: “Joint Network on European Private Law”</i>	http://www.copecl.org/
<i>Network of Excellence: “Languages in a Network of European Excellence”</i>	http://linee.info/linee/home2.html
<i>Network of Excellence: “Network of Research Centres in Human Sciences in the Mediterranean Area”</i>	http://ramses2.mmsh.univ-aix.fr/
<i>Network of Excellence: “Policies for Research and Innovation in the Move Towards the European Research Area”</i>	http://www.prime-noe.org/index.php
<i>Network of Excellence: “Reconciling Work and Welfare in Europe”</i>	http://www.recwowe.eu/
<i>Network of Excellence: “Sustainable Development in a Diverse World”</i>	http://www.feem.it/getpage.aspx?id=186&sez=Research&padre=18&sub=70&idsub=126&pj=Ongoing
<i>Network of Excellence: “Wider Europe, Deeper Integration?”</i>	http://www.eu-consent.net/DEFAULT.ASP
Radcliffe Institute for Advanced Study	http://www.radcliffe.edu/
Stockholm International Peace Research Institute	http://www.sipri.org/about
Swedish Collegium for Advanced Study	http://www.scasss.uu.se/index.html
Swedish Institute for Social Research	http://www.sofi.su.se/pub/jsp/polopoly.jsp?d=5570
Turku Institute for Advanced Studies	http://www.utu.fi/sivustot/collegia/tias/
Wissenschaftskolleg zu Berlin [Institute for Advanced Study]	http://www.wiko-berlin.de/
Zentrum für interdisziplinäre Forschung [Centre for Interdisciplinary Research] [Bielefeld]	http://www.uni-bielefeld.de/(en)/ZIF/
Zentrum für transdisziplinäre Geschlechterstudien	http://www.gender.hu-berlin.de/eng/center/



Chapter 2

Some Reflections on Choices in Developing Collaborative Networks

Sanne Bor

1. Introduction

This short paper is intended to support researchers and research institutes considering organising their collaboration into a network to think through how they wish to do so. Collaborative networks can have a variety of goals, for example: shared research, teaching, training or the development of policies or standards. This paper discussed the elements of network forms that are of importance when setting one up. In the process of establishing a network, each element discussed in this paper will thus need to be considered. The purpose of the paper is to make clear to those seeking to establish a collaborative network what the main possibilities are.

In this paper I draw mainly on the insights gained from my ongoing doctoral research project, “Managing international R&D consortia,” which focuses on the governance, management and administration of European Commission-funded Networks of Excellence. These networks often have multiple goals, including shared research, training and the development of standards or policies, and some also have the goal of developing products or methodologies.

2. Elements of networks

Collaborative networks can take various forms. This paper aims to make explicit the choices that lead to these various forms and therefore it concentrates on the aspects that make a key organisational difference. Five different elements of networks will be highlighted. These are:

- Membership;
- Formalisation;
- Structure;
- Administration;
- Governance.

Each of these elements is discussed separately. However, for anyone considering organising collaboration in a network, the first step in the process is to consider who is to be included in the *initial* collaboration

and what the goals and mission of the collaboration will be. Thinking through the participants and the purpose of the collaboration can render some of the choices presented below self-evident. The initial goal and participants may of course change during the development of the network. Furthermore, funding requirements as well as demands and possibilities from possible funding bodies need to be considered as they may influence the choices that need to or can be made.

2.1 Network membership

There are three important dimensions to discuss concerning network membership.¹ The first dimension concerns the question of who is to become a member and who is to take part in the network; the second concerns how open or closed the network is in terms of membership and the third is concerned with how permanent the network membership is. The choices made concerning network membership influence the size, the type of relationships, the types of contract possible and the governance structure of the network, as well as motivational questions.

Who?

Depending on its goal, the members and those who take part in the network may be individuals, departments or whole organisations. When the member is not an individual, the question arises as to who is to represent the department or organisation in the network and become involved in its work and possibly its administration, management and governance.

Networks with individual members can be, for example, research projects with individual members from different institutes. An example of a network with member departments could be a content-specific training network within which students from member departments can take part in the training offered. Networks with organisations as their members may be training or research networks within which an institute as a whole is involved due to the required infrastructure and organisational or other commitments.

How exclusive?

Another important dimension to consider is how open the network is to new members and whether the network is to grow or not.

When the network is to be very open, any organisation or individual who is interested may join and leave the network if minimum requirements are met. These networks often have a wish to grow, and members

1 Cropper, S. et al. (Eds.) (2008) *The Oxford Handbook of Inter-organizational Relations*. Oxford/New York: Oxford University Press.

may join and leave relatively easily. Informal networks that link through an email list on a specific topic are an example of such a structure. These networks vary in complexity from very low (one or a few individuals responsible for keeping the infrastructure in place) to medium (having central administrative co-ordination), depending on the activities undertaken.

When the network is more exclusive, the membership will be bound by more rules. If these networks wish to grow, each candidate will be evaluated based on those criteria. A professional network with a membership fee could be an example of this. This type of network typically has a central administrative co-ordination with rather large decision-making powers, for example to evaluate those who wish to join and to keep track of and organise activities for the network.

A network with a fixed membership often does not wish to grow, but if it does, often all the existing members need to agree on the new members who wish to join. Consortia and alliances are examples of this type of network. These networks often have a rather complex organisational structure.

How permanent?

The last dimension in relation to network membership concerns the timeframe of the membership. Especially when a network has organisations as its members, the timeframe needs to be thought through for both the member organisations and those individuals who take part in the work.

The question here is whether the membership is fixed term, renewable, or open-ended in time. Related to this is the question of how open-ended the network is. If it is open-ended, the membership is usually also open-ended (on email lists for example) or renewable (yearly membership fee). When the network is fixed term, the membership is usually fixed term as well.

2.2 Network formalisation

In this paper, I use the term network formalisation to describe the extent to which a network is established through contracts. The formalisation in terms of practices and processes, which do not necessarily follow the degree of contractual formalisation, will be discussed partially under network administration and network governance. Grandori and Soda present three different degrees of formalisation.²

2 Grandori, A. and Soda, G. (1995) "Inter-firm Networks: Antecedents, Mechanisms and Forms", *Organization Studies*, 16(2), 183-214.

The first degree, the least formalised, concerns networks that formalise only through exchange. In these so-called *social networks*, the participants work together without formalising their co-operation through a contract binding the participants together. Contracts may exist concerning particular exchanges, but not concerning the relationship of the participants beyond these. The membership of these networks can vary from tightly closed to very open.

The second degree of formalisation concerns networks which are established through exchanges based on a contract defining the nature of their co-operation. Grandori and Soda call these networks *bureaucratic networks*. A network with this degree of formalisation will have explicit rules about how the participants are to co-operate, make decisions and solve problems. Also, membership of these networks is regulated as new members will need to be annexed to the contract in some way.

The third degree of formalisation is reached by establishing a structure through exchanges based on a contract defining the co-operation, whereby the exchange also includes the exchange of equities and property rights. These networks are called *proprietary networks* by Grandori and Soda. These networks go one step further in their involvement with the network by exchanging equities and property rights, which leads to further formalisation and more explicit and extensive contracts. Membership of these networks will be more exclusive and if new members are accepted to join, this can be expected to be a result of an extensive negotiation process.

As shown above, the degree of formalisation has an effect on the ease with which new members can join the network. The more formalised the network is in terms of contracting, the more exclusive the network will tend to be. Furthermore, as the contracts will define the nature of the co-operation, we can expect that the more formalised a network is, the more explicitly focused it will be as its members will be forced to define and demarcate their collaboration.³ Furthermore, a greater degree of formalisation may lead to less flexibility in terms of changing the collaboration. On the other hand, formalisation serves as a safeguard for the investments made by members of the network.

2.3 Network structure

Network structure is the way in which a network is organised. Both the layers of co-ordination needed to organise the work done in the network and the level of integration/interaction needed between the various mem-

3 Bor, S. and Boersma, K. (2010) "The Management of Formalisation Processes in R&D Collaboration", *International Journal of Information Technology Project Management*, 1(3), 1-13.

bers are of importance here. Networks are often thought of as rather flat organisational structures. However, they can also be relatively or even very hierarchical. Below, two extremes will be presented and discussed.

Hierarchical inter-organisational networks are often structured based on location or institution, whereby each institute, department or research group works separately from the others. This means that there are various layers of co-ordination needed to gain insights from other groups.

Flat inter-organisational networks often have a structure based on particular topics, integrating people from various institutions into groups working on these topics. Co-ordination here is needed to reach over-arching goals and to bring the insights from various topics together.

Hierarchical structuring often builds on the specialisms present within each institute. Co-operation is expected to be easier as most participants may only work and interact with those in their close proximity. Other participants are often very familiar with one another and existing hierarchical structures can be used for co-ordinating the work within the unit. Network co-ordination is achieved by representatives of each group interacting. The participating individuals can thus be distant and know little about what others do within the network. On the one hand this means that the loyalty of most participants and the learning effect of the network for those participants can be very low. On the other hand, cultural differences and difficulties of geographical distance in the co-ordination at a work level are minimised and may be met only by those participating in co-ordination at higher levels.

The flat structuring often builds on the specialisms of individuals from various institutes. The co-operation is expected to create highly integrated and interconnected networks between these individuals and thus between the departments and institutes where these individuals work. However, the link between individuals can be expected to be far greater than between the departments or institutes as the involvement of the member organisations more broadly depends on the position and role of the individuals who partake in the collaboration.

2.4 Network administration

Typically networks will have some form of administrative support. The extent of the administration differs from network to network, creating variations in the size of the administrative support, ranging from a side job for one person to a central office with several people working full-time. In addition to the size of the administrative support, it can also be internal or external to the network members. Internally organised administrative support can be provided by one member of the network. Externally organised administrative support can be provided by a cen-

tral administrative organisation set up by the members together, or it can be given as a task to an external office specialising in network administration.

Thinking through the necessary level of administrative support is important for the experience of both the members and those performing the support tasks. As administrative support is not the core of a network, it often seems to be underemphasised. However, its quality influences how members feel about the network and the work they do for it. High quality administrative support can function as glue between the network members and can ensure that the experience of dealing with the network is positive. It is therefore important to give attention during the design of the network to how the administration can best support the work to be undertaken by its members.

Another issue to be considered is the power the administrative support will gain and the influence it has on the experience of the network members.

2.5 Network governance

Network governance concerns control over what is being done, strategic thinking about what the network is going to do and where it should focus its energies, and may also be concerned with important external contacts. Provan and Kenis distinguish three forms of governance.⁴

In the first, *shared governance*, the network members work collectively to make both strategic and operational decisions. The members often create a governing body with representatives of all members to discuss and decide on network matters. In order to prepare these decisions an administrative organisation or management team may be created, especially in larger networks.

The second, *lead-member governance*, has a single member taking the strategic and (most) operational decisions for the whole network. The other members are normally able to voice their opinions about these decisions, but in situations where the lead member is not willing to reconsider particular decisions, the only option for other members is to leave the network.

The third, *network administrative organisation*, is a form of governance whereby a separate organisation is set up by the network members with the idea that it functions as the lead organisation governing the co-operation.

4 Provan, K. G. and Kenis, P. (2008) "Modes of Network Governance: Structure, Management, and Effectiveness", *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, 18(2), 229-253.

Both the governing forms of lead-member governance and network administrative organisation give members less of a say in what the network ought to do. In these governing forms there is a need to create alternative modes of communication to keep in touch with the needs and wishes of the (other) network members. In the shared governance form, all members are directly connected and they can express their opinions and influence the decision-making because they are involved in it. The major challenge faced by this form is that it can suffer from situations in which network members contribute very unequally to the work. Active members can become frustrated when a lot of work has been put into preparing proposals and others only use their voting right to vote these proposals down.

3. Conclusion

As shown in this paper, membership, formalisation, structure, administration and governance are all key elements about which choices have to be made when setting up and developing a collaborative network. Each combination of choices will lead to a different form of network. Carefully thinking through the various options is useful in order to create the form that will best support the achievement of the network's goal, whether that goal is collaborative research, teaching, training, or the development of shared policies or standards.

4. References

- Bor, S. and Boersma, K. (2010) "The Management of Formalisation Processes in R&D Collaboration", *International Journal of Information Technology Project Management*, 1(3), 1-13.
- Cropper, S. et al. (Eds.) (2008) *The Oxford Handbook of Inter-organizational Relations*. Oxford/New York: Oxford University Press.
- Grandori, A. and Soda, G. (1995) "Inter-firm Networks: Antecedents, Mechanisms and Forms", *Organization Studies*, 16(2), 183-214.
- Provan, K. G. and Kenis, P. (2008) "Modes of Network Governance: Structure, Management, and Effectiveness", *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, 18(2), 229-253.

Notes on Contributors

Sanne Bor, PhD student in Management and Organisation, Hanken School of Economics, Finland

Nina Lykke, Professor of Gender Studies at Linköping University; Director of GEXcel

Björn Pernrud, PhD in sociology; Research coordinator for GEXcel