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Foreword

The evaluation of research and doctoral training is being carried out in the years 2010–2012 and will end in 2012. The steering group appointed by the Rector in January 2010 set the conditions for participating in the evaluation and prepared the Terms of Reference to present the evaluation procedure and criteria. The publications and other scientific activities included in the evaluation covered the years 2005–2010.

The participating unit in the evaluation was defined as a Researcher Community (RC). To obtain a critical mass with university-level impact, the number of members was set to range from 20 to 120. The RCs were required to contain researchers in all stages of their research career, from doctoral students to principal investigators (PIs). All in all, 136 Researcher Communities participated in this voluntary evaluation, 5857 persons in total, of whom 1131 were principal investigators. PIs were allowed to participate in two communities in certain cases, and 72 of them used this opportunity and participated in two RCs.

This evaluation enabled researchers to define RCs from the “bottom up” and across disciplines. The aim of the evaluation was not to assess individual performance but a community with shared aims and researcher-training activities. The RCs were able to choose among five different categories that characterised the status and main aims of their research. The steering group considered the process of applying to participate in the evaluation to be important, which lead to the establishment of these categories. In addition, providing a service for the RCs to enable them to benchmark their research at the global level was a main goal of the evaluation.

The data for the evaluation consisted of the RCs’ answers to evaluation questions on supplied e-forms and a compilation extracted from the TUHAT – Research Information System (RIS) on 12 April 2011. The compilation covered scientific and other publications as well as certain areas of scientific activities. During the process, the RCs were asked to check the list of publications and other scientific activities and make corrections if needed. These TUHAT compilations are public and available on the evaluation project sites of each RC in the TUHAT-RIS.

In addition to the e-form and TUHAT compilation, University of Leiden (CWTS) carried out bibliometric analyses from the articles included in the Web of Science (WoS). This was done on University and RC levels. In cases where the publication forums of the RC were clearly not represented by the WoS data, the Library of the University of Helsinki conducted a separate analysis of the publications. This was done for 66 RCs representing the humanities and social sciences.

The evaluation office also carried out an enquiry targeted to the supervisors and PhD candidates about the organisation of doctoral studies at the University of Helsinki. This and other documents describing the University and the Finnish higher education system were provided to the panellists.

The panel feedback for each RC is unique and presented as an entity. The first collective evaluation reports available for the whole panel were prepared in July–August 2011. The reports were accessible to all panel members via the electronic evaluation platform in August. Scoring from 1 to 5 was used to complement written feedback in association with evaluation questions 1–4 (scientific focus and quality, doctoral training, societal impact, cooperation) and in addition to the category evaluating the fitness for participation in the evaluation. Panellists used the international level as a point of comparison in the evaluation. Scoring was not expected to go along with a preset deviation.

Each of the draft reports were discussed and dealt with by the panel in meetings in Helsinki (from 11 September to 13 September or from 18 September to 20 September 2011). In these meetings the panels also examined the deviations among the scores and finalised the draft reports together.

The current RC-specific report deals shortly with the background of the evaluation and the terms of participation. The main evaluation feedback is provided in the evaluation report, organised according to the evaluation questions. The original material provided by the RCs for the panellists has been attached to these documents.
On behalf of the evaluation steering group and office, I sincerely wish to thank you warmly for your participation in this evaluation. The effort you made in submitting the data to TUHAT-RIS is gratefully acknowledged by the University. We wish that you find this panel feedback useful in many ways. The bibliometric profiles may open a new view on your publication forums and provide a perspective for discussion on your choice of forums. We especially hope that this evaluation report will help you in setting the future goals of your research.

Johanna Björkroth  
Vice-Rector  
Chair of the Steering Group of the Evaluation

---
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1 Introduction to the Evaluation

1.1 RC-specific evaluation reports

The participants in the evaluation of research and doctoral training were Researcher Communities (hereafter referred to as the RC). The RC refers to the group of researchers who registered together in the evaluation of their research and doctoral training. Preconditions in forming RCs were stated in the Guidelines for the Participating Researcher Communities. The RCs defined themselves whether their compositions should be considered well-established or new.

It is essential to emphasise that the evaluation combines both meta-evaluation\(^1\) and traditional research assessment exercise and its focus is both on the research outcomes and procedures associated with research and doctoral training. The approach to the evaluation is enhancement-led where self-evaluation constituted the main information. The answers to the evaluation questions formed together with the information of publications and other scientific activities an entity that was to be reviewed as a whole.

The present evaluation recognizes and justifies the diversity of research practices and publication traditions. Traditional Research Assessment Exercises do not necessarily value high quality research with low volumes or research distinct from mainstream research. It is challenging to expose the diversity of research to fair comparison. To understand the essence of different research practices and to do justice to their diversity was one of the main challenges of the present evaluation method. Understanding the divergent starting points of the RCs demanded sensitivity from the evaluators.

1.2 Aims and objectives in the evaluation

The aims of the evaluation are as follows:

- to improve the level of research and doctoral training at the University of Helsinki and to raise their international profile in accordance with the University’s strategic policies. The improvement of doctoral training should be compared to the University’s policy.\(^2\)
- to enhance the research conducted at the University by taking into account the diversity, originality, multidisciplinary nature, success and field-specificity,
- to recognize the conditions and prerequisites under which excellent, original and high-impact research is carried out,
- to offer the academic community the opportunity to receive topical and versatile international peer feedback,
- to better recognize the University’s research potential.
- to exploit the University’s TUHAT research information system to enable transparency of publishing activities and in the production of reliable, comparable data.

1.3 Evaluation method

The evaluation can be considered as an enhancement-led evaluation. Instead of ranking, the main aim is to provide useful information for the enhancement of research and doctoral training of the participating RCs. The comparison should take into account each field of science and acknowledge their special character.

---

\(^1\) The panellists did not read research reports or abstracts but instead, they evaluated answers to the evaluation questions, tables and compilations of publications, other scientific activities, bibliometrics or comparable analyses.

\(^2\) Policies on doctoral degrees and other postgraduate degrees at the University of Helsinki.
The comparison produced information about the present status and factors that have lead to success. Also challenges in the operations and outcomes were recognized.

The evaluation approach has been designed to recognize better the significance and specific nature of researcher communities and research areas in the multidisciplinary top-level university. Furthermore, one of the aims of the evaluation is to bring to light those evaluation aspects that differ from the prevalent ones. Thus the views of various fields of research can be described and research arising from various starting points understood better. The doctoral training is integrated into the evaluation as a natural component related to research. Operational processes of doctoral training are being examined in the evaluation.

Five stages of the evaluation method were:

1. Registration – Stage 1
2. Self-evaluation – Stage 2
3. TUHAT\(^3\) compilations on publications and other scientific activities\(^4\)
4. External evaluation
5. Public reporting

1.4 Implementation of the external evaluation

Five Evaluation Panels

Five evaluation panels consisted of independent, renowned and highly respected experts. The main domains of the panels are:

1. biological, agricultural and veterinary sciences
2. medicine, biomedicine and health sciences
3. natural sciences
4. humanities
5. social sciences

The University invited 10 renowned scientists to act as chairs or vice-chairs of the five panels based on the suggestions of faculties and independent institutes. Besides leading the work of the panel, an additional role of the chairs was to discuss with other panel chairs in order to adopt a broadly similar approach. The panel chairs and vice-chairs had a pre-meeting on 27 May 2011 in Amsterdam.

The panel compositions were nominated by the Rector of the University 27 April 2011. The participating RCs suggested the panel members. The total number of panel members was 50. The reason for a smaller number of panelists as compared to the previous evaluations was the character of the evaluation as a meta-evaluation. The panelists did not read research reports or abstracts but instead, they evaluated answers to the evaluation questions, tables and compilations of publications, other scientific activities, bibliometrics and comparable analyses.

The panel meetings were held in Helsinki:

- On 11–13 September 2011: (1) biological, agricultural and veterinary sciences, (2) medicine, biomedicine and health sciences and (3) natural sciences.
- On 18–20 September 2011: (4) humanities and (5) social sciences.

\(^3\) TUHAT (acronym) of Research Information System (RIS) of the University of Helsinki

\(^4\) Supervision of thesis, prizes and awards, editorial work and peer reviews, participation in committees, boards and networks and public appearances.
1.5 Evaluation material

The main material in the evaluation was the RCs’ self-evaluations that were qualitative in character and allowed the RCs to choose what was important to mention or emphasise and what was left unmentioned.

The present evaluation is exceptional at least in the Finnish context because it is based on both the evaluation documentation (self-evaluation questions, publications and other scientific activities) and the bibliometric reports. All documents were delivered to the panellists for examination.

Traditional bibliometrics can be reasonably done mainly in medicine, biosciences and natural sciences when using the Web of Science database, for example. Bibliometrics, provided by CWTS/The Centre for Science and Technology Studies, University of Leiden, cover only the publications that include WoS identification in the TUHAT-RIS.

Traditional bibliometrics are seldom relevant in humanities and social sciences because the international comparable databases do not store every type of high quality research publications, such as books and monographs and scientific journals in other languages than English. The Helsinki University Library has done analysis to the RCs, if their publications were not well represented in the Web of Science databases (RCs should have at least 50 publications and internal coverage of publications more than 40%) – it meant 58 RCs. The bibliometric material for the evaluation panels was available in June 2011. The RC-specific bibliometric reports are attached at the end of each report.

The panels were provided with the evaluation material and all other necessary background information, such as the basic information about the University of Helsinki and the Finnish higher education system.

Evaluation material
1. Registration documents of the RCs for the background information
2. Self evaluation material – answers to the evaluation questions
3. Publications and other scientific activities based on the TUHAT RIS:
   3.1. statistics of publications
   3.2. list of publications
   3.3. statistics of other scientific activities
   3.4. list of other scientific activities
4. Bibliometrics and comparable analyses:
   4.1. Analyses of publications based on the verification of TUHAT-RIS publications with the Web of Science publications (CWTS/University of Leiden)
   4.2. Publication statistics analysed by the Helsinki University Library - mainly for humanities and social sciences
5. University level survey on doctoral training (August 2011)
6. University level analysis on publications 2005–2010 (August 2011) provided by CWTS/University of Leiden

Background material

University of Helsinki
- Basic information about the University of the Helsinki
- The structure of doctoral training at the University of Helsinki
- Previous evaluations of research at the University of Helsinki – links to the reports: 1998 and 2005

The Finnish Universities/Research Institutes
- Finnish University system
- Evaluation of the Finnish National Innovation System
- The State and Quality of Scientific Research in Finland. Publication of the Academy of Finland 9/09.

The evaluation panels were provided also with other relevant material on request before the meetings in Helsinki.
1.6 Evaluation questions and material

The participating RCs answered the following evaluation questions which are presented according to the evaluation form. In addition, TUHAT RIS was used to provide the additional material as explained. For giving the feedback to the RCs, the panellists received the evaluation feedback form constructed in line with the evaluation questions:

1. Focus and quality of the RC’s research
   - Description of
     - the RC’s research focus.
     - the quality of the RC’s research (incl. key research questions and results)
     - the scientific significance of the RC’s research in the research field(s)
   - Identification of the ways to strengthen the focus and improve the quality of the RC’s research

The additional material: TUHAT compilation of the RC’s publications, analysis of the RC’s publications data (provided by University of Leiden and the Helsinki University Library)
A written feedback from the aspects of: scientific quality, scientific significance, societal impact, innovativeness
   - Strengths
   - Areas of development
   - Other remarks
   - Recommendations

Numeric evaluation: OUTSTANDING (5), EXCELLENT (4), VERY GOOD (3), GOOD (2), SUFFICIENT (1)

2. Practises and quality of doctoral training
   - Organising of the doctoral training in the RC. Description of the RC’s principles for:
     - recruitment and selection of doctoral candidates
     - supervision of doctoral candidates
     - collaboration with faculties, departments/institutes, and potential graduate schools/doctoral programmes
     - good practises and quality assurance in doctoral training
     - assuring of good career perspectives for the doctoral candidates/fresh doctorates
   - Identification of the RC’s strengths and challenges related to the practises and quality of doctoral training, and the actions planned for their development.

The additional material: TUHAT compilation of the RC’s other scientific activities/supervision of doctoral dissertations
A written feedback from the aspects of: processes and good practices related to leadership and management
   - Strengths
   - Areas of development
   - Other remarks
   - Recommendations

Numeric evaluation: OUTSTANDING (5), EXCELLENT (4), VERY GOOD (3), GOOD (2), SUFFICIENT (1)

3. The societal impact of research and doctoral training
   - Description on how the RC interacts with and contributes to the society (collaboration with public, private and/or 3rd sector).
   - Identification of the ways to strengthen the societal impact of the RC’s research and doctoral training.

The additional material: TUHAT compilation of the RC’s other scientific activities.
A written feedback from the aspects of: societal impact, national and international collaboration, innovativeness
   - Strengths
   - Areas of development
   - Other remarks
   - Recommendations

Numeric evaluation: OUTSTANDING (5), EXCELLENT (4), VERY GOOD (3), GOOD (2), SUFFICIENT (1)
4. International and national (incl. intersectoral) research collaboration and researcher mobility

- Description of
  - the RC’s research collaborations and joint doctoral training activities
  - how the RC has promoted researcher mobility
- Identification of the RC’s strengths and challenges related to research collaboration and researcher mobility, and the actions planned for their development.

A written feedback from the aspects of: scientific quality, national and international collaboration

- Strengths
- Areas of development
- Other remarks
- Recommendations

Numeric evaluation: OUTSTANDING (5), EXCELLENT (4), VERY GOOD (3), GOOD (2), SUFFICIENT (1)

5. Operational conditions

- Description of the operational conditions in the RC’s research environment (e.g. research infrastructure, balance between research and teaching duties).
- Identification of the RC’s strengths and challenges related to operational conditions, and the actions planned for their development.

A written feedback from the aspects of: processes and good practices related to leadership and management

- Strengths
- Areas of development
- Other remarks
- Recommendations

6. Leadership and management in the researcher community

- Description of
  - the execution and processes of leadership in the RC
  - how the management-related responsibilities and roles are distributed in the RC
  - how the leadership- and management-related processes support
    - high quality research
    - collaboration between principal investigators and other researchers in the RC
    - the RC’s research focus
    - strengthening of the RC’s know-how
- Identification of the RC’s strengths and challenges related to leadership and management, and the actions planned for developing the processes

7. External competitive funding of the RC

- The RCs were asked to provide information of such external competitive funding, where:
  - the funding decisions have been made during 1.1.2005–31.12.2010, and
  - the administrator of the funding is/has been the University of Helsinki
- On the e-form the RCs were asked to provide:
  1) The relevant funding source(s) from a given list (Academy of Finland/Research Council, TEKES/The Finnish Funding Agency for Technology and Innovation, EU, ERC, foundations, other national funding organisations, other international funding organisations), and
  2) The total sum of funding which the organisation in question had decided to allocate to the RCs members during 1.1.2005–31.12.2010.

Competitive funding reported in the text is also to be considered when evaluating this point.

A written feedback from the aspects of: scientific quality, scientific significance, societal impact, innovativeness, future significance

- Strengths
- Areas of development
- Other remarks
- Recommendations

8. The RC’s strategic action plan for 2011–2013

- RC’s description of their future perspectives in relation to research and doctoral training.

A written feedback from the aspects of: scientific quality, scientific significance, societal impact, processes and good practices related to leadership and management, national and international collaboration, innovativeness, future significance

- Strengths
- Areas of development
9. Evaluation of the category of the RC in the context of entity of the evaluation material (1-8)

The RC’s fitness to the chosen participation category
A written feedback evaluating the RC’s fitness to the chosen participation category
- Strengths
- Areas of development
- Other remarks
- Recommendations

Numeric evaluation: OUTSTANDING (5), EXCELLENT (4), VERY GOOD (3), GOOD (2), SUFFICIENT (1)

10. Short description of how the RC members contributed the compilation of the stage 2 material
Comments on the compilation of evaluation material

11. How the UH’s focus areas are presented in the RC’s research?
Comments if applicable

12. RC-specific main recommendations based on the previous questions 1-11

13. RC-specific conclusions

1.7 Evaluation criteria

The panellists were expected to give evaluative and analytical feedback to each evaluation question according to their aspects in order to describe and justify the quality of the submitted material. In addition, the evaluation feedback was asked to be pointed out the level of the performance according to the following classifications:
- outstanding (5)
- excellent (4)
- very good (3)
- good (2)
- sufficient (1)

Evaluation according to the criteria was to be made with thorough consideration of the entire evaluation material of the RC in question. Finally, in questions 1-4 and 9, the panellists were expected to classify their written feedback into one of the provided levels (the levels included respective descriptions, ‘criteria’). Some panels used decimals in marks. The descriptive level was interpreted according to the integers and not rounding up the decimals by the editors.

Description of criteria levels

Question 1 – FOCUS AND QUALITY OF THE RC’S RESEARCH

Classification: Criteria (level of procedures and results)

Outstanding quality of procedures and results (5)
Outstandingly strong research, also from international perspective. Attracts great international interest with a wide impact, including publications in leading journals and/or monographs published by leading international publishing houses. The research has world leading qualities. The research focus, key research questions scientific significance, societal impact and innovativeness are of outstanding quality.

In cases where the research is of a national character and, in the judgement of the evaluators, should remain so, the concepts of “international attention” or “international impact” etc. in the grading criteria above may be replaced by “international comparability”. 
Operations and procedures are of outstanding quality, transparent and shared in the community. The improvement of research and other efforts are documented and operations and practices are in alignment with the documentation. The ambition to develop the community together is of outstanding quality.

**Excellent quality of procedures and results (4)**

Research of excellent quality. Typically published with great impact, also internationally. Without doubt, the research has a leading position in its field in Finland.

Operations and procedures are of excellent quality, transparent and shared in the community. The improvement of research and other efforts are documented and operations and practices are to large extent in alignment with the documentation. The ambition to develop the community together is of excellent quality.

**Very good quality of procedures and results (3)**

The research is of such very good quality that it attracts wide national and international attention.

Operations and procedures are of very good quality, transparent and shared in the community. The improvement of research and other efforts are documented and operations and practices are to large extent in alignment with the documentation. The ambition to develop the community together is of very good quality.

**Good quality of procedures and results (2)**

Good research attracting mainly national attention but possessing international potential, extraordinarily high relevance may motivate good research.

Operations and procedures are of good quality, shared occasionally in the community. The improvement of research and other efforts are occasionally documented and operations and practices are to large extent in alignment with the documentation. The ambition to develop the community together is of good quality.

**Sufficient quality of procedures and results (1)**

In some cases the research is insufficient and reports do not gain wide circulation or do not have national or international attention. Research activities should be revised.

Operations and procedures are of sufficient quality, shared occasionally in the community. The improvement of research and other efforts are occasionally documented and operations and practices are to some extent in alignment with the documentation. The ambition to develop the community together is of sufficient quality.

**Classification: Criteria (level of procedures and results)**

**Outstanding quality of procedures and results (5)**

Procedures are of outstanding quality, transparent and shared in the community. The practices and quality of doctoral training/societal impact/international and national collaboration/leadership and management are documented and operations and practices are in alignment with the documentation. The ambition to develop the community together is of outstanding quality. The procedures and results are regularly evaluated and the feedback has an effect on the planning.

**Excellent quality of procedures and results (4)**

Procedures are of excellent quality, transparent and shared in the community. The practices and quality of doctoral training/societal impact/international and national collaboration/leadership and management are documented and operations and practices are to large extent in alignment with the documentation. The ambition to develop the community together is of excellent quality. The procedures and outcomes are evaluated and the feedback has an effect on the planning.

**Very good quality of procedures and results (3)**

Procedures are of very good quality, transparent and shared in the community. The practices and quality of doctoral training/societal impact/international and national collaboration/leadership and
management are documented and operations and practices are to large extent in alignment with the
documentation. The ambition to develop the community together is of very good quality.

**Good quality of procedures and results (2)**

Procedures are of good quality, shared occasionally in the community. The practices and quality of
doctoral training/societal impact/international and national collaboration/leadership and
management are documented and operations and practices are to large extent in alignment with the
documentation. The ambition to develop the community together is of good quality.

**Sufficient quality of procedures and results (1)**

Procedures are of sufficient quality, transparent and shared in the community. The practices and
quality of doctoral training/societal impact/international and national collaboration/leadership and
management are occasionally documented and operations and practices are to some extent in
alignment with the documentation. The ambition to develop the community together is of sufficient
quality.

**Question 9 – CATEGORY**

Participation category – fitness for the category chosen

The choice and justification for the chosen category below should be reflected in the RC’s responses to the
evaluation questions 1–8.

1. *The research of the participating community represents the international cutting edge in its field.*
2. *The research of the participating community is of high quality, but the community in its present
composition has yet to achieve strong international recognition or a clear break-through.*
3. *The research of the participating community is distinct from mainstream research, and the special
features of the research tradition in the field must be considered in the evaluation.* The research is
of high quality and has great significance and impact in its field. However, the generally used
research evaluation methods do not necessarily shed sufficient light on the merits of the
research.
4. *The research of the participating community represents an innovative opening.* A new opening can
be an innovative combination of research fields, or it can be proven to have a special social,
national or international demand or other significance. Even if the researcher community in its
present composition has yet to obtain proof of international success, its members can produce
convincing evidence of the high level of their previous research.
5. *The research of the participating community has a highly significant societal impact.* The
participating researcher community is able to justify the high social significance of its research.
The research may relate to national legislation, media visibility or participation in social debate,
or other activities promoting social development and human welfare. In addition to having
societal impact, the research must be of a high standard.

**An example of outstanding fitness for category choice (5)**

The RC’s representation and argumentation for the chosen category were convincing. The RC recognized
its real capacity and apparent outcomes in a wider context to the research communities. The specific
character of the RC was well-recognized and well stated in the responses. The RC fitted optimally for the
category.

- Outstanding (5)
- Excellent (4)
- Very good (3)
- Good (2)
- Sufficient (1)

The above-mentioned definition of outstanding was only an example in order to assist the panellists in
the positioning of the classification. There was no exact definition for the category fitness.

---

5 The panels discussed the category fitness and made the final conclusions of the interpretation of it.
1.8 Timetable of the evaluation

The main timetable of the evaluation:

1. Registration  
   November 2010
2. Submission of self-evaluation materials  
   January–February 2011
3. External peer review  
   May–September 2011
4. Published reports  
   March–April 2012
   - University level public report
   - RC specific reports

The entire evaluation was implemented during the university’s strategy period 2010–2012. The preliminary results were available for the planning of the following strategy period in late autumn 2011. The evaluation reports will be published in March/April 2012. More detailed time schedule is published in the University report.

1.9 Evaluation feedback – consensus of the entire panel

The panellists evaluated all the RC-specific material before the meetings in Helsinki and mailed the draft reports to the evaluation office. The latest interim versions were on-line available to all the panellists on the Wiki-sites. In September 2011, in Helsinki the panels discussed the material, revised the first draft reports and decided the final numeric evaluation. After the meetings in Helsinki, the panels continued working and finalised the reports before the end of November 2011. The final RC-specific reports are the consensus of the entire panel.

The evaluation reports were written by the panels independently. During the editing process, the evaluation office requested some clarifications from the panels when necessary. The tone and style in the reports were not harmonized in the editing process. All the reports follow the original texts written by the panels as far as it was possible.

The original evaluation material of the RCs, provided for the panellists is attached at the end of the report. It is essential to notice that the exported lists of publications and other scientific activities depend how the data was stored in the TUHAT-RIS by the RCs.
2 Evaluation feedback

2.1 Focus and quality of the RC’s research

- Description of
  - the RC’s research focus
  - the quality of the RC’s research (incl. key research questions and results)
  - the scientific significance of the RC’s research in the research field(s)
- Identification of the ways to strengthen the focus and improve the quality of the RC’s research

ASPECTS: Scientific quality, scientific significance, societal impact, innovativeness

The research of KUMU, an interdisciplinary research unit, is concentrated on studying various aspects of the transformations of the Finnish consumer society after World War II. It consists of consumer researchers of the consumer economics unit (in Viikki) and researchers in social history.

Considering the vast area of consumer behavior research, the focus is somewhat narrow, which can be regarded also as a strength, the research is coherent and (well-focused). Nevertheless, a wider perspective including comparisons with other consumer societies and present-day consumer problems could be useful.

The problem with focusing on the historical development in Finland is that the research conducted at KUMU may not have much impact on consumer research in general. This conclusion is evident from the publication record of KUMU. A majority of articles are in Finnish, and only few of the ones in English articles have been published in high-quality journals. The focus being on the Finnish consumer society and Finnish data leads naturally to publishing in Finnish. Although the publications are of high quality, they do not have the same value in the evaluation processes as international publications.

On the other hand, the research community has been founded rather recently, and the effort of creating doctoral dissertations in the field has been given the first priority. In this the community has been successful.

Judging from their titles, the published research papers seem to be more of sociological than economic nature. This is understandable since both professors of the community have an origin in social history.

It appears that quantitative analyses have not been common. The reasons for this are not evident in the evaluation material. Perhaps one reason is the recent popularity of qualitative, interpretative studies in consumer behaviour research in general, as well as the fact that Foucaultian or other constructive approaches and qualitative studies of everyday life phenomena have gained popularity in the social history.

A stronger focus on quantitative research would probably improve the quality of research and increase the international visibility of KUMU. Besides, the group could pay more attention to the typical difficulty of interdisciplinary research in general, namely, that studies often lack a coherent theoretical base and remain descriptive.

Numeric evaluation: 3 (Very good)

2.2 Practises and quality of doctoral training

- Organising of the doctoral training in the RC. Description of the RC’s principles for:
  - recruitment and selection of doctoral candidates
  - supervision of doctoral candidates
  - collaboration with faculties, departments/institutes, and potential graduate schools/doctoral programmes
  - good practises and quality assurance in doctoral training
  - assuring of good career perspectives for the doctoral candidates/fresh doctorates
• Identification of the RC’s strengths and challenges related to the practises and quality of doctoral training, and the actions planned for their development.
• Additional material: TUHAT compilation of the RC’s other scientific activities/supervision of doctoral dissertations

ASPECTS: Processes and good practices related to leadership and management

Due to its small size, KUMU (or its background institutes) does not have a well structured PhD program and recruitment procedures. There is no mention of any courses common to all doctoral students.

Nevertheless, it seems that supervision of students is very well organized and every student has a personal supervisor. The positive side of the small community is that doctoral students are well integrated in the research community and have tight relationships with the advisors.

The role of seminars by members of KUMU and visiting scholars in PhD education is emphasized. These are, however, not likely to compensate for the lack of PhD courses in (consumer) economics, consumer behaviour theory, and social science methodology which would give a common basis for students coming from different disciplines.

Some PhD students are studying part-time while working to earn their living. This is very inefficient and has a negative effect on the quality of the dissertation. Lack of funds is given as the reason for this state of things, but the question is whether it is sensible to admit students who cannot be funded in full. However, it seems to be a common feature of the Finnish doctoral education that, especially in the beginning of studies, full-time financing is rare.

Lack of coursework could be partly remedied by collaborating with economists or/and consumer studies in marketing. Some of their courses (e.g. microeconomics, statistical research methods, consumer behavior theory) could be quite useful for students in consumer economy and strengthen the quantitative skills of the students. The doctoral program should cover also other than social and historic aspects of consumption at a micro level.

Numeric evaluation: 4 (Excellent)

2.3 The societal impact of research and doctoral training

• Description on how the RC interacts with and contributes to the society (collaboration with public, private and/or 3rd sector).
• Identification of the ways to strengthen the societal impact of the RC’s research and doctoral training.
• Additional material: TUHAT compilation of the RC’s other scientific activities.

ASPECTS: Societal impact, national and international collaboration, innovativeness

Many KUMU members work at Statistics Finland and contribute to the society through their work there. Contacts with the National Consumer Research Centre can also be mentioned here and KUMU’s leader has been active collaborator in consumer policy issues in several trust positions.

KUMU members have been writing popular books on the aspects of consumer society, which can be deemed a useful activity, although its impact may be hard to measure. References to or public awareness and debates of the books could be used as indicators.

Consultations are not mentioned as an area in which KUMU members are contributing to the society. In principle, consumer economists could be useful as consultants in various situations related to consumption of items such as alcohol, tobacco and medicines or other regulation, competition issues, consumer protection, etc. This type of activity could play a role in future activities of KUMU and also be a vehicle for obtaining funds for research and teaching doctoral students.

The small size and rather narrow focus of KUMU have obviously prevented an increase in the societal relevance and media visibility of the RC, which could for example include commenting on present macroeconomic and social trends in consumption and consumer mentalities.

Numeric evaluation: 3 (Very good)
2.4 International and national (incl. intersectoral) research collaboration and researcher mobility

- **Description of**
  - the RC’s research collaborations and joint doctoral training activities
  - how the RC has promoted researcher mobility
- **Identification of the RC’s strengths and challenges related to research collaboration and researcher mobility, and the actions planned for their development.**

**ASPECTS: Scientific quality, national and international collaboration**

Seminars by visiting scholars and participation in international workshops and conferences are indicated as main forms of international collaboration.

The report claims that KUMU has excellent international and national networks. There is, however, no mention of joint research projects with international research groups of centres of consumer research. This shows that KUMU perhaps does not make full use of its international networks. Research on comparing various aspects of emerging consumer societies, for example Scandinavian ones, could be a place to start.

**Numeric evaluation: 2 (Good)**

2.5 Operational conditions

- **Description of the operational conditions in the RC’s research environment (e.g. research infrastructure, balance between research and teaching duties).**
- **Identification of the RC’s strengths and challenges related to operational conditions, and the actions planned for their development.**

**ASPECTS: Processes and good practices related to leadership and management**

Leaders of KUMU (only two professors, one in consumer economics, one in social history) have a heavy teaching load and plenty of administration. The University should find ways of alleviating the problem, so that the professors would have more time for research and supervision and improve the quality of research in their areas of interest.

Since KUMU and the consumer economics unit is one of the few places in Finland which educates in consumer theory and research, it would urgently need additional professor-level resources both in economics and consumer behavioral sciences such consumer psychology.

This would improve both the theory development and the societal relevance of consumer research in Finland. As it is now, the consumer economics unit is far too small to reach a critical mass of researchers and cover a broader area of consumer economics. Consumer economics is socially highly relevant area for which there exist for the moment no other university unit that could concentrate on the doctoral education.

University of Helsinki as the only comprehensive university in Finland should pay attention to this. It is rational to invest in this kind of established, well-working research units by increasing their resources and possibilities to real interdisciplinary work.

2.6 Leadership and management in the researcher community

- **Description of**
  - the execution and processes of leadership in the RC
  - how the management-related responsibilities and roles are distributed in the RC
  - how the leadership- and management-related processes support
    - high quality research
    - collaboration between principal investigators and other researchers in the RC
• the RC’s research focus
• strengthening of the RC’s know-how

Identification of the RC’s strengths and challenges related to leadership and management, and the actions planned for developing the processes

**ASPECTS:** Processes and good practices related to leadership and management

The management structure is light because KUMU is small. Most issues can be handled informally without a hierarchy for decision-making, which can be seen as a strength. The best recommendation is to keep things as they are.

### 2.7 External competitive funding of the RC

• The RCs were asked to provide information of such external competitive funding, where:
  • the funding decisions have been made during 1.1.2005–31.12.2010, and
  • the administrator of the funding is/has been the University of Helsinki

• On the e-form the RCs were asked to provide:
  1) The relevant funding source(s) from a given list (Academy of Finland/Research Council, TEKES/The Finnish Funding Agency for Technology and Innovation, EU, ERC, foundations, other national funding organisations, other international funding organizations), and
  2) The total sum of funding which the organisation in question had decided to allocate to the RCs members during 1.1.2005–31.12.2010.

**Competitive funding reported in the text is also to be considered when evaluating this point.**

**ASPECTS:** Scientific quality, scientific significance, societal impact, innovativeness and future significance

KUMU has been able to attract funds from the Academy of Finland, TEKES, and private foundations. Given the size of the centre, the sums are quite substantial (by Finnish standards).

For obvious reasons, no EU funds have been obtained. Getting international financing would require broadening the focus of research and starting active research collaboration with international researchers and centers. This has not yet been done due to the very limited human resources. To give an example, the number of post-doctoral researchers who could commit themselves to international projects, is very small.

### 2.8 The RC’s strategic action plan for 2011–2013

• RC’s description of their future perspectives in relation to research and doctoral training.

**ASPECTS:** Scientific quality, scientific significance, societal impact, processes and good practices related to leadership and management, national and international collaboration, innovativeness, future significance

The action plan mentions broadly many good things such as making research results internationally available by publishing them in good journals and continuing PhD education. However, no precise goals e.g. in the form of the number of articles per person in high-quality journals, or the number and time table of finished doctoral dissertations are not proposed. Neither is there any mention of fields (theoretical or practical) that would need more attention in the future.

KUMU has only recently combined its social science-oriented consumer economics with the resources of social history. This has been a useful step forward in order to reach the size of a critical mass. However, other collaborative efforts should follow as well. Especially important collaborators could be found in economic sciences but also in several quantitatively oriented behavioral sciences (e.g. nutrition science, consumer psychology, consumer marketing). The collaboration could start by organizing joint doctoral courses in these disciplines.

Moreover, a weakness is that there are no plans to make use of the excellent international networks to broaden the scope of the research and thereby raise the level of the research conducted at KUMU to an
international level. Strengthening the international relations is mentioned as priority, but it is not clear what that might mean in practice.

2.9 Evaluation of the category of the RC in the context of entity of the evaluation material (1-8)

The RC’s fitness to the chosen participation category.
Category 3. The research of the participating community is distinct from mainstream research, and the special features of the research tradition in the field must be considered in the evaluation.

KUMU has placed itself in category 3, which is an excellent fit because of the multidisciplinary character of the research field and the small size of the unit, which should be taken into consideration.
   Numeric evaluation: 5 (Outstanding)

2.10 Short description of how the RC members contributed the compilation of the stage 2 material

2.11 How the UH’s focus areas are presented in the RC’s research

Focus area 10: Globalisation and social change

2.12 RC-specific main recommendations

To sum up, KUMU’s main benefit is that it has a clearly defined and coherent research focus and it has not committed itself to too many other research tasks and too much consultancy that would take up all the research time. However, in the future it has to find new interest areas and theoretical approaches outside the present ones in order to gain international recognition and fulfill societal problem solving needs related to consumption.
   Suggestions to be considered by KUMU in the future:
   • FOCUS
   Gradually expand the problem focus from the historic analysis of the Finnish society. Moreover, the theory base and methodological approaches and know-how need some broadening. This can be done by recruiting personnel and doctoral students from several disciplines including economics.
   • PUBLISHING ACTIVITY
   Consider defining somewhat more specific goals for international publishing. Even if publishing of dissertations takes place in the form of Finnish monographs or books, each doctor should also publish his/her results in internationally renowned journals.
   • DOCTORAL PROGRAM
   Develop the yearly recruitment procedure and selection of doctoral candidates, and design a more structured doctoral program with obligatory courses in basic theory and methodology for every accepted student. This is important since doctoral students come from many disciplines and may have no basic education in economic consumer theory and methodology. This can be done in cooperation with other institutes in economic sciences and/or other established consumer research traditions.
   • STRATEGY
List the future research areas that need attention in the next evaluation period. State more precise goals for publication activity (number, quality) and the number of dissertations. They need not be strictly followed, but they give the researchers an idea of what is expected from them.

- **INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS**
  Develop further the international networks, e.g. in the form of common research projects, cooperation in article writing, exchange of doctoral students, or visiting PhD course lecturers.

### 2.13 RC-specific conclusions

KUMU is a successful effort to combine the research resources of consumer economics unit and social history. So far it has focused on the historical transformation of the Finnish consumer society. The quality of research is good but has internationally low impacts because too few articles have been published in high impact journals.

KUMU would need a broadening of its research interest and expertise towards comparative perspectives as well as towards several present-day problems of the consumer society. For this purpose, it definitely needs more resources in the form of professor chairs both in consumer economics and consumer behavior sciences.

As a well organized, coherent research community KUMU has good possibilities to become a leading academic unit of consumer research in more general terms than social history. However without considerable additional resources it will be difficult, because its present size is too small for that.
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NAME OF THE RESEARCHER COMMUNITY:
Transformation of the Consumer Society (KUMU)

LEADER OF THE RESEARCHER COMMUNITY:
Professor Visa Heinonen, Department of Economics and Management, Consumer Economics

RC-SPECIFIC MATERIAL FOR THE PEER REVIEW:

- Material submitted by the RC at stages 1 and 2 of the evaluation
  - STAGE 1 material: RC’s registration form (incl. list of RC participants in an excel table)
  - STAGE 2 material: RC’s answers to evaluation questions
- TUHAT compilations of the RC members’ other scientific activities 1.1.2005-31.12.2010

NB! Since Web of Science(WoS)-based bibliometrics does not provide representative results for most RCs representing humanities, social sciences and computer sciences, the publications of these RCs will be analyzed by the UH Library (results available by the end of June, 2011)
INTERNATIONAL EVALUATION OF RESEARCH AND DOCTORAL TRAINING AT THE UNIVERSITY OF HELSINKI

RC-SPECIFIC STAGE 1 MATERIAL (registration form)

1 RESPONSIBLE PERSON

Name: Heinonen, Visa
E-mail: visa.heinonen@helsinki.fi
Phone: +358-9-191 58085
Affiliation: Department of Economics and Management (Consumer Economics)
Street address: P. O. Box 27 (Latokartanonkaari 9), 00014 Helsinki, Finland

2 DESCRIPTION OF THE PARTICIPATING RESEARCHER COMMUNITY (RC)

Name of the participating RC (max. 30 characters): Transformation of the Consumer Society (Kulutusyhteiskunnan muutos, KUMU)
Acronym for the participating RC (max. 10 characters): KUMU
Description of the operational basis in 2005-2010 (eg. research collaboration, joint doctoral training activities) on which the RC was formed (MAX. 2200 characters with spaces): Our co-operation is based on shared interests between researchers in two different disciplines (Consumer Economics, Economic and Social History) to study the transformation of the Finnish consumer society in the post-war era. We have organized common research and supervision of doctoral students from the late 1990s. The co-operation started with three doctoral student grants given by the University of Helsinki.

3 SCIENTIFIC FIELDS OF THE RC

Main scientific field of the RC's research: social sciences
RC's scientific subfield 1: Social Sciences, Interdisciplinary
RC's scientific subfield 2: --Select--
RC's scientific subfield 3: --Select--
RC's scientific subfield 4: --Select--
Other, if not in the list: Consumer economics, economic and social history.

4 RC'S PARTICIPATION CATEGORY

Participation category: 3. Research of the participating community is distinct from mainstream research, and the special features of the research tradition in the field must be considered in the evaluation

Justification for the selected participation category (MAX. 2200 characters with spaces): Transformation of the Consumer Society (KUMU) research community represents genuine interdisciplinary co-operation between two subjects that are usually neglected in academic classifications of research fields. Furthermore, in the University of Helsinki these subjects are situated in different faculties in the Department of Economics and Management (Consumer Economics) and the Department of Political and Economic Studies.
INTERNATIONAL EVALUATION OF RESEARCH AND DOCTORAL TRAINING AT THE UNIVERSITY OF HELSINKI

RC-SPECIFIC STAGE 1 MATERIAL (registration form)

(Economic and Social History). In the Finnish system of higher education, both consumer economics and economic and social history are only represented at the University of Helsinki. Thus, generally used evaluation methods do not shed sufficient light on the research merits of the community.

### 5 Description of the RC’s Research and Doctoral Training

**Public description of the RC’s research and doctoral training (MAX. 2200 characters with spaces):**

Transformation of the Consumer Society (KUMU) research community has organized research and doctoral training in the form of joint post-graduate seminars, national and international workshops, research projects financed by the Finnish Academy and other organizations and funds and joint publications.

**Significance of the RC’s research and doctoral training for the University of Helsinki (MAX. 2200 characters with spaces):**

The KUMU research community produces the great majority of doctoral dissertations and a fair amount of master theses in these subjects. Consumer economics is the only major subject in Finland, where students can graduate in consumer studies as a major at the university level. KUMU is also a rare case of co-operation over faculty boundaries.

**Keywords:** Consumer studies, interdisciplinary research, consumer society, study of social change, consumerism

### 6 Quality of RC’s Research and Doctoral Training

**Justified estimate of the quality of the RC’s research and doctoral training at national and international level during 2005-2010 (MAX. 2200 characters with spaces):**

The research and doctoral training has been successful and innovative. The justification for this is the amount doctoral theses and the considerable share of international post-graduate students. Co-operation with leading international scholars in the field has raised the level of supervision of doctoral students in our seminars. The interdisciplinary nature of this co-operation has been valuable for our work. KUMU is also a rare example of co-operation over faculty borders and we have been able to share our experiences to other subjects in our faculties.

**Comments on how the RC’s scientific productivity and doctoral training should be evaluated (MAX. 2200 characters with spaces):**

It is evident that the interdisciplinary nature of our research group makes the evaluation of our work a demanding task. Obviously, it cannot be evaluated by traditional historians or pure main-stream economists. Because of the rarity of both disciplines and the cultural significance of the research for national self-understanding, research publications written both in domestic and foreign languages must be evaluated. Besides academic publications our research community has published also joint collections of articles aimed at wider audience.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Last name</th>
<th>First name</th>
<th>PI-status (TUHAT, 29.11.2010)</th>
<th>Title of research and teaching personnel</th>
<th>Affiliation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ahlqvist</td>
<td>Kirsti</td>
<td>Doctoral candidate</td>
<td>Statistics Finland</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frisk</td>
<td>Matleena</td>
<td>Doctoral candidate</td>
<td>Social Sciences, Dept. Of Political and Economic Studies</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Autio</td>
<td>Jaakko</td>
<td>Doctoral candidate</td>
<td>Social Sciences, Dept. Of Political and Economic Studies</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kilpiö</td>
<td>Kaarina</td>
<td>University researcher</td>
<td>Social Sciences, Dept. Of Political and Economic Studies</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kortti</td>
<td>Jukka</td>
<td>Senior researcher</td>
<td>Social Sciences, Dept. Of Political and Economic Studies</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kuusi</td>
<td>Hanna</td>
<td>University researcher</td>
<td>Social Sciences, Dept. Of Political and Economic Studies</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kaartinen</td>
<td>Aija</td>
<td>Doctoral candidate</td>
<td>National institute for health and welfare</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matilainen</td>
<td>Riitta</td>
<td>Doctoral candidate</td>
<td>Social Sciences, Dept. Of Political and Economic Studies</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Polttoenen</td>
<td>Matti</td>
<td>x Professor</td>
<td>Social Sciences, Dept. Of Political and Economic Studies</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poikolainen</td>
<td>Janne</td>
<td>Doctoral candidate</td>
<td>Social Sciences, Dept. Of Political and Economic Studies</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Huokuna</td>
<td>Tiina</td>
<td>Doctoral candidate/University researcher</td>
<td>Social Sciences, Dept. Of Political and Economic Studies</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Autio</td>
<td>Minna</td>
<td>x University Lecturer</td>
<td>Agriculture and Forestry, dept. of Economics and Management</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heinonen</td>
<td>Visa</td>
<td>x Professor</td>
<td>Agriculture and Forestry, dept. of Economics and Management</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hossain</td>
<td>Motaher Md.</td>
<td>Doctoral Candidate</td>
<td>Agriculture and Forestry, dept. of Economics and Management</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Huittunen</td>
<td>Kaisa</td>
<td>Doctoral Candidate</td>
<td>Agriculture and Forestry, dept. of Economics and Management</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jakosuo</td>
<td>Katri</td>
<td>Doctoral Candidate</td>
<td>Agriculture and Forestry, dept. of Economics and Management</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lorek</td>
<td>Sylvia</td>
<td>Doctoral Candidate</td>
<td>Agriculture and Forestry, dept. of Economics and Management</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lähteenmaa</td>
<td>Jaana</td>
<td>researcher</td>
<td>Agriculture and Forestry, dept. of Economics and Management</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mäki</td>
<td>Sari</td>
<td>Doctoral Candidate</td>
<td>Agriculture and Forestry, dept. of Economics and Management</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raijas</td>
<td>Anu</td>
<td>University Lecturer</td>
<td>Agriculture and Forestry, dept. of Economics and Management</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rynnänen</td>
<td>Toni</td>
<td>x Postdoctoral Researcher</td>
<td>Agriculture and Forestry, dept. of Economics and Management</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strand</td>
<td>Teija</td>
<td>researcher</td>
<td>Agriculture and Forestry, dept. of Economics and Management</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wahlen</td>
<td>Stefan</td>
<td>Doctoral Candidate</td>
<td>Agriculture and Forestry, dept. of Economics and Management</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Niiva</td>
<td>Mari</td>
<td>Researcher</td>
<td>National Consumer Research Center</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
INTERNATIONAL EVALUATION OF RESEARCH AND DOCTORAL TRAINING AT THE UNIVERSITY OF HELSINKI

RC-SPECIFIC STAGE 2 MATERIAL

BACKGROUND INFORMATION

Name of the RC’s responsible person: HEINONEN, VISA
E-mail of the RC’s responsible person: visa.heinonen@helsinki.fi

Name and acronym of the participating RC: Transformation of the Consumer Society, KUMU

The RC’s research represents the following key focus area of UH: 10. Globalisaatio ja yhteiskunnan muutos – Globalisation and social change

Comments for selecting/not selecting the key focus area: The emergence of the consumer society is a major aspect in societal development in the contemporary history of the modern world. Globalisation is also one aspect of our research community as many of our doctoral students come from abroad (e.g. Germany and Bangladesh).

FOCUS AND QUALITY OF RC’S RESEARCH (MAX. 8800 CHARACTERS WITH SPACES)

• Description of the RC’s research focus, the quality of the RC’s research (incl. key research questions and results) and the scientific significance of the RC’s research for the research field(s).

Our co-operation is based on shared interests between researchers in two different disciplines (Consumer Economics, Economic and Social History) to study the transformation of the Finnish consumer society in the post-war era. Besides general characterisation of the coming of the consumer society we have selected special themes that are common to several members of the research community. Such themes are alcohol consumption and its cultural meaning, the transformation of advertising in the age of television; youth as an emerging important new segment of consumers; the phenomenon of Finnish design in the after war period and gambling as a form of consumption. We have organized common research and supervision of doctoral students since the late 1990s. The fruitful co-operation continued with three doctoral student grants 2005-2009 given by the University of Helsinki.

The research and doctoral training has been innovative and successful. The justification for this is the amount of doctoral theses and the considerable share of international post-graduate students among them. During the assessment period 2005-2010 we have produced altogether eight doctoral dissertations (five in consumer economics: Jakosuo, Autio, Niva, Rynänen and Lorek; three in economic and social history: Kilpiö, Huokuna, Ahlqvist). At the moment there are altogether nine doctoral students participating in the work of the research community (four in consumer economics and five in economic and social history). Md. Motaher Hossain and Stefan Wahlen are going to finish their dissertations in 2011. Co-operation with leading international scholars in the field has raised the level of supervision of doctoral students in our seminars. The interdisciplinary nature of this co-operation has been valuable for our work. KUMU is also a rare example of co-operation over faculty borders and we have been able to share our experiences to other subjects in our faculties.

The key research questions have been how the Finnish consumer society has emerged and transformed. The common issues linking all the research done by the members of the community have concerned the transformation of the society towards a modern consumer society after the Second World War and a variety of special features in this process. All the partial research projects have focused on the strong role of the state as governing sector like in all the Nordic countries and especially Sweden, the development of different institutions of consumer society like distribution channels, advertising and
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media, the cultural role of youth as actors influencing the markets with its consumer behavior and overall cultural role of advertising and design as factors of the transformation.

So far, the results of the studies of our research community have been interesting and novel, because the main emphasis of the study of the Finnish society and the recent Finnish history has been clearly on other things than consumption. Thus, our research project has illuminated various fields in social, cultural and economic development like the transformation of the ethos of consumption during the decades after the Second World War, youth culture and especially the making up of consumerism in the narratives of Finnish youngsters, the strong regulatory role of the government in gambling and alcohol consumption and the experiences of television as the emerging media during the 1950’s and the 1960’s.

Our research community has both male and female members. The majority of doctoral candidates have been female researchers in our community. In this way KUMU has contributed in doctoral training and academic careers of women.

Questions relating to consumption have become lately more important both in social sciences and in historical studies. The dissertations written in our research community are an important contribution to this emerging focal area of research. The KUMU research community produces the great majority of doctoral dissertations and a fair amount of master theses in these subjects. Consumer economics is the only major subject in Finland, where students can graduate in consumer studies as a major at the university level.

• Ways to strengthen the focus and improve the quality of the RC’s research.
  Tighter coordination between the research problems of dissertations and overall research could be one way to strengthen the focus and improve the overall quality of research. Furthermore, a more active interaction between teaching in the respective subjects and the research activities in the research community could improve the focus in our work. We could also be more active in offering our results to international refereed journals.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2 PRACTISES AND QUALITY OF DOCTORAL TRAINING (MAX. 8800 CHARACTERS WITH SPACES)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• How is doctoral training organised in the RC? Description of the RC’s principles for recruitment and selection of doctoral candidates, supervision of doctoral candidates, collaboration with faculties, departments/institutes, and potential graduate schools/doctoral programmes, good practises and quality assurance in doctoral training, and assuring good career perspectives for the doctoral candidates/fresh doctorates.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Transformation of the Consumer Society (KUMU) research community represents genuine interdisciplinary co-operation between two subjects that are usually neglected in academic classifications of research fields. Furthermore, in the University of Helsinki these subjects are situated in different faculties in the Department of Economics and Management (Consumer Economics) and the Department of Political and Economic Studies (Economic and Social History). In the Finnish system of higher education, both consumer economics and economic and social history are only represented at the University of Helsinki. Research of the participating community is distinct from mainstream research, and the special features of the research tradition in the field must be considered in the evaluation.
Recruitment of doctoral candidates has been carried out by open call for applications and the selection has been made based on research plans and other merits.

Co-operation with National Consumer Research Centre, other universities and polytechnics, and Finnish consumer authorities has made the environment of consumer studies and consumer administration familiar to our doctoral candidates. Besides, guaranteeing the high quality of doctoral dissertations written in our research community makes it easier to fresh doctorates to continue their career. Transformation of the Consumer Society (KUMU) research community has organized research and doctoral training in the form of joint post-graduate seminars, national and international workshops, research projects financed by the Finnish Academy and other organizations and funds and joint publications.

The supervision of the doctoral candidates participating KUMU research community is carried out both in the regular post-graduate seminars of consumer economics and economic and social history and own seminars organized by the research community for its members (KUMU seminars). Besides, supervisors have been nominated to every post-graduate student. National and international top level scholars (Research Professor Mika Pantzar, Aalto University & National Consumer Research Centre, Professor Emerita Anne Murcott, UK, and Professor Frank Trentmann, UK) have participated some of the seminars organized by the research community. Doctoral candidates have been encouraged to present their research in suitable seminars and conferences both in Finland and abroad to receive feedback from wider circle of scholars. All these practices – supervision by professors of the subject and visiting specialists, participation in many seminars – have shown to be good practices of doctoral training. Besides, the doctoral students in our research community have conducted by themselves a reading seminar for classical texts in consumption research. More research funding and resources could allow us to continue these good practices in the future.

Co-operation with Kulutustutkimuksen Seura (Finnish Association of Consumer Research) has been very fruitful. Several members of the KUMU community have served as members of the board of the association and participated in editing the journal Kulutustutkimus. Nyt that is the peer reviewed national journal of consumer researchers. The journal offers a good forum for post-graduate students and other scholars for presenting their research to the Finnish audience of consumer researchers. It has been an encouraging experience for many doctoral students to publish first in Finnish peer reviewed journal and then in the international arena. Thus, we think that a national journal is a good practice in supporting the publishing activity of doctoral candidates and forms a means to reach the Finnish audience.

- RC’s strengths and challenges related to the practises and quality of doctoral training, and the actions planned for their development.

The short-term nature and scarcity of funding have been our main problems in doctoral training. Some of the doctoral candidates have been forced to earn their living while preparing the dissertation. The more active role of the university in funding its own doctoral candidates could be an improvement in this regard.
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3 SOCIETAL IMPACT OF RESEARCH AND DOCTORAL TRAINING (MAX. 4400 CHARACTERS WITH SPACES)

- Description of how the RC interacts with and contributes to the society (collaboration with public, private and/or 3rd sector).
  We have reached the wider audience by publishing several anthologies aimed at wider circle of readers and a textbook of consumer economics: Arkinen kumous (Revolution in Everyday Life), eds. Peltonen, Kurkela & Heinonen (2003); Kuluttajaekonomia – kotitalous ja kulutus (Consumer Economics – household and consumption), eds. Heinonen, Rajjas et al. (2005); Vaikuttamista ja valintoja (Influencing and Choices) eds. Heinonen & Kortti (2007); Televisiosta digiboksiin (From Television to the Digital Converter Box), Kortti (2007); Alkoholin vuosisata (The Century of Alcohol), Peltonen, Kilpiö & Kuusi (2006); Suomalainen muotoilu (Finnish Design), I-III, eds. Peltonen et al. (2008-2009), e.g.
  Our research community has very close collaboration with the National Consumer Research Centre. Several members of our research community work there and Statistics Finland. Professor Visa Heinonen is the chairman of the board of the National Consumer Research Centre. We have also contributed in many ways to the popularization of science being interviewed in the media, giving public lectures for example in Tieteen päivät (Days of Science).
  The members of the research community have published articles in the yearbook of the National Consumer Research Centre.

- Ways to strengthen the societal impact of the RC’s research and doctoral training.
  We should continue to encourage the young doctoral students and post-doctoral researchers to present their research results to other experts and the wider audience.

4 INTERNATIONAL AND NATIONAL (INCL. INTERSECTORAL) RESEARCH COLLABORATION AND RESEARCHER MOBILITY (MAX. 4400 CHARACTERS WITH SPACES)

- Description of the RC’s research collaborations and joint doctoral training activities and how the RC has promoted researcher mobility.
  We have organized seminars and workshops, where distinguished international top-level specialists have participated as guests and commentators. In autumn 2006 we organized in collaboration with German scholars and Finland-Institut a seminar in Berlin. Professor Emerita Anne Murcott (University of Nottingham, UK) visited our seminar in the spring 2008 and 2009 and Professor Frank Trentmann (University of London, UK) visited as quest lecturer in autumn 2007 and 2008. Several of our doctoral candidates are from abroad, for instance from Germany and Bangladesh. Our doctoral students participate actively in international conferences of their special fields. Members of our research community participated actively in creating and carrying out a special session on consumption in 21st International Congress of Historical Sciences in Amsterdam 2010.
  In addition several members of our research community actively participated besides giving papers the organization of the Nordic Consumer Policy Research Conference organized in Helsinki, October 3–5 2007. During the conference we organized a separate session for our doctoral students with Professor Frank Trentmann.
Members of our research community have participated the founding of Kulutustutkimuksen Seura (Finnish Association of Consumer Research) in 2001, its journal Kulutustutkimus.nyt (Consumer Research. Now) and actively participated as members of its board.

- **RC’s strengths and challenges related to research collaboration and researcher mobility, and the actions planned for their development.**
  We have excellent international and national networks of collaboration. The main problem so far has been the financing the visits of international guests. Besides collaboration networks another strength is the active participation of doctoral candidates in international seminars, workshops and conferences. The relative share of international post-graduate students in our research community has been rather large.

### 5 OPERATIONAL CONDITIONS (MAX. 4400 CHARACTERS WITH SPACES)

- **Description of the operational conditions in the RC’s research environment (e.g. research infrastructure, balance between research and teaching duties).**

  Both leaders of the research community, Professors Heinonen and Peltonen, have had heavy teaching obligations and administrative duties. The subjects consumer economics and economic and social history are situated in different campuses. In spite of the fact being situated in different the cooperation has worked well.

  The outside funding of our research community comes from different sources. The most important ones have been the Academy of Finland (during the period 2005-2010 all in all 512 810 €), TEKES 78 842 €, The Ministry of Social Affairs and Health (78, 000 €) and different national foundations all in all 279 582 €. Besides that the posts for doctoral training funded by the University of Helsinki (three 4-year grants for the period 2005-2009) have been important to our work. In addition, the posts for doctoral training funded by the University of Helsinki (three 4-year grants for the period 2005-2009) have been very important to our work.

- **RC’s strengths and challenges related to operational conditions, and the actions planned for their development.**

  We need to increase the long-term funding for doctoral students (e.g. posts for doctoral training funded by the Ministry of Education and Culture and the Academy of Finland).

### 6 LEADERSHIP AND MANAGEMENT IN THE RESEARCHER COMMUNITY (MAX. 4400 CHARACTERS WITH SPACES)

- **Description of the execution and processes of leadership in the RC, how the management-related responsibilities and roles are distributed in the RC and how the leadership- and management-related processes support high quality research, collaboration between principal investigators and other researchers in the RC, the RC’s research focus and strengthening of the RC’s know-how.**

  Management tasks have been shared, not only with Professors Heinonen and Peltonen, but also with other members of the research community. Riitta Matilainen, Kaisa Huttunen and Toni Ryynänen have maintained our web-pages and coordinated the seminars. Professors Heinonen and Peltonen meet more frequently than other members of the community to discuss the activities of the research community and supervision of dissertations and to write applications for external funding. Because of the relatively small and compact size of the community, we do not need very hierarchical management system. Thus, collegial division of labour works well in our community. We see the size of the community as a strength.
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During the research project principal investigators have been writing joint papers with doctoral candidates, which has strengthened candidates' skills for academic writing, also at the international level. Furthermore, post doctoral principal investigators have been acting as a supervisor for doctoral candidates, and recently principal investigators have been creating their own research teams, which then strengthen the aims of whole project’s scientific development.

- RC’s strengths and challenges related to leadership and management, and the actions planned for developing the processes.

We could benefit from financing intensive seminars outside Helsinki (2-3 days) to be free from other obligations (teaching, administration). Also, a part-time co-ordinator for our activities could make our work more efficient.

7 EXTERNAL COMPETITIVE FUNDING OF THE RC

- Listing of the RCs external competitive funding, where:
  - the funding decisions have been made during 1.1.2005-31.12.2010, and
  - the administrator of the funding is/has been the University of Helsinki

- Academy of Finland (AF) - total amount of funding (in euros) AF has decided to allocate to the RC members during 1.1.2005-31.12.2010: 512 810 €

- Finnish Funding Agency for Technology and Innovation (TEKES) - total amount of funding (in euros) TEKES has decided to allocate to the RC members during 1.1.2005-31.12.2010: 78 842 €

- European Union (EU) - total amount of funding (in euros) EU has decided to allocate to the RC members during 1.1.2005-31.12.2010: -

- European Research Council (ERC) - total amount of funding (in euros) ERC has decided to allocate to the RC members during 1.1.2005-31.12.2010: -

- International and national foundations – names of international and national foundations which have decided to allocate funding to the RC members during 1.1.2005-31.12.2010, and the amount of their funding (in euros).
  - names of the foundations: Alkoholitutkimussäätiö, Ella ja Georg Ehrnroothin säätiö Koneen Säätiö, Kyösti Haatajan Säätiö, Suomen Kulttuurirahasto, Wihurin rahasto
  - total amount of funding (in euros) from the above-mentioned foundations: 279 582 €

- Other international funding - names of other international funding organizations which have decided to allocate funding to the RC members during 1.1.2005-31.12.2010, and the amount of their funding (in euros).
  - names of the funding organizations:
  - total amount of funding (in euros) from the above-mentioned funding organizations:

- Other national funding (incl. EVO funding and Ministry of Education and Culture funded doctoral programme positions) - names of other national funding organizations which have decided to allocate funding to the RC members during 1.1.2005-31.12.2010, and the amount of their funding (in euros).
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- names of the funding organizations: The Ministry of Social Affairs and Health
- total amount of funding (in euros) from the above-mentioned funding organizations: 78 000 €

8 RC’S STRATEGIC ACTION PLAN FOR 2011–2013 (MAX. 4400 CHARACTERS WITH SPACES)

- Description of the RC’s future perspectives in respect to research and doctoral training.
  We are determined to continue our work. Our two main targets are 1) to continue doctoral training in consumption studies and 2) make our research results available to the international audience. The latter target will be realized through participating international seminars and conferences and publishing articles in international journals, and in addition to that write an anthology concerning Finnish consumption after the Second World War seen in comparative perspective. We aim at strengthening the international relations between our community and scholars studying consumption abroad.

We have also plans to use our research potential (several young post-doctoral researchers) in a more comprehensive way in respective subjects (consumer economics and economic and social history). In this way young doctors can get teaching experience which is important to their academic careers. We also plan to improve our communication with the wider audience by developing further the web-pages of KUMU research community.

9 SHORT DESCRIPTION OF HOW THE RC MEMBERS HAVE CONTRIBUTED TO THE COMPILATION OF THE STAGE 2 MATERIALS (MAX. 1100 CHARACTERS WITH SPACES).

The material for stage 2 has been compiled by professors Heinonen and Peltonen with the help of the other members of the research community, who have made comments and improvements on the final text.
KUMU/Heinonen

1 Analysis of publications

- Associated person is one of Kirsti Ahlqvist, Matleena Frisk, Matleena.Frisk@helsinki.fi, Jaakko Autio, Jaakko.A.Autio@helsinki.fi, Kaarina Kilpio, kaarina.kilpio@helsinki.fi, Juuka Petren Kontt, juuka.kontt@helsinki.fi, Hanna Kuusi, Hanna.Kuusi@helsinki.fi, Ritta Mattiainen, ritta.mattiainen@helsinki.fi, Matti Peltonen, Matti.Peltonen@helsinki.fi, Jaarne Polsikainen, jaarne.polsikainen@helsinki.fi, Tiina Huokuna, tiina.huokuna@helsinki.fi, Minna Maarit Autio, Minna.Autio@helsinki.fi, Visa Heinonen, Visa.heinonen@helsinki.fi, Md. Motaher Hossain, Motaher.Hossain@helsinki.fi, Hannakaisa Huttunen, Hannakaisa.huttunen@helsinki.fi, Kati Jaakonsuu, Sylviia Louna, Jaarne Tuhkki Laitteenmaa, Sari Malé, sari.mal@helsinki.fi, Anu Rajas, anu.rajas@helsinki.fi, Toni Rovininen, toni.rovininen@helsinki.fi, Tiago Shriks, Stefan Wahlén, stefan.wahlen@helsinki.fi, Mari Niva

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Publication type</th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>Total Count 2005 - 2010</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A1 Refereed journal article</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A2 Review in scientific journal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A3 Contribution to book/other compilations (refereed)</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A4 Article in conference publication (refereed)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B1 Unrefereed journal article</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B2 Contribution to book/other compilations (non-refereed)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B3 Unrefereed article in conference proceedings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C1 Published scientific monograph</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C2 Edited book, compilation, conference proceeding or special issue of journal</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D1 Article in professional journal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D2 Article in professional handbook or guide book or in a professional data system, or text book material</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D3 Article in professional conference proceedings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D4 Published development or research report</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D5 Text book or professional handbook or guidebook or dictionary</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E1 Popular article, newspaper article</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E1 Popular contribution to book/other compilations</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E2 Popular monograph</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## 2 Listing of publications

### A1 Refereed journal article

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Author(s)</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Journal</th>
<th>Volume, Issue, Pages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>Huttunen, K.</td>
<td>'Sinäkin olet kuluttaja: E-liikkeen poliittisesta etujärjestötoiminnasta konsensushakoon'</td>
<td>Historical Aikakauskirja</td>
<td>104, no. 4, pp. 408-418.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>Heinonen, V.</td>
<td>'Mainonta, brandit ja nuoret: kampailuja nuorten huomiosta kulutuskulttuurissa'</td>
<td>Nuorisotutkimus</td>
<td>25, no. 1, pp. 36-52.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Heinonen, V, Pantzar, M 2005, 'Maja Isola - löytöretkiä elämään', Maja Isola, elämä, taide, Marimekko., Designmuseo Marimekko, [Helsinki], pp. 118-125.


2006


Peltonen, M 2006, 'Maija Isola - löytöretkiä elämään', Maija Isola. elämä, taide, Marimekko., Designmuseo Marimekko, [Helsinki], pp. 236-256.
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2007


A4 Article in conference publication (referred)

2005


2006


2007
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2008


2009


2010


B1 Unrefereed journal article

2005
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2006

Maatilainen, R 2006, 'Doing the pools became so important that a saturday night was unthinkable without it: gambling and gamblers's experiences in XX century Finland', Ludica : annali di storia e civiltà del gioco, vol 12, pp. 137-146.
Peltonen, M 2006, 'Mihin kääntymme "kiihtelyn käänteen jälkeen"?', Tieteessä tapahtuu, no. 3, pp. 77-81.

2007

Huttunen, K 2007, 'Suomalaisen kulutustutkimuksen klassikko jo syntyessään', Agricola - Suomen historiaverkko.
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Peltonen, M 2007, 'Yhteiskunnallinen alkoholikysymys voi edelleen hyvin', Tieteessä tapahtuu, no. 7, pp. 75-77.


2010


B2 Contribution to book/other compilations (non-refereed)

2005


2006


2008

KUMU/Heinonen


2009


2010


B3 Unrefereed article in conference proceedings

2010


C1 Published scientific monograph

2005


2006


2007


2008

KUMU/Heinonen


C2 Edited book, compilation, conference proceeding or special issue of journal

2005

2006

2007

2008

D1 Article in professional journal

2005


D2 Article in professional hand or guide book or in a professional data system, or text book material

2005
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2009

D3 Article in professional conference proceedings

2006

D4 Published development or research report

2005

2008

2009

2010

D5 Text book or professional handbook or guidebook or dictionary

2005

E1 Popular article, newspaper article

2005

2006


2006

Auto, M 2006, 'Elämäni paras ostos', Suomen luonto, vol 65, no. 6, pp. 25.
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Peltonen, M 2006, 'Foucault olikin paljolti psykologi', Helsingin Sanomat.
Ryynänen, T 2006, 'Muotoilulla rajattomat mahdollisuudet', Kauppalehti, pp. 16.
Ryynänen, T 2006, 'Muotoilulla myös kilpailukykyä', Kauppalehti, pp. 16.

2007


2008
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2009


Huokuna, T 2009, 'Yle-keskusteluiden voittaja - me mediakuluttajat', Kanava, vol 37, no. 9, pp. 577.


2010


Kortti, J 2010, 'Yle-keskusteluiden voittaja - me mediakuluttajat', Kanava, vol 37, no. 9, pp. 577.

Kortti, J 2010, 'Ylen ja kaupallisten mediayhtiöiden kiistassa ainakin yksi voittaja', Kaleva.


E1 Popular contribution to book/other compilations

2005


2006


2007
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2009


E2 Popular monograph

2005


2007

Peltonen, M 2007, Suomen torpparykäyttö, Karttakeskus, [Helsinki].


## Analysis of activities 2005-2010

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity type</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Supervisor or co-supervisor of doctoral thesis</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prizes and awards</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Editor of research journal</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peer review of manuscripts</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Editor of series</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Editor of special theme number</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment of candidates for academic posts</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Membership or other role in national/international committee, council, board</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Membership or other role in public Finnish or international organization</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Membership or other role of body in private company/organisation</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other tasks of an expert in private sector</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participation in interview for written media</td>
<td>238</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participation in radio programme</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participation in TV programme</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2 Listing of activities 2005-2010

Supervisor or co-supervisor of doctoral thesis

Matti Peltonen, Matti.Peltonen@helsinki.fi

Ohjattu väitöskirja (Minna Uimonen), Matti Peltonen, 1999 → ...
Ohjattu väitöskirja (Simo Laakkonen), Matti Peltonen, 2001 → ...
Ohjattu väitöskirja (Auli Suojanen), Matti Peltonen, 2002 → ...
Ohjattu väitöskirja (Jukka Rantalai), Matti Peltonen, 2002 → ...
Ohjattu väitöskirja (Peter von Baghi), Matti Peltonen, 2002 → ...
Ohjattu väitöskirja (Juha Kontti), Matti Peltonen, 2003 → ...
Ohjattu väitöskirja (Hanna Kuusi), Matti Peltonen, 2004 → ...
Ohjattu väitöskirja (Mikko Salasuo), Matti Peltonen, 2004 → ...
Ohjattu väitöskirja (Kaarina Kilpiö), Matti Peltonen, 2005 → ...
Ohjattu väitöskirja (Iona Kemppainen), Matti Peltonen, 2006 → ...
Ohjattu väitöskirja (Tiina Huokuna), Matti Peltonen, 2006 → ...
Ohjattu väitöskirja (Juha Mälkiä), Matti Peltonen, 2008
Ohjattu väitöskirja (Kirsti Ahlqvist), Matti Peltonen, 24.04.2010

Minna Maarit Autio, Minna.Autio@helsinki.fi

Annu Markkula, supervision of doctoral thesis "Ethical Consumption in Fashion and Clothing Markets", Minna Maarit Autio, 01.10.2007 → 30.04.2011, Finland

Visa Heinonen, Visa.heinonen@helsinki.fi

Supervision of a doctoral dissertation, Visa Heinonen, 01.01.2001 → 26.06.2006
Supervision of a doctoral dissertation, Visa Heinonen, 01.05.2003 → 26.06.2008
Supervision of a doctoral dissertation, Visa Heinonen, 01.09.2003 → 15.06.2009
Supervision of a doctoral dissertation, Visa Heinonen, 24.11.2003 → 15.01.2010
Supervision of a doctoral dissertation, Visa Heinonen, 01.09.2005 → 25.03.2011
Supervision of a doctoral dissertation, Visa Heinonen, 30.05.2005 → 31.10.2011
Supervision of a doctoral dissertation, Visa Heinonen, 01.09.2007 → 31.05.2011

Prizes and awards

Kaarina Kilpiö, kaarina.kilpio@helsinki.fi
Mainostajien rahaston palkinto, Kaarina Kilpiö, 02.06.2005, Finland
KUMU/Heinonen

Hanna Kuusi, Hanna.Kuusi@helsinki.fi

Valtiotieteilisen tiedekunnan hyvän opettajan palkinto 2007, Hanna Kuusi, 2007

Minna Maarit Autio, Minna.Autio@helsinki.fi


Editor of research journal

Kaarina Kilpiö, kaarina.kilpio@helsinki.fi

Etnomusikologian vuosikirja, Kaarina Kilpiö, 01.01.2007 → 31.12.2007, Finland

Jukka Petteri Kortti, jukka.kortti@helsinki.fi


Minna Maarit Autio, Minna.Autio@helsinki.fi

International Journal of Consumer Studies, Minna Maarit Autio, 01.01.2005 → 31.12.2005, United Kingdom

Kuluttava nuoros, Nuorten elinolot vuosikirja, Minna Maarit Autio, 01.01.2005 → 31.12.2005, Finland


Nuoriso- ja taloustutkimus, toimituskunnan jäsen, Minna Maarit Autio, 01.01.2006 → 31.12.2006, Finland

Nuoriso- ja taloustutkimus, toimituskunnan jäsen, Minna Maarit Autio, 31.03.2006 → 31.12.2006, Finland

Theorimi: Rtvisti, pojat, hyvinvointi, terveys, Minna Maarit Autio, 01.01.2006 → 31.12.2006, Finland

International Journal of Consumer Studies, Minna Maarit Autio, 05.02.2007 → 13.09.2007

Journal of Youth Studies, Minna Maarit Autio, 06.12.2007 → 31.12.2007, United Kingdom

Kuluttaja- ja taloustutkimuksen vuosikirja 2007, Minna Maarit Autio, 01.01.2007 → 31.12.2007, Finland

NURTURE, Minna Maarit Autio, 10.12.2007 → 31.12.2007, Pakistan

Nuoriso- ja taloustutkimus 3/2007 - Mediana kuulus, vierailuvana päätömittajana yhdessä Mari Mäkirannan kanssa (Lapin yliopisto), Minna Maarit Autio, 01.01.2007 → 31.12.2007, Finland

Nuoriso- ja taloustutkimus, toimituskunnan jäsen, Minna Maarit Autio, 15.02.2007 → 31.12.2007, Finland

Nuoriso- ja taloustutkimus, toimituskunnan jäsen, Minna Maarit Autio, 01.01.2007 → 31.12.2007, Finland


Journal of Youth Studies, Minna Maarit Autio, 09.06.2008 → 31.12.2008, United Kingdom

International Journal of Consumer Studies, Minna Maarit Autio, 28.01.2009 → 13.05.2009


Nuoriso- ja taloustutkimus, toimituskunnan jäsen, Minna Maarit Autio, 01.01.2009 → 31.12.2009, Finland

Visa Heinonen, Visa.heinonen@helsinki.fi

Konferenssijulkaisu “Human Perspectives on Sustainable Future”, Visa Heinonen, 01.01.2006 → 31.12.2006, Finland
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KULUTAJATUTKIMUS. Nyt (verkkolehti), Visa Heinonen, 01.01.2006 → 31.12.2006, Finland


Kuluttajat kehittäjänä (toim. Minna Lammi, Raija Järvinen & Johanna Leskinen), Kuluttajatutkimuskeskuksen vuosikirja, Visa Heinonen, 01.01.2007 → 31.12.2007, Finland

Kuluttajatutkimus.Nyt, Visa Heinonen, 01.01.2007 → 31.12.2007, Finland


Kuluttajat kehittäjänä (toim. Minna Lammi, Raija Järvinen & Johanna Leskinen), Kuluttajatutkimuskeskuksen vuosikirja, Visa Heinonen, 01.01.2007 → 31.12.2007, Finland

Kuluttajatutkimus.Nyt, Visa Heinonen, 01.01.2007 → 31.12.2007, Finland


Kuluttajat kehittäjänä (toim. Minna Lammi, Raija Järvinen & Johanna Leskinen), Kuluttajatutkimuskeskuksen vuosikirja, Visa Heinonen, 01.01.2007 → 31.12.2007, Finland

Kuluttajatutkimus.Nyt, Visa Heinonen, 01.01.2007 → 31.12.2007, Finland

Kuluttajatutkimus.Nyt, Visa Heinonen, 01.01.2006 → 31.12.2006, Finland

Kuluttajatutkimus.Nyt, Visa Heinonen, 01.01.2007 → 31.12.2007, Finland

Kuluttajatutkimus.Nyt, Visa Heinonen, 01.01.2007 → 31.12.2007, Finland

Kuluttajatutkimus.Nyt, Visa Heinonen, 01.01.2007 → 31.12.2007, Finland

Md. Motaher Hossain, Motaher.Hossain@helsinki.fi

Ecological Economics, Md. Motaher Hossain, 01.01.2008 → 31.12.2008, United Kingdom

Anu Raijas, anu.raijas@helsinki.fi


Toni Ryynänen, toni.ryynanen@helsinki.fi


Peer review of manuscripts

Riitta Matilainen, Riitta.Matilainen@helsinki.fi

Peliltutkimuksen vuosikirja 2010, Riitta Matilainen, 2010 → …

Peliltutkimuksen vuosikirja 2010, Riitta Matilainen, 2010 → …

Minna Maarit Autio, Minna.Autio@helsinki.fi

1st Nordic Conference on Consumer Research, Minna Maarit Auto, 01.04.2010 → 31.05.2010

Journal of Youth Studies, Minna Maarit Auto, 01.01.2010 → 31.12.2010

Psykologia, Minna Maarit Auto, 01.06.2010 → 15.06.2010

Talous- ja velkaneuvonnan koulutusohjelma 30 op, Korkeakoulutettujen työelämääliitetilin täydennyskoulutus, Lopputöiden arvointi, Minna Maarit Auto, 15.09.2010 → 15.10.2010

Stefan Wahlen, stefan.wahlen@helsinki.fi

International Journal of Consumer Studies, Stefan Wahlen, 06.2009 → …

International Journal of Home Economics, Stefan Wahlen, 07.2010 → …

Editor of series

Matti Peltonen, Matti.Peltonen@helsinki.fi

Suomalainen muotoilun historia 1-3 teossarjan toimituskunnan jäsen, Matti Peltonen, 2007 → 2009

Editor of special theme number

Minna Maarit Autio, Minna.Autio@helsinki.fi

Nuorisotutkimus, vierailuav BUTTONITATA, Lapussu visuaalisessa ja audiovisuaalisessa kulutuskulttuurissa, Minna Maarit Auto, 2009 → …

Assessment of candidates for academic posts

Matti Peltonen, Matti.Peltonen@helsinki.fi

Lausunto professorin viran täytössä (Turun yliopisto), Matti Peltonen, 2002 → …

Lausunto professorin viran täytössä (Turun yliopisto), Matti Peltonen, 18.12.2006

Lausunto professorin viran täytössä (Joensuun yliopisto), Matti Peltonen, 14.08.2007
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**Membership or other role in national/international committee, council, board**

**Kaarina Kilpiö**, kaarina.kilpio@helsinki.fi

- Suomen Akustisen Ekologian seura, Kaarina Kilpiö, 01.01.2007 → 31.12.2007, Finland

**Riitta Matilainen**, Riitta.Matilainen@helsinki.fi

- Kuluutustutkimuksen Seura Ry, Riitta Matilainen, 01.01.2008 → 31.12.2008,
- Hallituksen jäsenyys Kuluutustutkimuksen seurassa, Riitta Matilainen, 2010 → ...

**Matti Peltonen**, Matti.Peltonen@helsinki.fi

- Management Committee, Euroopan Unionin rahoittama COST-hanke A35 “Programme for the study of European rural societies”, Matti Peltonen, 01.01.2006 → 31.12.2006
- Management Committee, Euroopan Unionin rahoittama COST-hanke A35 “Programme for the study of European rural societies”, Matti Peltonen, 01.01.2007 → 31.12.2007

**Minna Maarit Autio**, Minna.Autio@helsinki.fi

- Kuluutustutkimuksen seura, Minna Maarit Auto, 01.01.2005 → 31.12.2005, Finland
- Maatalousmetsätieteellisen tiedekunnan tutkimus- ja jatkokoulutustoimikunta, Minna Maarit Autio, 01.01.2005 → 31.12.2005, Finland
- Kuluutustutkimuksen seura, varajäsen, Minna Maarit Autio, 01.01.2006 → 31.12.2006, Finland
- Maatalousmetsätieteellisen tiedekunnan tutkimus- ja jatkokoulutustoimikunta, Minna Maarit Autio, 01.01.2006 → 31.12.2006, Finland
- FIN-IFHE (International Federation for Home Economics) Neuvottelukunta, Minna Maarit Autio, 01.01.2007 → 31.12.2007, Finland
- Kuluutustutkimuksen seura, varajäsen, Minna Maarit Autio, 01.01.2007 → 31.12.2007, Finland
- Maatalous-metsätieteellisen tiedekunnan tutkimus- ja jatkokoulutustoimikunta, Minna Maarit Autio, 01.01.2007 → 31.12.2007, Finland
- Opetuksen kehittämistoimikunta, Maatalous-metsätieteellinen tiedekunta, Minna Maarit Autio, 01.01.2007 → 31.12.2007, Finland
- Taustateen iltaos, taustajohdonhymy, Minna Maarit Autio, 01.01.2007 → 31.12.2007, Finland
- Kuluutustutkimuksen seura, Minna Maarit Autio, 01.01.2008 → 31.12.2008, Finland
- Opetuksen kehittämistoimikunta, Minna Maarit Autio, 01.01.2008 → 31.12.2008, Finland
- Suomen Akatemia, Vrkau-laskekuusilaitur, Minna Maarit Autio, 01.01.2008 → 31.12.2008, Finland
- Taustateen iltaos, taustajohdonhymy, Minna Maarit Autio, 01.01.2008 → 31.12.2008, Finland
- Kuluutustutkimuksen seura, Minna Maarit Autio, 01.01.2009 → 31.12.2009, Finland
- Opetuksen kehittämistoimikunta, Maatalous-metsätieteellinen tiedekunta, Minna Maarit Autio, 01.01.2009 → 31.12.2009, Finland
- Suomen Akatemia, Vrkau-laskekuusilaitur, Minna Maarit Autio, 01.01.2009 → 31.12.2009, Finland
- Taustateen iltaos, taustajohdonhymy, Minna Maarit Autio, 01.01.2009 → 31.12.2009, Finland
- The Consumer Insight Group at Queen Margaret University, arviointi 4th International Consumer Sciences Research Conference "Consumer Voice and Representation", 24-26 June 2009, Minna Maarit Autio, 01.01.2009 → 31.12.2009, United Kingdom
- Johtoryhmän jäsen, SiMBe: Smart Infrastructures for Electric Mobility in Built Environments -research project, Minna Maarit Autio, 01.03.2010 → 12.12.2011, Finland
- Kuluutustutkimuksen seura ry., Hallituksen jäsen, varapuheenjohtaja, Minna Maarit Autio, 01.01.2010 → 12.12.2010, Finland
- Luomuopetuksen ohjausryhmän jäsen, Minna Maarit Autio, 08.06.2010 → 31.12.2011, Finland
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Membership or other role of body in private company/organisation

Kaarina Kilpiö, kaarina.kilpio@helsinki.fi
JAPA-hallitus, Kaarina Kilpiö, 2009 → 2010, Finland

Minna Maarit Autio, Minna.Autio@helsinki.fi
Agronomiliitto, liittovaltuusto edustaja, Minna Maarit Autio, 01.01.2005 → 31.12.2005, Finland
Agronomiliitto, varaedustaja, Minna Maarit Autio, 01.01.2006 → 31.12.2006, Finland
FIN-IFHE, International Federation for Home Economics -Finland, Minna Maarit Autio, 01.01.2006 → 31.12.2006, Finland
Agronomiliitto, liittovaltuusto, varaedustaja, Minna Maarit Autio, 01.01.2007 → 31.12.2007, Finland
Agronomiliitto, liittovaltuusto, varaedustaja, Minna Maarit Autio, 01.01.2008 → 31.12.2008, Finland
Agronomiliitto, Minna Maarit Autio, 01.01.2009 → 31.12.2009, Finland

Hannakaisa Huttunen, hannakaisa.huttunen@helsinki.fi
UniPID (Universities Partnership for International Development) seurantaryhmän jäsen taloustieteen laitokseella, Hannakaisa Huttunen, 01.01.2006 → 31.12.2006

Other tasks of an expert in private sector

Minna Maarit Autio, Minna.Autio@helsinki.fi
Agronomiliitto ry., Liittovaltuuston jäsen, Minna Maarit Autio, 01.01.2009 → 31.12.2011, Finland

Participation in interview for written media

Kaarina Kilpiö, kaarina.kilpio@helsinki.fi
Kauppalaihe, toimittajana Sirku Nyström, Kaarina Kilpiö, 06.05.1999 → 31.12.2011, Finland
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Ylen Ykkönen ohjelma Merkkituote; toimittajana Jukka Mikkola, Kaarina Kilpiö, 24.01.2003 → 31.12.2011, Finland
Asiantuntijahaastattelu, Kaarina Kilpiö, 19.06.2005, Finland
Juustoat, jyrsee Beethovenin!, Kaarina Kilpiö, 31.03.2005, Finland
Sano se sävelin (haastattelu) / Käyttömusiikin nousu ja uho (kirja-arvio), Kaarina Kilpiö, 22.04.2005, Finland
Ylen Ykkönen, toimittajana Jukka Mikkola, Kaarina Kilpiö, 06.05.2005 → 31.12.2011, Finland
Melodiaa ilmassa, Kaarina Kilpiö, 06.06.2006, Finland
Jukka Petteri Kortti , jukka.kortti@helsinki.fi
Asiantuntijana Nelosen Kahdeksan uutisissa, Jukka Petteri Kortti, 04.03.2003 → 31.12.2011, Finland
Asiantuntijana Nelosan Kahdeksan uutisissa, Jukka Petteri Kortti, 24.03.2003 → 31.12.2011, Finland
Asiantuntijana Nelosan Kahdeksan uutisissa, Jukka Petteri Kortti, 04.03.2003 → 31.12.2011, Finland
Asiantuntijana Nelosan Kahdeksan uutisissa, Jukka Petteri Kortti, 24.03.2003 → 31.12.2011, Finland
Asiantuntijana Nelosan Kahdeksan uutisissa, Jukka Petteri Kortti, 04.03.2003 → 31.12.2011, Finland
Asiantuntijana Nelosan Kahdeksan uutisissa, Jukka Petteri Kortti, 24.03.2003 → 31.12.2011, Finland
Asiantuntijana sanomalehti Kansan Uutisissa, Jukka Petteri Kortti, 26.08.2003 → 31.12.2011, Finland
Asiantuntijana sanomalehti Nelosan Uutisissa, Jukka Petteri Kortti, 04.03.2003 → 31.12.2011, Finland
Asiantuntijana sanomalehti Nelosan Uutisissa, Jukka Petteri Kortti, 28.06.2003 → 31.12.2011, Finland
Asiantuntijana sanomalehti Nelosan Uutisissa, Jukka Petteri Kortti, 26.08.2003 → 31.12.2011, Finland
sanomalehti Nelosan Uutisissa, Jukka Petteri Kortti, 27.01.2004 → 31.12.2011, United States
Miksi mainoselokuva kiinnostaa tutkijaa?, Jukka Petteri Kortti, 07.06.2004 → 31.12.2011, United States
Eläkeläinen-lehti Nro 2, Maaliskuu 2005, 6 7., Jukka Petteri Kortti, 01.01.2005 → 31.12.2011, Finland
Televisionomanaato.fi, Jukka Petteri Kortti, 01.01.2005 → 31.12.2011, Finland
Asiantuntijana Nelosan uutisissa, Jukka Petteri Kortti, 05.09.2006 → 31.12.2011, Finland
Asiantuntijana Ihastelehdessä: Kahvia (Tommi-Nieminen) Helsinki Sanomien Kuukausiliit, Jukka Petteri Kortti, 01.01.2006 → 31.12.2011, Finland
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Asiantuntijana paneelissa. Ravintola Belly, Helsinki, Jukka Petteri Kortti, 15.03.2007 → 31.12.2011, Finland
Paneelissa YLE:n ständillä Helsingin kirjamessulla yhdessä Tanja Sopasen, Aarne Elion ja Juhani Wilion kanssa (kuuluttaja Smith), Jukka Petteri Kortti, 28.10.2007 → 31.12.2011, Finland
Riitta Matilainen, Riitta.Matilainen@helsinki.fi
Talou- ja sosiaalihistorian Opiskelijat Ryn järjestämä Pahilla-tilaisuus, Riitta Matilainen, 30.03.2007 → 31.12.2011, Finland
Itla-Sanomat, haastattelu artikkeli varten, Riitta Matilainen, 22.08.2008 → 31.12.2011, Portugal
Itla-Sanomat, haastattelu artikkeli varten, Riitta Matilainen, 27.08.2008 → 31.12.2011, Portugal
Matti Peltonen, Matti.Peltonen@helsinki.fi
Yliopistolehti 2001:2, Matti Peltonen, 01.01.2001
Aamulehti, Matti Peltonen, 17.03.2002 → 31.12.2011, Finland
Seura 2002:45, Matti Peltonen, 01.01.2002 → 31.12.2011, Finland
Kalto 2003:6, Matti Peltonen, 01.01.2003 → 31.12.2011, Finland
Tiede 2003:6, Matti Peltonen, 01.01.2003 → 31.12.2011, Finland
YLE 1, Ykköseamuu, Matti Peltonen, 29.11.2003 → 31.12.2011, Finland
Anna-lehti 2004:23, Matti Peltonen, 03.06.2004 → 31.12.2011, Finland
Hidenkivi 2004:4, Matti Peltonen, 01.01.2004 → 31.12.2011, Finland
Hidenkivi 2004:5, Matti Peltonen, 01.01.2004 → 31.12.2011, Finland
Minna Maarit Autio, Minna.Autio@helsinki.fi
Kodin kuvalehti., Minna Maarit Autio, 01.01.2001
Kuluttajalehti., Minna Maarit Autio, 01.04.2001
Peiton paikka - lehti oikeille opiskelija-asujille., Minna Maarit Autio, 01.01.2001
YLE, Uudenmaan auletutkimus., Minna Maarit Autio, 23.11.2001
Lehtiahaastattelu, Markkinointi ja mainonta -lehdi, Minna Maarit Autio, 20.09.2002
Lehtiahaastattelu, Vantaan lauri., Minna Maarit Autio, 04.09.2002
Keskiromaalainen -lehdi, Minna Maarit Autio, 08.05.2004
Kuningaskunnallista ohjelma, YLE1, Minna Maarit Autio, 19.03.2004
Suomen luonto -lehti, Minna Maarit Autio, 02.11.2004 → 31.12.2011, Finland
Aamulehti, Minna Maarit Autio, 25.11.2005 → 31.12.2011, Finland
Helsingin Sanomat, Minna Maarit Autio, 02.03.2005 → 31.12.2011, Finland
Hufvudstadsbladet, Minna Maarit Autio, 27.05.2005 → 31.12.2011, Finland
RC-SPECIFIC TUHAT COMPILATIONS OF OTHER SCIENTIFIC ACTIVITIES 2005-2010

KUMU/Heinonen

Aamulehti, Minna Maarat Auto, 26.02.2006 → 31.12.2011, Finland
Anna, Minna Maarat Auto, 12.10.2006 → 31.12.2011, Finland
Anna-Lehti, blogi haastattelu, Minna Maarat Auto, 29.11.2006 → 31.12.2011, Finland
Etelä-Suomen Sanomat, Minna Maarat Auto, 22.09.2006 → 31.12.2011, Finland
Gloria-lehti Heinokuu 2006, Minna Maarat Auto, 29.05.2006 → 31.12.2011, Finland
Helsingin Sanomat, Minna Maarat Auto, 12.07.2006 → 31.12.2011, Finland
Hufvudstadsbladet, Minna Maarat Auto, 28.05.2006 → 31.12.2011, Finland
Maatalous-metsätieteellisen tiedekunnan valmistumisjuhla, Minna Maarit Autio, 27.10.2006 → 31.12.2011, Finland
Me Naised, Minna Maarit Autio, 02.03.2006 → 31.12.2011, Finland
STT, Suomen tietotoimisto, Minna Maarat Auto, 24.05.2006 → 31.12.2011, Finland
Sanomalehti Kareva, Minna Maarat Auto, 02.06.2006 → 31.12.2011, Finland
Sanomalehti Kareva, Minna Maarat Auto, 06.08.2006 → 31.12.2011, Finland
Suomen Luonto-lehti, Minna Maarat Auto, 01.11.2006 → 31.12.2011, Finland
Suomen luonto-lehti, Minna Maarat Auto, 01.01.2006 → 31.12.2011, Finland
Taloussanomat, INFO-sivu, Minna Maarat Auto, 23.05.2006 → 31.12.2011, Finland
Tampereen kaupunkilehti Tori, Minna Maarat Auto, 28.09.2006 → 31.12.2011, Finland
Turun Sanomat, Viikkolite Extra, Minna Maarat Auto, 08.07.2006 → 31.12.2011, Finland
Yle 1, Kuninkaankullattaja, Minna Maarat Auto, 19.10.2006 → 31.12.2011, Finland
YleX, Uutiset, Minna Maarat Auto, 26.05.2006 → 31.12.2011, Finland
Yliopisto-lehti, Minna Maarat Auto, 16.10.2006 → 31.12.2011, Finland
Ympäristömerkki-lehti, Minna Maarat Auto, 01.02.2006 → 31.12.2011, Finland
Aamulehti, Minna Maarat Auto, 07.04.2007 → 31.12.2011, Finland
Aamulehti, Minna Maarat Auto, 24.10.2007 → 31.12.2011, Finland
Aamulehti, Koti &amp; Asuminen, Minna Maarat Auto, 31.03.2007 → 31.12.2011, Finland
Apu-lehti, Minna Maarat Auto, 16.02.2007 → 31.12.2011, Finland
H2 - Haaga-Helian opiskelijakunta Helga, Minna Maarat Auto, 01.03.2007 → 31.12.2011, Finland
Häipi Magazine, Minna Maarat Auto, 01.01.2007 → 31.12.2011, Finland
Helsingin Sanomat, Minna Maarat Auto, 14.02.2007 → 31.12.2011, Finland
Ilta-Lehti, Minna Maarat Auto, 14.02.2007 → 31.12.2011, Finland
Kuopion kaupunkilehti, Minna Maarat Auto, 01.03.2007 → 31.12.2011, Finland
Kuopion kaupunkilehti, Minna Maarat Auto, 20.09.2007 → 31.12.2011, Finland
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Olivia, Minna Maarit Auto, 01.01.2007 → 31.12.2011, Finland
Peili: lasten ja nuorten mediakulttuurin lehti, Minna Maarit Auto, 01.02.2007 → 31.12.2011, Finland
Talouselämä, Minna Maarit Auto, 14.09.2007 → 31.12.2011, Finland
Talouselämä, Minna Maarit Auto, 09.03.2007 → 31.12.2011, Finland
Talouselämä, Minna Maarit Auto, 01.01.2007 → 31.12.2011, Finland
Trendi-lehti 1/2007, Minna Maarit Auto, 01.01.2007 → 31.12.2011, Finland
Turun sanomat, Kaleva, Savon sanomat ja Pohjalainen, Minna Maarit Auto, 15.01.2007 → 31.12.2011, Finland
Yhteishyvä-lehti 2/2007, Minna Maarit Auto, 01.01.2007 → 31.12.2011, Finland
Aamulehti, Minna Maarit Auto, 29.08.2008 → 31.12.2011, Finland
Helsingin Sanomat, Hinta &amp; Laatu, Minna Maarit Auto, 03.09.2008 → 31.12.2011, Finland
Ilta-lehti, Minna Maarit Auto, 22.01.2008 → 31.12.2011, Finland
Porin Kaksplus, Minna Maarit Auto, 01.01.2008 → 31.12.2011, Finland
Taito - Suomalaisen käsityön lehti, Minna Maarit Auto, 01.01.2008 → 31.12.2011, Finland
Talouselämä, Minna Maarit Auto, 17.08.2008 → 31.12.2011, Finland
Yleisopisto-lehti, Minna Maarit Auto, 25.01.2008 → 31.12.2011, Finland
Kotikandiseniorit, Minna Maarit Auto, 01.01.2009 → 31.12.2011, Finland
Eettinen kuluttaminen, Minna Maarit Auto, 01.06.2009 → 31.12.2011, Finland
Tuhlaajasta nuukaksi nuoreksi, Minna Maarit Auto, 18.11.2010, Finland

**Visa Heinonen , Visa.heinonen@helsinki.fi**

Books from Finland, Visa Heinonen, 01.04.2001 → 31.12.2011, Finland
Economic Trends, Visa Heinonen, 01.06.2001 → 31.12.2011, Finland
Estomia - Helsingin luonnontiedekylissä, Visa Heinonen, 28.03.2001 → 31.12.2011, Finland
Helsingin sanomat, Visa Heinonen, 08.04.2001 → 31.12.2011, Finland
Ilta-lehti, Visa Heinonen, 15.01.2001 → 31.12.2011, Finland
Kotikalous, Visa Heinonen, 01.06.2001 → 31.12.2011, Finland
Maakasit, Ameripapin tiedotuslehti asiakkaille, Visa Heinonen, 01.02.2001 → 31.12.2011, Finland
Markkinointi &amp; Mainonta, Visa Heinonen, 01.01.2001 → 31.12.2011, Finland
Pirkka, Visa Heinonen, 01.04.2001 → 31.12.2011, Finland
Enintäväistyöoppilas, Visa Heinonen, 01.01.2002 → 31.12.2011, Finland
Hufvudstadsbladet, Visa Heinonen, 07.07.2002 → 31.12.2011, Finland
Hufvudstadsbladet, Visa Heinonen, 17.10.2002 → 31.12.2011, Finland
INTERNATIONAL EVALUATION OF RESEARCH AND DOCTORAL TRAINING AT THE UNIVERSITY OF HELSINKI

RC-SPECIFIC TUHAT COMPILATIONS OF OTHER SCIENTIFIC ACTIVITIES 2005-2010
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Koti, Visa Heinonen, 01.05.2002 → 31.12.2011, Finland
Oloskulu, Visa Heinonen, 01.02.2002 → 31.12.2011, Finland
Taloussanomat, Visa Heinonen, 09.11.2002 → 31.12.2011, Finland
Turun Sanomien viikkolle Extra, Visa Heinonen, 01.01.2002 → 31.12.2011, Finland
Uutiset, televisiokanava Nelonen., Visa Heinonen, 12.02.2002 → 31.12.2011, Finland
Yhteiskuntapolitiikka 67, Visa Heinonen, 01.01.2002 → 31.12.2011, Finland
Yliopistolehti, Visa Heinonen, 01.03.2002 → 31.12.2011, Finland
Yliopistolehti, Visa Heinonen, 01.01.2003 → 31.12.2011, Finland
Alimenta, Visa Heinonen, 01.05.2003 → 31.12.2011, Finland
Faita, Visa Heinonen, 01.08.2003 → 31.12.2011, Finland
Graafisen viestinnän erikoislehti, Visa Heinonen, 01.01.2003 → 31.12.2011, Finland
Haastattelu yritysten yhteiskuntavastuusta Stakesin ja Helsingin klubitalon tuottamalle videolle Klubitalo yhteistyökumppanina Sähkömatka ja yritysten yhteiskuntavastuu, Visa Heinonen, 01.01.2003 → 31.12.2011, Finland
Helsingin Sanomat, Visa Heinonen, 29.10.2003 → 31.12.2011, Finland
Ilta-Sanomat, Visa Heinonen, 18.08.2003 → 31.12.2011, Finland
Iltalehti, Visa Heinonen, 30.05.2003 → 31.12.2011, Finland
Musikin suunta, Visa Heinonen, 01.02.2003 → 31.12.2011, Finland
Seepra (Kouvolan Sanomien viikkolehti), Visa Heinonen, 26.08.2003 → 31.12.2011, Finland
Suomen Lehdistö, Visa Heinonen, 01.08.2003 → 31.12.2011, Finland
Taloussanomat, Visa Heinonen, 05.06.2003 → 31.12.2011, Finland
Vihreä Lanka 41, Visa Heinonen, 01.01.2004 → 31.12.2011, Finland
Yliopisto, Visa Heinonen, 01.01.2003 → 31.12.2011, Finland
COTES Kuluttajakäymiskistot ja teknologi työ, Jäsenliitto, Visa Heinonen, 17.04.2004 → 31.12.2011, Finland
Sosiologia 41(1), 45-47, Visa Heinonen, 01.01.2004 → 31.12.2011, Finland
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Kalajokilaakso 27.6.2006, Visa Heinonen, 27.06.2006 → 31.12.2011, Finland
Kankaanpään Seutu 29.6.2006, Visa Heinonen, 29.06.2006 → 31.12.2011, Finland
Me-lehti 1/07, 22-31., Visa Heinonen, 01.01.2006 → 31.12.2011, Finland

Md. Motaher Hossain, Motaher.Hossain@helsinki.fi
Interviewed and participated in a commercial filmed by the University of Helsinki. Promotion material for the University of Helsinki, Md. Motaher Hossain, 01.01.2008 → 31.12.2011, Finland

Anu Raijas, anu.raijas@helsinki.fi
Iltaanomat, Anu Raijas, 08.10.2002 → 31.12.2011, Finland
Jyväskylän yliopiston taloustutkimuksen XIX kesäseminaari, Anu Raijas, 05.06.2002 → 31.12.2011, Finland
Lehittaastattelu Kulttuuria-lehti 1/2003, Anu Raijas, 01.01.2003 → 31.12.2011, Finland
Lehittaastattelu Matkaviesti, Anu Raijas, 01.01.2003 → 31.12.2011, Finland
Suomen Kuluttajälleen kututtajan talous toimintaryhmän kokous, Anu Raijas, 01.01.2003 → 31.12.2011, Finland
A-piste ohjelma YLE1, Helsinki, Anu Raijas, 01.01.2004 → 31.12.2011, Finland

Toni Rynnänen, toni.rynnanen@helsinki.fi
Debatti, Kauppalehti Presso., Toni Rynnänen, 18.03.2006 → 31.12.2011, Finland
Debatti, Kauppalehti Presso., Toni Rynnänen, 19.06.2006 → 31.12.2011, Finland
Mielipide, Kauppalehti., Toni Rynnänen, 11.05.2006 → 31.12.2011, Finland
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Participation in radio programme
Kaarina Kilpiö, kaarina.kilpio@helsinki.fi

Kultakuume, Kaarina Kilpiö, 06.05.2005, Finland
Populaarimusiikikohtelmat Radio Suomi, Kaarina Kilpiö, 31.03.2005, Finland
Radio Suomen Tiedeutiset, Kaarina Kilpiö, 02.04.2005, Finland
Radiouutiset, Kaarina Kilpiö, 11.04.2005, Finland
Sokkotreffit, Kaarina Kilpiö, 16.05.2005, Finland
Yle X, Kaarina Kilpiö, 22.07.2005, Finland
Poptehdas, Kaarina Kilpiö, 28.03.2008, Finland
Lauantain toivotut levyt, Kaarina Kilpiö, 30.10.2010, Finland

Jukka Petteri Kortti, jukka.kortti@helsinki.fi

Minna Maarit Autio, Minna.Autio@helsinki.fi

Radio Suomi, Suhteellista -ohjelma, Minna Maarit Autio, 02.08.2006 – 31.12.2011, Finland
Radio Yle Suomi, Uutiset, Minna Maarit Autio, 03.08.2006 – 31.12.2011, Finland
Radio Yle Suomi, Uutiset, Minna Maarit Autio, 24.05.2006 – 31.12.2011, Finland
Vapaa-ohiteton vaatimattomuus, Minna Maarit Autio, 19.02.2010, Finland

Visa Heinonen, Visa.heinonen@helsinki.fi

Participation in TV programmes

Kaarina Kilpiö, kaarina.kilpio@helsinki.fi
Huomenta Suomi, Kaarina Kilpiö, 22.06.2005, Finland
Kuningaskulttuuritaja, Kaarina Kilpiö, 31.03.2005, Finland
Pirnma Studio, Kaarina Kilpiö, 30.03.2005, Finland
Vihde vuoset, Kaarina Kilpiö, 30.04.2005, Finland
Yle Kulttuurisuudet, Kaarina Kilpiö, 03.04.2006, Finland

Jukka Petteri Kortti, jukka.kortti@helsinki.fi
MTV3, Subtv, Nelonen, Jukka Petteri Kortti, 18.02.2006 → 31.12.2011, Finland

Minna Maarit Autio, Minna.Autio@helsinki.fi
Huomenta Suomi/MTV3, Minna Maarit Autio, 03.06.2005 → 31.12.2011, Finland
Yle Aamu-TV, Minna Maarit Autio, 24.11.2005 → 31.12.2011, Finland
TV4-Uutiset, Minna Maarit Autio, 01.03.2006 → 31.12.2011, Finland
YLE, TV1, Kuningaskulttuuritaja, Minna Maarit Autio, 31.08.2006 → 31.12.2011, Finland
YLE, Yle 1, aamu-TV, Minna Maarit Autio, 18.12.2006 → 31.12.2011, Finland
YLE Aamutv, Uutiset, Minna Maarit Autio, 24.05.2006 → 31.12.2011, Finland
YLE Aamutv, Suomi, Yleisradion urheilutunnelma sarja urheilu [Yle-Teeema 28.8 alkaen], Minna Maarit Autio, 07.05.2007 → 31.12.2011, Finland

YLE TV1, Yleisradion urheilualalta vuodet, Minna Maarit Autio, 28.08.2008 → 31.12.2011, Finland

Visa Heinonen, Visa.heinonen@helsinki.fi
Appendix B.b.

Maria Forsman, Chief Information Specialist, DSocSc
Helsinki University Library 7.7.2011

The bibliometric analyses by Helsinki University Library (HULib)

Background: The bibliometric analyses – especially citation analyses – have raised a lot of discussion and critics among researchers in social sciences and humanities. Researchers view that bibliometric analyses are often unfair to these fields of sciences because they do not give a good enough picture of the publishing. Citation databases – Web of Science and Scopus – cover only weakly the main publications in these fields. Also, in humanities and social sciences monograph is still the main form of publishing, and it does not include in these article databases.

At the University of Helsinki, the above mentioned concerns have been taken into account in the evaluation. The Evaluation Office has ordered analyses from the Helsinki University Library (HULib) for the participating researcher communities that are weakly represented in Web of Science. The database for the HULib analyses is TUHAT (https://tuhat.halvi.helsinki.fi/portal/en/) including all the publications that the researchers have considered important.

Based on this data, information specialists at HULib have carried out the following analyses:

1) Number of authors/publication/year as a table; a pie of authors/publication in the period 2005-2010;
2) Language of publication/year; a pie of language of publication in the period 2005-2010;
3) Articles/journal/year; journals have been compared by ISSN with the Norwegian, Australian and ERIH (2007-2008) journal ranking lists; number of articles in ranked journals;
4) Publisher/monograph type (according to TUHAT database); monographs have been compared with the Norwegian publisher ranking list. According to this, it has been counted how many monographs are published by a leading scientific publisher (2) or a scientific publisher (1).
5) Conference publications (from TUHAT database) especially in computer sciences; compared with the Australian conference ranking list.

Where relevant, some additional analyses and notes concerning the publication culture of a scientific field have been added. Overall, these analyses complement the other evaluation material and lists of the publications of the participating researcher communities.

If the publications of the RCs were less than 50 or/and the internal coverage less than 40 percentage, the WoS analyses were considered not reliable. These RCs were 58 altogether.

In addition, both Leiden and Library analyses were done to the RCs if WoS analyses covered less than 40 per cent of the peer review (A+C) publications of the RC. These RCs were 8 altogether.

The appendix includes the analyses of the RC under discussion.
### Biological, Agricultural and Veterinary Sciences
- Luukkanen, Olavi – VITRI
- Valsta, Lauri – SUVALUE

### Natural Sciences
- Abrahamsson, Pekka – SOFTSYS
- Kangasharju, Jussi – NODES
- Ukkonen, Esko – ALKO
- Väänänen, Jouko – HLG

### Humanities
- Aejmelaeus, Anneli – CSTT
- Anttonen, Pertti – CMVG
- Dunderberg, Ismo – FC
- Haukka, Eva – CoCoLaC
- Heikilä, Markku – RCSP
- Heinämaa, Sara – SHC
- Henriksson, Markku – CITIA
- Janhunen, Juha – LDHFTA
- Kajava Mika – AMNE
- Klippi, Anu – Interaction
- Knuuttila, Simo – PPMP
- Koskenniemi, Kimmo – BAULT
- Lauha, Aila – CECH
- Lavento, Mika – ARCH-HU
- Lukkarinen, Ville – AHCi
- Lyytikäinen, Pirjo – GLW
- Mauranen, Anna – LFP
- Meinander, Henrik – HIST
- Nevalainen, Terttu – VARIENG
- Pettersson, Bo – ILLC
- Puikkonen, Tuja – Gender Studies
- Pyrhönen, Heta – ART
- Ruokanen, Miikka – RELDIAL
- Saarinen, Risto – RELSOC
- Sandu, Gabriel – LMPS
- Tarasti, Eero – MusSig
- Vehmas-Lehto, Inkeri – TraST
- Östman, Jan-Ola – LMS

### Social Sciences
- Airaksinen, Timo – PPH
- Engströöm, Yrjö – CRADLE
- Granberg, Leo – TRANSRURBAN
- Haila, Anne – Sociopolis
- Hautamäki, Jarkko – CEA
- Heinonen, Visa – KUMU
- Helén, Ilpo – STS
- Hukkanen, Janne – GENU
- Jallinoja, Riitta – SBII
- Kaartinne, Timo – SCA
- Kettunen, Pauli – NordSoc
- Kivinen, Markku – FCREEs
- Koponen, Juhan – DEVERELE
- Koskenniemi, Martti – ECI
- Kultti, Klaus – EAT
- Lahelma, Elina – KUFE
- Lanne, Markku – TSEM
- Lavonen, Jari – RCMER
- Lehtonen, Risto – SocStats
- Lindblom-Yläne, Sari – EdPsychHE
- Nieminen, Hannu – MECOL
- Nuotio, Kimmo – Law
- Nyman, Göte – METEORI
- Olikainen, Markku – ENFIFO
- Pirttilä-Backman, Anna-Maija – DYNASOBIC
- Rahkonen, Keijo – CulCap
- Roos, J P – HELPS
- Simola, Hannu – SOCE-DGI
- Suikunen, Pekka – PosPus
- Sumelius, John – AG ECON
- Vaattovaara, Mari – STRUTSI
- Vainio, Martti – SigMe

The next appendix includes the analyses of the RC under discussion.
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Category 3.

The research of the participating community is distinct from mainstream research, and the special features of the research tradition in the field must be considered in the evaluation. The research is of high quality and has great significance and impact in its field. However, the generally used research evaluation methods do not necessarily shed sufficient light on the merits of the research.

Basic Statistics

The group has 302 publications in TUHAT. Scientific and popular articles and book chapters are predominant as well as edited book compilations.

Out of some 90 publications with more than one author, 5 have international co-authors and 53 national co-authors. These are only approximate results, as the affiliations are not clearly indicated in all cases.

The following table shows the yearly breakdown of papers with 1...11 authors:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th># of Authors</th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>210</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4...11</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>302</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The chart shows the breakdown of the number of 1-3 authors for each year. The clear majority, 70% of publications have a single author.
Languages

Out of 302 publications, 82% are in Finnish. The rest are written in English, with one publication in Swedish.

The following chart shows the differences between classification types for the Finnish and English language publications. The popular writings, book chapters and unrefereed scientific papers tend to be in Finnish while English is the most common only in the refereed scientific papers and conference papers category.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Journal title</th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Addiction</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advertising &amp; Society Review</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agricola - Suomen historiaverkko</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agricolan kirja-arvostelut</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arttu</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baltic worlds : scholarly journal : news magazine</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bolus</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design Issues</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diakonia.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>European Journal of Communication</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helsingin Sanomat</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hiidenkivi</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historiallinen Aikakauskirja</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hyvinvointikatsaus</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Journal of Consumer Studies</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International journal of home economics UHE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Irtolainen : talous- ja sosiaalihistorian opiskelijoiden aikakautinen julkaisu</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journal of business research (Dhaka).</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journal of Consumer Behaviour</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title</td>
<td>Volume</td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Year</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journal of Euromarketing</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journal of Social Sciences</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kaleva</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kanava</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kansalliskirjasto</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kasvatus &amp; Aika</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kaupparehti</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kaupparehti Presso</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keskisuomalainen</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kommentti : nuorisotutkimuksen verkkokanava</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kotitalous</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kronikka</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kuluttajapuntari</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kuluttajatutkimus. Nyt</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kuluttajatutkimus. Nyt : Kuluttajatutkimuksen seuran julkaisu.</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lähikuva : Turun elokuvakerho ry:n jäsenlehti.</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ludica : annali di storia e civilta del gioco</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Max Weber studies.</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Museo : Suomen museolliton julkaisu</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Musiikki</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Niin &amp; näin : filosofinen aikakauslehti.</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nordisk Alkohol- och Narkotikatidskrift</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nuorisotutkimus</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Progress in Industrial Ecology</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Science Research Network</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sosiologia</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suomen luonto</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technology in Society</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teho</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tekniikan Waiheita</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tietotutkimus</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tieteesä tapahtuu</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tieto&amp;Trendit</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turun Sanomat</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Työväentutkimus</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verkkari : Helsingin yliopiston kirjastojen verkkolehti.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yhteiskuntapolitiikka</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>22</strong></td>
<td><strong>37</strong></td>
<td><strong>28</strong></td>
<td><strong>30</strong></td>
<td><strong>27</strong></td>
<td><strong>20</strong></td>
<td><strong>164</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Journal Ranking (Norway, Australia)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Journal title</th>
<th>Australia</th>
<th>Norway</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Addiction</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advertising and Society Review</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design Issues</td>
<td>A*</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>European Journal of Communication</td>
<td>A*</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finnish Historical Review</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Journal of Consumer Studies</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Journal of Home Economics</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journal of Consumer Behaviour</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journal of Euromarketing</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journal of Social Sciences</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Max Weber Studies</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Musiikki</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Niin and Nain</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nordisk Alkohol- and Narkotikatidskrift</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Progress in Industrial Ecology</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technology in Society</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tiedotustutkimus</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Amount of ranked articles (Norway)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Norway</th>
<th>Journal articles</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Level 2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level 1</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Level 2 = highest scientific, Level 1 = scientific

### Amount of ranked articles (Australia)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Australia</th>
<th>Journal articles</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Level A*</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level A</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level B</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level C</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
A

Typically an A* journal would be one of the best in its field or subfield in which to publish and would typically cover the entire field/subfield. Virtually all papers they publish will be of a very high quality. These are journals where most of the work is important (it will really shape the field) and where researchers boast about getting accepted. Acceptance rates would typically be low and the editorial board would be dominated by field leaders, including many from top institutions.

B

The majority of papers in a Tier A journal will be of very high quality. Publishing in an A journal would enhance the author’s standing, showing they have real engagement with the global research community and that they have something to say about problems of some significance. Typical signs of an A journal are lowish acceptance rates and an editorial board which includes a reasonable fraction of well known researchers from top institutions.

C

Tier B covers journals with a solid, though not outstanding, reputation. Generally, in a Tier B journal, one would expect only a few papers of very high quality. They are often important outlets for the work of PhD students and early career researchers. Typical examples would be regional journals with high acceptance rates, and editorial boards that have few leading researchers from top international institutions.

C

Tier C includes quality, peer reviewed, journals that do not meet the criteria of the higher tiers.

Journal Ranking (ERIH)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Journal title</th>
<th>Art</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>History</th>
<th>Literature</th>
<th>Musicology</th>
<th>Philosophy</th>
<th>Psychology</th>
<th>Religion</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Design Issues</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kulttuurintutkimus</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historiallinen Aikakauskirja</td>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kanava</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Musikki</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Niin &amp; näin</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Addiction</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journal of Consumer Behaviour</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diakonia</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**ERIH ranking 2007–2008**

Purpose of The European Reference Index for the Humanities (ERIH) is to develop and to maintain an impact assessment tool for European research journals. Journal classification processes are conducted by discipline-specific expert panels. In the ERIH 2007 Initial List there are three categories:

A = international publications, both European and non-European, with high visibility and influence among researchers in the various research domains in different countries, regularly cited all over the world.

B = international publications, both European and non-European, with significant visibility and influence in the various research domains in different countries.

C = European publications with a recognized scholarly significance among researchers in the respective research domains in a particular readership group in Europe; occasionally cited outside the publishing country, though the main target group is the domestic academic community.
### Book Publisher rankings (Norway)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Publisher</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MIT Press</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sage Publications</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gaudeamus</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inderscience Publishers</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lapin yliopistokustannus</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pergamon</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suomalaisen Kirjallisuuden Seura</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wiley</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WSOY</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>#</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2 = leading scientific  
1 = scientific

C1 Published scientific monograph  
C2 Edited book, compilation, conference proceeding or special issue of journal  
D5 Text book or professional handbook or guidebook or dictionary  
E2 Popular monograph