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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 panellists as compared to the previous evaluations was the character of the evaluation as a meta-evaluation. 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 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
   - 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”.
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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.

Question 2 – **DOCTORAL TRAINING**
Question 3 – **SOCIETAL IMPACT**
Question 4 – **COLLABORATION**

**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) 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
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

This is a network of researchers in many departments having a common interest in studies of science and technology. A number of interesting contributions have been published, and the overall publication record is good in the context of Helsinki social science, around the median with 1.7 refereed publications (A1, A3, C1) a year by non-student scholars, and around the field average according to the bibliographic data. Journal publications are hardly in internationally leading journals, though.

The field itself is very wide and dispersed, and in order to raise its profile STS should give priority to one or a few areas where it wants to make its main scholarly impact.

Examples of how wide the RC is reflected in the foci of this RC. These foci are the production and preconditions of science and technology in society. One of their interests is biomedicine and the ethical problems generated by the blurring of boundaries between public and private. Another interest is the tension found amid the social & biological sciences, and the role of economics in that stress. In addition, the RC is interesting in the ideological limitations of policy. Interestingly, the RC works with the postmodern theory of Michel Foucault and published two articles in the Philosophy of the Social Science.

Is the RC too wide and what is the rationale for inclusion and exclusion in the RC? Why is some philosophy with politics and economics and not in this RC?

A challenge is to ensure this particular grouping is academically justified.

**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 practices 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

The national Titeko program of training doctoral candidates in Science, Technology and Innovation studies is excellent, although very small, with five students for 2010-13. An unknown number of students with other funding also participate in the program. The program also has an eminent input of teachers from abroad, and is part of international networks.
The structure and requirements used in the recruitment of doctoral students is suitable. The requirements for admission are clear and germane. The concern for the socialization of students into the community of scientific scholars is laudable.

A challenge for the RC, as with most RCs, is the career prospective for their graduates. The STS states that the opportunities for appointments for their undergraduates are good.

**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

The RC is clearly very actively engaged with society extra muros, with enterprises, governmental agencies, and other social users of knowledge. One of the principal investigators has received an award from the Academy of Finland for Social impact of research.

The STS demonstrates an abundance of interactions with organs of the greater society. Importantly, the STS seem to utilize their extra-academic interactions to help their doctors to find nonacademic employment.

**Challenges:** The STS has identified several challenges for their RC such as interventions, policy generation, recommendations to governing bodies. The RC could consider more private sector consulting.

**Numeric evaluation:** 4 (Excellent)

### 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

STS is participating in many international research projects. It is also involved in researcher exchange with research institutes and universities in USA as well as in several countries of Europe. The STS seems to have developed very good research mobility.

**Challenge:** The RC should deliberately nurture international researchers as co-authors. This should be a particularly important goal.

**Numeric evaluation:** 4 (Excellent)

### 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
STS is embedded in several organizational frameworks, which may have advantages of providing wide and multiple perspectives. But operational conditions seem to be sub-optimal. The development of science and technology studies will need the establishment of a real research institute, and not just a network.

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 decentralized, network character of STS means collegial equality and flexibility, but it also means a lack of leadership and of interactive integration. In effect, there is no organizational leadership. This situation often employs euphemisms such as fair, egalitarian or non-hierarchical to couch the situation of low or no leadership. It is assumed that, like many other RC’s, the PIs that gain the external funding function as de facto leaders.

The plan to set up a steering group of the Principal Investigators is an overdue first step towards a better organization. This step seems essential prior to the implementation of the group’s bold plan to build its own permanent and independent research institute.

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

STS has been quite successful in attracting external funding, including from EU and the Nordic Council. Specifically, the RC obtained 4,414,000 euros during the evaluation period or 735,667 euros per year. This is a very good record for the 24 member RC.

The challenge, of course, is to continue this rate of external funding. It may be that funding efforts should be closely linked with the primary plan of creating an independent research institute for the RC. That is probably the number one funding effort for the STS.
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 plan has two main organizational goals, integration into the European Forum of Studies of Policies for Research and Innovation, and the establishment of a research institute in Helsinki. Especially the latter is necessary for further development of science and technology studies. The plan includes no goals of scholarly foci and priorities, a weakness following from current operational conditions.

Also, a unique, comprehensive and extensive “business plan” should be developed to counter the current temporary organization with (HIST) and (Titeko). The planned new STS Institute requires a professionally expounded “business plan” that can elicit support from both the public and private sectors.

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 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.

STS places itself in category 2, which seems quite adequate, and largely due to its dispersed character, without any firm institutional base of its own.

Numeric evaluation: 4 (Excellent)

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

The material presented was written by a STS professor and a STS senior researcher. All 24 members of the RC head opportunities for input.

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

Focus area 10: Globalisation and social change

STS is not quite in the focus of the university, but it does have a relationship, through its studies of innovation to area 4.

2.12 RC-specific main recommendations

At least by the time the necessary institutional basis of STS has been decided, a scholarly plan of foci and priorities should be drawn up.
2.13 RC-specific conclusions

This is a network on an important topic, socially as well as scholarly, and it has demonstrated quite considerable potential. However, for a real breakthrough of Science and Technology studies at Helsinki University a proper organizational infrastructure of a real – not just a virtual – research institute will be necessary.
3 Appendices

A. Original evaluation material
   a. Registration material – Stage 1
   b. Answers to evaluation questions – Stage 2
   c. List of publications
   d. List of other scientific activities

B. Bibliometric analyses
   a. Analysis provided by CWTS/University of Leiden
   b. Analysis provided by Helsinki University Library (66 RCs)
NAME OF THE RESEARCHER COMMUNITY:
Science and Technology Studies (STS)

LEADER OF THE RESEARCHER COMMUNITY:
Professor Ilpo Helén, Department of Social Research

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)
1 RESPONSIBLE PERSON

Name: Helén, Ilpo  
E-mail: ilpo.helen@helsinki.fi  
Phone: +358 9 191 24618  
Affiliation: Department of Social Research  
Street address: Unioninkatu 35

2 DESCRIPTION OF THE PARTICIPATING RESEARCHER COMMUNITY (RC)

Name of the participating RC (max. 30 characters): Science and Technology Studies  
Acronym for the participating RC (max. 10 characters): STS

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): The RC consists of internationally acknowledged scholars working in the multidisciplinary field of science and technology studies. The key objectives of the RC fall under two broad categories: to advance research and doctoral training in the field of science and technology studies and to strengthen the institutional basis of science and technology studies in Finland. More specifically, the research and education focus on 1) the production of scientific knowledge and technical innovations, and their diffusion in society and 2) the preconditions of science and technology processes as well as their societal and environmental consequences (for further details, see section 5).

The members of the RC include 10 principal investigators (PI) and 16 researchers and doctoral students. Of the PIs, one is Academy Professor, two Full Professors, two Acting Professors and one Professor emerita. The RC members work in many departments at the University of Helsinki (UH) and represent disciplines like sociology, social policy, education and philosophy. They do collaborate with one another within two interdisciplinary research networks, the Helsinki Institute of Science and Technology Studies (HIST) and the Network for Higher Education and Innovation Research (HEINE). The RC is also engaged with joint doctoral training organized under the auspices of the Finnish Post-Graduate School in Science, Technology and Innovation Studies (Titeko), established in 2006. In addition to these activities, the members of the RC have collaborated with one another in research projects and in organizing courses, research seminars and symposiums of various kinds.

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: Sociology
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RC’s scientific subfield 3: Philosophy
RC’s scientific subfield 4: Environmental Studies
Other, if not in the list: Science and technology studies, Adult education

4 RC'S PARTICIPATION CATEGORY

Participation category: 2. 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

Justification for the selected participation category (MAX. 2200 characters with spaces): Being composed of 26 members from different disciplines and organizational units at UH, the RC is producing work that is of both international quality and social relevance. This progress is proved by the numerous articles by the RC members in leading international journals (e.g., Social Studies of Science, Research Policy, Studies in History and Philosophy of Science) as well as by books published or forthcoming by major international publishers (e.g., Routledge, Cambridge University Press, Oxford University Press). The doctoral training by the RC members shows continuous growth both in quality and quantity, supported by established graduate schools in the fields of sociology, philosophy, education and science and technology studies. In the years to come, the aim of the RC is to become Finland’s focal point for internationally recognized science and technology studies activities. In 2008, this goal was highly acknowledged by the Strategic Advisory Board of HIST, in the activities of which the most of the PIs are engaged with.

Despite the fact that many members of the RC are doing cutting edge research in their fields of investigation, the RC as a whole still lacks a clear international break-through. This is largely due to the dispersed nature of the field of science and technology studies in general, an irretrievable aspect of the global, expanding science and technology studies community. Furthermore, the RC has operated in its present form for a relatively short period of time and thereby lacks a strong and established organizational home base, such as a joint research center.

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): The research activities of the RC fall into two main categories, 1) the production of scientific knowledge and technical innovations, and their diffusion in society and 2) the preconditions of science and technology processes as well as their social, ethical and environmental consequences. Concerning the studies on the production of scientific knowledge, the research by the RC addresses the practices of university research groups and the ways in which they collaborate with one another as well as with relevant stakeholders in society. Another major topic of interest in this area is interdisciplinarity among and between the social and natural sciences. In addition to studying academic research, the RC members are actively engaged in understanding the production and use of technical innovations both in business and in public services. Topics most prominently addressed in this field are producer-user interaction in technology development, user-centered creation of technological realities as well as participation of general publics in biomedical research. The preconditions of science and technology processes within the RC include research on different aspects of science and technology policy, both from the Finnish and comparative international perspectives, as well as sustainability assessment and strategy, with empirical applications in
environmental and technology policy, waste management and environmental governance in northern regions.

In addition to supervising doctoral students in their home departments (and in other graduate schools), the PIs pursue joint doctoral training under the auspices of the Finnish Post-Graduate School in Science, Technology and Innovation Studies (Titeko). Within Titeko, the PIs have organized (with senior researchers from other universities) seminars as well as winter and summer schools focused on different topics in science and technology studies. Titeko has enabled to recruit prominent international scholars as lecturers and commentators in its seminars, and has formed permanent collaborative relations with the universities of Oxford, York, Lund and Oslo.

Significance of the RC's research and doctoral training for the University of Helsinki (MAX. 2200 characters with spaces):
The RC's research and doctoral training is important not only from the perspective of UH but from that of Finland as well. Since the 1980s, the country has adopted a line of policy which puts strong emphasis on science and technology. More recently, it has emphasized the effective operation of the national innovation system to enhance its prosperity and global competitiveness. Despite these policy priorities, there is not a single major research center with permanent funding in this country focusing on these topics of central importance. Furthermore UH has adopted the goal of doing high-level, high-profile and long-term research with significant impact on society. In meeting these national and university-level objectives, social scientific research on science, technology and innovation is indispensable.

With the help of a small grant obtained from the Ministry of Education and Culture (€ 200 000/year), UH established in 2004 the Helsinki Institute of Science and Technology Studies (HIST), a network consisting of the total of nine research groups coming from UH and Aalto University. Given the fact that only a handful of scholars are engaged in science and technology studies in Finland, it is evident that the current RC is by far the most extensive group of scholars committed to work in this field in the country. The prominence of the RC is further emphasized by the fact that it has taken the leading position in the Finnish Post-Graduate School in Science, Technology and Innovation Studies (Titeko) since its beginning in 2006. The RC has thus a major responsibility in creating new knowledge on issues related to science, technology and innovation, as well as securing the production of the competent experts for academia, industry and public sector.

Keywords: sociology of science and technology, philosophy of science, interdisciplinarity, environmental policy, innovation policy, learning

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 RC's research activities meet high international standards in different sub-fields of science and technology studies. This is evidenced by the constant flow of articles and books by the RC members in leading international journals and scientific publishers. Thus all major work by the RC members has gone through peer review process at international level. The RC members also have been granted numerous positions of trust in international scientific journals and associations, which evidences the recognition of their contribution to the scientific activities.
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worldwide. The same holds true for the measure of external competitive research funding received by the
RC members during the evaluation period. It should be noted as well that among the RC members is the
holder of the position of Academy Professor, which is the highest-ranking professorship in Finland. Younger
members of the RC received public recognition for their outstanding scientific work too (e.g., Academy of
Finland Award in 2010). In addition to these, the members of the RC acted regularly as examiners of
dissertations in Finland and abroad as well as taught in universities in many countries. During the
evaluation period, the RC had active collaborative relationships with many established scholars and
research groups all over the world.

Much of what was said above about the RC members in general also holds true for the doctoral students. It
is common for the doctoral candidates of this RC to publish in peer reviewed scientific journals during their
studies, which serves as a constant quality assessment of their work. Quality assurance also takes place
through established exchange of doctoral candidates between the Finnish Post-Graduate School in Science,
Technology and Innovation Studies (Titeko) and its international partner universities. Resulting from these
measures, it is common for the RC’s doctoral candidates to receive high grades for their PhD dissertations
and be hired to expert positions in academia and elsewhere after their graduation.

Comments on how the RC’s scientific productivity and doctoral training should be evaluated (MAX. 2200
characters with spaces): The most appropriate method for assessing the scientific outcomes of this RC
would be peer review conducted by experts coming from the RC’s areas of scientific specialty. Analysis of
documentary materials and publications should be supplemented with site visits and face-to-face
discussions with the RC members. To improve the future activities of the RC, the evaluation report should
not only include the positioning of the RC’s activities both in the Finnish and international scientific
contexts but put forward realistic developmental measures for implementation by both the RC and the
university. When it comes to the evaluation of the doctoral training, similar method should be applied.
Attention should be paid to the educational practices used in the doctoral education as well as on the
resources at hand by the RC. Current and former doctoral students should be interviewed and the quality
of their scientific work should be evaluated.

The RC’s publishing strategy is diversified. First of all, the RC members will publish their major research
results in leading international journals representing different sub-fields of science and technology studies.
The relevant journals are many and they appear in the following areas of research: sociological and
philosophical studies on science, technology and innovation, methodology of the social sciences, higher
education research, environmental, educational and research policy as well as R&D and innovation
management. Second, results that are supposed have more extensive readership in the contexts of current
discussions in philosophy, sociology, education and environmental sciences will be published in major
disciplinary outlets covering these areas. Third, major theoretical and empirical work will be pulled together
in the form of scholarly books appearing in both national and international planes. And fourth, new
scientific perspectives and results that have potential practical value in the national context will be
published in Finnish either as books or articles in journals directed to scientific, professional and general
publics.
# LIST OF RC MEMBERS

**NAME OF THE RESEARCHER COMMUNITY:** Science and Technology Studies (STS)

**RC-LEADER:** I. Helen

**CATEGORY:** 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<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>1</td>
<td>Helén Ilpo</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>Dept of Social Research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Lehtonen Turo-Kimmo</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>Dept of Social Research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Häyrinen-Alestalo Marja</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>Dept of Social Research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Miettinen Reiho</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>Institute of Behav. Sciences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Mäki Uskali</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>Dept of Pol. and Econ Studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Huikkinen Janne</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>Dept of Social Research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Arminen Ilkka</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>HEINE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Tapaninen Anna-Maria</td>
<td></td>
<td>Senior researcher</td>
<td>Dept of Social Research</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Hyysalo Sampsa</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>Senior researcher</td>
<td>Collegium of Adv. Studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Tuunainen Juha</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>Senior researcher</td>
<td>Dept of Social Research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Meskus Mianna</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>Postdoctoral Researcher</td>
<td>Dept of Social Research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Snell Karoliina</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>Postdoctoral Researcher</td>
<td>Dept of Social Research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Tupasela Aaro</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>Postdoctoral Researcher</td>
<td>Dept of Social Research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Pelkonen Antti</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>Postdoctoral Researcher</td>
<td>Dept of Social Research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Jansik Nina</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>Doctoral candidate</td>
<td>Dept of Social Research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Hautamäki Lotta</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>Doctoral candidate</td>
<td>Dept of Social Research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Silvast Antti</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>Doctoral candidate</td>
<td>Dept of Social Research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Liukko Jyri</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>Doctoral candidate</td>
<td>Dept of Social Research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Veilahti Antti</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>Doctoral candidate</td>
<td>Dept of Social Research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Teräväinen Tuula</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>Doctoral candidate</td>
<td>Dept of Social Research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Waltari Suvi-Tuuli</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>Doctoral candidate</td>
<td>Dept of Social Research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Huustoniemi Katri</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>Doctoral candidate</td>
<td>Dept of Social Research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Saikkonen Paula</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>Doctoral candidate</td>
<td>Dept of Social Research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Freeman Stephanie</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>Doctoral candidate</td>
<td>Institute of Behav. Sciences</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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RC-SPECIFIC STAGE 2 MATERIAL

Name of the RC’s responsible person: Helén, Ilpo
E-mail of the RC’s responsible person: ilpo.helen@helsinki.fi

Name and acronym of the participating RC: science and technology studies, STS

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: Science, technology and innovation are key driving forces of societal change today. They are global phenomena that are linked in many intimate ways to various other sectors of the society, such as economy, politics and culture. They are, therefore, at the heart of globalization and related societal change processes.

1. 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).

   The RC’s work has focused on the ways in which science and technology (S&T) affect politics, economy, environment and culture and how these influence S&T. Under this theme, two foci can be discerned: 1) the production of scientific knowledge and technical innovations, and their application and diffusion in society and 2) the preconditions of S&T processes, and their social, political and environmental consequences. Concerning the former, the RC has addressed the practices of scientists and the ways in which they collaborate with one another as well as with relevant societal stakeholders. It also has investigated interaction between S&T and other societal institutions, such as politics, business and public service production. Concerning the latter, the RC has addressed different aspects of S&T policy, e.g., analysis of S&T policy in national and comparative perspectives, and sustainability assessment, governance and strategy. The RC has established many significant and timely research topics in science and technology studies (STS) in Finland, e.g.:

   - university-society relationship and change of research work;
   - relationship between biomedicine and society;
   - interdisciplinarity;
   - S&T policy analysis;
   - user-producer interaction in technical development; and
   - environmental policy, governance and assessment.

Concerning the changing nature of the university, and the relationship between science and other social institutions, the RC has confronted and criticized general models of university-industry relations, e.g., the mode-two knowledge production. According to these, there has been major transformation in the relations between science and other institutions with profound impact on the nature of scientific work and knowledge. By refining such models the RC has shown that while universities and science may be changing, the movement is far from uniform. Even within rather applied areas there are constituencies that do not see commercialization as the only way to go: no single resolution is predetermined by the larger historical and institutional processes but the transformation is contradictory involving many institutions and their stakeholders.
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epistemic and organizational options. The results thus constitute a good basis for understanding the third mission of the university in a richer way than is usually the case.

Within the RC, historical and sociological studies of biomedicine have created international collaboration with top research centres in the world. The research has provided insights about the ways in which biomedicine is assembled in society today confirming results about the transformation of science into transnational activity and the blurring of boundaries between public and private research institutions. Studies also have shown that the establishment of new specialties in biomedicine requires a socio-political foothold in the realm of health practices and general policy; the relations between clinical genetics and maternal care as well as biobanking and national innovation policy are examples of this. Finally, the research has shown that embeddedness of biomedicine in medical care and health policy creates an intensive pressure to implement advanced technologies in actual practices. This technical imperative seems to engender ethical problems and questions about sharing of responsibility, too.

Still another set of results focuses on the unity and disunity in the social sciences. Important interdisciplinary encounters are taking place within the social sciences, as well as between the social sciences and cognitive and biological sciences. These interactions and transformations are not smooth and uniform but involve tensions and conflicting tendencies towards both integration and disintegration. By looking at these tendencies and tensions, the RC members have shown that economics have played a major role in these developments, both as an exporter and importer of new ideas. Furthermore, analysis of the Academy of Finland’s general research grants have produced a typology of indicators for interdisciplinarity research plus recommendations for organizing interdisciplinary evaluation panels and procedures.

In studying S&T policies, sociological and political theories have been used to explain the socio-political transformation and its relationship to the S&T systems in Europe. Because economic and S&T policies are fundamental to the social development, an effort has been made to analyse the expanding role of S&T in the economy and the larger society, the increasing public concern in new technologies, the renewal of public services, the logic of market forces and the demand for globalization. The RC has been among the forerunners in the field to pay attention to permanent inconsistencies and tensions between economic and broader societal concerns, especially in relation to universities, public services and globalization. It also has introduced the need for multipurpose, horizontal and integrated ways of policy-making, and for participatory democracy in the S&T policy. Finally, the RC has used rhetorical analysis to stress the ways in which vocabulary derived from the national innovation systems approach and evolutionary economics of innovation has influenced the S&T policy. By so doing, a deeper understanding of the ideological limitations of the current policy has been fostered.

In distributed innovation and user-producer interaction one of the major tasks has been to understand the ways in which users shape the development of new technologies. The research has focused on developing methods for involving users as a source of inventive ideas and showing their decisive input during early stages of innovation processes. In addition, attention has been paid to the ways in which users modify and adjust technologies to their needs and practices during stages of end-use. The longitudinal research on new health-care technologies has confirmed that users are crucial for the success and social acceptability of new technologies: all studied projects have been redirected by users, as the original ideas have proved unfeasible. All in all, the major contribution has been to question the dominant “project and tools” focus in innovation studies and to articulate a more sophisticated approach to user involvement in innovative projects. In addition to this, the RC has repeatedly underlined
the importance of user-producer interaction in the context of S&T policy, an endeavour which has fostered the inclusion of user collaboration in the Finnish innovation strategies.

Under the topic of environmental policy, governance and assessment several research questions have been investigated. First, questions concerning resource governance in the north have led to recommendations for participatory institutions to manage conflicts between competing northern land users. They have also improved methodologies for the integration of knowledge produced by local practitioners, government planners and academic researchers. Second, questions concerning the framing of sustainable development and its monitoring have produced conceptual models for improved sustainability governance, structured around indicators that use scenarios as their frame of reference. Third, questions concerning the emergence of new environmentally relevant technologies and compounds have improved understanding of new generation risks and the mental models underlying such risks. They also have provided guidance to the socio-cognitive processes of deliberation that are needed for reliable governance of the new generation risks. Finally, issues related to new energy technologies and climate change have received attention within the RC.

- **Ways to strengthen the focus and improve the quality of the RC’s research.**

As evidenced by the CVs and publication lists of the RC members, the quality of the research is of high international standard with constant flow of articles in leading scientific journals. This standard will be maintained and increased - if possible - by means of further international collaboration and researcher exchange.

The members of the RC have different kinds of theoretical, methodological and empirical backgrounds, which opens up opportunities to make creative scientific breakthroughs in STS and other fields of study. To achieve this, the RC will combine different topics, approaches and traditions in theoretically informed ways. Such work has already begun within the RC between STS and Foucauldian analysis, cultural-historical activity theory and pragmatism, among others. The many common and complementary themes of empirical research also form useful platforms for increasing scientific quality of the RC, for instance, through joint seminars, research projects and publications.

### 2. Practices and Quality of Doctoral Training (max. 8800 characters with spaces)

- **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 practices and quality assurance in doctoral training, and assuring good career perspectives for the doctoral candidates/fresh doctorates.

Doctoral training, one of the key activities of the RC, was pursued by in multiple ways. The most important organization in this respect was the Finnish Post-Graduate School in Science, Technology and Innovation Studies (Titeko) where the PIs of the RC played a leading role, for instance, by serving as the leaders of the school between 2005-10. The education given by Titeko was regarded as excellent in quality and productivity in the Academy of Finland’s evaluation in 2008.

The number of positions for doctoral candidates in Titeko was three in 2006-09 and five in 2010-13. In addition to these posts, additional students have been appointed to the school as status members. These students participate in the activities of Titeko but get their funding from other sources.

Students of Titeko have been recruited through an open call published in the University of Helsinki’s (UH) web pages. In the application phase, each person submitted the following documents to the...
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Titeko’s steering group: a cover letter, a research plan and an account of the study place and supervision of the dissertation. The group selected the students on the basis of the following criteria: 1) relatedness of the topic to the research themes of the school, 2) membership of the student in a research group participating in Titeko, 3) scientific significance of the topic of dissertation, 4) quality of the research plan, 5) need for interdisciplinary supervision, 6) capacity for independent research and scientific writing and 7) applicant’s international orientation. Moreover, Titeko observed equality between men and women, and took account of disciplinary and regional representation when recruiting the students. According to the Academy of Finland’s evaluation, the selection process of the students followed good practice and acceptable criteria.

The activities of Titeko were organised into four themes on the basis of the students’ research objects and disciplinary backgrounds. These were: 1) the transformation of science and scientific institutions, innovation as well as science and technology policy, 2) technology, environment and organizations, 3) historical studies on science and technology and 4) ethics and philosophy of science. Within Titeko, the PIs of the RC organized, together with other senior scholars, seminars as well as winter and summer schools on different topics in science and technology studies (STS).

In the research seminars students presented their work in the form of written papers and presentations, and received comments from supervisors, external experts, senior scholars and other students. In winter seminars different phases of the dissertation process were addressed, in addition to issues related to scientific profession and research funding. Representatives of research funding agencies and other key actors in science and technology policy were often present to give their contributions to the discussion. Finally, the summer schools were organized around topical themes of STS, such as multidisciplinarity or the notion of commons. The summer schools included lectures by international experts accompanied by relevant articles, group work, methods workshops and panel discussions. Doctoral students were encouraged to take part in domestic and international research seminars and conferences too, as well as to participate in international student exchange programmes.

Dissertations pursued within Titeko were supervised by the members of the school’s management group many of which were PIs of the RC, including the current and former leaders of Titeko.

Titeko has formed permanent collaborative relations with the following universities:
- Prof. Steve Woolgar, University of Oxford;
- Prof. Andrew Webster, University of York; and
- Prof. Merle Jacob, Lund University and University of Oslo.

Other international teachers participating in Titeko’s activities include:
- Prof. Jürgen Schriewer (Humboldt University);
- Prof. Sverker Sörlin (Umeå University);
- Prof. Benoit Godin (University of Quebec);
- Prof. Raymond Miller (San Francisco State University); and
- Prof. Jouni Paavola (University of Leeds).
Titeko collaborates with Globelics Academy, an international graduate school focused on innovation systems and economic development. Globelics Academy is organized under the auspices of the Interim Scientific Board of Globelics network, members of which include Prof. Bengt Åke Lundvall (Aalborg University), Dr. Jorge Niosi (University of Québec), Prof. Luc Soete (Maastricht University) and Prof. Richard Nelson (Columbia University), among others. Through Helsinki Institute of Science and Technology Studies (HIST), Titeko is currently engaged in plans of expanding the international collaboration in doctoral training through a membership in the European Forum for Studies of Policies for Research and Innovation (Eu-SPRI Forum), a collaborative network of 13 European research organizations in the field of science, technology and innovation policy. Eu-SPRI Forum is, currently, headed by Prof. Stefan Kuhlman of the University of Twente.

In addition to the teaching activities by Titeko and its partners, the PIs of the RC supervise doctoral students in their home departments as well as in other graduate schools operating in such fields as sociology, philosophy, adult education and environmental research.

The quality assurance procedures in doctoral training are closely tied to the socialisation of the students into the international scientific community in STS. During the socialization process the students learn best practices in research as well as international quality standards. Some examples of the ways in which quality assurance is achieved are listed below:

- careful evaluation of the research plans written by students during the recruitment process;
- critical and constructive discussion about the empirical, methodological and theoretical choices made by them during the dissertation projects;
- analysis of empirical data together with senior scholars;
- writing of articles together with senior scholars;
- critical review of dissertation manuscripts in supervisory meetings and seminars;
- presentation of research results in domestic and international conferences during doctoral studies;
- participation of doctoral candidates in international student exchange programmes;
- publication of articles in peer-reviewed international journals;
- preliminary examination of PhD theses by external experts nominated by Faculties of UH; and
- public defence of the thesis.

Career perspectives of the students with background in STS are good. Because science, technology and innovation are all the more important issues in policy making, experts in STS are urgently needed, for instance, in ministries, public research institutes (e.g., VTT Technical Research Center of Finland) and science and technology funding agencies (Academy of Finland, The Finnish Funding Agency for Technology and Innovation Tekes). In addition to this, the number of private sector organizations (e.g., consultancies, interest groups) focusing on science, technology and innovation has expanded in Finland. Many of them make use of scientific knowledge developed in this field to advance operation of knowledge-based industries and national innovations systems in many countries (e.g., Advansis Ltd in South Africa and Latin America). Furthermore, Finnish universities and polytechnics have expanded their activities in STS, which has increased their demand for qualified labour force. Finally, some of the scholars having graduated from Titeko have moved to work in universities located abroad.
• RC’s strengths and challenges related to the practises and quality of doctoral training, and the actions planned for their development.

The strengths of the doctoral training include:
- established structures and practices of doctoral training through post-graduate school in science and technology studies;
- close collaborative relationships with relevant other schools;
- expanding international collaboration; and
- good career prospects for PhDs.

The challenges of the doctoral training include:
- small amount of student positions in the doctoral school;
- limited supply of courses in STS in Master’s level; and
- lack of permanent teaching positions in STS (one professorship only).

Because Titeko has just reformed its structure, collaborative relationships and action plan for the years 2010-13, there is not an urgent need to address them. Concerning the next lifetime of Titeko, the school will apply for more student positions on the basis of its supposedly productive activity. In addition to this, there have been initiatives to establish a university lecturer’s position in STS too, but with no success for the time being. Nonetheless, the work towards increasing undergraduate teaching at the UH has already begun.

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).

Globalization of economy and fast technological progress has enthroned science, technology and innovation (ST&I) in the heart of the societal development. New knowledge, technologies and commercial products are needed for fostering the prosperity of nations in the knowledge intensive social and economic competition. Knowledge about ST&I is important from the point of view of public policy and decision-making too. Research on ST&I thus has strong societal relevance built into it. The RC’s work forms no exception to this rule. It has contributed to the society, e.g., by
- developing sophisticated approaches to user involvement for innovative technology development;
- giving recommendations for participatory institutions to manage conflicts between competing land uses;
- improving methodologies for the integration of knowledge produced by local practitioners, government planners and academicians;
- producing conceptual models for improved sustainability governance;
- creating better understanding of the new generation risks and the mental models underlying such risks;
- supporting the development of practices in different areas of public policy and service; and
- producing new understanding about the latest socio-economic transformations.
Many means have been applied in disseminating research results from the scientific community to practitioners working in different sectors of the society. Examples below give some indication of the significance of the research done by the RC:

- Projects have included interventionist research designs, e.g., in TeleChemistry Ltd and Vivago Ltd.
- Results have been published in bulletins and publication series of public sector organizations to communicate their social implications as widely as possible.
- The RC has contributed to the evaluation and improvement of public R&D programs and conducted commissioned policy-oriented projects, e.g., evaluation of the Finnish environmental cluster research programme, final synthesis of the ProAct technology policy initiative and promotion of interdisciplinary research at the Academy of Finland.
- Projects funded by the Ministry of Education, Finnish Funding Agency for Technology and Innovation Tekes, OECD, EU or other have had steering groups where users of knowledge have been represented. Such groups have been vital for making sure that the research results will meet the needs of the end-users.
- Results have been communicated to those investigated by means of face-to-face interaction or by sending publications to them.
- Projects have held public seminars, lectures and talks during and after the research. This has been important from the point of view of communication between researchers and relevant societal interest groups.
- Researchers have been invited to give briefings and talks about topics investigated by insurance companies, ministries and other public sector organizations etc.
- The RC members have served as experts in committees in public sector and in civic organizations.
- Dr. Hyysalo received in 2010 Academy of Finland Award for Social Impact of Research.
- Many doctors have found jobs outside academia.

Many PIs are also members of HEINE, HiST and Titeko that produce knowledge relevant to public administration and policy-making.

- **Ways to strengthen the societal impact of the RC’s research and doctoral training.**

Until now, the RC has contributed to the society in diverse ways. These activities will be continued in the future, too. The RC will, for instance,

- become engaged with policy makers and other users of the RC’s knowledge during early stages of new research projects,
- direct its research and teaching activities so as to produce societally relevant knowledge;
- do interventionist research together with different user communities;
- conduct commissioned, policy-oriented projects;
- communicate its research results to various user groups in the society; and
- give recommendations to administrators and policy-makers.

One of the central missions of the University of Helsinki’s Network for Higher Education and Innovation Research (HEINE, see Section 5 below) is to produce scientific knowledge that is relevant to university administration and policy-making in Finland. Having been established in 2010, HEINE is currently in the
midst of developing ways in which such contribution will be materialized. The RC will play an active role in this endeavour whenever possible.

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.

The international research collaboration has been extensive ranging from hands-on joint research to membership in international organizations and networks. The RC publishes its work in leading international journals and books, and participates in multiple, in-depth projects funded by international funding agencies, e.g.:  
- DNA and Immigration – Exploring the Social, Political and Ethical Implications of Genetic Testing for Family Reunification;  
- Privacy regimes in variation and transformation – The emerging field of post-genomics;  
- Knowledge-based Tools for Sustainable Governance of Energy and Climate Adaptation in the Nordic Periphery (Nordic Center for Spatial Development);  
- Collaborative Priority-setting for Innovation Activities in Eastern Finland (European Social Fund);  
- Public Debate on Research Policy in Nordic Countries – Issues and Trends (Nordic Research Board);  
- Work package on precautionary procedures for nanomaterial safety assessment for the project Nanomaterials in REACH – Evaluation of Applicability of Existing Procedures for Chemical Safety Assessment to nanomaterials (EU 6th FP);  
- Knowledge-Based Tools for Sustainable Governance of Energy and Climate Adaptation in the Nordic Periphery (Nordic Center for Spatial Development); and  
- Work package on dissemination and exploitation: social-ecological analysis of nanopatterning and related applications for the project Nanopattering, Production and Applications Based on Nanoimprinting Lithography (EU 7th FP).

The RC has represented Finland in the management groups of two EU COST programmes Science and Technology Research in Knowledge-based Economy and Bio-objects and their Boundaries: Governing Matters at the Intersection of Society, Politics and Science. The RC members also have served in boards of international scientific societies (e.g., ISA, ESA).

The RC has actively participated in international researcher exchange with the help of EU’s Marie Curie fellowships and other support structures. Longer time periods were spent in the following universities: Harvard, Edinburgh, Westminster, Graz, Rotterdam, Paris I, Bielefeld, Santa Clara, Sussex, Oslo and York. Researcher mobility from abroad has been equally ample with scholars coming from London, Leuven, Rotterdam, Alabama, Naples, Exeter, Sussex, Berlin and Budapest. The PIs have acted as supervisors and examiners of dissertations in many countries and participated in numerous scientific journals and associations as reviewers, editors, board members, members of organizing committees etc. They also have acted as experts in international organizations (e.g., EC, ESF and OECD) and reviewed research proposals, job and student applications and promotion proposals for universities, research institutes and funding agencies worldwide.
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The RC is a major actor in the Finnish STS community with extensive collaboration with actors coming from higher education, philosophy of science and environmental research. Good working relations exist between the RC and scholars coming from different departments. The RC members hold many expert positions and collaborate with other researchers under the auspices of HEINE, HIST, Titeko and Finnish Society for Science and Technology Studies.

For collaboration in doctoral training, see Section 2.

- **RC’s strengths and challenges related to research collaboration and researcher mobility, and the actions planned for their development.**

  **Strengths concerning international collaboration:**
  - well established, extensive and rich collaborative relationships in Finland and abroad.

  **Challenges concerning international collaboration:**
  - relatively small number of co-authored publications with international scholars and
  - uneven distribution of international collaborative relations within the RC.

  In the future, the RC will develop its national and international collaboration, for instance, by:
  - organizing national and international seminars and workshops on research topics pursued by the RC members;
  - using existing memberships in international scientific organizations and networks as platforms to initiate new collaborative projects;
  - actively seeking possibilities to produce joint publications with international partners;
  - socializing the RC members to international STS community already during the doctoral studies; and
  - disseminating international contacts among the members of the RC.

  For plans to increase collaboration in doctoral training, see Section 2.

---

**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).**

  The operation of the RC is embedded in many organizations, such as:

  1) Finnish Society for Science and Technology Studies

  The society supports research and teaching in STS in Finland. It brings together a range of scholars from different disciplines and publishes an international peer-reviewed journal Science Studies. The PIs of the RC have been key actors in the society serving as editors and editorial board members of the journal and holding chairman’s and board members’ positions in the society.

  2) Finnish Post-Graduate School in Science, Technology and Innovation Studies (Titeko)

  The school aims at developing researcher training in STS, strengthening the research groups operating in the field and fostering multidisciplinary research. The school’s goal is to educate international level scholars with abilities needed in S&T administration. It is a multidisciplinary entity and the University of
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Helsinki (UH) is liable for its activities. Other member universities include Tampere, Oulu, Eastern Finland, Jyväskylä and Aalto. Titeko’s current term ends in 2013.

3) Helsinki Institute of Science and Technology Studies (HIST)
HIST is a network established by the UH and Aalto University (AU). It aims at strengthening research and doctoral training in the two universities and intends to become Finland’s focal point in internationally recognized STS. Its goals include: 1) to advance research and post-graduate education and 2) to strengthen the institutional basis of STS. Research and education in HIST focuses on the production of scientific knowledge and development of technical innovations in connection to their larger societal and environmental preconditions and consequences. The task of institutional strengthening focuses on the facilitation of high-quality research and conducting commissioned policy analyses. Currently, the unit’s organizational structure and legal status are in limbo due to the fact that UH and AU have not lengthened the contract period beyond 2009. The funding of HIST is secured until the end of 2012.

4) Network for Higher Education and Innovation Research (HEINE)
HEINE was established to bolster research and education in science, technology and innovation studies, higher education and economics of education. HEINE gets its funding from the Ministry of Education and Culture and it is secured until the end of 2012. The goal of HEINE is to produce knowledge that is relevant to university policy and has value for the development of university research and education. The network consists of four units: 1) Helsinki Center of Economic Research responsible for research in economics of education and innovation, 2) Higher Education Governance and Management responsible for research on higher education policies and university management, 3) Helsinki Institute of Science and Technology Studies responsible for research on the innovation system and its changes, and on the development of science and technology, and 4) Centre for Research and Development of Higher Education, which promotes research-based education and its development.

The PIs are closely engaged in the activities of their home departments at the UH. They contribute to the undergraduate teaching in the study block of STS and offer courses in different departments.

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

The strengths of the operational conditions consist of the manifold organizations operating in the field of science and technology studies. The weaknesses include their short lifetimes, scant resources and the lack of mature teaching program at the undergraduate level.

For actions planned to address these and other weaknesses, please see Sections 1-4, 6 and 8 of this document.

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.**

The research and teaching activities pursued by the RC are organized in a decentralized manner. The work organization of the RC is based on independent research groups operating under the leadership of professors, that is, PIs of the RC. There are six major research groups within the RC at the University of
INTERNATIONAL EVALUATION OF RESEARCH AND DOCTORAL TRAINING AT THE UNIVERSITY OF HELSINKI

RC-SPECIFIC STAGE 2 MATERIAL

Helsinki (UH) plus two more groups of researchers working under the PIs in other universities (Aalto University and University of Tampere). The groups located at the UH are:
- the research group on innovation and organization of research work;
- the research group for comparative sociology;
- the research group on biomedicine and society;
- the research group on material culture, markets and welfare;
- the research group on trends and tensions in intellectual integration; and
- the research group on environmental policy.

These groups finance their work through external competitive research funding. This means that no formal organizational or managerial body – not to mention a joint department or institute – exists within the RC. However, the RC is tied together by two cooperative organizations pursuing scientific research and doctoral training in science and technology studies: the Helsinki Institute of Science and Technology Studies (HIST) and the Finnish Post-Graduate School in Science, Technology and Innovation Studies (Titeko). The managerial model applied in both of these organizations is collegial rather than administratively or managerially driven. This means that neither HIST nor Titeko has a director. Instead, major decisions concerning the research and teaching activities are prepared and made in concert by members of their management groups that are composed of the PIs of this RC.

Another link tying together the RC is the Professor of Science and Technology Studies located at the Department of Social Research. The professor acts as the chairman of the management groups of HIST and Titeko thus serving as a mediator between them. In addition to this, the professor acts as a convenor within the entire RC supported by HIST’s research co-ordinator who also takes part in the planning, administration and direction of the RC’s activities.

In addition to the above mentioned collaborative organizations, the PIs of the RC collaborate with one another in many issues related to teaching and research in STS, and come together to deal with common issues whenever necessary.

The future plans by the RC to form a strong and permanent research institute focusing on STS will evidently necessitate stronger management and coordination of research and teaching activities within the RC (please see Section 8 below).

For the RC’s research focus and collaboration related to it, please see Section 1.

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

The strengths of the current collegial model of leadership of the RC are as follows:
- managerial orientation is based on teamwork, responsible behavior and self-discipline by those involved;
- the managerial model fosters supportive and egalitarian work practices; and
- open and collegial management style facilitates free movement of ideas and fosters formation of a shared motivation among the RC members.
The weaknesses of the collegial model are as follows:
- the research and teaching activities by the RC may remain somewhat disintegrated; and
- the performance of strategic leadership is difficult due to the lack of joint organizational home base, central managerial body and financial resources.

To address these weaknesses, a steering group consisting of the PIs will be formed. It will be responsible for decisions concerning the RC as whole. It also will facilitate interaction within the RC thus integrating present and future research themes and approaches. On the longer run, the RC seeks to form a permanent institute led by a director and management group (see Section 8).

### 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: **4640000**

- **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: **2100000**

- **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: **250000**

- **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: **0**

- **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: 
    - Koneen säätiö € 68600
    - Emil Aaltosen säätiö € 209600
    - Maj ja Tor Nesslingin säätiö € 111000
    - Suomen kulttuurirahasto € 104000
    - Fortumin säätiö € 16000
    - Konkordia-liitto € 2500
    - Kansan sivistysrahasto € 5000
  - total amount of funding (in euros) from the above-mentioned foundations: **520000**

- **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:
    - Nordic Council of Ministers (Nordregio) € 211000
    - Nordic Research Council € 15000
    - University of Lausanne and Research Council of Switzerland € 6000
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- total amount of funding (in euros) from the above-mentioned funding organizations: 230000

- 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).
  - names of the funding organizations: - Ministry of Education and Culture € 504000
  - The Finnish Work Environment Fund € 150000
  - The Finnish Post-Graduate School in Science, Technology and Innovation Studies (Titeko) € 110000
  - The Finnish Doctoral Program in Social Sciences (Sovako) € 86000
  - total amount of funding (in euros) from the above-mentioned funding organizations: 850000

B 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.
  The main goal of the RC is to to strengthen research and post-graduate education in the field of science and technology studies (STS) and to become Finland’s focal point for internationally recognized STS activities. The RC aims at doing high-level scientific research on science-society interaction, including research on basic mechanisms of science, technology and innovation processes as well as their societal conditions and impacts. To achieve this, the members of the RC will fortify pooling together their complementary knowledge and expertise as well as further expand their international collaborative relationships.

  In addition to doctoral training given at University of Helsinki’s (UH) different departments, the RC members will continue their active participation in the Finnish Post-Graduate School in Science, Technology and Innovation Studies (Titeko). Because Titeko has just reformed its structure, collaborative relationships and action plan for the years 2010-13, there is no need to address them in the near future. In addition to the existing plans of Titeko to strengthen its international educational activities, the RC members will work towards integrating the Finnish STS community into the European Forum for Studies of Policies for Research and Innovation (Eu-SPRI Forum), which is a joint effort of 13 European research organizations operating in the field of science, technology and innovation policy. Eu-SPRI Forum is in the process of broadening its activities to cover South and South-East Asian countries too, an area where one of the members of the RC already has been active in.

  The achievements of the RC members during the past five years lay a solid foundation for its future activities. Key challenge for the RC’s future is, however, the organizational consolidation and institutionalization. Currently, the organizational structures related to STS at UH are temporary only. This creates uncertainty and directs energy from research and teaching to organizational manoeuvring. The strategic goal of the RC is thus to secure its operational conditions by creating a strong home base in the form of an independent research institute.

  To achieve this, the RC will act together with scholars coming from Aalto University (AU) to form a strong research institute in the Helsinki metropolitan area. In this endeavour, the current temporary organizations, the Helsinki Institute of Science and Technology Studies (HIIST) and the Finnish Post-Graduate School in Science, Technology and Innovation Studies (Titeko) will serve as useful platforms. The organizational model of the new institute will be the Helsinki Institute for Information Technology (HIIT). The mission of HIIT is to carry out international level research and to provide undergraduate and doctoral education based on the Institute’s collaborative research activities. The forthcoming unit will be
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directed, developed and supervised by a director and a board, supported by an international scientific advisory committee. If a joint research institute between UH and AU will appear to be unrealistic, the RC will work towards forming a research institute of its own at UH only.

The above mentioned goal was supported by the International Scientific Advisory Board of HIST in 2008. The board stated in its recommendation: “Being composed of nine committed, top-level research groups from the three prominent capital area universities […] HIST is producing work that is of both international quality and societal relevance. This progress is evidenced, for instance, by the many publications of the HIST-affiliated scholars in leading international journals as well as by the several national and international rewards, positions of responsibility and assignments granted to them. To ensure that these contributions continue in the future, it is the strong belief of the Strategic Advisory Board of HIST that the Institute’s organizational structure, legal status, human resources and scientific activities ought to be consolidated by the participating universities beyond 2009.”

This document was written by HIST’s research co-ordinator, Dr Juha Tuunainen, and Professor of Science and Technology Studies, Ilpo Helén, on the basis of the materials produced and supplied by the members of the RC. The contents of the document were initially discussed by the RC’s PIs in a joint meeting organised before drafting the first version of the text. The final document was subjected to review by all of the members of the RC before submitting it to the evaluation panel.
## Analysis of publications

- Associated persons are Ilpo Antero Helen, Ilpo.Helen@helsinki.fi, Turo-Kimmo Lehtonen, Turo-Kimmo.Lehtonen@helsinki.fi, Marjuk Attila Isakakio, Marja.Aleksio@helsinki.fi, Reijo Miettinen, Reijo.Miettinen@helsinki.fi, Uskali Maki, uskali.maki@helsinki.fi, Janne Ilmari Hukkinen, Janne.I.hukkinen@helsinki.fi, Jukka Ammon, Jukka.ammon@helsinki.fi, Anna-Maria Tapaninen, Anna-Maria.Tapaninen@helsinki.fi, Sampsa Ilja Hyytalin, Sampsa.Hyytalin@helsinki.fi, Juhu Tsuren, Juhu.Tsuren@helsinki.fi, Miina Meikosu, Miina.Meikosu@helsinki.fi, Kariina Nel, Kariina.Nel@helsinki.fi, Aaro Tupolah, Aaro.Tupolah@helsinki.fi, Pekka Anttik, Pekka.Anttik@helsinki.fi, Nina Sariania, Nina.Sariania@helsinki.fi, Liisa Hautamäki, Liisa.Hautamäki@helsinki.fi, Antti Silvast, Antti.Silvast@helsinki.fi, Jyrki Lähko, Jyrki.Lähko@helsinki.fi, Tuula Tanitsen, Tuula.Tanitsen@helsinki.fi, Suvi-Tuuli Waltari, Suvi-Tuuli.Waltari@helsinki.fi, Katharina Hautoinen, Katharina.Hautoinen@helsinki.fi, Paula Säkkinen, Paula.Säkkinen@helsinki.fi, Stephanie Freer, Stephanie.Freer@helsinki.fi

<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>12</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A2 Review in scientific journal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A3 Contribution to book/other compilations (refereed)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A4 Article in conference publication (refereed)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B1 Unrefereed journal article</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B2 Contribution to book/other compilations (non-refereed)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C1 Published scientific monograph</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C2 Edited book, compilation, conference proceeding or special issue of journal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D1 Articles in professional journal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D4 Published development or research report</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E1 Popular article, newspaper article</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E2 Popular monograph</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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2 Listing of publications

A1 Refereed journal article

2005


2006


2007

2008
Mäki, U 2008, ‘Modeli és experimenty: eto odno i to z;’, Voprosy èkonomiki, no. 11, pp. 81-89.

2009


2010


Hyyssalo, SII, Johnson, M, Tamminen, S 2010, 'Virtuality of Virtual Worlds, or, what can we learn from play-acting horse-girls and marginalized developers.', Symbolic Interaction, vol 33, no. 4, pp. 603-633.


INTERNATIONAL EVALUATION OF RESEARCH AND DOCTORAL TRAINING AT THE UNIVERSITY OF HELSINKI

RC-SPECIFIC TUHAT COMPILATIONS OF PUBLICATIONS DATA 2005-2010

STS/Helen


A2 Review in scientific journal

2007

2008

2010


A3 Contribution to book/other compilations (refereed)

2005


2006
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2007

2008

2009
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Pelkonen, A, Teräväinen, T, Wattari, S 2009, ‘Assessing policy coordination capacity: higher education, science, and technology policies in Finland’, Education in Finland, National Institute of educational Resources and Research (NIOERAR), Taipei.


2010


Pelkonen, A, Teräväinen, T, Waltari, S 2009, ‘Assessing policy coordination capacity: higher education, science, and technology policies in Finland’, Education in Finland, National Institute of educational Resources and Research (NIOERAR), Taipei.


A4 Article in conference publication (refereed)

2006


2008


2009


B1 Unrefereed journal article

2005


2006


2007


2008


2009


2010


B2 Contribution to book/other compilations (non-refereed)
2005

2006


2008

2009


2010


C1 Published scientific monograph

2005
Freeman, S 2005, Opening the Office: Motivation and Emerging Patterns of Participation in a Firm-Community Hybrid Free and Open Source Software Project, Working papers, no. 33, University of Helsinki, Helsinki.

2006

2007

2008


2009

2010

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

2009

2010

D1 Article in professional journal

2007

2008
Hukkinen, JI 2008, 'Which way scientific publishing?', ESEE newsletter.

2009

2010
Meskus, M 2010, 'Yhteiskunta ja humisevat hormit'. Yhteiskuntablogiikka.

D4 Published development or research report

2005
Ta paninen, A 2005, Tohtoriksi valtiotieteellissä tiedekunnassa, Helsingin yliopiston valtiotieteellinen tiedekunta.

2006
Ta paninen, A 2006, Learning, Living, Wondering: International Degree Students in the Faculty of Social Sciences,

2007
Siltala, JK, Freeman, S, Miettinen, R 2007, Exploring the tensions between volunteers and firms in hybrid projects, Working papers, no. 36, Center for Activity Theory and Developmental Work Research, University of Helsinki, Helsinki.

2009

2010

E1 Popular article, newspaper article

2005
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2007

2008

2009

2010

E1 Popular contribution to book/other compilations

2008

E2 Popular monograph

2005

2006
Tapaninen, A 2006, Sosiaali- ja kulttuuriantropologian johdantokursusk.,
1 Analysis of activities 2005-2010

- Associated person is one of Ilpo Antero Helen, Ilpo.Helen@helsinki.fi, Turo-Kimmo Lehtonen, Turo-Kimmo.Lehtonen@helsinki.fi, Marja Hijanen-Aikalalo, Marja.Aikalalo@helsinki.fi, Reijo Miettinen, Reijo.Miettinen@helsinki.fi, Ukko Mäki, ukko.maki@helsinki.fi, Janne Ilmari Hukkinen, Janne.i.hukkinen@helsinki.fi, Ilkka Arminen, Ilkka.Arminen@helsinki.fi, Anna-Maria Tapani, Anna-Maria.Tapani@helsinki.fi, Sampsa Ilja Hyyrylainen, Sampsa.Hyyrylainen@helsinki.fi, Juha Tuomainen, Juha.Tuomainen@helsinki.fi, Manna Meikis, Manna.Meikis@helsinki.fi, Kerttu Soini, Kerttu.Soini@helsinki.fi, Aaro Tupasela, Aaro.Tupasela@helsinki.fi, Antti Pelkonen, Antti.Pelkonen@helsinki.fi, Nina Margareta Janssik, Nina.janssik@helsinki.fi, Lotta Hautamäki, lotta.hautamaki@helsinki.fi, Antti Silvast, antti.silvast@helsinki.fi, Jyrki Liukko, Jyrki.Liukko@helsinki.fi, Tuula Teräväinen, Tuula.Teravaainen@helsinki.fi, Suvi-Tuuli Waltari, Suvi-Tuuli.Waltari@helsinki.fi, Katri Ilona Huutoniemi, Katri.Huutoniemi@helsinki.fi, Paula Salkkonen, Paula.Salkkonen@helsinki.fi, Stephanie Freeman, stephanie.freeman@helsinki.fi

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity type</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Supervisor or co-supervisor of doctoral thesis</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prizes and awards</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Editor of research journal</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peer review of manuscripts</td>
<td>15</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>Membership or other role in research network</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Membership or other role in national/international committee, council, board</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Membership or other role in public Finnish or international organization</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Membership or other role of body in private company/organisation</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participation in interview for written media</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participation in radio programme</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participation in TV programme</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participation in interview for web based media</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2 Listing of activities 2005-2010

**Supervisor or co-supervisor of doctoral thesis**

*Ilpo Antero Helen*, Ilpo.Helen@helsinki.fi
- Väitöskirjatutkimuksen ohjaaja, Ilpo Antero Helen, 15.02.1999 → 10.09.2007
- Väitöskirjatutkimuksen ohjaaja, Ilpo Antero Helen, 15.03.2002 → 10.02.2009
- Väitöskirjatutkimuksen ohjaaja, Ilpo Antero Helen, 10.04.2003 → 31.05.2009

*Marja Häyrinen-Alestaño*, Marja.Alestaño@helsinki.fi
- Co-supervisor of the students of the Finnish Doctoral School of Science and Technology Studies, Marja Häyrinen-Alestaño, 2004 → 2006, Finland
- Supervisor of Doctoral Thesis (Antti Palokari), Marja Häyrinen-Alestaño, 2006 → 2008, Finland
- Supervisor of Doctoral Thesis (Kariolina Snell), Marja Häyrinen-Alestaño, 2008 → 2009, Finland
- Co-Supervisor of Doctoral Thesis (Arja Haapakorpi), Marja Häyrinen-Alestaño, 2008 → 2009, Finland

*Uskali Mäki*, uskali.maki@helsinki.fi

*Janne Ilmari Hukkinen*, Janne.I.hukkinen@helsinki.fi
- Doctoral dissertation co-supervisor, Janne Ilmari Hukkinen, 01.09.1999 → 05.02.2010, Finland
- Doctoral dissertation co-supervisor, Janne Ilmari Hukkinen, 01.09.2000 → ..., Finland
- Doctoral dissertation co-supervisor, Janne Ilmari Hukkinen, 01.09.2001 → ..., Finland
- Doctoral dissertation co-supervisor, Janne Ilmari Hukkinen, 01.08.2008 → 18.03.2011, Finland
- Doctoral dissertation co-supervisor, Janne Ilmari Hukkinen, 01.08.2008 → ..., Finland
- Doctoral dissertation supervisor, Janne Ilmari Hukkinen, 01.08.2008 → ..., Finland
- Doctoral dissertation supervisor, Janne Ilmari Hukkinen, 01.08.2008 → ..., Finland
- Doctoral dissertation supervisor, Janne Ilmari Hukkinen, 01.08.2008 → ..., Finland
- Doctoral dissertation supervisor, Janne Ilmari Hukkinen, 01.08.2008 → ..., Finland
- Doctoral dissertation supervisor, Janne Ilmari Hukkinen, 01.08.2008 → ..., Finland
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Anna-Maria Tapaninen, Anna-Maria.Tapaninen@helsinki.fi
Supervision of doctoral thesis, Anna-Maria Tapaninen, 01.01.2006 → 31.12.2006, Finland

Juha Tuunainen, Juha.Tuunainen@helsinki.fi
Väitöskirjatyön ohjaus, Juha Tuunainen, 01.01.2010 → 31.12.2010, Finland
Väitöskirjatyön ohjaus, Juha Tuunainen, 01.01.2010 → 31.12.2010, Finland

Prizes and awards

Sampsa Ilja Ilari Hyysalo, Sampsa.Hyysalo@helsinki.fi
Suomen Akatemia, tunnustuspalkinto yhteiskunnallisesta vaikuttavuudesta, Sampsa Ilja Ilari Hyysalo, 14.10.2010, Finland

Antti Silvast, antti.silvast@helsinki.fi
Helsingin yliopiston tiedesäätiön apuraha lahjakkaalle nuorelle tutkijalle, Antti Silvast, 2007 → ...
Koneen säätiön apuraha, Antti Silvast, 2007 → ...

Editor of research journal

Ilpo Antero Helen, Ilpo.Helen@helsinki.fi
Science, Technology & Human Values, Ilpo Antero Helen, 01.01.2005 → 31.12.2005, United States
Social Science & Medicine, Ilpo Antero Helen, 01.01.2005 → 31.12.2005, United Kingdom
Sosiaalilääketieteellinen aikakauslehti, Ilpo Antero Helen, 01.01.2005 → 31.12.2005, Finland
tiede & edistys, Ilpo Antero Helen, 01.01.2005 → 31.12.2005, Finland
Distinktion – The Scandinavian journal of social theory, Ilpo Antero Helen, 01.01.2006 → 31.12.2006, Denmark
Science, Technology & Human Values, Ilpo Antero Helen, 01.01.2006 → 31.12.2006, United States
Sosiaalilääketieteellinen aikakauslehti, Ilpo Antero Helen, 01.01.2006 → 31.12.2006, Finland
Vest Journal for science and technology studies, Ilpo Antero Helen, 01.01.2006 → 31.12.2006
tiede & edistys, Ilpo Antero Helen, 01.01.2006 → 31.12.2006, Finland
Psykologia, Ilpo Antero Helen, 01.01.2007 → 31.12.2007, Finland
Social Science & Medicine, Ilpo Antero Helen, 01.01.2007 → 31.12.2007, United Kingdom
Sociology of Health and Illness, Ilpo Antero Helen, 01.01.2007 → 31.12.2007, United Kingdom
tiede & edistys, Ilpo Antero Helen, 01.01.2007 → 31.12.2007, Finland

Marja Häyrinen-Alestoalo, Marja.Alestoalo@helsinki.fi

Reijo Miettinen, Reijo.Miettinen@helsinki.fi
Mind, Culture and Activity, Reijo Miettinen, 01.01.2005 → 31.12.2005
Mind, Culture and Activity, Reijo Miettinen, 01.01.2005 → 31.12.2005
Research Policy, Reijo Miettinen, 01.01.2005 → 31.12.2005
Science and Technology Studies, Reijo Miettinen, 01.01.2005 → 31.12.2005
Aikuiskasvatuslehti, Reijo Miettinen, 01.01.2006 → 31.12.2006, Finland
Mind, Culture and Activity, Reijo Miettinen, 01.01.2006 → 31.12.2006
Outlines, Reijo Miettinen, 01.01.2006 → 31.12.2006
Research Policy, Reijo Miettinen, 01.01.2006 → 31.12.2006
Science studies, Reijo Miettinen, 01.01.2006 → 31.12.2006
Cognitive Systems Research, Reijo Miettinen, 01.01.2007 → 31.12.2007
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Organization Studies - Special issue on the concept of practice, Reijo Miettinen, 01.01.2007 → 31.12.2007
Science Studies, Reijo Miettinen, 01.01.2007 → 31.12.2007
Science, Technology, & Human Values, Reijo Miettinen, 01.01.2007 → 31.12.2007
Science as Culture, Reijo Miettinen, 01.09.2009 → 30.09.2009, United Kingdom

Uskali Mäki, uskali.maki@helsinki.fi

Economics and Philosophy, Uskali Mäki, 1994 → ...
Energie. International Journal of Philosophy and Epistemology of Economics, Uskali Mäki, 2001 → ...
Journal of Economic Methodology, Uskali Mäki, 2005 → ...
British Journal for the Philosophy of Science, Uskali Mäki, 01.01.2007 → 31.12.2007
Economics and Philosophy, Uskali Mäki, 01.01.2007 → 31.12.2007
Economics and Philosophy, Uskali Mäki, 01.01.2007 → 31.12.2007
Episteme. A Journal in Social Epistemology (Honorary Founding Editor), Uskali Mäki, 01.01.2007 → 31.12.2007
Journal of Institutional Economics, Uskali Mäki, 01.01.2007 → 31.12.2007
Metroeconomica, Uskali Mäki, 01.01.2007 → 31.12.2007
British Journal for the Philosophy of Science, Uskali Mäki, 01.01.2008 → 31.12.2008
Economatica, Uskali Mäki, 01.01.2008 → 31.12.2008
Erasmus Journal for the Philosophy of Science, Uskali Mäki, 01.01.2008 → 31.12.2008
Erkennnis, Uskali Mäki, 01.01.2008 → 31.12.2008
European Journal for Philosophy of Science, Uskali Mäki, 2009 → ...

Janne Ilmari Hukkinen, janne.i.hukkinen@helsinki.fi

International Journal of Learning and Change, Janne Ilmari Hukkinen, 01.01.2003 → 31.12.2010
Journal of Integrative Environmental Sciences, Janne Ilmari Hukkinen, 01.01.2003 → 31.12.2010
Biodiversity and Conservation (Springer), Janne Ilmari Hukkinen, 01.01.2008 → 31.12.2008, Germany
Biodiversity and Conservation (Springer), Janne Ilmari Hukkinen, 01.01.2008 → 31.12.2008, Germany
Environmental Sciences Journal of Integrative Environmental Research (Taylor & Francis), Janne Ilmari Hukkinen, 01.01.2008 → 31.12.2008, United Kingdom
Environmental Sciences Journal of Integrative Environmental Research (Taylor & Francis), Janne Ilmari Hukkinen, 01.01.2008 → 31.12.2008, United Kingdom
Human Organization (Society for Applied Anthropology), Janne Ilmari Hukkinen, 01.01.2008 → 31.12.2008, United States
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Human Organization (Society for Applied Anthropology), Janne Ilmari Hukkinen, 01.01.2008 → 31.12.2008, United States
International Journal of Learning and Change (Inderscience), Janne Ilmari Hukkinen, 01.01.2008 → 31.12.2008, United Kingdom
International Journal of Learning and Change (Inderscience), Janne Ilmari Hukkinen, 01.01.2008 → 31.12.2008, United Kingdom

Sampsia Iija Ilari Hyysalo, Sampsia.Hyysalo@helsinki.fi
Guest Editor, Human Technology, Sampsia Iija Ilari Hyysalo, 2006 → 2007
Reviewer for the following journals and presses, Sampsia Iija Ilari Hyysalo, 01.01.2006 → 31.12.2010

Juha Tuunainen, Juha.Tuunainen@helsinki.fi
Juha Tuunainen, 01.01.2005 → 31.12.2005, Finland
Science Studies, Juha Tuunainen, 01.01.2005 → 31.12.2005, Finland
Science, Technology, & Human Values, Juha Tuunainen, 01.01.2006 → 31.12.2006, United States
Science Studies an Interdisciplinary Journal for Science and Technology Studies, Juha Tuunainen, 01.01.2007 → 31.12.2007, Finland
Tiedepolitiikka, Juha Tuunainen, 01.01.2010 → 31.12.2010, Finland

Aaro Tupasela, Aaro.Tupasela@helsinki.fi
Science Studies, Aaro Tupasela, 2000 → 2006
Critical Public Health, Aaro Tupasela, 01.01.2005 → 31.12.2005, United Kingdom
Science Studies, Aaro Tupasela, 2006 → ...

Antti Pelkonen, Antti.Pelkonen@helsinki.fi
Politiikka, Antti Pelkonen, 01.01.2005 → 31.12.2005, Finland
Regional Studies, Antti Pelkonen, 01.01.2005 → 31.12.2005, United Kingdom

Stephanie Freeman, stephanie.freeman@helsinki.fi
Assistant Editor / Toimitussihteeri, Stephanie Freeman, 05.2009 → ...

Peer review of manuscripts

Janne Ilmari Hukkinen, janne.i.hukkinen@helsinki.fi
Ecological Economics, Janne Ilmari Hukkinen, 01.01.2010 → 30.01.2010
Ecological Economics, Janne Ilmari Hukkinen, 01.04.2010 → 30.04.2010
Ecological Economics, Janne Ilmari Hukkinen, 01.07.2010 → 30.07.2010
Ecological Economics, Janne Ilmari Hukkinen, 01.08.2010 → 30.08.2010
Ecological Economics, Janne Ilmari Hukkinen, 01.10.2010 → 30.10.2010
Ecological Economics, Janne Ilmari Hukkinen, 01.12.2010 → 30.12.2010
Energy Policy, Janne Ilmari Hukkinen, 01.10.2010 → 30.10.2010
Environmental Policy and Governance, Janne Ilmari Hukkinen, 01.11.2010 → 30.11.2010
Global Environmental Change, Janne Ilmari Hukkinen, 01.05.2010 → 30.05.2010
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Global Environmental Change, Janne Ilmari Hukkinen, 01.11.2010 → 30.11.2010
Journal of Cleaner Production, Janne Ilmari Hukkinen, 01.07.2010 → 30.07.2010
Journal of Cleaner Production, Janne Ilmari Hukkinen, 01.10.2010 → 30.10.2010
Journal of Planning Education and Research, Janne Ilmari Hukkinen, 01.04.2010 → 30.04.2010

Juha Tuunainen, Juha.Tuunainen@helsinki.fi
Prometheus - Critical Studies in Innovation, Juha Tuunainen, 10.05.2010
Social Studies of Science, Juha Tuunainen, 19.08.2010

Editor of series
Uskali Mäki, uskali.maki@helsinki.fi
Strategies for Social Inquiry, Uskali Mäki, 2009 → ...

Editor of special theme number
Juha Tuunainen, Juha.Tuunainen@helsinki.fi

Membership or other role in research network
Juha Tuunainen, Juha.Tuunainen@helsinki.fi
Helsinki Institute of Science and Technology Studies (HIST), Juha Tuunainen, 01.09.2005 → 31.12.2010, Finland
ISA Research Committee 23: Sociology of Science and Technology, Juha Tuunainen, 01.06.2006 → 31.12.2010
Science and Technology Research In a Knowledge-based Economy (STRIKE), Juha Tuunainen, 07.03.2007 → 31.12.2010

Aaro Tupasela, Aaro.Tupasela@helsinki.fi

Lotta Hautamäki, lotta.hautamaki@helsinki.fi
Jäsensihteeri, Lotta Hautamäki, 2008 → ...

Antti Silvast, antti.silvast@helsinki.fi
E-Newsletter Editor and Web Manager of European Sociological Association's Disaster & Social Crisis Research Network (http://www.dscrn.org), Antti Silvast, 06.2010 → ...

Membership or other role in national/international committee, council, board
Ilpo Antero Helen, Ilpo.Helen@helsinki.fi
Vital Politics II conference, London School of Economics; the organising committee, Ilpo Antero Helen, 01.11.2005 → 30.09.2006, United Kingdom
ENSN steering committee, Ilpo Antero Helen, 12.06.2007 → 11.06.2012, United Kingdom
Qualitative Research on Mental Health II conference; scientific committee, Ilpo Antero Helen, 01.10.2007 → 31.12.2007, Finland
Director of executive board, Ilpo Antero Helen, 15.01.2010 → 31.12.2010, Finland

Marja Häyrinen-Alestalo, Marja.Alestalo@helsinki.fi
ETAN (European Technology Assessment Network) of the European Commission, Marja Häyrinen-Alestalo, 01.01.2005 → 31.12.2005, Belgium
Organizing Committee preparing the International Conference of the ProACT programme “Innovation Pressure, Rethinking Competitiveness, Policy and Society in a Globalised Economy”, Marja Häyrinen-Alestalo, 01.01.2005 → 31.12.2005, Finland
Organizing Committee preparing the sessions of RC23 for the XVI World Congress of Sociology, Marja Häyrinen-Alestalo, 01.01.2005 → 31.12.2005, Spain
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The Belgian Science Policy: The Programme Interuniversity Attraction Poles, Marja Häyrinen-Alestalo, 2005, Belgium
The European Commission Pilot Action: Regions in the Knowledge Economy, Marja Häyrinen-Alestalo, 2005, Belgium
The Helsinki School of Economics, Docent Application, Marja Häyrinen-Alestalo, 2005, Finland
VTT:n teknologian tutkimuksen tukirahmat, Marja Häyrinen-Alestalo, 01.01.2005 → 31.12.2005, Finland
Helsinki Institute of Science and Technology Studies (HIST), Marja Häyrinen-Alestalo, 01.01.2006 → 31.12.2006, Finland
Opintosuorituksen tutkintolautakunta, Marja Häyrinen-Alestalo, 01.01.2006 → 31.12.2006, Finland
Organizing Committee preparing the sessions of RC23 for the XVI World Congress of Sociology, Marja Häyrinen-Alestalo, 01.01.2006 → 31.12.2006, South Africa
The Society for the Study of Science and Technology in Finland, Chair, Marja Häyrinen-Alestalo, 01.01.2006 → 31.12.2009, Finland
Tieteen- ja teknologiantutkimuksen valtakunnallinen tutkijakoulu, Marja Häyrinen-Alestalo, 01.01.2006 → 31.12.2006, Finland
VTT:n teknologian tutkimuksen tukirahmat, Marja Häyrinen-Alestalo, 01.01.2006 → 31.12.2006, Finland
Chair and Member of the Board, Marja Häyrinen-Alestalo, 01.01.2007 → 31.12.2009, Finland
European Science Foundation (ESF) kutsuma asiantuntija konferenssiin: "Forward Look on Higher Education in Europe Beyond 2010: Resolving Conflicting Social and Economic Expectations", Marja Häyrinen-Alestalo, 15.03.2007 → 16.03.2007, Belgium
Expert panel of the ESF, Marja Häyrinen-Alestalo, 01.01.2007 → 31.12.2011
Helsingin yliopiston opintosuorituksen tutkintolautakunta, Marja Häyrinen-Alestalo, 01.01.2007 → 31.12.2007
Helsinki Institute of Science and Technology Studies (HIST) kehittämis- ja johtoryhmä, Marja Häyrinen-Alestalo, 01.01.2007 → 31.12.2007, Finland
The Expert Pool of the OECD, Marja Häyrinen-Alestalo, 01.01.2007 → 31.12.2011, France
The Helsinki Research Network for Higher Education and Innovation Studies (HEINE), Marja Häyrinen-Alestalo, 2008 → 2009, Finland
Doctoral School of Comparative Studies in Higher Education and Science Institutions, COHERES, Marja Häyrinen-Alestalo, 2010 → 2014, Finland
The Preparatory Professor Group for the Professorship of Higher Education Management, Organization and Leadership, Marja Häyrinen-Alestalo, 2010 → 2011, Finland
The Preparatory Professor Group for the Professorship of Science and Technology Studies, Marja Häyrinen-Alestalo, 2010 → 2011, Finland

Reijo Miettinen, Reijo.Miettinen@helsinki.fi

HIST:n (Helsinki International Center for Science and Technology Studies) kehittämisryhmän jäsen, Reijo Miettinen, 01.01.2006 → 31.12.2006, Finland
HIST:n (Helsinki Institute for Science and Technology Studies) ohjausryhmän jäsen, Reijo Miettinen, 01.01.2008 → 31.12.2008
KASVAN (Kasvatusalan valtakunnallinen tohtorikoulu) ohjausryhmän jäsen, Reijo Miettinen, 01.01.2008 → 31.12.2008, Finland
TITEKON (Tieteen ja teknologian tutkimuksen kansallinen tohtorikoulu) ohjausryhmän jäsen, Reijo Miettinen, 01.01.2008 → 31.12.2008, Finland

Uskali Mäki, uskali.maki@helsinki.fi

Member of the Advisory Board of the BUES Center for Pluralistic Economic Studies, Uskali Mäki, 1998 → ...
Member of the Academic Advisory Board of the Helsinki Institute for Science and Technology Studies, Uskali Mäki, 2004 → ..., Finland
Member of the International Advisory Committee of the Witten Lectures in Economics and Philosophy, Uskali Mäki, 2005 → ..., Finland
Erasmus Institute for Philosophy and Economics, Uskali Mäki, 01.01.2007 → 31.12.2007
European Association for Evolutionary Political Economy, Uskali Mäki, 01.01.2007 → 31.12.2007
European Philosophy of Science Association, Uskali Mäki, 01.01.2007 → 31.12.2007
Helsinki Institute for Science and Technology Studies, Uskali Mäki, 01.01.2007 → 31.12.2007
Honorary Member of EIPE, Uskali Mäki, 2007 → ...
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Erasmus Institute for Philosophy and Economics, Uskali Mäki, 01.01.2008 → 31.12.2008
European Association for Evolutionary Political Economy, Uskali Mäki, 01.01.2008 → 31.12.2008
Member of the Erik Allardt Academic Advisory Board, Uskali Mäki, 2009 → …
Member of the Executive Board of INEM, Uskali Mäki, 2009 → …
Janne Ilmari Hukkinen, janne.i.hukkinen@helsinki.fi
Member of the Advisory Board of Finnish Futures Research Centre, Janne Ilmari Hukkinen, 01.01.2000 → 31.12.2010, Finland
Board Member of National Graduate School in Environmental Social Science, Janne Ilmari Hukkinen, 01.01.2010 → 31.12.2010, Finland
Board Member of National Graduate School in Science and Technology Studies, Janne Ilmari Hukkinen, 01.01.2001 → 31.12.2010, Finland
Member of the Board of the European Society for Ecological Economics (ESEE), Janne Ilmari Hukkinen, 01.01.2006 → 31.12.2010, United States
Board of Directors of Helsinki Institute of Science and Technology Studies (HIST), Janne Ilmari Hukkinen, 01.01.2007 → 31.12.2010, Finland
Board of Directors of Helsinki Institute of Science and Technology Studies (HIST), Janne Ilmari Hukkinen, 01.01.2008 → 31.12.2008, Finland
Board of Directors of Helsinki Institute of Science and Technology Studies (HIST), Janne Ilmari Hukkinen, 01.01.2008 → 31.12.2008, Finland
Board of Directors of the Finnish Graduate School in Environmental Social Science (YHTYMÄ), Janne Ilmari Hukkinen, 01.01.2008 → 31.12.2008, Finland
Board of Directors of the Finnish Graduate School in Environmental Social Science (YHTYMÄ), Janne Ilmari Hukkinen, 01.01.2008 → 31.12.2008, Finland
Board of Directors of the Finnish Graduate School in Future Business Competencies (TULIO), Janne Ilmari Hukkinen, 01.01.2008 → 31.12.2008, Finland
Board of Directors of the Finnish Graduate School in Science and Technology Studies (TITEKO), Janne Ilmari Hukkinen, 01.01.2008 → 31.12.2008, Finland
Board of Directors of the Finnish Graduate School in Science and Technology Studies (TITEKO), Janne Ilmari Hukkinen, 01.01.2008 → 31.12.2008, Finland
Board of Directors of the Finnish Graduate School in Science and Technology Studies (TITEKO), Janne Ilmari Hukkinen, 01.01.2008 → 31.12.2008, Finland
Board of Directors of the Finnish Graduate School in Science and Technology Studies (TITEKO), Janne Ilmari Hukkinen, 01.01.2008 → 31.12.2008, Finland
Member of the European Commission’s 7th Framework Programme Environment and Climate Scientific Advisory Group, Janne Ilmari Hukkinen, 01.01.2008 → 31.12.2010, Belgium
Member of the Steering Committee of Helsinki University Centre for Environment (HENVI), Janne Ilmari Hukkinen, 01.08.2008 → 31.12.2010, Finland
Steering Committee of Helsinki University Centre for Environment (HENVI), Janne Ilmari Hukkinen, 01.08.2008 → 31.12.2008, Finland
Steering Committee of Helsinki University Centre for Environment (HENVI), Janne Ilmari Hukkinen, 01.08.2008 → 31.12.2008, Finland
Ympäristönsuojelun kummiprofessori, Teknillinen korkeakoulu, Lahden keskus, Janne Ilmari Hukkinen, 01.01.2008 → 31.12.2008, Finland
Ympäristönsuojelun kummiprofessori, Teknillinen korkeakoulu, Lahden keskus, Janne Ilmari Hukkinen, 01.01.2008 → 31.12.2008, Finland
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of Directors of the Finnish Graduate School in Future Business Competencies (TULIO), Janne Ilmari Hukkinen, 01.01.2008 → 31.12.2008, Finland

Board Member of the National Graduate School in Arctic Studies, Janne Ilmari Hukkinen, 01.01.2010 → 31.12.2010, Finland

Board member of Ruralia Institute, University of Helsinki, Janne Ilmari Hukkinen, 01.01.2010 → 31.12.2010, Finland

Chair of Advisory Board of Finnish Environment Institute, Janne Ilmari Hukkinen, 01.01.2010 → 31.12.2010, Finland

Member of selection committee, professor of Russian energy policy, University of Helsinki, Janne Ilmari Hukkinen, 01.03.2010 → 31.12.2010, Finland

Member of selection committee, professor of science and technology studies, University of Helsinki, Janne Ilmari Hukkinen, 01.10.2010 → 31.12.2010, Finland

Member of the Publication Forum, Janne Ilmari Hukkinen, 01.12.2010 → 31.12.2011, Finland

Anna-Maria Tapaninen , Anna-Maria.Tapaninen@helsinki.fi

Suomen Antropologinen Seura, Anna-Maria Tapaninen, 01.01.2006 → 31.12.2006, Finland

Suomen Tieteen ja teknologian tutkimusseura ry., Juha Tuunainen, 01.01.2007 → 31.12.2007, Finland

European Sociological Association's (ESA) Sociology of Science and Technology Network (SSTNET), Aaro Tupasela, 05.09.2007 → 04.09.2011, Finland

Suomen Tieteen- ja teknologiantutkimuksen seura ry., Antti Pelkonen, 01.01.2005 → 31.12.2005, Finland


Marja Häyrinen-Alestalo , Marja.Alestalo@helsinki.fi

European Science Foundation, HELF: Forward Look on Higher Education - Workshop 2: Higher education and the needs of the knowledge society, Marja Häyrinen-Alestalo, 24.11.2006, Finland

Hannu Uusitalon haastattelema asiantuntija Suomen Akatemian tutkimusrahoituksen vaikuttavuuden arviointia varten, Marja Häyrinen-Alestalo, 04.01.2006 → 31.12.2006, Finland

Days of Science 2007: The Disappearing Borders of Science, Panelist, Marja Häyrinen-Alestalo, 12.01.2007, Finland


Opetusministeriön sekä korkeakoulujen ja tiedelaitosten johdon seminaarii: "Korkeakoulujen tulevaisuus"-paneelikeskustelu, Marja Häyrinen-Alestalo, 14.11.2007 → 31.12.2007, Finland
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Project PUBIT, Marja Häyrinen-Alestalo, 2007 → 2008, France


Reijo Miettinen, Reijo.Miettinen@helsinki.fi

Hallituksen kuovuustategian valmisteluryhmä (Luova Ihminen), Reijo Miettinen, 08.02.2005 → 20.10.2005, Finland

OPM:n korkeakoululautakunnan puheenjohtajan puheenjohtajan "Tutkimustulosten hyödyntämisestä korkeakouluiden kehittämisessä" -työryhmän asiantuntija, Reijo Miettinen, 01.01.2006 → 31.12.2006, Finland

Janne Ilmari Hukkinen, Janne.I.hukkinen@helsinki.fi

Expert Counselor on the Environment for the Supreme Administrative Court of Finland, Janne Ilmari Hukkinen, 01.01.2000 → 31.12.2010, Finland

Korkein hallinto- orkeus (KHO), ympäristösuojelun järjestelyjen ja ympäristönvalvonnan, Janne Ilmari Hukkinen, 01.01.2008 → 31.12.2008, Finland

Vice Member of Finnish National Commission on Sustainable Development, Janne Ilmari Hukkinen, 01.01.2008 → 31.12.2010, Finland

Membership or other role of body in private company/organisation

Marja Häyrinen-Alestalo, Marja.Alestalo@helsinki.fi

Lauttasaari-Seura, Marja Häyrinen-Alestalo, 01.01.2005 → 31.12.2005, Finland

Helsingin kaupunginosat ry (HELKA), Marja Häyrinen-Alestalo, 01.01.2007 → 31.12.2011, Finland

Janne Ilmari Hukkinen, Janne.I.hukkinen@helsinki.fi

Ekosäätiö, Janne Ilmari Hukkinen, 01.01.2008 → 31.12.2008, Finland

Ilmari Turjan seuran hallitus, Janne Ilmari Hukkinen, 01.01.2008 → 31.12.2008, Finland

Suomen Kulttuurirahaston Kannatusyhdistys ry, Janne Ilmari Hukkinen, 01.01.2008 → 31.12.2008, Finland

Suomen Kulttuurirahaston Kannatusyhdistys ry, Janne Ilmari Hukkinen, 01.01.2008 → 31.12.2008, Finland

Member of the Board of WWF Finland, Janne Ilmari Hukkinen, 01.07.2010 → 31.12.2010, Finland

Juha Tuunainen, Juha.Tuunainen@helsinki.fi

International Sociological Association, Research Committee 23 Sociology of Science and Technology, Juha Tuunainen, 01.01.2006 → 31.12.2006, United States

Suomen tieteellisen ja tekniikkatuotannon seura ry, Juha Tuunainen, 01.01.2006 → 31.12.2006, United States

Participation in interview for written media

Marja Häyrinen-Alestalo, Marja.Alestalo@helsinki.fi


Suomen Akatemian järjestämä keskustelutilaisuus ja erityiskunnostus kokouksessa, Marja Häyrinen-Alestalo, 27.11.2006 → 31.12.2011, Finland

Reijo Miettinen, Reijo.Miettinen@helsinki.fi

INSBIS, Turku, Reijo Miettinen, 30.03.2006 → 31.12.2011, Finland

Tieteen päivät, esitelmä, Reijo Miettinen, 11.01.2001 → 31.12.2011, Finland

VTT-automaatio, Hyva tutkimuskäytäntö kurssi, luento, Reijo Miettinen, 22.01.2001 → 31.12.2011, Finland

Helsingin Sanomien mielipidepalsta, Reijo Miettinen, 01.01.2006 → 31.12.2011, Finland
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Janne Ilmari Hukkinen, janne.il.hukkinen@helsinki.fi
Jäähyväiset kasvupakolle, Janne Ilmari Hukkinen, 06.06.2010, Finland

Kasvun rajat, Janne Ilmari Hukkinen, 17.09.2010, Finland

Juha Tuunainen, juha.tuunainen@helsinki.fi

Jäähyväiset kasvupakolle, Janne Ilmari Hukkinen, 06.06.2010, Finland

Kasvun rajat, Janne Ilmari Hukkinen, 17.09.2010, Finland

Juha Tuunainen, juha.tuunainen@helsinki.fi

Helsingin yliopiston ja Ulkoministeriön yhteisesti ulkomaisille bimittajiille järjestämä Press Tour : Education and R&D a Key to Competitiveness in Finland, Juha Tuunainen, 22.05.2004 → 31.12.2011, Finland

Mianna Meskus, mianna_meskus@helsinki.fi
Naisten kaupunki, Mianna Meskus, 15.05.2004 → 31.12.2011, Finland

Karoliina Snell, karoliina.snell@helsinki.fi

Aaro Tupaselä, aaro.tupaselä@helsinki.fi
The Politics of Biobanking, Helsinki, Finland Seminar organizer and presenter, Aaro Tupaselä, 12.10.2005 → 31.12.2011, United Kingdom

Antti Pelkonen, antti.pelkonen@helsinki.fi
Tutkittu juttu: Väärää kaistaa kotiin? YLE Teema, Antti Pelkonen, 01.01.2006 → 31.12.2011, Finland

Lotta Hautamäki, lotta.hautamaki@helsinki.fi
Asiantuntija-haastattelu, Lotta Hautamäki, 2009 → ...

Jyri Liukko, jyri.liukko@helsinki.fi
Myytävänä vastuuta ja unelmia, Jyri Liukko, 06.2006, Finland

Sosiaalivakuutus-lehti 1/2006, Jyri Liukko, 01.01.2006 → 31.12.2011, Finland

Yhteisvastuu on kadonnut, Jyri Liukko, 01.06.2006, Finland


Participation in radio programme

Marja Häyrinen-Alesta, marja.alesta@helsinki.fi

Karoliina Snell, karoliina.snell@helsinki.fi
Kvantopp, Karoliina Snell, 29.10.2009

Lotta Hautamäki, lotta.hautamaki@helsinki.fi
Päiväntasaaja, Lotta Hautamäki, 2010 → ...

Participation in TV programme

Lotta Hautamäki, lotta.hautamaki@helsinki.fi
Epäkorrektia, Tuomas Enbuske, Lotta Hautamäki, 2008 → ...

Participation in interview for web based media

Lotta Hautamäki, lotta.hautamaki@helsinki.fi
Asiantuntija-haastattelu, Lotta Hautamäki, 2010 → ...
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.
Analysis of publications by Helsinki University Library – 66 RCs altogether

### 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
- Hauk, Eva – CoCoLaC
- Heikkinen, Markku – RCSP
- Heinämaa, Sara – SHC
- Henriksson, Markku – CITA
- Janhunen, Juha – LDHFTA
- Kajava Mika, – AMNE
- Klippi, Anu – Interaction
- Knuutila, Simo – PPMP
- Koskenniemi, Kimmo – BAULT
- Lauha, Aila – CECH
- Lavento, Mika – ARCH-HU
- Lukkarinen, Ville – AHCI
- Lylykäinen, 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
- Engeström, Yrjö – CRADLE
- Granberg, Leo – TRANSRUBAN
- Haila, Anne – Sociopolis
- Hautamäki, Jarkko – CEA
- Heinonen, Visa – KUMU
- Helén, Iipo – STS
- Hukkinen, Janne – GENU
- Jallinoja, Riitta – SBII
- Kaartinen, Timo – SCA
- Kettunen, Pauli – NordSoc
- Kivinen, Markku – FCRES
- Koponen, Juhani – DEVERLE
- Koskenniemi, Martti – ECI
- Kultti, Klaus – EAT
- Lahelma, Elina – KUFE
- Lanne, Markku – TSEM
- Lavonen, Jari – RCMSER
- Lehtonen, Risto – SocStats
- Lindblom-Ylänne, Sari – EdPsychHE
- Nieminen, Hannu – MECOL
- Nuotio, Kimmo – Law
- Nyman, Göte – METEORI
- Ollikainen, Markku – ENFIFO
- Pirttilä-Backman, Anna-Maija – DYNASOBIC
- Rahkonen, Keijo – CulCap
- Roos, J P – HELPS
- Simola, Hannu – SOCE-DGI
- Sulkunen, Pekka – PosPus
- Sumelius, John – AG ECON
- Vaattovaara, Mari – STRUTSI
- Vainio, Martti – SigMe

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

Number of authors in publications / year

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of authors</th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>Grand Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>144</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Total</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>211</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Language of publication / Year

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language</th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>Grand Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>en_GB</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>es_ES</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>et_EE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fi_FI</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>it_IT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ru_RU</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sv_SE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Total</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>211</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Language of publications 2005-2010

- **en_GB**: 51%
- **es_ES**: 46%
- **et_EE**: 0%
- **fi_FI**: 0%
- **it_IT**: 1%
- **ru_RU**: 1%
- **sv_SE**: 1%
Most of the articles have been published in *Tiede & edistys* that is one of the leading journal in social sciences in Finland. It does not include, however, to the ranking lists. The international journals on the top are *Social Studies* and *Acta Sociologica* that belong to the Australian ranking category B and A. Nine of the articles have been published in the leading Finnish newspaper *Helsingin Sanomat*.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Journal</th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>Grand Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tiede &amp; edistys</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helsingin Sanomat</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sosiologia</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science Studies : a Scandinavian journal published by the Finnish Society for Science Studies</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acta Sociologica</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Janus : sosiaalipolitiikan ja sosialityön tutkimuksen aikakauslehti</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research Policy</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tiedepolitiikka</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nii &amp; näin : filosofinen aikakauslehti.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scandinavian Journal of History</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Studies of Science</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science and Public Policy</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Higher Education</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suomen Antropologi</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Technology</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scandinavian Journal of Public Health</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journal of Economic Methodology</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discourse Studies</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mind, Culture, and Activity</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sosiaaliäketieteellinen aikakauslehti</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Genetics and Society</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Symbolic Interaction</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philosophy of the Social Sciences</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tieteessä tapahtuu</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESEE newsletter</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Understanding of Science</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Journal of Innovation Management</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contemporary Sociology</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gerontologia</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journal for the Theory of Social Behaviour</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Studies in History and Philosophy of Science</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journal Name</td>
<td>Count 1</td>
<td>Count 2</td>
<td>Count 3</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>European Journal of Cancer Care</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tiede &amp; Tiede: Tiede &amp; Tiede</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journal of Integrative Environmental Sciences</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creativity and Innovation Management</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journal of Medical Humanities</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Erkenntnis</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journal of Pragmatics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ecological Economics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kansanterveys: Kansanterveyslaitoksen tiedotuslehti.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suomen laakärilehti</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kuntapuntari</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teknikan Waiheita</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laadullisen terveystutkimuksen tutkijaverkosto</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psykologia</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management Learning</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R &amp; D Management</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>European Planning Studies</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Genomics, Society and Policy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>European Society for Ecological Economics Newsletter</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computer Supported Cooperative Work</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continental Philosophy Review</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science, Technology &amp; Society</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Politics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If: Journal of Italo-Finnish Studies.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verkkolehti Megafoni</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Storia del Pensiero Economico. Nuova Serie</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yhdyskuntasuunnittelu</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information Society</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Erasmus Journal for Philosophy and Economics</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suomen potilailehti</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outlines: Critical Practice Studies</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technology Analysis &amp; Strategic Management</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal and Ubiquitous Computing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elore</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fennia</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Sociology</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Politics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NordForsk magasin.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voprosy ekonomiki</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nordic Studies on Alcohol and Drugs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yhteiskuntayleikki</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organization</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organization Studies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Grand Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>18</strong></td>
<td><strong>23</strong></td>
<td><strong>18</strong></td>
<td><strong>22</strong></td>
<td><strong>25</strong></td>
<td><strong>21</strong></td>
<td><strong>127</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Journal ranking (Norway, Australia, ERIH)

Norway ranking

Level 2 = highest scientific, Level 1 = scientific

Australian ranking

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.

A

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.

B

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.

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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Journals</th>
<th>Norway</th>
<th>Australia</th>
<th>Grand total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Journal of Economics and Methodology</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>A*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journal of Integrative Environmental Sciences</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journal of Pragmatics</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science Studies: a Scandinavian journal published by the Finnish Soc</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research Policy</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>A*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scandinavian Journal of History</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scandinavian Journal of Pedagogical and Educational Science</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>A*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Studies of Science</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science and Public Policy</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Higher Education</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scandinavian Anthropology</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Technology</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scandinavian Journal of Public Health</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scandinavian Journal of Psychology</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scandinavian Journal of Social Anthropology</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Studies of Science</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mind, Culture, and Activity</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Genetics and Society</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Symbolic Interaction</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philosophy of the Social Sciences</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Understanding of Science</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Journal of Innovation Management</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journal for the Theory of Social Behaviour</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>European Journal of Cancer Care</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>A*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journal of Integrative Environmental Sciences</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creativity and Innovation Management</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journal of Medical Humanities</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economy</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journal of Pragmatics</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ecological Economics</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science and Public Policy</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>A*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management Learning</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R&amp;D Management</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>European Planning Studies</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science, Technology &amp; Society</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Politics</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information Society</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Critical Practice Studies</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technology Analysis &amp; Strategic Management</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal and Ubiquitous Computing</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Sociology</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nordic Studies on Alcohol and Drugs</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organization</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organization Studies</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>A*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Grand Total: 68
Amount of ranked articles (Norway)

Level 2 = highest scientific, Level 1= scientific

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Norway</th>
<th>Journal article</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Level 2</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level 1</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Amount of ranked articles (Australian)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Australian</th>
<th>Journal article</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Level A*</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level A</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level B</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level C</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Publisher ranking (based on Norwegian ranking list)

2 = leading scientific  
1 = scientific  
no = non-scientific or not ranked

C1 Published scientific monograph (18)  
C2 Edited book, compilation, conference proceeding or special issue of journal (2)

Three books of are published by a high ranked leading scientific publisher, 4 by a ranked scientific publisher.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Publisher</th>
<th>c1_Scientific_monograph</th>
<th>c2_Edited_book_compilation_conferenceproceedings_special</th>
<th>Grand Total</th>
<th>Publisher ranking</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kauppa- ja teollisuusministerio</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cambridge University Press</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edita</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gaudeamus</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helsingin yliopisto</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>no</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kelan tutkimusosasto</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>no</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lehmans Media</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>no</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nordisk MinisterrŒd</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nordregio</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>no</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Routledge</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shinhyoron Inc.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>no</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stakes</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>no</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taideetollinen korkeakoulu</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>no</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tekes</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>no</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tutkijaliitto</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Helsinki</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>no</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yliopistopaino</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>no</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(blank)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Grand Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>18</strong></td>
<td><strong>2</strong></td>
<td><strong>20</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>