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

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

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

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

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

Numeric evaluation: OUTSTANDING (5), EXCELLENT (4), VERY GOOD (3), GOOD (2), SUFFICIENT (1)
4. International and national (incl. intersectoral) research collaboration and researcher mobility
   - Description of
     - the RC’s research collaborations and joint doctoral training activities
     - how the RC has promoted researcher mobility
   - Identification of the RC’s strengths and challenges related to research collaboration and researcher mobility, and the actions planned for their development.

A written feedback from the aspects of: scientific quality, national and international collaboration
   - Strengths
   - Areas of development
   - Other remarks
   - Recommendations

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

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

A written feedback from the aspects of: processes and good practices related to leadership and management
   - Strengths
   - Areas of development
   - Other remarks
   - Recommendations

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

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

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

The focus in this RC is said to be multiple although in general it seems difficult to spell this out. In fact, there are multiple foci that maybe are linked by the broad notions of relatedness and social bonding in a reflexive, ethical, and interdisciplinary approach. The various constitutive subgroups have a track record of their own and look as being quite separate communities. It is not very clear why to continue together if they do not seem to work together around a unifying focus. This is admitted by the RC among the challenges and uncertainties for the future, in view of “the relative separateness of the groups”.

There seems to be some contradiction between the assertion of joint authorship and the encouragement of single authorship. Despite the assertion that “joint authorship is particularly salient in the RC’s publication profile, since this is the most important form of publication with multidisciplinary areas strongly represented in the RD”, 65% of the publications have only one author and 20% have only 2 authors. And further on, a very explicit remark is made to the effect that “Doctoral candidates are encouraged to be independent very early on in their careers; this guideline is manifested for example in the custom of single authorship. A relatively high degree of autonomy of doctoral candidates is not only seen as a necessary condition for genuinely innovative work in the social sciences (where results are rarely the fruit of joint laboratory like work), but is also a necessity dictated by the present conditions of funding”.

More than half the publications are in Finnish and only 41% in English, which suggests that SBII’s research attracts mainly national attention although possessing international potential. The largest concentration of articles (14) has been published in Sosiologia, the leading journal of Finnish sociology, which has not been included in the ranking lists.

Challenge: (or, in a way, conclusion) The SBII has the challenge to defend its structure. What is the rationale for the six divergent groups to be in the RC? For example, what is the purpose of the philosophy of science to be in this RC instead of being with other areas of philosophy?

**Numeric evaluation:** 3 (Very good)

2.2 Practises and quality of doctoral training

- **Organising of the doctoral training in the RC. Description of the RC’s principles for:**
  - recruitment and selection of doctoral candidates
  - supervision of doctoral candidates
  - collaboration with faculties, departments/institutes, and potential graduate schools/doctoral programmes
  - good practises and quality assurance in doctoral training
  - assuring of good career perspectives for the doctoral candidates/fresh doctorates
- **Identification of the RC’s strengths and challenges related to the practises and quality of doctoral training, and the actions planned for their development.**
- **Additional material:** TUHAT compilation of the RC’s other scientific activities/supervision of doctoral dissertations
The RC shows a good intake of doctoral candidates (about 16 per year). Apparently the RC participates in several multidisciplinary doctoral programs recruiting candidates in sociology who are attracted to the SBII projects. The specific thematic orientations of the RC are given through thematically focused research seminars offered by members of the RC, in addition to the general seminars on a wide range of subjects that are offered by a number of related doctoral programmes.

Strong emphasis is placed in integrating doctoral students to the life and activities of the professional community of researchers from an early stage. Doctoral candidates are encouraged to make public appearances and act as experts in the media and other agencies which continuously make requests for lecturing.

A strength of the RC is its doctoral student selection process. The students must pass admissions procedures. Potential students are magna cum laude, and have high quality research plans. Wisely, new doctoral students are recruited into research groups with existing funding. In addition, doctoral candidates are encouraged to and successful at making public appearances in the popular media.

The challenge recognised by the RC is “to make more efficient use of the wide expertise of the group in doctoral training, for example through organizing RC-wide graduate courses”.

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.

The research carried out by RC members sheds light on processes of inclusion and exclusion in the current processes of social change. Its members actively contribute to discussion and decision-making processes both nationally and internationally publishing in different style publications to insure reaching distinct audiences.

The RC pays a great deal of attention to and is well connected with the public and the third sector in Finnish society, for the topics they deal with resonate with Finnish society, where a great many public and private resources have been directed to policy work and development projects in the RC fields of expertise.

It is a clear strength of the RC that they are asked to testify at Finnish parliamentary committee hearings and give talks to non-academics.

The RC is well aware that greater efforts must be made to increase cooperation with research institutes and third sector organizations to get appropriate feedback of ideas and problems as well as possible sources of employment for its graduates.

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

The SBII RC is an active participant in joint research and publications resulting from participation in national and international conferences. In the same vein they have an intense researchers and doctoral and postdoctoral student mobility record in terms of short of medium-term visits to foreign universities and hosting visiting researchers in Helsinki.

The group is aware that in the future it needs to encourage more doctoral candidates and post-doc researchers to include a stay at a foreign university in their studies and research, as well as to increase the recruitment of foreign doctoral candidates into the SBII RC.

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

The RC has developed a research intensive environment which is more demanding than the average in the Faculty of Social Sciences. RC research is organized mainly in separate projects focusing on specific themes, and trying to secure its operational conditions directly with the Department of Social Research.

It is felt that the teaching load of RC members is often too heavy to allow serious engagement in research during the teaching period. Also administrative tasks take time and concentration away from research. Although the introduction of the right for teachers to keep one out of four teaching periods during the academic year free from teaching and supervision of students, is an improvement, the imbalance between teaching and research is a challenge for the UH since it aims to reinforce its role as a research university. This seems to be a burden particularly for the social sciences and humanities, for they have less opportunity to secure external funding than the hard sciences.

The Department of Social Research to which members of the RC belong, does not have a fixed funded quota for doctoral students and it is common that doctoral candidates have to apply for research grants themselves, often for short periods. Although doctoral candidates are affiliated to at least one project in progress while doing their dissertation to provide him/her with a support reference group even when their funding is from an external source, this is clearly not enough and it would be positive if they could be better integrated into the RC with funding as well.

A challenge for the UH is to seriously consider the future viability of doctoral and particularly postdoctoral researcher programs, in view of present financial uncertainties and stringencies.

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 project leaders, who are senior researchers and professors, are responsible for the activities, progress and finances of the projects, mainly in a supportive role. Since funding is granted to individual researchers, the work of the RC is managed in separate research projects. Through a non-hierarchical structure and the predominantly supportive role of project leaders and senior researchers, the group tries to create an atmosphere of collegiality, in which doctoral candidates are encouraged to proceed in “non-conventional and innovative directions”.

A challenge to the RC is to clarify its leadership. If there is “no fixed leadership structure”, it may follow that there is no leadership. In addition, if the RC views leadership as primarily nurturing and non-hierarchical than it may be advisable for the RC to explicitly recognize the PIs as the leaders of their projects and leave it at that.

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

The RC’s external funding of 4,380,000 euros and 750,000 euros in personal grants over the evaluation period is outstanding. The Academy of Finland is the main funder of individual projects as well as some other national funding sources.

The RC’s challenge is to explore other national and international sources of funding.

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 RC members are aware that they need to work more on developing the focus of their research community. Thus they envisage enhancing scientific exchange and making more specific the scientific collaboration within the RC in the next two years. They plan to hold two annual meetings in May and December to this effect, and also common foci of the RC will be sharpened and joint lecture courses and seminars will be arranged at all levels of teaching. The RC will enhance the mobility of doctoral students and post doc researchers as well as the contacts with research institutes and third sector organizations of doctoral students to facilitate future employment and to insure their integration as potential partners of the RC.

There is a good harvest of products expected in the coming two years, both in terms of dissertations to be completed and books and articles to be published that are already in the pipeline.

The major challenge perceived by the group is to find more permanent funding for doctoral students, post doc and senior researchers. Since the RC perceives that it cannot solve this problem alone, it will strive for a more permanent research funding policy structure together with other academic actors. They
will also struggle for longer periods free from teaching and administrative duties to concentrate on research.

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.

The choice and justification for the chosen category 2 lies in the research of the participating community, which is of good quality but in its present composition has yet to achieve strong international recognition. For that it is recommended to increase the number of publications in English. The RC has highly promising early career researchers, a fact enhancing the potential of the community. The RC perceives as negative structural factors that constitute a challenge the lack of stable funding leading to piece-meal research, lack of permanent research structures, general instability and absence of clear career prospects in the university system, which differs from the perceptions in the other RCs. The UH administration could look into this matter in connection with its human resources policy and research policy.

Numeric evaluation: 4 (Excellent)

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

It is said that the compilation was a collaborative effort of all members of the RC including doctoral candidates and junior researchers. Maybe this has resulted in some inconsistencies, as in the case of the single author or joint author publication habits. The input used to prepare the answers to the evaluation questions was assigned to the six groups of the RC.

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

The Group is aware that although their thematic interests cut through several key focus areas of the UH (welfare, language and culture, social justice, globalisation and social change) none is accurately described in the research themes of the RC. However, the relative heterogeneity of the fields covered seem to be a reflection of the attempt to open up innovative approaches in these most classical fields of social research. In this sense, even though it does not yet present a cutting edge definition, it promises interesting breakthroughs within a very rich group of senior and young researchers.

2.12 RC-specific main recommendations

The SBII should pursue the effort towards a clearer research focus, demonstrating the rationale for the six divergent groups that make up the RC.

Make more efficient use of the expertise in the group in doctoral training, for example through organizing RC-wide graduate courses.

Although the RC has an excellent societal impact record, it is recommended to make further efforts to increase cooperation with research institutes and third sector organizations to maintain and enhance an appropriate feedback of ideas and problems as well as possible sources of employment for its graduates.
We support the group’s idea of encouraging more doctoral candidates and post-doctoral researchers to include a stay at a foreign university in their studies and research, as well as of increasing the recruitment of foreign doctoral candidates into the SBII RC.

Despite recent improvement, there continues to be a challenge for UH to strike the right balance between teaching and research, particularly since UH aims to reinforce its role as a research university. This seems to be a burden, particularly for the social sciences and the humanities, for they have less opportunity to secure external funding than the hard sciences.

To try to insure a fixed funded quota for doctoral students affiliated with the SBII doctoral program; the ideal would be to have a doctoral and post-doctoral researcher program capable of overcoming the current financial uncertainties and stringencies.

It is recommended that the kind of shared leadership issue within the RC be clarified, beyond the main management of separate research projects led by independent researchers.

The capability of the SBII to obtain external competitive funding has been remarkable. Still, the RC could profitably explore other national and international sources of funding to cover more satisfactorily the needs and prospects of the doctoral program.

2.13 RC-specific conclusions

This is a challenging RC, with highly innovative research potential. The relative heterogeneity of the fields covered seems to be a reflection of the attempt to open up innovative approaches in some among the most classical fields of social research. In this sense, even though it does not yet present a cutting edge definition, it promises interesting breakthroughs within a very rich group of senior and young researchers.

But it should work in a concerted action plan, with clear thematic goals of convergence to achieve this.
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NAME OF THE RESEARCHER COMMUNITY:
Social bonds, Interactions and Institutions (SBII)

LEADER OF THE RESEARCHER COMMUNITY:
Professor Riitta Jallinoja, Faculty of Social Sciences, 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)
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RC-SPECIFIC STAGE 1 MATERIAL (registration form)

1 RESPONSIBLE PERSON

Name: Jallinoja, Riitta
E-mail: riitta.jallinoja@helsinki.fi
Phone: 19123916
Affiliation: Faculty of Social Sciences, Department of Social Research
Street address: Unioninkatu 25

2 DESCRIPTION OF THE PARTICIPATING RESEARCHER COMMUNITY (RC)

Name of the participating RC (max. 30 characters): Social bonds, Interactions and Institutions
Acronym for the participating RC (max. 10 characters): SBII
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 researcher community is constituted by six subgroups engaged in research on social action, family and relatedness, childhood, youth, boundaries and transnational relations, and conversation analysis. The RC consists of both theoretically and empirically oriented researchers.

The RC shares common research interests, concepts and analytical perspectives, as well as methodological and ethical concerns. The RC addresses issues which are at the core of the social and cultural, and thus at the core of sociology and social anthropology, such as agency, relationality and interaction, and qualities like intimacy, trust, commitment, belonging and well-being. Examples of relevant concepts and perspectives cutting across subgroups are citizenship and rights, gender and generation, materiality and spatiality, transitions and commodification. Issues are scrutinized against the background of societal change in the form of globalization, individualization, medical technology, mobility and migration and the dynamics, challenges and conflicts they give rise to in societal institutions, such as the family, education, and systems of governance.

Qualitative approaches, in which the interaction between researchers and research objects is close, are a common denominator for the empirically oriented research of the RC. How to conceptualize the field in ethnographic research, the researcher’s positioning in the field and relation to research objects, qualitative comparative approaches, and ethical concerns and responsibilities in different phases of the research process are examples of common methodological and ethical concerns.

Research collaboration across the subgroups takes place in interdisciplinary, externally funded research projects led by the principal investigators of the RC. There is also close cooperation in the teaching of undergraduates, master-level students and in the doctoral training taking place in graduate schools and in the research projects. RC members engage in joint lecture courses and seminars on all levels of teaching.
The publication strategy includes publications resulting from teaching on methodological and ethical issues common to the participants.

### 3 Scientific Fields of the RC

**Main scientific field of the RC’s research:** social sciences  
**RC’s scientific subfield 1:** Anthropology  
**RC’s scientific subfield 2:** History and Philosophy of Science  
**RC’s scientific subfield 3:** Social Sciences, Interdisciplinary  
**RC’s scientific subfield 4:** Sociology  
**Other, if not in the list:** area studies, behavioral studies, family, youth and childhood sociology, ethnicity, education, gender, medical anthropology, migration, political anthropology

### 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):** The researcher community is participating in the evaluation in the category number 2. The choice is supported by several strong arguments. Individual researchers and sub-groups of the RC have been highly successful in obtaining funding from national and international sources (Academy of Finland, EU-funds, private foundations). All participants are actively networking, collaborating and publishing with internationally recognized scholars in their respective fields. The RC includes several highly promising early career researchers which enhances the innovative research potential of the community. Doctoral students are actively included in the research projects of the senior members. The social relevance of the research results of the community, for instance those related to family, health care and generational problems as well as transnational and ethnic questions, is highly significant and the researchers are actively contributing to public discussions and decision-making processes both nationally and internationally.

Despite the undeniably high quality of the research, the relative heterogeneity of the fields covered does not easily yield to a cutting edge definition. Moreover, some of the methodological and theoretical approaches applied represent new and innovative openings in their fields, and have therefore not yet reached an established position in international research. It should be emphasized that a strong international recognition or a clear international breakthrough has not yet been achieved due to lack of permanency of funding of individual researchers. This results in short-term research projects, general instability and uncertainty of prospects for future research and lack of permanent research structures and clear career prospects in the university system. The individual researchers of the RC have joined their intellectual resources in order to counteract the negative influence of such structural factors.
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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): As such the RC represents one of the oldest and arguably even the most basic field of sociological and anthropological research (the social bond). The most important single research themes of the RC include family relations and family policy, transnationality, ethnicity and migration, inequalities, health care and medical technology, parenthood, gendered violence, ethics and human rights, the constitution of social relations in face-to-face interactions, childhood and youth (transitions, commercialization, spatiality, peer-group interaction, education), social action and social cognition, affectivity, sociality and relatedness. The methodological and theoretical approaches cover ethnographic, phenomenological and multidisciplinary methodology, qualitative comparison, conversation analysis, history of ideas and social theory.

Researchers of the RC actively participate in planning and implementing of international doctoral and young scholar supervision, hence furthering internationalization of research training. Equally, RC members are receiving doctoral training through a number of national programmes. These include The Finnish Graduate School in Education and Learning (FIGSEL), The Finnish Doctoral Program in Social Sciences (SOVAKO), The Finnish Graduate School of Human Rights Research, and Gender System Graduate School.

As the teaching of the members of the RC is based upon research, students are offered teaching that reflects the diversity of research approaches and subjects. RC members are engaged in the planning and implementation of joint teaching projects in the areas of social theory, research methodology and contemporary societal themes.

Significance of the RC’s research and doctoral training for the University of Helsinki (MAX. 2200 characters with spaces): RC members, as part of the Department of Social Research, are actively involved in training professional researchers in the fields of sociology and anthropology, as one of the most significant departments in Finland. RC members seek to increase contacts over disciplinary borders and to plan and develop collaboration in research and teaching within the university system. The community enhances critical thinking in future generations of researchers, by focusing on issues debated in contemporary society.

The RC produces high quality research on contemporary social issues, actively engaging with different sectors in an increasingly multicultural and global society. The comparative aspect is of importance in the RC’s research and is enhanced through participation in international research networks (such as those of ESA, EASA and ISA), international research projects and doctoral education, impacting on the international profile of the University.

Researchers of the RC have produced a wide variety of publications that are of high academic quality and in line with international standards. In addition, with reference to the University’s third task they have produced scholarly and popular publications in Finnish and Swedish. RC’s publications have appeared in
significant peer reviewed journals both within the field of sociology and anthropology and in interdisciplinary journals (see point 7).

The RC’s research and teaching constitute the basis of its interaction with society, on both national and international levels. Members of the RC are strengthening their contacts with public and third sector institutions, thereby creating new forms of collaboration between research and society. International collaboration has been developed with key researchers in sociology and anthropology as mentioned in point 7. In this manner the RC increases the visibility of the University in society as well as on the international level.

Keywords: social bond, affectivity, relatedness, belonging
social action, social cognition
agency, ethnography, transnational social fields, borders, identity
interaction
health care, medical technology
family
childhood
gendered violence
gender, generations
youth, education

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>6 Quality of RC’s Research and Doctoral Training</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Justified estimate of the quality of the RC’s research and doctoral training at national and international level during 2005-2010 (MAX. 2200 characters with spaces): The research conducted in the RC is in many ways at the core of the Finnish and European social sciences. Both the scientific quality and the social impact of the research are high. Most senior researchers of the group are leading figures in Finnish and Nordic social sciences, well-known and acknowledged on international level as well, such as professors Jallinoja, Honkasalo and Peräkylä.

All members are highly regarded in their respective fields and active in international networks and collaboration (EastBordNet, Management Committee of ESF/COST Action). They participate in scientific discourses and publish in several languages, Finnish, Swedish, English, French, German and Estonian. RC members publish jointly and in collaboration with international partners. They are serving as reviewers and members of editorial boards in several international journals.

Academic mobility is high. All senior members have spent periods abroad in research institutes and universities and many have also conducted research abroad, together with local colleagues. Such active
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collaboration is going on in Nordic and Baltic countries, France, Germany, Ireland, Italy, Russia, UK, USA and Canada.

During the evaluation period, the RC has had as its collaborators key figures in the field: Elisabeth Beck-Gernsheim, Sarah Green, Anita Hardon, Geoffrey Hodgson, Janet Holland, Tim Ingold, Allison James, Dmitri Shalin and Barbara Yngvesson.

The latest awarded RC member is Professor Honkasalo (The Steve Polgar Professional Prize of the AAA 2010). Members have succeeded in obtaining highly competitive research funding and positions, and been invited to give international lectures and key note speeches. The productivity of the RC is attested by the number of peer reviewed publications (215), academic anthologies (19) and monographs (7). The quality of the research training is demonstrated by the high grades of the supervised doctoral dissertations. Supervision in Finnish, Swedish and English has resulted in 31 completed doctoral degrees and 40 on-going dissertations. Members of the RC have participated as experts in research evaluations in Finland, other countries and on the EU level.

Comments on how the RC’s scientific productivity and doctoral training should be evaluated (MAX. 2200 characters with spaces): Due to the fact that the RC consists of a diversity of interrelated fields and approaches, this should be taken into account in assessing its productivity and quality. Also the career structure should be taken into account, since even younger members are internationally accomplished and productive scholars. The strong presence of the third mission of universities in the publishing profile of the RC requires that special weight be given also to publications in Finnish and Swedish. When assessing the doctoral training, the panel should not only pay attention to the number of PhDs successfully defended and directed, but also to the number of national and international networks and conferences the doctoral candidates have participated in.

The RC subgroups have each published monographs, academic anthologies and peer reviewed articles in international scientific journals representing the top of their fields (for instance Theory Culture & Society, Journal for the Theory of Social Behaviour, Health, Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies, Gender and Education). On the other hand, the subgroups targeting their research more specifically to the national community and public have also published in various Finnish scientific journals (Sosiologia, Suomen Antropologi, Nuorisotutkimus, Yhteiskuntapolitiikka) and national edited collections in their respective fields. Joint authorship is particularly salient in the RC’s publication profile, since this is the most important form of publication with multidisciplinary research areas strongly represented in the RC. The same goes for national network-publications and text-books, specifically destined to the professionals of family, youth or child welfare questions and to wider public (the so called third mission of universities). The future publication strategy of the group will continue to emphasize this multidisciplinary and joint authorship aspect along with the more traditional individual authorship, with a strong investment in both international and national publications, not only in the Anglo-Saxon, but also the Scandinavian and even other European linguistic areas (French, Italian, Estonian, Russian).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Last name</th>
<th>First name</th>
<th>PI-status (TURAT, 29.11.2010)</th>
<th>Title of research and teaching personnel</th>
<th>Affiliation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aaltonen</td>
<td>Sanna</td>
<td>postdoctoral researcher</td>
<td>Social sciences/social research</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aapola-Kari</td>
<td>Sinikka</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>senior researcher</td>
<td>Social sciences/social research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arppe</td>
<td>Tiina</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>senior researcher (Academy Research Fellow)</td>
<td>Social sciences/social research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assmuth</td>
<td>Laura</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>senior researcher (Academy Research Fellow)</td>
<td>Social sciences/social research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Castrén</td>
<td>Anna-Maija</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>university researcher</td>
<td>Social sciences/social research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gordon</td>
<td>Tuula</td>
<td>senior researcher</td>
<td>Social sciences/social research</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gronow</td>
<td>Antti</td>
<td>doctoral candidate</td>
<td>Social sciences/social research</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Halikkola</td>
<td>Lotta</td>
<td>doctoral candidate</td>
<td>Social sciences/social research</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hart</td>
<td>Linda</td>
<td>doctoral candidate</td>
<td>Social sciences/social research</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Högbäck</td>
<td>Riitta</td>
<td>postdoctoral researcher</td>
<td>Social sciences/social research</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Honkasalo</td>
<td>Marja-Liisa</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>professor</td>
<td>Social sciences/social research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jallinoja</td>
<td>Riitta</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>professor</td>
<td>Social sciences/social research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kailoja</td>
<td>Tuukka</td>
<td>postdoctoral researcher</td>
<td>Social sciences/social research</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karimi</td>
<td>Zeinab</td>
<td>doctoral candidate</td>
<td>Social sciences/social research</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ketokivi</td>
<td>Kaisa</td>
<td>postdoctoral researcher</td>
<td>Social sciences/social research</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kilpinen</td>
<td>Erkki</td>
<td>university lecturer</td>
<td>Social sciences/social research</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kotanen</td>
<td>Riikka</td>
<td>doctoral candidate</td>
<td>Social sciences/social research</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kullman</td>
<td>Kim</td>
<td>doctoral candidate</td>
<td>Social sciences/social research</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mäkisalmi</td>
<td>Jaana</td>
<td>doctoral candidate</td>
<td>Social sciences/social research</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mattila</td>
<td>Anne</td>
<td>doctoral candidate</td>
<td>Social sciences/social research</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mölsä</td>
<td>Mulki</td>
<td>doctoral candidate</td>
<td>Social sciences/social research</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paju</td>
<td>Elina</td>
<td>doctoral candidate</td>
<td>Social sciences/social research</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peltola</td>
<td>Marja</td>
<td>doctoral candidate</td>
<td>Social sciences/social research</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peräkylä</td>
<td>Anssi</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>professor</td>
<td>Social sciences/social research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ruckenstein</td>
<td>Minna</td>
<td>postdoctoral researcher</td>
<td>Social sciences/social research</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Silvonen</td>
<td>Elia</td>
<td>doctoral candidate</td>
<td>Social sciences/social research</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strandell</td>
<td>Harriet</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>university lecturer (Academy Senior Scientist)</td>
<td>Social sciences/social research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tiilikainen</td>
<td>Marja</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>postdoctoral researcher</td>
<td>Social sciences/social research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tolonen</td>
<td>Tarja</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>university researcher</td>
<td>Social sciences/social research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turtiainen</td>
<td>Pirjo</td>
<td>doctoral candidate</td>
<td>Social sciences/social research</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virtanen</td>
<td>Mikko</td>
<td>doctoral candidate</td>
<td>Social sciences/social research</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ylönen</td>
<td>Suvi</td>
<td>doctoral candidate</td>
<td>Social sciences/social research</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ædahl</td>
<td>Susanne</td>
<td>postdoctoral researcher</td>
<td>Social sciences/social research</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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BACKGROUND INFORMATION

Name of the RC’s responsible person: Jallinoja, Riitta
E-mail of the RC’s responsible person: riitta.jallinoja@helsinki.fi

Name and acronym of the participating RC: Social bonds, interactions and institutions, SBII
The RC’s research represents the following key focus area of UH: -- Select --
Comments for selecting/not selecting the key focus area: Research of the RC “Social Bonds, Interactions and Institutions” cut through several key focus areas of the UH (welfare, language and culture, social justice, globalisation and social change), but none of the titles listed above describe the research themes of the RC accurately.

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).

Since the RC is constituted by six groups (social action, family and relatedness, childhood, youth, boundaries and transnational relations, and conversation analysis), the foci of the research are necessarily multiple. This is an advantage, because social bonding and relatedness can thereby be examined more comprehensively, thus creating opportunities to recognize different types of relatedness.

The group on social action conducts basic research with a twofold focus. First, it develops more up-to-date models for social action, drawing on research advances in behavioral sciences. The action theory project has created new explanatory models for social action, in which the traditional mind-first explanation is relativised. A new relation between social and behavioral sciences is thus being developed. This strengthens the status of sociology and opens up new connections to neighbouring disciplines. The second focus in theoretical research is the history and theory of affectivity. The project traces a major discursive shift in 19th century social theory, characterized by a change from a juridical to a normative approach in the conceptualization of affectivity. This result has significance, not only for the sociological theory of affectivity, but also for other human and social sciences.

The group on family and relatedness examines social bonds as lived relationships and the ways they are conceived in contemporary society. The focus is on relatedness as a general concept and on the question of how relatedness transforms into binding social bonds in different ways in different contexts. In these processes different types of social bonds are created, such as kinship, families, friendship, and acquaintances. The rules and flexibilities of bonding are of great interest for the RC, as well as the symbolic order which tends to channel bonding in a habitual manner. Family policy and jurisdiction are important elements in directing bonding processes. These issues are examined both empirically and theoretically. Members have investigated the familialistic turn, new definitions of parenthood, international adoption, family and kin relationships in post-divorce situations, biographical disruption (e.g. mental illness, unexpected widowhood or divorce) and its effect on the configuration of significant ties, romantic love and couple relationship as a therapy-cultural relationship, the legal definitions of family in the European Union, violence in relationships, and work-life balance. In particular, the group has contributed internationally to the development of the configurational perspective in the sociology of family and relatedness.
The childhood research group has three predominant common foci. First, there are studies of changed forms of governance in childhood and their links to institutional childhood arrangements, to children’s agency and participation, and to social relations and identities in childhood. The second common interest is in spatial perspectives on social relations in childhood, comprising mobile approaches to space and regarding space as unfixed. The third focus is on innovative methods, such as video and photographing in child studies, and combinations of discourse analysis and ethnographic approaches. The group has contributed to several theoretical and methodological discussions crossing over the disciplinary and research traditions divide, such as discussions on space and mobility, space and culture, human geographies, science and technology studies, and studies on governance.

The group studying youth focuses on transitions into adulthood. These are multiple and infused with relations of power and inequalities based on gender, social class, locality and ethnicity. The research interests include successful transitional paths and processes of marginalization. The members have addressed such fundamental sociological issues as the tensions between structural constraints and agency in a critical and theoretically informed framework. Besides offering relevant insights for social policy on youth and educational work, the research conducted by this group is widely cited within youth, gender and educational studies.

The group on boundaries and transnational relations tackles the social and theoretical challenges posed by the changes in current life situations, reflected in international migration, transnational social fields, multiculturalism, and body technology. Such changes generate new kinds of agency and identity which are bounded and anchored in inequity, marginalization and powerlessness, touching people independently of their social position. Such problems arise from inadequacy in social contexts where success is attributed to, and expected of, the autonomous actor. The foci of the group are: the intersection of state and identity in post-socialist contexts; transnational agency among migrants searching for care; youth in multicultural families; cultural variety of agency reflected in illness; and new technologies of curing the body. The defining feature of the research is its strong multi-disciplinary character as social anthropologists work together with sociologists, scholars of religion and social policy. Agency as a key focus and ethnography as a key method are the common denominators.

The conversation analysis group studies the ways the expression of emotion is embedded in the organization of interaction in everyday encounters and institutional interaction. It shows how the sequential and institutional context shapes the production and the reception of emotional expressions. The data comes from everyday interactions among adults, mother-baby interactions, psychotherapy and from workplace meetings. The results thus far elucidate, for example, how psychotherapists combine empathic and interpretative responses to patients’ affective responses, and usages of facial expressions in ordinary conversation in establishing the emotional valence of utterances prior to their onset and after their completion. Recently, new work has been initiated, exploring the interconnections between verbal and non-verbal expression of emotion and the psycho-physiological processes in the participants to interaction. The members have pioneered in expanding the agenda of conversation analytical research on facial expression, emotion, and psychotherapeutic interaction.

The RC is committed to a reflexive, ethical and interdisciplinary approach. The members have an excellent track record in the use of mixed research methods and innovative qualitative research techniques.
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- Ways to strengthen the focus and improve the quality of the RC’s research.

The strength of the RC’s research lies, first, on the expert standings achieved by the researchers in their respective fields internationally and nationally, and second, on its wide interdisciplinary background. The high quality of the research and its scientific significance are reflected in the RC’s success in obtaining competitive external funding: 4.38 million € administered by the UH and 750,000 € received as personal grants.

The challenges lie in the general instability of funding, uncertainty of prospects and the relative separateness of the groups. The RC is committed to increasing mutual collaboration in order to cross-fertilize research results, as well as theoretical and methodological discussions. A challenge is to secure the continuity of all groups in the RC. This is a challenge for the youth research group in particular, because key group members have recently been employed outside the university.

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

Recruitment

A high number of PhDs have graduated in the RC in 2005 - 2010, 9 under the supervision of Peräkylä, 8 by Jallinoja, 7 by Gordon, 4 by Honkasalo, 4 by Assmuth, and 1 by Strandell, Castrén and Aapola-Kari each, resulting in 35 completed dissertations in all. In addition, 29 doctoral dissertations are in progress under the supervision of the senior researchers. This high number indicates a wide interest among doctoral candidates in research on social bonds, interaction and institutions. The excellent standard of dissertations reflects the quality of our doctoral training. Students have been recruited from amongst the best qualified MAs, from various universities in Finland and abroad. Students have shown familiarity with the topics of this RC in their MA theses. They have passed the normal admission procedure organized by the Faculty of Social Sciences twice a year. Admission to doctoral studies is awarded on the basis of the high quality of the research plan and MA thesis graded magna cum laude or higher, but other qualifications are also taken into account, such as recruitment to a research group with funding granted for the proposed research. On average, 16 new doctoral candidates are annually recruited in sociology. Recruitment into the RC is not a problem since the best doctoral candidates are attracted to SBII-projects due to their interest in the research themes and the excellent record and reputation of senior researchers and professors.

Supervision and collaboration

The evaluation board of professors in sociology nominates a supervisor for each new doctoral candidate according to the expertise of professors, university lecturers and docents, who form the basic pool of supervisors. Each doctoral candidate has one senior supervisor as the first supervisor and another as junior supervisor, who, both together and separately, provide personal supervision to doctoral candidates. Supervision is also given in seminars of different kinds. There are several national multi-disciplinary doctoral training programs: the Finnish Graduate School of Social Sciences (SOVAKO), the Graduate School of Family Research (PETU), the Finnish Graduate School for Human Rights Research, the Finnish Graduate School in Education and Learning (KASVA), the Gender System Graduate School, and the Doctoral Program of Public Health. These programs gather up a great number of doctoral candidates, university teachers and researchers annually to nation-wide conferences and training.
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courses, which also serve as noteworthy forums for contact-making and familiarisation with research on relevant topics. Peräkylä is a member of the board of SOVAKO and Jallinoja of the board of PETU.

Within the discipline of sociology at UH the doctoral candidates of the RC participate in doctoral seminars, for a total of four years. Each year doctoral candidates give a presentation on her or his dissertation research. Peer reviewing is greatly emphasised in these seminars, but the leaders of the seminars also comment on the presentations. The professors of this RC have acted as leaders of these doctoral seminars, that are obligatory for all doctoral students. In addition, the groups of the RC have organized thematically focused research seminars in connection with projects, led by Jallinoja, Peräkylä, Strandell, Kilpinen, Assmuth and Honkasalo. These seminars also include junior and senior researchers. In the research seminars, the thematic subjects and related research methods are elaborated in more depth than is possible in the regular seminars, where a great variety of subjects sets limitations to a more focused deliberation. Thus, these two types of seminars, one with a wide range of subjects, the other with a more focused target serve different aims. In both seminars doctoral candidates are encouraged to work and think independently; they are considered to be researchers whose scientific contribution benefits the whole group. Supervision is thus not an adjacent task given separately, but a compound part of the flow of scientific activities in the group.

The research seminars apply different procedures in enhancing training and in stimulating innovative approaches and perspectives to social bonds, interaction and institutions. Some groups of the RC have developed study circles, peer mentoring practices, and two-day seminars in order to concentrate on topical questions. These gatherings have yielded brainstorming that has challenged self-evident truths and inspired new scientific openings. As a part of supervision and mentoring, joint publications involving doctoral candidates have been accomplished.

Supervisors and senior researchers encourage doctoral candidates to make public appearances and act as experts in the media. This is possible due to the great number of contacts the principal investigators of the RC have with the media and other agencies which continuously make requests for lecturing. Doctoral candidates are also incorporated into conference practices from the beginning of their doctoral studies, both at national and international levels. As a rule, one international conference attendance per year has been granted. Doctoral candidates have presented papers at the conferences of the International Sociological Association (ISA), European Association of Social Anthropologists (EASA), American Anthropological Association (AAA), and the European Sociological Association (ESA), but also at more specific international conferences. At the national level, annual conferences organized by the Westermarck Society, the Finnish Anthropological Society, the Philosophical Society of Finland, the Finnish Society for Child Research, and the Society for the Study of Ethnic Relations and International Migration have been popular among doctoral candidates.

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

The doctoral candidates of the RC conduct independent high quality research in their respective fields. They publish already during the doctoral training and their dissertations appear as ISBN numbered books. In this way the research results of even the junior members are disseminated widely, and become part of the body of research advances.

As described above, the RC has accomplished a great deal in improving and diversifying the training of doctoral candidates. The amount of training is praiseworthy and the quality is high. The challenge is to make more efficient use of the wide expertise of the groups in doctoral training, for example through organizing RC-wide graduate courses.
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3 SOCIETAL IMPACT OF RESEARCH AND DOCTORAL TRAINING (MAX. 4400 CHARACTERS WITH SPACES)

• Description of how the RC interacts with and contributes to the society (collaboration with public, private and/or 3rd sector).

In the present societal climate of changing modalities and structures within the Welfare State and globally it is of utmost importance to conduct research on how processes of social change are experienced by various actors and groups in society. The research carried out by the RC members sheds light on processes of inclusion and exclusion.

The researchers are actively contributing to public discussions and decision-making processes both nationally and internationally. In addition to the publications of high academic quality, aimed for international audiences, researchers produce scholarly and popular publications in Finnish and Swedish. The RC’s research and teaching constitute the basis of its interaction with society, on both national and international levels.

Interaction with different societal actors representing the public and the third sector in Finnish society plays a notable role in the RC’s activities. Researchers are frequently invited as lecturers, panelists, commentators and consultants in undertakings of state and municipal officials and third sector organizations in their respective fields. For example, researchers have been active in answering to various calls for expertise at the Finnish parliament (committee hearings); Working Group for the State Government Policy Programme; The Family Federation in Finland; Central Union of Child Welfare; The Evangelical Lutheran Church of Finland; The Ombudsman for Equality; The Ombudsman for Minorities; representatives of various NGOs; Institutions, authorities and practitioners in the fields of migration, health, family, youth and childhood issues. Members of the research community also train professionals in health and therapeutic care, social work and medicine, and multicultural issues.

The researchers disseminate their research widely. They write popular articles and columns about their topics of research. The research results are in demand also internationally, and the researchers are often invited as experts to present their findings to different academic and non-academic audiences abroad. Moreover, they are regularly contacted by the media and participate in public discussions and debates both in print media and other media channels.

The themes that the researchers deal with are extremely topical in Finnish society, where a lot of public and private resources have been directed to policy work and development projects in the fields covered by the RC. The research conducted clearly benefits society through the development of comprehensive knowledge and related practice, vital for political decisions. The researchers, including the doctoral students, are aware of the high importance of disseminating and popularizing their knowledge, including knowledge on methodology and the ethical considerations of qualitative research.

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

Doctoral training would benefit from a more intense co-operation with research institutes and third sector organizations. The intensification of such contacts helps doctoral candidates make important contacts and create networks useful in finding a future job or position. Researchers and doctoral students would benefit from media training in order to further enhance the popularization of academic results. The RC will increase its efforts in both these areas.
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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 members of the RC have actively participated in international conferences. These conferences have promoted opportunities for joint publications and research projects. For example, Jallinoja has organized two interim conferences on family sociology within the context of the ESA (in 2007 and 2008). Two books resulted from this collaboration, one by Peter Lang (2008), the other by Palgrave Macmillan (2010). A panel organized by Honkasalo and Assmuth at the EASA in 2010 will result in an anthology published by Berghahn Publishers. Several of the researchers have organized sessions at international conferences, served as board members in the ESA, the ISA and other international scientific organizations. Gordon has served as a member of the Executive Committee of the ESA. Important networks are EastBordNet, studying borders; COST Research Action “Remaking borders”; Research Action COST A 19 “Children’s Welfare” resulting in an anthology published in 2007; Nordforsk (Nordic Council of Ministers) research network studying Nordic childhood; Nordic Pragmatism Network; Diaspora and State-formation in the Horn of Africa and Diasporas for peace (DIASPEACE, EC 7th Framework Programme).

A large number of foreign contacts created by the RC members and the eminence they have established have attracted highly qualified scholars to Helsinki. The visitors’ lectures have been incorporated into doctoral training. The members of the RC have also been active in visiting universities and research institutes abroad. Some of them have stayed abroad for a longer period, as invited guest researchers, visiting guest professors, regular teachers or researchers (Swedish Collegium for Advanced Studies in Uppsala, Nordic Africa Institute in Uppsala, University of Linköping, University of Tartu, University of Freiburg, University of Lausanne, University of Rome, University of Erfurt, University of California at Berkeley, University of Las Vegas and University of Toronto). Some of the doctoral candidates and post doc researchers have been provided with an opportunity to attend one-year visits as well as shorter visits to several universities and research institutes.

On the national level, the members of the RC take part in annual conferences organized by scientific societies to make their research known among colleagues from other Finnish universities and research institutes. In addition, RC members have been active in the initiation of national networks. Projects funded mostly by the Academy of Finland and backed by foundations have been important forums for smaller scale collaboration. The RC has succeeded very well in getting grants for research projects which constitutes the basis for conducting research with colleagues with the same scientific interest. Projects are important also as providers of money for participation in conferences, buying literature and organizing workshops.

Research collaboration has resulted in the publication of several anthologies in Finnish and English. In addition to taking part in international research discussions, the anthologies serve the Finnish audience and its need for scientific knowledge on the topics studied in the RC.

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

RC members are well integrated and have been active partners in international and national research collaboration. A future challenge is to encourage more doctoral candidates and post doc researchers to include a stay at a foreign university in their studies and research, as well as to increase the recruitment
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of foreign doctoral candidates into SBII. Publication in international forums is also encouraged to enhance the international visibility of the RC members.

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 RC operates in a research intensive environment where the proportion of researchers, research groups and doctoral students is higher than in the Faculty of Social Sciences on average. Research of the RC is organized mainly in separate projects focusing on specific themes. Every project seeks to secure its operational conditions directly with the department, which means that working facilities such as offices, computers etc. are arranged by the department. Working facilities are good and university library services are excellent. To a limited extent, the department has been able to provide financial support for participation in conferences and meetings. Until now the department has managed to secure working facilities also for researchers on scholarships, who do not have overheads to cover such expenses included in their grants. To treat scholarship researchers on the same line with other researchers has been a conscious policy on the part of the department, thus signaling appreciation of the contribution they make to research, as well as to teaching at the department.

At the UH researchers participate in teaching and are thereby introduced to academic work from all sides, including planning of the future curriculum, in which several members of the RC have participated throughout the period. This also gives them the opportunity to directly influence course content. However, the teaching load of those RC members holding teaching positions is often too heavy to allow a more serious engagement in research during teaching periods. Lately, also administrative tasks have increased, taking time and concentration away from research. The introduction of the right for teachers to keep one out of four teaching periods during the academic year free from teaching and supervision of students is an improvement. The imbalance between teaching and research is mainly due to the notoriously poor teacher-student ratio in Finnish universities which has chronically declined over the 1990s and 2000s. This is arguably one of the biggest challenges facing the whole university sector in the years to come, in particular in social sciences and humanities, since they have less opportunity to secure external funding than the so called hard sciences.

The Department does not have a fixed amount of financed positions for doctoral students. In many cases doctoral candidates have to apply for research grants themselves, for longer or shorter periods, mostly from private foundations. The quality of doctoral students’ work is thus being assessed several times during the process. Short funding periods, the lack of continuity and certainty of funding is clearly a problem, in particular for the doctoral students of the RC. At worst, the lack of continuity in funding can lead to interruption of studies.

Doctoral candidates are affiliated to at least one project in progress while doing their dissertation even though their funding may be from an external source. Such affiliations guarantee that doctoral candidates have a supporting reference group.

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

Strengths of the RC in relation to the operational conditions of research and in the face of decreasing resources lies in the extremely high motivation of its members. The department is forced to cut down
expenses on offices and other facilities which create a real threat to research communities like SBII including talented scholars working on short term funding, grants, and under-budgeted projects. Financial uncertainty prevents the RC from developing research programs in a long-term perspective. This problem most seriously concerns post doctoral researchers.

- 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 work of the RC is managed in separate research projects led by independent researchers who have joined collaborative projects. The most important large research projects funded by the Academy of Finland of which the principal investigators are or have been in charge are: Suffering, healing and health-care: The transnational lives of Somalis in exile (Tiilikainen 2008-2010); Changes in the populations, changes in distress (Honkasalo2005-2009); Intimate Relationships in Contemporary Society (Jallinoja 2005-2007); Solidarity and the body as gift – Ethnographic explorations into the social and cultural context of organ transfer in Finland (Ádahl 2010-2012); Childhood, welfare and (new) forms of governance (Strandell 2007-2010); The Affective Foundations of the Social Bond (Arppe 2007-2012); and Rural futures: Ethnographies of transformation from Finland, Estonia, Russia and Ukraine (Assmuth 2007-2010).

The project leaders, who are senior researchers and professors, are responsible for the activities, progress and finances of the projects. In relation to junior researchers and doctoral candidates they have mainly a supporting role. There is no fixed leadership structure, and the RC strives for a community of autonomous researchers without rigid roles. The structure can be described as non-hierarchical, which is an asset to the RC: a collegial working environment is more likely to produce high quality research. Doctoral candidates are encouraged to be independent very early on in their careers; this guideline is manifested for example in the custom of single authorship. A relatively high degree of autonomy of doctoral candidates is not only seen as a necessary condition for genuinely innovative work in the social sciences (where results are rarely the fruit of joint laboratory-like work), but is also a necessity dictated by the present conditions of funding. A considerable part of the project funding stems from private foundations and is granted to individual researchers.

The RC is managed in formal and informal meetings in which members participate in the give-and-take of information and the sharpening of the RC’s research foci.

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

The non-hierarchical structure and the predominantly supportive role of project leaders and senior researchers create an inspiring atmosphere of collegiality. Doctoral candidates are encouraged to make decisions concerning their work independently and to proceed also in non-conventional and innovative directions. The main focus in developing leadership and management is in nurturing inspiration and enthusiasm. However, the growing load of administrative tasks of principal investigators, who have to manage without sufficient assisting personnel, is a strain on the time and resources that should be spent on supervision and research.
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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: 3900000

- 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:

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

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

- International and national foundations - names of international and national foundations which have decided to allocate funding to the RC members during 1.1.2005-31.12.2010, and the amount of their funding (in euros).
  - names of the foundations: Youth Research Network, Kone Foundation
  - total amount of funding (in euros) from the above-mentioned foundations: 260000

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

- Other national funding (incl. EVO funding and Ministry of Education and Culture funded doctoral programme positions) - names of other national funding organizations which have decided to allocate funding to the RC members during 1.1.2005-31.12.2010, and the amount of their funding (in euros).
  - names of the funding organizations: Ministry of Education and Culture funded doctoral programme positions
  - total amount of funding (in euros) from the above-mentioned funding organizations: 220000

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

- Description of the RC’s future perspectives in respect to research and doctoral training.

In order to enhance scientific exchange and make the collaboration between the groups of the RC more specific, a biannual collective workshop will be organized, one in May, the other in December. Its aim is to generate ideas for future research and deepen the analysis of research findings and theoretical explications. In addition, the different groups of the RC will continue to arrange meetings, seminars and working groups in order to secure the high quality of research and doctoral training also in years to come. Common foci of the RC will be sharpened. Joint lecture courses and seminars will be arranged on all levels of teaching.
INTERNATIONAL EVALUATION OF RESEARCH AND DOCTORAL TRAINING AT THE UNIVERSITY OF HELSINKI

RC-SPECIFIC STAGE 2 MATERIAL

A future perspective in regard to doctoral training is the intensification of the use of the theoretical and methodological expertise of the RC and its international and national partners in the training of doctoral candidates. The RC will supply students with information about its research in order to maintain its attractiveness among doctoral candidates and to secure the recruitment of doctoral candidates of high quality, in Finland and abroad. For that purpose, a home page of SBII will be created by the leaders of the RC groups. The RC will enhance the mobility of doctoral students and post doc researchers, by supporting them to include both longer and shorter visits to foreign universities as part of their studies and research. Agreements for such visits have already been made with University of Toronto and University of New York. Doctoral candidates are supported in creating contacts with research institutes and public, third sector and private organizations, in order to facilitate their future employment.

At least 13 doctoral dissertations supervised by principal investigators will be completed during 2011-2013, most of them by members of the RC.

In addition to articles in refereed journals, several books will be published by members of the RC in 2011-2013. A doctoral dissertation "From Habits to Social Structures" will be published by Peter Lang in 2011. Preliminary publishing agreements for the books "Valvottua vapaa-aikaa? Kouluiltaisten ittälätoiminnan tutkimus", and "Lapsuuden muuttuvat tilat" to appear in 2011 have been made with Gaudeamus. A publishing agreement for the book "The Affective Foundations of the Social Bond" to appear in 2012 has been made with British Ashgate. The book "Semiotic Pragmatism and Pragmatist Semiotics" will be published by Mouton de Gruyter in 2012. The book "The Dynastic Family and the Emergence of the 'Bare' Family" will appear in 2012; a proposal will be made to Palgrave Macmillan, which recently published a compilation by the author.

The ties with societal actors are numerous and well established; the RC will secure their continuity and make a special effort to recognize societal actors that could be potential partners for the RC.

The major challenge will be to find more permanent funding for doctoral students, post doc and senior researchers. The RC cannot solve this problem alone; therefore, the professors and university lectures of the RC, in particular, together with other academic actors will strive for a funding policy that secures more permanent funding of research. A challenge is also to strengthen post doc and senior researchers' possibilities to concentrate on doing research, by creating longer periods free from teaching and administrative duties. This is of vital importance for a policy to secure research of high quality, which in turn guarantees a strong international recognition of the RC.

The compilation of the stage 2 materials has been a thoroughly collaborative effort involving all members of the RC. Each of the six constituting groups has held its own meetings, and assigned one or two coordinators who have been responsible for the preparation and reporting of the group's contribution to the evaluation report. The doctoral candidates and other junior researchers have been actively involved. Three meetings have been arranged during the process; to two of them all members of the RC have been invited. At the first meeting (27.1) an initial discussion was held about important foci of SBII. For the second meeting (10.2) group leaders collected relevant data and important viewpoints from the members of their groups. The responsibility for preparing the answers to each of the nine questions of the evaluation was distributed among the group leaders. Drafts written were sent out to all members and were commented upon before the third meeting (21.2). This meeting was arranged as a whole-day in-depth writing session, in which the final text was formulated.
# 1 Analysis of publications

- Associated person(s) include: Sanna Aaltonen, Sanna.Aaltonen@helsinki.fi, Sinikka Aapola-Kari, Sinikka.Aapola@helsinki.fi, Tiina Arppe, tiina.arppe@helsinki.fi, Laura H Asmunth, Laura.Asmunth@helsinki.fi, Anna-Maja Castren, Anna-Maja.Castren@helsinki.fi, Tuula Gordon, Tuula.Gordon@helsinki.fi, Antti Gronow, Antti.Gronow@helkki.fi, Lotta Haukka, Lotta.Haukka@helsinki.fi, Linde Hart, Linde.hart@helsinki.fi, Ritta Högbacka, Ritta.Hogbacka@helsinki.fi, Marysia Horbaso, Marysia.Horbaso@helsinki.fi, Riitta Jallinoja, Riitta.Jallinoja@helsinki.fi, Zaraa Kaddem Kermi, Zaraa.Kaddem.Kermi@helsinki.fi, Erkki Kärnen, Erkki.Kaerninen@helsinki.fi, Tiina Kokkonen, Tiina.Kokkonen@helsinki.fi, Suvi Korhonen, Suvi.Korhonen@helsinki.fi, Eija Kunnas, Eija.Kunnas@helsinki.fi, Jouko Leppänen, Jouko.Keppelen@helsinki.fi, Pertti Penttilä, Pertti.Penttila@helsinki.fi, Salmi Pihlaja, Salmi.Pihlaja@helsinki.fi, Elina Pulkki, Elina.Pulkki@helsinki.fi, Anja Pöllänen, Anja.Pollarinen@helsinki.fi, Antti Puhakka, Antti.Puhakka@helsinki.fi, Suvi Tuukkanen, Suvi.Tuukkanen@helsinki.fi, Susanna Aaltonen, Susanna.Aaltonen@helsinki.fi

## Publication type

<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>10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A2 Review in scientific journal</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A3 Contribution to book/other compilations (refereed)</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A4 Article in conference publication (refereed)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B1 Unrefereed journal article</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B2 Contribution to book/other compilations (non-refereed)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C1 Published scientific monograph</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C2 Edited book, compilation, conference proceeding or special issue of journal</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D1 Article in professional journal</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D2 Article in professional hand or guide book or in a professional data system, or text book material</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D4 Published development or research report</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D5 Text book or professional handbook or guidebook or dictionary</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E1 Popular article, newspaper article</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E1 Popular contribution to book/other compilations</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2 Listing of publications

A1 Refereed journal article

2005
Tiilikainen, M 2005, ‘Suffering, social memory and embodiment: experiences of Somali refugee women’, Pakistan journal of women’s studies, vol 12, no. 2, pp. 1-16.

2006
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2008


2009


Arppe, T 2009, 'Sorcerer's apprentices and the 'will to figuration': the ambiguous heritage of the College de Sociologie', Theory, Culture & Society, vol 26, no. 4, pp. 117-148.
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Castrén, A, Maillochon, F 2009, ‘Who chooses the wedding guests, the couple or the family: individual preferences and relational constraints in France and Finland’, European Societies, vol 11, no. 3, pp. 369-389.


2010


A2 Review in scientific journal

2007


**A3 Contribution to book/other compilations (refereed)**

2005


Gordon, T. 2005. 'To which state to belong?: ethnicity and citizenship at Russia's new EU-borders', in TM Wilson, H.Donnan (eds), *Culture and power at the edges of the state. national support and subversion in European border regions.*, European studies in culture and policy, vol. 3, Lit Verlag, Mu., pp. 269-279.


Gordon, T. 2005. 'To which state to belong?: ethnicity and citizenship at Russia's new EU-borders', in TM Wilson, H.Donnan (eds), *Culture and power at the edges of the state. national support and subversion in European border regions.*, European studies in culture and policy, vol. 3, Lit Verlag, Mu., pp. 255-288.
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2006


2007


2008
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2009
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Tolonen, T 2009, Vanhemmuuden puute ja nuorten sosiaalinen pääoma, Lastensuojelun ytimissä / Marjatta Bardy (toim.); toimituskuunda. Tarja Heino ... [et al.], Terveyden ja hyvinvoinnin laitos, Helsinki, pp. 144-162.

2010


Assmuth, LH 2010, 'Tutkimus ja pedagogika', in T Martikainen, L Haikola (eds), Maahanmuutto ja sukupuoluet, Suomalaisen Kirjallisuuden Seura, Helsinki, pp. 219-238.


2007


B1 Unrefered journal article

2005


2006

Aaltonen, S 2006, 'Työnt, pojat ja sukupuolinen hänHintä', Nuorisotutkimus, vol 24, no. 4, pp. 61-64.

2007
Tiilikainen, M 2007, ‘Mobile patients, local healers: transnational dimensions of heling Somaliland’, News from the Nordic Africa Institute, no. 2, pp. 3-5.
2008
2009
2010
Tiilikainen, M 2010, ‘The transnational Somali field: ethical and methodological changes’, Anthropology news, vol 50, no. 9, pp. 21-
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2010

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

2005

2006

2007

2009

2010

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

2005

2006

2007

2009

2010
C1 Published scientific monograph

2005

2006

2007
Boyer, P 2007, Et l'homme créa les dieux: - comment expliquer la religion, translated by Tiina Arppe, WSOY.

2008
Ferry, L 2008, Apprendre à vivre : traité de philosophie à l'usage des jeunes générations, translated by Tiina Arppe, Otava.

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

2005

2007
SBII/Jallinoja
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2009


2010


D1 Article in professional journal

2007


2010

Ketokivi, K 2010, 'Saako lääkäri sanoa yksityishenkilönä mitä vaan?', Suomen lääkärilehti.

Ketokivi, K 2010, 'Mielialan arvoituksen äärellä', Suomen lääkärilehti.

Ketokivi, K 2010, 'Yksilöiden yhteisö on utopia', Suomen lääkärilehti.

Ketokivi, K 2010, 'Saako lääkäri sanoa yksityishenkilönä mitä vaan??', Suomen lääkärilehti.

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

2006


2007


D4 Published development or research report

2006


Đahl, S, Hakkarainen, O 2006, Democratizing South-North Relations: Learning from the association between Lokayan / CSOS (India) and KEPA (Finland), Kepa raportit, no. 86, vol. 9, Kehtysyhteistyön palvelukeskus.
SBII/Jallinoja

INTERNATIONAL EVALUATION OF RESEARCH AND DOCTORAL TRAINING AT THE UNIVERSITY OF HELSINKI
RC-SPECIFIC TUHAT COMPILATIONS OF PUBLICATIONS DATA 2005-2010

2008
Ådahl, S 2008, Civil Society in Nicaragua, Kepa background papers, Kehitysyhteistyön palvelukeskus.

D5 Text book or professional handbook or guidebook or dictionary

2007
Tiilikainen, M, Ahlén, M 2007, Kirjallinen omaksuise i Finland, Förbundet för mänskliga rättigheter, Helsingfors.

2009

E1 Popular article, newspaper article

2005

2006
Aaltonen, S 2006, ’Don’t let me be misunderstood’, Kommentti : nuorisotutkimuksen verkkokanava.
Strander, H 2006, ’Familjens Id?: att hitta balans mellan arbetet, samvoro och hushållsarbete i dagens Finland’, Mifamilj.
Tiilikainen, M 2006, Diaspora ja Somalimaan jälleenrakennus: ketkä palaavat, Ydin : rauhanpoliittinen aikakauslehti, no. 4, pp. 48-49.

2007

2008
Högbacka, R 2008, 'Voiko kansainvälinen adoptio olla avoin?', Yhteiset lapsemme, no. 4.

2009
Högbacka, R 2009, 'Biologista äitiä tuettava adoptiossa', Helsingin Sanomat.
Tiilikainen, M 2009, 'Merirosvojillan kääntöpuolensa', Helsingin Sanomat.
Tiilikainen, M 2009, 'Vaihtoehtoiset hoitomuodot ja kulttuuriset parantamiskäytännöt: on asioitako?', Laadullisen terveystutkuvien verkosto.

2010
Ketokivi, K 2010, 'Yhteisön rakentaminen painotuu lähimpiini', Sydän.
Ketokivi, K 2010, 'Yhteiskunnan yksilölle ihmiskuva ei vastaa elettä täytyä', Väestölitto verkkosivusto.
Tiilikainen, M 2010, 'Kansalaisjärjestöjen työ Somaliassa on ensiarvoisen tärkeää', Helsingin Sanomat.

E1 Popular contribution to book/other compilations

2005

2007

2010
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1 Analysis of activities 2005-2010

- Associated person is one of Sanna Aaltonen, Sanna.Aaltonen@helsinki.fi, Sinikka Aapola-Kari, Sinikka.Aapola@helsinki.fi, Tiina Arppe, tiina.appe@helsinki.fi, Laura H.Aasmuth, Laura.Aasmuth@helsinki.fi, Anni-May Castren, Anni-Maja.Castren@helsinki.fi, Tuula Gordon, Tuula.Gordon@helsinki.fi, Antti Gronow, Antti.Gronow@helsinki.fi, Lotta Hakola, Lotta.Hakola@helsinki.fi, Linde Hart, Linde.hart@helsinki.fi, Ritva Högbacka, Ritva.Hogbacka@helsinki.fi, Marja-Liisa Honkasalo, Marja-Liisa.Honkasalo@helsinki.fi, Ritva Jallinoja, Ritva.Jallinoja@helsinki.fi, Zainab Karimi, Zainab.Karimi@helsinki.fi, Erkki Kilpinen, Erkki.Kilpinen@helsinki.fi, Jaana Makamäki, Jaana.Makamaki@helsinki.fi, Anna Mattila, Anna.Mattila@helsinki.fi, Anna Molko, Anna.Molko@helsinki.fi, Elina Pajunen, Elina.Pajunen@helsinki.fi, Riikka Johanna Ketokivi, Riikka.Johanna.Ketokivi@helsinki.fi, Kim Kullman, Kim.Kullman@helsinki.fi, Jaana Maksimainen, Jaana.Maksimainen@helsinki.fi, Anne Pennanen, Anne.Pennanen@helsinki.fi, Miisa Ruokonen, Miisa.Ruokonen@helsinki.fi, Susanne Ådahl, Susanne.Adahl@helsinki.fi, Susanne Adahl, Susanne.Adahl@helsinki.fi, Tuulis Ylonen, Suvi-Tuuli.Ylonen@helsinki.fi, Suvi-Tuuli Pennanen, Suvi-Tuuli.Pennanen@helsinki.fi, Susanne Adahl, Susanne.Adahl@helsinki.fi, Suvi-Tuuli Pennanen, Suvi-Tuuli.Pennanen@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>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prizes and awards</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Editor of research journal</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Editor of research anthology/collection/conference proceedings</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peer review of manuscripts</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Editor of communication journal</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Editor of series</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Editor of special theme number</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment of candidates for academic posts</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Membership or other role in review committee</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Membership or other role in research network</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Membership or other role in national/international committee, council, board</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Membership or other role in public Finnish or international organization</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Membership or other role of body in private company/organisation</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participation in interview for written media</td>
<td>153</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participation in radio programme</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participation in TV programme</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participation in interview for web based media</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2 Listing of activities 2005-2010

Supervisor or co-supervisor of doctoral thesis

Laura H Assmuth, Laura.Assmuth@helsinki.fi
Supervision of a doctoral dissertation, Laura H Assmuth, 2010 → ...

Anna-Maija Castren, Anna-Maija.Castren@helsinki.fi
Co-supervisor for a doctoral student, Anna-Maija Castren, 01.08.2009 → 26.05.2010, Finland

Marja-Liisa Honkasalo, Marja-Liisa.Honkasalo@helsinki.fi
Supervisor for Ph.D. dissertation of Susanne Ådahl, University of Helsinki, Marja-Liisa Honkasalo, 02.02.2007, Finland
Supervisor for Ph.D. dissertation of Annika Launiala, University of Tampere, Marja-Liisa Honkasalo, 10.12.2010, Finland

Riitta Jallinoja, Riitta.Jallinoja@helsinki.fi
Supervision of Dr. thesis, Riitta Jallinoja, 2006
Supervision of Dr. thesis, Riitta Jallinoja, 2006
Supervision of Dr. thesis, Riitta Jallinoja, 2007
Supervision of Dr. thesis, Riitta Jallinoja, 2009
Supervision of Dr. thesis, Riitta Jallinoja, 2009
Supervision of Dr. thesis, Riitta Jallinoja, 2010
Supervision of Dr. thesis, Riitta Jallinoja, 2010
Supervision of Dr. thesis, Riitta Jallinoja, 2010

Erkki Kilpinen, Erkki.Kilpinen@helsinki.fi
Doctoral supervision, Erkki Kilpinen, 01.01.2006 → 31.12.2006
Supervision, Erkki Kilpinen, 01.01.2007 → 31.12.2007
Supervision of doctoral thesis, Erkki Kilpinen, 01.01.2007 → 31.12.2007, Finland
Doctoral supervision, Erkki Kilpinen, 01.01.2009 → 31.12.2009
Dissertation supervisor, Erkki Kilpinen, 01.01.2010 → 31.12.2010, Finland
Supervisor of dissertation, Erkki Kilpinen, 01.01.2010 → 31.12.2010, Finland

Anssi Peräkylä, Anssi.Perakyla@helsinki.fi
Completed PhD thesis, Minna Nikunen, Anssi Peräkylä, 2005
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Completed PhD thesis, Pekka Mattila, Anssi Peräkylä, 2006, Finland
Supervision of doctoral thesis, Anssi Peräkylä, 01.01.2006 → 31.12.2006, United Kingdom
Supervision of doctoral thesis, Anssi Peräkylä, 01.01.2007 → 31.12.2007, Finland
Completed PhD thesis, Manja Maskus, Anssi Peräkylä, 2009, Finland
Completed PhD thesis, Sanna Saksela-Bergholm, Anssi Peräkylä, 2010

Harriet Strandell, Harriet.Strandell@helsinki.fi
Supervision of doctoral thesis, Elna Paju, Harriet Strandell, 2005 → 2010

Marja Tiilikainen, Marja.Tiilikainen@helsinki.fi, marja.tiilikainen@helsinki.fi

Tarja Tolonen, Tarja.Tolonen@helsinki.fi
Supervision of doctoral thesis, Tarja Tolonen, 01.01.2007 → 31.12.2007, United Kingdom

Prizes and awards
Marja-Liisa Honkasalo, Marja-Liisa.Honkasalo@helsinki.fi
Steve Polgar Professional Prize, Marja-Liisa Honkasalo, 19.11.2010, United States

Riitta Jallinoja, Riitta.Jallinoja@helsinki.fi
Commander of the Order of the Lion of Finland, Riitta Jallinoja, 2008
the Prize for the Development of Teaching, Riitta Jallinoja, 2008

Editor of research journal
Sanna Aaltonen, Sanna.Aaltonen@helsinki.fi
Nuorisotutkimus-lehden toimittuskunnan jäsen, Sanna Aaltonen, 01.01.2006 → 31.12.2010, Finland
Nuorisotutkimus-lehden 2(25) vastaava toimittaja, Sanna Aaltonen, 2007, Finland

Sinikka Aapola-Kari, Sinikka.Aapola@helsinki.fi
Nuorisotutkimuslehti, Sinikka Aapola-Kari, 01.01.2005 → 31.12.2005, Finland
Young - Nordic Journal Of Youth Research, Sinikka Aapola-Kari, 01.01.2005 → 31.12.2005, United Kingdom
Nuorisotutkimus-lehti, Sinikka Aapola-Kari, 01.01.2006 → 31.12.2006, Finland
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Tiina Arppe , tiina.arppe@helsinki.fi

Distinktion – Scandinavian Journal of Social Theory, Tiina Arppe, 2006 → ..., Denmark
Tiede & Edistys, Tiina Arppe, 2007 → ..., Finland

Laura H Assmuth , laura.assmuth@helsinki.fi

Pro Ethnologia, Laura H Assmuth, 01.01.2005 → 31.12.2005, Estonia
Suomen Antropologi, Laura H Assmuth, 01.01.2005 → 31.12.2005, Finland
Identities: Global Studies in Culture and Power, Laura H Assmuth, 01.01.2006 → 31.12.2006, United States
Naisututkimus, Laura H Assmuth, 01.01.2006 → 31.12.2006, Finland
Anthropological Quarterly, Laura H Assmuth, 01.01.2007 → 31.12.2007, United States
COLLeGIUM: Studies across Disciplines in the Humanities and Social Sciences, Laura H Assmuth, 01.01.2007 → 31.12.2007, Finland

Laura H Assmuth , Laura.Assmuth@helsinki.fi

Identities, Global Studies in Culture and Power, Laura H Assmuth, 01.01.2007 → 31.12.2007, United States

Anna-Maija Castren , anna-maija.castren@helsinki.fi


Antti Gronow , anti.gronow@helsinki.fi

Tiede & edistysen toimitus­kunnan jäsen, Antti Gronow, 01.01.2010 → ..., Finland

Riitta Högbacka , riitta.hogbacka@helsinki.fi

Maaseudun Uusi Aika, Riitta Högbacka, 01.01.2005 → 31.12.2005, Finland
Luokka ja sukupuoli (toim. Tarja Tolonen), Riitta Högbacka, 01.01.2007 → 31.12.2007, Finland

Marja-Liisa Honkasalo , marja-liisa.honkasalo@helsinki.fi

Medical Anthropology Quarterly, Marja-Liisa Honkasalo, 01.01.2005 → 31.12.2005, United States
Social Science & Medicine, Marja-Liisa Honkasalo, 01.01.2005 → 31.12.2005, United Kingdom

Kaisa Ketokivi , kaisa.ketokivi@helsinki.fi

Notko, M & E Sevon (toim.) Puhetta perhesuhteista, Kaisa Ketokivi, 01.01.2006 → 31.12.2006, Finland
Soxiologia -lehden toimitus­kunnan jäsen, Kaisa Ketokivi, 01.08.2010 → ...

Erkki Kilpinen , erkki.kilpinen@helsinki.fi

Behavioral and Brain Sciences, Erkki Kilpinen, 01.01.2005 → 31.12.2005, United States
Subject Matters: A Journal of Communications and the Self, Erkki Kilpinen, 01.01.2005 → 31.12.2005, United Kingdom
History of Political Economy, Erkki Kilpinen, 01.01.2007 → 31.12.2007, United States
Organization Studies, Erkki Kilpinen, 01.01.2007 → 31.12.2007, United Kingdom
Pragmatismi filosofiaassa ja yhteiskuntatieteissä, Erkki Kilpinen, 01.01.2007 → 31.12.2007, Finland
Subject Matters, Erkki Kilpinen, 01.01.2007 → 31.12.2007, United Kingdom
Subject Matters, Erkki Kilpinen, 01.01.2010 → 31.12.2010, United Kingdom

Anssi Peräkylä , anssi.perakyla@helsinki.fi

Communication &amp; Medicine, Anssi Peräkylä, 2004 → ..., United Kingdom
Communication &amp; Medicine, Anssi Peräkylä, 01.01.2005 → 31.12.2005, United Kingdom
Communication &amp; Medicine, Special Issue: Professional theories and institutional interaction (Volume 2, No.2), Anssi Peräkylä, 2005, United Kingdom
Discourse and society, Anssi Peräkylä, 01.01.2005 → 31.12.2005, United Kingdom
Sociology of Health and Illness, Anssi Peräkylä, 2005 → ..., United Kingdom
INTERNATIONAL EVALUATION OF RESEARCH AND DOCTORAL TRAINING AT THE UNIVERSITY OF HELSINKI

RC-SPECIFIC TUHAT COMPILATIONS OF OTHER SCIENTIFIC ACTIVITIES 2005-2010

Sociology of Health and Illness, Anssi Peräkylä, 01.01.2005 → 31.12.2005, United Kingdom
Communication and Medicine, Anssi Peräkylä, 01.01.2006 → 31.12.2006, United Kingdom
Discourse and Society, Anssi Peräkylä, 01.01.2006 → 31.12.2006, United Kingdom
Social Science and Medicine, Anssi Peräkylä, 01.01.2006 → 31.12.2006, United Kingdom
Sociology of Health and Illness, Anssi Peräkylä, 01.01.2006 → 31.12.2006, United Kingdom
Communication & Medicine, Anssi Peräkylä, 01.01.2007 → 31.12.2007, United Kingdom
Discourse & Society, Anssi Peräkylä, 2007 → ..., United Kingdom
Discourse and Society, Anssi Peräkylä, 01.01.2007 → 31.12.2007, United Kingdom
Psykologia, Anssi Peräkylä, 01.01.2007 → 31.12.2007, Finland
Qualitative Research in Psychology, Anssi Peräkylä, 01.01.2007 → 31.12.2007, United Kingdom
Sociology of Health and Illness, Anssi Peräkylä, 01.01.2007 → 31.12.2007, United Kingdom
Qualitative Sociology Review, Anssi Peräkylä, 2008 → ...
Research on Language and Social Interaction, Anssi Peräkylä, 2009 → ...

Harriet Strandell, Harriet.Strandell@helsinki.fi
Barn, Harriet Strandell, 01.01.2006 → 31.12.2006, Norway
Janus, Harriet Strandell, 01.01.2006 → 31.12.2006, Finland
Nuorisotutkimus-lehti, Harriet Strandell, 01.01.2006 → 31.12.2006, Finland
Synteesi, Harriet Strandell, 01.01.2006 → 31.12.2006, Finland
Barn, Harriet Strandell, 01.01.2007 → 31.12.2007, Norway
Nordisk Pedagogik, Harriet Strandell, 01.01.2007 → 31.12.2007

Marja Tiilikainen, Marja.Tiilikainen@helsinki.fi , marja.tiilikainen@helsinki.fi
Finnish Journal of Ethnicity and Migration, Marja Tiilikainen, 01.01.2006 → 31.12.2011, Finland
Sosiaalityön tutkimuksen vuosikirja, Tarja Tolonen, 01.01.2005 → 31.12.2005, Finland
Janus, Referielausunto: manuscript Meantings of verbal abuse among same-age girls and boys. Exploring discursive practices of 8th-graders, Tarja Tolonen, 01.01.2007 → 31.12.2007
Sosiaalilääketieteellinen aikakauslehti, Refereelausunto käsikirjoituksesta Etnografian mahdollisuksista terveyden, sairauden ja terveydentuolion tutkimuksessa, Tarja Tolonen, 01.01.2007 → 31.12.2007
YOUNG, Referielausunto: manuscript Meanings of verbal abuse among same-age girls and boys. Exploring discursive practices of 8th-graders, Tarja Tolonen, 01.01.2007 → 31.12.2007

Tarja Tolonen, Tarja.Tolonen@helsinki.fi
Naistutkimus-lehti, Tarja Tolonen, 01.01.2005 → 31.12.2005, Finland
Nuorisotutkimus-lehti, Tarja Tolonen, 01.01.2005 → 31.12.2005, Finland
Qualitative Research, Tarja Tolonen, 01.01.2005 → 31.12.2005, United Kingdom
Sosiaalityön tutkimuksen vuosikirja, Tarja Tolonen, 01.01.2005 → 31.12.2005, Finland

Laura H Assmuth, Laura.Assmuth@helsinki.fi
Joint editorship an an international scientific book "Imaginative women: theoretical and methodological contributions of European female anthropologists, Laura H Assmuth, 2010 → ...

Editor of research anthology/collection/conference proceedings

Sanna Aaltonen, Sanna.Aaltonen@helsinki.fi
Tyttötutkimuksen oppikirjan toimittaja, Sanna Aaltonen, 01.01.2010 → 31.12.2010, Finland

Laura H Assmuth, Laura.Assmuth@helsinki.fi
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Anssi Peräkylä, Anssi.Perakyla@helsinki.fi
Member of advisory board: The Sage Handbook of Qualitative Methods in Health Research, Anssi Peräkylä, 2009 → 2010

Harriet Strandell, Harriet.Strandell@helsinki.fi
Lapsuuden muuttuvat tilat (työotsikko), Harriet Strandell, 2010 → …

Marja Tiilikainen, Marja.Tiilikainen@helsinki.fi, marja.tiilikainen@helsinki.fi
Maahanmuuttajanaiset: Kotoutuminen, perhe ja työ -kirjan toimitustyö, Marja Tiilikainen, 2006 → 2007

Peer review of manuscripts

Sanna Aaltonen, Sanna.Aaltonen@helsinki.fi
NORA Nordic Journal of Women's Studies, Sanna Aaltonen, 2007
Young, Sanna Aaltonen, 2008

Tiina Arppe, tiina.arppe@helsinki.fi
Referee of Theory, Culture &amp; Society, Tiina Arppe, 2007 → …, United Kingdom

Laura H Assmuth, Laura.Assmuth@helsinki.fi
Manuscript reviewer, Laura H Assmuth, 2010 → …

Anna-Maija Castren, Anna-Maija.Castren@helsinki.fi
Member of the editorial board of "Sosiologia", Anna-Maija Castren, 01.09.2009 → 01.06.2010, Finland
Reviewer for the Estonian Journal of Society and Politics, Anna-Maija Castren, 10.11.2009, Estonia
Reviewer in "Sosiaalilääketieteellinen aikakauslehti" (eng. "Journal of Social Medicine"), Anna-Maija Castren, 12.01.2010, Finland

Erkki Kilpinen, Erkki.Kilpinen@helsinki.fi
Behavioral and Brain Sciences, Erkki Kilpinen, 01.01.2005 → 31.12.2005, United Kingdom
BBE-associate, Erkki Kilpinen, 01.01.2006 → 31.12.2006
Behavioral and Brain Sciences, Erkki Kilpinen, 01.01.2007 → 31.12.2007
History of Political Thought, Erkki Kilpinen, 20.08.2007
Behavioral and Brain Sciences, Erkki Kilpinen, 01.01.2008 → 31.12.2008
Organization Studies, Erkki Kilpinen, 21.08.2008, United States
Sosiologia, Erkki Kilpinen, 18.08.2008
Behavioral and Brain Sciences, Erkki Kilpinen, 01.01.2009 → 31.12.2009
Janus, Erkki Kilpinen, 20.08.2009, Finland
Sociological Theory, Erkki Kilpinen, 10.08.2009, Canada
Behavioral and Brain Sciences, Erkki Kilpinen, 01.01.2010 → 31.12.2010, United Kingdom
Cambridge Journal of Economics, Erkki Kilpinen, 08.2010 → …, United Kingdom
Sociological Theory, Erkki Kilpinen, 09.2010 → …, United States

Kim Kullman, kim.kullman@helsinki.fi
American Journal of Play, Kim Kullman, 07.2010, United States

Anssi Peräkylä, Anssi.Perakyla@helsinki.fi
Social Science and Medicine, Anssi Peräkylä, 2005 → …, United Kingdom
Sosiaalilääketieteellinen aikakauslehti, Anssi Peräkylä, 2007, Finland

Harriet Strandell, Harriet.Strandell@helsinki.fi
Sosiaahtyön vuosikirja, Harriet Strandell, 04.2005
Childhood, Harriet Strandell, 04.2007 → 05.2007
Kasvatus, Harriet Strandell, 08.2007
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Marja Tiilikainen, Marja.Tiilikainen@helsinki.fi, marja.tiilikainen@helsinki.fi

Finnish Journal of Ethnicity and Migration (FJEM), vertaisarviointi, Marja Tiilikainen, 2005 → ...
Sosiaalilääketieteellinen Aikakauslehti, vertaisarviointi, Marja Tiilikainen, 01.01.2006 → ..., Finland
Islam Suomessa -käytäntö vertaisarviointi, Marja Tiilikainen, 2008

Kosmopolis-lehti, vertaisarviointi, Marja Tiilikainen, 2010

Editor of communication journal

Marja Tiilikainen, Marja.Tiilikainen@helsinki.fi, marja.tiilikainen@helsinki.fi

African San-vähennys päätöksimittaja, Marja Tiilikainen, 2010 → ...

Editor of series

Erkki Kilpinen, Erkki.Kilpinen@helsinki.fi

Nordic Studies in Pragmatism, Erkki Kilpinen, 15.11.2010 → 2011, Finland

Editor of special theme number

Tiina Arppe, tiina.arppe@helsinki.fi

Distinktion No: 19/2009 - "The Sacred", Tiina Arppe, 2009, Denmark

Marja-Liisa Honkasalo, Marja-Liisa.Honkasalo@helsinki.fi

Sosiaalilääketieteellinen Aikakauslehti, erikoisnumero Terveyden etnografinen tutkimus 1/2008, Marja-Liisa Honkasalo, 2008 → ...

Kaisa Ketokivi, kaisa.ketokivi@helsinki.fi

At a Crossroads. Contemporary lives between fate and choice, Kaisa Ketokivi, 01.2008 → ...

Marja Tiilikainen, Marja.Tiilikainen@helsinki.fi, marja.tiilikainen@helsinki.fi

Special issue of FJEM: Female Genital Cutting in the Past and Today, Marja Tiilikainen, 2007 → 2008

Assessment of candidates for academic posts

Laura H Assmuth, Laura.Assmuth@helsinki.fi

dosenttilauxaunon antaja, Laura H Assmuth, 12.2010 → 03.2011
Reviewer of an application for docentship (adjunct professorship) in sociology, Laura H Assmuth, 2010 → 2011

Anssi Peräkylä, Anssi.Perakyla@helsinki.fi

Reviewer for promotion to full professorship, Anssi Peräkylä, 2010
Reviewer for promotion to full professorship, Anssi Peräkylä, 2010, United Kingdom

Membership or other role in review committee

Anssi Peräkylä, Anssi.Perakyla@helsinki.fi

International Benchmarking Review of Sociology in the United Kingdom, Anssi Peräkylä, 2009 → 2010, United Kingdom

Harriet Straneell, Harriet.Strandell@helsinki.fi

Expert assessment, Harriet Strandeell, 2008, Sweden

Pirjo Turtiainen, pirjo.turtiainen@helsinki.fi

Member of the follow-up group of the Helsinki Neighbourhood Project (since 1999) and EUs Urban II Community Initiative Programme, Pirjo Turtiainen, 1999 → 2008
Membership or other role in research network

Sanna Aaltonen, Sanna.Aaltonen@helsinki.fi
Tutkijaverkosto KOUKERO:n (Koulutus, kasvatus ja entö) jäsen, Sanna Aaltonen, 01.08.1999 → ...
Tyttötutkimusverkoston johtoryhmän jäsen, Sanna Aaltonen, 01.01.2007 → 31.12.2010, Finland

Tiina Arppe, tiina.arppe@helsinki.fi
Member of the ESA research network "Social Theory" (RN29), Tiina Arppe, 2010 → ...
Member of the ESA research network "Sociology of emotions" (RN11), Tiina Arppe, 2010 → ...

Kaisa Ketokivi, kaisa.ketokivi@helsinki.fi
Mieliala-tutkimusverkoston perustaminen, Kaisa Ketokivi, 01.08.2010 → ...

Tiina Arppe, tiina.arppe@helsinki.fi
Member of the ESA research network "Social Theory" (RN29), Tiina Arppe, 2010 → ...
Member of the ESA research network "Sociology of emotions" (RN11), Tiina Arppe, 2010 → ...

Marja Tiilikainen, Marja.Tiilikainen@helsinki.fi, marja.tiilikainen@helsinki.fi
Diaspora and state-formation in the Horn of Africa, Nordic Network, Marja Tiilikainen, 2005 → ...
Yhteistyö DIASPACE-hankkeen kanssa, Marja Tiilikainen, 2008 → 28.02.2011

Susanne Ådahl, susanne.adahl@helsinki.fi
Elected member, Regional Officer, Susanne Ådahl, 11.2010 → ...

Elected member, Regional Officer, Susanne Ådahl, 11.2010 → ...

Membership or other role in national/international committee, council, board

Sinikka Aapola-Kari, Sinikka.Aapola@helsinki.fi
Nurisotutkimusseura, Sinikka Aapola-Kari, 01.01.2005 → 31.12.2005, Finland
Nurisotutkimusseura, Sinikka Aapola-Kari, 01.01.2006 → 31.12.2006, Finland
Nurisotutkimusseura ry, Sinikka Aapola-Kari, 01.01.2006 → 31.12.2006, Finland
Westernmarck-seura, Sinikka Aapola-Kari, 01.01.2006 → 31.12.2006, Finland

Laura H Assmuth, Laura.Assmuth@helsinki.fi
Invited expert in European Commission’s Call for Research NEST Pathfinder: Cultural Dynamics: from Transmission and Change to Innovation, preparation of the call, Laura H Assmuth, 01.01.2005 → 31.12.2005, Belgium
Invited research grant application evaluator for the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada, Laura H Assmuth, 01.01.2005 → 31.12.2005, Canada
Kristina-Instituutin johtokunta, Helsingin yliopisto, Laura H Assmuth, 01.01.2005 → 31.12.2005, Finland
Suomen Antropologinen Seura, Laura H Assmuth, 01.01.2005 → 31.12.2005, Finland
Westernmarck-seura, Laura H Assmuth, 01.01.2005 → 31.12.2005, Finland
European Commission Research Evaluation, NEST Pathfinder scientific panel, Laura H Assmuth, 01.01.2006 → 31.12.2006, Belgium
Suomen Antropologinen Seura, Laura H Assmuth, 01.01.2006 → 31.12.2006, Finland
Westernmarck-Seura, Laura H Assmuth, 01.01.2006 → 31.12.2006, Finland
Aleksanteri Institute, ECEBB-study program, Laura H Assmuth, 01.01.2007 → 31.12.2007, Finland
Finnish Anthropological Association, Laura H Assmuth, 01.01.2007 → 31.12.2007, Finland
Member of the Board, IKEBB-study program, Aleksanteri Institute, Laura H Assmuth, 2007 → 2010
Member of the board, Aleksanteri-instituti, Laura H Assmuth, 2008 → ...
Member of the management committee of ESF/COST Action ISD803, Remaking Eastern Borders in Europe, Laura H Assmuth, 2009 → ...
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Member of the Advisory Board of EU FP7 Project ELDEA (European Language Diversity for All: Reconceptualising, promoting and re-evaluating individual and societal multilingualism), Laura H Assmuth, 2010 → …, Finland

Anna-Maija Castren, Anna-Maija.Castren@helsinki.fi

Member of the board of The Master's Degree Programme in Ethnic Relations, Cultural Diversity and Integration (ERI), Swedish School of Social Sciences, University of Helsinki, Laura H Assmuth, 2010 → …, Finland

Lotta Haikkola, Lotta.Haikkola@helsinki.fi

ETMU ry:n hallitus, Lotta Haikkola, 01.01.2009 → 31.12.2010

Marja-Liisa Honkasalo, Marja-Liisa.Honkasalo@helsinki.fi

member, Marja-Liisa Honkasalo, 07.06.2010, Sweden

Elina Paju, elina.paju@helsinki.fi

Tytötutkimusverkosto, Elina Paju, 01.01.2007 → 31.12.2007, Finland

Anssi Peräkylä, Anssi.Perakyla@helsinki.fi

Economic and Social Research Council (U.K.), Anssi Peräkylä, 01.01.2005 → 31.12.2005, United Kingdom


International Conference on Conversation Analysis, Organizing committee, Anssi Peräkylä, 01.01.2006 → 31.12.2006

International Conference on Conversation Analysis, Scientific Committee, Anssi Peräkylä, 01.01.2006 → 31.12.2006

International conference on conversation analysis of psychotherapy: organizing committee, Anssi Peräkylä, 01.01.2006 → 31.12.2006, Finland

Mielitoimisto, Anssi Peräkylä, 01.01.2006 → 31.12.2006, Finland

Sosiaalitieteen tutkimus- ja valmistautumuskeskus (SOVAKO), Sosiaaliset toimijat ja muutokset - toimialakuntayhteistyö, Anssi Peräkylä, 01.01.2006 → 31.12.2006, Finland

Sosiologiopäivät, keskusteluanalyytiiksi, Anssi Peräkylä, 2006, Finland

British Academy / Lausunto fellowship, Anssi Peräkylä, 01.01.2007 → 31.12.2007, Finland

Harriet Strandell, Harriet.Strandell@helsinki.fi

ISA RC 53 Sociology of Childhood, member of the board, Harriet Strandell, 2002 → 31.12.2005


Suomen Akatemia, Harriet Strandell, 01.01.2005 → 31.12.2005, Finland


Norwegian Research Council, Harriet Strandell, 2006, Norway

Suomen Akatemia, Harriet Strandell, 01.01.2006 → 31.12.2006, Finland


Norges Forskningsråd, Harriet Strandell, 01.01.2007 → 31.12.2007, Norway

Editorial board of "Barn", Harriet Strandell, 2008 → …, Norway

Member of the board, Harriet Strandell, 2008 → …, Finland

Marja Tiilikainen, Marja.Tiiilikainen@helsinki.fi, marja.tiiilikainen@helsinki.fi

FOKO-Network (research on female circumcision in Nordic countries), Marja Tiilikainen, 2003 → …, Finland

Puhenvuojtaa ja kansainvälisen muuttoon keskustella tutkimuksen seura ry, Marja Tiilikainen, 01.01.2005 → 31.12.2007, Finland

Austrian Science Fund, Marja Tiilikainen, 01.01.2007 → 31.12.2007, Austria
INTERNATIONAL EVALUATION OF RESEARCH AND DOCTORAL TRAINING AT THE UNIVERSITY OF HELSINKI

RC-SPECIFIC TUHAT COMPILATIONS OF OTHER SCIENTIFIC ACTIVITIES 2005-2010

SBII/Jallinoja

Nordiska högskolan för folkhälsovetenskap, Göteborg, Marja Tiilikainen, 01.01.2007 → 31.12.2007, Sweden

Tarja Tolonen , Tarja.Tolonen@helsinki.fi


Nuorisotutkimusseura, varapuheenjohtaja, Tarja Tolonen, 01.01.2007 → 31.12.2007

YUNET-Nuorisotutkimuksen yliopistoverkosto, tutkimuskoordinaattori, Tarja T. Tolonen, 01.01.2007 → 31.12.2007

YUNET-in nimissä tehty aloite Suomen Akatemialle Nuoriso- ja lapsiin liittyvän tutkimusohjelman saamiseksi, Tarja Tolonen, 01.01.2007 → 31.12.2007

Membership or other role in public Finnish or international organization

Lauri H Assmuth , Laura.Assmuth@helsinki.fi

Member of the Advisory Board of the Foundation for the Finnish Institute in Estonia, Laura H Assmuth, 01.01.2005 → 31.12.2005, Estonia

Kalevi Sorsa Säätiö, yhteiskuntatutkimuksen työryhmä, Laura H Assmuth, 01.01.2006 → 31.12.2006, Finland

Member of the Advisory Board of the Foundation for the Finnish Institute in Estonia, Laura H Assmuth, 01.01.2006 → 31.12.2006, Estonia

Kalevi Sorsa Säätiön yhteiskuntatutkimuksen työryhmä, Laura H Assmuth, 01.01.2007 → 31.12.2007, Finland

Suomen Viron-Instituutin valuutakunta, Laura H Assmuth, 01.01.2007 → 31.12.2007, Finland

Anna-Maija Castren , Anna-Maija.Castren@helsinki.fi

Invited specialist on family and divorce, Anna-Maija Castren, 16.09.2010, Finland

Tuula Gordon , Tuula.Gordon@helsinki.fi

Lausunto henkilökohtaisen professuurin hakemuksesta - Department of Sociology, University of Warwick, Tuula Gordon, 01.01.2007 → 31.12.2007, United Kingdom

Member of the Advisory Board of ‘Timescapes’ - 5 year funded Qualitative Longitudinal Study ESRC(Economic and Social Science Research Council, Tuula Gordon, 01.01.2007 → 31.12.2007, United Kingdom

Member of the Steering Committee of EUROQUAL (Qualitative Research in Social Sciences), Tuula Gordon, 01.01.2007 → 31.12.2007, United Kingdom

Vice-president for Research Networks, European Sociological Association, Tuula Gordon, 01.01.2007 → 31.12.2007, France

Westernmarck Society, varapuheenjohtaja, Tuula Gordon, 01.01.2007 → 31.12.2007, Finland


Marja-Liisa Honkasalo , Marja-Liisa.Honkasalo@helsinki.fi

Oslon yliopistot, väitöskielen arviointityöryhmä, Marja-Liisa Honkasalo, 01.01.2005 → 31.12.2005, Norway

Riitta Jallinoja , Riitta.Jallinoja@helsinki.fi

Väinö Tanner-säätiön hallitus, Riitta Jallinoja, 01.01.2010, Finland

Kaisa Ketokivi , kaisa.ketokivi@helsinki.fi


Helsingin seurakuntatyöryhmä, tietokirjaan nuorten aikuisten elämäntarinoista arkkitehtin kirjoittaminen, Kaisa Ketokivi, 01.01.2006 → 31.12.2006, Finland

Joensuun yliopisto, Omashoidon asiointijapaneeli, Kaisa Ketokivi, 01.01.2007 → 31.12.2007, Finland

Anssi Peräkylä , Anssi.Perakyla@helsinki.fi
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European Psychoanalytic Federation, Working Party for Comparative Clinical Methods, Anssi Peräkylä, 01.01.2006 → 31.12.2009, United Kingdom

Suomen psykoanalyysin yrittystys, psykoanalyysin liittyvää tutkimusta edistävä tutkimuskonsortio, Anssi Peräkylä, 01.01.2006 → 31.12.2006, Finland

Suomen psykoanalyysin yrittystys, psykoanalyysin liittyvää tutkimusta edistävä tutkimuskonsortio, 2006, Suomi, ei-kansainvälinen, yritys, toimieliemen jäsen, Anssi Peräkylä, 01.01.2006 → …, Finland

Harriet Strandel, Harriet.Strandel@helsinki.fi
Haruituen Kansain, nuoret ja perheiden hyvinvoinnin politiikkahyvin, lyhyen säännöksen yhteiskunnan muodostaminen, Harriet Strandel, 01.01.2007 → 31.12.2007, Finland

Marja Tiilikainen, Marja.Tiilikainen@helsinki.fi, marja.tiilikainen@helsinki.fi
Ihmisoikeusliito ry, KokoNainen-projektiin (yhteisön ja naisten ympäristökoostuksen ehto säilyttäminen, Marja Tiilikainen, 01.01.2005 → 31.12.2005, Finland

Pirjo Turtiainen, pirjo.turtiainen@helsinki.fi


Osaallistuminen Helsingin lähiöprojektin ja EU:n Urban II-yhteesisäöveloittelujärjestelmän seurantaan. Seuranta koordinoi Helsingin kaupungin tietokeskus, Pirjo Turtiainen, 01.01.2007 → 31.12.2007, Finland

Membership or other role of body in private company/organisation

Anssi Peräkylä, Anssi.Perakyla@helsinki.fi
Kristillisen kulttuurin liito, tiedeklubitoimikunta, Anssi Peräkylä, 01.01.2006 → ...

Kristillinen kulttuuriliito, tiedeklubityöryhmä, Anssi Peräkylä, 01.01.2007 → 31.12.2007, Finland

Marja Tiilikainen, Marja.Tiilikainen@helsinki.fi, marja.tiilikainen@helsinki.fi
Ihmisoikeusliito ry, KokoNainen-hankkeen ohjausryhmän puheenjohtaja, Marja Tiilikainen, 01.01.2005 → 31.12.2005, Finland

Participation in interview for written media

Sanna Aaltonen, Sanna.Aaltonen@helsinki.fi
Haastattelu Huvudstadsbladet, Sanna Aaltonen, 01.12.2006, Finland

Haastattelu Kotimaa-lehdessä, Sanna Aaltonen, 14.12.2006

Haastattelu Six Degrees-lehdessä, Sanna Aaltonen, 2006

Haastattelu Salon Seudun Sanomissa, Sanna Aaltonen, 09.12.2007, Finland

Haastattelu Tehy lehteen, Sanna Aaltonen, 18.01.2007, Finland

Haastattelu Tulta-lehdessä, Sanna Aaltonen, 01.07.2007

Haastattelu Yliopisto-lehdessä, Sanna Aaltonen, 29.01.2007, Finland

Asiantuntijana Helsingin Sanomissa, Sanna Aaltonen, 13.02.2008, Finland

Haastattelu Meidän Perhe-lehdessä, Sanna Aaltonen, 30.02.2009

Sinikka Aapola-Kari, Sinikka.Aapola@helsinki.fi
HYKisin (Lastentutkimus ja nuorisovastaanoton työntekijöiden keskustelutilaisuus, Sinikka Aapola-Kari, 17.11.2000 → 31.12.2011, Finland


Suomen Tiedesäätiön liiton ja WSOY:n suorittaman kirjallisuuden kirjoittajakurssin, Ohveden opisto, Sinikka Aapola-Kari, 05.07.2000 → 31.12.2011, Finland

Zonta-järjestön seminaarin, Mitä kuuluu työölle?, Sinikka Aapola-Kari, 01.01.2000 → 31.12.2011, Finland
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Helsingin II Normaalikouluun lukion oppilaitte suunniteltu sociologian tutustumiskurssi, Sinikka Aapola-Kari, 05.10.2001 → 31.12.2011, Finland

Trendi-lehti, Sinikka Aapola-Kari, 01.01.2001 → 31.12.2011, Finland

Ilta-Sanomat, Sinikka Aapola-Kari, 01.01.2002 → 31.12.2011, Finland

Ilta-lehti, Sinikka Aapola-Kari, 01.01.2002 → 31.12.2011, Finland

Lapset maailma-lehti, Sinikka Aapola-Kari, 01.01.2002 → 31.12.2011, Finland


Opettaja-lehti, Sinikka Aapola-Kari, 01.01.2002 → 31.12.2011, Finland

Yliopisto-lehti, Sinikka Aapola-Kari, 01.04.2002 → 31.12.2011, Finland


Yle1:n Kulttuurikanava, Sinikka Aapola-Kari, 06.05.2003 → 31.12.2011, Finland

Yle1:n aamutelevisio, Sinikka Aapola-Kari, 28.05.2003 → 31.12.2011, Finland

Aamulehti, Sinikka Aapola-Kari, 01.01.2004 → 31.12.2011, Finland

Aamulehti, Sinikka Aapola-Kari, 01.01.2004 → 31.12.2011, Finland

Helmi-lite, Italihte, Sinikka Aapola-Kari, 01.01.2004 → 31.12.2011, Finland

Helsingin kaupungin opetusviraston seksuaalikasvatuksen kehittämisprojektin seminaari, Sinikka Aapola-Kari, 17.03.2004 → 31.12.2011, Finland


MeNaiset, Sinikka Aapola-Kari, 01.01.2004 → 31.12.2011, Finland

Salon Seudun Sanomat, Sinikka Aapola-Kari, 01.01.2004 → 31.12.2011, Finland

Tiede-lehti, Sinikka Aapola-Kari, 01.01.2004 → 31.12.2011, Finland

Yliopisto-lehti, Sinikka Aapola-Kari, 01.01.2004 → 31.12.2011, Finland

English-speaking women's group's meeting, Sinikka Aapola-Kari, 07.11.2005 → 31.12.2011, Finland

Kaunea ja terveys-lehti, Sinikka Aapola-Kari, 01.01.2005 → 31.12.2011, Finland


Trendi-lehti, Sinikka Aapola-Kari, 01.01.2005 → 31.12.2011, Finland

Yliopistoaineisto-lehti, Sinikka Aapola-Kari, 01.01.2005 → 31.12.2011, Finland

Helsingin Sanomat, Sinikka Aapola-Kari, 01.01.2006 → 31.12.2011, Finland

Helsingin aikuiskoskotuotannon luontosarja Naisten vuosisata, Sinikka Aapola-Kari, 16.03.2011 → 31.12.2011, Finland

Ittasanomat, Sinikka Aapola-Kari, 01.01.2006 → 31.12.2011, Finland

Kotivinkki, Sinikka Aapola-Kari, 01.01.2006 → 31.12.2011, Finland

Lapset maailma, Sinikka Aapola-Kari, 01.01.2006 → 31.12.2011, Finland

Trendi, Sinikka Aapola-Kari, 01.01.2006 → 31.12.2011, Finland

Yliopisto-lehti, Sinikka Aapola-Kari, 01.01.2006 → 31.12.2011, Finland

Tiina Arppe, tiina.arppe@helsinki.fi

Interview in Ylioppilaski 3.10.2008, Tiina Arppe, 03.10.2008

An interview in Yliopisto-lehti No 5/2009, Tiina Arppe, 03.10.2008
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Laura H Assmuth, Laura.Assmuth@helsinki.fi
Suomen Akatemian Kulttuuri-Tiedekatsauksen yhteydessä järjestety nitauttimusmaraton, Helsinki yliopiston Kristiina-Instituutti, Laura H Assmuth, 01.01.2003 → 31.12.2011, Finland

Asiantuntijahaastattelu, opinnäytetarkoiutukseen, Laura H Assmuth, 01.01.2003 → 31.12.2011, Finland

Helsingin Sanomat: haastattelu, Laura H Assmuth, 01.01.2003 → 31.12.2011, Finland

Kirkkoposti, Laura H Assmuth, 01.01.2003 → 31.12.2011, Finland

Seminari "Generation, Gender and National Identity in the CIS", Nuorisotutkimusseura ja Aleksanteri-Instituutti, Laura H Assmuth, 01.01.2003 → 31.12.2011, Finland

Universitas Helsingiensis, Laura H Assmuth, 01.01.2004 → 31.12.2011, Finland

Helsingin yliopiston Eurooppa-tutkimuksen verkon seminarisarja, Laura H Assmuth, 01.01.2006 → 31.12.2011, Estonia

Haastattelu lehdessä We are Helsinki, Laura H Assmuth, 10.01.2010 → 31.12.2011, Finland

Anna-Maija Castren, Anna-Maija.Castren@helsinki.fi


Vauva-lehti, Anna-Majaja Castren, 01.01.2004 → 31.12.2011, Finland

Interview for an article in "Kirikko ja Kaupunki", Anna-Maija Castren, 14.05.2009, Finland

Interview for the newspaper Hämeen Sanomat, Anna-Maija Castren, 12.11.2009, Finland

Interview for the newspaper Keskiuomalanainen, Anna-Miaja Castren, 11.05.2009, Finland

Interview on post-divorce families for the Helsinki Sanomat, Anna-Majaja Castren, 15.05.2009, Finland

Interviewed specialist for an article on divorce, Anna-Maija Castren, 13.10.2009, Finland

Interview for the newspaper Sannuntaisuomaliainen, Anna-Maija Castren, 24.06.2010, Finland

Antti Gronow, Antti.Gronow@helsinki.fi

Nuorisotutkimusverkon järjestämä tilaisuus Radikaalin kansalaistoiminnan uudet muodot eli kuka muistaa Kuokkavieraat, Antti Gronow, 14.06.2004 → 31.12.2011, Finland


Avain-lehti, Riitta Högbacka, 01.01.2004 → 31.12.2011, Finland

Keskisuomalaisten juttopankki, Riitta Högbacka, 16.03.2004 → 31.12.2011, Finland

Koti-lehti, Riitta Högbacka, 01.01.2004 → 31.12.2011, Finland

Kotilleesi-lehti, Riitta Högbacka, 23.03.2004 → 31.12.2011, Finland

Maa- ja kotitalouksia uudella vuoden jälkeen, Riitta Högbacka, 02.10.2004 → 31.12.2011, Finland

Sanomalehti Lalli, Riitta Högbacka, 27.02.2004 → 31.12.2011, Finland

Sunnuntaisuomaliainen -sanomalehti, Riitta Högbacka, 25.01.2004 → 31.12.2011, Finland

Universitas Helsingiensis, Riitta Högbacka, 01.02.2004 → 31.12.2011, Finland
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Haastattelu, Jaana Maksimainen, 06.11.2010
Haastattelu, Jaana Maksimainen, 02.12.2010
Haastattelu, Jaana Maksimainen, 20.12.2010

Anssi Peräkylä , Anssi.Perakyla@helsinki.fi

HUS:n lasten ja nuorten sairaalan lääkärinpalaveri, Anssi Peräkylä, 10.10.2007, Finland
Suomen psykoanalyysityön yhdistyksen talviseminaari, Anssi Peräkylä, 20.01.2007, Finland
Interview on social interaction for a patient journal, Anssi Peräkylä, 2010

Harriet Strandell , Harriet.Strandell@helsinki.fi

Anna-lehti, Harriet Strandell, 01.01.2004 → 31.12.2011, Finland
Filocafé, Harriet Strandell, 20.03.2005 → 31.12.2011, Finland
YLE Asiaohjelmat, Harriet Strandell, 06.06.2005 → 31.12.2011, Finland
Folkkärssem seminarium ”Familjen i centrum”, Harriet Strandell, 02.11.2006 → 31.12.2011, Finland
Haastattelu Kaks Plus-ledelle, Harriet Strandell, 01.01.2006 → 31.12.2011, Finland
Hallituksen Lasten, nuorten ja perheiden hyvinvoinnin politiikan hjelman seminaari, Harriet Strandell, 20.11.2007 → 31.12.2011, Finland
Hem och skola, tidning, Harriet Strandell, 01.01.2007 → 31.12.2011, Finland
Medborgabladet, tidning, Harriet Strandell, 01.01.2007 → 31.12.2011, Finland
Yliopisto-lehti, Harriet Strandell, 01.01.2007 → 31.12.2011, Finland

Harriet Strandell, Harriet.Strandell@helsinki.fi

Haastattelu, Ilta-Sanomat, Harriet Strandell, 17.04.2008, Finland

Marja Tiilikainen , Marja.Tiilikainen@helsinki.fi, marja.tiilikainen@helsinki.fi

Haastattelu, Helsingin Sanomat, Marja Tiilikainen, 05.02.2007, Sweden
Haastattelu Ilta-Sanomissa, Marja Tiilikainen, 02.12.2009
Helsingin Sanomat, haastattelu, Marja Tiilikainen, 10.05.2010

Tarja Tolonen , Tarja.Tolonen@helsinki.fi

Esitelmä Suomen kielten opettajien foorumissa, Tarja Tolonen, 01.08.2000 → 31.12.2011, Finland
Esitelmä TTK:n seminaarissa, Tarja Tolonen, 02.09.2000 → 31.12.2011, Finland
Esitelmä Tyttöjen seminaarissa, Tarja Tolonen, 02.10.2000 → 31.12.2011, Finland
Helsingin Sanomien haastattelu, Tarja Tolonen, 25.08.2001 → 31.12.2011, Finland
Kirja-arvostelu, Tarja Tolonen, 01.05.2002 → 31.12.2011, Finland
Nuorisotutkimus 1/2002, vol 20,66-70, Tarja Tolonen, 01.01.2002
Tulva-lehti, Tarja Tolonen, 01.01.2002 → 31.12.2011, Finland
Vauva ja leikki-ka, Tarja Tolonen, 01.11.2002 → 31.12.2011, Finland
Yle, Yle, Tarja Tolonen, 05.04.2004 → 31.12.2011, Finland

Pirjo Turunen , pirjo.turunen@helsinki.fi


Participation in radio programme
Sanna Aaltonen , Sanna.Aaltonen@helsinki.fi

Keskustelija YLE Radio 1:n puheohjelmassa, Sanna Aaltonen, 13.04.2005, Finland
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Haastattelu YLE Tampereen paikallisradiolle, Sanna Aaltonen, 17.11.2006
Haastattelu YLE:n Radio Suomessa, Sanna Aaltonen, 13.12.2006, Finland
Haastattelu YLE:n radiouutisissa, Sanna Aaltonen, 02.12.2006

Sinikka Aapola-Kari, sinikka.aapola@helsinki.fi
Iton ystävänt-yhdistyksen, YLE 1 -radioksi, Sinikka Aapola-Kari, 27.06.2005 → 31.12.2011, Finland

Tiina Arppe, tiina.arppe@helsinki.fi
Expert in a radio-interview/Asiantuntijahaastattelu, Tiina Arppe, 14.10.2008, Finland
Expert in a radio-interview, Tiina Arppe, 05.11.2009, Finland

Laura A Assmuth, Laura.Assmuth@helsinki.fi
YLE Radio 1 Tiedeutiset, Laura A Assmuth, 01.01.2006 → 31.12.2011, Estonia

Anna-Maija Castren, Anna-Maija.Castren@helsinki.fi
YLE Radio 1; invited discussant, Anna-Maija Castren, 19.12.2008, Finland
Interview in a radio program that discussed my book on post-divorce family, Anna-Maija Castren, 23.06.2008, Finland
Guest at a radio show in YLE Radio 1, Anna-Maija Castren, 11.02.2010, Finland
Invited specialist, participating in a radio discussion on divorce, Anna-Maija Castren, 18.11.2010, Finland

Riitta Högbacka, riitta.hogbacka@helsinki.fi
Haastattelu radioon (YLE1 tiedeutiset), Riitta Högbacka, 05.12.2008 → 31.12.2011, Finland
Tutkijahaastattelu YLE1 radio, Riitta Högbacka, 20.01.2010

Riitta Jallinoja, riitta.jallinoja@helsinki.fi
Interview, Riitta Jallinoja, 24.09.2006
Interview, Riitta Jallinoja, 23.02.2007
Interview, Riitta Jallinoja, 12.03.2007

Erkki Kilpinen, erkki.kilpinen@helsinki.fi
YLE: Tiedeutis, Erkki Kilpinen, 01.03.2009

Jaana Maksimainen, jaana.maksimainen@helsinki.fi, jaana.maksimainen@helsinki.fi
haastattelu, Jaana Maksimainen, 03.04.2008
Asiantuntijahaastattelu, Jaana Maksimainen, 04.11.2010
Asiantuntijahaastattelu, Jaana Maksimainen, 09.11.2010
Asiantuntijahaastattelu, Jaana Maksimainen, 26.11.2010

Ella Tuulia Sihvonen, ella.sihvonen@helsinki.fi
Radiohaastattelu, Ella Tuulia Sihvonen, 10.08.2009

Harriet Strandell, harriet.strandell@helsinki.fi
Radio Vega, Harriet Strandell, 15.11.2005, Finland
Radio program, YLE, Harriet Strandell, 01.01.2006, Finland

Marja Tiilikainen, marja.tiilikainen@helsinki.fi, marja.tiilikainen@helsinki.fi
Haastattelu, Radio Rock, uutiset, Marja Tiilikainen, 18.09.2007, Sweden
Haastattelu, YLE, radio 1, uutiset, Marja Tiilikainen, 18.09.2007, Sweden
Haastattelu, Yle, radio 1, uutiset ja Aamun peili, Marja Tiilikainen, 30.04.2007, Sweden

Participation in TV programme
Sanna Aaltonen, sanna.altonen@helsinki.fi
Välitsirjaan liittyvää haastattelu YLE:n Aamu-tyssä, Sanna Aaltonen, 04.12.2006, Finland
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Haastattelu Aamu-TV:ssä aiheesta "Hevostallit ja muut tytöjen reviirit", Sanna Aaltonen, 13.02.2008, Finland

PolisITV:n haastattelu aiheesta "Suupuoleni on tytölle arkipäivät", Sanna Aaltonen, 12.03.2009, Finland

Sinikka Aapola-Kari, Sinikka.Aapola@helsinki.fi

TV-ohjelma Voice Out, YLE TV 2, Sinikka Aapola-Kari, 01.01.2005 -> 31.12.2011, Finland

Tiina Arppe, tiina.arppe@helsinki.fi


Invited expert in the TV-discussion "T-klubi", Tiina Arppe, 21.06.2007, Finland

Invited expert in the TV-discussion "T-klubi", Tiina Arppe, 18.07.2007, Finland

Riitta Högbacka, Riitta.Högbacka@helsinki.fi

Haastattelu ja esiintyminen Voimala-ohjelmassa TV1, Riitta Högbacka, 16.10.2006 -> 31.12.2011, Finland

Tutkija-haastattelu YLE1 uutisat, Riitta Högbacka, 20.01.2010

Riitta Jallinoja, Riitta.Jallinoja@helsinki.fi

Interview, Riitta Jallinoja, 28.02.2006

Jaana Maksimainen, Jaana.Maksimainen@helsinki.fi, jaana.maksimainen@helsinki.fi

7. haastattelu, Jaana Maksimainen, 16.05.2005

Marja Tiilikainen, Marja.Tiilikainen@helsinki.fi, marja.tiilikainen@helsinki.fi

Haastattelu, Uudenmaan uutiset, TV 2, Marja Tiilikainen, 22.10.2007 -> 31.12.2011, Sweden

Susanne Ådahl, susanne.adahl@helsinki.fi

Intervju i A-plus programmet, Susanne Ådahl, 09.2005 -> ..., Finland

Participation in interview for web based media

Sanna Aaltonen, Sanna.Aaltonen@helsinki.fi

MTV3:n verkkouutisten haastattelu, Sanna Aaltonen, 01.10.2010, Finland

Jaana Maksimainen, Jaana.Maksimainen@helsinki.fi, jaana.maksimainen@helsinki.fi

Haastattelu, Jaana Maksimainen, 29.10.2010

Marja Tiilikainen, Marja.Tiilikainen@helsinki.fi, marja.tiilikainen@helsinki.fi

Ilta-Sanomat, verkkouutinen, Marja Tiilikainen, 11.08.2008

Ylen uutiset verkossa, Marja Tiilikainen, 08.11.2008

Uutisoitu Suomen Akatemian verkkoasian Ihminen ja Kosmos-tapahtumasta 19.-21.3.2010, Marja Tiilikainen, 07.04.2010, Finland

Susanne Ådahl, susanne.adahl@helsinki.fi

Kroppen som gäva, Susanne Ådahl, 01.2010

Participation in interview for web based media
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
- Havu, Eva – CoCoLaC
- Heikkilä, Markku – RCSP
- Heinämäa, Sara – SHC
- Henrikkson, Markku – CITA
- Janhunen, Juha – LDHFTA
- Kajava Mika, – AMNE
- Klippi, Anu – Interaction
- Knuuttila, Simo – PPMP
- Koskenniemi, Kimmo – BAULT
- Lauha, Aila – CECH
- Lavento, Mika – ARCH-HU
- Lukkarinen, Ville – AHCI
- Lyytikäinen, Pirjo – GLW
- Mauranen, Anna – LFP
- Meinander, Henrik – HIST
- Nevalainen, Terttu – VARIENG
- Pettersson, Bo – ILLC
- Puikkinen, Tuja – Gender Studies
- Pyrhönen, Heta – ART
- Ruokanen, Mikka – 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 – TRANSRURBAN
- Haila, Anne – Sociopolis
- Hautamäki, Jarkko – CEA
- Heinonen, Visa – KUMU
- Helén, Ilpo – STS
- Hukkinen, Janne – GENU
- Jallinoja, Riitta – SBII
- Kaartinen, Timo – SCA
- Kettunen, Pauli – NordSoc
- Kivinen, Markku – FCRREE
- Koponen, Juhan – DEVERELE
- 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 – ENFI
- Pirttilä-Backman, Anna-Maija – DYNASO
- 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.
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RC/SBII/Jallinoja

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>32</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>207</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Total</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>317</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The publications have mostly only one author (65%).
The language of publications is mostly Finnish (55%), 41% of publications are in English.
Most of the articles have been published in *Sosiologia* that is the leading journal of Finnish sociology. It does not include, however, to the ranking lists. The international journals on the top are *Communication and medicine, European societies and Children youth and medicine* that belong to the Australian ranking category C. Six 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 Grand Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sosiologia</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tiad &amp; edistys</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nuorisotutkimus</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helsingin Sanomat</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sosiaililäisketteellinen alakauslehti</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suomen Antropologi</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kommentti: nuorisotutkimuksen verkkokanava</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suomen lääkärilehti</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication &amp; Medicine</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duodecim</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>European Societies</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yhteiset lapsemme</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children, Youth and Environments</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distinktion</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnography and Education</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finnish Journal of Ethnicity and Migration</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health, Risk &amp; Society</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journal of youth studies</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kulttuurintutkimus</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medical Anthropology Quarterly</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oikeus</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pari &amp; perhe</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research on Language and Social Interaction</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Semiotica</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sarmuas</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TYPE sanomat</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yhteiskuntapolitiikka</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Young</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journal Title</td>
<td>Pages</td>
<td></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>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acta Historica Universitatis Klaipedensis</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acta Sociologica</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Action, Criticism &amp; Theory for Music Education</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amnesty : Suomen osastoon jäsenlehli</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>An-nur : Islamilainen lehti</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anthropology news</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anthropologia Medica</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ansvaropotti : Kansainvälisen solidaarisuussäästyön tiedote</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Archives de sciences sociales des religions</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barn : nytt fra forskning om barn i Norge</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>British Journal of Sociology of Education</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Childhood</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children’s Geographies</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crux</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current Sociology</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>European Journal of Social Theory</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>European Journal of Women’s Studies</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forum Qualitative Sozialforschung</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender and Education</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>History of Political Economy</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idäntutkimus</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Journal of Psychoanalysis</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Janus : sosiaalipolitiikan ja sosiaalityön tutkimuksen a</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journal of Comparative Family Studies</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journal of Consumer Culture</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journal of institutional economics</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journal of Law and Society</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journal of Medical Ethics</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journal of Virtual World Research</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kapet : Karlstads universitets pedagogiska tidskrift</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japaudellisen terveyttäimiksen verkosto</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maaseudun uusi aika : maaseutututkimuksen ja -politiik</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Melenteveys</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mifanu (Finnish)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>News from the Nordic Africa Institute</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nordisk Pedagogik</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pakistan Journal of women’s studies</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedagogy, Culture and Society</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Petijin ypöraliyhtyntien verkosto ry:n kuukausittainen</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4
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></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Suomen Antropologi</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suomen lääkärilehti</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication &amp; Medicine</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>European Societies</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children, Youth and Environments</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distinction</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnography and Education</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finnish Journal of Ethnicity and Migration</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health, Risk &amp; Society</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journal of youth studies</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kulttuurintutkimus</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medical Anthropology Quarterly</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research on Language and Social Interaction</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Semiotica</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Young</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acta Sociologica</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Action, Criticism &amp; Theory for Music Education</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Archives de sciences sociales des religions</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barn : nytt fra forskning om barn i Norge</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>British Journal of Sociology of Education</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Childhood</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children's Geographies</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current Sociology</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>European Journal of Social Theory</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>European Journal of Women's Studies</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forum Qualitative Sozialforschung</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender and Education</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>History of Political Economy</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>A*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idäntutkimus</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Journal of Psychoanalysis</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journal of Comparative Family Studies</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journal of Consumer Culture</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journal of institutional economics.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journal of Law and Society</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journal of Medical Ethics</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nordisk Pedagogik</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedagogy, Culture and Society</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qualitative Research</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qualitative Research in Psychology</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Social & Cultural Geography  1  2  B
Sociological Review  1  2  A
Sociology  1  2  A*
Sociology of Health and Illness  1  2  A
Space & Culture  1  A
Theory, Culture & Society  1  2  A  B
Transactions of the Royal Society of Tropical Medicine and Hygiene  1  1  B
Transcultural Psychiatry  1  1

Amount of ranked articles (Norway)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Norway</th>
<th>Journal articles</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Level 2</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level 1</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Amount of ranked articles (Australian)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Australia</th>
<th>Journal articles</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Level A*</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level A</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level B</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level C</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Book publishers

Publisher ranking (based on Norwegian ranking list)

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

C1 Published scientific monograph (11)  
C2 Edited book, compilation, conference proceeding or special issue of journal (19)  
D5 Text book or professional handbook or guidebook or dictionary (4)

Two books of 34 have been published by a high ranked leading scientific publisher, 15 by a ranked scientific publisher.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Publisher</th>
<th>c1_scientific</th>
<th>c2_edited</th>
<th>d3_textbooks</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Publisher</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aarhus Universitet</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Åbo Akademi</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cambridge University Press</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LTMU</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>no</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finnish Defence Forces</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>no</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finnish League for Human Rights</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>no</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finnish Literature Society</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Förbundet för mänskliga rättigheter</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>no</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gaudeamus</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helsingin yliopisto, Koulutus- ja kehittämiskeskus Palmenia</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>no</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kelan tutkimusosasto</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>no</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mannerheimin lastensuojeluliitto</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>no</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mouton de Gruyter</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>no</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nuorisotutkimusseura</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>no</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Otava</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Palgrave Macmillan</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peter Lang</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plan Finland Foundation publications</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>no</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suomalaisen Kirjallisuuden Seura</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Helsinki, Helsinki Collegium for Advanced Studies</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>no</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Southern Denmark</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>no</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vastapaino</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WSOY</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Väestöliitto</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>no</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Grand Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>11</strong></td>
<td><strong>19</strong></td>
<td><strong>4</strong></td>
<td><strong>34</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>