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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-evaluation1 and traditional research assessment exercise and its focus is both on the research outcomes and procedures associated with research and doctoral training. The approach to the evaluation is enhancement-led where self-evaluation constituted the main information. The answers to the evaluation questions formed together with the information of publications and other scientific activities an entity that was to be reviewed as a whole.

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

1.2 Aims and objectives in the evaluation

The aims of the evaluation are as follows:

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

1.3 Evaluation method

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

---

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

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

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

**Five stages of the evaluation method were:**
1. Registration – Stage 1
2. Self-evaluation – Stage 2
3. TUHAT\(^3\) compilations on publications and other scientific activities\(^4\)
4. External evaluation
5. Public reporting

### 1.4 Implementation of the external evaluation

**Five Evaluation Panels**

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

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

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

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

The panel meetings were held in Helsinki:

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

---

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Evaluation material

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

Background material

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

- Strengths
- Areas of development
- Other remarks
- Recommendations

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

5. Operational conditions

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

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

- Strengths
- Areas of development
- Other remarks
- Recommendations

6. Leadership and management in the researcher community

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

7. External competitive funding of the RC

- The RCs were asked to provide information of such external competitive funding, where:
  - the funding decisions have been made during 1.1.2005-31.12.2010, and
  - the administrator of the funding is/has been the University of Helsinki
- On the e-form the RCs were asked to provide:
  1) The relevant funding source(s) from a given list (Academy of Finland/Research Council, TEKES/The Finnish Funding Agency for Technology and Innovation, EU, ERC, foundations, other national funding organisations, other international funding organisations), and
  2) The total sum of funding which the organisation in question had decided to allocate to the 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”.
Operations and procedures are of outstanding quality, transparent and shared in the community. The improvement of research and other efforts are documented and operations and practices are in alignment with the documentation. The ambition to develop the community together is of outstanding quality.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

---

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

**Question 9 – CATEGORY**

Participation category – fitness for the category chosen

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

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

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

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

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

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

---

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

The main timetable of the evaluation:

1. Registration  November 2010
3. External peer review  May–September 2011
4. Published reports    
   - University level public report  March–April 2012
   - 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 RC is grounded in ethnography and social and cultural anthropology, it is informed by an awareness of changing historical realities and aims at an increased understanding of global social and political issues through the global ethnographic comparison of different societies and forms of human activity. It is from this disciplinary perspective that it represents the globalization and social change key focus of UH. The RC is in the center of the national anthropological scholar community for its members bear the main responsibility for running the Finnish Anthropological Society which publishes a highly ranked scientific journal and organizes visits by international scholars as well as a yearly international conference.

The focus of the RC is on joint doctoral training: a distinct doctoral program has been consolidated involving scholars at different stages of their careers, the program covers several regions of the world and is mainly dedicated to qualitative methods.

RC strengths are constituted by the consolidation of a specific curriculum for doctoral training in anthropological research, representing the largest research unit in the field at the national level, by the comparative character of research through different areas of study and by an intense international orientation.

However, in the description of RC engagement in anthropological research, there is a lack of attention to a more interdisciplinary approach within social sciences, what should be made easier from the overcoming of a state of a separate discipline and the RC’s new location in a Department of Social Research. As for the RC international orientation, it shows awareness that in order to strengthen the focus and improve the quality of the RC’s research they should publish more in international journals for the benefit of international peer review of research findings. Most of the articles have been published in Suomen Antropologi, which is the leading Finnish journal of anthropology. This is most likely due to their close connection with the Finnish Anthropological Society, but a more balanced publication structure would improve their international visibility. The second largest number of articles has been published in the leading Finnish newspaper Helsingin Sanomat, which is clearly not a scientific publication, although it does carry a strong national impact. Publications from postdoctoral researcher are quite limited in number.

In order to improve the scientific impact of this RC it is recommended a more carefully chosen publishing strategy enhancing international confrontation and recognition. Particularly, publications from postdoctoral researchers should be increased with respect to the current level, namely by encouraging them to publish within the frame of international conferences and journals. It is also recommended that the RC takes into account the need for a more interdisciplinary engagement within social sciences.

Numeric evaluation: 3 (Very good)

2.2 Practises and quality of doctoral training

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

ASPECTS: Processes and good practices related to leadership and management

The RC is explicitly focused on doctoral training. It is the only academic program in anthropology in Finland that has a global focus and is comparative in its approach. The organization of the doctoral program as well as procedures for selection of candidates look rigorous and transparent and the supervision of their research activities looks well organized in a weekly research seminar. Doctoral candidates are involved in undergraduate teaching as part of their training to an academic career. The RC’s strategy for maintaining good quality work is to keep contact with a wide range of area experts throughout the world while it continues to build its own distinctive model of comparative analysis.

The RC’s comments on how its scientific productivity and doctoral training should be evaluated attending to the specificity of anthropological field research seem thoughtful and reasonable, as for example the suggestion to assess “the maturity of particular research projects by the range of years during which they have yielded publications and deal with these publications as a single unit of analysis.”

The doctoral program looks consolidated in the 5 years under evaluation. 10 PhD degrees have been awarded. The RC is aware that an international orientation is crucial to improve their theoretical as well as empirical research abilities; hence most PhD dissertations have been based on fieldwork outside Europe, they have been written in English and evaluated by foreign scholars. However, all doctoral candidates come from Finland, the lack of foreign doctoral students reducing the impact of this international orientation. The research seminar looks to be held only at the Department level without any mention of structural international contributions to it, only guest lectures are mentioned. No strong strategy is mentioned in order to favor international exchanges for local students and to build strategies of international co-supervision of dissertations.

It is recommended that efforts are continued to be made for getting a more international group of doctoral students, particularly students from the countries of study - exchanges with them may have a favorable impact on the level of confrontation that the program research seminar would like to foster; and that the scope of the core seminar is opened internationally.

Numeric evaluation: 4 (Excellent)

2.3 The societal impact of research and doctoral training

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

ASPECTS: Societal impact, national and international collaboration, innovativeness

The group defines its main social impact in the knowledge support and in-depth information. It contributes to Finland’s international engagement, through its expertise on the areas and countries in which the fieldwork of its members is carried out. In the same vein, many of its graduates are said to have found an employment market in international and Finnish organizations broadly focusing in problems dealing with development, while a large number of RC members engage with Finnish media, museums, educational institutions and government agencies.

This, which appears as an important demand area, should be stimulated and deepened in the doctoral and research program of the RC. More particularly, it is recommended that a broader interdisciplinary
approach, already suggested, is enhanced in order to strengthen the contribution to the understanding of contemporary social issues that the RC indicates as its main target in terms of societal impact.

**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 RC looks well connected and active in international and national research networks, participating in joint conferences and publishing activities, collaborative fieldwork and international PhD training courses. It has been also active in arranging international conferences and workshops in Helsinki.

Nationally, the RC is also well connected and engaged at various levels in research and institutional settings, as well as in terms of publications involving researchers from different Finnish institutions.

However, what has already been remarked about some weaknesses with respect to internationalization of the PhD program, suggests some further recommendations. The group’s current exploration of expanding its connections and formal agreements with European universities with strong anthropology departments should be strongly encouraged, in order to enhance chances for mobility of their doctoral students. Also their plan to take more advantage of European research funding opportunities looks very promising. It is particularly recommended to make all possible efforts in both such directions.

**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 operational conditions of the RC are excellent, having overcome the condition of a separate disciplinary group and having been integrated into a Department of Social Research. The academic staff is congruent with the number of students, although a challenge is to ensure the continuity of the program after the retirement of one professor in early 2011. The teaching load is quite important and might make difficult to maintain the current balance between research and teaching; in fact a challenge well perceived by RC members is keeping the most productive scholars involved in teaching even if they are in good position to secure research funding for long periods, what is essential to research in the field.

### 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 group does not have a formal organization and no managerial authority over competitive research funding and the research topics undertaken by its members. For its coherence as a RC it relies on collegial academic practices. The role of principal investigators is to initiate projects and involve other members of the group in them as post-doctoral researchers and PhD students. The groups’ main strengths are its intellectual coherence, international orientation, and integrated training program.

### 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 organisations), and
  2. The total sum of funding which the organisation in question had decided to allocate to the RCs members during 1.1.2005–31.12.2010.

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

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

The RC has been funded in its research activities mainly by the Academy of Finland and other Finnish funding institutions, what sounds reasonable given the RC’s focus on doctoral training and the structure of doctoral system in UH. Other international funding has been limited and mainly coming from the Nordic area.

In the UH document, it is explicitly mentioned that only one third of doctoral students are actually funded by Academy of Finland and other Finnish institutions. The other 2 thirds of doctoral students may find funding opportunities for their studies only through external funding. Given that “acquiring funding for the studies is often the responsibility of the student”, it would be recommended that the RC enlarges its external funding strategy in order to help students’ chances.

Broadening the scope of its external funding is recommended also in the purpose to reinforce the RC’s international orientation. A good initiative is the explicit interest demonstrated in exploring EU financial sources and opportunities for collaboration, but also other international and national foundations might be explored.

### 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’s strategic plan for the coming two years refers to getting research project funding and insuring a recruitment of an average of two new doctoral students, in order to continue with the rhythm they have imposed themselves 20 years ago.
This looks as a conservative risk-aversion attitude, but which has ensured so far good quality results. It is recommended, though, that all efforts are made for increasing the number of PhD candidates, particularly in the direction of attracting foreign candidates, as it has already been stressed.

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

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

SCA is a RC clearly advancing in consolidating its academic activity and its doctoral training program, as well as in strengthening its international network.

However some weaknesses have been remarked in terms of strategy of publications, of international recognition, of integration of an international dimension as a structural part of their doctoral training. Although aware of such weaknesses, the RC seems to have set itself limited goals for the near future, mostly formulated in terms of further consolidation rather than identifying specific ways for reinforcing weak points.

The proposed participation category 3 does not seem to us the most proper category, giving that research activity of this RC does not sound specially distinct from mainstream anthropological research; it is the panel’s opinion that category would better fit this RC.

Numeric evaluation: 4 (Excellent)

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

There were preliminary discussions and the person responsible for submitting the proposal has drafted the answers and circulated the draft, what helps to give to the document effective coherence, although we do not know how much group discussion was involved. Consultation of RC members has provided information about projects, networks and funding incorporated in the final version.

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

Focus area 10: Globalisation and social change

The research activity of SCA locates as significant contribution to UH’s focus areas 8 on ‘Language and Culture’ and to focus area 10 on ‘Globalization and social change’.

2.12 RC-specific main recommendations

- A more interdisciplinary engagement within social sciences in order to fully integrate into UH focus areas.
- A more carefully chosen publishing strategy enhancing international confrontation and recognition and increasing opportunities of publication for postdoctoral researchers.
- Increasing the number of PhD candidates, particularly in the direction of getting a more international group of doctoral students.
- Efforts to reinforce the international dimension of doctoral students' training.
- Increased efforts for enhancing chances of mobility for doctoral and postdoctoral researchers.
- Reduction of the teaching load for favouring field research.
- Broadening the scope of external funding, particularly international funding.
- A clearer stance for overcoming some of current weaknesses in the near future.

2.13 RC-specific conclusions

SCA is a very good RC keeping high the standards of anthropological research in UH and in Finnish academy as a whole. It has a very good doctoral training program and is making clear efforts for expanding its international recognition. Maybe it may take a more challenging perspective towards future developments as its position becomes more consolidated, particularly in the direction of more interdisciplinary exchanges within the social sciences and of a more internationalized structure of the doctoral program.
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NAME OF THE RESEARCHER COMMUNITY:
Social and Cultural Anthropology (SCA)

LEADER OF THE RESEARCHER COMMUNITY:
Professor Timo Kaartinen, 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)
INTERNATIONAL EVALUATION OF RESEARCH AND DOCTORAL TRAINING AT THE UNIVERSITY OF HELSINKI

RC-SPECIFIC STAGE 1 MATERIAL (registration form)

1 RESPONSIBLE PERSON

Name: Kaartinen, Timo
E-mail: timo.kaartinen@helsinki.fi
Phone: 22638
Affiliation: Department of Social Research
Street address: Anthropology, Unioninkatu 38

2 DESCRIPTION OF THE PARTICIPATING RESEARCHER COMMUNITY (RC)

Name of the participating RC (max. 30 characters): Social and Cultural Anthropology
Acronym for the participating RC (max. 10 characters): SCA
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 research community organized around the discipline of social and cultural anthropology is focused on joint doctoral training. It has produced high quality Ph.D. theses at a steady pace since the 1990s and consolidated itself as an independent academic unit in 2004. The group is in a position to continue as a distinct doctoral program and to integrate its members in new innovative research topics which involve scholars at various stages in their careers. Students in the program are recruited on joint decision by the professors and docents in charge of doctoral training, and participation involves regular attendance in the program's own research seminar which is conducted in English. The doctoral students participate in undergraduate teaching, and many of them work in research projects organized by senior members of the RC. The research profile and training of the group builds on a comprehensive teaching program which includes course requirements for undergraduate as well as Ph.D. degrees.

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: --Select--
RC’s scientific subfield 3: --Select--
RC’s scientific subfield 4: --Select--
Other, if not in the list:

4 RC’S PARTICIPATION CATEGORY

Participation category: 3. Research of the participating community is distinct from mainstream research, and the special features of the research tradition in the field must be considered in the evaluation
INTERNATIONAL EVALUATION OF RESEARCH AND DOCTORAL TRAINING AT THE UNIVERSITY OF HELSINKI

RC-SPECIFIC STAGE 1 MATERIAL (registration form)

Justification for the selected participation category (MAX. 2200 characters with spaces): Several national traditions and specialized discussions are recognized in the international practice of anthropology. The holistic ethnographic orientation, long-term field research, and a comparative theoretical agenda emphasized by the RC makes it different from research groups and programs specialized in a particular subfield or research topic such as minority and area studies or medical and legal anthropology.

Public description of the RC’s research and doctoral training (MAX. 2200 characters with spaces):
Nationally the Department of Social and Cultural Anthropology is the largest research unit in its field, both in terms of the number of active researchers and the variety of research topics and areas of specialization. The research approach of the department emphasizes the global ethnographic comparison of different societies and forms of human activity. Instead of explaining the forms as responses to universal pragmatic problems or social and psychological functions faced by people everywhere, anthropologists use ethnographic comparison as a tool for identifying the social and systematic dimensions of human activity in each society. Comparative analysis is vital for invoking the questions and concepts which are useful for understanding the systematic features and significance of action in each case. While, for instance, the practices and knowledge of every society have political implications, "politics" is a theoretical construct without any uniform match in the diversity of human experience. The comparative analysis practised by anthropologists does not presuppose an underlying similarity of human realities. It works like a lens in revealing the significance of human action and making it intelligible to people in other frameworks of knowledge, helping anthropologists to convert empirical data from a particular society into concepts and arguments of general relevance.

The specializations of teachers and scholars currently in the research community of Social and Cultural Anthropology in Helsinki cover several regions and countries in the most populated continents of the world. They share foundational concepts regarding social relations and cultural systems, and emphasize qualitative (but not to the exclusion of quantitative) methods.

Significance of the RC’s research and doctoral training for the University of Helsinki (MAX. 2200 characters with spaces): The RC has maintained a consistent level of productivity in its doctoral training since the early 1990s and formed itself into a scholarly community which presently includes persons at each stage of their research career. Its international orientation is exceptional for its immediate academic environment, and it makes an important contribution to the internationalization of teaching and research at the University of Helsinki. The RC is the only academic unit in its field focused on global, comparative ethnography. It includes specialists in a wide range of geographic areas, and its recent projects cover several topics which have recently been defined as central to the research profile of the University of Helsinki. Its members bear the main responsibility for running the Finnish Anthropological Society which publishes a highly ranked scientific journal and organizes visits by leading international scholars as well as a yearly international conference. This places the RC in the center of the national scholarly community in its field.

Keywords: social anthropology, cultural anthropology, political systems, ritual processes, kinship, gender, memory, religious movements, diasporic societies, state-society relations, resource rights, value
6 Quality of RC’s research and doctoral training

Justified estimate of the quality of the RC’s research and doctoral training at national and international level during 2005-2010 (MAX. 2200 characters with spaces): The RC has created a coherent and comprehensive program of anthropological training and produced PhD theses at a stable rate since the 1990s. The ten PhD degrees awarded during the period of evaluation corresponds to the overall success of the program in doctoral education.

The program has a strong international orientation. With few exceptions its Ph.D. theses are written in English and evaluated by foreign specialists. The RC has a wide network of international cooperation which produces a high level of researcher mobility. Nationally the RC is the only the academic unit in its field which has a global focus. Most of its research projects and Ph.D. theses in recent years have been based on fieldwork outside Europe.

Comments on how the RC’s scientific productivity and doctoral training should be evaluated (MAX. 2200 characters with spaces): Anthropological training and research is based on a long-term commitment to specific ethnographic areas and research materials. This means that scholarship in the field takes a relatively long time to develop, and high publication rates can only be expected from mature scholars. This calls for a sufficiently long perspective in evaluating the impact of specific publications as well as the productivity of entire research projects and training programs.

Bibliometric methods for assessing scholarly productivity have a limited ability to predict the future impact of monographic studies which bear more weight in anthropology than in many other social science fields. This should be taken into account in assessing the weight of different types of publications. Another factor which defines the value of anthropological publications is that most ethnographic research is done by a single researcher or a very small group. A publication based on first-hand ethnographic or archival material may not get as much immediate attention and citations as an article which reviews a large body of theoretical discussion, but its long-term contribution to the discipline may be equally great. One possible way of taking this into account is to assess the maturity of particular research projects by the range of years during which they have yielded publications and deal with these publications as a single unit of analysis.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Last name</th>
<th>First name</th>
<th>PI-status (TUHAT, 29.11.2010)</th>
<th>Title of research and teaching personnel</th>
<th>Affiliation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Armstrong</td>
<td>Karen</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>professor</td>
<td>Social Research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aušio</td>
<td>Petra</td>
<td></td>
<td>postdoctoral researcher</td>
<td>Social Research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creemtsil</td>
<td>Matti</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>doctoral candidate</td>
<td>Social Research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eräsaari</td>
<td>Toomas</td>
<td></td>
<td>university lecturer</td>
<td>Social Research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Herrmans</td>
<td>Isabell</td>
<td></td>
<td>doctoral candidate</td>
<td>Social Research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Härkönen</td>
<td>Heidi</td>
<td></td>
<td>doctoral candidate</td>
<td>Social Research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kaartinen</td>
<td>Timo</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>professor</td>
<td>Social Research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kallinen</td>
<td>Timo</td>
<td></td>
<td>university lecturer</td>
<td>Social Research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karttunen</td>
<td>Marie-Louise</td>
<td></td>
<td>postdoctoral researcher</td>
<td>Social Research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keisalo</td>
<td>Marianna</td>
<td></td>
<td>doctoral candidate</td>
<td>Social Research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leppänen</td>
<td>Antti</td>
<td></td>
<td>postdoctoral researcher</td>
<td>Social Research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lounela</td>
<td>Anu</td>
<td></td>
<td>postdoctoral researcher</td>
<td>Social Research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martikainen</td>
<td>Touko</td>
<td></td>
<td>doctoral candidate</td>
<td>Social Research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mölkänen</td>
<td>Jenni</td>
<td></td>
<td>doctoral candidate</td>
<td>Social Research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partanen</td>
<td>Anni</td>
<td></td>
<td>doctoral candidate</td>
<td>Social Research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pietilä</td>
<td>Tuulikki</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>university researcher</td>
<td>Social Research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Siikala</td>
<td>Jukka</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>professor</td>
<td>Social Research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Säävälä</td>
<td>Minna</td>
<td></td>
<td>senior researcher</td>
<td>Institute of Population Studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tammiisto</td>
<td>Tuomas</td>
<td></td>
<td>doctoral candidate</td>
<td>Social Research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenhunen</td>
<td>Sirpa</td>
<td></td>
<td>senior researcher</td>
<td>Social Research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuominen</td>
<td>Pekka</td>
<td></td>
<td>doctoral candidate</td>
<td>Social Research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uusihakala</td>
<td>Katja</td>
<td></td>
<td>university lecturer</td>
<td>Social Research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Veisson</td>
<td>Marko</td>
<td></td>
<td>doctoral candidate</td>
<td>Social Research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilenius</td>
<td>Heikki</td>
<td></td>
<td>doctoral candidate</td>
<td>Social Research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Viljanen</td>
<td>Anna-Maria</td>
<td></td>
<td>university lecturer</td>
<td>Social Research</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Background Information**

Name of the RC’s responsible person: Kaartinen, Timo

E-mail of the RC’s responsible person: timo.kaartinen@helsinki.fi

Name and acronym of the participating RC: Social and Cultural Anthropology, SCA

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

Comments for selecting/not selecting the key focus area: While the group’s research is grounded in ethnography and cultural comparisons, it is informed by an awareness of changing historical realities and aims at an increased understanding of global social and political issues.

**1 Focus and Quality of RC’s Research (max. 8800 characters with spaces)**

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

The research approach of the group emphasizes the comparative ethnography of human societies, practices and forms of consciousness grounded in the concepts, methods and theoretical traditions of sociocultural anthropology. The comparative analysis practiced by anthropologists explores the local meanings and consequences of globally significant phenomena such as politics, cosmology, gender, conflicts, illness, migrations, law, technology, population movements, religious conversion, environmental relations, economic liberalization, and resource rights. The comparative agenda of the group means that it is not limited to a particular geographic area or type of society. Innovative questions and concepts in anthropology tend to derive from discussions surrounding a particular ethnographic area, but their theoretical interpretation relies on discussion between specialists focusing on different areas. For this reason, the variety of ethnographic specialization within the group is a source of high-quality ethnography. The research of the group includes studies on Finnish society, but its comparative concerns extend beyond topics and problems defined by the national perspective. The international orientation of the group is demonstrated by its dense interactions and research cooperation with anthropologists working in other countries. The quality of its research is also enhanced by its connection with a systematic teaching curriculum and a doctoral program run by members of the group.

The quality of the RC’s research

Recent work by the group covers several contemporary world issues and draws from broad anthropological research traditions for the comparative language in which they are addressed. One set of issues is political phenomena which members of the group have studied in Pacific island states, West Africa, South and South-East Asia, Russia and in the semi-autonomous territories of the United States. These studies ask how the meaning of modern state power is being redefined by cultural categories and hierarchies which people variously identify as their tradition. They reveal that this process takes place on shifting levels of political integration and articulates with imperial systems and the global economic order, challenging the view in which traditional political institutions simply serve a legitimizing function in the nation-state. Another broad interest of the group are displaced societies: the former Rhodesians in South Africa; the Yaqui in Mexico, the Karelians in Finland, and the exiled people of Banda in Indonesia. These studies reframe diasporas as more than a nostalgic relationship to a homeland and stress ongoing social relationships and place-making as key to their reproduction. A fourth topic is contemporary religious movements and the motivations which underlie Protestant conversions and the
transnational spread of Pentecostal groups. Exchange and the circulation of commodities is another
broad interest of group members working on gifts and money in the Fiji Islands, on globalizing African
music, remittances to Africa, and new technologies in India and Africa. A related question addressed by
the group is how market economy and economic liberalization manifest themselves in markets,
consumption and class formation. Studies carried out in the contexts of Cuban nationalism, migrant
education in China, and current transformations in Indian society center on gender and kinship as
central interpretive categories of contemporary life. The group’s research about the social relations of
illness focuses on infertility in Tanzania and HIV/AIDS in Ghana.

The scientific significance of the RC’s research
The comparative agenda cultivated in the group brings new light on contemporary world issues by
studying their socially embedded forms and the concrete contexts from which they derive their human
significance. Instead of applying general social science concepts uniformly to local realities, the group’s
research aims at enriching these concepts by studying the meanings which arise from their conjuncture
with social relations and everyday life. Responses to HIV/AIDS, nature conservation and women’s
education, for instance, derive from local models of sociality as well as global discourses about these
topics. By comparing how general phenomena are refracted by their conjuncture with specific
ethnographic contexts, anthropology grounds its production of knowledge in human differences.

Ways to strengthen the focus and improve the quality of the RC’s research.
The group should publish more in international journals for the benefit of international peer review of
research findings. It can strengthen its research focus by arranging more workshops on theoretical
topics which are open to all members of the community.

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.

The research community is organized around the discipline of social and cultural anthropology and
focuses on doctoral training. It has produced high quality Ph.D. theses at a steady pace since the 1990s
and consolidated itself as an independent academic unit in 2004. The group is in a position to continue
as a distinct doctoral program and to integrate its members in new innovative research topics which
involve scholars at various stages in their careers. Students in the program are recruited on joint
decision by the professors and docents in charge of doctoral training. In selecting them the group
considers their previous level academic achievements and systematic training in anthropology, other
evidence of their orientation to academic research, and the match between their research topics and
approaches with the profile of the group.

Instead of a pre-defined focus on particular topics, the group fosters theoretically informed comparative
discussion by involving its members in its weekly departmental seminar conducted in English. The
seminar is an integral part of supervising doctoral work. Doctoral students accepted in the group are
required to fulfill a number of course requirements which help them participate in broader theoretical
and ethnographic discussions in anthropology. Students whose previous studies do not include the core
content of anthropology training practiced in the group may also be required to do a certain amount of
coursework at the undergraduate level. Each student is assigned a supervisor from among the faculty,
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and towards later stages of their work their work may be advised by an outside expert in order to ensure its ethnographic quality.

In order to prepare doctoral students for an academic career they are systematically involved in undergraduate teaching as course assistants and encouraged to acquire further teaching experience by instructing Open University courses. Several of them work in research projects organized by senior members of the research community.

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

The research profile and training of the group builds on a comprehensive teaching program which includes course requirements for undergraduate as well as Ph.D. degrees. Nationally the RC is the only academic unit in its field which has a global focus, and most of its research projects and Ph.D. theses in recent years have been based on fieldwork outside Europe. One of the group’s main strengths is its wide ethnographic coverage which is maintained without compromising its intellectual coherence. Members of the group currently work in several parts of Asia, Africa, the Pacific, Europe, and the Americas, and this diversity of ethnographic fields is reflected in ongoing PhD projects. The group’s strategy for maintaining good quality work on this range of fields and topics is to maintain contacts with a wide range of area experts throughout the world, even as it continues to build on its own, distinctive model of comparative analysis.

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).

The globally oriented ethnographic work of the group is an important contribution to Finland’s international engagement. In addition to specialized knowledge it produces publicly significant expertise on the areas and countries which are the focus of fieldwork by the group. Several members of the group are leading experts in Finland of their research regions and provide in-depth information for media about these regions. The group receives frequent consultation requests, and many of its PhD graduates have found employment as experts in international and Finnish organizations and government agencies focusing on development assistance, conflict resolution, immigration and minority policy, social services and environmental planning. In addition to their academic work, members of the group participate in consultative committees and cooperate with civic groups, public authorities and businesses seeking to apply ethnographic research to their fields of activity. The group is also in a key position in maintaining its academic field in the Finnish context. PhD’s trained by the group presently work in other academic departments and communities, and a large number of MA’s and PhD’s graduated from the group’s anthropology program diffuse its anthropological perspectives to Finnish media, museums, educational institutions and government agencies. The group’s particular strength in these contexts is its international and comparative perspective on contemporary social issues.

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

The research community should continue responding to the demand for specialized anthropological knowledge in such fields as social services, public education, minority policy, organizational studies, international development and technological and commercial innovation. The group’s collaboration with the Finnish Anthropological Society offers one way for increasing the awareness of its potential contributions in these areas and involving doctoral students in providing them.
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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 group’s international research collaboration involves joint conference and publishing activities, fieldwork-oriented collaboration, research networks, and international PhD training courses. Recent conference panels and joint publications of the group have involved scholars from the Australian National University and LaTrobe U (Australia), Brown U, Duke U, U of Virginia, the University of California (San Diego and Irvine) and U of Illinois (USA), the Bergen U (Norway), U of Copenhagen (Denmark), and U of Tartu (Estonia). In addition to these academic contacts, the group’s academic network extends to local academics in each country of fieldwork and to scholars working in the members’ ethnographic area of specialization.

Members of the group are currently active in the following international research networks: the Nordic post-graduate network of South Asian research (supported by SASnet); the Peace and Conflict Studies in Anthropology network and the Network for Media Anthropology (supported by the European Association of Social Anthropology); Gendering Asia (Nordic Institute of Asian Studies); Global Economy, Regulation and Development (Danish Institute for International Studies, Copenhagen); the network on Music, politics and agency (focused on the Leeds University and Open University in the UK) and the Melanesia Interest Group (American Anthropological Association). The group’s international engagement has involved the arrangement of panels in international conferences. It has also arranged several conferences and workshops in Helsinki on its own or in cooperation with other university departments and the Finnish Anthropological Society.

Nationally the group’s research cooperation extends to a variety of fields which include forestry, ecology, folklore, international politics, law, development studies, sociology and several area studies departments. Owing to the interdisciplinary quality of anthropological topics, several members of the group are currently supervising, co-supervising or mentoring PhD students in sociology, forestry, geography, medicine and security studies enrolled at the Helsinki University and other universities in Finland. Members of the group participate in the Centre of Excellence in Global Governance Research, and the group is represented in the Research School of Asian Studies which has given funding to one of its doctoral students.

Research cooperation with Finnish partners also involves joint publications aimed at making anthropological perspectives available in the Finnish language. Members of the group have recently edited a volume (Rahan kuluttuuri, ‘Culture of Money’ SKS, 2009) based on contributions by 16 scholars from eight different universities and research institutions. A similar project (Ympäristö ja kuluttuuri, ‘Environment and Culture’) is currently in progress with 18 researchers from eight different institutions. Both projects involve scholars from various other disciplines: sociology, history, comparative religion, archaeology, folkloristics, development studies, consumer research, business studies, and forest ecology.

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

The strong international orientation of the research community encourages its doctoral students to visit university departments and consult specialists in foreign countries. Senior scholars are regularly invited to give guest lectures abroad, and the collaboration of the research community with foreign academics
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and departments has also made it possible to involve senior scholars from the United States, Australia, Great Britain, Germany, Norway and Denmark as visiting professors and guest lecturers in Helsinki. The group is currently exploring ways to expand its connections to European universities with strong anthropology departments and to take advantage of EU research funding opportunities. In addition to research networks and conference participation, these connections can be deepened by increasing the number of formal exchange agreements with foreign anthropology departments.

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 group consolidated in 2004 as a separate discipline with two professors and three university lecturers who formerly taught in two different departments at the University of Helsinki. At this point Social and Cultural Anthropology was placed at the Department of Sociology. In the administrative reform of 2010, the discipline became part of the newly formed Department of Social Research. The group continues to run its own teaching program, with an intake of 20-22 undergraduate and an average of two doctoral students each year. Each member of its teaching staff is expected to teach an equivalent of four courses or seminars each academic year, with the premise that each teacher continues his or her own research. According to faculty policy, each teacher should receive a yearly respite from coursework (one out of four 7-week course periods) in order to focus on research and publishing. For internationally oriented anthropologists, this is also a condition for sustained research engagement with a distant field area, and the departmental budget includes a provision for travel costs to this end. Long term field research presupposes a research leave covered with external funding.

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

Research-based teaching is a high priority for the group. In order to maintain a full teaching program without sacrificing research, the group needs to maintain the present balance between teaching and research commitments. One challenge is to keep the most productive scholars involved in teaching even if they are in a good position to secure research funding for long periods. The current aim is to increase the involvement of project researchers in the teaching program, but it is equally important to reward teaching work with research opportunities. This calls for a careful management of the time and funds allocated to the teaching program. Another concern is the possibility of inviting visitors and maintaining the group's international contacts in the environment of dwindling departmental funding. A third issue facing the group is how to ensure the continuity of its program after the retirement of one professor in early 2011.

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

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

The group aims at collegial decision making on its teaching program and joint activities. The recruitment of doctoral students happens at the faculty level which consults the discipline, and the internal evaluation of the candidates is done by a committee of professors and researchers with the competence to supervise doctoral work.
Management-related responsibilities within the group involve representing it in several administrative bodies in the Faculty of Social Sciences. These positions involve the coordination of the discipline, developing teaching activities, evaluating teaching skills, handling foreign student exchange, and the recruitment of undergraduate and doctoral students, and they are divided evenly between members of the teaching staff. Doctoral students may be assigned to coordinate joint activities with other departments and teaching programs, such as the training of civic religion teachers which has an anthropology component. The group agrees on these appointments in weekly meetings. Membership in the board of the faculty and the department is subject to vote by all members of the teaching and research staff under specific categories: professors, the "mid-level" (university lecturers, researchers and supporting staff), and students. Currently the discipline is represented in the departmental board by a university lecturer and a student, each of whom has a vice representative from the same category.

The group does not have managerial authority over competitive research funding and the research topics undertaken by its members. When the group is consulted over the recruitment of dissertation students it considers whether it has adequate resources for their supervision.

The role of principal investigators is to initiate projects and involve other members of the group in them as post-doctoral researchers and PhD students. While PI’s do not impose specific research topics for doctoral students, they may involve them in workshops, conference panels and joint publication projects when this is useful for advancing their dissertation work. The collaboration between PI’s and other researchers in teaching will increase in importance with the teaching duties required of externally funded researchers by the policy introduced by the faculty.

The group does not have managerial authority over competitive research funding and the research topics undertaken by its members. When the group is consulted over the recruitment of dissertation students it considers whether it has adequate resources for their supervision. The viability of the research community depends on its ability to maintain a good quality teaching program and to secure adequate external funding for research and publication activities. These presuppose adequate know-how about administering the discipline in its new institutional environment, preparing persons to new duties as teachers, and increased knowledge about new funding opportunities, including the research funding provided by the European Union.

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

  The group’s main strengths are its intellectual coherence, international orientation, and integrated training program. Apart from the administrative structures of university teaching it does not have formal organization and relies on collegial academic practices for its coherence as a research community. The members of the group have extensive networks in and out of Finland. The coordinated use of these should be an asset for improving access to new sources of external funding. The group attempts to provide all its members with opportunities to get experience in academic teaching which develops the pedagogical skills of the postgraduate researchers and in the long term ensures the viability of its teaching program.

**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: **1449444**

- **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: The Ella and Georg Ehrnrooth Foundation
  - Nordenskiöld Foundation
  - Finnish Culture Foundation
  - Finnish Foundation for Gaming Research
  - University of Helsinki Foundations
  - Oskar Öflund Foundation
  - Kone Foundation
  - The Sasakawa Young Leaders Foundation
  - Emil Aaltonen Foundation
  - total amount of funding (in euros) from the above-mentioned foundations: **359000**

- **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: Statens Samfundsvidenskabelige Forskningsråd (Denmark)
  - Forskningsrådet for Samfund og Erhverv (Denmark)
  - Higher Education Governance and Management (HEGOM, Finland)
  - total amount of funding (in euros) from the above-mentioned funding organizations: **69258**

- **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:
  - total amount of funding (in euros) from the above-mentioned funding organizations:

### 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.**

  Each of the principal investigators is presently leading an externally funded research project or seeking funding for one. In spite of its small size, the research community presently includes a fairly balanced...
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The number of members in different stages of their academic career. This reflects its consistent production of doctoral graduates. The number of PhD’s awarded by the program during 20 years is 35. During the 5-year evaluation period 12 PhD candidates have graduated from the program. The steady flow of PhD’s also improves the group’s ability to sustain its research and teaching agenda, and it is likely to continue during the next three-year period. Two of the group’s PhD students are anticipated to receive their degree in 2011 and at least two others will finish writing up their work during 2012-2013. With a view of sustaining the program, the group will recruit an average of two new doctoral students each year during 2011-2013.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Short description of how the RC members have contributed to the compilation of the stage 2 materials (Max. 1100 characters with spaces).</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>After preliminary discussions, the answers were drafted by the person responsible for submitting them and circulated for comments by members of the research community. Information about research projects, networks and funding was collected from other members of the group, and their comments on the draft have been incorporated in the materials submitted here.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1 Analysis of publications

- Associated person is one of Karen Armstrong, Karen.Armstrong@helsinki.fi, Petra Maria Autio, Petra.Autio@helsinki.fi, Perpetual Crentsil, Perpetual.Crentsil@helsinki.fi, Matti Eräsaari, Matti.Erasaari@helsinki.fi, Timo Kaartinen, Timo.Kaartinen@helsinki.fi, Timo Kallinen, Timo.Kallinen@helsinki.fi, Heidi Härkönen, Heidi.Harkonen@helsinki.fi, Toomas Pietilä, Toomas.Pietila@helsinki.fi, Minna Säävälä, Minna.Saevala@helsinki.fi, Heikki Wilenius, Heikki.Wilenius@helsinki.fi, Anna Maria Viljanen, AnnaMaria.Viljanen@helsinki.fi, Katja Uusihakala, Katja.Uusihakala@helsinki.fi, Heikki Wilenius, Heikki.Wilenius@helsinki.fi, Anna Maria Viljanen, AnnaMaria.Viljanen@helsinki.fi

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Publication type</th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>Total Count 2005 - 2010</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A1 Refereed journal article</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A2 Review in scientific journal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A3 Contribution to book/other compilations (refereed)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B1 Unrefereed journal article</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B2 Contribution to book/other compilations (non-refereed)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C1 Published scientific monograph</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C2 Edited book, compilation, conference proceeding or special issue of journal</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D3 Article in professional conference proceedings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D4 Published development or research report</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D5 Text book or professional handbook or guidebook or dictionary</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E1 Popular article, newspaper article</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E1 Popular contribution to book/other compilations</td>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E2 Popular monograph</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2 Listing of publications

A1 Refereed journal article

2005

2006

2007

2008


2009


2010


A2 Review in scientific journal


2010


A3 Contribution to book/other compilations (refereed)


2006


Säävälä, M 2006, 'Sterilized Mothers: Women's Personhood and Family Planning in Rural South India', in L Fruzzetti, S Tenhunen (eds), Culture, Power and Agency. Gender in Indian Ethnography., Stree, Calcutta


2007


Kallinen, T 2007, 'King of the World Bank: Global Legitimacy for Local Rulers', in M Ruckenstein, M Karttunen (eds), Transforming boundaries: women's work and domesticy in Calcutta, B Chaudhuri, S Chaudhuri (eds), PP. 31-54.


2008


SCA/Kaartinen


Säävälä, M 2008, 'Who are the foreigners and are there too many?', in D Avramov (ed.), Acceptance of immigrants in Europe?. Viewpoints about immigration and expectations towards foreigners in the Czech Republic, Germany, Estonia, Hungary, Austria, Poland, Slovenia and Finland., Pro BUSINESS, Berlin, pp. 67-82.


2009


2010


B1 Unrefereed journal article

2005

2006

2007
Eräsaari, M 2007, [Book review], Suomen Antropologi, vol 32, no. 3-4 (Special issue: Local culture and global governance), pp. 91-93.

2008

2009

2010


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

2009


2010


C1 Published scientific monograph

2005

Siikala, A, Siikala, J 2005, Return to culture: oral tradition and society in the Southern Cook Islands, FF communications, no. no. 287, Suomalainen Tiedeakatemia, Helsinki.

2007

Pietilä, T 2007, 'Gasas, markets, and gender: how dialogue constructs moral value in post-socialist Kilimanjaro', Women in Africa and the diaspora, University of Wisconsin Press, Madison (Wis.).


2009


Tenhunen, S 2009, Means of awakening: gender, politics and practice in rural India, Stree, Kolkata.

2010
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SCA/Kaartinen


Säävälä, M 2010, Middle-class Moralities: Everyday Struggle over Belonging and Prestige in India, Orient Blackswan, Delhi.

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

2005

2006
Fruzzetti, L, Tenhunen, S (eds) 2006, Culture, power, and agency: gender in Indian ethnography, Stree, Kolkata.

2007

2008


2009


D3 Article in professional conference proceedings

2009

D4 Published development or research report

2008

D5 Text book or professional handbook or guidebook or dictionary

2010

E1 Popular article, newspaper article

2005

2007
SCA/Kaartinen
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2009


Säävälä, M 2009, 'Suomalaisuus muuttuu eittämättä', Helsingin Sanomat.

Säävälä, M 2008, 'Monikulttuuristen perheiden tueksi tarvitaan omia palveluita', Helsingin Sanomat.

2010

Säävälä, M 2010, 'Monikulttuuriset nuoret koulunpenkiltä eteenpäin', Terveydenhoitaja, no. 6, pp. 18-20.


E1 Popular contribution to book/other compilations

2007


E2 Popular monograph

2007


2010

**1 Analysis of activities 2005-2010**

- Associated person is one of Karen Armstrong, Karen.Armstrong@helsinki.fi, Petri Maria Auto, Petri.Auto@helsinki.fi, Perpetual Crentsil, Perpetual.Crentsil@helsinki.fi, Matti Eräsaari, Matti.Erasaari@helsinki.fi, Toomas Gross, toomas.gross@helsinki.fi, Isabell Herrmans, Isabell.Herrmans@helsinki.fi, Heidi Härkönen, Heidi.Harkonen@helsinki.fi, Timo Kaartinen, Timo.Kaartinen@helsinki.fi, Timo Kallinen, Timo.Kallinen@helsinki.fi, Marie Louise Karttunen, Marie-Louise.Karttunen@helsinki.fi, Mariama Päiväri, Mariama.Paivari@helsinki.fi, Antti Lepolainen, Antti.Lepolainen@helsinki.fi, Anu Lounela, Anu.Lounela@helsinki.fi, Jenni Miklavers, Jenni.Miklavers@helsinki.fi, Tuija Pietila, Tuija.Pietila@helsinki.fi, Juhani Siikala, Juhani.Siikala@helsinki.fi, Minna Siikakivi, Minna.Siikakivi@helsinki.fi, Sirpa Tenhunen, Sirpa.Tenhunen@helsinki.fi, Pekka Tuominen, Pekka.Tuominen@helsinki.fi, Katja Uusihakala, Katja.Uusihakala@helsinki.fi, Heikki Viljanen, Heikki.Viljanen@helsinki.fi, Annamaria.Viljanen@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>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prizes and awards</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Editor of research journal</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Editor of research anthology/collection/conference proceedings</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peer review of manuscripts</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Editor of series</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment of candidates for academic posts</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Membership or other role in review committee</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Membership or other role in research network</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Membership or other role in national/international committee, council, board</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Membership or other role in public/Finland or international organization</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Membership or other role in private company/organisation</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participation in interview for written media</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participation in radio programme</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participation in TV programme</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participation in interview for web based media</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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2 Listing of activities 2005-2010

Supervisor or co-supervisor of doctoral thesis
Timo Kaartinen, Timo.Kaartinen@helsinki.fi
Dissertation supervision, Timo Kaartinen, 2003 → 2009, Finland
Dissertation supervision, Timo Kaartinen, 2009 → 2011, Finland
Dissertation mentoring, Timo Kaartinen, 2010 → …, Finland

Jukka Siikala, Jukka.Siikala@helsinki.fi
Supervisor of Value and cultural change in Fiji, Jukka Siikala, 2004 → …
Supervisor of Making a communal World: English Merchants in Imperial St. Petersburg, Jukka Siikala, 2005
Supervisor of How Kings are Made, How Kingship Changes. A Study of Ritual and Ritual Change in Pre-Colonial Owamboland, Namibia, Jukka Siikala, 2006
Supervisor of Human Rights in Action, Jukka Siikala, 2008
Supervisor of Memory Meanders. Place, Home and Commemoration in an Ex-Rhodesian Diapora Community, Jukka Siikala, 2008
Supervisor of Women and Marital Breakdown in South India. Reconstructing Homes, Bonds and Persons, Jukka Siikala, 2008
Supervisor of The Chapayekas: change, continuity and meaning in ritual clown practice, Jukka Siikala, 2010

Prizes and awards
Tuulikki Pietilä, Tuulikki.Pietila@helsinki.fi
Aidoo-Snyder Book Prize (USA), Tuulikki Pietilä, 20.11.2009, United States

Jukka Siikala, Jukka.Siikala@helsinki.fi
Fellow of Association of Social Anthropology, Jukka Siikala, 2008

Editor of research journal
Karen Armstrong, Karen.Armstrong@helsinki.fi
Current Anthropology, Karen Armstrong, 16.01.2005 → 24.11.2005, United States
Suomen Antropologi, Karen Armstrong, 01.01.2005 → 31.12.2005, Finland
Field Methods, Karen Armstrong, 01.01.2008 → 31.12.2008, United States

Matti Eräsaari, Matti.Erasaari@helsinki.fi
Suomen Antropologi: Journal of the Finnish Anthropological Society, Matti Eräsaari, 2007 → …, Finland

Timo Kaartinen, Timo.Kaartinen@helsinki.fi
Suomen Antropologi, Timo Kaartinen, 01.01.2006 → 31.12.2006, Finland
Studia Fennica Anthropologica, Timo Kaartinen, 01.01.2007 → 31.12.2007, Finland
Suomen Antropologi (Journal of the Finnish Anthropological Society), Timo Kaartinen, 01.01.2007 → 31.12.2007, Finland
Studia Fennica Anthropologica, Timo Kaartinen, 01.01.2008 → 31.12.2008, Finland

Timo Kallinen, Timo.Kallinen@helsinki.fi
Finnish Yearbook of International Law, Volume XV, Timo Kallinen, 01.01.2006 → 31.12.2006, Finland
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SCA/Kaartinen

Suomen Antropologi - Journal of Finnish Anthropological Society, Timo Kallinen, 06.08.2007 → 2011, Finland
Rahan kulttuuri, Timo Kallinen, 01.01.2008 → 31.12.2008

Jukka Siikala , Jukka.Siikala@helsinki.fi
Member of Editorial Board, Anthropological Theory, Jukka Siikala, 2004 → ...
Anthropological Theory, Jukka Siikala, 01.01.2005 → 31.12.2005
Anthropological Theory, Jukka Siikala, 01.01.2006 → 31.12.2006, United Kingdom

Sirpa Tenhunen , Sirpa.Tenhunen@helsinki.fi
Emerging Trends in Development Research, Sirpa Tenhunen, 01.01.2008 → 31.12.2008, India

Editor of research anthology/collection/conference proceedings

Timo Kallinen , Timo.Kallinen@helsinki.fi
Finnish Yearbook of International Law, Timo Kallinen, 2005, Finland
Kulttuuri ja Ympäristö, Timo Kallinen, 2009 → 2011, Finland

Peer review of manuscripts

Timo Kaartinen , Timo.Kaartinen@helsinki.fi
Torita maata? Translation of Thomas Hylland Eriksen’s teoksesta Small Places, Large Issues, Timo-Kaartinen, 2004 → ..., Finland
Anthropologi Indonesia, Timo-Kaartinen, 2010 → ..., Indonesia
Peer review, Timo Kaartinen, 2010 → ..., Australia

Timo Kallinen , Timo.Kallinen@helsinki.fi
Nordic Journal of African Studies, Timo Kallinen, 2010, Finland

Tuulikki Pietilä , Tuulikki.Pietila@helsinki.fi
Journal of Modern African Studies, Tuulikki Pietilä, 01.09.2005 → ..., United Kingdom
Social Anthropology Journal, Tuulikki Pietilä, 01.02.2006 → ..., United Kingdom

Jukka Siikala , Jukka.Siikala@helsinki.fi
Peer review for Anthropological Theory, Jukka Siikala, 2004 → 2008
Peer review for Contemporary Pacific, Jukka Siikala, 2006

Sirpa Tenhunen , Sirpa.Tenhunen@helsinki.fi
Peer review for the Journal of the Royal Anthropological Institute, Sirpa Tenhunen, 30.01.2010
Peer review of a book proposal for Palgrave Macmillan, Sirpa Tenhunen, 16.11.2010, United Kingdom

Katja Uusihakala , Katja.Uusihakala@helsinki.fi
Peer review, Katja Uusihakala, 2009 → ...
Peer review, Katja Uusihakala, 2010 → ...

Editor of series

Timo Kallinen , Timo.Kaartinen@helsinki.fi
Studia Fennica Anthropologica, Timo Kallinen, 2007 → ..., Finland
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SCA/Kaartinen

Assessment of candidates for academic posts

Timo Kaartinen, Timo.Kaartinen@helsinki.fi
Docentship assessment, Timo Kaartinen, 2009 → ..., Sweden

Tuulikki Pietilä, Tuulikki.Pietilä@helsinki.fi
Expert, Tuulikki Pietilä, 10.2005 → ..., Norway
Expert, Tuulikki Pietilä, 01.08.2010 → ..., Finland

Membership or other role in review committee

Timo Kaartinen, Timo.Kaartinen@helsinki.fi
Appointment committee of university lecturer, Timo Kaartinen, 19.04.2005 → 01.08.2005, Finland

Jukka Siikala, Jukka.Siikala@helsinki.fi
Review committee to evaluate The Australian National University, Jukka Siikala, 2008, Australia

Membership or other role in research network

Timo Kaartinen, Timo.Kaartinen@helsinki.fi
Board membership, Timo Kaartinen, 2010 → 2013, Finland

Antti Leppänen, Antti.Leppanen@helsinki.fi
Expert member of the Korean Society for Cultural Anthropology, Antti Leppänen, 2009 → ..., South Korea

Sirpa Tenhunen, Sirpa.Tenhunen@helsinki.fi
Gendering Asia, Sirpa Tenhunen, 01.11.2010 → 01.11.2011, Denmark

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

Karen Armstrong, Karen.Armstrong@helsinki.fi

Petra Maria Autio, Petra.Autio@helsinki.fi
Suomen Antropoliginen Seura, Petra Maria Auto, 01.01.2005 → 31.12.2005, Finland
Suomen Antropoliginen Seura, Petra Maria Auto, 01.01.2006 → 31.12.2008, Finland

Matti Eräsaari, Matti.Erasaari@helsinki.fi
Publishing secretary, Matti Eräsaari, 2004 → 2007
Board Member The Finnish Anthropological Society, Matti Eräsaari, 2007 → ...

Timo Kaartinen, Timo.Kaartinen@helsinki.fi
Board membership, Timo Kaartinen, 2001 → 2007, Finland
APS-ohjelman johtokunta (Helsingin yliopisto), Timo Kaartinen, 01.01.2005 → 31.12.2005
Suomen Antropoliginen Seura, Timo Kaartinen, 01.01.2005 → 31.12.2005, Finland
Vikin Tropiikin-Instituutin neuvottelukunta, Timo Kaartinen, 01.01.2005 → 31.12.2005
Suomen Antropoliginen Seura, Timo Kaartinen, 01.01.2006 → 09.03.2006, Finland
Suomen Antropoliginen Seura, Timo Kaartinen, 09.03.2006 → 31.12.2006, Finland
Board membership, Timo Kaartinen, 2007 → ..., Finland
Suomen Antropoliginen Seura, Timo Kaartinen, 01.01.2007 → 31.12.2007, Finland
Suomen Antropoliginen Seura, Timo Kaartinen, 01.01.2008 → 31.12.2008, Finland

Tuulikki Pietilä, Tuulikki.Pietilä@helsinki.fi
Board member, Tuulikki Pietilä, 02.02.2008 → ..., Finland
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SCA/Kaartinen

Jukka Siikala, Jukka.Siikala@helsinki.fi
Member of The International Professional Board, Globalism Research Centre, RMIT University, Melbourne, Jukka Siikala, 2002 → ...
Member of International Advisory Board, Local – Global Journal, Jukka Siikala, 2004 → …, Australia
Globalism Research Institute RMIT University, Melbourne, Jukka Siikala, 01.01.2005 → 31.12.2005, Australia
Globalism Institute, RMIT University Melbourne, Jukka Siikala, 01.01.2005 → 31.12.2006, Australia

Sirpa Tenhunen, Sirpa.Tenhunen@helsinki.fi
Nordic Association for Asian Research, Sirpa Tenhunen, 01.01.2005 → 31.12.2005
Nordic Institute for Asian Research, Sirpa Tenhunen, 24.08.2005 → 31.12.2005, Denmark
Pohjoismaan Etelä-Aasian tutkimusjärjestö (NASA), Sirpa Tenhunen, 01.01.2007 → 31.12.2007
Pohjoismaan Intián tutkimuskeskus, Sirpa Tenhunen, 04.09.2007 → 31.12.2007
Board membership, Sirpa Tenhunen, 01.01.2010 → 30.12.2010, Finland
Nordic Forum for South Asia Network's board membership, Sirpa Tenhunen, 01.11.2010 → 01.11.2011, Norway

Katja Uusihakala, Katja.Uusihakala@helsinki.fi
Member of Board in the Finnish Anthropological Society, Katja Uusihakala, 1996 → ...

Membership or other role in public Finnish or international organization
Karen Armstrong, Karen.Armstrong@helsinki.fi
Evaluation of Cultural Anthropology for the Ministry of Education in Estonia, Karen Armstrong, 18.05.2005 → 22.05.2005, Estonia

Petra Maria Autio, Petra.Autio@helsinki.fi
Helinä Rautavaaran etnografisen museon säätiö, Petra Maria Autio, 01.01.2005 → 31.12.2005, Finland
Helinä Rautavaaran museon säätiön hallitus, Petra Maria Autio, 01.01.2006 → 31.12.2006
Helinä Rautavaaran museon säätiön hallitus, Petra Maria Autio, 2007 → 2008, Finland

Timo Kaartinen, Timo.Kaartinen@helsinki.fi
Viikki Tropical Resources Institute (VITRI, HY), neuvottelukunnan jäsen, Timo Kaartinen, 01.01.2006 → 31.12.2006, Finland
Board membership, Timo Kaartinen, 2009 → …, Finland

Timo Kallinen, Timo.Kallinen@helsinki.fi
Member, Timo Kallinen, 2000 → 2011, Finland
Vice auditor, Timo Kallinen, 2007, Finland
Board member, Timo Kallinen, 2008 → 2011, Finland
Member, Timo Kallinen, 2008 → 2011, Finland
Member, Timo Kallinen, 30.06.2009 → 2011, United States
Member, Timo Kallinen, 2009 → 2011, Finland

Anu Louele, Anu.Lounela@helsinki.fi
Siemenpuu säätiö, Anu Louela, 01.01.2005 → 31.12.2005, Finland
Suomen maa- ja metsätalousministeriö Asinatuntijaesitelmä Suomen ja Indonesian metsädelegaatioiden tapaamisessa, Anu Louela, 08.09.2006 → 31.12.2006, Finland
Indonesia-työryhmän jäsen, Siemenpuu-säätiö, Anu Louela, 01.01.2008 → 31.12.2008, Finland

Tuomas Tammaso, tuomas.tammisto@helsinki.fi
Publishing secretary, Tuomas Tammaso, 09.2009 → 09.2010, Finland

Sirpa Tenhunen, Sirpa.Tenhunen@helsinki.fi
Kulttuurien museo, Helsinki, Sirpa Tenhunen, 01.01.2005 → 31.12.2005, Finland
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SCA/Kaartinen

Membership or other role of body in private company/organisation

Petra Maria Autio , Petra.Autio@helsinki.fi
Tyynenmeren saarten ystävyysseura ry, Petra Maria Auto, 01.01.2003 --> 31.12.2005
Tyynenmeren saarten ystävyysseura ry, Petra Maria Auto, 01.01.2005 --> 31.12.2005, Finland
Tyynenmeren saarten ystävyysseura ry, Petra Maria Auto, 01.01.2006 --> 31.12.2007, Finland

Timo Kallinen , Timo.Kallinen@helsinki.fi
Stella Development Consulting Association (SDCA), Timo Kallinen, 01.01.2006 --> 31.12.2006

Anu Lounela , Anu.Lounela@helsinki.fi
Suomi-Indonesia seura ry, Anu Lounela, 01.01.2006 --> 31.12.2006, Finland
Ympäristösäätiö Siemenpuu, Anu Lounela, 01.01.2006 --> 30.09.2009, Finland
Siemenpuu-säätiö, Anu Lounela, 01.01.2008 --> 31.12.2008, Finland

Participation in interview for written media

Karen Armstrong , Karen.Armstrong@helsinki.fi
Newspaper interview: with Esa Allas, for Karjalanlehti, Karen Armstrong, 01.01.2004 --> 31.12.2011, Finland

Timo Kaartinen , Timo.Kaartinen@helsinki.fi
Helinä Rautavaaran Museon avajaisesitelmä, Timo Kaartinen, 29.03.2000 --> 31.12.2011, Finland
Suomen Kuvatehdas, Timo Kaartinen, 26.05.2006 --> 31.12.2011, Finland
Tieteilijöiden Seurojen Valtiovuokran järjestämä itäpäiväseminaari, Timo Kaartinen, 19.10.2006 --> 31.12.2011, Finland
Väli-Suomen median Soista-viikkollite, Timo Kaartinen, 05.09.2006 --> 31.12.2011, Finland
Helinä Rautavaaran Museon yleisöesitelmä, Timo Kaartinen, 29.04.2007 --> 31.12.2011, Finland
Tiede 10/2007, Timo Kaartinen, 01.01.2007 --> 31.12.2011, Finland
Tieteiloiden yö: esitelmä Kulttuurien Museossa (Hki), Timo Kaartinen, 11.01.2007 --> 31.12.2011, Finland
Tutkittu juttu (YLE), Timo Kaartinen, 04.06.2007 --> 31.12.2011, Finland
Tosin silmin -keskustelusarja, Timo Kaartinen, 30.10.2008 --> 31.12.2011, United States
Varsinaissuomalaisen osakunnan 97-vuosijuhla, Timo Kaartinen, 19.02.2008, United States

Anu Lounela , Anu.Lounela@helsinki.fi
Helsingin kaivostien yliopisto, luonto, Anu Lounela, 01.01.2004 --> 31.12.2011, Finland
Porvoon kansatiesopisto, Anu Lounela, 01.01.2004 --> 31.12.2011, Finland
KITLV, research seminar, Anu Lounela, 01.01.2005 --> 31.12.2011, Finland
Nederlands Archeologisch Instituut, seminar, Anu Lounela, 01.01.2005 --> 31.12.2011, Finland
AEPF, työpaja, Anu Lounela, 03.09.2008 --> 31.12.2011, Finland
Siemenpuun lehden juliasuteliasuuksia, avauspuhe, Anu Lounela, 01.01.2006 --> 31.12.2011, Finland
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SCA/Kaartinen


Tuulikki Pietilä, Tuulikki.Pietila@helsinki.fi

Etroosil-Teemaseminaari: “No change for non-Europeans?”, järjestäjä Maailmanmusiikinkeskus ja opetusministeriö, Tuulikki Pietilä, 10.11.2006 → 31.12.2011, South Africa

Antropologinen keskustelusarja "Toisten silmin", Kulttuurikeskus Casa, Tuulikki Pietilä, 07.11.2007 → 31.12.2011, United States

Kulttuurinen Museo: Tieteiden yö: Antropologinen Kenttätyön Esittelyä, Tuulikki Pietilä, 11.01.2007 → 31.12.2011, United States


Sirpa Tenhunen, Sirpa.Tenhunen@helsinki.fi

Helsingin Sanomat, vieraskynäkirjoitus, Sirpa Tenhunen, 12.08.2007 → 31.12.2011, Finland

Hämeen Sanomat, Sirpa Tenhunen, 14.08.2007 → 31.12.2011, Finland

Ikäähminen yliopisto, Imatra, Sirpa Tenhunen, 11.09.2007 → 31.12.2011, Finland

Kalva, Sirpa Tenhunen, 15.08.2007 → 31.12.2011, Finland

Kehitysmaahdyöstys Pääläkkien Intia-luentosarja, Sirpa Tenhunen, 25.01.2007 → 31.12.2011, Finland

STT, Sirpa Tenhunen, 15.08.2007 → 31.12.2011, Finland

Suomen yliopistojen rehtorein neuvoston Intia-seminaari, Sirpa Tenhunen, 25.09.2007 → 31.12.2011, Finland

Taloussanomat, Sirpa Tenhunen, 09.08.2007 → 31.12.2011, Finland

Taloussanomat, Sirpa Tenhunen, 14.08.2007 → 31.12.2011, Finland

Turun Sanomat, Sirpa Tenhunen, 09.08.2007 → 31.12.2011, Finland

Turun Sanomat, Sirpa Tenhunen, 15.08.2007 → 31.12.2011, Finland

Ulkoministeriön Kehitys-lehti, Sirpa Tenhunen, 15.01.2007 → 31.12.2011, Finland

Verkkoouutiset, Sirpa Tenhunen, 14.08.2007 → 31.12.2011, Finland

Yliopistoliite, Sirpa Tenhunen, 26.02.2007 → 31.12.2011, Finland


Ikäähminen yliopisto, Lahti, Sirpa Tenhunen, 04.03.2008 → 31.12.2011, Romania


Interview for Premium magazine, Sirpa Tenhunen, 01.11.2010, Finland

Petra Maria Autio, Petra.Autio@helsinki.fi

Haastateltavana Tiedelinko-ohjelmassa, Petra Maria Autio, 16.01.2009, Finland

Timo Kaartinen, Timo.Kaartinen@helsinki.fi


Anu Lounela, Anu.Lounela@helsinki.fi

Ruotsissa toimiva sisuradio, haastattelu, Anu Lounela, 01.01.2005 → 31.01.2005, Finland

Tuulikki Pietilä, Tuulikki.Pietila@helsinki.fi

Radio Yle Peli, Tuulikki Pietilä, 13.01.2007 → 31.12.2011, United States

Radio Yle Ykkönen, Tuulikki Pietilä, 24.01.2007 → 31.12.2011, United States


Vikon tietokirja: Vapaa nainen törmää todellisuuteen, Tuulikki Pietilä, 14.10.2010, Finland

Jukka Siikala, Jukka.Siikala@helsinki.fi

Radiohaastattelu, Jukka Siikala, 17.11.2005 → 31.12.2011, Finland
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SCA/Kaartinen

Sirpa Tenhunen, Sirpa.Tenhunen@helsinki.fi
Radio interview for the Finnish Broadcasting Company, Sirpa Tenhunen, 18.11.2010, Finland

Katja Uusihakala, Katja.Uusihakala@helsinki.fi
Kaaosteoria: Kulttuurien synty (The origin of cultures), Katja Uusihakala, 07.2003 → ..., Finland

Harjavalassa pelataan Afrikan Tähden kääntöpuolta, Katja Uusihakala, 12.10.2009, Finland

Participation in TV programme

Karen Armstrong, Karen.Armstrong@helsinki.fi
Interview, scientific research/Karelia; TV Prisma show 1.4.2005 - shown on tv 18.5.2005, Karen Armstrong, 18.05.2005 → 31.12.2011, Estonia

Toomas Gross, toomas.gross@helsinki.fi
Viron TV, "Välsilm" ("Ulkolinja"), Toomas Gross, 21.09.2006, Estonia

Timo Kaartinen, Timo.Kaartinen@helsinki.fi
Kult-TV (TV1:n kulttuuri- ja ajankohtaisohjelma), Timo Kaartinen, 15.01.2005 → 31.12.2011, Finland

Antti Leppänen, Antti.Leppanen@helsinki.fi
Korean niemimaan kiristynyt tilanne, Antti Leppänen, 12.06.2010, Finland

Katja Uusihakala, Katja.Uusihakala@helsinki.fi
Afrikan Tähti, Katja Uusihakala, 07.03.2008, Finland

Participation in interview for web based media

Petra Maria Autio, Petra.Autio@helsinki.fi
Haastattelu yhtenä asiantuntijoista lehtiartikkelia varten, Petra Maria Autio, 2008, Finland

Sirpa Tenhunen, Sirpa.Tenhunen@helsinki.fi
Interview, Sirpa Tenhunen, 29.11.2010, Denmark
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
- Heikkinen, Markku – RCSP
- Heinämäa, Sara – SHC
- Henriksson, Markku – CITA
- Janhunen, Juha – LDHFTA
- Kaja, Ville – LFP
- Klippi, Anu – Interaction
- Knuutila, Simo – PPMP
- Koskenniemi, Kimmo – BAULT
- Lauha, Aila – CECH
- Lavento, Mika – ARCH-HU
- Lukkarinen, Ville – AHCI
- Lyytikäläinen, Pirjo – GLW
- Mauranen, Anna – LFP
- Meinander, Henrik – HIST
- Nevalainen, Terttu – VARIENG
- Pettersson, Bo – ILLC
- Pulkkinen, Tuja – Gender Studies
- Pyrhönen, Heta – ART
- Ruokanen, Miikka – RELDIAL
- Saarinen, Risto – RELSOC
- Sandu, Gabriel – LMPS
- Tarasti, Eero – MusSig
- Vehmas-Lehto, Inkeri – TraST
- Östman, Jan-Ola – LMS

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

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

Number of authors in publications /

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></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>14</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>144</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Total</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>177</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The publications have mostly only one author (81%).
The language of publications is mostly English (59%), 27% of publications are in Finnish.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language</th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>Grand Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Deutsch (DE)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English (GB)</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estonian (EE)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finnish (FI)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Total</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>177</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Journal / Year / Total

Most of the articles have been published in Suomen Antropologi, in the leading Finnish journal of anthropology. The international journals on the top are Perspectives on Sexual and Reproductive Health and Journal of Latin American and Caribbean Anthropology that belong to the Australian ranking category C. Five of the articles have been published in the leading Finnish newspaper Helsingin Sanomat.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Journal Title</th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>Grand Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Suomen Antropologi</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helsingin Sanomat</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Temenos</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duodecim</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FF Network</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tiede &amp; edistys</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journal of the American Geriatrics Society</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perspectives on Sexual and Reproductive Health</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modern Asian Studies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anaesthesia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terra</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emerging Trends in Development Research</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keel ja Kirjandus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Journal ranking (Norway, Australia, ERIH)

**Norway ranking**

- Level 2 = highest scientific, Level 1= scientific

**Australian ranking**

- A*

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

A

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

B

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

C

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

ERIH ranking 2007-2008

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

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

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

C = European publications with a recognized scholarly significance among researchers in the respective research domains in a particular readership group in Europe; occasionally cited outside the publishing country, though the main target group is the domestic academic community.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Journals</th>
<th>Grand total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Suomen Antropolologi</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Temenos</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journal of the American Geriatrics Society</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perspectives on Sexual and Reproductive Health</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modern Asian Studies</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anaesthesia</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keel ja õigus</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnology</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnos</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COLLeGUM Studies across disciplines in the humanities</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>European Journal of Cultural Studies</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ariadne Lõing: naiste- ja meesuurimuse ajakiri</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journal of the Royal Anthropological Institute</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finnish Journal of Ethnicity and Migration</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian Studies Review</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information, Communication and Society</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Popular music history</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contemporary Pacific</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journal of Latin American and Caribbean Anthropology</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journal of Baltic Studies</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journal of ethnology and folkloristics</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Total</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Amount of ranked articles (Norway)**

Level 2 = highest scientific, Level 1 = scientific

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Norway</th>
<th>Journal articles</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Level 2</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level 1</td>
<td>51</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>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level A</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level B</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level C</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Publisher ranking (based on Norwegian ranking list)

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

C1 Published scientific monograph (10)
C2 Edited book, compilation, conference proceeding or special issue of journal (8)
D5 Text book or professional handbook or guidebook or dictionary (1)

Two books of 19 have been published by a high ranked leading scientific publisher, four by a ranked scientific publisher.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Publisher</th>
<th>C1_C2</th>
<th>C2</th>
<th>D5</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Edita</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equinox</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finnish Academy of Science and Letters</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finnish Anthropological Society</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helsingin kaupunki, opetusvirasto</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HELSINKI COLLEGIUM FOR ADVANCED STUDIES</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orient Blackswan</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pacific Islands Fisheries Science Center Nation</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAGE</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stree</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suomalainen tiedeakatemia</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suomalaisen kirjallisuuden seura</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Tartu</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Wisconsin Press</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VÄESTÖLIITTO</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(blank)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Total</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>