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Foreword

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Johanna Björkroth
Vice-Rector
Chair of the Steering Group of the Evaluation
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1 Introduction to the Evaluation

1.1 RC-specific evaluation reports

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

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

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

1.2 Aims and objectives in the evaluation

The aims of the evaluation are as follows:

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

1.3 Evaluation method

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

---

1 The panellists did not read research reports or abstracts but instead, they evaluated answers to the evaluation questions, tables and compilations of publications, other scientific activities, bibliometrics or comparable analyses.
2 Policies on doctoral degrees and other postgraduate degrees at the University of Helsinki.
The comparison produced information about the present status and factors that have lead to success. Also challenges in the operations and outcomes were recognized.

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

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

### 1.4 Implementation of the external evaluation

**Five Evaluation Panels**
Five evaluation panels consisted of independent, renowned and highly respected experts. The main domains of the panels are:
1. biological, agricultural and veterinary sciences
2. medicine, biomedicine and health sciences
3. natural sciences
4. humanities
5. social sciences

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

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

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

---

\(^3\) TUHAT (acronym) of Research Information System (RIS) of the University of Helsinki  
\(^4\) Supervision of thesis, prizes and awards, editorial work and peer reviews, participation in committees, boards and networks and public appearances.
1.5 Evaluation material

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

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

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

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

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

Evaluation material

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

Background material

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

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

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

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

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

   The additional material: TUHAT compilation of the RC’s publications, analysis of the RC’s publications data (provided by University of Leiden and the Helsinki University Library)

   A written feedback from the aspects of: scientific quality, scientific significance, societal impact, innovativeness
   - Strengths
   - Areas of development
   - Other remarks
   - Recommendations

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

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

   The additional material: TUHAT compilation of the RC’s other scientific activities/supervision of doctoral dissertations

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

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

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

   The additional material: TUHAT compilation of the RC’s other scientific activities.

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

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

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

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

- Strengths
- Areas of development
- Other remarks
- Recommendations

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

5. Operational conditions

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

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

- Strengths
- Areas of development
- Other remarks
- Recommendations

6. Leadership and management in the researcher community

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

7. External competitive funding of the RC

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

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

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

- Strengths
- Areas of development
- Other remarks
- Recommendations

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

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

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

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

The RC’s fitness to the chosen participation category
A written feedback evaluating the RC’s fitness to the chosen participation category

- Strengths
- Areas of development
- Other remarks
- Recommendations

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

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

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

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

13. RC-specific conclusions

1.7 Evaluation criteria

The panellists were expected to give evaluative and analytical feedback to each evaluation question according to their aspects in order to describe and justify the quality of the submitted material. In addition, the evaluation feedback was asked to be pointed out the level of the performance according to the following classifications:

- outstanding (5)
- excellent (4)
- very good (3)
- good (2)
- sufficient (1)

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

Description of criteria levels

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

Classification: Criteria (level of procedures and results)

Outstanding quality of procedures and results (5)

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

In cases where the research is of a national character and, in the judgement of the evaluators, should remain so, the concepts of “international attention” or “international impact” etc. in the grading criteria above may be replaced by “international comparability”.

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

Excellent quality of procedures and results (4)
Research of excellent quality. Typically published with great impact, also internationally. Without doubt, the research has a leading position in its field in Finland.
Operations and procedures are of excellent quality, transparent and shared in the community. The improvement of research and other efforts are documented and operations and practices are to large extent in alignment with the documentation. The ambition to develop the community together is of excellent quality.

Very good quality of procedures and results (3)
The research is of such very good quality that it attracts wide national and international attention.
Operations and procedures are of very good quality, transparent and shared in the community. The improvement of research and other efforts are documented and operations and practices are to large extent in alignment with the documentation. The ambition to develop the community together is of very good quality.

Good quality of procedures and results (2)
Good research attracting mainly national attention but possessing international potential, extraordinarily high relevance may motivate good research.
Operations and procedures are of good quality, shared occasionally in the community. The improvement of research and other efforts are occasionally documented and operations and practices are to large extent in alignment with the documentation. The ambition to develop the community together is of good quality.

Sufficient quality of procedures and results (1)
In some cases the research is insufficient and reports do not gain wide circulation or do not have national or international attention. Research activities should be revised.
Operations and procedures are of sufficient quality, shared occasionally in the community. The improvement of research and other efforts are occasionally documented and operations and practices are to some extent in alignment with the documentation. The ambition to develop the community together is of sufficient quality.

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

Classification: Criteria (level of procedures and results)

Outstanding quality of procedures and results (5)
Procedures are of outstanding quality, transparent and shared in the community. The practices and quality of doctoral training/societal impact/international and national collaboration/leadership and management are documented and operations and practices are in alignment with the documentation. The ambition to develop the community together is of outstanding quality. The procedures and results are regularly evaluated and the feedback has an effect on the planning.

Excellent quality of procedures and results (4)
Procedures are of excellent quality, transparent and shared in the community. The practices and quality of doctoral training/societal impact/international and national collaboration/leadership and management are documented and operations and practices are to large extent in alignment with the documentation. The ambition to develop the community together is of excellent quality. The procedures and outcomes are evaluated and the feedback has an effect on the planning.

Very good quality of procedures and results (3)
Procedures are of very good quality, transparent and shared in the community. The practices and quality of doctoral training/societal impact/international and national collaboration/leadership and
management are documented and operations and practices are to large extent in alignment with the documentation. The ambition to develop the community together is of very good quality.

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

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

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

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

**Question 9 – CATEGORY**

Participation category – fitness for the category chosen

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

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

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

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

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

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

---

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

The main timetable of the evaluation:

1. Registration  November 2010
3. External peer review  May–September 2011
4. Published reports  March–April 2012
   - University level public report
   - RC specific reports

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

1.9 Evaluation feedback – consensus of the entire panel

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

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

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

2.1 Focus and quality of the RC’s research

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

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

This RC’s has a multidisciplinary research program that integrates scientists from the areas of psychology, sociology, educational sciences, epidemiology, genetics, psychiatry, neurology, cardiology, pediatrics, and internal medicine.

Research is presented in 4 separate areas, including 1) studies of personality as an adaptive system shaped by temperament, social learning, environment and genes, 2) determinants of psychological, social and somatic well-being (including the leading causes of morbidity in Western countries), 3) interactions of childhood environment and genes in the development of personality and health and social outcomes. The research combines epidemiological, social, biological, neuroscientific and advanced statistical methods to answer research questions. Large-scale Finnish population cohorts are used to conduct this research. There is an extensive network of national and international collaborators.

The Stage 2 materials are exceptionally well and clearly written. For each of the above research domains, the main novel findings are summarized. For each section, both the research program and the relevance/implication of the doctoral training are described and integrated. This is highly commendable.

The research program is characterized by highly innovative, current and relevant research questions. It seems that the RC optimally used and embellishes on the existing Finnish cohorts -- both for research but also for doctoral training/theses. The RC is highly productive as evidenced by a very large number of high profile original publications over the past 5 years (422) and a good number of doctoral students with 4 of the doctoral students now being professors themselves. The researches and the students have received substantial awards. Given that the members of the RC have only been affiliated with the UH since about 5-6 years, this is highly impressive.

The RC does not specifically formulate areas or plans of improvement.

Remark

One area of concern is that the majority of publications is in medical journals and based on medical study programmes with members of the TC being collaborators. It remains somewhat unclear what the contribution of the RC was in these publications. The RC should emphasize an overarching theory/goal.

Numeric evaluation: 5 (Outstanding)

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.
The RC presents a very clear and structured plan of the doctoral training. All of the above points are commented on.

It appears that the selection process is fair and targeted on identifying the most talented students.

The supervision of doctoral students is organized in a way that each student has a main supervisor in their own discipline, but additional supervisors from other disciplines, which fosters multidisciplinary thinking. Key areas of the training include research methods, statistics and scientific writing. Of note, many supervisors have had university pedagogical training and the supervising is being continuously improved. It is highly commendable that doctoral candidates are allowed to select or develop a topic according to their own interests (and are not assigned topics). They can then use the data of the cohort studies to answer research questions.

There are extensive collaborations with other faculties and institutions, which participate in the doctoral training, including networks at an international level. All students are encouraged to participate in the Psykonet Graduate School and some of them are funded through this school.

It appears that the RC particularly emphasizes that doctoral students participate and learn scientific practices from early on in their careers, i.e. scientific writing, conference presentations, etc. Four publications are required to graduate with a PhD. It is emphasized by the RC that these publications should be in high impact journals early on. This early training is extremely important.

The RC provides information regarding the placement of candidates after their degrees are completed. It appears that many of their doctoral students went on to have successful independent careers. The RC provides career assistance beyond the PhD degree into the postdoctoral phase. Mobility to institutions abroad is fostered.

The RC formulates 3 areas with challenges/areas of development, all of which would further improve the training (all supervisors need to take pedagogic training, forming collaborations inside of faculty, forming tighter contacts to organizations and companies outside of the research community).

Remarks: It should be stated how the students learn about the context, theories, content of research beyond the methods. How do they gain an understanding of a particular field?

**Numeric evaluation: 5 (Outstanding)**

### 2.3 The societal impact of research and doctoral training

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

**Identification of the ways to strengthen the societal impact of the RC’s research and doctoral training.**

**Additional material: TUHAT compilation of the RC’s other scientific activities.**

**ASPECTS: Societal impact, national and international collaboration, innovativeness**

The RC has a strong societal impact.

First, the topics studied by the RC are highly socially relevant. For example, the RC focuses on many of the leading causes of morbidity and death in the Western society. By identifying developmental risk factors and determinants of these disorders, the RC contributes to identifying targets for prevention and control of these disorders in the society.

Second, the RC’s research focuses on childhood factors as well as chronic stresses, e.g. in the workplace. Insights of the research have been translated into policy at the school level. There is also collaboration with research institutes concerning amelioration of stress at the work place. Hence, the RC should be commended for translating their research into practice.

Third, there seems to be a quite extensive engagement in public dissemination of research results. Members of the RC spent significant effort in public education, public media reports, etc.

All of these efforts enhance the RC’s contribution to society.
Areas of Development: The RC formulates areas of development which would further improve their societal impact. For instance, it is suggested to increase contact with public organizations and companies that could provide feedback of their needs which could be used to design new studies.

Recommendation: Given that a large proportion of the research is concerned with childhood risk factors, collaboration with child welfare offices to implement specific preventions would be recommended.

Numeric evaluation: 5 (Outstanding)

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 has extensive collaboration with researchers at the national and international level.

For each research area within the RC (Personality Psychology, Behavioral Genetics, Psychosomatic Research, Social Epidemiology, Experimental Personality Psychology), the RC provides a list of collaborators.

These include some of the most renowned international researchers in the respective field. Collaborators are within Finland and from UK, USA, Sweden, France, and other countries.

Importantly, it appears that these collaborations are very active and result in joint publications as well as joint supervision of theses.

International experts are invited as opponents in defences of theses.

It is specifically emphasized that students are encouraged to spend time in collaborator labs and that students of these collaborators are visiting the RC at HU. Research visits of renowned leaders in the field have also been hosted.

Students are also required to participate in international conferences.

A research visit exchange program is currently developed in conjunction with Washington University in St. Louis.

A challenge is to provide funding for visits abroad. The plan is to provide such funding for visits of 2–6 months. Another challenge is mentioned to refer to knowledge and skill transfer from collaborators to the RC.

Remarks

Research visits of 2–6 months abroad might be insufficient to have a benefit for the RC.

Numeric evaluation: 5 (Outstanding)

2.5 Operational conditions

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

ASPECTS: Processes and good practices related to leadership and management

The RC is a rather large group with 12 professors, 11 senior researchers, 2 post-docs, and 12 doctoral students. There is a good amount of external funding. The RC acknowledges that a major strength in terms
of infrastructure is the availability of high-quality large prospective epidemiological and psychological cohort datasets. Researchers and trainees can draw from these datasets. Basic resources for the research are provided by the University. In addition, the RC has its own lab space to be used for experimental research and training purposes. Genetic and medical data is gathered through collaborations. The large collaborative research network is an advantage. Due to funding, support staff could be hired. Overall, the infrastructure seems extremely strong and supportive for a strong research and doctoral training program.

The RC provides information on a teaching load in personality psychology and general courses, which seems to be in the normal range.

Remark
Where are these large scale datasets located? Are members of the RC the PI’s of these datasets? Is the access to these datasets unique to this RC? Is there overlap with DEVPSY?

Challenges: It appears to be a challenge to maintain the laboratory and to secure continuous funding to consistently maintain all areas of the RC and continuously improve the RC. There appears to be a lack of time to prepare funding applications, as stated by the RC.

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 leadership and management of the RC seem to be exceptionally well organized. The larger RC is divided into subunits, each of which has their own leader. Each research discipline has even smaller subunits with people in charge. As a basic principal, all members of the RC work together and all have the same rights and responsibilities. Data sharing and collaboration are the basic philosophy of the RC. There is a weekly meeting for the Core RC and half-yearly meetings for the entire RC. A specific emphasis is given to direct personal contacts and avoiding bureaucracy, in order to maintain the RC flexible.

Remarks: The Core RC should be better defined. Half yearly meetings for the extended RC seem infrequent.

2.7 External competitive funding of the RC

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

Competitive funding reported in the text is also to be considered when evaluating this point.
The RC lists the following funding:

- 1,200,000 Euros from the Academy of Finland (AF)
- 1,070,000 Euros from University funds, graduate schools, and different foundations

This is the funding for 5 years.

The funding seems relatively low in relation to the number of publications and dissertations.

The RC could be commended for being productive with relatively limited funding.

The RC should apply for more funding, including funding from international funding agencies (with their collaborators) and funding for research training.

It is assumed that research with collaborators is funded in their respective countries but was not listed in the evaluation material.

More details regarding the funding of the cohort datasets is needed.

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.

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 1. The research of the participating community represents the international cutting edge in its field.

RC is fit for the chosen category. The research is clearly cutting edge as evidenced by number of publications in high impact journals, international collaborations, scientific review activities, and awards.

Numeric evaluation: 5 (Outstanding)

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

All RC members have participated. No specifics provided.

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

The RC spans across areas 4, 5, and 6. The RC itself made no selection because none of the areas seemed adequate.

2.12 RC-specific main recommendations

1. Increase funding through collaborative grants
2. Increase mutuality of collaborations and knowledge transfer
3. Increase doctoral exchange programs with collaborators, including hosting doctoral students and postdocs from abroad at UH

2.13 RC-specific conclusions

This is a highly functioning and prolific RC with a cutting edge multidisciplinary research program and a very successful doctoral training program. There are very few weaknesses. Funding could be improved. The RC should find a more unified research profile/goal and should improve on strategic planning.
3 Appendices

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

B. Bibliometric analyses
   a. Analysis provided by CWTS/University of Leiden
   b. Analysis provided by Helsinki University Library (66 RCs)
International evaluation of research and doctoral training at the University of Helsinki 2005-2010

RC-SPECIFIC MATERIAL FOR THE PEER REVIEW

NAME OF THE RESEARCHER COMMUNITY:
Personality and Well-Being (PEWE)

LEADER OF THE RESEARCHER COMMUNITY:
Professor Liisa Keltikangas-Järvinen, Institute of Behavioural Sciences, University of Helsinki

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
- Web of Science(WoS)-based bibliometrics of the RC’s publications data 1.1.2005-31.12.2010 (analysis carried out by CWTS, Leiden University)

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: Keltikangas-Järvinen, Liisa  
E-mail: liisa.keltikangas-jarvinen@helsinki.fi  
Phone: 19129500  
Affiliation: The Institute of Behavioural Sciences, University of Helsinki  
Street address: P.O. Box 9 (Siltavuorenpenkari 1A), 00014 University of Helsinki

2 DESCRIPTION OF THE PARTICIPATING RESEARCHER COMMUNITY (RC)

Name of the participating RC (max. 30 characters): Personality and Well-Being  
Acronym for the participating RC (max. 10 characters): PEWE  
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): “Personality and Well-being” research community (RC) pools the researchers studying the development of personality and personality disorders, and/or personality’s social and health outcomes throughout the life course. RC is highly multidisciplinary comprising researchers from domestic and international universities and institutes. The following disciplines are represented: psychology, sociology, educational sciences, epidemiology, genetics, psychiatry, neurology, cardiology, pediatrics, internal medicine, nutrition. RC is joined by common research topics and grants, shared epidemiological data and joint doctoral training, and the results are manifested as joint papers. The research can be summarized by the following domains. First, we explore personality as an adaptive system shaped by the interplay of temperament and socioculturally learned personality components, and study the gene by environment interactions in a development of temperament and personality. Second, we study the determinants of psychological, social and somatic wellbeing, such as depression, social drop out and stress including chronic stress, acute task-induced stress and work stress. Somatic well-being is studied in terms of preclinical precursors (atherosclerosis and insulin resistance syndrome) of coronary heart disease (CHD) and type 2 diabetes; we examine a role of personality, stress and behavioral risk factors in their pathogenesis. Depression, CHD and type 2 diabetes belong to leading causes of morbidity in Western countries. Interactions of childhood environment and genetic background in the life-course development of personality, its disorders and health and social outcomes are of interest. In this context, personality is studied as a psychobiological factor that predisposes a person to adverse experiences or protects from detrimental environments. In addition, our research highlights the difference between personality and temperament by examining their life-span developmental trends, helps to understand the biological background of temperament with the methods of molecular genetics and brain imaging studies, and shows a role of a temperament in one’s stress proneness.
INTERNATIONAL EVALUATION OF RESEARCH AND DOCTORAL TRAINING AT THE UNIVERSITY OF HELSINKI

RC-SPECIFIC STAGE 1 MATERIAL (registration form)

3 SCIENTIFIC FIELDS OF THE RC

Main scientific field of the RC's research: social sciences

RC's scientific subfield 1: Psychology, Multidisciplinary

RC's scientific subfield 2: Psychology, Biological

RC's scientific subfield 3: Public, Environmental and Occupational Health

RC's scientific subfield 4: Cardiac and Cardiovascular System

Other, if not in the list: Behavioral genetics

4 RC'S PARTICIPATION CATEGORY

Participation category: 1. Research of the participating community represents the international cutting edge in its field

Justification for the selected participation category (MAX. 2200 characters with spaces): We want to be evaluated in the category of "Research of the participating community represents the international cutting edge in its field". This category has been justified by bibliographic information. A) This research community has participated in an international evaluation (in another context) resulting to the ranking of "belong the highest 1% in the field of medical epidemiology". B) Three of the researchers of this RC exist on the domestic top ten ranking list of the Scholar Chart Medical Researchers. One of them is psychologist (nota bene the ranking list of Medical Researchers). C) Individual citation indices and H-indices are high. Further, the RC has published several papers that can be seen as landmark papers, e.g. the literature's first findings on a role of childhood temperament in adulthood atherosclerosis, a role of an inherited temperament in adulthood stress, gene-by-childhood interaction in a life-course development of depression. These papers have received a lot of interest in scientific circles. We have an active co-work with the leading international scientists. Our doctoral training has been effective and high of quality. From the first beginning, the doctoral students learn to write and publish in international peer-reviewed journals, and get familiarized with international co-work.

5 DESCRIPTION OF THE RC'S RESEARCH AND DOCTORAL TRAINING

Public description of the RC's research and doctoral training (MAX. 2200 characters with spaces): The high quality of papers, multidisciplinary international co-work and societally relevant themes belong to the strengths of our RC. Key points of our doctoral training are systematic training in research methods, statistics and scientific writing to be organized within the group, continuous individual supervision received from scientists of many fields, active multidisciplinary collaboration and opportunities for international co-work. From the first beginning, the students are expected to publish their papers in high-grade international scientific journals, and they are highly encouraged to reach for high-impact journals for their publications. Training is provided by all senior members of the group, and all doctoral students in the group have got two or three supervisors. Owing to the multidisciplinary nature of the group, the students receive primary feedback from the supervisor within their own discipline, and additional feed-back from group members of other scientific fields. Our doctoral students are encouraged to join the Psykonet
Graduate School for Psychology that is a national network specializing in doctoral training in psychology, and that offers methodological education to the doctoral students. All our doctoral students take part in national and international multidisciplinary collaboration that is constantly going on in the group. In addition, students take part in regularly held national multidisciplinary seminars organized by our group. Doctoral students are offered opportunities to carry out part of their theses work abroad through our network of collaborators. Further, they have had continually opportunities to work together with international visitors of the group. Among those visitors, all levels of scientific carrier has been represented, i.e. both world-famous professors and novice at post graduate research have worked in our study group. Our students have served as co-authors of the papers of our international visitors. Since the first beginning doctoral students take part in international conferences in order to present their findings. Opponents for doctoral theses come abroad and are distinguished scientists of their field.

Significance of the RC's research and doctoral training for the University of Helsinki (MAX. 2200 characters with spaces): Significance of our RC for the University of Helsinki (HU) can be defined in terms of the quality and quantity of published papers and doctoral dissertations, and a high societal relevance of our study. The number of doctoral theses has been high: during the last 10 years, our study group by oneself has produced at least one doctoral thesis per year for the HU. With an exception of two theses, all of them have received the best possible grades (eximia or laudatur) thereby raising the quality of dissertations produced at the HU. Four theses of our study group have received the award of the best annual thesis of the faculty, and one the best annual thesis of the University of Helsinki. Furthermore, all dissertations produced in the group are article based (at least four papers published in high quality international scientific journals), which have increased the number of international publications and raised the profile of University of Helsinki. The group has taken up the challenge of promoting internationality in the doctoral training. Distinguished scientists from abroad have been invited as opponents. Furthermore, the group has welcomed doctoral students and post-doctoral researchers from abroad to work in the group. The group has also sent doctoral students to work abroad to gain international experience in research. In addition, the group has initiated and organized doctoral training for the whole faculty in the form of courses on international publishing. As regards the significance of our research for the HU, we have published c. 40 papers with an affiliation of the University of Helsinki the mean of the impacts of the journals being 5.8 reflecting a high quality of the papers. Many papers have resulted on non-scientific reviews and international and domestic media interviews. Thus, the societal visibility of our research has been high. Many of our research themes focus on important health and social issues (early prevention of coronary heart disease, type 2 diabetes, social and educational drop out etc.) that additionally increases a societal relevance of our study and leads to use our researchers as experts in several fields of the society.

Keywords: Personality, temperament, stress, life-course personality development, epidemiology, cardiac diseases, depression, coronary heart disease, type 2 diabetes, metabolic syndrome, atherosclerosis, long QT syndrome, brain imaging, behavioral genetics, childhood environment, health, occupational health, gene by environment interactions.
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RC-SPECIFIC STAGE 1 MATERIAL (registration form)

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): Quality of doctoral training and research at the national and international level

The group publishes in high ranking international journals. The group has found significant novel results as first in their field forming landmark findings. Even at international scope, the large population-based epidemiological data sets the group has at its use are unique. Around these data, a circle of international collaboration network including top of their field scientists has been developed.

The group includes several high ranking scientist as measured with citation indexes, eminent grants and awards, positions of trust, and invitations to act as key note speakers at international scientific conferences. Furthermore, several group members are included in the top 10 of Finnish medical ranking lists tapping international publishing merits.

The group continuously produces a considerable number of high quality dissertations that have received best marks and been awarded at faculty and university levels. Furthermore, the dissertations produced in the group have included significant novel findings that have been emphasized by the opponents. Research and dissertations produced by the group have received lot of public attention because of their societal relevance.

Comments on how the RC’s scientific productivity and doctoral training should be evaluated (MAX. 2200 characters with spaces): Research findings of the RC have been published in peer-reviewed international journals. Thus, the primary criteria for assessing the productivity and quality of our RC are the numbers of international papers, the impacts of the scientific journals where the papers have been published (means and medians of the individual researchers), the total citation indexes and H-indexes of individual researchers to be based on the WebSci system, i.e. the most traditional criteria that are used in the scientific evaluation. Further, the international record and visibility would be evaluated on the bases of invited, especially key note congress papers, and invitations to serve as reviewers for international grant applications and applications for offices, invitations to serve as opponents for doctoral theses, as members of different scientific boards and evaluation panels, and invitations to participate in scientific committees, i.e. on the bases of all activities that have traditionally been seen to reflect one’s scientific record. Different kind of ranking lists like the Scholar Chart of Medical Research are fit for use, too. As a rule, our publishing strategy makes the generally accepted scientific indexes most useful to evaluate our quality. Further, the non-scientific visibility (reviews and interviews in international and domestic medium) is of importance, too. Our research themes are of high societal relevance (early prevention of the leading health problems like coronary heart disease, depression and type 2 diabetes, societal drop out etc.). Therefore, popular books, reviews and interviews are in central position in our work, too. Regarding doctoral training within our RC, the numbers and grades of the doctoral theses are the first indexes to show the quality of the training. Further, our theses are based on international papers. Thus, the impacts of the journals where the
papers are published, and their status on the ranking lists of the journals give tools for evaluation, too. Again, generally accepted indexes are usable. Congress invitations and non-scientific interviews of the doctoral students are also relevant in evaluation of our doctoral training.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Last name</th>
<th>First name</th>
<th>PI-status (TUHAT-check, lista 29.11.)</th>
<th>Title of research and teaching personnel</th>
<th>Affiliation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Alatupa</td>
<td>Saija</td>
<td>Doctoral candidate</td>
<td>The Institute of Behavioural Sciences, University of Helsinki</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Chumaeva</td>
<td>Nadezda</td>
<td>Postdoctoral Researcher</td>
<td>The Institute of Behavioural Sciences, University of Helsinki</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Elovainio</td>
<td>Marko</td>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>The Institute of Behavioural Sciences, University of Helsinki</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Hakulinen</td>
<td>Christian</td>
<td>Doctoral candidate</td>
<td>The Institute of Behavioural Sciences, University of Helsinki</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Heponiemi</td>
<td>Tarja</td>
<td>Senior Researcher</td>
<td>Department of Psychology, University of Helsinki</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Hintsa</td>
<td>Taina</td>
<td>x Senior Researcher</td>
<td>The Institute of Behavioural Sciences, University of Helsinki</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Hintsanen</td>
<td>Mirka</td>
<td>x University Lecturer</td>
<td>The Institute of Behavioural Sciences, University of Helsinki</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Jokela</td>
<td>Markus</td>
<td>x Senior Researcher</td>
<td>The Institute of Behavioural Sciences, University of Helsinki</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Josefsson</td>
<td>Kim</td>
<td>Doctoral candidate</td>
<td>The Institute of Behavioural Sciences, University of Helsinki</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Kaven</td>
<td>Pertti</td>
<td>Doctoral candidate</td>
<td>Faculty of Arts, University of Helsinki</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Keltikangas-Järvinen</td>
<td>Liisa</td>
<td>x Professor</td>
<td>The Institute of Behavioural Sciences, University of Helsinki</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Kivimäki</td>
<td>Mika</td>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>The Institute of Behavioural Sciences, University of Helsinki</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Merjonen</td>
<td>Päivi</td>
<td>Doctoral candidate</td>
<td>The Institute of Behavioural Sciences, University of Helsinki</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Mullola</td>
<td>Sari</td>
<td>Doctoral candidate</td>
<td>The Institute of Behavioural Sciences, University of Helsinki</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Määttänen</td>
<td>Ilmari</td>
<td>Doctoral candidate</td>
<td>The Institute of Behavioural Sciences, University of Helsinki</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Pulkki-Råback</td>
<td>Laura</td>
<td>University Lecturer</td>
<td>The Institute of Behavioural Sciences, University of Helsinki</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Putkonen</td>
<td>Sampsa</td>
<td>x Senior Researcher</td>
<td>Department of Psychology, University of Helsinki</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Ravaja</td>
<td>Niklas</td>
<td>Senior Researcher</td>
<td>Department of Psychology, University of Helsinki</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Rosenström</td>
<td>Tom</td>
<td>Doctoral candidate</td>
<td>The Institute of Behavioural Sciences, University of Helsinki</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Salo</td>
<td>Johanna</td>
<td>Doctoral candidate</td>
<td>The Institute of Behavioural Sciences, University of Helsinki</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Santavirta</td>
<td>Nina</td>
<td>x University Lecturer</td>
<td>The Institute of Behavioural Sciences, University of Helsinki</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Santavirta</td>
<td>Torsten</td>
<td>Doctoral candidate</td>
<td>Aalto University School of Economics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Swan</td>
<td>Heikki</td>
<td>Senior Researcher</td>
<td>Department of Cardiology, University of Helsinki</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Tolvenen</td>
<td>Lauri</td>
<td>x Senior Researcher</td>
<td>Department of Cardiology, University of Helsinki</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Törnvist</td>
<td>Cecilia</td>
<td>Doctoral candidate</td>
<td>The Institute of Behavioural Sciences, University of Helsinki</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Virtanen</td>
<td>Marianna</td>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>Department of Psychology, University of Helsinki</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Collaborators from outside the University of Helsinki:

- Cloninger Robert Professor Department of Psychiatry, Washington university in St. Louis, USA
- Hietala Jarno Professor Department of Psychiatry, University of Turku
- Lehtimäki Terho Professor Medical School, University of Tampere
- Raitakari Olli Professor Department of Clinical Physiology, University of Turku
- Smith George Davey Professor Department of Social Medicine, University of Bristol, UK
- Telama Risto Professor Department of Physical Education, University of Jyväskylä
- Theorell Töres Professor Department of Public Health Sciences, Karolinska Institute, Stockholm, Sweden
- Vilkkari Jorma Professor Department of Medicine, University of Turku
- Yang Xiaolin Senior researcher LIKES, Research Center for Sport and Health Sciences, Jyväskylä
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BACKGROUND INFORMATION

Name of the RC’s responsible person: Keltikangas-Järvinen, Liisa
E-mail of the RC’s responsible person: liisa.keltikangas-jarvinen@helsinki.fi
Name and acronym of the participating RC: Personality and Well-Being, PEWE
The RC’s research represents the following key focus area of UH: -- Select --
Comments for selecting/not selecting the key focus area: None of those categories were completely adequate

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 can be summarized by the following domains. First, we study personality as an adaptive system shaped by the interplay of temperament and socioculturally learned personality components, and study the gene by environment interactions in a development of temperament and personality. Second, we study the determinants of psychological, social and somatic wellbeing, such as depression, social exclusion and stress including chronic stress, acute task-induced stress and work stress. Somatic well-being is studied in terms of preclinical precursors of coronary heart disease (CHD) and type 2 diabetes; we examine a role of personality, stress and behavioral risk factors in their pathogenesis. Depression, CHD and type 2 diabetes belong to leading causes of morbidity in Western countries. Third, interactions of childhood environment and genetic background in the life-course development of personality, its disorders and health and social outcomes are in focus. In this context, personality is studied as a psychobiological factor that predisposes a person to adverse experiences or protects from detrimental environments. In addition, our research highlights the individual characteristics of personality and temperament by examining their life-span developmental trends, helps to understand the biological background of temperament with the methods of molecular genetics and brain imaging studies, and shows a role of temperament in one’s stress proneness.

The key research questions are: (1) what is the role of childhood environment, temperament and personality in social and health outcomes (especially in cardiovascular health and depression), (2) what are the effects of childhood environment, dispositions and stressful life-events on the development of personality, stress vulnerability, atherosclerosis, metabolic syndrome and diabetes, and (3) what is the influence of acute and chronic stress on cardiovascular health, depression, development of personality, and social exclusion.

Early development of cardiovascular morbidity. Our most recent findings show that activity temperament traits both in childhood (women) and in adulthood (both sexes) are associated with preclinical atherosclerosis. We have shown that interaction between temperamental and environmental factors contributes to increased risk of CHD. The child’s difficult temperament (low sociability, hyperactivity and negative emotionality) and the mother’s hostile attitudes towards the child are related to increased somatic CHD risk factors in children. Children with a difficult temperament may be especially vulnerable to the adverse effects of hostile child-rearing. We have also found substantial age- and gender-related variation in the temperament dimensions that are associated with somatic CHD risk, suggesting that cultural norms of acceptable behavior play a role in defining the risk temperament.
Stress reactivity. We have also found that chronic stress that leads to ineffective cardiac stress reactivity is linked to preclinical atherosclerosis in men. Furthermore, we have shown that chronic psychosocial stress plays a role on the hypothalamic-pituitary-adrenocortical (HPA) axis dysfunction. The HPA axis is associated with metabolic abnormalities contributing to CHD risk. We suggest that it is the final stage of stress, called exhaustion, that is especially relevant in predicting HPA axis dysregulation and thus CHD risk. When combined with depressive tendencies the risk might be highest. In addition, we have revealed that the cardiac reactivity pattern of high heart rate, respiratory sinus arrhythmia and pre-ejection period has been shown to be associated with less preclinical atherosclerosis, thus, better cardiovascular health.

Psychosocial risk factors. We have found that work stress may be more detrimental to the vascular health of carriers of certain genotypes of neuregulin-1 and COMT genes than to carriers of other genotypes of these genes. These findings are the first examining genotypes interacting with work stress on atherosclerosis development and they therefore opened a new area of research for psychosocial cardiovascular epidemiology. Understanding the role played by genetic factors may provide new insights into the mechanisms linking psychological factors with CHD. Our findings emphasize the importance of childhood psychosocial factors and psychosocial stress in the development of CHD. All these results can help in explaining the between-individual variation in CHD morbidity. Although work stress originates mainly from work characteristics, temperament and personality seem to contribute to long-term work stress (low novelty seeking and high harm avoidance). We have also shown that Type A behavior component leadership predicts lower long-term work stress. Stressful childhood environments may contribute to later stress vulnerability. Our research findings show that deficient nurturing attitudes in childhood might affect sensitivity to work stress and selection into stressful work conditions in adulthood.

Behavioral risk factors in Long QT Syndrome, LQTS (inherited arrhythmia syndrome). We have recently found that LQTS mutation carriers who have arrhythmic events score higher in depressive symptoms than the asymptomatic ones. Furthermore, symptomatic LQTS mutation carriers have experienced more major stressful life events than the asymptomatic. Chronic mental stress is also related to increased risk of arrhythmias in LQTS.

Gene-environment interactions in development of depression. We have shown that certain temperament traits increase the risk of depressive symptoms. We have also reported that social support may be a long-term protective factor from depressive symptoms, even irrespective of personality characteristics. One of the most important findings concerns the ability of individuals to use environmental support. We showed that serotonin receptor 2A (HTR2A) gene moderates the association between childhood nurturance and depressive symptoms in adulthood so that in the presence of high maternal nurture the T/T and T/C genotype carriers expressed low levels of depressive symptoms in adulthood. This indicates that some genotypes may help the individual to benefit from the positive factors in the environment. Therefore, our finding shows that it is also important to examine potentially advantageous genotypes. Furthermore, we showed that low social support predicts higher level of depressive symptoms in the presence of the tryptophan hydroxylase 1 gene (TPH1) A allele genotype in adults. We reported dopamine receptor gene DRD2 to moderate the association between stressful life events and depressive symptoms in adults so that occurrence of stressful life events was associated with increased risk or depressive symptoms among those who were A2/A2 allele carriers.

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

The scientific significance and impact of the RC’s contribution for the above mentioned research fields are demonstrated by RC’s novel findings that are often published in high impact journals, and several evoked editorial comments on these research reports. Large-scale longitudinal data covering several decades of follow-up and combining several data sources (self-reports, parent-reports, objective
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medical data, genes, laboratory measures, brain imaging) makes it possible to examine issues that could not be studied with less comprehensive datasets. In addition, one measure of significance of our results is the continuous interest of public media toward our research findings and the dozens of interviews and public speeches given by the RC members. The RC members have also received prestigious awards for their scientific work.

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.

Selection of candidates

The selection of students to the Master’s program in psychology at the University of Helsinki is based on a rigorous entrance examination, and only less than five percent of the applicants are admitted; having gone through such a sieve requiring several months of preparation, the student population is highly talented and motivated. Promising doctoral students interested in continuing in the academia are then selected based on exceptional talent demonstrated in conducting and writing the master’s thesis. Furthermore, students with additional qualifications, such as another academic degree in a related subject (e.g. statistics), are given preference. Our research group enjoys great popularity and interest among the research oriented students, which provides us a rich talent pool from which to select the most promising doctoral students.

Supervision

Key points of our doctoral training are systematic training in research methods, statistics and scientific writing to be organized within the group, continuous individual supervision received from scientists of many fields, active multidisciplinary collaboration and opportunities for international co-work. Training is provided by all senior members of the group, and all doctoral students in the group have two or three supervisors. Owing to the multidisciplinary nature of the group, the students receive primary feedback from the supervisor within their own discipline, and additional feed-back from group members from other scientific fields. Many of the supervisors have taken part in extensive university pedagogical training and the supervising is continuously improved. The doctoral candidates are allowed to select a topic according to their own interests and they can use RC’s several unique datasets in their thesis research.

Collaboration with faculties, departments, graduate schools

Our doctoral candidates have received several competitive funded researcher positions in Psykonet Graduate School of Psychology, which is a national network specializing in doctoral training in psychology, and which offers methodological education to the doctoral candidates as well as funds the doctoral thesis work of the most talented students. All our doctoral students are encouraged to join in the Psykonet Graduate School for Psychology either on funded position or affiliate position. All our doctoral students take part in national and international multidisciplinary collaboration that is constantly going on in the group. Our collaborators include researchers from several universities and faculties in Finland (e.g. Department of medicine, University of Turku; Department of Clinical Chemistry, University of Tampere) and abroad (e.g. Center of well-being, Washington University in St. Louis, USA;
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The Department of Epidemiology and Public Health, University College of London, UK; Department of Public Health Sciences, Karolinska Institute, Sweden; Departments of Human Genetics and Psychiatry & Biobehavioural Sciences, UCLA, USA; Institute of Social Work, University of Tallinn, Estonia). We also have several collaborators at several research institutes in Finland (e.g., National Institute of Welfare and Health, Finnish Institute of Occupational Health, and Population Research Unit).

Good practices
From the beginning, the students receive intensive supervision and individual instruction on writing and statistical analyses. Also from the beginning of their training, the students are expected to publish their papers in high-impact international scientific journals. The success of this approach is illustrated by research papers of our doctoral students published in journals such as Archives of General Psychiatry, Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, American Journal of Epidemiology, and Psychotherapy and Psychosomatics. Doctoral students are offered opportunities to carry out part of their theses work abroad through our network of collaborators. Further, the RC’s doctoral candidates have continuing opportunities to work together with international visitors of the group. Among those visitors, all levels of scientific careers have been represented: leading professors in their fields to novices at post graduate research have worked in our study group. The doctoral students also actively take part in international conferences in personality and social psychology, epidemiology, and behavioral medicine to present and discuss their findings with other researchers, and even first year doctoral candidates have won prices for their presentations in these conferences.

Assuring good career perspectives for the doctoral candidates
In our group, the high scientific quality of the research, wide network of collaboration and international publishing that the candidates take part in, gives the candidates strong professional expertise. In addition, the doctoral students are given continuous mentoring and advice for example on study subjects and activities that would best benefit their career after the dissertation. Furthermore, they are given opportunities to take part in teaching and in supervising master’s theses, which helps them especially if they aspire for university career. They are also encouraged to take university pedagogic courses, which allows them to further develop their academic skills. The doctoral students have been highly successful in attracting competitive funding, including a total of 18 personal grants for doctoral research during the last five years. We also recognize other career paths besides the academia, and discuss such possibilities with the candidates in order to tailor individual plans at an early stage. Apart from two, all RC’s doctoral theses at the University of Helsinki have received highest marks (Eximia or Laudatur) and several have received university and faculty prizes. Doctoral students graduating from our group have been highly successful in finding subsequent employment. So far 20 doctoral dissertations have been produced using the Young Finns data and of the doctors supervised by our group, four have already gotten a professor’s position, which is a significant achievement in the Finnish university setting where professorships are very scanty available. Furthermore, several are in University lecturer’s positions and the majority hold titles of docent (corresponding to adjunct professor). Moreover, several have gotten leading positions in national research institutes.

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

Strengths
- Systematic high quality supervision practices
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- Every student has several supervisors and receives additional feedback from group members from other fields of study
- Strong international and multidisciplinary connections in which the candidates take part
- Students are given possibilities to take part in international conferences and to conduct part of their thesis work abroad
- Students publish their papers in high quality international journals from the beginning
- Candidates receive support for career planning from the supervisors throughout the post-graduate period
- Opponents for doctoral theses come abroad and are distinguished scientists of their field

Challenges
- To get all supervising collaborators to take part in university pedagogic training
- Although we already have collaboration, forming new contacts inside of our faculty could offer new possibilities for our doctoral students
- To form tighter contacts to organizations and companies outside of the research community to offer direct contacts to future employers also outside of the University

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).

Societal impact and relevance of our research and doctoral training can be described in terms of the social significance of our research topics, and of the high quality records and success stories of careers of many of our research group members. The main topics of our research are coronary heart disease (CHD), type 2 diabetes, and depression. They all belong to the main causes of morbidity in Western countries. Due to an effective medical treatment, the mortality caused by coronary heart disease has decreased. In spite of this, CHD is still a leading cause of death among middle aged Western men and incidence of CHD has not decreased. In addition to the mortality, a high amount of sickness absence and a need of rehabilitation belong to the costs of the society. Further, Type 2 diabetes and depression have been substantially increased in all industrialized countries. Nowadays, obesity, a risk factor for diabetes is a world-wide epidemic already in adolescence, even in childhood. Depression is the primary course of an early exclusion from the work life. Thus, we are in the core of the most important Western health problems.

Resulting from the societal relevance of our research topics, searching for instruments of prevention and intervention of risk factors of these diseases and disorders is our major challenge. We are studying the life course development of risk factors of the abovementioned diseases, but in terms of prevention and intervention, our main focus is in childhood. We want to identify family related risk factors, and environment (day-care, kindergarten school) related risks. In order to increase a societal understanding on those risks, we have published popular textbooks on the bases of our findings, and given lectures for non-professional audience, and given interviews in the media. In addition, we have served several times as experts and consultants to the government and ministry of education when new kindergarten programs or school reforms have been planned. Our findings could be most appropriately applied in school settings. Consequently, teachers and kindergarten teachers have been the important focus of our
"education", and in this context, prevention of an early drop out and societal exclusion is one of the main themes.

One branch of our research has highlighted stress, its early roots and health and societal outcomes. Consequently, we have worked together with many national research institutes in order to find the best tools for the prevention of work stress and its consequences.

As regards the impact of doctoral training, many of our doctors have a research career outside the university, which has additionally linked our research to national research institutes and other organizations and expanded our knowhow and research topics outside the university.

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

Although we have gotten a lot of attention in the public media, it would be still possible to increase communicating our research findings to the representatives of the media by systematically informing about all new research findings that we make. Binding even tighter contacts to public organizations and companies could give us possibilities to get more feedback of the needs of these instances and this could be used in advance in directing the research and in doctoral training.

**Description of the RC's research collaborations and joint doctoral training activities and how the RC has promoted researcher mobility.**

The RC has active and extensive collaboration with researchers of international and Finnish universities and research institutions. The list of researchers mentioned below is not comprehensive given the space limitations.

Personality Psychology. Together with Prof. Robert Cloninger and his research group (Washington University, St. Louis, USA) we are using the unique longitudinal data of the Young Finns study to examine the origins, development, and consequences of temperament. We have also joined forces with behavioral ecologists interested in biology of personality variation, including Drs. Virpi Lummaa, Ian J. Rickard, and Alexadre Courtiol (University of Sheffield, UK), and Alexandra Alvergne (University College London, UK), to incorporate biological theories further in our temperament study.

Behavioral Genetics. The RC is a part of a large collaborative venture investigating the molecular genetic basis of temperament, personality and indicators of psychological well-being. This work is carried out with several researchers (e.g. Prof. Nelson Freimer, University of California, USA; Prof. Marjo-Riitta Järvelin, Imperial College London, UK; and researchers at the British Trust Sanger Institute; Prof. Terho Lehtimäki, Tampere University Hospital) depending on the specific research topics. We have also started a collaboration with Finnish twin researchers Prof. Jaakko Kaprio and Dr. Karri Silventoinen (University of Helsinki) to study personality and mental health with quantitative genetic methods.

Psychosomatic Research. The RC has long-term collaborators investigating the psychological risk factors (e.g., work stress) associated with cardiovascular disease and depression, including Prof. Töres Theorell (Karolinska Institut, Sweden) and research teams investigating cardiovascular morbidity led by Profs. Olli Raitakari and Jorma Viikari (University of Turku).

Social Epidemiology. Researchers of the RC are closely connected with the Whitehall II study group based at University College London, UK (led by Prof. Michael Marmot) and other researchers working in the field of social epidemiology, including Prof. Archana Singh-Manoux (INSERM, France).
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Prof. Jussi Vahtera (University of Turku), Prof. Ian J. Deary (University of Edinburgh, UK), and Prof. Ichiro Kawachi (Harvard University, USA), and their research groups.

Experimental Personality Psychology. The experimental research branch of the RC studying the psychophysiology of personality and stress is working with Prof. Jarno Hietala and colleagues (University of Turku) in a brain imaging project to better understand the biological basis of personality and its disorders. Experimental research of temperament and stress sensitivity is also carried out together with researchers at the Finnish Institute of Occupational Health, and Department of Cardiology, Helsinki University Central Hospital.

Research mobility and international networking is strongly encouraged via research visits to collaborating departments and via participation to international conferences. The RC has also hosted several research visits of researchers in different career phases: e.g. Professor Cloninger (USA), post-doctoral researcher Helle Pullmann (Estonia), and post-doctoral researcher Nadja Chumaeva (Russia).

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

The RC is strongly interconnected with national and international research communities of several disciplines. The collaboration is active and productive, as demonstrated by joint research articles. The expertise of the RC members and unique research resources of the RC (e.g., the Young Finns data, research laboratory) offer a solid and fertile ground for building multiple collaborative ventures with other researchers.

The main challenge is to increase the transference of knowledge and skills from our collaborators for the use of the RC. In the future, the RC seeks to provide even better opportunities (e.g., funding) for RC members for research visits of 2-6 months to our collaborators’ institutions to learn new skills. We already have such practice in place with the Whitehall II team at University College London, but the RC would benefit from a broader international research exposure. Currently a new research visit program is being developed with the Center for Well-being at the Washington University in St. Louis (directed by Prof. Robert Cloninger).

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).

RC is highly multidisciplinary comprising researchers from domestic and international universities and institutes, representing the following disciplines: psychology, sociology, educational sciences, epidemiology, genetics, psychiatry, neurology, cardiology, pediatrics, and internal medicine. RC is joined by common research topics and grants, shared datasets and joint doctoral training, and the results are manifested as joint papers. At the moment, the RC includes 12 professors, 11 senior researchers, two post-doctoral researchers, and 12 doctoral students. The RC has been able to acquire numerous significant grants from competitive external funding sources and even the doctoral students have frequently received personal grants.

One of the crucial components of the RC’s research infrastructure is based on the high-quality datasets available for researchers. These are mostly large prospective epidemiological and psychological cohort studies, including

The Young Finns study, a 27-year follow-up study of 3596 participants with additional experimental studies carried out in smaller subsamples, (e.g., experiments on stress sensitivity and brain imaging studies)
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Long QT Syndrome study (n=1269) investigating psychosocial and stress-related factors and an experimental data among the LQTS mutation carriers and their relative controls.

Psychosocial Well-being or Social Exclusion study (n=3941): focuses on temperament, personality and school-related factors in relation to predictors of social exclusion and psycho-social well-being.

With the aid of these and other rich datasets, the RC offers ways to advance statistical methods to improve and expand approaches to data analysis. Availability of large observational data sets and growth of computing resources has brought new possibilities as well as new data analytic challenges. Together with expertise and collaboration with researchers in applied statistics and mathematics, methodological branch of the RC aims to keep us in the research front of newly developed sophisticated research methods.

The basic facilities, e.g. working spaces, are offered by the university. In addition, the RC has been able to build a laboratory for gathering of experimental data. The infrastructure for gathering medical and genetic data is provided by RC members from the field of medicine outside of University of Helsinki, even outside of Finland.

The members of the RC are responsible of all the personality psychology teaching in degree programs in psychology at University of Helsinki. This includes five yearly courses (31 ECTS credits). In addition, we arrange several courses every other year and a yearly entirety of minor subject studies (25 ECTS). In order to further encourage high-quality scientific research, we also take part in teaching on yearly general courses arranged by the faculty, such as a course in publishing in international scientific journals (4 ECTS).

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

Strengths and related plans
- Several excellent data sets
- Large collaborative network with expertise on variety of fields
- Advanced statistical methods and collaboration related to their use
- Good contacts decrease the need for infrastructure inside of University of Helsinki (e.g. data collection equipment)
- RC’s own laboratory
- RC has been able to hire supporting staff

Challenges and related plans
- To keep the laboratory up-to-date and to get support for using and maintaining the equipment.
- To guarantee continuous funding for all RC members and supporting staff in order to attain high quality research goals
- To find time for continuous application processes to get funding
- To be able to allocate staff resources evenly and purposefully between research, teaching, applying funding, and administrative duties
- To assure the possibility for professional training and keep up with continuous learning

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

Principally, all researchers work together, share the same databases, possibilities and responsibilities including the taking care of the data, supervision and fund-raising. In addition, the RC has divided into several smaller research groups according to the research themes, i.e. “laboratory group”, “epidemiological group”, “personality group”, “PET imaging group” etc. These subgroups have their own persons in charge, i.e. their own leaders who are responsible of fundings and post graduate students who are working in this subgroup. Researchers in these subgroups have, however, high overlap in the sense that researchers from different groups work together in collaborative projects and share common grants. All members have a right to use the data and all members apply for funding from various sources. Each smaller group is independent and responsible in the sense that they mostly (not always) have independent budgets.

Each research discipline has a leader of its own who is responsible for developing (with the aid of the group members) the research on that area and who coordinates the use of data (e.g. to prevent overlapping work) on that area.

The RC arranges regular meetings (weekly) for the core RC, that works at the University of Helsinki, and regular seminars (half-yearly) for the co-workers of different disciplines inside the RC to foster collaboration and to manage research work (e.g. to find novel research ideas and to organize data collections). The size of the RC enables direct personal contacts and minimizes bureaucracy in leadership and management issues making the RC extremely flexible and able to adjust its operations quickly.

The close co-work within the researchers from different fields in terms of personal contacts, meetings and seminars is the best way to strengthen the RC’s know-how.

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

Strengths
- Flexible organizational structure and minimal bureaucracy
- Strong history in data sharing and multidisciplinary collaboration have resulted in clear and smooth practices and in procedures known by all
- Strong personal connections between RC members
- Regular meetings and seminars

Challenges
- Challenges include effectively transferring tacit knowledge and RC culture related to the procedures and ways of collaborating to the new group members and doctoral students
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: 1200000

- 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: Helsinki University Science Foundation; Research Funds of the University of Helsinki (Principal investigator research project grants); Post Graduate School Positions; Kone foundation; Emil Aaltonen Foundation; Signe and Ane Gyllenberg Foundation; Yrjö Jahnsson Foundation; Ella and Georg Ehrnrooth Foundation, Dissertation Completion Grant, University of Helsinki Research Grant
  - total amount of funding (in euros) from the above-mentioned foundations: 1070000

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

- Other national funding (incl. EVO funding and Ministry of Education and Culture funded doctoral programme positions) - names of other national funding organizations which have decided to allocate funding to the RC members during 1.1.2005-31.12.2010, and the amount of their funding (in euros).
  - names of the funding organizations:
  - 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.
  In the future, the follow-up studies will be continued and new data collections arranged to the already rather unique data sets. We plan to dig in even deeper to the novel findings we have made utilizing multidisciplinary collaboration. The primary focus will be directed to those subjects of study that have
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high societal importance and that contribute to the development of applicable knowledge. Largely the doctoral training will be continued with the format we have developed as these supervising practices have been found effective (e.g. students publish in high quality international journals, apart from two all RC’s doctoral theses at the University of Helsinki have received highest marks (Eximia or Laudatur) and several have received university and faculty prizes).

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

All RC members have taken part in planning, collecting and maintaining the data sets and all are contributing as thesis supervisors.
### Analysis of publications

- Associated person is one of Saija Alatupa, saija.alatupa@helsinki.fi, Nadezda Chumaeva, nadezda.chumaeva@helsinki.fi, Marko Elovainio, marko.elovainio@helsinki.fi, Christian Hakulinen, christian.hakulinen@helsinki.fi, Tarja-Riitta Hepoinen, tarja.hepoinen@helsinki.fi, Mika Hintsanen, mika.hintsanen@helsinki.fi, Kim Henrik Josefsson, kim.josefsson@helsinki.fi, Liisa Keltikangas-Järvinen, liisa.keltikangasjarvinen@helsinki.fi, Mika Kivimäki, mika.kivimaki@helsinki.fi, Päivi Merjonen, paivi.merjonen@helsinki.fi, Samu Multisaari, samu.multisaari@helsinki.fi, Ilmari Eerikki Määttänen, ilmari.maatatanen@helsinki.fi, Laura Pulkki-Råback, laura.pulkki-raback@helsinki.fi, Sampsa Puttonen, sampsa.puttonen@helsinki.fi, Johanna Salo, johanna.salo@helsinki.fi, Nina Santavirta, nina.santavirta@helsinki.fi, Tom Rosenström, tom.rosenstrom@helsinki.fi, Lauri Toivonen, lauri.toivonen@helsinki.fi, Cecilia Törnkvist, cecilia.tornkvist@helsinki.fi, Heikki Swan, heikki.swan@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>45</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>422</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A2 Review in scientific journal</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A3 Contribution to book/other compilations (refereed)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A4 Article in conference publication (refereed)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B1 Unrefereed journal article</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C1 Published scientific monograph</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C2 Edited book, compilation, conference proceeding or special issue of journal</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D1 Article in professional journal</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D3 Article in professional conference proceedings</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E1 Popular article, newspaper article</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2 Listing of publications

A1 Refereed journal article

2005
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2006


Virtanen, P., Kivimäki, M., Vahtera, J., Koskenvuo, M. 2006, "Employment status and differences in the one-year coverage of physician visits: different needs or unequal access to services?", BMC Health Services Research, vol 6, no. 123.


2007
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2009


2010
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A2 Review in scientific journal

2005


2009


A3 Contribution to book/other compilations (refereed)

2005


2006


2007
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2008


2009


A4 Article in conference publication (refereed)

2005

Santavirta, N, Kovero, C 2005, 'Psychosocial work environment, well being and burnout - a study comparing female workers in five age groups within the human sector', in Assessment and promotion of work ability, health and well-being of ageing workers: proceedings of the 2nd International Symposium on Work Ability held in Verona, Italy between 18 and 20 October 2004, International congress series, no. 1285.

B1 Unrefereed journal article

2005


2006


2008


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

RC-SPECIFIC TUHAT COMPILATIONS OF PUBLICATIONS DATA 2005-2010

PEWE/Keltikangas-Järvinen


2010

C1 Published scientific monograph

2006

2008

2010

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

2007

D1 Article in professional journal

2010

D3 Article in professional conference proceedings

2008
E1 Popular article, newspaper article

2009
1 Analysis of activities 2005-2010

- Associated person is one of Saija Alatupa , saija.alatupa@helsinki.fi, Nadezda Chumaeva, nadezda.chumaeva@helsinki.fi, Marko Elsvaino, marko.elsvaino@helsinki.fi, Christian Hakulinen, christian.hakulinen@helsinki.fi, Tarja-Riitta Heponen, tarna.heponiemi@helsinki.fi, Mirka Hintsanen, mirka.hintsanen@helsinki.fi, Marko Jokela, marko.jokela@helsinki.fi, Kim Henrik Josefsson, kim.josefsson@helsinki.fi, Liisa Keltikangas-Järvinen , liisa.keltikangasjarvinen@helsinki.fi, Päivi Merjonen, paivi.merjonen@helsinki.fi, Sari Mullola, sari.mullola@helsinki.fi, Ilmari Eerikki Määttänen, ilmari.maattanen@helsinki.fi, Laura Pulkki-Råback, laura.pulkki-raback@helsinki.fi, Sampsa Puttonen, sampsa.puttonen@helsinki.fi, Tom Rosenstrom, tom.rosenstrom@helsinki.fi, Johanna Salo, johanna.m.salo@helsinki.fi, Nina Santavirta, Nina.Santavirta@helsinki.fi, Torsten Santavirta , torsten.santavirta@helsinki.fi, Heikki Swan , heikki.swan@helsinki.fi, Lauri Toivonen, Cecilia Törnkvist, cecilia.tornkvist@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>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prizes and awards</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Editor of research journal</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peer review of manuscripts</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment of candidates for academic posts</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Membership or other role in review committee</td>
<td>7</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>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Membership or other role in public Finnish or international organization</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Membership or other role of body in private company/organisation</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participation in interview for written media</td>
<td>115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participation in radio programme</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participation in TV programme</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participation in interview for web based media</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2 Listing of activities 2005-2010

Supervisor or co-supervisor of doctoral thesis

Marko Elovinio, marko.elovainio@helsinki.fi
- PhD Thesis Supervisor of Birgitta Juntumaa, Marko Elovinio, 2009

Taina Hintsa, taina.hintsa@helsinki.fi
- PhD Thesis Supervisor of Ilmari Määttänen, Taina Hintsa, 2009 → ..., Finland

Mirka Hintsanen, Mirka.Hintsanen@helsinki.fi
- PhD Thesis Supervisor of Sari Mulkola, Mirka Hintsanen, 2008 → ...
- PhD Thesis Supervisor of Christian Hakulinen, Mirka Hintsanen, 2009 → ...
- PhD Thesis Supervisor of Kim Josafsson, Mirka Hintsanen, 2009 → ...
- PhD Thesis Supervisor of Mika Turkia, Mirka Hintsanen, 2009 → ...
- PhD Thesis Supervisor of Saia Aitapura, Mirka Hintsanen, 2009 → ...
- PhD Thesis Supervisor of Tom Rosenström, Mirka Hintsanen, 2009 → ...

Supervised Doctoral Thesis - Nadezda Chumaeva, Mirka Hintsanen, 2010

Markus Jokela, Markus.Jokela@helsinki.fi
- PhD supervisor of MA Johanna Salo, Markus Jokela, 2008 → ...
- PhD supervisor of MA Päivi Merjonen, Markus Jokela, 2008 → ...
- PhD Thesis Supervisor of Christian Hakulinen, Markus Jokela, 2009 → ...
- PhD supervisor of MA Kim Josafsson, Markus Jokela, 2009 → ...
- PhD supervisor of MSocSci Anneli Miettinen, Markus Jokela, 2009 → ...
- PhD supervisor of Tom Rosenström, Markus Jokela, 2009 → ...
- PhD supervisor of MA Venla Berg, Markus Jokela, 2010 → ...
- PhD supervisor of MSocSci Henri Väisänen, Markus Jokela, 2010 → ...

Liisa Keltikangas-Järvinen, Liisa.Keltikangas-Jarvinen@helsinki.fi
- PhD Thesis Supervisor of Sampsa Puttonen, Liisa Keltikangas-Järvinen, 2005
- PhD Thesis Supervisor of Päivi Merjonen, Liisa Keltikangas-Järvinen, 2006 → ...
- PhD Thesis Supervisor of Saia Aitapura, Liisa Keltikangas-Järvinen, 2007 → ...
- PhD Thesis Supervisor of Johanna Salo, Liisa Keltikangas-Järvinen, 2008 → ...
- PhD Thesis Supervisor of Sari Mulkola, Liisa Keltikangas-Järvinen, 2008 → ...
- PhD Thesis Supervisor of Christian Hakulinen, Liisa Keltikangas-Järvinen, 2009 → ...
- PhD Thesis Supervisor of Ilmari Määttänen, Liisa Keltikangas-Järvinen, 2009 → ...
- PhD Thesis Supervisor of Kim Josafsson, Liisa Keltikangas-Järvinen, 2009 → ...
- PhD Thesis Supervisor of Tom Rosenström, Liisa Keltikangas-Järvinen, 2009 → ...
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Mika Kivimäki, Mika.Kivimaki@helsinki.fi
PhD Thesis Supervisor of Kirsi Ahola, Mika Kivimäki, 2007
PhD Thesis Supervisor of Niklas Granö, Mika Kivimäki, 2008
PhD Thesis Supervisor of Taina Hintsa, Mika Kivimäki, 2008

Laura Pulkki-Råback, laura.pulkki-raback@helsinki.fi
PhD Thesis Supervisor of Päivi Merjonen, Laura Pulkki-Råback, 2006

Prizes and awards

Mirka Hintsanen, Mirka.Hintsanen@helsinki.fi
Annual Faculty Award for Meritorious Doctoral Thesis, Mirka Hintsanen, 05.2008, Finland
Poster Presentation Award, Mirka Hintsanen, 07.2010, Austria

Markus Jokela, Markus.Jokela@helsinki.fi
Recipient of an annual Ph.D. thesis award of the Faculty of Behavioral Sciences, University of Helsinki, Finland, 2007, Markus Jokela, 2007
Honorary Research Associate, Department of Epidemiology and Public Health, University College London, UK, 2008-, Markus Jokela, 2008
Recipient of the Young Researcher Award for Early Career Contribution, Finnish Psychology University Network (PsykoNet), 2010, Markus Jokela, 18.08.2010

Liisa Keltikangas-Järvinen, Liisa.Keltikangas-Jarvinen@helsinki.fi
Knight, First Class, of the Order of White Rose of Finland, Liisa Keltikangas-Järvinen, 06.12.2005
Honorary award for nonfiction writing by WSOY's Literature Foundation (2006), Liisa Keltikangas-Järvinen, 2006
Honorary Member of the Southern Ostrobothnian Student Association, Liisa Keltikangas-Järvinen, 2008
J.V. Snellman award of the University of Helsinki (2008), Liisa Keltikangas-Järvinen, 26.03.2008, Finland
The speaker of the year prize (2008), Association of the Speech Teachers, Liisa Keltikangas-Järvinen, 2008
Honorary Lecture (Peggy Sansone Lecture), Washington University of St. Louis, Liisa Keltikangas-Järvinen, 2009, United States
Professor of the year (2008), Association of the University Professors in Finland, Liisa Keltikangas-Järvinen, 06.01.2009, Finland

Editor of research journal

Markus Jokela, Markus.Jokela@helsinki.fi
Frontiers in Personality Science and Individual Differences, Member of Editorial Board, Markus Jokela, 2010

Mika Kivimäki, Mika.Kivimaki@helsinki.fi
Archives of Occupational and Environmental Health, Mika Kivimäki, 01.01.2005 → 31.12.2005
International Journal of Epidemiology, Mika Kivimäki, 01.01.2005 → 31.12.2005
Journal of Epidemiology and Community Health, Mika Kivimäki, 01.01.2005 → 31.12.2005
Social Science and Medicine, Mika Kivimäki, 01.01.2005 → 31.12.2005
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Sampsa Puttonen , Sampsa.Puttonen@helsinki.fi
Human & Experimental Toxicology, Sampsa Puttonen, 01.01.2005 → 31.12.2005

Nina Santavirta , Nina.Santavirta@helsinki.fi
Educational Psychology, Nina Santavirta, 01.01.2006 → 31.12.2006, United Kingdom
Acta Orthopaedica Scandinavica, Nina Santavirta, 01.01.2007 → 31.12.2007, Sweden
Haemophilia, Nina Santavirta, 01.01.2007 → 31.12.2007, United Kingdom
Nordisk Pedagogik, Nina Santavirta, 01.01.2007 → 31.12.2007, Denmark
Patient Education and Counseling, Nina Santavirta, 01.01.2007 → 31.12.2007, United States
Educational Psychology, Nina Santavirta, 01.01.2008 → 31.12.2008
Haemophilia, Nina Santavirta, 01.01.2008 → 31.12.2008
Nordisk pedagogik, Nina Santavirta, 01.01.2008 → 31.12.2008

Peer review of manuscripts
Taina Hintsa , taina.hintsa@helsinki.fi
Reviewer in Occup Environ Med, Taina Hintsa, 2007
Reviewer in Journal of Health Psychology, Taina Hintsa, 2009
Reviewer in Journal of Health Psychology, Taina Hintsa, 2009
Reviewer in Psychosomatic medicine, Taina Hintsa, 2009
Reviewer in International Journal of Behavioral Medicine, Taina Hintsa, 2010
Reviewer in Journal of Occupational Health, Taina Hintsa, 2010
Reviewer in Learning and Individual Differences, Taina Hintsa, 2010
Reviewer in Occupational and Environmental Medicine, Taina Hintsa, 2010
Reviewer in Psychosomatic Medicine, Taina Hintsa, 2010

Mirka Hintsanen , Mirka.Hintsanen@helsinki.fi
Biological Psychology, Mirka Hintsanen, 2008
International Journal of Behavioral Medicine, Mirka Hintsanen, 2008
International Journal of Behavioral Medicine, Mirka Hintsanen, 2008
Journal of Adolescent Health, Mirka Hintsanen, 2008
International Journal of Behavioral Medicine, Mirka Hintsanen, 2009
International Journal of Behavioral Medicine, Mirka Hintsanen, 2009
Journal of Health Psychology, Mirka Hintsanen, 2009
Journal of Health Psychology, Mirka Hintsanen, 2009
Neuroscience & Behavioral Reviews, Mirka Hintsanen, 2009
Psychosomatic Medicine, Mirka Hintsanen, 2009
Behavioral and Brain Functions, Mirka Hintsanen, 2010
International Journal of Behavioral Medicine, Mirka Hintsanen, 2010
International Journal of Behavioral Medicine, Mirka Hintsanen, 2010
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Pediatrics, Mirka Hintsanen, 2010
Psychosomatic Medicine, Mirka Hintsanen, 2010
Psykologia-lehti, Mirka Hintsanen, 2010
Social Science and Medicine, Mirka Hintsanen, 2010

Liisa Keltikangas-Järvinen, Liisa.Keltikangas-Jarvinen@helsinki.fi
International Journal of Behavioral Medicine (Editorial Board), Liisa Keltikangas-Järvinen, 1998 → ...
Revue Européenne de Psychologie Appliquée-European Review of Applied Psychology (Editorial Board), Liisa Keltikangas-Järvinen, 2001 → ...
European Review of Applied Psychology, Liisa Keltikangas-Järvinen, 26.05.2005
International Journal of Behavioral Medicine, Liisa Keltikangas-Järvinen, 28.01.2005
International Journal of Behavioral Medicine, Liisa Keltikangas-Järvinen, 23.08.2005
International Journal of Behavioral Medicine, Liisa Keltikangas-Järvinen, 02.02.2006
International Journal of Behavioral Medicine, Liisa Keltikangas-Järvinen, 2007
International Journal of Behavioral Medicine, Liisa Keltikangas-Järvinen, 2007
The Open Epidemiology Journal (Editorial Board), Liisa Keltikangas-Järvinen, 2007 → ...
The Open Psychiatry Journal (Editorial Board), Liisa Keltikangas-Järvinen, 2007 → ...
Biological Psychiatry (Reviewing Board), Liisa Keltikangas-Järvinen, 2008 → ...
Obesity, Liisa Keltikangas-Järvinen, 2008
European Journal of Personality, Liisa Keltikangas-Järvinen, 2010
International Journal of Behavioral Medicine, Liisa Keltikangas-Järvinen, 2010

Päivi Merjonen, Pävi.Merjonen@helsinki.fi
Behavioral and Brain Functions, Päivi Merjonen, 2010
Personal Relationships, Päivi Merjonen, 2010

Assessment of candidates for academic posts

Liisa Keltikangas-Järvinen, Liisa.Keltikangas-Jarvinen@helsinki.fi
Reviewer for the applications of Programme Support within the field of Children’s living conditions, Liisa Keltikangas-Järvinen, 2005, Sweden
Reviewer for the applications, Liisa Keltikangas-Järvinen, 2006, Sweden
Reviewer for the professorship in Clinical Psychology, Mittuniversitetet Östersund, Sweden, Liisa Keltikangas-Järvinen, 2006
Reviewer for the applications, Liisa Keltikangas-Järvinen, 2007, Germany
Reviewer for the applications of Women’s Health Program, Liisa Keltikangas-Järvinen, 2008, Sweden
Reviewer for the applications of Women’s Health Program, Liisa Keltikangas-Järvinen, 2008, Sweden
Reviewer for the applications of Women’s Health Program, Liisa Keltikangas-Järvinen, 2008, Sweden
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Reviewer for the applications of the Epidemiology and Genetics, the Program of the Circadian clocks of individuals, Liisa Keltikangas-Järvinen, 2008, Germany
Reviewer for the applications of the Innovative Research Incentives Scheme, Liisa Keltikangas-Järvinen, 2009, Netherlands
Reviewer for the senior lecturer in Health Psychology, Karolinska Institutet Medical University, Stockholm, Sweden, Liisa Keltikangas-Järvinen, 2009, Sweden
Reviewer for the professorship (tenure track), Evaluation of a competence, Mid Sweden University, Östersund, Sweden, Liisa Keltikangas-Järvinen, 2010
Reviewer for the senior lecturer in clinical psychology, Mid Sweden University, Östersund, Sweden, Liisa Keltikangas-Järvinen, 2010, Sweden
Reviewer for the senior lecturer in general psychology, Mid Sweden University, Östersund, Sweden, Liisa Keltikangas-Järvinen, 2010, Sweden

Membership or other role in review committee
Liisa Keltikangas-Järvinen, Liisa.Keltikangas-Jarvinen@helsinki.fi
The Evaluation Team for the Norwegian Mother Child Cohort Study (MoBa), Oslo, Liisa Keltikangas-Järvinen, 2007, Norway
The Evaluation Team of Estonian Higher Education Institutions (The curricula evaluation of psychology of the Tallinn University), Liisa Keltikangas-Järvinen, 2007, Estonia
The Evaluation Team of Estonian Higher Education Institutions (The curricula evaluation of psychology of the University of Tartu), Liisa Keltikangas-Järvinen, 2007, Estonia
Member of the execution committee for a professorship, Professorship for a Science Centre, Liisa Keltikangas-Järvinen, 2008
The Member of Recruiting Group at Karolinska Institutet, Stockholm, Liisa Keltikangas-Järvinen, 2008, Sweden
Member of the execution committee for a professorship, Professorship of Brain and Education, Liisa Keltikangas-Järvinen, 2009
Member of the execution committee for a professorship, Professorship of the Education of Religion, Liisa Keltikangas-Järvinen, 2010

Membership or other role in research network
Taina Hintsa, taina.hintsa@helsinki.fi
Associate member of European Association of Work and Organisational Psychology (EAWOP), 2009-2010, Taina Hintsa, 2009 → 2010
Mirka Hintsanen, Mirka.Hintsanen@helsinki.fi
Ordinary member of European Association of Work and Organisational Psychology (EAWOP), Mirka Hintsanen, 2009 → 2010
Päivi Merjonen, Paivi.Merjonen@helsinki.fi
Associate member of Behavior Genetics Association, Päivi Merjonen, 2010 → …

Membership or other role in national/international committee, council, board
Saija Alatupa, saija.alatupa@helsinki.fi
Hallituksen jäsen, Saija Alatupa, 01.01.2009 → …
Puheenjohtaja, Saija Alatupa, 01.01.2009 → 31.12.2009
Asiantuntijajäsen, Saija Alatupa, 01.01.2010 → …
Varajäsen, Saija Alatupa, 01.01.2010 → …
Mirka Hintsanen, Mirka.Hintsanen@helsinki.fi
Vice representative in NordPlus Psychology Exchange network, Mirka Hintsanen, 2005
Markus Jokela, Markus.Jokela@helsinki.fi
Invited member of the Young-Researcher Society (Nuottten Akatemiajublii) of the Finnish Academy of Science and Letters, Markus Jokela, 2009 → 2010, Finland
Member of research ethics committee, Faculty of Behavioral Sciences, University of Helsinki, Markus Jokela, 2009 → …
Liisa Keltikangas-Järvinen, Liisa.Keltikangas-Jarvinen@helsinki.fi
Society for Personality Assessment, Liisa Keltikangas-Järvinen, 1983 → …
Participation in interview for written media

Saija Alatupa, saija.alatupa@helsinki.fi


Taina Hintsa, taina.hintsa@helsinki.fi

Interview in magazine, Taina Hintsa, 2010

Mirka Hintsanen, Mirka.Hintsanen@helsinki.fi

Interview in magazine - Yliopistolehti, Mirka Hintsanen, 2006
Interview in magazine - Diabetes, Mirka Hintsanen, 2007, Finland
Interview in magazine - Psychologia, Mirka Hintsanen, 01.2007, Finland
Interview in magazine - Terveydoksi, Mirka Hintsanen, 2007, Finland
Interview in magazine - Trendi, Mirka Hintsanen, 03.2009
Interview in newspaper - Helsingin Sanomat, Mirka Hintsanen, 11.2009
Interview in newspaper - Ita-Sanomat, Mirka Hintsanen, 08.2009
Interview in magazine - Ape, Mirka Hintsanen, 10.2010
Interview in magazine - Sara, Mirka Hintsanen, 11.2010
Interview in newspaper - Helsingin Sanomat, Mirka Hintsanen, 10.2010

Liisa Keltikangas-Järvinen, Liisa.Keltikangas-Jarvinen@helsinki.fi

Participation in interview for written media: Etelä-Saimaa, Liisa Keltikangas-Järvinen, 2005
Participation in interview for written media: Etelä-Suomen Sanomat, Liisa Keltikangas-Järvinen, 2005
Participation in interview for written media: Hufvudstadsbladet, Liisa Keltikangas-Järvinen, 2005
Participation in interview for written media: Hyvä Terveis, Liisa Keltikangas-Järvinen, 2005
Participation in interview for written media: Kaleva, Liisa Keltikangas-Järvinen, 2005
Participation in interview for written media: Kompleksi, Liisa Keltikangas-Järvinen, 2005
Participation in interview for written media: Kouvolan Sanomat, Liisa Keltikangas-Järvinen, 2005
Participation in interview for written media: Kymen sanomat, Liisa Keltikangas-Järvinen, 2005
Participation in interview for written media: Los Angeles Times, Liisa Keltikangas-Järvinen, 2005, United States
Participation in interview for written media: Meidän Perhe, Liisa Keltikangas-Järvinen, 2005
Participation in interview for written media: Opettaja-lehti, Liisa Keltikangas-Järvinen, 2005
Participation in interview for written media: Reuters Health, Liisa Keltikangas-Järvinen, 2005
Participation in interview for written media: Sunnuntaisuomalainen, Liisa Keltikangas-Järvinen, 2005
Participation in interview for written media: Tiede-lehti, Liisa Keltikangas-Järvinen, 2005
Participation in interview for written media: Tietytli, Liisa Keltikangas-Järvinen, 2005
Participation in interview for written media: Vauva-lehti, Liisa Keltikangas-Järvinen, 2005
Participation in interview for written media: Yliopistonlehti, Liisa Keltikangas-Järvinen, 2005
Participation in interview for written media: Aamulehti, Liisa Keltikangas-Järvinen, 2006
Participation in interview for written media: Anna-lehti, Liisa Keltikangas-Järvinen, 2006
Participation in interview for written media: Eeva, Liisa Keltikangas-Järvinen, 2006
Participation in interview for written media: Helsingin Sanomat, Liisa Keltikangas-Järvinen, 2006
Participation in interview for written media: Helsingin yliopiston vuosikertomus, Liisa Keltikangas-Järvinen, 2006
Participation in interview for written media: Ilkka, Liisa Keltikangas-Järvinen, 2006
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Participation in interview for written media: Koillis-Lappi, Liisa Keltikangas-Järvinen, 2006
Participation in interview for written media: Kompleksi, Liisa Keltikangas-Järvinen, 2006
Participation in interview for written media: Meidän Perhe, Liisa Keltikangas-Järvinen, 2006
Participation in interview for written media: Savon Sanomat, Liisa Keltikangas-Järvinen, 2006
Participation in interview for written media: Talouselämä, Liisa Keltikangas-Järvinen, 2006
Participation in interview for written media: Vauva-lehti, Liisa Keltikangas-Järvinen, 2006
Participation in interview for written media: Yliopisto-lehti, Liisa Keltikangas-Järvinen, 2006
Participation in interview for written media: Yliopisto-lehti, Liisa Keltikangas-Järvinen, 2006
Participation in interview for written media: Helsingin Sanomat, Liisa Keltikangas-Järvinen, 2007
Participation in interview for written media: Helsingin Sanomat, Liisa Keltikangas-Järvinen, 04.10.2007
Participation in interview for written media: Helsingin Sanomat, Liisa Keltikangas-Järvinen, 2007
Participation in interview for written media: Huvudstadsbladet, Liisa Keltikangas-Järvinen, 2007
Participation in interview for written media: Kaksplus, Liisa Keltikangas-Järvinen, 2007
Participation in interview for written media: Kasvatus ja koti, Liisa Keltikangas-Järvinen, 2007
Participation in interview for written media: Keski-Suomen Sanomat, Liisa Keltikangas-Järvinen, 2007
Participation in interview for written media: Sanomalehti Ilkka, Liisa Keltikangas-Järvinen, 2007
Participation in interview for written media: Tampereen Kirkkosanomat, Liisa Keltikangas-Järvinen, 2007
Participation in interview for written media: Turun Sanomat, Liisa Keltikangas-Järvinen, 05.10.2007
Participation in interview for written media: Turun Sanomat, Liisa Keltikangas-Järvinen, 14.10.2007
Participation in interview for written media: Apu, Liisa Keltikangas-Järvinen, 2008
Participation in interview for written media: Der Spiegel, Liisa Keltikangas-Järvinen, 2008, Germany
Participation in interview for written media: Eva, Liisa Keltikangas-Järvinen, 2008
Participation in interview for written media: Fakta, Liisa Keltikangas-Järvinen, 2008
Participation in interview for written media: Kirjasto-lehti, Liisa Keltikangas-Järvinen, 2008
Participation in interview for written media: Pere ja Kodu, Liisa Keltikangas-Järvinen, 2008, Estonia
Participation in interview for written media: Pohjalainen, Liisa Keltikangas-Järvinen, 2008
Participation in interview for written media: Sanomalehti Ilkka, Liisa Keltikangas-Järvinen, 2008
Participation in interview for written media: Talouselämä, Liisa Keltikangas-Järvinen, 2008
Participation in interview for written media: Tampereen Kirkkosanomat, Liisa Keltikangas-Järvinen, 2008
Participation in interview for written media: Yliopisto-lehti, Liisa Keltikangas-Järvinen, 2008
Participation in interview for written media: Aamulehti, Liisa Keltikangas-Järvinen, 2009
Participation in interview for written media: Acatiimi, Liisa Keltikangas-Järvinen, 2009
Participation in interview for written media: Editia, Liisa Keltikangas-Järvinen, 2009
Participation in interview for written media: Eva, Liisa Keltikangas-Järvinen, 2009
Participation in interview for written media: Espoon Seurakuntasanomat, Liisa Keltikangas-Järvinen, 2009
Participation in interview for written media: Helsinkiin Sanomat, Liisa Keltikangas-Järvinen, 2009
Participation in interview for written media: Koillis, Liisa Keltikangas-Järvinen, 2009
Participation in interview for written media: Lastentarhanopettaja-lehti, Liisa Keltikangas-Järvinen, 2009
Participation in interview for written media: Loviisan Sanomat, Liisa Keltikangas-Järvinen, 2009
Participation in interview for written media: Turun Sanomat, Liisa Keltikangas-Järvinen, 22.02.2009
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Participation in interview for written media: Työterveyslaitoksen henkilölehti, Lisa Keltikangas-Järvinen, 2009
Participation in interview for written media: Vauva-lehti, Lisa Keltikangas-Järvinen, 2009
Participation in interview for written media: Aamulehti, Lisa Keltikangas-Järvinen, 2010
Participation in interview for written media: Anna-lehti, Lisa Keltikangas-Järvinen, 2010
Participation in interview for written media: Etelä-Saimaan sanomat, Lisa Keltikangas-Järvinen, 2010
Participation in interview for written media: Etelä-Suomen Sanomat, Lisa Keltikangas-Järvinen, 05.10.2010
Participation in interview for written media: Helsingin Sanomat, Lisa Keltikangas-Järvinen, 2010
Participation in interview for written media: Helsinki Times, Lisa Keltikangas-Järvinen, 28.10.2010
Participation in interview for written media: Ittalehti, Lisa Keltikangas-Järvinen, 06.09.2010
Participation in interview for written media: Jusek Tidningen, Lisa Keltikangas-Järvinen, 2010, Sweden
Participation in interview for written media: Kauneus & Terveys-lehti, Lisa Keltikangas-Järvinen, 2010
Participation in interview for written media: Kolilääkäri lehti, Lisa Keltikangas-Järvinen, 2010
Participation in interview for written media: Olivia-lehti, Lisa Keltikangas-Järvinen, 2010
Participation in interview for written media: Osuuspankki sanomat, Lisa Keltikangas-Järvinen, 2010
Participation in interview for written media: Pohjois-Karjalan sanomat, Lisa Keltikangas-Järvinen, 2010
Participation in interview for written media: Sihteeri & Assistentti-lehti, Lisa Keltikangas-Järvinen, 2010
Participation in interview for written media: Steiner Kasvatus lehti, Lisa Keltikangas-Järvinen, 2010
Participation in interview for written media: Talouselämä, Lisa Keltikangas-Järvinen, 2010
Participation in interview for written media: Tiede, Lisa Keltikangas-Järvinen, 2010
Participation in interview for written media: Turun Sanomat, viikkoliite Extra, Lisa Keltikangas-Järvinen, 16.10.2010
Participation in interview for written media: Yrittäjä-lehti, Lisa Keltikangas-Järvinen, 2010

Mika Kivimäki, Mika.Kivimaki@helsinki.fi

BBC: N DOKUMENTTI, Mika Kivimäki, 01.01.2002 → 31.12.2011, Finland
YLE-CAPITALE, Mika Kivimäki, 01.01.2002 → 31.12.2011, Finland
YLEN PÄIVÄN PEILI, Mika Kivimäki, 01.01.2002 → 31.12.2011, Finland
Kotimaassa lukuisia kaikissa näissä, Mika Kivimäki, 01.01.2005 → 31.12.2011, Finland
New York Times, Mika Kivimäki, 01.01.2005 → 31.12.2011, Finland
Reuters Word Wide News Services, Mika Kivimäki, 01.01.2005 → 31.12.2011, Finland

Nina Santavirta, Nina.Santavirta@helsinki.fi

Lehtihaaastattelu: Hufvudstadsbladet, Nina Santavirta, 27.07.2001 → 31.12.2011, Japan
Hufvudstadsbladet, esitelmä, Nina Santavirta, 21.06.2002 → 31.12.2011, Finland
Opettaja lehti, Nina Santavirta, 01.11.2004 → 31.12.2011, Finland
7. Nina Santavirta, 01.01.2008 → 31.12.2011, Finland
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**Participation in radio programme**

Taina Hintsa, taina.hintsa@helsinki.fi
Interview, Taina Hintsa, 2010, Sweden

Mirka Hintsanen, Mirka.Hintsanen@helsinki.fi
Interview in the radio - Yleisradio, Mirka Hintsanen, 04.2007, Finland
Interview in the radio - YLE radio 1, Mirka Hintsanen, 09.2009

Liisa Keltikangas-Järvinen, Liisa.Keltikangas-Järvinen@helsinki.fi
Participation in radio programme: Radio Suomi, Ajantasa, Liisa Keltikangas-Järvinen, 2005
Participation in radio programme: YLE, Ylen Ykkönen, Liisa Keltikangas-Järvinen, 25.04.2005
Participation in radio programme: YLE, Ylen ykkönen, Liisa Keltikangas-Järvinen, 07.12.2005
Participation in radio programme: YLE, paikallisradio, Oulu, Liisa Keltikangas-Järvinen, 2005
Participation in radio programme: Yle, Radio1, Ykkösaamu, Liisa Keltikangas-Järvinen, 2006
Participation in radio programme: YLE, Päivän peli, Liisa Keltikangas-Järvinen, 2006
Participation in radio programme: YLE, Radio 1, Liisa Keltikangas-Järvinen, 17.05.2006
Participation in radio programme: YLE, Radio 1, Liisa Keltikangas-Järvinen, 19.05.2006
Participation in radio programme: YLE, Radio Q, Liisa Keltikangas-Järvinen, 11.08.2006
Participation in radio programme: YLE, Radiouutiset, Liisa Keltikangas-Järvinen, 2006
Participation in radio programme: YLE, Ruotsinkieliset uutiset, Liisa Keltikangas-Järvinen, 2006
Participation in radio programme: YLE, Suomenkieliset uutiset, Liisa Keltikangas-Järvinen, 2006
Participation in radio programme: YLE, Radio 1, Liisa Keltikangas-Järvinen, 2007
Participation in radio programme: YLE Radio 1, Liisa Keltikangas-Järvinen, 28.08.2008
Participation in radio programme: Radio Suomi, Liisa Keltikangas-Järvinen, 2009
Participation in radio programme: Taustapeili (Radio Suomi), Liisa Keltikangas-Järvinen, 05.02.2009
Participation in radio programme: YLE Radio 1, Reseptori, Liisa Keltikangas-Järvinen, 2009
Participation in radio programme: YLE Radio 1, Reseptori, Liisa Keltikangas-Järvinen, 2009
Participation in radio programme: YLE Radio 1, Reseptori, Liisa Keltikangas-Järvinen, 2009
Participation in radio programme: YLE, Kymenlaakson radio, Liisa Keltikangas-Järvinen, 2009
Participation in radio programme: YleX-radiokanava, Liisa Keltikangas-Järvinen, 2009
Participation in radio programme: Radio Nova, Keidas, Liisa Keltikangas-Järvinen, 15.09.2010
Participation in radio programme: YLE Puhe, Liisa Keltikangas-Järvinen, 23.10.2010
Participation in radio programme: YLE Puhe, Liisa Keltikangas-Järvinen, 24.10.2010
Participation in radio programme: YLE Puhe, Liisa Keltikangas-Järvinen, 26.10.2010
Participation in radio programme: YLE Radio 1, Liisa Keltikangas-Järvinen, 21.10.2010
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Päivi Merjonen, Paivi.Merjonen@helsinki.fi
Päivän kysymys, Päivi Merjonen, 04.09.2008, Finland

Participation in TV programme

Saija Alatupa, saija.alatupa@helsinki.fi

Liisa Keltikangas-Järvinen, Liisa.Keltikangas-Jarvinen@helsinki.fi
Participation in TV programme: TV1, ykkösdokumentti: Opin, siis ajattelen, Liisa Keltikangas-Järvinen, 2005
Participation in TV programme: YLE-TV1, A-talk, Liisa Keltikangas-Järvinen, 27.04.2005
Participation in TV programme: MTV3, Huomenta Suomi, Liisa Keltikangas-Järvinen, 2006
Participation in TV programme: TV 2, sitten, Liisa Keltikangas-Järvinen, 2006
Participation in TV programme: TV1, Tutkitti juttu, Liisa Keltikangas-Järvinen, 26.01.2006
Participation in TV programme: TV2, Inhimillinen tekijä, Liisa Keltikangas-Järvinen, 18.10.2006
Participation in TV programme: YLE-Teema, Tutkitti juttu, Liisa Keltikangas-Järvinen, 24.01.2006
Participation in TV programme: YLE-Teema, Tutkitti juttu, Liisa Keltikangas-Järvinen, 25.01.2006
Participation in TV programme: MTV4, Ulitset, Liisa Keltikangas-Järvinen, 2007
Participation in TV programme: TV1, Prisma Studio, Liisa Keltikangas-Järvinen, 2007
Participation in TV programme: YLE-Teema, Liisa Keltikangas-Järvinen, 2007
Participation in TV programme: YLE-Teema, Opettaja TV, Liisa Keltikangas-Järvinen, 2007
Participation in TV programme: YLE TV1, Liisa Keltikangas-Järvinen, 2007
Participation in TV programme: YLE, Tampereen alueuutiset, Liisa Keltikangas-Järvinen, 2007
Participation in TV programme: YLE, Ylen avoin, Oppimisen ohjelmat, Ohjelmasarja: Elinkäinen ja elämänlaajuinen oppiminen, Liisa Keltikangas-Järvinen, 2007
Participation in TV programme: TV1, Epäkorrektia, toimittaja Tuomas Enbuske, Liisa Keltikangas-Järvinen, 2008
Participation in TV programme: TV1, Yleeseen hoitoihin, Liisa Keltikangas-Järvinen, 11.03.2009
Participation in TV programme: TV1, Aamu-TV, Liisa Keltikangas-Järvinen, 2009
Participation in TV programme: YLE-Teema, Opettaja TV, Liisa Keltikangas-Järvinen, 2009
Participation in TV programme: YLE-Teema, Tutkivi Juttu, Liisa Keltikangas-Järvinen, 2009
Participation in TV programme: YLE-Teema, Tutkitti juttu, Liisa Keltikangas-Järvinen, 2010
Participation in TV programme: Aamu-TV, Liisa Keltikangas-Järvinen, 2010
Participation in TV programme: Ajankohtainen Kakkonen, Liisa Keltikangas-Järvinen, 2010

Participation in interview for web based media

Taina Hintsa, taina.hintsa@helsinki.fi
Interview, Taina Hintsa, 2010, Finland

Liisa Keltikangas-Järvinen, Liisa.Keltikangas-Jarvinen@helsinki.fi
Participation in interview for web based media: Helsingin Sanomien verkkosivu, Liisa Keltikangas-Järvinen, 2007
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Research Group: Keltinkangas-Järvinen L

**Basic statistics**

- Number of publications (P) 399
- Number of citations (TCS) 2,271
- Number of citations per publication (MCS) 5.70
- Percentage of uncited publications 27%
- Field-normalized number of citations per publication (MNCS) 1.53
- Field-normalized average journal impact (MNJS) 1.63
- Field-normalized proportion highly cited publications (top 10%) 1.91
- Internal coverage .82

**Trend analyses**

- MNCS
- THCP10
- MNJS

**Collaboration**

- Performance (MNCS) by collaboration type
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