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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\(^3\) 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.\(^4\)
- 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.

---

\(^3\) 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.

\(^4\) 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\(^5\) compilations on publications and other scientific activities\(^6\)
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.

\(^5\) TUHAT (acronym) of Research Information System (RIS) of the University of Helsinki

\(^6\) Supervision of thesis, prizes and awards, editorial work and peer reviews, participation in committees, boards and networks and public appearances.
1.5 Evaluation material

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

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

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

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

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

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

Background material

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

2. Practises and quality of doctoral training
- Organising of the doctoral training in the RC. Description of the RC’s principles for:
  - recruitment and selection of doctoral candidates
  - supervision of doctoral candidates
  - collaboration with faculties, departments/institutes, and potential graduate schools/docoral 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
   Competitive funding reported in the text is also to be considered when evaluating this point.
   A written feedback from the aspects of: scientific quality, scientific significance, societal impact,
   innovativeness, future significance
   - Strengths
   - Areas of development
   - Other remarks
   - Recommendations

8. The RC’s strategic action plan for 2011-2013
   - RC’s description of their future perspectives in relation to research and doctoral training.
   A written feedback from the aspects of: scientific quality, scientific significance, societal impact, processes
   and good practices related to leadership and management, national and international collaboration,
   innovativeness, future significance
   - Strengths
   - Areas of development
9. Evaluation of the category of the RC in the context of entity of the evaluation material (1-8)

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

- Strengths
- Areas of development
- Other remarks
- Recommendations

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

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

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

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

13. RC-specific conclusions

1.7 Evaluation criteria

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

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

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

Description of criteria levels

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

---

**Question 2 – DOCTORAL TRAINING**

**Question 3 – SOCIETAL IMPACT**

**Question 4 – COLLABORATION**

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

**Question 9 – CATEGORY**

**Participation category – fitness for the category chosen**

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

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

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

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

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

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

---

7 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

Strengths
Within its research fields, the RC has influenced in particular the phenomenological understanding of intersubjectivity, embodiment, and gender. At present it seeks to explore four areas: contemporary “crises” of reason; challenges to political life and communality; problems of birth, life, mortality; and questions concerning education and learning.

The research agenda is well formulated in that it combines focus and flexibility. The research is characterized by high quality and high academic significance. It is also innovative. The effort to apply philosophical resources to the analysis and understanding of topical problems – combining a transcendental and an empirical approach – is promising.

The list of publications comprises 313 items, among these 142 journal articles and 12 books. While the list of publication forums is broad and diverse, a portion of the journal articles have appeared in scientifically ranked (some in highly ranked) journals. 6.5% of the ranked articles of the SHC are Level 2 Norway, therefore the other 93.5% of the ranked articles are Level 1. From the Australian ranking system, 7.4% are Australia A* and 16.4% are Australia A. Considering that the RC has 22 members of which 13 are doctoral candidates and one is a professor, this is a sound record. It is clear that the RC is successful in its research and produces philosophical work of high quality.

Areas of development
Interdisciplinarity and co-authoring.

Other remarks
Some of the areas that the RC mentions are less well represented in its membership and publication -- for example aesthetics.

Recommendations
One possible line of development is to head for more joint authoring, including with fields outside philosophy. At present, 85 % of the articles are single authored which is not a high number. Nevertheless, as the RC’s ambition is to tackle real problems, this could be one fruitful way to increase interdisciplinarity and relevance. This might also be reflected in the publication policy.

The reflections in the self-evaluation on ways to strengthen and improve the research seem to hit the mark and show a mature self-understanding. A stronger co-ordination is probably useful, but it is also important to maintain the flexibility and openness which seem to be a fruitful aspect of this RC. (See also feedback to question no. 5.)

Numeric evaluation: 4 (Excellent)
2.2 Practises and quality of doctoral training

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

ASPECTS: Processes and good practices related to leadership and management

Strengths
The RC has been able to recruit motivated young scholars. Of the 7 candidates (6 UH) who have finished their PhD’s during the six-year period many have been able to pursue post doc -careers. The practices of doctoral training seem to be excellent: there is a strong commitment of supervisors and an emphasis on collateral and collegial practices where the candidates are given responsibilities early on. The panel agrees that the “exercise defenses” deserve special mentioning.

Areas of development
More co-operation with the “home departments” might be a good idea.

Other remarks
The self-evaluation report mentions the problem of “brain drain”, since there are not enough positions for the researchers at the UH. Is this really a fruitful perspective? One might also think that mobility between universities – nationally and internationally – is both inevitable and a good thing. Due to the internet, co-operation has become increasingly easy.

Recommendations
The RC might reflect upon developing its international recruitment, perhaps from the basis of the excellent international co-operation that already exists. Developing the co-operation with the candidates’ home departments and existing doctoral programs (not mentioned in the report) is also recommended.

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

Strengths
Members of the RC have published in many different for ums including newspapers and taken part in societal debates around gender, the university reform, etc. The research topics are often in themselves of societal importance.
Other remarks
A more concrete description of the transformative effect of the research work would have been informative. This is included to some extent. However, the societal relevance of the topics is one thing, their dissemination to a wider audience another thing.

Recommendations
The relevance of this research for society should be more clearly spelled out and “marketed”. The self-evaluation lists seven ways to strengthen this area, but it remains unclear what the RC’s strategy will be. The RC may wish to meet as a group to consider how to market their work in consideration of issues emerging in the greater society and in its public debates. There should be clear rewards for members of the RC that enter into and spend their time in these public debates. There seems to be a lot of motivation to develop in this direction, which is a positive sign.

Numeric evaluation: 4 (Excellent)

2.4 International and national (incl. intersectoral) research collaboration and researcher mobility

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

ASPECTS: Scientific quality, national and international collaboration

Strengths
The RC has a strong international and Nordic networking with many important centers and accomplished scholars. Of the total amount of publications 46% are in Finnish, 38% in English, and 10% in Swedish; in addition, RC members have published in French, Japanese, German, Russian and Estonian. This indicates strong international networking. There seems to be a fair amount of mobility of members going abroad, but it is less clear how much scholars from abroad come to visit at SHC.

Areas of development
There might be more formalized national and international collaboration both in doctoral training and research.

Recommendations
Although the percentage of non-Finnish academic journal articles is bigger than 54% (see above); the RC might consider sharpening its publication policy towards an even more international profile. The societal impact need not be seen only in national terms, as is perhaps the case at present.

Numeric evaluation: 4 (Excellent)

2.5 Operational conditions

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

ASPECTS: Processes and good practices related to leadership and management
Strengths
The SHC has been working as a network-type of community for about 15 years. Only two of its members have permanent positions at UH, which on the other hand implies that members can devote a lot of work to research rather than teaching and administration. This is therefore truly a research community. Among the strengths of the organization are its flexibility, which enables the circulation and birth of new ideas.

There are 6 PIs (of 22), which is a high number for a community of this size and definitely a strength. The Helsinki Collegium for Advanced Studies is mentioned as an excellent partner.

Areas of development
The majority of the 22 members work in philosophy but there are some people from political science and one from theology as well. The presence of these and other non-philosophy areas in the RC might be strengthened, taken how the RC describes its research foci. Most importantly, however, the RC’s organizational status should be settled. Several options certainly exist but it seems important at least to secure some administrative resources.

Other remarks
The situation of being spread over three Faculties may add to the dissatisfaction of having too few resources and permanent positions.

Recommendations
Discuss the operational conditions within the RC and with the relevant Faculty deans.

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

Strengths
The SHC aims at minimizing hierarchies and creating an open and collegial atmosphere between junior and senior scholars. Responsibilities, ideas, criticisms are shared. This is a fruitful way to work. However, it might be easier as there are no resources to share due to the network-character of the RC.

Other remarks
A challenge to the RC is to clarify its leadership. There is no fixed leadership structure. The RC’s evaluation material states that a “clearer and more stable organization” would be desirable. It may be advisable for the RC to explicitly recognize the PIs as the leaders of their projects and leave it at that until they develop a more solid, permanent arrangement within the UH.

Recommendations
The ideas for long-term and more coordinated planning are good. Finally, the future of SHC will probably depend largely on the University’s decisions (see also Recommendations under item 8).
2.7 External competitive funding of the RC

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

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

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

**Strengths**
The RC has been successful in getting external national funding, particularly from the Academy of Finland. It received 3,090,000 € of external funding during the evaluation period or 515,000 € a year. For a 22 member RC, including just one Research director at the very senior level, this is a strength.

**Areas of development**
International funding.

**Recommendations**
Apply also for international funding. Application partnerships should also be considered (both national and international).

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

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

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

**Strengths**
The RC’s hope is to be granted a position as a permanent research unit with a doctoral program. There are certainly prerequisites for this, although it might be most realistic to proceed step by step.
More concretely, there are plans for a European research application on Crisis and Communality, with relevant international partners.

**Areas of development**
The institutional framework is the most pressing area of development. Another is to further develop the international partnerships of the RC.

**Other remarks**
The SHC does not have a discrete strategic plan. It seems to have incipient activities based on initiatives of some of its members. The RC’s movement in this area is based more on “hope” than concrete planning. These remarks are not criticisms. It is probably rational for such a small RC that is spread over so many organizational entities to probe and explore rather than to try to adhere to a fixed strategic plan.
The reflective tone of the self-evaluation paper is promising with regard to future developments.
Recommendations
Discussions about the future status of the RC should be opened with the UH Collegium for Advanced Studies, with relevant departments and the Faculty Boards and University Senate.

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 4. The research of the participating community represents an innovative opening.

The category of this RC is 4, claiming that “The research of the participating community represents an innovative opening”.

Strengths
The innovative aspects of this RC are in its combination on the one hand of transcendental and empirical questions, and on the other hand in its interdisciplinarity. The RC has developed from within the university and the grass-root level, since the traditional strong areas of the department of philosophy at UH have been in the analytical rather than in the continental tradition. The members have been able to “produce convincing evidence of the high level of their previous research”.

Areas of development
While the RC is well on its way, there is still room to strengthen the work of this RC in the indicated direction and gain more international and national visibility.

Other remarks
Other possible categories would have been 1 or 2.

Recommendations
The RC could further sharpen its profile and make efforts to guard its innovative aspects, if this is the category where it wants to stay. There is a small risk here since the majority of its members are philosophers and there is a strong thrust towards the history of philosophy – which is no doubt worthwhile as such.

Numeric evaluation: 4 (Excellent)

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

Writing the report was a fairly collaborative effort with the leader and one assistant as the main responsible persons. PIs and post docs were asked to make suggestions about all questions at stage 2, and everyone was asked to provide basic information. The document was distributed to all members.

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

Focus area 4: The thinking and learning human being

The RC represents the focus area 4 The thinking and learning human being. The fundamental philosophical work on human subjectivity is evidently relevant for this area. In addition, the self-evaluation mentions
research on the philosophy of education and phenomenological analyses of theories of child development. One member is involved with education on the practical level. The RC might seek more partnerships with other disciplines in this important area, where it undoubtedly has potential to contribute.

2.12 RC-specific main recommendations

1. Stabilizing the operational conditions
The institutional framework is the most pressing area of development. The operational conditions should be discussed within the RC, with relevant Faculty deans and heads of departments, with the UH Collegium for Advanced Studies and ultimately with the University Senate. A strategic plan should then be drafted and implemented.

With a position as a permanent research unit (possibly with a doctoral program) the RC could put more effort into long-term, coordinated planning and probably be able to attract international funding. However it is also important to maintain the flexibility and openness which are obviously fruitful aspects of this RC.

With a clearer institutional identity the RC could formalize the co-operation with doctoral candidates’ home departments and existing doctoral programs.

2. Increased interdisciplinarity, sharpened research profile and increased societal impact
The RC could further sharpen its profile and develop its innovative aspects.

It might strengthen its interdisciplinarity by more actively inviting people from other fields than philosophy. Joint authoring is one way to deepen this co-operation. Interdisciplinarity is important in tackling real-world problems, which is one of the RC’s ambitions. Such ambitions should be reflected in the publication policy.

The relevance of research for society should be more clearly spelled out and marketed. The RC may consider how to market their work in consideration of issues emerging in the greater society and in its public debates.

3. Internationalization
International partnerships should be further developed. International (and national) application partnerships should be considered. The publication profile might be sharpened towards an even more international profile. The societal impact need not be seen only in national terms. The RC might develop a strategy for international recruitment of doctoral candidates.

2.13 RC-specific conclusions

This is a strong and genuine RC with an academically and socially ambitious research profile. The RC has evolved during the last 15 years and is now at a stage of development where it would need recognition and support in terms of being granted the status of a permanent research unit. This would probably “pay back” with more international visibility and competitive funding.
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NAME OF THE RESEARCHER COMMUNITY:
Subjectivity, Historicity, and Communality: Studies in Philosophy and Political Sciences (SHC)

LEADER OF THE RESEARCHER COMMUNITY:
Academy Research Fellow Sara Heinämäa, Helsinki Collegium for Advanced Studies

RC-SPECIFIC MATERIAL FOR THE PEER REVIEW:

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

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

RC-SPECIFIC STAGE 1 MATERIAL (registration form)

1 RESPONSIBLE PERSON

Name: Heinämaa, Sara
E-mail: sara.heinamaa@helsinki.fi
Phone: +358919121736 (office), +358405194523 (mobile)
Affiliation: Helsinki Collegium for Advanced Studies, University of Helsinki
Street address: P.O. Box 4 (Fabianinkatu 24), 00014 University of Helsinki

2 DESCRIPTION OF THE PARTICIPATING RESEARCHER COMMUNITY (RC)

Name of the participating RC (max. 30 characters): Subjectivity, Historicity, and Communality: Studies in Philosophy and Political
Acronym for the participating RC (max. 10 characters): SHC

Description of the operational basis in 2005-2010 (eg. research collaboration, joint doctoral training activities) on which the RC was formed (MAX. 2200 characters with spaces):
The researcher community SHC is formed on the basis of an effective cooperative network of research and doctoral training developed within the UH during the last 15 years. The community includes researchers working in various disciplines of the humanities and social sciences (philosophy, political theory, women’s studies, and art studies). Its theoretical basis is in the philosophical tradition commonly known as “Continental” – first and foremost, phenomenology, philosophical hermeneutics, and (post)structuralist theory.


These groups have been collaborating in the form of publications, conferences, and research seminars. Besides the common theoretical background, they share several research topics, most importantly: the general theory of subjectivity; embodiment and gender; intersubjectivity, communality, and historicity; the limits and crises of European rationality and modern rationalism.

The scientific results of the community, as well as its practical achievements in doctoral training and its international cooperation, are outstanding.

At the moment, the community is a loose network with no stable institutional setting. The aim of SHC is to consolidate the network, to develop its practices on the basis of the evaluation, and to create a cohesive institutional setting for the community within the organizational structure of the UH.
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3 SCIENTIFIC FIELDS OF THE RC

Main scientific field of the RC’s research: humanities

RC’s scientific subfield 1: Philosophy

RC’s scientific subfield 2: Political Science

RC’s scientific subfield 3: Women’s Studies

RC’s scientific subfield 4: History and Philosophy of Science

Other, if not in the list: History, art.

4 RC’S PARTICIPATION CATEGORY

Participation category: 4. Research of the participating community represents an innovative opening

Justification for the selected participation category (MAX. 2200 characters with spaces): SHC represents a new innovative opening and an original scholarly approach within the humanities and social sciences. It has already contributed to the establishment and development of two novel fields of inquiry on the international philosophical scene: (i) feminist phenomenology and (ii) phenomenology of intersubjectivity. Currently SHC explores new possibilities of applying phenomenological and postphenomenological methods and concepts in the analysis of political life and communality and in the understanding of the crises of rationality.

SHC combines three major scholarly virtues: innovativeness, high academic quality, and high impact. Despite their relative youth, the principal investigators and the senior researchers of the community have authored a considerable number of high quality scholarly publications on several international forums and have been highly successful in acquiring external research funding. Also many of the junior researchers (doctoral candidates and postdoctoral researchers) have published in high quality international and domestic journals and presented their work at key international conferences.

SHC shows innovativeness, high quality, and high impact also in doctoral training and postdoctoral mentoring. In spite of the fact that the community lacks a permanent administrative framework and mainly operates on external funding, it provides an exceptionally fruitful and firm environment for researchers at all levels of their academic careers. We believe that the excellent outcome of the community is due to its egalitarian practices in research cooperation and in doctoral training (see sections 5 and 7).

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): SHC represents new scholarly developments within contemporary phenomenology and postphenomenological theory. It focuses on the problems of embodiment and intersubjectivity, communal and political life, and rationality. It draws strongly upon its expertise in history of philosophy and history of sciences, but does not pursue exegetic aims for their own sake. Rather it employs phenomenological and postphenomenological methods and concepts in order to analyze concrete problems of today’s world.
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The unifying task of SHC is to understand contemporary developments in the discourse and debate on Europe as well as the founding ideas of European rationality, the ideas of science, democracy, and universalism.

The aim is to address the multiple "crises" of European rationality by integrating the fields of philosophy, political theory, and women’s studies. SHC therefore tackles many different topics: gender and sexual difference, embodiment and perception, sensibility and aesthetics, norms and normality, origins and dynamics of communities, multiculturalism, political and philosophical universalism vs. particularism, modern rationality and its limits, and the history of European sciences.

At the same time the operative concepts and methods of phenomenology are subjected to critical inspection and exposed to alternative frameworks, most importantly those of deconstruction and genealogy.

The UH provides an excellent context for such work. The new phenomenological and postphenomenological approach of SHC was established during the 1990s and it has been enriched and sharpened from the very beginning by close contacts with the domestic traditions of history of philosophy, history of sciences, and Wittgenstein studies, which all emphasize the importance of historical and analytical work on concepts.

SHC also puts into practice new ideas of doctoral training. The main innovation is to supplement traditional hierarchical relations of supervision and mentoring by collateral and collegial relations. This is done at all stages of research training and academic career in order to integrate all members into a dialogical community of mutual feedback and support from the beginning.

Significance of the RC’s research and doctoral training for the University of Helsinki (MAX. 2200 characters with spaces): The main significance of SHC lies in two directions. (1) SHC contributes in an innovative way to several fields of the humanities and social sciences, producing results well received by international scholarly communities. (2) SHC also produces young PhDs capable of developing their own research profiles and well equipped for success in raising research funding and competing for positions in domestic and international academic environments.

The core output of SHC consists of research publications: monographs, journal articles, and edited volumes with leading international and domestic publishers. The aim is to combine originality and innovativeness with clarity of concepts, systematic coverage, and profound historical-philosophical insight. The results of SHC’s work have already contributed strongly to the development of contemporary phenomenology of intersubjectivity and gender.

Doctoral training and postdoctoral mentoring are integrated with research and regulated by its high standards. This strategy has proven effective in both qualitative and quantitative terms, to the extent that SHC has received several requests for doctoral supervision from Europe and the USA. Due to the lack of a stable institutional setting, SHC has not yet been able to respond to these requests adequately. This lack also creates the inverse problem of “brain drain”: the scarcity of domestic positions compels young PhDs to seek employment abroad.

Within the scholarly milieu of the UH, SHC has had a significant impact on developments in philosophy, women’s studies, and political science. Prior to SHC’s input, research in philosophy was mainly focused on formal logic, semantics, and philosophy of science; women’s studies were centered on empirical
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inquiries; and political science was dominated by traditional realist-positivist approaches with a strong emphasis on governance. SHC has introduced a new set of research problems and created new connections to international research centers. Its methods relate concrete problems of the present to fundamental questions concerning meaning-constitution, thereby allowing a fruitful combination of empirical and transcendental approaches.

Keywords: Phenomenology, history of philosophy and science, political science, art studies, aesthetics; existence, embodiment, sexual difference, historicity, communality, modernity, rationality, science, crisis; deconstruction, genealogy, conceptual analysis; Europe, Europeanization

Justified estimate of the quality of the RC’s research and doctoral training at national and international level during 2005-2010 (MAX. 2200 characters with spaces): The quality of SHC’s research and doctoral training is exceptionally high within the UH and also in comparison to other domestic and international communities of the same size and resources.

SHC has produced an impressive amount of scholarly articles in high-standard international and domestic journals, as well as monographs and compilations with leading publishers. Seven of SHC’s members have been granted a principal investigator status by the UH. All of its senior members and many junior members participate actively in international meetings and organize international conferences and symposia at UH. Many senior members have administrative tasks in domestic and international scholarly societies and serve as referees and board members in scholarly journals. Several of them also work as experts for European scientific bodies.

SHC has multiple connections to Scandinavia, Central Europe, America, Australia, and Japan. The senior members work in close contact with the leading centers of excellence of their fields and participate actively in establishing and developing interdisciplinary research communities that connect philosophy, women’s studies, political sciences, and history.

The same excellent quality characterizes SHC’s doctoral training and postdoctoral mentoring. During the period under evaluation, SHC produced seven PhDs, and several are forthcoming. This is remarkable considering the fact that only a few of SHC’s members hold permanent positions and the community lacks a stable institutional setting. Moreover, PhDs produced in this community have defended their dissertations with great success and excellent grades. At the same time, they have taken part in scholarly publishing and organizing of research meetings, and have also initiated new forms of scholarly interchange (e.g., junior cooperation within the Nordic Society for Phenomenology).

Many young PhDs of the community have been successful in the competition for external funding and several have received postdoctoral positions at other academic institutions in Finland or abroad (UK, Sweden, USA). SHC has also begun to attract doctoral students from other countries (see section 5 above).

Comments on how the RC’s scientific productivity and doctoral training should be evaluated (MAX. 2200 characters with spaces): In evaluating SHC’s scientific productivity, the relative academic youth of the community should be taken into account. With regard to the early stage of their careers, the members’ productivity has been prolific. Guidelines for the bibliometrical assessment of relevant journals can be
found in the Scopus database and in scientific journal rankings created by the European Science Foundation and the Australian Research Council. It should be noted that in the Excellence in Research for Australia 2010 evaluation, many of the journals in which members of SHC have published (e.g., Epoche, Hypatia, Continental Philosophy Review, Philosophy Today, Review of Metaphysics) were classified as A* (best in its field or subfield) or A (very high quality). A key strength of SHC is the developing and expanding tendency and the attractiveness manifested by its intensely productive doctoral training and researcher mentoring. Few philosophers at the University of Helsinki have supervised as many doctoral students as SHC’s research director Sara Heinämaa, and it is even rarer to have so many students attaining PhDs within such a short time and moving on to successful research careers.

SHC’s publishing strategy consists in submitting monographs and edited volumes to leading academic publishing houses, authoring articles for leading peer-reviewed journals, and participating in edited volumes of the best publishing houses of the relevant fields. Members most often present their work at international conferences before submitting it for publication.

This strategy has proven successful: SHC has produced a considerable number of peer-reviewed publications of different kinds, and many of its products have been published by the leading publishing agents in Continental thinking, such as Springer, Cambridge University Press, Rowman & Littlefield, Routledge, Indiana University Press, and State University of New York Press.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Last name</th>
<th>First name</th>
<th>Title of research and teaching personnel</th>
<th>Affiliation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alhanen</td>
<td>Kai</td>
<td>Doctoral candidate / Postdoctoral researcher</td>
<td>Faculty of Theology, Department of Systematic Theology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Backman</td>
<td>Jussi</td>
<td>Doctoral candidate / Postdoctoral researcher</td>
<td>Faculty of Arts, Department of Philosophy / Department of Philosophy, History, Culture and Art Studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Björk</td>
<td>Ulrika</td>
<td>Doctoral candidate / Postdoctoral researcher</td>
<td>Faculty of Arts, Department of Philosophy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hartimo</td>
<td>Mirja</td>
<td>Postdoctoral researcher</td>
<td>Faculty of Arts, Department of Philosophy / Department of Philosophy, History, Culture and Art Studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heinämaa</td>
<td>Sara</td>
<td>Research director</td>
<td>Faculty of Arts, Department of Philosophy / Helsinki Collegium for Advanced Studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Himanka</td>
<td>Juha</td>
<td>University lecturer</td>
<td>Faculty of Arts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hotanen</td>
<td>Juho</td>
<td>Doctoral candidate</td>
<td>Faculty of Arts, Department of Philosophy, History, Culture and Art Studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Klockars</td>
<td>Kristian</td>
<td>Senior researcher / University lecturer / Professor</td>
<td>Faculty of Arts, Department of Philosophy / Faculty of Social Sciences, Department of Social and Moral Philosophy / Department of Political and Economic Studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lehtinen</td>
<td>Virpi</td>
<td>Doctoral candidate / Postdoctoral researcher</td>
<td>Faculty of Arts, Department of Philosophy / Department of Philosophy, History, Culture and Art Studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lindberg</td>
<td>Susanna</td>
<td>Postdoctoral researcher / University researcher / Senior researcher</td>
<td>Faculty of Arts, Department of Philosophy / Department of Philosophy, History, Culture and Art Studies / Faculty of Social Sciences, Network for European Studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miettinen</td>
<td>Timo</td>
<td>Doctoral candidate</td>
<td>Faculty of Arts, Department of Philosophy / Department of Philosophy, History, Culture and Art Studies / Faculty of Social Sciences, Network for European Studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ojankangas</td>
<td>Mika</td>
<td>Senior researcher</td>
<td>Faculty of Social Sciences, Department of Political Science / Department of Political and Economic Studies / Helsinki Collegium for Advanced Studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oksala</td>
<td>Johanna</td>
<td>Postdoctoral researcher</td>
<td>Faculty of Arts, Department of Philosophy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perhoniemi</td>
<td>Tuukka</td>
<td>Doctoral candidate</td>
<td>Faculty of Arts, Department of Philosophy / Department of Philosophy, History, Culture and Art Studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pulkkinen</td>
<td>Simo</td>
<td>Doctoral candidate</td>
<td>Faculty of Arts, Department of Philosophy / Department of Philosophy, History, Culture and Art Studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poleshchuk</td>
<td>Irina</td>
<td>Doctoral candidate / Postdoctoral researcher</td>
<td>Faculty of Social Sciences, Department of Social and Moral Philosophy / Department of Political and Economic Studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prozorov</td>
<td>Sergei</td>
<td>Senior researcher</td>
<td>Faculty of Social Sciences, Department of Political Science / Department of Political and Economic Studies / Helsinki Collegium for Advanced Studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reuter</td>
<td>Martina</td>
<td>Postdoctoral researcher / Senior researcher</td>
<td>Faculty of Arts, Department of Philosophy / Faculty of Theology, Department of Systematic Theology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ruonakoski</td>
<td>Erika</td>
<td>Doctoral candidate</td>
<td>Faculty of Arts, Department of Philosophy / Department of Philosophy, History, Culture and Art Studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sadinmaa</td>
<td>Antti</td>
<td>Doctoral candidate</td>
<td>Faculty of Social Sciences, Department of Social and Moral Philosophy / Department of Political and Economic Studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taipale</td>
<td>Joona</td>
<td>Doctoral candidate / Postdoctoral researcher</td>
<td>Faculty of Arts, Department of Philosophy / Department of Philosophy, History, Culture and Art Studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Westerlund</td>
<td>Fredrik</td>
<td>Doctoral candidate</td>
<td>Faculty of Arts, Department of Philosophy / Department of Philosophy, History, Culture and Art Studies</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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BACKGROUND INFORMATION

Name of the RC’s responsible person: Heinämaa, Sara
E-mail of the RC’s responsible person: sara.heinamaa@helsinki.fi

The RC’s research represents the following key focus area of UH: 4. Ajatteleva ja oppiva ihminen - The thinking and learning human being

Comments for selecting/not selecting the key focus area: The overarching focus of the community’s research is on human subjectivity, i.e., the human being as a conscious and self-conscious thinking being. The main aspects of subjectivity under study include embodiment, gender, intersubjectivity, rationality, historicity, cultural specificity, and communality. Questions of learning and education are central for this approach, since it understands and conceptualizes the human subject as a dynamic and developing whole, not as static or fixed. Several research results have already been attained and applied in this field: Juha Himanka and Mika Ojakangas have published extensively on the philosophy of education; Sara Heinämaa and Joonas Taijal are presently working on phenomenological clarifications of theories of child development; and Kai Alhanen is a board member in a company producing education and work supervision services for the public, private, and 3rd sectors. (Among the major and future fields of research listed by the UH Faculty of Arts, SHC covers cultural diversity and integration, the history of concepts and ideas, and Europe.)

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).


SHC’s research is primarily philosophical and theoretical. Its overarching topic is (1) human subjectivity and rationality, with a special focus on intersubjectivity, embodiment, and gender. Related key topics are (2) the historicity and cultural specificity of subjectivity and rationality, in particular, the “European” and modern background of our theoretical concepts of selfhood and reason and their historical roots and limitations, as well as (3) the communal and political aspects of subjectivity and rationality. SHC’s unifying task is to clarify and assess contemporary discourses and debates on all of these themes, with an emphasis on what are commonly regarded as the fundamental aspects of “European rationality,” such as scientific progress, democracy, and universalism. A part of this task is to address the alleged multiple “crises” of modern rationality from the respective viewpoints of philosophy, political science,
and gender studies. SHC therefore tackles many different but related issues: embodiment and perception; sensibility and aesthetics; norms and normality; gender and sexual difference; the origins and dynamics of communities; multiculturalism; political, epistemological and ontological universalism vs. particularism; biopolitics; modern vs. “postmodern” notions of rationality; and the history of the European sciences.

The main theoretical framework of SHC is contemporary Continental thought, first and foremost phenomenology, existentialism, philosophical hermeneutics, and poststructuralist theory. Its methodological and conceptual sources include the works of Edmund Husserl, Martin Heidegger, Hannah Arendt, Simone de Beauvoir, Maurice Merleau-Ponty, Michel Foucault, Jacques Derrida, and Giorgio Agamben. The research of the members draws strongly upon their expertise in the history of philosophy and the history of science, but SHC does not primarily pursue exegetic aims for their own sake. Rather, phenomenological and postphenomenological methods and concepts are applied to the analysis of concrete problems of today’s world. This approach allows a fruitful combination of empirical and transcendental questions, as well as positive scientific and philosophical-conceptual results. At the same time, the operative concepts and methods of phenomenology are subjected to critical inspection and exposed to alternative frameworks, such as Derridean deconstruction and Foucauldian historical genealogy.

QUALITY. The quality of SHC’s research is very high in comparison with other research communities of the same size and with similar resources in the field of the humanities and social sciences, both within UH and in the international academic context. SHC combines three major scholarly virtues: innovativeness, high academic quality, and high impact. Seven of its members have been granted a principal investigator status at UH. Despite their relative youth, the principal investigators and the senior researchers of the community have published an impressive amount of scholarly articles in high-standard international and domestic journals as well as monographs and compilations with leading publishers. They have been highly successful in acquiring external research funding. Many of the junior members have also published in high-quality international and domestic journals and presented their work at international key conferences. All of the senior members and many junior members participate actively in international meetings and organize international conferences and symposia at UH. Many senior members have administrative tasks in domestic and international scholarly societies and serve as referees and board members in scholarly journals. Several of them also work as experts for European scientific bodies.

SHC has multiple contacts with other academic communities in Scandinavia, Russia, Central Europe, the UK and Ireland, the US, Australia, and Japan. The senior members work in close contact with the leading centers of excellence of their fields and participate actively in establishing and developing interdisciplinary research communities. Many junior scholars trained in SHC have been successful in the competition for postdoctoral funding, and several have held postdoctoral positions in other academic institutions in Finland or abroad (the UK, Russia, Sweden, and the US).

SIGNIFICANCE. In terms of scientific innovations and new scholarly results, SHC’s work has already contributed strongly to the development of contemporary phenomenology of intersubjectivity, embodiment, and gender. In these fields, the community has produced new and original theoretical insights that have influenced international scholarly discussions within philosophy and gender studies. Currently, SHC is exploring new possibilities of applying phenomenological and postphenomenological methods and concepts to create new theoretical approaches in four topical areas: (1) the contemporary “crises” of reason, (2) the current challenges of political life and communality, (3) problems related to birth, life, and mortality, and (4) theoretical questions concerning education and learning.

SHC thus contributes innovatively to several fields within the humanities and social sciences, producing results well received by the international scholarly community. Its core output consists of peer-reviewed
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research publications: monographs, journal articles, and edited volumes with leading international and domestic publishers. The aim is to combine originality and innovativeness with clarity of concepts, systematic coverage, and profound historical-philosophical insight.

Within the scholarly environment of UH, the work of SHC’s members has had a significant impact on developments in philosophy, political science, and gender studies. Prior to their input, research in philosophy at UH was mainly focused on formal logic, semantics, and philosophy of science; gender and women’s studies were centered on empirical inquiries; and political science was dominated by traditional realist-positivist approaches with a strong emphasis on governance. Members of SHC have introduced a new set of research problems and theoretical discourses and created new connections to international research centers. At the same time, SHC’s methodology has been enriched and clarified through close contacts with more traditional fields of philosophical expertise at UH, such as history of philosophy, history of science, and Wittgenstein studies, all of which emphasize the importance of historical and analytical work on concepts.

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

At present, the organization of the community is rather loose and informal. Increasing the focus and synergy and improving the quality of SHC’s work requires a stronger coordination of its various research projects and a closer collaboration between its individual members. This can be achieved by (1) creating a permanent and integrated organization with a clearer assignment of research tasks and administrative responsibilities, (2) writing a joint research program for the community, (3) establishing a common research seminar, (4) organizing a series of meetings on methodological questions, and (5) encouraging members to coauthor publications. (6) The community should also be gradually extended and new members at various stages of their careers should be recruited. (7) Postdoctoral mentoring of members should be enhanced. However, long-term success would also require (8) a more established and coherent institutional setting and more resources in the form of research funding and permanent academic positions for senior members.

2 PRACTICES AND QUALITY OF DOCTORAL TRAINING (MAX. 8800 CHARACTERS WITH SPACES)

• How is doctoral training organised in the RC? Description of the RC’s principles for recruitment and selection of doctoral candidates, supervision of doctoral candidates, collaboration with faculties, departments/institutes, and potential graduate schools/doctoral programmes, good practises and quality assurance in doctoral training, and assuring good career perspectives for the doctoral candidates/fresh doctorates.

RECRUITMENT AND SELECTION. The recruitment of new PhD students normally takes place during the final phase of their MA studies, during which, in the Finnish system, students write an extensive scholarly Master’s thesis under the supervision of a professor, university lecturer, or docent. This first stage of academic interchange provides a natural basis for higher academic training.

SHC members select their doctoral students first and foremost on the basis of submitted research proposals, the scholarly quality of Master’s theses, as well as the students’ ability to meet the formal requirements for doctoral candidates in their respective faculties. So far, most of the community’s PhD students have been recruited from Finnish universities; selection of potential foreign students would put more emphasis on research proposals as well as recommendations. Since PhD students who are not members of funded research groups have to obtain funding in the form of personal grants, the ability to secure competitive funding is also an important practical requirement for doctoral education.
SUPERVISION. PhD supervision in SHC is based on several related working practices involving supervisors, PhD students, and other community members. Some of them (1, 4, 5) are quite traditional, some rather innovative (2, 3, 6). (1) The most important part of the process consists of the sessions in which the supervisor and the doctoral candidate discuss the content and form of the candidate’s dissertation on the basis of previously submitted research plans and chapters. Each chapter and subchapter is discussed in detail and corrections, extensions, elaborations, specifications, and/or abbreviations are suggested. (2) In addition to these dialogical sessions, students are also advised and trained collectively. The main channels for this are the weekly research seminars and smaller sessions that gather together members working on related topics. This work form also gives the students the opportunity to receive critical comments and suggestions from other PhD students and from advanced researchers of the community. (3) All PhD students are encouraged to present parts of their dissertations at conferences, research meetings, seminars, and workshops in Finland and abroad, and travel funding is provided for this aim when possible. Similar events are also organized in Helsinki by the community; the usual practice has been to invite 1–4 acknowledged experts of the field to present keynote papers and to comment on presentations by PhD students. (4) During the final year of the PhD project, the supervisor reads and comments on the entire dissertation manuscript and makes critical suggestions for final revisions. Many students also ask other advanced colleagues to read the dissertation or parts of it. After final revisions, the work is submitted for pre-examination, which is normally performed by two professors specialized in the topics of the dissertation, usually from abroad. (5) The pre-examiners' reports are received within 3–4 months. They are carefully studied together by the PhD candidate and the supervisor and a plan is made for necessary additional revisions. The student then revises the manuscript once more and submits it for final examination. The external examiner ("opponent") of the dissertation is most often a professor or docent from abroad specialized in the topics of the dissertation, often one of the pre-examiners. (6) In order to prepare candidates for the actual defense and to train the skills needed, the community has organized "exercise defenses" in which senior researchers present critical questions for the candidate concerning his or her work. The defendant is trained to answer in the systematic, formal, and argumentative manner required at the actual defense.

The majority of SHC’s dissertation have been and will be written in English in order to allow an examination by the best international experts available. Fluent oral and written English skills are therefore required also from PhD candidates. For the general improvement of academic English skills, the community’s seminar meetings and workshops are normally in English.

COLLABORATION. In PhD training, SHC collaborates primarily with the leading Nordic centers of phenomenology and Continental thought: the Center for Subjectivity Research (Univ. of Copenhagen) and Södertörn University College (Stockholm). Recently, SHC has also established a similar collaboration with University College Dublin and University College Cork (Ireland). These collaborative partners are described in detail in section 4 below.

Submitting a dissertation for pre-examination in Finland requires a permission from the head of the candidate’s home department. The PhD project therefore entails constant cooperation between the supervisor, the candidate, and the department head. In case the supervisor is not a member of the department’s acting faculty, an additional "formal" supervisor is often appointed from among the department’s faculty.

GOOD PRACTICES AND QUALITY ASSURANCE. SHC puts into practice several non-traditional principles of doctoral training. The main innovation is to supplement traditional hierarchical relationships of supervision and mentoring with more collateral and collegial relations. Dogmatism and authoritarianism are avoided. Doctoral students are given considerable freedom and responsibility in their choice of dissertation topics and approaches. Moreover, they are encouraged to present their research in
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progress to the community as well as to its international partner communities. This provides public feedback from senior members as well as opportunities of "peer-review" by other doctoral students. The idea is to develop argumentative and critical skills and to integrate students into a dialogical community of mutual feedback and support from the very beginning. The community’s doctoral training is integrated with its research practices and regulated by its high standards.

CAREER PERSPECTIVES. In order to ensure good career perspectives for junior scholars, SHC also emphasizes the importance of postdoctoral mentoring and feedback and research training. Many junior scholars of the community have been successful in the competition for external funding and several have held postdoctoral positions at other academic institutions in Finland or abroad (the UK, Sweden, Russia, and the US).

Since academic positions in the humanities and social sciences are scarce in Finland, even senior members have applied for and accepted positions at other universities, both in Finland and in other countries (e.g., University of Tampere, University of Jyväskylä, University of Dundee, Uppsala University, University of Oslo). While success in the competitive academic job market is a proof of competence and increases scholarly mobility, from the point of view of UH, this process can be characterized as a “brain drain.” It also decreases the institutional stability of the community.

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

SHC’s collegial and innovative strategy of doctoral training has proven effective and attractive in both qualitative and quantitative terms. During the five-year period 2005–2010, seven PhDs supervised by the PIs of the community (six of these at UH) were completed and several are forthcoming. The grades of these dissertations ranged from very good to excellent. This is remarkable considering the fact that only two of SHC’s members hold permanent academic positions at UH. SHC has also repeatedly received requests for PhD supervision from abroad, but due to its unstable institutional setting it has not yet been able to respond to these requests adequately. This instability also creates the inverse problem of “brain drain”: the scarcity of domestic positions compels postdocs to seek employment at other Finnish universities and abroad. While these problems are rooted in the structures of the entire Finnish academic community, SHC works to counter them by continuously seeking national and international funding for UH-based research projects consisting of postdocs and senior researchers.

3 Societal Impact of Research and Doctoral Training (max. 4400 characters with spaces)

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

As the community’s work predominantly consists of theoretical basic research, its primary impacts are academic. However, its research questions and topics do have a considerable societal significance and a transformative potential. This strength has already been demonstrated particularly in the thematic areas of gender and education.

One of the central goals of SHC’s work is to understand human thought, action, and communality in their cultural and historical contexts and to thereby contribute to an increased self-understanding and self-articulation of the contemporary – modern (or postmodern), Western (or European) – situation in terms of its past as well as its future. The methods and concepts offered by phenomenological philosophy and Continental thought are particularly valuable in this regard, as they help to understand and characterize the human being as a subject and agent that interprets reality in the light of meanings inherited from a historical tradition, but at the same time intersubjectively rearticulates and reconstitutes these meanings. Moreover, in this theoretical framework, the human being is
conceptualized as a dynamic being that changes, develops, and learns in constant interaction with the social environment and is not exhaustively reducible to causal explanations.

These conceptual starting points offer a rich and powerful set of analytical tools for the elaboration and reconsideration of many contemporary social and cultural problems. With respect to the topics of gender and education, SHC has already developed effective practices for communicating its scholarly insights to the general public. At the moment, the community is continuing this work in new topical areas.

The work of several SHC members– Heinämaa, Björk, Lehtinen, Oksala, Poleshchuck, Reuter, and Ruonakoski – in philosophical gender studies and feminist philosophy has had very concrete societal implications. This work has called into question many established and conventional notions of gender identities and problematized certain gender-related policies and practices in the academic environment as well as in the society at large. Sergei Prozorov’s work concerns highly topical political questions related to the developments in Post-Communist Russian society; Mika Ojakangas’ and Johanna Oksala’s genealogical investigations clarify the problems of contemporary democracies; and Timo Miettinen discusses the conceptual limitations of contemporary debates on the European Union and its future. Sergei Prozorov’s work concerns highly topical political questions related to the developments in Post-Communist Russian society; Mika Ojakangas’ and Johanna Oksala’s genealogical investigations clarify the problems of contemporary democracies; and Timo Miettinen discusses the conceptual limitations of contemporary debates on the European Union and its future.

Sara Heinämaa, Juha Himanka, Mika Ojakangas, and Martina Reuter have tackled the recent problems in higher education related to the university reforms in Europe. Virpi Lehtinen and Martina Reuter have also been active in a Finnish political think tank, and Reuter is running for parliament in the Finnish 2011 national elections. Kai Alhanen is putting his scholarly background into practice in his work for Aretai Oy, a Finnish company producing education and work supervision services for the public, private, and 3rd sectors.

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

Possible ways to strengthen the community’s societal impact include: (1) encouraging the members to articulate the potential societal significances of their individual research projects and of the community as a whole; (2) encouraging members to publish newspaper columns and other articles directed for the general public, in addition to their scholarly publications; (3) organizing an optional one-day workshop in which the members with most experience in public relations and popularization of science discuss their experiences and supervise exercises for the training of communication skills; (4) looking for new collaboration partners in the public, private, and 3rd sectors, especially in the field of education; (5) applying for funding that involves collaboration with public, private, and 3rd sectors and planning a pilot project in educational consulting; (6) recruiting more PhD projects with direct societal implications; and (7) elaborating the dialogical practices of the community and compiling on their basis a textbook of professional management and consulting.

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

COLLABORATION. SHC’s main areas of research collaboration are theoretical questions concerning intersubjectivity, political life and the history of modern thought. This collaboration is implemented in the form of common (1) research projects, (2) publications, (3) research meetings, and (4) doctoral training. The exchange is extensive in terms of partners, but well focused in terms of topics and research problems. Our partners include leading experts in the fields of phenomenology, Continental thought, gender studies, history of philosophy and political theory.
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In Scandinavia, the main partners are (1) the Center for Subjectivity Research (CSR), Univ. of Copenhagen, dir. Prof. D. Zahavi; (2) the Dept. of Philosophy at Södertörn University College (SUC), Stockholm, dir. Prof. H. Ruin; (3) the EDDA Center of Excellence, Univ. of Iceland, dir. Prof. S. Thorgerisdóttir; (4) the Understanding Agency research program, Uppsala Univ., dir. Doc. P. Remes; and (5) the Sexuality, Death, and the Feminine research project, Danish Institute of International Studies, dir. Doc. R. May Schott.

Other notable European partners are (1) Prof. R. Bernet (Katholieke Univ. Leuven); (2) Prof. N. Depraz (Univ. de Rouen); (3) Prof. emer. J.-L. Nancy (Univ. Marc Bloch, Strasbourg); and (4) Prof. D. Guénoun (Univ. Paris IV – La Sorbonne).

In the US, important partners are (1) Prof. D. Carr (Emory Univ.); (2) Prof. A. Steinbock (Southern Illinois Univ.); (3) Prof. W. Brogan (Villanova Univ.); (4) Prof. H. de Vries (Johns Hopkins Univ.); (5) Prof. R.L. Tieszen (San José State Univ.); (6) Prof. E. Grosz (Rutgers Univ.); and (7) Prof. M. Nussbaum (Univ. of Chicago).

In Finland, SHC collaborates with (1) the Philosophical Psychology, Morality and Politics Center of Excellence, UH, dir. Prof. S. Knuuttila; (2) the Center of Excellence in Global Governance Research, UH, contact Prof. H. Patomäki; (3) The Figures of Touch research project, Aalto Univ., dir. Prof. H. Laakso; (4) the Governing Life Globally research project, Univ. of Lapland, dir. Prof. J. Reid; and (5) the Political Thought and Conceptual Change Center of Excellence, Univ. of Jyväskylä and UH, dirs. Profs. K. Palonen and T. Pulkkinen. SHC is also developing collaboration with the research community Logic, Methodology, and Philosophy of Science, UH, dir. Prof. G. Sandu.

Joint doctoral training in the form of seminars and summer schools has been, and will be, experimented with CSR and SUC. Heinämaa has lectured at the summer schools organized in these institutions, and several SHC members have participated in PhD courses organized at the CSR. SHC is also planning to organize in Helsinki a summer school in phenomenology in cooperation with the CSR and SUC.

MOBILITY. SHC has promoted researcher mobility by encouraging members to visit other research institutes during their research periods, to submit their work to international key conferences, and to seek employment at other institutions. Heinämaa and Reuter have served as visiting professors of philosophy and gender studies at Nordic universities. Seven of SHC members have been employed in postdoctoral positions outside Finland. Several members have also completed academic degrees in foreign universities and/or made research visits to foreign research centers.

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

SHC’s research collaboration is rich and multiple. It includes a significant group of internationally leading scholars in philosophy, political science, and gender studies. The forms of cooperation are well-developed and established and all practices are multilevel in the sense that they involve members form all stages of their careers, from senior researchers to PhD candidates.

All SHC members participate actively in international societies and meetings. All are fluent in English, and many also speak French, German, Swedish, and/or Russian, which facilitates international mobility and the management of partnerships. The great majority of SHC’s PhD dissertations and peer-reviewed publications are written in English and evaluated by international experts.

The limited prospects for employment at UH and in Finland also encourage members to seek positions at other institutions. However, there is much potential for development on the level of institutional exchange and joint doctoral training, and efforts will be made to increase these forms of cooperation.
5 Operational Conditions

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

Among the members of the community, only Heinämaa and Himanka hold permanent positions at UH as university lecturers. Klockars holds a temporary university lecturership, while Lindberg and Ojakangas are currently employed by other Finnish universities. The other members of the community have temporary research positions with internal or external funding, and three are currently without research funding.

The community has been dependent on external project funding and grants from private foundations. During 2005–2010, in addition to the EUR 3.1 million of external project funding from the Academy of Finland and Emil Aaltonen Foundation listed below, individual members received ca. EUR 700,000 in personal grants from Finnish and Nordic foundations such as the Finnish Cultural Foundation, Kone Foundation, Emil Aaltonen Foundation, Helsingin Sanomat Foundation, Alfred Kordelin Foundation, Jenny and Antti Wihuri Foundation, Ella and Georg Ehrnrooth Foundation, Otto A. Malm Foundation, CIMO Foundation, The Helge Ax:son Johnson Foundation, The Swedish Foundation for International Cooperation in Research and Higher Education, The Gunvor and Josef Anér Foundation, The Swedish Cultural Foundation, and Oskar Öflund Foundation.

Within UH, the community operates in several units, of which the most important are the Helsinki Collegium for Advanced Studies, the Department of Philosophy, History, Culture and Art Studies (until 2009: Dept. of Philosophy), the Department of Political and Economic Studies (until 2009: Dept. of Social and Moral Philosophy, Dept. of Political Science), the Department of Systematic Theology, and the Network for European Studies. The departments have generally been supportive and many members have been provided with a workspace, computer, and other basic infrastructure during the period of their funding for a reasonable overhead fee. Teaching obligations have been very moderate: those with funding from the Academy of Finland are required to devote ca. 5% of working time to teaching, and many departments do not require those with personal grants to teach at all. However, the lack of permanent positions, together with the fact that the community’s research projects have introduced new topics from outside the previously established research foci in philosophy, political science, and gender studies at UH, has sometimes prevented SHC members from becoming fully integrated into their administrative units and/or gaining full collegial support for their research projects and doctoral dissertations, which, of course, can be a major obstacle for scholarly work.

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

The academically prestigious and diverse environment of UH and the interdisciplinary settings of the Helsinki Collegium for Advanced Studies and the new extended departments of the humanities and social sciences offer a potentially excellent environment for the community’s work. However, the lack of permanent positions and resources, the dependency on short-term funding, as well as occasional difficulties in becoming integrated with the older established research traditions within the respective disciplines, create major obstacles for SHC’s work at UH. This is particularly manifested in the “brain drain” problems described in section 2.

Developing a more coherent and integrated institutional framework, such as a research center, a graduate school, or an MA program, as well as gaining more permanent academic positions and more research funding, are vital conditions for the continuation, development, and improvement of SHC’s research and doctoral training activities.
6 LEADERSHIP AND MANAGEMENT IN THE RESEARCHER COMMUNITY (MAX. 4400 CHARACTERS WITH SPACES)

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

SHC represents and speaks for a new idea of management in research projects as well as in doctoral training and postdoctoral mentoring. Traditional hierarchical and top-down models of academic leadership are supplemented with collateral and collegial relations between principal investigators and junior scholars. The idea is that avoiding an authoritarian atmosphere, reducing hierarchies, and encouraging junior scholars to take initiative and responsibility regarding their own work and the work of the community increases scholarly creativity and innovativeness and supports the free flow of new ideas and perspectives. For SHC, scholarly independence is a fundamental prerequisite of genuine scientific productivity.

The community’s research focus is not exclusive or indefinitely fixed; rather, the introduction of new perspectives is promoted and mutual scholarly disagreement and critique are not shunned. An atmosphere of free critical discussion helps the community's research focus to develop and expand both thematically and methodologically. Encouraging internal critique and supporting new openings also prevent the community’s work from becoming dogmatic, introverted, or parochial. For these reasons doctoral students and postdoctoral scholars are allowed to choose their research topics and approaches quite independently, but they are also expected to discuss their choices critically with other SHC members. The main function of the community is to provide a forum for mutual feedback, supportive criticism, and exchange of ideas at all stages and on all levels of research.

Also certain administrative responsibilities are distributed within the group. Giving junior scholars responsibility for specific tasks related to project management, funding applications, research planning and reporting, and the organization of academic events allows the principal investigators to focus on urgent strategic and operational tasks of developing the community at large: its goals and practices, its structure and dynamic, and its research collaborations and partnerships. Moreover the practice of delegation provides junior scholars with valuable administrative experience, thereby increasing the community’s general academic know-how and exchange.

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

One of SHC’s strengths is its collegial, informal, and non-hierarchical management culture, which favors independent scholarly work, the introduction of new ideas and perspectives, open discussion and mutual feedback and critique, and the distribution of administrative duties to all members. However, the organization of the community is still somewhat loose and the community is lacking in institutional setting and support personnel. Its future work would benefit from a clearer and more stable organization, long-term planning and strategic visioning, and a systematic assignment of tasks. More attention should also be paid to the concerted and coordinated planning and execution of larger research projects. Fortunately, one SHC member, Kai Alhanen, is formally trained in work consulting and highly experienced in this field. The responsible person, Sara Heinämäa, has already discussed these challenges with Alhanen and they have started to devise a plan for leadership development at all levels of academic work.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>7 EXTERNAL COMPETITIVE FUNDING OF THE RC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Listing of the RCs external competitive funding, where:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- the funding decisions have been made during 1.1.2005-31.12.2010, and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- the administrator of the funding is/has been the University of Helsinki</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• 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: 2900000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• 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: 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• 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: 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• European Research Council (ERC) - total amount of funding (in euros) ERC has decided to allocate to the RC members during 1.1.2005-31.12.2010: 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• 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).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- names of the foundations: Emil Aaltonen Foundation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- total amount of funding (in euros) from the above-mentioned foundations: 190000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• 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).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- names of the funding organizations:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- total amount of funding (in euros) from the above-mentioned funding organizations: 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• 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).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- names of the funding organizations:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- total amount of funding (in euros) from the above-mentioned funding organizations: 0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>8 RC’S STRATEGIC ACTION PLAN FOR 2011–2013 (MAX. 4400 CHARACTERS WITH SPACES)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Description of the RC’s future perspectives in respect to research and doctoral training.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

LONG-TERM PERSPECTIVES. The future of the research community largely depends on the resources (academic positions, research funding) it is able to acquire, as well as its institutional settings. The main plan for research development is to submit an application for a larger scale European research project on the topics of crisis and communality. For this aim, several members of the community are now working to develop partnership relations in Finland, Scandinavia, Russia, the UK and Ireland, continental Europe, and the US.

One motivation for SHC to participate in this research evaluation was that unlike previous evaluations at UH, it proceeds in a bottom-up manner and not top-down. This raised hopes in SHC that the evaluation
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process would give the university leadership an opportunity to identify and recognize the academic merits of this highly innovative, productive, and solid research community which, due to the lack of a permanent institutional framework, is currently dispersed into many different administrative institutions. Our hope is that SHC would ultimately be able to establish at UH a research unit (e.g., a center of excellence) as well as an international and interdisciplinary PhD program with sufficient administrative staff and other resources. A model example of what we hope to become is SHC’s close collaborating partner, the Center for Subjectivity Research at the University of Copenhagen.

SHORT-TERM PERSPECTIVES. Most of the members will continue to apply for academic positions at the University of Helsinki and other institutions. Mika Ojakangas will continue working as professor of political science at the University of Jyväskylä. Sara Heinämaa’s current research project (Academy of Finland; members: Backman, Hartimo, Miettinen, Pulkkinen, Taipale) will continue to operate at the Helsinki Collegium for Advanced Studies until the end of 2013. During this time, the postdoctoral researchers of the community will become increasingly qualified to apply for academic positions. Most of its doctoral students (Hotanen, Miettinen, Perhoniemi, Pulkkinen, Ruonakoski, Westerlund) are expected to complete their PhDs at the University of Helsinki by the end of 2013 and move on to the postdoctoral stage. New junior members will accordingly be recruited into the community from the doctoral students of Heinämaa, Klockars, Lindberg, Ojakangas, Oksala, and Reuter.

The responsible person Sara Heinämaa, together with Jussi Backman as her assistant, have drawn up the main stage 2 document. All members of the community were asked to provide information regarding their external funding in the period 2005–2010, and all principal investigators and postdoctoral researchers were asked to give information and make suggestions regarding all the stage 2 questions. Participation was quite active and the material received was substantial for the task at hand. All information and all insights were then compiled, summarized, and integrated into the document by Heinämaa and Backman. The document was finally distributed to all members for the maximization of transparency and communication.

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

- Associated person is one of Kai Alhanen, kai.alhanen@helsinki.fi, Jussi Backman, jussi.backman@helsinki.fi, Ulrika Björk, ulrika.bjork@helsinki.fi, Mirja Hartimo, mirja.hartimo@helsinki.fi, Sara Heinämaa, sara.heinamaa@helsinki.fi, Juha Himanka, juha.himanka@helsinki.fi, Juho Hotinen, juho.hotinen@helsinki.fi, Kristian Klockars, kristian.klockars@helsinki.fi, Vojtislav Lehner, vojtislav.lehner@helsinki.fi, Susanna Lindberg, susanna.lindberg@helsinki.fi, Timo Miettinen, timo.pa.miettinen@helsinki.fi, Mika Ojakangas, mika.ojakangas@helsinki.fi, Johanna Oksala, johanna.oksala@helsinki.fi, Tuukka Perhonen, tuukka.perhonen@helsinki.fi, Simo Polonen, simo.polonen@helsinki.fi, Irina Poleshchuk, sergei.prozorov@helsinki.fi, Martina Reuter, martina.reuter@helsinki.fi, Erkka Ruonaitiski, erkka.ruonaitiski@helsinki.fi, Antti Sadinmaa, antti.sadinmaa@helsinki.fi, Fredrik Westerlund, fredrik.westerlund@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>15</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A2 Review in scientific journal</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A3 Contribution to book/other compilations (refereed)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A4 Article in conference publication (refereed)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B1 Unrefereed journal article</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>23</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B2 Contribution to book/other compilations (non-refereed)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C1 Published scientific monograph</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C2 Edited book, compilation, conference proceeding or special issue of journal</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D1 Article in professional journal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D4 Published development or research report</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D5 Text book or professional handbook or guidebook or dictionary</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E1 Popular article, newspaper article</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>27</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E1 Popular contribution to book/other compilations</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2 Listing of publications

A1 Refereed journal article

2005


2006


Prozorov, S 2006, 'Liberal Emnity: The Figure of the Foe in the Political Ontology of Liberalism', Millennium: journal of international studies, vol 35, no. 1, pp. 75-99.

2007
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2008


2009
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Prozorov, S 2009, 'From Husserl to Levinas: the role of hyletic data, affection, sensation and the other in temporality', Telos., vol 147, pp. 34-54.

A2 Review in scientific journal

2005
Björk, U 2005, 'Recension av Philosophical Writings', Kvinnovetenskaplig tidskrift, no. 4.

2008
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A3 Contribution to book/other compilations (refereed)

2005


Reuter, M 2005, 'Mary Wollstonecraft on love and friendship', Philosophical aspects on emotions, Thales, Stockholm, pp. 119-139.

2006
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2007
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A4 Article in conference publication (refereed)

2006


2009


Taipale, J 2009, Ajaltansa ja uusi.,

2010


B1 Un refereed journal article

2005


2007
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2008

2009
Miettinen, T 2009, 'Miksi historia tuottaa kriisejä?', Minervan pöllö, vol 2009, no. 3.

2010

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

2005

2006

2007
Heinämaa, S, Taipale, J 2007, 'Motivaatiot ja kausaatiot ruumiin liikkeiden selityksinä: Edmund Husserlin analyysi', in HJ, IN, RV (eds), Syy, Gaudeamus, Helsinki, pp. 351-367.
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2008

2009
Ruonakoski, E 2009, 'Approaching the Unknown: Some Phenomenological Considerations', in I Lechtleiner (ed.), Puzzle Box, Jan van Eyck Academie.

2010
Reuter, M 2010, 'Är förnuftet manligt?: En studie i könsmetaforens betydelser', in U Björk, L Folkmarson Käll (eds), Stil, kön, andrahet. Tolvsäker i feministiskt filosofi, Daidalos, Göteborg, pp. 25-52.

C1 Published scientific monograph

2005

2006
Ojakangas, M 2006, Ystäväästä ja vihollisesta, Kirjapaja, Helsinki.
Ojakangas, M 2006, 'A Philosophy of Concrete Life: Carl Schmitt and the political thought of late modernity', 2 edn, Peter Lang.
Prozorov, S 2006, Understanding Conflict between Russia and the EU: The Limits of Integration. Rethinking Peace and Conflict Studies, Palgrave Macmillan, Basingstoke, UK.

2007
Prozorov, S 2007, Foucault, freedom and sovereignty, Ashgate, Aldershot.

2008

2009
Prozorov, S 2009, The ethics of postcommunism: history and social praxis in Russia, Palgrave Macmillan, Basingstoke, Hampshire.
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2010

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

2005

2006

2007

2008

2009

2010

D1 Article in professional journal

2007

2010
D4 Published development or research report

2006
Prozorov, S 2006, A Time Like No Other: Russian Politics after the End of History, DIS working paper, no. 2006/17, Danish Institute for International Studies, Copenhagen, Denmark.

2010

D5 Text book or professional handbook or guidebook or dictionary

2005

2007
Klockars, K 2007, Öppna frågor 4: Samhällsfilosofi, vol. 4, Samhällsfilosofi, Söderström, [Helsingfors].

2008

E1 Popular article, newspaper article

2005

2007

2008
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2009

2010
Himanka, J 2010, 'Kiirtääkö maa aurinkoaa?', Kaleva.
Reuter, M 2010, 'Statslösa folk: Kolumn', Ny Tid, no. 34.
Reuter, M 2010, 'Nederlagers är: Kolumn', Ny Tid, no. 3.
Reuter, M 2010, 'Språkpolitik: Kolumn', Ny Tid, no. 45.
Reuter, M 2010, 'Fädliga, gäl! Om brådskans ideologi', Finsk Tidskrift, no. 6, pp. 302-10.

E1 Popular contribution to book/other compilations

2008

2010
1 Analysis of activities 2005-2010

- Associated persons are Kai Alhanen, kai.alhanen@helsinki.fi, Jussi Backman, jussi.backman@helsinki.fi, Ulrika Björk, ulrika.bjork@helsinki.fi, Miija Hartimo, miija.hartimo@helsinki.fi, Sara Heinämäa, sara.heinamaa@helsinki.fi, Juha Himanka, juha.himanka@helsinki.fi, Juho Hatama, juho.hatama@helsinki.fi, Kristian Klockars, kristian.klockars@helsinki.fi, Vojtěch Leh印尼, vojtěch.lehinden@helsinki.fi, Susanna Lindberg, susanna.lindberg@helsinki.fi, Timo Miettinen, timo.miettinen@helsinki.fi, Mika Ojakangas, mika.ojakangas@helsinki.fi, Johanna Oksala, johanna.oksala@helsinki.fi, Tuulikki Pajaste, tuulikki.pajaste@helsinki.fi, Antti Sadinmaa, antti.sadinmaa@helsinki.fi, Fredrik Westerlund, fredrik.westerlund@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>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prizes and awards</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Editor of research journal</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Editor of research anthology/collection/conference proceedings</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peer review of manuscripts</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Editor of communication journal</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Editor of special theme number</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment of candidates for academic posts</td>
<td>12</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>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Membership or other role in national/international committee, council, board</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Membership or other role in public Finnish or international organization</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Membership or other role of body in private company/organisation</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other tasks of an expert in private sector</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participation in interview for written media</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participation in radio programme</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participation in TV programme</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participation in interview for web based media</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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2 Listing of activities 2005-2010

Supervisor or co-supervisor of doctoral thesis

Kai Alhanen , kai.alhanen@helsinki.fi
Supervision of the PhD Thesis of Mari Rautiainen, Kai Alhanen, 2010 → ..., Finland

Ulrika Björk , ulrika.bjork@helsinki.fi
Bihandledare avhandlingsarbete, Ulrika Björk, 01.01.2010 → 31.12.2013, Sweden

Sara Heinämaa , Sara.Heinamaa@helsinki.fi
Supervision of the PhD thesis of Ingeborg Owesen, Sara Heinämaa, 2004 → 08.05.2008, Norway
Mentoring of Juusi Backman in his PhD project, Sara Heinämaa, 2005 → 14.11.2009, Finland
Supervision of the PhD thesis of Joona Tapio, Sara Heinämaa, 2005 → 07.11.2009, Finland
Supervision of the PhD thesis of Kai Alhanen, Sara Heinämaa, 2005 → 05.05.2007, Finland
Supervision of the PhD thesis of Ulrika Björk, Sara Heinämaa, 2005 → 08.01.2009, Finland
Supervision of the PhD thesis of Virpi Lehtinen, Sara Heinämaa, 2005 → 29.05.2010, Finland
Supervision of the PhD thesis of Erika Ruonakoski, Sara Heinämaa, 2006 → 2011, Finland
Supervision of the PhD thesis of Saara Hacklin, Sara Heinämaa, 2006 → 2012, Finland
Supervision of the PhD thesis of Tuukka Parthonen, Sara Heinämaa, 2006 → 2012, Finland
Mentoring of Erik Rietveld in his PhD Project, Sara Heinämaa, 2007 → 2008, Netherlands
Mentoring of Ville Lähteenmäki in his PhD project, Sara Heinämaa, 2007 → 24.10.2009, Finland
Supervision of the PhD thesis of Juho Hotanen, Sara Heinämaa, 2008 → 2013, Finland
Mentoring of Hanna Lukkari in her PhD project, Sara Heinämaa, 2009 → 2014, Finland
Supervision of the PhD thesis Lovisa Hakansson, Sara Heinämaa, 2009 → ..., Sweden
Supervision of the PhD thesis of Hermanni Yli-Tepsa, Sara Heinämaa, 2009 → 2013, Finland
Mentoring of Sanna Tirkkonen in her PhD project, Sara Heinämaa, 2010 → 2014, Finland

Kristian Klockars , Kristian.Klockars@helsinki.fi
Supervision of Doctoral Student: Charles Sona, Kristian Klockars, 2007 → ..., Finland
Supervision of Doctoral Student: Antti Sadinmaa, Kristian Klockars, 2009 → ..., Finland
Supervision of Doctoral Student: Jenny Martikainen, Kristian Klockars, 2009 → ..., Finland
Supervision of Doctoral Student: Joonas Leppänen, Kristian Klockars, 2009 → ..., Finland
Supervision of Doctoral Student: Vlad Navitski, Kristian Klockars, 2009 → ..., Belarus
Co-Supervision of Doctoral Student: Pilvi Toppinen, Kristian Klockars, 2010 → ..., Finland
Supervision of Doctoral Student: Hanna Lukkari, Kristian Klockars, 2010 → ..., Finland
Supervision of Doctoral Student: Sanna Tirkkonen, Kristian Klockars, 2010 → ..., Finland

Susanna Lindberg , Susanna.Lindberg@helsinki.fi
Co-supervision of a doctoral thesis, Susanna Lindberg, 01.2007 → ..., Finland
Co-supervision of a doctoral thesis, Susanna Lindberg, 01.2008 → ..., Finland
Co-supervision of a doctoral thesis, Susanna Lindberg, 01.2009 → ..., Finland
Supervision of a thesis, Susanna Lindberg, 12.2010, Finland

Johanna Oksala , Johanna.Oksala@helsinki.fi

...
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Martina Reuter, Martina.Reuter@helsinki.fi
Supervision of Doctoral thesis, Martina Reuter, 2008 → ..., Finland

Prizes and awards
Mirja Hartimo, mirja.hartimo@helsinki.fi
Emil Aaltonen Foundation, "Kannustusapuraha", Mirja Hartimo, 05.2009 → ...
Kristian Klockars, Kristian.Klockars@helsinki.fi
Encouragement prize, Kristian Klockars, 2010
Timo Miettinen, timo.pa.miettinen@helsinki.fi
SPEP Graduate Student Scholar Award, Timo Miettinen, 31.10.2008, United States

Editor of research journal
Jussi Backman, Jussi.Backman@helsinki.fi
Philosophical online encyclopedia <em>Logos</em>, Jussi Backman, 01.01.2007 → 31.12.2010, Finland
Mirja Hartimo, mirja.hartimo@helsinki.fi
Journal of History of Analytic Philosophy, http://jhaponline.org/journals/jhap/index, Mirja Hartimo, 27.09.2010 → ...
Sara Heinämaa, Sara.Heinamaa@helsinki.fi
SATS – Northern European Journal of Philosophy (Former: SATS - Nordic Journal of Philosophy), Sara Heinämaa, 1999 → ..., Germany
TIEDE&EDISTYS, Sara Heinämaa, 1999 → ..., Finland
Hypatia, Journal of Feminist Philosophy, Sara Heinämaa, 2000 → ..., United States
Continental Philosophy Review, Sara Heinämaa, 2008 → ..., United States
Virpi Päivikki Lehtinen, Virpi.Lehtinen@helsinki.fi
Niin&amp;Näin, Virpi Päivikki Lehtinen, 01.01.2006 → 02.12.2006, Finland
Journal of Global Ethics, Virpi Päivikki Lehtinen, 01.01.2007, United Kingdom
Mika Ojakangas, Mika.Ojakangas@helsinki.fi
Editor-in-chief Tiede &amp; edistys, Mika Ojakangas, 01.01.2007 → ..., Finland

Editor of research anthology/collection/conference proceedings
Jussi Backman, Jussi.Backman@helsinki.fi
Anthology Heidegger - Ajattelun aihetta [Heidegger - Matters of Thinking], co-edited with Miika Luoto, Jussi Backman, 2004 → 2006, Finland
Ulrika Björk, ulrika.bjork@helsinki.fi
Stil, kön, andrahet. Tolv essäer i feministisk filosofi, Ulrika Björk, 01.01.2005 → 31.05.2010, Sweden
Konsten att handla - konsten att tänka. Hannah Arendt om det politiska, Ulrika Björk, 31.12.2010 → 30.05.2011, Sweden
Mirja Hartimo, mirja.hartimo@helsinki.fi
Phenomenology and Mathematics, Mirja Hartimo, 2006 → 2010
Sara Heinämaa, Sara.Heinamaa@helsinki.fi
Edmund Husserl: Uudistuminen ja ihmisyyys [Renewal and Humanity: A Collection of Husserl’s Ethical and Cultural Writings], Sara Heinämaa, 2000
Consciousness: From Perception to Reflection in the History of Philosophy, Sara Heinämaa, 2007
Simone de Beauvoir: Onko Sade poltettava? ja muita esseitä [Must We Burn Sade? and Other Essays], Sara Heinämaa, 2007
Psychology and Philosophy: Inquiries into the Soul from Late Scholasticism to Contemporary Thought, Sara Heinämaa, 2008
INTERNATIONAL EVALUATION OF RESEARCH AND DOCTORAL TRAINING AT THE UNIVERSITY OF HELSINKI

SHC/Heinämaa

Chiasmatic Encounters, Sara Heinämaa, 2010
Kristian Klockars, Kristian.Klockars@helsinki.fi
Editor of Chiasmatic Encounters, Kristian Klockars, 01.01.2006 → 31.12.2011, United States

Susanna Lindberg, Susanna.Lindberg@helsinki.fi
Editor of a research anthology, Susanna Lindberg, 2009 → ...
coeditor of a research anthology, Susanna Lindberg, 2009 → ...
editor of a research anthology, Susanna Lindberg, 2010 → 2011, France

Timo Miettinen, timo.pa.miettinen@helsinki.fi
Fenomenologian ydinkysymyksiä -kirjan toimitustyö, Timo Miettinen, 01.01.2010 → 11.11.2010

Mika Ojakangas, Mika.Ojakangas@helsinki.fi
Editor of Special Issue on Hannah Arendt, Gollegium e-journal, Mika Ojakangas, 2010, Finland

Simo Pulkkinen, simo.pulkkinen@helsinki.fi

Sergei Prozorov, sergei.prozorov@helsinki.fi
Co-editor of research anthology, Sergei Prozorov, 01.02.2007 → 02.03.2007, Sweden

Joono Taipale, Joono.Taipale@helsinki.fi
Co-editor of the book: Fenomenologian ydinkysymyksiä, Joono Taipale, 01.12.2009 → 11.11.2010, Finland

Peer review of manuscripts

Ulrika Björk, ulrika.bjork@helsinki.fi
Rethinking Agency and Embodiment: Towards a Phenomenology of Excorporation, Ulrika Björk, 01.07.2010 → 31.12.2010, United States

Mirja Hartimo, mirja.hartimo@helsinki.fi
Centrone: Logic and Philosophy of Mathematics in the Early Husserl, Mirja Hartimo, 01.01.2009 → 15.03.2009
Logic and Philosophy of Mathematics in the Early Husserl, Mirja Hartimo, 2009 → ...
Are mathematical theories reducible to non-analytical foundations, Mirja Hartimo, 13.12.2010 → 17.12.2010

Sara Heinämaa, Sara.Heinamaa@helsinki.fi
Peer review of manuscripts for Tiede & edistys, Sara Heinämaa, 1989 → ..., Finland
Peer review of manuscripts for Naistutkimus/ Kvinnoforskning, Sara Heinämaa, 1996 → ...
Peer review of manuscripts for Hypatia – A Journal of Feminist Philosophy, Sara Heinämaa, 1998 → ..., United States
Peer review of manuscripts for SATS – Northern European Journal of Philosophy, Sara Heinämaa, 1998 → ..., Germany
Peer review of manuscripts for Body and Society, Sara Heinämaa, 2005 → ..., United States
Peer review of manuscripts for Feminist Theory, Sara Heinämaa, 2005 → ...
Peer review of manuscripts for Inquiry, Sara Heinämaa, 2005 → ..., United Kingdom
Peer review of manuscripts for Springer, Sara Heinämaa, 2005 → ...
Peer review of manuscripts for Phenomenology and Cognitive Science, Sara Heinämaa, 2008 → ..., Netherlands

Kristian Klockars, Kristian.Klockars@helsinki.fi
Journal for Value Inquiry, Kristian Klockars, 01.01.2006 → 31.12.2006, United Kingdom
NIn &amp; Nän, Kristian Klockars, 01.10.2006 → 31.10.2006, Finland
Journal of Value Inquiry, Kristian Klockars, 2007 → 2010, Germany
Journal of Value Inquiry, Kristian Klockars, 09.04.2007 → 31.12.2007, United Kingdom
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Susanna Lindberg, Susanna.Lindberg@helsinki.fi
referee, Susanna Lindberg, 2005
reviewer, Susanna Lindberg, 2005
peer review, Susanna Lindberg, 2006
peer review, Susanna Lindberg, 2007
peer review, Susanna Lindberg, 2007
peer review, Susanna Lindberg, 2008
Commentator of a translation, Susanna Lindberg, 2009, Finland
reviewer, Susanna Lindberg, 2009, Finland
Reviewer, Susanna Lindberg, 2010

Johanna Oksala, Johanna.Oksala@helsinki.fi
Journal of Global Ethics, Johanna Oksala, 09.2006 → ...
European Journal of Political Theory, Johanna Oksala, 12.2007 → ...
Hypatia, Johanna Oksala, 12.2007 → ...
SATS - Nordic Journal of Philosophy, Johanna Oksala, 04.2007 → ...
Contemporary Philosophy Review, Johanna Oksala, 12.2008 → ...
Contemporary Philosophy Review, Johanna Oksala, 09.2008 → ...
Hypatia, Johanna Oksala, 05.2008 → ...
Contemporary Political Theory, Johanna Oksala, 12.2009 → ...
Contemporary Political Philosophy, Johanna Oksala, 09.2009 → ...
Journal of Bioethical Inquiry, Johanna Oksala, 09.2009 → ...
The Journal for Cultural Research, Johanna Oksala, 09.2009 → ...
Contemporary Political Theory, Johanna Oksala, 03.2010 → ...
Contemporary Philosophy Review, Johanna Oksala, 09.2010 → ...
Foucault Studies, Johanna Oksala, 10.2010 → ...
History of the Human Sciences, Johanna Oksala, 12.2010 → ...
Hypatia - A Journal of Feminist Philosophy, Johanna Oksala, 07.2010 → ...
International Journal of Philosophical Studies, Johanna Oksala, 03.2010 → ...
Redescriptions - Yearbook of Political Thought, Conceptual History and Feminist Theory, Johanna Oksala, 01.2010 → ...
SATS - Nordic Journal of Philosophy, Johanna Oksala, 03.2010 → ...

Sergei Prozorov, sergei.prozorov@helsinki.fi
Moscow's Regional Ideology in Postcommunist Russia, Sergei Prozorov, 03.2005, United Kingdom
Michel Foucault's Analytics of War: The Social, the International, and the Racial, Sergei Prozorov, 15.06.2006
The Biopolitical Imaginary of Species Being and The Freedom to Underwrite in the Molecular Age, Sergei Prozorov, 01.09.2006, United Kingdom
European Union and the Production of Illegal Immigration, Sergei Prozorov, 15.08.2007, United Kingdom
Chivalry, Mimesis and ‘Machiavellianism’: Inquiry into the Interwar Finnish Political Imaginary on Russia, Sergei Prozorov, 01.02.2008
Meta-Methodology for the Discursive Analysis of IR Theories, Sergei Prozorov, 01.10.2008, United Kingdom
Sociological institutionalism, archaeology and governmentality: Reflections on the relevance of Foucauldian approaches for critical studies of international relations, Sergei Prozorov, 01.08.2008, United Kingdom
Beholding the Other: Securing the State in Post-Soviet Eurasia, Sergei Prozorov, 11.05.2009, United Kingdom

Democracy and the separation of powers: a Rancierean approach, Sergei Prozorov, 10.08.2009

Dissolution or Usurpation: Legacies of the Holocaust in the Thought of Giorgio Agamben and Alain Badiou, Sergei Prozorov, 15.01.2009, United Kingdom

From a ‘borderless world’ to a ‘world of borders’: Bringing History Back In., Sergei Prozorov, 01.03.2009, United Kingdom

Interference: Between Political Science and Political Philosophy, Sergei Prozorov, 20.11.2009, United Kingdom

The Agon of Reconciliation: Transitional Justice from (Non)Responsibility to Fugitive Democracy, Sergei Prozorov, 01.07.2009, United Kingdom

War without End(s): Grounding ‘Global War’, Sergei Prozorov, 20.01.2009, United Kingdom

Images of Russia, Sergei Prozorov, 01.12.2009 → 02.12.2010

Meanings of Partition, Sergei Prozorov, 01.10.2010

The Politics of Speed, Sergei Prozorov, 01.06.2010 → 10.06.2010

Violence & Killing Passion: Lethal Biopolitics or New Formation of Self, Sergei Prozorov, 01.03.2010, United Kingdom


Erika Ruonakoski, Erika.Ruonakoski@helsinki.fi

Environmental Philosophy, Erika Ruonakoski, 2008 → …, United States

Editor of communication journal

Martina Reuter, Martina.Reuter@helsinki.fi

Board of Editors, Martina Reuter, 2008 → …, Finland

Editor of special theme number

Sara Heinämaa, Sara.Heinamaa@helsinki.fi

Editor of the Special Issue of Nora – Nordic Journal of Women's Studies: Feminist Philosophy, Sara Heinämaa, 2007 → …, United Kingdom

Editor of the Special Issue of Continental Philosophy Review: Feminist Phenomenologies, Sara Heinämaa, 2010 → …, Netherlands

Assessment of candidates for academic posts

Sara Heinämaa, Sara.Heinamaa@helsinki.fi

Assessment of Docent candidate: Susanna Lindberg, Sara Heinämaa, 2005, Finland

Assessment of candidates for associate professorship in interdisciplinary humanist women’s studies, Sara Heinämaa, 2005, Norway

Assessment of Docent candidate: Timo Klemola, Sara Heinämaa, 2006, Finland

Assessment of candidates for professorial promotion, Sara Heinämaa, 2006 → 2007, Norway

Assessment of candidates for senior lectureship in theoretical philosophy, Sara Heinämaa, 2007, Finland

Assessment of candidates for professorship in theoretical philosophy, Sara Heinämaa, 2008 → 2009, Denmark

Assessment of Docent candidate: Heikki Iläheimo, Sara Heinämaa, 2010, Finland

Assessment of Docent candidate: Jari Kauppinen, Sara Heinämaa, 2010, Finland

Susanna Lindberg, Susanna.Lindberg@helsinki.fi

assessment of candidates for an academic post, Susanna Lindberg, 2008, Iceland

evaluation of the work for the position of docent, Susanna Lindberg, 2009, Sweden

Johanna Oksala, Johanna.Oksala@helsinki.fi

External Assessor, Tenure Review, Johanna Oksala, 2009 → …, China

Martina Reuter, Martina.Reuter@helsinki.fi

Hiring committee for the lectureship in the philosophy of religion, Martina Reuter, 2009
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Sara Heinämaa

Membership or other role in review committee
Sara Heinämaa, Sara.Heinamaa@helsinki.fi
Board member and international advisor for the Society for Interdisciplinary Feminist Phenomenology (SIFP) 2006-… , Sara Heinämaa, 2006 → …, United States
Member of the Society for Interdisciplinary Feminist Phenomenology (SIFP) 2006-…, Sara Heinämaa, 2006 → …, United States
Expert consultant for the Research Foundation of the University of Helsinki, Sara Heinämaa, 2009 → …, Finland

Susanna Lindberg, Susanna.Lindberg@helsinki.fi
member in a review committee, Susanna Lindberg, 2005
member of a publication of reviews concerning Hegel, Susanna Lindberg, 2005 → …, France
Member of the review committee, Susanna Lindberg, 2006 → …
Member of the review committee, Susanna Lindberg, 2008 → …, France

Membership or other role in research network
Sara Heinämaa, Sara.Heinamaa@helsinki.fi
Member of the Nordic Network for Women in Philosophy (NWIP), Sara Heinämaa, 1991 → …
Member of the Merleau-Ponty Circle, Sara Heinämaa, 1997 → …, United States
Member of the International Association of Women Philosophers (IAPh), Sara Heinämaa, 1998 → …, Germany
Member of the Nordic Society for Phenomenology (NoSP), Sara Heinämaa, 2001 → …
Member of the the Society for Phenomenological and Existential Philosophy (SPEP), Sara Heinämaa, 2001 → …, United States
Member in the Inter-Nordic research project "Sexuality, Death, and the Feminine: Feminist Philosophical Analyses", Sara Heinämaa, 2003 → 2009, Denmark
Member of the Society for Interdisciplinary Feminist Phenomenology, Sara Heinämaa, 2006 → …, United States
Co-operation partner of the Centre of Excellence in "Philosophical Psychology, Morality and Politics: Human Conduct in the History of Philosophy", Sara Heinämaa, 2008 → 2013
Member of the board of the Argumenta-project "Human Mortality", Sara Heinämaa, 2010 → 2012, Finland

Kristian Klockars, Kristian.Klockars@helsinki.fi
Member of North American Sartre Society, Kristian Klockars, 1999 → …
Member of International Association for Philosophy and Literature, IAPL, Kristian Klockars, 2000 → …
Member of Nordic Society for Phenomenology NoSP, Kristian Klockars, 2001 → …

Virpi Päiviikki Lehtinen, Virpi.Lehtinen@helsinki.fi
Member, Virpi Päiviikki Lehtinen, 01.01.2003 → …
Member in the organization committee, Virpi Päiviikki Lehtinen, 01.01.2005 → 27.02.2005, Finland
Member in the organization committee, Virpi Päiviikki Lehtinen, 01.05.2007 → 17.05.2007, Finland

Susanna Lindberg, Susanna.Lindberg@helsinki.fi
Member of a research network, Susanna Lindberg, 2008 → …
Associate member of a research team, Susanna Lindberg, 2010 → 2011
Member of a research group, Susanna Lindberg, 2010 → 2011

Simo Pulkkinen, simo.pulkkinen@helsinki.fi
Member of Nordic Society for Phenomenology, Simo Pulkkinen, 2005 → 2011
Member of Society for Phenomenology and Existential Philosophy, Simo Pulkkinen, 2009 → 2011, United States

Joona Taipale, Joona.Taipale@helsinki.fi
Member of the Finnish Society for Philosophy, Joona Taipale, 2003 → …, Finland
Member of Society for Phenomenology and Existential Philosophy, Joona Taipale, 2005 → …, United States
SHC/Heinämaa

Member of The Nordic Society for Phenomenology (NoSP), Joona Tapale, 2005 → ...

Fredrik Westerlund, fredrik.westerlund@helsinki.fi
Member of the Nordic Society for Phenomenology (NoSP), Fredrik Westerlund, 2009 → ...

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

Jussi Backman, jussi.backman@helsinki.fi
Board member, Finnish Researchers’ Association, Jussi Backman, 01.01.2007 → 31.12.2010, Finland
Member of department committee for the development of teaching, Jussi Backman, 2007 → 2009, Finland

Mirja Hartimo, mirja.hartimo@helsinki.fi
Haltiuksen jäsen, Mirja Hartimo, 02.2008 → ...

Sara Heinämaa, Sara.Heinamaa@helsinki.fi
Board member of the Nordic Society for Phenomenology (NoSP), Sara Heinämaa, 2001 → ...

Board member of and international advisor for the Society for Interdisciplinary Feminist Phenomenology (SIFP), Sara Heinämaa, 2006 → ..., United States
Expert consultant for Austrian Science Foundation (FWF), Sara Heinämaa, 2007 → ..., Austria
Expert consultant for National Endowment for the Humanities (NEH, US), Sara Heinämaa, 2007, United States
Expert consultant for the Academy of Finland, Sara Heinämaa, 2007 → ..., Finland
President of the Nordic Society for Phenomenology (NoSP), Sara Heinämaa, 2007 → ...
Expert consultant for the European Science Foundation, Sara Heinämaa, 2008 → ..., Germany

Juho Hotanen, juho.hotanen@helsinki.fi
Board member, Finnish Researchers’ Association, Juho Hotanen, 2010 → ..., Finland

Kristian Klockars, kristian.klockars@helsinki.fi
Philosophical Society of Finland, Board member, Kristian Klockars, 2000 → 2010, Finland
Board of Department of Social and Moral Philosophy, Member, Kristian Klockars, 2004 → 2009, Finland
Local Organising Committee, International Association for Philosophy and Literature, IAPL 2005 Chiasmatic Encounters, Helsinki, Kristian Klockars, 01.01.2005, United States
Vice-Head of Department, Kristian Klockars, 09.2008 → 12.2009, Finland
Head of Subject, Social and Moral Philosophy, Kristian Klockars, 01.01.2010 → 31.10.2010, Finland

Virpi Päivikki Lehtinen, virpi.lehtinen@helsinki.fi
Representative of the nordic journal of philosophy SATS, Virpi Päivikki Lehtinen, 01.01.2005 → 31.12.2005
Assessment of docent candidate (Teaching skills), Virpi Päivikki Lehtinen, 2007 → ...
Member in the teaching feedback committee, Virpi Päivikki Lehtinen, 01.01.2007 → 30.09.2007
Representative of junior faculty in the board, Virpi Päivikki Lehtinen, 01.01.2007 → 31.12.2009, Finland

Johanna Oksala, johanna.oksala@helsinki.fi
Executive Board Member, Johanna Oksala, 2007 → ..., United Kingdom
Member of the Peer Review College, AHRC, Johanna Oksala, 2007 → 12.2010, United Kingdom
Executive Board Member, Johanna Oksala, 2010 → ..., United Kingdom
Member of the Scientific Committee, Johanna Oksala, 2010 → ..., Italy

Sergei Prozorov, sergei.prozorov@helsinki.fi
*The European Union and Russia* Inquiry of the European Union Committee of the House of Lords, UK Parliament, Sergei Prozorov, 20.09.2007, United Kingdom
Editorial Board Membership, Sergei Prozorov, 01.06.2007 → ...
Standing Group on International Relations of the European Consortium for Political Research, Sergei Prozorov, 01.06.2007 → ...
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Martina Reuter, Martina.Reuter@helsinki.fi
Board of Department, Martina Reuter, 2005 → 2006
Board member, Martina Reuter, 2008 → ...

Joonu Taipale, Joonu.Taipale@helsinki.fi
Secretary/administrator of The Nordic Society for Phenomenology (NoSP), Joonu Taipale, 2005 → ...

Membership or other role in public Finnish or international organization

Jussi Backman, Jussi.Backman@helsinki.fi
Deputy board member, Department of Philosophy, University of Helsinki, Jussi Backman, 01.01.2007 → 31.12.2009, Finland

Ulrika Björk, ulrika.bjork@helsinki.fi
Medlem i Nordic Network for Women in Philosophy (NWIP), Ulrika Björk, 1998 → ...
Medlem i The Nordic Society for Phenomenology (NoSP), Ulrika Björk, 2001 → ...
Medlem i International Association of Women Philosophers (IAWP), Ulrika Björk, 2002 → ...
Medlem i Society for Phenomenological and Existential Philosophy (SPEP), Ulrika Björk, 2003 → ..., United States
Medlem i The Husserl Circle, Ulrika Björk, 2009 → ...

Sara Heinämaa, Sara.Heinamaa@helsinki.fi
Member of equality committee, Sara Heinämaa, 2008 → 2009, Finland

Kristian Klockars, Kristian.Klockars@helsinki.fi
Member of Demokratiforum - Vasudhaiva Kutumbakam, Kristian Klockars, 2003 → ...
Member of Network for International and Global Democratization, NIGD, Kristian Klockars, 2006 → ...

Virpi Päivikki Lehtinen, Virpi.Lehtinen@helsinki.fi
Expert in philosophy of sexual difference, Virpi Päivikki Lehtinen, 10.10.2006, Finland
Expert in women's studies, Virpi Päivikki Lehtinen, 14.11.2007, Finland
Expert in Women's Studies, Virpi Päivikki Lehtinen, 01.01.2009 → 30.05.2009, Finland
Expert in philosophy of love, Virpi Päivikki Lehtinen, 11.11.2009, Finland
Member in the steering board, Virpi Päivikki Lehtinen, 01.02.2009 → 01.09.2009, Finland

Timo Miettinen, timo.pa.miettinen@helsinki.fi
Hyvinvointi ilmastonmuutoksen oloissa -työryhmä, Timo Miettinen, 01.09.2009 → 31.05.2010

Martina Reuter, Martina.Reuter@helsinki.fi
Ylioppilastutkintolautakunta, apusensori, Martina Reuter, 01.01.1997 → ..., Finland
Board vice-member, Martina Reuter, 2008 → ...
Working group on education, Martina Reuter, 2010 → ...

Membership or other role of body in private company/organisation

Kai Alhanen, kai.alhanen@helsinki.fi
Consultant and work supervisor, Kai Alhanen, 01.07.2001 → ..., Finland

Virpi Päivikki Lehtinen, Virpi.Lehtinen@helsinki.fi
Member, Virpi Päivikki Lehtinen, 01.01.2007 → ..., Finland

Other tasks of an expert in private sector

Sara Heinämaa, Sara.Heinamaa@helsinki.fi
Expert consultant for The Finnish Cultural Foundation (Suomen Kulttuurirahasto), Sara Heinämaa, 1997 → …
Participation in interview for written media

**Jussi Backman**, Jussi.Backman@helsinki.fi
Interview for the periodical Yliopisto [University], Jussi Backman, 14.10.2010, Finland

**Ulrika Björk**, ulrika.bjork@helsinki.fi
Interviewed in Gofie Dagblad, Ulrika Björk, 10.2009, Sweden
Interviewed in Hufvudstadsbladet, Ulrika Björk, 01.2009

**Juha Himanka**, Juha.Himanka@helsinki.fi
Lehtikaustetut, Yliopistlehti 18/2000, Juha Himanka, 01.01.2000 → 31.12.2011, Finland

**Kristian Klockars**, Kristian.Klockars@helsinki.fi
Debatkivä: Liberal fundamentalism, Kristian Klockars, 10.08.2005, Finland
Kyrkpresse, Kristian Klockars, 08.09.2005, Finland
FST Debatt, Kristian Klockars, 01.10.2006, Finland
Studia Generalia-föreläsning, Helsingfors universitet, Kristian Klockars, 09.10.2007, Finland

**Virpi Päivikki Lehtinen**, Virpi.Lehtinen@helsinki.fi
Interviewed by Anna Lahelma “The Right One”, 30.11.2007, Virpi Päivikki Lehtinen, 30.11.2007, Finland

**Timo Miettinen**, timo.pa.miettinen@helsinki.fi
Lisää puhetta EU:sta, Timo Miettinen, 10.2007

**Mika Ojakangas**, Mika.Ojakangas@helsinki.fi
Esitelmä Auroran kouluilla, Espoo, Mika Ojakangas, 12.02.2002 → 31.12.2011, Finland
Esitelmä Keski-Suomen koulutusvaliokunnan kokouksessa, Mika Ojakangas, 04.10.2002 → 31.12.2011, Finland
Esitelmä Kockot kritiikkipäivillä, Mika Ojakangas, 09.02.2002 → 31.12.2011, Finland
Esitelmä Rauman opettajakoulutuspäivillä, Mika Ojakangas, 19.11.2002 → 31.12.2011, Finland
Esitelmä Savonlinnan metodimessuilla, Mika Ojakangas, 06.11.2002 → 31.12.2011, Finland
Esitelmä Strategisen johdannan laitoksesta, Sotakorkeakoulu, Mika Ojakangas, 19.03.2002 → 31.12.2011, Finland
Esitelmä Suomen sosiaalipedagogisen seuran päivitys, Mika Ojakangas, 12.04.2002 → 31.12.2011, Finland
Esitelmä Uudenmaan hiippakunnan hiippakuntakilpailuissa, Mika Ojakangas, 16.03.2002 → 31.12.2011, Finland
Esitelmä ammattivalintapsykologien TE-kokouksessa, Mika Ojakangas, 15.10.2002 → 31.12.2011, Finland
Esitelmä ehtoollinen sosiaalipurkkoja, Mika Ojakangas, 21.11.2002 → 31.12.2011, Finland
Haastattelut Hämeen sanomalehdissä, Mika Ojakangas, 01.01.2002 → 31.12.2011, Finland
Haastattelut Kirjallisuus ja kulttuuri, Mika Ojakangas, 25.10.2002 → 31.12.2011, Finland
Haastattelut Luokansopitaja-lehdessä, Mika Ojakangas, 01.01.2002 → 31.12.2011, Finland
Haastattelut Opetus-lehdestä, Mika Ojakangas, 01.01.2002 → 31.12.2011, Finland
Haastattelut Stockmannin LauantaiAkateemia, Mika Ojakangas, 06.04.2002 → 31.12.2011, Finland
Paneelikeskutelut kirjasta Kenen tahansa poliittista, Lapinlahti, Café Java, Mika Ojakangas, 09.10.2002 → 31.12.2011, Finland
Kritiisen korkeakoulun leisöönteen, Mika Ojakangas, 13.10.2003 → 31.12.2011, Finland
Ohjauksesta ja opetusalan seminaarista, Mika Ojakangas, 26.04.2003 → 31.12.2011, Finland
Haastattelu Hämeneen sanomalehdissä, Mika Ojakangas, 31.10.2004 → 31.12.2011, Finland
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Interview, Mika Ojakangas, 04.02.2005, Finland
Interview, Mika Ojakangas, 17.02.2007, Finland
Interview, Mika Ojakangas, 18.03.2008, Finland

Johanna Oksala, Johanna.Oksala@helsinki.fi
Krittisen korkeakoulun yleisöluentosarja, Porthania, Helsinki, Johanna Oksala, 29.04.2002 → 31.12.2011, United States
Keskustelutaittacus; Nainen, filosofia ja sukupuolero, Ravintola Juttutupa, Helsinki, Johanna Oksala, 06.03.2003 → 31.12.2011, Finland
Keskustelutaittacus; Mitä on valistus?, Parasitti-klubi, Taidemuseo Kiasma, Helsinki, Johanna Oksala, 01.03.2003 → 31.12.2011, Finland
Nuoren Voiman Liitto ja Yliopistolahti, Johanna Oksala, 05.10.2005 → 31.12.2011, Norway

Martina Reuter, Martina.Reuter@helsinki.fi
Unohdetut filosofit, Martina Reuter, 15.05.2006, Finland
Koulu markkinalogian vastavoimana, Martina Reuter, 10.10.2008, Finland
Kouluhärkäki, Martina Reuter, 10.10.2008, Finland

Erika Ruonakoski, Erika.Ruonakoski@helsinki.fi
Sukupuoli ei ole kohtalo, Erika Ruonakoski, 01.11.2009
Toinen sukupuoli vihdoin suomeksi: 50-vuotias klassikko ei vanhene, Erika Ruonakoski, 19.01.2010

Fredrik Westerlund, fredrik.westerlund@helsinki.fi
Föredrag om begreppet heder på Korpo filosofidagar, Fredrik Westerlund, 27.07.2007
Föredrag "Vad är filosofisk förståelse?", filosoficafé anordnat av Folkets bildningsförbund, Fredrik Westerlund, 28.09.2008

Participation in radio programme
Ulrika Björk, ulrika.bjork@helsinki.fi
Filosofiska rummet, Ulrika Björk, 02.11.2008, Sweden
Intervjuad i Sveriges Radio P3, Ulrika Björk, 09.01.2008, Sweden
Intervjuad i Finlands Svenska Radio, Ulrika Björk, 01.2009

Sara Heinämaa, Sara.Heinamaa@helsinki.fi
Interview by Silvia Stoller on Merleau-Ponty's philosphy, Sara Heinämaa, 2006, Austria
Naastutkimus 2 [Women's Studies], Sara Heinämaa, 30.07.2007
Kultakuume, Sara Heinämaa, 23.12.2010, Finland

Juha Himanka, Juha.Himanka@helsinki.fi
Ajantasä, Juha Himanka, 18.12.2009

Kristian Klockars, Kristian.Klockars@helsinki.fi
Radio Suomi, Kristian Klockars, 23.08.2005, Finland
Vallan vaiheilla, Ylen Radio 1, Kristian Klockars, 19.01.2006, Finland
Intervju, radioprogramserien Förundran, Radio Vega, Kristian Klockars, 2008, Finland
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Timo Miettinen, timo.pa.miettinen@helsinki.fi
Vieraan valinta (YLE1): “Onko EU:ssa Jumalaa?”, Timo Miettinen, 07.2007

Mika Ojakangas, Mika.Ojakangas@helsinki.fi
Interview, Mika Ojakangas, 27.03.2007, Finland
Interview, Mika Ojakangas, 23.09.2008, Finland
Discussion, Mika Ojakangas, 19.08.2009, Finland

Martina Reuter, Martina.Reuter@helsinki.fi
Slaget efter tolv, Martina Reuter, 27.10.2010, Finland

Erika Ruonakoski, Erika.Ruonakoski@helsinki.fi
Keskustelu eläimistä, Erika Ruonakoski, 2001
Keskustelu eläinsuhteesta, Erika Ruonakoski, 2002
Ajantasa, Erika Ruonakoski, 02.11.2009

Participation in TV programme

Sara Heinämaa, Sara.Heinamaa@helsinki.fi
YLE Uutiset [TV News], Sara Heinämaa, 02.11.2009, Finland

Kristian Klockars, Kristian.Klockars@helsinki.fi
TV-sarja Suomi vuonna 2030, Yle TV2, Kristian Klockars, 2008, Finland

Mika Ojakangas, Mika.Ojakangas@helsinki.fi
Interview, Mika Ojakangas, 16.08.2005, Finland
Discussion, Mika Ojakangas, 18.07.2007, Finland

Martina Reuter, Martina.Reuter@helsinki.fi
Min morgon, Martina Reuter, 25.10.2010, Finland
Min morgon, Martina Reuter, 01.11.2010, Finland
Min morgon, Martina Reuter, 08.11.2010, Finland
Min morgon, Martina Reuter, 15.11.2010, Finland
Min morgon, Martina Reuter, 22.11.2010, Finland
Min morgon: Måndagsfilosoferna, Martina Reuter, 29.11.2010
Min morgon: Måndagsfilosoferna, Martina Reuter, 13.12.2010

Erika Ruonakoski, Erika.Ruonakoski@helsinki.fi
T-klubi, Erika Ruonakoski, 2004

Participation in interview for web based media

Erika Ruonakoski, Erika.Ruonakoski@helsinki.fi
Nuorten päivä Helsingissä 10.1.2009, Erika Ruonakoski, 10.01.2009
Appendix B.b.

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

The bibliometric analyses by Helsinki University Library (HULib)

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

The appendix includes the analyses of the RC under discussion.
## Analysis of publications by Helsinki University Library – 66 RCs altogether

### Biological, Agricultural and Veterinary Sciences
- Luukkanen, Olavi – VITRI
- Valsta, Lauri – SUVALUE

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

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

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

The next appendix includes the analyses of the RC under discussion.
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PUBLICATION DATA 2005-2010

RC/SHC/Heinämaa

Category 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.

Number of authors in publications/year

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No. of authors</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>Grand Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>265</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Total</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>313</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The publications have mostly only one author (85%).
The commonest language is Finnish (46 %), as English (38 %) in the second place.
## Language of Publications 2005-2010

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language</th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>fr_FR</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 %</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>en_GB</td>
<td>10 %</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fi_FI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>46 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sv_SE</td>
<td>10 %</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>de_DE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 %</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ja_JP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 %</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ru_RU</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 %</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mult</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0 %</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>und</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>et_EE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0 %</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Journal / Year / Total

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Journal</th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tiede &amp; edistys</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Niin &amp; näin : filosofinen aikakauslehti.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ajatus</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ny Tid</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continental Philosophy Review</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foucault Studies</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nya Argus</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helsingin Sanomat</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minervan pöllö</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philosophy Today</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sats</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tietteessä tapahtuu</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fainomenon</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kaleva</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nora</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Notre Dame philosophical reviews</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philosophy &amp; Social Criticism</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phänomenologische Forschungen</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title</td>
<td>Volume</td>
<td>Issue</td>
<td>Page</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telos.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ab Imperio</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acta Philosophica Fennica</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aikuiskasvatus</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alea</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternatives</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ariadne Lõng : nais- ja meesuurimuse ajakiri</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COLLeGIUM Studies across disciplines in the humanities and social sciences</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cooperation and Conflict</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distinktion</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Epocha</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethical Perspectives</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethics and Global Politics</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Études Philosophiques</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Europe, revue littéraire mensuelle</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>European Journal of Social Theory</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>European Journal of Women's Studies</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Filosofisk tidskrift.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finsk Tidskrift</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate Faculty Philosophy Journal</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hufvudstadsbladet</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hugur : Timarit um heimspeki</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indo-Pasific journal of phenomenology</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International theory : a journal of international politics, law and philosophy</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journal for Cultural and Religious Theory</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journal of International Relations and Development</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journal of Political Ideologies</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kanava</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kasvatus</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Katsaus</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kvinnovetenskaplig tidskrift</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lignes</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liiketaloudellinen Aikakauskirja</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Millennium : journal of international studies.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Musiikin Suunta</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nuori Voima</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phenomenology 2005</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philosophia Mathematica</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philosophie.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political Geography</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Politiikka</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Review of Metaphysics</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revue Philosophique de Louvain</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Journal ranking (Norway, Australia, ERIH)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Niin &amp; näin : filosofinen aikakauslehti.</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ajatus</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continental Philosophy Review</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foucault Studies</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nya Argus</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philosophy Today</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sats</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nora</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philosophy &amp; Social Criticism</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phänomenologische Forschungen</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telos.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acta Philosophica Fennica</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aikuiskasvatus</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternatives</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ariadne Lõng : nais- ja meesuurimuse ajakiri</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COLLeGIUM Studies across disciplines in the humanities and social sciences</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cooperation and Conflict</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distinktion</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Epoche</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethical Perspectives</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethics and Global Politics</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title</td>
<td>Level</td>
<td>Rank</td>
<td>Category</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Études Philosophiques</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1 A</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Europe, revue littéraire mensuelle</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>European Journal of Social Theory</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2 A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>European Journal of Women’s Studies</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2 A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Filosofisk tidskrift.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate Faculty Philosophy Journal</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hugur : Tímarit um heimspeki</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1 C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indo-Pacific journal of phenomenology</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1 C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International theory : a journal of international politics, law and philosophy</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journal for Cultural and Religious Theory</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1 C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journal of International Relations and Development</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1 C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journal of Political Ideologies</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1 B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kanava</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kasvetus</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kvinnovetenskaplig tidskrift</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1 C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lihikeloudellinen Aikakauskirja</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1 C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Millennium : journal of international studies.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1 B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Musiikin Suunta</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philosophy.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political Geography</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2 A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Review of Metaphysics</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1 A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revue Philosophique de Louvain</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1 C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Studies in East European Thought</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1 C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Amount of ranked articles (Norway)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Norway</th>
<th>Journal articles</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Level 2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level 1</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Amount of ranked articles (Australian)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Australia</th>
<th>Journal articles</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Level A*</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level A</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level B</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level C</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Book publishers

## Publisher ranking (based on Norwegian ranking list)

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

C1 Published scientific monograph (12)  
C2 Edited book, compilation, conference proceeding or special issue of journal (14)  
D5 Text book or professional handbook or guidebook or dictionary (4)  
E2 Popular monograph (0)

4 books of 30 have been published by a high ranked leading scientific publisher, 14 by a ranked scientific publisher.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Publisher</th>
<th>C1</th>
<th>C2</th>
<th>D5</th>
<th>E2</th>
<th>Grand Total</th>
<th>Publisher ranking</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Springer</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Söderström</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>no</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Editions L'Harmattan</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>no</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eurooppalaisen filosofian seura</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>no</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tutkijaliitto</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gaudeamus</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Palgrave Macmillan</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ashgate</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cambridge University Press</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Granta Books</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>no</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kirjapaja</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>no</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Like : Into</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>no</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lunds universitet</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>no</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peter Lang</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Helsinki, Department of Philosophy (Helsingin yliopisto,</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>no</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>teoreettisen filosofian ja filosofian (ruotsinkiel.) sekä käytännöllisen</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>filosofian oppiaineet)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WSOY</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Grand Total</strong></td>
<td>12</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>