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**Summary:**
Researcher Community (RC) was a new concept of the participating unit in the evaluation. Participation in the evaluation was voluntary and the RCs had to choose one of the five characteristic categories to participate.

Evaluation of the Researcher Community was based on the answers to the evaluation questions. In addition a list of publications and other activities were provided by the TUHAT system. The CWTS/Leiden University conducted analyses for 80 RCs and the Helsinki University Library for 66 RCs. Panellists, 49 and two special experts in five panels evaluated all the evaluation material as a whole and discussed the feedback for RC-specific reports in the panel meetings in Helsinki. The main part of this report is consisted of the feedback which is published as such in the report.

Chapters in the report:
1. Background for the evaluation
2. Evaluation feedback for the Researcher Community
3. List of publications
4. List of activities
5. Bibliometric analyses

The level of the RCs' success can be concluded from the written feedback together with the numeric evaluation of four evaluation questions and the category fitness. More conclusions of the success can be drawn based on the University-level report.

**RC-specific information:**

| Main scientific field of research: | Humanities |
| RC-specific keywords: | Art, architecture, design, historiography, hermeneutics, art theory, gender, social history of art, visual culture, iconography, Middle Ages, Renaissance, 19th C. European art, Modernism |
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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/doctoral programmes
     - good practises and quality assurance in doctoral training
   - 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/supervision of doctoral dissertations
   A written feedback from the aspects of: processes and good practices related to leadership and management
   - Strengths
   - Areas of development
   - Other remarks
   - Recommendations

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

   Competitive funding reported in the text is also to be considered when evaluating this point.
   A written feedback from the aspects of: scientific quality, scientific significance, societal impact, innovativeness, future significance
   - Strengths
   - Areas of development
   - Other remarks
   - Recommendations

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

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

- Strengths
- Areas of development
- Other remarks
- Recommendations

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

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

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

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

13. RC-specific conclusions

1.7 Evaluation criteria

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

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

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

Description of criteria levels

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

Classification: Criteria (level of procedures and results)

Outstanding quality of procedures and results (5)
Outstandingly strong research, also from international perspective. Attracts great international interest with a wide impact, including publications in leading journals and/or monographs published by leading international publishing houses. The research has world leading qualities. The research focus, key research questions scientific significance, societal impact and innovativeness are of outstanding quality.

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

10
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
The RC covers a very broad scope of fields and brings together art historians with a diverse background. The doctoral training, which seems to be the most important motivation behind the formation of AHCI, looks like the most successful activity of the RC.

Areas of development
The RC’s publication strategy should be evaluated taking into account the specific problems and opportunities within the field of art history. Nevertheless, the number of publications for an international audience is limited at the moment as are the number of publications in leading international journals – even when 3 out of the 5 research themes have a clear international, or at least a non-Finnish scope. Many of the journals where articles in Finnish have been published indicate more societal than scientific impact (which is not an indication of the quality of research per se).

The RC does not seem to have a very reflected research strategy. There may be too many research topics for a community of this size. The fruitfulness of multidisciplinary discourses for the research is acknowledged, but there are not many concrete examples of this.

Other remarks
The RC is covers a very broad scope of fields, from medieval studies to contemporary art. Many methods seem to be used. The five themes in which the research is organized, are only partly interrelated. The cohesion of the RC could be problematic, although this cannot be concluded from the evaluation material.

Recommendations
The RC should think of ways to integrate the research themes, or perhaps focus on less themes and change the publication strategies in order to reach an international audience.

Numeric evaluation: 3 (Very good)

2.2 Practises and quality of doctoral training

- Organising of the doctoral training in the RC. Description of the RC’s principles for:
  - recruitment and selection of doctoral candidates
  - supervision of doctoral candidates
  - collaboration with faculties, departments/institutes, and potential graduate schools/doctoral programmes
  - good practises and quality assurance in doctoral training
  - assuring of good career perspectives for the doctoral candidates/fresh doctorates
- Identification of the RC’s strengths and challenges related to the practises and quality of doctoral training, and the actions planned for their development.
Strengths
The RC has provided a solid base for doctoral training. This training, which seems to be the most important motivation behind the formation of AHCI, looks like the most successful activity of the RC. 27 doctoral dissertations have been supervised and approved mostly with excellent grades, and a number of teaching activities developed. The doctoral training is founded in a strong national doctoral programme, including successful summer schools.

Areas of development
International recruitment could strengthen the international outlook of the RC. Participation in international doctoral training schemes can be improved. The participation of candidates in international symposia and conferences (other than the Summer school of the Doctoral Programme) is also worth developing. The same might be true for peer tutoring and the engagement of candidates in research administration, organization of symposia etc. The fact that many candidates do part-time research while also working in cultural institutions can be seen as an asset: ways to profit from this could be explored.

Numeric evaluation: 4 (Excellent)

2.3 The societal impact of research and doctoral training

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

ASPECTS: Societal impact, national and international collaboration, innovativeness

Strengths
The researchers of the RC are often asked to comment on various issues in the media and do participate in the public debate on issues like environmental preservation; art forgeries, etc. Members of the AHCI community have taken part especially in discussions concerning issues of the built environment. AHCI collaborates actively with the art and architecture museums of Finland and with other major national institutions dealing with cultural heritage.

Areas of development
The RC signals that it is willing to take a more active, instead of reactive, role in terms of societal impact: this could certainly be developed.

Other remarks
None.

Recommendations
Increase the number of popular publications in English.

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 most important International network of the RC is the network “Visions of the Past: Images as Historical Sources and the History of Art History” funded by NordForsk (2008-2010). This network is connected to the research project “A Portrait of Art History; Critical Approaches to the Finnish Art History and Historians”, funded by the Academy of Finland (2008-2011) also headed by Suominen-Kokkonen. There is an established international dimension through the Doctoral Programme, and co-operation with other Humanities disciplines nationally.

Areas of development
The RC has not taken the lead in creating more international networks or to apply for Marie Curie Funding. Of course individual members have also their own personal networks in Finland and abroad, but a more active international approach seems necessary.

Other remarks
Although the RC recognizes that monetary resources are lacking concerning researcher mobility, no initiative seems to be taken to find outside funds.

Recommendations
See above. The RC’s plans for strengthening this dimension are good and should be further developed.

Numeric evaluation: 2.5 (Good)

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 material resources include the premises of the School of Art History, with an extensive art historical library (30 000 volumes) and a vast picture-archive. The Finnish Doctoral Programme in Art History and its Summer School system add to the strengths of the RC.

Areas of development
The RC has 26 members but only 3 PI’s. Increasing the number of PI’s could create a bigger population with the capacity to draft funding applications nationally and internationally and in general take a more active role in strengthening the research profile. They could also step in and replace professors if these are able to get funding for research leaves.

The need for extra funding should be a stimulant to apply for extra EU- or national funding.
Other remarks
The evaluation document from the RC highlights some of the negative aspects of the current operational conditions. The picture archive has to close down great deal of its services, while the library will be moved to be part of the large main library of Humanities, and only small reference library will stay at the premises. However, these developments are not necessarily negative. It is increasingly difficult for individual departments of Art History to maintain a high quality infrastructure by their own. Larger libraries can maintain and develop a professional infrastructure better than small scale holdings, certainly in the age of Humanities.

Recommendations
To start a forward looking dialogue with the main library of Humanities.

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 small size of the RC means that information flows smoothly and informal exchange is easy.

Areas of development
The RC does recognize that the focus of researchers and teachers should be strengthened and that it is necessary to make Finnish research better known and to work with joint projects at the EU-level. The board of the RC comprises the PI’s, which means only 3 members. Taken the present breadth of research topics of themes, it would be a good idea to either grow the board or create other forums for the exchange of ideas and drafting of strategies.

Other remarks
It is regrettable that the RC has not followed its own recommendations above yet.

Recommendations
See above.

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
In the period under question, the RC has managed to gain funds which are around 1 million Euros, mainly from the Academy of Finland and partly from the Finnish Ministry of Culture and Education. In addition, there are personal grants of researchers (mainly doctoral candidates) adding up to 510 000 €.

Areas of development
Room for improvement is available, especially on the European level (Marie Curie and ERC).

Recommendations
See above.

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

Areas of development
The RC will strengthen cooperation between researchers and doctoral students, both within the School of art History as well as within humanities in general.
The RC will also seek new exchange partners among European universities to strengthen the exchange of teachers and researchers.

Recommendations
The plans of the RC, especially concerning the European level, should become more concrete.

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

The RC’s fitness to the chosen participation category.

Category 2. The research of the participating community is of high quality, but the community in its present composition has yet to achieve strong international recognition or a clear break-through.

Other remarks
The RC chose a category that reflects its primary goals. The overall quality of the research can be improved.

Numeric evaluation: 3 (Very good)

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

Other remarks
Professor Lukkarinen has made the base text on the basis of board meetings. Other members of the community have been contacted personally or via e-mail.
2.11 How the UH’s focus areas are presented in the RC’s research

*Focus area 8: Language and culture*

The RC represents the UH focus area 8, Language and culture. Art and art history are definitely a significant part of culture, and the historiographical research of this RC concerns one specific articulation of culture in language.

2.12 RC-specific main recommendations

See above.

2.13 RC-specific conclusions

See above.
3 Appendices

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

B. Bibliometric analyses
   a. Analysis provided by CWTS/University of Leiden
   b. Analysis provided by Helsinki University Library (66 RCs)
NAME OF THE RESEARCHER COMMUNITY:
Art, History and Critical Interpretations (AHCI)

LEADER OF THE RESEARCHER COMMUNITY:
Professor Ville Lukkarinen, Faculty of Arts, Department of Philosophy, History, Culture and Art 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)
Name: Lukkarinen, Ville
E-mail: ville.lukkarinen@helsinki.fi
Phone: 191 22361
Affiliation: Faculty of Arts, Department of Philosophy, History, Culture and Art Studies
Street address: Unioninkatu 34, 00014 HELSINGIN YLIOPISTO

Name of the participating RC (max. 30 characters): Art, History and Critical Interpretations
Acronym for the participating RC (max. 10 characters): AHCI

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 practical motivation behind AHCI has been to enhance high-quality art historical research and doctoral training in Finland. All the research done has been based on sound international standards and methods of current art historical research work. The work of the AHCI community is especially characterized by the active implementation of contemporary theoretical turns in art-historical scholarship as well as applying methods from other humanities and social sciences. International collaboration is an integral part of the activities of the community.

Finnish art historians have a social call to participate in the national project of writing the history of Finnish art, architecture and design. The project includes, of course, the constant critical reinterpretation of this history. However, the AHCI community is not restricted to that task only as the members of the group have attained recognition in studies concerning e.g. the art of the Italian Renaissance, ancient China and international contemporary art.

The research environment of AHCI is the School of Art History and its premises at UH, with an extensive art historical library (30,000 volumes). AHCI collaborates actively with the art and architecture museums of Finland with other major national institutions dealing with cultural heritage. Cooperation with other bodies, such as the Society for Art History in Finland includes organizing joint seminars, lectures and research projects.

The doctoral training is one of the motivations behind the formation of AHCI. Practically it is done with personal supervision plus post-graduate seminars maintained constantly during the academic year (8+8 sittings). The School of Art History has 50 registered post-graduate students at the moment. The post-graduate education is backed up by the Finnish Doctoral Programme in Art History headed by the School of Art History at UH. Several doctoral students of the programme have been supervised by the PIs of AHCI since 1999. Four-day Summer Schools involving all four art history departments in Finland, and organized by the doctoral programme, have been held every August since 1999.
3 SCIENTIFIC FIELDS OF THE RC

Main scientific field of the RC's research: humanities

RC's scientific subfield 1: Art

RC's scientific subfield 2: History

RC's scientific subfield 3: Medieval and Renaissance Studies

RC's scientific subfield 4: --Select--

Other, if not in the list:

4 RC'S PARTICIPATION CATEGORY

Participation category: 2. Research of the participating community is of high quality, but the community in its present composition has yet to achieve strong international recognition or a clear break-through

Justification for the selected participation category (MAX. 2200 characters with spaces): The research of the community does not differ from standards of the international mainstream research as international reviewers have often noted (see for example the Evaluation report from 2005). The various scholarly results (books, articles, conference papers) are of high international quality but mostly because a large part of the published material is in Finnish or Swedish and/or published by national publishers (even if written in English), and mostly deal with empirical material related to Finland, the community has not yet achieved international recognition as a group. Many of its members, however, have done that individually.

Members of the community are in contact with (or are the Finnish representatives of) important international networks and associations, such as NORDIK, CIHA, CAA, AAH, FIDEM, ICOM, ICOMOS and DoCoMoMo. International networks include the research network 'Visions of the Past: Images as Historical Sources and the History of Art History' funded by NordForsk 2008-10. Several universities from Denmark, Finland, Norway and Sweden are involved in this network, headed by PI Suominen-Kokkonen from AHCI.

5 DESCRIPTION OF THE RC'S RESEARCH AND DOCTORAL TRAINING

Public description of the RC's research and doctoral training (MAX. 2200 characters with spaces): The research done by the AHCI community covers a broad scope of fields, from medieval studies to contemporary art. The methods are derived from international art historical discussions, but interdisciplinary ventures have proved effective in forming new ways to investigate and interpret art. The research done within the RC is focused on the five following themes which are partly interrelated: 1) The art and architecture in Finland at the turn of the 19th and 20th C., 2) The historiography of art history in Finland, 3) New interpretations of late-medieval architecture, art and sculpture in the Baltic Sea region, 4) Studies in Italian Renaissance, and 5) Modernity and modernism in the arts.

The doctoral training done within the scope of the AHCI community is well organized. All the PIs supervise doctoral students. The constantly maintained post-graduate seminars and the joined Summer Schools, held every August with international guest teachers, guarantee good supervision. The PIs of the AHCI
community have had altogether ca. 40 (of which 12 attained their doctoral degree in 2008-09) officially registered graduate students.

There are several researchers of art history who are mentioned in another RC, Gender Studies, who have been affiliated to the AHCI community, for different time spans between 2005-2010: PhD Harri Kalha (University Lecturer 11 months), PhD Tutta Palin (University Lecturer 11 months) and PhD Annamari Vänskä (2 yrs 7 months). They would have wanted to take part as partners in both of the RCs. The multidisciplinary research project ‘A Portrait of Art History; Critical Approaches to the Finnish Art History and Historians’, funded by the Academy of Finland in 2008-11, and headed by PI Suominen-Kokkonen, seeks to explore in new and critical ways how historical interpretations have been produced in art history. And, interdisciplinary project ‘Representing and sensing gender, landscape and nature’ headed by then professor of Women’s Studies Kirsi Saarikangas, and funded by the Academy of Finland, has brought together art historians, ecologists and gender researchers.

Significance of the RC’s research and doctoral training for the University of Helsinki (MAX. 2200 characters with spaces):

The research and doctoral training of AHCI for UH is of great importance. The researchers of the community publish books and articles which are discussed and assessed publicly. Art historians are often asked to comment on various issues in the media. The reason for this is that they very often deal with questions which interest the media and society at large (new findings and interpretations in the history of Finnish art, architecture and design; questions of building restoration and environmental preservation; art forgeries, etc.). This gives great visibility to the university as a whole.

Cooperation with fields such as History, Gender Studies, Literature and Philosophy increases interdisciplinary activity within the university, thus enhancing the research in general.

Doctoral dissertations done within the AHCI community (The average being four to six doctoral dissertations per year which is one of the biggest numbers within the Faculty of Arts), and constant publishing gives the much sought-after credit points for the whole Department and thus for the Faculty of Arts in UH.

Keywords: Art, architecture, design, historiography, hermeneutics, art theory, gender, social history of art, visual culture, iconography, Middle Ages, Renaissance, 19th C. European art, Modernism.

6 QUALITY OF RC’S RESEARCH AND DOCTORAL TRAINING

Justified estimate of the quality of the RC’s research and doctoral training at national and international level during 2005-2010 (MAX. 2200 characters with spaces): In the previous evaluation in 2005 the success of the School of Art History was rated as good (6/7, as part of the Institute of Art Research). The publications of the AHCI community demonstrate the wide scope of themes covered by our research, and they have received national and international notice (especially PI Konttinen has received many national book prizes).

The number of doctoral dissertations between 2005-10, supervised mostly by the AHCI members in the unit of Art History at UH, is remarkable (27), and the grades received are of the highest level (average being ‘ecl’ which is second highest in the scale of seven).

The number of post-graduate students in the subject of Art History at UH shows clearly that the positive trend is continuing, and we have been successful in hiring motivated candidates for post-graduate studies.
The largest number of doctoral students in the Finnish Doctoral Programme of Art History is from UH (in 2010: three out of eight students).

Furthermore, we have to remember that all the PIs of the community have a great responsibility for the teaching of undergraduate students and do their research work and supervision of post-graduate students at the same time, without real research leaves of absence for research.

Comments on how the RC’s scientific productivity and doctoral training should be evaluated (MAX. 2200 characters with spaces):

The evaluation of AHCI’s research, both in quantitative and qualitative terms, can best be done with general evaluation methods common within the humanities: by reading statistics and the publications themselves. The statistics are found in the TUHAT database. It should be noted, however, that the publication strategies within art history do not follow the strict lines of sciences such as Medicine. The referee system is quite new, and not used on a broad basis, in the publication forms that art historians usually use (monographs, exhibition books and catalogues, etc.). This seems to be a phenomenon not confined to Finland alone. This means that if the published text at hand is non-peer reviewed it does not mean it is of minor quality.

The publishing strategy of the AHCI is based on regular publication within available opportunities. We have to remember that art historical texts usually need high-quality visual material, and therefore the publishers must be chosen according to their willingness and possibilities to print high-quality photographs. That is why the community is not able to restrict the publishing policy of its individual members. However, there are some renowned traditional publishers that art historians are eager to use: The Journal of the Finnish Antiquarian Society (est. 1874), The Journal of the Society of Art History (est. 1974), and the publications of the Society of Finnish Literature. The foremost museums also have publication series, which are highly respected in the field: Ateneum Art Museum, the Central Art Archives and the Sara Hildén Art Museum.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Last name</th>
<th>First name</th>
<th>PI-status (TUHAT, 29.11.2010)</th>
<th>Title of research and teaching personnel. Current title in 31.10.2010.</th>
<th>Affiliation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Aaltonen Susanna</td>
<td>I, Doctoral candidate</td>
<td>Faculty of Arts, DPHCAS; Art History</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Cadogan Jukka</td>
<td>I, Doctoral candidate</td>
<td>Faculty of Arts, DPHCAS; Art History</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Donner Julia</td>
<td>I, Doctoral candidate</td>
<td>Faculty of Arts, DPHCAS; Art History</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Eskelinen Kirsu</td>
<td>II, Postdoctoral Researcher</td>
<td>Faculty of Arts, DPHCAS; Art History</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Hiekkanen Markus</td>
<td>X, IV, Professor</td>
<td>Faculty of Arts, DPHCAS; Art History</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Hovinheimo Petja</td>
<td>I, Doctoral candidate</td>
<td>Faculty of Arts, DPHCAS; Art History</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Johansson Hanna</td>
<td>III, University Researcher</td>
<td>Faculty of Arts, DPHCAS; Art History</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Kemppi Hanna</td>
<td>I, Doctoral candidate</td>
<td>Faculty of Arts, DPHCAS; Art History</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Kiviranta Marja-Terttu</td>
<td>I, Doctoral candidate</td>
<td>Faculty of Arts, DPHCAS; Art History</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Konttinen Riitta</td>
<td>IV, Professor (now emerita)</td>
<td>Faculty of Arts, DPHCAS; Art History</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 Lahti Juhana</td>
<td>III, University Lecturer, Head of research</td>
<td>Faculty of Arts, DPHCAS; Art History</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 Lukkarinen Ville</td>
<td>X, IV, Professor</td>
<td>Faculty of Arts, DPHCAS; Art History</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 Pennonen Anne-Maria</td>
<td>I, Doctoral candidate</td>
<td>Faculty of Arts, DPHCAS; Art History</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 Pettersson Susanna</td>
<td>II, Postdoctoral, Director</td>
<td>Faculty of Arts, DPHCAS; Art History</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 Ripatti Anna</td>
<td>I, Doctoral candidate</td>
<td>Faculty of Arts, DPHCAS; Art History</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 Räsänen Elin</td>
<td>III, University Lecturer</td>
<td>Faculty of Arts, DPHCAS; Art History</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 Selkokari Hanne</td>
<td>III, Research Coordinator</td>
<td>Faculty of Arts, DPHCAS; Art History</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 Suominen-Kokkonen Renja</td>
<td>X, IV, Research Director</td>
<td>Faculty of Arts, DPHCAS; Art History</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19 Svinhufvud Leena</td>
<td>II, Postdoctoral Researcher</td>
<td>Faculty of Arts, DPHCAS; Art History</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 Teittinen Sanna</td>
<td>II, Museum Director</td>
<td>Faculty of Arts, DPHCAS; Art History</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 Tihinen Juha-Hoikki</td>
<td>III, University Lecturer</td>
<td>Faculty of Arts, DPHCAS; Art History</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22 Törmä Minna</td>
<td>III, Lecturer, University Researcher</td>
<td>Faculty of Arts, DPHCAS; Art History</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23 Vainio-Kurtakko Maria</td>
<td>II, Postdoctoral Researcher</td>
<td>Faculty of Arts, DPHCAS; Art History</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24 Vakkari Johanna</td>
<td>III, University Researcher</td>
<td>Faculty of Arts, DPHCAS; Art History</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 Väätäinen Marja</td>
<td>I, Doctoral candidate</td>
<td>Faculty of Arts, DPHCAS; Art History</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26 Westergård Ira</td>
<td>II, Museum Director</td>
<td>Faculty of Arts, DPHCAS; Art History</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

AHCI Researchers from outside the UH

Erkkilä Helena | Researcher |
Henttonen Maarit | Head of Research | Espoo City Museum |
Hjelm Camilla | Researcher |
Tillander-Godenhielm Ulla | Researcher |
Wager Henrik | Researcher | National Board of Antiquities |
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Name of the RC’s responsible person: Lukkarinen, Ville
E-mail of the RC’s responsible person: ville.lukkarinen@helsinki.fi
Name and acronym of the participating RC: Art History and Critical Interpretation, AHCI

The RC’s research represents the following key focus area of UH: 8. Kieli ja kulttuuri – Language and culture

Comments for selecting/not selecting the key focus area: The main focus of ASCI is art historical research in its various aspects (see below). It does not properly cover the indicated focus area “Language and culture” but is of course related to cultural studies in a broad sense as well as to questions concerning identities, built environment and visual culture.

1. FOCUS AND QUALITY OF RC’S RESEARCH (MAX. 8800 CHARACTERS WITH SPACES)

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

The research done by the AHCI community covers a broad scope of fields, from medieval studies to contemporary art. The methods are derived from international art historical discussions, but interdisciplinary ventures have proved effective in forming new ways to investigate and interpret art. Social History, the History of Ideas, Visual Studies, Gender Studies, Semiotics, Archaeology and Literary Theory are the main fields with which the members of the community have been cooperating. The community has done research on themes such as: (1) The art and architecture in Finland at the turn of the 19th and 20th C., (2) The historiography of art history in Finland, (3) New interpretations of late-medieval architecture, art and sculpture in the Baltic Sea region, (4) Studies in Italian Renaissance, and (5) Modernity and Modernism in the arts.

Even though the subjects studied vary there are certain common trends in the works of the AHCI community. First, there is a tendency to analyse the historical (or present day) situations through certain individual members of the artistic, or related, community in hand. This has proved to be an excellent way to come to terms with very different, and even the more abstract, questions of societal situations as well as with interpretations of art works. Second, Finnish art historians have a social call to participate in the national project of writing the history of Finnish art, architecture and design. The project includes, of course, the constant critical reinterpretation of this history. However, the AHCI community is not restricted to this task only as the members of the group have achieved recognition in studies concerning e.g. the art of the Italian Renaissance, ancient China and international contemporary art.

All the research done has been based on sound international standards and methods of current art-historical research work. This means developing theoretical and methodological discussions in art history, and also closely following scientific fields related to art history. The work of the AHCI community is especially characterized by the active implementation of contemporary theoretical turns in art-historical scholarship as well as applying methods from other humanities and social sciences. International collaboration is an integral part of the activities of the community.

In the previous evaluation in 2005 the success of the School of Art History was rated as good (6/7, as part of the Institute of Art Research). The publications of AHCI community demonstrate the wide scope of themes covered by our research. The publishing strategy of the AHCI is based on regular publication within available opportunities. Art historical texts usually need high-quality visual material, and
therefore the publishers must be chosen according to their willingness and possibilities to print high-quality photographs. That is why the community is not able to restrict the publishing policy of its individual members. However, there are some renowned traditional publishers that art historians are eager to use: The Journal of the Finnish Antiquarian Society (est. 1874), The Journal of the Society of Art History (est. 1974), and the publications of the Society of Finnish Literature. The foremost museums also have publication series, which are highly respected in the field: Ateneum Art Museum, the Central Art Archives and the Sara Hildén Art Museum, for example.

It should be noted, however, that the publication strategies within art history do not follow the strict lines of sciences like Medicine. The referee system is quite new, and not used on a broad basis, in the publication forms that art historians usually use (monographs, exhibition books and catalogues, etc.). This seems to be a phenomenon not confined to Finland alone. This means that if the published text at hand is non-peer reviewed it can still be of excellent quality.

The number of doctoral dissertations between 2005-2010, supervised mostly by AHCI members in the unit of Art History at the UH, is remarkable (27), and the grades received are of the highest level (average being ‘c’ which is second highest in the scale of seven).

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

By integrating more the various approaches the researchers of the community represent, and develop new ways to combine the know-how of the individual scholars. In the future, the focus of the themes in the RC will be even more integrated with multidisciplinary discourses and quality will be strengthened through intensive cooperation with the international field. This will be implemented by increasing mobility. The RC will apply these same principles with regard to doctoral training.

Doctoral candidates are mostly recruited from the best graduate students of the School of Art History at UH and from among the MAs in art history from other Finnish universities. The recruitment and selection of doctoral candidates has faculty level regulations which the departments or communities cannot change by themselves. The Faculty itself wants to underline the following points: In the period under assessment, the Faculty has reviewed its policies on PhD admission, supervision as well as examination of theses. It has also revised its PhD degree requirements in line with the Bologna process, particularly with view to employability both within and outside the academia. The Faculty of Arts supports all its doctoral students through provision of courses on a wide range of topics such as academic writing (also in English), research ethics, philosophy of science, conference presentations, popularization of science, and teaching skills.

Doctoral training done within the scope of the AHCI community is well organized. All the PIs supervise doctoral students, and many of the students have secondary supervisors chosen from the pool of docents of art history at the University of Helsinki, and even in some cases among the professors of other universities who have been willing to supervise works related to their special expertise. The PIs of the AHCI community have had altogether 41 (of which 12 attained their doctoral degree in 2008-09) officially registered graduate students.
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Doctoral training is one of the motivations behind the formation of AHCI. Practically it is done with personal supervision plus post-graduate seminars maintained constantly during the academic year (8+8 sittings). The School of Art History has 50 registered post-graduate students at the moment.

The post-graduate education is backed up by the Finnish Doctoral Programme in Art History. Its Summer Schools, held every August with international guest teachers, guarantee good supervision even for those doctoral candidates who are not members of the Finnish Doctoral Programme in Art History funded by the Academy of Finland and the Ministry of Education, and headed during the evaluation period 2005-10 by the Helsinki School of Art History. Summer school in 2008 was hosted by the University of Helsinki. Several doctoral students of the programme have been supervised by the PIs of AHCI since 1999. Four-day Summer Schools involving all four art history departments in Finland, and organized by the doctoral programme have been held every August since 1999 to enhance the activity of doctoral students with their thesis work. The teaching staff, with for example the PIs of AHCI, is reinforced every time by inviting 2-3 international and distinguished experts as commentators.

The number of doctoral dissertations between 2005-10, supervised mostly by the AHCI members in the unit of Art History at UH, is remarkable (27). Thus, the average being four to six doctoral dissertations per year which is one of the biggest numbers within the Faculty of Arts. The grades received are of the highest level (average being 'ecf' which is second highest in the scale of seven).

The number of post-graduate students in the subject of Art History at UH shows clearly that the positive trend is continuing, and we have been successful in hiring motivated candidates for post-graduate studies. The largest number of doctoral students in the Finnish Doctoral Programme of Art History is from UH (in 2010: three out of eight students).

Furthermore, we have to remember that all the PI's of the community have a great responsibility for the teaching of undergraduate students and do their research work and supervision of post-graduate students at the same time, without real leaves of absence for research.  

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

The strength of the RC's doctoral training has been the national graduate programme in Art History, and especially its Summer School system. The Summer Schools have guaranteed broad opportunities for all Finnish doctoral students in art history to attend and this has been an important way to promote our research at the international level. Planned development work seeks to intensify the meetings of the doctoral students and the national teachers, so that the students will report more often on their progress. On the other hand, we have post-graduate seminars held regularly during the academic year, and with a special emphasis on processual methods of text production. Furthermore, all the students have one or two personal supervisors specialized in their subjects.

The challenge of doctoral training in the School of Art History is that several doctoral students are doing their research while working at the same time in a museum or other cultural institution, but our plan is to keep more intense contact also with them.

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).

The researchers of the community publish books and articles which are discussed and assessed publicly. Art historians are often asked to comment on various issues in the media. The reason for this is that they very often deal with questions which interest the media and society at large (new findings and interpretations in the history of Finnish art, architecture and design, questions of building restoration...
and environmental preservation; Art forgeries, etc.). Members of the AHCI community have taken part especially in discussions concerning issues of built environment.

The members of the RC are often asked to make national and international evaluations of research applications for several foundations, or the evaluations of teaching and research at universities abroad. The members attend actively national and international seminars and conferences.

Publication of art-historical books through commercial publishers is common. This gives a great public visibility to art-historical research. Members of the community have received renowned book prizes.

AHCI collaborates actively with the art and architecture museums of Finland and with other major national institutions dealing with cultural heritage. Cooperation with other bodies, such as the Society for Art History in Finland includes organizing joint seminars, lectures and research projects.

- Ways to strengthen the societal impact of the RC’s research and doctoral training.
  
  As questions concerning urbanization, town planning, preservation and maintenance of built heritage as well as the role of visual culture, advertisements and creative economy are of growing importance in the society, the ACHI will, as far as possible, support the individual members to engage in discussions and decision making. Memory organizations, digitization and the connection between art, culture and well-being are yet another fields where the professional skills of art historians are relevant. The subjects of the doctoral dissertations are very often of national importance and thus do activate discussions on broad societal level. RC intensifies also the collaboration of new research with cultural organizations.

- Description of the RC’s research collaborations and joint doctoral training activities and how the RC has promoted researcher mobility.
  
  International networks include the network “Visions of the Past: Images as Historical Sources and the History of Art History” funded by NordForsk (2008-2010). Several universities from Denmark, Finland, Norway and Sweden are involved in this network which is headed by Suominen-Kokkonen. This is connected to the research project “A Portrait of Art History: Critical Approaches to the Finnish Art History and Historians”, funded by the Academy of Finland (2008-2011) also headed by Suominen-Kokkonen.

  Individual members have also their own personal networks in Finland and abroad. Two researchers of the RC have been involved in the Nordic Centre of Excellence project, Nordic Centre for Medieval Studies, NCMS (2005–2011) co-ordinated by the University of Bergen. PI Hiekkanen is a scientific member in about seven internationla networks and plans for medieval studies. Research in medieval studies is also carried on within the network Medieval Iconography. Means and Methods for the Interpretation of Medieval Images, MIMM, lead from the University of Oslo. Members of the community are in contact with (or are the Finnish representatives of) important international networks and associations, such as Nordic Committee for Art History (NORDIK), Comité International d’Histoire de l’Art (CIHA), College Art Association (CAA), Associations of Art Historians (AAH), Fédération Internationale de la Médaille d’Art (FIDEM), International Council of Museums (ICOM), International Council on Monuments and Sites (ICOMOS), DoCoMoMo International, International Planning History Society.

  AHCI collaborates actively with the art and architecture museums of Finland and with other major national institutions dealing with cultural heritage (as experts for exhibitions and writing in catalogues, making inventories, etc.). Cooperation with subjects like History, Gender studies, Literature and Philosophy at the UH increases interdisciplinary activity within the university.
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All the teachers and researchers in the RC have opportunities for international exchange within the Erasmus programme, and they have been widely used. Exchange programmes are active with the universities of Rome and Venice, the Academy of Art in Tallinn, and the universities of Karlsruhe, Essex, Basel and Vienna, the last three being the most recent ones. All these universities have high-level art history programmes and eminent faculty members in this discipline.

- **RC's strengths and challenges related to research collaboration and researcher mobility, and the actions planned for their development.**
  
The strength of the RC has been its possibility to establish research groups with funding from the Academy of Finland or other sources. The plan in the future is to make similar groups even more multidisciplinary. There has also been active interest in research networking, and in the future this will be intensified and there will be plans to have also EU-projects in art history, collaborating with other national and international universities and museums. RC has already good networks within the university and with other institutions. There is, however, monetary resources lacking concerning researcher mobility.

5 OPERATIONAL CONDITIONS (MAX. 4400 CHARACTERS WITH SPACES)

- **Description of the operational conditions in the RC’s research environment (e.g. research infrastructure, balance between research and teaching duties).**
  
The operational conditions are naturally based on the Finnish university structure of faculties and departments, of professors, senior lecturers and so forth. This system stipulates very much administration and teaching responsibilities for the principal investigators. This means that the time to do research is about 25% of the whole working time. There is now sabbatical system in the Finnish universities. The material resources are highly dependent on the general monetary situation within the university bodies, and the situation is not very good for the humanities at the moment.
  
The funding of the postgraduate and postdoctoral students comes mostly from private funding organizations and are thus personal in character. The sum total of them being over 510 000 euros during the years 2005-2010 from foundations such as Suomen Kulttuurirahasto, Koneen Säätiö, Wihurin Säätiö, etc.
  
Nonetheless, the Finnish Doctoral Programme in Art History and its Summer School system will also in the future be the most important national means to intensify the training of doctoral students and to raise its level. The future funding of this programme is indeed vital for the whole art history community in Finland.

- **RC's strengths and challenges related to operational conditions, and the actions planned for their development.**
  
The strengths of the RC have been well-planned doctoral training with seminars employing processual writing and the efficient supervision of individual doctoral students. The Summer School system of the Doctoral Programme has also been of vital importance. In the future, there will be more intensified working methods with supervision in addition collaboration with international teachers in the Summer Schools.
  
The material resources include the premises of the School of Art History, with an extensive art historical library (30 000 volumes) and a vast picture-archive. With the unsecure economical situation of the Department, the picture archive has to close down great deal of its services. The library will be moved to be part of the large main library of Humanities, and only small reference library will stay at the premises of the School of Art History - this will restrict the possibilities to conduct effective research.
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.

Professor Ville Lukkarinen is the responsible person for the AHCI community. The PIs of the community form the board of AHCI. The task of the board is to define the research focus of the community and synergize its scholarly endeavours.

The ACHI teachers have diversified tasks in accordance with their individual areas of expertise. All the teachers have had very good contacts at both national and international levels. The focus in this group of researchers and teachers will be to strengthen the subjects in the themes mentioned at the beginning. They will use their connections at the international level to make Finnish research better known and will work with joint projects at the EU-level.

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

The strength of the RC is its fairly small scale, which means that everyone knows each other and can thus easily exchange experiences and good practises. The PIs are accessible to the members of the group. The challenge for this ACHI group is the amount of bureaucratic work and under graduate teaching, which the PIs have to do, and therefore limited possibilities to have time for one’s own research. However, the research is on an international level and the methods of doctoral training have been appreciated by international teachers.

7 EXTERNAL COMPETITIVE FUNDING OF THE RC

- Listing of the RCs external competitive funding, where:
  - the funding decisions have been made during 1.1.2005-31.12.2010, and
  - the administrator of the funding is/has been the University of Helsinki

- Academy of Finland (AF) - total amount of funding (in euros) AF has decided to allocate to the RC members during 1.1.2005-31.12.2010: 560000 eur

- Finnish Funding Agency for Technology and Innovation (TEKES) - total amount of funding (in euros) TEKES has decided to allocate to the RC members during 1.1.2005-31.12.2010:

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

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

- International and national foundations - names of international and national foundations which have decided to allocate funding to the RC members during 1.1.2005-31.12.2010, and the amount of their funding (in euros).
  - names of the foundations: University of Helsinki
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- total amount of funding (in euros) from the above-mentioned foundations: **26000 eur**

**Other international funding** - names of other international funding organizations which have decided to allocate funding to the RC members during 1.1.2005-31.12.2010, and the amount of their funding (in euros).
  - names of the funding organizations: **NordForsk**
  - total amount of funding (in euros) from the above-mentioned funding organizations: **39000 eur**

**Other national funding** (incl. EVO funding and Ministry of Education and Culture funded doctoral programme positions) - names of other national funding organizations which have decided to allocate funding to the RC members during 1.1.2005-31.12.2010, and the amount of their funding (in euros).
  - names of the funding organizations: **Ministry of Culture and Education**
  - total amount of funding (in euros) from the above-mentioned funding organizations: **563000 eur**

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

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

The RC will strengthen cooperation between researchers and doctoral students, both within the School of art History as well as within humanities in general. There will already be in August 2011 an international conference organized by the Finnish Doctoral Programme in Art History together with the School of Comparative Literature and with the School of Gender Studies. At the same time the Programme of Art History will organize an extra workshop day for national and international doctoral students in art history.

The RC will also seek new exchange partners among European universities to strengthen the exchange of teachers and researchers.

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

The board of PIs has held several meetings concerning the evaluation. Professor Lukkarinen has made the base text for Stage 2 which the other PIs have commented and augmented. Other members of the community have been contacted personally or via e-mail.

Because the database Tuhat was taken into action at the same time as it is used for the evaluation, it gave severe technical problems for the members to fill in all the relevant information needed.
## 1 Analysis of publications

- Associated person is one of Susanna Aaltonen, susanna.aaltonen@helsinki.fi, Jukka Cadogan, julia.donner@helsinki.fi, Kirsi M Eskelinen, kirsi.eskelinen@helsinki.fi, Markus Heikkinen, markus.heikkinen@helsinki.fi, Petja Hovinheimo, petja.hovinheimo@helsinki.fi, Hanna Johansson, hanna.johansson@helsinki.fi, Hanna Kivirinta, marja-terttu.kivirinta@helsinki.fi, Riitta Konttinen, riitta.konttinen@helsinki.fi, Ville Lukkarinen, ville.lukkarinen@helsinki.fi, Anna-Maria Pennonen, anna-maria.pennonen@helsinki.fi, Susanna Peltarinen, susanna.peltarinen@helsinki.fi, Anna-Riitta Salli, anna-riitta.salli@helsinki.fi, Enni Säynätniemi, enni.sainanen@helsinki.fi, Hanne Tuulikki Salokangas, hanne.salokangas@helsinki.fi, Raija Suominen-Kokkonen, raia.suominen-kokkonen@helsinki.fi, Leena Svinhufvud, leena.svinhufvud@helsinki.fi, Johanna Vakkari, johanna.vakkari@helsinki.fi, Johanna Vainio-Kurtakko, johanna.vainio-kurtakko@helsinki.fi, Johanna Väätäinen, johanna.vaatainen@helsinki.fi, Ira Westergård, ira.westergard@helsinki.fi

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A1 Refereed journal article</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A2 Review in scientific journal</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A3 Contribution to book/other compilations (refereed)</td>
<td></td>
<td>20</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A4 Article in conference publication (refereed)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B1 Unrefereed journal article</td>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B2 Contribution to book/other compilations (non-refereed)</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B3 Unrefereed article in conference proceedings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C1 Published scientific monograph</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C2 Edited book, compilation, conference proceeding or special issue of journal</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D1 Article in professional journal</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D2 Article in professional hand or guide book or in a professional data system, or text book material</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D3 Article in professional conference proceedings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D4 Published development or research report</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E1 Popular article, newspaper article</td>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E1 Popular contribution to book/other compilations</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E2 Popular monograph</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F2 Public contribution to artistic work</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F3 Public artistic play or exhibition</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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2 Listing of publications

A1 Refereed journal article

2005

2006


2007


2008


2009

2010

A2 Review in scientific journal

2005

2009

A3 Contribution to book/other compilations (refereed)
INTERNATIONAL EVALUATION OF RESEARCH AND DOCTORAL TRAINING AT THE UNIVERSITY OF HELSINKI

AHCI/Lukkarinen

2005


Hiekkanen, M 2006, 'Suomen lasimaalaukset keskiajasta isonvihan loppuun asti', Suomalaisia lasimaalauksia = Stained glass in Finland, Suomen lasimuseo, Riihimäki, pp. 11-19.


Hiekkanen, M 2006, 'Stained Glass in Finland from the Middle Ages to the end of the Great Wrath (ca. 1280-1721)', Suomalaisia lasimaalauksia = Stained glass in Finland, Suomen lasimuseo, Riihimäki, pp. 11-19.
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2007
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2009
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2010


Aaltonen, S. 2010. 'Olavi Hänninen [Elektroninen aineisto]', Allgemeines Künstlerlexikon, AKL Online.


Aaltonen, S. 2010. 'Päivi Hvala [Elektroninen aineisto]', Allgemeines Künstlerlexikon, AKL Online.

Aaltonen, S. 2010. 'Luisa Hallamaa-Walden [Elektroninen aineisto]', Allgemeines Künstlerlexikon, AKL Online.

Aaltonen, S. 2010. 'Voitto Haapalainen', Allgemeines Künstlerlexikon, AKL Online.


Svinhufvud, L. 2010. 'Tekstiliit modernessa tilassa - rajauksia ja vastakuvia', in M Aav, J Savolainen (eds), Modernismen, kirjoituksia suomalaisesta modernismista, , Designmuso, Helsinki, pp. 7-37.


A4 Article in conference publication (refereed)

2010

Väätäinen, M 2010, Ringbom on Kandinsky: the contested roots of modern art, ...

B1 Unrefereed journal article

2005

2006

2007
Tihinen, J 2007, 'Puu on karhea ja haurastakin', Taide, vol 47, no. 4, pp. 64.


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

2005


2006
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2007
Tihinen, J 2007, ‘How close does the rubber come?’, Timo Heino. second skin., [Timo Heino], [Helsinki, Myllypadontie 5 a 3], pp. 28-34.
Tihinen, J 2007, ‘Kuinka lähelle kumi tulee’, Timo Heino. second skin., [Timo Heino], [Helsinki, Myllypadontie 5 a 3], pp. 5-12.

2008

2009


2010

B3 Unrefered article in conference proceedings

2009
Törmä, MK 2009, Enchanted by Lohans in Boston: Tales of Osvald Sirén’s Encounter with Chinese Art.,

2010

C1 Published scientific monograph

2005
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2006

2007

2008

2010

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

2005

2006

2007

2008
Aav, M, Svinhufvud, L, Savolainen, J (eds) 2008, fennofolk08: new nordic oddity, Designmuseo, Helsinki.

2009
AHCI/Lukkarinen


2010

D1 Article in professional journal

2005

2006

2007

2008


2010


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

2008

2009

2010

D3 Article in professional conference proceedings

2009

D4 Published development or research report

2005
Donner, J 2005, Koskipuiston ja Kirjastonpuiston historiallinen selvitys.,

2009
Donner, J 2009, Fastighets Ab Norra Kajen 4: Polyttaanta 4, Helsinki - asuinrakennusten rakennushistoriaselvitys.,

E1 Popular article, newspaper article

2005

2006
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2007


2008


Törmä, M 2008, 'Insiders in the landscape', Insiders in the landscape, pp. 7-8.


2009

Hiekkanen, M 2009, '28 000 vuotta sitten', Historia, pp. 3.


Kivirinta, EM 2009, 'Mustasukkaisuus on kuin halvaus', Helsingin Sanomat.


E1 Popular contribution to book/other compilations

2005
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2006


2007


2008
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2009

2010

E2 Popular monograph

2006

2007
Vakkari, J, Heimonen, L, Mehto, E 2007, Mestarimaalari Giotto: työkirja, Annantalon taidekeskus, [Helsinki].

2009

2010
Konttinen, R 2010, Modernistipäijä, Otava, Helsingissä.

F2 Public contribution to artistic work

2009
Kivirinta, EM On the Fragility of Gender and Culture: Kari Soinio, Like Kiasma, Helsinki.
Kivirinta, EM Sukupuolten aikana haurauta: Kari Soinio, Like Kiasma, Helsinki.
Kivirinta, EM Cultural Comments in Pizza Boxes: Kalle Hamm and Dzamil Kamanger, Like Kiasma.
Kivirinta, EM Ihmisten ja tavaroiden globaali kiertokuulku: Kalle Hamm ja Dzamil Kamanger, Like Kiasma, Helsinki.
Kivirinta, EM Kuvassa voi myös asua:: Jan-Erik Andersson, Like Kiasma, Helsinki.
Kivirinta, EM Häräifevä siistytystä:: Jouli Kujansuu, Like Kiasma, Helsinki.
Kivirinta, EM Image Can Be Habitable:: Jan-Erik Andersson, Like Kiasma, Helsinki.
Kivirinta, EM Catarina Ryöppy, Musta Taide, Helsinki.

2010
Kivirinta, EM Tapaaminen Queensissa, Ars Fennica, Helsinki.
Kivirinta, EM Anne Koskinen: Oma käsi, Ars Fennica, Helsinki.
ACH/Lukkarinen

**F3 Public artistic play or exhibition**

2009
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1 Analysis of activities 2005-2010

Activity type Count

Supervisor or co-supervisor of doctoral thesis 62

Prizes and awards 6

Editor of research journal 13

Editor of research anthology/collection/conference proceedings 1

Peer review of manuscripts 9

Editor of series 1

Editor of special theme number 1

Assessment of candidates for academic posts 4

Membership or other role in review committee 4

Membership or other role in research network 20

Membership or other role in national/international committee, council, board 29

Membership or other role in public Finnish or international organization 33

Membership or other role of body in private company/organisation 29

Participation in interview for written media 86

Participation in radio programme 26

Participation in TV programme 6

Participation in interview for web based media 1
2 Listing of activities 2005-2010

Supervisor or co-supervisor of doctoral thesis

**Hanna Johansson**, hanna-kaisa.johansson@helsinki.fi
Väitöskirjan ohjaus, Hanna Johansson, 2007 → ..., Finland
Väitöstyön ohjaus, Hanna Johansson, 2008 → ..., Finland

**Riitta Konttinen**, riitta.konttinen@helsinki.fi
Väitöskirjan ohjaus, Riitta Konttinen, 1998 → 2011
Väitöskirjan ohjaus, Riitta Konttinen, 2002 → ...
Väitöskirjan ohjaus, Riitta Konttinen, 2003 → ...
Väitöskirjan ohjaus, Riitta Konttinen, 2003 → ...
Väitöskirjan ohjaus, Riitta Konttinen, 2005 → ...
Väitöskirjan ohjaus, Riitta Konttinen, 2006 → ...
Supervision of doctoral thesis, Riitta Konttinen, 01.01.2007 → 31.12.2007, Finland
Väitöskirjan ohjaus, Riitta Konttinen, 2007, Finland
Väitöskirjan ohjaus, Riitta Konttinen, 2007, Finland
Väitöskirjan ohjaus, Riitta Konttinen, 2007 → ...
Väitöskirjan ohjaus, Riitta Konttinen, 2007 → ...
Väitöskirjan ohjaus, Riitta Konttinen, 2008, Finland
Väitöskirjan ohjaus, Riitta Konttinen, 2009, Finland
Väitöskirjan ohjaus, Riitta Konttinen, 2009, Finland
Väitöskirjan ohjaus, Riitta Konttinen, 2010, Finland
Väitöskirjan ohjaus, Riitta Konttinen, 2010

**Ville Lukkarinen**, ville.lukkarinen@helsinki.fi
Supervisor of doctoral thesis (Heikka), Ville Lukkarinen, 2002 → ...
Supervisor of doctoral thesis (Koponen), Ville Lukkarinen, 2002 → 2006, Finland
Supervisor of doctoral thesis (Passimäki), Ville Lukkarinen, 2003 → 2010, Finland
Supervisor of doctoral thesis (Heininen-Blomstedt), Ville Lukkarinen, 2005 → ..., Finland
Supervisor of doctoral thesis (Ollikainen), Ville Lukkarinen, 2005 → ...
Supervisor of doctoral thesis (Tahvilo), Ville Lukkarinen, 2005 → ..., Finland
Supervisor of doctoral thesis (Hovihinen), Ville Lukkarinen, 2006 → ...
Supervisor of doctoral thesis (Haapala), Ville Lukkarinen, 2009 → ...
Supervisor of doctoral thesis (Ikkala), Ville Lukkarinen, 2009 → ...
Supervisor of doctoral thesis (Koskinen), Ville Lukkarinen, 2009 → ...
Supervisor of doctoral thesis (Kuurne), Ville Lukkarinen, 2009 → ...
Supervisor of doctoral thesis (Nyberg), Ville Lukkarinen, 2009 → ...
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Supervisor of doctoral thesis (Pennonen), Ville Lukkarinen, 2009 → ...
Supervisor of doctoral thesis (Purhonen), Ville Lukkarinen, 2009 → ...
Supervisor of doctoral thesis (Schreck), Ville Lukkarinen, 2009 → ...
Supervisor of doctoral thesis (Tossavainen), Ville Lukkarinen, 2009 → ...
Supervisor of doctoral thesis (Valorinta), Ville Lukkarinen, 2009 → ...

Renja Suominen-Kokkonen, Renja.Suominen-Kokkonen@helsinki.fi
Supervision of doctoral dissertation, Renja Suominen-Kokkonen, 2005 → 2010

Leena Svinhufvud
Supervisor of doctoral thesis: Nithikul Nimkulrat, Leena Svinhufvud, 2007 → 2009, Finland
Supervisor of doctoral thesis: Minna Polus, Leena Svinhufvud, 2009 → ..., Finland

Minnia Katriina Torma, minna.torma@helsinki.fi
Supervision of doctoral thesis, Minna Katriina Torma, 01.01.2003 → 24.05.2008, Finland
vaihtokeskien ohjaus, Minna Katriina Torma, 01.01.2005 → 31.03.2008, Finland
vaihtokeskien ohjaus, Minna Katriina Torma, 01.01.2005 → 21.09.2010, Finland

Johanna Vakkari, Johanna.Vakkari@helsinki.fi
Supervision of doctoral thesis, Johanna Vakkari, 01.01.2007 → 31.12.2007, Finland

Prizes and awards
Riitta Konttinen, riitta.konttinen@helsinki.fi
Suomen valkoisen nussun ritarikunnan 1. luokan ritarimerkki, Riitta Konttinen, 2006, Finland
Lauri Jäntin salamön kunnapalkinto, Riitta Konttinen, 2008, Finland

Ville Lukkarinen, ville.lukkarinen@helsinki.fi
The State Award for Public Information (Valtion tiedonjulkistamispalkinto), Ville Lukkarinen, 2005
Suomen Taideyhdistys (Finnish Art Society) Literature Prize, Ville Lukkarinen, 2007

Hanne Tuulikki Selkokari, hanne.selkokari@helsinki.fi
Vuoden asiakas 2007, Hanne Tuulikki Selkokari, 2007 → ..., Finland

Maria Vainio-Kurtakko, maria.vainio-kurtakko@helsinki.fi
AHCI/Lukkarinen

Tunnustuspaikinto, Maria Vainio-Kurtakko, 01.12.2010, Finland

**Editor of research journal**

Riitta Konttinen, riitta.konttinen@helsinki.fi

SKS:n biografikeskuksen yhteistyöryhmä, Riitta Konttinen, 01.01.2007 → 31.12.2007, Finland

Ville Lukkarinen, ville.lukkarinen@helsinki.fi

Arkitehtitoimikunta, Ville Lukkarinen, 2009 → ..., Finland

Baltic Journal of Art History, Ville Lukkarinen, 2009 → ..., Estonia

Elina Irmeli Räsänen, elina.rasanen@helsinki.fi

Mirator - monikielinen keskiajantutkimukseen erikoistunut verkkojulkaisu, Elina Irmeli Räsänen, 01.01.2006 → 31.12.2009, Finland

Renja Suominen-Kokkonen, Renja.Suominen-Kokkonen@helsinki.fi

Taidehistoriallisia tutkimuksia 31, Renja Suominen-Kokkonen, 01.01.2005 → 31.12.2005, Finland

Taidehistoriallisia tutkimuksia 32, Renja Suominen-Kokkonen, 01.01.2005 → 31.12.2005, Finland


KESKELLÄ MARGINAALIA. RIITTA KONTTISEN JUHLAKIRJA. TAIDEHISTORIALLISIA TUTKIMUKSIA 33. HELSINKI 2006, Renja Suominen-Kokkonen, 12.03.2006 → 31.12.2006, Finland

Suomen Museo, Renja Suominen-Kokkonen, 01.01.2007 → 31.12.2007, Finland

Taidehistoriallisia tutkimuksia 36, Renja Suominen-Kokkonen, 01.01.2007 → 31.12.2007, Finland

SUOMEN MUSEO, Renja Suominen-Kokkonen, 01.01.2008 → 31.12.2008, Finland

Minna Katriina Törnä, minna.torma@helsinki.fi

Visual Culture in Shanghai, 1850s - 1930s, Minna Katriina Törnä, 08.08.2006 → 31.12.2006, United States

Johanna Vakkari, Johanna.Vakkari@helsinki.fi

* Taidehistoriallisia tutkimuksia, Johanna Vakkari, 01.01.2008 → 31.12.2008, Finland

**Editor of research anthology/collection/conference proceedings**

Elina Irmeli Räsänen, elina.rasanen@helsinki.fi

Methods and the Medievalist: Current Approaches in Medieval Studies, Elina Irmeli Räsänen, 01.01.2008 → 31.12.2008, United Kingdom

**Peer review of manuscripts**

Hanna Johansson, hanna-kaisa.johansson@helsinki.fi

vertaisarvointi, Hanna Johansson, 2006 → ...

vertaisarvointi, Hanna Johansson, 2009 → ...

Ville Lukkarinen, ville.lukkarinen@helsinki.fi

Finska vyen - Kuvia Suomesta, Ville Lukkarinen, 2010 → ..., Finland

NORDIK 2009. Taidehistoriallisia tutkimuksia 41, Ville Lukkarinen, 2010 → ..., Finland

Z. Topelius: Finland framställdt i teckningar (critical edition), Ville Lukkarinen, 2010 → ..., Finland

Elina Irmeli Räsänen, elina.rasanen@helsinki.fi

Mirator - monikielinen keskiajantutkimukseen erikoistunut verkkojulkaisu, Elina Irmeli Räsänen, 01.01.2009 → ...

Leena Svinhufvud

Peer reviewer for publication series Taidehistoriallisia tutkimuksia, Leena Svinhufvud, 01.05.2010 → 31.05.2010

Peer reviewer for the Journal of Design History, Leena Svinhufvud, 02.01.2010 → 31.01.2010, United Kingdom

Peer reviewer of the publication series Taidehistoriallisia tutkimuksia, Leena Svinhufvud, 01.05.2010 → 31.05.2010, Finland
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Editor of series
Johanna Vakkari, Johanna.Vakkari@helsinki.fi
Taidehistoriallisia tutkimuksia / Studies in Art History, 36, Johanna Vakkari, 01.01.2007 → 31.12.2007, Finland

Editor of special theme number
Hanne Tuulikki Selkokari, hanne.selkokari@helsinki.fi
Keskellä marginalia - Mitä marginalien. Riitta Konttisen juhliarki. Taidehistoriallisia tutkimuksia 33, Hanne Tuulikki Selkokari, 01.01.2005 → 31.03.2006, Finland

Assessment of candidates for academic posts
Riitta Konttinen, riitta.konttinen@helsinki.fi
Asiantuntijalausunto, Riitta Konttinen, 2009

Ville Lukkarinen, ville.lukkarinen@helsinki.fi
Examiner for a docentship, Ville Lukkarinen, 15.12.2009

Renja Suominen-Kokkonen, Renja.Suominen-Kokkonen@helsinki.fi
Professuurin ("befordrad") täytä Linköpingin yliopisto, Renja Suominen-Kokkonen, 01.11.2008 → 31.01.2009, Sweden
Yliopistonlehtorin virnatäyttö Uumajan yliopistossa, Renja Suominen-Kokkonen, 01.01.2010 → 01.03.2010, Sweden

Membership or other role in review committee
Hanna Johansson, hanna-kaisa.johansson@helsinki.fi
Jatko-opiskelijoiden valintalautakunta, Hanna Johansson, 01.01.2007 → 31.12.2011, Finland

Ville Lukkarinen, ville.lukkarinen@helsinki.fi
Committee for filling the post of professor in art history, chair, Ville Lukkarinen, 2009 → 2010
Committee for filling the post of university lector in art history, chair, Ville Lukkarinen, 2010 → ...

Membership or other role in research network
Markus Hiekkanen, markus.hiekkanen@helsinki.fi
Scholar member, Markus Hiekkanen, 1995 → ...
Scholar member, Markus Hiekkanen, 1995 → ...
Scholar member, Markus Hiekkanen, 1997 → ...
Member of editorial board, Markus Hiekkanen, 1999 → ...
Scholar member, Markus Hiekkanen, 1999 → ...
Scholar member, Markus Hiekkanen, 2001 → ...
Chairman, Markus Hiekkanen, 2007 → 2010
Member of editorial board, Markus Hiekkanen, 2007 → ...
Member of editorial group, Markus Hiekkanen, 2007 → ...
Member of editorial board, Markus Hiekkanen, 2008 → ...
Member of the board, Markus Hiekkanen, 2008 → ...
Member of direction committee, Markus Hiekkanen, 2010 → 2012
Scholar member, Markus Hiekkanen, 2010 → ...

Hanna Johansson, hanna-kaisa.johansson@helsinki.fi
Tunne maisema -tutkimus ja näytitysyhanki, Hanna Johansson, 01.01.2007 → ..., Finland
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Riitta Konttinen, riitta.konttinen@helsinki.fi
Tutkijakoulutus, Riitta Konttinen, 2006 → 2009, Finland

Elina Irmeli Räsänen, elina.rasanen@helsinki.fi
Medieval Iconography, Elina Irmeli Räsänen, 2010 → …, Norway
Medieval gender history, Elina Irmeli Räsänen, 15.04.2010 → …, Sweden

Maria Vainio-Kurtakko, maria.vainio-kurtakko@helsinki.fi
Grundande medlem: Kulturfeministerna, Maria Vainio-Kurtakko, 2007 → …, Finland
Jäsent: 1800-luvun tutkimusverkosto, Maria Vainio-Kurtakko, 2007 → …, Finland
Member: International Society for Cultural History, Maria Vainio-Kurtakko, 2010 → …

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

Markus Hiekkanen, markus.hiekkanen@helsinki.fi
Vice chairman, Markus Hiekkanen, 2007 → …
Vice head of project, Markus Hiekkanen, 2007 → …

Hanna Johansson, hanna-kaisa.johansson@helsinki.fi
Halfluksen jäsen, Hanna Johansson, 01.01.2006 → …, Finland
Työvaliokunnan jäsen, Hanna Johansson, 01.01.2008 → …, Finland

Elina Marja-Terttu Kivirinta, marja-terttu.kivirinta@helsinki.fi
Neuvoston jäsen, Elina Marja-Terttu Kivirinta, 2010 → 2011

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

Riitta Konttinen, riitta.konttinen@helsinki.fi
Biografiakeskuksen yhteistyöryhmä, Riitta Konttinen, 2003 → 2008

Naatutkimusen seura, Riitta Konttinen, 01.01.2005 → 31.12.2005, Finland
Suomalaisen Kirjallisuuden Sauran Seura, Riitta Konttinen, 01.01.2005 → 31.12.2005, Finland
Suomen Akatemia, arvointipaneeli, Riitta Konttinen, 01.01.2005 → 31.12.2005, Finland
Taidehistorian seura, Riitta Konttinen, 01.01.2005 → 31.12.2005, Finland
Aka Biografiakeskuksen yhteistyöryhmä, SKS, Riitta Konttinen, 01.01.2006 → 31.12.2006, Finland
Taidehistorian valtuuskunnan tutkijakoulu, Riitta Konttinen, 01.01.2008 → 31.12.2008, Finland

Ville Lukkarinen, ville.lukkarinen@helsinki.fi
Suomen rakennustaiteen museo- ja tiedotuskeskuksen edustajisto (Delegation of the Museum of Finnish Architecture Foundation), member, Ville Lukkarinen, 2009 → 2012, Finland
Committee for determining the colour-scheme for the National Library Building, expert member, Ville Lukkarinen, 01.10.2010 → …

Elina Irmeli Räsänen, elina.rasanen@helsinki.fi
Eurooppakomissio, Koulutuksen ja kulttuurin pääosasto, Suomen valtion(Opetusministeriö) valtuuttama asiantuntija evaluointiryhmässä / Kulttuuri 2000 -ohjelman hankkeenvalvontakomitean jäsen, Elina Irmeli Räsänen, 28.01.2005 → 05.02.2005, Belgium

Hanne Tuulikki Selkokari, hanne.selkokari@helsinki.fi
Asiantuntijajäsen, Hanne Tuulikki Selkokari, 01.01.2002 → 31.12.2005, Finland
Asiantuntijajäsen, Hanne Tuulikki Selkokari, 01.01.2007 → 31.12.2009, Finland

Renja Suominen-Kokkonen, renja.suominen-kokkonen@helsinki.fi
Suomen muinaismuistoyhdistys - Finska forminnesföreningen, Renja Suominen-Kokkonen, 01.01.2005 → 31.12.2005, Finland
Taidehistorian seura - Föreningen för konsthistoria, Renja Suominen-Kokkonen, 01.01.2005 → 31.12.2005, Finland
AHCI/Lukkarinen

Högskoleverket, Renja Suominen-Kokkonen, 01.01.2007 → 31.12.2007, Sweden
Suomen Muinaismuistoyhdistys, Renja Suominen-Kokkonen, 01.01.2007 → 31.12.2007, Finland
Taidehistorian saura Föreningen för konsthistoria, Renja Suominen-Kokkonen, 01.01.2007 → 31.12.2007, Finland
SUOMEN MUINAISMUISTOYHDISTYS FORMMINNESFÖRENINGEN I FINLAND, Renja Suominen-Kokkonen, 01.01.2008 → 31.12.2008, Finland

Minna Katriina Törmä, minna.torma@helsinki.fi
Finnish Antiquarian Society, expert member (invited), Ville Lukkarinen, 1990 → ..., Finland
Research Council of the Museum of Finnish Architecture, member, Ville Lukkarinen, 1990 → ..., Finland
Finnish Antiquarian Society, expert member (invited), Ville Lukkarinen, 1992 → 2100
Member of the Kalevalaseura Foundation (invited), Ville Lukkarinen, 28.02.2008, Finland

Membership or other role in public Finnish or international organization

Hanna Johansson, hanna-kaisa.johansson@helsinki.fi
Valtuuskunnan vara-puheenjohtaja, Hanna Johansson, 01.01.2006 → ..., Finland
Elina Marja-Terttu Kivirinta, marja-terttu.kivirinta@helsinki.fi
Neuvottelukunta, Elina Marja-Terttu Kivirinta, 2007 → 2011
Hallitukseen jäsen, Elina Marja-Terttu Kivirinta, 2010 → 2011

Riitta Konttinen, riitta.konttinen@helsinki.fi
Veikkaus rahaston hallituksen jäsen, Riitta Konttinen, 2000 → 2008
Palkintoraidat, Riitta Konttinen, 2003 → 2009
Johtokunnan jäsen, Riitta Konttinen, 2003 → 2009
Sara Hidénin säätiö, Riitta Konttinen, 01.01.2005 → 31.12.2005, Finland
Suomalaisen Kirjallisuuden Saurain, biograafikeskus, seurantaryhmä, Riitta Konttinen, 01.01.2005 → 31.12.2005, Finland
Suomen Kulttuurirahasto, E.J. Veikkaus rahaston hallituksen jäsen, Riitta Konttinen, 01.01.2005 → 31.12.2005, Finland
Alfred Kordelin säätiö, Riitta Konttinen, 01.01.2006 → 31.12.2006, Finland
Aspelin-taidetaidoja, Riitta Konttinen, 01.01.2006 → 31.12.2006, Finland
Eliel Aspelin-taidetaidoja, Riitta Konttinen, 01.01.2006 → 31.12.2006, Finland
Sara Hidénin säätiö, Riitta Konttinen, 01.01.2007 → 31.12.2007, Finland
Veikkaus rahaston hallituksen jäsen, Riitta Konttinen, 01.01.2007 → 31.12.2007, Finland
Eliel Aspelin-taidetaidoja, Riitta Konttinen, 01.01.2008 → 31.12.2008, Finland
Sara Hidénin säätiö, Riitta Konttinen, 01.01.2008 → 31.12.2008, Finland
Suomalaisen Kirjallisuuden Saurain, biograafikeskus, seurantaryhmä, Riitta Konttinen, 01.01.2008 → 31.12.2008, Finland
Veikkaus rahaston hallituksen jäsen, Riitta Konttinen, 01.01.2008 → 31.12.2008, Finland
Vanhopuolueenjohtaja, Riitta Konttinen, 2008 → ..., Finland
Yliopistomuseon säätiö, Riitta Konttinen, 01.01.2008 → 31.12.2008, Finland

Ville Lukkarinen, ville.lukkarinen@helsinki.fi
Research Council of the Museum of Finnish Architecture, member, Ville Lukkarinen, 1990 → ..., Finland
Finnish Antiquarian Society, expert member (invited), Ville Lukkarinen, 1992 → 2100
Member of the Kalevalaseura Foundation (invited), Ville Lukkarinen, 28.02.2008, Finland
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Finnish Academy of Science and Letters member (invited), Ville Lukkarinen, 12.04.2010, Finland

Elina Irmeli Räsänen, elina.rasanen@helsinki.fi

Taidehistorian seura - Föreningen för konshistoria - Society for Art History in Finland, Elina Irmeli Räsänen, 1996 → ..., Finland

ICOM - International Council of Museums, Elina Irmeli Räsänen, 2001 → ..., Finland

Glossa - Keskiajan tutkimuksen seura ry; Society for Medieval Studies, Elina Irmeli Räsänen, 01.01.2007 → ..., Finland

Suomen Muinaismuistoyhdistys - Finska Formminnesförening - Antiquarian Society in Finland, Elina Irmeli Räsänen, 2007 → ..., Finland

Glossa - Keskiajan tutkimuksen seura ry; Society for Medieval Studies, Elina Irmeli Räsänen, 01.01.2010 → ..., Finland

Renja Suominen-Kokkonen, Renja.Suominen-Kokkonen@helsinki.fi

Helsingin Yliopiston Humanistisen tiedekunnan opintoasiantoimikunta, Renja Suominen-Kokkonen, 01.01.2005 → 31.12.2005, Finland

RUOTSIN HÖGSKOLEVERKET: UTVÄRDERINGSPROJEKTET 2006 AV ÄMENA KONSTVETENSKAP, MUSIKVETENSKAP, FILMVETENSKAP OCH TEATERVETENSKAP, Renja Suominen-Kokkonen, 01.02.2006 → 31.03.2007, Sweden


Membership or other role of body in private company/organisation

Markus Hiekkanen, markus.hiekkanen@helsinki.fi

Member of expert group, Markus Hiekkanen, 2004 → ...

Hanna Kemppi, Hanna.Kemppi@helsinki.fi


* Suomen Ikonimaalarit ry, Hanna Kemppi, 01.01.2007 → 31.12.2007, Finland

Suomen Ikonimaalarit ry, Hanna Kemppi, 01.01.2008 → 31.12.2008, Finland

Riitta Konttinen, riitta.konttinen@helsinki.fi

Eero Jämefelitin seura, Riitta Konttinen, 01.01.2005 → 31.12.2005, Finland

Juhani Ahon seura, Riitta Konttinen, 01.01.2005 → 31.12.2005, Finland

Kalevalaseura, Riitta Konttinen, 01.01.2005 → 31.12.2005, Finland

Minna Canthin seura, Riitta Konttinen, 01.01.2005 → 31.12.2005, Finland

Suomalaisen Kirjallisuuden Sauran, Riitta Konttinen, 01.01.2005 → 31.12.2005, Finland

Suomen Muinaismuistoyhdistys, Riitta Konttinen, 01.01.2005 → 31.12.2005, Finland

Eero Jämefelitin seura, Riitta Konttinen, 01.01.2006 → 31.12.2006, Finland

Eero Jämefelitin seura, Riitta Konttinen, 01.01.2007 → 31.12.2007, Finland

Kalevalaseura, Riitta Konttinen, 01.01.2007 → 31.12.2007, Finland

Suomalainen kirjallisuuden seura, Riitta Konttinen, 01.01.2007 → 31.12.2007, Finland

Suomen Muinaismuistoyhdistys, Riitta Konttinen, 01.01.2007 → 31.12.2007, Finland

Eero Jämefelitin seura, Riitta Konttinen, 01.01.2008 → 31.12.2008, Finland

Juhani Ahon seura, Riitta Konttinen, 01.01.2008 → 31.12.2008, Finland

Kalevalaseura, Riitta Konttinen, 01.01.2008 → 31.12.2008, Finland

Minna Canthin seura, Riitta Konttinen, 01.01.2008 → 31.12.2008, Finland

Naistutkimusseura, Riitta Konttinen, 01.01.2008 → 31.12.2008, Finland

Suomalaisen Kirjallisuuden Sauran, Riitta Konttinen, 01.01.2008 → 31.12.2008, Finland

Suomen Muinaismuistoyhdistys, Riitta Konttinen, 01.01.2008 → 31.12.2008, Finland

Taidehistorian seura, Riitta Konttinen, 01.01.2008 → 31.12.2008, Finland

Ville Lukkarinen, ville.lukkarinen@helsinki.fi

Pekka Halosen Seura member of the board, Ville Lukkarinen, 2000 → 2012, Finland
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AHCI/Lukkarinen

Sara Hildénin Säätiö, member of the board, Ville Lukkarinen, 2009 → ... Finland
Juha-Heikki Antero Tiinen, juha-heikki.tiinen@helsinki.fi
Maria Vainio-Kurtakko, maria.vainio-kurtakko@helsinki.fi
Nylands nation, Förbundsområden för Nylands nations konstsamling, Maria Vainio-Kurtakko, 01.01.2003 → 31.12.2005, Norway
Johanna Vakkari, Johanna.Vakkari@helsinki.fi
Società Dante Alighieri, Helsinki, Johanna Vakkari, 01.01.2007 → 31.12.2007, Finland
Società Dante Alighieri, Helsinki, Johanna Vakkari, 01.01.2008 → 31.12.2008, Finland

Participation in interview for written media

Markus Hiekkanen, markus.hiekkanen@helsinki.fi
Halkon kirkko, Markus Hiekkanen, 05.08.2001 → 31.12.2011, Finland
Länsi-Uudenmaan kansalaisopisto, Markus Hiekkanen, 15.03.2001 → 31.12.2011, Finland
Länsi-Uudenmaan kansalaisopisto, Markus Hiekkanen, 27.03.2001 → 31.12.2011, Finland
Pyhään kirkko, Markus Hiekkanen, 16.09.2001 → 31.12.2011, Finland
Saunon kirkko, Markus Hiekkanen, 04.08.2001 → 31.12.2011, Finland
Suomen muinaismuistoyhdistys, Markus Hiekkanen, 07.03.2001 → 31.12.2011, Finland
Turun tuomiokirkko, Markus Hiekkanen, 14.03.2001 → 31.12.2011, Finland
Espoon kaupungimuseo, Markus Hiekkanen, 01.01.2002 → 31.12.2011, Sweden
Helsingin yliopiston alkuvaihtoyksikkö ja Kirjakan kansalaisopisto, Markus Hiekkanen, 27.11.2002 → 31.12.2011, Sweden
Turun yliopisto, Kulttuurien tutkimuslaitos, Markus Hiekkanen, 13.11.2002 → 31.12.2011, Sweden
Eskoltinsaarig Affiliated Suomi, Hämeenlinnan kirkko, Markus Hiekkanen, 10.10.2007 → 31.12.2011, Finland
Gloto - luontoasaja, Annantalo, Markus Hiekkanen, 11.10.2007 → 31.12.2011, Finland
Helsingin Sanomat, Markus Hiekkanen, 01.01.2007 → 31.12.2011, Finland
Ilkki Opisto, Markus Hiekkanen, 01.02.2007 → 31.12.2011, Finland
Helki Lehti, Markus Hiekkanen, 01.01.2007 → 31.12.2011, Finland
Historia 1/2007, Markus Hiekkanen, 01.01.2007 → 31.12.2011, Finland
Historia 10/2007, Markus Hiekkanen, 01.01.2007 → 31.12.2011, Finland
Historia 3/2007, Markus Hiekkanen, 01.01.2007 → 31.12.2011, Finland
Historia 5/2007, Markus Hiekkanen, 01.01.2007 → 31.12.2011, Finland
Historia 7/2007, Markus Hiekkanen, 01.01.2007 → 31.12.2011, Finland
Historia 8/2007, Markus Hiekkanen, 01.01.2007 → 31.12.2011, Finland
Hufvudstadbladet, Markus Hiekkanen, 30.03.2007 → 31.12.2011, Finland
Hufvudstadbladet, Markus Hiekkanen, 23.03.2007 → 31.12.2011, Finland
Kirjalon keskiikkö, Kirjalaite, Markus Hiekkanen, 21.11.2007 → 31.12.2011, Finland
Maanantaisa erva, Meilahti seurakuntakeskus, Markus Hiekkanen, 15.10.2007 → 31.12.2011, Finland
Opinto- ja koulutuspalvelut, Kirjonpalvelut ry, Markus Hiekkanen, 27.06.2007 → 31.12.2011, Finland
AHC/Lukkarinen
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-Studia generalia, Vaikun kansanopisto, Markus Hiekkanen, 04.02.2007 → 31.12.2011, Finland
-Studia generalia: Keskiakaset kirkot Kokemäenjoen varrella, Tyrvään seudun kulttuurijärjestys, Markus Hiekkanen, 28.02.2007 → 31.12.2011, Finland
-Suomen keskiajan arkeologian seuran syysseminaari, Hameenlinna, Markus Hiekkanen, 04.02.2007 → 31.12.2011, Finland
-Interview on the project to further archaeological study of the Town Church of Viipuri, Markus Hiekkanen, 25.01.2010
-Hanna Kemppi, Hanna.Kemppi@helsinki.fi
-Helsingin Yhteiskunnallisen Opiston Studio Sota-ajantasaisia Kariina Suomesta tuli Suomii?, Hanna Kemppi, 06.06.2008 → 31.12.2011, Finland
-Suomen ikonimaalari ry:n valtakunnallinen ikoniseminaari kulttuurikeskus Soflassa, Hanna Kemppi, 26.01.2008 → 31.12.2011, Finland
-Suomen ikonimaalari ry:n valtakunnallinen ikoniseminaari kulttuurikeskus Soflassa, Hanna Kemppi, 26.01.2008 → 31.12.2011, Finland

-Riitta Konttinen, riitta.konttinen@helsinki.fi
-Hämeenlinnan taidemuseon näyttelyn esittely, Riitta Konttinen, 23.08.2000 → 31.12.2011, Finland
-YLE 1, Anneli Tempakan Paletti, Riitta Konttinen, 06.12.2001 → 31.12.2011, Finland
-Hämeenlinnan taidehistoriallinen näyttely, Riitta Konttinen, 07.05.2002 → 31.12.2011, Finland
-Riihimäen taidemuseo, Riitta Konttinen, 26.05.2002 → 31.12.2011, Finland
-Eero Jämförlin seuran kokous, Riitta Konttinen, 01.01.2003 → 31.12.2011, Finland
-Iltalan taidehistoriallinen näyttely, Riitta Konttinen, 14.06.2003 → 31.12.2011, Finland
-Taidekoti Kirpilän tilaisuus, Riitta Konttinen, 12.02.2003 → 31.12.2011, Finland
-Yle Teema, keskustelu, Riitta Konttinen, 01.01.2003 → 31.12.2011, Finland
-Ratatou, FST, Riitta Konttinen, 17.02.2007 → 31.12.2011, Finland
-Orion Antiklikki, Riitta Konttinen, 01.01.2003 → 31.12.2011, Finland
-suomen Kuvaehdi, Riitta Konttinen, 01.01.2008 → 31.12.2011, Finland
-Haastattelu, Riitta Konttinen, 30.04.2010

-Hanne Tuulikki Selkokari, hanne.selkokari@helsinki.fi
-“Arkiston aikamatkailija” -haastattelu, Hanne Tuulikki Selkokari, 2007 → …, Finland
-“Museologi laati keräilijän muotokuvan” -haastattelu, Hanne Tuulikki Selkokari, 08.08.2008, Finland

-Juha-Heikki Antero Tihinen, juha-heikki.tihinen@helsinki.fi
-Taidemuseo, Juha-Heikki Antero Tihinen, 01.01.2003 → 31.12.2011, Finland

-Minna Katriina Türöma, minna.torma@helsinki.fi

* 20.2. YLE 1, Iلون Ystävä, Jaana Suominen-Kokkonen, 20.03.2002 → 31.12.2011, Finland
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Espon työväenopisto, Minna Katrina Törmä, 27.09.2000 → 31.12.2011, France
Galleria Otso, Espoo, Minna Katrina Törmä, 23.09.2000 → 31.12.2011, France
Galleria Otso, Espoo, Minna Katrina Törmä, 16.09.2000 → 31.12.2011, France
Taideopisto, Helsinki, Minna Katrina Törmä, 03.02.2000 → 31.12.2011, France
Taideopisto, Helsinki, Minna Katrina Törmä, 10.02.2000 → 31.12.2011, France
Vapaa taidekoulu, Helsinki, Minna Katrina Törmä, 14.01.2000 → 31.12.2011, France
Hämeenlinnan taidemuso, Minna Katrina Törmä, 01.04.2001 → 31.12.2011, United States
Kuopion taidemuso, Minna Katrina Törmä, 09.05.2001 → 31.12.2011, United States
Kiasma / Kriittinen korkeakoulu, Minna Katrina Törmä, 05.10.2006 → 31.12.2011, Finland

Johanna Vakkari, Johanna.Vakkari@helsinki.fi

Taidetilo Kirplin luentosarja, Johanna Vakkari, 07.04.2004 → 31.12.2011, Finland
"Helsingin sanomat, Johanna Vakkari, 27.01.2007 → 31.12.2011, Finland
Annantalon järjestämä luento opettajille, Johanna Vakkari, 12.02.2007 → 31.12.2011, Finland
Kirkko ja kaupunki, Johanna Vakkari, 22.08.2007 → 31.12.2011, Finland
Kyrkpressen, Johanna Vakkari, 30.08.2007 → 31.12.2011, Finland
Kyrkpressen, Johanna Vakkari, 04.10.2007 → 31.12.2011, Finland
Kyrkpressen, Johanna Vakkari, 04.10.2007 → 31.12.2011, Finland
Società Dante Alighierin luento, Johanna Vakkari, 01.01.2007 → 31.12.2011, Finland
Kansalliskirjasto, Helsinki, yleisöluento, Johanna Vakkari, 23.01.2008 → 31.12.2011, Finland
Tikkasen suukouluen sukukokous, Kuopio, Johanna Vakkari, 12.07.2008 → 31.12.2011, Finland

Participation in radio programme

Markus Hiekkanen, markus.hiekkanen@helsinki.fi
Yle radio 1, Kultakume, Markus Hiekkanen, 21.05.2007 → 31.12.2011, Finland
Yle radio 1, Kultakume, Markus Hiekkanen, 21.05.2007 → 31.12.2011, Finland
Yle radio 1, kulttuuriohjelmat, Markus Hiekkanen, 01.01.2007 → 31.12.2011, Finland
Yle radio 1, kulttuuriuutiset, Markus Hiekkanen, 14.05.2007 → 31.12.2011, Finland
Interview about translation of Emil Nervander’s book Summer travels, Markus Hiekkanen, 25.05.2010

Riitta Konttinen, riitta.konttinen@helsinki.fi
Kultakume, radio YLE 1, Riitta Konttinen, 01.01.2007 → 31.12.2011, Finland
Kulttuuriuutiset Radio YLE 1, Riitta Konttinen, 01.02.2007 → 31.12.2011, Finland
Haastattelu, Riitta Konttinen, 02.06.2010
Haastattelu, Riitta Konttinen, 12.10.2010
Haastattelu, Riitta Konttinen, 22.08.2010
Haastattelu, Riitta Konttinen, 05.12.2010

Anne-Maria Pennonen, anne-maria.pennonen@helsinki.fi
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AHCI/Lukkarinen

Collected explanations, Anne-Maria Pennonen, 07.09.2009, Finland

Elina Irmeli Räsänen, elina.rasanen@helsinki.fi

Digitaalinen madonna, Elina Irmeli Räsänen, 24.06.2008, Finland

Hanne Tuulikki Selkokari, hanne.selkokari@helsinki.fi

Haastattelu Kultakuume-ohjelmassa väitöskirjan aiheesta: Eliel Aspelin-Haapialta, Hanne Tuulikki Selkokari, 26.05.2008, Finland

Renja Suominen-Kokkonen, Renja.Suominen-Kokkonen@helsinki.fi

Yle Radio 1, Tiedekahvila, Renja Suominen-Kokkonen, 09.11.2005 → 31.12.2011, Finland


Leena Svinhufvud

Keskustelu Designmuseon Naisen muoto-näyttelyssä, toimittaja Maritta Alander-Valtonen, Leena Svinhufvud, 15.03.2006

Museolehtori Leena Svinhufvud ja toimittaja Maritta Alander-Valtonen Designmuseon nyörynäyttelyssä, Leena Svinhufvud, 21.06.2009, Finland

Moderni sisustus: Susann Vihma ja Leena Svinhufvud toimittaja Maritta Alander-Valtonen vierana, Leena Svinhufvud, 10.03.2010, Finland

Maria Vainio-Kurtakko, maria.vainio-kurtakko@helsinki.fi

Radioiliu luento, Maria Vainio-Kurtakko, 29.03.2005

Radio-ohjelma, Maria Vainio-Kurtakko, 05.06.2009

Radio-ohjelma, Maria Vainio-Kurtakko, 07.07.2009

Radio-ohjelma, Maria Vainio-Kurtakko, 28.06.2010

Radio-ohjelma, Maria Vainio-Kurtakko, 01.12.2010

Johanna Vakkari, Johanna.Vakkari@helsinki.fi


Participation in TV programme

Riitta Konttinen, riitta.konttinen@helsinki.fi

Turku TV haastattelu, Riitta Konttinen, 01.01.2008 → 31.12.2011, Finland

YLE Aamu-TV, Riitta Konttinen, 03.10.2008 → 31.12.2011, Finland

Haastattelu, Riitta Konttinen, 04.02.2009

Leena Svinhufvud

Designmuseon Ryijy-näyttelyssä, Leena Svinhufvud, 29.08.2009

Maria Vainio-Kurtakko, maria.vainio-kurtakko@helsinki.fi

TV-programmet, Maria Vainio-Kurtakko, 24.10.2010

Ira Westergård, ira.westergard@helsinki.fi

Kulttuuri-TV, Ira Westergård, 01.01.2005 → 31.12.2011, Finland

Participation in interview for web based media

Susanna Aaltonen, susanna.altonen@helsinki.fi

Prefab but Beautiful, Susanna Aaltonen, 12.2010 → ...
Appendix B.b.

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

The bibliometric analyses by Helsinki University Library (HULib)

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

**Biological, Agricultural and Veterinary Sciences**
- Luukkänen, 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
- Heikkinä, Markku – RCSP
- Heišämaa, Sara – SHC
- Henriksson, Markku – CITIA
- Janhunen, Juha – LDHFTA
- Kajava Mika, – AMNE
- Klippi, Anu – Interaction
- Knuuttila, Simo – PPMP
- Koskenniemi, Kimmo – BAULT
- Lauha, Aila – CECH
- Lavento, Mika – ARCH-HU
- Lukkarinen, Ville – AHCI
- Lyytikäinen, Pirjo – GLW
- Mauranen, Anna – LFP
- Meinander, Henrik – HIST
- Nevalainen, Terttu – VARIENG
- Pettersson, Bo – ILLC
- Puukkinen, Tuja – Gender Studies
- Pyrhönen, Heta – ART
- Ruokanen, Miikka – RELDIAL
- Saarinen, Risto – RELSOC
- Sandu, Gabriel – LMPS
- Tarasti, Eero – MusSig
- Vehmas-Lehto, Inkeri – TraST
- Östman, Jan-Ola – LMS

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

The next appendix includes the analyses of the RC under discussion.
Category 2. The research of the participating community is of high quality, but the community in its present composition has yet to achieve strong international recognition or a clear break-through.

Number of authors in publications/year

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No. of authors</th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>Grand Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>363</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Total</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>391</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The publications have mostly only one author (93%).
% of au in publications 2005-2010

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>Grand Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>fi_FI</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>272</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>en_GB</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language</td>
<td>2005</td>
<td>2006</td>
<td>2007</td>
<td>2008</td>
<td>2009</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>Grand Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sv_SE</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>23</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>de_OE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>und</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>it_IT</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mult</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Total</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>391</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The commonest language is Finnish (70 %), as English (18 %) in the second place.

**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>Taide</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historia</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helsingin Sanomat</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spaces : Finnish interiors &amp; design.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taide &amp; design</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arkkitehtti</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bulletin för trägdårdsbolagshistorik forskning</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SKAS</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suomen Kirkkohistoriallisien Seuran Vuosikirja</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baltic Mediterraneo : Italia &amp; Finlanda a confronto = Baltic Mediterranean : Italy and Finland</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Framework : the finnish art review</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glorian Antiikki</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hufvudstadsbladet</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Konsthistorisk Tidskrift</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muinaistutkija</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Naistutkimus</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nuori Voima</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parnasso</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spaces : Finnish &amp; international interiors.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Synteesi : Taiteidenvälisen tutkimuksen aikakauslehti</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teologinen Aikakauskirja</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tieteessä tapahtuu</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valöf</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aamun koitto : Suomen ortodoksisen kirkkokunnan äänenkannattaja ja ortodoksisten kotien hengellinen lehti</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agricola - Suomen historiallerkko</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Archäologie der Reformation : Studien zu den Auswirkungen des Konfessionswechsels auf die materielle Kultur</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title</td>
<td>Count</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>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bulletin : Laboratorium för folk och kultur</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glossae</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helsingin pitäjä</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hiidenkivi</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hiisi : lehti muinaisuuden harrastajille</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historisk tidskrift för Finland</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humanistilehti</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ikonimaalari</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insiders in the landscape</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journal of Art Historiography</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kansalliskirjasto</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kritiikki</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landscape theory</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lasuuri</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luonnontutkija</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MFA-lehti</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Museo : Suomen museolliton julkaisu</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nylandshembygd : organ för Nylands svenska hembygds- och museiförbund rf.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ortodoksia</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rakennustaitteen seura, Jäsentiedote</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sisustusprojektuutiset : suomalainen julkisen sisustamisen ammattilehti</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stylus : Kuvaamatalonopettajain liiton jäsenlehti.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suomen Tammi</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taidehistoriallisia Tutkimuksia</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taidemaalaus</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vakka-Suomen sanomat.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yliopisto : Helsingin yliopiston tiedelehti</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zbornik seminara za studije moderne umetnosti filozofskog fakulteta u Beogradu III/IV = Collection of department of history of modern art faculty of philosophy university of Belgrade III/IV</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Grand Total</strong></td>
<td>23</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>150</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The following titles were excluded from the table (not journals):

- Allgemeines Künstlerlexikon, internationale Künstlerdatenbank - online
- Petra Innanen
- Tiina Heiska
- VI International festival experiment's art
Journal ranking (Norway, Australia, ERIH)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Arkkitehti</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SKAS</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suomen Kirkkohistoriallisen Seuran Vuosikirja</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Konsthistorisk Tidskrift</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muinaistutkiija</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Naistutkimus</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nuori Voima</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parnasso</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teologinen Aikakauskirja</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valör</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historisk tidskrift för Finland</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taidehistoriallisia Tutkimusia</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Total</td>
<td>26</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>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level 1</td>
<td>11</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>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level A</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level B</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level C</td>
<td>9</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 (6)
C2 Edited book, compilation, conference proceeding or special issue of journal (15)
D5 Text book or professional handbook or guidebook or dictionary (0)
E2 Popular monograph (7)

0 books of 28 have been published by a high ranked leading scientific publisher, 3 by a ranked scientific publisher.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Publisher</th>
<th>C1 scientific_monograph</th>
<th>C2, edited book, compilation, conference proceeding or special issue of journal</th>
<th>E2 popular_monograph</th>
<th>Grand Total</th>
<th>Publisher ranking</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Taidehistorian seura</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>no</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Designmuseo</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>no</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multikustannus</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>no</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Otava</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>no</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finnish Literature Society</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tammi</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>no</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alvar Aalto Foundation</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>no</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annantalon taidekeskus</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>no</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cambridge Scholars Publishing</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helsingin yliopisto, Taidehistorian oppiaine</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>no</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Like</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>no</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multikustannus Oy</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>no</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rauman taidemuseo</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>no</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Söderströms</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>no</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taidekeskus Retretti</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>no</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tampereen taidemuseo</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>no</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yliopistopaino</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>no</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Total</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>28</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>