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

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

1.2 Aims and objectives in the evaluation

The aims of the evaluation are as follows:

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

1.3 Evaluation method

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

---

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 RC’s strengths and challenges related to the practises and quality of doctoral training, and the actions planned for their development.
   The additional material: TUHAT compilation of the RC’s other scientific activities/supervision of doctoral dissertations
   A written feedback from the aspects of: processes and good practices related to leadership and management
   - Strengths
   - Areas of development
   - Other remarks
   - Recommendations

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

3. The societal impact of research and doctoral training
   - Description on how the RC interacts with and contributes to the society (collaboration with public, private and/or 3rd sector).
   - Identification of the ways to strengthen the societal impact of the RC’s research and doctoral training.
   The additional material: TUHAT compilation of the RC’s other scientific activities.
   A written feedback from the aspects of: societal impact, national and international collaboration, innovativeness
   - Strengths
   - Areas of development
   - Other remarks
   - Recommendations

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

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

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

- Strengths
- Areas of development
- Other remarks
- Recommendations

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

5. Operational conditions

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

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

- Strengths
- Areas of development
- Other remarks
- Recommendations

6. Leadership and management in the researcher community

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

7. External competitive funding of the RC

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

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

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

- Strengths
- Areas of development
- Other remarks
- Recommendations

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

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

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

- Strengths
- Areas of development
• Other remarks
• Recommendations

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

The RC’s fitness to the chosen participation category
A written feedback evaluating the RC’s fitness to the chosen participation category
• Strengths
• Areas of development
• Other remarks
• Recommendations

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

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

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

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

13. RC-specific conclusions

1.7 Evaluation criteria

The panellists were expected to give evaluative and analytical feedback to each evaluation question according to their aspects in order to describe and justify the quality of the submitted material. In addition, the evaluation feedback was asked to be pointed out the level of the performance according to the following classifications:
• outstanding (5)
• excellent (4)
• very good (3)
• good (2)
• sufficient (1)

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

Description of criteria levels

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

Classification: Criteria (level of procedures and results)

Outstanding quality of procedures and results (5)

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

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

Excellent quality of procedures and results (4)

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

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

Very good quality of procedures and results (3)

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

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

Good quality of procedures and results (2)

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

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

Sufficient quality of procedures and results (1)

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

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

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

Classification: Criteria (level of procedures and results)

Outstanding quality of procedures and results (5)

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

Excellent quality of procedures and results (4)

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

Very good quality of procedures and results (3)

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

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

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

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

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

**Question 9 – CATEGORY**

Participation category – fitness for the category chosen

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

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

An example of outstanding fitness for category choice (5)⁷

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 acronym LFP stands for “Lingua Francas and Plurilingualism” and the RC’s main domain is language contact research, where it makes new inroads. English as a lingua franca (ELF) has recently become a fast-growing research field. This is, inter alia, reflected in the start of a new journal, Journal of English as a Lingua Franca (JELF), for which Prof. Mauranen is serving as a co-editor. The research of this RC involves three lingua francas and investigates bilingualism in depth by combining research in a highly analytical language like English, a highly inflectional language like Russian, and a completely unrelated non-Indo-European language, Finnish, with strong agglutinating tendencies. The chances of achieving significant results are noticeably enhanced by this cooperation from typologically diverse languages, and the already completed research into ELF is profitable for research in Russian and Finnish as lingua francas. The RC has made important openings in this field by compiling corpora, running projects involving three lingua francas, and investigating bilingualism in depth.

Other remarks
Even if both involve bilingualism, the relationship between the study of lingua francas and that of second language acquisition (SLA) is not obvious. The RC has chosen the Participation category 4 “Research of the participating community represents an innovative opening in the field”, a description that suits the RC’s research on lingua francas but hardly their research in SLA. The bibliometric analysis for the assessment period shows very few titles related to SLA.

The bibliometric record shows that publications in Finnish and Russian account for 70% of all publications. This is to some extent understandable since these two languages are studied as lingua francas. By increasing the number of publications written in English, the RC would enhance its international visibility.

Recommendations
The bibliometric record suggests that the RC would enhance its visibility by publishing more articles in ranked journals and more books with ranked publishers.

Numeric evaluation: 4 (Excellent)

2.2 Practises and quality of doctoral training

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

ASPECTS: Processes and good practices related to leadership and management

Strengths
The doctoral program is connected to the national LANGNET school, where most of the doctoral students have gained places and where prof. Mauranen is a programme co-leader. They also profit from the doctoral education organized by the faculty.

The supervising PIs’ international networks are particularly important in this new research area where expertise is spread around the world.

The strategy of involving Master’s students in the research team has had the effect of attracting talented students to continue their research at PhD level.

Areas of development
The RC is planning to offer more courses and opportunities for doctoral candidates to work together locally.

Other remarks
Since doctoral education has begun within the last couple of years, there seems to be no finished theses.

It is surprising that no mention is made of the project leader’s (Mauranen) scientific activities (supervising of doctoral theses, etc.) in the RC-specific TUHAT compilations 2005-2010.

Recommendations
Courses or seminars related to the scientific foci of the RC should be encouraged in order to strengthen the intern collaboration of the RC.

The RC should be encouraged to follow through with its plans for monitoring quality control of PhD work.

Further collaboration with other RCs, such as LMS, VARIENG, LDHFTA, ought to be developed, even if this RC takes a new direction.

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 societal impact of the RC’s research is important in the educational sector, transferring knowledge to language professionals and others working in multilingual environments and at various levels of the educational system. It also supports the strategy of internationalization at the university.

As for Russian, the cooperation with schools and kindergartens specializing in bilingual education in Finland, Russia, Europe, USA, and Israel is impressive.

Areas of development
By the applicational research interest of the RC the societal impact of its research seems already firmly grounded. The RC should continue to pursue its goal to propagate the importance of multilingualism and
intercultural communication and by that to advocate for more careful treatment of bilingual children and to introduce modern language teaching methods to the educational institutions.

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
International and national research collaboration is very well established by this RC, especially concerning research on ELF.

Other remarks
Whereas research collaboration is well established in the fields of lingua francas and bilingualism, no mention is made of cooperation in the domain of second language acquisition (SLA). This seems to reflect the weakness of this research branch in the RC.

Recommendations
Increased mobility of doctoral students should be encouraged.

Numeric evaluation: 4 (Excellent)

2.5 Operational conditions

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

ASPECTS: Processes and good practices related to leadership and management

Strengths
The principal strengths of the RC are undoubtedly the electronic corpora (e.g. ELFA corpus), which have resulted from earlier research projects, and thus feed onto its present work. Another strength is that most doctoral students are funded full-time.

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 PIs of the RC have professorial positions, and some also important administrative positions. This means a potential of competent leaders, especially since teaching load is not great.

Areas of development
The project is new, and largely based on the project’s leader’s direct contact with the other PIs, who in turn collaborate closely with their own doctoral students or other teams. It seems a good idea that, in future, the RC will have a steering committee to ensure more close collaboration, to plan and coordinate activities and look for opportunities for searching funding.

2.7 External competitive funding of the RC

The RCs were asked to provide information of such external competitive funding, where:

- the funding decisions have been made during 1.1.2005–31.12.2010, and
- the administrator of the funding is/has been the University of Helsinki

On the e-form the RCs were asked to provide:

1) The relevant funding source(s) from a given list (Academy of Finland/Research Council, TEKES/The Finnish Funding Agency for Technology and Innovation, EU, ERC, foundations, other national funding organisations, other international funding organizations), and
2) The total sum of funding which the organisation in question had decided to allocate to the RCs members during 1.1.2005–31.12.2010.

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

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

Strengths
The amount of funding from the Academy of Finland is a strong point. The RC have run several projects in 2005–10, and competed successfully for funding, mainly from the Academy of Finland.

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

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

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

Strengths
The RC’s future research is clearly stated and grouped under five headings which are consistent with their research questions: (1) Lingua Francas, (2) Contact, Community, and Change, (3) Plurilingualism, SLA, and Language Identities, (4) Language in International Use, and (5) Applications and Societal Relevance.

Areas of development
The intention of publishing an international refereed collection of papers in the ELF domain seems realistic, and the aim at a “strong societal impact with evidence-based discussion on language policy” is laudible.
2.9 Evaluation of the category of the RC in the context of entity of the evaluation material (1-8)

The RC’s fitness to the chosen participation category.
Category 4: The research of the participating community represents an innovative opening.

Strengths
The category (4) chosen by the RC seems entirely appropriate. Its research represents an innovative opening, since studies in the field of lingua francas are virtually nonexistent, apart from English, and even that is still a very recent field. The RC has already made important openings in this field.

Numeric evaluation: 4 (Excellent)

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

All members of the RC have contributed in the compilation of the material, which was put together by the project leader.

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

Focus area 8: Language and culture

The RC’s research relates to three of UH’s focus areas: “Language and culture”, “Globalisation and societal change”, and “Human thought and learning”.

2.12 RC-specific main recommendations

The bibliometric record suggests that the RC would enhance its visibility by publishing more articles in ranked journals and more books with ranked publishers.

Courses or seminars related to the scientific foci of the RC should be encouraged in order to strengthen the intern collaboration of the RC.

The RC should be encouraged to follow through with its plans for monitoring quality control of PhD work.

Further collaboration with other RCs, such as LMS, VARIENG, LDHFTA, ought to be developed, even if this RC takes a new direction.

Increased mobility of doctoral students should be encouraged.

This fairly new RC would profit from having a steering committee to ensure more close collaboration, to plan and coordinate activities and look for opportunities for searching funding.

2.13 RC-specific conclusions

This research represents an innovative opening and the RC has already made important openings in the study field of lingua francas. In order to maintain the high quality of its research, the RC ought to considerate the apparent weakness of its research in SLA – either strengthen it or leave it out.
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NAME OF THE RESEARCHER COMMUNITY:
Lingua Francas and Plurilingualism (LFP)

LEADER OF THE RESEARCHER COMMUNITY:
Professor Anna Mauranen, Department of Modern Languages

RC-SPECIFIC MATERIAL FOR THE PEER REVIEW:

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

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

RC-SPECIFIC STAGE 1 MATERIAL (registration form)

1 RESPONSIBLE PERSON

Name: Mauranen, Anna
E-mail: anna.mauranen@helsinki.fi
Phone: 050 468 7426
Affiliation: Department of Modern Languages
Street address: Faculty of Arts, P.O.Box 3 (Fabianinkatu 33)

2 DESCRIPTION OF THE PARTICIPATING RESEARCHER COMMUNITY (RC)

Name of the participating RC (max. 30 characters): Lingua Francas and Plurilingualism
Acronym for the participating RC (max. 10 characters): LFP

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):

Lingua francas have become major means of communication. In circumstances of expansive globalisation, investigating them helps understand how communication is achieved between people who use languages other than their first. In view of the significance of this development, it has attracted amazingly little research. Although interest in English as a lingua franca has begun to gain ground, it is still a very new research field, in which the university of Helsinki has played a pioneering role.

The basis for joining forces in a group of researchers of different languages is twofold: achieving greater depth of theoretical understanding requires combining information from different languages. This in turn requires that descriptive facts are available from these languages. To achieve theoretically significant goals, typological differences between the languages should be large, so that accidental features emanating from the particular features of one language do not distort the picture. This is achieved with remarkable economy and elegance by combining research in a highly analytical language like English, a highly inflectional language like Russian, and a completely unrelated non-Indo-European language like Finnish with strong agglutinating tendencies.

The LFP group straddles three kinds of research interest in the field: (1) theoretical, for grasping fundamental aspects of language in circumstances that can highlight ‘necessary features of language’ (2) descriptive, charting changes in the languages used as lingua francas, and (3) applicational, for greater efficiency in language teaching, translation and interpreting, and also in search of better computer systems interfaces. In each, the chances of achieving significant results are noticeably enhanced by cooperation from typologically diverse languages. This is the fundamental motivation for LFP research collaboration. In practical terms, the PIs have collaborated on mutual research interests around the achievement of comprehension via linguistic communication, and also in doctoral education within a doctoral school (Langnet), where the doctoral candidates also participate.
INTERNATIONAL EVALUATION OF RESEARCH AND DOCTORAL TRAINING AT THE UNIVERSITY OF HELSINKI

RC-SPECIFIC STAGE 1 MATERIAL (registration form)

3 SCIENTIFIC FIELDS OF THE RC

Main scientific field of the RC’s research: humanities

RC’s scientific subfield 1: Language and Linguistics Theory

RC’s scientific subfield 2: Applied Linguistics

RC’s scientific subfield 3: --Select--

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

Other, if not in the list: Lingua franca, bilingualism, plurilingualism, second language use

4 RC’S PARTICIPATION CATEGORY

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

Justification for the selected participation category (MAX. 2200 characters with spaces): Research in the field of lingua francas is virtually nonexistent, apart from English, and even that is still a very recent field. The understanding of lingua francas is nevertheless an important phenomenon that we need to address if we are to meet the new challenges now facing everyone in the globalised world where languages, cultures, and religions come together on a hitherto unprecedented scale. Two unique features typify today’s linguistic map: (1) one global, enormously widespread lingua franca spans the entire world and is in contact with virtually all other languages; (2) increasingly multilingual local mixes, with smaller national languages used as lingua francas among people from a wide range of mobile groups. As a result, we live in environments of a plethora of lingua francas; these are multilingual and comprise plurilingual speakers of all kinds. An enormous range of linguistic resources that get drawn on is increasingly characteristic of people’s linguistic experience. As societies get increasingly multilingual, more and more people are bi- or plurilingual; it becomes imperative to understand communication in this complex environment.

Our research group has made important openings in this field by compiling corpora, running projects involving three lingua francas, and investigating bilingualism in depth.

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 LFP group consists of three interrelated teams working on English, Russian and Finnish as lingua francas, and the effects of bilingualism on teaching. The use of a lingua franca inevitably involves the simultaneous presence of several languages in the social environment as well as in speakers’ minds. Investigating the use of a lingua franca is therefore inextricably linked with the study of bi- and plurilingualism. The research in LFP this covers second language use and second language acquisition.

The group has run five funded projects since 2005: (1) a project compiling a corpus of English as a Lingua Franca in Academic Settings (ELFA corpus), funded by the Academy of Finland (2004-7), (2) a project investigating the reality of studying and teaching in English as a lingua Franca at university (the SELF project), funded by the University of Helsinki (2008-10), and (3) a project studying the wider linguistic parallels of changing and globalising English (the GlobE Helsinki project, which is part of the GlobE programme).
INTERNATIONAL EVALUATION OF RESEARCH AND DOCTORAL TRAINING AT THE UNIVERSITY OF HELSINKI

RC-SPECIFIC STAGE 1 MATERIAL (registration form)

Consortium (Global English: contact linguistic, typological and second-language acquisition perspectives), funded by the Academy of Finland (2010-13), (4) Russian and Finnish as lingua francas funded by the Academy of Finland (2009-11) (5) Bilinguism in Teaching, funded by the Academy of Finland (2009-11). Project directors have been Anna Mauranen for projects 1 to 3, Arto Mustajoki (Project 4) and Ekaterina Protassova (Project 5). The ELFA corpus project has compiled the first large electronic corpus of English as a lingua franca, a million words of spoken English in university settings.

The research has made use of a number of methodological approaches, including corpus linguistic, ethnographic, and interactional analyses. The Helsinki-based team works in close collaboration with team members as well as partners from other Finnish universities, including Tampere, Joensuu, Aalto and Jyväskylä.

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

The main significance for the University of Helsinki of our research is the innovative nature of the research and its excellent international connections: this is cutting edge research with a high international profile, and extremely well connected to other centres engaged in similar research. We have run several projects in 2005-10, and competed successfully for funding, mainly from the Academy of Finland. We have created distinct niches in the field: ELF in academia, lingua francas and bilingualism from different perspectives. The research is strongly anchored in the Faculty profile: (1) cultural and linguistic diversity (2) corpus linguistics, and (3) linguistic interaction. It also supports three of the ten domains in the updated University profile: “language and culture”, “globalisation and societal change”, and “human thought and learning”.

The significance for the University of our doctoral education is in involving young researchers in innovative research that links up with the university research profile, and the strong national and international networks. The team has comprised doctoral as well as master’s students, providing opportunities for all to participate and publish. In addition to full time doctoral students, members from other universities have also been taken on, for example two part time students teach at Aalto/TKK, two doctoral students work at Tampere. A senior researcher from Jyväskylä participates as team member and co-supervisor. The groups meet regularly, and also run seminars with other collaborators and partners, such as the GlobE consortium, which adds to the strengths of the research environment.

Keywords: Lingua franca; language contact; multilingualism; plurilingualism

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): Doctoral education has begun in each of the group’s projects within the last couple of years, apart from two part-time students who began in 2005. It is therefore premature to try to count finished theses. We have altogether 7 full-time funded doctoral students, 2 part-time and thus self-funding.

PIs in the group have also acted as supervisors to doctoral students in other universities: two at Tampere and one at Verona.
Conversely, supervisor support has been forthcoming from the professors and senior researchers of the GlobE consortium (Univ. of Eastern Finland and Univ. of Tampere), as well as a senior researcher and co-supervisor from the University of Jyväskylä. This adds to the strengths of the research environment.

The strategy of involving Master’s students in the research team has turned out to be a good way of increasing the research output of the group in the form of MA dissertations (five completed so far on ELF), and also in attracting talented students to continue their research at PhD level. It has also been a fruitful practice to broaden the database by including part-time students who are able to gather their data from their place of work. So for example the part time students teach at Aalto/TKK have used data from there, in addition to strengthening cooperative relations between the universities.

Almost all of the doctoral students have been members of the national Langnet doctoral school, and presented their work in its seminars, thereby receiving comments from peers and the supervisor pool, sometimes including international visitors. International doctoral students’ conferences, particularly the annual conference at Bergen, have been made use of, and the students have also started presenting in international conferences as soon as they have had enough results. In this way, the students are accomplished presenters with good international connections at about the mid-stage of their thesis writing work. This has implications not only to their careers but also to the international impact of the research itself and the university.

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

In assessing publications based on database information, we would like to point out that since the Web of Science/Web of knowledge covers only a certain proportion of publications and citations, and that it might therefore be preferable to include the Publish or Perish database as well.

It should also be noted that as a Humanities field, our publications characteristically appear in edited volumes and also as monographs.

As a new field, our productivity has largely been in the impact the opening has had on the international and national domain; close collaboration with the pioneers in Europe and increasingly outside Europe.

The international visibility of the group members should be taken note of, and their active role in getting the field off the ground. At the national level, we constitute the hub of this research.

The publications cannot have a wide basis as yet, because the doctoral candidates have relatively little output, which is understandable in view of the short period in which they have been working on their doctorates. In view of this, the output by others than only the PIs is encouraging.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Last name</th>
<th>First name</th>
<th>PI-status (TUHAT, 29.11.2010)</th>
<th>Title of research and teaching personnel</th>
<th>Affiliation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mauranen</td>
<td>Anna</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>Dept of Modern Languages</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mustajoki</td>
<td>Arto</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>Dept of Modern Languages</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protassova</td>
<td>Ekaterina</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>University Lecturer</td>
<td>Dept of Modern Languages</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hynninen</td>
<td>Nina</td>
<td></td>
<td>Doctoral Candidate</td>
<td>Dept of Modern Languages</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hakala</td>
<td>Henrik</td>
<td></td>
<td>Doctoral Candidate</td>
<td>Dept of Modern Languages</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vetchinnikova</td>
<td>Svetlana</td>
<td></td>
<td>Doctoral Candidate</td>
<td>Dept of Modern Languages</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suvirinitty</td>
<td>Jaana</td>
<td></td>
<td>Doctoral Candidate</td>
<td>Dept of Modern Languages</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pilkinton-Pihko</td>
<td>Diane</td>
<td></td>
<td>Doctoral Candidate</td>
<td>Dept of Modern Languages</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reponen</td>
<td>Anu</td>
<td></td>
<td>Doctoral Candidate</td>
<td>Dept of Modern Languages</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pussinen</td>
<td>Olga</td>
<td></td>
<td>Doctoral Candidate</td>
<td>Dept of Modern Languages</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neuvonen</td>
<td>Olga</td>
<td></td>
<td>Doctoral Candidate</td>
<td>Dept of Modern Languages</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pikkarainen</td>
<td>Mervi</td>
<td></td>
<td>Doctoral Candidate</td>
<td>Dept of Modern Languages</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kalliokoski</td>
<td>Jyrki</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>Dept of Finnish, Finno-Ugrian &amp; Scandinavian languages</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tanskanen</td>
<td>Sanna-kaisa</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>Dept of Modern Languages</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lehtonen</td>
<td>Tuula</td>
<td></td>
<td>University Lecturer</td>
<td>Language Centre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pilkkinen</td>
<td>Kari</td>
<td></td>
<td>University Lecturer</td>
<td>Language Centre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virkkunen-Fullenwider</td>
<td>Anu</td>
<td>University Lecturer</td>
<td>Language Centre</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Siddall</td>
<td>Roy</td>
<td></td>
<td>University Lecturer</td>
<td>Language Centre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berazhnyi</td>
<td>Ivan</td>
<td></td>
<td>Doctoral Candidate</td>
<td>Dept of Modern Languages</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sammalkorpi</td>
<td>Ilona</td>
<td></td>
<td>Doctoral Candidate</td>
<td>Dept of Modern Languages</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saarikivi</td>
<td>Janne</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>Dept of Finnish, Finno-Ugrian &amp; Scandinavian languages</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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| **Name of the RC’s responsible person:** Mauranen, Anna |
| **E-mail of the RC’s responsible person:** anna.mauranen@helsinki.fi |
| **Name and acronym of the participating RC:** Lingua Francas and Plurilingualism, LFP |
| **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:** Languages in their cultural and societal contexts are at the core of our research, therefore this focus area fits our research most directly. Nevertheless, other focus areas are also relevant to our work, and these are indicated in the submission material itself |

### 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).**

  **Relevance to strategic goals**
  
The RC’s work touches upon three of the strategic research focus areas of the University of Helsinki: (1) Language and culture, in particular the changes taking place under the pressure of multiculturalism; (2) Globalisation and social change in that it looks into the consequences of globalisation and locality involving also European and Russian Studies perspectives; (3) The thinking and learning human being, in that it incorporates research on linguistic interaction, learning research, and cognitive research.

  The work of the RC is also closely intertwined with each of the three focus areas in the Faculty of Arts research strategy: (1) cultural and linguistic diversity (2) corpus linguistics, and (3) linguistic interaction.

  **The societal significance of the research**
  
  In our age of increasing geographic and social mobility, including overpopulation, one of the major challenges is to develop solutions for people coming together from different backgrounds. This is causing social turbulence in countries with large numbers of immigrants, refugees, and foreign labour. The global scale of the phenomenon exacerbates friction. Ensuing gaps in shared background are enormous; religion and language are the two focal points where intercultural tension manifests itself.

  At the same time, mobility creates new opportunities for individuals to pursue careers and obtain education. This is enabled by the rise of one language, English, to the position of a global lingua franca. The societal and linguistic consequences are considerable, with immediate effects on language professions – teaching, interpreting, and translation. Learning of foreign languages is transformed by this development.

  The linguistic scene is changing fast: we have one global and innumerable local lingua francas; people are increasingly plurilingual even in regions where established national understanding recognises far fewer languages. The work of this RC can help address problems ensuing from linguistic differences by generating in-depth understanding of people engaged in multilingual communities with plurilingual resources, vitally including the use of lingua francas. It intends to impact language policy, as well as practices of language teaching and learning.
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The quality of the research

In pursuing its main goals, the RC brings together different perspectives from different languages, levels of focus and analysis, and analytical traditions. The levels of analysis range from a macro-social and historical perspectives involving languages in long-term contact with their already observable linguistic and social consequences, via interactional study of ongoing negotiation of linguistic norms in multilingual groups, down to the processing of language by individuals engaged in situations of using non-native languages.

As a new opening, the common history of the RC is brief. It is nevertheless firmly rooted in strong research traditions at Helsinki: the study of contact, variation and change has a long tradition (LDHFTA with a historical, typological and contact linguistic research tradition), including classical languages (Ancient Greek Written Sources) and English (VARIENG). Bi- and plurilingualism research has strong traditions especially in the national languages (LMS in variation and multiligualism, language learning, language planning, history of Finnish and Swedish) and Russian. The lingua franca group is rooted in these traditions, but takes a new direction. The RC collaborates closely with the other groups, although the assessment format limits our possibilities of showing this to the full.

While its individual researchers have produced a considerable amount of mutually relevant results in their interrelated research fields, the RC focuses on the questions we have in common. The RC has a broad basis but a clear focus, with the following principal research questions:

1. What are the general features of lingua francas?
2. What do principal manifestations of language contact have in common: lingua francas, second-language use (SLU), second-language acquisition (SLA) and language-mixing
3. What do the different expressions of language contact tell us about its general effects, the tendencies of languages to change as a result of such contacts, and the consequences of contact situations to people’s language identities and linguistic behaviour

These questions incorporate a number of more specific questions, many of them feeding into applications of societal impact, as described above.

Language contact affects people’s linguistic identities and their social positions: the status of different languages and access to them are asymmetrically distributed. All the languages involved are also affected by contact in their linguistic features. On the basis of earlier language and dialect contact work we can expect to find certain kinds of structural simplification, spread and proliferation of lexis, and reallocation of item functions.

On the strength of our already completed research into ELF we can hypothesise that similar features might be found in other lingua francas:

(a) Limited simplification of certain structural phenomena – such as regularisation of irregular forms
(b) Most frequent words being used even more frequently
(c) Strong content-orientation, with nevertheless equal concern with interactional aspects as in native language communication
(d) New phraseological patterning

The scientific significance of the research for the field.

This is a new field, which unites many strains from long-established traditions but is above all a response to the fast-changing language situation in the world. Its main domain is language contact research, where it makes new inroads. Language contact research has overwhelmingly been carried out in
situations of stable contact between two languages. While research into lingua francas has been relatively rare, other mixed languages such as pidgins and creoles have been widely studied. English as a lingua franca (ELF) has recently become a fast-growing research field. In this domain we are at the international cutting edge (prof. Mauranen is co-editor of the new journal, JELF). Research into other languages as lingua francas, especially from a wide cross-language perspective that we are adopting, is virtually nonexistent. We are breaking new ground here.

A second major field the research fits into is variational studies. They have focused on dialects and other intra-linguistic variation, also pursued within our RC. Both contact and variation have been implicated in change, and both involve language mixing and acquisition of languages or dialects by adults. It is therefore a natural extension to take on second language acquisition (SLA) and second-language use (SLU) in the research, with their recent interest in multilingualism and particularly plurilingualism.

Our work spans typologically distant languages from Finno-Ugric and Indo-European families, which gives us an edge in theoretical generalisation and allows testing hypotheses on data across various language combinations.

LFP combines macro-social and interactional perspectives – and to some extent a cognitive one. The macro-social perspective includes minority and majority language angles, and languages with little anchorage to a locality, i.e. ELF. New media and multimodal data feature along with speech and writing. Altogether, by drawing on typologically diverse languages, different social contexts and a few research traditions, we combine insights that allow us to make a unique theoretical impact in understanding the effects of language contact.

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

It is important to maximize benefits from the synergy generated in the RC: meetings with presentations of junior and senior members play a key role in strengthening quality. Bringing together doctoral candidates with senior researchers, it provides a good forum for dissemination of new ideas the doctoral candidates can develop their work on. Each PI has their own national and international networks, which together cover a notable section of current linguistic research. This maintains breadth in the group.

The main emphasis in this cooperation is nevertheless in bringing together PIs. In the humanities the tendency has been to work in smallish groups – very often with a sole PI with his or her doctoral students. A RC of the present kind, where PIs with their doctoral students can join forces in the pursuit of larger and theoretically more challenging goals than is possible for individuals working on their own holds promise for making real progress in this new, challenging and important field.

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

The 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. In the period under assessment, the Faculty has reviewed its policies on PhD admission, supervision as well as
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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.

Recruitment and selection of doctoral candidates.

Doctoral candidates are recruited through the Faculty Doctoral Education Committee who recruit twice annually on the strength of a research plan and commitment of the Department to allocate sufficient resources to supervision.

The principal means of financing doctoral candidates are research projects run by our PIs and the Langnet doctoral programme. Langnet recruits doctoral candidates through a careful screening process every two years; both funded and self-funded positions are subject to competitive selection, with candidates applying from all Finnish universities as well as from abroad.

Supervision of doctoral candidates.

Doctoral candidates are assigned a supervisor from the outset: finding a supervisor prior to application is the normal procedure, and supervisors are committed to seeing the candidate’s progression to completion. Currently it is common for each candidate to have one principal supervisor who is a professor in the student’s major area, and secondary supervisors from other relevant specializations especially in the case of cross-disciplinary work. Junior supervisors at the postdoctoral stage are also encouraged. Multiple supervision is not always feasible in new research areas, which is why RCs of the present kind are extremely useful for widening opportunities for discussion for the candidates.

Individual sessions with supervisors are the basic procedure in supervision, but often with more than one supervisor the candidates meets them together.

Collaboration with faculties, departments/institutes, and potential graduate schools/doctoral programmes.

As doctoral education is largely carried out in supervision or research groups and/or departmental or subject-specific seminars; the RC provides a fruitful opportunity for discussion between PIs and doctoral candidates around shared research interests. This helps doctoral candidates in their work and stimulates new ideas.

As important support, instruction in important general skills such as methodology, scientific ethics, academic writing and presentation skills, are taught in doctoral schools or by the Faculty.

Most of the doctoral students have gained places in the Langnet doctoral school (http://www.joensuu.fi/fld/langnet/english/), a national doctoral programme in language studies. The doctoral dissertations completed by Langnet students investigate languages and linguistic phenomena from various angles and within various theoretical frameworks. As the largest doctoral programme in the arts in Finland, Langnet offers excellent opportunities to successfully complete a dissertation. According to Langnet students, peer support, integration into the research community, supervisory expertise offered as well as a versatile academic programme are among the programme’s best assets. Students enrolled in Langnet work full-time on their doctoral studies. At the moment, Langnet has 40 doctoral student positions financed by the Ministry of Education and some 60 students receiving funding from other sources.

Langnet offers travel grants to doctoral students, and opportunities for study abroad and participate in courses especially through its partners. Langnet has established collaboration with NordLing, a Balto-Scandinavian network of graduate schools in language and linguistic studies (https://sites.google.com/site/nordling15/) and the Hermann Paul School of Language Sciences
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(http://www.hpsl.uni-freiburg.de/profil). It is a partner in the Langscape network (http://www.uni-siegen.de/langscape/). PIs in the RC are supervisors in Langnet, prof. Mauranen a programme co-leader.

The Faculty organizes some doctoral education: in addition to introductory events to all new doctoral students, courses on research ethics, academic writing in English and Finnish, and courses on methodology have been organized on a regular basis. The faculty has plans to further strengthen its role in doctoral education. The Faculty offers regular qualifying courses in University Pedagogics, which count towards doctoral requirements and provide qualifications for those pursuing a university career and also for those heading for other positions in the educational sector. Langnet has already organized and the faculty is planning to organize education for supervisors of doctorates.

Participation in conferences is encouraged from early on: at first, most doctoral students participate in conferences and events for doctoral students, and when they have results to show, in international conferences. They can obtain travel grants from the Faculty, the research project, the Department, Langnet, or independent foundations.

Good practices and quality assurance in doctoral training.

The rights and obligations of doctoral students as well as supervisors are spelled out in Faculty guidelines to doctoral students. In addition, Langnet provides a very detailed description of the same. All candidates devise a supervision agreement with their supervisors, which specify the terms of the supervision process. Forms for this are provided by the Faculty and by Langnet.

The Faculty has an ethical committee, which devises ethical rules of conduct and settles disputes when necessary. It holds regular meetings, and doctoral candidates are represented in it.

Thesis examination processes are described in detail in Faculty regulations, and the qualifications for examiners, positions of supervisors, external examiners and internal assessors set by the Faculty are specified in detail. The Faculty Council approves the pre-examiners, the examiners, gives permission to defend and approves the grade.

Assuring good career perspectives for the doctoral candidates/fresh doctorates.

Supervisors are encouraged to discuss career prospects initially with all candidates as their recruitment is negotiated, there is even a box in the application form to be ticked off when this has been done. Information on career prospects and guidance are also offered in the Langnet network. In addition, the Faculty Doctoral Education Committee organizes regular events related to career development. In face-to-face interaction, the PIs give personal advice and help to the doctoral candidates and encourage them in pursuing academic careers.

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

Strengths: supervision of high-level expertise, support from the Faculty and Langnet, and well-connected PIs. The PIs’ international networks are particularly important in new research areas where expertise is spread around the world, often in new relatively unknown centres.

Quality assurance procedures are carefully planned and updated.

Challenges: National doctoral schools arrange courses around the country, which means time-consuming travelling and only intermittent contact with other candidates. For a university like UH, with large numbers of doctoral candidates, this is not ideal.

A practical challenge is workspace: departments with overburdened budgets have difficulties securing expensive workspace for candidates.
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Action: PIs cooperate with the Faculty to strengthen doctoral education. The first step is to offer more courses and opportunities for doctoral candidates to work together locally. Collaboration with other faculties is under way - courses in research ethics and academic writing are in the pipeline, joint solutions to workspace shortage are being negotiated.

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 societal impact of the research has made itself felt in the educational sector. Various sub-projects of the RC are engaging in knowledge transfer to language professionals and others working in multilingual environments.

The ELFA project has taught courses and given a number of presentations and workshops to teachers at various levels of the educational system: comprehensive school, vocational education, polytechnic, and university. The teachers have either been teachers of English or teachers of other subjects who engage in English-medium instruction. They collaborate with the UH Continuing Education Centre Palmenia.

This activity has expanded and continues in the next few years, as English-medium programmes keep proliferating. At university level, Aalto University employs two project members as their teachers. At Helsinki University the project at the Language Centre (Support to English-Medium Teaching, SEM), whose members are partners in the RC, constitutes an important applicational dimension to the research, and supports the strategy of internationalization at the university. The university continues to provide financial support to this project on the basis of this strategic goal.

As far as Russian is concerned, research projects are conducted in close cooperation with schools and kindergartens specializing in bilingual education in Finland, Russia, Europe, USA, and Israel. As a matter of fact, much of the data in doctoral and master’s theses are collected in the Finnish-Russian school and in kindergartens in Helsinki. Another partner is the Eastern Finland Finnish-Russian School, which works in three cities and schools and kindergartens in Russia where Finnish is taught as a foreign language. Seminars and conferences for the teachers of a second language are organized in Helsinki and elsewhere throughout the year every year, assembling from 30 up to 150-250 participants, where our research results and practical implications are demonstrated to the interested educators. Textbooks for students and pupils, as well as public appearances and articles for a larger auditorium belong to the normal routine. Research issues and panels at the international congresses are also organized. Professors Protassova and Saarikivi are board members in the Finno-Ugric Language Nest project, which promotes plurilingualism in Russia.

As a L2 PIs with their students have played an active role in continuing education for teachers, in collaboration with Palmenia as well as independently. They have thus engaged in active dissemination of research-based knowledge to professionals. They have played a central role in projects investigating and implementing language education to immigrants. Prof. Kalliokoski’s PhD students investigate plurilingualism and the use of Finnish as a lingua franca in schools with a large number of immigrant students in the Helsinki area.

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

Doctoral education and societal impact are closely intertwined in ELFA project: the subproject SELF (Studying in English as a lingua franca, 2008-2010) focused on English-medium programmes at Helsinki University, and has lead to regular collaboration with organizations and bodies involved in internationalization. Similarly, the RCs research at Aalto University draws its data from professors,
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lecturers and students, and the topics are oriented to solving central issues of what makes good lecturing in ELF.

It is our goal to propagate the importance of multilingualism and intercultural communication that has not been self-evident in the Russian-only speaking communities until now. Equal access to knowledge about linguistic development and language use must become an obtainable aspect of globalization in the modern world. We try to advocate for more careful treatment of bilingual children, especially those who have some language impairment, and to introduce modern language teaching methods to the educational institutions.

International conferences:
- 1st international conference on ELF in Helsinki in 2008, 150 participants
- 2nd seminar of the Russian lingua franca project in St Petersburg in 2011.
- A large conference on bilingual education in Helsinki in 2011 with 250 participants. Representatives of small Finno-Ugric nations will also take part, for whom contacts with researchers from other countries in similar situations are of particular value.

Extended research collaboration:
- With ELF teams in Vienna (prof. Seidlhofer) and Southampton (prof. Jenkins) for many years:
  - joint presentations at international conferences, organising ELF conferences (4th in Hong Kong 2011), joint publications (e.g. Mauranen & Ranta 2009);
  - an international journal JELF (published by Mouton)
- Special Interest Group in AILA.

With Roskilde University (CALPIU Research Network) and Copenhagen Business School

Both projects on Russian are joint activities funded by Academy of Finland and the Russian Foundation of Humanities. Two Russian teams:
- (1) lingua francas: Prof. Vakhitin, the European university in St Petersburg,
- (2) bilingual education: Prof. Yurkov, St Petersburg State University. Each group has 10 researchers from various universities and institutes from several Russian cities. The volume "Learning and teaching of the Russian Language in Finland (and of the Finno-Ugric languages in Russia)" had 50 authors from Finland and Russia, and "Non-Standard Russian" has 35 authors from 10 countries and many regions of Russia.

Russian scholars participate in COST Action on Language Impairment in a Multilingual Society: Linguistic Patterns and the Road to Assessment (www.bi-sli.org) with 26 European participant countries until 2013. Meeting twice a year, the Action provides a brilliant platform for keeping abreast with developments in the field in Europe.
INTERNATIONAL EVALUATION OF RESEARCH AND DOCTORAL TRAINING AT THE UNIVERSITY OF HELSINKI

RC-SPECIFIC STAGE 2 MATERIAL

National
ELF: partner in GlobE Consortium, with two other partner projects: GlobE Joensuu (U. of Eastern Finland, Prof. Filppula), and GlobE Tampere (U. of Tampere, Prof. Klemola). The projects investigate varieties of global Englishes: dialectal, second-language, and postcolonial.

Russian teams: several workshops with Kotus and Finnish department of UH on recent research results, fresh research materials, new data handling tools, experiences of interviewing techniques, and ethical issues. Tanskanen’s Language in Social Media project collaborates with the Interaction Research Group at the University of Turku (Profs. Helasvuo and Johansson).

Faculty-internal cooperation (cf Section 1): collaboration with the EU-funded ELDIA project investigating European linguistic diversity.

Doctoral education collaboration

International
- doctoral students’ workshops at Bergen; Nordic doctoral students’ courses.
- projects on Russian have senior scholars and doctoral students from both sides; all events have a doctoral training aspect.
- a doctoral student usually attends COST meetings for whom it is an especially worthy experience.
  Mauranen supervises a doctorate at Verona (D’Andrea).

National
ELF: Co-supervision of a doctoral thesis (Dr. Solin, U of Jyväskylä).
Annual Langnet seminars support the supervision of doctoral research

Mobility.
prof. Mauranen’s 5 months as a visiting professor in Copenhagen Business Sch

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

The challenges lie in limited resources in terms of funding. However, there are European and Nordic sources of mobility funding that can be applied for, and some European funding has already been obtained. Nordic cooperation is promising in the case of ELF, where existing groups (Stockholm, Reykjavik, Roskilde) are joined by new research in Gothenburg.

Contacts with the University of Michigan also enable a research period for doctoral candidates with a scholarship form them. The possibility is particularly useful for research in the psycholinguistic aspects of SLU.

The RC is international in itself, particularly with several doctoral candidates from Russia.
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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).

  Our PIs have professorial positions, and some also important administrative positions. This means they spend much of their time supervising, although the teaching load is not great. Most doctoral students are funded full-time, with the exception of four who were part-time on their doctorates. The infrastructure required for the present work consists of electronic corpora, which have already been completed and are a notable asset to the research. They (e.g. ELFA corpus) have resulted from earlier research projects, which thus feed onto our present work.

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

  The strengths are undoubtedly the corpus data we have compiled and have access to. The challenges are the other claims on the PIs time, and the fact that infrastructure development is at early stages of being recognised in the humanities: much of the time we are producers of valuable infrastructures rather than merely purchasers.

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.

  Leadership

  The project is new, and the research community resembles a consortium in type, with a number of relatively autonomous projects collaborating around common research interests. The initial formation of the was largely based on the project’s leader’s collaboration with other team members in different capacities depending on what the others do. The leadership has different levels, with individual projects being fairly independent, as befits research in the humanities. Essentially, the project leader has direct contact with the other PIs, who in turn collaborate closely with their own doctoral students or other teams. This of course includes the project leader’s own research group, which mainly consists of the ELFA project.

  In future, the RC will have a steering committee to ensure close collaboration.

  Management-related responsibilities and roles

  Each PI with their own project funding is responsible for that funding and the management of his or her group and doctoral students. The group whose application-oriented research at the Language Centre operates as one sub-team. As the cooperation continues, the Steering Committee will take on a larger role in managing the RC’s events and search for funding.

  The projects collaborating around common research interests to attain a higher level of generality in the interpretation of the results across the board.
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- RC’s strengths and challenges related to leadership and management, and the actions planned for developing the processes.
  
  Strength: each participating group and PI is responsible for their own leadership and management, which means that leadership and actual research are closely intertwined, as is characteristic in the humanities. The RC benefits its members by providing opportunities for stimulating and exchanging ideas. This is particularly important for innovative openings, where new conceptualizations, theoretical frameworks and methodological solutions need to be developed. The group is small enough to be manageable without a complex organization.

  Challenge: because the individual sub-groups are so independent, good communication channels are required between them and the project leadership. Communication practices during the application process (e.g. disseminating all relevant information to all members) form a good basis for establishing such channels.

  Action: We intend to establish a small steering committee, with a PI representative of each language as well as one of doctoral candidates. This group can plan and coordinate activities and look for opportunities for searching funding.

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: **1850000**

- Finnish Funding Agency for Technology and Innovation (TEKES) - total amount of funding (in euros) TEKES has decided to allocate to the RC members during 1.1.2005-31.12.2010: **0**

- European Union (EU) - total amount of funding (in euros) EU has decided to allocate to the RC members during 1.1.2005-31.12.2010: **0**

- European Research Council (ERC) - total amount of funding (in euros) ERC has decided to allocate to the RC members during 1.1.2005-31.12.2010: **0**

- 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: VolkswagenStiftung
  - total amount of funding (in euros) from the above-mentioned foundations: **40000**

- 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: NOS-HS (Nordiska samarbetsnämnden för humanistisk och samhällsvetenskaplig forskning), European Science Foundation, INTAS (the International
INTERNATIONAL EVALUATION OF RESEARCH AND DOCTORAL TRAINING AT THE UNIVERSITY OF HELSINKI

RC-SPECIFIC STAGE 2 MATERIAL

Association for the promotion of cooperation with scientists from the New Independent States of the Former Soviet Union)
- total amount of funding (in euros) from the above-mentioned funding organizations: 38000

- 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: University of Helsinki Research funds, Ministry of Education and Culture
- total amount of funding (in euros) from the above-mentioned funding organizations: 142000

B 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 core of the RC is the use of lingua francas and other secondary languages by multilingual individuals. A common thread is language contact at societal and individual level. For pursuit of this, our questions are already laid down at the outset (Section 1). Our approaches for answering them are grouped under five headings, most members engaging with several: (1) Lingua Francas, (2) Contact, Community, and Change, (3) Plurilingualism, SLA, and Language Identities, (4) Language in International Use, and (5) Applications and Societal Relevance.

(1) Lingua Francas
(1a) ELF
English as the global lingua franca is a uniquely complex language contact, incorporating social contexts with little cultural anchorage. Mauranen with her group investigates it from many angles: language regulation (Hynninen), accent accommodation (Hakala), interactionality in monologues (Suviniitty), and self-assessment and perceptions (Pilkinton-Pihko). They use the million-word ELFA corpus (www.helsinki.fi/elfa), and data from the SELF project (www.helsinki.fi/elfa/self).

(1b) Other Lingua Francas
Russian and Finnish as lingua francas pose intriguing contrasts to ELF in social and language typological terms; Mustajoki investigates Russian as a lingua franca, Pikkarainen both Russian and Finnish.

(2) Contact, Community, and Change
Sociolinguistic issues range from the macro-social to interaction in small communities. Saarikivi investigates interaction between Finno-Ugric languages and Russian in historical and contemporary perspectives, Pussinen looks at Russian as a secondary language in Mordovya and Finland, and Reponen links a community approach to plurilingual Russian speakers in Helsinki.

(3) Plurilingualism, SLA, and Language Identities
Plurilingualism is central to the RC. Protassova explores Russian in bilingual learning, Kalliokoski Finnish as L2. Vetchinnikova connects cognitive research with corpus linguistics, Nenonen studies language acquisition in bilingual children, and Sammalkorpi the social construction of bilingual identity.
(4) Language in international use

A language without anchorage to a local community takes new shapes compared to traditional communities. Tanskanen studies English in social media, and Berazhny English in international airline magazines.

(5) Applications and societal relevance

All members are involved in this, but the SEM group (Lehtonen, Pitkänen, Siddall, and Virkkunen-Fullenwider) orients to this exclusively, while drawing on the other work in the RC. Theirs is action research in English-medium Master’s Programmes at the UH.

In all, an interactional perspective features strongly, with consequent focus on small communities, while a sociocultural angle also remains salient. Interactional and cognitive approaches dominate in studying plurilingual individuals.

Methodologically the RC covers several intertwining strands, with all researchers engaging in more than one: linguistic analyses, interviews, ethnographic methods, and corpus linguistics are central. Also experimental methods, interactional and conversation analyses come in. Our work fits in well with the current trend of methodological pluralism in language sciences.

The main goal of the RC by 2013 is to provide new answers to all principal research questions. As a tangible outcome we aim at an international refereed collection of papers. We also aim at a strong societal impact with evidence-based discussion on language policy. Both goals feed into our publication plan.

Events plan

The group will meet for seminars for presenting and discussing research. Other scholars may join thematic sessions, with workshops organised around international visitors. An international symposium in 2013 will invite outside experts, partners, and collaborators.

Publication plan

The book fits Mouton’s series on ELF, widening the perspective beyond English. Articles will be published in scholarly journals, e.g. the new JELF, and ESP, JoP, Text & Talk, etc, and popular texts on language policy.

Doctoral education

Most PhDs will be completed by 2013, but with recruiting new candidates we expect to have a roughly equal number of doctoral candidates at the end of the period. Expected finishing of doctorates:

2012 Berazhny, Hynninen, Suvinilitty, Vetchinnikova
2013 Pikkarainen, Pilkinton-Pihko, Reponen, Sammalkorpi
2014 Hakala, Nenonen

Each member has produced a brief description of their contributions to the project as a whole, and the area of their own particular research. These materials were put together by the project leader, with comments and revisions made in several rounds in cooperation with all participants. The plans were also discussed in a general project meeting, which was followed by more drafting and collective commenting.
# Analysis of publications

- Associated person is one of Anna Mauranen: anna.mauranen@helsinki.fi, Arto Mustajoki: Arto.Mustajoki@helsinki.fi, Jyrki Kalliokoski: Jyrki.Kalliokoski@helsinki.fi, Ekaterina Protassova: Ekaterina.Protassova@helsinki.fi, Tuula Lehtonen: Tuula.Lehtonen@helsinki.fi, Henrik Hakala: henrik.hakala@helsinki.fi, Kari K Pitkänen: Kari.K.Pitkanen@helsinki.fi, Svetlana Vetchinnikova: svetlana.vetchinnikova@helsinki.fi, Janne Saarikivi: Janne.Saarikivi@helsinki.fi, Jaana Maria Suurinmaa: jaana.suurinmaa@helsinki.fi, Jona Salmikorpi: jona.salmikorpi@helsinki.fi, Diane Pilkinton-Pihko: Diane.Pilkinton-Pihko@aalto.fi, Olga Pussinen: olga.pussinen@helsinki.fi, Anu Reponen: anu.reponen@helsinki.fi, Sanna-Kaisa Tanskanen: sanna-kaisa.tanskanen@helsinki.fi, Olga Pussinen: olga.pussinen@helsinki.fi, Anu Vilkunen-Pulkaste: Anu.Vilkunen@helsinki.fi

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Publication type</th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>Total Count 2005 - 2010</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>A1 Refereed journal article</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>A2 Review in scientific journal</strong></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>A3 Contribution to book/other compilations (refereed)</strong></td>
<td>20</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>A4 Article in conference publication (refereed)</strong></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>B1 Unrefereed journal article</strong></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>B2 Contribution to book/other compilations (non-refereed)</strong></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>B3 Unrefereed article in conference proceedings</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>C1 Published scientific monograph</strong></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>C2 Edited book, compilation, conference proceeding or special issue of journal</strong></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>D1 Article in professional journal</strong></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>D2 Article in professional hand or guide book or in a professional data system, or text book material</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>D3 Article in professional conference proceedings</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>D4 Published development or research report</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>D5 Text book or professional handbook or guidebook or dictionary</strong></td>
<td>16</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>E1 Popular article, newspaper article</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>E2 Popular contribution to book/other compilations</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>E2 Popular monograph</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>I2 ICT programs or applications</strong></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1
2 Listing of publications

A1 Refereed journal article

2005

2006

2007
Protassova, E 2007, 'Preolodenie stereotipov: obzor pecat Finla ndii na russkom a a zyk', *Etntiko studio*.

2008

2009
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A2 Review in scientific journal
2005
2009

A3 Contribution to book/other compilations (refereed)
2005

2006

2007

2008
Protassova, E 2006, 'Gendernye osobennosti rec: `ego oby obs. `enali za rubez`om', "TI"`iz `ane sâjêseistik" Kalyparlyq g` `yymi-
tekst`.vlast'evnoe povedenie, Istoki, Voronez, pp. 45-66.

vedovoj., Azbukovnik, Moskva, pp. 299-333.

Mauranen, A 2006, 'Pereselenca: eskj z`jargon', "A`zykova;: lic;nost`, Izdatel`stvo Rossijskogo universiteta
drua.; by narodov, Moskva, pp. 76-88.


Protassova, E, Rooze, A 2006, 'The world under the Fredo: a forum of social inequality', in Peter Lang, Bern.

Mustajoki, A 2006, 'Indrik', Moskva, pp. 400-408.


Mauranen, A 2007, 'Hybrid voices: English as the lingua franca of academics', Language and discipline perspectives on academic

Protassova, E 2007, 'Otsa a `zykova;: sud`ba.', "A`zyk "en `z`jy`, k 70-letii L. P. Kryslina., Studia Philologica, Âzyki


Mauranen, A 2007, 'Why translate if you can read the original? Text, processes, and corpora, Kansainvälisen viestinnän laitoksen

Mauranen, A 2007, 'Hybrid voices: English as the lingua franca of academics', Language and discipline perspectives on academic


Mauranen, A 2007, 'Why translate if you can read the original? Text, processes, and corpora, Kansainvälisen viestinnän laitoksen
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2009


2010


Pilkinton-Pihko, O 2010, 'English as a lingua franca' in Mauranen, N Hynninen (eds), English as a lingua franca (Helsinki English Studies Vol. 6), Helsinki English Studies, vol. 6, Department of Modern Languages, English Unit, University of Helsinki, Helsinki, pp. 58-74.
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Pussinen, O 2010, 'Формирование академического вольного языка при двухъязычии' (на материале взаимодействия русского и финского языков)', Изучение и преподавание русского языка в Финляндии. Сборник статей, Златоуст, Санкт-Петербург.


A4 Article in conference publication (referred)

2005
Lehtonen, T 2005, 'Learning opportunity - a way to personal authenticity?', in Celebrating the second 10 workshops, pp. 143-149.

2006

2007

2008


Pilkinton-Pihko, D, Virkkunen-Fullenwider, A, Huhta, A 2008, Linking an English for Science and Technology Placement Test to CEFR.


Virkkunen-Fullenwider, A, Toepfer, T 2008, Common European Framework of Reference for Languages and inter-rater reliability,..

2009


2010

B1 Unreferred journal article

2005


2006
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2007


Protassova, E 2007, 'Varietas et concordia. essays in honour of professor Pekka Pesonen on the occasion of his 60th birthday .', Slavica Helsingiensia, vol. 31, University of Helsinki, Helsinki, Department of Slavonic and Baltic Languages and Literatures, Helsinki, pp. 434-443.


2009


2010


Suviniitty, JM 2010, 'Lecturers’ questions and student perception of lecture comprehension', Helsinki English studies, vol 6, pp. 44-57.

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

2005


Protassova, E 2007, 'A la russ': o russkosti pona: slaj', Varietas et concordia. essays in honour of professor Pekka Pesonen on the occasion of his 60th birthday ., Slavica Helsingiensia, no. 31, University of Helsinki, Helsinki, Department of Slavonic and Baltic Languages and Literatures, Helsinki, pp. 434-443.


Protassova, E 2007, 'Varietas et concordia. essays in honour of professor Pekka Pesonen on the occasion of his 60th birthday .', Slavica Helsingiensia, vol. 31, University of Helsinki, Helsinki, Department of Slavonic and Baltic Languages and Literatures, Helsinki, pp. 434-443.
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B3 Unrefered article in conference proceedings

2010


C1 Published scientific monograph

2006
Mustajoki, A 2006, ‘Теория функционального синтаксиса’ ot sintakticheskix struktur k yazykovym soobshchestvam, Studia Philologica, Časy slav'enskõj kultury, Moskva.


2008

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

2005


Lindstedt, J, Mustajoki, A, Protassova, E (eds) 2005, Kontakt i linko Balkano, Slavica Helsingensia, no. supplementum 3, University of Helsinki, Department of Slavonic and Baltic Languages and Literatures, Helsinki.
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2008


2009


2010
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D1 Article in professional journal

2005

2007

2010

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

2010

D3 Article in professional conference proceedings

2010

D4 Published development or research report

2010

D5 Text book or professional handbook or guidebook or dictionary

2006
2008

2009
Коллектив авторов. Ред. М.М. Эпштейн 2009. Актуальные вопросы социальной поддержки детей и семей мигрантов. Участие. Санкт-Петербург.
Protassova, E, Rodina, NM 2009, Обучение дошкольников иностранному языку: программа "Little by Little", методические рекомендации, тематическое планирование, Karapuz-Didaktika, Москва.

2010
Protassova, E, Rodina, NM 2010, Обучение дошкольников иностранному языку: программа "Little by Little", методические рекомендации, тематическое планирование, Karapuz-Didaktika, Москва.

E1 Popular article, newspaper article

2005
Protassova, E 2005, Как алфавит формируется?"по", какого ли в досвом, Gramota.ru. 63-83.
Saarikivi, J 2005, 'Monikulttuurisuuden autuaus ja autot', Campus : Cimon tiedotuslehti.

2006
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2007

2008

2009
Saarikivi, J 2009, 'Mitä he sanovat?', Parnasso, vol 59 (2009), no. 7, pp. 34.
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E1 Popular contribution to book/other compilations

2006

2009

E2 Popular monograph

2007

2009

I2 ICT programs or applications

2005
The Helsinki Annotated Corpus HANCO: Хельсинкский аннотированный корпус текстов ХАНКО. articles

2008
The Progress Tests on the Russian Language
## 1 Analysis of activities 2005-2010

Associated person is one of Anna Mauranen, anna.mauranen@helsinki.fi, Arto Mustajoki, Arto.Mustajoki@helsinki.fi, Jyrki Kalliokoski, jyrki.kalliokoski@helsinki.fi, Eпереереer of the 2005-2010

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity type</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Supervisor or co-supervisor of doctoral thesis</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prizes and awards</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Editor of research journal</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Editor of research anthology/collection/conference proceedings</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peer review of manuscripts</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment of candidates for academic posts</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Membership or other role in review committee</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Membership or other role in research network</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Membership or other role in national/international committee, council, board</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Membership or other role in public Finnish or international organization</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Membership or other role of body in private company/organisation</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participation in interview for written media</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participation in radio programme</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participation in TV programme</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2 Listing of activities 2005-2010

**Supervisor or co-supervisor of doctoral thesis**

**Jyrki Kalliokoski , Jyrki.Kalliokoski@helsinki.fi**

- Väitöskirjan ohjaus (Paattakallio), Jyrki Kalliokoski, 2003 → …
- Väitöskirjan ohjaus (Vehkanen), Jyrki Kalliokoski, 2003 → …
- Väitöskirjan ohjaus (Lehtimäki), Jyrki Kalliokoski, 2004 → …
- Väitöskirjan ohjaus (Komppa), Jyrki Kalliokoski, 2005 → …
- Väitöskirjan ohjaus (Makkonen-Craig, valmis), Jyrki Kalliokoski, 2005
- Väitöskirjan ohjaus (Merke), Jyrki Kalliokoski, 2005 → …
- Väitöskirjan ohjaus (Sviridova), Jyrki Kalliokoski, 2005 → …
- Väitöskirjan ohjaus (Heikkälä, valmis), Jyrki Kalliokoski, 2008
- Väitöskirjan ohjaus (Kankaanpää, valmis), Jyrki Kalliokoski, 2006
- Väitöskirjan ohjaus (Kokkonen), Jyrki Kalliokoski, 2006 → …
- Väitöskirjan ohjaus (Lehtonen), Jyrki Kalliokoski, 2006 → …
- Väitöskirjan ohjaus (Rahtu, valmis), Jyrki Kalliokoski, 2006
- Väitöskirjan ohjaus (Tanner), Jyrki Kalliokoski, 2006 → …
- Habilitaatio-väitöskirjan tarkastaja (Pantermöller), Jyrki Kalliokoski, 2007, Germany
- Väitöskirjan ohjaus (Mononen), Jyrki Kalliokoski, 2007 → …
- Väitöskirjan ohjaus (Triila, valmis), Jyrki Kalliokoski, 2007
- Väitöskirjan ohjaus (Cvetanovic), Jyrki Kalliokoski, 2008 → …
- Väitöskirjan ohjaus (Visakko), Jyrki Kalliokoski, 2009 → …
- Väitöskirjan ohjaus (Vuorijärvi), Jyrki Kalliokoski, 2009 → …

**Ekaterina Protassova , Ekaterina.Protassova@helsinki.fi**


**Janne Saarikivi , Janne.Saarikivi@helsinki.fi**

- Supervising, Janne Saarikivi, 2008 → 2011
- Supervising, Janne Saarikivi, 2008 → 2012, Finland
- Supervising, Janne Saarikivi, 2008 → 2012
- Supervising, Janne Saarikivi, 2008 → …, Estonia
- Supervising, Janne Saarikivi, 2009 → 2013, Finland
- Supervising, Janne Saarikivi, 2009 → 2013, Finland
- Supervising, Janne Saarikivi, 2009 → …, Finland
- Supervising, Janne Saarikivi, 2009 → 2015, Finland
- Supervising, Janne Saarikivi, 2010 → 2014, Finland

**Prizes and awards**
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Arto Mustajoki , Arto.Mustajoki@helsinki.fi
Ystävyyden kunniamerkki, Arto Mustajoki, 04.11.2010, Russia

Editor of research journal

Arto Mustajoki , Arto.Mustajoki@helsinki.fi
Scando-Slavica, Arto Mustajoki, 01.01.2007 → 31.12.2007, Denmark
Slavica Helsingiensia, Arto Mustajoki, 01.01.2007 → 31.12.2007, Finland

Jyrki Kalliokoski , Jyrki.Kalliokoski@helsinki.fi
Études Finno-ougriennes, Jyrki Kalliokoski, 01.01.1999 → …, France

Ekaterina Protassova , Ekaterina.Protassova@helsinki.fi
Child Bilingualism, Ekaterina Protassova, 01.01.2005 → 31.12.2005, Russia
Russian as Foreign Language, Ekaterina Protassova, 01.01.2005 → 31.12.2005, Finland
W.0. Dressler, I.Savickiene (eds), Diminutives in Child Language, Ekaterina Protassova, 01.01.2005 → 31.12.2005
Journal of Intercultural Education, Ekaterina Protassova, 01.01.2006 → 31.12.2006, Netherlands
Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development, Ekaterina Protassova, 01.01.2006 → 31.12.2006, Canada
Russkij jazyk i kultura v sisteme shkol'nogo obrazovanija evropejskikh stran, evropeiskie koncepcii i prepodavanie RKI v Rossii, Ekaterina Protassova, 01.01.2006 → 31.12.2006
Acta Collegii Naroviensis, Ekaterina Protassova, 01.01.2007 → 31.12.2007, Estonia
International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism, Ekaterina Protassova, 01.01.2007 → 31.12.2007, United Kingdom
Journal of Intercultural Education, Ekaterina Protassova, 01.01.2007 → 31.12.2007, Netherlands
Russkoe, litovskoe, èstonskoe i latyshskoe kommunikativnoe povedenie . Serija Kommunikativnoe povedenie , vyp. 27. Voronezh University, Ekaterina Protassova, 01.01.2007 → 31.12.2007, Russia
Studia Humanioria et Paedagogica Collegii Narovensis, II, Ekaterina Protassova, 01.01.2007 → 31.12.2007, Estonia
Finskoe i russkoje kommunikativnoe povedenie , Ekaterina Protassova, 01.01.2008 → 31.12.2008, Russia
Tuula Lehtonen , Tuula.Lehtonen@helsinki.fi
ICLHE 2006: Integrating Content and Language in Higher Education (Maastricht, 28 June-1 July 2006), Tuula Lehtonen, 01.01.2007 → 31.12.2007, Netherlands
Language Awareness, Tuula Lehtonen, 01.01.2007 → 31.12.2007, United Kingdom

Editor of research anthology/collection/conference proceedings

Jyrki Kalliokoski , Jyrki.Kalliokoski@helsinki.fi
Referointi ja moniäänisyys; (referee-julkaisu), Jyrki Kalliokoski, 01.01.2005 → 31.12.2005, Finland

Peer review of manuscripts

Ekaterina Protassova , Ekaterina.Protassova@helsinki.fi
Children’s drawings and explication of the concept of future in Latvian; Interrogatives in Russian and Lithuanian child-directed speech: do we communicate with our children in the same way?, Ekaterina Protassova, 2010
Janne Saarikivi , Janne.Saarikivi@helsinki.fi
Suomalais-Ugrilaisen Seuran aikakauskirja = Journal de la Société Finno-Ougrienne, Janne Saarikivi, 2007 → …, Finland
Virittäjä, Janne Saarikivi, 2010 → …, Finland
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Sanna-Kaisa Tanskanen, sanna-kaisa.tanskanen@helsinki.fi
Peer review of article in: Journal of Pragmatics, Sanna-Kaisa Tanskanen, 2010
Peer review of chapter in: Constructing Identity in Interpersonal Communication / Construction identitaire dans la communication interpersonnelle / Identitätskonstruktion in der interpersonalen Kommunikation, Sanna-Kaisa Tanskanen, 2010, Finland

Assessment of candidates for academic posts
Jyrki Kalliokoski, Jyrki.Kalliokoski@helsinki.fi
Asiantuntija professuurin täytössä, Jyrki Kalliokoski, 2009, Estonia
Kari K PItkänen, Kari.K.Pitkanen@helsinki.fi
Ulkopuolinen opetusnäytteen arvioija, Kari K Pitkänen, 05.2009, Finland
Opetusnäytteen arvioiminen, Kari K Pitkänen, 05.2010, Finland

Membership or other role in review committee
Jyrki Kalliokoski, Jyrki.Kalliokoski@helsinki.fi
Arvioija (referee), Jyrki Kalliokoski, 05.2005
Arvioijanäyttöjen järjestely, Jyrki Kalliokoski, 03.2006, Netherlands
Arvioija (referee), Jyrki Kalliokoski, 07.2007, Denmark
Nordiska publikaeringsskickan för humanistiska och samhällsvetenskapliga tidskrifter (NORD-HS), Pohjoismaiden ministerineuvosto, Jyrki Kalliokoski, 28.09.2007 → 30.09.2007, Denmark
Janne Saarikivi, Janne.Saarikivi@helsinki.fi
Membership of the editorial board, Janne Saarikivi, 2007 → ..., Hungary
Võru Instituudi välläandõq = Võru instituudi toimetised, Janne Saarikivi, 2007 → ..., Estonia
Uralica Helsingiensia, Janne Saarikivi, 2008 → ...

Membership or other role in research network
Janne Saarikivi, Janne.Saarikivi@helsinki.fi
Founder, Janne Saarikivi, 08.2007 → ...
Fellow, Janne Saarikivi, 01.08.2008 → 31.01.2009, Norway
Member, Janne Saarikivi, 08.2008 → 09.2009, Norway
Academy Club for Young Scientists, Janne Saarikivi, 2009 → 2010, Finland

Membership or other role in national/international committee, council, board
Arto Mustajoki, Arto.Mustajoki@helsinki.fi
European Reference Index for Humanities; Member of Steering Group, Arto Mustajoki, 2002 → 2010, France
European Science Foundation (ESF) Standing Committee for the Humanities, Arto Mustajoki, 01.01.2005 → 31.12.2005, France
Jyväskylän yliopiston tieteellinen arviointi, humanistisen tiedekunnan paneeli, Arto Mustajoki, 01.01.2005 → 31.12.2005, Finland
Kulttuurin ja yhteiskunnan tutkimuksen toimikunta (Suomen Akatemia), Arto Mustajoki, 01.01.2005 → 31.12.2005, Finland
Suomen Akatemiain hallitus, Arto Mustajoki, 01.01.2005 → 31.12.2005, Finland
Venäjän kielien ja kirjallisuuden opettajien kansainvälinen asosiaatio (MAPRIJAL), varapresidentti, Arto Mustajoki, 01.01.2005 → 31.12.2005, Russia
European Science Foundation (ESF) Standing Committee for the Humanities, Arto Mustajoki, 01.01.2006 → 31.12.2006, France
Kulttuurin ja yhteiskunnan tutkimuksen toimikunta, Arto Mustajoki, 01.01.2006 → 31.12.2006, Finland
Suomalainen tiedekatemia, varaesimies, Arto Mustajoki, 01.01.2006 → 31.12.2006, Finland
Suomen Akatemiain hallitus, Arto Mustajoki, 01.01.2006 → 31.12.2006, Finland
INTERNATIONAL EVALUATION OF RESEARCH AND DOCTORAL TRAINING AT THE UNIVERSITY OF HELSINKI

LFP/Mauranen

Venäjän kielen ja kirjallisuuden opettajien kansainvälinen assosiaatio (MAPRJAL), varapresidentti, Arto Mustajoki, 01.01.2006 → 31.12.2006, Russia
MAPRJAL (Venäjän kielen ja kirjallisuuden opettajien kansainvälinen assosiaatio), varapresidentti, Arto Mustajoki, 01.01.2007 → 31.12.2007, Russia

Suomalainen tieedekatemia, varasjäsen, Arto Mustajoki, 01.01.2006 → 31.12.2006, Finland
MAPRJAL (Venäjän kielen ja kirjallisuuden opettajien kansainvälinen assosiaatio), varapresidentti, Arto Mustajoki, 01.01.2008 → 31.12.2008, Russia
Suomalainen tieedekatemia, esimesi, Arto Mustajoki, 01.01.2008 → 31.12.2008, Finland
Suomalaisen tieedekatemia, esimesi, Arto Mustajoki, 04.2008 → 04.2010, Finland

Suomen tieteellisen infrastruktuurin arviointipaneeli (humanistiset ja yhteiskunnalliset tieteet), Arto Mustajoki, 03.09.2008 → 05.09.2008, Finland
TSV:n tiedekatemia jaosto, Arto Mustajoki, 2008 → 2010, Finland

Jyrki Kalliokoski , Jyrki.Kalliokoski@helsinki.fi
Suomalainen Kirjallisuuden Sauran hallitus, Jyrki Kalliokoski, 01.01.2002 → 31.12.2010, Finland
Nederlandse Taalunie, Commissie Lexicographische Vertaalvoorzieningen, Jyrki Kalliokoski, 2003 → ..., Netherlands
Yliopistolutkintolautakunta, Jyrki Kalliokoski, 01.01.2004 → 31.12.2006, Finland
Suomen Akatemia, Jyrki Kalliokoski, 2005
Yliopistolutkintolautakunta, Jyrki Kalliokoski, 01.01.2007 → ..., Finland
Suomalainen tieedakatemia, Jyrki Kalliokoski, 01.01.2008 → ..., Finland

Ekaterina Protassova , Ekaterina.Protassova@helsinki.fi
Consultation Scientific Board for the Project “Altersspezifische Sprachaneignung” (PROSA), Universitäten Munchen/Landau/Freiburg., Ekaterina Protassova, 01.01.2006 → 31.12.2006, Germany

Kari K Pitkänen , Kari.K.Pitkanen@helsinki.fi
Opintoasiainmielikunta (OAT) (varajäsen), Kari K Pitkänen, 01.01.2007 → 31.12.2007, Finland

Sanna-Kaisa Tanskanen , sanna-kaisa.tanskanen@helsinki.fi
Vice board member, Sanna-Kaisa Tanskanen, 2010, Finland

Anu Virkkunen-Fullenwider , Anu.Virkkunen@helsinki.fi

Membership or other role in public Finnish or international organization
Arto Mustajoki , Arto.Mustajoki@helsinki.fi
Jyväskylän yliopiston tutkimuksen arviointi, Humanistitiedekuntaa arvioivaa pankeelt, Arto Mustajoki, 01.01.2005 → 31.12.2005, Finland

Pietari-Säätölin haltuksen puheenjohtaja, Arto Mustajoki, 2005 → 2010, Finland

Esitymysen asiantuntijana EU-hankkeeseen "Fostering the rebirth of social sciences and humanities in the Central Asia (PHENIX)" littoisessa seminaarissa Bishkekissä, Arto Mustajoki, 01.01.2006 → 31.12.2006, Kyrgyzstan
Esitymysen asiantuntijana EU-hankkeeseen "Fostering the rebirth of social sciences and humanities in the Central Asia (PHENIX)" littoisessa seminaarissa Tallinnassa, Arto Mustajoki, 20.11.2006 → 31.12.2006, Estonia
Esitymysen asiantuntijana EU-hankkeeseen "Fostering the rebirth of social sciences and humanities in the Central Asia (PHENIX)" littoisessa seminaarissa Tashkentissä, Arto Mustajoki, 20.05.2007 → 29.05.2007, Uzbekistan
EU, yliopistossa tehtävän tutkimuksen arviointia pohittavan asiantuntijaryhmän jäsen, Arto Mustajoki, 01.01.2008 → 31.12.2008, Belgium
Venäjän suurlähettiläs, asiantuntijapäällikkö, aiheena venäjän kielen asema Suomessa, Arto Mustajoki, 08.02.2008 → 31.12.2008, Finland
Laitosrakenteen uudistamisen ohjausryhmän jäsen, Jyrki Kalliokoski, 01.01.2009 → 31.12.2009
Keskustakampuksen kirjastonneuvottelukunta, Jyrki Kalliokoski, 2010 → …
Laitoksen johtaja, Jyrki Kalliokoski, 01.01.2010 → …
Opettajankoulutuksen neuvottelukunta, Jyrki Kalliokoski, 17.05.2010 → 31.12.2012, Finland

Ekaterina Protassova, Ekaterina.Protassova@helsinki.fi

Competition The best Russian language teacher of the year, organized by the Association of Russian-speaking organizations in Finland, Russian centre of the Science and Culture in Finland, Association of the Russian teachers in Finland, Department, Ekaterina Protassova, 01.01.2007 → 31.12.2007, Finland

Materials upon binational families for the journal Russkiy svet, Russian club, Tampere, Ekaterina Protassova, 01.01.2007 → 31.12.2007, Finland

Seminar upon child bilingualism and multicultural education, member of the working group (Väestöliitto etc.), Ekaterina Protassova, 01.01.2007 → 31.12.2007, Finland

Suomalais-venäläisen koulun kannatusyhdistys, Venäjän kielen asiantuntija, Ekaterina Protassova, 01.01.2007 → 31.12.2007, Finland

Janne Saarikivi, Janne.Saarikivi@helsinki.fi

Member, Janne Saarikivi, 1996 → …
Secretary, Janne Saarikivi, 2004 → 2005
Suomalais-ugrilainen kansalaisjärjestöhanke (Finno-Ugrian NGO schooling project), Janne Saarikivi, 2009 → …, Finland
Suomalais-ugrilainen kielipesähanke (Finno-Ugrian language nest project), Janne Saarikivi, 2009 → …, Finland

Membership or other role of body in private company/organisation

Arto Mustajoki, Arto.Mustajoki@helsinki.fi

Suomen Pietari-instituutti, Arto Mustajoki, 01.01.2005 → 31.12.2005, Finland
Pietari-säätiön hallitus, Arto Mustajoki, 01.01.2006 → 31.12.2006, Estonia
Pietari-säätiö, Arto Mustajoki, 01.01.2007 → 31.12.2007, Kyrgyzstan

Participation in interview for written media

Arto Mustajoki, Arto.Mustajoki@helsinki.fi

Golos Suomi (YLE), Arto Mustajoki, 01.11.2001 → 31.12.2011, Finland
Paneelikeskustelu Yliopiston kirjastossa, Arto Mustajoki, 09.01.2001 → 31.12.2011, Finland
Suomen kansallibiografialistokunta (www.kansallibiografia.fi), Arto Mustajoki, 01.01.2001 → 31.12.2011, Finland
Peda-Forum kevätpäivät, Arto Mustajoki, 19.05.2003 → 31.12.2011, Russia
YLE-udistusmyöntä, Arto Mustajoki, 04.11.2003 → 31.12.2011, Russia
Venäjän opettajien kesäseminaari, Arto Mustajoki, 07.06.2005 → 31.12.2011, Finland
CSCNews, Arto Mustajoki, 01.06.2006 → 31.12.2011, Estonia
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Suomalaisen tieyhteisöjen 105-vuotisjuhlavuoden päätöstilaisuus, Arto Mustajoki, 10.10.2008 → 31.12.2011, Estonia
Tieteenkäydön liiton seminaari "Paremmat yliopistoa uudistamalla?", Arto Mustajoki, 12.08.2008 → 31.12.2011, Estonia
Venäjä-Forumi, Yle Aamun pelli, Arto Mustajoki, 08.09.2008 → 31.12.2011, Estonia
Haastattelu Humanistilehdessä, Arto Mustajoki, 2010 → ..., Finland
Haastattelu Kainuun Sanomissa koskien venäjäkielisten nimien translitterointia, Arto Mustajoki, 19.12.2010
Haastattelu koskien Turun yliopiston koulutuspolitiikkaa, Arto Mustajoki, 24.11.2010, Turun yliopisto

Jyrki Kalliokoski, Jyrki.Kalliokoski@helsinki.fi

Suomen sanomat, lehtihaastattelu, Jyrki Kalliokoski, 06.04.2004 → 31.12.2011, Finland
Universitas Tartuensis, haastattelu, Jyrki Kalliokoski, 04.05.2007, Finland
"Nortamon teksti on kuin kuva", Jyrki Kalliokoski, 07.06.2010, Finland

Ekaterina Protassova, Ekaterina.Protassova@helsinki.fi

"Questions of Russian linguistic and cultural minority in Finland (seminar), Säätytalo, Helsinki, Ekaterina Protassova, 05.12.2002 → 31.12.2011, Lithuania
"Ways to integration", 2nd Seminar of the Russian schools and organizations in Europe, Dortmund, Ekaterina Protassova, 02.03.2002 → 31.12.2011, Lithuania
International seminar "What is a good day care", Herzen Pedagogical University, Ekaterina Protassova, 09.09.2002 → 31.12.2011, Lithuania
Artikkelit venäjäkielisissä pedagogisissa lehdissä, Ekaterina Protassova, 01.01.2003 → 31.12.2011, Germany
Etelä-Säätiön seminarissa Tallinnassa, Ekaterina Protassova, 12.03.2003 → 31.12.2011, Germany
Etelä-Säätiön seminarissa Tallinnassa, Ekaterina Protassova, 02.03.2002 → 31.12.2011, Lithuania
Haastattelu Kasakstanin televisiossa, Ekaterina Protassova, 01.01.2003 → 31.12.2011, Germany
Luentosarja opettajille ja opiskelijoille, Ekaterina Protassova, 15.09.2003 → 31.12.2011, Germany
Opettajien seminaari izhevskissä, Ekaterina Protassova, 08.03.2004 → 31.12.2011, Germany
Kirjaesityt Venäjän tiede- ja kulttuurikeskuksessa ja Venäjän ja Itä-Euroopan instituutissa, Ekaterina Protassova, 28.11.2004 → 31.12.2011, Russia
Kymenlaakson kesäopettelu, Kotka ja Hamina, Ekaterina Protassova, 29.09.2004 → 31.12.2011, Russia
The working group on Russian as mother tongue for Finnish schoolchildren, Ministry of Education, Ekaterina Protassova, 02.09.2004 → 31.12.2011, Russia
Kymenlaakson kesäopettelu, Kotka ja Hamina, Ekaterina Protassova, 06.04.2005 → 31.12.2011, Russia
Russian pedagogical press, Ekaterina Protassova, 01.01.2005 → 31.12.2011, Russia
Seminar po detskoj rechi, Herzen Pedagogical University, St Petersburg, Ekaterina Protassova, 19.05.2005 → 31.12.2011, Russia
Suomalais-venäjäkielinen koulu, Ekaterina Protassova, 27.09.2005 → 31.12.2011, Russia
Venäjänopettajien kesäseminaari Helsingissä, Ekaterina Protassova, 06.06.2005 → 31.12.2011, Russia
Multidisciplinary nauchno-prakticheskiy seminar "Kak pomoch' rebenu?", Venäjän ja Itä-Euroopan instituutti, Ekaterina Protassova, 17.03.2006 → 31.12.2011, Kazakstan
Public library of Narva, Ekaterina Protassova, 07.03.2007 → 31.12.2011, Finland
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Roundtable Organizačija raboty doshkol'nyh obrazovatel'nyh uchrezhdenij v uslovijah mnogojazychija , Moscow, Ekaterina Protassova, 11.05.2007 → 31.12.2011, Finland

Seminar Mitmekultuurline haridus", Ekaterina Protassova, 11.05.2007 → 31.12.2011, Finland


2nd Forum of the Russian-speaking community in the UK, Ekaterina Protassova, 15.11.2008 → 31.12.2011, Russia

DVD "Lapsuuden monta kielta", Ekaterina Protassova, 15.10.2008 → 31.12.2011, Russia


LIGHT-project, different institutions, Ekaterina Protassova, 06.01.2008 → 31.12.2011, Russia

Nauchno-prakticheskij seminar po probleam soxranenija kul turnojazykovyh cennostej i semejnix tradicij v Vostochnoj Finlandii, Ekaterina Protassova, 14.11.2008 → 31.12.2011, Russia


Week of the Russian Language, Russian education, science and culture in Finland, Ekaterina Protassova, 28.10.2008 → 31.12.2011, Russia

Tuula Lehtonen , Tuula.Lehtonen@helsinki.fi

Yliopistolainen, Tuula Lehtonen, 01.10.2002 → 31.12.2011, Finland

lehtihaastattelu (Acatiimi), Tuula Lehtonen, 01.01.2005 → 31.12.2011, Finland

Helsingin Sanomat (lehtihaastattelun yhtenä asiantuntijana), Tuula Lehtonen, 18.09.2006 → 31.12.2011, Finland

Yliopistolainen (yhtenä haastateltavana), Tuula Lehtonen, 31.01.2006 → 31.12.2011, Finland

Henrik Hakala , henrik.hakala@helsinki.fi


Janne Saarikivi , Janne.Saarikivi@helsinki.fi

Etsijä, Janne Saarikivi, 01.01.2000 → 31.12.2011, Hungary

Etsijä, Janne Saarikivi, 01.02.2000 → 31.12.2011, Hungary

Etsijä, Janne Saarikivi, 01.03.2000 → 31.12.2011, Hungary

Vihreä Lanka, Janne Saarikivi, 01.01.2000 → 31.12.2011, Hungary


Vihreä Lanka, Janne Saarikivi, 01.01.2000 → 31.12.2011, Hungary

Ylioppilaslehti, Janne Saarikivi, 01.01.2000 → 31.12.2011, Hungary

Ylioppilaslehti, Janne Saarikivi, 01.01.2000 → 31.12.2011, Hungary

Ylioppilaslehti, Janne Saarikivi, 01.11.2000 → 31.12.2011, Hungary

Vihreä lanka 18/2001, Janne Saarikivi, 01.01.2001 → 31.12.2011, Finland

Vihreä lanka 33/2001, Janne Saarikivi, 01.01.2001 → 31.12.2011, Finland

Vihreä lanka 43/2001, Janne Saarikivi, 01.01.2001 → 31.12.2011, Finland


Helsingin Sanomat, Janne Saarikivi, 03.01.2003 → 31.12.2011, Finland

Hidenki 1/2003, Janne Saarikivi, 01.01.2003 → 31.12.2011, Finland


Vihreä Lanka 10/03, Janne Saarikivi, 01.01.2003 → 31.12.2011, Finland

LFP/Mauranen

Membership in “HS-raati”, Janne Saarikivi, 01.01.2010 → 31.12.2010, Finland

Participation in radio programme

Jyrki Kalliokoski, Jyrki.Kalliokoski@helsinki.fi
Characteristics of Finnish language, Ohjelmassa Val 202, Jyrki Kalliokoski, 29.07.2010, Slovenia

Ekaterina Protassova, Ekaterina.Protassova@helsinki.fi
Radio "Golos Rossi", Ekaterina Protassova, 01.01.2005 → 31.12.2011, Russia

Tuula Lehtonen, Tuula.Lehtonen@helsinki.fi
radio-ohjelma eli YLE:n tiedeutiset, myös netissä, Tuula Lehtonen, 01.01.2005 → 31.12.2011, Finland

Participation in TV programme

Arto Mustajoki, Arto.Mustajoki@helsinki.fi
TV-haastattelu Turkmenistanissa 2, Arto Mustajoki, 23.11.2010, Turkmenistan
TV-haastattelu Turkmenistanin televisioselle 1, Arto Mustajoki, 26.11.2010, Turkmenistan
TV-haastattelu Venäjällä, Arto Mustajoki, 02.11.2010, Russia

Ekaterina Protassova, Ekaterina.Protassova@helsinki.fi
Mezhdunarodnyj seminar po povysheniju kvalifikacii dlja prepodavatelej i uchitелеj russkogo jazyka, obuchajushchih detej sootechestvennikov za rubezhom, St Petersburg, Ekaterina Protassova, 01.01.2005 → 31.12.2011, Russia
International seminar Kaleidoskop kulturnykh i jazykovych semejnyh aspektov v prosesse integracii v finskoe obshchestvo, Helsinki, Ekaterina Protassova, 20.04.2007 → 31.12.2011, Finland
Aktualnaja Kamera, ETV, Ekaterina Protassova, 29.08.2007 → 31.12.2011, Finland

Janne Saarikivi, Janne.Saarikivi@helsinki.fi
Appearance in YLE TV News, Janne Saarikivi, 07.2007 → …, Finland
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/](https://tuhat.halvi.helsinki.fi/portal/en/)) including all the publications that the researchers have considered important.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

The next appendix includes the analyses of the RC under discussion.
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Category 4. *The research of the participating community represents an innovative opening.*

**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>37</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>229</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Total</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>344</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The publications have mostly only one author (67%).
36% of the publications are in Russian, 33% in Finnish and 27% in English.
### Journal / Year / Total

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Journal title</th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>Grand Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Parnasso</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td><strong>43</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virittäjä</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td><strong>5</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tieteesa tapahtuu</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helsingin Sanomat</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russkij âzyk v naučnom osvešenii</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tempus</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>3</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diaspory.</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td><strong>3</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idäntutkimus</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td><strong>3</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russkij язык в школе</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td><strong>3</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercultural Education</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>3</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nordic journal of English studies</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td><strong>3</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kepan verkkoutiset</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>3</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russian Linguistics</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>2</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helsinki English studies</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>2</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercultural Pragmatics</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td><strong>1</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Puhe ja Kieli</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td><strong>1</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russkij âzyk za rubežom</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>1</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Journal of the Sociology of Language</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>1</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English for Specific Purposes</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>1</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>System</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td><strong>1</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hiidenkivi</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>1</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jezik in Slovstvo</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td><strong>1</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doškil’na osvita</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td><strong>1</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The following titles were excluded from the table (not journals):

1. Että osaa ja uskaltaa kommunikoida
2. Izbrannnye raboty: teoričeskie i prikladnye problemy âzykoznaniâ
3. Russkij âzyk vne Rossii: lingvistichiêskij i social'no-pedagogichiêskij aspekty vzajmodejstviâ kul'tur
4. Russkoje, litovskoe, êstonskoe i latyškoe kommunikativnoe povedenie
5. Šiuolaikinës rusistikos teorijos ir praktikos tendencijos
6. The acquisition of diminutives

**Journal ranking (Norway, Australia, ERIH)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Journal title</th>
<th>Article count</th>
<th>Norway</th>
<th>Australia</th>
<th>ERIH Linguistics 2007</th>
<th>ERIH Literature</th>
<th>ERIH Pedagogical and Educational Research</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Parnasso</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virittäjä</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nordic journal of English studies</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journal Title</td>
<td>Level</td>
<td>Type</td>
<td>Grade</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercultural Education</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russkij âzyk v naučnom osvešenii</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idäntutkimus</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russian Linguistics</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Puhe ja Kieli</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian EFL Journal</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>System</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercultural Pragmatics</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Journal of the Sociology of Language</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English for Specific Purposes</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russian language journal</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kanava</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Etniškumo studijos</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heritage Language Journal</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keel ja Kirjandus</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Languages in contrast</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>European journal of education : research, development and policy</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jezik in Slovstvo</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Amount of ranked articles (Norway)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Norway</th>
<th>Article count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Level 2</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level 1</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Amount of ranked articles (Australian)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Australia</th>
<th>Article count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Level A*</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level A</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level B</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level C</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Book publishers**

**Publisher ranking (based on Norwegian ranking list)**

2 = leading scientific
1 = scientific
no = non-scientific or not ranked
3 books of 39 have been published by a high ranked leading scientific publisher, 6 by a ranked scientific publisher.