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Foreword

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

1.1 RC-specific evaluation reports

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

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

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

1.2 Aims and objectives in the evaluation

The aims of the evaluation are as follows:

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

1.3 Evaluation method

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

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

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

**Five stages of the evaluation method were:**
1. Registration – Stage 1
2. Self-evaluation – Stage 2
3. TUHAT³ compilations on publications and other scientific activities⁴
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 panelists as compared to the previous evaluations was the character of the evaluation as a meta-evaluation. The panelists did not read research reports or abstracts but instead, they evaluated answers to the evaluation questions, tables and compilations of publications, other scientific activities, bibliometrics and comparable analyses.

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

---

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Background material

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

8. The RC’s strategic action plan for 2011–2013
   - RC's description of their future perspectives in relation to research and doctoral training.

A written feedback from the aspects of: scientific quality, scientific significance, societal impact, processes and good practices related to leadership and management, national and international collaboration, innovativeness, future significance
   - Strengths
   - Areas of development
9. Evaluation of the category of the RC in the context of entity of the evaluation material (1-8)

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

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

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

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

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

13. RC-specific conclusions

1.7 Evaluation criteria

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

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

Description of criteria levels

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

Classification: Criteria (level of procedures and results)

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Question 2 – DOCTORAL TRAINING

Question 3 – SOCIETAL IMPACT

Question 4 – COLLABORATION

Classification: Criteria (level of procedures and results)

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

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

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

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

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

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

**Good quality of procedures and results (2)**
Procedures are of good quality, shared occasionally in the community. The practices and quality of doctoral training/societal impact/international and national collaboration/leadership and management are documented and operations and practices are to large extent in alignment with the documentation. The ambition to develop the community together is of good quality.

**Sufficient quality of procedures and results (1)**
Procedures are of sufficient quality, transparent and shared in the community. The practices and quality of doctoral training/societal impact/international and national collaboration/leadership and management are occasionally documented and operations and practices are to some extent in alignment with the documentation. The ambition to develop the community together is of sufficient quality.

**Question 9 – CATEGORY**
Participation category – fitness for the category chosen

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

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

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

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

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

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

---

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

The main timetable of the evaluation:

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

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

1.9 Evaluation feedback – consensus of the entire panel

The panelists 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 panelists 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 panelists 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

SocStats has a certain standing in Europe and has been invited to participate in developing methodologies for the EU’s 7th Framework Programme and the European Social Survey. It has also been involved in the OECD PISA project. This testifies to its quality of expertise in applied statistics.

Epidemiology and demography are the strong research areas of SocStats, measured by the quality of publications, i.e., journals in which the contributions have been published. SocStats is also active in areas such as social statistics, nonparametric and robust methods and time series analysis.

A problem is that some of the senior researchers seem to have retired or semiretired from research. One of the five principal investigators has no refereed publication for the six years of 2005-10, and another has only one.

SocStats should intensify their research efforts and aim at publishing in high-quality journals.

**Numeric evaluation:** 3 (Very good)

2.2 Practises and quality of doctoral training

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

**ASPECTS:** Processes and good practices related to leadership and management

SocStats graduate students typically work part time on their PhD theses. According to the self-evaluation, this is an advantage, because the students work at research institutes where they can concentrate on their thesis work. This may be so, but outsourcing the students may not be satisfactory from the department’s point of view. Graduate students are a lively ingredient in the daily life of any well working department.

Since SocStats is a small unit, there is no systematic PhD programme. Students take courses outside the University, often abroad. Funds for this have been available. The use of the Baltic-Nordic-Ukrainian Network in doctoral training is a strength.

A successful Master’s thesis, presumably at the University, is the main route to becoming a graduate student. There seem to be few or no openings for outsiders or foreign applicants, as no open competitions are arranged.

**Numeric evaluation:** 2 (Good)
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

A major societal impact is indirect: members of SocStats are involved in developing statistical methods and indicators that are going to be used for the gain of the society. The work on sampling methods and survey techniques is an example of this. There is cooperation with Statistics Finland, which is beneficial to the society.

Apparently, members of SocStats do not act as consultants. This is an area that would offer possibilities for contributing to the welfare of the society (in broad terms).

**Numeric evaluation: 3 (Very good)**

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

Members of SocStats are active in international research groups and formations and various international working parties, which is very positive.

Mobility of researchers is not particularly large, judging from the fact that in its report, SocStats does not mention the issue, except that increased mobility is on their list of improvements. Reasons for this lack of mobility are not known. Maybe the small size of SocStats does not allow long leaves of absence, maybe there is no system of sabbatical leaves. The University should look into this.

**Numeric evaluation: 3 (Very good)**

2.5 Operational conditions

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

ASPECTS: Processes and good practices related to leadership and management

The research structure is based on networks, which means that SocStats members are members in those. There seems to be no central organization to take care of research related issues. It seems that the individual researchers do not interact very much.

The Stage 2 material does not say anything about the teaching loads and administrative duties. From the low mobility of the SocStats researchers it may be guessed that they are nontrivial.
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

SocStats does not have a formal leadership. Researchers work in projects and networks that are managed by themselves. There do not seem to be any meetings to discuss joint problems such as practical details in organizing research activities and facilities, graduate students and their progress, etc.

SocStats might profit from some kind of a (loose) organization to handle practical matters, discuss the progress of graduate students, handle practical problems related to participation in PhD courses, etc.

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

SocStats has received substantial EU funding, which is good.

Statistics Finland has provided funds on the national level. It appears that they are also financing graduate students.

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

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

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

The action plan is rather general and does not contain new ideas. Strengthening existing structures, networks and ties is the main message.

Mobility is not mentioned in the plan.
2.9 Evaluation of the category of the RC in the context of entity of the evaluation material (1-8)

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

SocStats has placed themselves in category 3 but does not fit well in any category. Standard research evaluation methods are adequate to assess the strengths and weaknesses of this RC. But it is true that SocStats’ important role as methodological adviser to organizations of data collection and research is a special function.

Numeric evaluation: 4 (Excellent)

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

It has been put together by the RC leader from member inputs.

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

SocStats is not directly connected to any of the focus areas but supports (statistical methods) quite a number of them. The focus areas are not presented in the research of SocStats, which is fully appropriate.

2.12 RC-specific main recommendations

Research productivity needs to be raised.

2.13 RC-specific conclusions

This is largely a methodological RC, whose contributions have found international use, in the EU and the OECD. Its research output needs to be raised, and be more evenly balanced among its members.
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NAME OF THE RESEARCHER COMMUNITY:
RC on Social, Behavioral, Economic and Official Statistics (SocStats)

LEADER OF THE RESEARCHER COMMUNITY:
Professor Risto Lehtonen, Department of Social Research, University of Helsinki

RC-SPECIFIC MATERIAL FOR THE PEER REVIEW:

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

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: Lehtonen, Risto  
E-mail:  
Phone: 050 5593346  
Affiliation: Dept. of Social Research, UH  
Street address: Gustaf Hällströminkatu 2b FI-00014 University of Helsinki, Finland

2 DESCRIPTION OF THE PARTICIPATING RESEARCHER COMMUNITY (RC)

Name of the participating RC (max. 30 characters): RC on Social, Behavioral, Economic and Official Statistics  
Acronym for the participating RC (max. 10 characters): SocStats  
Description of the operational basis in 2005-2010 (eg. research collaboration, joint doctoral training activities) on which the RC was formed (MAX. 2200 characters with spaces): The Statistics group of the Department of Social Research constitutes the core unit of the Research Consortium on Social, Behavioral, Economic and Official Statistics (SocStats). There are six Principal Investigators (PI) involved in the RC, covering social statistics, non-parametric and robust methods, multivariate methods, empirical microeconometrics, time series econometrics, and psychometrics. In addition, the RC includes five persons who belong (or have belonged) to the department staff (the former Department of Mathematics and Statistics or the current Department of Social Research) and four doctoral candidates. The core group thus constitutes 15 persons.

A special feature of the RC is that research is typically carried out in collaborative international research networks, consortiums and research groups involving researchers from university departments, research institutes and statistical agencies from different countries. In the research activities carried out, the RC at the UH functions as a knot in the different networks. Because of this functional type, the partners of the networks are not often directly affiliated to the UH (by the definition of affiliation used in this context). We have included 12 key collaborators into the RC.

Examples of research networks are the international network on Comparative Analysis of Enterprise Data (CAED) focusing on microeconometrics, the research consortium for the EU’s Framework Programme project AMELI (Advanced Methodology for European Laeken Indicators) focusing in social statistics, the Nonparametric and Robust Multivariate Methods (NRMM) research group, the European Working Group on Small Area Estimation (EWORSAE), and the network organizing the European Social Survey ESS. The Baltic-Nordic-Ukrainian Network on Survey Statistics provides a platform for international research cooperation and doctoral training. The RC also is involved in the Finnish Doctoral Programme in Stochastics.
and Statistics (FDPSS). There is a special property in our doctoral studies: in many cases the students are in
working life and work outside the university in a governmental agency, a good example is Statistics Finland.

### 3 Scientific fields of the RC

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

**RC's scientific subfield 1:** Social Sciences, Mathematical Methods

**RC's scientific subfield 2:** --Select--

**RC's scientific subfield 3:** --Select--

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

**Other, if not in the list:** Social statistics

### 4 RC’s participation category

**Participation category:** 3. Research of the participating community is distinct from mainstream research,
and the special features of the research tradition in the field must be considered in the evaluation

**Justification for the selected participation category (MAX. 2200 characters with spaces):** Research of the
RC SocStats can be considered distinct from mainstream research for the following reasons. Research is
organized in networks and research groups involving partners from several other universities and institutes
from different countries (see Point 2). Research work, costs and risks are shared between partners
providing a special functional property of the RC. One consequence is that typically, the partners are not
formally affiliated to the UH (by the definition of affiliation). This obviously makes it difficult to meet the
definition of “affiliation” for the partners.

There also are certain contextual aspects that make the RC distinct from mainstream research. The
research networks and groups often involve institutions who are intended to implement the research
results in their production processes. This holds for research in social and official statistics in particular;
examples of such institutes are national statistical institutes (e.g. Finland, Germany, Switzerland, UK,
Sweden and Austria) and Eurostat, the statistical office of the EU that maintains the European Statistical
System. The aim of research is often to improve the existing statistical methods of analyzing important
social and economic phenomenon, such as poverty, unemployment, crime, economic recession. Because of
these properties, the research can often be characterized by R&D (Research and Development, see

The R&D property however does not hold for all research by the RC. There also are more theoretical
research topics, examples are nonparametric and robust methods, time series econometrics and model-
assisted methods in survey sampling. Thus the research profile of the RC is very broad supporting the
“distinct” characterization of the RC.
INTERNATIONAL EVALUATION OF RESEARCH AND DOCTORAL TRAINING AT THE UNIVERSITY OF HELSINKI

RC-SPECIFIC STAGE 1 MATERIAL (registration form)

The RC includes a unique research area in Finland. The statistics group of the Department of Social Research is the only unit among Finnish universities that is specialized in research and teaching in social and official statistics.

Because of the special type of the functional profile, standard evaluation criteria do not necessarily show fairly the positive impact of our work.

5 DESCRIPTION OF THE RC’S RESEARCH AND DOCTORAL TRAINING

Public description of the RC’s research and doctoral training (MAX. 2200 characters with spaces):
Research and doctoral training of the RC SocStats covers topics in survey sampling and survey methodology, multivariate methods and measurement errors, non-parametric and robust methods, and time series econometrics. Research is often organized in international research groups involving partners from universities, research institutes and statistical agencies from different countries. Multi-disciplinarity and sensitivity towards societal demand in applications characterize the research work.

Current research topics in social statistics include design-based and model-based methods of modelling social phenomena and change, using integrated data sources and generalized linear mixed models. Small area estimation of indicators on poverty and social exclusion provides an example. The discipline continues research cooperation in empirical cross-country microeconometrics. We have participated in development of methodology for sampling and nonresponse treatment in the European Social Survey, the PISA project of the OECD, and the European victim survey.

Research in non-parametric and robust methods is carried out by the Nonparametric and Robust Multivariate Methods (NRMM) research group. The aim is to develop multivariate nonparametric methods by using multivariate signs and ranks. This research is carried out partly in cooperation with top scientists from the United States, Belgium, Canada, Russia and Switzerland.

Research on multivariate methods and the effects of measurement errors is carried out combining theoretical and computational work as well as cooperation with applied researchers in the social and behavioral sciences. The focus is often on measurement quality, which is especially important in survey research, where random measurement error can be considerable.

Time series econometrics has concentrated on modern methods of modelling nonstationary and trending, typically economic, time series. Estimation and testing of nonstationary models by likelihood methods with focus in reducing the effect of nuisance parameters has been successfully explored. This line of research has involved collaboration with the Department of Mathematics and Statistics.

Significance of the RC’s research and doctoral training for the University of Helsinki (MAX. 2200 characters with spaces): The RC SocStats has several important roles with respect to the significance for the UH.
The members of the RC have wide international contacts and strong impact in research networks and groups (see Point 2). This holds for certain areas of survey statistics (survey sampling, survey methodology) and non-parametric and robust methods in particular, Active role in research communities tends to increase the international impact of the UH.

Our research profile is broad covering theoretical and applied research and R&D (see points 4 and 5). Publication of research results in different platforms, including international statistical journals and conferences, increases the scientific impact of the UH in statistical science. Publication of research results in more applied journals widens the scientific impact to other disciplines.

Much of research by the RC involves a practical goal. The new methods are aimed to replace an existing method or improve a production process (see Point 4). Our recruiting in doctoral training involves not only university students but also experts working outside the university, in governmental agencies for example. These properties tend to increase the societal impact of the UH.

The RC includes research and teaching in social and official statistics, which is unique in Finnish universities and is of great value added for the UH.

Our research relies often on external funding from international and domestic funding sources. Because research is often carried out in research groups involving partners from different institutions, costs and risks are shared between partners. Both of these aspects are of positive significance for the UH.

The RC members are often invited as opponents to PhD defence events and to evaluate research articles and PhD theses of students of our international colleagues. The members are active in providing methodological support to other scientists in Finland and especially for researchers in social and behavioral sciences at the UH. These activities tend to impact positively to the methodological competence of empirical research at the UH. During this evaluation period this “hidden” support has increased

**Keywords:** Statistical science, Social statistics, Non-parametric and robust methods, Multivariate methods, Time series econometrics

### 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): There are various indicators of high quality of research and doctoral training of the RC SocStats. With respect to scientific quality, research results are published in high-quality international peer-reviewed journals specialized in the sub-areas of statistical science that are the focus of the RC. In addition, papers are often published in journals in other disciplines, for example social, educational and behavioral sciences and economics. International and domestic
publishers also have published textbooks and handbook chapters written by researchers of the RC. Researchers are regularly invited to give papers for international conferences in statistics.

An indicator of high quality of research by the RC is the fact that members of the RC have selected to important positions in steering committees and similar bodies of the international networks and research groups we are involved in, and in editorial boards of international journals in statistics. In addition, members of the RC are invited in scientific committees of international conferences in statistics. All this indicates that our key researchers are internationally well recognized.

Quality of research is often measured by the practical applicability of research results. Our research is often of R&D type involving the implementation of the results into practice or releasing computational tools. An example is provided by the development of small area estimation methods and programming the accompanying software.

We have been successful in gaining external funding from international sources for research and doctoral training of the RC. Examples of such sources are the Framework Programmes for research of the EU and the programmes of the Nordic Council of Ministers.

Our doctoral students typically carry out their research part-time (see Point 2). This characterizes well the commitment of out institutional partners. During the evaluation period a total of six students have completed their PhD dissertation. We have included four doctoral candidates in the RC. Senior members of the RC are often invited to supervise doctoral students in other universities in Finland and abroad.

Comments on how the RC’s scientific productivity and doctoral training should be evaluated (MAX. 2200 characters with spaces): We propose a benchmarking type method of assessment. We propose the panel members such that the important areas of research of the RC are well covered. The panelists are selected to represent research units that have a comparable research orientation with the RC. The proposed units are Department of Statistics of Stockholm University, School of Business of University of Applied Sciences of Northwestern Switzerland (FHNW), Department of Mathematics and Statistics of Åbo Akademi University, and Department of Mathematics and Statistics of University of Tampere.

Description of the RC’s publishing strategy: See above in Point 7
# LIST OF RC MEMBERS

<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>Laaksonen</td>
<td>Seppo</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>UH, Statistics Finland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lehtonen</td>
<td>Risto</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>UH, Social Insurance Inst.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Niemi</td>
<td>Hannu</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>UH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vehkalahti</td>
<td>Kimmo</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>UH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Möttönen</td>
<td>Jyrki</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>University Lecturer</td>
<td>UH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pere</td>
<td>Pekka</td>
<td></td>
<td>University Instructor</td>
<td>UH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valaste</td>
<td>Maria</td>
<td></td>
<td>Project Researcher</td>
<td>Social Insurance Inst., UH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Veijanen</td>
<td>Ari</td>
<td></td>
<td>University Researcher</td>
<td>Statistics Finland, UH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Myrskylä</td>
<td>Mikko</td>
<td></td>
<td>University Researcher</td>
<td>Max Planck Institute, UH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tarkkonen</td>
<td>Lauri</td>
<td></td>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>UH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ahti-Miettinen</td>
<td>Outi</td>
<td></td>
<td>Doctoral candidate</td>
<td>Statistics Finland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Piela</td>
<td>Pasi</td>
<td></td>
<td>Doctoral candidate</td>
<td>Statistics Finland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salonen</td>
<td>Riku</td>
<td></td>
<td>Doctoral candidate</td>
<td>Statistics Finland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tarkoma</td>
<td>Janika</td>
<td></td>
<td>Doctoral candidate</td>
<td>Statistics Finland</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## RESEARCH AND DOCTORAL TRAINING COLLABORATORS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Last name</th>
<th>First name</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Affiliation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Böckerman</td>
<td>Petri</td>
<td>Researcher, Docent</td>
<td>U Tampere</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chambers</td>
<td>Ray</td>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>U Wollongong</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gabler</td>
<td>Siegfried</td>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>U Mannheim</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Häder</td>
<td>Sabine</td>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>U Mannheim</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lynn</td>
<td>Peter</td>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>U Essex</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mustonen</td>
<td>Seppo</td>
<td>Professor (emer.)</td>
<td>UH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Männich</td>
<td>Ralf</td>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>U Trier</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plikusas</td>
<td>Aleksandras</td>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>U Vilnius</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rendtel</td>
<td>Ulrich</td>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>FU Berlin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sännäsilä</td>
<td>Carl-Erik</td>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>U Montreal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traat</td>
<td>Imbi</td>
<td>Professor, Docent</td>
<td>U Tartu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vainiomäki</td>
<td>Jari</td>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>U Tampere</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Name of the RC’s responsible person: Lehtonen, Risto

E-mail of the RC’s responsible person: 

Name and acronym of the participating RC: Research Consortium on Social, Behavioral, Economic and Official Statistics, SocStats

The RC’s research represents the following key focus area of UH: -- Select --

Comments for selecting/not selecting the key focus area: The key focus area of Research Consortium on Social, Behavioral, Economic and Official Statistics (SocStats) covers statistical science and its application in social statistics, econometrics, psychometrics and demography. Statistical methods developed by the RC support the empirical quantitative research in many of the key focus areas of UH.

1. Focus and quality of RC’s research (max. 8800 characters with spaces)

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

The research of the RC SocStats focuses in statistical science and applications. Sound theoretical basis, multi-disciplinarity and sensitivity towards societal demand in applications characterize the research work. Statistical methods developed by the RC support the empirical quantitative research in many of the key focus areas of UH.

The RC constitutes a fairly small research group at UH focusing in specialized sub-areas in statistical science. The Statistics group of the Department of Social Research constitutes the core unit of the RC. Research of the RC covers social statistics, non-parametric and robust statistical methods, multivariate methods, empirical microeconometrics, time series econometrics, psychometrics, and demography.

A special feature of the RC is that research is typically carried out in collaborative international research networks and research groups involving researchers from university departments, research institutes and statistical agencies from different countries. In the research activities, the RC at the UH functions as a knot in the different networks (examples will be given below). Because of this functional type, the partners of a network are not often directly affiliated to UH. We have included a number of such key collaborators into the RC.

There are various indicators of high quality of research of the RC. With respect to scientific quality, research results are published in high-quality international peer-reviewed journals specialized in the sub-areas of statistical science that are the focus of the RC. Papers are also published in journals in other disciplines, for example social, educational and behavioral sciences, demography and economics. International and domestic publishers have published textbooks and handbook chapters written by researchers of the RC. Researchers are regularly invited to give papers for international conferences in statistics.

Quality of research is often measured by the practical applicability of research results. Our research is often of R&D type (Research and Development, see definition in Frascati Manual, OECD 2003) involving the implementation of the results into practice or releasing computational tools. The R&D property however does not hold for all research by the RC. There also are more theoretical research topics,
 examples are nonparametric and robust methods, time series econometrics, demography and model-assisted methods in survey sampling.

The RC includes a unique research area in Finland. The statistics group of the Department of Social Research is the only unit among Finnish universities that is specialized in research and teaching in social statistics and official statistics.

An indication of the high quality of research is that we have been successful in gaining external funding from international sources for research and doctoral training of the RC. Examples of such sources are the Framework Programmes (FP) for research of the EU and the programmes of the Nordic Council of Ministers.

Research of the RC SocStats and the associated international research groups covers topics in survey sampling and survey methodology, multivariate methods and measurement errors, non-parametric and robust statistical methods, empirical microeconometrics, time series econometrics, and demography.

In social statistics, the established research areas are the following. In survey methodology we have concentrated in assessing of and accounting for nonresponse and measurement error in empirical surveys. Special topics include statistical methods for imputation of item nonresponse and assessment of reliability and validity of measurement. In survey sampling we have concentrated both on cross-country sampling design and on estimation methods of population characteristics by using auxiliary information and complex modelling techniques. Examples are methods of modelling social phenomena and change, using integrated data sources and generalized linear mixed modelling. Small area estimation of indicators on poverty and social exclusion (such as at-risk-of-poverty rate, relative median at-risk-of-poverty gap and quintile share ratio) provides an example. Research is heavily relying on simulation experiments using multi-national (European) and Finnish data sources. The special property of the Finnish statistical data infrastructure for research, namely the availability of high-quality register information that can be merged with sample survey data at the micro level, is highly recognized.

The discipline continues research cooperation in empirical cross-country microeconometrics where a several years project on wage flexibility of 13 countries was ended in 2010. We also have participated in development of methodology for sampling and nonresponse treatment in the European Social Survey and the PISA 2006 project of the OECD. Moreover, we have developed the methodology for the harmonized European security survey, and also made a pilot survey in Finland in which three survey modes have been tested. Special area of the discipline is symbolic data analysis in which we have invented techniques to smartly aggregate survey micro data. Theoretical principles are developed by French and other Southern European researchers.

Research in non-parametric and robust methods is carried out by the Nonparametric and Robust Multivariate Methods (NRMM) research group. The aim is to develop multivariate nonparametric methods by using multivariate signs and ranks. The statistical properties of the new estimates and tests (large and small sample properties, equivariance, efficiency, robustness, etc.) are found and computationally efficient algorithms (R packages) will be developed.

The new techniques are applied to different high-dimensional data analysis problems in cooperation with other research groups. This research is carried out partly in cooperation with top scientists from the United States, Belgium, Canada, Russia and Switzerland.
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Research on multivariate methods and the effects of measurement errors is carried out combining theoretical and computational work as well as cooperation with applied researchers in the social and behavioral sciences. The focus is often on measurement quality, which is especially important in survey research, where random measurement error can be considerable.

Time series econometrics has concentrated on modern methods of modelling nonstationary and trending, typically economic, time series. Estimation and testing of nonstationary models by likelihood methods with focus in reducing the effect of nuisance parameters has been successfully explored. This line of research has involved collaboration with the Department of Mathematics and Statistics.

Research in demography focuses on developing statistical tools for analysing population dynamics and processes. The main focus has been on probabilistic forecasting. Examples of the work include stochastic diffusion model based forecasting of non-repeatable cohort processes such as first births or deaths, and Bayesian forecasting of fertility using priors on cohort schedules. Additionally, research has been done on the estimation of causal effects of macro environment on demographic processes in the presence of unobserved heterogeneity. The research is conducted within a collaborative network that includes scientists from the Max Planck Institute for Demographic Research (Germany), Bocconi University (Italy), University of Michigan (U.S.), and University of Pennsylvania (U.S.).

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

  Two points:
  - Improvement of interaction between the main research areas of the RC for increased innovativeness.
  - Identification of new research topics with great societal impact, e.g. in social and environmental statistics.

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

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

  A special feature of the RC SocStats is the fact that many of the doctoral students involved in the RC typically carry out their research part-time. All of the current doctoral candidates work as researchers or in related positions in collaborative research institutes, examples are the Research and Methodology Unit of Statistics Finland and the Research Department of the Social Insurance Institution of Finland. This characterizes well the commitment of our institutional partners. The arrangement is optimal for our doctoral candidates because the funding of their research and their time use for research are granted. In addition, career perspectives of doctoral candidates are assured.

  During the evaluation period a total of six students have completed their PhD dissertation. We have included four current doctoral candidates in the RC.

  Doctoral training follows basically the scheme applied in the Faculty of Social Sciences. Doctoral students must carry out further studies in statistical science and related disciplines by an amount of 60 ECTS credit units, where 50 units must come from statistical science.

  Let us describe the doctoral training scheme by an example. The RC SocStats students are encouraged to attend international summer schools and workshops in statistics. A good example is the Baltic-Nordic-
Ukrainian Network in Survey Statistics (BNU network), which organizes a training event every year in one of the Nordic or Baltic countries or in Ukraine. The events take one week and include a series of lectures given by invited high-level experts. In addition, it is obligatory for every participating student to give a paper on his or her research and act as opponent to a presentation of another student. A student also gains some credit units for completing these tasks. Students can apply for grants from the network to cover their participation costs. This scheme is documented in detail in the web pages of the BNU network (see also Point 4).

Our recruitment scheme to doctoral studies is based partly on recruiting good students from those who complete or have completed their Master’s studies in statistics or mathematics at the UH and partly by selecting new doctoral students from those who apply for further studies at the faculty. Let us briefly illustrate the first mentioned procedure with an example. Typically (especially in social statistics area), Master’s Thesis in statistics are prepared as a joint research project with the department and a collaborative research unit, such as the Research and Methodology Unit of Statistics Finland or the Research Department of the Social Insurance Institution. The project is funded by the collaborative unit (typically 6 months paid work by the student) and is jointly supervised by a department staff member and a subject-matter expert from the collaborative unit. Many of the current doctoral students have completed their Master’s thesis by this scheme and are then recruited to the staff of the collaborative unit. It is then natural to arrange the supervision in a similar fashion as for the Master’s thesis.

The RC also is involved in the Finnish Doctoral Programme in Stochastics and Statistics (FDPSS). Some of the senior members of the RC act as supervisors in the programme.

Senior members of the RC are often invited to supervise doctoral students, or act as faculty opponents in defense events of doctoral candidates, in other universities in Finland and abroad.

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

Strengths:
- Well established cooperational arrangements with partner research institutes in doctoral training of staff members.
- Commitment of partner institutes into doctoral training.
- Well established doctoral training schemes in some of the key research areas.
- Commitment of RC staff into doctoral supervision and training.

Challenges:
- Recruitment of further doctoral students.

3. Societal impact of research and doctoral training (max. 4400 characters with spaces)

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

As described in points 1 and 2, the RC SocStats has established good cooperational arrangements with certain research-oriented governmental units in Finland. The main collaborative partners are Statistics Finland (Tilastokeskus) and Social Insurance Institution (Kela). Based on an agreement between UH and Statistics Finland, a professorship in statistics is jointly funded by the partners. In addition, one of our
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professors works half-time at Statistics Finland and another professor works part-time as Research Professor at Social Insurance Institution. These examples indicate that there are direct interaction with the RC and the society in R&D related activities.

Research results of the RC often have high practical applicability. This especially holds for the R&D type of research involving the implementation of the results into practice. The new methods developed by the RC are aimed to replace an existing method or improve a production process. Examples of research topics with a practical orientation are reweighting methods for unit nonresponse adjustment and imputation methods for item nonresponse adjustment in sample surveys, and the estimation of population characteristics (e.g. ILO unemployment rate) for population subgroups and small areas by using methods developed by the RC. An example of our practical orientation is provided by the development of specialized estimation methods and programming the accompanying software in cooperation with Statistics Finland.

There are several examples of international societal impact of the RC. In EU’s Framework Programme (FP7) project AMELI (Advanced Methodology for European Laeken Indicators), we contribute to the development of accurate methods for the assessment of monetary poverty and social exclusion in Europe (more in Point 4). Our involvement in methodological development of large-scale European surveys such as the European Social Survey (ESS) and the PISA survey constitute important societal interaction. These examples indicate strong societal impact, because research results are used for EU-level and national evaluation and political planning.

The Baltic-Nordic-Ukrainian Network in Survey Statistics provides an example of international societal interaction and impact, aiming at methodological development of survey statistics infrastructures in the former Soviet states (more detailed description in Point 4).

RC members have invited in important positions in national and international research groups and networks, as documented in the Tuhat files. An example of cooperation with public sector outside Finland is the involvement of a RC member in the Scientific Advisory Commission of the German register-assisted Census 2011 ("Zensuskommission"). These commitments also provide an indication of societal interaction.

Our recruiting in doctoral training involves not only university students but also experts working outside the university, in governmental agencies for example (see Point 2). This property also tends to increase the interaction and societal impact of the RC.

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

Two points:
- Launching and involvement in R&D type research of substantial societal impact.
- Recruitment of doctoral students into the R&D type research projects.
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4 INTERNATIONAL AND NATIONAL (INCL. INTERSECTORAL) RESEARCH COLLABORATION AND RESEARCHER MOBILITY (MAX. 4400 CHARACTERS WITH SPACES)

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

Research of the RC is often carried out in collaborative international research groups and networks involving partners from different countries. Examples of research networks are the international network on Comparative Analysis of Enterprise Data (CAED) focusing on microeconometrics, the research consortium for the EU’s FP project AMELI focusing in social statistics, the Nonparametric and Robust Multivariate Methods (NRMM) research group, the European Working Group on Small Area Estimation (EWORSAE), and the network organizing the European Social Survey ESS. These activities are described in the corresponding websites.

The Baltic-Nordic-Ukrainian (BNU) Network on Survey Statistics provides a platform for international research cooperation and doctoral training. The aim of the network is long-term co-operation on education and research in survey statistics by exchange of knowledge and experiences. Efforts are made to strengthen contacts between university teachers, students, researchers and practitioners, between academic institutions, national statistical agencies, private institutions and 3rd section organizations, such as national statistical societies. The network also tries to promote interest among students and to motivate them to choose their professional career as survey statistician. Sample surveys are essential tools in a modern society to provide accurate information to politicians, businesses and the general public about the society. The creation and development of teaching and research capacity in universities is crucial for the establishment of good survey practice in government agencies and other sectors of the society. By the scheme of annual workshops and summer schools, the network also promotes student and teacher mobility (see Point 2).

As an example of involvement in planning of future research at the European level, two RC members are involved in the preparation of the next EU Framework Programme (FP) in Research in an international project launched by the European Commission (Eurostat).

The RC members have good international contacts and impact in research networks and groups (see Points 1 and 3). This holds for certain areas of survey statistics, non-parametric and robust methods and demography in particular. As an example on research networking in demography, research is carried out in an international network consisting of researchers from UH, Germany, Italy and the U.S.

Members of the RC have appointed in important positions in steering committees and similar bodies of the international networks and research groups we are involved in, and in editorial boards of international journals in statistics. Members of the RC are regularly invited in scientific committees of international conferences in statistics, indicating that our key researchers are internationally well recognized in the fields they are operating.

Our research profile is broad covering theoretical and applied research and R&D (see Point 1). Publication of research results in different platforms, including international statistical journals and conferences, increases the international scientific impact of the UH. Publication of research results in more applied journals widens the scientific impact to other disciplines.
RC-SPECIFIC STAGE 2 MATERIAL

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

Strengths:
- Well established international research and education networks.

Challenges:
- Improvement of researcher mobility.

5 OPERATIONAL CONDITIONS (MAX. 4400 CHARACTERS WITH SPACES)

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

Some of the RC's operational conditions are the following.

Research of the RC covers both theoretical topics in statistical science and more applied topics. Orientation towards practical applicability of research results constitutes an important operational framework for the RC. Research networks often involve institutions who intend to implement results of joint research projects in their production processes. This holds for research in social and official statistics in particular; examples of such institutes are national statistical institutes and Eurostat, the statistical office of the EU that maintains the European Statistical System. The aim of research is often to improve the existing statistical methods of analyzing important social and economic phenomenon, such as poverty, unemployment, crime, economic recession. Because of these properties, the research can often be characterized by the acronym R&D.

Because of the network-type operational framework of the RC, the collaborators are not always formally affiliated to the UH.

Research work, costs and risks are shared between partners of a network providing a special operational framework of the RC.

The members of the RC are active in providing methodological support to other scientists in Finland and especially for researchers in social and behavioral sciences at the UH. These activities tend to impact positively to the methodological competence of empirical research at the UH. During this evaluation period this "hidden" support has increased.

Members of the RC are active in teaching courses in their special areas at UH and other universities in Finland and abroad.

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

Strengths:
- Well established operational framework.

Challenges:
- Recruitment of visiting collaborative researchers more regularly.
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6 LEADERSHIP AND MANAGEMENT IN THE RESEARCHER COMMUNITY (MAX. 4400 CHARACTERS WITH SPACES)

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

The core of the RC constitutes of independent researchers who belong to the staff of UH and apply management procedures of the UH. In a networking type operational framework, leadership and management follow procedures of the given parent research project. For example, projects that are funded by the European Commission Framework Programmes, apply management and leadership procedures that have been established for these programmes.

- RC’s strengths and challenges related to leadership and management, and the actions planned for developing the processes.
  Strengths:
  - Well established management and leadership schemes.
  Challenges:
  - Development of management and leadership schemes to better support the RC’s research focus.

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:

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

  - European Union (EU) - total amount of funding (in euros) EU has decided to allocate to the RC members during 1.1.2005-31.12.2010: 200000

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

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

- Other national funding (incl. EVO funding and Ministry of Education and Culture funded doctoral programme positions) - names of other national funding organizations which have decided to allocate funding to the RC members during 1.1.2005-31.12.2010, and the amount of their funding (in euros).
  - names of the funding organizations: Statistics Finland, Social Insurance Institution, Hki/Tieke
  - total amount of funding (in euros) from the above-mentioned funding organizations: 280000

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

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

Main components of the strategic action plan of the RC for 2011-2013 are the following.

1. Research and teaching
   - Strengthening of resources in the key research and teaching areas including staff and funding.
   - Further involvement in international research projects, including EU’s Framework Programmes.
   - Strengthening of research and teaching cooperation with the main partner universities in Europe.
   - Strengthening of research cooperation with the main partner research institutes in Europe.
   - Further involvement in international research and education networks.
   - Improvement of interaction between the main research areas of the RC for increased innovativeness.

2. Societal impact
   - Launching of new research projects with great societal impact, e.g. in social and environmental statistics.
   - Recruitment of doctoral students into the R&D type research projects.

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

The Stage 2 material for RC SocStats has been compiled in cooperation with the RC members and with the lead of the RC’s responsible person. The material from Stage 1 have been extended considerably for the Stage 2 material.
## 1 Analysis of publications

- Associated person is one of Seppo Laaksonen, Risto Lehtonen, Kimmo Vehkalahti, Jyrki Möttönen, Pekka Pere, Maria Valaste, Ari Veijanen, Mikko Myrskylä, Lauri Tarkkonen.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Publication type</th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>Total Count 2005 - 2010</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A1 Refereed journal article</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A3 Contribution to book/other compilations (refereed)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A4 Article in conference publication (refereed)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B1 Unrefereed journal article</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B3 Unrefereed article in conference proceedings</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C1 Published scientific monograph</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D1 Article in professional journal</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D4 Published development or research report</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D5 Text book or professional handbook or guidebook or dictionary</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E1 Popular article, newspaper article</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I2 ICT programs or applications</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2 Listing of publications

A1 Refereed journal article

2005

2006

2007

2008

2009
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SocStats/Lehtonen

Myrskylä, M, Chang, VW 2009, ‘Weight change, initial BMI, and mortality among middle- and older-aged adults.’, Epidemiology, vol 20, no. 6, pp. 840-848.

2010

A3 Contribution to book/other compilations (refereed)

2005

2006
Laaksonen, S 2006, ‘Non-Exact vs. Exact Matching with Applications to Wages Statistics’, Recent Developments and Applications In Social Research Methodology, Barbara Budrich, Opladen.

2007

2008
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2007


2008
Lehtonen, R 2008. Cooperation between statistical authorities and research bodies.

2009

2010


B1 Unrefered journal article

2005

2006

2007
2008

2009

2010

B3 Unrefereed article in conference proceedings

2005
Lehtonen, R. 2005, Teaching environment for survey sampling based on a textbook and its Web extension,.
Myrskylä, M. 2005, When is logistic GREG more accurate than linear GREG?, Paper presented at Proceedings of the 9th Workshop on Survey Sampling Theory and Methodology, Lithuania,.

2006
Lehtonen, R, Myrskylä, M, Särndal, C, Veijanen, A. 2006, Model-assisted and model-dependent estimation for domains and small areas under unequal probability sampling,.

2009
Lehtonen, R. 2009, Estimation for domains and small areas with design-based and model-based methods,.
Valaste, M. 2009, Measurement error in survey data,.

2010
Laaksonen, S, Heiskanen, M. 2010, ‘Unit non-response and victimisation by three survey modes. Results from Finnish European Security Survey.’, in 21th Household Survey Nonresponse Workshop, 29 August-1 September, Nuremberg,.
Lehtonen, R, Veijanen, A. 2010, Estimation of poverty indicators for domains with unit-level auxiliary information under unequal probability sampling,.
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C1 Published scientific monograph

2005

2006

2007

2009

2010

D1 Article in professional journal

2005

D4 Published development or research report

2010

D5 Text book or professional handbook or guidebook or dictionary

2008

E1 Popular article, newspaper article

2007
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2008

2010

IJ ICT programs or applications

2007
VLSS: Virtual Laboratory in Survey Sampling, WWW

2009
MMN: Multivariate Nonparametric Methods: An Approach Based on Spatial Signs and Ranks

2010
OjaNP: Multivariate Methods Based on the Oja Median and Related Concepts
### 1 Analysis of activities 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>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prizes and awards</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Editor of research journal</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peer review of manuscripts</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Membership or other role in research network</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Membership or other role in national/international committee, council, board</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Membership or other role in public Finnish or international organization</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participation in interview for written media</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participation in radio programme</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participation in TV programme</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2 Listing of activities 2005-2010

Supervisor or co-supervisor of doctoral thesis

Seppo Laaksonen,
PhD in statistics, Seppo Laaksonen, 31.01.2003 → 20.02.2008, Finland
PhD in economics, Seppo Laaksonen, 01.01.2007 → 04.02.2009, Finland
PhD in Social Psychology, Seppo Laaksonen, 09.05.2009, Finland
Risto Lehtonen,
Supervision of PhD in Statistics, University of Jyväskylä, Risto Lehtonen, 2009 → ..., Finland
Kimmo Vehkalahti,
Supervising statistical methods in Johanna Vinkula’s doctoral thesis in West and South Slavonic Languages and Cultures, Kimmo Vehkalahti, 2009 → 2011, Finland
Supervising statistical methods in Ville Peltiäläinen’s doctoral thesis in Leadership, Kimmo Vehkalahti, 2007 → 2010, Finland
Supervising statistical methods in Minna Tervala’s doctoral thesis in Phonetics, Kimmo Vehkalahti, 2009 → 2011, Finland
Supervising statistical methods in Tomas Lehecka’s doctoral thesis in Nordic Languages and Literature, Kimmo Vehkalahti, 2009 → 2010, Finland

Prizes and awards

Seppo Laaksonen,
Who’s Who in the World, Seppo Laaksonen, 01.01.2010 → 31.12.2010, United States
Kimmo Vehkalahti,
Good Teacher, Kimmo Vehkalahti, 10.06.2009, Finland
Best Teacher of the City, Kimmo Vehkalahti, 07.10.2010, Finland

Editor of research journal

Risto Lehtonen,
Statistics in Transition - new series, Risto Lehtonen, 2005 → ..., Poland
ASIA - Advances in Statistical Analysis, Risto Lehtonen, 2007 → ..., Serbia

Peer review of manuscripts

Kimmo Vehkalahti,
Peer review for Journal of Multivariate Analysis, Kimmo Vehkalahti, 2008 → 2009
Peer review for Psychometrika, Kimmo Vehkalahti, 2008
Peer review for Scandinavian Actuarial Journal, Kimmo Vehkalahti, 2009

Membership or other role in research network

Risto Lehtonen,
Baltic-Nordic-Ukrainian Network on Survey Statistics, Risto Lehtonen, 2005 → ...
EWORSAE - the European Working Group on Small Area Estimation, Risto Lehtonen, 2007 → ...

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

Seppo Laaksonen,
International Evaluation of Research and Doctoral Training at the University of Helsinki

RC-Specific Tuhat Compilations of Other Scientific Activities 2005-2010

SocStats/Lehtonen

CAED (Comparative Analysis of Enterprise Data Global Network), Seppo Laaksonen, 06.1999 → ...
European Social Survey Sampling Expert Panel, Seppo Laaksonen, 01.11.2001 → ..., Germany
Scandinavian Journal of Statistics, Seppo Laaksonen, 15.06.2007 → ..., Denmark
Vice-president of the International Association of Survey Statisticians, Seppo Laaksonen, 21.08.2007 → 23.08.2009, Brazil
COST Comparative Analysis of Enterprise Data (CAED), Seppo Laaksonen, 12.02.2008 → 31.05.2012, United Kingdom
Nomination Committee of the International Association of Survey Statisticians (IASS), Seppo Laaksonen, 01.09.2008 → 28.02.2009
FEDERATION OF FINNISH LEARNED SOCIETIES, Seppo Laaksonen, 01.01.2009 → 31.12.2011, Finland
Terms in Science, Seppo Laaksonen, 11.19.2010 → ..., Finland

Risto Lehtonen,  
Tilastokeskuksen tieteellinen neuvoiltajakunta - Scientific Advisory Board of Statistics Finland, Risto Lehtonen, 01.01.1996 → 31.12.2012
56th Session of the International Statistical Institute, 2005, Risto Lehtonen, 2005
56th Session of the International Statistical Institute, Risto Lehtonen, 2007
Zensuskommission 2011 - Census Committee 2011, Risto Lehtonen, 2007 → ...
AMELI - Advanced Methodology for European Laeken Indicators, Risto Lehtonen, 2008 → ...
SAE2009 Conference on Small Area Estimation, Risto Lehtonen, 2008 → 2009

Membership or other role in public Finnish or international organization

Kimmo Vehkalahti,  
Membership in the Finnish Society of Biostatistics, Kimmo Vehkalahti, 2000 → ..., Finland
Membership in the Psychometric Society, Kimmo Vehkalahti, 01.01.2007 → ...
Membership in the International Association for Statistical Education (IASE), Kimmo Vehkalahti, 01.01.2010 → ...
Vice Chair of Finnish Statistical Society, Kimmo Vehkalahti, 2010 → ..., Finland

Participation in interview for written media

Seppo Laaksonen,  
Author of Iraqi Deaths Study Sanctioned, Seppo Laaksonen, 09.03.2009, United States
Kimmo Vehkalahti,  
Lähikuvaassa, Kimmo Vehkalahti, 18.19.2010 → 23.10.2010, Finland

Participation in radio programme

Seppo Laaksonen,  
Poli ennakkoluuloista, Seppo Laaksonen, 31.12.2009, Finland

Participation in TV programme

Kimmo Vehkalahti,  
Survo Puzzle challenges Sudoku, Kimmo Vehkalahti, 04.10.2006, 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/) 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 – CoCoLoC
Heikkilä, Markku – RCSP
Heinämäa, Sara – SHC
Henriksson, Markku – CITI
Janhunen, Juha – LDHFTA
Kajava Mika, – AMNE
Klippi, Anu – Interaction
Knuutilla, 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, Tuja – Gender Studies
Pyrhönen, Heta – ART
Ruokanen, Miikka – RELDIAL
Saarinen, Risto – RELSOC
Sandu, Gabriel – LMPS
Tarasti, Eero – MusSig
Vehmas-Lehto, Inkeri – TraST
Östman, Jan-Ola – LMS

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

The next appendix includes the analyses of the RC under discussion.
SocStats/Lehtonen

Category 3. The research of the participating community is distinct from mainstream research, and the special features of the research tradition in the field must be considered in the evaluation.

Number of authors in publications/year

Typically, the publications of this group have 1-3 authors. The following table shows the breakdown of papers with 1...10 authors:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number 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>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Total</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>125</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

% of authors in publications 2005-2010

- 1 au: 50%
- 2 au: 22%
- 3 au: 15%
- 4 au: 7%
- 5 au: 3%
- 6 au: 2%
- 10 au: 1%
Language of publications / Year

Out of 125 publications, 98 are in English and 26 are in Finnish. The Finnish language publications are mainly papers published by local publishers, associations and societies (such as: Finnish Statistical Society).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language</th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>Grand Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>en_GB</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fi_FI</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fr_FR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Total</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>125</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Language of publications 2005-2010

![Language of publications 2005-2010](chart.png)
### Journal / Year / Total

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Journals</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>International Statistical Review</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journal of official statistics : an international review publ. by Statistics Sweden.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donelaitis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hyvinvointikatsaus</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kansantaloudellinen Aikakauskirja</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solmu : matematiikalehti</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statistics in transition.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Survey methodology : a journal of Statistics Canada</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Survey statistician</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comparative Political Studies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computational Statistics &amp; Data Analysis</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demographic Research</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Epidemiology</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finnish Economic Papers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fisheries Research</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICES Journal of Marine Science</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Journal of Manpower</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Journal of Market Research</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journal of Autism and Developmental Disorders</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journal of Multivariate Analysis</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journal of the American Statistical Association</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kanava</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Koulutuksen arviointineuvoston julkaisuja</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Model Assisted Statistics and Applications</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Journal ranking (Norway, Australia, ERIH)

#### Norway ranking
Level 2 = highest scientific, Level 1= scientific

#### Australian ranking

**A**

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

**B**

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

**C**

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Journal Name</th>
<th>Norway Rank</th>
<th>Australia Rank</th>
<th>ERIH Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nature</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peda-Forum</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Piirtoheiten verkk-oetukseen verkkolehti</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population and Development Review</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research letters in the information and mathematical sciences</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Talous &amp; yhteiskunta</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Grand Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>7</strong></td>
<td><strong>6</strong></td>
<td><strong>12</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Nature                                           | 1           |                |           |
| Peda-Forum                                       | 1           |                |           |
| Piirtoheiten verkk-oetukseen verkkolehti         | 1           |                |           |
| Population and Development Review                | 1           |                |           |
| Research letters in the information and mathematical sciences | 1           |                |           |
| Talous & yhteiskunta                              | 1           |                |           |
| **Grand Total**                                  | **14**      | **6**          | **9**     |

| Nature                                           | 1           |                |           |
| Peda-Forum                                       | 1           |                |           |
| Piirtoheiten verkk-oetukseen verkkolehti         | 1           |                |           |
| Population and Development Review                | 1           |                |           |
| Research letters in the information and mathematical sciences | 1           |                |           |
| Talous & yhteiskunta                              | 1           |                |           |
| **Grand Total**                                  | **12**      | **14**         | **6**     |

| Nature                                           | 1           |                |           |
| Peda-Forum                                       | 1           |                |           |
| Piirtoheiten verkk-oetukseen verkkolehti         | 1           |                |           |
| Population and Development Review                | 1           |                |           |
| Research letters in the information and mathematical sciences | 1           |                |           |
| Talous & yhteiskunta                              | 1           |                |           |
| **Grand Total**                                  | **6**       | **9**          | **54**    |
Tier C includes quality, peer reviewed, journals that do not meet the criteria of the higher tiers.

**ERIH ranking 2007-2008**

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

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

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

C = European publications with a recognized scholarly significance among researchers in the respective research domains in a particular readership group in Europe; occasionally cited outside the publishing country, though the main target group is the domestic academic community.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>International Statistical Review</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journal of official statistics : an international review</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statistics in transition.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Survey methodology : a journal of Statistics Canada</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comparative Political Studies</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computational Statistics &amp; Data Analysis</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demographic Research</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Epidemiology</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>A*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finnish Economic Papers</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fisheries Research</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IESS Journal of Marine Science</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Journal of Manpower</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Journal of Market Research</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journal of Autism and Developmental Disorders</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journal of Multivariate Analysis</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journal of the American Statistical Association</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>A*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KanavA</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Model Assisted Statistics and Applications</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nature</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>A*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population and Development Review</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>A*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand total</td>
<td>39</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There are 54 articles, of which 39 (72%) are published in journals that include in international journal ranking lists.
Amount of ranked articles (Norway)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Norway</th>
<th>Journal articles</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Level 2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level 1</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Amount of ranked articles (Australian)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Australia</th>
<th>Journal articles</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Level A*</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level A</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level B</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level C</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Book publishers

Publisher ranking (based on Norwegian ranking list)

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

c1 Published scientific monograph  
d4 published development research  
d5 Text book or professional handbook or guidebook or dictionary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Publisher</th>
<th>c1</th>
<th>d4</th>
<th>d5</th>
<th>Grand Total</th>
<th>Publisher ranking</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tammi</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helsinki University Press</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
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