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Foreword

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

1.1 RC-specific evaluation reports

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

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

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

1.2 Aims and objectives in the evaluation

The aims of the evaluation are as follows:

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

1.3 Evaluation method

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

---

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

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

**Five stages of the evaluation method were:**

1. Registration – Stage 1
2. Self-evaluation – Stage 2
3. TUHAT\(^5\) compilations on publications and other scientific activities\(^6\)
4. External evaluation
5. Public reporting

**1.4 Implementation of the external evaluation**

**Five Evaluation Panels**

Five evaluation panels consisted of independent, renowned and highly respected experts. The main domains of the panels are:

1. biological, agricultural and veterinary sciences
2. medicine, biomedicine and health sciences
3. natural sciences
4. humanities
5. social sciences

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

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

The panel meetings were held in Helsinki:

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

---

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Evaluation material

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

Background material

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

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

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

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

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

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

- Strengths
- Areas of development
- Other remarks
- Recommendations

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

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

The additional material: TUHAT compilation of the RC’s other scientific activities/supervision of doctoral dissertations
A written feedback from the aspects of: processes and good practices related to leadership and management

- Strengths
- Areas of development
- Other remarks
- Recommendations

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

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

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

- Strengths
- Areas of development
- Other remarks
- Recommendations

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

13. RC-specific conclusions

1.7 Evaluation criteria

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

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

Description of criteria levels

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

Classification: Criteria (level of procedures and results)

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

**Question 2 – DOCTORAL TRAINING**

**Question 3 – SOCIETAL IMPACT**

**Question 4 – COLLABORATION**

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

**Question 9 – CATEGORY**

Participation category – fitness for the category chosen

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

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

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

3. The research of the participating community is distinct from mainstream research, and the special
features of the research tradition in the field must be considered in the evaluation. The research is
of high quality and has great significance and impact in its field. However, the generally used
research evaluation methods do not necessarily shed sufficient light on the merits of the
research.

4. The research of the participating community represents an innovative opening. A new opening can
be an innovative combination of research fields, or it can be proven to have a special social,
national or international demand or other significance. Even if the researcher community in its
present composition has yet to obtain proof of international success, its members can produce
convincing evidence of the high level of their previous research.

5. The research of the participating community has a highly significant societal impact. The
participating researcher community is able to justify the high social significance of its research.
The research may relate to national legislation, media visibility or participation in social debate,
or other activities promoting social development and human welfare. In addition to having
societal impact, the research must be of a high standard.

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

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

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

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

---

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

The main timetable of the evaluation:

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

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

1.9 Evaluation feedback – consensus of the entire panel

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

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

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

2.1 Focus and quality of the RC’s research

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

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

This is a small, well-established and very productive research group covering an impressive range of archaeological time periods and with a wide range of practical and technological expertise. While the work of the group is international, the majority of the work under review here (i.e. that funded in the period 2005-2010) was undertaken in Finland and other Northern European countries. Such an international spread with a local focus is quite normal in a high quality research group in archeology.

The group seems well organized and productive for its size. The work of the group is clearly driven by what they can raise funding for rather than by the vision of one or more members of staff. Whether or not this is desirable, it is the reality for many archaeological research groups around the world and should not be seen as a particular weakness of ARCH-HU.

The group seems to have lots of on-going and planned activities that will take their work forward in the coming years. All seem sensible assuming similar funding levels to those in recent years and are entirely in line with the kind of work they have been doing successfully for many years.

The recent investment in equipment is to be celebrated, but the group still seems to lack key facilities. Lack of space and a shortage of funds to routinely replace IT equipment both hamper the work of the group. What is not clear from the documentation is the primary reasons for these shortcomings and what avenues are open to the group, including from the university, to invest in up-to-date equipment. Rolling replacement of obsolete IT equipment, in particular, seems a key priority for the next few years.

Numeric evaluation: 4 (Excellent)

2.2 Practises and quality of doctoral training

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

ASPECTS: Processes and good practices related to leadership and management

The group has a very large number of PhD students for its size. Indeed so many that one wonders how they manage to offer high quality supervision to so many students given their other duties. How does the group achieve this in practice? Do the more experienced students play a role in helping to supervise the less experienced ones, for example?
As with their own research plans, the group’s plans for doctoral training are largely reactive (rather than proactive) since they seem to need to draw on sources of funding as they come available. That said, given the success of the group in attracting PhD students in recent years, there is reason to be optimistic that they will be able to continue to attract both candidates and funding to support them and that the students will work on projects directly of interest to the staff in the RC.

**Numeric evaluation: 4 (Excellent)**

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

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

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

Archaeology as a discipline captures the imagination of the press and the general public and so most archaeological research units have good records of societal impact. This group is no exception. They have clearly worked on some high profile projects (both locally and internationally) and have found ways to communicate their findings not just to their peers, but to a considerably wider audience (including via print and broadcast media). Assuming that such communication is making an impact (i.e. is being read and watched by a wide audience), for which no evidence seems to have been requested in this review, then this group should be considered successful under this heading. Their societal impact is largely local rather than international, but this is to be expected given the nature of their work and should not be seen as a weakness.

The group does not seem to have any particular plans to seek ways to increase their societal impact, but there is probably scope for this if they choose to invest further resources. Indeed, it is possible that the group could make a greater impact for relatively little extra effort by tapping into assistance from the University – as peer reviewers, we are, however, not informed whether such assistance exists. We hope that they could tell a little more about what options are available from the University, which ones they are already using and which ones might be relevant in future.

**Numeric evaluation: 3.5 (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

This seems to be a particular strength of the RC. The number and quality of links to colleagues in Finland, in neighbouring countries and around the world is very impressive. Indeed, maybe this is the key to the productivity of such a small group?

How does the group create and maintain so many links simultaneously? Do they proactively seek such links or do others come to them? How important are their PhD students in creating and maintaining the links?
Looking to the future, is there potential benefit to be gained from widening the international collaborations still further? Via an international training network or similar?

**Numeric evaluation: 4 (Excellent)**

### 2.5 Operational conditions

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

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

Without meeting the group, it is hard to assess day-to-day operations. However, from what we can tell from the paperwork, the RC seems to function well. Their small size and regular meetings must help with this.

The group seems to have rather a lot of administration to do. What kind of administration is it? Who requires that it is done? Is there no potential for sharing at least some of it with the larger department of which they are a part? The recent merger should surely provide some economies of scale?

The next few years will clearly be a telling period for this group given the recent merger into the much larger department. We can understand why they say very little about their own plans for changing, developing or improving operational conditions in the present circumstances – as they say, they now have less control than they did before. Nonetheless, a proactive response is surely preferable to reacting to the outside pressures as they arise?

### 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**

In addition to the recent merger, which (as the group say in their submission) has changed the leadership structure considerably, the leadership of their group is complex because of the autonomy that the PIs have to set their own research agendas. This is a key part of academic freedom, of course, but does make it hard for a small group which works well to say anything very concrete about their leadership. Again, without meeting the group, it is hard to assess how well the style works. From the paperwork, it seems to be working as well as can be expected, but one cannot help wondering whether a more proactive leadership style might not result in the group having greater control over their destiny.
2.7 External competitive funding of the RC

• The RCs were asked to provide information of such external competitive funding, where:
  • the funding decisions have been made during 1.1.2005–31.12.2010, and
  • the administrator of the funding is/has been the University of Helsinki

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

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

The group raises an impressive amount of its own funding from a very large number of sponsors including some from outside of Finland. Applying for and administering these funds is a burden on such a small group.

Given that most of the funding is tied to a particular project, and that this is quite typical in archaeology around the world, it is hard to see how this small group could do better in this area than they are doing at present without more core staff. Can core staff only be hired if further funding from non-competitive sources is found? If so, what are the options for improving this?

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 group’s planned work is as diverse as their recent work since they intend to build on recent successes. Capitalizing on investment in this way is sensible of course, but we would like to have seen slightly more evidence here of direction and leadership.

In this section of the report, the RC tell us: “Defining an exact research area for ARCH-HU is difficult, because all the principal investigators and PhD researchers have their own fields of expertise. Archaeologists are needed for different research purposes, which is why concentrating in only one area is difficult for the small RC.”

To us this statement could mean many things and we are slightly concerned that it may suggest a lack of vision and/or ambition on the part of the group. While we are sympathetic to the general argument that archaeology is a large discipline and that this group is as successful as it is partly because of its diversity and versatility, we would have liked to have seen greater evidence of leadership and vision in this part of the review paperwork.

Given the recent merger with other departments, some things must be changing in the local environment to which the group will need to respond to. In the light of this, and the desire by the group to improve their space and IT provision, we had expected to see evidence of some more proactive planning.
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.

Of the categories on offer, the group has chosen entirely appropriately and offered the review panel more than adequate evidence that the fit to it is good. The selection of category is determined as much by the very nature of the discipline of archaeology as it is by the work of this particular group, however.

The review panel might have suggested for this group the category 6 – not provided by the evaluation parameters: “doing solid and internationally respected work within the tradition of the field of research”.

Numeric evaluation: 5 (Outstanding)

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

The description of the method of compilation suggests that the group works well together, is well organised and has procedures in place that allow it to respond efficiently to requests for documentation of this kind. They seem to be experienced and well organised administrators, as their description of their day-to-day work would suggest.

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

Focus area 4: The thinking and learning human being

The RC align themselves with the focus area known as The Thinking and Learning Human Being. This is the most appropriate of the areas on offer, and the RC explains their links to it, but the links are not strong. It is not clear to the Panel what these focus areas are intended to do to help RC groups like this one.

2.12 RC-specific main recommendations

The RC has a solid research tradition; placing itself in category 3, the group perceives itself as something special requiring to be regarded under those auspices. There is impressive funding from diverse and prestigious sources – often acquired in interdisciplinary collaboration with other research initiatives.

The doctoral training possibilities – including within a national graduate network as well as a Nordic/Baltic network - are very good and should be maintained. The opportunity of some doctoral students to conduct their work under the Center of Excellence “the Ancient Greek Written Sources” is also positive.

The RC might, however, endeavor to coordinate the activities among its PIs and their divergent projects more strongly so as to provide a coherent core for doctoral students in archeology - esp. given the highly diverse research engagements pursued by the PIs in this RC. More inner cohesion or vision emanating from the PIs could add to the profile of the group – without lessening the breadth of the undergraduate training in methods and fields (which appears to be a major concern of the RC)

With ca. 30 doctoral students, the RC clearly attracts junior scholars’ interest – though this places a big burden on relatively few faculty mentors (with just one professor in the field). This also brings about an early specialization of young scholars – more intragroup exchange as part of the doctoral training is advised.
The group conducts in part work that also plays a role in major societal or global issues and a proactive “social impact” stance might consists in finding ways to foster social awareness for the relevance of archeological research also in such areas.

It is difficult to judge the weight of academic obligations besides research, but one has to assume, given the amount of doctoral students, that there is very little time for research for the PIs engaged in teaching, and one would like to have the university address this issue in this RC particularly, as archeological primary research demands field stays, complex expeditions, and interfacing with other fields on a very different epistemological footing (such as the successful cooperation with Science and Technology in research tool design). It would be important for the dean as well as the university to discuss such issues directly with the RC.

2.13 RC-specific conclusions

This RC continues a broad research trajectory in archeology, with its name indicating a previous disciplinary unit now operating under new departmental structures. The report emphasizes the need to maintain the current breadth of research directions as there is also a teaching obligation to offer insight into the breadth of the field and students do get tied into the research as well – though students then generally also remain within one area and the doctoral training supports this early specialization.

The RC has excellent international networks and enjoys international recognition. This is certainly an asset within the doctoral training that could also be fore-grounded further.

In terms of publication record, the number of non-Finnish publications is very good, though of course also a result of the internationally lodged research cooperation where publishing in a lingua franca is vital.

The group is very successful in securing grant moneys for which it is to be commended. Given the present era of transformations, though, the RC might consider shifting from a more reactive approach to pursuing research and grant opportunities to organize itself into a more focused group, with individual PIs also cooperating more closely so as to reach a more strongly discernible profile.

The RC is to be commended for its broad engagement in the field of archeology; but one would be interested to know to what extent the Helsinki unit differs from others within Finland, as this discipline is pursued at other Finnish universities as well. The RC might also endeavor to see what openings the new departmental structure holds for boundary-crossing endeavors.
3 Appendices

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

B. Bibliometric analyses
   a. Analysis provided by CWTS/University of Leiden
   b. Analysis provided by Helsinki University Library (66 RCs)
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)
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Name: Lavento, Mika
E-mail: 
Phone: 09 191 23578
Affiliation: Archaeology
Street address: Unioninkatu 38 F

2 DESCRIPTION OF THE PARTICIPATING RESEARCHER COMMUNITY (RC)

Name of the participating RC (max. 30 characters): Archaeology (in the Department of Philosophy, History, Culture and Art Studies)

Acronym for the participating RC (max. 10 characters): ARCH-HU

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): Archaeology is a major subject in the University of Helsinki. It belongs to the Department of Philosophy, History, Culture and Art Studies in the Faculty of Arts. ARCH-HU as a RC includes the teaching and research of archaeology on PhD level and a number of research projects. ARCH-HU is a small unit if measured in terms of permanent staff and the annual budget for teaching and supervising students on BA, MA and PhD levels. These resources depend mostly on the financial situation of the University. During the period 2005–2010 the permanent staff was 4 persons: Professor, University Lecturer, University Instructor, and Amanuensis. Yearly eight new students begin their studies in the Univ. of Helsinki with archaeology as their major subject. ARCH-HU has ca 30 doctoral students (November 2010). The research is done in the framework of temporary projects that apply for funding from outside the University, most often from cultural foundations or the Academy of Finland. In certain cases ARCH-HU has received research funding from the University. In projects, research is usually conducted by the affiliated postdoctoral and senior researchers and doctoral students, or these work together with the permanent staff as co-leaders. It is a great advantage that ARCH-HU educates young researchers from the very beginning and a few of them can start their scientific career in the projects already in their student time. Thus the RC has members from all levels of the scientific ladder from third-year students to senior researchers. The projects organized by ARCH-HU usually have multi-disciplinary and international character. Accordingly, ARCH-HU participates in a number of projects launched by PIs who are affiliated with other departments of the Univ. of Helsinki or other research institutes in Finland and abroad. The scientific profile of ARCH-HU is multi-faced. This means that ARCH-HU has not chosen any single specific field of archaeology to concentrate on. We support the many-sidedness of archaeology and its methodological variability both nationally and in international contexts.
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RC-SPECIFIC STAGE 1 MATERIAL (registration form)

3 SCIENTIFIC FIELDS OF THE RC

Main scientific field of the RC’s research: humanities

RC’s scientific subfield 1: Archaeology
RC’s scientific subfield 2: Geosciences, Multidisciplinary
RC’s scientific subfield 3: Environmental Sciences
RC’s scientific subfield 4: Humanities, Multidisciplinary

Other, if not in the list: Engineering sciences

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): Special features of the research tradition in archaeology as a science include: 1) There is strong emphasis on the search of empiric material and basic research of the discovered sites and artifacts; 2) Chosen methods have considerable consequences on the results during field work, post-excavation work and further research; 3) The variety of theoretical orientations is large and there is continuous discussion about interpretations of the materials; 4) The research is international in character: analogies are often found from faraway areas or different cultural context; 5) The work in multi-disciplinary: cooperation with natural sciences is necessary for understanding environmental contexts; 6) Technical innovations in engineering sciences frequently give possibilities to apply corresponding methods to archaeology. For these reasons, the research at ARCH-HU is distinct from the mainstream in Faculty of Arts in the HU. The research is of high quality. There are a few affiliated post-doc researchers who are reaching the international top level regarding their own specific field of study (e.g. rock art, osteoarchaeology, Sámi archaeology). The senior researchers have already reached international recognition in their studies of pioneer settlement in the Arctic zone and stone technology. The strength of ARCH-HU is the continuously increasing cooperation with biosciences, geosciences, engineering sciences, linguistics, history disciplines, and classical archaeology. The RC has joined several new multidisciplinary projects during 2005–2010. One developing field is the maritime cultural heritage. ARCH-HU offers supervising to doctoral students in a large variety of themes. The research projects are temporary in character; thus ARCH-HU would be productive on a specific field of study only as long as funding is available for a certain project or specialist(s). On the other hand ARCH-HU does not aim at one chosen break-through that would give the RC a sharp but only narrow scientific profile. The many-sidedness of the work should be taken into account in the evaluation. There are no simple criteria to measure cost-effectiveness in archaeology.

5 DESCRIPTION OF THE RC’S RESEARCH AND DOCTORAL TRAINING

Public description of the RC’s research and doctoral training (MAX. 2200 characters with spaces): The acronym ARCH-HU is applied for archaeology, a major subject in the Department of Philosophy, History, Culture and Art Studies. The RC includes 1) the teaching and research of archaeology on BA, MA and PhD
levels and 2) a number of research projects. The research is done in the framework of temporary projects that apply for funding from outside the University. The mission of the RC is twofold: 1) multi-disciplinary research of past material culture and human beings and 2) international participation in the search for empiric archaeological materials and theoretical analysis. During the period 2005-2010 both of these aspects were strongly developed, partly in cooperation with biosciences, geosciences, engineering sciences, linguistics, history disciplines, and classical archaeology. ARCH-HU conducted research periods as varied as the Palaeolithic in Jordan, the Mesolithic and Neolithic Stone Age in Finland and neighboring areas, the Metal Ages, the Medieval and post-Medieval times, and modern history up to the II World War. ARCH-HU has a global perspective. Affiliated researchers worked in Scandinavia, NW Russia, Siberia, the Near East, the Mediterranean area, East Africa, Bolivia, and Canada. Preliminary and final results of research are regularly published in international peer-reviewed periodicals and as monographs, mainly in English. New methodological openings were made in 2005–2010. One of the focus areas is archaeological prospecting and documentation with new and sophisticated equipments. ARCH-HU does not aim at one single breakthrough that would tie most of the affiliated researchers and give the RC a sharp but narrow scientific profile. We support the many-sidedness of archaeology and its methodological variability both nationally and in international contexts. The RC carries social responsibility for spreading knowledge of prehistory, early history and archaeological methods to the public. This is done via the Open University, Helsinki Summer University, and publishing of textbooks. ARCH-HU represents the Univ. of Helsinki in negotiations whenever the general conditions of archaeological research and antiquarian work are discussed in Finland.

Significance of the RC’s research and doctoral training for the University of Helsinki (MAX. 2200 characters with spaces): ARCH-HU is alone responsible for general archaeology as major and minor at the Univ. of Helsinki. Courses in archaeological field methods are attended also by students and postgraduates of other disciplines. In addition, the professor of archaeology is responsible for maritime archaeology. The international orientation of the RC brings Univ. of Helsinki recognition on various fields of sciences in many countries in Europe and other continents. The RC carries societal responsibility for spreading knowledge of prehistory, early history and archaeological methods to the public. Basic and special courses in archaeology are available to the general audience at the Open University and Helsinki Summer University. A few of the teachers are affiliated with ARCH-HU. The publishing policy of the RC takes the broad audience into account. For example, the textbook Johdatus arkeologiaan (Introduction to archaeology, in Finnish) was published in 2008. The initiative to this joint venture came from ARCH-HU. The RC represents the Univ. of Helsinki in negotiations whenever the general conditions of archaeological research and antiquarian work are discussed in Finland. For example, the standards for high-quality archaeology are currently revised at national level by the initiative of National Board of Antiquities. In this discussion the University is responsible for viewpoints that support the scientific goals of archaeology in the best possible way. ARCH-HU is preparing for joining the competition for finances based on market economy. The RC has in cooperation with the School of Science and Technology developed the methodology for the field research of different kinds of archaeological sites. During 2005–2010 the challenges included survey in a semi-arid environment (surroundings of Petra, Jordan), forensic archaeology, etc. In 2010 ARCH-HU has applied for and received funds for the purchase of equipment for field survey, excavations, and laboratory work. A few researches affiliated with ARCH-HU are experts in how to apply different analyses and measuring methods to archaeological materials. The next step will be that the RC will sell this expertise to customers.

Keywords: archaeology, multidisciplinary research, geosciences, field survey, social interpretations
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RC-SPECIFIC STAGE 1 MATERIAL (registration form)

6 QUALITY OF RC’S RESEARCH AND DOCTORAL TRAINING

Justified estimate of the quality of the RC’s research and doctoral training at national and international level during 2005-2010 (MAX. 2200 characters with spaces): During 2005–2010 five doctoral students have disputed at ARCH-HU. In November 2010, four more dissertations are almost ready for public disputation. The average number of new doctoral students in the RC is two or three yearly. In relation to the number of dissertations in archaeology in whole Finland, the result of ARCH-HU can be regarded as good. As a rule, supervising was given to each PhD candidate individually. The cooperation with other universities gave further support. Since 2006 ARCH-HU is a partner in the Finnish Graduate School of Archaeology. Cooperation with Scandinavian and Baltic universities is organized via the Nordic School in Archaeology and the theoretical seminar of Baltic and Finnish archaeologists (BASE). Some of the doctoral candidates get working experience and related education in multidisciplinary research projects. One such possibility is the Finnish Jabal Haroun Project in the Centre of Excellence titled The Ancient Greek Written Sources. During 2005–2010 ARCH-HU conducted research of all periods including the Palaeolithic in Jordan, the Mesolithic and Neolithic Stone Age in Finland and neighboring areas, the Metal Ages, the medieval and post-medieval times, and modern history up to the II World War. Geographically the research areas reach from the Åland Island to northernmost Lapland and from the Hanko peninsula to the Kola Peninsula. ARCH-HU has a global perspective as well. Affiliated researchers worked in Kenya, Tanzania, Bolivia, Siberia and Canada. New methodological openings were made in 2005–2010. An example is forensic archaeology at the mass grave site Huhtiniemi in Lappeenranta which was excavated by ARCH-HU and the Finnish Forensic Team. During 2005–2010 scholars affiliated with ARCH-HU have applied for research funding in an active and successful way. Archaeological projects have received funding from various national and international sources, e.g. the Ministry of Education, the European Science Foundation, etc. ARCH-HU participated in several joint applications, together with for example biosciences at the Univ. of Helsinki (the ARGEOPOP project), the dating laboratory of the University, etc.

Comments on how the RC’s scientific productivity and doctoral training should be evaluated (MAX. 2200 characters with spaces): The scientific productivity of ARCH-HU should be assessed by the following criteria: 1) the on-going projects, their scientific relevance and recognition at national and international level, 2) the projects that have published the final report during 2005–2010 or are ready for giving such, 3) articles and preliminary reports in peer-reviewed and other publications, 4) papers given in international conferences by the affiliated researchers, 5) new initiatives, i.e. new PhD students and their research plans, joining of ARCH-HU in multi-disciplinary projects; 6) methodological innovations and orientation to the future, 7) applied funding and the funds received for PhD theses and projects, 8) scholarships at foreign research institutes, 9) international scientific meetings arranged in Finland by ARCH-HU alone or in cooperation, 10) visibility of scientific approach in the societal activity. The effectiveness and quality of doctoral training can be assessed by the following criteria: 1) the published doctoral theses, 2) articles and oral presentations written and given by the doctoral candidates about the themes of dissertations, 3) the results in the framework of the Finnish Graduate School of Archaeology, 4) affiliations of the supervisors and docents in Finland and abroad, 5) international seminars and workshops for doctoral students, 6) international visitors at ARCH-HU and their contribution to teaching at PhD level. The publishing policy of ARCH-HU is based on the reporting of preliminary and final results of research projects and the doctoral dissertations on international forums, mainly in English and Swedish. These include peer-reviewed Finnish
and foreign journals, periodicals, annual publications, and monograph series as well as proceedings of international conferences. Finnish and Swedish language is used in articles and textbooks that are directed both to the scientific community and the broad audience. The number and thematic variety of publications has strongly increased since the period 2000–2004. Thus the results of the previous period might be taken into account in the evaluation concerning 2005–2010.
<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>Alenius</td>
<td>Teija</td>
<td>Postdoctoral researcher</td>
<td>ARCH-HU</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aalvik</td>
<td>Riikka</td>
<td>Doctoral Candidate</td>
<td>National Board of Antiquities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arima</td>
<td>Hell</td>
<td>Doctoral Candidate</td>
<td>ARCH-HU</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carpelan</td>
<td>Christian</td>
<td>Senior researcher</td>
<td>ARCH-HU</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fiema</td>
<td>Zbigniew</td>
<td>Senior researcher</td>
<td>Classical Philology</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haggrén</td>
<td>Georg</td>
<td>Postdoctoral researcher</td>
<td>ARCH-HU</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hakulin</td>
<td>Lena</td>
<td>Doctoral Candidate</td>
<td>ARCH-HU</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Halinen</td>
<td>Petri</td>
<td>University Lecturer</td>
<td>ARCH-HU</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hamari</td>
<td>Pirjo</td>
<td>Doctoral Candidate</td>
<td>National Board of Antiquities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harlin</td>
<td>Eeva-Kristiina</td>
<td>Doctoral candidate</td>
<td>University of Oulu</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Herrell</td>
<td>Esa</td>
<td>Doctoral candidate</td>
<td>ARCH-HU</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holmqvist</td>
<td>Virpi</td>
<td>Postdoctoral researcher</td>
<td>UCL Archaeology</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ikäheimo</td>
<td>Janne</td>
<td>Postdoctoral researcher</td>
<td>University of Oulu</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jalkanen-Mäkelä</td>
<td>Doctoral Candidate</td>
<td>ARCH-HU</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jansson</td>
<td>Henrik</td>
<td>Doctoral candidate</td>
<td>Metsähallitus</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jansson</td>
<td>Jonina</td>
<td>Doctoral Candidate</td>
<td>ARCH-HU</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kankaanpää</td>
<td>Jarmo</td>
<td>Senior researcher</td>
<td>ARCH-HU</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kirkinen</td>
<td>Tuija</td>
<td>Doctoral candidate</td>
<td>ARCH-HU</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kivimäki</td>
<td>Sanna</td>
<td>Doctoral candidate</td>
<td>ARCH-HU</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Koivisto</td>
<td>Satu</td>
<td>Doctoral candidate</td>
<td>ARCH-HU</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kouki</td>
<td>Paula</td>
<td>Doctoral candidate</td>
<td>Classical Philology</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kämäräinen</td>
<td>Elisa</td>
<td>Doctoral Candidate</td>
<td>ARCH-HU</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lagerstedt</td>
<td>John</td>
<td>Doctoral Candidate</td>
<td>National Board of Antiquities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lahelma</td>
<td>Antti</td>
<td>Postdoctoral researcher</td>
<td>ARCH-HU</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laukumaa</td>
<td>Vesa</td>
<td>Doctoral candidate</td>
<td>National Board of Antiquities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lavento</td>
<td>Mika</td>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>ARCH-HU</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lehtinen</td>
<td>Leena</td>
<td>Doctoral Candidate</td>
<td>ARCH-HU</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leimu</td>
<td>Kristiina</td>
<td>Doctoral Candidate</td>
<td>ARCH-HU</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leino</td>
<td>Minna</td>
<td>Doctoral Candidate</td>
<td>ARCH-HU</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maaranen</td>
<td>Päivi</td>
<td>Doctoral Candidate</td>
<td>National Board of Antiquities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mannermaa</td>
<td>Kristiina</td>
<td>Postdoctoral researcher</td>
<td>ARCH-HU</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manninen</td>
<td>Mikael</td>
<td>Doctoral candidate</td>
<td>ARCH-HU</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mikkola</td>
<td>Esa</td>
<td>Senior researcher</td>
<td>National Board of Antiquities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mikkola</td>
<td>Terhi</td>
<td>Doctoral Candidate</td>
<td>ARCH-HU</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mökkönen</td>
<td>Teemu</td>
<td>Doctoral candidate</td>
<td>ARCH-HU</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Niukkanen</td>
<td>Marianna</td>
<td>Doctoral Candidate</td>
<td>National Board of Antiquities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nordqvist</td>
<td>Kerkko</td>
<td>Doctoral candidate</td>
<td>ARCH-HU</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Niurminen</td>
<td>Katarina</td>
<td>Doctoral Candidate</td>
<td>ARCH-HU</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perttola</td>
<td>Wesa</td>
<td>University Instructor</td>
<td>ARCH-HU</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pesonen</td>
<td>Petro</td>
<td>Doctoral Candidate</td>
<td>ARCH-HU</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rankama</td>
<td>Tuija</td>
<td>Senior researcher</td>
<td>ARCH-HU</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rosendahl</td>
<td>Ullaika</td>
<td>Doctoral Candidate</td>
<td>Espoo Museum</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuohalä</td>
<td>Olavi</td>
<td>Doctoral Candidate</td>
<td>ARCH-HU</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salminen</td>
<td>Timo</td>
<td>Postdoctoral researcher</td>
<td>ARCH-HU</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sala</td>
<td>Kati</td>
<td>Doctoral candidate</td>
<td>ARCH-HU</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seitsonen</td>
<td>Oula</td>
<td>Doctoral candidate</td>
<td>ARCH-HU</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seppälä</td>
<td>Sirkka-Liisa</td>
<td>Doctoral Candidate</td>
<td>National Board of Antiquities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Silvenon</td>
<td>Sarianna</td>
<td>Doctoral Candidate</td>
<td>ARCH-HU</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suha</td>
<td>Mikko</td>
<td>Doctoral Candidate</td>
<td>ARCH-HU</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tallavaara</td>
<td>Mikka</td>
<td>Doctoral candidate</td>
<td>ARCH-HU</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuovinen</td>
<td>Tapio</td>
<td>Senior researcher</td>
<td>ARCH-HU</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ulinno</td>
<td>Pirjo</td>
<td>Postdoctoral researcher</td>
<td>National Board of Antiquities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Viitanen</td>
<td>Eeva-Maria</td>
<td>Postdoctoral researcher</td>
<td>ARCH-HU</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vajanto</td>
<td>Krista</td>
<td>Doctoral Candidate</td>
<td>ARCH-HU</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wessman</td>
<td>Anna</td>
<td>Postdoctoral researcher</td>
<td>ARCH-HU</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
INTERNATIONAL EVALUATION OF RESEARCH AND DOCTORAL TRAINING AT THE UNIVERSITY OF HELSINKI

RC-SPECIFIC STAGE 2 MATERIAL

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BACKGROUND INFORMATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Name of the RC’s responsible person: Lavento, Mika</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-mail of the RC’s responsible person:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name and acronym of the participating RC: Archaeology, ARCH-HU</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

Comments for selecting/not selecting the key focus area: ARCH-HU’s strength is its continuously increasing multidisciplinary cooperation with biosciences, geosciences, engineering, linguistics, and maritime and classical archaeology. ARCH-HU does not aim to select one breakthrough area that would give the RC only one sharp scientific profile. The wide range of research topics should be taken into account in the evaluation. Archaeologists study all aspects of human life, such as welfare, shelter, language, and culture, starting with the earliest known humans. ARCH-HU focuses on the prehistory of the northernmost parts of the world during the Holocene.

The basic structure, materials, and natural resources of the physical world and life, as well as the changing environment in water and on land, form the context of human life in all periods of prehistory and in historically documented times. Social justice, as well as globalization and social change, are contexts in which archaeological knowledge is needed by the scientific community and the general public. These contexts offer challenges for the societal impact of the work done by our RC.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FOCUS AND QUALITY OF RC’S RESEARCH (MAX. 8800 CHARACTERS WITH SPACES)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

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).

In the following, the most important areas of ARCH-HU’s research activity are introduced through projects carried out by the RC. The projects indicate the international, multidisciplinary, geographical, and chronological variety in the interests of the researchers.

Since 2002, the Lapland Pioneers (LaPio) project focuses on the earliest postglacial colonization of northern Finnish Lapland and the Norwegian Barents Sea coast. It uses cutting-edge methodology in lithic research to study the origin, direction, and mode of the colonization. It combines archaeology and anthropology in discussing boreal/arctic hunter-gatherer mobility and the settling of unknown landscapes. The project’s research has already changed the accepted wisdom about the date and mode of colonizing the inland areas of northern Lapland and the coast. Specific eastern features in lithic technology show that instead of just one wave of settlers from southern Scandinavia, the coast appears to have received colonists also from northwestern Russia. This observation has made it necessary to start discussing inter-group relations, and to have a fresh look at the origins of changes in lithic technology in a wide area stretching from Varangerfjord in the east to southwestern Norway in the west. Results of the research have been published by leading archaeological journals, including Antiquity. The LaPio project has also been instrumental in setting up the Nordic Blade Technology Network, a consortium of specialists in lithic technology from the Circum-Baltic region with an interest in studying the colonization processes and the spreading of blade production techniques during the early Postglacial. The methods of lithic analysis developed within the project will also have wide applicability within Stone Age archaeology.
In 2004, the Interfaces in the Mesolithic Stone Age of Eastern Fennoscandia Project began to use the technological approach to study the lithic assemblages. Internationally, the work is of interest to scholars in neighbouring countries keen to know about developments in eastern Fennoscandia, who have so far had very little to go by, but also to anybody with an interest in the methods and theory of lithic analysis, approaches to quartz assemblages, and hunter-gatherer archaeology in general.

Home, Hearth and Household (HHH) (2007-2009) was an international and multidisciplinary project and a sub-project of BOREAS, coordinated by the European Science Foundation. BOREAS was an "umbrella" project, comprising a large number of sub-projects in archaeology, anthropology, folklore and ethnology in the Circumpolar: in Europe, Asia, and Northern America. For HHH, the field work concentrated on Northern Lapland in Norway and Finland and on the Kola Peninsula in Russia. The focus of the project was on hearth row sites and understanding why and how the restructuring of Sámi settlement and domestic space took place during the Late Iron Age and Early Medieval Period. The order and symmetry implied by hearths organized in rows were probably related to the role they played in internal social dynamics and in negotiating regional processes of change. Several articles have been published and the final report is in preparation.

In southern Finland, the Iron Age and Medieval settlement history in the province of Uusimaa has been studied since 2002, with special focus on the Baltic Sea coast, inland and archipelago of Western Uusimaa. According to the old hypothesis, this area was nearly unpopulated during the Iron Age. The results from the new projects have challenged this view, as well as several other traditional assumptions concerning the settlement history of the area. Archaeological excavations are conducted annually in Uusimaa and in the exceptionally intact medieval village site of Mankby in Espoo. Since 2009, the long-term development in Uusimaa is put into a wider Baltic context in the multidisciplinary project "Settlements and Economies around the Sea (SEAS), maritime settlement, subsistence and economic histories around the Baltic Sea 500 BC – 1700 AD". The SEAS project includes archaeological surveys, analyses of old maps and written documents, palaeobotanical studies, and research excavations, for example, around the medieval castle of Raseborg.

Multidisciplinary cooperation between archaeology, forensic medicine, engineering, environmental sciences, and history led to interesting results and new methods at the Huhtiniemi site in Lappeenranta, SE Finland. ARCH-HU and the Dep. of Forensic Medicine (UH) carried out a number of trial excavations in order to prove or disprove the existence of illegal World War II mass graves. The research was followed by the mass media. The main result was the discovery of a collective grave from the 19th century instead of the debated military history from 1944. The field excavations of the project were carried out in 2006-2009, and the final publication is currently in preparation.

Settlement history was studied from multidisciplinary viewpoints in the National Park of Repovesi in Kouvola / Mäntyharju, SE Finland. The earliest slash-and-burn cultivation in a forest region is dated to ca. 4000 years ago. The results of the study were published in 2007. The methods of intensive archaeological survey and palaeobotany were applied and developed further. Archaeological surveys were carried out in Virolahti near the Baltic Sea coast in SE Finland between 2005 and 2008. Thanks to the accurate survey methods, several sites from different periods of prehistory and history were found. A Late Neolithic dwelling depression was partly excavated in 2010. The results have been published in two articles, and one is still under preparation. The research continued in 2010 with a two-year project focusing on the beginning and temporal fluctuations of agrarian economy from the Stone Age to historical times in the inland. The study consists of an archaeological survey and a palynological analysis.

ARCH-HU has conducted archaeological research on the Karelian Isthmus in cooperation with the Russian Academy of Sciences and Kunstkamera Museum, in St. Petersburg since 1998. The largest of these projects was the Subsistence Strategies and Change of Communities in 9000-1 BC project (2004-2006). The Lake Pyhäjärvi - Ozero Otradnoe project was launched in 2005. The project focuses on
mapping archaeological monuments in previously unexplored areas and on the intensive research of the Stone Age and Early Metal Period human habitation in one micro-region. The research has produced much new data related to the spatial distribution of prehistoric human habitation, chronology, and the hydrological and environmental history.

ARCH-HU has participated in multidisciplinary projects by philologists, archaeologists, and historians in the Mediterranean and Near East. Classical Archaeology has played a key role in Expeditio Pompeiana Universitatis Helsingensis (EPUH) in Pompeii, Italy, and in the Finnish Jabal Haroun Project (FJHP) near Petra, Jordan. The FJHP also made a thorough survey of archaeological remains dating from the Middle Palaeolithic to Islamic times. The EPUH project continues. The FJHP has published one of the three volumes of the final publication with internationally recognized results. Important are also the PhD dissertations which will be soon written about the material collected. Archaeology, history, geophysics, and geoarchaeology have joined forces in the survey and excavation project focusing on multi-period settlement in the valley of Thesprotia, NW Greece in cooperation with the Finnish Institute at Athens.

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

ARCH-HU will continue to allow and encourage individual researchers and projects to choose several geographical and chronological focuses for their studies regarding the human past. It is essential that researchers develop their expertise in the chosen field by means of archaeological as well as multidisciplinary methods.

Affiliated post-doc researchers are approaching the international top level in their own specific fields, and the senior researchers have achieved international recognition. Maintaining and developing international contacts will be essential to ARCH-HU in the future as well. The contact networks cover the Baltic sphere, as well as institutes in the Mediterranean, Near East, Latin America, East Africa, the United States, Canada, and Siberia. The topics of the PhD theses indicate that the doctors cooperate with many international research groups in different parts of the world. Publishing results in an international forum, including Open Access publications, will increase in importance.

### 2. Practices and Quality of Doctoral Training (max. 8800 characters with spaces)

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

The recruitment and selection of doctoral candidates in archaeology is carried out according to the rules and practices of the Faculty of Arts in order to ensure that each candidate has a realistic opportunity to conduct research on his/her topic. The procedure includes a discussion between the professor and the candidate before application, and a supervisor is also suggested. The supervisor takes part in the discussion, and the study plan of the applicant is discussed at an early stage. Most applicants are graduates of the University of Helsinki, but recently the number of applicants from the Universities of Oulu and Turku has increased. In addition, there are applicants from universities abroad who are interested in postgraduate studies in archaeology in Finland.

As the candidate’s research progresses, the supervision relationship is reconsidered. Usually the professor of our own department is replaced by a top-level expert in the candidate’s research area. In the future, supervision of doctoral candidates may involve more problems, because the Department of Philosophy, History, Culture and Art Studies has changed its strategy. Financing is no longer available for supervisors from outside UH. Inviting experts from abroad is becoming more difficult, and this will soon have a negative impact on the general quality of postgraduate studies.
Most dissertations in preparation in ARCH-HU between 2005 and 2010 are written as separate parts that are published as 4-6 articles in peer-reviewed journals and integrated later into a book. In this way, the actual number of commentators for one dissertation is quite large. Dissertations in monograph format are published in peer-reviewed series. Dissertations in article format, of which the articles have earlier been published in international peer-reviewed periodicals, are often collected together into a book with an extensive introduction. This procedure has its advantages and is similar to the corresponding practice in natural sciences. Actually, many of the articles that are or will be included in the latest archaeological dissertations have first appeared in natural-scientific publications. Nearly all of the articles and monograph-format dissertations have been published in English.

ARCH-HU holds a regular research seminar for postgraduate students. Each postgraduate student should give 2 to 4 oral presentations about his/her research topics. The first presentation always takes place at the beginning of the student’s PhD studies. During the research process, the student can give several presentations, and each time an article or a chapter of the dissertation is discussed by the audience.

Since 2006, collaboration between the three archaeological departments that offer postgraduate education in archaeology in Finland has often taken place via the Finnish Graduate School of Archaeology. All three universities (Helsinki, Oulu and Turku) are allotted financing for two postgraduate students from the School’s budget. During the first period of the School (2006-2009), two postgraduate students defended their doctoral theses in Helsinki. The School started a new period in 2010, providing two new doctoral students from Helsinki with financial support for preparing their theses. The School organizes meetings in which the students financed by the School present their ongoing work to the other students, professors, and a visiting expert who has been invited from abroad. During their visits, these experts also give a lecture to a wider audience of postgraduate students in archaeology.

Finnish and Estonian universities also cooperate on a regular basis. There is an annual or biennial meeting that is open to all postgraduate students in archaeology who are interested in giving a presentation on their research themes. Four universities (Helsinki, Turku, Oulu, and Tartu) take turns in organizing this event. Another regular event is the Baltic Archaeological Seminar (BASE), the aim of which is to discuss questions of theoretical archaeology by teachers, researchers, and postgraduate students, as well as advanced graduate students. The seminar is organized biennially by a university in Finland, Estonia, Latvia, or Lithuania. The postgraduate students in marine archaeology in Helsinki belong to the Stockholm-based Baltic Sea research group MARIS. International cooperation also takes place via the SAMIARC network, which aims to develop the research of the prehistory of circumpolar areas in Finland, Norway, Russia, and Sweden, and which is open to postgraduate students from these countries.

Archaeology today incorporates many multi- and cross-disciplinary methods for approaching prehistory. The postgraduate students have research interests in various human and natural sciences, such as geosciences, but also in the field of engineering (e.g., photogrammetry and remote sensing). Some of our students have concentrated on the analysis of human or animal and fish bones, thus specializing in forensic medicine or animal biology. During 2005-2010, the DNA analysis of archaeological material in the ARGEOPOP project has formed a new research area. This research is carried out together with experts in genetics, bioinformatics, and biometry. In archaeological postgraduate studies, all these topics require a supervisor from the field in question, because the archaeological material and approaches form only one aspect of the research. Geosciences (geology and geography) and radiocarbon dating by the Dating Laboratory in Helsinki have traditionally been specialized fields close to archaeology. Several postgraduate students participate in joint projects between archaeology and the Dating Laboratory.
INTERNATIONAL EVALUATION OF RESEARCH AND DOCTORAL TRAINING AT THE UNIVERSITY OF HELSINKI

RC-SPECIFIC STAGE 2 MATERIAL

The University of Helsinki provides several different fields of expertise in archaeology, each with its own research approaches. Archaeological fieldwork has been conducted by classical archaeologists, requiring knowledge of fieldwork techniques and handling find material in addition to the knowledge of classical Greek or Latin. The large excavation projects typical at classical sites demand archaeological expertise, which is available at ARCH-HU. Other examples of archaeology integrating with linguistic fields at the University of Helsinki are excavations conducted in cooperation with Egyptology and Assyriology, as well as exegetics of the Bible. The project leaders in many of these cases have been linguists, but sometimes also archaeologists. Postgraduate students often have important roles in these multidisciplinary projects. Several postgraduate students have proceeded actively in their studies independent of any official organizations. They have learned human and animal osteology, macrofossil analysis, or forensic archaeology at universities in other Scandinavian countries, Estonia, Great Britain, or elsewhere. We consider this normal practice, because archaeology is an international science.

Ensuring a good career for PhDs is not easy in archaeology in Finland. However, the average required level of education for employment at the National Board of Antiquities and in museums is continuously increasing. As for scientific research projects, several young doctors currently have project financing from the Academy of Finland or another source, such as Finnish private cultural foundations. International research projects have also provided opportunities for postdoctoral researchers. Ensuring relevant employment for all PhDs is a problem that requires further effort in Finland in the near future.

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

Applicants for doctoral studies are encouraged to continue with the research theme of their MA thesis, because they are already specialized in a particular methodology, material, period, area or archaeological approach. Already at the beginning of their doctoral studies, students are urged to apply for grants to participate in courses or exchange programs at universities or research institutes abroad.

Masters and doctors in archaeology often continue their research while simultaneously employed by museums, the National Board of Antiquities, or administrative institutions, or in various fields other than the research of the material culture of the past. In this case, good skills are required in areas such as environmental administration and marketing. Seven master’s degrees and one PhD in archaeology are usually awarded each year, and ARCH-HU will participate in developing opportunities for doctoral students to receive training in such areas in cooperation with the Career Services unit at UH.

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).

Section 20 of the Constitution of Finland (11.6.1999/731) states: “Nature and its biodiversity, the environment and the national heritage are the responsibility of everyone.” The Department of Archaeology has a responsibility to provide the public with information about our archaeological heritage, so that the public in turn can take its own responsibility for maintaining the national cultural heritage.

Several research projects of the Department of Archaeology have presented their results to the public (for example, Boreas-HHH and the SEAS project). Informative meetings have been held and public lectures given, as well as interviews for the press, radio, and TV. Local people all over Finland have been encouraged to participate in the projects. The Huhtiniemi mass grave project provoked active discussion between the researchers and media. A crossdisciplinary series of TV programs named “Maan povesta – From the ground” dealt with the prehistory of Finland. Archaeologists have also given popular Studia Generalia lectures at the University.
Finland’s indigenous people, especially the Sámi, have the constitutional right (Section 17) to maintain and develop their culture, and according to the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples, the Sámi have the right to their own history and cultural heritage. Some of the projects carried out by the Department of Archaeology (such as Boreas-HHH and Sujala) have cooperated with the Sámi Parliament and Sámi museum Siida to produce archaeological knowledge of Sámi prehistory. The Department of Archaeology organized the First International Conference on Sámi Archaeology, Rovaniemi, 19-22 October 2006, and the Archaeological Workshop in Helsinki, 24-25 January, 2008. This cooperation resulted, among other things, in the book "Saamentutkimus tänään – Sámi Studies today".

General interest in World War II rose in 2006, when the press took up the fall of Vyborg and the chaotic withdrawal of the Finnish troops. Finnish soldiers were said to have executed fugitives and buried them at Huhtiniemi in Lappeenranta. Local folklore told of skulls connected to the executions. The Department of Archaeology was invited to find out whether there were any signs of the rumored burials. The excavations during 2006 and 2007 proved that the mass grave, which was one reason for the folklore, originated from the 19th century. The Department of Archaeology took an active role in discussing a difficult matter regarding Finnish history.

The Department of Archaeology has actively taken part in the development of quality standards for archaeological research. This task is shared by the whole archaeological community, and the goal is to establish a set of principles for good archaeological research. Several persons from the Department of Archaeology have participated in the executive committees of archaeological societies: the Archaeological Society of Finland, the Finnish Antiquarian Society, the Society of Medieval Archaeology of Finland, Societas Archaeologiae Classicae Fennica, and so on. In these societies, two presidents, one vice president, and several members of executive committees now come from the UH Department of Archaeology.

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

In addition to the material and social approach, rising fields at ARCH-HU are research methodology and forensic archaeology, dealing not only with the ancient past, but also with 20th-century military events and global human rights. The study of environmental archaeology in the Baltic Sea area and further abroad, such as in Jordan in the Near East, is connected with the international research of environmental change in a long-term perspective. The RC will participate in the multidisciplinary research of the underwater heritage of the Baltic Sea. Empirical and theoretical archaeological research will develop together at ARCH-HU in the near future.

The Antiquities Act will be discussed at the Ministry of Education and Culture and may be subject to change by the Parliament during 2011-2015. ARCH-HU is a consulting partner in the negotiations. Ongoing background work at ARCH-HU includes updating fieldwork standards and preparing an ethical code for archaeology in Finland. In these documents ARCH-HU emphasizes the significance of basic research.

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

ARCH-HU maintains active intersectoral and international collaboration with colleagues. The intersectoral collaboration takes place mainly with the disciplines of human and natural sciences (including medicine).
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In the circumpolar north, active cooperation and multidisciplinary research has continued throughout the 2005-2010 period. For example, in several key regions in different parts of eastern Fennoscandia, the members of the Interfaces project have studied interface situations where different social groups can be assumed to have interacted in different stages of the Mesolithic. Another example of very extensive cooperation is the HHH project in the circumpolar area of northern Europe, which united anthropological, historical, and archaeological research in the Sámi region. The Samiarc Network was very active, organizing several workshops and conferences during 2005-2010.

In Finland, several museums in the neighborhood of Helsinki have collaborated in the Iron Age and medieval studies of the western Uusimaa region. They have financed and provided facilities for the archaeological fieldwork. The cooperation has been fruitful.

Forensic archaeology has increased in importance with several partners in cooperation, the most important of which are the Department of Forensic Medicine at the Hjelt Institute at the University of Helsinki and the Laboratory of Criminal Technology at the National Bureau of Investigation. The starting point of this research was the Huhtiniemi project, which began in Lappeenranta 2006 and concentrated on the study of the mass graves of supposedly executed Finnish soldiers. The key person behind the cooperation was Prof. Helena Ranta, who has instrumental in investigating the mass graves in Kosovo and Iraq. This cooperation has formed a starting point for the future international and multidisciplinary research of mass graves.

The Department of Forensic Medicine, the Department of Biosciences, the Dating Laboratory, and the Department of Mathematics and Statistics collaborate in the ARGEOPOP project, which began in 2006. The project aims to shed new light on the prehistory of the Finns by integrating the evidence achieved from genetic and archæological data in a Bayesian statistical framework. The time frame of the study covers the Holocene, from the early Mesolithic Stone Age (the genetic diversity of the Finns) to the Middle Iron Age (the Levänluhta project). The project has already produced two MA theses and will produce at least two PhD theses. The collaboration with the Dating Laboratory has been versatile: there are ongoing and future projects concerning isotope studies (prehistoric diet, palæoclimatology), population development, and so on. The post-graduate students of the Department of Archaeology have taken part in the Nordic Graduate School in Archaeology. The seminars have been arranged in several places in Europe. The annual postgraduate seminar with the Departments of Archaeology at the Univ. of Tartu, Turku, and Oulu has been very fruitful. The students have found it helpful to discuss and receive comments on their ongoing PhD theses. The seminar has been linked to the Nationwide Research School of Archaeology (Turku, Oulu, Helsinki), which has financed six students for four years since 2006.

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

If finances allow, collaboration and mobility will continue as earlier or intensify. ARCH-HU now receives funding from two sources: regular funding from the Chancellor of the UH and third-party grants for projects and individual researchers. No supplementary solutions are in sight. In quantity, the reliability of the funding was not always satisfactory during 2005-2010. Opportunities for receiving grants from the Academy of Finland, private foundations, and international sources seem fairly good because of recently achieved, internationally relevant results. ARCH-HU aims to create study paths for graduate students that include studies abroad in order to benefit from international education and contacts during future doctoral studies. Negotiations are in progress with several institutes.

Projects in Jordan and Italy have been important for collaboration. An especially important area in the future will be the circumpolar zone. Indigenous studies and the archaeology of indigenous peoples will be one of the main lines of collaboration between ARCH-HU and other Scandinavian universities.
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5 OPERATIONAL CONDITIONS (MAX. 4400 CHARACTERS WITH SPACES)

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

The Department of Archaeology has office space for four UH staff members and nine postgraduate scholars. There is a small computer room, a lecture room, and a laboratory. The facilities are too small for all the members of the RC.

The UH staff members devote 5-20% of their working time to research and 30-50% to teaching. The rest of the time is taken by ever-increasing administrative work. A major shift took place in 2011: the position of amanuensis became almost completely administrative. The position of assistant was replaced by a university lecturer whose tasks consist only of teaching. The research force of the staff has thus diminished.

Most of the research in the RC is carried out by the postgraduate scholars. If employed by the UH, they are obliged to devote 5% of their working time for the Department, for example, by teaching or acting as MA or PhD thesis supervisors. Most postgraduate students are financed by a foundation or an estate, and some of them have worked as part-time teachers as well. However, the funds for hiring non-faculty teachers at the UH were cut significantly in 2010.

The desktop computers used by ARCH-HU are outdated: half of them are at least five years old, and the oldest one is from 2003. For example, most of the computers cannot handle even viewing airborne laser scanning data, let alone analyzing it. In addition to basic peripheral office devices such as flatted A4 scanners and A4 B&W laser printers, the RC has access to a photocopier capable of printing B&W A3, a slide scanner, and two legacy devices, an A0 drum scanner and an A0 inkjet printer. On the software side, the computers are equipped with basic programs such as MS Office through the UH’s IT services. The geographical information system (GIS) programs Mapinfo and Idrisi are available through campus licensing, and the Department has some ArcGIS licenses of its own.

For archaeological fieldwork, the RC has a reasonable assortment of basic gear such as trowels, shovels, buckets, automatic levels, and so on. For documentation purposes, it has a state-of-the-art robotic total station, one outdated but still useful manual total station, an RTK-GPS system, handheld GPS receivers, and film and digital cameras. There is also an 8-seater van and two wetsuits for diving.

The laboratory for post-exavation work and research is equipped with two cleaning stations, fume hoods, and fridges. There are microscopes used for osteological, lithic, macrofossil, pollen, and mineralogical analyses. The flotation equipment for the soil samples for macrofossil analysis was built in 2009. The laboratory also serves for geochemical analyses. Some required devices are outdated, but with financial support from the HU, they can be updated in spring 2011. Storage space is allocated to the RC for finds, samples, field equipment, and so on, but the space is barely adequate to meet the need for it.

The RC participates in active reciprocal exchange networks. The partners include the Dating Laboratory and the Department of Forensic Medicine at UH, the Institute of Photogrammetry and Remote Sensing at Aalto University, the National Board of Antiquities, the National Bureau of Investigation, the Geological Survey of Finland, and Luksia’s professional diving instructors.
RC-SPECIFIC STAGE 2 MATERIAL

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

The RC has several parallel research projects with a varying number of staff and students. These projects require more working space in facilities close to the Department. New and up-to-date computers are urgently needed for handling maps and analyzing data.

At the end of 2010, the RC managed to receive funding for new equipment for prospecting for archaeological sites and developing the methodology of this field. The most important purchases include laboratory equipment and a geo-radar, a magnetometer, and an electronic resistivity indicator. So far, the laboratory suffices for the very basic methods of post-exavation work: cleaning finds and carrying out pollen and macrofossil analyses, as well as phosphorous and some other soil analyses. The analyses of human, animal, and fish bones will be increasingly important in archaeological laboratory work. The geochemical and -physical analyses will be carried out in the laboratory of Geosciences and Physics.

Other new equipment needs depend on the objectives of archaeological and multidisciplinary research projects in the near future.

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.

From 2005 to 2009, the Department of Archaeology belonged to the Institute for Cultural Studies together with Folklore, Ethnology, Museology and Marine History. Starting in 2010, the ARCH-HU has belonged to the large Department of Philosophy, History, Culture and Art Studies. Due to administrative reorganization in 2010, the beginning has been complicated. The former small but financially independent Department of Archaeology has lost the power to make any decisions concerning the use of money to the new, large administrative unit. As the person in charge (professor) has had to give up his/her financial role, the significance of the principal investigators (and project leaders) has increased. Because the new administrative system has functioned for only one year, it is too early to evaluate its effectiveness.

The leadership in the RC in archaeology is complex, because the roles of separate research projects and principal investigators are relatively strong in deciding the lines of research. Archaeology is a chronologically and regionally very versatile field of study. In addition, the variability in methodology and a multidisciplinary research approach mean that despite the small size of ARCH-HU, its members produce a rich variety of research. In addition to members of the TUHAT system, there are a number of active postgraduate students. However, they cannot devote themselves to full-time research due to economic constraints.

The administrative organization of the Department of Archaeology is carried out by the permanent staff: professor, university lecturer, university instructor, and amanuensis. This group has a weekly meeting for organizing everyday administrative work. In addition, the planning of teaching and many other activities requires additional meetings. It is also important to maintain relations with other institutions, such as the Open University and the Summer University. Despite its small size, ARCH-HU has active relationships with many organizations also outside the UH. Having good relations with all official institutions that conduct archaeological work in Finland is essential. The National Board of Antiquities and Metsähallitus (Forest Services) employ students, who thus acquire practical training in the field.
Important aspects in the relations between ARCH-HU and other institutions are related to research. There is study exchange between departments in the HU and with other universities. Relevant research networks can be formed to deal with specific research questions and serve the development of various methods. Archaeology has been developed and taught in many ways by the personnel. The role of docents, researchers and postgraduates is important, too. This makes ARCH-HU rich in topics and approaches to the past.

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

The leadership is formally in the hands of the person in charge. However, the planning of teaching is based on discussion between full-time or part-time teachers and students. As a rule, the opinions of the participating postdoctoral researchers and postgraduate students are also taken into account.

The research and teaching strategy of ARCH-HU is to support a wide thematic, theoretical, and methodological expertise in archaeology. The RC forms an archaeological expert network for multidisciplinary research. The selection of research interests is guided by the active role of the principal investigators.

The research has a wide global aspect. The affiliated postgraduate students focus on varying themes, such as the genetic history of the population in Finland or Mediterranean pottery. The chronological range extends from the Middle Palaeolithic in the Near East to post-medieval agriculture by the Baltic Sea coast. The role of international colleagues in ARCH-HU’s projects continues to be very important.

### 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: 1641460

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

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

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

- **International and national foundations** – names of international and national foundations which have decided to allocate funding to the RC members during 1.1.2005-31.12.2010, and the amount of their funding (in euros):
  - names of the foundations: Finnish Cultural Foundation, Ministry of Education and Culture, Jaalan kotiseutusäätiö (Jaala regional foundation), Kymen Osakeyhtiön 100-vuotissäätiö (Kymi Corporation's centennial foundation, Ella and Georg Ehrnroth foundation, Jenny and Antti Wihuri Foundation and Nordenskiöld samfundet, Federation of Finnish Learned Societies, Letterstedtska Föreningen, Jenny and Antti Wihuri Foundation, Emil Aaltonen Foundation, Karjalaisen kulttuurin
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edistämissäätiö (Foundation for the promotion of Karelian culture), Kone Foundation, Svenska Kulturfonden, Konstföreningen, Sparbankstiftelsen i Hangö

- total amount of funding (in euros) from the above-mentioned foundations: 480000

• 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: Norwegian Academy / Centre for Advanced Studies;
  - NOS-H/Uppsala universitet
  - total amount of funding (in euros) from the above-mentioned funding organizations: 63000

• Other national funding (incl. EVO funding and Ministry of Education and Culture funded doctoral programme positions) - names of other national funding organizations which have decided to allocate funding to the RC members during 1.1.2005-31.12.2010, and the amount of their funding (in euros).
  - names of the funding organizations: Ministry of Education and Culture, Helsinki University Foundation, The city of Lappeenranta.
  - Metsähallitus, The City of Hanko, The City of Espoo, Someron vesiensuojeluyhdistys (Somero water protection society)
  - total amount of funding (in euros) from the above-mentioned funding organizations: 698743

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

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

The central interests of the RC are pioneering settlement in the circumpolar region and Stone Age communities in the northern coniferous zone. The study of the medieval and historical period will continue in southern Finland and the coastal region. The emphasis of the work is in northern Europe, but ARCH-HU will also continue with research interests in the classical world, for example, sites in Italy and Greece. The final publications of the Finnish Jabal Haroun Project in Jordan will be published.

During 2011-2013, ARCH-HU will continue to research many periods of the past, many geographical areas, and many thematic and methodological questions together with the natural sciences. The goal is to understand humans and their various levels of communication in the past. This extensive challenge requires international cooperation, which will be active at ARCH-HU in the coming years.

Defining an exact research area for ARCH-HU is difficult, because all the principal investigators and PhD researchers have their own fields of expertise. Archaeologists are needed for different research purposes, which is why concentrating in only one area is difficult for the small RC. Finances will be sought from the same sources as earlier. Internationally relevant results from work done in recent years form a good basis. The significance of international funding may increase as a result of research cooperation with neighboring countries. Researchers in the field of classical archaeology already have international relationships, and new projects can be started in the near future when the large projects of the 2000s are published.

The study of the Stone Age in the north and southeast of Finland and the Late Iron Age and later settlement history in the province of Uusimaa, as well as cooperation with Russian, Scandinavian, and Baltic colleagues will continue. Other continuing themes include the research of pioneering settlement in northern Fennoscandia and the settlement history of the Late Iron Age and historical times in northernmost Lapland in cooperation with Scandinavian partners.
Cooperation with experts in osteology and palynology is essential, and expertise in osteoarchaeology will be a strong area at ARCH-HU also in the future. These are among the top priorities in the RC for the following three years. DNA studies connected with the population history of Finland represent top-level expertise on an international scale. Forensic archaeology will remain significant in the future. Methodological development concerns forensic and maritime archaeology. Methodology for the study of the marine environment in the Baltic Sea region will be important in analyzing environmental characteristics around sites on the mainland. The development of methods and technical means for prospecting and locating cultural remains below the surface and in underwater conditions will be emphasized in the research.

According to the latest information, the recently reformulated policy of the National Board of Antiquities (NBA), the main responsibility for the scientific research of ancient monuments and sites in Finland will in the future be increasingly in the hands of actors outside the NBA. The role of the NBA will be administrative, focusing on the maintenance of ancient sites. It follows that ARCH-HU should carry out excavations and surveys to a wider extent than before. It is not yet clear how competitive the HU will be in acquiring new resources. In addition to fieldwork in Finland, the members of ARCH-HU try to participate in classical archaeology projects in the future. ARCH-HU must take part in this economic competition by offering expertise in special sectors of archaeological fieldwork to private entrepreneurs. During 2011-2013, the new equipment for archaeological prospecting and trial excavating will be taken into use. Several docents specialized in fields such as lithic technology, Russian archaeology, numismatics or historical archaeology. The contribution of some of these experts cannot be read in in the TUHAT database, though. Postgraduate students and postdoctoral researchers are offered a versatile approach to archaeology, learning, understanding, and applying ideas that are developed by other research units. A number of people act as members of the RC although now affiliated with it. So, the future of ARCH-HU looks optimistic.

Each member of the RC has provided a list of publications and reported the most relevant activities concerning the 2005-2010 period in the TUHAT database. Some docents are not included, because they did not have projects financed through the HU.

The Stage 2 information was collected by the staff of the Department of Archaeology from principal investigators, researchers, postgraduate students, and other affiliated researchers. They provided data on projects, fields of research under focus, funding decisions, and so on. The office secretary corrected the budget data. Due to lack of space, the form contains only the core information. The actions planned for the future, plans and strategies were formulated by the other members of the RC. Close to the end of the process, all members of the RC had an opportunity comment on the draft.

The research evaluation is made problematic by changing instructions and the constraint that only funding received by the HU is accepted as criteria. Because of this, much relevant research has been left out of the text.
1 Analysis of publications

<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>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A2 Review in scientific journal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A3 Contribution to book/other compilations (refereed)</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A4 Article in conference publication (refereed)</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B1 Unrefereed journal article</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B2 Contribution to book/other compilations (non-refereed)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B3 Unrefereed article in conference proceedings</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C1 Published scientific monograph</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C2 Edited book, compilation, conference proceeding or special issue of journal</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D1 Article in professional journal</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D2 Article in professional hand or guide book or in a professional data system, or text book material</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D4 Published development or research report</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E1 Popular article, newspaper article</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E1 Popular contribution to book/other compilations</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E2 Popular monograph</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I1 Audiovisual materials</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2 Listing of publications

A1 Refereed journal article

2005


2006


Lahelma, A 2006, 'Excavating art: a "ritual deposit" associated with the rock painting of Valkeisaari, eastern Finland', Fennoscandia Archaeologica, vol 23, pp. 3-23.


2007


2008

2009


2010


Mökkönen, TO 2010, Kivikautinen maanviljely Suomessa, Suomen museo, vol 2009, pp. 5-38.


2005

2007


2010
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2006
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ARCH-HU/Lavento


Wickholm, A. 2006. 'Stay where you have been put! the use of spears as coffin nails in late iron age Finland', Etnos ja kulttuur. uurimusi Silvia Laukai auks., vol. 18, Muinasaja taudus, vol. 18, Tartu: Ulkooki arheologia oppetool, Tartu, pp. 193-207.

2007


Lavento, M. 2007. 'Archaeological observations on the origin of early iron production in eastern and northern Finland'. Jernkontorets bergshistoriska utkott H., Jerrkontorets, Stockholm, pp. 141-146.


Lavento, M. 2007. 'Mennesysyden ja madian kohtaaminen'. Arkeologiäväit, Suomen arkeologinen seura, Helsinki, pp. 34-44.


Mikkonen, T. 2007. 'From the present to the past: archaeological surveys in post-medieval towns in Finland and the use of urban cartography'. Hortus novus, Archaeologia Medii Aevi Finlandiae, vol. 14, Suomen keskijän arkeologian seura, Turku, pp. 52-64.


Sipila, J.; Lahelma, A. 2007. 'War as a paradigmatic phenomenon: endemic violence and the Finnish subneolithic'. In T Pollard, I Banks (eds), War and sacrifice. studies in the archaeology of conflict, Brill, Leiden, pp. 188-209.
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ARCH-HU/Lavento


2009


Lavento, M 2009, 'Deconstructing memories in archaeology: burial cairns as signs of memories', in A Sine, A Vasks (eds), Memory, society and material culture. papers from the third theoretical seminar of the Baltic archaeologists (BASE) held at the University of Latvia, October 5-6, 2007., Interarchaeologia, no. 3, University of Latvia, RI., ga., pp. 23-43.


2010


ARCH-HU/Lavento


A4 Article in conference publication (referred)

2006


2007

2008

2009
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B1 Unrefereed journal article

2005

2006

2007
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Seitsonen, O 2007, "Middle Stone Age component at the abandoned Sonjo Buri village site, Tanzania", Nyame akuma, vol 67, pp. 75-82.


2008


ARCH-HU/Lavento
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2009


Tallavaara, M 2009, ‘Evoluutioteorian soveltaminen ei ylläpidä eriarvoisuutta’, Tieteessä tapahtuu, no. 4-5, pp. 67-68.


2010


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

2005
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2006


Hertel, EJ 2006, 'Kivitekniikan maailma - esitteilyssä punaiset hiekkakivemme', in P Pesonen, T Mökkönen (eds), Arkeologia ja kulttuuri & uutta kivikauden tutkimuksessa, Arkeologipäivät, pp. 73-81.


2007


Kankaanpää, J, Rankama, T 2007, 'Kalliomaalaukset - ikkuna kivikauden henkiseen kulttuuriin.', in P Pesonen, T Mökkönen (eds), Arkeologia ja kulttuuri & uutta kivikauden tutkimuksessa, Arkeologipäivät, pp. 31-44.


Lahelma, A 2007, 'Kallioonalaikutukset - kukkina kivikauden henkiseen kulttuuriin.', in P Pesonen, T Mökkönen (eds), Arkeologia ja kulttuuri & uutta kivikauden tutkimuksessa, Arkeologipäivät, pp. 31-44.
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ARCH-HU/Lavento

2009
Halinen, P, Lavento, M 2009, 'Preface', Recent perspectives on Sami archaeology in Fennoscandia and North-West Russia, Finnish Antiquarian Society, Helsinki, pp. 5-6.

2010

B3 Unrefereed article in conference proceedings

2005
Mannermaa, K 2005, 'Revision of a Mesolithic bird bone artifact from Korpilahti in Vuoksenranta (find complex called “Antrea net find”) Russia', in From Hooves to Horns, from Mollusc to Mammoth. Manufacture and use of Bone Artefacts from prehistoric Times to the Present. Muinasaja teadus 15, pp. 75-78.

2006

2007

2008
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ARCH-HU/Lavento

2009


Mökkönen, TO, Belskij, SV, Nordqvist, K 2009. Distribution of Nabataean-Roman sites around Jabal Harûn: Analysis of factors causing site patterning.

2010
Belskij, SV, Mökkönen, TO, Nordqvist, K 2010. Site Rupunkangas 1A in the Archipelago of the Ancient Lake Ladoga: a Housepit with Several Rebuilding Phases from the Mesolithic Stone Age to Early Metal Period.


C1 Published scientific monograph

2005

2006


2008


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

2005


2006

2007


2008

ARCH-HU/Lavento

2009

D1 Article in professional journal

2006

2007

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

2008

2010

D4 Published development or research report

2006
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ARCH-HU/Lavento


2009


E1 Popular article, newspaper article

2005


2007
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2008


2009

ARCH-HU/Lavento


2010


E1 Popular contribution to book/other compilations

2006


2007

Haggren, G 2007, ‘Keskiaikaiset säädyt ja kartanoläänit’, in P Haapala, RM Toivo (eds), Suomen historian kartasto, Karttakeskus, [Helsinki].


Haggren, G 2007, ‘Väestönkehitys ja autioituminen’, in P Haapala, RM Toivo (eds), Suomen historian kartasto, Karttakeskus, [Helsinki].

Halinen, P 2007, ‘Metäätys- ja keräilytalous’, in P Haapala, RM Toivo (eds), Suomen historian kartasto, Karttakeskus, [Helsinki].


2008
ARCH-HU/Lavento


2009


2010


E2 Popular monograph

2008


2009


2010


I1 Audiovisual materials

2005

Fyndtomheten i Nyland under vikingeråt och tidig medeltid: en forskningshistorisk genomgång av hypoteeserna kring fyndtomheten
# 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>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prizes and awards</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Editor of research journal</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Editor of research anthology/collection/conference proceedings</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peer review of manuscripts</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Editor of series</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Editor of special theme number</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Membership or other role in research network</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Membership or other role in national/international committee, council, board</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Membership or other role in public Finnish or international organization</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Membership or other role of body in private company/organisation</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participation in interview for written media</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participation in radio programme</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participation in TV programme</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participation in interview for web based media</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2 Listing of activities 2005-2010

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

Zbigniew Tomasz Fiema,

- Supervision of Ph.D. dissertation, Zbigniew Tomasz Fiema, 2008 → 2011, Finland
- Supervision of Ph.D. dissertation, Zbigniew Tomasz Fiema, 2009 → 2012, Finland

Janne Iikäheimo,


Jarmo Kankaanpää,

- Väitöskirjan ohjaus, Jarmo Kankaanpää, 2007 → ..., Finland
- Väitöskirjan ohjaus, Jarmo Kankaanpää, 2010 → ..., Finland

Mika Lavento,


Tuja Rankama,

- Thesis supervision, Tuja Rankama, 2006 → ..., Finland
- Thesis supervision, Tuja Rankama, 2007 → 2010, Finland
- Thesis supervision, Tuja Rankama, 2008 → ..., Finland
- Thesis supervision, Tuja Rankama, 2008 → ..., Finland
- Thesis supervision, Tuja Rankama, 2008 → ..., Finland
- Thesis supervision, Tuja Rankama, 2008 → ..., Finland
- Thesis supervision, Tuja Rankama, 2009 → ..., Finland
- Thesis supervision, Tuja Rankama, 2009 → ..., Finland
- Thesis supervision, Tuja Rankama, 2010 → ..., Finland

**Prizes and awards**

Antti Lahelma,

- Kalevalaseuran nuoren tutkijan tunnustuspalkinto, Antti Lahelma, 30.10.2008, Finland

**Editor of research journal**

Zbigniew Tomasz Fiema,

- The Finnish Jabal Haroun project, Zbigniew Tomasz Fiema, 01.01.2005 → 31.12.2005, Finland

Georg Haggren,

- SKAS, Georg Haggren, 01.01.2006 → 31.12.2005, Finland
- AMAF, Georg Haggren, 01.01.2006 → 31.12.2006, Finland
- SKAS, Georg Haggren, 01.01.2006 → 31.12.2006, Finland
- SKAS, Georg Haggren, 01.01.2007 → 31.12.2007, Finland
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AMAF (Archaeologia Medii Aevi Finlandiae), Georg Haggren, 01.01.2008 → 31.12.2008, Finland

SKAS, Georg Haggren, 01.01.2008 → 31.12.2008, Finland

Janne Iläheimo, Fennoscandia Archaeologica, Janne Iläheimo, 01.01.2008 → 31.12.2008, Finland


Antti Lahelma, Aurinkopeura, Antti Lahelma, 01.01.2007 → 31.12.2007, Finland

Mika Lavento, Fennoscandia Archaeologica, Mika Lavento, 01.01.2005 → 31.12.2005, Finland

ISKOS, Mika Lavento, 01.01.2005 → 31.12.2005, Finland

Fennoscandia archaeologica, Mika Lavento, 01.01.2006 → 31.12.2006, Finland

Iskos, Mika Lavento, 01.01.2006 → 31.12.2006, Finland

Archaeological Research of Estonia, Mika Lavento, 01.01.2007 → 31.12.2007, Estonia

Fennoscandia archaeologica, Mika Lavento, 01.01.2007 → 31.12.2007, Finland

Iskos, Mika Lavento, 01.01.2007 → 31.12.2007, Finland


Iskos, Mika Lavento, 01.01.2008 → 31.12.2008, Finland

Kristiina Mannermaa, Fennoscandia archaeologica, Kristiina Mannermaa, 01.01.2006 → 31.12.2006, Finland


Arkeologipäivät, Teemu Olavi Mökkönen, 01.01.2006 → 31.12.2006, Finland

Muinaistutkija, Teemu Olavi Mökkönen, 01.01.2006 → 31.12.2006, Finland

Arkeologipäivät, Teemu Olavi Mökkönen, 01.01.2007 → 31.12.2007, Finland

Muinaistutkija, Teemu Olavi Mökkönen, 01.01.2007 → 31.12.2007, Finland


Muinaistutkija, Teemu Olavi Mökkönen, 01.01.2008 → 31.12.2008, Finland

Tuija Rankama, Suomen Museo, Tuija Rankama, 01.01.2005 → 31.12.2005, Finland

Antiquity, Tuija Rankama, 01.01.2006 → 31.12.2006, United Kingdom


Oula Seitsonen, Fennoscandia archaeologica, Oula Seitsonen, 09.10.2007 → 31.12.2007, Finland

Eeva-Maria Vitanen, Fossa, Eeva-Maria Vitanen, 2001 → 2010, Finland

Anna Wessman, Muinaistutkija, Anna Wessman, 01.01.2003 → 30.05.2010, Finland

Editor of research anthology/collection/conference proceedings

Zbigniew Tomasz Fiema,
ARCH-HU/Lavento


Peer review of manuscripts
Antti Lahelma , Current Anthropology, Antti Lahelma, 01.01.2007 → 31.12.2007, United States
Fennoscandia archaeologica, Antti Lahelma, 01.01.2007 → 31.12.2007, Finland
European Journal of Archaeology, Antti Lahelma, 18.12.2010
Fennoscandia Archaeologica, Antti Lahelma, 27.01.2010, Finland
Fennoscandia archaeologica, Antti Lahelma, 30.08.2010
Vertaisarvio sarjaan Studia Humaniora Oulunia, nro 12 ("Social Archaeology in Finland") (2010), Kristiina Mannermaa, 2010 → …
Kerkko Nordqvist , Fennoscandia archaeologica 2010, Kerkko Nordqvist, 2010 → …
Petro Anssi Pellervo Pesonen , Acting as a reviewer for Fennoscandia archaeologica, Petro Anssi Pellervo Pesonen, 2005 → …
Acting as a reviewer for Estonian Journal of Archaeology, Petro Anssi Pellervo Pesonen, 2010 → …
Mikka Tallavaara , Acting as a reviewer for Journal of Archaeological Science, Mikka Tallavaara, 09.2010
Anna Wessman , Estonian Journal of Archaeology, Anna Wessman, 01.01.2006 → 31.12.2006, Estonia
Fennoscandia archaeologica, Anna Wessman, 2009 → 2010

Editor of series
Eeva-Maria Viitanen , Arkeologipäivät 2009, Eeva-Maria Viitanen, 2009, Finland

Editor of special theme number

Membership or other role in research network
Jarmo Kankaanpää , Tutkimusvorkoston jäsen, Jarmo Kankaanpää, 10.06.2009 → …
Satu Koivisto , Näytetextien laatiminen, Satu Koivisto, 01.06.2008 → 30.06.2008, Finland
Työesiminaan: Arkeologisten kenttäidien hyvia käytännöt ja laatuvaatimukset, Satu Koivisto, 2009 → …, Finland
Tohtorikoulutettava, Satu Koivisto, 01.02.2010 → 28.02.2011, Finland
Mikael A. Manninen ,
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Arkeologian valtakunnallinen tutkijakoulu, Mikael A. Manninen, 2006 → 2009, Finland
Nordic Blade Technology Network, Mikael A. Manninen, 2010 → ...

Tuija Rankama, ...
Member of research network, Tuuja Rankama, 10.06.2009 → ...

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

Zbigniew Tomasz Fiema, The academy of Finland, Zbigniew Tomasz Fiema, 01.01.2005 → 31.12.2005, Finland
Georg Haggren, SKAS Suomen keskiajan arkeologiaan, Georg Haggren, 01.01.2008 → 31.12.2008, Finland
Satu Koivisto, Rahastorhotaaja, Satu Koivisto, 01.01.2006 → 31.12.2008, Finland
Töntarkastaja, Satu Koivisto, 01.01.2010 → 31.12.2010, Finland

Mika Lavento, Suomen muinaismuistoyhdistys, Mika Lavento, 01.01.2005 → 31.12.2005, Finland
Suomen kvartäärigeologinen kansalliskomitea, Mika Lavento, 01.01.2006 → 31.12.2006, Finland
Suomen muinaismuistoyhdistys, Mika Lavento, 01.01.2006 → 31.12.2006, Finland
Suomen kvartäärigeologinen kansalliskomitea, Mika Lavento, 01.01.2007 → 31.12.2007, Finland
Suomen muinaismuistoyhdistys, Mika Lavento, 01.01.2007 → 31.12.2007, Finland
Estonian Science Foundation (ETF), Mika Lavento, 01.06.2008 → 31.12.2008, Estonia
Högskoleverket; Swedish National Agency for Higher Education, Mika Lavento, 01.03.2008 → 19.12.2008, Sweden
ICOMOSin Suomen vedenalaisen kulttuuriperinnönkomitea, Mika Lavento, 01.01.2008 → 31.12.2008
Norges forskningsråd, Mika Lavento, 17.06.2008 → 18.06.2008, Norway
Suomen Lähi-idän instituutin säätiö (FIME), Mika Lavento, 01.01.2008 → 31.12.2008, Finland
Suomen Muinaismuistoyhdistysten seura ry., Mika Lavento, 01.01.2008 → 31.12.2008, Finland

Mikael A. Manninen, Suomen Arkeologinen Seura, Mikael A. Manninen, 01.01.2007 → 31.12.2007, Finland
Suomen arkeologisien seuran hallituksen jäsen, Mikael A. Manninen, 2007 → 2012
Suomen arkeologisen seuran seura ry., Mikael A. Manninen, 01.01.2008 → 31.12.2008, Finland
Suomen arkeologisen seuran sihteerä, Mikael A. Manninen, 01.01.2008 → 31.12.2009, Finland

Teemu Olavi Mikkonen, Suomen arkeologinen seura ry., Teemu Olavi Mikkonen, 01.01.2005 → 31.12.2005, Finland
Suomen keskiajan arkeologiaan seura ry, Teemu Olavi Mikkonen, 01.01.2008 → 31.12.2008, Finland
Suomen arkeologinen seuran seura ry, Teemu Olavi Mikkonen, 01.01.2006 → 31.12.2006, Finland
Suomen arkeologinen seura ry, Teemu Olavi Mikkonen, 01.01.2007 → 31.12.2007, Finland
Suomen arkeologinen seuran seura ry, Teemu Olavi Mikkonen, 01.01.2008 → 31.12.2008, Finland

Wesa Perttola, Hallituksen jäsenyys, Wesa Perttola, 2008 → ..., Finland

Oula Seitsonen, ...
ARCH-HU/Lavento

Suomen Forensisen arkeologian ja osteologian seura, Oula Seitsonen, 01.01.2006 → 31.12.2006, Finland
Suomen Forensisen arkeologian ja osteologian seura, Oula Seitsonen, 01.01.2007 → 31.12.2007, Finland
Suomen forensisen arkeologian ja osteologian seura ry, Oula Seitsonen, 01.01.2008 → 31.12.2008, Finland

Eeva-Maria Viltanan

Suomen klassillisen arkeologian seura ry., Eeva-Maria Viltanan, 01.01.2007 → 31.12.2007, Finland
Suomen klassillisen arkeologian seura ry., Eeva-Maria Viltanan, 01.01.2008 → 31.12.2008, Finland
Varapuheenjohtaja, hallituksen jäsen, Eeva-Maria Viltanan, 2009 → 2011, Finland

Anna Wessman

Helsingin yliopiston Humanistisen tiedekunnan Tutkimus- ja jatkokoulutus toimikunta, Anna Wessman, 01.01.2003 → 31.12.2008, Finland
Nordenskiöld samfundet i Finland rf, Anna Wessman, 01.01.2003 → 31.12.2011, Finland
Suomen forensisen arkeologian ja osteologian seura (FAFAA), Anna Wessman, 01.01.2007 → 31.12.2009, Finland

Membership or other role in public Finnish or international organization

Petri Halinen

Yleisradio, asiantuntijana toimiminen arkeologisen TV-ohjelman suunnittelu- ja kuvauksesta, Petri Halinen, 26.06.2005 → 02.07.2005, Finland

Satu Koivistö

Riihimäen Stilmäkevenan muinaisjäännöksien arkeologisen selvityksen koordinaattorina, Satu Koivistö, 01.04.2008 → 30.04.2008, Finland

Mika Lavento

Kymenlaakson historiatoimikunta, Mika Lavento, 01.01.2008 → 31.12.2008, Finland

Tuija Rankama

President, Tuija Rankama, 2009 → 2010, Finland

Eeva-Maria Viltanan

Domus Pompeiana -näyttelyn suunnittelun koordinointi, näyttelytekseen toimintatyö ja artikkelen kirjoittaminen, Eeva-Maria Viltanan, 01.01.2008 → 31.12.2008, Finland

Domus Pompeiana -näyttelyn koordinointi, näyttelytekseen toimintatyö sekä osa artikkeleista, Eeva-Maria Viltanan, 01.01.2008 → 31.12.2008, Finland

Membership or other role of body in private company/organisation

Antti Lahelma

Suomen muinaistaideseura r.y., Antti Lahelma, 01.10.2006 → 31.12.2006, Finland
Suomen muinaistaideseura ry, Antti Lahelma, 01.01.2007 → 31.12.2007, Finland
Suomen muinaistaideseura ry, Antti Lahelma, 01.01.2008 → 31.12.2008, Finland

Mikael A. Manninen

Sommelo ry, Mikael A. Manninen, 01.01.2005 → 31.12.2005, Finland
Sommelo Ry., Mikael A. Manninen, 01.01.2006 → 31.12.2006, Finland
Sommelo ry, Mikael A. Manninen, 01.01.2007 → 31.12.2007, Finland
Sommelo ry., Mikael A. Manninen, 01.01.2008 → 31.12.2008, Finland

Tuija Rankama

Velkustilan koirakerho, Tuija Rankama, 01.01.2006 → 31.12.2006, United Kingdom

Oula Seitsonen

Kehitysyhteistyövaliokunta, HYy, Oula Seitsonen, 01.01.2007 → 31.12.2007, Finland
Kehitysyhteistyövaliokunta, HYy, Oula Seitsonen, 01.01.2008 → 31.12.2008, Finland
ARCH-HU/Lavento

Eeva-Maria Viitanen,
Suomen Klassillisen Arkeologian Seura ry., Eeva-Maria Viitanen, 01.01.2005 → 31.12.2005, Finland
Suomen Klassillisen Arkeologian Seura ry., Eeva-Maria Viitanen, 01.01.2006 → 31.12.2006, Italy

Participation in interview for written media

Georg Haggren,

Petri Halinen,
lehti*: Inarilainen, Petri Halinen, 04.07.2007 → 31.12.2011, Finland
lehti: Min áigi, Petri Halinen, 12.09.2007 → 31.12.2011, Finland

Janne Ikäheimo,
Pohjoves-Suomen uutset, Janne Ikäheimo, 01.01.2004 → 31.12.2011, Finland

Henrik Jansson,
Esitelmä (Hangö stad), Henrik Jansson, 17.11.2005 → 31.12.2011, Finland
Esitelmä (Sparbanksstiftelsen i Hangö), Henrik Jansson, 30.11.2005 → 31.12.2011, Finland

Jarmo Kankaanpää,
He tulivat idästä, Jarmo Kankaanpää, 03.07.2010, Finland

Tuja Kirkinen,
Atk 2/06. HY:n tietotekniikkakouluun tiedotatulehti, Tuja Kirkinen, 28.11.2006 → 31.12.2011, Finland

Antti Lahelma,
Sanomalehtihaarattelu Etelä-Saimaa, Antti Lahelma, 21.08.2005, Finland
Sanomalehtihaarattelu Etelä-Saimaa 12.5.2005, Antti Lahelma, 12.05.2005, Finland
Sanomalehtihaarattelu Yhteissanomissa, Antti Lahelma, 19.08.2005, Finland

Kirkkonummen sanomat, Antti Lahelma, 23.05.2008, Finland

Kirkkonummen sanomat, Antti Lahelma, 23.05.2008, Finland

Neljän sanomalehden (Keskil-Uusimaa, Aamuposti, Länsi-Uusimaa ja Uusimaa) perjantai-sivuilla ilmestynyt juttu, Antti Lahelma, 23.05.2008, Finland
Suomen Kuva, Antti Lahelma, 01.08.2008, Finland

Yliopisto (5/2008), Antti Lahelma, 01.07.2008, Finland

Esitelmä Salon kansalaissopiston ketosarjassa "Muistoja mullan alta", Antti Lahelma, 14.01.2009, Finland

Mika Lavento,


Esitelmä Suomen Muinaismuistoyhdistyksen kokouksessa, Mika Lavento, 07.11.2002 → 31.12.2011, Finland

YLE 1, 2 haastattelua, Mika Lavento, 01.01.2002 → 31.12.2011, Finland


Karjala-Klubin kokous, Mika Lavento, 01.01.2003 → 31.12.2011, Finland


Lehtihaastattelu, Etelä-Saimaa -lehti, Oula Seitsonen, 02.09.2005 → 31.12.2011, Finland


Lehtihaastattelu, Aamuposti, Oula Seitsonen, 12.10.2006 → 31.12.2011, Finland

Tuija Rankama, 

ohjelma, Tuija Rankama, 01.01.2005 → 31.12.2011, Finland

He tulivat idästä, Tuija Rankama, 03.07.2010, Finland

Oula Seitsonen, 


Lehtihaastattelu, Etelä-Saimaa -lehti, Oula Seitsonen, 02.09.2005 → 31.12.2011, Finland


Lehtihaastattelu, Aamuposti, Oula Seitsonen, 12.10.2006 → 31.12.2011, Finland
ARCH-HU/Lavento
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Lehtihaastattelu, Demari, Oula Seitsonen, 20.05.2006 → 31.12.2011, Finland
Työelämäasemelmä, Oula Seitsonen, 13.02.2006 → 31.12.2011, Finland
Internetartiikkelit, Inarilainen (http://www.inarilainen.fi/03052007.htm), Oula Seitsonen, 03.05.2007 → 31.12.2011, Finland
Lehdistätiedote, Oula Seitsonen, 09.05.2007 → 31.12.2011, Finland
Lehtihaastattelu, Etelä-Saimaa, Oula Seitsonen, 01.06.2007 → 31.12.2011, Finland
Lehtihaastattelu, Kaupunkilehti Vartti, Oula Seitsonen, 02.09.2007 → 31.12.2011, Finland
Lehtihaastattelu, Suomen Kuvailetti, Oula Seitsonen, 18.05.2007 → 31.12.2011, Finland
Lehtihaastattelu, Valkeaan Sanomat, Oula Seitsonen, 05.09.2007 → 31.12.2011, Finland
Lehtihaastattelu, Venkouutiset, Oula Seitsonen, 09.05.2007 → 31.12.2011, Finland
Kirjata lukijolta: Pälsilläkin on paitansa, Oula Seitsonen, 09.05.2007 → 31.12.2011, Finland
Lehtihaastattelu, Valkealan Sanomat, Oula Seitsonen, 05.09.2007 → 31.12.2011, Finland
Lehtihaastattelu, Verkkouutiset, Oula Seitsonen, 09.05.2007 → 31.12.2011, Finland
Kirjata lukiolta: Pälsilläkin on paitansa, Oula Seitsonen, 09.05.2007 → 31.12.2011, Finland
Lehtihaastattelu, Lapin Kansa, Oula Seitsonen, 15.06.2008 → 31.12.2011, Finland

Pirjo Uino


Eeva-Maria Viitanen

Klassillista arkeologiaa Helsingin yliopistossa -näyttelyn esitelmäpaivä Helsingissä, Eeva-Maria Viitanen, 22.03.2000 → 31.12.2011, Italy
*Archeologia nei laghi Albano e Nomentana*, Nemin kaupungin ja pohjoismaisten instituutien yhteisselvitysmatka, Nemi, Italia, Eeva-Maria Viitanen, 18.07.2001 → 31.12.2011, Finland
Ango ry:n esitelmäiltä, Eeva-Maria Viitanen, 12.11.2001 → 31.12.2011, Finland
Suomen arkeologian seura ry:n vuosikokous, Eeva-Maria Viitanen, 24.02.2001 → 31.12.2011, Finland
Studia Pompeiana: Expeditio Pompeiana Universitatis Helsingensiksen ja Helsingin yliopiston vapaan sivistystyön toimikunnan yhteisötilaisuus, Eeva-Maria Viitanen, 23.01.2003 → 31.12.2011, Finland
Latinankielien opettajien yhdistyksen Latinlärmas frühling ry. koulutuspäivä, Kuopio, Eeva-Maria Viitanen, 04.08.2004 → 31.12.2011, Finland
Studia Pompeiana, Helsingin yliopiston Pompei-projektin esitelmäilta Turussa, Eeva-Maria Viitanen, 22.01.2004 → 31.12.2011, Finland
Ylen 1 ohjelma Apropos, toim. Ainomaija Pennanen., Eeva-Maria Viitanen, 01.08.2009 → 31.12.2011, Finland
Helsingin Sanomat, haastattelu, Eeva-Maria Viitanen, 26.01.2006 → 31.12.2011, Italy
Itala-Sanomat Pussia-lite, haastattelu, Eeva-Maria Viitanen, 01.01.2006 → 31.12.2011, Italy
Seura, haastattelu, Eeva-Maria Viitanen, 01.01.2006 → 31.12.2011, Italy
Sanomalehtihaastatteluja, Eeva-Maria Viitanen, 01.01.2008 → 31.12.2011, Finland

Anna Wessman

Huhtriniemen kaivauksissa on löytynyt viemärä ja kaapelia, Anna Wessman, 15.05.2009
Huhtriniemen kalmistoon laajuiset selvitelyt, Anna Wessman, 12.05.2009
Huhtriniemestä paljastui lisää hautuja, Anna Wessman, 16.05.2009
Huhtriniemestä paljastui lisää venäläishautoja, Anna Wessman, 15.05.2009
Rautakauden laajuiset hautat, Anna Wessman, 09.2010
Participation in radio programme

Yle Radio1, Petri Halinen, 23.05.2006 → 31.12.2011, Finland
Radio Inari, Petri Halinen, 14.06.2007 → 31.12.2011, Finland
Sámi radio, Petri Halinen, 10.08.2007 → 31.12.2011, Finland
Sámi radio, Petri Halinen, 15.06.2007 → 31.12.2011, Finland

Antti Lahelma, Radiohaastattelu YLEn Lappeenrannan radiolle., Antti Lahelma, 19.08.2005, Finland
Radiohaastattelu Ylen ykkösselle, Antti Lahelma, 12.12.2005, Finland
Ylen Radio 1, kulttuurututkimus, Antti Lahelma, 23.04.2008, Finland

Kristiina Mannermaa, "Siipien arkeologia" toimittaja Riitta Vauraan ohjelma joka perustuu haastatteluun väitöskirjatutkimuksestani, Kristiina Mannermaa, 01.01.2008, Denmark
Keskusluentoittaja, asiantuntijaraadin jäsen. Yle Radio Suomi, Kristiina Mannermaa, 19.05.2009
Vieraana suorassa lähetysessa Yle Puhe, YLE 1 12.10.2010 (toimittaja Kati Turholta) 30 min., Kristiina Mannermaa, 12.10.2010

Teemu Olavi Mökkönen, YLE Radio 1, Teemu Olavi Mökkönen, 01.06.2006 → 31.12.2011, Finland
radio-ohjelma Yle 1, Kultakuume, Teemu Olavi Mökkönen, 01.01.2007 → 31.12.2011, Finland

Eeva-Maria Viitanen, YLE Radio 1 Tiedekahvila, Eeva-Maria Viitanen, 07.06.2006, Finland
YLE Radio 1 Tiedekahvila, haastattelu, Eeva-Maria Viitanen, 07.06.2006 → 31.12.2011, Italy
YLE Radio 1 Tiedepersoona, Eeva-Maria Viitanen, 09.08.2006, Finland
YLE Radio 1 Tiedepersoona, haastattelu, Eeva-Maria Viitanen, 09.08.2006 → 31.12.2011, Italy

Anna Wessman, Lappeenrannan Huthiniemessä kaiutetuksi taas, Anna Wessman, 11.05.2009

Participation in TV programme

Petri Halinen, Yle TV1 ja Yle Teema, Petri Halinen, 03.03.2006 → 31.12.2011, Finland
Saamen TV-uutiset, Petri Halinen, 20.06.2007 → 31.12.2011, Finland

Jarmo Kankaanpää, Esitystietoineen asiantuntijana "Maan povesta" -ohjelmasarjassa, Jarmo Kankaanpää, 29.06.2005, Finland

Antti Lahelma, TV-haastattelu 23.8 arkeologia-ahiseen dokumenttisarjaan Maan povesta – Suomen arkeologi-aa, joka esitetään maaliskuussa 2006., Antti Lahelma, 23.08.2005, Finland
Maan povesta – Suomen arkeologiaa (TV-sarja), Antti Lahelma, 01.01.2006, Finland
Arte TV, Antti Lahelma, 16.05.2008 → 31.12.2011, Finland
YLEn TV-uutiset (samassa yhteydessä YLEn radio 1, sama aika ja sama aihe), Antti Lahelma, 19.04.2008, Finland
ARCH-HU/Lavento

Mika Lavento,
n. 30 TV-, radio-, ja sanomalehtihaastattelua, Mika Lavento, 01.01.2006 → 31.12.2011, Finland
n. 30 TV-, radio- ja lehtihaastattelua, Mika Lavento, 01.01.2007 → 31.12.2011, Estonia

Kristiina Mannermaa,
Lähikuussa Kristiina Mannermaa, Kristiina Mannermaa, 13.03.2008

Teemu Olavi Mökkönen,

Tuija Rankama,
Appearance as scientific expert in a TV documentary series "Maan povesta", Tuija Rankama, 29.06.2005 → ..., Finland
TV-ohjelma, haastattelu, Tuija Rankama, 01.01.2006 → 31.12.2011, United Kingdom

Eeva-Maria Vitanen,
YLE TV 1 Prisma Studio, Eeva-Maria Vitanen, 04.10.2006, Finland
YLE TV 1 Prisma Studio, haastattelu, Eeva-Maria Vitanen, 04.10.2006 → 31.12.2011, Italy

Anna Wessman,
Lappeenrannan Huhtiniemessä kaivetaan taas, Anna Wessman, 11.05.2009
Levänluhdan kadonnut kansa, Anna Wessman, 15.05.2009
Lappeenrannan Huhtiniemessä kaivetaan taas, Anna Wessman, 15.05.2009

Participation in interview for web based media

Anna Wessman,
Lappeenrannan Huhtiniemen kaivauksissa hautalöyty, Anna Wessman, 15.05.2009
Lappeenrannan Huhtiniemessä kaivetaan taas, Anna Wessman, 11.05.2009
Appendix B.b.

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

The bibliometric analyses by Helsinki University Library (HULib)

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

**Humanities**
Aejmelaeus, Anneli – CSTT
Anttonen, Pertti – CMVG
Dunderberg, Ismo – FC
Havu, Eva – CoCoLoC
Heikilä, Markku – RCSP
Heinämaa, Sara – SHC
Henriksson, Markku – CITA
Janhunen, Juha – LDHFTA
Kaja, Mika – AMNE
Klippi, Anu – Interaction
Knuutila, 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
Kaartinena, Timo – SCAC
Kettunen, Pauli – NordSoc
Kivinen, Markku – FCREEES
Koponen, Juhani – DEVERELE
Koskenniemi, Martti – ECI
Kultti, Klaus – EAT
Lahtela, Elina – KUFE
Lanne, Markku – TSEM
Lavonen, Jari – RCMSER
Lehtonen, Risto – SocStats
Lindblom-Ylänne, 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.
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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No. of authors</th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>Grand Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>289</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Total</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>462</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The publications have mostly only one author (63 %).
Language of publication / Year

<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>Finnish fi_FI</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>258</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English en_GB</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>175</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swedish sv_SE</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russian ru_RU</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The commonest language is Finnish (56 %), as English (38 %) in the second place.

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language</th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>en_GB</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fi_FI</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sv_SE</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ru_RU</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>et_EE</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fr_FR</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**Journal / Year / Total**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Journal</th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Muinaistutkija</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arctos : Acta Philologica Fennica</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SKAS</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fennoscandia Archaeologica</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fossa</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pirta : Kalevalaisten naisten liiton jäsenlehti.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karjala : puolueista riippumaton karjalaisten heimolehti.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pyhätärvi Vpl. : Pyhätärveläisyyden ja Karjalan puolustaja</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Antiquity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karjala</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journal Name</td>
<td>Volume</td>
<td>Issue</td>
<td>Pages</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eesti Arheoloogia Ajakiri</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journal of Near Eastern Studies</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nyame akuma.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suomen museo</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arkeologipäivät</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finskt Museum</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inarilainen : Inarin ja Utsjoen paikallislehti.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norwegian Archaeological Review</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Säkkiärvä</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tiede</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Journal of Archaeology</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Azania</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Before farming</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hiidenkivi</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hiisi : lehti muinaisuuden harrastajille</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journal of Archaeological Science</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kaakonkulma : Virolahden, Miehikkälän ja Ylämaan paikallislehti.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kimppu : Helsingin yliopiston ylioppilaskunnan kehitysyhteistyövaliokunnan julkaisu</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Koivistons viesti : Koivistolaisten seuran kotiseutulehti.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nordenskioöld-samfundets tidskrift.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quaternary International</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Radiocarbon</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Räisäläinen : karjalaisen perinteen vaalija - räisäläisten yhdyside</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acta Borealia</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AIACNews : Bolletino quadrimestrale dell'Associazione Internazionale di Archeologia Classica Onlus</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual of the Department of Antiquities of Jordan</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Antiquité tardive</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arkeologia NYT!</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Climate of the Past</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ekbladet</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>European Journal of Archaeology</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faravid</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Genos</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geological Survey of Finland. Special Paper</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hembygden : organ för Finlandssvenskt hembygdsarbete</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holocene</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICOMOS : Suomen osaston jäsentiedote.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Journal of Osteoarchaeology</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iskos</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journal of African Archaeology</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journal of Anthropological Archaeology</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journal of conflict archaeology</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journal</td>
<td>Rank</td>
<td>Country 1</td>
<td>Country 2</td>
<td>Country 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kanava</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karjalainen viesti</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lapin kullankaivaja</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Le Monde de la Bible</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marine Geology</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maunulan Sanomat</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mesolithic miscellany</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metsähallituksen luonnonsuojelujulkaisuja</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Museoviesti</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Near Eastern Archaeology</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nuclear Instruments &amp; Methods in Physics Research. Section B: Beam Interactions with Materials and Atoms</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nylandsk hembygd : organ för Nylands svenska hembygds- och museiförsamling rf.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pamatky Archeologice</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positio : paikkatiedon erikoislehti</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Radlovskij sbornik : naucznych issledowania i muzejnycy proekty MAE RAN v</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skholion : Suomen Bysantin tutkimuksen seura ry:n jäsenlehti</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suomen Antropologi</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suomen luonto</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suvannon seutu</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Synteesi : taitteidenvalisen tutkimuksen aikakauslehti</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Temenos</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tieteesää tapahtuu</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuglas-seura</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turun yliopiston julkaisuja. Sarja B, Humaniora</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>World Archaeology</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Västnylandsk årsbok</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zeitschrift des Deutschen Palästina-Vereins</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Total</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>226</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The following title was excluded from the table (book, not a journal):
- Den långa medeltiden

**Journal ranking (Norway, Australia, ERIH)**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Muinaistutkija</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arctos : Acta Philologica Fennica</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SKAS</td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fennoscandia Archaeologica</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Antiquity</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eesti Arheoloogia Ajakiri</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journal of Near Eastern Studies</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nyame akuma.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suomen museo</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finskt Museum</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norwegian Archaeological Review</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Journal of Archaeology</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>A*</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Azania</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Before farming</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journal of Archaeological Science</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>A*</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quaternary International</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Radiocarbon</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acta Borealia</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual of the Department of Antiquities of Jordan</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Antiquité tardive</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Climate of the Past</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>European Journal of Archaeology</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holocene</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Journal of Osteoarchaeology</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iskos</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journal of African Archaeology</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journal of Anthropological Archaeology</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kanava</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marine Geology</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journal Title</td>
<td>Level</td>
<td>Quality</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Near Eastern Archaeology</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nuclear Instruments &amp; Methods in Physics Research, Section B: Beam Interactions with Materials and Atoms</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Památky Archeologicke</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suomen Antropologi</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Temenos</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>World Archaeology</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zeitschrift des Deutschen Palästina-Vereins</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Amount of ranked articles (Norway)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Journal articles</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Level 2</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level 1</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Amount of ranked articles (Australian)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Journal articles</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Level A*</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level A</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level B</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level C</td>
<td>41</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 (3)
- C2 Edited book, compilation, conference proceeding or special issue of journal (7)
- D5 Text book or professional handbook or guidebook or dictionary (9)
- E2 Popular monograph (6)

0 books of 16 have been published by a high ranked leading scientific publisher, 1 by a ranked scientific publisher.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Publisher</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>Publisher ranking</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>City of Vantaa</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Otava</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weilin + Göös</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Archaeological Society of Finland</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finnish Antiquarian Society</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finnish Society of Sciences and Letters = Societas Scientiarum Fennica</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foundation of the Finnish Institute in the Middle East</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gaudeamus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metsähallitus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ministry of the Environment (Finland)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ministry of the Environment (Ympäristöministeriö, alueidenkäytön osasto)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Helsinki, Institute for Cultural Research, Department of Archaeology</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Helsinki, Palmenia Centre for Continuing Education</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Total</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>