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Foreword

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Johanna Björkroth  
Vice-Rector  
Chair of the Steering Group of the Evaluation

---
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1 Introduction to the Evaluation

1.1 RC-specific evaluation reports

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

It is essential to emphasise that the evaluation combines both meta-evaluation\(^3\) and traditional research assessment exercise and its focus is both on the research outcomes and procedures associated with research and doctoral training. The approach to the evaluation is enhancement-led where self-evaluation constituted the main information. The answers to the evaluation questions formed together with the information of publications and other scientific activities an entity that was to be reviewed as a whole.

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

1.2 Aims and objectives in the evaluation

The aims of the evaluation are as follows:

- to improve the level of research and doctoral training at the University of Helsinki and to raise their international profile in accordance with the University’s strategic policies. The improvement of doctoral training should be compared to the University’s policy.\(^4\)
- to enhance the research conducted at the University by taking into account the diversity, originality, multidisciplinary nature, success and field-specificity,
- to recognize the conditions and prerequisites under which excellent, original and high-impact research is carried out,
- to offer the academic community the opportunity to receive topical and versatile international peer feedback,
- to better recognize the University’s research potential.
- to exploit the University’s TUHAT research information system to enable transparency of publishing activities and in the production of reliable, comparable data.

1.3 Evaluation method

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

\(^3\) The panellists did not read research reports or abstracts but instead, they evaluated answers to the evaluation questions, tables and compilations of publications, other scientific activities, bibliometrics or comparable analyses.

\(^4\) Policies on doctoral degrees and other postgraduate degrees at the University of Helsinki.
The comparison produced information about the present status and factors that have lead to success. Also challenges in the operations and outcomes were recognized.

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

**Five stages of the evaluation method were:**
1. Registration – Stage 1
2. Self-evaluation – Stage 2
3. TUHAT\(^5\) compilations on publications and other scientific activities\(^6\)
4. External evaluation
5. Public reporting

### 1.4 Implementation of the external evaluation

**Five Evaluation Panels**

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

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

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

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

The panel meetings were held in Helsinki:

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

---

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Evaluation material

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

Background material

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

2. Practises and quality of doctoral training
   - Organising of the doctoral training in the RC. Description of the RC’s principles for:
     - recruitment and selection of doctoral candidates
     - supervision of doctoral candidates
     - collaboration with faculties, departments/institutes, and potential graduate schools/doctoral programmes
     - good practises and quality assurance in doctoral training
   - Identification of the ways to strengthen the 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 breakthrough.
3. The research of the participating community is distinct from mainstream research, and the special
   features of the research tradition in the field must be considered in the evaluation. The research is
   of high quality and has great significance and impact in its field. However, the generally used
   research evaluation methods do not necessarily shed sufficient light on the merits of the
   research.
4. The research of the participating community represents an innovative opening. A new opening can
   be an innovative combination of research fields, or it can be proven to have a special social,
   national or international demand or other significance. Even if the researcher community in its
   present composition has yet to obtain proof of international success, its members can produce
   convincing evidence of the high level of their previous research.
5. The research of the participating community has a highly significant societal impact. The
   participating researcher community is able to justify the high social significance of its research.
   The research may relate to national legislation, media visibility or participation in social debate,
   or other activities promoting social development and human welfare. In addition to having
   societal impact, the research must be of a high standard.

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

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

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

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

---

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

The main timetable of the evaluation:

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

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

1.9 Evaluation feedback – consensus of the entire panel

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

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

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

2.1 Focus and quality of the RC’s research

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

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

**Strengths**
The RC is specialised, longstanding and sustained in its research focus. It has established itself as a world centre for its research and convening of international research. Although its research focus is not necessarily central to the broader, much more established, field of study in music, it has firmly placed itself on the agenda of music study. In addition, in the context of semiotics globally, the RC has been more successful than any other area.

**Areas of development**
The RC has most of the cutting edge areas of musical signification covered, so it is difficult to make specific recommendations for areas of development.

**Other remarks**
An issue that pertains to the above comments and to this evaluation in general is the position of musical signification in relation to semiotics and the position of semiotics in the world of academia in general. The transdisciplinarity of semiotics means that it is not considered by some to be a discipline in itself like such other recently founded disciplines as media studies, sociology or English literature which have been institutionalized as specialist fields to be taught within tight boundaries in the Western education system. This fact must be taken into account in assessing this RC; for example, it prevents the flagship journal of semiotics, Semiotica, from gaining the highest possible grade despite its high grading elsewhere and the fact that it has regularly published globally renowned work.

**Recommendations**
Ways to strengthen the focus and improve the quality of the RC’s research include internal promotion of achieving staff and recruitment of younger, research-focused staff as well as, obviously, increased financial support for research projects.

**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.**
Strengths
The RC has provided a very solid base for doctoral training. Unlike many Western universities it figures doctoral recruitment as induction into international research rather than simply enrolment on programmes of study. Hence doctoral students are attracted to congresses and schools to pursue a common project of research to which their own specialism will contribute. Recruitment to an existing research community in this way seems optimal and places doctoral candidates in an environment of research endeavour from the outset rather than in an environment of pedagogy.

The RC's ongoing programme of events serves not just recruitment but the existing doctoral candidates. In general, those candidates are served very well by a publishing programme (especially the opportunity to publish in respected outlets such as Acta Semiotica Fennica) and advanced networking.

There seems to be a very good rate of timely completion among the RC's doctoral candidates as well as progression to research careers.

Areas of development
There is a good, varied international profile for the doctoral recruitment. It would be interesting to see if strong candidates could be recruited from non-Western areas, particularly East Asia.

Other remarks
To reiterate, the nature of recruitment is remarkable.

Recommendations
See ‘Areas of development’, above.

Numeric evaluation: 5 (Outstanding)

2.3 The societal impact of research and doctoral training

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

ASPECTS: Societal impact, national and international collaboration, innovativeness

Strengths
There are 3 main strengths in terms of impact of this RC. First, the subject of musical signification itself has social and cultural importance in and of itself in Finland and is already seen as a part of civic life. Second, the research focus is such that musical signification has had an impact on the broader semiotics community, on the community of doctoral researchers and on the community of musicologists (see ‘1. Focus and quality of the RC’s research’, above). Thirdly, there is the work that the RC has devoted to publishing in popular (especially Finnish) outlets during the period under review (28 publications, including 6 in English).

Areas of development
There is already a commitment to the diversity of music and the varied facets of musical signification (from conductors’ communication to music therapy). The RC's commitment to international study will no doubt extend on a global basis.

Other remarks
None.
Recommendations

 To continue expansion on the current basis, considering partnerships with Asian universities and studies of music outside the Western tradition.
 Increase the number of popular publications in English.

Numeric evaluation: 4 (Excellent)

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

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

ASPECTS: Scientific quality, national and international collaboration

Strengths
The long list of international collaborations of the RC speaks for itself. However, particularly noteworthy is not just the European and US connections but the research centre for Latin American music. (Eero Tarasti, among other things, is a world authority on Villa-Lobos). The Pan-European Programme and the Finnbarentz project are promising.

Areas of development
Possible collaboration with non-Western institutions.

Other remarks
None.

Recommendations
Highlight the possible collaboration with institutions at pre-doctoral level to work as ‘feeder’ for doctoral recruitment e.g. Erasmus.

Numeric evaluation: 4 (Excellent)

2.5 Operational conditions

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

ASPECTS: Processes and good practices related to leadership and management

Strengths
The evaluation document from the RC highlights some of the negative aspects of the current operational conditions. It would be useful to know more from the university about how RCs’ research infrastructure is constituted and the structure of negotiations for development.

One obvious strength is the longevity and established nature of the RC. This must contribute to the expertise with which operational conditions are negotiated. However, when conditions change, this longevity also enables acute evaluation of the change.
Areas of development
Difficult to judge on the basis of the current document, part from the fact that the increasing teaching load has had its impact on research.

Other remarks
When the focus of evaluation strengths turns to negatives, then this is an indication that the RC’s staff foresee problems with the impending circumstances in the institution despite the successes that their work to date has brought them.

Recommendations
The senior managers at the university must engage in close negotiation with the RC’s staff to address the teaching/research balance and to reach a compromise on the level of administration that is provided in order to maintain the palpable progress and achievement of the RC.

It is notable that a numeric evaluation is not called for, here.

2.6 Leadership and management in the researcher community

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

ASPECTS: Processes and good practices related to leadership and management

Strengths
The RC clearly has strong traditions and is well connected outside the University of Helsinki.

Areas of development
None.

Other remarks
More detail on the structure of leadership would be welcome.

Recommendations
See above.

2.7 External competitive funding of the RC

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

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

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

**Strengths**

It is assumed that where a figure in bold is not given, then no funding has been allocated. Nevertheless, in the period under question, the RC has managed to gain funds which are not far off 1 million Euros, thus averaging nearly 250,000 Euros per year. The funding has not just come from Finnish organizations but from international (especially European) ones.

**Areas of development**

None.

**Other remarks**

These figures seem to me to represent a considerable endeavour in light of staff numbers and they indicate that the RC is both strong and has a good profile outside the University of Helsinki.

**Recommendations**

None.

---

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

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

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

**Strengths**

Strong on international collaboration: especially with China – Nanjing conference and the arrival of the first Chinese postdoctoral scholar to the RC.

**Areas of development**

Latin America, Kazakhstan and Turkey links.

**Other remarks**

Although there is founded confidence in the future success of this RC, this strategic plan was too brief for the purposes of making a definitive evaluation.

**Recommendations**

RC to be given the opportunity to present a more detailed strategic plan listing the nature of collaboration with the countries/institutions mentioned, plans for future conferences/schools and recruitment of doctoral students, number of PhD awards expected to be made per year, and so forth.
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 1. The research of the participating community represents the international cutting edge in its field.

Strengths
The RC’s longevity is an indication of its strength and also its esteem beyond the boundaries of Helsinki. So, too, is its collaboration with European, North American and South American partners.
   The research environment-led nature of its doctoral student recruitment and training is one of the best.
   The RC’s commitment to impact, academic and social, is notable also.
   Above all, perhaps, is the RC’s demonstrable capacity for raising European research funds during the period assessed.

Areas of development
Links with Asia and the non-Western academic world are in the early stages of development.

Other remarks
Given the high profile of this RC and its excellent record of publications, a few points should be clarified in relation to the latter. The data seems to show that 2009 was a high point for numbers of publications with a dip thereafter. In fact, 2008 and 2009 witnessed a large number of publications in Finnish Music Quarterly (presumably a special issue featuring the RC’s members). Taking this into account, then it is clear that there has been a steady rise in publications and, excluding the annus mirabilis of 2008/9, the publications are still on the rise. In addition, there should be no underestimation of the good number (7) of monographs in English produced during the period. These – much more than articles – will contribute to the process of attracting doctoral students. There are some comments on the impact of popular articles (31 Finnish, 17 English), but it should be stressed the impact entailed by the good range of languages in which the RC’s publications appear.

Recommendations
- Consideration by the University of Helsinki of the teaching/research balance in the RC
- Robust promotions and recruitment procedure for staff to be discussed.
- RC to be allowed to submit a more detailed strategic plan.
- Encouragement of RC to collaborate beyond its extensive work in order to embrace non-Western perspectives, partners and institutions.

Numeric evaluation: 4 (Excellent)

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

Strengths
World renowned work of Tarasti and Martinelli dominates the RC. However, there are significant contributions from Navickaite-Martinelli and Huhta and the developers of the ICT music tools.

Areas of development
Semiotics, zoomusicology, Sibelius, Wagner, existential semiotics

Other remarks
This information was gleaned from the Tuhat compilations of publications data rather than from Section 9 of the RC’s evaluation response which is rather scant.
Recommendations
More doctoral students to collaborate in publication.

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

Comments if applicable
Oddly, the RC’s research fits with Focus 8, ‘Language and culture’, despite the fact that musical signification is a signification ‘beyond’ language. However, the RC’s work on music in Finnish culture in particular puts it within this focus. Of course, it also focuses on music in other cultures. Note, too, that some work on the nature of music and the animals that produce it puts some of the RC’s work in Focus 4, ‘The thinking and learning human being’ (see, especially, the publications of Martinelli).

2.12 RC-specific main recommendations

- Consideration by the University of Helsinki of the teaching/research balance in the RC
- Robust promotions and recruitment procedure for staff to be discussed.
- RC to develop a more detailed strategic plan.
- Highlight the possible collaboration with institutions at pre-doctoral level to work as ‘feeder’ for doctoral recruitment e.g. Erasmus.
- To develop the structure of leadership.
- To continue expansion on the current basis, considering partnerships with Asian universities and studies of music outside the Western tradition.
- Encouragement of RC to collaborate beyond its extensive work in order to embrace non-Western perspectives, partners and institutions.
- Increase the number of popular publications in English.

2.13 RC-specific conclusions

A very strong RC bringing much credit and international esteem to the University of Helsinki. Nevertheless, despite – or because of – the long-established RC and the professionalism of its members, the University needs to pay close attention to how Mus Sig’s staff can be supported to meet the challenges of facing global higher education. In particular, there is a threat to many music departments in countries where the culture of music is not as developed as it is in Finland and this may pose a threat to the RC if the flow of doctoral candidates should be impeded. Staff should be encouraged to explore new avenues and to engage in projects with even more impact. The RC should be enabled to recruit young staff (including from the doctoral pool) and to enhance existing staff for their contribution.

2.14 Preliminary findings in the Panel-specific feedback

The RC is specialised, longstanding and sustained in its research focus which fits with the University of Helsinki’s Foci 8 and 4. It has established itself as a world centre for its research and convening of international research. It has firmly placed itself on the agenda of music study. In addition, in the context of semiotics globally, the RC has been more successful than any other area. The RC has provided a very solid base for doctoral training. Unlike many Western universities it figures doctoral recruitment as induction into international research rather than simply enrolment on programmes of study. Hence doctoral students are attracted to congresses and schools to pursue a common project of research to which their own specialism will contribute. Recruitment to an existing research community in this way seems optimal and
places doctoral candidates in an environment of research endeavour from the outset rather than in an environment of pedagogy.

There are 3 main strengths in terms of impact of this RC. First, the subject of musical signification itself has social and cultural importance in and of itself in Finland and is already seen as a part of civic life. Second, the research focus is such that musical signification has had an impact on the broader semiotics community, on the community of doctoral researchers and on the community of musicologists (see ‘1. Focus and quality of the RC’s research’, above). Thirdly, there is the work that the RC has devoted to publishing in popular (especially Finnish) outlets during the period under review (28 publications, including 6 in English).

The RC has managed to gain funds which are not far off 1 million Euros, thus averaging nearly 250,000 Euros per year. The funding has not just come from Finnish organizations but from international (especially European) ones.

The strategic plan was not iterated at its best in the evaluation. The RC should be given the opportunity to present a more detailed strategic plan listing the nature of collaboration with the countries/institutions mentioned, plans for future conferences/schools and recruitment of doctoral students, number of PhD awards expected to be made per year, and so forth.

It appears that the operational conditions as reported by the RC need to be considered by the University of Helsinki, specifically the teaching/research balance.

The initiation of collaboration beyond the RC’s extensive work in order to embrace non-Western perspectives, partners and institutions is worthy of extension.

2.15 Preliminary findings in the University-level evaluation

The RC is specialised, longstanding and sustained in its research focus which fits with the University of Helsinki’s Foci 8 and 4. It has established itself as a world centre for its research and convening of international research. It has firmly placed itself on the agenda of music study. In addition, in the context of semiotics globally, the RC has been more successful than any other area. The RC has provided a very solid base for doctoral training. Unlike many Western universities it figures doctoral recruitment as induction into international research rather than simply enrolment on programmes of study. Hence doctoral students are attracted to congresses and schools to pursue a common project of research to which their own specialism will contribute. Recruitment to an existing research community in this way seems optimal and places doctoral candidates in an environment of research endeavour from the outset rather than in an environment of pedagogy.

There are 3 main strengths in terms of impact of this RC. First, the subject of musical signification itself has social and cultural importance in and of itself in Finland and is already seen as a part of civic life. Second, the research focus is such that musical signification has had an impact on the broader semiotics community, on the community of doctoral researchers and on the community of musicologists (see ‘1. Focus and quality of the RC’s research’, above). Thirdly, there is the work that the RC has devoted to publishing in popular (especially Finnish) outlets during the period under review (28 publications, including 6 in English).

The RC has managed to gain funds which are not far off 1 million Euros, thus averaging nearly 250,000 Euros per year. The funding has not just come from Finnish organizations but from international (especially European) ones.

The strategic plan was not iterated at its best in the evaluation. The RC should be given the opportunity to present a more detailed strategic plan listing the nature of collaboration with the countries/institutions mentioned, plans for future conferences/schools and recruitment of doctoral students, number of PhD awards expected to be made per year, and so forth.

It appears that the operational conditions as reported by the RC need to be considered by the University of Helsinki, specifically the teaching/research balance.

The initiation of collaboration beyond the RC’s extensive work in order to embrace non-Western perspectives, partners and institutions is worthy of extension.
Given the high profile of this RC and its excellent record of publications, a few points should be clarified in relation to the latter. The data seems to show that 2009 was a high point for numbers of publications with a dip thereafter. In fact, 2008 and 2009 witnessed a large number of publications in Finnish Music Quarterly (presumably a special issue featuring the RC's members). Taking this into account, then it is clear that there has been a steady rise in publications and, excluding the annus mirabilis of 2008/9, the publications are still on the rise. In addition, there should be no underestimation of the good number (7) of monographs in English produced during the period. These – much more than articles, in my opinion – will contribute to the process of attracting doctoral students. Some comments on the impact of popular articles (31 Finnish, 17 English) can be made, but it should be stressed the impact entailed by the good range of languages in which the RC's publications appear.

In summary, this is an excellent RC demonstrating impressive endeavour during the assessment period. It has established traditions and has been able to retain focus and carry out cutting edge work which contributes to its international profile. To maintain its upward trajectory, however, the University of Helsinki will need to pay close attention to issues of staffing, funding, allocation of duties and the encouragement of partnerships beyond the Western world in those instances where there is potential for academic growth.
3 Appendices

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

B. Bibliometric analyses
   a. Analysis provided by CWTS/University of Leiden
   b. Analysis provided by Helsinki University Library (66 RCs)
NAME OF THE RESEARCHER COMMUNITY:
Musical Signification (MusSig)

LEADER OF THE RESEARCHER COMMUNITY:
Professor Eero Tarasti, Department of Philosophy, History, Culture and Art Studies, Musicology

RC-SPECIFIC MATERIAL FOR THE PEER REVIEW:

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

NB! Since Web of Science(WoS)-based bibliometrics does not provide representative results for most RCs representing humanities, social sciences and computer sciences, the publications of these RCs will be analyzed by the UH Library (results available by the end of June, 2011)
Name: Tarasti, Eero
E-mail: 
Phone: 040 861 9031
Affiliation: Professor
Street address: Dep. of Musicology, P.O. Box 35, Vironkatu 1, 00014 University of Helsinki

Name of the participating RC (max. 30 characters): Musical Signification
Acronym for the participating RC (max. 10 characters): MusSig

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):
International research project on musical semiotics; it was founded in Paris in 1984, among six scholars: Francois Delalande (French Radio), Marcello Castellana (EHESS, Paris), Costin Miereanu (Paris I) Gino Stefani (Bologna) Luiz Heitor Corrêa de Azevedo (UNESCO, chief of Music), Eero Tarasti (University of Helsinki). Now it has over 600 members all over the world. The center of the project has been since its foundation Department of Musicology, University of Helsinki, and its director prof Tarasti, during 25 years. It has organized regular, almost biannual international congresses on its work in the universities, institutes and music academies of Helsinki, Imatra (twice, hosted by the International Semiotics Institute), Edinburgh, Bologna, Aix en Provence, Paris (twice), Rome, Vilnius, and Cracow. Next one will be in Catholic University of Louvain, Belgium in 2012. The popularity and fame of the project is reflected by the size of these meetings, last one in Cracow had 170 papers and 8 parallel sessions. The trend has been increasing participation from all over the world.

At the same time its other practical working form has been international doctoral and postdoctoral seminars on musical semiotics, which have been organized only in Finland, by Department of Musicology at Helsinki University, and ISI at Imatra. Altogether 13 such seminars have been held so far, 20-25 international students attending each one, director prof Tarasti with several co-directors, among them leading specialists of the world like Charles Rosen, who attended 6 times seminars. These seminars like the aforementioned large congresses have been a major recruiting channel of doctoral students for University of Helsinki.

Main scientific field of the RC’s research: humanities
RC’s scientific subfield 1: Music
RC’s scientific subfield 2: --Select--
INTERNATIONAL EVALUATION OF RESEARCH AND DOCTORAL TRAINING AT THE UNIVERSITY OF HELSINKI

RC-SPECIFIC STAGE 1 MATERIAL (registration form)

RC’s scientific subfield 3: --Select--
RC’s scientific subfield 4: --Select--
Other, if not in the list: musicology, semiotics, musical semiotics

4 RC’S PARTICIPATION CATEGORY

Participation category: 1. Research of the participating community represents the international cutting edge in its field

Justification for the selected participation category (MAX. 2200 characters with spaces): Since the project of the RC has a long history behind it, 25 years, it has been extraordinarily successful in its academic work, both research and teaching, it is internationally well-known and recognized, it publishes at major authoritative publishing houses its work, its impact on the development of its discipline has been global, there is no doubt that it should belong to the 1st category.

The project is working in the first place in the field of musicology, but second in semiotics, as well. In fact the combination of these two has launched a new discipline or paradigm in these fields, called musical semiotics. This new paradigm which still in the 1970s was at its initial phase has, thanks to the activities of RC, become an esteemed new avenue for music scholars and semioticians. This has been noted in the world congresses of both musicology and semiotics during the period under question.

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 major form of doctoral training has been the international doctoral and postdoctoral seminars held biannually and regularly at the Department of musicology in Helsinki University. Each seminar has lasted one week, during which about 20-25 doctoral students from all over the world has presented their doctoral projects. The director has been always prof Tarasti, one of the leading scholars in the field and President of the IASS/AIS (International association of semiotic studies) after Umberto Eco. But co-directors have included the best forces of the world from profs. Charles Rosen (New York), prof. Marta Grabocz (Strasbourg), Costin Miereanu (Paris I Sorbonne), Jean-Marie Jacono (Aix en Provence) and others. In addition prof. Tarasti has held regularly at the University of Helsinki, an international seminar on musical semiotics in English, to which numerous international students have attended during 2005-2010; these seminars have convened on weekly basis.

Moreover the summer congresses of ISI Imatra have offered an opportunity to young doctoral students to present their works for a truly international audience in semiotics. For many this has been their first international speech occasion, and hence of high pedagogical meaning.

Significance of the RC’s research and doctoral training for the University of Helsinki (MAX. 2200 characters with spaces): The number of PhD:s obtained during the period, from the 17 theses at UH musicology 11 use semiotics, for a period of 5 years more than 1 per year, shows the efficiency of our doctoral training. But also how well musicology has met the challenges of the internationalization of higher academic studies in Helsinki University. Yet our Finnish students likewise have benefited from the international community of musicologists and semioticians which have dwelt at the Department of Musicology during the period. 7 of these have been published in English.
INTERNATIONAL EVALUATION OF RESEARCH AND DOCTORAL TRAINING AT THE UNIVERSITY OF HELSINKI

RC-SPECIFIC STAGE 1 MATERIAL (registration form)

Keywords: narrativity, gesture, topics, sign, signifier/signified, communication/signification, competence/performance, isotopies, existentiality

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): Publishing strategy of the RC continues the same as shown by the evidence. All the congress proceedings are published at major international publishing series, including those among highest ranked in the world like De Gruyter Mouton, Sorbonne, Indiana Uni Press, Ricordi, Laterza etc. Also the international publishing series of Acta semiotica fennica continues publishing all doctoral theses of the project, as well as individual monographs by its scholars. The books by project directors appear at leading academic publisher, like at the above mentioned De Gruyter Mouton in Berlin, and L’harmattan Paris and others.

Project has published also PhD theses defended elsewhere, like the one by Maciej Jablonski at Poznan University (Music as sign, Acta semiotica fennica XXXVI); some of our doctoral candidates have defended theses elsewhere in other disciplines like Vladimir Franta in Brno University 2010 (cultural studies, and having now become research director at Pilsen Univ.) and Hector Bahillo 2010 (Valladolid Univ, linguistics), but they still aim for a PhD also in musicology at Helsinki University. These are typical cases which show that our doctoral training is also labour market oriented, i.e. the doctors of the RC community get jobs in the society after graduation.

Moreover following students who enjoyed our training at seminars became doctors in their home universities: Aurea Versekenaite (Vilnius), Francesco Spampinato (Aix), Jeremy Noyer (Aix), Julia Pnzio (Bari), Kaire Maimets (Tartu), Lola Rossignol (Aix), Emmanuel Gorge (Paris I), Benoit Aubigny (Strasburg, habilitation), Christine Escalpeze (Lille, habilitation), Ruben Loez Cano (Valladolid), Raphael Brunner (Paris VIII), Edith Zack (Univ of Jerusalem).

Comments on how the RC’s scientific productivity and doctoral training should be evaluated (MAX. 2200 characters with spaces): We suggest that for the evaluation of RC’s doctoral training it will be taken account:

- all the seminars the RC has organized
- congresses organized and number of doc students of RC attending them
- where PhD:s are now, and how long the present doc students have been studying
- we propose that all the scholars, doc candidates, PhD:s and senior scholars would have an opportunity to provide a qualitative assessment of the meaning, value and significance of Musical Signification for their career developments as well for the science in general
- all the publications of RC
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<tr>
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</tr>
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<td>RC-LEADER</td>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>CATEGORY</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
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</table>

<table>
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<th>Last name</th>
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<th>PI-status (TUHAT, 29.11.2010)</th>
<th>Title of research and teaching personnel</th>
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<td>Pirkko</td>
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<td>IV Professor</td>
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<tr>
<td>Lassfolk</td>
<td>Kai</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>III University Lecturer</td>
<td>Faculty of Arts, Department of Philosophy, history, culture and art studies, musicology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Padilla</td>
<td>Alfonso</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>III University Lecturer</td>
<td>Faculty of Arts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martinelli</td>
<td>Dario</td>
<td>II Postdoctoral Researcher</td>
<td>Faculty of Arts, Department of Philosophy, history, culture and art studies, musicology</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Määtänen</td>
<td>Pentti</td>
<td>II Postdoctoral Researcher</td>
<td>Faculty of Arts, Department of Philosophy, history, culture and art studies, musicology</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Torvinen</td>
<td>Juha</td>
<td>II Postdoctoral Researcher</td>
<td>Faculty of Arts, Department of Philosophy, history, culture and art studies, musicology</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ablova</td>
<td>Alla</td>
<td>I Doctoral Candidate</td>
<td>Faculty of Arts, Department of Philosophy, history, culture and art studies, musicology</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calleja</td>
<td>Marianela</td>
<td>I Doctoral Candidate</td>
<td>Faculty of Arts, Department of Philosophy, history, culture and art studies, musicology</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dominguez Moreno</td>
<td>Aurea</td>
<td>I Doctoral Candidate</td>
<td>Faculty of Arts, Department of Philosophy, history, culture and art studies, musicology</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helkala-Koitisto</td>
<td>Sari</td>
<td>I Doctoral Candidate</td>
<td>Faculty of Arts, Department of Philosophy, history, culture and art studies, musicology</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Huhta</td>
<td>Jarno</td>
<td>I Doctoral Candidate</td>
<td>Faculty of Arts, Department of Philosophy, history, culture and art studies, musicology</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Junchaya Rochas</td>
<td>Rafael</td>
<td>I Doctoral Candidate</td>
<td>Faculty of Arts, Department of Philosophy, history, culture and art studies, musicology</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laiho</td>
<td>Timo</td>
<td>I Doctoral Candidate</td>
<td>Faculty of Arts, Department of Philosophy, history, culture and art studies, musicology</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lainela</td>
<td>Reijo</td>
<td>I Doctoral Candidate</td>
<td>Faculty of Arts, Department of Philosophy, history, culture and art studies, musicology</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Macdonel</td>
<td>Grisell</td>
<td>I Doctoral Candidate</td>
<td>Faculty of Arts, Department of Philosophy, history, culture and art studies, musicology</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motiekaitis</td>
<td>Ramunas</td>
<td>I Doctoral Candidate</td>
<td>Faculty of Arts, Department of Philosophy, history, culture and art studies, musicology</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Navickaite-Martinelli</td>
<td>Lina</td>
<td>I Doctoral Candidate</td>
<td>Faculty of Arts, Department of Philosophy, history, culture and art studies, musicology</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ojala</td>
<td>Juha</td>
<td>I Doctoral Candidate</td>
<td>Faculty of Arts, Department of Philosophy, history, culture and art studies, musicology</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ojanen</td>
<td>Mikko</td>
<td>I Doctoral Candidate</td>
<td>Faculty of Arts, Department of Philosophy, history, culture and art studies, musicology</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pajuelo Valdez</td>
<td>Camilo</td>
<td>I Doctoral Candidate</td>
<td>Faculty of Arts, Department of Philosophy, history, culture and art studies, musicology</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rosato</td>
<td>Paolo</td>
<td>I Doctoral Candidate</td>
<td>Faculty of Arts, Department of Philosophy, history, culture and art studies, musicology</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stepien</td>
<td>Wojciech</td>
<td>I Doctoral Candidate</td>
<td>Faculty of Arts, Department of Philosophy, history, culture and art studies, musicology</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suominen</td>
<td>Marjo</td>
<td>I Doctoral Candidate</td>
<td>Faculty of Arts, Department of Philosophy, history, culture and art studies, musicology</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tolvakka</td>
<td>Svetlana</td>
<td>I Doctoral Candidate</td>
<td>Faculty of Arts, Department of Philosophy, history, culture and art studies, musicology</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vainiomäki</td>
<td>Tiina</td>
<td>I Doctoral Candidate</td>
<td>Faculty of Arts, Department of Philosophy, history, culture and art studies, musicology</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Viljanen</td>
<td>Elina</td>
<td>I Doctoral Candidate</td>
<td>Faculty of Arts, Department of Philosophy, history, culture and art studies, musicology</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pareyon</td>
<td>Gabriel</td>
<td>I Doctoral Candidate</td>
<td>Faculty of Arts, Department of Philosophy, history, culture and art studies, musicology</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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BACKGROUND INFORMATION

Name of the RC’s responsible person: Tarasti, Eero
E-mail of the RC’s responsible person:

Name and acronym of the participating RC: Musical Signification, MusSig

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

Comments for selecting/not selecting the key focus area: Our research is focusing in the following areas:

- musiikki kielenä; musiikin merkitykset; musiikkialan viestintä; semiotiikka; estetiikka;
- eurooppalainen taide-musiikki; popularimusiikki; musiikkialan historia/musiikin historia; musiikkialan historia

Our RC is focusing on studies of musical signification, i.e. music is seen in its semiotic context as a human communication conveying meanings and significations. Our project is not entitled ‘musical semiotics’ since the term ‘signification’ is broader. The much used metaphor of music as ‘universal’ language may hold true in the theoretical sense i.e. referring to the fact that music is analysed as if it were a kind of language without ‘sense’ as Claude Lévi-Strauss once put it (La musique c'est le langage moins le sens); but on the other hand the RC focuses on European art music tradition which has its particular cultural and idea historical roots in the Europe, albeit it has become universal culture.

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

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

Musical Signification is an international project of music scholars all over the world which has made the study of music as language and communication one of the major paradigms of our time, both in semiotics and in musicology.

The international research project Musical Signification was founded at Paris Broadcasting Company in a direct emission 25 years ago. From this event emerged by the time a major international gathering of scholars interested in musical semiotics, in the broadest sense of the term, including also hermeneutic, phenomenological, and cognitive approaches. The center of this project became Department of Musicology at the University of Helsinki; its director has been since its beginning professor Eero Tarasti. Via publications at renowned international publishing houses from DeGruyter Mouton, Sorbonne and CLUEB (Bologna) to Indiana University Press, and via large international conferences held regularly in Helsinki, Imatra, Paris, Rome, Bologna, Edinburgh, Aix en Provence, Vilnius and Cracow, the project has grown into a global community of over 600 scholars, both young and more advanced. Biannual doctoral seminars have been as well organized in Helsinki since the beginning. Such famous scholars as Charles Rosen, Daniel Charles, Raymond Monelle, Gino Stefani, Robert S. Hatten, Márt Grábóc, Costin Miereanu and Ivanka Stoianova have attended these courses as their co-directors. In this manner a lot of international doctoral students have been recruited to the Musicology Department at Helsinki University.

What is involved is an approach to music history, analysis, and aesthetics – covering both the ‘classical’ or traditional styles of European erudite music, as well as anthropological and cultural dimensions; it
emphasizes that music is an activity, interaction based upon and creating meanings. These meanings emerge in musical communication, say, performance and listening experiences, as well as they are embedded in musical texts, compositions as ‘significations’, by composers. They can be studied by particular concepts, metalanguages and methods whose inspiration stems partly from the semiotic tradition partly from the history of musicology itself. Thanks to Musical Signification project musical semiotics has grown from its modest pioneering position in the 1960s and 70s into one of the major paradigms of contemporary musicological scene.

The research of the project has been efficient in many subfields. One hand it has represented a basic theoretical study on music, enriching this field from the beginning of musical semiotics in the 1970s, when linguistic models were directly and often by force applied to music. Musical signification has emphasized the autonomous nature of music as a non-verbal sign system. Its research is undertaken by scholars with a full musical competence, not only researchers originating outside of musical field. In this manner it has been able to open new avenues to the ‘canonized’ composers of our music history from J.S. Bach to Mozart, Beethoven, Liszt, Chopin, Wagner, Sibelius, Debussy, minimalists, Kaija Saariaho etc. Its theorizing is paralleled the so-called ‘new musicology’ movement (in the US), with its interest in psychoanalysis, gender studies, cultural studies, Marxism, semiotics etc. One line has lead it to cognitive studies of music. Another line has lead to applied research in musical therapy, like the Stefani school in Italy. In the European musicological tradition the project has scrutinized the essence of national style and culture. Altogether it has constituted a new, modern way to speak about facts of music history, about members of musical communication from the composer via performer to listeners. One strong field just now are narrative studies in music. Very often its research has been done in an intertextual field, viewing music together with other arts, as it has been done in studies about opera and film music. One very strong field has been computer assisted research of musical signals and notations, leading to direct applications in various forms of electronic communication. Our electronic studio is maintaining active contacts with corresponding centers in Italy, Belgium, the U.K. and the US.

However, what is keeping all such diverse topics together, is just a kind of coherent metalanguage and concepts stemming from semiotic tradition partly, and also from the historical and systematic musicology. In spite of the fact that semiotics itself is epistemologically split into different schools, like Peirceans, Paris School, Eco, Tartu-Moscow school, etc this has not been an obstacle for intense cooperation in the project. The fact is that we are no longer living in any poststructuralist or postmodern phase, but rather in a phase of ‘neosemiotics’, in which we freely use and apply the achievements of classical semiotics, to solve problems of one particular empirical field, such as music.

The quality of the scientific significance of RC can be already seen in its intense publishing activities through major and authoritative academic publishing houses and institutes. Almost all of its 10 international congresses have been published, as well as papers from its doctoral seminars. Note also that the project has existed already over 25 years, getting all the time larger and more intensive. This means that what is involved is a serious, longstanding academic work, nothing like following any surface fashion phenomena in science. This longevity has been one reason why the RC has also been so efficient in doctoral training, which is always slow, time consuming and strenuous process if one wants to keep highest standards of the level of investigation.
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- Ways to strengthen the focus and improve the quality of the RC’s research.

We are already working with maximal intensity. We organize biannually a large international congress in some of our centers, normally and so far in the Europe, but open also for non-European members of the project. Likewise there is a doctoral and postdoctoral seminar at Helsinki University biannually. This latter could be done every year if there could be funding for that. Such a seminar with several coldirectors, highest specialists of the field and doc students coming all of ther world (normally 20-25) has proved to be very productive. By that means University of Helsinki has recruited many young international doctoral students. Also more publications could be done with a better funding. Now one of the major channels has been the international series Acta semiotica fennica, and its subseries Approaches to Musical Semiotics, in which majority of our doctoral theses have appeared. This is thanks to cooperation with International Semiotics Institute at Imatra, also existing over 25 years already, and now one of the best known permanent institutions of semiotic education in the world.

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.

Doctoral training has mostly taken place by three educational options: first we have the institute called ‘International doctoral and postdoctoral seminar of musical semiotics’, at the Dep. of Musicology, University of Helsinki, which has been basically a biannual event over 25 years already. During the evaluation period 2005-2010 it has thus been realized three times: no. 11: Nov 6-12, 2005, no. 12: April 15-19, 2008, and no. 13: March 8-11, 2010. In these seminars as my co-directors have served such scholars as prof. Charles Rosen (New York), Prof. Jean-Marie Jacono (Aix en Provence), Tom Pankhurst (Liverpool Hope University), Rick Littlefield (Michigan State Univ.), Dario Martinelli (Helsinki Univ.), prof Milena Mollova (New Bulgarian Univ Sofia), prof Costin Miereanu (Paris I Sorbonne), prof Marta Grabocz (Strasbourg), Juan Miguel Gonzalez Martinez (Murcia), Edward Venn (Lancaster, U.K.); these scholar represent the top of expertise in the world; second: there is a regular, weekly, international, mostly English seminar on musical semiotics at the Dep. of Musicology, Helsinki University which I have been running through all these years. This seminar has normally had students from 15-20, mostly foreign students on various levels, particularly from countries like Italy, Spain, Greece, Germany, France, Holland, Czech Republic, Poland, Russia, Baltic countries, Peru, Mexico, Chile, Brazil and Argentina. They have constituted a forum for learning the basic methods and concepts of musical signification studies; as multicultural interaction they have been successful to my mind, and as said made many a student to return here and enroll as doctoral student. The doctoral students who have already settled here have been benefitting this as an intellectual and social meeting point. Third, once having received impulses in our approach at Helsinki, doctoral students have continued in their home universities and sometimes graduating as PhD:s there, very often prof. Tarasti has been invited
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to juries of such defenses (as in the U.K. and France, particularly); in this manner the project’s fame has been expanded to many new areas all over the world.

An important forum for new doctors have been our congresses of musical signification, but also congresses of general semiotics. The latter ones to which our doctoral students have been able to attend have been organize every summer in June at Imatra by its ISI, whose director prof. Tarasti is. These events have meant for many young student the first public appearance as a congress speaker. The importance of such an opportunity cannot be overestimated. Also the member institutes of our project have organized their own symposia on related topics to which our students have attended. Our most important cooperative partners have been: Paris I Sorbonne, IDEAT, University of Paris VIII, Krakow Music Academy, Vilnius Music Academy, Dep of Musicology at University of Aix en Provence, University of Strassbourg, Università Tor Vergata (Roma), Fermo Music Academy, University of Valladolid, Universidad Autónoma de Mexico, Università di Torino, Freie Universität Berlin, Mazaryk Univ of Brno, Academy of Science of Nitra, Università di Bologna, Université Catholique Francais de Louvain, Aristotelian University of Thessaloniki, Università degli studi di Bari, Music Academy of Barcelona.

Sometimes we have succeeded to run a research project with special funding, like the project Philosophies of Performance (Esittämisen filosofia: Suomalainen musiikki, taide ja avantgarde), which was funded by Finnish Academy of Sciences in 2008-2009. Nine young scholars worked there, aiming for a doctor's degree, some of post-doctoral level. Its major context was just Musical signification, in whose congresses the project featured with its own sections.

Our RC has served an ideal context for young doctors’ training since formally in the universities, not only in Helsinki but also elsewhere a candidate can get only 1-2 supervisors. Via this project young candidates have been immediately taken in the center of a large international community from which they have been allowed to freely choose those scholars who represent their special fields. Such an international communication, learning its manners and principles, is an extremely important issue influencing deeply the future career of each one. They have been able to form an idea what it means to work in a large team, and got into circles of scholars using same approaches.

Many of our PHD:s have settled well in the markets of jobs. After their studies in Helsinki, and elsewhere, they have been nominated to permanent academic posts and so been able to establish themselves in the academic life (for instance: Vladimír Frant: now prof. at Pilsen Univ; Satoru Kambe, now prof. at University of Tokyo; Wojciech Stepien, now prof at Katowice Music academy; Danuta Mirka now prof at Nottingham Univ. etc.), José Luiz Martinez (got a position at Sao Paulo Catholic University). It has been a merit in their career to have worked in our RC, and especially to become a part of its scientific international network.

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

  The strength of the doctoral training of the RC are the following:
  - the RC constitutes so large a group that most varied empirical fields i.e. musical styles, periods, problems are there represented and a doc student can find and use many supervisors for his/her work
  - the doctoral education is completely international
  - Helsinki University offers to publish doctoral thesis as an individual book i.e. monograph unlike in almost all other countries in the Europe
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- RC has access to many international publishing series for PhD theses
- doc students can benefit all the congresses and events organized not only in musicology but also in semiotics, good example being the world congress of the IASS/AIS in 2007 in Helsinki/Imatra in which the RCV appeared with its own section
- we have a well furnished electronic studio at our Department which is suitable even for most demanding computer assisted research of musical signs

3 SOCIETAL IMPACT OF RESEARCH AND DOCTORAL TRAINING (MAX. 4400 CHARACTERS WITH SPACES)

- Description of how the RC interacts with and contributes to the society (collaboration with public, private and/or 3rd sector).
  - The topics of doctoral theses most often deal with issues of high relevance for the musical life and culture in general, in Finland and elsewhere; they deal with either relevant composers and their output, whose music has a ‘social order’, or they deal with genres of high actuality (opera, media music, heavy metal), or the elucidate other aspects of culture (myths, archaeology) or they have direct applied value, like say in psychotherapy or music as performing art (conductor’s gestures). In the computer assisted field we have had contact with Nokia, who has used our doctors in their equipment to explore mobile phone signals and tunes, to mention one concrete case of our RC’s social relevance.

  The seminars and symposia the RC has arranged have always included artistic program in which world famous artists have appeared with speeches and concerts (Penderecki in Poland, Ennio Morricone in Rome, Brunius Kutavicius in Vilnius). Recitals by Charles Rosen have illustrated our impact on musical life and big audience in general. In our congresses abroad often we have arranged Finnish music evening followed by reception of Finnish Embassy (in all three congresses in 2005-2010: Rome Vilnius, Krakow). So the RC has made the music culture of its hot country Finland better known abroad. In Latin America doctors educated by us have occupied important educational positions and continued our work in that continent.

- Ways to strengthen the societal impact of the RC’s research and doctoral training.
  We only have to continue our activities under those lines portrayed above. All those doctoral theses which will be defended during this year of 2011 have their pragmatic value, as well, for the society in broader sense.

4 INTERNATIONAL AND NATIONAL (INCL. INTERSECTORAL) RESEARCH COLLABORATION AND RESEARCHER MOBILITY (MAX. 4400 CHARACTERS WITH SPACES)

- Description of the RC’s research collaborations and joint doctoral training activities and how the RC has promoted researcher mobility.
  Above we have already listed our most important partners for research, exchange of scholars and students, there are about 30 such universities and institute altogether. For the exchange during normal semesters we have been able to use Erasmus contracts which we also have in plenty. For doctoral students arriving at Helsinki University, earlier the CIMO exchange grants were used but nowadays most often foreign students have grants from their home countries. Latin American have their special own awards for such stays abroad, they can use Ford foundation or similar. Our Dep. has also a lively functioning Latin American Music research center, which helps the adaptation of our South-American students. Sometimes our students have got a research assistantship at their home university which presupposed they should stay abroad for one semester.
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Earlier RC invited a lot of foreign scholars to visit Helsinki Univ. by grants from the Finnish Pro Musica Foundation. After a change in the policy in that foundation it was no longer possible but other private foundations like Niilo Helander have subventioned our activities. The ISI at Imatra has also been helpful in this sense, and the semiotic study program at Helsinki Univ.

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

Strength has been our ability to combine various sources of funding for such collaboration, for which Finland has quite unique opportunities. Also our cooperation with other funded projects in neighbouring areas have been an advantage. For instance prof Tarasti is running since 2008 a Pan-European doctoral program in semiotics together with four partners: Lapland University, Tartu, Turin and New Bulgarian University, Sofia. This is funded by the EU and the result, a common doctoral training program would then be accepted by many European universities. Since musical semiotics is one of the strengths of Finnish semiotics altogether this project, when ready to be implemented in 2012 will certainly tempt here certain young scholars and students in our field as well. In future also we shall applying for other research funding via the agency Finnbarentz at Lapland University, and when successful, this will also greatly promote studies in musical signification.

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).
   - All our colleagues of the RC are naturally also putting rather much energy to teaching. This is due to the fact that very often at their home universities they can be the highest specialists on the field, i.e. research of music from a semiotic point of view. Therefore we have the responsibility to educate new scholars to the field. In Helsinki Univ. earlier our doctors were immediately charged to teaching per hours of their specialities. With economic crisis this seems to have stopped now. However, the permanent post holders teach all the time their research.

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

   Strengths: there is a balance between the required regular teaching and research in most cases, i.e. in the lives of our international colleagues, although the university reforms all over the EU threaten this traditional balance by increasing administrational duties. Still the situation is better in Finland than elsewhere since our doctors can get postdoctoral positions and grants. In order to develop the situation we have to apply for new research projects by Finnish Academy and University of Helsinki, as well as from international agencies such as the EU funding, which we are already enjoying.

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.
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The leadership of the RC focused since its beginning at Department of Musicology, University of Helsinki. This happened in Paris convention in 1984. One of the leading semioticians of the time, founder of the Paris School of semiotics Prof. A.J. Greimas (EHESS) advised prof. Tarasti to take it to Finland. It may feel amazing that this leadership has continued until now, and the interest in the activities of the project is all the time increasing. In our last international congress in Krakow we had 170 papers. Via the central position of our Dep. linked to leaderships in other central institutions of semiotics, such as the ISI at Imatra (since 1986 under Tarasti’s leadership) and in the IASS/AIS (under Tarasti’s leadership since 2004 until 2014, he was elected for a second five year period as President of it at LaCoruna world congress of semiotics in 2009), we have been able to maintain the management of the RC extremely stable. Also its ecumenic nature in relation to various schools in the field has been preserved. However the management has space for individual and reforming initiatives via the fact that our RC convenes for our bigger symposia always in different places. Then the local organizers choose the theme according to their research emphasis and interests. Thus the project has not stagnated as the adherent of only one school or theory. Also the recruitment on new young members has refreshed its habitus all the time.

RC forms an umbrella organization also for subprojects in various countries and also to various thematic sub groupings, like the Musical meaning research group in Denmark, musical gesture analysts in the U.K.. These have found their funding from their own national and institutional sources. The administrative center of the RC is not providing any funding outside Finland, but via cooperation links and successful programs and project, say, in the level of the EU, it has been able to support also other minor centers of the RC.

High quality of our research is all the time scrutinized and checked by our publications in major academic publishing houses who use their own devices to guarantee the scientific quality. Knowing how difficult it is nowadays to publish anything on that level, this a significant factor in our quality assessment. In the earlier evaluations, like those done in Paris I Sorbonne, IDEAT, our RC has made a major contribution by serving as their most important international connection. In the same way being a member in our RC has individually helped often our colleagues to get research grants in their home countries.

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

see above box

### 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: **222 359 euros**

- **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:
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- **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: \[550,000\] euros (via UoLapland)

- **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: Pro Musica, Niilo Helander
  - total amount of funding (in euros) from the above-mentioned foundations: \[60,000\] euros (approx.)

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

- **Other national funding** (incl. EVO funding and Ministry of Education and Culture funded doctoral programme positions) - names of other national funding organizations which have decided to allocate funding to the RC members during 1.1.2005-31.12.2010, and the amount of their funding (in euros).
  - names of the funding organizations: Ministry of Foreign Affairs,
    - the ISI at Imatra, Univ of Helsinki
  - total amount of funding (in euros) from the above-mentioned funding organizations: \[100,000\] euros (approx.)

**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.**
  - Insofar as our research become better and better known both in musicological and semiotic research communities globally, we seem to have much research potential and particularly for education. New avenues are opened towards China since next world congress of semiotics (IASS/AIS) will be arranged at Nanjing Normal University in the fall of 2012. Also many Latin American countries are more and more participating to our activities, as well as some new countries in the East like Kazakhstan, Turkey etc. We are receiving our first Chinese postdoctoral scholar to Helsinki in august this year, who wishes to study existential semiotics. Note that our computer assisted research sector seems to have year by year more demand in the ‘markets’, guaranteeing also jobs for our doctors.

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

We have received answers to our inquiries related to the issues in paragraph 2 from all our doctoral and postdoctoral scholars in the RC. We also receive from them regularly feedback via email etc concerning our activities. They actively make proposals for future themes of our seminars, who should be invited as co-directors, they are in touch with us with their publishing problems and attendances to other symposia. The young scholars of the RC and also more advanced keep also regularly contact
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directly without any official center, the RC has thus created I believe many international and collegial friendships which will be of major importance in their future careers.
1 Analysis of publications

- Associated person is one of Pirkko Moisala, Antoo Antoni, Kai Lassfolk, Eero Tarasti, Pirkko Moisala, Eero Tarasti, Pirkko Moisala, Eero Tarasti, Pirkko Moisala, Eero Tarasti, Pirkko Moisala, Eero Tarasti, Pirkko Moisala, Eero Tarasti.

<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>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>33</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A2 Review in scientific journal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A3 Contribution to book/other compilations (refereed)</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A4 Article in conference publication (refereed)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>27</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B1 Unrefereed journal article</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B2 Contribution to book/other compilations (non-refereed)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B3 Unrefereed article in conference proceedings</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>24</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C1 Published scientific monograph</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C2 Edited book, compilation, conference proceeding or special issue of journal</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D1 Article in professional journal</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></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></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D3 Article in professional conference proceedings</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D5 Text book or professional handbook or guidebook or dictionary</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E1 Popular article, newspaper article</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E1 Popular contribution to book/other compilations</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>32</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E2 Popular monograph</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F1 Published independent artistic work</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F2 Public contribution to artistic work</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F3 Public artistic play or exhibition</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I1 Audiovisual materials</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Publication type</td>
<td>2005</td>
<td>2006</td>
<td>2007</td>
<td>2008</td>
<td>2009</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>Total Count 2005 - 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICT programs or applications</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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MusSig/Tarasti

2 Listing of publications

A1 Refereed journal article

2005

2006

2007

2008
Moisala, P 2008, 'Jouku (yok), place, and yok transmission in Finland', European Meetings in Ethnomusicology, vol 2008/12, pp. 239-255.

2009
Martinelli, D 2009, 'How spatial is a whale? Places and processes in zoomusicology', kohta ja paik, vol VI.

2010


Tarasti, E 2010, 'Musiikin semiotiikka Suomessa', Musiikki, no. 3-4, pp. 89-97.

2010


2009


2010

2005


A2 Review in scientific journal
2009


2010

A3 Contribution to book/other compilations (referred)
2005


2006
INTERNATIONAL EVALUATION OF RESEARCH AND DOCTORAL TRAINING AT THE UNIVERSITY OF HELSINKI

RC-SPECIFIC TUHAT COMPILATIONS OF PUBLICATIONS DATA 2005-2010

MusSig/Tarasti


2009


2010


Pareyon, G 2010. ‘Conservadurismo, negación y diáspora: Retrospectiva de la música experimental en Jalisco en los últimos cuarenta años’, in HR Solís Gadea, KA Planter (eds), Jalisco en el mundo contemporáneo. Aportaciones para una enciclopedia de la época., 1 edn, vol. 1, Universidad de Guadalajara, Guadalajara, pp. 77-84


A4 Article in conference publication (referred)

2006

Musig/Tarasti

Rosato, P MG 2006, 'Un contributo semiotico allo studio delle relazioni tra testo e musica nel Palestrina: Analisi del Mottetto "Beatus Laurentius" (1563) e del Madrigale "La cruta mia nemica" (1586)', in Palestrina e l'Europa: Atti del III Convegno Internazionale di Studi, pp. 519-572.

2007


Tarasti, E 2007, 'An essay on appearance, or: The present structure and existential digressions of the subject', in Convergences and divergences of existential semiotics: proceedings from international symposium at Constantine the Philosopher University, April 12th 2007 / ed. by Julius Fujak, pp. 11-32.

2008
Lassfolk, K 2008, 'Measurements and meaning: toward a specialized high level methodology for analyzing sound quality of musical signals', in Musical senses body: proceedings from the 9th International Congress on Musical Signification / Roma 19-23/09/2006 / ed. by Dario Martinelli ; [language editing Louise Anderson ... et al.].


Tarasti, E 2008, 'Mozart, or, The idea of a continuous avantgarde', in Musical senses body: proceedings from the 9th International Congress on Musical Signification / Roma 19-23/09/2006 / ed. by Dario Martinelli ; [language editing Louise Anderson ... et al.].

2009
Martinelli, D 2009, 'Le canzoni della mafia: Italian music, as represented abroad', in Poetics and Politics of Place in Music.


Tarasti, E 2009, 'Presidential address: opening of the 9th World Congress of Semiotics (Solemnity Hall, University of Helsinki)', in Communication: understanding/misunderstanding, Acta semiotica Fennica, vol. 34.


Ojala, J 2010, Before and after the emergence of musical thought-signs,

Tarasti, E 2010, Three Modes of Narrativity: Illustrated by Proust and Wagner,

Tarasti, E 2010, What Is Musical Signification?: Who We Are and How We Got Here,


B1 Unrefered journal article

2005


2006


2007


Toivonen, J 2007, 'Musiikki ahdistuksen taktional', Musiikki, vol 37, no. 1, pp. 72-76.

2008


2009
MusSig/Tarasti


2010


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

2005


2006


2007


2008


2009


B3 Unrefereed article in conference proceedings

2006

Martinelli, D 2006, 'More or less music: a zoosemiotic approach to the definition of musical phenomena', in Music and Arts.


2008


Martinelli, D 2008, 'Mind-matter, etcismic, and other nightmares in zoosemiotics', in Global Signs.


INTERNATIONAL EVALUATION OF RESEARCH AND DOCTORAL TRAINING AT THE UNIVERSITY OF HELSINKI

RC-SPECIFIC TUHAT COMPILATIONS OF PUBLICATIONS DATA 2005-2010

MusSig/Tarasti


2009


Martinelli, D 2009, 'Notes on the theoretical program of biosemiotics; or ‘what exactly am I doing here?’', in Communication: understanding/misunderstanding


2010

2010, Rol’ tvorchestva N.A. Rimskogo-Korsakova v opredelenii russkogo nazional’nogo identiteta.


Martinelli, D 2010, 'The Possible After’s and the Impossible Before’s of Musical Semiotics: Reflections on Media, iPods, and (the Trouble with) Post-modernism', in Before and After Music


Vainiomäki, T 2010, Psychological Realism in Janáček’s Musical Aesthetics and Theoretical Works.

C1 Published scientific monograph

2006


2007


2009
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Martinelli, D 2009, Of Birds, Whales and Other Musicians: An Introduction to Zoomusicology, University of Scranton Press.


2010


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

2005


2006


2007


2008


2009


Martinelli, D, Lehto, O (eds) 2009, Sign System Studies 38:1.,


MusSig/Tarasti

2010

D1 Article in professional journal
2007

2008

2010

D2 Article in professional hand or guide book or in a professional data system, or text book material
2009

D3 Article in professional conference proceedings
2006

2007

2009

2010
MusSig/Tarasti

D5 Text book or professional handbook or guidebook or dictionary

2007

E1 Popular article, newspaper article

2005

2006

2007
E1 Popular contribution to book/other compilations

2005


2006
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2009


2010


Tarasti, E 2010, ‘Jean Sibelius, sinfoniat nro 5,6, ja 7’, Käsiöehelma, Helsingin juhlaviikot. 27.8.2010, pp. 4-6.


E2 Popular monograph

2006

Tarasti, E 2006, Mustokuvia: tulkintoja, muistelmia tarinoita, Imatran kansainvälisen semiotiikka-instituutin julkaisuja, no. nr. 3, Imatran kansainvälinen semiotiikka-instituutti, [Imatra].

2007


2010


F1 Published independent artistic work

2005

Huhta, J, Huhta J Chiaroscuro, Comatronic, Linz, Itálvalta.

2006


2007

Huhta, J, Huhta, J, Vanhanen, M Traum-a, Thinner / Autoplate, Frankfurt, Saksa.

2008

Huhta, J, Huhta J Bulb Appreciation-kokoelma: Grimalik, [In]arace, Saksa.
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2009
2010
Huhta, J, Huhta, J Caught Association-kokoelma: Traum-a, [in]anace, Saksa
Huhta, J, Huhta, J, Vanhanen, M Traum-a, Global Warming, Helsinki, Suomi.

F2 Public contribution to artistic work

2009
2010

F3 Public artistic play or exhibition

2008
Huhta, J, Huhta, J, Vanhanen, M Concert, Valtholava, Helsinki, Suomi.
Huhta, J, Huhta, J Concert, Alas-klubi / URB-festivali, Kuudes Linja, Helsinki, Suomi.
Huhta, J, Huhta, J Concert, manseSEDANse-festivali, Telakka, Tampere, Suomi.
2009
Huhta, J, Huhta, J Concert, Every Shiny Fish, Kokoteatteri, Helsinki, Suomi.
Huhta, J, Huhta, J Concert, Bleepfest Berlin, Theaterkapelle, Berliini, Saksa.
2010
Huhta, J, Huhta, J, Szwarc, E Concert, Every Shiny Fish, Siltanen, Helsinki, Suomi.
Huhta, J, Huhta, J, Szwarc, E, Elisabeth, S Concert, Schaubühne Lindenfels, Leipzig, Saksa.
Huhta, J, Huhta, J, Szwarc, E, Szwarc, E Concert, Essen, Saksa.
Huhta, J, Huhta, J, Szwarc, E Concert, Cafe Nora Roman, Leipzig, Saksa.

I1 Audiovisual materials

2006
Joussoittimen äänen arviointi spektrianalyysin avulla
Sound Processing Kit Technical Documentation

I2 ICT programs or applications

2006
Sound Processing Kit: Version 2.0.0

2008
Spectutils: Version 1.0.0
MusSig/Tarasti

2010
Helsinki Music Tools: Version 0.1.0
A Spectutils Tutorial
Spectutils: Version 2.0.0
## 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>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prizes and awards</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Editor of research journal</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Editor of research anthology/collection/conference proceedings</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peer review of manuscripts</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment of candidates for academic posts</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Membership or other role in review committee</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Membership or other role in research network</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Membership or other role in national/international committee, council, board</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Membership or other role in public Finnish or international organization</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Membership or other role of body in private company/organisation</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participation in interview for written media</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participation in radio programme</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participation in TV programme</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2 Listing of activities 2005-2010

Supervisor or co-supervisor of doctoral thesis

**Pirkko Moisala**, 
Supervisor of a Ph.D. work outside of Helsinki University, Pirkko Moisala, 01.01.2010 → 31.12.2010
Supervisor of a Ph.D. work outside of Helsinki University, Pirkko Moisala, 01.01.2010 → 31.12.2010

**Eero Tarasti**, 
Supervision of doctoral thesis, Eero Tarasti, 01.01.2006 → 31.12.2006, France
Supervision of doctoral thesis, Eero Tarasti, 01.01.2006 → 31.12.2006, France
Supervision of doctoral thesis, Eero Tarasti, 01.01.2006 → 31.12.2006, France
Supervision of doctoral thesis, Eero Tarasti, 01.01.2006 → 31.12.2006, France
Supervision of doctoral thesis, Eero Tarasti, 01.01.2006 → 31.12.2006, France
Supervision of doctoral thesis, Eero Tarasti, 01.01.2007 → 31.12.2007, France
Supervision of doctoral thesis, Eero Tarasti, 01.01.2007 → 31.12.2007, France
Supervision of doctoral thesis, Eero Tarasti, 01.01.2007 → 31.12.2007, France
Supervision of doctoral thesis, Eero Tarasti, 01.01.2007 → 31.12.2007, France
Supervision of doctoral thesis, Eero Tarasti, 01.01.2007 → 31.12.2007, France
Supervision of doctoral thesis, Eero Tarasti, 01.01.2007 → 31.12.2007, France
Supervision of doctoral thesis, Eero Tarasti, 01.01.2007 → 31.12.2007, France
Supervision of doctoral thesis, Eero Tarasti, 01.01.2007 → 31.12.2007, France
Supervision of doctoral thesis, Eero Tarasti, 01.01.2007 → 31.12.2007, France
Supervision of doctoral thesis, Eero Tarasti, 01.01.2007 → 31.12.2007, France
Supervision of doctoral thesis, Eero Tarasti, 01.01.2007 → 31.12.2007, France
Supervision of doctoral thesis, Eero Tarasti, 01.01.2007 → 31.12.2007, France
Supervision of doctoral thesis, Eero Tarasti, 01.01.2007 → 31.12.2007, France
Supervision of doctoral thesis, Eero Tarasti, 01.01.2007 → 31.12.2007, France
Supervision of doctoral thesis, Eero Tarasti, 01.01.2007 → 31.12.2007, France

**Alfonso Antoni Padilla Silva**, 

**Dario Martinelli**, 

**Pentti Määttänen**, 

**Prizes and awards**

**Eero Tarasti**, 
Fellow of the Japan Foundation, Eero Tarasti, 1991 → ..., Japan
Fellow of the Advanced Studies Institute at the Indiana University, Bloomington, Eero Tarasti, 1993 → ..., United States
Membre du Conseil Scientifique &amp; Ecole Doctorale Arts Plastiques, esthétique et sciences de l’art, Université de Paris I-Panthéon Sorbonne, Eero Tarasti, 1998 → ..., France
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Member of the Board at Istituto Superiore Scienze Umane (directed by Umberto Eco), Eero Tarasti, 2005 → ..., Italy
Honorary Member of the Richard Wagner Society, Eero Tarasti, 2008, Finland
Fellow of the International Communicology Institute, Eero Tarasti, 2010, United States

Dario Martinelli,
Knighthood, Dario Martinelli, 2006, Italy
Prize for Scientific Poetry, Dario Martinelli, 2010, Italy

Marianela Calleja,
The Whuri Foundation Grant, Marianela Calleja, 09.10.2005 → 09.10.2007, Finland
The Whuri Foundation Grant, Marianela Calleja, 09.10.2008 → 09.10.2009, Finland

Áurea Dominguez,
Comunidad de Madrid’s Scholarship (Ayuda económica para ampliación de estudios de música de la Comunidad de Madrid), Áurea Dominguez, 2007 → 2008, Spain
Comunidad de Madrid’s Scholarship (Ayuda económica para ampliación de estudios de música de la Comunidad de Madrid, Áurea Dominguez, 2008 → 2009, Spain
Doctoral grant, Áurea Dominguez, 01.09.2009 → 01.05.2012, Spain

Gabriel Pareyon
First Prize (solo saxophone category), Gabriel Pareyon, 05.07.2006 → 09.07.2006, Slovenia
Mention of Honor, Gabriel Pareyon, 29.05.2008, Mexico

Editor of research journal

Pirkko Moisala,
Etnomusiikin tieteinen vuosikirja, Pirkko Moisala, 01.01.2008 → 31.12.2008, Finland
Musiikki, Pirkko Moisala, 01.01.2008 → 31.12.2008, Finland
Svensk tidskrift för musik, Pirkko Moisala, 01.01.2008 → 31.12.2008, Sweden

Eero Tarasti,
Acta musicologica universitatis helsingiensis, Eero Tarasti, 01.01.2006 → 31.12.2006, Finland
Acta semiotica fennica, Eero Tarasti, 01.01.2006 → 31.12.2006, Finland
Acta semiotica fennica, Eero Tarasti, 01.01.2006 → 31.12.2006, Finland
Deligninis, Eero Tarasti, 01.01.2006 → 31.12.2006, Argentina
Interdisciplinary studies in musicology, Eero Tarasti, 01.01.2006 → 31.12.2006, Poland
Lithuanian musicology, Eero Tarasti, 01.01.2006 → 31.12.2006, Lithuania
Seemiootikee, Eero Tarasti, 01.01.2006 → 31.12.2006, Estonia
Semiotica, Eero Tarasti, 01.01.2006 → 31.12.2006, Germany
Signa, Eero Tarasti, 01.01.2006 → 31.12.2006, Spain
Synteesi, Eero Tarasti, 01.01.2006 → 31.12.2006, Finland
Trans., Eero Tarasti, 01.01.2006 → 31.12.2006, Spain
Acta musicologica universitatis helsingiensis, Eero Tarasti, 01.01.2007 → 31.12.2007, Finland
Acta semiotica fennica, Eero Tarasti, 01.01.2007 → 31.12.2007, Finland
Deligninis, Eero Tarasti, 01.01.2007 → 31.12.2007, Argentina
Interdisciplinary studies in musicology, Eero Tarasti, 01.01.2007 → 31.12.2007, Poland
Lithuanian musicology, Eero Tarasti, 01.01.2007 → 31.12.2007, Lithuania
Maamme Suomi, Eero Tarasti, 01.01.2007 → 31.12.2007, Finland
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Seemiootikee, Eero Tarasti, 01.01.2007 → 31.12.2007, Estonia
Semiotica, Eero Tarasti, 01.01.2007 → 31.12.2007, Canada
Signa, Eero Tarasti, 01.01.2007 → 31.12.2007, Spain
Svensk Tidskrift för Musikforskning, Eero Tarasti, 01.01.2007 → 31.12.2007, Sweden
Synteesi, Eero Tarasti, 01.01.2007 → 31.12.2007, Finland
Trans, Eero Tarasti, 01.01.2007 → 31.12.2007, Spain
Acta Semiotica Fenica, Eero Tarasti, 01.01.2008 → 31.12.2008, Finland
Acta musicologica universitatis helsingiensis, Eero Tarasti, 01.01.2008 → 31.12.2008, Finland
Deliignis, Eero Tarasti, 01.01.2008 → 31.12.2008, Argentina
Interdisciplinary studies in musicology, Eero Tarasti, 01.01.2008 → 31.12.2008, Poland
Lithuanian musicology, Eero Tarasti, 01.01.2008 → 31.12.2008, Lithuania
Musica Humana, Eero Tarasti, 01.01.2008 → 31.12.2008, South Korea
Musica Humana, Eero Tarasti, 01.01.2008 → 31.12.2008, China
Semiotica, Eero Tarasti, 01.01.2008 → 31.12.2008, Canada
Signa, Eero Tarasti, 01.01.2008 → 31.12.2008, Spain
Synteesi, Eero Tarasti, 01.01.2008 → 31.12.2008, Finland
Trans, Eero Tarasti, 01.01.2008 → 31.12.2008, Spain

Kai Lassfolk,

Dario Martinelli,
Editor-in-Chief, Dario Martinelli, 01.01.2007 → 31.12.2011, Finland

Pentti Määttänen,
Synteesi, Pentti Määttänen, 01.01.2005 → 31.12.2005, Finland

Lina Navickaitė-Martinelli,
IF Journal of Italo-Finnish Studies, Lina Navickaitė-Martinelli, 01.01.2007 → 31.12.2007, Finland

Editor of research anthology/collection/conference proceedings
Dario Martinelli,
Editor, Dario Martinelli, 01.10.2007, Finland
Editor, Dario Martinelli, 01.10.2008, Finland

Peer review of manuscripts
Pirkko Moisala,
Reviewer of a disciplinary article for Etnomusikologian Vuosikirja, Pirkko Moisala, 10.05.2010
Reviewer of a disciplinary article for the Yearbook of Traditional Music, Pirkko Moisala, 10.06.2010, Australia
Reviewer of a scientific monograph for the University of Illinois Press, Pirkko Moisala, 01.03.2010 → 15.03.2010, United States

Kai Lassfolk,
Proceedings of the 11th International Society for Music Information Retrieval Conference (ISMIR 2010), Kai Lassfolk, 01.05.2010 → 15.06.2010, Netherlands
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Dario Martinelli ,
Editorial Board Member, Dario Martinelli, 01.01.2006 → 31.12.2011, Germany

Marianela Calleja ,
KATHARINA CLAUSIUS, "Narratives of structural pacing in Mozart’s string Quartets and quintets", Marianela Calleja, 30.06.2009 → 28.07.2009, Netherlands

Mikko Ojanen ,
Musiikki : Suomen musiikkitieteellisen seuran julkaisu , Mikko Ojanen, 2007, Finland

Assessment of candidates for academic posts
Pirkko Moisala ,
Reviewer for the applications for university lecturer in musicology, Pirkko Moisala, 01.01.2010 → 01.04.2010, Sweden

Membership or other role in review committee
Pirkko Moisala ,
Member of the Pedagogical Evaluation group of the School of History, Philosophy, Cultural and Art Studies, Pirkko Moisala, 01.01.2010 → 31.12.2010

Member of the Research Evaluation group of the Faculty of Humanistic Studies, Helsinki University, Pirkko Moisala, 15.08.2010 → 31.12.2010

Referee of the European Research Council, Pirkko Moisala, 01.01.2010 → 31.12.2010, Belgium

Eero Tarasti ,
Member of the Board of Pro Musica Foundation, Eero Tarasti, 1984 → 2010

Member of the Board of Niilo Helander Foundation, Eero Tarasti, 1995 → …

Member of the Wihuri Foundation International Prize Committee, Eero Tarasti, 2000 → 2009

Kai Lassfolk ,
9th International Conference on Music Information Retrieval (ISMIR 2008), Kai Lassfolk, 06.04.2008 → 04.06.2008, United States

10th International Conference on Music Information Retrieval (ISMIR 2009), Kai Lassfolk, 24.05.2009 → 14.07.2009, Japan

Membership or other role in research network
Pirkko Moisala ,
Leader of the research project "Deleuzian Music Research", Pirkko Moisala, 01.09.2010 → 31.12.2010

Leaders of the research project "Finland-Swedishness constructed through music", Pirkko Moisala, 01.01.2010 → 31.12.2010

Member of the steering committee of "Acoustic Environments and Cultural Sustainability: Strategies for Local Action!", Pirkko Moisala, 01.01.2010 → 31.12.2010


Dario Martinelli ,
Senior Researcher, Dario Martinelli, 2007 → 2009, Finland

Marianela Calleja ,
ISST, Marianela Calleja, 01.05.2003 → 01.05.2010, United States

Membership or other role in national/international committee, council, board
Pirkko Moisala ,
Multiculturalisms and the Arts, Pirkko Moisala, 01.01.2008 → 02.09.2008, Finland

Music Research Institute, Pirkko Moisala, 01.01.2008 → 31.12.2008, United States

Musical Instrument Museum, Pirkko Moisala, 01.01.2008 → 31.12.2008, United States

Musikin ja näyttämötaiteen tutkimusosastomu, Pirkko Moisala, 01.01.2008 → 31.12.2008, Finland
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Regulated Liberties, Negotiating Freedom in the Art, Culture, and Media, Pirkko Moisala, 01.01.2008 → 31.12.2008, Finland
Soundscape and Cultural Sustainability: Strategies for Local Action, Pirkko Moisala, 01.01.2008 → 31.12.2008, Finland
Chair of the Society of Ethnomusicology in Finland, Pirkko Moisala, 01.01.2010 → 31.12.2010
Member of the editorial board of "Women and Music, Journal on Gender, Music, and Culture", Pirkko Moisala, 01.01.2010 → 31.12.2010, United States
Member of the research committee of the Finland-Swedish Folk Music Institute, Pirkko Moisala, 01.01.2010 → 31.12.2010
Member of the research committee, Swedish sound archives, Pirkko Moisala, 01.01.2010 → 31.12.2010, Sweden
Member of the steering group of the Research School of Music and Performing Arts., Pirkko Moisala, 01.01.2010 → 31.12.2010
Women and Music, Journal on Gender, Music, and Culture, member of editorial board, Pirkko Moisala, 01.01.2010 → 31.12.2010, United States

Eero Tarasti

 Founder and President of the Semiotic Society of Finland, Eero Tarasti, 1979 → …
 Member of the Executive Committee of the IASS/AIS, Eero Tarasti, 1979 → …
 Director of the international research project Musical Signification, Eero Tarasti, 1986 → …
 Member of the Academia Europaea, Eero Tarasti, 1987 → …
 Director of the International Semiotics Institute at Imatra, Finland (ISI), Eero Tarasti, 1988 → …
 Founder and President of the Music Society of University of Helsinki, Eero Tarasti, 1989 → …
 Member of the Academy of Informatization, Eero Tarasti, 1994 → …
 Member of the Advisory Board of TRANS (electronic journal on musicology and ethnomusicology, Barcelona), Eero Tarasti, 2000 → …
 Member of the Advisory Board of "Perspectiva Interdisciplinaria de Musica", UNAM, Mexico, Eero Tarasti, 2000 → …, Mexico
 Member of the Advisory Panel of "Musica Humana", Journal of Korean Institute of Musicology, Eero Tarasti, 2000 → …
 Member of the Board of the South-Eastern European Semiotic Center, Bulgaria, Eero Tarasti, 2000 → …, Bulgaria
 Member of the Editorial Board of "Lithuanian musicology", Eero Tarasti, 2000 → …, Lithuania
 Member of the Honorary Committee of LEXIA, Journal of Semiotics, Turin, Italy, Eero Tarasti, 2000 → …
 Member of the Editorial Board of Jean Sibelius Gesamtausgabe, Eero Tarasti, 2003 → …
 Director of the Finnish Network University of Semiotics, Eero Tarasti, 2004 → …
 President of the IASS/AIS (International Association for Semiotic Studies), Eero Tarasti, 2004 → …
 Chief Advisor of the Chinese Semiotic Studies, Nanjing Normal University Press, Eero Tarasti, 2005 → …
 IASS/AIS, International Association for Semiotic Studies, Eero Tarasti, 01.01.2006 → 31.12.2006, France
 IASS/AIS, International Association for Semiotic Studies, Eero Tarasti, 01.01.2006 → 31.12.2006, France
 ISI, International Semiotics Institute, Eero Tarasti, 01.01.2006 → 31.12.2006, Finland
 Istituto Superiore Scienze Umane, Università degli studi di Bologna, Eero Tarasti, 01.01.2006 → 31.12.2006, Italy
 Musical Signification, Eero Tarasti, 01.01.2006 → 31.12.2006, Finland
 Semiotikan valtakunnallinen verkostoyliopisto, Eero Tarasti, 01.01.2006 → 31.12.2006, Finland
 Suomen Semiotikkan Seura, Eero Tarasti, 01.01.2006 → 31.12.2006, Finland
 IASS/AIS, International Association for Semiotic Studies, Eero Tarasti, 01.01.2007 → 31.12.2007, France
 ISI, International Semiotics Institute, Eero Tarasti, 01.01.2007 → 31.12.2007, Finland
 ISIS, Société international pour information sémiotique, Paris, Eero Tarasti, 01.01.2007 → 31.12.2007, France
 Istituto Superiore Scienze Umane, Università degli studi di Bologna, Eero Tarasti, 01.01.2007 → 31.12.2007, Italy
 Musical Signification, Eero Tarasti, 01.01.2007 → 31.12.2007, Finland
 Semiotikan valtakunnallinen verkostoyliopisto, Eero Tarasti, 01.01.2007 → 31.12.2007, Finland
 Suomen Semiotikkan Seura, Eero Tarasti, 01.01.2007 → 31.12.2007, Finland
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MusSig/Tarasti

Director of the research project "Philosophies of performance" at Finnish Academy of Sciences, Eero Tarasti, 2008 → 2009

IASS/AIS, International Association for Semiotic Studies, Eero Tarasti, 01.01.2008 → 31.12.2008, France

ISI, International Semiotics Institute, Eero Tarasti, 01.01.2008 → 31.12.2008, Finland

ISISS, Société internationale pour information sémiotique, 1, Paris., Eero Tarasti, 01.01.2008 → 31.12.2008, France

Istituto Superiore Scienze Umane, Università degli studi di Bologna., Eero Tarasti, 01.01.2008 → 31.12.2008, Italy

Musical Signification, Eero Tarasti, 01.01.2008 → 31.12.2008, Finland


Semiotiikan valtakunnallinen verkostoyliopisto, Eero Tarasti, 01.01.2008 → 31.12.2008, Finland

Suomen Semiotiikan Seura, Eero Tarasti, 01.01.2008 → 31.12.2008, Finland

Kai Lassfolk,
8th International Conference on Music Information Retrieval, ISMIR 2007, Kai Lassfolk, 01.04.2007 → 31.05.2007, Finland

Dario Martineilli,
Scientific Director, Dario Martineilli, 01.01.2003 → 31.12.2015, Finland

Scientific Board Member, Dario Martineilli, 01.01.2006 → 31.12.2011, Finland

Member of Scientific Board, Dario Martineilli, 2008 → 2009

Member of the Scientific Board, Dario Martineilli, 04.2010, Lithuania

Lina Navickaitė-Martineilli,
Musical Signification Project, Lina Navickaitė-Martineilli, 01.01.2007 → 31.12.2007, Finland

Umweb, Lina Navickaitė-Martineilli, 01.01.2007 → 31.12.2007, Finland


UMWEB, Lina Navickaitė-Martineilli, 01.01.2008 → 31.12.2008, Finland

Membership or other role in public Finnish or international organization

Pirkko Moisala,
Finlandsvensk folkmusikinstitut, Pirkko Moisala, 01.01.2008 → 31.12.2008, Finland

Eero Tarasti,
Member of the Board of Promotion of Finnish Art Music Foundation, Eero Tarasti, 1995 → ...

Member of the Editorial Board of Interdisciplinary Studies in Musicology (Poznan), Eero Tarasti, 2000 → ..., Poland

Member of the International Editorial Board of "Seemiootikee", Sign Systems Studies, Eero Tarasti, 2000 → ...

Member of the International Editorial Board of the Journal 'Signa' (Spanish Society of semiotics), Eero Tarasti, 2000 → ...

Amfion ry., Eero Tarasti, 01.01.2006 → 31.12.2006, Finland

Nilo Helanderin Säätiö, Eero Tarasti, 01.01.2006 → 31.12.2006, Finland

Pro Musica säätiö, Eero Tarasti, 01.01.2006 → 31.12.2006, Finland

Suomen säveltäjilleen suosittu säätiö, Eero Tarasti, 01.01.2006 → 31.12.2006, Finland


Amfion ry., Eero Tarasti, 01.01.2007 → 31.12.2007, Finland

Nilo Helanderin Säätiö, Eero Tarasti, 01.01.2007 → 31.12.2007, Finland

Päiviö-juhlavuoden (2009) järjestelytoimikunnan puheenjohtaja, Eero Tarasti, 01.01.2007 → 31.12.2007, Finland

Pro Musica säätiö, Eero Tarasti, 01.01.2007 → 31.12.2007, Finland

Amfion ry., Eero Tarasti, 01.01.2008 → 31.12.2008, Finland

Nilo Helanderin Säätiö, Eero Tarasti, 01.01.2008 → 31.12.2008, Finland
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MusSig/Tarasti

Pro Musica säätö, Eero Tarasti, 01.01.2008 → 31.12.2008, Finland

Dario Martinelli,
Scientific advisor, Dario Martinelli, 01.01.2005 → 31.12.2008, Italy

Lina Navickaite-Martinelli,
Musical monthly Muzikos barai, Lina Navickaite-Martinelli, 01.01.2007 → 31.12.2007, Lithuania

Marjo Suominen,

Membership or other role of body in private company/organisation

Eero Tarasti,
Member of the International Editorial Board of the Journal “DeSignis” (Publicacion de la Federación Latinoamericana de Semiótica), Eero Tarasti, 2000 → …

Helsingin yliopiston musiikkisäätiö, HUMS, Eero Tarasti, 01.01.2006 → 31.12.2006, Finland

Helsingin yliopiston musiikkisäätiö, HYMS, Eero Tarasti 01.01.2007 → 31.12.2007, Finland

Pro Opera-yhdistys, Eero Tarasti, 01.01.2007 → 31.12.2007, Finland

Alfonso Antoni Padilla Silva,
Iberilais-amerikkalainen säätiö, Alfonso Antoni Padilla Silva, 01.01.2008 → 31.12.2008, Mexico

Lina Navickaite-Martinelli,
Lithuanian Musicians Union, Lina Navickaite-Martinelli, 01.01.2007 → 31.12.2007, Lithuania
Lithuanian Composers Union, Musicological section, Lina Navickaite-Martinelli, 01.01.2008 → 31.12.2008, Lithuania

Participation in interview for written media

Pirkko Moisala,
Beijing Today, Pirkko Moisala, 01.11.2008 → 31.12.2011, Finland

Rondo, Pirkko Moisala, 01.01.2008 → 31.12.2011, Finland

Eero Tarasti,
Esitelmä Ateneumissa, Eero Tarasti, 26.03.2000 → 31.12.2011, Finland

Esitelmä Haminan Tattoo -solistamusiikkitahtojaan symposiumissa, Eero Tarasti, 01.01.2000 → 31.12.2011, Finland

Esitelmä Mikkelin Musiikkikouluilla, Eero Tarasti, 07.02.2000 → 31.12.2011, Finland


Musicologists as Pianoists, Concert of Participants of ICMS7, Eero Tarasti, 09.06.2001 → 31.12.2011, Finland

Marcel Proust-seuran tilaisuus, Villa Gyllenbergt, Eero Tarasti, 06.10.2002 → 31.12.2011, Finland

Mikkelin musiikkijuhlat, Eero Tarasti, 28.06.2002 → 31.12.2011, Finland

Mikkelin musiikkijuhlat, Eero Tarasti, 02.07.2002 → 31.12.2011, Finland


Studio Semiotica -tulosarja, Eero Tarasti, 14.01.2002 → 31.12.2011, Finland

Suomen Symbolit, esitelmäsarja Suomen Kansallismuseossa, Eero Tarasti, 23.10.2002 → 31.12.2011, Finland
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MusSig/Tarasti


Didrichsenin Galleria, Eero Tarasti, 23.03.2003 → 31.12.2011, Finland

Einar Marvia Konseriti, Helsingin yliopiston kirjasto, Eero Tarasti, 30.11.2003 → 31.12.2011, Finland

Karjala-luentosarja, Karjalan liitto, Eero Tarasti, 18.11.2003 → 31.12.2011, Finland


Mikkelin Muusikkujuhlat, Eero Tarasti, 01.07.2003 → 31.12.2011, Finland

Mikkelin Muusikkujuhlat, Eero Tarasti, 04.07.2003 → 31.12.2011, Finland


Gyllenbergin museo,jär Suomen Marcel Proust seura, Eero Tarasti, 06.03.2006 → 31.12.2011, Finland

Itiin muusikkujuhlat, Eero Tarasti, 27.06.2006 → 31.12.2011, Finland

Kirjamesut, Ylen osasto, Eero Tarasti, 28.10.2006 → 31.12.2011, Finland

Mikkelin muusikkujuhlat, Eero Tarasti, 02.07.2006 → 31.12.2011, Finland

Mikkelin muusikkujuhlat, Eero Tarasti, 05.07.2006 → 31.12.2011, Finland

Savonlinnan opperaajuhlat, Eero Tarasti, 10.07.2006 → 31.12.2011, Finland

Suomalainen klubi, Maecenas, Eero Tarasti, 13.03.2006 → 31.12.2011, Finland

Syvä-Symposium, Plekkämäki, Eero Tarasti, 05.08.2006 → 31.12.2011, Finland

Tiedekeskus Heureka, yleisöesitelmä, Eero Tarasti, 05.10.2006 → 31.12.2011, Finland

YLE, Eero Tarasti, 17.02.2006 → 31.12.2011, Finland

YLE, Eero Tarasti, 06.04.2006 → 31.12.2011, Finland


Esitelmä Helsingin Kaupunginkonsertti Kajanus-juhliensa Arppeanumissa, Eero Tarasti, 09.10.2007 → 31.12.2011, Finland

paneelissa Suomen Kansallisopera asettaa jär, Pro Opera ja HYMS, Eero Tarasti, 11.05.2006 → 31.12.2011, Finland

DVD-elokuva, filmiyhtiö Bady Minck, ohj. ja filmaus Jean-Laurent Csinidis, Wien., Eero Tarasti, 01.01.2007 → 31.12.2011, Finland

Estolma Mikkelin kaupunginkonsertin Hange sai tapahtuma, Mikaeli, Mikkelin, Eero Tarasti, 31.03.2007 → 31.12.2011, Finland

Estolma seminaarissa Agricolan perintö, Suomi yhtenäisessä Euroopassa, jär, Suomalaisen kirjallisuuden seura, Helsinki, Eero Tarasti, 09.10.2007 → 31.12.2011, Finland

Estolma,Helsingin Työväenliitto, Eero Tarasti, 17.09.2007 → 31.12.2011, Finland

Estolma,Mikkelin Muusikkujuhlat, Meriinski, Mikkelin, Eero Tarasti, 01.07.2007 → 31.12.2011, Finland

Estolma,Mikkelin Muusikkujuhlat, Meriinski, Mikkelin, Eero Tarasti, 05.07.2007 → 31.12.2011, Finland

Estolma,Suomen Ranskayhdistyksen liitto, Eero Tarasti, 27.01.2007 → 31.12.2011, Finland

Imatran Rotary ry. Imatra, Eero Tarasti, 12.02.2007 → 31.12.2011, Finland

Juri Lotmanin monumentin paljastustilaisuus Tarton yliopisto/ Tarton kaupunki/Viron Opetusministeriö, Tartto., Eero Tarasti, 06.10.2007 → 31.12.2011, Finland

Kirjamesut., Eero Tarasti, 27.10.2007 → 31.12.2011, Finland

Semioksiikoit tutkivat taitteiden välisiä suhteita, Eero Tarasti, 01.06.2010

Semioksiikko tuottaa Imatralle, Eero Tarasti, 05.06.2010

Semioksiikko tuottaa Imatralle, Eero Tarasti, 12.06.2010

Taide- ja musiikkiarvosteluja, Eero Tarasti, 12.05.2010

Alfonso Antóni Padilla Silva

, Ilkajuliste, Alfonso Antóni Padilla Silva, 01.01.2006 → 31.12.2011, Mexico

Sinebrychoff /Perun hopeänäyttely, Alfonso Antóni Padilla Silva, 01.01.2008 → 31.12.2011, Mexico
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Juha Torvinen, Erik Bergman 90-v symposium, Juha Torvinen, 01.01.2001 → 31.12.2011, Finland
Helsingin kiitasuran kokous, Juha Torvinen, 01.01.2001 → 31.12.2011, Finland
Tauno Marttinen 90 vuotta-seminaari Hämeenlinnassa, Juha Torvinen, 01.01.2002 → 31.12.2011, Finland

Marjo Suominen,
Ilahminen yliopisto, Helsingin yliopisto, Imatran työväenopisto, Marjo Suominen, 10.10.2006 → 31.12.2011, Finland
Vierailuluento Analyyttinen kuuntelu ja esittävä säveltaide -kursilla, Marjo Suominen, 29.06.2006 → 31.12.2011, Finland

Elina Viljanen,
Haastattelu Venäjän aika -lehdessä, Elina Viljanen, 01.01.2009, Finland

Participation in radio programme

Eero Tarasti,
Classic Radiossa, Metro Radiot, Eero Tarasti, 01.02.2006 → 31.12.2011, Finland
Radio-ohjelma, sarjassa Semio-Radio, Eero Tarasti, 17.02.2007 → 31.12.2011, Finland

Kai Lassfolk,
Konemusiikki syntyy napia painamalla, Kai Lassfolk, 30.06.2008, Finland

Dario Martinelli,
Interview, Dario Martinelli, 09.12.2007, Italy
Interview, Dario Martinelli, 19.03.2008, Finland
Interview, Dario Martinelli, 30.07.2009, Finland
Interview, Dario Martinelli, 26.12.2009, Finland

Participation in TV programme

Eero Tarasti,
TV 1, Eero Tarasti, 16.09.2006 → 31.12.2011, Finland
TV1 toim Tiina-Maija Lehtonen, Eero Tarasti, 10.10.2006 → 31.12.2011, Finland
haastattelu Sibeliusen sinfoniateja, Eero Tarasti, 23.08.2010

Kai Lassfolk,
YLE Prisma Studio, Kai Lassfolk, 01.01.2007 → 31.01.2007, Finland

Lina Navickaite-Martinelli,

Elina Viljanen,
Haastattelu Venäjän aika -lehdessä, Elina Viljanen, 01.01.2009, Finland
Appendix B.b.

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

The bibliometric analyses by Helsinki University Library (HULib)

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

**Social Sciences**
Airaksinen, Timo – PPH
Engeström, Yrjö – CRADLE
Granberg, Leo – TRANSRURBAN
Haila, Anne – Sociopolis
Hautamäki, Jarkko – CEA
Heinonen, Visa – KUMU
Helén, Ilpo – STS
Hukkanen, Janne – GENU
Jallinoja, Riitta – SBiI
Kaartinen, Timo – SCA
Kettunen, Pauli – NordSoc
Kivinen, Markku – FCRES
Koponen, Juhan – DEVEROLE
Koskenniemi, Martti – ECI
Kultti, Klaus – EAT
Lahelma, Elina – KUFE
Lanne, Markku – TSEM
Lavonen, Jari – RCMER
Lehtonen, Risto – SocStats
Lindblom-Ylänne, Sari – EdPsychHE
Nieminen, Hannu – MECOL
Nuotio, Kimmo – Law
Nyman, Göte – METEOIR
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 – STRUTS
Vainio, Martti – SigMe

The next appendix includes the analyses of the RC under discussion.
MusSig / Tarasti

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

Basic Statistics

The group has 334 publications in TUHAT, distributed through a wide range of publication types. Note that this includes about 20 items that are compositions, concerts and other artistic works that do not bend easily to bibliometric analysis.

Out of 334 publications, 70 had more than one author. Of these, 13 had international co-authors and 26 national co-authors.

The following table shows the yearly breakdown of papers with 1...7 authors for each year:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th># of Authors</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>1</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>264</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>334</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The clear majority of publications have a single author. It has to be noted that some works listed as having two or more authors are often single author works, with the author listed in various roles (composer, musician).

The enclosed graph shows a steady rise in the number of publications until 2009.
Out of 334 publications, 127 are in English and 120 are in Finnish. The following chart shows the differences between classification types for the English and Finnish language publications. The popular writings and unrefereed scientific papers tend to be in Finnish while conference papers are in English.

There are a few papers published in a range of other European languages, as shown in the accompanying chart.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Journal title</th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Action, Criticism &amp; Theory for Music Education</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agon</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Akustikkapaaval</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applied semiotics : an international journal of</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>literary research</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bohemia</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boletín del Instituto Ibero-Americano - Berlin</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CO Compact</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chinese semiotic studies</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classica</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Con Roland Barthes : alle sorgenti del senso</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contemporary Aesthetics</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duodecim</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dvadesimties metu kelias</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Etnomusikologian Vuosikirja</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>European Meetings in Ethnomusicology</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finnish Music Quarterly</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fontes artis musicae</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Framework : the finnish art review</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helgingin Sansomat</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hufvudstaarbbladet</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idäntutkimus</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If : journal of Italo-Finnish studies.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Innerworldaudio</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kansalliskirjasto</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title</td>
<td>Volume</td>
<td>Number</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>Keel ja Kirjandus</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kohi ja paik</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kompositsio - Suomen saveltajat ry:n jäsentiedote</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kultturinntutkimus</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kulturos barai</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lexia</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberación</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lietu vos muzikologija</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Literaturuš</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Literatura ir menas</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muinaistutkiša</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Musetti : jäsentiedote / Suomen etnomusikologinen seura &amp; Suomen musiikkitieteellinen seura</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Musikin Suunta</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Musikki</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muzikos barai</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muzyka</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nouvelle Revue d'Esthétique</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oksikon</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Panorama Musical</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parnasso</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pauta</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance Online - Journal of Musical Interpretation</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Porrasalmi : Etelä-Savon kulttuurin vuosikirja</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Res farta nova : teksty o muzyce wspoczescnej</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rondo</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Runoleht Korppi : kirjoittajien julkaisufoorumi : nyt ja ennen</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Semiotica</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skeppari</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Semiotics</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Studi musicali</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Svensk tidskrift för musikforskning</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Synkoppi</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Synteesi : taiteidenvälisen tutkimuksen aikakauslehti</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theory &amp; Event</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wagnerisaari : Suomen Wagner-seuran julkaisu</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yliopisto : Helsingin yliopiston tiedelehti</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>18</strong></td>
<td><strong>18</strong></td>
<td><strong>22</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Page dimensions: 595.2x842.0
Journal Ranking (Norway, Australia)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Journal title</th>
<th>Australia</th>
<th>Norway</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Action Criticism and Theory for Music Education</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contemporary Aesthetics</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>European Meetings in Ethnomusicology</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finnish Review of East European Studies</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fontes Artis Musicae</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keel Ja Kirjandus</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muinaistutkija</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Musilki</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muzyka: kwartalnik poswiecony historii i teorii muzyki</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opcion: revista de ciencias humanas y sociales</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revue d'Esthetique</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Semiotica</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sémiotique appliquée</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Semiotics</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Studi musical</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Svensk tidskrift för musikforskning</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swedish Journal of Musicology</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theory and Event: an online journal of political theory</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Amount of ranked articles (Norway)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Norway</th>
<th>Journal articles</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Level 2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level 1</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Level 2 = highest scientific, Level 1= scientific

Amount of ranked articles (Australia)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Australia</th>
<th>Journal articles</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Level A*</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level A</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level B</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level C</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Australian ranking

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

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

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

C
Tier C includes quality, peer reviewed, journals that do not meet the criteria of the higher tiers.

Journal Ranking (ERIH)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Journal title</th>
<th>Musicology</th>
<th>Linguistics</th>
<th>Literature</th>
<th>Archaeology</th>
<th>Gender Studies</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Applied semiotics</td>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>European Meetings in Ethnomusicology</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fontes artis musicae.</td>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keel ja Kirjandus</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kulttuurintutkimus</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muinaistutkija</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Musiikin Suunta</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Musikki</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parnasso</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Semiotica</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Studi musicali</td>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Svensk tidskrift för musikforskning</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ERIH ranking 2007–2008

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

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

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

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

Book Publisher rankings (Norway)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Publisher</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SAGE</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gaudeamus</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L’Harmattan</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Springer</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Illinois Press</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2 = leading scientific
1 = scientific

C1 Published scientific monograph (12)
C2 Edited book, compilation, conference proceeding or special issue of journal (17)
D5 Text book or professional handbook or guidebook or dictionary (1)
E2 Popular monograph (3)