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Foreword

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

1.1 RC-specific evaluation reports

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

It is essential to emphasize that the evaluation combines both meta-evaluation\(^1\) and traditional research assessment exercise and its focus is both on the research outcomes and procedures associated with research and doctoral training. The approach to the evaluation is enhancement-led where self-evaluation constituted the main information. The answers to the evaluation questions formed together with the information of publications and other scientific activities an entity that was to be reviewed as a whole.

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

1.2 Aims and objectives in the evaluation

The aims of the evaluation are as follows:

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

1.3 Evaluation method

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

---

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

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

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

- biological, agricultural and veterinary sciences
- medicine, biomedicine and health sciences
- natural sciences
- humanities
- social sciences

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Evaluation material

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

Background material

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

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

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

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

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

   The additional material: TUHAT compilation of the RC’s publications, analysis of the RC’s publications data (provided by University of Leiden and the Helsinki University Library)

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

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

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

   The additional material: TUHAT compilation of the RC’s other scientific activities/supervision of doctoral dissertations

   A written feedback from the aspects of: processes and good practises 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”.
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Operations and procedures are of outstanding quality, transparent and shared in the community. The improvement of research and other efforts are documented and operations and practices are in alignment with the documentation. The ambition to develop the community together is of outstanding quality.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

**Question 2 – DOCTORAL TRAINING**

**Question 3 – SOCIETAL IMPACT**

**Question 4 – COLLABORATION**

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

**Question 9 – CATEGORY**

Participation category – fitness for the category chosen

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

The main timetable of the evaluation:

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

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

1.9 Evaluation feedback – consensus of the entire panel

The 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

In so far as Deverele’s research has a focus it is Finnish development aid and cooperation, including a highly policy-relevant project on Does Finnish aid matter? But its research is quite dispersed, not concentrated on issues of socio-economic and political development, including security issues, diasporas, and migration. According to its self-presentation the RC is more a “conglomeration” than a community. Research on Eastern and Southern Africa constitutes a developmentalist core. Publications (A1, A3, C1) number 1.6 a year per post-PhD researcher, mostly in scholarly peripheral journals and publishing-houses.

“Strengthening the focus is not a self-evident goal to this researcher community”, says the self-report. We think this unfortunate, and we would recommend an RC discussion about priorities and concentrations of effort in order to raise the research profile and increase socially relevant expertise.

Numeric evaluation: 3 (Very good)

2.2 Practises and quality of doctoral training

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

ASPECTS: Processes and good practices related to leadership and management

Students are selected from global calls, and about half of the RC’s doctoral candidates have non-Finnish names. The relationship between the graduate program of the discipline of Development studies and the Finnish Graduate School in Development Studies, Devestu is not made quite clear in the report.

While supervision seems to be well provided for, a more comprehensive program of methodological and theoretical training seems to be needed, especially in the given context of heterogeneous student backgrounds and the dispersion of the research field. As the report mentions the output of PhDs is low.

Numeric evaluation: 3 (Very good)
2.3 The societal impact of research and doctoral training

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

ASPECTS: Societal impact, national and international collaboration, innovativeness

Deverele is closely linked to the Ministry of Foreign Affairs and the Service Centre for Development Cooperation, and the RC sees its societal impact mainly in relation to Finnish policy-makers. Media presence is not mentioned, and is in fact rather low. Mentioned but very briefly, almost in passing, and with no concrete information, is a societal impact in countries of development. It is recommended that much more attention is given to that.

We fully agree with the RC report that a prerequisite of a valuable societal impact is the intellectual independence and high academic quality of research.

Challenge: By definition societal impact of the Deverele is paramount! Deverele is an immense research community. It includes the disciplines of economics, political science, psychology, management, anthropology, geography and sociology and encompasses eight academic departments. Some of its interests are safety and security, trade, agriculture, environment and mass migration. Besides having such a vast framework, the RC is a practical and action-oriented scholarly entity. This RC responds and intends to influence public policy matters. Because of the unit’s unusual structure and purpose the evaluation material suggests that it is necessary to widen the scope of evaluation for their RC. They certainly have a very practical mission. The panel can understand and sympathize with this RC’s mission, however that very mission necessitates a powerful societal impact. The RC must demonstrate in the clearest manner possible such an impact.

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

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

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

ASPECTS: Scientific quality, national and international collaboration

As should be expected Deverele has extensive North-South links, primarily with the Universities of Dar es Salaam and Zambia. It also participates actively in Nordic and European networks of development researchers. So, by its very nature, this RC should be one of the most mobile RCs at the University. The University should support and expect the internationalization of the Deverele.

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

2.5 Operational conditions

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

ASPECTS: Processes and good practices related to leadership and management
Funding of doctoral candidates seems to be a constant problem, deriving from the costs of fieldwork, including of travel to/from field sites on other continents. More senior permanent staff is needed for teaching, and above all the panel recommended more teaching to PhD students.

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**

The organizational context of development studies at Helsinki University seems to be complicated and is not made very clear in the report. There is a discipline of Development studies, which previously was an autonomous institute but which is now part of a larger unit, the Department of Political and Economic Studies. The relations between the former and the latter are not obvious. There is also a third structure, the national graduate school Devestu.

DEVERELE is only a loose framework, and as such unlikely to provide any leadership. The amount of coherence there is seems to hinge on the person of Professor Koponen as head of Development studies and of Devestu, but he is now retiring from (at least) the former post.

Leadership and management of this RC seem to have become an open problem. The faculty and the University should see to it that Development studies are given a manageable structure for a more focused development.

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**

Not much international funding has been acquired, though some from EU. From Finnish sources fairly substantial funding has been acquired, but apparently not fully adequate, given the costs of necessary extensive fieldwork abroad.
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

Because of imminent central personal changes in the RC and uncertainty at the time of writing about future funding of the Devestu doctoral program, it is understandably impossible to draw up much of a plan for the future. However, the planned project on the history of development as idea and as practice is very commendable.

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 5. The research of the participating community has a highly significant societal impact.

The RC is primarily oriented to social relevance and societal impact, so its fits into category 5. But this orientation seems to be too much interpreted, in the emphases of the report, on impact on Finnish policymakers. At the same time, as the report implies, higher quality of research is likely to mean more societal impact. Specifically, this conglomerate RC needs more time to consolidate, amalgamate and strengthen.

Numeric evaluation: 4 (Excellent)

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

The materials presented by the RC state that all members of the Deverele were able to participate in the compilation of the information presented to the panels.

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

Focus area 10: Globalisation and social change

The research of DEVERELE clearly pertains to the focus area of Globalisation and social change, but it is not highlighted in the report.

2.12 RC-specific main recommendations

- A firmer organizational structure
- More focused research

2.13 RC-specific conclusions

With its primary orientation to study contexts and consequences of Finnish development aid, the research of this RC is of national importance. But further significant achievements in this field will require more focus and concentration, in turn calling for more cohesive organization. Either the loose “conglomeration”
of the present RC should be pulled together, or it should be divided into two or more RCs, capable of functioning as research communities.
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:
Research for Relevance - Development Policy (DEVERELE)

LEADER OF THE RESEARCHER COMMUNITY:
Professor Juhani Koponen, Department of Political and Economic Studies

RC-SPECIFIC MATERIAL FOR THE PEER REVIEW:

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

NB! Since Web of Science (WoS)-based bibliometrics does not provide representative results for most RCs representing humanities, social sciences and computer sciences, the publications of these RCs will be analyzed by the UH Library (results available by the end of June, 2011)
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RC-SPECIFIC STAGE 1 MATERIAL (registration form)

1 RESPONSIBLE PERSON

Name: Koponen, Juhani
E-mail: 
Phone: 09-19124265
Affiliation: Professor
Street address: Development Studies, P.O. Box 59 (Unioninkatu 38E), 00014 University of Helsinki

2 DESCRIPTION OF THE PARTICIPATING RESEARCHER COMMUNITY (RC)

Name of the participating RC (max. 30 characters): Research for Relevance – Development Policy
Acronym for the participating RC (max. 10 characters): DEVERELE

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): This researcher community is bound together by an endeavour to produce high-quality social research that is relevant for the purposes of development policy and to actively engage in development policy discussions and policy-making. Most of its members come from or are related to the discipline of Development Studies at the Department of Political and Economic Studies which also hosts the Finnish Graduate School for Development Studies (Devestu) but it also includes researchers from other areas such as political science, social psychology, management studies, anthropology, geography, and sociology. Development policy is here defined as actions in different sections of international co-operation and national policy that affect the position of developing countries (e.g. security, trade, agriculture, environment, migration...). Civil society actors such as non-governmental organizations and companies are also relevant. Thus, it is a broader concept than development cooperation, which is seen as a key instrument of development policy, or development aid, which refers to resources involved and transferred in development co-operation. The role of research here is to produce knowledge that helps to understand and explain the processes of development and the factors affecting them and through such knowledge to contribute towards solving the problems of development. The focus is on the complex interaction between intentional development interventions and more spontaneously generated processes of social change. This research community shares these aims. Its members undertake both some applied research but also more basic type of research that is deemed of longer term relevance to development policy. Co-operation with researchers from developing countries is seen as a must. The doctoral training is aimed at building the basic academic skills that are needed for both types of research. Some members have development policy relevance as a major purpose of their research activity; for others it is one aspect among many others.

3 SCIENTIFIC FIELDS OF THE RC

Main scientific field of the RC’s research: social sciences
RC’s scientific subfield 1: Social Sciences, Interdisciplinary
RC’s scientific subfield 2: Planning and Development
RC’s scientific subfield 3: Political Science
RC’s scientific subfield 4: Anthropology
Other, if not in the list: Management, Social Psychology, Geography, Sociology

4 RC’s PARTICIPATION CATEGORY

Participation category: 5. Research of the participating community has a highly significant societal impact

Justification for the selected participation category (MAX. 2200 characters with spaces): According to the guidelines for the evaluation, the researcher community participating in this category must be able to justify the high social significance of its research and we believe that research for development relevance is of such significance. Basically, all development research is required to be relevant for development and thus also relevant for development policy. The problems of world poverty and international inequality are far from solved. They are both fundamental economic and social problems in their own right while, at the same time, they contribute to a host of other problems from accelerating climate change to uncontrolled flows of migration. A great deal of public funds is annually used to promote development – almost one billion euro in Finland alone and some 100 billion euro globally. But the relevance of research for solving development problems is a complicated matter. Much of it is bound to be indirect. Most academic research and policy development apply different time horizons. Also the relevance of the policy itself on development on the ground is seldom straightforward. Many kinds of research are needed: applied, critical and basic. The boundaries between them are permeable. We think that one of the main functions of policy relevant research is to critically understand both how policy-making takes place and how development processes unfold on the ground and how they are affected by development interventions and other factors. Even the most purely academic research can in the long run prove the most relevant for supporting development. At its best, development research can keep policy alternatives alive. That is, we see impact as a critical, research based output to often conflictive political environment of policy making. It goes without saying that to achieve such aspirations, the research itself must be of a top quality.

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): Development research is problem-oriented and inherently multi- or interdisciplinary. Development interventions mingle with complex, deep-rooted, structural processes. These are affected by culturally regulated worldviews and religions that fashion values, norms and practices. Thus the members of this researcher community conduct research on development topics within a wide range of academic fields. In addition to development studies, development policy oriented research draws from anthropological, sociological, political science and management backgrounds. Main research themes include aid effectiveness and the impacts of aid; politics of aid and state formation; diaspora and peace, and; corporate social responsibility. The research takes places both in the North and the South and makes linkages between them. To identify the interconnected economic, political and social problems and their internal
relations, both familiarity with local conditions and knowledge of global structures and forces affecting them is needed.

Much of doctoral training has taken place under the auspices of the Finnish Graduate School in Development Studies (Devestu), hosted by Development Studies at the Department of Political and Economic Studies. It offers interdisciplinary higher education in development studies. The school involves eight academic departments across Finland and is coordinated by the Department of Political and Economic Studies/Development Studies at the University of Helsinki. Devestu offers different forms of tuition for graduate students working on development-related theses. All postgraduate students are allocated two personal academic supervisors. In addition to the supervisory support for individual students, the following activities take place regularly: weekly seminar, annual methodology courses, supervisory laboratories, and review workshops.

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

One could argue that in a sense, almost all academic research is meant to have some policy relevance in one way or another – with shorter or longer time span. Development research is one of those fields where this endeavour is explicitly recognized and its implications are taken seriously. Development Studies at the University of Helsinki has also a national function. It is the only academic institution in Finland providing academic research in development studies and degree courses from Bachelor’s, through Master’s up to the Doctoral level. This researcher community represents significant scientific and practical expertise in development related matters.

Keywords: development policy, relevance, social impact, aid effectiveness, intentional development interventions, social change

Justified estimate of the quality of the RC's research and doctoral training at national and international level during 2005-2010 (MAX. 2200 characters with spaces): In previous evaluations, Finnish development research in general and that at the University of Helsinki has been found to be of good international standard. In the Research Assessment at HU in 2005, a major strength of the then Institute of Development Studies was mentioned to be the use of an integrative social science approach. This was reflected in the variety of research methodologies, allowing a more situational and historical analysis of political and social influences on development processes. Interdisciplinarity was seen to have been taken seriously and could be recognized both in the background of the staff and selection of research topics. The relatively low number of publications was a concern. Since then, efforts have been made to correct the shortcomings but it is up to the evaluation to discover to what extent they have been successful.

The Ministry for Foreign Affairs commissioned an independent evaluation of its support to development research in 2009. The evaluation report did not have much to say on the more academic development research. On the shorter-term commissioned research, where the topics are defined by the Ministry but researchers propose individual approaches, the evaluators expressed that the commissioned research reports are good summaries of the state of the art within particular fields, but a clearer operational focus would be needed. Here there would be room for further analysis as to where the gist of the problem lies.
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RC-SPECIFIC STAGE 1 MATERIAL (registration form)

In the internal feedback and evaluations of doctoral training, the students have expressed their appreciation of the teaching and supervisory arrangements but the lack of resources has been seen as a problem. The number of doctorates is still relatively low but many more are on the pipeline and those who have taken their doctorates have been employed in research positions or equivalent positions in Ministries, international development organizations or non-governmental organizations (NGOs).

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

It is not an easy task to evaluate the actual degree of the relevance and societal significance of any research by means of conventional scientific or other indicators such as the number of publications in various forums and the modalities of doctoral training. In development research, the task is further complicated by the indirect nature of much of the relevance which makes the policy discussion a crucial site for engendering relevance. While peer-review publications, book compilations, and other academic writings have of course to be included, in order to fully assess the societal impact it is necessary to widen the scope of evaluation to such areas that assess the impact on development policy and policy discussion through the following three dimensions: 1) policy relevant publications and impact on policies and development projects, 2) activities in organizations, advisory boards, and various sorts of groups of experts, as well as 3) impact on wider public on development related matters. Therefore, it is our suggestion that in addition to academic publications and the organization of doctoral training the evaluation materials include directly policy-related documents such as development reports, evaluations, and commissioned research, and writings for the broader public, public appearances in media, positions in development related committees and organizations at both public and private sector including non-governmental organizations, public lectures, and development activism in general. Additional interviews might be needed in order to fully understand the significance of specific publications for development policy decisions. It would also be important to realize that a period of five years is a short timeframe for assessing a policy impact of research.

The PI’s of this community have a long experience in publishing development policy relevant texts at a wide variety of publication forums. The younger researchers have published articles and Ph.D. studies both as monographs and article collections. All researchers have been encouraged to take part in public discussions on development related matters in the form of policy texts and public writings.
**NAME OF THE RESEARCHER COMMUNITY:** Research for Relevance - Development Policy

**RC-LEADER**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Last name</th>
<th>First name</th>
<th>PI-status (TUHAT, 29.11.2010)</th>
<th>Title of research and teaching personnel</th>
<th>Affiliation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Abdile</td>
<td>Mahdi</td>
<td></td>
<td>Development Studies, Department of Political and Economic Studies</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ahonen</td>
<td>Pertti</td>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>Political Science, with special reference to administrative research, Department of Political and Economic Studies</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duh</td>
<td>Abdalla</td>
<td>Doctoral Candidate</td>
<td>Development Studies, Department of Political and Economic Studies</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ghimire</td>
<td>Sujan</td>
<td>Doctoral Candidate</td>
<td>Tribhuvan University, Kathmandu, Nepal (affiliated with development studies, department of political and economic studies at the HY)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gould</td>
<td>Jeremy</td>
<td>x Professor</td>
<td>Development and International Cooperation, University of Jyväskylä (prior to that university lecturer in development studies at the University of Helsinki)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hakkarainen</td>
<td>Minna</td>
<td>Doctoral Candidate</td>
<td>Development Studies, Department of Political and Economic Studies</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hautaniemi</td>
<td>Petri</td>
<td>Postdoctoral researcher</td>
<td>Development Studies, Department of Political and Economic Studies</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jänis</td>
<td>Julia</td>
<td>Doctoral Candidate</td>
<td>Development Studies, Department of Political and Economic Studies</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kontinen</td>
<td>Tiina</td>
<td>Postdoctoral researcher</td>
<td>Development Studies, Department of Political and Economic Studies</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Koponen</td>
<td>Juhani</td>
<td>x Professor</td>
<td>Development Studies, Department of Political and Economic Studies</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laakso</td>
<td>Liisa</td>
<td>x Professor</td>
<td>Political Science, Department of Political and Economic Science, Dean of the Faculty of Social Sciences</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mattila</td>
<td>Päivi</td>
<td>Doctoral Candidate</td>
<td>Development Studies, Department of Political and Economic Studies</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mendoza</td>
<td>René</td>
<td>Doctoral Candidate</td>
<td>Institute of Research and Development (NITAPAN), Central American University, Nicaragua (affiliated to Development Studies, Department of Political and Economic Studies at the HY)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metsola</td>
<td>Lalli</td>
<td>Doctoral Candidate</td>
<td>Development Studies, Department of Political and Economic Studies</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mustalahti</td>
<td>Irmeli</td>
<td>Postdoctoral researcher</td>
<td>Development Studies, Department of Political and Economic Studies</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Niemi</td>
<td>Saija</td>
<td>Doctoral Candidate</td>
<td>Development Studies, Department of Political and Economic Studies</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pakkasvirta</td>
<td>Jussi</td>
<td>x Research Director</td>
<td>Department of Political and Economic Studies</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pirttilä-Backman</td>
<td>Anna-Maija</td>
<td>x Professor</td>
<td>Social Psychology, Department of Social Research</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ranta-Owusu</td>
<td>Eija</td>
<td>Doctoral Candidate</td>
<td>Development Studies, Department of Political and Economic Studies</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rovaniemi</td>
<td>Sirpa</td>
<td>Doctoral Candidate</td>
<td>Development Studies, Department of Political and Economic Studies</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sharma</td>
<td>Sudhînдра</td>
<td>Senior Lecturer</td>
<td>Sociology, the Nepal School of Social Sciences and Humanities in Kathmandu (docent of development studies at the University of Helsinki, approximately one year of grant based research at the HY)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Siitonen</td>
<td>Lauri</td>
<td>University lecturer</td>
<td>Development and International Cooperation, University of Jyväskylä (prior to that amanuensis in development studies at the University of Helsinki)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stocchetti</td>
<td>Mariikki</td>
<td>Doctoral Candidate</td>
<td>Development Studies, Department of Political and Economic Studies</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tiilikainen</td>
<td>Marja</td>
<td>x Postdoctoral researcher</td>
<td>Sociology, Department of Social Research</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wang</td>
<td>Gyamtso</td>
<td>Ph.D. Candidate, Postdoctoral researcher</td>
<td>Development Studies, Department of Political and Economic Studies</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ylhäisi</td>
<td>Jussi</td>
<td>Postdoctoral researcher</td>
<td>Development Studies, Department of Political and Economic Studies</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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RC-SPECIFIC STAGE 2 MATERIAL

BACKGROUND INFORMATION

Name of the RC’s responsible person: Koponen, Juhani

E-mail of the RC’s responsible person:

Name and acronym of the participating RC: Research for Relevance – Development Policy, DEVERELE

The RC’s research represents the following key focus area of UH: 10. Globalisaatio ja yhteiskunnan muutos – Globalisation and social change

Comments for selecting/not selecting the key focus area:

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).

This researcher community is as multifaceted as its research subject: it covers global and local development, intentional development interventions driven from outside and internally generated processes of social change, the North and the South, and – above all – the linkages between these. Development research is problem-oriented and multi- or interdisciplinary. Its scope is global while it pays due attention to the national frameworks and reaches down to the local level. It tries to understand and explain how the intentional development interventions mingle with complex, deep-rooted, structural processes of social change springing from internal dynamics of the societies concerned and how these are affected by culturally regulated worldviews and religions that fashion values, norms and practices. Familiarity with local conditions and knowledge of global structures and forces affecting them are both needed. The 26 members of this researcher community, originating from four continents, conduct research all over the globe on a variety of topics with differing approaches and within a wide range of academic fields. The core of the community is formed by researchers affiliated with the discipline of Development Studies which is now part of the Department of Political and Economic Studies at the Faculty of Social Sciences. As Development Studies is inherently multi- or interdisciplinary these researchers have their background in many social science disciplines, mainly in social anthropology, human geography, history, and sociology, but also in the study of religions, political science, and management.

While global in its reach and varied as to the topics, the research community does have certain areas of emphasis. Geographically, roughly half of the researchers are focused mainly on Africa, where Eastern and Southern Africa are especially well covered, in particular the Horn of Africa, Tanzania, Namibia and Zambia. The rest are almost equally divided between Latin America, especially Central America and the Andean region, and certain Asian countries such as India, Nepal and Vietnam. A few researchers work in and on two or three developing continents. The researchers share the belief that it is – and has long been – impossible to study the local economic, political and social processes and problems and the national policies with which they are tackled without relating them to global and transnational structures and forces affecting them. Thus all these studies pay close attention to the linkages between the different levels, i.e. local, national and global. Often, but not always, there is also a discernible link to Finland and Finnish development policy. This is most evident in studies concerning development aid where the emphasis has been on the attempts to find out how aid in practice functions, what have been its effects and impacts and how the latter can be evaluated and assessed (Ahonen, Ghimire, Kontinen, Koponen, Laakso, Mendoza, Mustalahti, Sharma, Silttonen, Stocchetti). A particular area of interest in aid...
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Research has been that focusing on civil society discourse and NGOs (non-governmental organizations) (Duh, Hakkarainen, Kontinen, Rovaniemi). The Finnish connection has been evident in studies on immigration, refugees and immigrants and their ways of coping in new environments including transnational engagements (Hautaniemi, Niemi, Tiilikainen) and corporate social responsibility (Pakkasvirta). Moreover, diasporas play a role in topics like development and corporate social responsibility (Pakkasvirta) as well as peace mediation (Abdile). Some studies have tackled the issue of the role and transformation of the state in and through policy making (Gould, Metsola, Ranta-Owusu) while others have examined the role of market forces (Pakkasvirta, Wang) as well as the sundry pressures and forces affecting national policy-making and life of local communities in developing countries in areas from natural resource management, conservation and ownership to tourism (Jänis, Mustalahä, Ylhäisi). In examining different social forces, gender issues have been given prominence in a few studies (Mattila, Metsola, Pirttilä-Backman).

Basically, the community is bound together by the common endeavour to produce research that is relevant to an understanding and explanation of what are conceived as development problems and could provide help in resolving them. But the relevance of research for solving development problems is a complicated matter. Much of it is bound to be indirect. Academic research applies a time horizon different from both policy and development: to realise its relevance may take time. Even the relevance of the policy itself on the development that happens – or does not happen - on the ground is seldom straightforward. We need - and do - research of many kinds: applied, critical and basic and the boundaries between them are blurred. We think that one of the main functions of policy relevant research is to keep policy alternatives alive. The most basic academic research can in the long run prove the most relevant for supporting development. Anyway, to achieve its practical aspirations, the research itself must be of a top quality.

It is against this background that the quality and significance of the research of the community has to be assessed. This is made difficult by the fact that it is not possible to succinctly summarize the research 'results' of such multifarious research programme, undertaken not as a group but by individual researchers and groups within the community. The academic merits of the particular studies must be assessed case by case. We ourselves think that much of our work it is of high international standard although it may not have been widely known outside due to the relatively short period during which this research tradition has been built up at the University of Helsinki and some lag in international academic publication as much effort have been directed to publications and other activities aimed at broader public in Finnish. In our view, a particular strength in most of our studies lies in taking the people's agency and the local conditions and forces affecting it seriously and seeing them both molded by and themselves molding the larger structural forces at national and global level. This approach has provided us with a much enhanced understanding of how social relations, markets, states and aid work in the Third World countries and where the possibilities of and the limits to outside intervention lie, whether we talk of conventional development aid, peace mediation, or reducing forest degradation to combat climate change.

In addition, it is not easy to find the standards to assess the relevance of such a work. 'Normal’ academic criteria naturally apply but it is not enough. Yet if the practical criteria of relevant research are reduced to its ability to produce operational advice to policy actors, as was done in a recent evaluation commissioned by the Ministry for Foreign Affairs of Finland, the basic nature and the field of applicability of social research are lost. The way we see it, research outputs cannot be single and simple pieces of policy advice but a critical contribution to understanding and explaining the complexities of social phenomena with the help of which to it will be possible to better frame and facilitate the
participation in the often conflictive political environment of policy making. This is what we have tried to do in all the ways presented in this evaluation form.

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

  Strengthening the focus is not a self-evident goal to this researcher community. This is not a tightly-knit research group modeled on the natural science example but a conglomeration of intersecting circles of groups and individual researchers working in a common field and sharing some basic starting points. The discipline of Development Studies has been at pains to keep its research open to different approaches as to not to preclude innovative scientific initiatives in what is the only academic institution of its kind in Finland.

  This said, there obviously are many ways to make the research in the community more coherent and improve its quality. The most important of them are related to the resources, but even within the existing frame it would be possible to intensify internal and external cooperation and build within the community more focused research groups collaborating with each other. Such groups could then seek to network with international partners. It would also be imperative to increase the number of submissions to international peer reviewed journals.

### 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.

  In the Faculty of Social Sciences of the University of Helsinki the main responsibility for doctoral training has been left with the disciplines, i.e. former departments that have now been merged into two large departments, Development Studies (DS), formerly an administratively independent Institute within the Faculty has had and still has a Doctoral programme of its own, with some 20-25 active students. However, much of doctoral training in DS and nearby disciplines has taken place under the auspices of the Finnish Graduate School in Development Studies (Devestu) which is financed by the Ministry of Education through the Academy of Finland and hosted by the discipline and the new Department of Political and Economic Studies. Devestu is both a funding organization and a Doctoral programme providing substantial teaching and supervision. Most students belong both to Development Studies and Devestu and the resources and activities of the discipline and the graduate school largely overlap.

  Although Devestu is hosted and to a great extent run by DS at the UH, seven other institutions at Helsinki or other Universities are its members, They include:

  - Department of Geosciences and Geography, UH
  - Communication, Department of Social Sciences, UH
  - Department of Economics, Aalto university
  - Department of Geography, University of Turku
  - Centre for East Asian Studies, University of Turku
  - Department of Social Sciences and Philosophy, University of Jyväskylä
  - School of Social Research, University of Tampere
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All of these are represented in the Board of the programme. In addition, Social and Economic History in the same Department as DS at UH has joined in as a new member in the application for continued funding in 2012-15.

Devestu provides full-time funding for a small number on students – in principle for five for four years but as the funding periods vary also the actual numbers have been somewhat higher. It also accepts students funded from other sources as its status members (about 10 active ones). Devestu students are expected to submit their theses at the member institutions, which, in practice, means that they have to be enrolled at one of them. As all the Doctoral students in the present RC (except Ghimire who is about to defend her thesis at her home University in Nepal) are or have been enrolled at Development Studies in Helsinki and/or involved in Devestu, what will be said below applies to Development Studies and Devestu.

In Development Studies, post-graduate applications are handled according to the regulations and procedures of the University and the Faculty of Social Sciences. There are two application deadlines per year. Calls are global but only those are considered who have obtained a Master’s degree from a recognized university and have the necessary language skills (English). The applications are assessed on the basis of documents by a committee within the discipline and the final decisions are made by the Faculty. The main criteria for student selection include the applicant’s academic background, the quality and feasibility of a research plan submitted by the applicant, and the capacity of the discipline to provide supervision for the applicant’s topic and approach. The number of the applicants varies annually from about ten to twenty; the corresponding intake has lately been from one to a few.

Devestu announces the posts it will fund nationally and internationally, mainly on e-mail lists, once basic funding has been secured. The selection is made by the Board and the main criteria are on the one hand academic potential which is assessed on the basis of the research plan and the topic and approach of the research on the other and the capacity of the programme to provide supervision. Previous academic achievements, publications, experience in developing countries and development intervention, cultural and language skills and general innovativeness are considered as merits. The number of applicants tends to greatly exceed the available resources. In the last full application round in 2006, funding of lengths varying from four one years could be provided to six applicants among 47.

The status students do not receive salary funding from Devestu but are provided with supervision and are eligible to participate in all the activities and also apply for small travel grants. Their selection takes place according to the same academic criteria but applications are continuously taken in and processed by the Board.

Devestu combines the ‘Nordic’ and the ‘Anglo-Saxon’ modes of Doctoral training: seminars and courses together with intensive personal supervision. To start with, Devestu students participate in the PhD seminars organized by their home institutions. In DS in Helsinki, the preliminary research proposal submitted by the student will be revised and substantial and methodological aspects of the work will be discussed. Devestu itself organizes every year, usually in late August, a week-long methodology course during which the participants go deeper into a common theme, connected to social theory, research ethics, etc., by means of lectures, and practical exercises and students present papers of their own related to the topic. The responsibility for the practical organization of the courses goes to each member institution in turn. Another yearly event is a shorter, one-day review workshop, in which the students account for the progress of their work and bring possible problems forward to be commonly discussed. Interestingly, the more advanced students have on their own initiative formed writing groups to conclude their manuscripts.
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The courses and workshops are meant to support supervision which is taken by Devestu and DS as the core of Doctoral training. Supervision happens both in groups and individually. Students working on related themes have formed small groups with the teacher, sometimes called 'laboratories' in which common literature is read and the work of the students discussed. But most emphasis has been placed on personal supervision where Devestu provides a pool of supervisors which goes vastly beyond what any individual member institution could produce. Each student has been promised two supervisors closely following her or his work; and in most case this has been accomplished. One supervisor normally comes from the substance area of the student while the other represents more general development studies approach.

The courses and workshops are meant to support supervision which is taken by Devestu and DS as the core of Doctoral training. Supervision happens both in groups and individually. Students working on related themes have formed small groups with the teacher, sometimes called 'laboratories' in which common literature is read and the work of the students discussed. But most emphasis has been placed on personal supervision where Devestu provides a pool of supervisors which goes vastly beyond what any individual member institution could produce. Each student has been promised two supervisors closely following her or his work; and in most case this has been accomplished. One supervisor normally comes from the substance area of the student while the other represents more general development studies approach.

The quality of the activities is followed by continuous feedback. The supervisors are annually asked progress reports on their students and vice versa the students are asked feedback on supervision. The Broad may discuss possible problems and change the supervisors. Feedback is also collected on the methodology and other courses; satisfaction with them seems to be fairly high. An external evaluation was commissioned in 2006. The students expressed their appreciation of funding and the teaching and supervisory arrangements but the lack of resources was seen as a problem.

The number of PhD holders in this field in Finland is still so low and the need for them seems to be growing so fast that the fresh Doctors will have good career prospects. Although the years of expansion of the Finnish academia and public administration are over, and it is not clear what happens to the Finnish development funds, the on-going change of generation and reallocation of resources will keep up a constant demand of knowledgeable people and consultancy companies and NGOs will need and appreciate better trained staff.

A strength is that through the national and international networks of Devestu it has been possible to mobilise more teachers and with regular teaching and intense supervision the students have been able to tackle their topics from interlinked perspectives.

The challenges are related to resources and the conditions of development research. While the secure basic funding through Devestu is appreciated it is not enough even for the salaries of the students but the UH must top them up, and funds for other costs, such as field work, conference trips, language check and printing of dissertations etc., have to be sought from outside. Most Devestu activities fall on the senior DS staff on the top of their already heavy duties. It has also turned out difficult to the students to produce their dissertations in four years. Multidisciplinarity, long-term fieldwork abroad, and coping with foreign cultures take time. The number of doctorates is still relatively low (DS three, Devestu five in 2005-10) although many more are on the pipeline. In the future, more attention will be given to this.

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).

Development Studies, and by implication all development research at the UH, has a national function as it is the only University in Finland undertaking academic research on development and giving degrees from Bachelor’s through Master’s up to the Doctoral level. This researcher community represents a major resource in development related matters in Finland and is frequently resorted to by officials, NGOs, media and companies. The main partners include the Ministry for Foreign Affairs (MFA), the
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Service Centre for Development Cooperation (KEPA) with many of its member organizations, and some consultancy companies.

The dialogue between research and action is promoted in a variety of forms. The conventional ‘enlightenment’ way continues to be important. Academic books and papers contribute to research discourse and indirectly influence policy, and the lessons from university teaching percolate through graduating student to the broader society. In addition to Doctoral students there are more than 200 Bachelor’s and Master’s students at Development Studies alone. They find jobs in NGOs and international organizations, and some in the Ministry of Foreign Affairs and consultancy companies. It is a major practical effect of our academic work to produce a fair number of young Masters and Doctors with the required skills and knowledge.

In the more direct ‘policy influence’ way the researchers publish popular writings, appear in media, lecture to popular audiences and contribute to policy discussions in committees of different kind. These activities are commonly conducted in the Finnish language. Two PIs of the community are members of the semi-official Development Policy Committee, which also includes representatives of political parties and interest groups. It gives advice to MFA and evaluates the quality and effectiveness of Finnish development policy. Several members of the researcher community have been heard by the Foreign Affairs committee and other committees of the Parliament. Many are members of the board of development NGOs and service centers (f.e. KEPA).

A third, even more direct way is that of ‘close collaboration’ whereby researchers provide direct contributions to on-going development processes. This is undertaken e.g. by establishing common organisational development projects and initiating joint research efforts, something that has been done with some NGOs; conducting participatory research or action research in the field and supplying the results immediately to local communities and development workers; or by taking part of the implementation of development interventions as consultants. Development Studies has a framework agreement with the MFA and Finnish Consultancy Group, a company, on undertaking a number of peer review and meta-analyses of the evaluation reports commissioned by MFA.

Many of the RC (Koponen, Gould, Mattila, Metsola, Siitonen, Sharma) have conducted commissioned research for the MFA.

We have indications that our researchers have made a difference through all these three channels although its exact extent is difficult to measure. And it is important to keep the time horizon in mind: if one of the functions of research is to develop and keep alive policy alternatives, this will take its time to materialize.

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

The first requirement to continued societal impact and its improvement is to guarantee the independence and high academic quality of research. This implies that the basic research funding must remain independent of the MFA, NGOs or private companies. The temptation to rely increasingly on such external sources in those fields conceived of high policy relevance must be resisted.

Once the conditions for the independence and quality of the research are secured, there is plenty of room for continuing the dialogue and collaboration with the outside society, and for explication and information on research findings and discussion on their implications. This can take place through conventional means such as publications and workshops, or through more modern means using internet and social media. Especially the Doctoral students would benefit – and already do so- from a more
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intense co-operation with research institutes and NGOs. In this way, doctoral candidates would make important contacts and create networks useful in finding a future job or position.

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

RC’s doctoral training is organized mostly through the Finnish Graduate School in Development Studies (Devestu), cooperation between eight academic departments mentioned earlier. Joint doctoral training activities are organized between these collaborating partners especially in teaching and supervision.

Most members of this RC spend long periods of time in developing countries conducting research and fieldwork, often in collaboration with local universities in Africa, Asia and Latin America. The group leader Koponen conducts research annually in Tanzania and collaborates with the University of Dar es Salaam, Institute of Development Studies and Department of History, and the University of Dodoma, College of Humanities and Social Sciences. Additionally, he has made research visits to universities and fieldsites in Vietnam, Cambodia, Nepal, and India. Gould has had long-term collaboration with the University of Zambia. His Ministry of Foreign Affairs funded ‘Rule of law’ study involved scholars from Helsinki, Ghana/Legon, Bayreuth and Nairobi. There is an ongoing North-South-cooperation project with the University of Dar es Salaam and the University of Zambia, in which researchers from Finland visit and teach in Tanzania and Zambia, while southern scholars conduct similar visits to Finland. Pakkasvirta has made various research visits to many universities in Costa Rica, Argentina, Brazil and Mexico. Tillikainen has worked at the University of Toronto. Kontinen spent a month as a Visiting Fellow at IDS-University of Sussex. Many members of the RC cooperate closely with the Nordic Africa Institute, Uppsala. PhD students have conducted fieldworks in countries such as Bolivia, India, Namibia, Sudan, and Vietnam.

PhD students, postdoctoral and senior researchers have actively presented their research in international conferences.

The Finnish development research community has been represented by the members of the present RC (Koponen, Laakso, Siitonen) in the European Association of Development Research and Training Institutes (EADI). Laakso and Pirttilä-Backman have visited extensively at many European universities and are members of the editorial boards at various international journals. Laakso is Advisor for the European Report on Development (ERD) and chair for the European NGO Confederation for Relief and Development, CONCORD. Koponen and Gould are members of the editorial organs of the journal “Forum for Development studies”, Tillikainen of the editorial board of the Finnish Journal of Ethnicity and Migration and Horn of Africa Journal. Nordic cooperation has been enhanced for example through the NORFACE seminar series network which Gould coordinated. It involved UH, Uni Roskilde, IDS-Sussex, DIIS-Copenhagen, ISS-Den Haag, Uni Oslo and Uni Tallinn. Tiina Kontinen has collaborated with the Nordic societies of development research to enhance cooperation for example in the form of joint conferences.

Many members of the RC collaborate closely with the Finnish University Partnership for International Development (Unipid) and the Finnish Society for Development Research. Some work closely with the Finnish Somalia-Network and the Finnish Society for the Study of Ethnic Relations and International Migration.
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- RC’s strengths and challenges related to research collaboration and researcher mobility, and the actions planned for their development.

This RC has by its nature very extensive research mobility to developing countries. Almost all members of the RC have spent extensive periods of time in one or more countries in Africa, Asia and/or Latin America. The cooperation with and support for universities in developing countries is considered to be very important. These ties are often stronger than academic ties with European and American universities although most cooperation in relation to conferences and publishing happen in the north.

For senior scholars, it is difficult to make time for fieldwork and for long-term academic exchange due to extensive teaching load and administrative tasks. Neither they nor the PhD students have secured funds for travel.

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

The members of the community have the privilege of working at the heart of the centre of Helsinki in a well-maintained research environment which provides the basic infrastructure such as office space, IT-facilities, access to e-journals, mp3-recorders etc. for research activities undertaken in the home country. There are also several academic forums on which to discuss ongoing research: monthly research seminars organised by Development Studies, more ad hoc seminars held by smaller research groups within the community, the annual Conference of the Society for Development Research, etc.

Yet most members of the community feel that they work under a resource scarcity. The competitiveness of research funding with the concomitant insecurity of employment and career prospects may be a fact of academic life with which researchers have to learn to live but it inevitably affects especially the younger members of the community. Even more problematic is that even when basic funding has been granted it seldom is enough to conduct the research in the way as proposed in the original plan. The proposed budgets are routinely cut by the funders and the researchers are left to wonder where to get the funds for field travel, common workshops, etc. Especially disadvantaged are the Doctoral students at the Devestu programme who are granted only a basic salary and have to cover all actual research costs from external sources.

Basically all members of the RC participate in teaching and have some administrative duties as the leading principle of the University is that all researchers teach and all teachers do research. Many – probably most – actually like teaching and also some of the younger members with posts nominally devoted to research only tend to accumulate quite a lot of it. There is a growing pressure from the side of the University administration to use researchers more in teaching and they have been given a teaching task of 56 hours per year. The interpretation of this is controversial as it is not clear to what extent it includes time used to the preparation of teaching. Development Studies has decided to use the norm of maximum 5 % of working time devoted to teaching which is also applied by the Academy of Finland.

The senior members of the community have a heavy teaching and/or administrative load as Professors and academic leaders and can devote only a minor share of their official working time to research. The problem is particularly urgent in Development Studies which has only one full Professor in its teaching staff. The lack of having enough permanent senior scholars is also reflected in the work of PhD students who are increasingly demanded to devote more of their resources to teaching. The researcher
community itself pays a great attention to the quality of teaching - and especially learning outcomes. Due to the complexity of the development research, it is necessary to work closely with the students in the form of seminars and other face-to-face teaching to guarantee the competence of candidates and masters to work in the field of development. The focus on quality teaching, naturally, leads to continuous balancing with time devoted to research and teaching.

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

While the members of the community are mostly happy with their working premises and basic working conditions they are concerned with the scarcity of available resources, as explained above. The senior members of the community are constantly struggling to find more time to do research. The UH, or any other University in Finland, has no arrangements for sabbatical leaves for teaching staff. Unfortunately, the Academy of Finland has just done away with the only equivalent there was, the one-year post of Senior Scholar. It would be imperative that the right for a sabbatical for every senior teacher would be established within the University system. Even some younger members of the RC, whose positions allow concentration on research feel that administrative work load increasingly takes time from research. All PhD students are required to teach and they do so to a varied degree. Due to the societal importance of development studies, many students are very active in NGOs, social movements, campaigns, opinion-making, etc.

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.

As DEVERELE is not a closely organized research group but a conglomeration of smaller groups and individual researchers working in a common field it has no single hierarchical management structure nor appointed leadership. Instead, its various components have their own management structures and leaderships, which collaborate in the DEVERELE framework.

The responsible person for the RC in this evaluation is Juhani Koponen, Professor of Development Studies at the University of Helsinki. He is also the person-in-charge for (formerly Director of the Institute of) Development Studies and the Director of the Devestu programme. Co-director of Devestu, and formerly Vice-Director of the Institute of Development Studies is Jeremy Gould. He took up a Professorship at the University of Jyväskylä in 2010 but was in the DS staff of the UH for most of the review period. One of the PIs, Jussi Pakkasvirta, worked as Professor and Director of IDS at UH for one year in 2005-06 during Koponen’s leave of absence, and is presently Director of the Department of Economic and Political Studies at UH. Liisa Laakso, who was a staff member at Development Studies and Political Science at UH before receiving Professorship at the University of Jyväskylä is now back at UH as the Dean of the Faculty of Social Sciences. The other Professor level PIs, Pertti Ahonen and Anna-Maija Pirtilä-Backman have conducted research under the DEVERELE umbrella and Ahonen is also part of the consultancy framework agreement with MFA and FCG.

The senior scholars have research groups of their own. Koponen has been responsible for two major research projects funded by the Academy of Finland: ‘Does Finnish aid matter?’ in 2005-08 and ‘NGOs in developmentalist complex’ in 2008-11. Among the members of this RC, Ghimire, Mustalahti, Mendoza and Sharma participated in the first and Hakkarainen, Kontinen and Rovaniemi in the last-mentioned.
More research funding for the basically same NGO-research has been mobilized by Kontinen. Koponen has also directed a number of projects of commissioned research for the MFA, among the one 'Security-Development Nexus' in which Sharma and Siitonen participated. In addition, Koponen has also been the PhD supervisor for Duh, Jänis, Kontinen, Stocchetti, Wang and Ylhäisi. Gould has, in addition of his own research, been responsible for a project commissioned by MFA on "Rule of Law", where Metsola participated. He has also supervised Ranta-Owusu. Pakkasvirta has conducted several projects such as "World Politics, Global Ethics and Corporate Social Responsibility: an Interdisciplinary Perspective 2009-2010" and "Intergration and New Democratic Development in the Americas". Laakso is responsible for a major EU funded project on "Diasporas for Peace" and Academy funded project on "Security, governance and identities in flux" where Abdile, Hautaniemi and Tiilikainen participate. Tiilikainen, Kontinen and Mustalathi have post-doctoral research projects.

All groups and individual researchers as well as doctoral candidates conduct independent research. As the hierarchical structure is not strict, and the driving force for conducting high quality research is personal motivation of the researchers.

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

As the structure of the researcher community is so diffuse the leadership and management obviously is quite decentralized. One of the main aims of the administrative reform at the University of Helsinki has been to merge small units and tear down academic fences between disciplines and departments. When preparing for this evaluation we have found between our research groups and projects common ground even more than what we anticipated. We have to now seriously consider whether we wish to strengthen our internal coordination and collaboration to the point of becoming a more closely knit community and how this could be organized, given that the disciplinary boundaries and interests are still there although most of us now belong to the same new Department. It will also depend on the comments we are going to receive from the evaluators.

Some younger members have expressed the wish that the senior scholars of this RC would take a stronger leadership on guiding research, providing ideas and support –and even pressure- for publishing and for results-based work.

### 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: **1787000**

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

- **European Union (EU)** - total amount of funding (in euros) EU has decided to allocate to the RC members during 1.1.2005-31.12.2010: **143000**
INTERNATIONAL EVALUATION OF RESEARCH AND DOCTORAL TRAINING AT THE UNIVERSITY OF HELSINKI

RC-SPECIFIC STAGE 2 MATERIAL

- **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: Kone Foundation, Tiedonjulkistamisen neuvottelukunta, Suomen tietokirjailijat, CIRIUS, CIMO, Emil Aaltonen Foundation, Ella ja Georg Ehrnroothin säätö, Nordic Africa Institute, Kordelinin säätö, HY, kansleri
  - total amount of funding (in euros) from the above-mentioned foundations: 245000

- **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, University of Helsinki, Ministry of Education and Culture funded doctoral programme positions
  - total amount of funding (in euros) from the above-mentioned funding organizations: 1321000

**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.**

Whatever will happen with DEVERELE as researcher community, development research at the University of Helsinki will continue within the discipline of Development Studies and outside it. Development Studies has in its strategy defined its research priorities about a number of broad themes and their prospects look as follows:

Political, social, economic and cultural systems in developing countries of the groundwork of research. While historically much of this has concentrated on Eastern and Southern Africa it increasingly covers Asia, Middle East and Latin America as well and this trend seems to be continuing. Major research outputs are expected at least on the Horn of Africa, Tanzania, Namibia, India, Vietnam and Bolivia.

Aid effectiveness and aid impact. Research on long-term impacts of aid has become and is meant to stay one of the major topics. This also includes work on aid evaluation and evaluation methodologies. Research on NGOs in development is seen as a major emphasis in the future, based on the on-going projects.

Global and local structures and institutions in development. This includes studies on global economy and governance, development discourse, and civil society. A major project on the history of development as idea and practice is planned.
Finnish relations with developing countries. While a traditional focus on the practices and effects of Finnish development cooperation is to be maintained, in the future there will be a gradual move towards a broader approach to Finnish and European Union development policies.

The interface between development and natural resources. This partly overlaps with several of the above and has gained additional urgency from the rise of climate change into the global agenda. Most attention will continue to be given to the role forests and forestry where their role in mitigation of and adaptation to climate change is becoming a major theme.

Human mobility, migration and transnational engagements, both globally and from the point of view of Finland and Finnish policies, are a rising theme, well evident in the work of the present RC and will certainly attract increasing attention in the years to come both within and outside DS.

Particular emphasis in the next few years will be given to international publishing in terms of peer-reviewed articles and books chapters and monographs. Most, but not all, of this will be in English. In addition to prestigious international journals, our researchers also want to publish in those countries on which they are writing. This will mostly happen in an international language (English, Spanish) but in some cases also in national languages. Many Finnish members of the RC will continue to publish more popular work in Finnish.

The Devestu programme has applied for continued funding for 2012-15 and the resource base of our Doctoral training is crucially depended on the success of this application. In any case, the discipline of Development Studies and its partners will continue to develop and teach methodological approaches based on the whole gamut of social sciences that are useful in examining development processes and interventions and the linkages between them. The practical aim of our Doctoral training continues to be to produce a number of well-trained and skilful PhD holders who are capable to work in the complex environment of international development.

Presently some uncertainty is created by the fact that changes in key personnel are imminent. A new Professor is sought to Development Studies to replace Koponen who will continue to work as senior scholar. This will naturally have an effect but due to the loose structure of the community and the self-governing nature of its constituent research groups and projects no immediate big changes the research profile are expected. Historically, there has been much continuity in the underlying approaches. Many scholars have been long engaged with certain themes and/or countries and will no doubt continue to do so. While there is always a need for new openings it is believed that these come from researchers and cannot dictated from above.

The compilation of these materials has taken place through e-mail correspondence. All the members of the Research Community have been presented sets of questions and the responsible person, together with a group member, has drafted the text which has been distributed for comments for researchers and revised in the light of them.
1 Analysis of publications

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Publication type</th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>Total Count 2005 - 2010</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A1 Refereed journal article</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A3 Contribution to book/other compilations (refereed)</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A4 Article in conference publication (refereed)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B1 Unrefereed journal article</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B2 Contribution to book/other compilations (non-refereed)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B3 Unrefereed article in conference proceedings</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C1 Published scientific monograph</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C2 Edited book, compilation, conference proceeding or special issue of journal</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D1 Article in professional journal</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</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>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D3 Article in professional conference proceedings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D4 Published development or research report</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D5 Text book or professional handbook or guidebook or dictionary</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E1 Popular article, newspaper article</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E1 Popular contribution to book/other compilations</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E2 Popular monograph</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2 Listing of publications

A1 Refereed journal article

2005


Tiilikainen, M. 2005, 'Suffering, social memory and embodiment: experiences of Somali refugee women', Pakistan journal of women's studies, vol 12, no. 2, pp. 1-16.

2006


2007


2008
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DEVERELE/Koponen


2009


Ylääsi, J 2010, 'Sustainable land privatisation involving participatory land use planning: An example from Tanzania', Land Tenure Journal, vol 1, no. 1, pp. 91-114.

A3 Contribution to book/other compilations (refereed)

2005


DEVERELE/Koponen


2006


2007
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DEVERELE/Koponen


Ranta-Owusu, E 2010, 'Gender expertise and state transformation in contemporary Bolivia', in M Opas, PK Virtanen, S Vuoriso, Tittinen (eds), In islands of madness: normativity and marginalization in Latin America, Instituto Iberoamericano de Finlandia, Instituto iberoamericano de la Universidad de Goteborg & Departamento de Culturas del Mundo de la Universidad de Helsinki, Madrid, pp. 47-70.


A4 Article in conference publication (referred)

2010


B1 Unrefered journal article

2005


2006


2007

DEVERELE/Koponen


Tiilikainen, M 2007, 'Mobile patients, local healers: transnational dimensions of healing Somaliland', News from the Nordic Africa Institute, no. 2, pp. 3-5.

2008


2009

Mattila, P 2009, 'When we talk about the youth…', Young, vol 17, no. 3, pp. 327-329.


2010


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

2005


2006


2007
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DEVERELE/Koponen


2008


2009


2010


B3 Unrefereed article in conference proceedings

2006


2008

DEVERELE/Koponen

2010


C1 Published scientific monograph

2005


White, P, Mustalahti, I 2005, Finnish forestry assistance: success story or failure? : analyses of case studies from Sub-Saharan Africa and their possible impacts on poverty reduction, Silva Carelica, no. 48, University of Joensuu, Faculty of Forestry, Joensuu.

2007


Mustalahti, I 2007, Handling the stick: practices and impacts of participation in forest management : case study analyses of Finnish forestry assistance in Tanzania, Mozambique, Laos and Vietnam, Danish Centre for Forest, Landscape and Planning, Copenhagen.

2008


2010


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

2005


2007
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DEVERELE/Koponen


2008


2009

2010


D1 Article in professional journal

2005

2010


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

2008


2010


D3 Article in professional conference proceedings

2008
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DEVERELE/Koponen

2009

D4 Published development or research report

2005


2006

2007

Mustalahti, I, Lund, JF, Nielsen, Ø, Treue, T 2007, Decentralising Power and Natural Resource Control: Contradictions in Decentralised Forest Management in Tanzania, Mozambique and Laos,.

2008


Kontinen, T, Hakkarainen, O (eds) 2008, Vapaaehtoisuus kehitysyhteistyössä, Kepan Raportisarja, no. 91, Kehitysyhteistyön palvelukeskus.

2010
Akatama, L, Mustalahti, I 2010, REDD+ and Women: Who needs whom?,
Bolen, A, Mustalahti, I 2010, Reducing Emissions from Deforestation and Dgradation (REDD): Linking local realities with national and global REDD + frameworks in Tanzania.,

Mustalahti, I, Taku Tassa, D 2010, Participatory Forest Management in NEJD: Opportunity or poverty trap?.,
Sundström, R, Mustalahti, I 2010, Participatory land-use planning for REDD: exploring approaches to avoid leakage and ensure permanence in the context of Angaie Village Land Forest Reserve.
D5 Text book or professional handbook or guidebook or dictionary

2007

Tiilikainen, M, Ahlö, M 2007, Kiivinl omistäreise i Finland, Förbundet för mänskliga rättigheter, Helsingfors.


2009

2010

E1 Popular article, newspaper article

2005


2006


DEVERELE/Koponen

2007
Pakkasvirta, J. 2007, 'Pulp Fiction – It takes more than two to tango', Diploblogi, no. 30.3.2007.
Stocchetti, M. 2007, 'The development dimension or disillusion: the EU's development policy goals and the economic partnership agreements', NAI-Policy notes on trade, no. 1, 10 s.

2008
Ranta-Owusu, E. 2008, 'Mittä se köyhyyden vähentäminen tarkoittaa?', Kepan verkkouutiset.

2009
Tiilikainen, M. 2009, 'Merkkoomaksu on kääntöpuhelma', Helsingin Sanomat.

2010
DEVERELE/Koponen


Mustalaiti, I 2010, "Sweating under the blanket", Helsinki University Bulletin, no. 4, pp. art. 147.


Tiilikainen, M 2010, "Kansalaisjärjestöjen työ Somaliassa on eriarvoisen tärkeää", Helsingin Sanomat.


E1 Popular contribution to book/other compilations

2005
Pakkasvirta, J 2005, "Kuvittele kansakunta", in J. Pakkasvirta, P Saukkonen (eds), Nationalismit, WSOY, Helsinki, pp. 70-89.


2006

Pakkasvirta, J 2006, "[Puheenvuoro]", Teach-in, kulttuurien välinen kunnioitus, pyhä ja ilmaisun vapaus, ., Helsinki Collegium for Advanced Studies, Helsinki.

E2 Popular monograph

2005

Koponen, J 2005, Oma suu ja pussin suu: Suomen kehitysyhteistyön suppea historia, [J. Koponen], [Helsinki].

2006


2010
Hakkarainen, M 2010, Vietnam ja demokratian haasteet, Pystykorvakirja, Like.
### 1 Analysis of activities 2005-2010

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity type</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Supervisor or co-supervisor of doctoral thesis</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prizes and awards</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Editor of research journal</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Editor of research anthology/collection/conference proceedings</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peer review of manuscripts</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Editor of communication journal</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Editor of special theme number</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment of candidates for academic posts</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Membership or other role in review committee</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Membership or other role in research network</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Membership or other role in national/international committee, council, board</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Membership or other role in public Finnish or international organization</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Membership or other role of body in private company/organisation</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participation in interview for written media</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participation in radio programme</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participation in TV programme</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participation in interview for web based media</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2 Listing of activities 2005-2010

Supervisor or co-supervisor of doctoral thesis

Jeremy Gould,
PhD supervision, Jeremy Gould, 2008 → 2011
PhD thesis supervision, Jeremy Gould, 2008 → 2011, Finland

Tiina Kontinen,
Promoting development in the grassroots, Tiina Kontinen, 01.03.2010 → 2012
With Good Intentions: Actor Oriented Process Consultation for Improved Evaluation Practice in Finnish Development NGOs, Tiina Kontinen, 01.03.2010 → 2014

Irmeli Mustalahti,
PhD student supervision, Irmeli Mustalahti, 2010 → 2014, Finland

Jussi Pakkasvirta,

Anna-Maija Pirttilä-Backman,
Supervision of Satu Liimakka's doctoral thesis, Anna-Maija Pirttilä-Backman, 2002 → ..., Finland
Supervision of Anna Huotilainen's doctoral thesis, Anna-Maija Pirttilä-Backman, 2005, Finland
Supervision of Jaana Niinäinen's doctoral thesis, Anna-Maija Pirttilä-Backman, 2006 → ..., Finland
Supervision of Tuula Seppäläis doctoral thesis, Anna-Maija Pirttilä-Backman, 2008 → ..., Finland
Supervision of Salla Ahola's doctoral thesis, Anna-Maija Pirttilä-Backman, 2007 → ..., Finland
Supervision of Kaarina Isoherranen's doctoral thesis, Anna-Maija Pirttilä-Backman, 2008 → ..., Finland
Supervision of Peter Peltonen's doctoral thesis, Anna-Maija Pirttilä-Backman, 2008 → ..., Finland
Supervision of Tehetna Alevis doctoral thesis, Anna-Maija Pirttilä-Backman, 2008 → ..., Finland
Supervision of Valma Lehinen's doctoral thesis, Anna-Maija Pirttilä-Backman, 2008 → ..., Finland
Supervision of Mikael Wahlstrom's doctoral thesis, Anna-Maija Pirttilä-Backman, 2009 → ..., Finland
Supervision of Auli Airila's doctoral thesis, Anna-Maija Pirttilä-Backman, 2010 → ..., Finland
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Marja Tiilikainen,
Väitöskirjan ohjaus (menellä), Marja Tiilikainen, 2006 → 31.12.2013

Prizes and awards

Tiina Kontinen,
PhD Prize from the Faculty of Behavioral Sciences, Tiina Kontinen, 05.2008

Anna-Maija Pirttilä-Backman,
Award for developing teaching in the Faculty of Social Sciences, Anna-Maija Pirttilä-Backman, 10.06.2009, Finland

Editor of research journal

Petri Hautaniemi,
Guest editor together with Helena Jerman in Anthropological Journal of European Cultures, Petri Hautaniemi, 02.2006

Juhani Koponen,
Forum for Development Studies, Juhani Koponen, 2008 → ..., Norway

Liisa Laakso,
Member of the Advisory Editorial Board, Liisa Laakso, 2002 → ...
Co-editor, Liisa Laakso, 2006 → ...
Member of the Advisory Editorial Board, Liisa Laakso, 2006 → ...
Member of Editorial Board, Liisa Laakso, 2010 → ...

Irmeli Mustalahti,
Editor: Footprints in Forests, Irmeli Mustalahti, 2009 → 2011, Finland

Jussi Pakkasvirta,
El Caribe Centroamericano, Jussi Pakkasvirta, 01.01.2005 → 31.12.2005
Nationalism, Jussi Pakkasvirta, 01.01.2005 → 31.12.2005
Yearbook of Political Thought and Conceptual History, Jussi Pakkasvirta, 01.01.2005 → 31.12.2005
Yearbook of Political Thought and Conceptual History, Jussi Pakkasvirta, 01.01.2006 → 31.12.2006
Yearbook of Political Thought and Conceptual History, Jussi Pakkasvirta, 01.01.2007 → 31.12.2007
Historiallinen Aikakauskirja, Jussi Pakkasvirta, 01.01.2008 → 31.12.2008, Finland

Anna-Maja Pirttilä-Backman,
Psykologia (Journal of the Finnish Psychological Society), Anna-Maja Pirttilä-Backman, 1996 → ..., Finland

Marja Tiilikainen,
Finnish Journal of Ethnicity and Migration, Marja Tiilikainen, 01.01.2006 → 31.12.2011, Finland

Jussi Ylhäisi,
Journal of Tropical Forest Science, Jussi Ylhäisi, 01.01.2006 → 31.12.2006
DEVERELE/Koponen

Editor of research anthology/collection/conference proceedings
Anna-Maija Pirttilä-Backman,
Arvot, moraali ja yhteiskunta, Anna-Maija Pirttilä-Backman, 2005, Finland
Marja Tiilikainen,
Maahanmuuttajaiset: Kotoutuminen, perhe ja työ -kirjan toimitustyö, Marja Tiilikainen, 2006 → 2007

Peer review of manuscripts
Irmeli Mustalahti,
Forest Policy and Economics, Irmeli Mustalahti, 2005 → …
International Forestry Review, Irmeli Mustalahti, 2007 → …
Small-scale Forestry, Irmeli Mustalahti, 2008 → …
Environment Management, Irmeli Mustalahti, 2010 → …
Anna-Maija Pirttilä-Backman,
Appetite (journal), Anna-Maija Pirttilä-Backman, 09.2008 → 12.2008, United Kingdom
Kasvatus-lehti (Finnish journal of education), Anna-Maija Pirttilä-Backman, 01.2010 → 12.2010, Finland
Public Understanding of Science, Anna-Maija Pirttilä-Backman, 01.2010 → 12.2010, United Kingdom
Revija za sociologiju (Sociologian review), Anna-Maija Pirttilä-Backman, 01.2010 → 12.2010, Croatia
Marja Tiilikainen,
Finnish Journal of Ethnicity and Migration (FJEM), vertaisarviointi, Marja Tiilikainen, 2005 → …
Sosiaalilääketieteen Akatauseitse, vertaisarviointi, Marja Tiilikainen, 01.01.2006 → …, Finland
Islam Suomessa -kirjan vertaisarviointi, Marja Tiilikainen, 2008
Kosmopolis-lehti, vertaisarviointi, Marja Tiilikainen, 2010

Editor of communication journal
Sirpa Rovaniemi,
Chief editor of the development cooperation publication SAMOK, Sirpa Rovaniemi, 2006 → 2007
Marja Tiilikainen,
Afrikan Sarvi -lehden päätoimittaja, Marja Tiilikainen, 2010 → …

Editor of special theme number
Marja Tiilikainen,
Special issue of FJEM: Female Genital Cutting in the Past and Today, Marja Tiilikainen, 2007 → 2008

Assessment of candidates for academic posts
Liisa Laakso,
Assessment of proposals, Liisa Laakso, 2002 → 2010, Belgium
Expert, Finland’s Development Policy Programme at the Foreign Affairs Committee of the Parliament (Ulkokoalivaliokunnan kuuleminen), Liisa Laakso, 06.11.2007, Finland
Application evaluation, Liisa Laakso, 10.2010, Finland
Assessment of Research Proposals, Liisa Laakso, 01 2010, Finland
Assessment of candidates, Liisa Laakso, 01.2010, Denmark
Assessment of candidates, Liisa Laakso, 02.2010, Sweden
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Anna-Maija Pirttilä-Backman,
Assessment of candidates for post doc positions, Anna-Maija Pirttilä-Backman, 2005, Finland
Assessment of a candidate for docentship, Anna-Maija Pirttilä-Backman, 2006, Finland
Assessment for candidates for post doc positions, positions of fixed term professor, research grants and research school positions, Anna-Maija Pirttilä-Backman, 2007 – 2009, Finland
Assessment of candidates for post doc positions, Anna-Maija Pirttilä-Backman, 2008, Finland

Membership or other role in review committee

Jussi Pakkasvirta,
Anuario de Estudios Centroamericanos, Jussi Pakkasvirta, 2010
Argos, revista de ciencias sociales y humanidades de la Universidad Simón Bolívar, Jussi Pakkasvirta, 2010, Venezuela
Pensares y Quehaceres, Jussi Pakkasvirta, 2010, Mexico
Textos de Economía, Paz y Seguridad, Jussi Pakkasvirta, 2010, Mexico

Anna-Maija Pirttilä-Backman,
Institut National de la Recherche Agronomique, Anna-Maija Pirttilä-Backman, 2005, France

Membership or other role in research network

Petri Hautaniemi,
Deputy Board Member of Youth Research Society, Petri Hautaniemi, 2004 – 2005, Finland
Member of editorial board of Youth Research Society (Nuorrostutkimus), Petri Hautaniemi, 2004 – 2005, Finland
A contact person in the Nordic Network on Diaspora and the State Formation in the Horn of Africa, Petri Hautaniemi, 2005, Sweden
A contact person in the Nordic Network on Diaspora and the State Formation in the Horn of Africa, Petri Hautaniemi, 2005 – 2006, Sweden
Chair of the committee for the best Pro gradu -thesis in youth research 2005, Petri Hautaniemi, 2005, Finland
Member of the Finnish Network of Somali Studies, Petri Hautaniemi, 2005 – 2008, Finland
Board member of the Finnish Society of Ethnic Relations and International Migration, Petri Hautaniemi, 2006 – 2007, Finland
Member of the organising committee in the Conference on Diaspora and Horn of Africa, Petri Hautaniemi, 2006, Finland
Advisory board member of research program Gendered vulnerability, asylum and possibilities of return among Iraqi and Afghani asylum seekers in Finland, Petri Hautaniemi, 2010 – 2011, Finland

Irmeli Mustalahti,
A coordinator, Irmeli Mustalahti, 2006 – 2007

Marja Tiilikainen,
Diaspora and state-formation in the Horn of Africa, Nordic Network, Marja Tiilikainen, 2005 – ...

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

Jeremy Gould,
Member, Nordic African Institute Research and Programme Council, Jeremy Gould, 2006 – 2011, Sweden

Minna Hakkarainen,
Chair, Minna Hakkarainen, 1998 – ...
Committee Member, Minna Hakkarainen, 2006 – ...
Board Member, Minna Hakkarainen, 2010 – 2011

Tiina Kontinen,
EIBAMAŻ Consolidation Phase, Tiina Kontinen, 01.01.2010 – 2012
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Juhani Koponen ,
Development Policy Committee, Juhani Koponen, 2007 → ..., Finland

Liisa Laakso ,
Co-convenor, Liisa Laakso, 2004 → ...
Chair, Liisa Laakso, 2006 → 2010
Chair in researchers' and practitioners' network meeting "How to value and take into account Southern experiences and visions in the national and international development policy decision-making", organized by KEPA, the Service Centre for Development Cooperation, Liisa Laakso, 27.03.2006, Finland
Member of Board, Liisa Laakso, 2006 → ..., Finland
Substitute member of board, Liisa Laakso, 2008 → 2010, Finland
Member, Liisa Laakso, 2010
Member of Board, Liisa Laakso, 2010 → ...
Member of Board, Liisa Laakso, 2010 → ..., Finland
Member of Board, Liisa Laakso, 2010 → ..., Finland

Irmeli Mustalahti ,
PhD students' representative at International Council, Irmeli Mustalahti, 02.2005 → 12.2006, Denmark
A member, Irmeli Mustalahti, 2010 → 2012, Finland
A member, Irmeli Mustalahti, 2010 → 2012, Finland
A vice member, Irmeli Mustalahti, 2010 → 2013, Finland
A vice member of Faculty Council and a member of International Working Group at Faculty of Social Sciences and a member of Subject Group, Development Studies, University of Helsinki, Finland, Irmeli Mustalahti, 2010 → ..., Finland

Jussi Pakkasvirta ,
Amici Instituti Iberoamericani Universitatis Helsingiensis r.y., Jussi Pakkasvirta, 01.01.2005 → 31.12.2005, Finland
EU:n ALFA-ohjelma, Jussi Pakkasvirta, 01.01.2005 → 31.12.2005
HY, Yliopiston Kollegio, Jussi Pakkasvirta, 01.01.2005 → 31.12.2005
HY, Yliopiston kv. toimikunta, Jussi Pakkasvirta, 01.01.2005 → 31.12.2005
HY, hum tdk, jatkotutk. toimikunta, Jussi Pakkasvirta, 01.01.2005 → 31.12.2005
HY, tdk-neuvosto, Jussi Pakkasvirta, 01.01.2005 → 31.12.2005
Siirtolaisinstituutti, Jussi Pakkasvirta, 01.01.2005 → 31.12.2005
Suomen Akatemia, Montietehtysys Venäjän tutkimuksessa, Jussi Pakkasvirta, 01.01.2005 → 31.12.2005
Suomen Rauhantutkimusyhdistys, Jussi Pakkasvirta, 01.01.2005 → 31.12.2005
Amici Instituti Iberoamericani Universitatis Helsingiensis r.y., Jussi Pakkasvirta, 01.01.2006 → 31.12.2006, Finland
EU:n ALFA-ohjelma, Jussi Pakkasvirta, 01.01.2006 → 31.12.2006
SAREC-SIDA (Ruotsin UM), Jussi Pakkasvirta, 01.01.2006 → 31.12.2006, Sweden
Siirtolaisinstituutti, Jussi Pakkasvirta, 01.01.2006 → 31.12.2006, Finland
Suomen Rauhantutkimusyhdistys, Jussi Pakkasvirta, 01.01.2006 → 31.12.2006, Finland
Amici Instituti Iberoamericani Universitatis Helsingiensis r.y., Jussi Pakkasvirta, 01.01.2007 → 31.12.2007, Finland
SAREC-SIDA, Jussi Pakkasvirta, 01.01.2007 → 31.12.2007, Sweden
SIDA / SAREC evaluation committee, Jussi Pakkasvirta, 15.05.2007 → 15.12.2010, Sweden
Siirtolaisinstituutti, Jussi Pakkasvirta, 01.01.2007 → 31.12.2007, Finland
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Suomen Rauhantutkimusyhdistys, Jussi Pakkasvirta, 01.01.2007 → 31.12.2007, Finland
jatkotutkimuksen toimikunnan, Jussi Pakkasvirta, 01.01.2007 → 31.12.2007, Finland
SRTY: Suomen Rauhantutkimusyhdistys, Jussi Pakkasvirta, 01.01.2008 → 31.12.2008, Finland

Anna-Maija Pirttilä-Backman,
Suomen Psykologinen Seura (The Finnish Psychological Society), Anna-Maija Pirttilä-Backman, 01.01.1999 → …, Finland
European Science Foundation, The European Social Cognition Network (ESCON), Anna-Maija Pirttilä-Backman, 01.01.2003 → 31.12.2008, France
Scientific Council of the University of Helsinki, Anna-Maija Pirttilä-Backman, 2007 → 2009, Finland
European Science Foundation, Social Cognition Network 2 (ESCON 2), Anna-Maija Pirttilä-Backman, 01.09.2009 → 12.2014, France
European Science Foundation, pool of reviewers, Anna-Maija Pirttilä-Backman, 05.2009 → 04.2012, France
Helsinki Collegium for Advanced Studies, Anna-Maija Pirttilä-Backman, 2010 → …, Finland

Eija Ranta-Owusu,
Kehystutkimuksen seuran hallituksen jäsen, Eija Ranta-Owusu, 02.2008 → …, Finland
Member of the directing board of Latin American Studies, Eija Ranta-Owusu, 09.2008 → 12.2009, Finland
Vice-member of the directing board of Development Studies, Eija Ranta-Owusu, 09.2009 → 12.2009, Finland
Vice-chair of the steering committee of the political and economic studies, Eija Ranta-Owusu, 2010 → 2013

Marikki Stocchetti,
Koherenttyyppiryhmä, Marikki Stocchetti, 01.09.2006 → …, Finland

Marja Tiilikainen,
FOKO-Network (research on female circumcision in Nordic countries), Marja Tiilikainen, 2003 → …, Finland
Puheenjohtajajuus, Etnisten suhteiden ja kansainvälineen muuttoliikkeen tutkimuksen seuran työryhmä, Marja Tiilikainen, 01.01.2005 → 31.12.2007, Finland
Austrian Science Fund, Marja Tiilikainen, 01.01.2007 → 31.12.2007, Austria
Nordiska högskolan för folkhälsovetenskap, Göteborg, Marja Tiilikainen, 01.01.2007 → 31.12.2007, Sweden

Membership or other role in public Finnish or international organization

Jeremy Gould,
Member, Jeremy Gould, 2008 → 2011, Finland

Juhani Koponen,
Ceren:Etnisten suhteiden ja nationalismin tutkimuskeskus, Juhani Koponen, 01.01.2005 → 31.12.2005
Kehyspoliittinen toimikunta, Juhani Koponen, 01.01.2005 → 31.12.2005

Liisa Laakso,
Chair of Advisory Group, Liisa Laakso, 2006 → …, Belgium
Committee member, Liisa Laakso, 2007 → …, Finland
Advisor for the Steering Committee, Liisa Laakso, 03.2008 → …, Finland
Chair of Steering Committee, Liisa Laakso, 2010 → …, Finland
Member of Research Council, Liisa Laakso, 2010 → …, Finland
Member of Steering Group, Liisa Laakso, 2010 → …, Finland
Steering Group Member, Liisa Laakso, 2010 → …, Finland
Vice-Chair, Liisa Laakso, 2010 → …, Finland
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Irmeli Mustalahti, A secretary, Irmeli Mustalahti, 2010 → ..., Finland

Jussi Pakkasvirta, Helinä Rautavaaran museon säätiö, Jussi Pakkasvirta, 01.01.2005 → 31.12.2005, Finland
HY, Yliopiston Kollegio, Jussi Pakkasvirta, 01.01.2006 → 31.12.2006, Finland
HY, Yliopiston kv. toimikunta, Jussi Pakkasvirta, 01.01.2006 → 31.12.2006, Finland
HY, tdk-neuvosto (hum tdk), Jussi Pakkasvirta, 01.01.2006 → 31.12.2006, Finland
Helinä Rautavaaran museon säätiö, Espoo, Jussi Pakkasvirta, 01.01.2006 → 31.12.2006, Finland
Helinä Rautavaaran museon säätiö, Jussi Pakkasvirta, 01.01.2007 → 31.12.2007, Finland
Eduskunnan tulavaisuusvaliokunta, Jussi Pakkasvirta, 01.01.2008 → 31.12.2008, Finland
Eduskunnan tulavaisuusvaliokunta, Jussi Pakkasvirta, 01.01.2008 → 31.12.2008, Finland
Helinä Rautavaaran Museon säätiö, Jussi Pakkasvirta, 01.01.2008 → 31.12.2008, Finland
Yleisradio (usaita haastatteluja), Jussi Pakkasvirta, 01.01.2008 → 31.12.2008, Finland
Yleisradio (usaita haastatteluja), Jussi Pakkasvirta, 01.01.2008 → 31.12.2008, Finland
Asiantuntijajäsenten asiantuntijajäsen, Jussi Pakkasvirta, 2009 → 2010, Finland

SOVAKO, the Finnish Doctoral Program in Social Sciences, Anna-Maija Pirttilä-Backman, 01.01.2010 → ..., Finland
The National Graduate School of Social Psychology, director, Anna-Maija Pirttilä-Backman, 01.01.2010 → ..., Finland
Vice Dean, Anna-Maija Pirttilä-Backman, 2010 → 2013, Finland

Marja Tiilikainen, Ihmisokouluuittto ry, KokoNainen-projektin (tytöjen ja naisten ympärileikkauksen ehkäisy) ohjausryhmä, Marja Tiilikainen, 01.01.2005 → 31.12.2005, Finland

Membership or other role of body in private company/organisation

Julia Jänis, Member of Delegation, Julia Jänis, 1998 → 2006
Member of Board, Julia Jänis, 2008 → 2009
Member of Board, Julia Jänis, 01.03.2010 → ...

Liisa Laakso, Member of editorial board, Liisa Laakso, 11.2006 → ..., Finland
Member of the advisory editorial board, Liisa Laakso, 2007 → ..., Finland

Päivi Mattila, Suomen Unifem ry, Päivi Mattila, 01.01.2006 → 31.12.2006, Finland

Anna-Maija Pirttilä-Backman, Jessie Obidiegwu Education Fund, Anna-Maija Pirttilä-Backman, 2009 → ..., United States

FinnWID - Naiset kehitystyössä ry, puheenjohtaja, Eija Ranta-Owusu, 03.2007 → 03.2009
Kehitysyhteistyön palvelukeskuksen (KEPA) hallituksen jäsenen, Eija Ranta-Owusu, 11.2009 → ...
INTERNATIONAL EVALUATION OF RESEARCH AND DOCTORAL TRAINING AT THE UNIVERSITY OF HELSINKI

RC-SPECIFIC TUHAT COMPILATIONS OF OTHER SCIENTIFIC ACTIVITIES 2005-2010

DEVERELE/Koponen

FinnWED - Naiset kehitystyössä ry:n hallituksen jäsen, Eija Ranta-Owusu, 03.2010 → ...
Kehitysyhteistyön palvelukeskuksen (KEPA) strategiapohjymäen jäsen, Eija Ranta-Owusu, 10.2010 → ..., Finland

Marja Tiilikainen,
Ihmisoskeussiteet Kokonaisnäkemään ohjausryhmän puheenjohtaja, Marja Tiilikainen, 01.05.2005 → ..., Finland

Jussi Ylääsi,
Suomen Maantieteellä Kulta Ry, Jussi Ylääsi, 01.06.2006 → 31.12.2006, Kenya

Participation in interview for written media


Petri Hautaniemi, Interview about globalisation in the magazine Kehitys - Utveckling, Petri Hautaniemi, 26.09.2006, Finland

Interview for the development news of Ministry for Foreign Affairs in Finland, Petri Hautaniemi, 01.10.2008, Finland

Tiina Kontinen, Kansalaisjärjestöjen kehitystyön palvelukeskuksen järjestämä seminaari kansalaisjärjestöjen kehitystyön laadusta, Helsinki, Tiina Kontinen, 06.04.2005, Finland


Juhani Koponen, Haastattelu Helsingin Sanomin Villakoulu, Juhani Koponen, 01.01.2000 → 31.12.2011, Finland

Haastattelu Helsingin Sanomin, Juhani Koponen, 01.01.2000 → 31.12.2011, Finland

Haastattelu Kaleva lehtiin, Juhani Koponen, 01.01.2000 → 31.12.2011, Finland

Kehitysyhteistyön palvelukeskuksen seminaari '0,7% laatua - mitä on kehitystyön sisältö', Juhani Koponen, 18.04.2001 → 31.12.2011, Finland

Helsingin Sanomat, haastattelu, Juhani Koponen, 14.08.2002 → 31.12.2011, Finland

Uutispäivä Demari, haastattelu, Juhani Koponen, 26.08.2002 → 31.12.2011, Finland

Yliopisto-lehti 12/03, Juhani Koponen, 01.03.2002 → 31.12.2011, Finland

Kehitys-lehti 2003, Juhani Koponen, 01.01.2003 → 31.12.2011, Finland

News from the Nordic Africa Institute 12/03, Juhani Koponen, 01.01.2003 → 31.12.2011, Finland

Suomen Kuvalehti/Mies 1/2003, Juhani Koponen, 01.01.2003 → 31.12.2011, Finland

Vihreä Lanka 50/2003, Juhani Koponen, 01.01.2003 → 31.12.2011, Finland


Kv. asiantuntijoiden koulutus, Opetusalan koulutuskeskus, Ouloo, Heinola, Juhani Koponen, 26.01.2004 → 31.12.2011, Finland


RV-lehti 23/04, Juhani Koponen, 01.01.2004 → 31.12.2011, Finland
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Liisa Laakso,
Suomen Kuvalehti, Liisa Laakso, 01.01.2000 → 31.12.2011, Finland
www-lehti Sirkus, Liisa Laakso, 01.01.2000 → 31.12.2011, Finland
A-Studio, Liisa Laakso, 01.01.2001 → 31.12.2011, Finland
lehti Ny tid, 15/5 2001, Liisa Laakso, 01.01.2001 → 31.12.2011, Finland
lehti Policy 02/01, Liisa Laakso, 01.01.2001 → 31.12.2011, Finland
Kotimaa, Liisa Laakso, 01.01.2002 → 31.12.2011, Finland
Kehitys-lehti, Liisa Laakso, 01.01.2003 → 31.12.2011, Denmark
Tiedonjyvä ” Kehitystyön kentällä on monta toimijaa” professori esityssä, by Kirsi-Marja Nurminen, Liisa Laakso, 04.2007, Finland
Yliopistolainen, Alas norsunluutornista, by Elias Krohn, Liisa Laakso, 02.2007, Finland
Haastattelu, Liisa Laakso, 2010, Finland

Päivi Mattila,
Lehthaaastattelu, Kotivinkki-lehti, Päivi Mattila, 01.01.2006 → 31.12.2011, Finland

Saija Niemi,
Article about my lecture on Sudan and Sudanese refugees given to Vuolijoki municipality, Saija Niemi, 2005, Finland

Jussi Pakkasvirta,
Helsinki Forumin järjestämä Isensäsväyspäiviä, Jussi Pakkasvirta, 06.12.2001 → 31.12.2011, Finland
Akateeminen kirjakauppapaikka, kirjallinen esitys, Jussi Pakkasvirta, 06.05.2002 → 31.12.2011, Finland
Peltirumpu, YLE Q, Jussi Pakkasvirta, 01.01.2004 → 31.12.2011, Finland
FST, Spotlight, Jussi Pakkasvirta, 01.01.2005 → 31.12.2011, Finland
YLE1, Jussi Pakkasvirta, 01.01.2005 → 31.12.2011, Finland
Haastattelu 9.11.2007 Uutispäivä Demari, Jussi Pakkasvirta, 09.11.2007
Uselä kymmenä, Jussi Pakkasvirta, 01.08.2008 → 31.12.2011, Finland
Interview for written media, Jussi Pakkasvirta, 09.05.2009, Argentina
Interview for written media, Jussi Pakkasvirta, 05.05.2010, Costa Rica
Interview for written media, Jussi Pakkasvirta, 01.12.2010, Finland
Interview for written media, Jussi Pakkasvirta, 26.11.2010, Finland

Anna-Maija Pirttilä-Backman,
"Tasting and Trying New Foods", background interviews, Anna-Maija Pirttilä-Backman, 01.05.2005, United States
Feature in Kaleva (Finnish newspaper) weekend supplement, Anna-Maija Pirttilä-Backman, 10.11.2005, Finland
Yliopisto-lehti (magazine of the University of Helsinki), Anna-Maija Pirttilä-Backman, 2005, Finland
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Eija Ranta-Owusu,
Bolivian alkuperäiskansojen itsetunto kasvaa hitaasti, Eija Ranta-Owusu, 17.05.2010

Sirpa Rovaniemi,

Lauri Siitonen,

Marikki Stocchetti,

Marja Tiilikainen,
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Haastattelu Ilta-Sanomissa, Marja Tiilikainen, 02.12.2009
Helsingin Sanomat, haastattelu, Marja Tiilikainen, 10.05.2010

Jussi Ylhäisi,

Participation in radio programme

Petri Hautaniemi,
Interview in Radio Helsinki - Program: Unelmien Helsinki, Petri Hautaniemi, 28.10.2005, Finland

Julia Jänis,

Saija Niemi,
Expert interview about Sudanese refugee situation, Saija Niemi, 2009, Finland

Jussi Pakkasvirta,
haastattelu Radio Uno, Jussi Pakkasvirta, 30.03.2007 → 31.12.2011, Finland
haastattelu, Radio Nederland, Jussi Pakkasvirta, 25.08.2007 → 31.12.2011, Finland
Radio Argentina, Jussi Pakkasvirta, 12.01.2008 → 31.12.2011, Finland
Finnish Broadcasting Company (Yleisradio), Jussi Pakkasvirta, 12.2010

Anna-Maija Pirttilä-Backman,
Radio interview in Yle's (Finnish Broadcasting Company) series "Keltä olemme" ("Who we are"), Anna-Maija Pirttilä-Backman, 01.01.2005, Finland

Eija Ranta-Owusu,
Naisten asema kehitysmaissa, Eija Ranta-Owusu, 09.05.2008
Tiedelinko Etelä-Amerikassa, Eija Ranta-Owusu, 16.10.2009

Lauri Siitonen,

Marikki Stocchetti,
Radiohaastattelu, Marikki Stocchetti, 10.09.2010

Marja Tiilikainen,
Haastattelu, Radio Rock, uutiset, Marja Tiilikainen, 18.09.2007, Sweden
Haastattelu, YLE, radio 1, uutiset, Marja Tiilikainen, 18.09.2007, Sweden
Haastattelu, Yle, radio 1, uutiset ja Aamun peili, Marja Tiilikainen, 30.04.2007, Sweden

Jussi Ylhäisi,

Participation in TV programme

Petri Hautaniemi,
Weight loss campaign for enhancing literacy in Nepal, Petri Hautaniemi, 23.02.2010, Finland

Liisa Laakso,
Haastattelu, Liisa Laakso, 22.10.2008, Finland
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Haastattelu, Liisa Laakso, 12.12.2008, Finland
Haastattelu, Liisa Laakso, 12.10.2009, Finland
Haastattelu ”Afrikka Mahdillsuuksiin manaosa” Ykkösen aamu tv, YLE TV1, 12.10.2009, Liisa Laakso, 01.12.2009
Haastattelu, Liisa Laakso, 17.03.2010, Finland

Saija Niemi,
Expert interview on refugee and IDP situation generally, and in Uganda and Sudan, Saija Niemi, 2007, Finland

Marja Tiilikainen,
Haastattelu, Uudenmaan uutiset, TV 2, Marja Tiilikainen, 22.10.2007 → 31.12.2011, Sweden

Participation in interview for web based media

Liisa Laakso
Haastattelu, Uudenmaan uutiset, TV 2, Marja Tiilikainen, 22.10.2007 → 31.12.2011, Sweden

Irmeli Mustalahti
Pitkäkestoinen tiedonsaanti on turvattava osallistavissa metsäprojekteissa, Irmeli Mustalahti, 2007 → ..., Finland
Kuva hyötyy metsästä?, Irmeli Mustalahti, 2009 → ..., Finland
Palkitut turvato parhaiten kehityksen edistä ja myöntää metsäprojekteissa, Irmeli Mustalahti, 2010 → ..., Finland
Tansianalaksyläästien valkea vaalinta: ruokaa vai metsiä suojella?, Irmeli Mustalahti, 2010 → ..., Finland

Marikki Stocchetti
Haastattelu, Marikki Stocchetti, 15.09.2008

Marja Tiilikainen
Ilta-Sanomat, verkkouutinen, Marja Tiilikainen, 11.08.2008
Ylen uutiset verkossa, Marja Tiilikainen, 08.11.2008
Uutisoi Suomen Akatemian verkkosivuilta ihminen ja Kosmos-tapahtumasta 19.-21.3.2010, Marja Tiilikainen, 07.04.2010, Finland
Appendix B.b.

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

The bibliometric analyses by Helsinki University Library (HULib)

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Humanities
Aejmelaeus, Anneli – CSTT
Anttonen, Pertti – CMVG
Dunderberg, Ismo – FC
Havu, Eva – CoCoLaC
Heikkinen, Markku – RCSP
Heinämaa, Sara – SHC
Henriksson, Markku – CITTA
Janhunen, Juha – LDHFTA
Kajava Mika, – AMNE
Klippi, Anu – Interaction
Knuutila, Simo – PPMP
Koskenniemi, Kimmo – BAULT
Lauha, Aila – CECH
Lavento, Mika – ARCH-HU
Lukkarinen, Ville – AHC1
Lyytikäinen, Pirjo – GLW
Mauranen, Anna – LFP
Meinander, Henrik – HIST
Nevalainen, Terttu – VARIENG
Pettersson, Bo – ILLC
Puikkonen, 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
Halla, 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 – FCREES
Koponen, Juhani – DEVERELE
Koskenniemi, Martti – ECI
Kultti, Klaus – EAT
Lahelma, Elina – KUFE
Lanne, Markku – TSEM
Lavonen, Jari – RCMSER
Lehtonen, Risto – SocStats
Lindblom-Yläne, Sari – EdPsychHE
Nieminen, Hannu – MECOL
Nuotio, Kimmo – Law
Nyman, Göte – METEORI
Ollikainen, Markku – ENFIFO
Pirttilä-Backman, Anna-Majia – DYNASOBIC
Rahkonen, Keijo – CulCap
Roos, J P – HELPS
Simola, Hannu – SOCE-DGI
Sulkunen, Pekka – PosPus
Sumelius, John – AG ECON
Vaattovaara, Mari – STRUTSI
Vainio, Martti – SigMe

The next appendix includes the analyses of the RC under discussion.
Category: 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.

Number of authors in publications/year

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Authors</th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>Grand Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>205</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>28</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</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>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Total</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>304</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

% of authors

- 1 au: 68%
- 2 au: 19%
- 3 au: 9%
- 4 au: 3%
- 5 au: 1%
- 6 au: 0%
- 7 au: 0%
- 8 au: 0%
### Language of publication / Year

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language</th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>blanks</th>
<th>Grand Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>fi_FI</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>162</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>en_GB</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>127</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>es_ES</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sv_SE</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pt_PT</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>und</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Total</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>305</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Language of publications

- **fi**: 53%
- **en**: 42%
- **es**: 4%
- **sv**: 1%
- **pt**: 0%
- **und**: 0%
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Journal / Year / Total</th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>Grand Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Helsingin Sanomat</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yliopisto: Helsingin yliopiston tielehti</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kypari yleisnäyttely</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Global Finland: kehityssykymykset ja globaalikeskus</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sosiaalitiedetteliitännäisen aikakauslehti</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kosmopolis</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suomen Antropologi</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yliopisto: Yliopiston aikakauslehti</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kansainvälinen aikakauslehti</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nordisk Østforum</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pan &amp; parha</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nukusleim</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>News from the Nordic Africa Institute</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>El Niter</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nuoriso- ja nuorisoelämä</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food Quality and Preference</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pakeemi</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hiihto muutollituesta verkkoprosjekti</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development and Change</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ukropoliikka</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scarf Magazine</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tieto&amp;Trendit</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cooperation and Conflict</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amnesty: Suomen osaston jäsenlehti</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pakistan journal of women's studies</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helsingin University Bulletin</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Future</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diplöörog</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terra</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Forestry Review</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nueva sociedad.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Journal of Psychology</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forest, Trees and Livelihoods</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Studies Review</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small-Scale Forestry</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journal of Community and Applied Social Psychology</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sosiaalipsykologi</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journal of educational research in Africa = revue africaine de recherche en education</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suomen luonto</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journal of youth studies</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Third World Quarterly</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Afrimur: Islamiainen lehti</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ubuntu: Suomi-Etiä-Afrika-Seuran jäsentiedote</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kepa Newsletter</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finnish Journal of Ethnicity and Migration</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anthropology news</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dialog Delphi Study</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kiper</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Round Table</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apuraportti: Kansainvälisten sosiaalivuonnollisten tiedote.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sirtolaisuus - Migration</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cadernos PAGU</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Society and Natural Resources</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Young</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A Propos</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Studies in Higher Education</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ukkoministerin kehitysviestintä</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suomen Kuvalehti</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Journal ranking

Norway ranking

Level 2 = highest scientific, Level 1 = scientific

Australian ranking

A*

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

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.

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.

Amount of ranked articles (Norway)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Norway</th>
<th>Journal articles</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Level 2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level 1</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Amount of ranked articles (Australian)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Australia</th>
<th>Journal articles</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Level A*</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level A</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level B</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level C</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journal</td>
<td>Grand Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suomen Antropologi</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nordisk Østforum</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food Quality and Preference</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development and Change</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cooperation and Conflict</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Forestry Review</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Journal of Psychology</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forest, Trees and Livelihoods</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Studies Review</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small-Scale Forestry</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journal of Community and Applied Social Psycholog</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journal of youth studies</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Third World Quarterly</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finnish Journal of Ethnicity and Migration</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Round Table</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cadernos PAGU</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Society and Natural Resources</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Young</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Studies in Higher Education</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>European Journal of Development Research</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transcultural Psychiatry</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Total</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Book publishers

C1 Published scientific monograph (7)
C2 Edited book, compilation, conference proceeding or special issue of journal (14)
D5 Text book or professional handbook or guidebook or dictionary (5)

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

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

The total amount of monographs is 26, two of which are published by a leading scientific publisher and 3 by a scientific publisher
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Publisher</th>
<th>c1</th>
<th>c2</th>
<th>c3</th>
<th>c4</th>
<th>c5</th>
<th>Grand Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gaudeamus</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Väestöliitto</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aksant Academic Publishers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alma Mater</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Danish Centre for Forest, Landscape and Planning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ediciones Abya Yala</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Editorial de la Universidad de Costa Rica</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Editorial La Colmena</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eduskunnan tulevaisuusvaliokunta</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ETMJ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finnish International Studies Association, The Foundation for Foreign Policy Research</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finnish League for Human Rights</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Förbundet för mänskliga rättigheter</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instituto Renvall</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lit Verlag</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Finnish Political Science Association</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Helsinki, Institute of Development Studies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Joensuu, Faculty of Forestry</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WSOY</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WSOY Oppimateriaalit</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WSOYpro</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VAESTOUITTO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zed Books</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Total</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>26</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>