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Foreword

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

1.1 RC-specific evaluation reports

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

It is essential to emphasise that the evaluation combines both meta-evaluation\(^1\) 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:
1. biological, agricultural and veterinary sciences
2. medicine, biomedicine and health sciences
3. natural sciences
4. humanities
5. social sciences

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

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

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

\(^3\) TUHAT (acronym) of Research Information System (RIS) of the University of Helsinki

\(^4\) Supervision of thesis, prizes and awards, editorial work and peer reviews, participation in committees, boards and networks and public appearances.
1.5 Evaluation material

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

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

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

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

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

Evaluation material

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

Background material

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

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

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

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

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

   - Identification of the ways to strengthen the focus and improve the quality of the RC’s research

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

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

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

2. **Practises and quality of doctoral training**
   - Organising of the doctoral training in the RC. Description of the RC’s principles for:
     - recruitment and selection of doctoral candidates
     - supervision of doctoral candidates
     - collaboration with faculties, departments/institutes, and potential graduate schools/doctoral programmes
     - good practises and quality assurance in doctoral training

   - Identification of the ways to strengthen the practises and quality of doctoral training, and the actions planned for their development.

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

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

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

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

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

   The additional material: TUHAT compilation of the RC’s other scientific activities.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

8. The RC's strategic action plan for 2011–2013
   - RC's description of their future perspectives in relation to research and doctoral training.
   - A written feedback from the aspects of: scientific quality, scientific significance, societal impact, processes and good practices related to leadership and management, national and international collaboration, innovativeness, future significance
   - Strengths
   - Areas of development
9. Evaluation of the category of the RC in the context of entity of the evaluation material (1-8)

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

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

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

Comments on the compilation of evaluation material

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

Comments if applicable

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

13. RC-specific conclusions

1.7 Evaluation criteria

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

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

Description of criteria levels

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

Classification: Criteria (level of procedures and results)

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

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

Strengths

The KUFE research group has a clear and at the same time generous focus that allows application in many areas and contexts. The research is multidisciplinary as well as theoretically and methodologically ambitious. Among the strong areas the RC’s work on ethnographic methodology in education can be mentioned. Members receive international invitations as key note speakers, reviewers and network members/co-ordinators (Lahelma). There is a fair amount of co-authored work (33%).

Many of the publications of the group (particularly professor Lahelma and her collaborators) are relatively widely cited in the international research community of educational sociology and gender studies. Unfortunately that is not visible in the Web of Science based bibliographic analysis because many of the main publications are monographs of chapters in edited books. An increasing number of senior members is making the RC stronger.

Areas of development

The publication strategy applied in the KUFE has somewhat limited the international visibility of the unit. The RC has published some articles in the international top journals but the majority of the publications are domestic or published in less known forums. Because of the very small number of senior members in the RC cannot reach the same level of international visibility than many much larger groups in this evaluation.

Recommendations

The RC might revise its publications strategies in order to increase international scientific and societal impact.

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
Strengths
As a small and intensive research unit closely connected to the master programmes of the institute the RC has the opportunity for “gradual” recruiting of doctoral student during a longer period of time (master students, part-time research assistants).

Doctoral training is well organized, comprising not only individual but also peer supervising, a post graduate seminar, study groups and the integration of doctoral candidates in the research activities including management responsibilities, as well as teaching. One of the strengths of the RC’s doctoral training is the active participation in the work of the national doctoral programme. There is also some international doctoral training collaboration within the Nordic countries. Doctoral candidates get early international contacts and publishing opportunities.

The number of PhDs who have finished in the period (9) is good, given that KUFE is very small and it does not have a fixed institutional status. Especially noteworthy are the successful academic careers of those who have finished: most continue as researchers. Areas of development

Even though the “gradual” selection is often good method to recruit new doctoral students it has also its problems. More clear competition based selection could help to avoid these problems.

There seems to be no international recruitment. The international dimension could be further strengthened.

Recommendations
See above.
 Numeric evaluation: 4 (Excellent)

2.3 The societal impact of research and doctoral training

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

ASPECTS: Societal impact, national and international collaboration, innovativeness

Strengths
Gender issues have become an important question in educational policy and the members of the RC have participated as experts in different practical projects in this field. Due to the focus of this RC, societal impact is closely integrated with the research, much of which has direct rather than just indirect political relevance.

Areas of development
Is there at present even too much of policy work and consultancies, or should the balance between this and international research output be checked? Is it possible to channel part of the societal impact through teaching rather than research?
 Numeric evaluation: 4 (Excellent)

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

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

ASPECTS: Scientific quality, national and international collaboration

Strengths
The RC is well networked on the national level with other units doing research in the field of education and gender studies. They have also a relatively active and well-established international collaboration which has already produced joint publications with international colleagues (especially Nordic, UK and US). Important is also the active participation in international scientific organizations and editorial boards of publications. There is a fairly active mobility of KUFE scholars abroad.

Areas of development
The international dimension could be further strengthened and extended: not much is said about the long-term mobility of researchers from other countries to Finland. There are however plans in this direction. The RC could also pay more attention to international recruiting of doctoral students and postdoctoral researchers.

Numeric evaluation: 4 (Excellent)

2.5 Operational conditions

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

ASPECTS: Processes and good practices related to leadership and management

Strengths
The RC is an appreciated part of the Faculty of Behavioral Sciences and it seems that its present status (other than department) is not experienced as problematic for scholarly work. The present situation might instead provide flexibility for the members to develop research topics in collaboration. The collaborative spirit is reflected in the self-evaluation in many ways, just one of them being the observation that the real number of participating researchers is higher than the 23 who are listed.

The increasing number of PI’s is an asset with regard to new research openings, applications and resources.

Areas of development
Due to its non-departmental status, the RC is strongly dependent on short-term funding. There is willingness to take on more teaching responsibilities, but the burden of administrative work is too heavy. There is need of secretary services (a general problem within Finnish universities).

Other remarks
The operational conditions of the RC are directly depending on the situation of the PI members in the Institute of Behavioral Sciences, because the unit has no official status.

The pressure towards publishing doctoral dissertations as articles instead of monographs, caused by the merge of the Faculties of Education and Psychology, is experienced as problematic – and rightly so.

Recommendations
A vision about the future status and role of the RC should be drafted and discussed with the Faculty and University.
2.6 Leadership and management in the researcher community

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

ASPECTS: Processes and good practices related to leadership and management

Strengths
The RC as such is well functioning: leadership and management are facilitating research and doctoral training through informal structures, shared responsibilities and a collaborative, democratic spirit.

Areas of development
It is positive that they have already taken into account the retirement of the leader of the RC in 2014, yet a more detailed plan for the long-term continuation of research should be drafted.

Other remarks
The undefined status of the RC in the department makes it difficult to evaluate the wider aspects of the management.

Recommendations
See above.

2.7 External competitive funding of the RC

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

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

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

Strengths
The RC has been very successful in raising external competitive research funding: 2,730,000 € of which 200,000 € EU and ERC. This is quite impressive for a group in which the leader is the only one in a tenure position.

Areas of development
International funding for research projects, networks and mobility could be increased.
2.8 The RC’s strategic action plan for 2011–2013

- RC’s description of their future perspectives in relation to research and doctoral training. ASPECTS: Scientific quality, scientific significance, societal impact, processes and good practices related to leadership and management, national and international collaboration, innovativeness, future significance

Strengths
The strategic plan of the RC shows a serious attempt to further develop the high quality of research and strengthen the international collaboration. The plan is both ambitious and concrete. The plans to apply for a CoE on the national or Nordic level are of key importance.

Areas of development
The plan does not mention the administrative status of the RC. Although research is naturally of prime importance it is to be expected that the RC’s formal status affects research, especially after Lahelma’s retirement.

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

Strengths
Even though the publication strategies of the RC are not fully suitable for the strict evaluation of the international level excellence, for the future development of the RC it was a good decision to participate in the evaluation in the category 1. In its special field the RC has already reached relatively strong international reputation and they have collaborative research with important international partners.

Areas of development
The publishing strategy and international dimension of both research and doctoral training should be further strengthened in order to make the RC stronger in this category. The RC is also too small in its current form to reach the international cutting edge in its field

Other remarks
Competition in category 1 is tougher than in category 2 – to be “good” in category 1 equals “outstanding” in category 2.

Recommendations
See above.

Numeric evaluation: 4 (Excellent)

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

Lahelma carried the chief responsibility for the material but members contributed significantly: doctoral students for example wrote on doctoral training. There were several meetings and one workshop outside Helsinki. The RC regrets that work across faculty borders could not be fully acknowledged, due to the design of the evaluation process.
2.11 How the UH’s focus areas are presented in the RC’s research

*Focus area 9: Social justice*

The research of the unit is directly related to the focus area “Social Justice”, where it contributes both in terms of research topics and themes and in terms of societal impact.

2.12 RC-specific main recommendations

The RC has a clear focus and it is a good basis of future development. The small size of the RC makes it coherent and productive but in order to higher the level of the work towards "international cutting edge in its field" it would be wise to merge or intensify collaboration with some other groups doing research on same topics. The RC is publishing very much but in order to increase the international scientific impact they should pay more attention to their publication strategies.

2.13 RC-specific conclusions

See comments above.
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:
Cultural and Feminist Studies in Education (KUFE)

LEADER OF THE RESEARCHER COMMUNITY:
Professor Elina Lahelma, Institute of Behavioural Sciences

RC-SPECIFIC MATERIAL FOR THE PEER REVIEW:

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

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

RC-SPECIFIC STAGE 1 MATERIAL (registration form)

1 RESPONSIBLE PERSON

Name: Lahelma, Elina
E-mail:
Phone: 191 20553, 050 344 4313
Affiliation: Institute of Behavioural Sciences
Street address: Siltavuorenpenger 5A

2 DESCRIPTION OF THE PARTICIPATING RESEARCHER COMMUNITY (RC)

Name of the participating RC (max. 30 characters): Cultural and Feminist Studies in Education
Acronym for the participating RC (max. 10 characters): KUFE
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):

Unit of Cultural and Feminist Studies in Education (http://www.helsinki.fi/ktl/kufe/index.htm)
KUFE has a long history as a group of PIs, post docs and doctoral students that work collaboratively, with master students participating. It is the most central part of the national network Educational and Difference (EDI) http://www.helsinki.fi/koukero/english/index.htm, that was built in the 1980s. KUFE collects participants of EDI that are affiliated in IBS, other members of it belong to other RCs, mostly in SBII with Sanna Aaltonen as a joint member. KUFE members also are active in the RC SOCE-DGI, Lahelma is a joint member. The number of actual KUFE members that now are counted within RC KUFE is 23.

During 2005-2010 this unit has comprised of the following interlinked projects:
1) Learning to be Citizens: Ethnographic and Life Historical Perspectives to Education (Academy of Finland 2005-08, Lahelma). This (still ongoing) project has a direct continuation in the second:
2) Citizenship, agency and difference in upper secondary education – with special focus on vocational institutions (AMIS 2007-, Academy of Finland 2010-13, Lahelma).
3) Gender awareness in teacher education (TASUKO; MinEd 2008-11) TASUKO, a national project with links to all universities in Finland with teacher education, directed by Lahelma.
4) Individual projects within KUFE. Several KUFE members conduct their post doc research or doctoral thesis on other themes within the theoretical and methodological framework of KUFE. Currently Sirpa Lappalainen and Sanna Aaltonen have projects of post doc researcher of the Academy of Finland. Both Aaltonen’s project ‘Feasible Futures’ (2008-10) and Lappalainen’s project ‘Learning to Become Practical Nurse’ (2010-12) are linked to Amis, but individual projects. A new focus within KUFE is in critical adult education.

During 2005-2010 7 doctoral studies has been finalised in KUFE, and doctoral training is most active. KUFE is one of the projects in the national graduate program Education, Knowledge and Culture, one of the programs of FIGSEL graduate school (http://vanha.edu.utu.fi/kasva/tohtoriohjelmat/EKC.htm).

3 Scientific fields of the RC

Main scientific field of the RC’s research: social sciences

RC’s scientific subfield 1: Education and Educational Research
RC’s scientific subfield 2: Sociology
RC’s scientific subfield 3: Women’s Studies
RC’s scientific subfield 4: Social Sciences, Interdisciplinary

Other, if not in the list:

4 RC’s participation category

Participation category: 1

Justification for the selected participation category (MAX. 2200 characters with spaces):

KUFE is a research unit that has a long history of co-operation and joint working, nationally as well as internationally. KUFE members were central researchers when the national Education and Difference network applied for a center of excellence, Academy of Finland, 2004. Even if we did not get the status, the evaluation was most positive and the plan is largely accomplished, with important new openings. Research conducted in KUFE was especially mentioned when the Department of Education received the top evaluation (7/7) 2007.
The research is ground breaking in many ways, and we have received several grants from the Academy of Finland. KUFE is recognized as the main unit of gender and education studies in Finland. Intersecting with gender, other dimensions of difference has been the focus of studies in KUFE, and analysis is conducted at macro as well as micro levels. The ethnographic work of the group is internationally appreciated. Our doctoral training has been very successful, with links to doctoral schools and international courses of doctor education.

### Description of the RC's Research and Doctoral Training

Cultural and Feminist Studies in Education (KUFE) is a research unit based at the Institute of Behavioural Studies (earlier Department of Education). It is the most central group within a national research network Education and Difference (Edi) that was founded in the 1980s. KUFE members are active in the Sociology of Education group that participates in the evaluation as the RC SOCE-DGI.

In KUFE, educational processes and pedagogical practices that construct normality and address differences are explored in several interlinked studies, contextualised in national and global politics and policies. Citizenship, nationality, gender, difference and agency are central concepts. Innovative methodological perspectives have been elaborated by interlinking contextual and cross cultural ethnographic studies with life historical work and discursive and genealogical analysis. Contexts are preschool, comprehensive school, upper secondary education and young people’s educational transitions, but also working life, youth cultures, families, asylums and prisons. Focus is on dimensions of difference, such as gender, social background, ethnicity, sexuality, locality, background in special education, age, and their interlinking.

The research in KUFE is multidisciplinary. It draws especially from educational studies, sociology, gender studies, sociology of education, feminist and cultural studies, critical adult education, youth research, childhood studies, disabilities studies and critical multiculturalism.

### Significance of the RC's Research and Doctoral Training for the University of Helsinki

The research of KUFE brings high standard, internationally appreciated research and doctoral training into the strategic area Society and Culture. International collaboration is active, for example through board
memberships in international associations and editorial boards, through collaborating publishing, and within a NorFa network and active impact in Nordic and international doctoral courses. External money has been received from the Academy of Finland, Norfa, EdMin and foundations.

The RC also supports the goal of collaboration with the society. A national project Gender awareness in teacher education (TASUKO), supported by the Ministry of Education, is co-ordinated in KUFE. Several members of KUFE have been involved in providing data and analysis for the Government Report on Gender Equality 2010. Collaboration with The Finnish Association on Intellectual and Developmental Disabilities (FAIDD) and the Ministry of the Interior has been active in providing analysis on young people with background in special education.

Keywords: cultural studies in education, gender studies in education, ethnography, feminist studies in education

### 6 Quality of RC’s Research and Doctoral Training

Justified estimate of the quality of the RC’s research and doctoral training at national and international level during 2005-2010 (MAX. 2200 characters with spaces):

1. **Gender studies in education.** Cutting edge research has been conducted in research on gender and gender equality in education with extensive publication. This is evidenced, for example, by being invited as the international consultant in the most central journal of the field, Gender and Education (Lahelma) and as a coordinator of the Nordic network of Gender Studies (Lehtonen), as well as by regular invitations as speakers nationally and internationally, regular acting as an evaluator of thesis, promotions and projects also internationally.

2. **Ethnography of education.** In this field internationally highly respected work has been conducted also in the elaboration of methodology. This is evidenced through several ethnographic studies, but also by writing and editing publications on ethnographic methodology.

3. **High quality of doctoral training and post doc mentoring.** All PhDs have received very good or excellent evaluations of their dissertations. Most are continuing as researchers at the University of Helsinki, some elsewhere.
Comment on how the RC’s scientific productivity and doctoral training should be evaluated (MAX. 2200 characters with spaces):

The work of KUFE is by paradigm, methodology and traditions of publication closer to social sciences than to other subjects of IBS. Therefore we wish to be assessed by sociologists of education and gender and education researches, and together with SOCE-DGI

Because of the multidisciplinarit, several active members participate in other RCs and are not included here. We suggest that cooperation between RCs, even if it diminishes measurable results, is evaluated as strength.

Along with numeric methods of assessing scientific productivity (external funding, publications, number of PhDs, etc.), we wish the empirically grounded theoretical and methodological excellence of the RC to be evaluated. We suggest that the impact of our work on the society, writing for the Finnish audience and collaboration with actors in the field to be included in the criteria. Also our participation in the developing of educational sciences and, especially sociology of education, gender and education, and ethnography in education, nationally and internationally through activity in scientific societies, editing and reviewing publications and organizing conferences should be assessed.

In doctoral training emphasis in evaluation is in numbers, quality and employment of PhDs. But we suggest focus also on the collective and democratic traditions in supervision, for example the method of ‘peer supervising’. PhD students’ active participation in the research communities, as well as national and international co-operation that gives the students possibilities to get international contacts early in their careers, should be among the criteria used.

Our strategy is to publish both internationally and nationally. Members of the community, including many PhD students, have published extensively in referred national and international journals and edited books. They also have experience in editing books and theme issues nationally and internationally. This suggests our strong networking in the field and excellent supervision.
<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>Lahelma</td>
<td>Elina</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>Institute of Behavioural Sciences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Palmu</td>
<td>Tarja</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Doc., univ.lecturer, PI</td>
<td>Institute of Behavioural Sciences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lappalainen</td>
<td>Sirja</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Doc., post doc, PI</td>
<td>Institute of Behavioural Sciences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salo</td>
<td>Julla-Maija</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Doc., Univ.lecturer, PI</td>
<td>Institute of Behavioural Sciences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lehtonen</td>
<td>Jukka</td>
<td>Phd, research coord</td>
<td></td>
<td>Institute of Behavioural Sciences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isopahkala-Bouret</td>
<td>Ulpukka</td>
<td>Phd, post doc</td>
<td></td>
<td>Institute of Behavioural Sciences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brunila</td>
<td>Kristiina</td>
<td>Phd, post doc</td>
<td></td>
<td>Institute of Behavioural Sciences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kelhä</td>
<td>Minna</td>
<td>PhD</td>
<td></td>
<td>Institute of Behavioural Sciences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hakala</td>
<td>Katarina</td>
<td>PhD</td>
<td></td>
<td>Institute of Behavioural Sciences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Antikainen</td>
<td>Maire</td>
<td>PhD</td>
<td></td>
<td>Institute of Behavioural Sciences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rajander</td>
<td>Silja</td>
<td>PhD</td>
<td></td>
<td>Institute of Behavioural Sciences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mietola</td>
<td>Reetta</td>
<td>doctoral student</td>
<td></td>
<td>Institute of Behavioural Sciences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kurki</td>
<td>Tuuli</td>
<td>doctoral student</td>
<td></td>
<td>Institute of Behavioural Sciences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haapala-Samuel</td>
<td>Aino</td>
<td>doctoral student</td>
<td></td>
<td>Institute of Behavioural Sciences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Niemi</td>
<td>Anna-Maija</td>
<td>doctoral student</td>
<td></td>
<td>Institute of Behavioural Sciences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mononen-Batista</td>
<td>Sari</td>
<td>doctoral student</td>
<td></td>
<td>Institute of Behavioural Sciences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ikkävalko</td>
<td>Elina</td>
<td>doctoral student</td>
<td></td>
<td>Institute of Behavioural Sciences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lähteennäki</td>
<td>Minna</td>
<td>doctoral student</td>
<td></td>
<td>Institute of Behavioural Sciences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hohti</td>
<td>Riikka</td>
<td>doctoral student</td>
<td></td>
<td>Institute of Behavioural Sciences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pellikka</td>
<td>Laura</td>
<td>doctoral student</td>
<td></td>
<td>Institute of Behavioural Sciences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gutorm</td>
<td>Hanna</td>
<td>doctoral student</td>
<td></td>
<td>Institute of Behavioural Sciences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lang</td>
<td>Tarja</td>
<td>doctoral student</td>
<td></td>
<td>Institute of Behavioural Sciences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Altonen</td>
<td>Sanna</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>PhD</td>
<td>Inst of social sciences</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
INTERNATIONAL EVALUATION OF RESEARCH AND DOCTORAL TRAINING AT THE UNIVERSITY OF HELSINKI

RC-SPECIFIC STAGE 2 MATERIAL

BACKGROUND INFORMATION

Name of the RC’s responsible person: Lahelma, Elina

E-mail of the RC’s responsible person:

Name and acronym of the participating RC: Cultural and feminist studies in education, KUFE

The RC’s research represents the following key focus area of UH: 9. Yhteiskunnan oikeudenmukaisuus – Social justice

Comments for selecting/not selecting the key focus area: Social justice is a self evident key focus area of the KUFE RC, the members of which conduct critical analyzes of social justice issues in educational politics, policies and practices. We analyze everyday life in and experiences of education within a broad social, economic and political context. Applying a multidisciplinary approach, studies focus on intersectionality: on differences and inequalities based on gender, social class, ethnicity, sexuality, disability, location, and age, and the ways these are interlinked.

Research conducted in the RC has ambitious theoretical and methodological openings, and is appreciated internationally. It contributes to strengthening social justice and awareness of power structures in educational policies and practices as well as elsewhere in society. RC members engage in dialogue with policy makers, organizations, and other researchers. Many of us have been involved in producing the Finnish Government’s Report on Gender Equality for instance, and in integrating perspectives on awareness of gender and other differences into university teaching.

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

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

KUFE, Unit of Cultural and Feminist Studies in Education (http://www.helsinki.fi/ktl/kufe/index.htm) has a long history as a group of PIs, post docs, master and doctoral students who work collaboratively. It forms the central part of the national network Educational and Difference (EDI) that was established in the 1980s. KUFE collects participants of EDI that are affiliated with the IBS; other UH members of EDI belong to other RCs, mostly in SBII with Sanna Aaltonen as a joint member. KUFE members also are active in the RC SOCE-DGI, and Lahelma is a member of this RC. The count of RC KUFE members for this evaluation is 23, but the actual number is about 30.

In KUFE, educational processes and pedagogical practices that construct normality and address differences are explored in several interlinked studies, contextualised in national and global politics and policies. Citizenship, nationality, gender, difference and agency are central concepts. Innovative methodological perspectives have been elaborated by interlinking contextual and cross cultural ethnographic studies with life historical work and discursive and genealogical analysis. Studies are situated in the contexts of preschool, comprehensive school, upper secondary education, and project-based education; and in analyses of young people’s educational transitions, youth cultures, families, working life, asylums, and prisons. The focus is on exploring dimensions of difference, such as gender, social background, ethnicity, sexuality, locality, disability, age, and on how these are interlinked.
Projects

Several ethnographic studies at preschools and comprehensive schools (including PhD studies of Lappalainen, Hakala, Berg, Rajander) were conducted in the project Learning to be Citizens: Ethnographic and Life Historical Perspectives to Education (Academy of Finland (AF) 2005–08, Lahelma). The focus of interest in KUFE moved into post compulsory education through ethnographically grounded life historical studies within this project (Lahelma and Palmu).

The project Citizenship, Agency and Difference in Upper Secondary Education – with Special Focus on Vocational Institutions (AMIS) started in 2007 (AF 2010–13, Lahelma). The aim of this project is to analyze how citizenship and difference are constructed in upper secondary education, and how teachers and students are positioned and position themselves as agents in this field. This project comprises of several sub studies, including Lappalainen’s post doc project Studying to Become Practical Nurse (AF 2010–12). Other sub studies of this project focus on teachers, youth transitions and disabled students in vocational education, and have produced several publications. The first PhD thesis (Antikainen) and several MA theses within AMIS have been completed, and 5 PhD studies are currently in process. Aaltonen’s project Feasible Futures (AF 2008–10) is linked to AMIS. Collaboration within the AMIS project has inspired new research projects lead by younger colleagues (see future plans).

KUFE carries the main responsibility for the national project Gender awareness in teacher education (TASUKO; MinEd 2008–11), directed by Lahelma (with Lehtonen, Ikävalko, Pellikka, Hyyninen, Helakorpi). This project has analyzed teacher education, building on the strong tradition of gender studies in education. The project is working towards a research program on gender and gender awareness in teacher education and in pedagogical practices. It has a wide network of experts, teacher educators and researchers of education in all universities providing teacher education in Finland.

Along with projects, KUFE includes individual studies that share theoretical and methodological perspectives, but with a focus on various spheres of life. Guttorm studies cultures of craft, gender and research; Haapala-Samuel diplomatic spouses; Kelhä age and social conditions of motherhood; Lähteenmäki asylum seeking children in reception centers; Mononen education of entrepreneurial selves; Salo studies young people, participation and politics; and Rajander is developing a study on young Cambodian women attending private education institutes.

General research questions in KUFE studies

1. How are citizenship and differences constructed in the politics, policies and practices of educational institutions?
2. How are students’, teachers’ and professionals’ agency and subjectivities produced within power relations in practices, cultures and policies of education?
3. How can social justice be advanced in educational institutions?
4. How can theoretical and methodological perspectives be developed to explore complexities in educational processes and research practices?

Quality and results

In KUFE, cutting edge studies of various contexts have been conducted to analyze education from the perspectives of social justice and equality. KUFE is internationally recognized as the main gender and education studies unit in Finland. Alongside gender, other intersecting differences form the focus of analysis. Researchers at KUFE have created empirically-grounded theorizations and conceptualizations aimed towards enhancing our understanding of the complexities of educational realities. Many
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previously under-researched areas have been brought into the focus of attention. New interdisciplinary approaches have been implemented into explorations of educational practices, cultures and politics, such as projectization of education (Brunila, Kurki), nationality as an exclusive practice (Antikainen, Lappalainen, Rajander), the maintenance of normativities (Lehtonen, Mietola, Niemi, Palmu), narrative constructions of expertise (Isopahkala-Bouret), and children as citizens (Salo, Lappalainen).

KUFE members’ methodological contributions and ethnographic studies of educational contexts are internationally highly respected. This is evidenced by invited contributions to handbooks and editorial boards, and writing and editing key publications on methodology. The methodological strengths of our ethnographic studies include multiple sites of observation and participation that cross-cut dichotomies such as the ‘local’ and the ‘global’. Within this multi-sited ethnography our methodological principles are in collective, contextualized, comparative and cross cultural work. A broad range of other methods, such as deconstructive-discursive and genealogical analysis, life history and narrative analysis, have been successfully applied.

Our work is multidisciplinary, and we draw on sociological, political, feminist and cultural studies, education, adult education, youth, childhood and disability studies, critical multiculturalism and criminology. Employing multiple methodologies to explore institutional practices, experiences of actors, and policy documents, our analyses have problematicized the taken-for-granted idea of Finland as a country with equality in education. The method ‘analysis through discussion’ has provided possibilities for theoretical reflections that draw from different contexts in order to reveal social/societal differences produced within power relations, and the effects of policy measures. We develop research-based knowledge/power sensitive feminist pedagogy.

Research conducted in KUFE received special mention when the Dept of Ed received top international evaluation (7/7) 2006. KUFE members were core researchers in the national EDI-network that applied for a status of Centre of Excellence, AF, 2004. This status was not awarded, but the evaluation was most positive. Moreover, the original plans of EDI have mostly been accomplished and strengthened through new openings.

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

In 2008, Lahelma was the only senior in KUFE. Salo joined later and Palmu, Lappalainen and Aaltonen became PIs. Lehtonen achieved the title of docent recently and Isopahkala-Bouret has applied for docentship. Currently KUFE is in an active phase. Several PIs and forthcoming PIs are planning new projects and starting with new doctoral students. Broadening KUFE’s scope has strengthened its collaborative work.

For example, Lappalainen has started a new project Special class in life course and Brunila and Isopahkala-Bouret another Constitutive Other in the Politics and Practises of Adult Education in Knowing Capitalism. Projects on gender awareness in teacher education (Lehtonen) and on life historical and historical perspectives to educational transitions (Palmu) are in their planning stage. New international projects are planned on global ethnography in high status schooling, and in partnership in EU applications on inclusive education and gender equality. KUFE members will also be involved in projects planned together with SOCE-DGI.

(See question 8 for more details)
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2. PRACTICES AND QUALITY OF DOCTORAL TRAINING (MAX. 8800 CHARACTERS WITH SPACES)

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

During 2005–2010 nine doctoral studies were completed, supervised by KUFE seniors, and doctoral training is active. PhDs have received from very good to outstanding evaluations. Most have continued as researchers at the University of Helsinki.

KUFE projects are included in the national graduate school The Finnish Doctoral Programme in Education and Learning (FiDPEL) and its programme Education, Knowledge and Culture (EKC).

Recruitment and selection

KUFE has a tradition of recruiting doctoral students through graduate studies, with KUFE members supervising their master’s theses. Many have joined KUFE’s research projects as trainees or research assistants, with the opportunity to take part in seminars and meetings arranged by the projects. This has given them an insight into research, and ideas for theoretical and methodological approaches already before applying for doctoral studies.

We have welcomed the PhD topics selected by new doctoral students so long as the research topics and theoretical and methodological perspectives are relevant to KUFE’s research focus. New doctoral students have had the possibility to join KUFE’s ongoing research projects.

Supervision

All doctoral students have at least two supervisors. Students within KUFE share the feeling of being privileged among doctoral students because there is a tradition among supervisors to give high priority to their students – a tradition that is transferred to new supervisors who have experienced this during their own studies. Most research topics are multidisciplinary, and many students have one supervisor outside KUFE. Students are supervised in conducting their research and their post doctoral studies.

All doctoral students take part in KUFE’s post graduate seminar KiTKa. This was originally a seminar for EKC members in Helsinki, lead by Lahelma and Gordon, and it has included students from several universities and fields of studies (e.g. education, sociology, social psychology, gender studies, history). During the 2000s, 19 KiTKa students achieved a PhD, several of them continuing in KiTKa as post docs and supervising new doctoral students. Currently KiTKa is coordinated by a doctoral student (Ikävalko) and lead by Lappalainen and Palmu. Salo leads another research seminar within KUFE. PhD students also form smaller flexible study groups, for example reading groups on central theoretical or methodological texts. Peer tutoring is central to KUFE and has fostered a culture of collaborative research and writing.

Collaboration

KUFE doctoral students have excellent possibilities to participate in national and international doctoral courses. The relation of KUFE to the faculty’s doctoral studies has thus been in contributing rather than using. Members of KUFE participate in the development of post graduate studies at departmental and faculty level. Lahelma is chair of the working group on doctoral studies in education at IBS, and since 2007 one of KUFE’s students has acted as secretary (Mietola, Kurki), and Kurki is the doctoral students’ representative in the faculty’s research commission. Brunila and Guttorm have worked as faculty
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doctoral studies officers. Members of KUFE, including doctoral students, regularly teach in faculty’s doctoral courses. TASUKO project has organized SUKO-seminars 4–6 times each year for the faculty’s master’s and doctoral students interested in developing their views on gender and other differences in relation to their research topics. Some students from other faculties and universities have participated too.

Lahelma, Palmu and Lappalainen work in boards and/or as supervisors in FiDPEL and EKC. Several doctoral students in KUFE have received funding from FiDPEL and most others are 'status members' of and actively participate in seminars organized by it.

Nordic educational research networks Etnoped (earlier) and NordCrit have been important partners for Nordic research collaboration and doctoral courses, funded by NordForsk. NordCrit in particular encourages co-operation between research students and PostDocs, with the aim of joint publishing. In 2010 several KUFE students participated in a Nordic research course on Sociology of Education, organized with NordForsk money, with Lahelma a partner in the application and a teacher in the course.

We have been active as students, organizers and mentors in the students’ preconference of European Educational Research Conference, especially in 2010. KUFE students have been active in searching for research courses internationally, and FiDPEL or project resources have been applicable.

Good practises and quality assurance in doctoral training.

Practices of research training in KUFE have produced high quality research: PhD’s have received very good or excellent evaluations and 5 Master’s theses written in the context of research projects have received awards. Doctoral students and new PhDs have been successful in applying for doctoral posts in the department, and in applying for funding from FiDPEL and other central financiers in the field.

Quality assurance of doctoral training in KUFE is based on high quality and intensity of supervision, and the involvement of the doctoral students in research groups. Doctoral students participate actively in the post graduate seminars and present papers on regular basis in conferences. These practices provide many possibilities to discuss and present research and receive feedback. KUFE members read each others’ manuscripts in different stages of the writing process.

Good practices: The recruitment of undergraduate students has been beneficial to both students and ongoing research projects. Participation of post graduate students in research groups and peer tutoring have supported research and planning of doctoral studies (finding relevant literature, post graduate courses etc.) Participation in national and international conferences is strongly encouraged. Doctoral students also participate in the teaching and administrative work of the department, often acting as second supervisors of MA theses, and new doctorates are recruited as second supervisors of new doctoral students.

Assuring good career perspectives for the doctoral candidates/fresh doctorates

Many PhDs have remained in KUFE as post doc researchers: 8 out of the 11 current PhDs of RC KUFE were supervised by Lahelma. Doctorates are entrusted to work for the projects and collaboration already as doctoral students has equipped them with tacit knowledge of academic work. This helps on the first steps as post doc researcher. Funding applications are produced collectively, and doctorates participate in administrative tasks in KUFE, for example as deputy leaders of the projects. The tradition of peer tutoring and doctorates’ participation in supervising and in teaching research seminars have been an effective introduction into post doc and senior tasks at the university. KUFE’s new doctorates often already have wide research networks, conduct research collaboration with Finnish and
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international colleagues and have published internationally – also those who conduct their thesis as monographs in Finnish.

KUFE members accumulate extensive experience of different aspects of academic work, and doctorates have been successful when competing for Post Doc positions at the Department, and for external funding. Some have continued as researchers or professionals outside the university, but have maintained close contact with KUFE.

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

The strengths of doctoral training in KUFE are in well established structures and practices. KUFE has functional practices of recruitment, providing supervision for students, and active local post graduate seminars. Peer tutoring and the collaboration of doctoral students are strengths. KUFE has close connections to national graduate schools, and close international collaboration, especially in the NordCrit network which places strong emphasis on doctoral training. KUFE students have actively pursued new methods, for example workshops on themes such as collaborative writing.

Challenges are related to financing. In our field of research, grants are difficult to get; EKC even tends to have the most strict competition within FidPEL. Although many are financed for only short periods, currently all doctoral students have funding. Senior researchers’ funding also challenges doctoral training. Only Lahelma has a tenured post, and for the rest in unsecure positions committing to long-term supervision is risky.

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).

Many of us, including doctoral students and some MA students, are active partners with administrative and third sector actors in the field of equal and socially just education. We act as researchers, experts and members of working groups, and are regularly invited as speakers and commentators nationally and internationally, and to evaluate theses, promotions and projects nationally and internationally.

The societal impact of our work in the field of gender equality in education is evident and sustainable. The national communication and specialist network of the TASUKO project includes about 90 people who mostly work in teacher education units as teachers and researchers. Drawing on work in TASUKO, KUFE members have been invited to speak at tens of seminars and conferences and to produce publications aimed for practitioners. This work has received international recognition at various Nordic and European symposia and seminars.

KUFE members have been invited to contribute as researchers or experts in providing data and analysis for the Government Report on Gender Equality 2010 (Brunila, Lehtonen, Ikävalko, Lahelma). Many act as experts in administrative bodies, for example in bodies of the Council of Gender Equality, and regularly give talks, also in EU and Nordic seminars on gender equality. Lehtonen was the director of an international collaborative project Sexual and Gender Minorities at Work (2002–06, funded by European Social Fund and Ministry of Labour). He was awarded by the UH in 2008 for his work on gender equality. In 2003–05 Brunila and Hynninen conducted the largest national research on project-based equality work in Finland so far, in co-operation with the Ministry of Labour. This research was highly regarded by the Ministry and in EU’s project evaluation. Within ESF-funded MONIKKO-project Brunila and Ikävalko conducted research and development work in ICT-companies (2005–06).
The project Special class in life course (Lappalainen) has close connections with practitioners of special education and disability associations. Collaboration with The Finnish Association on Intellectual and Developmental Disabilities is active. In collaboration with the Ministry of Interior, analysis on young people with a background in special education has been provided in the programme YES – Equality is a Priority (Niemi, Mietola, Helakorpi), co-financed by the EU Progress Programme.

The research conducted in KUFE is relevant to teachers, practitioners, parents, and administration and participates in national critical dialogue with policy makers and administrative bodies. We regard it important to disseminate also in Finnish. We have edited several refereed books in Finnish, and two are currently in process. The feedback among students, teachers and other readers has been most positive. Publications of KUFE, of doctoral students too, are regularly used as study materials. For example, an article by Niemi is included as an article in the national entrance examination into teacher education.

KUFE has cooperation with Finnish Social Science Data Archive (FSD, University of Tampere). The research material produced in Lappalainen’s project is part of a pilot project where new methods for archiving ethnographic projects are developed.

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

RC members share ethical principles of social justice. We regard concrete work for equality in schools, society and university as important. TASUKO finishes this year, and we are actively searching for possibilities for new forums and resources for continuing the societal work towards gender aware education. Here our focus is also international, and Lehtonen is partner in an EU application. Another focus is in deepening contacts with organizations that provide education for disabled people.

We have plans to activate scientific and practice-related discussion between different interest groups (researchers, politicians, practitioners, media) on issues of education, for example, by using the forum Siltamat of the faculty, Simola and Brunila have been initiating this process. Simola and Guttorm are organizing an interdisciplinary and multi-artistic research network Miitinki (meet and think), a site for societal enterprise for researchers, think tank -activities and the productization of research results in innovative ways.

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

Collaboration

At IBS, KUFE forms the strongest part of the sector or research focus area Education, Society and Culture (SOCE). In this evaluation Lahelma is also a member of RC SOCE-DGI. We have been active in organizing and participating in the Education, Society and Culture seminars of SOCE each year since it was established in the 1990s.

National collaboration, evidenced by regular joint publishing, takes place with other members of EDI who work in several projects that are interlinked with ours. Tuula Gordon, Tarja Tolonen and Sinikka Aapola (RC SBII), Liisa Tainio (RC Interaction) and Paivi Berg (RC Dynasobic) are members of or associated with KUFE. Many of us are collaborators with RC Gender. We have sustainable relations to many research groups at the University of Eastern Finland (e.g. joint publication with SA project of Katri IINTERNATIONAL AND NATIONAL (INCL. INTERSECTORAL) RESEARCH COLLABORATION AND RESEARCHER MOBILITY (MAX. 4400 CHARACTERS WITH SPACES))
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Komulainen; she also organized an excellent doctoral course with KUFE 2007–09). We have strong connections to FAIDD Center for Research and Development with Hakala as a member of KUFE.

In the context of TASUKO we are networking with colleagues in all teacher education institutions in Finland, with strong international relations (including regular invitations to deliver key note speeches). Well attended TASUKO symposia have been organized in the context of ECER conference 2010, and in FERA pre-conferences and research symposia each year.

Joint work with Janet Holland and Rachel Thomson (UK) and their collaborators dates back to the 1990s, with interlinked projects, researcher visits and joint publications. Collaboration with Therese Quinn (USA) has started. In Nordic countries, we collaborate with Elisabet Öhrn, Lisbeth Lundahl and Anne-Lise Arnesen and their research groups in the Nordic Research Network: Critical Perspectives on Young People, Welfare and Education (NordForsk grant 2010–12, Lahelma). NordCrit organises seminars, courses and symposia and develops joint publications, including a special theme issue in EERJ, 2010.

During 2005–10 KUFE members have been board members in Finnish, Nordic and European research associations of education (FERA, NERA, EERA), adult education (ATS, ESREA) and youth studies (NTS); organized dozens of conferences and symposia; been invited in editorial groups of Gender and Education, Ethnography and Education, Nordic Pedagogy, Kasvatus, Nuorisotutkimus, Aikuiskasvatust, special publications of EERA and FERA; and served as reviewers for more than 20 international journals, and for all Finnish publications relevant to KUFE’s research areas.

Research mobility

KUFE encourages international mobility and creates contacts with foreign universities. Rajander is currently at the Royal University of Phnom Penh in Cambodia. Visits of over one month to various universities have been made by Niemi (Hungary), Aaltonen (Melbourne), Ikävalko (Germany), Lahelma (Sweden) Kurki (South-Africa). Several members have been on shorter visits. Many distinguished professors have visited KUFE and delivered talks or conducted workshops, including Jo-Anne Dillabough, Becky Francis, Ivor Goodson, Janet Holland, and Ann Phoenix (UK); Tom Popkewitz and Therese Quinn (USA); Hillevi Lenz-Taquchi, Lisbeth Lundahl, and Elisabet Öhrn (Sweden); and N. Hashimoto (Japan). (See 1,2,8)

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

We have a strong emphasis on international cooperation, and are planning to strengthen this emphasis by focusing more on joint dissemination. In the NordCrit network, two internationally published books are planned: an edited book on comparative and cross cultural ethnography, and another on segregation in education. We plan to hold international seminars and symposia in conferences, and conduct doctoral courses that aim for joint publications of younger colleagues across the countries. The ethos of equality in education continues to be in the focus of our research initiatives.

We have participated actively in the new plans of RC SOCE-DGI to develop the annual ESC conference held at the faculty into an international conference of sociology of education. Another joint plan within SOCE is to establish an international e-journal Sociology of Education – Diversity, Governance and Interaction.

We encourage research mobility for KUFE members, and several plans and applications for longer visits to other universities are in process.

(see also question 8)
Description of the operational conditions in the RC's research environment (e.g. research infrastructure, balance between research and teaching duties).

At the end of 2010, 6 members held teaching posts in IBS (only Lahelma a tenured post), most others were affiliated staff with external funding. Some are currently employed outside the IBS. The situation changes constantly, and members have been involved on an ongoing basis in applying for posts at IBS and for external funding. This is very time consuming, for funding is normally for the short-time only. Even PhD students that have received FIDPEL funding (currently 4) have to reapply after two years.

KUFE members with external funding take part in teaching (max 5%) and curriculum development. We are engaged in planning and teaching core components of the curriculum, but no teaching positions have been allotted. We are regularly asked to give lectures in other courses too, and tens of our publications are used in the curriculum, some in the entrance examination.

KUFE is thus an appreciated group at IBS, well known to students too. Participating in teaching and administrative work, even if time-consuming, is regarded as a positive, rewarding experience as it is integrated with academic work. All doctoral students with external funding have been provided with desks and facilities by IBS.

The university reform has had a negative impact on KUFE, however. In 2010, the well functioning Department of Education was obliged to merge with the departments of psychology and speech sciences, which have different academic cultures and scientific paradigms. This mergence created increased bureaucracy and administrative tasks, and together with the worsening economic situation it has taken time from research and teaching. This has been compounded by the fact that even professors do not receive secretary services.

In the new Institute, the paradigms and traditions of doctoral studies and publishing that are typical for natural and behavioural sciences collapse with those representing the social sciences on which KUFE predominantly draws. Social studies cannot win a competition based purely on numbers of international publications. Doing for example ethnographic research is time consuming; producing and analyzing data is ‘hands on’ work that needs reflection, and instant publishing with clear answers to concrete questions does not always provide good science. Publishing PhD theses as a collection of articles jointly with the supervisor is rather new in social sciences, but preferred at IBS. The new PhD students of KUFE are expected to adapt to this. Even if they (and the supervisors) thus will get more publications, this change is not only positive, because articles are not necessarily the best form to disseminate final results from qualitative studies. The particular advantage and unique quality of a monograph in ethnographic research is the possibility to interpret research findings in depth, contextualizing findings within an interconnected schematic of research interests and through multiple lenses of analysis. Moreover, excellent monographs written in Finnish (as several PhD theses of KUFE) have acquired an active readership among teachers and students. Thus they improve awareness of questions of social justice among educational practitioners, and ensure the sustainability of Finnish as a language of social sciences.

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

Marketisation and commercialization of science have caused changes to basic research in social sciences and education. The promotion of entrepreneurialism, commissioned research and responsibility for
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constantly obtaining external funding have increased competition. Although members of KUFE have been successful in obtaining external funding and post doctoral positions at the department, most struggle with insecurity based on impermanent positions.

The regulations of this research evaluation provide an example of the effects of increasing competition. We were not able to participate as a larger RC EDI, because some EDI members were expected to participate in RCs in other faculties. Interdisciplinarity and the major contributions of some KUFE’s members and associates thus remain invisible.

However, KUFE members’ commitment to work together, the enjoyment derived from joint activities, young colleagues who are willing to join, and the excellent results of KUFE’s work maintain momentum and motivation, despite the challenges present in the university environment.

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.

At IBS, KUFE forms the strongest part of the sector or research focus area Education, Society and Culture (SOCE). Whilst the new department (IBS) already is over one year old, the organization of research and teaching within it is still debated and most unclear; therefore KUFE does not have an official status.

KUFE RC has 23 members, of which five PIs, seven Post Docs (some of them soon PIs) and 11 doctoral students, one of which (Lang) PhD in January 2011, four more began before 2008. Thus the majority of the current students are in an early phase of their career. In January 2011 two more doctoral students joined KUFE (Mari Simola and Ville Kainulainen).

KUFE was originally established as a research community composed of EDI members who worked at the Department of Education. Its aim was to collaborate on planning how to incorporate our perspectives into the evaluation 2006 and into the curriculum of educational studies. Thus EDI members at other Departments of UH (e.g. Gordon, Aapola, Tolonen), who participated in activities related to research and supervision, were included as associates of KUFE. Later on, several KUFE members who moved away from the Department of Education/IBS, still continued in KUFE (Berg, Hakala, Kelhätä, Rajander, Tainio). KUFE’s doctoral seminar KITKa has been open to members of other RCs, and several doctoral students who belong to and have supervisors in other RCs or research groups participate in KITKa (e.g. Mari Simola, Chian Chan-Cheng, Susanna Hannus and Tuija Veintie from RC SOCE-DGI; Jenny Vainio from RC Cradle). Moreover, KUFE’s research projects include IBS members who are not KUFE members (e.g. Leila Pehkonen, Aino-Maija Lahtinen and Marianne Teräs (RC Cradle). KUFE includes MA and MA students who work in administrative tasks or coordinators at IBS or TASUKO, and are thus not included in KUFE RC in this evaluation (e.g. Pirkko Hynninen, Jenni Helakorpi, Anna Kuuteri, Johanna Snellman).

KUFE is thus actually a much bigger group than KUFE RC. It is a dynamic research community with low borders as researchers and students are free to decide on the degree of their involvement in the activities. It does not have any explicit or formal structure of leadership or management; the absence of which is one of the strengths in KUFE.

In situations when formal leadership is needed (as in this evaluation), Lahelma, as a professor, has taken this responsibility. In relation to IBS, she is nominated as the immediate superior for most KUFE members and as the director of doctoral students even when their supervisors are other members of KUFE. Several interlinked relations of seniority and mentoring, in relation to supervising and
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Responsibilities in research projects take place in KUFE, but without emphasized hierarchies. Doctoral students, PhDs and PIs take positions as leaders, deputies and chairs in projects, research seminars and various events, and as home page coordinators. These responsibilities are rotated among members so that nobody gets too much work and all have the opportunity to gain experience in managing such tasks.

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

PIs, post docs and PhD students all participate in developing new projects and in organizing doctoral training. The participation and taking responsibility of PIs in leadership is particularly important because Lahelma will retire in the end of 2014.

The system of organizing KUFE has been effective in that all unnecessary bureaucracy and hierarchical structures have been avoided. This has helped to encourage innovativeness, commitment and initiatives within the fields of research, doctoral studies, teaching and societal work. This innovativeness is a fundamental character of KUFE that has been recognized by several international colleagues too.

However, the unclear situation at IBS makes our position somewhat uncertain. It is possible that we will have to build more formal structures to continue to receive recognition by the new university and mobilize resources.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>7 EXTERNAL COMPETITIVE FUNDING OF THE RC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Listing of the RCs external competitive funding, where:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- the funding decisions have been made during 1.1.2005-31.12.2010, and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- the administrator of the funding is/has been the University of Helsinki</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• 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: <strong>1640000</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• 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:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• 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: <strong>60000</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• 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: <strong>140000</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• 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).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- names of the foundations: Nordforsk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Finland’s Cultural Foundation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Oskar Öflund foundation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Niilo Helander foundation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- A Malm foundation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Konkordia foundation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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- KOrdelin foundation
- Kone foundation
- Research foundation of the University of Helsinki
  - total amount of funding (in euros) from the above-mentioned foundations: 190000

• 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 Education
  - Ministry of Social and Health
  - Ministry of Internal Affairs
  - National Board of Education
  - total amount of funding (in euros) from the above-mentioned funding organizations: 700000

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

• Description of the RC’s future perspectives in respect to research and doctoral training.
  The theoretical and methodological work in KUFE is of high standard. Innovative and reflective cross disciplinary work continues. We publish extensively, and doctoral students as well publish internationally. KUFE members have almost 200 scientific publications 2005–10; around 80 refereed articles or chapters, and 20 authored or edited books. The number of accepted or submitted manuscripts is over 50, a majority of which to refereed publications (listed at the KUFE home page). This suggests that KUFE’s research and doctoral studies is in a dynamic phase. We are active in editing books and theme numbers of journals, and in disseminating our findings to practitioners. We collaborate in various networks, conferences, journals, for instance. This work will be further strengthened. PIs have started new research projects, and several others are in a planning stage.

Lappalainen (with Mietola, Niemi, Helakorpi) has started a project Special class in life course. Ethnographic and life historical perspectives on subjectivity, agency and differences in practices of special education (outstanding evaluation but no money in the first grant application). The project will challenge the problem-based perspective on young people’s lives through paying attention to structural and cultural features in the formation of their life-courses, subjectivities and agencies.

Brunila and Isopahkala-Bouret (with Iikävalko, Kurki, Kainulainen and 3 Master’s students) are starting a new collaborative research project and network Constitutive Other in the Politics and Practises of Adult Education in Knowing Capitalism. The aim is to bring societal differences into the analysis of politics and practices of adult education, conducting a critical analysis of the production of knowledge, by linking it to economic and social change in the era of knowing capitalism. Isopahkala-Bouret has started a research project Ageing and expertise. Narrative inquiry into the experiences of older workers who acquire MA degrees in their fifties. Its purpose is to theorize how age, gender and expertise are intertwined. It will involve collaboration with Sara Arber, UK.
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Drawing on TASUKO’s national research program, a project on gender awareness in teacher education (Lehtonen), and another on life historical and historical perspectives to educational transitions (Palmu) are in their planning stage. Lappalainen is planning to build a multi-disciplinary ‘umbrella’ centre on multicultural educational research, in collaboration with researchers at other departments.

KUFÉ welcomes new openings suggested by PhDs and PhD students. Examples described in question 3 include Miitinki and Siltamat forums (Guttorm, Simola, Brunila). Miitinki network crosses university borders and aims to widen the discussion on knowing and power/knowledge-relations, and to bring art-, affect- and experience-based methodologies (back) into the research and the representations of knowing. New scientific and more practice related projects around these themes are planned for the future.

A growing focus is in comparative and cross cultural work across different countries. In the NordCrit context, a collaborative research project is planned. Another plan for comparative work in the Nordic context will take place in connection with SOCE-DGI. This planned programme is concerned with ongoing changes in education in the Nordic welfare states.

In planning stage is the Finnish part of an ongoing global ethnography on elite schools with e.g. Jane Kenway and Fazal Rizvi, Australia, and Debbie Epstein, UK (Lahelma invited as partner, Rajander in Cambodia). Lahelma and Lappalainen are partners in an EU application concerning inclusive education in Europe, and Lehtonen in another on gender equality in European education.

One focus in the future will be on methodological aspects of ethnography on education and on discourse analysis. Lahelma has been invited to act as editor of the ethnography section in an international handbook of methodology. This work will be conducted with other members of KUFÉ.

KUFÉ seniors in EDI were active in the application for AFs centre of excellence 2004. When the plans of new projects above materialise, it will be time to reapply. Another option is to develop an application for a Nordic centre of excellence, which is planned in the context of Nordcrit.

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

Lahelma has taken the main responsibility for the compilation of materials for this report, with active contributions from KUFÉ RC members. For example, the text on doctoral training was written by doctoral students. KUFÉ RC had shorter meetings, and 11 members participated in an intensive workshop outside Helsinki focused on reflecting on KUFÉ’s future plans. Everyday life seldom allows us to reflect at length KUFÉ’s future, and this discussion has had some positive impact in our work.

We found the process problematic, as well. One of the many strengths of KUFÉ is its dynamic and flexible character and its aim to lower academic hierarchies, but instructions for this evaluation did not give space to make this strength visible. It was a pity that we could not work across faculty borders and include all KUFÉ members and associates into this process. Unfinished technical innovations, especially the TUHAT system, took a lot of time from the actual evaluation work.
1 Analysis of publications

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Publication type</th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>Total Count 2005 - 2010</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A1 Refereed journal article</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A2 Review in scientific journal</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A3 Contribution to book/other compilations (refereed)</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A4 Article in conference publication (refereed)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B1 Unrefereed journal article</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B2 Contribution to book/other compilations (non-refereed)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B3 Unrefereed article in conference proceedings</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C1 Published scientific monograph</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C2 Edited book, compilation, conference proceeding or special issue of journal</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D1 Articles in professional journal</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D2 Article in professional hand or guide book or in a professional data system, or test book material</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D4 Published development or research report</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D5 Text book or professional handbook or guidebook or dictionary</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E1 Popular article, newspaper article</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E1 Popular contribution to book/other compilations</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E2 Popular monograph</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2 Listing of publications

A1 Refereed journal article

2005


2006


2007


2008


KUFE/Lahelma


2009


2010


A2 Review in scientific journal

2007


A3 Contribution to book/other compilations (refereed)

2005
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KUFELahelma


2006


Vehviläinen, M, Brunila, K 2005, 'From bringing women to technology to situated agency: gender equality in "technology and equality" projects', in 3rd European Gender and ICT Symposium: Working for change: papers.


Isopahkala-Bouret, U 2008, ‘Ill-defined, elastic and incomplete - shifting interpretations of expertise,’.


KUFE/Lahelma


2008
Salo, U 2008, 'Tiedemies, lahjakkaat ja naiset', Tieteessä tapahtuu, vol 26, no. 8, pp. 61-64.

2009

2010

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

2006
KUFELahelma


2007


2009


2010


B3 Unrefereed article in conference proceedings

2005


C1 Published scientific monograph

2005


2006


KUFELahelma

2009

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

2005

2006
Lehtonen, J 2006, Seksaalii- ja sukupuolvähemmistöt Suomen kunnissa: keinoja ja ideologia yhdenvertaisuuden tueksi. ESR tutkimuksel ja selvityset - sarja, no. 8/06, Työministerö, Helsinkin.

2007

2009

2010

D1 Article in professional journal

2005

2007


Lehtonen, J 2007, 'Moninaiset erot haaste sekualaalitehokkuuteen', Terveydenhoitaja, vol 40, no. 9, pp. 8-12.


2008


2009
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Author(s)</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Publication Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>Aaltonen, S</td>
<td>'Don't let me be misunderstood'</td>
<td>Kommentti : nuorisotutkimuksen verkkoanava.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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2007


2009


2010


E1 Popular contribution to book/other compilations

2006


E2 Popular monograph

2005
Brunila, K, Heikkinen, M, Hynninen, P 2005, Difficult but doable: good practices for equality work, Oulu University, Kajaani University Consortium, [Kajaani].

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>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prizes and awards</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Editor of research journal</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Editor of research anthology/confERENCE proceedings</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peer review of manuscripts</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Editor of series</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Editor of special theme number</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment of candidates for academic posts</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Membership or other role in review committee</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Membership or other role in research network</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Membership or other role in national/international committee, council, board</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Membership or other role in public Finnish or international organization</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Membership or other role of body in private company/organisation</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participation in interview for written media</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participation in radio programme</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participation in TV programme</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participation in interview for web based media</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2 Listing of activities 2005-2010

Supervisor or co-supervisor of doctoral thesis

Elina Lahelma,

Tarja H Palmu,

Sirpa Lappalainen,
Immigration Experiences of Intermarried East Asian Women in Finland (in process), Sirpa Lappalainen, 2006 – 2006
Troubling special Ethnography of special education and students in special education (in process), Sirpa Lappalainen, 2007 – 2007
Education, Knowledge and Culture, Sirpa Lappalainen, 2010 – 2010

Ulla-Maija Salo,

Jukka Lehtonen,

Ulpuukka Isopahkala-Bouret,
Väitöskirjan ohjaus, Ulpuukka Isopahkala-Bouret, 2008 – 2008, United States
Väitöskirjan ohjaus, Ulpuukka Isopahkala-Bouret, 2010 – 2010, Finland

Kristiina Brunila,
Doctoral thesis supervisor: Eila Iivalko, Kristiina Brunila, 2009
Doctoral thesis supervisor: Tuuli Kurki, Kristiina Brunila, 2010
KUFE/Lahelma

Prizes and awards
Jukka Lehtonen,
Helsinki University Maikki Friberg Equality Prize, Jukka Lehtonen, 2008

Editor of research journal
Elina Lahelma,
International Consultant, Gender and Education Journal, Elina Lahelma, 2005 → 2010
Member of Editorial Board, Kasvatus, Journal of Educational Sciences, Elina Lahelma, 2008 → 2010, Finland
Member of Editorial Board, Ethnography and Education Journal, Elina Lahelma, 2010 → ...
Tarja H Palmu,
Nordisk Pedagogik, Tarja H Palmu, 01.01.2005 → 31.12.2005
Ethnography and Education -journal, reviewer 2006 – &gt; Tarja H Palmu, 2006 → ...
Ulla-Maija Salo,
Member of editorial board/ Journal of Youth Research, Ulla-Maija Salo, 01,01,2008 → ...
Kristiina Brunila,
Reviewer, Information, Communication &amp; Society, Kristiina Brunila, 01,01,2007 → ...
Sanna Aaltosen,
Nuorisotutkimus -lehden toimitusjohtaja, Sanna Aaltosen, 01,01,2006 → 31.12.2010, Finland
Nuorisotutkimus -lehden 2(25) vastaava toimitaja, Sanna Aaltosen, 2007, Finland

Editor of research anthology/collection/conference proceedings
Elina Lahelma,
Etnografia metodologiana, book published by Vastapaino, Elina Lahelma, 2007 → ..., Finland
Tarja H Palmu,
Book editor: Sukupuoli ja toimijuus koulutuksessa 2009 (Gender and Agency in Education), Tarja H Palmu, 01,04,2007 → 01,04,2009, Finland
Sirpa Lappalainen,
Editor in book Kohtaamisia kasvatukseen ja koulutukseen kentällä, Sirpa Lappalainen, 2005
First editor in edited book Etnografia metodologiana, Sirpa Lappalainen, 2007
Editor in peer reviewed book Yrittäjyyskasvatus hallintana, Sirpa Lappalainen, 2010
Jukka Lehtonen,
Sukupuolitutkimus tutkimusperustaseen opettajakoulutukseen, Jukka Lehtonen, 2010 → 2011
Sanna Aaltosen,
Tytötutkimuksen oppikirjan toimitaja, Sanna Aaltosen, 01,01,2010 → 31,12,2010, Finland

Peer review of manuscripts
Elina Lahelma,
Nuorisotutkimus, member of board and reviewer, Elina Lahelma, 1981 → ..., Finland
Nordisk Pedagogik, Elina Lahelma, 1997 → ..., Norway
Alkukasvatus, 1999, Elina Lahelma, 1999 → ..., Finland
Kasvatus, member of editorial board and reviewer, Elina Lahelma, 1999 → ..., Finland
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KUBE/Lahelma

Naistutkimus, Elina Lahelma, 1999 → ..., Finland
Qualitative Research, Elina Lahelma, 2000 → ..., United States
Gender and Education, International consultant and reviewer, Elina Lahelma, 2002 → ...
Life Long Learning, Elina Lahelma, 2002 → ...
Publications of Nuorisotutkimusseura, Elina Lahelma, 2002 → ...
Young. Nordic Journal of Youth Research, Elina Lahelma, 2003 → ...
International Journal of Educational Research, Elina Lahelma, 2004 → ...
Publications of Gender Equality Commission, Elina Lahelma, 2004 → ...
Qualitative Research, Elina Lahelma, 2005 → ...
Qualitative Sociology, Elina Lahelma, 2005 → ...
Educational Research and Evaluation, Elina Lahelma, 2006 → ...
Qualitative Studies, Elina Lahelma, 2006 → ...
Social Research Methodology, Elina Lahelma, 2006 → ...
Ethnography and Education, editorial board member and reviewer, Elina Lahelma, 2007 → ...
Publications of FERA, Elina Lahelma, 2007 → ...
Publications of Vastapaino, Elina Lahelma, 2008 → ...
Akulkaasuksen vuoksi, Elina Lahelma, 2010 → ...
European Journal of Psychology of Education, Elina Lahelma, 2010 → ...
Scandinavian Journal of Educational Research, Elina Lahelma, 2010 → ...

Tarja H Palmu
Youth research -journal, reviewer 2006 &gt; Tarja H Palmu, 01.01.2006 → ..., Finland

Sirpa Lappalainen
Lapin Yliopisto, Sirpa Lappalainen, 2007 → ...
Nordisk Pedagogik, Sirpa Lappalainen, 01.01.2007 → 31.12.2007
Nordisk Barnehageskoleforsking, Sirpa Lappalainen, 01.01.2008 → 31.12.2008
Vastapaino, Sirpa Lappalainen, 2008 → ...
Suomen Kasvatustiedeillinen Seura, Sirpa Lappalainen, 2009 → ...
Young, Sirpa Lappalainen, 2009 → ...
Ethnography and Education, Sirpa Lappalainen, 2010 → ...
Finnish journal of Youth Studies, Sirpa Lappalainen, 2010 → ...

Ulla-Maija Salo
Reviewer/ The Finnish Journal of Education, Ulla-Maija Salo, 2000 → ...
Reviewer/ Journal of Youth Research, Ulla-Maija Salo, 2006 → ...
Reviewer/ Publications of Vastapaino, Ulla-Maija Salo, 2007 → ...
Reviewer/ Publication series of the Finnish Youth Research Network, Ulla-Maija Salo, 2008 → ...

Jukka Lehtonen
Finnish research journal of youth studies, Jukka Lehtonen, 2004 → ...
Young -Nordic Journal of Youth Research, Jukka Lehtonen, 2006 → ...
Sexualities, Jukka Lehtonen, 2007 → ...
NORA - Nordic Journal of Women’s Studies, Jukka Lehtonen, 2008 → ...
Finnish Journal of Women’s Studies, Jukka Lehtonen, 2009 → ...
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KUFE/Lahelma

Finnish Journal of Educational Research, Jukka Lehtonen, 2010 → ...
Finnish Journal of Psychology, Jukka Lehtonen, 2010 → ...
Sex Roles, A Research Journal, Jukka Lehtonen, 2010 → ...
Kristiina Brunila,
Reviewer, Sexualities in Education -Reader, Kristiina Brunila, 2010 → ...
Katariina Hakala,
Kasvatus ja Aika, Katarina Hakala, 2008 → ..., Finland
Yhdistyksenkasvatus hahmottana, Katarina Hakala, 2009 → ..., Finland
Silja Rajander,
International Journal of Ethnography and Education, Silja Rajander, 01.11.2009 → ...
Sanna Aaltonen,
NORA Nordic Journal of Women's Studies, Sanna Aaltonen, 2007
Young, Sanna Aaltonen, 2008

Editor of series
Ulla-Maija Salo,
Vice member of editorial board, Research in Educational Sciences/ publication series, Ulla-Maija Salo, 01.01.2009 → ...

Editor of special theme number
Elina Lahelma,
Editor of special issue, Kasvatus, Journal of Educational Research, Elina Lahelma, 2007 → ..., Finland
European Journal of Educational Research, Elina Lahelma, 2009
Sirpa Lappalainen,
Finnish educational Research journal, Sirpa Lappalainen, 2010 → 2011

Assessment of candidates for academic posts
Elina Lahelma,
Assessment for professorship, Päivi Naskali, Elina Lahelma, 2005
Statement of Docentship, Vappu Sunnari, Elina Lahelma, 2005
Statement of Docentship, Päivi Harinen, Elina Lahelma, 2008
Statement of Docentship, Päivi Harinen, Elina Lahelma, 2008
Statement of Docentship, Lisa Husu, Elina Lahelma, 2009
Statement of Docentship, Tero Järvinen, Elina Lahelma, 2009
Assessment of docentship, Seija Keskiisto-Foley, Elina Lahelma, 2010
Assessment of readership, Carolyn Jackson, Elina Lahelma, 2010, United Kingdom

Membership or other role in review committee
Elina Lahelma,
Portugals Foundation of Science and Technology, Elina Lahelma, 2005, Portugal
Evaluator of candidates for post doc posts, Elina Lahelma, 2007 → ...
Evaluation of applicants for 3-year grants, Elina Lahelma, 2010
Membership or other role in research network

Elina Lahelma

Member of board, vice chair, Graduate school program Education, Knowledge and Culture, Elina Lahelma, 1995 → ... Finland

Member of Board, Finnish Educational Research Association, Elina Lahelma, 2002 → 2005

Member of the Board, Helsinki Collegium for Advanced Studies, Elina Lahelma, 2002 → 2006, Finland

Member of the Council, European Educational Research Association, Elina Lahelma, 2002 → 2005

Member of the Board, UNESCO Chair in Education, University of Helsinki, Elina Lahelma, 2004 → 2009

Member of the steering group, Department of education, University of Helsinki, Elina Lahelma, 2004 → 2009

Debating member of board, University of Helsinki, Faculty of Behavioural Sciences, Elina Lahelma, 2010 → ... Finland

Debating chair in the local organisation of ECER conference 2010, Elina Lahelma, 2010 → ... Finland

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

Elina Lahelma


Suomen Akatemia (Viksu-tiedekilpailu, lukioklassit, Tarja H Palmu, 01.01.2005 → 31.12.2005, Finland


Tarja H Palmu


Suomen Akatemia (Viksu-tiedekilpailu, lukioklassit, Tarja H Palmu, 01.01.2005 → 31.12.2005, Finland


Viksu-tiedekilpailu (Suomen Akatemia), Tarja H Palmu, 01.01.2008 → 31.12.2008, Finland

Governor in board YUNET (Youth Research University Network) national board 2009 - &gt; Tarja H Palmu, 2009 → ...

Sirpa Lappalainen

Board member, Finnish educational research Association, Sirpa Lappalainen, 2006 → 2007
INTERNATIONAL EVALUATION OF RESEARCH AND DOCTORAL TRAINING AT THE UNIVERSITY OF HELSINKI

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

KAFE/Lahelma

Deputy board member, Nordic Educational Research Association, Sirpa Lappalainen, 2006 → ...
Nordic Educational Research Association (NERA), Sirpa Lappalainen, 01.01.2006 → ...
Deputy board member, Finnish Educational Research Association, Sirpa Lappalainen, 2007 → ...
Suomen kasvatustieteellinen seura, Sirpa Lappalainen, 01.01.2007 → 31.12.2007, Finland
Deputy member of executive group, Sirpa Lappalainen, 01.06.2008 → 31.12.2009, Finland
Membership in a Nordforsk research network NordCIf, Sirpa Lappalainen, 2010 → ...

Ulla-Maija Salo, Member of board/ FERA, Ulla-Maija Salo, 01.01.2008 → ...
Member of Organising Committee/ ECER Helsinki 2010, Ulla-Maija Salo, 13.01.2009 → 27.08.2010

Jukka Lehtonen, Convener of Gender and Education Network of NERA (Nordic educational research association), Jukka Lehtonen, 2010 → ...

Kristiina Brunila, Board member, HY Kääntökyprobitieteen työtkin tutkimustyöryhmä, Kristiina Brunila, 01.01.2007 → 31.12.2007
Board member, Helsingin tutkimustyöryhmä, Kristiina Brunila, 2007 → ...
Board member, Helsingin tutkimustyöryhmä, Kristiina Brunila, 01.01.2007 → 31.12.2007, Finland
Board member, Helsingin yliopiston kääntökyprobitieteen työskentelyryhmä, Kristiina Brunila, 2007 → ...
Secretary, Helsingin yliopiston kääntökyprobitieteen työskentelyryhmä, Kristiina Brunila, 2008 → 2009
Secretary, Helsingin yliopiston kääntökyprobitieteen työskentelyryhmä, Kristiina Brunila, 2008 → 2009
Member, ECPR Standing Group on Gender and Politics, Kristiina Brunila, 2009 → 2011
Member, ATS Adult Education Research Society, Kristiina Brunila, 2010 → 2011
Member, Finnish Association for Legal and Social Sciences, Kristiina Brunila, 2010 → 2011
Member, Finnish Educational Research Association, Kristiina Brunila, 2010 → 2011
Member, Finnish Youth Research Society, Kristiina Brunila, 2010 → 2011

Katarina Hakala, Suomen kasvatustieteellisen Seuran erityisteemarühmä KaFaE, Katarina Hakala, 01.01.2005 → 31.12.2005, Finland
Suomen kasvatustieteellinen seura, Katarina Hakala, 01.01.2005 → 31.12.2005, Finland
Tutkimus Verkosto Koukurou (Koukurou, kasvatustieteen rühmä), Katarina Hakala, 01.01.2005 → 23.09.2005, Finland

Hanna Guttorm, Expert in the Committee of Alleviation of Segregation, Hanna Guttorm, 08.10.2010

Membership or other role in public Finnish or international organization

Elina Lahelma, Member of the high status working group of equal pay, Elina Lahelma, 2008 → 2011
Member of the working group on demolishing gender segregation, Elina Lahelma, 2009 → 2010

Jukka Lehtonen, Member of men’s and media division of The Council of Gender Equality, Jukka Lehtonen, 1996 → 2006
Member vice-member of the Council of International Human Rights in the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Jukka Lehtonen, 1996 → 2007
Member in governmental gender equality report committee, Jukka Lehtonen, 2009 → 2010
Member of steering group of Centre in Gender Equality Information in Finland, Jukka Lehtonen, 2010 → ...
The Council of Gender Equality’s working group on education, Jukka Lehtonen, 2010 → ...

Kristiina Brunila,
Työterveyslaitoksen koordinoiman Monikko (sukupuolten tasa-arvo monimuotoisissa työyhteisöissä) -hankkeen johtoryhmän jäsen, Kristiina Brunila, 01.01.2006 – 31.12.2006, Finland

Membership or other role in private company/organisation

Kristiina Brunila,
Board member, Monikko-project, Kristiina Brunila, 2005 → 2006
Member, ECPR (The ECPR Standing Group on Gender and Politics), Kristiina Brunila, 01.01.2007 → 31.12.2011

Participation in interview for written media

Elina Lahelma,
Etelä-Suomen lääninhallituksen seminaari, Elina Lahelma, 15.09.2005, Finland
Haastattelu ja video Helsingin Yliopiston verikolehdessä, Elina Lahelma, 01.02.2005, Finland
Siltamat, Elina Lahelma, 29.11.2005, Finland
Tiedelehti, Elina Lahelma, 01.11.2005, Finland
Tästä puhutaan: Helsingin yliopiston tiedustelulääsruu nuorouutukmusksesta, Elina Lahelma, 25.05.2005, Finland
Woman-IT leenapäivä: Kasvatukseen tasa-arvosat käytännöt, Elina Lahelma, 19.01.2005, Finland
Öppetaito lehti, Tallinn, Elina Lahelma, 01.09.2005, Finland
Kvinnomis röstätt 100 år seminar, Elina Lahelma, 2006, Finland
Naisten avoiki korkeakoulu: 100 vuotta naisten äänioikeutta -seminaari, Elina Lahelma, 09.10.2006, Finland
Siltamat: Perhe ja tutkijanur -seminaari, Elina Lahelma, 03.10.2006, Finland
Artikkelissa: Kasvaka koarmeissa aikuiseksi? Varmusmies 2/07, 34-46 (Sanna Pöllönen), Elina Lahelma, 2007
Artikkelissa: Pokkalukussa on kiva opiskella, kertovat Okaaisten koulun ekaluokkalaiset, Kaks plus (TERHI FRIMAN, ARTO VIIKARI), Elina Lahelma, 2007
Luento Eduskunnan naisverkoston seminaarissa, Pikku Parlamentti, Elina Lahelma, 09.10.2007, Finland
Luento Helsingin englantilaisessa koulussa, Elina Lahelma, 26.04.2007, Finland
Luento Nuorouutukmus suunnitteluun perustuessaan verkkopäätöksissä, Elina Lahelma, 14.11.2007, Finland
Suomen Kasvatustieteellisen Seuran 40-vuotisjuhla, Kaks plus (TERHI FRIMAN, ARTO VIIKARI), Elina Lahelma, 2007
Västernorrlanderingeröskolan Lihm, Elina Lahelma, 2007
Yliluento Saimaan YH-lyseon vuoksioperaatiossa, Elina Lahelma, 15.09.2007, Finland
Puheenvuoro paneelissa "Kulttuurikontti, Helsinki 16.3.2010, lehdistötee, Elina Lahelma, 2009
Kön och utbildning seminar i Vasa, PF 21.4.2010, pyydetty luento, lehdistöinfoa, Elina Lahelma, 2009
Kö and education seminar in Vasa, PF 21.4.2010, pyydetty luento, lehdistöinfoa, Elina Lahelma, 2009
Me Naiset: haastattelu, Elina Lahelma, 2010

Tarja H Palmo,
Kotinverkkoiheitti, Tarja H Palmo, 01.01.2007 – 31.12.2011, Finland

Sirpa Lappalainen,
Interview in Vihreä lanka: Kansallisuus on esikouluon tärkeää, Sirpa Lappalainen, 01.2006
Interview in Kaks+ magazine 2/2009, Sirpa Lappalainen, 02.2009

Ulla-Maija Salo,
Kida, Lapin yliopiston tiedustelutehtävi 2001. Graduution ohjaukseen varatut tutkimusarot ovat pienentyneet, Ulla-Maija Salo, 2001 → ...
KUFE/Lahelma

**Participation in radio programme**

Tarja H Palmu,
Radio ohjelma: Ionan ystävä, Tarja H Palmu, 01.01.2006 → 31.12.2011, Finland

Radio ohjelma, Kaaoin paikka, Yle 1, Tarja H Palmu, 01.01.2007 → 31.12.2011, Finland

Ulla-Maija Salo,


Riikka Hohti,
Eve Mantu, Riikka Hohti, 31.08.2010, Finland

Sanna Aaltonen,
Keskustelija YLE Radio 1:n puheohjelmassa, Sanna Aaltonen, 13.04.2005, Finland

Haastattelu YLE Tampereen paikallisradiolle, Sanna Aaltonen, 17.11.2006

Haastattelu YLE:n Radio Suomessa, Sanna Aaltonen, 13.12.2006, Finland

Haastattelu YLE:n radiouutisissa, Sanna Aaltonen, 02.12.2006

**Participation in TV programme**

Elina Lahelma,
MTV 3 - Huomenta Suomi, Elina Lahelma, 28.11.2005, Finland


Ulla-Maija Salo,
YLE1, Asiakirjailijat Kirjapi, viikon vieraas 2.12.2006 toimittaja Anna-Maija Vartolan haastateltavana, Ulla-Maija Salo, 2006

Sanna Aaltonen,
Väitiskirjan liityvä haastattelu YLE:n Aamu-tv:ssä, Sanna Aaltonen, 04.12.2006, Finland

Haastattelu Aamu-TV:ssä aiheesta "Hevostallit ja muut tytöjen reviirit", Sanna Aaltonen, 13.02.2008, Finland

PoliisiTV:n haastattelu aiheesta "Sukupuolinen häirintä on tytölle arkipäivä", Sanna Aaltonen, 12.03.2009, Finland

**Participation in interview for web based media**

Elina Lahelma,
Luento Nuoristotutkimuksen valtakunnallisessa verkkokurssissa, Elina Lahelma, 2007


Sanna Aaltonen,
MTV3:n verkkouutistilan haastattelu, Sanna Aaltonen, 01.10.2010, 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 – CoCoLoC
Heikilä, Markku – RCSP
Heinämäa, Sara – SHC
Henriksson, Markku – CITA
Janhunen, Juha – LDHFTA
Kaja Mika, – AMNE
Klippi, Anu – Interaction
Knuuttila, Simo – PPMP
Koskenniemi, Kimmo – BAULT
Lauha, Aila – CECH
Lavento, Mika – ARCH-HU
Lukkarinen, Ville – AHCI
Lyytikäinen, Pirjo – GLW
Mauranen, Anna – LFP
Meinander, Henrik – HIST
Nevalainen, Terttu – VARIENG
Pettersson, Bo – ILLC
Pulkkinen, Tuia – 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 – TRANSURBAN
Haila, Anne – Sociopolis
Hautamäki, Jarkko – CEA
Heinonen, Visa – KUMU
Helén, Ilpo – STS
Hukkinen, Janne – GENU
Jallinoja, Riitta – SBII
Kaartinen, Timo – SCA
Kettunen, Pauli – NordSoc
Kivinen, Markku – FCRES
Koponen, Juhani – DEVERELE
Koskenniemi, Martti – ECI
Kultti, Klaus – EAT
Lahtela, Elina – KUFE
Lanne, Markku – TSEM
Lavonen, Jari – RCMSER
Lehtonen, Risto – SocStats
Lindblom-Yläne, Sari – EdPsychHE
Nieminen, Hannu – MECOL
Nuotio, Kimmo – Law
Nyman, Göte – METEOUS
Ollikainen, Markku – ENFIFO
Pirttilä-Backman, Anna-Maija – DYNASOBIC
Rahkonen, Keijo – CulCap
Roos, J P – HELPS
Simola, Hannu – SOCE-DGI
Sulkunen, Pekka – PosPus
Sumelius, John – AG ECON
Vaattovaara, Mari – STRUTSI
Vainio, Martti – SigMe

The next appendix includes the analyses of the RC under discussion.
Basic statistics

Researcher Community: Cultural and Feminist Studies in Education (KUFE)
Members: 23, with 5 Principal Investigators
Participation category: 1 (community represents the international cutting edge in its field)
Main scientific field: Social sciences (educational sciences; multidisciplinary, draws especially from sociology of education, gender studies, feminist and cultural studies)
Publication data entries into the UH Research Information System within the period 2005–2010: 194

Fig. 1
KUFE: no. of publications per year 2005-2010

Fig. 2
KUFE: outputs in national publication categories 2005-2010
Fig. 3

KUFE: distribution of publications in national classification categories 2005-2010

Number of publications with different authorship patterns, per year and in total

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Count / No. of authors</th>
<th>Columns Year</th>
<th>Grand Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 author</td>
<td>2005 2006 2007 2008 2009 2010</td>
<td>130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 authors</td>
<td>28</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 authors</td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 authors</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 authors</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 authors</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Total</td>
<td>194</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1
KUFE: distribution of single and multi-author publications 2005-2010

1 author; 130; 67%
2 authors; 28; 14%
3 authors; 15; 8%
4 authors; 16; 8%
5 authors; 3; 2%
6 authors; 2; 1%

KUFE: distribution of single author and co-authored publications 2005-2010

1 author; 130; 67%
Co-publications; 64; 33%
Number of publications in different languages, per year and in total

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Count / PURE 2005-2010 publication language</th>
<th>Columns</th>
<th>Grand Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Language</td>
<td>2005</td>
<td>2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>en_English</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fi_Finnish</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>it_Italian</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ja_Japanese</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ru_Russian</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sv_Swedish</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lt_Lithuanian</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Grand Total # of PUBLICATIONS per YEAR

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>194</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2

KUFE: distribution of publication languages in 2005-2010

- English; 43; 22%
- Finnish; 144; 74%
- Italian; 1; 0.5%
- Japanese; 1; 0.5%
- Russian; 1; 0.5%
- Swedish; 3; 2%
- Lithuanian; 1; 0.5%
### Number of KUFE authored contributions to periodicals in descending order

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kasvatus (Finnish Journal of Education / Finnish Educational Research Assoc.)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nuorisotutkimus [Youth Research / Finnish Youth Research Society]</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Naistutkimus [Women’s Studies / Association for Women’s Studies in Finland]</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>European Educational Research Journal</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kommentti: nuorisotutkimuksen verkkokanava</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aikuiskasvatus [Adult Education / Finnish Society for Research on Adult Educ.]</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helsingin Sanomat [National newspaper]</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nordisk Pedagogik [Nordic Studies in Education]</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnography and Education</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender and Education</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Resource Development International</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Journal of Inclusive Education</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lapin Kansa [Regional newspaper]</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nora: Nordic Journal of Feminist and Gender Research</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedagogy, Culture and Society</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tieteesa tapahtuu [Science Now / Federation of Finnish Learned Societies]</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elo [The Guild of Adult Education Magazine]</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Akutumi: viestejä Oulun yliopistosta [Akutumi Magazine / University of Oulu]</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aamattikasvatuksen aikakauskirja [Finnish Journal of Vocational Training]</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dialogi [Magazine of The Natl. Res. and Development Ctr. for Welfare and Health]</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>European Journal of Women's Studies</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information, Communication and Society</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journal of Lesbian Studies</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kasvatus &amp; Aika [Online publication of The History of Education Network]</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ketju [Journal of The Finnish Assoc. on Intellectual and Developmental Disabilities]</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KeVer ammattitöreeksikoulututkimuksen verkkoylehti</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liito [Magazine of The Association of Physical and Health Educators in Finland]</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nettilehti Sysäys [E-journal of The Finland Forward without Discrimination Project]</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norma: nordisk tidsskrift for maskulinitetstudier</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Osaa.net / Rectors' Conference of Finnish Universities of Applied Sciences</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedagogisk Forsknin</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psykologa [Journal of The Finnish Psychological Society]</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qualitative Research</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saaraanhoitaja [Journal of The Finnish Nurses Association]</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seksuaaliterveys : verkostolehti</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sosiologia [Journal for Finnish sociology / The Westermarck Society]</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Studies in Continuing Education</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Särmmä [Youth Magazine / The Finnish Children and Youth Foundation]</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tasa-arvo [Magazine / The Equality Board, Ministry of Social Affairs and Health]</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tekstiiliopettaja [Journal of The Textile Teachers Association]</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terveydenhoitaja [Journal of The Finnish Public Health Nurses Association]</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tulva: feministinen aikakauslehti</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Young: Nordic Journal of Youth Research</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Grand Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>10</strong></td>
<td><strong>7</strong></td>
<td><strong>22</strong></td>
<td><strong>17</strong></td>
<td><strong>15</strong></td>
<td><strong>22</strong></td>
<td><strong>93</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3 shows the 44 periodicals, i.e., journals and yearbooks, in which KUFE has published research articles and other writings over the six-year-period of 2005–2010. Only publications in journal contribution categories were taken into account in this calculation, i.e.,

- refereed contribution to journal / a1 article
- refereed contribution to journal / a2 review
- non-refereed contribution to journal / b1 writing in scientific journal
- contribution to journal / d1 article in professional journal
- contribution to journal / e1 popular article.

Total amount of journal contributions by the members of KUFE in 2005–2010: 93.

While nearly two-thirds (28/44) of the periodicals have published KUFE authored contributions only once, do the repeatedly contributed periodicals account for larger proportion, nearly three-quarters, of KUFE’s journal articles (65/93). On average, each periodical has published 2.11 KUFE authored papers, which indicates some constancy of publication channels.

**Contributions to UHR classified publications 2005–2010**

UHR classified publications are journals or series that fulfill specific criteria given by The Norwegian Association of Higher Education Institutions (UHR). There are two levels: Ordinary publication channels (level 1) and highly prestigious publication channels (level 2).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Count / Norway Journal Levels</th>
<th>Cols</th>
<th>Year</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>Rows</td>
<td>UHR LEVEL (1,2) / JOURNAL TITLE</td>
<td>Year</td>
<td>2005</td>
<td>2006</td>
<td>2007</td>
<td>2008</td>
<td>2009</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Ordinary publication channels</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnography and Education</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Resource Development International</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information, Communication and Society</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Journal of Inclusive Education</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journal of Lesbian Studies</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Naistutkimus (Women’s Studies / Association for Women’s Studies in Finland)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nora: Nordic Journal of Feminist and Gender Research</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nordisk Pedagogik (Nordic Studies in Education)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norma: nordisk tidsskrift for maskulinitetstudier</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedagogisk forskning i Sverige [J. of Swedish Educational Res.]</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedagogy, Culture &amp; Society</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qualitative Research (Sage)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Studies in Continuing Education</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Young: Nordic Journal of Youth Research</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Highly prestigious publication channels</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>European Educational Research Journal</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender and Education</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The European Journal of Women’s Studies</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Total</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4
Only publications in journal contribution categories were taken into account in the calculation, i.e.,
- refereed contribution to journal / a1 article
- refereed contribution to journal / a2 review
- non-refereed contribution to journal / b1 writing in scientific journal
- contribution to journal / d1 article in professional journal
- contribution to journal / e1 popular article.

Total amount of journal contributions by the members of KUFE in 2005–2010: 93.

"Other academic publication channels" are scientific journals, domestic in this case, that have not been proposed to the Norwegian Social Science Data Service register. These should not be confused to journals which, based on UHR criteria, have been classified as "other", i.e., as local scientific periodicals or popular science magazines. Among KUFE’s publication channels there are no journals verified by UHR as “others”.

Total amount of scientific journal contributions by the members of KUFE in 2005–2010 is 70, constituting approximately three-quarters of all journal contributions. Slightly more than half of the scientific articles and writings, 37 precisely, have been published in UHR classified journals.

**Contributions to ERIH classified publications 2005–2010**

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.
Out of the 44 periodicals contributed by the members of KUFE, a total of 14 appear on the ERIH 2007 Initial Lists. All of them are included on the lists for the most focal research domains of KUFE, that is, Pedagogical and Educational Research and Gender Studies. Since the ERIH lists are aimed at serving the humanities research assessment, there are no discipline-specific lists for the other main fields of KUFE, namely sociology and social studies. In Table 5, the discipline-specific lists are indicated by letter codes: (Ped) stands for the Pedagogical and Educational Research List, and (G) respectively for the Gender Studies List.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Count / ERIH 2007 Pedagogical and Educational Research / Gender Studies</th>
<th>Cols</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Grand Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rows</td>
<td>ERIH CAT (A,B,C) / JOURNALS</td>
<td>2005</td>
<td>2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A (INT 1)</td>
<td>European Educational Research Journal (Ped)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>European Journal of Women’s Studies (G)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gender and Education (Ped + G)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Intl. Journal of Inclusive Education (Ped)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B (INT 2)</td>
<td>Ethnography and Education (Ped)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Human Resource Development Intl. (Ped)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Journal of Lesbian Studies (G)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nora: Nordic J. of Feminist and Gender Res. (G)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nordisk Pedagogik (Ped)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pedagogy, Culture and Society (Ped)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Studies in Continuing Education (Ped)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C (NAT)</td>
<td>Aikuiskasvatus [Adult Education] (Ped)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kasvatus [Finnish Journal of Education] (Ped)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Naistutkimus [Women’s Studies] (G)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Total</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5

![KUFE: proportion of different journal contributions in and outside ERIH journal categories in 2005-2010](image)
Only publications in journal contribution categories were taken into account in the calculation, i.e.,
- refereed contribution to journal / a1 article
- refereed contribution to journal / a2 review
- non-refereed contribution to journal / b1 writing in scientific journal
- contribution to journal / d1 article in professional journal
- contribution to journal / e1 popular article.


Scientific journal articles and writings constitute approximately three-quarters of all journal contributions. Approximately two-thirds (47) of all KUFE authored scientific journal contributions have been published in classified ERIH journals.

It should be noted that scholarly journals of high quality may be missing from ERIH, either for being founded three years or less before the closing dates of the second peer-review round (2008–2011), or for not being submitted to ERIH at all.

Recent revision of ERIH caused one change to the categories of KUFE contributed journals:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>ERIH 2007 Initial List</th>
<th>ERIH 2011 Revised List</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nordisk pedagogik (Nordic Educational Research)</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>NAT</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Subcategories INT1 and INT2 on the ERIH 2011 Revised List, together with NAT, may be considered to be equivalents to the former Initial List categories, which were indicated respectively by letters A, B, C.

Consequently, compared to the ERIH 2007 Initial List, the number of KUFE articles in INT2 (B) journal category has decreased from 13 to 10, while the number of articles in NAT (C) journals has increased from 23 to 26.

**Contributions to ERA classified publications 2005–2010**

The Excellence in Research for Australia (ERA) initiative assesses research quality within Australia’s higher education institutions. To support the evaluation, discipline-specific tiered quality rankings have been developed for peer reviewed journals. The tiers for the Australian Journal Ranking indicate overall criterion for quality of papers:

- **A*** = one of the best journals in its field; all papers of a very high quality, influential within the field; acceptance rates typically low; editorial board dominated by field leaders.

- **A** = majority of papers of a very high quality; authors earn credit by getting their papers published in the journal; acceptance rates quite low; editorial board includes a reasonable fraction of well known researchers.

- **B** = journal has solid, but not outstanding reputation; only a few papers of a very high quality; important publication channel for PhD students and early stage researchers; may be regional journals with high acceptance rates; only few leading researchers in editorial boards.

- **C** = quality, peer reviewed journals that do not meet the criteria of the higher tiers.
The table above shows the counts of KUFE contributions to journals which have quality ratings on the ERA 2010 Ranked Journal List.

Only publications in journal contribution categories (a1, a2, b1, d1, e1) were taken into account in the calculation. Total amount of journal contributions by the members of KUFE in 2005–2010: 93. Total amount of scientific journal contributions by the members of KUFE in 2005–2010: 70. Less than half (32) have been published in ERA ranked journals.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aikuiskasvatus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aktuumi: viestejä Oulun yliopistosta</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ammattikasvatuksen aikakauskirja</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dialogi</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elo</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnography and Education</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>European Educational Research Journal</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>European Journal of Women's Studies</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Futura</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender and Education</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helsingin Sanomat</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Resource Development</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information, Communication and Society</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Journal of Inclusive Education</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journal of Lesbian Studies</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kasvatus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kasvatus &amp; Aika</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ketju</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KeVer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kommentti</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lapin Kansa</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liito : Liikunnan ja terveystiedon opettaja</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Naistutkimus</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nettilehti Sysäys</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nora</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nordisk Pedagogik</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norma</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nuorisotutkimus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Osaaja.net</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedagogisk Forskning i Sverige</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedagogy, Culture and Society</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psykologia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qualitative Research</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sairaanhoitaja</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seksuaaliterveys : verkostolehti</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sosiologia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Studies in Continuing Education</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Särmää</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tasa-arvo</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tekstiiliopettaja</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terveydenhoitaja</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tietteessä tapahtuu</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tulva</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>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Contributions to conference publications 2005–2010

Only 5 conference contribution records are linked to KUFE in the UH Research Information System. Since the ERA initiative does not rank conferences either in the fields of educational sciences or social sciences, there are no scientometrical indices available for evaluating the quality of the KUFE contributions. However, one of the conferences attended by KUFE members, namely ESGICT, appears on the ERA 2010 Ranked Conference List in tier C (of good quality, albeit not outstanding).

The KUFE contributions have been published in the proceedings of these 5 conferences:
- The 3rd European Symposium on Gender & ICT (ESGICT) – Working for change. February 1, 2005, Manchester, UK. Organizers: The Open University (UK), Jive Project (UK Resource Centre for Women in Science Engineering and Technology, Bradford College), Women in Northwest IT (WINWIT, Salford University, UK), Women and Information Society Project (WomenIT, Finland), The Danish Society of Engineers, The Dutch Gender and Technology Association.

UHR authorized publishers of KUFE books and book contributions 2005–2010

The classification criteria of The Norwegian Association of Higher Education Institutions (UHR) is applied not only to evaluate journals and series, but to point out publishers’ scientific level, too. There are two levels: ordinary publishers (Level 1) and highly prestigious publishers (Level 2). The UHR list of publishers contains 2,333 publishers in total.

In the case of “other” scientific level (Table 7a), a publisher may be newly proposed for the UHR Publication Committee, or publisher’s peer review practices may be varied or unclear. The “unknown” category (Table 7b) includes publishers who do not appear on the UHR list.

In total, KUFE members have used 33 different publishers as publication channels for their monographs. vi

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rows</th>
<th>UHR Trims_Publisher</th>
<th>UHR Publisher Level</th>
<th>Year 2005</th>
<th>Year 2006</th>
<th>Year 2007</th>
<th>Year 2008</th>
<th>Year 2009</th>
<th>Year 2010</th>
<th>Grand Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Level 1</td>
<td></td>
<td>Finnish Literature Society</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Unicopli (Italy)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Vastapaino (Finland)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>WSOY (Finland)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>other</td>
<td></td>
<td>Otava (Finland)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Symposium Journals (United Kingdom) vi</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>University of Oulu, Kajaani University Consortium</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Total</td>
<td># PUBLICATIONS through UHR VERIFIED BOOK PUBLISHERS</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>37</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 7a
### Table 7b

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>UHR LEVEL (unknown) / PUBLISHER</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>unknown</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ajatus kirjat (~2009, Finland)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Akatiimi Research and Publication Service (Finland)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Organisation of Finnish Trade Unions (SAK)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finnish AIDS Council (Finland)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finnish Educational Research Association</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finnish League for Human Rights</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finnish National Board of Education</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finnish Social Science Data Archive (FSD), Centre for Gender Equality Information in Finland</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finnish Youth Research Society</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harrington Park Press (United States)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helmer (Germany)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tomsk State Pedagogical University (Russia)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laurea University of Applied Sciences (Finland)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>London South Bank University, Families &amp; Social Capital Research Group</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ministry of Labour (Finland)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ministry of Social Affairs and Health (Finland)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Institute for Health and Welfare (THL, Finland)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PS-Kustannus (Finland)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sakurai Shoten (Japan)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Save the Children Finland</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tampere University Press</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Union of Salaried Employees (Finland)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Joensuu</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Lapland</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Tampere, Dept. of Education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vytauto Didžiojo (Vytautas Magnus) University (Lithuania)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Grand Total # of BOOKS AND BOOK CONTRIBUTIONS BY YEAR AND IN TOTAL**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>93</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Table 7b**

![KUF: proportion of UHR verified and unverified publishers for books and book contributions in 2005-2010](image)

**Fig. 10**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Publisher</th>
<th>a3 refereed contribution to book</th>
<th>b2 non-refereed contribution to book</th>
<th>c1 scientific monograph</th>
<th>c2 edited book or compilation</th>
<th>d1 article in professional book or journal</th>
<th>d2 article in book of professional interest</th>
<th>e1 popular contribution to book</th>
<th>e2 popular monograph</th>
<th>Total of publications</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ajetus kirjat</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Akatiimi</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finnish AIDS Council</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finnish Educational Research Association</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finnish League for Human Rights</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finnish Literature Society</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finnish National Board of Education</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finnish Social Science Data Archive (FSD), Centre for Gender Equality Information in Finland</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finnish Youth Research Society</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harrington Park Press</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helmer</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Izdatel'sto Tomskogo gosudarstvennogo pedagogiceskogo universiteta</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laurea University of Applied Sciences</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>London South Bank University, Families &amp; Social Capital Research Group</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ministry of Labour</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ministry of Social Affairs and Health</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Institute for Health and Welfare</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Otava</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PS-Kustannus</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAK, Central Organisation of Finnish Trade Unions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sakurai Shoten</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Save the Children Finland</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Symposium Books</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tampere University Press</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unicopi</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Union of Salareed Employees</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Joensuu</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Lapland</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Oulu, Kajaani University Consortium</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Tampere, Dept. of Education</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vastapaino</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WSOY</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vytauto Didliojo (Vytautas Magnus) University</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Total</td>
<td><strong>49</strong></td>
<td><strong>19</strong></td>
<td><strong>4</strong></td>
<td><strong>9</strong></td>
<td><strong>6</strong></td>
<td><strong>1</strong></td>
<td><strong>3</strong></td>
<td><strong>2</strong></td>
<td><strong>93</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Some additional bibliometric measures

Fig. 11-13

KUFE: countries of publication 2005-2010

- United States; 3; 1.5%
- Finland; 154; 79%
- United Kingdom; 23; 12%
- Sweden; 4; 2%
- Norway; 3; 1.5%
- Russia; 2; 1%
- Lithuania; 1; 0.6%
- Japan; 1; 0.6%
- Italy; 1; 0.6%
- India; 1; 0.6%
- Germany; 1; 0.6%
- France; 8; 4%
- China; 6; 3%
- The rest of Europe; 5; 3%
- The rest of the world; 26; 13%
- Nordic countries; 2; 1%

KUFE: national vs. international publishing

- National; 134; 69%
- International; 60; 31%

KUFE: countries of publication in groups

- Finland
- Nordic countries
- The rest of Europe
- Anglosphere (UK, US)
- The rest of the world
The KUFE PIs:
The Institute of Behavioural Sciences, Educational sciences
- Elina Lahelma, Professor
- Sirpa Lappalainen, Postdoctoral Researcher
- Tarja Palmu, Senior Research Fellow
- Ulla-Maija Salo, University Lecturer
The Finnish Youth Research Network
- Sanna Aaltonen, Senior Researcher.

The primary RC publication data was extracted from the University of Helsinki Research Information System TUHAT in April 8, 2011, and collectively prepared for further analyzing in May 12, 2011, at the Helsinki University City Centre Campus Library. Contact concerning the analysis of KUFE RIS publication data: P. Kaihoja, Librarian, City Centre Campus Library / Behavioural Sciences.

The national categories for publication types have been defined by the Ministry of Education and Culture of Finland.

Journals that commenced in 2008 have been considered too new to be assigned a quality rating on the ERA 2010 Journal List. A total of 397 proposed journals were considered not to meet the criteria for inclusion. A total of 20,712 peer reviewed journals are included. In order to distinguish core publications to different fields of research (FoR) and to derive citation benchmarks, The Australian Research Council (ARC) has consulted Scopus based citation analysis services.

The ERA 2010 Ranked Conference List relates to the ERA 2010 reference period of 2003–2008. The rankings should not be used to make subsequent assessments about the current state of conferences.

The calculations were based on publication records in these national classification categories:
- a3 refereed contribution to book
- non-referred contribution to book b2
- scientific book (monograph) c1
- edited book or compilation c2
- article in handbook or textbook d2
- textbook or professional handbook d5
- popular contribution to book e1
- popular book or anthology e2.

Symposium Journals, a sister publishing house of Symposium Books Ltd, Didcot, Oxford, UK.