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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  
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1 Introduction to the Evaluation

1.1 RC-specific evaluation reports

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

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

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

1.2 Aims and objectives in the evaluation

The aims of the evaluation are as follows:

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

1.3 Evaluation method

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

---

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 panelists 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”.

10
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.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

**Question 9 – CATEGORY**

**Participation category – fitness for the category chosen**

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

---

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

The main timetable of the evaluation:

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

The set of related topics making up the HELPS RC, deal with helping between generations, reproduction, aging, welfare in general as well as in connection with social security and social policy. The HELPS acronym fits very nicely the focus of the RC.

The research team has a long and many-sided experience in various research methods. It is made up of a group of principal investigators/senior researchers, with specific research interests most of them associated to the GENTRANS study in 2007, the VASTUU Doctoral Program and the Aging, Welfare and Technology Doctoral Program, and related projects.

The group has an appreciable number of publications. Most publications are in Finnish (79%), and only 15% are in English, which seriously hinders to this reader the possibility of looking into more detail their written production.

Out of 340 publications 211, that is to say about two thirds are journal articles, of which 20% have been published in a ranked journal, and 45% of the articles are popular or newspaper articles. Clearly, this seems to be a preferred communication channel addressed to the large media audience. Since this RC has emphasized the societal impact, another preferred means of communication are monographs.

**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

The three pillars of the HELPS RC are the Gentrans research project, the VASTUU Social Policy Doctoral program and the Aging, Welfare and Technology doctoral program.

The VASTUU program is very selective, based on the Academy of Finland grading system. In the first selection in 2010, out of 60 applicants finally 8 were accepted. There is close student monitoring through the training period, with good cooperation and good convivial spirit within the group.

It is said that the places of the doctoral program will be open to all EU applicants. In such case, more emphasis will have to be placed in the offer of seminars and courses in English.
The Department of Social Policy is the oldest such department in Finland and one of the largest departments at the Faculty of Social Sciences, although by international standards it is relatively small (two tenured positions in social policy and one fixed five-year professor in aging research). In addition there are temporary professors and a few tenured university lecturers and senior researchers funded by the Academy of Finland and other research sources. Ageing research is the most recent of the Department’s study programs, having started in 2002. All Finnish university departments of Social Policy are members of the Finnish Graduate School in Social Policy, which is coordinated by the Department of Social and Public Policy at the University of Helsinki.

Although it receives foreign students most of the research is intended to be relevant to Finnish society in its wellbeing and welfare state dimensions and often seminars are given in Finnish. However, the summer schools and methods seminars, with more international participants, are normally delivered in English.

The application of rigorous selection rules for entering students, the existence of high-quality supervisors, and a well-funded thematic doctoral program is a good basis for this innovative initiative. Research collaborations with research institutes in other countries, particularly in Africa and other needy regions, and greater exposure, interactions and continued engagement are the main challenges the RC faces.

The submission does not make it very clear for an outside reader for it lacks details about the organization of the doctoral program between participant institutions throughout Finland, with headquarters in UH, how does it cope with a variety of full and part-time doctoral students and how the mix between national and foreign students is expected to work given the very Finnish thematic approach.

**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

A strong societal impact may be expected in view of the nature of the research topics in this RC. Impact is shown by numerous interactions with the popular press through written interviews and popular articles, as well as through participation in radio and TV programs, as well as by their popular monographs and contributions to books and other compilations.

Changes in the governance structure of Finnish society are rapidly changing the scenario of allies and possible employers for graduates, and the private sector may come to need more specialists graduated from this Program. The challenges facing Finnish society – pensions, shortage of new employees, the needs for social services and health care, the demographic dependence ratio, gendered divisions of care, etc. requires scholars capable of dealing with such issues, with reasonably good knowledge of the institutions making up the welfare state, their adjustments and welfare consequences.

**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

Researchers of HELPS seem to have a well-knit network of contacts among researchers and research organisation in Finland and some other countries. In Finland the RC is a natural attraction centre because of the tradition of the social policy program and the dynamism of the group. They try to expand their contacts and encourage students to visit other institutions. In fact students have been able to participate in the doctoral programs of institutions in Britain, Germany, Russia, Norway, Italy, and Luxemburg. The reciprocal is not so clear, in function of the language difficulties for people from other countries. That is why we wonder about the language of teaching in the doctoral program. How do they cope with their interest in Finnish problems and their comparative approach. A broad international support is desirable, also to make better known the rich welfare experience of Finland.

The RC also has many good interactions with the community beyond academia.

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

Research infrastructure in UH is said to be quite developed. No particular indication is given as to conditions in which the doctoral program functions with students attached to their chosen university in Finland, although it is said that in the framework of this evaluation, only students of the UH are included.

The submission recognizes that the teaching of research methods was unsatisfactory but has recently been improved.

Efforts are continuously being made to improve and expand their teaching activities. There is awareness in the group that the fact of not having participated in SHARE or Generation and Gender surveys prevents Finland from having important comparative data. Indeed one of the aims of the RC is to get Finnish participation in those surveys.

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

It gives the impression that that Prof. Roos is actually exerting the managerial leadership of the group from his position as director of the GENTRAM project and the VASTUU program, and from what he says of having collaborated closely with all the members of the RC.
The question of leadership and management is not really answered. There is an appeal to freedom and autonomy of scientific research. In practical terms, leadership is exercised by the most experienced senior researchers who “lead” the various projects making up the thematic focus of the RC. The RC strengths lie in the combined experience of its members, their high standing and productivity. The theoretical implications of their research interests are among the areas to be developed given the current transition in social thinking about welfare, well-being and social justice.

The RC is critical of what it considers to be too much bureaucratic demand for planning and evaluation of on-going research and argue that there is risk of leading to unduly homogenisation. They admit, nonetheless, that the RC was itself created expressly for the current evaluation purpose, in the expectation that it may help in building a real community.

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

The figures mentioned in this item do not seem very impressive. The RC has attracted funding from the Academy and also from some other national sources. However, the international funding is non existent and could be higher if a clear strategy towards Europe is developed. And it is not clear from the submission whether the current level of funding is sufficient to cover the planned activities of the RC and its planned development.

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

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

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

The submission provides us with a very broad description of the RC’s future perspectives in respect to research and doctoral training and not a true action plan.

The RC is preparing the second round of the Gentram study that ought to provide important data.

We may infer that social policy has evolved through the years into an academic discipline and a scientific society in Finland with clear Finnish features, and that social policy is growing in importance. The current changes in the welfare state in Finland resulting from demographic changes, competitiveness and equality, pose new questions about financing, cost-shifting, flexicurity, innovative diffusion, etc. The RC expects to pay renewed attention to well-being and care in policy-making and welfare policies.

It is suggested that maybe a fresh look at such developments in light of global challenges, social inclusion and inequality as a defining feature of current global society may provide a useful comparative approach.
2.9 Evaluation of the category of the RC in the context of entity of the evaluation material (1-8)

The RC’s fitness to the chosen participation category. Category 5. The research of the participating community has a highly significant societal impact.

The participation category seems to be well chosen: 5, but the justification for the selected participation category in Stage 1 material escapes the comprehension of this evaluator. There is a “but” which seems to be beside the point, when it says that “the research community is of good quality BUT it strives for a significant societal impact.” Most of all, it is difficult to understand what the second sentence stands for. What are the secondary PI Research communities that fill the other slots already? What are the other slots? What are the secondary PI research communities?

Numeric evaluation: 4 (Excellent)

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

It was a joint effort. All members have participated, with a single rapporteur. This may be an advantage in terms of producing a consistent text.

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

Focus area 9: Social justice

It simply mentions that it develops the UH focus area corresponding to Social justice.

2.12 RC-specific main recommendations

The RC is very well positioned in Finland. The group might benefit from expanding its outlook on a more comparative perspective and increase its international visibility and interactions. This is already done in the summer school but the program might be usefully expanded in this sense, with research collaborations with research groups in other countries, particularly in needy regions and greater exposure and continuous engagement.

The RC might find it useful to look into novel forms of interacting with non-scientific partners, besides those which it already deployed with effectiveness, which include mostly presentations in seminar and conferences, written interviews, participation in ration and TV programs and monographs and popular books.

The RC would seem to be in very good situation to explore sources of international funding, particularly if it enlarges its scope on a more comparative vein, based on the rich Finnish experience in social policies.

2.13 RC-specific conclusions

Very good group that concentrates on an important topic that has a strong tradition in Finland.

A challenger the near future is to become more international both in terms of getting the Finnish approach to be better known internationally as to benefit from a more comparative perspective.
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INTERNATIONAL EVALUATION OF RESEARCH AND DOCTORAL TRAINING
AT THE UNIVERSITY OF HELSINKI 2005-2010

RC-SPECIFIC MATERIAL FOR THE PEER REVIEW

NAME OF THE RESEARCHER COMMUNITY:
Helping between generations, reproduction, aging, and social policy (HELPS)

LEADER OF THE RESEARCHER COMMUNITY:
Professor J P Roos, Department of Social Science Research

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: Roos, J P
E-mail:
Phone: 19124582
Affiliation: Department of Social Science Research
Street address: Snellmanink 10

2 DESCRIPTION OF THE PARTICIPATING RESEARCHER COMMUNITY (RC)

Name of the participating RC (max. 30 characters): Helping between generations, reproduction, aging, and social policy
Acronym for the participating RC (max. 10 characters): HELPS
Description of the operational basis in 2005-2010 (eg. research collaboration, joint doctoral training activities) on which the RC was formed (MAX. 2200 characters with spaces): The research community is based on the doctoral training program Vastuu and the research projects Gentrans, GOAL (Ikihyvä Päijät-Häme), Reproductive behavior in contemporary societies, and Valinnat terveydenhuollon hoitokäytänteissä in the Department of social science research, Väestöliitto and Faculty of Theology. It includes some researchers doing related work or supervising Vastuu students, but not involved in the research projects.

3 SCIENTIFIC FIELDS OF THE RC

Main scientific field of the RC’s research: social sciences
RC’s scientific subfield 1: Social Issues
RC’s scientific subfield 2: Gerontology
RC’s scientific subfield 3: --Select--
RC’s scientific subfield 4: --Select--
Other, if not in the list:

4 RC’S PARTICIPATION CATEGORY

Participation category: 5. Research of the participating community has a highly significant societal impact
Justification for the selected participation category (MAX. 2200 characters with spaces): The research community is of good quality but it strives for a significant societal impact. A secondary reason is that the secondary PI Research communities fill the other slots already
5 DESCRIPTION OF THE RC'S RESEARCH AND DOCTORAL TRAINING

Public description of the RC's research and doctoral training (MAX. 2200 characters with spaces): The RC has a doctoral candidate network comprising mainly of doctoral candidates in social policy and partly financed by the Vastuu doctoral program. Its research has to do with three connected fields: helping and altruism, generations and reproduction, intergenerational relations and aging.

Significance of the RC's research and doctoral training for the University of Helsinki (MAX. 2200 characters with spaces): The research undertaken is the specialty of department of Social science research and the doctoral program is the only one in social policy.

Keywords: generations, aging, transfers between generations, reproduction, social policy

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): This is a research community based on the other hand long research cooperation between the members and a recently started doctoral programme, the results of which will begin to come in the years 2011-2013. Some of the doctoral candidates have started before this

Comments on how the RC's scientific productivity and doctoral training should be evaluated (MAX. 2200 characters with spaces): The RC encourages all the doctoral candidates to publish journal articles and present conference papers well before the completion of the PhDThesis. Most of our doctoral candidates now strive to write an article thesis.

As to general publication strategy, we try to publish in a way which is most relevant has the greatest practical impact. This means that many publications will have to be in Finnish. Still, we also try to see to it that our central results and theoretical contributions will be published in english, both as conference papers and later as articles.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Last name</th>
<th>First name</th>
<th>PI-status (TUHAT-check, lista 29.11.)</th>
<th>Title of research and teaching personnel</th>
<th>Affiliation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>J P Roos</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>Dept social science research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haavio-Mannila</td>
<td>Elina</td>
<td></td>
<td>Professor emerita</td>
<td>Dept social science research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karisto</td>
<td>Antti</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>Dept social science research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seppälä</td>
<td>Ulla-Maija</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>Professor, Docent</td>
<td>Dept social science research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teppo</td>
<td>Annika</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>University lecturer, Docent</td>
<td>Dept social science research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sulander</td>
<td>Tommi</td>
<td></td>
<td>Postdoctoral researcher, Docent</td>
<td>Ikäinstituutti</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rotkirch</td>
<td>Anna</td>
<td></td>
<td>Research director, Docent</td>
<td>Väestöliitto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Silvasti</td>
<td>Tiina</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>University lecturer, Docent</td>
<td>Dept social science research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hämäläinen</td>
<td>Hans</td>
<td></td>
<td>Doctoral candidate</td>
<td>Dept social science research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isola</td>
<td>Anna-Maria</td>
<td></td>
<td>Doctoral candidate</td>
<td>Dept social science research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Majamaa</td>
<td>Karoliina</td>
<td></td>
<td>Doctoral candidate</td>
<td>Dept social science research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pekkarinen</td>
<td>Sanna</td>
<td></td>
<td>Doctoral candidate</td>
<td>Dept social science research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tanskanen</td>
<td>Antti</td>
<td></td>
<td>Doctoral candidate</td>
<td>Dept social science research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Määttä</td>
<td>Anne</td>
<td></td>
<td>Doctoral candidate</td>
<td>Dept social science research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kashaga</td>
<td>Frateline</td>
<td></td>
<td>Doctoral candidate</td>
<td>Dept social science research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mudi-Okorodudu</td>
<td>Cristal</td>
<td></td>
<td>Doctoral candidate</td>
<td>Dept social science research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meincke</td>
<td>Mirkka</td>
<td></td>
<td>Doctoral candidate</td>
<td>Dept of history</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Danielsbacka</td>
<td>Mirkka</td>
<td></td>
<td>Doctoral candidate</td>
<td>Dept social science research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valkendorff</td>
<td>Tiina</td>
<td></td>
<td>Doctoral candidate</td>
<td>Dept social science research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lämsä</td>
<td>Rikka</td>
<td></td>
<td>Doctoral candidate</td>
<td>Dept social science research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kuronen</td>
<td>Tanja</td>
<td></td>
<td>Doctoral candidate</td>
<td>Dept social science research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tapanila</td>
<td>Tiina</td>
<td></td>
<td>Doctoral candidate</td>
<td>Dept social science research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nurminnen</td>
<td>Eija</td>
<td></td>
<td>University lecturer</td>
<td>Dept social science research</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Name of the RC’s responsible person: Roos, J P
E-mail of the RC’s responsible person: 

Name and acronym of the participating RC: Helping between generations, reproduction, aging and social policy, HELPS

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: Generational policies and aging are an important new area of social policy which is related to social justice both directly and indirectly. Reproduction is again an important factor in connection with generations. Both are also related to welfare in general, as well as to social security. As people age, their family relationships have special significance, both for their expectation of life and for their need of institutional care and general health. The questions of helping are an important aspect of both social justice and welfare.

1. Focus and Quality of RC’s Research (max. 8800 characters with spaces)

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

The following questions are in the focus of the HELPS RC: the life situation of the Finnish baby boomers as a large ageing and mostly retired generation, how this generation receives and gives different kinds of help and what consequences this has for the development of the welfare state. We are also interested in comparisons with the situation of European countries (in the framework of the SHARE project). We are interested in health and ageing, as well as fertility behavior.

The principal investigators/senior researchers of the RC have following specific research interests:

Professor emerita Elina Haavio-Mannila: comparing giving and receiving practical and financial help by relatives and friends in Europe. Because life expectancy increases and the demographic composition of the population changes, it is important to know how much and what kind of informal help there is in addition to public services. Her research is based on surveys and qualitative interviews of the baby boomers and their children and parents who were investigated in the Finnish Gentrans study in 2007. Comparisons will be made with SHARE surveys conducted in 14 other European countries. Haavio-Mannila has collaborated actively with both other PI:s and doctoral students of the HELPS community. She does not have officially named doctoral students but she gives guidance to many of them.

Professor Antti Karisto;

Ageing studies, related especially to post-retirement migration, baby boomers and “third age”. He is also responsible for the doctoral program “Aging, well-being and technology”, one of whose doctoral students (Kuronen) are included in the HELPS RC.

Antti Karisto has 10 PhD students who have already finished their studies during 2005-2010, and he has now three HELPS PhD’s. Karolliina Majamaa, Tiina Kuronen and Tiina Koskimäki (Tapanila) in addition to 10 others.
INTERNATIONAL EVALUATION OF RESEARCH AND DOCTORAL TRAINING AT THE UNIVERSITY OF HELSINKI

RC-SPECIFIC STAGE 2 MATERIAL

Professor J P Roos:
Roos is the director of both Gentrans-research project and Vastuu doctoral program. His main research interest has been to develop the comparative study of intergenerational relationships, especially from the baby boomer point of view. He has collaborated closely with all of the researchers in the RC.
Roos is supervising Hans Hämäläinen (Helping patterns), Sanna Pekkarinen (Development of unemployment insurance), Antti Tanskanen (short time work/ grandparental interaction with grandchildren), Anne Määttä (people in problem situations), Frateline Kashaga (Healing and religious beliefs), Christal Mudi Okorodudu (Urban poverty and resilience), Maylin Meincke (Traditional healers in Namibia), Mirikka Danielsbacka (Evolution and grandparenting) and Eija Nurminen (Life stories of academic couples)

Adjunct professor (docent), Director of research unit of Väestöliitto Anna Rotkirch:
Fertility and family policies, how nations and citizens respond to family policy incentives aimed at raising fertility and reducing the challenges of ageing societies.
Intergenerational transmissions: importance of grandparenting in Finland, forms of grandparental assistance to grandchildren and their parents, how lineage and sex affects biases in grandparental care provision.
She has one HELPS/Vastuu PhD student, Anna-Maria Isola who is finishing a PhD thesis on national fertility policies, but she has cooperated closely with Danielsbacka and Tanskanen.

Adjunct professor Ullamaja Seppälä: Health and illness. How do people experience illnesses, how does illness affect their everyday lives. She has been studying people with epilepsy, mental disorders, learning disabilities and also discussions around rehabilitation. Seppälä supervised in 2004-2006 a project funded by UH, "Terveyden valinnat – Health choices" together with Jaana Hallamaa, professor of social ethics. Two theses were completed during the project. Seppälä has also worked as a research Director for Rehabilitation foundation – Centre for Rehabilitation Research and Development in 2008 - 2010. During that time she was leading several research projects. Seppälä has three HELPS students (in addition to several others):
Riikka Lämsä and Tiina Valkendorff, connected with the project Health choices. Lämsä is writing her thesis, The "Patient in Hospital - an ethnographic study of patienthood". The study is based on ethnographic fieldwork in three Finnish hospital wards. Tiina Valkendorff’s research interest has focused on eating disorders based on the study of internet discussions. The study focuses on people with disorders, and the question of recovery from the disease. Her perspectives are the theories of religion and life politics. She is also supervising Anne Määttä.

Adjunct professor, senior researcher Tommi Sulander:
Health and aging. He is conducting a research project on this subject financed by the Institute of Health and Welfare.
Sulander is giving guidance on methods to most of the Vastuu students and his research interests are closely related to those of Karisto and Seppälä.

Ways to strengthen the focus and improve the quality of the RC’s research.
The main means to improve research quality is continued writing and submission of articles and participation in conferences. We also strive to strengthen the cooperation of students, other researchers and teachers by arranging meetings and seminars. Reading and commenting the
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manuscripts of the other participants of the RC is actively supported. Also writing popular articles in newspapers and other than scientific journals and in the internet is strongly encouraged.

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

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

There are three main poles of the HELPS RC: the Gentrans research project and the Vastuu (Finnish Social Policy) and Aging, welfare and technology doctoral programs. Student enrolment has taken place at two levels. Open EU-wide selection was and will be central and open to all qualified candidates who apply for the funding regardless of locality or nationality. The criteria are the following: Excellent grades in MA studies in Finland or abroad, an excellent research plan which has practical significance, recommendations of two well-qualified academics, mastery of both quantitative and qualitative research methods. Additional merits are publications in international referee journals or otherwise of very high quality. The students will be attached to their chosen university in Finland. In the framework of this evaluation, only students of the University of Helsinki will be included.

The doctoral programs accept also students with independent funding. In this case the criteria will be the same, but with more emphasis on already proven scientific activity. Also here, students from abroad will be accepted. However, the doctoral program will not be exclusively in English language, as most of the research will be relevant for the Finnish society. The language used will depend of the subject and the composition of the seminar. The summer schools and methods seminars, with many international participants, will be normally held in English.

In the first selection of VASTUU(2010), we had over 60 applications, one third of which from abroad. After initial selection, we sent about 30 applications which fulfilled the criteria, to two referees each. The referees were selected from among the domestic and international network of the Vastuu programs and they were not supervisors of the applicants (or from the same department). If the referees disagreed strongly in their grading and at least one referee gave high marks to the applicant, we asked the opinion of a third referee. The grading was based on the Academy of Finland grading system. The final selection was based on the points given and the required time periods. This made possible to divide the 8 places among 16 applicants altogether. The system is transparent and the VASTUU shall not allow any exceptions from these general rules.

The places of the doctoral program will be equally open to all EU applicants. There will be no discrimination on the basis of nationality or ethnicity (or sex). The recruitment will take place actively via the European social policy network. There will be active student exchange between the cooperating universities. In the present VASTUU program, there are two foreign students and several self-financed foreign students. While its focus shall be in well-being and welfare state in Finland, it nevertheless has strong comparative, European and global components that allow it recruit talented individuals from different countries without a prior knowledge on Finnish society. The VASTUU will also systematically exploit colleagues in different countries by linking their visits in Finland to various events organized by the VASTUU, thereby providing added value for all partners involved. We have tried to develop an extensive network of supervisors.
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We follow the progress of the Vastuu-financed doctoral students closely and in case of failure, can even terminate financing. On the other hand, the students are given intensive guidance and have been selected carefully, so it is highly probable that they will succeed. We also respect their autonomy and freedom of research. We encourage active and continuous publication activity with a view of improving one’s possibilities of recruitment. A too single-minded concentration on the thesis only is not the best way to ensure employability.

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

The RC includes a well financed thematic doctoral program, with high-quality supervisors, very selective intake, close cooperation between senior and junior members of the group and a good spirit inside the group. We have highly motivated and talented students with initiatives and ideas, creating spinoffs from supervisor-student cooperation in the forms of joint articles and journal interviews.

With regard to doctoral training, we should work towards the provision of funding for full time doctoral study and organizing seminars and workshops on methods and theories. In the future we could initiate/expand research collaborations/exchange with research institutes in the South (e.g. Africa). The goal is to develop and strengthen researchers/PhD students through exposure, interactions and engagement.

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).

Our main partners outside the university are the state and local government research institutes and also social policy oriented professional colleges (such as the Diaconia University of Applied Sciences). The graduates will normally be employed by state and local government institutions as well as various NGO’s (which is a flourishing and rather well-funded field in Finland). The private sector has historically employed fewer social policy graduates, although some of our PhD graduates find employment in the private research institutes, in particularly in pension and health and social services. This is now rapidly changing due to the changes in the governance structures, in particularly in services but also in some transfers.

The principal investigators take active part in the public debate and disseminate the results of their research work. The more junior members are also encouraged to take part in debates and go out and give lectures and interviews on their research. Some doctoral students (eg Danielsbacka, Tanskanen) have been visible in the Finnish media and also contribute to the general discussion on scientific policies in Finland, e.g. related to availability of large data sets to scholars.

Most if not all of the members are active in third sector activities and work with organizations that are important for the functioning of the civil society. They include organization for the aged, disabled, child protection, human rights etc. The research group members are presently or have been working in third sector (Finnish Family Federation, Finnish rehabilitation foundation, Diaconia university of applied sciences, etc). The Vastuu doctoral school is closely associated with these organizations also.

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

The participants should accept invitations to give presentations in conferences and seminars organized by non-scientific actors, for example, voluntary organizations, commercial enterprises, state and municipal committees and councils, trade unions etc. It takes time but it also clarifies one’s own
thoughts. It is also important to share research results with journalists and TV and radio reporters and give statements in popular arena.

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

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

Researchers of the HELPS RC are in close contact with other Finnish research organisations, for example, Statistics Finland, National Institute of Health and Welfare (THL), Finnish Family Federation (Väestöliitto), Ageing institute (Ikäinstituutti) and social science departments in the other universities. Yearly conferences of the national social policy and sociology associations function also as contact forums. Students are encouraged to participate in these events. We encourage students to apply for positions in doctoral programs abroad and make our best to ease their contacts. We have discussed with professors from the European University in Florence the lack of applications from Finland, and will encourage our students to seek high quality foreign study places.

We have reached (informal, based on our personal contacts) agreements in the framework of either Gentrans or Vastuu with following departments and institutions regarding research cooperation and student supervision and exchange:

- LSE Department of Social Policy
- Cambridge University, Department of Sociology
- European University Institute
- Swedish Social Research Institute
- NOVA, Norwegian Social Research Institute
- Soclife doctoral program, University of Cologne
- European University in St Petersburg
- REASSESS Centre of Excellence
- RECWOWE (Reconciling Work and Welfare in Europe)
- Luxembourg Income Study Centre
- Liverpool Hope University, Department of Social Policy and Sociology
- City university of London, Department of Sociology

In practice, this has meant that our students have been able to participate in the doctoral programmes of these institutes and they have contributed in the referee process as well as supervision. We are planning to extend this to regular exchange so that we will also receive some students from the cooperating institutions. Presently we are discussing possibilities of cooperation with the Department of social policy and intervention, University of Oxford where two of the senior researchers of the RC are working for the academic year 2010-2011.

The students of the doctoral program will be encouraged to apply to visit other institutions, such as EUI. In our summer schools, we will invite some foreign teachers from our network. Furthermore, they will be required to present at least once a year papers in international conferences and take part in them.
INTERNATIONAL EVALUATION OF RESEARCH AND DOCTORAL TRAINING AT THE UNIVERSITY OF HELSINKI

RC-SPECIFIC STAGE 2 MATERIAL

We have presently several PhD students who are either doing research abroad or being at least part-time in foreign departments. We promote actively participation in international cooperation by giving the students an annual travel stipend.

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

  The RC has a close knit cooperation between the PI:s of the community. They have research interests which support each other, as can be seen from the themes and collaborations practiced. We will improve these connections in the future and have invited such people in the RC whose work we believe will be useful for the community as a whole.

**5 OPERATIONAL CONDITIONS (MAX. 4400 CHARACTERS WITH SPACES)**

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

  At the University of Helsinki the research infrastructure is fairly well developed. We have technical equipment and people who can help with problems with computers. The teaching of research methods has been unsatisfactory but has recently been improved. Most researchers are helping in teaching. We give special guidance and hands-on instruction in teaching and scientific writing.

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

  One problem which has overall significance is the data infrastructure. Finland does presently have excellent register data which we have used and endeavour to use. Finland also participates in the collection of some important data sets on the European level, such as ESS or SILC. But Finland has renounced to participate in SHARE or Generation and Gender surveys which contain a lot of important comparative data. It would be extremely important to get Finnish participation in these surveys also. This is one of the objectives of our RC.

**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.**

  We believe in freedom and autonomy of scientific research. Leadership and management demands presently too much time of research-oriented professors and project leaders. One should eliminate the continuous bureaucratic demands for planning and reporting of on-going research. We don’t really believe that evaluation of research improves its quality or is cost-effective. Evaluation may also result in homogenisation and spread of fashions, precisely as in the management sector (from which these fads come and go). In addition to its demands on the time and energy of the evaluatees. Note that the HELPS "research community" has been created expressly for evaluation purposes. We hope that the evaluation will help in developing a real community.

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

  See the answer above
7 EXTERNAL COMPETITIVE FUNDING OF THE RC

- Listing of the RCs external competitive funding, where:
  - the funding decisions have been made during 1.1.2005-31.12.2010, and
  - the administrator of the funding is/has been the University of Helsinki

- Academy of Finland (AF) - total amount of funding (in euros) AF has decided to allocate to the RC members during 1.1.2005-31.12.2010: **650 000**

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

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

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

- International and national foundations - names of international and national foundations which have decided to allocate funding to the RC members during 1.1.2005-31.12.2010, and the amount of their funding (in euros).
  - names of the foundations: Kone Foundation
  - Kordelin Foundation
  - Alli Paasikivi Foundation
  - Konkordialliitto
  - Emil Aaltonen foundation
  - total amount of funding (in euros) from the above-mentioned foundations: **146200**

- 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: National Pensions Institute KELA, Kirkon diakonia ja yhdyuskuntayö, Helsingin ja Uudenmaan sairaanhoitopiiri
  - University of Helsinki
  - Institute of Health and Welfare
  - Tiedonjulkistamisen neuvottelukunta
  - total amount of funding (in euros) from the above-mentioned funding organizations: **180 800**
Description of the RC’s future perspectives in respect to research and doctoral training.

In the second round of the Gentrans study, we are especially interested in following the dynamics between generations as the baby boomers now approach old age and retire, while their children may reach a higher socioeconomic position than their parents and also have had more (grand)children. We will be able to assess interactions between transmissions and demographic transitions, such as the effect of helping patterns on retirement and on childbearing behavior. We study major forms of support (practical assistance, financial transfers, mental support, contact frequencies and care) between different family members, more distant kin, and other people. We will also study how the cuts in welfare spending affect generational assistance. Finally, our earlier findings call for more specific studies of particular family relationships such as the interaction between grandparents and their in-laws and between siblings.

The main research theme concerns changes in Finnish baby boomer’s family relations and helping between 2007 and 2012. The first round of the GENTRANS survey was collected in spring 2007 when altogether 32.8 percent of baby boomers in our data received a pension (but only 12.3 were on old-age pension). We plan to renew the survey in 2012 when practically all of the respondents are retired, while more of their adult children have become parents. This makes it possible to study interactions between transmissions and demographic transitions, such as the effect of helping patterns on retirement and on childbearing behavior. The first follow-up enables us to test causal relations that single surveys cannot assess. We study major forms of support (practical assistance, financial transfers, mental support, contact frequencies and care) between different family members, more distant kin, and other people.

The special quality of the VASTUU doctoral program is that it is based on one broad discipline, social policy. This discipline is one of the original disciplines of the new faculty of social sciences in the University of Helsinki and in a sense a Finnish specialty that has evolved since the mid 1940s as an academic discipline and a scientific society with about one thousand members. On the other hand social policy in Finland is gradually growing in importance for several reasons.

The welfare state in Finland is in transition due the various trade-offs between demographic change, competitiveness and (subjective and objective) equality resulting in clear demand for research (and development activities) that can either assess the consequences of these changes or to contribute for current policies and reform processes. In particular, we need scholars capable to deal with institutional issues like financing, cost-shifting, flexicurity, innovation diffusion, the adaptive efficiency and costs of technologies and institutions.

Well-being is (again) becoming a central concept of policy making and welfare policies. Consequently, there is a clear need for up-dating current theories of well-being and welfare, including those inspired by evolutionary psychology, subjective welfare theories, and current theories of justice and systematically apply them to various empirical and comparative data sets, in order to generate theories that apply well to affluent societies.

Care has become one of the most important social policy issues of the 2000s due to changes in family and population structures, globalization of economy and labor market relations and cultural changes. Globally, migration and changes in labour market relations have created new forms of care provision and care workers. This is connected with the question of fertility in the developed countries. The extremely low fertility of Southern and Central European countries and the somewhat higher fertility of
the Nordic countries and France seem to be explained by different politics of care, e.g., when adequate child care is made very difficult.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>9 SHORTH DESCRIPTION OF HOW THE RC MEMBERS HAVE CONTRIBUTED TO THE COMPILATION OF THE STAGE 2 MATERIALS (MAX. 1100 CHARACTERS WITH SPACES).</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>This has been a joint effort, put together by J P Roos. All members of the RC have been asked to contribute, but it is clear that the main responsibility has been with the principal investigators. The questions have also been so formulated that they have been rather difficult (and quite uninspiring) for the more junior members of the research community to answer. The have, however, contributed with many suggestions and corrections.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
INTERNATIONAL EVALUATION OF RESEARCH AND DOCTORAL TRAINING AT THE UNIVERSITY OF HELSINKI

RC-SPECIFIC TUHAT COMPILATIONS OF PUBLICATIONS DATA 2005-2010

HELPS/Roos

1 Analysis of publications

- Associated person is one of J P Roos, Elina Huovio-Mannila, Antti Karisto, Elina Huovio-Mannila, Anni Ritikirch, Tiina Silvasti, Anna-Maria Isola, Anna-Karoliina Majamaa, Sanna Pekkarinen, Tiina Koskimäki, Eija Nurminen, Anna Rotkirch, Tiina Valkendorff, Anna Karoliina Majamaa, Sanna Pekkarinen, Tiina Koskimäki, Eija Nurminen, Anna Rotkirch, Tiina Valkendorff, Anna Karoliina Majamaa, Sanna Pekkarinen, Tiina Koskimäki, Eija Nurminen

<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>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A2 Review in scientific journal</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A3 Contribution to book/other compilations (refereed)</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B1 Unrefereed journal article</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B2 Contribution to book/other compilations (non-refereed)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B3 Unrefereed article in conference proceedings</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C1 Published scientific monograph</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C2 Edited book, compilation, conference proceeding or special issue of journal</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D1 Article in professional journal</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D4 Published development or research report</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E1 Popular article, newspaper article</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E1 Popular contribution to book/other compilations</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E2 Popular monograph</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F1 Published independent artistic work</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Listing of publications

## A1 Refereed journal article

### 2005


Roos, JP 2005, ‘"Saan olla subjektiivinen" - vai saanko?’, *Yhteiskuntapolitiikka*, vol 70, no. 5, pp. 567-569.

Roos, JP 2005, 'Vastaus Tom Arnkilille', *Yhteiskuntapolitiikka*, vol 70, no. 6, pp. 684.


### 2006


Roos, JP 2006, 'The arctic Bourdieu: four theses from the Nordic countries', *Sosiologisk årbok* ..., no. 3-4, pp. 87-102.
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2008


2009


Silvasti, T 2009, 'Giving up the family farm: an alternative story of the structural change in agriculture in Finland', Maaseudun uusi aika : maaseutututkimuksen ja -politiikan aikakauslehti, vol 2, no. 7, pp. 21-32.


HELPs/Roos


A2 Review in scientific journal

2006


2010

A3 Contribution to book/other compilations (referred)

2005
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Veijas sociolodés, nueva sociología, CIS, Madrid, pp. 87-100.
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2010


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

2005

Haavio-Mannila, E 2005, 'Kuvia laitoksen historiasta ja nykypäivästä', Helsingin yliopiston sosioologian laitos 50 vuotta, Helsingin yliopiston sosioologian laitoksen monisteita, no. [64], Helsingin yliopisto, sosiologian laitos, [Helsinki].


2006


2007


2008

Teppo, A 2008, 'Mustaa, valkoista, värillistä tilaa: Kapkaupungin lähiöissä apartheidin jälkeen', in R Kivikkokangas-Sandgren, S Jääskeläinen (eds), Kaupunki apartheidin jälkeen Etelä-Afrikassa = The City after Apartheid in South Africa, Helsingin yliopiston maantieteiden laitoksen tutkimusretkiaraportteja, no. 44, [Helsingin yliopisto], Helsinki, pp. 25-34.
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2010


B3 Unreferied article in conference proceedings

2006
Sulander, T 2006, Eläkeikäisen väestön terveyskäyttäytymismuutokset.,

2008

C1 Published scientific monograph

2005

2006

Haavio-Mannila, E, Kontula, O, Rotkirch, A, Hashimoto, N 2006, Finnando ni okeu setekii raitu sutairu no hen.: yO.:; sansedai nhayaku no jibunshi ni yoru cho.: sa kenkyo.: ; tsukishoten, To: ky o.: ;

2007


2008

2009

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

2005


2006


2007


2008


2010


D1 Article in professional journal

2005


2006

Sulander, T 2006, 'Kohtle asennetuista', Vanhustyö, no. 6, pp. 3.

2008


2009
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D4 Published development or research report

2006

2008
Lämsä, R. 2008, Poittaa ihanneisaalassa. Ihanneisaala-hankkeen raportti, Helsingin ja Uudenmaan sairaanhoitopiiri (HUS), [Helsinki].

2009
Väänänen, Ari; Toivanen, Minna; Aalto, Anna-Mari; Bergbom, Barbara; Härkäpää, Kristiina; Jaakkoila, Magdalena; Koponen, Päivi; Koskinen, Seppo; Kuusio, Hannamari; Lindström, Kari; Malin, Mali; Markkula, Heila; Merlanieri, Riva; Pettola, Ulla; Seppälä, Ulla; Sallamaa, Tiina; Suikkula, Vartta; Väänänen, Maarit; Vuorensaari, Marja; Vuorento, Mirika & Vahlbeck, Kristiina. 2009, Maahantuittelimien integrointimen suomalaisen yhteisöaluksen elämän eri osa-alueilla. Esiselvitysraporttti. Sektoritutkimuksen neuvottelukunta Osaaminen, työ, hyvinvointi, Sektoritutkimuksen neuvottelukunta, no. 9, vol. 2009, Sektoritutkimuksen neuvottelukunta.

2010

E1 Popular article, newspaper article

2005

2006

2007

2008
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2010
INTERNATIONAL EVALUATION OF RESEARCH AND DOCTORAL TRAINING AT THE UNIVERSITY OF HELSINKI

RC-SPECIFIC TUHAT COMPILATIONS OF PUBLICATIONS DATA 2005-2010

HELPs/Roos


Roos, JP 2010, 'Archives et concours en Finlande', La faute à Rousseau , no. 55, pp. 41-42.


Silvasti, T 2010, 'Ruokapolitiikka: Tulevaisuuden avauskäärteydet, ympäristön ja sosiaalisen yhteysin?', Sininen planeetta.

Tanskanen, A, Danielsbacka, M 2010, 'Isovanhemmat ovat pikemminkin auttajia kuin autettavia', Helsingin Sanomat.


E1 Popular contribution to book/other compilations

2006


2007


2008


2009


E2 Popular monograph

2005


2006

Haavio-Mannila, E 2006, 'Arkipäivän erotiikka, tämärikeskussäätiö', [Helsinki].


2007

Haavio-Mannila, E 2007, Eroticism in everyday day, Baltic Sea Centre Foundation.

2008


2010
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F1 Published independent artistic work

2008
INTERNATIONAL EVALUATION OF RESEARCH AND DOCTORAL TRAINING AT THE UNIVERSITY OF HELSINKI

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

HELPS/Roos

1 Analysis of activities 2005-2010

- Associated person is one of J P Roos, Elina Haavio-Mannila, Anna Rotkirch, Tiina Silvasti, Antti Karisto, Tommi Sulander, Frateline Kashaga, Mirkka Danielsbacka, Riikka Lämsä, Anna-Maria Isola, Anna-Karoliina Majamaa, Taina Koskimäki, Eija Nurminen.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity type</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Supervisor or co-supervisor of doctoral thesis</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prizes and awards</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Editor of research journal</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Editor of research anthology/collection/conference proceedings</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peer review of manuscripts</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment of candidates for academic posts</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Membership or other role in research network</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Membership or other role in national/international committee, council, board</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Membership or other role in public Finnish or international organization</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Membership or other role of body in private company/organisation</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participation in interview for written media</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participation in radio programme</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participation in TV programme</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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2 Listing of activities 2005-2010

Supervisor or co-supervisor of doctoral thesis

J P Roos,
Supervision of doctoral thesis, J P Roos, 01.01.2007 → 31.12.2007, Finland
Supervision of doctoral thesis, J P Roos, 2010, Finland

Antti Karisto,
Supervision for doctoral thesis of Katri Ylikulppi, University of Lapland, Antti Karisto, 2001 → ..., Finland
Supervision for doctoral dissertation of Riitta Kuparinen, Antti Karisto, 2004 → 2006, Finland
Supervision for doctoral dissertation of Tommi Sulander, Antti Karisto, 2004 → 2005, Finland
Supervision for doctoral dissertation of Jorma Seitsamo, Antti Karisto, 02.02.2007, Finland
Supervision for doctoral dissertation of Leena Vuorinen, University of Helsinki, Antti Karisto, 2007 → 2009, Finland
Supervision for doctoral dissertation of Risto Haverinen, Antti Karisto, 2007, Finland
Supervision for doctoral dissertation of Sirpa Andersson, Antti Karisto, 07.12.2007, Finland
Supervision for doctoral dissertation of Tuula Mikkola, Antti Karisto, 09.05.2008, Finland
Supervision for doctoral dissertation of Anne Hartikainen, Antti Karisto, 12.06.2009, Finland
Supervision for doctoral dissertation of Matilda Wrede-Jäntti, University of Helsinki, Antti Karisto, 2009 → 2010, Finland

Ulla-Maija Seppälä,

Tiina Silvasti,
Supervision of doctoral thesis, Tiina Silvasti, 2008 → ..., Finland
Supervisor of doctoral thesis, Tiina Silvasti, 2008 → ...

Prizes and awards

Elina Haavio-Mannila,
Postimerkki Itellan postimerkkivihkossa Merkkinaisia, Elina Haavio-Mannila, 08.03.2010, Finland
Tietoarkistotyön edistäjä (Promoter of the information archive work), Elina Haavio-Mannila, 17.12.2010, Finland

Tiina Silvasti,
The teacher of the year 2010, Tiina Silvasti, 2010 → ..., Finland

Mirkka Danielsbacka,
Helsingin yliopiston humanistisen tiedekunnan historian laitoksen pro gradu-palkinto parhaasta Suomen ja Pohjoismaiden historian opinnäytteestä vuonna 2007, Mirkka Danielsbacka, 2007
Onni Talan säätiön stipendi, Mirkka Danielsbacka, 02.2008
Työväen Opintorahaston stipendi, Mirkka Danielsbacka, 11.2008
Helsingin yliopiston humanististen ja yhteiskuntatieteiden raahston stipendi, Mirkka Danielsbacka, 03.2009
Kaarlo ja Irma Koskimiehen stipendiarahaston apuraha, Mirkka Danielsbacka, 03.2009
Suomen Kulttuurirahaston apuraha, Mirkka Danielsbacka, 02.2009
Eino Jutikkalan rahaston apuraha, Mirkka Danielsbacka, 10.2010
Helsingin yliopiston valtiotieteilien tiedekunnan pro gradu palkinto vuoden 2010 parhaasta sosiaalipolitiikan pro gradu -työstä, Mirkka Danielsbacka, 12.2010
Otto A. Malmi lahtoisurahaston apuraha, Mirkka Danielsbacka, 07.2010

2
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Tiina Koskimäki, Kansallinen parhaan gerontologisen pro gradu -työn palkinto, Tiina Koskimäki, 16.04.2010, Finland

Editor of research journal

J P Roos

Memory and Narrative, J P Roos, 01.01.2005 → 31.12.2005, United Kingdom
Sociology, J P Roos, 01.01.2005 → 31.12.2005, United Kingdom
Theory, Culture and Society, J P Roos, 01.01.2005 → 31.12.2005, United Kingdom
Yhteiskuntapolitiikka, J P Roos, 01.01.2005 → 31.12.2005, Finland
Memory and Narrative, J P Roos, 01.01.2006 → 31.12.2006, United Kingdom
Sex Roles, J P Roos, 01.01.2006 → 31.12.2006, United States
Sociology, J P Roos, 01.01.2006 → 31.12.2006, United Kingdom
Theory, Culture and Society, J P Roos, 01.01.2006 → 31.12.2006, United Kingdom
Yhteiskuntapolitiikka, J P Roos, 01.01.2006 → 31.12.2006, Finland
European Societies, J P Roos, 01.01.2007 → 31.12.2007, France
Finnish Journal of Ethnicity and Migration, J P Roos, 01.01.2007 → 31.12.2007, United Kingdom
Sociology, J P Roos, 01.01.2007 → 31.12.2007, United Kingdom
Theory culture and society, J P Roos, 01.01.2007 → 31.12.2007, United Kingdom
Sociology, J P Roos, 01.01.2008 → 31.12.2008, United Kingdom
Theory Culture and Society, J P Roos, 01.01.2008 → 31.12.2008, United Kingdom
Yhteiskuntapolitiikka, J P Roos, 01.01.2008 → 31.12.2008, Finland
Body & Society, J P Roos, 2010, United Kingdom
Likunta ja tede, J P Roos, 2010, Finland

Antti Karisto

Sosiaalilääketieteellinen aikakauslehti, Antti Karisto, 01.01.1988 → 31.12.2011
Gerontologia, Antti Karisto, 01.01.2002 → 31.12.2011, Finland

Ulla-Maija Seppälä

Sosiaalilääketieteellinen aikakauslehti, Ulla-Maija Seppälä, 01.01.2005 → 31.12.2005, Finland
Kuntoudus, Ulla-Maija Seppälä, 15.01.2008 → 30.09.2010, Finland

Tiina Silvasti

Maaseudun uusi aika, Tiina Silvasti, 2003 → 2005, Finland
Maaseudun uusi aika, Tiina Silvasti, 01.01.2005 → 31.12.2005, Finland
Producers of rural goods and services in five European countries: a comparative analysis of rural regions under urban pressure, Tiina Silvasti, 01.01.2005 → 31.12.2005, Finland
Environmental management, Tiina Silvasti, 01.01.2006 → 31.12.2006, United States
Maaseudun uusi aika, Tiina Silvasti, 2006 → 2011, Finland
Maaseudun uusi aika, Tiina Silvasti, 01.01.2006 → 31.12.2006, Finland
Ruokakysymys. Näkökulmia yhteiskuntatieteelliseen elintarviketutkimukseen, Tiina Silvasti, 01.01.2006 → 31.12.2006, Finland
Journal of Environmental Policy & Planning, Tiina Silvasti, 01.01.2007 → 31.12.2007, United Kingdom
Journal of Rural Studies, Tiina Silvasti, 01.01.2007 → 31.12.2007, United Kingdom
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Maaseudun uusi aika, Tiina Silvasti, 01.01.2007 → 31.12.2007, Finland

Journal of Environmental Policy and Planning, Tiina Silvasti, 01.01.2008 → 31.12.2008, United Kingdom

Journal of Rural Studies, Tiina Silvasti, 01.01.2008 → 31.12.2008, United Kingdom

Maaseudun uusi aika, Tiina Silvasti, 01.01.2008 → 31.12.2008, Finland

Maaseudun uusi aika, Tiina Silvasti, 01.01.2008 → 31.12.2008, Finland


Editor of research anthology/collection/conference proceedings

Eija Nurminen,
Avoin yliopisto : sivistystä, osaamista ja tasa-arvoa : Helsingin yliopiston Avoimen yliopiston 30-vuotisjuhlakirja, Eija Nurminen, 2006 → 2007, Finland

Peer review of manuscripts

Antti Karisto,


Annika Teppo,
Article referee, Annika Teppo, 01.05.2009 → 01.06.2009

Suomen Itämainen Seura, Annika Teppo, 01.04.2010 → 01.05.2010

Tiina Silvasti,
Referee, Tiina Silvasti, 2003 → …

Referee, Tiina Silvasti, 2006 → …

Referee, Tiina Silvasti, 2007 → …

Referee, Tiina Silvasti, 2007 → …

Referee, Tiina Silvasti, 2008 → …

Referee, Tiina Silvasti, 2008 → …

Referee, Tiina Silvasti, 2009 → …

Referee, Tiina Silvasti, 2009 → …

Referee, Tiina Silvasti, 2010 → …

Referee, Tiina Silvasti, 2010 → …

Assessment of candidates for academic posts

J P Roos,
Lausunto vrantäytössä, J P Roos, 04.2010, Finland

Antti Karisto,
Assessment of candidates for academic post, Antti Karisto, 2005, Finland

Membership or other role in research network

J P Roos,
Tohtorikoulutusohjelman johtaja, J P Roos, 01.10.2010 → 31.12.2010, Finland

Tiina Koskimäki,
Jäsenyys, Tiina Koskimäki, 01.01.2010 → 31.12.2011, Finland
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Membership or other role in national/international committee, council, board

J P Roos,
ESA, J P Roos, 01.01.2005 → 31.12.2005, France
Skepsis, J P Roos, 01.01.2005 → 31.12.2005, Finland
Westermarck Society, J P Roos, 01.01.2005 → 31.12.2005, Finland
Skepsis, J P Roos, 01.01.2006 → 31.12.2006, Finland
Westermarck Society, J P Roos, 01.01.2006 → 31.12.2006, Finland
ESA, J P Roos, 01.01.2007 → 31.12.2007, United Kingdom
European Sociological Association, J P Roos, 01.01.2007 → 31.12.2007, France
Skepsis, J P Roos, 01.01.2007 → 31.12.2007, Finland
European Sociological Association, Tutkimuskomitea, J P Roos, 01.01.2008 → 31.12.2008, Finland
Westermarck Society, J P Roos, 01.01.2008 → 31.12.2008, Finland
Neuvottelukunnan jäsen, J P Roos, 2009 → ..., France
Toimielimien jäsen, J P Roos, 2010, France

Antti Karisto,
Helsingin yliopiston tutkimus- ja koulutuskeskus Palmenian johtokunnan jäsen, Antti Karisto, 2000 → 2009, Finland
Jyväskylän yliopiston koordinoiman valtakunnallisen ikääntyminen, hyvinvointi ja teknologia -tutkimuskoulun johtokunnan jäsen, Antti Karisto, 2008 → ...

Ulla-Maija Seppälä,
Laadullisten terveyttävien verkkot (LATE), Ulla-Maija Seppälä, 01.01.2005 → 31.12.2005
Kirkon sosiaalifoorumi 2010-2011, Ulla-Maija Seppälä, 2010 → 2011

Annika Teppo,
Suomen Antropologinen Seura, Annika Teppo, 01.01.2005 → 20.03.2005, Finland

Tiina Silvasti,
Sosiaalipoliittisen yhdistyksen johtokunnan jäsen, Tiina Silvasti, 2003 → 2006, Finland
European Society for Rural Sociology, Tiina Silvasti, 01.01.2005 → 31.12.2005
Member of the scientific committee of the ESRS, Tiina Silvasti, 2005 → 2006
Sosiaalipoliittinen yhdistys, Tiina Silvasti, 01.01.2005 → 31.12.2005
Sosiaalipoliittinen yhdistys, Tiina Silvasti, 01.01.2006 → 31.12.2006, Finland
European maaeuteusociologiseuran (ESRS) vuoden 2007 kansainvälisen konferenssin tieteellisen komitean jäsen, Tiina Silvasti, 01.01.2007 → 31.12.2007, Netherlands
HY, Valtioledeleen tiedekunta, Opiskusenkehätäsmikunnan jäsen, Tiina Silvasti, 01.01.2007 → 31.12.2007, Finland
Helsingin yliopisto, Valtioledeleen tiedekunta, Yhteiskuntapolitiikan laitos, johtoryhmän jäsen, Tiina Silvasti, 01.01.2007 → 31.12.2007, Finland
Helsingin yliopisto, Valtioledeleen tiedekunta, Yhteiskuntapolitiikan laitos, johtoryhmän jäsen, Tiina Silvasti, 01.01.2008 → 31.12.2008, Finland
Helsingin yliopisto, Valtioledeleen tiedekunnan opintojen kehätäsmikunnan jäsen, Tiina Silvasti, 01.01.2008 → 31.12.2008, Finland
Member of the executive committee of the ESRS, Tiina Silvasti, 2010 → 2011

Membership or other role in public Finnish or international organization

J P Roos,
Akatemia, asiantuntija Sosiaalipoliittis, J P Roos, 01.01.2005 → 31.12.2005, Finland
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Akademia, asiuntiju Sosiaalipolitiikan alan, J P Roos, 01.01.2006 – 31.12.2006, Finland
Stakes Tutkimuseettinen neuvottelukunta, J P Roos, 01.01.2006 – 31.12.2006, Finland
Stakes Tutkimuseettisen neuvottelukunnan jäsen, J P Roos, 01.01.2007 – 31.12.2007, Finland
Suomen Akademia, J P Roos, 01.01.2007 – 31.12.2007, Finland
Toimielimen jäsen, J P Roos, 2010, Finland

Antti Karisto


Eija Nurminen

Johtokunnan varajäsen, Eija Nurminen, 01.01.2007 – 31.12.2009, Finland

Membership or other role of body in private company/organisation

J P Roos

Nordiska Kommittén för Mänskliga Rättigheter, J P Roos, 01.01.2006 – 31.12.2006, Finland
Professoriliitto, Helsingin osasto, J P Roos, 01.01.2006 – 31.12.2006, Finland
Professoriliitto, J P Roos, 01.01.2007 – 31.12.2007, Finland
Valtuuston varajäsen, J P Roos, 2010, Finland

Tiina Silvasti

Maaseudun uusi aika -lehden toimikunnan jäsen, Tiina Silvasti, 01.01.2006 – 31.12.2006, Finland
Maaseudun uusi aika -lehden toimikunnan jäsen, Tiina Silvasti, 01.01.2006 – 31.12.2006, Finland
Sosiaalipolitition yhdistys, Tiina Silvasti, 01.01.2006 – 31.12.2006, Finland

Anna-Maria Isola


Participation in interview for written media

J P Roos

(ks. edellä), J P Roos, 01.01.2002 – 31.12.2011, Finland
(ks. edellä), J P Roos, 01.01.2002 – 31.12.2011, Finland
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Joel Roos

Promo-lehti, 45.2006, 4-7, Joel Roos, 01.01.2006 → 31.12.2011, Finland
Sosiaaliturva-lehti 1.2007, 6-10, Joel Roos, 01.01.2006 → 31.12.2011, Finland
Dialogi-lehti, Joel Roos, 01.01.2008 → 31.12.2011, Finland
Helsingin Sanomat, Joel Roos, 28.05.2008 → 31.12.2011, Finland
Helsingin Sanomat, Joel Roos, 25.01.2008 → 31.12.2011, Finland
India Forward-lehden haastattelu 2.2008, s. 4-11, Joel Roos, 01.01.2008 → 31.12.2011, Finland
Kansan Uutiset Viikkolite, Joel Roos, 29.08.2008 → 31.12.2011, Finland
Keralan valtion television (Doordarshan) 1-ohjelma, Joel Roos, 12.12.2008 → 31.12.2011, Finland
Turun Sanomat, Joel Roos, 17.02.2008 → 31.12.2011, Finland
Västra Nyland, Joel Roos, 22.07.2008 → 31.12.2011, Finland
Yliopiston järjestämä tiedotustilaisuus, Joel Roos, 01.01.2008 → 31.12.2011, Finland

Elina Haavio-Mannila

Ilkäihmisten yliopisto, Tuusula, Elina Haavio-Mannila, 01.11.2000 → 31.12.2011, Finland
Leonia pankin tilaisuus, Elina Haavio-Mannila, 01.01.2000 → 31.12.2011, Finland
Leonia pankin tilaisuus, Elina Haavio-Mannila, 01.01.2000 → 31.12.2011, Finland
Suomen Teknisten liiton järjestämä tapahtuma, Elina Haavio-Mannila, 19.03.2000 → 31.12.2011, Finland
Viron perheenavunlaitoksen taidenäyttely, Elina Haavio-Mannila, 14.05.2001 → 31.12.2011, New Zealand
Helsingin kaupungin koulutustilaisuus, Elina Haavio-Mannila, 09.10.2002 → 31.12.2011, Finland

Antti Karisto

Kansan Uutiset Viikonvaihde, 31.03.2000 → 31.12.2011, Finland
Ilkä-lehti, Antti Karisto, 12.01.2000 → 31.12.2011, Finland

Anna Rotkirch

Helsingin Sanomat, Anna Rotkirch, 01.01.2000 → 31.12.2011, Finland
Hufvudstadsbladet, Anna Rotkirch, 30.03.2000 → 31.12.2011, Finland
Humanisti-päivät: Miten ymmärtää Venäjää?, Anna Rotkirch, 01.01.2000 → 31.12.2011, Finland
Ilta-lehti, Helmi-litte, Anna Rotkirch, 31.03.2000 → 31.12.2011, Finland
Kansan Uutiset, Vikonvakihde, s. 16-17, Anna Rotkirch, 01.09.2000 → 31.12.2011, Finland
Ny Tid, Anna Rotkirch, 07.04.2000 → 31.12.2011, Finland
Ragälbunden kolumnist i Hufvudstadsbladet, Löntagaren och Ny Tid, Anna Rotkirch, 01.01.2000 → 31.12.2011, Finland
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Suuri työ? 3. sukupolven Suomi-klubi -ilta, Anna Rotkirch, 01.01.2001 → 31.12.2011, Finland
YLE, venäjänkieliset ohjelmat, Anna Rotkirch, 01.01.2001 → 31.12.2011, Finland
BANG, Anna Rotkirch, 23.05.2002 → 31.12.2011, Finland
FST OBS-debatt, Anna Rotkirch, 01.01.2002 → 31.12.2011, Finland
Helsingin Sanomat, Anna Rotkirch, 12.10.2002 → 31.12.2011, Finland
Hufvudstadsbladet, Anna Rotkirch, 01.01.2002 → 31.12.2011, Finland
Ilta-Sanomat, Anna Rotkirch, 01.01.2002 → 31.12.2011, Finland
Missä on nainen? seminaari, Anna Rotkirch, 06.11.2002 → 31.12.2011, Finland
Peholikunnan valtakunnalliset neuvottelupäivät, Anna Rotkirch, 05.03.2002 → 31.12.2011, Finland
Sydäntautiliitto, esitelmä, Anna Rotkirch, 30.04.2002 → 31.12.2011, Finland
YLE Naisten tunni, Anna Rotkirch, 22.11.2002 → 31.12.2011, Finland
YLE X3M-talk, Anna Rotkirch, 01.01.2002 → 31.12.2011, Finland

Tiina Silvasti

Kestävä tuotanto ja kulutus. Ympäristötutkijat ja -kasvattajat haastavat toisensa keskiuuteluna, Tiina Silvasti, 07.03.2005 → 31.12.2011, Finland
MMM:n valtakunnallinen hankeseminaari "Maaseutuasuminen ja sosiaaliset innovaatiot", Tiina Silvasti, 16.06.2005 → 31.12.2011, Finland
Maaseudun uusi aika yhdistyksen vuosikokoukseseminaari, Tiina Silvasti, 01.01.2005 → 31.12.2011, Finland
Sosiaalipsykologian päivitys, Tiina Silvasti, 17.11.2005 → 31.12.2011, Finland
YLE 1, Tiina Silvasti, 22.02.2005 → 31.12.2011, Finland
Ensimmäisen, toisen ja kolmannen maailman nälkä, Tiina Silvasti, 30.11.2007 → 31.12.2011, Finland
GM-keskustelu, Tiina Silvasti, 05.10.2007 → 31.12.2011, Finland
Ikääihmisten yliopisto, Tiina Silvasti, 24.10.2007 → 31.12.2011, Finland
Maatalousyrittäjien eläkelaitos, Tiina Silvasti, 06.09.2007 → 31.12.2011, Finland
Sosiaalityön ammatillinen lisensiaatintutkinnon seminaari, Tiina Silvasti, 01.12.2007 → 31.12.2011, Finland
Sosiaalityön jatkokoulutus seminaari, Tiina Silvasti, 20.11.2007 → 31.12.2011, Finland
Ikääihmisten yliopisto, Tiina Silvasti, 17.11.2008 → 31.12.2011, Finland

Anna-Maria Isola

Kansainvälinen imetysviikko, imetysaiheinen seminaari Kätilöopistolla, Anna-Maria Isola, 16.10.2003 → 31.12.2011, Denmark
Keskiuukeaamhaastateltu Itä-Savon ja Länsi-Savon suunnittainumeroon-, Anna-Maria Isola, 31.01.2010

Mirkka Danielsbacka

A gene that rocks the cradle, Mirkka Danielsbacka, 2010, Finland
Geeni kehotaa keinuttia, Mirkka Danielsbacka, 09.2010, Finland

Participation in radio programme

J P Roos
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Esiitelmä Ylen Radio 1:n uutistoimitukselle, J P Roos, 01.01.2008 → 31.12.2011, Finland
Yle Radio 1 Teesinnulaajat, J P Roos, 01.01.2008 → 31.12.2011, Finland
Haastattelu, J P Roos, 01.01.2010, Finland

Antti Karisto,
Ylen VIII vuotet, suuret ikäluokat radio-sarja 2008 (toim. Päivi Istdala), Antti Karisto, 22.03.2008, Finland

Tiina Silvasti,
Keskusteluohjelma, Tiina Silvasti, 2006 → 2007
YLE Radio 1, Tiina Silvasti, 01.01.2007 → 31.12.2011, Finland
Keskusteluohjelma, Tiina Silvasti, 12.11.2008
YLE Radio Suomi, Tiina Silvasti, 12.11.2008 → 31.12.2011, Finland
Keskusteluohjelma, Tiina Silvasti, 2009 → ...
Yle Radio 1, Tiina Silvasti, 05.01.2009 → 31.12.2011, Finland
Keskusteluohjelma, Tiina Silvasti, 26.02.2010

Anna-Maria Isola,
Vierailu Kalle Haatasen radio-ohjelmassa, Yle Radio 1, Anna-Maria Isola, 19.07.2010
Yle Radio Suomi: Naisten ilan vieraana, Anna-Maria Isola, 14.03.2010

Mirkka Danielsbacka,
Ajantasa, Mirkka Danielsbacka, 03.11.2010

Participation in TV programme

J P Roos,
luokisia radio- ja tv haastatteluja, kihtähastatteluja (yht 6-7 kpl, Kaleva, Keskisuomalainen, Dialogi, Yle Radio 1, Radio Vega), J P Roos, 01.01.2007 → 31.12.2011, Finland
Haastattelu, J P Roos, 02.2010, Finland
Haastattelu, J P Roos, 2010, Finland
Suomalaisen päiväkirja, J P Roos, 22.02.2010, Finland

Annika Teppo,
Aamu-TV, Annika Teppo, 19.04.2010
Appendix B.b.

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

The bibliometric analyses by Helsinki University Library (HULib)

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

**Humanities**
Aejmelaeus, Anneli – CSTT
Anttonen, Pertti – CMVG
Dunderberg, Ismo – FC
Havu, Eva – CoCoLaC
Heikkilä, Markku – RCSP
Heinämäa, Sara – SHC
Henriksson, Markku – CITA
Janhunen, Juha – LDHFTA
Kaja, Mika – AMNE
Klippi, Anu – Interaction
Knuutilla, Simo – PPMP
Koskenniemi, Kimmo – BAULT

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

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

PUBLICATION DATA 2005-2010

RC/HELP /Roos

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

Number of authors in publications/year

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>N of authors</th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>Grand Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>186</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Total</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>340</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

% of authors in publications

- 1 au: 55%
- 2 au: 25%
- 3 au: 8%
- 4 au: 2%
- 5 au: 3%
- 6 au: 2%
- 7 au: 1%
- 8 au: 1%
- 11 au: 0%
- 12 au: 0%
- 13 au: 0%
- 14 au: 0%
55% of the publications have one author, 25% two authors and 8% three authors. There are, however, some publications with more than ten authors.

### Language of publications / Year

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language</th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>Grand Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>fi_FI</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>269</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>en_GB</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sv_SE</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fr_FR</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>es_ES</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>et_EE</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ja_JP</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ru_RU</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Total</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>340</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Most of the publications are in Finnish (79%), and in English are 15%.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Journals</th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>Grand</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Etelä-Suomen sanomat.</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yhteiskuntapolitiikka</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helsingin Sanomat</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gerontologia</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Janus : sosiaalipolitiikan ja sosiaalihyppyn tutkimuksen aikakauslehti</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suomen liikaräätie</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maaseudun uusi aika : maaseutututkimuksen ja -politiikan aikakauslehti:</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tieteenä tapahtuut</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vanhuuslehti</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kuntoutus</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Archives of Gerontology and Geriatrics</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hyvinkøntikatsaus</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kansan Uutiset</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>La faute : &quot; Rousseau</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Libero : vasemmistolainen mielipide- ja kulttuurilehti.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ny Tid</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sosiaalitöietieteellinen aikakauslehti</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sosiologia</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elämäntarina</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Journal of Public Health (Print Edition)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kansanterveys : Kansanterveyslaitoksen tiedotuslehti.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laadullisen terveydistutkimuksen verkosto</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Naistutkimus</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural Society</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scandinavian Journal of Public Health</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suomen Antropologi</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(J. P. Röösin kotisivu)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acta Sociologica</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age and Ageing</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agricolaan kirja-arvostelut</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aikalaisten</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ajankohtaista</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alue ja ympäristö</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Behavioral Ecology</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural Geographies</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diakonia.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dooris</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>eCredo verkkoivestin</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Epilepsia</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>European Journal of Contraception and Reproductive Health Care</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evolution and Sociology</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evolutionary Psychology</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health &amp; Place</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helsingin sanomat. Verkkoliitte</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historiallinen Aikakauskirja</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identi-tutkimus</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>India-forward</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Journal of Ageing and Later Life</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Journal of Behavioral Medicine</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Journal of Epidemiology</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journal of Sex Research</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jääsentiedote : Westermark Society</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Typically an A* journal would be one of the best in its field or subfield in which to publish and would typically cover the entire field/subfield. Virtually all papers they publish will be of a very high quality. These are journals where most of the work is important (it will really shape the field) and where researchers boast about getting accepted. Acceptance rates would typically be low and the editorial board would be dominated by field leaders, including many from top institutions.

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

B

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

C

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

ERIH ranking 2007-2008

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

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

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

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

There are 211 journal articles, of which 43 (20%) have been published in a journal that has been ranked. 50 articles (24%) have been published in a newspaper. 95 (45%) of the articles are popular or newspaper articles.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Suomen Lääkärilehti</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Archives of Gerontology and Geriatrics</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1 C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Journal of Public Health (Print Edition)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1 C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neistutukimus</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1 C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural Society</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1 C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scandinavian Journal of Public Health</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2 B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suomen Antropologi</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1 B</td>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acta Sociologica</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2 A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age and Aging</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1 B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Behavioral Ecology</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2 A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural Geographies</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2 B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Epilepsia</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1 A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
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