

PUBLICATIONS OF THE ACADEMY OF FINLAND 1/13

MEDIA AND COMMUNICATION RESEARCH IN FINNISH UNIVERSITIES

EVALUATION REPORT



ACADEMY OF FINLAND

PUBLICATIONS OF THE ACADEMY OF FINLAND 1/13

MEDIA AND COMMUNICATION RESEARCH IN FINNISH UNIVERSITIES

EVALUATION REPORT

Members of the Evaluation Panel

Thorsten Quandt

Jostein Gripsrud

Maria Heller

Caroline Pauwels

Srikant Sarangi

ACADEMY OF FINLAND

The Academy of Finland is a leading public funding agency for cutting-edge scientific research in Finland. We finance high-quality and innovative research aiming at scientific breakthroughs, act as a science policy expert and strengthen the position of science and research.

The Academy has several funding opportunities to support researchers at different stages of their career. We also encourage researcher mobility in a number of ways: between universities and research institutes, within public administration and business and industry, and internationally as well. Our cooperation with research organisations and funding agencies in other countries is active and fruitful.

Academy funding is based on open competition and independent peer review. In 2013, we will make funding decisions worth about EUR 317 million. Each year, some 5,000 people work on Academy-funded projects.

The Academy of Finland is an agency within the administrative branch of the Ministry of Education, Science and Culture.

For more information, go to our website at www.aka.fi/eng.

ISSN 0358-9153

ISBN 978-951-715-846-6 (PDF)

Page layout: DTPage Oy

CONTENTS

Preface	9
1 Introduction	11
2 Aims and scope of this report	14
3 Communication research – An imagined community?	16
4 In between theories and traditions	18
5 Players of the Finnish field of communication research	20
6 Historical perspectives	23
7 New Universities Act	26
8 Units involved	28
9 General reflections on structures, publications, education, internationalisation and future	49
10 Individual unit assessments	56
11 Summing up	72
12 Recommendations	76
References	80
Appendices	
1 Members of the evaluation panel in brief	81
2 Terms of reference	84
3 Submission form	91
4 Funding obtained	94
5 Publications	96
6 Staff	97

DESCRIPTION

Publisher	Academy of Finland	Date	April 2013
Author(s)	Evaluation panel, ed. PhD Sanna Kivimäki		
Name of publication	Media and Communication research in Finnish Universities. Evaluation report		
Abstract	<p>Finnish media and communication research has been evaluated by an international panel. This report presents the panel's findings and its recommendations for the further development of the field. The evaluation included twelve units from nine Finnish universities. The evaluation is based on material collected in spring 2012, covering the years 2010–2011, and on interviews conducted by the panel in September 2012.</p> <p>The panel notes that Finnish media and communication research is a highly diverse field in terms of its background, targets and methods, including very different fields of study. The panel recommends that a project be launched on the history, structure, theories and methods of Finnish media and communication research to clarify the boundaries of the field. The diversity of the field should be taken better into account so that the research could be assessed in the right frame of reference.</p> <p>The panel finds that many Finnish media and communication research units are of a high international standard and that there are a number of internationally leading-edge Finnish researchers in the field.</p> <p>Internationality is an integral part of the research in most units, and Finnish researchers have extensive international networks. However, young researchers in particular have difficulties in mobility. Researchers should be increasingly encouraged to international mobility and active conference participation. The panel finds it important that international publishing be increased. International publishing would facilitate the publishing of research results on national forums and in national languages as well.</p> <p>Much of the research done by the units is dependent on external funding and resources are spent on preparing funding applications instead of producing publications. Funding has directed research and, for instance, the impact of the funding from various foundations is seen on research themes and on the distribution of funding between units in different fields. The recent structural changes in the university system and the organisational changes of universities have also impacted communication research.</p> <p>The panel also expressed concern about the situation of young researchers and doctoral students. In some of the units, the situation of doctoral students in particular is uncertain and unequal, depending on the funding source. National collaboration between doctoral programmes should be further promoted on the basis of the previous national graduate school system. The panel further recommends that strategic mentoring be strengthened to improve career planning, international mobility, publishing strategies and inclusion in the research community.</p>		
Keywords	communication sciences, communication research, evaluation, research funding, media research, information sciences, library science, journalism research, speech communication, intercultural communication, organisation communication, organisational communication and public relations, film studies, audio-visual communication		
Name and number of series	Publications of the Academy of Finland 1/13		
ISSN	0358-9153		
ISBN	Print	PDF	978-951-715-846-6
Number of pages	97		
Distributed by	Academy of Finland, POB 131, FI-00531 Helsinki, viestinta@aka.fi		
Published by	Academy of Finland		
Place and date of printing			
Other information	www.aka.fi/publications		

KUVAILEHTI

Julkaisija	Suomen Akatemia		Päivämäärä	25.3.2013
Tekijä(t)	Arviointipaneeli, toim. YTT Sanna Kivimäki			
Julkaisun nimi	Media and Communication research in Finnish Universities. Evaluation report			
Tiivistelmä	<p>Kansainvälinen arviointipaneeli on arvioinut suomalaista media- ja viestintätieteellistä tutkimusta vuonna 2012. Tässä raportissa paneeli esittää arvioinnin tulokset ja suosituksia alan tutkimuksen kehittämiseksi. Arvioitavana on ollut 12 yksikköä yhdeksästä suomalaisesta yliopistosta. Arvioinnin näkökulma on tulevaisuus-orientoitunut. Se perustuu yksiköiltä keväällä 2012 kerättyyn aineistoon, joka koskee vuosia 2010–2011 sekä paneelin syyskuussa 2012 toteuttamiin haastatteluihin.</p> <p>Paneeli toteaa suomalaisen viestintätieteellisen tutkimuksen olevan taustoiltaan, kohteiltaan ja menetelmiltään moninaista, eikä se muodosta yhtenäistä kokonaisuutta. Alaan lasketaan kuuluvaksi tiedaustaltaan varsin erilaisia oppiaineita. Paneeli suosittaa suomalaisen viestintätieteellisen tutkimuksen historian selvittämistä alan rajojen selkeyttämiseksi. Alan monitahoisuus tulisi huomioida entistä paremmin, jotta tutkimusta arvioidaan oikeassa viitekehyksessä.</p> <p>Suomalainen viestintätieteellinen tutkimus on paneelin mukaan rikasta niin aiheiden, näkökulmien kuin lähestymistapojenkin osalta. Monet yksiköt ovat kansainvälisessä vertailussa hyvin korkeatasoisia ja Suomessa on kansainvälistä huippua edustavia tutkijoita.</p> <p>Ueimmassa yksiköissä kansainvälisyys on kiinteä osa tutkimusta ja suomalaisilla tutkijoilla on laajat kansainväliset verkostot. Kuitenkin etenkin nuorten tutkijoiden kohdalla liikkuvuuteen liittyy ongelmia. Tutkijoita tulisi kannustaa nykyistä enemmän kansainväliseen liikkuvuuteen ja konferenssiosallistumisiin. Paneeli pitää tärkeänä kansainvälisen julkaisemisen lisäämistä. Kansainvälisen julkaisemisen pohjalta tutkimustuloksia voitaisiin julkaista myös kansallisilla foorumeilla ja kielillä.</p> <p>Suuri osa tutkimustyöstä yksiköissä on ulkopuolisen rahoituksen varassa ja rahoitushakemusten tekemiseen kuluu paljon resursseja, joita tulisi käyttää julkaisujen tuottamiseen. Rahoitus on ohjannut tutkimusta ja esimerkiksi säätiörahoituksen vaikutus näkyy niin tutkimusaiheissa kuin rahoituksen jakautumisessa eri aloilla toimivien yksiköiden välillä. Myös viime vuosina käynnissä olleiden yliopistojärjestelmän ja yliopistojen organisaatiomuutokset ovat vaikuttaneet viestinnän tutkimukseen.</p> <p>Paneeli on huolissaan nuorten tutkijoiden ja tutkijakoulutettavien asemasta. Osassa arvioiduista yksiköistä etenkin tutkijakoulutettavilla tilanne on tutkimuksen rahoituslähteestä riippuen epävarma ja epätasa-arvoinen. Kansallista tohtori-ohjelmayhteistyötä tulisi edelleen vakiinnuttaa aiemman kansallisen tutkijakoulu-järjestelmän pohjalta. Paneeli suosittaa ohjauksen strategista vahvistamista urasuunnittelun, kansainvälisen liikkuvuuden, julkaisusuunnitelman ja tutkimusyhteisöön kuulumisen kehittämiseksi.</p>			
Asiasanat	viestintätieteet, viestintätieteellinen tutkimus, arviointi, tutkimusrahoitus, mediatutkimus, informaatiotutkimus, kirjastotiede, journalismin tutkimus, puheviestintä, kulttuurienvälinen viestintä, organisaatioviestintä, yhteisöviestintä, elokuvatutkimus, audiovisuaalinen viestintä			
Julkaisusarjan nimi ja numero	Suomen Akatemian julkaisuja 1/13			
ISSN	0358-9153			
ISBN	Painetulle kirjalle annettu tunnus	Pdf-versiolle annettu tunnus 978-951-715-846-6		
Sivumäärä	97			
Julkaisun jakaja	Suomen Akatemia, PL 131, 00531 Helsinki, viestinta@aka.fi			
Julkaisun kustantaja	Suomen Akatemia			
Painopaikka ja -aika				
Muut tiedot	www.aka.fi/julkaisut			

PRESENTATIONSBLAD

Utgivare	Finlands Akademi	Datum	April 2013
Författare	Utvärderingspanel, red. Dr Sanna Kivimäki		
Publikationens namn	Media and Communication Research in Finnish Universities. Evaluation Report. [Utvärdering av medie- och kommunikationsvetenskaplig forskning vid Finlands universitet]		
Sammandrag	<p>Denna rapport presenterar en internationell utvärdering av den finländska forskningen i medie- och kommunikationsvetenskap. I rapporten presenteras utvärderingens resultat och panelens rekommendationer. Panelen utvärderade totalt tolv forskningsenheter vid nio universitet i Finland. Utvärderingen hade en framtidsinriktad infallsvinkel och grundar sig på material som samlats in år 2012 om åren 2010–2011 samt på enhetsintervjuer som genomfördes i september 2012.</p> <p>I rapporten konstaterar panelen bl.a. att den finländska forskningen i medie- och kommunikationsvetenskap är mycket varierande vad gäller bakgrund, forskningsobjekt och metoder; forskningen bildar inte en enhetlig helhet. Det finns en hel del olika läroämnen som anses höra till disciplinen. Panelen rekommenderar att historien av den kommunikationsvetenskapliga forskningen utreds för att få klarhet på disciplingränserna. Disciplinens mångsidighet borde iaktas allt bättre så att forskningen kunde utvärderas i en lämpligare referensram.</p> <p>Forskningen på området är enligt panelen rik på såväl ämnen som infallsvinklar. Många av de enheter som panelen utvärderade håller hög standard internationellt sett och det finns finländska forskare som är internationellt ledande på sina respektive områden.</p> <p>I de flesta enheter är internationellt samarbete integrerat i forskningen och forskarna har omfattande internationella nätverk. Trots det finns det fortfarande problem vad gäller unga forskares mobilitet. De borde uppmuntras att öka sin internationella rörlighet och sitt deltagande i internationella konferenser. Enligt panelen vore det viktigt att också öka publiceringen i internationella tidskrifter för att mer effektivt sprida forskningsresultat på internationella forum och på andra språk. En stor del av enheternas forskning hänger på externa medel och utarbetandet av finansieringsansökningar åter upp av de resurser som borde användas för att producera publikationer. Finansieringen styr forskningen och t.ex. stiftelsefinansieringens inverkan syns både i forskningsteman och i hur finansieringen fördelats mellan olika enheter. De organisatoriska och strukturella förändringarna som drabbat universiteten har även de påverkat forskningen på området.</p> <p>Utvärderingspanelen är orolig över de unga forskarnas och doktorandernas ställning. I vissa forskningsenheter var särskilt doktorander i en osäker och ojämlig situation beroende på finansieringskällan. Det nationella doktorandprogramsystemet borde därför ytterligare etableras på basis av det tidigare systemet med forskarskolor. Panelen rekommenderar att styrningen stärks strategiskt för att utveckla karriärplaneringen, den internationella mobiliteten, publiceringsplaneringen och forskargemenskapen.</p>		
Nyckelord	kommunikationsvetenskap, kommunikationsvetenskaplig forskning, utvärdering, forskningsfinansiering, medieforskning, informationsforskning, biblioteksvetenskap, forskning i journalistik, talkommunikation, interkulturell kommunikation, organisationskommunikation, kommunikation inom organisationer, filmforskning, audiovisuell kommunikation		
Seriens namn och nummer	Finlands Akademi's publikationer 1/13		
ISSN	0358-9153		
ISBN	Tryck	Pdf 978-951-715-846-6	
Sidantal	97		
Distribution	Finlands Akademi, PB 131, 00531 Helsingfors, viestinta@aka.fi		
Förlag	Finlands Akademi		
Tryckeri/tryckningsort och -år			
Ytterligare information	www.aka.fi/publikationer		

PREFACE

Compared to the Academy of Finland's three other research councils, the Research Council for Culture and Society is by far the most diverse and broad-based considering the disciplines to which it provides funding. Following the Finnish classification of research fields provided by the Ministry for Education, Science and Culture, the Research Council comprises fourteen disciplines. This is not the whole truth, however, since many of these disciplines are diverse in themselves.

This is not the least true of communication research – it is rooted in several academic disciplines and contexts. Today, communication research and postgraduate training are provided by nine Finnish universities, some of them with more than one unit. If the history of communication research is relatively brief – at least if compared to fields such as philosophy, theology, law or history – its evolution can be associated with changes in modern and postmodern society. In this respect, it is not alone among the social sciences and humanities. In Finland, the post-war period saw the growth and decentralisation of the university system, with modernisation and structural changes in society, including rapid urbanisation and the baby boomers entering education. The last half-century has witnessed discussions of post-industrial society, knowledge society and postmodern society. Catchwords aside, the development of digital media in particular has had far-reaching effects on communication and the media as well as on research in this field.

The dynamics of the media landscape was one of the reasons for the Research

Council for Culture and Society to choose communication research as a field to be evaluated by an international panel. There were views saying that these changes had had an impact on research and on the self-understanding of the discipline, which would make an evaluation at this point very interesting. Another, national, reason concerns the funding structures and more specifically the strong position of the Helsingin Sanomat Foundation as a funding body for communication research – an issue also discussed in this evaluation report. The existence of the Helsingin Sanomat Foundation is seen to have impacted other private foundations, so that they direct their funding to other fields, as there are already enough resources for communication research. However, the Foundation's funding has also been seen to impact research themes and topics.

The Finnish universities have been undergoing quite heavy structural reforms over the past few years. The new Universities Act became effective in 2010 and has probably speeded up changes that were under way in any case. Departments have merged and basic university education has been developed towards more general degrees, while there has also been a pressure to identify strong research areas. In this new situation, the universities are responsible for doctoral training, which means that there is no longer earmarked money for networking between universities in doctoral schools. In such a situation, small units and disciplines are more vulnerable than before.

The present evaluation covers a short period of time, from 2010 through to 2012.

The self-evaluations of the departments and units had a key role in the process, and the international panel met with all twelve units involved in the evaluation. The aim was to produce a thoroughly reflected assessment and discussion of the state of communication research in Finland today, not to compare universities or units. The main task of the Academy of Finland is to fund cutting-edge scientific research in Finland. Hopefully, the report can serve various actors of communication research in their work for the future success of the field.

Finally, I would like to extend my sincere thanks to everyone who participated in the evaluation process: the members of the international panel, the steering group members, Senior Science Adviser Hannele Kurki and Science Adviser Kaisa Vaahtera, the Coordinator of the evaluation, Dr Sanna Kivimäki, and – last but not least – the participating researchers.

Helsinki, 17 March 2013

Pauline von Bonsdorff
Chair of the steering group

1 INTRODUCTION

In its performance agreement for 2011, the Academy of Finland's Research Council for Culture and Society decided that the quality and status of communication research will be evaluated with respect to the international level. The field of communication research has not been comprehensively evaluated nationwide before, so the evaluation was considered highly relevant and justified.

The members of the steering group of the evaluation were:

Professor (art education) **Pauline von Bonsdorff**, Chair, University of Jyväskylä, member of the Academy's Research Council for Culture and Society

Research Director (visual communication, graphic design) **Päivi Hovi-Wasastjerna**, Aalto University

Professor (Finnish literature) **Lea Rojola**, University of Turku, member of the Research Council for Culture and Society

Professor (theoretical philosophy) **Matti Sintonen**, University of Helsinki, member of the Research Council for Culture and Society

Professor (Scandinavian languages) **Jan-Ola Östman**, University of Helsinki, member of the Research Council for Culture and Society.

Senior Science Adviser **Hannele Kurki** and Science Adviser **Kaisa Vaahtera** acted as contact persons for the evaluation at the Academy. In addition, Kaisa Vaahtera and trainee Elina Hakoniemi also participated in some of the site visits.

The group appointed the evaluation panel and the evaluation coordinator and defined the target groups and the objectives of the evaluation and the assignment of the panel, as well as the practical aspects of the evaluation project at the Academy.

The evaluation was carried out by an international panel. The members of the panel were (see Appendix 1):

Professor **Thorsten Quandt**, Chair, University of Hohenheim/University of Münster, Germany

- research topics: online communication, media innovation research, digital games and journalism

Professor **Jostein Gripsrud**, University of Bergen, Norway

- research topics: communication studies, communication theory, cultural sociology, cultural studies, film and TV history, media, media and cultural policy, media studies, popular culture, popular music, film and TV, textual theory

Professor **Maria Heller**, Eötvös Loránd University (ELTE), Budapest, Hungary

- research topics: communications theory, media sociology, theories of the public sphere, new information and communication technologies, and discourse analysis of public debates

Professor **Caroline Pauwels**, Vrije Universiteit Brussel, Belgium

- research topics: European audiovisual policy, media, convergence and concentration issues in media industries

Professor **Srikant Sarangi**, Cardiff University, United Kingdom

- research topics: discourse analysis and applied linguistics, language and identity in public life, institutional and professional discourse (e.g., health, social welfare, bureaucracy, education, etc.), quality of life and risk communication in genetic counseling.

To assist the panel, **Sanna Kivimäki** (University of Tampere), PhD, was appointed as a part-time (hourly wage) coordinator for the evaluation. The coordinator's tasks included organising and implementing the evaluation plan, organising evaluation materials and the site visits, and helping with the report.

The kick-off seminar for the evaluation was held in Helsinki on 22 March 2012. The main speaker at the seminar was Professor **Colin Sparks** from Hong Kong Baptist University, who gave a lecture on the future of communication research. After his lecture, the ground plan of the evaluation was presented by steering group member, Professor Päivi Hovi-Wasastjerna and Coordinator Sanna Kivimäki. After that, the stage was open for comments on the planned self-evaluation questionnaire. On the basis of this discussion, some changes were made to the evaluation form. For instance, questions concerning gender balance and equality were added.

There are some research or evaluation projects that have provided a lot of useful background information to this evaluation report. For instance, media and communication research conducted in Finland has also been examined in the research project *Mapping Communication and Media Research* (2010). The research project was funded by the Helsingin

Sanomat Foundation (est. 2005) and it reviewed media and communication research in several countries (Australia, Belgium, Estonia, Finland, France, Germany, Japan, the Netherlands, South Korea, the UK and the US) in 2006–2008. The main research questions of the project were close to the interests of this evaluation: What kind of communication and media research is carried out in a specific country? How do different approaches relate to each other? How is research focused? Where is it heading in the future (Koivisto & Thomas 2010, 7)? Unlike this evaluation report, the focus of Koivisto's and Thomas' research project was on mass communication research, not on the whole field. It excluded organisational communication, speech communication, information studies and artistic research in film and media production, for instance.

A report by Juha Herkman and Miika Vähämaa (Viestinnän tutkimuskeskus CRC, Helsingin yliopisto, Viestinnän laitoksen tutkimusraportteja 1/2007) *Viestintätutkimuksen nykytila Suomessa* [State of the communication research in Finland] (2007) is connected with the project mentioned above, focusing on Finnish communication and media research. In their report, Herkman and Vähämaa also defined 'communication research' as mass communication and media research, based on social sciences and the humanities. The report was based on interviews and the examination of publication databases (theses, articles, reports, books) in 2001–2006.

There are some earlier articles and evaluations that are closely related to the object of this evaluation. For instance, Finnish researcher Ilkka Mäkinen (2007) has written a retrospective review about

Finnish research in information studies, and Professor Maarit Valo (2012) has recently reflected on the development of Finnish speech communication. *Research in Art and Design in Finnish Universities* (2009) evaluated five Finnish art universities, including the University of Art and Design Helsinki (now part of Aalto University) and the University of Lapland, Faculty of Art and Design, which were also included in this

evaluation. *Evaluation of Media and Communication Studies in Higher Education in Finland* was produced in 2002, and it also observed the basic degrees provided at polytechnics and universities of applied sciences. Because of the major organisational changes in the universities during recent years, the latter evaluation was not valued as proper comparison material for this evaluation.

2 AIMS AND SCOPE OF THIS REPORT

The evaluation should cover the disciplines of media and communication research (journalism, organisational communication, speech communication, audiovisual communication, information sciences and other fields of communication research) with a view to assessing the strengths and weaknesses of research and researcher training to secure internationally high-standard research and researchers for the future. One of the key purposes of the evaluation is to support the future development of this research field.

The objectives of the evaluation were defined in the terms of reference (see Appendix 2) as follows:

1. To evaluate the quality of communication research in Finland as compared to the international level
2. To identify the strengths and weaknesses of the research
3. To estimate communication and collaboration with key partners at home and abroad
4. To estimate the significance of communication research to Finnish society
5. To evaluate the efficacy of the research, i.e. how much output is produced in relation to the resources invested
6. To evaluate the quality of researcher training
7. To make suggestions and recommendations to ensure the future supply of qualified academic and communication professionals in Finland
8. To make suggestions and recommendations for the further development of communication research and research policy in Finland.

The present evaluation combines an external assessment by an international panel with an internal self-assessment exercise. The views and opinions were collected with a self-evaluation questionnaire (see Appendix 3), which was sent out soon after the kick-off seminar in spring 2012. In addition to the questions on basic numerical data, the self-evaluation form included a number of open questions. The goal was to give the units an opportunity to describe their aims, practices and possible problems more freely, especially now, under the major and still ongoing changes in organisational cultures. This opportunity was also given by asking the units' comments on the report draft.

The aim of this report is to make the diversity of the field visible, reflect the state of the field, or some aspects of that, as well as to give some ideas on how to improve the possibilities of communication and media research. The idea is to give an (impressionistic) overview of the current situation in the field of Finnish communication and media studies as well as to make some proposals for improving the situation in the research field in the future. In addition, the purpose of this report is to make the units' own views visible.

The target of this evaluation is not to compare Finnish communication and media research with the research conducted in some other countries. For instance, geopolitical power relations, historical reasons, language questions and research resources make the question of reasonable comparability tensioned. Each

country constitutes a unique context for communication and media research, which is organised in multiple ways (Koivisto & Thomas 2010, 7–8). The target of this evaluation is neither to compare Finnish communication and media research conducted at different Finnish universities. As Koivisto and Thomas (2010) argue in their book, it is difficult to illustrate comprehensively all communication and media studies in the case countries. The difficulty of ‘getting the whole picture’ – even regarding one single country – is also reflected in this report.

Regarding the aims, the limits of the evaluation are obvious. First, the evaluation was carried out in the middle of extensive changes in the whole Finnish university system. The most important of these was the new Universities Act (effective as of 1 January 2010). This brought a number of structural changes, including the merger of some universities. Many essential changes were still under construction during the evaluation, and the staff did not have any adequate experiences of the final impacts of these changes. Because of this, the evaluation period was defined to be rather short, covering only the years 2010–2011, from the Universities Act onwards. Still, the staff numbers describe the situation in the spring 2012.

Second, due to the panellists’ schedules, the evaluation took place at the beginning of the autumn term, and the discussions were tightly scheduled to take place during one week (17–21 September). Each interview or discussion took only some two hours, which is, of course, a very limited time to discuss the complex situation of communication and media studies in a changing university. All in all, the evaluation panel met 89 people during one week.

Third, the time for this kind of knowledge production is also limited. The first parts of this report were written before Christmas 2012 and the final version was completed in March 2013. Many things may have changed in Finnish universities by the publication of this report, and some of the presented points do not hit their targets any longer. Hopefully, the major structural changes have settled down and researchers and teachers can concentrate on their tasks better.

Due to the extensive organisational changes and the short evaluation period, it is hard to present statistically comparable and exact data. It is also important to acknowledge that, due to the organisational changes and new administrative practices with new and unfortunately sometimes ineffective computer programs, some of the answers asked for the evaluation were somewhat difficult for the units to produce. All in all, the ‘under construction’ situation at the universities, mentioned in several self-evaluation questionnaires, reveal more about general orientations, plans for the near future and trends and tendencies. The panel provides some numerical data to illustrate not so much crystal-clear facts as the tendencies and scales of Finnish communication and media research and its resources.

Still, on the basis of the self-evaluation forms collected in spring 2012 and the discussions conducted in September, the aim is to give a critical, but constructive view of the field of Finnish communication and media research.

3 COMMUNICATION RESEARCH – AN IMAGINED COMMUNITY?

According to the current Finnish classification of fields of science, communication and media studies are placed in the main category of social sciences, in category 518, *media and communication*. The category includes *journalism, information studies (with societal aspects), library science, media communication and socio-cultural communication*. Despite its classification among social sciences, it is widely accepted that ‘communication’ is an interdisciplinary field, situated somewhere between the humanities and social sciences, between art and technology, between theory and practice. The field is based merely on the objects of study rather than on methodology or certain theoretical approaches. The field is also often defined on a social and institutional level, not on the level of disciplinary basic concepts or theoretical understandings, and not even as the supposed common object of study. (Koivisto & Thomas 2010, 40.)

Thus, communication studies in Finland is an extensive field, ranging from information studies to journalism, speech communication, organisational communication, media studies, visual communication and graphic design as well as the artistic education of film directors and photographers. The field is based on diversified scientific and theoretical orientations far beyond the social sciences. There are at least four main orientations or traditions that shape the profiles of different units and subjects: 1) social sciences, 2) humanities, 3) artistic, practice-based research, and 4) natural sciences and technology, the latter concerning mainly some approaches of information studies.

‘Communication’ is used as an umbrella category in order to gather together different subjects, even if they want it or not, and despite the fact that ‘communication’ can refer to almost anything (Koivisto & Thomas 2010, 29). ‘Media’, with its long history and its meta-conceptual nature, is also an ambivalent concept.

According to Finnish mass communication researcher Veikko Pietilä (2005), (mass) communication has not emerged as a unified discipline but has evolved from an incoherent set of approaches into a multiple field of discourses. This means that the definitions and conceptualisations of ‘communication’ and ‘communication research’ are not self-evident and even highly contested. Despite this – or because of this – communication and media research has been an expanding institutional success in the academic world globally in the last few decades. However, this progress has largely occurred by redefining and expanding its subject matter. (Koivisto & Thomas 2010, 13–15)

This has inevitably led to the question of whether there is something we can call ‘communication research’ on the whole and whether communication research can be regarded as a ‘discipline’ in a traditional academic sense (Kivikuru 1998; Koivisto & Thomas 2010) – even when regarding just one part of the field, mass communication research.

The diversity of the theory field can be illustrated, for instance, with the

classification constructed by American researcher Robert T. Craig (1999). He has itemised several research traditions in the field of communication:

1. rhetorical tradition – communication theorised as the practical art of discourse
2. semiotic tradition – communication theorised as intersubjective mediation by signs
3. phenomenological tradition – communication theorised as experience of otherness; dialogue
4. cybernetic tradition – communication theorised as information processing
5. socio-psychological tradition – communication theorised as expression, interaction, and influence
6. socio-cultural tradition – communication theorised as (re)production of social order
7. critical tradition – communication theorised as discursive reflection.

Today, the field of ‘communication research’ is often described as a crossroads, a bazaar, a market or a department store. The new phenomena of the communication and media world have increased the number of specific research cultures, which have produced several different researcher identities.

According to Koivisto’s and Thomas’ considerations (2010, 83), many Finnish scholars are worried about the national line(s) of research, hoping they would unify the field better. On the one hand, pluralistic research is appreciated; on the other hand, the lack of national unity is seen as a threat to the development of research, which is connected to funding problems, too. However, fluidity, slack identity, close relations to the so-called practices and certain eclecticism can be seen as strengths of the field, too. (Koivisto & Thomas 2010, 143)

4 IN BETWEEN THEORIES AND TRADITIONS

One way to reflect the complicated concept of ‘communication’ is to split it at least into three subcategories: mass communication, organisational communication and speech communication. Some writers add more subareas to this list, such as group communication, intercultural communication, interpersonal communication, computer-mediated communication and visual communication. In this categorisation, ‘communication’ forms the major concept, referring to the general process by which people arrive at shared meanings through the interchange of messages. The history of the area is situated in the ancient rhetoric, and the effective delivery of spoken word. Nowadays, it is often emphasised that ‘communication’ is a modern discipline, essentially intertwined with modern life and technology. (e.g. Rubin, Rubin & Piele 2005.)

According to Herkman’s (2008, 153–155) observations from the Finnish context, despite the unifying projects of, for instance, linguistic and rhetorical turns and feminist and cultural studies approaches, ‘mass communication research’ refers mainly to traditional social sciences approaches, ‘media studies’ more to the humanities and art studies. According to Herkman, the separation of social scientific ‘research’ and humanistic ‘studies’ also draws lines between theory and empiricism as well as between quantitative and qualitative methods. Social-science-oriented research tends to stress the mastery of methodology and methods and the transparency of the research process. The humanities-oriented approaches tend

to emphasise the subjective, creative and original role of the researcher, as well as the creative way to interpret research materials and combine different methods. As he notes, these differences are ill-defined and by no means all-inclusive. Still, at least three main categories can be found among media and communication researchers: 1) those who emphasise political and social questions in relation to media or communication, 2) those who emphasise the cultural aspects of media and communication, and 3) those who focus on media and communication technology.

The interests of communication research in ‘cultural aspects’ and ‘communication technology’ make the connections to artistic research and information studies comprehensible. ‘New’ technologies and the internet have also, of course, blurred the borderlines in many varying ways. Still, the methodology of both artistic research and information studies might vary a lot from the traditional social sciences and the humanities. In art and design, there has been much debate on the nature of artistic and practice-based research and its productive relationship with practice and artistic creation (e.g. *Research in Art...* 2009). At any rate, design and art, as well as behavioural sciences, may create an important context to information studies. The research topics often concentrate on ‘new technologies’, such as the internet, and their impact on people, practices and society. Likewise, the research focuses on topics such as information retrieval, user-created media, game design and gaming experiences as well as health information, everyday information and media practice.

One interesting phenomenon in the field of communication is the 'internal' specific areas of interests or research cultures, such as health communication, scientific communication or visual journalism, for instance. These areas are often based more on specific objects of interests, and they might combine different approaches from several different backgrounds. Some of these areas have special chairs and some do not; thus, the academic positions of these specific areas of interests are often off-balance. For instance, feminist research established its position in the 1990s. Despite this, feminist communication and media research does not have any professorship at the Finnish universities.

Tensions between the different traditions are often seen in education. 'Multidisciplinarity' or 'interdisciplinarity' are not just a practical and inexpensive way to combine different approaches but much harder goals. Disciplines and different traditions have their own social and cultural characteristics, that is, norms, values, modes of interaction, lifestyle and pedagogical and ethical codes, which are sometimes described with the metaphor of a tribe, too. (Ylijoki 2000)

5 PLAYERS OF THE FINNISH FIELD OF COMMUNICATION RESEARCH

One indicator of the heterogeneity of the Finnish communication research field is that the researchers are organised in different organisations.

1. *The Finnish Association for Mass Communication Research* (Tiedotusopillinen yhdistys, TOY/MEVI), (www.uta.fi/jarjestot/toy/english.php) was established in 1974. It promotes media and mass communication research and has some 500 members. The journal *Media & Viestintä* (earlier *Tiedotustutkimus*) is published by TOY and Nordicom Finland. Usually, TOY has been a partner in the organising committees of both the *Finnish Conference on Communication and the Finnish Conference on Media Studies*. It is also a co-organiser of the biennial Nordmedia conference. TOY changed its name to the Finnish Association for Media and Communication Studies (MEVI ry) in February 2013.
2. *The Finnish Society for Cinema Studies* (Suomen Elokuvatutkimuksen Seura, SETS, <http://sets.wordpress.com/in-english>) was founded in 1985 and it aims to promote academic film studies and studies in audiovisual culture as well as common interests of these fields in Finland. The main activities of SETS are publishing, disseminating information and organising seminars. The society has currently some 80 paying members. SETS publishes the academic journal *Lähikuva* together with the Department of Media Studies of the University of Turku, the Film Centre of Varsinais-Suomi in Turku and the Film Club of Turku. SETS is usually a partner in the

organisation committee of the *Finnish Conference on Media Studies*.

3. *Prologos* (www.prologos.fi) is the Finnish National Association of Speech Communication, founded in 1989. Prologos aims at promoting the research and instruction of speech communication. It arranges conferences and seminars, including an annual scientific meeting of the Finnish professionals of speech communication. Prologos is usually a partner in the organisation committee of the *Finnish Conference on Communication*. Prologos has currently some 170 members. Prologos publishes a yearbook called *Prologi*.
4. *The Finnish Society of Information Studies* ITY (<http://pro.tsv.fi/ity>), founded in 1979, brings together people interested in information studies. The members of the society are mainly researchers and teachers, as well as students, librarians and information specialists. ITY arranges a national conference on information studies every other year. It also publishes the academic journal *Informaatiotutkimus* (until 1995 *Kirjastotiede ja informatiikka*).
5. *The Finnish Society on Media Education* (<http://en.mediakasvatus.fi/node/5568>), founded in 2005, aims to support and develop the field of research and practices concerning media education, contribute to the public debate and provide opportunities to share media education experiences. The association has more than 200 members, most of whom are teachers, researchers, kindergartners, youth workers, librarians, and workers in the media branch.

6. Many Finnish media and communication scholars are members of the *Society for Cultural Studies in Finland* (<http://kultut.fi/about-us>). The society was established in 2008 but previously operated as a network (est. 1984). The society networks researchers from several different disciplines and arranges multidisciplinary seminars, conferences and summer schools. It publishes the academic journal *Kulttuurintutkimus*.

Besides the societies, one player in the field is – or was – the *University Network for Communication Sciences*, which started in 1998. Its goals were: 1) to enhance scientific cooperation and exchange of information, 2) to enhance undergraduate instruction, especially with the help of information and communication technologies (ICT), 3) to enhance doctoral studies and design novel research programmes, 4) to plan and implement innovative degree programmes, and 5) to lobby for communication research and teaching (Hurme & al. 2004).

Networking was a very popular form of cooperation during the 1990s, and many scientific networks received financial support from the Ministry of Education. The University Network of Communication Sciences has not had many activities since the suspension of its funding in 2010, but it still exists.

National cooperation has been carried out in two national doctoral programmes, Elomedia and VITRO.

Elomedia, the Doctoral Programme of Cinema and Audiovisual Media (www.elomedia.fi), carries out practice-based audiovisual research. Elomedia's research areas cover film, television, animation and gaming industry, media art and other audiovisual cultural and content production, regardless of the distribution

channel or format. Elomedia is coordinated by Aalto University School of Arts, Design and Architecture.

VITRO, the Doctoral School of Communication Studies (www.uta.fi/cmt/en/doctoralstudies/doctoralschools/vitro/index.html), previously known as CORE, focuses on three themes: 1) changes in communication, 2) changes in information and communication practices, and 3) communication and changing values. VITRO is coordinated by the School of Communication, Media and Theatre of the University of Tampere.

The Finnish doctoral programme system was established in 1995 (doctoral programmes were previously called graduate schools), with funding from the Ministry of Education (now the Ministry of Education, Science and Culture), the universities and the Academy of Finland. The goal was to make postgraduate education more systematic and efficient, shorten the time it takes for doctoral candidates to write their dissertations and thus lower the age at which doctoral candidates defend their dissertations. Students in doctoral programmes are paid a salary and they work full-time on their research. The doctoral programmes also have so-called status students who are allowed to take part in the teaching organised by the doctoral programme but who are not funded through the system. When writing this, the future of both doctoral programmes is slightly unclear. The special funding of the network-based doctoral programmes from the Ministry will end at the end of 2015.

In addition to the above lists, it is worth mentioning *Nordicom*, the Nordic Information Centre for Media and Communication Research (www.nordicom.org).

nordicom.gu.se/eng.php), which is based at the University of Tampere. Nordicom is a cooperation project between the Nordic countries (Denmark, Finland, Iceland, Norway and Sweden). Nordicom aims at developing media studies and helping

ensure that research results are made visible in the treatment of media issues at different levels in both the public and private sector. Nordicom is an institution that operates under the auspices of the Nordic Council of Ministers.

6 HISTORICAL PERSPECTIVES

By reason of the heterogeneity of the field, a coherent story of the scientific development of the field is an unfeasible project and out of the question in this context. In spite of the difficulties of getting ‘the whole picture’, some fragments of the historical development can be given. Of course, the history and development of the disciplines partly reflect features specific to the country and partly universal trends.

In Finland, rhetoric became a university subject when the country’s first university was established in Turku in 1640. Later, the base of the university-level instruction of speech communication was constructed in instruction in public speaking and oral interpretation for careers such as clergymen, primary school teachers and secondary school teachers in the 19th century, with influences from the German *Sprechkunde*. The tradition of speech teaching is also strongly influenced by the theatre, recitation, voice training and popular enlightenment, too. The first lectureship in speech communication was established at the University of Helsinki in 1928. A special department of elocution was established in Jyväskylä in 1962. (Valo 1998, 2012; Isotalus 2005.)

The University of Tampere was the first university to start teaching speech communication as a minor subject in 1970. In Jyväskylä, speech communication was established as a subject in 1975. In 1982, the University of Jyväskylä started a comprehensive programme (both MA and PhD) in speech communication, and the first professorship in speech communication was installed in Jyväskylä in 1987. At present, there are three

professors in speech communication in Finland, two in Jyväskylä and one in Tampere. (Valo 1998, 2012; Isotalus 2005.)

According to Isotalus (2005), there are two different orientations in the Finnish study of speech communication today. The domestic tradition is more speech-oriented than the international trends, which tend to emphasise more communication aspects. The communication orientation is clearly seen in the American influence of the textbooks, for instance. There are discussions about whether ‘speech’ is needed in the name of the subject or whether it should be replaced by ‘interaction’ or just ‘communication’, as computer-mediated communication, for instance, is nowadays one of the specific research areas (Valo 2012).

As in many other countries, the emergence of journalism and mass communication was also in Finland originally connected to very pragmatic needs. Practically oriented education in the area originated from German ‘newspaper science’, *Zeitungswissenschaft*, and started as college-level training of journalists at the Helsinki School of Social Sciences (later the University of Tampere) in 1925. In 1947, the first chair of ‘newspaper science’ in the Nordic countries was established at this school. Research in the area of communication was rather modest, consisting of historical studies of the press and its personalities. However, sociologist and political scientists were analysing the press and public communication by content analysis and audience surveys in the 1950s. Some humanistic approaches to film studies were also made.

According to Veikko Pietilä, Tarmo Malmberg and Kaarle Nordenstreng (2004), journalism and mass communication studies began to unfold as an independent area of research in Finland as late as the 1960s. The field is rather diversified with a number of different research traditions and has been influenced by Euro-American, French and German research traditions. In addition, different researchers have been influenced by a number of different research fields, such as sociology, political science, psychology, linguistics and cultural studies.

Since the 1980s, the diversification and the growth of the field have been tremendous. Research has been affected by theories of, for example, structuralism, post-structuralism, semiotics and psychoanalysis, as well as by cultural studies and feminist studies. Instead of communication, which earlier was often considered the basic concept, 'media' and 'media culture' have increased their popularity since the 1990s.

Today, journalism and mass communication are taught in Jyväskylä, Helsinki and Tampere. In Jyväskylä, the Department of Communication comprises four communication subjects: journalism, organisational communication & PR, speech communication, and intercultural communication. In Tampere, journalism and mass communication is combined with speech communication, theatre and drama studies and theatre work. In Helsinki, media and communication studies combines approaches from mass communication, organisational and interpersonal communication, and web-based communication, for instance.

Humanities-oriented media studies, which combine approaches from art research and cultural studies, are taught in Turku. The

unit has a long tradition in cinema studies, which has its roots in literature and theatre studies. The unit concentrates on film and television studies, popular culture, media philosophy, feminist media studies, digital media and rhetoric.

Finnish information studies has had several varying names in different contexts, such as *library science*, *Bibliothekswissenschaft*, *biblioteksvetenskap*, *information science(s)*, *Informationswissenschaft*, *informationsvetenskap*, *library and information science (LIS)*, *documentation*, *documentation studies*, *documentation science and information studies*. It has its roots in the German *Bibliothekswissenschaft*, which developed in the early 19th century. The aim of the study was very practical, too, that is, to develop systems to organise libraries in a meaningful way. (Haasio & Vakkari 2005–2006)

More intensive interest in information and scientific communication emerged in the 1940s and the 1950s. Researchers became interested in fact-finding and data acquisition, for instance. Information retrieval and information requirement research also started to develop. Thus, the essential elements of modern information studies were ready in the 1960s. The first chair in library and information science was established at the University of Tampere in 1971. At the moment, the subject of information studies is taught at three universities: Tampere, Oulu and Åbo Akademi. (Haasio & Vakkari 2005–2006)

Systematic and institution-wide artistic research in media is a relatively new enterprise in Finland, as it is elsewhere around the world. In Finland, the first institutions for educating artists were established in the 19th century in the fields of fine arts, crafts and industrial art,

architecture and music. Until the latter half of the 20th century, their task was to train creative artists. Research activities at art universities and departments were gradually launched from the 1980s onwards with a focus on doctoral training.

This change was largely a result of the changing of the status of art academies to universities of higher learning, with the expectation of reflection and systematic development of theory and explanation of the creative enterprise. This also meant a new appreciation of the productive relationship of theory and practice, because

it was problematic to distinguish between performance and the ideas which motivated it. (Research in art... 2009)

Until the beginning of 2013, there were four art universities in Finland (Finnish Academy of Fine Arts, Sibelius Academy, Theatre Academy, and University of Art and Design Helsinki). Today, the first three form the University of the Arts. The units involved in this evaluation are located elsewhere. The University of Art and Design Helsinki became part of Aalto University in 2010. The Faculty of Art and Design at the University of Lapland has maintained its position.

7 NEW UNIVERSITIES ACT

The Finnish university system has been undergoing a major organisational change since the new Universities Act was adopted in 2010. Before this, all Finnish universities were state universities and received their funding mainly through the state budget. This situation has not radically changed, but the Universities Act brought a number of changes over a very short period of time.

According to the Ministry of Education, Science and Culture, the purpose of the reform was to improve the universities' ability to

- react to changes in the operational environment
- diversify their funding base
- compete for international research funding
- cooperate with foreign universities and research institutes
- allocate resources to top-level research and strategic focus areas
- ensure the quality and effectiveness of research and teaching
- strengthen their role within the innovation system.

This reform has also meant that university staff are no longer employed by the state. Civil-service employment relationships have become contractual employment relationships and universities negotiate in collective bargaining. The idea is that universities will be able to pursue independent human resource policies, improve their attractiveness as employers and strengthen their competitive advantage in order to recruit the best possible staff.

Consequently, universities have taken steps to develop their four-stage career system in research and education (doctoral candidate, postdoctoral fellow, independent senior researcher, professor) in order to make the research career more predictable and transparent. Tenure-track systems are also applied or currently being developed.

The network of universities and institutions of higher education has also changed recently. For example, the Universities of Joensuu and Kuopio have merged to form the University of Eastern Finland, while Helsinki University of Technology, Helsinki School of Economics and the University of Art and Design Helsinki have merged to form Aalto University. All these changes have resulted in very different university structures – faculties, departments or schools, or combinations of these – and in varying study cultures and communities.

In many cases, the university reform has also been linked to major reorganisational arrangements within the universities. The target has been to construct broad units, where communication studies, for instance, are often combined with very different types of subjects. 'Communication' seems to be often defined partly administratively, too, and it is resituated and forced to search for new contexts and partners in the changing university structures.

At many universities, the division of labour regarding doctoral studies has been divided into two sections: 1) the universities' own doctoral schools, which

provide general courses, such as academic presentations or writing in English, and 2) the units' own, subject-specific doctoral programmes.

In 2013, further changes will be made in the university funding system with the launch of a new strategy. According to this new state funding model, the indicators for universities' performance are, for instance: completed doctoral degrees (9%), publications (13%), success in gaining funding and supporters (9%), doctoral degrees by foreign students (1%) and the number of foreign staff (2%).

As described above, the role of scientific publications as an indicator for university performance will increase considerably, to 13 per cent. Researchers are highly encouraged to publish articles in top-ranked international, peer-reviewed journals. In some cases, this might mean challenging changes in publication policy.

There have been two projects with the aim of evaluating the quality of publications. In 2010, the Ministry of Education, Science and Culture adopted a new publication type classification. It creates a basis for a common classification within the higher education sector and seeks to provide a level of accuracy to encompass the publication activities of the entire field. The classification (known as KOTA) groups articles (peer-reviewed or not), monographs and other publications, published in Finland or abroad, for instance.

The Finnish Publication Forum Project is a project that aims to assess the quality of scientific publication channels, especially journals and book publishers, in all research fields. The project was launched in August 2010 at the initiative of Universities Finland (UNIFI). It is funded by the Ministry of Education, Science and Culture and based at the Federation of Finnish Learned Societies.

The Publication Forum Project rates publication channels in two basic categories: domestic and foreign scientific publication channels (level 1) and leading scientific publication channels (level 2). Level 1 covers the central publication channels of domestic and foreign origin that meet the criteria of a scientific publication channel. Level 2 covers leading scientific publication channels in which researchers from different countries publish their best research. A panel may also choose to classify 25 per cent of level-2 journals and series in level 3 to mark the world's top publication channels in its field.

There has been a lot of discussion on this topic lately. Additionally, there is a lot of discussion on the ability of varying ranking systems, citation indexes and bibliometric methods (e.g. Web of Science) to measure and value particularly contributions from the humanities and social sciences as well from artistic subjects.

8 UNITS INVOLVED

The target of this evaluation, communication and media studies, is based at nine universities all over the country:

1. Aalto University in Helsinki (business communication, new media, film and photography)
2. University of Jyväskylä (intercultural communication, journalism, organisational communication and PR, speech communication)
3. University of Helsinki (media and communication studies)
4. University of Lapland (graphic design)
5. University of Oulu (information studies)
6. University of Tampere (journalism and mass communication, speech communication, information sciences)
7. University of Turku (media studies)
8. University of Vaasa (communication studies)
9. Åbo Akademi University in Turku (information studies)

In addition to the nine universities and twelve units that provide education on communication and media on the postgraduate level, there are also some units where communication and media studies are offered as minor subjects, or, as in case of the University Consortium of Pori, in cooperation with other universities.

Most of the units included in this evaluation are part of science universities

and their system of degrees and curricula is formed in line with the legislation of science universities. However, there are two exceptions: Aalto University School of Arts, Design and Architecture and the University of Lapland; the latter being the only science university art unit in Finland. The special feature of these units is that part of the dissertation can also be an art production, a series of art productions meaningfully connected to each other, or a product development project. In this case, a written thesis is to be included, which should be in a dialogic and analytic relation to the art productions or product development project.

The Department of Communication at the University of Jyväskylä is the only department focused on communication and consists of four different communication subjects. Usually, communication studies is organisationally linked to other subjects, such as social sciences (Helsinki), administration and health studies (Oulu), theatre studies and acting (Tampere/journalism, media studies), computer sciences (Tampere/information studies), the humanities and art research (Turku), language studies (Vaasa) or business and administration (Åbo Akademi).

The following descriptions of the units are based on the self-evaluation questionnaires collected in spring 2012 and on the information given on the unit's websites.

1 Aalto University, School of Arts, Design and Architecture, Department of Film, Television and Scenography

Aalto University (est. 2010) consists of six schools, one of them being the School of Arts, Design and Architecture (est. 1871/1973).

The major activity of the Department of Film, Television and Scenography is artistic work, which forms the basis of teaching and research. Besides unravelling and analysing the artists' tacit knowledge, the research scopes for new working methods that are being developed in the field at present. The aim is to serve as a link between the professional field and academic research, mediating ideas in both directions.

Staff of the Unit spring 2012.

	Task category	
1	Professors	10.5
2	Other senior researchers	
3	Post-doc researchers	3
4	Doctoral students receiving salary	8
5	Doctoral students on grants	
6	Visiting researchers and visiting research students	
7	Other research staff	3
	Total number of active research staff (1–7)	24.5
8	Teachers, lecturers	
9	Teachers, practical or vocational education	
10	Technical personnel	
11	Administrative personnel	
12	Other personnel	
	Staff, total (1–12)	24.5

Units' funding sources (2010–2011) (EUR 1,000).

Funding source		2010	2011	Total
Core funding	Budget funding	3,850	4,015	7,865
	Other	3	29	32
Total core funding		3,853	4,044	7,897
External funding	Academy of Finland	328	380	708
	Tekes	70	43	113
	EU	32	7	39
External funding, total		430	430	860
Funding, total		4,283	4,474	8,757

Publications produced by the Unit (2010–2011).

	Type of publication*	2010	2011	Total
A	A1 Journal articles (refereed), original research	8	2	10
	A2 Review article, literature review, systematic review	1		1
	A3 Book section, chapters in research book	1		1
	A4 Conference proceedings			
B	B1 Non-refereed journal articles			
	B2 Book section		3	3
	B3 Non-refereed conference proceedings			
C	C1 Book	2	2	4
	C2 Edited book, conference proceedings or special issues of a journal	1		1
D	D1 Article in a trade journal	3	5	8
	D2 Article in a professional manual or guide	1		1
	D3 Professional conference proceedings			
	D4 Published development or research report or study		3	3
	D5 Textbook, professional manual or guide, dictionary		2	2
E	E1 Popularised article, newspaper article			
	E2 Popularised monograph	1		1
F	F1 Published independent work of art		2	2
	F2 Public partial realisation of a work of art	1	1	2
	F3 Public artistic performance or exhibition	2	1	3
	F4 Model or design adopted for production/use			
H	H1 Granted patent			
	H2 Invention disclosure			
I	I1 Audiovisual material			
	I2 ICT software			
Total				42

* F1–F3: Staff’s independent works of art and partial realisations of a work of art are numerous, such as long fiction films and documentaries.

2 Aalto University, School of Arts, Design and Architecture, Department of Media

Within the Aalto University School of Arts, Design and Architecture, the Department of Media comprises the Graphic Design, Media Lab and Photography units. From an artistic and design perspective, the research subject of the department is media itself, how it is created and used and what its potential impact is in society. Not all actors within the Department are directly involved with fine arts, its establishments and research practices. The focus on digital media in audiovisual production is also important in much of the research.

This evaluation takes into account the research education and selected work of four research groups: Media Concepts, ARKI, Systems of Representation (SysRep) and Learning Environments (LeGroup).

Staff of the Unit spring 2012.

	Task category	
1	Professors	9.5
2	Other senior researchers	3
3	Post-doc researchers	4
4	Doctoral students receiving salary	28
5	Doctoral students on grants	
6	Visiting researchers and visiting research students	5
7	Other research staff	10*
	Total number of active research staff (1–7)	59.5
8	Teachers, lecturers	
9	Teachers, practical or vocational education	
10	Technical personnel	
11	Administrative personnel	
12	Other personnel	**
	Staff, total (1–12)	59.5

* These individuals are also doctoral candidates

** This information is missing

Units' funding sources (2010–2011) (EUR 1,000).

Funding source		2010	2011	Total
Core funding	Budget funding	4,406	5,274	9,680*
	Other	39	38	77
Total core funding		4,445	5,312	9,757
External funding	Academy of Finland	162	60	222
	Other foundations or organisations	118	103	221
	Tekes	226	345	571
	Industry	44	114	158
	Other public funding	13	56	69
	EU	137	208	345
External funding, total		739	886	1,625**
Funding, total		5,184	6,198	11,343

* Total funding (department)

** External funding of four research groups

Publications produced by the Unit (2010–2011).

	Type of publication	2010	2011	Total
A	A1 Journal articles (refereed), original research	4	18	22
	A2 Review article, literature review, systematic review			
	A3 Book section, chapters in research book		6	6
	A4 Conference proceedings	18	21	39
B	B1 Non-refereed journal articles	8	6	14
	B2 Book section			
	B3 Non-refereed conference proceedings			
C	C1 Book	3		3
	C2 Edited book, conference proceedings or special issues of a journal	17	13	30
D	D1 Article in a trade journal			
	D2 Article in a professional manual or guide			
	D3 Professional conference proceedings			
	D4 Published development or research report or study		3	3
	D5 Textbook, professional manual or guide, dictionary			
E	E1 Popularised article, newspaper article			
	E2 Popularised monograph			
F	F1 Published independent work of art			
	F2 Public partial realisation of a work of art			
	F3 Public artistic performance or exhibition			
	F4 Model or design adopted for production/use			
H	H1 Granted patent			
	H2 Invention disclosure			
I	I1 Audiovisual material			
	I2 ICT software			
Total				117

3 Aalto University, School of Business, Department of Communication

The Department of Communication is one of seven departments at Aalto University School of Business – formerly known as Helsinki School of Economics (HSE, est. 1911). The Department offers teaching at the interface of communication and management studies.

As the Department’s focus of research and teaching is on communication in business and economic contexts, it cooperates especially with the Department of Management and International Business and the Department of Accounting.

The main research areas of the Department are: 1) corporate and organisational communication, 2) strategy-as-practice/

discourse-as-practice, and 3) multimodality and the methodology of communication and discourse studies.

Staff of the Unit spring 2012.

	Task category	
1	Professors	3
2	Other senior researchers	
3	Post-doc researchers	3
4	Doctoral students receiving salary	5
5	Doctoral students on grants	1
6	Visiting researchers and visiting research students	
7	Other research staff	
	Total number of active research staff (1–7)	12
8	Teachers, lecturers	10
9	Teachers, practical or vocational education	
10	Technical personnel	
11	Administrative personnel	1
12	Other personnel	
	Staff, total (1–12)	23

Units' funding sources (2010–2011) (EUR 1,000).

Funding source		2010	2011	Total
Core funding	Budget funding	1,078	1,078	2,156
	Other	10	106	116
Total core funding		1,088	1,184	2,272
External funding	Academy of Finland			
	Finnish Cultural Foundation			
	Helsingin Sanomat Foundation	22	99	121
	Kone Foundation			
	Kordelin Foundation			
	Wihuri Foundations	9	10	19
	Emil Aaltonen Foundation			
	Other foundations or organisations	1	26	27
	Tekes			
	Industry			
	Other public funding			
	EU			
Other foreign organisations				
External funding, total		32	135	167
Funding, total		1,120	1,319	2,439

Publications produced by the Unit (2010–2011).

	Type of publication	2010	2011	Total
A	A1 Journal articles (refereed), original research	11	14	25
	A2 Review article, literature review, systematic review		1	1
	A3 Book section, chapters in research book	4	2	6
	A4 Conference proceedings	5	17	22
B	B1 Non-refereed journal articles	2		2
	B2 Book section	1	1	2
	B3 Non-refereed conference proceedings		4	4
C	C1 Book	1		1
	C2 Edited book, conference proceedings or special issues of a journal	2		2
D	D1 Article in a trade journal			
	D2 Article in a professional manual or guide			
	D3 Professional conference proceedings		1	1
	D4 Published development or research report or study	1		1
	D5 Textbook, professional manual or guide, dictionary		1	1
E	E1 Popularised article, newspaper article	2		2
	E2 Popularised monograph			
F	F1 Published independent work of art			
	F2 Public partial realisation of a work of art			
	F3 Public artistic performance or exhibition			
	F4 Model or design adopted for production/use			
H	H1 Granted patent			
	H2 Invention disclosure			
I	I1 Audiovisual material			
	I2 ICT software			
Total				70

4 University of Jyväskylä, Department of Communication

The Department of Communication at the University of Jyväskylä (est. 1934) is part of the Faculty of Humanities. The Department consists of four subjects: journalism, speech communication, organisational communication and PR, and intercultural communication. The Department was founded in 1985.

The Department's research strategy consists of three focus areas: 1) media and communication in social change processes (history and future of communication and media, changes in organisations and communication professions, crisis and risk communication), 2) human interaction, communication and culture (communication relationships from the perspectives of development, leadership, efficiency and wellbeing, intercultural communication competence, social media

and networking, technology-mediated communication), and 3) communication and wellbeing in work environments (communication in multicultural workplaces, communication in dispersed teams and organisations).

Staff of the Unit spring 2012.

	Task category	
1	Professors	6
2	Other senior researchers	7
3	Post-doc researchers	2
4	Doctoral students receiving salary	11
5	Doctoral students on grants	17
6	Visiting researchers and visiting research students	1
7	Other research staff	
	Total number of active research staff (1–7)	44
8	Teachers, lecturers	3
9	Teachers, practical or vocational education	
10	Technical personnel	1
11	Administrative personnel	2
12	Other personnel	6
	Staff, total (1–12)	50

Units' funding sources (2010–2011) (EUR 1,000).

Funding source		2010	2011	Total
Core funding	Budget funding	1,862	1,758	3,620
	Other			
Total core funding		1,862	1,758	3,620
External funding	Academy of Finland	38	65	103
	Finnish Cultural Foundation	87	61	148
	Helsingin Sanomat Foundation	116	76	192
	Kone Foundation			
	Kordelin Foundation			
	Wihuri Foundations	29		29
	Emil Aaltonen Foundation			
	Other foundations or organisations	32	102	134
	Tekes	160	67	227
	Industry			
	Other public funding	68	99	167
	EU	221	210	431
Other foreign organisations	42		42	
External funding, total		793	680	1,473
Funding, total		2,655	2,438	5,093

Publications produced by the Unit (2010–2011).

	Type of publication	2010	2011	Total
A	A1 Journal articles (refereed), original research	19	12	31
	A2 Review article, literature review, systematic review		1	1
	A3 Book section, chapters in research book	2	3	5
	A4 Conference proceedings	6		6
B	B1 Non-refereed journal articles	8	6	14
	B2 Book section	7	15	22
	B3 Non-refereed conference proceedings	3	1	4
C	C1 Book	3	4	7
	C2 Edited book, conference proceedings or special issues of a journal	2	3	5
D	D1 Article in a trade journal	14	15	29
	D2 Article in a professional manual or guide	1		1
	D3 Professional conference proceedings			
	D4 Published development or research report or study	1	2	3
	D5 Textbook, professional manual or guide, dictionary	2		2
E	E1 Popularised article, newspaper article	11	11	22
	E2 Popularised monograph			
F	F1 Published independent work of art			
	F2 Public partial realisation of a work of art			
	F3 Public artistic performance or exhibition			
	F4 Model or design adopted for production/use			
H	H1 Granted patent			
	H2 Invention disclosure			
I	I1 Audiovisual material			
	I2 ICT software			
Total				152

5 University of Helsinki, Department of Social Research/Media and Communication Studies

The University of Helsinki was established in Turku in 1640 but was transferred to Helsinki in 1828. At present, the University has eleven faculties. The Faculty of Social Sciences comprises two departments and the independent Swedish-language Swedish School of Social Science.

Media and Communication Studies at the Department of Social Research focuses on the role of media and communication in the transformations in public life. The main body of the discipline's research was divided into three thematic areas:

- 1) media, society and democratic governance,
- 2) media culture and social networks, and

Staff of the Unit spring 2012.

	Task category	
1	Professors	5
2	Other senior researchers	1
3	Post-doc researchers	8
4	Doctoral students receiving salary	9
5	Doctoral students on grants	
6	Visiting researchers and visiting research students	
7	Other research staff	4
	Total number of active research staff (1–7)	27
8	Teachers, lecturers	
9	Teachers, practical or vocational education	
10	Technical personnel	
11	Administrative personnel	2
12	Other personnel	
	Staff, total (1–12)	29

- 3) organisational communication and public relations.

The Communication Research Centre (CRC) coordinates the discipline's research and development projects. The CRC's core areas of research are journalism, public

administration communication, crisis communication, social media and communication policy.

Units' funding sources (2010–2011) (EUR 1,000).

Funding source		2010	2011	Total
Core funding	Budget funding	2,101	1,914	4,015
	Other			
Total core funding				4,015
External funding	Academy of Finland	175	212	388
	Finnish Cultural Foundation			
	Helsingin Sanomat Foundation	890	808	1,699
	Kone Foundation			
	Kordelin Foundation			
	Wihuri Foundations			
	Emil Aaltonen Foundation			
	Other foundations or organisations			
	Tekes	151	188	339
	Industry			
	Other public funding	84	41	126
EU	42	72	114	
Other foreign organisations				
External funding, total		1,345	1,324	2,669
Funding, total		3,446	3,238	6,684

Publications produced by the Unit (2010–2011).

	Type of publication	2010	2011	Total
A	A1 Journal articles (refereed), original research	22	18	40
	A2 Review article, literature review, systematic review	1	2	3
	A3 Book section, chapters in research book	22	20	42
	A4 Conference proceedings	2	1	3
B	B1 Non-refereed journal articles	7	7	14
	B2 Book section	5	10	15
	B3 Non-refereed conference proceedings	3	0	3
C	C1 Book	5	2	7
	C2 Edited book, conference proceedings or special issues of a journal	4	5	9
D	D1 Article in a trade journal	3	1	4
	D2 Article in a professional manual or guide		1	1
	D3 Professional conference proceedings	1		1
	D4 Published development or research report or study	2	2	4
	D5 Textbook, professional manual or guide, dictionary		1	1
E	E1 Popularised article, newspaper article	3	7	10
	E2 Popularised monograph	1	1	2
F	F1 Published independent work of art			
	F2 Public partial realisation of a work of art			
	F3 Public artistic performance or exhibition			
	F4 Model or design adopted for production/use			
H	H1 Granted patent			
	H2 Invention disclosure			
I	I1 Audiovisual material		1	1
	I2 ICT software			
Total				160

6 University of Lapland, Faculty of Art and Design/Media Culture/Graphic Design

The Faculty of Art and Design of the University of Lapland (est. 1979) was established in 1990 and it has five degree programmes: audiovisual media culture, graphic design, art education, textile and clothing design, and industrial design. Only graphic culture is included in this evaluation.

Research at the Faculty of Art and Design is characterised by close interaction between research and art. The Faculty focuses on northern and Arctic issues in the research on art, art education, media and design, in cooperation with the experience industry and tourism. Education may also have artistic objectives if the doctoral dissertation includes an artistic production.

Staff of the Unit spring 2012.

	Task category	
1	Professors	1
2	Other senior researchers	
3	Post-doc researchers	0.5
4	Doctoral students receiving salary	3
5	Doctoral students on grants	1
6	Visiting researchers and visiting research students	
7	Other research staff	
	Total number of active research staff (1–7)	5.5
8	Teachers, lecturers	3
9	Teachers, practical or vocational education	
10	Technical personnel	
11	Administrative personnel	0.5
12	Other personnel	
	Staff, total (1–12)	9

Units' funding sources (2010–2011) (EUR 1,000).

Funding source		2010	2011	Total
Core funding	Budget funding	280	280	560
	Other		20	20
Total core funding		280	30	580
External funding	Academy of Finland			
	Finnish Cultural Foundation			
	Helsingin Sanomat Foundation			
	Kone Foundation			
	Kordelin Foundation			
	Wihuri Foundations			
	Emil Aaltonen Foundation			
	Other foundations or organisations			
	Tekes			
	Industry			
	Other public funding			
	EU		170	170
	Other foreign organisations			
External funding, total			170	170
Funding, total		280	470	750

Publications produced by the Unit (2010–2011).

	Type of publication	2010	2011	Total
A	A1 Journal articles (refereed), original research		2	2
	A2 Review article, literature review, systematic review			
	A3 Book section, chapters in research book	2		2
	A4 Conference proceedings	1		1
B	B1 Non-refereed journal articles		1	1
	B2 Book section			
	B3 Non-refereed conference proceedings			
C	C1 Book			
	C2 Edited book, conference proceedings or special issues of a journal	1		1
D	D1 Article in a trade journal			
	D2 Article in a professional manual or guide			
	D3 Professional conference proceedings			
	D4 Published development or research report or study			
	D5 Textbook, professional manual or guide, dictionary			
E	E1 Popularised article, newspaper article		3	3
	E2 Popularised monograph			
F	F1 Published independent work of art			
	F2 Public partial realisation of a work of art			
	F3 Public artistic performance or exhibition		2	2
	F4 Model or design adopted for production/use	1	1	2
H	H1 Granted patent			
	H2 Invention disclosure			
I	I1 Audiovisual material			
	I2 ICT software			
Total				14

7 University of Oulu, Faculty of Humanities/Information Studies

The research conducted in Information Studies at the University of Oulu (est.1958) focuses on health information and communication, knowledge management, evaluation studies, documentation studies, science communication (public communication of science) and scientific communication including infometric studies, as well as political communication and PR communication.

In addition to the Information Studies Degree Programme, there is a Master's programme in science communication (TIEMA) launched in autumn 2007 by the

Staff of the Unit spring 2012.

	Task category	
1	Professors	2
2	Other senior researchers	
3	Post-doc researchers	1
4	Doctoral students receiving salary	3
5	Doctoral students on grants	
6	Visiting researchers and visiting research students	
7	Other research staff	
	Total number of active research staff (1–7)	6
8	Teachers, lecturers	2
9	Teachers, practical or vocational education	0.5
10	Technical personnel	
11	Administrative personnel	
12	Other personnel	
	Staff, total (1–12)	8.5

Faculty of Humanities. TIEMA comprises 120 credits, leading to the completion of the Master's degree within two years.

The University of Oulu is currently setting up a new, multidisciplinary research institute for human sciences.

Units' funding sources (2010–2011) (EUR 1,000).

Funding source		2010	2011	Total
Core funding	Budget funding	351	348	699
	Other			
Total core funding				
External funding	Academy of Finland	153	155	308
	Finnish Cultural Foundation			21
	Helsingin Sanomat Foundation			
	Kone Foundation			
	Kordelin Foundation			
	Wihuri Foundations			
	Emil Aaltonen Foundation			
	Other foundations or organisations			
	Tekes	23	31	54
	Industry			
	Other public funding	70	91	161
	EU	33	80	113
Other foreign organisations				
External funding, total		300	357	657
Funding, total		651	705	1,356

Publications produced by the Unit (2010–2011).

	Type of publication	2010	2011	Total
A	A1 Journal articles (refereed), original research	3	2	5
	A2 Review article, literature review, systematic review	1		1
	A3 Book section, chapters in research book	1	2	3
	A4 Conference proceedings	9	6	15
B	B1 Non-refereed journal articles	5	7	12
	B2 Book section	1	1	2
	B3 Non-refereed conference proceedings			
C	C1 Book		2	2
	C2 Edited book, conference proceedings or special issues of a journal			
D	D1 Article in a trade journal			
	D2 Article in a professional manual or guide			
	D3 Professional conference proceedings			
	D4 Published development or research report or study			
	D5 Textbook, professional manual or guide, dictionary			
E	E1 Popularised article, newspaper article		1	1
	E2 Popularised monograph			
F	F1 Published independent work of art			
	F2 Public partial realisation of a work of art			
	F3 Public artistic performance or exhibition			
	F4 Model or design adopted for production/use			
H	H1 Granted patent			
	H2 Invention disclosure			
I	I1 Audiovisual material			
	I2 ICT software			
Total				41

8 University of Tampere, School of Communication, Media and Theatre/ Journalism and Mass Communication & Speech Communication (CMT)

The School of Communication, Media and Theatre (CMT) at the University of Tampere (est.1925/1966) was established in January 2011 after a fusion of journalism and mass communication, speech communication, theatre and drama research and theatre art. There are two research centres, Tampere Research Centre for Journalism, Media and Communication (COMET) and the Research Centre for Theatre as Practice (T7).

The origins of the unit are in a civic college established in Helsinki in 1925, which was later changed to Helsinki School of Social Sciences (1930). In 1960, it was moved to Tampere and was in 1966 re-established as the University of Tampere.

Staff of the Unit spring 2012.

	Task category	
1	Professors	10
2	Other senior researchers	9
3	Post-doc researchers	1
4	Doctoral students receiving salary	3
5	Doctoral students on grants	6
6	Visiting researchers and visiting research students	
7	Other research staff	23
	Total number of active research staff (1–7)	52
8	Teachers, lecturers	5
9	Teachers, practical or vocational education	8
10	Technical personnel	4
11	Administrative personnel	9
12	Other personnel	6
	Staff, total (1–12)	84

Today, the research focus of journalism and mass communication covers, for instance, structures, contents and use of mass/social media, journalism and its

Units' funding sources (2010–2011) (EUR 1,000).

Funding source		2010*	2011	Total
Core funding	Budget funding		7,096	7,096
	Other		61	61
Total core funding			7,157	7,157
External funding	Academy of Finland		446	446
	Finnish Cultural Foundation		23	23
	Helsingin Sanomat Foundation		1,118	1,118
	Kone Foundation			
	Kordelin Foundation			
	Wihuri Foundations			
	Emil Aaltonen Foundation			
	Other foundations or organisations		570	570
	Tekes		237	237
	Industry			
	Other public funding		677	677
	EU		993	993
Other foreign organisations		35	35	
External funding, total			4,099	4,099
Funding, total			11,256	11,256

* Due to the change in the university organisation, it is impossible to give comparable budget information for 2010. Obviously, the magnitude and distribution of income were approximately the same but scattered differently across the department structure of that time.

position in democracy, production processes of journalism, legal and ethical regulation and governance of media, media culture and media criticism, media theory, and history of the discipline. As to speech

communication, the major research areas include political communication, various forms of interpersonal and professional communication, health communication and listening.

Publications produced by the Unit (2010–2011).

	Type of publication	2010	2011	Total
A	A1 Journal articles (refereed), original research	24	26	50
	A2 Review article, literature review, systematic review	1		1
	A3 Book section, chapters in research book	28	29	57
	A4 Conference proceedings	1	1	2
B	B1 Non-refereed journal articles	16	8	24
	B2 Book section	12	6	18
	B3 Non-refereed conference proceedings	4	1	5
C	C1 Book	5	8	13
	C2 Edited book, conference proceedings or special issues of a journal	9	6	15
D	D1 Article in a trade journal	7	3	10
	D2 Article in a professional manual or guide	8	1	9
	D3 Professional conference proceedings			
	D4 Published development or research report or study	5	9	14
	D5 Textbook, professional manual or guide, dictionary			
E	E1 Popularised article, newspaper article	4	13	17
	E2 Popularised monograph		1	1
F	F1 Published independent work of art			
	F2 Public partial realisation of a work of art			
	F3 Public artistic performance or exhibition			
	F4 Model or design adopted for production/use			
H	H1 Granted patent			
	H2 Invention disclosure			
I	I1 Audiovisual material			
	I2 ICT software			
			Total	236

9 University of Tampere, School of Information Sciences/Information Studies and Interactive Media (SIS)

The University of Tampere School of Information Sciences was launched in 2011. It consists of a versatile collection of sciences dealing with information processing, management and use. All degree programmes are in the field of natural sciences.

The research profile of the Degree Programme in Information Studies and Interactive Media (INFIM) includes basic and applied research on issues closely related to the internet, such as information retrieval, game research and information and media practices.

The unit is multidisciplinary, with scientists from computer, behavioural and social sciences, as well as the humanities, design and art.

Staff of the Unit spring 2012.

	Task category	
1	Professors	5
2	Other senior researchers	1
3	Post-doc researchers	6
4	Doctoral students receiving salary	16
5	Doctoral students on grants	
6	Visiting researchers and visiting research students	
7	Other research staff	15
	Total number of active research staff (1–7)	43
8	Teachers, lecturers	7
9	Teachers, practical or vocational education	
10	Technical personnel	2
11	Administrative personnel	6
12	Other personnel	
	Staff, total (1–12)	58

Units' funding sources (2010–2011) (EUR 1,000).

Funding source		2010	2011	Total
Core funding	Budget funding	2,463	2,494	4,957
	Other			
Total core funding		2,463	2,494	4,957
External funding	Academy of Finland	474	842	1,317
	Finnish Cultural Foundation			
	Helsingin Sanomat Foundation		52	52
	Kone Foundation			
	Kordelin Foundation			
	Wihuri Foundations			
	Emil Aaltonen Foundation			
	Other foundations or organisations	282	285	567
	Tekes	651	675	1,326
	Industry	100	56	156
	Other public funding	153	129	282
	EU			
	Other foreign organisations	33	10	43
External funding, total		1,695	2,050	3,746
Funding, total		4,158	4,544	8,703

Publications produced by the Unit (2010–2011).

	Type of publication	2010	2011	Total
A	A1 Journal articles (refereed), original research	14	21	35
	A2 Review article, literature review, systematic review	2	1	3
	A3 Book section, chapters in research book	9	8	17
	A4 Conference proceedings	23	31	54
B	B1 Non-refereed journal articles	3	7	10
	B2 Book section	6	23	29
	B3 Non-refereed conference proceedings	6	3	9
C	C1 Book	1	1	2
	C2 Edited book, conference proceedings or special issues of a journal	5	7	12
D	D1 Article in a trade journal	5	13	18
	D2 Article in a professional manual or guide			
	D3 Professional conference proceedings			
	D4 Published development or research report or study	1	5	6
	D5 Textbook, professional manual or guide, dictionary	0	1	1
E	E1 Popularised article, newspaper article			
	E2 Popularised monograph	2		2
F	F1 Published independent work of art			
	F2 Public partial realisation of a work of art			
	F3 Public artistic performance or exhibition			
	F4 Model or design adopted for production/use			
H	H1 Granted patent			
	H2 Invention disclosure			
I	I1 Audiovisual material			
	I2 ICT software			
Total				198

10 University of Turku, School of History, Culture and Arts Studies/Department of Media Studies

The University of Turku (est. 1920) is a multidisciplinary university with traditions in humanities research. The Department of Media Studies is a humanities department that draws on traditions of art studies and cultural studies: it is focused on cinema and TV studies, media philosophy, popular culture, feminist media studies, studies of digital media and rhetoric. The Department of Media Studies collaborates with the other Arts Studies departments, as well as with the departments of Gender Studies, Cultural History and Digital Culture in terms of publishing, research seminars and research projects.

The department hosts *Läbikuva*, the journal for audiovisual culture published

Staff of the Unit spring 2012.

	Task category	
1	Professors	2
2	Other senior researchers	
3	Post-doc researchers	2
4	Doctoral students receiving salary	2
5	Doctoral students on grants	5
6	Visiting researchers and visiting research students	
7	Other research staff	1
	Total number of active research staff (1–7)	12
8	Teachers, lecturers	5
9	Teachers, practical or vocational education	
10	Technical personnel	
11	Administrative personnel	1
12	Other personnel	
	Staff, total (1–12)	18

by the Finnish Society for Cinema Studies. It also hosts the international Association for Cultural Studies.

Units' funding sources (2010–2011) (EUR 1,000).

Funding source		2010	2011	Total
Core funding	Budget funding	468	451	920
	Other			
Total core funding		468	451	920
External funding	Academy of Finland	100	99	199
	Finnish Cultural Foundation	10	21	31
	Helsingin Sanomat Foundation			
	Kone Foundation	22	25	48
	Kordelin Foundation			
	Wihuri Foundations			
	Emil Aaltonen Foundation	9		9
	Other foundations or organisations	12	21	33
	Tekes			
	Industry			
	Other public funding	55	84	139
	EU	3		3
Other foreign organisations				
External funding, total		214	251	465
Funding, total				1,385

Publications produced by the Unit (2010–2011).

	Type of publication	2010	2011	Total
A	A1 Journal articles (refereed), original research	5	9	14
	A2 Review article, literature review, systematic review	1	2	3
	A3 Book section, chapters in research book	1	12	13
	A4 Conference proceedings		1	1
B	B1 Non-refereed journal articles		6	6
	B2 Book section		4	4
	B3 Non-refereed conference proceedings			
C	C1 Book	1	1	2
	C2 Edited book, conference proceedings or special issues of a journal		5	5
D	D1 Article in a trade journal	2		2
	D2 Article in a professional manual or guide			
	D3 Professional conference proceedings			
	D4 Published development or research report or study			
	D5 Textbook, professional manual or guide, dictionary			
E	E1 Popularised article, newspaper article	2	7	9
	E2 Popularised monograph		1	1
F	F1 Published independent work of art			
	F2 Public partial realisation of a work of art			
	F3 Public artistic performance or exhibition			
	F4 Model or design adopted for production/use			
H	H1 Granted patent			
	H2 Invention disclosure			
I	I1 Audiovisual material			
	I2 ICT software			
Total				60

11 University of Vaasa, Faculty of Philosophy/Department of Communication Studies

The Department of Communication Studies (est.1991) is part of the Faculty of Philosophy at the University of Vaasa (est. 1966). The Faculty consists of three parts: Administrative Sciences, Languages and Communication, and the University Language Centre. The Department of Communication Studies forms part of the academic field of Languages and Communication.

The focus areas are professional communication, multimedia and online communication as well as media communication. Different approaches are combined: applied linguistics (especially discourse studies and terminology), technical communication, media studies and digital communication (especially computer-mediated communication and

game studies). The University of Vaasa declares in its profile that it is a multidisciplinary, business-oriented university. This means that some form of business orientation is expected of the research in all fields.

Staff of the Unit spring 2012.

	Task category	
1	Professors	2
2	Other senior researchers	
3	Post-doc researchers	
4	Doctoral students receiving salary	1
5	Doctoral students on grants	
6	Visiting researchers and visiting research students	
7	Other research staff	2
	Total number of active research staff (1-7)	5
8	Teachers, lecturers	3
9	Teachers, practical or vocational education	
10	Technical personnel	
11	Administrative personnel	
12	Other personnel	1
	Staff, total (1-12)	9

Units' funding sources (2010-2011) (EUR 1,000).

Funding source		2010	2011	Total
Core funding	Budget funding	372	343	715
	Other	2	28	30
Total core funding		374	371	745
External funding	Academy of Finland			
	Finnish Cultural Foundation			
	Helsingin Sanomat Foundation			
	Kone Foundation			
	Kordelin Foundation			
	Wihuri Foundations			
	Emil Aaltonen Foundation			
	Other foundations or organisations			
	Tekes			
	Industry			
	Other public funding	2	28	30
	EU			
Other foreign organisations				
External funding, total		2	28	30
Funding, total		376	399	776

Publications produced by the Unit (2010–2011).

	Type of publication	2010	2011	Total
A	A1 Journal articles (refereed), original research	5	2	7
	A2 Review article, literature review, systematic review			
	A3 Book section, chapters in research book	2	1	3
	A4 Conference proceedings	5	5	10
B	B1 Non-refereed journal articles		1	1
	B2 Book section			
	B3 Non-refereed conference proceedings	1	1	2
C	C1 Book	1		1
	C2 Edited book, conference proceedings or special issues of a journal		2	2
D	D1 Article in a trade journal			
	D2 Article in a professional manual or guide			
	D3 Professional conference proceedings			
	D4 Published development or research report or study			
	D5 Textbook, professional manual or guide, dictionary			
E	E1 Popularised article, newspaper article		1	1
	E2 Popularised monograph			
F	F1 Published independent work of art			
	F2 Public partial realisation of a work of art			
	F3 Public artistic performance or exhibition			
	F4 Model or design adopted for production/use			
H	H1 Granted patent			
	H2 Invention disclosure			
I	I1 Audiovisual material			
	I2 ICT software			
Total				27

12 Åbo Akademi University, School of Business and Economics/Information Studies

The Unit of Information Studies is part of the School of Business and Economics at Åbo Akademi University (est. 1918). The School of Business and Economics is one of four departments at the Division for Social Sciences. Information Studies was previously (1981–2009) part of the Faculty of Economics and Social Sciences but joined the School of Business and Economics in 2010, when the University carried out a major reorganisation in connection with the new Universities Act.

Research at the unit comprises several research profiles: information behaviour

Staff of the Unit spring 2012.

	Task category	
1	Professors	1
2	Other senior researchers	
3	Post-doc researchers	2
4	Doctoral students receiving salary	2
5	Doctoral students on grants	2
6	Visiting researchers and visiting research students	
7	Other research staff	
	Total number of active research staff (1–7)	7
8	Teachers, lecturers	2
9	Teachers, practical or vocational education	1
10	Technical personnel	
11	Administrative personnel *70%	2*
12	Other personnel	
	Staff, total (1–12)	12

(e.g. in everyday life, work environments, business organisations, libraries, youth, older people, the unemployed and different professions), information and knowledge management, health information, information literacy, library 2.0 and bibliometrics. In the area of information and knowledge management, research has

focused on information culture, knowledge sharing and knowledge construction and collaborative information behaviour with an organisation and business approach. There is an emphasis on the Finnish-Swedish responsibility and the Nordic perspective.

Units' funding sources (2010–2011) (EUR 1,000).

Funding source		2010	2011	Total
Core funding	Budget funding	260	270	530
	Other			
Total core funding		260	270	530
External funding	Academy of Finland	222	169	391
	Finnish Cultural Foundation			
	Helsingin Sanomat Foundation			
	Kone Foundation			
	Kordelin Foundation			
	Wihuri Foundations			
	Emil Aaltonen Foundation			
	Other foundations or organisations*		30	30
	Tekes			
	Industry			
	Other public funding**	6		6
	EU	58	18	76
Other foreign organisations				
External funding, total		286	217	503
Funding, total		546	487	1,033

* Foundation of Åbo Akademi University, TSV, Rector of ÅAU, Eila and Georg Ehrnrooth Foundation

** NSS/CIMO North-South-South collaboration for international mobility

*** AVO, a project funded by EU

Publications produced by the Unit (2010–2011).

	Type of publication	2010	2011	Total
A	A1 Journal articles (refereed), original research	9	5	14
	A2 Review article, literature review, systematic review			
	A3 Book section, chapters in research book		3	3
	A4 Conference proceedings	4	11	15
B	B1 Non-refereed journal articles	1	1	2
	B2 Book section	2		2
	B3 Non-refereed conference proceedings	2		2
C	C1 Book	2		2
	C2 Edited book, conference proceedings or special issues of a journal		3	3
D	D1 Article in a trade journal	1		1
	D2 Article in a professional manual or guide			
	D3 Professional conference proceedings		1	1
	D4 Published development or research report or study			
	D5 Textbook, professional manual or guide, dictionary			
E	E1 Popularised article, newspaper article		3	3
	E2 Popularised monograph			
F	F1 Published independent work of art			
	F2 Public partial realisation of a work of art			
	F3 Public artistic performance or exhibition			
	F4 Model or design adopted for production/use			
H	H1 Granted patent			
	H2 Invention disclosure			
I	I1 Audiovisual material			
	I2 ICT software			
			Total	48

9 GENERAL REFLECTIONS ON STRUCTURES, PUBLICATIONS, EDUCATION, INTERNATIONALISATION AND FUTURE

Structures

The organisational structures of the units under analysis reflect the pluralism of approaches and viewpoints. Structures – as understood in the context of this evaluation – can be seen as a specific set of rules, regulations and resources aimed at supporting and maintaining organisational aims and *raison d'être*. As such, they are partially based on the respective approaches to the field and the needs emanating from these approaches. However, structures are also planned and implemented in a given context and depending on the possibilities of that context. Not everything that seems to be sensible on the basis of an approach's ideas and needs can be realised in a given local reality.

What the panellists observed at the respective premises was very often a trade-off, and in many cases the interim result of ongoing negotiations. And it was also the manifestation of a specific disciplinary understanding of how to deal with the aspects of communication in teaching and research. Some of the discussion partners at the respective units noted a less than ideal implementation based on limited funding and options inside their universities, but also based on more general difficulties in the university system, and most notably the Universities Act. The resulting changes in the Finnish university system also left a notable mark in some units and was also obvious in the still ongoing restructuring processes – greeted by some while also criticised by many others. Therefore, what the panel observed,

was an interim state of a system in flux, and by no means a finished and ideal state.

Despite these challenges, many units showed a commendable spirit dealing with the situation, and quite a few structures could be regarded as being in good shape, even according to international standards. Certainly, there could always be a 'more and better' kind of situation, and many discussion partners expressed their need for additional resources – but these wishes are most likely universal and not specific to the Finnish system. However, the panellists observed a thread that connected many of the talks and that is specific to the current situation in the Finnish system: Many units seemed to be seeking a new balance after the turmoil of restructuring inside the universities and the units, most notably in the structures and resources but also in research, teaching and the career paths offered to young academics.

Taking these considerations into account, the overview of the units' structures and resources tries to depict an observed situation, and some of its peculiarities, but remains restrained when it comes to recommendations and criticism that goes beyond the given situation. Again, this situation seems to be one of transformation rather than stability, and the units try to cope with the dynamics of change. Naturally, some recommendations might be plausible and obvious on the basis of the very general observation that the Finnish field of communication research is unbalanced and in a state of flux – but that should be part of a political discussion and not part of this evaluation.

Publications

Within the new Finnish state funding model, publication features prominently (13%) – with high-quality publications deemed as a key indicator of success. To this effect, the adoption of a common classification system (KOTA), which incorporates a ranking system, seems justified. Against this backdrop, seminal changes with regard to publication strategy at both institutional and individual levels are in place or being anticipated. Any future publication strategy, however, will remain closely linked with access to research funding.

Another influential factor is the growing internationalisation of the Finnish universities, leading to an increasing number of courses and programmes being offered in English. This development may be seen as an incentive towards targeting publications in high-ranking journals in English.

It was also mentioned several times that international publishing unevenly finances the international publication of small countries' scientific results compared to certain big nations and big languages. Still, the cooperation between the Nordic countries in communication studies is a remarkable achievement, which does not exist in the case of other geographical regions. This endowment should continue to be supported.

In the self-evaluation questionnaires, publication outputs were listed in detail using the established categories under the KOTA system. Sample outputs were provided for the panel to consult, although time constraints and the limited expertise of the evaluation panel did not afford a close appraisal of these materials to determine their quality. The panel instead

relied on the classification system that is operational in the Finnish context.

The units being assessed had provided cumulative publication output data over a two-year period. With regard to both the quantity and quality of publication outputs, the panel felt that the units being evaluated were comparable internationally in this disciplinary area, keeping in mind the variable unit sizes being appraised and the wider interdisciplinary remit of communication and media studies. Overall, the publication profiles of individual units and as a collective entity are encouraging.

As expected, the outputs ranged from book-length monographs to edited volumes and to peer-reviewed and non-peer-reviewed journal articles and book chapters. The panel identified a high constellation of publications under the following labels: 'conference proceedings' (A4); 'book section, chapters in research book' and 'non-referred journal articles' (B1); and 'book section' (B2). It was felt that some of these outlets may not have a wider appeal in terms of scholarship and readership.

Although it seemed there was a clear division of labour in terms of publications in the English language aimed at an international audience vis-à-vis in the Finnish or Swedish language targeted at local audiences, the questionnaire format did not elicit such language-specific data. Some topics no doubt privileged decisions about dissemination in Finnish or Swedish in the local setting. While appreciative of this bilingual dissemination policy, the panel felt a balance needed to be maintained at a strategic level – nationally, institutionally and individually.

The proportion of basic versus commissioned research varied considerably

across the units depending on staff profiles and areas of specialisation. This may have directly impacted the research outputs, as commissioned research does not always translate into scientifically rigorous publications.

The panel was also given information on research dissemination at local, national and international conferences and workshops, which was seen as a necessary platform for sustaining publication trajectories.

In the panel discussions, the following trends were identified. For instance, a distinction was made between research-active staff and teaching-intensive staff, pointing to the need for efforts to drive towards a research- or publication-led teaching ethos. However, this distinction was made in the self-evaluation questionnaire, not necessarily in the actual research and teaching practices of the units.

Also, a tension emerged with regard to theoretical and empirical research. This was also framed as the basic versus commissioned research divide. A feeling was expressed that it was difficult to synergise research excellence and applied research. Discrepancies were noticed between funded and commissioned research on the one hand and unfunded research on the other. It was suggested that commissioned and unfunded research affected not only publication outputs but also publication categories (e.g. choosing between trade journals and academic journals).

A lack of fit between communication studies (which by definition crossed disciplinary boundaries) and constitution of evaluation panels at funding bodies was identified. This meant difficulty in accessing funding streams for many

researchers, as they experienced that there was a gap between the diversely rich field of communication and media studies and the extremely narrow base of funding sources currently available.

Tensions emerged with regard to publication outputs in English as compared to outputs in Finnish and Swedish. A strong case was made in favour of reaching target audiences locally, while validation of one's research via peer-reviewed journal articles remained a priority. It was also stressed that researchers needed to report pilot studies through easily accessible outlets in Finnish (and Swedish where relevant), including in-house journals, for purposes of building their research profiles. The challenge then becomes one of discriminating what is more suitable for these local outlets vis-à-vis high-ranking journals.

The benefits and challenges associated with collaborative research, locally as well as internationally, with colleagues in other disciplines and with practitioners and external stakeholders, were also raised as topics.

As part of the publication agenda, the panel inquired about existing research groups. It was not clear what was meant by a research group and what its status was within a given institutional structure. It was noted that different universities had different criteria and many of the groupings were in a constant flux because of restructuring processes at the institutional level. It emerged that there were numerous research groups and clusters, organised along themes (sometimes just keywords), disciplinary leanings etc., with no explicit overriding rationale. The risks and opportunities posed by smaller or larger research groups had not been thought through systematically.

Although many colleagues stressed that there was an institutional imperative for prioritising high-ranking publications (A1 category), this was not evident in the list of types of publication listed. Indeed, the number of A1 category publications is generally in decline, while the number of publications in conference proceedings and B1/B2 categories has increased (only exceptionally, the number of publications under B1 and B2 are proportionate to A1 and A2 categories).

There was an indirect reference to the unequal division of labour in co-authored publications involving senior colleagues in the supervisory role and their doctoral and postdoctoral researchers. This is likely to increase with the shift towards article-based PhD dissertations.

Education

Central among the differentia specifica of the university as an institution is the link between research and education. The university is not a school distributing available knowledge to pupils but an institution where knowledge is both produced and distributed by eternal students, also known as professors, and temporary ones, i.e. those normally referred to as students. It is vital to the university's function that teaching is conducted by active researchers so that students get a better, more critical understanding of what knowledge is and how it comes into being.

Against this background, it becomes evident that the transition from 'temporary student' to 'eternal student' is of key importance to the university as an institution and to the condition and future of any specific field. The training of researchers in what is now known as PhD programmes is absolutely and strategically

central to the quality and volume of the contributions to society that a scholarly field such as communication can deliver.

A good PhD programme should have sufficient funding for full-time students and grant scholarships of salaried PhD positions on a competitive basis. Furthermore, it should have built in obligatory coursework in areas such as general theories of knowledge or philosophy of science, as well as on methodologies and other field-specific subjects. Especially in smaller nations, it should also provide support for prolonged (at least 3-month) stays as visitors at foreign institutions so as to provide all students with international experience and personal acquaintance with the field outside of one's home country. This is important for each future researcher's building of a personal scholarly network as well as for the general international orientation and standing of the national field as a whole.

The situation for PhD programmes in communication institutions in Finland varies considerably in several respects. Some smaller units have only a small handful of PhD students, while others have up to about 100 students. It seems, though, that the greater the number of students, the less certain are the exact numbers of students. This situation is directly tied to a traditional system where it seems that anyone with a Master's degree or an equivalent able to write an acceptable project description would be allowed to register as a PhD student. Funding of the work has largely been the responsibility of each individual student. Consequently, many or most of them have had to find jobs wherever they could find them, often outside of the university and other research institutions. This drastically reduces students' possibilities for continuous work

on their projects as well as involvement in required coursework. As time passes, and family and other responsibilities pile up, many end up with rather loose ties to their respective institutions and PhD programmes, a situation that may make it unclear to these institutions and programmes whether students are active or not.

Two important exceptions to this have been identified: Some PhD projects have been funded by national graduate schools in the field, and some have been funded as part of research projects led by experienced researchers financed by the regular sources of research funding, that is, mostly the Academy of Finland and the Helsingin Sanomat Foundation. What has happened over the last few years, though, is that the special funding of national graduate schools has been closed down and the Academy of Finland has advertised that it emphasises postdoctoral researchers in research projects. At the time of the site visits, the prospects for compensation of these losses appeared highly unclear. The panel can safely identify the lack of a system for sufficient funding for full-time students as a major factor hampering the realisation of the fully productive PhD programmes any scholarly field needs in order to stay internationally up-to-date and in control of the reproduction of the teaching and research resources needed for each institution's continued quality and very existence.

As for the obligatory coursework required to secure adequate academic standards in the production of candidates, the situation also seems to vary considerably between institutions. Most of them seem to have some obligatory courses incorporated into programmes, but their organisation seems to vary greatly as do also their contents. The closing down of the funding of

national graduate schools also affects this area, since courses offered by these schools played an important role in the consolidation of standards across differences between institutions. While cooperation between related PhD programmes at each university takes place in several cases and should be encouraged, it seems some kind of replacement for the national graduate schools in terms of field-specific courses should be found.

Finally, even if the situation varies considerably from institution to institution, the international profile of PhD programmes also seems to be in need of systematic efforts aimed at strengthening this element. A stay abroad is now largely left to individual students to organise and fund.

Internationalisation

All in all, the theme of internationalisation was touched upon during all the interviews with the evaluated units. The definition of this term is, however, rather broad. Thus, not all examined departments have the same understanding of the notion and their reports focused on different aspects of it in their pre-prepared written self-evaluations. Consequently, the aims and possibilities of the examined units in achieving international cooperation and visibility are quite different, depending on their own aims and on their financial conditions.

As a global picture, it should be stated that, for most of the examined units, international relations, visibility and participation in international networks are important goals, and the units do have sound results in this respect. English is widely used not only by teaching staff but by students of all levels and many of the units offer courses in English for foreign students. In international comparison,

Finnish communication studies can be evaluated among the well-performing ones, with some remarkable units and some highly valued scholars. The examined units' international publishing activity needs reinforcement and – perhaps – more funding.

The fact that communication studies is a very broad field, comprising divergent domains and research topics with various theoretical and empirical orientations, guarantees a rich international network of contacts for Finnish scholars, which the panel could acknowledge at the visited institutions. Teaching staff members participate in international scholarly meetings and also have membership in various international associations.

Some weaknesses or hardships were identified by the self-evaluations and the interviews. During the interviews and among panel members, the content of the term 'internationalisation' also gave rise to long discussions. Certain units aim at high level of international cooperation in teaching trying to attract foreign students via English courses or curricula. These units actively look for student and staff exchange programmes (e.g. Erasmus and other programmes), while other units are more turned to international collaboration through scientific research networks and programmes. These units base their international activity on the personal relations of teaching staff among fellow researchers abroad, and encourage their staff and PhD students to participate in international workshops, conferences or summer schools (e.g. ECREA SuSo summer school).

The challenge of internationalisation was also present in the units' and individual staff members' difficult choice regarding publication in Finnish or in other

languages (mainly English, due to the global state of scientific communication and the traditions of the field of communication studies). International publications are more highly evaluated in formal evaluation criteria as they enhance the visibility on the international scientific 'market'. Books and journal articles published in English or some other widely used foreign languages (French, German and Spanish) facilitate participation in the international scientific community, but researchers are faced with the dilemma that publishing in Finnish help them keep up the public discussion in Finland. Many of the interviewed units feel that it is their duty and responsibility to stay in close connection with the Finnish society and they want to share their research interests and results with the home community, which – in most cases – also participates in the financing of higher education and research. The units think it is important to cultivate the scientific domain in Finnish, to address interested audiences in the country, to develop specific vocabulary in Finnish and maintain interaction and enhance public discussions on topics of communication, media and information studies.

Most units, however, have difficulties in financing these activities (except with special research funds). The panel could find evidence that in certain cases, funding opportunities are lagging behind the units' plans for international activities. Especially PhD students are reluctant to use all opportunities for international mobility because of financial or private reasons. Some PhD students reported that it was beyond their resources to go abroad, because they had families or young children and they had problems in having their families follow them abroad while keeping their home in Finland. Most of them cannot afford to pay double rents,

and the partner's constraint to give up his/her current position in Finland was also mentioned as an obstacle.

The panel found that the evaluated units had more or less well-defined strategies to foster international mobility and activity. Some units have elaborated good and reliable strategies for international excellence, while others are struggling with more concrete problems of restructuring (new curricula, new educational law, high teaching load, etc.) that first need to be settled.

Future

'Future orientation and strategy' was the last topic to be discussed. It is implicitly connected to the other topics, but the panel preferred to address it separately in this evaluation report. The panellists think it is important for the authorities to know whether the Finnish communication and media units are just in the process of coping with the past and implementing the transition imposed to them by the Universities Act, or, on the contrary, whether they are prepared for the future with a clearly outlined strategy. In order to address the 'future' topic, the panel asked the units to draw some overall lines of action. These were then, where possible, used to deduct strengths, weaknesses, opportunities and threats, as well as a 'wish list'.

However, as highlighted on some occasions in this evaluation report, the panel got the overall impression that many units are still in a process of coping with the implementation of the 2010 Universities Act. The adapting of old ways to a new managerial modus operandi (restructuring in bigger units, exploring new revenue streams, more proactive research strategy articulation, HR policy, etc.) is still 'under construction' for most of the units.

Overall, a clear and explicit outline of future strategies on research and all its comprising aspects (choice, HR policy and revenue diversification) seem to be lacking in the majority of departments and units. While they implicitly exist in many units, they may not be spread to all members of personnel. Some efforts to articulate future visions in an explicit and coherent way seem necessary to unleash the full potential of research activities in Finnish universities and exploit opportunities offered by the Universities Act. The panel was, however, impressed by the dynamics of the units and the voluntarism of its constituting members. In that sense, the future looks promising overall.

10 ASSESSMENTS OF THE UNITS, DISCUSSED INDIVIDUALLY

1 Aalto University, School of Arts, Design and Architecture, Department of Film, Television and Scenography

At the time of the evaluation, the Department of Film, Television and Scenography had a staff of 24.5, including 10.5 professors (of which four had a doctoral degree). All these professors are professors of practice (PoPs), primarily focusing on teaching and artistic production. A full-time research professorship was planned at the time of the evaluation, but the position was not filled yet. Like the Department of Media in the same school, the department is diverse – posing some problems for everyday work. However, the diversity was regarded as being not only a problem in the external view, but also as a problem for the unit itself.

During the talks, it was noted by unit members that the research situation is difficult, as most of the research work is done by less than a handful of people. Furthermore, they feel that art- and practice-based research is still evolving, and needs to develop into a tradition – however, that state has not been reached yet.

Although the situation was regarded as less than ideal, the overall funding with about 4 million euros per year, of which 430,000 euros was external funding at the time of the evaluation, was felt to be sufficient. However, the situation was not considered to be stable – the unit's members noted that the external funding was fluctuating a great deal. Furthermore, it needs to be noted that the work of the unit heavily relies on technology and expensive

equipment, differentiating it from some of the social sciences units the evaluation panel visited. The research activities consisted of basic and commissioned research in equal parts, including practice- and art-based projects.

The Department does not have many international partners teaching the same subjects, because only a few universities are doing the same kind of training and degree. They plan to strengthen their international activities and collaboration trying to find new partners. The Department would like to have international students; at present, they are scarce because of a lack of funding. The language of teaching is also a question under discussion, because it might be a difficult choice in the teaching of screen writing.

Students are encouraged to participate in exchange programmes and conferences (at least once a year), and they can provide funding for one conference per student per year. The Department regrets that the special funding of the Elomedia network is going to end: It was a very useful programme that provided many opportunities of collaboration and that also financed the participation of students in international conferences. It also provided opportunities to host visiting lecturers. The Department's strategy for the near future involves trying to find an international partner school for education and research, and trying to find solutions for how to continue the fruitful collaboration that characterised Elomedia.

The challenge in this department is to create a research climate and tradition.

Whereas the Department was formerly practice-driven, it is increasingly important and urgent to identify people with research skills and ambitions, strike a balance between research, teaching and doing practice, identify research outputs that match the practical, experimental and artistic strengths of the Department, and find the appropriate but underexplored financial means to do so. Creating a true research culture is a necessity, but the Department still lacks a clear and comprehensive view on how to get there. A need for specific evaluation procedures of cross-disciplinarity is spelled out, as well as a need for recognition of the specificity of artistic and experimental output as a research result. Unleashing the artistic and interdisciplinarity potential of the Department requires adapted procedures and revenue streams, as well as adapted, artistic specific mechanisms and a new 'state of mind' of all stakeholders involved: administration, professors, PhD students, the Academy of Finland, etc. So, the wish list only made one thing explicit: grant the Department time to develop research ambitions and install a true research culture.

2 Aalto University, School of Arts, Design and Architecture, Department of Media

The Department of Media at Aalto University School of Arts, Design and Architecture had a staff of 59.5 (incl. 9.5 professors) at the time of the evaluation. The staff come from very diverse backgrounds rooted in arts and design, media production, media theory, philosophy and aesthetics. New strategic professorships are planned for the future to further increase the number of professors.

The unit is interdisciplinary and, in some respects, diverse; however, students and

staff alike regard this as intellectually stimulating. The inter- or cross-disciplinary work poses some problems though, as it does not fall within the to-be-expected patterns of media and communication research and, therefore, does not fit into funding categories that are typical of foundations and programmes directed at the field. Furthermore, the unit members felt that the diversity is greeted by the unit itself, but often not fully understood by those outside the unit.

The funding situation is described as being difficult due to high overhead costs and the university's move to full costing. Despite these problems, the unit had 5–6 million euros of funding, including some 700,000 to 800,000 euros of external funding (more than 80% is commissioned research, Tekes being the main funding agency at the time of the evaluation). This is due to the practice-based research done at the Department, which lends itself well to media planning, design and production. Still, the administrative regulations for projects at the University are seen as a burden to research, artificially limiting the options of doing research.

The Department struggles with its new structure and the results of the past merger of several institutions and have less energy for international activities at the moment. All of the incoming units have a lot of international contacts and are, as a result of their professional activities (design, photo, etc.), strong on the international market. Doctoral students are encouraged to go abroad and come back with new experiences; new teaching staff and young professionals are needed.

Due to the global character of the discipline, the Department is well able to attract foreign students: 60 per cent of the

students are non-Finns, although this situation can create complications for non-Finnish students in using Finnish textbooks. Some courses are available in the national languages, others in English. Internationalisation is highly valued, as academic markets of the fine arts are limited in Finland, so they have to continue international visibility.

Writing in English or Finnish is also a problem. Some doctoral students decided to write their dissertation in Finnish because their data is in Finnish; thus they may later publish parts of their research in English for international audiences. The Department has experience in international collaboration, as it used to be responsible for Cumulus, a big professional network, which also attracted international participants to its conference.

Mobility is not compulsory for doctoral students but warmly encouraged, and some grants are available. The Department affirms that one semester abroad is a good requirement although many of the students are older and come back to university from working positions and this hinders mobility. Doctoral students are also encouraged to present their work at international conferences or workshops.

The Department, created as a result of a global Aalto restructuring and consisting of three former separate units and several research groups, sees both opportunities and threats as regards its new situation. Overall, a challenge for creating a common brand and a shared, cohesive but also coherent community feeling arises. Whereas the new situation demands (formerly existing) flexibility, things seem more difficult today due to an administrative overload and a lack of so many necessary (financial, organisational, etc.) mechanisms to create and sustain the

objectives of cross- and interdisciplinarity. As such, the closing down of the special funding of national doctoral programmes and the non-existence of relevant and competent evaluation panels is seen as an impediment to exploit inter- and cross-disciplinarity to its full potential. Overall, an urgent plea for more resources and adapted mechanisms to concretise the great opportunities of cross-disciplinarity seems legitimate. Without it, a 'zero growth' perspective might become reality. From the point of view of doctoral students, more effort should be made regarding job opportunities, funding and enabling mechanisms, also with a view to optimising their valorisation potential after gaining a doctorate (publications, dissemination of results to a broader public, etc.).

3 Aalto University, School of Business, Department of Communication

The Department of Communication at Aalto University has emerged from a languages unit located at a business school. In its current form, the Department of Communication defines itself close to the mainstream noted above, and seems to be oriented towards social-scientific communication studies. The structural embedding of the Department as part of a business school is not a typical one, neither when compared to international standards nor to the situation in Finland. The overall school – with 50–60 professors – is very big when compared to the Department, which has 23 staff, of which only three were professors and ten lecturers at the time of the evaluation. The department members themselves called this 'imbalanced' in the interviews with the panellists, noting a lack of professors.

The Department's aspiration of becoming further internationally renowned is certainly confined by this staff situation.

While the unit's members find collaboration with other members of the school rewarding and fruitful, certain challenges related to the business school context emerge in, for instance, publication policies.

Related to the question of limited staff, the funding situation is a slightly difficult one (as it is in many other schools as well). At this unit, most of the funding comes from internal sources – out of the budget of approximately 1 million euros at the time of the evaluation. Unit members noted the difficulties of getting funding from external foundations, and they pointed out that not all major funding agencies in the field (e.g. Tekes) are interested in the type of communication studies they pursue. This is a recurring message the panellists received during the talks with the units under analysis, however, at some places one could witness different approaches and results.

It should be noted that a high dependency on external funding can lead to difficulties as well. Not in all cases, then, this is something the units need to aim for. In the given case, the unit members noted a high administrative and teaching load, with only a quarter of the time devoted to research. However, they also noted that teaching is valued. Nevertheless, it was obvious that a certain lack of staff and time was limiting options of striving for funded research and international research cooperation – to the regret of the unit's staff members.

Aalto University is interested in international relations and provides good opportunities for mobility. The university central infrastructure helps departments in their international contacts and international activities are frequent at all (personal, departmental and

organisational) levels. The unit has active, established research contacts with similar departments in Europe, Asia and the US. PhD students are encouraged to go abroad, but this is not a compulsory requirement. They get funding for conferences (about once a year), but external funds are also available.

The unit plans to develop international relations and more mobility; currently it has one international postdoctoral researcher. Visiting professors teach special courses, and courses on academic writing are also available. Both staff and PhD students find it important to further develop international cooperation with foreign departments and researchers.

The new situation, a department of communication, triggered an overtly positive feeling about manifold possibilities to grasp. Still, some fears of more reforms and some doubts whether offered opportunities will concretise were formulated. Actions to be undertaken refer to publication strategies, the need for more intensive collaboration both within Aalto University and with other universities, a balancing act between research and teaching, and an increased focus on communication with a view to disseminating research results and activities and having more societal impact. Overall, it would be helpful to articulate a future strategy on all these topics, as well as on internationalisation. A real threat for the unit comes from the administrative overload and the obvious lack of resources, both regarding premises and personnel and opportunities provided to PhD students. This needs to be tackled in cooperation with all stakeholders involved and does not solely depend on the unit.

4 University of Jyväskylä, Faculty of Humanities, Department of Communication

The Department of Communication at the Faculty of Humanities of the University of Jyväskylä is focused on four areas of interest: journalism, speech communication, organisational communication/PR and international communication. It has strong roots in humanities and social-scientific research.

Including all teachers and researchers, there are up to 50 people working in the unit, with a core of six professors. There are plans to hire two more professors, so there should be actually eight. The members of the unit noted a lot of fluctuation in the unit, and they seemed to wish for more stability in that respect. However, the fluctuation was not an effect of the Universities Act, because the unit was structurally not affected by the systemic changes. Furthermore, and in contrast to some other units, the Department of Communication was not aiming at a growth in staff – the current numbers were seen as sufficient, and even somewhat difficult to maintain.

This is due to the specific situation of the Finnish funding system in media and communication research – something that was also communicated to the evaluation panel by other units. The unit's core funding amounted to about 1.8 million euros at the time of the evaluation, and it was able to attract about 700,000–800,000 euros of external funding, mostly from the EU, the Academy of Finland and Tekes. However, in contrast to some other units, the unit could not get very significant funding from the Helsingin Sanomat Foundation – something the unit seems to be worried about. Unit members feel that their research aims do not fit this

foundation's mission statement, so the funding situation is regarded as problematic. Members noted that the unit could not reach all its developmental goals due to this situation, especially in the field of intercultural communication.

The University of Jyväskylä actively encourages international research and education. It participates in Erasmus exchange projects, has many incoming students and offers many courses in English. Mobility programmes are also available for PhD students (e.g. Erasmus), and they are recommended but not compulsory. The Department of Communication emphasises the importance of cooperation with foreign communication schools in various forms (e.g. joint doctoral seminars). The unit also intends to strengthen collaboration and synergy outside the school through special projects. International relations could be reinforced with better allocated resources. PhD students would profit from longer or more stays abroad but funding is not provided.

The unit's publication policy emphasises the importance of publishing in English, but it also gives much importance to societal connections. The unit affirms that communication studies are useful to society, thus it puts special effort to organise contacts with schools, media and policy-makers, and to hold workshops and open seminars for the general public. An especially dedicated area of social communication with the general audience concerns risk communication. The unit's crisis and risk communication projects are funded by EU.

The unit articulates a strong vision on internationalisation, optimising research synergies and teamwork and develop sustainable, high-quality research projects,

also outside the school. More efforts in all these issues are felt necessary, however. Building networks is part of its research strategy for 2013–2017. A publication strategy, focusing on A1 publications, has been defined and recruitment is internationally oriented.

The unit has been selective regarding PHD student selection and follow-up for quite some time and will favour article-based dissertations in order to increase efficiency in completing PhD dissertations, on the one hand, and peer-reviewed publications, on the other. All in all, the unit describes itself as effective and coherent. It multiplies efforts to attract external money (also at EU level), and considers it absolutely necessary for developing the unit. It does identify funding problems, however, especially in relation to postdoctoral positions. An effort for career path development is felt a necessity.

5 University of Helsinki, Faculty of Social Sciences, Department of Social Research, Media and Communication Studies

The Department of Social Research, Media and Communications Studies at the University of Helsinki has an ambition to be a top player in its field. The unit defines itself as being heavily rooted in sociology and political communication, basically describing a position in the mainstream of communication studies. The Department is embedded in the Faculty of Social Sciences, but it is not struggling with a forced ‘cross-disciplinary’ structure (as is the case for some other units regarded as outsiders or ‘exotic’ in their own faculties).

In contrast to some of the more production-oriented units that are depending on large staff numbers, equipment and production budgets, the unit’s staff numbers are modest. At the

time of the evaluation, the unit had five professors among a research-active staff of 27. There are about half a dozen additional doctoral students, and a handful of research assistants and administrative staff. Unit members note that the university funding has decreased, but student numbers have not – thus, resources and staff do not develop in parallel with the obligations and needs of the unit.

Despite these problems, the unit is doing well, especially when it comes to external funding. At the time of the review, they relied on 1.3 million euros of external funding – which is quite a substantial sum when compared to the staff numbers.

The unit is the most internationally visible and active institution in Finnish communication and media studies. Several internationally acknowledged teachers and researchers actively participate in international networks, research groups and conferences, as well as in ECREA. The international visibility is a sound outcome of the unit’s three-fold strategy: enhancing collaboration on the domestic, the Nordic and the international level. Most of these relations are based on individual relations between researchers and the unit plans to elaborate a common strategy of internationalisation built on these professional contacts. Some individual researchers have broad international activity including in Africa, the US, etc. They also look forward to participating in EU bids in order to better fund participation in international research projects.

Courses for PhD students are held either in Finnish or English, depending on the visiting professors’ participation and the presence of foreign PhD students. Increased teaching in English, however, might endanger contacts with national

audiences. The problem with the Finnish versus English publication policy is often debated and, as an overall tendency, the Department would like to encourage international relations other than Anglo-American, to counterbalance the overwhelming weight of English.

Collaboration in other languages is also foreseen as well as the diversification of staff exchange, not to “invite one British male professor every year”. The unit aims at collaboration with certain regions and countries according to researched topics, on ethnicity with other Nordic countries, for instance.

PhD students are encouraged to participate in conferences and workshops but funding is scarce. The unit has taken an active part in the creation of the ECREA SuSo summer school; professors and PhD students participate in this summer school every year.

As the overall ambition of the University of Helsinki is to be among the top 20 universities, the Department of Social Research, Media and Communication Studies also has strong and elaborated views on what is needed to reach a top level and build on its own strengths. The unit is obviously in good shape. However, a strong need is felt for more and substantial financing lowering the pressure on the unit. Whereas multidisciplinary does offer a lot of opportunities, it is hard to get funding for it. European funds are difficult to obtain and manage due to the administrative overload. A strategy needs articulation in order to maximise these EU funding opportunities and add to revenue diversification.

Another balance that needs to be struck is the one between books and articles in Finnish and the pressure for peer-reviewed international articles with, however, a

regretted Anglo-Saxon bias and a possible negative impact on Finnish societal impact. Books, especially international ones, of course also offer opportunities for networking, triggering new research possibilities and international mobility, etc.

Overall, an explicit, comprehensive and shared view of a strategic document outlining the future with special attention to publications, internationalisation, HR policy, etc. would help unleash the strong potential of the unit and the discipline. However, a stronger relationship between research groups and identified research challenges needs further thinking and operationalisation.

Another challenge – common to many units – is to create a research collectivity, community rather than individualised research trajectories. From a PhD students’ point of view, pressures (publications, funding, premises, etc.) should be lowered. More balance between teaching and research is needed, as well as some formal organisation to defend and protect PhD students’ interests in the short and long term and to empower those who have no power.

6 University of Lapland, Faculty of Art and Design, Graphic Design

The Graphic Design Programme at the Faculty of Art and Design of the University of Lapland is one of the smallest units in the evaluation, with one professor and a staff of 9. It is somewhat of a niche unit, both with regard to its topic and size. The unit does design-oriented and artistic research, as well as research on visual communication, much depending on one professor.

Naturally, due to this dependency on the input of one person, there is also some

fluctuation in applications and their success. At the time of the evaluation, the unit had 280,000 euros of core funding per year, with one project of 170,000 euros with external funding. The unit members note that the difficulties in funding are not only based on the size of the unit, but also on the distance to southern Finland – in many ways, the unit feels remote and far away from the funding bodies located in the south, not only geographically, but also topically.

Still, the unit has international relations, especially an interesting project with Norway and Sweden, but more collaboration could be organised if resources were available. Students are encouraged to go abroad, but short trips are preferred by students because of private and financial constraints. Participating in international conferences is also difficult because of a lack of funding.

The unit offers courses in English and has incoming foreign students. The publishing policy focuses on English and Finnish publications, but the number of English publications is higher. In the future, the unit plans to work out its internationalisation strategy, to get more opportunities and to build more international relations. The unit feels a need for global thinking and wants to be more open towards Europe, not only to Northern Europe, but to other regions as well.

Established in 2002, this small unit is obviously still ‘under construction’ and finding its way as a practice-based design research unit within the Faculty of Art and Design. The unit considers itself somewhere between Aalto University and the recently created arts university. This new situation will create some uncertainty. The idea of ‘small is

beautiful’ is considered an asset rather than a weakness, offering a lot of flexibilities (“when we are good at something, we just do it”). Being small also means a need for global thinking, developing synergies and opening up more intensively towards Europe, and not per se only to the North (Norway and Sweden, with which the unit has interesting projects).

Implementing a publication strategy of A1 publications is seen as a strategic choice for the future. The unit does regret a southern Finnish bias from both the Academy of Finland and the Helsingin Sanomat Foundation. It is difficult to foresee what comes next and therefore build a sustainable research agenda. Due to this regional imbalance, a lot of potential is underexploited. As there is only one professor, a need for more support is felt, not only with a view to writing applications but also to supervising PhD students. This is obviously a very critical issue, even though the University helps with writing applications. The unit should nevertheless build on its ‘unique selling proposition’ as a practice-based research unit.

7 University of Oulu, Faculty of Humanities, Information Studies

Information Studies at the Faculty of Humanities of the University of Oulu is focused not only on ‘library studies’ but on all kinds of information retrieval and behaviour, knowledge management and science and scientific communication. Like other units with a strong focus on information studies, it occupies a specific niche inside a bigger unit. There seems to be a move towards more centralised and bureaucratic administration practices (which negatively affects the organisation and practices of the unit).

At the time of the evaluation, the unit consisted of a staff of 8.5, with two professors and two lecturers being the only permanently employed persons. However, the members of the unit do not complain about these fairly small staff numbers – on the contrary, they describe the situation as being balanced and efficient.

The unit is successful when it comes to funding: it relies on 350,000 euros of core funding and it could attract some 300,000 euros of external funding per year. The external funding came primarily from the Academy of Finland at the time of the evaluation. This was not seen as a problem though, as the unit members felt that they can attract the necessary funding for research projects quite easily. However, they noted that due to their specific topical niche, they often get the impression that reviewers do not have the necessary expertise to review their proposals.

The unit has solid international bonds and experience, more than many other units, but resources are scarce. The unit has participated in the elaboration of a new EU project, an application with 19 partners, but it did not get funded. The unit participates in the Erasmus exchange programme, and there are some incoming students, some of them from African countries.

Internationalisation is a strong emphasis in the unit, both in encouraging students to go abroad and in increasing the international visibility of the unit. PhD students cannot easily arrange their stay abroad for funding and family reasons and most students prefer to stay abroad for short periods.

The unit considers scientific publications, knowledge transfer and the communication of current research highly

important. Its publication policy is under elaboration and will attempt to make distinctions concerning the target audiences: research results are published both in English and Finnish. The science communication programme is focused on national audiences, although there have been some efforts to work out an international publication policy in the field as well. The unit, however, affirms that discussion with the national community is very important and this can only be done in the national language.

This is a rather small, but very well-organised and successful unit in information studies. Although successful in attracting external funding, it sees it as a permanent challenge, also in the future. A research strategy is defined along five research lines, with a view to creating small research communities of a critical amount of researchers, who also try to create crossovers with other units. This is clearly a process under construction. A need is also felt for more competent and cross-disciplinary evaluation panels. After investing time and effort in high-quality research, the unit will now focus on valorisation and popularisation strategies, for instance through a publication strategy.

Future challenges are said to lie in building a shared understanding of the research focus and increase synergies and interfaculty collaborations. Information literacy is identified as a binding and very promising research area, aligning very well with the strategic ideas of the faculty. Attention will also be paid to HR policy formulation and implementation with a view to supporting career development, especially on the postdoctoral level. Job opportunities are only created as a result of retirement, which is a regrettable situation, undermining long-term research sustainability. The Academy of Finland is once again experienced as

being a distant player, favouring centres such as Helsinki and Tampere. Redressing this (regional) imbalance is needed. Some effort on publication strategy is also felt as a necessity in order to cope with future challenges and build a sustainable research agenda. All in all, an impression of a coherent and shared view on the future research is present.

8 University of Tampere, School of Communication, Media and Theatre (CMT)

The School of Communication, Media and Theatre hosts four disciplines: journalism and mass communication, speech communication, theatre and drama research, and theatre art. At the time of the evaluation, it was home to 84 staff members in communication, of whom ten were professors and approximately 50 active research staff. The head count was particularly difficult at the unit, as there was also additional technical and administrative staff working for the school and as most of the doctoral students were working independently and not on a salaried basis. Furthermore, the unit members noted some fluctuation due to the large size of the school (when compared to other units under analysis). Despite the notable size in national comparison, the school itself is the smallest school at the University of Tampere after reorganisation and fusion processes that took place in 2011.

Taking the above-mentioned structure into account, only the journalism and mass communication and speech communication parts of the school were evaluated. This includes one of the school's two research centres, the Tampere Research Centre for Journalism, Media and Communication (COMET) (the other one is directed at theatre, and as such does not belong to the

field under analysis). This subgroup of the school can be located in the core of journalism and mass communication research, with historical standing roots in journalism or newspaper studies. As such, this group is – internally – more homogeneous than other units under analysis. However, like in other places, the embedding into a larger school is not without its challenges, unifying groups that do not naturally fit in terms of topics and approach.

As the unit is very big when compared to other units in the evaluation, the resources are equally high: the core funding at the time of the evaluation was about 7 million euros, with 4 million euros of external funding. One of the biggest funding sources for COMET and the journalism and mass communication group is the Helsingin Sanomat Foundation. More than 1 million euros came from this one source. This was seen as positive – as this success allowed for a large number of interesting projects – but also as problematic, as the unit's members are aware of a certain dependency on that one, big funding body.

The unit is involved in many international projects, mainly on the basis of individual professional contacts. It also participates in Erasmus and other exchange programmes, but incoming students sometimes have to face hardships because there are not enough courses in English and most of the basic information is only available in Finnish. Although the Erasmus exchange programme is part of the University's international policy, the shortage in resources hinders the organisation of English-language courses. PhD students are encouraged to study abroad or to participate in workshops and conferences, although this cannot always be supported financially. The unit's policy is to cover conference costs of its staff members in

case they cannot allocate them to a research project. The University is busy elaborating new international programmes but the funding problem is hard to resolve.

A publication policy is also under discussion; both Finnish and English publications are encouraged but the order is of importance. As most international journals only accept articles that have not yet been published (not even in the national language), the publication policy is designed so that research results should first be published in international journals in English and then in Finnish for the national public.

The School of Communication, Media and Theatre is still in a process of reorganisation and dealing with new structures and challenges. It has some very specific characteristics as it used to have a high turnover of journalists doing research, and a strong dependency on the Helsingin Sanomat Foundation. With the restructuring, adaptation was needed, and a strategy to balance teaching, practice and research was implemented. A decision to have permanent research positions and allocated research time was taken. The strategic research agenda needs some more attention and the unit should gradually move from a collection of researchers to coherent and cohesive research groupings. As many PhD students are not funded or just passively present, stronger selection and follow-up procedures are envisaged. The unit is clearly at the beginning of a new structure, or era, and cooperation inside the school is under development. The PhD students need particular attention as an impression of a lottery for selection as well as funding exists. They are confronted with many insecure working and funding conditions, therefore threatening the long-term sustainability of research at the unit. The closing down of

the funding of the doctoral programmes VITRO and Elomedia is regretted, especially as there are no clear views on future initiatives.

9 University of Tampere, School of Information Sciences, Information Studies and Interactive Media (SIS)

Information Studies and Interactive Media (INFIM) at the School of Information Studies is one of two media-related units at the University of Tampere. It features aspects of information retrieval and processing, library science, knowledge management and the study of digital, interactive media, like computer games. The multidisciplinary combination of these elements is unique. Similarly, the scientists at the unit come from computer, behavioural and social sciences, design, art, and the humanities, so the staff are heterogeneous in many ways.

At the time of the evaluation, the unit had a staff of 58, of which 43 were working in research and five were professors. The unit is one of the bigger units under analysis, so it does not come as surprise that the resources needed to maintain the unit are quite high. It can rely on a core funding of about 2.5 million euros, and it could attract about 1.7 to 2.0 million euros of external funding per year. Most of the funding comes from the Academy of Finland and Tekes.

The multidisciplinary structure of the unit is regarded as a big asset but also as a big problem by some of the unit's members. While they greet the opportunity to do cross-disciplinary work, they note the difficulty to find funding sources for some of their project proposals. They attribute this to the lack of multidisciplinary funding lines in their area of expertise, which does not fall within the mainstream

of media and communication studies. Furthermore, they note that there are not many capable reviewers available to actually assess their work.

Like in other cases, this stresses some of the challenges being generated by the lack of canonisation and disciplinary boundaries within the communication and media field. It is worth noting that it is primarily the more diverse units (like the one discussed here) that do not vote for a forced disciplinary division between a mainstream or in-group and more peripheral parts of the field. To a certain extent, this is due to their own self-definition and positioning as being located 'outside the mainstream', but it can be also attributed to some positive experiences emanating from working with people from various backgrounds. On the other hand, it is always difficult to think about alternative structural solutions (that are not implemented yet) from within the units themselves, so the evaluation's findings should be interpreted carefully, as they are primarily based on self-descriptions.

In the given case, the evaluation panel noted that the combination of computer sciences and social-scientific research of interactive media is a very fruitful one, opening some exciting options for future research. However, the link between library sciences or information retrieval and communication studies seemed not to be equally strong. In many ways, the panel identified stronger topical (but not structural) links between the social-scientific work of the unit and some of the work witnessed at the University's other media-related unit (CMT).

Due to the special field of expertise, its international character and the many incoming students, most courses and publications are in English, although the

problem of maintaining contact with the national audience is deemed to be important. Although publications are mainly in English, even on lower levels (because English is the main language of the field of informatics and game studies), a yearbook in Finnish is published every year to enhance the use of national vocabulary.

The unit takes part in Erasmus programmes and there are a great number of applicants from abroad. And although Erasmus exchange is available and highly recommended but not compulsory for home students, few of them actually take the opportunity to go abroad because of family- and funding-related problems. Earlier, doctoral students were involved in a Nordic project for doctoral studies but, unfortunately, this funding has stopped.

The unit is aware that it should look for more EU funding, but it finds the administrative task to prepare applications too huge. The university central offices help with the applications, but the unit does not get enough assistance from university officials and experts. Regarding EU funding, the unit would also welcome more light-weight funding instruments from the EU.

As a consequence of the Universities Act, the unit faces huge administrative changes. Restructuring is still ongoing and the newly created opportunities need further exploration and concretisation. They gradually move towards closer interactions within the school, creating new research opportunities and synergies through combining technology, computer sciences, social sciences and humanities. However, this cross-disciplinarity is not, or hardly, valued in the existing procedures, categories and funding mechanisms. A plea for multidisciplinary panels was

made. The unit and school are building more focused research centres (centres of excellence), and a strategic research agenda needs to be defined and shared. Even though already quite successful in attracting external funding, the unit will further explore revenue diversification, increasingly looking at EU funding opportunities, although considered burdensome. More funding is required, however, with special attention to postdoctoral funding in order to sustain and optimise built research excellence.

10 University of Turku, Faculty of Humanities, School of History, Culture and Art Studies, Media Studies

At the time of the evaluation, the Department of Media Studies at the Faculty of Humanities of the University of Turku consisted of two professors, with 12 research-active staff members. The staff structure is seen as being imbalanced and too small by the unit's members. During the talks, they noted the absence of permanent research positions as a major disadvantage of the current situation, preventing them from a stronger focus on funded research. In addition to this, the unit had recently lost one senior lecturer position.

These limiting factors notwithstanding, the unit could still attract 200,000 euros of external funding at the time of the evaluation. This is notable, as the unit concentrates very much on theory-driven research, specially focusing on media culture and media history – an approach that does not attract or rely on large grants (as, for example, is the case for some media production units under analysis).

While the background in humanities explains some of the structures witnessed at the unit, it still has to be noted that the

unit members themselves portrayed the situation as being problematic. They obviously see themselves as being under (external) pressure, with not enough staff and resources to achieve their goals.

The unit participates in international exchange programmes, especially based on individual contacts. It is also part of the Erasmus programme, but does not have many incoming students, due to its limited resources. Doctoral students are encouraged to go abroad for conferences and to study and the necessary contacts and networks exist. Funding is a problem, but there are some resources for conferences and language editing, and most of the funded PhD students are mobile. The unit is well aware that it has to look for more financial resources in order to raise the level of international contacts. The unit's PhD theses are mainly written in English, and some of them have found their way to international publishers, too.

This highly specialised and academically recognised unit obviously suffers from the restructuring imposed by the Universities Act. The unit appears too small to handle it. Due to its restricted resources, the unit indeed faces some severe work overloads and constant insecurity, and cannot live up to its own expectations and ambitions. Brain drain is seen as a threat, whereas the University of Turku and the Faculty of Humanities seeing arts as a strategic focus area is seen as an opportunity. Some doctoral graduates from the unit have been recruited to very respected European universities.

Therefore, more resources are desperately needed, and a plea was made for the prolongation of funding for the national doctoral programmes. The academic reputation of the unit is widely recognised, but a real research environment,

collectively supported and not solely driven by individual PhDs, is lacking. The lack of funding for PhD students is identified as a major problem. More external funding is seen as a solution but would increase the workload for an already small team. This is a vicious circle that needs remediation. The Academy of Finland is felt as a distant player, not an ally, except for the funding. More perspectives and job opportunities for PhD students should also be created.

11 University of Vaasa, Faculty of Philosophy, Communication Studies

The Unit of Communication Studies at the Faculty of Philosophy of the University of Vaasa consists of two professors, one associate professor and three lecturers and teachers. Despite its size, the unit is multidisciplinary, integrating aspects of research into digital and multimedia communication, as well as language studies or linguistics.

There is a strong emphasis on teaching in this unit, as its funds are based on the number of graduated students. Naturally, this has an effect on the funding situation as well: The unit has 370,000 euros of core funding, with nearly no external funding – mostly between 2,000–20,000 euros a year. Several reasons for this could be identified: most obviously the limited size of the unit, the teaching orientation and also the lack of stability on a structural level – the unit has not evolved into a shape that is regarded as being ‘final’ by unit members.

In addition to these problems, there is also the challenge of being far away from the funding bodies in southern Finland – this distance is not only geographical by nature. The unit members feel that it is hard to get access to the funding

programmes there. Some of this might be attributed to the multidisciplinary nature of the unit, though, as in many ways, it is caught between two stools – something that has also been explained to the panel by members of other units that do not belong to a ‘mainstream’ of media and communication studies or media production.

The University of Vaasa is internationally well connected; it has many international exchange agreements and offers special courses for exchange students. The University has a unique international profile, as it is a Finnish-speaking university in a bilingual region. Publications are in Swedish and in English, but publishing in Finnish is also undertaken as an important task. In the past, international relations of the unit were mainly based on Nordic cooperation, especially in research. The new policy is to get more integrated in EU projects with the help of the university central administration. Unfortunately, the choice of the University in new relationships does not collide with the unit’s choices.

The unit is developing its participation in Erasmus exchange programmes. Incoming students participate in English-language courses. In the unit, all students take certain courses in English. The unit is keen on starting new plans for international cooperation.

Imposed changes that were felt as an opportunity on the one hand, create a quite unstable environment on the other. Moreover, an impression exists of semantic changes concerning the reduction of the administrative load of the head of the unit. Needless to say, the unit is still looking for its own research identity and focus, especially as it was originally set up as a mere teaching institution (overall

impression of being “not there, not yet”). Challenges lie in finding the right proportion between teaching and research on the one hand, big and small research group settings on the other. It is still not clear which strategy the unit should follow. More time should be allocated to research.

As the overall funding of the national doctoral programme will be closed down, interuniversity collaborations opportunities will be undermined, which is felt particularly harmful and regrettable for smaller units such as this one. The unit will have to find new ways of financing cooperation both within the University of Vaasa and with other universities, as well as across disciplines within the field. However, no outlined strategy exists for achieving this. The unit explicitly works on creating interfaculty cooperation, creating more inter- and cross-disciplinary opportunities. These collaborations allow the unit to learn from best practices. The umbrella organisation of the University allows for these kinds of opportunities, which is seen as an added value. Key staff members also offer research support and decide on international cooperation agreements. A downside of this kind of centralised organisation is that decisions are made top-down, which possibly hampers the autonomy of the unit.

In the case of this unit, the Academy of Finland is considered a too distant (literally) player, not taking the needs of smaller and peripheral units into account and therefore strengthening the already strong universities and units. Creating more opportunities for career development from the PhD to the postdoctoral level should be considered. Facilities and mechanisms creating more national networking and collaboration are seen as an absolute necessity. As there is no

structural funding for PhD students, long-term research sustainability is undermined. Moreover, the money budgeted for salaries is allocated to the faculty level. Also, for this reason, the autonomy of the unit to set its own research agenda is at stake.

12 Åbo Akademi University, School of Business and Economics, Information Studies

Information Studies at the School of Business and Economics of Åbo Akademi University is a special case, both when it comes to the embedding inside a larger structure and the internal structure of the unit itself. Basically, it consists of one professor, two senior lecturers, one university teacher and two postdoctoral researchers. The unit was located at the Faculty of Economics and Social Sciences but moved to the School of Business and Economics in 2010. The unit focuses on information behaviour research and education, with a specific ‘human’ perspective, that is, its work is influenced by psychology and social sciences, and not so much by technology.

There was discussion among the panel members on whether the rather small but successful unit, with strong roots in library science, has a clear identity. Its self-definition seems to place it outside what most of the other units do, with only limited similarities to the other units.

At the time of the evaluation, the unit could attract 250,000 euros of external funding – a success that, naturally, depends very much on the success of the professor at the unit.

Although well-funded considering the number of senior researchers who can apply for larger projects, the unit

acknowledges that it should be more active in attracting EU-funded research or exchange projects. Nordic cooperation is important for the unit; research traditions in the library field have been strong in the Nordic countries. Being visible in the Nordic context is a strategic point, but other international relations should also be developed.

PhD students are encouraged to take part in international mobility, but students are not very mobile during their education (mainly for family reasons). The unit has more incoming foreign students than outgoing. It is more frequent that those who have finished their PhDs take the opportunity to go abroad. Student mobility should be supported more. PhDs are mainly written in English, which facilitates international visibility. The unit has experience in organising conferences, and this activity should be continued. The unit agrees that its small size may be an asset: it leaves room for more flexibility. The staff would welcome a network of similar units or communication schools organised in the future.

After the 2010 Universities Act, the unit moved from the Social Sciences Department to the School of Business and Economics. This rather recent situation is seen as a positive development with many possibilities and as the result of a collective, explicit choice. The field of information studies is, however, felt to be a subject rather than a discipline.

Research collaboration opportunities within the unit could be optimised through intensifying meetings, organising joint research seminars and platforms, and especially through increased communication. Positively affirming and positioning the unit's own identity within the School is seen as an added value, although the unit members feel appreciated, recognised and supported. Many research opportunities still exist in the domain of information studies that can benefit the business school, that is, looking into the choice behind consumer behaviour. However, PhD students did identify some funding issues. The idea of 'small is beautiful' was also seen by them as a strength rather than a weakness, because of the importance of peer support.

11 SUMMING UP

During the talks with the staff and doctoral students in various units, it became evident that the panel is not evaluating one unified field or discipline. The units are connected by having some links to societal communication processes and media in a relatively wide understanding – but that is the small, and sometimes only common, denominator they have. There are several disciplinary backgrounds and traditions being reflected in the units' programmes, structures and viewpoints, from social-scientific communication studies, practically oriented media production or journalism studies, humanistic media studies to information systems.

Consequently, the definitions of 'communication' and 'media', as well as the epistemological characters and values, might vary a great deal between different subjects and units. The lowest common denominator seems to be in the conceptual area of mediatisation, digitalisation, the production of signs, symbols, (re) presentations, media and information as well as media and information professions and behaviour with more or less practical emphases. What seems to be common in and shared by most of the profiles is the multidisciplinary nature of the different approaches and often a rather intensive relation to the so-called practice (however, not in all units). All in all, the ability of the concepts of 'communication' and 'media' to cover and express the research profiles and practices of the field is often questioned especially in the fields of arts, the humanities and information studies.

There are some agglomerations in the heterogeneous selection of units presented to the evaluation panel – one might portray

them as clusters of units sharing a similar perspective. These units are aware of each other, visit the same conferences, read the same journals, and have an exchange of staff inside the small job market these units offer to young academics. Social-scientific communication studies, in some cases combined with journalism studies, seemed to be a common reference point in some units under analysis.

This reflects a certain core or mainstream in international media and communication research to some extent – a mainstream that is debatable in itself. For example, Annie Lang (2013) recently suggested that the "Field's first paradigm, Media Effects" is in a state of crisis (following Thomas Kuhn's considerations on scientific revolutions; Kuhn 1996). She adds to an enduring debate on the essence of the field – others have already discussed the theoretical, methodological and also the principal scientific foundations of the field before, most prominently in the 'ferment of the field' issues of *Journal of Communication* (Vol. 33, 1983:3; Vol. 43, 1993:3). This debate on the basis and outline of the field is by no means finished. There is no firm canonisation as it has happened (or has been forced) in other fields, and there are no clear disciplinary delineations that mark an in-group or out-group.

This makes research in the field of media and communication more difficult than in more clearly defined disciplines (e.g. psychology), as researchers have to discuss not only their findings but also the validity of their perspectives. On the other hand, this can also be seen as a strength, as this patchwork of perspectives and the ongoing

clash of scientific ideals and ideologies might lead to new and unexpected directions. If one accepts this as the condition of the field, forms of chaotic disorder and innovation seem to go hand in hand. So the scientific pluralism of the field is, in short, a challenge but also a big asset.

The structural evaluation revealed a wide range of units, from small niche groups focusing on special interest areas to large units operating close to what could be depicted as a disciplinary mainstream. However, there is no one mainstream here. There are at least three groups of units that seem to have a certain consistent approach to media and communication:

1. Units that feel close to social-scientific media and communication studies, like it is also organised internationally in associations such as the European Communication and Research Association (ECREA), the International Communication Association (ICA) or the International Association of Media and Communication Research (IAMCR)
2. Units that focus on media production, with roots in arts, design and sometimes even philosophy
3. Units with a disciplinary background in information systems, with roots in library research, but many links to modern, computer-based information retrieval and analysis.

A fourth tradition at some units is newspaper studies (with roots in historic *Zeitungswissenschaft*), but this tradition seems to be paralleled with the social-scientific approach. This also reflects some international developments, where journalism production and research have become part of the larger communication associations (in the form of specific divisions focusing on journalism), or where

journalism-related associations (e.g. AEJCM, the Association for Education in Journalism and Mass Communication) have integrated more and more social-scientific research.

It needs to be noted that these three streams are by no means closed disciplines, but very much in flux. In that sense, there is no disciplinary core that unifies all these streams – they share the topic (media, communication and information), but that is already the major common ground. It is debatable whether a stronger canonisation and ‘closure’ would help develop more clearly shaped – and stronger – disciplines, or whether the plural and multi-faceted analysis of media through many different disciplinary lenses is an advantage. There are supporters and opponents for both viewpoints in the evaluated units.

Obviously, the size and staff structure of the units depends on the viewpoints as well: some particularly small units successfully filled a niche subject. In contrast to this, production-oriented units are usually big, as they rely on large numbers of teachers (as most courses for media production are small, so there is a natural need for more teachers) and supporting (technical) staff. Again, there are no pros or cons to this, only different viewpoints. Some of the smaller units were following a ‘small but beautiful’ strategy, concentrating on one specific aspect, and filling a niche efficiently. However, the bigger units offer a complete scientific environment, and can attract larger projects and resources in a more stable way. They might also attract scientific talent more easily than smaller, remote places.

One part of the staff and recruitment structure are gender issues, which were added to the self-evaluation questionnaire

after the kick-off seminar. The position of women in academia is often seen as a good indicator of the extent of the reforms to traditional university structures and of the capacity to respond to social pressures. The main problems of gender equality usually arise from broader institutional problems, such as the recognition of different career paths and expectations.

According to Koivisto and Thomas (2010, 130–131; 140–141), the special problems of communication and media research were the identification of ‘communication’ and related concepts with a more or less gendered public sphere that has remained predominantly masculine. That poses the question of the universities’ own involvement in a broader network of disempowering social relations. No matter what academic institution is under scrutiny, the diminishing share of women and the growing share of men on the academic ladder is a constant phenomenon. All in all, regarding the whole field, the gender distribution seemed to be rather different. Speech communication and information studies (except for the SIS unit in Tampere) are mainly dominated by women, with some difficulties in attracting male applicants. This probably reflects the rather segregated Finnish labour market.

Many units also noted a difficult funding situation in Finland, as the whole system relies on just a few large funding bodies (e.g. the Academy of Finland, Tekes and the Helsingin Sanomat Foundation), with sometimes very specific mission statements and interests, which exclude many interesting approaches that do not fit those statements. It could be argued that this leads to a mainstreaming of interests through funding. However, even some units with very specific niche interests seemed to be able to attract larger grants despite this situation.

On the basis of the analysis of structures and resources, the evaluation panel got the impression that media and communication units in Finland are in a state of transition. While there are some focal points and approaches that seem to be accepted in several units, there is no consensus on disciplinary boundaries – something that might change in the future, based on both international scientific developments and structural and organisational changes in the country itself. However, not only the overall field is in transition – many units themselves are also in a process of change, in many cases triggered by the Universities Act and its organisational, structural, financial and administrative impact. It remains to be seen whether the overall field and the units will (re)gain the balance after this transitional phase is over, or whether the current change will lead to a more severe differentiation and selection process.

Considering the future of research on media and communications in Finland, some overall impressions and conclusions need highlighting.

First, as an overall impression, the Academy of Finland is felt as a distant player, not per se an ally. It does not consider the cross- or interdisciplinarity of the field in a sufficient way and fails to create the right mechanisms and procedures to use this potential. The activities of the Academy seem to foster a discrepancy between the central and the peripheral units and universities.

Second, most units are definitely in need of more resources. Attracting external resources is still quite new for many of them (except for the Helsingin Sanomat Foundation and Tekes). A possible downside of the Helsingin Sanomat Foundation is that it considers traditional

journalistic research more than future-oriented communication and (cross-)media research. An outlined strategy for optimising external funding opportunities is missing almost everywhere.

Another specificity of the Finnish system is the presence of 'passive' PhD students who see the PhD as a lifetime project or hobby, not as a profession with a set end. While this system certainly has some attractive elements, it also creates a lack of transparency, adds to administrative overload and pressures supervising enthusiastic, but limited, staff. The situation calls for PhD follow-up, allocating more resources to PhD students and developing career opportunities, also at the postdoctoral level.

Fourth, the imbalance between teaching and research needs remediation at almost all departments and units. This is not only needed for professors but also for PhD students.

Overall, establishing a genuine research culture seems both a challenge and an opportunity. Generally speaking, all units would benefit from outlining a future strategic research agenda (SRA), considering topics such as internationalisation, publications, HR policy, attracting external money, etc. The units should discuss the SRA, define it and make it shared and supported by all in order to create long-term sustainability of Finnish research and to make use of the many opportunities to their full potential.

12 RECOMMENDATIONS

Media and communication are the heart of modern societies. Without communication, societies would not even exist, and without media, complex societal communication would be impossible. Research in the field has a long tradition – on the one hand, going back to ancient rhetoric, on the other hand, to early sociological analyses of communication and newspaper or journalism studies – despite the common misunderstanding that this is a ‘new field’. Since these beginnings, the field has developed, and so have the disciplines that do research in the field. Nowadays, media and communication research has matured, and developed many units with strong and healthy teaching and research traditions. However, a canonisation of one major disciplinary mainstream has not happened yet – there are still several approaches and viewpoints focusing on various aspects of the field.

Unsurprisingly, the current evaluation sketches the outlines of a heterogeneous field in transition. The changes triggered by the Universities Act, but also the ongoing debate about the ‘core’ of the field where multiple research traditions try to find a home, make it difficult to identify clear goals, identities, strengths and weaknesses. The panellists found contradicting problems and wishes at the various units under analysis. Therefore, the recommendations given here need to be understood in the light both of a mélange of interests communicated and of ambiguous observations made.

Furthermore, it should be noted that the panel did not find one discipline that was tilling the field, but several streams that were doing work on media and

communication. In principle, there are several major schools of thought: social-scientific media and communication research, media studies with roots in humanities, journalism education and research, arts and design-oriented programmes, as well as speech communication and information and library studies.

Naturally, there are alternative ways of organising the multitude of perspectives in the field – one could also try grouping them according to the level of applied work they do, from theoretical research to professional or practice-based research connected to vocational studies, or according to the phenomena they focus (journalism, public communication, movies, speech, libraries, online communication, etc.). However, it became obvious from the evaluation that a coherent disciplinary background and approach works much more as a unifying factor than the observed phenomena. Social-scientific researchers share a common set of research interests, methods and general ideas about scientific work in general, as researchers with a background in humanities, the arts or information systems do – and they differ very much from each other.

Therefore, one major finding and recommendation is based on this observation of largely differing units and researchers being ‘lumped together’ in one overarching category. It seems to be wise to rethink the categorisation, and the delineations of (sub)disciplines in the field. As it is, many researchers feel ill-treated by the funding organisations, and in some cases even their universities, as their very

identity is not understood by these third parties. However, it is not only a problem of identity and self-definition in a – sometimes perceived as ignorant – environment, but also a very practical, essentially even financial question. For example, it was communicated to the panellists that project proposals sent to funding bodies were falsely categorised and understood by these institutions, and as a consequence, sent to reviewers from completely different disciplines (according to the definition of the submitters).

This needs to be rectified, if it is a more common problem. If researchers with a humanities background or a preference for ethnographic fieldwork have to review psychologically oriented lab experiments, or if scholars from the arts and humanities have to evaluate projects from information studies focusing on big data analysis, then less than desirable outcomes are to be expected. In order to support excellence in research, a disciplinary fit of experts and submitters is necessary – and this works only if there are some disciplinary boundaries. It might be useful to continue the work started with this evaluation, and constitute a project on the history, structures, theories and methods of Finnish media and communication research, in order to clarify these boundaries.

On the other hand, with such boundaries, there comes a certain danger of privileging one disciplinary approach over the other, in the field and the institutions, but also in funding. This problem is difficult to solve: Treating each approach equally might not be just, as there are varying sizes of units and disciplinary streams in the field. For example, the panel found the social-scientific media and communication units as well as the journalism units to be quite strong in staff, publications and other successes. However, strengthening the

already strong might lead to a limitation of options and scientific pluralism, and some smaller but interesting and very competitive units might lose during such a process of focusing. On the other hand, more focused support might improve competitiveness for the ones that do receive this support. The panel cannot give a definitive answer here, as this is a strategic and political decision – however, the panellists agreed on the observation that the mix of disciplines and viewpoints, while being inherently rich and colourful, also poses some serious problems.

Beyond this more general observation, the panel members found several points that need to be borne in mind when thinking of future strategies for the field.

Structures and resources

While in general, many of the units under analysis seemed to be in good shape, the panel also observed many units that seemed to be working on a very thin basis of resources and staff. Some of these smaller units do an excellent job coping with the limitations and the inevitable inclusion into bigger departments and units (although the bigger environment sometimes did not fit really well). However, there is a danger of being reliable on the success or failure of individuals in such limited structures – and this was communicated to the panel several times.

Not only the size of individual units, but of the overall field in Finland, poses a problem. As there are just over a dozen of units – with differing disciplinary backgrounds – the possibilities of a healthy transfer of staff and ideas become very limited. In principle, the ‘job market’ for researchers in communication and media is so small that it cannot sustain everyone in the field. Naturally, this becomes a

problem for young researchers first (see below). However, there are also other side effects that are undesirable – several of which are mentioned in this report.

In addition to this, there is an imbalance in funding. Many units depend on external research funding to sustain their staff numbers and their scientific work – up to a point where the external funding becomes a necessity for the basic functioning of these units. It is alarming if units implement a factory-like production process for research applications – not born out of scientific interest, but out of sheer need. While some incentive for scientific research can be healthy, too much of it might leave academic units in a state of dependency. Quite a few units communicated that they felt at the mercy of big funding organisations and their decisions, rather than deciding on their own goals (and in effect: also their structures) themselves.

Research

Overall, the evaluation panel found a very diverse and rich field with many perspectives and approaches. Many units could tell success stories in research, even on an international level. As mentioned above, the diversity of the field makes it difficult to tar all the units with the same brush – so it might be wise to develop evaluation measures that are specific for the (sub)disciplines observed in the field. For example, standard publication indices may not be useful for a comparison across disciplinary borders, due to the differing publication traditions. While some of the units were primarily focusing on books in Finnish, others were strongly promoting publications in peer-reviewed, international journals. Applying the same measure here could be the proverbial comparison between apples and oranges.

As mentioned above, the units seemed to be generally productive when it comes to funding applications. That said, the success rate was understandably low (given the limited number of funding organisations). A realistic calculation of time and effort spent on preparing research bids against publication outputs may offer useful insights here (in one instance, 16 applications were submitted over an 18-month period). It should be noted that the units may channel some of their efforts into publication outputs, too, so that not all of the work on unsuccessful applications is lost. It is recommended that units formulate their strategic research agenda and disseminate it within the whole unit. This would probably help bring together a research community internally and make it visible externally. Moreover, it would help create a genuine, shared research culture.

Publishing

As noted above, the publishing strategies of the units differed immensely. However, in order to improve the publishing situation, some more general recommendations seem to be appropriate. For example, researchers should be made aware that, given copyright conventions followed by journal publishers, they should first aim at disseminating their original research internationally to ensure a wider access before tailoring their internationally published work to local and national audiences. Access to and provision of international publishing workshops (especially for doctoral students opting for article-based English dissertations) would constitute a good investment, including discussions surrounding challenges faced in getting research papers accepted in high-ranking international journals. Assuming language plays a crucial part, the possible lack of English language support at the institutional level may be explored further.

However, the observations of the evaluation panel are confined by the limits of the provided data basis and the time for the respective talks. The publication data provided over a two-year period (2010–2011) is inadequate to detect any general trends. Longitudinal publication data covering a five-year period (or longer) is likely to yield useful insights about research trajectories by levelling out fluctuations in staffing, research funding etc. Such data over a longer timescale will contribute towards the formulation of future research or publication strategies.

Furthermore, a mapping exercise may help to establish any potential correlation between funded projects and publication profiles. It is likely that in the field of social sciences and humanities, good quality publications may not require funding. A further mapping exercise should be undertaken to see what percentage of conference or workshop presentations lead to high-quality publication outputs (when compared to publications in conference proceedings).

Situation of young researchers

The panel found the situation of young researchers to be problematic. Many PhD students noted a lack of options, security and future prospects in the field. A pyramid-like structure is typical for university systems, but in the case of the observed field, it seemed to be a very unbalanced structure – with a small and quite stable peak, a thin and fragile middle, and a very broad and fluctuating base. While the top of the structure – with the professors – seems to be already very well occupied with successful professors, there is only a very limited number of postdoctoral positions, and many PhD researchers working under short-term contracts, hoping for contract extensions

through further research projects. It was especially troublesome that some PhD students and researchers seemed to be primarily occupied with writing ‘their professor’s next application’ to prolong their own position in the system instead of concentrating on their research and qualification. Naturally, the panel members cannot verify these statements, and whether they are typical to the Finnish funding system, or the field under analysis – but at least the repetition of similar statements at several units led to the conclusion that this is a pattern based on a problematic foundation of the system.

Ideally, structural and economic changes in the system might help improve the situation. However, other steps can be taken to help young researchers. For example, mentoring should be provided to early-career researchers, also with respect to career planning, publication strategies and alternative (exit) options. Units might also think about clearer and stricter rules for the inclusion of PhD students and researchers in the production of funding applications, limiting a one-sided dependency on their superiors.

As already mentioned before, these recommendations need to be seen in the context of an evaluation in a phase where the field is obviously in transition. Some of the conclusions here might be inadequate in a changed situation. Given the observed status quo, such developments are not only a remote possibility, but almost inevitable. However, this is nothing to complain about – media and communication are changing continuously, so the respective field and its disciplines have to be flexible and need to adapt accordingly. With a solid structural and scientific basis, such adaptations are not a challenge, but they offer possibilities for further research and an evolution of the overall field.

REFERENCES

- Craig, Robert T. (1999) Communication Theory as a Field. *Communication Theory* 2, 1999, 119–161, www.stes-apes.med.ulg.ac.be/Documents_electroniques/MET/MET-COM/ELE%20MET-COM%20A-8191.pdf
- Haasio, Ari & Vakkari, Pertti (2005–2006) Informaatiotutkimus tieteenä ja tutkimusalueena [Information Studies as a science and a field; learning material] http://oppimateriaalit.internetix.fi/fi/avoimet/0viestinta/informaatiotutkimus/po1/perusteet/06_01_tutkimusala
- Herkman, Juha (2008) Current Trends in Media Research. *Nordicom Review* 29(2008):1, 145–159. www.nordicom.gu.se/common/publ_pdf/264_herkman.pdf
- Herkman, Juha and Vähämaa, Miika (2007) Viestintätutkimuksen nykytila Suomessa. [Current state of communication studies in Finland] Viestinnän laitoksen tutkimusraportteja 1/2007. Helsinki: Helsingin yliopisto, Viestinnän tutkimuskeskus CRC, Viestinnän laitos.
- History of Speech Communication, www.jyu.fi/hum/laitokset/viesti/en/subjects/speech/history
- Hurme, Pertti, Lehtisalo, Anneli & Kivimäki, Sanna (2004) From Division to Cooperation. Finnish University Network for Communication Sciences. *Nordicom Review* 26:1, 141–143. www.nordicom.gu.se/common/publ_pdf/145_069-072.pdf
- Isotalus, Pekka (2005) To study speech or communication in speech communication? In Laukkanen & Puro (ed.) 30 years of existence. Lectures presented at the festive seminar held 4 November 2004, 96–104. *Journal of Communication*, Vol. 33, Issue 3, pp. 4–362, September 1983.
- Journal of Communication*, Vol. 43, Issue 3, pp. 4–238, September 1993.
- Kivikuru, Ullamaija (1998) Communication Research. Is there such a thing? *Nordicom Review* 19:1, 7–12.
- Koivisto, Juha & Thomas, Peter D. (2010) Mapping Communication and Media Research. *Conjunctures, Institutions, Challenges*. Tampere: Tampere University Press.
- Kuhn, Thomas (1996) The structure of scientific revolutions (3rd edition). Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Lang, Annie (2013) Discipline in crisis? The Shifting Paradigm of Mass Communication Re-search. *Communication Theory*, 23(1), 10–24.
- Mäkinen, Ilkka (2007) Suomalaisen informaatiotutkimuksen kehityspiirteitä ja menestyksen taustatekijöitä [Features in the development of the Finnish research in Information Studies and some factors explaining its success]. *Informaatiotutkimus* 26(2), 34–47.
- Pietilä, Veikko (2005) On the Highway of Mass Communication Studies. Cresskill, New Jersey, Hampton Press.
- Pietilä, Veikko, Malmberg, Tarmo & Nordenstreng, Kaarle (2004) Theoretical Convergences and Contrasts: A View from Finland. *European Journal of Communication* 5, 2–3: 165–185.
- Research in art and design in Finnish universities, www.aka.fi/Tiedostot/Tiedostot/Julkaisut/04_09%20Research%20in%20Art%20and%20Design.pdf
- Valo, Maarit (1998) Speech communication the Finnish way: Fifteen years of university degrees of speech communication in Jyväskylä, Finland. *Communication Education*, 47:3, 286–291 <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/03634529809379132>
- Valo, Maarit (2012) Puheviestintä – taitoaineesta tieteenalaksi. [Speech communication – from practical subject to discipline]. In Mustonen, Moisander & Valo (ed.) Laatus ja liikettä: rehtori Aino Sallisen juhla- ja tutkimusraportti. Jyväskylä: Jyväskylän yliopisto, 182–209.
- Ylijoki, Oili-Helena (2000) Disciplinary cultures and the moral order of studying – A case-study of four Finnish university departments. *Higher Education* 39: 339–362.

APPENDIX 1. Members of the evaluation panel in brief

Thorsten Quandt, Chair of the panel, is Full Professor of Communication Studies at the University of Münster, Germany.

Thorsten Quandt held the Chair of Online Communication and Interactive Media at the University of Hohenheim in 2009–2012, where he also served as the Director of the Institute of Communication Studies in 2012. Previously, he worked as Assistant Professor of Journalism Research at Freie Universität Berlin and as a researcher and lecturer at Ludwig-Maximilians University Munich, Berlin University of the Arts, the University Trier, the University of Applied Sciences (FHW) in Vienna, the University of Applied Sciences (FH) Bremen and Ilmenau University of Technology. His research and teaching fields include online communication, media innovation research, digital games and journalism.

Quandt is the founding chair of the temporary working group “Digital Games Research” of the European Communication Research and Education Association (ECREA), a member of the Executive Board of ECREA, a board member of the journals *Communication Theory and Digital Journalism*, and an ERC grant holder (European Excellency Programme). Furthermore, he has served as a member on the Scientific Advisory Board of the Helsingin Sanomat Foundation. He has also served as the chair of the research network ‘Integrative Theories in Communication Studies’ (DFG), as the chair of the Journalism Division in the German Communication Association (DGPK) and as the secretary of the Journalism Studies Division in the International Communication Association (ICA).

He has (co-)published several books and more than 90 scientific articles. His work has been awarded with several scientific prizes, including various Top Paper Awards and the dissertation award of the German Communication Association (DGPK).

Jostein Gripsrud is Professor of Media Studies at the University of Bergen, Norway.

Jostein Gripsrud has published extensively on theatre, popular literature, film history, television, journalism, popular music, media and cultural policy and relevant social and cultural theory for all of these media, genres and cultural forms. Gripsrud has lectured at numerous universities across Europe and the US. He was International Francqui Professor at the Vrije Universiteit Brussel, Université Libre de Bruxelles and Gent University in 2011 and he has been Visiting Scholar/Professor at UCLA, the University of Southern California, Copenhagen University, the Université de Paris II, and École des Hautes Études en Sciences Sociales (EHESS). He has led a string of national and international research projects on film and TV history, on rhetoric and knowledge, “cultural disorder”, European media, and *Democracy and the Digitisation of Audiovisual Culture (DIGICULT)* (2007–2010). Among his publications are *Media, Markets and Public Spheres* (2009), *Relocating Television: Television in the digital context* (2010) and *The Idea of the Public Sphere: A Reader* (2010).

Maria Heller is International Director of the Faculty of Social Sciences and Director of the Institute of Sociology of the Faculty of Social Sciences at Eötvös Loránd University, Budapest, Hungary.

Maria Heller is a sociologist with background in linguistics. Her research interests include media and communications, theories of the public sphere, discourse analysis and new ICTs. She holds lectures and seminars on various related topics, including communication theory, sociolinguistics, information society and qualitative research methodology.

She has done research and has published in several languages concerning the structure of the public sphere and the opposition between ‘public’ and ‘private’ in communications; public debates (discourse analyses on demography, national, ethnic and European identity, NATO and EU enlargement, globalisation, Eurosceptic discourses); discursive strategies of public and private speakers; symbols in political campaigns; models of communications; value analysis of mass culture, commodity aesthetics; symbolic politics and the European public sphere; the structure of the public sphere in state socialism and in pluralist societies; new perspectives in 21st-century communications; discursive strategies in advertising and the sociology of games.

She is a member of several Hungarian and international scholarly associations and was a “Freedom of Speech” professor at the University of Bergen, Norway. She has participated in various international conferences and research programmes and was the leader of the Hungarian team in the European Commission’s Reconstituting Democracy in Europe (RECON) project coordinated by Arena (University of Oslo, Norway).

Caroline Pauwels is Full Professor at the Department of Communication Studies at Vrije Universiteit Brussel, Belgium.

Caroline Pauwels lectures in national and European media policy and has published widely on these topics. She is a member of different boards in the media and cultural domain and acts as a government representative for the Flemish public broadcaster VRT. She is Director of the Iminds Digital Society Department, which comprises two research groups: Iminds SMIT (VUB) (www.smit.vub.ac.be), which she also heads, and IMinds-MICT (Ghent University). Both research centres focus on the social, cultural, economic and policy impact of ICTs (information and communication technologies), and employ more than 100 researchers, coming from different disciplines. She is currently a member of the EU Media Futures Forum, convened by Commissioner Kroes and chaired by Christian van Thillo.

Her book publications include: Cammaerts, B., Van Audenhove, L., Nulens, G. & **Pauwels, C.** (Eds). *Beyond the Digital Divide: Reducing Exclusion and Fostering Inclusion*. Brussels, VUBPress, 2003, 333 p. **Pauwels, C.**, Kalimo, H., Donders, K. & Van Rompuy, B. *Rethinking European Media and Communications Policies*. Brussels, VUBPress, 2009, 376 p.

Upcoming publications are: Donders, K., **Pauwels, C.** & Loisen, J. (Eds). *Private television in Europe: genesis, evolutions and challenges ahead*. ‘Global Media Policy and Business’ series (edited by Iosifidis and Steemers). Basingstoke, Palgrave MacMillan, forthcoming in late 2012. Donders, K., **Pauwels, C.** & Loisen, J. (Eds). *Handbook of European Media Policy*. Basingstoke, Palgrave MacMillan, forthcoming in 2013.

She also acts as co-editor for the new Palgrave series on European Film and Media studies, together with Ib Bjondeberg and Andrew Higson.

Srikant Sarangi is Professor in Language and Communication and Director of the Health Communication Research Centre at Cardiff University, Wales, UK.

Srikant Sarangi is also Professor in Language and Communication at Norwegian University of Science and Technology (NTNU), Trondheim, Norway; Honorary Professor at the Faculty of Humanities, Aalborg University, Denmark; Visiting Research Professor at the Centre for the Humanities and Medicine, the University of Hong Kong. In 2012, he was awarded the title of 'Academician' by the Academy of Social Sciences, UK.

His research interests are in discourse analysis and applied linguistics; language and identity in public life and institutional/professional communication studies (e.g., healthcare, social welfare, bureaucracy, education). He has held several project grants (e.g., Wellcome Trust, Leverhulme

Trust, ESRC) to study various aspects of health communication, such as genetic counselling, HIV/AIDS and telemedicine. The other areas of healthcare research include communication in primary care and palliative care, with particular reference to assessment of consulting and communication skills.

He is author and editor of twelve books, five journal special issues and has published more than 200 journal articles and book chapters. He is the founding editor of *Communication & Medicine*, editor of *TEXT & TALK: An Interdisciplinary Journal of Language, Discourse and Communication Studies* (formerly TEXT) and co-editor of *Journal of Applied Linguistics and Professional Practice* (formerly Journal of Applied Linguistics). He is also general editor (with C. N. Candlin) of three book series.

Over the last twenty years, he has held visiting academic attachments in many parts of the world including Australia, Brazil, Canada, Denmark, Finland, France, Germany, Hong Kong, India, Iran, Italy, Malaysia, Norway, South Africa, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland and the US.

APPENDIX 2. Terms of reference for the evaluation panel

This document sets out the standard Terms of Reference applicable to the panel.

Table of contents

- 1 Background and purpose
- 2 Definition of field to be evaluated
- 3 Organisation
- 4 International evaluation panel
- 5 Objectives of the evaluation
- 6 Evaluation criteria
 - 6.1 Quality of research and researcher training
 - 6.2 Research environment and organisation
 - 6.3 Interaction between research and society
- 7 The panel's recommendations for the future
- 8 Tasks, responsibilities and working arrangements of the panel
 - 8.1 Desk research
 - 8.2 Site visits and interviews
 - 8.3 Confidentiality and secrecy
 - 8.4 Publicity of the evaluation material
 - 8.5 Conflicts of interest
 - 8.6 Declaration
- 9 Timetable of the evaluation process
- 10 Coordination of the evaluation
- 11 Funds

1 Background and purpose

Discipline and research field evaluations at the Academy of Finland are one of the key elements in the long-term development of research and science policy in Finland. In its performance agreement for 2011, the Academy's Research Council for Culture and Society decided that the quality and status of communication research will be evaluated with respect to the international level. The field of communication research has not been comprehensively evaluated

nationwide before, so the evaluation was considered highly relevant and justified.

The evaluation should cover the disciplines of media and communication research (journalism, organisational communication, speech communication, audiovisual communication, information sciences and other fields of communication research) with a view to assessing the strengths and weaknesses of research and researcher training to secure internationally high-standard research and researchers for the future. One of the key purposes of the evaluation is to support the future development of this research field.

The present evaluation combines an external assessment by an international evaluation panel with an internal self-assessment exercise. The main objectives of the external evaluation are: to examine the quality of the research of the units during 2010–2012; and to provide recommendations on how to develop the research and researcher training of the field in the future.

2 Definition of the field to be evaluated

The field to be evaluated consists of communication research and researcher training carried out by eight Finnish universities (University of Helsinki, University of Jyväskylä, University of Lapland, University of Oulu, University of Tampere, University of Vaasa, Åbo Akademi University and Aalto University). The evaluation should be focused mainly on the field, not on a unit, research group or individual researchers, although these structures form the basic tools for the evaluation.

3 Organisation

The evaluation is commissioned by the Research Council for Culture and Society of the Academy of Finland. The Research Council appointed a Steering Committee to lead and support the execution of the evaluation.

The members of the Steering Committee are:

Professor Pauline von Bonsdorff, Chair, University of Jyväskylä and member of the Academy Research Council for Culture and Society; and the members: **Research Director Päivi Hovi-Wasastjerna**, Aalto University; **Professor Lea Rojola**, University of Turku, member of the Academy Research Council for Culture and Society; **Professor Matti Sintonen**, University of Helsinki, member of the Academy Research Council for Culture and Society; and **Professor Jan-Ola Östman**, University of Helsinki, member of the Academy Research Council for Culture and Society.

The appointed coordinator, a list of the invited panel members, a list of the evaluation documents to be submitted and the Terms of Reference have been reviewed and approved by the Steering Committee.

4 International evaluation panel

The external evaluation will be carried out by an international panel of independent high-level experts.

The Academy of Finland has invited five renowned scholars as evaluators:

Chair

Professor Thorsten Quandt, University of Hohenheim, Germany

Members

Professor Jostein Gripsrud, University of Bergen, Norway

Professor Maria Heller, Eötvös Loránd University, Hungary

Professor Caroline Pauwels, Free University of Brussels, Belgium

Professor Srikant Sarangi, Cardiff University, the UK

5 Objectives of the evaluation

The purpose of this exercise is to evaluate Finnish communication research and researcher training in the units defined above. The evaluation covers the period 2010–2012, on which the recommendations to be provided for the future will be based.

The objectives of the evaluation are:

- 1 To evaluate the quality of communication research in Finland as compared to the international level
- 2 To identify the strengths and weaknesses of the research
- 3 To estimate communication and collaboration with key partners at home and abroad
- 4 To estimate the significance of communication research to Finnish society
- 5 To evaluate the efficacy of the research, i.e., how much output is produced in relation to the resources invested
- 6 To evaluate the quality of researcher training
- 7 To make suggestions and recommendations to ensure the future supply of qualified academic and communication professionals in Finland
- 8 To make suggestions and recommendations for the further development of communication research and research policy in Finland.

6 Evaluation criteria

The basic unit to be evaluated by the panel is a faculty, department, unit or school (Appendix 1: Instructions to submission form). Each unit will be evaluated as such, but the focus is on the research field as a whole.

The panel is asked to give

- a written statement on the quality of the research, achieved results, academic contribution as well as doctoral training
- a written statement on the quality and efficiency of the research environment and organisation
- written feedback on the interaction between research and society, and its impact
- recommendations for the future of the field.

The main emphasis is on the evaluation of academic research. The panel should ensure that the evaluation takes into account all relevant material available.

6.1 Academic quality of the research

The panel's main task is to evaluate the quality of research and researcher training. The quality statement is based on the evaluation documents submitted by the units. Panel members will have the opportunity to complete this information during their site visits. All research, whether basic or applied, should be given equal weight.

The quality statement must reflect the work of all the research staff listed in a unit.

Important issues to be considered:

- What is the international quality and status of the unit's research?
- What are the competence and cooperation relationships of the unit?

- What is the significance of the research (projects) to the professional promotion of the researcher's career?
- How innovative and challenging are the research programmes and research lines?
- What is the impact and status of the research within each research sub-field?

6.2 Research environment and organisation

The evaluation deals with the research environments, prevailing research practices and collaborative networks.

Important issues to be considered:

- What kind of a research environment facilitates the research in terms of funding, infrastructure and mobility (strengths, weaknesses, needs for improvement)?
- What is characteristic of the activity, management and administration in the field?
- Are the national and international networks sufficient (universities, research centres, enterprises)?
- How does the research interrelate with the strategies of the parent organisation?
- What is the role of interdisciplinarity within the research groups as well as in the whole field?
- What is the quality of the researcher training and its organisation?

6.3 Interaction between research and society

The panel is asked to give feedback on the interaction between research and society. The feedback is to be based on all evaluation documents as well as interviews. The panel should especially consider other activities such as expert tasks, productions, communication of research results to the general public, technology transfer and cooperation with other sectors of society.

The questions to be asked are “How actively and efficiently does the unit communicate its points and findings to various stakeholders and the rest of society and in what way does the research of the unit contribute to society?” The panel should consider this issue from the point of view of, for example, development of cultural life, use of novel technical solutions and innovations, the impact the research has on communication practices. The panel is asked to discuss the interaction between the research of the unit and society from relevant aspects.

Important issues:

- How fruitful is cooperation between the unit and the various actors of society, and what kinds of results have been achieved?
- Is the research of the field relevantly focused with respect to the future scenarios of national as well as international developments?
- What is the academic and non-academic need for research doctorates in the field, and how well is it met with the current intensity of doctoral training?
- In case of innovations, how are the results of research transferred to industrial producers and partners who are able to develop new products for the market and society?
- Is sufficient and systematic effort made to find suitable collaborators for the commercialising and visibility of productions and innovations?

7 The panel's recommendations for the future

The focus of the evaluation is on the future development of the field. The panel is asked to provide concrete recommendations for the future development of the research field. The

panel will need to consider that the recommendations should be focused mainly on the field, not on single units, research groups or researchers.

Key issues to be addressed:

- What strengths and weaknesses does the field have in Finland; for example, is there missing expertise in certain sub-fields or overrepresentation compared to the total research volume?
- What opportunities and challenges does the field have?
- How should the field improve its performance in carrying out its research?
- How should the development of the field be advanced?
- What kinds of means could be recommended to improve and strengthen the research performance at various levels?

The panel should provide recommendations on

- research representing single-, multi- and interdisciplinarity
- development of research: staff, environment and infrastructure
- strengthening the effectiveness and impact of the research on society
- development and securing of training and research enthusiasm
- suggestions on how to guarantee enough research-active staff in the future
- other issues.

8 Tasks, responsibilities and working arrangements of the panel

In conducting the expert evaluation, panel members will base their examination on desk research at home on the basis of the background information to be provided. Ultimately, this will supplement their view during the panel meeting in Finland.

Panel members will set responsibilities within the panel and together with the evaluation office at the Academy of Finland. All evaluation documents are provided by the evaluation office. For the full description of the research-active staff and the evaluation documents, please see the Instructions to submission form (Appendix 1), which will be used by the units being assessed when preparing their evaluation documents.

8.1 Desk research

Desk research will be carried out before the site visits. The material includes facts about the research staff and funding:

- list of publications
- collection of the key publications of senior researchers to be sent to panel members
- list of doctoral theses
- lists of visits and collaborations
- self-assessment exercise of the unit.

8.2 Site visits and interviews

The site visits will consist of the following sessions:

- A session for presentations organised and selected by the institution
- Interview of a subset of researchers during the site visit, for example:
 - Heads of units (research)
 - Professors, senior staff, postdoctoral researchers, visiting foreign scholars
 - PhD students, junior researchers.

The specific timetable and instructions will be provided by the evaluation office at the Academy of Finland in due time.

8.3 Confidentiality and secrecy

Panel members undertake not to make any use of and not to divulge to third parties any public or non-public facts, such as

information, knowledge, documents or other matters communicated to them or brought to their attention during the performance of the evaluation.

Confidentiality must also be maintained after the evaluation process has been completed.

8.4 Publicity of the evaluation material

The evaluation and the ratings are confidential and for official use only. Once the evaluation has been completed, panellists are required to destroy all evaluation documents and any copies made of them, or return them to the Academy. The evaluation report is confidential and only for official use until publication.

The evaluation report including the main recommendations is based on the evaluation criteria defined by the Academy of Finland. The evaluation report will be written and edited by the panel members (main responsibility of the Panel Chair) with the assistance of the evaluation coordinator. Prior to final editing and publishing, the units being assessed are given the opportunity to review the report to correct any factual errors. The Academy will publish the final evaluation report in its publication series (www.aka.fi/publications).

8.5 Conflicts of interest

Panel members are required to declare any personal conflicts of interest. They must disqualify themselves if they can in any way benefit from a positive or negative statement concerning the research group under evaluation. They must also disqualify themselves in the following circumstances:

- They have close collaboration with the research group to be evaluated (e.g. have co-authored a scientific article, research

plan or funding application during the past three years, or are planning to co-author one/some of these in the near future).

- They have acted as a superior, subordinate or instructor of the research group during the past three years
- The member of the research group is a close person to them. A close person is:
 1. their spouse (also *de facto*), child, grandchild, sibling, parent, grandparent or a person otherwise especially close to them (e.g. fiancé/e or a close friend), as well as their spouses (also *de facto*),
 2. a sibling of their parent or his/her spouse (also *de facto*), a child of their sibling, their previous spouse (also *de facto*),
 3. a child, grandchild, sibling, parent or grandparent of their spouse as well as their spouses (also *de facto*), a child of a sibling of their spouse,
 4. or a half-relative comparable to the above mentioned.

Panel members are also disqualified if their impartiality may otherwise be endangered, or if they feel that they have a conflict of interest and are therefore disqualified to evaluate the research group.

Therefore, if you feel that you are unable to evaluate a research group, you must notify the Academy as well as the other panel members of this as soon as possible. Clarification of all conflict of interest matters must preferably be done during the first panel meeting.

8.6 Declaration

Accepting the task as a member of an evaluation panel, I guarantee not to disclose the information I receive as panel member and not to use it for anybody's

benefit or disadvantage as it is stipulated in the paragraph "Confidentiality". Further, I affirm that if I have a conflict of interest I will immediately inform the Academy as well as the other panel members of it.

9 Timetable of the evaluation process

2011 *Oct*

Decision to organise an international evaluation by the Research Council for Culture and Society

2011 *Nov*

Appointment of Steering Committee by the Research Council

2012 *Feb*

Appointment of evaluation coordinator

2012 *Apr*

Appointment of evaluation panel

2012 *Mar-Apr*

Definition of evaluation criteria

2012 *Apr-Jun*

Preparation of the documents and self-evaluation by units being assessed

2012 *Jun-Aug*

Preparation and delivery of evaluation documents

2012 *Sep*

Site visits to the units being assessed

2012 *Oct-Dec*

Preparation of report

2013 *Feb-Mar*

Publication and release of the report

2013 *Jan-Mar*

Recommendations for the follow-up by the Steering Committee

2013–

Follow-up of implementation of recommendations made

10 Coordination of evaluation

The evaluation process is coordinated by Evaluation Coordinator Sanna Kivimäki and Senior Science Adviser Hannele Kurki and Science Adviser Kaisa Vaahtera from the Academy of Finland (Culture and Society Research Unit). The duties of the coordinator are to compile the evaluation documents collected from the field and to assist the panel during the site visits and the report editing. The administrative support and assistance for the Evaluation Steering Committee and coordinator as well as the practical details of the seminars and site visits are organised by the Academy of Finland.

11 Funds

The evaluation is funded by the Research Council for Culture and Society of the Academy of Finland. The Academy will pay an expert fee to the panel members. All travel expenses related to the panel's visits and accommodation in Finland will be covered or reimbursed by the Academy of Finland.

APPENDIX 3. Submission Form

Evaluation of communication research in Finland 2010–2011

GENERAL INFORMATION

Please, describe the organizational structure of your university (faculty, department, unit, school) and the position of the communication studies within it. Describe also the remarkable cooperation between the various subjects within these structures.

Organisation	
Faculty or equivalent	
Department or equivalent	
Address	
Phone	
Website	http://
Head of the unit	
Phone	
Email	
Contact person for evaluation	
Phone	
Email	

PART 1. RESOURCES AND RESEARCH OUTPUT WITH REGARD COMMUNICATION RESEARCH

1. Staff (Appendix 1)

1.1. Staff members (spring 2012): researchers, teachers, administrative staff (App. 1.1.)

1.2. Please, give more detailed information on the research active staff (App.1.2.)

1.3. What is the present staff situation at the unit? Is the staff structure balanced, does staff recruitment or funding involve any specific problems?

1.4. Are your recruitments international? If they are, have they been successful?

1.5. The Act on Equality between Women and Men prevents discrimination based on gender and promotes equality between women and men. The law obligates to improve the status of women particularly in working life, too. The Non-Discrimination Act bans discrimination on the basis of age, ethnic or national origin, nationality, language, religion, belief, opinion, health, disability, sexual orientation or other personal characteristics. Please, reflect your staff situation and staff policy regarding these obligations.

2. Funding (Appendix 2)

2.1. Unit's core and external research funding in 2010–2011 (App. 2.1.)

2.2. Please, estimate the percentage of basic research and commissioned research in your research activities.

2.3. What are the main problems of research funding in the field of communication studies?

3. Publications and other academic activities (Appendix 3)

- 3.1. Please, describe the research profile of your subject with regard to the profile of your university and your faculty, department, unit or equivalent.
- 3.2. Number of academic publications in 2010–2011. Please, use the KOTA-classification when describing the publications. (App.3.1.)
- 3.3. Give some examples of the remarkable academic publications of your unit/subject in 2010-2011. (App. 3.2.)
- 3.4. Reflect the criteria of the “remarkable publication”. For instance, what is the role of an international or a domestic publication in your area? How do you value monographies, articles, popular publications, open access -journals etc.? Do the researchers in your field write usually in groups or individually?
- 3.5. Editors or members on editorial boards of academic journals (names, years)
- 3.6. Members on boards of academic associations (names, years)
- 3.7. Editors or members on editorial boards of popular, journalistic or artistic etc. journals (names, years)
- 3.8. Member of boards of e.g. societal or artistic associations

4. Researcher training and research careers

- 4.1. Describe the aims, practices and arrangements of doctoral training at the unit, the role of graduate schools/doctoral programmes and other researcher training.
- 4.2. The annual number of registered doctoral students, the annual intake and the number of students attending the doctoral schools. (App. 4.1.)
- 4.3. Describe the active doctoral students in 2010-2011, their topics and if they are working fulltime or part-time. (App.4.2.)
- 4.4. The number of completed licentiate and doctoral degrees in the field of communication in 2010-2011. (App.4.3.)
- 4.5. Please, reflect the number of registered doctoral students regarding the Act on Equality between Women and Men and the Non-Discrimination Act mentioned before. Is the situation on the same line with the legislation?
- 4.6. Describe the funding of doctoral students at your university. What are the basic advantages or problems of the funding?
- 4.7. Postdoctoral researchers (2010–2011). Enter information on postdoctoral researchers (name, topic of research, etc.) and their funding (sponsors, sums, etc.). (App. 4.4.)
- 4.8. Please, reflect the postdoctoral careers. What are the key principles in promoting postdoctoral research careers? What are the main obstacles in terms of the career development of postdoctoral researchers in your field?

5. Collaboration and contacts

- 5.1. Give information on cooperation between your university and other universities in Finland (research, education, infrastructure etc.) What kind of role this kind of cooperation has in the field of communication studies?

5.2. Name the most important international collaborators of your unit (max. 5 per dept. or equivalent) and describe the most important outcomes of the visits and collaboration contacts (max. 1 page).

5.3. Visits abroad in 2010–2011, minimum duration: two weeks. (App. 5.1.)

5.4. Visits to the unit in 2010–2011, minimum duration: two weeks. (App.5.2.)

5.5. Short but particularly important visits in 2010–2011. (App. 5.3.)

5.6. International mobility of the doctoral students (in and out). (App. 5.4.)

6. Other scientific and societal activities

6.1. Number of academic meetings and conferences in 2010–2011. (App.6.1.)

6.2. Academic expert tasks (App.6.2.)

6.3. Academic honours and prizes awarded since 2010 (App.6.3.)

6.4 Other significant tasks of no primarily academic nature (App.6.4.)

6.5. Studia Generalia lecture series, activities within the Open University, adult education, media and other societal activities. (App.6.5.)

PART 2. UNIT'S SELF-ASSESSMENT

7. Self-assessment

7.1. Please, evaluate and describe the impact of the new Universities Act in 2010. Did the organisational changes have an impact on the focus of the unit, on the number of staff, on the working atmosphere, etc.?

7.2. Did it have an impact on your research profile, strategies etc.?

7.3. Did it have an impact on your teaching and educational practices?

7.4. Did it have an impact on your administrative practices?

7.5. Infrastructures.

Describe a) any infrastructures that the unit possesses that are unique or of major importance, and b) any other infrastructures important for the unit's research.

7.6. Assess

a) the academic and societal need for doctoral training within the communication research fields in Finland and internationally

b) your unit's role in doctoral training in Finland and internationally, and

c) your unit's role in research in Finland and internationally.

8. Future

What are the greatest challenges – theoretical or applied - right now in the field of communication studies? What is the most important research object right now – or in the future? Where are the blind spots of the research?

9. Other comments

If you wish to pay attention to research-related issues that are not touched upon in this questionnaire, please discuss them on a separate paper.

APPENDIX 4. Funding obtained by the universities (€1,000)

	2010	2011	Total
Aalto/ARTS/ELO			
Internal funding	3,853	4,044	7,897
External funding	430	430	860
Total	4,283	4,474	8,757
Aalto/ARTS/DOM			
Internal funding	4,445	5,312	9,757*
External funding	739	886	1,625**
Total	5,184	6,198	11,343
Aalto/BUSS/COMM			
Internal funding	1,088	1,184	2,272
External funding	32	135	167
Total	1,120	1,319	2,439
University of Jyväskylä			
Internal funding	1,862	1,758	3,620
External funding	793	680	1,473
Total	2,655	2,438	5,093
University of Helsinki			
Internal funding	2,101	1,914	4,015
External funding	1,345	1,324	2,669
Total	3,446	3,238	6,684
University of Lapland			
Internal funding	280	300	580
External funding		170	170
Total	280	470	750
University of Oulu			
Internal funding	351	348	699
External funding	300	357	657
Total	651	705	1,356
University of Tampere /CMT			
Internal funding		7,157	7,157
External funding		4,099	4,099
Total		11,256	11,256

* Total funding (department)

** External funding of four research groups

	2010	2011	Total
University of Tampere/SIS			
Internal funding	2,463	2,494	4,957
External funding	1,695	2,050	3,746
Total	4,158	4,544	8,703
University of Turku			
Budget funding	468	451	920
External funding	214	251	465
Total	682	702	1,385
University of Vaasa			
Budget funding	374	371	745
External funding	2	28	30
Total	376	399	775
Åbo Akademi University			
Budget funding	260	270	530
External funding	286	217	503
Total	546	487	1,033

Source: Evaluation questionnaire.

APPENDIX 5. Publications

	Type of publication
A	A1 Journal articles (refereed), original research A2 Review article, literature review, systematic review A3 Book section, chapters in research book A4 Conference proceedings
B	B1 Non-refereed journal articles B2 Book section B3 Non-refereed conference proceedings
C	C1 Book C2 Edited book, conference proceedings or special issues of a journal
D	D1 Article in a trade journal D2 Article in a professional manual or guide D3 Professional conference proceedings D4 Published development or research report or study D5 Textbook, professional manual or guide, dictionary
E	E1 Popularised article, newspaper article E2 Popularised monograph
F	F1 Published independent work of art F2 Public partial realisation of a work of art F3 Public artistic performance or exhibition F4 Model or design adopted for production/use
H	H1 Granted patent H2 Invention disclosure
I	I1 Audiovisual material I2 ICT software

Type	Aalto/ Elo*	Aalto/ Dom**	Aalto/ Buss	UJ	UH	UL	UO	UT/ CMT	UT/ SIS	UT	UV	ÅA
A1	10	22	25	31	40	2	5	50	35	14	7	14
A2	1		1	1	3		1	1	3	3		
A3	1	6	6	5	42	2	3	57	17	13	3	3
A4		39	22	6	3	1	15	2	54	1	10	15
B1		14	2	14	14	1	12	24	10	6	1	2
B2	3		2	22	15		2	18	29	4		2
B3			4	4	3			5	9		2	2
C1	4	3	1	7	7		2	13	2	2	1	2
C2	1	30	2	5	9	1		15	12	5	2	3
D1	8			29	4			10	18	2		1
D2	1			1	1			9				
D3			1		1							
D4	3	3	1	3	4			14	6			
D5	2		1	2	1				1			
E1			2	22	10	3	1	17		9	1	3
E2	1				2			1	2	1		
F1	2											
F2	2											
F3	3											
F4						2						
H1						2						
H2												
I1					1							
I2												
Total	42	117	70	152	160	14	41	236	198	60	27	47

* F1–F3: There are many independent works of art and partial realisations of a work of art by staff, such as long fiction films and documentaries.

** The publications of DOM were listed differently, this classification is made by SK.

Source: Evaluation questionnaire.

APPENDIX 6. Staff

	Aalto/ Elo*	Aalto/ Dom**	Aalto/ Buss	UJ	UH	UL	UO	UT/ CMT	UT/ SIS	UT	UV	ÅA
Task category												
1. Professors	10.5	9.5	3	6	5	1	2	10	5	2	2	1
2. Other senior researchers		3		7	1			9	1			
3. Post-doc researchers	3	4	3	2	8	0.5	1	1	6	2		2
4. Doctoral students receiving salary	8	28	5	11	9	3	3	3	16	2	1	2
5. Doctoral students on grants			1	17		1		6		5		2
6. Visiting researchers and visiting research students		5		1								
7. Other research staff	3	10*			4			23	15	1	2	
Total number of active research staff (1-7)	24.5	59.5	12	44	27	5.5	6	52	43	12	5	7
8. Teachers, lecturers			10	3		3	2	5	7	5	3	2
9. Teachers, practical or vocational education							0.5	8				1
10. Technical personnel				1				4	2			
11. Administrative personnel			1	2	2	0,5		9	6	1		2***
12. Other personnel		**		6				6			1	
Staff, total (1-12)	24.5	55	23	50	29	9	8.5	84	58	18	9	12

* These individuals are also doctoral candidates in the department

** This information is missing

*** 70%

Source: Evaluation questionnaire.



ACADEMY OF FINLAND

Hakaniemenranta 6 • POB 131, 00531 Helsinki
Tel. +358 29 533 5000 • Fax +358 29 533 5299
www.aka.fi/eng • viestinta@aka.fi