

Societal impact through lingual plurality

Recent tendency towards internationalization of academic publishing has reinforced the dominant role of English language in scholarly debates and discussions. The monolingualistic development has led to several drawbacks: it risks to sustain global inequalities in knowledge production, limits the access of non-native English speakers to international publishing, and disengages place-specific knowledge from national and local contexts, not only in scholarly communities but also among decision-makers and within the civil society. In response, *Fennia* seeks ways towards multicultural publishing, including lingual plurality. The journal has a long history in multilingual publishing yet, in its present form – following international standards of journal publishing, with modest resources – its content is solely in English. The editorial briefly introduces this linguistic development, since 1889, and presents ideas for further activities. *Fennia's* current multilingual strategy emphasizes the popularization of the peer reviewed content in different languages, which is implemented through collaboration with the online popular science forum *Versus*. This serves two ends in broadening the audience, beyond the academy and the primarily English-speaking world. The collaboration of *Fennia* and *Versus* has already yielded multilingual popular science articles accessible in the contexts that the research concerns and in the societies where the authors work. Based on positive experiences and feedback, we are eager to continue similar efforts promoting linguistic plurality. As achieving these aims requires notable extra effort – from authors, editors, and the publisher – we call for support and commitment from the funding agencies and academic institutions that we rely on, along with the scholarly community whose voluntary work forms the basis of all activities in *Fennia*.

Keywords: multilingualism, scholarly publishing, open science, research popularization, Anglophonic hegemony

Broadening the audience of international academic publishing

If you want to contribute to the state-of-the art as a scholar, in nearly every research field this means publishing your work at least partly in English. While there are lively discussions going on in other languages – quantitatively the next linguistic arenas being French, German, Spanish and Chinese – the critical edge advances most importantly in Anglophonic debates. According to Curry and Lillis (2017), a couple of years ago there were more than 9,000 peer-reviewed journals published in other languages than English. This offers important arenas especially for discussing geographically specific matters in national and regional contexts, and to young scholars who benefit from writing first articles in their mother tongue. However, even in these cases national publication forums may not be selected as they

tend to be less respected by research institutions and funding agencies; publishing nationally does not advance research careers as powerfully as international publications (read: publishing in English).

Another drawback of the increased pressure for English publishing is the loss of local knowledge. Scholars conducting research in non-Anglophonic contexts are balancing between international and regional journals. The latter often means 'perishing' in the global academic community. Therefore, much of the research accomplished in different local contexts ends up available only for the English-speaking academic audience. This is particularly distressing in Geography where geographical plurality and contextualization are among the core aims. While scholars are increasingly linguistically capable of accessing these publications, many local actors such as decision-makers, developers, public administration, students, and members of the civil society cannot read academic English. Such 'knowledge flows' to global arenas may therefore have disturbing implications to the development of local research communities and the societies at large (Curry & Lillis 2018).

As a further aspect, Collyer (2018) points out that current academic publishing mechanisms risk to sustain or even deepen global inequalities in academic knowledge production. These mechanisms, leaning on Anglophonic dominance, allow systematic marginalization of non-native English speakers particularly in the global South. Specifically, her analysis shows that many high-ranking journals tend to publish research conducted in the geographical area of the journal, emphasizing Northern scholarship and with marginal interest in studies from the global South. Moreover, oftentimes citations can only be made to English publications and referencing scholarly work published in other languages is not favored; following the idea that the peer reviewers and the readers should be able to verify the made arguments through the cited work. The access of scholars from the global South to publish in such journals can be further halted by financial barriers, due to the expensive processes of English translation, language editing, and in some cases article processing charges.

Some disciplines closely connected to societal practices – such as law, local governance, education, and social work – continue to value publishing in national languages more than others, as their scope reaches beyond the academy. Yet in most areas of research, like that of geography, scholarly debates in English have adopted a dominant position. Both natural and human geographers meet internationally in English-speaking conferences and publish their work in journals where the (usually only) language used is English. In its present form, *Fennia* stands among these journals, however the journal used to be rather multilingual. Established in 1889, and originally named *Fennia: Bulletin de la Société de Géographie de Finlande*, it was first published in four languages: French, German, Swedish and Finnish. In the 1910s, the number of articles in French started to decrease while German became the leading international language. At the same time, indications of English as an emerging language of science started to appear, first in the form of summaries as early as 1907. The first full article published in English, by Pentti Eskola in the volume 33, was published in 1912–1913. In the early 1920s, the French title of the journal was substituted by a Latin version *Societas Geographica Fenniae*. For the next five decades, the journal published articles and PhD theses regularly quadrilingually, and occasionally in French or including a French summary.

At the turn of the 1950s and 1960s, a notable internationalization took place in *Fennia*, and both Finnish and Swedish content became rare. A decade later, we start to see the rise of the Anglophonic domination. The last piece published in German is an article by Uuno Varjo, in 1972. In 1976, the name of the publisher at the journal front cover was translated into English, *Geographical Society of Finland*. After that, the journal has been published solely in English. It continued the tradition of publishing PhD and licentiate theses in parallel with research articles until the early 1990s. In 2000, the name was changed once again, into its present form: *Fennia – International Journal of Geography*. Since then, the journal has followed international standards of journal publishing, with central focus in refereed original articles published in English. The *Geographical Society of Finland* publishes another journal – *Terra* – in Finnish and Swedish, thus in that regard we follow a trilingual strategy. But this clearly does not offer a broad multicultural coverage.

During the recent years, *Fennia* has considered different possibilities to move beyond the Anglophonic hegemony, including lingual plurality and dialogue (see reflections on academic publishing in our [2017 195\(2\) issue](#)). We make a slight nod towards multilingualism on our webpage by stating that our *main* language is English, which in practice means that other languages can be

used during the production of the articles, that we welcome papers including materials and references in other languages, and that we are acknowledgeable of the different positions from which native and non-native speakers of English contribute to the journal and seek to take this into account in the publication processes as feasible. However, with our rigorously international profile and limited editorial resources, we have not found a way to return to publishing high-quality scholarly work in other languages. Instead, our current experimental strategy focuses on the popularization of the *Fennia* content in different languages, through collaboration with the online popular science forum *Versus* (Kallio & Riding 2019). This serves two ends: broadening the audience beyond the academy and moving their impact beyond the primarily English-speaking world.

We began this tryout by publishing popularized texts based on *Fennia* articles in Finnish (Lehtinen 2018; Kaisto 2019), and by asking commentaries to articles popularized in English from Finnish experts (Sawatzky & Albrecht 2018). This allowed us, among other things, to 'give back' to the Finnish taxpayers and the members of the Society, who support the journal through state subsidies and membership fees. Yet we felt this was not enough. Our authors come from various countries and linguistic areas, and the topics discussed in their articles may concern any part of the world. Hence, for many authors the opportunity to popularize their work in the Finnish context makes little sense. Therefore, the *Versus* forum also publishes popularized content from *Fennia* in English where appropriate (Sawatzky & Albrecht 2017; Nielsen 2020). Our latest opening is to broaden the scope to other languages, with the aim to make our work accessible in the very contexts that the articles concern, and in the societies where the authors work.

The first example of the multilingual format is the article by Moritz Albrecht, Gleb Yarovoy and Valentina Karginova-Gubinova (2020), included in the previous issue of *Fennia*, on Russian waste policy and management in the Karelian Republic. Obviously, the social interest towards this highly topical article is among Russian speaking communities, yet it concerns the neighboring countries as well. To reach the key audiences, *Versus* edited two parallel versions of the paper: first, a popularized article in English with commentaries in English, Finnish and Russian (Yarovoy *et al.* 2021a); second, the same popularized article and commentaries all translated into Russian (Yarovoy *et al.* 2021b). The commentaries consist of views from local Russian NGO staff to Finnish governmental officials working on the waste matter. Each discussant was free to choose the language of their contribution. In this way, we wanted to create a manifold and linguistically plural space of discussion, bringing together diverse voices from Russia and Finland, and being accessible in terms of language for local Russian decision-makers and others whom the issue concerns. Within the past couple of months, the publications have received notable interest. According to *Versus* reader statistics, particularly the popularized article in Russian has stayed within top 20 of the most read publications, the readers coming mainly from Russia. Both articles were also widely shared in the social media, by Twitter primarily.

Based on the positive experiences from our first experiment in multilingual popular science publication, and the discussion it sparked, we are continuing similar efforts that promote linguistic plurality. Our next endeavor is to publish an international discussion among youth activists who are involved in the *Fridays for Future* movement and other environmentally oriented youth networks, around the world. This will be based on the article by Huttunen and Albrecht (2021) – included in this issue – which continues discussion on youth environmental citizenship in the journal (Bowman 2019; Huttunen *et al.* 2020; Lock 2020; Wood 2020). Our aim is to invite and engage both young activists and scholars in a linguistically and geographically rich discussion around the topic. Further, we are planning on a special issue to result in a multilingual popular theme issue in *Versus*, published as a dialogue between diverse Nordic languages. With these "small experiments" we hope to contribute to "the ecosystem of [our] discipline's publications", thus joining a broader movement in alternative non-profit scholarly publishing; as highlighted in a recent report from the *Cooperate for Open study* that explored, with 32 journals, the aspired dimensions of ethical open scientific publishing (Herman 2021, 12):

The intention of this feasibility study was to identify the needs that must be met in order for participating publications to increase capacity and build toward sustainability. However, it quickly became clear that the publishing industry's standard definition of increased capacity (i.e., more issues, more articles, quantifiably more content) was not at all how these publications approached capacity. Instead, when asked what was next for their publication, several participants described

small experiments that they hoped to have the time or resources to carry out. Instead of defining stability through growing in size, participants described carving out a specific role or specialty within the ecosystem of their discipline's publications. From this perspective, it was easier to understand why there was little to no competitive undertone when discussing sharing knowledge or skills among peer publications. For the participants of this study, becoming more unique held more promise than meeting the expectations of a traditional scholarly journal, and vying for status and readers through impact factors and rankings.

Compared to a publication process that ends in the copy-editing phase of the article, the multilingual popularization of the papers requires notable extra effort – from authors, editors, and the publisher. Unsurprisingly, then, the major challenge in promoting lingual plurality is related to resources. The efforts to promote the multilingual publishing that we have in mind are carried out by the support of three Finnish scientific societies that publish *Fennia*, *Versus* and another two scientific journals, all non-profit. Hence the implementation of our aims depends on, first, locating funding agencies who wish to support the societies' commitment to multilingualism. This is clearly needed for translation and language editing services as no editor can be competent on all languages. A move where "resources are directed toward local or context-driven solutions" is emphasized in the results of the *Cooperate for Open* study, too, which shows that our endeavors go along an international trend (Herman 2021, 4). Moreover, following other similar surveys, they bring up the "importance of providing direct support for the production of open scholarship rather than using mechanisms such as APCs (Fuchs & Sandoval 2013) or subscriptions (Holcombe & Wilson 2017, 5; Reinsfelder & Pike 2018)". We hope that these developments start taking place soon, in Finland and beyond. Secondly, academic institutions that do not typically support researchers towards multi-lingual activities – as their success is measured through English publications in high-ranking refereed journals – should also see the value of alternative formats of publishing, including popularization and multilingualism.

The broadening of the publishing field challenges various quarters to new ways of thinking about scientific publishing. Our publishing scheme does certainly not claim to solve at once the multiple drawbacks created by the Anglophonic dominance. It rather serves as one attempt to provide space for researchers to widen the visibility and societal impact of their work, in the geographical and linguistic contexts most relevant to them. We wish that such endeavors by researchers – to advocate plurality and equality in access to research knowledge – will gain increasing appreciation in academic communities and their supporters around the world.

KIRSI PAULIINA KALLIO (<https://orcid.org/0000-0002-8761-1159>)
FENNIA EDITOR-IN-CHIEF

ANNA MARJAANA HEIKKINEN (<https://orcid.org/0000-0002-2955-4862>)
VERSUS CO-EDITOR-IN-CHIEF

Content of the issue

This issue of *Fennia* includes four original research articles, two articles in the reviews and essays section, and seven reflections texts of which six are commentaries to our published articles, stemming from the open review processes. As our next 'open opening', we invite the authors of the original articles to respond to these commentaries, to continue the thematic debates in the Reflections section.

The first original article is by Kim Pawliw, Étienne Berthold and Frédéric Lasserre. Their paper *The role of cultural heritage in the geopolitics of the Arctic: the example of Franklin's lost expedition* discusses the role of cultural heritage in Arctic geopolitics, specifically in the Canadian context where a failed expedition of discovering the Northwest Passage, in the mid-19th century, was used in the 2000s by the Conservative Government of Stephen Harper, with the intent of giving rise to 'Canadian Arctic

identity' as part of a geopolitical power game where the sovereignty over the Arctic was at stake. Through narrative discourse analysis the authors show how the British explorer Sir John Franklin was established, during Harper's term in 2006–2015, as a significant figure representing Canada's diversity and, thus, uniting the people under a shared northern identity. By drawing attention to the socially constructed nature of cultural heritage that can be made to serve state power, the analysis offers a welcomed novel perspective to geopolitical analysis.

Our second research paper is a methodological exploration by Chiara Valli, titled *Participatory dissemination: bridging in-depth interviews, participation, and creative visual methods through Interviews-Based Zine-Making (IBZM)*. It introduces a particular form of participatory research aiming at strong societal impact, which the author has named 'Interviews-Based Zine-Making (IBZM)'. In her own study, she offered the transcribed texts from the research interviews to the study participants and other members from the local community, to be ripped apart and rearranged into pamphlets that, concurrently, comment on and communicate the research results to the local community and other lay audiences. The collective processes proved fruitful both for the dissemination and the research itself; the 'experts by experience' helped to interpret and enrich the analysis that the researcher had created from the very same materials before sharing them. Besides for action research scholars, Valli proposes that this practice can be useful in bringing participatory elements into more traditional research projects where data gathering is made through interviews and other researcher-led methods.

Continuing the discussion on youth environmental citizenship in *Fennia*, the third original article by Janette Huttunen and Eerika Albrecht offers a media analysis that reveals how the *Fridays for Future* movement was received in Finland in 2019, by the major news media, and in the social media platform Twitter where the views of the general (adult) public were enthusiastically expressed. *The framing of environmental citizenship and youth participation in the Fridays for Future Movement in Finland* identifies three dominating framings of the phenomenon. First, by approaching the youth activities in terms of 'sustainable lifestyle', the media discussions emphasized individuality as characteristic to environmental citizenship. From another perspective, youth participation was linked with formal politics through what Huttunen and Albrecht call 'the active youth frame'. Thirdly, the media discussions paid attention to the strike aspect of these activities, emphasizing 'school attendance' as a central matter. Based on the analysis the authors argue that the public debate on youthful environmental citizenship is dominated by the adult voice and an individualizing perspective, which resonates with findings from other geographical contexts and begs further research and public debate that gives visibility to young people's own interpretations of their activities, including the collective and cooperative elements of environmental citizenship.

The last research paper in this issue, *A comprehensive spatial model for historical travel effort – a case study in Finland*, is co-authored by Timo Rantanen, Harri Tolvanen, Terhi Honkola and Outi Vesakoski. It offers an in-depth description of a comprehensive spatial historical travel environment model, created by the authors, combining high-quality terrain and landscape spatial data with information from historical sources on the studied landscape. Contributing to interdisciplinary research on human and cultural spread, the empirical focus is on travel effort and contacts between population groups in Finland during two historical periods: The Pre-Medieval period (approx. 12th–15th centuries) and the Post-Medieval period (from late medieval time to the late 19th century). Methodologically, the paper suggests that the multi-dimensional approach combining spatial data archives with archaeological, linguistic, and genetic data, in a GIS analysis, offers novel opportunities to studying the human past. Empirically, the results highlight a notable difference in the overall travel effort in southern and northern Finland, and the variability of the least-cost routes in different landscapes and between different source data combinations in each cost surface.

The first review article is by Sören Köpke who offers a critical literature review related to the global agri-food system, connected directly or indirectly with political ecology. In *Reinvigorating a political ecology of the global agri-food system* he identifies seven potential perspectives to this research agenda, all of which are introduced and discussed in relation to each other. Köpke argues that each one of them provides fitting theoretical and methodological instruments for the analysis of the complex empirical problems of global agri-food systems and, thus, invites more scholarly

work specifically from political ecologists whose attention has remained largely in extractivism, energy production, water, and conservation.

In the second review article Diana Soeiro introduces urban living labs as potential research sites for applied geographical study, based on the principles of co-creation, exploration, experimentation, and evaluation. Her article *Smart cities and innovative governance systems: a reflection on urban living labs action research* makes four methodological suggestions: urban living labs enable balancing between top-down and bottom-up research strategies; the settings are particularly fruitful for comparative qualitative analyses; the research processes encourage cooperation between public and private actors; and that in the related innovation strategies, the role of governance should be rethought so that it pushes forward rather than hinders novel co-creative process. Such approaches are gaining foothold in many urban contexts – including in Tampere where the editor-in-chief is based – with great potential to cross-disciplinary projects that aim at strong societal impact.

The Reflections begin with an intervention from Daniela Ferreira and Mário Vale which reflects on the meaning of the term cyberspace for geographers, and is called *From cyberspace to cyberspatialities?* It takes the reader through a history of cyberspace and related concepts drawing upon a range of thinkers in geography and beyond, arguing that cyberspace is a significant geographical concern.

The section continues with a commentary by Tatek Abebe and Tanu Biswas which reflects upon the Fennia Lecture 2019 article by Nicola Ansell and colleagues. Their commentary titled *Rights in education: outlines for a decolonial, childist reimagination of the future* builds on concerns of appropriate, relevant, and contextual learning for the future, embracing powerful impulses from decolonial proponents using the childist lens.

The Reflections on recent articles published in *Fennia* continue with a commentary by Alexandra Carleton called *Discourse in a modern Arctic: can we supplant sovereignty?* It reflects upon the article by Kim Pawliw, Étienne Berthold, Frédéric Lasserre that opens this issue of the journal, noting that it enacts a serious question of how we seek sovereignty over areas of wilderness and may point to a human desire to tame it.

Next, we present a small review forum on Interviews-Based Zine-Making (IBZM) emanating from the second research article published in this issue by Chiara Valli. In the first response, Jennifer Bagelman continues the cut and paste mashup aesthetic of the original article and retains the spirit of zines, asking, how can research become more inclusive? In the second reply, Sofia Cele notes that IBZM is both a participatory method of data collection and a participatory way to disseminate results, arguing it is important to bring forward this dual nature of the approach.

The Reflections end with another review forum on the third original research article published in this current issue by Janette Huttunen and Eerika Albrecht on the FFF youth climate strikes in Finland. In the first response, Georgios Kyroglou argues that it is the recognition of young people's agency that can be particularly problematic. While similarly in the second reply, Arita Holmberg focuses in particular upon adult depoliticization of this youth protest movement. Finally, Lena von Zabern and Christopher D. Tulloch focus their commentary on individualized lifestyle choices and a dominant adult voice in relation to the media representation of environmental citizenship in the FFF movement.

KIRSI PAULIINA KALLIO (<https://orcid.org/0000-0002-8761-1159>)

JAMES RIDING (<https://orcid.org/0000-0002-7632-5819>)

FENNIA EDITOR-IN-CHIEF & FENNIA REFLECTIONS SECTION EDITOR

References

- Abebe, T. & Biswas, T. (2021) Rights in education: outlines for a decolonial, childist reimagination of the future – commentary to Ansell and colleagues. *Fennia* 199(1) 118–128. <https://doi.org/10.11143/fennia.107490>
- Albrecht, M., Yarovoy, G. & Karginova-Gubinova, V. (2020) Russia's waste policy and rural waste management in the Karelian Republic: building up a ruin to come? *Fennia* 198(1–2), 135–150. <https://doi.org/10.11143/fennia.95519>

- Bagelman, J. (2021) Zines beyond a means: crafting new research process – commentary to Valli. *Fennia* 199(1) 132–135. <https://doi.org/10.11143/fennia.109263>
- Bowman, B. (2019) Imagining future worlds alongside young climate activists: a new framework for research. *Fennia* 197(2) 295–305. <https://doi.org/10.11143/fennia.85151>
- Carleton, A. (2021) Discourse in a modern Arctic: can we supplant sovereignty? – commentary to Pawliw, Berthold and Lasserre. *Fennia* 199(1) 129–131. <https://doi.org/10.11143/fennia.102004>
- Cele, S. (2021) Communicating back: reflections on IBZM as participatory dissemination – commentary on Valli. *Fennia* 199(1) 136–138. <https://doi.org/10.11143/fennia.109264>
- Collyer, F. M. (2018) Global patterns in the publishing of academic knowledge: global North, global South. *Current Sociology* 66 56–73. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0011392116680020>
- Curry, M. J. & Lillis, T. (eds.) (2017) *Global Academic Publishing: Policies, Perspectives and Pedagogies*. Multilingual Matters, Blue Ridge Summit, PA. <https://doi.org/10.21832/9781783099245>
- Curry, M. J. & Lillis, T. (2018) The dangers of English as lingua franca of journals. *Inside Higher Ed* 13.3.2018 <<https://www.insidehighered.com/views/2018/03/13/domination-english-language-journal-publishing-hurting-scholarship-many-countries>> 12.6.2021.
- Ferreira, D., & Vale, M. (2021) From cyberspace to cyberspatialities? *Fennia* 199(1) 113–117. <https://doi.org/10.11143/fennia.100343>
- Fuchs, C. & Sandoval, M. (2013) The diamond model of open access publishing: why policy makers, scholars, universities, libraries, labour unions and the publishing world need to take non-commercial, non-profit open access seriously. *TripleC: Communication, Capitalism & Critique* 11(2) 428–443. <https://doi.org/10.31269/triplec.v11i2.502>
- Herman, K. (2021) *Exploring mutuality: a report on independent open access publications in the social sciences*. Libraria. <<https://zenodo.org/record/4795689#.YLgWfagzY2w>>
- Holcombe, A. & Wilson, M. C. (2017) Fair open access: returning control of scholarly journals to their communities. *LSE Impact Blog* 23.10.2017 <<https://blogs.lse.ac.uk/impactofsocialsciences/2017/10/23/fair-open-access-returning-control-of-scholarly-journals-to-their-communities/>> 12.6.2021.
- Holmberg, A. (2021) The framing of environmental citizenship and youth participation in the Fridays for Future Movement in Finland – commentary to Huttunen and Albrecht. *Fennia* 199(1) 144–146. <https://doi.org/10.11143/fennia.108085>
- Huttunen, J. & Albrecht, E. (2021) The framing of environmental citizenship and youth participation in the Fridays for Future Movement in Finland. *Fennia* 199(1) 46–60. <https://doi.org/10.11143/fennia.102480>
- Huttunen, S., Salo, M., Aro, R. & Turunen, A. (2020) Environmental citizenship in geography and beyond. *Fennia* 198(1–2) 196–209. <https://doi.org/10.11143/fennia.90715>
- Kaisto, V. (2019) Lasten alueelliset mielikuvat ja identiteetit muutoksessa Suomen ja Venäjän raja-alueella. *Versus* 21.11.2019 <<https://www.versuslehti.fi/tiededebatti/lasten-alueelliset-mielikuvat-ja-identiteetit-muutoksessa-suomen-ja-venajan-raja-alueella/>> 12.6.2021.
- Kallio, K. P. & Riding, J. (2019) Open policies, open practices – open attitudes? *Fennia* 197(1) 1–7. <https://doi.org/10.11143/fennia.80428>
- Kyrogrou, G. (2021) An ‘inconvenient truth’? The problem of recognition of the political message – commentary to Huttunen and Albrecht. *Fennia* 199(1) 139–143. <https://doi.org/10.11143/fennia.108034>
- Köpke, S. (2021) Reinvigorating a political ecology of the global agri-food system. *Fennia* 199(1) 89–103. <https://doi.org/10.11143/fennia.99209>
- Lehtinen, A. (2018) Megatrendejä ja kasvukipuja? Kiinteistönjalostuksesta laadulliseen kaavoitukseen. *Versus* 20.12.2018 <<https://www.versuslehti.fi/tiededebatti/megatrendeja-ja-kasvukipuja-kiinteistonjalostuksesta-laadulliseen-kaavoitukseen/>> 12.6.2021.
- Lock, R. (2020) Beyond imagining: enacting intergenerational response-ability as world-building – commentary to Bowman. *Fennia* 198(1–2) 223–226. <https://doi.org/10.11143/fennia.98008>
- Nielsen, H. D. (2020) Dangerous border – but for whom? *Versus* 10.12.2020 <<https://www.versuslehti.fi/tiededebatti/dangerous-border-but-for-whom/>> 12.6.2021.
- Pawliw, K., Berthold, Étienne, & Lasserre, F. (2021) The role of cultural heritage in the geopolitics of the Arctic: the example of Franklin's lost expedition. *Fennia* 199(1) 9–24. <https://doi.org/10.11143/fennia.98496>
- Rantanen, T., Tolvanen, H., Honkola, T. & Vesakokiski, O. (2021) A comprehensive spatial model for historical travel effort - a case study in Finland. *Fennia* 199(1) 61–88. <https://doi.org/10.11143/fennia.98357>
- Reinsfelder, T. L. & Pike, C. A. (2018) Using library funds to support open access publishing through crowdfunding: going beyond article processing charges. *Collection Management* 48(2). <https://doi.org/10.1080/01462679.2017.1415826>
- Sawatzky, M. & Albrecht, M. (2018) Translating EU energy policy into energy independence: reunion Island's rocky road as a French overseas territory. *Versus* 15.10.2018 <<https://www.versuslehti.fi/>>

- [tiededebatti/translating-eu-energy-policy-into-energy-independence-reunion-islands-rocky-road-as-a-french-overseas-territory/](#)> 12.6.2021.
- Soeiro, D. (2021). Smart cities and innovative governance systems: a reflection on urban living labs and action research. *Fennia* 199(1) 104–112. <https://doi.org/10.11143/fennia.97054>
- Valli, C. (2021) Participatory dissemination: bridging in-depth interviews, participation, and creative visual methods through Interview-Based Zine-Making (IBZM). *Fennia* 199(1) 25–45. <https://doi.org/10.11143/fennia.99197>
- Wood, B. (2020) Youth-led climate strikes: fresh opportunities and enduring challenges for youth research – commentary to Bowman. *Fennia* 198(1–2) 217–222. <https://doi.org/10.11143/fennia.91089>
- Yarovoy, G., Albrecht, M. & Karginova-Gubinova, V. (2021a) Building up a ruin to come: why the Russian waste reform seems doomed to fail in rural areas? *Versus* 15.2.2021 <<https://www.versuslehti.fi/tiededebatti/building-up-a-ruin-to-come-why-the-russian-waste-reform-seems-doomed-to-fail-in-rural-areas/>> 12.6.2021.
- Yarovoy, G., Albrecht, M. & Karginova-Gubinova, V. (2021b) Почему российская «мусорная» реформа обречена на провал в сельской местности? *Versus* 15.2.2021 <<https://www.versuslehti.fi/tiededebatti/почему-российская-мусорная-реформ/>> 12.6.2021.
- von Zabern, L. & Tulloch, C. D. (2021) Changing thoughts, changing future – commentary to Huttunen and Albrecht. *Fennia* 199(1) 147–151. <https://doi.org/10.11143/fennia.109348>