

Research Review
Cultural Anthropology
2007-2012

Quality Assurance Netherlands Universities (QANU)
Catharijnesingel 56
PO Box 8035
3503 RA Utrecht
The Netherlands

Phone: +31 (0) 30 230 3100
Telefax: +31 (0) 30 230 3129
E-mail: info@qanu.nl
Internet: www.qanu.nl

Project number: Q421

© 2014 QANU

Text and numerical material from this publication may be reproduced in print, by photocopying or by any other means with the permission of QANU if the source is mentioned.

CONTENTS

Foreword by the Committee chair	5
1. The review Committee and review procedures.....	7
2. General remarks.....	11
Assessment at Institute and Programme level.....	19
3. Leiden University.....	21
4. Radboud University Nijmegen.....	29
5. University of Amsterdam.....	37
6. Utrecht University.....	43
7. VU University Amsterdam.....	51
Appendices.....	59
Appendix A: Explanation of the SEP criteria and scores	61
Appendix B: Programme for the site visit.....	63
Appendix C: Short Curriculum Vitae of the committee members.....	65
Appendix D: Citation-analysis by Ad Prins	67

FOREWORD BY THE COMMITTEE CHAIR

Research Reviews are complicated affairs. They involve a substantial number of people, all with backgrounds supposed to be comparable, but in fact often quite different, both on the Committee and among those ‘evaluated’. This makes for interesting interaction, but also opens the door to potential misunderstandings and misinterpretations. In the present case we were most fortunate to have on the Committee people from around the world who worked not only very hard, but also operated very well together. We all had varying experiences with this kind of work, which helped to keep us on our toes. And in Floor Meijer we had an extremely effective Secretary of the Committee, ably assisted by Liza Kozłowska. I cannot thank our Committee members, as well as ‘our’ QANU staff, enough.

Equally, I want to express the Committee’s appreciation for the seriousness with which the participating Institutions and Departments approached the evaluation. Sure, it was in their interest to do so, but beyond such formal collaboration, *c’est le ton qui fait la musique*. And that ‘tone’ was splendid, in all cases. So I feel that this exercise, which most certainly was not a mere formality, went very well indeed. I only hope that the participating Institutions, at the end of the road, feel the same.

Emanuel de Kadt
Chair of the Committee

1. THE REVIEW COMMITTEE AND REVIEW PROCEDURES

Scope of the assessment

The Cultural Anthropology Committee was asked to perform an assessment of the research in Cultural Anthropology at Leiden University (LEI), Utrecht University (UU), VU University Amsterdam (VU), University of Amsterdam (UvA) and Radboud University Nijmegen (RU). This assessment covers the research conducted in the period 2007-2012.

In accordance with the Standard Evaluation Protocol 2009-2015 for Research Assessment in the Netherlands (SEP), the Committee's tasks were to assess the quality of the institutes and the research Programmes on the basis of the information provided by the institutes and interviews with the management and the research leaders, and to advise on how it might be improved.

Composition of the Committee

The composition of the Anthropology Committee was as follows:

- Prof. E. (Emanuel) de Kadt (chair), Professor emeritus of Cultural Anthropology at Utrecht University, the Netherlands;
- Prof. D.L. (Donald) Brenneis, Professor of Anthropology at the University of California Santa Cruz, USA;
- Prof. K. (Kenneth) George, Director of the School of Culture, History and Language, ANU College of Asia and the Pacific, at The Australian National University, Australia;
- Prof. U. (Ulf) Hannerz, Professor emeritus of Social Anthropology at Stockholm University, Sweden;
- Prof. P. (Penelope) Harvey, Professor of Social Anthropology at the University of Manchester, UK;
- Prof. N. (Norman) Long, Professor Emeritus of Development Sociology at Wageningen University & Research Centre, the Netherlands.

Dr. F. (Floor) Meijer of QANU (Quality Assurance Netherlands Universities) was appointed secretary to the Committee. A short curriculum vitae of the Committee members can be found in Appendix C.

Independence

All members of the Committee signed a statement of independence to guarantee that they would assess the quality of the institutes and research Programmes in an unbiased and independent way. Any existing personal or professional relationships between Committee members and the Programmes under review were reported and discussed in the Committee meeting.

Data provided to the Committee

The Committee received detailed documentation consisting of the following parts:

- Self-evaluation reports of the units under review, including all the information required by the Standard Evaluation Protocol (SEP), with appendices;
- Key publications per research Programme, with a maximum of five articles/books;
- Publication lists of staff members per research Programme;

- Results of the bibliometric study carried out by Ad Prins.

Committee remarks regarding the data provided

The Committee received the self-evaluations of the Institutes and Programmes under review well in advance of the actual visitation. The distribution of information on the Institute and Programme levels in these reports proved somewhat lopsided, as the participating institutions chose to focus mainly on the Programmes, while the Institutes were dealt with only briefly. Although understandable, this decision made it difficult for the Committee to form an idea of the policies and strategies at the Institute level. In its Institute assessments, it has therefore limited itself to those policies that clearly have an effect on the Programmes under review. At the Programme level, the Committee could work satisfactorily on the basis of the extensive information provided in the self-evaluation reports. The same can be said of the publications submitted: these did indeed give Committee members the chance to assess the quality of the Programmes' output, which, as might have been expected, was not always of uniform quality. The publications lists of staff members provided further background information, useful where further checks were desirable.

The Committee also received a thorough bibliometric study by Ad Prins, covering the years 2004-2012. This study examined, for each Programme, whether the selected publications were to be ranked as above, similar to or below the average of its specific 'domain'. It is quite a complex analysis, including both the type of outlet in which publication occurred (e.g. journal articles, book chapters, monographs) and a citation analysis. The five-point scale of the CERES/EADI classification was used. Even though this scale was conceived primarily with development studies in mind, it is probably also the most appropriate for anthropology. The Committee noted that the overall results show that each Programme receives an above average recognition for its selected publications. (Some further remarks on the utility of bibliometric analysis follow below.)

Procedures followed by the Committee

The Committee proceeded according to the SEP 2009-2015. Each Programme was assigned to two reviewers, who independently formulated a preliminary assessment. The first reviewer was chosen on the basis of his or her expertise in the domain of the Programme; the second reviewer was chosen to provide a more general, complementary perspective.

Before conducting interviews with representatives of the Institutes and Programmes under assessment, the Committee was briefed by QANU about research assessment according to SEP, and discussed the preliminary assessments. It also agreed upon procedural matters and aspects of the assessment. For each university it discussed the self-evaluation report, key publications and the preliminary findings of all research Programmes and the institute before starting on the interviews.

The site visit took place on 18 and 19 September 2013 (see the schedule in Appendix B) at a central location in Utrecht, the Netherlands. It consisted of 60-minute interviews with (1) the management of the research institutes and (2) representatives of each of the research Programmes. The first reviewers led the interviews, and then the second reviewers and the other Committee members were given the opportunity to ask questions. After each interview the Committee took some time to prepare a preliminary assessment. During its lunch breaks, the Committee met with PhD candidates of each of the participating Programmes.

At the end of its meeting in Utrecht, the Committee discussed the scores and comments of all 5 Programmes and 5 Institutes. The final assessments are based on the documentation

provided by the Institutes, the key publications, and the interviews with the management and the leaders of the Programmes. The texts for the Committee report were finalised through email exchanges. The first assessor was responsible for writing the draft assessment and for sending it to the second assessor for amendment and/or approval. After both assessors had approved it, the assessment was inserted into the report. After receiving all assessments, the secretary compiled the report and returned it to the Committee for a final approval. The approved version of the report was presented to the faculties for factual corrections and comments. The final report was presented to the Boards of the participating universities and was printed after their formal acceptance.

The SEP 2009-2015 uses a 5-point rating scale (see Appendix A). It quickly became clear to the Committee that cultural anthropology is a field in which Dutch scholarship is of a remarkably high standard and strongly internationally competitive, implying that scores in the higher end of the scale (3-5) would be most appropriate. To allow differentiation in this rather narrow range, the Committee decided to extend the 5-point scale to a 9-point scale (1, 1.5, 2, ..., 4.5, 5) The .5 was used to indicate that a Programme is between two integer ratings.

2. GENERAL REMARKS

These introductory general remarks deal with some overall issues that the Committee has encountered and needed to address.

Cultural anthropology in the Netherlands

In the 1980s, the Departments of cultural anthropology in the Netherlands agreed on a division of labour, involving above all a regional specialisation, in order to avoid unproductive overlap in their work and to ensure some reasonable coverage of 'the world'. The Committee was given to understand that this agreement had broken down some time ago, and indeed the geographical spread of the work being undertaken by some of the Departments now tends to be very wide indeed, an issue to which the Committee returns in the discussion of the Programmes. Nevertheless, current Programmes still show some residual effect of that agreement: note, for example, the strength of Utrecht University (UU) in Latin America, while Leiden University (LU) still has considerable on-going work in Indonesia and Africa. The exception in terms of *regional* specialisation was the Free University of Amsterdam (VU), though there a long-term interest (specialisation) developed in the 'anthropology of religion'. Overall, many researchers in the different departments do have strong inter-connections. Moreover, it is now widely recognised – at least among anthropologists! – that anthropology does not merely concern itself with so-called 'non-Western' societies ('exotic places' in the view of some non-anthropologists), but has a contribution to make to the analysis of issues and problems in contemporary Western societies, including of course the Netherlands. This is notably the case around the relations between groups with different cultural backgrounds, particularly the interactions of Muslims and non-Muslims and 'the place of Islam'. For virtually all Programmes the issue of *globalisation* and its effects has taken on considerable importance, as it has become clear that what happens at the grassroots level is increasingly entangled with global processes, thus needing broader contextualisation. Anthropology can make a distinctive contribution to discussions about globalisation, for example through considering transnational and diaspora family linkages. The emergence of new family patterns, new forms of reproduction and changing perspectives towards gender have also created a renewed interest in issues of family and kinship.

Some collaboration between the Programmes has continued in the last decades through their participation in the Research School CERES, specifically in the cases of Radboud University Nijmegen (RU), the VU and UU. Nevertheless, the influence of Research Schools appears to have diminished since the early years of the present century, when – everywhere – Deans became more forceful, driven by their wish to see more coherence and synergy *within* the Universities.

There is at the present time only one Research Master's Programme in cultural anthropology in the Netherlands, at Utrecht University. Other universities do have Research Master's Programmes in contiguous fields, or Programmes that are meant to be directly relevant to cultural anthropology graduate students, such as Radboud's Research Master's Programme in Social and Cultural Sciences.

Cultural anthropology and development sociology

Then there is the relationship between cultural anthropology and development sociology. At Leiden University the Department has covered both these disciplines, while Radboud University has combined anthropology with the broader subject of development studies (which has a strong economic component). Other anthropology Departments have developed close, but less formal, links with those working on development. It is clear that for

research in so-called developing countries there is overlap between the concerns of these disciplines. Particularly where anthropological research focuses on matters that are of a practical, operational nature, matters that have relevance for policy-making, such overlap can be significant. Moreover, having the disciplines ‘close together’ was seen as helping to open up the anthropology of development, and leading to the concept of culture being increasingly embraced outside anthropology. Even so, development sociology, and even more clearly development studies, usually approach problems from a structural perspective that is broader than that of cultural anthropology; the latter’s focus is mainly on the interactions between people, and the effect that cultural values and norms have on such interaction. An important aspect of the work of cultural anthropology is at the micro-level, often dealing with the interpersonal (yet setting it in a broader context) – this is hardly ever a focus of development studies. Finally, cultural anthropology is essentially qualitative, development studies often have a quantitative approach. The distinction between the two should be clear. Even though development studies were mentioned in the discipline protocol submitted by the participating universities, this report restricts itself to assessing the work done within the various branches of anthropology, including what may be called the anthropology of development.

Cultural anthropology in social sciences faculties

This leads to another contextual issue. In all the universities concerned, cultural anthropology is part of the faculty of social sciences; it has been so for ‘as long as we can remember’. In many respects this would indeed appear to be the right place for the discipline, bringing benefits all round – for example when psychologists, in dealing with traumatised refugees and discovering that their approach does not work because of cultural differences, get help from cultural anthropologists, and in the process ‘discover’ the importance of the cultural. Yet that grouping also has certain drawbacks, the main one being that – certainly in the Netherlands – virtually everywhere psychology has become the dominant player in this domain, with the result that anthropology seems destined to live in its shadow. Not a major issue *per se*, but it does become problematic when the methods and approaches of psychology come to be seen as templates for all other disciplines in the faculty. The Committee encountered two specific examples.

(a) Ethics

The first concerns the issue of ethics. In many psychological investigations those participating (the ‘subjects’) are asked to indicate their explicit understanding of what they are participating in, and to give their consent to the researchers’ use of the results. In one of the Institutions we examined, such ‘consent forms’ were in principle expected to be used for *all* research undertaken in the faculty concerned. Such consent forms are neither appropriate to, nor useable in, anthropological research. Fortunately, once this was pointed out it was agreed (in the first instance as a pilot project) that anthropology could have its own ethics board, as a sub-panel of the main board. Anthropology, here, was a path-breaker: other disciplines, such as political science, are in a similar situation. In general, the professional associations of anthropology pay close attention to ethical questions: the guidelines they have issued are broadly supported across the discipline.

(b) Bibliometrics

The second issue was trickier, and less easily resolved. It concerned the evaluation of publications. Here, again, the ‘psychology model’ prevailed through the emphasis on ‘bibliometrics’ – and the Committee was specifically requested by the universities (through their overall strategic question) to comment on its value. While the Committee recognised the merits of the bibliometric analysis that was provided, it developed some unease about the way in which its procedures appeared to be frequently used. Most types of bibliometrics, and

explicitly those used by some of the Institutions themselves as part of resource allocation procedures, give different weights to different kinds of publications – with the greatest value usually given to publications in internationally recognised, refereed journals. While the Committee fully acknowledges the merit of the latter, it also wishes to point to the significance of other types of publication for anthropology. Monographs provide extensive analytical descriptions of a complex socio-cultural field; books (often edited volumes) play a key role for theory-development as well as comparative analysis, both of central importance to the discipline. Though the value of such heterogeneity in output was recognised in most faculties, in one case the Committee was told that a monograph would not count unless it is proven that it has been cited, and that it was, moreover, *not* published in Dutch.

This ‘tyranny’ of bibliometrics caused a significant paradox. Individual researchers in cultural anthropology, following the expectations from *within* the discipline, might see a monograph as the preferred medium to present the results of their research. Yet local management, when evaluating them, might stick to the ‘standard’ ranking of bibliometrics, where refereed journal articles are accorded greater weight. So even though, in anthropology, monographs may often make more sense, researchers might feel under pressure *not* to produce these – or not to publish in languages other than English or to avoid regionally based journals – but to go for the kind of output likely to be approved by management. As a result, the Committee struggled with the marks to be given for the ‘output’ of the different Programmes, and was concerned about the interpretation that might be given to these. Overall, the Committee reaches the conclusion that ‘standard’ bibliometric procedures are not particularly helpful in judging the output of anthropologists, and are likely to discourage researchers from producing monographs, out of fear of being penalised. The Committee therefore chose to give at least equal weight to a more qualitative assessment of output – less ‘precise’, no doubt, but also less constricting.

The Standard Evaluation Protocol rating scale

(a) General issues

In its assessments of the Programmes the Committee was expected to use the SEP-rating scale, discussed above (in the section ‘Procedures followed by the Committee’). Before it deals specifically with the rating for productivity (closely linked to the issues around bibliometrics, discussed above), the Committee wants to make some general comments about the scale.

Looking back over the exercise, it is clear that the Committee found no major issues with any of the Programmes it considered: all were ‘doing a good job’. Of course, there were shades of goodness, nuances in how different Programmes did in terms of specific criteria. In awarding grades, the Committee worked within the parameters and definitions given by the Standard Evaluation Protocol (and it recognises that such definitions are necessary in order to ensure comparability between assessments). As already noted, the Committee felt that it needed a more discriminating scale, which it achieved by also giving 0.5 marks. But it found the definition of the top ranking problematic. For a particular Programme to be given a 5, it had to be ‘excellent’, spelled out as meaning that it had the following characteristics: ‘Research is world leading. Researchers are working at the forefront of their field internationally and their research has an important and substantial impact in the field.’ While the epithet ‘world leading’ may be meaningful in some disciplines (for example, where one or more researchers have received the Nobel prize, or some comparable award), it is more dubious in others, including anthropology. In those cases, without having undertaken a comparable assessment of comparable Programmes elsewhere, giving such a top mark would be based on little more than a ‘fair guess’ based on the personal judgment of Committee members – even though

their combined experience with programmes from across the world would mitigate the element of ‘guess-work’. Even so, the Committee might have been more inclined to place aspects of Programmes in the top category had this just meant awarding the label ‘excellent’. The committee has tried to resist the ongoing trend of score inflation, which leads to a situation wherein variation between scores disappears and scores become meaningless (Cf. Rathenau Instituut, ‘Twenty years of research evaluation’, July 2013). The committee urges institute and programme leaders, as well as others who make use of these scores, to interpret them accordingly, and, moreover, always consider the numerical score in relation to the qualitative comments.

(b) The rating for productivity

After what has been written above about bibliometrics, it should not be surprising that the Committee struggled particularly with the rating for productivity. It had understanding for the pressures arising from the use of ‘normal’ bibliometric procedures, both on Departments and individuals, especially the explicit preference for publication in internationally refereed journals. Even so, it chose to give greater weight to monographs, notably for tenured staff. Where that was less than might have been expected, it is reflected in the marks given. The Committee also noted the considerable output of edited volumes. In terms of rating a specific Department, these are problematic for a different reason: often, much of the content of such volumes is the work of persons who are *not* associated with the Department concerned. So while such volumes may well be valuable in a broader intellectual sense, their significance for the ‘productivity’ of the Department as such is not always easy to establish.

In some of the institutional settings in which it operates, cultural anthropology is manifestly under pressure. This is partly related to overall changes in the circumstances (including the financial) facing Universities in the Netherlands, though it is also in part specific to this discipline. Even when its methods and contribution are said to be ‘valuable’, some senior managers still regard cultural anthropology as ‘exotic’. Fancy ideas and faraway, irrelevant, places – that remains their image of the discipline, while they prefer the social sciences to be rather more ‘practical’ and ‘applied’. Yet the Committee was pleased to note that others are fully supportive. Also, with the increasing interest by a number of Programmes in contributing to research on emerging issues around the interaction of different cultural, ethnic and religious groups in the Netherlands, that view of a concern with the exotic is, in any case, becoming increasingly outdated – even if, to date, the actual work being undertaken around such issues remains modest.

(c) Societal relevance

An important question in the assessment relates to the extent to which the research is of relevance to society. Reference will be made to this criterion in the discussion of the different Institutions; overall they were all judged to comply with this particular requirement, even if some did so to a greater extent than others.

Yet it is important to clarify briefly how this criterion has been used. We recognise that there are differences in the extent to which the *subjects* researched can be said to have societal relevance: some clearly deal with matters that are of greater interest from this point of view than others. But the Committee has not primarily focused on that aspect of the issue. Rather the Committee has been concerned above all with the extent to which the results of the research came to the notice of audiences beyond the academic community, how far the Programmes reached out to them. From an academic point of view, publishing in international, refereed journals remains of paramount importance. But such publications also need to be ‘translated’ for those outside academia. Research becomes relevant to non-

professionals, to policy makers and the general public, when its results are made available, when results are translated into a language that is understood beyond the confines of academia. This could involve preparing documents specifically aimed at policy-makers, publishing summaries and discussions in non-academic media, speaking about the results on radio or television, promoting them via social media, and publishing the writings – both the originals and those meant for outreach – not only in the language of the country where the research was originally done, but significantly also in Dutch, given that much of the work in anthropology is published in English. It is this aspect on which the Committee has focused when considering societal relevance.

The funding climate

In all the interviews the Committee conducted, and in virtually all the self-evaluations that were submitted, the recent change in the funding climate in the Netherlands loomed large. In the first place there has been a significant reduction in overall direct funding (so-called first stream funding) to universities. This reduction has been of the order of 12% between the years 2000 and 2010. As a result, the competition for the financial resources available from national grant-giving bodies, mainly the Netherlands Organisation of Scientific Research (NWO) and to a lesser extent the Royal Academy of Arts and Sciences (KNAW), the so-called second stream, has become increasingly fierce.

Secondly, the government has named nine priority areas for research, thereby restricting the freedom of second stream agencies. These priority areas are water, agro-food, horticulture, hi tech, life sciences, chemistry, energy, logistics, and creative industries. Although cultural anthropology, or the social sciences in general, can have a supportive role in research on *some* of these topics – topics largely related to areas in which Dutch enterprise has been, or might be, successful – most of them approach these issues in terms that fall squarely outside their time-honoured and typical work areas. The Committee understands the desirability of reducing the overall spread, even scatter, of research efforts, yet it is concerned that the current framing of priorities, as well as the overall proportion of funds earmarked to them, is likely to have a seriously detrimental effect on cultural anthropology. In this it echoes apprehension expressed by all Departments. While it is aware that this issue is not part of its remit, the Committee nevertheless hopes the universities will find ways to put pressure on the authorities to rethink their present policy – either in terms of the actual topics given priority, or in terms of the proportion of funds so earmarked, or both.

In the third place, these changes in the funding climate have brought about a shift in the sources of financing for research, which has had a number of significant effects:

(1) In the light of the increasing scarcity of first stream funds and the growing competition for second stream and EU funds, Departments have begun to rely increasingly on third stream financing, which is predominantly funding for applied projects – in the case of the social sciences this often means consultancy work. Rather than leading to articles in academic journals or edited books, or to monographs, the output from such projects tends to be in the form of reports, not in themselves favoured by the standard bibliometric assessments, even though they may be particularly pertinent in terms of the criterion ‘societal relevance’ (see below). The Committee recognizes that there is a contradiction, here, between the requirements of societal relevance and scientific productivity (as was noted by RU in their strategic question to the Committee). Should such a shift towards applied work herald a long-term trend the Committee would be seriously concerned. Yet it recognizes that in the current circumstances it may be the lesser of two evils, as the alternative would be to lay off staff and

prejudice the potential for a return to more academic work when circumstances will again allow this.

(2) Indirectly, reduced funding has affected doctoral students, who increasingly have to rely on part-time jobs as research assistants on other projects or as teachers to enable them to continue their studies. Such jobs provide students with valuable experience, which can contribute to a more mature doctoral dissertation, yet they can also put them under time pressure to complete. As was noted by the University of Amsterdam, science policy in the Netherlands nowadays tends to provide national science foundation funding for shorter three-year PhD tracks, and there is also a tendency to evaluate research institutions in terms of the average speed at which doctorates are completed. The Committee was asked by the UvA, in its strategic question, what response can be given to this external pressure to shorten the time it takes to complete a PhD. It notes that, while the time given to part-timers is usually adjusted *pro rata*, there are indications that especially teaching tasks tend to be underestimated as a matter of course. Students appear to use considerably more time for these than their appointment would justify; thereby they lengthen the time needed to complete their doctoral research. The Committee recommends a more realistic assessment of the time required for teaching, together with focussed assistance for part-time teachers to reduce their preparation time. While, from a current Dutch perspective it may seem not unreasonable that external financial assistance be limited to three years (full time), in anthropology grasping the realities of an initially alien way of life and thought, and then effectively communicating this, is a complex and time-consuming process, during which students often encounter unexpected problems. The committee also believes that failure to complete during a 'standardised' time should not give rise to a quality judgment of the Departments concerned. Also, it should be noted that universities in the United States appear to allow considerably more time for the completion of a doctorate – five to eight years is frequently mentioned – though that does include considerably more coursework than is the case in European universities.

(3) In view of these mounting difficulties for the financing of research from Dutch sources, Programmes look increasingly to the EU for resources. This has meant the need to think in much grander terms, as applications for EU research grants are expected to be for multi-item Programmes rather than for projects, and to involve other academic institutions, perhaps even in continents other than Europe, and preferably also more than one discipline. The 'lone wolf anthropologist' is a dead species in the Netherlands, the Committee was told. Doing the background work for such 'grand' applications is seriously time-consuming, with the need to get different organisations from various countries on board and to elaborate a complex research set-up – activities outside the usual experience of anthropologists. Fortunately, some faculties do provide earmarked resources to compensate for the time it takes to write such complex applications. The push among some of the Institutions towards inter-disciplinary work, the view that this is somehow 'a good thing' in itself, may well be related to this new reality.

Finally, the general shift in economy and society over recent decades towards a market orientation needs to be remembered. Yes, research does continue to be assessed on its own merits, but increasingly questions lurk in the background about its economic benefits. Such questions are also asked when appointments are made: new staff, especially at the higher levels, may well be expected to 'generate their own value' – so whether they are likely to do that, or not, in fact becomes part of the appointment criteria. It is significant that the Standard Evaluation Protocol enquires about 'valorisation' – that is to say, what value does the research have in economic terms. In the current economic climate ideally everything has

to 'pay for itself'. That is a tough and unrealistic demand to make of anthropological research. So it may not be a surprise that the Committee had little to say about 'valorisation'.

Assessment at Institute and Programme level

3. LEIDEN UNIVERSITY

Programme Leiden: Global Challenges

Programme director: Prof. Patricia Spyer
Research staff 2012: 3.8 fte tenured, 15.9 total fte

Assessments:	Quality:	4
	Productivity:	4
	Relevance:	3
	Viability:	4

Since there is large overlap between the Institute and Programme level at Leiden University, and as the self-assessment did not separate the two, the Committee decided to integrate its assessment. Accordingly, the following assessment covers both levels.

1A. The Institute

The Institute of Cultural Anthropology and Development Sociology is one of five institutes within the Faculty of Social and Behavioural Sciences (FSW). Its research mission is ‘to conduct research in culture and development (with a special emphasis on the situational analysis of global challenges); and to disseminate its results in high-quality, globally acknowledged venues of publication and through national and international collaborations in order to further enhance its academic reputation and the societal relevance of its research’.

The Institute participates in two of Leiden University’s designated research profile areas (RPA’s), *Global Interactions* and *Asian Modernities and Traditions*. Two of its staff members have a leadership position in these profile areas, which serve as platforms for interdisciplinary, comparative, and collaborative research. Furthermore, the Institute maintains formal research exchanges and collaborative ventures with local, national and global partners such as the Royal Netherlands Institute of Southeast Asian and Caribbean Studies (KITLV), the African Studies Centre (ASC), and the LDE Centre for Global Heritage and Development (an outflow of the interuniversity research triangle established by Leiden University, Delft University of Technology and Erasmus University Rotterdam).

An Executive Board, consisting of the Scientific Director, the Director of Research, the Director of Education and a student representative manages the Institute. The Scientific Director is responsible for Institute policy in general, while educational and research matters are delegated to the Director of Education and the Director of Research respectively. The Research Committee, established in 2008, supports the Director of Research.

1B. The Programme

The research Programme ‘Global Challenges’ was established in 2012 as the successor to the Programme ‘Global Connections’. According to the self-evaluation report, the name change reflects the societally engaged and proactive nature of the Programme’s research, which builds on the ethnographic, theoretical and methodological strengths of both cultural anthropology and development sociology. It begins with the recognition, stated rather grandly, that ‘our current global moment is defined by political and economic instability and the dramatic realignment of global centres of power, a shift from rural to urban concentrations of population, climate change, and diverse movements for self-determination and recognition, together with the role of image circulation and digital technologies in these far-reaching

transformations'. Within the larger field of global transformation, it singles out three terrains in particular:

1. Media and Material Culture;
2. Environment and Development;
3. Economy and Culture.

Research foci of the staff include the circulation of commodities, labour and persons; the movement of images and other media; the constitution and social impact of financial regimes; the societal and cultural implications of resource exploitation; social movements; youth and popular culture; digital citizenship and mobile technologies; borderlands; the study of development policy and practice. Following from the 1980s geographical division of labour among the five Departments of Social and Cultural Anthropology in the Netherlands, particular attention has gone out to Indonesia and Sub-Saharan Africa. The two remaining structural chairs are devoted to these areas. Five other structural chairs have been lost in the recent past.

The Committee notes that, for a relatively small Department (3.8 tenured fte in 2012), the large number of topics raises questions as to the meaning of the term research *foci*: how much mutual reinforcement can there be when researchers work across such a broad range? While this issue is said to be acknowledged within the Institute, and there is discussion about a possible reduction in the number of research specialisations from three to two, at the present time the Department merely states that action in this direction remains 'possible', and it is not clear what, if anything, the outcome will be.

There are also questions about the supposed integration of cultural anthropology and development sociology in the Institute's work. The Committee notes that no member of staff is said to be working exclusively either at the micro-level or at the 'quantitative' macro-level. Yet things are surely more complex than was suggested during the site visit by the remark that the difference between a focus on 'culture' and a focus on 'development' has been abolished. If the Institute seriously intends to bring together the perspectives and analytical contributions of cultural anthropology and development sociology, then it is, according to the Committee, essential to spell out how this might work out in the three selected research topics.

2. Quality and academic reputation

To testify to the Institute's academic reputation, the self-evaluation report points to its central position in international interdisciplinary networks. This position is said to be reflected in the international research projects, networks and collaborative ventures (with *Academia Sinica* in Taiwan, Harvard, Heidelberg, Nanyang Technical University, New York University, Princeton, Stanford, Xiamen) in which staff members participate. Several staff members have senior positions on the boards or advisory boards of research institutions and scientific organisations in the Netherlands, Germany and the USA. They serve as editors or guest editors and members of editorial boards of journals and book series, and are members of national and international research institutions and professional organisations. Staff members are regularly invited to sit on (national and international) review Committees, scientific panels, and PhD Committees. They have given guest lectures, keynote speeches, and plenary talks and received fellowships or honorary doctorates.

The Committee notes that anthropology at Leiden University has a long-established reputation as a one of the leading centres of the discipline in continental Europe – its history

going back to the era when the Netherlands as a colonial power had a head start in building a discipline devoted to the study of overseas cultures and societies. By being open to research traditions elsewhere, Leiden has been able to maintain its reputation.

The publications examined by the Committee show high quality and notable breadth. Many are in interdisciplinary/transdisciplinary journals. While praiseworthy, this orientation does carry some risk in the light of today's vogue for bibliometrics: the journals in question may not get the highest ratings. The publications do, however, show sophistication, and should find respectably broad readerships in their respective segments of the discipline, as well as outside it. Topics are at current research frontiers of interdisciplinary and public interest work (environmental research and policy, movement studies), but also engaged with the history of the discipline (a study of colonial anthropology in Tanganyika).

3. Resources

Over the review period, staff numbers at the Institute of Cultural Anthropology and Development Sociology have gone up, from 21 people (equivalent to 6.6 research fte's) in 2007 to 29 people (15.9 research fte's) in 2012. The increase is largely due to a growing number of PhD students, from 5 (3.5 research fte's) in 2007 to 12 (11.34 research fte's) in 2012. The number of tenured fte's has gone up only slightly, from 3.1 in 2007 to 3.76 in 2012. Even after the recent increase of staff numbers, Leiden remains one of the smallest Programmes in the review.

The increase in total research fte's was paralleled by an increase in total funding. The ratio between direct funding, research grants and contract research has somewhat shifted over the review period. While the share of direct funding from Leiden University decreased from 90% in 2007 to 61% in 2012, the share of research grants increased from 5% to 24%, with a peak at 27% in 2011.

According to the self-evaluation report, these changing percentages result from institutional shifts at Leiden University, as well as from shifts in national funding policies, which the Institute identifies as threats in its SWOT analysis. With direct funding on the decline, the Institute is more and more dependent on acquiring research grants. This is particularly the case for the graduate Programme. After the closure of The School of Asian, African, and Amerindian Studies (CNWS Research School) in 2009 and the disappearance therewith of an important source of PhD funding, the Institute became increasingly reliant on national competitions through the Netherlands Organisation of Scientific Research (NWO) and the Netherlands Royal Academy of Sciences (KNAW). As the self-evaluation report points out, since 2009 the Institute has been quite successful in bringing in PhD grants. There are currently 31 PhD candidates in the Institute. A number of them are (co)funded by the Indonesian government's Higher Education initiative (DIKTI), which funds three years of the PhD trajectory of DIKTI PhDs, with the fourth year supplemented by Leiden University or joint Dutch-Indonesian research Programmes.

The peak in research grants (2010-2012) reflects recent successes in the VENI, Cultural Dynamics and Open Competition Programmes run by the NWO. According to the self-evaluation report, the Institute's strong international embedding puts it in an excellent place for the consortia building that is a prerequisite for obtaining European funding. It therefore offers staff members encouragement and support to apply for larger grant initiatives through the European Commission such as the Marie Curie Programme, the European Research Council, and the larger Horizon 2020 Framework Programme for Research and Innovation.

Despite these efforts, the Committee notes that the Institute has not yet been successful in the competition for international grants.

In general, the decrease of primary funding and the increasing dependence on grants are characterised as having a negative influence on productivity. The self-evaluation report states that research staff believe they have insufficient time and resources to do research.

4. Productivity

During the review period the research staff of the Programme produced 307 publications. The total yearly output has fluctuated somewhat over the years. Generally speaking it was higher during the first half of the period (with a peak of 70 publications in 2008; 19.4 per tenured fte) than during the second half (with a low point of 39 publications in 2011; 9.75 per tenured fte). On average, the Programme produced 13.7 publications per tenured fte per year. Book chapters and refereed articles are the main categories of output (5.6 and 3.0 per tenured fte per year respectively). The staff was less effective when it comes to monographs (0.2 per tenured fte per year). The Committee notes that, perhaps under some pressure to respond to the present bibliometric demands, Leiden anthropologists have recently published rather more extensively in journals. During the site visit, however, institute representatives mentioned that five monographs are currently in preparation.

Over the review period 2007-2012, the Programme produced 33 PhD theses. This means that there was an average of 1.5 PhD theses per tenured fte, which is high. The last two years have shown a significant rise in the number of PhD theses defended: 2007 (4), 2008 (7), 2009 (4), 2010 (4), 2011 (6), 2012 (8). The completion rates of the 10 internal PhD candidates who entered the Programme between 2004 and 2008 are – compared to other programmes – reasonable. After 4 years, 1 (10%) of these candidates had graduated, after 6 years a further 5 candidates (60% total) had graduated. There were no dropouts.

The self-evaluation report states that the Institute's productivity strategy is twofold: it encompasses staff seminars on writing strategies and publication impact, as well as a quantitative standard by which staff members should ideally produce a minimum of two peer-reviewed articles annually (or an average of 12 over the course of six years). Since 2012, the Institute follows the university-wide policy of allocating research time on the basis of individual performance; this means that such time is reduced when a tenured staff member does not meet this standard during a three-year period or half the term of the six-year period of an external research assessment. The Institute aims to internationalise its publication output further by increasing the number of refereed journal articles over book chapters and edited volumes. But, following international anthropological practice, it continues to hold monographs in high esteem.

It is clear that the Institute feels under pressure from these policies, and especially from the 'punishment' of reducing a person's research time for failing to produce on average two refereed articles per year. This is seen as an overly rough and ready, and inflexible, approach, likely to have detrimental effects not only on morale but also on staff effectiveness, overall. While understanding the need for some form of accountability, the Committee regards current bibliographic practices, applied across a great variety of disciplines, to be poorly attuned to the publishing logic in anthropology (see wider discussion above, under 'General Remarks'). There is no indication that in Leiden this has been taken on board.

5. Policy on societal relevance

Many research topics of the Institute should be of interest to a wider public. To enhance the Institute's public profile and to increase the means and effectiveness of knowledge utilisation, a number of policy measures have been introduced in recent years (partly outside of the current review period). These include the appointment of a staff member specialised in communication (March 2012), the start of an anthropology blog (Spring 2013), the organisation of collective activities (2012-2013) to encourage staff members to reflect explicitly on the societal relevance of their research, and the appointment of an Institute Advisory Board in 2013, whose members have been deliberately selected from among persons who fulfil important functions beyond academia.

According to the self-evaluation report, the dissemination of research results involves staff members (1) making their research results available through a range of social media by contributing to important debates, for instance on the financial crisis, contemporary social movements like Occupy, public-private partnerships, and CSR policies of multinationals (2) producing a professional code of ethics and contributing more generally to discussions on ethics (3) working with a range of public and private organisations including the World Wildlife Fund - Netherlands, the Prince Claus Fund, the Timber Procurement Assessment Committee (TPAC), the International Working Group for Indigenous Affairs (IWGIA), development organisations like CORDAID, as well as NGOs in the countries where staff conduct research. These activities are appreciated by the Committee.

Nevertheless, over the current review period, the Leiden Programme produced only 41 professional publications and publications aimed at the general public, which amounts to 1.0 publication per tenured fte per year. This is the lowest average of all Programmes in the review. Even so, much of the research of Leiden anthropology is, according to the Committee, clearly of interest to wider audiences. The changed name of its research Programme, from 'Global Connections' to 'Global Challenges', reflects an increased concern with issues relevant to a broader public. The recent appointment of a 'communications expert', who was herself trained as an anthropologist, is an interesting development in this context. The 'Leiden Anthropology Blog', easily accessed through the Departmental web site, is also a noteworthy example of efforts in this area, particularly by junior staff members and doctoral students.

Even so, insofar as its emphasis is on research fields outside the Netherlands, 'relevance' to a Dutch public may be reduced. Attention, therefore, also needs to be given (1) to the translation of findings into issues of relevance in the Netherlands, and (2) to promoting societal relevance through outreach to policy makers and the general public in the countries where research is being undertaken. Although staff members appear to be aware of the underlying issues, more practical consideration could be given to the matter.

6. Strategy for the future

Following the 2009 research review, the Institute has, according to the self-evaluation report, aimed to further sharpen its research foci, as well as its public profile. Four years later, the Institute is, in its own words, 'confident that it is well-positioned locally as well as more broadly to address, in collaboration with strategically chosen partners, the myriad intellectual challenges of today and of times to come'.

According to the self-evaluation report, several changes in particular demonstrate the Institute's ability to adapt to and benefit from new circumstances. First of all, it mentions the staff rejuvenation and research management improvements that have resulted in a significant

increase in funding obtained from secondary sources. While aiming to uphold its successful track record in bringing in grants in the future, the Institute maintains that it has adopted a number of policies that are aimed at minimising the potential risk of spreading itself too thin. Yet details of these, and their effects, have remained unclear to the Committee. Secondly, the Institute holds that its doctoral Programme is sound and attractive, and points to the increase in the number of PhD candidates. Here, the Committee feels it is on more solid ground. Finally, it lists the embedding in (inter)national networks, which has enabled the relatively small-sized Institute to participate in initiatives such as two Leiden research profiles, the Leiden Institute for Global and Area Studies (LIGA), and the LDE Centre for Heritage & Development.

Yet the self-evaluation report also links the viability of the Institute to the wider and unfavourable funding climate, for research grants as well as for doctoral studies. It also notes that the age distribution of staff is at present unbalanced: the appointment of at least two associate professors is needed to fill the gap between the ranks of full and assistant professors. This also would allow the institute to profile itself further in new areas of expertise.

The Committee is aware of the pressures on anthropology departments, especially those that are small, to contribute to all manner of broader, especially inter-disciplinary, projects, a matter raised in Leiden's strategic question. It recognizes that such contributions can be valuable, both for the projects, and for the anthropology departments concerned. Yet 'disciplinary integrity' will only be maintained through a combination of focused conventional anthropological work and the clear articulation of the specific value of the anthropological contribution when participating in such broader partnerships and consortia.

The Committee feels that the institute is characterised by both stability and vitality, although it is not as large as one might expect. The effects of the latter situation might be mitigated through close collaboration with other units within the wider Leiden academic environment, also by way of joint appointments ('extraordinary professorships'). While it is clear that the Institute is focused on securing its future, the Committee believes that it may not have faced up sufficiently to some of the wider earlier mentioned issues, notably that of over-stretch, which may negatively influence the implementation of these intentions.

7. PhD training and supervision

The Institute hosts both salaried PhD candidates with a four-year appointment and external PhD candidates, who are either self-funded/employed elsewhere, or on a scholarship. The mandatory training Programme is primarily tailored to the first group. The Institute has recently established a PhD Programme within the Graduate School of the FSW. Its main curricular component is a general course ('Projects and Practices of Anthropologists', PPA), which consists of three annual course modules related to the three research foci of the Programme. Additionally, the Graduate School offers an annual PhD conference, skills courses, such as a dissertation writing course and a course in academic English, and occasional master classes.

According to the self-evaluation report, the training Programme 'aims to educate professional, internationally-oriented scholars who can make significant contributions to the sub-field(s) in which they specialise and have a working knowledge of the standards of the wider disciplinary and area studies context concerned as well as an appreciation for the larger implications of their particular research topic.' In order to promote interdisciplinarity, staff members of the Leiden Institute of Area Studies (LIAS) and the van Vollenhoven Institute

are involved in the PhD Programme. Cooperation with the Leiden Institute of Global and Area Studies (LIGA) is currently under discussion.

The research of PhD students is predominantly structured as an individual project, although candidates for a PhD are more likely to be accepted if the subjects they wish to study have links with the research interests of one or more staff members. Their supervision is the responsibility of a Committee of three, which consists of a primary supervisor (*promotor*), a *co-promotor* (mandatory only since the Fall of 2012) and a third supervisor, either from the Institute itself or elsewhere. Within the first two months of acceptance, the primary supervisor and PhD candidate draw up a plan for supervision and training, which is submitted to the Graduate School. In the 9th month, PhD candidates submit an '8th Month paper'. Based on this paper, the candidate is granted/not granted permission to continue his/her research. In subsequent years, progress is monitored through annual performance reviews.

In conformity with common ethnographic practice, dissertations usually take the shape of a monograph rather than a collection of articles. With an eye towards their chances on the job market, PhD candidates are, however, encouraged to publish journal articles before graduating.

The Committee finds the Programme for doctoral training well planned and productive. It offers students a clear view of some of the interests and issues at the forefront of current international anthropology, and also provides them with an understanding of classic anthropology. While PhD candidates may not easily succeed in completing all work required for their degrees within the time period formally allotted to this, the standard period in question is shorter than that usually allowed for an anthropology doctorate in international centres of the discipline. The new graduates of the PhD Programme are generally successful in finding relevant academic or non-academic jobs: a table in the self-evaluation report shows that 18 (70%) of the 26 PhD candidates who graduated between 2007-2012, went on to academic positions in the Netherlands and abroad, which is a very high percentage. The Programme draws on the useful feedback from its graduates through an advisory board and through their talks to the current student body.

There is, at present, no specific anthropology Research Master's Programme in Leiden. However, during the site visit the Committee learned that there are on-going discussions about the possibility of including an anthropology track within the Research Master's Programme offered by the area-based institutes.

8. Conclusion

After studying the documentation and speaking to the Institute and Programme representatives, the Committee has concluded that the Leiden anthropology Programme functions with cohesion and effectiveness, in an organisation attentive to management needs, and strategically active in promoting productivity. Anthropology at Leiden also works in close and rewarding relationships with several other research and teaching units within the university. The senior professors are persons of strong international reputation in anthropology, as evident from a wide range of speaking invitations, editorial appointments etc. Yet, as previously discussed, the Committee also retains some concerns around the Institute's capacity to implement some of the measures planned and needed, specifically in relation to the continued wide range of topics studied, which is likely to make collaboration between staff members less effective than it might otherwise be, and also diminish the potential academic as well as societal impact of the work undertaken.

4. RADBOUD UNIVERSITY NIJMEGEN

A. Institute level

1. The Institute

The Nijmegen Institute for Social and Cultural Research (NISCO) is a research institute within the Faculty of Social Sciences (FSS) of the Radboud University Nijmegen (RU). It consists of two research groups: 1) Anthropology and Development Studies, and 2) Sociology. While the disciplines of Anthropology and Development Studies were, at the time of the previous review, still formally separated, significant changes in personnel over the past five years have resulted in their integration within a single research Programme in 2010: 'Mobility, Marketization and Marginalization: Cultural Encounters, Economic Exchange and Shifting Social Arrangements'. This Programme is devoted to multidisciplinary and comparative approaches to the study of socio-cultural phenomena and processes in both 'Western' and 'Non-Western' societies, and deploys a wide range of theoretical and methodological approaches. It also embraces both historical and contemporary contexts.

Some tensions appear to exist between the two components, with anthropologists feeling that there is pressure on them to work on 'practical issues', notably around development co-operation. Yet there are also benefits for anthropologists in the co-habitation with more quantitatively oriented disciplines. NISCO prides itself on its tradition of collecting and storing large-scale data sets. These include both longitudinal collections, e.g. on individuals and their life courses and networks within specific social contexts, such as the Netherlands *Levens-Loop Studie*, ('Life Course Study'), and cross-national collections that contain a wide range of countries, such as the Dutch database on non-governmental development cooperation (see: www.ngo-database.nl). It is interesting and rather unusual that Radboud encourages not only those utilising large-scale methods to take account of the contribution of anthropologists, but also makes anthropologists aware of the potential usefulness of the work of sociologists in placing the findings of their field-work in a wider context.

Researchers at NISCO focus mainly on three themes:

- *Inequality*. This theme centres on differences in access to and control over resources that affect peoples' opportunities, such as educational level, success in the labour market and health;
- *Cohesion*. This theme studies the impact of the globalisation process on changing socio-cultural and politico-economic relations within and between societies;
- *Modernisation*. This theme focuses on the comparison of economic, socio-cultural and technological developments in western societies with similar processes taking place in other societies.

To understand and possibly explain the dynamics of socio-cultural phenomena and processes, staff members use integrated multidisciplinary and comparative approaches. NISCO's overall objective is to contribute innovative knowledge to the academic and social community by means of these comparative and systematic approaches of research. There are collaborative ventures, e.g. in the form of joint PhD projects, between the two research groups within NISCO, but also with the Faculty of Philosophy, Theology and Religious Studies, the Faculty of Science, the Faculty of Law and the School of Management.

The Institute Director is appointed by the Dean of the Faculty of Social Sciences and authorised to make managerial and financial decisions within the confines of the Institute's budget. An Advisory Board, composed of Programme leaders of both research groups, is involved in approving research project proposals, staff appointments and the recruitment of PhD candidates as well as evaluating publication output. Its role appears to be rather more than simply advising.

2. Policy on scientific quality and academic reputation

According to the self-evaluation report, NISCO aims to provide its staff with a 'fruitful academic environment'. It hosts an annual conference and there are regular formal and informal meetings that are open to staff members from both research groups.

The quality policy of the Institute aims principally at stimulating cooperation with national and international academic communities. According to the self-evaluation report, the Institute's academic reputation is evident from the long-standing tradition built by its researchers to provide the academic community with accessible, large-scale data. This tradition has, reportedly, been widely recognised as a best practice.

Furthermore, it is part of the quality policy to encourage staff members to publish in international sources, preferably A-ranking journals. The selection criteria for new staff members, which have been developed in conjunction with criteria used elsewhere in the Faculty of Social Sciences, and the annual evaluations of existing staff reflect this objective. The situation regarding monographs is ambiguous – those published through 'international top quality publishers' (see below, Productivity Strategy) are said to be valued as contributions to books or to international high impact journals (not the same), but other monographs apparently do not 'count' in the complex bibliometric assessments, unless it can be demonstrated that they have been cited. It was also suggested that publications in Dutch were ignored. Apparently, especially younger staff are rigorously subjected to these rules.

3. Resources and resource policy

In its self-evaluation report, NISCO points to the ever-growing emphasis on acquiring external funding within Dutch universities. Because of the growing competition for second-stream research funds, and the moderate success in acquiring these funds, the Institute has compensated by intensifying applications for contract research funds. While it has been quite successful in this respect, this has not always been appreciated by the anthropologists. Although the scientific value of contract research projects is, according to the self-evaluation report, modest, these do significantly add to the societal relevance of the Institute. The Committee notes that this tension exists in the case of most Universities considered in this Report.

During the site visit, institute representatives informed the Committee that anthropology at RU went through a problematic period in financial terms at the beginning of the review period. Reserves of around €300.000, originally earmarked for research, were suddenly required to cover an unexpected and large deficit (€530.000) in the teaching budget, due to a decline of income caused by a reduction of student enrolments. Since then, reserves are slowly being rebuilt.

The self-evaluation report mentions that, as part of the Institute's quality strategy, NISCO researchers receive a special budget for ethnographic field research. This budget of €32.000 can be spent at the discretion of the management of the research group, albeit within the confines of university criteria for reimbursement of employment related expenses.

4. Productivity strategy

The self-evaluation report mentions that the publication policy and productivity strategy of the Faculty of Social Sciences has recently changed in favour of the publication of journal articles, especially in high-ranking journals. During the period under review, NISCO has had to adopt different selection and evaluation criteria based on a set of accreditation/publication points in relation to the proportion of full time equivalence. Whereas before 2010 new staff members were evaluated only after five years, currently there are annual evaluations within a five-year moving frame. For the time being, publications in international B-ranking journals are valued as equal to contributions to books published by international top-publishers, while publications in (inter-) national C-ranking journals are valued as equal to contributions to books published by international publishers. While it is stated that alterations and adaptations of these publication criteria are possible, the Committee cannot shake off the impression that, with this highly complex protocol for ‘counting’ output, bibliometrics clearly rules.

The Committee wishes to draw the attention of NISCO – and the University – to the potential, even likely, deleterious effects on staff morale (and on productivity itself) of such highly detailed rules, manifestly inspired on the working practices of other disciplines. These problems are especially serious for anthropologists – as has been discussed in various other sections of this report.

5. Policy on societal relevance

The self-evaluation report does not discuss societal relevance at the institute level, but from the discussion of the issue at Programme level it is clear that the matter of disseminating research results beyond the academic community is taken seriously. Some consultancies can serve this purpose. Undertaking advisory work can also be helpful for ‘spreading the word’, which is further advanced by contributing to public debates. While *research* publications in Dutch are discouraged, research findings are communicated to a wider audience by secondary publications in that language.

6. Strategy for the future

As in the case of all social science institutions, the increased competition for grants weighs heavily on NISCO. In addition, because of the interlocking of anthropology and development studies in the Institute, the possible (even probable) reduction in the government budget for development co-operation may have further problematic effects on research funding. Continued reliance on third stream funding, and operationally oriented work, seems inevitable. This makes the University’s intensified insistence on judging people and Departments on the publication of traditional, refereed articles all the more problematic. These challenges will be uppermost in the agenda of the newly to be appointed Professor of Development Studies.

NISCO intends to remain at the forefront of further efforts to improve the accessibility of both local and (inter-)national storage systems for empirical data underlying all publications, in the first instance by improving the availability of data collected and used by its own researchers. The overall aim of this work will continue to be to improve scientific transparency and integrity. The Committee regards this as an interesting and valuable contextual contribution to the work of anthropologists

7. PhD training and supervision

In preparation for PhD work, the Faculty offers a Research Master’s Programme in ‘Social and Cultural Sciences’, aimed at students in anthropology, development studies, sociology and communication sciences. Four fifths of those completing this course go on to the PhD.

The Advisory Board plays a major role in the selection and monitoring of PhD students. The Board advises on admissions of internal and external candidates, and it prioritises research proposals for external funding (*e.g.* NWO Talent). It also follows up all of these candidates by means of a project monitoring system: to improve the success rate of the PhD projects, each PhD candidate must submit an annual progress report.

Given the changing landscape of research funding in the Netherlands, the faculty has developed a policy for the recruitment and screening of external PhD research scholars. In fact, a considerable proportion of doctoral candidates are from abroad, often staff members in foreign universities.

B. Programme level

Programme RU1: Mobility, Marketization and Marginalization: Cultural Encounters, Economic Exchange and Shifting Social Arrangements

Programme director: Prof. Toon van Meijl
Research staff 2012: 4.21 tenured fte, 13.07 total fte

Assessments:	Quality:	3
	Productivity:	4
	Relevance:	4.5
	Viability:	3.5

Brief description

The overall context of this research Programme is the increasing mobility of people, things and meanings. Its key objectives are to investigate the impact of mobility on (a) cultural encounters; (b) marketisation and processes in the political, economic and socio-cultural spheres; (c) marginalisation, in terms of human agency and inequality.

Central research questions deal with the implications of mobility for cultural identities and social cohesion in increasingly diversified societies; shifting arrangements in development relations; and the restructuring of power differences and gender relations.

The number of staff fte's has remained roughly the same over the review period, but this was mostly due to an increase of the non-tenured staff (from 1.14 fte in 2007 to 6.61 fte in 2012). Tenured staff fte's decreased somewhat (from 5.01 fte in 2007 to 4.21 fte in 2012), while the fte's for PhDs were in sharp decline, especially in the last two years (from 6.66 fte in 2007 to 2.25 fte in 2012).

Quality

The work done in this Programme displays an interesting combination of a classical anthropological approach with longitudinal large-scale studies. The quality of the work is overall sound, though in some publications the use of unnecessary jargon and over-complicated word choice leads to problems of comprehensibility. The Department partially recognises that limiting or consolidating research areas might be necessary; the Committee urges it to take this issue seriously.

The broad research themes fit well with each other. The description of the three key topics or themes – mobility, marketisation and marginalisation and how they are intertwined – is clear and shows how different pieces of research can produce an overall stimulating set of research findings.

Issues arise, however, from the 2010 merger into one Programme of anthropology and development studies, two quite different disciplines. The resulting ambiguities might be avoided by framing the anthropological research in terms of 'Anthropology and Development', with the Programme presenting itself as one where anthropologists work on development issues, but this could have the unfortunate effect of anthropology coming to be seen as the mere handmaiden of development studies, losing its capacity to make a distinctive contribution.

Productivity

During the review period, the Programme produced an impressive total of 605 publications (a yearly average of 21.0 per tenured fte), 175 of these were articles published in refereed journals (6.1. per tenured research fte per year). In the publication lists of 2007-2012 the committee counted 7 monographs (0.24 per tenured fte per year).

The Programme produced 23 PhDs, i.e. 0.8 per tenured fte. None of the 10 internal candidates who entered the PhD Programme between 2004 and 2008 completed within four years. After 6 years, 4 candidates (40%) had finished their projects. One student dropped out, while the remaining 5 students are still working on their dissertations. Over the review period, there has been a sharp decline in PhD numbers. The Committee hopes that the Programme can secure sufficient funding to rebuild its PhD Programme.

Societal relevance

The Committee notes that much work addresses important societal concerns, and there are clear efforts to make the output available in a form relevant to policy makers, and wider publics – hardly surprising in a Programme that includes development studies. These are by definition relevant to societal concerns, and there are long-standing relationships with official and private aid organisations. The Programme has also aimed to regularly publish works (in Dutch) aimed at a general public. Over the review period, it produced 181 such publications (6.3 per tenured fte per year, which is very high).

Viability, feasibility and vision for the future

While cherishing the link between anthropology and development studies, members of staff recognise the need to develop a narrower research focus. Yet research continues to be done ‘across the entire range of the Programme’.

Given the fair number of staff who have retired since 2006, it is desirable to consolidate the team by the recruitment of new members, a professor in Development Studies in particular, and to seek additional funding for training postgraduates, who might then contribute to the research Programme.

Maintaining the balance between academic and ‘applied’ research, and between the requirements of scientific productivity and societal relevance is difficult, an issue specifically raised in Radboud’s strategic question. The Committee believes that the scientific integrity with which professional anthropologists approach their work is highly beneficial to applied projects; this more than justifies their involvement with these in the present difficult circumstances. It urges the Faculty to take account of this, in addition to adjusting its expectations based on bibliometric requirements developed with other disciplines in mind, but not adapted to the working patterns of anthropologists.

Conclusion

The Radboud anthropological research Programme has many merits: its research topics are highly relevant to the continuous restructuring of global processes and their consequences. The three research foci, mobility marketisation and marginalisation are well chosen and clearly interlinked and have already produced some interesting findings.

Having anthropology and development studies integrated in the same Programme remains a challenge. They clearly have much to contribute to each other, but the Committee cautions that the relationship can become lop-sided, with anthropology engulfed by development studies.

Like the research in general, PhD projects are spread across the globe. It would be preferable to concentrate this work on a more limited number of topics, and to focus on two or three regions. Given the decline in staff numbers over the evaluation period, it is to the Programme's credit that the level of publications and research activities has been maintained.

5. UNIVERSITY OF AMSTERDAM

A. Institute level

1. The Institute

In 2010, the Faculty of Social and Behavioural Sciences (FMG) of the University of Amsterdam (UvA) brought together all of its social sciences research to form the Amsterdam Institute for Social Science Research (AISSR). It thereby created one of the largest social science research institutes in Europe.

An academic director responsible for research policies and Programmes and an executive director responsible for management and finance lead the Institute. To allow for decentralised decision-making, the Institute organises its research Programme into four disciplinary domains (Anthropology, Sociology, Political Science and Human Geography) and twelve Programme groups, led by Programme directors, which function as relatively autonomous administrative units. All Programme directors sit on the AISSR Programme Council, which meets six times a year to discuss policies and plan academic activities.

Furthermore, AISSR hosts five multidisciplinary centres: *Urban Studies*, *Social Science & Global Health*, *Inequality Studies*, *Migration & Ethnic Studies*, and *Gender & Sexuality*. Two of these, *Urban Studies* and *Global Health*, have been selected as university-wide research priority areas (RPA's) and thereby receive additional funding.

AISSR's mission is to create an academic environment that enables social scientists to conduct research that is cutting-edge and has societal relevance. This mission is accomplished by:

- Supporting and stimulating academic excellence;
- Mentoring and teaching (junior) staff members;
- Enhancing knowledge exchange and dissemination;
- Fostering global connections.

The Committee notes that the organisational complexity of the faculty (four disciplinary domains and five multi-disciplinary centres) must place some stress on its capacity to function effectively. Yet according to faculty administrators their policy of decentralised decision-making allows Programme directors and their staff to play a critical role in shaping their own research and educational affairs. It is said that attention is paid to the importance of synergy between different projects, also in terms of the PhD Programme, which appears to be well supported. It currently hosts around 140 PhD candidates distributed among the four Departments of Anthropology, Sociology, Political Science and Human Geography.

2. Policy on scientific quality and academic reputation

AISSR's strategy to support and stimulate academic excellence entails stimulating staff to publish with prominent academic publishers and in high-impact peer-reviewed journals, encouraging them to prioritise quality over quantity in their publishing strategies, and providing them with the administrative and substantive support necessary to develop high-quality grant proposals. The Committee appreciates this focus on quality, also with respect to the formulation of grant proposals.

It is part of AISSR's human resources policy to fill new research positions through open international competition, to evaluate personal performance partly on the basis of research

output, to facilitate sabbaticals, and to invite researchers with exceptional research output ('top quality researchers') to enter merit tracks, which may involve promotion to the newly created position of Strategic Professor, each in a particular research field. The occupants of these posts are largely exempt from administrative and teaching obligations. During the site visit, Institute representatives explained that these strategic professorships were created to stop talented researchers leaving the Department for professorships elsewhere. In that sense, the new rank was intended to complement the traditional pyramid structure of PhD candidate-postdoc-UD-UHD-Professor, in which very few people make it to the rank of professor.

In terms of academic accomplishments, the self-evaluation refers to the fact that UvA's Social Sciences have been placed highly both in the Times Higher Education rankings and in the QS World University Rankings. Furthermore, AISSR has been very successful in terms of the number of ERC awards received: since its foundation in 2010, the AISSR has been awarded eight ERC Starting/Consolidating Grants and four ERC Advanced Grants. It is also mentioned that AISSR hosts numerous visiting professors and fellows and holds international seminars on a regular basis. The institute is reportedly a leading partner in a large number of international research consortia and takes part in institutionalised international exchange Programmes for researchers and PhD candidates, such as the international exchange Programme with Washington University (WU) of St. Louis and the École des Hautes Études en Sciences Sociales (EHESS) in Paris. Overall, the Committee finds these achievements impressive and the policies of AISSR appropriate.

3. Resources and resource policy

According to the self-evaluation report, AISSR has a finance structure that is characterised by decentralisation and transparency. It provides financial incentives to groups of high scientific productivity and receives core funding from the Faculty of Social and Behavioural Sciences amounting to about €12.2 million yearly, allocated on the basis of past performance in terms of the number of completed PhDs, and Bachelor's and Master's degrees awarded. The funds are distributed to the Programme groups according to the same allocation logic.

Like those of all other faculties, the self-evaluation report notes that core funding for social science research in the Netherlands has suffered drastic cuts over the past decade. The Institute has responded by increasing its efforts to obtain grants from alternative sources. In the three years since the foundation of AISSR in 2010, its researchers have obtained over €45 million in grant funding from multiple sources, including €20 million through competitive funding Programmes of NWO and €13.4 million from the ERC. The influx of NWO, ERC and other research funding has enabled the hiring of new assistant professors, post-docs and PhD candidates.

In addition to intensifying its grant applications, the Institute has aimed to develop partnerships with societal actors. It has, for example, established a research Programme on long-term care within the university wide RPA *Global Health*, to which private foundations and care institutions contribute funding. To be able to benefit from the NWO Gravitation Programme it has developed the new research Programme *CareQuests*. The self-evaluation report regards the substantial portfolio of externally funded projects as a strength and a liability at the same time, in the sense that the Institute strongly depends on external funding to maintain its excellence.

During the period under review, PhD research also became more dependent on external funding. New PhD positions have, for example, been created through applied research projects funded by non-academic partners. The downside of this, mentioned in the self-

evaluation report, is that PhD completion is often delayed as applied tasks take priority over academic output. In 2011 and 2012, several major long-term grants were acquired. Their effects in terms of research capacity, particularly at the PhD and post-doctoral levels, are not yet visible in the data provided. During the site visit, the management mentioned that 24 new PhD candidates are expected for this year, all of them funded externally.

The Committee is impressed with the varied response of AISSR to the problems it has faced due to the hardening of the official position vis-à-vis university finance in the Netherlands. This response appears to be very largely successful in ensuring that the faculty can overall maintain its Programme.

4. Productivity strategy

During the site visit, the institute management mentioned that the combination of anthropology and sociology within one institute had, in the past, led to tensions around the assessment of research output. The Committee was pleased to hear that, after a long struggle, the diversity of publication strategies of different disciplines is now acknowledged by the Faculty Board. Anthropologists are said to have risen to prominence and to be doing well in the rankings, which has heightened their visibility not just within AISSR, but within the Faculty of Social and Behavioural Sciences as a whole. As mentioned before, the Institute expressly wishes to let quality prevail over quantity.

Information on the number of publications and PhD theses produced over the review period, will be provided in the Programme section of the assessment.

5. Policy on societal relevance

Social engagement, in the sense of producing knowledge that addresses contemporary societal debates for multiple audiences, is at the core of AISSR's mission. According to the self-evaluation report most, if not all, of the Institute's research concerns pressing issues such as citizenship and belonging, global health, environmental sustainability, urban complexity, and transnational governance. It is also stated that AISSR research is intended to be 'agenda setting'. The Committee has established that some of its publications indeed inform new policy agendas, as is the case in the Institute's cooperation with the Municipal Council of Amsterdam on the subject of long term care.

During the site visit, Institute representatives admitted that doing socially relevant work is not the same as actually getting your message across to a variety of non-academic publics. The Institute representatives felt that – in that respect – anthropology still has work to do. While most anthropological research is indeed socially relevant, there is no culture of 'branding' it in this way. The Committee appreciates that UvA anthropologists are aware of the need to bridge the gap between academic and public concerns and have developed several initiatives to do so, amongst others the so-called '*frisse blikken sessies*' (fresh perspective sessions). The Institute acknowledges the fact that some researchers are better at outreach activities than others and, for example, offers social media training to researchers who wish to improve their visibility in online debates.

6. Strategy for the future

The self-evaluation report states that, in the coming years, the Institute aims to continue supporting talented researchers' efforts to develop their research profiles, while at the same time generating synergies between on-going research projects. It strives to attract able junior scholars in order to maintain a vibrant and viable research culture of high scientific and social relevance. It intends to extend its collaboration with international partners and to further increase pressure on Dutch and European funding agencies to invest more resources in the social sciences.

The Committee wishes to point out that unresolved questions remain over the complex structure of the Institute, the balance between top-down and bottom-up elements (while research decisions are said to be decentralised, institutional centralisation of decision-making is said to be on the increase), and the strategy to cope with the growing pressure on researchers caused by the general financial atmosphere and heavy teaching duties. Some of these issues are specific to UvA and might be addressed through simplifying and streamlining management, others are the result of wider financial pressures on research funding in the Netherlands.

7. PhD training and supervision

At present, AISSR hosts 142 PhD candidates, half of whom are non-Dutch. The self-evaluation report describes the PhD candidates as 'a vibrant community' of talented young researchers from all over the world. Each PhD candidate is embedded in a Programme group while partaking simultaneously in the broader AISSR PhD community by taking advanced theory courses, methods courses and elective short intensive courses offered by the Graduate School. The self-evaluation report describes the educational Programme that individual PhD candidates follow as 'tailor-made'.

Each PhD candidate has a supervisory team that offers guidance and monitors progress. One of the team members takes on the role of 'daily' supervisor. In the first year of the appointment, the supervisory team and PhD candidate jointly establish an educational plan, which is updated annually. Upon completion of the first nine months of PhD training, the supervisory team takes a Go-No-Go decision based on the candidate's progress.

At the present time regular PhD trajectories run over 4 years. Representatives of the institute told the Committee that it is likely that in the near future a 3-year model will be adopted. This may have severe consequences for completion rates, as has been discussed in the General Remarks, above.

B. Programme level

Programme UvA1: Mobilities, Embodiment and Materiality

Programme director: Prof. Anita Hardon

Research staff 2012: 13.0 tenured fte, 58.7 total fte

Assessments:	Quality:	5
	Productivity:	4
	Relevance:	4
	Viability:	5

Brief description

The Programme sees its mission as engaging in high-quality research embedded in international networks of scholars, in order to develop new theoretical and methodological insights within social and cultural anthropology, and to contribute to emergent interdisciplinary endeavours. The Programme aims to achieve these goals by stimulating research grounded in long-term ethnographic fieldwork. Staff members seek to contribute to debates about pressing contemporary societal issues and experiment with new ways of communicating their research findings to a wider public.

The focus of the research is on how people in diverse places and particular historical trajectories shape - and are shaped by - the tension between local dynamics and global forces. Staff members contribute to three interconnected themes (mobilities, embodiment and materiality), which provide common grounds for debate and the exchange of ideas.

The number of staff fte's has remained roughly the same over the review period, although between 2007 and 2012 fte's for tenured staff and non-tenured staff increased respectively from 10.3 to 13.0, and from 7.3 to 12.9, while the number for PhD candidates declined from 41.0 to 32.8.

Quality

In the opinion of the Committee, this is a world-leading Programme of great strength. The publications submitted for review were of very high quality, some of these setting the international agenda in their specific fields of study, while the overall publication record of the Programme for the review period has considerable depth of quality. The research agendas of the Programme are broad and connect with international agendas in contemporary anthropology. The umbrella themes of mobility, embodiment and materiality focus the work of more junior researchers. More senior researchers draw these approaches together to provide a distinctive research profile for this Programme. Staff have been very successful in attracting international funding, notably from the European Research Council. The international reputation of the Programme is enhanced by the originality and importance of some of the analytical frameworks and concepts generated by Programme researchers and broadly adopted across the international research community. Programme researchers are embedded in strong research networks across the globe. The PhD Programme is also very strong, and although there has been a decline in the number of PhD candidates during the review period, the Programme has seen a dramatic increase in the number of PhD theses submitted.

Productivity

The Committee notes that productivity is very good and improving. The strong commitment to the publication of monographs forms a solid basis for their international reputation. The range and quantity of edited volumes and scholarly articles is also impressive. This work is published in leading international journals and by international publishers.

The overall metrics for publications appears relatively low by comparison with other Programmes, with an average of 10.5 publications per year per tenured fte, 3.3. of which were published in peer reviewed journals. The number of monographs (0.4 per tenured fte per year) and the high quality of these publications, however, imply a robust strategic approach. Publication rates increased over the review period.

The number of completed PhD theses increased from 3 in 2007 to 14 in 2012, with an average of 9.8 per year (0.9 PhDs per year per tenured fte). After 4 years, only one of the 22 PhD candidates who entered the Programme between 2004 and 2008 had graduated (4.5%). After six years another 10 candidates had finished their projects (50% in total). One candidate dropped out. Programme representatives expressed concern over the fact that many PhD students are now funded with awards that require them to meet funder agendas as well as manage their own independent research trajectories.

Societal relevance

The Committee noted that researchers are actively engaged in making their work accessible to a broad range of non-academic audiences both in the Netherlands and internationally, but also that they believe their efforts in this respect need to be intensified. Compared to other Programmes, professional publications and publications for the general public are few (0.4 per *research* fte per year). Even so, this Programme clearly supports the kind of long term ethnographic engagements that tend to embed researchers in spaces of societal relevance and foster engagement with other non-academic agencies active in such spaces. There is also interesting work with alumni aimed at building connections between academic research and broader applications and cooperation with (semi-)professional artists in the field of exhibits and film, which is said to reach a far larger audience than many professional publications would. There is room for further strategic initiatives of this kind.

Viability, feasibility and vision for the future

This is a vibrant research Programme, which has had much success in gaining ERC awards that should strengthen the Programme in the next three to five years with respect to postgraduate numbers, and research outputs. The Programme pays attention to strengthening professional training, and has a valuable strategy for re-directing some funds from successful applications to support projects under development.

Conclusion

This is an excellent research Programme, which has drawn in considerable international research funding, and funding for special chairs. This funding has been strategically deployed to develop the Programme as a whole and to strengthen the PhD Programme. Its current international reputation is likely to be further enhanced over the next five years as these research Programmes come to fruition.

6. UTRECHT UNIVERSITY

A. Institute level

1. The Institute

The Faculty of Social and Behavioural Sciences (FSBS) of Utrecht University (UU) hosts a variety of Programmes. One of these is in Cultural Anthropology; others deal with Sociology, Educational Sciences, Pedagogics, Methodology and Statistics, and Psychology, the last by far the largest of all.

The Faculty's mission is to offer scientific expertise regarding key issues in the domains of the social and behavioural sciences. Its tasks include:

- academic education of students;
- formation of a new generation of researchers;
- formation of scholars who combine scientific knowledge and academic attitudes with professional competences;
- innovative research;
- contribution to finding solutions for societal problems, and other forms of knowledge valorisation.

All anthropological research at the FSBS takes place within a single Programme: Political Conflict, Cultural Trauma, and Social Reconstruction (CTR).

As of 2007, Utrecht University has strengthened its multidisciplinary research agenda by establishing 15 research focus areas across its research Programmes and faculties. The Faculty of Social and Behavioural Sciences' researchers participate in several of these. During the site visit, the Committee was informed that CTR's involvement in the research focus area *Conflicts and Human Rights*, in which anthropologists have worked side by side with scholars from the Faculty of Humanities and the Faculty of Law, Economics and Governance, will shortly come to an end. In 2014 this focus area will be integrated into the new focus area *Cultures, Citizenship, and Human Rights* that has been developed by the Faculty of Humanities.

More recently, as part of its new Strategic Plan, Utrecht University has decided to develop four 'strategic themes', or research priority areas (RPAs), for future research, based on the research focus areas. These are: *Institutions*, *Life Sciences*, *Sustainability*, and *Youth & Identity*. The FSBS is commissioner (*penvoerder*) for *Youth & Identity* and strongly involved in *Institutions*.

There are interesting instances of collaboration between different disciplines and Programmes within the Faculty. One example may be given. When clinical psychologists realised that their usual approaches to traumatised persons were not effective in the case of refugees, anthropologists helped them to focus on the issue of culture, and on the fact that the cultural background of refugees was different from that of their usual clients. As a result 'non-European' trauma came to be distinguished, as a matter of course, from 'European' trauma.

2. Policy on scientific quality and academic reputation

The Faculty is concerned to maintain and present a high international standard of scientific quality. The Committee believes that it has, overall, been successful in this respect and notes that it has been recently listed in the Top 50 Social Sciences universities in the Times Higher Education (THE) World University Rankings. The Faculty aims to publish 'groundbreaking

articles in prominent international scientific journals' and is strongly committed to an interdisciplinary research approach, as is evidenced by its role within the university-wide research focus areas and strategic themes.

3. Resources and resource policy

The self-evaluation report states that the recent introduction of the so-called national 'top sector policy', which has shifted research funds from NWO to the Ministry of Economic Affairs, has been unfavourable. As noted in the General Remarks, above, the nine 'top sectors' fit less than perfectly with the research domains of the social and behavioural sciences. Increasingly, funds need to be procured from other sources such as the EU's new Horizon 2020 Programme. Even so, during the site visit, the Dean assured the Committee that the financial situation of the FSBS is overall sound. The Faculty has benefited from a University policy by which the allocation of first stream funding is influenced by (1) the number of students, (2) the success in gaining second-stream funds and (3) the number of completed PhDs.

Its participation in the university-wide research focus areas and strategic themes has also had a favourable effect on funding. Each focus area received €1 million extra funding for the period 2009-2013 from the university budget, matched by the same amount from participating faculties. In the period 2013-2017, the University will invest €26.5 million of extra funds in its strategic themes, including €5 million for *Youth & Identity* and €6 million for *Institutions*. FSBS itself will also invest considerable extra faculty funds in *Youth & Identity* and *Institutions*. Large proportions of these university and faculty funds are allocated through open calls for project proposals. During the site visit, the Dean explained that the idea behind the research focus areas and strategic themes is to help Programmes and researchers compete for second stream funds at NWO and ERC. Although the research focus areas had variable degrees of success in that respect, the applications of some of them have indeed resulted in ERC grants. According to the Dean, it has always been the Faculty's strategy to build on the intrinsic strength of its researchers and not to impose restrictions on them.

Another strategy that has proven successful is to give junior faculty the opportunity to prepare competitive ERC and Veni applications. The Faculty has reserved funds to give its best graduate students a contract extension of three months, in which they can prepare grant proposals. The Faculty has furthermore hired an experienced grant officer who can coach staff in the application process. The anthropology Department was said to have become more successful, over the review period, in acquiring outside funding.

All in all, the Committee considers that these strategies have been well considered. From the evidence presented they appear to have been quite successful in the current difficult circumstances.

4. Productivity strategy

The Committee was pleased to learn that the Faculty Board is well aware of the different publication cultures in different disciplines within the social sciences. The allocation of funds is therefore not based on H-indices and citation scores. Also, the management recognises the importance of the monograph within the discipline of cultural anthropology, a fact ignored by the current European trend of valuing articles above books. The Committee, therefore, responded positively to the Faculty's productivity strategy.

Information on the number of publications and PhD theses produced over the review period will be provided in the Programme section of the assessment.

5. Policy on societal relevance

The Faculty considers it important that its research be socially relevant, but does not (yet) include this as a criterion for resource allocation. The Faculty's Communication Office seeks to help researchers make a wider impact, beyond academia. A recent development, mentioned during the site visit, was the creation of a small advisory group, consisting of senior scholars who advise all staff on outreach and 'valorisation' initiatives. Workshops on valorisation will also be part of the fair that will be held in the spring of 2014 to commemorate the 50th anniversary of the Faculty.

While these initiatives are positive, the Committee believes that it would be beneficial to place greater emphasis on the issue of societal relevance, by adopting a more systematic and regular assessment of the extent to which research results are communicated to those outside the academic community.

6. Strategy for the future

It is the Committee's clear impression that the Faculty aims to keep abreast of changing circumstances in the academic domain in the Netherlands, and is aware that these circumstances can shift unexpectedly, and to a considerable extent. Formulating the research focus areas was one such 'strategic response'. Internally, cohesion within the Faculty seems good. The policy of creating multidisciplinary research focus areas has aimed at stimulating cooperation between anthropologists and scholars from other disciplines, and this appears to have succeeded. Programme representatives stressed that their role within the Faculty is now more fruitful than it was before. The concerns and interests of anthropologists will continue to be placed by the Dean before the Faculty, as well as in the national college of social sciences Deans. The Committee therefore considers that the Faculty's strategy for the future is well attuned to the present difficult circumstances.

7. PhD training and supervision

Each year, roughly forty PhD candidates start their doctoral research at the Graduate School of Social and Behavioural Sciences. It hosts both regular PhD candidates employed by the Faculty, and external PhD candidates. Regular PhD appointments are for 4 years (1.0 fte), comprised of research (0.7 fte) and instruction (0.3 fte). Most students, however, opt for 0.8 fte appointments for a period of five years (0.56 fte research and 0.24 fte instruction).

PhD candidates follow a teaching Programme, which is adjusted in accord with their research project. The Graduate School of Social and Behavioural Sciences offers seven PhD Programmes, which are usually organised in cooperation with local research institutes or national research networks. One of these is the Cultural Anthropology Programme, which is partly situated in the KNAW-accredited Research School for Resource Studies for Development (CERES). This Programme's PhD students enrol in CERES's four-month Basic Training Course, and, in addition, choose specific methods courses and thematic seminars offered by both CERES and the Graduate School. Students also have bi-weekly tutorials with their thesis supervisor and co-supervisor, and attend and present preliminary research findings at the CTR research seminar, the CERES annual meeting, and at national and international conferences.

FSBS is currently the only Faculty in the Netherlands that, alongside a regular Master's Programme in Cultural Anthropology, runs a two-year Research Master's Programme (*Cultural Anthropology: Sociocultural Transformations, CASTOR*), which allows students to combine classical anthropological training with the opportunity to study more broadly within the social sciences. According to the self-evaluation report, since the start of this research

Master's Programme in 2010, there has been a steady supply of top PhD students. Admission is highly competitive because the maximum enrolment is 20 students per year, as stipulated by the Graduate School. CASTOR graduates have been successful in entering PhD Programmes at UU, at other Dutch universities, and abroad.

B. Programme level

Programme UU1: Political Conflict, Cultural Trauma, and Social Reconstruction

Programme director: Prof. Tony Robben (2007-2008), Prof. Patrick Eisenlohr (2009-2012)

Research staff 2012: 4.12 tenured fte, 9.28 total fte

Assessments:	Quality:	4
	Productivity:	3
	Relevance:	4
	Viability:	5

Brief description

This Programme investigates the dynamics and disruptive consequences of political, ethnic and religious diversity, adjustment, conflict and violence in contemporary societies. Its regional specialisations are Latin America, the Caribbean, Central-Eastern Europe, and the Indian Ocean region. The Programme's anthropological research methodology employs a multi-level approach, and is conducted through ethnographic methods with an analytical concern for the interconnections of different forms of social complexity. Research at the micro, meso and macro level comprises interpersonal relations, local communities, the regional setting, the nation-state, its institutions, and transnational linkages.

The number of research staff members has increased over the review period, from 19 in 2007 to 22 in 2012, both due to an increase of tenured staff members and of PhD students. Even so, their equivalent in fte's has diminished somewhat in recent years. After a peak of 9.88 research fte's in 2010, the number fell back to 9.28 in 2012.

Quality

The Department of Cultural Anthropology at Utrecht University is an internationally visible and widely respected Department. With its core Programme during the review period, Political conflict, cultural trauma, and social reconstruction (CTR), the Department made significant contributions to worldwide debates on these consequential topics. The Department's current transition to a new research Programme, Sovereignty and Social Contestation (SoSCo), should sustain some of the previous distinctive research topics. SoSCo adapts research to a changed global situation with its focus on national sovereignties and emergent competing forms of transnational regimes and sources of alternative value. This is a well-conceived redirection – and one that embraces key contemporary issues. In regional terms, the Utrecht Department is well known for its innovative research in Latin America, the Caribbean, Central-Eastern Europe, and the Indian Ocean region.

Each of the five submitted publications draws upon shared programmatic themes in distinctive and original ways, bringing sophisticated theoretical perspectives together with textured ethnographic data. Four articles appeared in major peer-reviewed international journals. The fifth, 'Media and religious diversity', appeared in *Annual Review of Anthropology*, a high impact publication whose editorial board invites essays from the leading international specialists on particular topics; such peer invitation is in itself a mark of high regard. In general, staff publish widely in English, Spanish and Dutch, thus making an important contribution to the field of anthropology. They are active and visible internationally,

presenting keynote addresses and conference papers, leading workshops, and serving on the editorial boards of major journals and book series.

CTR staff have been successful in obtaining important research grants, despite a decreasing pool of national level funding. The new Programme should be well placed to compete for substantial support from the ERC; achieving such large-scale funding would be invaluable for Utrecht's future trajectory.

Productivity

The Programme produced a total of 403 publications (17.2 per tenured fte per year, which is high). This includes 68 refereed articles (2.9 per tenured fte per year, which is low) and 4 monographs (0.2 per tenured fte per year, also low). While the rather low score for articles is to some extent compensated for by the quality and range of the journals in which they were published, the paucity of monographs is a cause for concern.

The number of PhD completions is also low, with an annual average per tenured fte of only 0.47. Staff are apparently also to a considerable extent involved in supervision of students at other universities, but these PhD completions cannot be formally taken into account because that would potentially involve double counting in the case of co-supervision in other universities considered in this report. The low score for PhD completions is, it appears, at least partly due to the increasing difficulty in securing grant support for doctoral students, with the situation being exacerbated by the refocusing of Dutch national research funding initiatives away from core issues in the social sciences. Nevertheless, while the research master CASTOR provides excellent preparation for students who want to move into doctoral research at Utrecht, numbers enrolled for a doctorate have remained disappointingly small.

As far as the completion rate of doctoral students enrolled between 2004 and 2008 is concerned, of the 10 internal candidates 2 (20%) had graduated after 4 years and 3 (30%) after 6 years, while 1 had given up. A mixed picture.

Societal relevance

The Utrecht Programme has been very successful in terms of media relations and reaching a broader public audience, both in the Netherlands and beyond. Both the past and new research foci are clearly relevant and significant in the contemporary world, and it is clear that the Chair and the School have worked effectively to engage with media, both in the Netherlands and well beyond. Over the review period, the Programme produced a total of 50 professional publications and publications for the general public (2.1 per tenured fte per year), which is admirable. Department members also publish in Dutch, Spanish, and other relevant languages other than English. Anthropology generally, and not solely at Utrecht, is unlikely to have much of a role in economic valorisation, however.

Viability, feasibility and vision for the future

This is an effective, well-organised, and strongly collaborative Programme with a good track record as a centre of internationally recognised scholarship within Anthropology. The previous programme focus helped shape a distinctive and significant set of contributions concerning conflict, trauma, and reconstruction. The new theme, Sovereignty and Social Contestation, should build effectively on the programme's hallmark work while extending its intellectual ambit in generative ways. This is a very promising trajectory and bodes well in terms of the programme's viability and vision. It also struck the committee that the Chair and the Dean have a strong and effective working relationship, one that further inspires confidence in the programme's forward path.

Conclusion

This is a relatively small but overall very accomplished Programme. It has a strong sense of shared focus, with each member bringing his or her specific interests, energy, and expertise to bear on the research in question. The new focus of SoSCo is promising for the Programme's future trajectory, one that should be able to draw on present strengths and develop new ones. The impending new appointments promise to sustain continuity well into the future. Focused efforts will be needed, however, to improve the intake and success rates of doctoral candidates.

7. VU UNIVERSITY AMSTERDAM

A. Institute level

1. The Institute

The Faculty of Social Sciences (FSS) of VU University Amsterdam includes six Programmes, one of which is the research Programme in cultural anthropology: Constructing Human Security in a Globalizing World (CONSEC). Ethnological research also takes place in the research Programme of the Organisation Sciences Department (Organizations & Processes of Organizing in Society, OPOS), which also employs anthropologists.

The research aim of the FSS is ‘to strengthen research in specific domains of the social sciences: e.g. integration and diversity, religion and identity, security and conflict, media communication, societal participation, aging and the welfare state.’

In accordance with university policy, FSS aims to organise its research in an interdisciplinary fashion. Its researchers participate in interfaculty research institutes, such as the Amsterdam Centre for Contemporary European Studies (ACCESS; proposed), the Amsterdam Global Change Institute (AGCI), the Phoolan Devi Institute and the Research institute for the heritage and history of the Cultural Landscape and Urban Environment (CLUE).

The FSS is directed by the Faculty Board, consisting of the Dean, Associate Deans for Education and Research, and the Managing Director. The Programme leaders and Department heads share responsibility for research within FSS. The Board therefore develops its policies in direct interaction with the Department heads. In practice the Board allows the Department heads and Programme leaders considerable managerial independence in the financial and scientific organisation of their research Programmes.

The Committee sees the Institute as comprising a meaningful cluster of disciplines that address important socio-cultural and political-economic dimensions, though it has concerns about the distracting effect of Institute participation in such a wide range of inter-faculty research institutes.

2. Policy on scientific quality and academic reputation

The Faculty describes its own quality policy as based on seeking and rewarding talent. Criteria for professorial appointments, tenure tracks and (temporary) promotions are part of this policy. Individual staff members are expected to publish regularly in high impact outlets, be well cited, acquire grants, and supervise PhD students. Furthermore, a talent programme has been introduced, wherein specific attention is paid to talented female scholars and coaching is offered to staff to obtain personal grants.

In terms of academic accomplishments, the self-evaluation report recalls that senior staff members of the Programmes have acquired national and international grants and awards. Staff members were awarded two Mosaic, two NWO Research Talent, four VENI, two Aspasia, three VIDI, one ERC Starting and two ERC Advanced grants. The Faculty identifies the pool of junior and senior researchers with extensive international networks and the high quality PhD dissertations as one of its strengths. Even so, the wide range of research themes undertaken within the Faculty is recognised as somewhat of a weakness. The self-evaluation report states that, as a consequence, the Graduate School lacks substantive focus for specialised PhD research.

3. Resources and resource policy

Funding details in the self-evaluation report show that tenured and non-tenured staff numbers at the Faculty have increased over the review period, although staff numbers within CONSEC have decreased. In line with the situation elsewhere, the Faculty's research staff and PhD students are increasingly financed via grants and contract research. In 2012, 56% of the Institute's fte's was funded directly, while 23% was funded by research grants and 21% by contract research. Within CONSEC this ratio was somewhat different in 2012: 65% of the Programme's staff was directly funded, while 32% was funded by research grants and just 3% by contract research.

External funding sources included NWO (personal and Programme grants), European funds (FP7, ESF, ERC, Norface) and private companies and charitable organisations (Dutch Railway, Rabobank, VSB Foundation). For the near future, the Faculty pins its hopes on the Horizon 2020 funding scheme and therefore aims at the prerequisite interuniversity collaboration. A high share of research funding is for interdisciplinary research and for projects intended to have direct societal relevance.

During the site visit, the Committee learned that direct research funding is allocated to the Departments on the basis of performance measured in output (acquisition of grants and PhD completion), with spending decisions and those on the (dis-)continuation of research groups being made by the Departments themselves. Part of the bonus for each finished doctorate (as of 2012: €40.000 out of €93.000) is sluiced through to the Departments.

The Faculty claims to have taken various measures to maintain or improve its earning capacity. The high opportunity cost to researchers of organising and leading large grant applications is, however, seen as a negative outcome of the present funding system. Nevertheless, in spite of harsh times, it considers its earning capacity to be stable. The Committee considers these efforts as commendable, and is pleased to note they have been largely successful.

4. Productivity strategy

According to the self-evaluation report, the Faculty accepts a measure of flexibility in respect of publication requirements across Programmes and researchers. Even though peer-reviewed articles became the semi-official benchmark for the Faculty's publication policy during the current review period, edited volumes and monographs are also valued, provided that they are published by internationally acclaimed publishers. From the numbers given in the self-evaluation report it is clear that refereed articles retain an important share (33%) of the Faculty output, as do book chapters (30%).

Staff members are expected to produce at least one internationally published product per year, with monographs counting for two such products. The benchmark for finishing a monograph is set at three years. Even so, the Faculty expects researchers working on monographs also to publish articles: monographs and books are said to delay publication of findings and to be less accessible online. If a staff member fails to comply with the expectation regarding the publication of at least one article per year, the Department in question is sanctioned financially. This involves the withdrawal of €12.000 per fte from the Department's budget for the year in question.

The Committee notes that the expectations around staff publications are explicit and detailed, with financial incentives and penalties attached. While in general it deplores the increasing use of such mechanisms, copied from the world of business, it recognises that these result from

pressures coming from the wider financial climate. The instruments developed by the VU have the merit of being clear and unambiguous, so that researchers (and the Departments that house them) know what is expected. In that sense the Committee finds merit in the arrangements.

Information on the number of publications and PhD theses produced over the review period, will be provided in the Programme section of the assessment.

5. Policy on societal relevance

Relevance to society is an important feature of the Faculty mission ‘to continue being a stimulating environment for committed academics who contribute to scientific and public debates’. From this viewpoint, the Faculty claims to encourage all Programmes to participate in public debates and to enter into partnerships with societal organisations. As a university which was founded in the late 19th century to improve the chances of persons discriminated against in the Netherlands on religious grounds, it has always seen itself as having an ‘emancipatory’ role, with clear visibility to the public. Today, this translates into a strong respect for, and concern with, diversity – currently a significant social issue in the Netherlands. It also finds expression in the make-up of the Faculty itself, which has fifteen sponsored chairs from various types of societal organisations (2012 data). The Committee has no doubt that the Faculty is strongly aware of the importance of being relevant to society, and that its activities are well-attuned to this need.

6. Strategy for the future

The self-evaluation report states that, in the coming years, the Faculty has committed itself to attuning all six Programmes, with their distinctive expertise and networks, to societal developments. At the same time the six Programmes should continue to work closely together and to share data, technology and methodology. Furthermore, the Faculty aspires to consolidate its management and meet the demands of the changing national research agenda. The self-evaluation report states that the Faculty ambitions will more specifically be realised by strengthening the focus on a limited number of research themes and increasing their visibility; by increasing the international orientation in grant writing and the recruitment of students and staff; by improving procedures to ensure ethical quality and integrity of research; and by protecting research time of selected individual staff members. The Committee believes that if these ambitions are indeed realised, identified weaknesses within the institute (e.g. a lack in sufficient focus in research themes and a lack in time for organising grant applications) should be reduced. Even so, it repeats its concern over the over-complex nature of the Faculty’s web of relationships, which are perhaps less easily disentangled than its strategy implies.

7. PhD training and supervision

In 2012, the Faculty staff supervised 230 PhD candidates. These included candidates employed by FSS, scholarship PhDs and external (non-funded) PhD candidates (*buitenpromovendi*).

The self-evaluation report states that the FSS Graduate School stimulates the completion of high quality PhD-projects by offering students a course Programme. PhD students in the Graduate School follow a Programme of 30EC, part of which is obligatory and part of which is tailored to the discipline, prior training and the research project of the PhD student. Graduate School courses are offered by FSS-staff, international fellows, national disciplinary Research Schools or international institutions. Until 2010, PhD candidates were offered a personal budget to be used exclusively for training purposes. From 2011 onwards, FSS introduced a Graduate Student Support Fund to replace this system of personal budgets. PhD students can apply to this support fund for training funds. The Scientific Assessment Board and the Academic Director judge the applications. In 2012, the budget for this support fund was €70.000,-

Progress and completion of PhD trajectories are followed using a monitoring system. Part of this consists of a Training and Guidance Plan elaborating on work appointments, a detailed work plan for the first year, a training Programme and the supervision structure. Furthermore all students have at least one co-supervisor in addition to their own supervisor.

Dissertations can consist of a number of published articles or take the form of a monograph. Both count equally.

B. Programme level

Programme VU: Constructing Human Security in a Globalizing World (CONSEC)

Programme director: Pál Nyíri
Research staff 2011: 4.15 tenured, 13.37 total fte

Assessments:	Quality:	4
	Productivity:	4
	Relevance:	4
	Viability:	4

Brief description

The Programme Constructing Human Security in a Globalizing World (CONSEC) aims to understand ‘the way contemporary globalization produces new forms of insecurity, fear, and precarity as well as new discourses of security and securitization’; and ‘the multiple and contradictory ways in which people around the world respond to [globalization] by seeking physical, existential, and emotional security through social and religious movements, social media, migration, violence, and quests for meaning and equity’. Research is transnational and focuses especially on:

- New forms of religious and ethnic belonging under contemporary globalisation;
- Development, marginalisation and violence generated by global capital and governance interventions.

The Programme is in the midst of generational change. It plans to shift the focus of its research Programme to ‘Mobilities, Belonging, and Belief: Human Perspectives on Global Insecurities’ so as to better reflect the research strengths of its staff and its overall mission.

The number of research staff has decreased over the review period, from 35 (17.0 fte) in 2007 to 30 (13.4 fte) in 2012, mostly due to a decline in PhD candidates (from 12.0 fte in 2007 to 8.3 fte in 2012).

Quality

Though currently in the midst of change and renewal, this Department has designed and sustained a very good programme of research and publication. It has a strong international reputation in the anthropology of globalisation; consistent high-impact publications; and a strong engagement with national and international organisations. Programme staff members impressed the Committee in general, and specifically with respect to their response to the challenges posed by shifts in the availability of funding and by the broader institutional context at VU.

Research on the ways contemporary globalisation produces unforeseen instabilities and risks to human well being has yielded significant understandings, notably concerning social and religious movements, migration, violence, and ethnicity. The quality of these research endeavours rests on the strengths of the VU staff in ethnographic and comparative methods, including long-term fieldwork, and on publishing their findings in book-length monographs.

The earning capacity has remained strong, despite the increasing competition for national funding, and the priority given to applied research targeting the ‘top sectors’ of the Dutch economy.

Productivity

Their productivity strategy rests on promoting shifting thematic research clusters to address different aspects of globalisation and human security, and this has yielded good results. Publication strategies are diverse, reflecting individual and cluster-based preferences and opportunities; staff are encouraged to publish in first-tier, peer-reviewed English language journals and university presses.

Between 2007 and 2012, the Programme produced 432 publications (14.4 per tenured fte per year), 115 of which were published in refereed journals (a yearly average of 3.8 per tenured fte). The Committee counted a total of 9 monographs (0.3 per tenured fte per year). Overall publication productivity climbed steadily through 2011, only to be stalled by the departure of four senior faculty. The Committee assumes that once staffing is restored to pre-2011 levels productivity will resume its climb.

The Programme turned out 24 theses during the review period (0.8 per tenured fte per year). A further 42 doctoral projects are in progress. Completion time is long: not surprising in light of the need for fieldwork and language training. Of the 17 internal PhD candidates who entered the Programme between 2004 and 2008, none had graduated after four years. After six years just 3 candidates (18%) had finished, while 1 had dropped out. The Programme anticipates increased PhD productivity with the growth of joint supervision with foreign universities, and improved prospects for PhD students supported by funds from Turkey, Brazil, and China.

Societal relevance

The Programme engages well with stakeholder professions and organisations. Individually and collectively, staff members lend their expertise to national ministries and international organisations. In doing so, they have cultivated a strong national reputation for defining and debating issues of societal relevance. An emphasis on outreach in the national sphere, and on collaborative research and consultancies in the international sphere, best describes their energies and direction. The Programme’s blog, *Standplaats Wereld*, is the most active anthropology blog in Dutch.

Viability, feasibility and vision for the future

The foundations of this Programme are very strong; so too is its strategic leadership. It is exploring promising cooperative endeavours for a Research Master’s programme with the anthropology Programmes at Leiden and UvA, and with the Programme in critical law at VU. Its extensive international work, as well as its theoretical and methodical orientations, position the programme extremely well not only to answer pressing social questions and problems, but also to question answers and solutions or to reframe problems in the light of empirical findings. Nonetheless, the Committee has some concern about its viability at this time of transition. The recruitment of replacements for staff that have recently left, and especially of a senior scholar to fill the vacant chair, will be crucial to its performance, reputation and viability. Although the Programme is committed to this recruitment, with a search planned to commence in the late Spring of 2014, it isn’t clear that the Faculty fully supports the initiative. Though senior personnel changes are apparently imminent in the Faculty, remarks in both sets of interviews with VU representatives suggest that the Faculty leadership could do more to support this work and to foster a meaningful engagement between the anthropologists and

the wider Faculty. At present, the Faculty leadership seems to see the former as overly self-absorbed, a characterisation that did not resonate at all with the evidence presented to the Committee. While the Committee believes that the current situation could well affect the longer-term viability of the Programme, it also recognizes that this could rapidly change if properly addressed, notably by the Faculty. Moreover, viability would certainly be improved if the envisaged Research Master's Programme were to go forward, which the Committee strongly supports.

With the viability of the research Programme in mind, the Committee urges both the FSS leadership and the Programme to find common ground from which to proceed, rather than engaging in persistent rehearsal of the shortcomings attributed to this side or that.

Conclusion

The Committee takes an extremely favourable view of this strong and promising research Programme currently on the cusp of renewal. Its quality, productivity, and relevance are exceptionally good. Its leadership is prepared to meet the funding and research challenges common to all anthropology Programmes in the Netherlands. But the Committee notes that the Programme and Faculty leadership more than occasionally speak past one another and, for the sake of this excellent Programme, exhorts them urgently to find common ground from which to proceed and thus removing the obstacles to achieving a better and more satisfying partnership.

Appendices

Appendix A: Explanation of the SEP criteria and scores

The four main criteria for assessment are: Quality, Productivity, Relevance, and Vitality & Feasibility. The assessment at the institute level primarily focuses on strategy and organisation, whereas the assessment at the level of the research group or programme primarily focuses on the performance and activities of researchers and the results of their work (output and outcome).

Quality	<p>The level or degree of excellence of the research, compared to accepted (international) standards in that field.</p> <p>The scope of the term ‘research’ is not limited to the research results. Research management, research policy, research facilities, PhD training and the societal relevance of research are considered integral parts of the quality of work in an institute and its programmes.</p>
Productivity	The relationship between input and output, judged in relation to the mission and resources of the institute.
Relevance	<p>Social, economic and cultural relevance. Aspects to be considered are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Social quality</i>: efforts of the institute or group to interact in a productive way with stakeholders in society • <i>Social impact</i>: how research affects specific stakeholders or procedures in society • <i>Valorisation</i>: activities aimed at making research results available and suitable for application in product, processes and services. <p>Committee members can also remark on the relevance for the academic community, but the assessment should be on societal relevance.</p>
Vitality & Feasibility	The ability to react adequately to important changes in the environment. Also vision for the future.

The scores on a five-point scale are:

5 Excellent	<p>Research is world leading.</p> <p>Researchers are working at the forefront of their field internationally and their research has an important and substantial impact in the field.</p>
4 Very Good	<p>Research is considered nationally leading.</p> <p>Research is internationally competitive and makes a significant contribution to the field.</p>
3 Good	<p>Research is considered internationally visible.</p> <p>Work is competitive at the national level and makes a valuable contribution in the international field.</p>
2 Satisfactory	<p>Research is nationally visible.</p> <p>Work adds to our understanding and is solid, but not exciting.</p>
1 Unsatisfactory	<p>Work is neither solid nor exciting, flawed in the scientific and/or technical approach, repetitions of other work, etc.</p>

Appendix B: Programme for the site visit

September	17		Hotel MaryK, Utrecht	
16.00	19.30		Introduction / Preparatory committee meeting	
20.00			working dinner	

September	18		Kernkampkamer, Academiegebouw, Utrecht	
8.30	11.00		Introduction / Preparatory committee meeting	
11.15	12.15	RUN	Institute management RUN	Prof. Peer Scheepers (Director of Research) Prof. Paul Hoebink (Institute Chair) Prof. Toon van Meijl (Head of Department)
12.15	13.30		PhD lunch with LEI/RUN	LEI: Marlous van den Akker, Lusvita Nuzuliyanti, Christoph Rippe RU: Rahil Roodsaz, Xuefei Shi, Michiel Swinkels
13.30	14.30		Programme RUN	Prof. Henk Driessen Prof. Paul Hoebink Prof. Willy Jansen Dr. Luuk van Kempen Prof. Toon van Meijl (Head of Department) Prof. Ruerd Ruben
14.45	15.45	LEI	Institute management LEI	Prof. Gerard Persoon (Scientific Director/Institute Chair) Prof. Patricia Spyer (Director of Research) Dr. Bart Barendregt (Director of Education) Dr. Sabine Luning (Director of Graduate Studies) Ms. Renske Kok (Institute controller)
16.00	17.00		Programme LEI	Prof. Peter Pels Prof. Gerard Persoon Prof. Patricia Spyer Dr. Erik Baehre Dr. Marianne Maeckelbergh Dr. Tessa Minter
17.00	18.00		committee meeting	
18.30			working dinner	

September	19		Kernkampkamer, Academiegebouw, Utrecht	
9.00	10.00	UU	Institute management UU	Prof. Werner Raub (Dean) Prof. Tony Robben (Chairman Dept. of Cultural Anthropology)
10.00	11.00		Programme UU	Prof. Patrick Eisenlohr (Director of Research 2009-2012) Dr. Martijn Oosterbaan (Assistant Professor) Prof. Wil Pansters (Director of Research 2012-present) Dr. Yvon van der Pijl (Assistant Professor) Prof. Tony Robben (Director of Research 2007-08)
11.15	12.15	VU	Institute management VU	Prof. Anton Hemerijck (Dean) Prof. Theo van Tilburg (Vice-Dean)
12.15	13.30		PhD lunch UU/VU/UvA	VU: Erik van Ommering en Daan Beekers UvA: Anneke Beerkens en Anna Mann UU: Dr. Katrien Klep and Nikki Wiegink
13.30	14.30		Programme VU	Prof. Thijl Sunier (Head of Department) Prof. Mattijs van de Port Prof. Pal Nyiri (Research Manager) Dr. Marjo de Theije (Associate Professor) Dr. Freek Colombijn (Associate Professor) Dr. Marina de Regt (Assistant Professor)
14.45	15.45	UvA	Institute management UvA	Prof.dr. Anita Hardon (Academic Director AISSR/UvA) Drs. José Komen (Executive Director AISSR/UvA)
15.45	16.45		Programme UvA	Prof. Ria Reis Prof. Annelies Moors Prof. Willem van Schendel Prof. Mario Rutten Dr. Amade M'charek Prof. Mattijs van de Port
17.00	18.00		committee meeting	
18.30			working dinner	

September	20		Hotel MaryK, Utrecht	
9.00	13.00		committee meeting	
13.00	14.00		lunch	
14.00			end of site visit	

Appendix C: Short Curriculum Vitae of the committee members

Emanuel de Kadt was educated in the Netherlands, the UK, and the US. He taught sociology at the London School of Economics from 1961-1969, then worked for some 27 years at the Institute of Development Studies at the University of Sussex, including as its Academic Director. His interests centred on social policy and on social policy management (especially institutional issues). He is now Emeritus Professor at Utrecht University in the Department of Cultural Anthropology and is (again) working on issues related to religion and society. From 1994 to 1996 he chaired the Dutch Government's Advisory Council for Scientific Research in Development Problems (RAWOO), and between 1997 and 2003 he was a member of the Dutch government's Advisory Council on International Affairs (AIV). His latest book, *Assertive Religion*, was published in April 2013.

Donald Brenneis is Professor of Anthropology at the University of California, Santa Cruz, and works at the intersections of language and other kinds of communicative practice with social, political, and intellectual life. His initial research was in a diasporic South Asian community in Fiji and focused both on the complex relationships between language and conflict and on the transformation of local cultural life from its north Indian antecedents. In recent years he has pursued related questions in quite different settings, focusing on the ethnography of research funding panels and the underlying structure, uses, and consequences of citation analysis and other bibliometric indicators. He edited *American Ethnologist* from 1989-1994, was President-Elect and then President of the American Anthropological Association (1999-2003), and served on the editorial committee of the University of California Press from 2005-2010 (including two years as co-chair). He is currently Co-Editor of the *Annual Review of Anthropology* and has been a Fellow at the Center for Advanced Study in the Behavioral Sciences (Stanford), a Visiting Scholar at the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, *Professeur Invité* at *Ecole des Hautes Etudes en Sciences Sociales*, and Fellow at Lichtenberg-Kolleg, University of Goettingen.

Kenneth George joined the ANU College of Asia and the Pacific in 2013 as Professor of Anthropology and Director of the School of Culture, History and Language, having served previously at the University of Wisconsin-Madison, Harvard University and the University of Oregon. He is a specialist on Southeast Asia and a Past Editor of the *Journal of Asian Studies* (2005-2008). His ethnographic research in Indonesia has focused on the cultural politics of minority ancestral religions (1982-1992), and more recently (1994-2008), on a long-term collaboration with painter A. D. Pirous, exploring the aesthetic, ethical, and political ambitions shaping Islamic art and art publics in that country. Ken has been the recipient of major postdoctoral fieldwork fellowships from the Social Science Research Council, the Wenner-Gren Foundation for Anthropological Research, and the Aga Khan Trust for Culture. His fellowships for writing and study include awards from the National Endowment of the Humanities, the John Simon Guggenheim Foundation, and the Institute for Advanced Study, Princeton.

Ulf Hannerz is Professor Emeritus of Social Anthropology, Stockholm University, Sweden, and a member of the Royal Swedish Academy of Sciences, the American Academy of Arts and Sciences, and the Österreichische Akademie der Wissenschaften. A former Chair of the European Association of Social Anthropologists, and a former member of the Committee on World Anthropologies of the American Anthropological Association, he has also taught at several American, European, Asian and Australian universities. He has carried out field studies in West Africa, the Caribbean, and the United States, as well as a multi-site study of the work of news media foreign correspondents. Among his books in English are *Soulside*

(1969), *Exploring the City* (1980), *Cultural Complexity* (1992), *Transnational Connections* (1996), *Foreign News* (2004) and *Anthropology's World* (2010). Several of them have also appeared in French, Spanish, Italian and Polish.

Penelope Harvey Penelope Harvey is Professor of Social Anthropology at the University of Manchester, Director of the ESRC funded Centre for Research on Socio-Cultural Change (CRESC), and Professor II in Social Anthropology at the University of Oslo. She has carried out ethnographic research in Peru and in Europe (Spain and the UK) on knowledge practices, technology and statecraft. She has published widely on engineering expertise, infrastructures and social transformation, information and communications technologies, the social life of digital data, and the politics of language. Books include *Hybrids of Modernity: Anthropology, The Nation State and the Universal Exhibition* (1996); *Researching Language: issues of power and method* (1992, co-authored with Cameron, Frazer, Rampton and Richardson); *Anthropology and Science: Epistemologies in Practice* (2007, co-edited with Edwards and Wade); *Technologized Images, Technologized Bodies* (2010, co-edited with Edwards and Wade); *Objects and Materials: A Routledge Companion* (2013, co-edited with Casella, Evans, Knox, McLean, Silva, Thoburn, Woodward); and a forthcoming research monograph (with Hannah Knox): *Roads. A Material Anthropology of Political Life in Peru* (2014). Harvey is currently writing a book with colleague Deborah Poole entitled *Experimental States: decentralization and regional government in Peru*.

Norman Long is Professor Emeritus in the Sociology of Development at the University of Wageningen in the Netherlands, Adjunct Professor of Sociology of Development at China Agricultural University, Beijing, and Honorary Professorial Fellow of the White Rose East Asia Centre at the University of Leeds. He has carried out detailed ethnographic research in Central Africa and Latin America (Peru and Mexico) and over the past ten years has contributed to the training of postgraduates and the design of rural development research in China. Long is best known for development of an actor-oriented, interface analysis for understanding processes of development policy intervention and the dynamics of change 'from below'. His book publications include *Social Change and the Individual* (1968), *An Introduction to the Sociology of Rural Development* (1977), *Peasant Cooperation and Capitalist Expansion in Central Peru* (1977), *Miners, Peasants and Entrepreneurs* (1984), *Encounters at the Interface* (1989), *Battlefields of Knowledge* (1992), *Development Sociolog.* (2001), *Rural Transformations and Development: China in Context* (2007).

Appendix D: Citation-analysis by Ad Prins

Introductory briefing

Following the Standard Evaluation Protocol (SEP), this bibliometric analysis provides a quantitative international comparison for the forthcoming evaluation of research programs in anthropology. The results are intended to inform both program leaders and the evaluating committee. The analysis has two approaches. One is a classification of publications according to the CERES EADI research valuation system, the other is a citation analysis of a set of the publications for each of the programs in anthropology.

The classification of publications according to the CERES EADI Research Valuation system

The publications of each program have been classified according to the CERES EADI valuation system. This system has been developed for the research school CERES and has been adopted by EADI. The system classifies journals and publishers on a five point scale, from A to E, and has been updated for the purpose of this analysis. Not all publications can be classified in this system, as titles and publishers are even more diverse than the extensive lists of 5296 journal titles and 914 publishers. Addendum I provides an overview of the criteria and details of the coverage of the system.

The citation analysis of publications in anthropology

In brief, the citation analysis seeks to answer the question “How does the recognition of Dutch anthropologists compare to the recognition of their international colleagues? “ Although certainly not measuring “quality” of research in terms of academic standards, citation analysis provides quantitative indications of the degree of recognition among academic scholars. This analysis seeks to establish whether or not each program achieves an above average degree of recognition (impact) for a number of selected publications.

Databases commonly used for citation analysis, such as Web of Science (WoS) and Scopus cover fields like anthropology in a rather limited way, using only information from selected journals. However, anthropology is very diverse in its forms of publications. A citation analysis might provide useful additional information for the evaluation of research once based on data sources that include a much larger and more diverse body of literature. Google Scholar includes such sources and has therefore been chosen as a more suitable data source.

The diversity in anthropology is also notable among the programs, of which some have interdisciplinary ties with medicine, psychiatry or economics. Disciplinary differences among programs are manifest also in publication and citation culture. The outputs of programs result in a wide range of journals and publication formats (including also scientific reports, books and chapters in volumes). Moreover, the programs differ also in size. The design of the analysis addresses the issues of size of the field, of the academic and (inter)disciplinary diversity of the programs and of their different sizes.

Citing academic work in the social sciences may involve an extensive time frame. Therefore, the analysis includes publications that have appeared since 2004, even though the evaluation period is 2007-2012. The tables allow a year by year comparison.

The disciplinary diversity among programs is addressed by comparing citations of publications with data of the domain that is typical for each of the programs. Although data for such domains are only available for journals it is assumed that titles of journals that appear

more often in the list of cited publications (the title appears twice or more) offer an approximation of the domain. The lists of journals typical for a program range from 5 in smaller programs to 17 for larger or more diverse ones¹ The degree of fit of the approximation of the domain is indicated by the percentage of journals among the total of cited publications, which ranges from 41,8% to 63,5%.

In two smaller programs, Utrecht and Nijmegen, the chosen approach to address disciplinary diversity has led to a separate analysis of the majority of the publications from those of two very productive researchers working in specific domains of their own. In Utrecht one of the researchers works in an interdisciplinary area of psychiatry, epidemiology and anthropology. The other researcher, of Nijmegen, works in an interdisciplinary area of development studies and economy. Separating the data for these researchers from their respective programs was necessary, since both the impact of their publications and the journals typical for these researchers lead to a biased representation of the programs. Further details are found in the specific sections for Utrecht and Nijmegen.

The data for the journals have been derived from Google Scholar with Publish or Perish (PoP)², and consist of averages of citations per published paper for each journal. As Google Scholar accumulates the citations of a publication since the year of its publication, the averages are computed per year of publication. Averages for each journal in year X are averaged again to obtain the average of the domain of the program in year X.

The selection of publications included for the analysis is based on an initial citation analysis (without data correction) based on Google Scholar (using PoP). For each program and for each year X, the most frequently cited publications were selected. However, the basis for selection depends on the size of the program. The number of highly visible publications to choose from might be limited in the smaller programs. The selection of publications is therefore related to the size of the programs. Smaller programs include five (Utrecht) or six publication per year, the larger program of UvA ten publications per year.³

The final retrieval of citations for the selected publications presented here are based on detailed information of the citing data derived directly from Google Scholar. Data retrieval was between April 26 and May 10, 2013. After retrieval data correction has taken place. Self-citations and untraceable information are excluded from the citing data. Further details about citation analysis are in addendum II.

In order to support the self-evaluation of programs, program leaders have received detailed information about the selected publications. They also have provided valuable feedback about these publications and the lists of domain journals which was gratefully received.

¹ For interdisciplinary programs or programs relating to larger fields such as medicine, economics or psychology, journals have been included that, because of addressing these larger fields, also have higher degrees of impact. Interdisciplinary programs with larger sizes are thus counterbalanced by higher standards for their domain.

² Harzing, A, Publish or Perish, www.harzing.com

³ For an extensive description of definitions, methods and quality of data, See Addendum I.

General conclusions

The results of the citation analysis are for each program represented in two tables and a graph. One table compares the program with its domain and the other specifies the journals that are used to construct the domain. Two general conclusions can be drawn:

1. For each program, the test is whether the selected publications are to be ranked as above, similar to or below the average of its specific domain. The results of this analysis show that each program receives an above average recognition for its selected publications.⁴
2. The domains of the programs are very diverse. Only four journals out of 53 are common among two or more programs. Consequently, the citation results for programs are to be compared with their domain, rather than by a direct comparison.

Legend

CERES EADI output valuation

The publications of the programs have been classified on a five point scale from A to E according to the journal in which is published or the publisher of the book or volume.

Average citations of programs

The degree of recognition of the selected publications (impact) of programs is computed as (1) the average of citations of the publications published in year X (2004 or later), and (2, in italics) as the overall average of all years.

Impact of domains

The impact of a domain is (1) the average in year X of impacts of all journals in the domain typical for the program, and (2, in italics) the average for all years of all averaged journal impacts in that domain.

Graphs: Boxplots

As averages in the tables may suggest a level of exactness that defies the variations in the underlying data (both for programs and for the journal data), graphs represent the distribution of these data with boxplots. The boxplots show whether the computed average for the program is the result of a single or few publications, or rather the result of more publications. As all graphs show, at least half or very frequently also more of the selected publications are above the benchmark for the domain.

The graphs represent the minimum (bottom thin line), lower quartile⁵ (bottom of the box), median (thick horizontal line somewhere in the middle of the box), upper quartile (upper limit of box), and maximum of the data (upper thin line). The horizontal line represents the median, with its value in the label. Statistically extreme values are indicated by an 0. The Y-axes of the graphs (Citations) represent numbers of citations, on a logarithmic scale. The maximum of the scale may vary according to the findings per program from 100 for most programs and 1000 for UvA.

⁴ Because of the skewness in the data, the values for program and domain are best not interpreted on scale level. Rather, the statistics represent data on an ordinal level, indicating a ranking of selected publications against the domain.

⁵ The lower quartile represents the value which splits 25% of the publications or journals with the lower averages for citations, the median or second quartile represents the value at which these data are split in equal parts, and the upper quartile represents the value at which 25% of the data with upper values are split.

Results

Leiden

Table 1. Leiden Ceres Output Valuation

	A		B		C		D		E		Total	%
Book Chapter	7	8,0%	22	25,0%	35	39,8%	17	19,3%	7	8,0%	88	100%
Journal Article	16	22,5%	13	18,3%	22	31,0%	18	25,4%	2	2,8%	71	100%
Edited Volume	1	4,8%	2	9,5%	12	57,1%	5	23,8%	1	4,8%	21	100%
Book Review	2	25,0%	1	12,5%	4	50,0%		0,0%	1	12,5%	8	100%
Monography	1	33,3%			2	66,7%					3	100%
Dissertations		0,0%		0,0%		0,0%	34	100%		0,0%	34	100%
Proceedings							1	100%			1	100%
Publications for Professionals and General Public							3	18,8%	13	81,3%	16	100%
Grand Total	27	11,2%	38	15,7%	75	31,0%	78	32,2%	24	9,9%	242	100%

The total output of Leiden is 315 publications, of which 73 are not classified because of missing data in the CERES list

Table 2. Average Leiden citations compared with its domain: average impact of journals typical for Leiden


	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	Overall average
Average Leiden citation counts	16,17	37,33	27,50	21,71	12,17	7,20	2,89	4,00	1,63	13,51
Averages of Leiden domain	8,14	6,80	5,78	4,80	3,96	3,07	1,85	1,06	0,35	3,98

Table 3. Domain of Leiden: Benchmark journals typical for Leiden

	Av of Average citations per publication, 2004-2012
Africa	1,52
African Studies	2,80
Anthropology Today	3,61
European Education	3,45
History in Africa	1,58
International Journal of Urban and Regional Research	15,81
International Review of Social History	1,36
Social Anthropology	1,69
Overall Average	3,98

Degree of fit: 41.8% of the cited publications of Leiden are in journals

Figure 1. Boxplot of citations, comparing Leiden with journals typical for Leiden



Nijmegen

Table 4. Nijmegen Ceres Output Valuation

	A		B		C		D		E		Total	%
Journal Article	19	12,9%	40	27,2%	34	23,1%	32	21,8%	22	15,0%	147	100%
Chapter	11	8,5%	40	30,8%	44	33,9%	18	13,9%	17	13,1%	130	100%
Bookreview	8	38,1%	6	28,6%	4	19,1%	1	4,8%	2	9,5%	21	100%
Edited Volume			7	35,0%	7	35,0%	3	15,0%	3	15,0%	20	100%
Book, Monograph							4	100%			4	100%
Report							1	100%			1	100%
Grand Total	38	11,8%	93	28,8%	89	27,6%	59	18,3%	44	13,6%	323	100%

The total output of Nijmegen is 424 publications of which 101 were not classified due to missing data in the CERES list

Table 5. Average Nijmegen citations compared with its domain: average impact of journals typical for Nijmegen


	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	Overall average
Average of Nijmegen Citation counts	13,67	22,50	19,00	13,67	11,33	8,75	10,33	11,20	10,83	12,44
Average of Nijmegen domain	12,27	9,40	6,36	6,53	5,04	6,59	7,28	4,01	2,02	6,38

Table 6. Domain of Nijmegen: Benchmark journals typical for Nijmegen

	Av of Average citations per publication, 2004-2012
Asian Journal of Social Science	1,66
International Journal of Cultural Property	2,24
Journal of Peasant Studies	10,50
Journal of the Polynesian Society	1,28
Third World Quarterly	15,31
Overall Average	6,38

Degree of fit: 62,5% of the cited publications of Nijmegen appear in journals

Figure 2. Boxplot of citations, comparing Nijmegen with journals typical for Nijmegen



Publications of one researcher have been singled out from the tables above for reasons specified in the introduction. The researcher works in an interdisciplinary area of developmental studies and economy. In the period between 2004 and 2012, 16 of the most frequently cited publications of this researcher (two for each year) received 321 citations, which is an average impact of 20,1, whereas the average impact of frequent journals typical for this researcher was 15,8.

Utrecht

Table 7. Utrecht Ceres Output Validation

	A		B		C		D		E	Total	%	
Book chapters	20	26,3%	35	46,1%	11	14,5%	10	13,2%		76	100%	
Refereed articles	18	28,6%	12	19,1%	26	41,3%	7	11,1%		63	100%	
Phd theses - external							13	100,0%		13	100%	
Edited volume	3	27,3%	3	27,3%	4	36,4%	1	9,1%		11	100%	
Phd theses - internal							11	100%		11	100%	
Journal Non refereed					5	71,4%	2	28,6%		7	100%	
Professional publications					1	14,3%	5	71,4%	1	14,3%	7	100%
Journal (edited issue)					2	33,3%	4	66,7%		6	100%	
Key edited books	2	40,0%	1	20,0%	2	40,0%				5	100%	
Key publications	2	40,0%			3	60,0%				5	100%	
Monografie			1	20,0%	3	60,0%	1	20,0%		5	100%	
Grand Total	45	21,4%	52	24,8%	57	27,1%	55	26,2%	1	0,5%	209	100%

The total output of Utrecht is 271 publications, of which 62 were not classified because of missing data in the CERES list

Table 8. Average Utrecht citations compared with its domain: average impact of journals typical for Utrecht

	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	Overall average
Average of Utrecht Citation count	34,00	45,80	20,00	18,80	8,67	10,50	4,60	3,00	n.a. ¹⁾	18,17
Average of Utrecht Domain	10,03	9,22	5,81	6,68	7,09	3,36	2,04	1,12	0,54	5,14


Two of the five selected publications were found to be cited in 2012, with 47 and 3 citations respectively. The computation of an average is in such a case meaningless. The effect for the all year average would be that it would rise from 18,17 to 18,44 citations per publication.

Table 9. Domain of Utrecht: Benchmark journals typical for Utrecht

	Average of citations per paper, 2004-2012
American Ethnologist	9,77
Anthropological Theory	8,35
Foro Internacional	0,92
Journal of Linguistic Anthropology	5,49
Social Anthropology	1,69
Overall average	5,14

Degree of fit: 60% of the cited publications of Utrecht are in journals

Figure 3. Boxplot of citations, comparing Utrecht with journals typical for Utrecht



Publications of one researcher have been singled out from the tables above for reasons specified in the introduction. In the period between 2004 and 2012, 16 of the most frequently cited publications of this researcher (two for each year) received 627 citations, which is an average impact of 39,2, whereas the average impact of frequent journals typical for this researcher was 17,9.

UvA

Table 10. UvA Ceres Output Valuation

	A		B		C		D		E		Total	%
Refereed articles	59	30,0%	55	27,9%	50	25,4%	30	15,2%	3	1,5%	197	100%
Book Chapters (Academic refereed + non-refereed)	24	13,8%	41	23,6%	65	37,4%	37	21,3%	7	4,0%	174	100%
Book Reviews	14	25,9%	12	22,2%	8	14,8%	11	20,4%	9	16,7%	54	100%
Professional Publications	1	2,0%	1	2,0%	4	8,0%	9	18,0%	35	70,0%	50	100%
Edited volumes	3	10,3%	9	31,0%	11	37,9%	4	13,8%	2	6,9%	29	100%
Books, Monographs	6	22,2%	4	14,8%	12	44,4%	4	14,8%	1	3,7%	27	100%
Editorships Special Journal Issues			4	20,0%	8	40,0%	8	40,0%		0,0%	20	100%
Non-refereed articles			2	14,3%	3	21,4%	6	42,9%	3	21,4%	14	100%
Grand Total	107	18,9%	128	22,7%	161	28,5%	109	19,3%	60	10,6%	565	100%

The total output of UvA is 875 publications of which 310 were not classified because of missing data in the CERES list

Table 11. Average UvA citations compared with its domain: average impact of journals typical for UvA


	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	Overall average
Average UvA Citation counts	68,40	57,64	71,70	39,40	83,70	35,91	38,30	13,30	4,30	45,85
Averages of UvA domain	17,86	18,17	14,38	12,18	10,86	7,18	4,60	2,87	0,74	10,03

Table 12. Domain of UvA: Benchmark journals typical for UvA

	Average citations per paper, 2004-2012
African Studies Review	2,48
AIDS Care	16,14
American Ethnologist	9,77
Anthropological Theory	8,35
Anthropology & Medicine	8,73
BMC Health Services Research	10,65
BMC Public Health	13,65
Critique of Anthropology	5,39
Culture, Health & Sexuality	13,74
Ethnos	6,24
European Journal of Public Health	10,32
International Labor and Working-Class History	1,61
Journal of Ethnobiology and Ethnomedicine	17,26
Journal of the Royal Anthropological Institute	5,27
Malaria Journal	11,40
Social Anthropology	1,69
Social Science & Medicine	25,36
Overall average	10,03

Degree of fit: 63,5% of the cited publications of UvA are in journals

Figure 4. Boxplot of citations, comparing UvA with journals typical for UvA



VU

Table 13. VU Ceres output valuation

	A		B		C		D		E		Total	%
Book Chapter	8	6,5%	44	35,5%	48	38,7%	15	12,1%	9	7,3%	124	100%
Journal Article	15	13,2%	19	16,7%	51	44,7%	16	14,0%	13	11,4%	114	100%
Book review	13	25,5%	14	27,5%	9	17,7%	12	23,5%	3	5,9%	51	100%
Publications for professionals and general public	1	4,2%		0,0%		0,0%	15	62,5%	8	33,3%	24	100%
Edited Volume	1	5,0%	7	35,0%	11	55,0%	1	5,0%			20	100%
Book, Monograph	2	22,2%		0,0%	4	44,4%	3	33,3%			9	100%
Inaugural Address					6	100%					6	100%
Report			1	20,0%	4	80,0%					5	100%
Grand Total	40	11,3%	85	24,1%	133	37,7%	62	17,6%	33	9,4%	353	100%

The total number of publications of VU is 454, of which 101 are not classified because of missing data in the CERES list.

Table 14. Average VU citations compared with its domain: average impact of journals typical for VU


	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	Grand Total
Average of VU citation counts	50,00	45,50	50,14	7,89	25,33	18,20	16,43	4,57	1,00	23,20
Average for VU domain	12,43	9,69	7,64	5,89	6,97	3,64	2,56	1,22	0,71	5,57

Table 15 Domain of VU: Benchmark journals typical for VU

	Average of citations per paper, 2004-2012
Africa	1,52
African Affairs	7,99
American Ethnologist	9,77
Comparative Studies In Society and History	3,55
Development and Change	15,51
Focaal	2,42
Journal of Contemporary African Studies	6,75
Journal of Eastern African Studies	4,78
Journal of Muslim Minority Affairs	2,81
Journal of Southeast Asian Studies	2,01
Journal of Vietnamese Studies	1,66
Social Anthropology	1,69
The China Quarterly	4,45
The Journal of Modern African Studies	5,88
Urban Geography	5,96
Urban Studies	11,79
Overall average	5,57

Degree of fit: 54,1% of the cited publications of VU are in journals

Figure 5. Boxplot of citations, comparing VU with journals typical for VU



Addendum I - The CERES EADI Research Valuation System

Table 16 lists the criteria for the CERES classification of output, both for scientific journals and for science publishers. The system has been developed by the research school CERES in 2003 and has been accepted by the European Association of Development Institutes EADI in 2006. The system has been updated for the purpose of this analysis and includes 5296 journals and 914 publishers. A full description of the CERES EADI research valuation system can be found at the CERES webpage.⁶

Table 16. Criteria in CERES for book and journal publications

	A	B	C	D	E
Publishers	>500,000 hits in Scholar	50,000-500,000 hits in Scholar	1,000-50,000 hits in Scholar	100-1,000 hits in Scholar	< 100 hits in Scholar or unclear
Journals	Journals with an ISI rating and a relatively high citation index	Other journals with an ISI rating	Other refereed journals	Non-refereed journals for an academic public	Non-refereed journals for a non-academic public

Most programs use typologies for publications that differ from the CERES definitions. In this analysis the publication types of each program are considered leading. This may result for instance in numbers of non-refereed publications that appear in journals that are classified in CERES as C or D, even though the criterion for non-refereed publications in CERES specifies that the publication is to be rated as D or E.

Due to the diversity in the output of programs CERES does not cover all journals and publishers. The coverage of CERES in the total of output is listed in table 17. Although the system does not cover all output, it represents and classifies journals and publishers according to what CERES participants and EADI regard as important.

Table 17. Coverage of CERES in relation to total number of publications of programs

	Not found in CERES	Total number of publications	Not classifiable
Leiden	73	315	23,2%
Nijmegen	101	424	23,8%
Utrecht	62	271	22,9%
UvA	310	875	35,4%
VU	101	454	22,2%

⁶ <http://ceres.fss.uu.nl/documenten/research-output-valuation-summary-ceres-eadi-system.pdf>

Addendum II. Notes on Citation analysis

Selection of publications

The analysis is based on the publications with highest visibility in terms of citations. For each program an initial citation analysis has been performed to select publications with high visibility. These publications have been checked by research directors of the programs for proper attribution and completeness.

The selection basis for each program varies with the size of the program: smaller programs have possibly fewer publications with high visibility to select from. Therefore, the number of publications with high visibility varies with size. The projected numbers of publications to be analyzed per year are listed in table 18. As some publications received equal citations with others, *ex aequo*'s have been included in the subsequent analysis. In some cases, this leads to higher numbers of publications included in the analyses.

Table 18. Sizes of programs, numbers of publications analyzed

	Size in number of staff	Projected Publications to be analyzed per year	Total number of publications including <i>ex aequo</i> 's
Leiden	22	6	64
Nijmegen	22	6	63
Utrecht	13	5	43
UvA	46	10	94
VU	17	6	60
Total	120	33	324

Selection of journals

Journals that appear more frequently in the list of cited publications of program have been used as an approximation for the academic domain of the program. The criterion for inclusion is a minimum frequency of two for most programs, except for UvA and VU, for which longer initial lists were used of twenty titles each. In the case of Nijmegen, the selection resulted in four titles, which is a too small basis for defining the domain. The list was extended to five, by adding a journal title in which researchers of Nijmegen publish very often. In the case of Leiden, one journal was regarded as uncharacteristic for its domain, which led to the replacement by a journal title in which the researchers of Leiden have published most frequently.

Data for the journals were searched per year with PoP. Excluded are journals for which scant or no information was found, which was in particular the case for Dutch journals. This resulted in a somewhat shorter list for UvA and VU of 17 and 16 journals respectively.

Data correction

Google Scholar is chosen as the source for data retrieval about the impact of the 324 publications, in order to have a broader view of the impact of the field.⁷ However, as Scholar results also have been scrutinized for reliability, attention has been given to this issue.

⁷ In contrast to Web of Science or Scopus, Scholar includes books, reports, volumes and chapters in volumes as sources for citations, as long as these are made available by publishers and large (university) libraries. For bibliometric analysis of the social sciences Scholar is therefore a more inclusive source of information. Kousha, K., M. Thelwall; Sources of Google Scholar citations outside the Science Citation Index: A comparison between four science disciplines, *Scientometrics*, 2008, V73, nr 2, 273-294.

Information of all references⁸ to the 324 publications has been downloaded in full for further analysis. Citations with different spellings of the same publication were included. This was necessary because Scholar ranks its finding according to the results of its indexing.

In total, over 9.000 referring sources were found. Excluded from the analysis were the references without further detail about their specific (internet)location, i.e. lacking a proper URL, and references predating the year of publication.⁹ This resulted in a total of 8.427 traceable and proper references, 93,5% of the total number of referring sources.

List of Tables and Figures

Table 1 Leiden Ceres Output Valuation	70
Table 2 Average Leiden citations compared with its domain: average impact of journals typical for Leiden	70
Table 3 Domain of Leiden: Benchmark journals typical for Leiden	70
Table 4 Nijmegen Ceres Output Valuation	71
Table 5 Average Nijmegen citations compared with its domain: average impact of journals typical for Nijmegen	71
Table 6 Domain of Nijmegen: Benchmark journals typical for Nijmegen	71
Table 7 Utrecht Ceres Output Valuation	72
Table 8 Average Utrecht citations compared with its domain: average impact of journals typical for Utrecht	73
Table 9 Domain of Utrecht: Benchmark journals typical for Utrecht	73
Table 10 UvA Ceres Output Valuation	74
Table 11 Average UvA citations compared with its domain: average impact of journals typical for UvA	74
Table 12 Domain of UvA: Benchmark journals typical for UvA	74
Table 13 VU Ceres output valuation	75
Table 14 Average VU citations compared with its domain: average impact of journals typical for VU	75
Table 15 Domain of VU: Benchmark journals typical for VU	76
Table 16 Criteria in CERES for book and journal publications	77
Table 17 Coverage of CERES in relation to total number of publications of programs	77
Table 18 Sizes of programs, numbers of publications analyzed	78
Figure 1 Boxplot of citations, comparing Leiden with journals typical for Leiden	71
Figure 2 Boxplot of citations, comparing Nijmegen with journals typical for Nijmegen	72
Figure 3 Boxplot of citations, comparing Utrecht with journals typical for Utrecht	73
Figure 4 Boxplot of citations, comparing UvA with journals typical for UvA	75
Figure 5 Boxplot of citations, comparing VU with journals typical for VU	76

⁸ Terminology: a *reference* is a document or other source listing the publication of which the impact analysis is sought for. This results in a *citation* as the property of this latter publication, i.e. the occurrence of a reference to be found in another source.

⁹ Google Scholar is based on information in books (e.g. Google Books), of libraries and publishing houses. In most cases, this information is traceable and can be considered to represent proper citations.