

# **QANU Research Review**

**Sociology  
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](mailto:info@qanu.nl)  
Internet: [www.qanu.nl](http://www.qanu.nl)

© 2014 QANU Q0455

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

<b>Preface</b> .....	7
1. The review Committee and the review procedures .....	9
2. General remarks .....	11
<b>Assessment of institutes and programmes</b> .....	17
3. University of Groningen .....	19
4. Utrecht University.....	25
5. Radboud University Nijmegen.....	31
6. Interuniversity Centre for Social Science Theory and Methodology (ICS).....	37
7. Erasmus University Rotterdam.....	39
8. VU University Amsterdam .....	45
9. University of Amsterdam.....	49
10. Tilburg University .....	55
<b>Appendices</b> .....	59
Appendix A: Curricula vitae of the Committee members.....	61
Appendix B: Explanation of the SEP scores .....	63
Appendix C: Programme of the site visit.....	65
Appendix D: Quantitative information on staff, funding and output as provided in the self-evaluation reports .....	69



## **Professor Jos Berghman: an appreciation**

As members of the Dutch review committee for Sociology we were privileged to have Jos as our chairman. He was warm, friendly and open and exhibited clear and decisive leadership and fair judgement. We are all saddened to hear news of his premature death and send our condolences to his wife and family and his colleagues.



## Preface

This report describes the quality assessment of the seven explicit sociological research programmes at Dutch universities. It covers the period 2007-2012 and was done according to the Standard Evaluation Protocol 2009-2015 for Public Research Organizations and to the Discipline protocol for Research Assessment of Dutch Sociology 2007-2012.

As chairman of the Evaluation Committee I am very grateful that I could rely on six eminent colleagues from a variety of countries and with complementary sociological expertise. The variety in national research management background and in sociological sub-disciplines did however not withstand an open minded attitude and a loyal team spirit among the members of the Evaluation Committee. I am very grateful for that. At the same time this variety and the consensus in opinion which the members showed should guarantee a valid and reliable appreciation of the quality of the programmes.

I am aware as chairman, and to some extent I deplore, that our Committee was not able to evaluate the academic sociological research in the Netherlands as such, but that we were confined to the seven research programmes that are explicitly coined as sociological ones. So we were not able to score Dutch sociological research, but the seven programmes under scrutiny. The latter are without doubt of a high quality, also when considered in an international context.

On behalf of my colleagues I would like to thank the programme leaders and collaborators for their informative Self Evaluation Reports and for the sincere and instructive interviews we could have with them. I hope that the high marks we could give them will be fully appreciated by their respective faculties and universities as proof of their high professional standards. At the same time the members of the Committee would like to warn the Dutch sociological and broader research community for the danger of too narrowly defined quality indicators that cannot grasp the full breadth and depth of social research and could endanger the variety in sociological research practice which the Committee appreciated so much and would like to see safeguarded in the future.

As members of the Committee we would not have been able to do our job properly if we would not have been assisted and backed by our most skilled secretary, Dr. Meg Van Bogaert. We owe her our most sincere appreciation and thanks.

Prof. Jos Berghman  
Chairman of the Committee





# 1. The review Committee and the review procedures

## Scope of the assessment

The Review Committee was asked to perform an assessment of the research in Sociology during 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 institute and the research programmes on the basis of the information provided by the institute and through interviews with the management and the research leaders, and to advise how this quality might be improved.

## Composition of the Committee

The members of the Committee were:

- Prof. Jos Berghman, chair, Professor of Social Policy, KU Leuven, Belgium;
- Prof. Peter Abell, emeritus Professor of Management, London School of Economics, UK;
- Prof. Karen Cook, Professor of Sociology, Stanford University, USA;
- Prof. Ronald Eyerman, Professor of Sociology, Yale University, USA;
- Prof. Chris Hamnett, Professor of Geography, King's College London, UK;
- Prof. Anthony Heath, Professor of Sociology, University of Oxford, UK;
- Prof. Johannes Huinink, Professor of Sociology, Institute of Sociology at the University of Bremen, Germany.

A profile of the Committee members is included in Appendix A.

Dr. Meg Van Bogaert of the QANU Office was appointed secretary to the Committee.

## Independence

All members of the Committee signed a statement of independence to safeguard that they would assess the quality of the Institute 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 preparatory meeting. The Committee concluded that there were no unacceptable relations or dependencies and that there was no specific risk in terms of bias or undue influence.

## Data provided to the Committee

The Committee received the following detailed documentation:

1. Self-evaluation report of the unit under review, including all the information required by the Standard Evaluation Protocol (SEP), with appendices;
2. Copies of five key publications per research programme;
3. A selection of PhD theses of each research programme.

## Procedures followed by the Committee

The Committee proceeded according to the Standard Evaluation Protocol 2009-2015 (SEP). Prior to the preparatory meeting, each programme was assigned to two reviewers, who

independently formulated a preliminary assessment. The final assessments are based on the documentation provided by the Institute, the key publications, and the interviews with the management, with the leaders of the programmes and PhD students. The interviews took place on 7-10 January 2014 (see the schedule in Appendix C) in Utrecht.

Preceding the interviews, the Committee was briefed by QANU about research assessment according to SEP, and it discussed the preliminary assessments. For each programme a number of comments and questions were decided upon. The Committee also agreed upon procedural matters. After the interviews the Committee discussed the scores and comments. The report was prepared through email exchanges. The final version was presented to the faculty for factual corrections and comments. The comments were discussed in the Committee. The final report was printed after formal acceptance by the Boards of the universities.

Three SEP criteria strongly relate to past performance. The Committee has therefore taken the outcomes and results of the period 2007-2012 to assess the quality, productivity and societal relevance. Vitality/feasibility was assessed based on the SWOT analysis and strategy of the programme, but the Committee also included developments that took place in 2013 to provide its assessment of the future of each programme.

The Committee used the rating system of the Standard Evaluation Protocol 2009-2015 (SEP). The meaning of the scores is provided in Appendix B. The Committee would like to state that it slightly adapted this rating scale as it was clear to the Committee that the research on Sociology in the Netherlands is generally of a very good to excellent level, implying that most ratings involved the higher end of the scale. 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 interim values were used to indicate that a programme is between two integer ratings. Furthermore, the Committee would like to emphasize that although it took notice of the outcomes of the previous research assessment (2008), comparing the scores given in this report with those of 2008, would not provide a valid picture of the developments in sociological research in the Netherlands over time. The present Committee has a different composition from the Committee of six years ago, not all programmes of the 2008 assessment were evaluated by the present Committee, and the programmes have changed over the period of assessment, as have the assessment criteria. Furthermore, international sociological research has developed as well, which was taken into account by the present Committee.

## **2. General remarks**

These introductory remarks deal with some general issues the Committee encountered and needs to address.

### **Sociological research in the Netherlands**

The main overall conclusion drawn by the Committee with respect to the quality of sociological research in the Netherlands is that it is of very high quality. Given the international character of the Committee, it felt free to conclude that the Netherlands ranks among the top units internationally. Despite this conclusion, it intends to use the evaluation and this report to provide critical feedback to encourage further improvements. The Committee is aware that in the Netherlands quite some sociological research takes place at universities outside the research programmes the Committee was asked to evaluate. Yet, the evaluations and suggestions made in this report pertain only to the seven research programmes that were brought to the Committee's attention.

There are clear differences in size of the research programmes evaluated, as well as their focus, themes and methodology. The Committee considers this variety to be a strength of the Dutch field of sociological research. Although this variety did not make the Committee's task easier, it tried to assess each research programme based on its own ambitions, strategy and with the intention to appreciate differences between the programmes. The Committee would like to emphasize that the variety it encountered should be safeguarded by the Dutch universities.

### **Qualitative versus quantitative sociological research**

In the European context, the Netherlands occupies a strong position in quantitative sociological research. Many discussions were held with representatives of the programmes as well as among the Committee members about the balance Dutch sociological research should find between qualitative and quantitative research, or to what extent they should be combined. The Committee saw different solutions at different departments and once again strongly appreciates the variety in the Netherlands.

Although differences exist between the research programmes, in general the Committee is positive about the increasing collaboration between qualitative and quantitative methods in some departments. This was also seen in the training of PhD students, which – across universities – involves combining methodologies.

Related to the methodology discussion, the Committee spent time discussing the tradition and strategy of publications, often leading to a discussion of whether to write only journal articles or also to include monographs. It regrets to find that only a few departments were actively promoting the writing of monographs by its staff members, in addition to writing journal articles. It is understandable that young scholars will focus more on journal articles, since they are building a track record, which is indisputably required in acquiring funding. However, according to most Committee members, established researchers should take the time and opportunity to add monographs to their output. It became clear that only two departments have an explicit strategy in place in which the writing of monographs is stimulated and appreciated as a valuable output. Other departments had a neutral to even a negative strategy. Dutch universities are not generally acquainted with sabbatical periods that allow senior staff members time to write monographs. The Committee would like to stimulate the management of faculties and universities both to include monographs in output categories that are appreciated, since this

is an output category that will remain strong over time and to provide the time to engage in such writing.

### **Transfer of scholars**

Although differences are observed between departments, they all have a significant number of short-term contracts for younger staff members, which leads to a high degree of insecurity for these researchers. Many departments have introduced tenure track positions, but with an increased dependence on external funding, a rise in the number of short-term positions can be expected. Many of the current PhD students might end up in these positions. The building of an impressive track record – in order to acquire funding - is made more difficult if the academic career of a young scholar is undermined due to short-term contracts. The Committee is well aware that solving this issue requires a strategy not only at the department level, but also at the faculty and university level and even at the level of national and international funding. Nevertheless, the universities have a responsibility towards the scholars they train and should take care of their graduates.

In addition to the career progression issue for young scholars, nearly all departments had to deal with the departure of talented people to other universities or because of retirement. This puts a strain on the management to come up with solutions and strategies. Although the Committee did not assess the size of the research programmes and in fact appreciates that differences in size exist, some programmes are rather small and focussed on their particular research themes. As can be concluded in the assessment of these programmes, this can lead to high-quality research and fascinating outcomes. It also makes these programmes more vulnerable to staff leaving for other institutes. The Committee noted quite a lot of transfers in the period of assessment (and in 2013) between Dutch and international universities. The small size of the country combined with job uncertainties and better job opportunities at other institutes encourage young, talented scholars to develop their careers by regularly changing universities. This is beneficial for these scholars, but research programmes – especially smaller ones – require a solid strategy to deal with this issue. Larger programmes are less vulnerable and must focus their attention on the choice of topics to prevent undesired broadening and loss of coherence as the result of a fast turnover of staff. Finally, the Committee observed an inconsistent approach between the institutes to recently retired staff. Many emeritus professors continue to be active in the research programme, which is of high value for the programmes. Some programmes provide minimal contracts (e.g. 0.1 fte) and included the results of these retirees in the output tables, while other programmes did not. The Committee tried to take into account the involvement of emeritus professors, irrespective of their formal contract situation.

### **Citation scores and top ISI journals**

Citation scores of the individual researchers were calculated by the research programmes. The H-indices of staff (Google Scholar and Web of Science) were very informative with respect to the track records of individuals and research programmes. It revealed that the Netherlands has a number of world-class researchers. The Committee would like to make a remark in order to clarify the limitations on the use of citation scores in the assessment. First, the research programmes agreed to include H-indices for staff who worked for the programme in 2012. Transfer of staff members towards the end of the assessment period might therefore result in a distorted picture for the entire period of assessment. Both retiring professors and the departure of (rising) stars to other departments had a major influence on the mean citation scores of each department.

Each programme provided an overview of the number of top 10% and top 25% ISI journal publications in its self-evaluation report. This was a useful addition to assess the quality of the research. Unfortunately, it was not clear to the Committee in which years these publications appeared, making it difficult to detect trends over the years. Furthermore, the possibility to publish in ISI journals depends on the sociological sub-discipline and is strongly dependent on the US interest in a sub-discipline. Publications on topics/sub-disciplines that are important in the US are more easily published in top ISI journals whereas some topics will find it more difficult. The Committee was aware of this variety of sub-disciplines when making its assessments.

### **Funding of Sociological research**

The Committee noted that all departments claim a steady decline in government funding over the period of assessment. For some departments this decline will be continuing in the years ahead, while others claim that the situation has now stabilised. Overall, one- to two-thirds of the research budget now relies on external funding, with the faculties and universities in which the departments are located providing a minority of the funding.

In addition to a declining primary funding, most departments claimed that parts of research organisation funding opportunities are also gradually declining. NWO grants on the topics relating to the social sciences are being reduced as the result of the *top sectoren beleid* by the Dutch government. The Committee emphasizes that a strong discipline, internationally visible, should be supported in continuing to do high-quality research. The societal relevance of these research programmes is high and should be retained for the Netherlands. The Committee positively noted that the departments have responded by actively seeking European funding. Many researchers seem well integrated in European networks, and many substantial European grants were successfully acquired over the period of assessment.

It is clear that most departments are becoming more and more effective in obtaining external contracts, by improving both research organisation and contract funding. Faculties provide support in this aspect, and as a result a constant enrolment of new PhD students is ensured. The Committee strongly encourages the faculties to continue to support their researchers when applying for external grants. Relying strongly on external funding without a clear strategy might endanger the coherence of research at a department.

### **Next generation**

The greatest pleasure for the Committee was interviewing PhD candidates from the research programmes. Without exception the Committee was impressed by the enthusiasm and quality of the groups of PhD students. Each student from every department seemed passionate and well trained. Since the position as well as recruitment strategy of Dutch PhD students is very different from those of other European countries and the US, the Committee initially had some reservations with respect to the pre-set research topic and outline of the projects prior to hiring a PhD student. However, PhD students seemed to greatly appreciate the combination of a research topic within a larger, often externally funded project and the freedom to adapt the research to their own preferences and theories. From the track records of many PhD students, this approach seems to work; the Committee was impressed by the number and quality of their international publications.

The departments have different numbers of PhD positions, different strategies in training their students, and differences in the scope and focus of their research. Nevertheless, the training of

the next generation is taken seriously at all departments and is executed successfully. PhD graduates have great faith in the quality of their training and do not seem to be very worried about their future prospects in academia. A specific remark is dedicated to the training of PhD students in the ICS programmes, which is a fine example of how different departments at different universities make use of the strengths of other departments to train students to become fully fledged members of academia.

In several departments, the Committee observed a decline in the number of PhD students over the years. Many of these departments are still searching for an effective strategy to deal with less government funding, which often was the major source for hiring PhD students. The Committee strongly encourages the faculties to help these departments in finding a strategy to stop the decline, which is worrying at some points. Other departments have already found a way to deal with the budget cuts and found external funding to hire PhD students.

Apparently, the graduation rates of PhD students are similar to those of most other Dutch disciplines, but for most Committee members it was difficult to understand that many PhD students take longer than the set four years to graduate, some even taking up to seven years. The Committee does not consider itself fit to criticize this topic without extensive knowledge of the Dutch research system, but would like to point out that an increasing number of externally funded PhD positions have been reduced to a period of three years. This might lead to even more PhD students not graduating by the set deadline.

The final general aspect of the next generation is the difference in thesis approach. Most departments understandably stimulate their students to produce a collection of journal articles, which are then integrated and completed with an introduction and conclusion. This will allow the young scholars to start building a track record. Some departments allow the thesis to be a monograph, but encourage the simultaneous publication of journal articles.

### **Societal relevance**

Most topics that concern sociological research almost by definition have the potential to be or become societally relevant. This does however not automatically lead to the conclusion that all sociology research is in practice societally relevant. High quality sociological research that is potentially relevant for society needs a strategy and efforts to actually become societally relevant. Therefore, the main assessment criterion of the Committee is related to the strategy of a department in the dissemination, knowledge transfer and communication of its research to stakeholders and to the wider public. Overall, the Committee considers the ties maintained to society to be a strength of Dutch sociological research. The departments all found a position in between being on the one hand highly professionalised and oriented solely towards academic outputs and on the other hand oriented toward both academia and society. Some programmes implemented special means, e.g. web pages, to increase their outreach or supported special programmes in non-academic contexts. The highest score has been reserved for programmes that were really innovative in their efforts to make their work societally relevant. Greater focus on dissemination activities inevitably means less time being available for scholarly articles. Hence, this was taken into consideration when assessing productivity.

There was considerable diversity in the way the research programmes interpreted societal relevance, and the extent and nature of their activities – some were nationally and some more locally oriented. The Committee did not have any prior assumptions that national was of higher priority or of more value than local, but looked carefully at the actual nature and effectiveness of the activities. Due to the national (and local) aspects of many societally relevant activities, it

was difficult for an international Committee to assess their impact. Nevertheless, the interviews helped the Committee in getting a grasp on this aspect and especially for European projects, the Committee feels it has a sound view of the societal relevance of the different departments.

The Committee wants to emphasize that in assessing societal relevance of the seven programmes, it not only took into consideration the description of this aspect in the Standard Evaluation Protocol. The criteria given in the discipline protocol were also used by the Committee to assess the broad range of aspects that are part of the societal relevance of the research programmes.

### **Productivity**

Given that it is a heterogeneous discipline, the Committee did not always find it easy to assess productivity. All of the departments have a strategy that focuses on the top journals in their disciplines, making the number of international, peer-reviewed articles one of the output categories that was taken into consideration. However, more might not always be better, and simply comparing the numbers of articles per research fte does not provide the full picture. Monographs and the output of edited volumes of books were given particular attention by the Committee. Despite the overall decline, differences were observed between departments in non-academic output. Finally, approximately half of the departments are engaged in collecting large data sets. The production of these data sets is crucial in sociological research and takes up the time and resources of the responsible departments. This might hamper the quality of fundamental research and therefore of high-quality, high-impact publications. The Committee decided to value data collection under the criterion *Productivity*.





## Assessment of institutes and programmes



### 3. University of Groningen

<b>Programme:</b>	<b>Social Networks, Solidarity, and Inequality</b>		
Programme director:	Prof. Rafael Wittek		
Research staff 2012:	23.1 fte		
Assessments:	Quality:	5	
	Productivity:	4.5	
	Relevance:	5	
	Viability:	4.5	

---

Since there is a large overlap between the institute and programme level at the University of Groningen, and as the self-assessment did not distinguish between the two, the Committee decided to integrate its assessment. Accordingly, the following assessment covers both levels.

#### 3.1A. The Faculty of Behavioural and Social Sciences

The Department of Sociology is one of four departments at the Faculty of Behavioural and Social Sciences. The Faculty's main decision-making body is the Faculty Board, consisting of the Dean, Vice-Dean and Head of Finance. The Faculty Board is responsible for all research and training programmes of the departments. The main decision-making body of the Department of Sociology is the Directorate, consisting of the Department Head, Research Director and the Director of Studies. The directorate reports directly to the Faculty Board. The Department researches six themes, each coordinated by a senior researcher who reports to the Director of Research. According to the self-evaluation report, the leadership of the Department puts considerable effort into the creation and maintenance of a mutually supportive, yet challenging and productive academic work environment.

Based on the discussion with Faculty management, the Committee concluded that the sociology department is considered an asset to the Faculty and University, despite its small size. The small size and focused nature of the department are clearly not considered to be an issue, since it is part of a wider pallet of disciplines at the Faculty level. The Committee considers that this has proven to be an excellent position from which the department can conduct high-quality research.

The Committee would like to point out that the Faculty policy of hiring staff at the lowest level, even to replace departing senior staff, might not always be the best solution for a small, focussed department like Sociology. In the period being evaluated, the department managed to deal with departing staff in an impressive manner, allowing younger and talented scholars to mature. However, the number of established senior staff members should remain at a certain level to assure that the quality of the research can be kept at the high level of the previous period.

#### 3.1B. The Programme

The sociology programme of the University of Groningen is embedded in the ICS research programme. A separate chapter (chapter 6) is included in this report in which the Committee provides feedback on ICS.

The mission of the Department of Sociology is threefold. Firstly to occupy a leading role in the advancement of theoretical micro-foundations using social network analysis and to guide

empirical social research on solidarity and inequality, which meets international state-of-the-art quality standards in the social sciences. Second, to recruit the most talented junior researchers and train them to become excellent independent social scientists. Finally, the mission is to contribute, in collaboration with external stakeholders, to the development of evidence-based solutions of the societal problems in selected policy domains.

The research programme consists of a common core (research strategy and field of interest), which is applied to six substantive themes (problem domains). According to the self-evaluation report, the common core fulfils a vital role in ensuring coherence in the programme across several problem-driven studies with a focus on social mechanism explanations of social phenomena. The six themes address individual-level outcomes at all stages of life and collective-level dynamics in communities and organizations.

### **3.2. Quality and academic reputation**

The self-evaluation report provides a number of results to illustrate some substantive topics covered by the six themes. It also includes citation scores and H-indices of staff members in Google Scholar and ISI journals (web of science). The programme notes that many citations are generated by the programme's most senior scholar. If this scholar is taken out, the number of citations drops significantly, while the impact metrics drop only slightly. The self-evaluation report furthermore states that citations and H-indices fluctuate considerably between programme members, due to the age distribution of the research staff, variation in research time allotted to programme members, and differences in the publication and citation culture in various (sub)disciplines.

The self-evaluation report describes that grants and awards were received by the programme, including collaborative research prizes, one career award and two PhD theses awards. NWO grants included Veni, Vidi and TopTalent. Staff members have a total of 30 editorial positions in 22 high-quality scientific journals. Five programme members held or still hold guest professorships.

The Committee concluded that the Groningen sociology programme is one of the smallest departments reviewed in terms of average tenured fte. The programme has chosen to concentrate upon problems that can be analysed within a social networks framework. This is strongly reflected in the published output of tenured staff, research staff and PhD students. Internationally, this is a competitive field with well-established leading journals, maintaining high technical standards, in which the members of the department publish frequently, though not exclusively. Some 30% of the publications are in the top 10% journals, a higher proportion than any of the other departments reviewed.

Although it was published before the period of assessment, one of the most important textbooks on multiple-level modelling was written in the department and can be said to have set international standards in a significant field of social sciences inquiry (Snijders and Bosker, 1999, three reprints, 2<sup>nd</sup> ed. 2013). In addition, a recent text devoted to survival analysis (Mills) looks promising in this respect. Three of the carefully selected key articles have attracted international awards, indicative of their originality both theoretically and empirically.

The leadership of the department has proved robust through a difficult period brought upon by the retirement and departure of senior staff. Its academic reputation has also been conserved, against the odds. The department is efficiently run and was subject to an innovative analysis by an external coach. The strong leadership has been extended down to the programme level, and

use is made of leadership courses. Considerable attention is devoted to human resource management, and its facilities are at the requisite standard for an internationally competitive department. Notable aspects in this respect are the computer lab, a subject pool for experimental work, *Socio quest* devoted to the society research interface, alleviation of teaching in order to prepare applications for research grants, and the integration of senior retiring staff into the fabric of the department.

### **3.3. Resources**

Appendix D provides an overview of the research staff and funding of the programme. The directorate of the Department pursues a supportive funding policy and has earmarked funds for this purpose. First, on a yearly basis, the programme seeks to realize 1-3 internally funded strategic PhD positions. Maintenance of a critical mass of PhD students in a theme is among the criteria for allocating funds. Second, funds are reserved to meet matching requirements from external funding agencies. Third, funds are made available to facilitate operational processes, including experiments, organization of small international workshops, etc. The Department invests to maintain relevant research facilities, like the computer lab and an active subject pool (n=1200).

After the previous assessment, there were major changes in personnel, including the retirement of three full professors and the transfer of one full professor to another university. The latter kept a 0.2 fte part-time appointment. Measures were taken by the Department to facilitate this major transition phase for the programme. First, the tenure track system allowed the institute to offer career perspectives to promising young scholars. Second, two of the retiring full professors kept their offices and all rights as regular programme members.

The total funding of the programme increased in the period of assessment. The Committee noted that the percentage of direct funding from the university is among the highest of the programmes assessed and the absolute amount has not significantly changed in the period of assessment. From the interview with Faculty management, it became clear that budget cuts in direct funding led to a reduction in the number of PhD students on high-risk projects, which is considered a loss. In the future, the department will have to increase income from other sources, such as research organisations and contracts. The Department and Faculty management stated that staff applying for research grants will be supported. This is of the utmost importance, according to the Committee, specifically in relation to the policy of hiring talented scholars at the start of their careers. Acquiring funding requires expertise and a track record. For junior staff members it will be more difficult to obtain major grants, and supporting them is therefore crucial.

### **3.4. Productivity**

There were a total of 444 publications, of which approximately half are refereed articles in non-Dutch scientific journals. After the previous assessment, the programme continued its efforts to achieve high productivity scores by increasing the absolute number and relative proportion of publications in international, peer-reviewed journals. Programme membership requires at least one international, peer-reviewed publication per year, based on three-year averages. The programme endorses the general University of Groningen policy with regard to journal publications, which aims for fewer publications but in journals of a higher profile.

According to the Committee, despite the award of the highest grade for quality, productivity is not quite at the same level. The department works under a university-wide edict, soliciting 'fewer

publications but in journals of a higher profile'. This has not been endorsed by the department without reservation but has promoted an impressive rolling performance review internal to the department.

The programme acknowledged the conflicting time demands with respect to publishing in peer-reviewed journals while simultaneously engaging in high-quality collaboration with external societal stakeholders and teaching activities. The policy is to achieve an optimal balance between the activities and outcomes of conflicting time demands on the programme level rather than the individual level. The tension between allocating time to write reports for commissioned research (which impacts Societal Relevance appraisal) and following the university edict was openly acknowledged in the interview with the Committee.

The average publications (non-Dutch) per tenured fte over the review period is the third highest amongst the reviewed programmes, and distinctly above the bottom four. The similar average in Dutch publications reflects the acknowledged tension and puts Groningen at the bottom of the league. Combining Dutch and non-Dutch publications places the department at about the average for all the departments. The average number of academic publications (Dutch and non-Dutch) per research fte again puts Groningen towards the bottom of the comparative statistics.

Visibility in outlets other than scientific journals is generally regarded as important within the discipline of sociology, so the programme endorses the publication of books and textbooks, edited volumes on specific topics, and professional publications. The programme noticed a change since the previous assessment; programme members have become more cautious and selective with regard to their contributions to other outlets than scientific journals. The Committee confirmed this observation based on a comparison of numbers with other sociology departments in the Netherlands. As stated in the assessment of quality, the impact of a high-quality book can be long lasting and major. Although the Committee accepts that university and faculty policy as well as the custom of the sub-discipline might lead to predominantly international academic journal publications, it encourages the university to value the writing of monographs in addition.

The department has assembled a number of significant data sets – particularly panels – which are available through DANS, a national data-sharing scheme. Some of them produce longitudinal network data, which are currently regarded as pivotal to the development of the theory of networks by the international community. SIENA is an outstandingly original software package that originated in the department and is available as open source. The average number of completed PhDs per tenured fte puts the department midway in the distribution. The small department provided a large number of members of external Committees and membership on editorial boards. Although the Committee readily acknowledged the limitations of comparative statistics as unequivocal indicators of productivity, in the face of the variety of output, the conclusion was that Groningen is doing well, but narrowly failed to compare with the highest international standards.

### **3.5. Policy on societal relevance**

The Groningen programme aims to contribute to the solution of solidarity and inequality problems for four types of external target groups: individuals, communities, organizations and governments. The main strategy consists of the theory-driven development of evidence-based 1) interventions, 2) policy advice, and 3) training of professionals.

At the university level, the primary infrastructure, the emerging societal focus areas are *Healthy ageing* and *Sustainable Society*. They provide seed money and a coordination structure, facilitating interfaculty cooperation and the creation of a collaborative network with external stakeholders. The second infrastructure is at the programme level, where there are two central initiatives: a research-society interface was launched in 2009 (<http://www.socioquest.nl>), and a professorship by special appointment, financed by an organizational consulting firm (specializing in social sustainability issues).

The department at Groningen is notably active in linking its research to wider societal issues via ten initiatives, each of which targets a different “domain”. This orientation is nothing short of outstanding, despite the above-mentioned university edict, leading to a large number of reports and active engagement with public and private bodies both nationally and internationally. It has also attracted substantial financial support from the university (oQuest) and the foundation of a privately funded chair.

Members of the department are active in the media and contribute to the public debate. An anti-bullying intervention seeded by high-quality academic research and leading to a online instrument has been adopted by a large number of schools. A number of commercial spin-offs have also been generated. Across the department, scholars are engaged with various issues of societal relevance. This is particularly important for the visibility of a small department.

### **3.6. Strategy for the future**

The programme plans to further consolidate its approach of refining its common theoretical core and applying it to the study of substantive themes. Advancements in the field of social rationality theory building will be used to guide the evolution of the programme’s common field of interest towards problems of sustainable cooperation.

The department has acquired a very substantial international recognition for research and teaching in the areas upon which it has chosen to focus. This reputation is way beyond what one might expect given its rather modest size and is significantly attributable to a number of scholars with outstanding careers. Unfortunately, several of these scholars have either retired or left for posts in other universities. The retirees still contribute to the department, and one retains a 0.2 fte appointment; but this turnover, within such a small department, raises serious questions about the continued vitality of the department. During a major part of the assessment period, the programme had only one full-time professor with managerial responsibility. The department had regained strength at the senior level by mid-2013 with the appointment of three tenure trackers to full professor.

The Committee was impressed with the current leadership and management of the department. The programme has succeeded in maintaining its performance in the past few years. The programme claims that it now has a well-balanced structure in terms of seniority levels, the ratio of tenured faculty and gender.

The programme leader steered the department through a period when the senior staff appointments were temporarily depleted and managed to retain a good record in raising resources, attracting research staff and developing high-quality PhD students. The pre-eminence in network analysis and to a lesser extent in rational choice theory has been significantly retained, and prospects for the future now look optimistic. Extension of the research perspective to include genetic data and agent based modelling are notable recent achievements and should begin to address the possible vulnerability of a highly specialised department. The SWOT

analysis appears realistic and does not evade the challenges the department faces. A small department is always vulnerable to departures, but having survived the situation once already, the Committee is optimistic that this closely integrated department could survive future shocks of this nature. It appears that the teaching loads are rather high, and this is exacerbated by reductions in funding. The department is actively looking to inter-departmental collaboration as a possible route to alleviate these problems.

### **3.7. PhD training and supervision**

The PhD training at Groningen overlaps with that at Utrecht and Nijmegen. PhD and research master training is monitored by the Faculty's Graduate School (GSBSS). The implementation of training in the Sociology track (one of five tracks) is delegated to the ICS. Chapter 6 of this report provides information about and the Committee's assessment of ICS.

The programme aims at training highly qualified independent researchers and future university faculty who excel in theoretically and methodologically advanced social science research. It is integrated in the Graduate School of Behavioural and Social Sciences and the ICS research school. Supervision is regulated in a structured mentoring system. Each PhD student has a team of supervisors with the theoretical, methodological and substantive expertise required for the project. All PhD projects are regularly discussed in local supervisor meetings and by the interuniversity ICS board.

Of the 27 PhD students scheduled to finish during the assessment period, 70% graduated within the period of four years, 15% are still continuing. Another 11% dropped out, and one PhD student finished her PhD in the Psychology programme of the Faculty. About 65% of graduated PhD students find their first academic position in academia and 30% in non-academic positions.

The PhD programme is fully integrated into ICS and the Graduate School of Behavioural and Social Sciences, and consequently appears to benefit from economies of scale in teaching and interlinked research agenda. Also concerning the breadth of topics that can be taught to PhD students, the small, focussed Groningen programme benefits from the ICS structure.



## 4. Utrecht University

<b>Programme:</b>	<b>Social Networks, Solidarity and Inequality</b>		
Programme director:	Tanja van der Lippe (since September 2011), Prof. W. Raub (until September 2011), Maykel Verkuyten (throughout the review period)		
Research staff 2012:	26.4 fte		
Assessments:	Quality:	5	
	Productivity:	5	
	Relevance:	4.5	
	Viability:	5	

---

Since there is a large overlap between the institute and programme levels at Utrecht University, and as the self-assessment did not distinguish between them, the Committee decided to integrate its assessment. Accordingly, the following assessment covers both levels.

### 4.1A. The Institute

The Faculty of Social and Behavioural Sciences (FSBS) participates in national and local research institutes, networks and schools. The Faculty management is responsible for scientific research and higher education. Utrecht University has been fostering multidisciplinary research and has defined 15 research focus areas. The sociology programme participates in two of these research focus areas, *Origins and Impacts of Institutions*, and *Coordinating Societal Change: Life Course Dynamics, Economic Flexibility and Social Cohesion*. In these focus areas, researchers from sociology collaborate with groups from the Faculties of Law, Economics and Governance, Humanities and Geosciences.

FSBS focuses on five multidisciplinary research clusters based on its own research agenda. These clusters shape the profile of the faculty and will be prominent in allocating budgetary incentives at the faculty level in the years to come. The Social Networks, Solidarity and Inequality research programme belongs to the Behaviour in Social Context cluster.

The Committee appreciates that the multidisciplinary focus of research is taking place at both the level of the programme and the level of the Faculty. The latter provides a solid basis for disciplinary researchers who work on interdisciplinary themes and programmes.

### 4.1B. The Programme

The Utrecht sociology programme conceives of social sciences as problem- and theory-driven rather than data-driven. Its mission is threefold: 1) to play a leading role within the national and international scientific community in the advancement and growth of theoretical and empirical knowledge in sociology and the social sciences by conducting innovative, high-quality, theory-driven empirical research; 2) to recruit the most talented junior researchers and train them to become excellent independent social scientists; and 3) to contribute to societal debates, social interventions and policies, and establish structural collaboration with professional top institutes in the social sciences.

The overall size of the programme design combines a common core, including a common research strategy and shared field of interest, with a number of different research lines in

different domains. Each research line combines a set of interrelated projects. Collaboration between research lines is supported and encouraged. The overall design of the programme has been consistent in the past six years.

#### **4.2. Quality and academic reputation**

The self-evaluation report provided a number of results (key findings) to illustrate some substantive topics studied by the themes. It also includes citation scores, namely H-indices of staff members in Google Scholar and ISI journals (web of science). Of the 456 English journal articles, 158 (35%) were in the top 25% journals relevant to the discipline, with 70 (15%) of them in the top 10%.

There is interdisciplinary collaboration in the strategic theme *Institutions* with other Departments at Utrecht University. The programme also has structural international collaboration, consisting of visiting university appointments, the Reinhard Wippler visiting professorship for master classes for master students, and EU-funded projects such as NORFACE Children of Immigrants Longitudinal Study.

The overall quality of the programme is excellent, with strong leadership during the period under review and continuing through the most recent transition in leadership. The focus on a common core with different, but related research lines is an evident strength of the Utrecht sociology programme. The umbrella for the research programme, Social Networks, Solidarity and Inequality, is innovative and puts the department at the centre of important sociological research developments internationally. These topics are issues of central significance not only in sociology but also in the related social sciences, and thus this focus positions the faculty to be involved in significant interdisciplinary and international research efforts.

The quality of the scientific output is very high by international standards, in terms of both citation indices and the quality of the journals in which the work appears. This leads to a programme that is internationally well known. The overall placement record for this programme is excellent, with a very strong completion rate for doctoral students and a good track record of graduates obtaining positions in academia as well as prestigious postdoctoral posts (such as those at Oxford). A similar record of excellence is characteristic of the research master's programme with its emphasis on social research and ethnic relations (two separate tracks).

Programme members won several prestigious grants, e.g. ERC Advanced grant, Veni, Vidi and Vici grants from the NWO. A number of PhD projects and postdocs were secured via NWO funding programmes. An academic reputation is claimed by the programme with examples of memberships in international and national academic communities, e.g. De Jonge Academie and the European Academy of Sociology. Various articles and dissertations have received awards, key lectures were given at conferences, visiting professorships were arranged, and programme members are on editorial boards.

#### **4.3. Resources**

Appendices A and F provide an overview of the research staff and funding of the programme. An increase in the number of undergraduate students plus the rising external funding has allowed the programme to attract researchers with teaching qualifications for tenured positions during the assessment period. The percentage of external grants has increased from 27% of total funding in 2007 to 65% in 2012. According to the programme, it has a rather young staff, which was gender balanced and international in 2012.

According to the self-evaluation report, the programme has been successful at generating funds for designing and collecting several multi-actor, multi-level, and multi-event data sets.

The total funding of the programme increased slightly in the period evaluated. The Committee noticed that the funding of research grants increased significantly in this period, and as a consequence the direct funding (both competitive and non-competitive) dropped from 72% to 34%. This exemplifies the quality of the programme and its ability to obtain competitive external funding in a period of cutbacks in direct funding. From the interview with the Faculty management and the programme leaders, it became clear that the programme is receiving funds and grants from numerous sources, providing a solid basis for the near future.

An increase in external funding and a decline in internal funding led to a slight reduction in tenured staff and an increase in the number of PhD students, giving Utrecht the highest number of PhD students per tenured fte.

#### **4.4. Productivity**

The aim of the programme is to publish in high-impact journals of the web of science. In the assessment period, the programme had 456 publications in international, scientific, peer-reviewed journals. This is an average of 2.8 papers per fte research staff per year. In addition, programme members have also published some edited books and made various chapter contributions. Between 2007 and 2012 the programme had a total of 52 successfully completed PhDs.

The scientific output of the programme is notable for its impact both in academia and in society more generally. The production of cutting-edge knowledge is the most important output of those involved in the sociology programme. Work on cooperation, cultural diversity and ethnic relations, families and employment, social capital, stratification and inequality, and immigration are all areas of strength in the programme with output that is significant in terms of both knowledge production and societal relevance. The Utrecht sociology programme (and its affiliated ICS training programme) is known in the USA and Europe especially for the strength of its training in theory, methodology and empirical research. It is notable that a number of the doctoral students have studied in other countries and at prestigious universities as part of their training.

The publication strategy seems appropriate for an internationally focused programme. The mix of publications in Dutch and non-Dutch outlets, together with the emphasis on publication in the top 25 internationally ranked sociology and social sciences journals is a good strategy to provide a strong reputation for the programme locally and internationally. The review of productivity of the research staff with goals that need to be met for continued engagement in the ICS programme is a useful mechanism for maintaining the quality of the programme.

#### **4.5. Policy on societal relevance**

The goal of the programme follows from its mission to contribute to societal debates, to identify solutions for societal problems, and to provide other forms of knowledge valorisation. The goal of the programme members is to make a theoretically and empirically informed contribution to social issues and to policies related to social networks, solidarity and inequality. A number of examples are given in the self-evaluation report showing how this goal is being achieved.

Members of the research faculty have obtained grants from various ministries in the Netherlands and from professional organizations and municipal offices to conduct research that is relevant to policy formation and evaluation. Faculty members have also given lectures to local groups as well as published in relevant news and media outlets to communicate their findings and policy suggestions. They also serve on a number of Committees and scientific advisory boards where they provide relevant expertise, for example the Ministry of Justice and the Dutch National Gender Audit Committee. Efforts to increase engagement with the public and external audiences when appropriate should be encouraged in the future, given the importance of the research being conducted at Utrecht.

#### **4.6. Strategy for the future**

According to the self-evaluation report, the programme members have shown a capacity to acquire external funding for their research since the previous assessment. Furthermore, Utrecht University has chosen *Institutions* as one of the four university-wide strategic themes, the research programme benefits from funding through contributions made to teaching undergraduate tracks, and new grants have been recently obtained.

The SWOT analysis led to a major goal for the upcoming period, which is to maintain and to enhance the programme's strengths wherever possible. In order to maintain the overall quality of research staff and balanced staff composition, the personnel policy will continue to focus on identifying promising young postdocs and junior and senior staff members, with support from FSBS management. The programme will closely follow changes in NWO funding policy and continue to submit applications. Local, interdisciplinary collaboration, as well as networking with national and international partners will be tried. The programme will continue to collect sizable multi-actor, multi-level and multi-event data sets, further increase PhD and Research Master training, and continue to take advantage of opportunities for societal contributions.

The Committee finds that the strategic plan includes increased efforts to obtain further external funding for research in a highly competitive environment for such funding. The research faculty has more than doubled the percentage of competitive external funding received since 2007. This is a strong indicator of the vitality and quality of the research output. In addition, the annual number of refereed articles has increased, even under conditions of significant competition, especially in the prestigious, non-Dutch journal outlets. The faculty seems to be aware of the need for external funding to build their international reputation and to fund not only their own research, but also that of their trainees. They reported an excellent record of external funding in 2013 as well.

Engagement with two of the key themes of the university, *Institutions* and *Youth and Identity*, is indicated in the self-evaluation report. The sociology programme is central to the development of these interdisciplinary themes across the university, and the faculty should be centrally involved in future developments as well. Strategic engagement with university priorities is important. The leadership is clearly aware of the significance of remaining connected to the priority foci of the university at large. The SWOT analysis is fairly comprehensive with respect to the strengths of the programme, but could be more detailed in specifying the implications of the stated weaknesses and threats.

#### **4.7. PhD training and supervision**

The PhD training at Utrecht overlaps with that at Groningen and Nijmegen. The PhD programme is integrated into the ICS research school, and the current role of ICS is recognised

and supported by all three universities. Chapter 6 of this report provides further information and the Committee's assessment of ICS.

The goal of the PhD programme is to turn out highly qualified researchers and new university faculty members who are able to conduct theoretically and methodologically advanced social sciences research.

The programme has a low dropout rate, and a large percentage of PhD candidates finish on time (81%), along with the generally good labour market position of graduates, with 75% having their first appointment in academia. The Committee adds that publications by PhD students are of good quality overall.



## 5. Radboud University Nijmegen

<b>Programme:</b>	<b>Nijmegen Institute for Social and Cultural Research</b>	
Programme director:	Prof. G. Kraaykamp	
Research staff 2012:	10.59 fte	
Assessments:	Quality:	4.5
	Productivity:	4
	Relevance:	4
	Viability:	4

---

Since there is a large overlap between the institute and programme levels at Radboud University Nijmegen, and as the self-assessment did not distinguish between them, the Committee decided to integrate its assessment. Accordingly, the following assessment covers both levels.

### 5.1A. The Institute

The sociology department at Radboud University Nijmegen is embedded in the Nijmegen Institute for Social and Cultural Research (NISCO). The institute consists of two research groups, Sociology and Cultural anthropology and development studies.

The overall aim of NISCO research is to contribute innovative knowledge to the scientific and social community by means of systematic comparative research. The rationale to focus on comparative research is that it puts societal phenomena and processes into perspective and thus provides insights into and explanations of similarities and differences. Although NISCO stimulates research with strong links to national and international disciplinary scientific communities, cooperation between sociology and cultural anthropology is also exploited.

The Committee was initially somewhat worried about the strong quantitative focus of the sociology programme at Nijmegen. However, the possibilities in NISCO of cross-fertilization and collaboration with the cultural anthropology department are exciting and should certainly be further explored.

The impression exists that publication strategies at the Faculty level might be dominated by other disciplines than sociology, leading to a predominant focus on international academic articles. Although the programme is doing rather well in that respect, the Committee points out that the writing of monographs by senior staff could be a welcome addition to the current output.

### 5.1B. The Programme

The aim of the research programme in sociology is to attain theoretical and empirical progress in sociology by answering comparative questions about contemporary societies. The programme advances empirical sociology that 1. takes contemporary societies as key units and describes and explains differences and similarities between them, as well as developments within single units; 2. regards social inequality, social cohesion and modernisation processes as crucial societal phenomena; 3. studies existing macro-societal phenomena by means of micro-level assumptions; and 4. holds that empirical progress in testing explanations may be achieved by systematic data collection and advanced data analysis.

The research programme is closely related to the ICS programme in which Nijmegen participates (with Groningen and Utrecht). The common fields of interest are social dilemmas. The common core of the programme lies in the integration of theory formation, methodologically advanced empirical research, and state-of-the-art statistical modelling. The research strategy emphasizes a problem-driven approach.

## **5.2. Quality and academic reputation**

The self-evaluation report provides a number of results (key findings) to illustrate some substantive topics studied by the themes. It also gives citation scores, namely H-indices of staff members in Google Scholar and ISI journals (web of science). Of the 172 English journal articles published in the period evaluated, 90 (52%) were in the top 25% of journals relevant to the discipline, with 27 (16%) of them being in the top 10%. Specifically, the number of articles in the top 25% of journals is impressive.

According to the self-evaluation report, research on social inequality has exemplified to what extent parental reading socialization and early school involvement account for performance differences between low-status and high-status children in primary school. An article on social cohesion focused on the relation between ethnic diversity and informal social capital. Another publication on modernization processes investigated trends and determinants of religious belief and belonging in Europe from a combined cross-national and longitudinal perspective.

The Nijmegen programme is small, coherent, integrated, and highly professional. In terms of overall quality, the Committee considers it to lie midway between excellent and very good. The research carried out at Nijmegen is of a very high standard, but just short of being world-leading or pioneering. There is an acknowledged emphasis on theory testing rather than theory development. For all its strengths, this might restrict the potential for innovative discovery. The recent turn toward policy and arrival of new faculty members might well serve to stimulate such a development, however.

The programme specializes in the collection of large-scale data that have been systematically provided to facilitate cooperation with members of local, national and international scientific communities. NISCO strongly stimulates international cooperation, and a number of examples of international cooperation are given in the self-evaluation report.

The emphasis on data collection and the production of data sets makes for a very important contribution to national and international scholarship. This is highly commendable. The internal use of these data sets is evidenced in the publications by members of the faculty and graduate students. These publications are of a very high quality, most particularly with regard to technical skill and empirical reasoning. They are rigorous and convincing, though with perhaps one exception, none appears to be a landmark publication.

Almost all the researchers at Nijmegen are associated with the ICS research school. Various researchers maintain contacts with external research institutions, like the Social and Cultural Planning Office (SCP), Statistics Netherlands (CBS) and the Institute for Applied Social Sciences (ITS). Researchers of the programme have been invited by various ministries to participate in policy and advisory meetings.



### **5.3. Resources**

Appendix D provides an overview of the research staff and funding of the programme. The self-evaluation report mentions that there have been some cuts in government funding and consequently in staff, particularly in government-funded PhD projects. This decrease was partly compensated for by increases in research organisation and contract funding.

The total funding of the programme increased slightly in the assessment period. The Committee learned that budget cuts on two occasions during the assessment period resulted in a decrease in direct funding. To compensate, research organisation and contract funding was increased over the years. The Committee did note a sharp decline in the number of PhD students between 2007 and 2012, making the Nijmegen programme the one with the least number of PhD students per research fte. In 2013 the department claimed it had regained its funding level. Nevertheless, a small department like Nijmegen is more vulnerable to changes in staff members as affecting its high-quality research and output. The department should therefore continue to focus on a steady and viable PhD population.

A number of staff members have been successful in obtaining research grants, both from the NWO Conflict & Security programme on Ethnic Diversity in Europe and personal grants, Veni and Vidi.

### **5.4. Productivity**

The publication policy of NISCO focuses on placing articles in high-ranked sociology journals, specialised journals and Dutch sociology journals. This policy aims at both public visibility and academic impact.

The publication strategy appears to target refereed journals, which has led to a decline in the overall number of publications from 80 in 2007 to 59 in 2012. The average publication rate of the tenured staff is among the lowest, also when taken into consideration the small size of tenured staff, though differences between the programmes at the bottom end of this measure are small. There is a decided emphasis on the publication of articles rather than books. This seems a sensible strategy, especially given the pressure for short-term results, but may actually be a detriment to a long-term impact.

Three long-term surveys are partly organised by sociology at Nijmegen and are financed by the innovation facilities of the Faculty of Social Sciences in Nijmegen. In the interviews during the site visit, it became clear that the department is working on the necessary funding to continue its data collection activities.

In the period 2007-2012, a total of 18 PhD students were enrolled, of which one dropped out and one has yet to finish. Some 78% of PhD candidates graduate within six years. The self-assessment report describes a decreasing trend of new PhD students due to increasing problems with obtaining internal and external funding. This steep decrease is clearly a point requiring attention in the Committee's opinion, which is also explained under the heading of resources. Nevertheless, the completion rates for PhDs are very good.

### **5.5. Policy on societal relevance**

The sociology programme facilitates the use of primary data sources by making them available to the general public through DANS-KNAW. In addition, several textbooks and monographs

applicable in academic and non-academic teaching on the use of SPSS and statistics for a general audience were published, and statistical software has been developed. A number of research staff members have initiated collaboration with the Netherlands Institute for the Study of Crime and Law Enforcement on a project addressing the overlap between victimisation and offending.

The programme performs a very valuable public service through the production of data sets which are made available to third parties. Staff members are active in policy-related work with government agencies; though rather limited now, this is likely to increase with the new hires. This is a promising development which should bear fruit in the future. There is an active core of staff engaged in the production of school texts and other materials, especially related to data analysis, but also connected to 'parental socialization' regarding the school performance of their children. The Committee views these attempts at outreach very positively.

The self-evaluation report describes examples of media attention for the research in national newspapers, opinion magazines, and television and radio performances. Various works of staff members have found their way to politicians and policy makers. A number of external recognitions are mentioned in the self-evaluation report, such as membership in the advisory board of ITS, and membership in the board of election research.

## **5.6. Strategy for the future**

The funding of research carried out by programme members is stated to be ensured by financial support from the Faculty of Social Sciences. Funding for data collection is guaranteed through innovation funds provided by the Faculty, and it seems realistic to assume that external funds may be attracted to support this.

With respect to infrastructure, the ICS in combination with the research master's programme is claimed to provide opportunities for doing innovative research in the future. The programme feels that with the enrolment of new staff members in 2011 and 2012, its innovative capacity has improved. It may be expected that new themes will be elaborated. This would clearly be a positive development.

Based on the SWOT analysis, the programme has formulated a strategy. For the near future, the focus will be on specific questions related to social inequality, social cohesion, and modernization, in a comparative mode. The focus will also be on publishing in highly ranked international journals, while also including subjects relevant to policy and politics in the Netherlands. The programme will collect multi-actor, multi-moment and multi-context data, making these available to the social science community, and analyse such data with the aid of advanced methodologies. It will also educate promising young sociologists and invest in the acquisition of research grants from NWO and EU programmes.

Overall, the outlook appears to be promising, with new staff members opening up opportunities for development, while at the same time the strong focus on data collection and the production of data sets provides continuity. Membership in the ICS also provides a stable and excellent recruiting and training base for new PhD students. As mentioned earlier in this chapter, the relatively small size of the programme makes it comparatively more vulnerable to the departure of staff members. Although the programme seems to have done well in hiring new staff, this will continue to require the attention of management.

The SWOT analysis provided is one of the most perceptive of all the institutions that were studied. The leadership appears to have a clear grasp of the strengths and weaknesses of the

programme. One of the latter, the 'limited attention for policy research' has already been addressed. Another, concerning the heavy emphasis on theory testing at the expense of new societal issues, might be something to reflect upon in greater depth. This should be of concern in planning for the future, along with the threats due to the decline in funding, especially as regarding PhD students.

### **5.7. PhD training and supervision**

The PhD training at Nijmegen overlaps with that at Groningen and Utrecht. The PhD programme is integrated into the ICS research school, and the current role of ICS is recognised and supported by all three universities. Chapter 6 of this report provides further information and the Committee's assessment of ICS.

According to the self-evaluation report, the research master in Social Cultural Science is a good preparation for starting a PhD project. Sociology at Nijmegen is associated with the ICS in providing education to PhD students.

The reduced PhD student population over the past period could have easily endangered the quality of training for PhD students. In this respect, the Nijmegen programme could rely on the integration of the PhD programme in ICS, to provide a complete PhD training. The Committee was also impressed by the fact that many PhD students manage to publish in major journals.

The Committee noticed that the increasing cross-fertilization within NISCO has not yet reached the level of PhD projects. Such collaborations would further broaden the perspective of PhD students beyond quantitative research.



## 6. Interuniversity Centre for Social Science Theory and Methodology (ICS)

The ICS is a collaborative effort between the graduate schools of the Social Sciences faculties of the universities of Groningen, Utrecht and Nijmegen. One important component is the inter-university PhD training programme. The programme is embedded in the ICS research programme *Social Networks, Solidarity, and Inequality*, with which it shares a common core.

The ICS PhD programme has KNAW accreditation and received a NWO Graduate Programme Award in 2009. It has an annual recruiting and selection procedure resulting in year groups of 8-10 PhD students. The key components of the ICS training programme are a structured mandatory course programme during the first 18 months, interuniversity Forum Days to present a student's own work and discuss the work of fellow PhD students, and a 6-12 week internship abroad. The programme has a broad range of theoretical, methodological and substantive expertise through interuniversity collaboration.

The ICS is strongly governed and retains the allegiance of its constituent universities and departments. The completion rates and number of theses per tenured fte is ranked second among the departments reviewed.

For all three universities it is a strength to be linked to ICS, which is internationally well-known. All three add to and make use of the breadth of research done there, creating synergy. PhD students all announced that they are very content with ICS, they consider themselves to be privileged.

The Committee was pleased to learn that the viability of national graduate schools is currently increasing. Although none of the PhD training programmes at any of the seven evaluated institutes was less than of very high quality, ICS has the track record as well as the size to be a success.



## 7. Erasmus University Rotterdam

### **Programme Rotterdam: Social Problems in Contemporary Modernity**

Programme director: Prof. Godfried Engbersen

Research staff 2012: 22.39fte

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

---

Since there is a large overlap between the institute and programme levels at Erasmus University Rotterdam, and as the self-assessment did not distinguish between them, the Committee decided to integrate its assessment. Accordingly, the following assessment covers both levels.

#### **7.1A. The Institute**

Sociology is one of the four capacity groups of the Faculty of Social Sciences at Erasmus University Rotterdam. The research mission of the Faculty is to promote and conduct socially relevant research of a high standard that is internationally recognized. In particular, the Faculty stimulates international and interdisciplinary co-operation linking theoretical, knowledge-driven questions to society-driven questions. It aims to improve the quality of the research that is being carried out.

The Faculty has transferred research and education responsibilities from the dean's office to the capacity groups. The Sociology Department is headed by a Chair of the Institute, a Director of Education and a Director of Research. The research director is responsible for the establishment and disbanding of a research group, admittance of members to a research programme, funding of research activities, assessment of individual research results by staff members, and overall research achievements and the functioning of the research group.

During the site visit the Committee was informed about the financial restraints with respect to replacing (senior) staff members who have recently left the programme. It understands that financial restraints are to be taken into consideration, but considers that the Faculty should support the programme as much as possible in formulating a strategy to deal with these departures. Too many losses at the senior level will have an effect on the quality of the research in the next period. The Committee was reassured with respect to the continuation of tenure-track positions. The SWOT analysis in the self-evaluation report mentioned termination of these positions, but it was made clear that the tenure-track positions will remain for now.

In the period of assessment, the Faculty formulated an explicit policy on production strategy. Programmes are encouraged to focus on both national and international publications. Individual researchers receive points for certain publications, both books and articles, and a steep rise was observed for researchers, sub-groups, and groups.

#### **7.1B. The Programme**

The research programme *Social Problems in Contemporary Modernity* addresses the formation of social problems and their consequences in the context of 'liquid modernity'. It specifically

focuses on social problems, on understanding their cultural aspects, their institutional contexts and the policy responses to them. The most pertinent examples, according to the self-evaluation report, are: public issues, professional contexts and personal consequences.

The research programme has three research themes, and co-operation between them is encouraged. The first line is 'Family, Welfare and Work'. It combines empirical research on family development with welfare state studies that comment on and interpret welfare state developments, based on a Dutch point of origin. It is interesting to note that their Dutch analyses can be presented and published at an international level. The second theme on 'Citizenship, Migration and the City' is very different methodologically but it comments on developments in a very eye-opening way, building not only on the team's research but also bringing together findings from other research projects. The third theme on 'Culture and Meaning in Contemporary Society' leads partly to discursive analyses and partly to conceptual analyses.

## **7.2. Quality and academic reputation**

The self-evaluation report provides a number of results (key findings) to illustrate some substantive topics studied by the themes. It also includes citation scores, namely H-indices of staff members in Google Scholar and ISI journals (web of science). Of the 260 English journal articles, 42 (16%) were in the top 25% journals relevant to the discipline, with 10 (4%) of them in the top 10%. According to the self-evaluation report, the programme also published 51 books, both in Dutch and English. The Committee concluded that improvement in publishing top articles is possible, but it is also aware of the fact that publishing books puts article publications under pressure. Combination of the two requires a solid strategy and close monitoring by the Department.

The programme consists of three research themes that differ in research methodologies as well as in subject. However, to the Committee it appears that the extent and manner of interlinking of these themes is still in progress. The programme is definitely keen on safeguarding pluralism and mutual respect for the different research themes and methodologies, which is admirable.

The quality of the programme looks quite impressive as it manages to publish internationally with innovative contributions and to address a national audience at the same time. The fact that the previous collaboration with the University of Amsterdam ended apparently did little to damage the Erasmus programme in terms of the quality of its research. Last year two tenured staff members left for other universities. Whether and how they will be replaced are topics that are still under discussion.

As an indicator of international reputation, the capability to acquire international funding (including one ERC advanced research grant) was given. The programme relates its results to its mission and to the classical tasks of the sociologist: to be a myth-hunter, to study the unanticipated consequences of international human actions, and to test new theoretical explanations for central sociological questions. A number of key findings are given in the self-evaluation report.

The programme leaders and senior researchers have a good academic reputations and are visible and recognized at the international level. The collaborations and key roles played in international research programmes and networks testify to this. The launching of the third research line on 'Culture...' is relatively new and seems to consist of bringing together some previous research activities under this specific heading. Although the research line is still in a developmental phase,



it is conceived as a fruitful initiative that does not hinder close cooperation with the other research lines.

### **7.3. Resources**

Appendix D provides an overview of the research staff and funding of the programme. The programme grew in terms of staff and research capacity between 2007 and 2012. Specifically, the number of tenured staff increased with the appointment of six tenure-track positions. According to the Committee, the investment in new tenure-track positions is very welcome.

When compared to the sociological research programmes at other universities there is a contrast observed in total funding with respect to the total staff fte's. The number of total staff fte is average when compared to the sociological research programmes at other universities, while total funding was the highest of all programmes at other universities. The observed variance makes it difficult for the Committee to comment on the financial position of the programme. However, increase in total funding primarily results from an increase in external sources which is commendable.

Members of the programme acquired funding at the international level (ERC and FP7) as well as from the national NWO programmes, Dutch ministries, GAK Foundation and international organizations (EU, OECD). The total funding is among the highest of Dutch sociological research teams, with significant growth noted during the assessment period. At 36%, direct funding is relatively low, but contract funding (20%) and especially research organisation funding (45%) is rather high. According to the Committee, the programme has been very successful in generating external research funding, making it able to increase PhD recruitment and provide a boost for the upcoming period. The share of research grants has risen while the share of contract research has fallen

### **7.4. Productivity**

As the number of tenured staff increased in the period of assessment, both absolute and relative numbers of international academic publications have also increased per tenured staff research fte. Dutch academic publications increased in absolute numbers and dropped in relative terms, while the other output figures (mostly professional publications) are more or less stable in absolute terms, but decreased in relative terms. According to the Committee, the faculty certainly progressed in terms of productivity in the period of assessment. While non-Dutch publications in top journals exist and are increasing over the years, they are relatively lower compared to other Dutch Sociology programmes.

The programme concludes that there is a clear trend moving from publishing in Dutch to publishing internationally. Nevertheless, a substantial number of Dutch academic publications and professional publications are still realised. The programme had not defined productivity goals and a publication strategy as such in the self-evaluation report. From the interview with the Dean, it became clear that at the Faculty level, a policy had been introduced which the Committee considers strict, but fair. The Department policy is to more strongly focus on publication in top 10% journals which the Committee thinks may be over restrictive. It is, however, pleased to notice that despite the focus on articles, there is also appreciation for the writing of monographs.

Compared to the other research programmes, Rotterdam is quite successful in its publication record. Given its policy orientation, it is not surprising that it ranks highest for Dutch

publications, but it is also in the top league for its number of non-Dutch publications, be it, as said before, not in top 25% or top 10% journals. With respect to PhDs, however, Rotterdam performed less impressively. Recently, external research contracts allowed the programme to attract a new cohort of PhD students. The procedures for PhD research and its supervision look well established.

In allocating research time, quite some flexibility exists. All tenured staff is requested to do some teaching.

### **7.5. Policy on societal relevance**

The programme aspires to combine both scientific and public relevance. Staff members are active in national and international policy debates and public debates, and the products of their research efforts are used by non-academic actors. Staff members aim to reach policy makers and the public at large by publishing key aspects of their work in non-specialized books, by writing for popular Dutch blogs, such as Sargasso.nl, and writing pieces for Dutch daily newspapers. Furthermore, the department works together with professionals on joint projects, e.g. with ministries, the Health Insurance Board, and OECD. Finally, the department takes great pride in societal representation, for example in giving lectures to non-academic audiences.

With its research projects the Erasmus programme tries to be relevant for more than just policy making, it aims at a broader perspective of what the self-evaluation report calls 'public relevance' and 'participation in the broader societal debate'. From the site visit it became clear that the Erasmus programme is heavily invested in the dissemination of its research beyond academic outlets.

Several of the Rotterdam contributions have a scope and impact that go well beyond national relevance by promoting innovative frames of reference as part of sociological 'myth-hunting'. Moreover, in the national social policy scene, some of the senior staff members are well known and respected in the policy debate. The programme may rightly claim to be capable of combining scientific and public relevance.

### **7.6. Strategy for the future**

According to the self-evaluation report the Europeanization of the infrastructure of the university has most likely contributed to the ability to attract external EU funding.. The visibility of programme members has generated funding for applied social research, and the diversified research funding strategy makes the programme less vulnerable to specific cutbacks. The department aims to maintain the present balance between EU, NWO, and applied funding. Furthermore, the programme claims that the presence of young, talented staff demonstrates its viability. The steep increase in external funding in the assessment period shows that the programme is clearly capable of bringing in large grants.

For the future, the programme aims at improving its presence in the top 10% journals covered by ISI, while at the same time publishing more books with prominent university presses. Although the Committee supports the ambition to write high-quality articles for top journals, it strongly suggests to the programme not to lose sight of the fact that some of the most appropriate journals for publishing its work might be the top 25% journals and not the top 10% journals.

The aim of the department is to strengthen the networks in the Horizon 2020 programme and produce joint publications. It also intends to strengthen its societal and policy position by introducing new forms of dissemination. It seeks to enhance the differentiation in staff member allocation and to maintain the tenure-track system. The department wants to strengthen its current cooperation with relevant stakeholders.

According to the Committee, the SWOT analysis provides a valid picture of the actual situation and future perspectives. The reliance on external and university funds, both of which are under threat of being cut, may pose a risk; it may also destabilize the balance that has been reached between academically and problem-driven approaches. Compared to the previous assessment period, the Rotterdam programme has made clear progress. It might be a special point of attention to safeguard the investment through the tenure-track system.

A score of very good indicates that the programme is doing very well, however, this is dependent on exogenous factors that deserve attention and preventive action. One clear example is that the department lost two senior scholars and has had no opportunity to replace them with other senior staff. It was clear to the Committee that the programme leader is fully aware that a solution must be found, since these two scholars had a high academic reputation and were producing some of the top publications of the programme .

### **7.7. PhD training and supervision**

In the period 2004-2008 a total of 15 PhD students began their PhD projects. Most (87%), needed more than four years to finish. One eventually dropped out. After six years, approximately 75-80% of PhD students have obtained their PhD (40% after five years). During the site visit, the Committee was informed that the number of PhD students had increased to 23, as a result of increased hiring.

PhD candidates draft a PhD Trajectory Plan in close cooperation with their main supervisor(s) in the first two months of their programme. This plan requires approval by the promoter(s) and research director. After 15 months a go/no-go decision is made, based on results up to that moment. The Trajectory Plan distinguishes between two main approaches to writing a PhD dissertation: as a monograph or as a series of articles.

Annual PhD meetings are organized in which PhD candidates present their work in progress. These meetings are mandatory for PhD students and staff. All PhD students will be embedded in one of the three research lines of the programme. Monthly meetings are held in each research line at which members, including PhD students, present their work. Additionally, monthly meetings are organized by the research lines in which the work in progress of PhD candidates is discussed.

In 2012 an Erasmus Graduate School for Social Sciences and Humanities was established. This graduate school will offer an education programme for PhD students. On average, PhD students are expected to follow relevant courses up to 0.1 fte on average per year. A tailor-made educational programme will be developed for each PhD student in cooperation with the supervisor. Part of the training for PhD students includes courses abroad (summer schools). Courses should ideally include methodology, theory and an 'elective' part. In addition to following courses, PhD students are expected to devote 0.1 fte to teaching. From the interviews it became clear to the Committee that the Graduate School is still in a start-up phase. The options for PhD students are still limited. Nevertheless, the impression the Committee gained was that a lot of time and attention is being paid to the Graduate School, and it is confident that

it will mature over the next few years. The management of the Graduate School, as well as supervisors of PhD students, are aware of the limitations of the school and provide PhD students with sufficient alternatives that are tailored to the individual PhD requirements.

For PhD students, the research programme has a well-devised procedure that distinguishes projects relying on new data collection and those based on articles. Taking into consideration the relatively high number of tenured staff, the number of PhD students remains rather low. The overall success rate seems to be fine, although on average quite some years are spent on it.

## 8. VU University Amsterdam

<b>Programme:</b>	<b>PARTicipation In Society</b>		
Programme director:	Prof. H. Ganzeboom (until September 2013) Prof. M. Broese van Groenou (from September 2013)		
Research staff 2012:	18.2 fte		
Assessments:	Quality:	4	
	Productivity:	4.5	
	Relevance:	4	
	Viability:	4	

---

Since there is a large overlap between the institute and programme levels at VU University Amsterdam, and as the self-assessment did not distinguish between them, the Committee decided to integrate its assessment. Accordingly, the following assessment covers both levels.

### 8.1A. The Faculty

The Faculty of Social Sciences (FSS) of VU University Amsterdam houses six programmes, one of which is the research programme in sociology: PARTicipation In Society (PARIS), which is one of the three largest departments in the Faculty.

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 in the disciplinary programmes participate in interfaculty research institutes.

The FSS is small in the Dutch context, since psychology is not a part of the faculty. FSS thus considers it important to have specific areas of expertise that go beyond the individual programmes. At the time of the site visit, discussions were being held on the choice of themes. The Faculty management is stimulating bottom-up cooperation on common topics, making the research of the entire FSS more visible.

### 8.1B. The Programme

The research programme PARIS investigates continuity and change in formal and informal social participation in late modern Western societies in relation to macro-developments characteristic of these societies. Core social processes are studied in a wide spectrum of social participation. PARIS researchers employ a variety of theories and methods best suited for the research problem.

PARIS resulted from a merger of the Departments of Sociology and Social Research Methodology in January 2011 and has four research lines: Social Inequality in the Life Course (SILC), Social Context of Aging (SoCA), Social Change and Conflict (SCC), and Identities, Diversity and Inclusion (IDI).

During the site visit the merger of two departments into PARIS was extensively discussed. The management convinced the Committee that although it had not always been easy, the merger

was broadly successful and improved the viability of the programme. The Committee considers that PARIS has a great potential to transfer from its current umbrella function with many distinct types of work towards a cross-fertilization between the different pillars.

## **8.2. Quality and academic reputation**

The self-evaluation report provides a number of results (key findings) to illustrate some substantive topics studied by the themes. It also gives citation scores, namely H-indices of staff members in Google Scholar and ISI journals (web of science). A small number of senior staff members have excellent reputations and high visibility internationally. These members have high H-indices, while many younger staff members are less well known and have low H-indices. The programme is encouraged to formulate a strategy to increase the visibility of younger staff.

Of the 198 English language journal articles that appeared, 54 (27%) were in the top 25% journals relevant to the discipline, with 33 (17%) of them in the top 10%. These numbers show that VU University scores well in comparison with other Dutch sociology programmes in the top 10%, but less well in the top 25% journals.

The governance of PARIS seems to be good even if it is a little complex and there were initial concerns in regard to its efficiency. However, the Committee has been convinced by the representatives of the programme that the coordination of the programme by the board of the four group leaders and supported by the department's research manager as the programme director works in a reasonable way.

The research programme of PARIS is diverse in the Committee's opinion, but each of the four groups follows a clear mission. The co-operation between the groups could be strengthened to allow more synergy effects to evolve. The research agenda and the quality of the research output of PARIS meet very high international standards of social research.

The quality of the scientific output is internationally competitive. The contributions of the four research groups add considerably to the field, and are of significant societal relevance in terms of highly distinguished investigations of social processes and institutions.

The international reputation of the research groups SILC, SoCA and SCC is very strong. IDI is catching up considerably in this regard. Members of PARIS are highly visible internationally and recognized scholars in their research fields and beyond. The programme was successful in raising contract funding and has a high level of direct funding. The programme was successful in obtaining ERC grants and other European-based funding as well as contract research, which obviously is mostly due to projects conducted by SCC and IDI.

## **8.3. Resources**

Appendix D provides an overview of the research staff and funding of the programme. The total funding of the programme slightly increased in the period of assessment. The Committee noticed that the percentage of direct funding remained around 60% over the period of assessment, which is high compared to most other sociology programmes in the Netherlands.

Research organisation funding declined slightly in the period of assessment, but based on information from the site visit, it seems to have increased again in 2013. It was noted that while it seemed difficult for the programme to obtain research organisation funding in the period of assessment, it was very successful in obtaining ERC-grants and contract funding the latter being

mostly due to projects of SCC and IDI. The Committee would like to see programme members going also for Veni, Vidi or Vici grants. The share of direct funding should be reduced.

#### **8.4. Productivity**

While the number of tenured and non-tenured staff increased slightly in the period of assessment, the number of PhD students remained fairly stable. The total number of publications also remained stable, with a peak in 2010. There was an increase in non-Dutch refereed articles and a decrease in Dutch book chapters, reflecting the effect of faculty policy on non-Dutch publications.

The publication record and data collection activities are very impressive. The groups of PARIS achieve a very good coverage of top journals in the social sciences. The standard and scientific relevance of findings in various research areas is remarkable. Even though the publication record is not extraordinary in terms of quantity, it is excellent by international standards. The Committee felt there was a lack of cutting-edge monographs as candidates for widely recognized contributions to the progress of social research, theoretically or empirically.

In addition, the Committee observed the strong engagement of members of PARIS in conceptualizing as well as organizing the collection and distribution of highly relevant data (e.g. ISSP; ESS; GGS; ISMF; LASA) and international research networks. This is of major importance for the international social science research community. The contribution by PARIS in this regard is at the forefront of the field.

The strong outreach regarding a wider audience is documented by an impressive number of projects and activities. The increasing share of contract research among the research activities supports the impression of a major impact on public institutions beyond the scientific sphere.

#### **8.5. Policy on societal relevance**

According to the self-evaluation report, societal relevance is evident from contributions to public debates and frequent appearances in the national and international media. The programme members have developed and evaluated various intervention programmes aimed at reducing loneliness and dealing with deprived neighbourhoods, informal care and human rights.

The core research themes of PARIS are also of considerable societal relevance and have a potentially major impact on politics, other societal institutions, and public debates on current and future societal development – nationally and internationally. They have a strong focus on dealing with those issues and offer great opportunities to provide society with valuable evidence and strategies to deal with upcoming problems. The manner of conveying the findings and advice to interested institutions seems to be still somewhat conventional. The groups should consider developing new innovative strategies of knowledge dissemination.

#### **8.6. Strategy for the future**

PARIS resulted from the merger of four smaller groups, bringing together researchers with complementary and diverse research interests and skills, resulting in a less vulnerable and more viable research programme.

The SWOT analysis shows convincingly that the members of the programme are well aware of its strengths and weaknesses and what the challenges for the future are. In terms of the development of the research programmes, the strategy for the future and the research issues

referred to are quite general in nature. The plans with regard to strengthening international cooperation are convincing and reasonable. It is also good to see that improving the acquisition of research grants nationally and internationally is emphasised. In general, the share of direct funding is likely to decline. It will be interesting to see how the engagement in interdisciplinary research institutes at VU University like TALMA will develop in the future. The Committee misses a clear-cut strategy in regard to that.

By now, PARIS has established a sound basis in terms of resources and manpower. The Committee is confident that PARIS can keep its strong position in the international social scientific community. There is strong support from the FSS, but there also seems to be inner-faculty competition in the FSS. There is no doubt that PARIS will hold its ground or strengthen its position.

PARIS is encouraged by the Committee to re-introduce a Research Master focussing on the topics of the programme, although the Committee understands that this decision is not up to PARIS. Ambitious teaching has a positive impact on research and is important for the CVs of the assistant professors. It also helps to build up an in-house pool of candidates for research positions in PARIS. Therefore, measures should also be taken to attract more bachelor and master students.

Finally, the Committee would like to see clearer plans for the future when key members of the programme with a great international reputation leave or reduce their engagement. It perceives a research programme with a bright future and potential for cross-fertilization. There is a clear potential for the renewal of ideas with four different and complementary approaches of theory and methods.

### **8.7. PhD training and supervision**

PhD projects are embedded in the faculty's Graduate School of Social Sciences (GSSS), which assesses the quality of their research and monitors progress. The PhD programme prepares students to work as academics or professionals, capable of conducting research independently. PhD students are encouraged to develop their own individual research trajectories, and have regular sessions with their supervisors to work on this.

Since the termination of the Research Master programme, PARIS has introduced research assistantships for two years for talented master graduates to prepare them for a future PhD position.

The Committee was excited about the interview with the PhD students and the potential that PhD students have in the programme. There is a lot of interaction and support between PhD students in the programme. Furthermore, solid and good supervision of PhD students was observed. However, the duration of many PhD projects is quite long, and although dropout rates are low, the percentage of successful completions within a 7-year period could be higher.



## 9. University of Amsterdam

<b>Programme:</b>	<b>Dynamics of Institutions: Life Course, Culture and Citizenship</b>		
Programme director:	Prof. J.W. Duyvendak, Prof. G. Kuipers, Prof. H. van de Werfhorst		
Research staff 2012:	41.1 fte		
Assessments:	Quality:	4.5	
	Productivity:	4	
	Relevance:	4.5	
	Viability:	5	

---

Since there is a large overlap between the institute and programme levels at the University of Amsterdam (UvA), and as the self-assessment did not distinguish between them, the Committee decided to integrate its assessment. Accordingly, the following assessment covers both levels.

### 9.1A. The Institute

The sociological research programme is embedded in the Amsterdam Institute for Social Science Research (AISSR), which was founded in January 2010. The AISSR encompasses four disciplinary domains: Anthropology, Sociology, Political Science and Human Geography. The mission of AISSR is to create an academic environment that enables researchers to conduct cutting-edge and socially relevant research. The decentralised structure results in the programme groups having responsibility for research management and programme development. AISSR provides financial incentives to groups with higher productivity (in terms of doctorates awarded) and has invested in an infrastructure to assist researchers in their grant applications. The sociological research at the UvA is embedded in a large institute that is continuing to grow.

The Committee noticed that the self-evaluation report included a significant number of institutes, leading to questions with respect to organisation. During the interview it became clear that the staff are the responsibility of Human Resource Management (HRM) and can be lent out to teaching programmes and to research institutes. The department head is responsible for the balance between demands from education and research. Although complicated, it seems to work for the university.

### 9.1B. The Programme

The UvA sociological research is part of the AISSR programme and examines both the shaping and the effects of institutions, which are conceptualized as formal and informal societal rules and arrangements governing individual behaviour and social relationships. The central mission of the programme is to produce high-quality, theory-driven empirical research in a wide range of institutional fields, employing a variety of research methods.

The research programme consists of two groups, namely Dynamics of Culture and Citizenship (DCC) and Institutions, Inequalities and Life Courses (IIL). During the site visit, the Committee discussed the introduction of a third programme group, Cultural Sociology. Both the self-evaluation report and the interviews emphasised that rejuvenation of staff was considered very important in order to go forward.

## **9.2. Quality and academic reputation**

The self-evaluation report provided a number of results (key findings) to illustrate some substantive topics studied by the themes. It also gave citation scores, namely H-indices of staff members in Google Scholar and ISI journals (web of science). A number of senior staff members have excellent reputations internationally and high H-indices, while some staff members are less well known and have low H-indices.

Of the 251 English journal articles published recently, 96 (38%) were in the top 25% journals relevant to the discipline, with 23 (9%) of them in the top 10%. These numbers show that the University of Amsterdam does well in comparison to other Dutch sociology programmes in the top 25%, but less well in the top 10% journals. This could be partly related to the sub-disciplines that are being studied.

The research of this programme has clearly become high quality and internationally significant. The location of the sociological research programme in the Amsterdam Institute for Social Science Research appears to bring considerable benefits in terms of linkages with other researchers. The range of research topics in the programme is very broad, and coherence between the groups is not totally clear to the Committee, specifically with the establishment of a new group. Although the Committee considers the choice for an additional research line good and the focus well chosen, it is of the opinion that this will require paying attention to the coherence of the programme as a whole.

Several members of the programme have high visibility in the international research community, and their research is well recognised. The AISRR has had considerable success in attracting EU grants. The programme is well represented in terms of journal editorships and editorial board memberships and memberships of boards and Committees.

The department is committed to theoretically driven empirical research with a strong comparative element and engagement with international audiences. It plays a significant part in multidisciplinary research centres in the University.

Specifically in the second part of the assessment period, the programme succeeded in hiring scholars that increased its citation scores and international reputation. It also maintained a substantial research income. These are examples the Committee noted that show the change in strategy and consequently an increase in quality since the previous assessment.

## **9.3. Resources**

Appendix D provides an overview of the research staff and funding of the programme. The total funding of the programme has significantly increased in the period of assessment. It is striking that direct funding dropped from 42% to 29%, which is amongst the lowest of the programmes assessed. In 2007 the Amsterdam programme was already receiving nearly 50% of its funding from external research grants, and it has maintained this percentage, which indicates a strong increase in absolute research organisation funding. The increase in funding specifically led to an increase in the number of PhD students, producing a sound percentage of PhD students in 2012.

## **9.4. Productivity**

The programme aims to disseminate research findings to both the academic community and other stakeholders like policy makers, professionals, and the general public. All programme

members are expected to contribute to international sociological debates, and other forms of dissemination are stimulated. The programme states in the self-evaluation report that staff members are not expected to excel in all outlets, and not all sub-disciplines are equally suited for wider dissemination.

The total number of publications remained stable over the period of assessment, but a clear shift is observed from professional to academic publications. It should be noted that the number of international, peer-reviewed publications in 2007 was the lowest of all the evaluated programmes. In the interview with the programme leaders, it became apparent that changes in staff and rejuvenation of staff were major factors in the increase in academic publications.

Nevertheless, there has clearly been an impressive and major increase in productivity in recent years, particularly in terms of non-Dutch publications. It is notable that the number of papers in international refereed journals has grown from around 20 per year at the beginning of the assessment period to 40 in later years and 80 in 2012. The number of books published has also risen, which is impressive considering the strong increase in journal articles.

The increasing numbers of international publications and books have been balanced by broad stability in the number of papers in Dutch refereed journals and book chapters. It appears that sociology in Amsterdam has undergone a significant shift towards greater internationalization.

It is clear that the publication strategy of the programme has led to catching up in the number of international publications, which is a very good result. The Committee appreciates that although the strategy on publication of books was adapted, the writing of monographs still lags behind.

### **9.5. Policy on societal relevance**

According to the programme, the legitimacy of sociology depends partly on its societal contribution. The production of knowledge should inform citizens and policymakers and even be used by or co-produced with societal stakeholders. The self-evaluation report states that although not all staff members are equally involved in the valorisation of research, as a group the programme aspires to contribute as much as possible to what citizens, policy makers or professionals know and do.

The self-evaluation report contains examples of the societal relevance of the programme. They include funding by external parties, which is indeed one of the highest percentage among the programmes evaluated. Furthermore, contributions to policy and parliamentary documents are numerous. The Amsterdam Sociology group has especially excelled in media appearances.

It is clear to the Committee that sociology at Amsterdam has a strong social and political engagement, with members of staff writing widely in Dutch journals and newspapers and engaging in political and policy debates and media appearances. This is important in maintaining the profile of the department and discipline in the Netherlands. This is reflected in the very high number of other scientific outputs, such as newspaper articles.

### **9.6. Strategy for the future**

In the self-evaluation report the programme provides a view for the next ten years. It aims to consolidate its position as a major European centre for sociological research, and as a broad department with an empirically grounded yet methodologically diverse research agenda. It

furthermore aims to become a centre for research innovation and data collection using qualitative, quantitative and mixed method designs to study the effects of institutions.

With respect to acquiring funding, the programme will continue to target research funds from NWO and the European Research Council as well as societal stakeholders, specifically to create PhD and postdoc positions and additional research time for faculty members.

AISSR has developed several policies to facilitate the career development of young scholars and internationalisation of the research programme. Since 2013 a policy has been introduced to enhance promotions to appropriate levels in cases of outstanding performance. Moreover, AISSR has started a visiting fellowship programme for foreign early-career and established scholars.

The SWOT analysis is very clear and explicit about both the strengths and weaknesses of the programme. There has been considerable rejuvenation in terms of staff composition, with several older members of staff being replaced by younger researchers. The number of staff has grown, particularly in the associate and assistant professor ranks, and the number of PhD candidates has tripled to 21. This is indicative of a strong and lively PhD culture.

The programme has seen a substantial (50%) increase in overall funding even in the context of declining direct funding. This is a result of an increase in research grants. While this makes the department more dependent on research grants, it can be seen as an indicator of success. The department has a strongly growing research master's programme with substantial numbers of students. It benefits from its location in the centre of a major European city which is attractive to both students and visitors. The groups themselves believe that the viability of their research group is very high, and they have an ambitious goal to position it as a leading centre within European sociological research. It is not wholly clear what the strategy is to address some of the threats such as the large numbers of temporary staff who are dependent on research grants. The Committee understands the staff and PhD students are in the process of moving into a single building which will aid integration.

In conclusion, the Committee is of the opinion that the Amsterdam research programme has shown excellent progress in the period of assessment and has clear and realistic views for its future.

### **9.7. PhD training and supervision**

PhD candidates are enrolled in the AISSR PhD programme. They are embedded in one of the programme groups and are part of the larger AISSR PhD community. The educational component of the programme is organised in cooperation with the Graduate School of Social Sciences (GSSS), which focuses on graduate teaching (including master's programmes). GSSS also monitors the progress of all PhD candidates.

AISSR offers three- and four-year PhD trajectories; three-year positions are open to students with a research master's degree only. At present, the programme hosts 142 PhD candidates, of whom approximately 50% are foreign.

The PhD programme is structured to cater to the specificities of individual research projects by offering individual supervision, general PhD courses, tailor-made courses and PhD clubs where work in progress is discussed with peers. The programme clearly shows an increase in independence for a PhD student in the choice of courses. PhD candidates are supervised by a minimum of two supervisors, at least one of which is a full professor.

Of the standard PhD candidates who started between 2004 and 2008, 63% managed to graduate within five years. A total of 79% has completed the thesis. The structure of the PhD programme seems plausible, and the large PhD community is stimulating for the participants of the programme. The Committee was impressed by the high quality of the PhD theses it read. It agreed with PhD students that the possibility to combine a monograph with article publications is an asset of the Amsterdam programme.



## 10. Tilburg University

<b>Programme:</b>	<b>Social and Cultural Dynamics</b>
Programme director:	Prof. P. de Graaf
Research staff 2012:	8,98 fte

Assessments:	Quality:	5
	Productivity:	4.5
	Relevance:	5
	Viability:	4

---

Since there is a large overlap between the institute and programme levels at Tilburg University, and as the self-assessment did not distinguish between them, the Committee decided to integrate its assessment. Accordingly, the following assessment covers both levels.

### 10.1A. The Institute

The Tilburg School of Social and Behavioural Sciences (TSB) is one of five schools at Tilburg University. TSB has two broad guiding principles: 1) to provide excellent, research-based education and 2) to conduct research at the frontiers of core areas. According to the self-evaluation report, TSB programmes are characterised by their multidisciplinary perspective, research is targeted at valorisation and also at fundamental social and behavioural sciences topics.

The research at TSB is organized in ten programmes, each with a Programme Leader who is in charge of the department's research programme. The Committee believes that the management of TSB has a realistic view of the sociology programme and has been supportive in a period of financial difficulties and the departure of a number of internationally prominent scholars. The Committee would like to emphasize that, although the replacements look promising, the programme will need time and support from TSB to return to its optimal state.

### 10.1B. The Programme

The Social and Cultural Dynamics (SCD) programme covers the area of social inequality and social cohesion from a comparative and dynamic perspective. Topics studied in the theme of social inequality are work, occupation, welfare, well-being, housing and health. Those studied in the theme of social cohesion are values, solidarity, religion, family, membership of voluntary organizations and social networks. The comparative perspective focuses on the comparison of countries, either from a macro-perspective or from a micro-macro perspective.

The mission of the programme is to maintain the status received in the last research assessment as one of the leading programmes of social and cultural change which combines 1. micro- and macro-level perspectives and 2. comparative and longitudinal research designs. The programme aims to publish in high-quality journals and participate in European networks, publish books (as editors or authors) and publish in Dutch in order to communicate findings to a broader audience of policy makers, students and the public at large.

## 10.2. Quality and academic reputation

The Tilburg programme is a relatively small programme, but over the assessment period it had some very distinguished senior staff who are among the most cited in the Netherlands and with very strong international reputations.

The self-evaluation report includes citation scores, namely H-indices of staff members in Google Scholar and ISI journals (web of science). Towards the end of the assessment period, the Tilburg programme lost some of its star researchers to other universities. Taking the H-indices of these researchers into consideration, Tilburg would rank among the top programmes. Even without these star researchers, the citations of the Tilburg programme are very good.

TSB stimulates high-quality, empirical research which is publishable in top international journals. Of the 149 English language journal articles published in the assessment period, 60 (40%) were in the top 25% journals relevant to the discipline, with 16 (11%) of them being in the top 10%. These numbers show that Tilburg University scores high in comparison with other Dutch sociology programmes in the top 25%, but less well in the top 10% journals.

Over the assessment period, each of the senior full professors took responsibility for a specific research line. The different research lines, and their senior leaders, have produced high-quality outputs. Each research line is involved in international networks, often taking a key coordinating role (as with the European Values Study, the Network for European Social Policy analysis, and the European Consortium for Sociological Research), and all publish in high-ranking journals. The key articles are at the forefront of scientific development and contribute to important international debates. In the self-evaluation report, Tilburg's academic reputation is described as outstanding, with examples of membership of the Royal Academy of Sciences and leading positions in a wide range of international bodies and networks.

## 10.3. Resources

Appendix D provides an overview of the research staff and funding of the programme. The total funding remained stable over most of the period of assessment, although with a decline in 2012. Direct funding remained rather stable in the period of assessment, while research organisation and contract funding fluctuated. The programme has clearly been searching for a strategy to increase external funding. The Committee was pleased to learn about the ERC Starting grant that was obtained, but the funding issue nevertheless remains an important concern.

With an average of 4.8 fte tenured staff and a non-tenured staff that has grown in recent years towards 2.0 fte, the group remains small. The number of PhD students is rather low, although it increased somewhat during the period of assessment.

During most of the period of assessment, the composition of the research group was rather stable, but as noted above two senior full professors left the programme in 2012. During the site visit the Committee was informed about the replacement of these full professors by one new full professor and one associate professor.

All tenured staff members have teaching tasks alongside their research time. The programme's policy is that all tenured staff must regularly apply for grants from national and international funding agencies.



#### **10.4. Productivity**

The research group aims to publish in the best international sociology journals, to contribute to national journals, to edit English and Dutch books, and to disseminate its results to a general public. The total number of academic publications increased from that in the previous period. Also, the number of published articles in ISI journals has increased. Finally, five PhD candidates have successfully defended their PhD dissertations.

In terms of publications, the Tilburg programme has prioritized quality rather than quantity. Nevertheless, the publication rates both in Dutch and non-Dutch outlets are at a good level, and non-Dutch publications have shown excellent growth over the assessment period. In addition, members of the programme have been highly productive in data collection activities, which raises the assessment of their overall level of productivity even higher.

Particularly impressive was the fact that the 2008-2009 wave of the European Values Study was successfully completed to high methodological standards in all 47 European countries with populations of more than 100,000. Members of the programme have also played major roles in the Netherlands Kinship Panel Study and the Netherlands Longitudinal Life-course Study (jointly with other universities) and have given researchers access to a large number of relevant datasets through the European Data Centre for Work and Welfare. These databases are of high quality, and impressive efforts are being made to make them available to the wider research community.

#### **10.5. Policy on societal relevance**

One of the themes of the Tilburg University strategic plan is to continuously strengthen the scientific quality and societal relevance of its research. The multidisciplinary research centres of CoRPS, TIBER and CIR have a high societal impact according to the self-evaluation report.

The topics covered by the Tilburg sociology programme have great societal relevance. Members of the programme have placed particular emphasis on the valorisation of the European Values Study. They have ensured through high-profile publications such as the Atlas of European Values that their research findings are made available to a wider public and not solely to academic audiences, and they have lectured widely about European values. Together with Fontys University of Applied Sciences, Tilburg, educational material for secondary school students has been developed. This includes a website and companion guides.

The programme also invests in data collection for the research community. Finally, most of the researchers publish in Dutch sociology and social policy journals. This makes research findings available to a national audience and can contribute to policy discussions, especially on the labour market and welfare state policies.

#### **10.6. Strategy for the future**

Based on its SWOT analysis, TSB formulated a strategy based on a number of topics. The first one is to invest in a grants specialist to assist with and promote the acquisition of research funds. Second, TSB will stimulate intra-university, national and international collaborative projects and consortia. Third, TSB will expand its efforts to improve the quality of its Graduate School to promote the educational experiences of the PhD students and to enhance their professional competitiveness. TSB has a tenure-track system, and the self-evaluation report claims that the

multidisciplinary research programmes provide good foundations for achieving the long-range goals of TSB, including excellent fundamental and applied research.

The consolidation of quality and productivity of the programme remains its top priority. As noted above, a particular issue is that two of the leading senior scholars moved to other universities towards the end of the assessment period. The university's plan is to engage one new full professor and one or two assistant professors, which the Committee finds reassuring. Indeed, an excellent appointment had already been found for the full professorship at the time of the site visit and was expected to start in February 2014. The new appointment will both complement the expertise of the existing staff and enlarge the range of substantive research themes.

Although these unfortunate losses could be seen as confirmation of the high quality of the programme and its researchers, it does provide a challenge for the future of the programme. The SWOT analysis in the self-evaluation report is compelling. Since the programme is likely to remain relatively small, the challenge is to enable programme members to continue to publish at the forefront of their discipline.

Given its small size, the group will be relatively vulnerable to external influences. Despite promising recent developments, it will remain challenging for the programme to increase external funding and integrate the new hirings to create a consistent programme that will enable the high-quality research of the current and the previous assessment period to be maintained in the future.

#### **10.7. PhD training and supervision**

PhD students are affiliated with the TSB graduate school. A promoter and one or two supervisors mentor a PhD student and oversee the research project. TSB Graduate School offers an education programme which is partly a common programme for all PhD students and partly a topic-specific tailored programme. The supervisors and PhD students establish a training and supervision plan at the onset of the study.

The PhD coordinator of the Graduate School monitors the progress of individual PhD students and their projects. Excellent PhD students may be offered a postdoctoral position upon completion of their thesis. In addition to PhD students who are employed at TSB, the Graduate School also coordinates the dissertation trajectories of external PhD students.

In the period 2004-2009, ten PhD students started their research project, five finished their dissertation and two are still working on it. Three students dropped out. The programme aims to increase the number of PhD students and is applying for funding. The Committee considers it essential to increase the number of PhD students; during the site visit only six PhD students were working in the programme.

The TSB Graduate School allows for the Sociology PhD students to participate in a larger PhD community, which is beneficial for the small group. The Graduate School allows a lot of flexibility for individual programmes, which the students appreciate. Despite the flexibility, there seems to be adequate supervision. The success rates are not especially good, but the low number of PhD students in the programme make the numbers unreliable.

## Appendices



## Appendix A: Curricula vitae of the Committee members

---

**Peter Abell** is Emeritus Professor of Management at the London School of Economics and Political Science, where he is part of the Interdisciplinary Institute of Management. He is also affiliated to Copenhagen Business School (INO) and associate at Nuffield College, Oxford University. He contributed to mathematical social science, both quantitative and qualitative. Abell has founded and directed the Interdisciplinary Institute of Management and is the author of several books on methodology and individual participation and co-operation. He currently focuses on narratives and network analysis particularly the role of signed structures in group formation and identity change.

**Jos Berghman** (chair) is Professor of Social Policy, holds a personal chair in pension policy and is head of the sociology department at the Faculty of Social Sciences, KU Leuven University (Belgium). He is director of the International master programme in social policy analysis (Impalla), president of the European Institute of Social Security, vice-president of the Ceps research centre in Luxembourg and member of the Lisbon Agenda Group. Previously he was researcher and director of the Centre for Social Policy in Antwerp (Belgium) and professor of social security studies and dean of the Social Faculty of Tilburg University (NL). He chaired the tripartite Supervisory Board of the Belgian Social Security System and is member of the Expert Commission on Belgian Pension Policy. His main research interests are comparative and European welfare state and social security policies, social exclusion and social cohesion policies and social security administration.

**Karen Cook** is the Ray Lyman Wilbur Professor of Sociology; Director of the Institute for Research in the Social Sciences (IRiSS); and Vice-Provost for Faculty Development and Diversity at Stanford. She conducts research on social interaction, social networks, and trust. She has edited a number of books in the Russell Sage Foundation Trust Series she co-edits with M. Levi and R. Hardin, including *Trust in Society* (2001), *Trust and Distrust in Organizations: Emerging Perspectives* (with R. Kramer, 2004), *eTrust: Forming Relations in the Online World* (with C. Snijders, V. Buskens, and Coye Cheshire, 2009), and *Whom Can Your Trust?* (with M. Levi and R. Hardin, 2009). She is co-author of *Cooperation without Trust?* (with R. Hardin and M. Levi, 2005) and she co-edited *Sociological Perspectives on Social Psychology* (with Gary Alan Fine and James S. House, 1995). In 1996, she was elected to the American Academy of Arts and Sciences and in 2007 to the National Academy of Sciences. In 2004 she received the ASA Social Psychology Section Cooley Mead Award for Career Contributions to Social Psychology.

**Ronald Eyerman** is Professor of Sociology at the Center for Cultural Sociology at Yale University and received his B.A. from the New School for Social Research, a Masters in Labor and Industrial Relations from the University of Oregon, and his Doctorate at the University of Lund, Sweden. He is the author of several recent books, including *Music and Social Movements* and *Cultural Trauma* both from Cambridge University Press and *Cultural Trauma and Collective Identity* from the University of California Press. His interests include cultural and social movement theory, critical theory, cultural studies and the sociology of the arts. He is Co-Director of the Center for Cultural Sociology (CCS)

**Chris Hamnett** is professor at the Department of Human Geography at King's College, London. He had a long career at the Open University interspersed with numerous visiting positions including UBC, George Washington University, ANU, the Netherlands Institute for Advanced Studies, Nuffield College Oxford. He is expert on housing wealth and inheritance and a leading researcher in the fields of social polarization, gentrification and housing. He has

authored or co-authored a number of books. He was a member of the Dutch geography assessment team in 2000-1, and in 2006 he was on the international assessment panel for the departments of geography and urban studies at the Hebrew University in Jerusalem. He is on the editorial boards of several academic journals. His current research is on the links between social class, ethnic change, the housing market and education in East London, the impact of welfare benefit cuts in London and he is currently working on a book on the rise of China and its impact on the west. He was elected an Academician of the Academy of Social Sciences in 2007 and a Fellow of the Royal Society of Arts in 2010.

**Anthony Heath**, CBE, FBA is Professor of Sociology at the Institute for Social Change, Manchester University and Emeritus Professor at the Department of Sociology, Oxford University. His research interests cover social stratification and mobility, ethnicity, electoral behaviour, social and political attitudes, national identity and social cohesion. He has published many books and scientific papers. His most recent book, *The Political Integration of Ethnic Minorities in Britain*, was published by OUP in September 2013. He is currently leading a team designing a module of questions on attitudes to immigration for the European Social Survey. Heath has carried out work for many government and international bodies, including work for UNDP in Bosnia and Herzegovina on social capital and human development, for OECD on racial discrimination, for the Department for Communities and Local Government on ethnic diversity and social cohesion, for Lord Goldsmith's Citizenship Review on national identity, for the Department for Work and Pensions on employer discrimination, for the Cabinet Office on social mobility, for the National Audit Office, and for the Equality and Human Rights Commission on ethnic and gender inequalities. He was a lead expert for the Government Office for Science on a Foresight Project on the future of identity.

**Johannes Huinink** is Full Professor for Sociology at the University of Bremen, Germany. His main research interests lie in the research fields of social structure analysis, sociology of the life course (especially family and spatial mobility) as well as research methods. Johannes Huinink is co-initiator of the "Panel Analysis of Intimate Relationships and Family Dynamics" (pairfam) sponsored by the Deutsche Forschungsgesellschaft (German Research Foundation). This Panel is a representative, multidisciplinary, longitudinal study for researching partner and family dynamics in Germany. Johannes Huinink has published several monographs, edited volumes, and articles in high-standard German and international journals such as *Kölner Zeitschrift für Soziologie und Sozialpsychologie*, *Zeitschrift für Soziologie*, *American Journal of Sociology*, *Social Science Research*, *International Sociology*.

## Appendix B: Explanation of the SEP scores

---

<b>Excellent (5)</b>	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.
<b>Very Good (4)</b>	Research is nationally leading. Research is internationally competitive and makes a significant contribution to the field.
<b>Good (3)</b>	Research is internationally visible. Work is competitive at the national level and makes a valuable contribution in the international field.
<b>Satisfactory (2)</b>	Research is nationally visible. Work adds to our understanding and is solid, but not exciting.
<b>Unsatisfactory (1)</b>	Work is neither solid nor exciting, flawed in the scientific and/or technical approach, repetitions of other work, etc.

*Quality* is to be seen as a measure of excellence and excitement. It refers to the eminence of a group's research activities, its abilities to perform at the highest level and its achievements in the international scientific community. It rests on the proficiency and rigour of research concepts and conduct; it shows in the success of the group at the forefront of scientific development.

*Productivity* refers to the total output of the group; that is, the variegated ways in which results of research and knowledge development are publicised. The output needs to be reviewed in relation to the input in terms of human resources.

*Societal relevance* covers the social, economic and cultural relevance of the research. Aspects are:

- societal quality of the work. Efforts to interact in a productive way with stakeholders in society who are interested in input from scientific research, and contributions to important issues and debates in society.
- societal impact of the work. Research affects specific stakeholders or procedures in society.
- valorisation of the work. Activities aimed at making research results available and suitable for application in products, processes and services. This includes interaction with public and private organisations, as well as commercial or non-profit use of research results and expertise.

*Vitality and feasibility*. This dual criterion regards the institute's ability to react adequately to important changes in the environment. It refers to both internal (personnel, research themes) and external (developments in the field, in society) dynamics of the group. On the one hand, this criterion measures the flexibility of a group, which appears in its ability to close research lines that have no future and to initiate new venture projects. On the other hand, it measures the capacity of the management to run projects in a professional way. Policy decisions and project management are assessed, including cost-benefit analysis.





## Appendix C: Programme of the site visit

Tuesday 7 January 2014

start	end	activity	names participants
9:00	9:45	general introduction assessment in NL and SEP	Committee and secretary
9:45	11:00	general preparation	Committee and secretary
11:00	11:45	preparation RuG	Committee and secretary
11:45	12:30	lunch	
12:30	13:00	management institute RuG	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Prof. dr. H.A.L. Kiers (Dean)</li> <li>• Prof. dr. R.P.M. Wittek (Chairman Department of Sociology)</li> <li>• Prof. dr. A. Flache (Director of Studies)</li> </ul>
13:00	13:45	Programme leader(s) RuG	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Prof. dr. R.P.M. Wittek (Theoretical Sociology)</li> <li>• Prof. dr. A. Flache (Modelling Norms and Networks)</li> <li>• Mrs. dr. M.H. Bosman (Research Secretary, PhD coordinator)</li> </ul>
13:45	14:30	PhD students RuG	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ms. M Djundeva MSc (3rd year)</li> <li>• T. Kowalewski MSc (4th year)</li> <li>• Ms. N. Niezink MSc (2nd year)</li> <li>• Ms. B. Oldenburg MSc (3rd year)</li> </ul>
14:30	15:00	assessment RuG	Committee and secretary
15:00	15:45	preparation UU	Committee and secretary
15:45	16:15	management institute UU	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Prof. dr. W. Raub (Dean)</li> <li>• Mrs. prof. dr. T. van der Lippe</li> <li>• Prof.dr. M. Verkuyten</li> </ul>
16:15	17:00	programme leader(s) UU	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Prof. dr. V. Buskens (Theoretical Sociology)</li> <li>• Mrs. prof. dr. T. van der Lippe (Sociology of households and employment relations)</li> <li>• Prof. dr. F. van Tubergen (Theoretical and empirical sociology)</li> <li>• Prof. dr. M. Verkuyten (Interdisciplinary Social Science)</li> </ul>
17:00	17:15	break	
17:15	18:00	PhD students UU	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ms. S. Geven MSc</li> <li>• T. Immerzeel MSc</li> <li>• Knigge MSc</li> <li>• D. Macro MSc</li> <li>• Ms. A. Smeekes MSc</li> <li>• Ms. S. Westphal MSc</li> </ul>
18:00	18:30	assessment UU	Committee and secretary
19:00		dinner	Committee and secretary

### Wednesday 8 January 2014

start	end	activity	names participants
9:00	10:00	continue assessment RuG and UU	Committee and secretary
10:00	10:15	break	
10:15	11:00	preparation TiU	Committee and secretary
11:00	11:30	management institute TiU	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Prof.dr. K. Sijtsma (dean)</li> <li>• Prof.dr. W.J. Kop (vice dean research)</li> </ul>
11:30	12:15	programme leader(s) TiU	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Prof.dr. P. de Graaf (Social and Cultural Dynamics)</li> <li>• Mrs. prof.dr. C. Dewilde (Housing regimes and Inequality)</li> </ul>
12:15	13:00	lunch	
13:00	13:45	PhD students TiU	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Mrs. F. Roosma MSc</li> <li>• Mrs. I. van Deurzen MSc</li> <li>• Mr. B. Wind MSc</li> </ul>
13:45	14:45	assessment TiU	Committee and secretary
14:45	15:30	preparation RUN	Committee and secretary
15:30	16:00	management institute RUN	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Prof. H. Schriefers (vice-decaan research FSW)</li> <li>• Prof. P. Scheepers (director NISCO)</li> </ul>
16:00	16:45	programme leader(s) RUN	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Prof. G. Kraaykamp (Sociology)</li> <li>• Prof. P. Scheepers (Methodology)</li> </ul>
16:45	17:00	break	
17:00	17:45	PhD students RUN	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Mevr. J. Lameris (first year PhD)</li> <li>• Mevr. M. van Hek (second year PhD)</li> <li>• M. Visser (second year PhD)</li> <li>• M. Savelkoul (fourth year PhD)</li> </ul>
17:45	18:15	assessment RUN	Committee and secretary
19:00		dinner	Committee and secretary

### Thursday 9 January 2014

start	end	activity	names participants
9:00	9:30	assessment RUN	Committee and secretary
9:30	10:15	preparation VU	Committee and secretary
10:15	10:45	management institute VU	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Prof.dr. A. Hemerijck (Dean)</li> <li>• Prof.dr. L. Huberts (Vice dean Research)</li> <li>• Mrs. dr. J. van Stekelenburg (Head of Sociology Department)</li> </ul>
10:45	11:30	programme leader(s) VU	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Prof.dr. H. Ganzeboom (programme leader until 1-9-13)</li> <li>• Prof.dr. M. Broese van Groenou (from 1-9-13)</li> </ul>
11:30	11:45	break	
11:45	12:30	PhD students VU	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Mrs. M. Jacobs (fourth year)</li> <li>• Mrs. J. Slootjes (second year)</li> <li>• Mr. E. Sozeri (second year)</li> <li>• Mr. I. Petrovic (first year)</li> </ul>
12:30	13:15	lunch	
13:15	14:15	assessment VU	Committee and secretary
14:15	14:45	preparation institute EUR	Committee and secretary
14:45	15:15	management institute EUR	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Prof. dr. H. van der Molen (Dean of the Faculty)</li> <li>• Mrs. prof. dr. L. van Zoonen (Dean of the Graduate School)</li> </ul>
15:15	16:00	programme leader(s) EUR	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Prof.dr. G. Engbersen (Citizenship, Migration &amp; the City)</li> <li>• Mrs. prof. dr. P. Dykstra (Family, Welfare &amp; Work)</li> <li>• Mrs. prof. Dr. L. van Zoonen (Culture &amp; Meaning in Contemporary Modernity)</li> </ul>
16:00	16:15	break	
16:15	17:00	PhD students EUR	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ms. B. Ory MSc (first year)</li> <li>• S. de Hoon MSc (second year)</li> <li>• Ms. I.van Oorschot MSc (second year)</li> <li>• J. Haramban MSc (third year)</li> <li>• Msr. S. van Bohemen MSc(fourth year)</li> <li>• F. van Houdt MSc (fifth year)</li> </ul>
17:00	18:00	assessment EUR	Committee and secretary
19:00		dinner	Committee and secretary

### Friday 10 January 2014

start	end	activity	names participants
9:00	9:45	preparation UvA	Committee and secretary
9:45	10:15	management institute UvA	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Prof.dr. E.H.F. de Haan (Dean)</li> <li>• J. Komen (Executive Director AISSR)</li> <li>• Prof.dr. Jan Rath (Department chair of Sociology &amp; Anthropology)</li> </ul>
10:15	11:00	programme leader(s) UvA	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Prof.dr. J.W. Duyvendak (Dynamics of Citizenship and Culture)</li> <li>• Mrs. prof.dr. G. Kuipers (Cultural sociology)</li> <li>• Prof.dr. H. van de Werfhorst (Institutions, Inequalities and Life Courses)</li> </ul>
11:00	11:15	break	
11:15	12:00	PhD students UvA	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ms. V. Di Stasio MSc</li> <li>• T. Franssen MSc</li> <li>• Ms. E. van der Laan MSc</li> <li>• M. Olsthoorn MSc</li> <li>• Ms. M. Slotman MSc</li> </ul>
12:00	12:45	lunch	
12:45	13:45	assessment UvA	Committee and secretary
13:45	16:30	final assessment of all institutes and general conclusions	Committee and secretary

## Appendix D: Quantitative information on staff, funding and output as provided in the self-evaluation reports

### D.1 University of Groningen

Research staff	2007		2008		2009		2010		2011		2012	
	n	fte	n	fte	n	fte	n	fte	n	fte	n	fte
Tenured staff	14	4,6	14	4,5	17	5,3	17	5,3	18	5,6	16	5,3
Non-tenured staff	6	3,1	7	3,3	4	1,3	2	1	9	2,9	8	4,2
PhD students	16	8,7	19	10,2	19	11,3	24	10,6	23	12,4	22	13,5
<i>Total Research staff</i>	<i>36</i>	<i>16,4</i>	<i>40</i>	<i>18</i>	<i>40</i>	<i>17,9</i>	<i>43</i>	<i>16,9</i>	<i>50</i>	<i>20,9</i>	<i>46</i>	<i>23</i>
Support staff	2	1,7	2	1,7	2	1,7	2	1,7	2	1,7	2	1,7
<i>Total staff</i>	<i>38</i>	<i>18,1</i>	<i>42</i>	<i>19,7</i>	<i>42</i>	<i>19,6</i>	<i>45</i>	<i>18,6</i>	<i>52</i>	<i>22,6</i>	<i>48</i>	<i>24,7</i>

Funding	2007		2008		2009		2010		2011		2012	
	M€	%	M€	%	M€	%	M€	%	M€	%	M€	%
Direct funding	0,95	56	1,22	59	1,14	75	1,13	68	1,27	49	1,26	54
Research funds	0,47	33	0,41	29	0,16	15	0,22	23	1,07	42	0,6	26
Contracts	0,07	5	0,13	9	0,03	3	0,05	5	0,17	7	0,48	20
Other	0,1	7	0,04	3	0,07	7	0,04	4	0,06	2	0,01	0,3
<i>Total</i>	<i>1,59</i>	<i>101</i>	<i>1,8</i>	<i>100</i>	<i>1,4</i>	<i>100</i>	<i>1,44</i>	<i>100</i>	<i>2,57</i>	<i>100</i>	<i>2,35</i>	<i>100</i>
Personnel costs	1,28	85	1,5	88	1,5	90	1,58	91	1,86	91	2,1	87
Other costs	0,23	15	0,21	12	0,17	10	0,17	9	0,24	9	0,31	13
<i>Total</i>	<i>1,51</i>	<i>100</i>	<i>1,71</i>	<i>100</i>	<i>1,67</i>	<i>100</i>	<i>1,75</i>	<i>100</i>	<i>2,1</i>	<i>100</i>	<i>2,41</i>	<i>100</i>

Output	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012
Non-Dutch publications						
Refereed articles	36	39	24	53	40	47
Books	1	2	0	0	1	2
Book chapters	14	13	8	5	13	11
Publications in Dutch						
Refereed articles	1	4	4	2	2	4
Books	0	0	1	0	1	0
Book chapters	1	0	5	4	0	5
<i>Total academic publications</i>	<i>53</i>	<i>58</i>	<i>42</i>	<i>64</i>	<i>57</i>	<i>69</i>
PhD theses	5	4	2	6	6	4
Other Scientific output	1	0	0	0	0	2
Professional publications	18	11	8	9	14	11
<i>Total publications</i>	<i>77</i>	<i>73</i>	<i>52</i>	<i>79</i>	<i>77</i>	<i>86</i>

## D.2 Utrecht University

Research staff	2007		2008		2009		2010		2011		2012	
	n	fte	n	fte	n	fte	n	fte	n	fte	n	fte
Tenured staff		7,14		7,71		8,25		8,08		6,93		6,91
Non-tenured staff		3,77		2,85		2,81		3,46		3,52		2,81
PhD students		11,19		16,53		18,71		18,62		19,37		16,71
<i>Total Research staff</i>	<i>0</i>	<i>22,1</i>	<i>0</i>	<i>27,09</i>	<i>0</i>	<i>29,77</i>	<i>0</i>	<i>30,16</i>	<i>0</i>	<i>29,82</i>	<i>0</i>	<i>26,43</i>
Support staff		0,88		0,53		0,43		0,4		0,4		0,4
<i>Total staff</i>	<i>0</i>	<i>22,98</i>	<i>0</i>	<i>27,62</i>	<i>0</i>	<i>30,2</i>	<i>0</i>	<i>30,56</i>	<i>0</i>	<i>30,22</i>	<i>0</i>	<i>26,83</i>

Funding	2007		2008		2009		2010		2011		2012	
	M€	%	M€	%	M€	%	M€	%	M€	%	M€	%
Direct funding	0,89	31,06	0,88	29,29	0,84	26,1	0,84	22,08	0,86	25,63	0,84	29,26
Research funds	0,74	25,79	0,87	28,68	1,33	41,1	1,79	46,95	1,89	56,35	1,78	62,28
Contracts	0,04	1,57	0,11	3,61	0,14	4,37	0,08	2,1	0,08	2,33	0,09	3,3
Other	1,19	41,59	1,16	38,42	0,92	28,43	1,10	28,87	0,52	15,69	0,15	5,16
<i>Total</i>	<i>2,85</i>	<i>100,01</i>	<i>3,02</i>	<i>100</i>	<i>3,24</i>	<i>100</i>	<i>3,82</i>	<i>100</i>	<i>3,35</i>	<i>100</i>	<i>2,86</i>	<i>100</i>
Personnel costs	1,70	77	1,99	74	2,52	85	2,65	82	2,68	79	2,35	77
Other costs	0,51	23	0,70	26	0,44	15	0,58	18	0,71	21	0,70	23
<i>Total</i>	<i>2,21</i>	<i>100</i>	<i>2,69</i>	<i>100</i>	<i>2,96</i>	<i>100</i>	<i>3,23</i>	<i>100</i>	<i>3,40</i>	<i>100</i>	<i>3,05</i>	<i>100</i>

Output	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012
Non-Dutch publications						
Refereed articles	65	70	85	83	73	80
Books	3	1	5	1	4	4
Book chapters	23	16	29	9	15	11
Publications in Dutch						
Refereed articles	13	9	18	13	8	10
Books	6	2	3	3	0	4
Book chapters	24	5	15	8	8	15
<i>Total academic publications</i>	<i>134</i>	<i>103</i>	<i>155</i>	<i>117</i>	<i>108</i>	<i>124</i>
PhD theses	8	7	9	12	6	10
Other Scientific output	2	1	0	1	0	0
Professional publications	35	33	33	19	16	17
<i>Total publications</i>	<i>179</i>	<i>144</i>	<i>197</i>	<i>149</i>	<i>130</i>	<i>151</i>

### D.3 Radboud University Nijmegen

Research staff	2007		2008		2009		2010		2011		2012	
	n	fte	n	fte	n	fte	n	fte	n	fte	n	fte
Tenured staff		5,85		5,56		5,45		4,83		5,18		4,97
Non-tenured staff		0,6		0,02		0		0		0,3		1,46
PhD students		12,85		11,93		9,35		7,74		4,23		4,16
<i>Total Research staff</i>	<i>0</i>	<i>19,3</i>	<i>0</i>	<i>17,51</i>	<i>0</i>	<i>14,8</i>	<i>0</i>	<i>12,57</i>	<i>0</i>	<i>9,71</i>	<i>0</i>	<i>10,59</i>
Support staff												
<i>Total staff</i>	<i>0</i>	<i>19,3</i>	<i>0</i>	<i>17,51</i>	<i>0</i>	<i>14,8</i>	<i>0</i>	<i>12,57</i>	<i>0</i>	<i>9,71</i>	<i>0</i>	<i>10,59</i>

Funding	2007		2008		2009		2010		2011		2012	
	M€	%	M€	%	M€	%	M€	%	M€	%	M€	%
Direct funding	0,61	75	0,48	74	0,81	73	0,82	69	0,77	64	0,72	55
Research funds	0,20	25	0,17	26	0,30	27	0,37	31	0,42	35	0,43	33
Contracts	0,00	0	0,00	0	0,00	0	0,00	0	0,01	1	0,14	11
Other												
<i>Total</i>	<i>0,81</i>	<i>100</i>	<i>0,65</i>	<i>100</i>	<i>1,114</i>	<i>100</i>	<i>1,185</i>	<i>100</i>	<i>1,208</i>	<i>100</i>	<i>1,3</i>	<i>99</i>
Personnel costs	745	92	606	93	986	89	764	64	841	70	1013	78
Other costs	65	8	44	7	128	11	421	36	367	30	287	22
<i>Total</i>	<i>810</i>	<i>100</i>	<i>650</i>	<i>100</i>	<i>1114</i>	<i>100</i>	<i>1185</i>	<i>100</i>	<i>1208</i>	<i>100</i>	<i>1300</i>	<i>100</i>

Output	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012
Non-Dutch publications						
Refereed articles	23	28	32	30	28	31
Books	0	0	0	0	0	2
Book chapters	7	4	4	5	2	3
Publications in Dutch						
Refereed articles	14	16	15	5	10	5
Books	0	0	0	0	0	0
Book chapters	8	0	4	2	9	3
<i>Total academic publications</i>	<i>52</i>	<i>48</i>	<i>55</i>	<i>42</i>	<i>49</i>	<i>44</i>
PhD theses	5	4	5	3	8	4
Other Scientific output	1	2	2	1	2	0
Professional publications	22	11	5	10	9	11
<i>Total publications</i>	<i>80</i>	<i>65</i>	<i>67</i>	<i>56</i>	<i>68</i>	<i>59</i>

## D.4 Erasmus University Rotterdam

Research staff	2007		2008		2009		2010		2011		2012	
	n	fte	n	fte	n	fte	n	fte	n	fte	n	fte
Tenured staff		5,86		5,59		5,89		8,28		8,53		9,32
Non-tenured staff		2,1		1,67		2,56		3,58		4,07		3,98
PhD students		7,11		9,45		10,05		10,25		9,1		9,09
<i>Total Research staff</i>	<i>0</i>	<i>15,07</i>	<i>0</i>	<i>16,71</i>	<i>0</i>	<i>18,5</i>	<i>0</i>	<i>22,11</i>	<i>0</i>	<i>21,7</i>	<i>0</i>	<i>22,39</i>
Support staff		1,8		1,8		1,8		1,8		1,8		1,8
<i>Total staff</i>	<i>0</i>	<i>16,87</i>	<i>0</i>	<i>18,51</i>	<i>0</i>	<i>20,3</i>	<i>0</i>	<i>23,91</i>	<i>0</i>	<i>23,5</i>	<i>0</i>	<i>24,19</i>

Funding	2007		2008		2009		2010		2011		2012	
	M€	%	M€	%	M€	%	M€	%	M€	%	M€	%
Direct funding	1,16	40	1,09	34	1,19	32	1,59	37	1,60	37	1,67	36
Research funds	1,34	46	0,87	27	1,45	39	1,98	46	2,25	52	2,64	57
Contracts	0,41	14	1,25	39	1,08	29	0,73	17	0,48	11	0,37	8
Other	0,00	0	0,00	0	0,00	0	0,00	0	0,00	0	0,00	0
<i>Total</i>	<i>2,91</i>	<i>100</i>	<i>3,21</i>	<i>100</i>	<i>3,72</i>	<i>100</i>	<i>4,30</i>	<i>100</i>	<i>4,33</i>	<i>100</i>	<i>4,63</i>	<i>101</i>
Personnel costs	2,50	86	2,63	82	3,20	86	3,66	85	3,68	85	3,75	81
Other costs	0,41	14	0,58	18	0,52	14	0,65	15	0,65	15	0,88	19
<i>Total</i>	<i>2,91</i>	<i>100</i>	<i>3,21</i>	<i>100</i>	<i>3,72</i>	<i>100</i>	<i>4,3</i>	<i>100</i>	<i>4,33</i>	<i>100</i>	<i>4,63</i>	<i>100</i>

Output	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012
Non-Dutch publications						
Refereed articles	21	22	45	60	53	59
Books	1	9	10	10	10	11
Book chapters	17	28	41	22	28	49
Publications in Dutch						
Refereed articles	12	15	26	31	17	10
Books	4	7	6	7	2	9
Book chapters	9	13	19	18	18	15
<i>Total academic publications</i>	<i>64</i>	<i>94</i>	<i>147</i>	<i>148</i>	<i>128</i>	<i>153</i>
PhD theses	1	2	2	6	2	8
Other Scientific output						
Professional publications	44	57	54	57	84	51
<i>Total publications</i>	<i>109</i>	<i>153</i>	<i>203</i>	<i>211</i>	<i>214</i>	<i>212</i>



## D.5 VU University Amsterdam

Research staff	2007		2008		2009		2010		2011		2012	
	n	fte	n	fte	n	fte	n	fte	n	fte	n	fte
Tenured staff	18	5,3	18	5,5	20	5,27	22	5,71	25	5,13	24	5,85
Non-tenured staff	2	1,3	1	0,75	2	1,1	2	1	4	1,1	4	2,4
PhD students	21	11	20	10,22	21	11,02	23	10,14	22	9,7	20	9,97
<i>Total Research staff</i>	<i>41</i>	<i>17,6</i>	<i>39</i>	<i>16,47</i>	<i>43</i>	<i>17,39</i>	<i>47</i>	<i>16,85</i>	<i>51</i>	<i>15,93</i>	<i>48</i>	<i>18,22</i>
Support staff												
<i>Total staff</i>	<i>41</i>	<i>17,6</i>	<i>39</i>	<i>16,47</i>	<i>43</i>	<i>17,39</i>	<i>47</i>	<i>16,85</i>	<i>51</i>	<i>15,93</i>	<i>48</i>	<i>18,22</i>

Funding	2007		2008		2009		2010		2011		2012	
	M€	%	M€	%	M€	%	M€	%	M€	%	M€	%
Direct funding	1	62	1	59	1	66	1	62	1	57	1	55
Research funds	0	29	0	28	0	14	0	15	0	18	0	16
Contracts	0	9	0	13	0	20	0	23	0	25	0	28
Other												
<i>Total</i>	<i>1,086</i>	<i>100</i>	<i>1,038</i>	<i>100</i>	<i>1,155</i>	<i>100</i>	<i>1,151</i>	<i>100</i>	<i>1,162</i>	<i>100</i>	<i>1,377</i>	<i>99</i>
Personnel costs	0,923	85	0,882	85	0,982	85	0,978	85	0,988	85	1,17	85
Other costs	0,163	15	0,156	15	0,173	15	0,173	15	0,174	15	0,207	15
<i>Total</i>	<i>1,086</i>	<i>100</i>	<i>1,038</i>	<i>100</i>	<i>1,155</i>	<i>100</i>	<i>1,151</i>	<i>100</i>	<i>1,162</i>	<i>100</i>	<i>1,377</i>	<i>100</i>

Output	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012
Non-Dutch publications						
Refereed articles	26	30	27	44	30	40
Books	0	0	0	0	0	1
Book chapters	11	13	8	18	11	2
Publications in Dutch						
Refereed articles	5	6	3	7	2	10
Books	2	0	0	1	4	1
Book chapters	23	13	13	13	10	6
<i>Total academic publications</i>	<i>67</i>	<i>62</i>	<i>51</i>	<i>83</i>	<i>57</i>	<i>60</i>
PhD theses	3	1	4	7	6	5
Other Scientific output	7	8	16	14	4	7
Professional publications	10	14	14	16	14	16
<i>Total publications</i>	<i>87</i>	<i>85</i>	<i>85</i>	<i>120</i>	<i>81</i>	<i>88</i>

## D.6 University of Amsterdam

Research staff	2007		2008		2009		2010		2011		2012	
	n	fte	n	fte	n	fte	n	fte	n	fte	n	fte
Tenured staff		7,8		9,8		11,1		11,4		12		10,6
Non-tenured staff		7,3		8,8		6,2		6,6		7,5		7,7
PhD students		9,6		9,3		13,6		18,7		22,3		22,8
<i>Total Research staff</i>	<i>9,6</i>	<i>24,7</i>	<i>0</i>	<i>27,9</i>	<i>0</i>	<i>30,9</i>	<i>0</i>	<i>36,7</i>	<i>0</i>	<i>41,8</i>	<i>0</i>	<i>41,1</i>
Support staff		0,4		0		0		0		0		0
<i>Total staff</i>	<i>9,6</i>	<i>25,1</i>	<i>0</i>	<i>27,9</i>	<i>0</i>	<i>30,9</i>	<i>0</i>	<i>36,7</i>	<i>0</i>	<i>41,8</i>	<i>0</i>	<i>41,1</i>

Funding	2007		2008		2009		2010		2011		2012	
	M€	%	M€	%	M€	%	M€	%	M€	%	M€	%
Direct funding	1,27	42,00	1,16	35,00	1,50	34,00	1,63	44,00	1,64	39,00	1,33	29,00
Research funds	1,48	49,00	1,63	49,00	2,20	50,00	1,37	37,00	1,77	42,00	2,62	57,00
Contracts	0,27	9,00	0,53	16,00	0,70	16,00	0,70	19,00	0,76	18,00	0,69	15,00
Other												
<i>Total</i>	<i>3,02</i>	<i>100,00</i>	<i>3,32</i>	<i>100,00</i>	<i>4,40</i>	<i>100,00</i>	<i>3,70</i>	<i>100,00</i>	<i>4,21</i>	<i>99,00</i>	<i>4,60</i>	<i>101,00</i>
Personnel costs	2,44	94,00	2,62	92,00	3,10	91,00	3,34	91,00	3,81	91,00	3,91	91,00
Other costs	0,16	6,00	0,23	8,00	0,31	9,00	0,33	9,00	0,38	9,00	0,39	9,00
<i>Total</i>	<i>2,60</i>	<i>100,00</i>	<i>2,85</i>	<i>100,00</i>	<i>3,41</i>	<i>100,00</i>	<i>3,67</i>	<i>100,00</i>	<i>4,19</i>	<i>100,00</i>	<i>4,30</i>	<i>100,00</i>

Output	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012
Non-Dutch publications						
Refereed articles	19	22	42	45,5	42	80,5
Books	1	7	9	4	5,5	8
Book chapters	19	22	25	14,5	40,5	24
Publications in Dutch						
Refereed articles	11	11	10	4,5	12,5	10
Books	7	10	15,5	4	3	4
Book chapters	17	8	14	13,5	9	10
<i>Total academic publications</i>	<i>74</i>	<i>80</i>	<i>115,5</i>	<i>86</i>	<i>112,5</i>	<i>136,5</i>
PhD theses	5,5	4	5	9,5	6	4
Other Scientific output	220	221	365	253	249	251
Professional publications	52	34	37	31,5	15,5	24,5
<i>Total publications</i>	<i>351,5</i>	<i>339</i>	<i>522,5</i>	<i>380</i>	<i>383</i>	<i>416</i>

## D.7 Tilburg University

Research staff	2007		2008		2009		2010		2011		2012	
	n	fte	n	fte	n	fte	n	fte	n	fte	n	fte
Tenured staff		4,76		5,13		5,13		4,98		4,86		3,68
Non-tenured staff		0,1		0,81		2,37		2,04		2,51		1,61
PhD students		3,26		4,9		4,5		4,18		5,04		3,69
<i>Total Research staff</i>	0	8,12	0	10,84	0	12	0	11,2	0	12,41	0	8,98
Support staff		0		0		0		0		0		0
<i>Total staff</i>	0	8,12	0	10,84	0	12	0	11,2	0	12,41	0	8,98

Funding	2007		2008		2009		2010		2011		2012	
	M€	%	M€	%	M€	%	M€	%	M€	%	M€	%
Direct funding	0,538	31	0,737	57	0,747	51	0,691	51	0,703	52	0,524	52
Research funds	0,918	52	0,475	36	0,482	33	0,423	31	0,364	27	0,37	37
Contracts	0,158	9	0,129	10	0,181	12	0,193	14	0,222	17	0,091	9
Other	0,149	8	-0,037	-3	0,052	4	0,053	4	0,056	4	0,016	2
<i>Total</i>	1,763	100	1,304	100	1,462	100	1,36	100	1,345	100	1,001	100
Personnel costs	1,59	90	1,26	97	1,40	96	1,18	87	1,16	86	0,92	92
Other costs	0,18	10	0,04	3	0,06	4	0,18	13	0,19	14	0,08	8
<i>Total</i>	1,763	100	1,304	100	1,462	100	1,36	100	1,345	100	1,001	100

Output	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012
Non-Dutch publications						
Refereed articles	17	19	30	36	21	26
Books	0	4	0	2	1	0
Book chapters	6	18	7	10	4	5
Publications in Dutch						
Refereed articles	1	4	3	8	7	5
Books	2	3	3	1	3	1
Book chapters	6	8	11	4	29	7
<i>Total academic publications</i>	32	56	54	61	65	44
PhD theses	3	2	2	3	1	1
Other Scientific output	0	0	0	0	0	0
Professional publications	9	13	25	18	25	18
<i>Total publications</i>	44	71	81	82	91	63