Quality assessment of education and research in Dutch universities was until recently carried out by the Quality Assurance Department of the VSNU. In 2004 the activities of this department were transferred to QANU, which has assumed the responsibility for completion of the VSNU activities initiated before 2004.
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FOREWORD

This report is part of the periodic quality assessment of all publicly financed research in the Netherlands. Its purpose is to present a reliable picture of the results of the psychology research submitted for this review and to offer feedback to the internal quality assessment team of the organisations concerned.

This psychology research review was initiated and commissioned by the boards of governors of six universities in the Netherlands: the University of Groningen, the University of Amsterdam, the Vrije Universiteit Amsterdam, Utrecht University, Tilburg University and Maastricht University.

It is QANU’s aim to ensure independent, unbiased, critically constructive research assessments based on the use of identical quality criteria as far as possible, while taking specific circumstances into account.

We assume that the report’s conclusions and recommendations will be considered carefully by the researchers, the research directors and their department or faculty boards, and by the boards of governors at the six universities concerned, as an aide to maintaining and possibly improving the level of quality of their psychology research.

We thank the chairman and members of the Review Committee for their willingness to participate in this assessment and for the dedication with which they carried out this task.

Dr. Jan G.F. Veldhuis
Chairman of the QANU Board

Mr. Chris Peels
QANU Director
PREFACE

This report reviews psychology research at six universities in the Netherlands: the University of Groningen, the University of Amsterdam, the Vrije Universiteit Amsterdam, Utrecht University, Tilburg University and Maastricht University. The boards of governors of these universities have accepted this review report.

The research review for the six-year assessment period 1998-2004 was undertaken according to the Standard Evaluation Protocol for Public Research Organisations (SEP 2003-2009), as defined by the main Dutch organisations responsible for publicly funded research: the Royal Netherlands Academy of Arts and Sciences (KNAW), the Netherlands Organisation for Scientific Research (NWO) and the Association of Universities in the Netherlands (VSNU). The focus of the review lies on the quality of the research, its output, relevance and prospects at the level of the programmes offered by the psychology faculties.

As chairman of the committee, I feel grateful to have had the opportunity to examine the various psychology research programmes in the Netherlands thoroughly and in close cooperation with an outstanding group of international scholars from within the rich field of psychological disciplines.

A word of thanks must also go to all those at the various psychology departments who were involved in preparing the self-evaluation reports and to those who welcomed and assisted the committee at its visits to the particular sites. The committee was impressed by the amount of enthusiasm and time spent by many university administrators and others willing to answer the sometimes overwhelming number of questions asked by the committee members. The committee was also impressed by the open discussions and the great interest shown by all who took part in the different stages of the review procedure.

It is my conviction as a result of this exercise that psychology research will continue to flourish in the Netherlands.

Prof. W.A. Wagenaar
Chairman of the committee
1. Research Evaluation Psychology

1.1. Research Review Psychology 1998-2004

This report presents the results of the evaluation by an international review committee of the psychology research at six universities in the Netherlands: the University of Maastricht, the University of Tilburg, the University of Amsterdam, the Vrije Universiteit University of Amsterdam, the University of Utrecht and the University of Groningen. The university boards of the participating universities asked QANU (Quality Assurance Netherlands Universities) to organise the evaluation. The evaluation was carried out in accordance with the Standard Evaluation Protocol 2003-2009 for public research organisations (SEP) as published by the Association of Universities in the Netherlands (VSNU), the Netherlands Organisation for Scientific Research (NWO) and the Royal Netherlands Academy of Arts and Sciences (KNAW) in January 2003.

Following the guidelines of the Standard Evaluation Protocol, paragraph 3.2, a Discipline Protocol for Psychology Research at the six participating universities (see Appendix 1) was produced by the psychology research directors participating in the Discipline Board Psychology. The Psychology Chamber also provided proposals for international experts to take part in the Review Committee. The responsible university boards agreed upon both the proposed discipline protocol and the proposed Review Committee including the proposed chair and secretary to the committee. The QANU board installed the committee on July 6, 2005. The review is based upon the self-evaluation reports and key articles provided by the psychology institute boards for the years 1998-2004. The committee visited the psychology institutes at their universities in the months October (UvA, UvT and UM) and November (VU, UU, RUG) of 2005.

1.2. The Review Committee for Psychology Research

The composition of the Review Committee for Psychology Research, as proposed by the psychology institutes and installed by the QANU board, is as follows:

- **Chairman:** Prof. dr. W.A. Wagenaar, Leiden University
- **Cognitive Psychology:** Prof. dr. J. Duncan, Cambridge University
- **Clinical Psychology:** Prof. dr. M. Eysenck, Royal Holloway, London
- **Organisation Psychology:** Prof. dr. M. West, Aston University, Birmingham
- **Developmental Psychology:** Prof. dr. A. Demetriou, University of Cyprus
- **Social/Cultural Psychology:** Prof. dr. C. Sedikides, University of Southampton
- **Quantitative Methods:** Dr. R. Langeheine, University of Kiel.
- **QANU secretary to the committee:** Dr. R.R. Braam

An overview of the backgrounds of the committee members is presented in Appendix 2.

In addition the committee was advised by two referents:

- **Theory and History of Psychology:** Prof. dr. H. Van Rappard
- **Social and Cultural Psychology:** Prof. dr. P. B. Smith.

The chairman Prof. Wagenaar allocated all programmes under review to committee members as 1st and 2nd reviewers. The 1st reviewers were chosen on the basis of their expertise in the
domain of the programme; the 2nd reviewers were chosen to provide a more general complementary perspective. In deliberating the preliminary assessments both at the programme and institute level, the committee acted as one body and takes ultimate responsibility for the final assessments of all research programmes and institutes.

1.3. Information for the committee and site visits

The assessment is performed on the basis of the six self-evaluation reports provided by the research programme directors and the faculty/research institute or school for the period 1998-2004. The self-evaluation reports were sent to all committee members together with three key articles for each separate research programme. The committee held meetings with the responsible boards for research management and policy within each university, and with the particular institute management. The committee undertook site visits to each of the research groups, where meetings and conversations were held with all programme directors, and informal gatherings with other participants in the research programmes, especially PhD students (AIOs).

The committee assessment covered the research carried out in the period 1998-2004, according to the elements in the self-evaluation report as mentioned in Appendix 4 of the Standard Evaluation Protocol 2003-2009, and according to additional specifications in the approved Discipline Protocol for Psychology (Appendix 1). The five-point scale of the SEP used in the assessment scores on quality, productivity, relevance and viability (or 'prospects') are also explained in Appendix 4.

The committee noticed that in the various self-evaluation reports, the research capacity invested in PhD students is not always calculated in exactly the same manner. This is partly caused by real local differences, but also by the absence of clear definitions in the QANU protocol. The solution chosen by the committee was to follow the (corrected) figures as reported to us wherever possible and necessary. This mainly pertains to the comparison of psychology research at the different universities at the national level (tables in Chapter 2), not so much at the level of the institutes and their programmes.

The committee thinks that more specific reporting guidelines for uniform calculation and presentation of research versus teaching time will be helpful for future reporting.
2. Psychological Research in the Netherlands

The assessment of psychology research at six universities in the Netherlands in the period 1998-2004 should be seen against the background of the wider context of psychology as a growing international field of science. The several characteristics of the currently assessed programmes are more clearly understood if placed within this context and with a look at the history of psychology research in our country. Finally, the prospects of research groups depend also on balancing staff-student ratios and on (minimal) group sizes, things that may depend heavily on university policies defining the external conditions to programme growth. These circumstantial aspects are now briefly discussed in this field overview of psychology research and its characteristics in the Netherlands. Thereafter, the relevant sub-fields of psychology are discussed separately.

2.1. The growth of Dutch psychology research

Considering the modest size of the population and the limited number of universities, psychological research in the Netherlands is surprisingly visible on the international stage. Understandably, the USA is the major player, but the Netherlands ranks high among the others, and especially in Europe, even though it is a small country.

The productivity of psychology research in the Netherlands at 2.6% (2000-2003) is way above other countries as a percentage of total national productivity, indicating special interest. As to research impact, international orientation proves rewarding as is seen in a high relative citation impact (RCI) of 1.16 (above the world psychology average set at 1.0) of publications performed with international partners. This becomes even clearer given the lower impact of purely Dutch contributions scoring a modest 0.89 RCI below the average psychology impact score.¹

**Psychology research productivity (1998-2004) and citation impact**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Psychology institute</th>
<th>Research staff fte²</th>
<th>Citation impact 1998-2001*('03)</th>
<th>Publications from institutes **</th>
<th>Productivity: publications per research fte ***</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>UvA</td>
<td>433</td>
<td>0.96</td>
<td>1628</td>
<td>3.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UvT</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>0.80</td>
<td>404</td>
<td>3.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UM</td>
<td>245</td>
<td>0.80</td>
<td>996</td>
<td>4.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VU</td>
<td>393</td>
<td>0.98</td>
<td>1350</td>
<td>3.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UU</td>
<td>407</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>1580</td>
<td>3.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RUG</td>
<td>358</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>1321</td>
<td>3.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>1942</strong></td>
<td><strong>0.93¹ (0.95)</strong></td>
<td><strong>7259</strong></td>
<td><strong>3.74</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹ Source: NOWT reports 2003 and 2005: www.nowt.nl (productivity is 41% above 8-country average).
² fte = fulltime research equivalent (men-year), excl. teaching time (staff 40-50%, PhD student 30%, postdoc 20%).
³ Netherlands total, including figures for the Nijmegen, Leiden and Rotterdam institutes.
The international impact of Dutch psychology research increased in terms of citation impact from 0.93 in the years 1998-2001 to 0.95 in 2003. This international presence figures in the range of the world-average impact (0.90-1.10). Some of our psychology institutes (UvA and RU Nijmegen) perform even better given their share in the worlds’ top 10% of most highly cited articles.\(^4\) Within the Netherlands, psychology productivity ranges around the national mean of 3.74 (see table above), all institutes doing rather well, some more than others.\(^5\)

Things have not always been like this, however. After the Second World War, psychology in the Netherlands was lagging behind. International publications were scarce, and the academic organisation was weak. Since then, this leeway has not only been eliminated, but the Netherlands research community has pushed itself to the forefront of scientific research.

The factors responsible for this remarkable development are manifold. One of them clearly is the presence of a small but influential group of young psychologists, now long retired, who founded a research tradition based on mathematical modelling and empirical testing, instead of upon speculation or phenomenological analysis. Particularly the textbook *Methodology* of A.D. de Groot should be mentioned here. The Heymans Institute in Groningen proudly displays a pedigree of Dutch psychologists illustrating this descent from a relatively small number of Dutch pioneers in more exact and empirical psychology research.

Another evident factor was the organisation of psychological research across the various institutions in the sections of PSYCHON. Formally, PSYCHON was the organisation responsible for the assessment of NWO funding proposals at the national level, which in practice however served for researchers to demonstrate that they met international standards.

A third factor was the enormous influx of psychology students, which resulted in the growth of psychological institutes and their research programmes. In 1945 the few psychology groups did not offer an independent and complete education, but were rather subordinate to other programmes, such as medicine, letters, or law. At present, it cannot even be imagined that Dutch universities would not offer a complete psychology curriculum, in independent faculties or departments, which rank among the largest in academia.

A fourth factor was definitely the regular evaluation of research programmes, both in the process of the organisation and recognition of national research schools, and in the periodical VSNU visitations. These evaluations carried so many consequences for universities that they provided administrators with a legitimate basis for taking far-reaching decisions. The importance of this provides the basis for the present exercise: it serves to promote even further the quality of psychological research in the Netherlands. The research community clearly endorses this objective, as is apparent from the enormous effort spent at producing the excellent and highly informative self-evaluation reports the committee gladly received.

\(^4\) This means a 20%-50% above average share in top-10 highly cited psychology articles; source: NOWT report 2005: www.nowt.nl. Note: RU Nijmegen did not participate in this research review evaluation.

\(^5\) The committee noticed that in the various self-evaluation reports, the research capacity invested in PhD students is not always calculated in exactly the same manner. This is partly caused by real local differences, but also by the absence of clear definitions in the QANU protocol. The solution chosen by the committee was to follow the figures as reported to us wherever possible.
2.2. Characterization of the current psychology field in the Netherlands

All branches of modern psychological theorizing and experimentation are now well represented in the Netherlands. Within this wide field of research, however, a preference for a more scientific and exact approach is apparent. The main characteristic features of this approach are: mathematical modelling, advanced statistical methods, data theory, complex experimental designs, modern and sophisticated equipment, and close relations to other scientific disciplines such as medicine, biology, neurosciences and physics. All this applies equally to such diverse fields as neuropsychology, cognition, social psychology, developmental psychology and clinical psychology. It should be stressed here that this strong tendency to move forward may bring with it the disadvantage that some traditional and still useful areas become somewhat neglected. Examples include the branches of theoretical psychology & history, therapy evaluation studies and human performance theory. Especially the first of these three seems to have become an endangered species: the programme in Maastricht has already been terminated, and the Groningen group, though excellent, is small, perhaps too small to survive.

Although research methods and statistics play a major role in all programmes, it is not obvious how to best organise this domain within the context of a psychology department. In principle, two models may apply. One is an independent methods group with its own research programme, occasionally rendering some services to the other groups. The other is the distribution of methodology experts across all groups, leading to the absence of a separate methods programme. The advantage of the first option is a strong and viable research programme. The disadvantage is that this programme may become fully disconnected from the needs of the other groups, and consequently will create a diminished ability to support the other groups. The advantage of the second option is clearly the service geared to the immediate needs of the respective group. The disadvantage in this case is that isolated experts might fail to initiate innovative programmes, which in the end may render their assistance obsolete. The current evaluation committee encountered both models in the Netherlands, and both seem to demonstrate their specific merits. It must be stressed here that the psychology departments should be aware of the disadvantages of either model, and take all precautions they can to avoid these negative consequences.

In the 1970s and 1980s all psychology departments in the Netherlands used to have a section on experimental psychology, in Dutch: ‘psychologische functieleer’. Several developments have changed that. The first is that the term ‘experimental psychology’ has always been a misnomer. It was reserved for the empirical study of general psychological functions, such as perception, memory, thinking, motivation, action, emotion, etc. Experimental social psychology, developmental psychology or clinical psychology did not belong to it. Initially, this did not cause too many problems, because these disciplines had not invested much in their own laboratories. However, this situation has now changed radically. The laboratory facilities of social, developmental and clinical psychology are as elaborate as the former experimental laboratories used to be. Often the various departments use much the same facilities, especially when it comes to the measurement of physiological and neuropsychological variables. Another development is that the separation between general psychology and the other disciplines has largely disappeared. Memory, thinking, emotion are equally studied in social, developmental, and clinical psychology. As a consequence, the traditional experimental psychology programmes have largely disappeared. Groups like Psychonomics, Cognitive Psychology, or Cognition have partly taken over this interest, but in quite a few universities no single group remained to be
viewed as the sole inheritor of the experimental psychology tradition. Experimentation spread over all groups. Therefore, we do not discuss experimental psychology separately in this report in the discipline overviews.

2.3. Size, quality and feasibility of the psychology programmes

The current assessment concerned six universities. The number of tenured staff and total staff are presented in the table below, and are compared with the number of Bachelor students arriving each year.

### Balance of staff and students

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>University</th>
<th>Tenured staff 1998-2004</th>
<th>Total staff 1998-2004</th>
<th>First year psychology students 2000-2004</th>
<th>First year student/Total staff ratio*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>UvA**</td>
<td>146 (18%)</td>
<td>433 (22%)</td>
<td>1850 (23%)</td>
<td>6.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UvT***</td>
<td>57 (7%)</td>
<td>163 (8%)</td>
<td>1083 (14%)</td>
<td>9.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UM</td>
<td>222 (27%)</td>
<td>245 (12%)</td>
<td>624 (8%)</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VU</td>
<td>121 (15%)</td>
<td>393 (20%)</td>
<td>961 (12%)</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UU</td>
<td>117 (15%)</td>
<td>407 (20%)</td>
<td>1980 (25%)</td>
<td>6.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RUG****</td>
<td>147 (18%)</td>
<td>358 (18%)</td>
<td>1516 (19%)</td>
<td>5.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>810 (100%)</td>
<td>1999 (100%)</td>
<td>8014 (100%)</td>
<td>5.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sources: staff: University self-study reports; students: VSNU figures: [www.vsnu.nl](http://www.vsnu.nl)

* Ratio corrected for time span differences (5 years of student data and 7 years of staff data)
** Figures corrected for PhD students (70%-87.5% research time) and postdocs (80% research time).
*** Psychology Research staff in the four assessed programmes (33 tenured, 106 total staff), in Economic Psychology, Pediatric Psychology (Learning & Instruction) and other programmes (24 tenured, 57 total).
**** Figures corrected for PhD (30%) and postdoc (20%) teaching time.

The results in this table should be treated with some reservation, but local differences with respect to the organisation of teaching may have some influence. Nevertheless, the committee feels that the overall trend is reliable.

The results show the sizes of the six departments to be rather similar, with the exception of the Tilburg department, which is relatively small. More importantly, however, attention should be paid to a comparison of research staff and student numbers. On the whole a research effort of 1 fte (men-year) is realised for every 5-6 new Bachelor students or 15-18 Bachelor students across the three-year curriculum. The resulting teaching load seems to leave a satisfactory research capacity. The outliers are the University of Maastricht in the positive direction, and the University of Tilburg in the negative direction. Especially the latter programme creates cause for some concern. The number of 9.3 new Bachelor students or an estimated 28 Bachelor students in the entire programme per 1 fte research capacity suggests a somewhat less undesirable ratio between teaching time and research time, in the view of the committee.

In relation to staffing size of the programmes, it must be said that there seems to be some discrepancy among the ways in which the programmes are financed. Some programmes have the status of an exact science, partly or in its entirety, which leads to higher levels of funding. Considering the fact that all psychology research programmes do now heavily rely on sophisticated and costly laboratory facilities, it could be imagined that the universities should reach a
joint agreement to fund psychological research as an exact science (or beta discipline), instead of its traditional funding as a social science (gamma discipline). This should not so much be reflected in the size of the research staff at the academic level, but more in the size of crucial technical support staff, and in funding sources for the running, hiring and acquisition of costly research facilities.

The committee notes that all programmes host predominantly very good and sometimes excellent research groups. This, however, does not mean a bright future for all groups. The major threat seems to stem from the simple fact that the research groups tend to be rather small, which is characteristic for psychological research all over the world. The total research staff of 1999 fte distributed over 39 programmes and 7 years leads to an average of 7.3 research fte per group, of which only 2.9 fte is tenured. Given a certain standard distribution about this mean, the implication is that a considerable number of these programmes depend on the presence of one or two leaders. If they retire or move to other places, the entire programme is endangered, and a substantial investment may be lost. The assessment panel noticed a number of situations in which this danger was real, but did not always express its concern, as the assessments should in the first place reflect past performance, and it is not always easy to base a feasibility judgment on the expected mobility of individual researchers. Nevertheless, the committee wants to point to the importance of adequate staff development to guarantee the prosperity of Dutch psychology research. Investment in staff therefore remains a crucial concern to both institute and university management in order to keep psychology research flourishing.
3. Psychology Discipline Overviews

3.1. Cognitive neuroscience

Cognitive neuroscience has developed through the merging of two levels of explanation for human behaviour. The first is an analysis of cognitive or computational functions, based on the early information-processing work of the 1950s and 1960s. The second is an analysis of neural functions, based on a range of methods for direct investigation of the brain. Cognitive neuroscience attempts to combine these two kinds of functional approach, examining how information processing/computational functions are realised at the neural level.

From the mid-1970s, there was rapid acceleration of cognitive studies in brain-damaged patients. Of course, such work develops from a century-long tradition of lesion work in both humans and other animals. In the early 1990s, cognitive neuroscience was massively boosted by the development of methods for the direct measurement of regional activity in the human brain, first positron emission tomography (PET) and then functional magnetic resonance imaging (fMRI). Based largely on the excitement generated by these methods, cognitive neuroscience is now a major growth area in world science, with a rapid acceleration in the number of research positions available, in new fMRI centres commissioned, and in links between different cognitive and neurophysiological methods. In research management terms this creates a vigorous but also intensely competitive climate, with universities around the world competing to attract scientists of high calibre.

In this context the Netherlands has a very satisfactory position. Since the 1960s, the tradition of work in human cognition has been strong, certainly not comparable to the UK, where the volume of work is much greater, but more than comparable to any other European country. Now we see across-the-board success in the newer field of cognitive neuroscience, with good programmes in every university assessed, including research in brain-damaged patients, in fMRI, in brain-behaviour genetics and in direct links to animal neurophysiology. As in many other countries, we see an increased commitment of resources to brain-behaviour methods, in particular fMRI. Though some strong groups are still dependent on collaboration with MRI centres elsewhere, either within the Netherlands or abroad, we would expect this situation to evolve as the volume of work and investment here continues to increase. In several centres there are excellent programmes linking different physiological methods, in particular human and animal work. Though it was not included in our assessment, we note the strongly positive influence of the Donders Centre in Nijmegen, a national resource allowing several groups access to top quality cognitive neuroscience facilities. In general, all universities assessed are making at least significant, often prominent international contributions in this field. As long as future investment matches the field’s competitive climate, we would expect this strength to grow over the short- to medium-term.

3.2. Clinical psychology

The field of clinical psychology covers an understanding of the aetiological factors causing mental disorders, the factors maintaining mental disorders, and the development of effective forms of therapy. In addition, there are important links between clinical psychology on the one hand and health psychology on the other.
The range of techniques used by researchers within the field of clinical psychology has expanded in recent years. For example, there has been a substantial increase in the use of brain-imaging techniques such as functional magnetic resonance imaging (fMRI), more widespread use of numerous psycho-physiological measures, and utilisation of ambulatory electronic diaries. In addition, there has been a heightened interest in identifying threat-related processes operating below the level of conscious awareness in mentally disordered patients.

In principle, it should be possible for there to be a productive synergy between basic laboratory research in clinical psychology and therapeutic practice. However, it has proved disappointingly difficult to produce findings from basic research that are readily applicable in the therapeutic situation. The situation is gradually changing as researchers combining considerable expertise in experimental methodology and clinical excellence contribute to bridging the gap.

Dutch clinical psychology is in excellent shape. The various recent developments outlined above are all being fully incorporated into the research in clinical psychology being carried out by Dutch psychologists. One out of several areas in which Dutch clinical psychology excels is in utilising recent developments within cognitive psychology to enhance our understanding of cognitive processes and structure in mentally disordered individuals. This is an area in which basic research seems to offer enormous potential for increasing the effectiveness of therapy. More generally, the quality and quantity of research within clinical psychology produced by Dutch psychologists are extremely high, with Dutch clinical research being internationally recognised for its excellence. The fact that there are so many excellent young clinical researchers doing PhDs and embarking on research careers in clinical psychology offers enormous hope for the future. All of these factors (combined with the generally very high level of motivation and enthusiasm shown for clinical research) mean that the prospects for the future are extremely encouraging. The one proviso is that there needs to be recognition that cutting-edge research in clinical psychology (e.g., involving brain-imaging techniques) is rapidly becoming much more expensive, and so substantial additional resources will be needed to guarantee that Dutch clinical research maintains its current enviable reputation.

3.3. Developmental psychology

Developmental psychology is the entirety of psychological science from a developmental perspective. That is, it aims to chart and explain the development of all kinds of processes and functions from birth to death, including cognition, social behaviour, personality and emotions, and derive applications that may facilitate, support or accelerate development or deal with the problems that individuals may face as they develop.

In recent years, developmental psychology has become a very dynamic interdisciplinary field of science. Developmental phenomena are examined from the perspective of both the genetic and neurological mechanisms that may underlie developmental change and the social and cultural influences that may be exerted on them. Interdisciplinarity is even stronger within the field itself. That is, traditional boundaries between different lines of development, such as cognitive development, social or emotional development, do not exist any longer, so that each line of development is regularly submitted to the perspective of other lines.

Given these aims, developmental psychologists use all kinds of methods that are available to psychological science. That is, experimental, correlational, observational and field studies are ana-
lysed, using the two main developmental data collection methods, namely cross-sectional and longitudinal research, in order to uncover the characteristics and abilities of interest and explain their transformation during the particular age phase targeted. Developmental psychologists use modern recording, statistical and computational technologies in their everyday practice. As a result, developmental science is booming so much that the volume of knowledge produced in the last couple of decades may greatly exceed that produced in the past few centuries.

The place of Dutch developmental psychology in this frame is exemplary and enviable. The research produced is of the highest international standard, and in some fields, the Netherlands has been an international leader, at least for some time. This is certainly the case with the recent introduction of the dynamic systems approach in developmental science, with which the Netherlands developmental psychologists led the field in the early 1990s. Moreover, the current plans of interconnecting developmental research with first class research in statistical methods, neuro-imaging and other biological research, and the research into issues of social and emotional development which have direct practical applications, make this one of the most thriving developmental science communities in the world and certainly in Europe. The future of this community seems to be ensured by the high level of training offered to graduate students, the excellent facilities and infrastructure available for research, and the open-minded and inspired policies adopted by management at both the level of psychology departments and the level of the universities themselves.

3.4. Social psychology

The field of social psychology covers the social dimension of psychological functioning and is concerned with the interplay between the individual and her or his social environment. As such, social psychology focuses on how people influence, and are influenced by, one another.

Social psychologists (a) use experimental and correlational methods, both in the laboratory and the field; (b) employ procedures to assess not only explicit social cognition (i.e. verbal reports) but also implicit social cognition (e.g. non-conscious information processing); (c) measure overt behaviour (e.g. resource allocation decisions); and (d) increasingly incorporate in their research techniques pioneered by cognitive neuroscience (e.g. fMRI, ERP, TMS).

The above-mentioned methods, procedures, measurements and techniques are implemented for the examination and understanding of such phenomena as: perception and memory of others; the way self-knowledge is linked to other-knowledge; the trade-off between self-interest and other- or group-interest; empathy and decision-making; behaviour that contributes to one's psychological or physical health/illness; emotion and emotion regulation; self-regulation; social identity; interpersonal relationships; language and communication; perceptions of social and organization justice; intra-group (including organizational) relations; cooperation and competition; aggression and conflict resolution; and inter-group perception and behaviour, including stereotyping, prejudice and discrimination.

Dutch social psychology is thriving. It is in the frontier of the field in terms of both theoretical originality and methodological innovativeness. The overflow of talent manifests itself in extraordinary levels of research activity, productivity, and participation in major intellectual events on the international scene (e.g., conferences, workshops, edited volumes, editorship of journals). Graduate students are superb and receive first-rate training. The morale, enthusiasm and energy are exemplary, while the unbridled optimism for the future is fully justifiable. As-
suming equivalent or higher levels of institutional support, social psychology is guaranteed to flourish in the Netherlands for years to come.

3.5. Work and organizational psychology

The Netherlands is internationally visible and excels in the field of work and organizational psychology. However, it is not clear that there is a national research programme that is coherent and integrated. Given the small number of research groups working in this area, it would make sense for programme leaders in all universities to discuss an overall vision and strategy for the field in the Netherlands. Overlapping and duplication of research content do not use national resources to the best effect.

The quality and quantity of research produced in this field in the Netherlands are, on average, very high, though there is some considerable variation. Overall, the research is internationally recognised, with some being internationally excellent. In some programmes there is a tendency to focus on well-worn and therefore relatively barren fields.

There is a trend in some groups to retreat into the laboratory at the expense of field research, and this should be carefully considered. There appears to be a similar trend in some places for research to shift to more traditional social psychology areas rather than maintaining an orientation to areas that can squarely be described as work psychology. Rigour is high in this field in the Netherlands, but relevance must also be maintained. The slight trend towards more traditional social psychology and experimental research could lead to a loss of relevance to advancing understanding about the effectiveness of people, teams, organizations and markets at work.

This trend is possibly a result of a failure to respond to important developments in the world of work. Science should reflect the needs of society, not only an interest in basic questions. It is important that research leaders in this field reflect on current issues in organizations, markets, and national and global economies. For example, there are huge research agendas in relation to the management of diversity, a rapidly ageing workforce, international collaboration and cooperation, and partnerships and alliances across organizations. It is notable in this regard that the field is not attracting a high level of research funding in comparison with other areas of psychology, and it is easy to attribute this to external factors, but a lack of relevance of applications to important issues in society may be an explanation. There is a clear need for programmes in this field to attract higher levels of research funding.

The Netherlands produces a proportionately high number of excellent PhDs in the field of work and organizational psychology, offers excellent training to PhD students and is a model for the rest of Europe in its training of PhD students. Many go on to be academic leaders in the field in the Netherlands and other European countries.

3.6. Quantitative methods

All of the three programmes in quantitative methods cover a relatively broad range of research themes, such as psychometric methods (latent structure analysis, item response theory, component and factor analysis) and modern regression methods (multilevel analysis, structural equation modelling, logistic regression).
In addition, each programme shows a more specific and in some cases a rather unique research focus. For UvA3 this is: mathematical psychology, measurement theory, measurement of change, N=1 analysis. In UU9 we find: Bayesian statistics, governmental statistics, survey methodology. And in RUG6 we see: component and factor analysis, social network analysis, re-sampling methods, and robust statistics. All of the three programmes are active in the Interuniversity Graduate School of Psychometrics and Sociometrics (IOPS), a programme that is unique around the world in educating and training young researchers in the field of social statistics.

Considering the past, there have been no real problems with these programmes. All ratings for quality, quantity and relevance are at least very good, and even excellent in some cases.

On the occasion of an external evaluation of IOPS by three professors from the USA in 2003, R.K. Hambleton wrote about the Netherlands: “No country other than the US comes close to having the same impact on research advances, and the US is probably 20 times larger in population.” The following table supplements this by giving the number of papers published in *Psychometrika*, the leading journal in the field, for the USA, the Netherlands and the German-speaking area (Germany, Austria and Switzerland) during the period from 1998 to 2004 (counting author and one co-author per country only). The ratio gives the number of papers relative to the population. This is undoubtedly a striking result.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>US</th>
<th>NL</th>
<th>Ger/Aus/Swi</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Papers in <em>Psychometrika</em></td>
<td>107.0</td>
<td>63.0</td>
<td>15.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population in millions (1999 figures)</td>
<td>262.8</td>
<td>15.5</td>
<td>96.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ratio</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td>4.06</td>
<td>0.16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Given these numbers, it may seem surprising that productivity ratings are considered only very good. In comparison to the other sub-disciplines in psychology, the academic output is not very high. This may result from, among other things, methodological support given to other programmes that does not always lead to participation in co-publications. The committee has made allowance for these kinds of differences between sub-disciplines, and acknowledges the still relatively high level of academic output, in particular of RUG6. However, looking at other aspects of productivity as well, such as the number of PhD theses, professional publications and the distribution of output within groups, the committee has given overall scores of 'very good' for all three groups.

There are differences in prospects, however. And these are mainly due to the fact that there are changes in personnel (RUG6) or even considerable changes (UvA3) that make regrouping necessary that, at the same time, offer opportunities to strengthen the coherence of the programmes. However, there is no doubt that the programmes will survive.
4. Assessments per Institute and per Programme

4.1. University of Groningen (RUG)

4.1.1. The Heymans Institute

The Heymans Institute of Psychological Research was established in 1992, including its current six programmes, and functions in the Faculty of Behavioural and Social Sciences together with four other research institutes. The institute participates in several research schools, both local (BCN) and at the national level (EPP, IOPS, ISED, KLI, TRAIL, WTMC).

The mission of the institute is clearly stated in the self-evaluation report as providing a stimulating environment for fundamental research that meets international standards and is published in international journals directed to experts in psychology and related fields, while also paying attention to application and societal impact through contract research and trade publications.

At the faculty level, the board is ultimately responsible for the Heymans Institute, while the Institute’s two directors of research and education carry out daily responsibilities. Within the Department of Psychology the faculty has organised four sections that attend to personnel issues and serve to communicate with the two directors about both research and teaching matters. In a matrix-like structure the capacity for research (and teaching) is provided from these sections to each of the six programmes. Each research programme has its own research leader (who may also be heading a section, as in two instances), who is responsible for the quality and content of the programme but has no hierarchical authority over the participating researchers. Within the Department an advisory board, including PhD students, and various committees in charge of education serve to help steer the department’s activities.

The report mentions six programmes and related research schools for the Institute:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Research programmes</th>
<th>Research schools</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RUG 1 Information Processing &amp; Task Performance</td>
<td>BCN, TRAIL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RUG 2 Interpersonal Behaviour</td>
<td>KLI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RUG 3 Experimental Psychopathology &amp; Psychopathology</td>
<td>EPP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RUG 4 Theory and History of Psychology</td>
<td>WTMC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RUG 5 Developmental Processes</td>
<td>ISED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RUG 6 Psychometrics and Statistics</td>
<td>IOPS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Institute modernized and expanded its psychological laboratory with an eye to the growing demands of experimental research, and installed an ethical committee for approval of all research involving human subjects. Electronic library and ICT services are provided at the faculty level. In order to enhance communication between its researchers, the Institute organizes annual symposia, including invited lecturers, poster sessions and journal paper awards for PhD students, and various lectures by researchers from abroad throughout the year.

As part of the strategy and policy, the line of programmes has been modified according to changes in staff and in response to the 1999 VSNU assessment report. All research programmes aim at a quality level sufficient to participate in research master curricula. Acquiring funds

---

*In these paragraphs, the Committee follows the (local) figures on staff as presented in the original reports.*
from national bodies such as NWO, KNAW and at the European level ESF is a top priority, also as a criterion in the recruitment and promotion of personnel.

Resources and funding in 2004 add up to nearly €4 million, of which over 20% is from the above priority funding agencies (at the national level mainly). Three-quarters is now directly subsidised by the Ministry of Education, and some 2% by contracts. Compared to earlier years contract funding has gone down significantly from €1,133,000 in 1998 to €924,000 in 2003 and just €92,000 in 2004. This might affect the applied research goals.

At the programme level the distribution ranges from 5 to 40% of the budget for individual programmes over the years.

The Heymans Institute in 2004 staffed 67.3 fte research personnel, including PhD students attending courses and involved in teaching part of the time, and a further 9.6 fte supporting staff. Total research staff increased from some 55 fte in the first three years of this period up to 67 fte in 2004. Over the assessment period as a whole, the Institute produced a total number of 1955 publications, including nearly 1300 academic publications, 23 monographs, 91 theses and 543 professional publications. Given the number of personnel, 358 fte over the years, the Heymans Institute research staff produced a yearly average of 5.5 publications per fte in the current evaluation period.

Staff quality and productivity are monitored and stimulated in a systematic way by means of individual tracking of productivity and qualitative inspection by the research director who may add or withdraw research time depending on the outcome in relation to interviews held annually with their supervisors to discuss perspectives in the short and long run.

PhD students and postdocs participate in research schools, whereby their progress is monitored. The wellbeing of PhD students is considered in several ways by the director, a counsellor, their supervisor and a teaching load coordinator, and by providing courses on time management and other skills. Teaching load amounts to some 15%.

Internal evaluation amongst research leaders shows the Institute as democratic and effective, which may well be reflected in the programme management that is considered by the committee as being very good to excellent for all programmes.

Recruitment of tenured staff, PhD students and postdocs is based on teaching demands and on research funds acquired.

Evaluation amongst PhD students shows high positive judgements (7-8) for supervision, workload, attending courses and conferences, and facilities, and 90% feel confident that they will finish their theses within the agreed period. Low marks were however given to the Health and Safety Office. On all aspects outliers of both high and low marks occur, which have to do with individual situations that need to be given due attention. RSI problems related to working place conditions should be handled soon. Evaluation results are communicated to all students, who are invited to visit their tutors, the Institute’s personnel service or the Institute directors for individual problems.

Strengths and weaknesses, opportunities and threats

The Institute combines a strong empirical tradition with a strong international focus and freedom for researchers within the programmes. As the university matches grants from NWO, the focus on acquiring this type of funding remains a focal point in the strategy.
As funding has gone down, in particular contracts and research funding, while direct funding from the government remained stable, the acquisition of funds has become a pressing issue. As the growing dependence on externally funded PhD positions forms a potential danger, the focus will remain on groundbreaking fundamental research and on more dissertations. Laboratory facilities may become insufficient in this respect, and have to be improved. The Neuro-Imaging Center opens perspectives for several of the programmes. A threat is seen in decreasing research time resulting from an enlarged influx of students, continuing efforts in restructuring towards the BA-MA system, and budgetary constraints.

The committee feels the funding policy and the hierarchical structure of the Institute require additional attention to promote an effective solution for the main threats, which the Institute correctly analyses itself. Especially the sharp decline in contract funding may pose problems that affect the Institute's mission relating to both basic research and application. Also, the bottom-up approach in steering the programmes may lead to a lack of synergy. Generally, as the research programmes seem to be managed very well (very good to excellent), the committee expects the funding problems will be coped with effectively. The treatment of psychology as an exact discipline (beta status) may be helpful in this.

4.1.2. Assessments per programme

The committee comes to the following overall programme scores for quality (Q), productivity (P), relevance (R) and viability (V) for the six RUG programmes.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>University of Groningen</th>
<th>Q</th>
<th>P</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>V</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RUG1</td>
<td>1. Information Processing &amp; Task Performance</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RUG2</td>
<td>2. Interpersonal Behaviour</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RUG3</td>
<td>3. Experimental Psychopathology &amp; Psychotherapy</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RUG4</td>
<td>4. Theory and History of Psychology</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RUG5</td>
<td>5. Developmental Processes</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RUG6</td>
<td>6. Psychometrics and Statistics</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5 = Excellent, 4 = Very good, 3 = Good, 2 = Satisfactory, 1 = Unsatisfactory

Below the assessment results of the research evaluation committee are given regarding the quality, productivity, relevance and viability for each research programme of the Heymans Institute separately.
Programme 1: Information processing & task performance

Programme director: Prof. A. Johnson
Academic staff in 2004: 11.54
Assessments:
- Quality: Very good
- Productivity: Excellent
- Relevance: Very good
- Viability: Good

The first programme of the Heymans Institute discussed here is the programme on Information Processing & Task Performance, led by professor dr. Johnson and performed by a research staff of nearly 12 fte at the end of the assessment period 1998-2004.

This research programme includes studies of driving and safety, attention and memory (including effects of ageing), electroencephalography, cardiovascular and autonomic functioning, stress, mental effects of fatigue, rehabilitation and developmental problems. The programme has produced 30 PhDs and nearly 400 publications over the review period. The quality of the publications and the groups' productivity seem very good.

Though the programme clearly performs research of very good relevance within science as well as in societal terms, its prospects require due attention to keep the programme flourishing. The main worry in this respect is that the programme spreads its focus over a wide variety of areas, and the methodologies employed in the group are not a unifying theme since these too vary considerably.

The point made above on a seeming lack of focus probably has to do with the presence of two implied groups: performance and rehabilitation. Their combination in a single group produces some incoherence. Although there are benefits to cross-fertilisation, it is not clear to the committee what the group's overall strategy is for the future.

The programme has also witnessed a decline in the level of research funding over recent years, and a strategy to maintain funding is needed if the research is to continue to develop.

Overall, however, the programme has been excellently productive in research output, and this output is of a high quality and makes a visible and impressive contribution to international knowledge in the areas the programme addresses.

The evaluation committee thinks the future vitality of this programme will require a more focused strategic choice of research areas, methods and funding.
Programme 2: Interpersonal Behaviour

Programme director: Prof. dr. A.P. Buunk
Academic staff in 2004: 27.61 (of which 7.35 tenured)\(^7\)
Assessments:
- Quality: Very good
- Productivity: Very good
- Relevance: Excellent
- Viability: Very good

The research agenda of the Interpersonal Behaviour programme is diverse. Its focal point has traditionally been on behaviour, and there are many indications that it continues to be so. For example, staff members investigate the determinants and consequences of behaviour related to aggression, negotiation, altruism, organizational citizenship, health and discrimination. A few staff members emphasize social-cognitive processes underlying some of these behaviours; other staff members emphasize motivational explanations; and still others emphasize personality, organizational or cross-cultural explanations.

Over the assessment period, a total of 92 researchers were involved in the programme: 25 were tenured staff, 20 were non-tenured staff, and 47 were PhD students. In 2004, the distribution was 7.35 fte tenured staff, 4.05 non-tenured staff, and 16.2 PhD students, respectively. This unusually large programme size would normally raise issues of strategy and policy, such as (a) theoretical and methodological coherence (e.g. are staff members able to appreciate the theoretical and methodological underpinnings of each other's work?) and (b) group harmony (i.e. do staff members work well together?). Although elements of such issues are bound to arise and persist, the programme deserves recognition for generally being thematically coherent and well functioning.

On the face of it, there are a good number of PhD students. Over the assessment period, 26 PhD theses were completed, or 4.3 per year. However, in the last 4 years (2000-2004), 2.25 students on average completed their PhDs. This low completion rate is due mostly to the relatively high attrition rate. Several measures have been recently taken to curb the attrition rate (e.g. hiring a graduate student mentor, improving the quality of graduate students, establishing a team spirit), and early evidence indicates that these measures are working. Still, the programme may grapple in the near future with concerns surrounding the staff-to-student ratio, the quality of the annual graduate student intake, PhD student productivity, and PhD student career placement. In addition, the programme may also grapple with juggling 3 (!) Master's programmes simultaneously.

Overall, the quality of the research is commendable. Several key senior figures are or have been involved with key journals in the field (as editors or editorial board members), and have given invited addresses or edited key volumes. The quality of the conducted research is also manifested in publications in several high-impact fundamental-research journals (e.g. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, Social Cognition*) and applied research journals (e.g. *Behaviour Research and Therapy, Health Psychology, Journal of Applied Psychology, Journal of Applied Social Psychology*).

\(^7\) On request the Committee was informed that academic staff in 2005 included: 9 tenured staff (4 professors, 5 associate professors), 9 non-tenured staff (6 assistant professors, 3 postdocs), 28 PhD students.
Nevertheless, the variability in quality is perhaps higher than it need be, as there is an unusually high proportion of articles published in somewhat obscure journals.

The productivity of the programme is very good. For example, the programme boasts 251 journal publications in English over the assessment period, or 41 such publications per year. If the annual output (41) is divided by the number of tenured staff (25), the annual average is 1.65 per year. This may appear somewhat low, but may not be so: The number of staff taken into consideration in this calculation may be misleading, as the majority of the staff was in residence during only part (rather than the whole) of the assessment period.

The relevance of the programme is excellent. The philosophy and practice of the programme are exemplary. The programme strives to and does conduct fundamental research with visible applications and applied research with a clear theoretical impetus. The large number of professional publications (163 or over 21 per year) and impressive contracts attest to the programme’s high degree of relevance.

The prospects for the programme are very good. The level of funding is going up, while the number and quality of junior researchers (e.g. assistant professors, postdocs, graduate students) is on the increase (hopefully bolstering coherence and harmony). Also, the research facilities are impressive, and the level of ambition is high.
Programme 3: Experimental Psychopathology and Psychotherapy
Programme director: Prof. dr. P.J. de Jong
Academic staff in 2004 (research fte): 5.37
Assessments:
Quality: Good
Productivity: Very good
Relevance: Good
Viability: Very good

This very good research programme focuses on developing an understanding of psychological disorders and on providing effective treatment. Within the programme, there are systematic attempts to integrate basic and clinical research. However, the research strategy is less coherent than would be ideal, and there is some heterogeneity in terms of the specific research topics being investigated. Nevertheless, the group has good leadership, and several articles in good journals have been published over the period of the review. Accordingly, the rating for the programme as a whole is very good.

The research group has published a substantial amount of research over the period 1998-2004. The output is heterogeneous, with a mixture of articles in excellent journals and in lesser journals. The selected key publications have attracted relatively few citations even though three of them date from 2000 and 2001. In addition, the level of research funding is respectable but not high. In view of the evidence, the research quality is rated as good.

The research group is very active. There is a good publication record that has remained relatively constant (or increasing) in recent years, with a substantial majority of the journal articles appearing in English-language journals. The number of students completing PhD theses is relatively low, but there are a reasonably high number of professional publications. Overall, the group’s productivity merits a rating of very good.

The research is somewhat heterogeneous in terms of relevance. Some of the basic research and studies on therapeutic effectiveness have great relevance, but other parts of the research programme are not coherently related to the main themes and are also somewhat deficient in relevance. Overall, the rating for research relevance is good.

There are a number of positive and encouraging indications with respect to future prospects. Examples include the trend towards an increase in journal articles, the improving integration of clinical and basic experimental research promoting synergy between these areas, the availability of excellent and wide-ranging research facilities, the increased focus of the overall research programme, and developing research links with cognitive psychologists in other research programmes. Negative signs so far as the future is concerned are the reduction in research time due to increased teaching loads and the increasingly expensive nature of much clinical research. Overall, the positive signs easily outweigh the negative ones, and so the rating for prospects is very good.
This small but highly visible programme in Theory & History of Psychology publishes in the most respected journals in the field. But due to the publication traditions prevailing in the Humanities and the small size of the field, these journals tend to have relatively low impact ratings. Undoubtedly however, the programme does make a significant contribution to the field. It would seem that the programme could do even better if some of the time and energy currently spent on professional publications, which are admittedly pertinent to the theory & history field, would be diverted to academic publications. This is said with due respect for the often translated popular books by one of the professors.

The research topics addressed tend to be methodologically oriented and presently include such timely themes as evolutionary psychology and cerebral processes, which makes for a high scientific relevance, whereas the publications in the Dutch language address a wider audience. As mentioned, the programme is highly visible, both internationally and in the Netherlands.

In spite of its merits, the programme may come to face serious problems in the long run. Being unique is a dangerous position in the current research climate, which is not necessarily alleviated by affiliation with the non-psychological Science and Technology Studies as this programme is.

Given the kind of research conducted, the Societal and Behavioral Sciences section of NWO will now be virtually irrelevant as a funding source. Perhaps an alternative funding source to consider might be the Humanities section of NWO. On the other hand, the programme seems able to profit from very good relations with the Wellcome Trust.

As the unit does not teach a Master’s programme of its own in the new BA-MA system, it may turn more difficult to attract PhD students. Establishing a ‘Free Master’s Programme’, analogous to the ‘Free Doctoral Programme’ in the former system might provide opportunities in this respect. Or the programme could attract PhD students from abroad, further strengthening Theory & History of Psychology’s international reputation. Also, the unit might profit from close collaboration with an empirical programme, as in the Theory & History of Psychology unit at Maastricht.

Overall this excellent research programme, in terms of past performance, should beware of disadvantages in the future. Regarding the future, it remains unclear how plans deal with the threat of a too small a group in view of staff age and mobility. If just one of the leading professors leaves, the group will be severely weakened! To overcome the threat of becoming an endangered species, the programme management should pay attention to strengthening internal and external collaboration in order to develop new perspectives and expectations that help the Theory and History of Psychology to flourish in the future.
Programme 5: Developmental Processes
Programme director: Prof. dr. P.L.C. van Geert
Academic staff in 2004: 4.25
Assessments:
Quality: Very good
Productivity: Very good
Relevance: Very good
Viability: Very good

This programme aims to develop a dynamic systems approach to the study and modelling of a broad range of developmental processes including cognition, language, learning, and personality and identity formation. In fact, the group, and especially its leader, Professor van Geert, has been one of the most active and important institutions in the world in the promotion of the dynamic systems approach in developmental psychology, especially in the 1990s. The influence of the ideas developed here was well received by many important laboratories in the world, including the School of Education of Stanford University and the Graduate School of Education of Harvard University.

The productivity of the group, in terms of the sheer volume of publications, is close to the national average. However, the quality of some publications has been exemplary as indicated by the fact that they appeared in the foremost journals of psychological science in general, including Psychological Review, and developmental psychology, including Developmental Review and Developmental Psychology. As mentioned above, the work published in Psychological Review proved to be very influential when it appeared, because it opened up the dynamic systems movement in modern developmental psychology.

The relevance may in principle be excellent, but due to the complexities of the approach, the formalism involved, and the demands posed on the data collection methods, the approach is still far from being systematically adopted in both fundamental and, especially, applied contexts. Thus, some important steps need to be taken. First, more researcher-friendly data collection methods need to be developed, appropriate for dynamic conceptions and modelling of development. Second, psychology is in general a long way from the formulation of its concepts and models in the language and formalism of dynamic systems theory. The programme must strive to convince theorists and researchers who still prefer more classical concepts and methods of theory building that this approach does provide added value to our understanding and description of the phenomena of interest. Some of these initiatives seem to have been already taken.

The prospects may prove very good, especially if measures such as those suggested in the paragraph above are taken. This seems all the more likely given that current developments in statistical theory and computational technology as well as developments in recording and monitoring technology enable the researcher to collect and handle data that conform to the requirements of the dynamic systems approach.
The programme is well-known for its expertise in covering a broad range of quantitative techniques for the analysis of different types of complex data, such as hierarchically organised data (multiway and multilevel data) and relational data (sociometric data), the latter being unique in the field of psychology due to a co-operation with the Sociology Department. There is a certain focus on the following techniques: component and factor analysis, structural equation modelling, multilevel analysis, social network analysis, and item response theory. Research on these techniques is problem-oriented by 1) evaluating existing techniques to solve given problems, 2) improving existing or developing new techniques and 3) evaluating the latter.

The quality of the work is rated as excellent. The group has a clear-cut publication strategy, resulting in almost 100% of its academic publications being published in English. Moreover, roughly 70% of the journal articles appeared in top-rank journals. The international prominence of the group members is obvious from 1) serving as associate editors of journals like *Psychometrika, J. Educ. and Behav. Statistics, Current Index to Statistics*, 2) holding positions on national and international scientific boards and societies, 3) conference organisations, invited lectures, foreign research visits and two awards.

Productivity is considered as very good. This is mainly due to the number of academic publications, which is very stable over the period considered.

Relevance is rated as very good as well. Most of the techniques focused on are mainstream, and the group follows precise goals to promote its results by 1) giving concrete advice for (social science) researchers, 2) improving access to techniques, developing and evaluating software, 3) giving courses and offering consultation and 4) keeping a keen eye on matching the needs for methodology in content-specific fields (a recent example are methods for analysing brain scan data).

Considering the past it is well-known that the group is strong. There have been some changes in personnel at the level of full professors. This may require attention in order to maintain adequate coverage of the various techniques the group has to focus on. Two assistant professors are in charge of network analysis now. The earlier strong topic of item response theory is to be continued by a PhD project. It remains to be seen how this works. Overall, the prospects are considered as very good.
4.2. Vrije Universiteit Amsterdam (VU)

4.2.1. Institute assessment

The seven psychology research programmes are housed in the Faculty of Psychology and Education together with four pedagogic and education programmes. The faculty board is responsible for research, education, personnel and finance of the faculty as a whole.

The mission of the faculty is innovation and excellence in the generation, dissemination and application of psychological knowledge, directed at high-quality research that is recognized both nationally and internationally.

The faculty is steered by the dean and two directors, one for research and one for education, all recruited from the faculty staff and switching every 3-5 years. An operational director and a student member serve to advise the board. The research programmes are located within each of seven departments of which the head in charge also directs the programme.

At the level of the faculty, a research plan outlines a 5-year strategy. The programmes evaluated are in the 2001-2005 plan, while the next plan covering 2006-2010 is in development. The current programmes were strong or promising new ones at the time.

The report mentions seven department/programmes and related research schools:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Departments</th>
<th>Research programmes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>VU1 Biological Psychology</td>
<td>Genes, behaviour, health</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VU2 Clinical Neuropsychology</td>
<td>Mapping the brain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VU3 Clinical Psychology</td>
<td>Cognition, affect, behaviour and intervention in mental disorder</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VU4 Cognitive Psychology</td>
<td>Attention and performance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VU5 Developmental Psychology</td>
<td>Emotional development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VU6 Social Psychology</td>
<td>Cognition, communication and interdependence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VU7 Work and Organisational Psychology</td>
<td>Management of individual differences and social processes in organisations</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Research quality, output level and quality, and PhD progress are all monitored, while the successful acquisition of external funding, research talent, visits abroad for PhD students and timely graduation are stimulated by a bonus system. Also, programmes that fit well with university focus areas, such as Life Sciences, Health and Disease, Communication, or Text and Culture, may obtain additional funding from within the university. Thus, the Department of Social Psychology receives extra funds for collaboration with the Faculty of Arts in the focus area of Communication. Other departments received extra funding as well from this source. University focus areas remain important in the next research plan.

Funding mainly comes directly from the government, but over the years funding from other government parties, like NWO, has increased, rising from 6% in 1998 to 15% in 2004. Contracts with third parties continued to fluctuate within the range of 13-21%. The total budget went from €5 million in 1998 to €8 million in 2004, neatly balancing expenditure.
The departments/programmes differ somewhat in budget amounts and the funding type. Partly this results from the bonus system, by the addition or subtraction of funded fte to programmes based on research performance and successful acquisition of funds (thus redistributed). Besides direct funding, an accent on third party contracts has shifted over the years to more basic research funding in competition from the government (NWO, etc.). Most of the departments now profit from both types of gained external funding sources.

As to research instruments, including brain imaging, the faculty applies a separate budget that profits from the obtained status as ‘hard science’ faculty (beta status), providing extra money to the amount of some €0.3 million yearly. The brain imaging capacity is distributed over the departments by a special committee, and based on quality criteria.

The department heads are in charge of the recruitment of personnel to the level of associate professors, above which the dean is to be consulted and the faculty board decides. The faculty research personnel balances adequately, though the number of female professors is on the low side. The number of PhD students graduating on time should be raised, from nearly 45% to 75%. The implementation of measures to improve this situation, requiring more detailed research plans before starting, closer monitoring of their progress and a bonus system for timely completion, should be of help in achieving this goal.

The Psychology Departments employed 55 to 70 fte researchers yearly in 1998-2004, total research staff per department ranging from 3 (smallest) to 20 (largest) in any year. The total staff over the period, mounting up to 387 fte, produced a total output of 1751 publications per 4.5 per fte every year, including academic publications, monographs, PhD theses and professional publications. European awards received and high citation numbers for some of these publications reveal the international impact of the faculty research. National impact is shown in the prestigious grants acquired like the Veni and Vidi grants, a Spinoza prize laureate, a KNAW professorship, and affiliation of international scholars to the faculty.

Strengths and weaknesses, opportunities and threats

The faculty is strong in having an open structure with strong scientific and managerial leaders, a broad pool of talented researchers and adequate funding. As such, it sees itself as having a substantial impact on science both at the national and international level. Synergy with the other departments (Education and Pedagogics) is weak.

The faculty sees opportunities in participating in the multi-disciplinary Centre for Neuro-genomics and Cognition; and in strengthening departmental synergy by a top-master in Social Psychology, a master in Cognitive Neuropsychology, and by starting a new graduate school of Psychology and Education. Finally, attracting more foreign students will improve the research quality.

Threats are seen in the unclear developments in funds, both internal and external, in the educational system (positions of educational masters and research schools), and future personnel replacements in faculty management. Also, difficulties are anticipated in keeping talented young researchers at the faculty and the loss of identity of psychology resulting from the growing pressure on interdisciplinary research.

The Institute analyses the Faculty of Psychology as healthy in all reviewed aspects. Both changes in the educational system and in research funding are actively monitored in order to be able to adapt to changes.
The research evaluation committee is of the opinion that the faculty indeed provides a stimulating environment for the research programmes that are on the whole well managed and produce interesting research output. The matrix-like fashion of structuring methods and techniques expertise within the faculty seems efficient, but may be so vulnerable to new developments in this respect that a separate unit would be better.

4.2.2. Assessments per programme

The committee comes to the following overall programme scores for quality (Q), productivity (P), relevance (R) and viability (V) for the seven VU programmes.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Vrije Universiteit Amsterdam</th>
<th>Q</th>
<th>P</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>V</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>VU1</td>
<td>1. Biological Psychology</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VU2</td>
<td>2. Clinical Neuropsychology</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VU3</td>
<td>3. Clinical Psychology</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VU4</td>
<td>4. Cognitive Psychology</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VU5</td>
<td>5. Developmental Psychology</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VU6</td>
<td>6. Social Psychology</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VU7</td>
<td>7. Work &amp; Organisational Psychology</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5 = Excellent, 4 = Very good, 3 = Good, 2 = Satisfactory, 1 = Unsatisfactory

The results of assessments by the research evaluation committee as a whole are given below regarding the quality, productivity, relevance and viability for each of the seven research programmes separately.
Programme 1:  
Programme director:  
Academic staff in 2004 (research fte):  
Assessments:  

Biological Psychology  
Prof. dr. D.I. Boomsma  

19.21  
Quality:  Excellent  
Productivity:  Very good  
Relevance:  Excellent  
Viability:  Excellent  

This is an excellent programme growing from a research staff of 7.21 fte in 1998 to 19.21 fte in 2004. The number of tenured staff has increased in proportion, from 0.9 fte to 3.68 fte. During the whole reporting period there have been 20 PhD students associated with the programme, of whom 13 have already completed their degree. Overall, this is a flourishing programme, with a first class mix of basic and applied research topics, a strong international presence, substantial success in obtaining grant income, and a key national/international resource in the Netherlands Twin Register/biobank.

The programme's key topic is the genetics of individual differences in mental and physical health. Core regions within this are cognitive neuroscience, cardiovascular health and psychopathology. There has been an increasing shift from standard behaviour genetics to molecular genetics and the study of behavioural effects of known genes. Methods extend from large-scale surveys, in particular extensive longitudinal twin studies, to measurements of brain function using fMRI.

Both nationally and internationally, the group has an enviable record in establishing active research collaborations and in attracting grant income. Examples in the reporting period include grants from the international Human Frontier Science Programme, the US National Institutes of Health, the European Union and a good number of other sources. With around 70,000 recruits, the Netherlands Twin Register is an outstanding resource for genetic studies. The value of this resource is reflected both in the group's own productivity and their ability to attract collaborative partners from all over the world. Its publications are good. With some 200 papers in refereed journals during the reporting period, and representation in the fields' top journals, it has the potential for excellent productivity.

A major strength of the programme is its interface between basic research and societal relevance. There are significant contributions to the public understanding of science, for example the Twin Newsletter sent to 60-80,000 recipients.

In the post-genomic era, the analysis of genetic influences on the mind and brain is entering a phase of excitement and growth. Our scores reflect the established status of the VU programme as a world leader. The committee thinks the programme is well positioned to retain a central place in this international endeavour in the coming future.
Programme 2: Clinical Neuropsychology
Programme director: Prof. dr. J.A. Sergeant
Academic staff in 2004 (research fte): 8.83
Assessments: Quality: Very good
Productivity: Very good
Relevance: Very good
Viability: Very good

Founded in 1999 with the appointment of the current director, this is a new and growing very good programme. From a total of 4.44 fte in 1999, it has increased to 8.83 in 2004. In large part, this growth reflects the increased number of graduate students; 15 students have been associated with the programme over the entire period, of which 4 have already completed their degree. Grant income has similarly increased, from 13.5% of funding in 1999 to 56.1% in 2004. Publications are strong, with 124 papers in refereed journals in 1999-2004. These are signs of a healthy and well-managed programme.

The research has both clinical and basic science themes. Among the former, the core topics are Attention Deficit/Hyperactivity Disorder (ADHD), Parkinson’s Disease, aging/dementia, and hormone disturbances. Though these topics are diverse, the programme draws them together through the basic science theme of executive functions and their impairments. The strategy is to use diverse clinical conditions to assess the validity of executive function concepts, including attention, inhibition, self-monitoring and self-regulation. A strength of the work is the explicit attempt to operationalise these concepts and to assess their merit in the explanation of both normal and impaired behaviour.

The best-established research topic is ADHD. The Programme Director has a strong international presence in this field, with much active collaboration within the Netherlands and other parts of Europe, in the USA, in Australia and elsewhere. In addition to his scientific contributions, he has a number of senior advisory roles, e.g. to government, and in advising on international criteria for clinical assessment (DSM V). Other research topics are more recent, but with promising proposals for their development.

The combination of basic and clinical work allows flexibility in attracting grant income. The plans for pharmacological studies, for example, should profit from the Director’s close links to the pharmaceutical industry. In addition to research, programme staff play a direct role in clinical practice (e.g. ADHD clinic), with benefits both for science and society.

Future plans are ambitious, combining behavioural work with measures of brain function using fMRI, EEG and MEG, and pharmacological manipulations. Where required, these developments are based on established links to collaborative teams within the university. At the same time, a sensible strategy is in place for choosing the most advantageous lines of effort given limited resources. Providing an effective replacement can be put into place upon the current director’s retirement, the programme has good potential.
Programme 3: Clinical Psychology: Cognition, Affect, Behaviour, and Intervention in Mental Disorder

Programme director: Prof. dr. P. Cuijpers

Academic staff in 2004 (research fte): 4.4

Assessments:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quality</th>
<th>Good</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Productivity</td>
<td>Very good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relevance</td>
<td>Very good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Viability</td>
<td>Very good</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This research group focuses on understanding the development of mental disorders and providing psychological treatment. It is a small group and may have suffered in the past from attempting to pursue too many different research themes. However, it is increasingly the case that the research programme as a whole is becoming more coherent and more achievable. In addition, the dramatic increase in research funding should permit the research group to expand and develop its programme in various beneficial ways. Overall, the rating for the programme is good.

There has been a recent improvement in the quality of the research being carried out by this research group. There has also been a marked improvement in its productivity, which was definitely low in terms of research funding, number of publications per person, and postgraduate students completing on time. It is appropriate to consider quality and productivity together, because the low level of productivity has probably had an adverse effect on the achievable quality of research. The recent improvements mean that there are relatively few concerns for the future. In view of these considerations, ratings of good for quality and a very good for productivity are appropriate.

The research group has consistently pursued research possessing a high level of relevance. All of the research themes are concerned either with basic research in clinical psychology or with the process of psychotherapy, and all are thus of direct societal relevance. An important component of relevance is the dissemination of knowledge, and it is significant that the total numbers of all kinds of publications (academic and professional) were higher in 2004 than in any of the preceding six years. Overall, the rating for relevance is very good.

There are a number of positive and encouraging signs with respect to future prospects. For example, there have been substantial improvements recently in the number of research articles and the amount of research funding. When these encouraging signs are considered in the context of the research plan, which seems coherent and focused, then there are solid grounds for optimism. In view of all these encouraging signs, the rating for prospects is very good.
Within the setting of the VU, this group is of medium size, much smaller than the large programmes of Biological Psychology and Social Psychology, but larger than e.g. the programme in Work and Organisational Psychology. Despite its modest size the group has achieved a very high standard of quality, resulting in a high international visibility. The programme leader, Prof. Theeuwes, is one of the most cited first authors in the Psychology Department. One explanation of this success must be the partial beta status, granted by the university board, which enables the group to maintain excellent laboratory facilities, both with respect to the classical equipment for stimulus presentation and response recording, as to the more innovative and costly equipment for neuropsychological research.

A second explanation for the success of this group is the choice of the general theme, Attention & Performance. The decision to focus on a not too wide area seems especially appropriate for a medium-sized group. The group succeeded in combining this traditional theme with the new technical possibilities of brain imaging and neural network modelling.

Over the assessment period a total of 34 fte was spent on research, of which 18.5 fte by 10 PhD students. There seems to be a promising trend of continuous growth from 3.5 fte in 1998 to 7.5 fte in 2004. In 2004 the distribution over the various groups was: 1.3 fte tenured staff, 2.2 non-tenured staff, 4.0 PhD students. This seems an optimal division.

The number of completed PhD theses in the assessment period is only 2, but this is fully explained by the recent start of most PhD students employed in this period. The yearly number of academic publications has doubled in the review period, with quite a few articles in the world’s leading journals, such as the Journal of Experimental Psychology. It should be noted, however, that the total productivity is to a considerable extent (35%) dependent upon the programme leader, which makes the group somewhat vulnerable. This is why productivity was not awarded with the maximum score.

The university and other funding agencies equally share the funding of this programme. The contribution from contract research is modest, with a correspondingly modest number of professional publications. Here there is clearly some room for growth, in order to make funding not too much dependent upon an overly limited number of grant organisations.

The prospects of this programme look good, although it should be realised that the success of a group of this moderate size depends on the presence of one or two critical members. Especially the low number of tenured researchers should be a reason for further attention.
Programme 5: Developmental Psychology; Emotional Development

Programme directors: Prof. dr. W. Koops (until 2000) and Prof. dr. J. M. Koot (since 2002)

Academic staff in 2004: 6.94

Assessments:

- Quality: Very good
- Productivity: Excellent
- Relevance: Very good
- Viability: Very good

This programme focuses on the study of the development of emotion understanding and emotion regulation, and the relations between emotions, self-regulation and psychopathology. A diversity of methods is employed including experimental, observational methods and use of questionnaires, etc., which are addressed to a wide age range of persons, both longitudinally and cross-sectionally. Clearly, this orientation of the programme is at the forefront of modern developmental research. Therefore, the programme is well tuned to current international research.

The productivity of the programme is excellent. That is, the sheer volume of publications produced by the group in the period of interest is well above the international average. Moreover, many of these publications appeared in top international developmental journals, including Child Development, Developmental Psychology and Cognition and Emotion.

The relevance of the programme is also very good. This is due to both the character of the programme and the strategy adopted by the group for the distribution of their findings. That is, research on emotions, especially as it relates to psychopathology, may be directly relevant to dealing with behavioural and social problems at various levels, including the individual, the family and the school. The group systematically tried to disseminate their findings to various interested agents through the appropriate publication outlets. Moreover, their cooperation with other groups, especially biological and clinical psychology, is good and is developing in the right directions.

It is implied from the analysis above that the prospects of the group are very good. The research conducted is at the forefront of modern developmental psychology, it is concerned with issues that are important from the points of view of fundamental and applied science, it is well connected both internationally, nationally, and within the department itself. If it develops along the present lines, it has the potential to evolve into an internationally leading programme of developmental research.
The excellent Social Psychology Programme at the VU is focused on the regulation of social interaction. The programme is organized around three areas of inquiry: social cognition, communication and interdependence. The programme was brought to prominence in the 1990s through the outstanding stewardship of Prof. Gun Semin. This outstanding scholarly tradition continued in the last few years under the leadership of Prof. Paul van Lange, and the programme is currently also thriving under the leadership of Prof. Caryl Rusbult.

Over the assessment period, a total of 72 researchers were involved in the programme, of which 16 were tenured staff (3 full professors, 7 associate professors, 6 assistant professors), 24 were non-tenured research staff (e.g. postdoctoral research fellows, research assistants), and 32 were PhD students. In 2004, the distribution over the tenured versus non-tenured staff was 3.48 versus 16.94, respectively. The staff-to-student ratio is satisfactory, although the number of PhD students appears to have been on the high side. The number of completed PhD theses in the assessment period is 18, or an impressive 3 per year. Productivity is remarkable, at approximately 30 articles and chapters per year, plus approximately 8 professional publications per year. PhD students receive excellent training and contribute substantially to this productivity.

The research carried out at the VU is programmatic, theory-driven, and methodologically impeccable. The research is at the cutting edge of international social psychology and is published in major journals such as Annual Review of Psychology, Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, Journal of Personality, Journal of Personality and Social Psychology and Social Cognition. Other quality or esteem indicators include keynote or invited addresses at notable international conferences, editorial involvement with a number of prestigious journals, invited chapter contributions to timely edited volumes, and important international collaborations (including the association with two eminent social psychologists, Professors Cacioppo and Smith). The quality of this programme has been substantially enhanced by hosting the Kurt Lewin Institute, which over the years served as a hotbed of intellectual activity at the international level and also as the defining point of the programme.

Grant support is stellar. The relevance of the research conducted by programme members is excellent. The most important objective of the programme is theory-building and theory-testing, but also a definite focus towards application of knowledge is manifest by relatively high numbers of publications in respectable applied outlets (e.g. Behavioural Decision Making, Cognitive Systems Research, Journal of Applied Social Psychology).

---

*Academic staff in 2005: 6 tenured staff (3 professors, 3 associate professors) and 22 non-tenured staff (2 assistant professors, 4 instructors, 4 postdoctoral fellows, 12 PhD students)
The eminence of the senior members and the promise of the junior ones assure a brilliant future. Indeed, both the first-rate research facilities and the vibrant and friendly social climate are extraordinarily conducive to professional exchange and collaboration. In addition, the teaching excellence of the programme is bound to continue, facilitated in particular with the establishment of two Master’s programmes. Many of the top students of these programmes, of course, are likely to pursue PhD degrees, thus feeding back into the research excellence of the programme.
Programme 7: Work & Organisational Psychology
Programme director: Prof. dr. H. van der Flier
Academic staff in 2004: 5.70
Assessments:
Quality: Good
Productivity: Very good
Relevance: Good
Viability: Satisfactory

This programme needs a new vision to become more than just good enough. As a long-standing programme it has produced outstanding scholars from its PhD programme over the years. The PhD programme is particularly well organised, well managed and generative. It makes a contribution to the field of work and organizational psychology in the Netherlands by providing well-trained and motivated staff to other programmes.

The programme focuses on traditional personnel psychology and less traditional social processes. The former, apart from its focus on minority ethnic groups, does not appear to offer novelty, and the domains it covers have been well harvested already. The programme on leadership, social processes, group emotion, etc. is more innovative and potentially fruitful.

The commission has expressed its concern that the group should be more cautious about maintaining a balance between field and laboratory research since the department has a well-deserved reputation for good field research, and moving too far into experimental research would be damaging. The intention to move to 30% experimental work (even in addition) could damage the core of research in the field in the Netherlands in particular. The programme is in need of reinvigoration and a clear and unique research focus to give a strong external identity and high levels of excitement internally.

This group is small and therefore vulnerable. There is an urgent need to increase the group size, given there are only 1.6 tenured staff. Coupled with low levels of funding this suggests the group needs to develop a strategy that leads to the acquisition of substantially more external funds. The publication strategy also needs invigoration. Most publications are in the middle tier with a few in the second tier, but almost none in the very top tier journals. The group’s productivity is high, but the quality of the output could be developed more.
4.3. University of Amsterdam (UvA)

4.3.1. Institute assessment

The psychology research programmes have been housed in the Psychology Research Institute since 1998, when the former Psychology Faculty became part of the Faculty of Social and Behavioural Sciences, in line with the university policy to reduce the number of faculties.

The Institute is oriented towards basic quantitative research. The self-assessment report 1998-2004 states that all the research programmes of the Institute emphasize quantitative experimental research on basic processes that shape and determine human behaviour. Where interdisciplinary research has grown alongside the monodisciplinary research tradition of psychology research at UvA, the focus remains on research directed at theoretical progress rather than on practical results in applied contexts.

The Institute is led by an Institute Director and separate directors for each programme, that have relative management autonomy, which also means that contract research benefits remain within the groups that acquired them. Progress in the programmes is assessed annually at the Institute level. Quality is stimulated by a reward system wherein the two programmes with the highest external assessment scores are rewarded with extra PhD grants from the Institute and extra budget from the university. At the individual level teaching activities in national research schools are compensated by (10-15%) extra research time.

The UvA has asked the committee to evaluate six programmes of psychology research in the Psychology Research Institute, each with its own director.

UvA programmes and directors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Research programme</th>
<th>Director</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>UvA1</td>
<td>Clinical Psychology</td>
<td>P. Emmelkamp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UvA2</td>
<td>Developmental Psychology</td>
<td>M. van der Molen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UvA3</td>
<td>Methodology</td>
<td>H. van der Maas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UvA4</td>
<td>Psychonomics</td>
<td>J. Raaijmakers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UvA5</td>
<td>Social Psychology</td>
<td>A. Fischer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UvA6</td>
<td>Work &amp; Organisational Psychology</td>
<td>C. de Dreu</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Funding of the Psychology Research Institute mainly comes directly from the government, though external funds acquired in competition (from NWO, etc.) rose from 14% in 1998 to 23% in 2004 and doubled in size from €0.8 million to €1.6 million, which explains most of the growth in total funding from €5.9 million at the start to €6.9 million at the end of the assessment period 1998-2004. From the direct funding income of €4.7 million, some €3.1 million goes to personnel costs for the six programmes and the Institute, over 20% to the Institute and Psychonomics, and 7-15 % to the other programmes.

A total amount of €2.0 million has been invested in laboratory facilities, partly funded also by external sources, making it possible to upgrade and extend the facilities required by the type of basic research performed. The investments are put into research facilities such as fast computers and physiological equipment, a TMS facility for neurological research, participating in an
fMRI facility (at the AMC), observation and interview facilities, a sleeping research unit and several other units and ICT facilities.

A total number of nearly 2,050 publications, including all academic publications, monographs, PhD theses and professional publications, was produced by the Institute’s research staff during the period 1998-2004, corresponding to an average number of almost 4.0 publications per full time researcher, from the total research staff capacity of 517 fte in this time span. Citation scores for programme leaders and theme leaders are in the range of 35 to 500 (corrected for self-citations) as first authors, reflecting the international impact of the UvA psychology research in the evaluation period.

The research staff of the Institute rose from nearly 60 fte to 80 fte in the assessment period, distributed over the programmes from 8 fte in Methods to 21 fte in Psychonomics, and the others range between 10 and 14 fte, including tenured, non-tenured and PhD staff. In some of the programmes the tenured staff forms a very small fraction of the programme staff.

All research programmes are evaluated at the Institute level annually, regarding its research strategy, quality of research management, and quality of research facilities. From 2005 onwards the Institute itself will assess all the PhD projects monitored in the evaluation period in the context of research schools.

The Institute communicates its expertise to the wider audience within the Netherlands in various ways, e.g. by providing on-line information to the media, organising open-days to the general public and collaboration with major Dutch science museums.

Strengths and weaknesses, opportunities and threats
The Institute’s emphasis on basic empirical research strengthens agreement on research methods and collaboration between the six programmes. Also, the improved facilities and international orientation are sufficient to strengthen the research possibilities. The Institute sees another strength in the large number of PhD students in the several programmes. The focus on basic research becomes a weakness if the costs of required investments in research infrastructure exceed the budget, as in fMRI and other neuro-imaging facilities. In this view a ‘life-sciences approach’ would seem more suitable to the way psychology research is developing. This also means that collaboration with the life sciences offers new opportunities. The growing dependence on external funding presents a threat, together with a need for expensive research facilities to uphold the strong emphasis on basic empirical research the Institute is striving at. Also, the ethical aspects of experimental research approaches worry the Institute’s management, for which a committee has been installed to prevent hindrances to the research activity. In its overall analysis, the Institute states it will require additional funding resources to remain its focus on empirical basic approaches at the international level of psychology research.

The committee is of the opinion that the programmes are indeed managed very well to excellently. The research group size in some of the programmes, however, relies heavily on external PhD and postdoctoral grants. Where tenured staff is rather limited, in some of the programmes this proportion is just over 20 % (in Methods or Developmental Psychology), the large PhD presence – seen as a strength - may well turn out not to foster programme vitality in the long run, especially if perspectives after the PhD period are unclear. This demands strategic measures. In general, the programmes seem to be managed very well and most even excellently.
4.3.2. Assessments per programme

The committee comes to the following overall programme scores for quality (Q), productivity (P), relevance (R) and viability (V) for the six UvA programmes.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>University of Amsterdam</th>
<th>Q</th>
<th>P</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>V</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>UvA1</td>
<td>1. Clinical Psychology</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UvA2</td>
<td>2. Developmental Psychology</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UvA3</td>
<td>3. Methodology</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UvA4</td>
<td>4. Psychonomics</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UvA5</td>
<td>5. Social Psychology</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UvA6</td>
<td>6. Work &amp; Organisational Psychology</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5 = Excellent, 4 = Very good, 3 = Good, 2 = Satisfactory, 1 = Unsatisfactory

The results are given below of the assessments by the research evaluation committee regarding the quality, productivity, relevance and viability seen in each of the six research programmes of the psychology research programmes of the faculty.
This excellent research programme appears generally strong with its emphasis on experimental studies designed to identify processes associated with mental disorders and those designed to reduce psychopathology. There is impressive research leadership from the Programme Director. The overall direction of the research programme with its emphasis on an experimental approach is admirable, as is the notion of focusing on the commonalities across different mental disorders. The academic reputation of members in the group is strong. Another positive feature is that the group is involved in research of considerable societal relevance.

The overall quality of the research carried out by this research group is impressive. Members of the group have published in several journals with high impact factors. Additional evidence is available in the form of citations, with several members of the group having moderate or very high numbers of citations. Productivity is also relatively high in terms of both research articles and professional publications. However, there have been relatively few students obtaining PhDs in recent years, and there is heterogeneity of output across the members of the group. In view of these considerations, the quality rating is excellent, and the productivity rating is very good.

The research group is very strong in terms of relevance. It has been very successful in advancing knowledge. The publication record (research articles and professional publications) has provided excellent dissemination of that knowledge. Finally, the group has been extremely successful in conducting proper experimental studies within clinical psychology, as a result of which the advances in knowledge produced by the group have mostly been successfully implemented. These achievements jointly explain the rating of excellent for relevance.

The considerable strength of the research group in every way over recent years means that the prospects for the future are very promising. The availability of an MRI scanner will undoubtedly enhance the group’s research over the next few years. There are some concerns over increasing teaching loads and potential difficulties with future funding. However, the positive signs for the future greatly outweigh the negative ones, and thus the rating for prospects is excellent.

The prospects of the research group are good. The recent appointment of two new Chairs, one in experimental psychopathology and the other in child psychopathology, enhance the future prospects. The levels of research funding and contract research funding are both satisfactory (totalling about 45% of income) and have remained fairly constant in recent years. The increased use of fMRI in research should prove an advantage and permit the expansion of the research. A concern for the future is the fact that salaries in mental health institutes surpass those on offer within UvA. In spite of this, the prospects for the future appear to be very good.
Programme 2: Developmental Psychology
Programme directors: Prof. dr. H. van der Maas and Prof. dr. M. van der Molen
Academic staff in 2004 (research fte): 12.39
Assessments:
- Quality: Very good
- Productivity: Very good
- Relevance: Good
- Viability: Very good

This programme involves two lines of research: Developmental Processes and Brain and Development. The unifying subject of these two lines of research is Cognitive Development. That is, the first one studies cognitive development with the aim to (1) understand and model its forms and dynamics by nonlinear dynamic systems modelling and (2) specify relations between cognitive developmental change and changes in various parameters of brain functioning through the analysis of EEG/MEG measures. The second one studies the development of cognitive control throughout the human lifespan with the aim to understand individual differences in cognitive development.

Both lines of research are at the forefront of modern research in cognitive development. Specifically, the study of the dynamics of cognitive development through the theoretical and methodological tools of dynamic systems theory is a powerful line of research in cognitive development nowadays, and the study of the development of cognitive control and its brain correlates is probably the most dynamically emerging trend in cognitive developmental research. Therefore, their bridging in the context of the present programme is laudable. The excellent research facilities available to the members of the programme offer many possibilities for groundbreaking research.

The quality of the research produced so far is of the highest international standards. This is evidenced by the fact that a large part of this research is published in very good international journals, in developmental psychology, such as Developmental Science, Developmental Review and Journal of Experimental Child Psychology, psychophysiology, such as the International Journal of Psychophysiology, and general psychology and cognitive science, such as Acta Psychologica and Cognitive Science. This work is clearly visible and rather well known, as this is evidenced by the satisfactory number of citations accorded to this work, especially in association with the two programme directors.

The productivity of the group is good. That is, it involves an average of about two publications/year/person in refereed journals for the period evaluated, a rather small number of book chapters and professional publications, one book, and a total of 8 PhD theses. The production was generally stable over the years, as indicated by the production of journal papers and PhD theses. It may be noted, however, that the publication of book chapters and professional publications was rather unstable, if not decreasing, which may indicate either an intensification of efforts to publish in international journals or a decrease in invitations extended to group members to author such material.

The relevance of the programme is good but not exceptional. Specifically, the research conducted so far is, on the one hand, highly relevant to general theories of cognitive development. Specifically, the dynamic systems and, more generally, the mathematical modelling of cogni-
tive development can potentially affect the direction that the development of theories may take as well as their form. However, this has not taken place, so far. This is due to several reasons, including the research and publication policy of the members of the programme and the nature of the work as such. Specifically, the mathematical modelling approach adopted, probably because of its very nature, focuses on some well-known phenomena of cognitive development, which are rather limited in scope, such as understanding the relations involved in the balance task. In epistemological terms, this may expose the research conducted as paradigmatic rather than as truly original and ground-breaking. Moreover, this research may be difficult to follow by many in developmental psychology, due to the formalism and mathematical knowledge that it requires. It is also notable that parts of this work have not yet been published in the topmost developmental journals, such as *Child Development, Developmental Psychology* or the *SRCD Monographs*. It may be noted, however, that the neuroscience work of the group is more in tune with the international trends of our time in developmental cognitive neuroscience. Overall, however, the research of the group is more of the pure rather than applied science in nature. As a result, its relevance to concerns of everyday application is rather limited, but it is clear that this is not among the priorities of the group, which is of course fully acceptable.

The prospects, under some conditions, may be excellent. Specifically, the two lines of research, the mathematical and dynamic systems modelling of cognitive development and the specification of the neuronal aspects of cognitive development, must come closer in both the phenomena studied and their interpretation. This is in principle possible by developing mathematical and dynamic systems models of brain processes whose relation to cognitive developmental phenomena is well established. This will enable the group to develop new theoretical constructs and models that would place the group in the frontiers of the field.
Programme 3: Validity of Empirical Research in Psychology
Programme director: Prof. dr. H. van der Maas

Academic staff in 2004 (research fte): 8.46
Assessments:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quality</th>
<th>Very good</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Productivity</td>
<td>Very good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relevance</td>
<td>Very good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Viability</td>
<td>Good</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

During the past seven years the group has continued its work under the label of the previous assessment period (“Validity of empirical research in psychology”). The major contributions of the programme have been in:

1) Psychometric theory, which includes topics such as the status of latent variables and the concept of validity, the development of new Item Response Models (IRT), implications of the common factor model, mixture modelling and time series analysis with latent variables.

2) Measurement invariance, a prerequisite for the comparison of groups (black-white differences, for instance), has been attacked by IRT models and, more recently, by using multi-group confirmatory factor analysis.

3) Intra-individual processes, a topic resulting from the fact that the majority of substantive theories in psychology are not about the structure of variables in the population, but about processes at the individual level. Techniques have thus been developed to allow for an idiographic approach using latent variable modelling.

Adequate communication of new methodologies as well as their application in substantive areas is an important part of the groups’ mission, resulting in collaborations both within and outside the Psychology Department. Just recently, a new line of research for the appropriate statistical methods in cognitive neuroscience has been started with other researchers from the Psychology Department.

The quality of the programme is rated as very good. This is mainly based on the percentage of publications in top rank journals, several awards and prizes, and memberships on editorial and scientific committees. Productivity is also rated as very good, both with respect to the number of scientific publications and PhD dissertations. Relevance is also assessed as very good. The group has a keen eye on the advancement of knowledge of the specific topics it focuses on as well as their implementation and dissemination by practising extensive cooperation with other groups of the Psychology Department as well as with outside partners presenting needs motivated by society. Taken together, these results are also reflected in a steady increase of the percentage of external funds (almost exclusively NWO and KNAW) from 5% in 1998 to 70% in 2004 in line with a considerable increase of non-tenured staff. There have been hardly any problems for the period assessed. This is less clear with respect to the coming period. Though the group has developed a strategic agenda under the header “Latent variable theory in psychology”, its realization is less obvious in view of the fact that three full professors and two associate professors left the group (retirement or move to other places) during the past few years. There has been no director for about two years, and at the moment the group has only an interim director. The programme should be given some credit for restructuring the group and filling open positions. Some new promising personnel are on board already. The prospects for the programme are good, that is: more than ‘satisfactory’, due to this.
### Programme 4: Psychonomics

**Programme director:** Prof. dr. J. Raaijmakers

**Academic staff in 2004 (research fte):** 20.72

**Assessments:**
- **Quality:** Excellent
- **Productivity:** Excellent
- **Relevance:** Very good
- **Viability:** Very good

This area of research represents a long-standing excellent tradition in the psychological school of UVA, which is reflected in the considerable size of the group and the fortunate mixture of outstanding scientists in various age groups and at different levels of employment. Many of the contributors can claim international fame. The general theme is human cognition, with a strong emphasis on theory development and the foundation on neurobiological principles. The work of Professors Raaijmakers and Lamme reflects these approaches. The programme as it is now presented results from a regrouping that took place in 2003, with clearly beneficial results.

Over the assessment period a total of 142 fte was spent at research, of which 83 fte by 30 PhD students. In 2004 the distribution over the various groups is: 6.6 fte tenured staff, 3.5 non-tenured staff, 10.5 PhD students. This seems an optimal division. The number of completed PhD theses in the assessment period is 23, which exceeds three per year on average; this result is outstanding. There is a constantly high flow of academic publications around 50 per year, which is predominantly produced by the non-PhD staff at a strength of about 9 fte per year. The scientific articles are often published in the world’s leading journals, like *Psychological Bulletin* and the *Journal of Experimental Psychology*. The various scientists have strong ties with other outstanding researchers throughout the world. We have rated both Quality and Productivity as excellent, because the programme is as good as any research institute in the world might wish for these criteria.

The university and some of the major funding agencies in the country equally share the funding of this programme. The contribution from contract research is modest, which is a direct consequence of the strategy to focus on theory development and on the neurological substrate of behaviour. As a result, the number of professional publications is considerably smaller than the number of academic publications. This preference is understandable, but makes the programme dependent on the strategies of a very limited number of grant organisations. It could be necessary in the future to find access to other funding institutes, for instance at the European level, which also have an interest in applications of the basic findings. Therefore, the criteria Relevance and Prospects are scored as very good.
The Social Psychology Programme at UvA has traditionally been a center of excellence in social psychological research. There is every reason to believe that this tradition will continue. The programme involves three themes or research domains: Social Cognition, Identity, and Emotion. Each research theme is headed by a highly reputable scholar (Prof. dr. Dijksterhuis, Dr. Doosje and Prof. dr. Fischer, respectively) and is contributed to by up-and-coming and talented researchers along with a senior and internationally renowned scholar (Prof. dr. Joop van der Pligt).

Over the assessment period a total of 52 researchers were involved in the programme, of which 15 were tenured staff, 9 were non-tenured staff, and 28 were PhD students. In 2004, the distribution over the three groups was: 4.07 fte tenured staff, 0.94 non-tenured staff, and 9.76 PhD students. Thus, the staff-to-student ratio is good. The number of completed PhD theses in the assessment period was 12, or two per year – also a good number. Productivity is remarkable, at approximately 50 articles and chapters per year, plus approximately 8 professional publications per year. The contribution of PhD students to the programme’s productivity is highly commendable.

The research across the three themes (Social Cognition, Emotion and Identity) is theoretically substantive, programmatic, methodologically sound and at the core of international social psychology. The quality of the research conducted by programme members is reflected in the prestigious outputs in which it is published. Examples include *Advances in Experimental Social Psychology*, *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *Psychological Bulletin* and *Psychological Science*. Other quality indicators include the impressive grant support, participation at prestigious conferences, and editorial membership in key journals in the field. The relevance of the research is very good, although it should be noted that the key and direct objectives of the programme is theory testing, understanding and knowledge building, although the programme seems ready to recognize that “there is nothing as practical as a good theory”.

The prospects for the programme are excellent. The structure of the programme is such that it encourages social interaction, cooperation and intellectual exchange among its members. The social atmosphere is one of vitality and enthusiasm for the research process, coupled with a commitment to student training. Of course, frontiers could always be pushed back by, for example, pursuing European Union funding opportunities more vigorously or increasing the number of postdoctoral research fellows. Nevertheless, given the prominence of the senior researchers and the strength of the junior researchers, the future of the programme is undoubtedly bright.

---

* Academic staff in 2005: 10 fte. One staff member is 0.80 (Dr. Doosje), another 0.05 (Prof. Spears). In addition, a staff member is on an early retirement scheme (Dr. Meertens), whereas another member has retired but is contributing to the programme’s research mission (Dr. Koomen).
Programme 6: Groups and Individuals at Work/
Work and Organisational Psychology

Programme director: Prof. dr. C. de Dreu
Academic staff in 2004 (research fte): 10.52
Assessments:
- Quality: Very good
- Productivity: Very good
- Relevance: Very good
- Viability: Very good

This programme focuses upon multilevel issues related to the effectiveness of individuals, groups and organizations at work. The programme examines group processes, conflict, innovation, personnel selection, psychometrics and person organization fit.

In the group there is a critical mass of internationally known research leaders whose work is published in the top outlets in the field internationally. There has been a historic failure to win second and third stream funding though the last assessment period has seen a significant improvement in winning NWO funding. The programme is seeking to influence and respond to NWO priorities in this area and also to selectively target third stream funding to achieve a sound financial base.

Concerns about the coherence of the programme have been met by the recent appointment of a third full professor whose work integrates the existing strands. This depends, however, on the other professors not leaving the group, otherwise the coherence of the programme is at risk.

The productivity of the group is focused on some key areas of theoretical and practical importance, particularly innovation among individuals, groups and organisations at work, and conflict and its management within groups and organisations. The group produces much high quality research and is well-known internationally. The committee welcomes the evidence of a developing dissemination strategy. The move towards more social psychological and experimental perspectives could weaken the impact of the group’s work in the field of work and organizational psychology, however, and produce a decline in relevance if this is not guarded against. Therefore, there is a need to ensure a clear statement of the future overall research strategy of the programme to keep it on track.
4.4. University of Tilburg (UvT)

4.4.1. Institute assessment

The four psychology research programmes of the University of Tilburg are housed in the Faculty of Social and Behavioural Sciences, founded in 1963. The university Executive Board has delegated all management responsibilities at the level of the faculty to the faculty dean.

The faculty mission is to become an upmarket player in education and research in the Netherlands and a competitive player on the international academic arena in two chosen core areas: ‘Psychology and health’ and ‘Psychology and society’ in the faculty’s strategic plan 2001-2004. The faculty research focuses on both individuals and groups. The university and faculty strategic plan 2005-2008 require all research programmes to be externally evaluated as very good or excellent. As in the university mission as a whole, the faculty combines striving for academic freedom and progress with contributing to the quality of society by training people for responsible positions in society and in acquiring sustainable solutions to societal problems, while taking into account Tilburg’s philosophy of life (Catholic) in relation to science.

In line with its striving for research excellence, the faculty participates in national research schools, joins in interfaculty research, and has partnerships with universities and other educational and research institutions both at the national and international level.

The report mentions four psychology research programmes in two departments, each within one of two strategic core areas in the Oldendorf Institute, as named in 2004. These programmes are to be seen as part of the new line of action taken after the previous evaluation, in order to better organise and upgrade the quality of research at the faculty. A board, consisting of the research institute chair, the secretary, being also the managing director of the research institute, representatives of the institute’s research areas and a PhD student, manages the research institute. A full professor appointed by the dean of the faculty coordinates the programmes, including its staffing and publication productivity.

Research programmes and departments as mentioned in the self-evaluation reports

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Research programme</th>
<th>Department Core Area</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>UvT1 Medical Psychology</td>
<td>Psychology and Health</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UvT2 Conscious and Unconscious Processing</td>
<td>Psychology and Health</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UvT3 Social Decision-Making</td>
<td>Psychology and Society</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UvT4 Behaviour in Cultural Context</td>
<td>Psychology and Society</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Besides these programmes, the university recently started research in a programme on paediatric psychology and terminated its programme on economic psychology. Both these programmes, for the above reasons, were not invited for evaluation.

A Methods and Statistics Department functions at the faculty level for both sociology and psychology, and was considered excellent in a former evaluation round of the social-cultural sciences. This mid-term review (January 2005) also evaluated the psychology research programmes as very good to excellent in the aspects considered, though this mid-
term review committee had some worries about the vitality of two programmes (UvT2 and UvT4).

The Institute receives a stable amount of direct funding of approximately €3 million annually. The faculty also obtains funds from NWO, prestigious grants in the VIDI and VICI programmes, and special professorships financed by NWO, and regular PhD project grants. Contract research has sharply decreased due to personnel changes in the aftermath of the faculty reorganization and a stronger emphasis on fundamental research. The reorganized faculty is now gaining renewed attention from external parties, leading to an increase of contract research again. Facilities provided by the faculty include ICT facilities, with a budget of €200,000, a library with a budget of €200,000 for books and academic magazines, and a laboratory for experimental research, renewed in 2002.

In the evaluation period 1998-2004, international recruitment of staff personnel became a more active policy than before the 1998 reorganisation. This is implemented e.g. by organizing several international events and by advertising in English on the Internet. Another recruitment policy is an emphasis on target groups, striving for more women in higher positions and offering working time adjustment possibilities for elderly staff. Research time for staff members is based on past performance, PhD students spending 30% of their time on educational activities and teaching. Traditional yearly performance interviews, twice for PhD students, will be changed to a tenure track system introduced in 2004 to the whole faculty, including a performance monitoring system.

The faculty policy of allocating research money and time to programmes and researchers underwent changes in 1992, 2002 and 2003, emphasising the quality of publications as a prime basis for the allocation. Since 2004 the faculty has used a weighted score count model covering publications in four categories: articles published in ISI-covered journals, other English-language journals, contributions to prestigious books in English, scientific articles in all other journals and contributions to books by non-prestigious publishers. The policy, according to the self-evaluation report, shifted emphasis from productivity to quality in the research evaluation period assessed.

Supervision and monitoring of PhD students were restructured along with the faculty reorganization, with an eye on the number and graduation time of PhD students. PhD students discuss their progress with the managing director of the institute twice a year, while their supervising professors give daily support. The continuation of PhD projects depends on good results in the first year, including course results, quality of literature study and a plan of action prepared by the student. Projects are related to themes in the research Master educational programme.

The four programmes together produced a total number of 531 publications, in all categories taken together, that is: academic publications, monographs, PhD theses and professional publications. With a total research staff over the evaluation period of 103.5 fte, this amounts to an average of 5.1 publications per fte over the years 1998-2004.

It is clear to the evaluation committee that the university and faculty policy towards Psychology Research clearly strives at improving high-quality research in the strategic areas chosen. The rather limited size of some of the programme groups, however, makes them vulnerable, depending too much on the prevalence of a single outstanding professor. Therefore, the
committee wonders whether the internal budget allocation system sufficiently supports the growth of the psychology groups to a size that permits them to flourish on the safe side of research capacity to keep up with international standards. A rationale for this is found also in the considerable interest and success rate of PhD students.\textsuperscript{10}

4.4.2. Assessments per programme

The committee comes to the following overall programme scores for quality (Q), productivity (P), relevance (R) and viability (V) for the four UvT programmes.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>University of Tilburg</th>
<th>Q</th>
<th>P</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>V</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>UvT1</td>
<td>1. Medical Psychology</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UvT2</td>
<td>2. Conscious and Unconscious Processing</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UvT3</td>
<td>3. Social Decision-Making</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UvT4</td>
<td>4. Behaviour in Cultural Context</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5 = Excellent, 4 = Very good, 3 = Good, 2 = Satisfactory, 1 = Unsatisfactory

The results of assessment by the research evaluation committee as a whole are given below regarding the quality, productivity, relevance and viability for each of the four research programmes of the psychology research programmes of the Oldendorff Institute.

\textsuperscript{10} A total number of 55 PhD students started in the period 1998-2003, of which 44 successfully completed their thesis or are still on track and 11 PhD students failed or resigned from their projects (according to additional information from the UvT received by the Committee).
Programme 1: Medical Psychology
Programme director: Prof. dr. J. Denollet
Academic staff in 2004 (research fte): 7.76
Assessments:
- Quality: Very good
- Productivity: Very good
- Relevance: Very good
- Viability: Very good

The activities of this very good research group reflect changes in the structure of the Department of Psychology including the appointment of a new Programme Director. Research within this group focuses on factors relevant to five chronic medical conditions, and the research programme is more homogenous and structured than was the case in the past. Until comparatively recently, this group was very heavily reliant on direct funding, but the award of €1,250,000 for research into personality and vulnerability to heart disease has greatly improved the level of research funding. The research group has coherent research plans, and several of its members have prominent research reputations. The overall strength of the programme merits a rating of very good.

The quality of the research undertaken by this group is high. In particular, the research on the Type D personality is innovative and is having a major impact on the understanding of various medical conditions. The Programme Director has a prominent and growing reputation (e.g., his citations have almost doubled in the past four years). There is real strength in depth, with several members of the research group attracting dozens of citations each year. In view of these strengths, the rating for quality is very good.

The record on productivity is mixed. The group has established a very good record in terms of number of articles in peer-reviewed journals, but less has been achieved in terms of professional publications. There has recently been an increase in the number of postgraduate students, but that figure was fairly low for much of the period. The low level of external research funding (until recently) and the need for some researchers to shift from health psychology to medical psychology have had an impact on productivity. Overall, these factors have influenced productivity, which is still scored as very good.

The research group is carrying out research of substantial relevance. Members of the group have disseminated their knowledge well in terms of journal publications but less so in terms of professional publications. However, the research on Type D personality has attracted considerable media coverage, and generally the group has performed very well in terms of relevance. Thus, the rating for relevance is very good.

The future prospects of the group seem very positive for various reasons. First, the Programme Director has a prominent international reputation and is already boosting the group’s research programme. Second, the group members are rapidly developing expertise within medical psychology. Third, the level of research funding available to the group has recently increased dramatically. In view of these considerations, the prospects are rated as very good.
Programme 2: Conscious and Unconscious Processing
Programme director: Prof. dr. B. de Gelder
Academic staff in 2004 (research fte): 7.16
Assessments:
Quality: Excellent
Productivity: Very good
Relevance: Excellent
Viability: Very good

This is a small programme, recording a total of 33.9 fte’s of effort (reported period 1998-2004), with only 12.1 from tenured staff. Of 13 PhD students associated with the programme at some point in the review period, 4 have completed their degree. The focus is on basic research, addressing questions in language, spatial cognition, face perception and integration across sensory modalities. For this reason our review has focused on basic science output rather than professional publications or other forms of knowledge application.

Given its small size, the programme shows substantial vigour and international visibility. This is clear in the published output, often in first-rate journals, and an impressive series of national and international collaborators. Our ratings primarily reflect this strong presence in the field, with sustained contributions to the development of knowledge.

As regards future prospects, there are several organizational features to be noted. A great strength of the programme is its multidisciplinary approach, with significant work in normal human behaviour, neuropsychology, ERP and fMRI. By and large, this multidisciplinary effort is necessarily based on external collaborations, with little resource for modern cognitive neuroscience within the university itself. Perhaps related to this is the modest grant income. The recent award of a prestigious Human Frontier grant to the Programme Director reflects her prominence in the international arena, and ability to draw together a top class international team of collaborators. Otherwise, grant income within the group is rather modest, with 77% of the budget coming from direct funding. A final point is that the research output is rather heavily weighted towards the Director herself; a broader base of publications would certainly be desirable to guarantee future group stability.

In summary, our impression of this programme is of a rather individualistic success carved out with modest resources and institutional support. It is vital to appreciate that experimental psychology/cognitive neuroscience is a field undergoing rapid movement and growth. Serious resource commitment is certainly required from any university wishing to maintain a long-term presence in this competitive market.
Programme 3: Social Decision-Making
Programme directors: Prof. dr. M. Zeelenberg, Dr. D. de Cremer
Academic staff in 2004 (research fte): 3.75
Assessments: Quality: Very good
Productivity: Very good
Relevance: Excellent
Viability: Very good

The Social Decision-Making Programme at the University of Tilburg is new, having been established in 2000. The programme involves three research areas: Social Cognition and Decision-Making, Emotion and Decision-Making, and Interdependence and Decision-Making.

Over the assessment period a total of 11 researchers were involved in the programme, of which 3 were tenured staff, 3 were non-tenured staff, and 5 were PhD students. In 2004, the distribution was: 1.17 fte tenured staff, 0.60 fte non-tenured staff, and 3.75 fte PhD students. This reflects a satisfactory staff-to-student ratio. No student completed his or her PhD thesis during the assessment period. Productivity is very good, at approximately 10 articles and chapters per year, plus approximately 2 professional publications per year.

The research addresses important theoretical and applied issues and is well-conducted. Also, the quality of the research is generally high, as is evident by publications in such reputable journals as Journal of Consumer Research, Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, Organizational Behaviour and Human Decision Processes and Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin. Still, it is worth considering trading off quantity for even higher quality as a sensible strategy. In addition, the programme members have achieved impressive grant support, were present at prestigious conferences, and are board members of central journals in the field. The relevance of the research is excellent, as it is specifically focused on addressing applied problems, albeit always from a theory-relevant and theory-construction perspective.

The prospects for the programme are very good. The programme is shaping around two established researchers (Prof. Zeelenberg and Dr. de Cremer), who seem to have galvanized an impressive roster of junior researchers. The programme will be graduating its first students soon. Yet, there are some impediments that need to be overcome if the programme is to flourish fully. One impediment is infrastructure. At present, the programme has facilities that do not match the ambition of its members. Another impediment is the social climate. Although programme members seem to get along quite well with each other, their morale and job satisfaction can stand some improvement. Perhaps a good start toward achieving this latter objective would be for the upper management to relinquish more autonomy to this (but also other) programme.

11 Including 5 professors in 2004, and 6 in 2005
Programme 4: Behaviour in Cultural Context
Programme director: Prof. dr. F.J.R. van de Vijver
Academic staff in 2004 (research fte): 3.71
Assessments:

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Quality:</td>
<td>Very good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Productivity:</td>
<td>Excellent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relevance:</td>
<td>Very good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Viability:</td>
<td>Satisfactory</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This is a small but vibrant research programme, which has established a worldwide reputation. It builds creatively upon a strong doctoral intake and upon the distinctive skills of the senior staff, particularly those of the programme leader, being arguably the leading expert in research methods in cross-cultural psychology. The programme has developed and disseminated a variety of enhancements to the methodology of research in the field that have been employed in collaboration with many research teams around the world. Developing the focus of the group’s research on acculturation of migrant populations within the Netherlands has promise in contributing to currently pressing practical issues.

Overall, this is a productive and impressive programme of research into cross-cultural issues. Besides some uncertainties with respect to funding policies, the question remains whether the tight focus on methods of cross-cultural research is adequate. A broader research strategy may be needed given that the area is already tightly focused. The quality of publications is good, consistently so, but there are few top journal publications. The quantity of output is very high indeed, but this is very much due to the prodigious output of the Programme Director.

The programme has a high degree of relevance, particularly given the currents of inter-group conflicts centred on culture in the modern world. The programme could make more of a contribution in this respect and, with a broader focus, could well be a big influence, scientifically and practically. Prospects are good as long as the programme leader remains. Even so, a broader scientific strategy would be welcome, and the current narrowness probably reflects the fact that this programme has been a one-person programme (largely) for a long period. Cross-fertilisation could potentially be very helpful, or merging this programme with the existing social decision-making programme.

A major threat to the continuing high-quality performance of this group is its small size. Loss of Prof. van de Vijver would destroy the group. The practical relevance of the developing focus upon acculturation should open up additional funding avenues. Additional external funding for 2004-2009: €667,000 (€57,000 + €186,000 + €84,000 + €20,000 + €20,000 + €100,000 + €200,000), of which €270,000 in collaboration with VU and Wageningen University (of which some €20,000 goes to UvT). This according to additional information the Committee received from the UvT after the visit.

Given the rich opportunities, the main obstacle to future prospects seems to be to secure continuity in the programme leadership and enlargement of the group in some way.

---

12 Additional external funding for 2004-2009: €667,000 (€57,000 + €186,000 + €84,000 + €20,000 + €20,000 + €100,000 + €200,000), of which €270,000 in collaboration with VU and Wageningen University (of which some €20,000 goes to UvT). This according to additional information the Committee received from the UvT after the visit.
4.5. University of Maastricht (UM)

4.5.1. Institute assessment

The Faculty of Psychology at Maastricht University has organised its psychology research into two broad programmes: Neurocognition and Experimental Psychology. The committee decided to look at the research at the sub-programme level, also presented in the self-evaluation report, including in total seven research sections or (sub-)programmes.

Research programmes and sub-programmes in the Maastricht Psychology Faculty

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sub-programme level as assessed by the committee</th>
<th>Programme level UM1 and 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>UM1 a. Biological Psychology</td>
<td>Neurocognition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UM1 b. Cognitive Neuroscience</td>
<td>Neurocognition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UM1 c. Developmental Biopsychology</td>
<td>Neurocognition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UM1 d. Theory and History (not a separate programme)</td>
<td>Neurocognition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UM2 a. Applied Psychology</td>
<td>Experimental Psychology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UM2 b. Eating Disorders &amp; Addiction</td>
<td>Experimental Psychology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UM2 c. Psychology &amp; Law</td>
<td>Experimental Psychology</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Psychology Department started at Maastricht by developing an undergraduate course for some 180 students in 1995 with a small staff of 10 fte, and moved to its current location as a separate faculty in 1999 when the number of students had risen to 700 undergraduates. At the end of the evaluation period, beginning 2005, some 800 undergraduates and 130 staff members consumed some €10 million of annual budget.

The faculty is now a full-scale graduate teaching and research institute devoted to biological and cognitive psychology, and striving at international recognition. The Institute strives to perform basic research that makes a difference in everyday life, linking to practical applications.

The role of the board and committees is seen as facilitating individual creativity. The dean of the faculty and the faculty board, advised by a research committee representing the two main programmes, decides upon research policy. Within the faculty a committee on research infrastructure is also active, and all projects have to be approved by an ethical committee. Both programmes are represented on the ethical committee.

The research policy includes recruiting and retaining excellent scientists, both senior and young, encouraging grant acquisition, investing in facilities and financial reserves for innovative experimental research, and the careful balancing of teaching and research time for each researcher. The faculty develops a system of research fellows and members based on publication track quality, including extra research time (above 50%), a financial research bonus, and privileges regarding faculty PhD grants and entrance to facilities. Finally, the faculty policy includes a number of bottom-up developed research lines to direct research in the programmes coherently, both of a fundamental and applied nature. These are called sections, or sub-programmes as listed above, which the research evaluation committee has taken as the units of assessment in the current review round.

Whereas the faculty started with an accent on experimental research in the psychology of health, in the course of time its programme on neurocognition was strengthened as a second
focus of research attention, for which the faculty was successful in recruiting an international pioneer in the field of neuro-imaging. The research and teaching staff at the end of 2004 comprised nearly 110 full-time places, of which 35% tenured, 13% non-tenured and 50% PhD students. The large share of PhD students means a very strong growth compared with the 13% PhD students in 1998 at the beginning of the evaluation period. From the year 2000 onwards, the two instituted programmes, Neurocognition and Experimental Psychology, have had an equivalent share in staff.

Total funding grew from €1.4 to €5.1 million in the evaluation period, as did expenditures, with the share of personnel costs changing from 80% in the first years to 58% in 2004. This shift resulted from receiving extra university budget to invest in novel research facilities (several experimental laboratory facilities, fMRI and TMS). External funding in competition from the government (e.g. Veni, Vidi and Vici grants from NWO) rose from only 3% to a considerable ca. 30% in the last assessment year. Whereas in the early years the budget mainly went to Experimental Psychology (over 80% in 1998), in later years the distribution spread more evenly over the two main programmes, Neurocognition receiving some 42% in 2004.

The steering of research is left to the programmes in a bottom-up fashion, within the domains specified at the faculty level, biological and cognitive psychology, as currently performed in four sub-programmes or sections in Neurocognition and three sub-programmes in Experimental Psychology (see table above). The faculty policy in this is based on the belief that good research is a question of facilitating the creativity of individual talents. PhD projects are formulated and guided at the level of the sections. The faculty board, together with the research committee, decides upon research policy in general (lines of research) and opening of new chairs and research positions. All projects have to be pre-approved by the ethical committee concerning relevant ethical aspects. Also, the faculty participates in several research schools, which had already been founded when the Psychology Faculty at Maastricht started its research and teaching activities.

The reputation of Maastricht psychology research has been building up gradually, as indicated by citation scores of senior staff in the range 25-2300 (for all publications; 10-417 first authorships only), including one neuroscience article from 1998 cited 131 times by 2004. Internal evaluation includes staff interviews (emphasizing the need for the realised reduction of teaching load by 5% and improved research facilities), now apparently rather satisfied with the faculty research climate. The faculty has to find a solution to balance its rewarding but time-consuming approach of problem-oriented teaching/learning in order to safeguard research time for its staff members. Also, current training courses for PhD students should be better directed at the needs of the PhD students [EEG, MRI and TMS methods, advanced statistics, and media training (to inform a broader lay audience)].

The idea of media training for PhD students relates to the faculty’s ambition to disseminate research results outside the academic community to raise awareness of the societal implications and provide research ‘intelligence’ in formats accessible for the lay public. This is done in several ways, e.g. by acting as an opinion leader in the popular media, informing professionals about research results, or acting as expert witnesses in court.

The two programmes and seven sections, together with research in the earlier years of the department, produced a total number of 1132 publications, including academic publications,
monographs, PhD theses and professional publications and products. With a total staff of 490 fte in this period (1998-2004),\textsuperscript{13} this amounts to an average of 2.3 publications per fte. This figure, however, is misleadingly low, as the self-evaluation report does not distinguish between research and teaching staff. Estimating average research time at 50\% (245 fte), the productivity figure would go up to 4.6 publications per research staff equivalent. Looking at \textit{academic} publications only (976) the figure is 4.0, illustrating a relatively high production of \textit{academic} publications compared with \textit{professional} (applied science) publications.

As the two programmes, Neurocognition and Experimental Psychology, became first institutionalised in 2000, figures at the programme level are also given for 2000-2004. In that period 196 fte research staff (50\% of 392 research and teaching staff)\textsuperscript{14} produced 764 academic and 138 other publications (monographs, PhD theses, professional). In terms of productivity: 4.6 publications per research fte, with 3.9 academic publications.

It follows that the earlier Institute period was more productive: 230 publications produced by 38 research fte (50\% of 76 fte research and teaching staff): a 6.0 productivity score.

The self-evaluation report analyses perspectives and expectations for the Psychology Institute. The main conclusion from this, given the young history of the Institute, pertains to believing the Maastricht Psychology Faculty to be a growing and flowering part of psychology as a mature branch of science. Therein, NWO funding acquisition has to be brought to a higher level, and extra funding is needed from third parties using facilities (MRI). Also, PhD duration and staff research time have to be monitored closely. The faculty aims to uphold a strong international orientation and wants to realise a more balanced productivity of the two main programmes, Neurocognition (454 publications) and Experimental Psychology (640 publications), in line with balancing budgets and staff.

The committee is of the opinion that both research programmes are in a very creative mode and have a high potential to grow successfully if integration/interaction of activities between the sections is intensified in the future. The combination of the present different – and developing – qualities provides a good chance of something very good emerging, and producing new growth potential. Finally, the theory and history section should not be treated as a separate unit – and the committee did not assess it as such – but another solution should be found to have philosophy and history of psychology as an inspiring source within the faculty.

\textsuperscript{13} In this paragraph the Committee considers the whole review period 1998-2004. Elsewhere in the report the figures concern the five-year period 2000-2004, as the period covering the two main programmes.

\textsuperscript{14} The Institute estimates overall research time at 50\% of all research and teaching staff fte’s.
4.5.2. Assessments per programme

The committee comes to the following overall programme scores for quality (Q), productivity (P), relevance (R) and viability (V) for the Maastricht research programmes.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>University of Maastricht</th>
<th>Q</th>
<th>P</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>V</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>UM1a</td>
<td>1 a. Biological Psychology</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UM1b</td>
<td>1 b. Cognitive Neuroscience</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UM1c</td>
<td>1 c. Developmental Biopsychology</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UM1d</td>
<td>1 d. Theory and History (not considered a separate programme)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UM2a</td>
<td>2 a. Applied Psychology</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UM2b</td>
<td>2 b. Eating Disorders &amp; Addiction</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UM2c</td>
<td>2 c. Psychology &amp; Law</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5 = Excellent, 4 = Very good, 3 = Good, 2 = Satisfactory, 1 = Unsatisfactory

The assessment results given by the research evaluation committee as a whole are presented below regarding the quality, productivity, relevance and viability of each separate research programme of the psychology faculty at Maastricht University.
Programme 1: Neurocognition

Sub-programme 1a: Biological Psychology

Programme director: Prof. dr. J. Jolles
Academic staff in 2004 (research fte): 7.22
Assessments:
- Quality: Very good
- Productivity: Very good
- Relevance: Excellent
- Viability: Very good

This is a healthy, growing, very good programme, consistently increasing in size over the report period 2000-2004. It represented a total of 4.4 fte in 2000, increasing to 7.22 in 2004. The programme is jointly administered within the Faculties of Psychology and Medicine; combining PhD students registered in these two faculties, a total of 21 have completed their degree in the reporting period. The health of the programme is reflected in the breadth of topics covered, including work in normal human development and aging, neuropsychological studies in a broad variety of clinical groups, and a strong programme of psychopharmacology. A particular feature is translation from basic science to application, for example in studies of driver behaviour. This strong applied orientation gives the programme substantial stability and flexibility in management, funding routes and research strategy.

The international impact of the programme is good. Academic publications are strong, with a significant presence in front rank journals. The programme’s collaborative network is excellent, with active links to groups in Europe, North America, Japan and elsewhere. Among others, one striking example is Project Lifelong Learning. Transfer to applied settings is a particularly strong element of the communication strategy, including extensive efforts in providing public information on Alzheimer’s disease, etc.

Though a full breakdown of research income has not been separately provided for this sub-programme, the portfolio of grant funding is impressive. Again, this success derives partly from the mixture of basic research and contract funding, including good representation of funding from the pharmaceutical industry.

The threat of Riedel leaving the Institute has been adequately dealt with as he now holds a chair in pharmacology at the faculty, but is also affiliated with a pharmaceutical company. In all, this programme seems strikingly healthy, with good university support, clear scientific and organizational enterprise, and a well-developed future strategy.
Sub-programme 1b: Cognitive Neuroscience
Programme director: Prof. dr. R. Goebel

Academic staff in 2004
(research fte): 19.94
Assessments:
Quality: Excellent
Productivity: Excellent
Relevance: Excellent
Viability: Excellent

Since the appointment of the Director in 2000, this programme has developed dramatically into an excellent flagship of European cognitive neuroscience. From 6.63 fte in 2000, the programme has grown to 19.94 in 2004 with the pace slackening only slightly. A total of 19 PhD students have been associated with the programme over this period, but it is hard to assess the completion rate since the programme is so new. The Director is a major international figure in brain imaging methods and their application to a broad range of central cognitive problems. His Brain Voyager analysis package is used worldwide for the analysis of fMRI data, including groundbreaking work in cortical flattening, functional connectivity analysis and many other features.

A central strength of this group’s work is the breadth of methods employed, including fMRI, EEG/MEG, TMS and single-cell physiology in the behaving monkey. Some of these methods are directly available in the university, representing first-class investment in this rapidly growing field. Others are gained through close links to the F.C. Donders Centre in Nijmegen, where the Director is a board member. This is a field in which Maastricht has seized the initiative to establish a world-class group. At least as significant is the strong strategy of combining basic studies of brain/mind function with a very significant commitment to methods development. Cognitive topics now under investigation include vision, hearing, attention, motor control, speech, error detection, dyslexia and number processing.

The academic output is excellent, with heavy representation in the field’s premier journals, and a good number of highly prominent individual papers. While a separate breakdown of grant income for this sub-group is not available, the list of individual grants gives clear evidence of success at both national and international levels, including for example prestigious awards from the McDonnell-Pew and Human Frontier programmes.

Such a varied and rapidly developing programme brings significant management challenges. For example, it has been a substantial enterprise to integrate primate neurophysiology into the group. It is reassuring and crucial that these potential problems have been foreseen, and that a strong management strategy is in place. We see only excellent prospects for future consolidation and development.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sub-programme 1c: Developmental Biopsychology</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Programme director: Prof. dr. C. Kemner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic staff in 2004, (research fte): 5.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessments:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality: Good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Productivity: Good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relevance: Good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Viability: Very good</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This very well managed programme is directed to the study of the development of behaviour and cognitive functions in relation to brain development. Given this aim, various measures of brain functioning are used, such as brain imaging by fMRI, ERP, trans-cranial electromagnetic stimulation, and eye movements. Beyond any doubt, the facilities available to the programme are world class, and they can support first-class research in hot issues in developmental biopsychology. The research conducted in the period evaluated is moving in this direction, but it is not there yet. That is, it is technically and methodologically excellent, and this is reflected in the fact that some of it is published in very good international journals. However, this research lacks coherence, and in some cases, it seems to be driven by the facilities available rather than by comprehensive developmental models or hot current problems and questions in developmental science.

The productivity of the group is satisfactory (1.5 publications/year/person in refereed journals). That is, it is considerably lower than the average of the six universities evaluated but close to the international average. This is probably understandable because the programme is new and still under formation.

The relevance of the programme is satisfactory but needs to be closely monitored and directed to align itself better with developmental science, both in its cognitive and its clinical dimensions. Specifically, the programme needs to be informed by the long-standing models, concerns and questions of developmental science rather than by the available technology and “trendy” publications in the field of modern neuro-imaging (which is also rather weak as a field in this respect). It is to the credit of the programme that its leaders recognize this need.

In fact, the prospects of the programme are conditional upon this tuning with developmental science. That is, the excellent facilities available to it together with the enthusiasm, very high morale and pride of the group promise that in a few years, they can thrive and become a first-class centre for developmental neuroscience in Europe. International or national collaborations with established developmental scientists may be particularly conducive to the attainment of this aim.
**Sub-programme 1d:** Theory and History  
Programme director: Prof. dr. J. van Heerden  
Academic staff in 2004 (research fte): 4.45 (there are 7 contributors)  
Assessments:  
- Quality: not applicable to assessment  
- Productivity: not applicable to assessment  
- Relevance: not applicable to assessment  
- Viability: not applicable to assessment

This sub-programme was designed to have a philosophical and theoretical input into the other programmes and is therefore hardly visible as a separate endeavour. There is no clearly defined theme, either with respect to the theory or to history of psychology. The major output of the participants is probably hidden within the other sub-programmes, so that it is virtually impossible to make a fair assessment of the achievements over the last 7 years. On top of that, we learned that a major reorganisation is taking place, now Prof. van Heerden has retired. Thus, the prospect of this programme is uncertain. The assessment panel suspects that it was not a good decision of the Department to present this programme as a separate entity. On the other hand, it is also not perfectly clear why this programme is presented as a sub-section of neurocognition, but that may be due to the fact that there were hardly any publications that provided insight into the research of this group. On the basis of all this, only a rather negative assessment of this sub-programme could be made. Such an assessment would probably be unfair to its leader and the participants, and not serve any positive goal, because the group as such is no longer in existence. The panel will therefore not assess this sub-programme separately, but will include its opinion in the overall assessment of the neurobiology programmes.
Programme 2: Experimental Psychology

Sub-programme 2a: Applied Psychology
Programme director: Prof. dr. G. Kok
Academic staff in 2004: 14.49
Assessments:
Quality: Very good
Productivity: Very good
Relevance: Very good
Viability: Very good

The Applied Psychology Sub-programme at the University of Maastricht (established in 1997) focuses on behaviour and behaviour change. The sub-programme covers such areas of research as self-regulation and self-control, HIV testing and prevention, values and nutrition, persuasive appeals and public campaigns, and intervention mapping. This is clearly a broad, albeit somewhat dispersed focus.

Over the assessment period a total of 8 professors were involved in research, and in 2005 these were: Prof. Kok (20%), Prof. Hospers (40%), Dr. Ruiter (50%), Dr. Martijn (50%), and Dr. van de Wiel (50%). All of them were tenured. Also, over the assessment period (and in 2004) the sub-programme featured 14 PhD students, with 10 PhDs in 2004. The staff-to-student ratio is very good. The committee was informed that by 2005 seven PhD students who started their PhD project during the assessment had completed their theses.

The productivity of the sub-programme is very good. Staff and student publish an impressive 22 articles, chapters or professional publications per year. Eleven of these publications appeared in peer-reviewed journals, such as *AIDS Care*, *AIDS and Behaviour*, *Psychology and Health* and *Health Education and Behaviour*. Quality is high, although the programme members could consider publishing the theoretical gains of their research in more prestigious applied-psychology outlets. Grant support is highly commendable. In addition, the relevance of these publications is very good.

The prospects for the programme appear to be very good. The research facilities are excellent, the morale is high, and the staff is competent and ambitious. Also, staff members have established close collaborative relationships that set a prototypical example of how cross-fertilization of theories and methods can be beneficial to the development of knowledge.
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Sub-programme 2b: Eating Disorders and Addiction
Programme director: Prof. dr. A. Jansen
Academic staff in 2004 (research fte): 10.03
Assessments:
- Quality: Very good
- Productivity: Good
- Relevance: Very good
- Viability: Excellent

This area of research at the University of Maastricht forms part of Experimental Psychology. It is a small group focusing on two main lines of research: strategic research and more applied interventions based on theoretical models. The programme of research is becoming increasingly coherent. Most of the funding depends on student numbers, which is a potential vulnerability. However, the research group appears to have clear goals for the future, and its research programme is improving systematically. Accordingly, the rating for the programme is very good.

This relatively small research group is carrying out much research of very high quality under the leadership of the Programme Director. The publication record of the group is generally good, even though there appear to be relatively few professional publications. However, some members seem much more productive than others, both in terms of publications and in terms of funding. Against that, the group is generally young, and the omens are favourable for the future. In view of these considerations, the research quality is rated as very good, whereas the heterogeneity of productivity leads to a rating of good.

The research group has demonstrated a high level of relevance. Its publications have contributed substantially to the advancement of knowledge, although it might be desirable for the group to produce more professional publications. The combination of strategic and theory-driven applied research means that the knowledge obtained by the members of the research group is effectively implemented. As a consequence, the rating in the category of relevance is very good.

There are several positive signs as far as future prospects are concerned. The group is young and on an upwards trajectory in terms of research. There is a feeling of real enthusiasm and dynamism that will serve to drive the research onwards. In addition (and very appropriately) the members of this small group are increasingly engaging in fruitful collaboration with members of other groups within the Faculty of Psychology. In view of all these promising signs for the future, the rating for prospects is excellent.
This very well-managed programme has its roots in a standing tradition of UM and has grown considerably in the assessment period, from 5.38 to 12.33 research fte. Although the research staff are predominantly young, quite a few of them have already earned an international reputation. The general theme is memory and its failures or pretended failures in forensic settings. This is studied at a fundamental level, using the most modern technical facilities, but always in a manner that the outcomes can be translated into legally relevant expert opinions. The programme leader is quite famous for this approach, both at national and international levels. The quality of the programme is therefore rated as very good.

Over the assessment period a total of 44 fte was spent on research, including 27 fte by 11 PhD students. In 2004 the distribution over the various groups was: 2.8 fte tenured staff, 1.1 non-tenured staff, 7.9 PhD students. This seems a somewhat lopsided division, with relatively few tenured scientists. The number of completed PhD theses in the assessment period is 2; the other PhD students were still in the preparatory stage on 31 December 2004. As in the Theory and History programme, the panel wonders whether the presentation as a separate entity to be assessed may lead to a slightly limited view. The members of this group seem to be fairly well integrated in the group of experimental Psychology, and even in the group of Neurobiology. Also this way of presentation makes it difficult to rate productivity and funding.

There is a constant flow of academic publications. The scientific articles are spread over journals with various impact rates. As can be expected in this interdisciplinary field, there are many professional publications, aimed at various interest groups, in the shape of journal articles and book contributions, but a more direct address to the legal community could be considered. Productivity is rated as good, while relevance is rated as excellent.

It is not clear from the self-evaluation report exactly how this group is funded, but from the listing on p. 81ff. it becomes apparent that there is a regular input from external sources, and that besides the programme leader, others also manage to attract funds. Since the group is still relatively young, no major changes are to be expected in the near future. The elaborate technical facilities are more than adequate for the next assessment period. Therefore the criterion prospects is assessed as excellent.
4.6. **Utrecht University (UU)**

4.6.1. **Institute of Psychology (Linschoten Institute to be)**

The psychology research programmes are situated in the Faculty of Social Sciences (FSS) since 1963, as part of Utrecht University. Scientific research in psychology should fit within the mission of the FSS as a knowledge centre offering prominent, internationally respected, high-level scientific expertise with respect to important issues in the domains of the social and behavioural sciences. From 2006 on, the psychology research programmes, now fully embedded in national research schools accredited by the Royal Academy of Sciences (KNAW), will be housed in the new Linschoten Institute with a more local focus, as part of the strategy of the university board to strengthen the training of researchers at local graduate schools. The Methods and Statistics programme will function in the faculty as a separate unit, serving all of the faculty’s departments.

The report mentions nine programmes, eight of which are in the new Linschoten Institute:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Research Programmes</th>
<th>FSS situation 2006</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>UU1</td>
<td>Work and Mental Health</td>
<td>Linschoten Institute</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UU2</td>
<td>Stress and Self-Regulation</td>
<td>Linschoten Institute</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UU3</td>
<td>Trauma and Grief</td>
<td>Linschoten Institute</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UU4</td>
<td>Social-Cognitive and Interpersonal Determinants of Behaviour</td>
<td>Linschoten Institute</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UU5</td>
<td>Social and Personality Development</td>
<td>Linschoten Institute</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UU6</td>
<td>Neuropsychology, Psychopathology and Cognition</td>
<td>Linschoten Institute</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UU7</td>
<td>Cognition and Perceptual Systems</td>
<td>Linschoten Institute</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UU8</td>
<td>Attention, Anxiety and Impulsivity</td>
<td>Linschoten Institute</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UU9</td>
<td>Methodology and Statistics for the Behavioural and Social Sciences</td>
<td>M&amp;S unit</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Associated research schools: P&H, HH, KLI, ISED, IOPS, ICS, CERES.

The faculty aims at continuity in its sub-disciplines in order to permit the development of theory and methods and to build excellent reputations. Thus, a number of outstanding senior researchers were recruited and appointed as professors in the faculty. This strategy led to a relatively strong growth of competition funding from NWO as compared to direct funding by the government. Together with contracts, the income of the ‘institute’ has nearly doubled from €3.7 million in 1998 to €6.6 million in 2004, as did expenditures. The distribution of funds over the programmes varies from 5% to some 20% of the budget.

The psychology research staff also grew strongly, from 30 fte in 1998 to over 80 fte in 2004, the distribution of staff over the programmes being similar to that of the budget.

The research staff produced a total number of 1884 publications over the years of this evaluation period, including academic and professional publications as well as monographs and theses. This means a production of 4.6 per fte research staff annually.

The quality of research and personnel is safeguarded by appointing excellent professors, who help and guide senior researchers, by attracting and holding young talented researchers through
offering them perspectives and enhancing their development, and by collaboration in national research schools, and internal and external networks. PhD students and their supervising professors agree on a plan for training and supervision that is minutely observed. Also, the structuring of work in continuing programmes helps to enhance and maintain a high quality of research.

The analysis of strengths, weaknesses, opportunities and threats leads to the conclusion that the main goal of the faculty in psychology research will continue to be stimulating fundamental research of high quality and safeguarding the scientific quality of researchers at the programmes in the Institute, thereby keeping up with new developments both in research and funding opportunities, and in new fields and multidisciplinary collaborations.

Of course, the organisational change from local research centres, related to national research schools, into the new Linschoten Psychology Institute presents a major policy issue in the coming years, directed at facilitating local and multi-disciplinary collaboration and preventing the fragmentation and isolation of groups. Development of a local research profile and collaboration directed at strong external funding is a primary imperative, while creating opportunities for societal valorisation functions as a secondary goal.

The research evaluation committee applauds the establishment of the new Linschoten Institute as a means of creating more profile and local collaboration with other faculties. It seems an interesting strategy choice to promote both excellence and continuity in psychology research – with training of new research talent – and a strong funding base.

### 4.6.2. Assessments per programme

The committee comes to the following overall programme scores for quality (Q), productivity (P), relevance (R) and viability (V) for the nine UU programmes.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>University of Utrecht</th>
<th>Q</th>
<th>P</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>V</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>UU1</td>
<td>1. Work and Mental Health</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UU2</td>
<td>2. Stress and Self-Regulation</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UU3</td>
<td>3. Trauma and Grief</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UU4</td>
<td>4. Social-Cognitive and Interpersonal Determinants of Behaviour</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UU5</td>
<td>5. Social and Personality Development</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UU6</td>
<td>6. Neuropsychology, Psychopathology and Cognition</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UU7</td>
<td>7. Cognition and Perceptual Systems</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UU8</td>
<td>8. Attention, Anxiety and Impulsivity</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UU9</td>
<td>9. Methodology and Statistics for the Behavioural and Social Sciences</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5 = Excellent, 4 = Very good, 3 = Good, 2 = Satisfactory, 1 = Unsatisfactory

The results of assessments by the research evaluation committee as a whole are given below regarding the quality, productivity, relevance and viability for each research programme, that are all seen to be very well or even excellently managed.
Programme 1: Work and Mental Health
Programme director: Prof. dr. W.B. Schaufeli
Academic staff in 2004: 4.74
Assessments:
Quality: Excellent
Productivity: Very good
Relevance: Very good
Viability: Very good

This very well managed programme focuses on workplace stress and well-being, particularly in high-risk occupational sectors. The aim is to understand the problems of job stress burnout, and how these can be prevented or ameliorated. The programme also, unusually, conducts intervention studies, opening ways to contribute to societal benefits by the practical application of results. A new and promising focus lies on the positive aspects of employee well-being (work engagement).

Much of the research is founded on a social exchange theoretical basis. The area of stress, well-being and burnout at work is a mature research field, but this group offers novel perspectives and a strong applied orientation, offering solutions and interventions for policy-makers and practitioners. The future prospects in terms of content are therefore positive.

The programme produces a high level of very high quality scientific publications and also has a very good policy and practice impact. It is a significant group in the area of work and organizational psychology in the Netherlands and is highly visible internationally.

The leadership of the programme is strong and internationally visible, and there is a clear presentation of vision, mission, strategy and goals. However, the group is not well funded, and there is a need for a vigorous strategy to ensure this work is sustained. This is also necessary to ensure a vibrant PhD programme of a sufficient size. Trusting that due attention is given to these aspects, the prospects seem to be very good.
Programme 2: Stress and Self-Regulation

Programme directors: Prof. dr. L. van Doornen, Prof. dr. J. Bensing, Prof. dr. D. de Ridder

Academic staff in 2004 (research fte): 9.84
Assessments:
- Quality: Very good
- Productivity: Excellent
- Relevance: Excellent
- Viability: Very good

The research of the group in the general area of stress and self-regulation focuses particularly on physiological and psychological adaptation in individuals suffering from stress-related illness and disease. An important part of the research programme involves considering the interface between these two forms of adaptation to stress, but there would appear to be scope for better integration between the two major research themes. In addition, there is a danger that the range of diseases considered is too large to permit very detailed examination of adaptation to each of them. However, the leadership is fine, and the programme works very well. Accordingly, the rating for the programme is very good.

There are various reasons for arguing that the quality of the research programme is good. The research group has been successful in obtaining research and contract funding throughout the period 1998-2004, and the group has published many articles in leading journals. There is reasonable coherence to the research programme, and the programme directors are prominent on the basis of their research contributions. In view of these considerations, the quality of the research programme merits a rating of very good.

There are several indications of high levels of productivity within the research group. There is a relatively high rate of publication of journal articles, and this has remained high throughout the entire seven-year period. In addition, the number of students obtaining their PhD theses over the period has been very good. However, there has been a relative lack of professional publications. Overall, productivity in the research group is very high, and so the rating for productivity is excellent.

The research programme has as its mission the study of the relationships between psychological and physiological adaptations and health and disease. This mission is being achieved. The high rate of journal publications helps to ensure that the knowledge acquired by the research group is appropriately disseminated, although there may be a case for producing more professional publications. Overall, the high level of relevance achieved means that the rating for relevance is excellent.

The solid achievements of the past seven years mean that the future prospects are good, and the high level of ongoing research and contract funding will provide the basis for the development of research. In addition, the group is of a reasonable enough size to continue to generate high-quality research. However, there are concerns for the future relating to increasing teaching loads, to high demands on research budgets, and to a large number of PhD students relative to the number of senior staff. Overall, however, the prospects are very encouraging, and so the rating for prospects is very good.
Programme 3:
Programme directors: Prof. dr. J. van den Bout, Prof. dr. M.J.M. van Son
Academic staff in 2004 (research fte): 5.5
Assessments:
Quality: Very good
Productivity: Excellent
Relevance: Excellent
Viability: Very good

The research group focuses in its research programme on the mental health and social functioning of individuals suffering from trauma and/or grief, and there is a particular emphasis on major life events and adaptation. The academic reputation of the group is generally high, and research funding has sufficed to permit a wide range of research. The strengths of the research programme are much more substantial than its weaknesses, and so the programme receives a rating of very good.

The research programme possesses a number of distinctive characteristics, and thus is reasonably original in approach and ideas. In addition, the various components of the research programme are coherent and serve to complement each other. Some of the research staff are prominent and are recognised internationally for the quality of their research, but there is heterogeneity among senior staff with respect to prominence. Overall, there is considerable evidence of quality within the research group, and so the rating is very good.

The productivity of the research group is high. There are various indications of this. For example, there are several PhD students, and there is a high number of professional publications and products. In addition, there has been a reasonably high number of journal publications, although the record here is somewhat inconsistent. The overall performance of the research group means that a rating of excellent for productivity is justified.

The research programme is very relevant in the sense that the great majority of the research being carried out is of direct relevance to the programme's mission. The large number of publications (journal articles + professional publications) ensures that the knowledge acquired by the research group is disseminated widely. Finally, the clinical expertise and involvement of members of the research group help to ensure that the knowledge that has accumulated as a result of the research programme is implemented effectively. Accordingly, the relevance of the research programme receives a rating of excellent.

The solid achievements of the research group over a period of years combined with a substantial increase in research funding following integration with Prof. van den Hout's group mean that the future prospects are very encouraging. However, there are some potential issues relating to the future. There are relatively few tenured young researchers, there are fewer support staff than ideal, it is proving increasingly difficult to attract contract funding, and the funding for PhD students is decreasing. Overall, however, the positives are sufficiently strong for the rating for future prospects to be very good.
Programme 4: Social-Cognitive and Interpersonal Determinants of Behaviour

Programme directors: Prof. dr. K. van den Bos, Prof. dr. W. Stroebe

Academic staff in 2004 (research fte):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assessments</th>
<th>Quality: Excellent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Productivity: Very good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Relevance: Very good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Viability: Very good</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Over the assessment period, a total of 11 fte were involved in research: 6 were tenured staff, 5 were non-tenured staff, and 14 were PhD students. In 2004, the distribution was 2.27 fte tenured staff, 3.20 non-tenured staff, and 12.91 PhD students, respectively. The staff-to-student ratio is good. Also, the training of PhD students is impressive in its philosophy and efficiency. Eight students completed their PhD thesis during the assessment period. The productivity of the programme is very good, at approximately 16 articles and chapters per year, plus approximately 2 professional publications per year (which is moderate in size).

The quality of the conducted research is excellent, as manifested by publications in such high-impact journals as Advances in Experimental Social Psychology, Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin and Social Cognition. Moreover, the programme members have received excellent funding (13 major grants secured between 2001 and 2004). The important work carried out in this programme is reflected in such esteem indicators as editorship or board membership in prestigious journals, posts on key advisory committees, invited addresses, and initiative in organizing research seminars, symposia and conferences of note.

The relevance of the research is very good. The programme is conducting research that is theoretically grounded and highly relevant to ‘real-world’ problems, such as organizational relations (e.g. perceptions of organizational justice and its implications for cognition, emotion and behaviour) or health behaviour (e.g. over-eating, over-drinking) and bereavement.

The programme, although just three and a half years old, has flourished under the leadership of Prof. Wolfgang Stroebe and Prof. van den Bos. Significantly, the prospects are bright. The programme joined the Kurt Lewin Institute in 2002 to its benefit, has very good facilities and satisfactory technical support, is attracting plenty of competent PhD students, is intending to hire 1 assistant professor and 2 instructors, and has recently (2005) participated in a research Master’s. Another factor that contributes substantially to the long-term viability of the programme is its social climate: it is collaborative, pleasant and supportive, yet rigorous and ambitious.

---

16 Academic staff in 2005: 5 tenured staff (3 professors, 2 associate professors), 1 non-tenured staff (postdoc), 13 PhD students, and 2 research assistants.
Programme 5: Social and Personality Development
Programme directors: Prof. dr. W. Koops (2000-2003), Prof. dr. M. van Aken (2003-present)
Academic staff in 2004: 7.40
Assessments: Quality: Excellent, Productivity: Very good, Relevance: Very good, Viability: Very good

This programme aims to study the normal and deviant development of children and adolescents by focusing on the intra-individual characteristics of the person (personality, temperament and social-cognitive processing styles) and inter-individual characteristics of their environment. Both longitudinal and cross-sectional methods are used for the data collection, involving both clinical and non-clinical populations. The programme evolves along four lines of research: (1) transactions between personality and social relationships; (2) an evolutionary approach to person × environment transactions; (3) person × environment transactions as predictors of behaviour problems; (4) social-cognitive functioning as a mediator in person × environment transactions. The research conducted along all four lines resides at the cutting edge of modern developmental psychology as they all deal with issues and questions of top priority from the point of view of both fundamental and applied research.

The research conducted is of the highest quality. The questions asked are incisive, the manipulations effected to answer them are ingenious, and the results produced very solid. This is reflected in the quality of the publication outlets, some of the top journals of developmental psychology, such as Child Development and Developmental Review, social psychology and personality psychology, such as Journal of Personality and Social Psychology and Journal of Personality. This work is well known and recognized by the community of social and personality developmental psychologists. It is clear that the research delivered by this programme is internationally acclaimed.

The relevance of the work is very high. This is due to the fact that all of the lines of research deal with issues that are of direct relevance to problems of personal adaptation or interpersonal relations. It is a credit to the group that they systematically produce publications addressed to professionals who may profit from this research. Moreover, it is noted that the group systematically tries to develop links with other research groups in the department whose work is related to the four lines of research.

The prospects of the programme are very good. This is due to the fact that it focuses on issues that are of very high priority in developmental, social and personality psychology, the work produced so far is very well known and respected, and the members of the group, especially the programme leaders, are very well connected internationally with very distinguished scholars. Moreover, the work produced is of importance to both fundamental and applied science. If the programme continues to develop along these lines, it may establish itself as one of the most important European programmes in the field of social and personality development.
Programme 6: Neuropsychology, Psychopathology and Cognition
Programme director: Prof. dr. E.H.F. de Haan

Academic staff in 2004 (research fte):
14.6

Assessments:
Quality: Very good
Productivity: Excellent
Relevance: Excellent
Viability: Excellent

This is a healthy and very well managed programme, whose success and visibility are reflected in growth from a total research input of 8.5 fte in 1998 to 14.6 fte in 2004. In large part, this growth reflects increases in grant income over the reporting period (from 20% total research income in 1998 to 50% in 2004), and correspondingly to a large increase in non-tenured staff. At 2.0, the number of tenured staff is still small in relation to the total programme size and success. Of 24 PhD students associated with the programme over the reporting period, 17 have already completed their degree, making this a highly productive programme in terms of graduate education.

The core theme is cognition, in particular cognitive disorders after brain damage. An important extension in the current period has been the use of transcranial magnetic stimulation (TMS) to examine temporary impairment of function in targeted regions of the normal brain. Within the general realm of cognition, the programme is broad, with interests including spatial cognition, emotion, visual and somato-sensory perception, and memory. This diversity appears healthy, reflecting one traditional research style of cognitive neuropsychology driven in part by everyday patient contact.

The programme director has a firmly established international reputation in cognitive neuropsychology. This reputation is reflected in an eminent list of collaborators worldwide, extensive committee memberships, and important publications in the leading journals of the field. The group is also becoming established as one of the more serious international players in TMS. Effective use of this promising method requires serious consideration of its limitations and pitfalls, and in this respect the present group’s work is careful and realistic.

The group’s success in increasing grant income is largely focused on basic research awards from NWO. Diversification might be required if this focused strategy leads to future shortfalls. Despite this strong emphasis on basic research, an important aspect of the group’s vigour comes from its close link to clinical practice. The group has direct responsibility for clinical neuropsychology at UMC Utrecht. This clinical work is important to provide continued ready access to brain-damaged patients; the group is also making significant moves towards international coordination of patient resources/databases.

Like other UU programmes, this one is influenced by heavy teaching requirements given the total number of tenured staff. This said, they appear successful in preserving a satisfactory proportion of research time. If this can continue, the group should be strongly placed to maintain their established position on the international scene of cognitive neuropsychology.
Programme 7: Cognition & Perceptual Systems
Programme director: Prof. dr. F.A.J. Verstraten
Academic staff in 2004 (research fte): 7.18
Assessments:
Quality: Very good
Productivity: Very good
Relevance: Very good
Viability: Excellent

This is a medium-sized research programme, but it should be realised that it is also in the general field of experimental psychology. The programme originated within the Biology Department, and was moved to Psychology around the year 2000, when it was combined with an existing programme that has been largely discontinued since. Therefore, it would not be very useful to consider the numbers across the entire review period as fully representative or as a sound basis for extrapolation into the future. However, the rationale of research assessment demands that the activities of the no longer existent programme also be evaluated.

The current programme is evaluated as highly promising. The programme leader has an international reputation, and was involved in all key publications. The latter does also reflect a weakness, since the future of the group seems to depend upon the presence of the programme leader to a large extent. The group did not receive a partial beta status, which is somewhat surprising, given the nature of the work. Nevertheless, the facilities of the group seem to be adequate.

Over the assessment period a total of 30.6 fte was spent on research, of which 24.3 in the active programme. Of these, 6 PhD students took up 10.1 fte. There seems to be some stagnation in the growth of the number of tenured staff members. Although psychology as a whole doubled in the assessment period, this is not reflected in the numbers of this group. In 2004 the distribution within the groups was: 1.7 fte tenured staff, 1.5 non-tenured staff, 4.0 PhD students. This seems an optimal division.

There were no PhD theses completed in the assessment period. Although this is explained by the relatively late introduction of this group within the Psychology Department, it must be noted that neither programme produced any theses. The yearly number of academic publications was steady at around an average of 10. The lack of growth is only partially explained by the constant level of tenured staff, since the number of non-tenured staff has increased considerably. The expectation is, however, that the PhD students will contribute in the very near future. As noted above, a considerable proportion of the published work involved the programme leader, which makes the group somewhat vulnerable. This is why productivity was not awarded the maximum score.

The funding of this programme was initially mainly dependent upon the university’s contribution. Only recently has a clear trend of growing contributions from research funds become visible. The contribution from contracts is small, which explains why this group produced no professional publications. This seems to be an unnecessary weakness of the programme and is the reason why relevance did not receive the maximum score.
The prospects of this programme look excellent, with many PhD theses about to be completed. But it should be realised that the success of a group of this moderate size depends critically on the presence of one or two of its members. Especially the absence of growth in the tenured research staff should be a concern for the department as a whole.
Programme 8:  Attention, Anxiety & Impulsivity
Programme directors:  Prof. dr. J.L. Kenemans, Prof. dr. M.N. Verbaten
Academic staff in 2004 (research fte):  6.32
Assessments:
Quality:  Excellent
Productivity:  Very good
Relevance:  Very good
Viability:  Very good

This programme functions in cooperation between the Departments of Psychology and Psychopharmacology. Only the sub-section employed by the Psychology Department is assessed here, which may lead to an underestimation of the programme size, impact, and viability. Therefore, the wider context of this programme’s embedding was weighed in the panel’s judgement. The combination of expertise in pharmacology and psychology is rare, and has resulted in a very high standard of quality and international visibility. Both the current programme leader and its predecessor are of international stature, which is also reflected in the number and quality of their publications. Due to the partial placement within pharmacology, the group disposes of highly adequate laboratory facilities.

Over the assessment period a total of 36 fte was spent on research. It should be noted however that only numbers for the years 1999-2004 were provided. Of this total, 9 PhD students used 23.8 fte. Since 2000 there has been very little growth. In 2004 the distribution over the various groups was: 1.45 fte tenured staff, 0.0 non-tenured staff, 4.9 PhD students. The number of PhD students seems to be a bit large for the relatively small number of staff. This should be weighted, however, within the context of the entire group, including psychopharmacology. Since the number of completed PhD theses (13) is very high, there should be confidence in this group’s ability to support the large number of PhD projects.

The annual number of academic publications has been consistent in the review period, with a heavy emphasis on articles in English-language, refereed journals, and almost no other written products. This may in the end appear to be a weakness, as the field of psychopharmacology suits itself very well to the writing of professional publications. Since the programme is supported by a considerable number of research contracts, it should not be difficult to produce a substantial number of publications not directly aimed at the academic forum. The score for productivity reflects this weakness.

The funding of this programme is well distributed over the university and other funding agencies. The prospects of this programme look good, although the Psychology Department might well consider a modest growth of the tenured staff, in order not to make the success of the group dependent upon a rather limited number of researchers.
Programme 9: Methodology and Statistics for the Behavioural and Social Sciences

Programme director: Prof. dr. P.G.M. van der Heijden

Academic staff in 2004 (research fte): 10.33
Assessments:
- Quality: Excellent
- Productivity: Very good
- Relevance: Very good
- Viability: Excellent

Since its start in 1999, the programme has undergone a rapid growth from 1.55 fte to 3.24 fte tenured staff in 2004, with roughly the same growth in total staff from 4.42 fte to 10.33 fte. In 2004 the group consisted of three relatively young full professors with a good reputation in the field, four assistant professors, four non-tenured postdocs and nine PhD students, with an allowance to fill five openings for tenured positions in the next two years.

With respect to themes covered, the programme goes beyond the scope of its specific discipline (psychometrics) by including sociometrics as well. This is reflected as well in the journals in which members publish and the places where they give courses. The themes covered are Bayesian statistics, psychometric methods (such as item response theory), modern regression (such as structural equation modelling, multilevel analysis and logistic regression), governmental statistics (such as population size estimation, randomised response and official statistics), and survey methodology (such as non-response, missing data and sampling theory).

The quality of the programme is rated as excellent. First of all, this is due to the fact that about half of their articles are published in refereed, English-language, top rank journals. Second, the publication strategy results in more than 80% of their academic publications appearing in English. Third, members of the group are well-known in the field, resulting in invited addresses, associate and guest editorships on journals as well as positions in national and international societies and committees. Four, high visibility and reputation were gained from giving courses within and outside the Netherlands. Finally, 60% average external funding underpins the quality of the programme.

A comparatively high percentage of PhD students completed their degrees, and professional publications and a fair amount of academic publications lead productivity to be rated as very good.

Relevance is also considered very good. Some of the themes promoted (Bayesian statistics, governmental statistics and survey methodology) are unique to this group, which is strong in the advancement and dissemination of all of its themes by giving courses. Finally, the programme plays a prominent role in IOPS (Interuniversity Graduate School of Psychometrics and Sociometrics) and is the only IOPS branch that has been accredited a research Master in methodology and statistics, which will start in 2006.

To sum up, this excellently managed programme has undergone a very positive development. It should not come as a surprise therefore that its prospects are rated as excellent.
Appendix 1: Discipline protocol psychology

1. Introduction

This research assessment covers psychological research at universities in the Netherlands. Six universities will participate in this assessment: University of Groningen (RUG), University of Utrecht (UU), University of Amsterdam (UvA), Vrije Universiteit Amsterdam (VU), University of Tilburg (UvT), University of Maastricht (UM).

The main aims of the assessment are, in concordance with the standard Evaluation Protocol 2003-2009 for Public Research Organisations:

- **Improvement** of the quality of research through an assessment carried out according to international standards of quality and relevance;
- **Improvement** of research management and leadership;
- **Accountability** to higher levels of the research organisations and funding agencies, government, and society at large.

Furthermore, the assessment will be placed in the context of the activities of the faculty or the institute in which it is embedded, and it also will give an appraisal of the general features of the scientific area covered in this assessment.

2. Delineation and required expertise of committee members

This research assessment covers the whole field of psychology. The following distinction into sub-disciplines will be made:

1. psychonomics (i.e. “functieleer”/experimental)/cognitive psychology/cognitive neurosciences
2. clinical psychology/clinical neuropsychology/medical psychology
3. developmental psychology
4. social psychology/cultural psychology
5. quantitative methods
6. labour and organisation psychology/economic psychology
7. theory and history of psychology

Members of the review committee should have:

- Excellent expertise in and overview of the main fields of psychology, as described above
- Expertise in one of the seven sub-disciplines described above

The review committee consisting of six members, the chair included, can cover the fields mentioned above in a balanced way and on an excellent level of expertise.

3. Units of assessment; positioning of programmes

The local research programme is the level on which the assessment takes place. The programme should be concisely described, should be coherent and should ideally be the result of a group of people working together on a daily basis.
A programme can be the work of a department within a faculty or institute or a coherent part thereof. A programme can also be defined on the basis of the group's mission in the context of the research policy of the faculty or research institute or school.

A guideline for the formulation of a mission statement can be found in the following description:

a) descriptive elements
   • the scope of the research: a factual description of the area covered;
   • the nature of the work in terms of fundamental, strategic or applied research;

b) goals and objectives
   • the objectives and ambition of the group, the institute or the faculty: the aims, the focus on specific targets; a statement of what is envisaged as the achievements after completion of projects or sub-programmes; the type of products envisaged (scientific or professional articles, patents, (industrial) designs, advisory reports, etc.);
   • the audience (or clients) of the research: the academic community, professional audiences, society, undergraduate or graduate students, etc..

Ideally, a mission statement should be less than 300 words.

4. Specific aims and elements of this assessment

More specific questions for this assessment will be:

• What is the overall quality of the research? This judgement reflects the programme's scientific interest, the significance of its contributions to psychology and the originality of its approach as reflected in theoretical contributions and innovative methods. This question regards the relevance of the research from a scientific point of view and reflects also the centrality of the research area relative to psychology as a whole and the degree of advancing psychological expertise.

• What is the productivity of the programme? In the assessment of productivity some form of bibliometrical analysis will be performed, including the following elements: (i) total number of publications, (ii) number of articles in journals mentioned in the SSCI or SCI; (iii) PhD theses. A distinction will be made between foreign-language publications and Dutch-language publications. The exact form of the analysis will be determined after discussion with the chair of the committee.

• What is the relevance of the research for societal issues?

• What is the vitality and feasibility (flexibility, management and leadership) of the research? This regards the rating of the future perspective of the programme and the productive unit. The judgement reflects the quality of planned research and new initiatives. Future personnel changes, the stability of the productivity, and stated plans and prospects will be taken into account.

• What is the fit between the goals and objectives of the programme, as formulated in the mission statement, and the actual state of affairs?

5. Information for the committee

The assessment will be performed on the basis of a self-evaluation report provided by the research programme directors and the faculty/research institute or school. Furthermore, the
committee will have meetings with the responsible boards for research management and policy within the university and with programme directors and, if desired by the committee, other participants in the research programmes [e.g. PhD students (AIOs)]. Furthermore, site-visits to the research groups are being envisaged. The assessment will cover the research carried out in the period 1998-2004. The elements of the self-evaluation report are mentioned in appendix 3 of the Standard Evaluation Protocol 2003-2009.

6. Programme members

In the self-evaluation report, the list of programme members of each programme shall include the following ranks:

- **full professors** ('hoogleraar')
- senior lecturers/associate professors ('universitair hoofddocent'/ 'senior docent onderzoeker'), henceforth called **associate professors**
- lecturers/assistant professors ('universitair docent'/ 'junior docent-onderzoeker'), henceforth called **assistant professors**
- Other **tenured staff** (engineers and technicians).
- fellows (e.g. KNAW fellows, EU fellows), postdocs and others with a PhD degree involved in research, henceforth called **non-tenured staff**
- **PhD students** ('promovendi')

The list will include all members who were involved in the programme during the assessment period, and will specify the period of time during which they were involved. Only the period during which the programme members were affiliated (i.e. appointed or paid for research at the institution, either through direct or indirect governmental funding ('1e en 2e geldstroom') or through industrial or European Union funding ('3e geldstroom') shall be taken into account.

7. Research input of academic staff

In the tables concerning research input, the new protocol of 2003 will be followed. In this assessment the research input of all personnel will be quantified on the basis of the new protocol of 2003. The research input will be calculated in proportion to the size of the appointment of the researcher involved. In the tables in Appendix 3 that refer to the years of the evaluation, the years that should be covered are:

| 1998 | 1999 | 2000 | 2001 | 2002 | 2003 | 2004 |

8. Output categorisation

The different kinds of publication output are listed below (see Standard Evaluation Protocol, pp. 31-32).

1. **Academic publications**: scientific papers aimed at an audience of scientists and researchers.
   a. (left blank, see SEP p. 31)
   b. **Refereed journals**: papers in academic journals
   c. **Book chapters**, if they fall within the definition of academic publications.
      Editorship of such books is also reported here.
A distinction should be made here between publications in English and publications in other languages.

2. Monographs: books written for a learned audience, reporting results of scientific research.

3. PhD theses that are predominantly (> 50%) the result of research carried out within the institute/programme. PhD theses that are supervised by researchers from the institute, but for which the research was mainly carried out elsewhere may be listed separately within the framework of Table 7.

4. Professional publications and products: scientific papers aimed at a broader professional audience (e.g. inaugural addresses, book reviews, columns, contributions to professional organisations, yearbooks), chapters, books and reports (including '3e geldstroom') aiming at the dissemination of scientific knowledge, software, CD-ROMs, etc.

A list is added of (a) patents granted (titles) and (b) other commendable results, awards and activities that contribute to the mission of the institute. The elements in this additional list are not counted; they may be repeated in the programme documentation (see Table 7) if they are attributed to a single programme. As for invited addresses, they should only be mentioned if the inviting organisation has paid for the costs of travel and residence.

Besides the above-mentioned research output, five key publications from the period 1998-2004 will be included for each programme.

9. Responsibilities

Discipline board (Kamer Psychologie):

- preparation of the discipline protocol
- proposals for committee chairman and members

University/faculty/research institute/school:

- approval of discipline protocol
- agreement with committee chairperson and members
- preparation of self-evaluation reports

QANU

- determination of the terms of reference for the committee
- appointment of the committee secretariat
- publication of the final report

10. Finances

According to QANU rules the standard costs of the assessment will be charged to the universities. An offer has been made for the participating groups. The university boards (‘Colleges van Bestuur’) have to agree with this offer. They ultimately give the order for the coordination of the research assessment to QANU.
Appendix 2: Background of committee members


John Duncan: Professor at the Medical Research Council, Cognition and Brain Sciences Unit, Cambridge, UK. Research interests: (1) Selective attention from behavioural to cellular levels, (2) Action planning, frontal lobe function and intelligence, (3) Integration of cognitive and brain function. [http://www.mrc-cbu.cam.ac.uk/Common/People/people-pages/John_Duncan.shtml]

Michael Eysenck: Professor of Cognitive Psychology, Royal Holloway, University of London, UK. Research interests: (1) Cognitive factors in anxiety, including clinical anxiety and implications for therapy, (2) Memory functioning and attention mechanisms, personality and mood, (3) Modular approaches to trait anxiety. [http://www.pc.rhbnc.ac.uk/staff/meysenck.htm]

Andreas Demetriou: Professor of Developmental Psychology at the Department of Psychology, University of Cyprus. Research interests: (1) Cognitive development and the ensuing educational implications, (2) Development of mental processing, integrating several psychological approaches in order to (3) Create a more comprehensive theoretical system. [http://www.ucy.ac.cy/epa/staffE/demetriouE/demetrioue.htm]

Constantine Sedikides: Professor in Social and Personality Psychology, Director of the Centre for Research on Self and Identity, University of Southampton, UK. Research interests: (1) Intrapersonal and interpersonal constraints of self-superiority beliefs (self-enhancement), (2) Relative benefits and performance consequences of self-enhancing versus self-improving feedback, (3) Narcissistic self-esteem, (4) Genetic bases of self-esteem, (5) Implicit and explicit strategies deployed to protect the self against threatening feedback, (6) The importance of close relationships for the self, and (7) Functions of nostalgia. [http://www.psychology.soton.ac.uk/People/show_profile.php?userno=137]

Michael West: Head of Research and Professor of Organisational Psychology, Aston Business School, UK. Current research interests: (1) Team effectiveness and well-being, (2) Innovation and creativity at work, (3) Organizational effectiveness in manufacturing, and (4) in the National Health Service, (5) Employee involvement in the National Health Service, (6) HRM and organizational performance. [http://www.abs.aston.ac.uk/newweb/staff/detail.asp?sfldStaffID=A0000229]

### Appendix 3a: Overview of scores per programme

Overall programme scores Quality (Q), Productivity (P), Relevance (R) and Viability (V)*

5 = Excellent, 4 = Very good, 3 = Good, 2 = Satisfactory, 1 = Unsatisfactory

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>University</th>
<th>Q</th>
<th>P</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>V</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RUG1</td>
<td>1. Information Processing &amp; Task Performance</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RUG2</td>
<td>2. Interpersonal Behaviour</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RUG3</td>
<td>3. Experimental Psychopathology &amp; Psychotherapy</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RUG4</td>
<td>4. Theory and History of Psychology</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RUG5</td>
<td>5. Developmental Processes</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RUG6</td>
<td>6. Psychometrics and Statistics</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VU1</td>
<td>1. Biological Psychology</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VU2</td>
<td>2. Clinical Neuropsychology</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VU3</td>
<td>3. Clinical Psychology</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VU4</td>
<td>4. Cognitive Psychology</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VU5</td>
<td>5. Developmental Psychology</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VU6</td>
<td>6. Social Psychology</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VU7</td>
<td>7. Work &amp; Organisational Psychology</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UvA1</td>
<td>1. Clinical Psychology</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UvA2</td>
<td>2. Developmental Psychology</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UvA3</td>
<td>3. Methodology</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UvA4</td>
<td>4. Psychonomics</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UvA5</td>
<td>5. Social Psychology</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UvA6</td>
<td>6. Work &amp; Organisational Psychology</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UvT2</td>
<td>1. Medical Psychology</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UvT1</td>
<td>2. Conscious and Unconscious Processing</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UvT3</td>
<td>3. Social Decision-Making</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UvT4</td>
<td>4. Behaviour in Cultural Context</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UM1a</td>
<td>1 a. Biological Psychology</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UM1b</td>
<td>1 b. Cognitive Neuroscience</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UM1c</td>
<td>1 c. Developmental Biopsychology</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UM1d</td>
<td>1 d. Theory and History (not a separate programme)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UM2a</td>
<td>2 a. Applied Psychology</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UM2b</td>
<td>2 b. Eating Disorders &amp; Addiction</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UM2c</td>
<td>2 c. Psychology &amp; Law</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UU1</td>
<td>1. Work and Mental Health</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UU2</td>
<td>2. Stress and Self-Regulation</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UU3</td>
<td>3. Trauma and Grief</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UU4</td>
<td>4. Social-cognitive and Interpersonal Determinants of Behaviour</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UU5</td>
<td>5. Social and Personality Development</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UU6</td>
<td>6. Neuropsychology, Psychopathology and Cognition</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UU7</td>
<td>7. Cognition and Perceptual Systems</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UU8</td>
<td>8. Attention, Anxiety, and Impulsivity</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UU9</td>
<td>9. Methodology and Statistics for the Behavioural and Social Sciences</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: The overall scores given by the committee consider all assessed aspects together (see Appendices 4 and 5); the here used label ‘Viability’ is shorthand for the aspect of ‘Vitality and feasibility’ from the Standard Evaluation Protocol (SEP).
Appendix 3b: Overview of quantitative data per programme 1998-2004*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Programme</th>
<th>Number of years</th>
<th>Total research staff</th>
<th>Total tenured staff</th>
<th>Academic publications and monographs</th>
<th>PhD theses</th>
<th>Professional publications</th>
<th>Academic publications and monographs per total staff fte</th>
<th>PhD theses per tenured staff fte</th>
<th>Professional publications per total staff fte</th>
<th>Percentage direct funding (average) fte</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RUG1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>107.8</td>
<td>44.1</td>
<td>393</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>3.65</td>
<td>0.68</td>
<td>1.10</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>131.8</td>
<td>47.0</td>
<td>448</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>3.40</td>
<td>0.65</td>
<td>1.24</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>34.2</td>
<td>17.4</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>4.80</td>
<td>0.29</td>
<td>1.99</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>20.8</td>
<td>8.9</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>3.94</td>
<td>0.67</td>
<td>3.27</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>31.0</td>
<td>13.4</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>3.10</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>3.10</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>32.7</td>
<td>16.5</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>4.22</td>
<td>0.55</td>
<td>0.89</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VU</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>82.6</td>
<td>13.1</td>
<td>255</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3.09</td>
<td>0.99</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>39.6</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4.22</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>36.8</td>
<td>31.9</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>4.92</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>2.53</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>34.0</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3.18</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>34.9</td>
<td>19.8</td>
<td>232</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>6.65</td>
<td>0.46</td>
<td>4.21</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>115.6</td>
<td>22.0</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>1.57</td>
<td>0.86</td>
<td>0.42</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>49.5</td>
<td>17.8</td>
<td>205</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>4.14</td>
<td>0.79</td>
<td>0.97</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UvA</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>66.5</td>
<td>27.1</td>
<td>363</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>234</td>
<td>5.44</td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td>3.52</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>68.0</td>
<td>18.3</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>2.43</td>
<td>0.43</td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>45.5</td>
<td>18.2</td>
<td>174</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>3.83</td>
<td>0.88</td>
<td>1.21</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>118.6</td>
<td>34.3</td>
<td>358</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>3.02</td>
<td>0.67</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>73.2</td>
<td>22.8</td>
<td>302</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>4.13</td>
<td>0.53</td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>61.3</td>
<td>22.0</td>
<td>266</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>4.34</td>
<td>0.77</td>
<td>1.65</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UvT</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>36.9</td>
<td>11.2</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>3.58</td>
<td>0.80</td>
<td>0.62</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>33.9</td>
<td>12.1</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>2.89</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>2.09</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>13.7</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.94</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>21.1</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5.69</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>0.57</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UM</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>97.7</td>
<td>42.6</td>
<td>322</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>3.30</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>0.82</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>98.5</td>
<td>34.8</td>
<td>459</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>4.66</td>
<td>0.37</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UU</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>43.0</td>
<td>14.5</td>
<td>232</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>5.40</td>
<td>0.62</td>
<td>0.79</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>63.0</td>
<td>19.7</td>
<td>260</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>4.13</td>
<td>0.76</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>39.0</td>
<td>14.0</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>5.13</td>
<td>1.14</td>
<td>2.21</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>48.9</td>
<td>13.1</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>3.44</td>
<td>0.61</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>31.1</td>
<td>14.9</td>
<td>178</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>5.72</td>
<td>0.54</td>
<td>0.84</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>80.8</td>
<td>10.6</td>
<td>272</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3.37</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>24.4</td>
<td>11.4</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3.07</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>36.0</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2.14</td>
<td>1.43</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>40.3</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>2.93</td>
<td>1.19</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Reported data for staff research time, excluding teaching for staff members (generally 40% per fte), PhD students (generally 30%) and for postdocs (generally 20%). Some programmes started later than 1998, and thus include fewer years.
Appendix 4: Preliminary Assessment Form, according to SEP 2003-2009

Preliminary Assessment Programme
(only for internal use by the committee)

Programme title (short): ............................................................

5 = Excellent, 4 = Very good, 3 = Good, 2 = Satisfactory, 1 = Unsatisfactory
(See descriptions below, according to page 25 of the Standard Evaluation Protocol SEP 2003-2009)

Research Programme

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>How do you evaluate the programme with respect to:</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Leadership</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Mission and goals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Strategy and policy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Adequacy of the resources</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Funding policies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Facilities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Academic reputation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Societal relevance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Balance of strengths and weaknesses</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Quality

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>How do you evaluate the quality with respect to:</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. originality of the approach and ideas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. significance of the contribution to the field</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. coherence of the programme</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. publication strategy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. prominence of the programme director</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. prominence of the other members of the research group</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. quality of scientific publications</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(scientific impact)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. quality of other results</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall assessment of quality</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Productivity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Considering the number of staff, how do you evaluate the productivity with respect to:</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. number of PhD theses</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. number of scientific publications</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. number of professional publications</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. other results (if applicable)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. distribution of published output within the group</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall assessment of productivity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Programme no.: Reviewer ................
Relevance

Considering the stated mission of this programme, how do you evaluate the relevance of the research with respect to

| 1. | the advancement of knowledge | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| 2. | the dissemination of knowledge | |
| 3. | the implementation of knowledge | |

Overall assessment of relevance

Viability (Vitality and feasibility)*

Considering the present status and future developments (if known) of staff and facilities, how do you evaluate the long-term viability of the programme

| 1. | in view of the past scientific performance | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| 2. | in view of future plans and ideas | |
| 3. | in view of staff age and mobility | |

Overall assessment of viability

Extended description of the five point scale

Excellent score 5
Work that is at the forefront internationally, and which most likely will have an important and substantial impact in the field. Institute is considered an international leader.

Very Good score 4
Work that is internationally competitive and is expected to make a significant contribution; nationally speaking at the forefront in the field. Institute is considered an international player, national leader.

Good score 3
Work that is competitive at the national level and will probably make a valuable contribution in the international field. Institute is considered internationally visible and a national player.

Satisfactory score 2
Work that is solid but not exciting, will add to our understanding and is in principle worthy of support. It is considered of less priority than work in the above categories. Institute is nationally visible.

Unsatisfactory score 1
Work that is neither solid nor exciting, flawed in its scientific and or technical approach, repetitions of other work, etc. Work not worth pursuing.

* Note: During the review the label 'Prospects' has been used, with hindsight it seems however that 'Viability' is a better shorthand word for 'Vitality and feasibility'.
# Appendix 5: Preliminary Institute Assessment Form

## Preliminary Assessment of Institute

(Only for internal use by the committee)

Institute (full name): ............................................................

5 = Excellent, 4 = Very good, 3 = Good, 2 = Satisfactory, 1 = Unsatisfactory

(See page 25 of the Standard Evaluation Protocol)

### Institute

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>How do you evaluate the institute with respect to:</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Leadership</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Mission and goals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Strategy and policy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Adequacy of the resources</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Funding policies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Facilities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Academic reputation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Societal relevance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Balance of strengths and weaknesses</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Remarks and questions:

---