



UNIVERSITY OF AMSTERDAM

Amsterdam Institute for Social Science Research (AISSR)

Political Science
Self-Assessment Report
2013-2019



AMSTERDAM INSTITUTE FOR
SOCIAL SCIENCE RESEARCH

Visiting address

Amsterdam Roeterseilandcampus
Building B-REC B 8.01
Nieuwe Achtergracht 166
1018 WV Amsterdam

Postal address

AISSR/Universiteit van Amsterdam
Postbus 15718
1001 NE Amsterdam

Tel: +31(0)20-525 2262
Email: aissr@uva.nl

Design

Stroomberg

Dtp

Lauran Blommers

October 2020

Political Science
Self-Assessment Report
2013-2019

Contents

- 1 Objectives, research programme and strategies 7
- 2 Organisation, composition and financing 12
- 3 Output for science and society 15
- 4 Self-evaluation of performance 25
- 5 PhD programme 27
- 6 Research integrity 30
- 7 Diversity 30
- 8 Trends and SWOT-analysis 31

Self-Assessment Report

Political Science, UvA

1 Objectives, research programme and strategies

1.a Key objectives

The department seeks to foster and maintain:

- **Excellence:** making key contributions to contemporary academic debates and theoretical developments in political science and other relevant fields through theoretically and methodologically innovative and empirically grounded research, as one of the leading political science departments in Europe
- **Pluralism:** fostering methodological, thematic and epistemological pluralism, leading to cross-fertilization between theoretical and research traditions within and beyond political science
- **Societal engagement:** disseminating research findings that respond to the most pressing and daunting challenges of contemporary political life, and fulfilling what we consider to be our dual obligation to engage with society at large and with the specific stakeholders for whom our research is of particular importance, locally, nationally and internationally.

1.b Research programme

Traditional strengths of the department

The departmental research programme clusters its research activity into three programme groups. These have grown out of a bottom-up process, and intentionally cut across traditional sub-fields of political science, but together encompass the discipline as a whole.

The programme group *Challenges to Democratic Representation* addresses the conditions under which basic safeguards to democracy such as accountability, representation and legitimacy flourish or come under threat. The empirical research examines the interactions between individual and collective political actors, in particular political parties, civil society, mass media and citizens, with an increasing focus on populism. Its theoretical research takes a policy-relevant approach to normative and constitutive theory, focusing on the history

of modern political theory, democratic theory, gender theory, political economy and global ethics.

The *Political Economy and Transnational Governance (PETGOV)* programme group explores the ongoing transformation of political and economic governance within and beyond nation-states. It does so across a range of policy fields, from environmental protection and financial regulation to violent conflict. PETGOV's exploration of transnational governance focuses on varying forms of contestation and regulation, including multi-level architectures for coordinated learning from local experimentation.

The programme group *Transnational Configurations, Conflict and Governance (TCCG)* analyses politics as transnational processes in which a multitude of actors are involved. The group critically examines the identities, categories and boundaries at work in these processes, beyond state-based concepts and explanations. A key feature of the TCCG group is its interdisciplinarity. The group's interest in transnational transformations has given rise to research on three main themes: (1) studies of reflexivity and learning in policy development; (2) a conceptually driven interest in new security challenges, migration and border control; and (3) the study of authoritarian rule, democratic practices and contestation, with a focus on civil society and political processes beyond the state, both subnational and transnational.

**Cross-cutting
themes and
methodological
innovation**

Beyond the programme groups, staff collaborate on cross-cutting themes including migration, Europe, transnational governance, democracy and its alternatives, and conflict. Just one example of the diversity of research that emerges from these cross-cutting themes is the study of gender, with L. Mügge investigating political representation of women and ethnic minorities in Europe; Roggeband studying the relation between gender equality policies and the quality of democracy in Latin America and Eastern Europe; Van Hooren focusing on (lack of) trade union representation in feminized professions; Schliesser interpreting feminist thinkers in 18th century political theory; and Afsahi doing research on gender differences in willingness and capacity for deliberation. In 2019, the department hosted the European Conference on Politics and Gender (ECPG) with 900 participants.

Another shared feature across the three programme groups is the commitment to methodological innovation, reflected in work ranging from computational social science to handbooks on politically sensitive fieldwork. Heemskerk's project CORPNET delivers an important advance in the study of big data and network analysis, which the project uses - in collaboration with computer scientists - to better understand the political power of transnational corporations. Schumacher and Rooduijn's *Hot Politics Lab* uses experiments, physiological measurement and automated text analysis to advance the study of individual and elite political behaviour. It provides a new approach to the role of emotions in politics, a subject also developed in qualitative work by Matthies-Boon (on Egypt), Sanchez Salgado (on the EU), Verhoeven (on municipal politics in the Netherlands), and in theoretical work by Schliesser. Departmental staff are leading in a recent trend of methodological reflection on field research in challenging circumstances, including authoritarian contexts (Glasius), secrecy in security research (De Goede, Pallister-Wilkins) and violent conflict contexts (Krause). Finally, important methodological work is done on spatial disaggregation through new quantitative as well as qualitative methods (Harbers, Daxecker, Steele).

1.c Strategies 2013-2019

To pursue our objectives, the department has developed a number of strategies in four areas: institutional, publication, funding, and societal impact strategies.

Institutional strategies

Pursuing breadth and pluralism from the bottom up

The department strives to be inclusive of all major theoretical, substantive and methodological colours in political science. This comes about through inductive aggregation and consultative processes within and between programme groups rather than through a particular top-down design.

- We foster pluralism by acknowledging the programme groups' different substantive, methodological and epistemological orientations. Our investment in pluralism offers the department a variety of pathways to innovate research agendas.
- We encourage (and modestly fund) fruitful intellectual exchange in cross-group thematic settings wherever it is appropriate and relevant to do so, i.e. on among other things Europe, migration, gender, and conflict.
- We do not set priorities in terms of research niches or identify individual 'talent' in a top-down manner.

Programme group autonomy and collective excellence

We give programme groups considerable autonomy to define and implement their research focus and strategies, including prioritising particular kinds of publication strategies and to some extent, personnel decisions.

- In order to avoid purely individualistic or one-size-fits all research strategies, we strive to fulfil all three components of our research mission (excellence, pluralism and societal relevance) not at the level of individual researchers but at the level of the programme groups and the department at large.

Publication strategies

Promoting individual quality in publications

- Quality is understood first of all in terms of scholarly value – in innovation, importance of findings, impact on the field, interdisciplinarity, etc. based on a reading of the work. This is necessarily a qualitative and intersubjective judgment.
- Quality is also understood in bibliometric terms: encouraging work placement in the most highly-ranked, widely-read and prestigious publication venues (i.e. journals and academic publishing houses).
- The department prioritizes quality over quantity. This means we encourage and help researchers to target the highest-quality venues possible for their first submission, but then to keep submission and revision going until invested research actually gets published and disseminated.

Improving collective quality standards (bibliometric):

- Aiming for an average of 2 ISI-ranked (Web of Science listed) articles per research fte (not per person) per year for permanent staff.
- Monitoring and maintaining the number of our articles in the top-25 percent of journals (ranked by 5-year impact factor) in any WoS category list. Since we value interdisciplinarity, we do not focus exclusively on the Political Science List.
- Encouraging anonymously peer reviewed monographs with international publishers. Some large, slowly gestating projects are best published as monographs, and as such, typically have a much longer citation shelf life than the average article.

Maintaining an individual quantitative and qualitative minimum standard:

- We expect permanent research staff to publish one internationally-refereed article or its equivalent per year, judged on the basis of several-year averages. Internationally-refereed means that a publication is either formally ranked and given an impact factor in the SSCI (or ISI) list relevant to the Web of Science (WoS), or otherwise subject to anonymous peer review.
- A book chapter can be an equivalent to an article if subject to anonymous peer review.
- A monograph can be considered as equivalent to two to four articles, depending on length and level of ambition, only if anonymously peer reviewed.
- Failure to maintain this minimum over a number of years results in a recalibration of a staff member's tasks towards a more teaching-oriented trajectory and/or other responsibilities.

Maximising impact in terms of citations

- We recognise that citation scores are heavily dependent on sub-disciplinary and thematic orientation as well as cultures of sole- or co-authoring. Therefore, we do not set specific targets for citation scores at the individual or collective level.
- We encourage staff to publish in visible outlets generally, but also for the particular debates they contribute to, and promote their work beyond publication, i.e. through blogposts or opinion pieces.
- We track citations on Google Scholar, Scopus, and Web of Science lists, since each list has its own advantages.

Funding strategies

Promote submission of proposals to the most prestigious and profitable funding bodies

- In our hiring policies, we consider not only a candidate's teaching and research records at that time, but also the quality of their plans for grant applications.
- We prioritise Netherlands Organization for Scientific Research (NWO) VENI/VIDI/VICI and Open Competition instruments and European Research Council (ERC) Marie Curie and Starter/Consolidator/Advanced grants, for their high gain against relatively low opportunity costs: even rejected proposals yield insights useful for other funding instruments and ongoing research output.
- We recognise that submitting major proposals demands considerable time investment, and that there are trade-offs between regular publications and grant proposals.
- We provide extensive assistance with grant-writing, especially by programme leaders and AISSR support staff: setting aside seed money for proposal writing; providing budgets; editing parts of proposals; arranging individual or group feedback and mock interviews.
- Advice and assistance is also provided to those who try and fail, to cushion disappointment, help smooth continuation of research lines, and to promote looking forward to future submissions that can take advantage of the investment made.

Discourage proposals with high likelihood of wasted investment

- We discourage submission when a person's CV and output appears insufficiently competitive, and would put them at a disadvantage.
- We prioritise participation in - rather than coordinatorship of - demanding network calls, such as some thematic Horizon 2020 lines, which require highly tailored proposals or putting together large consortia that are wasted time and energy if the proposals do not get funded.

**Societal
engagement
strategies**

A collective commitment with tailored operationalisation

- We put a high value on translating our research findings in ways that make them relevant for society, and where appropriate, capable of impacting on the behaviour of societal actors.
- We discuss the form(s) of societal engagement staff members undertake, on an equal footing with research and teaching performance, during annual review meetings.
- We recognise many ways in which societal engagement can be operationalised, and not everyone should be expected to do and be good at everything.
- We have dedicated support staff with expertise in facilitating various forms of engagement, at AISSR and Faculty level.

Engagement of three kinds; at two levels

- As a department, we strive to ensure three basic *types* of societal engagement: (1) policy and stakeholder engagement (primarily through membership of policy counsels and committees, and publication of policy reports); (2) dissemination to a broad audience (primarily through traditional and social media); and (3) societal and stakeholder engagement as research, where doing research and engaging with non-academic audiences go hand in hand.
- We also strive to achieve societal engagement at two *levels*: at the national level in the Netherlands; and at the international level, i.e. in international media and policy fora.

1.d New objectives and strategies for the next 5-10 years

We aim to maintain our track record in EXCELLENCE, PLURALISM and SOCIETAL ENGAGEMENT. We have also formulated some additional objectives for the coming period.

AUGMENTING JOB SATISFACTION: While our staff is intrinsically motivated and deeply committed to their work, work is also at times experienced as very stressful, competitive, and generating boundless obligations. In our next period we aim to better manage and reduce work stress and augment job satisfaction.

INCREASING DIVERSITY: We have an international staff and a good gender balance up to the level of associate professor. However, our permanent staff is very white, and at the level of full professor, predominantly male. In our next period we aim to increase our diversity through building a more diverse pool of PhDs and post-docs and through more diversity-sensitive hiring and promotion policies, to the point that our staff is as diverse as it is excellent.

ADVOCACY FOR SOCIAL SCIENCE: despite ceaseless societal engagement by scholars, the status of and funding for science in general, and the social sciences and humanities in particular, are eroding. In our next period, we want to use our existing expertise to better understand why this is so (specifically in the Netherlands, and specifically for the social sciences), and to make a focused effort to advocate more effectively on our own behalf.

2 Organisation, composition and financing

2.a Organisation

The Political Science Department forms part of the Faculty of Social and Behavioural Sciences. The current head of the department is Marlies Glasius. At the University of Amsterdam (UvA), departments are responsible for human resource management and development of the discipline. The political science research programme is the largest of four disciplinary departments embedded in the Amsterdam Institute for Social Science Research (AISSR, see Appendix H for an organisational chart). The AISSR is led by Brian Burgoon (academic director) and Yomi Van der Veen (manager). The department's three programme groups each have 14-20 permanent staff members. The programme group directors are:

- 1 *Challenges to Democratic Representation*: Wouter Van der Brug and Eric Schliesser
- 2 *Political Economy and Transnational Governance*: Ursula Daxecker, Daniel Mügge¹, Philip Schleiffer
- 3 *Transnational Configurations, Conflict and Governance*: Marieke De Goede² and John Grin

Each of these groups nurtures intellectual exchange through intensive research discussions within its own domain. But no less important to the department as a broad political science community is intellectual exchange across group boundaries and sometimes beyond the discipline, in a number of thematic centres. These include the Amsterdam Centre for European Studies (ACES), funded by the central University and the Faculty; the Amsterdam Centre for Inequality Studies (AMCIS), funded by the Faculty; the Amsterdam Centre for Middle Eastern Studies (ACMES); the Amsterdam Centre for Political Thought (ACPT); the Amsterdam Research Centre for Gender and Sexuality (ARC-GS); the Institute for Migration and Ethnic Studies (IMES); the Seminar on Quantitative Social Science; and the recently revived Amsterdam Centre for Conflict Studies.

2.b Composition

Table 1 (see Appendix A for the underlying data) shows a considerable increase in permanent research staff in the years 2013-2016 and a subsequent consolidation. It has been a long-standing principle at our department that permanent staff with a combined teaching/research mandate are expected to spend 60% of their time on teaching and 40% on research. In the early 2010s structural funding to universities from the Dutch Ministry of Education had declined to such a degree that combining a primary reliance on core funding with occasional grant-raising was no longer sustainable, and would threaten the 40% baseline.

The department reoriented itself towards much more systematic fundraising, not only in applying for NWO VENI grants and societal funds as before, but also VIDI's and especially ERC grants. Our success in this respect is reflected in Table 1. At the level of permanent staff, the increase from ca. 20 to 29 fte actually reflects two interconnected trends. First, holders of permanent grants now spend more than 40% on research, showing an increase in research fte without an

¹ Replaced by Franca van Hooren, sept. 2020

² Replaced by Darshan Vigneswaran, sept. 2020

Table 1 **Research Staff**

Political Science UvA														
Research staff	2013		2014		2015		2016		2017		2018		2019	
	#	FTE	#	FTE	#	FTE	#	FTE	#	FTE	#	FTE	#	FTE
Scientific Staff (1)	51	19,97	53	21,90	52	24,09	58	28,83	60	29,25	58	29,10	57	28,95
Post-docs (2)	4	1,78	9	3,77	17	10,32	17	9,83	17	9,42	19	10,84	17	9,26
PhD Candidates (3)	18	12,51	22	14,12	23	15,51	25	18,11	36	25,51	38	26,60	33	23,94
Total research staff	73	34,26	84	39,78	92	49,92	100	56,77	113	64,18	115	66,54	107	62,16

Note 1 Comparable with WOPI categories HGL, UHD and UD; tenured and non-tenured staff (research time allocated is 40% per FTE)

Note 2 Comparable with WOPI category Onderzoeker (research time allocated is 100% per FTE)

Note 3 For the purpose of this table, we only include Standard PhD (employed) and Contract PhDs (externally or internally funded but not employed) – according to the VSNU definitions – and only if they are allowed to spend at least 0.8 FTE on their research. (research time allocated is 90% per FTE)

increase in absolute members of staff. But second, as substantial teaching buy-outs based on external funding became less exceptional and more of a regular feature of academic life in the department, it was gradually recognised that a structural increase in permanent staff was necessary to be able to realise both our research ambitions and our teaching needs. Because of our sustained success in fundraising, and by operating on a solidarity principle, we have been able to maintain a minimum of 40% research time for all staff with a combined mandate.

Table 1 also shows a five-fold increase followed by consolidation in the number of post-doctoral researchers, and a doubling in the number of PhDs during the years 2013-2019. Both categories came from a low base in 2013 since core funding for such positions had gradually dried up and the tradition and experience with submitting high-quality grant proposals to NWO and especially ERC was still in its infancy. The growth in both categories is due to subsequent acquisition of large personal grants allowing for the hiring of research staff under a principal investigator; the growth in PhDs is also due to acquisition of – very competitive – PhD grants in national NWO competitions.

2.c Financing

The AISSR receives core funding from the Faculty of Social and Behavioural Sciences, based on past performance in research as well as teaching (completed PhDs and diplomas awarded), as well as targeted research funding for designated priority areas, channelled to the Amsterdam Centre for European Studies (ACES) and the Amsterdam Centre for Inequality Studies (AMCIS). The funds are decentralized to the three programme groups in political science. The department and the AISSR pay for overhead costs that are standard for university facilities, such as office space and library facilities.

Approximately two-thirds of the research budget of the political science programme groups now comes from external sources (see Table 2 below, and Appendix B for a full overview of our external fundraising over the period 2009-2019). Table 2b shows that between 2013 and 2019 our researchers have successfully obtained almost €30mln in funding from multiple sources, including more than €24mln through competitive calls for proposals from the Netherlands Organization for Scientific Research (NWO) and the European Research Council (ERC). The department and the AISSR more broadly have extensive experience with stimulating researchers to develop high-quality grant

proposals through writing workshops, internal peer review, and administrative support, within and across the programme groups. The AISSR is the second most successful institution in the social sciences (after the University of Oxford) in terms of the number of ERC grants awarded.

Table 2 Funding of Research Staff

Funding and earning capacity: Political Science														
Funding of FTE	2013		2014		2015		2016		2017		2018		2019	
	FTE	%	FTE	%	FTE	%	FTE	%	FTE	%	FTE	%	FTE	%
Direct funding (1)	20,82	61%	19,86	50%	17,41	35%	21,90	39%	22,18	35%	22,32	34%	21,05	34%
Research grants national (2)	8,05	24%	9,58	24%	16,41	33%	16,89	30%	17,07	27%	17,12	26%	15,50	25%
International Research grants (3)	4,03	12%	8,54	21%	13,25	27%	16,63	29%	21,31	33%	23,10	35%	22,72	37%
Contract research (4)	1,35	4%	1,80	5%	2,85	6%	1,35	2%	3,63	6%	4,01	6%	2,90	5%
Other (5)	0,00	0%	0,00	0%	0,00	0%	0,00	0%	0,00	0%	0,00	0%	0,00	0%
Total FTE	34,26	100%	39,78	100%	49,92	100%	56,77	100%	64,18	100%	66,54	100%	62,16	100%

Note 1 Direct funding (basisfinanciering / lump-sum budget)

Note 2 Research grants obtained in national scientific competition, specifically, grants obtained from the Dutch Science Foundation (NWO) and the Dutch Royal Academy (KNAW).

Note 3 International Research grants include research grants obtained in scientific competition organised by non-Dutch bodies like the European Research Council (ERC) and the European framework programme (most recently Horizon 2020), as well as Non-Dutch national science foundations (like the ESRC in the UK).

Note 4 Research contracts for specific research projects obtained from external organisations, such as industry, governmental organisations and charitable organisations

Note 5 Funds that do not fit into the other categories

Table 2b Acquisition 2013-2019

Year	Amount in €
2013	€ 2.446.823
2014	€ 5.950.028
2015	€ 3.698.341
2016	€ 3.115.290
2017	€ 4.201.878
2018	€ 4.979.951
2019	€ 5.336.119
Total	€ 29.728.428

Table 2d Number of Personal Grants 2013-2019

NWO Veni	14
NWO Vidi	5
NWO Vici	1
ERC (SG, AG, CoG)	7
EU Marie Curie	6

3 Output for science and society

3.a Main categories of research output

The department's pursuit of excellence, pluralism and societal engagement is reflected in research output and activities of its researchers. Table 3 provides a summary of the research output of our permanent staff with research time only (i.e. faculty); a complete list of all output items counted in Table 3 (ordered per category by year and author) is included in Appendix C. In the category 'refereed articles', we have further specified the number of ISI-ranked articles, and within this category, the number of articles in the top 25-percent of any given WoS list of journals. Tables 3a and 3b in Appendix C specify our output per fte and the data underlying the percentages of articles that are ISI ranked and the top 25% journal ranking. UvA political science output includes pieces in the absolute top of the profession (*APSR, AJPS, Governance, World Politics*) as well as top journals beyond political science (*Nature; Annual Review of Sociology; Scientific Reports*). But our broader list also includes a variety of contributions in all categories that captures the excellence, pluralism and impact of our publications, including monographs with Oxford University Press, Cambridge University Press and Cornell University Press.

Table 3 **Research Output of Scientific Staff**

Output Categories	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	Total
Refereed Scientific Articles	72	62	72	85	75	91	68	525
<i>ISI ranked</i>	46	43	61	68	51	74	48	391
<i>Top 25%</i>	25	27	35	33	24	33	33	210
Non-refereed Scientific Articles	9	4	4	1	3	4	1	26
Scientific Books	3	7	9	5	12	6	8	50
<i>Scientific Monographs</i>	1	2	2	0	4	4	3	16
<i>Scientific Editorships</i>	2	5	7	5	8	2	5	34
Scientific Book Chapters	18	33	36	30	46	27	35	225
Sub-total Scientific Publications	102	106	121	121	136	128	112	826
Professional Publications	37	43	17	35	34	21	24	211
Publications aimed at general public	15	12	9	9	19	15	20	99
Other Research Output (published inaugural and farewell speeches)	1	0	0	0	4	0	0	5
Total Publications Scientific Staff	155	161	147	165	193	164	156	1141
PhD Theses	5	7	5	10	8	8	9	52

Note 1 Scientific articles will only be included for the year of their official publication. Articles that are only available as 'online first' are excluded and will then probably be included in the subsequent review period. We do not include a separate category for the editorship of Special Issues.

Note 2 This is a subsection of the broader category 'refereed articles'. This subcategory should not be counted towards the total number of publications.

Note 3 The top 25% is defined based on the 2018 impact factor (2019 for the 2019 column), within any given disciplinary category of Web of Science.

Note 4 Articles in journals that are non-refereed, yet deemed important for the field (*vakpublicaties*).

Note 5 Publications aimed at professionals in the public and private sector (*professionele publicaties*), including scientific reports.

Note 6 Also known as *populariserende artikelen*. Only including publications that have appeared in hard-copy (not online only) and have passed an external editorial board.

Note 7 PhD-theses defended at the institute and supervised by one of the 'staff members'.

Top six research outputs

Whilst it is impossible to represent the full breadth of our research programme over a seven-year period with a handful of publications, we offer the following six contributions as a gauge of the excellence and pluralism of our department's production. They represent our very different research themes and theoretical and methodological orientations, and reflect the pride the department takes in its diversity and breadth.

Table 3c **Top 6 Research Outputs**

Author(s)	Year	Journal/publisher	Title
Meer, T. van der & Tolsma, J.	2014	Annual Review of Sociology	Ethnic diversity and its effect on social cohesion
Schliesser, E.	2017	Oxford University Press	Adam Smith: Systematic philosopher and public thinker
Overdevest, C. & Zeitlin, J.	2014	Regulation & Governance	Assembling and experimentalist regime: Transnational governance interactions in the forest sector
Pollister-Wilkins, P.	2015	International Political Sociology	The humanitarian politics of European border policing: Frontex and border police in Evros
Rooduijn, M., Lange, S. de & Brug, W. van der	2014	Party Politics	A populist Zeitgeist? Programmatic contagion by populist parties in Western Europe
Linsi, L. & Mügge, D.	2019	Review of International Political Economy	Globalization and the Growing Defects of International Economic Statistics

Van der Meer – Ethnic diversity and social cohesion

Van der Meer and Tolsma's article in the renowned *Annual Review of Sociology* (5-year impact factor 10.8) offers a definitive meta-analysis of the plethora of studies investigating the controversial claim, put forward in particular by Robert Putnam, that ethnic diversity has detrimental impacts on social cohesion, finding that it holds only under very limited scope conditions. It embodies several broader trends of research within the department, including (1) our long-standing tradition of interdisciplinary social science research on ethnic diversity and social cohesion, at different levels of governance (see also Kuhn; Maussen; Medeiros; Van Heelsum; Vermeulen), (2) our increasing interest in spatial disaggregation (exemplified also by Harbers; Daxecker; Steele) and (3) a quest to debunk attention-grabbing but controversial claims in political science research (also for instance by Schumacher in *Science*).

Schliesser – Adam Smith: a systematic philosopher

Schliesser's landmark book on Adam Smith has been reviewed – mostly very favourably - in at least ten journals in politics, philosophy and beyond. It was described by reviewers as “a new point of reference” and “the first ... serious, well worked-out argument for seeing Smith as a systematic philosopher”. For us, it represents (1) our interest in the history of political thought (De Dijn; Olsthoorn), and (2) our continued commitment to profound, slowly gestating work that finds its expression in monographs (incl. Bader; Krause; Kuhn; Sanchez Salgado; Steele; Vigneswaran).

Zeitlin – Experimentalist governance in forestry

Overdevest and Zeitlin's influential article on experimentalist governance in the forest sector demonstrates how experimentalist governance enables the building of flexible and adaptive regimes even when actors have diverging interests and in the absence of a hegemonic power. It has established the relevance of experimentalist governance beyond the European Union. In broader terms, it exemplifies (1) our research focus on the complexities of transnational, multi-level and multi-actor governance (Berkhout; Franssen; Hanegraaff; Krapohl;

Schleifer), and (2) our commitment to seminal programmatic publications (De Goede; Glasius; L. Mügge).

**Pallister-Wilkins –
Humanitarian
border policing**

Pallister-Wilkins' article on humanitarian border policing in *International Political Sociology* demonstrates that elements of 'care' and 'control' are intimately intertwined in these practices, and that the lines between governmental, non-governmental and intergovernmental agencies are increasingly blurred. Her critical reading of the humanitarianism in search-and-rescue operations has become a reference point in border studies. The article represents (1) our broader interpretive research agenda's on migration (Bonjour; Doomernik; Isleyen; Vigneswaran) and on critical security (De Goede; Jeandesboz), (2) the various forms of challenging fieldwork our scholars undertake (Gruin; Krause; Matthies-Boon; Steele).

**Rooduijn et al. –
Programmatic
contagion from
populism**

The highly-cited article by Rooduijn, De Lange and Van der Brug finds that mainstream parties have *not* become more populist in recent years. Like the first article in this list, it exemplifies our penchant for setting the record straight through better measurement and solid, painstaking investigation. It reflects (1) our longstanding strength in researching party-politics and electoral behavior, as well as (2) our visibility in contemporary debates on the nature and diffusion of populism (also Hakhverdian, Harteveld, Schumacher, Van der Pas).

**Linsi & D. Mügge –
The politics of
economic
measurement**

The recent but already influential article by Linsi and D. Mügge in the *Review of International Political Economy* focuses on major problems and noise in the measurement of key metrics of economic globalization, including trade and foreign direct investment. It challenges the foundations of widely used and influential statistics that most governments, scholars and media take for granted as unproblematic, opening-up a research agenda that may fundamentally improve the way scholars use and compare quantitative and qualitative research in the social sciences. As such, it represents (1) our department's strength in political economy (e.g. Burgoon, Heemskerk, Underhill), and (2) an interest in issues of measurement and comparability (e.g. Harbers, Rooduijn, De Lange, Schumacher).

3.b Use and recognition in scientific community

Our international visibility, and recognition of our work, is manifested partly in the citations to our work, captured both in terms of total citations and H-index scores for our faculty staff (see Table 4). Appendix F shows the same table with links to each individual staff profile included. We show the scores both in Google Scholar, which is the most comprehensive measure, and in Scopus, which focuses on ranked scientific articles and tends to be the one used in global university rankings. Equally important are the many grants and prizes won by members of the department, and our contributions as editors of major journals and leaders of professional associations.

**Visibility in terms
of citations**

This citation analysis demonstrates the extensive visibility of our faculty staff within very different research traditions, both in absolute terms and in relation to their seniority, and both in Google-Scholar and in Scopus. These absolute scores are best assessed, however, in a systematic comparison with other political science departments worldwide. We discuss such comparisons, as made in various university rankings on p.26.

Table 4 Citation scores according to Google Scholar and Scopus*

Scientific Staff Member	Year of PhD	Total GS Citations	H-index GS	H-index last 5 years GS	Total Scopus Citations	H-index Scopus	Scopus Documents by author
Professor (HGL)							
Brug, W. van der	1997	8450	45	37	3374	32	90
Burgoon, B.	1998	2761	28	21	960	18	42
Gladius, M.	1999	4574	30	21	571	14	40
Goede, M. de	2001	4640	29	23	1577	19	44
Grin, J.	1990	8327	34	28	2879	22	64
Meer, T. van der	2009	4039	29	27	1430	18	46
Mügge, D.	2008	1056	18	16	364	12	26
Schliesser, E	2002	1340	21	17	369	11	50
Underhill, G.	1987	3678	26	14	562	11	39
Zeitlin, J.	1981	12825	53	32	2651	24	55
Associate Professor (UHD)							
Berkhout, J.	2010	1248	16	14	518	11	30
Daxecker, U.	2008	632	14	13	225	7	21
Ersanilli, E.	2010	715	13	11	215	6	8
Fransen, L.	2010	1291	14	14	635	11	24
Freyberg-Inan, A.	1998	621	14	10	177	7	30
Hakhverdian, A.	2010	1140	15	15	435	12	16
Harbers, I.	2010	528	11	10	179	6	16
Heemskerk, E.	2007	1795	18	17	394	11	25
Holman, O.	1993	1061	15	8	141	5	19
Kuhn, T.	2011	1204	13	13	412	8	17
Lange, S. de	2008	2411	23	20	728	12	21
Laws, D.	1998	969	14	10	280	8	23
Loeber, A.	2004	1050	15	10	264	9	16
Maussen, M.	2009	1075	16	13	137	8	14
Mügge, L.	2008	1038	19	17	229	7	22
Roggeband, C.	2002	1793	20	17	481	10	26
Rossi, E.	2008	787	14	14	268	7	19
Schumacher, G.	2012	1471	19	19	665	12	30
Vermeulen, F.	2005	1594	20	17	469	12	32
Vigneswaran, D.	2006	1136	19	14	211	9	26
Assistant Professor (UD)							
Bader, J.	2012	462	8	6	155	4	9
Bonjour, S.	2009	1071	16	15	367	11	22
Bouris, D.	2012	356	9	9	80	4	9
Doomernik, J.	1991	1713	20	11	263	6	18
Ferracioli, L.	2012	181	8	8	48	5	15
Gruin, Y.	2015	92	5	5	29	3	8
Hanegraaff, M.	2014	476	12	12	289	10	33
Harteveld, E.	2016	448	8	8	208	7	12
Heelsum, A	1997	1144	19	12	78	5	12
Hooren, F. van	2011	656	12	11	154	6	8

Scientific Staff Member	Year of PhD	Total GS Citations	H-index GS	H-index last 5 years GS	Total Scopus Citations	H-index Scopus	Scopus Documents by author
Isleyen, B.	2014	145	7	7	70	5	11
Krapohl, S.	2007	768	14	8	185	6	13
Krause, J	2013	293	8	7	38	3	6
Kwa, C.	1989	949	13	9	217	7	18
Matthies-Boon, V.	2010	213	7	6	9	2	3
Medeiros, M.	2014	202	6	6	92	4	16
Olsthoorn, J.	2014	71	5	5	25	3	13
Pallister-Wilkins, P.	2010	873	15	15	311	10	16
Pas, D. van der	2014	169	6	6	89	5	10
Rooduijn, M.	2013	2751	22	22	980	14	20
Sanchez Salgado, R.	2006	598	10	9	44	3	7
Schleifer, P.	2014	482	10	10	168	6	12
Steele, A.	2010	651	9	9	246	6	12
Vandekerckhove, N.	2010	104	4	4	51	3	3
Verhoeven, I.	2009	905	16	12	105	5	8

* Reference date: 1 September 2020

Prestigious cases of research grants

Competitive scientific research grants are not only important as sources of funding to facilitate our research, they are also marks of recognition in their own right. In the period under review, members of the department were awarded six ERC Starting Grants (D. Mügge; Heemskerk; Ersanilli; Schumacher; Daxecker; Krause), and an ERC Consolidator Grant (De Goede), as well as six Marie Curie awards. Most recently, in 2020, a further ERC Starting Grant was awarded to Harbers. The department has served as the coordinator for two large Horizon2020 cooperative projects: ADMIGOV and EUSOCIALCIT, whilst being a partner in five other Horizon2020 projects (ENLIGHTEN; DIVERIMPACTS; IndivEU; New HORIZON; CEASEVAL).

We have been equally successful with the national science foundation NWO, with 14 VENI grants for junior scholars during the review period, 5 mid-career VIDI grants (Bonjour; D. Mügge; L. Mügge; Rossi; Van der Meer) and 1 senior VICI grant (De Goede, declined).

Book and best article awards

Among the many publication awards are three prizes for academic monographs, for De Goede's *Speculative Security: The Politics of Pursuing Terrorist Monies* (2013), Kuhn's *Experiencing European Integration: Transnational Lives and European Identity* (Oxford University Press, 2015) and Krause's *Resilient Communities: Non-Violence and Civilian Agency in Communal War* (2018). In addition, fourteen articles by our staff won awards in 2013-2019, usually for best article of the year, and seven of our PhDs won best thesis awards (see Table 3d1-2). Worthy of special mention is Van der Meer, who received three article awards with various co-authors, as well as the Prinsjesboekenprijs 2017 for the best general audience book on politics.

Table 3d1 Article and Book Prizes

Article Prizes				
Year	Prize	Author	Journal	Title
2013	The Gordon Smith and Vincent Wright Memorial Prize 2013	Akkerman, T.	West European Politics	Comparing Radical Right Parties in Government: Immigration and Integration Policies in Nine European Countries (1996–2010)
2015	JEPP Award for best article 2014	Kuhn, T. & Stoeckel, F.	Journal of European Public Policy	When European integration becomes costly: the euro crisis and public support for European economic governance
2015	Voluntas best article 2015	Glasius, M. & Ishkanian, A	Voluntas: International Journal of Voluntary and Nonprofit Organizations	Surreptitious symbiosis: engagement between activists and NGOs
2015	JEPP Award for best article 2015	Baggesen Klitgaard, M., Schumacher, G., & Soentken, M.	Journal of European Public Policy	The partisan politics of institutional welfare state reform.
2016	Best Paper Prize 'How to Govern Europe? Call for papers' by Italian Parliament and by the newspaper Eunews	Nicoli, F.	Politica Economica – Journal of Economic Policy	Politica Economica – Journal of Economic Policy
2016	The Gordon Smith and Vincent Wright Memorial Prize 2016	Elsas, E. van, Hakhverdian, A. & Brug, W. van der	West European Politics	United against a common foe? The nature and origins of Euroscepticism among left-wing and right-wing citizens
2017	2017 ARNOVA price for outstanding article	Vermeulen, F., Minkoff, D. & Meer, T. van der	Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly	The local embedding of community-based organizations
2017	2017 EHESS / Fondation France-Japon Best Paper Award	Lim, S. & Burgoon, B.	SASE 2017 Annual Conference (in 2018 published online in Socio-Economic Review)	Globalization and Support for Unemployment Spending in Asia: Do Asian Citizens Want to Embed Liberalism?
2017	Worcester Prize 2017	Meer, T. van der, Hakhverdian, A. & Aldering, L.	International Journal of Public Opinion Research	Off the Fence, Onto the Bandwagon? A Large-Scale Survey Experiment on Effect of Real-Life Poll Outcomes on Subsequent Vote Intentions
2017	Best Article Award of the APSA Migration & Citizenship Section	Bonjour, S.	Law & Policy	Speaking of Rights: The Influence of Law and Courts on the Making of Family Migration Policies in Germany
2018	2018 David P. Baron Award	Fichtner, J., Heemskerk, E. & Garcia Bernardo, J.	Business and Politics	Hidden power of the Big Three? Passive index funds, re-concentration of corporate ownership, and new financial risk
2018	Best article in 'Urban Studies' Journal	Miltenburg, E. & Meer, T. van der	Urban Studies	Lingering neighbourhood effects: A framework to account for residential histories and temporal dynamics'
2019	'Politics' best article prize	Celis, K. & Mügge, L.	Politics	Whose equality? Measuring group representation
2019	Aldi Hagenaars Memorial Award of the Luxembourg Income Studies, LIS, for best paper by under-forty researchers Van Noort and Rooduijn	Burgoon, B., Noort, S. van, Rooduijn, M. & Underhill, G.	Economic Policy	Positional deprivation and support for radical right and radical left parties

Book Prizes

Year	Prize	Author	Publisher	Title
2013	Book Award International Studies Association (International Political Sociology Section)	Goede, M. de	University of Minnesota Press	Speculative Security: the politics of pursuing terrorist monies
2016	UACES Prize for the best Book in Contemporary European Studies	Kuhn, T.	Oxford University Press	Experiencing European integration: transnational lives and European identity
2017	Prinsjesboekenprijs 2017 for the best Dutch book on politics	Meer, T. van der	Spectrum	Niet de kiezer is gek
2019	Lee Ann Fujii Award for Innovation in the Interpretive Study of Political Violence	Krause, J.	Cambridge University Press	Resilient Communities: Non-Violence and Civilian Agency in Communal War

Table 3d2 **Thesis Prizes**

Year	Prize	Author	Title
2014	Prize for Best Dissertation from the Dutch-Belgian Political Science Association	Rooduijn, M.	A populist Zeitgeist? The impact of populism on parties, media and the public in Western Europe.
2015	2015 ECPR Gender and Politics PhD Prize for the best Thesis	Miškovska Kajevska, A.	Taking a stand in times of violent societal changes: Belgrade and Zagreb feminists' positionings on the (post-) Yugoslav wars and each other (1991-2000)
2016	Prize for Best Dissertation from the Dutch-Belgian Political Science Association	Hoofdt, P. van	The Future in the Past: Victory, Defeat, and Grand Strategy in the US, UK, France and Germany
2016	2016 Max van der Stoep Human Rights Award	Parlevliet, M.	Embracing concurrent realities: Revisiting the relationship between human rights and conflict resolution
2017	Prize for Best Dissertation from the Dutch-Belgian Political Science Association	Steenvoorden, E.	Societal pessimism: A study of its conceptualization, causes, correlates and consequences
2018	JC Ruigrok prize 2018	Di Salvatore, J.	Peacekeepers against ethnic and criminal violence. Unintended consequences of UN peacekeeping
2019	Prize for Best Dissertation from the Dutch-Belgian Political Science Association (Els Witte Award)	Bokhorst, D.	Governing imbalances in the economic and monetary union: A political economy analysis of the macroeconomic imbalance procedure

Editorships

Since 2018, the *European Journal of International Relations* has been edited by an UvA team, with Underhill as Editor in chief and Daxecker³, Freyberg-Inan, Glasius⁴ and Vigneswaran as associate editors. Daxecker was also previously an editor of *International Interactions*, Freyberg-Inan of the *Journal of International Relations and Development*, and Vigneswaran of *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space*. L. Mügge is the founding editor in chief of the new *European Journal of Politics and Gender*. Rossi is one of two editors of the *European Journal of Political Theory*. Furthermore, D. Mügge has served as lead editor of the *Review*

³ Replaced in 2020 by Lee Seymour, ex-UvA, now at University of Montreal.

⁴ Replaced in 2020 by Fransen.

of *International Political Economy* (2013-2016), De Goede served as associate editor of *Security Dialogue* (2012-2019), and Harbers continues to be associate editor of *Regional and Federal Studies*. The memberships of (advisory) editorial boards are too numerous to mention.

Other important awards, chairmanships and memberships

Jonathan Zeitlin has held the Jean Monnet Chair in European and Transnational Governance since 2011. Freyberg-Inan was Vice-president of the International Studies Association (ISA) in 2014, as well as holding board positions in the ISA's Theory Section and the Central East European Studies Association. Schliesser was Vice-President of the European Early Modern Society from 2013 - 2016. Recently, Bonjour was elected a member of the Young Academy of the Royal Dutch Academy of Sciences (KNAW) and Schumacher won the prestigious Early Career Achievement Award of the Academy. The number of keynote speeches given by our staff and memberships of scientific committees are again too numerous to mention.

3.c Relevance to society

We do not see research and societal engagement as alternative or competing goals, but as strengthening one another. While different categorisations can be made of the many ways in which societal engagement can be operationalised, we tend to think of it in three broad *categories*, both at the local/national and at the international level. Collectively, we aim to engage across all six cells of what can be thought of as a matrix. We facilitate these efforts with dedicated support staff, and we monitor them in annual review meetings. We also monitor to what extent our efforts translate into *impact* on and *recognition* from society (while recognising that these do not always follow automatically from our efforts).

The first form is engagement with policy-makers and other stake-holders (including NGOs, corporations, parliamentarians, etc). This form of engagement provides policy-makers with the knowledge they need to make evidence-based decisions, but also 'speaks truth to power' where necessary. UvA political scientists influence policy-making across local, national and international governmental bodies.

The second form is engagement with broader audiences, disseminating our research findings to stimulate critical and reflexive discussion in the public sphere, through traditional and social media and public speaking. Engaging with highly politicized topics such as populism, migration, gender, diversity and climate change comes at a price. It has sometimes sparked vitriolic messages and threats towards our staff via email and social media. We are working with the AISSR in developing a protocol for handling such challenges to safety and academic freedom.

In its third form, societal engagement does not follow after research, as we tend traditionally to think of it but instead, research and societal engagement go hand in hand. We offer some examples of this below. Finally, although this is not included in our matrix because it is a core task regardless of other activities, we view educating our students as one of the most powerful ways to disseminate the knowledge we generate.

As in the case of our research output, no top five can fully do justice to the scale and diversity of our societal engagement. For this list, to offset the primary international and English-language orientation of the research output top five, we have chosen to concentrate on Dutch-language output. Below the discussion of the top five, we give further examples of local, national and international

Table 3d **Top 5 Societal Impact**

Staff member	Year	Outlet	Title	Link
Lange, S. de	2019	Raad van Openbaar Bestuur	Jong geleerd, oud gedaan	https://www.binnenlandsbestuur.nl/Uploads/2019/6/Jong-geleerd-oud-gedaan-Adviesrapport-201906.pdf
Hakhverdian, A., Meer, T. van der, Rooduijn, M., Schumacher, G.	2013	StukRood-Vlees (SRV)	StukRoodVlees (SRV)	http://stukroodvlees.nl/
Loeber, A. & Laws, D.	2016	Planbureau voor de Leef-omgeving	Reflecterend in de Delta: naar een systematiek voor monitoring en evaluatie in het Deltaprogramma gericht op lerend samenwerken	https://pure.uva.nl/ws/files/2799558/178147_Reflecterend_in_de_Delta_UvA_rapport_tbv_PBL_M_E_DP_augustus_2016_DEF.pdf
Meer, T. van der	2017	Spectrum	Niet de kiezer is gek	http://www.unieboekspectrum.nl/boek/9789000352746/Niet-de-kiezer-is-gek/
Heemskerk, E.	2017	Public Cinema	Who owns big business: The rise of passive investors	https://corpnet.uva.nl/corpnet-video-owns-big-business-rise-passive-investors/

societal engagement (still far from exhaustive) in the form of the described matrix. In section 4b we revisit the recognition and impact of our societal engagement.

**De Lange –
Report of the
Council on Public
Governance on
the voting age**

De Lange has been a member of this advisory council since 2011, and was lead author of this report, which follows on from her research on how differences in age, gender and education affect political cleavages. Young people were involved in the study from the beginning, through an initial animation, a debate, a mindmap, a number of visits to secondary schools, and an invitation to blog or vlog their views. The eventual report was again accompanied by an animation explaining the process leading up to the advice and its main recommendations. The advice received a great deal of media attention spearheaded by De Lange. The Minister of Internal Affairs has responded positively, and political parties D66, Green Left and PvdA (Labour) have expressed their support for a change in the law.

**Stukroodvlees.nl
and podcasts**

This is the most important political science blog in The Netherlands. It was co-founded by Hakhverdian, Rooduijn, Schumacher and Van der Meer, together with several other scholars, in 2013 and has produced almost 1300 pieces, always grounded in research, since its foundation. Rooduijn had more than 36.000 hits on his 2019 blogpost on the ideology of the new far right party Forum for Democracy. Hakhverdian has since initiated an equally popular Stukroodvlees podcast, now with 82 episodes, which have been listened to 320.000 times.

**Loeber and Laws –
Evaluation Delta
Programme**

Loebers and Laws provided a report on collaborative policy learning for the Delta Programme of national water management, commissioned by PBL, the Netherlands Environmental Assessment Agency. They proposed an annual cycle of monitoring and evaluation facilitating adaptive water management. The system proposed was introduced into policy on Prinsjesdag (i.e. the King's speech) in 2016, and reaffirmed by the Minister for Infrastructure and the Environment later that year.

**Van der Meer –
general audience
book on the
intelligent voter**

Based on Van der Meer's research, the book argues that the Dutch electorate is not capricious or apathetic, but assertive and engaged, and that it is not Dutch democracy that is in crisis, only the traditional parties. The book won the 2017 Prinsjesboekenprijs for best political book of the Netherlands, its ideas have

been much referenced by journalists, and it has become an important basis for the analysis and recommendations of the recently established State Commission on the Parliamentary System, of which Van der Meer became a member. The book was also disseminated through official channels to parliamentarians and to municipal councils.

**Heemskerk et al. –
Who owns big
business?**

This animated video popularizes one of the important findings of the ERC-funded CORPNET project. The project analyses the distribution and networked nature of economic power through the use of big data; the subproject highlights the tremendous concentration of business ownership in the hands of just three passive investors. The animation has had more than 15.000 hits on YouTube and nearly 8.000 on Facebook. The accompanying blog has been read 147.000 times,

Societal Engagement Matrix

Stake-holders & policy-makers	<p>Local and National level</p> <p>(co-) authored policy reports</p> <p>Loebers on spatial adaption for Amsterdam city council</p> <p>De Goede and Wesseling on counter-terrorism financing</p> <p>De Lange on party finance</p> <p>Bonjour on migration</p> <p>Fransen on sustainability in pharmacy</p>	<p>International level</p> <p>(co-) authored policy reports</p> <p>Zeitlin & Vanhercke on EU social policy</p> <p>Schleifer & Fransen on UN Forum for Sustainable Standards</p> <p>Vandenbroucke, Burgoon, Kuhn et al. on European Unemployment Risk Sharing</p> <p>Presentations</p> <p>United Nations Conference on Future of Jerusalem (Bouris)</p> <p>United Nations Statistical Division (D. Mügge)</p> <p>German Foreign Office (Glasius)</p>
General audiences	<p>Social Media</p> <p>Influential Twitterers: De Lange (9926 followers); Hakhverdian (8765)</p> <p>Traditional media</p> <p>Hakhverdian: programme editor Buitenhof; Even tot hier</p> <p>Vermeulen contributions on migration to <i>Het Parool</i></p> <p>Books for broad audience</p> <p>Van der Heijden on neoliberalism</p> <p>Van Es on management of change in organisations</p>	<p>Social Media</p> <p>Blog: Digressionsnimpresions by Schliesser, 1 mln hits</p> <p>Animation: Glasius on authoritarianism (30.000 views)</p> <p>Traditional media</p> <p>Rooduijn: coordinator of the <i>Guardian's</i> Popu-List</p> <p>Steele: Regular contribution to <i>Washington Post's</i> Monkey Cage</p> <p>Pallister-Wilkins: regular commentator on migration for Sky News</p> <p>De Lange: coverage Dutch elections for CNN</p> <p>Books for broad audience</p> <p>Holman on Global Europe (in English and Dutch)</p>
Engagement as research	<p>Schumacher & Rooduijn: physiological experiments at public events such as music festival, racing event, evangelical meeting</p>	<p>Grin & Koole: farmer-researcher network devoted to sustainable value chains from farmer to dinner table</p> <p>Pallister-Wilkins: deep engagement with Medecins sans Frontiers' organisational self-reflection</p>

and led to a presentation of the findings in the European Parliament. A different publication by the same project, on tax havens, has led to parliamentary questions as well as national and international media attention.

In our discussion of societal relevance we must acknowledge the roles of research associate Ram Manikkalingam and professor by special appointment Geert-Jan Knoops. Manikkalingam, a former staff member of our department, founded the Dialogue Advisory Group (of which Burgoon is a board member), which played a central role in overseeing the disarmament and dissolution of the Basque liberation organization ETA. Knoops is a famous criminal lawyer in high-profile political cases such as that of Geert Wilders, but his practice, research interests and teaching really meet when it comes to the international criminal court (ICC), where he led the defence in two cases, as well as publishing a book with Brill. A final, unusual form of cross-fertilisation between research and societal engagement was Egypt specialist Matthies-Boon's advocacy, with Amnesty International, on behalf of Rami Sidky, a former UvA student who was imprisoned without trial in Egypt. Sidky was released in May 2019.

4 Self-evaluation of performance

4.a Research quality

We believe that actually reading scholarly works remains essential to any assessment of the quality of research, and we invite the Committee to at least read our top publications, and hopefully also beyond, according to their interests. Here, we assess primarily to what extent we have met our own quality targets in bibliometric terms. On many of these metrics, the UvA's political science department has developed into a research leader in Europe.

Our main targets, as described above under strategies, were:

- maintaining an average of 2 ISI-ranked (Web of Science listed) articles per research fte per year for permanent staff
- monitoring and maintaining the number of articles in the top-25 percent of journals (ranked by 5-year impact factor) in any WoS category list
- encouraging anonymously peer reviewed monographs with international publishers
- maximising impact in terms of citations

As our Output table (Table 3) suggests, output fluctuates from year to year, but we comfortably meet the first target every year. We have not increased our productivity in terms of quantity, but this is in line with the priority we give to quality over quantity. Roughly half of the ISI-rated articles were in the top 25% of journals each year, which is a considerable achievement. Faculty staff has also increased the number of anonymously peer-reviewed monographs with international academic publishers in recent years (3 or 4 each year, up from an average of 1 in the previous four years). In short, we have met our targets for the number of ranked articles and prestigious monographs, and strongly improved our visibility in terms of citations.

The quality of our research is translated into the UvA Political Science Department's high position in the leading global university rankings, two of which focus explicitly on political science and international relations: the QS Ranking by Subject and the "Shanghai" Global Ranking of Academic Subjects. In the QS ranking for 2019 and 2020, UvA Political Science is ranked 26th out of 300 universities. It scores even higher for the ranking's most objective research quality measure, as opposed to reputation measures: the UvA is ranked 4th worldwide for staff H-indexes in Scopus. In the Shanghai ranking in 2019, UvA Political Science was ranked 20th worldwide (out of 400 ranked departments), and 9th worldwide with respect to the bibliometric "publications" sub-metric. These Shanghai rankings were consolidated in 2020 with a 19th place in the total ranking and an 12th place in citation impact.

4.b Relevance to society

A collective commitment with tailored operationalisation

Our strategy has been to collectively do societal engagement of three kinds and at two levels, while facilitating each staff member in doing one or two things really well. As is evident from the matrix presented (p.24), this results in a wide variety of forms of societal engagement, fulfilling what we consider to be our dual obligation to society at large and to the specific stakeholders for whom our research is of particular importance, locally, nationally and internationally.

Impact

When it comes to having *impact*, particularly on policy-makers, we are proud of having achieved this in some instances (i.e. Loebers and Laws influence on adaptive water management policies), but we also believe that it is not always appropriate to attempt to have immediate impact on the basis of research findings. Some recommendations may have a longer road to go before leading to policy change (i.e. De Lange on the voting age). But equally importantly, some findings and recommendations may be uncomfortable to policy-makers, and in the short term one may only hope to contribute to shifting the terms of debate (i.e. De Goede and Wesseling on counterterrorist finance policies, or D. Mügge on financial statistics).

Recognition

We find the recognition of our efforts at societal engagement reflected in a number of ways. One of these is the membership of a number of our staff in official governmental advisory bodies. These include Bonjour (Advisory Council on Migration Affairs) and De Goede (Advisory Council on Security Affairs), as well as De Lange (Council on Public Governance, ROB) and Van der Meer (State Commission on the Parliamentary System). Another form of recognition comes in the form of commissioned research, for instance by the Minister of Justice and Security (Vermeulen, De Goede), the Presidency of the European Union (Zeitlin), or the US Department of Defence (Daxecker). Other forms of recognition are more behind the scenes and therefore harder to document; an example of this is Grin's inclusion in a Top-100 listing of most influential people on Sustainability (*Trouw* newspaper, 2016); two other examples are the successful mediation processes led by Laws at the local level and by research associate Manikkalingam, with Burgoon, at the international level. In all, while recognition by society remains hard to measure, we are satisfied with the marks of recognition we can discern. We also want to draw attention, however, to the negative reactions – a kind of anti-recognition – that comes with certain forms of societal engagement, in the form of personal insults and threats against scholars who engage with general publics.

4.c Viability

Financial viability

The starting point here is to recognise that structural public support for social science research in the Netherlands has been diminishing for at least a decade. While at the beginning of the assessment period this had led to a decrease in the number of PhDs and post-docs, by the end of it we had more than made up the – still increasing – shortfall in structural public spending: in 2013 only 40% of our €6mln budget came from external funds, by 2019 this constituted 66% of an €8mln budget. Next to a small but steady flow of commissioned research, this mostly came through a strong increase in highly competitive NWO and especially EU grants. Given our continued strategies for targeting of such grants, our experience in gaining them, the quality of our staff and our excellent institutional support in this respect, we expect to be able to maintain this level of external funding, with possibilities for growth towards more of the most senior (NWO VICI and Open Competition and ERC Advanced) grants. Next to this, we will continue to target appropriate Horizon2020 and successor grants, and commissioned research, and begin to target National Science Agenda grants where appropriate. Finally, the department's research finances are substantially strengthened by our starting a dual-language Bachelor (next to an already existing English language master programme) in 2017, which has turned around a previous downward trend in the number of students.

Personnel viability

As evidenced elsewhere in this report, UvA political science comprises a mix of scholars in terms of rank, gender, age and research orientation. In the last decade we have invested considerably in attracting and retaining top-quality personnel; all our research-related searches are now international and highly competitive. Our staff make-up has been quite stable with some growth at the level of assistant professor. We have only advertised one senior position during the assessment period: Eric Schliesser as chair in political theory. Given the quality and potential of our existing staff, we prefer to hire at the junior level and allow for internal promotions. This has led to the promotion of D. Mügge and Van der Meer to full professor, and De Lange as endowed professor; a number of promotions to associate professor have been realised during the assessment period.

Infrastructural viability

The University supports our research in important ways. Most important in infrastructural terms is the excellent administrative support that AISSR provides in relation to both grant writing and managing existing grants, and dissemination of our research output. The excellent UvA computer and library resources allow rapid and efficient access to existing scholarly works and many primary materials (e.g. government archives). The UvA also provides the necessary ICT infrastructure for high-demand processing of big data and GIS-coded data.

5 PhD programme

In 2019, the department hosted 33 PhD candidates who spent at least 0.8fte on their PhD research. From the cohort of 25 (almost) full-time funded PhDs who started their dissertation between 2010 and 2015, 20 graduated within six years (Table 5a). This cohort did not make up the totality of our PhD graduates during the assessment period, however. As shown in Table 6a, an additional 20 PhD candidates who had either begun before 2010, or who were only partially funded

Table 5a Duration and Success Rates Political Science UvA – Standard PhD Candidates

Starting Year	Enrolment (head count)			Success rates (head count; %)													
	Enrolment (male/female)	Total (m+f)		Graduated in year 4 or earlier		Graduated in year 5 or earlier		Graduated in year 6 or earlier		Graduated in year 7 or earlier		Total graduated		Not yet finished		Dis-continued	
2010	0	1	1	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	1	100%	0	0%
2011	2	5	7	0	0%	1	14%	5	71%	6	86%	6	86%	0	0%	1	14%
2012	1	1	2	0	0%	2	100%	2	100%	2	100%	2	100%	0	0%	0	0%
2013	1	1	2	0	0%	2	100%	2	100%			2	100%	0	0%	0	0%
2014	7	1	8	1	13%	6	75%	7	88%			7	88%	1	13%	0	0%
2015	3	2	5	0	0%	4	80%	4	80%			4	80%	1	20%	0	0%
Total	14	11	25	1	4%	15	60%	20	80%			21	84%	3	12%	1	4%

Table 5b Duration and Success Rates Political Science UvA – Contract PhD Candidates

Starting Year	Enrolment (head count)			Success rates (head count; %)													
	Enrolment (male/female)	Total (m+f)		Graduated in year 4 or earlier		Graduated in year 5 or earlier		Graduated in year 6 or earlier		Graduated in year 7 or earlier		Total graduated		Not yet finished		Dis-continued	
2010	0	0	0									NA	NA				
2011	0	0	0									NA	NA				
2012	0	1	1	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	1	100%
2013	0	0	0									NA	NA				
2014	0	1	1	1	100%	1	100%					1	100%	0	0%	0	0%
2015	1	0	1	0	0%	0	0%					0	0%	1	100%	0	0%
Total	1	2	3	1	33%	1	33%					1	33%	1	33%	1	33%

Data in tables is cumulative → from graduated year 4 (or earlier) till graduated year 7 (or earlier)

Table 6a Graduated PhDs 2013-2019 per category

	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	Total
Standard PhDs	4	6	3	6	4	5	4	32
Contract PhDs	0	1	1	1	1	1	0	5
External PhDs	1	0	1	3	3	2	5	15
Total	5	7	5	10	8	8	9	52

This table also includes PhDs which were appointed for less than 0.8 FTE and external PhDs

Table 6c PhD Career Destination

Assistant professor	11
Postdoc	7
Researcher academic	4
Researcher non-academic	15
Academic Lecturer	6
Other	9
Total	52

Current position PhDs 2013-2019

or non-funded, achieved their doctorate between 2013 and 2019 (see Appendix G for a full list of their names and dissertation titles).

We consider the work and training of PhD candidates as embodying the synthesis of our research and our teaching mission and as a crucial source of scholarly innovation. We have invested substantially in a well-structured PhD programme in terms of courses and training, monitoring and promoting high supervision standards, and offering meaningful teaching-hour compensation to faculty staff for their PhD supervision. There is a high level of camaraderie among a significant cohort of PhDs. The results in professional terms are clear: high rates of completion; many publications of the highest calibre; prizes in many years for best dissertation in political science or subfields; and a high rate of completed PhD scholars who pursue a research or academic career (see Table 6d in Appendix G for full data on career destinations).

Our PhD programme is run by the research school AISSR. Within this framework, we have developed a number of processes and standards to attract talented PhD candidates and allow them to develop to the best of their abilities.

Hiring PhD candidates

- We aim to hire PhDs either through an open recruitment procedure in the case of externally funded research projects, or based on their own proposal, with their own funding.
- We combine a minimum requirement of a Master's degree and an English test requirement for non-native speakers with tailored admission requirements appropriate to the project, but always to be approved by the relevant programme group.

Supervising PhD candidates – quality assurance

- Every PhD candidate has at least two supervisors
- Within two months after starting, a PhD candidate and their supervisors agree a Trajectory Plan, spelling out the composition of the supervision team; type and frequency of supervision meetings; research summary; individual training programme; trajectory schedule; publication plans; and conference attendance.
- In the first year, the PhD produces an 'eight-month paper': an extended proposal outlining the theoretical basis for the dissertation, research questions, methods and ethical implications. This paper is read by two external evaluators, and a Go/No-Go decision for continuation with the PhD is based on their recommendation.

After the first year, aside from regular meetings between PhD candidates and their supervisory team, PhDs have Annual Human Resource Meetings with someone outside their team (typically the programme leader) and Annual Thesis Progress Evaluations with their supervisors. In case of problems with supervisors, PhDs can either turn to the Programme Leader, or to the department's PhD confidence person.

Giving PhD candidates a social science education and preparing them for their further careers

- PhD candidates are expected to take courses in the PhD Training Program including 1) social science theory, 2) methods training, 3) transferable skills courses, 4) customised courses.
- We typically ask PhDs to take up a maximum of 10% of their time teaching Bachelor courses useful for their CV within the department, usually starting with tutor groups in year 1 and 2 and teaching their own elective in year 3 or 4.
- At the later stages of their project, PhD candidates are facilitated in presenting at national and international conferences.

- They also participate in Faculty and University-wide career orientation courses and career days.
- There are various PhD clubs, organised by the candidates themselves, based on shared interests, which function as low-threshold platforms to discuss ongoing work.

6 Research integrity

The AISSR has an Ethics Advisory Board, which has developed a specific procedure for the ethical review of research plans in line with the research methods that characterize the domain of social sciences. The procedure stimulates researchers to design their research in an ethical way, rather than adding to formalities. In 2017, the AISSR developed a Research Integrity and Data Management Protocol, based on the Netherlands Code of Conduct for Research Integrity 2018 of the VNSU, formulating standards with respect to seven different aspects of (non-)integrity: (1) scientific fraud; (2) plagiarism; (3) self-citation; (4) ownership and intellectual property rights; (5) authorship standards; (6) conflicts of interest; and (7) research data management. Our Protocol calls for awareness and vigilance in avoiding all violations of integrity, but also for proportional responses and transparent review: without exaggeration or witch-hunts, but also without cover-ups or censorship. Our three programme groups strive to maintain an open research environment where all forms of scientific best and worst practices, including misconduct, can be aired, discussed, and monitored. Beyond them, the AISSR Integrity Committee handles questions and issues of integrity, and deliberates on how to deal with violations of any aspect of the Protocol that come to the Committee's attention, where appropriate in consultation with the Ethics Board and central University-level integrity officials.

7 Diversity

The gender balance within our staff is fine at assistant professor level (40% male/60% female) and has now reached acceptable levels at associate professor level (58% male/42% female), but is extremely skewed (73% male/27% female) at full professor level, a situation we hope to address primarily through internal promotions. But while our staff can be considered very international, our racial diversity is much more problematic: much like Dutch academia in general, our department is still largely a white bastion. At the beginning of the assessment period we had two members of staff who were non-white/from a migrant background (both at assistant professor level), we currently have three (with two now at associate professor level). There are various initiatives at UvA, Faculty and departmental level devoted to improving our diversity profile in general, and we intend for the next period to develop policies and practices for increasing the diversity of our new hires, as well as retaining them. One positive development is that the diversity of our PhD community outpaces the rest of the UvA and the more senior levels of staff. In a recent (2020) hiring round at assistant professor level, diversity was treated as a relevant criterion in our procedure, and was operationalised among other things by signalling UvA's commitment to diversity in the advertisement, targeting networks of scholars of colour, and explicitly asking for a discussion on contributions to diversity in teaching statements. As a result of the procedure, two of our three offers went to persons of colour.

8 Trends and SWOT-analysis

In the past seven years, Dutch academia has experienced a shift of emphasis in terms of research output from pure productivity to quality of output, which is reflected in the publication strategies of the department. Financially, the social sciences (and the humanities) remained underfunded even at a time of relative economic prosperity. There has been a renewed appreciation for societal engagement, in part in response to the erosion not just of social science funding, but of the reputation of scientists more generally. In the coming years, we want to invest in better understanding these financial and reputational threats, which we do not expect to dissipate any time soon. We also see an increasing interest in interdisciplinarity in research, funding, and teaching alike, which the department and the AISSR are well-placed to contribute to and benefit from. In terms of our working environment, we observe and welcome the increased attention, at the UvA and in our wider society, to (1) fostering a more diverse staff profile and (2) improving job satisfaction and work/life balance. This is reflected in the new objectives and strategies we have set ourselves for the coming period.

SWOT-analysis

Internal development	Strengths	Weaknesses
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Broad, pluralist, internationally visible research - Interdisciplinary profile: interface with communication studies, economics, geography, history, law, sociology, the humanities and the hard sciences - Coherence between different research lines through a range of cross-cutting collaborations - Institutional stability at level of research school, department and programme groups - Sustained success in grant acquisition, esp. ERC Starting Grants and VENI/VIDI - Increase in PhDs and postdocs because of successful acquisition - Many forms of societal engagement; clear departmental visibility outside academia 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Work pressure perceived as high at all levels - Not much diversity in staff; stark gender imbalance at full prof level - The large number of very good and ambitious young scholars puts pressure on our ability to realise sufficient upward career mobility - Our funding success puts more pressure on already very limited amount of workspace - The teaching load for staff not funded by external grants is high: our teaching year lasts 40 weeks, divided into small blocks
External developments	Opportunities	Threats
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Growth towards senior subsidies (VICI; ERC Consolidator & Advanced) - More investment in National Science Agenda proposals - Better understand and influence national and int. level politics of funding; advocate for social science - Improve diversity and work/life balance strategies 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Despite flourishing economy, structural under-investment in social sciences (specifically threatened by Van Rijn report) - Talented staff with high work pressure and limited perspectives on promotion can lead to exit and/or stress-related illness - Frequent changes in labour law complicate contractual agreements with temporary staff



AMSTERDAM INSTITUTE FOR
SOCIAL SCIENCE RESEARCH

