

Transdisciplinary perspectives on validity: bridging the gap between design and implementation for technologyenhanced learning systems

Haastrecht, M.A.N. van

Citation

Haastrecht, M. A. N. van. (2025, January 24). *Transdisciplinary perspectives* on validity: bridging the gap between design and implementation for technology-enhanced learning systems. SIKS Dissertation Series. Retrieved from https://hdl.handle.net/1887/4177362

| Version: | Publisher's Version |
|------------------|--|
| License: | <u>Licence agreement concerning inclusion of doctoral</u> <u>thesis in the Institutional Repository of the University</u> <u>of Leiden</u> |
| Downloaded from: | https://hdl.handle.net/1887/4177362 |

Note: To cite this publication please use the final published version (if applicable).

TRANSDISCIPLINARY PERSPECTIVES ON VALIDITY

BRIDGING THE GAP BETWEEN DESIGN AND IMPLEMENTATION FOR TECHNOLOGY-ENHANCED LEARNING SYSTEMS

Max Anton Nicolaas van Haastrecht

Universiteit Leiden 2025

This document was typeset using LATEX and has the typographical lookand-feel of the classicthesis package developed by André Miede and Ivo Pletikosić: https://bitbucket.org/amiede/classicthesis/.

Transdisciplinary Perspectives on Validity © 2025, Max Anton Nicolaas van Haastrecht

ISBN: 978-94-6506-528-1 Printing: Ridderprint | https://ridderprint.nl

TRANSDISCIPLINARY PERSPECTIVES ON VALIDITY

BRIDGING THE GAP BETWEEN DESIGN AND IMPLEMENTATION FOR TECHNOLOGY-ENHANCED LEARNING SYSTEMS

Proefschrift

ter verkrijging van de graad van doctor aan de Universiteit Leiden, op gezag van rector magnificus prof.dr.ir. H. Bijl, volgens besluit van het college voor promoties te verdedigen op vrijdag 24 januari 2025 klokke 13:00 uur

door

Max Anton Nicolaas van Haastrecht geboren te Bloemendaal, Nederland in 1995 ркомоток: Prof.dr. M.R. Spruit

CO-PROMOTOR: Dr. M.J.S. Brinkhuis (Universiteit Utrecht)

PROMOTIECOMMISSIE: Prof.dr. M.M. Bonsangue Prof.dr.ir. N. Mentens Prof.dr.ir. J.M.W. Visser Prof.dr. F. Dalpiaz (Universiteit Utrecht) Prof.dr. S.A. Fricker (Fachhochschule Nordwestschweiz) Prof.dr. A.G.J. van de Schoot (Universiteit Utrecht)



SIKS Dissertation Series No. 2025-01 The research reported in this thesis has been carried out under the auspices of SIKS, the Dutch Research School for Information and Knowledge Systems.

The research of this dissertation was made possible through a European Commission Horizon 2020 grant for the GEIGER project (ID: 883588).

The things you regret most in life are the things you didn't do.

— Steve Jobs

CONTENTS

List of Figures viii List of Tables ix Acknowledgements xi

- 1 Introduction 1
- I Problem Investigation
- 2 SYMBALS: A Systematic Review Methodology 15
- 3 Respite for SMEs: A Systematic Review 39
- 11 Treatment Design
- 4 Threat-Based Cybersecurity Risk Assessment for SMEs 69
- 5 A Shared Cyber Threat Intelligence Solution for SMEs 89

III Treatment Validation

- 6 Embracing Trustworthiness and Authenticity in Validation 111
- 7 Validity Criteria for Technology-Enhanced Learning 123
- 8 VAST: Validating Socio-Technical Systems 147

IV Treatment Implementation

- 9 Federated Learning for Educational Analytics 171
- 10 Conclusion: Transdisciplinary Perspectives on Validity 185

Bibliography 193 List of Publications 231 Summary in English 233 Samenvatting in het Nederlands 235 Curriculum Vitae 237 SIKS Dissertation Series 239

| Figure 1.1 | The socio-technical ecosystem of GEIGER | 4 |
|------------|--|-----|
| Figure 1.2 | Transdisciplinary research and other strategies | 6 |
| Figure 1.3 | Transdisciplinary process and engineering cycle | 8 |
| Figure 2.1 | Depiction of the SYMBALS screening process | 19 |
| Figure 2.2 | Outline of the steps involved in SYMBALS | 22 |
| Figure 2.3 | The backward snowballing process | 25 |
| Figure 2.4 | Visualisation of case study steps | 29 |
| Figure 2.5 | Inclusions per year for case study | 32 |
| Figure 2.6 | Comparison of SYMBALS and FAST ² recall | 35 |
| Figure 3.1 | Visualisation of SYMBALS steps in our review | 51 |
| Figure 3.2 | Consideration of ADKAR factors over the years | 53 |
| Figure 3.3 | Visualisation of a socio-technical system | 58 |
| Figure 3.4 | Summary of STS interactions in our framework | 62 |
| Figure 4.1 | View on SME cyber-systems | 74 |
| Figure 4.2 | Data model for threat-based risk assessment | 75 |
| Figure 4.3 | Data flow diagram of the system | 76 |
| Figure 4.4 | Metric and countermeasure impact on threats | 78 |
| Figure 4.5 | Main interface and score calculation process | 83 |
| Figure 4.6 | Interfaces of all devices and all employees | 85 |
| Figure 4.7 | Interfaces of user-specific recommendations | 86 |
| Figure 5.1 | VCDB and ENISA threat rankings over time | 96 |
| Figure 5.2 | Events shared from MISP to GEIGER cloud | 98 |
| Figure 5.3 | Incoming MISP data processed by GEIGER | 99 |
| Figure 5.4 | Process for turning CTI into recommendations | 101 |
| Figure 5.5 | Phishing and malware recommendations | 104 |
| Figure 5.6 | Response to a malware wave using MISP data | 104 |
| Figure 6.1 | The epistemological plane of validity | 114 |
| Figure 6.2 | The Learning Analytics Validation Assistant | 117 |
| Figure 7.1 | Systematic review PRISMA flowchart | 132 |
| Figure 7.2 | Validity criteria bubble plot | 136 |
| Figure 7.3 | Assessment of validity criteria in inclusions | 138 |
| Figure 7.4 | Comparison of evaluation theme occurrences | 139 |
| Figure 7.5 | Most frequently encountered validity criteria | 139 |
| Figure 7.6 | Validity criteria positioning over time | 140 |
| Figure 7.7 | Network of co-occuring validity criteria | 142 |
| Figure 8.1 | Inferences making up the inference chain | 154 |
| Figure 8.2 | An example CJML swimlane diagram | 155 |
| Figure 8.3 | An example Toulmin argument | 156 |
| Figure 8.4 | The grounding procedure of our methodology | 157 |

| Figure 8.5 | The VAST validation framework | 158 |
|-------------|---|-----|
| Figure 8.6 | Mapping inference chain to user journey | 162 |
| Figure 9.1 | Machine learning architectures | 174 |
| Figure 9.2 | Accuracy for varying client numbers | 179 |
| Figure 9.3 | AUC for varying client numbers | 180 |
| Figure 9.4 | FLAME values for EdNet and KDD Cup 2015 | 181 |
| Figure 10.1 | Research process visualisation | 187 |

LIST OF TABLES

| Table 1.1 | Correspondence of dissertation to cycle phases | 7 |
|------------|---|-----|
| Table 1.2 | Research questions of this dissertation | 12 |
| Table 2.1 | Overview of systematic review methodologies | 20 |
| Table 2.2 | Quality criteria assessments for inclusions | 30 |
| Table 3.1 | Cybersecurity metric (systematic) reviews | 43 |
| Table 3.2 | Various classes of metric aggregation strategies | 47 |
| Table 3.3 | Statistics regarding the different databases used | 49 |
| Table 3.4 | Quality criteria applied to inclusions | 51 |
| Table 3.5 | ADKAR factors and related concepts | 53 |
| Table 3.6 | Security assessment concepts covered by papers | 54 |
| Table 3.7 | Different social viewpoints in our inclusions | 55 |
| Table 3.8 | Aggregation strategy classes in the literature | 55 |
| Table 3.9 | ADKAR and aggregation strategy frequencies | 56 |
| Table 3.10 | Socio-technical cybersecurity framework | 59 |
| Table 4.1 | The variables used within the algorithm | 82 |
| Table 5.1 | Keywords and synonyms for database search | 92 |
| Table 5.2 | Extracted data on CTI usage and SME type | 93 |
| Table 6.1 | Validity criteria quadrants encountered | 119 |
| Table 7.1 | Search terms and synonyms for review | 130 |
| Table 7.2 | Validity criteria considered in review | 134 |
| Table 7.3 | Constructs used for TEL evaluation | 137 |
| Table 8.1 | Consolidated table of validity types | 152 |
| Table 8.2 | Mapping of inferences and validity types | 159 |
| Table 8.3 | Details of our three interviewees | 164 |
| Table 8.4 | Questions asked during expert interviews | 165 |
| Table 8.5 | The three axes of improvement for VAST | 166 |
| Table 9.1 | Descriptive statistics of investigated datasets | 176 |
| Table 9.2 | Comparison to state-of-the-art results | 178 |

Alle Sätze sind gleichwertig. Der Sinn der Welt muß außerhalb ihrer liegen.

Ludwig Wittgenstein

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

There are different ways to interpret the above statement by Wittgenstein, but I interpret it as a reminder that while propositions can describe facts about the world, they struggle to express deeper meaning or purpose. While the propositions in this dissertation have brought me to the point of defending my PhD, it is the people in my life who have given meaning and purpose to my PhD journey.

First of all, a massive thank you to Marco Spruit and Matthieu Brinkhuis, for your unwavering support throughout these years. Marco, thank you for giving me the chance to join your group in Utrecht and later in Leiden, and thank you for the trust you placed in me from day one. The way you allowed me to take on a leading role in GEIGER activities enabled me to grow as a researcher and as a person, and I honestly cannot think of many supervisors who would be as daring. Matthieu, you were always a cheerful and creative voice during our meetings and lunches. It is safe to say that the second half of this dissertation would have looked very different if you had not suggested looking into learning analytics and educational measurement for a change. It is even safer to say that I would not have my current job at Cito without your relentless enthusiasm and your support for me when looking for my next step. Thank you both for making these 4.5 years such a smooth ride.

That ride started in Utrecht in 2020, in the middle of the COVID pandemic. Jelmer Koorn, Ellen Deelen, Anna Wegmann, and Jan Posthoorn, thanks for helping me get settled during these strange times. Jan deserves a special mention for also having guided me through my MSc thesis at ORTEC, in a time when programming languages still seemed scarier to me than publication reviews.

In October 2021 I moved to Leiden University, where Bram van Dijk and Tom Kouwenhoven were so kind to welcome me. We organised the monthly LIACS PhD seminar together during my first year, which really helped me to get settled and get to know our amazing colleagues at LIACS. I want to thank Alexandra Blank for always being there to energise the PhD community at LIACS. You inspired me to organise the LIACS PhD/postdoc weekend, first with Nathan Schiele, then with Matthias Müller-Brockhausen. Nathan and Matthias, you have been an amazing asset to LIACS over the years, not in the least through your activism in fighting for the rights of Teaching PhDs. From September 2022 onwards, I spent two years as a representative for PhDoc in Leiden's University Council. Thank you Lis Kerr and Niko Kontovas for all the work you did and for granting me this opportunity, and good luck to Tahmina Fariaby and Marie Kolbenstetter in the coming years. There are far too many people that I met during my time in the council to thank them all, but thank you to everyone who is going above and beyond to make Leiden University an inspiring home for students and staff. I do want to mention a few people specifically. Janneke Vader and Anita Romijn, thank you for making Leiden a better place for PhDs and postdocs. Pauline Vincenten and Robert-Jan van Ette, thank you for all the work you are doing for our university. Leiden is lucky to have you.

Thank you to all those who have been a part of Marco's TDS Lab over the years, who have welcomed me in Utrecht and later made me feel at home in Leiden. Armel Lefebvre, Chaïm van Toledo, Emil Rijcken, Friso van Dijk, Hielke Muizelaar, Jim Achterberg, Marcel Haas, Noha Tawfik, Pablo Mosteiro Romero, Samar Samir, whether you know it or not, you have all inspired me in your own way.

Bilge Yigit Ozkan, thank you for your support during my first year in Utrecht. You helped me discover what it means to do research. Alireza Shojaifar, thank you for being a great collaborator and for granting me the honour to be a paranymph at your defence. Injy Sarhan, thank you for being a wonderful friend and colleague, and for all the work you did in the GEIGER project, making me look a lot smarter and productive than I really am. I wish you all the best in life, you deserve it.

Maarten Hamming and Bram van Dijk, thank you for supporting me as paranymphs on my final day in Leiden. You seem a fitting duo, with Bram being the longest-standing colleague and friend from my time in Leiden, and Maarten being the longest-standing friend from my time in Groningen.

Finally, a massive thank you to the people closest to me, who were so kind to put in the effort to understand what I was doing, even when I did not always understand it myself. Mom, dad, Thomas, and Ties, thank you for being who you are and for making me who I am. Veerle, I could not have done this without you, and would not have wanted to either. Everything just seems so much easier when I am with you.