



Universiteit
Leiden
The Netherlands

Visible: discovering the impact of research conducted by universities of applied sciences

Coombs, S.K.

Citation

Coombs, S. K. (2025, February 21). *Visible: discovering the impact of research conducted by universities of applied sciences*. Retrieved from <https://hdl.handle.net/1887/4195763>

Version: Publisher's Version

License: [Licence agreement concerning inclusion of doctoral thesis in the Institutional Repository of the University of Leiden](#)

Downloaded from: <https://hdl.handle.net/1887/4195763>

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

Visible:
Discovering the Impact of Research Conducted by
Universities of Applied Sciences

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
ter verdedigen op vrijdag 21 februari 2025

klokke 13:00 uur

door

Sarah Katherine Coombs

geboren te Calgary, Alberta, Canada

In 1978

Promotor:

Prof.dr. P. F. Wouters

Co-promotor:

Dr. I. Meijer

Promotiecommissie:

Prof dr L. R. Waltman (Voorzitter/Wetenschappelijk Directeur Instituut CWTS)

Prof.dr. L. K. Hessels

Prof.dr. A. A. Nemeth (Saxion Hogeschool)

Prof.dr. N. Vermeulen (University of Edinburgh)

Prof.dr. D. D. Feringa (Fontys)

Saxion Hogeschool financially enabled the realization of this dissertation

Visible



DISCOVERING THE IMPACT OF
RESEARCH CONDUCTED BY
UNIVERSITIES OF APPLIED SCIENCES

SARAH K. COOMBS

ABSTRACT



This dissertation aims to address the following questions:

- What are the requirements for evaluating the research impact created by Dutch Universities of Applied Sciences' (UASs) research?
- How can these requirements be applied within the context of the goals of Dutch UASs?

It sets out to discover the requirements for evaluating the research impact made by UAS research and explore how these can be implemented in real-life within the current policy landscape. Answering these questions has resulted in two distinct yet interlinked segments as we moved from theory to practice. Firstly, we sought to delineate the rules governing the evaluation of UAS research impact. Secondly, we analysed the current practices within the contextual playing field in which Dutch UASs find themselves and experimented with applying the requirements to the impact evaluation process of Dutch UAS research. Our results culminate in recommendations for conducting UAS research impact evaluation as well as discussing how our conclusions can be applied by researchers, administrators and policy-makers in practice.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Abstract	ii
List of Figures	v
List of Tables	v

CHAPTER 1

Introduction	1
Exploring the Playing Field	1
Evaluating Research Impact	8
The Undiscovered Terrain of UAS Research Evaluation	12
This Dissertation on UAS Research Impact Evaluation	13

CHAPTER 2

Towards Evaluating the Research Impact made by Universities of Applied Sciences	15
Abstract	15
Introduction	16
Theoretical Requirements for Evaluating the Research Impact of UAS Research	18
Discussion	25
Conclusion	26

CHAPTER 3

Exploring Research Groups at Universities of Applied Sciences and the Implications for Research Impact Evaluation	27
Abstract	27
Introduction	28
Materials and Methods	32
Discussion	39
Conclusion	41

CHAPTER 4

Evaluating the Research Impact of Dutch Universities of Applied Science: An Examination of Their Themes; Their Output; and Desired Impacts	43
Abstract	43
Introduction	44
Methods	47
Results	53
Discussion	55
Conclusion	58

CHAPTER 5

Using Contribution Mapping to Evaluate the Research Impact of Universities of Applied Sciences	60
Abstract	60
Introduction	61
Theoretical Framework	61
Method	64
Results	67
Discussion	70
 CHAPTER 6	
Conclusion	75
An Overview of the Study and its Conclusions	76
Applying the Conclusions	80
Scientific Relevance	85
Societal Relevance	86
Limitations	87
Directions for Future Research	88
 Appendix A.....	90
Bibliography.....	97
English Summary	107
Samenvatting.....	110
Acknowledgements	111
Curriculum Vitae.....	112

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure 1.1: Knowledge Triangle of Dutch UASs (Franken et al. 2018, 11)	7
Figure 3.1: Knowledge Triangle of Dutch UASs (Franken et al. 2018, 11)	30
Figure 3.2: How Many Weekly Hours Are Contractually Allocated for Research Related Tasks	36
Figure 3.3: How Many Weekly Hours Do You Realistically Spend on Research Related Tasks.....	36
Figure 3.4: Are You a Lector, Associate Lector or Researcher?.....	37
Figure 3.5: How Do You Perceive Yourself According to Your Skills and Expectations of You?	37
Figure 3.6: Age.....	38
Figure 4.1: Overview of Respondents and Theme Choices.....	48
Figure 4.2: Overview of Questionnaire Results Concerning Impact	49
Figure 4.3: Overview of Questionnaire Results Concerning Types of Output.....	49
Figure 4.4: Overview of Workshop Results on Outputs	51
Figure 4.5: Overview of Workshop Results on Desired Types of Impact and the Most Important Impact	52
Figure 5.1: Diagram of Contribution Mapping (Kok and Schuit 2012, 5)	65
Figure 5.2: Anonymized Visualization of GoNoord! Contribution Mapping.....	68

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1.1: Matrix of Optional BKO Indicators as Found in the BKO Itself (NAUAS 2022, 21-22)	6
Table 2.1: Overview of the Suitability of Established Frameworks.....	22
Table 3.1: Demographic Overview.....	34
Table 3.2: Factor Loadings: Content (1); and Connectivity (2).....	35
Table 3.3: Number of Respondents to Questions of Contractual/Realistic Research Hours Per Hourly Category and Role	35
Table 4.1: Netherlands Association of Universities of Applied Sciences Theme Name and Corresponding Abbreviation Throughout Article	45
Table 4.2: Questions/Respondents	47
Table 4.3: Workshops, Participants and Themes Represented	50
Table 5.1: Results Matrix	67
Table 5.2: Final Results of the Thematic Analysis	70
Table A.1: Philosophical Assumption (Greenhalgh et al. 2016, 3)	90
Table A.2: Types of Research Impact Evaluations and Their Commonly Used Methods/Approaches (Reed et al. 2021, 5)	91
Table A.3: Tools for Research Impact Evaluation (Budtz Pedersen et al. 2020, 9-14).....	95
Table A.4: Tools for Research Evaluation (Guthrie et al. 2013, 9).....	96