

**Evaluation of research and professional activity
of research-oriented institutes of the Czech Academy of
Sciences for the period 2015–2019**

Final Report

Name of the Institute: Institute of Psychology of the CAS, v. v. i.

Evaluated team and its leader:

1. Institute of Psychology (Tomáš Urbánek)

Part A: Evaluation of the institute

Strengths:

- A differentiated research profile, both in terms of basic research (perception, cognitive psychology, psycholinguistics, developmental psychology), methodology (quantitative, qualitative, longitudinal studies, experimental), and application possibilities (development, school psychology, social psychology and intergroup relations).
- An organized team with a strong team spirit despite being located in two different cities (Prague and Brno).
- A great visible progress in terms of publication record and high productivity. Motivation to publish in high quality refereed journals and to enter into international collaboration.

Weaknesses:

- Compared to the strongest institutes (e.g., Economics), little presence of researchers from abroad (e.g., post docs, international students).
- Small portion of international funding sources, they rely mostly on national grant competitions.
- Elements of academic inbreeding
- Disperse and unprioritized research directions from space to children

Opportunities:

- A very detailed and matter of fact analysis of own strengths and weaknesses. The Institute has prepared a strategy for the incoming five years that on one hand seem very realistic, on the other - takes into account the real strengths and challenges of the Institute.
- The institute has increased the intra-institutional collaboration, as they created working groups labs, which include members from different departments. The department structure was kept and fulfils mostly an administrative role. The report of activities mentions 12 scientific working groups whose research tackles an impressive amount of diverse topics. Given the size of the institute, these working units seem to be relatively small sub-divisions, thus the institute may benefit from continuing the efforts to increase collaborations between members, and support synergistic efforts to tackle big research questions from different angles.
- The institute's success with funding from Horizon 2020, and specifically MSCA, shows that the institute has a potential to seek competitive international funding, and may benefit from strategic efforts to support the members in applying for Horizon Europe funding.
- The institute could benefit from on one hand, strengthening the internal collaboration, and on the other hand, increasing the cooperation with researchers from within and beyond their national and international network, e.g., by organising intra-institutional scientific seminars, and invited lectures.

Threats:

- A lack of sufficient administrative support and project management, which may hinder attempts to apply for competitive international grants.
- A relatively small inflow of early-career researchers from different (international) institutions (e.g., post-docs), which would bring new, exciting, research ideas and directions.

Main criterion: 1. Quality of results (H1.1-H1.5)

H1.1	Quality of selected outputs of Phase I
	<p>Altogether 51 papers were submitted for evaluation in the Phase I out of the overall number of 179 outputs. The majority of the submitted outputs are papers published in refereed journals that are listed on the JCR list (WoS). The only exception is a chapter in the highly renowned The Sage Handbook of Qualitative Research in Psychology and a textbook (in Czech) on language development. There are of course good reasons why these two have been included. Of the selected outputs 5 were published in the journals from the highest decile, 11 in the first quartile, 13 in Q2, 8 in Q3, and 10 in Q4 journals. Taking into account all outputs, 7 were published in the first decile, 17 in Q1, 24 in Q2, 36 in Q3, and 70 in Q4. The large number of the Q4 publications is due mostly to publications in the <i>Ceskoslovenska Psychologie</i>, a flag journal of the Czech Academy of Science, one of the oldest Czech psychological journals. About one third of all outputs come from this journal. Although it may sound as the easy way to increase one's publication record, it is necessary to understand that publications in <i>Ceskoslovenska Psychologie</i> are also meant for the local audience, as well as practicing psychologists.</p> <p>Members of the Institute of Psychology publish in a highly diverse array of journals, of which many represent the top tiers journals in the discipline: social psychology (e.g., <i>Group Processes and Intergroup Relations</i>, <i>Journal of Personality and Social Psychology</i>), personality psychology (<i>Journal of Personality</i>, <i>European Journal of Personality</i>), developmental psychology (<i>Developmental Psychology</i>, <i>Journal of Experimental Child Psychology</i>, <i>British Journal of Educational Psychology</i>), cognition (<i>Attention, Perception & Psychophysics</i>), psycholinguistics and language acquisition (<i>First Language</i>, <i>Journal of Speech, Language and Hearing</i>), methods (<i>Behaviour Research Methods</i>) etc.</p> <p>In the Phase I of the Evaluation, the output of the institute was evaluated as high-quality. A clear majority (44/51) of the evaluated outputs were classified as belonging to quality groups 2 (internationally excellent) and 3 (recognized internationally). Approximately half of the outputs belonged to category 3, showing an international recognition of the outputs. A small portion (4/51) of outputs was classified as the highest, world-leading, quality.</p>
H1.2	Contribution of workers on the outputs reached
	<p>Of the 51 outputs selected for evaluation in Phase I, in 67 percent of the outputs, members of the Institute were either their first authors or their only authors. It should also be emphasized that almost all researchers forming the two teams (Brno and Prague divisions) were represented as authors and co-authors of the outputs selected for the review in the Phase I (the highest number of the outputs presented by one author was 8, the lowest was 1 (the mean about 3 outputs per researcher). This points to a very even contribution of all members of the Institute. A similar analysis done for all outputs of the team, showed that there was no member who would not contribute with at least several outcomes (half of the team members contributed over 20 outputs). The two divisions (Prague and Brno) presented an equal number of contributions for the Phase I, respectively 24 and 23, with four contributions authored by researchers from both divisions. The small number of joint publications seems to be due to differences in research interests of the two divisions (developmental, personality and social psychology in Brno, and cognitive and language psychology in Prague). Nevertheless, more cooperation between the two divisions is recommended.</p> <p>Over 60 percent of the contributions selected for the Phase I were financed from the Czech sources (mostly by the Czech Science Foundation, some by the Czech Academy of Sciences grants). Fourteen outputs selected for evaluation in Phase I were products of international collaboration, either in the form of a close collaboration with particular researchers (University of Helsinki, University of Leicester, University of Vienna/Linz; Paris</p>

<p>Descartes University, ERCOMER - the Netherlands) or in the form of work on large sets of cross-cultural data collected in different countries and compared with the Czech data (e.g., Estonian, Russian, US, China, Germany, Cameroon and others).</p>	
H1.3	Quality of all outputs and results
<p>One of the measures of the quality of an output is the publication outlet. As mentioned above, members of the Institute of Psychology publish in high quality journals, of which a number is listed as a top tier in their respective disciplines. The respective figures were listed in H1.1.</p> <p>Another measure of the quality is the impact and recognition of publications in terms of number of citations. While it may be too early to assess the impact of the publications from 2015–2019 on the field, according to the bibliometric parameters provided by CAS, the majority of those publications, which could be evaluated on this criterion, fall into 3+4 quartile. Therefore, although the number of citations has significantly increased compared to previous evaluation periods, there seems to be a room for further increasing the impact, and world-wide recognition.</p>	
H1.4	The most valuable discoveries and findings in the fields, their importance for the field
<p>Members of the Institute were involved in several research programs. We mention those that seem to warrant particular attention.</p> <p>First and foremost, the great ongoing longitudinal research of the life-span development has been conducted in Brno since 1961, that is for 60 years. This means that the available data probably cover not only the original participants, but also their children, and grandchildren. Longitudinal methodology allows to draw causal inferences despite the correlational design. Hence, in this project it was possible to establish personality and temperamental factors diagnosed in early childhood that are probable causes of the future success in adult life.</p> <p>Within Brno laboratory there is also an active team combining research in personality and social psychology, with particular emphasis on the intergroup relations, particularly relations with ethnic minorities. The findings support the positive role of the intergroup contact and of the role of linguistic factors in triggering stereotypes (nouns vs. adjectives).</p> <p>In the Prague division, of particular value seem two projects that deal with the quality of life among adolescents and in the sector of higher education. One is the research on bullying in schools and the role of the peer norms and the social status in a classroom that motivates an adolescent to defend others against bullying. Particularly interesting is a series of studies, carried out jointly by the two divisions of the Institute, that deal with predictors of well-being among academic staff. Given the pressure on publication efficiency and the rat race climate present at the majority of universities and in academia, it is particularly intriguing what factors help researchers preserve their intrinsic motivation and satisfaction with work. The findings point first of all to the role of the work-life balance as the main predictor of the quality of life. An interesting finding is the relatively low rate of the burnout which the authors call the „satisfaction paradox“. Drawing on job demands–resources theory, they suggest that the relatively high level of satisfaction is due to (still) high levels of key job resources that support the intrinsic motivation of academics despite an environment that can be considered suboptimal in many aspects.</p> <p>Another very unique and intriguing project consists of the two flight simulations (Mars and Sirius), of different duration (over 500 days and 100 days), products of international cooperation, investigated with respect to the participants' well being, personal growth and interpersonal relations. Valuable research comes from the experimental psychology group that studies space perception, perception of scenes and processes of attention in dynamic settings. One of the findings points to the limits of human attention in a dynamic attention task. This may have serious implications for decision making in real life-situations.</p>	

<p>Research conducted by the developmental psycholinguistics team is also of particular interest, as it combines various methods to provide unique findings about the acquisition of Czech language.</p> <p>An interesting feature of research done within the Institute of Psychology is a combination of diverse methodologies. Along with the sophisticated multivariate statistics, longitudinal cross-lag methods, and experimental studies, there is also a team that specializes in qualitative methodology, including narrative studies and personal construct theory. The latter deserves particular attention for its creative combination of the theory (e.g., dialogical self) and the constructivist methodology.</p>	
H1.5	Contribution of the participation of the authors in large collaborations
<p>Members of the Institute of Psychology have a broad network of international collaboration. This includes both formal and informal forms of collaborations. Apart from the international co-workers of the papers submitted for evaluation in the Phase I (mentioned in H1.2), the list of foreign collaborators in years 2015-2019 includes 23 researchers coming from various European and non-European countries (e.g. the Netherlands, Italy, Great Britain, Ireland, Sweden, Switzerland, Finland, Austria, France, Australia). They also participated in a number of international projects in different themes (research on aging, happiness, entitlement attitudes, personality traits, social mindfulness etc.).</p>	

Main criterion: 2. Societal relevance (H2.1-H2.5)

H2.1	Societal relevance of outputs and results pursuant to CAS and institute mission
<p>The Institute mission has been defined as „to conduct scientific research in psychology, to promote the use of its results and to provide the research infrastructure”. The overview of the Institute activity shows that this mission was fulfilled to a large extent. There was an impressive increase in the number of highly ranked publications in the evaluated period 2015-2019 and international collaborations and this number further grows. An overview of the reception of the results by the academic audience, as judged by the number of citations listed in the Google Scholar base, shows that 10 members of the Institute had a citation score over 1000, and only a few of very young researchers had a score below 100. Moreover, the research carried out in the Institute has a clear societal and not only academic relevance. The issues of reactions to bullying, predictors of life satisfaction in organizational contexts, attitudes towards minorities and means of resolving interethnic conflicts – all those topics have a clear societal relevance.</p>	
H2.2	System functionality for knowledge transfer into practise, its usefulness for society. The impact of the team’s activity on proper practice in society in the area of social sciences and humanities
<p>As highlighted above (see H1.4 and H2.1), research conducted at the institute has a clear societal impact and potential to be transferred into practice. The institute has an important position in the Czech professional psychological community, and the members are involved in national scientific councils, R&D council bodies etc.</p>	
H2.3	Relation to practice
<p>Research carried out in the Institute involves psychodiagnostic testing, norming studies, and development of new questionnaire methods. These tools may be used by other researchers and subject to technology transfer. Apart from the contribution with new measurement instruments, the relation to psychological practice is also through the flag</p>	

journal of the Institute of Psychology, <i>Ceskoslovenska Psychologie</i> , which not only is listed on the JCR list but also can serve practitioners with the publications published in Czech.	
H2.4	Participation in AV21 strategy
In 2015-2019 the Institute of Psychology participated in a research program Strategy AV21 initiative “Forms and Functions of Communication” and deals with topics such as the “Roles of Communication and Social Interaction in Personality Development” and “Cognition, Communication, Mind and Brain”. Within the program "Cognition, communication, mind, brain", the funds were used to organize the yearly Winter School of Cognitive Psychology and the autumn mini - conference.	
H2.5	Cooperation with regions of the Czech Republic
Members of the Institute declare that they do not cooperate with other regions of the Czech Republic.	

Further criterion: 1. Position in international and national context (D1.1-D1.3)

D1.1	Comparison of the team with similar international and national institutes
Possible comparisons with similar international institutes are for example with psychology institutes in other Central-Eastern European countries, for example Poland. One of evaluators involved in evaluation of the Institute of Psychology of CAV has a good overview of the Polish institutes and departments of psychology at the universities and in the Academy of Sciences. Psychology in Poland is the most advanced discipline within social sciences with respect to internalization and publications in international refereed journals. The Institute of Psychology of CAV is no different from the good and very good Polish psychology institutes, and were it evaluated according to the Polish criteria it would be assigned category A (very good one). In comparison to the leading European institutes or the best performing institutes of CAS, however, the Institute seems to lack sufficient international recognition, and leading position in the respective fields of research. Nevertheless, they seem to be aware of their own limitations, they strive to overcome this, and there seem to be emerging leaders with a high international recognition (e.g., Brno Lab of Intergroup Processes).	
D1.2	Scope and quality of international and national cooperation and the role of the team in such cooperation; engagement in broad international cooperation
<p>The institute is active in international collaborations, through participation in the research projects (~15 international projects). The institute is part of several large formal collaborative projects, such as a project funded by National Science Foundation, or a broad collaboration within COST action CA15101. One member of the institute was awarded an MSCA individual fellowship, and two researchers were recipients of Fulbright fellowships. Currently, Brno Lab of Intergroup Processes has joined the European Training Network (ETN) “G-VERSITY – Achieving Gender Diversity” and they will train an incoming researcher. Besides these formal collaborations, the institute lists a large number of informal international collaborations.</p> <p>The researchers participate as co-investigators in national collaborative projects funded by TACR and GACR. Particularly strong is the collaboration with universities (Masaryk University and Charles University).</p>	

D1.3	Participation of the workers in scientific community activities (organizing of conferences and workshops, invited lectures, awards)
<p>The institute was the main organizer for one international meeting, and the members are involved in organizing a large International Congress of Psychology. The members are also actively participating in organizing annual international winter and summer schools (Winter School of Cognitive Psychology and Summer School of Linguistics).</p>	

Further criterion: 2. Vitality, sustainability and strategy (D2.1-D2.9)

D2.1	Direction in line with the perspective of the planned research directions
<p>The main recommendations from the previous evaluation were to: 1) strengthen cooperation within the institute, both between individual staff and research teams or departments evaluated at the time, 2) to consider setting up an international advisory board, and 3) to seek new ways to fund research.</p>	
D2.2	Assessment of the previous research objectives and their achievement
<p>The institute has fulfilled their research objectives. They have increased their visibility in the international research context, and significantly expanded international collaborations. The departments have continued in the previously defined research objectives, but some teams also report bringing in new relevant research perspectives, such as intergroup relations in post-conflict societies, or early and perinatal speech perception.</p>	
D2.3	Assessment of implementation of recommendations from past evaluation
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) The institute has increased the intra-institutional collaboration, as they created working groups labs, which include members from different departments. The department structure was kept and fulfils mostly an administrative role. There are currently 12 scientific working groups/teams. 2) The reports of activities state that "...thanks to relatively extensive international cooperation, we in fact do have an informal international advisory body. These discussions and reflections are still ongoing, as we are currently unsure whether the establishment of a formal scientific advisory board would bring any visible and unequivocal benefit." The benefit of the international advisory board may be in helping to establish a coordinated research strategy for different research teams. 3) The third recommendation was to diversify ways of funding research. The institute was successful in receiving funding from the Technology Agency of the Czech Republic (TACR) with applied research projects. The institute had success with funding from Horizon 2020, and specifically MSCA (an individual fellowship and a participation in the European Training Network). 	
D2.4	Success in receiving grants
<p>The institute has a high success rate in receiving external funding from national sources. In the Czech Science Foundation competition, their success rate is 61 % in comparison to the base rate of 20–25 %. They also achieved success with applied research projects (TACR).</p>	
D2.5	Adequacy of instrumental equipment
<p>The institute seems to be well-equipped. The Prague division recently moved to new premises, which provides a larger space for their research activities. The institute has a joint research unit with Faculty of Arts at Charles University, in which they share the technical equipment (eye-tracking, EEG, 'Baby Lab'). Part of their experimental research is</p>	

conducted in collaboration with other research institutions (e.g. fMRI facility at Masaryk University Brno).	
D2.6	Effectiveness of management
The institute's management structure seems to be horizontal, rather than vertical. Researchers work in relatively small teams.	
D2.7	Assessment of professional structure, development strategy and the strategy of keeping best scientists, age structure, career and qualification growth
The institute has a promising age structure (1/3 of the institute members are under the age of 40; ~1/4 of the members is in the 40–45 category), with majority of members (17) in qualification level V5 (researcher) and 13 members in lower qualification levels (V1–V4, mostly early career researchers. Many members work at the institute part-time, with other appointments at the universities. The institute has a transparent HR policy, and the evaluation is based mostly on publication performance. The institute seems to experience difficulties with hiring new promising (and international) talents, but they strive to improve this situation (e.g., by motivating promising researchers to apply for post-doctoral fellowships in the CAS program Support for Perspective Human Resources). The institute's leadership supports career growth by supporting international mobility and nominating early career researchers for awards (e.g., Otto Wichterle Prize).	
D2.8	Creating work-life balance conditions, assessment of approach towards possible gender issues
The institute emphasizes its friendly, collegial atmosphere. They are very well aware of work-life balance issues in academia (as some of the members actively research these topics), and seem to be motivated to create favorable conditions for their employees with flexible working hours and home office possibilities. Researchers highlighted a very friendly approach to parent-researchers. The majority of employees (as listed on the institute website) are female.	
D2.9	Relation of the team with regard to the integration, development and sustainability of the research centre funded by the National Programme of Sustainability II.
Not applicable.	

Further criterion: 3. Cooperation with universities and participation in education (D3.1-D3.6)

D3.1	Scope of cooperation with universities on national and international level
IPS has a number of both formal and informal agreements with universities, mostly at the international level, somewhat less on the national level. The cooperation is within networks financed by EU (COST action with University of Manchester and Tübingen), EU funded fellowships (Marie Curie Fellowship), and in the form of participation in numerous international projects (15 projects within the last five years). This participation takes different forms, in some cases it consists simply in collecting national data for cross-cultural comparisons (e.g. the two Polish projects, one on Happiness, the other on Entitlement), but in a number of other projects the scholars from IP had the leading role. In both cases, the scope of cooperation seems significant. Moreover, the presence of the Czech data in cross-cultural publications plays an important role – it makes data from the Czech Republic visible and available to a large international audience.	

D3.2	Effectiveness of joint research centres
<p>The main joint research center has been established between the Laboratory of Behavioral and Linguistic Studies of IP (Prague division) and the Faculty of Arts, Charles University. The research center shares technical equipment and lab space, in addition the University provides access to students. The cooperation is effective as seen in a number of joint publications. Joint activities with other subjects also include organization of an annual Winter school of Cognitive Psychology, and the Summer School of Linguistics.</p>	
D3.3	Success rate in supervision of PhD students
<p>The Institute has an agreement on the joint education of doctoral students in the field of psychology with the Faculty of Arts, Charles University and the Faculty of Social Sciences, Masaryk University. Within this agreement during the last 5 years there were defended 29 theses (no. of supervisors 7, no. of consultants 8). This appears to be an impressive number, considering that the Institute has a modest staff (little bit over 20 researchers), and probably not all Institute members have rights to supervise doctoral students. Under the circumstances, it seems somewhat surprising that the strategy plan of the IP is “that the core staff can supervise and lead more students” (p.31). This point needs clarification.</p>	
D3.4	Participation of PhD students in the outputs
<p>PhD students were the first-authors (e.g., Zingora & Graf, 2019; Rupař & Graf, 2019) or co-authors (e.g., Smolík & Bláhová, 2019) on a number of outputs.</p>	
D3.5	Participation of the team in master or bachelor studies
<p>Even more impressive is the number of defended Bachelor and Master theses (respectively, 120 and 220). When taking into account that the Institute members seem to have quite a high teaching load at both universities (the overall number of courses taught at the Bachelor level was 173, at Master level 149, and at the Doctoral level 12 courses) then it is obvious that members of the IP have heavy teaching obligations, not different from the regular teaching staff at the universities.</p>	
D3.6	Assessment of cooperation intensity with universities in the form of teaching
<p>See comment to the previous point (D3.5). The above shows there are long lasting personal connections in the form of being employed in two institutions simultaneously.</p>	

Further criterion: 4. Outreach activities (D4.1-D4.3)

D4.1	Sufficiency of media strategy and activities in the area of research popularisation
<p>The IP is active in communicating science to a larger public. This is done through different channels, such as participation in the Week of Science and Technology within the science festival in the Czech Republic, in the Science Fair – the event that popularizes science in the Czech Republic, and delivering lectures during the Week of the Brain, a scientific event that popularizes the new discoveries in the field of neuroscience and brain research. IP also uses media channels for science popularization, such as the Institute’s Facebook and presence in mass media, gives popular lectures, workshops and interviews, and participated in TV movies devoted to the areas of research developed within IP (Aging, and Language development). By far the most interesting contribution is the Illusorium exhibition, an event meant to demonstrate principles of human visual perception through</p>	

visual illusions. The exhibition was extremely popular and it was shown in several cities in the Czech Republic.	
D4.2	Publishing activities and its quality
<p>During the last 5 years, the IP placed particular emphasis on the quality of their publications, as measured first of all through the number of publications in the internationally acknowledged refereed journals. Respective statistics show a systematic progress in this respect during successive evaluation periods (see comments in H1.1). Apart from journal publications, members of the IP also published books and book chapters, both in Czech and English. Altogether 9 monographs and over 40 book chapters were published in the evaluated period. Some of the latter publications, such as <i>Psychology of School Bullying</i> published in 2016 is a guide to the issue of bullying in schools, and offers examples and methods of prevention. Particular attention should perhaps be also given to the journal <i>Ceskoslovenska Psychologie</i>, published by the Institute of Psychology, one of the oldest in the Czech Republic. It is the first Czech psychological journal that has been indexed in Web of Science (with current IF = 0.478), it publishes articles in three languages, English, Czech and Slovak, and from the issue 1/2021 it is published in the open access format. With its emphasis on the publications' ethics (the journal endorses Codes of Conduct, such as COPE) and free availability through open access, the journal stands a good chance to become a form that can attract international, and not only local researchers.</p>	
D4.3	Participation in professional organisations in the area of research and development
<p>Employees of the IP are members of a number of scientific councils, R&D council bodies, and research grants panels within the Czech Republic. One IP member (Filip Smolík) is the chairman of the Czech-Moravian Psychological Society. These are all national organizations and boards. We have no information on the participation of the IP staff members in international organizations.</p>	

Other comments of the commission:

Part B: Evaluation of teams

The Institute of Psychology presents itself as a single team. This seems appropriate because of the coherence of the discipline and the methodology. All relevant comments are above.

Strengths:

See Institutional report

Weaknesses:

See Institutional report

Opportunities:

See Institutional report

Threats:

See Institutional report

Main criterion: 1. Quality of results (H1.1-H1.5)

H1.1	Quality of selected outputs of Phase I
See institutional report	
H1.2	Contribution of workers on the outputs reached
See institutional report	
H1.3	Quality of all outputs and results
See institutional report	
H1.4	The most valuable discoveries and findings in the fields, their importance for the field
See institutional report	
H1.5	Contribution of the participation of the authors in large collaborations
See institutional report	

Main criterion: 2. Societal relevance (H2.1-H2.5)

H2.1	Societal relevance of outputs and results pursuant to CAS and institute mission
See institutional report	

H2.2	System functionality for knowledge transfer into practise, its usefulness for society. The impact of the team´s activity on proper practice in society in the area of social sciences and humanities
See institutional report	
H2.3	Relation to practice
See institutional report	
H2.4	Participation in AV21 strategy
See institutional report	
H2.5	Cooperation with regions of the Czech Republic
See institutional report	

Further criterion: 1. Position in international and national context (D1.1-D1.3)

D1.1	Comparison of the team with similar international and national institutes
See institutional report	
D1.2	Scope and quality of international and national cooperation and the role of the team in such cooperation; engagement in broad international cooperation
See institutional report	
D1.3	Participation of the workers in scientific community activities (organizing of conferences and workshops, invited lectures, awards)
See institutional report	

Further criterion: 2. Vitality, sustainability and strategy (D2.1-D2.9)

D2.1	Direction in line with the perspective of the planned research directions
See institutional report	
D2.2	Assessment of the previous research objectives and their achievement
See institutional report	
D2.3	Assessment of implementation of recommendations from past evaluation
See institutional report	
D2.4	Success in receiving grants
See institutional report	
D2.5	Adequacy of instrumental equipment
See institutional report	
D2.6	Effectiveness of management

See institutional report	
D2.7	Assessment of professional structure, development strategy and the strategy of keeping best scientists, age structure, career and qualification growth
See institutional report	
D2.8	Creating work-life balance conditions, assessment of approach towards possible gender issues
See institutional report	
D2.9	Relation of the team with regard to the integration, development and sustainability of the research centre funded by the National Programme of Sustainability II.
See institutional report	

Further criterion: 3. Cooperation with universities and participation in education (D3.1-D3.6)

D3.1	Scope of cooperation with universities on national and international level
See institutional report	
D3.2	Effectiveness of joint research centres
See institutional report	
D3.3	Success rate in supervision of PhD students
See institutional report	
D3.4	Participation of PhD students in the outputs
See institutional report	
D3.5	Participation of the team in master or bachelor studies
See institutional report	
D3.6	Assessment of cooperation intensity with universities in the form of teaching
See institutional report	

Further criterion: 4. Outreach activities (D4.1-D4.3)

D4.1	Sufficiency of media strategy and activities in the area of research popularisation
See institutional report	
D4.2	Publishing activities and its quality

See institutional report	
D4.3	Participation in professional organisations in the area of research and development
See institutional report	

Other comments of the commission:

Final report was elaborated by:

Commission 9 - Social sciences

Evaluated teams No.: 1

Commission Chair: Kristian Csach

Commission Deputy Chair: Artem Prokhorov

Commission Members:

Bedanna Bapuly
Thomas Cooley
Lydia Coudroy De Lille
Eleanore Kofman
György Lengyel
Maria Lewicka
Anna Marzecová
Patrick O´Farrell
Jiri Priban
Assaf Razin
Stein Ringen
Louis-André Vallet