

## Main Panel J Overview

### Purpose

1. This was the first time that a Main Panel structure had been used for the RAE. There were 15 Main Panels, each responsible for a number of sub-panels in “cognate disciplines”. Within the two-tiered panel structure of RAE2008, the division of responsibility between Main and Sub Panels was as follows:

2. Main panel J was responsible for:

- providing leadership and guidance to sub-panels on their approach to the assessment process, including approving their criteria for assessment and working methods.
- working with the sub-panels during the assessment period to ensure consistent application across the exercise of the overall quality standards, common assessment procedures, and equal opportunities guidance.
- signing off quality profiles for all submissions to the sub-panels, based upon the work and advice of the sub-panels.
- giving advice as requested by the RAE team and funding bodies on aspects of the assessment process, including requests for additional specialist advice.

3. In signing off the quality profiles assigned to submissions, Main Panel J confirmed that in its view each of its sub-panels had adopted reasonable and consistent subject-specific approaches to the assessment of all forms of research, including basic, applied, practice-based and interdisciplinary research; and that each sub-panel had interpreted the five quality levels across the exercise in a consistent manner.

4. Sub-panels were responsible for:

- producing draft criteria for assessment and working methods for approval by the Main Panel.
- working within the agreed criteria and in collaboration with the Main Panel, to produce draft quality profiles (to be signed off by

the Main Panel) and associated brief feedback for all submissions made to them.

- advising the Main Panel and RAE team on cross-referrals to other sub-panels of submissions or cited research, and on the need for additional specialist advice.

## **Composition**

5. Main panel J was one of the largest Main Panels, covering six sub-panels as follows: Law (38), Politics and International Studies (39), Social Work and Social Policy & Administration (40), Sociology (41), Anthropology (42), Development Studies (43). The Development Studies UOA was a new unit of assessment for 2008.

6. Membership of the Main Panel comprised the six sub-panel chairs, two international members, one user member, and one observer from the ESRC.

## **Working Methods**

7. The working relationship between Main Panel J and its sub-panels was close and collaborative, with each sub-panel developing its criteria for assessment and later its advice on the quality profiles through an iterative process in dialogue with the Main Panel. Main and sub-panel meetings were scheduled to make these discussions possible.

8. Main Panel J employed a number of approaches, including attendance by the Main Panel chair at some sub-panel meetings and electronic-based discussion, to promote ongoing contact between sub-panel chairs and the Main Panel chair between its formal meetings. The sub-panel chairs shared draft statements of criteria and working methods to identify and explore issues of variation and ensure broad consistency of approach. Sub-panels referred matters of principle in their approach to the Main Panel for feedback and discussion during the assessment phase. The sub panel chairs shared examples of approaches to assessing submissions in developing quality profiles of the three elements judged against the quality levels.

9. The Main Panel met 10 times between 2005 and 2008, including one residential meeting. In addition, the chairs of all Main Panels met occasionally to discuss consistency of approach across the exercise as a whole.

## **Evaluation**

### **Strengths**

10. The Main Panel structure was felt to be effective in achieving a broad consistency of approach among the Main Panel J sub-panels. The Main Panel provided a framework for discussion where sub-panel chairs could consider and work through common challenges. The Main Panel meetings were helpful in reaching a consensus on approaches, in ironing out practical difficulties and learning from each other. The Main Panel also provided a support and mutual source of advice to sub-panel chairs. This supportive framework was particularly helpful for sub-panel 43 as a new unit of assessment for 2008.

11. Main panel J was one of the largest Main Panels both in terms of number of sub-panels and number of submissions, and we would recommend that Main Panels should not be any larger than this. The particular combination of cognate disciplines in Main Panel J was helpful in achieving consistency of approach.

### **Areas for consideration**

12. The Main Panel meetings were helpful in achieving consistency of approach and were generally synchronised with sub-panel meetings in a way that would do that most effectively. However, the frequency and timing of meetings of Main Panel chairs could have been better planned. As a result, the process of bringing Main Panel chairs together was less effective than it might have been.

13. The role of the two international members on the Main Panel had not been clearly articulated prior to the assessment process. Having two international members from particular disciplines on a multi-

disciplinary Main Panel meant that their role was necessarily circumscribed. In the event, one of the international members only attended one meeting. The other international member was often useful as a sounding board and for providing a different perspective on issues, but felt under-used and the Main Panel was not able to carve out a meaningful role, other than broad oversight of processes.

14. The workload of the sub-panels within Main Panel J was extremely uneven. Three of the sub-panels had extremely heavy workloads (38, 39, 40), while at least one sub-panel (43), by comparison, had a much lighter workload. The differences in workload were not reflected in general administrative arrangements (particularly meeting time) or in the number of sub-panel members, which meant that the burden on individual members was vastly different within Main Panel J sub-panels. It also meant that the RAE timetables had a significantly different impact on the sub-panels.

### **General observations**

15. Main Panel J sub-panels exceeded their aspirations as far as detailed examination of outputs was concerned. The sub-panels adopted a rigorous approach to their work and succeeded in meeting deadlines, despite the differential burden referred to in Para 14 above.

16. Main Panel J sub-panels were impressed with the vitality of their disciplines and with the expansion of work in some areas. Work of world-leading quality was found across the board and not limited to a small number of institutions, nor to particular areas or types of research or places of publication.

**RAE2008 SUBJECT REVIEW : J43 : DEVELOPMENT STUDIES**

29.10.08

**1.Scope:**

For the RAE2008, Development Studies was described as ‘issue-driven research concerning the analysis of global and local processes of cultural, demographic, economic, environmental, political, technological and social change in low and middle income parts of the world’. The RAE descriptor referred particularly to ‘structures and institutions; the changing relationships between developed and developing countries; and the critical interrogation of theories of these processes and relationships, and of development policy’.

Development Studies has now been actively taught and researched for over 50 years, emerging as colonies became independent, and developing with the expansion of new universities while moving away from a dependence on government and post colonial states. It is now more diversified in terms of stakeholders and a subject of intense public interest nationally and globally. Research reflects this and is continually feeding into under- and post-graduate teaching, into professional training, to a lesser extent into exchanges with, and teaching in, developing countries themselves as well as into advisory and consultancy work.

In the 21<sup>st</sup> century assessment period, development studies has flourished not only inside dedicated departments, in cognate disciplines and thematic departments in the social sciences and humanities but also in branches of development science such as agriculture, engineering, medicine/public health and climate science. In no mean part this is due to the impact of globalisation on research and teaching in cognate disciplines.

While representation to HEFCE in the 1990s resulted in Development Studies being assessed by a sub-panel housed within Geography in RAE2001, further discussions with the Development Studies Association led to its being recognised in 2004 as a separate Unit of Assessment (UoA) for RAE2008. The Development Studies Association currently lists 37 specialist departments, units and centres sited in universities (not all of which, however, receive HEFCE funding). Ten submitted 816 outputs to the new sub-panel. A further 137 outputs from 45 researchers (from nine other UoAs and 14 submissions) were cross-referred-in. Four outputs from one researcher were cross-referred-out. The specialist sub-panel feels that the submissions reflect the state of Development Studies despite the fact that it knew of the existence of much research in development<sup>1</sup> which was not submitted to sub-panel J43. Most large Development Studies university departments did submit their research to this sub-panel and it is to be expected that more centres and units will do so in future.

Research outputs from 220 staff were submitted to RAE2008; 209 staff were category A and 11 category C. A further 58 Category B staff were also mentioned in the submissions. Eighty six per cent of individuals submitted 4 outputs each while the

---

<sup>1</sup> in and across disciplines such as economics, geography, demography, politics and international relations, anthropology and sociology, social policy, law, public health and other ‘development sciences’.

remainder had fewer due to their special circumstances, most being early career researchers (ECRs).

In 2001, 176 category A and B staff were submitted from seven departments, while 60 staff were cross-referred-in from other panels. While a strict comparison with 2001 is not possible because the set of submitting departments has changed substantially, the number of outputs submitted in Development Studies has expanded.

## **2. Procedure:**

The sub-panel for the Development Studies UoA consisted of twelve members whose research expertise spanned the major disciplinary and interdisciplinary sub-fields as well as the major regions of the developing world. Members of the sub-panel also had relevant user-experience. It is important to acknowledge two particular aspects of the sub-panel: it was a new subject sub-panel and half its members were from institutions submitting their research to other UoAs.

Between February 2005 and October 2008 the sub-panel held nine meetings, and their advice and decisions were reviewed and confirmed by main panel J in ten meetings during and bracketing the same period. Panel J meetings provided a forum in which very useful advice on best practice could be exchanged and challenges with the exercise could be discussed.

Prior to the start of the assessment phase of the exercise, the sub-panel drafted specific guidelines for criteria and working methods for the UoA and revised them for publication, after thorough consultation with the professional community, well in advance of the deadline for the submission of material. The sub-panel then calibrated its judgements in a dry-run exercise not involving outputs from RAE2008. As laid out in the Criteria and Working Methods, the sub-panel applied expert peer review. It started by reading all the RAE2008 submissions. It considered the special circumstances of all individuals listed in RA5b and c. While the sub-panel had committed itself to examining in detail 'virtually all of the outputs submitted', in fact every output submitted except for one was then examined in detail by two expert readers and their draft grades considered by the full sub-panel. In addition, cross-referrals-in were assessed by members of the sub-panel and cross-referrals-out were indicated to HEFCE. Next, the sub-panel re-considered all the submissions' quantitative indicators and descriptions of their environment and measures of esteem (RA5a). Two members then took responsibility for each submitting department to lead the holistic and detailed evaluation of environment and esteem undertaken collectively by the sub-panel. The three sub-profiles plus the overall profile for each submission were considered as a whole. Finally the sub-panel drafted, discussed, revised and agreed the reasoned cases and subject overview. All sub-panel members were involved in the recommendations, subject to conflicts of interest, and recommendations were reached by consensus. Panel J discussed and accepted the profiles, reasoned cases and subject overview.

## **3. Sub-disciplinary areas:**

The sub-panel was impressed by the great range of disciplinary, interdisciplinary and multi-disciplinary research submitted. Research in Development Studies is characterised by activity in an increasing range of sub-fields, within some of which there is also a rich diversity of theoretical and paradigmatic approaches. The creation

of many new specialist journals testifies to this vitality. Whether research groups were explicitly mentioned on the coversheet or not, every submission characterised itself in terms of research groups, clusters, themes, centres, areas, issues, dimensions, organising/core concepts, strands, and/or lists of collective projects. These were further presented in individualised ways. The structure of Development Studies research is thus one of complexity and specialist particularity. As Development Studies has been defined as issue-based and interdisciplinary (as well as multidisciplinary), the classifications of sub-fields rarely refer to disciplines or theoretical approaches. Within submissions, it is also common to find individual researchers belonging to more than one group. While enabling the flexibility to develop new research themes, this situation clearly presents organisational and managerial challenges, and the institutional mechanisms by means of which the internal dynamics of groups create the evident synergy, or broadly similar groups relate to one another across universities, were rarely clarified.

#### **4. Areas of strength:**

The sector has seen considerable change over the RAE period.

Maturing sub-fields include poverty, inequality and human and social development; governance and policy; international economics and finance; industrialisation; livelihoods; environment and development (with evidence both of growth and of major international influence in the fields of climate change, water, energy, land use, natural resource management, conservation and the relations between society and nature); science, technology and innovation (including biotech, ICT and infrastructure) and the political economy of (global) development. Research in gender has been extensively mainstreamed. The exploration of research and ideas outside development studies continues to feed creative and innovative ideas inside the UoA, e.g. in this round from international relations, evolutionary and experimental economics, psychology and philosophy.

Emerging fields include identity (notably religion); conflict and security; migration and refugees; the specialist study of children; the Asian drivers of development (notably China); value chains, corporate enterprise and CSR; new problems of urban development - together with new kinds of comparative research stretching the scope of development across scales as well as regions, new applications of methods from developing countries to advanced ones (e.g. participation, and development ethnography) and work focussing on change in advanced countries of relevance to developing ones (e.g. science policy and technology development and regulation in advanced states).

Some of these subfields are widely dispersed throughout the sector, and common to many submissions e.g. poverty, human and social development; livelihoods; governance and politics; markets, enterprise and finance - and increasingly environment (driven by their centrality to teaching in development). Other sub-fields reveal specialisation within the sector e.g. HIV/AIDS and public health; conflict; migration; religion; social learning; science, technology, innovation and development. The sub-panel considered this to be a positive evolution given the relatively small size of most submissions/departments compared with those of many related cognate disciplines.

### **5. Areas less well represented in the UoA:**

The sub-panel received a lower volume of outputs than anticipated (given their key importance to the Millennium Development Goals) in sub-fields such as employment, health, education, demography and nutrition; it is likely that outputs in these sub-fields were submitted elsewhere. However there was no lack of quality in outputs from these sub-fields that were submitted to J43. Research on participation, civil society and NGOs was less prevalent than had been anticipated. While some histories of ideas reflected on the uniquely distinctive capacity of Development Studies to require the linking of global issues to local processes, relatively little research submitted reflected upon development studies as a post-colonial project or called for its redefinition as international development or development science. Relatively little research problematised the policy process.

In terms of geographical focus, the major continental and sub-continental regions of the developing world were the subject of extensive research between 2001-8. Research on the former USSR and new kinds of regional aggregations and comparative research (e.g. on the BRICS) is strengthening, while that on MENA, South-East and East Asia was relatively under-represented.

The period 2001-8 has seen the consolidation of mixed methods. It has also been marked by novel explorations of measurement, new dimensions of analysis and classification, increased rigour and formalisation of technique in qualitative research. The sub-panel noted, however, the regrettable omission of discussion of research methods and methodology in some journal publications.

The distribution of outputs in RAE2008 inevitably reflect research activities over the period since 2001 and it is to be expected that many of the emerging and new sub-fields of research will soon start to bear fruit in terms of published outputs.

### **6. Outputs:**

To the extent that RAE2001 and 2008 can be compared, the UoA has witnessed a considerable improvement in the quality of research.<sup>2</sup> In RAE2008, the sub-panel found 13 % of outputs to be of world leading quality (4\*) while a further 29 % were of international excellence (3\*). Every submission without exception had outputs of world class and internationally excellent quality. Thirty five per cent of staff submitted had at least one output of world leading quality (4\*) and 71 percent had at least one of 3\*.

Just as sub-fields and eclectic approaches have proliferated so have specialist journals. Outputs of excellent quality were to be found throughout the range of publication outlets including those in developing countries. While a significant proportion of research in the economics of development is disciplinary, much of the other scholarship assessed by the sub-panel is interdisciplinary, not only within the social sciences but also between social and natural sciences including psychology, environmental sciences and innovation / technology studies. This mix of disciplinarity and inter-disciplinarity, of creative encounters between the frontiers of disciplines, the capacity to examine the relationships between the local and the specific on the one

---

<sup>2</sup> In 2001 three of the seven departments were awarded 4, and one a 3a while three received 3b grades. While in 2001 the sub-panel noted some excellent outputs, these were said to be rarely concentrated, and the 2001 sub-panel was disappointed by the overall quality.

hand and the general and universal on the other, and the combination of primary data gathering and use of secondary sources constitute the distinctive contribution of Development Studies. However, in some instances the fine case material distinctive of Development Studies would gain from being explicitly related to issues of more universal policy or theoretical concern. Signal advances have been made in the theoretical analysis of topics such as uncertainty, risk, vulnerability and resilience, human development, the state, governance and regulation including corporate social responsibility and the interaction between society and nature. There is however, a strong current of research without obvious moorings in theory. The sub-panel does not believe this is confined to development studies but reflects wider movements in social science. It saw evidence of the theoretical limitations of purely descriptive reviews of literature and ‘analytical narrative’.

### **7. Environment:**

In RAE2001, Development Studies, assessed by a sub-panel of Geography, found high numbers of research students and significant quantities of research funding, mainly from the UK government. It criticised the sub-field for its limited strategic direction and its funder-led agendas, lacking intellectual justification.

In RAE 2008 the sub-panel found evidence for significantly increased capacity to carry out world-leading research in all branches of the UoA, with well-laid foundations to continue into the future and to bring further transformations to development studies.

The research environment for Development Studies spreads outside those of the submissions per se. The UoA occupies varied kinds of institutional position, ranging from centres which support the research and teaching needs of larger units on the one hand to research-oriented graduate schools on the other. While half the submissions represented the work of a single institutional department, one submission included more than one department and four were centres within departments. Research in Development Studies clearly depends on supportive and encouraging environments. But the sub-panel discerned evidence of variation in the availability of support - and resources provided by institutions - for the ten submissions and this was generally reflected in the research environment profiles.

The sub-panel appreciated evidence of considerable investment by several universities to enhance the environment for Development Studies. It noted evidence of university support for a wide range of types of research – including professional scholarship, critical research, plus work which engages with policy and practice. Some departments with the support of their institutions have been able to take advantage of the enhanced resources coming into the sector in order to build sustainable research environments in which support staff heavily engaged in policy research, training and teaching may have periods of time devoted to analytical reflection and basic research. However, other departments do not appear to have received such support.

While there is abundant evidence of achievement and innovation in research outputs the sub-panel found uneven evidence regarding the mechanisms through which innovative research is created in the groups reported to comprise their environments - showing whether and how research synergy exceeds the sum of its parts. The submissions have emphasised collaboration, teamwork and networks in groups which

have been described through themes. Development Studies is now characterised by some outstandingly successful and substantial research centres, programmes and consortia funded by the UK's Economic and Social Research Council (ESRC) and the UK government's Department for International Development (DFID) and distributed across the size range of submissions. Yet while several submissions presented evidence of esteem classified by individual, only two submissions described their environment explicitly as one in which either lone research or desk research is supported. The sector is somewhat reluctant to acknowledge individual research and its support, though the sub-panel found uneven evidence that grouped research has special strengths in comparison with lone research or networked research with colleagues outside the RAE. The sub-panel found good evidence of maturity and equality in networked and partnership arrangements as well as a range of types of successful capacity building in developing countries as well as in the UK itself. It would be useful if future research strategy gives explicit consideration to the strengths of individual scholarship and group research and to the balance struck between them.

*Research students:* Over the assessment period there were 603 new studentships. The rate of award of PhD degrees rose from 40 in 2001 peaking at 62 in 2004 and declining to 42 in 2007, with a median stock of 3.2 research students per FTE. Many submissions provided evidence of expanded doctoral programmes (and some also of masters degrees grounded in research). A significant proportion of Development Studies students come from overseas - including from developing countries. Financial support for this expansion is very diverse - approximately 15% split equally between research councils and the UK government, 17% from institutional self funding and 18% 'overseas'<sup>3</sup>. But nearly half the research students were funded by 'other' means, the detail of which was not required by RAE2008. This means any analysis of funding can only be rough and ready. One important conclusion is that UK research councils provide only a very small proportion of research student funding, including for UK/European students. More institutions receive ESRC recognition than win ESRC scholarship funding. The sub-panel knows from sources outside the RAE2008 that high quality demand for doctoral research training in Development Studies in the UK far exceeds its present funding supply. The erosion of funds for students from developing countries when the costs of doctoral research are increasing plays no small role in constraining opportunities.<sup>4</sup>

*Funding for research:* As so much research is conducted overseas, funding is of vital significance to Development Studies and its terms and conditions matter greatly to the UoA. The sub-panel was impressed by the evidence for a rise in funding from research councils including through ESRC centres, the ESRC-DFID programme, other joint initiatives between research councils and government departments as well as substantial support from the UK government. Over the period a total income of £57m was devoted to research - an average of £258k per FTE. Over half the research income (56%) came from the UK government, 11 % from research councils (a considerable increase compared with 2001) and 22% from overseas and the EU. While industry and commerce supplied 5% of research income, it supplied only 0.6% of research studentships. The sub-panel found, however, that the sheer quantity of

---

<sup>3</sup> The category of 'overseas' included students from high income as well as developing countries.

<sup>4</sup> UK government visa policy is also not helpful to the UoA.

research income/ per FTE staff is not by itself a sensitive indicator of the output quality profile.

Some departments have been able to attract endowment funding for important research issues of the day. Some departments had also received support from their HEIs to invest entrepreneurially in capital expenditure for new subfields and in infrastructure.

The policy impact of Development Studies research is mediated in significant ways through DFID which has supplied the majority of research funds to the submissions in RAE2008. DFID's initiative is an important influence on the agenda of research in the UK, and on the manner in which it is carried out (increasingly through research subcontracting and consortia). Given the key importance and time-consuming nature of the capacity building, research management across multiple sites and dissemination activity required for much of this funded research, it is remarkable that research quality is so good. The sub-panel also welcomed the evidence that DFID funded Research Programme Consortia were able to integrate theoretical work into their policy-oriented programmes. It also noted that DFID's future research strategy matches existing mature or emerging fields as evinced by the submissions: growth, climate change, governance in challenging environments (including conflict, social exclusion and poverty, hard to reach MDGs and migration), new technologies, and development success 'beyond aid'. DFID's strategy supports other research areas strongly linked to development sciences such as sustainable agriculture and health. But the sector is now more diverse than indicated by DFID's strategic research needs and it will thus continue to stimulate DFID and in turn to need support for new fields of research.

The research environment is also affected by other official funding from within the UK and other European government sources, from international banks including the World Bank and a wide range of UN agencies. The sector is supported by established UK and international charitable foundations such as the Nuffield, Leverhulme and Ford Foundations, by new funding agencies such as UKIERI. It is also affected by research priorities set by the new generation of private foundations such as the Gates Foundation. The sub-panel welcomes the renewed interest in development from highly globally respected British institutions like the British Council and the British Academy. This multiplicity of sources provides the conditions for continued diversity in research. HEFCE's FEC requirement, however, inhibits UK universities from gaining access to some of the other sources, e.g. from charities and the EU, without cross-subsidies. These are few and far between.

Lastly the sub-panel observed that the researchers in the submitted departments are notably cosmopolitan in origin and about one third of them are female.

## **8. Esteem**

British Development Studies has a global reach and reputation; it constitutes a focus of international scholarship attracting top researchers both as visitors and collaborators from all over the world. In turn the sector's involvement in hundreds of international conferences, often as organisers and suppliers of keynote addresses and the impressive number of fellowships awarded from prestigious foreign and international institutions testify to its global recognition. Recent funding increases

allow for international collaborations second to none. DFID has ‘a reputation for providing the wider development community with cutting-edge research and analysis’ [DFID, *Research Strategy*, 2008]. That British universities are regularly approached by colleagues in North America and East Asia wishing to copy the UK approach to the study of international development testifies to the excellence and global influence of its research and teaching.

The British Academy has concluded that the government is not ‘leveraging the academic research base as effectively as it could’ and has called for many changes in the way social sciences and humanities interact with the policy process [British Academy, *Punching our Weight: the humanities and social sciences in public policy making* 2008]. It notes that long term and longitudinal multi-disciplinary research is needed for future-oriented, multi-departmental policy. Development Studies is diversified enough to expand the provision of such research. It already has examples of the interdisciplinary centres for public policy called for by the BA. The UoA’s evidence for research student funding is consistent with the BA’s call for more public investment in skills to support policy development. Close policy and advisory links with the British government (evidence commissioned by House of Commons select committees, DFID, the FCO, the British Council, the National Audit Office etc), with the Welsh Assembly, with other OECD governments and some developing country governments, a wide range of UN agencies, the EU, the OECD, development banks including the World Bank and the IMF - and long-term, active practitioner links with NGOs, the media and a range of other stakeholders all testify to high levels of international user-group esteem throughout the submissions.

While the UK is a major centre of publishing, and the UoA is active in book series editing and every aspect of journals, there was also strong evidence of the foreign language translation of research submitted to RAE2008 and of publications in books edited from developing countries. The sub-panel was also impressed by the commitment of many scholars to knowledge exchange, capacity building and the production of international and national public goods and public services connected to research, ranging from invitations to act as external examiners, international peer review and promotions referees to trusteeships of international bodies and long term research associations with institutions in developing countries.

### **9. Sustaining the future:**

The history of the establishment of Development Studies within UK universities means that some of the departments in the UoA are in a period of intense inter-generational change.

The sub-panel was impressed by the excellent quality of some of the work of Early Career Researchers, which bodes well for the future of the subject. Thirteen per cent of staff submitted were ECRs, generating 7 per cent of total outputs. Half had at least one output of internationally excellent quality while 14% of ECRs had one or more 4\* outputs. The distribution of their output grades is 10% at 4\*; 38% at 3\*; 28% at 2\*; 21% at 1\* and 3% unclassified. This sub-profile is more biased towards international excellence than is the output profile for the UoA as a whole. Where departments have supported ECRs, they have performed notably well. This support includes post-doctoral fellowships, research fellowships and assistantships, mentoring, co-supervision of new doctoral students, joint funding applications, financial and

logistical support for organising workshops and conferences. Some departments have commendable schemes for sabbatical leave and other mechanisms to encourage ECRs to (co)publish research from doctoral projects. Nonetheless, younger staff are often in short/fixed term posts which is not satisfactory for the consolidation of their doctoral research.

**10. Thanks:**

RAE2008 has demanded intellectual energy and physical stamina devoted to sets of readings in arbitrary orders on a scale which is difficult to reconcile with normal academic life and vocation; those sub-panel members in receipt of administrative support and/or remission of duties are very grateful. The sub-panel is also grateful to the invisible army of academic colleagues and support staff which produced the documentation for the 2008 submissions. They would like to thank – for their 4\* expert advice and support - Jean Grier, Andrew Walsh, David Coombes, Nicola Owen as well as colleagues who chaired other sub-panels in Panel J, chair Professor Dame Hazel Genn, professional adviser Phil Sooben, international advisers Prof Peter Cain, Sharon Witherspoon and Pippa Norris, HEFCE's RAE management team, especially Ed Hughes, Davina Madden and the Bristol warehouse team, and - last but not least - the Development Studies Association. Without their work and advice it is most unlikely that the new sub-panel's complicated and time-consuming tasks could have been completed.