
Cultivating conformity or promoting pluralism?

The politics of output diversity for the Politics and International
Studies Panel (UoA19) in REF2029

BISA / PSA Working Paper

Helena Farrand Carrapico and Stefan Wolff¹

June 2026

¹Helena Farrand Carrapico is Professor of International Relations at Northumbria University and Secretary of the British International Studies Association (BISA); Stefan Wolff is Professor of International Security at the University of Birmingham and is Honorary Treasurer of the Political Studies Association (PSA).

Introduction

The Research Excellence Framework 2029 (REF2029) represents the most explicit commitment to research diversity that the framework has ever made (Flinders, 2024). Its architects have introduced a set of structural changes designed to recognise the full breadth of research being produced across disciplines, acknowledging that knowledge is advanced not only through journal articles and monographs, but through a far wider range of scholarly outputs and contributions (REF2029, 2026). In an environment that has often been characterised by perceived strict hierarchies of what constitutes (quality) research and eligible (i.e., likely high-scoring) REF outputs, this push towards the recognition of the diversity present in our work feels like a breath of fresh air.

These preparations, however, are unfolding in one of the most difficult sector contexts in living memory. Higher education is under acute financial pressure and in a state of institutional retrenchment, with nearly half of all UK universities facing deficits in 2025/26 (Office for Students, 2026). In addition, public trust in universities is low (UCL Policy Lab, 2026) and confidence in the value of a university degree is at an all-time low (Scholes, Sivathasan and Bailey, 2026). Last but not least, the ongoing review of UKRI strategy adds considerable uncertainty for both institutions and individual researchers inside them. Considering the sector's already deep and historically embedded risk-aversion about what a perceived *safe* REF submission looks like, the current context, therefore, risks undermining the REF2029's rhetoric of pluralism and stated commitment to diversity.

Bearing this background in mind, the present working paper has two linked aims: 1) informational: it demonstrates that REF2029 has created genuine, if uncertain, space for a broader definition of outputs that reflect research excellence than previous exercises; and 2) transformational: for this space to be utilised for the maximum benefit of all stakeholders in REF2029, a cultural transformation is required at two levels. First, institutions and decision makers within them need to embrace the idea of non-traditional outputs² holding equal potential to demonstrate research excellence and decide on the inclusion of outputs based on merit not on a speculative calculation of the reputational and financial risks of deviation from established norms. Second, REF panels may lack the expertise, experience, or consistent interpretive frameworks necessary to assess non-traditional outputs fairly.

This working paper therefore makes the case for shifting the disposition of universities and, in particular, of Politics and International Studies staff away from risk-aversion and towards embracing a more comprehensive and inclusive understanding of REFable outputs.

²We use the term 'non-traditional outputs' as a shorthand for outputs outside the predominant standard of past submissions to UoA 19, which, for REF 2021, consisted of 947 authored books, 14 edited books, 152 book chapters, and 3,572 journal articles. In addition, there were only 22 other outputs (or less than 0.5% of the total volume of submissions): 6 research reports, 1 feature film, 2 scholarly editions, 1 research dataset, 1 documentary short film series, and 9 working papers; with two outputs classified as 'other' being a two-part journal article.

Underlying these two aims is also an explicitly political reading of REF2029 itself, given the REF's long perceived potential to reproduce structural inequalities (Manville *et al.*, 2021). REF outcomes have the capacity to shape institutional decisions about future investment, staffing, and, in extreme cases, the survival of departments and disciplines within academic institutions. Large, well-resourced universities with long REF track records have historically benefitted from a process in which reputation and infrastructure compound advantage. Scholars working in Politics and International Studies will not be immune to such institutional pressures, despite the fact that their discipline has a long tradition of theoretical and methodological pluralism. REF2029 is now pushing us to ask whether this pluralism extends to the forms in which research excellence is recognised and rewarded.

The paper addresses these issues by offering some tentative answers to five questions. The first asks what evidence there is that REF2029 is genuinely committed to a wider definition of research excellence; the second examines how this commitment differs from REF2021, with particular attention to the UoA19 submission; the third considers what non-traditional/diverse outputs might look like in practice for a Politics and International Studies panel; the fourth analyses the main barriers and blockages for the full range of contributions to knowledge and understanding produced across the discipline to be acknowledged and rewarded in REF2029; and the final one asks what realistic boosters and enabling conditions might look like.

In formulating our answers, we draw on publicly available REF2021 and REF2029 documentation, analysis of submission data, conversations with former UoA19 panel members and with other former members of other sub-panels in Main Panels C (Social Sciences) and D (Arts and Humanities), as well as insights from a BISA/PSA Research Directors' Forum (May 2026), and from a workshop on non-academic/diverse outputs held at Northumbria University (Carrapico and Brandon, 2026).

QUESTION 1

Is REF2029 committed to a wider definition of research excellence?

The most visible sign of REF2029's intent is the renaming of the 'Outputs' element as 'Contribution to Knowledge and Understanding' (CKU) (REF2029, 2026). Simultaneously, the decision to "expand our definition of research excellence and ensure that appropriate recognition is given to the people, cultures and environments that underpin a vibrant and sustainable research system" was a core and explicit part of the *Initial Decisions* taken in the current REF cycle (Research Excellence Framework, 2023).

The choice of language deliberately reflects a re-conceptualisation of what research does (and not just what it produces) to support the shift from outputs as discrete countable

products to contributions as relational and embedded acts of knowledge-making. To further illustrate this shift, the CKU guidance explicitly names the large range of outputs that can be submitted to REF, including not only traditional outputs such as journal articles, monographs, and book chapters, but also audio, visual, multi-modal artefacts, performance and practice-led outputs, reviews and research synthesis, software and code, datasets, translations and critical editions, reagents, multi-component outputs (also called portfolios), policy summaries and analyses, and different types of reports. It is worth noting that the REF's definition of research continues to be 'a process of investigation leading to new insights, effectively shared' (REF2029, 2026, 5.3.1).

This shift is reinforced by structural changes, including modifications to the components of any submission and their weighting, as well as the creation of a Research Diversity Advisory Panel (RDAP). The REF2021 'Environment' element has now been re-designed as 'Strategy, People, and Research Environment' (SPRE) with a weight of 20% of a submission's total score and explicitly acknowledging collaboration with non-academic partners and public engagement as indication of research quality. SPRE will include an Institution Level Statement (ILS) and a Unit Level Statement (ULS) which will describe how a unit's research has advanced knowledge, shifting the focus from focussing on the aggregation of individual outputs to rewarding intellectual coherence and cumulative contribution. The RDAP constitutes a concrete structural commitment to the exercise's diversity agenda (REF2029, 2024). The RDAP's remit is to support the recognition of an expanded definition of research excellence and to advise on how diverse and non-traditional outputs should be treated across panels.

In addition, it is also worth noting that all sub-panels have members who have been appointed due to their experience and knowledge in relation to non-traditional outputs. The emphasis on promoting and absorbing a wider definition of research excellence has also been a core element of the criteria setting phase that is currently (June 2026) running and involved the requirement for all sub-panels to discuss and list examples of non-traditional outputs they would view as valid and be willing and able to assess.

Taken together, the CKU name change, the SPRE expansion, the Unit Level Statement, and the RDAP indicate a commitment to an enhanced assessment of excellence that defines quality more broadly and a genuine departure from, rather than a simple rerun of, any previous iteration of the REF.

QUESTION 2

What role did 'Non-Traditional' outputs play in REF2021?

The REF2021's stated principles included a commitment that 'all forms of research output will be assessed on a fair and equal basis' and that panels would 'not regard any particular

form of output as of greater or lesser quality than another per se' (REF2021, 2018, p. 62). The submission data, however, tells a different story.

The national picture

Across REF2021 as a whole, 185,594 outputs were submitted by 157 Higher Education institutions (REF2021, 2022a). Journal articles (output type D, please see Annex 1 this document) accounted for over 80% of all submissions, with 152,367 articles submitted. Non-traditional outputs represented only 2.4% of all submissions (a figure that had actually declined from 3.0% in REF2014), including 399 physical artefacts, 1,141 exhibitions and performances, 540 digital artefacts, 1,068 other documents, and 1,380 outputs classed as 'Other' were submitted across all Units of Assessment.

Despite the limited presence of non-traditional outputs in REF2021, their scoring data complicates any simple narrative of journal-article and monograph dominance as quality-maximising. 44% of digital artefacts and 32% of exhibitions and performances submitted scored 4*, compared with 34% of journal articles and 48% of books and book chapters (REF2021, 2022c). Although the majority of non-traditional output submission took place in the context of Panel D (REF2021, 2022b), these figures indicate that these outputs have the potential to score well and should be more seriously considered.

The UoA19 picture

The contrast between the national picture and the UoA19 non-traditional submission is particularly stark. UoA19 received 4,146 output submissions in REF2021, which included 3,065 journal articles, 917 monographs, 129 chapters in edited volumes, and 14 edited volumes. The Main Panel C Overview Report noted that 'it was journal articles and, above all, authored books which were most likely to be judged world-leading' (REF2021, 2022b, p. 119). Of the entire submission, only 20 outputs (0.48%) were classified as non-traditional (output types other than A, B, C, D, and R). These comprised 9 working papers, 6 research reports for external bodies, 3 outputs classed as Other (including a series of five documentaries), 1 research dataset, and 1 digital or visual media output (a feature film) (please see Annex 2 of this document). They were submitted by a small number of institutions including Oxford (3), Bradford (5), LSE (2), and East Anglia (3) (REF2021, 2022b). The report also noted that 'the few non-standard output submissions were well-received, though it was noted that in some cases these kinds of output needed more contextualisation in the accompanying statement' (REF2021, 2022b, p. 119).

QUESTION 3

What might a non-traditional output look like in REF2029?

REF2029's criteria-setting phase is expected to publish an expanded list of potential output types, explicitly inviting panels to consider diversity of form alongside quality of contribution. For UoA19, the range of non-traditional outputs that might plausibly constitute excellent research is considerable, given recent emphasis on co-production of research, interdisciplinarity, and the usage of visual and creative methods. The following illustrates some of these possibilities:

- Policy reports and analyses, including short-form/rapid-research contributions that constitute incremental research steps towards final output, represent a category with an already established presence in political and international studies research. These differ from impact because of a demonstrable scholarly contribution that advances disciplinary understanding, rather than merely translating research findings for external audiences;
- Documentary films and audio-visual works represent another important category. The growing use of visual and creative methods, particularly in conflict studies, migration research, and participatory action research, makes this a plausible area of growth;
- Podcasts, interactive data visualisations, digital archives, blogposts, and other public-facing content produced as genuine research outputs represent an emerging category;
- Community-facing toolkits and participatory research outputs, especially where the research process itself is co-designed with non-academic communities, align well with REF2029's emphasis on engagement and inclusive research cultures;
- Translations and critical editions, now explicitly recognised in the CKU guidance, may be of particular relevance for scholars working with non-English-language sources and traditions.

Another innovation, potentially combining one or more of the above, would be an explicit recognition of research portfolios as an eligible submission category in UoA19. Unlike individual outputs, portfolios constitute a coherent body of work with a clear and explicit connecting thread. Rather than presenting a set of discrete artefacts, an accompanying narrative documents the research process that connects the different elements within the portfolio (the research questions asked, methods deployed, sources drawn on, and evolution of thinking over time). This connecting thread would also present an opportunity for explaining how the portfolio addresses the REF criteria of originality, significance, and rigour. In practice, portfolios enable authors to offer a more comprehensive presentation of their work, often combining traditional outputs with non-traditional ones, while giving

panels the opportunity to assess portfolios as a whole (as opposed to their individual components), thus allowing for the submission of more coherent and higher scoring bodies of work. In Arts and Design disciplines, for example, portfolios are typically double-weighted, reflecting the sustained research they represent. Furthermore, from the perspective of universities, portfolios can also represent a lower risk route to the inclusion of non-traditional outputs.

A related issue concerns the question whether, and if so, under what conditions, portfolios might meet the long-form/extended-process criteria for submissions. This has several dimensions. First, a feature film or documentary film, for example, might be classifiable as both long-form and extended-process and therefore qualify for double-weighting and portability across institutions.³ A podcast series or regular blog, in turn, might only qualify cumulatively as an extended-effort contribution to knowledge and understanding and thus also be eligible for portability. In either case, submissions would need to be contextualised to demonstrate how they fit originality, significance, and rigour criteria. Second, especially because of potential portability implications, long-form/extended-effort criteria are likely to have an impact on career opportunities for junior scholars, while the question of double-weighting is likely to affect colleagues at all career stages. For example, a single blogpost or podcast might matter little, whereas sustained, multi-year efforts might – raising issues about individual and institutional commitments and investments that can have long-term implications for who can afford to produce such non-traditional contributions to knowledge and understanding.

QUESTION 4

What might the main barriers and blockages look like?

Signalling clear intent towards greater output diversity is not the same thing as translating this into more diverse submissions that genuinely reflect the full range of contributions to knowledge and understanding produced in the discipline. The main barriers to achieving the intended shift include institutional risk-aversion, panel capacity and evaluative uncertainty, cultural and disciplinary conservatism, and the (likely contestable) boundary between outputs and impact (and engagement).

Institutional risk-aversion

University leaders, research directors, REF leads and research and innovation services are currently operating under enormous financial pressure and public scrutiny. Hence, any submission that could depart from established norms, even informal ones, carries strategic risk, as the reputational and financial consequences fall primarily on the institution, and

³A crucial difference between these two distinct, though connected, processes is that double-weighting applications have a reserve, applications for the exemption do not and are therefore 'high-risk' submissions.

potentially also on the individual researchers for which they have a duty of care. It would be unsurprising, therefore, if the rational institutional response, under conditions of uncertainty, might be to stay conservative. This dynamic was evident in REF2021 and is likely to intensify in REF2029, given the acute funding pressures affecting the sector.

Underlying this specific barrier is a structural dynamic that any honest discussion of REF2029 must acknowledge. Research-intensive institutions with extensive infrastructure, including well-resourced research management and support services, are likely to be better placed to invest in non-traditional submissions, than smaller or less well-resourced departments. If diversity of output continues to be associated with risk, then only the institutions that can afford to take risks will pursue it (Hidden REF, 2026), both at submission and at research stage.

Panel capacity and evaluative uncertainty

Even where institutions are willing to submit non-traditional/diverse outputs, their quality can only be properly acknowledged and rewarded if panels have the expertise, experience, and interpretive frameworks to assess them fairly. Developing evaluative capacity is therefore as important as encouraging submission diversity. In fact, demonstrating evaluative capacity is critical to assuring institutions that the perception of the submission risk is actively mitigated. We therefore strongly support any efforts to seek training that the panel may already be putting in place.

Conversations with former panel C and D members highlighted a degree of uncertainty as how to score certain types of non-traditional outputs and how to differentiate them from impact. The existing criteria were often adapted to accommodate non-traditional outputs, but with considerable ambiguity about the appropriate evaluative framework. There was broad agreement that the fundamental REF criteria should remain the framework for assessing non-traditional outputs (to avoid creating a two-tier system that implicitly devalues such work), but that they need to be unpacked and interpreted for different forms of contributions to knowledge and understanding, rather than applied mechanically.

Cultural and disciplinary conservatism

A third barrier operates at the level of disciplinary culture. Politics and International Studies have historically operated with a fairly narrow conception of what a strong REF output looks like. The monograph and the journal article carry enormous reputational weight, and academic career incentives (promotion criteria, grant eligibility, peer recognition) are structured around them.

There is also an infrastructural dimension to this barrier. A non-traditional output may require substantially more institutional support (or different institutional support) than a journal article, such as dedicated time for development, professional design support, material infrastructure (recording material for example), and a coherent documentation

infrastructure (in the case of portfolios). This is a significant investment that many departments, particularly those under financial pressure, may not be able to make.

The outputs–impact boundary

Policy reports, documentary films, community toolkits, and other outputs with public-facing dimensions can plausibly be claimed both as research outputs and as elements of a research impact case. REF rules prevent double-counting, but the practical question of where a contribution to knowledge and understanding ends and an impact case study begins is not always easy to resolve.

The relatively greater impact of a 4* impact case, as compared to a 4* output, further skews incentives away from the inclusion of diverse outputs in an output submission. This question was live in REF2021 and is likely to recur wherever non-traditional outputs are submitted. It needs to be addressed explicitly in institutional planning and in the criteria-setting phase, rather than left to be resolved under submission pressure.

QUESTION 5

What are the potential boosters for promoting diversity in relation to research excellence?

Despite the barriers outlined above, several enabling conditions and practical mechanisms could meaningfully improve the prospects for a more diverse UoA19 submission in REF2029.

Early guidance from REF on assessment processes

The single most effective intervention would be early, specific, and credible guidance from REF, and from the UoA19 panel in particular, on how non-traditional submissions will be assessed. Institutions will not take strategic risks on non-traditional outputs until they have a reasonable degree of confidence that those outputs will be evaluated fairly and consistently in line with the standard submission type of monographs and journal articles. The UoA19 panel has an opportunity to publish criteria interpretations, annotated examples, or worked illustrations during the criteria-setting phase that would substantially reduce uncertainty. The RDAP's advisory role could also usefully extend to producing UoA-specific guidance that speaks directly to the evaluative questions raised by practice-based, visual, or policy-oriented research in Political and International Studies.

Contextualising narratives and accompanying statements

Given that the REF2021 UoA19 panel identified contextualisation as the key deficit in non-traditional submissions, investing in guidance concerning the quality of accompanying statements is a high-leverage intervention. A well-crafted statement can make the

contribution intelligible to panel members, address the criteria explicitly, and pre-empt questions about the outputs–impact boundary. The development of genre conventions and worked examples for accompanying statements in Politics and International Studies would be a concrete practical resource.

Sector-wide conversation and community building

Re-socialising a discipline toward a broader conception of what counts as excellent contribution to knowledge and understanding requires sustained collective effort, rather than a single intervention. Regular meetings of research directors and REF leads across UoA19 institutions can be used to map the appetite for diverse output submissions, identify where capacity already exists, surface shared concerns about evaluative uncertainty, and begin to develop community norms around what a strong submission that includes non-traditional outputs looks like in Politics and International Studies.

The British International Studies Association and the Political Studies Association are particularly well-placed to host such conversations, and the British Academy and the Academy of Social Sciences could play a convening role at the sector level. They could also play a role in providing formal training for panel members on how to assess non-traditional outputs, which constitutes a necessary condition for closing the evaluative gap identified above.

Panel training should address not only the criteria, but also the specific interpretive challenges posed by practice-based work, portfolios, policy reports, and audio-visual outputs. Without this, the rhetoric of assessment on equal terms will not translate into consistent evaluative practice. In this context, a time-limited pilot assessment exercise including pre-2021 outputs from the Politics and International Studies disciplines, as well as outputs and their assessment in other units, could be integrated with panel training and contribute to formulate sector guidance, for example on how to compose a portfolio that enables the REF panel to adequately assess non-traditional outputs against established REF criteria.

Learning from other panels

UoA32 (Art and Design: History, Practice and Theory), UoA13 (Architecture, Built Environment and Planning), UoA27 (English Language and Literature), and UoA33 (Music, Drama, Dance, Performing Arts, Film and Screen Studies) have developed extensive experience of portfolio working, practice-led research assessment, and the application of REF criteria to creative outputs.⁴ Colleagues from these panels have highlighted the role of interdisciplinary learning as an approach to non-traditional outputs and of proactive institutional positioning. The development of a Practice Research Resource Hub, portfolio

⁴For examples of portfolios developed in these areas, please visit: Northumbria University Arts and Design REF Portfolios. Available at: <https://unnartdesignfolios.com/> and Goldsmiths Practice Research LibGuide. Available at: <https://libguides.gold.ac.uk/practiceresearch>

tracker templates, shared vocabulary, and internal peer review processes were identified as necessary institutional investments.

Conclusion

The title of this working paper poses a choice between two trajectories for REF2029. The cultivating-conformity path leads to an exercise in which the rhetoric of diversity is genuine, but the practice reverts, under institutional pressure and evaluative uncertainty, to the familiar hierarchy of journal articles and monographs. The promoting-pluralism path leads to an exercise in which the structural changes introduced in REF2029 are translated into genuinely inclusive submissions and truly fair assessment. Neither path is predetermined and the disciplines of Politics and International Studies have the conceptual resources to make the case for pluralism.

References

- Carrapico, H. and Brandon, T. (2026) Thinking Beyond Articles and Books: Diverse/Non-Traditional Outputs in REF2029. Workshop Summary, Northumbria University, 27 April 2026.
- Flinders, M. (2024) *Is it safe to trust that the next REF will reward a wider range of outputs?*, *Times Higher Education (THE)*. Available at: <https://www.timeshighereducation.com/depth/it-safe-trust-next-ref-will-reward-wider-range-outputs> (Accessed: 11 May 2026).
- Hidden REF (2026) 'The Hidden REF 5% Manifesto', *The Hidden REF*. Available at: <https://hidden-ref.org/5-manifesto/> (Accessed: 11 May 2026).
- Manville, C. et al. (2021) *Understanding perceptions of the Research Excellence Framework among UK researchers: The Real-Time REF Review*. Available at: https://www.rand.org/pubs/research_reports/RRA1278-1.html (Accessed: 11 May 2026).
- Office for Students (2026) *Financial sustainability of higher education providers in England: 2026 - Office for Students*. Office for Students. Available at: <https://www.officeforstudents.org.uk/> (Accessed: 20 May 2026).
- REF2021 (2018) *Draft guidance on submissions (2018/01) - REF 2021, Higher Education Funding Council for England*. Available at: <https://2021.ref.ac.uk/publications-and-reports/draft-guidance-on-submissions-201801/index.html> (Accessed: 11 May 2026).
- REF2021 (2022a) *Guidance on REF 2021 results - REF 2021, Higher Education Funding Council for England*. Available at: <https://2021.ref.ac.uk/guidance-on-results/guidance-on-ref-2021-results/index.html#overview> (Accessed: 11 May 2026).
- REF2021 (2022b) *Main panel overview reports - REF 2021, Higher Education Funding Council for England*. Available at: <https://2021.ref.ac.uk/publications-and-reports/main-panel-overview-reports/index.html> (Accessed: 11 May 2026).
- REF2021 (2022c) *Output profiles - REF 2021, Higher Education Funding Council for England*. Available at: <https://2021.ref.ac.uk/results-analysis/output-profiles/index.html> (Accessed: 11 May 2026).
- REF2029 (2024) *REF 2029 Research Diversity Advisory Panel - REF 2029*. Available at: <https://2029.ref.ac.uk/panels/research-diversity-advisory-panel/> (Accessed: 11 May 2026).
- REF2029 (2026) *Section 4 - Contributions to Knowledge and Understanding (CKU) guidance - REF 2029*. Available at: <https://2029.ref.ac.uk/guidance/section-4-contributions-to-knowledge-and-understanding-cku-guidance/> (Accessed: 11 May 2026).
- Research Excellence Framework (2023) 'Research Excellence Framework 2028: initial decisions and issues for further consultation (REF2028/23/01)'. Available at: <https://repository.jisc.ac.uk/9148/1/research-excellence-framework-2028-initial-decisions-report.pdf> (Accessed: 4 June 2026).
- Scholes, A., Sivathasan, C. and Bailey, K. (2026) *Analysing Current Public Attitudes towards Higher Education in the UK. British Social Attitudes. Report 43 | Higher Education*. London: National Centre for Social Research. Available at: <https://natcen.ac.uk/publications/bsa-43-higher-education> (Accessed: 4 June 2026).

UCL Policy Lab (2026) *Shared Institutions: perspectives on the role of universities in national and local life*. London: University College London. Available at: <https://www.ucl.ac.uk/policy-lab/news/2026/may/university-sector-must-take-lead-rebuild-trust-and-renew-public-purpose> (Accessed: 20 May 2026).

Annex 1: The REF2021 output type taxonomy

For reference, the full REF2021 output type taxonomy is reproduced below⁵. Types highlighted beyond A–D and R represent the space in which UoA19’s non-traditional submission was concentrated, and the space into which REF2029 invites expansion.

Code	Output Type
A	Authored book
B	Edited book
C	Chapter in book
D	Journal article
E	Conference contribution
F	Patent / published patent application
G	Software
H	Website content
I	Performance
J	Composition
K	Design
L	Artefact
M	Exhibition
N/O	Research report for external body (public and confidential)
P	Devices and products
Q	Digital or visual media
R	Scholarly edition
S	Research datasets and databases
T	Other
U	Working paper
V	Translation

⁵Source: https://2021.ref.ac.uk/media/1016/draft-guidance-on-submissions-ref-2018_1.pdf

Annex 2: Non-traditional Outputs submitted to UoA 19 in REF2021⁶

Submitting Institution	Output Type	Output Title	Comments
The University of Bradford	N - Research report for external bodies	Community engagement on climate adaptation	Environment Agency 2019
The University of Bradford	N - Research report for external bodies	Conflict Minerals in the DRC and Great Lakes Region	Swedish International Development Agency 2015
The University of Bradford	N - Research report for external bodies	Examining Resilience Related Initiatives and Programmes in the Horn of Africa	Swedish International Development Agency 2015
The University of Bradford	N - Research report for external bodies	Extractive Economies and Sustainable Development: An analysis of infrastructure, health and social development	United Nations and Government of Brazil 2014
The University of Bradford	N - Research report for external bodies	Social safety nets and targeting mechanism in COMCEC member countries	COMCEC 2014
King's College London	N - Research report for external bodies	The National Security Council : National security at the centre of government	AHRC Arts and Humanities Research Council 2014
Queen Mary University of London	Q - Digital or visual media	Pili 2017	Feature Film. https://vimeo.com/229861806
University of Durham	R - Scholarly edition	Selected Writings of James Fitzjames Stephen: Liberty, Equality, Fraternity (1873, 2nd	Accompanying statement: James Fitzjames Stephen was a distinguished jurist, a codifier of the law in England and India, and the judge in the ill-fated Maybrick case; a serious and

⁶Source: <https://results2021.ref.ac.uk/outputs>.

Submitting Institution	Output Type	Output Title	Comments
		ed. 1874), by James Fitzjames Stephen. Oxford University Press. 2017.	prolific journalist, a pillar of the Saturday Review and the Pall Mall Gazette. This is the first critical edition of his major work Liberty, Equality, Fraternity, a systematic attack on J. S. Mill's later social and political philosophy. The text originated in a series of twenty letters to the Pall Mall Gazette following Stephen's return from India as the Legal Member of the Viceroy's council in 1872. It was published as a book in 1873 and revised the following year in response to its critics, particularly Frederic Harrison and John Morley. It is the second edition of 1874 that forms the basis of this new edition. Stephen's abrasive style matched his disdain for what he regarded as Mill's enthusiasm for 'abstract' ideals such as liberty and equality--particularly sexual equality. Against Mill's emphasis on freedom of discussion as the most effective means of addressing differences of thought and belief, Stephen argued that conflict could only be resolved by the exercise of force--physical and legal. Rejecting Mill's faith in human improvement through the exercise of reason, he emphasised the importance of revealed religion to morality and to the maintenance of political order. Liberty, Equality, and Fraternity raises significant questions concerning the limits of tolerance, the relationship between liberty to individuality and between temporal and spiritual power in modern society. It was memorably described by Sir Ernest Barker as 'the finest flowering of conservative thought in the latter half of the nineteenth century'. However, the book sought not so much to abandon liberalism as to situate it firmly within the realm of 'experience'.
The University of Manchester	R - Scholarly edition	When the Nerds Go Marching In: How Digital Technology Moved from the Margins to the Mainstream of Political Campaigns. Oxford University Press. 2020.	
University of Glasgow	S - Research Datasets	De facto states in international politics (1945-2011): a new data set. 2014. http://researchdata.gla.ac.uk/1123/	
University of St Andrews	T - Other	Liberia: Legacies of Peace. 2019	Documentary short film series
The University of East Anglia	T - Other	The "Who?" Question in the Hate Speech Debate Part 1: Consistency, Practical, and Formal Approaches Part 2: Functional and Democratic Approaches. 2016.	Canadian Journal of Law and Jurisprudence
The University of East Anglia	T - Other	What is hate speech? Part 1: The Myth of Hate Part 2: Family Resemblances. 2017.	Law and Philosophy

Submitting Institution	Output Type	Output Title	Comments
University of Oxford	U - Working paper	A reversal of positions rather than of law: Protracted contestation over the status of Kosovo, South Ossetia and Abkhazia 2019	International Studies Association
The University of East Anglia	U - Working paper	Collective Management Organisations, Creativity and Cultural Diversity 2015	CREATe
University of Oxford	U - Working paper	Do Brazil's Covid-19 government response measures meet the WHO's criteria for policy easing? 2020	Blavatnik School of Government
Kingston University	U - Working paper	'No chief ever bought a piece of land!' Struggles over property, community and mining in the Bakgatla-ba-Kgafela Traditional Authority Area, North West Province 2015	Society Work and Development Institute (SWOP Institute) University of Witwatersrand https://2b912727-9f2a-44dd-9a10-190714b850bf.filesusr.com/ugd/4e496b_a0cb6067c0f545c09d361066dd54f272.pdf
King's College London	U - Working paper	Political Dividends of Digital Participatory Governance: Evidence from Moscow Pothole Management 2020	The World Bank
The London School of Economics and Political Science	U - Working paper	The consolidation of coalition politics in the Republic of Ireland 2020	LSE London, London School of Economics and Political Science
School of Oriental and African Studies	U - Working paper	The Rise Of China, In Theory: Peasants, Urban-Rural Relations, And The Internationalization Of The State 2020	SOAS University of London https://doi.org/10.25501/SOAS.00034590
The London School of Economics and Political Science	U - Working paper	The role of the European Union in the international trade and investment order 2019	The Dahrendorf Forum: Dahrendorf Forum IV
University of Oxford	U - Working paper	Variation in government responses to COVID-19 2020	Oxford University