

**March 2009**

**UNIVERSITY COUNCIL OF GENERAL AND APPLIED LINGUISTICS**

**This report is for information**

# **Linguistics within the 2008 Research Assessment Exercise**

# Linguistics within the 2008 Research Assessment Exercise

Of interest to	Those responsible for managing linguistics research within UK publicly funded higher-education institutions Learned societies and other professional associations in general and applied linguistics
Publication date	March 2009
Enquiries to	Dr Paul Rowlett, Chair, University Council of General and Applied Linguistics Tel: 0161 295 4131 Email: P.A.Rowlett@salford.ac.uk

## ***Executive summary***

### **Purpose**

1. This document provides an analysis of linguistics within the 2008 Research Assessment Exercise (RAE).

### **Key points**

2. While the number of submissions across the RAE and within Panel M fell from 2001 to 2008, the number of submissions to the linguistics unit of assessment (UoA) rose (by 4%, from 24 to 25).
3. While the number of FTE researchers submitted to the RAE and to Panel M rose by 9% and 14% respectively, the number of FTE researchers submitted to the linguistics UoA rose by 46%.
4. The importance of linguistics within Panel M has grown. Linguistics represented 7.2% of the FTE researchers submitted to (the UoAs subsequently brought together under) Panel M in 2001, but 9.2% in 2008. Of the eight UoAs within Panel M, linguistics has risen, in terms of FTE researchers submitted, from fourth place to third place, overtaking German, etc.
5. While the 4\* profile across the RAE was 17.43% and across Panel M was 20.36%, the 4\* profile of the linguistics UoA was 16.00%. Combining the 4\* and 3\* profiles, the RAE and Panel M figures were 54.60% and 52.85%, while the figure for the linguistics UoA was 46.73%. This relatively poor performance of linguistics in the 2008 RAE echoes the results of the 2001 RAE.

6. In terms of the average level of mainstream QR funding per FTE research submitted, linguistics comes seventh out of the eight UoAs within Panel M (on the assumption that the base level of mainstream QR funding is the same for all eight UoAs). Like for like, linguistics researchers are funded at a level which is 19% lower than the funding of researchers in Celtic studies.
7. A number of panel overview reports, both within and outside Panel M, comment on the quantity and range of language-related outputs submitted.

**Action required**

8. This document is for information only.

## Introduction

9. This commentary has been produced by the University Council of General and Applied Linguistics, an umbrella body representing a number of learned societies and professional associations in the area of general and applied linguistics.<sup>1</sup>

10. The commentary focuses on linguistics, and has been produced primarily on the basis of:

- Data relating to submissions to the 2001 and 2008 RAEs;
- Data relating to results of the 2001 and 2008 RAEs;
- Comments contained within a number of overview reports produced by the 2008 RAE panels and sub-panels (henceforth, UoAs).

All other data sources used are given in the document.

## Submissions

11. Table 1 below provides comparative data relating to the RAE submissions made in 2001 and in 2008.

	2001 subs	2008 subs	Change	2001 FTE	2008 FTE	Change	2001 ave FTE/sub	2008 ave FTE/sub	Change
All panels	2598	2363	-9%	48022	52409	+9%	18.5	22.2	+20%
Panel M*	281	249	-11%	2911	3323	+14%	10.4	13.3	+29%
51 Russian, Slavonic and East European Languages	17	15	-12%	77	118	+52%	4.5	7.8	+72%
52 French	43	33	-23%	446	386	-13%	10.4	11.7	+13%
53 German, Dutch and Scandinavian Languages	42	29	-31%	255	223	-13%	6.1	7.7	+26%
54 Italian	19	18	-5%	103	99	-4%	5.4	5.5	+1%
55 Iberian and Latin American Languages	32	29	-9%	208	236	+14%	6.5	8.1	+25%
56 Celtic Studies	15	13	-13%	92	104	+12%	6.1	8.0	+30%
57 English Language and Literature	89	87	-2%	1519	1851	+22%	17.1	21.3	+25%
58 Linguistics	24	25	+4%	210	307	+46%	8.8	12.3	+40%

Table 1

\*Panel M as constituted in 2008 did not exist in 2001. The 2001 data in this line correspond to the combined submissions to the eight units of assessment (UoAs) which, in 2008, were brought together under Panel M.

12. Comparing 2001 with 2008, the number of submissions made to the RAE fell by 9% (from 2598 to 2363); across the eight UoAs within Panel M, the drop was of 11% (from 281 to 249).

13. With the exception of linguistics, the number of submissions made to each of the eight UoAs within Panel M fell. The drops range from 2% (English) to 31% (German, etc.). Uniquely, the number of submissions to the linguistics UoA rose by 4% (note that the

number of submissions per UoA is in some cases quite small, and so care needs to be taken when interpreting the statistics).

14. Turning to researchers submitted to the RAE in 2001 and 2008, FTE numbers rose across the RAE exercise by 9% (from 48,022 in 2001 to 52,409 in 2008). Across the eight UoAs within Panel M, the rise was of 14% (from 2911 to 3323).
15. Of the eight UoAs within Panel M, three saw a drop in the FTE number of researchers submitted, while five saw a rise. The changes range from a drop of 13% (German, etc., French) to a rise of 52% (Russian, etc.). The Russian, etc., overview reports explicitly mentions the fact that the largest submission to the UoA included a significant number of researchers from outside the field defined in the UoA's criteria and that the true number of researchers in the UoA's field was 'not much in excess of 100' (headcount, rather than the FTE figures considered here). In view of this observation, the growth in the number of FTE researchers submitted to the linguistics UoA is even more significant.
16. The ranking is set out in Table 2:

UoA	Percentage change from 2001 to 2008 in FTE researchers submitted
Russian, Slavonic and East European Languages	+52%
Linguistics	+46%
English Language and Literature	+22%
Iberian and Latin American Languages	+14%
Celtic Studies	+12%
Italian	-4%
French	-13%
German, Dutch and Scandinavian Languages	-13%

Table 2

17. Given the general shift toward a smaller number of submissions alongside a larger FTE number of researchers submitted, the average size of submissions necessarily rose. Across the entire RAE exercise, the average size of submissions rose by 20% (from 18.5 FTE to 22.2 FTE). Across Panel M the rise was of 29% (from 10.4 FTE to 13.3 FTE). For the eight individual UoAs within Panel M, the average size of submissions rose by between 1% (Italian) and 72% (Russian, etc., but see the comments above regarding this UoA). While the increase in the FTE number of researchers submitted is to be welcomed, the reduction in the number of submissions made, and the increase in the average size of the submissions made, may reflect a concentration of research in a smaller number of institutions. Note that any analysis of the submissions to the UoAs within Panel M cannot be conducted without appropriate reference to the submissions to disciplinarily neighbouring UoAs, for example, within Panel L (in particular Middle eastern and African studies, Asian studies, European studies), within Panel K (Education) and within Panel N (in particular Classics, ancient history, Byzantine and modern Greek studies). Indeed a number of the Panel M overview reports refer to outputs referred to Panel M UoAs from UoAs outside Panel M (see below).

## Qualitative results

18. Table 3 provides data relating to the results of the 2008 RAE. The data are 'weighted quality profiles' derived from the size and actual quality profile of each relevant submission. Note that the actual quality profile of each submission to each UoA was rounded to the nearest 5%, on the basis of the weighted combination of separate unrounded assessments of (a) outputs (75%), (b) environment (20%) and (c) esteem (5%), in line with the cumulative rounding methodology set out in Annex A of HEFCE document RAE 03/2005. Thus, while the data in Table 3 may give the appearance of precision, they are derived from raw data which has already been subject to rounding.

19. In addition to showing the quality profile across each of the 4\*, 3\*, 2\*, 1\* and u/c quality levels separately, the table also shows cumulative results for 3\* and above and for 2\* and above (in italics), and the GPA as calculated by the *Times Higher Education*:

	FTE	4*	3*	<i>4*+3*</i>	2*	<i>4*+3*+2*</i>	1*	u/c	GPA
All panels	52409	17.43	37.18	<i>54.60</i>	32.74	<i>87.35</i>	11.29	1.37	
Panel M*	3323	20.36	32.49	<i>52.85</i>	33.66	<i>86.51</i>	12.24	1.25	
51 Russian, Slavonic and East European Languages	118	15.07	33.46	<i>48.53</i>	32.64	<i>81.17</i>	15.66	3.17	2.42
52 French	386	15.07	34.42	<i>49.49</i>	35.01	<i>84.49</i>	14.88	0.62	2.45
53 German, Dutch and Scandinavian Languages	223	16.41	31.47	<i>47.88</i>	34.39	<i>82.27</i>	16.29	1.44	2.45
54 Italian	99	18.28	32.46	<i>50.74</i>	34.91	<i>85.64</i>	11.88	2.47	2.52
55 Iberian and Latin American Languages	236	17.56	37.38	<i>54.93</i>	31.67	<i>86.60</i>	11.46	1.94	2.57
56 Celtic Studies	104	22.96	35.21	<i>58.17</i>	28.23	<i>86.40</i>	11.36	2.24	2.65
57 English Language and Literature	1851	23.32	31.67	<i>54.99</i>	33.57	<i>88.56</i>	10.67	0.77	2.66
58 Linguistics	307	16.00	30.73	<i>46.73</i>	35.32	<i>82.05</i>	15.14	2.81	2.42

Table 3

20. In the context of an RAE-wide 4\* profile of 17.43% the Panel M 4\* profile was 20.36%. The presence within Panel M of English, which was both large (the Panel M overview report notes that over half the work submitted to Panel M was to the English UoA) and strong (the English UoA had the largest percentage of 4\* quality work of any Panel M UoA), had a significant impact on the overall 4\* profile: if the English result is taken out, the overall 4\* profile for the remaining UoAs within Panel M falls to 16.64%, which is below the RAE-wide figure.

21. The 4\* profile of the eight individual UoAs within Panel M range from 15.07% (Russian, etc., French) to 23.32% (English):

UoA	Percentage 4* quality
English Language and Literature	23.32%
Celtic Studies	22.96%
Italian	18.28%
Iberian and Latin American Languages	17.56%

German, Dutch and Scandinavian Languages	16.41%
Linguistics	16.00%
French	15.07%
Russian, Slavonic and East European Languages	15.07%

Table 4

22. Taking 4\* and 3\* together, and an RAE-wide profile of 54.60%, the Panel M 4\*+3\* profile was 52.85%. Again, the presence of English appears to have had a significant distorting effect: if the English results are taken out, the combined 4\*+3\* profile for the remaining UoAs within Panel M is 50.16%, which again is below the RAE-wide figure. In terms of *outputs* only (which count 75% of the overall quality profile), the (unrounded) 4\*+3\* result for Panel M was 47.6% (according to the Panel M overview report). The difference between the overall 4\*+3\* profile and the profile for outputs only indicates that the overall results were 'brought up' by esteem and environment.

23. The combined 4\*+3\* profile of the eight UoAs within Panel M ranges from 46.73% (Linguistics) to 58.17% (Celtic):

UoA	Percentage 4*+3* quality combined
Celtic Studies	58.17%
English Language and Literature	54.99%
Iberian and Latin American Languages	54.93%
Italian	50.74%
French	49.49%
Russian, Slavonic and East European Languages	48.53%
German, Dutch and Scandinavian Languages	47.88%
Linguistics	46.73%

Table 5

24. Taking 4\*, 3\* and 2\* together, finally, and an RAE-wide profile of 87.35%, the Panel M 4\*+3\*+2\* profile was 86.51%. The equivalent figure for the eight UoAs within Panel M ranges from 81.17% (Russian, etc.) to 88.56% (English):

UoA	Percentage 4*+3*+2* quality combined
English Language and Literature	88.56%
Iberian and Latin American Languages	86.60%
Celtic Studies	86.40%
Italian	85.64%
French	84.49%
German, Dutch and Scandinavian Languages	82.27%
Linguistics	82.05%
Russian, Slavonic and East European Languages	81.17%

Table 6

## Funding

25. In the context of England and Northern Ireland, HEFCE has released some detail of how the RAE quality profiles will be translated into QR funding for 2009—2010 (Doc. Ref. EP 01/2009, dated 28 Jan 09), and the Welsh funding council has announced that it will be following HEFCE's methodology. While providing for some ringfenced funding for STEM disciplines, the HEFCE document indicates that HEFCE will preferentially use the 2008 RAE quality profiles to determine a formulaic QR research-grant distribution, with

funding following excellence, irrespective of its institutional or disciplinary home. However, HEFCE indicates that QR funding in 2009—2010 will continue to be selective, broadly along previous lines, and will not be available to 1\* or unclassified proportions of RAE submissions. The 2\*, 3\* and 4\* proportions of RAE submissions will be QR funded with the following differential: 3\* work will be funded at three times the level of 2\* work; 4\* work will be funded at seven times the level of 2\* work. The document does not indicate what the base unit of resource (UOR) will be for any UoA (but see below). The advantage of the new quality-profile system and HEFCE's approach to QR funding, in comparison with the system of the former single-band system, is that, while institutions might have been tempted, for strategic reasons, to exclude weaker researchers, with a view to optimising their GPA, there is in principle no longer any financial advantage to be gained from being exclusive, or indeed any financial penalty to face by being inclusive.

26. Table 7 provides data based on the overall quality profiles of the eight UoAs within Panel M and HEFCE's decision in respect of the formulaic distribution of QR funding. In Table 7 the UOR is the base level of funding for each UoA, which will be used (together with the 1—3—7 multipliers) to determine the overall 09—10 QR grant per submission on the basis of the proportion of work deemed to be of 2\*, 3\* or 4\* quality. Given the similarity, in terms of cost base, across (most of?) the eight UoAs within Panel M, it is perhaps reasonable to expect that the UOR for each UoA will be similar if not identical. 2009—2010 QR funding allocations for English HEIs released in early March 2009 indicate that the base UOR for linguistics and English, etc., is £6184. The comments below the table are based on the expectation that the UOR for all the UoAs within Panel M will be identical. The UoAs within Panel M are ranked in Table 7 according to the average multiple of UOR awarded per FTE researcher submitted.

	FTE	Multiple of UOR formulaically allocated to each UoA	Average multiple of UOR awarded per FTE submitted	GPA	Change in FTE sub'd
51 Russian, Slavonic and East European Languages	118	280.57	2.39	2.42	+52%
58 Linguistics	307	735.31	2.40	2.42	+46%
52 French	386	941.45	2.44	2.45	-13%
53 German, Dutch and Scandinavian Languages	223	542.26	2.44	2.45	-13%
54 Italian	99	257.92	2.60	2.52	-4%
55 Iberian and Latin American Languages	236	628.71	2.67	2.57	+14%
57 English Language and Literature	1851	5402.89	2.92	2.66	+22%
56 Celtic Studies	104	305.32	2.95	2.65	+12%

Table 7

27. There are significant differences in the level of QR funding to flow through the eight UoAs within Panel M. This is perfectly natural given that the 3323 FTE researchers submitted to Panel M were distributed unevenly across the eight UoAs which consequently varied in size from 99 (Italian) to 1851 (English).

28. There are differences in the average level of QR funding per FTE researcher submitted, from 2.39 (Russian, etc.) to 2.95 (Celtic). These differences cannot be explained by the differing 'sizes' of the eight UoAs within Panel M. Rather, they stem from UoA-internal



differential distributions across the five qualities 4\*, 3\*, 2\*, 1\* and u/c, and run in close parallel with the GPAs for each UoA.

29. The data in the last three columns of the table show that the average level of QR funding per FTE researcher submitted does not correlate with proportional growth in the number of FTE researches submitted. This is a significant observation since it could plausibly have been the case that growth in the number of researchers submitted to a particular UoA had occurred at the expense of quality.

### **Linguistics**

30. The following observations consider the *quantitative* position of linguistics within the context of Panel M on the basis of the above data.
31. The linguistics UoA was unique in Panel M in seeing an increase in the number of submissions made in 2008 in comparison within 2001. To the extent that this runs counter to the widespread trend within Panel M and across the RAE, and arguably indicates a broadening out of the presence of linguistics across the UK HEI sector, this is to be welcomed.
32. The 46% increase in the number of FTE researchers submitted to linguistics was the second highest within Panel M (surpassed only by Russian, etc., where the increase was 52%; but see the comments above). Again, in terms of its significance for the health of linguistics within UK HEI (and assuming there was no change between 2001 and 2008 in the extent to which linguistics work was submitted to other UoAs), this is to be welcomed.
33. Of the eight UoAs within Panel M, linguistics is the third largest in terms of FTE researchers submitted, up from fourth position in 2001 (linguistics has overtaken German, etc.).
34. Linguistics represented 9.2% of the FTE researchers submitted to Panel M in 2008, up from 7.2% in 2001. This again looks like good news for linguistics, and the overall profile of linguistics research is likely to be even higher than these figures suggest: the linguistics overview report mentions a significant number of in-referrals from other UoAs (187 outputs, that is, 16% of the 1172 outputs that the linguistics UoA considered within its 'own' submissions), and a number of the Panel M UoA overview reports explicitly mention the number of out-referrals of individual outputs to linguistics. While the Iberian, etc., and Celtic overview reports note a number of in- and out-referrals to/from a long list of UoAs, linguistics is conspicuous by its absence in both cases, either due to an absence of linguistics outputs, or because the members of the UoA felt that they had adequate expertise to assess the linguistics outputs themselves. In addition, UoAs such as English and education had applied linguists as members, and so would have been able to deal with applied linguistics outputs without necessarily out-referring.
35. In terms of the proportion of 4\* work submitted, linguistics was sixth out of the eight UoAs in Panel M. In terms of the combined proportion of 4\*+3\* work submitted, linguistics was eighth. In terms of the combined proportion of 4\*+3\*+2\* work submitted (and therefore QR funded), linguistics was seventh. Within Panel M, linguistics was therefore a relatively poor performer. This result echoes the 2001 RAE result where (again in the context of the eight UoAs grouped under Panel M in 2008), linguistics had

the lowest proportion of work graded 5\* and 4 or above, and came fifth for work graded 5 or above (note, though, that the 2001 RAE results were issued in a much less fine-grained way than has been the case for the 2008 RAE results). Following the release of the 2001 RAE results the Linguistics Strategy Group<sup>ii</sup> highlighted the disparity between how linguistics had fared and how the other UoAs within Panel M had fared, and was reassured by the Chair of Panel M and the Chair of the linguistics UoA (doubtless reflecting a commitment on the part of the individual members of the linguistics UoA) that, in the context of the 2008 exercise, quality research would be recognised wherever it was found and in whatever form it was found. It is therefore disappointing to note that linguistics has again ranked poorly.

36. Not surprisingly given the observations above, in terms of the average multiple of UOR awarded per FTE researcher submitted, linguistics comes seventh out of the eight UoAs within Panel M. This is disappointing since it means, on the assumption that funding follows excellence, irrespective of its institutional or disciplinary home, and on the assumption that the value of UOR is constant across the eight UoAs within Panel M, that an average submission to linguistics will receive 19% less formulaic QR funding than an average submission (of the same size) to Celtic studies.
37. The following observations consider the *qualitative* position of linguistics within the context of Panel M on the basis of the Panel M overview report and the eight UoA overview reports:
38. The balance between journal and book publication, and the size of grants is different in linguistics compared with the other UoAs within Panel M. The Panel M overview report does not explicitly state which way the differences go, but one might guess that linguistics had relatively fewer book publications and relatively higher levels of grant income, differences possibly attributable to the literary focus within the UoAs of Panel M other than linguistics.
39. Within the context of such a widespread literary focus, it is interesting to note that the Russian, etc., overview report lists its first three areas of interest as “languages, linguistics, translation studies”, ahead of “literature, culture, society, history and thought” even though work on language was only thinly represented or altogether unrepresented. Similarly, the Celtic overview report lists “language and linguistics” ahead of its areas of literary and historical interests.
40. The French overview report expresses ongoing concern at the relatively low numbers of specialists in fields such as linguistics, with fewer than half the submissions including work on French linguistics, and only a handful including more than one linguistics researcher. The report also notes a disappointing lack of evidence of integration of the work of specialist linguists within the wider work of departments. Within this overall context the report highlights the distinctive and productive area of French sociolinguistics, as well as French historical linguistics, semantics/pragmatics and phonetics/phonology, but reports relatively less work in second-language acquisition and translation, and particularly morphology and syntax.
41. The German, etc., overview report explicitly mentions outputs in linguistics and philology, despite the fact that only seven (of the twenty-nine) submissions included work in German historical linguistics and twelve included work in German synchronic linguistics, where the standard was nevertheless high. The report also mentions high-quality work

on Dutch language. Finally, in the context of the shrinking area of Scandinavian, the report notes a shift away from diachronic and synchronic linguistics.

42. The Italian overview report mentions work in: philology; language, linguistics and history of language; and translation and interpreting studies. The report highlights the significant role played by research in linguistics within Italian studies, across a broad range of Italian and Italo-Romance varieties, from the (synchronic and diachronic) perspectives of syntax, semantics, etymology, grammar, rhetoric, and contact linguistics and sociolinguistics.
43. The Iberian, etc., overview report notes that 7% of the total number of outputs were in linguistics (spread across fifteen but concentrated in twelve of the twenty-nine submissions). The report observes that work in linguistics continues to diversify, and specific mention is made of work in descriptive linguistics, historical linguistics, sociolinguistics, pragmatics, creole linguistics, text linguistics, forensic linguistics, and translation studies, across Ibero-Romance.
44. The Celtic overview report refers to a willingness to cross disciplinary boundaries, for example, with linguistics, and highlights the presence within most submissions of work relating to the sociology of the Celtic languages (especially language policy and planning) and, on a more concentrated basis, high-quality work in diachronic and synchronic linguistics, as well as an increase in work in translation studies.
45. The English overview report notes a steady growth in work on the history of English and related languages (accounting for 12% of outputs), as well as an expansion in the core areas (taken to be grammar, lexicology, phonetics and phonology) and growth in corpus linguistics, discourse analysis and literary linguistics. Strangely, the report mentions a growth in work in "applied linguistics" and "English language teaching and learning" while commenting that "little applied research, or research on pedagogy, was submitted".
46. The linguistics overview report refers to what might be termed the relative invisibility of research in linguistics, that is, the fact that staff are often working in departments not institutionally badged as linguistics and, consequently, that a significant amount of work was submitted to other UoAs (and possibly out-referred to linguistics; see the comments above). The report emphasises that high-quality work was found across submissions, new and old, large and small alike, including among those outputs in-referred from other UoAs. The report highlights the diversity and quality of submissions in terms of disciplinary and theoretical coverage, including the growth of clinical linguistics, language typology and language documentation, while noting the small amount of (albeit high-quality) work submitted in the core areas of theoretical phonology and semantics. The report notes that submissions show increasing signs of specialisation.
47. Outside Panel M, the education overview report mentions applied linguistics and language education as a major strand across a number of submissions, while the psychology overview report indicates that only a small number of submissions indicate the presence of research groupings centred on language. The Asian studies overview report explicitly mentions language work generally but a decline in work on the languages of South and Southeast Asia. The European studies overview report highlights a shift away from language-based work to work in the social sciences and humanities, as well as a significant fall in the amount of applied language work submitted (which was typically out-referred), while noting that some large-scale linguistics projects

had secured significant funding. The classics, etc., overview report mentions a small number of linguistics outputs from a handful of institutions (only a 'tiny fraction' of the work considered), albeit mostly of high quality. No reference to language/linguistics is made in the overview reports produced by the sociology or anthropology UoAs.

### **Individual submissions to linguistics**

48. Tables 8—10 set out the results of the twenty-five submissions to the linguistics UoA using different ranking criteria. Table 8 uses the GPA, as calculated by the *Times Higher Education*. The data in the final column indicate how many multiples of the base unit of resource (UOR) each submission will be awarded per FTE researcher. Table 9 is the 'power ranking' calculated by Research Fortnight. Table 10 is a ranking by overall QR funding on the basis of each submission's quality profile and HEFCE's 7—3—1 differential formula.

		FTE	4*	3*	2*	1*	u/c	GPA	£/FTE
1	Queen Mary, University of London	4.45	25	55	15	0	5	2.95	3.55
2	University of Edinburgh	36.00	30	30	30	10	0	2.80	3.3
3	University of York	13.00	20	45	30	5	0	2.80	3.05
4	University of Essex	16.00	25	35	25	15	0	2.70	3.05
5	University of Sheffield	13.50	20	40	30	10	0	2.70	2.9
6	University of Wolverhampton	5.00	15	40	45	0	0	2.70	2.7
7	University College London	14.50	20	30	35	15	0	2.55	2.65
8	University of Manchester	15.00	10	45	35	10	0	2.55	2.4
9	Lancaster University	31.70	20	25	40	15	0	2.50	2.55
10	University of Central Lancashire	6.00	15	25	55	5	0	2.50	2.35
11	University of Cambridge	10.00	20	30	35	5	10	2.45	2.65
12	University of the West of England, Bristol	6.00	10	35	40	15	0	2.40	2.15
13	University of Leeds	7.00	5	45	30	20	0	2.35	2
14	University of Newcastle upon Tyne	28.43	15	25	40	15	5	2.30	2.2
15	University of Reading	14.60	10	25	50	15	0	2.30	1.95
16	University of Ulster	3.00	15	25	40	10	10	2.25	2.2
17	University of Oxford	16.50	10	30	35	20	5	2.20	1.95
18	Queen Margaret University Edinburgh	15.60	10	30	25	30	5	2.10	1.85
19	University of Salford	9.60	5	30	40	20	5	2.10	1.65
20	Bangor University	6.22	5	30	40	20	5	2.10	1.65
21	School of Oriental and African Studies	19.00	10	25	35	20	10	2.05	1.8
22	Birkbeck College	6.40	5	15	45	30	5	1.85	1.25
23	University of Greenwich	1.00	0	20	40	35	5	1.75	1
24	University of Sussex	5.00	0	30	25	35	10	1.75	1.15
25	University of Westminster	3.50	5	5	40	35	15	1.50	0.9

Table 8: Quality ranking by *Times Higher Education* GPA

		FTE	4*	3*	2*	1*	u/c	Market share %age
1	University of Edinburgh	36.00	30	30	30	10	0	15.0%
2	Lancaster University	31.70	20	25	40	15	0	10.8%
3	University of Newcastle upon Tyne	28.43	15	25	40	15	5	8.6%
4	University of Essex	16.00	25	35	25	15	0	6.3%
5	University of York	13.00	20	45	30	5	0	5.2%
6	University of Sheffield	13.50	20	40	30	10	0	5.2%
7	University College London	14.50	20	30	35	15	0	5.1%
8	University of Manchester	15.00	10	45	35	10	0	5.1%
9	School of Oriental and African Studies	19.00	10	25	35	20	10	4.9%
10	University of Oxford	16.50	10	30	35	20	5	4.6%
11	University of Reading	14.60	10	25	50	15	0	4.1%
12	Queen Margaret University Edinburgh	15.60	10	30	25	30	5	4.1%
13	University of Cambridge	10.00	20	30	35	5	10	3.5%
14	University of Salford	9.60	5	30	40	20	5	2.4%
15	University of Leeds	7.00	5	45	30	20	0	2.1%
16	Queen Mary, University of London	4.45	25	55	15	0	5	2.0%
17	University of Central Lancashire	6.00	15	25	55	5	0	2.0%
18	University of Wolverhampton	5.00	15	40	45	0	0	1.8%
19	University of the West of England, Bristol	6.00	10	35	40	15	0	1.8%
20	Bangor University	6.22	5	30	40	20	5	1.6%
21	Birkbeck College	6.40	5	15	45	30	5	1.3%
22	University of Sussex	5.00	0	30	25	35	10	1.0%
23	University of Ulster	3.00	15	25	40	10	10	0.9%
24	University of Westminster	3.50	5	5	40	35	15	0.5%
25	University of Greenwich	1.00	0	20	40	35	5	0.2%

Table 9: Power ranking by *Research Fortnight*

		FTE	4*	3*	2*	1*	u/c	UORs	Market share %age
1	University of Edinburgh	36.00	30	30	30	10	0	118.80	16.2%
2	Lancaster University	31.70	20	25	40	15	0	80.84	11.0%
3	University of Newcastle upon Tyne	28.43	15	25	40	15	5	62.55	8.5%
4	University of Essex	16.00	25	35	25	15	0	48.80	6.6%
5	University of York	13.00	20	45	30	5	0	39.65	5.4%
6	University of Sheffield	13.50	20	40	30	10	0	39.15	5.3%
7	University College London	14.50	20	30	35	15	0	38.43	5.2%
8	University of Manchester	15.00	10	45	35	10	0	36.00	4.9%
9	School of Oriental and African Studies	19.00	10	25	35	20	10	34.20	4.7%
10	University of Oxford	16.50	10	30	35	20	5	32.18	4.4%
11	Queen Margaret University Edinburgh	15.60	10	30	25	30	5	28.86	3.9%
12	University of Reading	14.60	10	25	50	15	0	28.47	3.9%
13	University of Cambridge	10.00	20	30	35	5	10	26.50	3.6%
14	University of Salford	9.60	5	30	40	20	5	15.84	2.2%
15	Queen Mary, University of London	4.45	25	55	15	0	5	15.80	2.1%

16	University of Central Lancashire	6.00	15	25	55	5	0	14.10	1.9%
17	University of Leeds	7.00	5	45	30	20	0	14.00	1.9%
18	University of Wolverhampton	5.00	15	40	45	0	0	13.50	1.8%
19	University of the West of England, Bristol	6.00	10	35	40	15	0	12.90	1.8%
20	Bangor University	6.22	5	30	40	20	5	10.26	1.4%
21	Birkbeck College	6.40	5	15	45	30	5	8.00	1.1%
22	University of Ulster	3.00	15	25	40	10	10	6.60	0.9%
23	University of Sussex	5.00	0	30	25	35	10	5.75	0.8%
24	University of Westminster	3.50	5	5	40	35	15	3.15	0.4%
25	University of Greenwich	1.00	0	20	40	35	5	1.00	0.1%

Table 10: Power ranking by HEFCE formulaic QR funding

---

<sup>i</sup> The University Council of General and Applied Linguistics represents the following organisations: The Association for French Language Studies, The British Association of Academic Phoneticians, The British Association for Applied Linguistics, The British Association for Clinical Linguistics, The Forum for Germanic Language Studies, The Henry Sweet Society for the History of Linguistic Ideas, The Linguistics Association of Great Britain, The Poetics and Linguistics Association, The Philological Society, The UK Cognitive Linguistics Association, The University Council of Modern Languages.

<sup>ii</sup> The Linguistics Strategy Group was the forerunner to the University Council of General and Applied Linguistics.