

## **Commentary:**

# **The UK Research Assessment Exercise (RAE 2008) and retail research output**

**Anne Findlay and Leigh Sparks\***

**Institute for Retail Studies  
Stirling Management School  
University of Stirling  
Stirling FK9 4LA**

**Telephone: 01786 467384**

**E mail: [Leigh.sparks@stir.ac.uk](mailto:Leigh.sparks@stir.ac.uk)**

**(Submitted March 2010, Accepted July 2010)**

**\*Contact author**

**Commentary:  
The UK Research Assessment Exercise (RAE 2008) and retail  
research output**

**Abstract**

The 2008 Research Assessment Exercise (RAE) in the United Kingdom provides a further opportunity to consider changing trends and patterns in retail research, following on a previous commentary (Dawson et al. 2004). This comparison with shows that pressures continue to mount and are impacting retail knowledge creation and dissemination practices, not least in terms of those engaged in retail research, the topics and approaches utilised, the publication tactics and strategies and thus the standing of retail research in the UK and its reputation internationally.

**Keywords: Research assessment, RAE, retail research, UK, quality, journal ranking**

**Introduction**

There is increasing interest in what academics produce, in terms of quality, as well as volume and value of the output. To some extent these dimensions are of course impossible to define as there are so many conflicting stances, viewpoints and biases, as well as entrenched power and commercial positions to sustain. These concerns though have not stopped the burgeoning evaluation industry. There is thus a growing volume of assessment and evaluation of research at various levels. Commercial companies (such as Thomson Reuters) provide, interpret and act as gatekeepers to data. Associations and sector organisations (such as the UK Association of Business Schools) have attempted (though often, in the eyes of many, failed) to bring objectivity to disparate journal “quality” listings. Internally, universities are asking more searching questions about their staff performance and often seek outside 'objective' assistance. Universities in the UK, perhaps particularly, but by no means uniquely, are subject to official government research and teaching evaluation. This has taken the form of a sequence of Research Assessment Exercises (e.g. 1996, 2001), the latest of which reported in 2008. Such exercises, and the implications of their

(financial and 'league table') outcomes, provide further incentives to universities and others to help guide assessments of quality. Not surprisingly, such processes raise major issues (e.g. Fearn 2010) in terms of "judging the judges" and identifying and combating various biases. There is undoubtedly gameplaying of the highest order and a variety of exposed and hidden prejudices, biases and power positions.

Nonetheless, such periodic assessments can produce value by providing (selective) data on publication trends. The sequence of Research Assessment Exercises (RAE) in the UK stretch back in various forms to the 1980s. In terms of retailing, the outcome of the RAE (2001) has been commented upon in this journal (Dawson et al 2004). At the end of 2008 the latest UK RAE results were published. This paper therefore aims to comment on the results of the UK RAE (2008) with regard to our previous commentary on the RAE (2001). It also considers the data in the light of intervening publications and particularly the retail specific work of Runyan, who has produced three articles on various aspects of the publication process, outcome and 'quality' in retailing (Runyan 2008, Runyan and Droge 2008, Runyan and Hyun 2009 – see also Sparks 2007). This commentary is structured to first outline the process of the RAE (2008) and then to reflect on the results in terms of a comparison with the RAE (2001) and on the conclusions that have been drawn by Dawson et al. (2004) within the emerging context as exemplified by the work of Runyan.

### **The RAE 2008 Process**

The RAE (2008) process was broadly similar to that of 2001 and as presented by Dawson et al (2004). Institutions selected staff for inclusion in the RAE and for each included staff member submitted details of up to 4 publications 'published' between

January 2001 and December 2007. The staff member had to be in post at the institution on the census date of 31 October 2007. Staff were submitted in groups by Universities to particular Panels. Panel I covered the Business area and within this a sub-panel (Unit of Assessment 36) covered Business and Management Studies (BMS), to which most retail research was submitted.

The 2008 RAE differed however in one major way from the 2001 version. Rather than assigning submissions a single grade for their research quality as in 2001, a quality profile was generated for each institution's submission in terms of the proportion of the submission's research that was judged to be on a scale from 4\* to 0\*. Quality itself was defined in terms of three characteristics, originality, significance and rigour and the levels were defined as:

4\* - quality that is world leading, that has become or is likely to become, a primary point of reference in the field or subfield

3\* - quality that is internationally excellent, that has become, or is likely to become, a major point of reference in the field or subfield

2\* - quality that is recognised internationally, that has made, or will make, a contribution to knowledge, in theory, policy or practice

1\* - quality that is recognised nationally, that has made or will make a limited contribution

Unclassified (0\*) - quality that falls below the standard of nationally recognised work or which does not meet the definition of research

The requirement on the RAE Panels and sub-panels was to assess submissions' quality in terms of their submitted research outputs, the research environment and the esteem of the staff members. A profile was generated for each and these were combined (weighted 70%, 20%, 10% respectively in BMS) to produce an overall quality profile (i.e. a percentage grade for each point on the scale 4\* to 0\*). This

paper however is only concerned with the outputs. The RAE sub-panel was required to produce a quality grading for every single piece of work submitted; in the case of BMS some 12,575 items. The results that have been made public consist of the grade profile for each of the 90 institutions that submitted to the Business and Management Studies sub-panel, together with details of all the submitted individuals and publications. The grades given to individual outputs however have not been made available.

### **The Dataset**

The submissions to, and results from the RAE 2008 have been published at [www.rae.ac.uk](http://www.rae.ac.uk). The databases are both downloadable and searchable, making a study of retail related research and retail journal preferences in the submissions possible. Using the total submissions database, a keyword search was made for retail entries using key retail terms. Defining the boundaries of the sub-discipline is always problematic but the search process and mechanism followed that used to study the 2001 RAE submissions (Dawson et al., 2004), in order to aid comparability. As in 2001 the financial services sector was excluded from this analysis, as were submissions in Art and Design, which were mainly catalogues or collections for retailers or retail events. In addition to the keyword searching, lists of academics known to be interested in retail research (e.g. using the RAE (2001) and Stirling databases) were checked against submissions. Some of those known to be researching on retailing were either not selected for inclusion by their institution, or else had submissions based, in full or in part, on their publications on non-retail topics.

The data do not present an overall picture of research in the discipline or sub-discipline because of the numerical constraints on individual submissions (4 pieces) and also because of the institutional influence over submission choices (people and publications). Despite pleas to be inclusive, institutions were variably selective in order to maximise the perceived quality of the submission, post RAE league table positions, and financial outcomes. The data however do reveal how institutions present themselves, their academics and their research, giving some insights into disciplinary identities. The data also show journal preferences, which of course reflect to some degree perceptions of journal quality (by individuals, institutions and other ‘judges’). Since 2001, the importance of journal selection has been increasingly emphasised, with the continued publication of articles ranking journals and discussing the appropriateness or otherwise of so-called ‘official’ journal rankings (e.g. in marketing, Svensson, 2006, 2007, Svensson and Wood 2008, Svensson et al 2008, Macdonald and Kim 2007, and in retailing Runyan 2007, Runyan and Droge 2008, Runyan and Hyun 2009 provide details of some of the issues and debates).

As will be understood from this description, some retail scholars were excluded by their institution for varying reasons including lack of, or perceived low quality of, publications. Others may have been excluded for reasons of ‘strategic fit’. Choice of articles submitted will also have been processed through various perceptions and information (of varying quality). What follows therefore is an analysis of the submitted state of retail research in the UK in 2008, after it had been ‘filtered’ by individuals, institutions and “advice” by the Panel, and bearing in mind the different ‘games’ or strategies adopted by Universities.

## **Retailing research: comparing 2001 and 2008**

Table 1 provides some basic comparative data. Between 2001 and 2008 there was a large increase in the number of articles submitted to the RAE on retail topics, although the increase in the number of individuals involved was proportionately greater. This was accompanied by a wider disciplinary base and a substantial increase in the number of institutions containing some submitted retail papers. The number of different journals involved in publishing work on retailing also increased. The increase in articles (26%) mirrors the total increase in submission of publications to the BMS sub-panel.

### *Retail Specialists and Generalists*

A distinction can be made between generalists and specialists. Specialists are defined here as those who submitted all four articles (and in the RAE in BMS, it was articles rather than books that were submitted, although a very few individuals did include books, book chapters and conference papers) on retail topics to the RAE. Whilst overall there may appear to be an expansion in interest in retail research, the specialist sector has not expanded and indeed on all categories in Table 1 the level of entries by this group were lower than in 2001. The proportion of generalists with submissions of only one entry on a retail topic increased, representing 36% of all retail topic submissions and 65% of all individuals. By contrast only 17% of individuals submitted four articles on a retail topic representing 39% of all entries. This figure compares with 55% of submissions by specialists in 2001 and 34% of individuals.

From this we conclude that retailing appears to have become a topic of greater interest across academia, with more individuals, institutions, papers and journals involved.

This interest however, has grown more strongly away from traditional core retail specialists. Retailing is being 'picked up' by non-retail academics seeking new sectors to investigate from their own origins, interests and disciplinary bases. The retail specialists submitted a lower proportion of their papers on retail topics in 2008.

### *Retail Entries and Discipline Identity*

Business and Management Studies was again the main overall disciplinary base for submissions (Table 2). Business and Management was already the main base from 2001 but in RAE (2008) it has become even more dominant. This change seems to have been primarily due to the demise of retail research within the discipline of geography. In part this has continued as yet more geographers have shifted from positions in geography departments or units, to business and management schools or departments. This reflects both changes within geography as a discipline and possibly changes in retail research agendas which have necessitated a more business oriented or focused approach.

There has been an increase in retail submissions from areas such as history, economics and art and design. Their contribution remains proportionately low, but such expansion reflects the growing interest in retailing in these subjects. Retail history for example has undergone its own renaissance and even economists are now realising that retailing represents significantly distinct and difficult research challenges.

In terms of retail specialists, the disciplinary base is considerably narrower. This was true in 2001, but there has been further concentration of researchers in business and



management. This reinforces earlier comments about the ‘discovery’ of retail by non-specialists looking outside what is their mainstream subject area. An alternative explanation is that the number of retail specialists has declined as retail scholars have been drawn to research outside the field of retailing or have chosen to publish in fields outside the core area.

### *The Geography of Retail Research*

Table 3 lists the institutions most involved in retail based research. The University of Stirling numerically remains the lead institution in 2008, as it was in 2001, though other groups have grown significantly. There is similarity between 2001 and 2008, with some changes in relative contributions. Manchester Metropolitan University continues to have a presence, as do the universities of Manchester and Gloucestershire. Although the University of Surrey was on the 2001 list, it has increased its scale notably in 2008. Heriot Watt University is amongst new entrants. Similarly, Loughborough University did not make it on to the list of the largest retail research institutions in 2001, which at the time seemed curious (Dawson et al, 2004), but it does appear in 2008. These institutions accord with the analysis of publications provided by Runyan and Hyun (2009) and so are not surprising. The changes to some extent could reflect the movement of staff from one institution to another, but also demonstrate where investment has been made (and has paid off). In both 2001 and 2008 in BMS alone, only 6 institutions had more than 10 entries. Table 3 seems to be pointing to a limited consolidation in institutions between 2001 and 2008. Although as in 2001, a few institutions were the foci of research, they constituted a smaller proportion of total retail entries in 2008. The proportion of entries in the top eight institutions was 41% in 2001 but only 38% in 2008. This might suggest that there are

two related processes underway; a small consolidation of specialists into leading centres and a widening of the scholar base overall interested in retailing.

The large number of entries from non-retail specialists has several implications. Some of these individuals are in institutions with retail research clusters, and thus may be associated with them, but the majority are not. The distinction between those whose interest in retail research is the primary focus of their research and those for whom a retail example may be part of another piece of work, remains and is reinforced. Many of the Business and Management departments are large and the number of research entries on retail topics and individuals relatively small.

#### *Journals and Retail Research*

The majority of entries in RAE (2008) in Business and Management Studies were journal articles (90%). Only 4% were books and 5% book chapters with a small remainder of other types of publication (e.g. conference papers). Amongst retail specialists 94% of entries were journal articles. Over recent years there have been many attempts to establish rankings of journals (e.g. The Association of Business Schools and Thomson Reuters), sometimes based on a variety of bibliometric measures which aim to capture the impact of the articles submitted to the journal (e.g. Geary et al, 2004), and sometimes as an amalgam 'list of lists'. This, as noted above, is a controversial field. There is discussion of an increasing emphasis on metrics (e.g. citations and impact) for the Research Excellence Framework (REF - as the 2013/14 replacement for the RAE).

There are many critiques of metrics both within marketing and business and management but also more widely in the academy. Much of the emphasis of the literature on journal citations and journal rankings has focused on the mechanics of achieving meaningful rankings. A recent article based on RAE results in the context of geographical research (Richards et al. 2008) makes the point that metrics look back, whilst peer review looks forward and that metrics measure some dimension of impact, but not quality. They dispute the oft quoted view that impact equates to quality, on the basis of the rankings that individual articles achieved in the RAE process, compared with what they would have achieved on the basis of prescriptive thinking about journals. The RAE 2008 subject overview report for Business and Management (and the RAE Panel in this area were expressly forbidden to formulaically use journal quality ranking lists) similarly notes:

*'The sub-panels assessed virtually all the submitted work by examining it and did not use its place of publication as an evaluative criterion. It is worthy of note that there was not a perfect correlation between the quality of a piece of work and its place of publication. Although much top-quality work was indeed published in what are generally regarded as leading journals, top-quality work could also be found in journals occupying a lower position in conventional rankings. Similarly, some of the work considered that had been published in so-called leading journals was thought to be less than top quality. The proportions of these categories also varied across sub-disciplines. There was also a considerable amount of work published in books or other formats, some of which was of world leading quality. **It would therefore be inappropriate in the future to use assessments of journal quality alone to assign quality ratings to individual items of work**'. (RAE 2010, p1-2, emphasis added)*

Paul (2008) who was a member of the 2008 RAE main Panel I states that *'one major conclusion appears to be journal rankings are not a good indicator of the quality of any paper published in the journal, nor necessarily the combined quality of all the papers'* (Paul, 2008, p 324). This of course does not stop the cottage industry of journal quality rankings, nor does it stop some academic managers from grasping at

such 'objective' rankings as the least effort by which to judge their academics' performance.

In a specialist sub-discipline such as retailing authors are faced with the dilemma of attempting to publish in journals which focus on the main discipline and may be more 'prestigious' (according to the journal ranking lists), or of publishing in specialist journals, which are often regarded (by generalist oriented journal quality ranking lists) as less prestigious, but which reach readers in the community of interest.

With retail articles in RAE (2008) in over 100 different journals, the retail literature is at one level dispersed. This is due to some extent to the interdisciplinary nature of some retail research and the rising importance of generalists as noted earlier.

However, within the Business and Management disciplinary area there is both dispersal of the literature on the one hand, but also an important focus on key retail journals. 35% of all entries are to be found in only 5 journals which include the retail specialist journals *The International Review of Retail, Distribution and Consumer Research* and *The International Journal of Retail and Distribution Management*.

Amongst retail specialists this rises to 51% of entries. For those with single retail entries however it is less than 20% (Tables 4-5).

Table 4 shows a number of trends. There is clearly a penetration of a wider literature base and a growth in breadth. This comes from both more general journals increasing their representation, but also significant specialist journals such as *Business History* gaining status. There is growth in the presence of marketing journals. Much of this may be attributed to metrics (e.g. Thomson Reuters) and journal ranking lists (e.g.

Association of Business Schools (ABS)), as well as to the increase in interest in retailing from outside the specialist subject body. The two main retail specialist journals have declined proportionately, though there remains a substantive specialist community.

Runyan's analysis of journal rankings highlighted several aspects of place of publication choices (Runyan and Droge 2004, Runyan 2008) and two sets of particular issues; discipline issues and geographical issues. In terms of discipline issues Runyan noted that in his study of academic preferences, *Journal of Retailing* and *Journal of Marketing* were the top preferences for many retail researchers (though given that the vast majority of these respondents do not publish in these journals, there is a degree of unclarity and aspirational blindness in the argument). Journals such as *The International Review of Retail, Distribution and Consumer Research* and *The Journal of Retailing and Consumer Services* are regarded as of lesser but still significant status. *The International Journal of Retail and Distribution Management* was regarded as acceptable.

Issues of geography focused on differences in preferences between the US and Europe and the UK. *The Journal of Retailing* has long been regarded as Americentric, with a bias against non-US submissions (Sparks 2007, Runyan, 2008). The composition of the editorial board and the journal's track record in publishing papers from outside the US help substantiate this view (80% of *The Journal of Retailing* articles were authored by academics in the US; by contrast less than 25% of articles in the other three retail journals were authored in the US). Of the six entries in *The Journal of Retailing* submitted to the RAE (2008), three of these individuals were not working in

the UK when they submitted the articles and their papers were either on US topics or had US co-authors. The RAE panel noted with specific reference to marketing, that the recruitment of US scholars with papers in 'top rated' journals was a practice adopted by some institutions (and the Panel were against it in principle). European academics had, from Runyan's work, a more positive view of the European based retail journals. However the RAE results showed that although both generalists and specialists did choose to publish in *The International Review of Retail, Distribution and Consumer Research*, *The Journal of Retailing and Consumer Services* and *The International Journal of Retail and Distribution Management*, generalists often preferred mainstream marketing or business journals whilst specialists selected papers from a mix of generalist journals and retail journals. To some extent this is understandable; generalists will use retailing as an example in papers in their home subject base, whilst specialists, probably due to the effect of journal ranking lists and other perceptions, will attempt to play both a specialist and a mainstream 'game'. This may be particularly the case for more established researchers.

A different approach to the subject of journal quality has been taken by Mingers et al (2009) in attempting to reverse engineer the RAE (2008) results into journal quality rankings via a linear programming approach. Some caution is advised though, as the underlying assumptions of this process may not be entirely justified. However this does not impinge on two specific comments that are of interest here. Mingers et al. (2009) note that:

(a) The volume of submissions to *The International Review of Retail, Distribution and Consumer Research* and *The International Journal of Retail and Distribution*

*Management* again (as in 2001 and 1996) place them in the top 6% of frequency of submitted journals in BMS **as a whole**. They thus have considerable 'face value' with academics in the field, despite not being in Thomson Reuters and lowly scored by ABS;

(b) The output of the linear programming exercise (Table 6) confirms to some extent the thrust of the earlier discussion about journal quality in the retail field. There is a problem in Mingers et al (2009), as they have two entries for *The International Review of Retail, Distribution and Consumer Research* due to confusion over ampersands! The results do seem to suggest a halo effect of *The Journal of Retailing*, solid performance in *The International Review of Retail, Distribution and Consumer Research* and lower than expected outcomes for *The International Journal of Retail and Distribution Management* and *The Journal of Retailing and Consumer Services*. 'True' outcomes from the panel for each individual output are of course not published.

### **Conclusions: Retailing Research in the UK in 2008**

In 2004 the commentary on the RAE (2001) concluded that in the UK the sub-discipline of retail studies was firmly located in Business and Management having migrated from its geographical roots (Dawson et al., 2004). The RAE (2008) sees a strengthening of this identity. Within retail research whilst there was a decline in the number of specialist entries there are a number of important clusters of specialists and the specialist literature is important.

The American/European divide identified in RAE (2001) and by others (e.g. Runyan 2008) has continued. This is a methodological and epistemological issue. From the RAE perspective, however, issues relating to journal quality rankings and the possible future use of metrics must be of concern to retail researchers. The European based specialist retail journals have not as yet been accepted by Thomson Reuters (which is Americentric). This is a problem for UK (or indeed global) retail research and particularly for the future of the key specialist journals which draw the sub-discipline together to be a research community. The RAE (2008) outcome has demonstrated the impact of this on the wider and specialist research communities.

Our commentary on the 2001 RAE drew a number of conclusions and possible directions for retail research endeavour:

1. An implied (American, external) model of subject development is being imposed on retail research in the UK;
2. US cultural, technological and methodological approaches are being imposed on the UK in the form of greater standardisation of retail research;
3. Journal ranking lists, due to their inherent norms and stereo typing will alter the publication process for retail research;
4. There will be an increasing narrowness and similarity of topics being published in retailing research as a consequence;
5. UK retail research will be diminished internationally as a consequence;
6. Funding for retail research will be scarcer in the future due to institutional and subject concentration.

The discussion here of the results of RAE (2008) would seem to point to the continuation and impact of these tendencies. The model of retail research



development has adjusted to a more positivist, US-centric, culturally specified approach. This has been driven by the continued biases of the journal ranking 'gatekeepers' and by the approaches taken by the 'top-ranked' journals. The evidence is clear for a changed approach for research and for publication strategy. We contend that this is detrimental to UK retail research and its national and international standing. Whilst we have not performed a topic analysis on the submitted papers, our understanding is that there has been an impact on the topics being pursued. The implication of all these tendencies is for a squeeze on funding and status of retail research in the UK and likely further concentration of specialists. There are great concerns for the stability, ability and probable role of any 'next generation' retail researchers in the UK.

The RAE (2008) indicates that many of the concerns broached in Dawson et al (2004) are now taking 'centre stage'. There is a rising influence of generalists into retail research, reflecting the 'discovery' of retailing, though these are perhaps not fully engaged with the subject and its subject specialists. There may be a clear demarcation between two elements emerging, and this is to some extent the outcome of the RAE process under way as it has been implemented and 'played'. The likely introduction of metrics into future assessments is probably going to exacerbate these tendencies.

For retail researchers it is somewhat problematic that the focus of research managers and others has become so much on **where** we publish rather than **what** we publish, for whom and to what effect or even impact. One has to wonder where such a process will end up, and thus where UK and international retail research will be situated in the future.

## References

- Dawson, J. A., Findlay, A. M. and L. Sparks, 2004 The UK Research Assessment Exercise (RAE) 2001 and retail research output. *International Review of Retail, Distribution and Consumer Research* 14, no.4: 479-491.
- Fearn, H, 2010 “Me” focus skews journal ratings. *Times Higher Education* 4 March 2010, p13.
- Findlay, A.M. and Sparks, L. 2002 European retail journals: a bibliometric analysis. *International Journal of Retail and Distribution Management* 30, no. 8: 373-382.
- Geary, J., Marriott, L., and M. Rowlinson 2004 Journal rankings in business and management and the 2001 research assessment exercise in the UK. *British Journal of Management* 15: 95-141.
- Macdonald, S. and J. Kam 2007 Ring a ring o’roses: quality journals and gamesmanship in Management Studies. *Journal of Management Studies*,44, 640-55.
- Mingers, J., Watson, K. and P. Scaperra, 2009, Estimating Business and Management Journal Quality for the 2008 RAE in the UK. *Kent Business School Working Paper* 205.
- Paul, R. 2008 Measuring research quality: the UK Government’s Research Assessment Exercise. *European Journal of Information Systems*, 17, 324-9.
- RAE 2010, *RAE Subject Overview Reports, Panel I, UoA 36 Business and Management Studies*. Downloaded from [www.rae.ac.uk/pubs/2009/ov/](http://www.rae.ac.uk/pubs/2009/ov/) on 4<sup>th</sup> May 2010.
- Richards, K. and the Geography and Environmental Studies Sub-Panel, 2008, The nature of publishing and assessment in geography: evidence from the Research and Assessment Exercise 2008, *Area*, 41, 231-243.
- Runyan, R. 2008 Defining a forum for retailing scholars: academics’ rankings of journals in the discipline. *International Review of Retail, Distribution and Consumer Research* 18, no.4: 437-446.
- Runyan, R. and C. Droge 2008 A categorization of small retailer research streams: what does it portend for the future? *Journal of Retailing* 84, no.1: 77-94.
- Runyan, R., and J. Hyun 2009 Author and institution rankings in retail research: an analysis of the four retail journals from 1994-2008. *International Review of Retail, Distribution and Consumer Research* 19: 571-586.
- Sparks, L 2007 Retail Journals and Retail Research Metrics, Keynote Presentation at the EAERCD Research Conference, Saarbrucken, June.
- Svensson, G. 2006 The paradoxnoia of top journal(s) in marketing. *European Journal of Marketing* 40, no. 11/12: 1153-1168.

Svensson, G. 2007 Scholarly journal ranking(s) in marketing: single- or multi-item measures? *Marketing Intelligence and Planning* 26, no.4: 340-352.

Svensson, G. and G. Wood 2008 Top versus leading journals in marketing: some challenging thoughts. *European Journal of Marketing* 42, no.3/4: 287-298.

Svensson, G., Helgesson, T., Slatten, T., and B Tronvall, 2008, Scientific identity of “top” research journals in the broader discipline of marketing. *European Business Review*, 20, 384-400.

**Table 1 Base Data: Comparison of 2001 and 2008 RAE Entries**

	2001		2008	
	All	Specialists	All	Specialists
No. Institutions	54	24	72	23
No. Individuals	110	36	189	33
No. Articles	269	144	338	132
No. Disciplines	13	7	19	4
No. Journals	86	52	111	39

**Table 2 Disciplinary Identity – Entries by Subject Area**

N (%)	Generalists		Specialists	
	2001	2008	2001	2008
Business and Management	184 (68.4)	241 (71.3)	108 (75.0)	116 (87.9)
Geography	39 (14.5)	14 (4.1)	12 (8.3)	4 (3.0)
Town and Country Planning	12 (4.5)	16 (4.7)	8 (5.6)	8 (6.1)
History	6 (2.2)	15 (4.4)	4 (2.8)	4 (3.0)
Art and Design	4 (1.5)	18 (5.3)	4 (2.8)	0 (0)
Economics and Econometrics	4 (1.5)	9 (2.7)	4 (2.8)	0 (0)
Other	20 (7.4)	25 (7.4)	8 (5.6)	0 (0)
Total	269	338	148	132

Figures in parentheses are in column percentages.

**Table 3 Geography of Retail Research: Institutions with the Most Retail Entries**

<b>Overall</b>				<b>Business and Management Only</b>			
2001	No. 2001	2008	No. 2008	2001	No. 2001	2008	No. 2008
University of Stirling	28	University of Stirling	27	University of Stirling	28	University of Stirling	27
Manchester Metropolitan	17	University of Surrey	19	Manchester Metropolitan	13	University of Surrey	19
University of Ulster	12	Heriot Watt University	16	University of Ulster	10	Heriot Watt University	16
University of Gloucestershire	11	Loughborough University	15	University of Gloucestershire	11	Loughborough University	12
Manchester University	11	Manchester Metropolitan	14	Manchester University	11	Manchester Metropolitan	12
Glasgow Caledonian University	11	University of Gloucestershire	13	University of Surrey	10	University of Gloucestershire	12
University of Oxford	11	University of Cardiff	12	Glasgow Caledonian University	9	Manchester University	9
University of Surrey	10	Manchester University	12	University of Oxford	7	Brunel University	7
		University of the Arts, London	10			University of Cardiff	6
		Brunel University	10				

**Table 4 Outlet of Publication (Journals with 6 entries or more)**

	<b>2001</b>		<b>2008</b>	
	All Entries (n=269)	Specialist (n=148)	All Entries (n=338)	Specialist (n=132)
International Review of Retail, Distribution and Consumer Research	33	21	29	18
International Journal of Retail and Distribution Management	33	19	35	16
Environment and Planning A	16	7	24	16
European Journal of Marketing	11	5	17	10
Journal of Marketing Management	9	4	14	8
International Research in Marketing	8	5	0	0
British Food Journal	7	4	0	0
Property Management	6	5	0	0
Journal of Retailing and Consumer Services	4	3	10	5
Service Industries Journal	4	1	7	6
Urban Studies	3	2	7	6
Journal of Retailing	1	1	6	0
Business History	3	0	6	3
Journal of Business Research	1	3	6	2

Note: The criterion for entry to the table is 6 entries in either 2001 or 2008. We have then included any entered journal for both years to show change.

**Table 5 Place of publication: Comparison between Specialists and Single Retail Entry 2008**

	Single retail entry (n=124)		Specialists (n=132)	
	Number	%	Number	%
International Review of Retail, Distribution and Consumer Research	7	5.6	18	13.6
International Journal of Retail and Distribution Management	11	8.9	16	12.1
Environment and Planning A	2	1.6	16	12.1
European Journal of Marketing	2	1.6	10	7.6
Journal of Marketing Management	2	1.6	8	6.1
Journal of Retailing and Consumer Services	4	3.2	5	3.8
Service Industries Journal	1	0.8	6	4.5
Urban Studies	1	0.8	6	4.5
Journal of Retailing	6	4.8	0	0
Business History	2	1.6	3	2.3
Journal of Business Research	2	1.6	2	1.5
Totals	40	32.2	90	68.2

**Table 6: Retail Journal Quality Profiles according to Mingers et al (2009)**

	N=	4*	3*	2*	1*	0
International Journal of Retail and Distribution Management	34				<b>100</b>	
International Review of Retail, Distribution and Consumer Research	13			<b>79</b>	21	
International Review of Retail, Distribution & Consumer Research	15		<b>37</b>	36	27	
Journal of Retailing	6	<b>100</b>				
Journal of Retailing and Consumer Services	10				<b>100</b>	

Note: the figures in bold are the implied modal grading for the journals according to Mingers et al (2009).