

What We Know about REF2029 (Relevant to Your Article)

From the official guidance and related institutional sources:

1. **Contribution to Knowledge and Understanding (CKU)** is replacing “Outputs”. Research outputs (papers etc.) are still important, but REF2029 puts more emphasis on *how the work advances knowledge* in disciplinary contexts. [REF 2029+2Research Support+2](#)
 2. There is a **move away from focusing on individuals** to assessing quality at the **institutional / unit / discipline level**. That means demonstrating that your output is part of a coherent research agenda or contributes to the broader disciplinary area. [REF 2029+1](#)
 3. **Open Access, Code of Practice, Substantive links, and Expenses** are part of the new guidance; outputs must be supported by the institution. [REF 2029+2REF 2029+2](#)
 4. There is still emphasis on *impact and engagement*, but the weighting and formats may have changed. CKU has roughly **50% weighting** of the overall quality profile. [Loughborough University+2REF 2029+2](#)
 5. Interdisciplinary and policy-relevant work is often valued, especially if it clearly shows how it bridges gaps, has methods or findings that can be used outside your immediate domain, or influences or informs policy/practice. (While not always explicit, REF panels often look favourable on rigorous work that is cross-disciplinary or has wide implications.)
-

Why Political Scientists Might Care About Your Paper

Political scientists will care if your findings touch political/institutional structures, policy implications, power, rights, regulation, legality, state vs. non-state actors, and comparative or theoretical generalizability. Also, methods are increasingly appreciated in political science if they help reveal hidden populations, inequalities, rights violations, regulation/good governance issues.

So, to attract political scientists, your Analysis, Results, and Discussion should highlight:

- How exploitation ties into political/institutional settings (labor law, visa policies, regulation, citizenship rights, state oversight).
 - How your findings might compare or generalize to other political systems or policy frameworks.
 - The implications for policy reform, governance, human rights enforcement etc.
 - Clear theoretical framing that links to political science literature: state power, regulation, migration politics, citizenship rights, welfare state, social policy.
-

How to Organize / Emphasize Analysis, Results, Discussion to Meet REF & Political Science Expectations

Here are some concrete suggestions for your Analysis, Results, and Discussion sections, with alignment to REF2029 and political science relevance.

Section	What to Emphasize / Add	Why & How It Helps with REF & Political Science Audience
Analysis (Methods + Data)	- Make very clear <i>which legal/institutional variables</i> are measured or could be relevant (visa status, legal protection etc.)	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Identify which demographic or political/policy-relevant subgroups (e.g. Filipino vs Latinx vs other nationalities; tied vs non-tied visas) Possibly include variables capturing exposure to regulation, knowledge of rights, or legal status as part of the risk index or covariates. Show robustness of results across these groups. Political scientists care about power, legality, rule of law; showing variation by legal/policy status adds texture; in REF, demonstrating breadth (that your output speaks to larger structural/policy issues) strengthens CKU. Results - When reporting prevalence and risk index, present not just overall aggregates, but subgroup results that show how exploitation differs by policy or legal context (visa regime, nationality, gender, length of stay) Show policy-relevant effect sizes: e.g., how much more risk do tied-visa workers face vs. non-tied, how legal/ regulatory differences matter Use confidence intervals, sensitivity analyses and maybe comparisons across estimation methods (RDS vs NSUM) to show robustness. If possible, compare your estimates with official estimates or NGO reports or prior studies to show where gaps or undercounting exist. These make the findings richer, more convincing to political scientists; show that your empirical results have something to say about state policy, visa regimes, governance. Also evidence of methodological rigor helps meet REF's CKU guidance. Discussion - Distinct subsections: Policy Implications (visa reform, enforcement, regulation, migrant labour rights), Institutional / Governance Implications (how state institutions, immigration policy, law enforcement oversight currently fail or succeed), Theoretical Implications (for political science: concepts like citizenship, regulation, vulnerability, power, migration policy), Methodological Contribution (brief but precise), Limitations, then Future Research including comparative/political comparative possibilities. Explicitly engage political science literature (migration studies, citizenship, regulation) in discussing your findings. Possibly suggest how these findings might inform or challenge existing political science theories (e.g. state control, governance gaps, legal exclusion). This makes your contribution visible to political scientists; shows you're not just reporting numbers but engaging with institutions, law, rights, state power. Also for REF, demonstrating knowledge contribution + policy relevance + disciplinary relevance helps. 	

Suggested Adjustments to Your Draft in those Sections

To make this concrete, here's what you (SM) might do in the draft:

1. Analysis tweaks

- Add subgroup analyses by visa type, legal rights knowledge etc. as covariates or moderators in your risk models.
- If possible add variables or data points that capture institutional/legal context (perhaps from your survey: e.g. whether respondents know their legal rights, whether their employer is registered, whether domestic work is regulated in their contracts).

2. Results enhancements

- For each major finding (overall prevalence, risk index), accompany with subgroup tables/figures.
- Compare across estimation methods: show maybe a figure with bars: RDS estimate, NSUM estimate, then subgroup RDS estimate for tied visa vs non-tied.

3. Discussion additions

- Insert a theoretic grounding paragraph bringing in political science: perhaps theories of labour regulation, legality of migrant labour, state capacity, human rights enforcement.
- Break out policy/institutional suggestions: clear calls to policy makers about visa reform, enforcement, regulation, legal protections.
- Explicitly reflect on how findings challenge or support political science expectations (for instance, the importance of legal status, or the degree of invisibility).
- Limitations: include what you cannot say or what your sample cannot show about national legal variation, or cross-country generalization.

4. Abstract and Title tweaks

- Consider adding wording that signals political science relevance: e.g., “labour exploitation under visa regimes”, “state obligations”, “law & policy implications”.