

University  
of Regina

**Hill** | **levene**  
SCHOOLS OF BUSINESS

# Journal Lists & Rankings

CFBSD AD Research Annual Meeting  
Montreal June 1 & 2, 2017

Moderator: Gina Grandy

# Popular Journal Lists

## o FT50

### o Chartered Association of Business Schools (ABS) UK

- o 2015 version includes 1,401 journals

- o 1, 2, 3, 4, 4\* star journal rankings

- o 4\* = 2.4%; 4 = 6.1%; 3 = 22.3%; 2 = 34.3%

### o Australian Business Deans Council (ABCD)

- o 2,767 journals in 2016 version

- o A\* = 6.9%; A = 20.8%; B = 28.4%; C = 43.9%

o **Harzing list** - collection of journal lists

o **Management Learning List** Currie & Pandher (2013)



# Journal Lists: Benefits

- o Provides an explicit measure of the value of research output
- o Establishes explicit publication targets
- o Reduces uncertainty in planning and evaluation
- o Provides guidance in publication strategies
- o Provides useful information on journal quality
- o Reduces time and effort in evaluations
- o Provides defensible information in grievance situations
- o Useful in benchmarking/baselining

Van Fleet, D., McWilliams, A. & Siegel, D. (2000) A theoretical and empirical analysis of journal rankings: The case of formal lists. *Journal of Management* 26 (5): 839-861

# Journal Lists: Costs

o The use of lists *“dramatically skews scholarship as it implicitly encourages conservative research that asks familiar questions using accepted methodologies rather than research addressing new, often controversial questions that are investigated using innovative methodologies”* (Alder & Harzing, 2009: 80)

Source. Adler, N. J. and Harzing, A-W. (2009) 'When Knowledge Wins: Transcending the Sense of and Nonsense of Academic Rankings', *Academy of Management Learning and Education* 8(1): 72–95.



# Journal Lists: Costs

- o Development can be arduous and time-consuming
- o May be damaging to interpersonal relations
- o May induce rigidity in research standards
- o Could discourage faculty from reading colleagues' work
- o Focus on inputs (articles) rather than on outputs (effect of contribution to the field)
- o Subject to biases and political processes
- o May hinder career development if standards are too institutionally specific
- o Could disadvantage those who do specialized work, especially if they publish in newer journals

Van Fleet, D., McWilliams, A. & Siegel, D. (2000) A theoretical and empirical analysis of journal rankings: The case of formal lists. *Journal of Management* 26 (5): 839-861

# Schools Using Lists

- o Loren Falkenberg,  
Haskayne School of  
Business, UofC
- o Robert Gagné, HEC  
Montreal
- o What list? Why this  
list?
- o How do you use the  
list?
- o Process of introducing  
the list?
- o Faculty response?





Discussion /  
Questions

# Journal List Links / Relevant Articles

o FT50 <https://www.ft.com/content/3405a512-5cbb-11e1-8f1f-00144feabdc0>

o ABS list <https://charteredabs.org/academic-journal-guide-2015/>

o ABCD list <http://www.abdc.edu.au/pages/abdc-journal-quality-list-2013.html>

o Harzing List <https://www.harzing.com/resources/journal-quality-list>

o Currie & Pandher (2013), "Management Education Journals' Rank and Tier by Active Scholars," Academy of Management Learning & Education, Vol. 12, No. 2, 194-218.

o Rowlinson, Harvey, Kelly & Morris (2011) The use & abuse of journal quality lists. Organization 13(4): 443-446.

o Willmott (2011) Journal list fetishism & the perversion of scholarship: reactivity and the ABS list. Organization 18(4): 429-442.

o Mingers & Willmott (2013) Taylorizing business school research: on the "one best way" performative effects of journal ranking lists. Human Relations 66(8): 1051-1073.