

# Quality Journals and Gamesmanship in Management Studies

Stuart Macdonald and Jacqueline Kam

*Management School, University of Sheffield and School of Economics, Finance and Management, University of Bristol*

## Introduction

Higher education in the UK is an industry supplying an education product for mass consumption. British universities are businesses selling education, managed like other large organisations. Academics are employees serving customers; they are managed, told what to do, their performance assessed and, where possible, measured.

Academics respond with the efficiency their managers admire and encourage (Thornton, 2004), by doing what is counted and eschewing what is not.

Managerialism rewards “academics who willingly restrict their work to duties and activities that provide the greatest measurable output” (Willmott, 1995). Academic endeavour can be particularly hard to measure, and indicators of performance often substitute for performance itself.

Publication in quality journals has become the major indicator of research performance in UK universities. The rewards are huge, though for achieving the indicator rather than for performing the research. The indicator has become the target (Lewis, 2000). Small wonder, then, that gamesmanship is rife: academics, editors, university departments all play the game, their eagerness to win enhanced by the prospect of the winner’s prerogative – the ability to set the rules. The losers are not so much those less skilled in the game as those who look to publication as a means of communicating research findings for the public benefit. In UK universities, the situation is made more acute, rather than caused, by the Research Assessment Exercise (RAE), allocating vast sums largely on the basis of publications in quality journals. We focus on the area we know best, on Management Studies. There we find farce. We propose laughter as not only an appropriate response, but also a stimulus to reform.

## Quality journals

Just what is a ‘quality journal’? The terms ‘premier’, ‘key’, ‘core’, ‘flagship’, ‘top rank’ and ‘top tier’ seem to be used synonymously with ‘quality’ as descriptors of journals to suggest that these journals are superior in some way. Oddly, in just what way they are superior hardly seems to matter. The value of a quality journal lies not in its quality, but in its status as a quality journal.

Academics are notoriously poor at identifying quality journals not known to be quality journals. They tend to be very familiar with very few journals, and very ignorant of the vast majority (Boor, 1973; Levin and Kratochwill, 1976). Academics think more highly of journals when they have published in them (Donohue and Fox, 2000), or served on their editorial boards (Theoharakis and Hirst, 2002). To be sure, there are lists of quality journals in Management Studies, but none of these is compiled in isolation (Harzing, 2005a; Park and Gordon, 1996).

“The initial set of journals was selected on the basis of the number of times they had been included in previous studies of journal influence.” (Podsakoff *et al.*, 2005, p. 475)

Once a journal is on one list of quality journals, it is fairly likely to appear on other lists of quality journals (Johnson and Podsakoff, 1994; Parker *et al.*, 1998); it is a quality journal because it is on a list of quality journals. Conversely, journals not on the lists are likely to remain excluded.

Such circularity is endemic in the world of quality journals. For instance, one characteristic of quality journals in Management Studies is that authors from top business schools publish in them, but then, which are top business schools is often determined by publication in quality journals (Baden-Fuller *et al.*, 2000; Borokhovich *et al.*, 1995; Fische, 1998; Trieschmann *et al.*, 2000). Authors with the highest reputation in Management Studies publish in quality journals, but then those who publish in quality journals acquire the highest reputation (Dewett and DeNisi, 2004). Similarly, quality journals are quality journals because they contain quality papers, known to be quality papers because they appear in quality journals (Johnson and Podsakoff, 1994). Zoroastrian calculations of citation rates and impact factors can be attempted to discover quality in journals, but only inclusion in the Social Science

Citation Index (SSCI) makes analysis possible, and inclusion is reserved for quality journals (MacRoberts and MacRoberts, 1989; Porta, 1996).

High rejection rates are often taken to be the mark of the quality journal (Donovan, 1998; Kirkpatrick and Locke, 1992). Surveys of Management Studies journals find an overall rejection rate of 72.8% in 1970 and 81.7% in 1994, apparently as quality journals become more prevalent (Pierce and Garven, 1995). This compares most favourably with rejection rates of about 50% among eight journals published by learned societies in the fields of Science, Technology and Medicine (Bence and Oppenheim, 2004a). The *Journal of Management* currently has a splendid rejection rate of 92% (Feldman, 2005) and that of the *Harvard Business Review* approaches an almost perfect 99% (Podsakoff *et al.*, 2005).

There are lots of other criteria used to identify quality journals – degree of quantification, circulation, age, affiliated institution, and so on (Ali *et al.*, 1996; Polonsky *et al.*, 1999). Then there is citation, the general assumption being that the more a paper is cited, the better it must be (Phelan, 1999). And the better a paper is, the more it is cited, which means that the same papers are more and more likely to be cited. Of papers cited, the half more cited is actually ten times more cited than the rest (Seglen, 1997). Interestingly, they tend to be published in the same few quality journals. Just seven journals (though not the same seven) account for:

- 61% of citations in 28 Management Studies journals (Podsakoff *et al.*, 2005)
- 58% of citations in 60 Finance and Economics journals (Fishe, 1998)
- more than half the references in 65 Management Studies and social science journals (Tahai and Meyer, 1999).

Our futile hunt for the characteristics of the quality journal is surely to miss the point: all that really matters is that there are some journals that can be designated ‘quality journals’. While the precise nature of their superiority may be difficult to identify, it is, of course, guaranteed by that last bastion of academic professionalism, peer review.

## **Peer review**

The system of peer review screens and improves papers so that, at least in theory, the refereed journal publishes only good and reliable papers (Bence and Oppenheim, 2004b). But does this theory hold in practice these days? Absolutely fundamental to peer review are collegiality and professionalism (Brown, 1997; Roberts, 2003), which means adherence to personal loyalties not circumscribed by an organisation, and a value system established by colleagues rather than imposed by an employer. In a hierarchical world with superiors and inferiors, which is what the university has become (Harley, 2002), peer review becomes a mechanism that allows those who know little about a subject to judge the work of those who know more (Albert, 1997; Coe and Weinstock, 1984; Extejt and Smith, 1990; Fry *et al.*, 1985), and to justify their decisions (Rowland, 2002). With so many desperate authors submitting papers to the same few quality journals, the system struggles to cope. At some point – Miner (2003) suggests a rejection rate of 90% – even the most searching selection processes must break down simply because it becomes inexorably harder to pick a single winner among so many losers. At this point, the editor of the quality journal must intervene if selection is not to be random among the authors, ideas and styles that are most familiar. The editor must invite authors to submit, he must initiate themes, he must fast track (Laband and Piette, 1994).

“... we ‘established authors’ find it a lot easier to go the unrefereed route ... I inadvertently had an article published in the mainline journal *Administrative Science Quarterly*. It was neither submitted nor refereed, something one might consider the best of all possible worlds. This is what happened. I was talking with Karl Weick, the innovative editor of *ASQ*, and asked him if he knew where I might publish a technical report I had done for an agency ... Weick said he knew of some journals that might publish my report, that I should send it to him and that he would check it out. He read it and passed it on to the managing editor, who liked it. She, in turn, passed it on to the two associate editors, and, to my surprise, she said *ASQ* decided to publish it, though I should make unspecified changes to make it more appropriate to the journal.” (Perrow, 1985, pp. 212-213)

The problem is exacerbated by academics having little incentive to referee these days: the work is anonymous and does not count towards performance assessment. Editors have to twist arms to persuade people to review.

“... people are already working 60 hours or more a week and have no time for reviewing submissions; editors have to press friends into doing them favors or tell authors who have had their submission accepted that they will be expected to do a few reviews in return.” (Moret, 1997)

And in practice, editors – not referees – often reject or accept papers in that it is the editor who chooses the referee.

“Editors can err in the choice of specialists (indeed, it is well-known among editors that a deliberate bad choice of referees can always ensure that a paper is either accepted or rejected, as preferred) ...” (Harnad, 2000).

The double blind process in peer reviewing can easily guard the identity of the referee, but not that of the author, especially the prominent author. And editors, of course, always know the identity of authors, and are much more likely to reject papers from the unknown than from the known (van Teijlingen and Hundley, 2002). It could be that known authors write better papers than unknown authors, yet even when papers, identical but for their authorship, are submitted in experiment to various journals, editors accept the papers attributed to known authors and reject the others (Armstrong, 1984). As Bedian (2004) nicely explains, refereeing is best understood as a ‘social process’. It is a sobering reality that, whatever the merits of peer review, papers submitted to quality journals are unlikely to be refereed at all. There must be many ambitious young academics, resolutely submitting to quality journals, who have hardly ever received a referee’s report.

“Certainly as a junior academic in the last RAE round I found it difficult to place papers in the so-called ‘best’ journals, because they already had such a huge backlog of contributions. I cannot even say that they refused my contributions for their lack of quality because they did not even look at them.” (Barnard, 1998, p. 479)

### **Gamesmanship**

Such conditions tempt gamesmanship in the Potter sense – the art of winning games without actually cheating (Potter, 1966). Universities departments play the game, encouraging staff to submit their papers to approved journals (Harley *et al.*, 2004; Polonsky *et al.*, 1999). In Australia, just about to introduce its own version of the RAE, gamesmanship involves incentives of the most blatant sort. The University of Queensland Business School pays staff A\$12,000 each for every paper published in a quality journal. The going rate at Melbourne University Business School is A\$15,000.

Editors also game. They encourage appropriate authors (Ali *et al.*, 1996; Rowlands, 2005), cultivate cadres of regulars who can be relied upon to satisfy one of the major indicators of the quality journal by citing themselves and each other shamelessly, and they inflate rejection rates by encouraging authors to submit. Authors play the game,

citing to impress editors and referees, especially citing papers published in the journal to which submission is made (Liebowitz and Palmer, 1984). It is important to cite papers that others have cited (de Solla Price, 1980; Redner, 2005; Thorne, 1977). This will improve the chances of the author's own paper being cited. Self-citation also helps to increase the impact factor (Phelen, 1999), especially when combined with multiple authorship (Amin and Mabe, 2000). Between 10% and 30% of citation is self-citation (MacRoberts and MacRoberts, 1989). And the more citations a paper carries, the more likely it is to be cited itself (Baird and Oppenheim, 1994; Oppenheim, 1996).

“I once asked a successful author why he kept citing work that he privately characterised as ‘crap’. He frankly admitted that he retained references of dubious value because he felt his public demanded it.” (Thorne, 1977, 1160)

To cite is not necessarily to have read. In fact, about a third of all academic citation is to secondary material (which obviates reading the original), but even the secondary material often goes unread (Sweetland, 1989). Some surveys find more inaccurate citations than accurate (MacRoberts and MacRoberts, 1989; Pope, 1992), and the same errors being passed down through generations of papers (Harzing, 2002).

### **Implications for Management Studies**

The greater the reward for publishing in some journals rather than others, the more effort that goes into targeting. What quality journals are most likely to publish determines what and how research is conducted, and its presentation. Ultimately, this becomes homogenous research, research that “can impose a deadening uniformity on its field of endeavour” (Harley and Lee, 1997, p.1434). In Management Studies, such developments are noted with approval (Podsakoff *et al.*, 2005). It is inevitable that most of what is published, even in quality journals, is not the stuff of Nobel prizes. In other subjects, this seems to be acknowledged (see, e.g., May, 1968), but not in Management Studies. It **often** seems that all publications in quality journals in Management Studies are novel and brilliant, the best of the best (Baden-Fuller *et al.*, 2000).

More effort goes into negotiating publication in quality journals than into research (Bedian, 2003; Spector, 1998). Years are spent in an assessment process that has become more cumbersome and convoluted than ever (Ellison, 2002). Time from first

submission to eventual publication is estimated to average about four years, not counting time taken to conduct research and to write a first draft (Harzing, 2005b). Originality and excitement are unlikely to survive such prolonged evisceration, which might help explain why Management Studies academics tend to associate quality journals with papers that are a struggle to understand (Armstrong, 1980; Vastag and Montabon, 2002).

In Management Studies, quality journals are generalist journals (Johnson and Podsakoff, 1994; Polonsky *et al.*, 1999). Papers about specialised, multidisciplinary research (Easton and Easton, 2003; Henkel, 1999; Polonsky *et al.*, 1999; Tomlinson, 2000) and practical applications tend to be relegated to lesser journals (Ormerod and Kiossis, 1997; Parker *et al.*, 1998). New journals are treated with disdain, no matter how good the papers they publish (Piercy, 2000). The Business and Management Studies panel assembled for the RAE in 2001 was faced with papers to read in 1489 different journals (Bence and Oppenheim, 2004c), and certainly considered new journals a threat to quality (Bessant *et al.*, 2003). The panel was scathing about papers not grounded in the established thinking of Management Studies – as published in quality journals.

While the 1996 RAE exercise was admitted to be subjective, dependent on professional judgement (Cooper and Otley, 1998), by 2001 the Business and Management Studies panel had come to accept that quality is whatever is in quality journals and **that** publishing in other journals indicated scope for improvement. Those following 1996 panel members' advice to produce more inter-disciplinary, comparative, policy work on emerging and neglected areas (Campbell *et al.*, 1999), to invigorate research in Management Studies with 'trans-disciplinarity' (Tranfield and Starkey, 1998), and to close the 'relevance gap' by focusing on the interface with business (Starkey and Madan, 2001) would have had difficulty publishing in **the** quality journals revered by the 2001 panel.

It is said that many in British universities have lost sight of any purpose other than to improve their RAE score (Humphrey *et al.*, 1995; Piercy, 2000). Management academics scramble to identify with the prevailing ideology (Armstrong, 1994), publishing less to communicate than to associate (Easton and Easton, 2003). Staff

certainly seem to be encouraged to publish in quality journals, which means performing the sort of research and writing the sort of paper these journals favour (Harley, 2002).

“... most departments pressure members (each other) to do what *scores*, not what they think will contribute to human knowledge. Morale suffers conspicuously. The system is appalling and eliminates both the lazy and useless *and* the eccentric and brilliant.” (emphasis in original) (Harley, 2002, p. 201)

In August 2005, we surveyed the heads of management departments that had submitted to RAE 2001 Unit 43 (Business and Management Studies). **They sketch a predictable scene** (see Table 1). 42 of the 48 departments responding actively encourage staff to publish in some journals rather than others, and most resort to the lists to help determine quality journals. Nearly two-thirds maintain their own lists, generally adapted from lists compiled elsewhere. Professional journals are definitely out of favour. Various inducements to publish in quality journals are offered, though not usually as blatant as the Australian examples we have noted. Quality journals are overwhelmingly seen as publishing mainstream research rather than niche or interdisciplinary work. The major discrepancy between these findings and the observations of this paper is that UK heads of department are unimpressed by rejection rates. This may reflect a bias in the literature towards US attitudes, but the finding is still strange.

#### **Table 1 about here**

#### **Concluding thoughts**

In a professional system, the academic writes partly for his own benefit and partly for public benefit. In a managerial system, the academic writes for the organisation (Harley *et al.*, 2004) and performance indicators are needed to monitor employees. Publication in quality journals has become the chief of these indicators in Management Studies. Academics have not been mere pawns, tragic victims in this transition. At the very least, they have been complicit, seeing protest as unprofessional (Miller, 1995; Parker and Jary, 1995; Parker *et al.*, 1998). Some have been active supporters.



Of course, academic publishing has always been ridden with self-interest, and academics have always schemed to promote themselves. But while collegiality and professionalism imposed at least some constraint on this behaviour, managerialism offers positive incentives. The winners in the game to produce indicators of research performance feel no obligation towards the losers. No collegial responsibility deters them from exploiting their position to ensure that the indicators incline towards what the winners produce. It is the ultimate in gamesmanship to be able to control the rules of the game. This is akin to what Merton (1988) identifies as the 'Matthew Effect', the observation from the Book of Matthew that those who have most get more, and those who have least tend to lose what little they have. Publication in quality journals has become a currency, representing value rather than having any intrinsic worth, and maintained only by consensus. Papers published in quality journals are money rather than wealth; they are published to be counted rather than read.

Following Harmon (2006), we suspect that ridicule and mockery might be more effective in bringing about reform than wailing and gnashing. Dare we have a good laugh at what we have been doing, or are interests so vested that everyone has too much to lose? Dare we admit that the rewards to scholarship in Management Studies are, in large part, rewards to gamesmanship? Dare we admit that publishing in quality journals has become the academic equivalent of painting by numbers? We might start by taking what we call the 'Tinkerbell option'. Tinkerbell was saved by children everywhere clapping their hands to demonstrate their belief in fairies. Quality journals also need applause to survive in our academic Neverland. Ridicule and mockery mean good riddance to Tinkerbell, but Tinkerbell is a small price to pay for restoring some sanity to publishing in the journals of Management Studies.

**While there is real pleasure in challenging the po-faced self satisfaction that so often accompanies publication in quality journals, mockery alone will not effect change. For change, we must return to basics. Consider what is so often forgotten – the point of academic publication. Pompous as it sounds, surely the point is to contribute to knowledge, not to fill the pages of quality journals. The esteem and the rewards should flow from the former, not the latter.**

And there is the rub. As long as the accomplishment is seen to be publishing in quality journals, there is little incentive to make papers worth reading, or even readable. As we have seen, they are often not read, or not read carefully. What might happen were papers published in quality journals not simply as a matter of record, but actually to be read? Imagine waiting excitedly for the next issue of a quality journal, its papers all so enticing that which to devour first is an impossible decision, their arguments all so stimulating that the corridors buzz with discussion. There is a way to go yet.

It is tempting to expect the editors of quality journals to take the first step – let them publish better stuff. This is unrealistic and unfair; editors are as chained to the quality journal treadmill as academics generally, and - to be even more fair - as university managers. No, the most appropriate agents of at least initial change are those academics who can afford to publish elsewhere without attracting the accusation that they are unable to publish in quality journals. Of all parties, they are best positioned to defy the system by placing some of their most significant work in specialist journals. There it will be very carefully read, the reputation of both author and journal dependent upon the scrutiny. Let our intellectual leaders show young researchers an alternative to desperately refining gamesmanship to achieve the single ambition of publishing in quality journals.

It is simply not acceptable that academic papers are published where they will yield the greatest financial gain for an employer, not where they will be read by the most appropriate audience. That stance will smack of precious professionalism to many a university manager, comfortable with a system in which publication in quality journals is central to the allocation of funds and the positioning of individuals in the university hierarchy. The more fundamental that system to institutional survival, and the greater the returns from managing it effectively, the more change will be resisted. Our mockery might reveal how contrived the system has become, but change itself demands less control of academics and more trust. Are those who have become so accomplished at gamesmanship still worthy of such trust? They have much to prove. Let them seize the opportunity.

## Acknowledgement

The authors are grateful to the many individuals who provided information for this paper, and to those who commented on drafts. They are especially grateful for the kind encouragement of the editors and referees of the *Journal of Information Science* and the *Journal of Management Science*, in which versions of this paper have been published.

## References

- Albert, T. (1997). 'Why bother with peer review?', *Lancet*, 350, 822.
- Ali, S., Young, H. and Ali, N. (1996). 'Determining the quality of publications and research for tenure and promotion decisions', *Library Review*, 45, 1, 39-53.
- Amin, M. and Mabe, M. (2000). 'Impact factors: Use and abuse', *Perspectives in Publishing*, 1, 1-6.
- Armstrong, J. (1980). 'Unintelligible Management research and academic prestige', *Interfaces*, 10, 2, 80-86.
- Armstrong, J. (1984). 'Peer review of scientific papers', *Journal of Biological Response Modifiers*, 3, 1, 10-14.
- Armstrong, J. (1994). *Why Management Fads Persist: On Experience Curves, the BCG Matrix, Escalation Bias and Such*, Wharton School, University of Pennsylvania, mimeo.
- Baden-Fuller, C., Ravazzolo, F. and Schweizer, T. (2000). 'Making and measuring reputations', *Long Range Planning*, 33, 5, 621-650.
- Baird, L. and Oppenheim, C. (1994). 'Do citations matter?', *Journal of Information Science*, 20, 1, 2-15.
- Barnard, J. (1998). 'Reflections on Britain's Research Assessment Exercise', *Journal of Legal Education*, 48, 4, 467-495.
- Bedeian, A. (2003). 'The manuscript review process: The proper roles of authors, referees and editors', *Journal of Management Inquiry*, 12, 4, 331-338.
- Bedian, A. (2004). 'Peer review and the social construction of knowledge in the Management discipline', *Academy of Management Learning and Education*, 3, 2, 198-216.
- Bence, V. and Oppenheim, C. (2004a). 'The role of academic journal publications in the UK Research Assessment Exercise', *Learned Publishing*, 17, 1, 53-68.
- Bence, V. and Oppenheim, C. (2004b). 'The influence of peer review on the Research Assessment Exercise', *Journal of Information Science*, 30, 4, 347-368.
- Bence, V. and Oppenheim, C. (2004c). 'Does Bradford-Zipf apply to Business and Management journals in the 2001 Research Assessment Exercise?', *Journal of Information Science*, 30, 5, 469-474.
- Bessant, J., Birley, S., Cooper, C., Dawson, S., Gennard, J., Gardiner, M., Gray, A., Jones, P., Mayer, C., McGee, J., Pidd, M., Rowley, G., Saunders, J. and Stark, (2003). 'The state of the field in UK Management research: Reflections of the Research Assessment Exercise (RAE) panel', *British Journal of Management*, 14, 1, 51-68.

- Borokhovich, K., Bricker, R., Brunarski, K. and Simkins, B. (1995). 'Finance research productivity and influence', *Journal of Finance*, 50, 5, 1691-1717.
- Boor, M. (1973). 'Unfamiliarity breeds disdain: Comment on department chairmen's ratings of psychological journals', *American Psychologist*, 28, 11, 1012-1013.
- Brown, J. (1997). 'Editorial: The citation rating game', *British Society for Plant Pathology Newsletter*, 31, available at: [www.bspp.org.uk/bsppnews/bsppnews31/bsppnews31.htm](http://www.bspp.org.uk/bsppnews/bsppnews31/bsppnews31.htm)
- Campbell, K., Vick, D., Murray, A. and Little, G. (1999). 'Journal publishing, journal reputation, and the United Kingdom's Research Assessment Exercise', *Journal of Law and Society*, 26, 4, 470-501.
- Coe, R. and Weinstock, I. (1984). 'Evaluating the management journals: A second look', *Academy of Management Journal*, 27, 3, 660-666.
- Cooper, C. and Otley, D. (1998). 'The 1996 Research Assessment Exercise for Business and Management', *British Journal of Management*, 9, 2, 73-89.
- de Solla Price, D. (1980). 'The citation cycle', in Griffith, B. (ed.), *Key Papers in Information Science*, White Plains, New York: Knowledge Industry Publications.
- Dewett, T. and DeNisi, A. (2004). 'Exploring scholarly reputation: It's more than just productivity', *Scientometrics*, 60, 2, 249-272.
- Donohue, J. and Fox, J. (2000). 'A multi-method evaluation of journals in the decision and management sciences by US academics', *Omega*, 28, 17-36.
- Donovan, B. (1998). 'The truth about peer review', *Learned Publishing*, 11, 3, 179-184.
- Easton, G. and Easton, D. (2003). 'Marketing journals and the Research Assessment Exercise', *Journal of Marketing Management*, 19, 1-2, 5-24.
- Ellison, G. (2002). 'The slowdown of the Economics publishing process', *Journal of Political Economy*, 110, 5, 947-993.
- Extejt, M. and Smith, J. (1990). 'The behavioural sciences and Management: An evaluation of relevant journals', *Journal of Management*, 16, 3, 539-551.
- Feldman, D. (2005), editor, *Journal of Management*, personal correspondence, May.
- Fishe, R. (1998). 'What are the research standards for full professor of Finance?', *Journal of Finance*, 53, 3, 1053-1079.
- Fry, E., Walters, C. and Scheuermann, L. (1985). 'Perceived quality of fifty selected journals: Academicians and practitioners', *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, 13, 2, 352-361.
- Harley, S. (2002). 'The impact of research selectivity on academic work and identity in UK universities', *Studies in Higher Education* 27, 2, 187-205.
- Harley, S. and Lee, F. (1997). 'Research selectivity, managerialism, and the academic labor process: The future of nonmainstream Economics in UK universities', *Human Relations*, 50, 11, 1427-1460.
- Harley, S., Muller-Camen, M. and Collin, A. (2004). 'From academic communities to managed organisations: The implications for academic careers in UK and German universities', *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 64, 2, 329-345.
- Harmon, M. (2006). 'Business research and Chinese patriotic poetry: How competition for status distorts the priority between research and teaching in US business schools', *Academy of Management Learning & Education*, 5, 2, 234-243.
- Harnad, S. (2000). 'The invisible hand of peer review', *Exploit Interactive*, 5, April, available at: [www.exploit-lib.org/issue5/peer-review/](http://www.exploit-lib.org/issue5/peer-review/)
- Harzing, A-W. (2002). 'Are our referencing errors undermining our scholarship and

- credibility? The case of expatriate failure rates', *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 23, 127-148.
- Harzing, A-W. (2005a). *Journal Quality List*, available at: [www.harzing.com](http://www.harzing.com)
- Harzing, A-W. (2005b). 'Australian research output in Economics and Business: High volume, low impact?', *Australian Journal of Management*, 30, 2, 183-198.
- Henkel, M. (1999). 'The modernisation of research evaluation: The case of the UK', *Higher Education*, 38, 1, 105-122.
- Humphrey, C., Moizer, P. and Owen, D. (1995). 'Questioning the value of the research selectivity process in British university accounting', *Accounting, Auditing & Accountability Journal*, 8, 3, 141-164.
- Johnson, J. and Podsakoff, P. (1994). 'Journal influence in the field of Management: An analysis using Salancik's Index in a dependency network', *Academy of Management Journal*, 37, 5, 1392-1407.
- Kirkpatrick, S. and Locke, E. (1992). 'The development of measures of faculty scholarship', *Group & Organization Management*, 17, 1, 5-23.
- Laband, D. and Piette, M. (1994). 'Favouritism versus search for good papers: Empirical evidence regarding the behaviour of journal editors', *Journal of Political Economy*, 102, 1, 194-203.
- Levin, J. and Kratochwill, T. (1976). 'The name of the journal fame game', *American Psychologist*, 31, 9, 673-674.
- Lewis, J. (2000). 'Funding social science research in academia', *Social Policy and Administration*, 34, 4, 365-376.
- Liebowitz, S. and Palmer, J. (1984). 'Assessing the relative impacts of Economics journals', *Journal of Economic Literature*, 22, 1, 77-88.
- MacRoberts, M. and MacRoberts, B. (1989). 'Problems of citation analysis: A critical review', *Journal of the American Society for Information Science*, 40, 5, 342-349.
- May, K. (1968). 'Growth and quality of the mathematical literature', *Isis*, 59, 4, 363-371.
- Merton, R. (1988). 'The Matthew Effect in science, II: Cumulative advantage and the symbolism of intellectual property', *Isis*, 79, 4, 606-623.
- Miller, H. (1995). *The Management of Change in Universities*, Buckingham: Open University Press.
- Miner, J. (2003). 'Commentary on Arthur Bedeian's "The manuscript review process: the proper roles of authors, referees, and editors"', *Journal of Management Inquiry*, 12, 4, 339-343.
- Moret, B. (1997). 'Bridging the gap between theory and practice', *Journal of Electronic Publishing*, 3, 1, available at: <http://www.press.umich.edu/jep/03-01/JEA.html> (accessed March 2005).
- Oppenheim, C. (1996). 'Do citations count? Citation indexing and the Research Assessment Exercise (RAE)', *Serials*, 9, 2, 155-161.
- Ormerod, R. and Kioussis, I. (1997). 'OR/MS publications: Extension of the analysis of US flagship journals to the United Kingdom', *Operations Research*, 45, 2, 178-187.
- Park, S. and Gordon, M. (1996). 'Publication records and tenure decisions in the field of strategic management', *Strategic Management Journal*, 17, 2, 109-128.
- Parker, L., Guthrie, J. and Gray, R. (1998). 'Accounting and Management research: Passwords from the gatekeepers', *Accounting, Auditing & Accountability Journal*, 11, 4, 371-406.
- Parker, M. and Jary, D. (1995). 'The McUniversity: Organization, management and

- academic subjectivity', *Organization*, 2, 2, 319-338.
- Perrow, C. (1985). 'Journaling careers', In Cummings, L. and Frost, P. (eds.), *Publishing in the Organizational Sciences*, London: Sage, 96-107.
- Phelan, T. (1999). 'A compendium of issues for citation analysis', *Scientometrics*, 45, 1, 117-136.
- Pierce, B. and Garven, G. (1995). 'Publishing international business research: A survey of leading journals', *Journal of International Business Studies*, 26, 1, 69-89.
- Piercy, N. (2000). 'Why it is fundamentally stupid for a business school to try to improve its Research Assessment Exercise score', *European Journal of Marketing*, 34, 1/2, 27-35.
- Podsakoff, P., Mackenzie, S., Bachrach, D. and Podsakoff, N. (2005). 'The influence of Management journals in the 1980s and 1990s', *Strategic Management Journal*, 26, 5, 473-488.
- Polonsky, J., Jones, G. and Kearsley, M. (1999). 'Accessibility: An alternative method of ranking Marketing journals', *Journal of Marketing Education*, 21, 3, 181-193.
- Pope, N. (1992). 'Accuracy of references in ten Library Science journals', *Research Quarterly*, 32, 2, 240-243.
- Porta, M. (1996). 'The bibliographic "impact factor" of the Institute for Scientific Information: How relevant is it really for Public Health journals?', *Journal of Epidemiology and Community Health*, 50, 606-610.
- Potter, S. (1966). *The Theory and Practice of Gamesmanship*, Harmondsworth: Penguin.
- Redner, S. (2005). 'Citation statistics from 110 years of *Physical Review*', *Physics Today*, 58 (June), 49-54.
- Roberts, G. (2003). *Review of Research Assessment: A Report to the Funding Bodies*, HEFCE Report, 22, Bristol, May.
- Rowland, F. (2002). 'The peer-review process', *Learned Publishing*, 15, 4, 247-258.
- Rowlands, I. (2005). 'Emerald authorship data: Lotka's law and research productivity', *ASLIB Proceedings*, 57, 1, 5-10.
- Seglen, P. (1997). 'Why the impact factor of journals should not be used for evaluating research', *British Medical Journal*, 314, 15 February, 497-502.**
- Spector, P. (1998). 'When reviewers become authors: A comment on the journal review process', *Academy of Management Research Methods Forum* 3, available at: [http://division.aonline.org/rm/1998\\_forum\\_reviewers\\_ecome\\_authors.html](http://division.aonline.org/rm/1998_forum_reviewers_ecome_authors.html)
- Starkey, K. and Madan, P. (2001). 'Bridging the relevance gap: Aligning stakeholders in the future of Management research', *British Journal of Management*, 12, S3-S26.
- Sweetland, J. (1989). 'Errors in bibliographic citations: A continuing problem', *Library Quarterly*, 59, 4, 291-304.
- Tahai, A. and Meyer, M. (1999). 'A revealed preference study of Management journals' direct influences', *Strategic Management Journal*, 20, 3, 279-296.
- Theoharakis, V. and Hirst, A. (2002). 'Perceptual differences of Marketing journals: A worldwide perspective', *Marketing Letters*, 13, 4, 389-402.
- Thorne, F. (1977). 'The citation index: Another case of spurious validity', *Journal of Clinical Psychology*, 33, 4, 1157-1161.
- Thornton, M. (2004). 'Corrosive leadership (or bullying by another name): A

- corollary of the corporatised academy?', *Australian Journal of Labour Law*, 17, 2, 161-184.
- Tomlinson, S. (2000). 'The Research Assessment Exercise and medical research', *British Medical Journal*, 320, 4 March, 636-639.
- Tranfield, D. and Starkey, K. (1998). 'The nature, social organization and promotion of Management research: Towards policy', *British Journal of Management*, 9, 4, 341-353.
- Trieschmann, J., Denis, A., Northcraft, G. and Niemi, A. Jr. (2000). 'Serving multiple constituencies in the business school: MBA program vs. research performance', *Academy of Management Journal*, 43, 6, 1130-1141.
- Van Teijlingen, E. and Hundley, V. (2002). 'Getting your paper to the right journal: A case study of an academic paper', *Journal of Advanced Nursing*, 37, 6, 506-511.
- Vastag, G. and Montabon, F. (2002). 'Journal characteristics, rankings and social acculturation in Operations Management', *Omega*, 30, 109-126.
- Willmott, H. (1995). 'Managing the academics: Commodification and control in the development of university education in the UK', *Human Relations*, 48, 9, 993-1027.

**Table 1. Attitudes Towards Quality Journals of Heads of Management Studies Departments in UK Universities**

	% of respondents (n = 48)
Criteria to determine quality journals	
• journal is refereed	85
• journal high in ranking lists	81
• personal experience	31
• high rejection rate	8
• read by managers	4
Maintain own ranking list	64
Characteristics of papers published in quality journals	
• mainstream	81
• specialist	48
• critical	26
• interdisciplinary	21
Means of encouraging publication in quality journals	
• advice on writing	79
• exhortation	71
• promotion	64
• money	21
• steering research into favoured areas	21

**Stuart Macdonald**

**Stuart Macdonald is Professor of Information and Organisation in the Management School at the University of Sheffield. His research explores the role**



**of information in innovation, and especially the means by which information is sought, gathered, screened, mixed and used to produce change. Of particular interest are the flow of information and the information exchange that occurs in personal and informal networks. Making information central in issues where this is not the normal approach can have interesting results.**

**Jacqueline Kam**

**Jacqueline Kam is a Lecturer in the School of Economics, Finance and Management at the University of Bristol. She joined academia after a varied corporate and consulting career. She is interested in topics in technology management, innovation, strategic management and professional service firms, with a focus on information and knowledge, and the impact of management fads.**