Journal rankings and the *ABS Journal Quality Guide*

The Authors

Huw Morris, ***Manchester Metropolitan Business School, Manchester, UK***

Charles Harvey, ***Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences, Newcastle University, Newcastle, UK***

Aidan Kelly, ***Department of Sociology, University of London, London, UK***

Abstract

Purpose – The purpose of this paper is to provide an outline of the arguments for and against different types of journal ranking lists, and, against this background, an account of the development of the Association of Business Schools' (ABS) *Journal Quality Guide*.

Design/methodology/approach – The paper identifies recent trends in academic journal publication that have increased the need for mechanisms to assess the overall quality of academic journals. Six approaches to ranking are outlined and evaluated including the hybrid approach adopted in producing the *ABS Journal Quality Guide*.

Findings – The *ABS Journal Quality Guide* provides wide journal coverage; has high levels of internal and external reliability; is sensitive to small variations in the ratings of journals, and is generally accepted as a fair means of ranking journals within its user community.

Research limitations/implications – This paper focuses on developments in the UK, and while the findings of this study may be of interest to researchers in other countries, the implications for policy and practice will be felt most keenly in British business schools.

Originality/value – This paper describes a hybrid, iterative and consensual approach to developing and validating a journal quality guide that is likely to be of value to researchers, academic managers, subject librarians and research auditors.

Article Type:

Research paper

Keyword(s):

Business studies; General management; Serials.

Journal:

Management Decision

Volume:

47

Number:

9

Year:

2009

pp:

1441-1451

ISSN:

0025-1747

Introduction

The number and range of academic journals in business and management has increased rapidly in recent years (Ulrich, 2007). This has brought both benefits and problems. It is now easier for researchers to find outlets for their papers, and for lecturers and students to locate articles in a wide range of specialist areas. However, there are now so many journals available that it is difficult for academics, university managers, librarians and institutional auditors to determine the currency and relative value of publications in the numerous sub-fields that constitute business and management as a whole.

There are currently five widely used methods for evaluating the quality of academic publications: individual citation scores, institutional lists, peer surveys, derived lists, and citation studies. This article describes the main features of each of these approaches, comments on their relative advantages and disadvantages and then outlines a new hybrid method of rating journals developed on behalf of the Association of Business Schools (ABS). It is argued that there is no perfect method of assessing journal quality, but that the *ABS Journal Quality Guide* (ABS, 2007a) overcomes some of the failings of established methods. It is suggested that the use of a range of indicators and an iterative process for gaining consensus among peers sets the ABS Guide apart from others. Its value lies in making it easier for researchers to identify with confidence journals that might to publish their work; in helping academic managers to make staff selection, development, promotion, and reward decisions; and in enabling librarians to make the most of acquisition budgets by securing access to the most appropriate journals. It may also assist research auditors to make more informed judgements about the nature and quality of work being undertaken in particular schools and departments. Finally, it offers the prospect, through the demonstration of consensus within the field and related specialities, of winning reputational advantages for business and management researchers.

This article is divided into three sections. The first describes recent changes in the volume and form of journal publications in business and management. The second outlines the main features of the five established methods of assessing the quality of articles and journals. The final section describes the process of developing and maintaining ABS guide, and discusses the merits and problems associated with the approach taken.

1. Academic journal publication in business and management

The history of journal publication in business and management is a relatively short, beginning in the USA in the third decade of the twentieth century (the *Harvard Business Review* was first published in 1922; the *Journal of Marketing* in 1936; *Personnel Psychology* in 1948; *Management Science* in 1954; the *Administrative Science Quarterly* in 1956; and the *Academy of Management Journal* in 1958). In the UK, the history is even shorter, with the first academic journals concentrating solely on contemporary business and management appearing in the 1960s (*Management Decision* was first published in 1963; the *Journal of Management Studies* in 1964; and *Long Range Planning* in 1968). The *British Journal of Management*, the house journal of the British Academy of Management (BAM), was first published in 1990, in the wake of the formation of BAM in 1986 and the Research Selectivity Exercises of 1986 and 1989. Only *Human Relations*, published by the Tavistock Institute since 1947, can reasonably lay claim to a pedigree comparable to the most prestigious American publications.

For much of the twentieth century, academic journal publication was paper based and low in volume. In the 1990s and early twenty-first century, five noteworthy changes have occurred. The first, and perhaps the most significant, has been an increase in the number of business academics and students. In the UK alone, the number of academic staff in university business schools increased between 1994 and 2006 by 30 per cent from 7,157 to 9,608. Meanwhile, the number of students grew over the same period by 40 per cent from 159,700 to 223,041 (ABS, 2007b). The number of business and management researchers around the world likewise moved upwards (Pettigrew, 1997). Growth on this scale has made it increasingly difficult for researchers to keep pace with developments (Scott, 1995; Becher and Trowler, 2001). In the Research Assessment Exercise conducted in 2001, the business and management panel had the unenviable task of assessing the publications of 2,554 researchers, working in 91 universities, undertaking research in 22 specialist fields. Business and management was the largest subject to be assessed and will be so once again for RAE 2008.

The second important change has been an increase in the number of academic journal published. In all subjects, the number of titles and the number of issues and articles in each volume increased steadily between 1980 and 2000 (Mabe and Amin, 2001). Between 2000 and 2006 the rate of growth appears quickened, especially in business and management (Ulrich, 2007). In consequence, there were over 1,000 academic journals that by 2006 might be classified as vehicles for the publication of business and management research. Growth in the number of journals in part has been a response to the growth in numbers of research active academics across the world. In the UK, the academic scene was coloured by the RAE audits of 1992, 1996 and 2001, which directly and indirectly have had a profound impact on the distribution of research funding (Henkel, 2000; Strathern, 2000; Roberts, 2003). In the 2001 RAE, refereed journal articles as a proportion of all publications submitted stood at 80.2 per cent in Business and Management, 81.9 per cent, in Accounting and Finance and 76.25 per cent in Economics and Econometrics. The overall proportion was approximately twice as high as for other social science disciplines.

A third change, accompanying this expansion in the number of journals, has been an ongoing transformation in the means of delivery. From the beginning of the 1990s print journals have been complemented and increasingly replaced by electronic journals. In 1991, the number of journals distributed electronically in all subject areas was 27, by 1997 this had grown to 3,634, and by 2006 the number had grown to more than 20,000 (Okerson, 2000; Ulrich, 2007). As the number of journals has grown, publishers and aggregating companies have sought to provide libraries with searchable collections of many thousands of titles (including EBSCO Business Source Premier, Emeraldinsight, Ingentaconnect and ProQuest ABI Inform). The bundled nature of these products makes it difficult for librarians to secure access to journals on a selective basis, contributing to above inflation price increases and inflated library budgets (Tenopir and King, 2000). This is not to say that these changes have been without benefit. Bringing together many journals in a few databases has made it easier for researchers to locate and access articles, rather than systematically working through paper indexes and individual journal series. However, this change in search behaviour, combined with an increased number of titles and a corresponding decline in individual journal subscriptions, has reduced the sense of personal connection academics once had with their journals of choice (Tenopir, 2003).

A fourth important change has been an increase in the average number of journal articles read by academic researchers (Tenopir and King, 2002; Tenopir, 2003). While reading patterns vary between subject areas, Tenopir found that among social science academics in the USA at the beginning of the twenty-first century it was not uncommon for individuals to read 150 articles per year. Most academics select articles from a small number of core journals and trawl more widely when looking to make lateral connections. However, despite the growth in the average number of articles read, it is not clear that reading has kept pace with the growth in material available. The "quantum leap" problem is similar to that faced by RAE panel members. In the 2001 exercise, business and management panel members were faced with 9,020 journal articles to read in less than four months. With an average of 694 articles per panel member, it is not surprising that they reported reading "15-30 per cent of outputs with some reading as much as 75 per cent" (Bessant *et al.*, 2003, p. 53).

The final change has been increased diversity in the content of publications. Business and management researchers draw on a wide range of theoretical approaches, methodologies and analytical methods. The field has resisted normative pressures to coalesce around a set of ontological, epistemological and methodological norms (Tranfield and Starkey, 1998). Instead, it has remained a loose collection of specialisms and quasi-disciplines with a common interest in business and management practices, with conspicuous and persistent differences in values, theoretical reference points, methods, and writing styles. Thus, marketing specialists continue to differ in approach from colleagues in human resource management (HRM), who, in turn, differ from information systems researchers, strategists and the small business researchers. Developing the metaphorical allusions of Becher (1989), business and management research is a conurbation or an urban sprawl rather than a city. To someone from another discipline, it might appear that distinct groups within this metropolis know how to get to one another (in all senses of this phrase), but who do not necessarily share the same interests, or act in the same ways, or indeed have the same accents. In recent times, to add complexity to these internal differences, these separate traditions have themselves been bisected by wider movements in social science disciplines, altering relationships within and between fields, and giving rise to new specialisms (Becher and Trowler, 2001; Lee, 2003).

2. Methods of assessing the quality of articles and journals

When confronted with the challenge of assessing the quality of large numbers of journal articles or journals with very varied content, there are a limited number of methods that might be used. Simply replicating the peer review process is impractical, given the time, resources and specialist knowledge needed to conduct a thorough appraisal of even a single article. In practice, therefore, five methods are commonly used to assess the quality of articles and journals; none of which is without limitations or free from criticism.

a. Individual citation

A commonly used proxy for the quality of an article or the impact of an author is the citation score. This is a measure of the number of times the work or author is referred to in articles from a select range of journals and occasionally other forms of publication. There are an increasing number of places from which this information can be gleaned. For example, ISI HighlyCited.com provides a searchable database of 250 leading researchers in 21 subject areas as defined by the number of citations their work has received (ISI, 2007a). Of these, just nine were based at UK institutions and all are economists. Other resources that can be used to gain citation information include Thomson's ISI Web of Knowledge and Elsevier's Scopus. Both of these online databases provide data on over 22,000 journals, but both have less than 500 business and management titles – fewer than half the number of journals in the field (ISI, 2007b; Scopus, 2007). Aside from these subscription services, perhaps the most commonly used citation database is Google Scholar. This database ranks peer-reviewed papers, books, theses and conference papers by their citation count and length. Regrettably, the algorithm and automated search methods that produce these data are not publicly available and change from time to time. These changes mean that the recorded citation scores can go up and down and may be affected by high numbers of references in non-refereed publications.

b. Institutional lists

This approach relies on an academic researcher, school or department compiling a list of journals and then ranking them according to perceived quality and standing within the field. A particularly useful resource is the "list of lists" compiled by Ann Wil-Harzing, which includes journals ranking lists from business schools in the USA, Australia, China, France, Germany and the UK (Harzing, 2009). The motivation behind the compilation of such institutional rankings is to make explicit the criteria used in hiring decisions, appraisals, tenure track decisions, promotion, reward and inclusion in external assessments. In the USA, research by Van Fleet and colleagues found that 35 of 252 institutions surveyed maintained a list. More than 1,000 journals were found in one or more lists, although the average number of journals contained in each list was just 72. On the basis of subsequent analysis they concluded that "the probability of [a department] adopting a list is positively correlated with department size and inversely correlated with the perceived quality of the department" (Van Fleet *et al.*, 2000).

In the UK, the risks associated with managing performance in successive RAE exercises appears to have encouraged departments of all types and sizes to reference journal lists. The business schools that have generated their own lists over the last ten years include Aston, Bath, Cranfield, Durham, Bradford, Imperial, Kent, Lancaster, London Business School, Nottingham, Sheffield, West of England and Warwick. Meanwhile a larger number of institutions have implicitly adopted these measures as external assessors have used lists in their mock assessments for RAE 2008. When it comes to assessing the strengths and weaknesses of these lists it is worth noting that they have the virtue of high internal reliability, but are often criticised for over-rating some specialisms and ignoring or under-rating others. It has been suggested that in consequence they may promote the formation of institution specific human capital (Van Fleet *et al.*, 2000).

c. Peer surveys

Journal rankings in this category typically are derived from ratings made by members of a research society or network of scholars, and most often focus on a single sub-field. Over recent years, lists have been published covering accounting, entrepreneurship, information systems, international business, international human resource management, marketing, and tourism and hospitality management (Caligiuri, 1999; Dubois and Reeb, 2000; Mylonopoulos and Theoharakis, 2001; Theoharakis and Hirst, 2002; Ballas and Theoharakis, 2003; McKercher and Lam, 2006). Only occasionally do peer surveys cover several business and management sub-fields, and when they do the intention typically is to produce a league table of the academic standing of business schools (e.g. *Financial Times*, 2006). The biggest advantage of single sub-field assessments is the detailed coverage of titles within a specialism. The main disadvantage is that it is difficult to compare such rankings with those covering other sub-fields or a range of sub-fields. Furthermore, it has been suggested that peer surveys, like institutional lists, have a tendency systematically to inflate the ratings of journals in which the assessors and associates have published (Van Fleet *et al.*, 2000).

d. Citation studies

Citation studies are perhaps the most favoured method for assessing journal quality, and the data source for many of these is ISI Thomson's Journal Citation Rating Reports (ISI, 2007b). The standard measure drawn from the reports is the journal citation impact factor, which refers to the mean number of citations for articles published in a particular journal in articles within other journals listed in the ISI Thompson database. The main perceived advantage of citation studies is that they offer the prospect of definitive, fine grained judgements about the relative worth of particular journals based on the principle that the most highly cited publications are the most valuable.

However, these studies are not without problems. The most common criticism with respect to business and management is that less than half of all journals in the field are included in the database, which is a lesser proportion than for cognate fields such as economics. Many well-regarded and highly regarded

journals do not carry an impact factor. This is problematic in itself, but it also works to depress the impact factors of those journals that are listed, making comparison in and between fields and sub-fields difficult. A further problem is that there are different scholarly traditions between fields and sub-fields that have a bearing on citation impact factors, favouring those that require exhaustive lists of references to similar, often experimental, studies. Hence the relatively high citation impact factors for journals in fields like psychology when compared to disciplines like history that prioritise references to source materials and research monographs rather than journal articles. To overcome these criticisms analyses have been undertaken which either construct citation databases for all journals in a sub-field or attempt to smooth the inter-field effects of different citation practices (Tahai and Meyer, 1999; Starbuck, 2007).

e. Derived lists

These lists are drawn up using data originally intended for another purpose. For example, the online publication of data submitted to the RAE in 2001 has enabled researchers to analyse submissions and derive lists of the most significant publications by volume and institutional source of submission (Easton and Easton, 2003; Geary *et al.*, 2004). These lists, while comprehensive, can be criticised for the inherent circularity of their assessment method. High quality journals are high quality because a high proportion of the articles were contributed by authors from institutions rated as high quality by other means.

3. The *ABS Journal Quality Guide*

The *ABS Journal Quality Guide* is based on elements of the methods used in institutional lists, peer surveys, citation studies and derived lists. As such, it is best described as a hybrid list combining the virtues of different approaches and developed through an iterative process. At each stage, the Guide has been amended and validated by successively broader processes of benchmarking and peer review. It is the intention of the editorial board that it should contribute to debate within the business and management community about the size and limits of the field, as well as discussion about the status of journals in different sub-fields. It is hoped that by promoting a broader consensus on these issues that researchers will benefit collectively both culturally and economically. Cultural gains can be seen to result from early career researchers have a better understanding of the journals in their field, thereby informing both literature searches and publication strategies. Economic gains might result from librarians concentrating resources on securing access to the most appropriate journal collections, and also by demonstrating achievements in research to university authorities and external funding agencies. As Pfeffer (1993, p. 602) noted 15 years ago, "there is evidence that more highly developed fields [with a high degree of internal consensus] fare better in the contest for resource allocations".

The ABS Guide originated from a list of all journals from which three or more articles were submitted to the business and management panel at RAE 2001. Other journals were then added through comparison with lists from six UK business schools: Aston, Cranfield, Durham, Imperial, Kent and Warwick. A conscious decision was taken to avoid lists compiled by institutions or individuals from other countries to ensure that the Guide reflects the views of the UK research community.

The next stage was to compute a citation impact factor index on a four-point scale. This index was calculated by taking the mean citation impact factor for the last three years for each listed journal and then converting these scores into a scale from one to four based on a percentile standardisation of the scores recorded in the relevant sub-field. It was assumed that journals with citation impact scores warranted an impact factor score of two or above, in recognition of the fact that large number of journals do not qualify for issue of a citation impact factor. These adjustments were undertaken to take account of the effects of sub-fields on raw impact factors. While this is not a wholly satisfactory means of correcting variations in the range and distribution of scores within sub-fields, the procedure eliminates gross distortions arising from differences in citation coverage and the referencing behaviour of researchers in different specialisms.

Additional titles were added to the list of journals using information gained from a review of the websites

of major journal publishers, as well as recommendations received from colleagues in the business and management research community. Working from the master list, each title was systematically reviewed to determine its length and frequency of publication; links if any with a research association; the status of its editor and editorial board; statements of editorial policy; as well as the quality of articles in at least three recent issues by reference to research design, analytical methods, theoretical underpinnings, and significant findings. On the basis of this review and a comparison of the ranks awarded to each journal in institutional lists and the citation impact factor index, a provisional ABS ranking was determined. This provisional ranking was arrived at by reference to the criteria mapped out in Table I.

Once a provisional rating had been assigned to each journal, the list was sorted into 22 sub-field groupings and opinion sought from experts in each of these specialisms. At least three experts and sometimes four were recruited from a variety of institutions were asked to read the criteria and assign rankings to the journals in their allotted sub-field. In many cases this review confirmed the original rankings. In less than 30 cases it produced significant differences that were resolved through a further round of reviewing the publication and seeking opinion from other experts. When the final draft list of ABS rankings was produced it was then compared with the five other institutional lists and the citation impact factor index by means of a Spearman's rank order correlation. This analysis revealed a high level of consistency and inter-correlation. The ABS list recorded the highest mean correlation with other lists (0.72) and the highest correlation with the citation impact factor index (0.77).

Once complete the final journal rankings were placed on the ABS web site with an electronic form requesting feedback from people in the business and management research community. Over the period January to September 2007 comments were received from over 300 researchers active in the field. While all of these comments have recommended additions or amendments to the list, none have sought to fundamentally question the legitimacy of the list or its potential usefulness. The recommendations received through this process of peer review were considered in early September 2007 by a panel of ten academics drawn from different sub-fields and institutions across the UK. It is expected that by repeating this process on an annual basis that the field of business and management will gain a progressively more consensual understanding of relative journal rankings and through this process will also gain a better sense of itself, its relationships with other fields, and its links to publications in the UK and overseas.

Conclusion

This article has highlighted a rapid expansion in recent years in numbers of researchers, refereed journals and types of research within the business and management field. It has proposed that these developments have increased the need for a systematic and consensual means of ranking the quality of academic journals in the field. The ABS Guide is intended to serve five purposes. First, it might help researchers to identify which journals to access and target for submission. Second, it might inform decisions about which staff to hire and how to develop, promote and reward those already in employment in business schools. Third, it might help institutions in deciding which journals to access for its staff and student communities. Fourth, it might inform internal and external assessments of the quality of research undertaken in particular institutions. Finally, it might encourage a more fine grained understanding of the contours of the business and management field and its numerous sub-fields, helping promote the field inside universities and in dialogues with government and external agencies.

Typically, there have been five ways to assess and rank the quality of journals:

1. individual author or article citation;
2. institution lists;
3. peer surveys;
4. citation studies; and
5. derived lists.

In this article we have argued that the first four of these methods lack the coverage needed to provide a systematic assessment of the quality of research in business and management. Additionally, derived lists

embrace a tautological logic in their construction, conflating institutional prestige with journal ranking and reducing internal reliability and sensitivity. Similarly, while institution lists, peer surveys and citation studies have high levels of internal reliability, the calibration and sensitivity of the judgements contained within these lists is rarely fully endorsed by external audiences.

The ranking of journals is an imprecise science that brings with it the danger that highly original work fails to make a significant contribution to a field because it is damned by the name of the publication it appears in. Equally, journal ranking may cause poor work to be seen in a better light because of the company it keeps within the covers of a highly ranked journal. While recognising these dangers, we have argued that people do not always read all that they are expected to read prior to selection interviews, promotion boards, library committees and assessment panels. In this environment, it is surely a good thing if a systematic method of determining journal quality, like the ABS Guide, is used, albeit imprecise, alongside whatever peer review process is possible within the constraints of time and money. Better, that is, than the unsystematic and imprecise methods that might prevail in the absence of ranking journal titles as a proxy for the quality of articles and the contributions to research made by authors.

It has been argued in the recent past that "enhancing scholarly quality remains essential, but [that] any further retreat to defining scholarship just in terms of publication in 'A'-rated scholarly journals will trap us in further in the social echo chamber of our own voice." (Pettigrew, 2001, p. S69). In this article we have argued that defining excellence with reference to journal quality is already widespread within the UK and that to pretend otherwise, or to wish that it were not so, is more damaging than to reveal and systematically compare differences in the standing of journals. An informed use of journal rankings such as the ABS Guide might help the business and management community to better prepare itself for a world in which research metrics are becoming ever more commonplace and routinely used by governments, agencies, universities, charitable bodies and the business community to make decisions about what research should be funded and what should not.

ImageTable IJournal quality guide ranking criteria
Table I*Journal quality guide ranking criteria*

References

ABS (2007a), *The Association of Business Schools' Journal Quality Guide*, ABS, London, available at: www.the-abs.org.uk/?id=257 (accessed 10 September 2007), .

[Manual request] [Infotrieve]

ABS (2007b), "Analysis of HESA staff dataset 1994/95-2005/06", internal report, ABS, London, .

[Manual request] [Infotrieve]

Ballas, A., Theoharakis, V. (2003), "Exploring diversity in accounting through faculty journal perceptions", *Contemporary Accounting Research*, Vol. 20 No.4, pp.619-44.

[Manual request] [Infotrieve]

Becher, T., Trowler, P. (1989), *Academic Tribes And Territories: Intellectual Enquiry and the Cultures of Disciplines*, 1st ed., Open University Press, Milton Keynes, .

[Manual request] [Infotrieve]

Becher, T., Trowler, P. (2001), *Academic Tribes And Territories: Intellectual Enquiry and the Cultures of Disciplines*, 2nd ed., Open University Press, Milton Keynes, .

[Manual request] [Infotrieve]

Bessant, J., Birley, S., Cooper, C., Dawson, S., Gennard, J., Gardiner, M., Gray, A., Jones, P., Mayer, C., McGee, J., Pidd, M., Rowley, G. (2003), "The state of the field of business and management research: reflections of the Research Assessment Exercise (RAE) panel", *British Journal of Management*, Vol. 14 No.1, pp.51-68.

[Manual request] [Infotrieve]

Caligiuri, P. (1999), "The ranking of scholarly journals in international human resource management", *International Human Resource Management Journal*, Vol. 10 No.3, pp.515-9.

[Manual request] [Infotrieve]

Dubois, F., Reeb, D. (2000), "Ranking international business journals", *Journal of International Business*, Vol. 31 No.4, pp.689-704.

[Manual request] [Infotrieve]

Easton, G., Easton, D. (2003), "Marketing journals and the research assessment exercise", *Journal of Marketing Management*, Vol. 19 No.1-2, pp.5-24.

[Manual request] [Infotrieve]

Financial Times (2006), "Financial Times journal list", available at: http://bear.cba.ufl.edu/centers /MKS/marketing%20science/list.pdf (accessed 10 September 2007), .

[Manual request] [Infotrieve]

Geary, J., Marriott, L., Rowlinson, M. (2004), "Journal rankings in business and management and the 2001 research assessment exercise in the UK", *British Journal of Management*, Vol. 15 No.3, pp.95-141.

[Manual request] [Infotrieve]

Harzing, A-W. (2009), Harzing.com, available at www.harzing.com (accessed 28 September 2009), .

[Manual request] [Infotrieve]

Henkel, M. (2000), *Academic Identities and Policy Change in Higher Education*, Jessica Kingsley Publishers, London, .

[Manual request] [Infotrieve]

ISI (2007a), “ISI HighlyCited.com”, available at: http://isihighlycited.com/ (accessed 10 September 2007), .

[Manual request] [Infotrieve]

ISI (2007b), “ISI web of knowledge”, available at: http://isiwebofknowledge.com/ (accessed 10 September 2007), .

[Manual request] [Infotrieve]

Lee, R. (2003), "Putting Humpty Dumpty back together again? The structures of knowledge and the future of the social sciences", *Futures*, Vol. 35 No.6, pp.621-32.

[Manual request] [Infotrieve]

McKercher, B., Law, R., Lam, T. (2005), "Rating tourism and hospitality journals", *Tourism Management*, Vol. 27 No.6, pp.1235-52.

[Manual request] [Infotrieve]

Mabe, M., Amin, M. (2001), "Growth dynamics of scholarly and scientific journals", *Scientometrics*, Vol. 51 No.1, pp.147-62.

[Manual request] [Infotrieve]

Mylonopoulos, N., Theoharakis, V. (2001), "On site – global perceptions of IS journals", *Communications of the ACM*, Vol. 44 No.9, pp.29-33.

[Manual request] [Infotrieve]

Okerson, A. (2000), "Are we there yet? Online e-resources ten years after", *Library Trends*, Vol. 48 No.4, pp.671-94.

[Manual request] [Infotrieve]

Pettigrew, A. (1997), "The double hurdles for management research", in Clarke, T. (Eds),*Advancement in Organizational Behaviour: Essays in Honour of D.S. Pugh*, Dartmouth Press, London, .

[Manual request] [Infotrieve]

Pettigrew, A. (2001), "Management research after modernism", *British Journal of Management*, Vol. 12 No.special issue, pp.s61-s70.

[Manual request] [Infotrieve]

Pfeffer, J. (1993), "Barriers to the advance of organisational science: paradigm development as a dependent variable", *Academy of Management Review*, Vol. 18 No.4, pp.599-620.

[Manual request] [Infotrieve]

Roberts, G. (2003), “Review of research assessment”, available at: www.ra-review.ac.uk/reports /roberts.asp (accessed 10 September 2007), .

[Manual request] [Infotrieve]

Scopus (2007), “Scopus info”, available at: www.info.scopus.com/ (accessed 10 September 2007), .

[Manual request] [Infotrieve]

Scott, P. (1995), *The Meanings of Mass Higher Education*, Open University Press, Milton Keynes, .

[Manual request] [Infotrieve]

Starbuck, W. (2007), “Journals ranked by citation per article”, available at: http://pages.stern.nyu.edu/ ~ wstarbuc/cites.htm (accessed 25 August 2007), .

[Manual request] [Infotrieve]

Strathern, M. (2000), *Audit Cultures: Anthropological Studies in Accountability, Ethics and the Academy*, Routledge, London, .

[Manual request] [Infotrieve]

Tahai, A., Meyer, M. (1999), "A revealed preference study of management journals direct influences", *Strategic Management Journal*, Vol. 20 No.3, pp.279-96.

[Manual request] [Infotrieve]

Tenopir, C. (2003), *Use and Users of Electronic Library Resources: An Overview and Analysis of Recent Research Studies*, Council on Library and Information Resources, Washington, DC, available at: www.clir.org/pubs/execsum/sum120.html (accessed 9 September 2007), .

[Manual request] [Infotrieve]

Tenopir, C., King, D.W. (2000), *Towards Electronic Journals: Realities for Scientists, Librarians and Publishers*, Special Libraries Association, Washington, DC, .

[Manual request] [Infotrieve]

Tenopir, C., King, D. (2002), "Reading behaviour and electronic journals", *Learned Publishing*, Vol. 15 No.4, pp.259-65.

[Manual request] [Infotrieve]

Theoharakis, V., Hirst, A. (2002), "Perceptual differences of marketing journals: a worldwide perspective", *Marketing Letters*, Vol. 13 No.4, pp.389-402.

[Manual request] [Infotrieve]

Tranfield, D., Starkey, K. (1998), "The nature, social organization and promotion of management research: towards policy", *British Journal of Management*, Vol. 9 No.4, pp.341-53.

[Manual request] [Infotrieve]

Ulrich (2007), “Ulrich's periodicals index”, available at: www.ulrichsweb.com/ (accessed 10 September 2007), .

[Manual request] [Infotrieve]

Van Fleet, D., McWilliams, A., Siegel, D. (2000), "A theoretical and empirical analysis of journal rankings: the case of formal lists", *Journal of Management*, Vol. 26 No.5, pp.839-61.

[Manual request] [Infotrieve]

Further Reading

Adams, J. (2005), “The RAE and publication patterns. A frdgliometric analysis”, paper presented at the Publishers Association Conference: Publishing for the RAE and Beyond, University College London, London, 29 June, available at: www.publishers.org.uk/paweb/paweb.nsf /0/defe2a8fde739c5c8025703100301f90/$FILE /Jonathan%20Adams%20-%20RAEPublicationsAndFrdgliometrics2005June29.ppt (accessed 10 September 2007), .

[Manual request] [Infotrieve]

Becher, T. (1997), *Academic Tribes And Territories: Intellectual Enquiry and the Cultures of Disciplines*, Open University Press, Milton Keynes, .

[Manual request] [Infotrieve]

Wil-Harzing, A. (2004), “Journal quality list, twenty eighth edition”, available at: www.harzing.com (accessed 10 September 2007), .

[Manual request] [Infotrieve]

Corresponding author

Huw Morris can be contacted at: h.morris@mmu.ac.uk