

Making “The List”

Business School Rankings And The Commodification Of Business Research¹

CATHERINE E. CONNELLY
McMaster University

DANIEL G. GALLAGHER
James Madison University

IN HIS *New Yorker* essay on college admissions practices, Gladwell (2005) reflects on how he chose which post-secondary school to attend. He recalls that:

In Ontario, there wasn't a strict hierarchy of colleges. There were several good ones and several better ones and a number of programs...that were world class. But since all colleges were part of the same public system and tuition everywhere was the same (about a thousand dollars a year, in those days), and a B average in high school pretty much guaranteed you a spot in college, there wasn't a sense that anything great was at stake in the choice of which college we attended. (n.p.)

Obviously, higher education has seen many changes in the past twenty years. Not only have universities become known for specific areas of excellence, but business schools in particular have become widely differentiated. The “stakes” have certainly changed. Perhaps one of the most noticeable changes in recent years has been the appearance of multiple school rankings, generated by popular press periodicals such as *MacLean's* magazine in Canada, and *US & World News Report* in the United States. These publications typically create special issues devoted to assessing various post-secondary institutions according to a wide number of criteria, including innovativeness, reputation, and class sizes. Although many educational programs have been ranked, business school rankings appear to be particularly popular; media rankings of undergraduate, MBA, EMBA, and executive development programs have been conducted by *Businessweek*, *Canadian Business Magazine*, *The Wall Street Journal*, the *Financial Times*, and many more.

The fact that some of the criteria used to rank the programs, such as the school’s reputation among community members (Johnston & Dwyer, 2003), student satisfaction, and salary advancement do not relate to student learning has generated some controversy among business faculty members. This emphasis is concomitant with recent shifts towards characterizing business students as “consumers” of management knowledge, who can exercise their choices as customers in a way that pressures program administrators to keep them entertained while in class, and to provide them with jobs upon graduation (Gross & Hogler, 2005).

As noted by Trank and Rynes (2003), the media rankings and how they are derived would not be of concern if the ratings were merely a pop culture curiosity, but unfortunately they have a significant impact on the behavior of educational decision makers, who naturally seek to have the positive media exposure that comes with a high ranking. The larger concern is that media rankings of business school “quality” are causing schools to shift massive resources from substantive pedagogical improvements to public relations efforts that merely create the *image* of progress and improvement (Gioia & Corley, 2002). Although many academics take issue with the uses and abuses of media rankings, individual schools are hesitant to avoid participation. Corley and Gioia (2000) note that deans are more likely to “play the game” with the media, rather than challenge them, out of fear of reprisal. Collective action has thus far been fruitless; the Association to Advance Collegiate Schools of Business (AACSB) has historically “looked for ways to recognize and sanction ever-larger numbers of programs rather than to uphold a particular set of professional standards or to restrict accreditation to schools that meet a well-defined and broadly accepted criteria of professionalism” (Trank & Rynes, 2003). Indeed, a recent AACSB task force report recommends a strategy of influencing the media to change its rankings, while volunteering to collect the data that makes the media rankings possible (Duncan, LeClair, Park, Policano, & Smoski, 2005).

Commodification

Commodities may be defined in two ways. The Marxist view defines commodities as that which can be exchanged for something of value. As such, “commodification is the process by which goods or services formerly outside a market enter a market, acquire exchange value, and are subsequently produced for profit” (Nelson & Barley, 1995, p. 623). The standard business definition indicates further that commodities are products or services that are interchangeable, in that they lack unique qualities or defining features (e.g., barrels of oil, pork bellies, dollars, etc.). Thus, we argue that the commodification of academic research has two components: the treatment of research products as interchangeable, and the assignment of a market value to these outputs. That which was once viewed as a “craft” becomes a standardized product.

On one hand, there is evidence that business educational experiences as a whole are being more commodified, in that business schools are seeking to differentiate their degrees. For example, the inherent quality of a Harvard MBA is marketed as being unique and superior to any other MBA. Other schools are offering specialized and joint programs (e.g., the University of Toronto offers a joint MBA and law degree, and the Rutgers Business School offers an MBA with a concentration in “pharmaceutical management”). In contrast to Gladwell’s experiences a quarter century ago, business schools are becoming more “business-like” in their marketing plans and “branding” initiatives; students are not sold on the merits of business education, rather, they are sold on the merits of the individual program in question. The media rankings have an

important role here; any cursory examination of a business school’s brochures for students and alumni is likely to reveal a positive media ranking evaluation, no matter how obscure. For example, the George Washington University website notes that they are ranked fifteenth in the world in terms of post-graduation advancement, and that they were the only U.S. program where a majority of the full-time students are women.

On the other hand, we are also seeing a stark re-commodification of the business school experience. The media rankings require each school to be compared along identical criteria. First, this assumes that the business educations offered at different schools can actually be quantitatively compared. The dean of the School of Management at the University of Texas at Dallas, Hasan Pirkul, writes that “the rankings provide a tool for business school faculties and administrators to benchmark their research productivity against that of their peers” (Prikul, 2006, np).

Secondly, the ranking process may create a convergence as all schools seek to emulate the qualities embodied in the ranking criteria. Commodifying pressures can take the form of initiatives that are intended to make workers’ “discretionary” activities comply with management’s expectations about what is truly valued (Willmott, 1993, 1995). One such pressure forms the basis of our inquiry: How are business faculty members affected by the *Financial Times*’ MBA rankings?

Financial Times MBA Rankings

Founded in 1888, the *Financial Times* is a London-based business newspaper with a circulation of approximately 1.8 million readers in approximately 140 countries. In 1998, the newspaper began a worldwide ranking of MBA programs, in order to provide information for students and recruiters interested in management education. Indeed, many business schools have incorporated their *Financial Times* ranking into their promotional materials. Within the highly competitive and financially lucrative environment of MBA and EMBA student recruitment, a favorable *Financial Times* ranking has become a major selling point. Despite the popularity of the rankings, these “league tables” have not been without controversy. “While many business schools blatantly promote their ranking position in their marketing material, others would rather see the publications disappear in a puff of smoke” (Bradshaw, 2006). Indeed, top ranked schools such as the Harvard Business School and University of Pennsylvania’s Wharton School of Business have excluded themselves from the ranking process, only to return in the following year.

To rank the various business schools, the *Financial Times* uses a number of criteria. Two of these criteria, worth 20% each, relate to students’ salaries upon graduation. The criterion with the next heaviest weighting is the “idea generation” category, which is made up of three components: the percentage of faculty with doctorates, the number of PhD students who find jobs at *Financial Times* Top-50 schools, and the number of publications on a list of preferred journals. Of the different media rankings, the *Financial Times* appears to place the most emphasis on faculty research as one of multiple criteria for program evaluation.

The *Financial Times* research evaluations are based on a list of forty academic and practitioner-focused journals, and have a substantial impact on each school’s ranking. Indeed, this component of the overall ranking, worth 10% overall, may be one of the least subjective elements, in that it can be tracked by a third party (i.e., it does not depend on perceptions of alumni or reports by administrators). The top twenty-five schools are also among the highest ranked schools in the research category. Moreover, a comparison of the 2004 and 2005 ratings of the

research component of the *Financial Times* rankings suggests that these ratings are relatively more stable than other categories. This may be partially explained by the fact that the schools’ research outputs are not assessed every year, and they are less subject to perceptual manipulations.

Generally, the business schools’ research ratings (i.e., the number of their “list” publications) correlate with the other “idea generating” measures, and therefore with the overall rankings. It is also interesting to note that schools with high research ratings also tend to have high ratings regarding the proportion of faculty members with doctoral degrees (5% of the overall weighting) and the likelihood of doctoral students finding jobs at a top-100 school (also 5% of the overall weighting).

Faculty Members' Perspectives

In order to understand how the *Financial Times* list of 40 approved journals has been incorporated into different business schools’ performance evaluation systems, we interviewed twenty-five tenured or tenure-track faculty at twenty-three different educational institutions in North America and Europe. This convenience sample is not intended to be representative, but we sought a variety of perspectives; our interviewees were from schools that were ranked highly on the list as well as not on the list, and they specialized in accounting, entrepreneurship, finance, human resources, industrial relations, management information systems, marketing, operations management, organizational behavior, strategy, and tourism management. We asked our respondents their opinions regarding the journals that were included and excluded from the *Financial Times* list, as well as for a description of their own research interests (e.g., methods, topics, paradigms, etc.), and an overview of how the *Financial Times* list is used (or not used) at their school.

According to most of our interviewees, the journals on the *Financial Times* list have privileged status in the business school. In a number of cases, faculty members are explicitly told that they need to publish in these journals in order to receive promotions and tenure. For example, assistant professors seeking a tenured appointment at one school were expected to publish at least one article in the *Financial Times* list, as well as four other articles in “respectable” outlets. More rarely, faculty members who publish in these journals receive direct financial rewards. For example, at one Canadian school, faculty members receive a \$5,000 cash award for each publication in a journal on the *Financial Times* list; at another school the faculty members would receive \$1,000 in additional research funds. At many other schools, merit pay (i.e., yearly adjustments to salary) is linked to publication in journals on the *Financial Times* list; in fact, this criteria is unambiguously indicated in the merit pay applications.

In addition to the explicit incentives that link publishing in certain journals with job security and financial rewards, many of the professors we spoke with felt an implicit requirement to publish in journals on the *Financial Times* list. In the words of one Associate Professor, “every year, the dean asks everyone what their Financial Times publications are, and later everyone gets a memo stating if the dean is ‘pleased’ or ‘disappointed.’” Similarly, another respondent explained that his dean frequently spoke with potential donors about faculty members’ research that had been published in Financial Times listed journals. At other schools, faculty members who publish in these journals are profiled in their schools’ annual reports or Alumni newsletters. Although this social pressure may be more subtle than explicit publication requirements that are

linked to job security and pay, these tactics are no less likely to influence faculty members’ behavior. Social identity theory suggests that individuals maintain a positive self-image by categorizing themselves into “in-groups” and others into “out-groups” (Tajfel & Turner, 1986). Because a distinction is being made by some schools between those faculty members who publish among “listed” journals and other journals, certain academics may face undue scrutiny from their “in-group” colleagues.

Although these explicit and implicit incentive structures do not openly penalize academics who publish in non-*Financial Times* journals, all academics are affected by the resulting culture change. As noted by Willmott (1993), the tying of rewards to measures of performance, educational institutions provide an approximation of market discipline by making individuals compete with each other in order to secure material and symbolic resources. This, in essence, represents a transition to a commodified environment (Parker & Guthrie, 2005).

Journals

In Table 1, we list the *Financial Times*’ preferred journals and identify each journal’s relevant citation index, as reported by the Web of Science in 2006 (ISI Web of Knowledge, 2006). This index represents the average number of citations per published journal article, and provides a measure of a journal’s impact in its field. This measure is not adjusted for variations across disciplines (i.e., the average finance article has 31 references, but the average general management article has 54) or across journal types (i.e., a typical review article or research methods article will generally receive more citations than an empirical article). The citation index was included in order to provide a more objective measure of each journal’s influence.

In this table we have also included the journals’ ratings according to three business school indices: that used by the Cranfield University School of Management in the United Kingdom, the Hong Kong Baptist University School of Business (HKBU), and the Virginia Commonwealth University (VCU). These indices were chosen to provide additional judgments of journal quality; each is used internally at a different university, and each was derived in a different way. For example, the Virginia Commonwealth University ratings represent the “ratio of articles authored by faculty at 60 US universities and colleges with highly rated business programs to total articles authored by faculty at US universities and colleges” (Harzing, 2006). This is in contrast with the Cranfield and HKBU ratings, which were based on more qualitative assessments by faculty.

It is clear from an examination of the citation indices and the alternative rankings that the journals preferred by the *Financial Times* in economics, finance, accounting, marketing, management information systems, and operations management are of reasonably high quality. In each of these fields, the journals that are represented on the list have uniformly high journal citation statistics, as well as high reputational ratings among a variety of international universities. However, this raises the issue of the relative quality of the journals on the list. For example, if one compares the mean Journal Citation Rating for journals in human resources (the mean number of citations is 1.12) with those in marketing (mean is 2.22; see Table 1), the disparity is clear. It appears that some journals have been allocated status beyond what their reputations and impact factors would indicate. If status on the list is being used as a criterion for the quality of a journal, it would appear as though this status is not awarded equitably.

In consequence, one might argue that additional journals could also be included. In fact, the shortness of the list was a key element of contention among our interviewees. As one participant

noted, with “modern technology” the *Financial Times* should be able to include more than forty journals in the analysis of research productivity. In the marketing, economics, and finance areas, for example, the mainstream top-tier journals are represented. However, by completely omitting various journals that are of high quality (but not among the superlatively prominent or highly cited journals), the list errs on the side of restrictiveness rather than inclusiveness. In this way, the *Financial Times* list does not provide an accurate representation of the management disciplines.

Table 1 also includes the mean ratings for all the *Financial Times*’ preferred journals as well as some “comparison journals,” such as *Review of Accounting Studies*. We see that a number of these additional journals have “impact factors” or journal citation indexes that exceed the lowest-scored journal in its category (e.g., *Research Policy* in the “General Management and Strategy” category), exceed the category mean (e.g., *Communications of the ACM* in the Practitioner category), or exceed the highest citation index in the category (e.g., *Personnel Psychology* in the Human Resources category). It is not clear why such journals are excluded; again this suggests that the *Financial Times* list is an inadequate approximation of high quality business research.

The journal list is also selective in that certain business-related disciplines are omitted. Although many business schools contain Industrial Relations or Public Administration programs, the outlets appropriate for these faculty members are notably absent. Furthermore, the organizational structures of various universities may affect their research rankings. For example, some business schools include an Economics Department (e.g., The University of Iowa), and as such these faculties would benefit from all University publications in economics. In contrast, other schools have separate Economics and Business departments (e.g., The University of Michigan), and as such the publications of Economics faculty members would not be tabulated by the *Financial Times* (unless the faculty members are cross-appointed).

The absence of journals that are neither business-related nor reference disciplines for business fields, including journals that focus on pedagogical issues, is also notable (e.g., the *Journal of Curriculum Theorizing* or the *Annual Review of Sociology* are not represented). Although interdisciplinary or extradisciplinary research is generally treated with respect by funding agencies and the public, business faculty members may be penalized for submitting research to journals with diverse or non-business readerships. It is also notable that the list does not contain specialized journals that treat a subdiscipline or topic exclusively. These outlets, such as the *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, or the *Journal of Consumer Psychology*, are effective ways of disseminating research results to a subsection of the field, but they are less likely to enjoy a broad reputation that would allow them to be represented on a short list.

Unfortunately, journals that are not part of the *Financial Times* list appear to be negatively affected by their lack of privileged status. A number of our participants indicated that because having an article published in a journal on the *Financial Times* list could influence their teaching assignments, pay, and job security, they would typically begin their publication process by first submitting their articles to journals on the list, and then, if the article was rejected submitting the articles to non-list outlets. In this case, journals need to either cope with “second-choice” status, or creatively market themselves to academics, perhaps by increasing their proportion of “special issues” or “calls for papers” that are targeted towards top academics (e.g., Parker & Guthrie, 2005).

Oddly enough, journals that are represented on the *Financial Times* list might also be negatively affected by this status. According to one of our participants, who is on the editorial board of one of the “listed” journals, his journal has seen a record number of submissions in the past

few years. Although he would like to attribute this to the quality of the editorial board, he believed that the recent surge was due to the pressures faced by faculty members to publish in his journal. Unfortunately, faculty members who submit articles to journals preferred by the *Financial Times*, on the off-chance of receiving an acceptance, put additional pressure on these journals’ editors, editorial boards and reviewers. According to another interviewee, the increase in submissions has meant that the average time for an article to be reviewed has also increased, to the point where she avoids submitting articles to journals on the *Financial Times* list if she needs a quicker response (e.g., for a co-author’s promotion decision). Interestingly, a minority of participants explained that the *Financial Times* list did not affect where they submitted their articles. Of this group, the majority believed that it did affect where their colleagues submitted their research.

The *Financial Times* list differs from discipline-specific journal rankings in that it focuses on both academic and practitioner-focused publications. This aspect of the list was noted by many of our interviewees. On one hand, some faculty members believed that the inclusion of publications such as the *Harvard Business Review* would create a sorely-needed higher standard for academics who claimed that their wide influence in the business world excused them from traditional publication requirements. On the other hand, some faculty members believed that the practitioner-focused publications on the *Financial Times* list were too biased in favor of behavioral topics, and that they would not be appropriate outlets for their disciplines (e.g., accounting, operations management, finance).

Consequences of “The List”

According to the principles of procedural justice, organizations should ensure that evaluation processes are applied consistently to all individuals, and that everyone should be made aware of the criteria being used for decisions that affect them (Bies & Moag, 1986). In this regard, one could argue that the *Financial Times* list of journals, when it is used as part of the promotion, tenure, and renewal criteria for business faculty, would help to increase the fairness and transparency of the process. By clearly articulating the basis on which faculty will be evaluated, it could be argued that everyone is on a “level playing field.”

However, the *Financial Times* list of preferred journals has not remained static since its inception. For example, it has grown from 35 journals to 40 journals since 1998. Moreover, the *Financial Times* have recently changed their list. In 2006, two journals were added: *Marketing Science*, and *Journal of Financial & Quantitative Analysis*. At the same time, two journals were removed: *Long Range Planning*, and *Journal of Small Business Management*. Such changes may be in response to pressures arising from perceptions regarding the relative quality of these journals, as well as a general concern (identified by many interviewees) that the list was biased in favor of generalist journals and lacking in journals appropriate for specialist research in marketing and finance. Nevertheless, these changes may pose a challenge for faculty members who use the *Financial Times* list of journals as a guide for where to submit their research.

It would be useful to examine more specifically how business faculty attitudes towards the *Financial Times* list are affected by their career stages. Based on our faculty interviews, it appears as though senior faculty have far less positive attitudes towards a more commoditized system of research evaluation. However, there are many possible explanations for this observation. Experienced faculty members may be more familiar with the merits of niche journals that

are less well-known than those on the *Financial Times* list, but are frequently read by colleagues with similar interests. Senior faculty may also have learned from experience how difficult it may be to publish in well-known outlets, or they may be minimizing the differences in quality between these journals and others. Furthermore, it is not clear from our interviews how faculty members’ attitudes will shift over time. After receiving tenure, a new associate professor has likely spent five to seven years of assiduous list-following. Even given their job security, it is not likely that they would suddenly “de-internalize” the journal ranking system to publish in different outlets.

Despite its many shortcomings, the *Financial Times* business school rankings are not likely to be eliminated any time soon. Business school graduates in particular (which form a core market of business publications) have a vested interest in monitoring the statuses of their alma maters. In addition, highly ranked schools are likely to continue using such rankings as a means to promote their programs. The *Financial Times* newspaper and other popular-press outlets are entitled to generate any ranking system that they choose, and these types of articles are likely to continue to be popular. Indeed, among the business faculty with whom we spoke, there was an acknowledgement that the distinction between journals that were respectable and journals that were outstanding should be maintained, and that media rankings are an important tool in promoting the value of business research. However, our interview participants generally argued that the *Financial Times* list should be refined and expanded somewhat, in order to become a more accurate representation of their field or discipline.

Conclusions

A consistent theme in our interviews with faculty members was the importance of business schools’ recognition for research excellence. No one appeared to see their research simply as a product with market value, nor as an item that was fungible or undifferentiated from similar others. Our participants stressed the value of business research, and it was clear that their own research endeavors (and that of their graduate students) had personal meaning to them. This is an important distinction, as “the more tightly activities are tied to culturally cherished roles, the more commodification is likely to be disputed” (Nelson & Barley, 1997, p. 626). Therefore, the restriction or distortion of a formerly discretionary behavior is likely to be met with substantial opposition. As noted by Willmott (1995), “in universities, the introduction of reforms and disciplines that have eroded the pay, conditions, and discretion of academics has generated simmering resentment and individual withdrawal from unmonitored responsibilities rather than organized resistance” (p. 1002). This response, however predictable, is especially unfortunate, because, as noted by many of our participants, academics that are able to publish in highly-respected journals are likely to do so whether or not these journals are sanctioned by a non-academic newspaper or magazine.

The *Financial Times* journal ratings may be used as a way to begin dialogue between different functional areas about what constitutes good research. In fact, many of our participants indicated that the *Financial Times* list had been used as the basis for an expanded internal list that was more comprehensive and inclusive, and a minority of participants further indicated that the *Financial Times* list was useful for defending the virtues of a particular journal article in discussions with administrators or faculty members in another discipline. Indeed, these expanded lists can provide a more accurate representation of the management disciplines, while also

including high quality outlets from appropriate reference disciplines (e.g., industrial relations). However, it must be stressed that business schools need to decide for themselves how the *Financial Times* list is used. Third-party definitions of “quality” in research cannot completely substitute for business faculty members’ own judgment or decision-making processes.

The de-commodification of academic business research asks that the contributions of individual articles be determined on their own merits. Therefore, the “exchange value” of an article (i.e., value in rankings) should not be supplanted by its “use value” (i.e., its own inherent quality or lack thereof). Article assessment is particularly important during the faculty promotion, tenure, and renewal processes; appropriate checks and balances on this process should be maintained. For example, when faculty members are candidates for promotion or tenure, quantitative assessments can be augmented with reference letters and individual statements regarding the impact of a program of research. These qualitative assessments can also examine the contributions made in alternative outlets such as books, book chapters, and annual series. However, it must be acknowledged that peer-reviewed journals are in many ways a more accurate measure of the value of an article than assessments by individual colleagues, who may have different areas of research expertise or a personal agenda.

The broader issue remains the priorities of business education as a whole. The true role of research in the business schools needs to be established and defended. The role of the academic community must be to advance knowledge and understanding, not simply to create a marketing tool that will assist with business school rankings. As Brief (2000) argues, business schools and their professional associations (such as the Academy of Management and the AACSB) need to support the broader public interest. As such, the academic community needs to de-commodify business faculty research by keeping the *Financial Times* list of preferred journals in its proper place: the news stand.

Table 1: Evaluation of Journals on the *Financial Times* List

Journals on the <i>Financial Times</i> List	Journal Citation Index	Cranfield	HKBU	VCU
Accounting				
Accounting, Organisations and Society	.75	4	A	.42
Journal of Accounting and Economics	1.87	4	A	.70
Journal of Accounting Research	1.58	4	A	.86
The Accounting Review	1.36	4	A	.72
Mean Category Rating	1.39	4		
<i>Comparison Journal: Review of Accounting Studies</i>	<i>1.51</i>	<i>4</i>	<i>A</i>	--

Journals on the <i>Financial Times</i> List	Journal Citation Index	Cranfield	HKBU	VCU
Economics				
Econometrica	2.23	4	A	.90
Journal of Political Economy	2.37	4	A	.85
The American Economic Review	1.81	4	A	.75
The RAND Journal of Economics	1.36	4	A	.82
Mean Category Rating	1.94	4		
<i>Comparison Journal: Quarterly Journal of Economics</i>	4.78	4	A	.93
Entrepreneurship				
Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice	1.54	2	--	--
Journal of Business Venturing	1.85	4	--	--
Mean Category Rating	1.70	3		
Finance				
Journal of Finance	3.16	4	A	.81
Journal of Financial and Quantitative Analysis	1.03	4	A	.53
Journal of Financial Economics	2.59	4	A	.67
Review of Financial Studies	1.72	4	A	.00
Mean Category Rating	2.13	4		
<i>Comparison Journal: Journal of Risk Uncertainty</i>	2.10	2	--	--
General Management				
Academy of Management Journal	2.78	4	A	.56
Academy of Management Review	3.84	4	A	.67

Journals on the <i>Financial Times</i> List	Journal Citation Index	Cranfield	HKBU	VCU
Journal of International Business Studies	1.25	4	A	.23
Management International Review	--	2	B+	--
Strategic Management Journal	2.35	4	A	.58
Mean Category Rating	2.04	3.6		
<i>Comparison Journal: Research Policy</i>	<i>1.84</i>	<i>4</i>	<i>--</i>	<i>--</i>
Human Resource Management				
Human Resource Management	1.72	4	B+	--
International Journal of Human Resource Management	.51	3	B+	--
Mean Category Rating	1.12	3.5		
<i>Comparison Journal: Personnel Psychology</i>	<i>2.09</i>	<i>4</i>	<i>A</i>	<i>.51</i>
Marketing				
Journal of Marketing	2.78	4	A	.60
Journal of Marketing Research	2.08	4	A	.75
Journal of Consumer Research	1.42	4	A	.60
Marketing Science	2.60	4	A	.82
Mean Category Rating	2.22	4		
Operations and MIS				
Information Systems Research	2.25	4	A	.00
Journal of Operations Management	1.86	4	B	.54
MIS Quarterly	2.67	4	A	.44
Management Science	1.62	4	A	.74

Journals on the <i>Financial Times</i> List	Journal Citation Index	Cranfield	HKBU	VCU
Operations Research	.49	4	A	.76
Mean Category Rating	1.78	4		
<i>Comparison Journal: Automatica</i>	<i>1.70</i>	--	--	--
Organisational Behaviour				
Journal of Applied Psychology	2.29	4	A	.50
Organization Science	2.10	4	A	.00
Organizational Behaviour and Human Decision Processes	1.42	4	A	.72
Mean Category Rating	1.93	4		
<i>Comparison Journal: Journal of Personality and Social Psychology</i>	<i>3.64</i>	<i>4</i>	<i>A</i>	--
Practitioners				
Academy of Management Perspectives	1.26	3	B	--
California Management Review	1.34	4	B	--
Harvard Business Review	1.44	4	B	--
Sloan Management Review	1.13	4	B	--
Mean Category Rating	1.29	3.75		
<i>Comparison Journal: Communications of the ACM</i>	<i>1.87</i>	<i>4</i>	<i>A</i>	<i>.66</i>
Other				
Administrative Science Quarterly	3.20	4	A	.82
Journal of the American Statistical Association	1.71	4	A	--
The Journal of Business Ethics	.64	3	A	--

Journals on the <i>Financial Times</i> List	Journal Citation Index	Cranfield	HKBU	VCU
Mean Category Rating	1.85	3.67		
<i>Comparison Journal: American Sociological Review</i>	2.77	--	A	--
<i>Comparison Journal: Industrial Relations</i>	1.66	2	B+	.47

About the Authors

Dr. Catherine E. Connelly is an Associate Professor of Organizational Behavior at the De-Groote School of Business at McMaster University. Her research has been published in various journals including the Journal of Applied Psychology, the Journal of Management, the Journal of Vocational Behavior, and the Journal of Management Information Systems.

Dr. Daniel G. Gallagher is the CSX Corporation Professor of Management in the College of Business at James Madison University. His research has appeared in many journals including the Journal of Applied Psychology, Academy of Management Journal, the Journal of Management, the Journal of Organizational Behavior, and Human Relations.

NOTES

1. The authors would like to gratefully acknowledge the assistance of Haniyeh Yousofpourfard as well as our many professional colleagues who graciously agreed to be interviewed as part of our research for the preparation of this paper.

REFERENCES

- AACSB International (2005). *The business school rankings dilemma*. Tampa, FL: AACSB International.
- Bies, R. J., & Moag, J. S. (1986). Interactional justice: Communication criteria of fairness. In R. J. Lewicki, B. H. Sheppard, & B.H. Bazerman (Eds.), *Research on negotiations in organizations* (pp. 43–55). Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.
- Bradshaw, D. (2006, January 30). The response is anything but silence in the ranks. *The Financial Times*, 4.
- Brief, A. (2000). Still servants of power. *Journal of Management Inquiry*, 9, 342–351.
- Corley, K., & Gioia, D. (2000). The rankings game: Managing business school reputation. *Corporate Reputation Review*, 3, 319–333.
- Gioia D. A., & Corley, K. G. (2002). Looking vs. being good: Business school rankings and the Circean transformation from substance to image. *Academy of Management Learning and Education*, 1, 107–120.

- Gladwell, M. (2005, October 10). Getting in: The social logic of Ivy League admissions. *The New Yorker*, 80–86.
- Gross, M. A., & Hogler, R. 2005. What the shadow knows: Exploring the hidden dimensions of the consumer metaphor in management education. *Journal of Management Education*, 29, 3–16.
- Harzing, A. -W. (2006). Journal Quality List. 20th Edition, May 7th, 2006. www.harzing.com.
- Johnston, A. D., & Dwyer, M. (2003, November 17). Ranking Canadian Universities. *Maclean's*, 116, 40–41.
- Parker, L., & Guthrie, J. (2005). Welcome to “the rough and tumble”: Managing accounting research in a corporatised university world. *Accounting, Auditing & Accountability Journal*, 18, 5–13.
- Prikul, H. (2006). U. T. Dallas school of management releases business school rankings based on faculty research productivity. News Release. www.utdallas.edu/news/archive/2006/som-research-rankings.htm.
- Nelson, B. J., & Barley, S. R. (1997). For love or money? Commodification and the construction of an occupational mandate. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 42, 619–653.
- Tajfel, H., & Turner, J. (1986). The social identity theory of intergroup behavior. In S. Worchel, & W. Austin (Eds.), *Psychology of intergroup relations* (pp. 7–24). Chicago: Nelson-Hall.
- Trank, C. Q., & Rynes, S. L. (2003). Who moved our cheese? Reclaiming professionalism in business education. *Academy of Management Learning and Education*, 2, 189–205.
- ISI Web of Knowledge (2006). Journal Citation Reports. The Thomson Corporation.
- Willmott, H. (1993). Strength is ignorance, slavery is freedom: Managing culture in modern organizations. *Journal of Management Studies*, 30, 515–552.
- Willmott, H. (1995). Managing the academics: Commodification and control in the development of university education in the U.K. *Human Relation*, 9, 993–1027.

