A Caste and Class among the Relative Frequency of Faculty's Publications: A Content Analysis of Refereed Business Journals

Reginald L. Bell
Prairie View A&M University

H. Gin Chong
Prairie View A&M University

This paper reports on the relative frequency of faculty's publications in refereed business journals. Chi-Square analyses show significant differences on the three null hypotheses tested. Furthermore, Lambda tests ($p < .01$ when refereed business journal was used as independent variable) significantly predicted an institution's Carnegie 2000 Classification, AACSB accreditation status, and the number of coauthors appearing on a single publication. In lieu of the findings, deans and heads of departments who tie merit pay, promotions and tenure decisions to having been published in one or more of the elite journals should rethink their policies. These measures of association indicate that a caste and class exists among the business and related journals.

INTRODUCTION

All too often we hear about business schools that impose policies on faculty that tie controversial criteria like impact factors and journal rankings to merit pay increases and promotion and tenure decisions. These policies appear to make sense to many deans and department heads whose efforts are to improve the reputational standing of their schools of business. Nevertheless, without validation, such practices seem a bit uninformed, and at best, they are applicable only to a handful of top-ranked business schools (Polonsky, 2004). An objective scrutiny of faculty's publications can help administrators make informed decisions as to whether or not implementing such policies makes sense. Before business school deans begin establishing policies affecting faculty's careers, many questions need answers.

Is there some sort of caste and class among business schools' faculty members vying for space in certain types of refereed business journals? Do some journal editors target certain class of business school faculty? Are faculty members from research extensive institutions targeting the top tier business journals? Does having the Association to Advance Collegiate Schools of Business International (AACSB) accreditation make a difference in the types of journals faculty members are publishing their work? Knowing the answers to these and related questions would benefit policy makers, including deans and heads of department, tenure and promotion committees, and sponsors of funded research.

Despite the benefits of answers to the aforementioned questions, journal bias controversy still lingers as highly-charged emotional issues—in nearly every tenure granting department. In fact, the credibility of a handful of the elite refereed business journals is predicated entirely on the perception of the importance of impact factors and acceptance rates. Many faculty members are using impact factor statistics (number

of citations of their works) to gauge the influence of their published articles; this is evidence they submit to their department heads and deans as proof they are making meaningful contributions in their respective fields. Furthermore, impact factors have shown to be vulnerable to manipulation.

According to *Information World Review,* controversy on impact factors remains. Caldwell (2006) in an online article, titled "Impact Factors Rocked by Manipulation Charge," gives a summary of interviews with editors of major journals from major publishing houses on their perspectives of what to do. Caldwell (2006) quotes the editorial director for the Oxford Journals:

> Janet Boullin, editorial director, Oxford Journals, said she "strongly discourages the manipulation of impact factors" and feels that any such action is to be deplored…She added: "Skewing impact factors does the scientific community no favors, and as a result the use of impact factors as an industry standard may become damaged" (p.7).

In addition to impact factors, review processes are subject to manipulations. For example, when Epstein (1995) met a group of associate editors at an international psychology conference, there was a general consensus among the group that:

> Several in the group were associate editors who had many publication credits in APA journals and did a considerable amount of reviewing themselves. I was impressed with the widespread discontent with the journal review process in this select group. Some of the terms people used to describe the reviews were 'arbitrary,' 'biased,' 'self-serving,' 'irresponsible,' and 'arrogant.' (p. 884)

Epstein (1995) calls upon the need to improve the review process by suggesting some tentative solutions, by soliciting comments from others, by making constructive changes in the behavior both as a reviewer and a reviewee, and by urging the editors to make the whole review processes transparent and accountable[1]. Rabinovich (1996) agrees, mostly, with Epstein's (1995) comments, and views the whole review process as a `personal attack' on reviewees (p. 1190). Bedeian (2004) echoes a similar discontent that prior research on the peer-review process has almost exclusively focused on its surface features, that is, its impartiality, validity, and reliability, but not the social component that shapes the content of the discipline's published record and, in turn, determines its scientific progress. This means, as a product of social process, all knowledge-claims are socially constituted rather than being an absolute truth. More specifically, Bedeian (2004) calls upon the social processes underlying the peer-review process to warrant closer scrutiny by a balancing of the inevitable author–editor–referee tensions operating throughout the editorial process to ensure that a clear authorial voice is preserved (p. 198).

Miller (2006), in the *Academy of Management Journal*, agrees that `peer-review is used in most scientific disciplines to assess the value of new knowledge presented in journal submissions' (p. 425), but reviewees are often faced with unnecessarily harsh critiques. Reviewers sometimes focus solely on uncovering and aggressively highlighting the flaws in a submission. Complicating this situation is the possibility of reviewers seeing themselves not as peers but as superiors in the hierarchy of science (Starbuck, 2003). Miller (2006) identifies the second issue for the peer review system is biased judgments. Biases can take many forms. Zuckerman (1988) observes in the fields and journals without blind review, particularistic criteria related to authors' social relations, doctoral origins, and current affiliations can play major roles. Such criteria provide clues, albeit imperfect ones, as to the competency of a manuscript's author(s), and these clues are used as means to avoid the burden of deeply evaluating research or as unconscious or conscious shortcuts around any uncertainty about the value of a submission (Miller, 2006, p. 425). Peters and Ceci (1982) identify 12 published articles written by individuals from prestigious institutions. Of these, they turn in nine papers to the same highly regarded journals in which the work had originally appeared, but with fictitious authors' names and affiliations. Of the nine papers, the editors rejected eight papers on basis of negative recommendations from 16 of 18 reviewers (p. 188). The argument against such direct evidence is editor's jobs are not fraud detection. Raelin (2008) considers

the whole review process as a `high-stakes game involving three parties: editor, reviewer, and author (p. 124).

In most cases, an editor is the ultimate decision maker on accepting or rejecting a submitted manuscript. Even when there are competing reviews, one positive and one negative, the editor has complete hegemony over the publication decision. Miller (2006, p. 426) reports "Dissensus—disagreement among the reviewers evaluating a paper—has received a great deal of attention because it goes to the heart of peer review." The entire review process appears to be to keep acceptance rates within the publishers' or sponsors' pre-selected low level. For example, a quick perusal in *Cabell's Publication Opportunities in Management* from 2002 to 2008 shows a large number of business journals are reporting the same acceptance rates year after year after year, including many of the reputational elite journals; some journals are reporting ranges of their journals' low acceptance rates.

In sum, there is a lack of transparency and accountability in the editorial article review and selection processes. There is no evidence of independent audits on the numbers of all submittals, of the actual reviews they send out, and of those rejections. The blind review process is predicated entirely on an honesty system or honor code, per se. There is a lack of empirical evidence to support these common review practices.

This paper fills the gap by analyzing the relative frequencies of works published in 12 randomly selected business journals, with a large sample of published authors. The findings help improve our understanding on the outlets where faculty from various Carnegie 2000 Classified institutions are being published, and to what degree of significance these association measures can be understood and interpreted.

A Need for This Study

There is a need for this type of study because many faculty members are involved in submitting their manuscripts to the wrong types of journals, to be punished time after time with rejection letters. Deans and heads of departments are establishing policies that require faculty to publish in reputational elite journals, irrespective of their institution's Carnegie 2000 Classification—and they too are surprised when their faculty cannot produce results. A study of this type is needed because of the many benefits to stakeholders once it is determined empirically if there are significant class differences among the business journals where faculty is publishing their writings.

Purpose of This Study

The purpose of this study is to use association measures to compare institutions by their Carnegie 2000 Classification, by AACSB accreditation, and by the number of coauthors appearing on a single publication; since these are variables independent of any type of experimental treatment they exist naturally. Much could be learned by tallying these independent variables that are obviously correlated to faculty productivity in some way. The research purpose was achieved by testing three null hypotheses. Before discussing the hypotheses, we present findings of the prior research.

REVIEW OF THE RELATED LITERATURE

A simple approach to measure a faculty member's research productivity is to count the number of publications (Chung, Pak, & Cox, 1992; Heck, Jensen, & Cooley, 1990; Zivney, Bertin, & Gavin, 1995). Counting is objective but it fails to consider quality of the journal. Everett, Klamm, and Stoltzfus (2004), Hasselback and Reinstein (1995) and Hasselback, Reinstein, and Schwan (2002) assigned weight to each article by quality of the journal. This process, also called impact factors, involves an overall quality assessment for the journals. Two primary methods to measure a journal's quality are citation analysis (Brown & Gardner, 1985; Dyckman & Zeff, 1984; Smith & Krogstad, 1988) and faculty perceptions (Ballas & Theoharakis, 2003; Brown & Huefner, 1994; Herron & Hall, 2004; Johnson, Reckers, & Solomon, 2002; Jolly, Schroeder, & Spear, 1995; Lowensohn & Samelson; 2006 and Smith, 1994).

Citation analysis assumes the number of citations received by a particular journal is indicative of its quality. However, citation analysis suffers several challenges. First, an author may quote a particular journal and its author because of reputation, but this does not necessarily reflect the quality of the articles (Smith, 2004). Secondly, authors may cite their own works to claim credits, and thirdly, it is normally only the first author who is included in the citation count, while the co-authors do not get credits or recognitions.

For faculty perceptions, a journal's quality depends on the extent of faculty members' familiarities with a journal and opportunities to publish in the journal. Faculty members will face difficulties in allocating weights on the quality, in particular the increasing number of specialized journals. These are journals that publish articles of a particular discipline such as accounting, and sub-disciplines such as auditing and inter-disciplinary; they tend to accept a broad range of disciplines and issues including business, finance, accounting and education. To ease comparisons, a number of studies (e.g., Baldwin, Morris, & Scheiner, 2000; Ballas & Theoharakis, 2003; Herron & Hall, 2004; Lowensohn & Samelson, 2006) focus attention on specialized journals and within certain sub-disciplines.

These complexions make it difficult for comparing rankings between the sub-disciplines. For example, Herron and Hall (2004) perceive *The Accounting Review* as a top quality journal with a score of 100. With that in mind, the authors request respondents in the surveys to allocate weighting in comparison with the top journal. This is a useful guide as long as the respondents are familiar with the content, rigorousness and quality of the top and remaining accounting journals. Furthermore, Herron and Hall (2004) observe that when a tax faculty assessed *Critical Perspectives on Accounting* the average score was 67, but when the auditing faculty rated that same journal it was 47. The disparity reflects background and familiarities of a particular journal between the two groups of respondents. For a tenure and promotion committee with two or more faculty drawn from different disciplines and sub-disciplines, this will make the rating challenging. Finally, if citations are the sole criterion for ranking a journal, this means the authors may limit the number and range of journals. All these are limitations on assessing journals based on impact factors, using citations or faculty perceptions.

To address these issues, Ballas and Theoharakis (2003) sent 6,994 emails to accounting faculty worldwide with 1,230 (20.6%) usable responses requesting them to rank 40 accounting journals using four variables. These four variables were familiarity, average rank position (the number of times the respondents consistently ranked a particular journal in a same position), percentage of respondents who classify a particular journal as top tier, and readership (the percentage of respondents who listed a particular journal among the ones they regularly read) (p.626). They find accounting faculty worldwide consistency ranked 15 accounting journals as top.

Bean and Bernardi (2005) use age, acceptance rate, and audience as variables of journals' quality. Their model predicts that as a journal ages, in terms of number of years the journal has been published, its quality rating increases. For acceptance rate as a measure, a higher acceptance rate indicates a lower journal quality, and a journal that targets particular groups of academic audience is perceived to be of higher quality than a journal targeted to a practitioner audience. Bean and Bernardi (2005) find significant relationships among the three variables. These and other findings prompted us to ask if there is consistency in the literature regarding perception of top journals in the business fields.

Top Journals in the Business Fields

Rupp and McKinney (2002) found publication patterns to exist among 25 elite economics departments. Despite such findings, attempting to create a list that is universally adoptable to any of the other departments would appear brash and somewhat naïve (Polonsky, 2004). Different disciplines require different methods. Accounting, finance, marketing, MIS, organizational behavior, human resources, operations management, and related fields such as economics or business communication resolve disciplinary issues from somewhat esoteric approaches.

There is an apparent inconsistency of judging the quality of hundreds of scholarly business journals, outside a handful of journals that consistently appear as top journals named in various empirical studies. Moreover, the reputational elite business journals do not guarantee top articles (Chow, Haddad, Singh, &

Wu, 2007; Smith, 2004). The empirical facts on determining the quality of the hundreds of academic business journals is woefully unsystematic. The question of determining a journal's acceptable quality is obviously meaningful to administrators.

Stretcher, Hynes and Stowe (2006) are among social scientists whose work on E-journals appears to highlight the dangers of ranking journals in general, including dismissive attitudes about articles available online only. Hynes and Stretcher (2005) highlighted there is no empirical evidence in the literature for the way that electronic journals are evaluated compared to printed paper versions. Stretcher, et al. (2006) further elaborated E-journals are clearly now part of the intellectual, peer-reviewed journals' landscape. In their survey of 419 deans, 84% reported having evaluation policies that included criteria for rating the quality of journals in which their faculty are publishing.

Alexander, Scherer, and Lecoutre (2007) compared business journal ranking systems from six countries and found a low degree of agreement among the systems, and a low to moderate relationship between pairs of systems. There is some consistency among ratings for a handful of business journals, respective to economics, accounting, marketing, operations management, and finance; on the other hand, only four or five in each disciplinary area appear to emerge at the top.

Based on department chairs' perceptions there is some consistency in opinion of quality of economics journals. Mason, Steagall, and Fabritius (1997) examined economic journal ratings and rankings based on a survey of economics department chairs' perceptions. They found, when data was stratified according to the degree of research versus teaching orientation of institution, remarkable symmetry across school types, although significant variations occur in a few journals. Department chairs' rankings were significantly correlated to rankings reported in previous studies, including quality-adjusted rankings. They concluded department chairs tend to rank journals both consistently and in accordance with generally accepted measures of quality.

Davis (1998) provided evidence of the inconsistency in rating journals in economics. Davis warned economists about results derived from depending on Social Sciences Citation Index (SSCI) used to rank existing journals to evaluate scholarly productivity and evaluate economics departments. Among the economics disciplines, little consistency has been found empirically on rating the quality of the hundreds of economics journals. Just over a decade ago, Beed and Beed (1996) determined the citation method measures influence rather than excellence and the correlation between influence and quality was uncertain. However, they found some consistency in the literature when rating the top four or five economics journals.

Recently, Azar (2007) determined three economics journals to be top: 1) Journal of Economic Behavior & Organization ranked first, 2) Journal of Economic Psychology ranked second, and 3) Journal of Socio-Economics ranked third. Liner and Amin (2004) critiqued methods of ranking economics journals, compared results of some methods, and suggested new uses of judging the quality of journals via citation research methods. In the field of marketing, a handful of journals are ranked at the top in two recent studies.

Mort, McColl-Kennedy, Kiel, and Soutar (2004) derived a list of top-tier marketing journals: 1) Journal of Consumer Research, 2) Journal of Marketing, 3) Journal of Marketing Research, 4) Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science, and 5) International Journal of Research in Marketing. They report the list was not surprising; however, they caution their readers about adhering to any list, citing the diversity of journal types and the different target audiences that most researchers are trying to reach. Similarly, Bauerly and Johnson (2005) determined there were five journals cited mostly in marketing syllabi for doctoral programs. These are 1) Journal of Marketing, 2) Journal of Consumer Research, 3) Journal of Marketing Research, 4) Marketing Science, and 5) Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science. Among these, they account for 66.5 percent of citations in syllabi analyzed from 109 doctoral programs accredited by AACSB.

Our literature search for consistency of perception of top journals led us to find articles relating to top accounting journals too. Bonner, Hesford, Van der Stede, and Young (2006) report four journals consistently were at the top rank in their field: 1) Accounting, Organizations and Society, 2) Contemporary Accounting Research, 3) Journal of Accounting and Economics, and 4) Journal of

Accounting Research. Despite four or five journals that consistently appear as perceived to be top journals in the respective discipline, empirical research remains inconsistent for the remaining business journals, which number in the hundreds. In short, a top journal does not guarantee a top article.

In an intriguing study, Smith (2004) compares the rankings of 15 leading finance journals by the average number of Social Sciences Citation Index cites per article for articles published in 1996. A "top article," was compared to an "article in a top journal" an examination of Type I error (a "top" article is rejected by a particular decision rule, e.g., in top three journals) and the Type II error (a "non-top" article is accepted as a top article) for each journal and combinations of the journals. Due to the high error rates, Smith found the results suggested that identifying top articles requires looking beyond the Top 3 finance journals, as well as examining each article more carefully for their intrinsic qualities.

A similar study in accounting, Chow et al (2007) use a very similar methodology to Smith (2004) and they caution against using the top three accounting journals as a proxy for asserting the quality of an article. They stress empirical research is rife with evidence that discounting an article as not being a top quality article because it did not appear in one of the top accounting journals is faulty thinking. Too many articles that should have been rated as top articles were too often discounted as not being so merely because they had not been published in one of the three top accounting journals; and there are other business fields producing empirical results on the journal quality questions.

Polonsky and Whitelaw (2004) developed a weighted multi-dimensional perceptual ranking based on respondents' evaluation of a journal's prestige, contribution to theory, contribution to practice, and contribution to teaching, adding fuel to the fire. Business communication has joined in on journal quality rating research fray, citing the Journal of Business Communication, Business Communication Quarterly, and Journal of Business and Technical Communication as top journals (Rogers, Campbell, Louhiala-Salminen, Rentz, & Suchan, 2007). Many journal quality studies appear to base their ratings on surveying the opinions and perceptions of academicians.

Unfortunately, ranking journals using survey methodology tends to be too subjective (Katerattanakul, Razi, Han, & Kam, 2005); while Alexander and Mabry (1994) use the 50 most frequently cited finance journals they conclude that among the most cited top finance journals are: 1) Journal of Finance, 2) Journal of Financial Economics, 3) Journal of Financial and Quantitative Analysis, and 4) Review of Financial Studies. These are based on both the average number of articles and average number of words used in the experimental design.

Peffers and Ya (2003) ask information systems (IS) researchers to rate the value of IS publication outlets and categorize them into IS journals. Altogether 1129 IS researchers responded, and resulted in 326 journals being rated. Vastag and Montabon (2002) find social acculturation to be an influence on the characteristics and ranking of operations management journals (OM), while Vokurka (1996) finds journal rankings are important for a variety of reasons, most importantly they are the bases of academic tenure and promotion decisions. By reviewing the frequency of citations within OM journals, between 1992-1994, based on total citations, citations per article and citations per word published, the journals with the most importance to OM research were: 1) Management Science, 2) Decisions Sciences, 3) Operations Research, 4) the Harvard Business Review, 5) Journal of Operations Management, and 6) IIE Transactions. Olson (2005) measures what top-25-business-school-professors rated as quality in OM journals concludes with similar findings for top journals.

Geary, Marriott, and Rowlinson (2004) find a concentration of citation to be represented by a fraction of journal outlets: 126 journals had 50% of all citations among 9,942 publications in 1582 journal titles. Journal rankings are repeatedly used to measure both journal and author research quality. Oltheten, Theoharakis, and Travlos (2005) sampled an international group of 862 finance educators and found remarkable consistency in how they ranked top finance journals. Among the remaining journals, perception of journal quality differed depending on the researcher's geographic origin, research interests, seniority, and journal affiliation. Their findings appear to be consistent with Reinstein and Calderon (2006), who found rankings used by both doctoral-granting and non-doctoral-granting accounting programs to confirm the existence of an elite set of journals whose rankings are invariant to school type, faculty size, resource base or mission. From the published reports, there is very little consistency in

criterion for rating the quality of a scholarly business journal, beyond the popularity of four or five journals in each of the academic business fields; each field is dominated by a handful of journals at the top.

The literature is just too fragmented when it comes to journals that fall outside the handful of "top" journals in any of the business fields. Furthermore, a top journal does not guarantee a top article (Chow, et al. 2007; Smith, 2004). When reviewing the related literature, no studies were found that directly compared the likelihood of faculty's demographic characteristics (Carnegie 2000 Classification, AACSB accreditation status, and number of co-authors) and their likelihood of being published in peer reviewed refereed business journals. Knowing if these variables are significantly related to the likelihood of being published in such journals is needed because there is still a mixture of findings in the literature (Azar, 2007). The literature confirms there is agreement on the top journals in most of the business fields (Polonsky, 2004), including business communication (Rogers, et al. 2007). The problem with deans or department heads expecting most of their faculty members to publish in one of the elite journals is that the math stops working for most seeking tenure or promotion or merit pay increases when there are 400 authors vying for 20 slots per issue, as with the Academy of Management Review. Based on these discussions, we wrote the following three null hypotheses.

Three Null Hypotheses

Hypothesis $_1$: The relative frequency of publications in any of the 12 refereed business journals is the same for all faculty members regardless of their affiliations with any of the Carnegie 2000 classified institutions.

Hypothesis $_2$: The relative frequency or percentage of faculty members affiliated with AACSB accredited institutions who publish in the 12 refereed business journals is the same as faculty members affiliated with non-AACSB accredited institutions who publish in the 12 refereed business journals.

Hypothesis $_3$: The relative frequency of publications in any of the 12 refereed business journals is the same for all faculty members regardless of the number of coauthors on any single publication.

METHODOLOGY

Sample, Descriptive Statistics and Results

Among the Carnegie 2000 Classification, 185 authors were affiliated with research extensive institutions, 41 were from research intensive, 144 were from Masters I or lower level institutions and 123 were from foreign institutions or consulting firms not classified by the Carnegie Foundation. For the sake of authenticity, each author, regardless of whether the article had more than one author, was entered into the Excel file as a unique row count. This was done because a large number of co-authored articles were from different universities, with a mix of coauthors, in many cases. Descriptive statistics are shown in Tables 1a, 1b, 1c, 1d, and 1e.

Twelve refereed business and related journals, broad ranging in aims and scopes, were selected based on their affiliation with conferences, acceptance rates and frequency of published articles associated with those journals. Acceptance rates for the 12 journals ranged from 5% to 30%. Faculty information was tallied by the respective journal in which they got published. Data were analyzed using SPSS 15.0. Of the observed variables, 493 authors were counted: 343 published authors were from AACSB accredited institutions and 150 were from non-AACSB institutions.

TABLE 1A
DESCRIPTIVE STATISTICS WITH FREQUENCY AND PERCENTS FOR JOURNAL OUTLET

Journal Outlets Sampled	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Percent
(a) JABE = Journal of the Academy of Business Education	25	5.1	5.1
(b) JBC = Journal of Business Communication	19	3.9	8.9
(c) SBAJ = Southwestern Business Administration Journal	22	4.5	13.4
(d) JBL - Journal of Business and Leadership: Research, Practice and Teaching	48	9.7	23.1
(e) AMSJ = Academy of Marketing Studies Journal	23	4.7	27.8
(f) IJBPA = International Journal of Business and Public Administration	27	5.5	33.3
(g) AMS = The Academy of Marketing Science, Journal	82	16.6	49.9
(h) CBR = Central Business Review	26	5.3	55.2
(i) MIS = MIS Quarterly	22	4.5	59.6
(j) HBR = Harvard Business Review	12	2.4	62.1
(k) AR = Accounting Review	141	28.6	90.7
(l) AF = Accounting Forum	46	9.3	100.0
Total	493	100.0	

(a) JABE = Journal of the Academy of Business Education, Volumes 4, 5 and 6: 2003, 2004 and 2005; (b) JBC = Journal of Business Communication, Volume 45, Number 1, 2, and 3, 2008; (c) SBAJ = Southwestern Business Administration Journal, Volume 7, Numbers 1 and 2, 2007; (d) JBL - Journal of Business and Leadership: Research, Practice, Teaching, Volume 3, Number 1, 2007; (e) AMSJ = Academy of Marketing Studies Journal, Volume 12, Number 2, 2008; (f) IJBPA = International Journal of Business and Public Administration, Volume 5, Number 2, 2008; (g) AMS = The Academy of Marketing Science, Journal, Volume 33, Issues 1,2,3, and 4, 2005; (h) CBR = Central Business Review, Volume 25 and 26, Numbers 1 and 2, 2005 and 2006; (i) MIS = MIS Quarterly, Volume 30, 2006, issue 1, 2006; (j) HBR = Harvard Business Review, 2009; (k) AR = Accounting Review, Volumes 84, Issues 1, 2, 3 2009; Volumes 83, Issues 6, 5, 4 2008; (l) AF = Accounting Forum, Volume 33, Issues 1, 2, 3; Volume 32, Issue 4.

TABLE 1B
DESCRIPTIVE STATISTICS WITH FREQUENCY AND PERCENTS FOR AACSB VS NON-AACSB

AACSB	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Percent
Non-AACSB Institutions	150	30.4	30.4
AACSB Accredited Institutions	343	69.6	100.0
Total	493	100.0	

TABLE 1C
DESCRIPTIVE STATISTICS WITH FREQUENCY AND PERCENTS FOR CARNEGIE 2000 INSTITUTIONAL CLASSIFICATION

Carnegie 2000 Classified Institutions and Foreign	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Percent
Research Extensive	185	37.5	37.5
Research Intensive	41	8.3	45.8
Masters I and lower	144	29.2	75.1
Foreign Institutions and Firms*	123	24.9	100.0
Total	493	100.0	

*Among the 123 institutions, 9 were from private firms including consulting firms.

TABLE 1D
DESCRIPTIVE STATISTICS WITH FREQUENCY AND PERCENTS FOR PUBLICATION DATES

Publication Dates for Articles	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Percent
2003	10	2.0	2.0
2004	7	1.4	3.4
2005	104	21.1	24.5
2006	34	6.9	31.4
2007	70	14.2	45.6
2008	150	30.4	76.1
2009	118	23.9	100.0
Total	493	100.0	

TABLE 1E
DESCRIPTIVE STATISTICS WITH FREQUENCY AND PERCENTS FOR NUMBER OF COAUTHORS

Number of Authors	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Percent
One Author Only	70	14.2	14.2
Two Authors	173	35.1	49.3
Three Authors	172	34.9	84.2
Four Authors	60	12.2	96.3
Five authors	15	3.0	99.4
Six Authors	3	.6	100.0
Total	493	100.0	

We used Carnegie 2000 Classification to ascertain authors' institutional affiliations (Driscoll, 2008). The Carnegie 2000 Classification system includes all U.S. colleges and universities that grant degrees and are accredited by U.S. Secretary of Education. Based on the 2008 edition, there are ten categories of institutions: (1) *doctoral research extensive universities*-provide a wide variety of baccalaureate degrees and award fifty or more doctoral degrees per year, (2) *doctoral research intensive universities*--offer a wide variety of baccalaureate degrees and award at least ten doctoral degrees per year, (3) *master's colleges and universities I*--offer a wide variety of baccalaureate degrees and forty or more master's degrees per year, (4) *master's colleges and universities II*--offer a wide variety of baccalaureate degrees and twenty or more master's degrees per year, (5) *baccalaureate colleges liberal arts*--award at least half of their baccalaureate degrees in liberal arts, (6) *baccalaureate colleges general*--award less than half of their baccalaureate degrees in liberal arts, (7) *baccalaureate-associate's colleges*--award ten percent of bachelor's degrees but less than half of all undergraduate awards, (8) *associate's colleges*--award less than ten percent of bachelor degrees, (9) *specialized institutions*--award degrees in a particular field, for example medicine, laws and others, and (10) *tribal colleges and universities*--tribally controlled and located on reservations[2].

For this study, we grouped the institutions in four broad categories (Driscoll, 2008). These are the doctoral research extensive universities (extensive), doctoral research intensive universities (intensive), and masters' colleges and universities (masters I and below) and foreign. The classifications based on the pretext that faculty members from these four categories are expected to publish and subject to tenure and promotion reviews of their intellectual contributions, including peer-reviewed journal articles.

Hypotheses Testing and Results

Hypothesis $_1$: The relative frequency or percentage of faculty members affiliated with any of the Carnegie 2000 classified and foreign institutions who publish in any of the 12 refereed business and related journals is not the same. Chi-Square test shows the observed frequency is not the same for faculty affiliated with Research Extensive institutions, Research Intensive institutions, Masters or lower institutions, and Foreign institutions, with a critical value of 391.943 exceeding the 47.40 critical value found in the Chi-Square Table, with df = 33 and p= .05. Lambda was λ =.464 when Carnegie Classification represented the dependent variable, assuming a null hypothesis. We present Chi-Square findings in Table 2.

As can be seen in Tables 2b and 2c, journals are better at predicting publication frequency among the Carnegie 2000 Classification listings than the Carnegie 2000 Classification is at predicting journals. In fact, journal outlets explain nearly 47 percent of the error in authors' publications across institutional classes. Therefore, journal outlets reduce the prediction error by 46.4 percent when Carnegie class is dependent variable. We place triple asterisks indicating numbers with four or more above the expected count in each cell. This means journals appear to be targeting particular institutions within the Carnegie 2000 Classification and foreign. This evidence appears to confirm what is already suspected to be true, that is, certain journals are looking to publish the works of a targeted (niche) group of institutional types (classifications).

TABLE 2A
CHI SQUARE TEST OF AUTHORS' CARNEGIE 2000 CLASSIFICATION ACROSS JOURNALS OUTLETS***

Carnegie 2008 Cross-tabulation			Carnegie 2000 Classification				
			Extensive	Intensive	≤Masters I	Foreign	Total
Journal	JABE	Count	3	4	18***	0	25
		Expected Count	9.4	2.1	7.3	6.2	25.0
		% of Total	.6%	.8%	3.7%	.0%	5.1%
	JBC	Count	8	1	3	7	19
		Expected Count	7.1	1.6	5.5	4.7	19.0
		% of Total	1.6%	.2%	.6%	1.4%	3.9%
	SBAJ	Count	3	3	13***	3	22
		Expected Count	8.3	1.8	6.4	5.5	22.0
		% of Total	.6%	.6%	2.6%	.6%	4.5%
	JBL	Count	5	5	37***	1	48
		Expected Count	18.0	4.0	14.0	12.0	48.0
		% of Total	1.0%	1.0%	7.5%	.2%	9.7%
	AMSJ	Count	4	0	14***	5	23
		Expected Count	8.6	1.9	6.7	5.7	23.0
		% of Total	.8%	.0%	2.8%	1.0%	4.7%
	IJBPA	Count	1	7***	16***	3	27
		Expected Count	10.1	2.2	7.9	6.7	27.0
		% of Total	.2%	1.4%	3.2%	.6%	5.5%
	AMS	Count	42***	5	13	22	82
		Expected Count	30.8	6.8	24.0	20.5	82.0
		% of Total	8.5%	1.0%	2.6%	4.5%	16.6%

	CBR	Count	1	6	19***	0	26
		Expected Count	9.8	2.2	7.6	6.5	26.0
		% of Total	.2%	1.2%	3.9%	.0%	5.3%
	MIS	Count	13***	4	0	5	22
		Expected Count	8.3	1.8	6.4	5.5	22.0
		% of Total	2.6%	.8%	.0%	1.0%	4.5%
	HBR	Count	3	2	2	5	12
		Expected Count	4.5	1.0	3.5	3.0	12.0
		% of Total	.6%	.4%	.4%	1.0%	2.4%
	AR	Count	101***	3	7	30	141
		Expected Count	52.9	11.7	41.2	35.2	141.0
		% of Total	20.5%	.6%	1.4%	6.1%	28.6%
	AF	Count	1	1	2	42***	46
		Expected Count	17.3	3.8	13.4	11.5	46.0
		% of Total	.2%	.2%	.4%	8.5%	9.3%
	Total	Count	185	41	144	123	493
		Expected Count	185.0	41.0	144.0	123.0	493.0
		% of Total	37.5%	8.3%	29.2%	24.9%	100.0%

***denotes observed count is four or more above the expected count.

Table 2B: Chi-Square Tests	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	391.943(a)	33	.000
Likelihood Ratio	397.802	33	.000
Linear-by-Linear Association	3.810	1	.051
N of Valid Cases	493		

a) 14 cells (29.2%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 1.00.

Table 2C: Directional Measures			Value	Asymp. Std. Error(a)	Approx. T(b)	Approx. Sig.
Nominal by Nominal	Lambda	Symmetric	.286	.027	9.491	.000
		Journal Dependent	.131	.030	4.170	.000
		Carnegie Dependent	.464	.032	11.937	.000
	Goodman and Kruskal tau	Journal Dependent	.111	.012		.000(c)
		Carnegie Dependent	.320	.026		.000(c)

a) Not assuming the null hypothesis.
b) Using the asymptotic standard error assuming the null hypothesis.
c) Based on chi-square approximation

Hypothesis $_2$: The relative frequency of publications in any of the 12 refereed business and related journals observed is not the same for faculty members affiliated with AACSB accredited institutions and faculty members from non-AACSB institutions. The Chi-Square test shows AACSB compared to non-AACSB authors differed significantly in relative frequency of their publications, with a critical value of 90.22 exceeding the 19.68 critical value found in the Chi-Square Table, with df = 11 and p = .05. Lambda was λ =.20 when AACSB represented the dependent variable, assuming a null hypothesis. We present the Chi-Square findings in Table 3a.

TABLE 3A
CHI-SQUARE TEST OF AACSB ACROSS JOURNAL OUTLETS***

			AACSB		
AACSB Cross tabulation			Non-Accredited	Accredited	Total
Journal	JABE	Count	8	17	25
		Expected Count	7.6	17.4	25.0
		% of Total	1.6%	3.4%	5.1%
	JBC	Count	5	14	19
		Expected Count	5.8	13.2	19.0
		% of Total	1.0%	2.8%	3.9%
	SBAJ	Count	10	12	22
		Expected Count	6.7	15.3	22.0
		% of Total	2.0%	2.4%	4.5%
	JBL	Count	**21*** **	27	48
		Expected Count	14.6	33.4	48.0
		% of Total	4.3%	5.5%	9.7%
	AMSJ	Count	9	14	23
		Expected Count	7.0	16.0	23.0
		% of Total	1.8%	2.8%	4.7%
	IJBPA	Count	7	20	27
		Expected Count	8.2	18.8	27.0
		% of Total	1.4%	4.1%	5.5%
	AMS	Count	10	**72*** **	82
		Expected Count	24.9	57.1	82.0
		% of Total	2.0%	14.6%	16.6%
	CBR	Count	8	18	26
		Expected Count	7.9	18.1	26.0
		% of Total	1.6%	3.7%	5.3%
	MIS	Count	3	**19*** **	22
		Expected Count	6.7	15.3	22.0
		% of Total	.6%	3.9%	4.5%
	HBR	Count	3	9	12
		Expected Count	3.7	8.3	12.0
		% of Total	.6%	1.8%	2.4%
	AR	Count	28	**113*** **	141
		Expected Count	42.9	98.1	141.0
		% of Total	5.7%	22.9%	28.6%
	AF	Count	**38*** **	8	46
		Expected Count	14.0	32.0	46.0
		% of Total	7.7%	1.6%	9.3%
Total		Count	150	343	493
		Expected Count	150.0	343.0	493.0
		% of Total	30.4%	69.6%	100.0%

***denotes observed count exceeding expected count by three or more.

Table 3B: Chi-Square Tests	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	90.219(a)	11	.000
Likelihood Ratio	87.792	11	.000
Linear-by-Linear Association	.255	1	.613
N of Valid Cases	493		

a) 1 cells (4.2%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 3.65.

Table 3C: Directional Measures			Value	Asymp. Std. Error(a)	Approx. T(b)	Approx. Sig.
Nominal by Nominal	Lambda	Symmetric	.080	.026	2.943	.003
		Journal Dependent	.028	.023	1.233	.218
		AACSB Dependent	.200	.040	4.514	.000
	Goodman and Kruskal tau	Journal Dependent	.025	.006		.000(c)
		AACSB Dependent	.183	.032		.000(c)

a) Not assuming the null hypothesis.
b) Using the asymptotic standard error assuming the null hypothesis.
c) Based on chi-square approximation.

As can be seen in Tables 3b and 3c, journals are better at predicting publication frequency among the AACSB status than the AACSB status is at predicting journals. In fact, journal outlets explain 20 percent of the error in authors' publications when compared with accreditation status. Therefore, journal outlets reduce the prediction error by 20 percent when AACSB is dependent variable. We place the triple asterisks by numbers with four or more above the expected count in each cell. This means journals appear to be influencing particular institutions with both AACSB accreditation and not.

Hypothesis $_3$: The relative frequency of publications in any of the 12 refereed business and related journals observed is not the same for single author, dual authors, and manuscripts with three or more authors. Chi-Square test shows the observed frequency is not the same for single author, dual authors, and manuscripts with three or more authors, with a critical value of 55.255 exceeding the 33.92 critical value found in the Chi-Square Table, with df = 22 and p= .05. Lambda could not be computed for journal as dependent; however, Goodman and Kruskal tau was significant with p = .000 when number of authors represented the dependent variable, assuming a null hypothesis. We present the Chi-Square findings in Table 4.

The count for published articles with three, four, five, or six coauthors were combined into one category because separate they represented too few in single cell counts. In many cases, the cell count was zero for some journals, specifically co-authored articles with five or six authors. As a group, articles with three, four, five or six authors were too few to stand alone as categories in a Chi-Square test. As can be seen in Tables 4b and 4c, journals are better at predicting publication frequency than numbers of authors on a single article (predicting only 1.4 percent of the error). In fact, journal outlets explain 5.1 (p = .000) percent of the difference in authors' publications across numbers of coauthors. Therefore, journal outlets reduce the prediction error by 5.1 percent. We place the triple asterisks by numbers with three or more above the expected count in each cell.

TABLE 4A
CHI SQUARE TEST OF NUMBER OF COAUTHORS' ACROSS JOURNALS OUTLETS***

			Authors			
Journal Authors Cross-tabulation			*One*	*Two*	*Three +*	*Total*
Journal	JABE	Count	4	**12*** **	9	25
		Expected Count	3.5	8.8	12.7	25.0
		% of Total	.8%	2.4%	1.8%	5.1%
	JBC	Count	**6*** **	4	9	19
		Expected Count	2.7	6.7	9.6	19.0
		% of Total	1.2%	.8%	1.8%	3.9%
	SBAJ	Count	3	6	13	22
		Expected Count	3.1	7.7	11.2	22.0
		% of Total	.6%	1.2%	2.6%	4.5%
	JBL	Count	**14*** **	14	20	48
		Expected Count	6.8	16.8	24.3	48.0
		% of Total	2.8%	2.8%	4.1%	9.7%
	AMSJ	Count	0	8	15***	23
		Expected Count	3.3	8.1	11.7	23.0
		% of Total	.0%	1.6%	3.0%	4.7%
	IJBPA	Count	2	10	15	27
		Expected Count	3.8	9.5	13.7	27.0
		% of Total	.4%	2.0%	3.0%	5.5%
	AMS	Count	2	24	**56*** **	82
		Expected Count	11.6	28.8	41.6	82.0
		% of Total	.4%	4.9%	11.4%	16.6%
	CBR	Count	3	**14*** **	9	26
		Expected Count	3.7	9.1	13.2	26.0
		% of Total	.6%	2.8%	1.8%	5.3%
	MIS	Count	1	**12*** **	9	22
		Expected Count	3.1	7.7	11.2	22.0
		% of Total	.2%	2.4%	1.8%	4.5%
	HBR	Count	1	6	5	12
		Expected Count	1.7	4.2	6.1	12.0
		% of Total	.2%	1.2%	1.0%	2.4%
	AR	Count	**28*** **	40	73	141
		Expected Count	20.0	49.5	71.5	141.0
		% of Total	5.7%	8.1%	14.8%	28.6%
	AF	Count	6	**23*** **	17	46
		Expected Count	6.5	16.1	23.3	46.0
		% of Total	1.2%	4.7%	3.4%	9.3%
Total		Count	70	173	250	493
		Expected Count	70.0	173.0	250.0	493.0
		% of Total	14.2%	35.1%	50.7%	100.0%

***denotes observed count exceeds expected count by three or more.

Table 4B: Chi-Square Tests	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	55.255(a)	22	.000
Likelihood Ratio	59.467	22	.000
Linear-by-Linear Association	.008	1	.929
N of Valid Cases	493		

a) 9 cells (25.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 1.70.

Table 4C: Directional Measures			Value	Asymp. Std. Error(a)	Approx. T(b)	Approx. Sig.
Nominal by Nominal	Lambda	Symmetric	.030	.018	1.676	.094
		Journal Dependent	.000	.000	.(c)	.(c)
		Authors Dependent	.074	.043	1.676	.094
	Goodman and Kruskal tau	Journal Dependent	.014	.004		.000(d)
		Authors Dependent	.051	.015		.000(d)

a) Not assuming the null hypothesis.
b) Using the asymptotic standard error assuming the null hypothesis.
c) Cannot be computed because the asymptotic standard error equals zero.
d) Based on chi-square approximation

DISCUSSION

Webster's Online (http://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/caste) defines caste "as a division of society based on differences of wealth, inherited rank or privilege, profession, occupation, or race or the position conferred by caste standing: prestige; or a system of rigid social stratification characterized by hereditary status, endogamy, and social barriers sanctioned by custom, law, or religion." Webster's Online also defines class "as a group sharing the same economic or social status (the working class) or social rank."

In this paper, we tested three hypotheses. In Hypothesis $_1$, the relative frequency or percentage of faculty members affiliated with any of the Carnegie 2000 classified and foreign institutions who publish in any of the 12 refereed business and related journals is not the same. The Chi-Square test shows faculty affiliated with Research Extensive institutions, Research Intensive institutions, Masters I or lower institutions and foreign institutions differed significantly in what we believe is a result of the 12 business journals targeting certain classes of institutions in their efforts to carve out a niche in the academic publication market.

For example, MIS Quarterly (MIS), Accounting Review (AR), and Academy of Marketing Science, Journal (AMS) published significantly more articles by faculty affiliated with Research Extensive institutions than the Journal of Business and Leadership (JBL), Southwestern Business Administration Journal (SBAJ) and the Academy of Marketing Studies Journal (AMSJ), whose published articles were significantly associated with faculty affiliated with Master I or lower institutions. The International Journal of Business and Public Administration (IJBPA) published a good number of articles by faculty affiliated with both Research Intensive and Masters I or lower universities. And, the Accounting Forum (AF) published significantly more articles by faculty from foreign institutions. The Journal of Business Communication (JBC) and the Harvard Business Review (HBR) appear even on their targeting of faculty from all groups of the Carnegie 2000 Classes of institutions and foreign institutions and consulting firms.

In Hypothesis $_2$, the relative frequency of publications in any of the 12 refereed business and related journals observed is not the same for faculty members affiliated with AACSB accredited institutions and faculty members from non-AACSB institutions. We find that journals are better at predicting publication frequency among the AACSB status than the AACSB status is at predicting journals. The AMS, MIS, and AR predicted articles published by faculty affiliated with institutions already AASCB accredited. On the

other hand, the JBL predicted articles published by faculty affiliated with institutions not yet AACSB accredited; once more, an indication of a market niche. This again supports our argument that a caste and class system exists.

In Hypothesis $_3$, the relative frequency of publications in any of the 12 refereed business and related journals observed is not the same for single author, dual authors, and manuscripts with three or more authors. The finding shows the observed frequency is not the same for single author, dual authors, and manuscripts with three or more authors. This means, journals are better at predicting publication frequency than numbers of authors on a single article. Faculty who are on the tenure track publish-or-perish bubble will be in a better position if they co-author with colleagues from AACSB institutions for improving the acceptance rates of their works. A manuscript written by coauthors with at least one being from a Research Extensive institution improves the odds of it being published in the MIS, AR, or AMS considerably. By our count, 250 of the 493 (50.7%) authors were a team of three or more coauthors on a manuscript that was published. The JBC, AMS, MIS and AR published 9, 56, 9, and 73 authors (29.82 % of the 493) respectively who were on a team of three or more authors on a single manuscript. Four hundred twenty-three (or 423/493 x 100 = 85.80%) of published authors were on a co-authored team of two or more authors.

While the possibility of being published is improved by collaborations among faculty members in the research community, this may discourage the individual publication efforts, in particular those from non-AACSB institutions submitting their research findings to certain journal types. The process of inter-college or interdepartmental research collaborations may continue as long as both authors enjoy the relationships and the true sense of collaborations. However, the relationships may come to a halt if one of the coauthors continuously takes advantage of the others or lacks enthusiasm to continue on with projects.

CONCLUSION

This paper uses association measures to compare institutions by their Carnegie 2000 Classification, by AACSB status, and by the number of coauthors appearing on a single publication. We selected 12 refereed business and related journals, broad ranging in aims and scopes, on their affiliation with conferences, acceptance rates and frequency of published articles associated with those journals. Of the observed variables, 493 authors were counted, out of these 343 published authors were from AACSB accredited schools. Among the Carnegie 2000 Classification listings, 185 authors were affiliated with research extensive institutions, 41 were from research intensive, 144 were from Masters I or lower level institutions and 123 were from foreign institutions or consulting firms not classified by the Carnegie Foundation.

Our findings show proof there is a caste and class system among the journals. There appears to be a lack of transparency and accountability surrounding the editorial article review processes. We suggest a need for continuing dialog and communications between reviewers, editors and reviewees to improve in the delivery of new knowledge through academic publications. The three-party peer review process should be documented and auditable. An auditable process will help improve the quality of acceptance rates and understanding among all three parties.

The 12 journals we analyzed are targeting among the Carnegie 2000 Classification, more so than faculty members are targeting these particular journals. Each of the 12 journals seems to have carved out a niche among the Carnegie 2000 Classification and foreign institutions. This evidence supports Miller's (2006) "Dissensus" argument and Epstein's (1995) Rabinovich's (1996) and Bedeian's (2004) arguments there is bias on the editorial and peer review process. We now know that for these 12 business journals, they are publishing articles in various concentrations of the Carnegie 2000 Classification. These findings led us to conclude faculty members on the tenure track should focus their publication efforts on the outlets that target their particular Carnegie 2000 Classification favorably.

Furthermore, deans and heads of departments of public institutions normally have custodial authority over state resources. And, how they develop policy is often resource based. Now that we can surmise there is a caste and class among the faculty publishing in the 12 business journals we analyzed, deans

writing policy to favor publishing articles in the reputational elite journals makes sense only for a handful of schools of business. For the majority, it behooves deans and heads of departments at Carnegie Research Intensive or Master I or lower institutions to support the organizations that sponsor conferences and regional scholarly business journals that target their particular Carnegie 2000 Classification niche.

Currently, reimbursing faculty's conference fees, page fees and other publication costs appears contradictory to the outcome if they are targeting the wrong types of journals. Spending state resources for a high probability of rejection letters now appears to amount to negligence on the part of academic administrators who impose such policies. In addition, faculty targeting the wrong journals circumvents the scientific process. Science pivots on the assumption all knowledge is tentative: new knowledge alters old knowledge. The end product of any scientific investigation should be the dissemination of new knowledge.

The very powerful nominal-by-nominal association measures we used in this study show little justification for deans and heads of departments to implement a "pie-in-the-sky" publication requirement for their faculty, unless they are among the Research Extensive institutions. In fact, with this new knowledge, it seems such policies would be a dereliction of duty to impose a list of reputational elite business journals on a business school faculty teaching at Research Intensive or Masters I or lower institution. There is a need for future research.

Future research could increase the number of refereed journals under review. Journals could be selected based on a specific field of study, for example accounting, finance, economics or engineering, rather than from a mixed range of business journals. Also, longitudinal studies on publication patterns may help establish the trends of faculty targeting on specific journals, journals that targeting particular institutions, and vice versa. It would be beneficial to compare 12 business journals in one business field, for five volumes of each journal, to determine if this type of targeting exists within disciplines as well. Gender, rank of authors and years of being academia are possible variables that we need to address and look at. All these will help faculty, deans and department heads, promotion and tenure committees, sponsors and stakeholders appreciate and understand the peer review processes should be about the dissemination of new knowledge and little about anything else.

ENDNOTES

1. These recommendations include (1) to provide explicit, uniform guidelines for editors and reviewers, (2) to have independence of editorial judgment, (3) to adherence to time constraints, (4) to provide constructive versus destructive comments, (5) to balance between positive and negative features, (6) to correctable versus uncorrectable limitations, (7) to make awareness and control of biases, (8) to provide Information to authors about recommending reviewers, (9) to provide a meaningful appeals procedure, (10) to provide identity of reviewers, and (11) to provide forms for authors to provide feedback to reviewers. In short, Epstein (1995, p. 885) urges `for reviewers to sign their reviews. The other is for authors to provide feedback to editors and reviewers of their reactions to the reviews they receive, with a request for the editors to forward their comments to the reviewers. We hope this comment will stimulate some penetrating discussion, and, in particular, stimulate additional suggestions for improving the review process. Some of my suggestions are obviously some editors strongly encourage authors of submitted manuscripts to include citations from the very journals in which they seek to be published. Similar is true for rankings based on acceptance rates; editors may on purpose forward papers to unforgiving reviewers in order to maintain a pre-established low acceptance rate.
2. Refer to www.carnegiefoundation.org for more details.

REFERENCES

Alexander, J. C., Jr. & Mabry, R. H. (1994). Relative Significance of Journals, Authors, and Articles Cited in Financial Research. The Journal of Finance, 49, (2), 697-712.

Alexander, J. K., Scherer, R. F. & Lecoutre, M. (2007). A Global Comparison of Business Journal Ranking Systems. Journal of Education For Business, 82, (6), 321-328.

Azar, O. H. (2007). Behavioral Economics and Socio-Economics Journals: A Citation-Based Ranking. Journal of Socio-Economics, 36, (3), 451-462.

Baldwin, A. A., Morris, B. W. & Scheiner, J. H. (2000). Where Do AIS Researchers Publish? International Journal of Accounting Information Systems, 1, 123-134.

Ballas, A. & Theoharakis, V. (2003). Exploring Diversity in Accounting through Faculty Journal Perceptions. Contemporary Accounting Research, 20, (4), 619-644.

Bauerly, R. J. & Johnson, D. T. (2005). An Evaluation of Journals Used in Doctoral Marketing Programs. Academy Of Marketing Science Journal, 33, (3), 313-330.

Bean, D. F. & Bernardi, R. A. (2005). Estimating The Ratings of Journals Omitted in Prior Quality Ratings. Advances in Accounting Education, 7, 109-127.

Bedeian, A. G. (2004). Peer Review and the Social Construction of Knowledge in the Management Discipline. Academy Of Management Learning and Education, 3, (2), 198-216.

Beed, C. & Beed, C. (1996). Measuring the Quality of Academic Journals: The Case of Economics. Journal of Post Keynesian Economics, 18, (3), 369-396.

Bonner, S. E., Hesford, J. W., Van Der Stede, W. A. & Young, S. M. (2006). The Most Influential Journals in Academic Accounting. Accounting, Organizations and Society, 31, (7), 663-685.

Brown, L. D. & Gardner, J. C. (1985). Applying Citation Analysis to Evaluate the Research Contributions of Accounting Faculty and Doctoral Programs. The Accounting Review, 60, (2), 262-277.

Brown, L. D. & Huefner, R. J. (1994). The Familiarity with and Perceived Quality of Accounting Journals: Views of Senior Accounting Faculty in Leading U.S. MBA Programs. Contemporary Accounting Research, 11, (1), 223-250.

Caldwell, T. (2006). Impact Factors Rocked By Manipulation Charge. Information World Review, 9. Retrieved From Http://Www.Iwr.Co.Uk/Information-World-Review/News/2160286/Impact-Factors-Rocked

Carnegie Foundation, Elective Classification: Community Engagement (2008) Documentation Framework. Available From the Carnegie Foundation Web Site, Http://Www.Carnegiefoundation.Org/Classifications/Sub.Asp?Key=1213andSubkey=2215

Chow, C. W., Haddad, K., Singh, G. & Wu, A. (2007). On Using Journal Rank to Proxy an Article's Contribution or Value. Issues in Accounting Education, 22, (3), 411-427.

Chung, K. H., Pak, H. S. & Cox, R. A. K. (1992). Patterns of Research Output in The Accounting Literature: A Study of Bibliometric Distributions. Abacus, 28, (2), 168-185.

Davis, J. B. (1998). Problems in Using the Social Sciences Citation Index to Rank Economics Journals. American Economist, 42, (2), 59-65.

Driscoll, A. (2008) Carnegie's Community-Engagement Classifications: Intentions and Insights, Change, Jan/Feb, 39-41. Retrieved September 20, 2009, From, Carnegie Foundation, Http://Www.Carnegiefoundation.Org.

Dyckman, T. R. & Zeff, S. A. (1984). Two Decades of the Journal of Accounting Research, Journal of Accounting Research, 22, (1), 225-297.

Epstein, S. (1995). What Can Be Done to Improve the Journal Review Process? American Psychologist, 50, (10), 883-885.

Everett, J. O., Klamm, B. & Stoltzfus, R. (2004). Developing Benchmarks for Evaluating Publication Records at Doctoral Programs in Accounting. Journal of Accounting Education, 22, (3), 229-252.

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, 15, (2), 95-141.

Hasselback, J. R. & Reinstein, A. (1995). A Proposal for Measuring Scholarly Productivity of Accounting Faculty. Issues in Accounting Education, 10, (2), 269-306.

Hasselback, J. R., Reinstein, A. & Schwan, E. S. (2002) Prolific Authors of Accounting Literature. Advances in Accounting, 20, 95-125. Retrieved from Http://Www.Jrhasselback.Com/Articles/Prolific.Pdf

Heck, J. L., Jensen, R. E. & Cooley, P. L. (1990). An Analysis of Contributors to Accounting Journals, Part I: The Aggregate Performances. The International Journal of Accounting, 26, 202-217.

Herron, T. L. & Hall, T. W. (2004). Faculty Perceptions of Journals: Quality and Publishing Feasibility. Journal of Accounting Education, 22, (3), 175-210.

Hynes, G. E. & Stretcher, R. (2005). Business Schools' Policies Regarding Publications In Electronic Journals. Journal of Education For Business, 81, (2), 73-80.

Johnson, P. M., Reckers P. M. J. & Solomon, L. (2002). Evolving Research Benchmarks. Advances in Accounting, 19, 235-243.

Jolly, S. A., Schroeder, R. G. & Spear, R. K. (1995). An Empirical Investigation of the Relationship between Journal Quality Ratings and Promotion and Tenure Decisions. The Accounting Educators' Journal, 7, (2), 47-68.

Katerattanakul, P., Razi, M. A., Han, B. T. & Kam, H. (2005). Consistency and Concern on IS Journal Rankings. JITTA : Journal Of Information Technology Theory And Application, 7, (2), 1-16.

Liner, G. H. & Amin, M. (2004). Methods of Ranking Economics Journals. Atlantic Economic Journal, 32, (2), 140-150.

Lowensohn, S. & Samelson, D. P. (2006). An Examination of Faculty Perceptions of Academic Journal Quality within Five Specialized Areas of Accounting Research. Issues in Accounting Education, 21, (3), 219-239.

Mason, P. M., Steagall, J. W. & Fabritius, M. M. (1997). Economics Journal Rankings by Type of School: Perceptions versus Citations. Quarterly Journal of Business and Economics, 36, (1), 69-80.

Miller, C. C. (2006). Peer Review in the Organizational and Management Sciences: Prevalence and Effects of Reviewer Hostility, Bias, and Dissensus. Academy of Management Journal, 49, (3), 425-431.

Mort, G. S., Mccoll-Kennedy, J. R., Kiel, G. & Soutar, G. N. (2004). Perceptions of Marketing Journals by Senior Academics in Australia and New Zealand. Australasian Marketing Journal, 12, (2), 51-63.

Olson, J. E. (2005). Top-25-Business-School Professors Rate Journals in Operations Management and Related Fields. Interfaces, 35, (4), 323-340.

Oltheten, E., Theoharakis, V. & Travlos, N. G. (2005). Faculty Perceptions and Readership Patterns of Finance Journals: A Global View. Journal of Financial And Quantitative Analysis, 40, (1), 223-239.

Peffers, K. & Ya, T. (2003). Identifying and Evaluating the Universe of Outlets for Information Systems Research: Ranking The Journals. JITTA : Journal Of Information Technology Theory And Application, 5, (1), 63-84.

Peters, D. P. & Ceci, S. J. (1982). Peer-Review Practices of Psychological Journals: The Fate of Published Articles, Submitted Again. Behavioral and Brain Sciences, 5 (2), 187-255.

Polonsky, M. J. & Whitelaw, P. (2004). Exploring Multi-Dimensional Perceptual Ranking of Marketing Journals by North American Academics. American Marketing Association. Conference Proceedings. Chicago: Summer, 15, 13-21.

Polonsky, M. J. (2004). Journal Rankings: Does One Size Fit All? Australasian Marketing Journal, 12, (2), 64-67.

Rabinovich, B. A, (1996). A Perspective on the Journal Review Process. The American Psychologist, 51, (11), 1190.

Raelin, J. (2008). Refereeing the Game of Peer Review. Academy of Management Learning and Education, 7, (1), 124-129.

Reinstein, A. & Calderon, T. G. (2006). Examining Accounting Departments' Rankings of the Quality Of Accounting Journals. Critical Perspectives on Accounting, 17, (4), 457-490.

Rogers, P. S., Campbell, N., Louhiala-Salminen, L., Rentz, K. & Suchan, J. (2007). The Impact of Perceptions of Journal Quality on Business and Management Communication Academics. Journal of Business Communication, 44, (4), 403-426,

Rupp, N. G. & Mckinney, C. N. (2002). The Publication Patterns of the Elite Economics Departments: 1995-2000. Eastern Economic Journal, 28, (4), 523-539.

Smith, G. & Krogstad, J. L. (1988). A Taxonomy of Content and Citations in Auditing: A Journal of Practice and Theory. Auditing, 8, (1), 108-117.

Smith, L. M. (1994). Relative Contributions of Professional Journals to the Field of Accounting. Accounting Educators' Journal, 6, (1), 1-31.

Smith, S. D. (2004). Is An Article In A Top Journal A Top Article? Financial Management, 33, (4), 133-150.

Starbuck, W. H. (2003). Turning Lemons into Lemonade: Where Is the Value in Peer Reviews? Journal of Management Inquiry, 12, (4), 344-351.

Stretcher, R., Hynes, G. E. & Stowe, C. R. B. (2006). S- And E-Journals: Policies and Perceptions. Academy of Educational Leadership Journal, 10, (1), 83-89.

Vastag, G. & Montabon, F. (2002). Journal Characteristics, Rankings and Social Acculturation In Operations Management. Omega, 30, (2), 109-126.

Vokurka, R. J. (1996). The Relative Importance of Journals Used in Operations Management Research - A Citation Analysis. Journal of Operations Management, 14(4), 345-355.

Zivney, T. L., Bertin, W. J., & Gavin, T. A. (1995). A Comprehensive Examination of Accounting Faculty Publishing. Issues in Accounting Education, 10, (1), 1-25.

Zuckerman, H. (1988). The Sociology of Science. In N. J. Smelser (Ed.), Handbook of Sociology, (Pp. 511-571). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

APPENDIX

	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Percent
Agder University College, Norway	1	.2	.2
Allen University	1	.2	.4
Arizona State University at the West campus	1	.2	.6
Auburn University Montgomery	1	.2	.8
Baruch College-City University of New York	1	.2	1.0
Baylor University	1	.2	1.2
Belmont University	3	.6	1.8
Ben-Gurion University of the Negev	2	.4	2.2
Bentley College	3	.6	2.8
Bentley University	1	.2	3.0
Bentley University and University of New South Wales	1	.2	3.2
Bethune Cookman University	1	.2	3.4
Boise State University	1	.2	3.7
Bologna University, Italy	1	.2	3.9
Bradley University	1	.2	4.1
Brigham Young University	2	.4	4.5
Bristol Business School	1	.2	4.7
Bristol Business School, UK	1	.2	4.9
Brock University, Canada	1	.2	5.1
Bryant College	1	.2	5.3
California State University-East Bay	1	.2	5.5
California State University-Los Angeles	2	.4	5.9
California State University-San Marcos	1	.2	6.1
California State University, Long Beach	2	.4	6.5
Cameron University	2	.4	6.9
Cardiff Business School	1	.2	7.1
Cardiff Business School, UK	1	.2	7.3
Cardiff University	4	.8	8.1
Case Western Reserve University	1	.2	8.3
Cass Business School	1	.2	8.5
Central Washington University-Des Moines	1	.2	8.7
Central Washington University	1	.2	8.9
Chonnam National University	1	.2	9.1
Claremont Graduate University	1	.2	9.3
Colorado State University	2	.4	9.7
Columbia University	1	.2	9.9
Columbus State University	4	.8	10.8
Concordia University, Canada	2	.4	11.2
Cornell University	1	.2	11.4
Delaware State University	1	.2	11.6
Dominican University	2	.4	12.0
Drury University	1	.2	12.2
Duke University	2	.4	12.6
East Carolina University	1	.2	12.8
Elon University	1	.2	13.0
Emory University	3	.6	13.6
Fayetteville State University	1	.2	13.8
Florida Atlantic University	1	.2	14.0
Florida International University	1	.2	14.2
Florida State University	1	.2	14.4
Fort Hays State University	9	1.8	16.2
George Washington University	3	.6	16.8
Georgetown University	1	.2	17.0
Georgia College & State University	1	.2	17.2
Georgia Institute of Technology	1	.2	17.4
Georgia Southern State University	1	.2	17.6
Georgia State University	3	.6	18.3
Goethe-University Frankfurt am Main	1	.2	18.5
Grambling State University	3	.6	19.1
Hansung University	1	.2	19.3
Harvard Medical School, Boston	1	.2	19.5
Harvard University	3	.6	20.1
Hofstra University	2	.4	20.5
Humboldt University Berlin	2	.4	20.9
Indiana University	10	2.0	22.9
Indiana University Purdue University Fort Wayne	1	.2	23.1
Indiana University South Bend	1	.2	23.3

Iowa State University	3	.6	23.9
ITESM Campus Monterry	2	.4	24.3
Jacksonville State University	3	.6	24.9
Korn Ferry International	2	.4	25.4
Kuwait University	2	.4	25.8
La Trobe University, Australia	2	.4	26.2
Lancaster University	1	.2	26.4
Lehigh University	2	.4	26.8
London Business School, England	1	.2	27.0
Louisiana Tech University	1	.2	27.2
Maastricht University	1	.2	27.4
Maastricht University and University of Antwerp	1	.2	27.6
Manchester Business School, United Kingdom	1	.2	27.8
Massachusetts Institute of Technology	1	.2	28.0
Michigan State University	3	.6	28.6
Middle Tennessee State University	2	.4	29.0
Midwestern State University	1	.2	29.2
Millikin University	1	.2	29.4
Mississippi State University	1	.2	29.6
Missouri State University	4	.8	30.4
Monash University	1	.2	30.6
Montana State University	1	.2	30.8
Moravian College	1	.2	31.0
National Taipei University	1	.2	31.2
National Taiwan University	2	.4	31.6
New Mexico State University	1	.2	31.8
New York University	2	.4	32.3
Newcastle University	1	.2	32.5
Nicholls State University	1	.2	32.7
Nnamdi Azikiwe University	1	.2	32.9
North Carolina State University	1	.2	33.1
North Georgia College and State University	1	.2	33.3
Northeastern University	3	.6	33.9
Northern Arizona State University	1	.2	34.1
Northern Illinois University	5	1.0	35.1
Norwegian School of Economics and Business Administration, Norway	2	.4	35.5
Nottingham University	1	.2	35.7
Nova Southeastern University	3	.6	36.3
Ohio State University	1	.2	36.5
Oklahoma Christian University	2	.4	36.9
Oklahoma State University - Stillwater	3	.6	37.5
Oklahoma State University	1	.2	37.7
Ouachita Baptist University	1	.2	37.9
Pennsylvania State University	1	.2	38.1
Prairie View A&M University	3	.6	38.7
Providence College	1	.2	38.9
Purdue University	3	.6	39.6
Purdue University Calumet	2	.4	40.0
Queen's University, Canada	3	.6	40.6
Queensland University of Technology	1	.2	40.8
Quinnipiac University	1	.2	41.0
Regent University	1	.2	41.2
Retired US Government	1	.2	41.4
Rice University	5	1.0	42.4
Richard Stockton College	1	.2	42.6
Rockhurst University	3	.6	43.2
Samford University	1	.2	43.4
San Diego State University	2	.4	43.8
San Francisco State University	1	.2	44.0
Santa Clara University	2	.4	44.4
Seattle Pacific University	1	.2	44.6
Seton Hill University	1	.2	44.8
Sheffield University, United Kingdom	1	.2	45.0
Singapore Management University	2	.4	45.4
Southeast Missouri State University	2	.4	45.8
Southern Illinois University-Carbondale	1	.2	46.0
Southern Illinois University	3	.6	46.7
Southern Louisiana University	1	.2	46.9
Southern Methodist University	3	.6	47.5
Southwest Missouri State University	1	.2	47.7

St. Cloud State University	4	.8	48.5
St. John’s University	1	.2	48.7
St. Joseph's College of Maine	1	.2	48.9
St. Mary's University-San Antonio	1	.2	49.1
St. Mary's University	1	.2	49.3
St. Micheal's College	1	.2	49.5
Stanford University	4	.8	50.3
State University of New York at Binghamton	1	.2	50.5
Syracuse University	1	.2	50.7
Tel Aviv University	1	.2	50.9
Tel Aviv University, Israel	1	.2	51.1
Texas A&M International University	2	.4	51.5
Texas A&M University-Commerce	5	1.0	52.5
Texas A&M University, College Station	1	.2	52.7
Texas Southern University	3	.6	53.3
Texas State University-San Marcus	2	.4	53.8
The University of Texas-San Antonio	1	.2	54.0
Towson University	1	.2	54.2
Troy University	5	1.0	55.2
Universidad Carlos III de Madrid	1	.2	55.4
Universidade do Minho, Portugal	1	.2	55.6
Universita deli Studi di Siena	1	.2	55.8
University College Dublin	1	.2	56.0
University of Aarhus	1	.2	56.2
University of Alaska Fairbanks	1	.2	56.4
University of Amsterdam	1	.2	56.6
University of Arkansas-Fort Smith	3	.6	57.2
University of Arkansas	4	.8	58.0
University of Auckland	1	.2	58.2
University of Birmingham, United Kingdom	2	.4	58.6
University of California-Irvine	1	.2	58.8
University of California, Berkeley	3	.6	59.4
University of California, Davis	2	.4	59.8
University of California, Irvine	2	.4	60.2
University of California, Riverside	1	.2	60.4
University of Cambridge, United Kindom	2	.4	60.9
University of Central Florida	2	.4	61.3
University of Central Oklahoma	4	.8	62.1
University of Colorado at Boulder	1	.2	62.3
University of Connecticut	4	.8	63.1
University of Dallas	2	.4	63.5
University of Dundee, Fulton Building	3	.6	64.1
University of Dundee, UK	3	.6	64.7
University of Florida	4	.8	65.5
University of Georgia	3	.6	66.1
University of Glasgow	1	.2	66.3
University of Hertfordshire, Hatfield, United Kingdom	3	.6	66.9
University of Hertfordshire, UK	4	.8	67.7
University of Idaho	1	.2	68.0
University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign	1	.2	68.2
University of Iowa	5	1.0	69.2
University of Kentucky	2	.4	69.6
University of Louisiana	1	.2	69.8
University of Mannheim, Germany	2	.4	70.2
University of Melbourne	1	.2	70.4
University of Melbourne, Australia	3	.6	71.0
University of Miami	3	.6	71.6
University of Michigan-Dearborn	1	.2	71.8
University of Michigan	4	.8	72.6
University of Mississippi	4	.8	73.4
University of Missouri	4	.8	74.2
University of Missouri at Kansas City	1	.2	74.4
University of Montana	1	.2	74.6
University of Nebraska-Lincoln	1	.2	74.8
University of Nebraska at Kearney	1	.2	75.1
University of Nebraska at Lincoln	3	.6	75.7
University of Nevada, Las Vegas	2	.4	76.1
University Of Nevada, Reno	2	.4	76.5
University of New Mexico-Main Campus	1	.2	76.7
University of New Orleans	1	.2	76.9

University of New South Wales	3	.6	77.5
University of Newcastle Upon Tyne	1	.2	77.7
University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill	3	.6	78.3
University of North Carolina at Greensboro	1	.2	78.5
University of North Dakota	2	.4	78.9
University of Notre Dame	3	.6	79.5
University of Oklahoma	4	.8	80.3
University of Otago	2	.4	80.7
University of Padova, Italy	1	.2	80.9
University of Pennsylvania-Wharton School	2	.4	81.3
University of Pennsylvania	2	.4	81.7
University of Pittsburgh	2	.4	82.2
University of Quebec in Montreal, Canada	1	.2	82.4
University of Queensland, Australia	2	.4	82.8
University of Sheffield, United Kingdom	1	.2	83.0
University of South Australia, Adelaide	1	.2	83.2
University of South Australia, Australia	1	.2	83.4
University of South Dakota	3	.6	84.0
University of South Florida	1	.2	84.2
University of Southern California	5	1.0	85.2
University of Southern California, Los Angeles	1	.2	85.4
University of Southern Mississippi	1	.2	85.6
University of Southern Queensland, Toowoomba, Australia	1	.2	85.8
University of St. Andrews, United Kingdom	2	.4	86.2
University of St. Thomas-Houston	1	.2	86.4
University of St. Thomas-Minneapolis	1	.2	86.6
University of Strathclyde	1	.2	86.8
University of Strathclyde, United Kingdom	1	.2	87.0
University of Sydney	1	.2	87.2
University of Sydney, Australia	3	.6	87.8
University of Tasmania, Australia	1	.2	88.0
University of Tennessee at Chattanooga	1	.2	88.2
University of Tennessee at Martin	2	.4	88.6
University of Texas-Arlington	1	.2	88.8
University of Texas at Arlington	1	.2	89.0
University of Texas at Austin	3	.6	89.7
University of Texas at Dallas	2	.4	90.1
University of Texas at Tyler	3	.6	90.7
University of Toronto	1	.2	90.9
University of Utah	1	.2	91.1
University of Vermont	1	.2	91.3
University of Virginia	3	.6	91.9
University of Waikato	2	.4	92.3
University of Warwick, United Kingdom	1	.2	92.5
University of Washington, Tacoma	1	.2	92.7
University of Waterloo	1	.2	92.9
University of Wisconsin-Eau Claire	1	.2	93.1
University of Wisconsin-Madison	1	.2	93.3
University of Wisconsin-Oshkosh	1	.2	93.5
University of Wollongong	2	.4	93.9
Utah State University	1	.2	94.1
Utah Valley State College	1	.2	94.3
Vanderbilt University	1	.2	94.5
Victoria University of Wellington	1	.2	94.7
VU University, Amsterdam	1	.2	94.9
Wake Forest University	1	.2	95.1
Washington State University	4	.8	95.9
Washington University in St. Louis	1	.2	96.1
Wayne State University	1	.2	96.3
West Chester University	1	.2	96.6
West Texas A&M University	2	.4	97.0
Western Connecticut State University	2	.4	97.4
Western Illinois University	2	.4	97.8
Western Kentucky University	1	.2	98.0
Wichita State University	1	.2	98.2
Wilfrid Laurier University, Canada	1	.2	98.4
Willamette University	1	.2	98.6
Winona State University	3	.6	99.2
Winthrop University	3	.6	99.8
Youngstown State University	1	.2	100.0