



**BRITISH ACADEMY
OF MANAGEMENT**

BAM
CONFERENCE

3RD-5TH SEPTEMBER

ASTON UNIVERSITY BIRMINGHAM UNITED KINGDOM

This paper is from the BAM2019 Conference Proceedings

About BAM

The British Academy of Management (BAM) is the leading authority on the academic field of management in the UK, supporting and representing the community of scholars and engaging with international peers.

<http://www.bam.ac.uk/>

Diversity in academe, scientific imperialism and discrimination.

Bill Lee
(Sheffield University Management School)

And

Usman Aslam
(Birmingham Business School)

Paper prepared for presentation at the British Academy of Management Annual Conference, Aston University, Birmingham, 3rd-5th September 2019.

Contact details

Corresponding author

Professor Bill Lee
Management School
University of Sheffield
Conduit Road
Sheffield
S10 1FL
UK
Telephone: +44 (0)114-222-3473
E-mail: w.j.lee@sheffield.ac.uk

Other author

Dr Usman Aslam
Birmingham Business School
University of Birmingham
Edgbaston Park Road
Birmingham, U.K.
B15 2TT
E-mail: U.Aslam@bham.ac.uk

Abstract: This article is concerned with how research practice may prevent universities from becoming high performance organizations. Starting from an understanding that journals' preferences for particular types of research and English as a lingua franca of publication provide a basis for discrimination, this article contends that such discrimination is transplanted into universities through mechanisms such as journal quality lists. These practices discriminate against non-indigenous academics and constitute a form of scientific imperialism. Using an empirical study of twenty-seven UK-based academics, this article examines how such discrimination is experienced. The article concludes by arguing that if the academic community wish to have a sustainable, more equitable and better-informed future, it should change its own practices that limit expression of diverse research voices.

Keywords: Diversity; academic capitalism; discrimination; scientific imperialism; research practice.

1) Introduction

This article's principal focus is the research environment and the way in which that environment creates disparate opportunities to publish in some 'elite' outlets. Some might argue that this focus renders this contribution irrelevant to the Research Methodology track; indeed, such a comment was suggested by a reviewer when an earlier iteration of this article was submitted to a previous conference. Our response is simple; everything that affects the generation and dissemination of knowledge is relevant to research methodology. Those who deny this and favour narrow discussions about the detail of popular methods and approaches, risk stifling the processes of generating knowledge that they seek to facilitate. Indeed, at a conference that has a theme of the challenges and opportunities of 'Building and Sustaining High Performance Organisations in Uncertain Times', it is appropriate to ask senior academics whether their actions contribute to their own organizations performing well?

In addressing this concern, this article makes two important contributions. Firstly, we construct an argument about the operation of scientific imperialism. Our contention is that growth in UK Business and Management Schools' faculty has seen a healthy internationalism and a diverse multinational workforce as 61,580 or just over 30% of the 204,915 academic staff working in higher education in 2016/2017 and whose nationality was known, were not from the UK (HESA, 2018). However, discrimination external to academic institutions is manifest in epistemological, methodological, theoretical and empirical biases of journals (Özkazanç-Pan, 2012) and the lingua franca of English as a publication language (Gantman et al., 2015; González-Alcaide et al., 2012; Özbilgin, 2014; Pascale, 2016). Such biases are transplanted into academic institutions when journal quality lists are used to evaluate publications records and inform appointment and promotion decisions (Hussain, 2015; Mingers and Willmott, 2013; Tienari, 2012; Tourish and Willmott, 2015). This process of scientific imperialism could disadvantage non-indigenous scholars to the detriment of all concerned. Universities are able to ignore their own part in this process when making career-defining decisions by claiming to be judging performance by an objective criterion of publications record (Tourish and Willmott, 2015, p. 38). Our second important contribution is to extend understanding of scientific imperialism through an empirical study of UK-based academics.

Our argument is prosecuted in the following way. Section 2 reports the biased nature of ranking of journals and the pattern of authors publishing in allegedly top journals. Section 3 constructs our argument of scientific imperialism. Section 4 reports empirical evidence

from our interview study of academics' experience of publishing in this context. Section 5 concludes by considering the impact of discrimination on the academic community.

2) Context

The demographic profile of authors publishing in some journals deemed as top is of central concern. Although quality is multidimensional, definitions of its character are limited and value-laden (Hussain, 2015). Thus, recognition as a top journal is a political accomplishment rather than an objective statement of quality (Grey, 2010). Journals described as top originate from close to the inception of a discipline and have a high impact factor of aggregate citations of the articles that they publish (Battilana et al., 2010; Üsdiken, 2014). Table 1, below summarises the geographical base of all journals listed as 4 or 4* – the highest rankings – across management disciplines, in the most recent edition of the Chartered Association of Business Schools' (CABS) Journal Quality List. Full details are provided in the appendix. As table 1 demonstrates, American journals dominate the top rankings. Üsdiken's (2010; 2014; see also, Li & Parker, 2013) idea of a geography of academic centre, second centre, semi-periphery and periphery helps to explain this distribution. Although business school equivalents have long histories in some countries (Engwell & Danell, 2011),

Area	4*	4	Total	% of 4*	% of 4	% of total
USA	36	57	93	95%	68.7%	76.86%
UK	2	16	18	5%	19.3%	14.88%
Europe	0	6	6	0%	7.2%	5%
International	0	3	3	0%	3.5%	2.48%
Canada	0	1	1	0%	1.2%	0.8%
	38	83	121	100%	100%	100%

Percentages may not add due to rounding

the influential Ford Foundation report in the USA in 1959, prompted massive funding to allow American Business Schools to gain research prominence. Massumi's (1987) observation that universities' initial philosophers articulate the spiritual and moral stance of the state is apposite here. It was intended that USA business schools would develop ideas to "enhance managerial capability to support economic growth" for the benefit of all (Currie, Davies & Ferlie, 2016, p 743). However, they soon became "servants of capital" preoccupied "with maximizing profits and shareholder value" (Pettigrew & Starkey, 2016, pp 656-657), reflecting the values of the American capitalist system. These schools provided the main source of copy for the existing journals which were strengthened and the new ones that were established to "publish scientifically rigorous work" (Mangematin & Baden-Fuller, 2008, p. 214; see also, Cooke & Alcadipani, 2015) to establish the USA as the academic centre (Üsdiken, 2014). The journals adopted a functionalist approach to management consistent with support of the capitalist order and their content favoured a positivist epistemology and pursuit of objective, universal truths that encourage adoption of quantitative methods, reflecting the early academics' desire to emulate the natural sciences' nomothetic formulations (Grey, 2010; Üsdiken, 2014).

In the 1980s-1990s, a second centre emerged in Western Europe, particularly in the UK (Üsdiken, 2014) where many Business and Management Schools were established from the 1960s onwards (Currie et al., 2016; Engwell & Danell, 2011; Lee & Cassell, 2013). Some appointees at such schools were refugees from other social science disciplines and their theoretical and methodological predilections reflected this (e.g., Morris, 2011). Although this led to inception of a new set of journals that: emphasized social difference rather than universalism; were more willing to accept qualitative research methods; and embraced the interpretive, postmodern, critical and Marxist perspectives found across Europe (Üsdiken,

2010; 2014), table 1 confirms Grey's (2010) description of these as a second tier. Some might ask why some of the second centre's journals express different values to those in the centre? Gramsci's (1978) suggestion that intellectuals are not a unified distinct stratum, but are distinguishable by the class with whom they align themselves and their articulation of ways in which a society could develop under the leadership of that class, helps to explain why some journals in the second centre accommodate perspectives critical of capitalist assumptions. The first and second centres were supplemented by emergence of a semi-periphery, including Australia, Canada and some other European countries in the 1980s-1990s. In the 2000s, an academic periphery evolved elsewhere (Üsdiken, 2010; 2014).

Publication patterns in journals by authors vary according to their domicile. In the 1980s-1990s, American authors had most publications in American top journals, followed by a smaller number of Canadian authors, with UK authors third with less than 1% of all articles (Doyle & Arthurs, 1995; see also, Baruch, 2001). More recently, Üsdiken (2014; see also Tsui, 2007) found UK and European-based authors' articles predominated the second centre's journals and authors based in the US continued to dominate publications in top American journals, although there may be small variations in sub-disciplines of management (e.g., Fry, Donohue, Saladin & Shang, 2013). Mangematin and Baden-Fuller (2008; see also Engwell & Danell, 2011; Saunders, Wong & Saunders, 2011) offer some qualification to this pattern. While the earlier leading positions of USA, Canada and UK authors remain, American journals accommodate an increasing number of articles from authors from Holland, Australia and Asian countries, particularly China, when those authors adopt the "American model" of business research" (Saunders et al., 2011, pp 408-409). Üsdiken, (2014 p 785; c.f., Hardy, 2013) found that journals in the second centre "have been more open than top US journals to the non-European parts of the semi-periphery as well as to the periphery".

Having outlined ways in which journals in a geographical region have the status of leading and academics from some areas dominate publications in those journals, the next section contends that a form of scientific imperialism in academe may handicap some authors when seeking to publish in those journals.

3) Theoretical Framework: Academic capitalism and scientific imperialism

Capitalist economies experience cycles of expansion and slump. At times of slump, economies may be restructured in preparation for the next period of expansion and accumulation. Following the crisis of the 1970s, UK governments from 1979 – like governments elsewhere – sought to liberalize markets in the private sphere and introduce market-type practices in the public sphere through New Public Management (NPM) (Lorenz, 2012). While acknowledging that universities are not archetypal capitalist organizations (Sayer, 2008), this article accepts others' (Jessop, 2017; Slaughter and Leslie, 2001; Watson, 2011) term of 'academic capitalism' to describe how NPM's introduction of marketization led universities to subordinate educational concerns to financial considerations. This has contributed to the rise of a class of career managers who use a range of performance measurement techniques to manage academics' performance in increasingly bureaucratized institutions (Ashcraft, 2017; Dallyn et al., 2015; Kallio, Kallio, Tienari, & Hyvönen, 2016; Lorenz, 2012; Willmott, 1995). Academic capitalism's form varies between countries (Kallio et al., 2016) but it has been marked by increasing commercialisation, performance management of inputs and commodification of outputs of academics. Of most importance to this discussion is the area of research where centralized systems of periodic research evaluation have been introduced. In the UK, this has taken the form of the Research Assessment Exercise from 1986 and its replacement by the Research Evaluation Framework from 2014. Different allocations of funds have been attached to outputs ranked 4*, 3*, 2* and 1* with no monies being awarded to publications below 3* since 2014 (for other

countries, see for example, Ylijoki and Ursin, 2013). Consequently, some research outputs have exchange value while others do not. Quantification of the value of research outputs damages collegiality within universities – sometimes leading to unfair distributions of less attractive administrative and teaching responsibilities (Willmott, 1995) – and has the potential to discriminate against academics whose background hinders their capability to publish their research if journals have biases against their research. This could potentially occur for non-indigenous colleagues if there are imperialist qualities in the publication process.

While capitalism is an economic system involving relationships between classes within territories, imperialism refers to relationships of domination and subordination between people of different territories, often through military force and occupation, or by the installation of indigenous governments who act in the interest of the imperial power. Galtung (1967; 1971) analyses imperialism in some depth in ways that offer insights into the development of academe. Galtung does not see imperialism as confined to relationships between national governments, but it could instead involve derivative collectives such as academic sectors in countries. Moreover, he sees imperialism having different forms at different times. While earlier forms were based on physical occupation, followed by location of organizations owned by a centre across the periphery, latter forms involve a system in which information is disseminated from global organizations in the centre, which affords a significant role to cultural forms of dominance. Scientific imperialism is a particular subtype of cultural domination identified by Galtung (1967; 1971). This relates to the different mechanisms by which the centre obtains and exploits knowledge resources from other territories.

One way in which knowledge may be extracted is through expectations that academics from other territories will repackage knowledge from their research in other domiciles to make it palatable and accessible for an audience at the centre. Obviously, there are variations in the potential for different authors to be exploited by scientific imperialism, depending on whether they originate from the second centre, the semi-periphery or the periphery. In order to gain a greater understanding of the way in which different groups may suffer discrimination depending on their base and origin, the ensuing discussion will disaggregate scientific imperialism into academic knowledge imperialism evident in the predilections of some journals, linguistic imperialism arising from English being the lingua franca of publication and the transplantation of such biases into universities through an academic administrative imperialism.

3.1 Academic knowledge imperialism

Academic knowledge imperialism refers to the way in which knowledge that resides in the centre dominates, shapes and marginalizes knowledge generated in other areas. The consequence is that the former knowledge is over-valued while the latter is under-valued. The epistemological tradition of positivism evident in many of the centre's journals assumes a single rationality and application of quantitative methods to analyse large populations by predefined procedures that claim "compliance with idealized conventions of science" (Bell et al., 2017, p. 539) so that any knowledge generated may be represented as abstract principles and theories with universal applicability (Pascale, 2016) even though those ideas were developed "for Anglo-American contexts, especially the USA" (Meyer, 2006, p. 120). Proponents of this tradition ignore the possibility that their concepts of objectivity and neutrality are cultural assumptions that overlook "the important ontological, epistemological and political issues inherent in any research process" (Jack & Westwood, 2006, p. 481). Other societies exude different values and contrast with the centre in other ways (Khatri et al., 2012). For a range of reasons, the centre enjoys greater economical wealth than other countries. Theories developed in the centre often assume the primacy of economic factors

and present other societies as lagging which downgrades research conducted outside the Anglo-American sphere (Jack & Westwood, 2006; 2009; see also, Alcadipani & Caldas; Ibarro-Colado, 2006; Nkomo, 2015). This assumed superiority of ideas in the centre provides the central tenet of academic knowledge imperialism. Academic knowledge imperialism is enforced by editors and editorial boards – who constitute the gatekeepers to publication in journals – who are concentrated in the USA (Alcadipani et al., 2012; Baruch, 2001; Gantman et al., 2015; Murphy & Zhu, 2012). When an article is sent out to review, there are expectations that it will adopt the epistemological stance, theories, methods and empirical focus preferred by those networks if the author wishes to achieve success (see also Barkema et al., 2015; Jack & Westwood, 2009; Jia, You and Du, 2012; Murphy & Zhu, 2012; Özkazanç-Pan, 2012; Tsui, 2007). The consequence is that areas of management knowledge continue to be “dominated by concepts, models and theories originated in the Anglo-Saxon World” (Gantman et al., 2015, p. 126).

Colleagues from outside the centre might experience academic knowledge imperialism, so it is appropriate to ask whether this was the case and how did this manifest?

3.2) Linguistic imperialism

Disadvantages created by academic knowledge imperialism may be accentuated by linguistic imperialism. Linguistic imperialism is:

“The phenomenon in which the minds and lives of the speakers of a language are dominated by another language to the point where they believe that they can and should use only that foreign language when it comes to transactions dealing with the more advanced aspects of life such as education, philosophy, literature, governments, the administration of justice, etc. ... Linguistic imperialism has a subtle way of warping the minds, attitudes, and aspirations of even the most noble in a society and of preventing him from appreciating and realizing the full potentialities of the indigenous languages.” (Ansre, 1979, pp. 12-13; cited in Phillipson, 1992, p. 56.)

Phillipson (1992, p. 47) observes that “the dominance of English is asserted and maintained by the establishment and continuous reconstitution of structural and cultural inequalities between English and other languages”. Phillipson’s observation applies to publishing where English has become the lingua franca of scholarship (Gantman et al., 2015; González-Alcaide et al., 2012; Mangematin and Baden-Fuller, 2008; Pascale, 2016).

Some assume that a lingua franca promotes international scholarship, but it marginalizes knowledge, theories and methods not reported in English (Gantman et al., 2015; González-Alcaide et al., 2012; Özbilgin, 2014; Pascale, 2016). Consequently, non-native English speakers have to write in English if they want their work read. Not only does this create the need for non-native English speakers to learn the vocabulary and conventions of two languages when native English speakers need only one to publish, but their more recent acquisition of the language means that they are less likely to be “familiar with the Anglo-Saxon standards of research and academic writing [that] is necessary for authors to be able to write papers ... according to the dominant academic format” (Battilana et al., 2010, p 707; see also, Alcadipani et al., 2012; Gantman et al., 2015; Horn, 2016). Furthermore, to make their empirical data interesting and relevant to audiences in the centre authors will have to constantly reinterpret it using texts written in their second language (Meriläinen et al., 2008).

There are questions of whether any two languages or semantic systems – or even individual concepts within them (Temple, 1997) – correspond with one another to allow an accurate explanation of a phenomenon in one language when it was experienced via another. Tayeb (1994, p. 431; see also Meriläinen et al., 2008) has said: “The different structure of

words and concepts, as between two different societies, is a measure of different realities, as lived and understood, in the fullest sense, by different people.” Derivative of this is some words that appear in one language have no direct equivalents in other languages (Blenkinsopp & Pajouh, 2010; Xian, 2008). Thus, linguistic imperialism has the potential to render some knowledge from other cultures untranslatable.

Colleagues from countries where English is not a first language, might experience linguistic imperialism, so it is appropriate to ask whether this was the case and what were the ways in which this was manifest?

3.3) Academic administrative imperialism

Academic administrative imperialism may provide the mechanisms by which academic knowledge imperialism and linguistic imperialism are transplanted into universities. Academic administrative imperialism is defined here as a means by which a dominant academic power is perpetuated from afar through local power structures outside their own base. An important mechanism through which academic administrative imperialism operates is in the use of journal quality lists. CABS that represent business schools' deans produces a list that is used in at least some UK institutions (Cederström and Hoedemaekers, 2012; Mingers and Willmott, 2013; Tienari, 2012; Tourish and Willmott, 2015). These lists are used to symbolize different journals with grades of a 4, 3, 2 or 1. Those in senior positions who have responsibility for decisions about appointments, career advancement and deployment of resources, interpret the symbols as indicating that all articles share the ranking of the journal in which they appear, despite evidence to the contrary (Pidd and Broadbent, 2015). Consequently, decision-makers may avoid reading journal articles before making appointments, embody expectations of publication in such journals as benchmarks in annual appraisals and anticipate – inaccurately – scores that an institution will receive in subsequent quality audits. Another manifestation which is overlooked is reproduction of the values in the journals that they are privileging; journals that may discriminate against their non-indigenous academic employees. The consequence of the reification of value in the list is the latent creation of a culture of unfair discrimination.

Colleagues might experience academic administrative imperialism if their institutions are using journal quality lists, so it is appropriate to ask whether this was the case and in what other ways did academic imperialism materialise?

4) Method and findings

Initially, this research aimed to examine the skills and attributes necessary to conduct “glocalistic research” (Gobo, 2011), namely research that combines sensitivity to local conditions with generation of knowledge that may have global applicability. That subject matter inevitably demanded consideration of relationships between less powerful countries and those able to exercise broader influence which resulted in collection of the evidence about discrimination that is reported below. We adopted a purposive approach to recruitment of research participants by sending out a call to the research methods community belonging to the British Academy of Management, inviting interviewees who had experience of conducting research in a language other than English but who had to report their findings in English. Our selection strategy was informed by a belief that an interest in research methods would indicate understanding of the salience of the issues and willingness to participate to help others overcome any difficulties previously encountered. Fortuitously, the UK provides an ideal site for exploration of discrimination in research because it has been a forerunner in the development of neo-liberal policies (Kallio et al., 2016) and any senior managers' use of English as a first language may render them less able to understand the problems faced by non-indigenous colleagues.

There is not an ideal number of interviews for qualitative research; selection should depend on the objectives of a project (Pratt, 2009). Alvesson and Ashcraft (2012) argue that design of qualitative research projects should observe the principles of quality and representativeness in coverage. Our invitation yielded twenty-seven UK-based participants. Quality was realised by only including participants meeting the twin criteria of researching another country and writing-up findings for an English-speaking audience. Table 2 below uses Tietze and Dick's (2013) classifications of early career researchers, midcareer academics and senior career academics to collapse different titles of academics in comparable positions at different institutions. As the table shows, representativeness was attained by drawing participants from all levels of the academic hierarchy and from a range of countries. The non-European academics came from the periphery countries of Brazil, China (2), Colombia, India (4), Jordan (2), Libya (2), Mauritius, Nigeria, Pakistan (3) and Saudi Arabia. The Europeans came from countries in the semi-periphery or from non-English parts of the second centre of Austria, Germany, Rumania, Ukraine and Spain.

Semi-structured interviews were used to explore pertinent issues in depth. Interviews lasted between 40 and 150 minutes with the average being 90 minutes. The interview schedule included each participant's background, area of research, choice of methods,

	Non-European	European	British	Total
Early Career Researcher (ECRs)	15	1	1	17
Mid-career Academics (MCAs)	1	3	1	5
Senior Career Academics (SCAs)	2	1	2	5
Total	18	5	4	27

experiences and challenges of conducting international research, changes experienced as a career progressed and cultural sensitivity in research design. Issues of difficulties of publishing their work and the experience of expectations in their own institution were recurrent themes and prompted the writing of this paper. Interview transcripts were scrutinised using template analysis, a form of hierarchical thematic coding that was developed initially from the original interview schedule and then iteratively as new literature was read and coding progressed (King and Brookes, 2016). Origin and position in the academic hierarchy were used as primary codes. This allowed comparisons between the problems faced by people from different backgrounds at different stages of their career. An interpretive approach was adopted to the data and the authors' experiences provided a vantage point from which to understand others' different experiences. This comparative approach was also facilitated by including the four researchers who originated from the UK in the analysis. The secondary codes included the broad mechanisms of discrimination of academic knowledge imperialism, linguistic imperialism and academic administrative imperialism. Specific manifestations of discrimination provided the tertiary codes. The discussion below is ordered into sections according to the second level of coding, although both the primary and tertiary codes will be evident in each section.

4.1) Findings: Academic knowledge imperialism

Academic knowledge imperialism may materialise because journals at the centre favour particular epistemological, theoretical and methodological approaches and empirical foci, thus discriminating against other work of value. All participants indicated aspirations and willingness to publish in elite outlets, but their research often embodied ideas that made their

writings incompatible with the character of the centre's journals. Some reported positivist logic and assumptions of causal relationships between atomistic components were incompatible with other cultures that they had studied. An SCA of UK origin explained an instance from his international research in Peru when his international partners advised him that the epistemology of positivism, particularly the idea of cause and effect, was not applicable. He said:

“[T]here is a different way of thinking about the world. ... The idea of ... causation, you know, you have got this and you will have [that] ... they will say “well, we don't think about it in that way”.”

Reflecting others' (Gantman et al., 2015; Jack & Westwood, 2006; 2009; Meriläinen et al., 2008) arguments, there was evidence that theoretical assumptions of superiority of some nations, led to work conducted elsewhere being devalued. For example, an ECR studied labour markets in her country of origin, Mauritius, where there was a long-standing multicultural population because of its history as a colony of various countries and proximity to two different continents. These factors made the manifestation of ethnicity in labour markets and practices of discrimination unique to Mauritius. However, the reviewers who saw the paper chose not to recognise the significance of the cultural context. The ECR said:

“The dynamics that I was talking about where I tried to bring in ethnicity and how it influenced movement in the work place ... [the paper] got rejected ... all I was told was that how is this different? ... So they couldn't see the dimensions that I was talking about.”

There were even indications that devaluation of some empirical foci was influenced by publishers' concerns about the financial returns from some audiences. A MCA from India explained how the criterion of scale of distribution overrode the importance of an event:

“[W]e studied onion supply chains ... and how to manage that supply chain in order to avoid crises ... there was a point of time when, because of the onion crisis the government changed in India. ... The onion was so expensive ... The relevance of that problem is that ... something happening in the supply chain can actually change your government. ... But ... they rejected [the article] because it was just in the Indian setting and the editors clearly said that's a very small market.”

Of course, it is possible to rationalize these instances in the same way as a SCA originating from a country in the periphery but who now held editorial responsibilities, who said that some articles are “too narrow ... not international enough ... too niche”. Not only does such a claim raise the question of whether generalization across countries has a greater value than providing a theory of particularization of why a unique situation is as it is (Lee & Saunders, 2017; Stake, 1995), but it also demands consideration of whether “international enough” embodies a cultural bias that studies in the centre are presented as having international value because of their positioning as leaders in different theories (Alcadipani & Caldas, 2012; Ibarro-Colado, 2006; Jack & Westwood, 2006; 2009).

The views of such an editor also fails to recognise that some theories simply cannot explain many situations. Many theories deployed in the centre tend to assume liberal economies in which individuals live in a nuclear family and pursue their own interests in organizations holding universal values. Many participants found such assumptions – and the literature in which they materialized – were incommensurable with the phenomena which they studied. For example, a MCA who originated from – and was researching – a European island that formed part of a country in the semi-periphery spoke of the enduring impact of “medieval structures” that promoted obligations to the collective so that there was “no such

thing as individual thinking” apparent in the Western theory she was using. Similarly, an ECR from China discussed how the strength of respect for family obligations in her native land had a different accepted logic to the emphasis on equal opportunities for individuals in the West.

A range of issues materialised around the methodological preferences of journals at the academic centre. Many research participants found that the resources that were assumed to be available by the centre’s journals – such as reliable sampling frames of populations and informed participants willing to respond to surveys – to conduct quantitative research, were often absent and created a need for considerable additional work. For example, an ECR visited 360 factories across his country of origin in the periphery and spoke with a gatekeeper at each to identify the person with the knowledge to complete his questionnaire. He then explained the relevance of the research to the prospective participant, subsequently phoned that person to arrange a visit to collect the completed questionnaire, to obtain 233 completed responses. Yet researchers from countries in the periphery often found that the logic in strict application of statistical tests of representativeness and significance employed by editors and reviewers overrode the uniqueness of the research, leading to novel empirical evidence being precluded from publication. Another ECR from a country in the periphery said:

“[W]e spend more time ... getting access to the data ... it’s a bit about doing research in developing cultures [that] ... is not taken into account, in a sense, in terms of the publication, because it’s like a yes tick or no. You can publish in a two-star journal and that’s it with the data you’ve got.”

In summary, academics – particularly those in a junior position – from the periphery were most likely to experience forms of academic knowledge imperialism, although some from the semi-periphery also experienced this when the culture in their country of origin was different to assumptions in the centre’s journals. The most senior academics, regardless of origin, appeared to have either assimilated the values favoured by the centre’s journals, or had identified a home for their work in the second centre’s journals.

4.2) Findings: Linguistic imperialism

Linguistic imperialism arises from English being the lingua franca of publishing. There was evidence that knowledge produced in other languages was being marginalized (Gantman et al., 2015; González-Alcaide et al., 2012; Özbilgin, 2014; Pascale, 2016) and so researchers had to use background literature written in English, if they wanted to publish in Western journals. One SCA originating from India, explained:

“Some of the Indian scholars have talked about the kinds of theories ... [but] have obviously talked about it in local Indian languages, so therefore the accessibility of that literature to a global audience is limited. So if you are trying to publish in international journals then the same ideas as used by Western scholars have to be used.”

The issues of standards of written English identified by others (Alcadipani et al., 2012; Battilana et al., 2010; Gantman et al., 2015; Horn, 2016) was a problem for many participants when making journal submissions. A European SCA writing in English as a second language reported her own experiences that:

“[I]n my attempts to publish on three occasions, where the letter of the editor said there are too many problems with the English language or what they said, and I quote, “as long as you don't know how to handle hyphens correctly you should not try to publish”.”

Different ECRs from countries in the periphery reported:

“Most of the Asian researchers typically get a comment ... “the author is advised to get the paper read through a native English speaker”. This clearly means that they have identified that the author is not from the ... Western world.”

“When I submit a paper to a journal one of the first comments coming from reviewers, “I can sense that this is written by a second language person or scholar, colleague. I strongly suggest that it is sent for proofreading”.”

“I get a lot of feedback from the reviewers that you have to check your English.”

Such problems are not insurmountable. The success of a small minority can serve to legitimize such discrimination, especially if that minority present discrimination as being applied fairly according to some quality criteria. An SCA from a country in the periphery with editorial responsibilities said that there had to be some understanding that it was not because “this paper comes from Columbia that’s why it’s not good enough, but if the paper is not reading well, it’s not reading well”. He added “I get many UK papers which are not properly written. So then it’s not good”. However, reflecting Baruch’s (2001) call to make academic contribution the overwhelming criterion, others felt that the editor’s view privileged style and presentation over an article’s substance in a discriminatory way. An ECR from the periphery said:

“[I]t’s unfair because you’re looking for quality research [as editors], but at the same time you are downgrading that quality research purely because the English is not proper or the grammar is not good.”

Issues of writing in English extended to styles of presentation. For example, a MCA who originated from a European country in the semi-periphery, highlighted how the writing style of Balkan academics was less detached than that adopted by Western scholars. He said: “Writing [style] in the Balkan area is much more emotional. ... I know that these [academics] ... don’t have any less good ideas and still they will never be able to write it the way it is published in the top tier journals. ... [T]his is not a matter of language and this is not a matter of following the instructions, it’s beyond the instructions. ... [It is] those things that you cannot read from the journal website, those things that you have to develop a feeling for.”

These implicit dimensions of language in Western journals were explained by a European SCR writing in English as a second language, in the following terms:

“It’s also about the traditions you haven’t been educated in ... the deep engrained knowledge about rhetoric, how you set up an argument, what’s considered to be a problem, you know, and how we create that through language.”

As noted above, linguistic imperialism serves to obscure weaknesses in the English language (Blenkinsopp & Pajouh, 2010; Meriläinen et al., 2008; Tayeb, 1994; Temple, 1997; Xian, 2008). A European SCA writing in English as a second language, challenged the assumption that “we can capture the whole of the world experiences through one particular linguistic medium, the English language”. The limitations of the English lexicon create a disadvantage by necessitating that authors curtail explanations of their work to fit the boundaries of the English language. An ECR originating from a country in the periphery said:

“[A]t the moment I am trying to bring in as much as cultural concept and elements in that paper without making people feel that “oh this is all wrong. This is poor English; too many foreign concepts”.”

The same ECR went on to say changing some concepts would mean losing “some of the originality, the foreignness that’s embedded in that culture”. Some researchers experienced a moral conflict of either adapting their findings to satisfy an English-reading audience, or representing the viewpoint of their research participants accurately. Sometimes, they could not do both. This problem should not be understated, as adapting interpretations to satisfy an English-reading audience could result in the researcher contributing to academic knowledge imperialism of imposing inappropriate lenses onto their own culture which are then used in posterity by others.

In summary, there was an odd participant who did not report the existence of linguistic imperialism. However, the majority at all levels from the academic hierarchy and from all countries where English was not the first language, reported experience of linguistic imperialism.

4.3) Findings: Academic administrative imperialism

Academic administrative imperialism entails a dominant academic power from afar being perpetuated through local power structures. As noted above, journal quality lists provide an important mechanism through which biases from outside universities are transplanted into them. Research participants provided evidence of this. Many of their institutions ranked the quality of articles by the journal in which they appeared. A European SCR criticized the “40 [UK] universities” that used the CABS list which favours journals in the American centre, to interpret the quality of an article. Such practices were often endorsed by sessions where academics might learn from more “successful” colleagues on how to publish in “4 and 4* journals”. Unsurprisingly, many research participants were so inculcated with the logic that quality was intrinsic to the journal, that they often adopted a discourse of “2* journals”, “3* journals” and “4* journals”. Consequently, junior academics were encouraged to make inappropriate submissions to journals that were biased against their research. One ECR who originated from a country in the periphery, said:

“As junior scholars when you're starting off, you'll get the professors telling you that you need to target the American journals, but then the American journals have no idea.”

Evidence was also found of academic knowledge imperialism being manifest in other mechanisms. All participants had access to libraries storing the American journals labelled as top that universities had agreed to purchase from publishers, but routine access was not provided to a number of other journals, particularly when they were published in languages other than English.

There was also evidence of academic administrative imperialism reproducing linguistic imperialism. While many universities invested in computer packages such as NVivo for analysis of qualitative data, these packages did not have the characters to analyse text in languages such as Mandarin or Arabic. Yet no assistance was provided to translate transcripts into English for analysis using such tools. While we know of institutions that claim to counter linguistic imperialism by providing funds for proof-reading of articles of non-indigenous academics prior to submission to journals, our participants did not suggest that such provisions existed in their institutions. Indeed, one instance was reported of non-indigenous academics earning monies for a personal research fund by additions to formal workload – such as extra teaching or additional supervision of Masters-level dissertations – but then being denied the opportunity to use those funds for proof-reading because it was not research.

In summary, although academic administrative imperialism varied in degree across different UK institutions, academics from all countries, at all levels of the academic hierarchy knew of instances of where it was present.

5) Concluding discussion

Internationalization of the UK academic workforce carries a threat of discrimination against non-indigenous colleagues. This paper makes a notable contribution by constructing a theory about the operation of a particular form of scientific imperialism (Galtung, 1967; 1971) residing in varying degrees in the academic administrative imperialism of UK universities from their use of journal quality lists that privilege journals that exercise academic knowledge imperialism by favouring some research over others and apply linguistic imperialism through a lingua franca of publication. An empirical study of UK-based academics has allowed elaboration of scientific imperialism's dimensions. Acknowledgement is made that journals at the centre vary in their degree of academic knowledge imperialism, institutions vary in the extent to which they exercise academic administrative imperialism and academics vary in the extent to which they suffer from academic knowledge imperialism and linguistic imperialism according to whether academic traditions in their country of origin and domicile are compatible with the assumptions made by the centre's journals. Nevertheless, this research found instances of academic knowledge imperialism being experienced through incommensurability between epistemological and theoretical assumptions and empirical foci, cultural blindness and insensitivity to national conditions for application of methodological tools. Linguistic imperialism was experienced as rigidity in receptivity to style and mode of presentation in submissions and the lexical limitations of the lingua franca. Academic administrative imperialism was experienced not only through the use of journal quality lists, but also through libraries that stocked some journals rather than others and the restricted nature of available data analysis software. This evidence expanding on manifestations of scientific imperialism is also a significant contribution to our knowledge.

Considerations of the challenges of 'Building and Sustaining High Performance Organisations in Uncertain Times' by this conference, need to address discrimination against some management researchers if our own organizations are to realise their potential. By limiting publication opportunities – which affects support for subsequent research – scientific imperialism obstructs our access to new intellectual perspectives originating from other countries and development of methods and practices that facilitate research in such communities. We know that such knowledge exists from this research, from recent additions to the vocabulary such as *Kanban* and *Guangxi* and from emergence of some post-colonial methodological ideas (e.g., Smith, 1999). At the current time, universities' modus operandi may preclude their own manifestation as 'High Performance Organizations' and limit the potential of all academics to gain the necessary understanding to conduct truly international – rather than Anglo-American dominated – research.

This research has a number of practical implications. Many Business and Management Schools are seeking a range of accreditations. Some accreditations are addressed specifically to issues of diversity. Bodies offering management accreditations often seek evidence of international research. Other accreditations such as Athena Swan address the way ethnicity intersects with gender and challenge academic institutions to promote diversity. Highlighting the forms of discrimination discussed above to those who prepare submissions to such panels and also to organizations that appoint accreditation panels could lead to such discrimination being addressed. It is also possible to reverse processes of academic administrative imperialism by adopting values of pluralism manifest in assumptions

about the multidimensional quality of academic research and abandoning lists while investing in multilingual computerized analysis packages and a broader range of academic journals. The outcomes are likely to be less discrimination against non-indigenous colleagues and a broadening of our understanding, informed by an internationalization of our knowledge to reflect the internationalization of our community.

References

- Alcadipani, R. & Caldas, M.P. (2012): “Americanizing Brazilian management”, *Critical perspectives on international business*, Volume 8, Number 1, pp. 37-55.
- Alcadipani, R., Khan, F.R., Gantman, E., & Nkomo, S. (2012): “Southern voices in management and organization knowledge”, *Organization*, Volume 19, Number 2, pp. 131-143.
- Alvesson, M. & Ashcraft, K.L. (2012): “Interviews” in Symon, G. & Cassell, C. (eds.) *op cit.*, pp. 239–57.
- Ashcraft, K.L. (2017): “‘Submission’ to the rule of excellence: Ordinary affect and precarious resistance in the labor of organization and management studies”, *Organization*, Volume 24, Number 1, pp. 36-58.
- Barkema, H.G., Chen, X.P., George, G., Luo, Y. & Tsui, A. S. (2015): “West meets East: New concepts and theories”, *Academy of Management Journal*, Volume 58, Number 2, pp. 460-479.
- Baruch, Y. (2001): “Global or North American? A Geographical Based Comparative Analysis of Publications in Top Management Journals”, *International Journal of Cross Cultural Management*, Volume 1, Number 1, pp. 109-126.
- Battilana, J., Anteby, M. & Sengul, M. (2010): “The circulation of ideas across academic communities: When locals re-import exported ideas”, *Organization Studies*, Volume 31, Number 6, pp. 695-713.
- Bell, E., Kothiyal, N. & Willmott, H. (2017): “Methodology-as-Technique and the Meaning of Rigour in Globalized Management Research”, *British Journal of Management*, Volume 28, Number 3, pp. 534-550.
- Blenkinsopp, J. & Pajouh, M.S. (2010): “Lost in translation? Culture, language and the role of the translator in international business”, *Critical perspectives on international business*, volume 6, Number 1, pp. 38-52.
- Cassell, C. & Lee, B. (eds.) (2011): *Challenges and Controversies in Management Research*, Abingdon: Routledge.
- Cederström, C. & Hoedemaekers, C. (2012): “On dead dogs and unwritten jokes: Life in the university today”, *Scandinavian Journal of Management*, Volume 28, pp. 229-233.
- Cooke, B. & Alcadipani, R. (2015): “Towards a Global History of Management Education: The Case of the Ford Foundation and the São Paulo School of Business Administration, Brazil”, *Academy of Management Learning & Education*, Volume 14, Number 4, pp. 482-499.
- Currie, G., Davies, J. & Ferlie, E. (2016): “A Call for University-Based Business Schools to “Lower Their Walls:” Collaborating with Other Academic Departments in Pursuit of Social Value”, *Academy of Management Learning & Education*, Volume 15, Number 4, pp. 742-755.
- Dallyn, S., Marinetto, M. & Cederström, C. (2015): “The Academic as Public Intellectual: Examining Public Engagement in the Professionalised Academy”, *Sociology*, Volume 49, Number 6, pp. 1031-1046.

- Doyle, J.R. & Arthurs, A.J. (1995): “Judging the Quality of Research in Business Schools: The UK as a Case Study”, *Omega, International Journal of Management Science*, Volume 23, Number 3, pp. 257-270.
- Engwell, L. & Danell, R. (2011): “Britannia and her Business Schools”, *British Journal of Management*, Volume 22, Number 3, pp. 432-442.
- Fry, T.D., Donohue, J.M., Saladin, B.A. & Shang, G. (2013): “The origins of research and patterns of authorship in the International Journal of Production Research”, *International Journal of Production Research*, Volume 51, Numbers 23-24, pp. 7470-7500.
- Galtung, J. (1967): “Scientific Colonialism”, *Transition*, Number 30, April-May, pp. 10-15.
- Galtung, J. (1971): “A Structural Theory of Imperialism”, *Journal of Peace Research*, Volume 8, Number 2, pp. 81-117.
- Gantman, E.R., Yousfi, H. & Alcadipani, R. (2015): “Challenging Anglo-Saxon dominance in management and organizational knowledge”, *Revista de Administração de Empresas*, Volume 55, Number 2, pp. 126-129.
- Gobo, G. (2011): “Glocalizing methodology? The encounter between local methodologies”, *International Journal of Social Research Methodology*, Volume 14, Number 6, pp. 417-437.
- González-Alcaide, G., Valderrama-Zurián, J.C. & Aleixandre-Benavent, R. (2012): “The Impact Factor in non-English-speaking countries”, *Scientometrics*, Volume 92, pp. 297-311.
- Gramsci A. (1978): *Selections from the Prison Notebooks*. London: Lawrence & Wishart.
- Grey, C. (2010): “Organizing studies: Publications, politics and polemic”, *Organization Studies*, Volume 31, Number 6, pp. 677-694.
- Hardy, C. (2013): “Treading fine lines”, *Journal of Management Inquiry*, Volume 22, Number, 4 pp. 452-456.
- HESA (2018): *Higher Education Staff Statistics: UK, 2016/17*, downloaded from <https://www.hesa.ac.uk/news/18-01-2018/sfr248-higher-education-staff-statistics> on 5th November 2018.
- Horn, S.A. (2016): “The Social and Psychological Costs of Peer Review Stress and Coping with Manuscript Rejection”, *Journal of Management Inquiry*, Volume 25, Number1, pp. 11-26.
- Hussain, S. (2015): “Journal list fetishism and the ‘sign of 4’ in the ABS guide: A question of trust?” *Organization*, Volume 22, Number 1, pp. 119-138.
- Ibarra-Colado, E. (2006): “Organization Studies and Epistemic Coloniality in Latin America: Thinking Otherness from the Margins”, *Organization*, Volume 13, Number 4, pp. 463-488.
- Jack, G. & Westwood, R. (2006): “Postcolonialism and the Politics of Qualitative Research in International Business”, *Management International Review*, Volume 46, Number 4, pp. 481-501.
- Jack, G., & Westwood, R. (2009): *International and cross-cultural management studies: A postcolonial reading*. Basingstoke: Palgrave MacMillan.

- Jessop, B. (2017): “Varieties of academic capitalism and entrepreneurial universities”, *The Journal of High Education*, Volume 73, Number 6, pp. 853-870.
- Jia, L., You, S. & Du, Y. (2012): “Chinese context and theoretical contributions to management and organization research: A three-decade review”, *Management and Organization Review*, Volume 8, pp. 173-209.
- Khatri, N., Ojha, A.K., Budhwar, P., Srinivasan, V. & Varma, A. (2012): “Management research in India: Current state and future directions”, *IIMB Management Review*, Volume 24, pp. 104-115.
- King, N. & Brooks, J.M. (2016): *Template Analysis*, London: Sage.
- Kallio, K.-M., Kallio, T.J., Tienari, J. & Hyvönen, T. (2016): “Ethos at stake: Performance management and academic work in universities”, *Human Relations*, Volume 69, Number 3, pp. 685-709.
- Lee, B. & Cassell, C. (2013): “Research Methods and Research Practice: History, Themes and Topics”, *International Journal of Management Reviews*, Volume 15, Number 1, pp. 123–131.
- Lee, B. & Saunders, M.N.K. (2017): *Conducting Case Study Research*, London: Sage.
- Li, E.Y. & Parker, M. (2012): “Citation patterns in organization and management journals: Margins and centres”, *Organization*, Volume 20, Number 2, pp. 299-322.
- Lorenz, C. (2012): “If You’re So Smart, Why Are You under Surveillance? Universities, Neoliberalism and New Public Management”, *Critical Inquiry*, Volume 38, Number 3, pp. 599-629.
- Mangematin, V. & Baden-Fuller, C. (2008): “Global Contests in the Production of Business Knowledge: Regional Centres and Individual Business Schools”, *Long Range Planning*, Volume 41, Number 1, pp. 117-139.
- Massumi, B. (1987): “Translator’s Foreword: Pleasures of Philosophy” in G. Deleuze & F. Guattari *A Thousand Plateaus: Capitalism and Schizophrenia*, London: Athlone Press.
- Meriläinen, S., Tienari, J., Thomas, R. & Davies, A. (2008): “Hegemonic Academic Practices: Experiences of Publishing from the Periphery”, *Organization*, Volume 15, Number 4, pp. 584-597.
- Meyer, K.E. (2006): “Asian management research needs more self-confidence”, *Asia Pacific Journal of Management*, Volume 23, Number 2, pp. 119-137.
- Mingers, J. & Willmott, H. (2013): “Taylorizing business school research: On the ‘one best way’ performative effects of journal ranking lists”, *Human Relations*, Volume 66, Number 8, pp. 1051-1073.
- Morris, H. (2011): “Business and Management Research in the UK from 1900 to 2009 and Beyond” in C. Cassell & B. Lee (eds.), *op cit.*, pp. 30-55.
- Murphy, J. & Zhu, J. (2012): “Neo-colonialism in the academy? Anglo-American domination in management journals”, *Organization*, Volume 19, Number 6, pp. 915-927.

- Nkomo, S.M. (2015): “Challenges for Management and Business Education in a “Developmental” State: The Case of South Africa”, *Academy of Management Learning & Education*, Volume 14, Number 2, pp. 242-258.
- Özbilgin, M. (2014): “Promoting Diversity in Management Scholarship: Opening the Doors for Multiple Languages, and Interdisciplinary Dialogue and Developing Our Communities”, *European Management Review*, Volume 11, Number 1, pp. 1-4.
- Özkazanç-Pan, B. (2012): “Publishing without betrayal: Critical scholarship meets mainstream journals”, *Scandinavian Journal of Management*, Volume 28, pp. 209-217.
- Pascale, C.-M. (2016): “Discourses of the North Atlantic: Epistemology and Hegemony”, *Qualitative Inquiry*, Volume 22, Number 4, pp. 219-227.
- Pettigrew, A. & Starkey, K. (2016): “From the Guest Editors: The Legitimacy and Impact of Business Schools – Key Issues and a Research Agenda”, *Academy of Management Learning & Education*, Volume 15, Number 4, pp. 649-664.
- Phillipson, R. (1992): *Linguistic Imperialism*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Pidd, M. & Broadbent, J. (2015): “Business and Management Studies in the 2014 Research Excellence Framework”, *British Journal of Management*, Volume 26, Issue 4, pp. 569-804.
- Pratt, M.G. (2009): “From the Editors: For the Lack of a Boilerplate: Tips on Writing up (And Reviewing) Qualitative Research”, *The Academy of Management Journal*, Volume 52, Number 5, pp. 856-862.
- Saunders, J., Wong, V. & Saunders, C. (2011): “The Research Evaluation and Globalization of Business Research”, *British Journal of Management*, Volume 22, Number 3, pp. 401-419.
- Sayer, A. (2008): “Moral Economic Regulation in Organizations: A University Example”, *Organization*, Volume 15, Number 2, pp. 147-164.
- Slaughter, S. & Leslie, L.L. (2001): “Expanding and Elaborating the Concept of Academic Capitalism”, *Organization*, Volume 8, Number 2, pp. 154-161.
- Smith, L.T. (1999): *Decolonizing Methodologies: Research and Indigenous Peoples*, London: Zed Books.
- Stake, R.E. (1995): *The Art of Case Study Research*, Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Symon, G. & Cassell, C. (eds.) (2012): *The Practice of Qualitative Organizational Research: Core Methods and Current Challenges*, London, Sage.
- Tayab, M. (1994): “Organizations and National Culture: Methodology Considered”, *Organization Studies*, Volume 15, Number 3, pp. 429-446.
- Temple, B. (1997): “Watch your tongue: Issues in translation and cross-cultural research”, *Sociology*, Volume 31, Number 3, pp. 607-618.
- Tienari, J. (2012): “Critical scholars in the machinery of publishing: Experiences, reflections, alternatives”, *Scandinavian Journal of Management*, Volume 28, pp. 205-208.

- Tietze, S. & Dick, P. (2013): “The victorious English language: Hegemonic practices in the management academy”, *Journal of Management Inquiry*, Volume 22, Number 1, pp. 122-134.
- Tourish, D. & Willmott, H. (2015): “In Defiance of Folly: Journal Rankings, mindless measures and the ABS Guide”, *Critical Perspectives in Accounting*, Volume 26, Number 1, pp. 37-46.
- Tsui, A.S. (2007): “From homogenization to pluralism: International management research in the academy and beyond”, *Academy of Management Journal*, Volume 50, Number 6, pp. 1353-1364.
- Üsdiken, B. (2010): “Between contending perspectives and logics: Organizational studies in Europe”, *Organization Studies*, Volume 31, Number 6, pp. 715–735.
- Üsdiken, B. (2014): “Centres and Peripheries: Research Styles and Publication Patterns in ‘Top’ US Journals and their European Alternatives, 1960–2010”, *Journal of Management Studies*, Volume 51, Number 5, pp. 764-789.
- Watson, C. (2011): “Accountability, transparency, redundancy: academic identities in an era of ‘excellence’”, *British Educational Research Journal*, Volume 37, Number 6, pp. 955-917.
- Willmott, H. (1995): “Managing the Academics: Commodification and Control in the Development of University Education in the UK”, *Human Relations*, Volume 48, Number 9, pp. 993-1027.
- Willmott, H. (2011): “Journal list fetishism and the perversion of scholarship: reactivity and the ABS list”, *Organization*, Volume 18, Number 4, pp. 429-42.
- Xian, H. (2008): “Lost in translation? Language, culture and the roles of translator in cross-cultural management research”, in *Qualitative Research in Organizations and Management: An International Journal*, Volume 3, Number 3, pp. 231-245.
- Ylijoki, O-H. & Ursin, J. (2013), “The construction of academic identity in the changes of Finnish higher education”, *Studies in Higher Education*, Vol. 38, No. 8, pp. 1135-1149.

Appendix: Base of journals ranked either 4 or 4* by the Chartered Association of Business School's Academic Journal Guide

Journal title	Discipline	Ranking	Base
Accounting Review	Accounting	4*	USA
Accounting, Organizations and Society	Accounting	4*	UK
Journal of Accounting and Economics	Accounting	4*	USA
Journal of Accounting Research	Accounting	4*	USA
Contemporary Accounting Research	Accounting	4	Canada
Review of Accounting Studies	Accounting	4	USA
Business History Review	Business History & Economic History	4	USA
Economic History Review	Business History & Economic History	4	UK
American Economic Review	Economics	4*	USA
Annals of Statistics	Economics	4*	USA
Econometrica	Economics	4*	USA
Journal of Political Economy	Economics	4*	USA
Quarterly Journal of Economics	Economics	4*	USA
Review of Economic Studies	Economics	4*	UK
Biometrika	Economics	4	UK
Econometric Theory	Economics	4	USA
Economic Journal	Economics	4	UK
International Economic Review	Economics	4	USA
Journal of Business and Economic Statistics	Economics	4	USA
Journal of Econometrics	Economics	4	USA
Journal of Economic Literature	Economics	4	USA
Journal of Economic Perspectives	Economics	4	USA
Journal of Economic Theory	Economics	4	USA
Journal of International Economics	Economics	4	USA
Journal of Labor Economics	Economics	4	USA
Journal of Monetary Economics	Economics	4	USA

Journal of the American Statistical Association	Economics	4	USA
Journal of the European Economic Association	Economics	4	Europe – Current Editor-in-Chief (EIC) from Finland
Journal of the Royal Statistical Society Series B (Methodology)	Economics	4	UK
RAND Journal of Economics	Economics	4	USA
Review of Economics and Statistics	Economics	4	USA
Entrepreneurship, Theory and Practice	Entrepreneurship/ Small Business Management	4	USA
Journal of Business Venturing	Entrepreneurship/ Small Business Management	4	USA
Strategic Entrepreneurship Journal	Entrepreneurship/ Small Business Management	4	USA
Academy of Management Journal	Ethics/CSR/Management	4*	USA
Academy of Management Review	Ethics/CSR/Management	4*	USA
Administrative Science Quarterly	Ethics/CSR/Management	4*	USA
Journal of Management	Ethics/CSR/Management	4*	USA
Academy of Management Annals	Ethics/CSR/Management	4	USA
British Journal of Management	Ethics/CSR/Management	4	UK
Business Ethics Quarterly	Ethics/CSR/Management	4	USA
Journal of Management Studies	Ethics/CSR/Management	4	UK
Journal of Finance	Finance	4*	USA
Journal of Financial Economics	Finance	4*	USA
Review of Financial Studies	Finance	4*	USA
Journal of Corporate Finance	Finance	4	USA
Journal of Financial and Quantitative Analysis	Finance	4	USA
Journal of Financial Intermediation	Finance	4	USA
Journal of Money, Credit and Banking	Finance	4	USA
Review of Finance (formerly European Finance Review)	Finance	4	Europe – Current EIC from UK

British Journal of Industrial Relations	Human Resource Management and Employee Relations	4	UK
Human Resource Management (USA)	Human Resource Management and Employee Relations	4	USA
Human Resource Management Journal(UK)	Human Resource Management and Employee Relations	4	UK
Industrial Relations: A Journal of Economy and Society	Human Resource Management and Employee Relations	4	USA
Work, Employment and Society	Human Resource Management and Employee Relations	4	UK
Journal of International Business Studies	International Business and Area Studies	4*	USA
Journal of World Business (formerly Columbia JWB)	International Business and Area Studies	4	USA
Information Systems Research	Information Management	4*	USA
MIS Quarterly	Information Management	4*	USA
Journal of Management Information Systems	Information Management	4	USA
Journal of the Association of Information Systems	Information Management	4	USA
Research Policy	Innovation	4*	USA
Journal of Product Innovation Management	Innovation	4	USA
Academy of Management, Learning and Education	Management Development and Education	4	USA
Journal of Consumer Psychology	Marketing	4*	USA
Journal of Consumer Research	Marketing	4*	USA
Journal of Marketing	Marketing	4*	USA
Journal of Marketing Research	Marketing	4*	USA
Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science	Marketing	4*	USA
Marketing Science	Marketing	4*	USA
International Journal of Research in Marketing	Marketing	4	Europe – although current EIC is from USA
Journal of Retailing	Marketing	4	USA
Journal of Operations Management	Operations and Technology Management	4*	USA
International Journal of Operations and Production Management	Operations and Technology Management	4	Europe – although current EICs are from Europe and USA
Production and Operations Management	Operations and Technology Management	4	USA

Management Science	Operations Research and Management Science	4*	USA
Operations Research	Operations Research and Management Science	4*	USA
European Journal of Operational Research	Operations Research and Management Science	4	Europe – Current EIC is from Poland
IEEE Transactions on Evolutionary Computation	Operations Research and Management Science	4	USA
Mathematical Programming	Operations Research and Management Science	4	USA
Organization Science	Organization Studies	4*	USA
Human Relations	Organization Studies	4	UK
Leadership Quarterly	Organization Studies	4	USA – although current EIC is from Switzerland
Organization Studies	Organization Studies	4	Europe – Although current EIC are from Denmark and Canada
Organizational Research Methods	Organization Studies	4	USA
Psychological Science	Psychology (General)	4*	USA
Annual Review of Psychology	Psychology (General)	4	USA
Current Directions in Psychological Science	Psychology (General)	4	USA
Journal of Experimental Psychology – Applied	Psychology (General)	4	USA
Journal of Experimental Social Psychology	Psychology (General)	4	USA
Journal of Personality and Social Psychology	Psychology (General)	4	USA
Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin	Psychology (General)	4	USA
Psychological Bulletin	Psychology (General)	4	USA
Psychological Review	Psychology (General)	4	USA
Psychological Science	Psychology (General)	4	USA
Journal of Applied Psychology	Psychology (Work/Organizational Psychology-Organizational Behaviour)	4*	USA
Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology	Psychology (Work/Organizational Psychology-Organizational Behaviour)	4	UK
Journal of Occupational Health Psychology	Psychology (Work/Organizational	4	USA

	Psychology-Organizational Behaviour)		
Journal of Organizational Behavior – formerly Journal of Occupational Behaviour	Psychology (Work/Organizational Psychology-Organizational Behaviour)	4	UK – because the founding editor, the Canadian Cary Cooper was based at Manchester, UK – current editor from USA
Journal of Vocational Behavior	Psychology (Work/Organizational Psychology-Organizational Behaviour)	4	USA
Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes	Psychology (Work/Organizational Psychology-Organizational Behaviour)	4	USA
Personnel Psychology	Psychology (Work/Organizational Psychology-Organizational Behaviour)	4	USA
Public Administration Review	Public Sector	4*	USA
Journal of Public Administration: Research and Theory	Public Sector	4	USA
Public Administration: An International Quarterly	Public Sector	4	UK
Environment and Planning A	Regional Studies, Planning and Environment	4	International - alliance from Canada, UK & USA
Environment and Planning D: Society and Space	Regional Studies, Planning and Environment	4	International - alliance from Canada, UK & USA
Annals of Tourism Research	Sector Studies	4	USA
Journal of Service Research	Sector Studies	4	USA
Journal of Travel Research	Sector Studies	4	USA
Tourism Management	Sector Studies	4	UK
Transportation Research Part B: Methodological	Sector Studies	4	USA
American Journal of Sociology	Social Science	4*	USA

American Sociological Review	Social Science	4*	USA
Annual Review of Sociology	Social Science	4*	USA
Economic Geography	Social Science	4	USA
Journal of Economic Geography	Social Science	4	International – alliance from Asia, Europe & North America
Risk Analysis: An International Journal	Social Science	4	USA
Social Science and Medicine	Social Science	4	USA – on the basis of affiliation of founding editor
Sociology	Social Science	4	UK
Sociology of Health and Illness	Social Science	4	UK
Strategic Management Journal	Strategy	4*	USA
Base of journal has been defined according to the criteria of learned society or university affiliation, origin of journal and geographical base of editors and editorial board in that order of precedence.			