

# Developing a Core List of Journals in an Interdisciplinary Area

## Implications for Academic Faculty and Librarians Demonstrated in the Business Literature

Jeffrey D. Kushkowski and Charles B. Shrader

*Faculty who publish in interdisciplinary areas may be faced with the challenge of justifying research published in journals that are not considered important by their home department. This paper uses corporate governance (an academic area in business) as an example of an interdisciplinary research area. A core list of journals is developed using citations from Corporate Governance: An International Review, that demonstrates the interdisciplinary nature of corporate governance research. This core list can be used by both corporate governance academics and business librarians to help justify faculty publishing decisions. The process devised for developing a core list is applicable to other interdisciplinary areas. The paper concludes by exploring the implications of departmental journal lists and provides suggestions for both faculty and librarians.*

**Jeffrey D. Kushkowski** (kushkows@iastate.edu) is Associate Professor and Business and Economics Librarian, and **Charles B. Shrader** (cshrader@iastate.edu) is University Professor and Ralph and Jean Eucher Faculty Fellow in Business Ethics, Department of Management, Iowa State University, Ames, Iowa.

Submitted June 2, 2012; tentatively accepted for publication July 4, 2012, pending modest revision; revision submitted August 30, 2012, and accepted for publication.

This research was funded in part by the Iowa State University Library Travel and Research Committee and the Iowa State University College of Business. The authors wish to thank Shawn Merselis, Pam Manhart, and Elaine Kushkowski for their help with data entry. An earlier version of this paper was presented at the 2010 American Library Association Annual Conference in Washington, DC.

An interdisciplinary field is one that combines the methods, conceptual frameworks, and knowledge of two or more disciplines to address questions that lie in the disciplinary nexus. Sustainability, African American studies, and neuroeconomics are all examples of fields that combine knowledge from different disciplines to answer specific research questions. Interdisciplinary fields pose challenges for both academics and librarians precisely because they are at the intersection of two (or more) disciplines. Academics who do interdisciplinary research may struggle with integrating their research and teaching into a traditional department structure. Librarians who support interdisciplinary fields may be faced with a subject area where the traditional methods for acquiring, accessing, and evaluating information do not apply. Librarians who provide resources and assistance to interdisciplinary scholars need to be diligent in defining the parameters of the field to ensure that they are adequately meeting scholars' teaching and research needs.

In this paper, the authors use citation analysis to determine the top-cited journals in *Corporate Governance: An International Review (CGIR)* from 1999 to 2008 and develop a core list of journals for corporate governance. The results demonstrate that corporate governance is an interdisciplinary field that relies

heavily on the disciplines of accounting, economics, finance, and management for both publishing venues and intellectual underpinnings. The authors then compare this core list with a composite list from business disciplines, including the fields of management, accounting, finance, and economics, to determine the overlap of top journals in these fields and corporate governance. The process devised for developing a core list is applicable to other interdisciplinary areas. Finally, the authors discuss the implications of this research and its benefits for both corporate governance academics and librarians with collection management responsibilities.

Corporate governance is an academic area in business concerned with the relationships between corporations' boards of directors and various corporate stakeholders—investors, regulatory agencies, corporate management, and the public. At the most basic level, research in corporate governance explores aspects of agency theory—the relationships that arise when a principal (board of directors) hires an agent (corporate officers) to run a company on behalf of shareholders.<sup>1</sup> Agency theory explores how the agent and principal work together and the incentives and behaviors in place to ensure that agents act in the best interest of the principal.<sup>2</sup> Corporate governance research, then, involves the study of how a board of directors motivates corporate officers and verifies that they are acting in the best interests of the board and shareholders. The research cuts across disciplinary boundaries and includes topics in accounting (e.g., financial reporting), economics (e.g., theory of the firm), finance (e.g., executive compensation), and management (e.g., strategic planning).

An important question for faculty in any academic discipline is how their research will be evaluated during promotion and tenure reviews. Faculty in business schools are generally affiliated with a specific academic department (e.g., management) even if their research focus is an interdisciplinary area. Business programs are required by accrediting agencies to provide evidence of academic rigor for their faculty publications and, to that end, departments may rely on disciplinary journal rankings that use a variety of metrics to determine the best titles in a discipline. The conventional wisdom that departments maintain lists of acceptable journals appears to be largely anecdotal. Van Fleet, McWilliams, and Siegel report that “surprisingly few institutions reported using formal lists.”<sup>3</sup>

Choosing an appropriate publishing venue can be critical for tenure-track faculty doing interdisciplinary research. Corporate governance researchers may publish in journals not included in disciplinary journal rankings because few journals exclusively publish corporate governance research. Some of the more prominent corporate governance journals are *Corporate Governance: An International Review*, *Corporate Governance: The International Journal of Business in Society*, *International Journal of Corporate Governance*,

*Directors and Boards*, and *The Corporate Board*. The last two titles are practitioner-oriented journals that are less likely to generate academic citations. They also focus slightly more on the director's role instead of the relatively wider array of business functions that pertain to corporate governance, such as strategic and financial management.

Publishing in corporate governance journals is essential for scholars who want to establish a reputation as researchers in the field. At the same time, publishing in journals that are not included on disciplinary journal lists may limit their ability to gain tenure in their home department. A National Academy of Sciences report on promoting interdisciplinary research found that while departments may value interdisciplinary researchers, publications “not recognized as being in the home department's discipline may be considered valuable but not sufficient for tenure.”<sup>4</sup> For corporate governance researchers, and interdisciplinary scholars in other fields, justifying publications that fall outside their department's disciplinary boundaries can be critical to their tenure or promotion success.

## Literature Review

### Disciplines versus Interdisciplinary Areas

One of the central questions in this paper is whether corporate governance is a distinct discipline or an interdisciplinary subject. The distinction is important because of the way that departments within business schools evaluate faculty for promotion and tenure. A perennial discussion in the business literature is whether corporate governance is a distinct discipline or whether it is an interdisciplinary field as described above. Durisin and Puzone assert that corporate governance is a discipline based on their analysis of citations from *CGIR* and other journals.<sup>5</sup> They argue that corporate governance research is seen as relevant but intellectually inferior, and they demonstrate using citation analysis that a strong intellectual foundation for corporate governance exists in the fields of management, economics, finance, and accounting.

Disciplines, as described by Salter and Hearn, have both a core of knowledge and an organizational infrastructure that supports further knowledge production.<sup>6</sup> The knowledge core includes both discipline specific knowledge and theoretical knowledge that underpins the discipline. According to Becher and Trower, infrastructure refers to the social and connective schema that holds the discipline together and includes everything from discipline specific journals and conferences to defining the social norms and expectations placed on scholars who belong to that discipline.<sup>7</sup> The social aspects of disciplinary membership for interdisciplinary researchers are particularly important in the context of this paper. The authors contend that corporate governance

research is interdisciplinary and offer a framework from which they can discuss the unique challenges to interdisciplinary researchers in business schools. The hallmarks of an interdisciplinary field are exactly what Durisin and Puzone show in their article—the widespread inclusion of corporate governance topics in established disciplinary areas.<sup>8</sup>

One measure of interdisciplinarity is the number of citations in journal articles that come from related disciplinary areas. Porter and Rafols provide evidence that science areas are becoming more interdisciplinary, though the exact reasons are not clear.<sup>9</sup> Rinia and colleagues examine citations from Science Citation Index and demonstrate that basic science disciplines (e.g., biology, mathematics, and physics) routinely share literature with one another.<sup>10</sup> Leavitt, Thelwall, and Oppenheim conducted a similar study for social science fields, which confirmed that the social sciences also share literature between disciplines.<sup>11</sup>

While interdisciplinary subjects draw on knowledge from their core disciplines, they also develop new methods and paradigms that may, over time, evolve into new disciplinary areas. Distinctions in the minutiae between disciplinary, interdisciplinary, multidisciplinary, and cross-disciplinary research are complex and beyond the scope of this paper. Van den Besselaar and Heimeriks provide a cogent introduction to the subject and propose an indicator of interdisciplinarity “based on the patterns and intensity of knowledge streams between research fields.”<sup>12</sup> A large body of literature describes trends in interdisciplinary research that focuses on both science and social science fields.<sup>13</sup> Klein’s 1996 book on the interdisciplinary nature of knowledge and research, now a classic, contains a thorough examination of interdisciplinarity.<sup>14</sup> Ostreng focuses on how interdisciplinary research interacts with traditional disciplines in the sciences.<sup>15</sup> The best current discussion of issues related to interdisciplinary research is edited by Frodeman, Klein, and Mitcham.<sup>16</sup>

Interdisciplinary subjects pose challenges for libraries in both collection management and reference activities. One of the challenges for librarians is identifying the domain of interdisciplinary subjects. This in turn leads to questions about information seeking by interdisciplinary scholars and the best way for librarians to provide services. Dobson, Kushkowsky, and Gerhard describe the characteristics of interdisciplinary subjects and propose an approach for evaluating collections of interdisciplinary materials.<sup>17</sup> They maintain that familiarity with the subject domains of interdisciplinary fields is central to successfully evaluating interdisciplinary collections. A complete issue of *Library Trends* in 1996 discussed the impact of interdisciplinary fields and included articles about subject domains, information seeking, and aligning library services with the research practices of interdisciplinary scholars.<sup>18</sup>

Literature that is more recent elaborates on those issues and informs current thought about libraries and

interdisciplinary scholars. Palmer and Cragin discuss how information science has adapted to the changing landscape of disciplinary change, focusing on “the social dimension of scholarly practice and its influence on how information is collected.”<sup>19</sup> Witt and Rudasill’s 2010 book elaborates on the challenges of increased interdisciplinary research for libraries supporting the social sciences.<sup>20</sup> Topics in the volume include an examination of differences in data-sharing practices between disciplines, a rethinking of traditional cataloging and collection management systems to accommodate interdisciplinary knowledge (e.g., into what traditional subject areas does sustainability studies fall?), and the development of research portals that facilitate the discovery of interdisciplinary knowledge.

### Use of Core Lists in Business Schools

Most reputable business schools are accredited by the Association to Advance Collegiate Schools of Business (AACSB International) in a process that involves a detailed self-study, a site visit, and the development of a detailed school mission statement that defines the goals and parameters in which the school operates. Accreditation standards require that institutions support “successful achievement of all dimensions of the stated missions with particular focus on high quality degree programs and scholarly research.”<sup>21</sup> They also require that schools provide “clear expectations regarding the quality of the intellectual contributions and how quality is assured (e.g., specific target journals or outlets, selectivity requirements, etc.)”<sup>22</sup>

A consequence of accreditation criteria is the need for business schools to quantify the research output of their faculty. Schools can meet the accreditation criteria for demonstrating research quality by comparing their faculty’s publishing output with journal lists that identify the top journals in a discipline. One side effect of this reliance on journal lists tied to business school accreditation is a large literature devoted to journal lists. Durisin and Puzone’s article includes an extensive bibliography about core lists.<sup>23</sup> Journal lists are available for business disciplines including accounting, finance, economics, and management areas and can be easily discovered by searching for “core list” and the discipline (e.g., accounting) in a database such as ABI/Inform.

In the realm of online resources, Harzing’s Journal Quality List (JQL) website provides a meta-analysis of journal rankings across a variety of business journal rankings.<sup>24</sup> JQL is a compilation of journal ranking studies in business fields including economics, finance, accounting, management, and marketing. Harzing’s Publish or Perish website allows researchers to calculate publication metrics based on the availability of their work in Google Scholar.<sup>25</sup>

The use of core journal lists to provide evidence of research quality is not a phenomenon unique to the United

States. Quantifying research output is an issue for universities in Europe, where institutional productivity is evaluated at a national level and the results are used to allocate research funding.<sup>26</sup> Journal lists for disciplines across the academy are one of the metrics used to define institutional research productivity. The Research Assessment Exercise in the United Kingdom uses the Association of Business Schools (ABS) list of journals when evaluating research productivity of business schools.<sup>27</sup> ABS is the British accrediting body for business schools. These periodic assessments of research productivity are used to determine research funding for universities in the United Kingdom and other European countries. The use of core journal lists to assess institutional productivity may explain the proliferation of journal lists across disciplines.

### Methods Used to Develop Business Core Journal Lists

Core lists may be developed by individual departments but enough published journal lists exist so that schools can select from published lists instead of creating their own. Data for lists often come from Thomson Reuters' *Journal Citation Reports* and the use of ISI impact factors and citation counts are one method of developing core journal lists. Authorship studies, as represented by Heck, Zaleski, and Dressler, explore who publishes in a discipline.<sup>28</sup> This particular article used journal citations found in a list of elite economics journals to explore the contributions of authors by academic institution to economics journal literature.

Citation analysis studies generally fall into two categories. The first is a citation analysis of a specific journal. Lindquist and Smith's citation analysis of the *Journal of Management Accounting Research* is an example of studies done to celebrate a milestone anniversary for a journal.<sup>29</sup> Studies of this type are common in business literature (and other disciplines) and can be used to discover the range of journals used in a discipline. The second type of citation study is broader and assesses the literature within a specific discipline or subdiscipline. In their study of corporate social responsibility and corporate social performance, De Bakker, Groenewegen, and Den Hond compiled citations from Social Science Citation Index and ABI/Inform and used them to map the scope of their subject.<sup>30</sup> The primary difference between the two approaches is that the former uses a single journal as a data source and the latter uses search results on a particular subject as the starting point.

In addition to the use of citation counts, other methods can be used to develop core journal lists. Wu, Hao, and Yao surveyed department heads to gather perceptions from department heads about journal rankings in accounting, finance and information systems.<sup>31</sup> Preference studies query department heads, faculty, business school deans, or other experts for an assessment of journal reputation based on

personal knowledge. The ranking of management journals by Harris is based on multiple sources of data including expert opinion and citation indexes.<sup>32</sup> It provides greater granularity and subject breadth than other management journal lists. By contrast, Ritzberger's list of 261 economics journals relies on a variant of the algorithm Google uses to rank search engine results.<sup>33</sup>

Many of the methods described above are familiar to library and information science (LIS) researchers. Citation analyses of journals or disciplines are a staple of LIS research, as are surveys of stakeholders about journal preferences. Quantitative studies may rely on data from the *Journal Citation Reports* or other bibliographic data. The examples above are representative of categories of core list methodologies, not an exhaustive list of methods. For each method, multiple studies are available in the business literature, and variations in method often reflect the differences in methodological approaches between business disciplines. One insight from the wealth of core journal studies in business is that no consensus about how to create core lists exists.

### Business Core Journal Lists: Critiques

Journal ranking in business schools has been the subject of many critiques, both methodological and otherwise. Considering the stakes for faculty whose careers may rise or fall on the basis of a core journal list, such critiques are understandable. A common thread that runs through the critiques of journal ranking is the reliance on the use (some would say misuse) of the journal impact factor for determining research worth.

Journal impact factor (JIF) is a metric developed by Eugene Garfield in *Journal Citation Reports (JCR)*, now owned by Thomson Reuters. The JIF measures the ratio of citations to a journal to the number of citable items published in that journal over a period. *JCR* includes both the two-year and five-year JIFs for journals, though one can use the data to calculate impact factors for different lengths of time. The different JIFs are provided as a way of recognizing that not all disciplines cite their literature at the same rate. Publishing lags in social science disciplines (e.g., sociology) may mean that the five-year JIF is a better representation of journal reputation than in a science discipline (e.g., chemistry) where publishing, and possible citations to articles, happens more quickly.

A number of substantive critiques, many from outside of the business literature, about the use of the JIF have been written. Seglen enumerates twenty-three reasons not to use JIF to evaluate research. Among the reasons not to use JIF is that it "conceals the difference in article citation rates" within a journal.<sup>34</sup> He contends that only a few articles in any given journal issue are highly cited and that relatively few articles contribute to the JIF for a given journal.

Althouse and colleagues focus on the variation in JIFs across disciplines and the upward trend in JIFs over time, a trend also explored in research by Campanario.<sup>35</sup> These articles argue that the increases in JIFs are the result of increased citations within articles and are not necessarily indicative of changes in journal quality. Neff and Olden demonstrate that an increased number of citations in journal articles inflates the JIF of ecology journals.<sup>36</sup>

Other critiques of JIF (and other journal metrics), such as the article by Finch, point out that no perfect method for evaluating articles and journals exists.<sup>37</sup> Sala and Brook explore the bias introduced into JIFs when multiple authors in an article cite their previous work.<sup>38</sup>

Critiques of journal lists within the business literature are similar to those of other fields. Adler and Harzing offer a meta-analysis of journal ranking methods, including those that use the JIF.<sup>39</sup> Their main objection to the use of the JIF is that it equates journal quality with article quality. Singh, Haddad, and Chow found that top management journals received more citations, but that not all the articles in top journals were of the same quality.<sup>40</sup> In a study related to journal lists, Bornmann and Dieter found that citation decisions are a complex phenomenon that includes both social and practical aspects.<sup>41</sup>

Other critiques of journal lists from business fields focus on the use of those lists by departments or colleges. Lange found that, while schools do indeed rank business journals, little consistency in ranking is found between institutions.<sup>42</sup> Adams and Johnson report that the implementation of a journal list at the University of Houston “is imperfect” but that the consistency of annual reviews has increased.<sup>43</sup> Henderson, Ganesh, and Chandy argue that faculty are specialists and are not necessarily able to judge work of other scholars because of limited knowledge of other fields.<sup>44</sup> Noteworthy is that critiques of journal lists and the JIF are found across disciplines, an indication that concerns about the use of the JIF are a nearly universal concern among academics.

### Citation Analysis

This research uses citation analysis as a tool for developing a core list of journals in corporate governance. Citation analysis is one of many tools used by both business faculty and library and information science researchers to examine the intellectual structure of disciplines. A number of recent library and information sciences titles explore bibliometric methods, including citation analysis. De Bellis provides a theoretical overview of bibliometric methods in library and information science, while the volume by Andrés has a more practical focus.<sup>45</sup> A specific discussion of bibliometric methods for revealing interdisciplinary fields can be found in an article by Morris and Van der Veer Martens.<sup>46</sup>

Business disciplines have a long tradition of using

citation analysis to examine trends in business literature. Citation analysis is used in several ways to examine business literature beyond compiling journal lists. Lindquist and Smith note that citation analysis of a single journal is usually done as a retrospective for journal anniversaries and also may include content analysis of article subjects and authorship.<sup>47</sup> De Baaker, Groenewegen, and Den Hond describe how the structure of disciplines or subdisciplines can be investigated to delineate subject boundaries.<sup>48</sup> Matherly and Shortridge conducted a meta-analysis of journal ranking studies that provides new measures for determine journal quality.<sup>49</sup> Bibliometric analysis of journal literature provides multiple means of assessing and evaluating subject literature in disciplinary or interdisciplinary fields.

### Research Method

The authors chose *CGIR*, (print ISSN 0964-8410, online ISSN 1467-8683) as a data source because it is the premier academic journal devoted solely to the topic of governance. The mission of *CGIR* is “to publish cutting-edge research on the phenomena of comparative corporate governance throughout the global economy,” and the journal is “committed to publishing rigorous and relevant research on corporate governance so that the practice of corporate governance can be influenced and improved throughout the world.”<sup>50</sup> According to Harzing’s online “Publish or Perish” citation analysis tool, *CGIR* has published articles for twenty-one years, generates 18.55 citations per article and has an h-index (an indicator of both quality and quantity of published work) of 56.<sup>51</sup> It is the only journal listed in *Journal Citation Reports* that exclusively publishes corporate governance research.

The data in this study include citations from research articles appearing in *CGIR* between 1999 and 2008. During this time, 420 research articles were published, with more than 15,000 individual citations across more than 1,100 journals. The journal expanded from four to six issues per year in 2005 and published an average of 8.75 articles per issue during the study period.

The research method in this study is based on journal ranking studies in library and information science that date back to a study of chemistry journals by Gross and Gross in 1927.<sup>52</sup> The categories used to classify citations are an adaptation of a coding method used by Kushkowsky in a study of web citation by graduate students.<sup>53</sup>

The authors used a multistep process to collect and analyze the data. The first step involved identifying the research articles included in the study period. The authors identified each research article in the study period and collected demographic data about the year of publication, volume, and page numbers, and total number of citations for each

article. Editorials, letters to the editor, and book reviews were excluded from the article count. Next, the authors created separate spreadsheet files that corresponded to each year in the study period. Tabs within each annual spreadsheet corresponded to individual issues and columns in the issue tabs corresponded to individual articles. Each issue tab included information about the volume number and issue number. Columns in the issue tabs included page numbers and the number of citation included in the article as a check during data entry. The last step in preparing the spreadsheets involved seeding them with an initial list of journals. The authors compiled a list of about 150 journals by counting citations in articles from one issue of *CGIR* and included these in the first column of each issue tab. They also identified categories of nonjournal formats to track during the study.

After developing the spreadsheets for the individual volumes with the issue and article information, data collection was straightforward. The authors and three research students entered information about each citation into spreadsheets. Coders would start with an article bibliography and a spreadsheet with a list of journals down the side and columns for each article. Each article was assigned a spreadsheet column and data were collected by matching the items in the bibliography with the journal titles or publication formats. If a journal title was not included on the spreadsheet, it was added at the bottom of the sheet.

After the data were collected, the authors consolidated spreadsheets from individual articles and issues into an annual database, verified journal titles, and summed citation counts for variant journals within and between spreadsheets. The final data set included three spreadsheets, one for individual issues, one for annual volume statistics, and a master spreadsheet that compiled annual figures for the years studied. Figures 1, 2, and 3 show examples of the individual issue, annual, and master spreadsheets used to collect and consolidate the data. The completed data set included 15,270 citations to 1,116 journals.

**Limitations of the Data**

The data are limited by possible errors in data entry, coding, and possible errors in the original citations. The authors provided training on identifying different types of citations and checked citations in random articles throughout the data collection process as a quality check. Multiple coders for the citations may present a problem in inter-coder reliability because the authors did no formal reliability checks.

The authors counted individual citations without regard for duplicates; unlike co-citation analysis, the authors did not track multiple occurrences of the same article. The authors counted citations to each journal without regard for duplicate citations. Likewise, the authors ignored the contributions of individual scholars. Other studies look at authorship

Citation Count sheet - CG Project				Date Completed:					
Year:	2008	Volume	16	Art 1	Art 2	Art 3	Art 4	Art 5	TOTALS
Issue:	2	Page #:		14	13	11	15	16	69
				116	104	41	65	63	
		Total Citations:		116	104	41	65	63	389
<b>Non-Journal formats:</b>									
Accounting Standard									0
Annual Reports				0				0	0
Reports				1		3	5		9
Book				24	8	1	1	3	37
Book Chapter				3	0	0	0	0	3
Government Document				2	0	0	0	0	2
Thesis/ dissertation									0
Unpublished									0
Website				1	0	0	4	0	5
Working Paper				2	0	1	1	1	5
<b>Journals below this line:</b>									
Abacus								1	1
Academy of Management Journal				2	24			2	28
Academy of Management Review				2	10				12
Accounting and Business Research								2	2
Accounting and Finance						1	2		3
Accounting Auditing and Accountability Journal									0
Accounting Auditing and Taxation									0
Accounting Forum									0
Accounting Historians Journal									0
Accounting Horizons							3	1	4
Accounting Organization and Society									0
Accounting Review						5	10	7	22
Accounting, Business and Financial History									0
Administrative Science Quarterly				6	12				18
Advances in Accounting									0
Advances in International Accounting									0

Figure 1. Single-issue Spreadsheet Pane

contributions of authors within *CGIR* and examine corporate governance as an interdisciplinary field.<sup>54</sup> Finally, the authors acknowledge that assessing journal quality is a subjective process and that institutions and even departments within the same school of business may disagree about what constitutes a quality journal.

**Results**

The complete data set includes 15,270 individual citations. Table 1 shows the breakdown of citations by format. Sixty-three percent (9,572) of the citations are to journal articles and 37 percent (5,698) were to other formats. The only other format with more than 10 percent of the citations is books with 17 percent (2,628). Book chapters are included as a separate category to track citations. The website category includes any item with a URL in the citation, regardless of its other characteristics, as a way of measuring the prevalence of citations to electronic media.

A total of 1,116 journals are represented in 9,572 citations for the ten years in the sample. A distribution showing the number of years that journals are cited is shown in table 2. Note that only 1.7 percent (19) of the journals are cited in all ten years of *CGIR* analyzed for this study, and they

#	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K
1	Citation Count sheet - CG Project				16(1)	16(2)	16(3)	16(4)	16(5)	16(6)	2008
2	Year: 2008 Volume: 16				TOTALS						
3	Issue: 1-6 Page #: 16				241	389	453	452	386	348	2269
4	Total Citations:				407	717	816	769	682	632	
5	Non-Journal formats: (Add others at end)										
6	Accounting Standard				0	0	0	0	0	0	0
7	Annual Reports				0	0	0	1	0	0	1
8	Book				48	37	31	71	50	30	267
9	Book Chapter				6	3	1	27	10	10	57
10	Conference Proceeding				0	0	0	3	2	5	10
11	Government Document				10	2	3	4	9	1	29
12	Reports				2	9	25	8	4	1	49
13	Thesis/ dissertation				0	0	0	1	0	0	1
14	Unpublished				0	0	0	1	0	3	4
15	Website				0	5	8	5	4	3	25
16	Working Paper				9	5	22	14	11	11	72
17	Journal Totals from below:				166	328	363	317	296	284	1754
19	Journal of Financial Economics				8	13	35	24	19	24	123
20	Corporate Governance: Int'l Review				17	13	17	23	13	20	103
21	Academy of Management Journal				5	28	22	21	13	7	96
22	Journal of Finance				9	11	25	10	14	24	93
23	Administrative Science Quarterly				13	18	25	13	12	3	84
24	Academy of Management Review				3	12	13	21	15	8	72
25	Strategic Management Journal				4	17	7	10	14	12	64
26	Journal of Accounting and Economics				3	23	13	0	8	10	57
27	Accounting Review				2	22	5	1	11	7	48
28	Journal of Accounting Research				3	19	5	0	9	6	42
29	Journal of Political Economy				2	6	9	2	3	6	28
30	American Journal of Sociology				4	3	9	5	4	2	27
31	Journal of Business Ethics				3	0	10	6	7	1	27
32	Journal of Management				2	6	5	3	2	7	25
33	Journal of Corporate Finance				1	4	5	6	2	6	24
34	Journal of Management Studies				0	4	6	3	4	7	24
35	Journal of Financial and Quantitative Analysis				0	2	6	3	6	6	23
36	American Sociological Review				3	1	8	6	2	2	22
37	Contemporary Accounting Research				3	8	2	0	0	9	22
38	Organization Science				5	3	4	7	0	0	19
39	American Economic Review				3	1	3	2	4	4	17
40	Organization Studies				0	3	3	7	2	1	16
41	Journal of Business				1	1	4	1	3	4	14
42	Journal of Business Finance and Accounting				0	4	6	0	1	3	14

Figure 2. Single-year Spreadsheet Pane

accounted for 47 percent (4,544) of the total citations. On the other end of the scale, 63 percent (701) of the titles were cited only once and contribute only 9.4 percent (900) of the total citations. The distribution of citations by number of years cited is evidence that corporate governance literature is highly concentrated in a few journals.

**Journal Concentration**

The spreadsheets provide detailed information about how many citations a journal received in any given year. Using this information, the authors constructed a core list that includes any journal cited in *CGIR* at least once a year in five or more consecutive years. Limiting the scope of the core list eliminated infrequently cited journals and focuses attention on heavily cited titles. A total of 137 journals are cited at least once a year in five or more consecutive years, including a total of 7,487 journal citations, representing 12 percent (137) of the 1,116 titles and 78 percent (7,487) of the 9,572 journal citations in the study.

**Subject Breakdown**

The authors assigned each of the 137 journals included in

#	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L	M	N	O	P	Q	R	S	T
1	Citation Count sheet - CG Project																			
2	Add columns for 1999 format and Subject																			
3	Total Citations by Year																			
4	1999-2008																			
5	846	909	930	840	940	948	948	908	939	1347	994	2389	1576							
6	846	909	930	840	940	948	948	908	939	1347	994	2389	1576							
7	Journals																			
8	457	458	497	329	379	796	1164	854	2087	1749	5572									
9	Non-Journal formats: (Add others at end)																			
10	389	451	423	321	389	610	855	493	1267	120	5496									
11	Accounting Standard																			
12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
13	Annual Reports																			
14	0	0	1	0	0	0	3	4	14	1	25									
15	Book																			
16	238	266	311	125	145	279	375	221	667	267	2628									
17	Book Chapter																			
18	60	76	48	25	64	151	132	29	392	49	836									
19	Conference Proceeding																			
20	14	37	28	38	11	25	35	11	7	12	196									
21	Government Document																			
22	5	29	21	30	36	36	36	27	39	29	334									
23	Other																			
24	4	5	1	0	0	0	3	33	8	0	34									
25	Report																			
26	75	84	100	87	69	99	99	49	144	49	547									
27	Thesis/ dissertation																			
28	6	2	2	4	7	3	6	4	12	1	47									
29	Unpublished																			
30	3	5	11	8	5	9	22	4	13	4	84									
31	Website																			
32	3	11	13	20	10	33	48	56	188	25	400									
33	Working Papers																			
34	5	21	15	12	22	37	54	55	157	72	400									
35																				
36	1972 CONSTRUCTIVE RM																			
37	Journal of Financial Economics																			
38	20	29	15	22	34	60	189	96	237	123	799	8								
39	Corporate Governance: An International Review																			
40	36	38	17	29	36	39	51	43	399	112	656	CG								
41	Journal of Finance																			
42	5	10	8	28	36	15	17	163	91	489	9									
43	Academy of Management Journal																			
44	17	45	39	4	35	29	31	23	181	66	368	AM								
45	Academy of Management Review																			
46	14	15	11	9	12	29	39	39	83	72	397	AM								
47	Administrative Science Quarterly																			
48	13	8	16	4	14	23	24	9	49	84	242	AM								
49	Journal of Accounting and Economics																			
50	8	5	9	4	39	20	26	64	37	233	AM									
51	Journal of Political Economy																			
52	5	9	3	5	33	20	43	34	48	26	239	J								
53	Academy of Management Review																			
54	3	2	1	1	4	11	9	9	58	48	146	AM								
55	Accounting Review																			
56	4	9	7	4	2	3	8	33	39	42	188	A								
57	Journal of Accounting Research																			
58	5	9	8	2	5	11	12	44	14	136	1									
59	Harvard Business Review																			
60	19	8	14	4	7	19	18	7	20	9	125	M								
61	American Economic Review																			
62	0	2	6	7	12	8	18	38	33	17	123	A								
63	Journal of Law and Economics																			
64	0	2	9	9	3	22	11	49	24	129	1									
65	Journal of Management Studies																			
66	0	8	8	1	3	9	9	5	29	24	303	M								
67	Journal of Financial and Quantitative Analysis																			
68	2	6	2	0	2	7	11	13	25	23	97	J								
69	Journal of Business Ethics																			
70	0	0	5	0	4	7	16	4	20	27	91	M								
71	Journal of Banking and Finance																			
72	3	1	2	0	2	9	8	38	30	12	81	J								

Figure 3. Master Spreadsheet—All Years

the core list a subject code based on the major subject for that journal. Subject codes provide a way of tracking the relative contribution of different disciplines to corporate governance research. Table 3 shows the subject distribution for the core journal list. The top subject areas represented by the journals citations are management, economics, finance, accounting, and corporate governance. They account for 82 percent of the journals and 94 percent of the total journal citations. None of the remaining subject categories (business news, law, news, psychology, or sociology) contribute more than 3 percent of the total citations. Citations to corporate governance journals are only 10 percent of the total journal citations. The distribution of citations in other than corporate governance journals is an indication of the interdisciplinary nature of corporate governance.

**Corporate Governance Core List**

The corporate governance core list is shown the appendix. The entries in the list are the 137 titles that are cited at least once a year in five or more consecutive years of *CGIR*. They are arranged in descending order by number of citations. Among the top 50 titles, only 2 (*CGIR* and *Directors and Boards*) are corporate governance titles. In the entire list, only 6 corporate governance titles and *CGIR* account for almost 90 percent (656 of 737) of the citations in corporate governance publications. What is clear from this list is that the literature of corporate governance is concentrated within established business disciplines.

The appendix also includes the subject code for each journal and the column “Highly Ranked,” which is an indicator of whether the journal is considered top-tier in its respective field. Because the focus of this paper is developing a

core list, including some indication of the relative importance of the journal in the authors' list is important. As discussed earlier, core lists constructed in business colleges and departments may be focused on established disciplinary areas and ignore interdisciplinary areas. The goal with the "Highly Ranked" field is to provide an objective indication of journal quality based on the intersection of journal rankings described in Harzing's Journal Quality List.<sup>55</sup> One strength of the JQL is that it collects journal-ranking studies from around the world and presents them side-by-side for comparison. Rankings come from a variety of sources, ranging from rankings done by individual institutions to those done

as part of national journal-ranking initiatives. The current edition of JQL contains information from twenty-one different journal ranking studies dated 1998 to 2012.

To arrive at an assessment of quality journals in corporate governance, the authors selected three rankings (the Australian Business Deans Council Journal Rankings List (ABDC), the Association of Business Schools Academic Journal Quality Guide (ABS), and a list from the ESSEC Business School in Paris (ESSEC)) in the forty-fifth edition of the JQL. Each ranking has the advantage of being recent (two dated from 2010 and one from 2011), and all have broad journal coverage. The ABS ranking is used as an evaluative tool when conducting the UK Research Assessment Exercise. ABCD is a ranking developed by the Australian Business Deans Council after input from professional societies. ESSEC is the equivalent of an individual school ranking.

Journals included in the "Highly Ranked" column ranked in the top two categories (indicating that the journals have an international reputation) in all three rankings. The criteria for including journals were as follows: ABCD journals were included if their ranking was A\* or A; ABS journals were included if their rankings were 4 or 3 (including the 4\* titles); ESSEC journals were included if their rankings were 0 or 1 (including the 0+ journals). Triangulating between three different rankings insured that the included journals were ranked as top-tier journals in multiple rankings. In this core list, 46 percent (63) of 137 titles are identified as "Highly Ranked," including the top 20 titles in the list.

**Table 1.** Citations by Format

Citation Type	Number	Percent
Articles	9,572	63
Nonarticle Citation Types		
Accounting Standard	2	0
Annual Reports	25	0
Book	2,628	17
Book Chapter	636	4
Conference Proceeding	196	1
Government Document	324	2
Other	54	0
Report	847	6
Thesis/Dissertation	47	0
Unpublished	84	1
Website	405	3
Working Papers	450	3
Subtotal	5,698	37
Total Citations	15,270	100

**Table 2.** Consecutive Years of Citation

Consecutive Years	Number of Titles	Percent Titles	Number of Citations	Percent Citations
10	19	1.7	4,544	47.5
9	21	1.9	1,073	11.2
8	21	1.9	727	7.6
7	18	1.6	439	4.6
6	22	2.0	312	3.3
5	36	3.2	392	4.1
4	48	4.3	378	3.9
3	80	7.2	404	4.2
2	150	13.4	403	4.2
1	701	62.8	900	9.4
Totals	1,116	100.0	9,572	100.0

## Discussion

This research successfully constructed a core list of journals for the field of corporate governance.

One lesson from the development of this core list is that many journals on the list are top-tier journals in traditional business disciplines. This core list demonstrates the interdisciplinary nature of corporate governance research and is free from the bias that may be present in a departmentally developed core list. This work has implications for both researchers and librarians with collection management responsibilities.

### Implications for Researchers

Researchers need to be aware that the perceived quality of an individual research article tends to be tied to the quality of the journal in which it appears. Faculty members often make judgments regarding journal quality to make informed decisions about promotion and tenure and performance evaluations



**Table 3.** Journals by Subject Area

Subject	Number	Total Citations	Percent Citations
Accounting	19	926	12
Business News	5	189	3
Corporate Governance	6	737	10
Economics	26	1,674	22
Finance	18	1,076	14
Law	10	124	2
Management	44	2,591	35
News	3	37	0
Psychology	2	20	0
Sociology	4	113	2
Total	137	7,487	100
<b>Broad Subject Groups</b>			
Accounting/ Finance / Economics	63	3,676	49
Management/ Corporate Governance	50	3,328	45
Other	24	483	6
Total	137	7,487	100

of their faculty colleagues. Faculty and administrators in academic institutions involved in making performance evaluations for both salary increases and promotion and tenure decisions need to exercise their subject expertise and professional judgment in conducting these evaluations. This paper potentially informs these types of decisions by indicating the core journals contributing to the field of corporate governance. Since corporate governance researchers may publish in a diverse set of academic disciplines, this paper is useful to faculty members on promotion and tenure committees and those who provide external letters of recommendation in terms of identifying the journals making the most important contributions to the development of the corporate governance field.

Therefore researchers interested in corporate governance employed in finance departments seeking promotion can claim that corporate governance research fits the mainstream of finance research in general. The same argument holds for economics, accounting, and management scholars. Governance researchers outside of business schools also will find these results useful in terms of where to submit their academic work.

The authors discussed earlier that corporate governance researchers are frequently affiliated with business departments whose publishing criteria may not match where the researcher is publishing. In this case, the core list

is a useful tool for demonstrating that the core journals in corporate governance are highly respected journals in other disciplines. This information can be useful when justifying publishing outside of a department's disciplinary journal lists.

Individual faculty also can take steps to ensure that their research is evaluated objectively by promotion and tenure committees and department administrators. One of the most important things that faculty can do is to find out how their department evaluates research outcomes during promotion and tenure cases. Particularly important is to find out if a disciplinary journal list exists, how the list compiled, how often is it updated, and who has input into the revision process. Also important is talking with promotion and tenure committees or recently promoted faculty to learn how journals that fall outside disciplinary lists are evaluated. The authors' list of core journals constitutes a set of target outlets for all governance research that can supplement existing departmental journal lists.

Beyond finding acceptable publishing outlets and understanding how their department evaluates research, faculty also need to be able to show the impact of their research on their discipline, regardless of whether that discipline is corporate governance, a more standard business discipline, or a different interdisciplinary field. Tracking citations to research is particularly important and can demonstrate the impact of an individual article. A highly cited article in a second-tier journal can signal that the article is of particular importance and should be evaluated on its merits and not the (presumed) prestige of the journal.

### Implications for Librarians

This paper demonstrates the complexities of interdisciplinary fields, and librarians can leverage the information in this paper in a number of ways. One important lesson from this study is that interdisciplinary fields differ from traditional disciplines in the way they produce and use knowledge. Knowing that a field is interdisciplinary can inform both research assistance and collection management decisions. Integrating methods of searching for interdisciplinary information (e.g., using multiple databases) with traditional collection evaluation methods enhances the ability of librarians to meet the needs of their interdisciplinary scholars.

Another important task for librarians is assisting faculty in interdisciplinary areas, such as corporate governance, in defending their choice of publishing venues, especially in cases where publications fall outside a department's disciplinary journal list. Educating faculty on ways to demonstrate the value of their articles despite their publication choice is important. One way to accomplish this is to emphasize that that journal rankings by themselves do not adequately represent the quality of individual articles.

Singh, Haddad, and Chow point out that “using journal rank as a proxy for quality can lead to substantial judgment errors: Many top articles are published in non-top journals, and many non-top articles are published in top journals.”<sup>56</sup> Being familiar with the literature that critiques journal ranking may provide the evidence departments need to change their evaluation methods. Research that explores individually evaluating articles for merit has been done by Mingers, Watson, and Scaparra.<sup>57</sup>

Another role of librarians is to educate faculty on the use and misuse of journal rankings. This may take the form of discussions with promotion and tenure committees or presentations at departmental meetings. Encouraging faculty and departments to judge research based on the impact of the article will enhance their ability to judge quality research. As Singh, Haddad, and Chow noted, “both administrators and the management discipline will be well served by efforts to evaluate each article on its merits rather than abdicate this responsibility by using journal ranking as a proxy for quality.”<sup>58</sup> Librarians should realize that educating faculty about journal rankings will be an ongoing discussion topic.

Collection management for corporate governance and other interdisciplinary areas is complicated by the need to examine literature in multiple subject areas. The references included in the literature review may assist librarians with interdisciplinary collection management challenges. The method used in this paper is transferrable and can be applied to any interdisciplinary subject area. It can be used for developing core lists that can be used for collection evaluation or for evaluating journal articles for promotion and tenure that are relevant regardless of discipline. The method also is useful for delineating the core subject areas that constitute an interdisciplinary subject.

## Conclusion

This research describes a method of identifying core journals in the interdisciplinary field of corporate governance. Specifically, the authors demonstrated that the primary journal in the field, *CGIR*, draws the majority of the citations in its articles from influential established business journals in established business disciplines. The core list developed by the authors contains top-tier journals primarily from the areas of accounting, economics, finance, and management.

Librarians can use these results to enhance their ability to reach out to corporate governance scholars, and knowledge gained from this research can inform both collection management and faculty outreach activities. Results from this method also can be used to educate faculty on the differences between disciplinary and interdisciplinary fields.

Other interdisciplinary fields face similar issues related to identifying core journal lists. The method can easily be adapted to other interdisciplinary areas. Using methods like the one described in this research allows librarians to document the scope of an interdisciplinary field for their interdisciplinary scholars.

The development of core lists in business schools, and other academic departments and programs, is an important component of evaluation processes that take place at the individual (e.g., promotion and tenure) and institutional (e.g., national research assessments) levels. This research method can be used to explore the structure of interdisciplinary research being conducted by academic departments. Librarians can use this information to help faculty provide a defense of publishing in interdisciplinary areas. The importance of this research is that it demonstrates a method for evaluating interdisciplinary research areas that informs both academics and librarians about the multifaceted research that takes place in the academy.

## References

1. Kathleen M. Eisenhardt, “Agency Theory—An Assessment and Review,” *Academy of Management Review* 14, no. 1 (1989): 57–74.
2. Eugene F. Fama, “Agency Problems and the Theory of the Firm,” *Journal of Political Economy* 88, no. 2 (1980): 288–307.
3. David D. Van Fleet, Abigail McWilliams, and Donald S. Siegel, “A Theoretical and Empirical Analysis of Journal Rankings: The Case for Formal Lists,” *Journal of Management* 26, no. 5 (2000): 847.
4. Committee on Facilitating Interdisciplinary Research, National Academy of Sciences, National Academy of Engineering, Institute of Medicine, *Facilitating Interdisciplinary Research* (Washington, DC: National Academies Press, 2005), 73.
5. Boris Durisin and Fulvio Puzone, “Maturation of Corporate Governance Research, 1993–2007: An Assessment,” *Corporate Governance: An International Review* 17, no. 3 (2009): 266–91.
6. Liora Salter and Alison Hearn, eds., *Outside the Lines: Issues in Interdisciplinary Research* (Montreal: McGill-Queen’s University Press, 1996).
7. Tony Becher and Paul R. Trower, *Academic Tribes and Territories: Intellectual Inquiry and the Culture of Disciplines*, 2nd ed. (Buckingham, UK: Open University Press, 2001).
8. Durisin and Puzone, “Maturation of Corporate Governance Research, 1993–2007.”
9. Alan L. Porter and Ismael Rafols, “Is Science Becoming More Interdisciplinary? Measuring and Mapping Six Fields over Time,” *Scientometrics* 81, no. 3 (2009): 719–45.
10. Ed J. Rinia et al., “Measuring Knowledge Transfer between

- Fields of Science,” *Scientometrics* 54, no. 3 (2002): 347–62.
11. Jonathan M. Levitt, Mike Thelwall, and Charles Oppenheim, “Variations Between Subjects in the Extent to Which the Social Sciences Have Become More Interdisciplinary,” *Journal of the American Society for Information Science & Technology* 62, no. 6 (2011): 1118–29.
  12. Peter van den Besselaar and Gaston Heimeriks, “Disciplinary, Multidisciplinary, Interdisciplinary—Concepts and Indicators,” in *8th International Conference on Scientometrics and Informetrics: Proceedings ISSI-2001, Sydney, 16–20 July 2001: An Internationally Peer Reviewed Conference*, ed. Mari Davis and Concepción S. Wilson, 705–15 (Sydney, Australia: Bibliometric & Informetric Research Group, 2001), 705.
  13. Leonard J. Ponzi, “The Intellectual Structure and Interdisciplinary Breadth of Knowledge Management: A Bibliometric Study of its Early Stage of Development,” *Scientometrics* 55, no. 3 (2002): 259–72.
  14. Julie Thompson Klein, *Crossing Boundaries: Knowledge, Disciplinarity, and Interdisciplinarity* (Charlottesville: University of Virginia Press, 1996).
  15. Willy Ostreng, *Science without Boundaries: Interdisciplinarity in Research, Society, and Politics* (Lanham, MD: University Press of America, 2010).
  16. Robert Frodeman, Julie Thompson Klein, and Carl Mitcham, eds., *The Oxford Handbook of Interdisciplinarity* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2010).
  17. Cynthia Dobson, Jeffrey D. Kushkowski, and Kristen H. Gerhard, “Collection Evaluation for Interdisciplinary Fields: A Comprehensive Approach,” *Journal of Academic Librarianship* 22, no. 4 (1996): 279–84.
  18. Robert Pahre, “Patterns of Knowledge Communities in the Social Sciences,” *Library Trends* 44, no. 2 (1996): 204–25; Marcia J. Bates, “Learning About the Information Seeking of Interdisciplinary Scholars and Students,” *Library Trends* 44, no. 2 (1996): 155–64; Carole L. Palmer, “Information Work at the Boundaries of Science: Linking Library Services to Research Practices,” *Library Trends* 44, no. 2 (1996): 165–91.
  19. Carole L. Palmer and Melissa H. Cragin, “Scholarship and Disciplinary Processes,” *Annual Review of Information Science & Technology* 42 (2009): 198.
  20. Steven W. Witt and Lynne M. Rudasill, eds., *Social Science Libraries: Interdisciplinary Collections, Services, Networks*, IFLA Publication Series no. 144 (New York: de Gruyter, 2010).
  21. AACSB International—The Association to Advance Collegiate Schools of Business, *Eligibility Procedures and Accreditation Standards for Business Accreditation* (adopted April 25, 2003; revised Jan. 31, 2012; revised Jan. 31, 2011), 3, accessed February 26, 2012, [www.aacsb.edu/accreditation/standards-2011-revisions-jan2011.pdf](http://www.aacsb.edu/accreditation/standards-2011-revisions-jan2011.pdf).
  22. *Ibid.*, 22.
  23. Durisin and Puzone, “Maturation of Corporate Governance Research.”
  24. Anne-Wil Harzing, “Journal Quality List,” 45th ed., Harzing.com, April 12, 2012, accessed May 23, 2012, [www.harzing.com/jql.htm](http://www.harzing.com/jql.htm).
  25. Anne-Wil Harzing, “Publish or Perish,” Harzing.com, accessed May 23, 2012, [www.harzing.com/pop.htm](http://www.harzing.com/pop.htm).
  26. European Union, Directorate-General for Research, *Assessing Europe’s University-Based Research*, EUR 24187 EN (Luxembourg: Publications Office of the European Union, 2010).
  27. Charles Harvey et al., eds., *ABS Academic Journal Quality Guide, Version 4* (London: The Association of Business Schools, 2010), accessed August 1, 2012, [www.associationof-businessschools.org/node/1000257](http://www.associationof-businessschools.org/node/1000257).
  28. Jean L. Heck, Peter A. Zaleski, and Scott J. Dressler, “Leading Institutional Contributors to the Elite Economic Journals,” *Applied Economics* 41, no. 17 (2009): 2191–96.
  29. Tim M. Lindquist and Gerald Smith, “*Journal of Management Accounting Research*: Content and Citation Analysis of the First 20 Years,” *Journal of Management & Accounting Research* 21, no. 1/2 (2009): 249–92.
  30. Frank G. A. De Bakker, Peter Groenewegen, and Frank Den Hond, “A Bibliometric Analysis of 30 Years of Research and Theory of Corporate Social Responsibility and Corporate Social Performance,” *Business & Society* 44, no. 3 (2005): 283–317.
  31. Ji Wu, Qian Hao, and Michelle Y. M. Yao, “Rankings of Academic Journals in Accounting, Finance, and Information System: Perception from the College Chairpersons,” *International Journal of Accounting & Information Management* 17, no. 6 (2009): 66–105.
  32. Claudia Harris, “Ranking the Management Journals,” *Journal of Scholarly Publishing* 39, no. 4 (2008): 373–409.
  33. Klaus Ritzberger, “A Ranking of Journals in Economics and Related Fields,” *German Economic Review* 9 no. 4 (2008): 407.
  34. Per O. Seglen, “Why the Impact Factor of Journals Should Not Be Used for Evaluating Research,” *British Medical Journal* 314, no. 7079 (1997): 498.
  35. Benjamin M. Althouse et al., “Differences in Impact Factor across Fields and over Time,” *Journal of the American Society for Information Science and Technology* 60, no. 1 (2009): 27–34; Juan M. Campanario, “Distribution of Changes in Impact Factors over Time,” *Scientometrics* 84, no. 1 (2010): 35–42.
  36. Bryan D. Neff and Julian D. Olden, “Not So Fast: Inflation in Impact Factors Contributes to Apparent Improvements in Journal Quality,” *Bioscience* 60, no. 6 (2010): 455–59.
  37. Adam Finch, “Can We Do Better Than Existing Author Citation Metrics?” *Bioessays* 32, no. 9 (2010): 744–47.
  38. Sergio D. Sala and Joanna Brooks, “Multi-Authors’ Self-Citation: A Further Impact Factor Bias?” *Cortex* 44, no. 9 (2008):

- 1139–45.
39. Nancy J. Adler and Anne-Wil Harzing, “When Knowledge Wins: Transcending the Sense and Nonsense of Academic Rankings,” *Academy of Management Learning & Education* 8, no. 1 (2009): 72–95.
  40. Gangaram Singh, Kamal M. Haddad, and Chee W. Chow, “Are Articles in ‘Top’ Management Journals Necessarily of Higher Quality?” *Journal of Management Inquiry* 16, no. 4 (2007): 319–31.
  41. Lutz Bornmann and Hans-Dieter Daniel, “What Do Citation Counts Measure? A Review of Studies on Citing Behavior,” *Journal of Documentation* 64, no. 1 (2008): 45–80.
  42. Thomas Lange, “The Imprecise Science of Evaluating Scholarly Performance: Utilizing Broad Quality Categories for an Assessment of Business and Management Journals,” *Evaluation Review* 30, no. 4 (2006): 505–32.
  43. Dennis Adams and Norman Johnson, “The Journal List and Its Use: Motivation, Perceptions, and Reality,” *European Journal of Information Systems* 17, no. 2 (2008): 158.
  44. Glenn V. Henderson, Gopala K. Ganesh, and P. R. Chandy, “Across-Discipline Journal Awareness and Evaluation: Implications for the Promotion and Tenure Process,” *Journal of Economics and Business* 42, no. 4 (1990): 325–51.
  45. Nicola De Bellis, *Bibliometrics and Citation Analysis: From the Science Citation Index to Cybermetrics* (Lanham, MD: Scarecrow, 2009); Ana Andrés, *Measuring Academic Research: How to Undertake a Bibliometric Study* (Oxford, UK: Chandos, 2009).
  46. Steven A. Morris and Betsy Van der Veer Martens, “Mapping Research Specialties,” *Annual Review of Information Science & Technology* 42 (2009): 213–95.
  47. Lindquist and Smith, “*Journal of Management Accounting Research: Content and Citation Analysis of the First 20 Years.*”
  48. De Baaker, Groenewegen, and Den Hond, “A Bibliometric Analysis of 30 Years of Research and Theory of Corporate Social Responsibility and Corporate Social Performance.”
  49. Michele Matherly and Rebecca T. Shortridge, “A Pragmatic Model to Estimate Journal Quality in Accounting,” *Journal of Accounting Education* 27, no. 1 (2009): 14–29.
  50. *Corporate Governance: An International Review*, accessed August 1, 2012, [www.blackwellpublishing.com/journal.asp?ref=0964-8410](http://www.blackwellpublishing.com/journal.asp?ref=0964-8410).
  51. Anne-Wil Harzing, “Publish or Perish.”
  52. P. L. K. Gross and E. M. Gross, “College Libraries and Chemical Education,” *Science* 66, issue 1713 (1927): 385–89.
  53. Jeffrey D. Kushkowsky, “Web Citation by Graduate Students: A Comparison of Print and Electronic Theses,” *portal: Libraries and the Academy* 5, no. 2 (2005): 259–76.
  54. Durisin and Puzone, “Maturation of Corporate Governance Research”; William Q. Judge, Thomas Weber, and Maureen I. Muller-Kahle, “What are the Correlates of Interdisciplinary Research Impact? The Case of Corporate Governance Research,” *Academy of Management Learning & Education* 11, no. 1 (2012): 82–98.
  55. Harzing, “Journal Quality List.”
  56. Singh, Haddad, and Chow, “Are Articles in ‘Top’ Management Journals Necessarily of Higher Quality?” 321.
  57. John Mingers, Kate Watson, and Maria Paola Scaparra, *Estimating Business and Management Journal Quality from the 2008 Research Assessment Exercise in the UK*, Working Paper no. 205 (Canterbury, Kent, UK: University of Kent Business School, 2009), accessed July 3, 2012, [kar.kent.ac.uk/25448/1/RAE\\_Papers\\_WP\\_Web.pdf](http://kar.kent.ac.uk/25448/1/RAE_Papers_WP_Web.pdf).
  58. Singh, Haddad, and Chow, “Are Articles in ‘Top’ Management Journals Necessarily of Higher Quality?” 319.

### Appendix: Corporate Governance Core Journals

Rank	Journal Name	ISSN	Total Citations	Subject	Highly Ranked
1	<i>Journal of Financial Economics</i>	0304-405X	740	ECO	Y
2	<i>Corporate Governance: An International Review</i>	0964-0701	656	CG	Y
3	<i>Journal of Finance</i>	0022-1082	469	FIN	Y
4	<i>Academy of Management Journal</i>	0001-4273	394	MAN	Y
5	<i>Strategic Management Journal</i>	0143-2095	368	MAN	Y
6	<i>Academy of Management Review</i>	0363-7425	297	MAN	Y
7	<i>Administrative Science Quarterly</i>	0001-8392	242	MAN	Y
8	<i>Journal of Accounting and Economics</i>	0165-4101	213	ACC	Y
9	<i>Journal of Political Economy</i>	0022-3808	210	ECO	Y
10	<i>Journal of Management</i>	0149-2063	169	MAN	Y
11	<i>Accounting Review</i>	0001-4826	146	ACC	Y
12	<i>Journal of Accounting Research</i>	0021-8456	138	ACC	Y
13	<i>Journal of Law and Economics</i>	0022-2186	136	ECO	Y
14	<i>Harvard Business Review</i>	0017-8012	125	MAN	Y

15	<i>American Economic Review</i>	0002-8282	121	ECO	Y
16	<i>Journal of Corporate Finance</i>	0929-1199	119	FIN	Y
17	<i>Journal of Management Studies</i>	0022-2380	103	MAN	Y
18	<i>Journal of Business Ethics</i>	0167-4544	91	MAN	Y
19	<i>Journal of Financial and Quantitative Analysis</i>	0022-1090	91	FIN	Y
20	<i>Journal of Banking and Finance</i>	0378-4266	85	FIN	Y
21	<i>Financial Management</i>	0046-3892	74	FIN	Y
22	<i>Quarterly Journal of Economics</i>	0033-5533	74	ECO	Y
23	<i>Accounting and Business Research</i>	0001-4788	73	ACC	
24	<i>Financial Times</i>	0307-1766	73	BNEWS	
25	<i>Long Range Planning</i>	0024-6301	63	MAN	
26	<i>Journal of Business Finance and Accounting</i>	0306-686X	61	FIN	Y
27	<i>Contemporary Accounting Research</i>	0823-9150	51	ACC	Y
28	<i>Economic Journal</i>	0013-0133	50	ECO	Y
29	<i>Academy of Management Executive</i>	0896-3789	47	MAN	
30	<i>American Sociological Review</i>	0003-1224	47	SOC	Y
31	<i>Organization Science</i>	1047-7039	46	MAN	Y
32	<i>Accounting Horizons</i>	0888-7993	45	ACC	
33	<i>British Journal of Management</i>	1045-3172	44	MAN	
34	<i>American Journal of Sociology</i>	0002-9602	43	SOC	Y
35	<i>Business Lawyer</i>	0007-6899	43	MAN	
36	<i>Journal of Business</i>	0021-9436	41	MAN	
37	<i>Wall Street Journal</i>	0099-9660	41	BNEWS	
38	<i>Human Relations</i>	0018-7267	39	MAN	Y
39	<i>Journal of Accounting and Public Policy</i>	0278-4254	39	ACC	
40	<i>Organization Studies</i>	0170-8406	39	MAN	Y
41	<i>Journal of Law, Economics, and Organization</i>	8756-6222	37	ECO	Y
42	<i>Journal of General Management</i>	0306-3070	36	MAN	
43	<i>Auditing: A Journal of Practice and Theory</i>	0278-0380	35	ACC	
44	<i>Business Week</i>	0007-7135	34	BNEWS	
45	<i>Journal of International Business Studies</i>	0047-2506	34	MAN	Y
46	<i>European Economic Review</i>	0014-2921	32	ECO	Y
47	<i>Directors and Boards</i>	0364-9156	31	CG	
48	<i>Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice</i>	1042-2587	30	MAN	
49	<i>British Accounting Review</i>	0890-8389	28	ACC	
50	<i>Review of Financial Studies</i>	0893-9454	28	FIN	Y
51	<i>Economist</i>	0013-0613	27	BNEWS	
52	<i>Journal of Applied Corporate Finance</i>	1079-1196	27	FIN	
53	<i>Journal of Economic Literature</i>	0022-0515	27	ECO	Y
54	<i>Managerial and Decision Economics</i>	0143-6570	27	ECO	
55	<i>Bell Journal of Economics</i>	0361-915X	26	ECO	
56	<i>Family Business Review</i>	1894-4865	26	MAN	
57	<i>Journal of Management and Governance</i>	1385-3457	26	MAN	
58	<i>Management Science</i>	0025-1909	26	MAN	Y
59	<i>Journal of Economic Perspectives</i>	0895-3309	25	ECO	Y
60	<i>California Management Review</i>	0008-1256	24	MAN	Y
61	<i>Econometrica</i>	0012-9682	24	ECO	Y
62	<i>Journal of Business Venturing</i>	0883-9026	24	FIN	Y
63	<i>Corporate Board</i>	0746-8652	23	CG	
64	<i>Accounting Auditing and Accountability Journal</i>	0951-3574	21	ACC	Y
65	<i>Accounting Organization and Society</i>	0361-3682	21	ACC	Y
66	<i>Columbia Law Review</i>	0010-1958	21	LAW	
67	<i>RAND Journal of Economics</i>	0741-6261	21	ECO	Y
68	<i>European Financial Management</i>	1354-7798	19	FIN	Y
69	<i>Ivey Business Journal/ Quarterly</i>	1481-8248	19	MAN	
70	<i>Yale Law Journal</i>	0044-0094	19	LAW	
71	<i>Accountancy</i>	0001-4664	18	ACC	

72	<i>Annual Review of Sociology</i>	0360-0572	18	SOC	
73	<i>Australian Journal of Management</i>	0312-8962	18	MAN	
74	<i>European Management Journal</i>	0263-2373	18	MAN	
75	<i>International Journal of Accounting</i>	0020-7063	18	ACC	Y
76	<i>New York Times Magazine</i>	0028-7822	18	NEWS	
77	<i>Pacific Basin Finance Journal</i>	0927-538X	18	FIN	
78	<i>Review of Economic Studies</i>	0034-6527	18	ECO	Y
79	<i>Accounting and Finance</i>	0810-5391	16	ACC	
80	<i>Mckinsey Quarterly</i>	0047-5394	16	MAN	
81	<i>Stanford Law Review</i>	0038-9765	16	LAW	
82	<i>Abacus</i>	0001-3072	15	ACC	Y
83	<i>Journal of Applied Psychology</i>	0021-9010	15	PSY	Y
84	<i>Journal of Business Research</i>	0148-2963	15	MAN	Y
85	<i>Journal of Business Strategy</i>	0275-6668	15	MAN	
86	<i>Journal of Corporation Law</i>	0360-795X	15	LAW	
87	<i>European Accounting Review</i>	0963-8180	14	ACC	Y
88	<i>Fortune</i>	0015-8259	14	BNEWS	
89	<i>Journal of Accounting Literature</i>	0737-4607	14	ACC	
90	<i>British Journal of Industrial Relations</i>	0007-1080	13	MAN	Y
91	<i>Company and Securities Law Journal</i>	0729-2775	13	LAW	
92	<i>Economic Policy</i>	0266-4568	13	ECO	
93	<i>International Journal of Industrial Organization</i>	0167-7187	13	MAN	Y
94	<i>Journal of Comparative Economics</i>	0147-5967	13	ECO	
95	<i>Journal of Managerial Issues</i>	1045-3695	13	MAN	
96	<i>Sloan Management Review</i>	1532-9194	13	MAN	Y
97	<i>Sunday Times (London)</i>	0956-1382	13	NEWS	
98	<i>Michigan Law Review</i>	0026-2234	12	LAW	
99	<i>Australian Accounting Review</i>	1035-6908	11	ACC	
100	<i>Business Horizons</i>	0007-6813	11	MAN	
101	<i>Directorship</i>	0193-4279	11	CG	
102	<i>Industrial and Labor Relations Review</i>	0019-7939	11	ECO	Y
103	<i>Journal of Economic Behavior &amp; Organization</i>	0167-2681	11	ECO	Y
104	<i>Journal of International Financial Management and Accounting</i>	0954-1314	11	FIN	
105	<i>Oxford Review of Economic Policy</i>	2666-903X	11	ECO	
106	<i>World Development</i>	0305-750X	11	ECO	Y
107	<i>Entrepreneurship &amp; Regional Development</i>	0898-5626	10	MAN	
108	<i>Journal of Financial Research</i>	0270-2592	10	FIN	
109	<i>Journal of Industrial Economics</i>	0022-1821	10	ECO	
110	<i>Managerial Auditing Journal</i>	0268-6902	10	ACC	
111	<i>Managerial Finance</i>	0307-4358	10	FIN	
112	<i>Review of Financial Economics</i>	1058-3300	10	ECO	
113	<i>Asia Pacific Journal of Management</i>	0217-4561	9	MAN	
114	<i>Australian Financial Review</i>	0404-2018	9	FIN	
115	<i>Business and Society</i>	0007-6503	9	MAN	
116	<i>Corporate Ownership and Control</i>	1810-3057	9	CG	
117	<i>Harvard Law Review</i>	0017-811X	9	LAW	
118	<i>Human Resource Management</i>	0090-4848	8	MAN	Y
119	<i>Research in Organizational Behavior</i>	0191-3085	8	MAN	
120	<i>Across the Board</i>	1047-1554	7	CG	
121	<i>European Journal of Finance</i>	1351-847X	7	FIN	
122	<i>Forbes</i>	0015-6914	7	FIN	
123	<i>Georgetown Law Journal</i>	0016-8092	7	LAW	
124	<i>Management International Review</i>	0938-8249	7	MAN	Y
125	<i>Scandinavian Journal of Management</i>	0956-5221	7	FIN	
126	<i>Applied Financial Economics</i>	0960-3107	6	ECO	
127	<i>Compensation and Benefits Review</i>	0886-3687	6	MAN	
128	<i>Economica</i>	0013-0427	6	ECO	Y

129	<i>George Washington Law Review</i>	0016-8076	6	LAW	
130	<i>Globe &amp; Mail (Toronto)</i>	0319-0714	6	NEWS	
131	<i>International Journal of Management</i>	0813-0183	6	MAN	
132	<i>Journal of Change Management</i>	1469-7017	6	MAN	
133	<i>Journal of Law and Society</i>	0263-323X	6	LAW	
134	<i>Journal of Monetary Economics</i>	0304-3932	5	ECO	Y
135	<i>Journal of Organizational Behavior</i>	0894-3796	5	MAN	Y
136	<i>Journal of Personality and Social Psychology</i>	0022-3514	5	PSY	Y
137	<i>Sociology</i>	0038-0385	5	SOC	Y

Note: Items that have the same number of citations are listed alphabetically.