



This is a repository copy of *Power, powerlessness, and journal ranking lists: The marginalization of fields of practice*.

White Rose Research Online URL for this paper:
<https://eprints.whiterose.ac.uk/160273/>

Version: Accepted Version

Article:

Anderson, V., Elliott, C. orcid.org/0000-0003-3838-4452 and Callahan, J. (2021) Power, powerlessness, and journal ranking lists: The marginalization of fields of practice. *Academy of Management Learning & Education*, 20 (1). pp. 89-107. ISSN 1537-260X

<https://doi.org/10.5465/amle.2019.0037>

© 2020 Academy of Management Learning & Education. This is an author-produced version of a paper subsequently published in *Academy of Management Learning & Education*. Uploaded in accordance with the publisher's self-archiving policy.

Reuse

Items deposited in White Rose Research Online are protected by copyright, with all rights reserved unless indicated otherwise. They may be downloaded and/or printed for private study, or other acts as permitted by national copyright laws. The publisher or other rights holders may allow further reproduction and re-use of the full text version. This is indicated by the licence information on the White Rose Research Online record for the item.

Takedown

If you consider content in White Rose Research Online to be in breach of UK law, please notify us by emailing eprints@whiterose.ac.uk including the URL of the record and the reason for the withdrawal request.



eprints@whiterose.ac.uk
<https://eprints.whiterose.ac.uk/>



Learning &
Education

Power, powerlessness, and journal ranking lists: The marginalization of fields of practice

Journal:	<i>Academy of Management Learning & Education</i>
Manuscript ID	AMLE-2019-0037-ESS.R3
Manuscript Type:	Essays
Submission Keywords:	Management education, Management learning, Publishing
Abstract:	<p>This essay contributes a new perspective to debates about journal ranking lists and their effects on the practice of scholarship. Our argument is grounded in practice theory and draws on Bourdieu's concept of field. We examine the effect of metrics, targets and rankings on Human Resource Development (HRD), a conjunctive field associated with the Management Learning and Education (MLE) field. We examine the ways in which the boundaries of the MLE field are shaped by journal ranking lists and how, irrespective of seniority in the field, scholars simultaneously experience both power and powerlessness as a result of journal ranking processes. We contribute a new perspective on issues of academic practice with consequences for specialized areas of scholarship. We conclude by proposing practical interventions that senior scholars and journal editors can undertake to challenge the undesirable effects of ranking systems and encourage scholarly diversity.</p>

SCHOLARONE™
Manuscripts

1
2
3 **Power, powerlessness, and journal ranking lists: The marginalization of fields of**
4
5 **practice**
6
7
8
9

10 Valerie Anderson¹,
11 University of Portsmouth,
12 Faculty of Business and Law,
13 Richmond Building, Portland Street,
14 Portsmouth, PO1 3DE, UK
15 Valerie.anderson@port.ac.uk
16
17 +44(0)23 9284 4029
18
19

20
21 Carole Elliott,
22 Roehampton University Business School
23 132 Queen's Building, Southlands
24 Roehampton,
25 London, SW15 5PJ, UK
26 carole.elliott@roehampton.ac.uk
27
28 +44(0)20 8392 3384
29
30
31

32
33
34
35 Jamie L. Callahan,
36 Newcastle Business School
37 Northumbria University, City Campus East
38 Newcastle upon Tyne, NE1 8ST, UK
39 Jamie.callahan@northumbria.ac.uk
40
41 +44(0)191 227 3350
42
43
44

45
46 **Author note:** All named authors contributed equally to a collaborative and collective
47 authorship process for this manuscript.
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57

58
59
60 ¹ Corresponding author

1
2
3 **POWER, POWERLESSNESS, AND JOURNAL RANKING LISTS: THE**
4
5 **MARGINALIZATION OF FIELDS OF PRACTICE**
6
7
8
9

10 **ABSTRACT**
11

12 This essay contributes a new perspective to debates about journal ranking lists and
13 their effects on the practice of scholarship. Our argument is grounded in practice theory and
14 draws on Bourdieu's concept of field. We examine the effect of metrics, targets and rankings
15 on Human Resource Development (HRD), a conjunctive field associated with the
16 Management Learning and Education (MLE) field. We examine the ways in which the
17 boundaries of the MLE field are shaped by journal ranking lists and how, irrespective of
18 seniority in the field, scholars simultaneously experience both power and powerlessness as a
19 result of journal ranking processes. We contribute a new perspective on issues of academic
20 practice with consequences for specialized areas of scholarship. We conclude by proposing
21 practical interventions that senior scholars and journal editors can undertake to challenge the
22 undesirable effects of ranking systems and encourage scholarly diversity.
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36

37 Key words: Human Resource Development; Management Learning and Education; social
38 practice, journal rankings.
39
40
41
42
43
44

45 **INTRODUCTION**
46

47 Management Learning and Education (MLE) is an important interdisciplinary field
48 with roots in the sharing of pedagogical activities that facilitate the transfer of knowledge
49 from educators to students (Gallos, 2008). MLE's growth from the "poor stepchild" (Gallos,
50 2008: 539) of the academy has been shaped by developments in management knowledge,
51 technological changes, and a recognition of the importance of effective management
52 education (Lewicki, 2002). These shifts have led to an increase in publication outlets for
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 MLE scholars and recognition of MLE as a legitimate research field (Currie & Pandher,
4
5 2013).

6
7
8 One mechanism used as a proxy for legitimation of a field is where publication outlets
9
10 for the field lie within a journal ranking list. Journal ranking lists are ubiquitous and our essay
11
12 examines their effect on the MLE field. We contribute to debates about the utility and
13
14 efficacy of journal ranking lists in three ways. First, using a Bourdieusian conceptualization
15
16 (Bourdieu, 1989; 1990), we examine the effect of journal ranking lists on the MLE field.
17
18 Second, using our own field of Human Resource Development (HRD) as an exemplar, we
19
20 identify how ranking lists act as a 'cloak of invisibility' for scholarship in applied disciplines.
21
22
23 Third, in relation to the scholarship of management more widely, we contribute a new
24
25 perspective about the effect of ranking lists which we conceptualize as a 'condition for
26
27 change' in the MLE and HRD fields of scholarship
28
29

30
31 Our essay is constructed as follows. First, we delineate the field of HRD as a field
32
33 related to MLE (both being situated within a broader field of scholarship), identifying shared,
34
35 as well as distinctive, features of their roots and their contribution to the social sciences. We
36
37 then establish the context and scholarly basis for the specific questions we address. Drawing
38
39 on the theorization of Bourdieu (1989; 1990), we argue that academics work in fields of
40
41 practice, some of which are characterized by struggles for legitimacy in relation to each other
42
43 (for example, the relationship between the sub-fields of HRD and MLE). We then examine
44
45 the effects of journal ranking lists on academic practice in general and on scholarship in our
46
47 focal sub-field of HRD in particular. We further consider the implications of our analysis for
48
49 HRD and MLE researchers, journal editors and publishers, and those in positions of
50
51 leadership in the field.
52
53

54
55 In submitting our work to this highly regarded journal, we are conscious that we are complicit
56
57 in the process about which we direct our critique. However, in speaking to those who hold
58
59
60

1
2
3 power and are powerful (AMLE editors and the Academy of Management) we seek to give
4
5 voice to those with less power. Our essay is grounded in a commitment to raise recognition of
6
7 power relations that limit individual agency (Ross, Nichol, Elliott, Sambrook & Stewart,
8
9 2019). We aim to reveal plurality of interests for scholars and practitioners, to raise
10
11 awareness amongst the powerful of who benefits and loses from publishing practices. We
12
13 argue that in the HRD and MLE fields, good quality research generates evidence and
14
15 theorization that is robust, ethical, stands up to scrutiny and is relevant, and informed by,
16
17 developments in applied practice-orientated situations. Therefore, we conclude with a call to
18
19 action for academic practitioners to initiate new practices to challenge the limiting effect of
20
21 journal ranking lists and which encourage intellectual pluralism, curiosity and flexibility with
22
23 impact on both theory and practice in the MLE and HRD fields.
24
25
26
27
28
29

30 31 **HRD AND MLE**

32
33 In spite of definitional debates concerned to establish boundaries and relationships
34
35 between professional and disciplinary areas, the relationship between HRD and MLE remains
36
37 unclear. HRD has been characterised as “a field in search of itself” (Chalofsky, 1992), a
38
39 search that is illustrated through numerous scholarly exchanges in the late 1990s and early
40
41 2000s aimed at defining HRD as a professional area of activity (Ruona, 2016). We contend
42
43 that HRD represents an applied domain that is related to, and conjunctive with, the field of
44
45 MLE scholarship and practice. HRD scholarship and practice is focused on three principal
46
47 constructs: people, learning, and organizations (Sambrook & Willmott, 2014). It is enacted
48
49 through practices that include learning, training and development; adult and vocational
50
51 education; management learning and organizational development (Hamlin & Stewart, 2011).
52
53 In part, the lack of attention to the relationship between HRD and MLE may be explained by
54
55 the focus of HRD scholars in the United Kingdom on the relationship between HRM and
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 HRD and its relevance for organizational performance (Woodall, 2003). In the United
4
5 Kingdom and Europe, HRD is largely taught and researched in Business Schools; in North
6
7 America, by contrast, it is predominantly taught and researched in departments of adult and
8
9 continuing education (Kuchinke, 2002).
10

11
12 Regardless of these different contexts, HRD, like MLE, is concerned with
13
14 management level learning, development, and education. Both fields share many other
15
16 characteristics. First, HRD and MLE scholars acknowledge their continuing interdisciplinary
17
18 foundations and their contribution to theory and practice in a range of organizational contexts
19
20 (McGuire, 2014; Lewicki, 2013; Chalofsky, 2007; Mintzberg & Gosling, 2002). Second, both
21
22 fields share a historical foundation from, and concern for, the application of scholarship in
23
24 organizational contexts. For example, the journal *Management Learning*, which has been
25
26 described as a “nascent publication for a trade association focussing on applied research”
27
28 (James & Denyer, 2009: 363), was known as *Management Education and Development* from
29
30 1970-1995. In 1995, however, scholars made a deliberate shift towards developing an
31
32 international academic journal and links with the U.K.-based Association for Management
33
34 Education and Development were broken (Vince & Elkjaer, 2009). A consequence of this
35
36 shift was the relative decline in practice-led, collaborative research, and encouragement of
37
38 theoretically and critically driven scholarship in the MLE field in the U.K. (James & Denyer,
39
40 2009). Similarly, *AMLE*'s principal tie is to the Academy of Management. Its mission, since
41
42 it was established in 2002, is to publish “high-quality scholarship” and its intended audience
43
44 is “scholars, educators, program directors, and deans at academic institutions, as well as
45
46 practitioners in training, development and corporate education” (Lewicki, 2002: 8).
47
48
49
50
51
52

53
54 With a similar historical context to that of the MLE field, the origins of the HRD field
55
56 lie in adult and vocational training and education and the continuing professional
57
58 development of practitioners of training, learning and development. In the U.K., the concern
59
60

1
2
3 for continuing professional development of HRD practitioners led to the formation of a
4
5 European scholarly body for HRD (The University Forum for HRD). In the United States, the
6
7 Academy of Human Resource Development (AHRD) developed from the practitioner body
8
9 now known as the Association for Talent Development.
10
11

12 As a specialist field, HRD has been described as holding a “paradoxical position of
13
14 primacy and subordination in relation to management education” (Sambrook & Willmott,
15
16 2014: 50). Both fields share a focus on matters of education and learning in organizational
17
18 settings but experience different levels of recognition within the wider scholarly field. For
19
20 example, the work published in this journal by Currie and Pandher (2013) proposed a ranking
21
22 of 84 journals in the MLE field but omitted HRD journals. As scholars whose practice
23
24 identifies with the field of HRD we regard this as evidence of “hierarchical power
25
26 differentials between MLE and HRD” (Sambrook & Willmott, 2014: 51). We contend that
27
28 our field can, and does, offer a unique contribution to knowledge which is equally relevant to
29
30 that of the MLE field. We further argue that the lack of interaction between MLE and HRD
31
32 sub-fields limits knowledge generation about learning, development and education to the
33
34 disadvantage of scholars in both. For example, HRD scholars examine inequalities of
35
36 learning experiences and opportunities at work in relation to gender, race and professional
37
38 (management) identity. These are also issues pertinent to MLE. In addition, HRD scholarship
39
40 provides a fertile ‘space’ from which critical voices can raise questions and problems that
41
42 reflect the experience and context of those who operate at levels of organizational hierarchies
43
44 that remain under-represented in knowledge generated about executive-level learning and
45
46 education.
47
48
49
50
51
52
53

54 Our positional point of identity is as scholars within the field of HRD, who have also
55
56 served as editors-in-chief of three different HRD journals. Our starting point is the omission
57
58 of HRD journals from the MLE rankings compiled by Currie and Pandher (2013). Our
59
60

1
2
3 motivation is to examine the contribution of HRD as conjunctive to the MLE field of
4
5 scholarship. Field theory examines relations at the meso level between actors who consider
6
7 each other in relation to “the shared stakes of a field” (Krause, 2016, p. 5). It affords us the
8
9 opportunity to enquire about the symbolic role that capital from other contexts, for example
10
11 the fields of international publishing and bibliometrics, plays in shaping relations within
12
13 fields. We aim to explain why, and how, journal ranking processes marginalize, or render
14
15 almost invisible, other related fields such as HRD.
16
17

18
19 The logics of rankings, and their consequences for academic practice in general, are
20
21 widely debated in the literature. However, our position as HRD scholars with a background in
22
23 journal editorship leads us to question whether the issues for specialized fields are
24
25 sufficiently understood. Our concern here is to critically examine the effect of journal ranking
26
27 lists on the activity ‘in practice’ of scholars in the specialist fields of HRD and MLE.
28
29 However, we contend that the issues we address are likely to be pertinent to other specialist
30
31 or applied fields. Therefore, although our concern is with the HRD field, we argue that our
32
33 field may not be the only one affected in this way by journal ranking lists.
34
35
36
37
38
39

40 **THEORETICAL CONTEXT: ACADEMIC PRACTICE**

41
42 In this section of our essay we discuss the Bourdieusian theoretical grounding of our
43
44 approach (Bourdieu, 1989; 1990). We argue that academics work in fields of scholarly
45
46 practice, some of which may be nested in or (as in the case of HRD associated with MLE)
47
48 conjunctive to others, that are informed by field-specific norms which influence behavior in
49
50 complex ways. These nested or conjunctive fields are ‘niche’ within the social science
51
52 disciplines; as such, they are deemed sub-fields because of their specialist focus. Discussing
53
54 the context of academic practice as a form of professional work and labor enables us to
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 contribute a novel and provocative insight into the effects of journal ranking lists on the
4
5 specialized sub-field of HRD and on the related sub-field of MLE.
6

7
8 Although a practice perspective features as a part of many theoretical traditions (see,
9
10 for example, Foucault, 1977; Giddens, 1984; 1991), we draw principally on Bourdieu's
11
12 theory of practice (1989, 1990) particularly his interpretations of the mobilization of
13
14 symbolic violence in the Academy (1988), that is how individuals misrecognise and impose
15
16 arbitrary power relations. This work provides a basis for understanding both the agency of
17
18 (academic) actors and the workings of the systemic context in which scholarly work occurs.
19
20 We use Bourdieu's socio-analytical tools to examine the invisible structures within which the
21
22 MLE and HRD fields operate to locate and examine journal ranking lists as a form of 'hidden
23
24 determinism' (Wacquant 1990, p. 687) through which symbolic capital is unequally
25
26 distributed. In our focus on journal ranking lists as a symbolic system of classification we
27
28 consider their reproductive and reinforcing effect on power relations within the Academy as a
29
30 whole and within the fields of HRD and MLE specifically. On the basis of our Bourdieusian
31
32 framing we also identify lines of tension engendered by journal ranking lists as features of
33
34 symbolic power relations and identify conditions for change in our field of scholarship that
35
36 might be exploited to impact positively on both HRD and MLE theorization and practice.
37
38
39
40
41

42 Bourdieu's (1988) concept of 'field of practice' is particularly appropriate to analyze
43
44 the work of scholarship that takes place in universities, and the role of institutionalized
45
46 cultural and symbolic capitals in the unfolding of social stratification between academic
47
48 fields. As a field, 'the academy' is well-bounded—encompassing the practice of university
49
50 management, leadership and administration (whose incumbents also frequently self-identify
51
52 as scholars), as well as those who practice as journal editors, researchers, teachers and
53
54 students. All those within the scholarly field of practice have experienced similar, but subtly
55
56 different, socialization processes. We contend that this process, generally referred to as
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 academic formation, reproduces structures of dominance through the relational distribution of
4
5 power between academic fields (Bourdieu, 1988; Wacquant, 1990).
6

7
8 Bourdieu defines a field as an arena where activity is carried out according to
9
10 accepted norms and rules, and where the activities are different to those carried out in sub-
11
12 fields or in an alternative 'adjacent' space (Joy, Game & Toshniwal, 2018). Fields of practice
13
14 (and their component sub-fields) have their own implicit and explicit rules which may
15
16 reinforce or contradict each other. These norms affect individual agency and practice in
17
18 complex ways, and are important for interactional and power relations. Fields are relatively
19
20 autonomous, but Bourdieu's conceptualization of 'field' indicates some members will accrue
21
22 relative advantage from the 'rules of the game' as they contest for specific types of symbolic
23
24 capital (Krause, 2016). Therefore, interactions, transactions and events that occur within
25
26 fields have consequences for different interest groups, and Bourdieu suggests "a certain
27
28 pattern of symbolic differentiation among positions in the field" (Krause, 2016, p. 6).
29
30
31
32

33
34 Cooperative practice amongst interest groups within fields is maintained through
35
36 implicit 'codes of civility' (Callahan, 2011). In academic fields, these codes of civility have
37
38 an important effect on the outlook, assumptions and practices of individuals. They underpin
39
40 specific and distinctive ways of thinking, feeling and acting. Bourdieu's conceptualization
41
42 further suggests that these field-specific dispositions and behaviors reinforce hierarchies and
43
44 maintain the interests of some 'players' in the field at the expense of others. For example, the
45
46 set of objective relations that exist between different disciplines in the field of the university
47
48 is a center of struggle between disciplines in the distribution of symbolic capital resources.
49

50
51 Analyzing the relational distribution of professors in France according to their social
52
53 origins and access to forms of social, cultural and symbolic capital, for example, allows
54
55 Bourdieu to identify how the structure of the dominant group is reproduced. Building on this
56
57 logic, business schools may be understood as having achieved a "temporal dominance"
58
59
60

1
2
3 (Wacquant, 1990. p. 280) with a power-base grounded in academic capital. The power of
4
5 “culturally autonomous” (ibid) disciplines, such as the natural sciences, by contrast, is based
6
7 on intellectual capital. The position between these two poles of power mirrors that between
8
9 the two principal elements of dominant social groups and stakeholders. On the one side sit
10
11 stakeholder representatives of economic and political capital, such as business executives and
12
13 government officials, on the other side sit those who derive power from their symbolic and
14
15 cultural capital including intellectuals and artists. Located at the midway point between these
16
17 two extremes are social science and humanities disciplines, who are “internally organized
18
19 around the clash between socio-political and scientific authority” (Wacquant, 1990, p. 680).
20
21
22
23

24 Bourdieu’s associated concept of habitus (1989) is also relevant to analysis of the
25
26 scholarly field of practice. Habitus explains how implicit assumptions, engendered through
27
28 educational and professional background, are acquired and sustained through imitation and
29
30 role-modelling. In the scholarly field of practice, as we have argued already, academic
31
32 formation (through socialization and role-modelling) explains the resilience of ‘rules’ and
33
34 networks of relationships, status distinctions and hierarchies that legitimize and sustain
35
36 inequalities of gender, race and class (Özbilgin, 2009).
37
38
39

40 Thus, drawing on Bourdieu’s conceptualization of ‘fields of practice’ we consider
41
42 academic practice itself as occurring within a ‘social space’ with its own social structures and
43
44 actor positions. We contend that within the scholarly field of practice taken as a whole, both
45
46 HRD and MLE are related, or conjunctive, sub-fields of research and study. Both draw on
47
48 theories and methodologies from a variety of mostly social science-related disciplines,
49
50 principally sociology, education, economics, and psychology within the scholarly field of
51
52 practice associated with learning and organizations taken as a whole. We do not refer to
53
54 either HRD or to MLE as an academic discipline per se but note that both areas of
55
56 scholarship and study are interdisciplinary, applied and problem-related. Consequently, we
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 claim that HRD is a sub-field or area of scholarship that is related to the MLE sub-field. The
4
5 distinction we draw, of access to capital based on relative positional power, plays a role in
6
7 our analysis of MLE and HRD. The dual location of the HRD sub-field between the
8
9 temporally dominant capital of business schools in the U.K. and the different capital
10
11 resources of education schools in the U.S. dilutes its status. On the other hand, the MLE sub-
12
13 field has a more consistent connection to business schools and their temporal dominance
14
15 afforded by their association with economic capital enabling consolidation of symbolic
16
17 capital. As a result, HRD carries less power than MLE within the field of scholarship
18
19 concerned with learning and development in organizational contexts.
20
21
22

23 24 **THE UBIQUITOUS INFLUENCE OF JOURNAL RANKING LISTS**

25
26 In this section, we examine the pervasive influence of journal ranking lists on shared
27
28 understandings, academic rules, languages and procedures that comprise the work of
29
30 researchers, journal editors, educators, managers and academic administrators in our field of
31
32 practice. Whilst this discussion applies to the field of scholarship as a whole, we illustrate the
33
34 issues in relation to the MLE and HRD fields. The core of our analysis is that journal ranking
35
36 lists form an important influence on the habits, tacit knowledge and ways of getting things
37
38 done in the academic field of practice. As journal ranking list systems privilege ‘where and
39
40 when’ work is published (Pettigrew, 2011) over the cultural value of knowledge generation
41
42 so the ‘currency’ of scholarship is redefined. Our Bourdieusian framing suggests that, as
43
44 journal ranking lists have become ubiquitous, so journal articles are better understood as
45
46 generating symbolic rather than cultural capital. The four-part analysis we present addresses
47
48 consequences of this shift for the practice of scholars.
49
50
51
52

53
54 First, we examine the power of journal ranking lists on the academic labor process
55
56 and the legitimacy it accords to implicit scholarly *norms of practice* as they occur in North
57
58 America and Europe. Second, we consider the influence of journal ranking lists on the *work*
59
60

1
2
3 *of academic administrators* in the higher education (HE) sector and the consequences for
4
5 scholar's performance expectations. Relating this analysis to the HRD and MLE fields, we
6
7 illustrate this discussion with examples from the promotion criteria of 15 HE institutions
8
9 located in North America and the United Kingdom. Third, we address the voluntary
10
11 *academic work for journal production* that facilitates an apparatus which (implicitly)
12
13 magnifies powerlessness and works to the disadvantage of scholarly practice situated in the
14
15 Global South. Finally, we assess the effect of journal ranking lists on the shape and priorities
16
17 of the HRD and MLE fields that influence *organizational application* of research.
18
19
20

21
22 The argument that integrates these four areas of discussion is that the ubiquity of
23
24 journal ranking lists leads to simultaneous power and powerlessness for scholars at all levels
25
26 of the hierarchy within the academic field of practice. For example, although AMLE is
27
28 ranked highly in journal ranking lists, we argue that the shape and priorities of the field, as
29
30 reflected in journal submissions and publications, reflect a 'skewing' of the MLE field. This
31
32 skewing is encouraged by the ubiquity of ranking list requirements and further renders
33
34 specialist 'applied' fields such as HRD almost invisible within the wider academic field of
35
36 practice, as evidenced by the exclusion of HRD journals from Currie and Pandher's (2013)
37
38 list.
39
40
41

42
43 In our critique of the effect of journal ranking lists, we acknowledge, but do not
44
45 accept, arguments that they represent a consensus in relation to journal quality. We further
46
47 acknowledge advocates' arguments that such lists provide a perceived objective way by
48
49 which scholars can select appropriate channels in which to publish their work (Chartered
50
51 Association of Business Schools, 2018). We also note that their use is regarded as a
52
53 justification of a basis from which scholars can be judged and rewarded (Lowry, Humphreys,
54
55 Malwitz, & Nix, 2007). However, although ranking lists have become a proxy for legitimacy
56
57 within the academic field of practice, we reject the claim that 'ranking' is an effective proxy
58
59
60

1
2
3 for quality. We align our view with critiques that journal ranking lists rely on a reductionist
4 and calculative paradigm that substitutes frequency of citation and placement in specific
5 journals for quality of thought or scholarly contribution. We further agree with critics who
6 identify that the dominance of selective databases on which journal ranking lists are based
7 may favor well-established North American journals but under-represent the quality of
8 journals in more specialist or emergent and innovative areas, including the HRD and MLE
9 fields (Currie & Pandher, 2013).
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18

19 **Norms of Practice**

20
21 Journal ranking lists encourage a language of research productivity and
22 instrumentality dominated by “where and when” work is published, rather than what has been
23 published (Pettigrew, 2011). Increasingly, academic performance assessments value success
24 rates in top-ranked journal publications over all other areas of socially useful or critical
25 practice or knowledge generation. As a consequence, journal ranking lists dominate
26 promotion and tenure decisions which may justify enduring status, hierarchical, employment
27 and career inequalities. For example, members of the tenured professoriate, and those who
28 are labelled as ‘research active or research excellent’, are expected to undertake progressively
29 more and more research-related activities, sometimes to the exclusion of local service and
30 teaching responsibilities. Those labelled as ‘not research excellent’ are often subject to
31 contingent and casual employment conditions and their focus and rewards are geared towards
32 teaching increasing numbers of students and to the wider income generation and commercial
33 functions of the institution (Leišytė, 2016; Ellis, McNicholl, Blake, & McNally, 2014;
34 Marginson, 2008).
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52

53 Those who aspire to employment in traditional academic (tenured) roles must submit
54 to an instrumental form of scholarship measured by ‘outputs’ published in high ranking
55 journals (Callahan, 2017). However, success in achieving publication in top ranked journals
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 requires new methods of practice. Evidence of increasing reliance on multi-authorship to
4
5 achieve publication in top-ranked journals (Kuld & O'Hagan, 2018) has led to contestation
6
7 over the author list order with the "first author" as a coveted position associated with status
8
9 or importance that may not accurately reflect the contribution to the paper of other members
10
11 of the authoring group. Critics also suggest that journal co-authorship might involve work
12
13 that resembles a highly organized and networked production process that increasingly relies
14
15 on principles of the division of labor (Ellis et al, 2014; Marginson, 2008). This is also
16
17 associated with the pressure for new academics to specialize in narrowly defined areas.
18
19 Critics suggest that the publication imperative leads new scholars to focus their attention on
20
21 finding an already well-published co-author with whom to write rather than on 'seeding' and
22
23 nurturing their own specific scholarly research topic (Kallio, Kallio, Tienari, & Hyyonen,
24
25 2016).

26
27 In short, journal ranking lists have an important influence on the 'norms of practice' of the
28
29 field. They affect the values, assumptions and management of day-to-day social practice
30
31 performed as academic work as well as judgements about performativity in the HE field².
32
33 Our concern is that this legitimization of the demands associated with publishing work in top-
34
35 ranked journals stifles empowerment, creativity and collegiality.
36
37

38
39 The prioritization of this understanding of scholarly practice, in turn, may be
40
41 associated with increasing patterns of chronically stressed academics (Dean & Forray, 2018).
42
43

44 45 **Work of Academic Administrators**

46
47 The second consequence of journal ranking lists relates to the work of heads of
48
49 academic departments and senior university managers and administrators. Most of those
50
51 whose practice involves university management, leadership and administration commenced
52
53

54
55
56
57
58
59 ² We use the term 'performance' to denote specific actions and measures. We use the term 'performativity' to
60 refer to notions of a systemic or ideological shift away from human values toward efficiency, performance, and money, following Lyotard (1984) as cited in Bierema and Callahan (2014).

1
2
3 their career as academics, and self-identify as academic practitioners. For university
4
5 managers, the ubiquity of ranking lists is manifested in the increasing requirement to
6
7 legitimize differentiation between institutions to achieve competitive advantage in the global
8
9 HE market. University administrators and managers find themselves in an ambiguous
10
11 position. They may espouse a rhetoric of academic autonomy within the HE sector, but
12
13 metrics about publication performativity form the taken-for-granted basis for strategy and
14
15 management within the ‘new public management’ paradigm (Alvesson & Spicer, 2016).
16
17 Therefore, the use of journal ranking list metrics as a feature of ‘new public management’
18
19 norms makes the academy “ever more complicit in its own subordination to performative
20
21 processes that it frequently criticizes when observing them in the outside, ‘real’ world of
22
23 management practice” (Tourish, 2011: 367). In this paradoxical situation, academic
24
25 practitioners at very senior levels in the higher education hierarchy experience both power
26
27 and powerlessness as a result of the ubiquity of journal ranking lists. They find themselves
28
29 subject to the ‘generative schemata’ of ranking list positions that structures the practice (and
30
31 reproduction) of internal and external institutional hierarchies and legitimacy (Bourdieu,
32
33 1988). University managers are ‘subjected’ to rankings at an institutional level but also make
34
35 use of them as a basis for decision making about resource distribution, determination of
36
37 workload and effort, and judgements about reward, rank promotions, and recognition at local
38
39 levels.
40
41
42
43
44
45

46
47 To illustrate this point, we noted the promotion criteria for 15 institutions (8 U.S.; 7
48
49 U.K.)³, all of which we know to have established HRD or MLE scholars on staff. All but two
50
51 of the U.K. institutions explicitly cite the U.K. Research Excellence Framework (REF) and
52
53

54
55
56
57 ³ The institutions included eight from the U.S. (a mix of public and private doctoral R1 universities (two of
58
59 which earned R1 status relatively recently), three of which are American Association of Universities (AAU)
60
institutions) and seven from the U.K. (five ‘post-92’ institutions, 1 research intensive university, and a Russell
Group university). Despite the differing status of these institutions, there are some remarkable patterns amongst
them that provide insight into our arguments about Business Schools’ use of ranking lists.

1
2
3 some form of journal ranking (i.e., journal impact factor or Chartered Association of Business
4 Schools (CABS) star-rating) in their promotion criteria. The two institutions that do not do so
5
6 nonetheless make use of language associated with the ranking hierarchies, using terms such
7
8 as “publication in journals acknowledged as internationally excellent” or “world-leading”.
9
10
11 The emphasis in U.S. institutions is more nuanced and complex. Only one of the eight U.S.
12
13 institutions has any mention of ranking list (the Science Citation Index or Social Science
14
15 Citation Index) as one of several indicators of publication quality. In the U.S. institutions, the
16
17 promotion criteria are based upon a wider evidencing of: scholarly reputation; demonstration
18
19 of a scholarly identity; articulation of a coherent and continuous research agenda; and / or
20
21 publication in “nationally regarded” outlets.
22
23
24
25

26
27 Some explanation of this difference in emphasis may be that U.K. institutions develop
28
29 promotion policies at the central university level. In the U.S., by contrast, promotion policies
30
31 are developed at the Faculty (or College) level. In the U.S., it is typical for *HRD* scholars to
32
33 be based in Colleges of Education and so the promotion policies applied by academic
34
35 managers are developed in Colleges of Education⁴. However, for four of the U.S.
36
37 institutions, we also were able to review the promotion criteria for Colleges of Business,
38
39 where *MLE* scholars are more likely to be based. In these institutions, we noted that the
40
41 published promotion criteria indicate a preference for publications in specific journals on
42
43 College of Business websites. These celebrated journals are included as 4* journals in the
44
45 CABS journal guide. Therefore, it is possible to infer that, although policies may differ for
46
47 Schools of Education, journal rankings lists are used to inform promotion processes in
48
49 Faculties of Business in the U.K. and in the U.S. where *MLE* scholars are likely to be
50
51 employed. This disconnect means that journals focusing on the sub-field of *HRD* are less
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

⁴ With the exception of one that was housed in a College of Technology.

1
2
3 likely to be targeted by MLE scholars or appear on ranking lists that are privileged by the
4
5 MLE sub-field, despite the conjunctive nature of HRD and MLE work. As we have already
6
7 indicated, our submission to this highly ranked journal renders us complicit in the process
8
9 that we critique. However, we submit our work here to raise questions about power relations,
10
11 individual agency, and plurality of interests in our field of scholarship and to heighten
12
13 awareness about the winners and losers from publishing practices.
14
15

16 17 **Academic Work of Journal Production**

18
19 The third consequence of journal ranking lists on academic practice is with the work
20
21 of journal editing, reviewing and publishing. These roles are important for the work of
22
23 scholars in any field and, yet, editing and reviewing are unrecognized and under-valued
24
25 activities within higher education institutions. A key feature of the ‘codes of civility’ of
26
27 journal publication is that the power relationship between journal editors, authors, and peer
28
29 reviewers is simultaneously personal, political and relational. Appointment to a journal
30
31 editorial team presents status and reputational advantage for those in academic practice.
32
33 However, the demand for publication outputs as a basis for tenure and promotion in academic
34
35 practice has led to a sustained increase in the number of paper submissions. Huisman and
36
37 Smits’ (2017) study of the duration and quality of the peer review process across all
38
39 discipline specialisms indicates lengthier review times and difficulties in accessing
40
41 potentially qualified reviewers, particularly in social science disciplines. It is, therefore,
42
43 unsurprising that editors find it increasingly challenging to obtain agreement from
44
45 appropriate (unremunerated) reviewers to ‘accept’ rather than ‘decline’ expert peer review
46
47 invitations. As a result, communication processes with authors in relation to their submitted
48
49 work occur over increasingly long periods of time.
50
51
52
53
54

55
56 As outgoing editors of journals in the HRD field ourselves, we have reflected on the
57
58 changed nature of editorial practice arising from greater volume and frequency of journal
59
60

1
2
3 submissions. Work processes related to manuscript submission are increasingly automated
4
5 and editorial discretion is increasingly curtailed. Responsibility for much of the editing
6
7 process, post acceptance, now resides with authors. Therefore, unless scholars are involved in
8
9 editing a special issue, meaningful decisions about assembling journal volumes or issues,
10
11 which serve as catalysts for substantive scholarly debates, no longer feature as part of
12
13 editorial practice. Modarres (2015: 168) argues that, in this context, the practice of journal
14
15 editorship risks being little more than being a “traffic controller”, having discretion only over
16
17 where if it is appropriate to accept a submission, and when that submission will be ‘landed’
18
19 into a journal.
20
21
22

23
24 For editors and authors alike, the imperative of achieving constant published outputs
25
26 now requires a process of extended persistence through what might be described as a
27
28 publishing ‘obstacle course’ (Hubbard, 2015). This involves practices targeted at ‘dodging’
29
30 the danger of desk rejection; followed by responses designed to overcoming the ‘hurdle’ of
31
32 reviewer comments. Subsequent practices underpin the process of persevering through a long
33
34 process of revisions, and further processes of peer review and critique. Therefore, rising
35
36 submission rates, limited ranges of journal outlets considered ‘acceptable’ as a result of their
37
38 differential symbolic capital, and peer review challenges also exacerbate the structural and
39
40 systemically slow processes of publication. As a result, in many scholarly disciplines
41
42 associated with management and business, the time-frame for decision, revision and eventual
43
44 production of journal articles can be two to four years. However, this time frame is
45
46 substantially slower than the organizational practice developments and management priorities
47
48 about which the journal article might have been concerned (MacIntosh et al., 2017).
49
50
51
52

53
54 Alongside the rapid increase in journal submission rates that pressure to publish in
55
56 ranked journals has encouraged, further changes to publication practices have occurred
57
58 leading to an emerging Global North - Global South bifurcation. Dissemination through top
59
60

1
2
3 ranked journals occurs through an industry dominated by corporate publishing houses which
4
5 “allows subscription rates to be inflated” (Collyer, 2018: 62). This has implications for
6
7 knowledge production in specialist fields (Nkomo, 2009) and costs for access to journals are
8
9 often prohibitive for scholars in the Global South. The dominance of U.S. journals that
10
11 reinforce ‘common sense’ expectations of conformance to the scholarly preference for
12
13 narrowly focused studies in well-established theoretical fields; a preference for abstract
14
15 theorization, and the discouragement of methodological pluralism have been critiqued as a
16
17 danger to scholarly diversity and as encouraging “quasi-colonial forms of identity work by
18
19 those being Englishized” (Boussebaa & Tienari, 2019, p. 2).
20
21
22

23
24 Such mechanisms not only sustain global inequalities in terms of academic career
25
26 trajectories (Collyer, 2018) but are also unresponsive to dynamic and fast changing fields of
27
28 practice in the management domain. Ironically, as publication volumes have increased, both
29
30 on-line and in-print, changes have occurred to journal production processes. Increasingly,
31
32 although journal submission and peer review processes are organized by editors working with
33
34 publishers headquartered in the Global North, journal production processes are undertaken by
35
36 production staff outsourced across the Global South (Modarres, 2015).
37
38
39

40 **Organizational Application**

41
42 The fourth consequence of journal ranking processes relates to perceptions of the
43
44 value accorded to abstract conceptualization and the impact this has on work directed towards
45
46 organizational application. An important consequence of journal ranking lists is the
47
48 increased preference of authors and editors towards abstract theorization and conceptual
49
50 ideas, something that is deemed to differentiate top-ranked journals. Consequently, the
51
52 development of models and frameworks to inform advances in organizational practice are
53
54 accorded less value (Tourish, 2011). Linked with this, the academic field of practice has
55
56 become accustomed to a situation where the sacrifice of time is accepted as a necessary
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 condition of the academic processes of peer review and publication processes that lead to the
4 accumulation of symbolic capital (Bourdieu, 1998). However, in applied fields such as MLE
5 or HRD, the level of abstraction and the lengthy publication and production periods we
6 highlight here, lead to a situation where ideas generated through research ‘upstream’ are
7 perceived by ‘downstream’ organizational practitioners as ‘time-expired’ and lacking in
8 relevance (MacIntosh et al., 2017).
9

10
11
12 A further consequence of the prevalence of journal ranking lists is that research
13 impact is increasingly identified through citation impact factor metrics (Klein & Chiang,
14 2004). The publisher Sage (Sage UK, n.d), for example, advises several ways in which
15 journal editors can increase citations of their journal. This advice privileges the interests of
16 those already in dominant positions in the scholarly field as it includes invitations to highly
17 cited authors to write for the journal and the identification of zero-cited papers in order to
18 identify and discourage authors who submit papers on topics that may not quickly attract
19 citations. Such practices also ignores the consequences of Open Access initiatives in U.K.
20 HE, whereby pre-publication versions of accepted journal articles are uploaded on university
21 websites. This allows scholars without institutional access to journals to download articles,
22 but reduces the number of downloads any one author will receive from a journal’s website.
23 Whilst this can make access to scholarship affordable for those without sufficient institutional
24 budgets to access electronic journal resources, it can have negative consequences for scholars
25 seeking promotion or tenure whose case may partially depend on the number of their articles
26 downloaded.
27

28
29 In addition, the algorithms supporting journal ranking lists ‘de-value’ scholarly
30 outputs over time as they assume a short ‘half-life’ of academic value. This is inappropriate
31 for fields such as MLE and HRD where good quality research is characterized by evidence
32 and theorization that are associated with long-term developmental practices in organizations
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 and extended and careful processes of maximizing the value of applied initiatives through
4
5 teaching, learning and curriculum development in education settings. Second, such measures
6
7 do not reflect the extent to which scholars adopt and use ideas as a feature of their teaching.
8
9
10 In such instances, although impact on subsequent practice by the student may occur, citations
11
12 will occur in what students write for their tutors rather than what their tutors might write for
13
14 publication (Schmidt-Wilk, 2019).
15
16

17 In this section, we argued that the ubiquitous influence of journal ranking lists has
18
19 engendered important consequences on the habitus of the broader academic order and has had
20
21 a negative effect on agentic academic practices in the field of scholarship as a whole. Journal
22
23 ranking lists specifically affect assumptions about research impact; pedagogic impact; the
24
25 decision criteria used to manage performance and careers, and the ‘shape’ of the field as it
26
27 develops.
28
29

30 **THE EFFECT OF RANKING LISTS ON HRD AND MLE**

31
32
33 In this section we further illustrate this by focusing particularly on the influence on
34
35 the field of HRD, conjunctive to the scholarship of MLE, as an example of their possible
36
37 effect in niche fields within the broader discipline of social science and other applied fields of
38
39 scholarship. As indicated already, the HRD field is concerned with inquiry into people,
40
41 learning and organizations; issues that align with the focus of the MLE field. As an applied
42
43 field, HRD has much to offer MLE, including practical and research expertise relevant to
44
45 personal, organizational and societal factors that affect learning and education. HRD
46
47 field values include a commitment to challenging contemporary social and
48
49 organizational practices, critically examining organizational and individual assumptions,
50
51 and identifying emancipatory practice as a feature of improved learning relationships,
52
53 creativity and productivity (Sambrook, 2008). Therefore, in this part of our essay we are
54
55 influenced by the perspective of Özbilgin (2009) who highlights the interaction between:
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 journal ranking systems, the (academic) labor process, and individual agency in order to
4
5 understand how ranking systems reproduce systemic inequalities. In our assessment of the
6
7 HRD and MLE fields, we acknowledge the probable inequities and disadvantages
8
9 associated with gender, race, and class that Özbilgin identifies. We contend that scholars
10
11 whose practice focuses on areas that may be characterized as peripheral, specialist, or niche,
12
13 must direct their citations and scholarly practices towards scholars, editors and topic areas
14
15 that dominate scholarly practice (Collyer, 2014; Danell & Hiern, 2013).
16
17
18

19
20 With regards to our concern that journal ranking lists exacerbate the “unequal
21
22 bifurcation of world knowledge production” (Collyer, 2018: 58), we highlight here how areas
23
24 of scholarship can become marginalized. Studies exploring publication practices in the
25
26 Global South argue that journal ranking lists privilege practices of scholarship in the Global
27
28 North, which can be described as largely self-referent and inward looking (e.g., Chavarro,
29
30 Tang & Ràfols, 2017; Collyer, 2018). Frequently, issues of importance to countries in the
31
32 Global South are of little interest to top-ranked journals which publish works for privileged
33
34 audiences predominantly in the Global North (Chavarro, Tang, & Ràfols, 2017; Nkomo,
35
36 2010). Yet, HRD scholars from the Global South can potentially play a significant role in the
37
38 HRD and MLE field’s conceptual and practical development through their research into the
39
40 interaction between learning and education, and economic, social, national (c.f., Cho &
41
42 McLean, 2017; Cunningham, Lynham, & Weatherly, 2006; Gedro & Hartman, 2016) and
43
44 organization (c.f., Achoui, 2009; Cho, Lim, & Park, 2015; Pareek & Rao, 2008)
45
46 development.
47
48
49

50
51 We acknowledge that our argument is grounded in our positions as members of the
52
53 HRD scholarly community and as past editors of HRD journals. We recognize that, as
54
55 scholars of the Global North, we are players in the field as well as subjects of the field.
56
57
58 However, as academic institutions become increasingly corporatized (Parker & Jary, 1995), it
59
60

1
2
3 becomes more important to consciously address the implications of practices that reproduce
4 restricted scholarly debate and which reinforce hegemonic race, class, and gender norms
5 (Chakravartty, Kuo, Grubbs, & McIlwain, 2018). It is also important to challenge the effect
6 of journal ranking lists of forcing a choice for scholars between publishing for career
7 progression or publishing to reach a relevant audience (Nkomo, 2009).
8
9

10
11
12 A further consequence and challenge for fields such as HRD and MLE is the
13 homogenization of scholarship and privileging of certain languages, topics, and
14 epistemologies that are deemed appropriate for top-ranking journals. This discourages
15 engagement with innovations in organization practice; it also limits the potential to achieve
16 impact on organizational practices and the quality of individuals' learning experiences. For
17 example, the growth of management coaching and employee mentoring have important
18 consequences for the MLE field. However, pressure on academic practitioners to research
19 'more of the same' (Alvesson & Gabriel, 2016) means that such research agendas, which
20 emanate from the field of practice, are less visible in top-ranked journals. A keyword search
21 for coaching or mentoring in the leading journals for HRD (*Human Resource Development*
22 *Quarterly*) and MLE (*Academy of Management Learning & Education*) from 2002-2018
23 highlighted this difference in visibility. During this period, coaching and mentoring appeared
24 in HRDQ three times more frequently than in AMLE. Interestingly a keyword search
25 relating to technology and learning, which is another emergent and important issue for both
26 fields, lends further support to the claim of 'more of the same' regarding research agendas but
27 indicates that this topic has found less 'traction' in HRDQ than in AMLE as we found a ratio
28 of 2:3 in relation to our key word search.
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52

53
54 Another issue that arises from the ubiquity of journal ranking lists is the prominence
55 of theoretical and conceptual development as a basis for sustained journal performance, as
56 opposed to an emphasis on 'social value' (Oswick & Hanlon, 2009). Critical thinking is
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 increasingly regarded as appropriate for publishing in top-ranked journals and our essay takes
4
5 a critical stance in relation to the fields of HRD and MLE. However, over-emphasis on
6
7 critical thinking that focuses principally on conceptual or abstract theory diminishes the
8
9 perceived value of co-creation and developments in the field of practice. This may side-line
10
11 practice-related research inquiry into topics such as diversity and social inclusion, incivility
12
13 in the workplace, the digitization of learning systems and issues concerning machine learning
14
15 and artificial intelligence (AI). These issues are relevant to HRD research agendas and have
16
17 important implications in the MLE field, but may not fit neatly into existing conceptual and
18
19 critical thinking frameworks.
20
21
22
23

24 The points we raise in this part of our essay all relate to our concern that scholars in
25
26 the HRD and MLE fields may lose an important feature of their authentic voice as a result of
27
28 journal ranking lists that foster a (de)valuing of academic practice. As numeric indicators
29
30 associated with journal ranking lists increasingly drive measures of scholarly performance so
31
32 research topics in the HRD and MLE fields may be evaluated through criteria directed at
33
34 publication proficiency at the expense of academic, organizational, or wider social value. The
35
36 danger is that HRD and MLE scholars' interests and curiosity become subsumed by the
37
38 requirements for success in a system that aligns scholarly quality with publication destination
39
40 (Alakavuklar, Dickson, & Stablein, 2017; Alvesson & Spicer, 2016). Such alienation of
41
42 scholars from the products of their (would be) passions serves to limit the generation of new
43
44 knowledge and constrain the boundaries of what is known and understood in the field beyond
45
46 what is considered to be immediately 'citable' (Sangster, 2015). As we have experienced in
47
48 the HRD field, journal ranking processes narrow the scope of publication outlets.
49
50 Increasingly authors select only journals at the top of ranking lists as the basis for their
51
52 literature search processes. This may further reinforce the invisibility of specialized and
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 potentially cutting-edge scholarship, published in niche field journals which, by their very
4
5 nature, will have lower citation rates.
6

7
8 Also directly relevant to the HRD and MLE fields is the depreciation of educational
9
10 activity in our field of practice. A premise of HRD and MLE is that important opportunities
11
12 for impact on practice occur through teaching, learning and curriculum development in
13
14 education settings. However, the dominance of journal ranking lists means that such activities
15
16 are accorded less priority. Thus, as publishing in high ranked journals is valorized so other
17
18 impactful practice involving education and teaching is less recognized. A negative
19
20 consequence of the ubiquity of ranking lists for the HRD and MLE field, as well as for
21
22 business and management more widely, is that the identification of learning innovations,
23
24 research agendas or methodologies are placed lower in the HE 'orders of preference'
25
26 (Bourdieu, 1988, p. 109) than publication work that meets the requirements of top-ranked
27
28 journals. Indeed, such activity may be rendered almost invisible to those in positions of
29
30 power and authority within Higher Education Institutions (HEIs) (Cotton, Miller, & Kneale,
31
32 2018). A consequence of the lack of recognition of the importance of teaching and education
33
34 is that novel learning innovations, research agendas or methodologies with potential value to
35
36 the MLE field are not developed. A further important consequence of journal ranking
37
38 processes is on issues and assumptions about value and impact. From our perspective as
39
40 scholars whose practice is located in the field of HRD, we are concerned that research
41
42 published in top ranked journals may privilege inquiry into high-status management and
43
44 leadership work but inhibit the space from which critical voices can question and examine the
45
46 learning and educational experiences of those in lower status roles within organizations.
47
48
49
50
51
52

53
54 These observations about the effects of journal ranking lists support our contention
55
56 that priorities for academic practice reflect the 'currency' of scholarly value dominated by
57
58 'codes of civility' that elevate the perceived value of journal rankings and citation metrics.
59
60

1
2
3 This means that learning, teaching, curriculum innovation and impactful professional
4 education and development practices are accorded less worth and are under-rewarded
5 compared with work leading to publication in top-ranked journals. We suggest that
6 innovations in learning and education as well as novel curriculum agendas or methodologies
7 are overlooked.
8
9

10
11 We also argue that journal ranking lists which are derived from citation metrics make
12 more visible a small 'élite' cadre of scholars in the HRD and MLE fields who publish a large
13 proportion of research and scholarship in the highest ranked journals. Scholars in the MLE
14 field whose work is extensively downloaded as a basis for practical application but not
15 necessarily cited, find their work devalued. In common with other parts of the academic labor
16 market, a further 'invisible majority' of scholars must operate in increasingly precarious work
17 circumstances. Their work progressively involves unrecognized activities linked with
18 learning, teaching, student support, income generation, and program administration. This
19 self-reinforcing system of practice in higher education serves to solidify the barriers between
20 different occupational work and makes the transition from one group to another increasingly
21 unlikely.
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39

40 **IMPLICATIONS**

41
42 In writing this essay we are aware that the scholarly field of practice has moved
43 beyond arguments for or against the existence of ranking lists, so our intention is not to argue
44 that they should be discontinued. Instead, we draw on our Bourdieusian framing of symbolic
45 power relations engendered and sustained through journal ranking lists to identify lines of
46 tension that underpin what we identify as conditions for change in our fields of scholarship.
47 We contend that academic agency might exploit these conditions for change to impact
48 positively on both HRD and MLE theorization and practice. In this section we pull together
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 and develop our argument to add to debate about the future shape of the MLE and HRD
4
5 fields.

6
7
8 An important conceptual contribution of our analysis is the identification of a shift in
9
10 the distribution of different types of capital across the academy. This represents the first
11
12 condition for change that we identify. We argue that journal ranking list systems privilege
13
14 assumptions about research quality as a function of 'where and when' work is published
15
16 (Pettigrew, 2011) over the cultural value of knowledge generation thus diminishing its
17
18 materiality and disrupting its relationship with the fundamental embodied form of
19
20 cultural capital. Our Bourdieusian framing leads us to suggest that in this context journal
21
22 articles are now better understood as generating symbolic rather than cultural capital. Whilst,
23
24 in contrast to economic, social and cultural capital, Bourdieu conceptualizes symbolic capital
25
26 as subjective, none-the-less symbolic capital legitimates power relations (Bourdieu, 1990).
27
28
29

30
31 We argue that this shift in the 'currency' of journal articles constitutes a condition for
32
33 change, as the redistribution of types of capital engenders a tension between simultaneous
34
35 power and powerlessness amongst those in positions of academic or management seniority.
36
37 Our analysis indicates that tension between power and powerlessness arises because objective
38
39 positions of institutional power in the field are subject to the outcome of increasingly
40
41 precarious outcomes from journal article submission. These rules are played out at both
42
43 individual and institutional levels but the accumulation of symbolic capital relies,
44
45 paradoxically, on what Bourdieu refers to as the objective existence of 'probable futures' (pp
46
47 89).
48
49
50

51
52 This shift means that a complicity is necessary that entrusts institutional 'probable
53
54 futures' as well as individual careers to the outcome of anticipated or achieved publication in
55
56 top ranked journals. The logic of journal submission and publication processes in a field of
57
58 practice characterised by competition and struggles for legitimacy, is to substantially increase
59
60

1
2
3 both the time periods involved in journal publication processes and the risks associated with
4 submission. Powerlessness, in relation to their ‘probable future’ career, increases for
5 individual scholars who submit their work to high ranked journals and must experience
6 processes of postponement, deferral, suspension, or rejection. Powerlessness in relation to
7 their probable future of employment also increases for those who choose not to play the game
8 by not submitting their work to high ranked publications; as institutional positioning within
9 ranking hierarchies, determined by the outcomes of journal publications success, will
10 determine the local labor market demand affecting their employment.
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20

21 Paradoxically, higher education managers also become increasingly complicit in their
22 own subordination. Whilst they wield formal power of performance management and career
23 futures, for example, through implementing tenure procedures or determining entry into
24 institutional research assessment and comparison exercises, senior scholars and managers
25 cannot influence what will be published or when publication might occur. Academic
26 managers are well aware that academic power is accumulated and maintained at the cost of
27 constant and heavy expenditure of time. They wield power over ‘workload’ allocation to
28 provide ‘space’ for publication focused labor. However, journal ranking list processes
29 represent a classification system that exerts a tacit, invisible, pervasive violence in everyday
30 management practices associated with institutional struggles for legitimacy. The time-scale or
31 outcomes of the journal paper submission process are neither controllable nor pre-
32 determined. In this regard, HE managers and administrators are powerless as their
33 institutional rankings and probable futures remain subject to increasingly uncertain ranking
34 list positions. Simultaneous power and powerlessness thus arises as the ‘rules of the game’
35 legitimize a classification system that structures academic careers and institutional
36 hierarchies, creating a field which “resembles a strange obstacle race where everyone
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 classifies, and is classified ... the best classified becoming the best classifiers of those who
4 enter the race” (Bourdieu, 1988, p. 217).
5
6

7
8 Our second contribution is to problematize conceptualizations of academic practice by
9 describing the differential symbolic power positioning in relation to ‘research’, ‘teaching’,
10 ‘learner support’, ‘academic leadership’, and ‘research administration’. The ‘ideal
11 representation’ of the virtues of the academy in a globalized higher education context where
12 levels of student enrollment continue to increase, is one that values common culture, norms
13 and values, driven by overlapping duties and responsibilities shared within the academic field
14 of practice. Our conceptualization of struggles resulting from unequal distribution of
15 symbolic capital in conjunctive fields is of practice and experience characterized by
16 contestation over legitimacy and status. We propose that journal ranking lists exert a divisive
17 effect on symbolic capital resources associated with learning, teaching and education. In this
18 struggle, symbolic capital associated with research publication in high ranking journals
19 degrades the symbolic resources associated with other areas of our practice.
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34

35 In developing this argument we acknowledge that the model of academic practice we
36 focus our attention towards is not necessarily universal. A large proportion of members of the
37 academic field of practice are employed in temporary jobs, and the extent to which academic
38 roles require exclusive specialization in research, teaching, learner support, academic
39 leadership, and research administration has proved difficult to estimate (Paye, 2012).
40 However, assessments of career profiles (c.f. Collinson, 2006; Paye, 2012) suggest that
41 ‘abandonment of research activity’ at any point in an academic’s career represents a ‘point of
42 no return’. The differential valorization of journal publication serves to diminish the cultural
43 and symbolic capital value of academic practice in areas outside of research for publication in
44 highly ranked journals. This represents a second line of tension and, we argue, might be a
45 condition of change.
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 Evidence from the U.K. suggests some initial responses that attempt to respond to this
4
5 condition of change. Increasing interest in the impact of research outside academia in the
6
7 Research Excellence Framework (REF) assessment process (Research England, 2019a) may
8
9 be interpreted as attempting to restore some sense of balance. Advocates have also suggested
10
11 that assessments focusing on institutional level Teaching and Learning (TEF) outcomes, such
12
13 as employability (Office for Students [OfS], 2018) and the efficiency and effectiveness of
14
15 universities in achieving knowledge exchange with non-academic stakeholders (Research
16
17 England, 2019b) represent policy responses to the lines of tension we have identified, at the
18
19 institutional level. These policy developments warrant our identification of unequal symbolic
20
21 capital distribution associated with different roles and specialisms within the academic field.
22
23 However, our Bourdieusian framing of the academy as a field of practice suggests the
24
25 enduring effect of symbolic violence that scholars bear within themselves (Bourdieu, 1977),
26
27 that is the ways in which scholars reproduce their own subordination. This means that policy
28
29 changes such as these represent an additional workplace stressor and add to task intensity for
30
31 academics. Without such policy developments, though, the bifurcation of capital between
32
33 research and other features of academic practice that is 'taken for granted' will persist.
34
35 Conceptually, this represents a disconnect between levels of aspiration and levels of
36
37 achievement in the academic field. It represents a contrast between the ideal representation of
38
39 the academy and objective career and practice realities.
40
41
42
43
44
45
46

47 Our third contribution is to reinvigorate debate about the shape of the fields of HRD
48
49 and MLE in the context of an increasingly crowded terrain of the Academy. The ubiquity of
50
51 ranking lists 'skews' the shape and priorities of the MLE and HRD fields. However, as
52
53 scholars we operate in a context that can ameliorate some of their negative consequences
54
55 through scholarship grounded in, and extending the range of, practical, ideological or
56
57 methodological contributions to the field. In common with other interdisciplinary forms of
58
59
60

1
2
3 scholarship, the context of the MLE and HRD fields is their positioning in different Schools
4
5 or Faculties that espouse different value systems and grounding paradigms. Joint scholarly
6
7 and professional activity and the principles of engaged scholarship (Van de Ven, 2007) are
8
9 fundamental to the espoused culture and discourse of both fields with a commitment to
10
11 research quality espoused as being robust, ethical and relevant to application in practice-
12
13 orientated situations. Building on Bourdieu's conceptualization of habitus we argue that
14
15 systemic culture and discourse results from both academic agency as well as from the
16
17 objective conditions of Higher Education. Scholarly experience is an important feature of the
18
19 formation and circulation of discourse. Although journal ranking systems are implicit features
20
21 of everyday academic life, scholarly 'self-hood' is a function of social conditions rather than
22
23 being determined by them.
24
25
26
27

28
29 Scholars in the HRD and MLE fields are both actors and subjects in the shape and
30
31 priorities of their fields (Dillabough, 2004). We have argued that journal ranking lists have
32
33 enabled the MLE field to hold more instantiated power relative to HRD but such power is
34
35 related in meaningful, and sometimes overlapping ways, across this and other conjunctive
36
37 sub-fields. Although journal ranking skews the shape of the MLE field and renders important
38
39 features of the HRD field almost invisible, conceptually the values of both fields extend
40
41 beyond these empirical and epistemic limitations. Consistent with the principles of
42
43 Bourdieu's challenge that scholars should critique and question 'taken for granted' forms of
44
45 knowledge and practice we contend that HRD and MLE scholars operate in a context with
46
47 the potential to ameliorate some of the undesirable consequences of journal ranking
48
49 processes. We propose re-valuing principles of scholarship grounded in practice-led
50
51 knowledge, actionable knowledge application as the basis of research quality evaluation. We
52
53 further propose an explicit legitimization of scholarship promoting a wider range of
54
55 ideological, methodological or practical settings.
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 Building on Anderson, Ellwood and Felman's argument (2017) we conceptualize
4 scholarship in the fields of MLE and HRD as directed at impact-focused knowledge and
5 learning beyond the limitations and assumptions about research quality that underpin journal
6 ranking processes. We conceptualize practice and research in MLE and HRD that encourages
7 plurality of theoretical paradigms as the basis for a diverse yet rigorous understanding of
8 ethical and scholarly value.
9

16 **CALL TO ACTION**

17
18
19 To conclude this essay we make a call to action for strategic scholarly engagement to
20 exploit transformative possibilities. Our contention is that journal ranking lists contribute to
21 the marginalization of individual scholars and to fields of scholarship in applied fields. Our
22 call to action addresses the danger to creative and innovative curricula and pedagogic
23 developments, research agendas and methodologies in the HRD and MLE fields. Journal
24 ranking lists do not simply provide a checklist for a place to publish and articles to cite. As a
25 mechanism for symbolic capital in the academy they reinforce hegemonic structures of
26 knowledge and inequality.
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36

37 Debates about ranking lists defy resolution. However, although the challenges faced
38 in fields of academic practice may appear to be intractable, grounded in Bourdieu's
39 conceptualization of fields of practice, we propose action to prevent journal ranking list
40 processes in their current form becoming too 'settled' a feature of field stability (Krause,
41 2016). The core of our call to action is Bourdieu's concept of habitus. Every field of practice
42 would be condemned to disappearance were there not a corresponding habitus of (academic)
43 agents. Fields of scholarship are only a social reality through their continual reanimation
44 through, and within, the interactions of scholars. Bourdieu's framing identifies the potential
45 for agency when breaches arise between expectations and contextualized experiences
46 (Decoteau, 2016). For applied fields such as HRD and MLE, the effect of journal ranking
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 lists constitutes a ‘material rift’; a disjuncture between the legitimizing reliance on journal
4 ranking lists with the habitus of HRD and MLE fields. In situating habitus within analysis of
5 (academic) field effects, our essay identifies the potential for social change. We call for
6 academic agency to contest, reconcile and reconstruct (Whitchurch, 2010) the fields of MLE
7 and HRD.
8
9

10
11
12
13
14
15 Our first call to action might be considered limited in scope. However, given the trend
16 towards the increasing size of co-authorship groups associated with the dominance of journal
17 ranking processes and the imperative for scholars to publish, we argue that, at the level of
18 individual scholarship, HRD and MLE scholars can over-turn ordering protocols that have
19 become proxies for hierarchization within article authorship. In place of a list of authors
20 where different symbolic value is attached to an author’s place on the list, we propose that the
21 HRD and MLE fields embed an expectation of a reflective explanation of the extent to which
22 authorship process of any publication featured collaborative and collective knowledge
23 generation. Even a small change such as this would represent a significant disrupter of the
24 ‘codes of civility’ that represent an important feature of habitus.
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36

37
38 Our next call to action ‘aims higher’. We invite senior MLE and HRD scholars to
39 shift the shape of their fields through radical revision to ‘codes of civility’, role-modelling
40 and revitalized forms of academic socialization, in order to revive and reactivate them. Our
41 call is to senior scholars, especially those with influence on University management and
42 reward processes, business school accreditation bodies, and those who are influential in
43 professional associations involved in learning and education. We call on these scholars, who
44 consider themselves empowered within the field, to engage in contestation of current norms.
45 We propose that reconciliation of scholarship with practice be advanced through knowledge
46 co-creation and imaginative approaches to evidence-based practice. Therefore, we call on
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 senior scholars to reconstruct commitment to co-created and evidence-based work through its
4 valorization in journal publication.
5
6

7
8 We recognize that this is a demanding call to action that would require sustained
9
10 commitment by both scholars and influential practitioners. One such initiative in the U.K. has
11
12 involved the development of collaborative relationships between senior HRD and MLE
13
14 scholars in U.K. and the U.K. Professional Body, Chartered Institute of Personnel and
15
16 Development (CIPD). This collaboration has led to the establishment of a high-profile
17
18 conference platform for senior practitioners and academics featuring good quality applied
19
20 research projects linked with publication opportunities in journals representing all ‘levels’ of
21
22 the current ranking lists (CIPD, n.d). Commitment to reconstruction of the field in this way
23
24 would further require the creation of role specifications, rewards and incentives to facilitate
25
26 mobility and role enhancement between the academy and practice settings. In addition, it
27
28 would require promotion and tenure criteria to recognize partnership building, consultancy
29
30 and teaching and pedagogic development activity as equivalent to academic and theoretical
31
32 research specialisms. HRD scholars who are located across different schools and faculties,
33
34 such as Schools of Education, and Technology Colleges, are well placed to work
35
36 collaboratively with those in other Faculty locations to contest, reconcile and reconstruct
37
38 promotion, tenure, performance and rewards systems to be less reliant on the normative
39
40 assumptions of journal ranking list outputs. We recognize that senior scholars experience as
41
42 many forms of ‘work intensification’ as others in the field of practice, wherever they are
43
44 located, and our proposals would add to this. However, we contend that agency at this time
45
46 has the potential to generate opportunities for meaningful and professionally fulfilling work
47
48 at all levels in the academic field of practice.
49
50
51
52
53
54

55
56 Third, we direct a call to action to journal editors and peer reviewers, who are key
57
58 agents in the objectified, and increasingly lengthy, knowledge production process that results
59
60

1
2
3 in journal publication. In collaboration with influential agents in scholarly associations, and
4
5 challenged by reviewer suggestions in the development of our essay, we call for contestation
6
7 of current journal review procedures and criteria as the basis for decisions about journal
8
9 quality and impact. Scholarly associations in our fields already espouse the basis for
10
11 reconciliation. For example, the vision of the Academy of Management is to “inspire and
12
13 enable a better world through our scholarship and teaching about management and
14
15 organizations” (Academy of Management [AoM], n.d). The aim of the journal, *Management*
16
17 *Learning*, is to “provide a unique forum for critical inquiry, innovative ideas and dialogue”
18
19 (Management Learning, n.d). The HRD journal *Human Resource Development International*
20
21 espouses a commitment to “questioning the divide between practice and theory; between the
22
23 practitioner and the academic; and between traditional and experimental methodological
24
25 approaches” (Human Resource Development International [HRDI] n.d.).
26
27
28
29

30 Peer review is acknowledged as the basis of quality assurance in journal articles and as HRD
31
32 scholars who have also served as editors-in-chief of three different HRD journals we
33
34 recognize the challenges of securing timely, rigorous and constructive reviews for an
35
36 increasing number of submissions. Our call to action is for reconciliation between theory,
37
38 research and practice through the inclusion of at least one practice-based reviewer for each
39
40 manuscript. This would enable a robust assessment of the direct link to practice or pedagogic
41
42 intervention, or the extent of knowledge co-creation processes involving practitioners as well
43
44 as scholars. Reconstruction of the journal review process through facilitating openly
45
46 accessible review processes would further provide opportunities for wider and more inclusive
47
48 discussion. For example, the journal *BMC Medical Education* operates an open peer-review
49
50 system, where the reviewers' names are included on the peer review reports for authors. If the
51
52 article is published, the named reviewer reports are published online alongside the article.
53
54
55
56

57
58 Invitations to undertake peer review remains an editorial responsibility but, through this more
59
60

1
2
3 transparent process peer reviewers and editors are accountable for decisions made. In
4
5 addition to greater transparency, the process also provides valuable learning opportunities for
6
7 experienced as well as emerging reviewers and such a system would provide a further
8
9 mechanism for reviewer's work to be appreciated. This approach, which has also been
10
11 suggested in relation to management journals more widely (Dobusch & Meimstadt, 2019),
12
13 requires bold editors who would be willing to interpret reviews where there is no clear
14
15 agreement. However, the HRD and MLE fields already lead the way in editorial skills of
16
17 synthesizing feedback in a constructive and developmental way as they reach decisions about
18
19 the manuscripts they receive.
20
21
22

23
24 Our fourth call to action addresses the bifurcation of the practice of scholarship
25
26 between the Global North and South that we, and other scholars, have described. A direct link
27
28 between the ubiquity of journal ranking lists, normative scholarly expectations and the lack of
29
30 published research from parts of the Global South is difficult to establish. Nonetheless,
31
32 ongoing concerns across the university sector about equality and diversity make it timely to
33
34 contest the disadvantage of scholarly expertise situated in the Global South. We urge the
35
36 MLE and HRD editorial boards to represent a wider range of geographical locations. We
37
38 further call for reconstruction of Editorial Boards to reconcile the 'voices' of other practice-
39
40 based stakeholder groups in encouraging and supporting the publication of work that
41
42 responds to the learning, education and training challenges and complexities of global events.
43
44 In taking this action, Boards will be better placed to take innovative steps towards
45
46 reconstructing scholarly communication through their journals to challenge the privilege of
47
48 geographic regions or the dominance of native English speakers. For example, the journal
49
50 *Critical Perspectives on Accounting* has called for papers to a special issue in Spanish
51
52 (<https://www.journals.elsevier.com/critical-perspectives-on-accounting/call-for->
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 papers/critical-perspectives-on-accounting-in-spanish)⁵. Manuscripts are to be submitted and
4
5 reviewed in Spanish; articles selected for publication will only then be translated into English
6
7 and published, with native language versions available online. This extends the reach of the
8
9 publication, gives greater voice to Global South scholars by making publishing in English
10
11 fiscally accessible.
12
13

14 We make a further call for field-wide challenge of the hierarchization and cultural
15
16 consequences of journal ranking lists, the limitations of which have been articulated in this
17
18 journal and elsewhere (cf Bachrach et al, 2017; Ryazanova, NcNamara, & Aguinis, 2017;
19
20 Adler & Harzing, 2009). Journal ranking systems as they are currently constituted are being
21
22 challenged (Declaration on Research Assessment [DORA], n.d.; Hicks, et al., 2015, Research
23
24 England, 2015) and radical questioning is necessary to challenge the assumptions about
25
26 research quality that they engender and to encourage innovation and socially beneficial forms
27
28 of knowledge generation and production. The formation in the U.K. of a Forum to promote
29
30 responsible research metrics, following the DORA Declaration on Research Assessment
31
32 (DORA, n.d.) initiated within the science community, suggests to us that agency by senior
33
34 scholars and managers is timely to add momentum to conditions of change that are already
35
36 evident in the broader field of scholarly practice.
37
38
39
40
41

42 The ‘conditions of change’ we have identified are grounded in our Bourdieusian
43
44 framing. We argue that contesting ranking processes and their negative effect on innovative,
45
46 integrative and international scholarship is something that is timely for our field. Our call is
47
48 for a reconsideration of the metrics to better reflect attributes of good quality research. We
49
50 advocate for agency to promote international agreement about appropriate use of metrics and
51
52 performance management processes to take account of a wider range of indicators of quality.
53
54
55

56
57
58
59 ⁵ We are indebted to Dr. Mary A. Vera-Colina, Universidad Nacional de Colombia, for bringing this special
60 issue to our attention.

1
2
3 First, citations over longer time frames are pertinent to research quality evaluations in applied
4 contexts. Second, research quality indicators that take into account citations in a broader
5 range of literature forms are necessary. We argue that evidence of practical application, and
6 other measures of sustained impact and ‘reach’ to relevant audiences, such as by geographical
7 region, by practitioner-based communities, are necessary in relation to download as well as
8 citation metrics. In addition, evaluation of research quality requires qualitatively grounded
9 assessments of the value of scholarship through its application in practice and benefit to
10 social and individual well-being is appropriate (Dean & Forry, 2016).
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20

21 We recognise that ‘regulatory’ issues affecting university governance and, in some
22 countries, funding opportunities and requirements, now rely on performance judged through
23 metrics associated with journal ranking lists.. However, our call is for contestation,
24 reconciliation and reconstruction of academic practice to transform expectations about the
25 influence journal ranking processes have on the boundaries, grounding paradigms, identity
26 and relationship with professional practice, of both MLE and HRD fields. In making this call
27 to action through the medium of the leading journal in the MLE field, we emphasize the
28 potential and distinctive power of scholars who might consider themselves currently
29 empowered to look beyond the normative assumptions of journal ranking list expectations.
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41

42 In the context of our own field of HRD in relation to MLE, we regret the erosion of
43 the value of scholarship focused on teaching and learning practice, and regard relationships
44 with practitioners as the worse for it. Even those academic practitioners who have benefitted
45 from the opportunities that journal ranking lists present may also have experienced a sense of
46 lost opportunities to engage in knowledge generation processes characterized by imagination,
47 creativity, and vision. Therefore, we call on scholars with compelling cultural and symbolic
48 capital resources to leverage their power and academic agency to shift the shape of the MLE
49 and HRD fields to promote and reward greater levels of pluralism, curiosity and intellectual
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 flexibility with impact on both theory and practice. We make a call for change, and hope that
4
5 those with power to make a difference in the field of practice and scholarship will read and
6
7 respond to our provocation. We hope that academic practitioners, whether they be established
8
9 academic leaders, members of the professorial elite, or at some earlier stage in their careers,
10
11 will grasp the opportunity to develop the basis for scholarship in our fields to develop
12
13 learning and education scholarship and to advance organizational and societal understanding
14
15 and well-being.
16
17
18
19
20

21 REFERENCES

- 22
23 Academy of Management (AoM). n.d. *Academy of Management, Learning and Education*.
24 Retrieved from <http://aom.org/amle/>
25
26
27
28 Achoui, M. M. 2009. Human resource development in Gulf countries: an analysis of the
29 trends and challenges facing Saudi Arabia. *Human Resource Development*
30
31 *International*, 12(1): 35–46. doi.org/10.1080/13678860802638826
32
33
34
35 Adler, N.J. & Harzing, A-W. 2009. When knowledge wins: Transcending the sense and
36 nonsense of academic rankings, *Academy of Management Learning and Education*,
37
38 18: 72-95. doi/10.5465/amle.2009.37012181
39
40
41
42 Alakavuklar, O.N., Dickson, A.G., & Stablein, R. 2017. The Alienation of Scholarship in
43 Modern Business Schools: From Marxist Material Relations to the Lacanian Subject.
44
45 *Academy of Management Learning & Education*, 16 (3). 454–468.
46
47 doi.org/10.5465/amle.2015.0004
48
49
50
51 Alvesson, M., and Gabriel, Y. 2016. Grandiosity in contemporary management and
52 education. *Management Learning*, 47: 464-473.
53
54
55 Alvesson, M., & Spicer, A. 2016. (Un)conditional surrender? Why do professionals comply
56 with managerialism? *Journal of Organization Change Management*, 29 (1), 29-45.
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3 Anderson, L., Ellwood, P. & Coleman, C. 2017. The impactful academic: Relational
4
5 management education as an intervention for impact. *British Journal of*
6
7 *Management*, 28: 14-28. doi.org/10.1111/1467-8551.12202
8
9
- 10 Bachrach, D. G., Bendoly, E., Beu Ammeter, D., Blackburn, R., Brown, K. G., et al. 2017.
11
12 On Academic Rankings, Unacceptable Methods, and the Social Obligations of
13
14 Business Schools, *Decision Sciences*, 48: 561-585. doi:10.1111/deci.12274
15
16
- 17 Bierema, L., & Callahan, J. L. 2014. Transforming HRD: A Framework for Critical HRD
18
19 Practice. *Advances in Developing Human Resources*, 16, 429–
20
21 444. doi.org/10.1177/1523422314543818
22
23
- 24 Bourdieu, P. 1977. *Outline of a Theory of Practice*. Cambridge: Cambridge University
25
26 Press.
27
- 28 Bourdieu, P. 1988. *Homo Academicus*. Cambridge: Polity.
29
- 30 Bourdieu, P. 1989. Social Space and Symbolic Power. *Sociological Theory*, 7: 14-25.
31
32
- 33 Bourdieu, P. 1990. *The logic of practice*. Cambridge: Polity.
34
- 35 Boussebaa, M, & Tienari, J. 2019 Englishization and the politics of knowledge production in
36
37 management studies. *Journal of Management Inquiry*, doi:
38
39 10.1177/1056492619835314
40
41
- 42 Callahan, J. L. 2011. Incivility as an instrument of oppression: Exploring the role of power in
43
44 constructions of civility. *Advances in Development Human Resources* 13(1): 10-21.
45
46
- 47 Callahan, J. L. 2017. The retrospective (im)moralization of self-plagiarism: Power interests in
48
49 the social construction of new norms for publishing. *Organization* 25(3): 305-319.
50
51 doi:10.1177/1350508417734926
52
53
- 54 Chakravartty, P., Kuo, R., Grubbs, V., & McIlwain, C. 2018. CommunicationSoWhite.
55
56 *Journal of Communication*, 68: 254-266. doi:10.1093/joc/jqy003
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3 Chalofsky, N. 1992. A unifying definition for the human resource development profession.
4
5 *Human Resource Development Quarterly*, 3: 175-182.
6
7 doi:10.1002/hrdq.3920030208
8
9
10 Chalofsky, N. 2007. The seminal foundation of the discipline of HRD: People, learning, and
11
12 organizations. *Human Resource Development Quarterly*, 18: 431-442.
13
14 doi:10.1002/hrdq.1212
15
16
17 Chartered Institute of Personnel and Development (CIPD). n.d. Applied Research
18
19 Conference. Retrieved from [https://www.cipd.co.uk/learn/events-networks/applied-](https://www.cipd.co.uk/learn/events-networks/applied-research-conference)
20
21 [research-conference](https://www.cipd.co.uk/learn/events-networks/applied-research-conference)
22
23
24 Chavarro, D., Ràfols, I., & Tang, P. 2018. To what extent is inclusion in the Web of Science
25
26 an indicator of journal “quality”? *Research Evaluation*, 27(2): 106-118.
27
28
29 Chavarro, D., Tang, P., & Ràfols, I. 2017. Why researchers publish in non-mainstream
30
31 journals: Training, knowledge bridging and gap-filling. *Research Policy*, SWPS
32
33 2016-22. Retrieved from <https://ssrn.com/abstract=3014349>
34
35
36 Cho, E., & McLean, G.N. 2017. National human resource development revisited in the
37
38 Republic of Korea. *KEDI Journal of Educational Policy*, 14 (1): 25-46.
39
40
41 Cho, Y., Lim, D.H. & Park, C.Y. 2015. The Evolution of Korean corporate HRD: launching,
42
43 growing pains, and transforming. *Human Resource Development*
44
45 *International*, 18:5, 464-480. doi:10.1080/13678868.2015.1079293
46
47
48 Collinson, J. A. (2006). Just ‘non-academics’?: Research administrators and contested
49
50 occupational identity. *Work, Employment and Society*, 20(2): 267–288.
51
52 doi.org/10.1177/0950017006064114
53
54
55 Collyer, F.M. 2018. Global patterns in the publishing of academic knowledge: Global North,
56
57 Global South. *Current Sociology*, 66 (1) 56–73. doi: 10.1177/0011392116680020
58
59
60

- 1
2
3 Cotton, D.R.E., Miller, W. & Kneale, P. 2018. The Cinderella of academia: Is higher
4 education pedagogic research undervalued in UK research assessment. *Studies in*
5 *Higher Education*, 43 (9): 1625-1636.
6
7
8
9
10 Cunningham, P. W., Lynham, S. A., & Weatherly, G. (2006). National Human Resource
11 Development in Transitioning Societies in the Developing World: South Africa.
12 *Advances in Developing Human Resources*, 8(1), 62–83.
13
14 <http://doi.org/10.1177/1523422305283059>
15
16
17
18
19 Currie, R.R. & Pandher, G. 2013. Management Education Journals' Rank and Tier by Active
20 Scholars. *Academy of Management Learning and Education*, 12 (2): 194-218.
21
22
23
24 Danell, R. & Hjerm, M. 2013. Career prospects for female university researchers have not
25 improved. *Scientometrics*, 94 (3): 999-100. doi:10.1007/s11192-012-0840-4
26
27
28
29 Decoteau, C. L. (2016). The reflexive habitus: Critical realist and Bourdieusian social
30 action. *European Journal of Social Theory*, 19(3): 303–
31 321. doi.org/10.1177/1368431015590700
32
33
34
35 Dean, K. L., & Forray, J. M. (2018). Slow Down, You Move Too Fast . . . *Journal of*
36 *Management Education*, 42: 315–318. doi.org/10.1177/1052562918768645
37
38
39
40 Dean, K. L., & Forray, J. M. 2016. Google, and Harzing, and Thomson! Oh My! Why Impact
41 Is More Than Just Numbers. *Journal of Management Education*, 40, 3–6.
42
43 doi.org/10.1177/1052562915621937
44
45
46
47 Declaration on Research Assessment (DORA). n.d. *Improving how research is assessed*.
48 Retrieved from <https://sfdora.org/>
49
50
51
52 Dobusch, L., & Heimstädt, M. 2019. Predatory publishing in management research: A call
53 for open peer review. *Management Learning*, 50(5), 607–619.
54
55 <https://doi.org/10.1177/1350507619878820>
56
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3 Ellis, V., McNicholl, J., Blake, A., & McNally, J. 2014. Academic work and
4
5 proletarianisation: A study of higher education-based teacher educators. *Teaching*
6
7 *and Teacher Education*, 40, 33–43. doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2014.01.008
8
9
10 Foucault, M. 1977. *Discipline and punish: the birth of the prison*. London: Penguin.
11
12 Gallos, J.V. 2008. Charting a New Course for the Scholarship of Management Teaching and
13
14 Learning. Future Directions, Powerful Opportunities, A Hopeful Future. *Journal of*
15
16 *Management Education*, 32: 535-540. doi: 10.1177/1052562908324357
17
18
19 Gedro, J. & Hartman, L. P. 2016. Education as a Response to NHRD Gaps in Developing
20
21 Economies: A Case Study of l'Ecole de Choix/The School of Choice (Haiti), as
22
23 Critical National Human Resource Development. *Human Resource Development*
24
25 *Quarterly*, 27: 67-94. doi:10.1002/hrdq.21220
26
27
28
29 Giddens, A. 1984. *The constitution of society*. Cambridge: Polity
30
31 Giddens, A. 1991. *Modernity and self-identity*. Cambridge: Polity.
32
33 Hamlin, B., & Stewart, J. 2011 What is HRD? A definitional review and synthesis of the
34
35 HRD domain. *Journal of European Industrial Training*, 35: 199-
36
37 220. <https://doi.org/10.1108/03090591111120377>
38
39
40 Hicks, D., Wouters, P., Waltman, L., de Rijcke, S., & Ràfols, I. (2015). The Leiden Manifesto
41
42 for research metrics. *Nature*, 520: 429-431.
43
44
45 Hubbard, R. 2015. *Corrupt Research: The Case for Reconceptualizing Empirical*
46
47 *Management and Social Science*. New Jersey: Blackwell,
48
49 Huisman, J. & Smits, J. 2017. Duration and quality of the peer review process: the author's
50
51 perspective. *Scientometrics*, 113: 633. doi:10.1007/s11192-017-2310-5
52
53
54 Human Resource Development International. n.d. *Aims and Scope*. Retrieved from
55
56 [https://www.tandfonline.com/action/journalInformation?show=aimsScope&journalCo](https://www.tandfonline.com/action/journalInformation?show=aimsScope&journalCode=rhrd20)
57
58 [de=rhrd20](https://www.tandfonline.com/action/journalInformation?show=aimsScope&journalCode=rhrd20)
59
60

- 1
2
3
4
5 James, K. T., & Denyer, D. 2009. Historical Roots and Future Directions: New Challenges
6 for Management Learning. *Management Learning*, 40: 363–
7
8 370. doi.org/10.1177/1350507609335844
9
10
11
12 Joy, S., Game, A.M. & Toshniwal, I. G. 2018. Applying Bourdieu's capital-field-habitus
13 framework to migrant careers: taking stock and adding a transnational perspective.
14
15 *The International Journal of Human Resource Management*.
16
17 doi:10.1080/09585192.2018.1454490
18
19
20
21 Kallio, K.-M., Kallio, T. J., Tienari, J., & Hyvönen, T. 2016. Ethos at stake: Performance
22 management and academic work in universities. *Human Relations*, 69(3), 685–709.
23
24 https://doi.org/10.1177/0018726715596802
25
26
27
28 Klein, D.B. & Chiang, E. 2004 The Social Science Citation Index: A black box – with an
29 ideological bias? *Econ Journal Watch*. 1(1), 134-165.
30
31
32
33 Krause, M. 2018. How fields vary. *British Journal of Sociology*, 69(1): 1-22.
34
35
36 Kuchinke, K. P. 2002. Institutional and curricular characteristics of leading graduate HRD
37 programs in the United States. *Human Resource Development Quarterly*, 13(2): 127-
38 143.
39
40
41
42 Kuld, L. & O'Hagen, J. 2018. Rise of multi-authored papers in economics Demise of the
43 'lone-star' and why? *Scientometrics* 114: 1207-1225. doi.org/10.1007/s11192-
44 017-2588-3
45
46
47
48
49 Leišytė, L. 2016. New public management and research productivity – a precarious state of
50 affairs of academic work in the Netherlands. *Studies in Higher Education*, 41 (5):
51 828–846. doi.org/10.1080/03075079.2016.114772
52
53
54
55
56 Lewicki, R.J. 2002. From the Editor. *Academy of Management Learning & Education*, 1
57 (1): 8-12.
58
59
60

- 1
2
3 Lewicki, R.J. 2013. On the impact of *AMLE*: Reflection on a decade. *Academy of*
4
5 *Management Learning and Education*, 12: 104-107.
6
7
8 Lowry, P. B., Humphreys, S. L., Malwitz, J., & Nix, J. 2007. A scientometric study of the
9
10 perceived quality of business and technical communication journals. *IEEE*
11
12 *Transactions on Professional Communication*, 50: 352-378.
13
14
15 Lyotard, J. F. 1984. *The postmodern condition: A report on knowledge* (Vol. 10). U of
16
17 Minnesota Press.
18
19 MacIntosh, R., Beech, N., Bartunek, J., Mason, K., Cooke, B. & Denyer, D. (2017), Impact
20
21 and Management Research: Exploring Relationships between Temporality, Dialogue,
22
23 Reflexivity and Praxis. *British Journal of Management*, 28: 3-13. doi:10.1111/1467-
24
25 8551.12207
26
27
28 Management Learning (n.d) *Management Learning*. Retrieved from
29
30 <https://journals.sagepub.com/home/mlq>
31
32
33 Marginson, S. 2008. Global field and global imagining: Bourdieu and worldwide higher
34
35 education. *British Journal of Sociology of Education*, 29 (3): 303-315.
36
37 doi.10.1080/01425690801966386
38
39
40 McGuire, D. 2014. *Human resource development*. London: Sage.
41
42
43 Mintzberg, H., & Gosling, J. 2002. Educating managers beyond borders. *Academy of*
44
45 *Management Learning and Education*, 1: 64-76.
46
47
48 Modarres, A. 2015. It's not just the author: the reader and the editor are dead, too.
49
50 *Publications*, 3: 168-173. Retrieved from www.mdpi.com/journal/publications
51
52 Nkomo, S.M. 2009. The seductive power of academic journal rankings: Challenges of
53
54 searching for the otherwise. *Academy of Management Learning and Education*,
55
56 8(1): 106-112.
57
58
59
60

- Office for Students (OfS). 2018. *What is the TEF?* Retrieved from
<https://www.officeforstudents.org.uk/advice-and-guidance/teaching/what-is-the-tef/>
- Oswick, C. & Hanlon, J. 2009. Discourse, academic work, and journals as commodities: a response. *Management Communication Quarterly*, 23 (1), 135-141. doi: 10.1177/0893318909335421
- Özbilgin, M.F. 2009. From journal rankings to making sense of the world *Academy of Management Learning and Education*, 8(1): 113-121.
doi.org/10.5465/amle.2009.37012185
- Pareek, U. & Rao, T.V. 2008. From a sapling to the forest: the saga of the development of HRD in India. *Human Resource Development International*, 11:5: 555-564 doi:10.1080/13678860802417734
- Parker, M., & Jary, D. 1995. The McUniversity: Organization, Management and Academic Subjectivity. *Organization*, 2: 319–338. doi.org/10.1177/135050849522013
- Paye, S. (2012) How (much) is academic labour divided?: Explaining the decoupling of the "teaching research nexus" in British universities. Retrieved from:
<https://halshs.archives-ouvertes.fr/halshs-00707529/>
- Pettigrew, A. M. 2011. Scholarship with Impact. *British Journal of Management*, 22: 347-354. doi:10.1111/j.1467-8551.2011.00769.x
- Research England. 2015. The Metric Tide: Report of the Independent Review of the Role of Metrics in Research Assessment and Management. Retrieved from
<https://re.ukri.org/news-events-publications/publications/metric-tide/>.
- Research England. 2019a. *REF Impact* – retrieved from <https://re.ukri.org/research/ref-impact/>
- Research England. 2019b. *Knowledge Exchange Framework (KEF)*. Retrieved from
<https://re.ukri.org/knowledge-exchange/knowledge-exchange-framework/>

- 1
2
3 Ross, C., Nichol, L., Elliott, C., Sambrook, S., & Stewart, J. (working paper). 2019. The
4
5 impact of context on HRD discourses and their implications for critical HRD practice.
6
7 Paper presented to 20th International UFHRD conference. Nottingham Trent
8
9 University, June 2019.
10
11
12 Ruona, W.E.A. 2016. Evolving Human Resource Development. *Advances in Developing*
13
14 *Human Resources*, 18 (4): 551–565. doi:10.1177/1523422316660968
15
16
17 Ryazanova, O., McNamara, P. & Aguinis, H. 2017. Research performance as a quality signal
18
19 in international labor markets: Visibility of business schools worldwide through a
20
21 global research performance system, *Journal of World Business*, 52, 831-841,
22
23 doi.org/10.1016/j.jwb.2017.09.003.
24
25
26 Sambrook, S. 2008. Critical HRD: a concept analysis, *Personnel Review*, 8: 61-73.
27
28 doi.org/10.1108/00483480910920714
29
30
31 Sambrook, S. & Willmott, H. 2014. The rigor of management education and the relevance of
32
33 human resource development: Natural partners or uneasy bedfellows in management
34
35 practice? *Management Learning*, 45 (1): 39-56. doi.org/10.1177/1350507612468422
36
37
38 Sangster, A. 2015. You cannot judge a book by its cover: the problems with journal rankings.
39
40 *Accounting Education: An International Journal*, 24 (3): 175–186.
41
42 doi.org/10.1080/09639284.2015.1055929
43
44
45 Schmidt-Wilk, J. 2019. Does My MTR Have “Impact”? *Management Teaching*
46
47 *Review*, 4(2), 92–94. doi.org/10.1177/2379298119841767
48
49
50 Tourish, D. 2011. Leading questions: Journal rankings, academic freedom and
51
52 performativity: What is, or should be, the future of leadership? *Leadership*, 7(3):
53
54 367–381. doi:10.1177/1742715011407385
55
56
57 Van de Ven, A. H. 2007. *Engaged scholarship: A guide for organizational and social*
58
59 *research*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
60

1
2
3 Vince, R., & Elkjaer, B. 2009. Breaking the boundaries of existing knowledge: a celebration
4
5 of the 40th anniversary of management learning. *Management Learning*, 40(4): 347–
6
7 352. doi:10.1177/1350507609335837
8
9

10
11 Wacquant, L. J. D. 1990. Sociology as socioanalysis: “Tales of Homo Academicus”.
12
13 *Sociological Forum*, 5(4): 677-689.
14
15

16
17 Whitchurch, C. 2010. Some implications of ‘public/private’ space for professional identities
18
19 in higher education. *Higher Education*, 60(6): 627–640. doi.org/10.1007/s10734-010-
20
21 9320-z
22
23

24
25 Woodall J. 2003. The common underlying assumptions of HRD? *Human Resource*
26
27 *Development International*, 6: 281-283, DOI: 10.1080/1367886032000135115
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60