

Influential Article Review - "A" List International Competitiveness and Distribution

Orlando Arnold

Verna Copeland

Tracy Aguilar

This paper examines journal research. We present insights from a highly influential paper. Here are the highlights from this paper: Focusing on the global diffusion of the "A" list consisting of predominantly U.S.-based journals, we argue that such diffusion represents an important form of professionalization in the management of business schools. The diffusion can also be viewed as an intellectual movement in the age of global competition characterized by a flat world. How can we explain the recent diffusion of the "A" list? More important, how does such diffusion impact the future of business and management scholarship? Addressing these important but underexplored questions, we identify the multilevel factors that explain the diffusion, and predict its likely trajectory and its impact on future scholarship. For our overseas readers, we then present the insights from this paper in Spanish, French, Portuguese, and German.

Keywords: Global competition, "A" list, Business schools, Scholarship, Professionalization, Publishing

SUMMARY

- Contributions and research implications. Overall, three contributions emerge. Specifically, this article contributes to the literature by arguing that the diffusion of the «A» list is an intellectual movement in a flat world, identifying the multilevel factors that may explain the diffusion, and predicting its likely trajectory and its impact on future business and management scholarship. In a broad sense, this article highlights an important aspect of the professionalization of business schools . Previous work on professions and institutional change in professional schools such as law schools and medical schools has not focused on the research dimension by investigating the diffusion of the «A» list that serves to define excellence and orient faculty behavior, as we have done here.
- This article also fosters theorizing at the institutional field level—an especially fruitful direction for theorizing in the twenty-first century as suggested by Davis and Marquis . Instead of endeavoring to generate a «general theory,» we focus on the mechanisms underlying the global diffusion of the «A» list. The global diffusion of the «A» list is broadly consistent with Frickel and Gross’s theory of social/intellectual movements centered on framing, differentiation, and mobilization. It also resonates with Hambrick and Chen’s theory of admittance-seeking social movements and with Zoogah and Peng’s model of the emergence of scholarly communities. The articulation of the benefits associated with the «A» list highlights the importance of rhetorical and discursive strategies

behind the framing necessary for an intellectual movement . The identification of differentiation between adopting and non-adopting schools in terms of perceived quality differences highlights the importance of using symbolic vocabularies, such as «world class,» to gain advantage. Finally, we highlight the mobilization of resources , in terms of joining AACSB, hiring more U.S. Ph.D. graduates, and widening income differential between faculty members who can hit the «A» list and those who cannot.

- This article also leverages and extends the insights from the innovation diffusion literature, by focusing on the attributes of a particular innovation , by highlighting the competitive pressure schools increasingly face in a flat world , and by drawing attention to the legitimacy-seeking imperative that is at the heart of institutional theory .
- Practical implications. There are different practical implications for the three groups—scholars, gatekeepers, and schools. For individual scholars, of course, a strategy of resistance is possible . But the scholarly impulse to have our voice heard, the bureaucratic imperative of schools to compete in the rankings game, and the personal career interest make it difficult to resist the prevailing norms in the long run—unless one does not mind being isolated and marginalized by peers.
- A more positive coping strategy for individual scholars may be to know the rules of the game, play hard, and play smart . For scholars struggling to publish their work in, and frustrated by, the notoriously tough «A» journals, it is important to note that most of the leading paradigms currently dominating the journals, such as five forces, transaction costs, resource dependency, population ecology, and agency theory, can trace their roots to the stereotypical large U.S. corporation of the mid-1970s . Believing that the «mine» for such theories may be nearing exhaustion, Davis and Marquis argue that some of these theories may not even be able to capture a sizeable chunk of the new organizational phenomena in the United States of the twenty-first century. It does not require a huge leap of faith to believe that the applicability of some of these theories may be significantly reduced outside the United States, which would generate fertile ground for new forms of theorizing . In other words, even the conservative «A» journals are constantly looking for a balance between exploitation and exploration . Decades of exploitation may force these «A» journals to confront the inevitable need for new exploration, which can be brought by more non-U.S.-based scholars with more novel approaches and data—indicated by the rising non-U.S. representation on the UTD list over the last two decades . Of course, U.S.-based scholars also need to play hard and play smart, now that their proximity-based advantage has been eroded in a flat world.

HIGHLY INFLUENTIAL ARTICLE

We used the following article as a basis of our evaluation:

Peng, M. W. (2019). Global competition and diffusion of the “A” list. *Frontiers of Business Research in China*, 13(1), 1–23.

This is the link to the publisher’s website:

<https://fbr.springeropen.com/articles/10.1186/s11782-019-0058-x>

INTRODUCTION

Increasing professionalization in the management of business schools has taken place recently. One of the noticeable signs of such professionalization is the explicit adoption of an “A” journal list on which faculty members are expected to publish. Without a formal list of desirable journals, faculty members of course have always endeavored to publish in the highest quality outlets possible. What is interesting is the recent formal adoption of an “A” list by more schools around the world.

Historically, scholarly publishing and competition often took place within one region, with relatively little cross-regional penetration. For example, Chinese scholars mostly published in China-based

journals, Footnote 1 and American scholars mostly published in U.S.-based journals. However, an emerging trend in the last two decades is that research, publishing, and competition in business and management scholarship have become more global (DeNisi 2010; Mangematin and Baden-Fuller 2008; Peng 2007; Peng and Dess 2010; Zoogah and Peng 2019). Specifically, U.S.-based journals have increasingly attracted scholars from around the world (Baum 2007; Leung 2007; Tsui 2007). Labeled as the “top tier,” the “mainstream,” and the “A” list, two sets of predominantly U.S.-based journals—compiled by the University of Texas at Dallas (UTD) and Financial Times (FT)—have emerged. These journals not only attract attention from scholars, but also from university administrators, funding agencies, and government ministries.

A case can be made that as the world of business competition becomes global, the world of scholarly competition has also become “flat” (Friedman 2005). In the age of globalization characterized by a flat world, a set of worldwide standards has emerged to assess the productivity and quality of business school research (Mangematin and Baden-Fuller 2008; Mudambi et al. 2008; Peng and Dess 2010; Peng et al. 2018a). The emergence and diffusion of these new standards have not been without controversies and resistance around the world (Adler and Harzing 2009; Macdonald and Kam 2007). Criticisms range from the objection against any formal journal list to the protest among some non-U.S.-based scholars against the use of the combined UTD/FT list, which is argued to be an American list cloaked under the name of a “global” list. The combined UTD/FT list—hereafter, the “A” list in the remainder of this article—is an unmistakably American list. Even with the 2010 addition of important European outlets such as the Journal of Management Studies and Organization Studies to the FT list, a majority of UTD and FT journals are edited by U.S.-based scholars. What is especially interesting is that the diffusion of the “A” list has recently taken place during a period of alleged American decline (in various areas such as geopolitical influence and economic competitiveness). Then, how can we explain the recent diffusion of the A(merican) list? More important, how does such diffusion impact the future of business and management scholarship?

This article addresses these two crucial but underexplored questions. Although there is “no explicit theory” underlying the development of formal journal lists (van Fleet et al. 2000: p. 842), we argue that the social movement and innovation diffusion literatures enable us to theorize about how scholars do research, publish, and compete in an increasingly flat world. Specifically, we suggest that the global diffusion of the “A” list represents the increasing professionalization in the management of business schools and also represents the rise of an intellectual movement converging on a set of global standards of excellence. Before proceeding, it is important to note that we are not asserting whether adopting the set of global standards represented by the “A” list is appropriate or inappropriate. Whenever possible, we outline both the pros and cons associated with this phenomenon.

While there is a stream of work on professions and institutional change, most of this work has focused on professional service firms such as accounting, health care, and law firms (Brock et al. 1999; Eleazar et al. 2019; Greenwood and Suddaby 2006; Muzio et al. 2013; Scott 2008). There is no doubt that universities are professional organizations operating in institutionalized environments. While universities have been studied (Schofer and Meyer 2005), the specific professional schools within universities have been studied include law schools (Sauder and Espeland 2009) and medical schools (Dunn and Jones 2010). Professions and institutional change within business schools are rarely investigated. This article thus contributes to the literature on professions and institutional change by starting to fill the gap with a focus on business schools. Our aim is to first develop a multilevel model to explain the factors behind the diffusion of the “A” list, and then to predict its likely impact on future scholarship.

CONCLUSION

How we choose to do research, publish, and compete as a community of scholars in a flat world reveals a lot about how our profession organizes the discipline and how we value knowledge production in a certain fashion. Clearly, as members of a professional school community, we are familiar with the professionalization processes affecting numerous other organizations. Yet, interestingly, relatively little research attention has been paid to the professionalization of our own profession (Peng et al. 2018b: p. 271).

This article argues that we need to devote some attention on how we organize our world of scholarship in an era of global competition. In theoretical terms, the diffusion and adoption of a formal “A” list can be conceptualized as the formalization of informal norms. “Professions are, themselves, institutions that, over the last 30 years, have experienced profound changes” (Muzio et al. 2013: p. 699). Therefore, a better understanding of how scholars, schools, and stakeholders strategically respond to such changing institutional environments has potential to significantly contribute to the institution-based view from a previously underexplored angle (Peng 2003; Peng et al. 2009; Peng et al. 2018b; Peng et al. 2008; Scott 2008).

Broadly, the debate on the rise and diffusion of the “A” list seems to be one more episode of the debate on convergence versus divergence in the larger context of globalization. While proponents of convergence celebrate the glory of the “A” list, advocates of divergence critique its tyranny. To non-U.S. scholars complaining about the U.S. hegemony, such as their need to cite U.S. theories and authors, we need to remind them that not too long ago, U.S. sociologists, in an effort to enhance the legitimacy of their work, needed to “cite a dead German who said it first” (Davis and Zald 2008: p. 635).Footnote10 While how German scholarship lost such a prestigious intellectual leadership position around the world is outside the scope of this article, suffice it to say that if history is any guide, no competitive advantage—in academia or in business—will be forever in global competition.

APPENDIX

TABLE 1

**GLOBAL COMPETITION IN BUSINESS AND MANAGEMENT SCHOLARSHIP: UTD TOP
100 BUSINESS SCHOOL RESEARCH WORLDWIDE RANKINGS™**

1990	2010	2018
1. U. of Pennsylvania	1. U. of Pennsylvania	1. U. of Pennsylvania
2. U. of Texas at Austin	2. Northwestern U.	2. New York U.
3. U. of Michigan	3. U. of Maryland	3. U. of Texas at Dallas
4. U. of Chicago	4. U. of Michigan	4. Columbia U.
5. New York U.	5. U. of Texas at Austin	5. U. of Southern California
6. Harvard U.	6. Stanford U.	6. Stanford U.
6. Duke U.	7. U. of Southern California	7. U. of Michigan
8. Stanford U.	8. U. of Chicago	8. U. of Chicago
9. Northwestern U.	9. Harvard U.	9. U. of Minnesota, Twin Cities
10. MIT	10. MIT	10. Harvard U.
11. Columbia U.	10. INSEAD	11. Washington U. in St. Louis
12. U. of Minnesota	12. Duke U.	12. U. of California, Los Angeles
13. U. of California, Los Angeles	13. New York U.	13. Indiana U.
14. Ohio State U.	14. U. of California, Los Angeles	14. U. of Texas at Austin
15. U. of Washington, Seattle	15. Hong Kong U. of Science & Technology	15. London Business School
16. U. of Wisconsin—Madison	16. U. of South Carolina	16. U. of Maryland at College Park
16. Arizona State U.	17. Columbia U.	17. Duke U.
18. U. of British Columbia	18. Pennsylvania State U.	18. INSEAD
19. U. of Southern California	19. U. of British Columbia	19. Ohio State U.
20. U. of Rochester	20. U. of Texas at Dallas	20. MIT
21. U. of Arizona	21. Emory U.	21. U. of Washington, Seattle
22. Purdue U.	22. U. of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign	22. Carnegie Mellon U.
23. U. of California, Berkeley	23. U. of North Carolina at Chapel Hill	23. Boston U.
24. U. of Florida	24. Washington U. in St. Louis	24. U. of North Carolina at Chapel Hill
25. U. of Houston	25. U. of Florida	25. Northwestern U.
25. Texas A&M U.	26. U. of Minnesota	26. Hong Kong U. of Science & Technology
25. Cornell U.	27. London Business School	27. Arizona State U.
28. Dartmouth College	28. Erasmus U.	28. Erasmus U.
29. Pennsylvania State U.	28. Ohio State U.	29. HEC France

29. U. of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign	30. Michigan State U.	30. U. of California, Berkeley
31. U. of Colorado at Boulder	31. National U. of Singapore	31. National U. of Singapore
32. U. of Pittsburgh	32. Nanyang Technology U.	32. Georgia State U.
33. Indiana U.	33. U. of California, Berkeley	33. U. of Florida
34. Rutgers U.	34. Carnegie Mellon U.	34. Yale U.
34. Southern Methodist U.	35. Arizona State U.	35. Purdue U.
36. Louisiana State U.	36. Purdue U.	36. Cornell U.
36. McGill U.	37. Tilburg U.	37. Pennsylvania State U.
36. U. of North Carolina at Chapel Hill	38. Texas A&M U.	38. U. of Toronto
36. Virginia Tech	39. U. of Miami	39. U. of Colorado at Boulder
40. U. of South Carolina	40. Dartmouth College	40. U. of Wisconsin—Madison
41. Carnegie Mellon U.	41. Yale U.	41. Nanyang Technology U.
42. U. of Iowa	42. Cornell U.	42. Singapore Management U.
43. Baruch College—CUNY	43. U. of Georgia	43. U. of South Carolina
44. Yale U.	44. U. of Houston	44. Boston College
45. U. of Maryland	45. U. of Connecticut	45. Georgia Inst. of Tech.
46. U. of Utah	46. Rice U.	46. Texas A&MU.
47. U. of Georgia	47. U. of Pittsburg	47. U. of Arizona
47. Tel Aviv U.	48. Indiana U.	48. Temple U.
47. Case Western Reserve U.	49. U. of Alberta	49. Chinese U. of Hong Kong
47. London Business School	50. U. of Toronto	50. McGill U.
51. U. of California, Irvine	51. Hong Kong Polytechnic U.	51. Dartmouth College
51. Vanderbilt U.	52. U. of Wisconsin—Madison	52. U. of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign
53. State U. of New York at Buffalo	53. Boston College	53. Johns Hopkins U.
54. Florida State U.	54. Georgia State U.	54. U. of Warwick
55. Northeastern U.	54. U. of Western Ontario	55. Rice U.
56. North Carolina State U.	56. HEC France	56. Copenhagen Business School
57. U. of Oklahoma	57. U. of California, Irvine	57. U. of Pittsburgh
58. U. of Connecticut	58. York U.	58. Tilburg U.
59. Boston U.	59. U. of Utah	59. City U. of Hong Kong
59. U. of Notre Dame	60. Boston U.	60. Bocconi U.
59. U. of New South Wales	61. Georgia Tech.	61. U. of Georgia
59. U. of Texas at Arlington	62. Singapore Management U.	62. U. of Hong Kong
63. U. of Toronto	62. U. of Virginia, McIntire	63. U. of Miami
64. Boston College	64. City U. of Hong Kong	64. U. of Utah
64. INSEAD	65. U. of Colorado at Boulder	65. Emory U.
66. American U.	66. McGill U.	66. Western U.
66. Universite Laval	67. Simon Fraser U.	67. U. of Notre Dame
66. U. of Alberta	68. U. of Groningen	68. U. of British Columbia
66. U. of Tennessee at Knoxville	69. U. of Arizona	69. U. of California, San Diego
70. U. of Texas at Dallas	70. Vanderbilt U.	70. Northeastern U.
70. York U.	71. U. of Hong Kong	71. U. of Houston
70. U. of Missouri—Columbia	72. Temple U.	72. U. of New South Wales
70. Emory U.	73. Georgetown U.	73. U. of Cambridge
70. Oklahoma State U.	74. U. of Washington, Seattle	74. U. of California, Irvine
75. Georgia State U.	75. Chinese U. of Hong Kong	75. Indian School of Business
75. Texas Tech U.	76. Korea U.	76. Virginia Tech.
75. Santa Clara U.	76. U. of Notre Dame	77. U. of Montreal
78. San Jose State U.	78. Peking U.	78. Hong Kong Polytechnic U.

78. U. of Baltimore	79. U. of Missouri—Columbia	79. Michigan State U.
80. Baylor U.	80. Brigham Young U.	80. City U. London
81. Hebrew U. of Jerusalem	81. Rensselaer Polytechnic Inst.	81. U. of Navarra
81. U. of Cincinnati	82. Texas Christian U.	82. U. of Kentucky
81. U. of Delaware	83. U. of Arkansas	83. Texas Christian U.
81. U. of Massachusetts at Amherst	83. U. of Virginia, Darden	84. U. of Iowa
81. U. of Warwick	85. Southern Methodist U.	85. Georgetown U.
81. U. of Wisconsin—Milwaukee	86. Florida International U.	86. U. College of London
81. Wayne State U.	87. U. of Central Florida	87. U. of Melbourne
88. Marquette U.	88. HEC Montreal	88. State U. of New York at Buffalo
89. U. of Oregon	89. Universidad Carlos III de Madrid	89. Case Western Reserve U.
90. Texas Christian U.	90. Rutgers U.	90. U. of Connecticut
91. Temple U.	90. Washington State U.	91. Fudan U.
91. HEC France	90. George Washington U.	92. Southern Methodist U.
91. U. of Virginia, Darden	90. American U.	93. U. of Rochester
91. Washington State U.	94. U. of Oklahoma	94. Imperial College London
95. La Salle U.	94. U. of Navarra	95. U. of Virginia, Darden
95. Brock U.	96. U. of Rochester	96. U. of Oregon
95. College of William and Mary	97. U. of Iowa	97. U. of Amsterdam
95. Georgia Institute of Technology	98. Tel Aviv U.	98. Cheung Kong Grad School of Bus
95. Concordia U.	99. Catholic U. of Leuven	99. U. of Virginia, McIntire
95. U. of Illinois at Chicago	100. Koc U.	100. U. of Massachusetts at Amherst
	100. Case Western Reserve U.	

REFERENCES

- AACSB. (2008). Final report of the AACSB International Impact of Research Task Force. Tampa: AACSB.
- AACSB. (2019). www.aacsb.edu (Accessed 20 Feb 2018).
- Adler, N. J., & Harzing, A.-W. (2009). When knowledge wins: Transcending the sense and nonsense of academic rankings. *Academy of Management Learning and Education*, 8, 72–95.
- Ansari, S. M., Fiss, P. C., & Zajac, E. J. (2010). Made to fit: How practices vary as they diffuse. *Academy of Management Review*, 35, 67–92.
- Barney, J. B. (2001). Resource-based theories of competitive advantage: A ten-year retrospective on the resource-based view. *Journal of Management*, 27, 643–650.
- Bass, F. M. (2004). A new product growth model for consumer durables. *Management Science*, 50, 1825–1832.
- Baum, J. A. C. (2007). Cultural group selection in organizational studies. *Organization Studies*, 28, 37–47.
- Brock, D. M., Powell, M., & Hinings, C. R. (Eds.). (1999). *Restructuring the professional organization: Accounting, health care and law*. London: Routledge.
- Burt, R. (1992). *Structural Holes*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Daft, R. L., & Lewin, A. Y. (2008). Rigor and relevance in organizational studies: Idea migration and academic journal evolution. *Organization Science*, 19, 177–183.
- Davis, G. F., & Marquis, C. (2005). Prospects for organization theory in the early twenty-first century: Institutional fields and mechanisms. *Organization Science*, 16, 332–343.

- Davis, G. F., & Zald, M. N. (2008). Sociological classics and the canon in the study of organizations. In P. S. Adler (Ed.), *Oxford handbook of sociology and organizational studies: Classical resources*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- DeNisi, A. S. (2010). Challenges and opportunities for the Academy in the next decade. *Academy of Management Review*, 35, 190–201.
- DiMaggio, P., & Powell, W. (1983). The iron cage revisited: Institutional isomorphism and collective rationality in business and management fields. *American Sociology Review*, 48, 147–160.
- Djelic, M. (1993). *Exporting the American model*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Dunn, M. B., & Jones, C. (2010). Institutional logics and institutional pluralism: The contestation of care and science logics in medical education, 1967–2005. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 55, 114–149.
- Durand, R., & McGuire, J. (2005). Legitimizing agencies in the face of selection: The case of AACSB. *Organization Studies*, 26, 165–196.
- Eleazar, M. W., Peng, M. W., & Pinkham, B. C. (2019). *Weaponizing institutions*. Working paper, Jindal School of Management, University of Texas at Dallas.
- Fourcade, M. (2006). The construction of a global profession: The transnationalization of economics. *American Journal of Sociology*, 112, 145–194.
- Frickel, S., & Gross, N. (2005). A general theory of scientific/intellectual movements. *American Sociological Review*, 70, 204–232.
- Friedman, T. L. (2005). *The world is flat: A brief history of the twenty-first century*. New York: Farrar.
- George, E., Chattopadhyay, P., Sitkin, S. B., & Barden, J. (2006). Cognitive underpinnings of institutional persistence and change: A framing perspective. *Academy of Management Review*, 31, 347–365.
- Graffin, S. D., & Ward, A. J. (2010). Certifications and reputation: Determining the standard of desirability amidst uncertainty. *Organization Science*, 21, 331–346.
- Greenwood, R., & Suddaby, R. (2006). Institutional entrepreneurship in mature fields: The Big Five accounting firms. *Academy of Management Journal*, 49, 27–48.
- Greenwood, R., Diaz, A. M., Li, S. X., & Lorente, J. C. (2010). The multiplicity of institutional logics and the heterogeneity of business and management responses. *Organization Science*, 21, 521–539.
- Guler, I., Guillen, M. F., & Macpherson, J. M. (2002). Global competition, institutions, and the diffusion of organizational practices: The international spread of ISO 9000 quality certificates. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 47, 207–232.
- Hambrick, D. C., & Chen, M.-J. (2008). New academic fields as admittance-seeking social movements: The case of strategic management. *Academy of Management Review*, 33, 32–54.
- Harvey, H., Morris, H., & Kelly, A. (2007). *Academic journal quality guide*. London: Association of Business Schools.
- Jack, G. A., Calas, M. B., Nkomo, S. M., & Peltonen, T. (2008). Critique and international management: An uneasy relationship? *Academy of Management Review*, 33, 870–884.
- Jenkins, J. C. (1983). Resource mobilization theory and the study of social movements. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 9, 527–553.
- Kim, T.-Y., Shin, D., Oh, H., & Jeong, Y.-C. (2007). Inside the iron cage: Organizational political dynamics and institutional changes in presidential selection systems in Korean universities, 1985–2002. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 52, 286–323.
- Leung, K. (2007). The glory and tyranny of citation impact: An East Asian perspective. *Academy of Management Journal*, 50, 510–513.
- Li, Y., & Peng, M. W. (2008). Developing theory from strategic management research in China. *Asia Pacific Journal of Management*, 25, 563–572.
- Lin, Z., Peng, M. W., Yang, H., & Sun, S. L. (2009). How do networks and learning drive M&A? An institutional comparison between China and the United States. *Strategic Management Journal*, 30, 1113–1132.
- Macdonald, S., & Kam, J. (2007). Ring a ring O'Roses: Quality journals and gamesmanship in management studies. *Journal of Management Studies*, 44, 640–655.

- Maguire, S., & Hardy, C. (2009). Discourse and deinstitutionalization: The decline of DDT. *Academy of Management Journal*, 52, 148–178.
- Mangematin, V., & Baden-Fuller, C. (2008). Global contests in the production of business knowledge: Regional centers and individual business schools. *Long Range Planning*, 41, 117–139.
- Mao, J.-Y. (2018). Forty years of business research in China: A critical reflection and projection. *Frontiers of Business Research in China*, 12, 323–330.
- McAdam, D., & Scott, W. R. (2005). Organizations and movements. In G. F. Davis, D. McAdam, W. R. Scott, & M. N. Zald (Eds.), *Social movements and organization theory*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Meyer, K. E. (2006). Asian management research needs more self-confidence. *Asia Pacific Journal of Management*, 23, 119–137.
- Mitra, D., & Golder, P. N. (2008). Does academic research help or hurt MBA programs? *Journal of Marketing*, 72, 31–49.
- Mudambi, R., Peng, M. W., & Weng, D. (2008). Research rankings of Asia Pacific business schools: Global versus local knowledge strategies. *Asia Pacific Journal of Management*, 25, 171–188.
- Muzio, D., Brock, D. M., & Suddaby, R. (2013). Professions and institutional change: Towards an institutionalist sociology of the professions. *Journal of Management Studies*, 50, 699–721.
- Nkomo, S. M. (2009). The seductive power of academic journal rankings: Challenges of searching for the otherwise. *Academy of Management Learning and Education*, 8, 106–112.
- Palmer, D. (2006). Taking stock of the criteria we use to evaluate one another's work: ASQ 50 years out. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 51, 535–559.
- Pederzini, G., & Barraza, M. (2019). Just let us be: Domination, the postcolonial condition, and the global field of business schools. *Academy of Management Learning and Education* in press.
- Peng, M. W. (2003). Institutional transitions and strategic choices. *Academy of Management Review*, 28, 275–296.
- Peng, M. W. (2007). Celebrating 25 years of Asia Pacific management research. *Asia Pacific Journal of Management*, 24, 385–394.
- Peng, M. W. (2012). Improving made-in-China management research. *Frontiers of Business Research in China*, 6, 120–133.
- Peng, M. W., & Dess, G. G. (2010). In the spirit of scholarship. *Academy of Management Learning and Education*, 9, 282–298.
- Peng, M. W., Lebedev, S., Vlas, C. O., Wang, J. C., & Shay, J. (2018a). The growth of the firm in (and out of) emerging economies. *Asia Pacific Journal of Management*, 35, 829–857.
- Peng, M. W., Nguyen, H. W., Wang, J. C., Hasenhubtl, M., & Shay, J. (2018b). Bringing institutions into strategy teaching. *Academy of Management Learning and Education*, 17, 259–278.
- Peng, M. W., Sun, S. L., Pinkham, B., & Chen, H. (2009). The institution-based view as a third leg for a strategy tripod. *Academy of Management Perspectives*, 23, 63–81.
- Peng, M. W., Wang, D., & Jiang, Y. (2008). An institution-based view of international business strategy: A focus on emerging economies. *Journal of International Business Studies*, 39, 920–936.
- Pfeffer, J. (1993). Barriers to the advance of business and management science: Paradigm development as a dependent variable. *Academy of Management Review*, 18, 599–620.
- Rogers, E. (1983). *Diffusion of innovations* (3rd ed.). New York: Free Press.
- Sauder, M., & Espeland, W. N. (2009). The discipline of rankings: Tight coupling and organizational change. *American Sociological Review*, 74, 63–82.
- Schofer, E., & Meyer, J. W. (2005). The worldwide expansion of higher education in the twentieth century. *American Sociological Review*, 70, 898–920.
- Scott, W. R. (2008). Lords of the dance: Professionals as institutional agents. *Organization Studies*, 29, 219–238.
- Shaw, J. D. (2017). Advantages of starting with theory. *Academy of Management Journal*, 60, 819–822.
- Starbuck, W. H. (2005). How much better are the most-prestigious journals? The statistics of academic publication. *Organization Science*, 16, 180–200.

- Staw, B. M., & Epstein, L. D. (2000). What bandwagons bring: Effects of popular management techniques on corporate performance, reputation, and CEO pay. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 45, 523–556.
- Suddaby, R., & Greenwood, R. (2005). Rhetorical strategies of legitimacy. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 50, 35–67.
- Tolbert, P. S., & Zucker, L. G. (1983). Institutional sources of change in the formal structure of organizations: The diffusion of civil service reform, 1880–1935. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 28, 22–39.
- Tsui, A. S. (2007). From homogenization to pluralism: International management research in the Academy and beyond. *Academy of Management Journal*, 50, 1353–1364.
- van Fleet, D. D., McWilliams, A., & Siegel, D. S. (2000). A theoretical and empirical analysis of journal rankings: The case of formal lists. *Journal of Management*, 26, 839–861.
- Wang, H., Ye, K., & Zhong, K. (2018). Accounting research in China: Commemorating the 40th anniversary of reform and opening up. *Frontiers of Business Research in China*, 12, 344–380.
- Weber, K., Heinze, K. L., & DeSoucey, M. (2008). Forage for thought: Mobilizing codes in the movement for grass-fed meat and dairy products. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 53, 529–567.
- Worrell, D. L. (2009). Assessing business scholarship: The difficulties in moving beyond the rigor-relevance paradigm trap. *Academy of Management Learning and Education*, 8, 127–130.
- Xiao, Z., & Tsui, A. S. (2007). Where brokers do not work: The cultural contingency of social capital in Chinese high-tech firms. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 52, 1–31.
- Xu, D. (2009). Opportunities and challenges for academic returnees in China. *Asia Pacific Journal of Management*, 26, 27–35.
- Zald, M. N. (2008). Social movements and political sociology in the analysis of organizations and markets. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 53, 568–574.
- Zammuto, R. F. (2008). Accreditation and the globalization of business. *Academy of Management Learning and Education*, 7, 258–268.
- Zoogah, D. B., & Peng, M. W. (2019). Behind the emergence of management scholarly communities in Asia and Africa. *Africa Journal of Management*, 5, 1–23.

TRANSLATED VERSION: SPANISH

Below is a rough translation of the insights presented above. This was done to give a general understanding of the ideas presented in the paper. Please excuse any grammatical mistakes and do not hold the original authors responsible for these mistakes.

VERSION TRADUCIDA: ESPAÑOL

A continuación se muestra una traducción aproximada de las ideas presentadas anteriormente. Esto se hizo para dar una comprensión general de las ideas presentadas en el documento. Por favor, disculpe cualquier error gramatical y no responsabilite a los autores originales de estos errores.

INTRODUCCIÓN

Recientemente se ha producido una mayor profesionalización en la gestión de las escuelas de negocios. Uno de los signos notables de tal profesionalización es la adopción explícita de una lista de revistas "A" en la que se espera que los miembros de la facultad publiquen. Sin una lista formal de revistas deseables, los miembros de la facultad, por supuesto, siempre se han esforzado por publicar en los puntos de venta de la

más alta calidad posible. Lo que es interesante es la reciente adopción formal de una lista "A" por más escuelas de todo el mundo.

Históricamente, la publicación académica y la competencia a menudo tuvieron lugar dentro de una región, con relativamente poca penetración interregional. Por ejemplo, los eruditos chinos publicaron principalmente en revistas con sede en China, Footnote1 y académicos estadounidenses publicados principalmente en revistas con sede en Estados Unidos. Sin embargo, una tendencia emergente en las últimas dos décadas es que la investigación, la publicación y la competencia en las becas de negocios y gestión se han vuelto más globales (denisi 2010; Mangematin y Baden-Fuller 2008; Peng 2007; Peng y Dess 2010; Zoogah y Peng 2019). Específicamente, las revistas con sede en Estados Unidos han atraído cada vez más a académicos de todo el mundo (Baum 2007; Leung 2007; Tsui 2007). Han surgido dos conjuntos de revistas predominantemente estadounidenses, compiladas por la Universidad de Texas en Dallas (UTD) y Financial Times (FT), dos conjuntos de revistas predominantemente estadounidenses, compiladas por la Universidad de Texas en Dallas (UTD) y Financial Times (FT). Estas revistas no sólo atraen la atención de los académicos, sino también de los administradores universitarios, agencias de financiación y ministerios gubernamentales.

Se puede hacer un caso de que a medida que el mundo de la competencia empresarial se hace global, el mundo de la competencia académica también se ha vuelto "plano" (Friedman 2005). En la era de la globalización caracterizada por un mundo plano, ha surgido un conjunto de normas mundiales para evaluar la productividad y la calidad de la investigación de las escuelas de negocios (Mangematin y Baden-Fuller 2008; 2008; Peng y Dess 2010; 2018a). El surgimiento y difusión de estas nuevas normas no han estado exentos de controversias y resistencias en todo el mundo (Adler y Harzing 2009; Macdonald y Kam 2007). Las críticas van desde la objeción contra cualquier lista formal de revistas hasta la protesta entre algunos eruditos no estadounidenses contra el uso de la lista combinada UTD/FT, que se argumenta que es una lista estadounidense oculta bajo el nombre de una lista "global". La lista combinada UTD/FT, en adelante, la lista "A" en el resto de este artículo, es una lista inconfundiblemente estadounidense. Incluso con la adición en 2010 de importantes medios europeos, como el Journal of Management Studies and Organization Studies a la lista FT, la mayoría de las revistas UTD y FT son editadas por académicos con sede en Estados Unidos. Lo que es especialmente interesante es que la difusión de la lista "A" ha tenido lugar recientemente durante un período de presunto declive estadounidense (en diversas áreas como la influencia geopolítica y la competitividad económica). Entonces, ¿cómo podemos explicar la reciente difusión de la lista A(merican)? Más importante aún, ¿cómo afecta esa difusión al futuro de las becas empresariales y de gestión?

Este artículo aborda estas dos preguntas cruciales pero infraexploradas. Aunque no hay "ninguna teoría explícita" subyacente al desarrollo de listas formales de revistas (van Fleet et al. 2000: p. 842), argumentamos que el movimiento social y las literaturas de difusión de la innovación nos permiten teorizar sobre cómo los eruditos investigan, publican y compiten en un mundo cada vez más plano. Específicamente, sugerimos que la difusión global de la lista "A" representa la creciente profesionalización en la gestión de las escuelas de negocios y también representa el auge de un movimiento intelectual que converge sobre un conjunto de estándares globales de excelencia. Antes de proceder, es importante señalar que no estamos afirmando si la adopción del conjunto de normas globales representadas por la lista "A" es apropiada o inapropiada. Siempre que sea posible, delineamos tanto los pros como los contras asociados con este fenómeno.

Si bien existe una corriente de trabajo sobre profesiones y cambios institucionales, la mayor parte de este trabajo se ha centrado en empresas de servicios profesionales como contabilidad, atención médica y bufetes de abogados (Brock et al. 1999; 2019; Greenwood y Suddaby 2006; 2013; Scott 2008). No hay duda de que las universidades son organizaciones profesionales que operan en entornos institucionalizados. Mientras que las universidades han sido estudiadas (Schofer y Meyer 2005), las escuelas profesionales específicas dentro de las universidades se han estudiado incluyen las escuelas de derecho (Sauder y Espeland 2009) y las escuelas de medicina (Dunn y Jones 2010). Las profesiones y el cambio institucional dentro de las escuelas de negocios rara vez se investigan. Este artículo contribuye así a la literatura sobre profesiones y el cambio institucional al comenzar a llenar el vacío con un enfoque en las escuelas de

negocios. Nuestro objetivo es primero desarrollar un modelo multinivel para explicar los factores detrás de la difusión de la lista "A", y luego predecir su probable impacto en futuras becas.

CONCLUSIÓN

La forma en que elegimos investigar, publicar y competir como una comunidad de estudiosos en un mundo plano revela mucho sobre cómo nuestra profesión organiza la disciplina y cómo valoramos la producción de conocimiento de cierta manera. Claramente, como miembros de una comunidad escolar profesional, estamos familiarizados con los procesos de profesionalización que afectan a muchas otras organizaciones. Sin embargo, curiosamente, se ha prestado relativamente poca atención a la profesionalización de nuestra propia profesión (Peng et al. 2018b: p. 271). Este artículo argumenta que tenemos que dedicar algo de atención sobre cómo organizamos nuestro mundo de becas en una era de competencia global. En términos teóricos, la difusión y adopción de una lista "A" formal puede conceptualizarse como la formalización de las normas informales. "Las profesiones son, por sí mismas, instituciones que, en los últimos 30 años, han experimentado cambios profundos" (Muzio et al. 2013: p. 699). Por lo tanto, una mejor comprensión de cómo los académicos, las escuelas y las partes interesadas responden estratégicamente a esos entornos institucionales cambiantes tiene el potencial de contribuir significativamente a la visión basada en la institución desde un ángulo previamente infraexplorado (Peng 2003; 2009; 2018b; 2008; Scott 2008).

En términos generales, el debate sobre el ascenso y la difusión de la lista "A" parece ser un episodio más del debate sobre la convergencia frente a la divergencia en el contexto más amplio de la globalización. Mientras que los defensores de la convergencia celebran la gloria de la lista "A", los defensores de la divergencia critican su tiranía. A los no EE.UU. Los estudiosos quejándose de la hegemonía de estados Unidos, como su necesidad de citar teorías y autores estadounidenses, necesitamos recordarles que no hace mucho tiempo, los sociólogos estadounidenses, en un esfuerzo por mejorar la legitimidad de su trabajo, necesitaban "citar a un alemán muerto que lo dijo primero" (Davis y Zald 2008: p. 635). Nota al pie de página10 Si bien la forma en que la beca alemana perdió una posición de liderazgo intelectual tan prestigiosa en todo el mundo está fuera del alcance de este artículo, basta con decir que si la historia es una guía, ninguna ventaja competitiva, ni en la academia ni en los negocios, estará para siempre en competencia global.

TRANSLATED VERSION: FRENCH

Below is a rough translation of the insights presented above. This was done to give a general understanding of the ideas presented in the paper. Please excuse any grammatical mistakes and do not hold the original authors responsible for these mistakes.

VERSION TRADUITE: FRANÇAIS

Voici une traduction approximative des idées présentées ci-dessus. Cela a été fait pour donner une compréhension générale des idées présentées dans le document. Veuillez excuser toutes les erreurs grammaticales et ne pas tenir les auteurs originaux responsables de ces erreurs.

INTRODUCTION

Une professionnalisation croissante dans la gestion des écoles de commerce a eu lieu récemment. L'un des signes notables d'une telle professionnalisation est l'adoption explicite d'une liste de revues « A » sur laquelle les membres du corps professoral sont censés publier. Sans une liste officielle de revues souhaitables, les membres du corps professoral ont bien sûr toujours essayé de publier dans les points de

vente de la plus haute qualité possible. Ce qui est intéressant, c'est l'adoption formelle récente d'une liste « A » par un plus grand nombre d'écoles à travers le monde.

Historiquement, l'édition savante et la concurrence ont souvent eu lieu dans une région, avec relativement peu de pénétration interrégionale. Par exemple, les chercheurs chinois ont pour la plupart publié dans des revues basées en Chine, Note de bas de page 1 et des chercheurs américains principalement publiés dans des revues basées aux États-Unis. Cependant, une tendance émergente au cours des deux dernières décennies est que la recherche, l'édition, et la concurrence dans les études d'affaires et de gestion sont devenues plus globales (denisi 2010 ; Mangematin et Baden-Fuller 2008; Peng, 2007; Peng et Dess, 2010; Zoogah et Peng 2019). Plus précisément, les revues américaines attirent de plus en plus de chercheurs du monde entier (Baum, 2007; Leung, 2007; Tsui, 2007). Étiquetés comme le « haut niveau », le « mainstream » et la liste « A », deux séries de revues principalement américaines – compilées par l'Université du Texas à Dallas (UTD) et le Financial Times (FT) – ont vu le jour. Ces revues attirent non seulement l'attention des chercheurs, mais aussi des administrateurs universitaires, des organismes de financement et des ministères.

On peut faire en sorte qu'à mesure que le monde de la concurrence commerciale se mondialise, le monde de la concurrence savante est également devenu « plat » (Friedman, 2005). À l'ère de la mondialisation caractérisée par un monde plat, un ensemble de normes mondiales a vu le jour pour évaluer la productivité et la qualité de la recherche en école de commerce (Mangematin et Baden-Fuller, 2008; Mudambi et coll. 2008; Peng et Dess, 2010; Peng et coll. 2018a). L'émergence et la diffusion de ces nouvelles normes n'ont pas été sans controverses et résistances dans le monde entier (Adler et Harzing, 2009; Macdonald et Kam, 2007). Les critiques vont de l'objection contre toute liste de revues formelles à la protestation de certains universitaires non basés aux États-Unis contre l'utilisation de la liste combinée UTD/FT, qui est soutenu comme une liste américaine masquée sous le nom d'une liste « globale ». La liste combinée UTD/FT — ci-après, la liste « A » dans le reste de cet article — est une liste incontestablement américaine. Même avec l'ajout en 2010 d'importants points de vente européens tels que le Journal of Management Studies and Organization Studies à la liste FT, la majorité des revues UTD et FT sont éditées par des chercheurs basés aux États-Unis. Ce qui est particulièrement intéressant, c'est que la diffusion de la liste « A » a récemment eu lieu au cours d'une période de déclin américain présumé (dans divers domaines tels que l'influence géopolitique et la compétitivité économique). Alors, comment expliquer la diffusion récente de la liste A (américaine)? Plus important encore, comment une telle diffusion a-t-elle un impact sur l'avenir des bourses d'études en affaires et en gestion?

Cet article aborde ces deux questions cruciales mais sous-exploitées. Bien qu'il n'y ait « aucune théorie explicite » sous-jacente à l'élaboration de listes de revues officielles (van Fleet et coll. 2000 : p. 842), nous soutenons que les documents sur le mouvement social et la diffusion de l'innovation nous permettent de théoriser sur la façon dont les chercheurs font de la recherche, publient et rivalisent dans un monde de plus en plus plat. Plus précisément, nous suggérons que la diffusion mondiale de la liste « A » représente la professionnalisation croissante dans la gestion des écoles de commerce et représente également l'essor d'un mouvement intellectuel convergeant vers un ensemble de normes mondiales d'excellence. Avant d'aller de l'avant, il est important de noter que nous n'affirmons pas si l'adoption de l'ensemble des normes mondiales représentées par la liste « A » est appropriée ou inappropriée. Dans la mesure du possible, nous décrivons à la fois les avantages et les inconvénients associés à ce phénomène.

Bien qu'il y ait un flux de travail sur les professions et les changements institutionnels, la plupart de ces travaux ont porté sur des cabinets de services professionnels tels que la comptabilité, les soins de santé et les cabinets d'avocats (Brock et coll., 1999; Eleazar et coll. 2019; Greenwood et Suddaby, 2006; Muzio et coll. 2013; Scott, 2008). Il ne fait aucun doute que les universités sont des organisations professionnelles opérant dans des environnements institutionnalisés. Bien que les universités aient été étudiées (Schofer et Meyer, 2005), les écoles professionnelles spécifiques au sein des universités ont été étudiées, notamment les facultés de droit (Sauder et Espeland, 2009) et les facultés de médecine (Dunn et Jones, 2010). Les professions et les changements institutionnels au sein des écoles de commerce sont rarement étudiés. Cet article contribue ainsi à la littérature sur les professions et le changement institutionnel en commençant à combler le vide en se concentrant sur les écoles de commerce. Notre objectif est d'abord de développer un

modèle à plusieurs niveaux pour expliquer les facteurs à l'origine de la diffusion de la liste « A », puis de prévoir son impact probable sur les bourses d'études futures.

CONCLUSION

La façon dont nous choisissons de faire de la recherche, de publier et de concourir en tant que communauté de chercheurs dans un monde plat en révèle beaucoup sur la façon dont notre profession organise la discipline et comment nous valorisons la production de connaissances d'une certaine manière. De toute évidence, en tant que membres d'une communauté scolaire professionnelle, nous connaissons bien les processus de professionnalisation qui touchent de nombreuses autres organisations. Pourtant, fait intéressant, relativement peu d'attention à la recherche a été accordée à la professionnalisation de notre propre profession (Peng et coll. 2018b: p. 271). Cet article soutient que nous devons consacrer une certaine attention à la façon dont nous organisons notre monde d'érudition à l'ère de la concurrence mondiale. En termes théoriques, la diffusion et l'adoption d'une liste officielle « A » peuvent être conceptualisées comme formalisation de normes informelles. « Les professions sont elles-mêmes des institutions qui, au cours des 30 dernières années, ont connu des changements profonds » (Muzio et coll., 2013 : p. 699). Par conséquent, une meilleure compréhension de la façon dont les chercheurs, les écoles et les intervenants réagissent stratégiquement à de tels environnements institutionnels changeants a le potentiel de contribuer de façon significative au point de vue des institutions sous-exploité (Peng, 2003; Peng et coll. 2009; Peng et coll. 2018b; Peng et coll. 2008; Scott, 2008).

D'une manière générale, le débat sur la montée et la diffusion de la liste « A » semble être un épisode de plus du débat sur la convergence par rapport à la divergence dans le contexte plus large de la mondialisation. Alors que les partisans de la convergence célèbrent la gloire de la liste « A », les partisans de la divergence critiquent sa tyrannie. Vers des pays non américains les chercheurs se plaignant de l'hégémonie américaine, comme leur besoin de citer des théories et des auteurs américains, nous devons leur rappeler qu'il n'y a pas si longtemps, les sociologues américains, dans un effort pour renforcer la légitimité de leur travail, devaient « citer un Allemand mort qui l'a dit en premier » (Davis et Zald 2008 : p. 635). Note de bas de page 10 Bien que la façon dont l'érudition allemande ait perdu une position de leadership intellectuel aussi prestigieuse dans le monde entier ne soit pas dans le cadre de cet article, il suffit de dire que si l'histoire est un guide, aucun avantage concurrentiel – dans le milieu universitaire ou dans les affaires – ne sera à jamais en concurrence mondiale.

TRANSLATED VERSION: GERMAN

Below is a rough translation of the insights presented above. This was done to give a general understanding of the ideas presented in the paper. Please excuse any grammatical mistakes and do not hold the original authors responsible for these mistakes.

ÜBERSETZTE VERSION: DEUTSCH

Hier ist eine ungefähre Übersetzung der oben vorgestellten Ideen. Dies wurde getan, um ein allgemeines Verständnis der in dem Dokument vorgestellten Ideen zu vermitteln. Bitte entschuldigen Sie alle grammatikalischen Fehler und machen Sie die ursprünglichen Autoren nicht für diese Fehler verantwortlich.

EINLEITUNG

In letzter Zeit hat die Professionalisierung in der Verwaltung von Business Schools zugenommen. Eines der auffälligen Anzeichen einer solchen Professionalisierung ist die explizite Annahme einer "A"-Journalliste, auf der Fakultätsmitglieder veröffentlicht werden sollen. Ohne eine formelle Liste von wünschenswerten Zeitschriften, Fakultätsmitglieder natürlich haben sich immer bemüht, in der höchsten

Qualität Outlets möglich zu veröffentlichen. Interessant ist die kürzliche formelle Annahme einer A-Liste durch mehr Schulen auf der ganzen Welt.

Historisch gesehen fanden wissenschaftliche Veröffentlichungen und Wettbewerbe oft innerhalb einer Region statt, mit relativ wenig überregionaler Durchdringung. Zum Beispiel, chinesische Gelehrte meist in China-basierten Zeitschriften veröffentlicht, Footnote1 und amerikanische Gelehrte meist in US-basierten Zeitschriften veröffentlicht. Ein sich abzeichnender Trend in den letzten zwei Jahrzehnten ist jedoch, dass Forschung, Verlagswesen und Wettbewerb in der Unternehmens- und Managementwissenschaft globaler geworden sind (denisi 2010; Mangematin und Baden-Fuller 2008; Peng 2007; Peng und Dess 2010; Zoogah und Peng 2019). Insbesondere us-basierte Zeitschriften haben zunehmend Wissenschaftler aus der ganzen Welt angezogen (Baum 2007; Leung 2007; Tsui 2007). Zwei Gruppen von überwiegend US-amerikanischen Zeitschriften, die von der University of Texas at Dallas (UTD) und der Financial Times (FT) zusammengestellt wurden, sind als "Top-Tier", "Mainstream" und "A"-Liste bezeichnet und haben sich herausgebildet. Diese Zeitschriften ziehen nicht nur die Aufmerksamkeit von Wissenschaftlern auf sich, sondern auch von Universitätsverwaltern, Förderagenturen und Ministerien.

Man kann sagen, dass die Welt des wissenschaftlichen Wettbewerbs mit der globalen Welt des Unternehmenswettbewerbs auch "flach" geworden ist (Friedman 2005). Im Zeitalter der Globalisierung, die von einer flachen Welt geprägt ist, hat sich eine Reihe von weltweiten Standards entwickelt, um die Produktivität und Qualität der Business School Forschung zu bewerten (Mangematin und Baden-Fuller 2008; Mudambi et al. 2008; Peng und Dess 2010; Peng et al. 2018a). Die Entstehung und Verbreitung dieser neuen Normen war nicht ohne Kontroversen und Widerstand auf der ganzen Welt (Adler und Harzing 2009; Macdonald und Kam 2007). Die Kritik reicht vom Einwand gegen eine formelle Zeitschriftenliste bis hin zum Protest einiger nicht-US-amerikanischer Gelehrter gegen die Verwendung der kombinierten UTD/FT-Liste, die als eine amerikanische Liste unter dem Namen einer "globalen" Liste getarnt wird. Die kombinierte UTD/FT-Liste – im Folgenden die "A"-Liste im Rest dieses Artikels – ist eine unverkennbar amerikanische Liste. Selbst mit der 2010 Aufnahme wichtiger europäischer Medien wie dem Journal of Management Studies und Organization Studies in die FT-Liste wird eine Mehrheit der UTD- und FT-Zeitschriften von US-amerikanischen Wissenschaftlern herausgegeben. Besonders interessant ist, dass die Verbreitung der A-Liste in letzter Zeit in einer Zeit des angeblichen amerikanischen Niedergangs stattgefunden hat (in verschiedenen Bereichen wie geopolitischem Einfluss und wirtschaftlicher Wettbewerbsfähigkeit). Wie können wir dann die jüngste Verbreitung der A(Merican)-Liste erklären? Noch wichtiger ist, wie wirkt sich eine solche Verbreitung auf die Zukunft des Unternehmens- und Managementstipendiums aus?

Dieser Artikel behandelt diese beiden entscheidenden, aber nicht erforschten Fragen. Obwohl der Entwicklung formaler Zeitschriftenlisten "keine explizite Theorie" zugrunde liegt (van Fleet et al. 2000: S. 842), argumentieren wir, dass die Literaturen der sozialen Bewegung und der Innovationsdiffusion es uns ermöglichen, zu theoretisieren, wie Wissenschaftler in einer immer flacher werdenden Welt forschen, veröffentlichen und konkurrieren. Insbesondere schlagen wir vor, dass die globale Verbreitung der "A"-Liste die zunehmende Professionalisierung in der Verwaltung von Business Schools darstellt und auch den Aufstieg einer intellektuellen Bewegung darstellt, die sich auf eine Reihe globaler Exzellenzstandards konvergiert. Bevor wir fortfahren, ist es wichtig zu beachten, dass wir nicht behaupten, ob die Annahme der globalen Standards, die durch die "A"-Liste dargestellt werden, angemessen oder unangemessen ist. Wann immer möglich, skizzieren wir sowohl die Vor- als auch Nachteile, die mit diesem Phänomen verbunden sind.

Während es eine Reihe von Arbeiten zu Berufen und institutionellen Veränderungen gibt, konzentrierte sich der größte Teil dieser Arbeit auf professionelle Dienstleistungsunternehmen wie Buchhaltung, Gesundheitswesen und Anwaltskanzleien (Brock et al. 1999; Eleazar et al. 2019; Greenwood und Suddaby 2006; Muzio et al. 2013; Scott 2008). Es besteht kein Zweifel daran, dass Universitäten Professionelle Organisationen sind, die in institutionalisierten Umgebungen tätig sind. Während Universitäten untersucht wurden (Schofer und Meyer 2005), wurden die spezifischen Berufsschulen innerhalb der Universitäten untersucht, darunter Rechtsschulen (Sauder und Espeland 2009) und medizinische Schulen (Dunn und Jones 2010). Berufe und institutionelle Veränderungen innerhalb von

Business Schools werden selten untersucht. Dieser Artikel trägt somit zur Literatur über Berufe und institutionelle Veränderungen bei, indem er beginnt, die Lücke mit einem Fokus auf Business Schools zu füllen. Unser Ziel ist es, zunächst ein mehrstufiges Modell zu entwickeln, um die Faktoren hinter der Verbreitung der "A"-Liste zu erklären und dann ihre wahrscheinlichen Auswirkungen auf zukünftige Stipendien vorherzusagen.

SCHLUSSFOLGERUNG

Wie wir als Gemeinschaft von Gelehrten in einer flachen Welt forschen, veröffentlichen und konkurrieren wollen, verrät viel darüber, wie unser Beruf die Disziplin organisiert und wie wir Wissensproduktion auf eine bestimmte Art und Weise schätzen. Als Mitglieder einer professionellen Schulgemeinschaft sind wir natürlich mit den Professionalisierungsprozessen vertraut, die zahlreiche andere Organisationen betreffen. Interessanterweise wurde der Professionalisierung unseres eigenen Berufs jedoch relativ wenig Aufmerksamkeit geschenkt (Peng et al. 2018b: S. 271). Dieser Artikel argumentiert, dass wir etwas Aufmerksamkeit darauf legen müssen, wie wir unsere Welt des Stipendiums in einer Ära des globalen Wettbewerbs organisieren. Theoretisch kann die Verbreitung und Annahme einer formalen A-Liste als Formalisierung informeller Normen konzipiert werden. "Berufe sind selbst Institutionen, die in den letzten 30 Jahren tiefgreifende Veränderungen erfahren haben" (Muzio et al. 2013: S. 699). Daher hat ein besseres Verständnis dafür, wie Wissenschaftler, Schulen und Interessengruppen strategisch auf solche sich wandelnden institutionellen Umgebungen reagieren, das Potenzial, einen wesentlichen Beitrag zur institutsbasierten Sichtweise aus bisher unterausgerüpfte Sicht zu leisten (Peng 2003; Peng et al. 2009; Peng et al. 2018b; Peng et al. 2008; Scott 2008).

Im Großen und Ganzen scheint die Debatte über den Aufstieg und die Verbreitung der A-Liste eine weitere Episode der Debatte über Konvergenz versus Divergenz im größeren Kontext der Globalisierung zu sein. Während die Befürworter der Konvergenz den Ruhm der A-Liste feiern, kritisieren die Befürworter der Divergenz ihre Tyrannei. An Nicht-USA Wissenschaftler, die sich über die US-Hegemonie beschweren, wie ihre Notwendigkeit, US-Theorien und Autoren zu zitieren, müssen wir sie daran erinnern, dass vor nicht allzu langer Zeit US-Soziologen, in dem Bemühen, die Legitimität ihrer Arbeit zu verbessern, "einen toten Deutschen zitieren mussten, der es zuerst sagte" (Davis und Zald 2008: S. 635). Fußnote¹⁰ Während die Art und Weise, wie das deutsche Stipendium eine so prestigeträchtige intellektuelle Führungsposition auf der ganzen Welt verloren hat, nicht in den Rahmen dieses Artikels fällt, genügt es zu sagen, dass, wenn Geschichte irgendein Leitfaden ist, kein Wettbewerbsvorteil – in der Wissenschaft oder in der Wirtschaft – für immer im globalen Wettbewerb sein wird.

TRANSLATED VERSION: PORTUGUESE

Below is a rough translation of the insights presented above. This was done to give a general understanding of the ideas presented in the paper. Please excuse any grammatical mistakes and do not hold the original authors responsible for these mistakes.

VERSÃO TRADUZIDA: PORTUGUÊS

Aqui está uma tradução aproximada das ideias acima apresentadas. Isto foi feito para dar uma compreensão geral das ideias apresentadas no documento. Por favor, desculpe todos os erros gramaticais e não responsabilize os autores originais responsáveis por estes erros.

INTRODUÇÃO

O aumento da profissionalização na gestão das escolas de negócios tem ocorrido nos últimos tempos. Um dos sinais visíveis de tal profissionalização é a adoção explícita de uma lista de revistas "a" na qual se espera que os membros do corpo docente publiquem. Sem uma lista formal de revistas desejáveis, os docentes sempre se esforçaram por publicar nos mais altos mercados possíveis. O que é interessante é a recente adoção formal de uma lista "a" por mais escolas em todo o mundo.

Historicamente, a publicação e a concorrência acadêmicas ocorreram frequentemente numa região, com uma penetração trans-regional relativamente pequena. Por exemplo, os estudiosos chineses publicados majoritariamente em revistas chinesas, footnote1 e estudiosos americanos publicados majoritariamente em revistas americanas. No entanto, uma tendência emergente nas últimas duas décadas é que a investigação, a publicação e a concorrência na bolsa de estudos de negócios e gestão se tornaram mais globais (denisi 2010; mangematin e baden-fuller 2008; peng 2007; peng e dess 2010; zoogah e peng 2019). Especificamente, as revistas norte-americanas têm atraído cada vez mais estudiosos de todo o mundo (baum 2007; leung 2007; tsui 2007). Rotulados como o "top tier", o "mainstream", e a lista "a", surgiram dois conjuntos de revistas predominantemente baseadas nos eua, compiladas pela universidade do texas em dallas (utd) e financial times (ft) - surgiram. Estes jornais não só atraem a atenção dos acadêmicos, mas também dos administradores universitários, das agências de financiamento e dos ministérios do governo.

Pode-se dizer que, à medida que o mundo da concorrência empresarial se torna global, o mundo da concorrência acadêmica tornou-se também "flat" (friedman 2005). Na era da globalização caracterizada por um mundo plano, surgiu um conjunto de normas mundiais para avaliar a produtividade e a qualidade da investigação em business school (mangematin e baden-fuller 2008; mudambi et al. 2008; peng e dess 2010; peng et al. 2018a). O aparecimento e difusão destas novas normas não foram sem controvérsias e resistências em todo o mundo (adler e harzing 2009; macdonald e kam 2007). As críticas vão desde a objeção contra qualquer lista formal de revistas até ao protesto de alguns estudiosos não-americanos contra a utilização da lista combinada utd/ft, que se argumenta ser uma lista americana camuflada sob o nome de uma lista "global". A lista combinada utd/ft - doravante, a lista "a" no restante deste artigo - é uma lista americana inequivocamente americana. Mesmo com a adição de 2010 de importantes pontos de venda europeus, como o journal of management studies and organization studies à lista ft, a maioria das revistas utd e ft são editadas por estudiosos sediados nos eua. O que é especialmente interessante é que a difusão da lista "a" ocorreu recentemente durante um período de alegado declínio americano (em vários domínios, como a influência geopolítica e a competitividade económica). Então, como podemos explicar a recente difusão da lista a(american) ? Mais importante, como é que essa difusão afeta o futuro da bolsa de estudos de gestão e negócios?

Este artigo aborda estas duas questões cruciais, mas subexploradas. Embora não exista "nenhuma teoria explícita" subjacente ao desenvolvimento de listas de revistas formais (van fleet et al. 2000: p. 842), argumentamos que o movimento social e as literaturas de difusão de inovação permitem teorizar sobre como os estudiosos fazem pesquisa, publicam e competem num mundo cada vez mais plano. Especificamente, sugerimos que a difusão global da lista "a" representa a crescente profissionalização na gestão das escolas de negócios e representa também a ascensão de um movimento intelectual convergindo num conjunto de padrões globais de excelência. Antes de prosseguir, é importante notar que não estamos a afirmar se a adoção do conjunto de normas globais representadas pela lista "a" é adequada ou inadequada. Sempre que possível, delineamos tanto os prós como os contras associados a este fenómeno.

Embora haja um fluxo de trabalho sobre profissões e mudanças institucionais, a maior parte deste trabalho tem-se centrado em empresas de serviços profissionais como a contabilidade, os cuidados de saúde e as sociedades de advogados (brock et al. 1999; eleazar et al. 2019; greenwood e suddaby 2006; muzio et al. 2013; scott 2008). Não há dúvida de que as universidades são organizações profissionais que operam em ambientes institucionalizados. Embora as universidades tenham sido estudadas (schofer e meyer 2005), as escolas profissionais específicas dentro das universidades têm sido estudadas incluem faculdades de direito (sauder e espeland 2009) e escolas médicas (dunn e jones 2010). As profissões e a mudança institucional nas escolas de negócios raramente são investigadas. Este artigo contribui assim para a literatura sobre profissões e mudança institucional, começando a preencher a lacuna com foco nas escolas de

negócios. O nosso objetivo é primeiro desenvolver um modelo multinível para explicar os fatores por detrás da difusão da lista "a" e, em seguida, prever o seu provável impacto na futura bolsa de estudo.

CONCLUSÃO

A forma como escolhemos fazer pesquisa, publicar e competir como uma comunidade de estudiosos num mundo plano revela muito sobre como a nossa profissão organiza a disciplina e como valorizamos a produção de conhecimento de uma determinada forma. Claramente, como membros de uma comunidade escolar profissional, estamos familiarizados com os processos de profissionalização que afetam numerosas outras organizações. No entanto, curiosamente, tem sido dada relativamente pouca atenção à investigação à profissionalização da nossa própria profissão (peng et al. 2018b: p. 271). Este artigo defende que precisamos de dedicar alguma atenção à forma como organizamos o nosso mundo de bolsas de estudo numa era de competição global. Em termos teóricos, a difusão e adoção de uma lista formal de "a" pode ser conceptualizada como a formalização de normas informais. "as profissões são, elas próprias, instituições que, ao longo dos últimos 30 anos, sofreram profundas alterações" (muzio et al. 2013: p. 699). Por conseguinte, uma melhor compreensão de como os académicos, as escolas e as partes interessadas respondem estrategicamente a tais ambientes institucionais em mudança tem potencial para contribuir significativamente para a visão baseada na instituição de um ângulo anteriormente subexplorado (peng 2003; peng et al. 2009; peng et al. 2018b; peng et al. 2008; scott 2008).

Em traços gerais, o debate sobre a ascensão e difusão da lista "a" parece ser mais um episódio do debate sobre convergência versus divergência no contexto mais vasto da globalização. Enquanto os defensores da convergência celebram a glória da lista "a", os defensores da divergência criticam a sua tirania. Para os não-e.u.a. estudiosos que se queixam da hegemonia dos eua, como a sua necessidade de citar teorias e autores americanos, precisamos lembrá-los que não há muito tempo, os sociólogos dos eua, num esforço para aumentar a legitimidade do seu trabalho, precisavam de "citar um alemão morto que o disse primeiro" (davis e zald 2008: p. 635). Nota de rodapé¹⁰ embora a bolsa alemã tenha perdido uma posição de liderança intelectual tão prestigiada em todo o mundo está fora do âmbito deste artigo, basta dizer que se a história for um guia, nenhuma vantagem competitiva - na academia ou nos negócios - estará para sempre na competição global.