

CAUTHE ABDC submission draft

What value does the ABDC JQL provide? Do the benefits of having the list outweigh the costs of undertaking the review?

The ABDC list offers a wide range of benefits for many stakeholders:

Scholars. The ABDC journal ranking list guides and inspire the research agenda, activities and publication outlets of scholars, and helps them plan their career and professional development. The ABDC journal ranking list is particularly important as a reference point for emerging and mid-career scholars, as it offers some guidance on which journal outlets to consider and which to dismiss.

Universities. The ABDC journal ranking list assists universities in assessing the performance of research priorities at their universities, in staff recruitment and professional development

Funding agencies. The ABDC journal ranking list assists funding agencies nationally and internationally in assessing the strength of investigators track records.

Industry. The ABDC journal ranking list assists industry in identifying quality knowledge and potential research collaborators

Government. The ABDC journal ranking list assists the government in identifying research priorities – areas in which Australia performs exceptionally well in a global context.

Continuing knowledge development in tourism. The ABDC journal ranking list is based on the Australian FOR codes. As such it acknowledges the value of tourism as a field of research. This is extremely important to ensure the continuation of knowledge development in this field which is of existential importance economically and socially to many countries around the world, including Australia.

Overall, CAUTHE members perceive that the benefits of the ABDC journal ranking list far outweigh the costs, especially given that many benefits come to fruition on the long term.

How frequently should the JQL be subjected to review?

The overall consensus of the CAUTHE members is that a review every three years represents a reasonable compromise between accounting for changes in the publication landscape and keeping the effort associated with an update reasonable.

How should reviews of journal rankings be conducted? For instance, should it be panel-based? How should these panels be appointed? Who should qualify to make submissions to the review?

Review should be panel based, using the FOR codes as classification criteria.

Panels should be established with scholars with expertise in the FOR codes they contribute to.

Panel members should consider both quantitative and qualitative indicators. Citation metrics should not be the primary driver, as there would otherwise be no point of having a separate ABDC journal ranking list.

Panel members should declare conflict of interest in a way that is visible to everyone.

Panel members should not be part of conversations involving their journals.

What factors should determine journal quality ratings? For instance, what type of metrics should be prioritised? What should be the nature of the peer review?

A wide range of quantitative metrics should be taken into consideration, keeping in mind that each metrics tells a different story.

A strong focus should be on qualitative metrics. Optimally, a set of qualitative criteria should be formulated, which may include: quality of work published, originality of work published, impact of work published on creating change, track record of sustainability of quality publications over time, the robustness of the review process, no evidence of game-playing by editors to push citation metrics

Which specific fields of research should be covered in the JQL?

Fields of research as covered by the Australian Bureau of Statistics Fields of Research (FOR codes). The ABDC list should be generous in including journals that are not primarily business journals but publish a substantial amount of business-related research.

To what extent should other journal quality lists (e.g., FT, CABs) be taken into account?

Different ranking use different evaluation criteria and processes. Each ranking is only of value if it adds insight, rather than replicated other ranking lists. Other journal rankings could be used to inform the discussion, but should not be used as a criterion for journal rating decisions.

Are the current percentage thresholds for A* (5–7% of listed journals), A (15–25%), B (25–40%), and C (remainder) journals appropriate?

Most members responded that these seem appropriate. It would be of value to explicitly list UNRANKED journals. That would be invaluable guidance for early career researchers, signalling they should avoid submitting to those journals.

Kirsten Holmes
CAUTHE Chair
13-July-2021