

# Shanghai Jiao Tong 4<sup>th</sup> International Business School Shanghai Conference

Oct. 18, 2012

## Symposium of Business School Rankings

Steven J. DeKrey, PhD  
President

Asian Institute of Management



# Beginning of MBA Media Rankings

**1983-Compared colleges**

*U.S. News*

“America’s Best Colleges”



**1988-Took Over the Brecker Study**

*BusinessWeek*

Biannual Best Full-time MBA  
Rankings

**2001**

*Wall Street Journal*  
Rankings

**1985-First Market Study**

Dick Brecker, of Brecker and Merriman  
*Wall Street Journal-Printed the results*  
“Top schools may not be top schools.”

**1999-first Global  
Ranking**

*The Financial Times*

Global MBA Rankings



**2002**

Economist Intelligence Unit/  
*The Economist*

“Which MBA” started their Rankings

## SOME BLAME RANKINGS

“U.S. business schools are locked in a dysfunctional competition for media rankings that diverts resources from long-term knowledge creation, which earned them global pre-eminence, into short-term strategies aimed at improving their rankings.”

- DeAngelo, DeAngelo, and Zimmerman, 2005  
What's Really Wrong with U.S. Business Schools?

# Schools Need to Care about rankings!

- Top reason for choosing an MBA program is **reputation.**
- Best single source of reputation data is **media rankings.**



# Results Depend on Criteria

Media Organization	Survey Criteria/ Components
<i>The Financial Times (FT)</i>	Quantitative and qualitative measures
<i>U.S. News</i>	Deans surveys
	Job placement
	Admissions data
<i>BusinessWeek</i>	Market-oriented
	– Graduate surveys
	– Employer surveys



# The Ranks are statistically **indefensible**

- Typical standard error crosses many **ranks**.
- *The Financial Times* four clusters are defensible but in small print.
- Weightings vary across rankings.
- *The Financial Times* uses PPP confidentially and may overweight salary data.



# Asian Schools Making Progress

- ***Asia Inc.*** – rankings in 1990s to 2005
  - Only Asian Schools
  - very unreliable
- ***The Financial Times*** Global MBA Rankings 2012 – 9% of Top 100 are in Asia
- ***The Economist*** “Which MBA” Rankings 2011 – 13% of 100 schools are in Asia



# What Matters Most

## *The Financial Times*



	CRITERIA	WEIGHT
1.	<b>Weighted Salary</b>	20%
2.	<b>Salary % Increase</b>	20%
3.	<b>Research Rank</b>	10%
4.	<b>International Mobility</b>	6%
5.	<b>Faculty with Doctorates</b>	5%
6.	<b>Doctoral Rank</b>	5%
7.	<b>Other Criteria</b>	34%



# What Matters Most

## *The Economist*



	CRITERIA	WEIGHT
1.	<b>New Career Opportunities</b>	35%
2.	<b>Personal Development/ Education Experience</b>	35%
3.	<b>Salary Increase</b>	20%
4.	<b>Potential to Network</b>	10%

# The HKUST FT MBA Story

- University was founded in 1991
- 2000 – ranked no. 70 out of 75
- 2012 – ranked no. 9 out of 100
- Key success factors:
  1. Diversity
  2. Research
  3. International
  4. PhD's Scholars

# FT:The Kellogg-HKUST EMBA Story

- Founded in 1998
- 2001 – FT rank no. 9
- 2009 – FT rank no. 1
- 2010 – FT rank no. 1
- 2011 – FT rank no. 1
- Key success factors:
  1. Salary
  2. International
  3. Diversity

# *The Financial Times* Rankings



The criteria of the Financial Times are defensible, and the results are helpful, so HKUST promotes them. Not all schools do: Asia Institute of Management, not yet!

# Past Results: Challenges for AIM



## PAST RESULTS

- 2009 and 2011 – Economist ranked no. 13 in Asia/Australia
- 1996 – ranked no. 3 in Asia Pacific by *Asia Inc.* (top rank)
- 2011 – ranked no. 1 in Asia by “Beyond Grey Pinstripes”

## MAJOR CHALLENGES

- Salary of graduates and diversity of recruiters should increase
- Diversity and student intake needs strengthening
- Number of Scholars and journal articles needs to increase

# Thank you!

Steven J. DeKrey, PhD  
President  
Asian Institute of Management

